**kind** (viz. is stated in what follows:  
“purporting as follows”) **by** (uttered by)  
**the sublime glory** (the words seem to be a  
way of designating God Himself. Others  
understand them of the bright cloud which  
overshadowed the company: others of the  
heaven: but the preposition **by**, in its  
only admissible meaning [see above], will  
not suit either interpretation), **This is my  
beloved Son, in whom** (literally, **on whom**)  
**I am well pleased** (the words are as in  
Matt. xvii. 5, where however we have “*in*  
whom” for “**on** whom,” and “*hear him*”  
is added. In Mark and Luke the words  
“*in whom I am well pleased*” are wanting: and in the critical text of St. Luke  
is, “*my chosen Son.*” It is worth notice,  
that the words are in an independent form  
here. **on whom** is what is culled a pregnant construction,—“on whom my pleasure has lighted and abides”).

**18.]** Substantiation of the personal testimony above adduced by reference to the  
fact. **And this voice we** (Apostles: Peter,  
James, and John) **heard borne from heaven**(not, as A. V, ungrammatically, “*this voice  
which came from heaven:*” we heard it  
borne, witnessed its coming, from heaven),  
**being with Him in the holy mount** (De  
Wette is partly right, when he says that  
this epithet “holy” shews a later view of  
the fact than that given us in the evangelistic narrative. The epithet would naturally arise when the Gospel history was  
known, as marking a place where a manifestation of this divine presence and glory  
had taken place. The place whereon Moses  
stood is said, in Exodus iii. 5, to be *holy  
ground.* So that really all we can infer  
from it is, that the history was assumed to  
be already well known: which is one entirely consistent with the probable date of  
the Epistle: see Introd. It is hardly necessary to refute Grotius’s idea, that Mount  
Sion is meant, and that the voice referred  
to is that related in John xii. 28).

**19–21.]** *The same*—i. e. the certainty  
of the coming of Christ, before spoken of,—is *further confirmed by reference to* Old Test. *prophecy*

**19.]** **And we have  
more sure** (i. e. hold more surely) **the prophetic word** (a double explanation is possible: 1) that the comparative alludes to  
what has gone before as its *reason,* as if  
it had been said, *Wherefore,* or *Now,* or  
*Henceforth* we have, &c.: i.e. ‘on account  
of this voice from heaven which we heard,  
we have firmer hold of, or esteem [possess]  
more sure, the prophetic word, as now having  
in our own ears begun its fulfilment.’ The  
great objection to such a view is, the omission of any such connecting particles as  
those above supplied. It is true the Apostle  
may have omitted them: but even supposing that, it is further against the view,  
that if such be the force of the comparative, the thought is not at all followed up  
in the ensuing verses, We come then to  
the other possible force of the comparative: 2) that it is used as comparing the  
prophetic word with something which has  
been mentioned before, as being firmer,  
more secure than that other. And if so,  
what is that other? The most obvious  
answer is, the voice from heaven: and  
this is at first sight confirmed by the consideration that one *word* would thus be  
compared with another. But then comes  
in the great difficulty. How could the  
Apostle designate the written word of  
God, inspired into and transmitted through  
men, as something firmer, more secure,  
than the uttered voice of God Himself?  
And our reply must be, that only in one  
sense can this be so, viz. as being of wider  
and larger reference, embracing not only a  
single testimony to Christ as that divine  
voice did, but “*the sufferings which were  
destined for Christ, and the glories that  
were to follow:*” as presenting a broader  
basis for the Christian’s trust, and not  
only one fact, however important. This  
is a modification of Huther’s view, which  
takes the comparison to be, that the testimony of the Transfiguration presented  
only the glory of Christ in the days of His  
flesh, whereas the prophetic word substantiates His future glory also. But this is