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 accused unto him that he 4 had wasted his goods. ® And he   
 called him, and said unto him, \* How is it that I hear this   
 of thee? ‘give am account of thy stewardship; for thou   
   
 & mayest be no longer steward. 3 Then the steward said   
 within himself, What shall I do? for my lord taketh   
 away from me the stewardship: I cannot dig; to beg I   
   
 4 render, was wasting—literally, scattering.   
   
 © see note. f render, give up the account.   
 8 render, canst.   
 steward: bear this in mind :—the whole malicious : and the why the word has   
 parabolic machinery is the standing- come eo generally signify ‘ ac-   
 going of the children this world. cusation,’ that bea charges are s0   
 in the interpretation, rich man is the ently slanderous. The steward him-   
 ty Possessor of all This is self does deny it. The charge aguinst   
 the only tenable view. Meyer, who sup- him was not, that he had wasted (A. V.),   
 poses him to be Mammon ( ding it but was wasting, his master’s In   
 the consideration that dismissal his this charge (spiritually) may see the   
 service is to being recetved into guilt of every man who is entrusted   
 everlasting habitations, it is not— the goods of our Heavenly Father. We   
 see below), involved in inextricable are all ‘scatteriug his goods’ If some   
 culties further Olshausen’s view, that one is to be found to answer to the ac-   
 he rey mts the Devil, the of this oat the analogy of ‘the Accuser of the   
 world, will be found equally untenable. ’ is too to escape us.   
 Schleformacher’s, the Romans are in- ijitm makes very little either in   
 tended, whose stewards Publicans were, missibility of construction of sense,   
 and that the debtors are the Jews, hardly whether we render, ‘why do I hear this   
 needs refuting not more refa- thee ?’ i. e. ‘what is thee?’ i. e. ‘give   
 ting, than any consistent will of some account of it.’ I prefer rather the   
 @ steward, a general former, because no opportunity of expla-   
 overlooker —very much what we under- nation what it is, given him, but he is   
 stand by an agent, or ‘a man of busi- commanded to produce his books, shew   
 ness,’ or, in the larger @ steward. how it has arisen. give up the ao-   
 They were generally of old, slaves: but count of thy stewardship; for (taking fc   
 this man is a freeman, vv. 8,4. This granted the correctness of the the   
 steward represents ly the steward not denying it) thou wilt net be   
 but also all the i.e. every man able to retain thy any longer,   
 in Christ’s Church. We are all God’s —in ordinary English, thou canst &c.   
 stewards, who oer b our Co His The impossibility lies in the nature of   
 property :—each one’s office larger thinge—thou art precluded from.   
 or cnaller trust and responsibility, The interpretation of this   
 ing to the measure entrusted to him. to the steward, is certainty, by   
 I say, especially the Publicans, because God in every one of our consciences,   
 the Twelve, and probably others, had we must give up, and give an account of,   
 relinguished all and followed Christ, our stewardship at death. The great trath   
 therefore the application the parable to lies in pack und, that that dismissal,   
 them would not be so direct: and also death itself, the consequence of seat”   
 because I cannot but put together with ne goods—the wages of sin.   
 this parable and consider as perhaps Lvetats sets before himself   
 generally by it or the zepert cf tt, the aeainty Poverty and misery. He has   
 This it was not here, Others not by Tae waste of lord’s property   
 ve supposed the steward to represent laying up any store for himself ;—that is   
 the Pharisees —bat then the parable not the point of parable ;—he has lived   
 have been addressed to them, it was softly and effeminately, cannot do an   
 not: and this view entirely in the ae honest day’s work :—dig is used for all   
 plication. was accused unto him: manual labours. This speech, of   
 the same word in the original which