42—49, ST. JOIIN. 471   
   
 Joseph. 46 And Nathanael said unto him, \*Can there #B-yi#.   
 any good thing come out of Nazareth? Philip saith unto   
 him, Come and see. 47 Jesus saw Nathanael coming to   
 him, and saith of him, Behold an Israelite indeed, in »Ps3zxi.2:   
   
 whom is no guile. 48 Nathanael saith unto him, Whence $,   
 knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him,   
   
 Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the   
 fig tree, I saw thee. 49 Nathanael . iMa   
 answered and said unto &   
 him, Rabbi, ‘thou art the Son of God; thou art \* the xxv   
   
 ance on the part of Philip with Jesus. No Our Lord probably referred to Ps. xy.   
 stress can be laid, has been most unfairly 48. The remark wes overheard by   
 done, on Jesus being called by Philip, the Nathanael, and recognized as indicating   
 son of Joseph, as indicating that the his- perfect knowledge of his character. The   
 tory of His birth and childhood, as related question, Whence knowest thou me ? is one   
 by St. Matthew and St. Luke, was anknown of astonishment, but not perhaps yet of   
 to St. John. Philip expresses what was suspicion of any thing supernatural. Our   
 the prevailing belief, in ordinary words, Lord’s answer first opens this to him.   
 as Olshausen remarks. In an admirable Before that &c.] The whole form of our   
 note, Neander remarks, that by combining Lord’s answer seems to indicate that the   
 the two declarations of John, that in Jesus place where Philip called Nathanael was   
 the Eternal Word of God became flesh not now in sight, nor had been. The de-   
 (ver. 14), and that ‘that which is born of claration that Jesus had seen him there, at   
 the flesh is (ch. iii. we caunot es- once brings the conviction which he ex-   
 cape the inference, that a supernatural presses in the next verse. This would   
 working of God in the conception of the not have been the case, unless the sight   
 Ban Christ Jesus is implied. 46.) had been evidently and unquestionably   
 As Liicke observes, the meaning of this supernatural : and unless the words “ when   
 question is simpler than at first sight thou wast under the fig tree” involved this.   
 appears. It is impossible that Nathanael, Had Jesus merely seen Nathanael without   
 himself a Galilean, could speak from any being seen by him, or had “ Z saw thee”   
 feeling of contempt for Galilee generally : only expressed, ‘I knew thy character,’   
 and we have no evidence that Nazareth was at first sight, ‘although at a distance, no   
 held in contempt among the G@alileans. such immediate conviction would have fol-   
 He alluded therefore to the smallness and lowed? when thou wast under the   
 insignificance of the town in proportion fig tree, ses Wordsw., “is something more   
 to the great things which were now pre- than merely ‘under the fig tree’ would   
 dicated of it. Nazareth is never named in be: it indicates retirement thither as well   
 the O. T. nor in Josephus. 47.] The as concealment there,—perhaps for pur-   
 Evangelist certainly intends a supernatural poses of prayer and meditation.” In fact   
 insight by the Lord into Nathanael’s cha- it contains in it, ‘when thou wentest under   
 racter to be here understood; and there is the fig tree, while thou wert there.’   
 probably no reference at all to the ques- 49.] The answer expresses, ‘Thou art the   
 tion which Nathanael had just asked. To Messiah ;’ see Ps. ii. 7: xi. 27: Matt.   
 suppose that Jesus overheard that ques- xvi. 16: Luke xxii. 70. Olshausen main-   
 tion, is just one of those perfectly gra- tains that the Son of God was not a Jewish   
 tuitous assumptions which the very Com- appellation for the Messiah,—on account   
 mentators who here make this supposition of the Jews taking up stones to cast at   
 are usually the first to blame. Compare Jesus when He so called Himself, ch. x.   
 ch. ii, an Israelite indeed] ‘An But as Liicke observes, it was not for the   
 Israelite who truly answers to the inner and mere use ot this Name,—but for using it   
 honourable meaning of the name’ When in a close and literal sense which was un-   
 we reflect what was contained. in that intelligible and appeared blasphemous to   
 name, and Who it is that speaks, we can them, ‘I and My Father are one,’—that   
 hardly agree with De Wette that the they wished to stone Him; see note on   
 words are spoken merely in the spirit in ch, x.36. It was certainly not so common   
 which every nation attaches some peculiar aname as ‘the Son of David, for the Mes-   
 virtue, etl especially those of openness siah. Nathanael can hardly have meant   
 and straightforwardness, to itselt. the name in other than its popular mcan-