repeated before patience, as if to point it out to especial  
attention.  
 Moreover, there was no declension in works, but progress rather. Herein he stands favourably compared  
with the angel of Ephesus.  
  
 20. “But I have (this) against thee that thou lettest alone  
thy wife Jezebel; who calleth herself a prophetess, and teacheth  
and seduceth my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things  
sacrificed unto idols.”  
  
 In the point in which he is blamed, the angel of  
Ephesus is his superior. His unbalanced love enervated  
his resistance to evil. What a story of imperfection is  
man!  
 The Saviour now *divides the Church into two parties*,  
the guilty, and the innocent; and gives suitable admonitions to each.  
 A great deal turns upon the reading here. Our  
translation has “the woman Jezebel”: I prefer, with  
Griesbach, Scholtz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Moses  
Stuart, and Hengstenberg, “thy wife.” The latter  
observes, “That the external reasons in support of the  
first reading greatly preponderate, is clear alone from its  
admission into the text of Lachmann. How should anyone have thought of thrusting in this ‘thy’—the cross of  
expositors—into the text, if it had not originally  
existed?”  
 We can thus account for the *severity of our Lord’s  
rebuke*. This offender was *doubly under his control*.  
(1) As head of the Church, he was bound to take the  
oversight of the members of it, and *could not be ignorant  
of his wife’s proceedings*. (2) And, as *husband*, he was  
especially *bound to check conduct so lawless*.  
 It is not enough for those in authority not to favour  
what is evil: they *must resist it*, and use discipline  
against the offenders.