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In laying before the Public the fruits of many years assiduous labour, the Author feels it incumbent on him to briefly premise the circumstances which led him to the subject, the motives which induced him to undertake so elaborate a work, the system adopted in the execution of it, and the advantages which the reader may expect to find in its use. Nearly twenty years ago, when advancing towards the close of his academical course at the University of Cambridge, and employing much of his attention upon the studies preparatory to Holy Orders, the Author, above all, anxiously and diligently explored the sources from which he might hope to derive an accurate and certain interpretation of the Scriptures. He had previously paid much attention to Classical and Oriental literature, and he hoped that these aids of philological science would, together with the assistance supplied by the ordinary guides to exegetical and doctrinal theology in our own language, suffice to furnish him with the requisite information. In this expectation, however, he was completely disappointed; nor was it without surprise that he discovered how ill furnished is the theological literature of our country in those most important (because fundamental) species of sacred annotation, the exegetical and the philological.
In further prosecuting his researches, the Author soon discovered a truth, (which few will, at this day, be disposed to question, but which was first laid down and established by the Father of all legitimate interpretation, the acute, eloquent, and judicious Chrysostom,) namely, that the only sure means of arriving at the genuine interpretation of Scripture, is first to ascertain the literal, grammatical, and historical sense, since on that alone can be founded the moral, spiritual, doctrinal, or mystical; though the latter is, not unfrequently, the more important, and sometimes the only true one. Under these circumstances, the Author was compelled to have recourse to such aids as he could find in foreign theology, and here that which had long been furnished by the indefatigable diligence of the German Divines, seemed likely to supply the very kind of annotation in which our own theological literature is so defective. In truth, he did find in them much various and valuable information of this kind, the substance of which, indeed, was often to be found in the earlier Commentators, but here digested, simplified, and moulded into a more regular and useful form; yet, not unfrequently, intermixed with new, and, in some respects, more enlightened views, at least on points of grammatical and philological discussion, for which the writers were chiefly indebted to the great masters of Grecian literature in which the eighteenth century stood so pre-eminent, as Bentley, Hemsterhusius, Valcknaer, and many others. It was not, however, without concern, that the Author found these advantages almost over-balanced by an
occasional laxity of opinions, and a latitudinarian spirit of interpretation, equally at variance with the sound principles of Orthodox Protestantism, and with the letter and spirit of Scripture in general; a temerity in hazarding hypotheses, and an excess of philological speculation that knows not where to stop, and which, by corrupting the best auxiliaries to legitimate interpretation, criticism, and philology, leaves no cure for the disorders which it breeds. This is surely, if any thing, what Pliny calls the morbus sapientiae, by which, as we learn from far higher authority, ἵππος κλός οὐ σῶτος.

Under these circumstances, it became necessary for the Author to have recourse for himself to the fountain heads of all sure interpretations, as they are found in the ancient Versions, Fathers, and Interpreters, in the earlier Commentators of the modern school, and, above all, in a diligent study of the phraseology of the sacred text itself. Various, however, and formidable were the difficulties which he had to encounter; since the materials for forming such accurate knowledge were dispersed amidst very numerous works, some of them very bulky, and many more obscure and ill digested. Forcing his way, however, through the complicated difficulties which environed him, the Author made a copious collection of such exegetical observations as he considered most useful and important, and likely to be serviceable to him in his private study, or public exposition of the Sacred Scriptures. He, moreover, at that time laid down a rule, from which he has never since deviated, namely, that whatever
might be, at any time, the nature or subject of his literary researches, to suspend his attention to the more immediate object in view, whenever an opportunity should offer itself of illustrating any passage of Scripture, or elucidating any point of theological doctrine, and to immediately enter down and record the illustrations so obtained. This plan the Author has continued to pursue for the last eighteen years, and with incalculable advantage, since some of the most apposite illustrations to be found in the present work were thus obtained. It is true that the opportunities for the acquisition of such incidental illustrations were very numerous; since, during the whole of that period, his attention was (in a most sequestered retirement) wholly devoted to classical, biblical, and literary researches in general; insomuch that, in the course of that period, every Greek author of the least importance had been critically read, and annotated upon, the most important of them twice or thrice; and of these his Classical labours, the fruits will, ere long, be laid before the Public in a new edition of Thucydides, together with an English translation of that writer, and in a series of miscellaneous emendations and illustrations of the Greek authors, especially the Historians and Dramatists. All these researches were materially aided by the incalculable advantages of a most extensive and very choice collection of the best classical and theological writers, and, what is more, were employed under the perpetual advice, and in frequent and familiar intercourse with, perhaps, the
most distinguished Scholar of his time, Dr. Samuel Parr. At the feet of this highly-gifted Gamaliel, it was very long the Author's good fortune to sit, and by him, for fifteen years, it was his pride to be regarded as a confidential friend and literary associate. Some years ago, the Author was urged, at the earnest exhortations of that revered friend, to digest and arrange for publication his Biblical collections. It may easily be conceived that such a requisition, and from such a quarter, would not be made in vain, and accordingly the task of arrangement was immediately and cheerfully entered upon. But little did the Author imagine the labor improbus that he was destined to encounter; for, in order to appreciate the value of these miscellaneous notes, it was indispensably necessary to prosecute profound researches, and institute extensive comparisons of them with the annotatory matter of the most eminent commentators of every age, and occasionally to ascend to the fountain heads of interpretations to be found in the early Versions, the ancient Fathers, and Greek Commentators. These labours had consumed a considerable time, when it occurred to the Editor, and was partly suggested by some judicious friends and faithful well-wishers of our church, and of the cause of orthodox protestantism in general, that he might engraft on his original design another of far greater importance, and thereby supply a universally acknowledged desideratum in theological literature.* It was proposed that, within

* See Mr. Horne's Introduction, Vol. 2. p. ult.
a moderate compass, and in a convenient form, he should endeavour to bring together the *disjecta membra Exegeseos*, the most important materials for the right interpretation of Scripture, hitherto dispersed amidst numerous bulky and expensive volumes; carefully digesting, condensing, simplifying, and moulding those heterogeneous materials, **including his own original notes**, into one connected and consistent body of erudite and accurate annotation, and, at the same time, intermixing with the whole a series of **critical remarks**, which might serve to guide the judgment of the student, or junior minister, amidst the contrarieties of jarring interpretations; and, finally, in order to more effectually adapt the work to general use, clothing the foreign matter in a vernacular dress, and expressing the sense in simple and perspicuous phraseology. Of this plan one of the most important advantages proposed was this, that it would render it **no longer necessary** for English Students in Divinity to have recourse to certain foreign works, however learned, of very questionable orthodoxy, and thereby obtaining the aids, valuable as they are, of exegetical and philological knowledge at too dear a rate, by the sacrifice, or, at least, depravation of sound principles in doctrinal theology. It is scarcely possible, however, for the most experienced theologian to conceive how arduous has been the task of **accomplishing** such a plan, and with what almost insuperable difficulties the Editor has had to struggle. These he has fearlessly, and he trusts not quite unsuccessfully, encountered, and, to use the words of Dr. Samuel Johnson, he
now commits his labours to the Public, with the confidence of one who has endeavoured to be useful, and who is conscious of having done his best.

Having premised thus much on his plan generally, the Editor will now proceed to further develop its details, and indicate the nature and contents of the present work. It has been, throughout, especially adapted to the use of Academical students, Candidates for Holy Orders, and all persons who possess any tolerable knowledge of the Greek of the New Testament, and it will, he hopes, materially tend to fix and establish the interpretation of the New Testament on the authority of the most eminent Commentators, both ancient and modern; and sub-serviently thereto, the phraseology is explained, and the subject matter illustrated, both from the Classical authors, and the Rabbinical writers. One peculiar feature of the work is, that the interpretations of the ancient Fathers and early Greek Commentators (as Theophylact, Theodoret, Euthymius, Õcomenius, and Aretas) together with the Scholiasts and Glossographers, have formed the basis of the exegetical and doctrinal matter, and the copious stores of Elsner, Raphel, Kypke, and Wetstein, that of the philological, or illustrative. Indeed, the present work contains the whole of the exegetical and philological annotations of Wetstein (whose New Testament has been emphatically termed by a celebrated Prelate, the invaluable book), and of the immensely numerous Classical and Rabbinical illustrations, all such as, on a diligent examination, appeared to be at all apposite, or important to the interpretation of
the New Testament. As approximating in authority to the Fathers and Greek Commentators, the Editor has assigned the next place of importance in interpretation to the works of those illustrious and orthodox Commentators of the modern School, who flourished from the glorious era of the Reformation to about the middle of the last century, and who, treading in the footsteps of a Chrysostom, an Origen, a Basil, a Gregory Nazianzen and a Jerome, completed the superstructure of legitimate interpretation, which had been originally founded, and partly raised, by the hands of those venerable Fathers of the Church.

Adverting, however, to the peculiar exigencies of the present times, and in compliance with the wishes and suggestions of some judicious friends, equally interested in the welfare of our Church, and attached to the cause of orthodoxy in general, the Editor has been induced to make by far the most ample selection from the exegetical and philological annotations of the foreign Commentators of the last half century; as Wetstein, Heumann, Kypke, Koecher, Carpzov, Ernesti, Bengel, Morus, Storr, Valcknaer, Michaelis, Fischer, Koppe, Pott, Henrichs, Knapp, Jaspis; and especially Rosenmuller, Kuinoel, and Tittman; from whose ample stores the Editor has largely profited; insomuch that it will, in future, be little necessary for the Student to resort to the works themselves. The Editor has, moreover, carefully compiled all important illustrations of the New Testament from the Classical writers found in the works of Grotius, Pricæus, Bos, Alberti, Homberg, Elsner, Raphel, Abresch, Palairet, Pincinelli,
Krebs, Munthe, Loesner, Kypke, and Wetstein; and, of our own countrymen, Blackwall, Wakefield, and Bulkley, including his own copious collections, formed gradually in a diligent study of the Classical writers during the last eighteen years. Nor has the Editor omitted to avail himself of the valuable aids to be found in the illustrations of the Scriptures from the Rabbinical writers, as collected by Cartwright, Dru-sius, Buxtorf, Lightfoot, Pococke, Hackspan, Surenhusius, Lampe, Schoettgen, Meuschen, Wetstein, and others, of which all that were found directly opposite have been adopted, though generally with abridgment, and often translated into English. Nor have the highly meritorious labours of our great English Theologians, of every age, been overlooked or undervalued, though the Editor has derived comparatively few materials from that quarter, partly because he supposed that the works of those Divines were generally in the hands of his readers, and especially since few of them supply much of those kinds of matter of which the present work is chiefly composed, i.e. exegetical and philological. The reader, however, will find several valuable annotations derived from that quarter, both exegetical and doctrinal; of these latter, indeed, the number would have been greater, had not the Editor wished to avoid the adoption of such as had already been extracted, and are to be found in the valuable Family Bible of Dr. D’oyly and Bp. Mant, or in those of Mr. Hewlett, or Dr. Adam Clarke, in Mr. Horne’s Introduction, or the Abstracts of Mr. Elsley and Mr. Slade.

In order to a fuller comprehension of the system
on which the Editor has acted, in the adoption, or rejection, or modification of matter, it will be necessary for him briefly to advert to the kind of interpretation which he has aimed at forming, and which, being founded in those sure and immutable canons of criticism that have been long so successfully adopted in the interpretation of the Classical writers, must (it is conceived) be the only certain means of attaining the true sense of Scripture.

In stating these his notions of legitimate and accurate interpretation, the Editor cannot do better than employ the words of one of the most distinguished Theologians of this age, and to whom the present work is deeply indebted, the very learned and orthodox Dr. Tittman, Superintendant of the Diocese of Dresden:—“In tractandis autem Scripturis, securi sumus, sequendamque putavimus semper rationem eam, quam omni tempore interpretes non tantum Librorum Sacrorum, verum etiam auctorum classicorum, in hoc genere principes, (hoc est, literarum Hebraicarum, Graecarum, Latinarumque peritissimi,) existimaram esse legitimam, certam, et unicè veram, homineque erudito dignam, quae grammatica dicitur; hoc est, eam, quae idoneis literarum copiis adjuta sensum verborum, per usus loquendi, vestigia, et alia Grammaticorum præidia, reperire instituit, repertam accommodatè ad cujusque linguae indolem exprimit, rationibus certis e Grammaticorum disciplinis confirmat, atque ex verbis, rectè intellectis, rerum scientiam assequitur.”

“Interpretationem eam, quæ nititur literarum Hæbraicarum, Graecarum, Latinarumque scientià justâ
et accuratâ, præceptisque grammaticis et rhetoricis atque aliis præsidiiis, usitatis in explicatione auctorum classicorum, statuerunt omni tempore viri eruditiissimi, unìcè veram, legitimam, et certam esse, atque ad veritatem et cognoscendam et defendendam fructuosam, eamque existimarunt accuratius cognosci ac disci non posse, quâm ab interpretibus et criticis scriptorum classicorum: hos, inculcarunt, consulendos esse ante omniam, ab unoquoque qui ad explicandos Libros Sacros accedere voluerit; horum severam disciplinam imitari oportere interpretem Scripturarum Sacrarum, quos videamus versatos esse in explicandis libris humanis curâ, diligentia, reverentia, modestia, religione adeo tanta, ut revocarent omnia diligentissimè ad præceptorum grammaticorum subtilitatem et observationum veritatem.”

Such, then, is the kind of interpretation which the Editor has systematically endeavoured to form; with what success he must now leave to his learned and candid readers to determine. One thing he must be permitted to observe, namely, that in the selection of matter, as well as in the adjustment of jarring interpretations, he has been guided by the strictest impartiality. His maxim has ever been—“Tros Rutuluvse fuat, nullo discrimine habebo; or, in the words of Plato, (de Republ. 614.) ἃπο ἅ ἡ λόγος, ἀντερ πνεύμα, φέρετ, ταύτῃ ἱερω. Though unfeignedly and conscientiously attached to the Church of which he has the honour to be a Pastor, yet the Editor has endeavoured to preserve the strictest impartiality in adjusting the interpretation of all those texts on which any difference of opinion unhappily subsists.
among the various denominations of professing Christians. So far, indeed, from willingly aggravating the bitterness of the *odium theologicum*, he would rather sound an *Irenicum* to his ministerial brethren, of every denomination, that Ephraim might no longer envy Judah, nor Judah vex Ephraim; that all (considering the doubtfulness and, in truth, the unimportance of many controverted points,) might agree to differ, ever remembering the maxim of Augustin—*Melius est dubitare de occultis quàm litigare de incertis.*

The utility, and even necessity of such a work as the present, is too obvious to need insisting upon. In order to place us on a fair footing in the contest which we have perpetually to maintain both against Infidels and Sceptics, it is surely necessary that the true sense of Scripture, to which we continually appeal, should be, at length, fully and satisfactorily ascertained. But this cannot be done without ridding ourselves of immense masses of learned lumber which have hitherto rather encumbered than assisted our exertions. It has been said, and perhaps truly, that, if the Scriptures were well understood, there would be no Infidels. Now, the Editor trusts he is not too sanguine in hoping that the present work may materially tend to remove the prejudices of unbelievers, by shewing them that the New Testament *is* capable of a most rational and consistent interpretation. It may, moreover, he is willing to hope, induce some of his fellow Christians, professing Socinian tenets, to re-consider the grounds on which the opinions they so confidently promulgate are
are really founded; thus they cannot, surely, fail to see how decidedly both the testimony of Scripture and the weight of authority are against them. Upon the whole, the work will be equally calculated to silence the infidel, and refute both the sceptic and the fanatic.

The foolish and irreverent speculations of what are termed the Rationalists, the Editor has not thought worthy of notice, much less refutation; for, as Dr. Tittman truly observes, "melius est opiniones ejusmodi seu potius figmenta manifesta, silentio præteriisse quàm commemorâsse."

The reader will observe that the Editor has not given any Introductions to the Books, with the exception of the Gospel of St. John (to which he has prefixed a free translation of the valuable Prolegomena of Dr. Tittman), and, for this reason, since he considered that almost all his readers were already in possession of the masterly works of Bp. Tomline, Professor Michaelis, Bishop Marsh, and especially Mr. Horne's most useful Introduction; in which there is so admirable a concentration of all the most important information collected from the most eminent Theologians, on the subject of Biblical criticism and interpretation, that it may be considered almost indispensable to every student in theology. For nearly the same reason the Editor has declined many discussions of ordinary and familiar questions; such information, when required, may be found in the useful abstracts of Mr. Elsley and Mr. Slade, and the Treatises on Sacred Geography and Antiquities, including Mr. Horne's Introduction. In fact, in order...
to accomplish this synoptic concentration of erudite exposition and enlightened illustration within any moderate limits, the Editor has been compelled systematically to omit, not only such minor details as those just adverted to, but also all conjectural emendations whatsoever, including minute critical discussions on unimportant various readings; and, moreover, whatever matter is purely controversial or polemical, and, finally, (with few exceptions,) whatever is merely practical. In order the more effectually to accomplish the above desirable objects, the utmost condensation and compression of the matter has been adopted consistent with perspicuity, and the utmost brevity of style admissible with propriety of language.

The Editor must not omit to state that, for reasons not necessary to be detailed to the Public, his plan was not fully developed before the 12th chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel. To effectually remedy, however, any deficiency, it is his intention to prepare for publication with the 2d Part (which will, he calculates, appear about January next), an Appendix, by which that portion will be treated of as much in detail as the rest. Typographical errors in so elaborate and critical a work were unavoidable. They will, however, the Editor believes, be found comparatively few and unimportant, and for this his great distance from the press, and the difficulties arising from the obscurity of his place, will, he trusts, be thought a sufficient excuse. Moreover, in uniting such disjecta membra, heterogeneous in themselves, frequently derived from va-
rious languages, and requiring (if he may be allowed the expression) a sort of literary dove-tail- ing, the Editor fears he may not always have attained the lucidus ordo, nor, in every instance, succeeded in representing the true sense (often obscure and involved) of his author, though sometimes (he must beg to observe) he has taken the liberty not only of lopping off excrescences, and compressing rambling reasonings, but even of supplying a link in the chain of argument, or of substituting a simpler explanation in the place of a recondite one; liberties not unwarrantable, and such as may be defended by the high authority of the translators of Michaelis and Matthæi's Greek Grammar. The Editor must not omit to observe that he has, with great diligence, formed glossarial notes, similar to those of Bp. Blomfield on Æschylus, on all the words, phrases, and formulas of the least importance or difficulty, by which the Student will generally be spared the irksome task of turning over the pages of Lexicons. These the Editor trusts will be found eminently serviceable, especially to his younger readers.

If it be permitted to the Author to advert to minor matters, he would say that the types, typography, and paper are such as might be expected from the disciplined skill and experience of the Printer, and the well-known liberality of the Publisher. The Editor may be permitted to observe, that as he has spared no labour, so neither has he declined any expense which might be necessary to the furtherance of his work, by the pur-
chase of every exegetical or philological publication of the least importance. On the present important undertaking he may be said, indeed, to have expended a fortune, and hence he confidently throws himself on the patronage and support of the Church to which he has especially dedicated these his best services, and in whose cause he only asks to be enabled to labour more effectually, so that (to use the words of Lord Bacon) as he has hitherto lived to study, he may not henceforth be compelled to study to live. Though, at the present, he can, with equal truth and concern, apply to his own case the impressive words of the Mantuan Bard—

"Grandia sæpe quibus mandavimus hordea sulcis, 
Infelix lolium, et steriles dominantur avenæ."

On the utility of such a plan as the present in developing the details of any extensive branch of knowledge, there can be but one opinion. Synoptical Digests have long been found eminently serviceable in the study of the Law, nor will they prove less useful in that of Theology, and, as books are rapidly multiplying, and knowledge is perpetually on the increase, they must soon be indispensable. There is, perhaps, no science which more strongly impresses on the minds of students the truth of the impressive adage, Art is long, and life is short; since it is so extensive as to require some aid from almost every other, and calculated to fully employ the labours of the longest life. Economy, too, of time, must, to all persons, at every period of life, be
considered highly important, but especially to such as are prosecuting a course of Academical education, are occupied in preparation for the ministry, or are engaged in the discharge of its important, but imposing duties. Nor can it be improper for the Editor to advert to the very considerable saving of expense which the possession of this work will occasion to all those who aspire to attain an accurate interpretation of the most difficult of all books, or to form correct views on the most momentous of all subjects. This is, indeed, a result of his labours, which, considering the very limited means of most of his Ministerial brethren, of every denomination, he cannot but contemplate with peculiar satisfaction.

The Editor must not conclude this slight sketch of his plan without adverting to one other important and original feature of his work, which is calculated to stamp a peculiar authority on it; namely, that each portion has been, wherever it was practicable, fairly ascribed to its respective author,* and where various interpretations are detailed, the names of the principal Commentators and Critics by whom each has been maintained, are generally stated; thus is united the satisfactoriness and definite authority of a Corpus Variorum, with the convenience and perspicuity of a Critical Digest.

* Such Annotations as have no signature are usually either entirely, or in a great degree, original; though occasionally the Editor can claim no higher credit than that of having diligently collected together many scattered fragments, each too minute to be ascribed to its respective author, into one mass, and sometimes moulded the whole anew by the adoption of his own phraseology.
Finally, in the present work there will be found by far the greatest quantity of valuable exegetical and philological matter ever yet brought together, no inconsiderable portion of which has been hitherto unknown, or inaccessible to many men of learning, but which now, by being thus collected, digested, simplified, and translated into the vernacular tongue, will be, as it were, engrafted into English theological literature, be brought, in some measure, within the reach of every tolerably well educated person, and thus be made available to the religious instruction of all intelligent and well-informed Christians.

The Editor has only to offer up his devout thanks to that Being by whose gracious support he has been enabled to accomplish so considerable a portion of his arduous undertaking, and his prayers that He would be pleased to bless it with usefulness, to the illustration of those sacred records and that divine religion in which the Editor feels so deep a personal interest, to which he has dedicated much of his youth, most of his maturity, and is prepared to devote the whole of his future life.

*Tugby, May 30, 1826.*
CORRECTIONS.

ST. MATTHEW, VOL. I.

Page 2, line 19, for should he, read should be—p. 7, mid. read ὅξινα—p. 8, read peccatori spem—p. 8, beg. Suicers—p. 90, l. 5, for Menschenius, read Meuschenius—p. 33, l. 14, for from, read for—p. 33, about mid. for for, read from—p. 37, mid. for digitii, read digito—p. 40, for Psalm, read 2 Samuel—p. 49, for collectanea, read collectaneae—p. 52, l. 3, read Ω πόλον—p. 57, read διαφήνων—p. 66, l. 30, for are, read were—p. 59, about end, for ῥήφθαι, read ῥήπεραι—p. 61, read projiciis—p. 80, beg. read κατάκεισθαι—p. 96, read Gataker—p. 102, about end, for He, read She—p. 140, l. 39, for is, read as—p. 140, l. 39, read when Abraham's servant asks—p. 168, read καθὼ—p. 231, l. 25, for he, read be—p. 259, l. 27, for was, read were—p. 262, line 6 from bottom, for notion, read nature—p. 274, read ἵκον—p. 277, read possum—p. 280, l. 10, for where, read whether—p. 288, l. 24, for by means, read by no means—p. 301, l. 13, for in produce came, read in produce had come—p. 307, about end, for δεινοκλητόρες—p. 356, for προσάκιν, read ὠσίκιν—p. 356, about end, for Hercul. read Heracl.—p. 361, l. 17, after destruction, dele that—p. 381, l. 23, for I say, read I see—p. 382, mid. read adultus—p. 392, about end. read ἐκφεύγει—p. 527, l. 26, read they heard Jesus, in dying, address God—p. 549, l. 8, for word, read world.

ST. MARK, VOL. 2.

Page 6, line 8, dele of—p. 13, l. 3, for obtain, read remain—p 52, l. 28, for argue, read agree—p. 57, l. 27, for Bezar, read Beza—p. 95, l. 4, after could be denied insert from—p. 97, l. 16, for prior to the fruit, read after the fruit—p. 106, l. 13, for whom, read which—p. 107, l. 4, from bottom, for it was, read it was not—p. 112, l. 23, for had ordered, read had ordained—p. 187, read ἀπορωθη—p. 231, read ἐχαβη—p. 238, read συνώνυμος—p. 263, read εἰπροδέκτον—p. 366, read νομικὸς—p. 381, mid. read ἡστῦ—p. 388, mid. read ἐργασίαν—p. 397, mid. read ἐγραι.

ST. LUKE, VOL. 2.

Page 230, line 22, read celebrated—p. 257, l. 29, for be extended, read shall be extended—p. 269, l. 18, for were formed, read were well formed—p. 307, l. 32, for has been, read had been—p. 352, l. 22, for is applied, read is here applied—p. 354, l. 20, for of prayed, read of prayer—p. 472, l. 17, for Pharisee, read Publican.
xxiv

CORRECTIONS.

ST. JOHN, VOL. 3.

Page 19, sub. fin. read Sturz.—p. 30, l. 17, for live, read to live—p. 52, read λεγομένων—p. 63, ult. for benevolence, read malevolence—p. 63 sub. med. read πιστοτευχείν—p. 69, sub fin. read βεβηροποιεῖν p. 106, l. 2, for readily, read ready—p. 109, l. 27, for Ephesian, read Ephraimitic—p. 110, l. 10, from bottom note, for fortified, read mortified—p. 140, 6 from bottom, for condemn, read condemn—p. 147, read προβατικός—p. 160, l. 8, note, for mother, read other—p. 171, l. 4, from bottom, for national, read natural—p. 188, l. 6 from bottom, for five hundred, read five thousand—p. 198, l. 2 from bottom, note, for where, read whose—p. 213, l. 1, for unless he, read but he—p. 217, l. 6, after in the sense, dele of—p. 237, l. 5, for addressed him, read addressed them—p. 254, penult, read σκηνοπηγία—p. 262, sub fin. read καρδία—p. 281, l. 4 from bottom, for know, read knew—p. 282, l. 34, for so many, read very many—ibid., l. 11 from bottom, read no probable one—p. 327, sub. med. for ξηρῷ, read ξηρῷ—p. 427, Arist, read Alcest.—p. 480, med. read κρὺ—p. 490, sub med. read ἐπὶ τιθέντων—p. 562, about end, read μεμερισθεῖν—p. 564, about end, for τερρήσει read τερρήσει—p. 576, about mid. read diessessu—p. 689, mid. read ἐφερε—p. 705, about beg. read Longinus—p. 717, l. 23, read καλυψαμένων.
ST. MATTHEW.

CHAP. I.

VERSE 1. Βιβλος γενεσεως Ιησου Χριστου. Some commentators interpret the words thus: Historia vitae rerumque a Christo gestarum, thus applying them to the whole of the Gospel. The sense, however, of the phrase, βιβλος γενεσεως, has led others, more correctly, to limit them to the genealogy, v. 2—16, or, at most, to the two first chapters. The true force of the phrase seems to be this: “the roll (or book) of the genealogy of Jesus Christ,” i.e. a genealogical table. The word βιβλος denotes not only a book, but a catalogue or index, as Genesis, 5, 5; and γενεσεως, amongst its other significations, bears that of a race, or progeny, as Genes. 6, 9. Vide Schleus. Lex. on the Old Test. To pass from words to things, the purpose and intent of the Evangelist, in giving the genealogical table, is to shew the fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham in Jesus Christ. He therefore runs through the order of generations, for the confirmation of our faith, it being so often signified, and so much insisted in the prophetical writings, that the promised Messiah was to be of the lineage of Abraham, and of David. Vide Calvin. Instit. 2, 12, 3. and Wetstein on the New Test. 1, 225. and Leo in Nativ. Serm. X. cited by Bulkley.

1. νικου Αβρααμ. The word νικου was used by the Hebrews and the Hellenists to signify not only son, VOL. I.
but grandson, &c. even to the whole race, which may be expressed by our word descendant. It is observed by Vossius, de Idolol. l. I. c. 37, p. 277, cited by Bulkley, "qui filium genuit, nepotem etiam, et omnem ejus genuisse posteritatem censetur." The same observation applies to γεννάω, v. 8. which is used with the same latitude as the Hebrew יִנְבּ, of which see Gesenii Lex. Hebr. and Rosenmüller Scholia, in loc. Wetstein observes, "Caute autem; nec ab Adamo communi hominum parente incepit, neque Esavum Ismaelem in catalogo recensuit, ne Judeos, quibus scribėbat, offenderet." Vide infra, 8, 9. Joan. 8, 39. Rom. 9, 7.

2. The reason for mentioning brethren, (which was not usual in genealogies) Wetstein thinks was this, to answer the objection of the Jews, who stumbled at Jesus being preferred to his brethren. Vide Matth. 13, 55, 57. It may seem strange, too, the women, as here Thamar, should be mentioned; but Thamar was one of the four women of whom the Jews were especially proud. The others were, Rahab, Ruth, and Bathsheba. See the very copious Rabbinical citations ap. Wetstein, who thus concludes his very long annotation: "Qui Thamarem, Rahab, Ruth, et Bathshebam, in genere Messiae numerari gloriabantur, quid habent quod in Mariā Virgine cavilentur? quique aperta crimina excusant, cur jam ad inanes suspiciones tam sunt proclives, si non studio partium ducuntur? Cur vitiligitationibus suis Doegum et ipsum Samulem imitari potius, quâm a falsâ criminatione abstinere maluerunt?"


11. Si quis quaerat quem morem secutus Mattheus, rationes ita inieret, ut ex 14. ter sumtis non nisi 41. conficerat,—respondeo; secutum esse morem medicorum in numerandis diebus criticis. Vide Galen. in Hippocr. de Prænot. 3. et Hippocr. Aphor. 2.
Eodem fere modo Judei numerant tempus duplicis Nasiræatus esse 59 dies; quia dies 80 ultimus dies primi Nasiræatus, et primus secundi habetur. Wetstein.

11. ἐν τῇς μετοικεσίαις Βασσαλῶν. Sub. about, not many years before; and then μετὰ τὴν μ. at the time of the exile: which signification is somewhat rare, and almost confined to the Hellenists; though in Josephus, a writer of almost Attic purity, we find it, (in Antiq. 1, 12, 2.) δν (Isaacum) εὕσε μετ' ὦγὸν ἣμέραν περίτεμνοσ. —On the word μετοικεσία there is abundance of matter in Wetstein: the article, however, in Schleusner's Lexicon, edit. ult. may suffice for the purposes of a student.

16. The race of Christ is traced in the manner of Scripture and the Hebrew canons, not from Mary, but from Joseph. Since from what follows it is manifest that Jesus was not the natural son of Joseph, the consequence is, that we must take him for the adoptive son. That adoptive sons passed into the family of him by whom they were adopted is well known. When, therefore, Joseph had taken Mary as his wife, and Jesus as a son and heir sent from God, it is manifest that Jesus was inserted and grafted into his family. Unless we admit this, to what family will be referred? for the maternal race is not taken into account. Wetstein; who then proceeds to observe, that γενεά is used both of the father and mother. His examples, however, are solely from the later Greek writers.


In the verse preceding, λεγόμενος is used for ἄν, by a sort of idiom not confined to the Hebrew, but found in the best Greek writers, especially poets, commencing with Homer, τοῦ δὲ κε νικήσαντι φίλη κεκληκατος ἄκωτις.
18. *μυστερίων* γάρ. Nempe, scilicet, nimirum. Of this signification Wetstein gives examples, as also do Palairet, Raphael, Beza, and Glass, who tell us it is redundant. It has, however, a reference to a sentence. Vide Krebs in loc. Hoogeve. de Partic. Gr. Sturzii Lex. Xenoph. and Schweigh. Lex. Herodoteum.

18. *πρὶν* ἢ *συνελθεῖν* αὐτῶς. The verb *συνελθεῖν* properly signifies coire, rem habere (like the Latin convenire); so, 1 Cor. 7, 5. Palæph. 50. 1. Other examples are produced by Kuinoel; but it is also used, as here, of the whole of the celebration of marriage, including the deductio in domum mariti, and the subsequent nuptial festivity; which has been established and illustrated by Loesner, Raphael, and Kypke.

18. *εὑρέθη* ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα. Rosenmuller and Kuinoel, after Olearius, take *εὐρε* for *η ἕκευσα*, i. e. *ἐχε*, accounting it an Hebraism, which, however, Kypke denies, alleging Joseph. Antiq. 7, 7. *μὴ βοηθεία τῶν φιλῶν εὑρίσκω τῷ κυνδύνῳ διαφυγαί*; also a passage of Hierocles, which, however, is not to the purpose, because there is no participle. The Hebraism, however, is questionable; nay, the opinion of Harenburg ap. Koecher is not devoid of probability, who understands the word to denote or allude to that inspection by midwives or matrons, which, in such a case, was usual among the Jews.

18. *ἐν γαστρὶ* ἔχουσα. Of this phrase numerous examples are collected by Wetstein from Herodotus, Pausanias, Artem. and Athen. Subaud *ἐμβρυον*; so Genes. 38, 18.

18. *ἐκ πνεύματος* ἀγίου. These words are regarded by Beza and Markland as a marginal note. Perhaps Matthew speaks *per prolepsin*, by anticipation. Wetstein observes, that all miracles are in Scripture referred to the Holy Spirit. Kuinoel translates *per vim divinam*, comparing Luke 1, 34, 35, where *πνεῦμα* ἀγίου is explained *δύναμις υἱόστου*. Compare Luke 11,
20. Matt. 12, 28. It is observed by Kuinoel, that scarcely any of the nations of antiquity were without these παρθενογένεις. He then cites a very curious passage of Hieronym. contr. Jovin. 1, 26. “Apud gymnosophistas Indiæ, quasi per manus hujus opinionis auctoritas traditur, quod Buddam, principem dogmatis eorum, a latere suo virgo generavit. Nec hoc mirum de barbaris, cum Minervam quoque de capite Jovis et Liberrum patrem de femore ejus procreatos, doctissima finixerit Graecia.”

19. δίκαιος ἄν. On the interpretation of this word there has been much diversity of opinion. I accede to that of Grot. Hamm. Æler. Gatak. Michael Rosenm. Kuinoel, who render it benignus, æquus, humanus; so in Theophy. Chrysost. confirmed by the Ethiopic and Persic version. We have a similar idiom, when we say a worthy good man. The Hebrew נבז has a similar use, in not a few passages. Vid. Gesenii Lex. Hebr. See Schleus. Lex. in ν. So Ἀσχyl. Choeph. 660. ἔως, λέγουσ᾽ ἄν εἰ τι δεῖ πάρεστι γὰρ. Θερμὰ λουτρὰ, καὶ πόνων θελκηρία, στροφίν δικαίων τ᾽ ὁμάτων παρουσία, kind looks. Compare a beautiful passage of Apollodorus, apud Athenaeum, p. 3. C. and Euripid. Elect. 858; also, in Thucyd. 1. 1, 76. δικαιότεροι is explained by the Scholiast μετριότεροι, which interpretation is confirmed by the subsequent words of Thucyd. ἀλλοι—εἰ τι μετριάζομεν—εἰ τοῦ ἐπι εἰκος. Thus also the Latin writers, e. gr. Horat. Serm. 2, 1, 70. Scilicet uni æquus virtuti atque ejus amicis. Id. Carm. 3, 18, 4. parvis æquus alumnis.

19. παραδειγματίζειν. Not being willing to expose her; namely, to disgrace and punishment, by denouncing her to the judge as adultera, which involved the punishment of stoning. See Deuteron. 22, 23. To do this, Joseph was induced, 1st, by lenity; 2d, the care of his own reputation; 3d, the care of his own tranquillity; 4th, and lastly, his love of her, which could not be so soon extinguished. Wetstein.


20. τ. δ. α. ε. ἄγγελος Κυρίου κατ᾽ ὅναρ ἐφάνη αὐτῷ. There is a very similar passage (perhaps imitated from hence) in Philostr. Vit. Apoll. 14, 34. διενοῦ μένῳ δὲ αὐτῷ ταύτα ἐγένετο ὅναρ τοιὸν: nor are such imitations unfrequent in Philostratus, as I can affirm after twice carefully perusing that curious author. Indeed, I have found that most of the philosophical and ethical writers after the first century profited by the Scriptures of the New, and even of the Old Testament. The subject is curious, and even important, but does not admit of being here enlarged upon.

20. ίδου, ἄγγελος Κυρίου. Markland, in Bowyer’s Conjectures on the New Testament, has thrown out some observations on the use of ίδου here and in some other passages, which I am surprised should have come from so admirable a scholar. He thinks the ίδου was often put in by the Evangelist (in a sense equivalent to—attend, reader!), or was foisted in by some Christian as a kind of N. B. This, he thinks the case in Luke 23, 14 and 15, and in innumerable other cases. I must be permitted to question whether it ever owes its origin to either of the two causes just stated.

The truth is, that as in the Hebrew כַּל perpetually occurs, so in the Hellenistic Greek does ίδο, and sometimes ecce in the Latin, as in Virg. Aen. 2, 270. “in somnis, ecce, ante oculos mostissimus Hector visus adesse mihi.”

In the Greek of the classical writers it is indeed rare: but there are examples, as in Euripid. Herc. Fur. 1066. Matth. ίδο, τί δεσμοῖς, νοὺς ἄγωσ, ἀφρωγμένος—πρόσεμι κ.τ.λ. where I am surprised that Mus-
grave should stumble at the ἵδον, and conjecture ἵνα, which would be quite unsuitable to the dignified firmness of Hercules, as it is well represented by the present reading.


20. παραλαβέων Μαρίαμ. Sibi adjungere, in domum deducere. It is spoken with an allusion to the parents, or others, by whom the woman was given in marriage. Wetstein cites Xenoph. O Econ. Arrian. Exp. Alex. 7, 4. Lucian. Toxar. Ἀ. Timon. 17. Joseph. Antiq. 1, 19, 7. The phrase is elliptical; the words εἰς οἴμαν are supplied in Lucian. Timon.

20. τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννήθην. A common mode of speaking of the fetus in utero, since its sex is yet unknown. Of this idiom Wetstein adduces numerous examples. The following may suffice: Luc. 1, 95. τὸ γεννόμενον ἐκ σοῦ ἁγίου; Herodo. 1, 29 and 30. Lucian. Dial. Prom. et Jov. τὸ τεχθὲν; Tim. 52. τὸ γεννησόμενον; Aristot. Polit. 1, 8. τὸ γεννηθὲν; Lucian. D. Mer. 2. οὐ γὰρ εὕος τὸ τεχθὲν; Plutarch, Thes. 40. E. ἂν ὡς εἴπος ἐκ ποιῶν ἔσται τὸ γεννηθέν.

20. διὰ νεύματος ἁγίου. That God could cause that a virgin should conceive δίκαι κοινωνίας ἀνθρώπων, no one will readily deny, who believes that the first man was born without father or mother, and that all the dead will return to life. Of the calumnies of Celsus, and of the Jews, there is no need to speak; they may be found in Origen. C. Cels. 1, p. 25. and in Wagenseil's Tela ignea Satanae. The wonder is, that in the present age not only the adversaries of the Christian Religion, but even theologians, should have disputed against it; some who admit it, accounting it as a mere philosophical Myth, which opinion is detailed by Kuinoel. Rosenmuller (from
whom the preceding matter is derived) and Seiler defend the truth and dignity of the miracle.

21. καλέσεις τὸ ἱγμα αὐτοῦ, i. e. thou shalt call him. This, according to Vorstius, is a Hebraism; so 1 Sam. 1. 20. Psalm 147. 4. That it is also a Graecism appears from Eurip. Jon. 74. cited by Wetstein. Comp. Luke 1. 18, 31. 2, 21.

21. σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτοῦ, i. e. will give salvation. “Peccata sunt res periculorum plena, quia hominem poenis gravissimis reddunt obnoxium: ab hoc periculo eripit, liberat servatque Christus, redemptione factâ per sanguinem suum, et veniâ per prædicationem Evangeliæ oblatâ. Igitur per salutem hic intelligitur remissio peccatorum, non quae peccatori Spem impunitatis et licentiae faciat, sed quae seriam resispicientiam, emendationem vitæ, animique a prioribus vitius purgationem requirat, cujus consequens est securitas perfecta, et spes certa æternæ felicitatis. Quæ omnia, ut sua natura sunt concatenata, voce salutis seu liberationis a periculo non imperfectæ brevisque, sed plenæ et Deo dignæ, significantur.” Wetstein. I add Max. Tyr. Diss. 34. 1. tom. 2, 153. ἰδοὺ ἡμῖν γένοιτο ζωὴν ιατρεῖς; who seems to have a reference to this. See the annotation just before (ver. 20). To my reader I need make no apology for the length of the following extract from a justly distinguished theologian, which contains the most luminous exposition that has yet appeared of the true sense of this very important word: “The verb σῴζειν, to preserve or save; and σώζωμαι, to escape, to be preserved or saved, occur perhaps more than one hundred times in the New Testament. The significations may be classed under four general heads. I. To preserve generally, from any evil or danger whatsoever. II. To preserve from sickness, or any bodily disorder; to heal. This sense is the most easy to distinguish; yet it has not been duly attended to in every instance by our translators. III. To preserve from the temporal anger of the Al-
mighty, such as was manifested in the destruction of Jerusalem. This notion appears to have been originally founded upon expressions in the Jewish Prophets. IV. To give future salvation in Heaven.

"It might have been desirable to have confined the use of the word save to those passages which come under the fourth class. Those in the third might have been interpreted, to put in the way, or into a state of salvation." Dr. Maltby's Sermons, vol. II. p. 546.

22. Ιησαῖος ἀνεπαφός τῷ ἡθέν. "Solebant Judæi etiam rebus in facto positis premittere vaticinia, vaticiniis que inexpectatos rerum eventus attexere et accommodare, omnis quodam amabant loqui vocibus et formulis e V. T. desumtis; imprimis tum quoque, cum similitudine quædam inter locum V. T. et rem de qua sermo erat, intercedebat. Hinc verba נַחְלָה et מִלּ, ut formulæ πληρωθήσων et τελεσθήσων in libris Rabbin. et N. T. variè occurrunt. Atque oracula et effata prophetarum πληρωθήσων et τελεσθήσων dicuntur, non modò cum illud ipsum quod predictum erat, evenit, sed etiam ubi tale quiddam accidit, quod ejusmodi dicta in memoriam nostram redigit, eaque quoque modo confirmat atque illustrat." Knapp ap. Kuinoel, in loco. This is not confined to the sacred writers, but extends in some measure to the profane. Examples are here produced by Wetstein, who concludes a long and admirable note with the following words, which merit the serious attention of all sober-minded Christians: "Neque enim testimonia Vetæris Testamenti semper confirmandi, sed sæpe illustrandi, et concinnioris accommodationis gratiâ adhibentur in Novo. Quod qui non attendunt, in textus propheticos violentis illis applicationibus corruptum, reprehensiones transmutant in consolationes, et narrationes facti præteriti transformant in promissiones rei future; adeoque Judæis se ridendos proponunt. Ut finem faciam, iterum dico, facile me pati, ut quis vires suas in hoc campo exerceat, multaque de Christo oracula inveniat, et gladio adversa-
rios aggregiatur, dummodo infirmioribus et minus exercitatis scutis ut concedat, ut vel hoc pacto periculum vitemus, dum juxta regulam juris semper in obscuris, quod minimum est, sequimur." Vide Sirach. 48. 25.

23. ἡ παρθένος. Campbell would have the article expressed, the virgin. I rather think that expresses the Hebrew particle יְהַ, which is indeed often pleonastic, but sometimes carries the sense of quidam; and indeed Kuinoel here renders it quædam.

24. διέγερθες. So Herodotus, 1, 34. ὁ δὲ ἔπει τ' εἴηρήθη καταρράθεισας τὸν ὄνειρον, κ. τ. λ.

25. οὐκ ἐγινοσκεν. An euphemism, for non cum ed rem habuit. It is not, however, a mere Hebraism, though ὄν often occurs in this sense. Many classical examples are produced by Wetstein and Elsner, to which I add Plut. Pomp. c. 36. Heraclid. p. 455. Vide Steph. Thes. 1, 1829. c.

Ver. 1. Μάγοι. This is a word of Persian origin, by which were designated the priests, philosophers, and men of letters in general, who devoted themselves to divine and human science, especially medi-
cine and astronomy, or rather astrology. Vide
Menag. ad D. Laert. 1, 1. Porphyr. de Abstin. 4,
16. Perizon ad Ælian. V. H. 2, 17. and Brisson de
Princ. Pers. 179. Such literati doubtless were those
who came to Jerusalem. See the learned Collecta-
nea of Wetstein. They came, he says, to Jerusalem,
as being the likeliest place where such a prince
would be born.

2. εἴδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῶν ἀστέρα. That stars ap-
peared at the birth and at the death of celebrated
personages, was the general belief of the antients.
Compare the following passages collected by Wet-
stein: Justin. 37. 2. Senec. 2. N. 1, 1. and 7, 17.
Juven. 6, 407. Lamprid. Alex. Sev. 13. Diod. Sic. 2,
de 4 Cos. Hon. Tacit. 14. 22.; to which I add,
Synes. 153 D. τουτ’ ἄρα ἂν ἄφερ ἄνεξατο Τίμαιος, διδοὺς
ἐκάστη ψυχῆ σύννομον ἀστρον.

2. προσκυνήσας αὐτῷ. This construction with the
dative is seldom found in the pure Greek style. The
passages adduced by Wetstein and Kypke on Matth.
2, 8. are almost wholly from the later writers. The
earlier and purer ones use the accusative. Προσκυ-
νεῖν answers to the Hebrew נזרני, and signifies a
complete prostration of the body (especially the
head) to the ground, a form of reverential salutation,
which has ever prevailed in the East. So Herodot.
1, 134. οἱ σωμαγχανότες ὤ ἄλληλοισι—έπεροι; Jos.
Ant. 6, 18. ἐπιστραφέντος δὲ του βασιλέως προσκυ-
νεῖται αὐτῷ τεσσάν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον. So also Luke 5, 12.
See also (as cited by Wetstein) Polyæn. p. 328 et
622. Plutarch, 488 c. and especially Sturzii Lex.
Xenoph. Among the Greeks and Romans this ho-
nour was never paid to mortals, but reserved for the
Curt. 8, 7, 18. Liv. 30, 16. Athen. 6, p. 251. D.

3. Ἡρ. ἐπάραξθη, κ. τ. I. μ. α. It is observed by
Markland, in Bowyer's Conjectures, p. 48, that there
is here a syllepsis: Herod was troubled, and Jerusalem was thrown into commotion. So, 21. 8. ἐσεῖθη, and Esther, edit. Hexapl. ἦ δὲ πόλις Σούσα ἐταράσσετο.

4. πάντας τῶν Ἁρχιερεῖς. By these we are to understand, besides the Ἁρχ. properly so called, and then in the office, all those also who had passed that office, which was not then, as formerly, for life. Vide Joseph. 17, 4, 6. Besides these, there was the Vicar or Deputy of the High Priest; also, the Heads of the Sacerdotal courses; 2 Paral. 36, 14. and 1 Par. 24, 6. Acts 4, 4. Josephus often mentions those who had passed office, de Vitâ, § 38. Bell. 2, 12, 6. 4, 8, 6. & 7, 9. & 4, 3. & 5, 2. & 6, 6, 22. Antiq. 2, 9. 2; from which passages it appears that they were not only held in honour by the people, but were taken into counsel by their successors; nay, were even clothed with the Archieratical robe. Jos. Bell. 4, 3, 10. Wetstein and Krebs.


6. γῆ Ἰουδα. The canton of Judah, says Cambell; but Rosenmuller and Kuinoel maintain that γῆ here denotes urbs. Kuinoel cites some passages from the Old Testament; also, ἈEschyl. S. C. Th. 105. προδόσεις τὰν στὰν γὰν; Schol. πόλιν; and by Euripides in Phenis. 6 & 232. Thebes is called ἐπιτάραγγος γὰ. Vide Markl. on Lysias, p. 443. Kuster on Aristoph. Thesm. 115. and Kypke in h. l.

6. αὐτὰμας ἔλακιστη ἐ. The interpreters remark the figure litotes,—thou art the greatest, most celebrated. Palaiaret cites Dion. Halic. μοῖρα τῆς ὀκ ἔλακ-χιστη. He might have added, that this is imitated from Thucyd. 2, 21, 3.

6. ποιμανεῖ τῷν λαόν μου. In this usage of π. for regere is a tacit comparison of kings to shepherds,


11. βησαυρούς. Caskets, chests, or other receptacles. Abundant examples of this word are produced by Alberti, Loesner, Bos, Raphel, Wets. Munthe, and others. One may suffice; from Herodian, 2, 6, 11. καὶ βησαυροὺς χρυσοῦ καὶ ἄργυρου τεπληρωμένους ἔλεγε. Vide Schleus. Lex. in Vet. et Nov. Test. and Valckn. ad Herod. 4. 162.

11. χρυσοῦ, καὶ λίβανον, καὶ σμύρναι. The nature of the gifts seems to denote that the Magi came from Arabia; for there especially are spices found. See Herod. 3, 107. and Strabo, 16, 11, 29. cited by Wetstein. Yet such precious commodities were imported doubtless into Persia, to which there is a ready course across the sea, and the distance inconsiderable.

12. χρηματιστεῖν signifies properly negotium tractare, and particularly to treat of public business in an harangue, or oration. Hence it signifies monere, admonere, jus dicere, responsa dare; and especially used of such responses as were returned by any
deity consulted, and lastly (as here) any suggestion from the deity, by dream or otherwise. Vide Kypke and Kuinoel.

12. κατ' εὐαρ. Wetstein remarks, that to the art of the Magi belonged not only astrology, but the onirocritica, or interpretation of dreams. They therefore attended to their own dreams, and those of others, which was gradually become a system, and was digested into regular canons by Artemidorus. Often, indeed, their judgment failed them, as in the interpretation of a dream of Xerxes mentioned by Herodotus, i. 7. 19. Here, however, they judged rightly, that the dream was sent from God.

13. φεύγε εἰς Ἀθήνας than which a fitter place of refuge could not have been found. It was within a few days' journey of Bethlehem. After its conquest by the Romans, many Jews settled there, who spoke Greek, used the Alexandrin version of the Old Testament, and had raised a temple. Wets.


16. ἀνείλε. Eckerman ap. Kuinoel thinks the children were destroyed by poison, which is very improbable. ἀνείλε is rendered by Wetstein, immisit percussores; by Rosenmuller, interfici jussit.

16. ἀπὸ διεστῶς. Fischer, in his Proclus. p. 49. seq. has shewn that this phrase ought not to be de tempore, i. e. a biennio, but de ætate; that it regards the infants themselves, and that 8. is of the neuter gender, not the masculine. So 1 Chron. 27, 23. where David forbids the Israelites to be numbered; ἀπὸ εἰκοσιτῶς καὶ κάτω. I add Herod. 1, 186. ἀπὸ πεντατῶν μέχρι εἰκοσιτῶν; Polyb. 3, 20, 3. Jos. 327, 21. Polyæn. 2, 30, 30. As καὶ κατανυσίζω is here used: so in the Scholiast on Theocr. Idyll. 8, 3. δαβίδεικτης ετείς καὶ κατανυσίζω. Mr. Bulkley compares this with the
tragical story related by Herodian, 4. 11. εἰνάς δὲ πάντες ἐφονεύωντο.


22. Ἀρχελάος βασιλεύει, i.e. ἀρχεῖ, imperat; for Arch. was not a king, but an ἐθναρχὴς. Hesych. βασιλεύει, κρατεῖ, ἀρχεῖ. Compare Herod. 1. 5, 11. Kuinoel.


23. κατάφηγον εἰς τόλμον, for εἰν τόλμοι—εἰς, at. So the Septuagint and Josephus, and occasionally the classical Greek writers. Vide Kypke, Palairet, Munthe.

CHAP. III.

VERSE 1. ‘Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις. ἐδὲ is omitted in many MSS.; but it is defended by Griesbach, on the principle that one may account for its omission but not for its addition. I add, that it has here, as in many other passages of Scripture, and of the Historians, what Hoogeveen de Part. p. 191. xi. calls the usus transitivus, where there is a reference to a μὲν omitted. As to this use of the plural for the
singular, it is not unusual in the Greek Classics. Blomfield on Ἀeschylus compares this passage with a similar one of Thucyd. 7, 33. Herod. 8, 15. Xen. Cyr. 1, 7, 14. Liv. 28, 30.

1. κρύσσω. Wets. cites Hom. II. β. 50. σ. 505, vi. 4. Vide Schleus. Lex.

1. ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. Hebr. יְרוּם not absolutely desert, but comparatively, as being thinly inhabited, by reason of lying unclosed by fences, not in tillage, but entirely in pasture. C. 14, 15. and Luke, 15, 4.

2. μετανοεῖτε. Vide Rosenmuller, Kuinoel, and Schleusn. Lex. and Wetst. Campbell has well rendered it reform, with whom Dr. Maltby coincides. Serm. 1, 519.

2. ἔγγυς γὰρ ἡ β. ἔγγυς is not only said of things which are approaching, and are certainly about to happen, but those which are present and happening. Rom. 13, 12. Here, however, it signifies instare; for Messiah had not yet appeared, and John was baptizing, εἰς τὸν ἐρχόμενον. Comp. v. 11, and Act. 19, 4. On the Formula see Wetstein, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoël. Dr. Maltby's Sermons, vol. II. p. 452 and 453, and the notes, p. 566 and 7, where Dr. Clarke and Bishop Lowth both agree that the sense of this formula (and that of βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ) is the state of the Gospel, the Church, and Religion of Christ upon earth, the Gospel Dispensation. I agree with Dr. Campbell that β. ought here to be rendered, not kingdom, but reign. Schleusner, in his Lexicon N. T. has well treated this subject. I add, that the expression often occurs in Proclus on Plato, in this moral sense.

3. φανερώτατος, scil. έστι. β. properly signifies to shout; but, secondly, to exclaim, teach loudly and openly.

3. ἐκμάθατε τῷ ὄλυν. τ. κ. viam quâ incedit Dominus; an image borrowed from the practice of Eastern monarchs, who, on taking a journey, or going on a military expedition, used to send forward persons who should level the eminences, smoothen
the unevennesses, fill up the hollows, &c. so as to form a road. To this purpose Wets. cites Sueton. Calig. 37. Joseph. B. J. 3. 5. 1. and 6. 2. 5, 2, 1. and 3, 5. Justin. 2. 10. Plutarch, 837. F. Strab. v. p. 364. Ovid. Amat. II. 16. 51. Vide et Munthe. There seems a reference to this custom in Thucyd. L. 2. 97. s. in ἐπομένῳ τῷ ὄδοι ἢν πρότερον ἐποιήσατο, τεμαύν τὴν ὄλνην, ὅτε ἐγὼ ἠ. ἐστρατεύσε, and L. 2. 100. ὁ δὲ ἄνθεια ἔστευσι. Appian. II. 33. 39. τέμνειν ὄοδος. Vide Wessel. in Herodo. L. 4. 136. οὐ τετριμένων τῶν ὀδών. Vide Appian. i. 516. 71. Diod. Sic. I. 127. 78. Wessel. Pausan. X. 8. 5. and 31. 2. Philo. 1. 316. 24. (cited by Wets.) τρίβως τετριμένη πρὸς ἄνθρωπον καὶ ὕπογυγίον ἰπτηλάτως καὶ ἀμαξίλατος ὀδός, which one may compare with Pausan. 2. 151. ὁδός ἐγὼ οὐ καλομενοῦ τρήτοι. The passage of Philo illustrates the etymology of τρίβος. The corresponding term in our language has a similar origin, in the participle of the verb to ride. Thus also ὄδος is derived (I think rightly), by Eustathius, from ἑοὶ παρεόμαι. Our word path, is from Angl. Sax. Fæthian, to trample, i.e. via trita, like the πρότος of Pausanias, and others. But I must refrain; to pursue these analogies further would be out of place. 4. εἰκὲ τὸ ἐνδομα ἀπὸ τρίχων κ. Rough cloaks, and especially of sheepskins, were worn by the Hebrew Prophets, (vide 1 Reg. 19, 19. compared with Hebr. 11, 87. as well pretended as real. Comp. Matt. 7, 15.) Zach. 13, 4. ἐνδομαται δέρρῳ τρίχην. Such was also the clothing of the poor, and of those who were in mourning. See Max. Tyr. Diss. 13. 5. Alciph. 1. 36. and 3. 42. Apoll. Mirab. C. 20. (Wetst.) I add, such is now in the East the clothing of those who lay claim to peculiar sanctity. Vide Harmer. Major Taylor, in his Travels, says that the lower classes are clothed in a covering of wool and camels' hair. The Scholiast on Euripides in Phoen. 329, mentions the τρίχων ἐνδοματα. From the Talmud we find that camels' hair was much used for garments by the Jews; that of John was doubtless rough and uncombed.
4. ἡ ὁρὰνθινὴ δερματίνη π. τ. ὁ. Se Elias the Prophet, 2 Reg. 1, 8. The difference was in the materials, for these girdles were in general use, and of gold or silver, or silk, or linen, according to the station of the wearer. Vide Homer, Od. ν. 544. Strabo 11. p. 811. B. Apoc. 1, 13. Exod. 28, 35. Vide Braun. de Vest. Sacerd. Hebr. 2, 3. and Suier's Thes. in v. (Wets.)

4. ἡ ὁρὰνθινὴ—ἡ ἄρετες. That this food was permitted appears from Levit. 11, 22; that it was customary to the Orientals is plain, from Agatharch. v. 27. Strab. xvi. p. 1118. a. Plin. vi. 30. Porphyr. de Abstin. i. 25. Plutarch. Sympos. p. 147. d. (Wets.) I add, Strabo, 1098. B. See Bow. Conj. p. 35. That it was by the Greeks thought a mean food, appears from the Scholiast on Aristoph. Acharn. 1115. Vide Bochart. Hieroz. 2, 4, 7. and Elsner. ad h. l.

4. μέλι ἄγριον, an inferior sort of honey, not formed by bees, but found trickling from certain trees. Salmasius and Ludolph suppose that the manna with which the Israelites were supported in the wilderness was this μ. α. Palm honey, and fig honey, are mentioned by the Rabbinical writers; and Diod. Sic. L. 19, 104. says of the Nabataei, φυσταὶ—καὶ ἀυτοῖς τὸ πέπερα ἀπὸ τῶν δέντρων, καὶ μέλι πολύ τὸ καλοῦμενον ἄγριον.

Be that, however, as it may, the honey here mentioned might be of bees; for Joseph. Bell. 4, 8, 3. says of the country near Jericho, μελιττορέιος δὲ ἡ χώρα, though just after he speaks of the palm honey.

5. τίτα ἐξεπορεύετο π. τ. α. I. Of this figure of speech Longinus, § 22. (cited by Wets.) gives us an example from Demosth. de Cor. ἐπειδὴ ἡ Πελοπόννησος ἀπάσα διειστήκει. I add, what appears an imitation of this passage in Philostr. Vit. Apoll. L. 8, 26. παρὰ γὰρ διαλεγομένῳ πᾶσα ἡ Ἐφέσος. Alciphr. Ep. 11. 4. ἐπιθυμουμ Ἀθηνᾶς πρὸς αὐτῶν διαβήμας. The reasons for this concourse are thus stated by Wetstein:

"Inde ad incunabilis erat in ore hominum. Luc. 1. 66, 67. Accessit singulare vitae genus, abstinentia,
vestis prophetae, doctrina de Adventu Messiae et calamitatibus imminentibus, quibus addo turbatum eorum temporum statum, et conscientiam peccatorum, quae homines incertos reddebat, quod se verterent.

6. ἐβαπτίζοντο. This, with the Jews, was always effected, not by sprinkling, but by immersion.

Baptisms, or ablutions, had from the earliest ages been thought necessary to Divine worship, as well in promotion of cleanliness and purity, as also that, by a solemn rite, they might take care that none should approach things sacred irreverently or rashly. Vide Virgil, Aen. 2, 717. Apul. xi. Meque protinus purificandi studio marino lavacro trado, septies submer-so fluctibus capite.—Deam sic apprecabar. Juvenal, 6, 521. Pers. 2, 15. Horat. Serm. 2, 8, 289. Eurip. Alcest. 157. Plutarch. Aristid. 331. d. Eurip. Ion. 94. Macrobi. Saturn. 3, 1. Herod. 2, 37. Plaut. Aulul. 3, 6, 48, 4, 2, 3. Porphy. de Abst. 4, 7. Since, however, this solemn ablation was a preparation to prayers and sacrifices and vows, by which the Deity was propitiated, it came to pass that this propitiation and expiation was said to be effected solely by this baptism, which preceded the remaining parts of Divine worship. Eurip. Iph. in T. 1193. Ovid. Fast. 2, 35. Judith 12, 7, 8. Prius loca ad preces fundendas accessit, ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ θεὸς. καὶ αἷς ἀνέβη, ἐβαπτίζοντο τοῦ κυρίου θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ, and 16, 18. Vide Phil. I. 273, 47, 251, 29. This was especially practised by the Essenes. Vide Joseph. Bell. 2, 8, 587.

But here the subject treats of one solemn washing once for all, and never afterwards to be repeated. Of this rite vestiges are found in the Jewish-baptism of proselytes. It is agreed, both by the antient and modern Jews that baptism was administered to every Gentile admitted to the Jewish religion, and not to himself only, but to his wife and children, even if infants.

It is true we find no mention made of it in Philo, Joseph. or the Targum Onkelos, or in the Misna;
but in the other Rabbinical writings it is of frequent occurrence. Wetstein; who proceeds to give copious extracts. That the baptism of proselytes was then in use has been satisfactorily proved by Danzius, in a Dissertation inserted in Menschenius, Nov. Test. illustr. e Talmude, p. 233 seq. and 287 seq. Formerly, indeed, the Jews had admitted no proselytes but by circumcision. After their return, however, from the Babylonian captivity, when many Gentiles came over to their religion, to whom lustrations had been in regular use, they introduced the baptism of proselytes, partly because many Gentiles had been already circumcised, partly because they wished to gratify those votaries who were afraid of circumcision, and, finally, to provide a rite by which women might be initiated. (Danz. Michael. Bengel. Kunoel.) The testimony of the above Rabbinical passages is confirmed by Arrian, Diss. Epictr. 2, 9. (cited by Bengel.) where the Jewish proselytes are said to be θεσαμμένοι. That John should baptize Jews, thus separating them from the rest, and introducing them into a new religion, though without being the Messiah or Elias, might seem likely to have excited more wonder than we find it did. The reason for which may be this: they thought, at the advent of the Messiah, that the face of things would be entirely changed, and especially that the Messiah, or his forerunner, would commence new sacred rites by baptism. Compare John 1, 25. and Luke 3, 7. with this passage. Rosenmn. and Kunoel.

6. ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν, confessing (unto God) their sins. This expression was accounted a Hebraism by Vorstius; but classical examples of it are produced by Elsner, and Wetstein, who, in illustration of the subject, has adduced a very appropriate citation from Arrian, Exp. Alex. 7, 29: Ἀλλὰ μεταγγιστά τε, ἐφ’ οίς ἐπλημμέλησεν, μόνον οίδα τών πάντων βασιλέων Ἀλεξάνδρου ὑπὸ γεγεναιότητος. Οἱ δὲ πολιτείαι, εἰ καὶ τι ἤγγισαν πλημμελήσαντες, οἱ δὲ τῷ προφητευτῷ, οἳ καλῶς δὴ πραξιάτενοι, ἐπικρύψειν οἴονται τὴν
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ἀμαρτίαν, κακῶς γιγαντιάσκοντες. Μόνη γάρ ἐμοίγε δοκεὶ Ἰασίς ἀμαρτίας, ὁμολογεῖ τε ἀμαρτώντα, καὶ δὴ δόλον εἶμαι ἐκ αὐτῶ μεταγιγαντιάκοντα, ὅς τοὺς παθούσι τι ἀχαρί οὐ παντὶ χαλέπτα τα παθήματα φαινόμενα, εἰ ὁ δράσας αὐτὸ ἐν γενεσί, διότι οὐ καλὰ ἔδρασεν. Αὐτῶ τε τις ἐστὶ τὸ μέλλον ταυτήν ἐκπίς ἀγάθην ἐποιημένην, μήποτε ἀν παραιτήσιων ἀμαρτείν, εἰ τοὺς πρόθεν πλημμελθείσιν ἄχρονος φαινότο. The confession seems to have been rather general than particular; for to men long immersed in vice, neither would the memory have supplied all the particulars, nor would the time have admitted such particularity; neither also from the bystanding crowd of different sexes and ages, some of whom were hypocrites, would such minute confession have been advisable.

7. Φαρισαῖον καὶ Σαδουκαίων. These, together with the Essenes, composed the three principal Jewish sects, which have been not unaptly compared to the three Grecian ones, the Pythagoreans, the Epicureans, and the Stoics. Their origin is referred to the times after the Babylonian captivity, when Judæa was in the power of the kings of Syria and Egypt. The Jews then imbibed many dogmas, derived from the Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy, especially on the immortality of the soul, the agency and power of spiritual beings.

Of these the Pharisees were so denominates from σήμα, to separate, as being separated and distinguished from others by peculiar sanctity. These anxiously and severely pressed the letter of the law, and even the traditions which had been handed down since the time of its promulgation. They enjoined a most diligent observance of the ritual law, and by such exact observance they maintained that pardon of sins was to be obtained. To these more antient doctrines were added many new opinions, which came to their knowledge while in Chaldea; such as dogmas on spirits, on fate, &c. To all this they added a peculiarity of dress, and whatever could attract public attention. Their opinions on fate, &c.
(which did not materially differ from those held by some religionists of our own days) are thus detailed by Rosenmuller (from Josephus, 18, 1, 3): "Dixabant fato omnia fieri, sed hominis voluntatem non privabant impetu à seipsa pendente, quippe sic Deo placuisse, ut certo temperamento misericordur in unum fati decretum et ratio humana, si quis velit agere cum vitio aut cum virtute." Vide Joseph. Bell. 1, 5, 2. Antiq. 18, 10, 6, 17, 2, 4, 2, 8, 14 & 18. 1, 8, 4.

The Sadducees thought more freely on Religion and Ethics; hence they set at nought all laws not written in Scripture. It was formerly supposed by theologians that they only admitted the books of Moses; but, as Rosenmuller and Kuinoel observe, it has been recently proved by Staudlin and others, that they did not deny the authority of the other books of the Old Testament; they only maintained their inferiority to the Pentateuch; rejected the novel doctrines of the Pharisees on daemonology, fate, &c. which, indeed, they altogether abrogated, subjecting all things to human free will. (Vide Joseph. 1, 2, 8, 14.) They did not admit the resurrection of the body; nay, they contended that not even the soul was immortal, holding an opinion not dissimilar to that of the Cabbalists, namely, that all souls were but emanations from that of God, and would return thither. Hence they excluded all idea of rewards after death.

Though this note has already extended to a considerable length, I cannot refrain from laying before my learned and reflecting readers two extracts from the copious collectanea of Wetstein:

"Sectæ Pharisaœorum addicia fuit plebs et mulierculae: cum Sadduceæis vero faciebant principes, nobiles atque divites. Unde satis patet, non rei evidentialia permotos ad hanc vel illam sectam se contulisse: sed prout cuique commodum erat. Mulierculæ, meticulousæ et superstitionæ detectabantur ceremoniis; plebs etiam quidlimet potius sibi imponi
pâtìebatur, quàm ut legem Dei naturalem et mo-
ralem servaret, patabatque id præstando, quod non
debebat, à præstatione debiti redimere se posse. Di-
vites contra et nobiles, ut eo securus in hâc vita
voluptatibus indulgerent, et dominatione abuteren-
tur, omni futurarum pœnarum metu, qui ipsis mo-
lestinus fuisset, cupidè semet exsolvisse videntur.

"Notamus autem Josephum sectæ Pharisaorum
se se addixisse.

"Unde justa oritur suspicio, ubi Pharisaorum
humanitatem et clementiam laudat, Sadduceorum
verò asperitatem atque sævitiam vituperat, Saddu-
caes iniquiorem fuisset." B. 2, 8, 14.

"Cum enim Sadducei optimatibus, Pharisaei ple-
beis studerent, consequens erat, ut plebas a nobilitate
contemneretur, nobilitas vero plebi esset exosa;
quæ res non magis optimatibus quam plebi vitio ver-
tenda erat. Porro hieri poterat, ut dissensus Saddu-
ceorum inter se justas habetiam rationes: conspIratio
vero plebis seditiosa et tumultuosa esset. Clémen-
tiam denique non alio exemplo probat, quàm quod
reis Majestatis parcum esse suascenatur, cui indul-
gentiam ceu Reipublicæ noxiae severitas necessaria
rectè à Sadduceis priëtata fuisse videtur. Cæterum
non mitissimos fuisse Pharisæos, indè etiam patet,
quod Alexander rex moriens illæ non alià via pla-
cari posse credidit, quàm si regina cadaver ipsius
Pharisæis traderet, illisque potestatem faceret, illi,
sepulture honore privato, illudendi, sive alia quæm-
cunque injuriam ex iracundia inferendi. 18, 16, 5. &
16, 2. Et quid humani expectari poterat ab homi-
nibus, qui, teste Josephò, ad Stoicos quàm proximè
accedereant?"

7. ἐγκυμένος ἔξι τὸ βασιλιά αὐτοῦ. The sense is
well expressed by the Persic and Syriac versions—
coming in order that they might be baptized. So
Luc. 3, 7. βασιλιά ἐκ αὐτοῦ. Examples of this
sense of ἔξι are given by Wets. and Krebs.

12, 84, 23, 88. Soph. Trach. 1106, δεινος ἐξινος
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7. τίς ὑπεδείξετο ὑ; vi. docere. The word occurs in this sense in the later Greek writers and the Septuagint. It is strange that the antient interpreters should have taken the sentence to indicate praise. It rather expresses surprise; namely, to see persons of such dissimilar opinions and characters, Sad-ducees and Pharisees, men of the world and votaries of pleasure, mixed with precise formalists, not to say hypocrites, unite in confessing their sins, in making declarations of repentance, and vows of reformation.


7. ἀπὸ τῆς μεταλογίας ὀργῆς. The word ὀ. must here be taken, by metonymy, for punishment; of which see many examples in Schleusn. Lex. in v. 9, 3.

Euthymius refers this either to the destruction of Jerusalem, &c. or the wrath and punishment of God, to be revealed at the day of judgment.

Wetst. understands the former, and compares Luc. 21, 18. and I Macc. 1, 64; Theophylact and Macknight the latter, whose distinction between ἔσται and μᾶλλος ἐσεθαι is frivolous.

8. τοιοῦτος ἱκανοὶς. Bring forth fruits. This is said to be a Hebraism; as ὕσυ is so used in Genes. 1, 11. and elsewhere. Yet examples from the Classical writers (though, indeed, not of the best age) are produced by Georgius, Schwartz, and Wetstein. The sense is, If you really repent, shew forth not merely the leaves of profession, but the fruits of performance, as resulting from a true repentance. Not only cease to do evil, but learn to do well. Of Wetstein’s Classical examples, the only apposite ones are the following: Plutarch 2, 1117, c. οὐ μὲν τοι τὸ θεράπευμα τούτο—ἔσχε καρπὸν ἁζίων, οὐ γὰρ ἀνηγραφείθη
9. \( \mu \lambda \) δέξητε λέγειν \( \\varepsilon \nu \ \varepsilon \alphaυτοίς. \) Euthym. interprets \( \\mu \nu \ \thetaελήτευτε. \) So Grotius; which seems justly accounted a Hebraism, though \( \deltaοκῶ \ \lambdaέγειν \) is produced from Xenoph. Memor. 4, 2, 20. Kuinoel regards it as a pleonasm, for \( \nu \mu \lambda \ \lambdaέγητε, \) and adduces many examples and references. Now it is well known that \( \deltaοκῶ \) is frequently pleonastic in the Classics, yet not, I believe, in the Septuagint, or the N. T. therefore I hesitate. Wetstein well renders it, "ne quæso hæc opinio vobis sedeat," &c.

The formula λέγειν \( \\varepsilon \nu \ \varepsilon \alphaυτοίς, \) secum cogitare, occurs in Esth. 6, 6. and as such is accounted a Hebraism by Kuinoel. Yet we find that Chrysippus (ap. Wetst.) distinguishes between \( \nu \varepsilon \ \varepsilon \alphaυτῶ, \) and \( \phiανὴ \ \διεξέναι. \)

9. πατέρα \( \\varepsilon \χομεν \ τῶν \ 'Αβραάμ. \) A constant theme of boasting was this to the Jews. Vide Joseph. 8, 33, 39, 53. Act. 13, 26. Rom. 9, 5. Luc. 13, 16, 1, 73. Matth. 22, 32. Jac. 2, 21, 23. Phil. Jud. 2, 486, 5, ν. Joseph. Λ. 3, 5, 8, 4, 11, 5, 9, 4. Macc. 13. and 15, 16, and 18. Wetstein; who adds copious extracts from the Rabbinical writers to the same purpose. The antient Jews, indeed, as also Philo, Josephus, and others, required that the genuine sons of Abraham should take him for an example. But when it was taught that the piety itself of Abraham was imputed to his posterity, no wonder that the Jews, conceiving a hope of impunity in the holiness of their forefathers, should have indulged in pride, and thought themselves set at liberty from all laws, by the vicarious performances of Abraham. This vain opinion, then, John here admonishes them to abandon.

9. δύναται \( \ Θεὸς \ \varepsilon \k τῶν \ \alphaίθαν—'A. i. e. God can effect that these stones, now lying in Jordan, (comp. Joseph. 4, 3.) i. e. men as unfit for useful purposes as these stones, shall become children unto Abraham, i. e. imitate the virtues of Abraham. There may
possibly be a proverbial allusion, intimating that God
could raise men even from the ground, and that he
had done so, of which there is a vestige in Pausan.
2, 29, 2. Αἰακοῦ—ἐκ τῆς γῆς. Wetstein cites Euseb.
Heaut. 5, 1, 4. Arrian in Epict. 8, 22. Plaut. Mil.
Anthol. 1, 2, 9. Hesiod. Theog. 38. Hom. Il. 10,
where is related the story of Deucalion and Pyrrha.
10. ἡδίν δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀξίη—κεῖται. Quinimo etiam.
Vide Raphel et Palairo. It is usual (says Wets.)
for good or evil men to be compared to good or bad
Agricul. 1, 302, 43. (ad Deuter. 20, 20.) τὰ ἀφροσύ-
νης δέντρα, καὶ ἀκόλουθοι τε καὶ δειλιὰς, πάντων ἐκχώρει
ἐκτενῶ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἡδίνας καὶ ἐπιθυμίας, οἷς τε καὶ
δυναμιν, καὶ παραπέπλειαν πυθῶν, καὶ ἄχρι ἀφανοῦ μηκῶν
tὰ φυτὰ ἐνυξαίωσα καὶ τὰς μίζας αὐτῶν, ἐφείσα ἄχρι
τῶν ὑστάτων τῆς γῆς φλογὸς βρέθην, οἷς μνημέως πέρος, ἄλλα
μηδ' ἤξωρ ή σκόν ἑγολεοφθή̆ναι τὰ παράτατα. A passage
of greater exuberance in metaphorical allusion will
not easily be found.

As noxious, and even useless trees, are cut down
and burnt, so are worthless and bad men destined to
be rejected, and cut off from the advantages of the
Christian economy, and left to be punished. Vide
Sirach, 10, 18. Dan. 4, 20 and 23. See Euthym. and
Suicer's Thes. 1, 398, b.
10. ἐνακτητεῖαι. Present for future; which is usual
when the actions are shortly to happen.
11. εἰς ἰδίας. The εἰς, which answers to the ἐν, is here
redundant. Comp. Luc. 3, 16. This is, however, not
unexamined in the Greek Classics.
11. εἰς μετάσωμα. In order to produce repentance:
A similar use of the εἰς I have before noted, v. 7.
11. ἵσσινθέρσος μοι, more powerful, of greater digni-
ty. Then of εἰσιν, in the sense of worthy, several
examples are produced by Wetstein.
11. τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι. This appears to be only a more copious enlargement on the preceding idea, ἵσχ. μ. τ. Observe, βαστάσαι is to carry off, or away. The office was servile. So Horace: “et soleas poscit;” and the natural order of its performance was, 1. to loose the straps; 2. pull off the shoes; 3. to carry them away; which particulars it would have been unnecessary to mention, had not the other Evangelists made use of the 1st, St. Matt. the 2d, and others the 3d. (Markl.) On the servility of the office Wets. cites Aristid. 1, 276. Lucian in Herod. 5. ὁ δὲ τὰ μάλα δουλικὰς ἀφαιρεῖ τὰ σανδάλιαν ἐκ τοῦ ποδός, ὡς κατακλωματίη Ἡή. Joseph. ά. 6, 18, 8. of Abigail. ἢ δὲ ἀνάξιαν μὲν εἶναι καὶ πολλῶν ἁπασθείς τῶν ἑκένω—ἔλεγεν. To which I add a very apposite passage of Plutarch, Symp. L. 7, 8, 1. T. 2, 712. δεὶ ταῖς παλλαξ ἡγεμονίας βασιλευόντως καὶ στρατηγίσας, οὕτω τοῖς τὰ ὑποδήματα κοιμήσουσι παιδαρίους, δὲ γε δὴ δεσπότων Ἰοσφρασθείσων ἀκομαθεῖτω προσήκει, where one may easily dispense with the Conjectures of Reiske. I see nothing objectionable, except in the words δὲ γε δὴ, which are manifestly corrupt. The sense seems to require ἠκένω δή. Vide Hoogeve. de Part. to whose examples add Thucyd. 7, 142. Herodian, 2, 11, 18. subaud τῶν. On what Markland has written I must remark, that the slave, who was usually a boy, did not always carry away the slippers, but kept them under his arm, to be ready to present them when his master awoke; to which there is an allusion in the passage of Lucian just before cited. From the Rabbinical writings we find that it was an office which the pupil was expected to perform for the master; and that this was performed towards the first Christian Teachers we ascertain from Euseb. H. E. 4, 15. cited by Kypke.

The ὑποδήμα denotes every kind of calceamentum; nor does it differ from σανδάλιον, since the Septuagint express ζυξ sometimes by δ., sometimes by σανθ. Vide Bynæum de calceis Hebr. c. 6.

11. βαστάσει ἐστὶν εὐφρατι ἀ. κ. τ. On the interpre-
tation of these words there has been much difference of opinion. See the Dissertation on Baptism in Suicer's Thes. 1, 628. et seq. Wolf. Cur. Phil. and Koecher. Analect. Glassius Phil. S. p. 254. takes et igni for ignito, manifesting itself in the symbol of fire, which happened in the miraculous effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Vide Act. 1, 5. 2. 3. 11, 15 & 16; and so I find Euthymius (probably from Chrysostom) explains, p. 105, where, inter alia, he says, ἄλλα καὶ εἷς πῦρ—ἀναλίσκων τῶν ρύτων τῆς ψυχῆς; and this seems to be confirmed, or at least illustrated, by some passages in Wetstein, ex. gr. Ovid. Fast. 4, 785: "omnia purgat edax ignis, vitiumque metalli excoquit."

Plutarch, 1, 263. E. τὸ πῦρ καθαιρεῖ, καὶ δῶαρ ἁγνίζει; κ. τ. λ. "Sicut autem ignis purgat et baptizat, ita etiam venti ventilanti paleas vis purgandi atque eluendi adscribi potest." Wets. Hom. II. ε. 499: αἰς δ' ἄνεμος ἁγνας φορεῖ· ἱερὰς κατ' ἀκράς, ἀνθρών λυμαίν- των. Virg. Æn. 6, 740: Aliæ panduntur inanes suspensæ ad ventos: aliis sub gurgite vasto infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni; where Servius remarks, "etiam in sacrís Liberi omnibus tres sunt istæ purgationes. Nam aut tædá purgantur et sulphure, aut aquâ abluuntur, aut aëre ventilantur. (Vide et Heynium.) So also on Virg. Georg. 1, 166: Mystica vannus Iacchi, Servius remarks, "Sic homines ejus mysteriis purgabuntur, sicut vannis frumenta purgantur." This purgation Wets. explains, of all those calamities which the Jews soon after experienced in the burning of the temple, and the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the state.

The purgatio by wind he interprets of this secret and wonderful virtue of God, which on the day of Pentecost, and at other times, is related to have been poured out on the baptized, and which is termed holy, inasmuch as it purges the mind from vice and ignorance, as water washes off the filth of the body, and withal it distinguishes the good from the bad, as the wind separates the wheat from the chaff.
Of the word ττόν Wets. gives several examples. It is explained ἑρνάς by Hesych. from which its form is clear, namely this, ἅ, the word denotes a winnowing shovel.


12. τὴν ἀλάνα. An area, always in the open air, and usually in an elevated site, where the straw, rough and broken, from the treading of the oxen, was tossed up by the πτών, or winnowing shovel, and thrust forward to a fire prepared for its consumption. The chaff was delivered to the wind, and the grain thus left in an heap. For the various modes of threshing and winnowing, see Bochart, Hieroz. 1, 2, 32. This may be reckoned among those agricultural comparisons so common in the Gospels, as we shall have frequent occasion to notice.

12. εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην, a repository, usually subterranean, such as those in which the oriental nations still preserve their corn, wine, oil, &c.

12. ἀσβεστο. Of this word examples, in superfluous abundance, are given by Wetstein. A remark here made by Theophylact deserves notice: ὡστε φλυαρεὶ ὁ Ὄριγενης, λέγων ὅτι ἕσται τέλος τῆς κολασίας.

18. τὸτε παραγίνεται. The particle here does not accurately define, but signifies generally about the time when John was baptizing; and thus in several other parts of the N. T. Vide Schleus. Lex. Whitby asks, how could John know Jesus? By the Holy Spirit, he suggests, and so Euthymius long ago settled the matter. There is, however, no need here to recur to any supernatural assistance, for from the connection of affinity and amity subsisting between the mothers of John and Jesus, John could scarcely be ignorant of the person, nor unaware of the pretensions of Jesus.

14. ὁ δὲ Ι. διεκάλεθαι αὐτῷν. διακ. properly signifies
to hinder by interposing (διὰ) between, or, as here, generally to hinder; in which sense it occurs not unfrequently in Thucydides. Other examples are produced by Palaiaret, Elsnor, and Munthe. The imperfect tense, as it properly notes imperfect or unconsummated action, so it sometimes, as here, signifies the attempt or wish to perform, rather than the performance.

14. ἔγω χρείαν. The passage is thus paraphrased by Euthymius: ἔγω, ὁ ἔχοντας ἀμαρτίας, ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀναμαρτήτου, ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν ψυλῷ ὑδατι ὑπὸ τοῦ βαπτισ[chopped_text]ωτός ἐν πνεύματι ἄγιῳ καὶ πνεύμα τοῦ δεσπότου, ὁ ἀναδεικνύει ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

15. ἀφές ἀρτι. Rosenmuller thinks the a. corresponds to the Hebrew נ, Gr. ἀφαίρεσις; and so, indeed, we use the word now. Euthym. however, explains τι γε νῦν ἔχον, for the present, which is perhaps preferable.

16. Ṿέβη εἰδός ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔκτος. Euthymius remarks, that there was a tradition that John plunged each of the baptized persons in the water up to the neck, and held him there while he was making confession of his sins; then, letting him go, he ascended from the water. I am not aware of any authority by which this may be confirmed; it is not devoid of probability, though I am inclined to suspect that it is founded solely on the ᾖβη of our Evangelist. If so, it must be regarded as a precarious conjecture.

Æn. 3, 198. Wets. then produces two curious passages: Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. καταλαβόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ τῆς Ὑδροῦν, πῦρ ἀνήφη ἐν τῷ Ἰαρδανῷ. That was, perhaps, founded on the Evangel. Ebion. which, from a fragment preserved by Epiphanius on Heresies, 30. had these words: καὶ εἰδὼς περιέλαμψεν τὸν τόπον θός μέγα.

αιτῶ is by some rendered eo spectante, i.e. Joanne. Comp. Jo. 1, 32. I would rather refer it to Jesus, and take it as a dative of profit and advantage. See the note infra, 4, 17.

16. οἷος περιστερᾶ. Here is an acknowledged ambiguity, which has given rise to much diversity of opinion. Some contend that the similitude is only in the manner of descent; and indeed the flight of a dove, especially when descending, has in it something peculiar. In this view Wets. cites Virg. Æn. 5, 513. Nam—aère lapsa quieta Radit iter liquidum, celeres neque commovet alas. Comp. Eurip. Bacch. 1088. In Koecher's Analecta the analogy is copiously illustrated between a dove and the Holy Spirit, as well in respect to its members as to its attributes, accidents, &c. So Rosenmuller and Kuinoel. The observations of Euthymius are deserving of attention. Humboldt, too, in his Researches on America, vol. 2. p. 64, mentions a Mexican picture, where is represented a dove descending and distributing the gift of tongues to man, whom they believe to have been dumb after the deluge; a coincidence which might be paralleled by many others in the same interesting work, and which I cannot regard as accidental, but indicating a common origin in the Oriental Mythology of the remotest periods; and thereby establishing the hypothesis of the Asiatic origin of the Americans.

17. φωνή, i.e. thunder; ῥοῆ Λυσ is often so used, as Psalm 18, 14. 29, 3. Comp. Jo. 12, 28, 29. Apoc. 6, 1. φωνή and εἰσόρατο are joined as synonymous in Apoc. 11, 19. The Hebrews (says Rosenmüller), as well as the Greeks and Romans, numbered light-


CHAP. IV.

VERSE 1. τότε ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον. τότε, about that time. See note supra 3, 13. Among the diversity of opinions entertained on this passage, I must notice one recently devised by some German theologians, who maintain that the διάβολος here mentioned was either the Pontifex Maximus, or one who had passed the office of High Priest, and had considerable influence with the people, and who at intervals, as occasion offered, had a mind to try Jesus—whether he was really the Messiah, and would deliver the Jews from the Roman subjection? This opinion is extremely ingenious, but utterly inadmissible, from various objections, which I cannot find room to state.

1. ἀνήχθη. Some take it for ἁχθη, and indeed Luke uses ἁγητα, 4, 1; which, however, is not decisive evidence. Others fancy there is an allusion to the force and violence of the Spiritual influence, an interpretation precarious. I am inclined to think that the use of the preposition may have an allusion to the high and mountainous country, of which what was called the Desert was composed: all admit the Desert here mentioned to have been mountainous. ἀνὰ has usually, and indeed properly and primarily, the sense of
use. Some render abductus est. That, however, would require δι’ Χρηστην, which may possibly be the true reading. The prepositions ἀνα and ἀπο in composition are perpetually confounded; and it is, moreover, somewhat confirmed by the parallel passage of Mark, εκ βασιλει.

On the circumstances of the temptation, the Student may consult with advantage Dr. Maltby’s Sermons, T. 2, p. 275 and 6, who, in common with many learned Commentators, adopts the hypothesis of Farmer, and regards the whole as a prophetic vision, designed by the Deity to supply that ideal experience of temptation, or trial, which it was provided in the Divine Counsels from our Lord to receive, previously to his entering upon the actual trials of his ministry.

1. εἰς τὴν ἐρημον. The situation of this desert cannot be fixed with any certainty. The common opinion is, that it was the Desert of Arabia and Sinai. Others, as Wetstein, Rosen. and Kuinoel, maintain it to have been the Desert of Quarantania, which extends from Jericho, by the mountain of Bethel, two and a half miles from Jerusalem. Vide Joseph. Ant. 16, 1. Bell. 4, 8, 2. Maundrell, and Hasselquist. This was certainly rough and uncultivated. Wets. compares the examples of Moses and Elias, who, on entering on their ministry, went into solitude; and cites Plato, 61 F.

2. μητέρας. Wets. observes, that those about to enter upon the prophetical office were accustomed to prepare themselves for its important duties by fasting and prayer,—prayer so earnest and continued that they sometimes neglected to take food. The number 40 he thinks sacred and solemnis. So many days (says he) did the deluge increase; so many did women, after childbirth, continue impure. See Num. 13, 26. 1 Sam. 17, 6. Genes. 50, 3. Ezek. 4, 6; and both Moses and Elias are related to have fasted 40 days. Nor (says he) was this confined to the Jewish theology: so many days was Pythagoras said to have
fasted when he died. Vide Diog. Laert. 8, 40. Por-
2. τῷ νῦντας. This may seem superfluous, says
Euthym.; but it is added because of the Jews, who
fasted by day, and feasted by night.
3. εἰ νῦντα τοῖς Θεοῖ. Wetstein thinks, that the De-
vil did not know who Jesus was: 1st, because he
does not call him εἰς τὸ Θ. the son of God, καὶ ἐξο-
χήν; 2dly, since, if he had known him, he would
have abstained from attacking him, in despair of the
victory. But the first argument has little or no
force, for in the Hellenistic Greek the article is ne-
ever used with the exactness of the classical Greek,
and in this case it is sometimes omitted. I cannot
therefore approve of Campbell's translation, a son of
God. As to the second argument, it is devoid of
any weight; for how can we venture to assert any
thing concerning what the Devil would, or would
not do, under such circumstances. Impudence and
hopeless audacity may seem to correspond not un-
aptly to the diabolical character.
4. εἰς ἀρτοίς, order, which is not merely a Hebraism,
but a Græcism likewise. Vide Albert, Vriemoet,
and Palairot, and Duker on Thucyd. 7, 29.
5. ἀρτοί γένωνται, become loaves. So Exod. 4, 3.
See Campbell.

4. ὡκ ἐκ' ἀρτοῖ μὲν ἥσσεται, sustentari soleat. Though
this phrase has the appearance of an Hebraism, yet
it occurs in the Greek writers. Kypk. cites M. Tyr.
Kuin. adds M. Tyr. D. 27, 6. ubi vide Markl. et
Wetstein observes that λίθων et ἄρτοι, as being con-
traries, are opposed, infra 7, 7. Fr. 20, 17. Phædr.
l. 2, 2. alli onerant saxis, quidam contra Misere pa-
 nem; ut sustineret spiritum. Vid. Horat. 1 Sat. 5,
91. Senec. de Benef. 2, 1. Plaut.

As to the sentiment, ὡκ ἐκ' ἄρτο ῶ μόνω ἥσσεται.
Wets. compares, very appositely, Sap. 16, 26. ὡχ αἱ
γενέσεις τῶν καρπῶν τρέφουσιν ἄθρωσκον, ἀλλὰ ὅ ῶρμα
God, who sustained the whole Jewish nation forty years without bread in the Desert, and also Moses and Elias and myself forty days, hath a thousand ways by which he can and will provide for his obedient servants.


5. ἀγίαν τόλμ. Jerusalem, as having the holy temple. So Troy and Athens are for a similar reason called sacred by the Poets. The inscription upon the shekels was, Jerusalem the holy.

Phil. Jud. usually calls it Ἱεροπόλις, and Josephus ἡ ἱερὰ πόλις.

5. ἵστησεν αὐτὸν ε. τ. π. τ. 1. The word is to be taken not in a physical but a moral signification: suadet ut se conferret, eum eo ducit. Comp. Gen. 48, 9. Matt. 18, 2.

5. τὸ πτερίγιον. On the interpretation of this word, the commentators are by no means agreed. One thing is certain, that it does not signify pinnacle, in the sense which we usually attach to the word, (i. e. the point of a spiral ornament, or, as Johnson explains it, a spiral point); for thus the article would not have been used. Grot. Hamm. Doddr. &c. take it in the sense of balustrade, or pinnated battlement, for which I can find no sufficient authority.

Preferable is the opinion of Wetstein and others, who take it to mean what was called the King’s Por- tico. Vide Joseph. A. 16, 11. & 5. So also Rosen. Kuin. Parkh. and, long ago, Euthymius. Ingenious, D 2
however, if not true, is the opinion of Krebs, adopted by Schleus. that it signifies the ridge of the roof of the temple. This is strongly confirmed by Joseph. A. 15, 11, 5: ἐθένε καὶ ἐθένε—περιμένειν. But to this it is opposed, that there were iron spikes fixed all over the roof of the temple, lest the birds should settle upon, and desile it with their dung. Krebs thinks this difficulty may be removed. May it not have been a lofty spiral turret, placed somewhere about the centre of the building, (like the spire in some cathedrals,) to the topmost look-out of which the Devil might take Jesus. As περιβλέπει signifies a small wing, a small pointed extremity of any thing, so it may well denote a spire.

6. τ. α. α. ἐπετέλεσται—ποδα. An image taken from parents who, in rough ways, lift up their children, lest they should trip and fall on the stones. Kuin.

The fallacy of the tempter (says Rosenm.) consisted in this: that he misapplied the passage of the Psalm to the case then in hand. (A practice, I may add, not confined to the Devil, but sometimes employed even by Saints); for though in the Psalm assistance is promised to the pious, in evils fortuitous, which happen without their knowledge or will, yet not to those who rashly and irrationally thrust themselves into dangers.

7. οὐκ ἔκτεινατεις Κύριον τὸν Θ. σ. Future for imperative, Hebr. This he does who plunges himself into danger in vain reliance on God's protection. See Wetstein, Hamm. Whitby, and Dodd.

8. πάλιν παραλαμβάνει, aliá vice, alio tempore. The temptations were doubtless brought forward not in a regular or continued series, but at intervals, as opportunities offered. Rosenm.
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8. δείκνυσιν—κόσμου. Most commentators understand this of Judaea, which had what might not improperly be called kingdoms, since their rulers were styled not only tetrarchs, but kings.

Yet this seems not quite satisfactory. I am inclined to think, with Beza, Heuman, and Wetstein, that an extensive prospect being shown, the kingdoms of the then known world were pointed out, according to their relative situations and quarters.

This was probably the opinion of Chrysostom; for, I find, Euthymius evidently adopts this view of the subject: δακτύλω δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ τὰ μέρη τῆς οἰκουμένης—λέγων, ἐν τούτῳ τῶ μέρει κεῖται ἡ βασιλεία Ῥωμαίων, ἐν τούτῳ δὲ—καὶ ἀπάλος πάντα καταλέγει.

8. δείκνυσιν. Kuinoel explains, “digitu monstrare, et verbis ac oratione demonstrare, menti representare.” Examples of this signification are adduced by Olear. and Palaiaret. as Herodi. 3, 13. 9. Thus it is taken for ὑπὸδ. ἀπὸ. I will take this opportunity of citing and emending a very similar passage of Dio Chrysost. p. 595, 41. εἰ μὲ τῆς ὑπηρ. ἄραι ἀνω μετεμφορ. ἐπὶ την ἡμ. ἥ—ὑποκινοῦν τὴν γῆν ἀπασάν, καὶ τὰς πόλεις. I conjecture ὑποτεινόν, which is unquestionably the true reading.

8. καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν, i. e. ornamenta in genere, ut amplitudinem, castella civitatum ac oppidorum multitudinem, fertilitatem, &c.

9. ἔδω π. προσκυνήσας μοι. This expresses the Eastern mode of doing homage, namely, by falling prostrate on the ground (and in China, &c. touching it with the head). In the words of Horat. Ep. 1, 12, 27. Ita Parthis rex datus est—Jus imperiumque Phraates Caesaris accepit genibus minor, we recognize an allusion to the Western mode, namely, kneeling.
10. ἵππε, Σατανᾶ. A page te à me, scélus, pestis! for Ἴδω, among its other significations, bears that of evil counsellour. See 1 Sam. 19, 23. In the same words Jesus accosts Peter, infra, 16, 23.

11. ἄγγελοι—διηκόνων. The word is often (as here) used especially of that ministration which provides food drink, and other necessaries. Comp. 8, 15. Jo. 12, 2. Luc. 22, 27. Wetsstein cites Eur. Cyc. 81. Lucian (plus semel). Anacr. Od. 4. Theophr. Ch. Eth. 11. Athen. 145. B. 195. E. Phil. Jud. 2, 482. So ministro in Latin. This, however, need not exclude the ministration also of consolation, congratulation, &c. Wets compares the whole passage with the case of Hercules, who, on meditating what course of life to pursue, went into solitude, &c. The rest of the story of Prodicus (so beautifully versified by Bishop Lowth) is well known.

12. Now follows, says Rosenm. the third part of the Gospel, containing a narrative of those sayings and actions of our Lord in Gallilee by which he demonstrated himself to be the Messiah. On which consult Kuinoel and Rosenm.

12. παρεδόθη, subaud eis φυλάχν, which is generally supplied, as Act. 8, 3. 22, 4. Diod. Sic. p. 105. ap. Munthe, or, subaud ἡξαμιος, as in Athen. 213. F. cited by Wets. Vide Luc. 21, 12. Act. 8, 3. 22, 4. Cùm multi et ad tumultum spectantes de Joannis custodià ab auditoribus ejus spargèrentur sermones, Jesus eis se immiscere noluit, ideoque secessit. Vide Joseph. A. 18, 5, 2. Si autem secessit, ut vitaret turbas in Judæa, eadem de causá vitandus erat etiam Herodes, secessit ergo in Galilæam non Herodis sed Philippi. Some cities of Galilæa Superior belonged to Philip, as Jannia. Christ had nothing to fear from Philip. Princes do not usually make inquisition after those who injure no one, and heal the sick: Christ, too, came, not to reprove the ruler, but to teach the people; nay, even the disciples visited their Master when in prison without impediment. Wet.

15. Νεφθαλεὶ. Drusius would read Νεφθαλεί, as
in the Hebrew. But the present reading seems better to correspond to the Syro-Chaldee, which was spoken by the Apostles, and according to whose peculiarities of termination many proper names of the O. T. would be conformed.

15. γῆ Ζαβουλῶν—ὄδον θ. subaud κατὰ, the ὄδον, which the commentators do not quite comprehend, signifies tract, as in Æschyl. P. V. 2. χθονὸς μὲν εἰς τῆλουσὺν ἡκομεν πέδουν Σκύθην εἰς ὄμοιν, where the Schol. I. explains ὄδον.

15. Ταλιαλία τῶν ἐθνῶν. The student will bear in mind that there were two Galilees; one τῶν ἐθνῶν, near to the borders of the Tyrian territory, another in Judæa, about Tiberias and the land of Gennesareth. See the passages of Eusebius and Hieronymus cited in Reland’s Palestine, p. 188.

16. καθίμενος ἐν σκότει, versabatur, in tenebris dwell. Comp. Judith 5, 3. 1 Macc. 2, 1, 29. Sir. 37, 18. Nor is this a Hebraism; for a similar expression is found in Aristoph. Pac. 642. ἤ πόλις γὰρ ἀκριμωστα, καὶ φόβῳ καθαιμένη. On the diversities which we find between these citations and the corresponding passages in the Septuagint as we now have it, Dr. Owen remarks, that the quotations, as they stand in the New Testament, are more exact representations of the Hebrew original. This cannot be decided till the text of that venerable version has been regularly formed by a critical examination of the immense body of various readings, &c. collected by the diligence of Dr. Holmes, and published by the munificence of the Curators of the Oxford Press. Whether we may entertain any expectation that the discrepancies will then be diminished, I know not: I find the early Greek commentators acknowledge these discrepancies. Thus Euthymius, vol. 1, p. 155, lays down this general rule, that the Evangelists sometimes abridge, and even alter the expressions of the O. T.; so that by the alteration no violence be done to the general sense of the passage.

16. φῶς here signifies an enlightener, a teacher:
abstract for concrete. Wets. has adduced a super-
fluous abundance of citations, of which I select the
most apposite. Eustath. φως ἄναβλεψις: Plato de
Republ. 6: Hom. II. π. 39. φως Δαναώς γένειας.
2, 281. ὁ λόγος Dardanie! spes ὁ fidissima gentis!
Psalm 21, 17. That thou quench not the light
of Israel.

16. ἐν χαρᾷ καὶ σκίῆ θανάτω, i. e. spiritually dead
(as says the Apostle) in trespasses and sins. Wets.
refers to Job 3, 5. 10, 21, 22, 12. 22, 16. 16. 24, 17.
28, 3. 34, 22. 38, 17. Amos, 5, 8. Jer. 2. 6. 13. 16.
Ps. 107, 10, 14. 23, 4.

16. ἀνέτειλεν. Rosenm. and Kuinoel think αὐτοῖς
redundant. It seems rather to be a dative of profit,
of which see Matthias, Gr. Gr. Vide not. supra, 3, 16.
17. ἀπὸ τότε. This idiom, which is censured by
the Greek grammarians, is justified by numerous
classical citations adduced by Wetstein.

17. ἁρέματο—κεφύσσειν, for εἰκρυφεῖ, which, however,
is not a mere Hebraism. So in the Latin we have
redire copit for redit. See Georg. and Palaiet.

19. ποιήσω—ἀλλεῖς ἄνθρωποι. This (says Kuinoel),
like many other terms of hunting and fishing, are
employed metaphorically of those who conciliate the
good-will and friendship of others. Wets. cites Diog.
1. 2, 125. ἄνθρωποι εἰς ἀκαδημίαι πρὸς Πλάτωνος, καὶ
θηραῖς κατέληξε τὴν στρατιὰν; also, Plato de Legg. 7;
but there it is used in the physical sense. In his So-
phista, however, Plato does compare the sophista to
a fisher. See Jerem. 16, 14—16. Ezek. 47. Palaiet
compares Stob. Serm. 93, p. 313, where Solon says,
ἐὰν οἱ μὲν ἄλλεσ ὑπομένουσι βαλεθαι τῇ θαλάσσῃ, ἢν
καβιόν θηράσωσιν. "Εγὼ δὲ μὴ ἀνασχῶμαι, ἢν ἄνθρωπον
ἀλλεῖσι. Vide et Crauser in Phosphoro vocum, p. 946.
I had forgotten to notice the elliptical formula
deikt, subaudēkoutheite, which is a vox solemnis de
hac re. Thus Socrates called Xenophon, as we are told
by Diog. Laert. 2, 48. ἐστο τοίνυν καὶ μάνθανε. The
words ὑπέστα μοι, omitted in some MSS. must not be thrown out. They are a Hebrew pleonasm.

23. διδάσκοντο. Christ might have ordered and commanded, as Lord and Legislator; but he preferred to persuade and teach, as did Solon and Lycurg. See Galen ap. Wets.

23. θεραπεύον τάσαν νόσων—μαλακίαν, disorders and infirmities of every kind. So Hebr. יְוֵל. Markland explains νόσος a disease of some standing, μαλακία an indisposition, or temporary ailment. Kuin. however, thinks the words synonymous, and certainly these terms are often used promiscuously. Could any distinction be safely made, it might be, that νόσος denotes an acute, a definite thoroughly formed and usually violent disorder; μαλακία, a chronical debility. Vide Alberti; Plin. N. 38, 7. in malaciā stomachii. Rosenm. says, apud medicos ignaviam stomachi significat, a sluggishness of stomach.

24. ἀπῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοή αὐτοῦ. There went out a report concerning him. Alberti, Olearius, and Wetstein, tell us that the ἀκοή is here used just as the Latin auditio for fama, and they produce examples of the whole phrase from the Greek Classics. So Virg. Æneid 4, 13. et fama per urbes. Cor. Nep. Ann. 9. exiisse famam. Krebs, however, says that the word is not used de famâ, but de narratione, as any thing which we have been told or read; and certainly, in the passage of Thucyd. produced by them (1, 20), it signifies narrationes. He regards this use of the word and the phrase (which, however, he cites from Jos. A. 8, 6, 5. διῆλθεν φήμη πρὸς ἡμᾶς) to be Hebrew. I add Jos. 786, 45. ἀφίκετο ἀγγελία πειρατῶν.
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24. δαιμονίζοντές. Wets. has a very long and important note, on a subject which has been discussed by some of the most eminent of our modern Biblical Critics. I shall lay before the reader a careful condensation of his very copious collectanea.

Tota res ad duas quaestiones commodè reduci potest, quorum altera ad medicinam, ad grammaticam altera spectat, I. quinam homines intelligantur? II. quænam ejus appellacionis sit ratio?

I. Existimo igitur per daemoniacos et lunaticos intelligi homines certo quodam morbo laborantes. He then proceeds to state the common hypothesis, which attributes these effects to no imperfection of the natural organs, but to the enchantment or fascination of the Devil; and then offers the eight following reasons why he cannot assent to that opinion.

1. Dæmoniaci disertè muti, surdi, et cæci vocantur Matth. 12, 22. Marc. 9, 25. Luc. 11, 14.; neque causa ulla idonea afferri potest, cur non simpliciter verè mutos, surdos, et cæcos intelligamus, h. e. quorum organis aliquod vitium inhæserit; alií vero dæmoniaci ita describuntur Matth. 8, 17. et parell. ut manifesta maniæ aut epilepsie signa atque symptomata in illis nemo non agnosceré possit.

2. Dicuntur a Christo sanati fuisse Matth. 15, 28. 17, 16. Luc. 9, 42. 8, 2. qui autem verè sanatur, illum prius verè in morbo fuisset necesse est. Alius dæmoniacus dicitur post curationem sanæ mentis fuisset Marc. 5, 15. Luc. 8, 35. Unde jure colligitur, prius illum insania, quæ morbus est, laborasse.

4. Matth. 11, 5. Luc. 7, 22. Ubi plura sǽgrorum a Christi curatorum genere recensentur, nulla fit dǽmoniacorum mentio, qui nullo modo videntur prǽtermitti debuisse, si alterius planè generis, fuissent.

5. Fl. Josephus & Medicorum libri, Gittin. f. 67, 2. Testantur dǽmoniacis medicamenta ex radicibus, lapidibus, herbis composita data profuisse; intellegimus autem medicamento vitium corporis corrigi tolisque: at quomodo in spiritum agant, aut ad præstigias pellendas utiliter adhiberi possint, nemo intelliget.

6. Sententia quam impugnamus auget potentiam diaboli, potentiam verò Christi minuit; multò enim majus est et mirabilia facere ut qui reverá cæcus non sit, cæcus esse omnibus videatur, quàm reverá hominem excæcare: contrà veram cæcitatem aut surditatem sanare, majus est quàm eam, quæ nonnisi opinione cæcitatis aut surditatis erat, curare. Comp. 1 Sam. 16, 14—23. Tob. 3, 8. 6, 17. 8. 3. Joseph. A. 6, 8, 2. et 11, 12. et 8, 2. 5. Jos. Bell. 7, 6, 3. Augustin de Gen. ad lit. 12, 17. Fortè reverá phreneticus erat, sed propter ista dǽmonium pati putabatur. Similar language is held by Bucer on Matt. 9, where, inter alia, occur these words: "quò satis significatur, morbi ejus dǽmonem suisse auctorem, verè tamen suisse juxta et lunaticum et dǽmoniacum.


8. Si cæcitas dǽmoniaci tantum ab impedimento externo a dǽmone objecti fuisset orta, potuisset idem dǽmon impedimento amoto cæsis visum pro lubitu
ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. IV.

restituere.—Hoc autem facere non potuit Jo. 10, 21. Num daemonium potest oculos cacorum operire? II. Quæritur quenam fuerit ratio, cur homines, certo quodam morbo laborantes, daemoniaci et lunatici appellarentur.—De lunaticis quidem non magna est disceptatio; satis enim convenit inter eruditos, ex vulgi opinione hoc nomenuisse sortitos.

Alii ergo diabolum morborum, quibus daemoniaci laborabant, causam proximam fecerunt, dixerunt-que illum corporibus humanis unum aut plures angulos malos immississe, qui anima quasi sede deturbatâ et vinculis constrictâ, tum motus omnes et singulos linguæ, manum pedumque, qui voluntarii esse solent, imperaverint, aut cohibuerint, tum etiam alios motus nervorum convulsione civerint.—Hæc vero sententia multis magnisque difficultatibus premitur.

1. Quia nec probatur, nec probari potest.—Scriptura daemoniorum numero multituidinis facit mentionem, de diabolo, qui unus est, in daemoniatorum historia ne verbum quidem.—Neque usquam dicitur, diabolum corpora daemoniacorum in potestate habere, et possidere, quod juniorum interpretum vocabulum est. Denique non satis videntur sibi constare, dum contendunt diabolum non posse dici ejici, aut expelli, nisi prius corpora hominum possedisset atque habitasset: alibi verò Judam proditorem, in quem diabolus intrâsse legitur, a diabolo possessum fuisse, cum indignatione rejiciunt. Vide Calvin in Jo. 13, 27. et in Luc. 22, 3.

exæcatur a diabolo, non magis aut minus caæcus est, neque aut facilius aut difficilius sanabitur eo, cujus caæitas a caussis naturalibus orta est: quomodo ergo vel curiosissimus spectator veram sed latentem mali caussam ita indagabit, ut caæitatem a diabolo ortam ab omni aliâ, citra periculum erroris, certò dignoscat?

3. Non immertò etiam quæritur ab illis, qui diabolo hæc ascribunt, qui factum ut eo præcipùè tempore, quo Christus apparuit, diabolus tantum in hominum corpora haberet potestatem, quantam nec bodie exercet, nec ab eo tempore ullibi exercuisse fide dignis testibus demonstratur? Quod enim quidam respondunt, Dei permissu id tunc contingisse, ut Christus eo ampliorum sanandi haberet occasionem atque materiam; vix serio et considerare dictum videtur.


5. Qui hæc diabolo ejusque ministris malis spiritibus adscribunt, de potentia ejus magnificè quidem sentiunt, at de calliditate ejus non cogitâsse videntur: videbantur convulsiones membrorum, audiebantur sermones inepti, quales furiosorum esse solent; quis dulus latens aut quod consilium calidum in his deprehendi possit, fateror me ignorare. Porro cùm dicunt, diabolum hominì perpetuum custodem ex satellitibus apposuisse, qui oculos illius comprimeret, contineretque ne videre posseìt, imò cùm statuunt, illum toti legioni militum suorum. hominem unum custodiendum tradidisse, adeoque idem catenâ et hominem et legionem suam constrinxisse, quæ hoc unum ageret, quid stultius facere poterat? annon unus custos poterat sufficere? imò annon poterat momento citius vel cerebrum vel
oculum hominis lædere, unde, etiam abeunte malo spiritu, et morbus et morbi symptomata omnia nascen-tur? annon interim satellites suos ad alia negotia, ad regni sui finis ampliandos et tuendos, utiliter adhibere poterat? Quid ergo hic desident, — ceu cætera nusquam Bella forent, nulli totâ morerentur in urbe?

6. Maximum vero momentum ad rem affert, quod medici magno consenso et unâ quasi voce non solum daemoniacos ægrotis annumerant, illisque remedia præscribunt, verum etiam disertè dicunt morbum non a spiritu quodam aut daemon fuisset immissum, et hanc appellacionem non rei veritati, verum opinioni vulgi originem debere. So Hippocrates, Galen, Aretæus, &c. Origens, indeed, on Matth. 17, 15. and Psellus de Oper. Dæm. set lightly by such authorities. But they will not easily persuade us that they are more worthy of credit on the nature of the disorder than physicians.


As the present article has already extended to so
considerable a length, I must find some future opportunity of briefly stating the substance of what has been written on this important subject by more recent Theologians, in which I shall endeavour to fairly represent, as well the ingenious hypothesis maintained by Mede, Farmer, &c. as also what has been advanced in defence of the opinion generally entertained.

25. καὶ πέραν του Ἰορδάνου. Vulg. de trans Jordanaem. Markland thinks he read ἀπὸ πέραν; but this is an ellipsis, not uncommon in the Greek, and even the Latin. Mr. Weston instances trans Alpes venio. The Vulgate, however, fills up the ellipsis here, and in Ps. 78, 70; a mode not elegant, indeed, but sometimes found even in the Classicks. Mr. Weston instances Flor. 2, 3. de sub Alpibus, de sub ipsis Italiæ faucibus.

CHAP. V.

VERSE 1. ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὅρος. i. e. εἰς τῇ ὅρος. Vide Kuin. (Tabor, or some other mountain near to Capernaum). So the Hebrew uses ה in the place of a pronoun indefinite. Vide ad Mar. 28, 17. on the nature and genius of the Sermon on the Mount. Vide Rosen. and Kuinoel. The chief scope and intent of the whole is thus stated by Rosenmuller, partly from Wetstein. In order to thus correct the false notions of the Jews concerning the Messiah's Kingdom, and teach what kind of happiness was to be expected in it, and to more expressly declare the dispositions necessary to attain it, by his truly admirable doctrines, and the miracles which attested his mission from God, Jesus had at that time so turned the eyes of all his countrymen upon him, that a very great multitude of persons from Galilee, Decapolis, Jerusalem, and all Judæa, nay even the the regions beyond Jordan, had collected together to hear him, and were following him for that purpose. But of this multitude a considerable part
were of mean station and humble circumstances; held in contempt by the Rulers, the Pharisees, and the Priests. Many hoped from Jesus (whom they accounted nothing inferior to Moses) at least the felicity promised by Moses—affluence, prosperity, and whatever is thought promotive of worldly happiness. But of that there was little hope, since those who had hitherto followed him were in no very desirable condition. Jesus, therefore, teaches them what was to be expected and aimed at by those who should commit themselves to his direction. In order, too, that he might render his auditors the more attentive, and in conformity to Eastern custom, he propounds his doctrines by certain *paradoxa*, which seem at first sight false, but on examination turn out to be true. It was the common persuasion (for instance) that the rich only were happy. To produce this persuasion their very Religion tended, not only that of the Pharisees, but of the Sadducees, who, admiring the gifts of the Temple, and the multitude of sacrifices, thought that those were most acceptable to the God who brought most victims and offerings.

Moreover, these followers of Jesus hoped that they should partake of the *honours and riches* of the Messiah. Jesus, however, teaches them that the felicity of the heavenly kingdom is of a *different* sort to that which they had been accustomed to expect; and withal, he expressly instructs them what those who were studious of this felicity ought to avoid, and what to follow; especially the disciples *interioris admissionis*, who were to be successors of the Prophets (Comp. 5, 12), and be a light to others, not only by doctrine, but by example. Discipuli Christi omnia ad æternam vitæ alterius felicitatem referunt, et prout quæque res ad eam vel ducit, vel ab eâ abducit, ad suam vel felicitatem vel miseriam pertinere arbitrantur. Hæc est sapientia spiritualis et cœlestis quæ philosophiam hujus seculi post se relinquit, quanto ipsa hæc philosophia vulgi imperitiæ et temeritati præstand.
2. ἄνοιξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν. Vorstius and Kuinoel call this a Hebraism. Wets. has produced similar examples in the Greek Classics. Rosen, however, very properly thinks it not so much a Hebraism as an usual adjection to verbs of speaking, though in the N. T. it contributes nothing to the sense. Sometimes it seems to be put instead of a verb of speaking: so in Psal. 78, 2. ἄνοιξα ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου.


4. οἱ πεσόντες—παρακληθοῦνται, i. e. who mourn for their sins. This interpretation is brought forward and ably proved by Euthymius, from Chrysostom. So Kuinoel. Mr. Bulkley cites a similar passage from Maimonides on Repentance, 2, 6, 49. "If a man say I have sinned against such a one, but I am heartily sorry for it,—talis consolabatur." It seems to have been imitated from this of our Lord. Indeed, I suspect that the Rabbinical writers read and profited by the New Testament more than is usually supposed.

5. μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, i. e. ἐπιεικεῖς. Those who bear meekly the injuries of others, and do not avenge them, but readily concede something of their right. Wets. cites Aristot. Nich. 4, 14, et idem in Magn. Mor. 1, 23. The vulgar judge differently; they think "nihil profici patientiâ, nisi ut graviora, tanquam ex facili tolerantibus, imperentur." Tacit. Agric. 15: "Ignavi esse, de jure suo aliquid remittere, aut injuriarum illatam non ulcisci. Veterem injuriarum ferendo invitare novam. Lenitate et indulgentiâ patrum familiaris perdi filios, servos corrumpi; severitate vero in officio contineri. Ita enim sentiebant Galilæi, auditores Jesu." Vide Joseph. Bell. 3, 3, 2, 2, 18, 1.
ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. IV.


24. διαμανισόμενος. Wets. has a very long and important note, on a subject which has been discussed by some of the most eminent of our modern Biblical Critics. I shall lay before the reader a careful condensation of his very copious collectanea.

Tota res ad duas quaestiones commodè reduci potest, quorum altera ad medicinam, ad grammaticam altera spectat. I. quinam homines intelligantur? II. quænam ejus appellationis sit ratio?

I. Existimo igitur per daemoniacos et lunaticos intelligi homines certo quodam morbo laborantes. He then proceeds to state the common hypothesis, which attributes these effects to no imperfection of the natural organs, but to the enchantment or fascination of the Devil; and then offers the eight following reasons why he cannot assent to that opinion.

1. Daemoniaci disertè muti, surdi, et cæci vocantur Matth. 12, 22. Marc. 9, 25. Luc. 11, 14.; neque causa ulla idonea afferri potest, cur non simpliciter verè mutos, surdos, et cæcos intelligamus, h. e. quorum organis aliquod vitium inhaeret; aliè vero daemoniaci ita describuntur Matth. 8, 17. et parell. ut manifesta maniae aut epilepsiae signa atque symptomata in illis nemo non agnoscere possit.

2. Dicuntur a Christo sanati fuisse Matth. 15, 28. 17, 16. Luc. 9, 42. 8, 2. qui autem verè sanatur, illum prius verè in morbo fuisse necesse est. Alius daemoniacus dicitur post curatoriem sanæ mentis fuisse Marc. 5, 15. Luc. 8, 35. Unde jure colligitur, prius illum insaniam, quæ morbus est, laborasse.


5. Fl. Josephus & Medicorum libri, Gittin. f. 67, 2. Testantur daemoniacis medicamenta ex radicibus, lapidibus, herbis composita data profuisse; intelligimus autem medicamento vitium corporis corrige tollique: at quomodo in spiritum agant, aut ad præstigias pellendas utiliter adhiberi possint, nemo intelliget.

6. Sententia quam impugnamus auget potentiam diaboli, potentiam vero Christi minuit; multò enim majus est et mirabilius facere ut qui reverà cæcus non sit, cæcus esse omnibus videatur, quàm reverà hominem excæcare: contrà veram cæcitatem aut surditanem sanare, majus est quàm eam, quàe non nisi opinione cæcitatis aut surditatis erat, curare. Comp. 1 Sam. 16, 14—23. Tob. 8, 6, 17. 8, 3. Joseph. Â. 6, 8, 2. et 11, 12. et 8, 2, 5. Jos. Bell. 7, 6, 8. Aqustin de Gen. ad lit. 12, 17. Fortè reverà phreneticus erat, sed propter ista daemonium pati putabatur. Similar language is held by Bucer on Matt. 9, where, inter alia, occur these words: "quò satis significatur, morbi ejus daemonem fuisset auctorem, verè tamen fuisset juxta et lunaticum et daemoniacum.


8. Si cæcitas daemoniaci tantum ab impedimento externo a daemon objecti fuisset orta, potuisset idem daemon impedimento amoto cæsis visum pro lubitu
ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. IV.


24. ἀκμαντὶγονεύονς. Wets. has a very long and important note, on a subject which has been discussed by some of the most eminent of our modern Biblical Critics. I shall lay before the reader a careful condensation of his very copious collectanea.

Tota res ad duas quaestiones commodè reduci potest, quorum altera ad medicinam, ad grammaticam altera spectat, I. quinam homines intelliguntur? II. quænam ejus appellationis sit ratio?

I. Existimo igitur per daemoniacos et lunaticos intelligi homines certo quodam morbo laborantes. He then proceeds to state the common hypothesis, which attributes these effects to no imperfection of the natural organs, but to the enchantment or fascination of the Devil; and then offers the eight following reasons why he cannot assent to that opinion.

1. Daemoniaci disertè muti, surdi, et cæci vocantur Matth. 12, 22. Marc. 9, 25. Luc. 11, 14.; neque causa ulla idonea afferri potest, cur non simpliciter verè mutos, surdos, et cecos intelligamus, h. e. quorum organis aliquod vitium inhæserit; alii vero daemoniaci ita describuntur Matth. 8, 17. et parell. ut manifesta manias aut epilepsiae signa atque symptomata in illis nemo non agnosceré possit.

2. Dicuntur a Christo sanati fuisse Matth. 15, 28. 17, 16. Luc. 9, 42. 8. 2. qui autem verè sanatur, illum prius verè in morbo fuisse necesse est. Alius daemoniacus dicitur post curationem sanae mentis fuisse Marc. 5, 15. Luc. 8, 35. Unde jure colligitur, prius illum insania, quæ morbus est, laborasse.


5. Fl. Josephus & Medicorum libri, Gittin. f. 67, 2. Testantur daemoniacis medicamenta ex radicibus, lapidibus, herbis composita data profuisse; intelligimus autem medicamento vitium corporis corrigit toliquque: at quomodo in spiritum agant, aut ad prestigias pellendas utiliter adhiberi possint, nemo intelliget.

6. Sententia quam impugnamus auget potentiam diaboli, potentiam verò Christi minuit; multò enim majus est et mirabilius facere ut qui reverà cæcus non sit, cæcus esse omnibus videatur, quam reverà hominem excaecare: contrà veram cæcitatem aut surditatem sanare, majus est quam eam, quæ non nisi opinione cæcitatis aut surditatis erat, curare. Comp. 1 Sam. 16, 14—23. Tob. 8, 8. 6, 17. 8, 3. Joseph. A. 6, 8, 2. et 11, 12. et 8, 2, 5. Jos. Bell. 7, 6, 3. Augustin de Gen. ad lit. 12, 17. Fortè reverà phreneticus erat, sed propter ista daemonium pati putabatur. Similar language is held by Bucer on Matt. 9, where, inter alia, occur these words: "quò satis significatur, morbi ejus daemonem fuisset auctorem, verò tamen fuisse juxta et lunaticum et daemoniacum.


8. Si cæcitas daemoniaci tantum ab impedimento externo a daemon objecti fuisset orta, potuisset idem daemon impedimento amoto cæsis visum pro lubitu
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24. δαιμονιζόμενος. Wets. has a very long and important note, on a subject which has been discussed by some of the most eminent of our modern Biblical Critics. I shall lay before the reader a careful condensation of his very copious collectanea.

Tota res ad duas questions commodè reduci potest, quorum altera ad medicinam, ad grammaticam altera spectat, I. quinam homines intelliguntur? II. quænam ejus apellationis sit ratio?

1. Existimo igitur per daemoniacos et lunaticos intelligi homines certo quodam morbo laborantes. He then proceeds to state the common hypothesis, which attributes these effects to no imperfection of the natural organs, but to the enchantment or fascination of the Devil; and then offers the eight following reasons why he cannot assent to that opinion.

1. Daemoniaci disertè muti, surdi, et cóeci vocantur Matth. 12, 22. Marc. 9, 25. Luc. 11, 14.; neque causa ualla idonea afferri potest, cur non simpliciter verè mutos, surdos, et cóceos intelligamus, h. e. quorum organis aliquod vitium inhaeret; alií vero daemoniaci ita describuntur Matth. 8, 17. et parell. ut manifesta maniæ aut epilepsiae signa atque symptomata in illis nemo non agnosceré possit.

2. Dicuntur a Christo sanati fuisset Matth. 15, 28. 17, 16. Luc. 9, 42. 8, 2. qui autem verè sanatur, illum prius verè in morbo fuisset necesse est. Alius daemoniacus dicitur post curationem sanitatis fuisset Marc. 5, 15. Luc. 8, 35. Unde jure colligitur, prius illum insania, quæ morbus est, laborasse.


5. Fl. Josephus & Medicorum libri, Gittin. f. 67, 2. Testantur daemoniacis medicamenta ex radicibus, lapidibus, herbis composita data profuisse; intelligimus autem medicamento vitium corporis corrige: at quomodo in spiritum agant, aut ad præstigias pellendas utiliter adhiberi possint, nemo intelliget.

6. Sententia quam impugnamus auget potentiam diaboli, potentiam verò Christi minuit; multò enim majus est et mirabilius facere ut qui reverà cæcus non sit, cæcus esse omnibus videatur, quam reverà hominem exæcare: contrà veram cæcitatem aut surditatem sanare, majus est quam eam, quæ nonnisi opiniones cæcitatis aut surditatis erat, curare. Comp. 1 Sam. 16, 14—23. Tob. 8, 8. 6, 17. 8, 3. Joseph. A. 6, 8, 2. et 11, 12. et 8, 2, 5. Jos. Bell. 7, 6, 3. Augustin de Gen. ad lit. 12, 17. Fortè reverà phreneticus erat, sed propter ista daemonium pati putabantur. Similar language is held by Bucer on Matt. 9, where, inter alia, occur these words: "quò satis significatur, morbi ejus daemonem fuisset autorem, verò tamen fuisset juxta et lunaticum et daemoniacum.


8. Si cæcitas daemoniaci tantum ab impedimento externo a daemon obiecti fuisset orta, potuisset idem daemon impedimento amoto cæsis visum pro lubitu

24. δαιμονικόμενος. Wets. has a very long and important note, on a subject which has been discussed by some of the most eminent of our modern Biblical Critics. I shall lay before the reader a careful condensation of his very copious collectanea.

Tota res ad duas quaestiones commodè reduci potest, quorum altera ad medicinam, ad grammaticam altera spectat, I. quinam homines intelligantur? II. quænam ejus appellationis sit ratio?

I. Existimo igitur per daemoniacos et lunaticos intelligi homines certo quodam morbo laborantes. He then proceeds to state the common hypothesis, which attributes these effects to no imperfection of the natural organs, but to the enchantment or fascination of the Devil; and then offers the eight following reasons why he cannot assent to that opinion.

1. Daemoniaci disertè muti, surdi, et cæci vocantur Matth. 12, 22. Marc. 9, 25. Luc. 11, 14.; neque causa ulla idonea afferi potest, cur non simpliciter verè mutos, surdos, et cæcos intelligamus, h. e. quorum organis aliquod vitium inhaeret; alii vero daemoniaci ita describuntur Matth. 8, 17. et parell. ut manifesta manœ aut epilepsiae signa atque symptomata in illis nemo non agnoscre possit.

2. Dicuntur a Christo sanati fuisset Matth. 15, 28. 17, 16. Luc. 9, 42. 8, 2. qui autem verè sanatur, illum prius verè in morbo fuisset necesse est. Alius daemoniacus dicitur post curationem sanæ nensis fuisset Marc. 5, 15. Luc. 8, 35. Unde jure colligitur, prius illum insania, quæ morbus est, laborasse.

5. Fl. Josephus & Medicorum libri, Gittin. f. 67, 2. Testantur daemoniacis medicamenta ex radicibus, lapidibus, herbis composita data profuisse; intelligimus autem medicamento vitium corporis corrigi tollique: at quomodo in spiritum agant, aut ad præstigias pellendas utilitatem adhiberi possint, nemo intelliget.  
6. Sententia quam impugnamus auget potentiam diaboli, potentiam verò Christi minuit; multò enim majus est et mirabilius facere ut qui reverà cæcus non sit, cæcus esse omnibus videatur, quam reverà hominem excæcare: contrà veram cæcitatem aut surditatem sanare, majus est quam eam, quæ nonnisi opinione cæcitatis aut surditatis erat, curare. Comp. 1 Sam. 16, 14—23. Tob. 8, 8, 6, 17. 8, 3. Joseph. A. 6, 8, 2. et 11, 12. et 8, 2, 5. Jos. Bell. 7, 6, 3. Augustin de Gen. ad lit. 12, 17. Fortè reverà phreneticus erat, sed propter ista daemonium pati putabatur. Similar language is held by Bucer on Matt. 9, where, inter alia, occur these words: "quò satis significatur, morbi ejus daemonem fuisset autorem, verò tamen fuisset juxta et lunaticum et daemoniacum.  
8. Si cæcitas daemoniaci tantum ab impedimento externo a daemon objecti fuisset orta, potuisset idem daemon impedimento amoto cæsis visum pro lubitu
Them. 245. Herod. 6, 12, 1. \( \beta \alpha \rho \alpha \nu \varepsilon \) occurs in this sense in I Macc. 12, 55. Euthym. explains \( \tau \varepsilon \sigma \tau \varsigma \tau \varphi \gamma \alpha \nu \nu \sigma \sigma \alpha \mu \nu \varepsilon \). Wet. cites D. Chrys. p. 302. Arist. Ran. 628, 642.

24. \( \delta \alpha \mu \nu \rho \iota \varphi \gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \) Wets. has a very long and important note, on a subject which has been discussed by some of the most eminent of our modern Biblical Critics. I shall lay before the reader a careful condensation of his very copious collectanea.

Tota res ad duas quæstiones commodè reduci potest, quorum altera ad medicinam, ad grammaticam altera spectat, I. quinam homines intelligantur? II. quænam ejus appellatönis sit ratio?

I. Existimo igitur per daemoniacos et lunaticos intelligi homines certo quodam morbo laborantes. He then proceeds to state the common hypothesis, which attributes these effects to no imperfection of the natural organs, but to the enchantment or fascination of the Devil; and then offers the eight following reasons why he cannot assent to that opinion.

1. Daemoniaci disertè muti, surdi, et cæci vocantur Matth. 12, 22. Marc. 9, 25. Luc. 11, 14.; neque causa ulla idonea afferri potest, cur non simpliciter verè mutos, surdos, et cæcos intelligamus, h. e. quorum organis aliquod vitium inhaeret; alii vero daemoniaci ita describuntur Matth. 8, 17. et parell. ut manifesta manœ aut epilepsiae signa atque symptoma in illis nemo non agnoscer e possit.

2. Dicuntur a Christo sanati fuisset Matth. 15, 28. 17, 16. Luc. 9, 42. 8, 2. qui autem verè sanatur, illum prius verè in morbo fuisset necesse est. Alius daemoniacus dicitur post curationem sanœ ments fuisset Marc. 5, 15. Luc. 8, 35. Unde jure colligitur, prius illum insania, quæ morbus est, laborasæ.


5. Fl. Josephus & Medicorum libri, Gittin. f. 67, 2. Testantur daemoniacis medicamenta ex radicibus, lapidibus, herbis composita data profuisse; intelligimus autem medicamento vitium corporis corrigi tollique: at quomodo in spiritum agant, aut ad præstigias pellendas utiliter adhiberi possint, nemo intelliget.

6. Sententia quam impugnamus auctor potestiam diaboli, potentiam verò Christi minuit; multò enim majus est et mirabilius facere ut qui reverà cæcus non sit, cæcus esse omnibus videatur, quam reverà hominem excæcare: contrà veram cæcitatem aut surditatem sanare, majus est quam eam, quæ nonnisi opinione cæcitatis aut surditatis erat, curare. Comp. 1 Sam. 16, 14—23. Tob. 8, 8, 6, 17. 8, 8. Joseph. A. 6, 8, 2. et 11, 12. et 8, 2, 5. Jos. Bell. 7, 6, 8. Augustin de Gen. ad lit. 12, 17. Fortè reverà phreneticus erat, sed propter ista daemonium pati putabatur. Similare language is held by Bucer on Matt. 9, where, inter alia, occur these words: "quò satis significatur, morbi ejus daemonem fuisse auctorem, verò tamens fuisse juxta et lúnaticum et daemoniacum.


8. Si cæcitas daemoniaci tantum ab impedimento externo a daemon objecti fuisset orta, potuisset idem daemon impedimento amoto cæsis visum pro lubitu
instance of μοιχεῖον or μοιχεία meaning any thing more in the New Testament; nor, I think, of ἥπα in the Old Testament. Though in the Classics μ. is used of all illicit venereal connection generally, by which women, whether wives or virgins, are adulterated, and appear what they are not. By βλέπων understand ἐμβλέπων, gazing upon. Euthym. thus marks the connection τῶν ὑμῶν ὑμῖν παιδαγογεὶ καὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν. A passionate gazer. So ἵδειν ἐφ' ὄβρει. Liban. Or. 265. c. says he, ἡμομάλησε πρὸς τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν, to lust, and sins, if not in action, at least in intention; for ἔτω. may, with Whitby, be defined, “such a desire as gains the full consent of the will, and would certainly terminate in action, did not impediments from other causes arise; which seems taken from Augustin. de S. Domini: thus making the essence of the vice to be in the intention. So also thought many of the sages of Greece and Rome. To this purpose there is a noble passage in Juvenal, Sat. 13, 200. Reddidit ergo motu non moribus, et tamen—Has patitur poenas peccandi sola voluntas. Vide Herod. 6, 50. and 60. and Jortin’s observation, in Beloe’s transl. ἡ δὲ Πότιν ἔφη, τὸ πειρηθήναι τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ ποιῆσαι, ἴσον δύνασθαι. So Max. Tyr. D. 18, 4. Rush. καὶ γὰρ μοιχῶν κολάζει ό νόμος ὠ τῶν δρᾶσεων μάνων ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν βουλήσεων, and then subjoins other examples. So Βελείαν, Β. H. 14, 18. ὦ γὰρ μάνων ὁ ἀδικήσας κακὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ ἐννοήσας ἀδικήσαι. And Max. Tyr. Diss. 33, 4. says that, to prevent criminal action, the only safe expedient is στήσαι τὰς πτυχὰς, καὶ ἀποφράξαι τῶν ἱδρόνων γένεσιν. Alciph. 1, 15. ἔλθεν τὰς χεῖρας, μᾶλλον δὲ τὰς ἀπλήσους ἐπιθυμίας. The philosophers maintained that there was a moral delimitation adhering to lascivious thoughts. So Eurip. Hipp. 317. makes Phædra exclaim χεῖρες μὲν ἄγαλ, φην δ' ἔχει μίαςμά τι. Vide note on Matt. 18, 19.

Wetstein has adduced examples in abundance, from which I will now select the most apposite. Val. Max. 4, 3. Non solem manus (continere) sed etiam
oculos a libidinoso aspectu continentes esse debere. Plut. 156. οὐ μόνον, ἐφ’ τὰς χεῖρας δεῖ καθαρὸν ἔχειν—
ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ὦσις. Propert. 2, 12. Qui videt, is
peccat, qui te non viderit ergo non cupiet; facti
crimina habet. For, as Plato observes, ἐπι-
θυμία διὰ ὄφθαλμων ἔρχεται. And Propert. 2, 10, 12.
Oculi sunt in amore duces.

The Rabbinical writers have many sentences to
the same purpose, but expressed in less guarded
terms than those of our Saviour; ex. gr. Intuens
vel in minimum digitum fœminæ est ac si intuetur,
in locum pudendum; and, Uterum mulieris aspihciens
est ac si cum ea coiret.

29. εἰ δὲ ὁ ὄφθαλμος σου ὁ δεξιὸς. Aristotle, cited
by Wetstein, says that the right is naturally better
than the left. See also Artem. 1, 44. Plut. 2, s. a.
This, however, does not apply to the right eye. I
wonder that none of the Commentators should have
perceived that the right eye is especially mentioned,
because without that men were rendered almost
useless for the purposes of war, as it was then car-
ried on.

πότερον πότε θραχύ τι τοῦ σώματος ἀποτεμεῖν ἔθελουσίν,
ἡ πάντες (I conjecture πάντως) ἀποθάλασσειν. Ubi vide
Huds. I add (from Rosenm. 117, f.) Cicer. Philipp.
In corpore si quid ejusmodi est, quod reliquo corpori
noceat, uri secarique patimir, ut membrum aliquod
potius quàm totum corpus intereat.

30. ἣ δεξιὰ—σκανδαλίζει. Tertullian, Apol. § 46.
explains ora manum ab impudicis contactationibus,
(and so also Rosenm.) I think rightly. So, to cut off
the hand is to suppress the lust, &c. Wets. appo-
sitely cites Phil. Jud. 1, 241, 19. Διότερ ἐλέσθαι ἢν
μὲν δοκοῦσιν οἱ μὴ τελείοις ἀπαίτεοι πεπηρόθαι μᾶλλον
ἡ τὰ μὴ προσηκοῦθ ὄψιν, κεκαφώθαι μᾶλλον ἡ ἐθαλαθεῖν
ἀκαύειν λόγοιν, καὶ εἰ τετρησθαί γλάτταν ὅπερ τοῦ
μυριῶν τῶν ἀρπητῶν ἐκλαθήσαι. Plut. 2, 65. e. τὸ
Projecti quaeque cor tuum laniat, quæ si aliter
extrahi nequirent, cor cum illis evellendum erat.
Kuinoel cites Heliod. Ἀθιοπ. 2, 104. τοῖς σώματος ὀφθαλμῶις τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτιστήναι.

σκάπασιλίζειν denotes, 1. the putting a stumbling-block (σκάπασιλι) in any one's way; so Judith, 5, 1; 2. the causing any one to trip or stumble; either proprie, or metaphorice, as here, and in Sapient. 14, 11. εἰς σκάπασιλι ψυχαῖς ἀσβροέπαιν.


32. Παρεκτὸς πορνείας. Though the word signifies properly whoredom, or fornication, it must here be confined to adultery. Vide Kuin. who, after much learned discussion on the whole passage, gives the following as the sense: "Qui uxorem repudiat, nisi intercesserit adulteriam, aliamque ducit, is adulteriam committit, et qui eam, propter alias causas praeter adulteriam, dimissam ducit, is quoque committit adulteriam." See, however, Rosenm. who thinks that the emendation suggested by Eich and Bolten is not to be adopted.

34. μὴ ὀμφασι  ὄνας. Hierocles, in Aur. Cam. Pyth. p. 34, edit. Needham, says, "to reverence an oath implies not only the swearing truly and justly, but also the abstaining, as much as possible, from oaths. For, adds he, the custom of swearing will easily bring on perjury; but the abstinence from, or sparing use of an oath will secure the pious observation of it; and he that takes this caution will either not swear at all, or swear piously or justly." The punctuation and interpretation of Heinsius was adopted and approved by Heuman and Moldenhauer, Koecher and Markland. The μῆτε before ἐν τῷ ὀφανείῳ might have been omitted. Instances of a similar redundancy, where another μῆτε follows, are not rare. Phil Jud. 770. A. does not permit to swear by God, but by the earth, the sun, stars, heaven, or the world in general. Such oaths were accounted harmless. Vide et Kuinoel 169. sub finem. The Hellenists say, ὄμυκεν ἐν τίνι; the Classics ὄμυκεν κατὰ τίνος or τίνα. Wets. says, oaths by the earth, the


35. πόλις ἐστὶ τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως. Dei Optim. Maximi. This title was commonly given to the king of Persia. It is here applied to God, as in Ps. 47, 3. 48, 2, 3. 95, 8. Job 13, 9. Sira. 86, 13. Mal. 1, 14. Dan. 2, 45. The antient Arabs, says Schulz. called God simply “the King.”

36. ἐν θῇ κεφάλῃ, i. e. by the life and safety, for by so doing you swear by God the author of your safety. Rosenm. Swearing by the head was common to the Greeks and Romans. Comp. Ovid. Trist. 5, 4, 45. Athen. 2, 66. C. ὤτι δὲ ἴκον ἐνόμιζον τὴν κεφαλὴν, δὴν ἔκ τῶν κατ' αὐτῆς ὁμοιώσει. Sil. 10, 488. Hom. II. β. 259. Eurip. Hel. 841. ἀλλ' ἄγνον ὅρκον σὺν κάρα κατάμοσα. Hynn in Merc. 274. πάτρος κεφαλὴν μέγαν ὅρκον ὁμοιώσει.

36. ὥστι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ἢ μέλαιναν ποιήσαι. “Non es capitis et vitae tuae dominus.” Jesus teaches, that in every oath, although the name of God be not expressed in it, but only a swearing by the heaven, &c. yet in fact God, the Lord of heaven and earth, of our life and preservation, is invoked as a witness and avenger. Rosenm. By making our hair white or black is (I think) meant: Thou has not power over thy life (and thou must not swear by thy head), nor of thy youth or vigour, and thou must not swear by thy hair, which thou mayest indeed dye of any colour; but hast no controlling power over thy habit of body, by which it grows grey sooner or later. The antient physical writers are (says Wets.) full of medicaments for communicating black colour to the hair. Joseph. A. 16, 8, 1. describes Herod. as dying his hair black, to hide the approaches of

37. ἐστώ δὲ ὁ λόγος όμαν ναλ, ναλ. νυ, νυ. Let your yea be yea, and your nay be nay. Let your whole conversation be true, so that when you have to affirm any thing, affirm it simply, and when you have to deny any thing, deny it simply, without the addition of an oath. Wets. cites Phil. 2, 194, 41. κάλλιστον δὴ βιαφελέστατον—ὄρκοις. Jambl. V. Pyth. 9. Liban. Or. 618. b. Euseb. ap. Stob. 725. Epict. 44. Diog. Laert. 822. Quint. 9, 2. Jos. A. 15, 10, 4. B. 2, 8, 6 & 7. Hieral. in Aurea Carm. Σέβου οὕρκου. Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. P. E. 14, 27. This is only to be understood as forbidding oaths in common conversation or slight occasions.


37. ναλ, ναλ. νυ, νυ. It was, as Rosenm. observes, a common saying, τῶν δικαίων ναλ ἐστὶ ναλ, καὶ νυ ἐστὶ νυ.


38. ὀφθαλμῶν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ. This is the ancient right which exists among all nations, namely, the Lex talionis. Thus, in the laws of the twelve tables: Si membrum rupit, ni cum eo paciscitur talio esto. The exercise of this avengement is enjoined on the magistrate. Exod. 21, 24. Levit. 24, 20. Deut. 19, 21. But the Jewish doctors taught, that the same right was free to every private person who had suffered injury from another. A yet more severe law of Solon is mentioned by Diog. Laert. in Sol. 1, 57. ἐὰν μὲν ἕνα ὀφθαλμὸν ἔχοντος ἐκκόψῃ τίς, ἀνεκόπτειν τοῦς δύο. That a personal injury, however, if small, might be bought off with money, appears from Jos: A. 4, 8, 35. Vide Rosenm. in Exod. 21, 24. Wets. Rosenm.

39. μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ, i. e. not to retaliate upon the injurer. a. here, like the Syriac and Arabic הַלֵּל, not only means to resist, but (from the adjunct) to retaliate upon. And π. is here to be taken, not in the neuter, but in the masculine, after the manner of the Sept. who translate יֵשָׁל by ἀδικῶν and πονηρός. Moral maxims, similar to the above, are produced from Epictetus and the other philosophers by Bulkley, ex. gr. Plato in Gorgia 317. fin. et 318. in ἐνι κύρος τύποντα—μὴ δίδοις δίκην—πασάι ἐλυχαν. It is, however, to be understood, that Christ forbids such a resistance as may extend to revenge, not such a defence of our innocence as may consist in words. The prohibition is meant to forbid private revenge, and especially with a disposition similar to that which actuated the injurer, i. e. with malice and hatred; and such injuries are here to be particularly understood as cannot be redressed by the magistrate, or by course of law. These we should bear, rather than resort to revenge. Rosenm.

A reason for this is judiciously suggested by Eu-thymius: οὐ γὰρ θυμῶ σβέννοται θυμῶς, ὡσπερ οὐδὲ πυρὶ πῦρ. Ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐναντία γίνονται. Τῶν ἐναντίων ἱάματα.

39. ῥαπίσει, to smite with the palm of the hand; as we use rap and slap. "To the examples produced by Wets. and Kypke, I add Procop. 102, 13. Aristoph. Lys. 821. The sentence appears to be a proverbial saying, and (as such often are) hyperbolical. It has especial reference to the case of resistance to a superior force. So Juvenal, 3, 289. Nam quid agas, cūm te furious cogat, et idem fortior? Seneca de Ira. 2, 34. Cum pari contendere ancesp est, cum superiori furiosum. Joseph. B. 2, 16. οὐδὲν ὅτων vol. 1.
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τὰς πληγὰς ὅς τὸ φέρειν ἀναστέλλει. Basil. de Leg. ἐτυπτε τις—Σωκράτου, εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ πρόσωπον ἐμπεσον ἁφεδώς. Ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἀντιρέει, ἀλλὰ παρείχε τῷ παροίκῳ τῆς ὀργῆς ἐμφορεῖσθαι. Vide Aristot. Eudem. 2, 5. The expression ora præbere contumeliis, which sometimes occurs in the Latin writers, is used with a similar hyperbole. Comp. Thren. 3, 30. Prov. 20, 22. 24. 29. Christ passes now from private injuries to public oppressions, and, in the then state of justice, his admonitions were salutary.

40. The ἴματιον was the upper garment, or surtout; the χιτῶν the under garment. This is proved by a passage of Heraclid. Pont. ap. Athen. 512. β. ἀλογη μὲν ἡμισώκυντο ἴματιον, ποικίλους ὑπεδονν χιτῶνας. I must also observe that ὑπεδώνω is used in this very way by Herod. L. 1, 155. κέλευε σφες κιθώνας ὑπεδώνειν τοῖς ἐλμασι.

41. ὡστις σε ἀγγαρεύεσθε μίλλον. The sense is, if a public courier compel you, &c. The custom of transmitting intelligence by couriers placed at regular distances was first practised by the Persians, and is accurately described by Herod. 8, 98. It was in perpetual use by the Romans, and is still retained by the Turks: the couriers are termed Tatars. Wetstein observes that Christ leaves to men undiminished their natural and civil rights; and this maxim had reference chiefly to those times when the seditious spirit of the Jews needed repressing. How seasonable and necessary was the admonition, was proved by the consequences of the contrary course.

42. τῷ αὐτοῦτι σε δίδου.—μὴ ἀποστραφῆς. i.e. do not indulge ungenerous suspicions, or too anxiously inquire whether he has been reduced to mendicity by his own fault, or whether, if he borrow, he will not be too poor to repay; for thus the opportunity of benefiting him may be lost. Wets. This must be understood, so far as our ability extends and their need requires. Vide Athen. 360. 1. sub finem. Euth. Zigab.

43. Ἀγαπήσεις—τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου. Levit. 19, 18.

44. ἀγαπῶτε τῶν ἐξήρωσι ὑμᾶν. Wets. Per gradus scandit oratio—hoste. The sense is, "bear good will towards your enemies." Wets. has collected similar passages from the Classics. I add, from Diog. Laert. (apud Bulky): It was a maxim with the sect of the Higians not to hate the offender, but to teach him better by your example. The words that follow, namely, εὐλογεῖτε, &c. explain the ἀγαπᾶτε.

44. οὗ τῶν φίλων αὐτῶν ἀνατέκλει ἐκ τ. κ. α.—ἀλίκους. Wets. gives many parallel passages from M. Ant. 7, 79. et 8. 48. Seneca de Benef. 4, 26. Si Deos imitatis; de et ingratis beneficia. Nam et sceleratis Soli

46. τίνα μ.ισθὸν ἔχετε. What reward have you laid up for you.


48. τέλειοι. Vide Schl. It is here used in a moral sense. So Noah is called (teste Philone 354. C.) in scripturā τέλειοι; as possessing not one virtue but all. And Joh. 1, 4. after terming some Christians τέλειοι adds (exegetically) ἐν μινθεὶ λειπομένους. Vid. Isocrat. apud Wet. He who loves his friends only, is not perfectly, but in part, good; since he ought to love all: thus imitating the common Father and God of all. Cicero pro Marcello, 3. Animum vincere, iraundiam cohibere, victoriam temperare, adversarium nobilitate, ingenio, virtute præstantem, non modo extollere jacentem sed etiam amplificare ejus pristinam dignitatem: hoc qui faciat, non ego eum cum summis viris comparo, sed simillimum Deo judico. Plut. 550. E. Phil. 1, 175, 8. Wet. Be ye perfect in love. So St. Luke concludes the parallel place with the precept, Be ye then merciful, as your Father in Heaven is merciful. M. Anton. 10, 8. says, The gods do not want us to flatter, but to imitate them.

CHAP. VI.

VERSE 1. προσέχετε, scil. νοῦν. The contrary word is omitted in our phrase, mind that you do, &c. which appears to be the best version of the word. Euthym. thus, very judiciously, points out connection: Φυτεύσας Ἦδη τὰς ἀρετὰς, λαυτὴν ἁναρεῖ καὶ τὸ παραφυόμενον καὶ ἐνοχλοῦν αὐτῶν πᾶσος, λέγει δὲ τὴν κενοδοξίαν, ἢν καὶ, μετὰ τὸ φυτεύσαι τὰ κατορθόματα, ἀναστά, διότι οὐ πρὸ τούτων, ἀλλὰ μετὰ ταῦτα παραφύεται. Κενοδοξία

2. μὴ σαλπίγγης ἐμπροσθέν σου. It is now agreed by the best commentators that this must not be taken propridé (for there is no proof that the Jews had a custom of sounding a trumpet when they gave alms), but impropridé. The phrase signifies to do any thing ostentatiously; and seems to have been a proverbial expression. Thus Αἰlian, V. H. 2, 44. cited by Weston, apud Bowyer, where it is said, "a man would not display the picture he had to show;" πρὶν ἢ Σαλπίγγη τὴν παρεστήσατο, καὶ προσέταξεν αὐτῷ τὸ παρομη-τικόν ἐμπυνεύσαι μέλος.


2. ἀπέχουσι τῶν μισθῶν. The Classical writers prefer ἀπολαμβάνω. So a Comic writer in Athen. 240. Α. ἐγκαυματίζων αὐτῶν—ἀπέλαβον τὴν χάριν. Wets. cites Achmet. 187. εἰ δὲ τὸ, ὅτι ἀπενεχεῖ, καὶ ἐπάλλαζεν μισθὼν, ἀπέχει τῶν μισθῶν αὐτῶν. Sil. 9, 194. Mihi magna satis, sat vire superque Bellandi merces sit gloria. Numerous passages of a similar sense are produced from the Rabbinical writers by Wets. and Schoetg. in loco, and by Scheid. apud Meuschen. in N. T. ex
Talmude illust. p. 66. Bulck. cites Epict. 3, 2. where, exposing the folly of those who do nothing but out of regard to the public eye, says, ἀπεχεὶς ἄπαντα.

3. μὴ γνάτω ἡ ἁρωτερα σου. An hyperbolical and proverbial form of expression, signifying the greatest possible secrecy. Action (says Wets.) is properly attributed to the right hand, as being more used than the left. Diod. Sic. 3, 4. ή μεν δεξία τοὺς διακύλους—χρημάτων. (Wets.) Vide Gatak.

4. The phrases ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ and ἐν τῷ ἰανερῷ are for κρυπτῶς and ἰανερῶς.

5. ἀμφότερον, λέγω ὧμιν—ἀπεχεύοις. Observe the emphasis, which Origen. de Orat. § 54. has judiciously illustrated.

5. ἐν ταῖς γανάλισ τῶν πλατεῖων. Where the streets meet, and where there is therefore a greater concourse of passengers, as well as a broader space in which to be observed.

5. ἐστῶτες. Castellio in Annot, 110. takes it simply for being; since the word sometimes signifies esse, or adesse. But it was not unusual to the Jews, and even the Greeks, to pray standing, as has been proved by Alard. Stock. in hoc loco. Zeibich. Spec. obs. in Nov. Test. ex numismatis antiquis, referred to by Koecher, and especially by Wets. in loc. Compare Marc. 2, 25. Luc. 18, 11. Dan. 9, 20. Martial, 12, 77.

5. ἄκος ἄν οἱ φανεροὶ. Wets. compares Origen. de Orat. § 30. and Horat, Epist. 1, 16.

6. εἰς τὸ ταμιεῖον. Thy private oratory. Kuinoel observes, that it answers to the Hebr. בהז, an upper room, set apart to retirement and prayer, among the Orientals; sometimes called the ἀποθέα. Vide not. ad Marc. 2, 3. et Vitring. de Synag. 1, 1, 6. Origen, de Orat. § 55. with more piety than judgment, allegorizes this.

6. πατήρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ. Grot. compares Arrian, Epict. 1, 14. Υπατον κλίνοντες τὰς θύρας, καὶ σκέπας ἔνδυον ποιήσατε, μεμφθεὶς μηδέποτε λέγειν, ἐκαὶ μόνοι ἐστε' οὐδὲ ἔστε, αλλ' ὁ θεὸς ἔνδυον ἐστί, καὶ ὁ οὐρανός δαίμων ἔνδυον ἐστί, καὶ τίς τούτοις χρεία φῶς εἰς τὸ

7. μὴ βαπτολογήσητε. Use not garrulous, prolix, and therefore vain, useless, and foolish speech. The Greek Lexicographers explain βαπτολογία by πολυλογία, ἀργολογία, ἀκαρπολογία (for the word itself is not found in the Greek authors preserved to us); and Gloss. vett. βαπτόλαλος, garrulus.

7. οἱ εὕνωκοι. The Jews called their own nation καὶ (λαός); all others ἡμᾶς (ἡμ). Wets.

7. δοκούσι γὰρ ὅτι ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ. The Commentators tell us that this is a Hebraism. It is found, however, in Soph. Aj. 963. θάνως ἄν εἰμιδέξειν ἐν χρείᾳ δορὸς.

8. Christ had before treated of those who pray that they may deceive others. Now he adverts to the case of those who in prayer deceive themselves; who use verbose repetitions, not approaching the Deity with due reverence, but uttering many things inconsiderately and foolishly. They address the Almighty as if they doubted his knowledge, as if it were necessary to say the same thing so many times over, that he might understand and not forget; or as if they doubted of his wisdom; as if he could be carried away by a flow of words, and thus be moved to give what otherwise he would not have granted; or as if they doubted of his goodness, which could need to be subdued by importunate solicitations. Xen. Mem. 1. εὐχητο πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ἀπλῶς τ' ἀγαθὰ δίδωναι, ὡς τοὺς θεοὺς κάλλιστα εἰδότας, ὅποια ἀγαθὰ ἔστι. Poeta ap. Plat. Zeu βασιλεύ, τὰ μ' ἐσθαλα καὶ εὐχομένοις καὶ ἀνεικτοῖς Ἀμμι δίδου τὰ δὲ δεινὰ καὶ εὐχομένοις ἀναλέξειν. Vide Heliod. 4. p. 188. Juvenal, 10, 7. Evertère domos totas optantibus ipsis Di faciles.—Si consilium vis, permittes ipsis expendere numinisbus, quid Conveniat nobis, rebusque sit utile nostris:
Nam pro iucundis aptissima quæque dabunt Df. Carior est illis homo, quam sibi; non animorum Impulsu, et cæcâ magnâque cupidine ducti, Conjugium petimus, partumque uxoris: at illis Notum, qui pueri, qualisque futura sit uxor. Orandum est, ut sit mens sana in corpore sano. Wetstein.

9. ὁταίς οὖν προσευχεῖτο. Euthymius says that our Saviour has given us this form of prayer, not that we should use it only, but that, having this fountain of prayer, we may thence draw out precatory thoughts. On the subject of prayer to God, there are many acute and just observations in Max. Tyr. Diss. 19, p. 314; and in Philostr. V. A. 4, 40, p. 181; for some of which, however, I suspect that they are indebted to the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament: ex. gr. in the latter we have, ἔνειλοι γὰρ τὰ πάντα ἐς εὐχὴν μιαν, καὶ προσῆλθαν τοῖς βαπτισίν, ὥσπερ εὐχαριστεῖς, ἀν Θεῷ, δοθέτε μοι τὰ ὑφειλόμενα—quæ mihi convenient. Proverb; feed me with food convenient for me, &c.

οὕτως, in this manner, this sense. Though we are not required to use the very words as often as we pray, yet it seems reverential and proper to include this prayer, which (as Wets. observes) contains all things that can be asked of God, together with an acknowledgment of his divine majesty and power, and of our own subjection. He also remarks that it is entirely composed of Jewish formulas skilfully put together.

9. πάτερ ἦ. v. a. It is here judiciously observed by Euthymius: κελευεὶ λέγειν τὰ πάτερ—ἳνα μιμησακιμεθα τῆς ἀνωθεν εἰγενείας, καὶ οἷς δωρεᾶς ἔξωθημεν, ιδονετθέντες τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἴνα ἄξιοις πατρὸς τοιοῦτον πολιτευώμεθα: ὁ γὰρ φαύλως μὲν βιών, πατέρα δὲ ἐαυτοῦ τὸν Θεὸν ἀναμάζουν, καταστείλεται, καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐαυτοῦ. Arrian, Epict. L. 1. considers God as our father and our head; and, in cap. 9, he treats περὶ τῆς συγγένειας τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων. Herodotus also, L. 4, 59. says that, among the Scythians, Zeus δὲ, (ὀρθῶσατα, κατὰ γυνώμην γε ἑν ἐμήν,) καλέται Παπάιος,
i. e. 

\[ \pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho\ \alpha\nu\rho\delta\omega\nu\ \tau\varepsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omega\nu\ \tau\varepsilon: \] where consult: the learned annotation of Valcknaer. Bulkley cites Max. Tyr. D. 38. o \(\tau\nu\varepsilon\ \omicron\tau\nu\ \pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho. \) This very expression is found in the Rabbinical writings; ex. gr. Cod. Jom. ap. Bulk. See also Wetstein.

9. \(\alpha\gamma\rho\alpha\sigma\theta\eta\tau\alpha\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \\delta\omicron\nu\mu\alpha\ \sigma\omicron. \) Observe the use of the imperative for the optative. The words of this and the following clause are not (says Wets.) petentium sed adorantium: et Dei majestatem agnoscentium colentiumque. — Wetstein thus paraphrases: Te Deum laudamus, te celebramus, tuam majestatem colimus, tu solus aeternus, tu solus immensus, tu solus tibi sufficit, nihil tibi est simile, aut secundum, tu supra omnia emines, tuas laudes depraeidamus, tu omni laude nostra major es, tuas virtutes embecilla mens nostra ne cogitatione quidem satis essequitur.

10. \(\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\beta\iota\tau\omega\ \tau\omicron\ \\theta\epsilon\ell\mu\mu\alpha\ \sigma\omicron. \) Wetstein remarks: "Cum dicimus: adveniat regnum tuum, promittimus obedientiam activam; cum verò addimus: fiat voluntas tua, promittimus etiam obedientiam passivam, ut in Scolis loquuntur. Voluntas Dei opponitur voluntati hominum; volunt homines esse divites, honorati, vivi, sani rectèque valentes, nullis injuriis obnoxii. At Deo sœpe aliter: videtur, qui nos vult cum morbis, cum paupertate, cum humiliitate et molestii conflictari; quo casu voluntatem nostram divinæ accommodare, imperio ejus nos subjacere, nosque totos illi permittere debemus. 1 Sam. 3, 18. 2 Sam. 15, 26. 1 Macc. 3, 60. Matth. 26, 42. Act. 21, 14, 2. Sam. 16, 10. Rom. 9, 19. Psalm 101, 2. 185, 6. Beracoth, f. 29, 2. Quænam est oratio brevis? R. Eliezer dicit: Voluntatem tuam fac in cœlis super, et dato quietem spiritus timentibus te infra. Bereschith. R. 61. Dixit Abrahamus: ego sum caro et sanguis, ego hodie hic, et cras in sepulcro; jam feci meum, porro quod Deus S. B. voluerit fieri in mundo suo, faciet.—Epictet. 18. \(\mu\eta\ \zeta\theta\iota\varepsiloni\ \tau\omicron\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\ \gamma\iota\nu\sigma\tau\omicron\ \omicron\ \\beta\epsilon\ell\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\iota\sigma. \) And 79. eì ta\(\omicron\tau\eta\) tois \(\theta\epsilon\omicron\sigma\iota\iota\sigma\iota\)
ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. VI.


10. αἷς ὑπερανό, καλ ε. τ. γ. Examples of this ellipsis of oūταω are adduced by Wets. from Luc. 6, 31. Jo. 20, 21. Act. 7, 51. Plut. 460. Δ. Herod. 7, 128. and 8, 64. I add Thucyd. 8, 1. αἷς δεδοκαν αὐτοῖς, καλ ἐκοινῷ ταύτα. Non patuerunt ordinem in coelis non agnoscerae etiam alii, qui dubitarunt, utrum providentia curaret terram et res hominem. Vide Aristot. de Part. An. 1, 1. Arrian. Epict. 1, 12. Cic. Ac. 2, 1, 7. de Nat. D. 2, 2. & 5. Diod. Sic. 2, 30. Claud. in Rus. 1. Sæpe mihi——non arte regt. Lucan, 2, 267. Philo, 2, 61, 50. The whole sentence is thus paraphrased by Rosenmuller: Nos autem precamur ut quam plurimis hominibus contingat doctrina Christi illustrari, ejusque legibus emendari. On this text see an admirable Sermon by Bishop Lowth, recently published (at the suggestion of Dr. Parr) by Mr. Nichols. The clause ἐλήθη τοῖς σ. is thus explained by the learned Prelate: "The meaning is, that we should make it a constant and perpetual subject of our petitions to Almighty God, that this Gospel-state, or Church of Christ, so begun and established on earth, may, through his grace, be still advanced and carried on, till at length it arrive at that maturity and completion,—that universality, unity, and spiritual perfection, which he hath decreed and promised that it shall in time attain."

The subject is farther illustrated in an excellent Sermon by Dr. Clarke, from which I lay before my readers the following extracts: "God is by nature King over all; and his Kingdom is the Universe. The Kingdom of God principally consists in his government of reasonable and intelligent creatures;
in his being served and obeyed by those who at the same time are capable of disobeying; who by their own actions set forth his glory, and not merely in their being acted upon by him.—This is that where-in principally consists the Kingdom of God: a kingdom wherein shines forth the goodness and justice and wisdom and holiness of the Supreme Governor, as clearly as his power and dominion does in his ruling the whole material universe."—"By sin this Kingdom of God, this his government over the hearts and wills of the rational part of the creation, is opposed and withstood.—In order to destroy which works of the Devil, God was pleased to give assistance and strength to the light of nature and reason, by making revelation of himself, from time to time, to a degenerate world;—at last by his own son; that, by the knowledge, worship, and love of the One true God and Maker of all things, in purity and holiness of life, in justice, meekness, and universal charity and good-will towards each other, he might bring them back from a state of general corruption, to become worthy and obedient subjects of his Father's Kingdom of Righteousness."—"For this reason, the state of the Gospel, the Religion of Christ, the obedience of Faith, is in Scripture perpetually styled the Kingdom of God,"

11. τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὴν ἐπιούσιον δὲ γὰρ ἡμῖν σήμερον. In the explication of the word ἐτί there has been much difference of opinion. See Wolf. Cur. Phil. Koecher's Analecta. Salmasius de Fœnore, p. 812. Suicer's Thes. Eccl. in v. Pol. Sun. in loco. Many antient and modern Philologists derived the word from ἐπισώσα, i.e. ἡμέρα. They do not, however, agree in the exposition founded on this derivation. Some say (as Wets and Paulus) that it signifies in futurum tempus—for the future, for the remainder of our lives. But, as Markland observes, this is going too far. The prayer was meant to remind us of our daily and continual dependance on God's bounty, and that we must not expect it unless we
seek it in daily prayer; and that it was incumbent to use the prayer daily, we learn from the Fathers. Others, with more probability, confine it to the morrow; taking the word to denote the same as εἰς αὔριον. This is espoused by many eminent scholars, Scaliger, Salmasius, Kuster; and recently by Jortin, Fischer, and Valck. It is, moreover, confirmed by the reading of the Nazaræan Gospel, noted by Jerome ἄρα.

But this derivation of ἐπιώσις, Toup. (Emend. 2, 274.) has satisfactorily proved to be contrary to analogy, and the genius of the Greek language; and I would observe, moreover, the sense arising from it is somewhat harsh and frigid. There is yet greater objection to the derivation of Noessell and Paulus, namely, from ἐπιέναι—ad manus esse semper paratum. For this is equally against analogy; and the petition, in the first case, would ask too much. It however brings to one's mind a similar passage of Horace (Epist. 1, 18, 109.) "Sit bona librorum et provisæ frugis in annum Copia, ne fluitem dubiae spe pendulus horæ."

The interpretation of Markland and Weston, who take it to signify "for the remainder of the day," or "till to-morrow," is liable to the contrary objection, and is very frigid and far-fetched.

I do not hesitate to accede to the opinion of Beza, Mede, Toup. Rosenm. Kuin. and others, supported, as it is, by the authority, not only of Basil and Chrysostom, but of Jerome himself, T. 9, p. 10. b. So also Greg. Nyss. ἐρτον τῆς σημερίνης χρείας. Suidas. Elym. Mag. The Syriac version. Euthymius and Theoph. τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς οὐσίας καὶ οὐκάκει τού σώματος ἐπιτήδειον. Thus ἐπὶ will have the force of belonging to, needful for, &c. Kuinoel compares ἐπιλήνιον and ἐπιτάφιον; and observes (in answer to the objections of Salmasius and Scaliger) that the iota is sometimes, as here, retained in the compounds; ex. gr. ἐπιεικῆς, ἐπιθέρκος, ἐπίαλλω. Of the word ἐπιώσις, no other example, except in the parallel passage of Luke, has
yet been produced. It may be regarded, probably, as one of the words of the Plebeian, idiotic, and popular diction, of which, comparatively, so few have been preserved to our age. For, as it has been acutely and truly observed by Salmassius, in his invaluable Comment. de Hellenisticâ, p. 107, Vix enim millesima pars restat eorum, qui alicquid Graecè commentati sunt. Si omnes extaret, nulla vox tam μονήγης in novâ et vetere paginâ reperiretur, quin Χρησίς ejus ex aliquo auctore, qui perìt, confirmari posset: præcipuè si illi extarent, qui plebeio stilo, et idiotico, res ac vitas privatorum scripserunt. Yet Origen, de Orat. 16. says that it is neither found in the writings of the Classics, nor used ἐν τῇ τῶν ιδιατῶν συνθέσει, ἀλλ’ έοικε πεπλάσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν.

Matthias thinks it formed after the same model as περιοικής; for as that means abundant or superfluous, so this signifies ἐπαρκής, χρεώδης.

12. ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡ. This must be taken in a figurative sense, and is more plainly expressed by Luke, ἀφαίρεις. This latter phrase is produced by Wets. from Lysias. ἀφ. is used of remission, both as applied to debts and to trespasses.

18. μὴ εἰσενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν—ne sinas nos immergi et succumbere nimis periculosus irritamentis malorum.

μη... Campbell translates, “do not abandon us to temptation:” and Cypr. Tertull. “ne nos patieris induci in tentationem.” So Augustin apud Bulk. “when we say unto God, Lead us not into temptation, what do we say, but, Suffer us not to be led into it.” And Gregory, “induci minimè permittas.”

13. ἀλλὰ ῥύσας ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. I render the evil one, Satan. This interpretation (which seems to me the true one) is not destitute of authority. Vide Wolf and Koecher. Thus in the ancient prayers of the Jews, “et libera nos a Satanâ.” By this same word Satan is elsewhere denominated: as in Matt. 18, 19. Jo. 2, 13 & 14. 3, 12. and so it is
here explained by Euth. and Theoph. Euth. says, the Devil is so called κατ' εξίσευσιν. As the prayer is almost composed of Jewish formulas, the first argument has considerable weight.

14. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφήνει τοὺς ἀνθράκτους τὰ παρακαταμαθμα αὑτῶν, ἀφήνει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος—uti vitia non emendata non condonari certum est, ita etiam vitia emendata non condonari nisi accedat indulgentia erga alios, Christus docuit. Wets.

16. ὅταν δὲ νηστεύει. Said not of common, or public fasts, but of private ones, as on Monday, Sunday, which most of the Pharisees observed, but also on other days. Vide Buxt. Synag. p. 279 et 574.

16. μὴ γίνεσθε ἀστεροὶ εἰ υποκριταί, σκυθρωτοῖς, signifies here, properly, scowling, obductis supercilii, and consequently morose, sorrowful, and sometimes pale. Each of these sentences is well illustrated by Wetstein, Kypke, Krebs, and Kuinoel, who says that the context requires that we should understand tristitia conjuncta cum squalore, in habitu corporis et vestitu. Lucian, in his Piscator, inveighs against pretended philosophers, calling them, as here υποκριτὰς and σκυθρωτοῖς. A similar passage is produced by Munth. from Diod. Sic. where ὑποκρίταις and σκυθρωτοῖς are joined.

16. ἀφανίζουσιν γὰρ τὰ πρόσωπα—deturpare solent vultum et caput. For πρ. may extend to both. Here is signified the letting the hair of the head and beard go uncombed and unanointed, and the head and face sprinkled with ashes. The sense is, “they screw their faces into a semblance to sorrow, thereby disfiguring them.” So AEschyl. in Agam. 766, says of persons affecting to sympathize with those who rejoice. ἐναχαλζουσίν ὑμοιοπρεπεῖς ἀγέλαστα πρόσωπα βιαζόμενοι; where see Dr. Blomfield.

17. ἀλευρίζει σοι τὴν κεφαλὴν, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν σου νίπτει. This custom, of washing and anointing, so prevalent in the East, in a hot climate is, doubtless, very refreshing. Wets. has copiously illustrated this from the Latin classics.

19. μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὃμεν θησαυροῖς. The word θησαυροῖς is especially said of such precious moveables as are accustomed to be treasured up, ex. gr. gold and silver, sumptuous apparel, of which the Orientals always lay up great quantities, and also the fruits of the earth, corn, wine, and oil. Gen. 35, 2, 41. Jos. 7:21. Jud. 14, 12. 2 Sam. 12, 20. Amos, 8, 5. where δ. is used of a repository of corn, as in Aelian. V. H. 6, 12. and Anim. 3, 10. Kuin. and Rosenm. These repositories were usually subterranean. There is a passage very apposite in Philost. Vit. Ap. 5, 36. πλούτων ἡγούμενον, μη τῶν ἀκαθέτων τι γὰρ ἀν βελτίων ὡθεὶς τῆς ὁ πόδες ὅ ἐσεν ἡ ἐκενεχθείσης ψάμμου; —ἀσφαλῆ τῶν πλούτων.


20. Θησαυρίζετε—θ. ἐν οἴραμι. Σο Λουκ. 12, 33, θησαυρὸς ἀνέκλειτος ἐν οἴραμι. Κυρπ. cites Themist. 219. B. (which I had also noted down). I add Phil. 116. A. ταμευοῦμεν ναρ′ ἐαυτὸς φιλάττε θησαυρον, οὐκ ἐν ὧν ἔρισθο καὶ ἄργυρος οὐδεὶς φοβαρτα κατάκανται, ἀλλὰ τῶν οὐτῶν κυβιμάτων το καλλιστευον, περὶ ἄρετῆς, κ. τ. λ. Philostr. Vit. Soph. 2, 1. θησαυρίζοντος τῶν πλούτων τῶν ἐν ταῖς τῶν μετεχόντων αὐτῶν γκλαίμας. Euthym. remarks, τι οὖν; τὸ χρυσόν σῆς ἄφανιΓε; εἴ καὶ μὴ σῆς, ἀλλὰ κλέεται. Τι δὲ; πάντες συλοῦνται; εἴ καὶ μὴ πάντες, ἀλλά δὲ πλείους. Ἀδηλὸν δὲ, τίνες ἄσυλοι μενοῦν. Τὰ γὰρ διανεμομένα τοῖς πένησι, πάς θησαυρίζονται; ἐν τῷ οἴραμι; πῶς; ἐν τῷ ταμευόσθαι ἐκεῖ τὰς αὐτοδίδεις τούτων καὶ τὰς ἀμοίβας, αὐτοὶ συλλεγόμεναι καὶ θησαυριόμεναι φιλᾶττονται ἀσφαλῶς.


Rosenm. observes, that this precept (like most other admonitions in this sermon) were properly and strictly meant for the Apostles only. It is, however, applicable, mutatis mutandis, to all Christians.


Olearius, however, has rightly perceived, that the words are to be taken proprie, and that the whole passage is adagial, of which the first part (namely, the eye, as the light of the body) forms the adage. Then, 2dly, we have the deduction, by consequence, “If therefore thine eye be,” &c. 3dly, the application, If the light—darkness. So in Artemid. Onir. 1, 28. the eyes are said to be τοῦ σώματος ἀποτοματον καὶ ἡγεμόνες. Christ, says Wets. compares the mind to the body, and judgment to the eyes. Thus Aristot. Top. 1, 14, αἷς ἂν ἔστε ὁ τριετής νοῦς ἐν πυρὶ, which is imitated by Phil. 1, 12, 2. also, Hierocles and Galen, ap. Wets. So also Aristid. ibidem. καὶ γὰρ ἂν ἔχει—οἶκον. Vide Plut. 2, 281. D. Jamb. de V. P. C. 32, νοῦς γὰρ, κατ’ αὐτοῦς, παθῇ ὅρις, καὶ πάντες ἀκούεις τὰλλα δὲ καὶ καφῶς καὶ τυφλὰ. Vide Marc. Ant. 1, 12. Ovid. Met. 15, 64. Et quae natura negavit visibus humanis, oculis ea pectoris hausitis. I add, that there is a similar passage in Isocr. Areop. § 5. By the φῶς ἐν σοὶ is meant the light of conscience. There is the same metaphor in a very sublime passage of Aeschyl. Eumen. 519. τίς δὲ μοιδῆν ἐν φάει καρδίας ἀνατηθεῖν η τοίχης βροτός ὀμιλοὶς ἐστὶ ἐν σέβοις οἴκαι. Compare Demad. Orat. § 6.

24. After δεῦριον Euth. understands ἐναντία ἐπιταττούμεν. He might have also noticed that the sense of the passage is this: as no one can serve two masters, so neither can ye serve God and Mammon.

Wets. compares D. Chrys. 608. C. On this qualified sense of μισεῖν and ἄγαταιν, which most interpreters inculcate, see, besides their notes, Dr. Maltby’s Sermons, vol. 2. I, however, am inclined to assent to Kuinoel, who maintains that there is no necessity for receding from the usual signification of the words. 24. ἐκτείνεται. He will studiously cling to the one, be attached to him, this sense is well illustrated by Wets. The difference between the Classical and the Hellenistic use (which has never yet been pointed
out) is this; that in the former we have the genit.
rei, in the latter genit. personæ. As in Prov. 3, 18.
1 Thess. 5, 14. It also occurs in the very recent
writer, J. Malela, p. 121. cited by Wetstein.

24. Μαμμανα. The God of riches among the
Syrians, who was Πλούτος among the Greeks. Vide
the Commentators. I add, see Eurip. Cycl. 316.
where Cyclops thus addresses Ulysses: ο Πλούτος,
ἄνθρωπισκε, τοὺς σόφοις Θεὸς τὰ δὲ ἄλλα κόμποι, καὶ λα-
γαποι, εὐμορφιαί. Vide Epict. 4, 2. Wets. has many
parallel passages, of which I select the following:
Demoph. Sent. φιλοχρήματον καὶ φιλόθεου τῶν αὐτῶν ἄδο-
ματον ἦναι: ο γὰρ—φιλοχρήματος ἦς ἀνάγκης ἄδικος.
Pausan. Lacon. 23. ἄνθρωπως γὰρ ἀφοράντι ἐς κέρδος
τὰ θεία ὑπερα κηρύκατον. Horat. Epist. 1, 10, 47. Im-
perat, aut servit collecta pecunia cuique. Euth.
tells us why we cannot serve God and Mammon.

25. μὴ μεριμνάτε. Ne nimiā sollicitudine distra-
hamini: be not excessively anxious about your life.
Vide Euth. in loco. Weston compares Lucret. 3,
1006. Sed Titios nobis hic est in amore jacentem
quem volucres lacerant atque exest anxius angor.

25. τῇ Ψυχῇ ύμῶν, τί φάγγε. Wets. compares
Senec. ad Marciam, 22. Arrian. Epict. 1, 9, &c. but
he appears not to have perceived that the passage
does not represent anxiety how the most enjoyment
may be attained, but rather how the necessary wants
of the body may be satisfied; and so Euth. under-
stands it, where see. I do not, therefore, agree with
Scapula Gr. Lex. 1634, that τί is here to be taken
for ποίον.

25. οὖν ἡ Ψυχή πλεῖον; prestantius, μεγὼν, Euth.
who well observes, ἢ τὸ πλεῖον δοὺς ὑμῖν καὶ ἔλασσον
δἀσεῖ.

25. καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνθύμητος. Wets. cites the fol-
lowing very similar passage from Aristid. T. 2, 30.
ἐνεπερ ἄν εἶ τις τὰ ὑπόθυμα κρεῖττα τῶν ποδῶν, τὴν δὲ
ἐσεθητα τοῦ σῶματος κρῖοι τιμωτέραν καὶ οἷς ἔσκε τά
μὲν χρῆματα τῶν πορίζωντων αὑτὰ καὶ χρωμένην ἀτμώ-
tερα ἦγομένα.
26. τὰ πτερνά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, fowls of the air; which fly in the air. Both phrases are frequent in Scripture: οὐ. for air, is not unusual. Wets. refers to Ps. 104, 12. Esth. 8, 15. The phrase brings to my mind a very elegant passage of Eurip. Elect. 897. ἡ σκύλον οἰκονομίαν αἰθέρος τέκνοις.


26. διαφέρετε. Are ye not superior to them. As an example of this signification, Wets. adduces Thucyd. 1, 84. πολλὶ διαφέρει ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπον, and other passages; to which I add Alexand. ap. Athen. 261. F.

27. τίς δὲ—μ. ὁ. τ. ἐ. τ. ἡμικινὴ—πτῆχω. All the best, and especially the more recent commentators, interpret ἡμ. not staturam, but στάτημα, vitæ cursum. Nam sermo est (says Wets.) de re, quam homines desiderant, et cujus possessione sese feliciores fore putant: atqui, si quis posset cubitum addere staturæ suas curas et molestias non minueret sed augeret, cum ipsi alia vestis, alius lectus, alia domus etiam quærenda esset. Porro loquitur Christus de cubito, tanquam re minimâ, quod Lucæ 12, 26. dicitur, τὸ ἐλάχιστον. Si vero staturæ nostræ cubitus addere- tur, magna et insignis esset additio. The word is used of age. So Minner. ap. Stob. τιχύον ἐπὶ χρό- νων ἁθέοιν ἡμῆς τεράσμεθα. In Psalm 39, 6. the duration of life is compared to a palm. This interpretation is adopted by Rosenm. and Kuin. who add Diog. Laert. 8, 16. οὐθεμην τοῦ βίου; and Alceus ap. Athen. 10, 7. ἡ δύνατος ἁμέρα.

28. καταμάθετε τὰ χρήματα. The preposition has an intensive force, as in κατανωεῖν (Luc. 12, 27.), attentively survey. The word is used by the Sept. Further illustrations may be seen in Kypke, Alberti, and Loesner.
28. τὰ κρίνα τοῦ ἄγρου. The field lilies, which are not cultivated with care, like the garden lilies.

28. οὐ κοπιᾷ, οὐδὲ νήθει. The former word has reference to the occupation of men in agriculture and other laborious employments, the latter to those which require close and sedentary attention, such as in antient times chiefly fell to the lot of women. L. Brug. Hamm. Wets.


30. οὗτος ἀμφίεννω — ornat. This word, and ἐνδύσωσθαί, like indui and vestiri, are used of plants and trees which are adorned with leaves and fruit. Vide Virg. Ecl. 3, 89. Gen. 1, 188. 2, 219. Triller. Vide et Wolf. Doddridge has not inelegantly illustrated the propriety and beauty of this expression.


30. εἰς κλίμανων. Not an oven, such as ours, but only a cauldron or pot, used for baking bread, and thus described by Hieron. ap. Wets. Clibanus est coquendis panibus ænsi vasculi ducta rotunditas, quæ sub uentibus flammis ardet intrinsecus. Cantic. 2, 2 in clibanum conjicebantur.

31. τὸ πιστευ. The words must (I think) be ut-
tered, not so much with an interrogation but an exclamation. See note supra 5, 25.

32. πάντα γὰρ τ. τ. ε. επιθυμεῖ. Eurip. 6, 7. The επίθυμεν is intensive, anxiously seek. It was no wonder (remarks Wets.) that the Gentiles should have felt vehement anxiety about food, &c. since they thought either that the world was not governed by Providence, or that the Gods slept, like men, or were absent from home, or could not attend to all employments at once.

32. οἶδε γὰρ—χρηστε. Jesus argues from God’s knowledge to his goodness. Your heavenly Father knoweth, and therefore will bestow them; i.e. on the supposition that ye ask for them, and are not otherwise unfit to receive them. So Rom. 14, 4. Markl.

33. ἡττεῖτε—δικαιοσύνη. The plan of salvation by Christ, which offers pardon of sin and eternal happiness. Wetstein.

33. προστεθήσεται, as accessory, celestial happiness being the principal. Lucian de Lapsu, 11. ἐν τούτῳ ἤγετο χυμαίνειν, οἷς ἐστ' ἀν τούτ' ἔχει, πάροικοι αὐτῶ τῶν ἄλλων προσγενησμένων. So Procl. in Plat. 5, 7. πρόσθηκαί τῆς δύνασ. Theocr. Epigr. 18. κεδομένωι γὰρ ἀθανάτων πλείον ἐκοισθώρτοι.

Aristippus: μήτι τοίς παρελθοσιν ἐπικάμενως μήτε τοῖς ἐπίστασι προκάμενως. Schol. ad Pind. Pyth. 2, 167. οἱ σταθμαίμενοι δὲ πολλὰ καὶ περιγεγραφητεῖ μέγαλα τινά μέλλοντα αὐτοῖς ἔστοι, προσδοκήσαν πρὸ τιν τυχεῖν, ὡς ἐπιμένοντι καὶ ἐπιφυγόντι. Dexippus ap. Corp. Hist. Byz. T. 1. p. 11. d. καὶ προκαμῶν ἐν τῷ ἀεὶ μοχθείν αὐτὸλιμοτερον ἔσται. Porphyr. de Abst. L. 8, 18. ἀρκεῖ γε ὃτι μηδὲν ποιεῖν ἀπορεῖνοι (i. e. oxen, horses, &c.) χαράμεθα προκάμενω καὶ μόχθους. Thus in the early editions, but Valentin. edited, from mere conjecture, προκάμενων πρὸς καμάτων. I would simply change καὶ into κατὰ, by which all will be right: κατὰ, de, as in Heraclid. de Polit. p. 432. τὰ κατὰ τὰς θυσίας, the words are perpetually confounded. I must not omit to observe, that Thucyd. appears to have had in mind ἈEschyl. Eum. 78, καὶ μη πρόκαμεν τὰς βουκολομένες τῶν (where Wakef. Schutz. and others, are quite on the wrong scent. The Hesychian Gloss, βουκολήσομεν, μεριμνήσομε; nay, even the interpretation of the Scholiast, περιέτων, might have taught them better.) Also ἈEschyl. Agam. 248. τὸ μέλλων δὲ ἐπεὶ οὐ γένοιτ' ἀν λύσις (effugium) προχαιρέτων ἱσον δὲ τῷ προστένειν. In ἈEsch. P. V. 721. we have προστέναξεν in the same sense. The student will observe the elegance, which has been imitated by Gray, in his Ode to Eton College: “To each his sufferings; All are men, condemned alike to groan.” Wetstein judiciously remarks: intellexerunt quidem philosophi, ut animi tranquillitas acquiratur, abiciendam esse istam sollicitudinem: ut Christus, qui doctrinam cœlestam proponit, semper animos hominum erigit ad considerationem divini numinis, ejusque sapientissimae atque optimae Providentiae, qua sola animum veri boni tranquillum securumque reddere potest.

84. ἅρκετων τ. ὃ. ὃ. κακία ἢ. There is an ellipsis of πράγμα, which Schl. takes for incommodum (to whose examples add ἈEschyl. P. V. 100. χλείδαν ἐδικαῖς τοῖς παροῦσι πράγμασι, where πῆμασι is a mere gloss,) which, however, is not necessary. One must
not too much press the signification of such nouns as are left to be understood in adjectives neuter, which, by the way, are often joined to substantives masculine or feminine; of this trite idiom examples are heaped up by Raphel, Kypke, Wets. &c. The triste lupus stabulis of Virgil, Ecl. 3, 80. will readily occur to my readers: naxia is for naxotys, adversity, affliction. Vide Heskin. ad Mosch. 4, 56. Rosenm. cites Senec. Ep. 13. Etiam si futurum est malum, quid juvat dolori suo occurrere? satis cito dolebis quum venerit: interim tibi meliora propone. Adagial sentences similar to the present are not unusual to the Jewish writers. Vide Scheid. ap. Meuschen. Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustr. p. 72.

CHAP. VII.

Verse 1. μὴ κρίνετε. Do not exercise rigid, severe, and uncharitable condemnation. This interpretation is confirmed by the parallel passage in Luke, 6, 37. μὴ κατάδικάζετε. So in James, 2, 13. τὸ ἔλεος is opposed τῇ κρίσει.

2. ἐν δὲ—ἀντιμετρηθῇσται υμῖν. A proverbial saying among the Jews (see Lightfoot), transferred from the affairs of common life to spiritual matters, (as is usual with our Lord). Wetstein; who, among other passages cites Paus. Cor. 18. μετρηθαι τὴν ἱστην. Horat. Serm. 1, 3, 67. Quam temerē in nosmet legem sancimus iniquam.

3. τὸ κάρφος. This word is copiously illustrated by Wets. It may be rendered by the English splinter.

3. δοκῶν. Doddridge supposes that the words κάρφος and δοκός might be no more than names of dis- tempers in the eyes, because it is impossible that such a thing as a beam could be lodged in the eye. Campbell, too, stumbling at the same circumstance, renders δοκῶν the thorn, without any sufficient authority, and, indeed, without necessity, since the expression is hyperbolical, and, as appears from the

4. ἵδος ἢ δοξος, a beam. English version. Rather the beam.

5. ὑποκριτα. “Simulator, tu, qui non ex animi bonis, quae habent, alii, sed ex aliis vitii carpendis laudem apud homines quaeres.” Rosenm. Compare Zeph. 2, 1. Wetstein has adduced passages from the Classics in abundance; they are, however (as is often the case) fitter for a common-place book than a commentary. The most apposite one (though even there the metaphor is not the same) is from Horat. Sat. 1, 3, 74. Qui, ne tuberibus propriis offendat amicum,. Postulat, ignoscet verrucis illius. Euthymius observes on the force of the word ὑποκριτα, that the person is so called either as usurping the office of a physician, when in fact he stands in the situation of a patient,—or as curiously prying into the faults of others, under pretence of reforming them, though, in fact, only with the view of exercising condemnation.

6. μη δώτε τῷ ἰησοῦ τῶν κυρίων. Lest any one should suspect that all liberty of judging even concerning matters the most manifest, Christ subjoins a precept fraught with that prudence which he elsewhere directs to be joined with simplicity. Grotius. Christ calls them dogs (says Euth.) αἰς καθαλακτοντας τοῦ Χριστοῦ: hogs, αἰς τῷ βορεβρῷ τῶν καθῶν ἐγκαλλινουμένοις. It may be explained generally, to profane and impious men, polluted and impure as dogs and swine were accounted by the Jews. Wetstein expounds: “Ut carnes sanctae non solent projici canibus, sed a sacrificante et sacerdotibus comeduntur: ita nec doctrina Christi iis tradenda est, qui vitii et
præjudiciis occœcati illum rejicunt ridentque:" which seems far fetched. Yet he appositely compares Diog. Laert. 1, 86. Ἐφωνηθεὶς ὑπὸ ἀσεβῶς ἀνθρώπου, τι πότε ἐστὶν εὐσέβεια; ἐσίγα. Τῶν δὲ τῆς αἰτίαν τῆς σιγῆς πυθομένου, Σισιπᾶ, ἡγέτη, δτι περὶ τῶν οὐδὲν σαλπροσηκόμενον πυθάνη. Similar maxims, couched under not dissimilar symbols and metaphors, are produced by Grotius. I add, Aristot. ap. Themist. 234. μὴ νῦν σοφίαν εἰς τοὺς τρίδους. Hence is illustrated Procop. 99, 21. ὁς οὐ μὴ πότε ὑπὸ χερσιν κυνῶν γενήται.

6. μαργαρίτας. It appears from the Rabbinical writers that the Jews called the precepts of wisdom pearls. So our Lord more than once compares the truths (especially the more recondite ones) of the Gospel to the same. Thus, in Matt. 13, 46. the Gospel is compared to a pearl of great price. Vide Seneca, Ep. 29. The word μαργαρίτης is of Oriental origin.

6. μὴστε κ. α. τ. π. α. κ. σ. ρ. ν. I cannot quite approve the mode of taking this passage brought forward from Hammond by Elsley, though it is supported by Theophylact, Heinsius, Castellio, Rosenm. and Kuin. I see no reason why both should not be understood of the swine. Vide Wets. And I approve of Campbell's rendering καλ by or. Pricæus has well observed that it is the nature of hogs to bite, not antrosum rectâ, at in latus deflexa.


9. ἢ τὶς ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀνθρώπος. The ἢ has a continuative force. Most of the Commentators tell us that ἀνθρώπος is pleonastic. But perhaps it is emphatical: it seems to have been so regarded by L. Brug. Beza, and Campbell, Owen and Doddridge. “Who amongst you men,” &c. which of you is there, though but a man? It is plain that Euth. thus took the
word. The son (says he) asks such things as are
suitable for a father to give, and for a son to receive.

9. ἀν ἐὰν αὐτής—ἀρτον, μή λύθων ἐτιδαθείς αὐτῶ; An Hebrew adage; not, however, confined to the Jews, but common to other Nations. So Plautus: Alterā manu fert lapidem, panem ostentat alterā. Maldon. Seneca de Benefic. 2, 7. Verrucosus benefi-
cicium, ab homine duro asperè datum, panem lapido-
sum vocabat.

11. ποιητός, i.e. compared with God. So Theo-
lyph. Euth. Grot. Mald. Schoettz. or rather, avari,
illiberales, parci, as Hamm. Rosenm. Kuinoel, and
Schol. whom see.

11. οἴδατε δόματα ἁγαθά διδόναι. Dare soletis. Wets.
But Kuin. takes it for datis; as in Propert. 1, 2, 12.
Sciatur currere, for currat.

12. πάντα οὐν ἰσα ἀν θέλητε ἵνα θεώσην ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρω-
ποί, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιήτε αὐτοῖς. A golden maxim of
frequent occurrence in the Classics. Pric. Wets.
and Bulkly, cite numerous passages; to which I
add, Isocr. Nic. p. 50. s. f. ἀ παρχόντες ὑφ' ἐτέρων
ἀργίσθε, ταῦτα τοῖς ἄλλοις μὴ ποιήτε. D. H. 4.41,
27. ἐπείτα ἄ παθεῖν οὐκ ἂν ὑπεμείνατε αὐτοῖ, ταῦτα ἐτέ-
ρων πάρχοντς ἀνέχεσθαι δικαίωτε; It was, moreover,
not unknown to the Jews; as appears by the cit-
tations from Rabbinical writers in Wets. and Hack-
span. Vide et Tobit. 4, 15. Sir. 34, 15. Seneca,
Ep. 94.

12. οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται. This is
the sum of what is taught in the Law and the Pro-
phets, concerning the mutual duties of men one to-
wards another; called the “Duties of the Second
Table.” Grot. and Brug.

13. εἰσέλθετε διὰ τῆς στένης πύλης. The idiom is
more unfolded in Luc. 13, 24. ἀγνωθέσθε εἰς ἐκδίκησιν.
The course of human action is often called in Scripture
τῇ ὀδῷ; and, consequently, from the restraints and
difficulties of virtue, its road is termed strait; and
that of vice broad. Here, however, the comparison
is to a gate into a road, and that road leading up to
an arx, or citadel. Similar comparisons and sentiments are found in the antient writers: ex. gr. Cebes says, of the road that leads to true knowledge, οὐκούν (ὅρας) καὶ θυράν τ. εν μικράν,—προσιδεῖν. Max. Tyr. D. 39, 3. μία δὲ τοῦ τίς στένη, καὶ ὁρίος καὶ τραχεία καὶ οὐ πολλοῖς πάνω ὀδεύσιμος. Wets. Vide Diod. Sic. p. 296. b. Cic. Off. 1, 32. Hesiod, Op. 285. Ælian. V. H. 13, 32. Xen. Cyr. 2, 2, 24. (Kuin.) I add, Clem. Alex. 63. a. One may compare, too, the Pythagorean maxim, as we find it in Porphyry. V. P. p. 199. ἐς τε λεωφόρους μη βαδίζειν. Or as Jambl. V. P. § 105. expresses it, τόσο λεωφόρους οὖν ἐκκλίνου, διὰ τῶν ἀτραπῶν βαδίζει; which maxim is thus explained by Athen. 452. d. γνωμή πολλῶν μη ἀκολούθειν. So Exod. Thou shall follow a multitude to do evil.

14. οτί στενή ἡ πύλη. How narrow is the way! So Theoph. Sim. 51. c. ἡ γὰρ ἄρτη υψηλῶν τι χρήμα, καὶ δύσαντες, καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς οὐ μετών, ἢ διὰ κακίας ἵσχυν, ἢ ἀνορεξίαν τοῦ κρείτων.


15. προσέχετε δὲ ἄπο τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν. Beware of false teachers. So called as falsely arrogating to themselves a divine mission, for influence and gain; as Wets. Schleusner, and some antient interpreters. Vide Euth. But this seems too confined a sense. Chrys. and Heinsius interpret it, “those who lead a life contrary to their Christian profession, but pretend to piety and innocence.” This also seems too limited. I rather incline to the opinion of Grotius, that they are so called in reference to their doctrines. The words are levelled not at the Pharisees only, but even such as may pretend to be followers of Christ. Of the Pharsaiical doctrines, Rosenm. observes that they were contrary to Christ’s; being in appearance austere, but in fact lax, and opening a
door to vice. The expression προσέχειν ἀπὸ is Hellenistic, and occurs in the Sept. Vide Schl. Lex. in V. T.

15. οὖν ἔρχονται πρὸς ύμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασι. Indumentum vel pallium e pellibus ovinis confectum. ἐν is here used like the Hebr. ָ: and so the Greek writers. Examples are produced by Krebs; and so Josephus, Ant. 6, 9, 4. ἐπέρχη μοι ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, καὶ ἐν δόραι καὶ ἐν θαρακί. et A. 18, 6, 7. ὁ ἐν τῇ πορφυρίδι. Ovid, A. A. 2, 292. In Tyriis, scil. vestimentis. Virg. AEn. 5, 37. Horridus in jaculis et pelle Lybistidos urae. See also Læsner.

15. ἔρχονται—εἰ. ἐ. προσβάτων. This was done to imitate, at least in garb, the antient Prophets. Thus Elijah and Elisha (1 Reg. 19, 13. 2 Reg. 2, 13.) are said to have been clothed with the μηλαστή scil. ἄρα. So in Zach. 13. it is predicted that the false prophets will no longer clothe themselves in the δέρριν τριχίννε, which they had put on after the example of the true prophets. The μ. was a garment worn usually by shepherds, and manufactured by themselves of the fleeces of their flocks, roughly worked up. See the Schol. on Theocr. cited by Wets. Sim. ΑΞοπ. Fab. τ. μ. σ. Edit. Fur. ἄνθρακι αὐξάθεν μὲν φίλιαν ὑποκείνονται, ἐσεθεν δὲ κακίας καὶ ἀπεικόνισε πεπλήρωνται. Horat. Ep. 1, 16, 45. Introrsum turpem speciosum pelle decorae. Comp. Luc. 11, 39. Act. 20, 29. Polyen. 11, 10, 5. ὅπως μὲν ἐξάρκει ἡ λεοντι, τότε χρῆ καὶ τῆς ἀλατεκής προσβάτει. Wets. Rosenm. Kuin. They then deserve to be treated as Horace (Sat. 2, 1, 66) tells us Lucilius treated the hypocrites of his time, “detrahere et pellem, nitidus quâ quisque per ora cederet, introrsum turpis.” Campbell takes the words as figurative.

And, indeed, this interpretation is somewhat confirmed by a similar passage, which I long ago noted down from Hermippus ap. Etym. Mag. 132. τὸν μὲν διάλεκτον καὶ τὸ πρόσαστον, ἀμφότερον ἔχειν δοκεῖσ, τὰ δ’ ἐν δου, οὔδεν διαφέρει οὔδεν δράκοντος. But it detracts some-
thing from the sense, and lowers the dignity of the expression.

15. ἐσωθεν δὲ εἰς λύκοι ἄρταγες. Hither refers Irenæus C. H. 1, 2. ἀγνοοῦντες αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὴν ἐσωθεν τῆς προβαίτου δορᾶς ἐπισυνεληκ. (I read ἐπισυνεληκ.) Wets. remarks on the epithet as being appropriated to wolves (citing Lycoph. 1309. ἐπιμείκαν ἄρταγες λύκους), as rapax is in Latin, of which Wetstein’s examples may be readily dispensed with. Bulkley compares Plato, p. 240, of which the sense is this. It is a grievous thing, when the dogs prey on the sheep, and so prove more like wolves than faithful curs.

16. ἀλλὰ τῶν καρπῶν—ἐπιγνώσεθε. Some commentators, as Hamm. Schmid. &c. interpret this, of their false doctrines; others, as Euth. and Grot. of their morals and actions. Perhaps both may not be meant; both will supply fit criteria. Grotius has enlarged on the fruits, quoting the adage, cito ad naturam flecta recederunt suam. Wets. cites Plut. 2, 75, 2. Α. οί; and Lysias, ὅλγοι χρόνον δύνατ' αὖ τὰς πλάσαι οὐ τὸν τρόπον τὸν ἐκυτοῦ.


18. δέντρων σιγρῶν. The word denotes primarily what is decayed and rotten; but 2dly, by metonymy, what is useless, refuse, and good for nothing (as old vessels, and small fishes); also, when applied to trees or fruit, what are malæ indolís, of a bad sort. The passages adduced by Wets. will illustrate all these senses.

21. οὐ γὰρ ὁ λέγων μ. Κύριε, not all who with the mouth recognize me as the Messiah will be acknowledged as my true disciples, and be partakers of salvation, but those also who perform what my Father enjoins. See note in John 14, 21.
22. εν εκείνη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, i.e. the day of judgment (so Euth.), as in Matth. 11, 24. and Luc. 10, 12. Schoet. and Wets: produce many passages from the Rabbinical writers, from which it appears that the Jews were accustomed to call the day of judgment by the emphatic name of that day, and to mention what they would then say, and what God would answer.

22. τραπετείσαμεν. The best interpreters explain "τοῦ auctoritate docuimus," in which sense the word often occurs.

22. δυνάμεις, miracula. So Euth. σημεία καὶ θαύματα. Rosenm. very justly remarks, "Docet igitur Jesus, nonnisi homines probos et praeceptis divinis convenienter viventes sibi fore gratos et acceptos, atque felicitatis veris Christianis paratae participes; nec posse defectum emendatae et probae vitae factis externis, quantumvis speciosis compensari. 1 Cor. 13, 1—3. Perspicimus inde, cautæ tractandum esse locum de miraculis et argumentis pro veritate religionis Christianæ inde desumptis. Patravit miracula Jesus; patraverunt etiam, vel patrare visi sunt falsi doctores et fraudatores. Matth. 24, 24. Sed erat inter alia hoc discrimen, quod Jesus et ejus Apostoli sanctissimam agebant vitam, nec unquam quærebant honores, aut pecunias, sed tantum aliorum hominum utilitatem et commodum. Jo. 8, 46—50. 7, 18. Quod secus erat in falsis doctoribus et fraudatoribus. Nec (quod obiter moneo) neigendum erat Francisci Baconis de Verulamio egregium dictum: Nunquam Deus edit miraculum, quo converteretur Athesus; quia poterat ipso naturæ lumin ad notitiam Dei perduci; verum miracula ad convertendos idololatras et superstitiones designata sunt, qui Numen agnoverunt, sed in cultu ejus aerrærunt. (De Augm. Scientiar. lib. 8, c. 2, p. 144.)


23. ὁδέποτε ἔγαν ὤμοι. I never have recognized, acknowledged, approved you (as my servants); for I
agree with Beza and Camer. that the word is not ignorantius, sed acerbissimè eos repellentis. See note on Matt. 25, 12. So also Wets. who adduces examples from Eurip. Hec. 255. Lucian. Timon. 5. & 49. and several from Terence and Plautus of ignorare in this sense. There is a passage more apposite in Isæus, p. 71. 27. Bek. σὺ δὲ τίς εἶ; σοὶ δὲ τί προσήκει βάπτειν; οὐ γιναύκωσεν οὐ (I do not recognize you as the person who, being nearest of kin, has a right to provide for the burial) οὐ μὴ εἰσίης τὴν οἰκίαν. Christ denies them (says Euthym.), as they had, in works, denied him.

23. οί ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν. This expression has been by some accounted a Hebraism. Others defend it as pure Greek, to whom the following example will be acceptable: Themist. 81. D. οί ἐργαζόμενοι ἄρετήν.

24. πᾶς οὖν ὅσις. Sequitur Epilogus. Kuin. Having concluded his teaching, he proceeds to exhort his Disciples to walk in this narrow way, promising that all necessary security shall be with them while they keep his commandments. Euth.

24. καὶ τοιεὶ αὐτῶν. Performs them habitually, and makes them the rule of his actions. Grotius.

24. φρονίμω, prudenti, provido. To the examples cited by the Commentators, I add, Soph. El. 1058. τῶς διόπληθος φρονιμωστάτοις οἰκάνους ἐσφοράμενοι τροφῆς κηδομένους.

26, 27. Similar passages are produced by Wetstein from the Rabbinical writers.

29. ἦν—διδάσκαλον. Doddridge wrongly translates, “he was still teaching them.” It is a mere Hebraism for ἔδιδαξε.

29. ὁς ἔχουσιν ἔχαν. Taught them as one having (self-derived) authority, not as the Scribes, resting only on that of their Doctors. So Euth. Theop. Cler. Wolf, Loesn. Paulus, Doddr. and Weston; as not the interpreter, but the maker of the law. Wets. Kuin. and Rosenm. understand it of the force and efficacy of his speech to persuade and move his
hearers, and cites the Homeric, ὡς ἔφοβός. οὐ δὲ ἀρά
pάντες ἄλην ἐγένοτο. Μίθουν ἀγαστᾶμενοι, μᾶλα γὰρ
κρατεῖς ἁγόφευμε. To which may be added Liban. Ὀρ. 102. Α. εἰσὶν μετ’ ἐξουσίας. Schol. ad Eurip. Ῥ. 978. λεγόμενα μετ’ ἐξουσίας. Pindar. Pyth. 2, 149. ἔτος ἐκβαλεῖν κραταιῶν. This and some other
passages of the N. T. seem to have been imitated, or had in view, by Philostr. Vit. Ap. 1, 17. ἀλλ’ ἀντερ εἰκ τριστὸς διαλεγότο, οἶς, ἐλεγε, καὶ δεκί
cοι καὶ χρή εἴδεια, καὶ δόξαι βραχείαν, ἀλλ’ ἀδια-
μάντινοι. κυρία τε νόματα καὶ προπεφυκότα τοῖς πράγ-
μασι καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα ἴχνο εἶχεν, ἀντερ ἀνέκπετρω
βεμιστεύμενα. The sense of the passage has been
Koecher.)

CHAP. VIII.

VERSE 2. Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλης, δώσαι με καθαρίσαι.
Wets. notices the modesty of this manner of speak-
ing; he who thus asks obtains more than if he had
asked less delicately; and compares the following
passages. Callimach. in Delum. 226. ἀλλὰ Φίλη,
δώσαι γὰρ, ἀμώμεν πόντια δούλοις ὑπέτειροι. Horat.
S. 2. 6. 39. Dixeris, experiar; si vis, potes, addit, et
instat. Arrian. Epict. 10. 10. τι κολακεύεις τὸν ιατρὸν;
τι λέγεις, κύριε, ἐὰν θέλης, καλῶς ἐξο. Aristid. T. 2,
p. 417. εἶναι γὰρ ἂν πάντα ἐπ’ ἐμοὶ τὸ καὶ ὑπ’ ἐμοὶ καὶ
tοῦτο ὁμαλῶς ὑπὸ πάντων λέγεσθαι τὸ εἰ ἐρωύλετο, καὶ
βουληθῇ πότε τοῦτ’ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐγκλῆμα. Horat. Epod. 17,
45. Ἐτ τυ, potes nam, solve me dementiā. Appian.
de B. G. 3. p. 871. εἰ μενοι καὶ τῶν γεγονότων μετα-
βέσθαι βέλεις, δώσαι γὰρ, εἰ βέλεις εἰ δὲ μὴ. Sap. 12,

2. ληπάδος. These poor wretches were excluded
from all human society. Vide Bemidbar. 7. Levit.

... 3. Ἰατρό. Christ touched him (says Wets.) more
medicorum. Solon, τὸν δὲ κακᾶς νοούσι κακοίμαντον
ἀργαλείως τε ἀνόμαμεν χειρίν αὐξα τίθης ὕγιν. Seneca
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dé Beneficiis, 6, 16. Medico, si nihil amplius quam manum tangit. Palaiot adds two examples from the Anthol. Gr. and one from Martial, Epigr. 5, 9. Languebamsus; sed tu comitatus protinus ad me Venisti, centum, Symmachè, discipulis. Centum me tetigere manus, aquilone gelatae : Non habui februm, Symmachè, nunc habeo. Perhaps, however, this may be thought to narrow the sense. Jesus probably touched the leper for the benevolent purpose of inspiring him with confidence; for he would easily have conceived that, unless Jesus had both the power and the will to effect the cure, he would not have incurred the pollution of touching a leper. Works, however, performed by divine virtue, were always exempted from the ritual precepts.

S. θέλω, καθαρίσθη. Markland and Wetstein (after Woltzogen) observe that this seems as true an instance of the sublime as that of Genes. 1. Let there be light, and there was light. It is impossible too severely to censure the mode of explanation adopted by Paulus (vide Kuin. 244), who contends that Jesus did not cure the leper, but only pronounced him pure; meaning that the disorder was not contagious, and that he would be pronounced pure by the Priest. The absurdity of which is so manifest, that it scarcely needed the satisfactory refutation which it has received from Kuinoel, whom see.

3. ἐκαθαρίσθη—εἰ λέπρα. The leprosy was removed. Kypke and Schl. Kuinoel, however, explains λέπρα as abstract for concrete, λέπρας.

4. ἵπτε μηδὲν ἵπτης. The order was only meant to extend to the time when the person should present himself to the Priest to be examined. Rosenm. (from Wets.) justly remarks that Christ urged him to go without delay to Jerusalem; lest, by delay, some rumour of the transaction should reach the ears of the Priest, who might, through envy of Jesus, pronounce the man uncleas; by which a great part of the benefit accruing to the leper would
be lost; for, until testimony of cure was given by
the Priest, he must live in a most uncomfortable
exclusion from all society. (Vide Theophyl.) Pro-
hibitions of this sort (says Campb.) were often trans-
gressed by those who received them; but that is not
a good reason for representing our Lord as giving
contradictory orders.

4. εἰς μάρτυριον. For a testimony unto them. To
whom? Some say the priests; others, properly, the
people—that they may know that you are healed.

6. ὁ παῖς μου—my servant. That this is not a
a Hebraism (as Schoettgen thought) is proved by
the numerous classical examples produced by Eck-
hard, Wetstein, and Kypke.

6. δεινὸς βασανίζομενος. So δεινὸς ἔχειν. Conon. et
Hippocr. and δεινὸς ἀφραστεῖν. Euth. ap. West. δ. β.
grievously tormented. Grotius, Hammond, Camp-
bell, and others, render simply, afflicted or dis-
tressed, or rather affected. For palsy, say they, are
not attended with torment. But there are two sorts of
paralysis, one attended with a contraction, the other
with a remission of the nerves. And, from the Ob-
servationes Medicæ ad N. T. collected by Goez. ap.
Koecher, and especially from the Tract of Richter
de Paralyti in N. T. it appears that there is one
stage of the disorder in which the paralysed mem-
bers do not lose sense and feeling, but suffer great
agony. Rosenm. thinks this was a case when the
paralysis had already passed (as it generally does)
into an apoplexy: thus the torture might be great.
In either case, I see no reason to deviate from the
sense tortured. The word is, in this sense, Helle-
nistic, and is condemned by Lucian. Solœcist. § 6,
3, 568. έτέρων δὲ εἰπότος βασανίζεσθαι τῶν παῖδα αὐτῷ
νοσώματα ἔτι τῷ, ἔφη, ἢ τί βουλομένου τοῦ βασανίζοντος.
It occurs in this sense in Apoc. 9, 5. 1 Sam. 5, 3. 2
Macc. 7, 13. No example has yet been produced
from a decidedly Classical writer. Krebs has ad-
duced Jos. 1, 2, 14, 4. But this passage is not quite
to the purpose; I wonder that so diligent a reader of that Historian should have missed the following examples, which I long since noted down: p. 405, 29. νῦν ὁσαννας, et p. 550, 40. δεσμὸς, vox solemnis de hac re. So Wets. cites Eusth. in Od. 240, 52. δεσμὸς ἀπαστωτη, and δεσμὸς ἐχει. from Hippocr. Liban. and Conon.

8. ὅπῃ ἐπὶ ἱερός—στέγης ε. i. e. ἡγεις, as Jo. 1, 27. He knew that he had spent a great part of his life in idolatry, and worldly defilements. He saw that the very Jews for whom he had built the synagogue declined any intimate intercourse with him; hence he thought humbly of himself. Comp. 3, 11. Grot. As to the change of situation in μον, it is not unfrequent in the Classical writers, especially Thucyd.

8. εἰπὲ λόγον. The reading εἰπὲ λόγον, as it is the more difficult, so it is justly considered the true reading. The adscript easily passes into an ν. So Euth. must have read, who explains εἰπὲ ἐν λόγῳ ὁλῷ, and again 907, simil. Wets. appositely cites Ter. And. 1, 1. Quin tu uno verbo die, quid est, quod me velis.

9. ἐγὼ ἀνθρώπος ε. ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν. I cannot agree with some antient Greek Commentators (vide Theodoret and Maldonat. ap. Bowy.) and several modern ones (as Heinsius and Schmidt), though supported by the Αἰθiopic and Persic Versions, that the sense is, “I am a man sustaining authority, and therefore know what authority is:” for that would require εἰς ἐξουσίας, and the parallel place of Luke 7, 8. is decidedly adverse, where τοιοῦτον, which is here understood, is there expressed, as in the passage of Diod. Sic. (201. b.) cited by Munth. ὅπῃ ἡγειτ. ὑπὸ μίαν ἠγειτ. τοῦ στραγγαν. I therefore agree with Grotius, Wets. Rosenm. and Kuin. that the sense is: I am a man placed under authority. So Euth. and Theophyl. ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὑπὸ ἐξουσίας τοῦ στραγγαν, ὑπεξουσίως. Beza and L. Brug. well remark, that he argues à minori ad majus. I cannot, however, agree with Markl. that ἀνθρώπος means, though but a man who,
alleges as examples of that sense of ἀνθρώπος, Matt. 7, 9, 13, 11. Act. 10, 26. Jo. 10, 88. Act. 14, 15. This is indeed confirmed by the authority of some of the antient Commentators and Fathers, but it seems strained and far fetched. Still less can I assent to the opinion of Wets. Schulz, Michaelis, Rosenmuller, and others (mentioned by Wolf), that the Centurion meant by εἶ, λ. "direct same angel or spirit to effect the cure." This to me seems very frigid and unnatural, and (as Kuin. observes) is contrary to the usual force of the phrase in the Greek, and its corresponding one in the Hebrew. The passage has been thus judiciously paraphrased by Rosenmuller: "Sic tibi parent vires naturae. Ut meia verbis, qui homo sum aliorum obnexitus imperii, parent tamen inferiore loco positi milites; sic tuo verbo creaturae, mare, tempestates, morbi cedere tanentur.

9. λέγο ταύτα, ποιείσθαι,—ἐρχεῖσθαι ἀνταναγίρήτως, say Euth.—without a word or reply, as the soldiers do. There is a similar passage of Menander, in Plut. Alex. 17. s. f. καὶ ἐγώ τινα, Ἀριστομάχος οὖν παρέστη. Markland remarks on the difference of address. To the soldiers, he says, go and come, or march and retire: but to his servant πείσθω, which expresses the obedience suitable to a servant.

10. οἵτινες ἐν τῷ Ἰ. τοποθετην πιστιν ἔργον. For the Jews thought that the presence and touch of Christ were necessary to the healing of the sick. But the Centurion entertained a higher opinion of Christ's power. Wets. The πίστις is here a firm persuasion of mind concerning the divine power of Jesus, and an entire reliance upon him.

This notion of πίστις is found also in the Classics. To the examples furnished by Schwartz. (Comm. 1101.) I add Plut. Nic. 29. s. m. μετ' εἰλαθείας τίνος μᾶλλον ἐπὶ πίστεως. Vide Elsley.

11. ἄρα ἀνατολῶν καὶ ἐναέρων ἓσουσι. Luke adds, from the North, and South. The expression signifies all the regions of the world. Thus also Classical writers, e. g. Xen. Cyr. 1, 1, 9. Vide Kuin. and
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Schwartz. Groten thinks that there is a reference to the promise made to Jacob, Gen. 28, 14.

11. ἀνακλήσθησινα μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ. A convivial term, as κατακλίσθησιν. Marc. 2, 15. ἀνακλήσθαν. Luc. 7, 36. & 37, 9. See Wetstein's Classical examples, or Schl. Lex. The word is suited to those times when they did not sit but reclined at table. Kuin. Both Eastern and Western writers represent the pleasures of Heaven under the image of a banquet, because nothing in this life is usually esteemed more excellent or desirable. Rosenm. Christ does not yet clearly reveal, but only obscurely hint at the calling of the Gentiles, and their obedience to that call. His auditors, perhaps, understood him of their being circumcised, and becoming proselytes of the Gate. Vidé Schoetg. in loco.

12. οἷς δὲ οἱ βασιλεῖς, i.e. the Israelites, for whom the happiness of the kingdom was especially destined, and who had arrogated to themselves a place there, to the exclusion of other nations.

12. σκότος—εξοπλεσρον. This formula denotes properly darkness the most remote from light, and therefore the densest: 2dly, the lowest and darkest prison, a place the most remote from the joys of Heaven, and the banquet lighted up with lamps, &c.; for, as Wets. thinks, our Lord continues in the same image of a banquet. Some think there is an allusion to the squalid ergastula of the antients, destined for the reception of the most worthless and incorrigible slaves, or other notorious offenders, which were subterraneous, and far removed from the light. Bene Euth. τὸ τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κολοσσίου καλεῖται. See Wets. who cites Quintill. In carceribus et in illâ profundâ nocte tenebrarum. Cic. Catilin. 5. Non dubitât P. Lentulum aeternis tenebris vinculisque mandare. Liv. 6, 14. Silius, 2, 332. Sophocles, Electr. 384. μέλλουσι γὰρ ἕσθεν—ὑπαίθρια πέμψεως, ἦδαι μενοῦτος θάλασσα προσακολούθησιν, ζέσῳ δὲ αὐτῷ κατηριβεί στέγη χθονὸς τῆς δ' ἑκτὸς ὑμνησεις κακά. Targum in 1 Sam. 2, 9, Impii in gehenna in tenebris judicabuntur; et
Psalm 83, 18. In tenebris gehennæ. Vide et Grot. I add, the same image is used by Dion. Hal. 522, 46. and Joseph. 1145 (speaking of suicides).


βεβρυκα κλαϊον.

13. αἳς ἐκτενως γενηθήτω σοι—understand οὗτοι. Quod me posse credistis, effectum habe. (Grot.)

13. ιάθη—ἐν τῇ ἀρα ἐκεῖνη. At that very instant; for ἀρα often means momentum, punctum temporis.


15. διηκόνοις αὐτοῖς. He supplied them with food, drink, and other necessaries of domestic accommodation.

Almost all the modern critics and commentators read αὐτῶ, with many M.S. Vide Rosenm. διακονοῦσα denotes properly to bustle through the dust, to hasten. So Homer, κούλουτες πεδίοις.
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15. καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ὁ πυρετός. So Hippocr. Aph. 4, 30. ἤν αὖ ἠφή ἀφῆ ὁ πυρετός. et § 61. ἀφῆ ὁ πυρετός. 16. ὄψια—γενομένης. That there were two ὄψια among the Jews is plain from Ex. 12, 6. Levit. 23, 5. Matt. 14, 15. One was from our three o’clock in the afternoon to six o’clock; the other from our six o’clock to the beginning of night.

17. ὅπως πληρωθῇ τῷ ῥήθει δ. Ἡ. τ. π. So that in this sense the saying of Isaiah, &c. The passage of the prophet is, by what is termed accommodation, referred to the healing of disorders. That of 1 Peter, 2, 24. properly refers it to the remission of sins: literally, “he took away our infirmities, and put his shoulders to the weight of healing our disorders.” Neglecting the version of the Sept. Matthew expresses more closely the cast of thought in the Hebrew words. λαμβάνειν θησί often signifies ἀναιρεῖν, ἀφαιρεῖν auferre, and βαστάζειν ἥθη signifies auxilium ferre. For auxilium and cura, in our mode of speaking and thinking, have something of weight and trouble. Rosenm. Vide Kuin. and Koech.

19. προσελθῶν εἰς Γραμματέως, for τις. A Hebraism, say some commentators. But Priceus, Kypke, and Bergler ad Alciphrr. 1, 3. p. 15. have adduced examples of a similar use of εἰς from the Greek; as also Wets. of unus from the Latin writers. So Ter. Andr. 1, 1, 91. and Plin. H. N. 35, 36.

19. ἀκολούθωσα. The observation of Rosenm. is taken from Grotius, who derived it from Euth. and Theophr.

20. αἱ ἀλάσκεις φαλεως ἐξουσι, lustra, latibula. Theocr. Id. 24, 83. καταλακα φαλασοτα. Theocr. Id. 1, 115. ἡ λύκοι, ὁ θάνατος, ὁ αὖ ἄρεα φαλάδες ἄρκτοι. Eurip. Inon. Frag. 22. καίλοις ἐν ἀντροις, ἄλυκοις, ἀσπιορθηρ, μύονος. Appian. de Vulp. καὶ πινιτα ναίει πυ-

matois eni φαλασοτιν. Ammonius limits the application of the words to ἔρπετα. But to his authority may be opposed that of Hesychius, Φαλεως. οὗ τὰ θηρία κομίζαται, and that of Plutarch, from whom Wets. cites several examples. I add, that Theophrastus
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(teste Athenæo, 105. d.) wrote a treatise περὶ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων, i. e. de animalibus qui, &c.


20. ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Christ is never so called but by himself: except in Act. 7, 56. Comp. Apoc. 1, 13. 14, 14. On the origin and ratio of the appellation, various are the opinions of Commentators. By most Christ is thought to have shadowed forth the κένωσις mentioned Philip 2, 7. Others (with Heinsius) conjecture that Jesus applied this name to himself with reference to the first man, Adam. Thus υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου will denote, ἐξίχθος, him who is said to be the second after Adam. For in the Jewish writings there is frequent mention of the first and second Adam; and Jesus was accustomed to signify his dignity thus obscurely. The phrase will therefore bear the sense of Messiah; and certainly the two terms are sometimes used promiscuously. This opinion has been diligently stated, and confirmed with new arguments, by Scholten, in a dissertation, of which Rosenm. (who acquiesces in his view of the subject,) has given the following compendium: “Appellatio ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, quoties a Jeu fuit adhibita, toties indicat certum illum hominem, qui forma humana, Danieli in viso symbolico (cap. 7, 18) fuit propositus; atque adeo Regem illum, a Deo constitutum, qui humane hominibus esse imperatorum, eundem, qui Messiae nomine indicatus fuit. —Maxime hæc appellatio accommodata fuit ad diversos notitias et sensus, quibus imbatus deprehenderet Conservator noster suæ ætatis homi-
nes.—Potuerunt enim, qui ex audientium numero essent perspicaciiores, eique fidem habentes, Messiae descriptionem intelligere, ex ejusque dictis efficere, eum esse hunc *hominis filium* a Daniele promissum. Qui autem minori essent, aut intelligentiā, aut veri discendi studio, potuerunt nescire hanc appellationis vim; potuerunt dubii de eo hærere; potuerunt odorari aliquid, nec tamen omnino Jesu mentem assequi. Qui Jesu adversarentur, quaerentes calumniandis causas, cupientesque affectati regni crimen impingere, nihil potuerunt; audita hac appellatione, lucrari, ne quidem intellecta ea, et cognito Jesu, semet ἐν τοῖς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου appellantis, consilio.—Denique nec turba hominum seditionis, in Messiâ promisco Romanorum debellatorem exspectans, potuit facile hac appellatione concitari ad tumultuandum, adhibito Jesu Messiae nomine.

20. ὧν ἔχει τῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ. This expression signifies, 1. to rest; 2. (for an obvious reason,) to make one's abode. So Theoph. (from Chrys.) ἀνυσίς εἰμι. Christ either dwelt (says Grot.) at Capernaum in a hired house, or sojourned with his disciples. Similar passages from profane writers are produced by Suicer, 2, 98.

21. ἐξετρέψας μοι—θάψαι τῷ πατέρα. Elijah, great as was his severity, yet permitted Elisha to bid adieu to his parents (1 Reg. 9, 20); this, therefore, might well be expected from the lenity of Jesus. The piety of Apollonius in this respect is particularly mentioned by Philostr. V. A. p. 14. Vide et Eurip. Phen. 1319. The father was, we may suppose, either dead, or dangerously sick, or very aged.

22. Ἀκολούθεσί μοι, i. e. become my disciple. So, on a similar occasion in Diog. Laert. 7, 8. τούτῳ παρακαλοῦθησον.

22. ἀνέφες—πενθείς. I am surprised that some modern Commentators should so pervert the sense of these words, which was distinctly seen by the ancient interpreters. See Enth. Theophyl. and the opinions of the Fathers, as reported by Suicer, Th. Eccl. 2, 98; in which Wolf, Koecher, Wets. and
recently Rosein. and Kuin. acquiesce. It is (as Wets. says) a sententia paradoxa, like many others of our Lord, which turns on the double meaning of θεραφος, signifying, in a metaphorical sense, spiritually dead, dead in trespasses and sins, (comp. Is. 26, 14. Eph. 5, 14. Apoc. 3, 1. Rom. 6, 13.) was familiar to the Jews, and not unknown to the Greeks. So Clem. Alex. 4. (cited by Alberti): ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ πεφεύγοντας τοῖς ημεροπνεύμονας τοῖς ἄνθρωποις τοῖς πάθεσιν, καὶ καθυστερήσατο τῷ νῷ τοῦ πάθει, ψυχικῶς.

See also Soph. Antiq. 1288. cited by Palaiiret; who also adduces Juven. 2, 23. Et sine Defunctis defunctos cordere terrā. See also Schabat and Georg. Of two employments the less urgent must be omitted; and Jesus will be supposed to order that omission which was permitted to the High Priest and Nazaræi under the Law. Wetstein; who farther cites Phil. 2, 230, 15. Serv. in Æn. 11, 2. Tacit. An. 1, 62. Eur. Iph. T. 380. See Grot. Whitb. ap. Elsley.


26. τί δειλί γάρ. Thus Caesar exclaimed to the sailors who were despairing of safety: τί, τόλμα καὶ δειλίνη, μηδέν, Καίσαρα φέρεις καὶ τὴν Καίσαρος τύχην. Vide Plutarch. et Dio Cass. But how much more dignity did Jesus display, who having gently reproved their weakness, in not expecting to be saved by him as well when asleep as awake, then rebuked the storm.

26. ἔπετράχθη τοῖς ἀνέμοις. I am surprised that Campbell should translate he commanded: though the Vulgate has imperavit, which exceedingly lowers one of the sublimest expressions any where to be met with. I am not ignorant, indeed, that it is me-
taphorical, almost poetical, and quite in the Oriental style; that it means, when rendered into plain diction, quiescere jussit, compressit and coercuit. Ros. says it sometimes (as infra 12, 16.) signifies to command by threat; and quotes Psalm 106, 9. ἐκτιμήσει τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ βαλάσσῃ. 68, 31. 18, 16. 104, 7. Neh. 1, 4. Add, 2 Macc. 9, 8. ὁ δὲ δρι δοκῶν τοῖς τῆς βαλάσσης κύμασιν ἐπιτάσσειν. See Olarius on Philostr. V. A. 4, 4. No. 2.

27. ποταμός εστιν οὗτος, ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ η βαλάσσα Ἱππακοώνων αὐτῷ; qualsis quantusque hic vir est. They began, we may perceive, to suspect in Christ something more than human greatness; for this attribute is an epithet of God. So Psalm. 65, 7. Compescens fremitum marium. καταστραινών τὸ κότος τῆς βαλάσσης, ἧς κυμάτων ἀντής. Theodoret. (L. Brug.) They had heard that he healed the sick; which was no more than their physicians professed to do, but now they see that even the wind and waves obey him; which plainly indicated a superhuman power. Stanley on Eschyl. V. P. thinks the expression a proverbial one. (Rosenm.) It is lamentable to see persons of such mental endowments as Paulus, Krumacher, and some others of this school, denying that there was a miracle performed at all. Storms (say they) suddenly rise in lakes surrounded by mountains, and as suddenly cease. But, as Kuinoel observes, could the Disciples be ignorant of this? and, if not ignorant, how could the sudden tranquillity of the sea affect them with such extreme wonder? Jesus, too, must have known that at that very moment the sea would return to tranquillity; which supposes supernatural endowments. Indeed it argues either mental obliquity not to see, or perversity not to acknowledge, the reality of this miracle. But alas! for the credulous incredulity of philosophers.

28. ἐκ τῶν μνημείων. The tombs, not only among the Jews but Gentiles also, were often spacious subterraneous caves excavated from the living rock. Hence they not unfrequently served as places of
abode to those destitute of, or expelled from, human habitations; as is clear from the passages cited by Wets. and others. And indeed at the present day they are often used for that purpose in the East. The antients, says Wets. thought that evil demons, i. e. the souls of the dead, hovered about sepulchres. So Lactan. 2, 2. Vide Platon. Phæd. 61. d. e. Tibull. 1, 6, 15. Hanc volitent animæ circum sua busta quærentes Semper, et Æ tectis strix violenta canat.

28. χαλερό. The word not only signifies difficult, but what throws one into embarrassment, difficulty, and peril; and is used, 1. de animatis, as brutes, or brutal persons; 2. de inanimatis. The passages produced by Wets. afford examples of all these significations. I must further observe that this active force has place in several other Greek words, though hitherto little perceived by philologists, ex. gr. ἀπορος, which is used in exactly the same manner. The subject is not unimportant, and I have much to observe; but as it is rather connected with Classical than Biblical criticism, I must reserve my remarks for some more suitable occasion.

The word here means savage, fierce, formidable; and that phrenetics are so, is well known, especially in the paroxysms of their disorder, when they exert a strength almost superhuman. The subject is illustrated by Wets. in extracts from Greek medical writers, P. Ægineta, Actuarius, Cælius, &c. who tell us that such persons fancied themselves to be gods or devils, or animals, as wolves, dogs. (Hence the disorder was that called the λυκανθρωπία, or the κυνανθρωπία. See Zoru. Misc. Duisb. ap. Kœchler.) Others birds, as cocks, sparrows, &c.; nay, even inanimate substances, as earthen vases, and were even afraid lest they should be broken; for as some desired death, so others timidly dreaded it.

29. τι ημιν καλ σολ. On this formula, which occurs perpetually in Arrian, and of which Wets. gives many examples, see Matthiae, Gr. Gr. 9, 385, 10.
There is an ellipsis of πράγμα, which is supplied in Demosth. de Cor. § 1. τ. μηδὲν εἶναι σοι καὶ Φίλιστωρ πράγμα: and in Nichom. ap. Athen. 291. ε. Γεωμετρὴν δὲ καὶ σοι πράγμα τί; In the present passage the interpreters explain, Why do you trouble us? (and this it usually bears in the N. T. and the Sept. whereas in the Classical writers it sometimes merely expresses contempt or indignation.) But perhaps the sense may be, "What authority have you over us, what have we, as subjects, to do with you?" So in Arrian. Epict. I. 22. there is said of Jupiter, τὰ μας καὶ αὐτῶ, εἰ οὐ δίωναται μοι βασιλείας: and again in 1, 27.

29. πρὸ καρποῦ βασιλείας ἡμᾶς; The maniacs (says Wets.) remembered the whips and chains with which they had been constrained (so Cælius mentions flagellation and chains among the modes of coercion), the nauseous medicines they had been compelled to swallow, the bleedings, and severe dietetics to which they had been subjected, and naturally feared a repetition of the like. Wets.

30. ἰδὲ μακρὰν. Some conjecture οὗ μακρὰν, with the Vulgate; but οὗ like the Hebrew בַּרְנֵי and the Latin procul, may signify any distance, even a shorter. Kuinoel; who gives examples, to which I add Nepos. Vit. Them. Noctemque procul ab insula in salo navem tenuit—off the island.

31. Οἳ δὲ δολομασὶ—χοιρὶς. The maniacs (says Wets.) fancied that they could not chuse a more apt dwelling, after the sepulchres, than the swine.

32. Οἳ δὲ ἑρμανοὶ, i.e. μανία, ut lepra. Némanis in Gebasi, 2 Reg. 5. 27. Wets. Hi autem aVenue (a conspectu Jesu) irrumerunt in istum porcorum gregem, vel in porcas, non in corpora porcorum; quis enim oculis conspicare potuisset, daemones ingressos esse in porcorum corpora? sed sensus est: Homines fluentes, agros percurrentes in gregem irrerunt, eumque dederunt præcipitern. Promiscuè id quod maniaci dixerunt et fecerunt illis ipsis et daemonibus tribuitur. Evangelista narrant res gestas prout in
sensus incurrebant. Audiebant spectatores sermones insanientium, qui se malos spiritus esse dicebant, videbant actiones eorum. Hæc dicta et facta Evangelistæ narrant. Ergo nobis non obstat Lucas, dicens c. 8, 33. τὰ δαμόνα ingressa esse in porcos, i.e. in gregem porcorum, nam alio etiam loco (c. 11, 14), δαμόνων vocat hominem, qui δαμόνις λέγεται vocatur apud Matthæum, c. 12, 22.

22. ἀκριβος—κατὰ καταμοῦ. With reference to the mode of taking these words, adopted by Mead, &c. Doddr. observes, that, considering what awkward creatures swine are to drive, it was not possible, without a miracle, for two men to drive twenty, much less two hundred into the water. This, however, appears not very convincing; for, as Rosen-muller, 188 s. f. remarks, one may observe in the heats of summer, when one of a herd of swine is agitated, that all impetuously follow it; and if they happen upon a watery place or a river, hurl themselves headlong. Something similar is said to have happened a few years ago at Erfurdt.

32. κατὰ τῶν καταμοῦ—διαστήματα. All the other miracles that Jesus wrought, were simply for the benefit of men. Why there should have been this exception to the rule there have been many reasons assigned. The one adduced by Rosenmuller is, “quod voluit Christus eos, quorum torpor monitis et beneficiis dispelli non potuerat, isto modo excitare, ut considerarent quis ipse esset, et quàm digna doctrina ejus quæ recipieretur.” This appears much more satisfactory than the reason commonly assigned. It has also been suggested, that he meant thereby to punish the owners for following an unlawful occupation forbidden by the constitutions of their forefathers. But perhaps it was not strictly forbidden by the law of Moses to keep them: for in Deut. 14, 8, it is said, “Ye shall not eat of their flesh, nor touch their dead carcase.” Therefore, they might touch their living carcase; and so they might feed and take care of them. Perhaps, when Moses ordered.
that a commutation of a shekel and a half in lieu of the first-born of unclean animals, he had chiefly swine in view, which is confirmed by Joseph. 144, 38. τῶν οὖ νεκρωμένων ἐσθίεν παρ’ αὐτοῖς, κατὰ τῶν πατρίων νόμων, τοὺς δεσπότας τῶν τικτομένων σίκλων καὶ ἐμυκείν αὐτοῖς (scil. πρέσβευσι) ἀντίφερεν.


CHAP. IX.

VERSE 1. ἤλθεν εἰς τὴν ἱδίαν πόλιν, i.e. Capernaum. For the expression is used not only of one’s place of birth, but where one dwells. Vide Raphael, 1 Sam. 8, 22.

2. προσέφερον αὐτῷ παραλυτικόν e. k. b. Labouring under what is called the paralysis universals, which induces a complete impotence of the limbs (which are colourless), together with a resolution and flaccidity of the tendons and muscles. Weddel. Enc. Med. Phil. ap. Rosenm.

2. εἰς τῷ παραλυτικῷ, who especially needed to be addressed and solaced.

2. ἀφεντει τοι ἀμαρτίαι σου. As ἀφέωκα is used for ἀφέωκα or ἀφέωκα, so ἀφεντει is used for ἀφεντει or ἀφεντει. It is therefore here, as 1 Joh. 2, 12. and Luc. 7, 47 and 48, the preterite indicative. The word may be translated, “thy sins are (hereby) forgiven thee.” On this passage there has been much discussion. Vide Grot. Lightfoot, and Whitby. To remit sins is to take away the punishment consequent on sin, namely, disease; for all disorders were thought by the Jews the punishments of sins, as appears from James 5, 14 and 15. Psal. 103, 3. Jo: 9, 2.
and therefore to remit sins is in this view the same as heal diseases. The paralytic, conscious to himself that he had, through his own fault, and by his intemperance, contracted his disease, and merited worse, was doubtless between hope and fear. Under which circumstances Christ vouchsafed to raise and comfort him, by forgiving his sins, from whence he might collect that he who had given what was greater would not deny what was less, and that he who had removed the cause of the disorder would remove the disorder itself. From this and some other passages of the New Testament it seems evident that Christ did sometimes forbear to attack prejudices, when they were at once deep-rooted and harmless; nay, that he even availed himself of them, to produce salutary convictions on his hearers. For as it was fully believed by them that most violent disorders were occasioned by the sins of the patient, so, to suddenly remove those disorders, must have been, in their opinion, most emphatically forgiving sins, and the strongest proof that he had the authority to forgive them: therefore, though (according to our Saviour's reasoning) it was as easy to say, "Arise, and walk," as "thy sins be forgiven thee," yet since the latter would be the strongest proof (to their ignorant and prejudiced minds) of an undisputed fact, therefore Christ condescended to promote truth, though at the expense of taking for granted what seems in fact error and superstition. In like manner St. Paul thought it right "to become all things unto all men, that he might thereby gain some;" i.e. not pressing hard on harmless prejudices and errors in non-essentials; shewing the wisdom of the serpent, as well as the harmlessness of the dove. See Acts 23, 6. Wets. Paulus and Thiess explain this transaction in accordance with the new psychological mode of interpretation adopted by too many German theologians; namely, they maintain that the man was a mere hypochondriac, and only fancied himself labouring under extreme debility. This hypothesis is too absurd to
merit the elaborate refutation it has received from Storr, Lang, Flatt, Kuinoel, and Schott; of whose judicious remarks I cannot find room to insert even an analysis.

3. εἰκὼν ἐν ἐκαυρίῳ. They maintained (and so far justly) that no one could remit sins but the Deity, and he who should speak in his name, and he sent by him. Vide 2 Sam. 12, 13. Cf. Marc. 2, 7. Luc. 5, 21. They however, most injuriously, take for granted that Jesus was not sent by God; and hence collect, that he who arrogates a power not received from God, makes himself God, and is therefore blasphemous, and injurious towards God. Wets. Vide et Grot.

4. ἂντι δέ μεθ' ἐσθιομάξεθε τονεδ. Why do ye judge so unjustly, namely, that I am not sent from God, &c.

5. τί γάρ—εἰκοπατήρον—περιπάτει. The interrogation has here a negative force. It is a greater thing to forgive a sin than to cure a disease. Grot.

6. ἦν δὲ εἰδήτα—εἰκν. These words have given occasion for some discussion. The best mode of taking them seems to be this: to treat the words τότε λέγω τινα παραλυτικόν as parenthetical. There is an aposiopesis, or ἀνανταπόδωσις, which Knatchbull supplies, when Jesus breaks off his discourse to the lawyers, and turning himself to the paralytic, says, "rise and walk." See Alberti and Kypk, who give examples of this idiom. Campbell has very well rendered this passage.

8. τῶν δέντη ἐκνομην τοιαύτην τοῖς ἅρματοις. An allusion of number common to all languages, especially in the popular phraseology.

9. εἴδε—Μαρτίαον. Observe this method of expression, used occasionally by the other Apostles. It is done to avoid egotism and ostentation, suggests Euthymius. Examples of it are to be found in the Classical writers; as, for instance, Thucydides, and especially Caesar.

10. τελέοι τινὶ καὶ ἀπαρτολαί. The τελέοι were not publicans, i.e. farmers of the revenue, but collectors vol. i.
of the portorium; and therefore servants of the publicani, or ἀρχιτελῶναι, who farmed the tribute. These were Roman knights, and were esteemed as very respectable persons. (See Cic. in Orat. pro Planco.) Those, however, through whose medium the publicani exacted the tribute, were freed-men or slaves, and provincials of the lower order. These are the persons meant in the Gospels. But as they frequently practised violence and extortion, they had accordingly become odious to the Jews, and even to the Gentiles, by whom it was proverbially said, θάντες τελῶναι πάντες εἰσὶν ἀρχαγγέλου. So Appian. T. 2, 301, 58. says that Cæsar, as he passed through Asia Minor, ἔχρηματικε τοῖς πόλεσιν, ἔνοχολμέναι ταύ τῶν μισθομένων τῶν φόρων. Hence the τελῶναι are usually joined with the ἀμαρτωλοί. With such it is no wonder that the Jews should have abstained from any sort of intercourse.

11. καὶ ἱσοτες οἱ Φαρίσαιοι. When the Pharisees had come to the knowledge of this, which they would do at the conclusion of the feast, and the departure of Jesus from Matthew's house; for it is not probable that the Pharisees entered the house of a tax-gatherer. Rosenm. and Kuin.

11. ἐσθίε—convivatur; by Synecdche.

12. οὐ χρείαν ἐκοιμζ οἱ ἱσοτες ἱατροὶ, ἄλλ' οἱ κακοὶ ἐκοιμζες. Christ speaks on supposition—"If you be such as you seem to yourselves, you want not my assistance." So Antisthenes ap. Diog. Laert. 7, 6. when it had been objected to him that he kept company with dissolute persons, answered, καὶ οἱ ἱατροὶ μετὰ τῶν νοσοῦτων εἰσίν, ἄλλ' οὐ πυρέτουσί. And Diogenes (teste Strabo, Serm. 2) being asked why, as he praised the Lacedemonian customs and institutions, he did not live among them, answered, οδὸν χαρ ἱατρὸς χρείας ἐν ποιητικός ἐν τοῖς υγείαν διατηρήσει ποιεῖται. Vide Pausan. ap. Plaut. Pr. La. 280. r. D. Chryst. 8.p. 151. Artem. 2, 62. and 3, 39. Ovid. de P. 3, p. 7, 7. Firma valent per se, nullumque Machaona quærunt: Ad medicam dubius confugit aeger opem. (Grot. and Wets.) I add, so Aristippus ap. Diog. Laert. 2, 70.
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13. *πρέπειντες δὲ μεθερ. This mode of speaking was usual to the Jewish Doctors. An example has been produced by Wets. from Virgil. Æn. 9, 654. I nunc et verbis virtutem illude superbis. Other examples are produced by Kypke and Palairet.

13. τί ἐστιν Ἑλεον θέλω. Surenhusius informs us that this abrupt way of quoting was usual to the Jewish Doctors. τί ἐστιν, i.e. τί βούλεσαι, δύναται, or τί θέλεις λέγειν. Vide Valck. ed. Herodo. 4, 181, 3.

13. Ἑλεον θέλω, καὶ ὦ θυσιαν. The καὶ οὗ (ἡ) designates not a simple but comparative negation, non tam quam; ἀλλὰ is frequently so used. Examples of this idiom are adduced by Wets. from the Latin authors; e.g. Frontin. 2, 18, 5. Cic. pro Sextio. 15. Sallust. Jug. 13. Flor. 2, 2. Passages similar in sentiment are produced from the Rabbinical writers by Wets. and Scheid. ap. Meuschen. Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustr. p. 79. Also from the Classical writers by Kypke and Munth.; to which I add Menander, Histor. ap. Corp. Byz. Par. 1, 156. κρέσσων ἐν τοῖς σάμιμας, καὶ οὕχι ταῖς ψυχαῖς φέρειν τὰ τραύματα. Of the same nature is Appian. 1, 148, 6. οὐ τοῦτο ἐστι φοβερόν—ἀλλ' ὦτι. By δυσία is meant, by synecdoche, the worship of God, such as it was prescribed in the Jewish ceremonial law.

13. οὐ—ἡδον καλέσαι δικαίως. This may be taken ironically, as Euthymius suggests, “Not you who, like the Pharisees, fancy yourselves righteous, but you who acknowledge yourselves sinners, and seek a method of expiation.”

14. διατῆμεν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύομεν πολλά, οἱ δὲ μαθηταί σου οὐ νηστεύωσι; We are not to understand public, but private fasts; such as John’s disciples had practised on account of their master’s captivity, and the Pharisees were accustomed to do, in obedience to the commands of their Doctors. Grot.
and Rosenm. Wetstein has well observed, that the fasts of the antients were an abstinence from all food: and as in the primitive ages it was thought that the Apostles spent the whole period of the forty hours during which Jesus lay in the sepulchre in fasting, so that custom was adopted in the Church, and long retained; till at length the forty hours were changed to forty days, and abstinence from all food was changed to abstinence only from animal food.

15. οἱ τῶν νυμφῶν, i.e. nuptial guests. A Hebraism for φίλοι τῶν νυμφῶν. So in Hebrew p, when added to substantives, implies partaker of. When Christ calls himself νυμφή he uses the same simile that the disciples of John had heard from their master. Jo. 3, 29. Apoc. 21, 2. (Rosenm. and Wets.)

15. ἐλεύθεραι, δὲ ημέραι ἐπαν ἀπαρθή ἢ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἡ νυμφία, καὶ τὰ της ἡμερίας τούται. Some obscurity is here occasioned by the similitude, and its application to Jesus and his disciples being confounded. Jesus does not say that he is the bridegroom of the Church, but he compares himself to a bridegroom, who introduces his guests to a splendid banquet. Rosenm. The application is thus detailed by Kuin. Christ means to say, I by no means wish to prescribe fastings to my disciples. No one in common life does things out of time and place, and against nature. Nor is it my intention to do so. My new and superior system of instruction is quite different from the ancient one, and especially the rigid discipline of the Pharisees, who oppress their devotees with severe precepts. (Vide Matth. 11, 28. 23, 4.) The antient ceremonial institutions cannot be annexed to my doctrine as things essential and important; for that would be highly detrimental to the cause of Christianity.—Euthymius, however, and Theophyl. Gröt. Whitb, &c. adopt the following interpretation; namely, that Christ forbears to lay the burthen of fasting upon them, as being unsuit-
able to their weakness and imperfection.—No novice (as Weston paraphrases) will like to be initiated into his office by fasting, a leather girdle, and a hair shirt.

16. οὐδεὶς δὲ ἐπιβάλλει, i.e. ἐπιφράττει—no one putteth a patch of undressed cloth upon, &c.

16. ῥακός ἀγνάφω. A patch of undressed cloth rough from the weaver, and which has not yet passed through the hands of the fuller, or cleaner. We have a similar allusion in our old English epithets brand-new and span-new; on which see H. Tooke’s Diversions of Purley, vol. 2. p. 36; and Lemon’s Etym. Dict.

16. αἰρεῖ γὰρ τὸ πλύσωμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱματίου, καὶ ξείρων σχίσμα γίνεται. For the patch, being of undressed cloth, shrinks on imbibing wet, and thereby draws up with it something of the old material. And even if it should not get wet, yet the two substances will never wear well together, one being rigid and the other supple. The application is obvious. Wets. compares Phil. Jud. 2, 370. 29. c. τὸ μὴ συμβαλὸν τὰς ἐπερείδεις υἱῶν, ἐρικ καὶ λινὰ καὶ γαρ ἐπὶ τούτων οὐ μόνον ἡ διαφοράς ἀκμαίωσαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἐπικράτεια ἐκείνῳ ῥῆξεν ἐπεργασώμενος μᾶλλον ἢ ἐνεμός, ἄτοι δὲ ἡ χρυσᾶς.

17. οὐδὲ βάλλωνσιν, infundunt. A Hebraism, say some. Wets. however, cites examples from Anacreon and Epictetus. ἄσκους, skins or bags, such as are yet in use throughout the East, and even some parts of Europe, as Spain, Turkey, Hungary, &c. Wets. adduces numerous passages which testify the use of ἄρχοι by the ancients, both Jews and Gentiles. I am surprised that he should have omitted Herodo. 2, 121, 69. ἐπιστάσαντα τῶν ἄσκων δύο ἡ τρεῖς πολεμεῖς αὐτῶν λίγον ἀπαρμένους· αὖς δὲ ἔφρε τὸ ὅνων, κ. η. η. This passage is pretty versified by Paulin, Natal. felc. 10, p. 301. (ap. Bulk.) Pejor enim scissura novo vetricaque coactis, Redditur et nova vina novos bene dantur in utres.

18. ἄρχων, i.e. ἄρχωμαιγός, as Mark calls him.
The Jewish Ἰουδαῖοι, whose business it was to read the Scriptures to the people, after the Priests and Levites, to order what was to be done in the synagogues, to distribute the offices of prayer, and the reading of the Scriptures, for which he received a stipend. To him were joined the ἱερεῖς, and seven aged citizens of good repute, called ἄγγελοι. Vide Rhenferd and Vitrin. de Synag. 2, 11. Wets.

18. ἀρπὶ ἐκελεύησεν, already as it were dead, i. e. is dying. For the aorist may bear rendered by the present; and ἄρπι means εἴδος. Vide Wetstein. Much the same as Mark, τὰ θ. µ. ἐσχάτωσ εἴξει: and Luke 8, 42. ἀπέθανον, was dying, as in Jos. A. 5, 1, 1.

18. εἰπῆς τῷ χειρῷ σου ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ γίνοσαι. Laying hands on, or touching, was indeed an act appropriate to physicians, but it was also the custom of the prophets and holy persons, who prayed for good on any one, to put their hands upon him. See Grot.

20. αἰμαρρόω. Mead, in his Medica Sacra, c. 11, understands by this a flux ex partibus naturalibus, which Hippocr. de Morb. 1, 3. calls Ρὸν αἰματαίη. Brugenses and Beza interpret a perpetual flux of the menses; and so, if I mistake not, Chrys. understands it. The thing is uncertain, and not very important. A flux of blood of long standing is known to be one of the most dangerous and least medicable of all disorders. Eusebius, H. E. 7, 18. and Theophylact tells us that the woman afterwards erected a statue to the honour of Christ.

20. ἄσπατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ. An usual mark of profound respect in the East, both then and at the present day, of which there is a notable example in Evelyn's Memoirs, vol. 1, 159: “The Turk would bring us presents, when he met us, kneeling and kissing the hem of our cloaks.”

Vestiges, however, of the custom are found in the classical writers. So Arrian. E. A. 6, 13, 19. οἱ δὲ ἐκελεύουσι, ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος, οἱ μὲν χειρῶν, οἱ δὲ γονάτων, οἱ δὲ ἐσθητοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀστόμενοι, which Wets. has, I find,
preoccupied, from whom I add Athen. 212. f. ό δὲ μελις προφιλε δομουφοιμενος ύστε των ευδοκιμεν παρα τοι θημα δελοντων, έκαστω σπευδοντος καθ προσανταση της εσπιτος, and in Plutarch Syll. 474. c. A person touches the hem of Sylla’s garment, with a view (he says) to partake of his good luck.

21. ἔλεγε γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῇ Ἐλεν μόνων ἂνθρωπων τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ; σωκήσαμαι. The legal impurity, joined with such a disorder, made her ashamed to draw on herself the gaze of the people while she implored assistance. She hoped, that by simply touching his garment Jesus would be made acquainted both of her miserable state and her implicit faith. Rosenm. and Grot.

22. ἔσωθη, sanata est. This is not, as some tell us, a Hebraism, but occurs in the Classical writers: Weston cites Diod. Sic. p. 15. c. Paulus treats this miracle in the same perverse and irreverent spirit which he evinces on most others. He denies in effect that there was any miracle at all. The woman (says he), having placed her firm faith and confidence in Jesus, when she touched the garment, felt a sudden change in the system, which led to sanity, and therefore imputed it to miraculous power. But surely our Saviour would not have arrogated to himself; nor even accepted, a merit which did not belong to him. And yet the words θάρσει δύνατερ, ὕπατος σου σέσωκε σε, imply as much: at all events, the words of Mark and Luke, έγω γὰρ ζητω δύσμαν εξελθούσαν απ’ εμού, are decisive, and utterly overturn Paulus’s hypothesis; insomuch that he is obliged to cut out the words δύσμαν εξελθούσαν απ’ εμού, without any warrant from MSS. It is grievous to see a writer of so much learning and acuteness reduced to such miserable shifts.

On this, as well as the other senses of σῳζειν, see note on Matt. 1, 22.

23. τοὺς αὐλητὰς. These were usual, not only to the Greeks and Romans (as appears from the numerous passages cited by Wets. and Kirckmann, de
Fun. Rom. 2, 5.), but to the Jews, as we learn from
Rosenm. and Kuinoel.

23. ὑλον διηρυσμένον. The multitude of relations
or domestica, says L. Brug. But it may rather be
interpreted the praefacæ, or hired mourners; for θε-
ρυσμαται may mean lamentari, nærias canere. So
Marc. 5, 38, θεωρεῖ θαυμωμ, κλαίοντες κ. α. π.

24. οὐ γὰρ ἀρτέθηκε τὸ κοράσιον, ἀλλὰ καθεξῆς, i. e. is
not so departed as not to return (Cler.); is not so
dead as you think, i. e. not so that no hope should
remain of her return to life. (Wets.) It does not
follow (says Rosenm.) that the girl was not dead.
For Christ might use the word, because he had re-
solved to bring her back to life. So Beza; which
seems, however, not very conclusive. Michaelis
(with whom agree Koen and Paulus) maintains that
she was not dead, but only in a deliquium animi
trance. He however acknowledges a miracle; first,
because Jesus knew the maid was not yet really
dead; secondly, because, without any medical appli-
cation, he suddenly restored her to life. Whitby's
explanation comes to the same thing: q. d. "You
may go away; there will be no funeral to be solemn-
nized here; she is no more dead than if she were
ὁ πατὴρ σοῦ οὔ τεθνεκεν, ἀλλὰ κοιμᾶται.

25. ἐξεβλῆθη. The signification of the word must
not be too much pressed. It means only dismissed:
an Hellenistic idiom. This he did (says Rosenm.)
that those whom he wished to be spectators and
witnesses of the affair might see everything more
easily. Among these were the parents, Peter, James,
and John. (Marc. 5, 37—40.) Stevenson ap. Bulk.
judiciously suggests that they might be all in the
next room; and that, if they had all been in the
room itself, they could not all have seen him touch
her.

25. ἐκράτησε τής χειρὸς αὐτῆς. Just as we are ac-
customed to do when we rouse any one from sleep
ST. MATTHEW, chap. IX.

(Grot.) ; or, I add, out of kindness and courtesy. So, indeed, do physicians.


30. ἔκειρισσαστε αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων Ὡράτε, μηδεὶς γινοικέτως. Jesus did not enjoin perpetual silence; but only for the present, lest the people might be incited to sedition.

32. ἀνθρωπον καρφὶ δαιμονιζόμενον. Rosenm. and Kuhn, coincide in opinion that, by a comparison of the context and the parallel passage of Luke, it plainly signifies a man afflicted with dumbness by an evil spirit. The man, say they, was doubtless dumb from disorder; but whether a nervous affection, apoplexy, or hypochondria, is uncertain. Now as the common opinion was that all severe disorders were occasioned by daemon, no wonder then that this dumb man was believed to be deprived of speech by a daemon, and our Evangelist thought proper to retain the common mode of expression on this subject. It is observed by Rosenm. that the truth and dignity of the passage will remain the same, whether the disorder proceeded from natural causes or from a daemon. Paulus, with his usual temerity, pursues a method of interpretation which is calculated to destroy both. He maintains that the man only laboured under a phantasy, namely, that he was possessed by an evil genius, who did not permit him to speak; and that Jesus, by removing that fancy, restored him to speech. How does this agree with the exclamation of admiration uttered by the bystanders? οὐδέποτε ἔφανεν οὖτας.

34. εν τῷ ἀρχαίῳ τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια. Spe, auxilio 2. It is, however, not only a Hebraism, but a Grecism. So Æschyl. Eum. 466. πράξας γὰρ ἐν σοὶ πανταχῦ τᾶδ'.

36. ἐστι δὲ γυνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν —was moved with
of the office, is further illustrated by an instructive observation of Mosheim de Rebus Christ. ante Constant. Mag. p. 69. not. Sciemum igitur est, vocabulum hoc ætate servatoris nostri usitatum et certis magnae auctoritatis et fidei ministris datum fuisse, quos Pontifex Judæorum Maximus secum habere, quibuscum de summi momenti rebus deliberare, quos cum potestate et curatione quædam ad externa maximè Judæos mittere, per quos tributum illud colligere, quod Judæi omnes templo quotannis debant, aliisque handlevia negotia perficere solebat, &c. See also Grotius.

2. πρῶτος—Πρῶτος, i. e. first in order, not in dignity; for Christ seems not to have authorized any difference. If he had done so, the Evangelists would have observed it; but they have not, for the names are recited by them in different order. Judas, however, is always named last, and Peter first, and John and his brother James third and fourth, or fourth and fifth. Certainly, these three were especially esteemed by Christ, perhaps for their docility, attachment, and mental endowments. Rosenm. That the Apostles were all placed on an equal footing, in point of rank, is certain. On the names, &c. of the Apostles, the student may consult Elsley.

5. εἰς ὧν ἐθέρμαν μὴ ἀκέλαθτε. Since the Jews cordially hated both Gentiles and Samaritans, and since, for the more extensive propagation of the Christian religion, it was thought necessary to be delivered to one nation only, i. e. the Jewish, already prepared to receive its doctrines; therefore Jesus, that the Jews might first receive his doctrine, and that he might give no occasion for dissension among the Apostles themselves (who even now nourished prejudices), takes care, on this first sending of his messengers, to charge them to preach the divine doctrine only to the Jews. Jesus himself professed that he was sent to the Israelites (Matt. 15, 24.); yet, when necessity required him to travel through Samaria, he sojournered with, and taught the Samaritans, and made
known that more nations should embrace his religion (Matt. 8, 11. Jo. 10, 16).

And when he sent out his disciples the last time, he, on bidding them farewell, taught them that his doctrine was thenceforward to be communicated far and wide. And thus the Apostles, after his death and ascension, enlightened by the Holy Ghost, preached it to Jews and Gentiles indiscriminately. Kuin. On the subject of the Samaritans Wetstein has much interesting matter, carefully collected from Josephus and the Rabbinical writers.

6. προβατα—ἀπολομλήτα. A lively image this of misery. The Jews are so called, because destitute of faithful teachers who should put them in the right way, and instruct their ignorance.

8. νεκροίς ἐγείρετε. It is the united opinion of Grot. Mill. Wets. Michaelis, Markl, Weston, Kuin, and Campbell (whom see) that these words are an interpolation. The authorities for their omission are very strong. Even Griesbach, who attempts to defend them, is obliged to admit that their genuineness is uncertain. I will state the arguments employed by those who impugn the authenticity of the words. In the first place, the most forcible argument employed by Grot. is this: "We do not read that any dead person was restored to life by the Apostles before the resurrection." Wetstein, too, urges, that if Christ had then given the Apostles the power of raising the dead, Matthew would not have neglected to mention it in verse 1, where was the proper place. This observation had been before made by L. Brug. who adds, "it is not likely that Christ gave that to the Apostles as ordinary, which he himself used only sparingly." Rosenmuller observes, that in Luke 10, 17. the Apostles mention it as a great thing, κἀντα δημοσία ὑπονόεσθαι ἐκεῖνος. Markland lays much stress upon the following passage in John 5, 25. "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." Here our Sa-
viour alludes to his raising Lazarus from the grave; for the general resurrection is plainly and distinctly spoken of just after, in verse 28. It therefore does not seem likely that he would have mentioned this power as peculiar to himself, if the Apostles during his lifetime had been endued with the same power. Or, as Mr. Weston states the matter, "the hour might have been already come, and the great miracle of resurrection would have been worked, and not first by the son of God.

To this I add, that if the Apostles had had the power, it is impossible to conceive why they should not have used it. Especially as, before the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit, they had shown strong symptoms of vanity and self-conceit. So that, when they boasted that even the devils were subject to them, it is scarcely possible but that they must have added, "and the very dead are raised at our word."

Griesbach's and Whitby's arguments in defence of the authenticity of the words seem of little force. The likelihood of omission would not apply equally as to cleansing lepers. And that some passages of the chapter have a reference to events after the Resurrection, and extend to the mission given afterwards, seems extremely doubtful. But no reason can be given why, if not in the original, the words should have been added. Reasons are assigned by Kuinoel and Paulus, which, though they would not be strong enough of themselves to convince, yet have weight when added to the testimony of MSS. Versions, Fathers, and Commentators.

8. δαρεάν εἰλαβερε, δαρεάν δότε. Copious extracts are to be found in Wetstein, shewing the sentiments of the Rabbinical writers on this subject: he subjoins this remark: Those who practise medicine expend much time and money, that they may learn their art. But the case was quite otherwise with the Apostles, to whom was conceded the power of working miracles (Act. 8, 20, 33. & 34. 1 Cor. 9.)
otherwise they might have been suspected of seeking filthy lucre. 1 Tim. 6, 3. 2 Thess. 3, 8, 10.

9. μὴ κτήσασθε χρυσὸν, i. e. You must not provide yourselves with. Vide Wets. and Schl. So Thucyd. often.


10. μὴ πήγαν. A wallet, scrip, or satchel, generally of leather, to sling on the shoulder, used from the earliest ages by shepherds and travellers for the reception of bread, flesh, cheese, and other necessaries. Hom. Od. p. 411. οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες δίδοσαν, πλῆσαν δ' ἀρα πήγην σίτου καὶ κρέαν. Vide Wets. Alb. et Valk, in Αμμον.

10. μηδὲ δῶ ξυτῶνας. The Greeks, Romans, and Jews especially, when travelling (Jos. Ant. 17, 5, 7.), wore two tunics; the one next the skin, called by the Romans interula, indusium, subucula; by the Greeks ἱπποδύτης, or, Atticè, χειμωνίας; by the Jews πλῆς. The other, which was very much like the toga, or pallium (and was therefore between the subucula and the outward garments), was by the Attics termed χιτών, by the rest of the Greeks ἐπωδύτης, by the Romans interula. Wets. Rosenm. and Kuin.

10. μηδὲ υποδήματα. The Jews commonly went without covering for the feet: but, on a journey, they found some covering necessary: so, however, that the sandals were used in summer, and the cal-
cei, or ὑπαίθρια, a kind of short boots or strong shoes, for the winter, or long journeys. The Apostles were to take no forethought, not even that of providing these strong shoes, but to depend entirely on the supply which, under Providence, would be ministered to them by their converts. Vide Kuinoel. One need not here use anxious diligence in discussing and reconciling the minute differences between the Evangelists. The sense which they all mean to inculcate is this: that the missionaries were not to be solicitous about providing necessaries. Schulz.

10. ἄξιος—τῆς τροφῆς. Maintenance, including raiment. See Campbell.

11. ἐξετάσετε τῆς—ἄξιος ἑστι, i. e. worthy of your company. On this absolute use of the word examples are given by Kypke, Alberti, and Elsner. To which I add App. 2, 578. 100. Eurip. Suppl. 1131. Arist. 1525. Perhaps it may signify men of good repute and estimation. And so it is taken by Augustin (ap. Bulk.). So also Liban. Or. 465. v. (apud Wets.). Icarius, πανταχοί καλοίμενοι ἡκού, οὐκ ἐξετάζον, τῆς αὐ-τῶν ἑστιν ὁ καλόν, ἀλλὰ πᾶς ἄξιος ἦν. This interpretation is further confirmed by Euth, where, in MS. A. is supplied τῆς ἀξιόδοξης, of “approved virtue.” Lightfoot and Gill take it in the sense of beneficent, hospitable; but without sufficient scriptural authority.

11. κακὲς μείνατε. Persons to whom every sojourn soon proves wearisome, and who never feel content with any quarters, are prone to perpetual change. But, as it was incumbent on the Apostles to avoid giving the slightest occasion for being suspected of avarice, so it was necessary not to incur any suspicion, either of levity in change (by which unnecessary trouble might be occasioned, or offence given to their hosts; vide Lucian. Asin. 4.), or of sensual preference to more luxurious fare. Euthym. Theoph. Rosenm. Wets.

12. ἀπεξάκουσεν αὐτῶν. The word ἀπεξάκουσεν here denotes wishing or praying for felicity of every kind.
The Greeks had a similar custom of saluting a house. So Eurip. Fur. 595. καλώς προσέλθαν, νῦν προσεπτε θ’ ἐστίαν; where see Musgrave. And Soph. Philoct. 540. ἰαμεν ὁ παῖ, προσκόπωντες τὴν ἐσο “Δαικον εἰσοὶκη- σων, where the Scholiast interprets, ἀσπασόμενοι τὴν ἑστίαν.

13. ἡ εἰρήνη. ὡλας. By this name the Hebrews designated whatever may be sought for, or desired. Wetstein.

13. ἡ εἰρήνη—ἐκπορευόμενος. The wish which is frustrated of the desired event, or the admonition not received, is said to return back to him that brought them forward. So that the other not only receives no benefit, any more than if it had never been offered, but suffers, through his own fault, and therefore deservedly, a very great injury. Comp. 15. Es. 55, 2. Psal. 35, 13. But since Christ uses a verb of wishing, it seems one should understand that the desired good is obtained, not by the persons for whom it was wished, but by the wishers themselves. Prov. 25, 2. So Aristoph. Acarn. 883. χαῖρε πολλάγε. Με. ἄλλα μὲν ὧν ἐπιχαρίων. Δι. πολυπραγμοσύνης νῦν ἐς κεφα- λὴν τρέποντ’ ἐμο. See Schol. (Wets.) The opinion, and the phrase founded upon it, still continues in the East. Thus Lord Henniker, in his Travels into Egypt, p. 267, says, that if a Mussulman salutes a Christian (by mistake) with the alekum salam (peace to you), on discovering his mistake, he insists on his revoking or returning his peace.

14. ἐκτινάξατε—κοινωρτν. Thus by this symbolical actio loquens, or mutum verbum (see Scharban ap. Koecher), declaring that they were impure, and unworthy of the Apostolical society. Of this custom Wets. has adduced many illustrations from the Rabbinical writers. See also Grotius.

15. ἀνεκτότερον ἐσται γῆ Σοδώμαν καὶ Γομράμμαν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως. Some commentators understand this of the destruction of the Jewish nation: and on this hypothesis Wets. has paraphrased the passage, citing in illustration Jos. B. 1. Præm. where he says, that no
calamities suffered by any nation since the creation will bear comparison with those of the Jews; and v. 15. he calls the Jews a more impious people than the Sodomites, and thinks, that if the Romans had not come to destroy Jerusalem, it would have been swallowed up by an earthquake, or been destroyed by fire from heaven. Yet the arguments of Whitby, in refutation of this hypothesis, remain, I think, still unanswered: to these I refer the reader. I agree with him in referring these words to the final judgment. On the equity of this dispensation Euthymius and Grotius judiciously observe, that sins are to be estimated, not precisely and solely according to the nature of them, but also according to other circumstances of things and persons. The Sodomites had nothing to depend on but natural religion, and the traditions of their forefathers; but the Jews had the clearer law of Moses. The Sodomites had indeed Lot as their monitor; but the Jews had the Apostles, messengers specially sent from Heaven for their reformation, and in confirmation of that mission working numerous miracles; so that as they sinned against greater light, so they merited severer punishment.

16. ἀποστέλλω ὡς αἰς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. A proverbial phrase, denoting the most imminent danger. See the Classical citations adduced by Wets. I add, that one of the antients gave his son the name of οἰλοκός, meaning to hint that he should leave him in the greatest dangers. See Herod. 4, 149. There is a similar thought in Philostr. V. Ap. 8, 22. καὶ τίνος ἀποσκάψαντος, μετελαίνειν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς ἀγοραίους προσιόντας μάθη, νὴ Δί, εἰπεν, ἵνα μὴ ἐμπίπτωσιν τῇ πόλιμῃ λύκαι.

16. γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι αἰς οἱ θεοί, καὶ ἀκέραιοι αἰς αἱ περιστεραί. This seems to have been a proverbial phrase, the force of which is thus illustrated by Wetstein: “Christ admonishes them to consult for their safety by flight, or by concealment. To fly and take refuge in some place of safety is simple and dove-like; but to withdraw one-self from danger,
after the manner of a serpent, by making use of various arts, is the part of prudence. (Vide Act. 14, 19, 20. 23, 6. 25, 11, 2. 2 Cor. 11, 32, 33.) They must not be stupid and affrighted (like sheep), but learn by circumspection to avoid the weapons opposed to them." But to this interpretation, as far as it respects the words "to fly—dove-like," I cannot accede. Perhaps it is not simplicity, but harmlessness, which our Saviour here inculcates. This seems to be required by the sense of the word itself, and the force of the antithesis: it is, moreover, supported by many ancient authorities. At the same time, it is not improbable that both these senses (which are closely connected) may be meant.

The words ἄκρεειος and ἄπλος are not unfrequently found united (as in Arrian. Epict. 3, 23.) and one is sometimes explained by the other in the Scholiasts and Glossographers. They are not to permit their wisdom and prudence to be accompanied with cunning or malice. In this, Rosenmüller's citation from Cicero (Offic. L. 2.) is apposite; where he says there are many, "qui versatos homines et callidos admirantes malitiam sapientiam judicent," think cunning wisdom. The very opposite was inculcated by some ancient philosophers, and seems expressed in the symbol or arms of Sparta, which, as we learn from Joseph. Ant. 12, 5. consisted of an eagle holding a serpent, denoting a mixture of force and cunning. This dove-like simplicity is not, however, to be unaccompanied by circumspection. For even the doves themselves, as Aelian (de Anim. 3, 4, 5.) tells us, παλαμῶνται πρὸς τοὺς ἱέρακας, where he details instances of their sagacity in that respect. To conclude, both (says Euthymius) must be mixed together, because both are necessary to form one whole and complete virtue.

17. προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Erasmus seeks a peculiar emphasis in the article, in which opinion Mr. Markland entirely acquiesces. For the sense, says he, requires some particular men; in the Jews. He
maintains that οἱ signifies the Jews, ἄθρωποι the Heathens. The remark, however, seems fanciful and unfounded. The Jews, indeed, are especially meant, but that is not expressed by the article. They might well be told to beware of men; since, (as Maldonat and Beza observe,) especially in matters of religion, man is a wolf to man. Gataker quotes Porphyrius saying that the enmity and malice of brutes is more tolerable than that of men. And Ana- chars. ap. Stobœum, τι ἐστι τὸ πολέμιον ἄθρωπος; αὐτὸν ἑαυτοῖς. See also Senec. Ep. 103.

17. παραδοσεῖς—συνεδρία. The word here denotes the lesser tribunals established in all Jewish towns. Vide supra, 5, 21. & 22.


18. ἐπὶ ηγεμόνας. Præsides provinciarum, Proconsules, Procuratores. Kuinoel has learnedly illustrated this word. See also Schleusner.

18. εἰς μαστιγίον αὐτῶι καὶ τοῖς ἑθεσίν. That you may, in the presence of them and foreign nations (on this occasion), declare the doctrine of salvation. (Rosenm. and Kuin.)

19. μη μεριμνήσητε πῶς ἢ τί καλήσητε—be not anxiously solicitous. πῶς refers to the forma orationis, τί to the matter. Μεριμνῶν here signifies to prepare oneself for, and anxiously to meditate a defence; as, Luk. 1, 14. μη προμελετῶν ἀπολογῆσαι. Wetstein cites Diog. L. 111, 94. τὸ ὀρθὸς λέγειν διαιρεῖται εἰς δ. ἐν μὲν ᾧ δεῖ λέγειν· ἡ δὲ ὅσα δεῖ λέγειν· γ. πρὸς οὐς δεῖ λέγειν, δ. ὡς περίκα λέγειν δει. ᾧ μὲν οὖν δεῖ λέγειν, αἱ μέλεις συμφέρειν τῷ λέγοντι καὶ τῷ ἀκούστι· τὸ δὲ ὅσα δεῖ λάλειν, μη πλείον μηδὲ ἐπάττατι τῶν ἰκανῶν. Eph. 6, 20. Comp. Daniel, 3, 16.

20. οἷ—ἀλλὰ—non tam quam. A sort of comparative negative. To the question how this promise
was fulfilled, Origen acutely answers, in Jud. 11, 29, 30. *Εἰ πνεύμα κυρίου ἐσ᾿ αὐτῶν, πῶς εὐχηται, ἃ μὴ προσήκει; ἐνὶ γὰρ καὶ κύνα ἀπανήγεισαι ἐπανοιγμεί τῷ Ἰσαακε. ἃρ νῦν εὐφάλη τὸ πνεύμα; οὐδαμῶς. ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πνεύμα βοηθεῖν παραγέγονεν, οὐχ ὑποβάλλειν τὴν ἀτοκοῦ εὐχὴν αὐτὸς δὲ σφάλλεται ἀπερισκέπτως εὐχή-μενος.

21. ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γυνείς. As witnesses in a court of justice. So Wakef. S. Cr. 2, p. 24; to whom assent Bolten and Paulus, Rosenm. and Kuin. Thus Matth. 12, 41. ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς τ. But there the words ἐν τῇ κρίσει are added, which is not the case in this passage. I certainly prefer the common sense, “shall rise up against, attack, and persecute. Of this examples in abundance are given by Wets. It occurs frequently in the historians, especially Thucydides; and I have much to observe, which must, however, be reserved for some more suitable occasion.

21. θαυμάσασθον. Sua operā, nempe testimoniis perhibendis, efficient ut morti addicantur. (Schl.) Capitis damno absentem. Plutarch. Themist. p. 124. b. Xenoph. ἀναβ. 2. 2 Paral. 32. 2. Polybius, Sig. 46.

22. μισοῦμεν οὐτὸ πάντων, i.e. quasi omnibus, of most men. So Theophr. explains οὗτοι πολλοὶ.

22. ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθῆται. This has been well rendered by Dorv. ad Charit. p. 458 (apud Kuin.) qui constantem se præstiterit—perpetuis. εἰς τέλος most commentators explain ad mortem. Others (as Hammond, Wets. and Rosenm.) understand the words of a temporal preservation from the destruction of Jerusalem; but this does not so well suit the context. Though the word sometimes bears that sense, (on its different significations see note on Matth. 1, 21.) it here clearly signifies salvation in heaven. Euthymius, who adopts this interpretation, has the following very beautiful passage, derived, I suspect, from Chrysostom: θαυμάσασθαι δὲ τοῦτος ἄξιον, ποῖς εἰς τοσοῦτος καὶ τοιοῦτος κυνδύνους ἀποστελλόμενοι, καὶ πάσας μὲν τὴν οἰκουμένην τολμήσω
ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. X.

ἐχειν ἀκούστης, παρ᾽ ὦλην δὲ πειράξεσθαι τὴν βιων᾽ οὐκ ἑβεβλάσῃ, οὐδ᾽ ἐξήτησαν ἀπαλλαγὴν τῶν δεινῶν; ὡστέ κοινὸν γὰρ, ὅσ ἐνεπείδη τὸ διδάσκαλον, καὶ ἐδραίον ὡσ τιστοῖ τῇ δύναμει τῶ τοῦ ἀποστέλλωνος. Μεμαθηκότες δὲ καὶ ὅτι τοσοῦτον ἵσχύει τῇ κήρυγμα τῆς πίστεως, οὐς διαλύσατι καὶ τὴν ἀδαμαντίνην στοργήν τῆς φύσεως, καὶ τὰς σχέσεις ἀλλήλαις ἐκπολεμοῦσαι, μᾶλλον ἀνηρείσθησαν, καὶ νευραθέντες λοιπῶν τῶς ἀκαμφίβολους ἐπίσης τοῦ κατορθών, ἐπεδύσατο, διάδεκα μόνοι, πρὸς ἔπαισαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, ἢ τὴν συμπαρατάττετο καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ διάβολος μετὰ τῶν ἀπείρων αὐτοῦ δαμαῶν, καὶ νεκτάκαισιν, οὐκ ἀνέλοντες τῶς ἑκατέρως, ἀλλὰ μεταβρύθησανε, καὶ δαμάων ἱσοὺς λαβόντες, ἀγγέλων ἱσοὺς ἐποίησαν.


23. ἦς δὲν ἔκλεψ ὁ οἷος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Some understand this of the destruction of Jerusalem, as Euthymius and Wetstein. Others of the coming of the Messiah spiritually, by the effusion of the Holy Ghost; as Grotius. Other opinions see in Pole and Whitby.


25. Βεθλεέμ. In this reading nearly all the MSS. concur, supported by some ancient versions. Jerome altered the reading to Βεθλεὲμ, because he thought it the same with the God of the Ecronites (2 Reg. 1, 2), called Ἰεβραῖος, Lord of Flies, or powerful against flies; and those who support that reading tell us that the Jews so called the chief of their ὀαιμονία out of contempt. But there are no
historical proofs of the fact, and the appellation would rather seem to imply praise. Ἐλεγξέθωσα is doubtless the true reading. This appellation of the chief of demons, Satan, was (I think) formed with a reference to Ἐλεγξέθωσα, and the change was meant to express contempt. For it was a Jewish custom, however different from the Heathen, to give opprobrious apppellations to beings of whom they were in dread. Now here not only was such contempt expressed, (Ἐλεγξέθωσα signifying Lord of Dung, or rather, in a metaphorical sense, idolatry,) but it was also thrown on the false God of the Ecronites. For Ἐλεγξέθωσα signifies not only dung, but idolatry, as has been proved by Lightfoot and Buxtorf. Ἐλεγξέθωσα will therefore denote God of, author and promoter of, idolatry. This will, I think, be found the most natural and probable solution of the difficulties which encircle this controverted subject.


Orest. 615. Pausan. 7, 22, 2. ἐρατὰ πρὸς τὸ ὄς τῶν Θεῶν.

27. κηρύχατε ἐτι τῶν δαμάτων. Roofs which, as being flat, would be well adapted to that purpose. Wets. cites Lucian. V. H. 2. 46. αὐτὸς δὲ ἀνελθὼν ἐπὶ τὸ στέγος, ἐβόαν τε καὶ τὸ ὅς ἐταίρους συνεκάλουν. And Jos. B. 2, 21, 5.


29. καὶ ἐν·—οὐ πεσεῖται· ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, i. e. will perish, die. The words ε. τ. γ. are suspected, without cause, by Griesbach. See Aelian, H. A. 1, 31. Vide et Scheid. ap. Meuschen. God, says Plato de Legg. 10, can attend (like eminent human artists) to things both small and great.

29. ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ἥμαν, i. e. without the knowledge and consent of. This formula is not unfrequent in the Classical writers. Wets. cites Hom. Od. o. 580. οὗτοι ἄνευ θεοῦ. Lucian. Conv. οὐκ ἄνευ θεοῦ: et per Lap. xvi. 15. ἄνευ θεοῦ. Appian. p. 1154. οὐκ ἄνευ θεοῦ. Diod. Sic. 1, 90. οὐκ ἄνευ δαμανῆν τινος. See more in Kypke and Palairot; also Wakef. on Mosch. 2, 159.

30. τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς πᾶσαν ἤρθηκεν ηἰρμημέναι εἰσὶ. Signifying that the very smallest of our concerns are watched over by God. So Pesickta, f. 18, 4. Nonne omnes capillos omnis creaturæ ego numero?

31. πολλὰν στροβίλαν διαφέρετε ύμεῖς. Markland conjectured πολλῷ, (which was read by Euthym. and Theophyl. and is found in some MSS.) with the ap-
probation of Valck: ad Herod. 5, 17, 12. whose ex-
amples may there be seen: but it has been observed 
by Kuin. that the words are not usually so disjoined: 
and that τολάων has reference to the words εἰς αὐτῶν 
and δό. The word is indeed liable to other ob-
jections, and cannot be admitted.

32. ὑμολογήσει ἐν ὑμ. A Hebraism, or Syriacism, 
for ὑμ. ἐμ. The word is here used figuratively: 
"he will profess my doctrine, be on my side." In 
the other member of the sentence, the word ὑμο-
λογησα is to be taken propriè for agnosco, amó, &c. 
ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν ὑπάρχεισ, are a periphras-
sis for the day of judgment. (Grot. Rosenm. Kuin.)

33. ἀφνησιάλ με—reject, cast off. Dion. Hal. 8, 
34. φίλους ἀφνησίαλ ἢταν ἀδικήσωσι. Alciph. 3, 40. 
tοῦ γόνεωι—ἀφορμήσαν.

34. μὴ φοινικτε ὅτι ἠλθεν βαλείν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν: 
οίκ ἠλθεν βαλείν εἰρήνην, ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν. Wolf supplies 
μὴ γινώσκειν. This is a forcible and Oriental mode 
of expressing the certainty of a foreseen conse-
quence of any measure, by representing it as the 
purpose for which the measure was adopted. (Wets. 
and Campb.) Lightf. and Whitby understand by a 
sword the wars which quickly followed, and proved 
the ruin of the Jewish State. But this seems too 
limited a sense.

35. διαχάσαι διαθησαν κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς. This use of 
διαχάσαι with κατὰ (which is a confounding of two 
phrases together) is Hellenistic. The good and the 
evil principles would be set in a ferment, and, from 
the corruption of our nature, prove too strong for 
the most deep-rooted affections. It was long ago 
remarked by a very acute observer (Zeno ap. 
Diog. Laert. 7, 32.) ἀλλοτρίως ἀλλήλων εἶναι πάντας 
τῶν μη σπουδαίως, καὶ γονεῖς τέκναν, καὶ ἀδελφῶς ἀδελ-
φῶν, ῥικεῖος ῥικεῖον. It has been truly observed by 
Democrats, in his Sententiae, p. 64 (ap. Bulk.) that 
the enmities of kindred are much more bitter than 
those between other persons.

36. ἐξηραὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, οἱ οἰκισκολ αὐτοῖ. More
usually οἱ οἶκεῖοι, which Euthym. has in his paraphrase. Philostr. V. A. 5, 35. p. 218. m. ἐκτεσζομείῳ (read ἐκτεσζομεῖῳ) πρὸς τὸν έαυτῶν οἶκον.

37. οἱ φιλῶν—οὕς ἔστιν Μοῦ σέξις, i. e. worthy of being my disciple. Grot. and Wets. have appositely cited from Hierocl. καλῶν μὲν τῷ θεῷ πειθοῦντα, καλῶν δὲ καὶ τοῖς γονεῦσιν—ei δὲ πρὸς ἄλλο μὲν οὐ θείος νομος, πρὸς ἄλλο δὲ οἱ γονεῖς φέροιε, μαχομένης τῆς αἱρήσεως, τοῖς ἀμείνοις ἐπεθανέν δὲ, πρὸς ταύτα μόνον ἀπειθοῦντας γανεῦσι, πρὸς αἱ καὶ αὐτῶ τοῖς θείοις νόμοις οὐ πειθοῦναι. Comp. 2 Macc. 7, 20. 25. 28. 29. Epictetus, 3, 3. says the true good is to be preferred to every relative tie. You are my father, he adds, but not my good, &c. Bulkley.

38. οὐ δὲ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρόν, i. e. is not prepared to suffer the worst evils, even the most cruel and ignominious death. As crucifixion was not a Jewish punishment, this mention of it may seem prophetic, and to have alluded to his own crucifixion. That the persons to be crucified bore their cross is known, as well from the Scripture as some passages of the Classics produced by Wetstein; Cic. Div. I. 26. Plut. 554. Α. Artem. 2, 61. Vide Lips. de Cruce, 2, 5. See note in 27, 33.

38. ἀκολουθεῖ ὑπίστω μου. This may seem an Hebraism, or Hellenistic pleonasm; but it is defended by Arist. Plut. 13, & 759, & 1210. Lucian. Ne 2. Herodian, 4, 1, 6. cited by Wetstein.

39. ὁ ἐφών τὴν ψυχήν αὐτοῦ, ἀπολέσεις αὐτῆν. Aν acute dictum, an Oxyoron, or a sort of Paronomasia between the two senses of ψυχή (namely, life and soul). There is also a dilogia in the word ἀπολέσει and εὕρισκα. Life is, says Kuin. an Hebrew image of felicity, and in this sense it ought to be taken in the following words: ἀπολέσεις αὐτῆν, and εὕρησεις αὐτῆν. The student will perceive some similarity in cast of thought and turn of expression, to the noble passage of Juvenal, Sat. 8. Summum crede nefas animam praeferre pudori, Et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas. This maxim is equally true in military affairs. See Wetstein’s classical citations; Dion.
Hal. 6, 9. Arrian. Ep. 4, 1. Front. 4, 1, 16. Philo. de Leg. 2, 574, 12. Xen. Cyr. 3. Horat. Sat. 2, 3, 13. Justin. 20, 3. Dum morte honeste quaerunt, feliciter vicerunt: nec alia causa victoriae fuit quam quod desperaverunt. The same may be said of Christ's disciples, whether we regard this life, or the next; for in the former case those who persevere with constancy, often escape out of the greatest dangers, beyond all expectation. Thus were Peter and Paul (and those Christians who in the Jewish war were divinely warned to withdraw to Pella) preserved. The contrary took place in the case of Judas, and also of those Jews who returned to Jerusalem: they lost their lives by the very measure which, humanly speaking, seemed likely to enable them to find and preserve it.

If, however, we regard the next life (which Christ has ever and chiefly in view, as being the only real life) the truth of the apothegm will be yet more apparent: for he who abandons Christ and his Religion either will not find, or not long preserve, that life which he thus studies to save; he will moreover incur a certain loss of the other, and precipitate himself to eternal misery. On the contrary, he who is constant in fidelity to Christ, will indeed expose this life to danger, yet he will not immediately lose it, or if he should lose it, he will receive it back from the hands of God with abundant interest. Wetc.

40. ὁ δεξάμενος ὑμᾶς, ἐμὲ δέχεσαι· and consequently he that receiveth not you receiveth not me. The treatment shown to an ambassador is in fact shown to his prince. Wetstein and Schoettgen have illustrated this by numerous Rabbinical citations.

41. εἰς ὅνωμα is for ἃ, qua quatenus quia. An Hebraism, say Glass. and Vorstius. See Wetstein's Rabbinical citations. Yet examples, not dissimilar, occur in Greek and Latin phraseology. It was a Jewish proverb, says Wetstein. Thus Lot and Abraham received angels, but not in the name of angels; i.e. not supposing them to be angels (Hebr. 13, 2). But the widow received Elias in the name of a prophet.
(1 Reg. 17), and Laban received Jacob in the name of a just man; and they received a reward from God. προφήτης is here legatus divinus. Wets.

42. δὲ—ποτίσῃ ἐνα τῶν μικρῶν. These Rosenmuller has proxily explained to mean, men of no rank, dignity, &c. But I prefer (with Euth. and Wets.) to understand the word as an Hebraism denoting disciples, as opposed to masters. Bolten and Kui- noel observe, that ἔνα signifies both parvus and discipulus. This is strongly confirmed by a passage of Bereschith. R. 42, 4. Si non parvuli ἔνα non sunt discipuli, si non sunt discipuli non sunt sapientes, &c.

42. ποτίσῃ—ποτίσιον ψυχροῦ. So ἄρα ἐνα ψυχροῦ. Jerem. 16, 7. (Kuin.) Perhaps ποτίσιον ποτίσιον may be a pleonasm for ποτίσιον, as in Greek most verbs admit an accusative of a noun of cognate sense. Vide Matth. Gr. Gram. After ψυχροῦ there is an ellipsis of ὅδατος, which is supplied in Mark 9, 41. It is frequent in Greek. One similar to it occurs in the Latin words frigida and gelida, scil. aqua. To give a cup of water was a proverbial phrase for giving the smallest thing. Thus in Αelian. V. H. 1, 21, 32. the Persian who had nothing else to offer King Artaxerxes (and it was the custom never to approach the king without some gift) takes up water from the river in his hands, and presents it. Small, however, as it may seem, this was not always given. The Jews habitually refused it to the Gentiles, as we learn from Juvenal, Sat. 14, 103. Quæsitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos. Nor was it always granted to their own countrymen. Thus, in the story of Isaac and Rebecca, is narrated by Josephus, 34, 24. when Isaac asks for water at the well, and is refused, Rebecca reproves the damsels, saying, τίνος ἄλλου κυνωνίσεων προς ἄνθρωπος αὐτάς ποτε, αἱ μηδὲ ὅδατος μετέδόσασθαι. And, as Euthymius and Theophylact observe, the gift was made small, that no one might plead poverty in excuse for neglecting this duty.

42. οὐ μὴ ἀφελέσῃ τῶν μικρῶν αὐτῶν. Observe the ele-
gance of this *litotes*, of which many Classical examples are produced by Elsner and Wetstein.

**CHAP. XI.**

**Verse 2.** ἀκούσας ἐν τῷ δεσμὸν ἑπιφάνεια. At Machænus, of which Josephus, A. 17, 7. treats.

2. τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Campbell thinks that Ἰσίσων (the reading of a few MSS.) is probably the true one. The word Χριστος is never, says he, used in the Gospel as a proper name; it is the name of an office. But I answer, this is the very import of the word here. These ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ are well explained by Wetstein, "deeds such as the Jews expected that the Messiah would perform." 2 Tim. 4, 5.

3. εἶπεν αὐτῷ: Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. John had ordered them to inquire, art thou he that is coming,—is to come. Kuinoel takes the present for the future, which is usual in the Hebrew when the thing spoken of is certain. So Act. 3, 2. where εἰσπορευόμενοι is interchanged with οἱ μελλόντες εἰσινεα. Upon the motive of this enquiry the Commentators are not agreed. As it is not distinctly mentioned why John sent messengers to Christ, we are reduced to conjectures. Just. Martyr, Tertull. Lightfoot, Beaus MacKnight, Le Clerc, Maltby, Wetstein, Thiass, Batt, and Mins, think that John sent on account of doubts and misgivings which occurred to him during his imprisonment. But Hammond, Whitby, Doddridge, Euthymius, Theophylact, Gregory Magnus, and others, think he sent, rather to satisfy his *disciples' doubts than his own; for he could have none, having already borne abundant testimony to his mission. I myself entirely assent to the opinion of Kuinoel, namely, that John did not send messengers because he had begun to doubt, but for the purpose of exciting Jesus to lose no time in entering on that earthly kingdom which he himself perhaps expected. For, as Rosenmuller has well remarked, after Batt in his Dissertation on this subject, that it does not
appear whether John had been informed from any other source than the Scriptures of the Old Testament, what should be the fate and condition of the Messiah, and especially at what time, and in what manner he should commence his reign, to publicly declare himself the Messiah. Hence John, who, from what we know of his life, discourses, and fortunes, is admitted to have been of an ardent temper, impatient of delay, (perhaps uneasy at the reserve maintained by Jesus towards him,) who so eagerly expected the commencement of the Messiah’s kingdom, who burnt with desire to promote so good a cause, who had so studiously prepared the minds of the Jews for the advent of the Messiah (of whom he was persuaded that he was the precursor), and who now, thrown into bonds, was compelled to cease from this goodly work; and who hoped that he should have been delivered by Jesus, desires Jesus to be thus interrogated in his name; σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἐτερον προσδοκῶμεν; Art thou indeed the Messiah? Dost thou sustain the character of the Messiah? We might fancy that thou wert not. Is any other to be expected? No: why then dost thou so long delay to publish and profess thy Messiahship? This view of the subject I believe to be correct as far as it goes; but it omits to state the most important purpose of John’s message, namely, the satisfaction of some of his disciples who, stumbling at the meanness of Christ’s birth, humble mode of life, and unambitious conduct, had entertained doubts of his being the Messiah: for whose satisfaction, therefore, the messengers were sent, and against whom, and not against John, as most commentators maintain, is levelled the gentle rebuke couched in the words “blessed is he who shall not be offended in me.” Notwithstanding the length to which this note has already extended, I cannot conclude without entering my protest against the mistaken (but too prevalent) notion that John sent to satisfy his own doubts, and advert to that specious form in which the hy-
pothesis is put by the able pen of Wetstein. If the disciples only had doubted, what need (asks he) to send a message? Was it to confirm the disciples? but nothing could be added to the force of ocular and auricular demonstration. Now, if we understand it as referring to a scruple in John's mind, all is clear. But surely all is clear without resorting to this unauthorized hypothesis. Of the two reasons which impelled John to send the messengers, one was to excite Jesus to delay no longer to enter upon his kingdom. Now from the words of our Lord's answer, when properly interpreted, it will appear that our Lord understood this purport of John's message. And the words of that answer refer to it plainly enough for John to comprehend the sense, (though perhaps not his disciples,) which was all that Jesus intended. The words of the answer may be thus paraphrased: You excite me to hasten the commencement of my kingdom. Know, then, that my kingdom hath already commenced, i. e. the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them: and this is all that my kingdom, being spiritual, is intended to effect.

3. ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν. Observe, this is the subjunctive present, for the indicative future, render, "must we, are we to expect another?"

4. τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν. Regain their sight. Weston. So 20, 34. Mar. 10, 51. Luc. 7, 22. Act. 22; and often in the Greek writers. It is indeed used once impropriè of a person born blind; where accipere will convey the truest idea. The present passage is an accommodation of Is. 35, 5, 6.

5. πτωχοὶ εἰσαγγελίζονται. This is equally true, whether we take πτωχοὶ in a physical, or in a metaphorical sense. On the word εἰσαγγελίζονται see Wetstein and Schleusner.

6. καὶ μακάριος ἢ. ἢ. ἡ. ὁ. σ. ἢ. ἢ. Markland proposes this punctuation, καὶ μακάριος—and (he said)
meaning, I suppose, to signify that these words are
to be applied to a person different from the preced-
ing ones; namely, to John’s disciples, who had
doubted of his Messiahship. This change of punc-
tuation, however, is not necessary.

7. τούτων δὲ πορευόμενων ἠξέτατο—λέγειν τοῖς ἔχλαισ.
It is a refined and judicious remark of Euthymius
and Theophylact, that our Lord waits for the de-
parture of the disciples to praise John, lest he should
incur the censure of adulation. He meant by this
praise to avert from John any suspicion of levity and
inconstancy, to which the words of the message, in-
terpreted literally, might lead.

8. ίδειν κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον; This ex-
pression may be taken either in a natural or meta-
phorical sense. The former is adopted by Grotius,
Beza, Campbell, Rosenm. Schleusner, and Wetstein,
who produces several passages where the same cir-
cumstance occurs, namely, reeds shaken by the
wind; and (what is more important) of κάλαμος in
the collective sense (as we use reed), citing 1 Macc.
9, 45. Jos. A. 13, 1, 3. The other sense is sup-
ported by Euthymius, Theophylact, Whitby, and
Kuinoel (whom see), and is not devoid of reason. I
however adopt the former, which is confirmed (as
says Rosenm.) by the antithesis of the rich man,
whose magnificence all gladly survey. For in v. 15.
seqq. he rebukes the fickleness of the people; as, in-
deed, he does in the present verse. For the image of a
reed shaken by the wind well represents the innate le-
vity and inconstancy of the vulgar. Vide Eph. 4, 14.

8. ἀλλὰ τί—for ἥν, when interrogation succeeds
interrogation. Wetstein gives examples from Xen.
Demosth. and Arrian. Kypke adds Andoc.

8. εν μαλακώις ἰματίωις ἢμφιεσμένοις; Any soft and
fine vestments, whether of wool, silk, or cotton. Of
this Wets. and Kypke have given many illustrations.
I add Diod. Sic. 3, 352. κραίνεται δ’ ἑσθισὶ μὲν μαλα-
κίωι. Polluc. 10, 2, 8. f. ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ ταῦτα. scil. mo-
bilis (moveables). μαλακά, οἴστερ εἰμεταχείριστα—

11. οὐκ ἐγέρθεται. This word, like the Hebrew וּל is particularly applied to the birth of eminent persons. Vide Jud. 24, 24. Luc. 7, 16. Jo. 7, 52. (Grot. and Kuin.)

11. ὁ δὲ μικρότερος (scil. προφήτης) ἐν τ. β. τ. ο. μείζον αὐτοῦ ἐστι. John was greater than preceding prophets; for, besides his wonderful conception, and his being himself the subject of ancient prophecies, he had seen and known the Messiah, and been his precursor. Yet any Christian teacher had some points of superiority over him.

12. ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται. On the interpretation of these words there is much difference of opinion. See Pol. Syn. Wolf, and Koech. Also that of Bolten, Eckerman, Schoetgen, Bengel, and Paulus. I prefer the interpretation of Siblous, Rosen. and Kuinoel, which gives the following sense: Doctrina Christi quasi vi et impetu extorquetur summâ cum cupiditate arripitur ab hominibus. So the Syriac: "Cum violentiâ accipitur. This interpretation is confirmed by Euthymius, who thus explains: βιάζε- ται η πτετις βιαλως ἀρπάζεται παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Thus the sense of the next words, καὶ βιασταὶ ἀρπά- ᾧσιν αὐτήν, may be thus paraphrased: Men of ardent minds seek it with avidity, and, as it were, snatch it. Vide Schoetg. Hor. Hebr. in loco.

13. πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφήται καὶ οἱ νόμοι ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις προεφήτευσαν. The words are thus paraphrased by Rosenm. All the prophets prophesied obscurely and enigmatically of those things which even John dis-
cerned only in part, but which you see clearly. Vide 1 Pet. 1, 10. 2, 12.

15. καὶ εἰ θέλετε δεξιάσασθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν Ἡλίας. Si creedere verbis meis vultis. Examples of this sense of δεξιάσασθαι are produced by Raphel, Kypke, and Wets. So Ἕβρ in Euth. 4, 4. is rendered πελάτεσθαι. This is the Elias meant by Malachi.

15. ἐχεῖν ὁτα ἀκοῦειν. A proverbial formula, by which attention was requested to things of serious import. The phrase ἐχεῖν ὁτα is used with a similar metaphor by Liban. Ep. 499. and Plutarch, 1118. c. The words ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ are added exegetically by Philo. 2, 19, 24. τοῖς ἀκούσας ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ θεσπίζει τάδε. de Charit. p. 400, 27. βοῶν καὶ κεκραγαί τοῖς ὁτα ἐχουσιν ἐν ψυχῇ.

16. τίνι—ὁμοιότατα τίνι γενεὰν ταύτην; An exordium familiar to the Jews on commencing a parable; as appears from the Talmud. and Marc. 4, 30. Luc. 13, 18 and 20. (Rosenm.) I add so Ἀeschyl. Choeph. 10. νοία ἐμφορά προσεκάσω (τοῦτο).


16. ἐν ἁγοραῖς. Wets. cites Jos. B. 5, 12, 3. which see.

17. ιὑλήσαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεσασθε. Pipes were used both among the Greeks and Romans, not only at funerals, but also at weddings and dances. Kuin. This is proved by the passages in Wetstein; to which I add Herod. 1, 145. 1—12. παύεσθε μοι ὄρχεσμοι, ἐπεὶ οὐκ, ἐμέοις αὐλέους, ἐκάθετε ἐκβαινειν ὄρχεσμοι.

17. ἐκόψασθε (scil. τὰ στῆθη). Luke in the parallel passage has κλαίειν. Wets. cites many passages to this purpose: as Xeph. de Pertinacis funere, καὶ τίνες ἐκόπτοντο, ἔτερον πένθιμον τί ὑπομενόταν. Jesus compares the Pharisees, &c. to sullen boys, whom nothing which their companions may do can please, whether they play at weddings, or at funerals; since they neither could be induced to hearken to the severe precepts of John, nor the milder ones of Christ.
There are two similar passages adduced by Wets. from Arrian. Epict. 3. 15. τὰ παιδία—νῦν μὲν ἄδοξος παιζεῖ, νῦν δὲ μενομάχους: and Epict. 35. ὡς τὰ παιδία ἀναστραφήσῃ, ἀ νῦν μὲν παλαιστὰς παιζεῖ νῦν δὲ μενομάχους.

18. μήτε ἐσθιαν, μήτε πίνων. This must be taken as a figurative and hyperbolical phrase, signifying great abstemiousness. So 7, 39. μήτε ἄρτων ἐσθιαν, μήτε οἶνον πίνων. Cf. Dan. 10, 3.

19. φάγωσ καὶ σινακόρης. The general sense is, a dissolute person. The phrase seems to have reference to Deuter. 21, 20. καιράι ὄνομα. Proverb. 23, 2. εἰσάγων ρόδον οὐδὲν ζῷον—a drunkard, profuse person. For Schultens thinks that ἁρὴ properly denotes laxity, profusion, &c. It may, however, be rendered edax, φάγος. In Deut. the Sept. translate συμβολοκεροῖν, comessator; and in Prov. σορνικανος, scortator. φάγος signifies comessator, or comedo (as Erasmus). The Hebrew phrase seems proverbial.

19. καὶ ἐξικαίαδην ἤ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων. On the sense of this passage there is much diversity of opinion. Vide Schleus. Wolf, Köcher, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, to whom I can only refer my readers. They have, however, omitted one interpretation to be found in Euthymius (and that probably derived from Chrysostom), which upon the whole I think the best. See p. 445. The sense is this: The wisdom of God in thus ordering that John and Jesus should pursue opposite courses in conduct, and yet unite in producing the same end, the benefit of man, is acknowledged, and recognized as just and unrebukeable by her sons (i. e. the wise) as doing every thing that ought to be done, and using every method for promoting their salvation. The above interpretation (on which Grotius's is founded) seems most suitable to the context. It is embraced by Campbell.

The whole passage is thus paraphrased by Weston: Wisdom, that is, the wisdom of God, is justified by the conduct of John and of Christ, since the abstemious and recluse life of the one was not owing to
insanity, nor the conviviality or social disposition of the other to any love for glutony or drunkenness.

21. πάλαι αὖ ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῷ μετενήσαν. The word πάλαι is passed over by most interpreters. Schleusner renders it olim; and Rosenmuller, prisco illo tempore quo difficilior erat penitentiam agere, which is far from satisfactory. I should prefer jamdiu, already, which does not materially differ from our term long ago. The sense is, “they would not have withstood so many exhortations, and overlooked so many miracles.” Grotius explains as if he took πάλαι with ἔγενοτο; but this is harsh, and curtails the sense. Wets. cites this passage of Plato: εἰ ἐγὼ πάλαι ἐπεχείρησα πράττειν τὰ πολιτικὰ, πάλαι ἄν ἀπολαλέην.


22. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως. As the subject of the next verse is the calamity which the city shall suffer, Wetstein interprets it of punishment in this life. But I assent rather to Brug, Piscator, and Grotius, who seem to take it of the last and general judgment.

23. καὶ σῦ, Ἐκείνοι, ἢ ἐστὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ψυχεῖσα. This is a proverbial and hyperbolical expression, derived from high towers, trees, &c. Thus Grotius and Wetstein produce similar phrases, ad astra tolli, sublimo vertice sidera ferire. Plut. 865. v. ἔθελε—τὴν δὲ θησαυρῶν ὑπερέχειν τε πασῶν καὶ μετέωρων ἀρδηναί πρὸς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἢ τὰ ἐξαίφνης ἀφανῆ γενέσθαι. Arist. Arist. 1, 2. ἐδικεῖ τῇ κεφαλῇ ψυχῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Herodot. 3, 30. and others. By all which is figuratively represented a state of wealth and prosperity. The contrary of this is signified by ἐστὶν ἄσω καταβιβασθῆναι. So An-
thol. 1, 80, 15. εἰς τὴν τῶν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν νεφελῶν εἰς ἀθνη κατάγει. Tob. 13, 2. (de Deo) αὐτῶς μαστιγωὶ καὶ ἐλείει, κατάγει εἰς ἀθην καὶ αὖγει. Comp. Is. 14, 12. 57, 9. To Capernaum, flourishing by the fisheries and mercantile pursuit, favoured by its maritime situation, Jesus denounces, if it perseveres in its incredulity, the heaviest calamities; a denunciation doubtless amply fulfilled in the war of Vespasian, and the civil commotions which then agitated Galilee; though heavier punishments are reserved for it in the final judgment. Grot. Wets. and Rosenm.


25. ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα. Grotius takes the word as if written ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας τ. because, thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, thou hast revealed, &c. For Christ does not praise God for the hiding, but for the revealing. It is a Hebraism. Campbell compares Rom. 6, 17. God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed, &c. Ἀπεκρύπτειν signifies to suffer to be hidden; ἀποκαλύπτειν, to cause to be revealed. These aorists have the sense of the present. Or render soles permittere. The event is therefore ascribed to God, because he permitted, and did not by his power hinder that the greater part of the rich and noble should reject the Gospel. (Rosenm. and Kuinoel.) ταῦτα, the mysteries of Christ; σώντοι, those who are in other respects wise, prudent, and intelligent; νησίοι, the unlearned, simple, and humble. Kuinoel.

27. πάντα μοι παρέδωκας ν. τ. π. All information on what might be taught and done: doctrina divina, consiliorum divinorum expositio. The signification of παρέδωκας is here reveal, teach, &c.

27. οὐδεὶς ἐπιθυμεῖ καὶ νῦν ἐκ ἡμῶν, εἰ μὴ ἐκ πατέρων. No one can perfectly know the Son, and the nature of his office, but the Father; and the nature of the con-
nection which subsists between him and the Father, and the counsels of the Father for the salvation of the human race; which not even the prophets saw, unless per transennam. Vide 1 Pet. 1, 10. (Grot. Rosenm. and Kuin.) Vide et Wets.

27. καὶ ὁ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ οἷς ἀποκαλύψαι. This is to be referred to both, as well what is known of the Father as of the Son. For to the wisdom of the Son was it permitted, to whom, and how much, and when to reveal. Neither did he open mysteries to all, but a certain part to believers in general, a part to the Apostles (Grotius); and this, for the weakness of the multitude, and for other causes. (Rosenm.)

28. δεῦτε τ. μ. π. ὁ. κ. κ. πεφορτισμένοι, i. e. come (to be taught) ye who, loaded with the weight of ceremonies, and the additional injunctions of the Rabbis, &c. which were said to be φάσμα δυσβάστακτα. (Cf. 23, 4. Act. 15, 10.) So Camer. Grot. & Kuinoel. But most others refer the words to the labouring under the weight of temptation and sin, and the various trials and tribulations of this mortal life. “Christ (explains Wetstein) eases them of a part of their burden, and, by his example, promises, miracles, and the influence of the Holy Spirit, strengthens them.”

I see no reason why we may not understand both; the former in reference to the Jews, the latter to the Gentiles. In this interpretation I am supported by the authority of Theophyl. 62. D. πάντας καλεῖ, ὃς μόνον Ἰουδαῖος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑβηνίκος, νοήσαι γὰρ ἄν κοιταντας μὲν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, οἱ παραπλήσιαι νομικὰ βαρέα μεταχειμένους, καὶ κοιταντας ἐν τῇ ἐργασίᾳ τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ νόμου. Πεφορτισμένους δὲ, τοὺς ἑβηνίκους, οἱ τῷ βάρει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐπιέχοντα. Τούτοις οὔν πάντας ἀνατάνει ὁ Χριστὸς. And so Origen. C. Cels. L. 3. πάντας ἐνθραπίζει, διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας φόβιν κοιταντας καὶ πεφορτισμένους, καλοῦνται ἐπὶ τὴν παρὰ τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνατάσιον. See also Chrysost. 38th Homil. on Matthew, p. 259.

29. ἅρατε τὸν γυγὸν μου. My doctrine, the precepts
of Christianity. The word γογγα, a law, or moral discipline, is thus compared with a yoke; a metaphor derived from oxen. Schleusner has accurately treated on this sense of the word; and Wets, has adduced numerous examples from the Rabbins. Diog. Laert. 1, 68. εἰ γὰρ ἥκε νόμος αὐτοῖς ἀχθεα κοινώτατα. Vide et Kyrke.

29. μάθετε ἀκριβῶς. Note this absolute use, for become my disciples.


CHAP. XII.

VERSE 1. διὰ τῶν στορίμων, scil. χαρίλαον, which is supplied by Dioscor. 8, 128. γενήσατε καὶ εἰς χάρας στορίμων. See Xen. Hist. 32, 7 & 8. γῆς στορίμων. Grot. 1, 4, 16. τὰ ἐργάσιμα. That there were paths through these στορίμα appears from the Codex Misch. Demai.

1. 2. ἢβασπετῖλλων σ. κ. ε.—οὐκ ἔξεστι τοιοῦτον. The disciples, it seems, had inferred from what they had just heard from their Master, that they were to be freed from the burden of ceremonial observances; and this story, and what follows, v. 10. shews that they rightly understood him. To pluck ears of corn in another’s field, only to satisfy one’s hunger, was permitted by law (vide Deut. 23, 16). But the question was, whether it were lawful to do this on the Sabbath-day. Moses had indeed forbidden any servile work to be done on the Sabbath; but what work was servile, and what not, yet remained a controverted point among the doctors. By the Roman pontifical law, many things were permitted on holy days. Vide Macrob. Sat. 1, 16. Virg. Georg. 1, 268. Quippe etiam festis quaedam exercere diebus Fas et
jura sinunt: rivos deducere nulla Religio vetuit, se-geti praetendere sapem, Insidias avibus moliri, incendere vepres, Balantiumque gregem fluvio mersare salubri. Wets.; who subjoins many passages out of the Rabbinical writers, from which it appears that plucking ears was considered by the rigid Rabbis as a sort of reaping, and therefore forbidden. On this opinion the Pharisees found the present objection. This accusation of the Pharisees Jesus meets on the ground of necessity, on the score of which he maintains that the ceremonial law may be dispensed with; and he, very aptly, alleges this example against the Pharisical traditions. (Rosenm. and Kuin.)

4. οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ. The tabernacle of the covenant, the Sanctum Sanctorum. Kuinoel, however, thinks that David entered not the temple itself, but only the portico or vestibule; but without sufficient authority. It was in like manner forbidden, under pain of death, among the heathens, for any one to enter the ναός of the temples. I find in Artemid. Onir. 4, 4, 1. γυνὴ ἐδοξεῖ εἰς τὸν ναόν, ἡ οἶκος τῆς Αρτέμιδος τῆς Ἐφεσίας εἰσελθοῦσα δειπνεῖν. ἡ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι μακρὰν ἀπέθανεν. Θάνατος γὰρ ἡ γημία τῆς εἰσελθούσης ἐκεί γυναῖκι. This is also confirmed by Jos. 615, 3. εἰδὼν ὅσα μὴ θερμότων ἦν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις, ἡ μόνος τοῖς ἄρχισετοι. So also Isaäus, p. 90, 18. εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἱδεῖν ᾧ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῇ.

4. ἐι μὴ τ. i. μ. Observe, that εἰ μὴ, preceded by a negative, is equivalent to ἀλλὰ. It is called a Hebraism, and indeed ἀλλὰ is so used in Hebrew: but it occurs also occasionally in the Classical writers. There is a passage very similar to the present in the Scholiast on Soph. Ἀδ. Col. 36. χῶρον σοὶ υἱὸν ἄγνον, εἰ μὴ μόνοις ἱερεῖσι.

4. τοῖς ἄρτοις τῆς προβείσεως. Panes appositius, vel propositos, vel expositos. Campbell renders loaves of the presence, which is perhaps not less objectionable than the shew-bread of the common translation.

6. λέγω—οἵ τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζων ἐστὶν ἄνε. As the service of the Temple excuses the Priests, so this will
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justify me, namely, that I am doing the work of God. L. Brug. Our Lord seems to anticipate an objection, that is, 'but you are no Priest, nor is your work for the benefit of the Temple.' To this he does not say, I am one greater than the Temple, but, modestly and delicately, here is one greater than the Temple. Paulus, however, and Kuin. object to this, as it would require τοῦ νομοῦ μεῖζον: and they explain, 'here is something of more importance than the Temple,' i.e. the health of my disciples, which is of more consequence than any external rite. This exposition is indeed specious, but is refuted by the eighth verse, which plainly has reference to this passage: κύριος γὰρ ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου οὗς τού ἀνθρώπου. For the words εἰ δὲ ἐγνάκειτε—ἀναιτίους are, I think, parenthetical. Μεῖζον is indeed properly the true reading. But even that is consistent with the former exposition; namely, Jesus does not say I am greater, but, there is something greater; vērecundo. So Theophylact and Euthymius, though they read μεῖζον, interpret it as μεῖζον. Μεῖζον is moreover strongly confirmed by another passage of the same kind infra, 12, 41. καὶ ἱδον πλεῖον ἰσωτά οὖν (ἐστι). And another similar one, πλεῖον Σολομῶντος, where Campbell remarks on the modesty and delicacy of the neuter gender.

7. εἰ δὲ ἐγνάκειτε—ἀναιτίους. These words are, I think, parenthetical. For the succeeding ones, κύριος γὰρ ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου οὗς τού ἀνθρώπου, are closely connected with the words μεῖζον ἐστιν. On the sense of the terms mercy and sacrifice I assent to Grotius. The words of our Saviour are thus paraphrased by Wetstein. “It is surely more laudable to interpret any thing for the better. You ought to excuse what my disciples have done, on the score of necessity, which has no law, and as you are accustomed to justify the action of David. But when two persons have done the same thing, and yet you pass not the same judgment on both, it is manifest that you are swayed in that judgment by malevo-
lence, and party spirit, and thereby you violate natural equity, which is a law to be preferred before all ritual observances.

8. κύριος γὰρ εἰς τὸν ἀνθρώπον. The expression εἰς τὸν ἀνθρώπον is by Grotius, Kuinoel, Poloni Fratres, and Simon, explained man, a man. any man: because of the parallel passage in Mark 2, 28, αὕτε κύριος ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου. But the αὕτε is there not illative, and may signify denique (as Brug. and Maldonati): or rather it is merely a continuative particle, and signifies moreover, as also. Of which signification Hoogeve. 596. gives an unexceptionable example from Aristotle; in which, from not attending to this sense, the Latin interpreters fall into an error which has been corrected by Hoogeveent, who quotes another example from Rom. 7, 4. Thus, I think, the case is satisfactorily made out. At the same time, we should bear in mind the following observation of Doddridge. The sacred writers were not always critically exact in the use of particles; and whoever considers the ambiguity of those Hebrew particles which correspond to the Greek, will find little reason to wonder at it." But, to come to the chief point, I must deny that the formula εἰς τὸν ἀνθρώπον (which occurs, as Whitby says, eighty-eight times in the New Testament) ever signifies merely man, or a man. I think I may venture to maintain that it always signifies the son of man, the Messiah; and I defy the Unitarians, who have always strenuously battled for this sense, as lowering the dignity of Christ, to prove that it ever does. Let not, however, passages be produced where ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου occurs without the article; for in those cases it signifies merely man, and consequently admits the plural, as in Mark 3, 28. Ephes. 3, 5. The expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the singular occurs in Hebr. 2, 6; in which place, however, (as in the Apoc.) our Translators have inaccurately rendered the son of man. But in this signification the indefinite article ought always to be used, a
son of man, a man. And so in the Old Testament, where the expression several times occurs. I will venture then to propose this canon: 1. That ὁ ἄνθρωπος with the article invariably signifies the son of man, in that mystical sense in which it is applied to our Redeemer, namely, the Messiah, or the Christ. And, 2. That whenever it occurs without the article, it denotes a man only, and is found both in the singular and plural. This being the case, the observation brought forward by Kuinoel from Glass ("Ex curiosā et minus necessariā arti-
culi consideratione falsē hypotheses et errores fa-
cile oriri et invehī possunt") is irrelevant, and proves nothing. The observation, as a general one, is true; but it is inapplicable here, since, in this for-
mula, the presence or absence of the article makes all the difference. To this interpretation of the present passage I am rejoiced to find Wetstein thus afford his unequivocal suffrage. Intelligo ipsum Jesum, qui 80 vicibus in N. T. hoc nomine designatur; ille, et dominus templi est, et dominus sabbati; ille novit verum sensum legis a patre suo latæ, scitque sabbat-
tum esse propter hominem, non hominem propter sabbatum. To which I may add the authority of Euthymius, and some of the antient Greek and Latin Fathers.

8. κύριος—σαββάτου. So Appian. 2, 657, 44. Θεοι—
poléma τικαλαν δεσπόται.

10. ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῇ χειρᾷ ἕχων ἔνθρωπος. This Paulus and others think was only a spasm, laxation, or rheu-
matism: and they quote 1 Reg. 12, 4. which (as Kuin. observes) proves nothing. It rather makes against their case; for there ἔναθρωπος means, was dried and stiffened; which would never happen in rheu-
matism, when the hand would rather fall down. Paulus adds, Jesum eam traxisse, intendisse et resti-
tuisses; treating it as a mere physical case. To this may be replied: But Jesus said to the man, stretch out thy hand: and he stretched it, and it was restored whole. Schulthesius thinks that the cure was ef-
fected by the anger which the man would feel at the answer of the Pharisees, producing and imparting a warmth to the limb; an opinion too absurd to merit a serious confutation. Such far-fetched criticisms dishonour both reason and Scripture; though I trust the authors of these and similar sceptical hypotheses do not perceive whither they tend. Michaelis (on this place) observes that there was in the limb a deficiency of vital juice and radical moisture, which was vitiated by atrophy, so that nothing could be there converted into juice and blood. Ader, however, thinks that the disease was twofold: an atrophy (of the limb); and, secondly, an inability to move the nerves and muscles, which would cause the limb to be rigid. And this, I add, was all that the Jews meant by a withered limb.

10. ei ἔξεστι τοῖς σάββασι θεραπεύειν; This may be regarded as a modest kind of negative. The passages from Rabbinical writers produced by Lightfoot, Schoetgen, and Wetstein, proved that it had been decided to be unlawful to heal any one on the Sabbath-day, unless those that were manifestly in peril of life, and to them medical aid might be imparted. Vide in Hiero Anodat. Zarah. (Kuin. and Rosenm.)

11. τίς ἔσται—οἷς. Buxtorf in his Synag. Jud. C. 11. tell us that in the Gemara this is prohibited, yet not in the earlier Mischna; and therefore it is probable that the opinion was in the age of Christ generally received. Hence we see no objection here made to it.


18. καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ὑγιὴς. The following remarkable story is here cited by Wetstein from Tacitus, H. 4, 81. Per eos menses, quibus Vespasianus Alexandriæ statos aestivis flatibus dies et certa maris operiebatur, multa miracula evenere, quis celestis favor et quædam in Vespasianum inclinatio numinum ostenderetur. Ex plebe Alexandrinâ quidam ocu-
lorum tabe notus, genua ejus advolvitur, remedium cæcitatis exposcens gemitu, monitu Serapidis Dei, quem dedita superstitionibus gens ante alios colit, precabaturque principem, ut genas et oculorum orbis dignaretur respergere oris excrementa. Alius manum sæger, eodem deo auctore, ut pede ac vestigio Cæsaris calcaretur, orabat. Vespasianus primo irridere, asperrari: atque illis instantibus, modò famam vanitatis metuere, modò obsecratione ipsorum, et vocibus adulantium in spem induci, postremò estimari a medicis jubet, an talis cæcitas ac debilitas ope humana superabiles forent. Medici variè disserere: huic non exesam vim luminis et reeditum, si pellerentur obstantia: illi elapsos in pravum artus, si salubris vis adhibeatur, posse integrari. Id fortasse cordi deis, et divino ministerio principem electum, denique patrati remedio gloriām penes Cæsarem, irriti ludibrium penes miserōs fore. Igitur Vespasianus cuncta fortunae suæ patere ratus, nec quicquam ultra incredibile, læto ipse vultu, erecta, quæ adstabat, multitudine jussa exequitur. Statim conversa ad usum manus, ac coco relaxit dies. Utrunque, qui interfuerē, nunc quoque memorant, postquam nullum mendacio pretium. This narration may suggest matter for serious reflection, both to the Philosopher and the Christian. On the word ἀποκατεστάθη see Wets. Schl. and Elsner, on Mark, 3, 5.

15. ἑβεράκτευσεν αὐτῶς πάντας, i. e. all who needed and who sought his aid. Grot.

16. ἐπετίμησεν αὑτοῖς, ἱνα μὴ φανερῶν. He charged them not to make it known that he was the Messiah, lest a tumult should be excited. Vide Kuin. et Grot. ap. Elsley.

19. οὐκ ἐρίσει, οὐδὲ κραυγάσει. Strive nor cry: non rixabitur. This use of the word is now obsolete. Ps. 31, 20. Thou shalt keep us from the strìfe of tongues.

22. ἄρετο τὸν τυφλὸν καὶ κωφὸν καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ βλέψειν. Observe the rhetorical figure of the chiasmus for βλέψειν, καὶ λαλεῖν. So in Philem. v. 5. and Hom. II. 6. 450. Casaub. and Schmidt.

24. Βεθλεέμβωλ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαίμονων. Not only was an hierarchy of good angels held; but a subordination and headship was believed to exist among the evil ones. And this not only by the Incantatores and Exorcistæ, &c. but by the Philosophers. So Porphyr. cited by Theodoret, on Angels. Βασιλεύει γὰρ ἐναὶ θεοὶ, καὶ ἡ προεστῶτα αὐτῶν δύναμις δοκεῖ Θεὸς εἶναι μέγιστος.—τοὺς δὲ πονηροὺς δαίμονας οὐκ εἰκῇ ὅτι τῶν Σάταν ὑπετέχουσιν.—οὕτω εἰσὶν οἳ ἄρχει ὁ Σάταν. So also in the Rabbinical writings the expressions; rex daemonum, caput diabolorum, and such like, often occur. The name sometimes there given to him is Asmodæus.

The expression ἐκ βάλλει δαίμονις has the air of a proverb, which is confirmed by what we find in Euseb. c. Hier. 451. δαίμονας γὰρ ἀπελάνωνε, ἄλλος ἄλλον ἀλογόν τέχνων τινυ, δαίμων. The reasoning of the Pharisees was thus put: he expels indeed the weaker daemon by the aid of the stronger; but by this process he communicates no benefit to the patient, but rather delivers him over to the power of a more cruel and malignant enemy. (Wets.) To this interpretation, however, Kuinoel, not without reason, objects. For even the Pharisees themselves could not deny that the health of the demoniacs was restored, which supposes no subjection to a more malignant demon.


27. οἱ οὖσιν ὅμοιοι ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσι. That there were,
besides Jesus and the Apostles, several at that time who pretended to cast out demons, and cure dangerous disorders, both by exorcisms and by medicaments, appears from Luc. 9, 45. Act. 19, 23. Jos. A. 8, 2, 5. 7, 6, 3. It is probable that these exorcisms were sometimes effectual by means of the medicaments which accompanied them. This superstitution continued for some time afterwards, as we learn from Iræn. 2, 62. (cited by Wets.): Judæi etiam nunc daemonas effugiant. And Lucian. Trag. 171. ἄλλας ἐπαινοῦσας ἐπιθέτων ἐμπαλαῖται Ἰουδαίος ἔτερον μερῶν ἐξάδει καβδών; and even led to this use of exorcism in the primitive Christian Church. See other passages in Whitby. You thus (argues Jesus) convict yourselves of partiality.

28. εἰ δὲ ἐγώ ἐν Πνεύματι Θεοῦ. Our Saviour’s reasoning stands thus: If I cast out devils by divine power, I perform miracles by the aid of God: hence it follows, that I am sent from God. But if I be a divine messenger, you should believe me, when I announce to you the kingdom of God. Rosenm.

29. ἣς πῶς δυνατά—διαρράσαυ. Christ's reasoning may be thus stated: If (as all must confess) he that binds another is stronger than he who is bound by him, you will easily perceive that I must be far more powerful than the prince of demons. Wets.

30. ὃ μὴ ἄνυ μετ' ἐμὼ, κατ' ἐμὼ ἐστιν κ. ο. μ. σ. μ. ε. σ. Here we have again a Jewish proverb, of which the converse holds equally true, and was equally in use. For it was also said, he that is not against us is for us (Luc. 9, 58). There are proverbs which seem in contradiction to other proverbs. Thus in Prov. 26, 4—5. Answer a fool according to his folly; and, Answer not a fool according to his folly. (Wets.) So in the Pythagorean maxims quoted by Grotius: λεωφόρω μη βαδίζειν and λεωφόρω μη βαδίζειν. The application is obvious. Christ admits no neutrals. Wets. compares Cic. pro Ligar. 2. Plut. Solon. p. 89. A. Plut. 550. c. & 828. f. and then subjoins the following admirable paraphrase: Nostis proverbium, qui
exorto bello civili viribus suis ipse diffidit, in lucro ponit, si qui spectatores sedent, et neutri partium accedunt, cium sentiat se non posse invitos in partes suas trahere, metuatque, ne si vires suas hostibus jungant, ipse opprimatur: qui verò ferocior audaciorque est, fiduciā virium etiam illos terrere solet, qui medii esse maluissent. Putatis autem principem daemoniorum esse ferocissimum audacissimumque, ille ergo etiam mediós et neutras partes secutus hostium numero habebit, nedum eos qui apertè ab ipso dissident, ejus præsidia expellunt, et bellum ipsi inferunt, quod cùm ego facio, me ab illius partibus stare absurdissimè suspicamini.

31. ἡ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος βλασφημία οὐκ ἄφεται. On the sin against the Holy Ghost see Campb. Diss. 10; and also Wolf and Koecher. The opinion of Hammond and Tillotson is supported by Wetstein, whose excellent exposition I will give: The crime is that of men who, though they see a miracle achieved by the power of the Holy Ghost, yet maliciously pronounce it to have been effected by the evil spirit. (Marc. 8, 30. Heb. 10, 29.) He who shall repent may now obtain pardon of all, even sins of the deepest dye (Act 18, 38 & 39), except blasphemy of the Spirit. For he who rails against so many and great miracles, such as could not have been effected but by divine power, is incorrigible and irreformable. For by what other method can he be brought to reason? He who blinks even at the solar ray, will have still less power of vision in the dark, or by the light of the moon, or by that of a candle. Having therefore rejected the last mode that can be resorted to for his cure, his disorder is irremediable. Some sins are punished in this world only; others only in the world to come. A sin which is neither remitted in the present, nor in the future state, is punished in both. He who believes not in Christ, either because he sees not his mighty works, or because he stumbles at the humility of his appearance, or because he is alienated by the authority of his teacher, is yet not past cure,
and may by the view, or the report of miracles, acknowledge his error. But he who to contempt joins calumny, and knowingly and wilfully refers the miracles wrought before his own eyes to diabolical agency, is altogether incurable and irreformable. This interpretation is confirmed by the authority of Chrysostom, Grotius, &c.


32. εἰς τὸν τοῦ αἰώνι, εἰς εἰς τῷ μέλλοντι, i.e. nunquam. The whole may be taken as a strong negative, frequent in the Jewish writers. Thus in the Talmud there is the history of a sick person whom a physician visited, who said to the patient: If you drink water, you will be in danger; and if you eat of a certain food, you will likewise hazard your life. Nevertheless, the sick man said to his son: Give me water, and that forbidden food; or else I will neither forgive you in this life, nor in the life to come. On the phraseology of the above Rosenmuller remarks: Nec est ex talibus colligendum, quod post hanc vitam quoque remissio quædam futura sit. Vide Vorstii Philolog. Sacr. c. 2. p. 41. s. edit. Fischer. Est igitur in his etiam verbis Christi σφόδρας, cujus exemplum habuimus supra, c. 11, 21. nec ejusmodi impetus pathetici sub leges sedatæ orationis revocari debent. Doederlini, ap. Rosenm. adds: Populariter nempe dictum videtur, ut si quis graviter offensus negaverit, se cum adversario unquam in gratiam redditur, quam huc tantum velit, se commissi sceleris veniam aeger concessurum. Sensus verborum Jesu itaque esset: equidem quascunque injurias tolerare potius, quam hanc impietatem excusare et condonare vellem. Against the above interpretations of Rosenm. and Doed. I must enter my protest, since I consider them as curtailing the plain sense of Scripture.

33. ἔτενσαι—γυναικαι, ponite, facite, singite;
suppose. The difference between the Classical and Hellenistical use is this: the Latinists used fac; but the Classical Greek authors did not use \( \tau \omega i \epsilon \nu \), but \( \tau \beta \eta \mu i \) as \( \tau \iota \beta \epsilon t e \). Theoph. Euth. Brug. Casaub. L'Enfant, Wets. Rosenm. and Kuinoel. This sense of \( \tau \omega i \epsilon \nu \) is proved and illustrated by Raphel and Kypk.

I must add a very apposite passage from Dion. Hal. 1, 601, 47. φιλεὶ γὰρ ἐκ μέν τῶν ἀγαθῶν σπερμάτων χρήστους τοὺς κάρπους. ἐκ δὲ τῶν τοιούτων, κακῶν καὶ ἀλεξημάτων. There is the same metaphor in Dion. Hal. 1, 602, 9. ὅστε περιέστιν ἡμῖν οἶκοι καὶ ἀλεξημάτα τῶν ἀναβλαστάνοντων ἐξ αὐτῶν κακῶν ζητεῖν,—μενούσης ἐτὶ τῆς τοιούτου ὤρις; where, for ὅστε περιέστιν, I conjecture ὅστις οὐ πάρεστι.

34. τῶς δύνασθε α. λ. π. ο. Hence may be illustrated Soph. Philoct. 1360. ἐφ γὰρ τὴ γνώμη κακῶν Μήτηρ γένηται, τὰλλα παϊδεύει κακά. Schol. οἱ γὰρ ἐχοντες φαύλην τὴν γνώμην, ἀκόλουθα τῷ λογισμῷ δια- πράττεται.


36. πᾶς ρήμα ἄργον—κρίσεως. On the exact sense of the word ἄργον there has been much discussion. Many commentators interpret falsi, comparing the Hebrew מַשֵּׁל. But השב, as an adjective, is
not found in the Hebrew, and in the cognate languages is not false, but vain and empty; which confirms therefore the interpretation of other critics, rash, vain, unprofitable. In this light Wets. seems to have considered the sense, for he remarks, that words spouted forth at random, though they may not be termed calumny, nor intentional injury, yet are justly punished by God. For when a man inconsiderately utters expressions not meditated on, he is withheld by no limits or constraints, and thus a door is opened wide to all sort of evils. The connection, however, of this verse with the preceding ones, seems rather to require the interpretation unprofitable, useless, and, by a common litotes, pernicious. So ἄχρηστος in Sirach. 16, 1. signifies impious, and in Philemon, prejudicial. The same figure is observable in ἄνωτελης, ἄσύμφορος; as in Thucyd. 2, 92. 8, 50. Eurip. Troad. 491. Χεν. Cyr. 5, 2, 11. Procop. Hist. 119, 13. et Arcan. 8. Liban. Or. 889. λόγος ἄσύμφορος πιθανῶς συντιθελ. κ. τ. λ. I conjecture συντιθελ. So άχρειων in Eurip. Suppl. Nor is this idiom unknown to the Latin writers, e. g. Horat. Sat. 1, 4, 25. An hoc inhonestum et inutile sit, ne dubites? And in our own tongue there is a phrase exactly similar to it, in the mouths of the vulgar.

The further illustration of this important principle (which is closely connected with the illustration, and even emendation, of numerous passages in the Classical writers) I shall defer to a more suitable occasion; and must now content myself with referring my readers to an excellent note of Dr. S. Clarke on Homer. II. 1, 269. also, to Wakef. on Eurip. Ion. 977. Finally, the sense of the passage may be thus paraphrased: A strict and solemn account must we give, not only of our deeds, but of our words; and condemned shall we be for all such as are found pernicious, and especially calumnious.

38. ἀπεκλιθησάν τινες τῶν Γραμματέων καὶ Φαρίσαων. Not those who had accused Christ of magical arts, but others; as we find from Luk. 11, 16.
They assumed, we may observe, the guise, not of accusers, but of doubters. 38. θέλομεν ἀρκ' σοι σημείον ἰδεῖν, i. e. (as appears from a comparison of Luc. 11, 10. and Matth. 16, 11.) a sign from heaven. For as to wonders on earth, these (they thought) he might effect by magic, or slight of hand, by the power of the Devil, (the prince of this world), and where there was room for imposture; but heavenly objects human art could not reach. They seek a sign, such as that of Moses when he gave manna from heaven; or of Samuel when he brought forth thunder and lightning; or of Isaiah when he gave Ahaz his choice of a sign from heaven. This they did to find occasion of censure. But they should have remembered that many of the miracles of Moses were not from heaven (as Origen observes on Matth. 16, 1). Certainly some thought him an impostor, and as such believed that he could show no such sign. Others were, doubtless, prepared to dispute the reality of the sign, even if he should show one; alleging it a mere fascination of vision, by which things seemed to be, that were not; or that the extreme distance hindered any distinct view, &c. Euth. Theoph. and Wets.

Euthymius, Theophylact, Wetstein, and some others, understand this of spiritual adultery, i. e. idolatry. But with this (says Campb.) we do not find the Jews charged in the New Testament. True; but their ancestors had been much addicted to it; and all infidelity and disobedience might well bear that name. In the Old Testament God is often compared to a husband, and the Jewish people to his wife. Hence every breach of such matrimonial covenant is so termed. Comp. Hos. 3, 1. Jos. 57, 3. Sap. 3, 16, 4, 3. Vide Suic. Epes. 1, 745. Grotius, Schleusner, and Rosenm. however, expound γενέα μεγάλας a spurious, suppositious, degenerate race, falsely boasting of its parents. This interpretation is somewhat confirmed.
by Jo. 8, 41. where, when Christ had denied those Jews to be the posterity of Abraham, they answer ἡμεῖς ἐκ πορφυρίας οὐ γεγενημέναι. The words will bear either interpretation; and perhaps Jesus might have both in view.

39. τῷ υμεῖν Ἰωάννα τῷ προφήτῳ. The passage may be thus paraphrased; "The proof of my divine legation shall be an event similar to what happened to Jonah." They sought a sign from heaven. A sign is promised them ab inferis, namely, resurrection from the dead, which was of all miracles the greatest and most efficacious. Wets. The whole is well illustrated by Just. Martyr, in Dial. 2. p. 366—9. ap.Bulkley.

40. ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς, i. e. in the earth, the sepulchre. An Hebraism; as may be seen in Ps. 46, 3. Deut. 4, 11. Ez. 28, 2. Ex. 15, 8. Prov. 30, 19. Ez. 27, 4. 25, 26. Jer..26, 5.; and especially Jon. 2, 4, where the words ἡμεῖς ἐστιν are rendered by the Septuagint εἰς καρδίαν θαλάσσης. We have a similar idiom in our own language. The story of Jonah was ridiculed by the heathens, who refused to give credence to it. Yet they readily swallowed the stories of Arion (in Herodot.) of Hercules, &c. I add from Wetstein, Αἰ. Gaz. de Immortal. Animæ: καὶ Ἰρακλῆς ἀδεται διαφανείας αὐτῷ τῆς μεσί, ἐφ’ ὡς ἔτει, ὑπὸ κῆτος καταποθήκαι καὶ διασώσθηκαι. Athen. 7. p. 288. b. καὶ μετ’ ὧν πολὺ δίκας ἐκτίσαι τῆς ἀσβείας κῆτος γὰρ ἐπελθὼν τῇ νητί τοῦ ἐπικτέα ἐν ὑφει τοῦ παιδὸς καταπελεῖ. Lyco. C. 38. τρισεπτέρου λέοντος, ἐν ποτὲ γυνάσιν τρίστανοι ἐμαλαξάτος καραχαρα κιών. Sext. Emp. a Gr. 1, 11. It is observed by Rosenm. and Kuin. that, whether the history of Jonah was true, or only a prophetic dream, or a poetic fiction, it matters not. That Christ, for the sake of illustration, often used stories commonly believed, appears from what is said at v. 43, 44, 45. That this popular mode of teaching is not unworthy of the character of an ingenuous teacher, but rather to be com-
mended and imitated, will be readily granted by every enlightened and impartial reasoner.

41. ἀναστήσονται ἐν—κρίσει. They will stand forward against the Jews, as prosecutors and as witnesses. They had all lived in idolatrous worship. Yet when they had heard the preaching of their guest, though unaccompanied by miracles, they within the space of forty days were brought to repentance. But you Jews, though prepared by the perusal of the Prophets to receive the Messiah, and have many examples from the lower ranks, and though a space of forty years has been granted to you, yet refuse to admit doctrines confirmed by miracles. What can ye plead in excuse for such weakness? (Wets.) See note on Matth. 10, 21.

41. ἄνδρες Νινεώτατοι. The word ἄνδρες is usually added by the Greeks, as ἄνδρες Ἁθηναίοι, &c. but not by the Latin writers. The Hebrews add it, but to primitives, not to derivatives, as viri Jerusalemani—ἄνδρες Νινεώτατοι. Luc. 11, 32. in this formula, ἄνδρες Νινεώτατοι, is redundant. Rosenm. and Kuin.

42. ἑαυτῆς. A Macedonian and Alexandrian form for ἑαυτῆς. She was called Queen of the South, because Σαθα was South in respect to Judea, being in Arabia felix. Vide Bochart. Geogr. Sac. and Munth.

42. πλείον Σολομώνος. The passage is thus paraphrased by Wetstein: A delicate female was excited by the fame of Solomon to leave her home, and undertake a long and irksome journey, and to bring precious gifts. I come freely to you: I have preached in your cities, have required no gifts at your hands, have pointed out the way to eternal felicity, and have confirmed my doctrine with miracles. Yet you are not disposed to listen to my admonitions.

43—45. It has been well observed that the different parts of this allusion are not to be minutely paralleled by fancied coincidences in the Christian system, as is sometimes injudiciously done. See Doddr. 127.

45. παραλαμβάνει—πνεύματα πονηρότερα ε. Jambl. de Myst. 3, 31. speaking of those who indulge themselves in all manner of voluptuousness and wickedness, observes, that, by a mutual similitude and cognition, they attract evil spirits to themselves, by which they are presently instigated to all kinds of iniquity, the wickedness on both sides increasing by their co-operation: Πάθων μεστοί καὶ κακίας υπάρχουσας διὰ συγγενείαν ἠλκοον τὰ πονηρὰ εἰς έαυτοὺς πνεύματα, &c.

45. γίνεται τὰ ἑσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου χειρον τῶν προτῶν. This occurs 2 Pet. 2, 20. The sentence seems proverbial. Wets. compares Tacit. A. 6, 32. Cesserunt prima postremis, et bona juventae senectus flagitiosa obliteravit. And then adds the following remark: Hodie diceremus, si febris expulsæ est, et sanatus valetudinem non curat diligenter, redit idem morbus, et recidiva febris multo est periculosior et insanabilior: eodem modo sese res habet cum homine, cui peccata condonata sunt. Jo. 5, 14. et cum natione Judaicâ, quam Christus ad meliorem frugem perducturus erat, ejusque rei gratiâ multa miracula patraverat, aëgrotoque sanaverat: cum verò omnibus istoribus beneficis se non permoveri paterentur, longè pejori loco erant, quam si Christum nunquam
audivissent, ejusque miracula nunquam vidissent. Wetstein.

46. oιος εσται κ. τ. γ. τ. τ. τ. Thus shall the case be with this evil Jewish nation, which I had endeavoured to bring to a better mind. I endeavoured to heal it, and free it from the disorders of ignorance and vice; but it rejects the medicine. Since, therefore, it suffers itself neither to be moved by my miracles nor my benefits, it will be in a worse state than if it had never heard my preaching, nor seen my miracles. (Rosenm. & Kuin.)

46. οι ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ. Whether these were uterine brothers of Jesus or not cannot be determined. Kuinoel has copiously treated on this subject. Euthymius says they were his brothers in law, their father espousing Mary.

46. εἰστήκεισαν. It has the termination of the pluperfect, but the signification of the preterite; of which idiom Wetstein gives examples from Thucyd. 4, 78. 5, 10. Theocrit. Id. 25, 101. Callim. H. A. 15.

46. εἰστήκας: εἶναι. They could not approach to Jesus, because of the crowd. (Luc. 8, 19.) Since not only his mother but his brothers had come, and particularly wished to speak with him. They seem to have meant to transact some urgent business. Having heard of the calumny of the Pharisees, they appear to have intended to apprize Jesus of his danger, and to urge him to withdraw himself from it as speedily as possible. Wets. See Mark 3, 21, 22.

50. ἵστατο—καὶ μὴ τῆς. See 7, 21. & 6, 9. Jesus opposes his father in heaven to his mother on earth, thereby indicating that he is in a peculiar manner the Son of God. Rosenm.

CHAP. XIII.

VERSE 1. ἔγειρα—ἀπὸ τῆς σικίας. The house (says Euth.) belonged to one of his converts. That it was too confined appears from 12, 46.

8. ἔλαβεν—παράβολαις. The word παράβολαι is used with the same extent of signification as Hebrew יָדָה; is properly a comparison of one thing with another in similitude or dissimilitude (called by the Latin writers collatio, similitudo), or an illustration of any thing derived from any other thing. It differs from an example, which is only an instance in kind. But, secondly, it signifies a fable, story, or apologue; thirdly, an enigmatical and wittily-expressed dict, gnome, or moral maxim; fourthly, an adage, proverb, or apothegm. The second signification is the one now especially under consideration. It consists of two parts; first, the image, or similitude, in which a fact or fiction is narrated; and, secondly, the ἀνταρκτοδοσία, which subjoins the thing of which the preceding thing was an image; that in which the similitude consists. This ἀνταρκτοδοσία is however sometimes wanting, and as that is added or omitted, so is the parable termed perfect or imperfect. The parabolical narrations of Christ, by which facts obvious, and striking the senses, or feigned, in accommodation to the popular comprehension, were generally destitute of this ἀνταρκτοδοσία, and were of two sorts; first, what regarded the illustration of moral doctrines and the duties of life; secondly, what signified, obscurely and sub involucris, the nature of the divine kingdom, and its future fortunes. Of these, a clear comprehension was so much the more difficult, because it could not be attained without the previous understanding of some
other matters, which required to be expounded by Jesus himself. Yet when parables of this sort are to be interpreted, we must avoid a too minute scrupulosity of interpretation; we must not resecare omnia ad latum ungueam, but rather regard their general intent and purpose; and since rarely does any parable correspond in every part to the thing compared, many circumstances occur which belong only to poetical or Oriental ornament. Dr. Campbell distinguishes between the parable and the apologue. In the former, he thinks, the action must be feasible, or at least possible; in the latter it need not. Of this apologue we have an example in Jotham’s fable of the trees choosing a king. There is also (adds Campbell) a difference between the parable and the allegory. In allegory, (which is no other than a lesson delivered in metaphor,) every one of the principal words has, through the whole, two meanings, the literal and the figurative. Whatever is advanced should be pertinent, understood either way. The allegory is always imperfect where this does not hold. It is not so in parable, where the scope is chiefly regarded, and not the words taken severally. That there be a resemblance in the principal incidents is all that is required. Smaller matters are considered only as a sort of drapery. In those instructions of our Lord promiscuously termed parables, there are specimens of all the different kinds above mentioned, apologue alone excepted. Let it be observed, that it matters not whether the relation itself be true history or fiction. The truth of the parable lies in the justness of the application. The parabolical species of instruction is of the most remote antiquity, and was in use both in the West, (as we find in the parable of Menenius, ap. Liv. 2, 38, who there terms it an ancient mode of instruction,) and still earlier in the East. See Jud. 9, 7. 2 Sam. 12, 1. 2 Reg. 14, 9. 2 Chron. 25, 18. Jas. 5, 1. Ezek. 17, 3. That in the times of Jesus, and afterwards, they were in frequent use in Syria and Pa-
lestine, we find, as well from the testimony of Jerome on Matth. 18, 23, (Familiare est Syris et maximè Paæstininis, ad omnem sermonem suum parabol.as jungere, ut quòd per simplex præceptum teneri ab auditoribus non potest, per similitudinem exemplaque teneatur,) as also from the Talmudical and Rabbinical writings, in which numerous parables occur, and among the rest some of those that bear a strong resemblance to those of the New Testament; e.g. that of the rich man and Lazarus, of the labourers called into the vineyard by the husbandman, &c. One very similar to that following (namely the sower and the seed) is found in the Jerusalem Talmud, and cited by Lightfoot. Rosenm. Kuin. Vide Schultens. Comment. on Prov. Salomnis, and Michaelis on Bp. Lowth’s Prælections, p. 64 seqq.

I shall proceed to place before my readers some important passages from ancient authors on the subject of instruction by parables. Senec. Ep. 59. (cited by Wets.) Illi qui simpliciter et demonstrandæ rei causâ eloquentur, parabolis referiti sunt; quas existimo necessarias, non ex eadem causâ, quà Poetis, sed ut imbecillitatis nostræ adminicula sint, et ut discentem et auditorem in rem præsentem adducant. Maimonid. port. Mos. p. 84 (cited by Wets.) Non potest doceri vulgus nisi per ænigmata et parabolas, ut ita communis sit ista docendi ratio mulieribus etiam puerisque et parvis, quo, cùm perfecti evasertint intellectus ipsorum, parabolam istarum sensus dignoscunt. To which I add a very opposite passage from Max. Tyr. Dissert. 29. Davis. πραγμάτων γὰρ οὕτω άνθρωπινας άσθενείας οὐ καθορισμένων σαφῶς ευς ὕποκατάστασις ἐφημερεύ τοῦ μοῦ. Thus, by the parabolical mode of instruction, not only were the truths of religion rendered more familiar to the comprehension of the multitude, but to the understandings of all, those truths were more vividly represented, and more lasting impressions of them inculcated.

3. ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τ. σ. Campbell renders the
sower. The article, he says, suggests that the application is to one individual, which version is indeed confirmed by the Vulgate, *qui seminat*. But here, as in many other instances, the more literal is the less faithful version. It is more accurately rendered by Beza sutor (ii quidam), and by our Engl. V. a sower. For the article is here ἀφροτος, and stands in the place of τίς, answering to the Hebrew נ prefixed to verbs and participles. In truth, the penury of their language compelled the Hebrews to put particles for verbals (as is observed by Grot. Rosenm. and Kui-noel). The whole of this parable we may compare with a very admirable passage of Themist. 398. δ. οἱ λόγοι δὲ εἰσὶ καρποὺς ψυχῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ εἰ ταῦτα θε- τήτευν τοῖς τε ἁμείνοις καὶ τοῖς χείροις αὐτῶν. Δεῖ μὲν τοι ἔτι τούτων, καὶ τέχνης τινὸς καθάπερ ἐκ' ἐκείνων, γενει- γυνῆς. Σκατείν δὲ ὁς ἁμφα τὰ ἔργα σφόδρα ἐμφεροῦ ἰχνεῖ πρὸς ἀλλήλα. Πρῶτον μὲν δεῖ σε διεργάσασθαι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ παρασχεῖν ἐπιτίθειν εἰς τὸν στόρο. Διεργάσῃ δὲ αὐτῆς εὑραμένη τε καὶ προσοχῇ. Ὡς ὁν εἰς σκληρῶν ἐάν γενεῖ καὶ στύφωσα, ἀπολεῖ μὲν ὁ καταβάλλων τὰ στέρματα, φύει δὲ ἐκεῖνη ἀντὶ δραμάτως καὶ ἀρετής, κακίαν τε καὶ ἁμαρτίαν, καθάπερ ἀκάθαρτος. "Επειτα δὴν σταρφεὶ τε καὶ φυτεύῃ, κινεῖ τε αὐτῆς καὶ ἀνανεώσῃ τα τα καταβαθμί- τα τῆς μορίας καὶ τῶν ἄγριων βλαστημάτων ἀποκαθαρίζειν, ἵνα μὴ ἀν δολαι οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ ἐν νοήματι ἀποκαθαρίζεται. Εἰς γὰρ καὶ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, ἀπέτερ ἐν τοῖς φυτοῖς, πολλαὶ χαριάντες μὲ ν καὶ ἁμφιλο- φεῖς, ἁκαρποὶ δὲ καὶ ἀνόητοι. Themistius seems to have had in view a passage of Aristotle in his Ethics (cited by Bulkley) where occurs this very similitude, and with the same application of it. We are not, says he, to expect that the word and doctrine (ὁ λό- γος καὶ δίδαξα) should have the same good effect upon all: but, that in order to this kindly operation, the soul of the hearer (τὴν τοῦ ἁκαρποτοῦ ψυχῆς) must be previously cultivated (ἀπὸ προδιδομασίας), as is the ground intended for the due reception of the seed.
4. παρὰ τῷ ὀδόν. By the side of a path or road which passed through the corn-field.

5. ἐπησεν ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη. Campb. disapproves of our common version, stony places, and translates rocky ground, by which, he says, is meant a continued rock, with a very thin cover of earth. To me the objection appears frivolous. There is an ellipsis of χώρια, which is supplied in Thucyd. L. 4, 9. ἐχόει ἐς χώρια πετρώδη.


6. Ἡλιοῦ δὲ ἀνατελαυτος εἰκαματίσθη. It must be remembered, that in Palestine, during the seed time (which is in November), the sky is generally overspread with clouds. The seed then springs up even in stony places; but when the sun dissipates the clouds, it quickly outgrows its strength. Rosenm.

7. ἀνάνθων—ἀπέτευξαν αὐτὰ. Wetstein compares Theophr. de C. Pl. 2, 25. and Xenoph. ÓEc. 23. where mention is made of brushwood springing up with the corn, and abstracting the nourishment of the soil, choking it, &c. He also cites Calpurn: Prolocata malignum Messis habet lollum. Virg. Ecl. 5, 39. Carduus et spinis surgit paliurus acutus. See
Prov. 24, 31. I add Polyæn. 615. χαρίαν ἀκαθάρτιας
Pollux, 1, 223. ὥσ μὲν κατὰ τῆν οἶκον τὰ φυτά. Thus
the word of God is choked, when secular cares pre-
vail in the mind, and leave no room for spiritual
meditation.

8. ἐνδοι καρπῶν, ἀ μὲν—ὅ δὲ. To the antient ferti-
licity of Palestine all authorities bear testimony. Of
the difference in quantity of produce in different
parts Wetstein has collected many accounts. (See
also Wessel. on Herod. 1, 193. and Doughty's An.
Sac. Kuin.) I add, Herod. is confirmed by Strabo,
p. 1054. ἡ χαρία φέρει κριτὰς μὲν δοσις ὦκ ἄλλη, καὶ
γάρ τριακοσία μία λεγοντί. See also Herodo. 4, 198.
Heliodor. t. 2, 341, 11. mentions a produce of three-
hundred fold. (credat Judæus Apella, &c.) Le Gentil
(cited by Rosenm.) mentions, that in the Philippian
Isles the ground yields sixty-fold, but formerly
an hundred, or even an hundred and fifty fold. Ro-
senm.; who observes, that if there be less fertility
now in the Eastern countries, that may be partly at-
tributable to the sloth of the husbandmen, and their
greater negligence in cultivating the soil. Kuinoel,
however, has judiciously observed, that the circum-
stance is not ad latum unquam radicanda, but that
fructus uberrimi is all that is meant. On the idiom
ἀ μὲν—ὅ δὲ partim, Wetstein gives many examples.
It may be sufficient to consult Schl. Lex. or Matth.
Gr. Gr.

11. γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια. Campbell renders secrets;
for, says he, the moral truths alluded to are far from
being mysterious, i. e. doctrines incomprehensible.
But this is confounding the use of the passage, by
not attending to the original and proper signification
of μυστήρια. It denotes a thing or doctrine,
knowledge, &c. hidden, withheld, and therefore un-
known: also, a doctrine, &c. of which something is
yet hidden and unknown; a doctrine more or less
obscure, and which requires explication. All mys-
tery is imperfect knowledge; or, as it is well ex-
plained by Theodoret on Rom. 11, 25. μυστήριον ἔστι τὸ μη πάσι γνώριμον, ἀλλὰ ρώνον τοῖς θεαριστοῖς.

The passage may be thus paraphrased. To you, my disciples, is granted by the Divine Being the faculty of accurately understanding the μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, and to you it is permitted for those hitherto unknown doctrines to be delivered openly and without being wrapped up in parables.” For those were discipli, ἐσωτερικοὶ, perpetually accompanying Christ, who could interrogate him, and hear the same thing often explained. To those (the ἐσωτερικοὶ, the οἱ ἔξω. Mark 4, 11. not regular attendants, but only temporary auditors, drawn by curiosity only, or not excited by desire for instruction) it is not permitted. Rosenm. and Kuin.

12. ὁστις γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ. An adage capable of various application. The proper signification is, that the rich may easily increase their riches; but that the poor, who have little, and do not manage that little well, easily lose it. The expression ἔχειν and ὁκ ἔχειν are symbolical; and the whole sentence is an oxymoron, or acutè dictum. ἔχειν scil. Χρηματα signifies to be rich. Thus the expression οἱ ἔχοντες, the rich, is frequent, and ὁκ ἔχειν to be poor; as appears by numerous examples cited by Wetstein, from whom I select the following similar sententiae acutæ. Juv. 9, 208. Nil habuit Codrus—et tamen illud Perdidit infelix totum nil. Mart. 5, 81. Dantur opes nulli nunc, nisi divitibus. A remarkable instance of this oxymoron, united with paronomasia, occurs in Alciplhr. Ep. 1, 16. ὁκ ἤτησα σε α ἔχεις ἀλλ’ α μη ἔχεις. Ἐπει δὲ οὐ βούλει α μη ἔχεις ἔτερων ἔχειν, ἔχε α μη ἔχεις. Strab. p. 1111. de Nabatais (gente Arabică): Σαφρονες δ’ εἰσὶ καὶ κυπρικοὶ, ὁστε καὶ δημοσία τῶν μὲν μειώσαντι τὴν υύσιαν ζημία κείται, τῶ δ’ αὐξήσασι τιμαί. Xenoph. An. 1, 9, 19. de Cyro. εἰ δὲ τινα ὁραθ’ δεινόν ὄντα οἰκονόμον ἐκ τοῦ δικαιόν, καὶ κατασκευάζοντα τε ἡς ἄρχοι χάρας, καὶ προσόδοους ποιοῦντα, οὔδενα ἀν πάποτε αφείλετο, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλείω στρεφόμενον.
The spiritual truth couched under the adage is this: He who hath considerable religious knowledge, and takes that care to improve it which men are observed to do with their wealth, will find it increase: while those who have but little, and manage it as the poor are often observed to do, will find it come to nothing. The little he hath learned will slip out of his memory; he will be deprived of it, and in that sense it will be taken from him. Vide infra, 25, 29. where the proverb is used in a more confined application. We shall now be prepared to understand the meaning of the following words, oi βλέπωντες ou βλέπουσι — what they see they overlook, and what they hear they heed not. Many similar examples of this oxymoron are produced by Wets. and Alberti (some of which I had myself noted). Jesus, therefore, involves the doctrine of the Gospel in parables, that his hearers might be thus excited to attention, and not by inattention be deprived of all knowledge, but make as great a proficiency as possible. Kuin. Christ adopted the parabolical method as best adapted to try his hearers, whether they were really earnest, attentive, and desirous of instruction, and therefore worthy of salvation. And as to those who were not, the enigmatical was united with the parabolical mode of instruction, in order that seeing they might not understand. Which was perfectly just; for how can those be thought proper objects of salvation, who are so indifferent about the matter as not to think it worth some pains to comprehend what is propounded to them. It was never the intention of God that men should attain heavenly knowledge, any more than earthly, without labour, pains, and attention.

To this purpose it is well remarked by Artemid. 4, 71. p. 386. καὶ γὰρ εἶκος τῶν θεοῦ τὰ καλλὰ δι’ αἰνιγμάτων λέγειν; ἐπειδὴ καὶ σοφότεροι ὄντες ἦματοι αὐτῶν, οὐδὲν ἦματος ἀβασανίστως βεβολυται μαθάνειν. It is not contumacy (says Rosenm.) with which they are reproached, but ignorance and imbecility is
described, for which the mode of teaching must be so attempered that they may not remain quite ignorant, and yet not have propounded those things which they cannot understand.

14. καὶ ἀναπληρώται, i.e. verified. What happened in the time of Isaiah has again happened. Plut. in Symp. ἀλλ’ εἰτὶ ἐξέλυτον, σῶν ἔργων, οὐ Ἀριστο-φανεῖς, ἀναπληρώσοι. Act. 7, 23. (Wets. Rosenm. and Kuin.) This is what Spanheim in this passage calls the secondary and improper use of the formula, by analogy or example, when a thing happens similar to one that has formerly been done, said, or predicted. Why they can understand nothing, we are then told.

14. ἀκοῦστε. This is an Hebraism, say the Commentators. Such an idiom is, however, sometimes found in the Greek writers, e.g. Polyb. 27, 13, 11. ἐνχύμενος εὐζάτο τῶι δεήσι. See also Dr. Owen ap. Bowy. 92.

15. ἐπαχύνθη. παχύς, and its derivatives, is often used as pinguis in Latin, in this metaphorical sense. It alludes (says Doddr.) to a notion the ancients had, that a great quantity of fat about the heart stu- pified both the intellectual and sensitive powers. See Alberti, Palairet, and Elsner. (See Kuin.) The cause of this stupidity in the Jews, was negligence in hearing the instruction, and weighing the causes of Christ’s miracles. Rosenm.


15. μὴ ἔστω ἡμοί τ. ὡς ne, ut adeo non—so that they see and hear nothing, understand not, and therefore I cannot heal, preserve, and thus accom-
plish their happiness. Kuin. When Jesus says that he propounds the nature of his divine kingdom obscurely, and by parables, because of the stupidity of the people, it may seem strange, to those who do not sufficiently consider the thing, that he did not rather instruct them by plain and perspicuous words. But Christ had very wise reasons for using the mode of instruction which he adopted. It is clear from history that the Jews expected the Messiah to be a splendid monarch. If therefore they had heard from Jesus that the kingdom of God was to be nothing but a religious society (i.e. ecclesia), and that to be a member of the divine kingdom was to be nothing but being a worshipper of God, they would have altogether despised him, nor lent an ear to his discourses. Yet did not Jesus intend to be entirely silent on the true nature of his divine kingdom, because the attention was to be excited to a circumstance of the greatest moment, and because there was hope that many of his hearers would, after his resurrection and exaltation into heaven, know from the event that the fate of his religion was foreseen by himself. For parables which have a reference to the kingdom of God are prophetical. Rosenm.

17. ἐπεθύμησαν ιδεῖν—desired to see, i.e. would have gladly lived to see—and saw them not—not clearly: though in John 8, 58. Abraham is said to have been rejoiced at seeing the day of Christ; and he saw it and was glad, by anticipation only, not perfectly. And in Hebr. 11, 13. says they died only seeing the promises afar off. Compare 1 Pet. 1, 10, 11.

19. τὴν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας. The instruction of the Gospel, the Christian doctrine. This doctrine is compared to seed. Jesus teaches them by this parable that he is the author of a new and better religion, whose seed he had then scattered, and which the Apostles were to propagate; the various effects of this religion (especially among the Jews), and its future impediments. He instructs them what those
ought to avoid, and what to perform, who desire to become partakers of the felicity promised to the followers of the Messiah. The word is well compared to seed. Thus sermo is deduced from sero. Plut. de Educ. 4, 4. calls τὸν λόγον seed.

19. μὴ συνιέντος—mindeth not, attendeth not to it. So Neh. 8, 10. Psal. 5, 1. and in the other passages. (Kuin.) That the verb συνήμενo frequently signifies this in the Scriptures is certain. (Camp.)

19. ἡξέχεται ὁ σατανᾶς. Satan. The knowledge of any thing may be said to be taken away, when it passes into oblivion, or seeming oblivion. Here Satan is said to impede the fruit of true doctrine, that men may not be saved. How he impedes it is not said. This, however, we may observe, that instruction is made void by negligence and inattention; a vice to which very many of the Jews were then too prone. Possessed with a vain fancy of the splendid dominion of the Messiah, they desired to hear only such things as should nourish the empty hopes of earthly benefits. On the contrary, heavenly doctrines, and the mode by which they might attain to happiness here and hereafter, they consigned to oblivion. Rosenm.

19. οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ἱδιὰν σφαγεις. Hammond would understand σφαγεῖς, in which he is followed by Campbell, who thinks the common mode presents a jumble unexamplied in holy writ. On that principle, however, is founded the following explanation of Rosenmuller and Kuinoel, in which I acquiesce: He who is such, may metaphorically be called a man sown by the way-side. A man may be termed sown, (σφαγεῖς) on the same principle that we call a field sown, which receives the seed. It may be rendered, he who is sown on the way-side. For the man is compared to the field, not to the seed. (Rosenm. & Kuin.)

21. οὐκ ἔχει δὲ βίγαν ἐν ἐμνῷ. Does not permit it to take (deep) root in his mind, by weighing its excellence and pre-eminence. (Rosenm. and Grot.)
Such were many who attended on the ministry of Christ, not that they might comprehend his doctrine, and lay it to heart, but that they might see and hear something new. Comp. Jo. 6, 26. 18, 38. Luc. 23, 8. Act. 17, 1. 2 Cor. 4, 4. Jac. 1, 22, 28, 24. (Wets.) This same metaphor is used by Cicero: “Virtutem altissimis radicibus defixam.” (Rosenm. & Grot.)

21. πρόσκαιρος. Temporarius; (Luc. πρὸς καιρὸν) unstable, inconstant. Thus we have amicitiae temporariae and temporaria liberalitas, in Seneca, quoted by Wetstein. skaνδάλιζεται; Luke, ἀφισταται, falls off.

22. ὃ δὲ ἐγὼ τὰς ἀκάνθας σκαρέως. This metaphor is also found in the Classical writers. So Phil. 1, 186, 28. ε. τί φυεται καὶ βλαστάνει ἐν ἀφρονίς ψυχῇ πλὴν τὰ καντούντα καὶ τυπράσκουντα αὐτὴν πάθη, ὃ δὲ ἐκμεθάλαμα ἐκκλησί; (Wets.) I add Lysias Pythagorius, ap. Jamb. V. Pyth. § 77. s. f. τικων γὰρ καὶ λάσιμα λόχμα περὶ τὰς φερέως καὶ τῶν καρδιῶν ἐμπεψό- 

22. ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος· αντία cura. It is derived from μέρισειν τῶν νοῶν, because, as Virgil says (cited by Schleusner), Dividit et distrahit animum, et in partes rapit varias. Eurip. Ion. 247. τί πότε:μέριμ- 

22. ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου. So Menand. ap. Grot. “This admirably expresses the various artifices by which people in the pursuit of riches excuse themselves from day to day, in putting off religious cares, and the confounding disappointment which often
mingles itself with their labours, and even with success. Dodd.

22. ἀκαρπος γίνεται, bearing no mature fruits; Luc. οὐ τελεσφόρος. Those are, in this respect, dissimilar to the preceding, that they have a sufficient comprehension of the doctrine, and do not suddenly and altogether abandon it; yet are they in no less peril; because they do not themselves perceive the remission of their former zeal, and their present backsliding; inasmuch, that they become lulled into security, and are involved, together with the rest, in one common destruction. Wets.

28. ὁ δὲ ἐστὶν τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρείς. So Philo, de Præmiis, calls ἄργασιιων χαίραν Ἡν λογικὴν ψυχήν. (Rosenm.) He might have more appositely cited Phil. Jud. 664. B. ἀμα καὶ φυσικὰ ἐμφανίαις χρηματευον, ἡν αὐτοκτηνογόνως ἀροφραγν, φιλοσοφία παραλαβοῦσα, κ.τ.λ. Observe, that φύσις is for ingenium.

25. ἐσπείρης ζύζανα. Some MS. versions and fathers read ἐπεσπείρης, which was probably used by Synesius, who seems to have had this in mind. Epist. 5. p. 169. S. t. μὴ λάθωσιν ὑμᾶς τῷ σιτῷ τὸ ζύζανον παραστείρουτε. Porphyr. de Abs. 1. § 30. compares minds depraved and corrupted by sensitive and corporeal objects, to a bad soil bringing forth tares, though wheat has been sown in it. Ἐκεῖνας κακοποιεῖ γῆς, ἡ πῦρω πάλλακις τῷ σπέρμα δεξαμένη αἰρας ἐγένθησαν. Bulk.

30. προς τὸ κατακαιδεῖ αὐτὰ. Lest, if mixed with the grain, it should affect the head, and injure the health; or, if thrown on the dunghill, should again be scattered on the ground. Rosenm.

Hom. Od. ε, 289. αἰγείρος τ' ἐλάτη τ' ἢν ὑπανομήκης. Jesus here brings forward the περίτατος, but omits the ἀνταπόδοσις. I should be "as a grain of mustard seed is small, and yet a tall plant grows from it; so are the beginnings of the kingdom of God (the church) small; but from little beginnings it will reach to the greatest progress." On the intent of Jesus in propounding these and similar parables, Rosenmuller refers to Mori. Comment. de Causis Allegoriarum explicandae, and adds: Since Jesus had ignorant auditors, whom he nevertheless wished to admonish, on the one hand, of the slow progress of his doctrine, and on the other, of very numerous multitudes of followers, which might be certainly looked forward to: and yet could not always express this without circumlocution; lest by the former he should damp their good-will, and altogether draw away the fickle and wavering, and by the latter he should seem a boaster, and be thought to utter incredibilities: he therefore propounded certain similitudes, which, when hereafter recalled to their memory, would make them perceive that there was no wonder that the thing should be so, for that he had predicted it. Such like discourses were at length perfectly comprehended by those who knew the event, and saw the vicissitudes of the Christian Church. These too, when they perceived the event to correspond to the words of Jesus, might easily be convinced of the authority and divine legation of Christ, who had so exactly adumbrated all these things.

34. ταῦτα πάντα—καὶ χαρις παραβολῆς οὐκ ἔλαλει αὐτῶς. Repeat ταῦτα, and understand τότε; for to the present subject, namely, the nature of the Christian Religion, and its success, must we restrain the application.

35. ἐρεύζομαι. Properly said of the gushing forth of liquids, but metaphorically, to speak freely; as Psal. 19, 3. &c. Here the Septuagint version has φθέγζομαι. But in the age of the Apostles, some copies probably might have ἐρεύζομαι, of which φθέγζομαι might be a gloss. Rosenmuller observes, "The passage of the Psalms is not brought forward by St. Matthew as a prophecy, but he only says this: That Jesus used a mode of teaching similar to that which the divine prophet formerly used, i.e. similitudes, new and before unheard of.

36. ἡλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν. By the force of the article, we are to understand that house which Jesus had inhabited at Capernaum.

37. ὁ σπείραν—τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Jesus describes himself as the author of a new and very numerous society of men throughout the world, who should hereafter profess his religion. Among them there would be bad as well as good, to be separated, one from the other, at the day of judgment. κόσμος signifies the whole world. Rosenm.

38. οἱ ὑιοὶ τῆς βασιλείας, cives regni Mess. Of the idiom τὸ δὲ καλὸν σπέρμα, ὡστε εἰσὶν οἱ ὑιοὶ, Grotius remarks as before τὸ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας πέειν οὕτως εἰσὶν, &c. for ὁ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπαρείς οὕτως εἶστιν. So here, τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα is put for οἱ τῷ καλῷ σπέρματι σπαρέντες. Vide et Kypke.

39. σωτήλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος. To the examples of this word produced by philologists, I add Dion. Hal. 1, 415, 5. τοῦ ἐργου λάβωντος τὴν σωτήλειαν.

40. οὕσπερ ὃν συλλέγεται—αἰῶνος τούτου. Rosenm. observes that bad men are by the wise counsel of God at present tolerated and permitted; as well that space for repentance may be granted, as because in this life they cannot be punished, but that the innocent, mixed as they are with them, must be involved in one common calamity; and moreover because the virtue and patience of Christ's faithful disciples is thereby meant to be exercised. It is not, however, to be doubted but that the Divine lenity
and patience is to a certain degree proposed to the imitation of all men, especially those who are clothed either with civil or ecclesiastical authority. (Wets.) I add, that there is a very opposite passage in Eurip. Æol. frag. 6. Οὐκ ἀν γένοιτο χαλῆς ἐσθάλα καὶ κακὰ. Ἀλλ’ ἐστι τις σύγκρασις, ὧν’ ἔχεις καλὸς.

41. συνλέξουσι—πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα, κ. τ. π. Σκάνδαλον signifies properly a stumbling-block, or impediment; also, metaphorically, whatever makes any one stumble or fall in his Christian principles. This is the signification in the present passage. Grotius and others take the word to denote the heresies and divisions of the Christian Church. But as it is joined with τῶν ποιοῦντας it plainly signifies not things but persons: abstract for concrete. So the best recent Commentators explain. Campbell renders it seducers. It denotes false teachers, such as are censured by Peter and Jude, who, under the semblance of Christian liberty, inculcated doctrines which are repugnant to natural virtue, and held it to be among the ἀδιάφορα, things indifferent. Grotius has here a very long and excellent note on the subject of heresies, and of punishment for error in opinions only, &c. to which I must content myself with referring the reader, especially as he may find the substance of it in Mr. Elsley’s Annotations. With these are joined οἱ ποιοῦντες τὴν ἀνομίαν, men of bad morals.

42. βαλακῶς αὐτῶς εἰς τὴν κάμιναν τοῦ πυρῶς. We have here an allusion to the Oriental custom of burning alive, mentioned in Dan. 3, 10. where Theodotio translates εἰς τὴν κάμιναν τοῦ πυρῶς, as does also the Sept. at v. 11, in the Codex Chisianus. These expressions, however, are not to be taken literally. For the wicked will have no longer flesh and blood; they can neither be burned nor gnash with the teeth, &c. We are to understand the words metaphorically. A similar use we find in Jambl. V. Pyth. § 68. ἕτο δεῖν ὑπάρχειν, καὶ τὰς τῆς ἐμφύτου καταμ ἀκρασίας τε καὶ πλούσιον βασάνους τε ποικιλοτάτας
kal ἐκλάτεις καὶ ἐνακτᾶς θυρὶ καὶ ἑιδήρη συνελουμένας. Euthymius judiciously points out that this expression denotes τὴν ἄφατον δύσην, misery not to be expressed or denoted by human language. Punishments are meant as exquisite in degree as burning is to our present bodies.

43. ἐκλάμψωσιν ὡς ὁ ἡλιός. Wetstein cites Plut. 861. n. δὲ εὐφυὴν ἐκλάμψωσιν καὶ λαβὼν ἄνωμα καὶ δέξαν. Plat. de Rep. 4. παρ’ ἄλησα σκοτώσατε καὶ τρίβωσατε, ὁστερ ἥν ἐκ τυρείων ἐκλάμψαι ποιήσαμεν τὴν δικαιοσύνην. 43. ὡς ὁ ἡλιός. Vide Dan. 12. 3. Sap. 3. 7. 4. Esdr. 7. 55. 1 Cor. 15. 41.

44. ἡ βασιλεία τῶν υἱῶν, i. e. the doctrine of Christ. Wetstein observes that the avaricious were accustomed to bury their treasure in the earth, when they feared the invasion of an enemy. He has copiously illustrated this from Hor. Sat. 2. 6. Pers. 2. 10. Virg. Äen. 1. 368. Aristot. Metap. 5. 30. Hor. Sat. 1. 1. 40, &c. The right of treasure trove is doubtful. From this passage, however, as from Bava Mezra ap. Wets. we learn that the Jewish law adjudged the treasure to the buyer of a field, not the seller. Ros.

44. εὐρων—ἐκρυψε, i. e. κατέκρυψε. Bryant translates, goes and hides it, but it merely signifies defossit, covered it up again.

44. ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς, pro ὑπὸ. An Hebraism, some say, answering to ὡ; but it is indeed frequent in Thucydides.

46. μαργαρίτην. On the origin of this word I assent to the opinion of the learned Bishop Marsh (on Michaelis, vol. 1. p. 412.) that as pearls are the produce of the East, it is more reasonable to suppose that the Greeks borrowed the word from the Orientalists, than the contrary, which is the common opinion. With the sentiment of the passage, Mr. Bulkley has compared that of Plato in his Phædo, § 13. p. 185, where he says that virtue is one genuine and precious piece of money, for which all other things ought to be parted with in exchange. The εἰμποροὶ of antient times were travelling traders who
took long journeys for the purpose of buying, selling, or exchanging goods. This may be illustrated by the following passages, cited by Wetstein. Plat. de Rep. 2. δεί τῇ πόλει καὶ ἄλλων διακόνων ποὺ τὰν τε εἰσαβάλων καὶ ἐξαλακτῶν ἐκατατό ὦτοι δὲ εἰσὶν ἔμποροι. Ib. ἔμποροις—τοὺς πλανήτας ἂτι τὰς πόλεις. Isocrat. ad Demon. τὸς ἔμπορος τοσοῦτα πελάγη διαπερῇ. Hor. Ep. 1, 1, 45. Impiger extremos curris mercator ad Indos. The petty ἔμποροι we may suppose were not dissimilar to our pedlars; and by them much of the traffic of ancient times was carried on.

48. τὰ δὲ σαπρὰ— the refuse. See 7, 17. ἔξω ἐβαλὼν—threw away. There is no allusion (as Dodd. thinks) to drawing up dead fish in a net with the living.

51. συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα. The parables in this chapter seem to contain divers events relating to the state of Christianity in the world, and of the effects of it upon different tempers.

52. διὰ τοῦτο. On the sense of this expression, which occurs elsewhere, the older Commentators are divided in opinion. Priscæus considers it redundant. Or it may be explained with Kuin. a formula transitionis, and to be omitted in translating.

52. ὅτις ἐκβάλλει—καὶ καὶ παλαιά. Supply βρῶμα. The prudent householder brings from his store wine both old and new, and sets before his guests sometimes the half-eaten viands of yesterday, sometimes hot and fresh-cooked meats. So in like manner must you lay before the people, sometimes the doctrine of salvation from the Old Testament, and sometimes urge to their attention those things which you have learned from me. Wets. Kuinoel remarks, that instructions are often compared to food. Sir. 24, 23. Theoph. Ch. 8, 1. Cic. Top. 5. Vide Victor. V. L. 38, 25. the sense is "a judicious teacher of religion should propound instructions of every kind, known and unknown, and in communicating that instruction he should use a style and manner sometimes old and usual, sometimes new
and uncommon, sometimes parabolical and sometimes perspicuous, adapting himself to the comprehension and necessities of his auditors; thus becoming all things unto all men. I add, Aristoph. Ran. 1107. λέγετον τὰ τε παλαιὰ καὶ τὰ καινὰ, κατοκισμῶν εἰς τὸν λεκτῶν τὶ καὶ σοφῶν λέγειν.

54. πατρίδα. Nazareth. Doubtless so called from the long residence there of his parents, and from being the place where he was brought up.

55. τέκτωνς υἱός. τέκτων is from τεύχω, quasi teiktων. Like faber, it denotes an artificer, or artisan, as opposed to a labourer; and, according to the word accompanying it, may denote any artificer, whether of wood, stone, or metal. But when it stands alone it denotes a carpenter (as faber and ψαλτή), both in the Scriptures and the Classical writers. So Xenoph. frequently, Homer, Soph. &c. Campbell shows that there is something analogous in the use of our word smith. He might have more appositely instanced wright, which (derived from the Saxon wrighta) denotes carpenter, in the North of England. That this is the sense in the New Testament cannot reasonably be doubted, especially as it is supported by the concurrence and testimony of ancient ecclesiastical writers. I cannot, however, agree with Campbell, that there is no passage where it of itself denotes a man of any other occupation. There are three passages in Thucydides where I am inclined to think it means smith. There are 5, 52. 6, 44. 7, 43. where the subject is the building of city walls; and it is there united with λιθούργοι, or λιθολόγοι. Now what carpenters could have to do with such walls is not easy to see. That smiths were employed in their erection is certain from other passages, e. g. in 6, 44. mentioning the preparations for the expedition to Sicily, he says they took with them λιθολόγους καὶ τεκτόνας: and adds, καὶ δοσα ἐς τεχνισμὸν ἐργαλεία. Now that these ἐργαλεία were of iron appears from 7, 18. σίδηρον περιήγησαν—καὶ τὸ ἄλλᾳ ἐργαλείᾳ ἦτοιμαζον ἐς τὸν ἐπιτεχνισμόν. In the first
book, he mentions that the huge stones of which the walls of Athens were composed, were fastened together by cramps of iron; and it was probably so, more or less, in most other city walls. It is indeed possible that carpenters may be included. What I have farther to offer on this subject I must reserve for a more suitable occasion.

56. καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ, consobrinae. (Wets.) Whitby has an excellent note on this subject, the substance of which is given by Elsley. The more recent Commentators seem inclined to the opinion that they were daughters of Joseph and Mary.

56. οὐχὶ πᾶσιν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσί; apud nos, with us; so that we know their origin thoroughly. So all the interpreters. I am surprised to find Markland rendering it like us, a signification harsh and unsuitable to the context. The signification apud is indeed unfrequent in the Classical writers, but not in the New Testament, Jo. 1, 1. ὁ λόγος πρὸς Θεόν, apud Deum. Vide Schl. Lex. in πρὸς, § 86.

this rule for himself,—to work miracles only in favour of those who should have implicit faith; an opinion which many adversaries of religion have so abused, as to attempt to render the truth of Christ's miracles suspected. It is indeed granted, that many wonderful effects may be produced by the power of imagination: yet surely not such as to go beyond the limits of nature's powers! Some indeed, in our age (as did Pomponatius de Incant. c. 5.), have suspected that the faith required by Christ from the sick to be healed, was nothing else than the imaginative faculty vehemently excited and agitated, which, together with the virtue of medical exhalations proceeding from the body of Jesus, might tend to restore corporal maladies. And, indeed, it cannot be denied that Christ required from all the sick faith, or entire reliance on his power: but it can by no means be demonstrated that any medical exhalations proceeded from his body. (Alas! for the credulous incredulity of certain philosophers.) He himself constantly affirmed, that he worked the miracles solely by divine aid; and with this intent principally, that he might show he was really sent by his Father; and thus to excite the unbelieving to attention, and lead them to faith. The reason why Christ did so few miracles among the Nazarenes was, in truth, this: that persons like them, with minds occupied by prejudices and διαποτος, would offer few or no opportunities for working miracles. They would not think it worth while to sedulously bring their sick to Jesus, and humbly seek his aid. Their knowledge of his humble birth did effectually prevent that implicit reliance on his power which could alone render them worthy of his protection and aid. Destitute therefore of this opportunity, despised and rejected by most, where is the wonder that he could not do many mighty works. (Rosenm.) See more on Mark 6, 5. Christ did not judge it suitable to obtrude his miracles upon them, and so could not properly perform them. Considering their unbelief of his Divine mission, it is hard to
say how he could have lavished away his favours on a people so unworthy of them. (Doddr.)

CHAP. XIV.

VER. 1. ὁ τεταραγχής, signifies, properly, the ruler over a quarter of any region. It had its origin from Galatia, which was governed by four princes. From thence the appellation passed to others who ruled over any portion of a country. Horat. Serm. 1, 3. 12, 3. Modo reges atque tetrarchas, omnia magna loquens. To bear in mind the distinction between the three Herods mentioned in the New Testament, the following verses will be found useful. Herodes Magnus pueros, Antipa Joannem, Teque Jacobe Agrippa necat, Petrum et capit idem. (Rosenm.)

1. ἀκοὴν 'I. from report; a signification used both in Scriptures and the Classics.

2. οὗτος ἐστιν 'Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής. The words of Luke, 9, 9. imply at least doubt. How is this difference to be reconciled. Euth. Mald. &c. say, that in Luke he speaks to the people, wishing to destroy their opinion of John, and therefore he feigns that he does not believe. Here he addresses his courtiers, and to them avows what he dared not openly confess. But the words of Luke do not imply a denial that he was John; which is inconsistent with what precedes. Δυστοξεί is a word which accurately represents his then state of mind; q. d. I know not what to think: some say it is John the Baptist; but John whom I beheaded, can it then be he? But this state of hesitation and demur is quite reconcilable with the words of Matthew when properly interpreted. These words, though they appear to contain an assertion, yet (I think) were not meant to assert, but imply doubt. Thus we have many similar sentences in Scripture, meant to be interrogative, by propounding the assertion for the consideration of the person addressed. An interrogative sense is plainly required; insomuch, that Markland thought
we should write a mark of interrogation after Bασιλεύς. But had that been the case, the oδηρός would have been placed differently. In the parallel passage in Mark 6, 16. Ἡραδίων—νεκρῶν, here the words express a sort of mixture of amazement and doubt. Not to say that thus the interrogation must be placed also after αὐτῶν, which would be harsh. The method I have proposed produces the same sense in a milder way. Those who maintain that Herod really believed, urge the crudity and superstition often found in atrocious offenders and even sceptical persons, and that the stings of conscience might harass the mind of Herod day and night with the image of a most holy person wantonly butchered. Some object, that he was a Sadducee, and therefore could not believe this. But Herod was only a follower of the political, not the religious dogmas of the Sadducees. He probably thought and cared very little about religion; yet his mind was by no means made up. The opinion of some, that he was a believer in the μεθομάχωσις is not only unsupported by proof, but devoid of credibility. The Jews of that age seem not to have had the doctrine. As far as Herod believed the re-appearace, he supposed it a revivescence of John’s body.

2. διὰ τοῦτο αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῶ. I cannot assent to Le Clerc, who explains δυνάμεις by angels, heavenly powers. He says, if they had been miracles the verb would rather have been in the passive voice. But ἐνεργεῖν, like many other active verbs, has sometimes a passive, or rather a neuter sense. Ἐνεργεῖν is used very irregularly, the passive form sometimes having an active sense. There is an ellipsis of the pronoun, or of ἐνεργεῖσαι. The complete phrase, ἐνεργεῖσαι ἐνεργεῖσαι, sometimes occurs.

4 ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ—to Herod himself. He did not hold this language to the people in the desert, which would have savoured of sedition; nor would he thus rashly have inveighed against Herod, since he would foresee that this could effect little good to Herod,
and draw down much evil upon himself. But rather he was sent for by Herod himself, and asked the question, to appease the invidiousness of such incestuous nuptials, and excuse the fact. On this occasion John answered as became a prophet and a good man. So Elias, 1 Reg. 18, 17. 18. (Ros. Kuin.)

5. θέλων αὐτὸν ἀποκτείναι. First in his sudden rage at John’s forbidding him to marry Herodias, and afterwards at the instigation of Herodias.

6. γενεσίαν δὲ ἀφομένων τοῦ Ἰεροδού. The birth-day (feast) being celebrated. Some, indeed, interpret the feast in commemoration of his accession, or inauguration: and that this day was also observed as a feast is certain, for Jos. A. 15, 11, 6. used it of Herod. Vide et 1 Reg. 1, 8 & 9. 18, 18. Hos. 7, 5. So also the Romans. Vide Plin. Ep. 10, 61. Spart. Hadr. 4. Vide Davis ad Hirt. B. A. 90. This, however, has not been proved by any authorities from the Greek Classics. The common interpretation is perhaps the safer. For that custom is abundantly proved from Gen. 40, 20. 2 Macc. 6, 7. Philo de M. Op. p. 20. Jos. 12, 4, 7. Also many passages of Greek authors cited by Wets. e. g. Herodot. 4, 26. θυσίας μεγάλως ἐκείνης ἐπιτελέσαντες, παῖς δὲ πατρὶ τούτῳ ποιεῖ, κατὰ τέρον ἐξ ἴλληνς τὰ γενεσία. There is in this phrase an ellipsis (says Krebs) of ἰμέρων, which cannot be admitted, for γενεσίαν is a neuter noun, as appears from numerous passages in Herodot and Dio Cass. ap. Wets. The critics, indeed, suppose an ellipsis of συμπαθείαν. But they produce no example of the complete phrase. It may not be necessary, nor is it always possible, to produce the word subauded, but I should prefer θῆματα. Thus in μουστῆριον (as in μουστηρίων ἀφομένων, in Arrian, E. A. 1, 10.) for μουστηρίων is properly an adjective. Examples of which may be seen in Bos. Ellips. 117. though there we find no example of the complete phrase. Something nearly approaching to it is found in Plat. Alcit. 1, p. 441. B. Βασιλεύς γένεθλια παρὰ θῦε καὶ ἐστάξει Ἄσια. On the sam principle
we may explain ἐγκαίνια, ἐλευσίνια, Διονύσια, in all which there is the same subaudition. It appears from what follows, that the feast was celebrated at Machænus, where John (as we learn from Josephus) was imprisoned. Ἄγειν is a word appropriate to this subject. See Plut. Symposium, 8, 1. Ἄγειν γενέθλιον, ἄγειν ἐορτήν. As Thucyd. 5, 47. 6, 6. et ssepe.

6. ἀφριχῆσατο. Not in that rude and unformed style of dancing which was anciently used by the Jewish matrons and maidens at public rejoicings; but that lascivious and pantomimic sort then recently introduced from the neighbouring nations into the Jewish Court, which by the movement of the hands and other members expressed human manners and affections. So Juv. 6, 63. Chironomon Leden molli saltanti Bathyllo; where see Rupert. Add. Hor. Carm. 3, 6, 21. Motus doceri gaudet Ioucicos Matura virgo, et ōntitur artibus jam nunc; where see Mitch. Wetstein has cited numerous passages on this subject. The reader may also consult Lucian. de Saltat. and Eustath. in H. g. p. 288, 32.


9. καὶ ἐλυπῆθη ὁ βασιλεὺς. The tetrarchichal power was indeed regal. Thus the tetrarch was sometimes called king. Horace joins them: Modo reges atque tetrarchas, &c.

9. ἐλυπηθη. Some Commentators maintain that this sorrow was pretended; as the apprehension of John, and his intention to have put him to death, might seem to warrant. Others, that it was real. And that he had some kindness for John we may infer from Mark 6, 20. Yet it was not true and salutary sorrow. (2 Cor. 7, 10.) He who had not hesitated to imprison an innocent man, to commit adul-
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tery and incest, would scarcely scruple at taking the life of his captive. It was rather on his own account than John's; for he feared the people, and justly. Thus they ascribed the unsuccessful event of a battle which occurred just afterwards to this very enormity. Kuinoel would interpret ἐλυτθη was moved with anger. And angry he might be at the liberty taken with him. But ἀνατεμνεις has in the New Testament very rarely this sense. Herod's feeling was doubtless a mixed one, compounded of anger, vexation, concern for himself; and regret for John. By the words διὰ τῶν συνανακειμένων we are to understand not wishing to break his oath before so many witnesses, (though the religio juramenti, says Wets. ought not to be a vinculum nequitiae,) from whom he would be likely rather to receive encouragement than dissuasions.

10. τέμψας ἀνεκεφαλευε—misset per quem decollatur, supplying τίνα. A Hebraism, says Rosenm. Yet in Plut. de Educat. we have καί ὅ μεν τέμψας ἀνειλε τὸν Θεόκριτον. And Herodian, 1, 28. τέμψας ἀνατέμνει τὴν κεφαλήν: and 1, 9, 19. where see the Commentators. Also consult Kypke and Wolf.


13. καὶ ἀκωσάς ἰ Ἰησοῦς—hearing, namely, that John was put to death. (for the words from verse 8. are parenthetical.) We may also, I think, understand that Jesus had heard of Herod's opinion that he was John risen from the dead, and of his desire to see him. Jesus, however, wished to avoid the Court of Herod, and the snares of the tyrant, and even the more populous parts of the country; lest the people, enraged at the murder of John, and prone to sedition, might rise into actual rebellion,
and he incur the blame. This reason appears to have most weight; not, however, to the exclusion of another suggested by Mark 6, 31. namely, a wish to refresh himself and his Apostles after a season of excessive fatigue. Vide Euthym. and Kuinoel.

19. ἡκαλύθησαν αὐτῷ πεζῷ. By land, as opposed to navigation, for it is not likely that the lame and sick mentioned in the following verse could go on foot. Wetstein; who produces many examples of this sense, as also Kypke, Munth. Loesn. Owen, Weston, Wolf, and Koecher. I add Thucyd. 1, 109. et sœpe. Polyæn. 644.

15. ἀφα ἔδε παρέμπεν. The time for dinner, as Markland interprets: or rather, the day is now far spent, as in Mark, ἀφα ἔδε πολλή, it is now late in the day; and Luke 9, 12. ἔδε ἡμέρα ἡκέετο κλίνειν ἀφα πολλή and νῦν πολλῇ are used promiscuously, either of a long portion of day or night elapsed, or yet at hand. Which of these is to be understood must be decided by particles allied, such as ἐν, ἔδε, ἐχρπ, or by other indications. Kypke and Raphel, on Mark 6, 35.


19. εὐλαχθεῖς here signifies gave thanks, so εὐχαριστεῖν, v. 27. Compare 15, 36. Mark 8, 6, 7. See Whitby, who has treated on this copiously and satisfactorily. The custom was always observed by the Jews (see Wets.), and even by the Heathens.

19. καὶ κλάσας, ἑδώκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους. Rosenm. and Kuinoel think there is an allusion to the Jewish loaves which, like all the Oriental ones, (see Lucas and Niebuhr,) were thin and brittle, and rather fit to be broken than cut. We have similar expressions in the Greek and Latin writers. (See Wets.)
20. τὸ περισσευόν τῶν κλασμάτων. Supply μέρος. So Anthol. 2, 31, 2. τὰ περισσά. Pollux 10, 91. ἄλλος δὲ εἰσέλειψε πλεκτῷ καυσίκῳ ἄρτων περίλυπα βρύματα. The κόφινος was a flag-basket in which the Jews always carried food when travelling, especially among Gentiles, having no reason to expect hospitality; or to avoid unclean food. So Juvenal, 6, 542. Cophino sênoque relicito Arcanam Judèa tremens mendicat in aurem. Id. 3, 14. Judeis, quorum cophinus sênumque supellex. Hence we may understand how it happened that there should be so many baskets with Jesus and the Apostles. The Greek and Romans used these flag-baskets, but of a larger sort, chiefly for vegetables, and for the removal of dung, and such purposes as those for which we use wheel-barrows. Kuin. and Rosenm. Wetstein then contrasts the splendid banquet of Herod and his courtiers with the homely meal of Jesus and his Disciples: "Herodes tribunos et τῶς ἐν τέλει ad convivium vocatos laútè excipit, et mox, juramento temerario et caede innocentis, et Deum offendit, et hominiibus se invisum reddit: Christus epulum frugale apportion pueros, mulieribus et pauperibus, ægrotos sanat, Deum et coram populo et solus adorat, eique agit gratias." That this miracle should be studiously depreciated and denied by Paulus, Thiess, &c. can excite less surprise than indignation. Their hypotheses and observations have been well refuted by Schott, Storr, Kuinoel, &c.

22. εἰδέως ἤναγκασεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβῆναι eis τὸ πλαίνον. Most of the old Commentators notice that this evinces the unwillingness of the Disciples to be deprived of Christ's company. Doddridge, however, imputes to them secular views in this reluctance to depart. But both remarks seem to be ill founded. Ἦναγκαζεν, like the Latin cogò, often denotes moral persuasion. Vide Krebs, Elsner, and Kypke, on Luke 14, 23. and the Lex. Xen. in Ἦναγκαζεν. To these examples I add a remarkable
one from Thucyd. 8, 41, 3. ἀναγκάζεται ὑπὸ τῶν Κυ-δίων παρανόμων μὴ ἐκβιβάσαι τοὺς ναῦτας, where the Scholiast explains it πείθεται. There is an allusion to this in the word πειθανάγκη.

We use the word make in a similar manner, and here we should translate: He made them enter, i.e. he ordered, caused them to enter. So John 6, 10. make the men sit down.

24. Τὸ δὲ πλοῖον—μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης ἦν; supply κατὰ. The adjective μέσος governs a genitive of the thing, in cujus medio versatur. This use, however, is Alexandrian Greek; for rarely do any examples occur except in Josephus, whose phraseology is not unfrequently formed upon the Hellenistic model.

24. πλοῖον βασανιζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν θυμάτων; tossed, metaphorical. So Polyb. ὃστε τὰς στοὰς διασαλέειν καὶ πῦργον βασανίζειν, agitate. So the corresponding Hebrew יב is used of commotion, or the noun יב, which the Septuagint translate βασάνος in Eg. 12, 18.

25. τετάρτη δὲ φυλάκη τῆς νυκτὸς. After the elaborate notes of various Commentators on this subject, it is unnecessary for me to enter into it. It will suffice to refer my readers to Mr. Elsley’s annotation, or rather to the more elaborate disquisitions of the writers on Grecian and Roman Antiquities, especially to John’s Biblical Archeology, and Mr. Horne’s instructive Introduction to the Critical Knowledge of the Scriptures, which I must suppose my readers to possess.

25. περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης. Than which nothing could be thought more impossible, even to a proverb. So Horapollo, Hierogl. 1, 58. says, that the Egyptian hieroglyphic for impossibility was, a man’s feet walking on the sea. Thus our Saviour evinced his divine power; for this is, in Job 9, 8. made a property of God, ὁ ταύτως τῶν ὄρανον, καὶ πε-ριπατῶν ὅπ’ ἑκάτων ἐπὶ θαλάσσης, which passage the Evangelist seems to have had in mind. Paulus and Bolten endeavour to elude this miracle in various ways, which do violence to the leges linguae, and the
usus loquendi, and are in contradiction to the manifest sense of the Evangelist, who from the context plainly meant to assert that Jesus walked on the surface of the sea. Compare 29, 30. Their hypotheses have been fully examined and satisfactorily refuted by Storr in his Opuscula, by Kuinoel, and others.

Many examples of περιπατεῖν ἐπὶ βαλάσσῃς in the sense usually ascribed to it, and of some similar ones, are produced by Elsner and Wetstein.

30. φαντασμα, i. e. φάσμα. An apparition, spectre. ΄Ελιαν. V. H. 12, 64. φάσμα νεκροῦ. Sap. 17, 15. Plato de Rep. 11. p. 431. See more in Schleusner and Wetstein. The Hebrews had their יָדוֹנ, the Romans their striss, and our ancestors their boggle-bo, of each of which personages many wonderful stories were told.

30. ἀρξάμενος κατατονίζειν. In the interpretation of this word I can recognize no such emphasis as Doddridge supposes, namely, sinking with a weight. He has, however, judiciously observed, that Peter perhaps could swim, and might venture, with some secret dependence on his art; which Christ, for wise reasons, suffered to fail him.

30. σῶσόν με. ΄Εν. 6, 370. Da dextram misero, et tecum me tolle per undas. Wets.

32. ἐπόκασεν ὁ ἄνεμος, requievit; properly, defatigatum quiescere. So Herodot. 7, 191. Jambl. V. P. c. 28. ascribes to Pythagoras the κυμάτων ἀκροδιάσμοι πρὸς ἑυμαρή τῶν ἑταίρων διάθασιν. (Bulk.) See Wessel. and Valck. on Herodot. 7, 171, 8. p. 229.

33. ἀληθῶς Θεός φίλος εἶ. A cognomen of the Messiah, say the Commentators; as Joh. 1, 50. and in other passages. Wetstein, however, plainly takes φίλος Θεός for a divine person sent from God, but not the Messiah. (And he might have cited Eurip. Ion. 1286. where the expression is used of Ion the servant, i. e. the Priest of Apollo: κατείχενες φάρσακι τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. But perhaps in this passage there may be an ellipsis of δοῦλον.) The sailors (says Wetstein) were perhaps heathens; and, as such, could not be ex-
pected to know any thing about the Messiah; especially as the Apostles themselves do not appear to have yet recognized the more divine nature of Christ. But that the sailors were heathens is a mere conjecture, and cannot be reasoned upon without proof; and if Jews, why should they not think that he who could do such things must be the Messiah; though they were (like the rest of the Jews) imperfectly informed as to the nature of his person and kingdom. Campbell thinks, that they might mean to acknowledge him as a prophet, for such were styled sons of God. Both Wetstein and Campbell, though they do not mention it, seem to have been influenced by the omission of the article; which induced Markland to come to the same conclusion; and he affixes this same sense to Matth. 27, 54. ἀνήστας Θεοῦ vios ἑν οὐς. But in the interpretation of the present passage, I dare not venture to lay so much stress on the omission of the article; and in the other it would be extremely harsh and fanciful to give vios του Θεου, the sense of the ‘Son of a God.’

35. σι ἄνδρες του τοπου ἐκεινου. The Vulgate renders viri; but it means human beings, without any reference to the persons; as in Gen. 26, 7.

35. εἰρηνορ εὑρον when they knew him again, or remembered him; for he had been in those parts before (Matth, 8, 28), and cured a daemoniac there; and hence appears the reason why our Saviour would not let that daemoniac, whom he had cured, be with him, but ordered him to go home, and relate what God had done for him, as the man did; all which was preparatory to this second visit, when they received him more favourably, and brought to him their sick to be cured. So that this daemoniac was a kind of apostle to all the people of that country. See Mark. 5. (Markland.)

36. ἵνα μων ἄραντας. That they might be permitted to touch: for, in verbs of action and effect, cause is often to be understood of permission to do the action; as Levit. 11, 3, 4, 8. Matth. 20. (Ros.)
36. ὅσοι ἠλπιοῦν, i. e. with a confidence that it would recover their health. Thus are particles of universality to be restricted from circumstances. Rosenm. Διεσωθησαν, were healed.

CHAP. XV.

VERSE 1. οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ Πραμματεῖς—those of Jerusalem. So οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας, Itali, the Italians. *Ἐλθώντες is not to be understood. Wolf. This was a private attempt; but at the instigation of the chief of the School of the Pharisees. They came to propose captious questions, and lay snares for Jesus.

3. Christ ably opposes the παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων (termed by Josephus παραδοσεῖς τῶν πατέρων) to the ἐντολή τοῦ Θεοῦ. Thus, before he disputes respecting the tradition to which they referred, he tears up the very foundation on which their whole reasoning was erected, and shows by a manifest example how this tradition is often at variance with the Divine Laws.


4. κακολογοῦν—τελευτάτω. When from the miracle of the loaves they ought to have acknowledged Jesus to be the Messiah, they resort to a futile objection, and ascribe blame to him because his Disciples, before they had eaten the loaves, had not washed their hands. Christ therefore repels them with merited indignation, and admonishes them to first reform their own vices, and not abrogate the primary and weightiest commandment, that of honouring their parents; under which is comprehended that of affording them sustenance. Eph. 6, 1 2, 8. 1 Tim. 5, 3 17, 18. Act. 28, 10. Sir. 38, 1.

It is well remarked by Origen (ap. Bulkley), who says that he should never have understood it, had it not been for the information he received from a Jew, who told him that it was the custom of some of their usurers, when they met with a tardy debtor, to transfer the debt to the poor's-box, by which means he was obliged to pay it, under the penalty of bringing upon himself the imputation of cruelty to the poor, and of impiety towards God: and that children would sometimes imitate this practice in their conduct towards their parents.

5. καὶ ὅ μὴ τιμῆσῃ. Many Commentators regard this as an hypothetical enunciation, but incomplete, wanting an apodosis, (such as ὦ ἔχει, or the like,) and such aposiopeses are not unfrequent. But there is no necessity for recurring to this principle here. It will be better to take ὅ μὴ τιμῆσῃ for ne colat, 'he need not honour,' &c. So Kuinoel; who also accounts the καὶ redundant, like the Hebrew γ, which I prefer to Whitby's method (though adopted by Markland), who gives it the sense of therefore, or then, which is too arbitrary. But why should we not repeat λέγετε from the preceding? Thus καὶ (λέγετε) μὴ τιμῆσῃ. There are many similar constructions in the New Testament, where Bowyer and Markland usually propose to point καὶ.

7. καλῶς προεφήτευσε περὶ ὑμῶν. It may be thus paraphrastically rendered: 'The words of Isaiah are exactly suitable to you.'

8. ἔγγίζει μοι—τῷ στόματι—τοῖς χείλεσι με τιμᾶ. These are accounted Hebraisms; and the Commentators compare a similar use of ὡς and ἐρως. But a similar use of στόματα (in the sense of verba) I have noted in Soph. Aj. 1110, 8. ὦ τῷ συν δείσας στόμα. And Soph. CE. Col. 68. τωιασθα—οὗ λόγοις τιμᾶμεν ἄλλα τῇ εξωσιᾷ πλέω, where the Scholiast expounds τῷ εγγίζῃ καὶ τῇ πειρᾳ πλέω τιμᾶμενα, οὗ τοῖς λόγοις.

8. ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πάρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. So
Samson says of Dalilah, Judg. 16, 15. ἡ καρδία σου οὐκ ἐστὶ μετ' ἐμοῦ. Rosenm.

9. μάτην δὲ σέβονται με νῦν. Jer. 2, 30. 4, 30. By a litotes, not only unprofitably to themselves, but to their hurt. Rosenm.

9. ἐντάλματα ἄνθρωπων. Injunctions, precepts, institutions; as appears from Mark 7, 7. διδάκτη τε διδασκαλίας, ἐντάλματα. So also Col. 2, 22. κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἄνθρωπων: where the words καὶ διδάκτη τε διδασκαλίας are exegetical, being explanatory of the preceding ἐντάλματα.

10. ἀκοῦει καὶ συνετῇ. A formula similar to the well-known one, “He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.”

11. οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινὸ τῶν ἄνθρωπων. The Pharisees thought that some things were impure by nature ad per se, and note merely ex instituto, and therefore polluted the soul. This opinion Christ refutes. (Rosenm.) τὸ εἰσερχόμενον, i.e. meat and drink. ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον, words of every kind. This sentiment is expressed more generally and briefly in Mark 7, 15 & 16. but more distinctly and authentically by Matthew. The sentiment is illustrated by Wets. in the following passages: Plat. Timæo. ἀναγκαῖων μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἄσων εἰσέρχεται, τροφῆν διδόν τῷ σάματι: τὸ δὲ λόγων νόμῳ ἐξω ρέων καὶ ἑπτετοίων, κάλλιστον καὶ ἀριστον πάντων νομάτων. Phil. 1, p. 29. Δ. στόματι, ἵνα γίνεται θνητῶν μὲν, οἷς ἐφι Πλάτων, ἐσωδος, ἐξοδος δὲ ἀθάνατον ἐπεισερχέται μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ σιτία καὶ ποτά, φθαρτον σάματος φθαρται τροφαι. λόγοι δ' ἔξισων ἀθανάτου ψυχῆς ἀθανάτοι νόμωι, ἵνα δ' ὁ λογικὸς βίος κυβερνηται.

11. κοινὸ τῶν ἄνθρωπων. So Jos. A. 11, 8, 7. κοινοφαγίας. Wetstein does not think that the word originated in the Hellenistic style, but ex re ipsa. Common foods were permitted to the Gentiles, and forbidden only to the Jews. This opinion, as is observed by Spenc. de Leg. H. 147. was formerly held by some of the Greek philosophers, and is even yet found amongst the Turks.
12. τοῦ λόγου. That concerning traditions; for of these they were most tenacious, and placed the greatest part of Divine worship in their observance.

13. πάσα Φυτεία—ἐκριγαθιστεται. Every religious doctrine which has not God for its author will be rejected of him. Such dogmas as were founded neither on Divine revelation nor on human reason, but were contrary to both, and therefore were deserving of being rejected and eradicated. Φυτεία, which properly denotes the art of planting, or, by metonymy, the plants themselves, here signifies doctrine, by a metaphor common to the Hebrew writers, who compare the human mind to a field, and precepts and doctrines to seed and plants. (Vide Schoett. H. H. 268, 299, S81.) Compare 1 Cor. 3. 6. That the Greek writers used the same metaphor has been proved by Kypke.

14. ἄφετε αὐτόν. Let them alone, have done with them, valeant cum ineptis constitutiunculis. Rosenm. Euthymius adds ὁς ἀνάστως, as incurable. Their being offended is not of such importance, as that to avoid it, we should desert the cause of truth and salvation. Grotius.

14. τυφλὸς—πεσοῦται. In illustration of this sentence, Wetstein has collected similar passages from the Classics. Hor. Ep. 1, 17, 4. Ut si cæsus iter monstrare velit. Sext. Emp. Plato, Philo, Xeno-phon, and D. Chrys. I add, Phil. Jud. 737. B. τυφλὸς προβλέκωτες οἰκριστόμενον πίστειν ἢς ἀνάγκης ὄφείλουσι: and 779. A. Plutarch, Frag. ap. Stob. 19. p. S65. ὁδηγῶν τυφλὸν λαβεῖν, καὶ συμβουλαν ἀνάητων, ἵον ἐστὶν. Vide et Frag. 74. The connexion (says Rosenm.) seems to be this: “If they will not consult for themselves, we must however consult for the people, which otherwise, by using such blind teachers, will blindly rush upon ruin. For εἰς βάδισμον is an image of perdition. Πεσοῦται has the force of the present, as is usual in proverbial speeches. The reading πίστωσι, though supported by the Vulgate cadunt is a gloss.
15. φρεάσων ἡμῶν τὴν ραμβαλίν. This weighty and pithy dict, or apothegm. It is not that Peter did not understand the dict; but he could scarcely believe his ears, that a distinction of meats availed not; and therefore, as Theophylact observes, προτοιείται ἡγοιοι καὶ ἐπιροάτη, pretends ignorance, and asks again.


17. ἀφεδρίων. A word coined by the Macedonians. (See Sturz. de Dial. Mac. p. 150.) It signifies a seat, stool apart and private, close stool, jakes, &c. Its different senses are learnedly discussed by Fisch. Prol. p. 698.

19. ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἐξέρχονταί. So Proverb. 4. 23. πάση σαρκὶ ἑαυτί. Πάση φαλακῇ τῆς σῶν καρδίας, ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἐξοδοὶ διψῆς. And Matth. 12, 34.

19. διαλογισµῶν, cogitationes, consilia, which, when not carried into action, were not regarded by the Jews as criminal in the sight of God. Doddridge has, without authority, rendered it evil reasonings, as containing a more universal and important sense. A principle of dangerous application; though I entirely assent to the justice of the following remark by the same pious writer: "There are multitudes in the present age like these Pharisees, who are contracting immense guilt by these corrupt and sophistical reasonings, on the subtlety of which they so highly value themselves and each other."

19. βλασφημǐας, calumnies: as in Ephes. 4, 31. Col. 8, 8.

20. ταυτά ἐστι τὰ κοινώντα τῶν ἄνθρωπων. These, and not the other. Therefore the Pharisees, whose minds were impure, were truly polluted, and therefore abominable in the sight of God. Wetstein.

21. ἑξελθὼν ἐκείθεν, i. e. from the region of Genesareth (C. 14, 34). And doubtless he departed from Galilee, in order that he might escape the snares of the Pharisees, who, proceeding from Jerusalem, had collected together against him. Rosenm.
21. *eis tâ mérh TÔrou kai Sìdônous.* As Christ does not appear to have actually entered into the Gentile territories, we must here interpret *eis,* versis, towards (with the Syriac). So the Hebrew יַנ local, like our *ward* in toward. Mark, indeed, has *eis tâ meôoria TÔrou:* but *meôoria* is a word of dubious significance, and denoted a strip of land which was between two countries, and properly belonging to neither. So it is explained by the Gloss. Vet. *inter-fines.* For *φρου* frequently signifies not *border,* but *country or territory.*

22. γυνὴ Χανααία. Mark, Ἦν δὲ γυνὴ Ἐλλήνις, Συροφάινσα τῷ γένε. By Greek is meant Gentile; as Paul divides men into Jews and Gentiles: so that Ἐλλήνις and Χανααία are one and the same thing; i.e. a Gentile woman. She is called Συροφάινσα by Mark, because she dwelt in the confines or territory of Tyre and Sidon. On this see Kuinoel. It does not, however, follow that she was an idolatress, for both in Judæa and the neighbouring countries there were many who were worshippers of the one true God, though without professing Judaism, as Cornelius, Lydia, and others. Hence there was no reason for Markland to wonder how this heathen should know and acknowledge Jesus as a son or descendant of David, unless she was divinely inspired, which is more, he presumes, than can be proved; and so he leaves the difficulty as he found it; though indeed it is rather fancied than real. The woman was probably a believer, like Cornelius and Lydia. She would be sure to *hear* that the Messiah was to be of the seed of David, and that he was often called by the name of the Son of David. Now the circumstances of Jesus’s life plainly showed him to be the Messiah. I see no reason why we may not understand the woman’s words as an acknowledgment of his Messiahship. Still less are we authorised to suppose, with Augustin de Fid. et Operibus, C. 16. that she was of a vicious and dissolute character, which he infers from our Saviour’s *contempt* of her. But
the neglect at first shown, by our Lord’s omitting to answer her, was not from contempt, but in order to try the faith and constancy of this Gentile, and bring those virtues more under the observation of his Disciples, that they might learn not to indiscriminately despise the Gentiles, and apply to them opprobrious apppellations. In this view of the subject I am supported by the authority of Euthymius.

22. ἐκραίνασεν, clamorem inconditum edidit, clamitabat. So, just after, κράζει. These are both strong expressions, the force of which has been sufficiently illustrated by the Interpreters.

23. ἠράτων αὐτῶν, i. e. ἐδέωντα, intreated him. Just as the Latin rogare, which is ambiguous, signifying both orare and interrogare. (Grot.) See also Euthym. Wets. and Schl. Lex.

23. ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν. Many Commentators render amanda. But the answer of Christ evinces that more is meant, namely, despatch her business.

24. οὐκ ἀπεστάλην ἐν μη ἐν τα πρόβατα τα ἀπολύκνων. Here is a reference to Jerem. 50, 6. lost sheep, oves perditas: a most expressive image, which includes every kind of misery. Οἶκος, family, nation: so said, because the Israelites had all one common father, Israel. Rosenm.

26. οὐκ καλόν, i. e. οὐ πρέπει, non decet, non aequum est, or (by a litotes) non fas est. Hom. II. 1. 19. οὐ μὴν καλὸν ὑπὲρβιον εὐκάτασθαι; and Od. u. 294. Eurip. Iph. A. 735. οὐ καλὸν ἐν ὁχλῳ σ᾿ εξομιλεῖσθαι στράτευον. Vide et Alberti and Kypk. Jesus used the word κῶνας rather after the manner of the Jews. Vide et Campb. There is no foundation for Wetstein’s remark, that Jesus changes κῶνας into κυναρίως, to soften the harshness of the term. This, like many other diminutives, does not differ from its primitive. The word was a term of reproach, common to both Jews and Gentiles, as appears from Wetstein’s copious examples.

27. ναὶ κυρίε. Many Commentators, as Scaliger, Casaubon, Glass, Schwartz, Kuinoel, Blackwall, and
Stock, take καλ in the sense of οbbecro τε: and so it occurs in Philen. 20. Apocal. 22, 20. So the Hebrew א. But with deference to the opinion of such celebrated scholars, I must observe, that this method of interpretation destroys half the force (δεινότης) of the answer. I must prefer the interpretation of Euthymius and Theophylact, the ancient versions, and most modern ones, to which Grotius inclines, and which is adopted by Sch. Lex. The only difficulty is, that ἄλλα does not follow, which appears essential to this formula. It is true that Schleusner 30 far extends the formula as to include καλ. But he has no authority, except from this passage. Here καλ must not be taken for ἄλλα, but has the sense of even.

We must therefore suppose an ellipsis of ἄλλα, or take καλ γὰρ together for καλτοι, atque, sed tamen. (Vide Hoogeveen.) An ellipsis such as this may, without difficulty, be admitted in sentences so highly pathetic as the one now under our consideration.

27. καλ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει—κυρίων. On this custom, which was common both to Jews and Gentiles, Wets. cites Athen. 97. a. Philostr. V. A. 1, 19. I add Liban. 182. c. πρὸς τὴν τραπέζης (I conjecture τὴν τραπέζης) κών ἐπὶ τῶν ὀστάω σκέλων ἴζων πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀνεβλέπει τὴν τραπέζην κεχωμοῦ, δότος εὑρεθὲς ἔχων τὸ στόμα πρὸς τὰ πιτεόμενον. ψίχων, not κυρίων, but scraps. Athen. 270. d. καὶ ἐκφαντισματά τινα ἔχης δοὺς τοῖς κυρίοις. The word ἐκφ. occurs also in Philostr. Vit. Ap. 1, 19. These ψίχων were directed not to be gathered up. Aristoph. ap. D. Laert. 8, 34. μὴ γένωσθι ἀπτ' ἄν κατακέραυ τῆς τραπέζης ἐκτὸς. Eurip. ap. Athen. l. 8, 17. νόμος δὲ λείψαι ἐκβάλλειν κύων. I must not omit to adduce a very beautiful passage from the most enigmatical of authors: καὶ κρίμα κειρῶν, καὶ ἱδρυμα τρόφος Μάξης πασοντος προσφιλές κυρίωμενοι. Lycoeph. Cass. 607.

30. κυλόως. Not maimed, as in our version, nor crippled; for neither does that distinguish it from κυλόως. Doddridge was deceived by Festus, who says, it signifies properly one whose hand or arm has
been cut off, but, *impropriè*, one disabled. It signifies one lame of a hand or foot. Yet *χαλός* and *κυλός* are both mentioned, as distinct. (Vide Foes, Elsner, and especially Kypk.) It signifies properly one lame from a distortion of the hand or foot. So Hesych. explains *κυλός* by *κάμπυλος*. It exactly answers to our expression, *a bow-leg*, and *bow-legged*. The origin of *κυλός* is uncertain: it seems to me cognate with *καλός*.

31. *καφώς*. The word here (as it often does) means deaf and dumb; since those who were born deaf, were necessarily dumb also.

32. ἢτι ἡδή ἡμέρας τρεῖς προσμένουσι μοι, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι τὰ φάγασι. Not that they fasted three days; but that after continuing three days, their provision fell short, and they had nothing to eat. The *καί* signifies, and now. See Euthym.

33. *χορτάσας τὸ χολον*. Compare Mark, 8, 4. and Joseph. 130, 39.

36. εὐχαριστήσας, ἐκλασε. To the examples of Wetstein I add Artem. 3, 14, 2. θύε καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ; where Reif cites Porph. de Abst. 2, 3, 4.

37. σπυρίδας. Hand-baskets, i.e. baskets with handles. Campbell renders *maunds*, a word which, though it occurs in Shakespeare, is unintelligible to the people, except in Scotland, and the North of England.

CHAP. XVI.

VERSE 1. *πειράζωντες*. This word implies a captious malevolence, or trial of his power for the purpose of calumny; “not that they might believe (says Euthymius), but that they might apprehend him as an imposter.”

1. ἐπηράστησαν. Markland is mistaken in rendering, still required as they did before. The compound is used for the simple; as often elsewhere. See Kuin. & Schl. So just after, ἐπιρήτει σημείων.

2. ὕλες γενομένης λέγετε, Εὐδία. This, and similar prognostics of weather, are collected from the Clas-
ical writers by Weststein, who cites Theophr. de
Sign. Pluv. θελαττία γλαύξ ἁδουσα χειμάων μὲν εὐδίαν.
σημαίνει, εὐδίας δὲ χειμάνα.—Ἐὰν ἀκτίνες ἄθραυσι ἀνίσο-
χωσι, ἄμιστος ἥλιος, σημεῖον ὑδάτος καὶ ὅταν ἲναχω-
τος τῷ ἥλιῳ αἱ οὐραί οἷον ἐκλεῖστος χρώμα ἄσχομιν,
ὑδάτος σημεῖον. Plut. H. N. 18, 78. Artem. 1, 75. &
Georg. 1, 441. Bulkley compares Lucan. 4, 123.
To which I add Xen. Anab. 5, 7, 7. λέγετε ὅταν ὁ
βορρᾶς πτεργή, αὐς κάλοι πλοῦ, κ. τ. λ.
3. σήμερον χειμαίν, pluvius, a storm of rain. Thu-
cyd. 1, 4, 34. ὅποτε χειμάων εἰν νότερος.
4. πυρράζει γὰρ στυγκάζων ὁ ὑφρανός. The word στυγ-
νάζω is very rare. Besides this passage, it has only
been produced in Nicetas (ap Sill.) But De Rhoer,
in Fer. Davent, asserts that he has met with it in the
Greek Scholiasts. Of στύνος, and its derivatives,
in this sense, see Raph. Kypk. and Weststein.
5. τὰ δὲ σημεία τῶν καιρῶν οὐ δύοντε (scil. γίνοσκε),
discern; i. e. you cannot discern even from my mi-
racles, which so plainly proclaim it, who I am, &c.
tῶν καιρῶν, hujus temporis. But see Whitby and Va-
ter. Weststein cites similar passages from Plut. 2.
p. 129. "Ατοπον γὰρ ἔστιν κοράκων μὲν λαμυγγίσμοις, καὶ
κλαυσμοίς ἀλεκτρίδαν, καὶ κυσίν ἐπί φορυτῳ μαραγοῦ-
σαις, καὶ ἐφη Δημοκρίτου, ἐπιμελείς προσέχειν, σημεία
ποιομένους πνευμάτων καὶ ἀμβραντον στὰ δὲ τῶν σώματος
κινήσεσα καὶ προσπαθείας μη ραλαμβάνειν μηδὲ προφυ-
λάττεν, μηδὲ ἔχειν σημεία χειμάων ἐν ἐωτῷ γεννησαμέ-
νου καὶ μελλόντος. and Diog. Laert. 1, 74.
5. εὐθύνετε—λαθεῖν. I would translate with Beza
and Kuinoel: "when they had passed over to the
other side, they saw that they had forgotten to take
bread." So also Markland, who observes, "they had
forgotten it before they took shipping, as much as
when they were come to the other side of the water;
but they were not aware that they had forgotten it
till they came to land."
6. ὄρατε καὶ προσέχετε. An Hebraism; studiosè
This was Jesus's usual method, from the minute occurrences of common life, to find matter for useful instruction.

7. λέγουσιν: "Οτι δρτους ουκ ἐλάβομεν. In the words as they now stand, there is plainly something wanting; and of the Commentators some supply тαύτα λέγει, others τουτο εἶπεν. Grotius and Glass (apud Pol.) have remarked, that a similar ellipsis occurs in the next verse. And in Matt. 25, 9. Glass observes, that in a connected sentence or proposition, sometimes there is a whole member wanting, and that either the former (as here, and in Mark 5, 30. Luc. 9, 13. 2 Thess. 2, 3.) or the latter (as Matth. 8, 9. Mark 11, 32.

8. τι διαλογίζεσθε—ἐλάβετε. I would translate the ὅτι not quia, but quod, that he took. Still the sentence is very elliptical; which Campbell endeavours, as well as he can, to fill up. It is ill pointed in Vater, εαυτοῖς;

11. τῶς οὐ νοεῖτε; cur, quare. Schleusner; to whose examples I add Eurip. Suppl. 147. where Markland produces several from the dramatic writers.

12. τῶς οὐ νοεῖτε, ὅτι οὐ περὶ ἄρτου εἶπον ὑμῖν, προσέγειν. So I would point; and supply εἶπον from εἶπον, which will lessen, if not remove, all the difficulty that has perplexed the Commentators. Certainly it is without cause that Rosenmuller suspects the words εἶπον ὑμῖν προσέγειν. As to the reading προσέχετε, which Rosenmuller prefers, whatever may be its authority, it is to be rejected as a manifest gloss proceeding from those who knew not the construction.

13. I point with Piscator, Beza, Le Clerc, and Markland: Τίνα μὲ λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι; τίνι οἱν τοῖς ἄνθρωποι. Kuinoel and others stumble at the omission of μὲ in many MSS. and they needlessly perplex themselves. One may more easily account for its omission than its addition. It was doubtless thrown out by those who did not perceive the construction.

14. Ἡλιαν. It was the opinion of the Jewish
Rabbins (founded on a wrongly interpreted passage of Malachi (see Sirach, 48, 9 & 10.), that Elias would appear a short period before the time of the Messiah. Of these there are vestiges in the writings of the Jews. Some maintain, that he will come in another body, as Kimchi on Malach: That the Jews expected the revivescence of Jeremiah appears from Ben Gorion. Others thought him one of the prophets risen again. Those who entertained such opinions appear to have heard nothing of the birth, &c. of Jesus, but to have received their first report of him from his miracles, and that recently. Rosenm.; who refers to Diog. Laert. Berthold's Christologia Judæorum, Jesu Apostolorumque ætate. Erlang. 1811, p. 58.

16. Ἡριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. The sense intended by Peter was this; "thou art the Messiah, the anointed King of man, and Legate of God. Of the divine nature of Jesus Peter was not then informed. (Kuin. and Rosenm.) Whitby, however, thinks that there was a difference between Ἡριστός and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ; the first referring to his office, the second to his divine original; though he admits that neither Nathaniel (Joh. 1, 50.), nor the other Jews, nor even the Apostles, used it in that sublime sense in which Christians always took it.

16. Ἐκκλησία. The (only) living and true God, as distinguished from dumb idols (εὐθαλα ἄφυχα, Sap. 14, 29.), fictitious deities, called νεκροὶ Psal. 106. 28. and in other places. (Rosenm. and Kuin.)

17. ὅτι σάρξ—ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ. The passage may be thus paraphrased: "Man hath not taught thee, but God, i.e. by whose providence it was brought about that thou becamest my disciple, and wast endowed with a disposition so docile as to thoroughly learn the truth."

17. ὅτι σάρξ—οὐρανῶς. Dr. Maltby, in the 23d Sermon of his second volume, remarks on the mistaken notions which were entertained by the Apostles on the nature of the Messiah's kingdom; and that in this declaration of Peter we may recognize a
triumph of spiritual disinterestedness over secular selfishness.

The words now under our consideration form the answer to that declaration, and, when freed from the obscurity of metaphor and idiom, may (with Dr. M.) be thus paraphrased: “Thou art not induced by worldly and carnal views to profess this faith, but by honest conviction, the love of truth and virtue infused into you by the Author of every good and perfect gift.”

Wetstein refers us to Sir. 14, 18. 27, 31, Gal. 1, 6. 1 Cor. 15, 50. 2 Paral. 32, 8. Eph. 6, 12. In the writings of the Jews the King of flesh and blood is often mentioned as opposed to God S. B. by which phrase they indicate, that even the most powerful man, though he may have the most prudent counsellors, is nothing in comparison with God, q. d. “If you listened to the Jewish doctors and priests, nobles and princes, and those who have the greatest authority, you would judge very differently of me.”

18. κάνε ὅπως συνέχεια, ὡσιῷ ἐλ πέτρος — ἐκκλησίαν. Concerning the sense of this and the next verse (which indeed contain the essence of the controversy between the Papists and the Protestants), various have been the opinions promulgated, and fierce the disputes agitated. They are very difficult of comprehension, and as they have been perverted by the former, so have they been misunderstood by the latter. Their real sense, which is much obscured by the peculiarities of Oriental idioms, can only be ascertained by every aid furnished us, as well by Sacred as by Classical criticism, in which investigation we shall find much valuable aid afforded by Dr. Maltby, Serm. vol. 2. Serm. 23.

As to the words συνέχεια, we must remember that Jesus had before given Simon the name Cephas, or Peter (see John 1, 44). That it was customary for the Jewish Doctors to impose new names on their disciples has been shown by Buttinghausen, in his Hor. Hebr. (cited by Rosenm.) and that it was
not unusual for the Jews to assume names derived from the Greeks and Romans we have reason to think, from the instances of change from John to Mark, and Saul to Paul. In this present case there is a paronomasia (which, however, cannot be expressed in our language as it is in French, Latin, and Italian), a figure of speech found both in the Classical and Sacred writers. Dr. Maltby (ubi supra) has produced some examples, to which I add the following: Genes. 27, 36. Is he not rightly named Jacob, for he has supplanted me twice? Eurip. Phæn. 645. ἄληθῶς δι' ἄνωμα πολυνείκη πατήρ εἶθετό σοι—νείκεων ἐπικυριον. So Æschyl. Pr. V. 472. Theeb. 401 & 532. & 655 & 667. Agamem. 670 & 680. There is too a fine example in Shakspeare’s Richard the Second. “How is’t with aged Gaunt? Oh! how that name befits my composition! Old Gaunt indeed; and Gaunt in being old,” &c. Rock, therefore, intimates the firmness which prompted Peter to avow his faith in Jesus; a sample of the intrepid zeal afterwards evinced in building up the Church and establishing the Religion of Christ. This is well alluded to in a passage of Juvencus, Hist. Evang. 3, 279. cited by Palaiet. Tu nomen Petri digna virtute tueris; Hac in mole mihi, Saxique in robore ponam Semper mansuras æternis moenibus ædes. On the name Πέτρος see Casaubon, Exercit. Baron. 15, p. 341.

18. καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτη τῇ πέτρᾳ α. τ. ἐ. Here again there has been much diversity of opinion. Most of the ancient Fathers, and some modern Commentators of credit (as Beza, Erasmus, Glassius, and Lightfoot), explain it of the confession or profession of faith here avowed by Peter. Others suppose that Jesus pointed with his finger towards himself, thereby indicating himself as the great foundation. So, besides some of the ancient Fathers, Augustin, Schoett. Witsius, Schultz. Bede, Georgius, Febroni, Chemnitz, and especially Olearius, Wolf, and Fabricius. This opinion has, however, been ably refuted
by others, and especially Whitby, to whom I refer the reader, and who proves that it must be understood of Peter, and, no doubt, the words were accompanied by a corresponding action, which indicated Peter to be meant. Le Moyne, in his Var. Sacra, has well observed that there is an allusion to the custom of building citadels on the tops of rocks, &c.

18. καὶ πύλαι ἀδοὺ οὐ κατισχύσωσιν αὐτῆς. Here again we have to encounter the jarring interpretations of Commentators, of which I can only advert to those which are at least specious, if not true. Some ancient and several modern Commentators, among whom are Olearius, Rosenm. and Kuin. explain it tartareæ potestates, consultationes Diabolorum. The force of the phrase is, however, more correctly explained by Camer. Grot. Cler. Hardt. Wivenfels, and especially Whitby and Dr. Maltby, to whom I am indebted for many of the following illustrations. It is remarkable that the expression πύλαι ἀδοὺ should be found (and in the same sense) both in the Classical and Hellenistic, both in the Greek and Hebrew writers. It probably had its origin in the bold imagery and poetic diction of the East. The word Ἄδης signifies in profane writers the god who presided over the regions of the dead, and also the place supposed to be their destined abode. In the Scriptures it partakes of both significations, but generally bears the latter. By both sacred and profane writers the expression gates of hell conveys the very same idea, i. e. the approach to the place of departed souls, the state of the dead, or death itself. So Hom. Il. 9, 312. Theocr. Idyl. 2, 159. See many more examples in Wets. It is, however, more desirable to examine the sense of Ἄδης in the Old Testament. The Hebrew יָם and יָמָן corresponds to the meaning which has been affixed to Ἄδης and ἀδοὺ πύλαι. See Gen. 37, 38. Prov. 14, 12. & 16, 25. in all which passages the word (which in the Sept. expresses the place of the
departed, and even the state of death itself) is the very same with that which is here translated hell. In Psal. 6, 5. & 94, 17. the word rendered grave, or silence, is the same in the Greek version with that whose signification we are now considering. So in 1 Cor. 15. "O, grave, where is thy victory?" In Is. 38, 9. 10, 18. "I shall go to the gates of the grave,"—the expression can only mean the grave, or death itself. And yet in the Greek version, the words are the same with those here translated hell. So Sapient. 16, 18. σῦ γὰρ ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου ἐξουσίαν ἔχεις, καὶ κατάγεις εἰς πῦλας ᾧδου καὶ ἀνάγεις. where the English translation renders the gates of hell. So Act. Tat. 3 Macc. (ap. Wets.) There are other passages of the Old Testament where a different phrase occurs, but apparently of the same signification; where for ἐρωσις and ἀθήνη some word is substituted, more unequivocally denoting death, as ἔρως and θανάτος. Job. 38, 17. Ps. 9, 18. Ps. 107, 18. In the passage of Matthew it must be noticed that πῦλαι ᾧδου are for ἁθήνη personified, as in the striking apostrophe and personification of St. Paul. (1 Cor.)

So we find Dis, and sometimes Orcus, in the Classical writers. Petron. Sat. 62. Arce autem miles fortiss, tanquam Orcus. Sometimes Mors; as Apul. 7. Ipsaque Morte, quam formidant alii fortio rem. This prince of the shades below was sometimes, by the Jews, represented as a Janitor. So Aloth. 24. and Chagiga 15, 1. Etiam janitor Gehennæ resistere tibi non potuit, cum eo venires ad educandum Acharæm. So also Hom. Od. 7. 276. η δ' ἐθη eius ἀθήνη πυλάς ταυρ. κρατέρα. See more passages ap. Wetstein. Vide Windet de vit. funct. statu. 8. 4.

18. οὐ καταγχώσων αὐτῆς. The αὐτῆς may refer to either of two antecedents, ἐκκλησίαν or Πέτρος, and it has been a subject of much discussion to which it ought to be referred. Almost all the Commentators maintain that the former is to be understood (i. e. ἐκκλ.) Some Critics, however, of great name, adopt the latter; as Le Clerc, and Wets. who
thus remarks: "Prædicit Petro, eum in discriminis vitae venturum, mei tamen eò absterritor iri, quo minus constanter in doctrinâ magistri perseveraret, mortemque adeo ipsam hostium terribilissimam vinceret atque triumpharet." Dr. Maltby too has very recently supported the same opinion, with his accustomed acuteness and erudition. (Serm. 29. vol. 2.)

If, says he, by the gates of death is to be understood the fear of death, such fear can operate only upon a person. Peter is the person described by the rock; and, if our acceptation of the phrase gates of death be correct, the latter part of the sentence should seem also to refer to him. The meaning then would be, that his courage and resolution in founding the Church of Christ would be so great, that not even this fear of death would discourage him from the effectual discharge of his duty. Now this, we know, was fulfilled; for, after a temporary falling off, occasioned by too much presumption, St. Peter became conspicuous for his zeal and constancy in preaching the Gospel, and finally suffered martyrdom.

The passage, Dr. M. adds, may be thus paraphrased: Thy name is rock, and thy character for firmness and constancy well besits the name. Upon such a rock as thee, by thy patience, suffering, zeal, and courage, I shall establish my religion; and not all the fierce opposition of the world, not even the fear of death itself, shall deter thee, faithfully and boldly, from teaching to others the truths which I have taught unto thee.

With deference to so high an authority, I must express my dissent. The reasoning seems to me not conclusive, and the interpretation somewhat harsh and far-fetched. I entirely assent to the great majority of the Commentators, who refer the αὐτῆς to ἐκκλησίας, both because it is the nearest antecedent, and also since it thus yields the more important sense of the two interpretations of which it is susceptible. For ἐκκλ. may be taken collectively, (thus the greater part of the Commentators;) and
the following sense will arise; namely, that the Church shall not die, or become extinct, in this world. So Wolf. Campb. Clarke, &c. But here it is not without reason objected by Le Clerc and Maltby, that such an assurance might seem superfluous, since the constant tenor of prophecy, and the very nature of the dispensation itself, warrant us in expecting that it will continue unimpaired and unshaken to the end of the world. It seems, therefore, safer, with Euthymius, Grotius, Camer. Hammond, and some others, to understand by ἐκκλ. the individual members of which composed the body of the faithful; a sense which it may very well bear, and which occurs elsewhere in the N. T. I cannot, however, assent to the interpretation of Grotius and Whitby: “They shall enjoy here in prospect, and hereafter in certain accomplishment, a happy resurrection.” Under the collective term ἐκκλ. is comprehended Peter; who, indeed, is particularly meant. On this interpretation, the passage admits of the following satisfactory paraphrase: “Neither persecution, nor even death itself, shall prevent thee, and thy faithful followers, who build on thy example, and who will constitute my Church, from persevering unto the end in the profession of my Religion.”

19. καὶ δῶσον σοι τὰς κλεῖς τ. β. τ. οὗ. The signification of these words will, as Dr. Maltby observes (ubi supra), depend on the sense of the formula, βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. Now this, from the connection in which it stands with the preceding words, and agreeably to the concurring opinions of the most learned and judicious Commentators, denotes (as frequently elsewhere) the Gospel dispensation. Of this important phrase, the origin and nature is admirably illustrated by Dr. Maltby, who refers it to the Jewish notion of Theocracy. As Christ (says he) was to reign in righteousness, the exercise of spiritual authority was expressed in phrases which properly denote temporal power. The head of this spiritual body would be described as a king sitting upon the
throne of his glory. The Apostles would hereafter sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. If then (continues he) we understand that the spiritual dominion of Christ is represented under the notion of worldly power, we shall perceive that the Kingdom of Heaven is, in Scripture language, the establishment of the doctrines of the Gospel on earth.

Having gained a clear idea of the nature and design of this kingdom, we shall easily ascertain what is meant by giving to any one the keys of it. The key was a badge of high office and distinction in the regal governments of antiquity, of which vestiges remain even in our own times. Thus the Lord Chamberlain of the British Court is installed into his office by delivering to him a silver key. This key (sometimes worn suspended from the shoulder) was also among the Greeks an ensign of sacerdotal dignity. (See Callim. Lav. Cer. 45. and the note of Dr. Blomfield. Valck. on Theocr. Ædon. 335. Wolf, (on the authority of Ursini, Antiq. Hebr. and Pincinelli’s Lumina reflexa,) tells us that it was a custom with the Jews to accompany and denote promotion by the delivery of a key. And from other authorities we learn that the Doctorate of Laws was conferred by putting into the hand of the aspirant a key of the closet where the sacred books were kept. To confer the key is therefore a phrase equivalent to bestowing a situation of great distinction and trust. Thus in Isaiah 22, 22. “And the key of the house, of the house of David, will I lay upon his shoulders, so that he shall open and none shall shut; and he shall shut and none shall open.” Where see Bishop Lowth. Thus to confer the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven on any one is to invest him with authority therein, for the promotion of its establishment and preservation. Now in this situation (continues Dr. M.) Peter was placed. By the strenuous efforts he made, and the conspicuous part he acted after Christ's ascension, and the effusion of the Holy Spi-
rit, (through whom also the Gentiles were first admitted to a participation in the privileges of the Gospel,) he emphatically unlocked the doors of the Kingdom of Heaven. We are now prepared to understand the yet remaining, and more intricate, clause of this very difficult passage.

19. ὅτι ἐὰν ἰδοὺς—οὐρανοῖς. It is well observed by Dr. Maltby that δεῖν and λάειν, with their compounds, which properly signify to tie and untie, are used figuratively in the judicial sense of condemning and absolving, and yet more extensively denoted the various acts of plenary power, legislative and executive. Here they must be interpreted according to the nature of the administration confided. Now, (adds the same learned Theologian,) the exercise of government has reference to three points: 1. making and repealing laws; 2. imposing or remitting contributions; 3. dispensing rewards and punishments.

Dr. M. then attempts to shew, that all those took place in the case of the Apostles, and are all to be included in the terms δεῖν καὶ λάειν. The hypothesis is not a new one, having been before propounded by Bengel. in Gnom. in these words: "Ligandi et solvendi verbis comprehenduntur omnia ea, quæ Petrus in virtute nominis Jesu Christi, et per fidem in illud nomen, apostolica potestate gessit; docendo, convincendo, hortando, prohibendo, permitendo, consolando, remittendo, sanando, resuscitando, puniendo." Elsner, too, combined the first and third of the above points.

Of those three points Dr. M. has most satisfactorily established the first; but in the second he has, I think, quite failed, since it would be harsh to interpret δεῖν καὶ λάειν, of imposing or remitting taxes or contributions; nor is it probable that our Lord would advert to such a circumstance on such an occasion. Dr. M. indeed, cites a solitary example of δεῖν καὶ λάειν in this sense, and that not from a writer of Hellenistic, but Classical Greek, and the verb is not λάειν, but ἀνακλώ. As to the third point (i.e. the power of
dispensing rewards and punishments, by either removing disorders or inflicting them, which was first proposed by Olearius, and was adopted by Clericus). I cannot consider it as satisfactorily established, and must apply to it the words of Wolf: Nec à contextu, nec a parallelissimo, nec a frequentiori vocis usu fulsitur. Nay, he adds a still stronger censure of the interpretation: Vix me impetrare possum, ut credam virum doctum (Olearium) hunc genuinum esse verborum Domini sensum, sed eo potius animo hæc protulisse suspicer, ut appareret, quæ interpretatio dari posset, si, caeteris hermeneuticis presidiis relictis, acquiescamus in significatu illo quo uno alterove loco se tueatur. The defenders of this interpretation have been more successful in establishing the sense of λέει than of δέει. They produce instances of the thing in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira, of Elymas, of Hymenæus and Alexander, but not of the word: δέειν νόμον has never been produced. But I have met with something approaching to it in Sophocl. Antig. 40. λύουσα δ' ἄν ἐ θάπτονσα, προσδέμην πλέων; where the Schol. interprets λύουσα τὸν νόμον, ἢ βεβαιώσα. The expression is, however, very rare, and merits attention; for which reason I have cited it. But to the mode of interpretation adopted by Bengel, or by Dr. M. there is yet this stronger objection; that it not only mixes together more senses than can well be supposed to be included in the words δέειν and λέειν, but attributes some which those words do not bear, at least in Hellenistic Greek, and others which, taken alone, would be unsuitable to the context. It is manifest that we must look around for some other and more satisfactory mode of interpretation. I shall therefore lay before the reader two which seem to carry with them the greatest probability; and one of which, if I mistake not, will be found the true one.

I. That brought forward by Schmid. Salmasius, and Wolf, and afterwards confirmed and illustrated by Professor Adam, in a Dissertation on these verses,

The supporters of this interpretation urge the similar passage of Matt. 18, 18; but the words there relate not solely to exclusion from, or admission to the Church, but chiefly to the management and general regulation of its affairs. The above interpretation also gives (I think) too limited a sense, not to mention that it would he harsh here to take things for persons, in neuters for masculines. That Christ says not (remarks Whitby) what persons thou shalt bind on earth, but what things, seems to intimate, that our Lord speaks primarily of things, and only consequentially of persons to be bound and loosed, as having contracted guilt by, or as being absolved from the guilt of, those things. It is well observed by Kuinoel, that the image taken from the keys seems not to be continued in these words, but that they contain rather a fuller development of the care and power of which keys are a symbol (on which see Artemid. 8, 5. ap. Wet.)

After mature deliberation, I do not hesitate to adopt, with some slight modifications, the interpretation of Lightfoot and Selden, which was embraced
by Hammond, Wagenseil, Campbell, Vitringa, Whitby, Limborch, Schleusner, and Kuinoel. Δέειν signifies to forbid, not only in the Rabbinical writings perpetually, (see Lightfoot and Wets.), but also, says Kuinoel, in Dan. 6, 8, 9, 11, 16.; so also in the Chaldee Paraphrase on Num. 11, 28: and λέειν (ὤμοι and ἴσης) (see Light. & Buxt. Lex. Tal. in v. and Holtinger. Diss. de Usu Script. Heb. in N. T. 400.) denotes to pronounce lawful, concede, permit, direct, constitute, &c. This clause of the sentence may be rendered: "Whatsoever thou shalt declare lawful, and constitute in the Church, shall be ratified, and hold good with God."

The student will observe, that this sense of the words δέειν and λέειν is directly contrary to that which obtains among the Classical writers, in which λέειν (ὠμοι) is synonymous with καταλόειν (ν.) to abrogate, &c. but no where, perhaps, in the sense concede, permit, except in Diod. Sic. l. 1, 27. ἵσα ἔγω δήσω κατέλει δύναται λύσαι, cited by Selden. But that is the literal Greek version of an Oriental inscription, and therefore is likely to contain the eastern idiom. This is so obviously the sense, that I am surprised it should have been missed by so many learned men, and especially by so consummate a scholar as Wesseling, who has in his editorial capacity introduced ἐνομοδέττασα into the text (for δήσω), a manifest gloss, which not even the testimony of a thousand MSS. could induce me to receive.

Thus much for the opposition in λέειν. The phrase δέειν νόμον has never been produced. I have, however, met with a passage which approaches to it in Soph. Antig. 40. εἰ ταῦτα ἤγοι Λύσωσι τὴν ἰ' φατουσα προσθείμην πλέον;

That the above powers were exercised by Peter, in conjunction with the other Apostles, is indisputable. We need only advert to the decisions of the Council held at Jerusalem, when nearly the whole of the Mosaic ritual law was loosed, given up, and abrogated, but part was bound, and still held obligatory.
In truth, the terms in question are so comprehensive, that they may well include all the measures pursued by the Apostles for the establishment, and ordinary regulation of the Church; even binding and loosing, in another and more figurative sense, i.e. condemning and absolving, a power which we know was bestowed, from the words of John, 20, 23, "whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained:" and, among the rest, what Dr. Maltby ranges under his second point, i.e. directing the payment of contributions for the maintenance of ministers, and the relief of pious poverty. For as to the power of working miracles, removing disorders, or inflicting them, that was extraordinary, (meant as an attestation of their divine legislation,) and does not seem to be adverted to in the above words.

Finally, to use the impressive and eloquent language of Dr. Maltby, whichever of the above interpretations be adopted, it will supply no ground of confidence to the Church of Rome. The praise bestowed upon, and the powers entrusted to, the Apostle Peter, will not justify the assertion of any peculiar prerogative to the pontiffs of that see. Every part of the prophetic declaration contained in this address of our Lord was, we know, completely fulfilled, but surely not in such a manner as to supply even the shadow of a reason for deducing from it the supremacy of St. Peter in the persons of his successors, or the right of judicial punishment and plenary absolution, claimed, and exercised, in too many fatal instances, by the opponents of Protestantism. On this subject it may not be unedifying to contrast the well-known language of modern Catholics with that of St. Jerome, as we find it expressed in his Comment on this passage, and extracted by Wetstein: "Istum locum Episcopi et Presbyteri non intelligentes, aliquid sibi de Phariseorum assumunt supercilii, ut vel damnet innocentes, vel solvere se noxios arbitrentur; cum apud Deum non sententia sacerdotum, sed reorum vita quaeratur."
20. διεστείλατο. Διαστέλλεσθαι signifies sometimes imperare, jubere, to strictly charge (see Camer. ap. Pol.) and, with a negative following, to interdict. It is rarely used in this sense by the Classical writers, but an example has been produced by Munthe from Diod. Sic. 262. Wetstein has some others. It often signifies distinctē definio, to definitely determine; from whence arises this of disertē præcipere, imperare. The reading ἐπετίμησεν, which is found in the MSS. is a gloss, or derived from the parallel place.


21. ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. Members of the public senate, principes, non solum aetate, sed dignitate. First called patres, then senatores; distinguished from the people, and termed ἄρις. So the συνέδριον is not unfrequently called τὸ πρεσβυτέρων and γερουσία. And even now in the East senex is a name of dignity and office.

21. καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθηναι. This phrase denotes after two days, i. e. the next day but one. An idiom to be found even in the Classical writers; as Thucyd. 7. 75. Paulus, Thiers, &c. deny that Christ foresaw and predicted his resurrection; and they have devised many subtle hypotheses, and fine-spun interpretations; which, however, carry with them scarcely a vestige of truth, or even verisimilitude, and have been answered at large by Suskind, Flatt, Reinhard, and especially by Kuinoel, whose note presents a careful digest of what is important in their tracts. I must not omit an observation of Rosenmuller; namely, that the Apostles indeed confessed that they did not understand these sayings of our Lord. (Mark 9, 32. Luke 9, 45. & 18, 31. Joh. 20, 9.) But the cause of this is manifest. They did not understand, because the common persuasion of the Jews con-
cerning the Messiah was so fixed in their minds, as to prevent them from crediting his representations concerning his resurrection.

22. καὶ προσλαμβάνεις αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰάκωβος. On the interpretation of these words there has been much controversy. It seems to me that προσλαμβάνω properly means to take by the hand, and draw on one side; an action usual to those who familiarly advise, or who chide or remonstrate with another. Schl. Lex. gives an example from Plutarch. To which I add, Aristoph. Lys. 1128. λαβοῦσα δ’ ὧμᾶς, λυγορήσας βουλομαι. So with us it is vulgarly said, “to take one to task;” where, observe, by the expression to task is meant to tax, i. e. to chide.

22. ἐμπράτευ εἰπτιμά. The meaning of this word must not be too much strained. It merely denotes affectionately chiding him for indulging in such melancholy forebodings.

22. Ἰάκως σοι. The phrase is elliptical; and to complete it must be supplied the words Θεὸς ἔσται, misereatutur tui Deus, propitius sit vobis Deus. That Ἰάκως was especially appropriated to this sense propitius is clear from the passages cited by Wetstein. This formula answers to the Hebrew one יִּנֶּשְׁנָה, in 1 Paral. 11, 19. where the Sept. renders Ἰάκως ματὶ Ἰσραήλ τοῦ ποιήσαι τὸ ρήμα τούτο. Add, 2 Sam. 20, 20. 23, 19. Genes. 43, 23. Jos. Ant. 7, 11, 8. Not dissimilar to this is our own phrase God forbid!. Thus in 1 Macc. 2, 21. Ἰάκως ἡμῖν κατάλητον νόμον, God forbid that we should leave the Law. The following words, οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τούτο, are exegetical of the preceding; where observe the use of the future for the optative, Hebraicè, μὴ γένοιτο. (Kuin. Rosenm. and Kypke.)

23. Ἰακώβα. Hebr. Ἰακώβα, which the Sept. sometimes renders εὐθείωσα, at other times διάθεσα. It however frequently signifies (as in Sam. 19, 23.) an evil counsellor; and so perhaps it may here; q. d. “Under the appearance of attachment, thou givest me the worst counsel.” So Rosenm. and Kuinoel.
Most other Commentators (with Schl.) take it in the sense of an adversary.

23. σκάνδαλον μου εἰ—offendiculo mihi es, i. e. by fostering that horror of his painful and ignominious death, which at various times, more or less, harassed Jesus. So Rosenm. But Kuinoel, less judiciously, takes σκάνδαλον in the sense of seducer, and evil adviser: as in Matth. 4, 10.

25. oυ φρονεῖς τα του Θεου. This formula, which is illustrated by Alberti, Raphel, Kypke, and Wetstein, signifies to mean “well inclined to, well affected to, to take one’s side, follow one’s orders.”

24. ει της θελει ουσιον μου ελθείν—be my disciple, embrace my religion. Of this formula, and the following one, αιρείν εις σταυρόν αυτοῦ, see note on 10, 38.

24. ἀπαρνησαθα εστιν.—let him deny himself, neglect his preservation, not value his life, &c. This word ἀπαρνησαθα answers to the Hebrew וְאֵינוּ, in Is. 31, 70. and is by the Sept. sometimes rendered ἀπαρνησαθα, at other times ἑξουδενείν. One may compare Act 20, 24. οικ ξειν τιμίων την ψυχήν αυτοῦ. and Luke 14, 26. μαθεῖν την ἐαυτοῦ ψυχήν. Kuin. Origen and Jerome (ap. Bulk.) apply the expression to abandoning vice. See also Sucer, 1, 422.


26. τι γαρ αφελείναι. This is an ellipsis of κατά. For as αφελέεσθαι has in the active the accusative of the person and another of the thing; so in the passive it retains one, and changes the other into a nominative. Rosenm. This is, I think, a proverbial expression, which Jesus transfers from temporal to spiritual application: q. d. “If we think an earthly and temporary life cheaply bought, at whatever price, how much more a heavenly and eternal one.” (See Campb. and Whitby.) Kuinoel, with too much
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limination, interprets (comparing Luke 9, 25.): "What will it profit you, if you shall have received all worldly advantages, honours, &c. but shall have rendered yourself miserable?"

26. τις δὲ ψυχῆς αὐτῶι ἐξημαθῇ; The difference between the Classical and Hellenistic use is this: the Classics use the dative (as Thucyd.); the Sacred writers the accusative. Though Wetstein quotes Herodot. 7, 89. and Agath. 3. as examples of the accusative. I must not omit to observe, that the word ἐξημαθῇ here contains no allusion (as Doddridge fancied) to undergoing capital execution.


27. μέλλει γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχεσθαι. Whitby refers these words to Christ’s second advent, the day of judgment (whom see in Elsley’s abstract of his observations); but Grotius, Simon. Rosenm. and Kuin. &c. interpret the words of the first advent. Kuinoel thus points out how much more suitable this interpretation is to the context. “Peter, when Christ had spoken of the calamities which hung over him, and his death, had advised him to avoid the danger of the death, and not endure that such unmerited calamities should happen to him. But Jesus had shewn that it was necessary for him to perform the will of his Father, and that whoever would be worthy of being called his follower, must be ready to undergo all sorts of calamities, nay even submit to death itself, for the sake of professing his religion: that whoever was so minded, and showed this piety
both by words and by deeds, would be recompensed with supreme felicity, both in this life and in that which is to come. To calm, however, the sorrow of his disciples, he adds, that notwithstanding the cruel death and calamities which must befall himself and his followers, his dignity would not be in the least depressed, nay rather that it would acquire an increase; for that there would be a glorious manifestation of his kingdom, and that those who had despised and opposed his religion would suffer punishment; and points out the certainty of this event so plainly, as to declare that many of his hearers would be eye-witnesses of it.


28. γεώσωνται θανάτου—mori. It properly signifies to try, feel, perceive, be partaker of. As applied to death, it is confined to the Hebrew writers. But the Greek Classics use it of other evils; as γεώσεθαι μόχθων, Soph. Tr. 1108. Eurip. Hec. 375. γεώσεθαι κακῶν. Herc. Fur. 1858. γέοσθαι πόνων. Pausan. 9, 7, 4. κακῶν μεγάλων γεώσασθαι. Pausan. 10, 59, 1. κακῶν ἀπέλαυσαν αἰώνια. And in Aristophanes we find γεώσαι τὰς θύρας. So Mr. Weston has produced from Shakspeare, taste your legs. This sense is also found in a cognate word of the French language, tâter le pouls, feel one’s pulse. See Cotgrave’s Fr. Dict.

28. ἔρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτῶν. This spiritual kingdom had its commencement after our Lord’s resurrection and ascension, when he sent the Holy Ghost, and propagated the Gospel by miracles throughout the world. (Rosenm.) Whitby, Kuinoel, and Wetstein, on the other hand, more accurately, I think, understand the words of Christ’s first advent, after forty years, to the destruction of the Jewish nation, &c. and therefore not only St. John,
but many standing there, might see it. By ἐστε-κώτων Markland (ap. Bowy.) interprets being; and truly observes, that “all verbs of posture and gesture, as go, walk, stand, sit, in good Greek writers (and some in Latin), signify to exist, to be. He observes too that xies is often said of one person.

CHAP. XVII.

VERSE 1. ἀναφέρει αὐτῶς εἰς ὅρος ὕψηλα. The force of the preposition, which almost all the interpreters have neglected, deserves attention. Translate, took them up. So Mark 9, 2. Luke 24, 51. καὶ ἀναφέρετε εἰς οὕραν ὅρος. It is proper to observe, that high mountains were by the ancients accounted sacred, and especially suited to religious worship. See Strab. 456. d. and 726. c. cited by Wetstein. Jesus especially made choice of them for prayer and religious meditation: which was the precise mountain is uncertain. The most ancient opinion is, that it was Tabor, which, however, seems founded only on the circumstance of its vicinity to Cæsarea, at which the transactions before narrated took place. But (objects Rosenmuller) in eight days Jesus might have traversed a considerable distance. To which I answer, there appears no motive to have induced Jesus to travel to a considerable distance. The reader who desires to enter further into the subject, may consult Wolf on this passage, and especially Koecher.

2. μετεμορφώθη ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν. On this mysterious and awful transaction many are the sophistical hypotheses of the sceptical theologians of Germany. Some are fully detailed and satisfactorily refuted by Kuinoel, who has himself proposed an hypothesis ingeniously devised, and acutely and learnedly supported, but which does not carry conviction to my mind. Not to mention other objections and difficulties, it should seem to have been unworthy of Jesus to have countenanced their error. That were more suitable to an Apollonius. Besides, after their minds
had been enlightened by the Holy Spirit, there was no reason to permit the continuance of the error. And yet St. Peter himself, in his 2 Ep. 1, 17. et seq., especially refers to this as a real occurrence. It is well observed by Olearius, in his Obs. Sacr. on this passage, and by Michaelis, that the purpose of this transfiguration was, that the Apostles might by a sign from Heaven be assured that their confidence in Jesus was well founded.

2. μετεμορφωθή. This word denotes that his form and aspect were changed. Μορφή signifies ὕσις, δόμα, exhibiting an indescribable dignity and majesty. Wetstein has produced passages of the Classical writers, but none very apposite.

3. ιδού, ἔφθασαν αὐτοῖς—συναλλάξατε. For that both should appear at the time of the Messiah was an ancient tradition among the Jews, as appears from the Rabbinical passages adduced by Lightfoot, Schoetgen, and Wetstein. Paulus; and others, think that these were not Moses and Elias, but some unknown persons. That is, however, refuted by the words of St. Luke, 9, 32. See Koecher.

4. τοιοῦτοι πόροι τρεῖς σημάδια. The word σημάδι denotes booths composed of branches of trees, such as travellers are accustomed to construct when they meet with a pleasant spot, unmindful of time and business. So Peter, forgetful of the cares and troubles of this life, and absorbed in the splendour of the appearance, wished to fix his habitation there, &c.


6. ἀκόω, pro-ἐκακόω. To the examples of Wetstein I add Soph. Antiq. 64. Αἰδip. Col. 172. 1640.

6. ἐκέκοιτο εἰς πόροις αὐτῶν. Stunned, and struck with fear, as though they had heard thunder. Any sudden glare of light makes us cast our eyes to the ground: on the same principle, then, it is no wonder
that a more powerful stupefaction should cast our very bodies themselves to the ground. Similar words are used, on a kindred subject, by the Sept. in Levit. 9, 24. The disciples therefore, stunned by the thunder, overpowered by this radiant light, and awed, as if by the divine presence, fell on their faces, as it were, struck with thunder. The antients had a notion, that when they beheld a deity they must die.

(Thomson.)

9. μηδὲν ἐκτύπητο ὅπαρκα. Tell the vision (as some interpreters explain it), or rather, simply, what you have seen, to no man. So also Schleusner: which mode of interpretation is confirmed by Mark 9, 9. δεινεναθείτω αὐτοῖς ὅτα μηδελ διηγησώμεθα αὐτόν. The present is here used for the future.

10. Ἰησοῦς ἦν Ἰάκω, i.e. in the person of John the Baptist.

11. oik ἐκένωσαν αὐτῶν. Euthymius remarks, ἔδικται κατὰ μνήμην αὐτῶν, which will not excuse them.

12. ἐκένωσαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἡ ἡμέρα ἑστήκει; ut libuit, prohibidice; i.e. malè cum tractarunt. 'Εν αὐτῷ corresponds to 3, as the Hebrews joined with. Markland (ap. Bull.) has well illustrated this by a similar expression used by Xenophon, Cyropaed. 2. p. 36. n. where an eagle having caught a hare, ἐκένωσεν ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν ἄγγελον, ἐκένωσεν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν αὐτῷ. So Mark 9, 13. They have had their will of him: which was to kill him. Luke 23, 25. τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν παρέδωκε τῇ ἡλικίας αὐτῶν.

15. ἐκτύπητο—he is moon-struck. The Commentators observe that, from the symptoms subjoined, this appears to have been the epilepsy. The application given it (says Campbell) shows the general sentiment at that time concerning the moon’s influence on this sort of malady. Isidorus 4, 7. (ap. Schl.) says of epileptics: “Hos vulgus lunaticos vocat, quod per hunc cursum comitatur eos insaniam daemonorum.” When seized with the paroxysm they lose all mental power, and almost all bodily
sense. Their speech is an inarticulate noise, not unaptly expressed by κραζει in Luke 9, 39.

15. κακῶς πάχει. Vide supra, 8, 6, et Aesop. F. 907, κακῶς πάχαν ἐφέβλητο.

15. πολλάκις γὰρ πίνετε εἰς τὸ πῦρ, καὶ πολλάκις εἰς τὸ ὄμορ. That this frequently happens to epileptic patients is well known; and it is noticed by Arétæus and Cælius on the epilepsy, cited by Wetstein. See also Celsius, 3, 23. Mark adds that the evil spirit φάστει αὐτῶν καὶ ἀφρίζει καὶ τρίζει τοὺς ὀδοντας αὐτῶν καὶ ξυραίνεται, contabescit: all symptoms of the epilepsy.

17. Ὡ γενὲς ἀπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη. Rosenm. maintains that the words are addressed to the Disciples, which he thinks evident from the context, since in c. 20. he censures their unbelief, &c. This, however, is not certain. I should rather agree with Doddridge, Beausobre, Kypke, Paulus, and Kuinoel, that the reproof was meant for those whom it might concern, according as they had deserved it. Or perhaps of the whole Jewish nation, says Markland, who has well observed (p. 102), that our Saviour seems to allude to the words of Moses, Deuter. 32, 5, concerning the Jews γενὲς σκολὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη. (as does St. Paul, in Philip. 2, 15.) After which he turns to the persons present, and says, Bring him hither to me. Dr. Whitby refers these words to the Scribes, who at that time were disputing with the Disciples. It seems probable that ἀπιστος is to be referred to the Disciples; διεστραμμένη to the Scribes: the former ἠμῶν to the Disciples, the latter to the Scribes. See Hor. Serm. 1, 1. “hinc vos, vos hinc, mutatis discedite partibus.” Rom. 14, 10. where I have noted many instances.

20. did τὴν ἀπιστίαν. The reading ἀληθείαν is a mere gloss, or softening; but it is unnecessary. For ἀπιστία is to be understood comparatively to that complete faith which they ought to have had, considering their long instruction, and the nature of the office entrusted to them. What is in Latin called levitas might be imputed to them, which consisted in a want of that complete reliance, whose very essence it would have been, to consider that, aided by the assistance of the Deity and Christ, they would be able to effect every thing, even what should exceed human powers. Rosenm.

20. οἰς κάκοις σινάκες, i. e. If ye had confidence, even in the smallest proportion. A proverbial comparison, a grain of mustard being the smallest of all seeds. οἰς like ἧ may note not only quality and similitude, but magnitude and quality.

20. ἔρειτε τῷ δρει τούτε. Μεταβην — μεταβισται. These are proverbial hyperboles, (of which examples are produced by Lightfoot on Matth. 21, 21. and from the Classical writers by Wets.) and are therefore not to be strained too far. They are explained by the following words, οὐδὲν ἀδυνατήσεις ὑμῖν. The passage may be thus paraphrased: So long as you trust in God and me, and are not deficient in self-reliance, you may accomplish the most arduous labours, undertaken for the purpose of furthering my religion. Rosenm.

20. οὐδὲν ἀδυνατήσει. The difference between the Classical and Hellenistic use of the word deserves attention: in the former it denotes non posse, in the latter impossibile esse.

21. τώρα τὸ γένος, i. e. δαιμονον q. d. This sort of disease cannot be removed. Jesus accommodated himself to the usus loquendi, just as we employ many
phrases derived from the rites and religion of the Gentiles.

21. οὐ γὰρ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστείᾳ. Jesus had just before said that implicit reliance was necessary to perform such mighty works. He now shows how it happened that they had it not; and indicates by what means it may be attained, namely by prayer, and, in subservience to it, fasting. These two are often conjoined, as in Luke 2, 37. Act. 10, 30. & 14, 23. 1 Cor. 7, 5. Upon this whole passage Mr. Balkley has the following sensible observation: “Without believing that they could really work the miracle, they would not attempt it; and therefore could not be sure perform the cure, while they had any distrust in that particular remaining: and this distrust was blameable, since our Saviour had assured them by express promise, when he sent them out, that they should have power over unclean spirits, and therefore prayer and fasting were proper for exciting their attention to divine promises, and to make them act a more consistent part.” This being the manifest sense of the passage, and that in which all the best Commentators acquiesce, I am surprised that Bowyer and Paula should have adopted a conjecture so absurd as that proposed by Dr. Sykes; namely, ἐν προσευχῇ νηστείᾳ, which (as Doddridge long ago observed) is neither natural in itself, nor pertinent to the occasion. It seems not at all to our Lord’s purpose to speak of the natural methods of cure, in answer to the Apostle’s demand, why they could not miraculously perform it? As if (says Rosenm.) Christ had meant to teach them what the diseased ought themselves to do, in order to be freed from the disorder. Euthymius (oddly enough) jumbles both together, assigning the prayer to the ἑπαρτέων, and the fasting to the patient. ’Ev, ministerio, Ἀν. See Sah. to whose examples I add, Ἀσχυλ. Choephe, 760.

28. οἱ τὰ διδαχμα λαμβάνεσσα. Piscator here pro-
poses to read, just after τά; but that would render it necessary to change διδραχμα into διδραχμο. For the student must observe, that it is not declined τά διδραχμα, τοι διδραχματα, but τά διδραχμα, τοι διδραχμοι. This I should have thought too minute to deserve mention; had it not seemed necessary to correct an error into which many critics, not of the lowest order, have fallen; ex. gr. Doddridge, Campbell, Hammond, and several in Pole's Synopsis. Translate therefore, "those who collected the didrachms. There is a propriety in the use of the plural, which is intended (as De Diei observes) with reference to the many from whom it was collected, each contributing one. In fact, the τά διδραχμα (the didrachms) was a collective name, for the tax of didrachms. I entirely agree with those who tell us that this was the sacred tribute, the half shekel (of which see more in Elsley). Observe εά is for εἰσι, which is more properly used in an interrogative sentence.

25. καὶ δέω εἰσήλθεν εἰς τὴν σίκλον. It may be enquired who? Jesus, says Whitby, and almost all the Commentators. I would, however, understand it of Peter, with L. Brug, and as the Syriac expresses it, doubtless from a very ancient marginal note. So also Cod. Corb. 1. We may therefore paraphrase it thus: "When Peter had entered into the house (whether Jesus had already gone, while the tax-gatherers were applying to Peter for the contribution), and was just about to ask Jesus whether he would not pay the contribution, Jesus was beforehand with his question, by asking him one, namely, Τί σοι δεικτεῖ, Σίμων; οι βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς ἀπο τῶν λαμβάνουσι τέλη, &c." And thus Euthymius seems to have taken the sentence. See also Theophyl. Some MSS. read προφθασεν, and so Hammond reads; by which the beauty of the above construction is destroyed.

26. ἰπροφθάσασιν αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. The word is unaccompanied by an example in St. Thes. It is, however, to be found in three passages of Thucydides.
25. ἕκτὸς τῶν φιλῶν αὐτῶν, ἕκτὸς τῶν ἀλλοτριῶν; Wetstein cites Justin. 1, 10. and Jos. 7, 15, 9. By φιλῶν understand not cives (as some), but in the proper acceptation, sons, those of their family; and by ἀλλοτριῶν those not of their family. So Campbell, who renders, from their own sons, or from others. This is copiously illustrated by Hammond. Schleusen-ner explains, a suis liberis, aut ab ipsis qui non sunt fa-mliares. Compare Psal. 49, 2. Sirach. 40, 29. Jos. 7, 15, 9.

27. ἵνα δὲ μὴ σκανδάλισομεν αὐτῶς, i. e. that we may not give them a handle for saying that we despise the temple, &c.; or rather, lest we should make them suppose that we undervalue the temple; which might cause them to stumble at, and reject my pre-tensions to the Messiahship. See also Whitby.

27. τὸν ἀναβάντα ἰχθύν, i. e. rising to, meeting the hook, as Brug. Beza, and Kuinoel, who translate de-cucurrīt ad hamum; or we may supply ἐκ τοῦ ἱθανος, which may be taken from the words εἰς τὸ ἱθανος, which must be understood after βαλέ ἄγκιστρον. The complete phrase occurs in Matth. 3, 16. Schleusen-ner in his Lex. interprets as if he supplied ἐκ τοῦ ἄγ-κιστρον, which I think harsh. Ἀναβάντα may, how-ever, be rendered eductum; for Rosenmuller truly observes, that the Hellenists use neuter verbs in a passive sense. As to the piece of money, we may suppose that it had before fallen into the sea, and been devoured by the fish; for there are not wanting instances of valuables found in the bellies of fish. In this view Wetstein has cited Bereshith, 11. 5. Herodot. 3, 42. Strabo, 9, 45, b. We need not therefore suppose (with Schmidt) that the piece of money was created on purpose. Doddridge well remarks on the illustrious knowledge and power of our Lord evinced in this transaction. The mira-cle has received the same treatment as others from the sceptical theologians of Germany, whose hypo-theses and futile remarks scarcely deserved the full examination and refutation which they have received
from Sorr in his answer to Paulus. The most important matter from both has been selected by Kuinoel, who agrees with Rosenmuller in rejecting the above hypotheses.

CHAP. XVIII.

VERSE 1. εν ἔκεινη τῇ ἀρχῇ. Whitby has noticed, and very ingeniously reconciled, the apparent difference that subsists between the Evangelists; which, however, Markland thinks may be done by simply placing a comma at ἀρχῇ. The sense is, “At that time, the disciples disputing among themselves which of them would be greater than the other in the kingdom of Heaven, came to Jesus.”

1. τίς ἀρχ. μεῖκον εστίν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν ὁμανῶν. This disputation, which had taken place on the way to Capernaum, seems to have arisen from the preference apparently shown of late by Jesus to Peter, John, and James, which had excited the pride of those three, and the envy of the rest. To repress these equally unchristian dispositions, Jesus (on Peter’s return from fishing) asks them what they had been disputing of on the way. The interrogation of the disciples is thus put by Wetstein: Quis erit imperator? quis consiliarius, quis procurator? An qui primus in doctrinam tuam se tradidit? An qui tibi sanguine est conjunctior? an qui te frequenter hospicio excepit? an estate proetector? They then avow it, and make the matter of their debate by the way the subject of a direct enquiry.

1. τίς—μεῖκον εστίν, i. e. μέγιστος εσται. The comparative for the superlative, say the Commentators (see Kuinoel), as is frequently the case. But to this principle we need not here resort. One may suppose, that they did not merely wish to know, who would be the greatest, but who would occupy the chief posts in the court of the Messiah; as, quis imperator? quis consiliarius? &c. ap. Wet. As the plural is often taken for the singular, so is the singular
for the plural. Therefore we need not take μαθητών
in a superlative, but only comparative sense, who
shall be the magistri, the magnates.

2. προσκαλεσάμενοι—παιδίον. That his admonitions
and expositions should more strongly strike the
minds of his hearers, Jesus is accustomed (says Wet-
stein) to represent (according to the Oriental usage)
his spiritual doctrine by corporeal images, obvious
to the sight. There is an interesting tradition that
the boy was the afterwards celebrated Ignatius.

3. εἰκι μὴ στραφητε. Unless ye be changed in dis-
position, and become, &c. There is, I believe, no
other example in the New Testament of this meta-
phorical sense. On this Rosenmuller has the follow-
ing remark: “Pueris similes vult fieri Christus sec-
tatores suos, modestiā et honorum peritores dum
piscientiā, quod ea ætas longissimæ ab sit a studio ho-
norum, quod ne ad inventam quidem se ad virilem et
robustam ætatem referri solet: nam, ut Horatius ait,
Conversis studiis ætas animusque virilis Querit opes
et amicitias, inservit honori.” (See also Whitby.)
This being the manifest sense, I am surprised that
Wetstein should interpret γένοιτο εἰς παιδίον to be
acknowledging the superiority of others to ourselves,
and that we are, (q. d.) as boys compared to men, a
comparison not unfrequent in the Classics, and of which
he produces several examples. It will not, however,
justify his interpretation, which is too limited and
far-fetched. Though I know that the Apostle to the
Romans 12, 10. gives it a characteristic of true
Christians, εἰ τιμὴ ἀληθινὴς πρεσβύτερου, yet the in-
terpretation is too restricted. Our Saviour means
to inculcate a childlike disposition in unambitious-
ess; not, however, that our Saviour intended to
confine himself to that circumstance. He might ad-
vert to the general simplicity and humility, docility
and guilelessness of young children, and such was
this, by Jesus taking him in his arms. The admo-
ition, therefore, is very similar to that of St. Paul,
1 Cor. 14, 20. ἀδελφοί, μη παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν.
Such were the sentiments of that gracious Being, who seems to have had a peculiar affection for children, and who particularly desired that they might be suffered to come unto him, and not be forbidden. John Calvin, however, presumes to teach us a contrary doctrine; telling us, in his Instit. 4, 15, 10. "infants bring along with them their own damnation from their mother's womb; having the seed of sin in their very natures, though not developed. Nay, their whole nature is a sort of seed-bed of sin, and therefore they cannot but be odious and abominable in the sight of God."

5. καὶ ὦ ἐὰν ἐξερευνήσῃ. The connection here is not very obvious. It has been explained by Whitby and Kunoed, but not very successfully. Perhaps it may be thus laid down: And remark, for your encouragement in your Apostolic labours, that my maxim is (and this I shall openly declare), He that receiveth one such guileless creature in my name, i.e. because he is my disciple, receiveth me; and whosoever by the contrary, i.e. by persecution, shall cause him to stumble at and forsake my faith, &c. Or perhaps the word whosoever might be addressed to the bystanders in general; for we are not told that this was addressed to the Apostles privately.

6. καταστολὴ σαφέως, ἵνα κρατήσῃ μῦλος βουκὸς—τῆς θαλάσσης. The sentence is elliptical; rather than that he should commit such a crime, must be supplied. So in the parallel passage, 16, 2, ἀποκριθεὶς—ἵνα σκοπήσῃ ἐνεργείαν ἢπ., &c. The student must observe, that in a large mūλη there were two mill-stones; the upper, which was moveable, and when large turned by asses, called in the Hebrew בֵּין, as riding upon the other, in Greek ἐξορχαται and ὀνομ.; the lower, immovable, called μῦλη. Schles. who here translates lapis molae asinariae. I add, Virg. Æn. 8, 520. Ramus vecto nique molaribus instat. Herodot. 3, 2, 14. τέκτωνεν μῦλον λιθίου. On which see Irmisch.

6. καταστολή. This was not a punishment used
among the Jews, who, it appears from historians and commentators, had but four sorts of capital punishments, burning, stoning, strangling, and beheading. It is a proverbial and hyperbolical expression, which may have derived its origin from their neighbours, the Egyptians or the Syrians, among both of whom it was in use. And there is reason to think that it extended to other parts of the East; for I find it said, in the Travels of F. M. Pinto, that the King of Mattaban, after being subdued and taken a prisoner, had a stone tied round his neck, and was cast into the sea. This mode of punishment was also in use among the Greeks. So Diod. Sic. t. 7, 93, 2. Bip. τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἱερούλους κατεκοντισσε, where Wesseling remarks, that the punishment was frequent, and cites Liv. 1, 51. and adds, "Cæterum inter legitimas sacrilegorum pœnas et κατακοντισσâs censebatur." Phil. Jud. νόμου κεφαλήν, τὸν ἱερούλου κατακεραθείσαν, ἢ κατακοντισσαν, ἢ κατακεραθείσαν. I add, that the observation, as it regards the κατακ. is confirmed by Αelian. V. H. 11, 5. and Diod. Sic. l. 16, § 35. So also in Diod. Sic. t. 7, 93. τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους κατεκοντισσε; so that in t. 7, 82. of the same author, instead of κατεκοντισσων, I conjecture κατεκοντισσων; also, in p. 155, 4. for κατεκοντισθησαν I conjecture κατεκοντισθησαν. In both places the criminals mentioned had been guilty of sacrilege. Also in Pausan. 10, 2, 3. for κατεκοντισθη read κατεκ. from the conjecture of Palmer. A, very similar hyperbole is produced by Elsner from Julian. Orat. 6, p. 198. οὐ βελτιών ἐστιν ὑπὲ τὴν Χάρμβιν, καὶ τὸν Κακυτὸν, καὶ μυρίας ὄργιας κατὰ γῆς δῶναι ἡ πεινὴ εἰς τοὺς τοιούτους βλεν. 6. ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης. This is not a very frequent phrase, but examples are produced by Alberti and Kyph. some of which may be seen in Schl. Lex. In fact, πελάγος in its primitive and proper sense, signifies the deep. But, as it was mostly applied to the sea by the addition of τῆς θαλάσσης, so at length it came to signify the same, without the addition. See Suic. Thes. 1, 661. The meaning of
this hyperbolical phrase is, "the worst punishment (and such was thought this) would be too good for him;" as Origen says on this passage, ἀσ ς ς ς ς ὑπερβαίνει τοῦ χρεαμαθήμα τι μιλοῦ. 7. οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἀπὸ τῶν σκάνδαλων ἄναγκη—ἐρχέται. Κόσμῳ, i.e. hominibus. Ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐστιν ἐλθεὶν τὰ σκάνδαλα. Compare the parallel passage of Luke, 17, 1. where the words ἀνεπικτόν ἐστὶ μὴ ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα must be interpreted, "it cannot but happen that offences (σκάνδαλα), circumstances which obstruct the reception, or occasion the abandonment of the faith, should occur, whether occasioned by persecution, denial of the common offices of humanity, contempt, &c. See on this passage Whitby and Grot.

7. I do not discern the connection of the next two verses, and I suspect, with Kuinoel, that they were not spoken by Christ in this connection, but are introduced from chap. 5. on the occasion of the word σκάνδαλον being mentioned. It is not unusual for Matthew to conjoin speeches which were uttered at different times; though occasionally I suspect that the passages have been introduced from the margin, where they had been written by some malè feriati homines. Certainly here the verses are parenthetical, for the former subject is resumed at verse 10. On the sentiment inculcated in these see note, supra, 5, 29, 38.

10. οὐ δὲ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν—μου. It was an opinion of the Gentiles that some persons had attendant angels. So Dio. Cassus, 37. p. 75. (ap. Bulk.) Plut. Anton. 83. ὁ σος, ἐφι, δαιμόνι τού του του ὑβεῖται. And Horat. Ep. 2, 1, 87. scit Genius—caput. Where see Dacier, and the other interpreters. I believe, however, that they confined them to persons of distinction. Among the Jews, however, it was a general belief (which Christ in his wisdom pleased not to disturb), that every person had his attendant angel, who was considered as his representative, and to whom they seem to have thought that he bore a personal resem-
blance. (As we find from Acts, where Rhoda tells the assembled Disciples that Peter is at the gate, to which they reply, it is his angel.) Some confined them to the good. So Hebr. 1, 14. there are said to be ministering spirits to those who shall be heirs of salvation. By the generality it was thought that all, both good and bad, had their attendant angels. So Theophyl. This notion is retained by the Mahometans.

They had many opinions about the offices of these attendant angels, (which may be seen in Lightf.) of which I need only advert to this, namely, that they thought the angelic representative stood in the same favour with God as did the person himself. This will guide us to the real meaning of our Saviour’s words, which is this: “These my humble and unambitious followers enjoy the perpetual favour and approbation of my Father in Heaven. Therefore despise them not, nor refuse them the offices of humanity. So Euthym. τῶν δοκοῦντων μικρῶν—ἔτι τῶν δὲ μεγάλων τῷ Θεῷ, δὲ ἄρεταν. And so indeed Theophyl. whom see. With the other opinions of the Jews about angels, which were handed down to the Christians, we have nothing to do. I confess I cannot see from these words of Jesus any certain testimony to the reality of this angelic attendance: an opinion liable to many objections, which it would be irrelevant here to introduce.

10. βλέπωσι τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς μου, i. e. enjoy the favour of. There is a reference to the Oriental custom by which monarchs are sequestered from the public view, and none admitted to see them, but such as are in especial favour. Compare Luke 1, 19. 1 Reg. 10, 8. Esth. 1, 14. רֹיאִי נְתוֹנָה רַע.

11. σῶσεῖ τὰ ἄγγελάς. Neuter singular for masculine plural, as is often the case. But here the neuter may have a reference to the neuter noun πρόβατα. The complete phrase occurs in Matth. 10, 6. πρὸς τὰ πρόβατά τα ἄγγελάτα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. And Matth. 15, 24. I am sent to the πρόβατα ἄγγελάτα
οίκου Ἰσραήλ. (Where see note.) And Peter, προ-βατα πλασάμηνα.

12. The connection (which is not very obvious) is perhaps this: "You may figure to yourselves the grief and anger which the Almighty feels at one of his faithful being seduced away, by the joy which he feels at the recovery of one that had gone astray: it is like that of the shepherd, &c.

12. ἀφέως τὰ ἑννε

13. I agree with the ancient versions, and Erasmus, Castilio, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, who connect ἀφέως with ἐν τὰ δρόμη: first, on account of the parallel passage in Luke 15, 4. where I take ἔν τῶ ἐρήμω for in pascuis. That the Desert abounded in pasture is well known. (vide Rosenm. on Matth. 8, 1.) because (as Rosenm. says) "nefas esset deserere non-aginta novem oves, nisi tuta essent in montibus, i.e. in locis pascuosis relictæ." For examples of this sense Kuinoel refers to Fischer on Weller, 3, 2, 141. Perhaps we may compare Luke 17, 35. διὸ ἔσωνται. Αλήθουσας ἔπι τὸ αὐτό. H. Steph. Beza, and others (as Sch. Lex.) connect with τοπευθείς, and (I believe) Wetstein, who cites Max. Tyr. D. 25, 2. and Pausan. 170. But ἀφέως ἐπὶ τὰ δρόμη. I would not render, in locis desertis et montibus, ubi tuta sunt, with Rosenm. but rather take ἐπὶ τὰ δρόμη in the sense of mountain pastures. For the mountains were a frequent pasture for sheep. 2 Chr. 18, 16. I did see all Israel scattered on the mountains, and as sheep. Ezek. 34, 6. My sheep wandered through all the mountains. And 18. Compare Job. 40, 20; and many others. The reason is obvious: for the mountains attract the showers, which nourish the grass. So Psal. 147, 8. Who maketh the grass to grow on the mountains. Indeed not only in the East, but in the
West, mountains are thought favourable to sheep pasture. So Virg. Ecl. 2, 21. Mille mææ Siculis errant in montibus agnas. Theocr. Id. 3, 46. οὐρέις μᾶλα νομέει, and 8, 2. These and other passages may be seen in Wetstein.

15. There seems here no connection with the preceding verse. A new subject is commenced; and Kuinoel thinks that it was delivered at some other time. It is introduced by Luke 17, 3, 4. in another connection. Kuinoel thinks that Matthew in this chapter has, according to his usual custom, joined together varios atque diversos Christi sermones.

15. ἐὰν ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ ἢ ἄδελφός, i. e. if thy brother Christian injure thee. Though, if the spirit of the injunction be observed, it may be extended to all, as being brother men, and being born for each other. In this view see Mark. Ant. 11, 18. Of this phrase, ἀμαρτάνειν εἰς τίνα, Wets. gives many examples from the Classical writers.

15. ἔλεγξον αὐτοῦ. Supply τῆς ἀμαρτίας. The genitive is sometimes expressed. (See Schl. Lex.) Campbell renders “expostulate with him,” which is too free a version. I would translate “endeavour to convince him of his fault, make him sensible of the injury he hath done thee.”

15. μετατέθη σοι καὶ αὐτοῦ μόνων, i. e. ἴδια, as Chrys. explains. So Plat. Apol. Socrat. where Socrates tells Melitus that he ought not to have brought him into court for his supposed criminality, but to have admonished him privately, ἴδια λάβωνα διδάσκειν καὶ νοθετεῖν. Bulk. So Anton. 11, 18. where see Gataker, p. 404.

15. ἐὰν σοι ἄκουσῃ, ἐκέρδησας τὸν ἄδελφόν σου. If he attend to thy representations (Luke ἐὰν μετα-τέθη) thou hast gained him, preserved him as a Christian. So in 1 Cor. 9, 19. Ἰνα τοῖς πλείονας κερδήσω. Compare verses 20, 21, 22. & 1 Pet. 3, 1. Mark. Ant. 5, 28. (cited by Wolf.) εἰ γὰρ ἔπαινει, βεράνεως, which is strikingly similar to this passage, as are many maxims, &c. in Philostr. Porphyr.
Jambl. and more or less in most of the Philosophers who lived after the time when the New Testament came into general use; and which seems to have arisen from a perusal of the New Testament.

15. Unto the 14th verse Christ had admonished those who despised others; from the 15th he begins to teach those who were themselves despised. Wets.

16. ἐπὶ στάματος δύο μαρτύρων. A Hebraism for ἐπὶ μαρτύρων. So Xen. Hist. 6. Lucian de Gym. 11. Reviv. 27. pro lapsu 1. (ap. Wets.) Ἐπὶ στάματος ἐν γυσερμον ac testimonio. Rosenm. In order to bear testimony, not of the offence, (as Hammond and Whitby understand it,) but that thou hast in vain endeavoured to obtain redress by a private representation. I am here supported by the authority of Euthymius, who explains βεβαιώθη by ὅτι σοὶ τὸ σὸν ἑκοίμησα, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐνέλειπες. Vide Intr. ap. Polum. Doddridge adds, “to silence his objections,” which is not quite relevant. Εἰπὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, i.e. the congregation of which you are both members, and of course to him who holds authority in it, and who may procure you redress.

17. ἔστω ὁ σοι ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ ἐθνικὸς καὶ ὁ τελαύνης. Of this passage there are many interpretations in Pole. Mr. Bulkley presents us with the following by a certain Dr. Collop (in his Catholic Medicine for the Disease of Charity): “Cite him before the Gentiles’ tribunal, as thou wouldst a heathen or a publican.” To this I cannot accede. The most probable sense is this: “Account him as a flagitious person, and one whose intercourse is to be avoided, as that of heathens and publicans.” To such persons (observes Rosenm.) the common offices of humanity did not cease to be due (as most of the Jews thought), but only those which respected a nearer intimacy. This admonition, however, is temporary and local, and, as not accommodated to our times, needs not be observed. For this public admonition can have place only in a very small congregation, without the least appearance of civil authority, and governing itself entirely by the precepts of Christ. To the present state of
the Church this Christian discipline is little adapted. Vide Nitch de judicandis morum præceptis in Nov. Test. a communi omnium hominum ac temporum usu alienis, Comment. 8. p. 165. seq.

I add that the enlightened interpreter of the New Testament must carefully distinguish between the letter and the spirit of the Divine injunctions, between counsels, (as they have been called by the acute Montesquieu,) which relate only to the time when the Apostles liyed, and laws, which are of perpetual and universal obligation. On this subject I must refer the student to an excellent essay of Lord Clarendon on the Reverence due to Antiquity, and must content myself with the following extracts; "There is not any one Christian church in the world that at this time doth believe all that the Fathers did believe and teach in their time, even in those things in which they did not contradict each other, nor is it the worse for not so doing: nor is there any one church in the Christian world that at this day doth enjoin and observe all, or the greater part, of what was enjoined and practised in the primitive church. And therefore it is little better than hypocrisy to pretend that submission and resignation to the ancient Fathers, and to the primitive practice, when they very well know that the learning and industry of pious men who have succeeded the Fathers, and the great skill in languages which they have arrived to, together with the assistance they have received from them, have discovered much which was not known to them, and made other interpretation of Scripture than was agreeable to their conceptions: and that the difference of times, the alteration of climates, the nature and humour of nations and people, have introduced many things which were not, and altered other things which were in the practice of the primitive church, and observed in the primitive times. And we have no reason to believe that such introductions or alterations are unacceptable to God Almighty, or
that he ever meant to limit posterity, when his church should be propagated and spread over the face of the earth, to observe all that was at first practised, when all the Christians of the world might have been contained in two or three great cities. This liberty God permitted to his own church of the Jews; which, notwithstanding his so particular prescription of whatsoever he thought fit for his worship, introduced many things, and left out other things, which they had been accustomed to. Many as material alterations have been, as warrantably, introduced by succession of time and difference of climates, and natures of people, both before and since, into the Church of God.

18. δόεις δὲ μητέρειοι—υπέρανω. This passage agrees almost verbatim with that C. 16, 19. which I have so copiously illustrated, where I have proved that the sense of δύειν and λέειν is to prohibit and forbid, or to permit and direct. Here, however, the general sense may be somewhat restrained by the circumstances of the present case. The sense of the passage may therefore be thus expressed: Whatever you shall determine and appoint respecting such an offender, whether as to his removal from the Christian society, if obdurate and incorrigible, or his re-admission into it on repentance, I will ratify. I must not omit to subjoin the following paraphrase of Wetstein. "If any one shall set at nought the sentence so pronounced by you respecting him, he will do it to his own utter condemnation. For if he refuses to be reconciled to you, he will be guilty before God. On the contrary, if he appease you by a reconciliation, he shall obtain pardon of the offence committed against you from God also."

19. τοι τούτος πρόφαρε, de quacunque re. The Hebr. use 75. The signification of the word τούτος must be restricted to the circumstances of the case. The sense is, any thing concerning religion, its propagation, and the salvation of their souls. Rosenm. and Kuinoel.
19. γενήσεται αὐτοῖς. They shall obtain it. This is not only a Hebraism but a Grecism, as has been proved by Raphel, Alberti, Elsner, and Kypke. Wetstein thus paraphrases it: Such will be the efficacy of the prayers of him who received the injury for him who had done the injury. I add, Polyæn. 745. It is also a Latinism.


20. εἰς μέσῳ αὐτῶν, i. e. μετ’ αὐτῶν, affording my assistance. So the Latin adesse alicui. Rosenm.


23. διὰ τοῦτο. This is an ellipsis: supply λέγω ὅμως ἐστὶ. Rosenm. Or, as Kuinoel thinks, a formula transitionis.

23. οἰκονόμησις ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οἰκειότερον ἀνθρώπων βασιλεία, i. e. the economy of the Divine government may be compared to that of a certain King, &c. Ἀνθρώπω is not emphatic, but merely for τοῖς, as the Hebrews use פִּטִנ. Compare 20, 1.

23. Ἰβέληος συνάπτα τὸν λόγον, rationes conferre. A Roman forensic term. So ver. 24. and 25, 19. It here signifies simply to bring together accounts, close accounts with, settle accounts with: for which the Sept. in Levit. 25, 50. has συναπήγγειλαν.

23. μετὰ τῶν δολῶν. With his ministers, says Grolius; his treasurers, says Kuinoel. I should rather think collectors of the revenues, or governors of provinces, who would have to pay a certain annual sum for their government, as is customary in Turkey and in the East. Hence the immense sum said to be due, which we may suppose would be in arrears, since in the East sometimes governors of provinces are often deeply in arrears, and do not pay
until compelled by an armed force. Wetstein produces similar passages from Galen, in which occurs the expressions ἀξιωθόναι and ἀπαίτεῖν λογίσμοις.

24. προσφέρεις. The Vulgate and Beza render oblatus est; Kuinoel accedebat. I prefer adductus est, brought up, as we say. It is sometimes used in a good sense; as τότε προσφέρεις αὐτῷ παιδία, but here it is used of those who are brought up as male-factors or debtors. Compare Luke 12, 11. οὖν προσφέρεσιν ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰς ἄρχας. And, 23, 14. προσήγκατε μοι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὧς ἀποστρέφοντα τὸν ὕλον.

25. μὴ ἔχωντος αὐτῶι ἀξιωθόναι — not being able to pay. There is an ellipsis of τὸ ὀφειλόμενον. Kuinoel produces examples, which are, however, not quite apposite. The following passage from Polyæn. 7, 6, 8. will be found more so: πιεῖν ὕδαρ οὐκ ἔχωντες, not having water to drink.

25. ἔκλεψεν αὐτῶι—πραβήμαι κ. τ. γ. According to the Hebrew laws free men, when insolvent, became the servants of their creditors, who came into possession of their property. Vide Amos, 8, 6. 2 Reg. 4, 1. which state, however, only continued six years.

26. πεσὼν—προσεκύνει αὐτῶι—prostrated himself at his feet.

26. μακροθυμησὼν ἐπ' ἐμοί. Engl. Vers. "have patience with me," i.e. wait a little longer for me. There is the same syntax in Sirach 32, 22. & 35, 18. and Luke 18, 7. That μακροθυμεῖν may signify defer is plain from a passage of Artemid. 4, 12. ap. St. Thes. κακροθυμεῖν κελεύει καλ. μὴ κενοποιοῦσθείν. The Latin phrase is indulge mihi. All these, and such like phrases, are frequent in the mouths of debtors, who, when urged, promise more than they can perform.

27. τὸ δάνειον ἀφῆκεν, Thus granting more than he asked. Rosenm.

28. καλ κρατήσας αὐτῶι ἔπημυγε. He seized him by the throat, or the collar; an action often attributed by the ancients to severe creditors. See Wets. and Hemsch. in Luke 1, 423. and Elsn. in loc. Doddridge presses the signification too far, when he ren-
dens "laying hold of him by the throat, and almost strangling him." It often meant no more than urgere, extorquere.

28. ἀτόνος μὲν ὁ χωρίς ἱφθαίρεσις. Plut. de Vit. Ær. Al. has well said ὁδὲν ἐστὶ τὸ τοῦτον ἀδικέω, ὡδὲ δισερμέντερεν σω ἀκοῦσαι ἀτόνος. This confirms the omission of μὲν in many MSS. and versions. The common reading οὖ ὁ is almost destitute of authority, and is perhaps a gloss of εἰ τι.

29. τοὺς—εἰς τοὺς τινάς αὐτῶν. The words εἰς τοὺς τινάς αὐτῶν are indeed omitted in many MSS. and are expunged by Griesbach, which I can scarcely approve, since they may have been omitted propter ὅπερ τέλεσαν. Vater has done better, by inserting them between brackets.

31. διασάρκως, gave an exact account of. The διὰ is intensive, having the sense of throughout. The word occurs in the Sept. Polybius, Arrian, Diod. Siculus, and Xenophon. Hesych. διασαρκεῖ διασαρκωμένη. See also Alberti, Munthe, and Palairet.

34. παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν τοῖς βέβαιοισθαί. The sense seems to be jailors (δεσμοφυλάκαι), not tormentors; for though the word had originally that sense, yet when applied to those who kept debtors confined, it can only mean jailors. Nor does it, indeed, appear that creditors had the power of using torture towards their debtors. The word βέβαιος sometimes signifies carcer; for Grutius has well observed that carcer is styled cruciatum corporis by the Jurisconsulta. I know not what authority Campbell has for asserting that the jailors were commanded to treat the wretches under their custody with every kind of cruelty, in order to extort payment from them, in case they had concealed any of their effects; or, if they had nothing, to wrest the sum owed from the compassion of their relations and friends, who, to release an unhappy person, for whom they had a regard, from such extreme misery, might be induced to pay the debt; for let it be observed, that the person of the insolvent debtor was absolutely in the power of the
creditor, and at his disposal." I answer, no further than to confine his person, though indeed incarceration is of itself a torture of the mind. Vater observes, that custodes carceris idemque, esse necesse tormentores. Perhaps debtors and malefactors were confined together.

35. εἰς μη ἀφήτε. So James 6, 16. Here is the full ἀνατροπής, or comparison.

37. ἀπὸ τῶν καρδιῶν. ὑμῶν, from your hearts, integro animo. So ἀπὸ ψυχῆς in Theophr. Ch. Eth. 17. 

CHAP. XIX.

VERSE 1. cis τὰ ὅρια, territory, of which see note supra.

8. κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν, for any cause whatsoever, even the slightest. So Aristid, μηδὲ ἐκ πάσης τρόπου συμβίωσιν πλέον ἔχειν. Eurip. Phæn. 525. On this question the schools of Hillel and Shammah were divided in opinion, interpreting the scriptural words in Deut. very differently. The former thought a man would be justified in so doing. Of this opinion was Joseph, Ant. 4, 8, 92. γυναῖκας—βουλόμενος διαβεγκαθήμεν καθ' ἕως ἄρτι ἄρτι αἰτίας κ. τ. λ. (quascunque ob causas) ἰττυριζέθηκε. And on this doctrine he himself acted in his own case, putting away his wife because she was (as he tells us) μη ἄρεσκομενες αὐτής τοῖς ἔθεσι, unamiable and disagreeable in her manners. See Krebs on Matth. The latter, adhering more to the letter of the Scriptures, maintained that he ought not, except for some manifest turpitude, as adultery, &c. The question was, however, yet a controverted one. And therefore the Pharisees (though with a malignant intention) bring it to Christ for his determination.

4. ἀ ποιήσας. Supply ἀδραπατημόν from the preceding ἀδραπατημόν, or from the passage in Genesis.

Rosenmuller, however, takes ἀ ποιήσας as a particle instead of a noun, Ἐνδιέακ. Rosenmuller and Kul-
noel regard as redundant, Hebraic: but they are mistaken. has a reference to the collective noun , which is supposed to precede (as in Gen. precedes, and follows. The construction is, (kai) (γένος). is supplied in Ap. Rhod. 1, 824. Had Dr. Campbell seen this, he would have spared his verbose and erroneous annotation, and forborne to censure our common version. He asks, what argument can be drawn from the circumstance of God's creating them male and female, to show that marriage was indissoluble. I answer, that it may seem indeed as an argument against polygamy rather than divorce. But the words do not refer to the preceding ones. Examine Genes. 2, 24. where they refer to the words, "she is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man." From which Adam (or rather Moses) infers, that the mutual attachment of the married couple should be complete. Christ manifestly regarded these words as Moses's, who doubtless inserted them in order to check the custom of divorces, to which the Israelites were so prone. The argument (which, though not logical, is yet popularis) is that which Jesus himself states, namely, What God hath joined together, let not man separate. Bradford, in his Fifth Sermon at Boyle's Lectures, thus puts the argument: "God at the first made one man, and one woman, and he himself joined them together in so strict an union, as to declare them thenceforward to be but one. Why did he make no more wives for Adam than one, but that he intended it as a pattern to all posterity? And why did he so expressly declare the strict union of these two, but in order to the preventing either the taking in a third, or the causeless separation of these?" But the force of the argument is not intended to rest on these words, but in the words and The phraseology is Hebrew, in which language unimport-
ant circumstances are sometimes expressed in separate members, as well as important ones. But in Greek, Latin, and the Western languages, unimportant circumstances are brought in as participles. A Western writer would have thus expressed it: God, who from the first made them male and female, hence commanded them to be attached to each other, and though two in number, to be one flesh or body.

5. προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ. The word προσκολληθήσεται (which occurs also in Mark 10, 7. Eph. 5, 31. and often in the Sept.) denotes close and intimate connection, whether of wedlock or otherwise. In the Classical writers it usually denotes illicit venereal connection, as in Plat. 839. e. (apud Wets.) τοὺς δὲ προσκολλάσθαι, διακοντα κατὰ τὰς ξυνοσίας, I add Liban. Ἀθ. 355. θ. τάσιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός ἐφαρμαί ἐπιτατισμὸς ὁ δὲ χύλος τοῖς κακοδαίμοσι πρὸς ἔσωσεν τῇ δεῖν προσκολλήση; (for I take it interrogatively) μακάριον. 1 Cor. 6, 16. ὁ καλλωπένος τῇ πορνῇ. So the Latin agglutinare. Plautus Menechm. 2, 2, 6, 8. (cited by Wets.) says of the meretricibus, "se applicant, agglutinant." It is sometimes, however, used in a good sense, as applied to the tender attachment of wives towards their husbands. So in Athen. 6, 17. λ. δὲ ἦν ὁ ἱερέας ἔλεγε τὴν κολακεῖαν ἔχειν τὴν ἐκπολυμένην ἀπὸ τοῦ προσκολλάσθαι τοῖς ὁμύλοις.

5. εἰς σάρκα μίαν. Just. 2, 6. Ante Deucalionis tempora regem habuere Cecropem, quem, ut omnis antiquitas fabulosa est, bisforcem tradidere, quia primus marem femine matrimonio junxit. So also Eustath. in II. σ. p. 1213. applies the same observation to Charax. Wets.; who observes: "The very notion of matrimony includes a perpetual society and the closest friendship. For if he who marries a wife leaves the father and mother with whom he had hitherto lived, he ought to do it, not through levity or lustful impetuosity, but after mature consideration, so that he may change a former good for one greater and more durable. If the bond of matrimony be closer than all others, it ought surely not to be tem-
perary. The education, too, of children, requires an undivided society. *Eis σάρκα μίαν* is an Hebraism for σάρκες μίκρα, and σάρκες means homo, person ἡμών. Grotius aptly compares the Platonic maxims, ἡ σῶμα σῶμα εἰς τὸ καθόδε ἄρεστα, ἓνα νόμον, ἓνα γεγονότο, and the old proverb, which says of friends, that they are μιᾶς ζωῆς. So also Tacit. de Morib. Germ. says of the German wives, "sic unum accipiant maritum quemodò unum corpus unamique vitam."

6. *συνέζευξεν, consociavit.* It is a *vov solemninis de bar re,* used by the best Classical writers. See Kypk. and Wess. Those are mistaken who refer this to the causes and occasions of contracting marriage; for that is not the subject, which is the nature of matrimony. This God, the author of it, intended to be the closest bond of friendship. If therefore every other friendship are not torn asunder, καὶ πᾶσαν αὐταν, without incurring great censure, how much less that which is kept together by the bond of so many pledges, on which depends both the honourable procreation and education of the noblest being, created after the image of God. (Grotius.)

6. *μὴ χαριστεῖα.* Which he does, who either thrusts out an innocent wife, or even refuses to bear what may well be tolerated. (Rosenm.)

7. *τί σών Μωϋσῆς—κατηρυ.* for διὰ τι. An objection is here proposed: "If the bond of matrimony is perpetual, why did Moses permit divorce, and why did he forbid her that was divorced to be married again? (Wets.) But every thing permitted by the law of the land is not just and equitable, as Christ shows. (Rosenm.)

7. *βιβλιακὸς ἐξοντασίων.* On this Koecher refers us to the Mishnah, to Calmet, Spencer, Buxtorf, Carpozou, &c.

8. *Μωϋσῆς, πρὸς τὴν σκηνοκυκλών δραίον, ἐκκένθησεν,* i.e. Moses, not God; so that it is a *consilium hominis,* not *imperium Dei,* says St. Jerome (ap. Rosenm). Moses is named as the promulgator, not of a common, primaeval and perpetual law, but of one only
Jewish, given in reference to the times. (Grot.) See also Whitby, who has ably treated the subject of divorce, both morally and theologically.

8. τρες την σκληροκαρδίαν. Some explain contumaciaem, unyielding spirit. So Mark 16, 14, and in the Sept. So ἑκατ’ετος and ἐκληροτάρκηνος. Others interpret inhumanitatem, which seems indeed more suitable. And so σκληρος in Matth. 25, 14, signifies severe, rigid, unforgiving, inhuman. See Eustath. ap. Wets. Euthymius has well remarked, that here our Saviour turns their cause against themselves, as on many other occasions. Kuinoel has this observation (from Theophyl.) on the whole passage: "Moses, that he might check the licentious levity of the Israelites in dissolving the matrimonial bond: and lest divorce should take place on sudden pique, or slight causes, had ordered, that a writing of divorce should be requisite to be given for repudiating the wife; which, since few knew how to draw up such a paper, was to be written by a scribe or notary, by whose exhortations mutual concord might be restored. The sum of Christ’s words is this: Moses wisely restrained by civil regulations your licentiousness, and permitted divorce only under certain conditions, and that because of your brutality, lest you should perpetrate something worse, namely, make away with them by sword or poison." On the seventh and eighth verse Whitby has admirably treated. The law of Moses (observes Rosenmuller) was written non optime rei-publicae, sed tanquam fueti Israel.

8. ἀρχής ὁ γένους ὦ Ἰσραήλ. Schleusner explains a. a. all the time that had elapsed from the creation of the world to the time of Moses. It may be rendered antiquituk, of old: as in Herod. 2, 104. Ἀρχιτοι περιταμόνοι ἄρχας, and 2, 113. ὁ νόμος οὗ τοῖς διατελεῖν ἠκο ὁμοια μεχρι ἐμοί τω ἄρχας. Aristoph. Ran. 1081. ἀρχής—οὐς αἰθέρας ὑγείνωσι. Also in Thucyd. 6, 21. Συρακοσιοὶ δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ βαρβάρους τικών ἄρχας ἐσφέρεται. Several of the best MSS.
read ἀφαργής φέρεται, which is, not without reason, approved by some critics.

9. εἰ μὴ ἐξεῖλημεῖ. Whitby, contrary to all other commentators, will have it to mean fornication committed before marriage, and discovered after cohabitation. But his reasonings are rather precarious.

9. δε τοῦ ἀφαργητοῦ. A restriction necessary in that age, when divorces were grown so common, as appears from numerous authorities. Hence in Eurip. Menalipp. frag. 9, 6. οἱ γὰρ διαλύεσθαι τῷ ραδίοις, I conjecture ei ραδίοι.

10. εἰ δυνατὸς ἐστὶν η ὁ αἷρα τοῦ ἀφαργητοῦ, si talis est condition viri cum uxore. (In the Ἀθ. lex.) I think with Camer, that this is a Latinism, and, like many other phrases in the New Testament, derived e foro Romanorum, in which causa often denoted condition and state. Many authorities may be seen in Brissen de Verb. Sign. 3, 102. In vain do Schwartz and Olearius de Stilo. 376, 3. deny it by producing Greek examples; for they are derived from later Greek authors, who wrote when Latinisms were plentifully introduced (ex. gr. Philostratus). Campbell need not have altered our common version; for case (which seems derived from causa) well expresses the sense.

11. οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον τούτων. Χωρεῖν means properly to hold, contain (of liquors) capax sum: as in Mark 2, 2. Jo. 2, 6. 21, 5. Sept. and the Classical writers. Here it signifies capax sum in a metaphorical sense, to admit, to be sufficient to bear (or, as some say, percipere, intelligere), be capable of, able to carry this maxim into practice. Λόγον is, however, interpreted rem by Grotius (from the Syriac and Origen), Palairet, Rosenmuller, Kuinoel, and Schleusner in v. § 25. res de quo agitur; whose examples see. Many Classical examples are produced by Els: Kypk. Grotius, and Wetstein. This was a hint meant for the Pharisees, q. d. You, for instance, cannot, &c.
11. ἀλλ' οὖς δεδοταί, scil. ἐκ Θεοῦ, as in 1 Cor. 7, 7. Yet not without the co-operation of human exertion, as appears from the following words. So Clem. Rom. Tertull. Clem. Alex. On this subject Greg. Naz. has the following eloquent and judicious observation: οἱ μὲν ἐκ φύσεως νεώσουσι πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθόν. Φύσεως δὲ ὅταν εἴπα, οὐκ ἀτιμάζω τὴν προαιρεσίν, ἀλλ' ἀμφότερα τίθημι, τὴν γε πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ἐπιτυχεῖται, καὶ τὴν εἰς ἔργον ἀγωσαν τὸ ἐκ φύσεως ἐπιτιθέειν, οὐ δὲ ὑπὸ διδασκάλων ἐκτείνεσθαι τὰ πάθη. οἱ δὲ, δὴ ἐαυτοῖ πέπεμψαν ταῦτα, διδασκάλων μὲν οὐκ ἐπιτυχεῖται. ἐαυτοῦ δὲ διδάσκαντες τὰ προστάκτα, καὶ τὴν τε ῥίζαν τῆς κακίας ἐκτείνεται, καὶ τὰ ὀργάνα τῆς πονηρίας ἐξορίζεται.

12. εἰσὶ εὕνοοι, οἰτίνες—εὐνοούσιοθεν. This is an hyperbolical phrase for voluntarily abstaining from venery (similar to that of ἐκκοστεῖν τὴν δεξίαν, &c. Matt. 5, 29, 30.) (Kuin.) These were called eunuchi mystici. Vide Sic. Thess. 1, 1255. seq. So also Max. Tyr. D. 84. ἀφελε τὴν αἰδοίαν ἐπιθυμίαν, καὶ διέκοψα τὸ θήριον. Euthymius has the following beautiful passage, derived; as I suspect, from Chrysostom: ἐπαίνεται ὁτίνες εὐνοούσιοθεν ἐαυτοῦ, ἂν τύχησι τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, οὐ ἔριθος σιδήρου τὰ παιδωγάνα μόρια ἐκτείνεται, ἀλλὰ ἔριος σαφρόσυνης τῶν ὀστρον τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἀσκοῦμαντες, καὶ ἐρωτὶ παρθενίας τὸν ἐρωτα τῆς συννοοίας καταμαράντες.

12. ο ὅμιλος ὑπρείν ὑπερεῖτο, let him that is capable of performing this, let him perform it. God (says Theophyl.) does not compel any one παρθενεῖν: he does not abrogate marriage; he only prefers virginity. This somewhat savours of monkish superstition. Euthymius, with rather more judgment, explains it thus: "God, knowing that the thing is arduous, and to be attained by few, leaves it to the voluntary choice of men." I know not whether there may not be as much of permission, as of command, in this verb, as is the case in many imperatives. Be this, however, as it may, our Lord doubtless had reference chiefly to the Apostles and Disciples, and adverted
to the peculiar circumstances under which the primitive Christians were placed.

13. ἦν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ αὐτῶς. It was a persuasion with the Hebrews that the prayers of men eminent for their piety and holiness, and particularly prophets, were especially available, and never missed their fulfilment, and that happy and blessed were those whom they had thus recommended to God. (Gen. 48, 14. Numb. 22, 6. Luke 2, 28.) Hence these young children were brought to Jesus, that he might put his hands upon them, and pray to God in their behalf for certain benefits: for it was a custom with the Hebrews, that he who prayed for any benefits whatever for another, should lay his hands on his head. (Gen. 18, 14. Matth. 9, 18. Mark. Act. 6, 6. 8, 17.) The Apostles, desiring to converse longer with Jesus on the subject of matrimony, and to propose curious questions, did not relish what they thought an unseasonable interruption, and endeavoured to keep off those who brought the children; for to these belongs the αὐτῶς, as appears even from Mark 10, 13. where we have τοῖς προσφέροντι, which here lies hid in the verb προσηνέχθη. (Ros. & Kuin.)

13. ἐπετίμησαν αὐτῶς, scil. προσφέροντι, which Mark supplies. Various reasons are assigned by the Commentators why they did so. The most probable are these: first, that of Lightfoot, Brug. and Lock. they were afraid lest their master, who was in so great a crowd, should be too much harassed; secondly, that of Wetstein (copied by Rosenm. and Kuin.) that they wanted to put some curious questions to their Master on the subject of matrimony, and therefore ill brooked this interruption. Either or both these reasons may have influenced them.

14. τοιοῦτον ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν,—of these, and such like, i.e. not only children in age, but children in disposition. (So the ancient Fathers, Maldonati, Brug. and, as it seems, Grotius.) Compare Mark 10, 15. Luke 18, 17. Dr. Doddridge acknowledges that these words will not of them-
selves prove infant baptism to be an institution of Christ; but if that appears from other Scriptures to be the case (which he thinks most probable), there will be proportional reason to believe that our Lord might here intend some reference to it. On that subject the student will do well to consult the long and excellent annotations of Grotius and Whitleby, and especially the tract of Dr. Wall.

16. εἰς πρωτεύθων—a young and rich man (ver. 22.) ἀρχαίν, synedrii assessor. (Luke 18, 18.) He was not, says Euthymius; ἄντολος: (as some think) he was in other respects good, and desirous of eternal life; but τῆς φιλαξιωρίας ἡ ἀκανθα τῆν λιπαρὰν ἄφωραν τῆς φυχῆς αὐτοῦ διελομήσατο. He hastened with juvenile ardour, and paying reverential homage, γονοτητας (Mark), not in a captious spirit, but with a wish to gain information, said, &c.

16. τί άγαθων παρήσαν; The Pharisees (as was remarked on ver. 5, 20.) divided the precepts of the Law into the weighty and the slight; and thought that many of them might be neglected and violated, so that by that neglect no blame was incurred worthy of punishment. Those Laws, however, which respected external rites they almost solely referred to the number of the weighty. Hence this youth, aware of these Pharisaical decisions, and desiring more certain information what kind of virtues was especially to be cultivated, and expecting (it seems) that he should receive from Jesus some unknown, and weightier, precepts of virtue, interrogates him τί άγαθων παρήσαν; what must I do that will be pre-eminently promotive of salvation and happiness? Kuinoel.

16. ἐχει γενητι αἰώνων; This doctrine, (only obscurely known to the Jews,) he had doubtless heard very plainly preached by Christ. Grotius.

17. τί με λέγεις άγαθων; Jesus by his answer shows that he is not delighted, like the Pharisees, with vain and timid titles. (Kuin.) q. d. Why ply me with the vain appellation of your doctors?
17. οὐδὲς ἁγαθὸς, εἰ μὴ εἶς, ὁ Θεός. This sentence is well illustrated by Grotius, who dilates on God's being the fountain of good, &c. Hence we may see the true force of the expressive term employed, with slight variations, by the Northern nations to denote the Supreme Being, the Deus Optimus Maximus, GOD. One may compare a similar passage of Phocyl. Frag. 13, 47. Edit. Gaisf. Μὴ γαρ ὑμοὶ σοφίς μὴ ἄλκη, μὴ ἐν πλωτῷ, Eis, Θεός, ἐστὶ σοφός, δυνάτος θ' αμα, καὶ πολυλθος. Such I conceive to be the true punctuation of that sentence.

17. εἰ δὲ θέλεις εἰσέλθειν — ἐντολάς, i. e. of God. Christ, indeed, has more exactly expounded the doctrine of morals (Matth. 5, 20. seqq.) but he neither abrogated the eternal law of right and good contained in the Books of Moses and the Prophets (Matth. 5, 17.) nor did he add any precepts. Rosenmuller; who refers to Michaelis in h. l.

17. εἰ δὲ θέλεις εἰσέλθειν εἰς τὴν ᾿Ωμήν. Jesus did not, after the manner of the Pharisees, recommend ritual precepts; nor yet did he prescribe any new rules to the interrogrator; but he now confirmed what he had already before affirmed, namely, that he came for the purpose of imparting a greater authority to the usual precepts. (Matth. 5, 17.) And, for the purpose of example, quoted those precepts of the Decalogue which regarded the duties men mutually owe to one another. Euthymius says, it may be asked whether the observance of the precepts of the Law possess an efficacy to introduce any one to eternal life? To this he answers, "it does;" but not such a life as the Gospel promises; for by eternal life (says he) we are to understand eternal felicity in heaven, which is various and diversified; for it is written, "In my Father's house are many mansions."

20. τι ἢτι υπερα; It must be observed that ὑπερεῖν properly signifies to be too late, in its derived sense, to be wanting. The accusative is governed of κατὰ. There are seven sorts of Pharisees (says a Rabbinical writer, in Wets.): "There is a Pharisee
who says, what ought I to do, and I will do it. This is good. But there is another Pharisee who says, what ought I to do besides, and I will do it.”

21. εἰ δήλως τέλειος εἶναι. Grotius says that τέλειος signifies a true Christian (as he had proved on Ch. 5, 48.) The word is used comparatively. The τέλειοι are so called in respect to the less advanced. For, says Euthymius, those that perform the legal precepts are imperfect, since the precepts themselves were imperfect, because of the weakness of the Jews. Aristot. in his Metaph. says a thing is perfect to which nothing is wanting of that perfection which is proper to it. Τέλειος is here used not only in the moral sense by which God is said to be perfect, but in that comparative sense, by which a thing is perfect, so far as the constitution of it permits. It therefore denotes a consummate Christian. So Rom. 12, 2. Phil. 3, 13. Col. 1, 28. & 4, 12. Jac. 3, 2. Wetstein compares a not dissimilar passage of Jos. Ant 13, 10, 5. λέγει—ἐπεὶ φόροι, ἡμέρας γνώναι τὴν ἀλήθειαν, εἰ δήλως εἶναι δίκαιος, τὴν ἀρχὴν-σύνην ἀπόθεν. An equally trying requisition.

21. παύλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα. It was a custom, says Origen (cited by Wets.) with the Pythagoreans, for any one who would be a disciple of Pythagoras to sell his property, and deposit the money, sealed up, with their master.

21. ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν ὠρανῷ—præmium, retributionem. (Mensch.) Sirach. 29, 11. ἔξεις τὸν θησαυρὸν σου καὶ ἐντολὰς ὑψίστου, καὶ λυσιτελήσει σοι μᾶλλον ἂ τὸ χρυσίον. Euthymius observes, that Jesus says this as soothing his avarice, promising that he should again be rich, and what is better, rich in heaven.

22. ἤν γὰρ ἔχων. Some say this is an Hebraism. Others produce a similar construction from the Classical writers. None exactly see the peculiar sense, which is, “for he chanced to have.” At least this is, I believe, its sense in Hellenistic Greek. Not so in the Classics, where it is a mere circumlocation. See Matth. Gr. Gram. 559, 9. The Classi-
cal writers use τυγχάνω to express that sense. The examples given by Schmid and Palairet are little to the purpose. The Greeks sometimes endeavoured to express imperfect action more accurately, by using a participle and the verb substantive, εἰμι, and sometimes τυγχάνω, as we do in English, I was loving; and sometimes they did so in the present. But this is not the case in this passage of Matthew.

23. ἐισελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν κόσμων — will enter into my company, embrace my heavenly religion. Of this formula see examples in Schl. Lex. Riches are an excitement to evil, or at least an impediment to good. The reason is, because those who are rich, trust in their riches, and as it were, place their summam boni in them (as we see in Mark 10, 24). The difficulty was in those times increased by the dangers to which all who professed the name of Christ were exposed, namely, that of being excommunicated, and deprived of their property. Jo. 9, 22, 3, 4. 12, 42. Rosenm.

24. εἰσαχώτερον ἐστι κάμηλον δ. τ. β. δ. Theophylact, with many ancient and some modern Commentators (as Bochart and Castellio), read κάμηλον, or at least interpret κάμηλον, a cable, as does Whitby. But Euthymius, and some ancient versions, with Grotius, Erasmus, Drusius, Lightfoot, Michaelis, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, are of opinion that the κάμηλον is to be retained. I am surprised that the Critics should prefer εἰσαχώτερον. Campbell has well defended the common reading. The Rabbinical citations adduced by Lightfoot, Schoetgen, and others, prove that there was a similar proverb in use among the Jews. And the very proverb itself is found in the Koran. Dr. Maltby, in a very able Sermon on this text, thus paraphrases the words: "So contrary is the real notion of my Kingdom to the expectations formed of it, so distinct from every notion of worldly power, or even comfort, that the rich will not surrender up their pomp and pleasure, will not bid adieu to their gratifications, renounce the prejudices of superstition and habits of vice, to be-
come members of a sect every where spoken against; as unlikely as for a camel to go through the eye of a needle." Dr. Maltby maintains that the expressions of the text apply only to the circumstances of the Gospel then, and that no conclusion can be drawn from them unfavourable to any order of men in the present day. I think, however that Jesus did not intend to confine the position solely to the circumstances of those times, but meant it as a gnome generalis, to be applied mutatis mutandis in every age. (As that of Matth. 13, 22. and elsewhere: "The cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful.") And I, thus much, differ from Dr. Maltby as to think, that the narration and the solemn asseveration, which it called forth from our Redeemer, is so far unfavourable to the rich as to hint to them their danger, in order that they may exert themselves to surmount the peculiar temptations which assault them; and learn not to trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God. By the parallel passage in Mark it appears, that Jesus meant by rich, one who trusts in his riches. On the dangers of riches see Intt. ap. Pol. Grotius aptly cites Plato: ἄγαθόν ἐντα διαφέρουσας καὶ πλούσιον εἶναι διαφέρουσας, ἀδύνατον. Celsus said, that this of our Lord was the same sentiment spoiled. See also Denophilus and Aristot. (ap. Bulk.) Euthymius well remarks, "If the rich man shall with difficulty enter, the extortioner shall not enter at all. For if he who gives not what is his own is condemned, how much more he who seizes what is not his own." It is excellently observed by Dr. Campbell, "When it was only by means of persuasion that men were brought into a society hated and persecuted by all the ruling powers of the earth, Jewish and Pagan, we may rest assured, that the opulent and the voluptuous (characters which, in a dissolute age, commonly go together), who had so much to lose, and so much to fear, would not, among the hearers of the Gospel, be the most easily persuaded. The Apostle James, 2, 5, 6. accordingly attests this
to have been the fact: it was the poor in this world whom God had chosen rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom; whereas, they were the rich in this world who oppressed them, dragged them before their tribunals, and blasphemed that worthy name by which they were called. As little can there be any doubt of the justness of the sentiment, in relation to the state of the blessed hereafter, when the deceitfulness of riches, and the snare into which it so often inveigles man, are duly considered. So close an analogy runs through all the divine dispensations, that, in more instances than this, it may be affirmed, with truth, that the declarations of Scripture are susceptible of either interpretation."

25. ἐξεπλήσσεντο—λέγοντες. Τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι. Euthymius, and (perhaps from him) Markl. are the only Commentators who have perceived, that after τίς there is an ellipsis of τῶν πλουσίων. The former has the following judicious exposition: ἐθαυμαζότα. Πλὴν οὐχ ὑπὲρ ἐαυτῶν' πέντες γάρ ἢ σαν ἄλλο ὑπὲρ τῶν πλουσίων· ἥξαντο γὰρ σπλάγχνα διδασκάλων ἀναλαβείν, καὶ ὑπεραλλείπειν τῆς ἀπαλλαγῆς τῶν ἀθρότων, λέγοντες, τίς ἄρα τῶν πλουσίων δύναται σωθῆναι; and the latter observes, that there is a treatise of Clem. Alex. on the subject τίς ὁ πλοῦσιος σωζόμενος. The compassion, however, of the Apostles, was, we may suppose, exerted not only for the rich, but for those who might set their heart on attainment of riches, to the neglect, if not peril, of their souls.

26. ἐμβλέψας—ἔστεν αὐτοῖς. I cannot agree with the learned Comm. in Pol. Syn. respecting this word. Hammond is most grievously mistaken. The word must not be too much pressed, being used pleonastically, though it has a peculiar elegance and pathos. So I take Mark 10, 21 & 27. Luke 20, 17. Jo, 1, 36. and Xenoph. Cyr. 1, 3, 2. ἐμβλέψαν αὐτῶ ἐλέγειν. In the same manner we have observed that ἐπιστρέφω is used as καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἐλεῖν. So in Act. 16, 18. ἐπιστρέφας ἐλεῖν. This confirms the reading of the Venetian Manuscript ap. Appian. T. 492, 27. ἐπιστρέφας
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εἶπεν, received, though with hesitation, by Schweigh.

26. παρὰ ἀνθρώπως τοῦτο ἀδύνατόν ἐστι, παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ πάντα δύνατά ἐστι. Non est humane opis tam tenacia vincula abrumpeper. (Grot.) Viribus solis humanis. (Brug.) Grotius and Wetstein have produced some similar sentences. The whole passage is somewhat hyperbolical. How hard it is, says Christ, for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven; hard, but not impossible. Reason, without the Gospel, can persuade few to renounce their riches, but the promises of God in the Gospel have persuaded many. ἀδύνατον is difficult (as δύσκολον, ver. 23.—in the same sense Plato, ἄγαθον εἶναι διαφερόντας, καὶ πλοῦσιον εἶναι διαφερόντας ἀδύνατον. Grot.), and δύνατον is easy, rather than possible, and impossible. (Le Clerc. ap. Elsley.)

27. ημεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα. Rosenm. thus observes (from Grotius): “The two things which Christ had required of the youth, Peter here says have been rendered by himself and his companions, truly, but, as many think, a little boastingly. The third he does not add, (that of selling his goods, and giving to the poor,) because Christ had not required this of them, nor was it suitable to their poverty. With this confidence Peter asks, what shall be their future reward? Christ might have silenced him by saying, what you have done, you did for yourselves, not for me. But with his usual goodness, he cherishes their hopes, and says, that their endurance of loss shall not fail to attain a peculiar and honourable reward. (Kuin.) So Grotius: “Jesus does not estimate their virtue from the quantity or measure of the things relinquished, but from the mind and intention with which they had relinquished them.” Euthymius has well observed, that they, by giving up all that they had to give, evinced that their wish and intention was complete. That all (says Dr. Maltby) was certainly little, but they yielded it cheerfully, and from fulness of conviction.

27. τί ἄρα ἐσται ημῶν; what shall be our reward?
will it be that promised to the youth? (Grot. & Brug.) This phrase is illustrated from the Classical writers by Wets. and Kypke.

28. ομείς—ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ—Ἰσραήλ. There is scarcely any passage the meaning of which has been more controverted than this. See Pol. Synop. Wets. Koecher, and Bowyer's Conjectures, where Dr. Owen cuts the Gordian Knot by proposing to cancel the passage, as the insertion of some person who highly favoured the doctrine of the Millenium. One thing seems certain, and has been proved, especially by Kypke, namely, that the words ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ are to be referred, not to the preceding, with Beza, Calvin, Gattaker, &c. but to the following words. The opinion of those who take it in the sense of resurrection from the dead is very ancient. So Euthymius (probably from Chrys.) explains it τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀντιστάσιν, ὁς παλιγκοιμών; from which Campbell does not seem to differ. But it is not, I think, well founded. Still it is difficult to fix the exact sense. The opinion of Schlesner is this; that the word παλιγγενεσίᾳ signifies either, as referring to Christ, the return to life, and, what follows it, a recovery of, and restoration to former glory; or, as referred to the Apostles, a resurrection from the dead, and a happier state after death. Had παλιγγενεσίᾳ meant resurrection, &c. (as Schlesner and others), whether referred to Christ or to the Apostles, it would have required some personal pronoun in the genitive. To Rosenmuller this seems the proper way of taking it: "Vos, discipuli mei, post meum in caelum reditum, docendo et salutariter agendo Israelitis publice consuletis; exponetis Judaeis pro me opes doctrinarum divinarum, esque jubetis vitam omnem ad ejus normam dirigere. Sicut enim Christus per doctrinam et spiritum suum imperavit; ita etiam Apostoli leges de religione ferendo praefuerunt iis, qui ex Judaeis Christo nomen dabant." This, however, seems harsh. To this, and to the hypothesis of Mede, Hammond, Fischer, &c. one may observe (with Kuinoel) that it is not countenanced by
any similar passages, nor does it appear how the Apostolic office, conjoined with its innumerable troubles, labours, and dangers, could be said to compensate them for all the evils which they had borne for Christ's sake. With deference to the opinion of other scholars, I incline to the opinion of Kuinoel, that by παλιγγενεσία some time must be understood when the Apostles should obtain the reward of their patient endurance, &c. namely, in that which the Jews called the new world, the future state, ילוא השם (see Lightfoot), when all things, they thought, would be as it were born again, including, of course, the resurrection of the dead. This is greatly confirmed by the ancient versions, Syriac, Arabian, Persian, and Æthiopian. In illustration of this sense, the following observations of Kuinoel will be found instructive: "Jesus, in order to quiet and soothe their perturbed minds, and restore them to confidence, promises the most abundant rewards of virtue and constancy, and used for this purpose the images of the Messiah's reign, familiar to the Jews, who thought that the Messiah would subdue the rest of the nations to their power, would recall the dead to life, and, bringing a new face over the world (see Lightfoot on Matth. 24, 3.), would restore the Jewish Theocracy to its pristine form, and bless the Jews with the highest felicity. It was to these opinions that Jesus had referred. This παλιγγενεσία, this new world (as the Syriac version renders it) this great restoration of all things, the Apostles themselves expected would then take place. Nor (as Flatt observes) did Jesus wish to thus delude them with a false hope, as is manifest from this and other conversations held with them, in which he studied to eradicate from the minds of his disciples a vain expectation of earthly advantages; so that they, and his other auditors, if not entirely stupid, must easily understand, that expressions, such as those above mentioned, were mere tropical phrases, elsewhere explained by Christ. He, moreover, used these invo-
lucra in his instruction, since he well knew, that in the minds of his disciples and hearers, there was not yet a clear sense of the felicity which he promised, nor such a desire for it, as could have weight enough to induce them to profess his doctrines with constancy. And although he well knew, that many of his disciples would attribute the natural sense (as so conformable to their prejudices) to expressions purely figurative; yet he foresaw too, that these preconceived opinions would be torn up from their minds; and, as the light of clearer knowledge beamed on them, and their understandings were reformed, they would place their wishes and expectations upon a felicity of a kind very different from that which is seated in vain splendour.

With the expressions ἐπὶ δῶδεκα δρόνους, and κρίνωντες τὰς δῶδεκα φολὰς, there will, I think, be less difficulty. All judicious and enlightened Commentators unite in taking the expressions as simply denoting pre-eminence over (by accommodation to their conceptions of it), and consequently preference to; by the communication of greater happiness, &c. So Schlesner explains: formula κρίνειν τινὰς, metaphorice sumpta, et ex adjuncto, notat; superiorem et præstantiorem aliis esse, praecipua præ alii felicitate, auctoritate et dignitate frui. That κρίνειν, and its derivatives, are used in the sense of authority, has been proved by the Philologists, (see Kypke and others). Exactly parallel is Luke 22, 28—30. Kuinnoel concludes by observing that the sense of this passage, when freed from Jewish images, is this: "You, my Apostles, as a return for your losses and sacrifices in this life, shall some time receive the ampest rewards, even eternal ones, in the enjoyment (with me) of the highest dignity and felicity."

29. τὰς ὅσα ἀφῆκεν, q. d. and not only they, but all Christians who, &c. Ἀφίσωμεν signifies posthabere omnes illas res; which is called μισεῖν in Luke 14, 26. The sense is, that spiritual things should be preferred to worldly ones, so that, if they should
come into competition, we may be prepared to give the preference to the former.

29. ἐκατονταπλασίωνα λήψεται. The phrases ἐκατονταπλασίωνα λήψεται are, I think, opposed to ζωῆν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει. This distinction, however, is much clearer in the parallel passages of Luke and Mark, who add ἐν τῷ καιρῷ. For Wets. has well observed: "The event confirmed the prediction. Instead of one house, they found hospitia throughout the whole world. Instead of a few brothers and sisters, an innumerable multitude of Christ’s disciples; instead of sons, all whom they should convert to the Christian faith; instead of lands and property, all the goods of Christians, which were common. Much the same had been said by Euthymius and Theophyl. Grotius, and Brug. &c. This, however, only applies to temporal recompense. It may be proper to advert to the spiritual compensation suggested by Ticinus and Maldonati ap. Pol. namely, that joy and peace of mind, resulting from God’s grace and favour, which passeth all understanding, the inexpressible satisfactions of a good conscience.

29. καὶ ζωῆν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει. The καὶ is by Rosenm. &c. rendered tandem. Dr. Owen, with his usual temerity, would take καὶ for namely: in order, as he says, to exclude the prospects of this life. But this seems a very unwarrantable limitation of the sense, and, as appears from the observations just produced, is irreconcileable with the parallel passage in Luke. I would rather suppose an ellipsis of some particle, left to be understood. Such as is found in Luke, who supplies ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ. This, as Grotius tells us, was formerly shadowed forth in the Levites, who (says Philo) left parents, children, brothers, &c. that they might obtain, instead of a mortal, an immortal portion.

30. παλαι ἔσονται πρώτοι, ἐσχάτοι καὶ ἐσχατοί, πρῶτοι. These words, says Le Clerc, plainly relate to the next chapter. And he thinks that the present one should have ended here. To the first position
I assent. It does appear closely connected with the next chapter, and forms a sort of text, on which the following parable seems founded. It was indeed the custom (as Schoetgen tells us) with the Rabbins, to first propound some γνωμή, or adagial sentence, which should then be illustrated by a simile or example, afterwards concluding with the γνωμή. I cannot, however, quite admit that the present chapter should have ended here. The following γνωμή is found united with the preceding passage in Mark 10, 31. And indeed it is not difficult to devise a connexion, which has been done variously by the paraphrasts (whom see). This was doubtless a proverb. So in Bara Bathra ap. Wets. "Vidi Mundum inversum: superiores inferius, et inferiores superius. So τὸ ἄνω κάτω ὅσω, in Herodot. 3, 3. and τὸ ἄνω κάτω στρεφεσθαι, in Demosth. not to mention many others. In like manner we say, to turn things upside down, which is the very sense of the Herodotean passage. It is, however, of more consequence to enquire who those are whom Jesus here has in view. Most Commentators (as Rosenm. and Quin.) interpret these of the Apostles; which I think most probable. Gro-tius, however, takes them to have reference to the Jews and Gentiles; and so also Theophylact. I think we are not warranted in limiting the application, which seems to be left general, and meant to apply to all whom it might concern. Though doubtless it was intended chiefly for the warning and edification of all Christians. Thus in the application Jesus says, πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσὶ κλητοί, ἐλήγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοῖ, words which suit neither the Jews nor the Apostles, and can only apply to Christians in general who are called, i.e. taken or hired into the spiritual vineyard. Thus in Luke 13, 30. in answer to the question, "are there few that shall be saved?" comes a passage of general instruction, intended for all Christians, ending with these very words.
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CHAP. XX.

VERSE 1. ἀνθρωπός οἰκοδεσπότης. Observe the pleonasm of ἀνθρωπός, as in Luke 2, 15. οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ποιμένες. Matth. 11, 19. ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰκοπότης. 13, 25. ἄνθρωπος ἐμπορός. 18, 23. ἄνθρωπος βασιλεὺς. So Genes. 9, 20. ἄνθρωπος γένος. Nor is it only a Hebraism; for so also we find in Max. Tyr. 9, 3. ποιμὴν ἄνηρ. The sentence may be translated: "The same thing will take place in the Christian economy that happened in the management of a certain householder." There is here an hypallage, such as is observable in many parables. Gomarus observes that the similitude is perfect, having a protasis and an apodosis. In this simile, as in others, some things are dissimilar, which may only respect the ornament, and do not affect the scope of the parable: as the labourers waiting to be hired, and the murmuring, &c. of the labourers after the distribution of the wages. The main point of similarity is the rejection of those who were first, and the admission of those who seemed last. In the Jerusalem Gemara there is a similar parable concerning labourers called into a vineyard.

1. ἀμα πρω — with the early dawn. So Thucyd. 4, 32. & 67. ἀμα ἤρω. Hom. ἀμα γοὶ φαινομένηφι. ἀμα ημέρα occurs very frequently.

2. συμφωνήσας — ἐκ ἐναρκειαν τὴν ἡμέραν — agreeing at, or for a penny. Of this, examples are produced from Diod. Sic. and Theophr. by Kypke and Kuin. A denarius was then the usual wages for a day, (see Wets. Tacit. Ann. 1, 17.) or, which was the same thing, a drachma. Tob. 5, 14. at ἡμέραν subaud katal.

3. ἀλλος ἐστίν τῇ ἄγορᾷ ἁγγείος. A place where the markets, judgments, and orations were held, and all public business was transacted, and the greatest number of persons assembled, where especially the idle, and those that were out of employ-
In illustrating the above passage I have to make the distinction, and can scarce expression used, because. I add Aristoph.

Luke where it

Hebr. siezaréne, the work which

equal sharers.

Raphel and

Equari sunt

(See Sch. Lex.)
12. καύσωνα. Καύσων, which is of the same form with δάσων, φάσων, σείσων, ἁξαν, μύζαν, &c. literally signifies the burner, the burning (wind) Eurus; as is often to be found in the Sept. Here it may be explained simply heat, as in Genes. 31, 40. ἐγενομένη, τῆς ἡμέρας, συγκαίρους τῷ καύσωνι, where in the Hebrew it is בֵּית, the shriveller, the drier. It is to be remembered, that though the air be cool in the early part of the day, yet during the remainder of it, the heat of the sun is exceedingly scorching.

13. ἔταιρε. Hebr. יָר. So ἀγαθε, φίλε, bone vir, mi homo; an idiom common to ancient, and modern languages.

14. όνειρον συνεφάνησας. Here we must understand ἐκ, which is supplied in verse 2.

Wetstein observes, that as the householder promises to give according to the proportion of work done, it is reasonable to suppose that the last, in only one hour, laboured as much as the former during the whole day. Perhaps too he had respect to the willingness and zeal of the labourers. So Berachoth. 2 Schir. R. 6, 2. Hi ceperunt murmurare ac dicere: Nos tota die laboravimus, hic vero ne duabus quidem integris horis laboravit, et nihilominus plenam mercedem accepit. Quibus respondit Dominus: hic duabus horis plus praestitit quam vos tota die præstititis." Le Clerc, indeed, thinks it likely that the Jewish writers (who came after the time of Christ) drew their parables from the Gospels. This, however, seems utterly devoid of probability. It is much more likely that the later philosophers profited by the Scriptures; as indeed I have observed on various occasions. The householder promises wages not correspondent to the time, but to the work done. To this purpose Drexelius de Rectâ Intentione, 2, 6, 5. observes that, by purity and ardour of intention only, one man may do more in one day, upon a moral calculation, than another in a whole year: that the labourer in the vineyard, who came into it at the ele-
venth hour, received a penny as well as they who had been working in it from morning to night: that long labour is one thing, intense labour another: and that God regards not so much how long a man labours, as how well.

15. ἡ γὰρ ἔξεστι—ἐμὸς; Supply χρήματι. Similar passages are cited by Wets from Terent. Eur. 3, 181. Plato, 969. ε.

15. ὁ ὑφάλλωμι—πονηρός. Envious. See Schl. Lex. and Wets. So said, because envy shows itself especially in the eyes. Indeed there is an allusion to this in the word invidia. Consequently, from the force of the antithesis, ἄγαλμος signifies beneficus.

16. ἵσονται—ἐκλεκτός. See Grot. ap. Elsley. "Many will receive my religion; but few will so receive it as to be approved by God. Kuinoel cites Virg. Æn. 6, 130. Pauci, quos aequus amavit Jupiter, atque ardens vexit ad sidera virtus." Markland thinks it a proverbial saying, like that of πολλὸι μὲν ναρθηκοφόροι, παῖδοι δὲ τε Βασιλεί. He translates, "there are many called ones, but few choice ones." So also Le Clerc and Grotius. See Dodd. 1273. As I observed before, there is much difference of opinion on the interpretation of these words. Dr. Owen eludes the difficulty by a device not unusual to him, i.e. he cuts out the passage, on the authority of two MSS. as if the testimony of two MSS. (out of an hundred and fifty) could have any weight. Here the cause of the mission is obviously homoeoteleuton. I am surprised that he should think the words have no reference to the parable. Certainly that is not the lemma of the parable, but it is an important, though incidental lesson. The scope of the parable, I think, with Rosenm. and Kuinoel, is meant for all Christians. On the word ἐκλεκτός Kuinoel remarks: "καλέω, ὅρ, which is used of God and Christ in the New Testament, not only denotes to destine a benefit for, and offer it to, but to bestow it upon, any one. Now since the Jews were the people of God, as it were, selected from the other nations, since they had the true religion, and had many ex-
cellent benefits conferred on them, they were called κλητοὶ, and also ἐκλεκτοὶ. But Christ and the Apostles were accustomed to apply the common forms of expression used in the Jewish ceremonies to Christians; and by them Christians were called κλητοὶ, as being distinguished with particular favours by God. The difference between κλητοὶ and ἐκλεκτοὶ is this: by τῶν κλητῶν must be understood those who took upon them the Christian religion, and by ἐκλεκτῶν those who so received it, as to be Christians properly disposed and approved of God. It is also to be observed that ὕπερτος, ἐκλεκτὸς, denote those who excel others, especially as applied to military affairs, 2 Sam. 6, 1. 21, 6. Ps. 89, 56, 13, and ὅπερ ὀνομάζεται all that is superior and excellent in its kind, and on that account approved and loved. Gen. 23, 26. where by the Sept. it is rendered ἐκλεκτός, and Matth. 12, 18. ὁ παῖς μου, ὁ ἰρέτως, is explained ὁ ἀγαπητὸς μου.

17. παρέλαβε — καὶ ἰδίαν — καὶ ἐλεύν. Lest (says Euthymius) he should by openly predicting his death, irritate the hatred of the Jews against himself; and thereby seem to have purposely procured the fulfilment of the prediction. To the Apostles he had often said the same thing, more and more expressly; that they might bear testimony to his prescience, and his voluntary death.

18. ἀναβαλόμενος εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ. This might be properly enough said of Jerusalem, in reference to its elevated site; but it is sometimes used of a metropolis, even when situated in a plain; as we say to go up to London, and down to the North. Kuinoel refers to a Dissertation of Michaelis de notionibus superi et inferi in SS.

18. κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ. This is to be understood impropriè, (for they had no judicial authority,) they merely pronounced him worthy of death. This is more clearly expressed in Mark 14, 64. κατέκρινον αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν θανάτῳ. Compare Matth. 12, 41. and see Schl. Lex.
19. τοῖς ἔθνεσιν Ὡν. Here the Romans are especially meant.
19. εἰς τὸ ἐμπαύξαι καὶ μαστιγώσαι. Grotius would (with the Syriac) rightly have εἰς taken ἐκβατικῶς. It may be thus paraphrased: "The consequence of which will be, that he shall be mocked, scourged, and crucified."

20. προσήλθεν—αἱτοῦσά. It is very natural for mothers to be anxious for their offspring, and to put up requests in their behalf; and Mr. Bulkley compares that of the Homeric Thetis, II. 1, 505, 510. Ζεῦ πάτερ, τίμησον μοι ὑπὸ κ. τ. λ.

21. ἵνα καθίσωσίν — εὐωνύμων. This may be considered as a common, and almost proverbial expression, for occupying the first and second place among the subjects. For, according to Eastern custom, the degree of proximity to the throne denoted the degree of dignity. This prevailed too among the Western nations. All which is illustrated by the Classical citations of Grotius, Wetstein, and others. See Vitring. Observ. Sacr. L. 2, 63. I add, Soph. Ἀεδ. Tir. 400. ἥρωις παραστατήσειν τοῖς Κρ. Ηροδ. 2, 30. οἶ εὖ ἄριστερής χεῖρις παριστάμενοι βασιλεί.] 21. ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου— in thy kingdom: which they thought would be an earthly one, to take place after his resurrection.

22. οὐκ ὀδηστε τῇ αἰτεῖσθε. The student will observe the propriety of the middle voice, which is thus expressed: "Ye know not the nature of that which ye ask for yourselves:" i.e. ye know not what sort of a kingdom mine is to be, and how many evils ye must encounter in your endeavours after such a dignity. Triller observes, that Lucian, in his Icarom. and Navig. Wittily satirizes the absurdity and inconsistency of the requests which men offer to God. It is well remarked by Euth. and Theophyl. that the answer is made to the sons, because they had themselves asked, and Jesus knew that they had in fact set their mother upon the business, who (by the way) seems to have ventured on this freedom, in reliance on the merits of her long and sedu-
lous attendance upon Christ. So that Wetstein's citation from Seneca is very inapposite, as it glances a very unfavourable imputation on Salome.

22. δῶναςθε — ποτήριον. An image frequent with the Hebrews, who thus compared God's benefits to an hospitable banquet and a liberal entertainment; and usually compared whatever is dealt out to men by the Almighty (whether good or evil) to a cup of wine. Nor was this confined to the Hebrews; for, as Doddridge tells us, it was customary among the ancients in general, to assign to each guest at a feast a particular cup, as well as dish; and by the kind and quantity of the liquor contained in it, the respect of the entertainer was expressed. Hence cup came in general to signify a portion assigned, (Psal. 16, 5. 28, 5.) whether of pleasure or sorrow. So Hom. II. α. 524. where see Heyn. See also Hierocl. upon that Pythagorean sentence, ὁς ἄν μοῦγαν ἔχησ. But the expression was more frequently used of evil than good. So Matth. 26, 39, 42. Apoc. 14, 10, 16, 19, 18, 6. Psal. 85, 9. Jos. 51, 17. Jer. 25, 15. Tibull. 1, 6, 14. Tristia cum multo pocula felle bibit. Plaut. Aulul. 2, 8, 12. Nam ecastor malum mœrorem metui ne mistum bibam. Ποτήριον is put for the drink. See Schl. Lex. Kuinoel compares Æschyl. Ag. 1408. κατηρ' ἐκτίνεν. So we say, to drain the goblet.

23. βαπτίσμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζωμαι, βαπτισθησόμεθα; A metaphor expressive of deep affliction, very frequent among the Hebrew writers, and not unknown to the Classical ones: with this difference, that, in order to soften the harshness of the metaphor, the latter usually add some word expressive of the evil or affliction.

23. οὐκ ἐστιν ἐμὲν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ἰτούμασται. The Commentators suppose an ellipsis of ἐργον, which is not unfrequently found supplied. Perhaps μέρος might be here preferable, and thus the sense would be non passum. Kuinoel compares the Hebrew ו. The early Commentators, misled by the ancient versions, thought that there was an ellipsis of
which gave an advantage to the Arians, who endeavoured to prove from hence the inferiority of the Son to the Father, to whom various replies were made, all of them, so far as concerns the present passage, unnecessary. For Grotius has satisfactorily proved that εἰ μὴ is put for ἀλλὰ. ἄλλα, when a negative precedes, is the same as εἰ μὴ. So ἀλλὰ in Mark 9, 8. is by Matthew 17, 8. expressed εἰ μὴ. The sense is ea a me tribui nonnisi iis potest quibus a patre meo destinata est. Rosenm. and Kuin. add: “habitâ scilicet ratione virtutum mentis et fructuosae industriæ in docendâ et propagandâ religionâ.”

24—27. The rest of the Apostles, as well as James and John, occupied with preconceived opinions, and longing after vain glory, (see 18, 1.) were angry with their fellow disciples. Wherefore Jesus drawing them nearer to him (25.) thus addresses them: “You know that the princes of the world and their courtiers hold dominion over their countrymen, but ye ought not to imitate their manners: no one of you should exercise dominion over the rest, or look down with superiority upon any one. He who would hold dignity in my kingdom must study to exceed others in modesty, courtesy, and a readiness to serve them, postponing his own private convenience to the general advantage. Thus only will he be greater than others in proportion as he is better.” (Rosenm. and Kuin.) Whitty justly infers from hence that none of Christ’s disciples imagined that he had promised the supremacy to Peter by the words, “Thou art Peter,” &c.

25. ὃς εἶ; οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν εὐαγ—αιτῶν—αιτῶν. Wetstein thus explains: “Et reges gentium, et quos illi provinciis præficiunt, solent superbè et impotenter in subditos dominari, eosque ad suam libidinem vexare atque premere; ac si populus propter imperantem, non verò imperans populum esse: ipsi tamen reges et præfeci, qui videntur imperare, subjecti sunt iis qui apud ipsos sunt gratiosi, libertis aut præceptoribus aut ducibus.” And so Grotius before
him, and Rosenmuller. But it is extremely harsh, thus to understand the first αὐτῶν of the people, and the second αὐτῶν of the kings themselves. Besides, it is quite irreconcilable with the parallel passage in Luke 22, 25. Why should we not take ἀρχοντες for princes, kings, and oi μεγάλοι for μεγιστάνες, pri-
mores, greater ones? Christ seems by the first to re-
fer to the αὐτόκράτορες, or imperatores of the Romans, and by the second to the great ones, to whom the government of provinces was committed. They were sometimes named εὐφρεταῖ, by those whom they governed (to which Luke refers in the parallel place).
The words compounded with κατα are often the same as the simple, which is used by Luke. The sense is not to govern them according to their will, as Whitby explains, but rather to exercise power over them.

38. δοῦσαι τῷ Ἰησοῦν αὐτῶν λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. Λύ-
trov properly signifies a price paid for the redemption of a captive, both in the Classical writers (see Wets. Kypk. Schleusner, and Munth), and in the Septuagint, where it answers to רָם. But by this very word, and by יִם (Levit. 6, 23. Num. 8, 8.), is signified also the hostia piacularis, sacrificium piaculare (Levit. 10, 17.); and in this latter sense λύτρο must here be taken. (Kuin.) So Schleusner explains, "ut morte suâ homines a peccati vi et pecnis liberaret." We must understand Christ to have said that he undergoes death as a piacular victim. (1 Tim. 2, 6.) He gave his life ἀντιλύτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, a ransom for all. Other Jewish and Heathen writers (says Whitby) have the like expressions as Joshua 2, 14. 60. ἡ Ἰουχὴ ὑμῶν ἀνθρωποῦμεν ὑμῶν. See Outram de Sacrif. 1, 22. Of the same opinion was Le Clerc, who has the following judicious remarks: "So both the Heathens and Christians used the word ἀντι". Thus Alcestes said to Admetus: Ἕγω δὲ πρεσβεύω τοῖς ἐμῖς θυμίαις καταστήσασα φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Θησαυρὸς — ὑπὲρ σέδεν. The Heathens, both of this early age, and in later times, had an idea of a person's avoiding death if another submitted to it in his place. Aristi-
des, contemporary with the Emperor Adrian, in Sacrarum 5, speaking of an oracular response founded on this idea, uses the same word, ψυχήν ἅρτη ψυχῆς ἀντέδωκε. See more examples in Is. Casaubon, ad Sueton. Caligul. ch. 14. et in Adrianum Spartiani, et Claud. Salmassium. These persons were named ἁρτηψυχῆ: which word is often used by Ignatius in his Epistles; see Pearson’s Vindic. Ignat. pars 2. ch. 15. Le Clerc. It has been matter of enquiry (says Kuin.) where there were, among the Jews living in the time of Christ, those who thought and expected that the Messiah would undergo many labours, many sufferings, and finally lay down life itself for the salvation of the people? Now the greater part of the Jews, and the Apostles, together with the Pharisees and Sadducees, thought that the Messiah could not die. (See Jo. 12, 34.) But there were certainly those, among the more enlightened Jews, who thought that the Messiah, the author of every kind of felicity, and who also should expiate the sins of the people by a sort of lustration, suffering punishment, the guiltless for the guilty, would also die before his supreme majesty should be manifest, or he be able to confer blessings on his people. Hence also they interpreted many passages of the Old Testament, which others understood and explained differently, of the misfortunes, calamities, and at length death, of the Messiah. Compare my note on Jo. 1, 29. p. 144, and note on Matth. 3, 2. Although, however, the nature of a suffering and expiating Messiah was not altogether unknown to the Jews, yet the Apostles, who believed, with the vulgar, that the Messiah would be an always successful conqueror, and never taste of death, occupied with this preconceived opinion, even now did not comprehend the words of Christ, though they were sufficiently perspicuous. (Kuin.) Thus this whole passage has been successfully vindicated from Socinian perversion by the above Commentators, and especially by Whitby; to whom, however, I can scarcely assent, when he so stifly maintains that
πολλοί must be taken for πάντες. For which interpretation, indeed, he has the authority of Euthymiou, who remarks that such a signification often occurs in Scripture; and adds: ὑπὲρ πάντων γὰρ ἐδωκε τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πάντας ἐντράφησε, εἰ καὶ πολλοί θέλοντες ἐνέμειναν τῇ δούλειᾳ. I do not deny but there may be passages where it has that signification. I am, however, inclined to think they are few in number; and in the New Testament I know of scarcely one passage where that sense has been satisfactorily established. The truth is, there is in the word πολλοί a tacit opposition to, or comparison with, some smaller number, whether one or more, usually expressed, but sometimes understood. Now when that number happens to be only one, or very few, the difference between them is so great that πολλοί may in a popular sense denote πάντες, being, as it were, all. In such cases, πολλοί may be correctly rendered very many. Upon this principle perhaps all the passages in the New Testament to which that sense has been attached may be explained, in preference to the common interpretation. Here Grotius, Calvin, Brugensis, Maldonati, and some others, adopt the interpretation for which I contend. In Matth. 26. τί περὶ πολλῶν ἐγχυσόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν αἰμαρτίων: and in the parallel passage in Mark 14, 24. almost all the Commentators interpret pro omnibus. Some celebrated ones assign to it the sense which I have laid down above. In Matth. 20, 16. πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσὶ κητοὶ, there is evidently a comparison between the ὁλογικὸς and the κητοὶ. In Rom. 8, 29. εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἀντίν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, as also in Hebr. 9, 28. there is the tacit comparison above mentioned. The same principle is applicable to some cases where πολλοὶ occurs with the article; as Rom. 12, 5. ἀλλὰς οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ. In others, however, οἱ πολλοὶ signifies not all, but the rest. Thus I would understand Rom. 5, 15. εἰ γὰρ τῷ τούτῳ ἔνοικο παραπτάματοι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀκένῳ, i. e. all the remaining part of the human race. 1 Cor.
10, 33. μὴ ἄρτον τὸ ἐρμαύτου, ἀλλὰ τὸν πολλὰν, i. e. the rest of Christians. In exactly the same manner I find οἱ πολλοὶ used in Thucyd. 1, 33. εἰ τῶι πλέον ἄφεσκατε ἐγώ ὑμῖν, τοὺς δ’ αἵοι μόνοις αὐτὶ ὥρδας ἀπαφέρκαμεν. The above passages are nearly all those of the New Testament to which the sense omnēs has been applied; though, as I trust I have shown, improperly. Whether πολλοὶ, or οἱ πολλοὶ, ever bears that sense in the Classical writers is another question. I am inclined to think that they do not, though the contrary has been maintained by many philologists; e. g. Damm. in his Lex. Hom. in v. writes πολλοὶ sape est pro πάντες. Yet, upon examining the passages cited by him, (Iliad, P. 98. T. είδε. Odys. τ. 534. P. 967.) I do not find that they bear that sense.

Schleusner, in Lex. cites Lucian, 1, 14. μάρτυς γὰρ ἐν παραστήσεωι πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς ὑβέλαι. But τ. e. there has the same signification as in Thucyd. above cited, and Rom. 8, 15. 1 Cor. 10, 33. i. e. ceteri. James Gronovius, indeed, maintained that in two passages of Arrian οἱ πολλοὶ had that sense; i. e. Exped. Alex. 1, 3, 2. and 7, 19, 12. But there τῶι πολλοὶ is well rendered by Vulcannius and Raphael, illos multos, those many, that populous nation. I wonder that none should have cited a passage of Tyrannus, cited by Plato de Republ. 778. λ. ύπ’ οἱ πολλὰ αὐτὰ κεκτημένησι: on which Plato remarks, ἐχεῖν σχῆμα ἀξίωσε. But it there signifies very many.

30. ὀς τον. Much has been said by some Commentators, who endeavour to devise methods of reconciling the minute discrepancy which here subsists between the accounts of the different Evangelists. (See Grotius, Calvin, and others, ap. Elsley.) I will only mention the hypothesis of Euthymius, as being hitherto unnoticed, and both ingenious and founded on the authority of Chrysostom. He conjectures that the blind man in Mark was different from these two—and that the one spoken of by Luke is different from the one mentioned by Mark. For, says he, the
one of Mark threw down his garment, out of excessive haste, and received the cure without touch; but he in Luke, rather as Christ was coming to Jericho, and not departing from it, received his cure.

On these variations Rosenm. and Kuinoel remark, that they arose from the diversity of oral narration, and that such trifling discrepancies, which are perpetually found in the best historians, are of no moment, and that it is not necessary to anxiously hunt after conjectures by which such diversities may be reconciled; and that, as the credibility of historians is not diminished by such, but rather increased, so will not that of the Evangelists be at all affected.

81. ἐκείνοι — ́νε — rebuked them because. E. T. But Campbell has more accurately rendered it, charged them that they should, &c. He well remarks “The historian surely did not mean to blame the poor men for their importunity. Our Lord, on the contrary, commended such importunity, sometimes expressly in words, and always by making the application successful. And so Euthymius took it; for he observes in the following very beautiful language: Ὅρα καρτέριαν, τούτους μαρτυρεῖτα καὶ ἡμεῖς, οἱ πατὴριοι τῶν ἑραλδίων τῆς φυλής, καὶ κραξίμως πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐὰν δάλμα καρδίας, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἑμαὐσίων ἐκπεπληνμένοι τὴν διέπεμ, καὶ μὴ ἀποπτῶμεν, καὶ τάσπερ κάψιμεν ἀθελον, οὐκ ἀλλὰ μόνον. On this of ἐκείν. Campbell has copiously treated on Mark 9, 25.

34. ἀνέβλεψαν αὐτῶν οἱ ἑραλδαὶ. The sense is, “and his eyes received their sight.” Wetstein compares Plato Charmide, ἀνέβλεψε τε μει τῶν ἑραλδαίων διήκανεν τι οἶον, καὶ ἀνῆγετο αἰπὶ ἐρωτήσεως.

The following introductory observations on this Chapter are derived from Rosenmuller and Kuinoel.

Among the principal acts of Jesus must be reckoned this last and solemn entry into Jerusalem, which all the four Evangelists have thought worthy
of being commemorated. From this entry of Jesus, unto the evening on which he was apprehended by the Jews, is a space of five days. There are those in our times who calumnioustly represent that Jesus entertained a hope of founding a temporal dominion; that he aimed at innovation in government; and thus gave occasion to sedition. But facts refute this base slander. For during these five days Jesus did nothing but what he had been doing for three years before; he aimed at no innovation, but conducted himself in his own proper character. He declared, indeed, more distinctly than he had ever before done, that he was the Messiah; and made his entry into the city amidst public acclamations. He assumed indeed a singular authority; began to carry himself with something of a royal air; but so far was he from exciting sedition, and stirring up innovation, that he removed as much as possible every suspicion that he was affecting temporal domination. For (as we read in Luke 21, 37.) by day he taught in the Temple during the above period; but at night retired from the city to the Mount of Olives, spending the time in solitude, remote from the busy crowd. And now, after having for three years done things which might induce a persuasion that he was the promised Messiah, it was now become his duty, and wish, to make public profession of this; which, indeed, the Jews, with rectitude of mind, might have collected from his words and deeds. But in all things he so comported himself, that it should easily appear that he did not affect political dominion, nor was such a Messiah as the Jews had figured to themselves. Rosenmuller.

Though Jesus was aware that his death was decreed by the Jewish rulers, yet he proceeded to celebrate the Passover at Jerusalem, and made a solemn entry into the city. It cannot, however, be therefore contended that, inflamed with desire of glory, he was prodigal of life, and with fanatical impetuousity rushed on death. Actuated rather by the no-
blest inducements, and in order to discharge the duty enjoined on him by his Father, he exposed himself to the snare of his enemies, and encountered death itself. It was the wish of Jesus that the seeds of salutary doctrine hitherto scattered by himself should be spread far and wide; that they should, even amidst the heaviest calamities, abundantly flourish; and the event happily corresponded to his wishes. But if we follow history as our guide, we easily discern that the cause of this rapid progress and propagation of Christianity, the cause of this ardour and constancy of Christ’s followers in holding fast and disseminating so salutary a religion, was not the excellence alone of their Master’s precepts respecting the moral duties and offices, but especially the firm persuasion that he was the Messiah, and that he would at some future period return and reward his dutiful and faithful disciples with perpetual felicity. The Jews, as worshippers of the one true God, expected (though the Gentile nations did not) a Messiah; and this hope was raised, nourished, and supported by the Prophets of the Old Testament. If Jesus, in order to avoid the snare of his enemies, had retired to some other country, not only would the Jews have strove to destroy him by treachery, as a condemned criminal, but also in the promulgation of his doctrine he would have incurred the hatred and envy of the priests; and for the sake of preserving his life he would have been compelled to deliver his doctrine to a few only, and those disciples interiores admissionis. But then he could not have vindicated his claim to the dignity of Messiah. For it was in Judæa that the Messiah was to come forward and erect his kingdom: nor would all those hopes and expectations of Jesus, as Messiah, which his followers nourished, (and which, when he had returned to life and ascended back to heaven, proved their strongest excitement to virtue and constancy,) have then had place. But if the propagation of Christianity among Jews as well as
Gentiles, and the general reformation dependent on
it, had been intercepted, the fruits of all the instruc-
tions which Christ had wished to be established
would have perished. When, therefore, Jesus per-
ceived that the kingdom of truth and virtue raised
by him could only be established and confirmed by his
death, and that from it advantages most transcendent-
ently beneficial would redound to the human race;
and therefore that he must either abandon his holy
office or meet a cruel death; moved by religion,
and induced by the best and most humane counsels,
and conformably to the will of his Father, he volunta-
rilly and with tranquillity delivered himself up to his
his persecutors, and yielded himself obedient unto
death. Kuinoel.

Verse 1. Matthew, Mark, and Luke, who pass by
in silence the history of the raising of Lazarus, have
in their narration joined what Jesus did and said at
Jericho with his triumphal entry into the city, as if
he had come to Jerusalem sine diverticulo. The
narration of John (ch. 12.) is fuller. He relates
that Christ made his solemn entry into the city,
after having partaken of supper at Bethany (12, 2.)
Matthew, Mark, and Luke, mention his entrance
before that meal. (See Matth. 24, 1.) But it is cer-
tain, from other passages, that the Evangelists, and
especially Matthew, did not always follow the order
of time in their narrations. Kuinoel.

1. Ἰδαν εἰς Βηθαφαγή. Mark and Luke add Βηθα-
παγά; therefore we may interpret thus, that Jesus
proceeded to the confines of Bethany and Bethphage.

1. τῷ ἵππῳ τῶν ἑλασίων. The Mount of Olives, which
was about five stadia east of the city. It derived its
name principally from its olives; but it produced
also figs and palms. Hence the name Bethpage is
derived from Ἕβα, region or tract, and Ἕβ, fig.

2. ἲππος. That, in the East, asses were used, and
still are, by princes and chief persons, is well known.
The reason may be, that Syria has never been so fa-
vourable to the breed of horses as the neighbouring
countries, especially Egypt. Hence the horses were reserved for war, the ass destined to the purposes of peace, of which it was proverbially the symbol. See Niebuhr, Hasselquist, Harmer, and Kuinoel.

2. τῶν. Mark and Luke add, on which never man had sat. Kuinoel observes, that yearlings which have never borne the yoke, and have never been employed for common purposes, are reserved for sacred uses. See Deut. 21, 3. 1 Sam. 6, 7. Horat. Ep. 9, 22. Ovid. Met. 3, 12. Virg. Georg. 4, 540, 551. Mark and Luke do not mention the ass as brought. Both are specified in the prophecy of Zechariah now fulfilled, and which Jesus had in mind. Thus Wetstein well remarks, that Christ, who had made the journey on foot, could have accomplished the yet remaining distance (less than a Sabbath-day’s journey, i.e. five stadia), but he chose to be conveyed on an ass because of the mystic signification. It seems a very insipid remark of Kuinoel (from Michaelis Bib. Heb.) that Christ doubtless ordered the ass to be brought, that the colt might the more readily follow his disciples. The ass, indeed followed her colt from the natural στόργη (as Theophylact says, διεμένω γὰρ τῷ ταύλῳ συνεκολουθεί καὶ ἡ μητέρα); but this does not hinder but that the circumstance might be purposely brought about by Divine Providence, which works by second causes. Euthymius observes, that they laid them upon both the ass and the colt, not knowing on which of them he would choose to be carried.

3. καὶ ἦν τὸν ὅμιον ἔλημι. This appears to me an Hebrew idiom, highly elliptical, but exactly similar to one in our own language. Kuinoel translates, “si quis vos interrogaverit;” but I prefer Rosenmuller’s version, contradixerit, or that of Piscator, si dehorsetur vos ab instituto. The ellipsis may indeed be filled up variously; either by modifying the verb, or by adding an interrogative sentence, as is done in Mark and Luke.

3. ἦν τὸν. One might expect τινες, but τις is often used where the plural is not employed.
3. ὁ Κύριος. Campbell rightly translates the master, i. e. our master. An imitation of the Hebrew ר, which means both lord and master, and teacher. So Matth. 7, 21. 8, 25. Many other examples are produced by Schleusner. It is usually taken in the sense of Dominus, i. e. the Messiah; and Brug. expounds the Lord of the universe, the Lord of Lords, &c. The thing is so plain, that I am surprised that Markland (ap. Bowy. 109.) should make a puzzle of the passage. He is not certain whether αὐτῶν is to be taken with Κύριος, or with κρείαν ἔχει, but he prefers the former; thus it will mean the Lord of them and of all things, the proprietor of them wants them; which will remove (he says) the injustice objected. But what injustice? It was no great injury done to the owner, to borrow an ass for a mile, and then doubtless to feed and return it. But the Evangelists do not descend to such minute particulars; not to mention that it has been by many supposed, and it is indeed highly probable, that Jesus and the disciples were well known to the owner. The other conjecture of Markland, namely, that there is an allusion to the aggraria, or pressing for the service of the Emperor, is by means applicable here. Doddridge has shown far more judgment in the following remark: "There is no appearance of Christ’s intending to shew his sovereignty in transferring the property of these creatures; and though, no doubt, he had a power to do it, his usual prudence would direct him to waive it at a time when so many eyes were upon him for evil.

4. τοῦτο δὲ ὅλων γέγονε—λέγοντος. Hæc omnia a Christo sunt instituta, ut eventu comprobaretur quod prædixerit. The passage of Zachariah (9, 9.) contains a poetical description of the golden age, i. e. the Messiah’s Kingdom. (Kuin.) Here, as in John 12, 14, 15. we have not the very words, but the sense of the Prophet, quoted, as some suppose, from memory. See Owen’s modes of Quotation.

5. ἐπὶ τῇ βουνατρὶ Σιὼν. A city of Sion, i. e. Je-
rusalem, its inhabitants. Sion, as being the most celebrated part of Jerusalem, is put (by synecdoche) for Jerusalem. It is a poetical figure usual with the Oriental writers to personify a country or city under a woman, girl, virgin, or daughter. See Glass. Philol. 8. Neither was this unknown to the Greek Poets, especially the Lyric ones. Pindar very frequently uses it.

3. πράσινος—mitis, mansuetus, pacificus. (So Matth. 11, 29: Learn of me, for πράσινος εἰμι.) Wetstein cites Pind. Pyth. 3, 124. ὁ Σωράκβοςοι νέρες Βασιλέως Πράσινοσ ἀστοίς, αὐτοί φωνέον ἀγάθοις, ξείνοις δὲ θαυμαστῶς πατήρ. Of the etymology of the word much has been said, nothing, however, clearly established. Perhaps it is derived from πέρα. The primary and leading idea seems to be liquid, moveable, as water which has a passage, yielding, &c. both in a good and bad sense. Of the latter we have, I believe, no example in the Greek writers preserved to us: (though one may compare ἄγοις. ἦ εἰκαστάφορος in Hesych. where see the interpreters). Yet that there was formerly one is clear from the Latin prassus, which must be derived from the Αἰolic πρασὶνος.

5. κτιβεθηκὼς ἐτὶ δένυ, καὶ τῶλον ὑλὸν ὑποτύγχανον. Jesus seems not to have used both. There is either an hendiadys (as Piscator and Rosenm.) or καὶ (like ἐν in Zach.) may be explicative, nempe (as Sculet and Kuinoel). Yet this does not seem quite satisfactory. For why should Matthew mention the two animals, the ass and the colt. Hence Euthymius, by δενυ καὶ τῶλον, understands τὸν τῶλον, scilicet δενυ μὲν τῇ φώτει, τῶλον δὲ τῇ ἠλικίᾳ. But this seems too subtle and far-fetched. As is that of Beza, who says: “Any one is said to go on three or four horses, if he have as many accompanying.” Some, as Glass, Clericus, Campbell, Weston, take the plural for the singular. But that is so arbitrary and precarious a principle, that it ought not to be resorted to except in extreme cases, and this is (I think) not one. Why should not the second ἀντὶν be understood of ἵππος? and vol. i.
set him thereon. Thus the difficulty will be removed. After having struck out this satisfactory solution, I find that it has been anticipated by Euthymius and Theophylact, who explain ἐπάνω αὐτῶν thus: οὐχι ταν δυο ὑποζυγίαν, ἀλλὰ ταν ἴματαν. The latter, however, injudiciously adds: “or rode first on the ass, then on the colt.” An interpretation absurd, and irreconcilable with the other Evangelists, and which has been long ago scouted by Euthymius, (perhaps from Chrys.) οὐκ ἰδίᾳ καὶ ἰδίᾳ, οὐδὲ αἰς ἐν συμφωνίᾳ. But after all, αὐτῶν may indeed seem suspicious. It is not expressed in the most ancient versions, nor is it found in several ancient MSS. especially the Cod. Cant. Campbell translates, “and made him ride;” but I prefer our common version, “and set him thereon;” which expresses the true sense. I am surprised that Griesbach and Kuinoel should read ἐστεκάθισαν. The authority of manuscripts is not worth mentioning, when the words are so similar. Ἐστεκάθισαν seems the most appropriate, for obvious reasons; since surely the same persons who laid their garments thereon, to do him honour, (compare 2 Reg. 9, 13.) would be likely to mount him thereon. More might be added, were it not irksome to discuss such minutiae.

8. ὅ δὲ πλεῖστος ὅχλος. The greater part of the people, the bulk of the people; as we vulgarly say the greatest part for the greater. Kuinoel says they were Jews, who were partly hastening to the festival, and were partly such as, on hearing of the resurrection of Lazarus, had left their city, and gone to meet Christ.

8. ἐστρωσαν αὐτῶν τὰ ἴματα ἐν τῇ ὕδη. The custom of reverently strewing vests, flowers, &c. for the great to walk upon, was always, and still is, prevalent in the East. Compare 2 Reg. 9, 13. With this honour Alexander was received, (see Jos. Ant. 2, 83.) as also Agrippa, when he came to Jerusalem. (Phil. de Leg. 1.) Nor was it confined to the East.
We find mention of it in Plut. Cat. Min. 12. Æschyl. Ag. 918. where see Stanl. Herodot. 7, 54. Claud. de Nupt. Honor. Wetstein, from whom the above examples are selected, has also two from the Jewish writers, and several where the scattering of flowers only is mentioned, which I omit, as being not so opposite.

8. ἄλλοι δὲ ἐκκητον κλάδους—καὶ ἐστρέφνυν. This was meant as a symbol of joy. 1 Macc. 19, 51. 2 Macc. 10, 6, 7. They were also carried by the Grecian antesignani, called θαλλόφοροι, and the Romans. See Liv. 16, 47. (Kuin.) And not merely strewed them in the way, but (as we find from John) carried them in their hands, honoris gratid.

9. Ἀσαννα τῷ ὑπὸ Δαβίδ. Hebr. יָשָׁר יַעַשָּׁר. Help us, we beseech thee, thou Son of David, the Messiah! A customary form of acclamation at the feast of tabernacles. This feast was celebrated in September, a little before the commencement of the civil year; and on this occasion they carried in their hands bundles of the boughs of palms, myrtles, withies, &c. Jos. A. 13, 13, 6. & 3, 10, 4. They then repeated Psal. 118, 24, 25. and in every one of the prayers, which they use to this day, they make mention of salvation; from which circumstances they gave the bundle, and these prayers, and the feast itself, the name of Hosanna, from salvation. They celebrated with the same forms also the Encænia (2 Macc. 10, 6, 7. 1 Macc. 18, 51. Apoc. 7, 9.) and the Passover. And as they celebrated the feast with great joy and gladness, so in the same manner do they now express joy at the coming of the Messiah, whose advent they believed to be represented in all the feasts. Wetstein.

9. ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὁνόματι Κυρίου, i. e. he who is to come. Some join ἐν ὁνόματι Κυρίου with εὐλογημένος. Most, however, and indeed the best, interpreters, join ἐν ὁνόματι Κυρίου with ἐρχόμενος. Ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὁνόματι Κυρίου is a periphrasis for legatus, ambassador, envoy.
9. ὸσινά (ὁ ἄν) εἰ τῷ νόστῳ, scil. ὀφεινός. A periphrasis of God. See Kuin. Luke 2, 14. Christ permitted this, since the time approached when he should publicly profess himself the long wished for Messiah. Rosenmuller.

10. ἐσελθη πᾶσα ἡ πόλις, i.e. commota est, was put in commotion, not through fear, but novitate spectaculi. (Kuin.) Maldonati explains, "non admiratione et gaudio, sed metu et invidia." Rosenmuller has well remarked: "This was doubtless caused by the various emotions excited, according to the different state of men's minds; the Pharisees on the one hand being agitated by the impulse of inerterate hatred and envy, and on the other hand those being filled with exultation who expected that the hopes of their forefathers would presently be realized." Of this metaphorical sense of σελω Schleusner has given examples from Pind. P. Δ. 484. Heliod. p. 484. I add, Liban. Ep. 1001. τὸ θεατρὸν ἔθεελθη. Heliod. 2, 370, 11. τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ἐσελθη, and 2, 405, 9; and, what is a remarkable phrase, 2, 58, 1. ἐσελθη ἡ ἀλκας, i.e. nautae, as here cwes. This significance is also illustrated by Wakef. in his Sylva Critica.

11. οἱ δὲ ὅχλοι ἔλεγον. Not the Jerusalemites, but the strangers from the country; persons of simplicity and rectitude. (Maldon. and Brug.)

11. ὁ προφήτης, i.e. whom we have hitherto acknowledged as a prophet, but now a true king. Markland would point and translate, "This is Jesus the Prophet—of Nazareth!—of Galilee!" which is very fanciful.

12. ἐξῆθεν λαῶς τῶν πελώντως καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. It plainly appears from St. Mark 11. that Jesus did not do this on the day of his entry into Jerusalem, (though it is there said that he entered into the Temple, and looked round the whole of it,) but the day after; spending the night at Bethany, and returning to Jerusalem in the morning (and in the way thither working the miracle of the fig-tree).
As Mark is so decisive, and so particular, in his account, and as Matthew does by no means expressly join Jesus’s driving out the traders with the events of the day, (though Doddridge says so,) we certainly ought to adopt St. Mark's account. To do which, there cannot be a greater inducement than the consideration that those who adopt the other hypothesis, are compelled (as Doddridge and Weston) to suppose that the circumstances of the driving out, &c. happened twice on two successive days. Nay thrice; for he had done much the same thing in the first year of his ministry. (2, 14.) Though Wetstein takes the words of John as descriptive of this ejection, yet, according to Matthew, the miracle of the fig-tree was worked the day after the ejection of the money-changers. I do not see how this trifling discrepancy can be reconciled. I would prefer Mark's account, as being more circumstantial and probable. Doddridge builds his preference of Matthew on the words in Mark, περιβλεψάμενος πάντα, which he thinks Jesus might do, without reforming the abuses. But he too much presses the words, which merely denote that he took a view of all the buildings. Indeed it is impossible to suppose that, had he cast out, &c. Matthew would not have mentioned it. But, indeed, the reason why our Lord did not then do it is suggested by the words of Mark, ἀψίδας δὲ γενομένης, when the buyers and sellers had most of them retired. That it should then be evening is no wonder, considering the events of a day of such importance and pomp, and which must have occupied a considerable time.

12. θεοθείων. Not the Temple itself, the ναός, the Sanctum Sanctorum, לְבֵית, but that quadrangular space of five hundred ells square, called שֵׁם. Within this were three courts, the women's, the Israelites', and the priests'. Before the women's, which was on the West side, was a space called the tabernae, תַֽעֲרָן, into which an entrance was permitted to those polluted by the touch of dead persons,
and to the Gentiles: in the spacious precincts of which were daily sold frankincense, oil, wine, and other requisites for sacrifice, such as doves, lambs, oxen; all which victims were previously examined and approved. Rosenmuller and Kuinoel.

12. τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν κατέστρεψε. John writes ἀνέστρεψε, and adds, καὶ ἔξεχε τὸ κέρμα. Κόλλυβος properly denoted a sort of petty coin, as we learn by the Scholiast on Aristoph. Pac. 1199. and Poll. 9, 72. and Hesych. in κολλυβιστής. And thence the coin given for the changing of money, and finally the very permutation itself. Money-changers were hence called κολλυβισταί, as here. These, by the small coin exposed on the tables, and by exchanging Greek or Roman money into Hebrew, promoted the convenience of the buyers and sellers, and those who came to give or pay money into the treasury, as for instance the annual half-shekel. Rosenmuller, Kuinoel, and Wetstein, produce many citations from the Classics; and some still more important ones from the Rabbinical writers, too long for me to introduce. The reason why our Lord turned them out is thus stated by Kuinoel: "The noise of the traders disturbed and interrupted those who were worshipping God in the Temple. Various kinds of dishonesty were practised there. The impositions and fraudulent dealings of the traders produced quarrels and brawls; and thus the Temple was profaned; the priests, for the sake of sordid gain, allowing this profanation of the Temple." The practice, however, was not confined to the Jewish Temple. It had place also in the Greek and Roman ones; from whom, probably, the abuse was derived.

12. περιστεράς. The usual offering of the poor, and furnished by the prefecctus oblationum.

13. ἐκθήλων ληστῶν. The word ληστής improprī denotes cheats, extortioners, or at least men devoted to lucre. John says, ὁκος ἐκτορίου. So Joseph. B. 5, 9, 4. (ap. Wets.) οὐ τὰ κρεπτὰ μὲν τῶν ἀμαστηράτων
Would to God (says the Bishop) that the money-changers and base trafficke
ners in the Temple of our own Sion were ejected, whose simoniacal practices
convert a house of prayer into a house of merchandize." The evil, however,
is of long standing. For Origen, in his commentary on this very passage, 1, 442. B. and 443. A. B. speaks of those who, boasting to sit in Moses's seat, sell whole churches of doves, by committing them to the care of improper persons. As likewise of those who, being entrusted with the church revenues, enrich themselves by abusing that trust. He applies the language to all whose thoughts are engrossed in buying and selling, and the like worldly matters, seldom addicting themselves to prayer, &c. And Jerome on this passage says: "Latro enim est, et templum Dei in latronum convertit specum, qui lucra de religione sectatur, cultusque ejus non tam cultus Dei quam negotiationis occasio est." Certainly the censures of our Lord were not meant only for the petty chapmen themselves, but were especially levelled against the priests, who tolerated such abuses, for a share in the lucre resulting from them.

14. προσήλθον αυτῷ —were brought to him: or, as Schleusner explains, adierunt precibus.

15. ἑδώντες —τὰ βαυμάσια τὰ ἐπινόσε —miranda et inaudita. So Sirach 43, 25. joins βαυμάσια καὶ παράδοξα. It was wonderful for him, whom they thought a private man, to exercise such authority. Though Jesus here acts as in his own house, as the Lord of the Temple, and the Son of God.

15. παίδας κρατούσα. Imitating, as usual, what they heard from their parents or others.

16. οὗτοι εἰκότωσι —κατηρτίσω αὐλον; Tandem tibi
parasti; spoken (in Psal. 3, 8.) of the existence and providence of God, which so clearly appears from the works of nature, that all persons not entirely devoid of understanding must see it. It is here applied to the present case. (Rosenm.) Ὠνακόντων, sucklings. The word is used both active and neuter. In our language it is distinguished by the words suckle and suck; as in the Latin by lacto and lacteō; the latter of which is rare, and almost confined to the Scripture. So Luke 11, 17. Lament. 3, 20. Joh. 3, 12. though it is cited by Wets. from Plut. Rom. 20. n.

17. ἡμᾶς ἕκα. The Vulgate renders maneat. Beza and others diversatus est. I prefer pernoctavit, as Cam. Syr. Ar. V. Not, however, sub die egit, with Grotius and Rosenmuller; though Christ sometimes did so. This sense is vindicated and illustrated by Wetstein, Kypke, and Munthe. He left the city, not to avoid the snares that might be laid for his life, but to avert all suspicion of affecting earthly domination, which so populous a city, and the concourse of strangers resorting to the feast, and the night, so favourable to attempts of that sort, might generate, and for promoting which, the strongly fortified buildings of the Temple would afford encouragement. Rosenmuller.

18. πρωτός ὑπὲρ ἐπάνω σε τὸν τοῦτον. On Sunday Jesus had made his solemn entry into Jerusalem, and had returned in the evening to Bethany. On Monday he ejected the money-changers, and in the evening again retired thither. On Tuesday he returned into the city, taught in it, and held all those discourses which we read in Luke 20. Mark 11—13. Matth. 21, 29—6. As to the fig-tree which Matthew and Mark relate that Jesus cursed, Matthew, narrating the thing more briefly, mentions it as being at once cursed and withered. But Mark, detailing the matter more circumstantially and accurately, says that Jesus had cursed it early in the morning of that day on which he drove the traders out of the
Temple, (2, 12.) that on the morning of the following day the Apostles had perceived that the tree was withered. (Ver, 20.) Therefore Mark says that it was withered, when this really took place, or else when it was observed by the Apostles that the tree on which Jesus had the day before pronounced the malediction was withered. Kuinoel.

20. παραχρήμα ἐξηρᾶτη. The fig (I think) was cursed on one day, and on the next the Apostles, seeing it already withered, exclaimed πῶς παραχρήμα ἐξηρᾶτη ἢ σωκῆ; Παραχρήμα is well rendered by Campbell forthwith. It has ever been usual with the sages of the east to express doctrines by certain symbolical actions. (Is. 20, 2.) Thus Christ was accustomed to shadow forth his doctrines by signs and symbols. Here (observes Wetstein) he chooses a fig-tree in Judæa, a tree of the lowest estimation, and, indeed, one belonging to nobody, but standing in the public way; a tree which was neither bearing, nor promising, fruit; in which he might prove that his power to punish the guilty, was as great as that which he had demonstrated in conferring benefits, and, withal, that he might prefigure the imminent destruction of the contumacious Jews, because in the time of fruits they had borne none; as is more clearly indicated from ver. 33 to 41. Compare Ezra 22, 30. Buxtorf. Synag. 457. tells us, that the Jews themselves interpret the rites of the feast of Tabernacles allegorically. (Wets.) My readers will feel little surprise in being told that this miracle has met with the same irreverent treatment at the hands of Paulus as have almost all the rest; nay, he even more studiously deprecates it. His objections are, however, so futile, that they scarcely merit the notice which they have received from Kuinoel.

21. μὴ διακριθῆτε, doubt not. Whitby tells us, that μὴ διακριθῆται here signifies, not to discriminate, or put a difference. That is, however, not the sense in the present passage. It here means to hesitate, to doubt. There is the same metaphor as in διστάξω and δισσίδο. It occurs in the same sense in Mark,
11, 23. Act. 10, 20. & 11, 20. Rom. 4, 20. &c. The various significations of this word are learnedly detailed by Heupel on Mark 11, 23. Τὸ τῆς συκῆς is an elliptical expression for τὸ περὶ τῆς συκῆς γεγονός, ἔγγον. There is the same ellipsis of ἔγγον in 8, 33. τὸ τῶν δαμουσιομένων. See Raphael on this passage.

21. ἀλλὰ κἂν τῶ ὅρει τοῦτο εἴπητε, thou shalt say to this mountain. This is spoken δεικτικῶς, by which is meant the Mount of Olives. So also Jo. 3, 9. & supra. Whitby prefers the allegorical signification, because Luke, instead of mountain, says sycamore-tree. But doubtless Jesus made use of both; and Matthew mentions one, Luke another. From which one circumstance, and the manner of relating, I believe some of the greatest difficulties in the Gospels depend. See note on Luke 6, 20. (Markland.)


23. εἰς τοὺς ἔξωντας. It was the province of the Synedrion to grant the right of teaching in the temple. Now this Christ had never received. (Grot.) They hoped that Jesus would answer that he acted under divine authority, that he was the Messiah, by which they might make out a matter of capital accusation. (Kuin.) But it was a vain question, after they had seen his miracles, which proved his commission to be (as he said) from God.

24. Jesus does not directly answer them, but (as often) by an interrogation; thus solving question by question; as Luke, 7, 43. 10, 29, & infra, 40. This is usual to the Hebrew writers, of whom see Schoetg. Hor. Heb. on this passage. It was also to the Greek philosophers, as appears from the following citations in Wetstein: Diog. Laert. 2, 116. Sext. Emp. ad Log. 2, 215. Simplic. in Epict. p. 233. Sext. Emp. ad Log. 2, 227, & 292. ad Physic. 1, 138. & 2, 110.
& sēpe. Pyrrhon. Hypoth. 3, 13. To which I add Eurip. Orest. 500. ἥρησομαι δὲ Μενελαίος, τοσόνδε σε. That this declining to directly answer was not through fear, the parables now produced evince.

25. τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου τὸδεν ἢν. Βάπτισμα here denotes the whole ministry and authority of John to preach repentance and reformation, and, as precursor, to announce the Messiahship of Jesus. It is put synecdochically, because baptism was the most striking peculiarity of John’s function, being a symbol of the purity which he recommended. Campbell’s free translation, “whence had John authority to baptize,” better represents this sense than the literal rendering of our common version.

25. ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, from God. A signification which often occurs in the Rabbinical writers, in which Heaven is opposed to men. Numerous examples are cited by Wetstein: nor is it quite unknown to the Classical writers. A passage from Claudian is produced by Wetstein, and others from Pfohen, which, however, do not seem to me to satisfactorily prove its Classical use. It occurs sometimes in the Sept.

25. διατί —οὐκ ἐτιασεῖστε αὐτῷ; Supply; as well in other things as in the testimony to me as Messiah. (Grot.) That many of the Pharisees had rejected the pretensions of John, appears from Luke 7, 27. See note on Matth. 3, 7. (Kuin.)

27. οὐκ αἰδημεν. Wetstein illustrates this by a remark of Donatus upon Teren. Eunuch. 5, 5, 11. nescio—“Perturbatur; nec negare potuit, nec consentire volebat, et ideo defensionis loco dixit: nescio.” They dared not deny that John was a prophet, for fear of the people; nor were they willing to confess it, because then they must have believed in Christ, of whom John had borne testimony. Act. 19, 4. Jo. 1, 27, 36, 5, 35. When, therefore, they saw themselves hemmed in on all sides, they confessed their ignorance. From which Christ rightly inferred that they were not fit judges in this matter, and that he was not bound to reverence their authority, and
answer their question. (Wet.) Those objectors are completely in error, who represent that Christ sought out subterfuges, and eluded question by question. The truth is, that he expected a reply, from which he might derive arguments for demonstrating the point in question. For the proposed question being affirmed, it followed by a necessary consequence. But when he found his enemies so perverse as to be not disposed to confess what was manifestly true, he felt justified in refusing to tell them by what authority he did these things. Indeed, vain would have been whatever he might have said, so long as they maliciously dissembled a plain fact, striking the senses of all the people, in which manifest proofs of his authority had been contained. He was therefore content to have convicted them of malicious craftiness, being meanwhile prepared, if there had been any straight-forward reply, from that very answer to demonstrate his authority and its origin. Lest, however, he should leave any thing unattempted which might tend to their conviction, he adds some parables, (ver. 28, seq.) in which he graphically depicts their perversity, contumacy, and malice, and the just punishment which would overtake them. Rosenm. & Kuin.

38. τί δέ ὠπώ δοκεῖ; i. e. what think you? give me your opinion of what I am about to say. (Euthym.)

28. ἐπιτίθεται εἰς τὰν δίον. By the τὰν δίον most Commentators interpret the Scribes and Pharisees. Whithy, however, would understand the Gentiles and Jews. This interpretation had been before devised by Euthymiua, who adds also an original observation, namely, that some parts of this parable were purposely expressed obscurely, that the Jews, not perceiving the intent, might give an unprejudiced answer. It was (says Rosenm.) an image of the publicans and harlots, who for a long time lived as if they denied that any laws had been laid down for them, but afterwards repented, and acknowledged Jesus for a divine teacher. Compare ver. 31.
29. οὕτως. There is a passage very similar to this in the Charact. Eth. of Theophrastus, where he gives the following as a trait of αὐθαδελα. Καὶ φίλοι δὲ ἔρανον κελεύοντος ἔκτενεςκεῖν εἰπον, θεί οὐκ ἄν δοιη, ἃτεραν ὑκεῖν κεῖν φέρουν.

30. ἑγὼ Κύριε. Grotius, Heinicus, and others, rightly take ἑγὼ in this form to correspond to the Hebrew יְהֹוָה, which is a phrase of responsive assent, rendered by the Sept. ἵνα ἔγω. So 1 Sam. 3, 4. Numb. 14, 14. See Luke 1, 38, and Act. 9, 10. The Hebrews (say Vatab. Eras. and Brug.) answer by pronouns, where the Latins use verbs and adverbs, as, etiam Domine. It may be paralleled by our own idiom, "aye, sir." So Origen, καὶ, Κύριε: and it is not improbable that aye (respecting which the etymologists give us little information) has its origin in οὐ. Certainly, the Greeks perpetually use ἔγω and ἔγαγε in this sense, of which Wolf here gives an example from Plutarch, p. 511. τί δὲ ἔφη πρὸς τὸν οἰμετήν, ἐκεῖ-κεῖσας αὐτὸν; ἔγαγε εἶπεν. There is, however, an ellipsis both in the Hebrew and in the Greek formula, and on both of the verb substantive, which is found supplied in the Greek version of Is. 6, 8. καὶ εἶπα, Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ εἰμι, where the Hebr. is יְהֹוָה. So that there is no occasion to adopt the conjecture of an eminent Critic, ἔγα. It appears also more natural to adopt the ellipsis of the verb substantive than ὑπάγω, or ἀπέρχο-μαι, or πόρομαι, which the Commentators suggest.

31. λέγει αὐτοῖς. One may suspect that Jesus prefaced these words with some application of the parable, and that the words ὑμῖν, &c. formed the connection or corollary. Τελεσκόι and πόροι are said by synechdoche for immoral persons in general; q. d. even they might have taught you what to do.

32. ἤλθε—ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης. 'Εν (ἢ) for with. To come with any thing is to bring it, Hebraice. Grotius understands ὁδὸν δικαιοσύνης for δικαιοσύνη. But this seems harsh. It simply signifies, "he came to you in the practice of righteousness, practising righteousness, and teaching true religion." Piscu-
tor, Maldonati, and Campbell understand by ὑποσύνη that singular sanctity and austerity of John, as exhibited in his manner, dress, fasting, &c. all which the Jews especially accounted righteousness.

33. ἀφυέλεν ἐν αὐτῷ λήψον. The λήψος properly denoted the large vat (called the wine-press) into which the grapes were thrown, to be expressed; in which sense it often occurs in the Sept. But as this vessel had connected with it on the side, (hence sometimes called προλήπτος), or under it, a cistern, into which the expressed juice flowed; so by synecdoche λήψος came to denote (as here) that vat; which, as it was necessarily subterranean, and sometimes under the vat, so it was often called ἰπολήπτος, as we see in Mark, and Is. 16, 10. These cisterns, which are even yet in use in the East, bore some resemblance to the λάκκοι of the Greeks, which the Scholiast on Aristophanes, Ecl. 154. (cited by Wets.) explains καὶ ὄργυματα εὐρύχαρα, καὶ στρογγύλα τετράγωνα, (I conjecture, καὶ στρογγύλα καὶ τετράγωνα), i.e. spacious subterranean cavities, sometimes round, and sometimes square; plastered and mortared for the reception of oil or wine.

33. φικδόμησε πύργον. These towers were built for defence to the servants, and for pleasure to the owners *, answering to our garden-houses, or summer-houses. In the application of the parable, the wall, cistern, tower, &c. must not be dwelt on, nor paralleled by fancied resemblances in the Jewish economy, as has been done by several antient and some modern interpreters. It has been judiciously observed by Grotius, that they only express generally, that every thing was provided both for pleasure and defence.

33. εἴσεδοτο αὐτῷ γεωργίος. The γεωργίος often (as here) denotes any tenant, or farmer, one who works

* The antients (says Schoettg. H. H.) were accustomed to build towers in gardens and vineyards, from which there being a view every way, the servants there stationed as guards would, as from a beacon, observe the approach of robbers.
the ground, as distinguished from the οἰκοδέσποτης, or proprietor. So Thucyd. 3, 68. τὴν γῆν—ἀκεμίσθωσιν ἐξι δέκα ἐτην. 'This (by the way) is one of the earliest instances on record of letting on lease. Ἀπεδήμητος, Kuinoel thinks, is inserted for ornament. Certainly, I do not see what it can be well referred to in the application; though here, as usual, the antient Commentators exercise their ingenuity.

34. ὅτε δὲ ἡμισεν δ' καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν, the season of the year for gathering the fruits. So I take Mark 11, 15. οἷς γὰρ τὸν καιρὸς συκῶν. Mark and Luke omit τῶν καρπῶν.

35. ἔθεσαν. Δέρεω signifies, properly, to skin, excoriare; 2dly, to severely beat, scourge, wound. There is a similar use of the expression in our own language, though confined to the vulgar. Indeed, in most languages, words which properly signify great violence are not unfrequently used in a milder sense.

36. πλείονας. Markland explains, "of greater dignity;" but that sense in the New Testament seems confined to the neuter πλεῖον. ἐλίβασθησαν, drove away with stones.

37. ἐντραγισμέναι τῶν υἱῶν μου—they will treat with reverence. It signifies, first, properly, to turn away from; secondly, for fear, or through reverence. Lest this should seem to involve ignorance of futurity in God, the ancient Commentators tells us that the words denote not what would happen, but what might justly and reasonably have been expected, or what ought to have been done: and Grotius says the expression is to be understood, θεοπρεπῶς, not to exclude prescience, but to denote that the contingency of an event is viewed in its causes. Perhaps, however, there is no occasion to resort to any such metaphysical distinctions. The circumstance seems merely ornamental, and not to be attended to in the application.

41. κακὸς κακῶς ἀπολέσει. Of this phrase, which frequently occurs in the best Greek writers, numerous examples are given by Wetstein and others. Dr. Campbell thinks he has well expressed the sense
without losing the paronomasia, by translating thus: "He will put those wretches to a wretched death."  

41. ἀπεκδομοµένας καὶ καρποῖς. It is worth while to notice this most ancient mode of paying rent, (which, by the way, signifies what is rendered or paid,) namely, in produce: of which I have met with vestiges in several passages of the Classical writers; ex. gr. Plato de Légg. 8. γεωργίαι ἄνευ δώλους, ἀπαρχὴ τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἀποτελοῦσιν. Dion. Hal. 616, 36. γεωργοῦντες ἐκ τῆς ρητίας τίς τεταγμέναις μεῖραις, ἃς ἐκ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτοῖς ἔτελον. Xenôp. O Econ. 15, 1. ἐπὶ τοῦ οὐτῆς ἡ ἀραία ἀποδεικνύοντα. After these payments in produce came, in process of time, to be commuted for money-payments, the word which denoted them (ἀπαρχή) came to signify rent, tribute, revenue, &c. So we find it in Thucyd. 6, 20. Συρακοσίως δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ βαρβάρων των ἀπαρχῆς ἐσφέρετο. I will take this opportunity of emending a corrupt passage of Josephus, in which the ἀ occurs in this sense. P. 329, 9. Hudson. καὶ νῦν δὲ οὗ τῆς ιδιας ἄντι ἄρχης διακοσία τάκατα. I read ἀπαρχῆς when there is an ellipsis of ἐκ or ἄν. The sense is, of his own private revenue, reserved to himself, on giving up the crown to his son David. So 2 Sam. and ἐξαιρέτων are joined by Demosth. de Corona. See Cant. 8, 11. Ps. 80, 9—12. Is. 5, 1. Herodian 1, 6, 8.  

42. λίθων, for λίθος. See examples of this idiom, which is similar to the well-known passage of Virgil: "Urbem quam statuo, vestra est." It is frequent both to Greek and Latin writers: on which see Alberti and Wetstein, and Matth. Gr. Gram. Κέφαλη γωνίας, the head stone, the corner stone, and consequently the principal stone for sustaining the edifice.  

49. αὐτῇ—θωμαστῇ. This was a comparison usual to the Jewish writers. See Wets. Θωμαστῇ may either be referred to γωνία, (with Wets.) and mean this extraordinary personage, or be taken feminine for masculine. Hebraice. An idiom adopted by the Sept. in this place and elsewhere. Thus in 1 Sam.
47. for ἡνίκα there is τοιάως for τοιοῦτο. So also 11, 2. Jud. 19, 30. Genes. 24, 14. Ps. 27, 4. (Rosenm. and Kuin.) See also Vorst. and Fisch. de Hebraismis in Nov. Test.

42. ὑπεραλμεῖσις ὑμῶν. Palairet endeavours to defend these words from the charge of Hebraism, and examples of the phrase are numerous; but the mode in which they are used is not quite the same.

43. διὰ τοῦτο. The passage may be thus paraphrased: “Because ye have rejected this stone, the benefits of the Messiah’s kingdom and religion shall not be communicated to you, but imparted to a nation or race of persons, (whether Jews or Gentiles,) all the obedient followers of Jesus, who shall, &c. The Jewish nation shall no longer be the peculiar people of God; but that nation or race shall be so which (of whatever country) embraces the plan of salvation now promulgated.” Rosenm. and Kuin. I know of no other modern Commentators who have perceived this sense. Though it had been long ago indicated by Euthym. who explains έθνος — καίζοις by τά γένες τῶν Χριστιάνων.

44. καὶ ὁ πεσὼν—λάμμησαι αὐτῶν. This should undoubtedly follow verse 42. Or rather it has been introduced from the margin, and derived from the parallel place in Luke 20, 18. Jesus alludes to Is. 8, 14, 15. and 28, 16. where God is compared to a holy stone or rock, to which whosoever flies for refuge, is safe. Those who distrust it are opposed to those who, through fear and carelessness in flight, trip at some stone by the way, fall and are bruised; which, if angular, wounds them worse. Dismissing the figure, the signification is, “whosoever shall stumble at, and reject me, as the Messiah, shall encounter misery, yet they may repent and be healed. Ἐφ’ ὅν ὅ’ ἀν πέσῃ, λάμμησαι αὐτῶν. The words may be thus paraphrased: “But on whomsoever this rock, (the Messiah,) which might have been their defence, shall fall, it will crush them in irreversible ruin;” i.e. the former shall be miserable for a time.
until they repent, the latter for ever and ever. Wetstein observes: “He who falls upon a stone is bruised indeed, yet may be healed; but he on whom an immense stone falls is crushed as it were to dust, like the chaff dispersed to the winds. They, in a metaphorical sense, fell upon the stone who were offended at the mean station of Jesus, though they might be healed by a glorious resuscitation. The stone falls upon those who do not suffer themselves to be healed (and their prejudices removed) by all these miracles, and therefore will be involved in the common destruction of the Jewish nation. (Wets.) I have, however, ventured to give it a somewhat more general application. (See Doddridge.) Αὐτῷ αὐτῶν properly signifies to thrash, but also to beat, bruise. So Dan. 2, 44. See Schl. Lex. Rosenm. compares Virg. Aen. 12, 684. Velut montis saxum de vertice præcepit quum ruit. He might more appositely have cited a Delphic oracular response in Herod. 5, 92, 92. Λαβδα κὼν, τέξει ἐν ὠλοιτρογογ' ἐν ὑ τεσεῖται 'Ἀνράσια, μουράρχους, δικαιοῦσει δὲ Κορινθίων. Thus translated by Beloe:

“A stone which, rolling with enormous weight, Shall crush usurpers, and reform the state.”

CHAP. XXII.

VERSE 1. τόλν εἰπεν αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολάσι. It would have been more Classical Greek if it had been διὰ παραβολᾶν. So Aristoph. Ran. 61. σοι δὲ αἰνηρίων ἔρω.

2. ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν—the economy of the Christian dispensation. The heads of this parable, levelled like the last at the chief persons, are these: The felicity of the Messiah’s kingdom is announced and offered to the chief rulers, the doctors, and the priests; but they, favouring vice, and nourishing and disseminating errors and prejudices, reject it, and injuriously treat the interpreters of the Divine
will. They will therefore suffer the most condign punishments; both their city and their country will be laid waste, and besides the Jews, other nations will be made partakers of the benefits of the Christian religion; while those who, after embracing it, do not live suitably to it, shall be excluded from the felicity of the Messiah's kingdom. To these heads the whole similitude should be referred; the other parts were added, merely for the sake of ornament. Kuinoel.

2. ἔποιησε γάμους τῷ ὕκῳ. The early Commentators understood a marriage feast. The Syriac version renders it convivium. So also Alb. Kypke, and Dr. Marsh, on Mich. p. 146. The more recent ones, Michaelis, Rosenm. Kuinoel, and Schleusner, explain an inaugural feast. On that day (Rosenm. tells us) the Oriental kings were considered as sponsi and mariti, solemnly united to their country, which is compared to a sponsa. Compare Ps. 46. and 1 Reg. 1, 5—9. Other examples of this sense see in Luke 12, 36. 14, 8. Esther 2, 18. 9, 22.

3. καλέσατι signifies generally to invite. So the Hebrew נָּרָם Pr. 9, 8. 1 Sam. 9, 22. and the Latin vocare. In this sense the word and its derivatives is frequently used. It however signifies rather to summon those who had been invited. For Grotius, Brug. and Kuinoel (though Rosenm. thinks the point not satisfactorily proved) observe, that it was the custom among the ancients for the guests to be twice invited, (or rather first invited and then summoned,) first invited some time before, that they might prepare themselves; secondly, summoned a short time previous to the banquet, that they might be there at a proper time. The servants who summoned them, were called καλλιτοπες, δευτεραλλιτοπες, and monitores. See Grotius on Luke 14, 17. Frs. Saet. Claud. 39. and on him Oudend. and Pignorius de Servis 113. Add Echa R. 4, 2. (ap. Wet.) Quænam fuit gloria Hierosolymitanorum? Nemo eorum venit ad convivium, nisi bis vocatus.
3. οὐκ ἔθαλην ἔλαβεν. Wetstein compares 2 Paral. 30, 10. and Jos. Ant. 9, 18, 2.

4. τὸ ἄριστον μου ἐτύλμασα. The ἄριστον was at first the breakfast; in process of time the noonday meal was so denoted; and as it became at length the chief meal of the day, and was deferred till the business of it was over, (namely, the evening,) it at length generally denoted a banquet, especially in the Alexandrian dialect. See Kypke on John 21, 12.

4. καὶ τὰ σιτιστὰ τεθυμένα. This is well expressed by our English fatlings. It included calves, sheep, and fowls, and all such animals as are put up to feed.

4. τεθυμένα, Θεόω properly signifies suffio; from whence comes θύω, thus, and θύσια, odoramentum in Porphyri. de Abst. 2, 5. It has been truly observed by Hemsterhus ap. Lennep. Elym. that the ancient Greeks did not offer bloody sacrifices, but flowers, incense, &c. This was denoted by θύειν. When these were afterwards changed, and beasts were offered, yet the word θύειν continued in use for expressing facere sacra, but now denoted mactari. Yet the ancient signification was retained in the compound εὐθύειν, as appears from Aristoph. Ran. 916. (Hemsterhus.) I add, that the Hebrew מָכַר, which denotes generally to slaughter for eating, sacrifice, perhaps, originally meant only to offer up. See Ps. 50, 14, & 23, & 116, 7. Jon. 2, 10. Thus מָכַר, which seems cognate, denotes δῶρον. Schleusner, however, thinks that it first denoted to stay, for food or for sacrifice, and then, by metonomy, from the adjunct, to immolate, sacrifice, to offer odoriferous spices to the Gods; denoted, secondly, to offer up slaughtered animals; and, thirdly, to slaughter animals, whether for sacrifice or not. And as slaughter for sacrifice was generally on a large scale, so there seems an adjunct signification of a considerable number to be slain; very suitably to a royal feast. In this very sense the word occurs in Acts 10, 13. θύσων καὶ φάγε. This is (to use the words of Dr.
Maltby, Serm. 2, 487.) one of those many passages in the New Testament which refer to the happiness of another world in terms borrowed from entertainments here. “It may appear singular,” continues Dr. M. “that in so many different languages, and so many forms of religion, the ideas of future bliss should be conveyed under the same imagery. Only we must recollect that what is understood literally in other dispensations is merely figurative in the Christian.”


8. οὐκ ἦσαν ἄξιοι. The absolute use is found elsewhere in the New Testament, and in the Classical writers. Palaiaret compares a very similar passage of Cinnamus: ο μὴ γάμος ἔτοιμος, οἱ δὲ κεκλημένοι οὐκ ἦσαν ἄξιοι εἰσελθεῖν.

9. διεξόδους τῶν θεῶν, compita viarum; so called because there were many roads competunt, concurrunt. Thus διεξόδοι will denote places where many roads or streets terminate. See Loesner and Kypke.

10. πουροῦς τε καὶ ἀγαθοῦς. For Jesus showed his disciples, that among them who might profess his religion there would be those who should harbour vice, and that these, as not bearing the fruits of his kingdom, would be subjected to the heaviest punishments. (Kuin.) Τάμος, coenaculum.

11. εἰσελθῶν—θεάσασθαι τῶν ἀνακειμένων. By this circumstance ancient manners are accurately depicted. For, as Grotius here tells us, grandees, and those who gave magnificent banquets, used, when
their guests were seated, to enter the dining-hall. Thus in Aristæn. Ep. 1, 5. πάνταν εἰς ταυτὰν ἀποσκευα－
μένον—δ ἠρεχὲς ἐστιάτωρ εἰσίτε. And Trimalchio in
Petronius says: "Amici nondum mihi suave erat
venire in convivium, sed ne absentivis esset, om-
nem mihi voluptatem denegavi." (Grot.) Add Suet.
Aug. 74. "Convivia nonnunquam et serius inibat,
et maturius relinquebat, cūm convivae et coena in-
ciperent, priusquam ille adeset, et permanerent di-
gresso eo. Wetstein.
11. ἰδεῖ—καθερίσται ὁς ἐνδεδυμένον ἐστὶ νῦν γὰρ
do not dressed in a banqueting robe, but only in his ordi-
nary garment. Wetstein has produced two very
similar parables from Koheleth R. 9, 8. and Midrasch
10, 11. where those who curarunt et unxerent se,
palaverunt vestimenta sua, praepararunt se ad con-
vivium, are opposed to those qui dederunt operam ne-
gotitis suis, et in regnum palatum intrarunt in turpi-
tudine sud. I agree with Grotius, Cler. and others,
that by this is meant, adorning our Christian profesi-
ion, by a conduct suitable to our high calling. Eu-
thymius has very judiciously illustrated this.
12. ἔραξε. See Grot. on 20, 13. So we English
"friend." Both in the ancient and modern lan-
guages, this and similar expressions are used impro-
piè to those of whom we have little knowledge.
12. πῶς εἰσῆλθε οὗτος μη ἔχων ηὗρα γάμου; Πῶς
is rendered quomodo by the Vulg. and Beza. E. T.
and Campbell render it how: but Brug. Rosenm.
and Kuinoel quod fronte; which, however, may per-
haps be taking too great a liberty. I prefer quare
or quo jure, with Schlesner. It has always been
an Oriental custom, to admit none to royal and other
magnificent banquets, but such as are previously
provided with a robe; to reject which, when sent,
or to neglect to put it on, and to enter without it,
would be considered as an insult, which would draw
down on the offender at least expulsion from the
company. See Harmer, and Henniker, p. 328.
"And as all who are invited have robes provided, so
to enter without can only be imputed to the perversity of the guest, and the consequences rest with him, and are not to be imputed to the master.*" Nor was this confined to the East. We find vestiges of it in the West. So Spartanus Vit. Sev. (ap. Bulkley.) "Habuit etiam aliudomen imperii. Quum rogatus ad cœnām imperatoriam, paliatus venisset, qui togatus venire debuerat, togam præsidariam ipsius imperatoris acceptit." And Capitolinus Vit. Max. Jun. "Ipse puerulus, quem ad cœnām ab Alexandro esset rogatus in patris honorem, quod ei deesset vestis cœnatoria; ipsius Alexandri acceptit."

13. ἐκβάλετε εἰς τὰ σκότα τὸ ἐξάτερον. See note on Matth. 8, 12. To be cast out from a feast was regarded as a mark of the greatest contempt. So Soph. Ἰρακίνη 267. where it is said of Eurytus, δεῖνως δ’ ἧν ὤνωμένος Εὐρυτέον ἐκτὸς αὐτῶν. Such an insult however to an eastern prince would be thought to merit more than ignominiously casting out, i. e. bonds and confinement.

14. πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσὶ κλητοὶ, οἵνοι δὲ εἰκλετοὶ. On this passage see note above, 20, 16. where Dr. Hammond has a very long, and most instructive annotation on the true sense of the words κλητοὶ and ἐκλετοὶ. I trust I shall render an acceptable service to the student, by laying before him the following very careful abridgment of this learned dissertation: "The words κλητος and κλητος in the New Testament will mutually illustrate each other. It will be useful first to examine them in a place of 3 Macc. where both occur together. There κλητος signifies guests invited to a feast: ἀρχον τῶν κλητῶν ἦσον, (as in the Classical writers; so Herac. de Incr. δὴν τὴν πληθώμεν

* This is copiously illustrated by Altman. Melit. I. 121. and Paaslen. p. 466. referred to by Koecher. They maintain, (notwithstanding the doubts of Krebs,) that Christ had reference to this custom, and thereby meant to teach us that God is pleased to offer to all the means of salvation, i. e. grace, faith, sanctification, which when any depreciate and reject God cannot but feel wrath, and decree them to the severest punishment.
ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. XXII.

καὶ λαμπρῶς συνευκομεθα; to which is opposed ἄκλητοι in Homer, and ἰνωκατί in Plautus, | the office of inviting and entertaining them: | and Judith 12, 11. a banquet, or invitation. So ὁ πρὸς | ταῖς κλησίας τεταγμένος is he that was to invite and | entertain (the κλητωρ, invitant). In the Sept. the word | has another notion. In 1 Kings, 1. 49. & 41. οἱ κλη- | τοὶ τοῦ Ἀδανίου are those called from Adonijah, i.e. | called after his name, and therefore his adherents. | So Absolam (2 Sam. 15, 11.) has two hundred such | κλητοὶ. So that hitherto κλητοὶ signifies those that | are selected to receive especial favours, or to be em- | ployed in special trusts; and the latter is the particu- | lar meaning of the word. So in Aristot. οἰκον. | we find τεχνίτας κλητοὺς subjoined to σταράτας προσδοκί- | μονος, i.e. choice artificers. Besides this notion of | the Greek, from the Hebrew for calling, there is | another for celebrate: and so the words נִקָּה | and נַגָם signify both vocatum and celebrēm, and is ren- | dered εἰκλητος and κλητός. Thus in Exod. 12, 16. | and in Levit. often, κλητῇ ἁγία which may be com- | pared with Act. 13, 34. ὑσία τὰ πιστὰ, sure mercies. | The κλητῇ ἁγία signifies, literally, a solemn holy, or | holy solemnity, a holiday. Agreeably to the above | senses is that of ἐπίκλητος in the Sept. either as ap- | plied to a day (Num. 28, 18. ἐπικλήτος ἁγία), or as to | persons (Numb. 1, 16. οἱ ἐπίκλητοι τῆς συναγωγῆς, and | Num. 26, 9. σύγκλητοι θουλῆς). Thus far will the | Old Testament lead us into the sense of this word; | and by the consent which subsists between that and | the writers of the New Testament, κλῆσις denotes | that peculiar favour now vouchsafed, first to the | Jews, and then to the Gentiles, which had not be- | fore been allowed to any, a state of favour vouch- | safed by God's especial providence and grace. In | 1 Cor. 1. 26. κλῆσις signifies that invitation unto | Christ, which brought in especially the poor in spi- | rit; not that others were not called, but they did not | accept the calling. In Ephes. 1, 18. & 44. ἔχεις κλῆ- | σεως is that hope which results from the mercy of |
God in revealing his Son. So in Philip. 3, 14. the ἐρασμὸν τῆς ἄνοικτήματος τοῦ Θεοῦ supposes the κλησίς to be some service of ours, to which the reward given by God, the judge, is styled ἐρασμὸν τῆς κλῆσεως. So 2 Thess. 1, 11. κλησίς is the honour of belonging unto Christ as his followers. So in 2 Tim. 1, 9. the holy calling is the honourable condition of being Christians through the free mercy of God in revealing his Son. So in Hebr. 3, 1. κλησίς φυσαλία is the appertaining to Christ: and in 2 Pet. 1, 10. where we are exhorted to make our calling and election sure, the calling is again the mercy of God in making us Christians; and the ἱκανός either again the same, because the favour of having Christ revealed to them was an act of God's free choice, or else, the purpose and mercy of God's rewarding believers eternally. By proportion to this signification of κλησίς we must render κλητὸς one that has received this mercy, and the honour of appertaining to Christ. So κλητὼν ἀπόστολον, in Rom. 1, 1. and 1 Cor. and ver. 6. κλητὸς Ἰησοῦ, i.e. Christians, though not Apostles: and ver. 7. and 1 Cor. κλητὸς ἁγιος, though not so dignified as to be Apostles, yet servants of Jesus, or Christians: and 8, 21. κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοὶ, denotes either they that are thus loved and favoured by God of his special grace, or they that are come unto the faith of Christ, not in body only but in soul. So in 1 Cor. 1, 24. οἱ κλητοὶ, the called (opposed to Jews and Greeks) are Christ's followers. Jude 1. τοῖς κλητοῖς, here the word is used absolutely and substantively, "to the saints or Christians." There are only three passages remaining; in two of which κλητὸς is opposed to ἐκλεκτὸς, here, and in ch. 22, 14. Here (i.e. 20, 16.) κλητὸς clearly has the sense of belonging to the service of Christ; and ἐκλεκτὸς that of special excellence or diligence therein. In the second place, Matth. 22, 14. the called are those to whom the first graces are given of inviting and calling to Christ, v. 3, 4. and yet farther, of bringing in to that spiritual feast, v. 10. but then those who were
invited, and did not at all come in, and so were not worthy, v. 8. that is, capable of the farther grace or reward, or reception there, and he that coming in, came without the wedding garment, (that due reformation and change of mind required of him in obedience to that call,) were not allowed those higher vouchsafements, but even those which they had taken from them, and they punished for the abuse of them, cast into utter darkness, where there is crying out, &c. The last place, Apoc. 17, 14. is very remarkable, where καθότι, ἐκλεκτοὶ, πιστοὶ, called, chosen, faithful, are set down either as all one, or else as different degrees of Christians, and πιστός the last or highest. 1. καθότι, retainers to Christ, or to the faith of Christ; then, 2. ἐκλεκτοὶ, those that had lived like such, that had not in vain received the Gospel; 3. the faithful servants, that continued faithful unto death, performed all the trusts that God had reposed in them.

15. ὅπως αὐτὸν παγιδεύσωσιν. Παγιδεύειν signifies, properly, to lay snares for birds, but it is here used metaphorically, as Prov. 6, 1. (Symm.) ἐπαγιδέως ἐν ῥημάσι στρατάς μου (which Matthew seems to have had in mind. It may be rendered, that they might ensnare him in his words, irretire, illaqueare, capture. So Cic. Acad. 4, 275. & 15. cited by Wetstein.

16. μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν, partisans of Herod Antipas. The word Ἡρωδιανῶν is formed after the model of the Latin termination in anus, which denotes "of a particular country, sect, or party." Thus in Roman history we read of the Cæsariani, the Pompeiani, Ciceroniani, and also Christiani, and many more produced by Wetstein. These held that tribute might lawfully be paid to the Romans, which the Pharisees denied; so that whomsoever Christ favoured by his answer, he would infallibly offend the other party. It appears that the Pharisees hoped that Jesus would have returned an answer against paying the tribute; and that they brought the Herodians
with them, as Luke says, ἵκακετον, suborned as witnesses of his words. (Euthym.)

16. ἄδικως μὴ κρίνει πρώτως τίνος mean nearly the same thing. The former, however, is a Greek phrase, of which Wetstein has produced examples: the other is a Hebraism, signifying the same with λαμβάνειν πρώτως. Luke 20, 21. Hebr. אוֹלָד יִשָּׂא. Though Phocylides 8. has ἄδικως μὴ κρίνει πρώτως, and Symmachus, 1, 19. personarum spectare gratiam. Πρώτως προσάω signifies the external appearance, or condition. The Latins so used persona, hinting that this no more formed part of the man than does a mask, such as was worn by dramatic actors.

17. ἔγετο δὲναι κήνου Καίσαρι, ἀν ὅ; Cicero pro Marcell. 10. Erat certamen inter clarissimos duces, multi dubitabant quid optimum esset: multi, quid sibi expediret: multi, quid decreter: nonnulli etiam, quid liceret. They do not enquire about the right of Caesar over Judæa; for among the Jews that was admitted to be none at all. It was the one hundred and twentieth year since Pompey, acting as mediator between Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, who were contending for the kingdom, subjugated Judæa to the Roman power. Jos. Ant. 14, 4, 4. and 5. Afterwards the Romans set Herod and his sons over the Jews against their wills, and finally exacted the census, or capititation tax; and Judæa, being reduced to the state of a province, fell to the administration of avaricious and unjust governors. It grieved the Jews to see theatres erected by Herod,—eagles displayed aloft,—the sacred treasury plundered by Pilot,—the Antonia which overlooked the Temple fortified by a Roman garrison,—the high priests created, and removed, at the pleasure of the governor; and they, not unreasonably, feared worse usage. Hence, impatient of these injuries, they began to debate, whether the obedience so rendered to the Romans could con-
sist with the duty which they owed to themselves, their fellow-citizens, nay, to God himself? whether or not their ancestors were to be imitated, who had disowned the dominion of Pharaoh, and afterwards of the Kings of Syria with a success which they attributed to the co-operation of the Almighty? Would therefore God have instilled this love of liberty in their minds, would he have made them his people by the command of circumcision and of the law promulgated and ratified by promises, that they should suffer a base and miserable bondage to foreigners, uncircumcised, idolaters, and tyrants? See 1 Macc. 2. 24—68. 3, 59. Deut. 17, 24. Thus Judas the Galilean taught them. Jos. 18, 1, 1. & 6. B. 2, 17, 8. To others, however, who recommended pacific counsels, rebellion seemed not so much unjust, as unavailing and ill-timed. Jos. B. 2, 16, 4. So King Agrippa and Joseph. B. 5, 9, 8. Their opinion, however, predominated who urged revolt; and this they did with such union of mind, that the whole nation ran to arms, and were all involved in one common destruction. This opinion had, even already, taken deep root, when by the confident expectation of the advent of the Messiah, not only were the bad impelled to hopes of innovation, under the guise of piety towards God, and attachment to their country, but even persons of probity and rectitude (and among them the disciples of Christ) wishing to create him the Messiah (Jo. 6, 15. Act. 1, 6. Luke 24, 21.), which they thought never could be effected unless by shaking off the Roman yoke. Finally, such was the pride of the nation, that they could not endure the very name of servitude. Jo. 8, 33. Jos. B. 3, 8, 4. The Pharisees, however, thought that they had so craftily spread their net for Christ, that whichever way he should turn himself, he could not escape their snares. If he had pronounced an opinion in favour of the Romans, he would have alienated the minds of his countrymen and disciples. "Yet think ye him (would they have said) as Messiah, monarch,
and liberator of the Jews, who thus adjudges you to Roman servitude? Can you consider him as true and regarding not the persons of men, who in the wilderness, in the fields and villages, and among the populace, inveighs against the extortions of publicans and the vices of rulers, but in the city, where freedom of speech and truth would expose him to danger, fawns on our tyrants?" If, on the contrary, he had pronounced an opinion against the Romans, nay, if he had uttered a word which might seem to glance that way, they would have delivered him up to the power of the governor, as an exciter of sedition, (Luke 20, 20. 23, 2.) which would have exposed him to inevitable death; for never were the judicia majestatis more severely exercised than under the reign of Tiberius. Tacit. A. 3, 38. addito majestatis crimen quod tum omnium accusationum complementum erat. 66. Suet. Tib. 58. Senec. de Benef. 3, 26. Philostr. p. 18. de Statuis. Joan. Sausb. de Nug. Cur. 3, 10. What answer did Christ make? For liberty, or for subjection? Did he define the just limits of liberty and subjection? He did, I think, neither. For since (as Luke tells us, 20, 27.) the Pharisees themselves, admiring his answer, held their peace, and could not carp at a single word that he had said amongst the people; it is a manifest proof that he had uttered nothing which tended to the determination of the matter in question. Furthermore, since we know, from Luke 12, 13 & 14. that he had refused to undertake the office offered to him of arbitrator and decider in an inheritance, it is not credible that he would have made a similar disputed question his own; nay, one of much more difficult determination, especially if we consider that Christ, whose kingdom is not of this world, came to lead men to heavenly felicity, and not, by the Gospel, to abolish forms of government, or to interpret pacts and covenants between rulers and subjects; which, indeed, was not necessary, since the rights of kings and people, the bounds of authority and obedience, may be suffi-
ciently understood from the nature of man, of society, and of mutual compacts, and were understood even by those who had never heard the name of Christ. So that here there was no need for a new revelation. As the Apostles left the liberty or slavery of men, and their condition in this life in the very same state as they found it, so are we justified in supposing that Christ did the same. See 1 Cor. 7, 20, 21.

On the Herodians mentioned in this sentence various have been the opinions of theologians, which are detailed by Wolf, Koecher, Calmet, and Elsley. It may be sufficient for me to observe, that though, from the slight mention of them in N. T. and the silence of Josephus, certainty cannot be attained, the prevailing and best-founded opinion seems to be, that they did not form any distinct religious sect, (though probably Sadducees in opinion, as was Herod,) but were rather a political party, or association, composed of the courtiers, ministers, domestics, and partisans and adherents generally of Herod. This opinion is confirmed by the termination of the word ἔνοικοι, which was in that age appropriated to denoting political partisans, such as Cæsariani, Pompeiani, Ciceroniani, &c. Herod, however, neither favoured the domination of Cæsar nor the liberty of the Jews. Hence, whether Christ sided with him or with these, he would equally offend the Herodians.

As to Herod himself, it is truly observed by Wetstein, that he aimed at an authority supreme, and not accountable to others. To hold only a part of the kingdom, and that precariously, and by favour of the Romans, the whole of which should have been his by a natural and hereditary right, seemed to him hard and unjust. Against the events of anticipated hostility, he had collected in his armories, such a quantity of military stores as would have been sufficient for accounting 70,000 men. On which very account, having afterwards fallen under suspicion of conspiring with Sejanus against Tiberius, and of forming a treaty with Artabanus, king of the Par-
thians, against Caius, (as we read in Jos. Ant. 18, 7, 12.) he was stripped of his tetrarchy, and condemned to perpetual exile, in which he at last died, at Lyons, in Gaul.

18. γυνος—τὴν ποιηριαν εὐτῶν, malitiam et calliditatem. So Aristid. Leuctr. 1, p. 46. ὑπερβλήκοτε πάντες ἄνθρωπος ποιηριά καὶ κακία. And Lucian 12, 6. ἐκράτησε—οὐκ ἵσχυν ἀλλὰ ποιηριὰ καὶ ἀτυχία. So Dan. 11, 27. (Theodot.) Mark 12, 15. ὑπόκρισιν. Luke 20, 23. πανοργίαν. So Cic. de N. D. 2, 30. malitia versuta; and in 3, 8, joins malitiosi and cal- lidi; and, in his Tusc. Disp. 4, 15. he says, malitia is the name of a certain vice. And Terence, Andr. 4, 8, 8. joins malitia and astutia. (Wets.) So Justin, 18, 3. malitia (craft) servos, non sapientiā, vincere. See also Schl. Lex.

18. ὑποκριταλ. Campbell renders dissemblers. Whetby, however, interprets the word in its full force; as also does Euthymius.

20. τίνος ἢ εἰκών. The origin of stamps and impressions on coins is attributed to the Persians. (Rosemn.) See Beckman on Inventions.

21. Kaisaros. Hence the denarius itself was sometimes called denarius Cæsarianus: as appears from a passage of Avod. S. f. 6. (ap. Wets.)

21. ἀκοδοτε. This may be rendered pay. So Matth. 5, 26. 18, 25. et ἡ σεπε. See Schl. Lex. Eusth. on II. 42, 42. says that δίδωμι is used of a gift, ἀκοδι- δωμι of the payment of a debt. So Thucyd. 4, 65. ἀκοδίδωμι ἀγγίσων τακτών. Wetstein cites Phil. Jud. 3, 21, 1. The receiving of any coin as current in a country was thought an acknowledgment of subjection. Compare Dio. 52, p. 328. and 1 Macc. 15, 6. (ap. Wets.) And so plainly Maimon. (as cited by Wets.) in Gezel. ch. 5. Ubcunque numisma alicujus regis obtinet, illic incolæ regem istum pro Domino agnoscent. And Hieros. Sanhedr. f. 20, 2. The argument is this: As by receiving as current the coins of Cæsar you acknowledge yourselves his subjects, then pay to him the tribute of subjects; but
to God render the things of God, i.e. the half shekel. It will also bear a more general application, which may be expressed in the words of Euthymius: 'Εξέτι γὰρ καὶ ἀνθραώπως ἀπονεμεῖν τὰ προστάκτων, καὶ τῶν τὰ ὁμολόγων τοὺς μὲν, τοὺς φόρους, καὶ εἶ τι τοιοῦτον τῷ δὲ, τὴν εὐσεβίαν καὶ φυλακὴν τῶν ἐντολῶν. Or, (with Le Clerc,) Cæsar is your prince, and may demand his tribute; your religion properly and solely belongs to God. Wetstein interprets the answer of Christ, as implying that the money was to be paid to Cæsar, whether he were ruler of the Jews or not; and certainly this may be fairly inferred from the example which he was himself pleased to set them, by working a miracle for the purpose of paying it.

23. λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν. E. T. Who say that there is no resurrection. Dr. Campbell, however, maintains that the words ought to be translated, "who say that there is no future life." This he attempts to prove in a long and able annotation, of which the following will be found the substance. The word ἀνάστασις, when applied to the dead, properly denotes no more than a renewal of life to them, in whatever manner this happen. Nay, that the Pharisees themselves did not universally mean, by this term, the re-union of soul and body, is evident from the account which the Jewish historian gives of their doctrine, as well as from some passages in the Gospels; in both which I had occasion to take notice in Diss. 6. p. 2, § 19. To say, therefore, in English, (in giving the tenets of the Sadducees,) that they deny the resurrection, is, at least, to give a very defective account of their sentiments on this very topic. It is notorious, not only from Josephus, and other Jewish writers, but from what is said Acts 23, 8. that they denied the existence of angels, and all separate bodies. In this they went much farther than the Pagans; who did, indeed, deny what Christians call the resurrection of the body, but acknowledged a state after death, wherein the souls of the departed exist, and receive the reward or the punishment of the
actions done upon earth. But not only is the version here given a juster representation of the Sadducean hypothesis, at the same time that it is entirely conformable to the sense of the word, but it is the only version which makes our Lord's argument appear pertinent, and levelled against the doctrine he wanted to refute. In the common version, they are said to deny the resurrection, that is, that the soul and the body shall hereafter be re-united; and our Lord brings an argument from the Pentateuch to prove—What? Not that they shall be re-united, (to this it has not even the most distant relation,) but that the soul survives the body, and subsists after the body is dissolved. This many would have admitted who denied the resurrection. Yet so evidently did it strike at the root of the scheme of the Sadducees, that they were silenced by it, and, to the conviction of the hearers, confuted. Now this, I will take upon me to say, could not have happened if the fundamental error of the Sadducees had been barely the denial of the resurrection of the body, and not the denial of the immortality of the soul. The Sadducee, as is common with disputants, thinks it sufficient for supporting his own doctrine, to shew some absurdity in that of his antagonist. And he considers this as furnishing him with a better handle for doing this, to introduce upon the scene the woman and the seven claimants all at once, who are no sooner raised than they engage in contests about their property in her. But this is no reason why we should not interpret our Lord's words, and the words of the historian, relating to the opinions of the sect, in all the latitude which the nature of the subject, and the context, evidently shew to belong to them. (Campbell.) After all, however, there is perhaps no sufficient reason to deviate from the common interpretation. Let us always bear in mind, that the language of Scripture is, and must be, popular language; and therefore to handle it metaphysically, will be to miss its real
sense. There seems little doubt but that the expression ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν, or ἀνάστασις simply, as here (and Mark 12, 16. Luke 20, 27, & 36. 1 Cor. 15, 12. Job. 11, 24. So Lucian, 2, 294. ult. τὴν θυσίαν ἀνάστασιν.) denoted, in common acceptance, not only the resurrection of the body, but the survival of the soul, i.e. a future life. The Sadducees, in fact, held the doctrines of what is now called materialism. Throughout the whole of this narration, ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν plainly denotes the restitution of bodies, and their conjunction with souls; so that marriages, &c. might exist, as the Pharisees maintained, whose opinion it seems to have been the especial purpose of the Sadducees to expose to derision.

23—24. ἐπηρεάτησαν αὐτῶν, λέγοντες. The question of the Sadducees, and the argument adduced from it, was foolish enough, yet sufficient to refute the Pharisees. They thus argued.—Moses had laid down a law de leviratus jure. Now if the dead shall return to life, so that the souls be conjoined with the bodies, it will necessarily follow, that a woman who has been married, at different times, to many husbands, must then be the wife of many at once, which would cause a shameful polyandria; or, if one, then quarrels may arise, &c. Now, such an absurd law Moses could not lay down. Therefore, even so far as the authority of Moses is concerned, there is no resurrection. The argument of the Pharisees was bottomed on the false hypothesis, that after the resurrection of the dead, and in another life, there would not only be marriage, but these would be between the same persons who had entered into them in this life. Kuinoel.

24. ἐνυγαμβρεύσει — or, if he should refuse, the nearest of kin. See Ruth. This must be understood of a brother not already married. (Rosenm.) Then μὴ ἔχων τέκνα is well rendered by Campbell, “and leave no children.”

24. καὶ ἀναστήσει σπέρμα — progeny. This word, like the Hebrew יִת, is a collective noun, and may
denote either one or more, though in Scripture is almost confined to the latter. On the contrary, in the Classics it is generally used of the former. So Soph. El. 1510. et OEd. Tyr. 1087. A Delphic oracle in Thucyd. 5, 16. Διὸς γινόμεν ἡμᾶς τὸ σπέρμα—ἀναφέρειν. There are, however, examples in the Classical writers of σπέρμα in a plural sense. Thus Soph. Tract. 304. Eurip. Med. 798. ἀλλὰ κτανεὶ σὺν σπέρμα, τολμήσεις, γνωρί; Examples of this signification in the plural are very rare; such as I could collect, or occurred to me, will be found in my note on Galat. 3, 16.

28. τίνος—ἐσται γυμν. The Pharisees thought that the future resurrection would take place immediately after the commencement of the visible kingdom of the Messiah; such as they fancied it would be. Whence Josephus compares the Pharisaical opinions on the sort of felicity to be enjoyed in the life to come, to those of the Greeks respecting the Fortunate Isles. See Horat. Epod. 16, 42, 58. The Sadducees, however, who believed that the resurrection was taught by Christ according to the opinion of the Pharisees, thought it an irrefrangible argument against the doctrine, that, on that hypothesis, there would be a shameful polyandria in the other world. (Rosenm.) And not only so, but (as Euthymius suggests) there would be procreation and sustenance of children, property, and the strifes consequent upon it, wars, diseases, death, and all other matters of this life; so that the other scene of existence would not differ from this. Why then should there be a resurrection? It is a reductio ad absurdum. They might, says Wets., in like manner, have asked, "If all return to life at once, who will be king, who proprietor of houses, farms, vineyards, where will they all get food, drink, and clothing? What disputes and strifes!" That such were sometimes matters of speculation among the ancients, we may suppose. Ὅστε Ἀρτεμίδ. 2, 67. κατὰ ἀναθώστας ταραχὰς σημαίνει καὶ βλαφᾶς, καὶ ἢπίθεσιν γὰρ ἐπιθνοῦτα χρῆ, υ2
29. μη είδοτε τὰς γραφὰς. As the Pharisees alleged a passage derived from the Pentateuch, and Jesus himself (ver. 32) produced a passage of that kind, undoubtedly we must here understand the Books of Moses. The next words Euth. thus paraphrases: "Not knowing the power of God, which is able to raise up the dead without their former passions and affections." As to the answering of this question, Wetstein observes: "When the Pharisees asked him respecting the liberty of the Roman government, that is to say, matters which regarded this life, Christ did not choose to concern himself with what did not belong to him. Now, however, when the Sadducees move this question concerning eternal life and immortality, he felt that, having come from the bosom of his Father, to bring life and immortality to light by the Gospel, he ought no longer to be silent. Wets.

30. οὖτε ἐκγαμίζωντας. This question had exercised the powers of the most distinguished Jewish doctors, and, as we find from the Rabbinical citations in Wetstein, was frequently propounded for discussion. The more recent Rabbins have held that there is marrying, as well as eating, drinking, &c. in heaven. The ancient ones maintained the contrary. Among the Greek writers, too, there was a diversity of opinion. Plotin. Ennead. cited by Wets. maintains that there is no marrying nor venery in heaven. Many of the profane writers maintained that none of the dead would or could return to life. Palaeph. 41. έμοι δε δοκει, μηδενα θανατα δωναι αναβιωναι. Dionys. Areop. πράγμα τη παλαιότητι μεν ισως παρά φυσιν δοκουν. Lucret. S, 942. Nec quisquam expurgitus exstat, Frigida quem semel ut vitai pausa secuta. Catull. 1, 3. Quì nunc et per iter tenebriscons Illuc unde negant redire quenquam. ΑEschyl. Eumen. 650. άνδρος δ' επειδ' αυτι.
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Mr. Bulkeley has a very apposite citation from Maimonides de Pænitentia, 8, 3. In the future state nothing corporeal has place; but only the souls of the just, divested of body, and like to the ministering angels; and, as there will be no body there, so there will be no food nor drink, &c. nor any accidents of the body, as sitting standing, sleep, grief, death, &c. neither food nor drink nor cohabitation; but the just shall sit adorned with crowns, and imbibing pleasure and delight from the splendour of the Divine Majesty.

30. εἰς ἀγγέλους—εἰς, i.e. similar to angels, in neither being subject to the appetites of the body, eating, drinking, &c. and in being immortal. (Luke 20, 36.) Euthymius thus explains in what respects: κατὰ τὸ ἀπάθες καὶ ἀφίληπον, ἦτι δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἀκηρατον καὶ φαντασίως. They are to be, (Luke says,) ἵσαγγέλως, but angels are composed of spirit only: like them, therefore, shall we be; and, if so, we shall have no faculties suited to propagation; therefore there will be no place for matrimony. The nature of those future bodies is described in 1 Cor. 15, 42. seq. From this comparison, therefore, of human beings restored to life with angels, it does not follow that we shall be destitute of bodies; for what Jesus says is not to be referred to the mind.

32. Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ, the God (and patron, benefac-
tor) of Abraham; for God is said to be the God of any one, inasmuch as he confers benefits on him. See Diddrs. There is a very similar passage produced by Wetstein from Menasse f. Israel de Resurr. Mort. 1, 10, 6. Cùm Mosi primum appararet Dominus, dixisse legitur: Ego sum Deus patrum tuorum, Deus Abrahami, Deus Isaaici, Deus Jacobi. Atqui Deus non est Deus mortuorum, qui non sunt, sed vivorum, qui existunt. Itaque Patriarchas etiamnum, respectu animæ, vivere ex eo rectè inferunt." Kuinol observes on the manner of argumentation pursued by Jesus, so agreeable to the usual method of the Jewish doctors, who used to slightly allude to passages of Scripture, and left their auditor to find the consequence of any proposition, omitting in argumentation, the transitions and conclusions, the use and applications.

34. συνιστήμασι. Kuinoel adds deliberaturi nirimum, quomodo eum opprimare possent. But this seems unwarranted.

35. σειράσθεν. Some Interpreters (with Grotius) think it may here be understood in a good sense, explorare, to which Rosenmuller answers at large. Kuinoel supports the opinion of Chrys. and Theophylact, that the man came with an evil intention, but departed better disposed. See their notes. I assent to Kuinoel. Μεγάλη is for μεγίστη, as 5, 10, and elsewhere.

37. ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον—ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου. One need not seek petty distinctions on the difference between these formulas, which have much the same force, and are here coupled together, to express greater intensity. Whitby has a long note, or rather dissertation, which deserves perusal. The correspondent Hebrew formula דב נט כה היא is sometimes rendered in the Sept. by all these words, sometimes two: sometimes in the Hebrew we have only דב, and in the Greek ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ. (Rosenm. & Kuin.) Other passages (together with Mark 12, 30. Luke 10, 27.) will defend the word against
Drusius, who suspected it to be a Scholium. The Classics often use the phrase εἰς ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς, coupled with verbs of loving, trusting, striving, &c. See Wetstein. Herodot. 8, 97. εἰκ τάρτας πιέων, or, as the Latin, toto animo. The phrases are not often found united. The following are examples: Philo. 2, 191, 18. διακοίτη καὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάση δυνάμει. Plut. Capt. 2, 8, 27. id persequer, corde et animo, atque viribus. Catull. 61, 69, toto exta pectore Theseu, Toto animo, tota pendebat perdità mente. Cic. Ep. Fam. 16, 8. Te videre tota cogitatione cupio. More examples may be seen in Wetstein, from whom these are selected.

39. ὅμως αὐτῷ, equal in importance, though it yields in dignity; as requiring (says Grotius) not internal, but external service, or as extending to all; also, as incessantly connected with the first; for “he who loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?” 1 Joh. 4, 20. See more ap. Grot.

39. ἀγαθεῖς τῶν πλησίων σου αἰς σεαιρτῶν. Most Commentators explain this, “to love and serve one’s neighbour as much as oneself.” But is this possible? I grant that Barnabus, Epist. p. 249. Voss. accounts it one step in the way of light, to love our neighbour ἐν τῷ ψυχῆν, above our own soul. But this should seem to be impossible. I agree with Brug. Grotius, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, that the αὐτῷ is to be taken like the Hebrew ז, which often compares things similar but unequal: as Matth. 5, 49. Joh. 17, 21. Act. 8, 29. Thus it implies that our love should be sincere and unfeigned, like that which we bear towards ourselves. Cassubon explains, “Love others as you would wish to be loved by them, if you were in their place.” It is to be carefully observed, that the term ἀγαθεῖς implies not only to wish well to our neighbour, but to do good to and benefit him; so that the maxim differs but little from that of “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.” What Grotius has written here concerning friendship is not appo-
site, as when he says, "friend is a second self," and that the goods of friends are common. We are not commanded to make bosom friends of others (and τῶν πλησίων has that extensive signification), but we are commanded to practice such affectionate sympathy towards all others, as may not only incline us to avoid injuring them (as we avoid injuring ourselves), but show active beneficence towards them. This interpretation is (as Campbell observes) confirmed by Rom. 13, 10. where the Apostle hence infers, that fulfilment of the law is charity, because it worketh no ill to its neighbour. For to work no ill to one's neighbour is, not to deny him any thing to which he has a fair claim, i.e. to treat him in the same manner as one might, if similarly circumstanced, justly expect that he should treat us. See Whitby's long note (or rather sermon) on this verse, which comprehends almost all that needs be said on the subject. 40. ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφήται κρέμασται. There is no allusion in this phrase, as some of the Commentators suppose, to this custom of hanging up the laws from a large pin. Neither, however, is it a Latinism, as others tell us. κρεμάσθαι, and other verbs of similar signification, both in Greek and Latin, are used in speaking of things which are closely connected, so that all form links of one common chain, depending from one origin. (See Genes. 44, 30. Judith, 8, 34.) This will more clearly appear by the examples produced by Elsner, Alberti, and Wets. Plut. 2, 116. c. γνωσθείη σεαυτῷ καὶ τῷ Μηδὲν ἀγαν ἐκ τούτων γὰρ ἦρεται τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα. Sext. Emp. 1, 158. Jamblich. Protrept. ad Symb. 24. τὸ γὰρ κυριότατον ὑδάμα τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν δογμάτων τούτω εἶναι, ἐξ ὧν τὰ πάντα σχεδόν ἦρεται, καὶ ὡς ὧν μέχρι τέλους κρατῶνται, & de V. Pythag. 29. πάντα — εἰκείην ἐξηρτῆσαι δοκεῖ. Eunap. in Maxim. ἐξεκρέματο τοῦ ἀνδρός. Hor. Ep. 1, 1, 105. de te pendentis, te suspicentis amici. One must, in the present passage, notice the use of the ἐν for ἐκ, which is an Hellenistic idiom. In propriety ἐν should have been followed by ἀνακεφαλούνται, or πληροῦνται,
as St. Paul expresses it, Rom. 13, 10. So the Syriac version continentur, and the Persian comprehensio sunt.

42. τερ στο Ἀρποῦ. This question Jesus proposed to the Pharisees, in order to convince them how little they knew the true office and dignity of the Messiah. They expected a terrestrial king, who should, like other earthly princes, reign in splendour. But, from the words of the Psalm they ought to have concluded, that the Messiah was to reign not on earth in a visible form, but in Heaven, with God; whence it followed that David also is subject to his dominion, and for that cause calls him εν πνεύματι, his Lord. (Ros.)

43. εν πνεύματι. Rosenmuller explains it, spiritus prophetico. Kuinoel takes it simply for vates, propheta, quoting Act. 2, 30. προφήτης οτάρχων. But he is mistaken: it signifies, "under the influence of the Holy Spirit." There are many passages from the Rabbinical writers adduced by Wetstein, from which it appears that this was the sense which Jesus meant to express. It is such as was commonly used of David, and other inspired writers of the Old Testament. See Grot. So Mark in the parallel passage, 12, 36. εν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ.

44. καθού ἐκ δεξιῶν μου. It is a comparison taken from kings, on whose right hand sat the heir, or he that was next in dignity, and he that was immediately below him in dignity, on the left hand. But sitting on the right implied also a participation in the regal power and authority. Hence συμβασιλεύων is interpreted by Paul, 1 Cor. 15, 25, βασιλεύων. See, on the term Κύριος for Deus, a long and learned note by Grotius.

45. ἐως ἐν τῷ τοῦ εἰρηνοῦ σου ὑπόστη. Rosenm. renders ita ut, as the Hebrew יְ, which particles (as Schlesusner says) do not always note an interjected interval, so as to exclude any further space or time; but are, not unfrequently, so referred to the time preceding, that the contrary cannot be affirmed of the following. It may be rendered in English while
I make. The image which follows is taken from the ancient custom of putting the foot on the neck of a subjugated adversary. So Virg. Æn. 10, 781. Tum super abjectum posito pede. Petron. 115. Agnovique terribilem paullo ante et implacabilem Lycam pedibus meis penè subjectum. Aristænet. 1, 22. ἐγὼ σὺ μόνη τῶν ἱστερίφαμον ἔστησα τῶν ποιῶν. (Wets.) In what sense these words are to be understood of the Messiah appears from 1 Cor. 15, 25. seq. (Rosenm.)

45. εἰ—ἔστι. The construction is inverted: the direct expression would have been, εἰ ὑμᾶς αὐτῶν ἔστι, τῶν αὐτῶν κύριον καλεῖ. (Grot.) Whichever way it be taken, the force of the argument comes to the same thing. David, by calling the Messiah, one of his posterity, Lord, acknowledged that there was something divine in him. (Rosenm.) There was, too, something extraordinary that the son should be superior to the father. In which view Wetstein cites Quintilian, 3, 7. Est varia laus hominum—lla quoque interim ex eo, quod ante ipsum fuit, tempore trahentur, quæ responsis vel auguriis futuram claritatem promiserint: ut eum, qui ex Thetide natus esset, majorem patre suo futurum cecinisse dicuntur oracula.

46. ὕπ' ἐπολαυσάτ' τις ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπερωτησει· αὐτῶν ὑμέν. By τις must be understood the Sadducees, Pharisees, and Jurists, all of whom he had silenced. (Rosenm.) For (as Doddridge observes) “the memory of this confusion impressed their minds during the short remainder of Christ’s continuance among them; and he was soon removed from them, so that they had no longer opportunity to do it, when that impression wore off.” Jesus, who knew all hearts, had thus effected what he had wished, had silenced them, had publicly exposed their malice and obstinacy to the crowd of people, and to those who had ears to hear he had afforded matter for meditating on the true dignity of the Messiah. (Kuin.) By ἐπερωτησαί must be understood that putting of such sort of captious, ensnaring questions as those above-mentioned.
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VERSE 2. ἐν τῷ Μωσέως καθέδρας ἐκάθεν, namely, by teaching and expounding the books of Moses, and such other precepts of the law. So καθέδρα was used by the Classical writers, where Seneca calls the philosophers Cathedralii. The Archisynagogi, &c. stood during the time of reading the very words of the law; then they sat down while they interpreted it. Luke 4, 7. (Rosenm.)

3. τέμνα υἱοὶ ἰσρα—τοιείτε. In the interpretation of this passage, we must restrict the words to the precepts read in the books of Moses; not extend them to traditions, even if they assert them to be from Moses. Euthymius explains the τέμνα thus: "all precepts that tend to correct and improve the morals, and which are not contrary to the ordinances of the Gospel." But imitate not (continues he) their lives, which are unworthy of their doctrines: ἀξιόπιστοι μὲν γὰρ εἰς διδάσκοντες, ὥς ἀξιοσθήλαιτοι δὲ πολιτευόμενοι. It is true, that in the Pentateuch were many precepts which required the aid of explications furnished by expounders skilled in philology and ancient history. So far, therefore, Christ probably did not mean to lessen their authority, or deny their usefulness. Still there did occur cases, in which their interpretations were manifestly sophisticated; then they were blind guides, and not to be followed. (Schmid.)

3. κατὰ δὲ τὰ ἔγγα αὐτῶν μὴ τοιείτε. Katâ here signifies conformably to. Wetstein compares Liv. 7, 82. Facta mea, non dicta vos milites inquit, sequi volo, nec disciplinam modò, sed exemplum etiam a me petere.

4. δεσμεύουσι γὰρ φορτία β. κ. β. Δεσμεύω signifies, properly, to bind or tie, and, as applied to a bundle, to bind up. Here (as not infrequently in the Jewish writers) it is used figuratively of the constraints of laws and precepts. (See note on Matth. 16, 19. εἰς δήσει.) There are similar phrases in the Greek Phi-
losophers, ex. gr. Wolf cites Porphyr. Vit. Pyth. p. 42. συμματιθέναι μὲν φορτίον τῶν βαστάζων, συμμα-
θαρεῖν δὲ μη. See more in Elsner, and Pincinelli’s
Lum. Reflex. Jesus proceeds to show which works
of the Pharisees are to be avoided; and what we read
in this and the following verses Jesus said especially
to his disciples, the teachers of his religion. Take
care that ye do not imitate the example of the Pha-
risees, who detail the precepts of the law in their
widest extent, and sift every thing with the most su-
perfluous nicety, yet pervert them in interpretation,
and superadd a load of traditions and irksome pre-
cepts: notwithstanding which they themselves ob-
serve not the precepts which they so scrupulously
enjoin upon others. (Kuin.) Thus making the law,
which was of itself a heavy burden, yet more irk-
some, and almost intolerable.

4. τὸ δακτύλον αὐτῶν οὐθέλοντο κυνηγαῖ. This has
the air of a proverbial phrase, of which there are
many examples produced by Wetstein: the follow-
ing are the most apposite. Lucian. Demon. 4. τὰς
ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ προσερέτεις οὐκ ἐν ἀλήγων, οὐδὲ, κατὰ τὴν
Ælian. V. H. 12, 1. Philo. 1, 297, 33. Aristoph. Ly-
sistrat. 365. Simpl. in Epictet. 122. So in Latin we
have the phrases, digito attingere, extremis digitis at-
tingere, uno, and minimo, digito attingere, and digito
tenus. Euthymius thus, very well, paraphrases the
passage: “they not only are unwilling to take upon
their own shoulders the burdens which they load on
the shoulders of others (in order to make them rea-
dier to bear them by their example), but they will
not even stir them with the tip of their finger.” This
is, no doubt, the true interpretation, and Menochius,
Maldonati, and Whitby, are quite mistaken in taking
the words, not of the neglect of the Pharisees to ob-
serve their own minute precepts, but of their tena-
ciously exacting them of others.

5. πάντα δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν τοιῶτοι—ἀνθρώποις. Eu-
thymius thus judiciously explains: all, what all?
such as seemed good to them. Observe too, that the before-mentioned accusations involved harshness towards others, and supine self-indulgence, but this the charge of vain glory. Christ then shows that their vanity is exercised not on great objects, but on little paltry matters, which increases the blame.

5. φυλακτήρια. Hebr. פְּרֶץ. See the description of these in Elsley. In the Greek name φυλακτήρια several writers recognize their use, not only as memorativa (legis), but conservativa, and having efficacy to keep off demons. That this was the name given to amulets worn on the neck and elsewhere, for the purpose of averting evils, appears from some passages of Dioscorides, Horapollo, and Plutarch, cited by Wetstein and Kypke. That the Jews too had this opinion appears from the Targum on Cant. 8, 3. cited by Kypke, who has treated copiously and accurately on this word. See also Wets. and Schl. Lex. Rosenmuller thinks it probable, that these (together with most of the other observances of this trifling kind) came into use after the return from the Babylonish captivity.

6. φιλωνύμενοι τιν πρωτοκλησιας εν τωι δειπνοις, κατι τας πρωτοκαθαριας εν ταις συναγωγαις, expetunt, affectant. Both are mentioned (says Euthymius); for they reclined at meals, and sat in the synagogues. The πρωτοκλησιαι were the first seats at banquets. So Jos. Ant. 15, 2, 4. Herod is said to have received Hyrcanus with every honour, assigning to him των πρωτων των εν τωι συναγωγαις, κατι παρα τως ἐστιασεις πρωτοκαθαριας, ήμηπάτα, πατέρα καλαν. Where these πρωτοκλησιαι were, is not quite certain, probably at the top of the table, as with us. Among the Greeks and Romans the middle place at a triclinium, or the top place, was the most honourable. Hence may be understood the expression a summō, which occurs in Plautus. See Wets. With the Persians it was different. This we find from Plutarch, 2, 619. β. cited by Wetstein: περὶ των τῶν ἑκτεσθ ἔτης, ἄλλος γὰρ ἄλλοις ἐντίμως, Πέρσαις μὲν ὁ μεσαίτατος, ἐφ'
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ο Κατακλήται δ Βασιλεὺς, Ἑλπιᾷ δὲ θρόνος. I add Athen. 544. c. ἀδήμοι τοὺς κατώς παρ' αὐτῷ τοχεῖς, ἤργεικε. As to the πρωτευκάθισεα here mentioned, it is to be observed, that according to the most ancient custom, those in the synagogue who were not engaged in the discharge of sacred duty were placed without any distinction of seats; which was retained by the Essenes, and adopted in the first Christian churches. Afterwards a preference was given to seniores, at least in some sects. But in many places a custom had crept in, that those who had obtained the fame of learning should occupy the more honourable seats; where they sat, with their backs to the pulpit, and their faces towards the people. See ReLAND, Ant. Hebr. 61. Vitring. de Synag. Vet. To this the present passage refers. There are, in the Jewish writers, some decisions on the point where the Jurists should sit, and where the Pharisees.

This brings to one's mind the πρωτευκάθισεα among the Greeks, which denoted a privilege of occupying certain appropriated benches at the theatre, and certain honourable stations at the councils and public assemblies.

I must take this opportunity of observing, that in the Sixth Fragment of Eurip. Philoct. where occur the words θεάκοις ἀρχικῶς ἐνήμεροι (of the Augurs), there is no occasion to read μαντικῶς, as Musgrave thought.

7. ἀρκασμός, salutationes, populis Orientis receptae in prolixà appreciatione, votis conceptis, et per contatione benevolà constiterunt. (Rossenm.) Ἀγερα, in the Macedonian and Alexandrian dialect, extended to all public places or streets of a city. (Fischer.)

7. Ῥαββα. Hebr. Ṭר, διδάσκαλε. This was usually repeated in salutation, out of respect. See the Rabbinical writers ap. Wets. Or it may denote to be often called Ῥαββα. This is illustrated by the following passage from Eurip. Hec. 628. ὕψηφοιμένου, Ῥ μὲν τις ἡμῶν, πλούσιος ἐν δόμαις, Ῥ ἐκ ἔν πολιταῖς τίμιοι.
κεκλημένος. It is well observed, by Casaubon on Theophr. Eth. Ch. 10. ἐνώπια τίμιος, that, as superiors in dignity were, among the Romans, saluted by their inferiors with the title of dominus, so were they among the Athenians by that of τίμιος. Therefore, in the passage of Eurip. κεκλημένος is not, as Musgrave thought, pleonastic. Christ. On this prohibition I add some judicious remarks from Nitch. "Christ forbade them to take to themselves those appellations, in that sense in which they were sought after by the Jews. For those among the Jews who were learned, together with the name of doctor, vindicated to themselves the authority of teaching what they thought proper. They said that the words of the Rabbis were the words of God. But the followers of Christ ought not to teach the people, as things necessary to be observed, what to them appeared such, but such only as Christ himself had pronounced necessary. Of the Jews, some followed the authority of one master, some of another. But among Christians it was not permitted thus to say: 'I am of Paul, and I of Apollos,' &c. This precept therefore of Christ was necessary, but local. It would have been lawful in other places to use these very names, if these were places in which they were commonly ascribed to teachers in a sense which parted not of superstitious veneration. The universal precept on which that local one rested, as on a foundation, was this. That a teacher of true religion ought to abstain from all such external honour as may be adverse to the intent and purpose of his office, impeding, rather than aiding and promoting it by the moral reverence of truth. This is what Christ meant to enjoin on his disciples: but he does it in a manner suited to their local condition; i. e. he interdicts the use of certain names of honour, which among the Jews, through the fault of both teachers and auditors, has become abused." (Nitch de Judicandis, mor. præcept. Comment. 10. cited by Rosenm.)
8. καθηγητής. In many MSS. is read διδάσκαλος, which, however, Griesbach and Rosenm. regard as an interpretation. But this seems improbable. I agree with Grotius, Beza, Sold. Bengel, Mill, Campbell, Kuinoel, and some others, (see Koecher,) who read διδάσκαλος. The word is used by the Philosophers: ex. gr. Sext. Emp. and Plutarch ap Wets.

9. καὶ πατέρα μη καλέστε. Since the title ἡμί was greater than ἥ αρ, therefore Christ applied that to his Father, and this to himself. The sense is, "call no one of your human teachers Father.' For those are the subject of these words. They who followed any Rabbi as chief of a school, and who, q. d. in nomen ejus juraverant, were called sons of the sage, and they themselves called him ἡμί. Therefore, in the sense in which the Jews called these wise men fathers, Christians ought to call no one father. In another sense, however, they are rightly called fathers, who have, as Paul says, 1 Cor. 4, 15. begotten us in the Gospel. Grot. and Rosenm.

10. μηδε καλθίτε καθηγηταῖ—Χριστός. Christ means to say, that his disciples ought to acknowledge God alone the supreme Author of true Religion, as their Father, and the Messiah alone as a teacher invested with his authority. Nothing is to be ascribed to Peter, nothing to John; and to this end, that the Divine origin of true Religion (and what must be supposed joined with it in the mind of Christ, its moral superiority) should be obscured by no human authority. That neither the teachers should be inclined to arrogance, nor the hearers to party spirit, so inimical to all moral reverence for truth. Nitch.

11. ὁ μελισσὸν ἡμῶν, ἐσται ἡμῶν διάκονος. Such, indeed, are or should be all public characters, as kings, rulers, magistrates. See Gassendi ap. Bulkley.

12. ἦστις δὲ ὕπολει ἑαυτῷ, ταπεινωθήσεται. A sentiment used by Christ more frequently than any other. Many similar ones have been collected by Raphel, Grotius, Wolf, and Wetstein, as well from the Jewish as from the Greek writers. Only we
must observe, that as those are of temporal, so is this of spiritual application, i. e. “Him God will exalt.” So 1 Pet. 5, 6.

13. οὐαὶ ὥμων, Γραμματεῖς. Jesus here, and in the next verse, apostrophizes the Scribes as if present, though indeed they were not so, as appears from verse 1. The Commentators justly remark on the force and beauty of the figure as it is here used.

13. κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐ. τ. ἁ. Luke 11, 52. says, ἢρατε τὴν κλείδα τῆς γνώσεως, i. e. by suppressing the true interpretation, and the daily inculcation of passages which treat of repentance, faith, and unfeigned charity, omitting which, you bestow all your pains on urging rites and enlarging ceremonies, thereby obstructing the approach of those who are willing to enter. (Rosenm.) Κλειέω ἐμπροσθεν has the force of ἀποκλείειν. It exactly answers to our English phrase, “to shut the door in any one’s face.”

14. κατεσθίετε τὰς οἰκίας τ. χ.—possessions. Examples of this are given by Wetstein from the Greek and Latin Classics. I add, Eurip. Ion. 1302. σὺ τῶν ἀτέκνων δὴ τ' ἀναρπάσεις ὄμως. The κατὰ is intensive, having the force of entirely. This was done, it should seem, from Sota Hieros. f. 20, 1. partly by caballing with the children, in order to deprive the widow of a portion of her aliment; but more especially by making them devotees, and thereby readily brought under contribution: and, indeed, this would be the easier, since it has been truly observed by Jambl. V. P. 2. ὅτι τῆς εὐσεβείας οἰκείοτατον ἐστὶ τὸ γένος τῶν γυναικῶν. That this was sometimes done, is plain from the Rabbinical writers. See Wetstein. I add, Terent. Heaut. 4, 1, 37. Ut stultæ et miserae omnes sumus religiosæ.

14. καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι. Καὶ has here the sense of idque, and this (ye do). Μακρὰ is used adverbially. That these were very long we may suppose from the testimony of Berachoth, f. 32, vol. i.
2. (ap. Wets.) where we are told that the very religious prayed mine hours a day.

15. περιάγετε τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηρὰν. This is spoken hyperbolically. In illustration of this, the following passages are cited by Wetstein. Sallust, Catilina. 13, 3. Vescendi causā terrā marique omnia exquirere. Arrian. Epict. 3, 26. διὰ γῆς καὶ βαλάντις φέρονται, ἄλλην ἐξ ἄλλης ἀφορμήν πρὸς τὸ διατρέφοντα ψιλοτέχνωντες. To which I add, Pausan. 2, 26. ὃ δὲ αὐτικὰ ἐπὶ γῆν καὶ βαλάσαν ηγεῖλετο.

15. τὴν ξηρὰν, scil. γῆν. So Sir. 37, 3. Macc. 8, 32. So ὑγρὰ in Homer and Aristophanes; siccum in Virgil, liquidum in Horace. See more in Kypke and Wetstein.


15. υἱὸν γεέννης, i.e. ἄξιον γεέννης. For (as Kuinoel observes) υἱὸς joined to nouns indicating reward or punishment, or place of reward or punishment, is equivalent to ἄξιος, as 2 Sam. 12, 5. γὰρ ἡμᾶς.

15. παίετε αὐτῶν υἱὸν γεέννης διπλάτερον ήμῶν, twofold, greater, &c. This was the old interpretation:
but a \textit{new one} was propounded by Kypke, who takes διπλότερον for an adjective in the sense of \textit{fallacem}, dolosum, &c. hominem duplicem, i.e. hypocritiam. This has been adopted by most recent philologists, as Rosenm. Schleusner, &c.; to whom, however, I cannot assent. Kypke is the only critic that has produced any \textit{arguments}, and those are not very strong. The comparative (says he) is not found in the Classical authors, indeed \textit{cannot} be found; since in no language do numerals of this kind (multiplicative and proportional) \textit{admit} by the force of their signification any degrees of comparison. I answer, perhaps in point of propriety they may not; and yet there are other words which, by the force of their signification, would seem not to admit comparison, yet are sometimes so used. As to διπλότερον, I cannot allow that it is \textit{never} so found. I have \textit{myself} met with it in Appian 1, 18, 97. σκειν τριπετικά διπλότερα: where Reisk and Schweigh conjecture διπλάσια. But (as in this place of Matth.) all the MSS. unite in the present reading. The word is also used by Justin Martyr, C. Tryph. (ap. Wets.) διπλότερον ὑπὸν βλασφημοῦσιν. Other examples may perhaps be found: so that the argument of its \textit{never} being used falls to the ground. Then, as to the grammatical objection, it might be sufficient to produce examples of other words, which properly (from the nature of their signification) admit no comparison, yet take the degrees, especially the comparative. Often these are comparatives which have gradually lost all \textit{comparative} force, and even the \textit{intensive} force; and have become, as it were, positives, insomuch that they take μᾶλλον and ἤττον. So Plat. Leg. 9. p. 5. (ap. Matth. Gram. 457.) μεγαλότερον ἤττον. In the very same light I view our words worser and lesser, which Samuel Johnson so strongly censures. As διπλότερον is used in this passage of Matthew, so is \textit{lesser} by Shakspeare, K. Rich. III. Act 3. sc. 4. “No man can lesser hide his love or hate than he.” But in such cases it will
usually be found (I think) that though the words assume a comparative form, yet they do not assume a comparative sense: in which case the comparative only is slightly intensive. See Matth. Gr. 457. This is manifestly the case with διπλῶτερον in the three passages where it is found; in every one of which it is an adverb, and simply means duplo jure, more than. Kuinoel, who supports the common interpretation, truly observes, that the "notio improbitatis jam latet in verbis ὐδε γεέννης." That the phrase was not unusual with the Greeks is probable from the Rabbinical illustrations adduced by Wetstein. How it happened that they should be worse (as Rosenm. observes) is, that the Pharisees did not sufficiently take care that they should cast away their old Gentile vices and superstitions, nay, rather were the means, by their example, of new ones being ingrafted on them. See Grotius.

16. τυφλοῖ, οἱ λέγοντες. Euthymius remarks, τυφλῶτα τούτως ὠνειδίζει τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς. So Soph. ΟEd. Τυγ. τυφλός ἐστα τ ὁ αὔτα τὸν τε νοῦν τὰ τ ὁματα. 16. ὅσ ἂν ὁμόθη ἐν—κρυσφί. Hebr. 7. οὐδὲν ἐστι, scil. τὸτο, exactly corresponds to our idiom: "it is nothing," it is of no importance.

As to the subject itself, the Jews divided oaths into great (such as by God, and κορβαν) and small, such as by the temple, altar, &c. (Rosenm.) With the former they reckoned oaths sworn by any thing offered to God, which they accounted the same as swearing by God himself.

There was a superstition not dissimilar among the Persians, as may be seen by the following passage of Zosimus, 5, p. 369. cited by Wets. (and which I had myself noted down.) L. 5, 51, 2. Edit. Rietem. εἰ μὲν γὰρ πῶς τὸν θεόν τετυχήκει δεδομένος ὄρκος, ἢν ἂν ὁς εἰκὸς παιδείαν, ἐνδιδοτες τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ φιλανθρωπία τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀπεθανεία συγγενικῆς έπει δὲ κατὰ τῆς τοῦ βασίλεως ὁμομοίωσαν κεφαλῆς, οὐκ εἶναι θεμίτων αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸν τοσούτων ὄρκον ἐξαμαρτεῖν.

16. ἐν τῷ κρυσφί τοῦ ναοῦ. Not the gold with which
the walls and ceilings are said to have glittered, but
gold offered as κορμαν. See Kuinoel.
16. ὠφείλει. He is an ὠφειλέτης; or (as Euthym.
expresses it) χρεωστεί, as bound to the fulfilment
of his oath. A distinction which (as Doddridge ob-
serves) evidently had reference to their own interest.
17. The money was holy, because it was subser-
vient to the uses of the temple, and other sacred
purposes, like the ἀνάβηματα among the Greeks, and
the donaria among the Romans. Rosenm.
21. Hence Jesus shows that all those smaller oaths
are of equal force with the greatest; because, as
no one would think of invoking an inanimate ob-
ject, so by them must be understood (per metony-
miam) the owner of them. Rosenm.
23. οὐαὶ—εἰ τα ἀποδεκατοῦτε—κύμινων. Ἀποδεκατεύειν
is an Alexandrian word properly signifying to tithe,
i. e. to take tithe, (compare 1 Sam. 8, 15, 17. Ne-
hem. 10, 35. Hebr. 7, 5. 8, 2.) but it here signifies
to pay tithe; as in Luke 11, 42. 18, 12. Genes. 28,
22. Deut. 14, 22. in both which senses it answers to
the Hebrew נכר. Upon the word κύμινων see Lesley,
in his Hierobot. P. 1, p. 516. Such very exact per-
sons were called κυμινοπρίσται. So Aristoph. Vesp.
1357. τὸ γάρ υἱὸν τηρεὶ μὲ, καθι δόσκολον, καθάρως
κυμινοπριστοκαρδιαμογλύφοι. By a similar hyperbole
we say skin-flint.
23. ἀνηθὸν. The English version renders it anise.
A mistake pointed out by Campbell, arising from
the resemblance of sound between the two words,
which have no connection. Anise is in Greek ἀνισον,
but ἀνηθὸν signifies dill. Mint, dill and cummin.
Of this dill see the Botanists. See Dioscorid. 3, 461.
cummin is here meant (says Rosenm.) the cumminum
sativum, semine longiore. We may suppose that it
was milder than our cummin, which is of a disa-
greeable pungency. These are specified as examples
of small and insignificant herbs. Thus Luke has
mint and rue, καὶ πᾶν λάχανον. Observe, Jesus does
not censure them for paying tithe of them, but that, after performing these minute observances, they omitted the weightier matters of the Law. This idiom occurs elsewhere, and should always be noted. For example, in verse 13, ὅτι ἔργα τοῦ κόσμου, ὑπάρχουσα ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀφίκεται. Our Saviour does not blame them for making proselytes, but for so making them, as that they were worse than before, and worse than they themselves. He explains his meaning by the following words: ταῦτα ἐστιν παράσια, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀφίκεται. The same remark applies to several succeeding verses in this chapter.

23. άφικετε τὰ βαρότερα τοῦ σώματος — καὶ τὴν πίστιν. Ἀφίκετε expresses the Hebrew שמה, misum facere, which in the Sept. is rendered by καταλαίκου and ἀφίκετε, especially as applied to the neglect of Divine precepts. So 2 Reg. 17, 16. Τὰ βαρότερα, Lat. graviora, the weightier and more important injunctions. The Rabbins are fond of distinguishing between the precepta gravia et levia of the Law; as appears from numerous examples cited by Wetstein.

The words following seem taken from Mich. 6, 7. Κρίσις, Hebr. קרש, here signifies quod suum cuique tribuit, justice. It is taken sometimes very widely, so as to comprehend all the duties of men towards each other; sometimes more strictly, so as to denote what may be required of right, as opposed to mercy and beneficence. Ελέος, Hebr. רוח, mercy, humanity, benevolence. Πίστις, fidelity, probity, and truth, fides et obseuimum erga Deum, et fides erga homines. Jer. 5, 1. פלט. In Germ. treu und dieube. The whole of the verse brings to my mind a very noble passage of Pindar, Olymp. 13, 6, 11. ἐν τῷ γὰρ ἑλέοις παῖς, καταγγείλε τε, βάθρον πείλων, ἀσφάλεις Λίβα, καὶ ὁρόποις Εὐράκα, ταύτῃ ἀναφαί πλούσιον, χρυσίνη παῖδες εὐθοῦλον Θέματος. So also Hor. Carm. cui Pudor, et Justitiae soror incorrupta Fides, nudaque Veritas, &c.

24. διαλέγωτε τῶν κανόνων. Upon this word we have a most frivolous note by Bowyer. His doubt as to the authority by which strain at has been
altered to strain out, has been satisfactorily removed by the very intelligent Mr. Nichols. It appears in Archbishop Parker’s Bible. Strain at was therefore a mere typographical blunder. Mr. Bowyer explains the word (obscurum per obscurs) dissubstantiating. He disapproves of the expression straining out, (which to Dr. Campbell sounded oddly, and seemed to be unauthorized,) observing, withal, that to say strain or force out a gnat from entering with the liquor, appears to him a contradiction in terms; and so, I confess, it does to me also. But (with his good leave) this is not the sense of strain out. Mr. Bowyer proposes strain off; which to me appears not so proper. The oddity complained of by Dr. Campbell does not arise from the English phrase, but is inherent in the original, διαλυω. It may be worth while to examine the ratio significations: by which we shall (if I mistake not) discover the reason of its oddity, and know how it may best be translated into any other language. It signifies simply to pass any liquid through (δια) a strainer, διαλυον. (Dioscor. 3, 9. & 5, 82.) in order to separate from it the δαν, or material particles. So it is often used in the Classics; and thus Amos 6, 6. si πυρετος τον διαλυσμενον ονον. It is twice used in the Old Testament impropriè of the process of smelting, or refining, liquefied metal. In all these cases the word διαλυω is only applied to the liquid to be strained or purified, never of any δαν, or material substance, in the liquid. But in the passage now under consideration this is not the case. We can therefore only understand the word by considering it as a vox praegnans, and see what it represents. It signifies then to strain (the liquor) so that the gnats may be passed out, or off, and got rid of. Therefore any attempt to represent this word by any single term of any other language, must partake of the obscurity of the original; to effectually avoid which a circumlocution must be used. And yet such circumlocutions are irksome. (Take, for instance, Dr. Camp-
bell's, "who strain your liquor to avoid swallowing a gnat.") And, therefore, to "strain out gnats," (which is sufficiently intelligible,) may be retained. I would translate, then, "strain out gnats and swallow camels;" for that is here (and not unfrequently) the force of the article; by which is denoted the whole genus of the animal, &c. In Southern countries these gnats swarm, and therefore may easily fall into wine vessels, nay, as I find from Wetstein's citations, they are sometimes bred in them, and are then called the vinula, or culex vivarius. Hence both Gentiles and Jews strained their wine. The former from cleanliness, the latter from cleanliness united with religious scruples; the κάμηλον being unclean. Athen. 420. D. has καθάλυσαι τὸν ὄνο. The word is not to be found in St. Thes. The observations of the Greek Fathers upon this passage may be seen in Suicer's Thes. 2, 29. This whole passage has, I find, been copiously treated by Greif in a Tract (Lips. 1749) intituled, "Oraculum Christi contra percolantes culicem, et devorantes camelum."

κάμηλον. I am surprised that several, and especially Dr. Doddridge, should have stumbled at this word, which can signify neither a cable, nor a beetle. It must be taken here (as supra, 19, 24.) hyperbolically. To make the antithesis as strong as may be, two things are selected as opposite as possible; the smallest insect, and the largest animal. This very antithesis was used both by the Jewish and by the Greek writers, as appears from Wetstein. To press too hard, and refine upon, such proverbial and hyperbolical expressions as these (for instance, "the beam in the eye") would be extremely injudicious.

καταπίνω cum. The difference between καταπίνω and πίνω is clear from a passage of Philo, cited by Wetstein: οὐδ' ἐν τῷ καταπίνειν τὸ πίνειν ἐστι, bolting is not drinking. The word is not only applied to liquids, but sometimes (as here) to solids. So Wetstein cites from Galen: εἰς τὴν γαστέρα καταποθέτων σίτιων: and καταπίνειν τὰ σίτια: also, κατέπιε τὸ ἔρι-
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25. καθαρίζετε τὸ ἐξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου. "This censure carries a double sting; what filled their cups was procured by injustice, and used with intemperance." (Rosenm. from Mr. Rider, ap. Elsley.)

25. παροψίδος. The Greek Grammarians tell us that the word was used by the Attics, of the meat placed on a dish; but by the Greeks in general for the dish itself. There are, however, exceptions. See the citations in Wetstein.

25. γεμοσθεν ἐξ ἄπαγγι καὶ ἀκρασίας. Rosenmuller and Kuinoel maintain that ἀδικίας (with many MSS.) is the true reading. It does not appear that the Pharisees were intemperate and luxurious. Campbell has truly remarked, that they are never accused of intemperance, though often of injustice. The former vice (says he) is rarely found with those who, like the Pharisees, make great pretensions to religion. So Jos. 18, 1, 3. οὖτε γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι τὴν διαίτην ἐξευτελίζωσιν, οὐδὲν εἰς τὸ μαλακώτερον ἐνδιδοῦσιν. Rosenm. would render, "your vessels are full of food, obtained by rapine and injustice." Bulkley compares Plut. 2, 719.

26. Φαρισαίε τυφλὲ. Koecher commends a remark of Schoetg. in Hor. Heb. who thinks there is an allusion to a sort of Pharisees who went about cowled like monks. But this is fanciful and far-fetched; though the fact is a curious one.

26. καθαρίσων—τὸ ἐντὸς. Wetstein compares similar passages from Plut. 467, & 780. οὐδ' ὀτιών τῶν
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27. κεκωσμημένοις. On these see Elsley. Act. 23, 3. τοίχει κεκωσμημένη. Our common version, and also Doddr. and Campb. render whitened. I prefer, whitened, whitewashed, daubed over with whitening, chalk, or lime; and sometimes, as will appear from the following examples, plastered. That was sometimes the sense of κωσία, and not merely dust. (See Deut. 27, 2. Amos. 2, 1.)

There seems no reason to suppose (with Doddr.) that they were ornamented with stone and marble. Suidas. κονάται οἱ τῶν τοίχων καταψάντες. Wets. cites Aristed. in Roman, p. 219. τὰ δὲ (τὰ τοίχη) οὐκ
They were whitened, as far on the surface, as the vault extended subterraneously, whither pollution was supposed to reach, to avoid which it was ordered that the tombs should be whitened. That the Jews annually whitened the sepulchres appears from the Rabbinical passages cited by Wetstein. To these newly whitened sepulchres our Lord especially adverts. Luke 11, 44. οἰς τὰ μνήμεια τὰ ἄδηλα. This is, however, only an apparent, not a real contradiction: and as there are two lights in which most things may be viewed, so here it is equally true in whichever way it be taken. The force and propriety of ἄδηλα is very well illustrated by Whitby. Yet, perhaps, Euthymius has approached more closely to the sense: τὰ γὰρ ἀφανή μνήμεια, ἐνδού μὲν γέμουσι σαπρίας, ἀνω δὲ φαινόμενα γῆ καθαρὰ καὶ λευκόφως.


28. μέστοι—ὑπωρίσσεσαι καὶ ἄνωμιας. Μέστοι is mostly
used by the Classical writers *cum genitivo* mali, vel vitii, as will appear even from the examples adduced by Wetstein.

29. ὀικοδομεῖτε, for ἀναοικοδομεῖτε, i. e. instaurare, reificere, repair.

29. κοσμεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τ. ὑ. Elsner and Kypke interpret κοσμεῖν, of the observance of those rites which were usually performed in honour of the dead, either at the funeral, or after it. These indeed were rendered both to Jews and Gentiles; but the manner of honouring was different. One thing, however, was common to both, which here seems especially intended, that of keeping the sepulchres in repair, and occasionally rebuilding them. In this view the following citations of Wetstein are apposite: Xenoph. Hist. 6. ἐκόσμησαν τὸ μνήμα πρὸ τῆς μάχας et de Socrate, 2. ἐὰν τίς τῶν γυναιῶν τελευτασάτων τῶν τάφων μὴ κοσμηῇ. Aristid. p. 85. τῶν τάφων κοσμεῖτε, καὶ ὁς ἀρχηγεῖτον καὶ οἰκιστὴν τιμᾶτι τὸν ἄνδρα. Diodor. 11, 39. καὶ ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων θήμος ἐκόσμησε τοὺς τάφους τῶν ἐν τῷ Περσικῷ πολέμῳ τελευτασάντων. Liban. 186. a. θάκτοντες, ἔσείται κοσμοῦντες τοὺς τάφους, ἐναυτῶν πληρωμένων. Vide 1 Macc. 18, 27—30. Athen. 595. b. I add, that the passage from Liban. shows that those honorary solemnities were unusual; as we also find from Thucyd. 3, 59. ἀπεθάνεστε ἐσ τατέρων τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν θῆκας, ὡς ἀποδοκιμάσα ὅπεν Ἡρακλῆς ἐτύμωμεν κατὰ ἐτῶν ἐκατόν δημοσίᾳ̣ ἐσθήμασι̣ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων νομίμως: where Ducker remarks, that this annual solemnity is fully described by Plutarch, Aristid. p. 608. I add, that there is also an allusion to it in Bion. Idyll. 1, 98. τοούμερον ἰχνος Κομμαίν, Δεῖ σε πάλιν κλαύσαι, πάλιν εἰς ἐτῶν ἀλλο δακρύσαι: as also Justin. 9, 7, 11. Tumulum ei fecit, parentari eidem quotannis, &c. Vide et Ἀσχυλ. Choephe. 481. et Pers. 615—24.

Many were the ceremonies of the Greeks on such occasions, with which we are not here concerned. It is sufficient for our present purpose, that with the Jews, this honouring of the sepulchres consisted in keeping in repair, and beautifying them; also in re-
citing certain prayers over them, and entreaties to the dead, to intercede with God in their favour. So Vitringa, Elsner, and Kypke. Kuinoel, indeed, remarks, that however these observances may have been performed by the Jews of later ages, yet that they were usual with those who lived in the age of Christ cannot be proved. Yet it seems highly probable, considering how little addicted to innovation the Jews have ever been.


31. μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς, you bear testimony against yourselves. For in vain does Markland tells us, that the sense would require καθ' ἑαυτῶν, which may indeed be true as applied to Classical Greek; but in the Hellenistic the dative is sometimes used in imitation (as some Commentators say) of the Hebr. †ז, which bears that signification. This syntax is, indeed, found in the Classical writers, and Wetstein gives examples from Hermogenes, Aristides, Isæus, Josephus, Dion. Hal., and Galen; but in them it is used in a good sense, namely, to bear witness for, not against.

It is, however, of more importance to observe, that in the words viol ἐστε τῶν φονευσάντων τῶν περιφέρας there is an elegant ἀμφιβολία. To be true sons of any one, even in our own language, is an idiom applied to those who imitate the manners, &c. of their fathers, and aim at being like them. Compare 5, 45. and Joh. 8, 44. The sense is, “you manifestly show that you are like unto your fathers; for as they slew the prophets, so do you meditate my death.” Wets. compares a similar passage of Losbonax, in his Admon. καὶ ἀναμμήσετε πάντας τοὺς ἀνδράως, ἢτι υμεῖς ἐκεῖνοι τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐστε παίδες, οἱ πότε ἀποβάντας τῶν βασιλάρω τῆς ἡμερέας εἰς Μαραθῶνα νικήσαντες. Markland proposes to insert ver. 30 in a parenthesis; and by applying some other signification, and by introducing some alteration in the reading, on the
authority of one MS. he produces a new sense, which however ingeniously devised, and learnedly supported, does not carry with it the stamp of truth; and the δειμότης and dignity of the passage is entirely destroyed.

32. καὶ ὑμεῖς πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πάτερον ὑμῶν. Euthymius well explains οὐκ ἐπιτάττων δὲ τοῦτο εἶ- πεν ἀλλὰ προαναφαγόν τὸ ἐσόμενον, do it whenever you please; go on to imitate your fathers. Brug. Bez. Cam. Maldonati, Campbell, &c. rightly consider this as an ironical concession; and Rosenmuller and Kuinoel say that the imperative is so used in Hebrew. It is not, however, as Campbell says, an ironical order. He indeed (after Wets.) compares Virg. Æn. 4, 381. I, sequere Ætiam ventis. But that will not prove the point; nor is the citation from Mark, 7, 9, quite to the purpose. Matth. 26. 45. is more apposite; "sleep on now, and take your rest." On the Virgilian passage Servius well remarks, "satis artificiosa prohibitio, quæ fit per concessionem." Wets. also compares Sil. Ital. 2, 256. Perge, ac primordia tantum Accumula paribus factis; and Tacit. Hist. 1, 41. Terent. Adel. 5, 3, 27. Conserva, quære, parce, fac plurimum illis relinquas. On the tardiness of divine vengeance (which forms the subject of one of the best of Plutarch's moral treatises), Grotius has the following admirable observations:

"It was an old adage, That God's mills grind slow, but they grind fine. Great, indeed, is the patience of God, but he compensates the tardiness of punishment by the severity of it: and what is manifest in the case of individuals, is yet more apparent in God's providence with respect to nations. For national crimes long dissembled, at length, when, to speak after the manner of men, they have overcome all patience, God so severely punishes, that though he does no injustice to the men of that age, nor inflicts evil above their deserts, yet the punishment appears so great, that it may seem to suffice for the crimes of all the antecedent ages."—This delictorum
modus, expected by God, is called the measure or complement of their iniquity. Genes. 15, 16. Is. 27, 8. Job. 20, 22. Herod. 5, 168. ἵσα γὰρ Κύριος ἀπέ-λυσεν τοὺς διακόνους, Περεπανθρωπίας ὕπερ τέλεσεν. God does not, says a Rabbinical writer cited by Wetstein, take vengeance of man, until the measure of their iniquities be completed.

33. πῶς φύγητε ἀπὸ τῆς κρίσεως τῆς γεννήσεως. Wetstein has collected numerous passages from the Rabbinical writers, showing the opinions of the Jews on γεννήσεως, which is here made a type of the punishments reserved for the impenitent.

34. διὰ τοῦτο. On the sense of this formula there is much difference of opinion. Olearius, Wolf, and Rosenm. maintain, that it answers to the Hebrew וַיָּדָע, interea, posthac, εἰπτο τοῦτο, but of this, Kuinoel observes, they bring no proofs. He takes it (like the Hebrew פַּלּ) for a mere formula transitionis, de-noting οτιμικ. verò, as in 13, 52. Mark 12, 24. Matth. 22, 29. I agree with him. Either of which modes is preferable to that adopted by those critics who connect these words with the preceding.

34. ἔγω ἀποστέλλω πρὸς υμᾶς προφήτας, καὶ σοφοὺς, i.e. teachers of religion (such as were the Apostles, &c.) who shall not be inferior to those whom you call such. So in the parallel passage of Luke 11, 49. ἀποστελώ εἰς αὐτούς προφήτας καὶ ἀποστόλους. The appellation was applied by the Jews to their doctors, who were thus termed as being interpreters of the Divine will. And as Jesus has just said that their forefathers put to death προφήτας καὶ δικαίους, so by now using the word προφήτας he seems to signify that his own legates (Apostles) are not less Divine messengers, &c. than those to whom the Jews applied those honourable appellations. (Kuin.) Σοφοὺς, Hebrew, וֹסְפָה. Josephus sometimes calls them σοφισταλ. Γραμματεῖς, Hebr. וֹרָפָם, religiones interpretes, legum divinarum periti. I cannot agree with Markland, that the ἔγω is here emphatical, nor can I admit that where the promises are expressed
they are commonly emphatical; this seems refining too much.

34. σταυρωσετε. It has indeed been observed, that there is no example on record, of any Christian teacher being crucified as such by the Romans. Grotius, therefore, thinks that Christ may here have numbered himself with his legates: and as to the preceding ἀποστέλλω, that he interprets per sythep-sin. But this can scarcely be admitted: and as to the case of Simon, son of Cleophas, whom Grotius says was crucified Judæorum operâ, Moschius ap. Kuin. truly observes, that this was done in the reign of Trajan, after the destruction of the Jews, and not by Jews, but Christians, though indeed they were Jews by nation. See Euseb. H. F. 3, 32. However (as Moschius has very truly observed), the history of those times which has come down to us is too brief, and that many historical monuments have not reached this age: therefore the silence of history proves nothing. Kuinoel, however, thinks that the whole difficulty may be removed by taking σταυρω-σετε for omni modo saeviunt in eos, and that crucifixion was therefore mentioned as being a usual capital punishment with the Romans. But this seems to me far fetched, and too much curtails the sense.

35. ἧς. This (like ἦν, a little before, ver. 26) is to be taken ἐκβατικός, as noting the event. It may be explained thus, "when it will happen that," &c.

35. έλθη ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς τῶν αἵμα δίκαιων, i. e. αἵμα πάν-των τῶν δίκαιων, saints. So Luke 11, 50. ἦν ἐκπετθεὶ τὸ αἵμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν κ. τ. λ. See Whitby. "Ελθη ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς, signifies, "come against you as a witness, convict you of its cause, and cry for punishment." So Acts 5, 28. καὶ βουλεθε ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς τὸ αἵμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τουτου. Nor is this quite unknown to the Classical writers. So Xenoph. (ap. Wets.) ἐξειν μέλλοντα τὰ ἐγκλήματα ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς. Rosenm. would take αἵμα, per hypallagen, for pæna homicidiorum, &c. But this seems harsh.

35. ἐκχυνόμενον. For the preterite, says Rosenm.
But this is not necessary; for the participle present stands for the imperfect, there being none. Rosenm. thus paraphrases it: "So horrible will be your punishment (at the destruction of Jerusalem) that it may seem to suffice for atoning all the homicides which you have ever perpetrated on innocent and virtuous men." Kuinoel thus: "Ita puniet vos Deus, ac si majores vestros non punitisset, i.e. gravissimè puniet." So Jer. 16, 13. Jes. 65, 7. Ez. 18, 2, 4, 20. 1 Thess. 2, 15.

35. ἦνος τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχαρίου. Who this Zachariah was, has been much disputed, and cannot with certainty be determined. The different opinions are diligently detailed by Kuinoel. Rosenmuller offers none. That of Krebs, &c. is espoused by Hoog, in his Einleitung, 2. p. 9. This had been before brought forward by Hammond, Tillotson, and others. But to this it is well objected by Doddr. 317. "Had we more evidence of his being a righteous man, it would be harsh to suppose Christ, in such a connexion, to speak of a future fact as what was already done; or to charge that deed on the whole Jewish nation which was done contrary to the decree of the Sanhedrim, by two resolute villains." Besides, as Ammon observes (ap. Kuin. 688.) "Virum sapientem atque divinum, crimina futura, quæ in libera coævorum potestate sint, admonitionibus atque hortationibus avertere, non verò pœnarum et vindictæ inevitabilis severitate in antecessum ulciscì debere." Others are offered by Ammon, Eichhorn, and Bertholdt in his Einleitung Nov. Test. To Kuinoel the most probable opinion seems that of those who maintain that it was Zacharias, son of Joiadas, the high priest, who, because of his having reproved the vices of the Jewish people, was by the command of King Joaz stoned in the court of the Temple. See also 2 Paral. 24, 20, seqq. That many among the Jews were binomines is certain. See Comm. on Mark 2, 26. and Wolf and Grotius on this passage, with whom agree Whitby and Clericus, Drusius, Casaubon, Erasmus,
Campbell, Doddridge, and the Scholiast on Euthym. Mosq. Z. δὲ τὸν Ἰωάννα λέγει, διαίνως γὰρ ἤν. The reason is ascribed by Wetstein to a superstitious abstaining from pronouncing a word compounded with the name of God, the τεσσαράμματος. For which reason he thinks that Matthew in his genealogy omitted the name of Jojakin, and Jude the Apostle was called Thaddæus. Hence Zachariah, in 2 Parap. is styled son of Joiada, but here of Barachias, since his father had two names; and to the Jews, who in the time of Christ paid much attention to genealogy, either name was known. Jesus, therefore, to express all the most cruel murders of the saints (as Luke adds ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου) committed by the Jews, mentioned the first and most memorable, and the last recorded in the Scriptures, i.e. of Zachariah. Kuinoel.

35. ἐφεσε ἐν τῷ Ναόντι. V. καθὸ. This was (says Wetstein) so much the more inexcusable, since an altar, except to very atrocious delinquents, was an asylum of refuge. Exod. 21, 14. 1 Reg. 1, 51. 2, 28—30. Justin. 17, 3. & 20, 2, 4. Senec. Tr. 45. Ipsa ad aras majus admisssum scelus. Æn. 3, 381. Excipit incautum, patriasque obturcat ad aras. Eurip. Troad. 562. Polæn. 475. Thucyd. 1, 126. 24, 98. Jos. Ant. 11, 7, 1. Ovid. Met. 7, 608. Ante ipsam, quo mors foret invidiosior, aram. But in some cases it was violated, as we see above. So in Polyb. 4, 36. εἰς τὸν θεὸν καταφεύγεσαι, ὅστε περὶ τῶν βαιρῶν καὶ τῆς τράπεζας τῆς Θεοῦ κατασφαγῆναι. As to the situation, where this enormity was perpetrated, Grotius informs us that it was in subdialecti, which the Jews called ἔνως, the Greeks αὐλὴν, Jos. ἵππαρον, in which was the altar of holocausts, &c. And Wetstein observes, that there was an altar sub die in the court of the priests: it had the aedem templi at the West; and cites Jos. B. 5, 5, 6 & 8, 4, 1. & 15, 11, 5. Philo 1, 378, 12. & 2, 149, 42. & 151, 13. & 157, 9. Middoth, 5, 1. Inter aedem et altare fuerunt 11 cubiti, pro ambulacro sacerdotum. 1 Macc. 7, 38. See also Kuinoel.
36. ἰδίᾳ ταύτα πάντα ἐκ τῆς γείεσθαι ταύτῃ. Kuijn. translates evenient, observing that this formula is used either in a good, or bad sense. But surely far more frequently in the latter. So Palaiaret and Crausser remark that the Greek authors express an imminent evil by the verb ἰδεῖν. But by ταύτα I would understand these enormities, atrocities. (So Markland supplies αἴματα.) And I would take the phrase as just before, 35. ὅπως ἐλθῇ ἐφ' ὦμας πᾶν αἷμα, where see the note. This seems to suppose the doctrine of visiting the sins of the parents upon the children; and Campbell translates, “All shall be charged upon this government,” though he denies that any such visitation, &c. is meant. He understands it thus: “That with every species of cruelty, &c. which had been exemplified in former ages, those of that age would be found chargeable.” But this seems harsh and far-fetched. The exposition of Wetstein is more judicious; namely: “It may justly aggravate the guilt of a criminal if, though he have seen a long series of misdeeds punished, yet has not even thus suffered himself to be deterred from similar delinquencies: and this, as it evinces a most incorrigible mind, so it is worthy of severer punishment.” Now assuredly this the Jews did evince, insomuch that (as Josephus says) they permitted no kind of wickedness to be peculiar to those that had preceded them, but had carefully imitated, and even exceeded, all the most atrocious deeds of their ancestors.” That there is no hyperbole in these words, his own History shows. Wetstein observes that they contain a prediction of what the Jews should commit and suffer in the Temple. He then produces the following passages from Josephus, which are most strikingly illustrative of the predictions. Jos. B. 4, 3, 12. & 5, 1, & 4. 6, 3. 5, 1, 3. & 9, 4. 6, 2, 1. & 4, 4, 6. & 5, 1.

37. πρὸς αὐτὴν. So it is found in the older editions, and Griesbach. But Wetstein and Vater edite αὐτὴν. If the former be the true reading, it must
be taken for σεωτήν ad te. So the Cod. Cant. and a few others have σε, and the Vulg. Ital. Pers. Ara. and the Latin Fathers follow them. But I prefer the more difficult, and therefore more genuine, reading, αὐτήν (as in Wets. and Vater). For in determining this point MSS. can have no weight. It is an Oriental idiom, by which, after the relative pronoun of the first and second person, or a participle, verbs or pronouns are subjoined of the third person. So Job. 27, 10. Mic. 1, 2. And so the Syriac Vers. on the Galatians, 4, 21. So the Jews in their prayers have, "Blessed art thou, O God! who hath sanctified us," &c.

37. προσάκις ἢδελφα εἰσωναγαγεῖν — πτέρυγας. Εἰσωναγαγεῖν signifies to bring together to any one. Examples of this word are adduced by Wetstein from Polybius and Galen, and by Schl. from Plutarch. The ἢδελφα here exerts some force; referring to the ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας. In the other Scriptural places, and in the Classics, it has little or none. Wetstein seems to have perceived this, by his note: "Volebat Christus ad discipulos, quos jam habebat, etiam Hierosolymitanos cives omnes aggregare." For three years (says Rosenm.) had Christ been endavouring, by miracles, admonitions and threatenings, to allure them to sincere penitence and faith; thereby to guard them from the imminent wrath of God. For all this is meant by εἰσωναγαγεῖν ὑπὸ πτέρυγας. (So Deut. 32, 11.) A very beautiful image, denoting protection and affection. Grotius compares Eurip. Her. Fur. 11. (where see Musgrave.) οἱ θ' Ηρωκλεῖοι παιδεῖς, οὓς ὑποπτέρους σαιγὼ νεόσσους ὥρνις ὡς ὑφειρένη. Wetstein adds Eurip. Hercul. 10. τὰκείων τέκν' ἔχων ὑπὸ πτεροῖς σαιγώ τάδ'. And Plut. 2, 494. e. and Anthol. 1, 87, 1. Vajikra R. 25. f. 168, 4. Gallina, quando pulli ipsius teneri sunt, congregate illas, et ponit sub alis suis, ipsos caeleficit, et pro ipsis humum pedibus effodit." By the ὥρνις is evidently meant the hen. See Heskin. ad Mosch. 4, 21.

37. καὶ οὐκ ήθελήσατε, i. e. συναχθήναι. There is a
similar use of καλ in the Schol. on Eurip. Phcen. 617. 
σε δ' αινω μήτερ ἐνεκα τῆς προβυπίας ἢν ἔχεις ἡμᾶς 
διαλλάξει, καλ ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐμβουλίζημεν.

38. ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ ὅλος ὑμῶν ἔρημος. Of the expression ἔρημος ὅλος, and ὅλον καταλείπω, Wetstein produces examples from Lysias, Iōsue, and Isocrates. It is, however, of more consequence, to enquire what is meant by ὅλος, about which the Commentators are not agreed. Theophylact, Euthymius, Hal, Maldonati, Olearius, Wolf, Dodridge, and others, take this of the Temple. Others, as Brug. Campbell, Grotius, Elsner, and especially Loesner (in a Dissertation de domo orbē), take it of the whole Jewish nation, and especially its metropolis. So the Latin writers use patria and domus promiscuously. I prefer, however, the former interpretation, with Rosenm. and Kuinoel, who observe that Christ held this very language in the Temple. His auditors, therefore, would easily understand that by ὅλος was meant the Temple, κατ' ἐξοχήν. I would translate, "in this your Temple." (So the Italians use duomo for cathedral.) This interpretation seems required by the following verse, where ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ is to be understood, (as Rosenm. has well perceived,) and also by the first verse in the next chapter. Josephus's description of the effects of the famine at the siege of Jerusalem is perhaps the most affecting representation of misery ever penned. It is, however, almost paralleled by one of Procopius, who in p. 240 and 241 describes the famine which afflicted Italy in the year 539.

39. οὐ μὴ με ὑπερ ἀτ' ἀρτί, ἐος ἐν ἐπητε. Εὐλογημένος. It is difficult to ascertain the sense of these words. Koecher details many opinions, and concludes by observing that, as far as he can see, the words being an appendix to threatening, do themselves contain a threatening, and that the most severe. He thinks that the verb ὑπερ, as is frequent in verbs of seeing in Hebrew and Greek, denoting "convenire aliquem, versari, colloqui cum aliquo,
cum delectatione, aliquem spectare." He adds this instructive remark, that ένδογημένος οί ἐργάσμοι έν ὀνοματι κυρίου, was a usual formula by which the Messiah was saluted. Kuinoel and Wetstein, Georgius and Moldenhauer, thus paraphrase it: "You shall not see me hereafter in this Temple as a Teacher, but a Judge; when I shall have returned for the destruction of your temple and city: then will you understand that I am the Messiah, and gladly acknowledge me in that character." Euth. and Theoph. say, (and perhaps truly,) that the word ἀνά denotes not that time only, but the whole period until his crucifixion, after which he was no longer publicly seen, or by the unbelieving Jews. Euth. beautifully observes, too, that the expression ὅ μέν ἔν τοις ἄπαρτι is of one σφόδρα ἐρωτημένον, ἀτυπαρθεμένου δὲ, καὶ διὰ τούτων, περιελαγωντος. When (continues he) would they say this? Never, willingly—but say it they must, though unwillingly, at his second advent, when he shall come with power and great glory, and when their recognition of him as Messiah will be of no service to them. The opinion of Mede approaches nearly to that of Euth. He takes ἀνά ἄρτι from the time of the Passover then celebrating; and Hammond and Whitby interpret, "after a little while," i.e. after my ascension. As examples of this sense, they adduce Jo. 1, 51. & 14, 19. & 16, 16. Rosenm. and others explain: "You shall not see me in this temple, until you shall acknowledge me for the Messiah," i.e. you shall never hereafter see me here at all. But this seems frigid and far-fetched.

CHAP. XXIV.

VERSE 1. προσήλθου-ἐπιδείκται αὐτῷ τὰς οἰκοδομάς. Pointing with wonder at their stateliness, as those are accustomed to do who admire any noble building. In illustration of its magnificence, Wetstein cites Philo, 2, 223, 29. d. Jos. Ant. 15, 11, 3. & Bell. 5,
5, 6. The Rabbins used to say, "he who has not seen the Holy House, has never seen a beautiful structure;" as much as to say, "what a building are you destroying by your oracles!" (Grot. and Brug.) So Euthym. "they wondered that such a Temple should be destroyed;" for which reason, also they approached to point out the buildings of the Temple, as being admirable. Tacitus applies to the Temple the terms immense opulentia; and Josephus calls it "of all buildings that he had seen or heard of the most wonderful for its size, structure, and magnificence." It is evident that they understood his preceding words of the Temple, not the Jewish state. To this Jesus nevertheless replies, that all this will be entirely destroyed. It may seem strange that they should express no lamentation, &c. But the Jews (as Kuinoel observes) expected that great calamities would precede the advent of the Messiah; yet at the time when these calamities should have reached their height, they hoped that He would unexpectedly appear, to bring them assistance from Heaven, and subdue their enemies. See Dan. 2, 44. 7, 13. 9, 24, 6. Jos. B. 1, 6, 5, 2. Among these visitations many numbered the destruction of the Temple. See Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on Matth. 2, 1. Jos. Ant. 10, 11, 7. But they expected also at the coming of the Messiah the renovation of the universe, a more splendid city and Temple. See the Commentators on 2 Pet. 3, 12. Schoet. Hor. Heb. on Apoc. 21, 1, 2. 2, 19, 24. The very prediction of the destruction of the Temple (which they thought would be conjoined with the beginning of the terrestrial reign of the Messiah) recalled to the memory of the disciples, all the other events which were to happen at the commencement of the Messiah's kingdom. They, therefore, interrogated Jesus, when the destruction of the Temple would take place? and what would be the sign of his advent, and of the end of the world which would follow that advent? To the first interrogation of the disciples Jesus made answer:
not to satisfy their curiosity (Act. 1, 7.), but only to bring forward things which it might be useful, and even necessary for them to know. He therefore treated on the signs which should precede the destruction of the Temple and city, then painted the destruction itself in vivid and poetical images. (Compare 24, 28. seq.) In order, however, to meet their preconceived opinion that the commencement of the Messiah's kingdom would be conjoined with the overthrow of the Temple, and Jewish state, he so answers the other question, that it should appear, that the end of the world would follow at a much later period. And that the destruction of the universe might be, clearly enough, separated from that of the Jewish state, he professed that he would so return to take vengeance on the Jews, and deliver his faithful followers from persecutions, (see Luke 21, 28.) that he himself indeed should not be visible; yet that he would so manifest his majesty, that they might almost see him with their eyes. Furthermore, that he would so return at the end of the world, and the solemn inauguration of the Messiah in his kingdom (though not such as they expected), that he should be conspicuous, and his majesty be made manifest to all. What has been observed may show that the 24th and 25th chapters treat of two separate advents of Christ. (See also note on 16, 27.) That the first section of the 24th (to ver. 43) treats of the destruction of the Temple and Jewish state, may be evinced by cogent arguments. In plain expressions, Jesus affirms that all that had been hitherto said will happen to the men of that age, and partly to the disciples yet alive. (Compare 24, 34. Mark 13, 30. Luke 21, 31. add Luke 21, 20. ὅτων ἔδησ. Matth. 24, 20. προσεύχεσθε, &c. ver. 38. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς.) That no other subject is treated of in ver. 29. et seq. but that in these verses is described, after the manner usual to the prophets, the destruction itself of the Jewish state, the words ἐκδέως μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν plainly evince. Mark 13, 24. ἐν ἑκείναις ταῖς ημέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἑκείνην. All
these passages, especially those which are read in ver. 40, 41. evidently demonstrate, that what is said in this chapter, is not on the subject of the end of the world, but the destruction of Jerusalem. Now, as to that part of Christ's discourse which belongs to the destruction of the Temple and Jewish state, the periods of calamity which should precede the commencement of that devastation, in v. 5—14. Luke 21, 8, 9. are carefully separated from the commencement of the devastation, (v. 15. Luke 21, 20.) and the devastation itself. (v. 29. et seq.) Moreover, Christ, as sustaining the character of a prophet, has used a prophetic diction, poetical imagery and colouring; and therefore, in the description of the signs which, he says, will precede the overthrow of the city and Temple, and in the picture itself of that destruction, that we are not to dwell upon all the expressions with scrupulously minute exactness, as has been learnedly and copiously shown by Eichhorn. I cannot therefore commend the diligence of those interpreters who (supposing that the description of those miserable times exhibited by Jesus was to be understood literally, and that all the particulars, especially such as are brought forward respecting the signs which should precede that devastation, are to be pressed), in order to prove their opinion, have sedulously compared passages of Josephus, and other writers of that age, with this chapter. For instance, in the signs which should precede the commencement of the devastation, Jesus has enumerated tumults, famines, pestilence, earthquakes. (ver. 7, &c.) Now, if we compare the passages of historians, &c. cited on this subject, in which events of that kind are described, we perceive that those calamities happened in regions remote from Palestine, and having little or no connection with the calamities there recorded. But surely if, in the description of those signs, all the circumstances were to be urged and dwelt upon; the things there narrated by the historians, ought to be such as happened in Palestine: at
least those which took place in foreign countries, ought to be such as had some near connection with the fate of the Jewish state. But this is not the case. Hence it seems clearly established, that Jesus intended only a general description of the calamities which should precede the destruction of Jerusalem, and that vividly adumbrated by more particular examples. We are therefore only to keep in mind a general idea of many and great calamities, with reference to Jewish opinions. For wars, famine, pestilence, earthquakes, are customary images with the Jewish poets, and in the Rabbinical writings are similar pictures of the infelicitous times which should precede the advent of the Messiah. (See Schoett. Hor. Heb. tom. 2, p. 512. 518. 519.) Finally, Jesus having to exhort his followers to constancy and diligence, used all these images, in order to meet their preconceived opinions; lest on the occurrence of any adverse event whatever, or any public calamity, they should conjecture that the time of the invisible advent of the Messiah was at hand, in which he would take vengeance on the oppressors of the Jews; and he further shows that the commencement of the siege of Jerusalem would be the only undoubted token or prognostic of that time (ver. 15). (Kuin. from Eichhorn.)

The above observations contain much truth and instruction, are acutely conceived, and ably supported. Whether, however, his peculiar view of the subject may be safely adopted, I leave it to others to determine. I cannot subscribe to it, taken as a whole, and must be permitted to suggest one remark to the consideration of the reflecting reader, (which one may wonder should not have occurred to the enquiring mind of the writer just mentioned,) namely, that from the paucity and imperfection of the historical documents of that period which have come down to us, it cannot be expected that we should be able to show the fulfilment of every particular. I can, however, assure my readers that I
have spared no pains and diligence in collecting, digesting, and concentrating whatever might tend to determine the true sense, or establish and illustrate the fulfilment of these most interesting prophetic descriptions of our Lord.

2. οὐ βλέπετε πάντα ταύτα; The student must observe, that the interrogation here is affirmative. The sentence also is elliptical; and may be thus supplied: “See ye not these buildings? Yes, ye do see them; but ye shall not see them long, for observe,” &c. So Euthymius: ἔρωτα πρῶτον αὐτών, οὐ βλέπετε ταύτα πάντα τὰ θαυμαστά; ἐγὼ προαναφέραμεν τὸν ὀλιθρόν αὐτῶν. Many Critics, on the authority of MSS. omit the negative; but the interrogation has more spirit with it. Campbell, by omitting (as he does) both the negative and the interrogation, has destroyed the energy of the sentence.

2. οὐ μὴ ἀφεθή ὡδὲ λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον. An Hebrew, and slightly hyperbolical phrase. So Theophyl. τὴν παντελὴ ἀπάλειαν τῆς οἰκοδομῆς αἰνιττόμενος, καὶ ἀπερβολικῶς τὸν λόγον ποιοτόμενος. Euthymius satisfactorily refutes the objections of those who urged that it was not fulfilled to the very letter. Vide Theodoret. 3, 2. Sazom. 5, 22. Socrat. 3, 20. On this prophecy see the valuable illustrations of Bp. Newton, in the second volume of his excellent work on the Prophecies. (2 Sam. 17, 18.) Similar ones are met with in the Classical writers. So Wetstein cites Eurip. Helen. 106. οἷς οὐδέ ἰχνός γε τείχεων εἶναι ταφές. So κατασκάπτειν sometimes only means to destroy, throw down. There, however, the prediction was literally fulfilled, (and by the enemies alike of the Jews and Christians,) as appears from Jos. B. 7, 1, 1. & 5, 5, 5.

2. καταλυθήσεται. Le Brug. points out the ratio metaphorae, by observing, dissoluta lapidum concrementione. For (observes Grotius), as in the building of the Temple, stone was said to be put upon stone (Hag. 2, 15.), so in the destruction it is predicted “that one shall not be left upon another.” Which Wetstein further illustrates by comparing Ca-
tull. 63. Urbis Dardaniae Neptuniae solvere vincla.”
We shall perceive still more the force of the expression, if we bear in mind that those huge stones of which the walls were composed (so Mark 13. ὁδὲ πο-
tapen λίθοι καὶ π. α. where see note), were, we know, (as in the walls of Athens) bound together with lead, and fastened with strong iron cramps. See Joseph. p. 702, 1. cited on Mark. 18, 1. Thucyd. 1, 93.
3. τάτε ταῦτα ἐσται, καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρου-
σίας, καὶ τῆς συντελεῖσας τοῦ αἰῶνος. Many interpre-
ters, and especially Hammond and Clericus, under-
stand this of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the
Jewish state. (See also other opinions ap. Wolf. Cur.) The question is a very difficult one. But I am
inclined to accede to the opinions of Wetstein, Ro-
senmuller, Kuinoel, Schleusner, and others, who take
it of the end of the world (as in Matth. 13, 39, 40,
49. 28, 21). In this view Dr. Popham cites a fine
passage of Brown’s poem De Animi Immortalitate:
“ Tempus erit, noli quo tempore, mori, Hoc satiis 
est, hoc constat, erit post funera tempus; Cum Deus, ut par est, æquos excernet iniquis, Sontibus insontes, et idonea cuique rependet.” The disciples speak according to the opinions of their nation, who believed that at the advent of the Messiah, the world would be destroyed, and a new one formed (by a sort of παλιγγενεσία) to endure for a thousand years. See Lightfoot. The disciples too thought that the de-
struction of the Temple would be immediately suc-
ceded by the destruction of the old, and the com-
 mencement of a new world. Τί σημεῖον; This may 
be well illustrated by a passage of Soph. ΟEd. Col,
94. σημεῖα δ’ ήξειν τῶν δ’ ἐμοὶ παρηγγυῖα, ‘Η σειμών, ὁ 
βροντήν τιν’, ὁ Δίος σέλας.
4. βλέπετε μὴ τις υμᾶς πλανήσῃ, q. d. “as these 
will do, either by spreading erroneous and un-
grounded opinions about the destruction of the Tem-
ple, and my advent; nay, even by assuming to them-
selves the character of Messiah. I shall return 
(though not visibly) at the destruction of Jerusa-
lem." Compare ver. 23. Wetstein cites a similar passage of Mosch. Idyl. 1, 25. φυλάσσει, νη σε πλα- νίασι. So much the more vividly does Christ depict the seductions and impudence of impostors, and in order to more effectually recall the minds of his followers from them, he commences this speech with mentioning those whom he, in ver. 24. calls ψευδοχριστόως. (Kuin.) Jesus prefaces his answer with cautions, since the minds of his disciples were occupied by the common error of the Jews, and they fancied that the Messiah would be a victorious conqueror of the Gentiles, and fill the whole universe with the celebrity of his triumphs; and withal, that from these his victories would arise a reign of the most profound peace, in which felicity of the most exquisite kind would be the portion of those who should participate in his government. They thought that then finally one true Religion (all dissent removed, and idolatry and false prophecy destroyed) would occupy the whole universe. That this advent would be displayed by some manifest signs, or extraordinary events, by which his appearance to take possession of his kingdom would be manifested, was then, and indeed is now, the received opinion among the Jews, which has been examined and discussed from the Rabbinical writings, and the history of past ages, by Olear. Obs. Sacr. 671. seq. (Rosenm.)

5. πολλοὶ ἐλεύνονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι μου, i.e. pretending to be Χριστοῦ, assuming my name and character. Wetstein compares Lucian. Revivisc. 15. γόητας ἄνδρας ἐπὶ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ ὄνοματι πολλὰ καὶ μιαρὰ πράττονται. By that name the Jews understood a vindex libertatis. Whoever professed to be such assumed the name of Χριστοῦ, and were ψευδοχριστωί. That there were many who arrogated to themselves that character, both the Scriptures and Josephus testify. See Jos. B. 2, 13, 4. & 5, 20, 5, 4. & 8, 10. & 1, 6. Various examples are adduced by Camer. Hammond, and Grotius. Euth. mentions Simon and Menander, Samaritans.
6. μελλήστε ἄκουειν πολέμους. Wetstein here understands a war mentioned in Jos. 18, 9, 1. On the ἄκουειν πολέμου he cites Jos. 20, 3, 8. See also 1, 2, 16. To this Rosenm. refers the fear of a war from Caius, when he endeavoured to set up his image in the Temple.

6. δεί γὰρ πάντα γενέσθαι. Grotius refers the δεί to the counsel of God, wisely permitting the evils to which men spontaneously hurried, that his justice might be the more apparent. See also Brug. and Maldonati. But perhaps it may be sufficient to observe, with Kuinoel, that this is expressed populariter, and the phrase is not to be too much pressed. I add, Polyen. 1, 32, 2. ἀνωτέρα γὰρ αὐτὰ συμβαλλεῖν. Soph. Phil. 1336. λέγει σαφῶς ὅσ δεί γενέσθαι ταῦτα.

6. ἀλλ' οὕτω εἴτε τὸ τέλος, i. e. the final and total destruction of the temple and the Jewish state. As to the phrase, Wetstein compares Hom. Β. 121. τέλος δ' οὕτω τῷ πέφανται. Manil. 1, 912. Nec dum finis erat: restabant Actia bella.
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7. ἐσονται λιμῶλ καὶ λοιμῶλ. These words are often joined: as in 2 Chron. 20, 9. Jer. 14, 12. 21, 7. And no wonder, pestilence being an usual attendant upon famine. Q. Curt. 9, 10. cited by Wets. Famem, deinde pestilentia seacula est, quippe insalubrium ciborum novi succi, ac hos, itineris labor, et agritudo animi vulgaverant morbos." I add, Thucyd. 1, 23. αὐχμων τε ἐστὶ παρ' ὅς — καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν καὶ λιμοὶ καὶ — λοιμάθεσι νόσοι: Metā λιμῶν λοιμῶν was a sort of pro-

verb, originally derived, it should seem, from Hesiod, Op. 240. ἐπήγαγε πῆμα κρονίων λιμῶν ὅμω καὶ λοιμῶν. Hence we not unfrequently find allusions to this passage, or imitations of it. Wets. compares Philo- 
lost. 11, 7. and Philo, 2, 13, 3. I add, Max. Tyr. 

Diss. 29, 5. ταυτὴν τὴν γεωργίαν οὕτως παίει, οὐ λοιμῶν οὗ λιμῶς. And Joseph. B. 4, 6, 1. τιμαῖος Ἰαμαίων 

αὐτοῖς ἐπήγαγο, λόμον τε καὶ λοιμὸν ἐπὶ τῶν πολέμων. Thus an old saying, or, I suspect oracle, mentioned 

by Thucyd. 2, 54. ἦσει Δαμιανὸς πόλεμος, καὶ λοιμὸς ἀν' αὖ τῷ. Where he tells us that it was doubted 

whether λοιμὸς or λιμῶς was uttered. Certainly the 

words are confounded by the Scribes, perhaps from 

that peculiarity in pronunciation termed Itacism. 

Hence in Dion. Hal. p. 177, 84. νόσοι τε καὶ λοιμῶλ 

κατέσκηναν. I conjecture λιμῶλ. Both words seem 

to be of common origin, and to have the same gen-

eral idea, that of wasting, pining. That there was a 

severe famine in the time of Claudius, we learn 

from history. In which view Wetstein cites Dio. 


7. καὶ σεισμῶλ. Kypke, Loesner, and Molden- 
hauer, take this metaphorically of civil wars. On 

which sense I have treated in Matth. 21, 10. But 

this is exceedingly harsh, and not here applicable. 

That earthquakes appertain to the description of 

calamitous times and prodigies is observed by Kuin. 

who refers us to the Commentary on Joel 3, 3, 4. 

Amas. 8, 9. Sil. Ital. 5, 615. Plin. H. N. 86. It must
be observed that earthquakes were, by the superstition of the ancients, regarded as ominous, and boding public calamity. In this view, two of Wetstein’s citations are very apposite. Herodot. 6, 98, Δῆλος ἐκινήθη—μέχρι ἐμοῦ οὐ σεισθείσα, καὶ τῶτο μὲν κοῦ τέρας ἄνθρωποις τῶν μελλόντων ἔστεθαι κακῶν ἐφηνε ἡ θεός. And Plin. H. N. 2, 86. Nec verò simplex malum: aut in ipso tantum motu periculum est, sed par aut majus ostento. Nunquam urbs Romana tremuit, ut non futuri eventus alicujus id praenun-cium esset. These earthquakes happened partly in the time of Claudius, partly in that of Nero. Wets. cites Tacit. Ann. 14, 27. Senec. N. Q. 6, 1. & 30. Tacit. Hist. 1, 2.

7. κατὰ τόσους. This expression is not to be rendered ubivis locorum, as many interpret; (so Kuin.;) but, as De Dieu and Wetstein explains, variis, diversis locis, hinc inde. Wetstein thinks that the expression is not to be referred to civil wars only, but to famine and pestilence. He seems to have taken σεισμὸν in a double sense, both physical and moral. He gives many examples of this sense of κατὰ, by which it denotes, not universal, but often indefinite and particular distribution. The words are to be referred both to λοιμὸν and σεισμὸν. Several instances of both are above detailed. It is not, however, to be expected that history should record all of them. See Le Clerc and Grot. ap. Elsley.

8. πᾶντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀρχῇ αἰῶναν. It will materially tend to the proper interpretation of these words, if we suppose an ellipsis of μόνον. Thus the sense will be, “all these calamities, however grievous, will be but the beginning of sorrows:” but the πρόομα τῶν συμφορῶν (as says Euth.): but a levis prolusio pugnae atrocioris, as Wets. expresses it, who appositely cites Eurip. Med. 60. ἐν ἀρχῇ πόμα, καὶ οὐδέκα μεροῦ. Others, dwelling on the literal sense of αἰὼν, interpret, “these sorrows will no more be comparable to the succeeding ones, than the pains which precede parturition are to those of parturition itself.” But
this seems injudicious. "Ωδών is here, as often both in the Sept. and the Classical writers, used in the general sense of severe grief or misery, whether corporeal or mental. The former seems to have been contemplated by Hesych. αἰδίναι τόναι, αλγηδώνες. As neither Wets. nor the other Philologists have given any Classical examples, the following may be acceptable. Ἀeschyl. Choeph. 207. Schutz. πάρετι δ οίδις, καὶ φρενῶν καταφθορὰ. Soph. Trach. 42. εἰμι πικρὰς αἰδίνας προσβαλάων. Ἀeschyl. Suppl. 783. φιλεί αἰδίνα τίμειν καὶ κυβερνήτη σώφ. Vide et Soph. Aj. 794. et Eurip. Heracl. 639. But to revert to the ἀρχη, &c. Wets. compares Plut. 1, 113. c. Philo, 2, 102, 35. I add, Philostr. Vit. Ap. 8, 13. σοι δ ἀρχη κυιδων ταύτα. Joseph. 365, 18. ἀρχη κακῶν ἐγένετο τούτο. And 1832. 1. ἀλλα ταύτα—μειζόνων ἀρχη κακῶν ἐφάνη. Eurip. Iph. Taur. 999. ἀρχαι δ' αἰδε μοι κελλαίων τίνων. Where we must not adopt Markland's conjecture, λόγων, though a somewhat similar passage of Pindar just occurs to me: μελιγάρμες Ἰμνων ἱστηρων ἀρχαι λόγων. Olymp. 11, 4.

9. τὸτε. This must be taken in a more lax sense, for circa ista tempora. (Rosenm.) For the events which follow, happened partly before the above-narrated calamities, partly at the same time with them.


9. ἀποκτενώσαν ὑμᾶς. As they did Stephen, James, &c.

9. ἐσεσθε μισομένοι ὑπὸ πάντων. Not by Jews only, but Gentiles; as appeared from the persecution excited by Nero. The contemptuous manner in which the Christians are mentioned in the Classical writers of that day, is well known. Διὰ τὸ ἰσομᾶ μου, for my sake, i. e. for the sake of my religion.

10. σκανδαλισθοῦσα — will abandon their Christian profession. On this word I have before treated. Thus Phygellus, Hermogenes, Demas, and many more, doubtless, not on record. See the note of Grotius.

10. παραδίσωσιν, καὶ μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους, i. e. by persecuting and delivering up each other to death. Euthymius well expresses this by the general phrase, ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκειομένων πολεμηθοῦσαν. Grotius explains it of the apostates betraying the true Christians. For none (says he) are more bitter enemies to true religion than those who have abandoned it: either because God avenges their contempt of the light, by permitting them to fall into the grossest mental darkness; or because they omit nothing that may free them from suspicion of attachment to their former principles. Of these, and other evils, Christ forewarns them, that they may be the better prepared. For (as says Euthymius) τὸ ἀποστροφοῦσθαι ἔκφθεγν ἐκφοβῆσαι καὶ ταράττειν προμαλίζει σὺν τὸν φόβον διὰ τοῦ προαγορέων τὰ μέλλοντα δεινὰ.
11. καὶ—ψευδοπροφήται εὐεργητοῦτα, "false teachers shall arise." Rosenm. interprets this of Christians themselves; as does Euthymius. Yet it appears probable, from many passages of Josephus, that these were Jews, who excited the people to insurrection, with the promise of help from God; upon which confidence, they undertook the war against the Romans. Jos. B. 2, 16, 4. & 17, 8. 20, 3. and A. 20, 8, 5. It may, however, extend to Christians also, who, even in that early age, had begun to grievously corrupt the orthodox doctrines. Grotius instances Hymenæus and Philetus, Simon Magus, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Ebion, and others.

12. διὰ τὸ πληθυσμὴν τὴν ἀνομίαν, i.e. increase, be prevalent. There seems to be an imitation of Euseb. 9, 6. ἦτε αἱ ἀνομίαι ἡμῶν ἐπιληψίσαν. Rosenm. explains ἀνομίαν, faction, factional spirit. But this seems too confined an interpretation. It seems to refer especially to injustice, cruelty, and illegal violence. i.e. the persecution and treachery of the betrayers, and, indeed, vice of every kind.

12. ζυγὴσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν. The mutual affection and confidence of most will grow faint. This is (says Euthymius) the worst of all; that they have not the consolation of mutual affection. When they shall see themselves (interprets Wetstein) betrayed by their nearest connections, they will no longer trust any one, they will study to consult for themselves only, lest, by conferring benefits on the ungrateful, they should but purchase enmity, or might at length themselves come to want. Theophylact has beautifully expressed it: ἐκθεσιαθήσονται οἱ ἀνθρώποι, οἰς μὴ ἔρχετο τοῦ οἰκειοτάτου σωτῆρι, ἵππα τὴν ἀγάπην. Grotius, and some others, explain it more generally (but I think less properly) of true Christian piety, embracing the love of God, and man for God's sake.

13. οὐκ ὑπομείνασι εἰς τέλος, εὗτος σωβηστεὶς. Krebs, and several Commentators, interpret this of the destruction of Jerusalem, and they affirm, from Euseb.
H. E. 3, 5. that several, who took refuge at Pella, in the mountainous region of Decapolis, were preserved in the national ruin. But this seems harsh. I prefer, with others, as Brug. Rosenm. Kuinoel, and Grotius, to take ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος as a proverbial formula, denoting to persist with constancy, i. e. to fight it out as a good soldier of Christ. So Theophylact explains it: ἀ δὲ καρπερικῶς φέρων καὶ μὴ ἐνδοῦς πρὸς τὰ ἐπαγόμενα, σωθήσεται ὡς δόκιμος σταυριῶν ἀναμφαῖς. Ὑσευρέται will signify all the felicity which Christianity can impart to its faithful followers, both in this life and in the next. (Rosenm. and Kuin.) On the true force of this word see an admirable note of Dr. Maltby, Serm. 2, 545—7.

. 14. κηρυχθήσεται — εὐαγγέλιον, i. e. my Religion shall be promulgated εἰς ἀγιὴ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ. This is, by most Commentators, explained of the Roman empire; for which there are sufficient authorities. Luke §, 10. See Wetstein’s note. Joseph. 1203, 10. εἰς πᾶσαν μετέχει τὴν οἰκουμένην. Lycurg. L. p. 149, 30. πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην περιπλέοντες. But this is not necessary here. Besides, there is reason to think that Christianity had been then promulgated to regions which formed no part of the Roman empire. (See the Ecclesiastical Historians.) The expression is hyperbolical, and signifies a considerable part of the world. When ἡ οἰκουμένη was used for the empire, ἀγιὴ was first expressed by an hyperbole; then ἡμετέρα, and then left to be understood. Though sometimes the words ὑπὸ τῶν Ρωμαίων, or ὑπὸ τῶν Ρωμαίων, were expressed. There is a remarkable phrase in Jos. 1208, 13. ἐκ πᾶσης τῆς θῶν οἰκουμένης, from all that part of the Roman empire which was already his. “It appears, (says Doddridge,) from the most credible records, that the Gospel was preached in Idumea, Syria, and Mesopotamia, by Jude; in Egypt, Marmonica, Mauritania, and other parts of Africa, by Mark, Simon, and Jude; in Ethiopia, by Candace’s Eunuch and Matthias; in Pontus, Galatea, and the neighbouring parts of Asia,
by Peter; in the territories of the Seven Asiatic Churches, by John; in Parthia, by Matthew; in Scythia, by Philip and Andrew; in the Northern and Western parts of Asia, by Bartholomew; in Persia, by Simon and Jude; in Medea, Carmenia, and several Eastern parts, by Thomas; through the vast tract from Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum, by Paul; as also in Italy, and probably in Spain, Gaul, and Britain: in most of which places Christian churches were planted in less than thirty years after the death of Christ, which was before the destruction of Jerusalem."

14. τότε ἔζης τὸ τέλος. Of the Jewish city and state. (Pisc. Brug. and Ham.) The end of God’s judgments against the Jewish nation. Ezek. 7, 2. Να γρ. (Mede.)

15. ἄταν οὖν ἤπει τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως. Jesus now proceeds to show by what signs his disciples and followers might know the approaching ruin of the Jewish state, in order that they might avoid it. (Compare ver. 8.) Dr. Doddridge well observes; that "it is remarkable that, by the special providence of God, after the Romans, under Cestius Gallus, made their first advance towards Jerusalem, they suddenly withdrew again, in a most unexpected, and indeed impolitic manner; at which Josephus testifies his surprise, since the city might then have been easily taken. By this means they gave, as it were, a signal to the Christians to retire; which, in regard to this admonition, they did, some to Pella, and others to Mount Libanus, and thereby preserved their lives." One must here note the Hebraism. Βδέλυγμα has the force of an adjective: as Luke 1, 48. ταπείνωσις τῆς δούλης, for δώλη ταπείνως. Ἐρημώσις is abstract for concrete, abominandus, devastation, vastatrix, i.e. the Roman army (under Cestius Gallus) with its ensigns and images: so called because they were at all times abominable, as Heathens; but they would then be peculiarly so, as invaders and destroyers. See an excellent note
of Grotius on the Religio Romanorum castrensis." To which I may be permitted to add, that the Roman ensign, the eagle, seems to have been derived, like many other Roman rites and institutions, from their Doric ancestors, the Lacedemonians. The arms of Sparta, as expressed on its device on its seal, were an eagle with a serpent in its talons, denoting an admixture of force and cunning. That the ancient Jews themselves explained the passage of Daniel here alluded to, (about whose interpretation there have been many difficulties raised,) to the destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans, is certain from Jos. Ant. 10 and 11, 7.

15. ἐστάς ἐν τῷ ἄγιῳ. Not in the temple, as L. Brug. and some others interpret (for, as Grotius observes, that would have been no mark of impending, but present destruction). Rather in the sacred confines, in the holy territory or district, including not only the city, but the immediate vicinity. So Kuin. who refers to Spanheim de usu Num. E. 669. See also Jos. B. 2, 19, 4.

15. ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω. Grotius conceives that this passage also is taken from Dan. 9, 25. and takes this opportunity of offering the following remarks on the intent of prophecy:

"Prophecies are more obscurely, or more clearly delivered, according to their different designation. If to try the constancy of the good, more obscurely; as in the persecution of Antiochus: where, though the continuance was declared, the commencement was not marked, which might have enabled the righteous to have avoided their trial. Jos. Jacchiades on Dan. 12. If to destroy and punish the wicked, more clearly; as in the destruction of Jerusalem, foretold by Daniel and Christ with such wonderful precision, and with so many circumstances, that the good might have sufficient warning to escape total desolation."

I think, however, with Outhou, Campbell (who has a long annotation on this,) Rosenmuller, and
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Kuinoel, that these words (and those of Mark 13, 4.) are a parenthetical admonition of the Evangelists, suggested to them by the words of Daniel, 9, 25. καὶ γνῶσις καὶ διανοηθέσις. On the sense of νοεῖται here it may be observed, that νοεῖ signifies properly to mind, i.e. to perceive, think; secondly, to mind in a secondary sense, to attend; as here, and in 2 Tim. 2, 7. νοεῖς ἀλέγω. Hom. II. θ. 596. ἄλλα σοὶ μὴ μοι ταῦτα νοεῖς φρεσί. Prov. 29. 1. νοητῶς νοεῖ τὰ περιπε- μένα σοι.

16. Φευγέτωσαν ἐκ τὰ ὅρη. Rosenmuller explains this of the inhabitants of Judaea only, not those of Jerusalem. Pole refers it to Jerusalem strictly. I am, however, of opinion that οἱ ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίᾳ signifies Jews, whether of Jerusalem, or the Jewish territory. That many of Jerusalem did effect their escape from the city is probable; and is illustrated by Jos. B. 2, 19, 6. & 20, 1. and Euseb. H. E. 3, 5.

16. Φευγέτωσαν ἐκ τὰ ὅρη. By ὅρη Kuinoel understands those immense caves with which Judaea abounds, and to which in time of war fugitives were wont to resort. See 1 Sam. 13, 6. Judg. 6, 2. But I imagine that here they had defence, as well as refuge, in view, for which mountains would be well adapted, and for such purposes we perpetually find them used. In this view Wetstein cites Gen. 19, 17. Jer. 4, 29. 1 Macc. 2, 28. 9, 5, 15. Flor. 4, 10. Virg. Æn. 2. ult. Pausan. Achaic. 15. & Phocic. 19. Thucyd. 8, 41. Ammian. Marcell. 27, 12. Lucian. Zeux. 2. I add, that there is mention made in Josephus of the hill-fortresses, which were so strong, that Titus thought they would have been impregnable, without the help of God. See Jos. B. 7, 48.

17. έκ τοῦ δόματος, μὴ καταβαίνεται. Rosenmuller would interpret this, and the following verses, not as recommending what was to be done, but as foretelling what would happen; a remark which, however, seems questionable. They are rather hyperbolical, and perhaps proverbial, expressions, by which the imminency of the danger, and the necessity of the speediest
flight, are vividly depicted. The passage, which has been misunderstood by some interpreters, is well illustrated by the following paraphrase of Wetstein: "If, looking from the house-top, you see the army of the enemies approaching, spend no time in packing up the moveables in the house, nor even stay to put up a bundle; but, without delay, throw yourself on your feet, and flee, descending from the roof by the shortest way, not through the house, but by the outside stairs." It must be borne in mind, that the houses in the East have flat roofs, encircled, for safety, by a railing. From some passages of the Classic authors cited by the Commentators, or to be met with in the writers of antiquities, it appears that the stairs, just mentioned, either had their outlet in the public streets (as among the Greeks and Romans), or rather (as among the Orientals) into an entrance-hall, or gateway issuing into the street.

18. μὴ ἔπιστρεψάτω ὀπίσω ζ. t. l. We may observe, that ὀπίσω is here pleonastic. So Xenoph. Cyr. 7, 5, 26. ἔφευγον τάλιν ὀπίσω. Herodot. 4, 183. ὀπίσω ἀνακατάθεντες, and 1, 61. ἀνακατάθεται ὀπίσω τῇ τριγωνίᾳ. Αἰε. Β. Η. 3, 18. ἀναλαμβάνειν ὀπίσω. Lucian. 3, 481. ὀπίσω ἀνακαίμε. So in the Latin. Virg. Αen. 6, 720. (cited by Wetstein), Iterumque in tarda verti corpora. Elsner has rightly interpreted i.e. to return back home, though Dodd. thought he had thereby impaired the beauty of the text.

18. ἀφαι τὰ ἰμάτια. Many MSS. read ἰματίον, but (as Grotius observes) it is one of those words which, with a plural form, have a singular signification; just as we use clothes for dress, vestment, &c. The outer garment, or cloak, was usually laid aside, and sometimes left at home. For so the agricultural operations of the ancients were usually carried on: as we find from Hesiod. Op. 2, 9. cited by Elsner, Τυμνόν στείρω, γυμνόν ἐς βουτεῖν, Τυμνὸν ὀὰμάσκαττω; and Virg. Georg. 1, 299. Nodus ara, sere nudus.

19. ωὲς δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἕχουσαι καὶ ταῖς θηλαξίασις. Because, in such a situation, they would pro-
ceed more slowly; these (says Euthymius) by reason of their internal, those of their external burthen. For, continues he, χρημάτων μὲν καὶ ἱππιῶν καταφρονήσαι έρωτιν, διά σαμπερίαν γενέσθαι δὲ τὴν ἕγκυρον κούφην καὶ ἀποτήρισαι τὴν θηλάζουσαν, δ ἡθάζει, παντελῶς άδυνατον, διὰ τὸν δεσμὸν τῆς φύσεως. Wetstein appositely cites the following pathetic passage of Joseph. A. 14, 13, 7. ούδες ἄν οὕτω στερρὸς τῇ φύσιν εὐθύνῃ, ὡς τότε παρὼν τῶν προαγομένων οὐκ ἂν ἀκτείρων αὐτῶν τῆς τύχης γυναικὸν ἐπαγομένων νησία τέκνα, καὶ μετὰ διακύμων καὶ οἴμακης ἀπολείποντων τὴν πατρίδα καὶ φίλους ἐν δεσμοῖς, καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν οὐδὲν ἔτι χρηστῶν προαγομένων. By the χείμαρα is to be understood the rainy season, when the inclemency of the weather, and the bad state of the roads, would be great hindrances.

20. μηδὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ. One must not here suppose, that by these words the observance of the Jewish Sabbath is commanded. Grotius and Whitby observe, that Christ does not thus establish the Jewish Sabbath, but cautions believers against the probable inconveniences arising from it. The fact is, that the strict observance of it had gradually abated from the times of the Maccabees, so that occasionally the Jews were induced to carry on at least defensive military operations on that day. An opinion, however, was gaining ground, that the observance of the Sabbath was to give way to the preservation of life. Yet still, the more religiously scrupulous at a breach of its observance, under any circumstances. The Nazarene Christians always retained the observation of the Sabbath, and indeed almost all the Christians of Palestine, up to the time of Adrian. At all events, very few at the period of the destruction of Jerusalem understood that they were free from its observance; and therefore the great multitude would have reason to pray that their flight might not be on the Sabbath. As to their progress being impeded by the gates being closed on the Sabbath, (Nehem. 13, 19.) that would doubtless be an additional hindrance; though we may suppose that at such a time the strict enforcement of the rule would.
be dispensed with. Wetstein has a great number of citations on the observance of the Sabbath, and the length of a Sabbath-day's journey: for instance, Ovid. Remed. Amor. 219. Invitos currere coges pedes. Nec pluvios opta, nec te peregrina morentur Sabbata. Jos. 14, 4, 2. Diog. Laert. 37. p. 21. Jos. C. Ap. 1, 22. and Ant. 12, 1. Nic. Dam. ap. Jos. A. 13, 8, 4. These passages are mixed up with a variety of Rabbinical citations: from all which it is clearly ascertained that no more than 2,000 cubits were allowed, except by a particular permission, (which few would even accept,) and that only given in case of extreme necessity.

21. ἐώς τοῦ νῦν, until then; a somewhat rare signification, but which the word may well admit, since it is derived from νῦν, cognate with νόσσω, pungo. It therefore properly denotes punctum temporis, and may signify any point or part of time.

21. ἔσται—βλάψις μ. — γένηται. Whitby, and most Commentators, take this only as a familiar and Oriental formula, for expressing something exceeding great, and therefore must not, they tell us, be too much dwelt on. Yet the description of the horrors of that siege, as they are pathetically depicted by Josephus, would justify even a literal acceptance of these words. In this view the following passages of that Historian are appropriately cited by Wetstein: Jos. B. 5, 10, 5. κυνηγώντι δ' εἰπεν, μήτε τόλμην ἄλλην τοίαντα πεπωθέναι, μήτε γενέαν ἐξ αἰῶνος γεγονέναι κακίας γονιμοτέρας & 1, 1, 4. τὰ γὰρ πάντως ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἀτυχήματα πρὸς τὰ Ἰουδαίων ἤττᾶσθαι μοι δοκεῖ κατὰ σύγκρισιν. Euthymius beautifully remarks, πάσαν ἐνίκησε συμφορὰν, καὶ πᾶσαν ὑπέρβη τραγωδίαν. So that, to use the words of Polybius, l. 40, 8, 7. as applied to the calamities of Greece during the Roman conquest, ὅστε κἀν ἐχθρὸν ἔλεησαί, θεασάμενον τὴν τότε περιπέτειαν. To use the words of Doddridge: "Criminal and detestable as the Jewish nation now was, will hardly be able to forbear weeping over these complicated miseries, brought upon them by plagues, and
famines, and fires occasioned by the siege, and by the carnages made, not only by the Romans, but by the yet greater cruelties of the seditious and zealots within the city, who really acted the part of so many incarnate fiends rather than of men.

21. οὐδ' οὐ μη γενηται. The triple negation (says L. Brug.) fortissimè negat. It is well expressed in our common translation, "no, nor ever shall be;" which Campbell injudiciously alters to "nor shall be ever after." The οὐ has a similar force in the formula οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ, which occurs in Thucyd. 2, 97. of which, as it has been negligently treated by Philologists, I will, for the information of the student, produce some examples. Joseph. 1088, 28. οὐ μὴν οὐδ' οἴ ἐργησαν, et 1301, 7. Herod. 2, 49. et 2, 140. also Ionice, οὐ μὲν οὐδὲ, 6, 72. et 8, 180. and in 2, 142. οὐ μέντοι οὐδὲ. Diog. Laert. 7, 14. οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ. The following examples are irregular: Polyæn. 1, 18, 2. οὐ μη οὐδὲ, nec tamen; and Dionys. Perieg. 240. οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' ὁλίγη, where one might conjecture οὐ γε μὲν, but the present reading is defended by a passage further on, l. 744. οὐ δὲ μὲν οὐδ' οἶνος, κ. τ. λ.

22. εἰ μη ἐκολοθήθησαν. Dr. Campbell here puzzles himself unnecessarily. To shorten means (says he), to make shorter, which sense he thinks not applicable here: he therefore translates, "if the time were protracted." But this alteration is quite unnecessary, as the common version, "except the Lord had shortened those days," gives the same sense; or, as Theophylact very well paraphrases the passage, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς βλάπτες καὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἐκολοθήσεν εἰ γὰρ ἐκράτησεν ἐπὶ πλέον, ὁ πόλεμος πάντες ἀν οἱ ἐνδον ὑπὸ τοῦ λιμνοῦ διαφάρησαν. This sense of κολοθῆσα is somewhat rare. Wetstein, however, gives an example from J: Malela, 237. τοῦ μηνὸς τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκολοθήσατο. Κολοθῆσα is derived from κολοθός, crippled, maimed; a word of the same form as κολοθός. It properly signifies, to amputate the members of the body. So Xenoph. Cyr. 1, 4, 2. 2 Sam. 4, 12. Arr. Epict. 2, 10. Pol. 1, 80, 13. Aristot. de Gen. An. 4. (ap. Wet-
stein). Wetstein gives a similar passage from Hilluk. Caræus ap. Trigland. Annon regni aurei et argentei dies imminuti sunt propter justitiam justorum. He adds a very apposite passage from Polybius, who, speaking of the conquest of the Greeks by the Romans, owing to the άνοια and άρεστία of the people, attributes their preservation to a particular Providence, which ordained that they should be speedily conquered. He concludes by mentioning a proverbial expression, then in the mouths of all, εἰ μὴ ταχέως ἀπωλέμεθα, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθημεν, which seems to have been suggested by a similar witticism ascribed to Alcibiades by Plutarch. Wetstein then very judiciously remarks: "There were many circumstances which seemed likely to protract and delay the siege. On the one hand, the rebellion of three chiefs, and the departure of Vespasian from Judæa, to enter upon the imperial dignity: on the other hand, the obstinacy of the Jewish nation, together with their hatred of the Romans; a successful engagement with Cestius, and the then increased hope of assistance from God, and their countrymen on the other side of the Euphrates; Jerusalem too, a city of extreme strength, both by nature and art, and well provided with every requisite for sustaining a long siege. Add to this the counsels of Titus's generals, who advised him to wait for famine to do the work. Jos. B. 5, 12, 1. All these circumstances threatened utter extinction to the Jews. But by the interposition of Divine Providence affairs took another direction. For (as says Tacit. Hist. 5, 11.), obsidio autem omnium exspectatione celerius finem habuit, dum tyranni Judaici mutuis vulneribus conciderebant, frumenta amburerent, et loca munitissimamentes sponte desererent. It is judiciously remarked by Grotius: "Itaque nisi accelerata esset obsidio urbis in quam confluxit non ex Judæa tantum, sed ex Galilæa et Idumæa quicquid erat pessimorum hominum, ac si bellum omne conclusum intra semestre tempus haud dubiè quotquot in Judæa
erant, concidissent aut latrocinio aut mutuis caedi-
bus." The consequence of long protracted hostil-
ity would probably have been the universal destruc-
tion of the Jews: those at home by the Romans, who
were exceedingly enraged against them; and even
by their own countrymen, the Sicarii zealots, &c. who
put all to death who did not unite in the same des-
perate hostility with them. Wretches (says Jose-
phus) who agreed in nothing but in butchering all
that were worthy of being preserved, and were peace-
ably inclined. But for the preservation of the sound
portion, however small, of the Jews, and especially
the Christians, God by his Providence shortened the
duration of the war, as, by the same Providence, he
had before protracted the commencement of it, in or-
der to give time to the Christians to escape.

22. ὡς ἀν ἔσασθη πᾶσα σάρξ, i. e. the whole Jewish
nation would perish, except such as should have fled
from it previously. So Euthymius. Οἱ πᾶσα σάρξ
is a Hebraism for nemo. The Hellenistic σάρξ, like
the Hebrew ἄνθρωπος signifies homo. The whole expre-
sion is termed by Rosenmuller populariter et hyper-
bolicè dictum: though, indeed, I say little, if any, of
hyperbole. It is well observed by Markland (ap.
Bowyer), that there is a reference to an opinion very
ancient, (see Gen. 18; 23. seq.) that in some cases of
public and general calamity, the wicked are preserved
for the sake of the righteous. Abraham there says,
"wilt thou destroy the righteous with the wicked?"
Even ten such would have saved Sodom: and there
is an allusion to this in Ezek. 14, 18. Though Noah,
Daniel, and Job, were in it, &c. The heathens too
(continues Markl.) had got this notion. So Max.

Tyr. D. 11. s. f. ὁ γὰρ καὶ ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῃ φύσει ὁι
πολε. φίλει γε μὴν πρὸς τοῦ ἀληθοῦ σαβεται τὰ
πάντα. This, he remarks, is the salt which keeps the
mass from putrefaction. He then refers to a most
Mangey.

23. ἐκὼ ὑς ὑπὲρ εἰση. For there those among the
Jews who thought that the Messiah would appear **adultum**, and unexpectedly show himself to men. (Kuin.) See his Proleg. on Joh. p. 88. and note on Joh. 7, 17. This opinion Jesus-seems to have had in view. Wetstein quotes Joseph. B. 6, 5, 4. τὸ δὲ ἐπάραν αὐτοῦς μάλιστα πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον, ἢν χρησίμα αὐτὸ-

φίδρολος ὅμοιος ἐν τοῖς ιεροῖς εἰρήμενος γεγομένων, αὐτῷ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἑκείνων ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς τῆς αὐτῶν ἀφεί 

τῆς οἰκου-

μένης. τούτο οἱ μὲν αἱ οἰκεῖοι ἐξέλαθον, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν οὐφόν ἐπλανήθησαν περὶ τὴν κρίσιν, where for ὅμοιος I conjecture ὅμως. So also Joseph. B. 6, 5, 2. τούτων αὐτίων τῆς ἀπωλείας ψευδοσφηνίς τις κατέστη, κατ-

ἑκείνην κηρύσσας τὴν ἡμέραν τοῖς ἐεί τῆς πόλεως, αὐτῷ δὲ ἐεί τὸ ἱερὸν ἀναλύσων κελεῦσεν, δεξιομένως τὰ σημεῖα τῆς σατανίας. Πολλοὶ δὲ ἦσαν ἑγκαθεὶς πάρα τῶν τυράννων τότε πρὸς τὸν ὅμοιον προφῆτα, προσμένειν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑστεροῦν καταγγέλλοντος, οἷς ἤτον αὐτομολοίκον, καὶ 

τοις ἐπάνω δύος καὶ φυλακῆς γενομένοις ἐπισ τή χαρα-

κατα-

ποίεται δὲ ταχέως ἀνθρώποι ἐν συμφοραῖς, ὅταν δὲ δὴ καὶ τῶν κατεχόντων δέινου ἀπαλλαγὴν ὅ ἐξαπατῶν ὑπογράφη, τὸ δὲ πάντων ὅλος γίνεται τῆς ἐπίδοσις. Τῶν 

φυών ἄθλων ὅμοιον οἱ μὲν ἀπατεώνες καὶ καταψεύδουμεν 

τοῦ υἱοῦ θυγατέρας παρέκπειον.

24. ἐγερθώτως γὰρ ψευδόχριστος καὶ ψευδοσφηνίς. Euthymius explains ψευδόχριστοι by οἱ ὑποκρίνομενοι τῆν Χριστοῦ, and ψευδοσφηνίς by οἱ ὑποκρίνομενοι τοὺς σφηνίτις, i. e. those that act Christ, or the prophets, or pretend to be such persons. Such as Theudas, and the sons of Judas Galileus, and others mentioned by Josephus, Ant. 20, 5 & 8, 6. As to Jona-

thas and Barchochebas, they rose up after the de-

struction of Jerusalem.

25. καὶ ψευδοσφηνίς. Grotius understands by these the partisans and favourers of the ψευδόχριστος, who abused the language of Scripture to prove this or that person to be the Messiah. Kuinoel conjectures, that the Jews expected the return of the Pro-

phets of the Old Testament from the grave (vide ad 11, 9): so here he speaks of impostors who should act the person of Elias (the precursor of the Mes-
siah), and of the other prophets of the Old Testament. In fact, there were doubtless many, both of impostors and false teachers. So Joseph. 2, 6, 5: ηστηριαν γαρ η χιμαρα παλιν άνεκπλησθηθη και γνητων άνθρακτων οи των άγγελον θητηνων. And in C. 4. of Theudas: προφήτης γαρ έλεγεν εναν καλ προστάγματι των ποταμων (i.e. the Jordan) σχισας, διδων έφη παρεξειν αυτως ραδιαν και ταυτα λεγεν τόλλως έρπατηςεν. See also p. 895, 38; et especially 1075, 34.

24. και διψουσι σημεία μ. και τέρατα. An interesting question here arises, whether these σημεία κα τέρατα were really performed. Grot. Lightf. Mosheim, Cudworth, and some others, think they were. Grot. thinks that God might permit miracles to be worked for certain purposes. Theophyl. and Lightf. consider them as deceipts worked by magic. And that the Jews were much addicted to curious arts, amulets, exorcisms, &c. is well known. Dodd. is of opinion, that if “anything supernatural were effected, it could be attributed only to daemoniacal influence.” The ancient Greek Grammarians tell us that the words σημείων and τέρας differ, inasmuch as the latter denotes what is preternatural, the former what is in the ordinary course of nature. They are often found conjoined, as in two passages cited by Wets. Orph. Argon. 37. Σημείαν τεράτων τε λύσεις. Polyb. 3, 10. σημείων δε και τεράτων πάν μεν λερών, τάδα δ' οίκια ην πλήρης. Others, with more judgment, suspect all to have been mere fraud and imposition. Yet they are staggered by the seeming certainty of the words. Many, therefore, have readily embraced the suggestion of Kypke, to take διψουσι in the sense of promise, of which he gives two examples. So ηρα in Deut. 13, 2. 1 Reg. 13, 3, 5. This seems too to be confirmed by Josephus, Ant. 20, 8, 6. and Bell. 7, 11, 1. who only says that the ψευδοροφήται promised to show miracles δειξειν ἐφασαν. The word μεγάλα somewhat confirms this mode of interpretation, which is greatly preferable to that of Kuinoel, who tells us that the words are
only ornamental, \textit{(pertinent ad ornamentum,) and all}
that is meant is, that they will leave nothing untried
to deceive the people. A mode of criticism neither
judicious, nor sufficiently reverent towards the sa-
cred text. But why all this difficulty? May we not
here, as in innumerable other passages, take the ac-
tion as put for the attempt? So \\
\textit{σωματαργοίων} is used
not of the really working miracles, but of professing
to do so. These \textit{σημεῖα} were probably slight-of-hand
tricks, various optical deceptions, and other phæno-
mena, by which all persons who are tolerably versed
in natural philosophy may deceive the eyes, and con-
found the senses of the vulgar. Thus, we learn from
Jerome, that Barchochebas pretended to vomit
flames: a common trick with our mountebanks.
The pretended cures of disorders, and casting out of
devils, (see Joseph. A. 8, 25.) were effected, doubt-
less, by powerful medical odours, in co-operation
with strong excitments of the imagination; and,
we may add, by \textit{artful collusion}. On these, and si-
milar principles, it is not difficult to account for
what might to the multitude appear \textit{σημεῖα μεγάλα}
\textit{kai τέρατα}, but which were in reality such as are in
\textit{2 Thess}. 2, 9. said to have been worked \textit{ἐν τῷ ὑπ'
δύναμες, καὶ σημείωσι καὶ τέρασι φεύγων.}

24. \textit{οὕτω πλανήται, εἰ δυνατόν, καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν,
ɪ. e. the Christians. It is astonishing that this pas-
sage should ever have been adduced, to prove the
final perseverance of the elect. Whithby has shown
how inconsistent it is with the following exhorta-
tions and cautions. This, therefore, it cannot mean.
What does it import? The formula implies indeed
difficulty; but it is difficult rather as it regards the
seducers, than the seduced. The sense is, “in order
to seduce, if they possibly can, as much as lies in
them,” \&c. So \textit{Rom}. 12, 18. \textit{εἰ δυνατόν, if possible,
live at peace with all men.}

26. \textit{ἰδον, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐστι, i. e. the Messiah. There
is a beauty in the substitution, even by ellipsis, of
the pronoun for the appellative, q. d. ΗΕ (you
know who). This sort of cautious language was, it seems, used by adherents of false Christs, who were obliged to lurk in closets, or in the secret retirement of the desert. See Joseph. A. 2, 8, 6. & B. 2, 13, 4, 5. There is a remarkable passage in Joseph. Bell. 2, 13, 4. Συνέστη δὲ πρὸς τούτοις στίχος ἔτερον πονηρῶν, χειρὶ μὲν καθαράστερον, ταῖς γνώμαις δὲ ασεβέστερον, ἵπτερ οὖν τῶν σφαγέων τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν τῆς πόλεως ἐλυμηνατο πλάναν γὰρ ἀνθρώποι καὶ ἀπατεώνες, προσχηματιζομενοι, νεωτερισμοὺς καὶ μεταβολὰς πραγματευμένους, δαιμόνιαν τὸ πλῆθος ἀνέπειδον, καὶ προῆγον εἰς τὴν ἑρμίαν, οἷς ἐκεῖ τοῦ Θεοῦ δείξαντος αὐτοῖς σημεία εἰλευθερίας.

27. οὕσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ ἐξέρχεται ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς.
The sense is, "as it cannot be said of the lightning, it is here, or it is there, but as it comes unexpectedly, so it goes instantly: thus will it be with respect to my presence, which I shall show forth, not conspicuously, in any one particular place, but, though invisibly, yet suddenly, and powerfully." So Origen and Augustin remark, that the thunder is expected on the appearance of the lightning, but the flash cannot be anticipated, for before you expect it, it has shown forth and vanished. This passage appears to have been in the mind of the great Scottish Theocritus, in the following exquisitely beautiful accumulation of similes:

"But pleasures are like poppies spread —
You seize the flower, its bloom is shed;
Or like the snow falls in the river,
A moment white, then melts for ever;
Or like the Borealis race,
That fit er you can point their place;
Or like the Rainbow's lovely form,
Evanishing amid the storm."

It is indeed an appropriate image of celerity, and also of suddenness. So Sext. Emp. Eth. 154. and Himer. (ap. Wets.) ταχεῖα——πρὸν ἀγγελθήναι παρῆν, πρὸν ἀκινητῆναι φαινώμενα, κατὰ τῶν σχημάτων ἡ τάς βροντάς, ὁλοκλήρως φθάνων τῆς προσωπικῆς, ἠφελησθαί. Who thus illustrates, (perhaps too fancifully,) the fulfilment of the
prophecy." "Uti astra feruntur ab oriente in occidentem: ita incendium illud quo totus terrarum orbis arsit, in oriente, seditione Judæorum ortum, statim Italiam in occidente, per rebellionem trium principum vastavit, singulari et justo Dei judicio."

27. ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν—ἐως δυσμάτων. Observe, that the plural is always used in this formula, both in the N. T. and the Classical writers, of which many examples are produced in a learned note of Dr. Blomfield on Æschyl. Pers. 237. There is an ellipsis of ἡλίου, which is supplied in Soph. ÕEd. Col. 1245. αἱ μὲν ἀπὸ αείνου δυσμάτων, αἱ δὲ ἀνατέλλοντος; and Plat. Phæd. both cited by Dr. B. who also notices the kindred formula ἐπὶ δυσμάτιοι, both in a physical, and moral sense. The present passage may illustrate an elegant expression of Eurip. Hippol. 559. βρονταὶ γὰρ εἰς μοιπόρφω.

28. δὲν γὰρ ἐὰν ἴ τὸ πτώμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθῶσιν οἱ ἄετοι. The connection between this and the preceding verses is disputed. See the Commentators. This passage is manifestly an adagial sentence, but in fixing the exact ratio of the phraseology and application, the Interpreters are not agreed. The different opinions are diligently stated by Wolf and Koecher. Those adopted by Kuinoel and Rosenm. seem the most probable. The former thinks that by it the certainty and suddenness of the punishment of the wicked is denoted. Rosenm. interprets, "As eagles fly to carcasses and feed on them, so when the city and nation shall be ripe for destruction, the eagles (i. e. the Romans) will fly upon and tear them." So Hammond, Markland, Wetstein, and Whitby. In one thing all seem agreed, namely, that there is an allusion to Job. 39, 30. where, of eagles, it is said, ὥς ἐὰν ὁς τεθεοῦτεσ, ἑκατοντάεια εὐρίσκονται. It has been indeed objected, that eagles do not feed on carcasses, and that there are few or none in Palestine. The former, however, has been established by Michaelis; but, as the latter is an undeniable fact, I am inclined to adopt the opinion of many learned men (see
Wolf and Kuinoel), that by the ἀετός here, and the ומכ of Job, and other passages of the O. T. we are to understand a sort of eagle called the περικόκτενος, or rather the vultur barbatus, which bears a similarity to the eagle, and is common in Palestine.

29. ὁ ἡλίος σκοτισθῇσεται. "A poetical description (says Rosenm.) of the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the Jewish state." The next four verses are supposed, by all the ancient, and most of the earlier of the modern Commentators, to denote the final judgment. But this would suppose a very harsh transition. Hence most all the recent Commentators understand them of the same subject as that of the preceding verses, i.e. the first advent and judgment of Christ, in the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish state. This seems required by the words εἰδέως, &c. which Mark and Luke render ἐγὼ ἐκεῖνοι ταῖς ἡμέραις. Christ has, from v. 15, shown by what signs his disciples might know that the destruction of the city and temple was at hand: he now, from v. 29, in prophetic imagery, depicts the total ruin of the Jewish nation. In all the three Evangelists, too, Christ says that this generation shall not pass away before all be fulfilled. See also Luke 21, 28. (which is especially urged by Grot.) all which seems to evidently mark the first advent. However, as many of the figures employed in these four verses would seem to have a more literal application to the destruction of the universe, I think it may be admitted to have some remote reference to it, by way of analogy and accommodation. The expressions of this and the following verses are metaphorical; such as are usual among the prophetic, and, indeed, in some measure, all animated writers, especially poets. As Christ here sustained the character of a prophet, so he vouchsafed to use prophetic imagery. "It was customary (says Doddridge) with the prophets, as it is still with the Eastern writers, to describe the utter ruin of states and kingdoms, not only in general, by an universal darkness, but also by such,

29. καὶ οἱ ἀστερεῖς πεσοῦνται, i. e. they shall no longer give their light. So in the passage of Herodot. just before cited. Rosenm. Kuinoel, and Pincinelli, however, interpret these words of globules of sulphureous and inflammable matter, which burn,
shine, and seem to fall from heaven, and are commonly called falling stars. Phenomena (says Rosenm.) called sternschnupper, star-shooting; thus elegantly depicted by Virgil, Georg. L. 1, 365. Sæpe etiam stellas, vento impendente, videbis Præcipites caelo labi, noctisque per umbram Flammarum longos a tergo alhescere tractus. These were, by the superstition of the ancients, thought to portend calamities. So Artemidorus, 2, 38. οὔτε δὲ καταπίτωτες ἑκά τῇ ὑπὲρ οἱ ἀστέρες εἰσὶν ἀγαθοὶ, οὔτε ἀφανιζόμενοι. πολλῶν γὰρ ἀθληῶν μακτέωνται καὶ ἀξιολόγων μὲν ἀνθρώ- πων οἱ μεγάλοι, λίτω δὲ καὶ ἀστέρων οἱ λέπτοι καὶ ἀμαυ- ροι. Wetstein cites Lucret. 8, 287. “Nec calor acventus scorum, seorsumque potestas aeris. And Claudian: Haud secus ac tacitam Luna regente per Arctum Sidera cedunt acies.” But this would be a circumstance too insignificant to match the sublime figures of the context, or suit the dignity of the Personage who uses them. A tremendous darkness is meant, such as is described in the following similar expressions by Statius, in his Theb. L. 10, sub init. “Pluraque laxato ceciderunt sidera caelo.” 1 Isaiah 34, 4. πάντα τὰ ἄστρα πεσεῖται, ἀς φίλλα ἐξ ἀμπέλου.

29. οἱ δύναμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν, i. e. the host of heaven, the sun, moon, and stars. See 2 Paral. 33, 5. Jeron. 33, 22, et sæpe. Or, as Kuinoel thinks, caelum ipsum, peripherastically. For, says he, in terrae motu hominibus titubantibus caelum sese motitari videtur. There is a similar expression in Isaiah 34, 4. ταχθῶνται πάσαι οἱ δύναμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν.

30. τότε φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The word σημεῖον is omitted by Mark and Luke, and indeed it is here used pleonastically. So Wolf, Kuinoel, and Rosenm. For σημεῖον signifies simply appearance. It may be translated, “Then shall be displayed the appearance of the Messiah, i. e. then shall the Messiah appear.” Some ancient and modern Commentators render σημεῖον ensign, banner. And the Greek Commentators, and early Critics, interpret it the cross. But σημεῖον is not so used in the
Scriptures, and the very idea of the banner and the cross savours of a crusading age. Wetstein explains it thus: “Pro signo in coelis, quod petierunt Judæi supra 16, 1. datur jam funus Hierosolymorum incensorum, qui interdiu solem, nocte vero lunam et stellas obscurabat.” An interpretation ingenious, but precarious.

30. τότε κόψωνται πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς. Many old Commentators interpret, “all the nations of the world;” and this sense our authorized version inculcates. But, in conjunction with Theophylact, and some of the best modern Commentators, I take γῆς for the land, i.e. Judæa. So in the passage of Zechar. 12, 12. (which Jesus had in mind.) κόψωνται ἡ γῆ κατὰ φυλὰς. This is also confirmed by Apos. 1, 7. (which evidently refers to this same event,) and (with Whitby) I think that it might be a vision seen by John before the destruction of Jerusalem, ἰδοὺ εὑρηται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν καὶ—καὶ κόψωνται ἐπὶ αὐτῶν πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς. There is a striking similarity between this passage of Matthew and that of the Apocal. which I can only account for by supposing that John employed the words which he remembered to have been used by our Lord. Κόψωνται signifies “they shall beat their breasts” (in sign of grief, repentance, &c.)

30. ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. A splendid image familiar to the Hebrew poets, signifying to come with majesty, &c. “They shall perceive the advent of the Messiah in power and glory.” The words μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς are exegetical of the preceding. This majesty and glory was shown by the destruction of the Jewish state, by the abrogation of the Mosaic Law, and the universal dissemination of the glorious truths of the Gospel. Wets. and Kuinoel.

31. ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ. The best Commentators interpret, “God will, by the intervention of his angels, (i.e. by his providence,) bring to pass that in this season of calamity, the true disciples
of Christ (οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ) shall be preserved." Others (with Rosenm.) take ἄγγελοι to mean the preachers of the Gospel. And so Doddridge, Hammond, Le Clerc, &c. Which opinion I think preferable. And this seems required by the word ἐπισυνάξουσι, which it would be extremely harsh to interpret preserve. By ἐκλεκτοῖ Rosenm. understands future Christians. Which Kuinoel thinks harsh. There is, however, no occasion to introduce the word future at all. Simply translate, "they will gather together all true worshippers of Christ. Examples of this sense of ἄγγελοι are given by Schl. Lex. from Gal. 4, 14. 1 Tim. 3, 16. Apocal. 1, 20, &c. Wets. traces an image of defence in ἐπισυνάξουσι (doubtless with reference to Matt. 28, 37. where Christ says, ποσάκις ἡβέλησα ἐπισωμαγαείν τα τέκνα σου, ο τρόπων ἐπισωμαγεί ὃς τα νοσσία ἐσωτήσ). He thus paraphrases: "Christ will be as careful to guard and defend his disciples, as he will be active in punishing the contumacious Jews. The disciples of Christ, dispersed throughout the whole world, will be preserved unhurt amid such commotions, as it were hidden and gathered up under the wings of Divine Providence." But this interpretation, however ingenious, seems to be scarcely supported by facts. The phrase μετὰ σάλπιγγος ἐπεσφῖ is taken from the Jewish custom of calling together the people by sound of trumpet. There is also a reference to it in the sublime imagery of 1 Cor. 15. and elsewhere.

31. ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἔ. α. α. These formulas (which mean the same) are of Hebrew colouring, signifying, "from all the regions of the world." In the earliest ages there were but four divisions, North, South, East, and West; nor does Homer mention more. Hence the various parts of the world were called quarters; and the Writers of the Old Testament, and the Rabbins, use the word ἀνέμος simply for part, or region. So Pea. ap. Wets. Ficus, quae sunt in omni vento.

31. ἀπ’ ἄκρων οὐρανῶν ἕως ἄκρων—α. These words
are an explication of what preceded; "from one extremity of the heavens to the other, i. e. from the whole universe, which is covered by the heavens." (Rosenm.) The phrase often occurs in the Old Testament, and even in the Classical writers, ex. gr. Themist. p. 179. εξ ἀκρας εἰς ἄκραν. Xenoph. Venti-gal. ἐξ ἐσχάτων τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐξ ἐσχάτα ἀφικέσθαι. Herodot. 7, 100. εξ ἐσχάτων ἐς ἐσχάτα ἀπίκετο. The sense will be this: "by those ἀγγέλων going forth, congregations of Christians will be formed in every quarter and region of the world."

32. ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μᾶθετε τὴν παραβολήν, "learn this parable (taken) from the fig-tree." A comparison probably suggested by the fig-trees, which, as well as olives, were grown in the place where they then were, i. e. the Mount of Olives. (Brug. Rosenm. and Kuin.)

32. ἦδη ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς γένηται ἀπαλός, has now become tender and succulent from the rising of the sap from the roots. (De Dieu.)

32. καὶ τὰ φύλλα ἐκφύει. Ἐκφύει usually signifies gigno, nasceor, as spoken of the offspring of animals; rarely of the productions of the earth. Hesych. explains ἐκφύει by βλαστάσει. Hence ἐκφυσάσθαι denotes shoots, branches. So in Philo (ap. Wets.), ἐκτάλλων ἐκφύεσθαι.

32. γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ βέρος. In this, and the parallel passages of Mark and Luke, βέρος denotes rather the spring than the summer. De Dieu rightly attributes the cause of it to the imitation of the Hebrew; for in that language there are no words to denote spring and autumn; the former being included under ᾱρηπ, the summer, and the latter under ἡμερ, the winter. The reason is (as Kuinoel suggests), that in the Oriental countries, there is far less difference in the temperature at different seasons, than in the Western ones. He refers to Harmer, whom the reader will do well to consult.

33. γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστίν, ἐτί ἡμέρας. So I would point, with Clarke. Bos. well compares Demosth.
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Or. 4. ὑπέριδε τοῦ ἐπὶ ταῖς θέραις ἐγγὺς αὐτῶς. And Sch. Lex. Arist. Plut. 707. ἐγγὺς πρὸ θυρεύν ἐστὶν. So the Latin, "in limine esse." Virg. Aen. 8, 656. This must be understood of the event before spoken, namely, the coming of the Messiah to judge the Jews, and establish his kingdom. Thus Luke adds, (21, 31.) ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.

34. ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῇ, this very generation, the race of men now living. So Matth. 11, 26. 23, 36. and elsewhere. Which was the case with St. John, and doubtless with several others. Certainly, all this can only be interpreted of the first advent of Christ to judge the Jewish nation, not the final judgment.

35. ὁ ωσαν καὶ ἡ γη παρελεύσονται, i. e. sooner shall heaven and earth pass away, than my words pass away and come to nought. So Clem. Ep. ad Corinth. p. 37. (Raphel.) Christ uses a comparison from a thing most impossible, to signify, &c. So Luke 16, 17. and Matth. 5, 18. "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than," &c. (Euthym.)

36. περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἑκεῖνης καὶ τῆς ἡμέρας. Markland would take ἑμέρα of the time in general, ἡμέρα of the time in particular; and compares Cæs. B. G. 7, 79. Clade omnium superiorum dimicationum fructum in eo die atque (f. eaque) horâ docet consistere. Owen, with his usual ἀκρισία, seems inclined to cancel τῆς ἡμέρας, on the authority of two MSS. though the omission can only be imputed to the carelessness of the scribes. In spite of what Kuinoel says, I assent to the opinion of Grotius, that these words signify time (as 25, 13.), or tempus definitum. See Hammond, and Le Clerc ap. Elsley. That Jesus hid from his disciples the exact time, in order to exercise their faith and constancy, is clear from what follows. Wetstein quotes the following similar passage from a Rabbinical writer: "Inquit, vel ipsos etiam Angelos terminum redemptioni praestitutum ignorare, cum illum ipsam haud revelaverit Deus." Compare Deut. 32, 34. 2 Cor. 22, 2.

37. ἐν τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Ναζ, οὕτως-ἀνθρώπου.
Euthymius well observes, Ἐκείνον καὶ ἀποστολήν αὐτῆς διὰ τοῦ παράδειγματος ἐμφαίνει. The sense is, “the same shall happen at the advent of Christ, as did in the time of Noah, namely, the calamity shall be sudden and unexpected.” So Rosenm. Camerarius, and L. Brugensis. This general sentiment is unfolded in ver. 37—41. Compare Luke 17. 26. seq. (Kuin.) But Piscator and Kuinoel, rather harshly, interpret “such as was the life of men in the time of Noah, so will be,” &c. What follows may be referred to the final judgment. But I assent to Rosenmuller, that the connection of the preceding requires the application of the words to the destruction of Jerusalem. The following opinion, however, of Rosenmuller may be questionable, namely, that Jesus spoke these words at different times and occasions. Compare Luke 12, 35. seq. & 17, 34.

38. τραγούντες καὶ πίνοντες, γάμοντες καὶ ἐγκαμίζοντες. There is no emphasis to be sought in τραγεῖν, nor any reference (as Beza thought) to the word being peculiar to brutes. It is used in common with ἐσθίειν in other parts of the New Testament. Though Triller and Fessel (ap. Wolf) have proved (which indeed no one could doubt) that γάμειν is used in the Classical writers for stuprum committere; as in the corresponding words in Latin. So Hor. Carm. 8, 27, 76. speaking of Europa: “Uxor invicti Jovis esse nescis?” Yet I cannot agree with them, that such is the sense here, for I know no example of it in the sacred writers. As to Mark 6, 17. it plainly signifies there lawful marriage. I should rather agree with Moerly, Doddridge, Rosenmuller, Schoetg. Kuinoel, and Schleusner, that these words express no more than the security and gaiety with which they pursued the usual employments and amusements of life, when on the brink of destruction. At the same time I must maintain that a reproof of the antediluvian vices is here implied; since in the parallel passage of Luke, 17, 34. this caution is subjoined; προσέχετε δε ἐαυτοῖς μῆποτε μαρωθός ὦμον αἱ καρδίαι ἐν
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κρατώλη καὶ μέθη καὶ μερίμνας βιωτικάς, κ. τ. λ. and just after, ἐσθίεν καὶ πίνειν μετὰ τῶν μεθώντων. They seem to have been (says L. Brug.) not only absorbed in security, but to have devoted themselves to things transitory, enslaved to their pleasures, not less than he who inscribed on his sepulchre τοσσ' ἔχω ὅσο' ἐπιον καὶ ἐδήσω. So utterly (says Grotius) were their minds bowed down to the earth, unmindful of being formed after the image of God, as the very erect posture of the human frame denotes, since for that reason, God “os homini sublime dedit,” &c. This our dignity we are to ever bear in mind, hence we are exhorted in the words of Luke ἀνακύψαι. This ἀνακόρασις (Phil. 1, 20.) is opposed to those secular cares in which the men of the old world were absorbed. (Grot.) One may appositely cite the celebrated passage of Juvenal, Sat. 9, 128. Dum bibimus, dum sertas, unguenta, puellas Poscimus, obrept non intellecta senectus.


39. καὶ ἥρεν ἀπαντας, took, swept away, destroyed. Luke ἀνακόρασεν. The Classical writers say ἀλρεῖν ἐκ μέσου, de medio tollere. Thus ἀλρεῖν answers to נְשָׁה, necare, in Job 32, 22. 1 Mac. 5, 2. (Rosenm. and Kuin.)

40. τίτε δύο ἐσοναι ἐν τῷ ἀγών, “two will be in the field.” The general sense of the passage seems to be, that of those absorbed in the occupations of this life, as many will be swallowed by the evil as those who escape. Παραλαμβάνεται, the present for the future, “taken away captive.” The Commentators and Schl. Lex. cite (from Munth.) as an authority, Thucyd. 1, 18. Ἀθηναίοι δὲ ναύς τῶν πολεμίων παραλαμβάνετε.
But Munthe, from not examining the passage, has been led into an error. Πολέμαον is an old and corrupt reading: πόλεαον has been received by all Critics since the time of Wasse. Wetstein gives examples of the cognate words ἐπιλαμβάνειν and καταλαμβάνειν from Polyb. 3, 24. Onos. 42.

41. δύο ἀλέθρωσαν ἐν τῷ μύλων. The μύλων was a handmill composed of two stones, such as was then, and still is, in use in the East, turned by two servants (Exod. 11, 5. Herodot. 7, 187. Gell. 3, 3.); mostly by females, both among the Jews (Is. 47, 2. Judith, 16, 21. Exod. 11, 5. Job 31, 10.) and Greeks. In proof of which Wetstein cites the following passages: Hom. Od. ν, 403. Plut. 2, 1101. παρυκελῆς ἀλετρίς πρὸς μύλην κινουμένη. Nidda, f. 6, 2. due mulieres molentes molis mulinaris.

42. γρηγορεῖτε, be watchful, and approve your virtue and fidelity. For γρηγορέω has two senses, the physical to be wakeful, as Matth. 26, 38. and a little further on; but, like the Latin, vigilare, and the Hebrew γῆ, it has frequently in the Scriptures (as here) a metaphorical one, “to be watchful and cautious.”

43. What follows from hence to 25, 31. is by most Commentators thought to refer, like the preceding, to the ruin of the Jewish state. But I assent rather to Rosenmuller and Kuinoel, who refer them to the last and final advent. For (observes Kuinoel) the parallel passage of Luke, 12, 35. seq. treats of the future felicity in the Messiah’s kingdom to be expected by pious Christians (compare v. 37, and see the introduction to 25.) and that Luke himself so understood these similitudes proposed by Christ, is hence apparent, because then follows what we find in v. 32. This very passage of Luke shows that Matthew, wishing, according to his custom, to give specimens of the discourses of Christ concerning his return to the final judgment, omitted various discourses and interrogatories of the disciples which Jesus (43. 1.) regarded. That the Jewish state was to come to ruin, while the men of the present generation should
be yet living, Christ had predicted (ver. 34.); but he had hitherto mentioned nothing of the συνέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, the resurrection of the dead, the final judgment; all which events indeed the Jews conjoined with the destruction of the Temple and city. The very words of Christ, ver. 48. ἐκεῖνο δὲ γινώσκετε, as well as those which follow, clearly show that a new subject is commenced from v. 48. and that some circumstances preceded, which have been omitted by Matthew. The Apostles seem, after Jesus had said what we read in ch. 24, 4—43. to have begun to speak of the last judgment, and the felicity of the Messiah's kingdom, and to have proposed various questions, and especially interrogated their Master as to the period when the συνέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, and the establishing of the Messiah's kingdom, would follow. To this interrogation Jesus replied (ver. 49. seq.), directing his discourse to the Apostles, and the rest of his followers present, "the time cannot be defined. I shall return suddenly; wherefore watch ye, and be vigilant; and, with all your care and labour study to discharge your respective duties." Then Peter, (fervid in his disposition, and full of affection to Jesus,) broke out (as we learn from Luke 12, 41.) into these words: "Sayest thou these words to us!" i. e. dost thou so strongly exhort us, thy Apostles, to vigilance and constancy! believe me, we will be watchful and constant! (Compare Matt. 26, 35.) "Do these thy words respect all the rest of thy followers?" To this Jesus replied, that certainly all had great need of this exhortation to vigilance, and that he addressed to all the admonition γνωρίσθε. (See Mark 18, 37.) This sentiment Jesus then illustrated by some parables. The first of them (24, 45.) regarded the Apostles; and by it they were taught, that the time of his return to the final judgment, and the solemn establishment of the Messiah's kingdom would be late, but that return he certainly should. The two remaining parables on the same subject (25, 1—31.) regarded not only the Apostles, but also the
other disciples and followers of Christ; and the sum of the discourse of our Lord (24, 45. 25, 31.) is this: "Be ye all watchful and constant; so that, whenever I shall come, even if this second return should be long after the first, I may find you not unprepared. Believe me, he who so conducts himself as not at any time to be ready to joyfully welcome his Master's return, will be excluded from the felicity of the Messiah's kingdom, and be subjected to the severest punishments."

This interpretation being admitted, a more exact connection will exist between this and the description of the last judgment (25, 31. seq.) and it will be manifest, that by these parables Christ meant, as it were, to pave the way to a more accurate description of his last advent in order to hold the final judgment. Moreover, this interpretation of Christ's parables now proposed, is far simpler than that other, which supposes that the words of Christ refer to the destruction of the Jewish state. Finally, when Christ treats of his coming to execute judgment on the Jewish state, he had said (24, 34.), οἵς μὴ παρέλθῃ η γεινή αὐτῆς ἐὰν πάντα ταῦτα γένηται. But in all the parables, from 24, 45. in which he speaks of his return, he informs them that it would be late; χρονίζει ο κόριος, 24, 48; χρονιζοῦσι τοῦ νυμφίου, 25, 5; μετὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ, 25, 19. See the note on chap. 25. (Kuinoel.) For some of the most important of the preceding observations Kuinoel is indebted to Rummell, from whom it will be only necessary for me to detail the following illustrations of this important subject now under our consideration:

"Certain it is, that the Apostles, and the Christians in general, of the Apostolic and the primitive ages, were of the opinion, that both the above advents would be separated by a very small interval: they knew not, at least, whether the destruction of Jerusalem, and the general judgment, would take place at the same time, or whether one should ensue after the expiration of some years, and the other after
the lapse of many ages. (See 2 Thes. 2, 1.) Even Christ himself has transferred to the representation of his kingdom all those ideas, images, and descriptions of the Messiah's kingdom to which the Jews had been accustomed. For they thought that the end of the world would be immediately subsequent to the advent of the Messiah (Matth. 24, 3.), and they expected, at the very same time, the resurrection of the dead (Joh. 11, 24.), and the general judgment. Hence to this common mode of speaking, and to the received notions of the Jews respecting the divine kingdom, Jesus, most wisely, accommodated many of the descriptions of his kingdom. No wonder, therefore, if the Evangelists, neglecting the distinction, with which they were unacquainted, between the proximate and the ultimate advent of Jesus, so relate the discourses of Christ as if they were to be understood of one and the same event. We, indeed, taught by the event, and by history, easily separate, in our thoughts, these different events, which they confounded. Hence it appears, that the admonitions contained in this and the following parables, appertain to us, and to all future generations unto the end of the world." Rosenm.

To these learned Commentators I entirely assent as to the general subject of the subsequent portion of Scripture, and will only observe, that this had been long before distinctly perceived by Dr. Doddridge, to whom perhaps they were indebted for the thought. "I humbly conceive, (says he) that the grand transition, about which Commentators are so much divided, and so generally mistaken, is made precisely after these two verses. Our Lord, in the following verses of Matthew and Mark, directs their thoughts to that final solemnity in which they are so highly concerned, by repeating, almost in the same words, the cautions and advices he had formerly given, Luke 12, 35. et seq. § 114, in which whole context (as I there observed, note f. p. 227.) there is no reference to those temporal calamities that were
coming on the Jews, which have been here the subject of almost the whole preceding discourse." Euth. and Theophyl. seem to have been of the same opinion.

43. ποίᾳ φυλακῇ. It signifies, by a metonymy, at what hour. I think, with Kuinoel, that the expression has the air of a proverb; and the general caution meant to be inculcated seems to be this; "My return cannot be defined, it will be unexpected: and as this uncertainty carries with it danger, therefore it is always to be apprehended, and always guarded against. (Rosenm. Grot. and Kuin.) Wets. compares Sallust, Cotil. 52, 29. Vigilando, agendo, bene consulendo omnia cedunt.

44. ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἑτοιμοὶ. So live, as you will wish to have lived at the coming of the Lord. (Rosenm.) It is one part of the character given of Pollius by Statius, Sylv. lib. 2. (cited by Bulkley,) that his last day would not find him in the confusion of outward things, but ready to go.

"Dubio quem non in turbine rerum
Depreendent suprema dies, sed abire paratum."

So also in a Greek Fragment preserved by Seneca (and cited by Weston): οὖτος ἀριστάτε, ὡς ἐν ἄδου δεινηθάναιε.

45. τίς ἐρᾷ εἰρήν. Glass takes τίς for qualis and quantus; and so Chrysostom, who observes that the word is used to express how rare and valued such should be. But I prefer, with Grot. Schmid. Ros. and Kuin. to understand the τίς as hypothetical: so Jac. 3, 10. and so ὑς Deut. 20, 5. Ps. 107, 43. Schl. Lex. refers to Matt. 7, 9, 12, 11. Luke 11, 5, 12, 45. James 3, 18. Sirach 6, 34. &c.

45. φοράμπος, mindful, attentive to his business. The following expressions seem to have an especial reference to the Apostles and Preachers of the Gospel. So in 1 Cor. 4, 1. they are called εἰκόνωμοι μουσφήμων Θεοῦ. To administer spiritual food in due season; to some milk, to others strong meat (σοφίαν).
All, however, in a certain sense are stewards of the manifold grace of God, and have to give an account.

45. κατέστησεν· επὶ τῆς θεωρείας. The abstract is here used for the concrete. A principle which is thus stated by Matthiae: "Substantives of different classes are often interchanged: substantives, especially, which express a general idea of kind, are put for the definite person or thing to which that idea, as in one single case, refers." Of such words Wetstein produces many examples; as does also Loeisner and Abres. Dil. Thucyd. 598. It may be sufficient for me to observe, that the principle is chiefly confined to nouns signifying service, as θεομετέρων, δουλεία, and and ὑπηρεσία, but also takes place with ευμαχία and προσβεία. This has been imitated by the Latin in servitium, famulatum, ministerium, legatio. Of all these Wetstein's note will furnish examples.

45. διδόναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφὴν ἐν καυμᾷ; Luke calls this σιτομετέρων, and the Greek Poets ἀρμαλην ἐμιχυνος. (Cas.) It appears, too, from L. Pignor. (ap. Cler.) that this allowance was dispensed monthly. This custom was continued down to the feudal times. The great Norman Barons had Le Dispenseur (from whence is derived the name Spencer).

46. τοιοῦτα δυτηρια. Casaubon and Castalio maintain that εὐτηρια, like the Hebrew מ, sometimes signifies duty: and they cite 2 Reg. 17, 9. and Phil. 4, 1. If this opinion were admitted, I should rather suppose an ellipsis of ὡς εἴδει. But it may, perhaps, be more properly referred to διδόναι τὴν τροφὴν ἐν καυμᾷ. For ἐν καυμᾷ implies at the (proper) time; καυμᾷ signifying tempus opportunum. As to the sentiment, Bulkley appositely compares Epict. 3, 5, n. τι ἐξεῖς τοῦτον κρείσσου ποιῶν καταληφθῆναι; Ποιεῖ ἐκεῖνο, Ἐμαθέ γὰρ καταληφθῆναι γένοιτο μηδένος ἀλλου ἐξηπελευμένῳ, καὶ τῆς προαιρέσεως τῆς ἔμης, ἢ ἀπαθῆς, ἢ ἀκαλύτους, &c.

47. πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπαχυσίων αὐτοῦ καταστήσει αὐτῶς. From being dispenser, or οἰκόνομος, he will make him

48. Χρονίζει. It is truly observed by Colum. (ap. Wets.) 1, 1. "Servi—dominorum distantiae corrum-puntur. So also Plaut. Pseudol. Act. 4, 7. (ap. Bulkley.) Qui (scil. servi) liberos esse illico se arbitrantur Ex conspectu heri si sui se abdiderunt Luxuriantur, lustrantur, comedunt quod Habet; ii nomen diu servitutis ferunt Nec boni ingenii quicquam in his inest—Ego ut imperatum est, etsi abest, hic adesse herum Arbitror: nunc ego illum metuo, cum hic non adest Ne cum assiet, metuam."

49. ἀπεξηται τύπτειν, for τύπτῃ, shall strike. This is an Hebrew idiom. Wetstein compares Lucian, Timon. 28. τῶς ὑμοῦσας μαστίγοι. The words τύπτειν τοὺς ὑμοῦσας, ἐσθένει καὶ πίνειν denote every sort of sensual excess, and the brutal violence which it engenders; also oppression, &c. How prone servants of any age have been to take this advantage of a master's absence, is obvious enough. Wetstein (from Triller) cites a humorous passage from Plaut. Mostel. 1, 1, 19. Nunc dum tibi lubet, licetque, pota, perde rem — Dies noctesque bibite, pergæ-camini — Hæccine mandavit tibi, cum peregrè hinc iit senex? Hoccine modo hic rem curatam offendet suam? It is, however, of more importance to advert to the reference which this has to those teachers of the Gospel, who yield themselves up to sensual indulgence, and carnal security: who, far from defending the cause of religion, slothfully betray its best interests, or even injure it by their own evil example. Grotius and Doddridge think that the words plainly refer to a debauched and persecut-ing clergy. The latter circumstance they have deduced (we may suppose) from τύπτειν, somewhat precariously, I think.
50. ἰδεῖ οὐ κύριος—προσδοκᾷ. Wetstein illustrates this circumstance by a very beautiful passage from Claudian. de B. Get. Ac veluti famuli, mendax quos mortis herilis nuntius in luxum falso rumore resolvit, Dum marcent epulis, atque inter vina chorosque Persultat variis effrēna licentia tectis: Si reducem dominum sors improvisa revexit, Hārent attoniti, libertatemque perosus Conscia servilis præcordia concutit horror.

51. διχωρησει αὐτῶ. On the interpretation of this word, there is much difference of sentiment. The various opinions (some of them absurd enough) are detailed in Pole, Wolf, Koecher, and Suicer, in his Thes. all of which it would be impossible for me to discuss. Most Commentators explain it, "crudeli morte afficiet;" which, however, is decidedly refuted by the following words, where the servant is spoken of as alive, being consigned to the place where there shall be weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth. Others (as Euthymius, Theophylact, Tertullian, and some modern Commentators, as Beza, Bishop Pearce, Campbell, Casaubon, Glass) interpret, "turn him away; separate, excommunicate:" but their proofs are weak, and (as Kuinoel observes) the sense is frigid, and inconsistent with the parallel passage of Luke 7, 47. This is, indeed, the other extreme; and perhaps proceeded from a confusion of ancient with modern manners. Let it be remembered that the δούλοι were liable to very severe corporal punishment, which, we know, was often harshly enough administered. The expression evidently implies severe punishment: and Chrys. explains it, τα ἐσχάτα διαβήσει, but, from the context, it must be a punishment short of death. I grant that in the East, where punishments have always been marked by peculiar atrocity, they used to saw asunder the body of the unhappy culprit, cut off limb after limb, strike off the head, leaving only the trunk. See Michaelis, Diss. de pœnis capit. Hebr. Compare Jud. 19, 29. 1 Sam. 15, 33. Dan. 3, 29. There are even vestiges of this
among the Greeks and Romans. Compare Tert. Apoc. Ch. 3. Diod. Sic. 1, 2. Suet. Calig. Ch. 27. Horat. Sat. 1, 1, 95, seqq. Add Diod. Sic. L. 10, 125, s. f. ἐν ταῖς τυχόνταις αὐτίασι τοὺς μὲν διέμεινε τοὺς—δὲ γὰρ τας ἐκπρίζε. Add (from Wets.) Liv. 1, 28, 9. Val. Max. 9, 2, 4. Herodot. 7, 189. Hebr. 11, 37. ἐπιστοῦσαν. Herodot. 2, 139, 5. Hom. Od. L. 18, 337. ᾧς ο’ αδια διακελείστι τάμησιν. See also Raphael and Munthe. But, as I repeat, the context requires a punishment short of death; and as sometimes δίχοτομεῖν is used metaphorically for taking severe punishment, (as in Hist. Susan. v. 55. σχίσει σε μέσον, and 39. πτώσι σε μέσον,) therefore I would interpret, with Heuman, Doddridge, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, “diverterare, discindere, flagris turgem secare.” For δίχοτομεῖν does not necessarily signify to cut into two parts, (as some Critics tell us,) but, as in the Sept. to cut in pieces, to carve, hack, dissect; and may well be employed as τέμεναι and δέραι are often used, for severe flagellation. The latter frequently in the New Testament, and the former sometimes in the Classics, as Arrian, Epict. L. 3, 22. where, with reference to a disobedient servant, it is said, ἐπιστορεῖ ο’ κύριος, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτόν σοβαρῶς διανιστόμενον, ἐκλύσες ἐτεμεὶν. It is well known that that was the punishment inflicted upon delinquent slaves, who were then thrown into a dungeon, where the pain of undressed wounds, added to the various miseries of their condition, might well cause weeping and gnashing of teeth. As to the interpretation of Heuman, chattering of teeth (from cold) is puerile, and utterly degrades the dignity of the image. That in all languages similar hyperboles occur, and expressions which commonly denote cutting in pieces, flaying, &c. are occasionally used for severe flagellation, I remarked on Ch. 21, 35. 25, 51. τὸ μέρος θήσει μετὰ ὑ. This is said to be a Hebrew formula, and signifies versari cum aliquo. Markland compares Psalm 49, 18. (Sept.) μετὰ μοιχεῖ τὴν μεγίσκου ἐτίθεσ. Also Prov. 29, 24. Dan. 4, 12, 12. Like
St. Matthew, Chap. XXIV. XXV.

and it signifies (as Grotius thinks) retribution. And Ptolemy compares Eurip. (Hippol. 1290. Monk.) ὁς ἐν γὰρ ἁγαθὸς ἀνδρᾶσιν ὁς τοι κακῶν μέρος ἔστιν. Kuin. translates, assignabit in locum apud simulatores, sic amandabit in ergastulum; an image by which the severest punishment is signified.

51. μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν. ὑποκριτῶν, as opposed to δουλοι πίστοι, signifies such as ἀκίντου, such as are different from what they appear to be, and whose profession would promise them to be. This interpretation is confirmed by the word employed by Luke in the parallel place, i.e. ἀκίντου. Some word must be taken which shall equally suit with the literal and metaphorical sense. This is not the case with hypocrite, which suits not the latter. It is difficult to find such a word. The perfidious of Campbell is liable to greater objection, as suiting neither. The nearest seems to be faithless, unprincipled, as opposed to trustworthy. Nor must we press too much on the idea of dissimulation: for in the Hellenistic use, the word signifies, (as Schleusner observes,) one who acts simulanter, and, from the adjunct, doloso, fraudulenter, inique. For the Hebrew גָּם, wicked, is rendered by the Sept. ὑποκριτῶν, in Job. 34, 30. 36, 13.

Chap. XXV.

Verse 1. δέκα ταρβένως. It has been made a matter of debate, whether what follows is to be referred to the destruction of Jerusalem, or to the final judgment. Rosenm. and Kuinoel have, I think, satisfactorily shown that, from Ch. 24, 42. to 25, 30. must be referred to the final judgment. Their arguments will be found stated at large in the note on the preceding chapter. On the following parable Kuinoel has this introductory remark: "In this parable Jesus exhorts his followers, that they should conduct themselves cautiously and circumspectly,
and rightly and exactly fulfil their duties, and constantly follow the precepts of piety and virtue, by which they might become partakers of the rewards of another life, and of the future felicity to be expected in the Kingdom of the Messiah. And he charges them not, when they saw the time of his return delayed, to become slothful and negligent in the study of virtue, and Christian piety, and indulge in immorality.” In this admirable parable, the duty of religious watchfulness and preparation is plainly inculcated, as in ver. 15. γρηγορεῖτε: but it has been observed by the Commentators, that there is a peculiar propriety and beauty in assigning to the persons watching the employment of lighting and keeping light their lamps, (which is an allusion to military watching, as Procop. περὶ λυγμαὶν ἀφάς,) since the very expression, to light lamps, is sometimes used for “to be watchful;” which is alluded to by Arrian, Epic. 11, 20. τι δὲ ἡμᾶς ἀγρυπνεῖς; τι λύχνων ἀπεῖς; and 2, 21. μὴ γὰρ διὰ τῶν πόλεων λύχνων ἡμᾶς ἡ ἡγεμονιάς. As to the custom of going out to meet the bridegroom, (from which the parable was derived,) we know but little. It appears, however, that not only among the Jews, but also the Greeks and Romans, it was the custom that the bridegroom, after espousal, and before the consummation, should, late in the evening, (and therefore by light of lamps,) with pomp, rejoicing, and feasting, bring the bride to his house. So Heliod. 2, 29. δέδει αἳ τὸ γαμήλιον ἐκλαμψασαι φῶς. Hom. II. σ. 491. Virg. Ecl. 8, 29. See many other passages in Wetstein. Stat. Theb. 8, 23. (ap. Bulkley.) Illi Cytheria laudant Connubia, et multa deductam lampade fratrum Harmoniem. That this was the custom in Persia we learn from Chardin. The bridegroom was accompanied by youths, as bridemen, who were to bring him to the spouse, and the bride had virgins, (sometimes married women, sometimes maidens,) who were to bring her to the house of the bridegroom. These, on the approach of the bridegroom’s party, went out
to meet them, and so accompany them (holding up lamps), to the house of the bridegroom, where the nuptial banquet was prepared. Here we may suppose, by the lateness of the hour, either some considerable distance, or the intervention of some accident which caused delay. The number is not (as Kuin. and Rosenm. think) a certain for an uncertain one. It seems probable that some number was customary of maiden lamp-bearers, (as Plutarch, π, 268. B. tells us that the Romans had five, neither more nor less,) and that this indicates the customary number in Judæa seems highly probable; especially as it is confirmed by a passage from Rabbi Salom. (cited by Wets.) "Mos est in terrâ Ismaelitica, ut sponsam ducant e domo patris sui in domum sponsi — ferantque ante eam circiter decem baculos ligneos, in unius cujusque summitate vasculum instar scutellae habentes, in quo est segmentum panni cum aleo et pice." Though in the application of the parable the number is not to be attended to.

1. ἐξῆλθον εἰς ἀψάντησιν τοῦ νυμφίου. Grotius here supposes the figure πρόληψις. Rosenm. and Kuinoel (from Gerard) explain volebant obviam ire. And, indeed, both in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin verbs, especially in the imperfect and aorist have this sense; in which some say the action is put for the intention. But here this would produce a very frigid sense: neither is it necessary. They plainly went forth twice. First, proceeding to a certain distance, where they waited for the bridegroom and his party; secondly, they moved forward, (for that is the sense of ἐξῆλθον,) when they saw the bridegroom's party approaching. This is plain from the words λαβοῦσαι τὰς λαμπάδας κ. τ. λ. This sense of ἐξέλθειν prodire is found in Mark 8, 11. compared with Matth. 16, 1. Ψάννοι, cautæ. See Reisk, Anim. 2, 265. referred to by Rosenmuller.

4. ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις — in their flasks. Num. 4, 9. ἀγγεῖα τοῦ ἐπίστου.

5. ἐνυσταχίων — καὶ ἐκάθενον, they nodded, dozed,
and (then) fell asleep. There seems to be what is called a *climax*.

6. μέσης νυκτὸς, i.e. later than was usual, or expected: as appears by the preceding words, *χριστοῦ τοῦ νυκτός*. Though, indeed, the *deductio* was always by night. (Rosenm.) So Wets. cites Vit. Max. 1, 5. More prisco, nocte connubia nuptialis petit. Catullus in Epith.—Vesper adest—vesper Olympos,—jam ducitur Hymeneus. Serv. in Virg. Ecl. 8. Varro in Altis dicit, spousas faces praerite, quod autem nonvis; nocte ducebantur a sponsis. From Chrysost. on 1 Cor. 12. we learn that the custom still kept its ground in his days.

6. κραυγῇ γέγονεν, i.e. (explains Kuinoel,) of the approaching multitude of persons. Or rather, of some of the prudent maidens:

7. ἐκόσμησαν τὰς λαμπάδας, trimmed. The Sept. use ἐπισκευάζειν of lamps, in Exod. 30, 7. where the Hebrew is יִשָּׁא, which verb is sometimes rendered by the Sept. κοσμεῖν, sometimes καλλίσκειν. Wetstein cites Petron. 22. Lucernis occidentibus oleum infuderat.

8. δόθε ἡμῖν ἐκ τοῦ ἐλαίου ὑμῶν, give us (some) of your oil. Here there is an ellipsis of μέρος. See Bos. Ell. 281. Schaef. The Hebrews thus use the ἐν partively. Compare 2 Chron. 30, 7. where the Sept. supply μέρος.

8. σφέννυται. The English Version, and Doddr. render this “gone out.” Kuinoel, max *expirabunt*. I should rather prefer “are going out,” are ready to go out.

9. λέγουσα — Μὴ ποτε οὐκ ἄρκεσθι. That there is here an ellipsis of ὅρα, or σκότην, seems generally admitted. Some, however, (as Rosenm. Kuinoel, and Sch.) think that, without attending to the ellipsis, in translating, it may be rendered, “Sic fortasse nesses vobis sufficeret.” And that μὴ ποτε has this sense often in Philo, is observed by Loesner. Kypke adduces examples from Hippocr. *μὴ ποτέ* οὐ τοις γέλαις τοιού τις αὐς λόγος. Max. Tyr. Diss. 12. Plut. 2, 119. and 106 & 107. Athen. 586. So also in the
Old Testament: as Genes. 24, 5. & 29. Compare 27, 12. Grotius, Glass, and some others, however, thought that there was also an ellipsis of a negative particle: as in Genes. 20, 11. ἐὰν γὰρ—μὴ προτε ὁμ ἐστὶ λ. τ. λ. And so our English Version renders, "not so;" which Campbell censures. But his reasonings are inconclusive and frivolous. I am of opinion that there is an ellipsis of ὁμ, and that, as our language cannot admit so elliptical a sentence, our Translators have done well in supplying the ellipsis. The negative is found in the Cod. Montf. doubtless from some very ancient marginal gloss, which shows the antiquity of the opinion with respect to this ellipsis (of which too there is some vestige in Euthymius). Kypke, indeed, and Kuin. think it harsh to supply so many words. But there are instances of even a longer ellipsis. There is perhaps here a delicacy in omitting the negative, by which the harshness of a direct denial is avoided, to which the ancients attached some sort of shame. So Diog. Laert. 7, 17. (of Zeno.) αἰς δὲ κυκλός τις ὡς φύσις ἔμαθεν ἔχειν ἐν ληκύθῳ, προς ὑπηρεσίαν αὐτῶν, ὡς ἐφι δεσιεῖν ἀπελευθεροῖ τὸν μόνον ἐκέλευεν εἰκάζοντες ὅπως ἐνεσίδειπρος.

9. τὸ πέριεσθε—ἐκαντοῖς. This seems to have been a common expression used to those who asked what could not well be spared. It is a merely ornamental circumstance; as is the following, ἀτεργομένων δὲ αὐτῶν. Hence it is amazing that the Romanists should have inferred from hence that the merit of good works may be bought. Directly opposed to this is the remark of Euthymius, probably derived from Chrysostom: "Hence we are taught (says he) that no one can from his own virtue assist another. For every one will with difficulty have enough for his own salvation, since even the most virtuous often fail in their duty." But even Theoph. Beza, Brug. and others, are not free from censure, who seek in these words a mystical sense, and derive a spiritual application. Euth. observes, that those foolish vir-
gins who went to buy, did not succeed; so vain are then all endeavours after virtue.

10. οἱ ἔτοιμοι, i. e. those who were ready. This absolute use of ἔτοιμος, as applied to persons, is somewhat rare. With things it is not unfrequent: as Matth. 22, 8. γάμος ἔτοιμος ἦτοι.

10. εἰς τοὺς γάμους, the house where the wedding was to be celebrated.

12. οἶκος οἶδα ὑμᾶς. Doddridge presses too much the sense of the word, by rendering, "I have no personal acquaintance with you: and so Euthymius, γνώσων τὴν ἐξ ὑμεῖς ἀλήθεια νῦν. Vatabl. on the other hand, goes into the opposite extreme by explaining "non mihi estis gratē." I would rather interpret, "I do not recognize you among those who accompanied me and my spouse, and so far you are unknown to me (and inadmissible)." Or it may only be a formula repulsionis, which indicates absolute and contemptuous rejection, similar to our expression, "I know nothing about you; go about your business." See note on Matth. 7, 23. The moral is this: "Equally irrational are they who hope for salvation, without approving their faith by good works, and who procrastinate the work of reformation, as were those foolish virgins mentioned in the parable. Wisely do those alone act, who conjoin with faith a studious attention to good works, and so regulate their lives as to be always prepared for their latter end." (Rosenm.) Euthym. judiciously closes his illustrations of this parable by observing that the minuter circumstances are not to be scrutinized, such as are thrown in by way of ornament, or to make the story natural and probable, on which principle we may account for nothing being said of the foolish virgins being sent off to punishment, though that cannot be meant to correspond in the application.


14. ἀσπερ ἄνθρωπος. To this parable is wanting
the ἀπόδοτος, which is left to be supplied from the context. Hence our version has inserted "the kingdom of Heaven." I prefer supplying ο ὦς ἀνθράκτων. This is preferable to the method of Campbell, who alters the preceding words, in order to introduce these. The sense requires us to supply "as this master did, so will your heavenly Master do." Ἀποδημᾶω. The present for the future. There is no occasion to conjecture ἀποδήμησαω, with Markland. The ancient fathers and interpreters refer this to the long-suffering of God, who waiteth to be merciful, &c. Schoetgen tells us that there are vestiges of this parable in the Rabbinical authors.

14. ἐκάλεσε τοὺς ἱδίους δούλους. Wetstein explains this, "quos maximè ad hoc idoneos judicabat c. 15. et quos accuratius et majore fide quam mensarios negotium gesturos esse sperabat;" "Seine eigenen Knechte." But this interpretation seems precarious. Perhaps it may be here not emphatical, but pleonastic. This seems an Hellenistic idiom; for, as the Sept. sometimes expresses the Hebrew suffix י by י (as in Job 7, 10. Prov. 27, 8.) so do the writers of the New Testament, as in Matth. 22, 5. 1 Pet. 3, 1. Tit. 2, 5. ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἱδίοις ἀνθρώποις.

14. παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ. According to any one's ingenuity, ability, activity, and industry, or aptitude to place out the money safely, and yet advantageously, so did he entrust to him a proportionable capital. (Rosenm.) It seems that masters sometimes committed to their slaves a little capital to employ in petty traffic, for the improvement of which they were to be accountable to them. This is, in some measure, still the custom in the East and Russia. The Boyars and masters in general, send their slaves, especially when artisans, to work in the towns, and they occasionally furnish their peasants (adscriptos glebas) with some small capital, to be employed, either in agriculture, or in petty traffic. The fathers, and ancient interpreters, injudiciously limit the application of this parable to preachers of
the Gospel; but it extends to all Christians; since to all, in a greater or less proportion, God has entrusted endowments of body or mind, in order that every one, in proportion to his ability, may contribute his quota towards the general welfare.

15. ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν. Kypke stiffly maintains, that δύναμις must here denote wealth, riches; referring the word to the master. I do not deny that this signification occurs in the Classical writers, but not, as far as I can find, in the New Testament. The sense too resulting from that mode of taking the word is frigid. I prefer the interpretation of most Commentators, who explain it, "according to his peculiar ability or skill." For, as Euthym. well remarks, έτι προστίθηκα καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἐν τῇ διανομῇ ἀνισότητος, έτι κατὰ τὴν ἐκάστου δύναμιν καὶ ἐπιτρέπεται. See Whitby's excellent note.


16. καὶ ἐτοίρησεν ἄλλα πέντε τάλαντα. This is thought, by Grotius and others, a Latinism; and, it is true, the phrase rem facere, confiscere; and pecuniam facere is cited by Wets. from Cic. and Nepos. But it occurs also in the Greek. So Pollux has ἀγγύρων παιστιναί, which is produced by Wetstein from Plato 734. v. and Aristot. Ὀε. 2. ἐτοίρησε χρήματα άδε. Also Palaiaret cites Ælian. V. H. 14, 32. οὐσιαν ποιήσατα, and Theophr. ch. 24. ποιήσατε δέκα τάλαντα. Kypke's examples are not so apposite, since the word is βλέπ. So also the Hebrew ויהי in Gen. 12, 5. &c.
It extends, indeed, to most languages: so we say "to make money."

20. ἄλλα πέντε τάλαντα ἐκέρδησα ἐξ' αὐτῶν. Some Commentators interpret ἄλλα besides, as the Hebrew by, which, however, is rather an illustration, than a direct proof. I should prefer ex iis, out of them, by the use of them, (with Fiscator, Beza, and Rosenm.) which I think more significant, and more apt. Examples of this sense of ἐξ with a dative, noting the efficient cause, are given by Schleusner in his Lex. p. 887. So Matth. 4. 4. Luke 4. 4. Man does not live ἐκ' ἄρτιο μόνον.

21. εἰ, δούλε ἄγαθε καὶ πιστέ, i.e. εὖγε, euge, εὖ; καλῶς. It was used (says Doddridge) "by spectators, to note applause;" and indeed generally corresponded to our "bravo." So Plato Euth. (ap. Wets.) ἄμα ἀνεβόθησαν τε καὶ ἐγέλασαν—καὶ τρὶς ἀναπνεύ- σαν καλῶς τε καὶ εἰ. Hor. A. b. 328. Eu nam poteris servare tuam. Πιστὸς and ἄγαθος both denote gnarus, industrious, one who traded with the talents, and therefore fulfilled the intention of his lord, and evinced himself to be trustworthy.

21. ἐκ ἀλάγα ἃς πιστὸς. This is an elliptical sentence. We must supply κατάστασις. The complete phrase occurs in Hebr. 2. 7. κατέστησας αὐτῶν ἐκ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου.

21. ἐκ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω. So Xenoph. Cyr. 1. εἰ δὲ τίνα ὁράη δεινὸν ὄντα ὀικόνομον ἐκ τοῦ δικαίου, καὶ κα- τακενάζοντα τε ἢς ἀρχαί κεφαλαί, καὶ προσεδώσας τοιόντα, οὖν ἐν ποικτε ἀφελάτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλείω προσεδεῖν: and Æcon. 7. (Wets.) So Cicero, cited by Rosenmuller, "Quanta est in quoque fides, tantum cuique committendum. Christ, we must observe, does not weigh the works themselves (to perform which all had not so much time, nor equal opportunity), but their faithful industry. Therefore there is often in tenui labor, at tenius non gloria. Justin: Apolog. 2, says, that every one must render an account πρὸς ἐνα- λογίαν, according to the proportion, of ability which he has received.
23. εἰς τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ κυρίου σου. Sculet, Cler. Adami Wolf, Schwett, Rosenm. and Kuin. say that the signification is convivium, cœnaculum, by a metonymy of the end or adjunct. For by this the Sept. often express ἐπισκοπή. Thus we may keep apart the story and the application. Others (and among the rest Schleusner) take it for premiunm. Grotius says that there is a tacit connection τοῦ ἐμμηνίου cum apologet, as ver. 80. I should, however, call this a confusion, which sort of συγχώρει is not unusual to the sacred writers.

24. προσέλθων δὲ καὶ ὁ ὁ ἐν τάλαντοι εἰληφὼς. Christ placed the example of negligence in him to whom the least was committed, lest any one should hope that he would be therefore excused from all labour, because he had not received eminent advantages. More will be required from those to whom more hath been given (as says Luke). But even he who has received least is bound to yield the fruit of it. This pretended excuse may merely appertain to the ornament; or else in it is expressed the sentiment that every excuse for sloth will be vain and inadmissible. "This may intimate," says Doddridge, "that we are accountable for the smallest advantages with which we are entrusted; but it cannot imply that they who have received much will ordinarily pass their account best; for it is too plain, in fact, that most of those whose dignity, wealth, and genius give them the greatest opportunities of service, seem to forget they have any Master in heaven to serve, or any future reckoning to expect; and many of them render themselves much more criminal than this wicked and slothful servant who hid his talent in the earth.

24. σκληροὶ ἀθρετοί. The passages cited by Wetstein in illustration of this word are not very apposite. Kypke has well treated its various senses, which he distributes into three classes: 1. austere, morose; 2. cruel; 3. hard, unfeeling, griping, avaricious. He well remarks, that the disposition of the avaricious is naturally adapted to all the above. So he cites from
ζωντι. Grotius explains it ἀκριβοδικαίως, one who, be-
ing avaricious, is at the same time both austere and 
cruel. Kuinoel and Schlesner explain severus, qui 
severè pecuniam oblatam repetit. Which is con-
firmed by αἰστηρος in Luke 19, 21. In this view, 
Bulky cites Max. Tyr. Diss. 30. s. f. Εἰς διακοπτήριον 
—ἀκριβὲς καὶ ἀπαραλῆτον οὐδεὶς ἀνέξεται Θεός— Ἐξ-
ετατές καὶ λογιστὴς ἐφέσπηκε ταῖς ἑκατον εὐχαίς πικρός. 
24. θερίζων—διασκόροισις. Proverbial formulas 
expressive of an avaricious, griping person, So Aris-
toph. Eq. 391. τάλλωριν ἡμῖν θέρος. Rosenm.; who 
oberves, that the adage is taken from the manners of 
the avaricious, who in exacting labour are severe 
task-masters. In the slothful servant we have de-
picted those men who live to themselves only, and 
think it too troublesome to study the advantage of 
others. There is just such a metaphorical allusion 
in our own language. Such persons are said to fork 
and rake together pelf. Beza takes it as said in the 
Hebrew manner, i.e. of expressing the same thing in 
different words, by a sort of parallelism, which I 
think true. So διασκορπίζω signifies to sow, in Is. 28, 
24. (of Aquila), where the Alexandr. has σπείρεις. 
Rosenm. Kuinoel, Fischer, and Maltby, Serm. 2. take 
διασκορπίζω for winnow, or thresh, for which I know 
no authority in the Scriptures. I would translate, 
"reaping where thou hast not sown, and hasting 
where thou hast not scattered." Συνάγειν is elliptical 
for συνάγειν κάρτους εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην, which is supplied 
in Matth. 3, 12, and elsewhere. 12, 30. ὁ μὴ συνάγαγ 
μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει. Perhaps διασκορπίζειν may mean 
turning the corn, in order to dry and prepare it for 
carrying. Συνάγειν denotes getting together in heaps, 
and carrying. Thus we may render, "reaping where 
theo hast not sown, and carrying where thou hast not 
turned." As to the winnowing, that was a subsequent 
process, "Θεσις is for θη, by an ellipsis of οὐ.
So (says Euthymius) as to be useful to no one.” Wets. cites Soph. Ajax. 667. κρύψαι τὸ δ’ ἔρχον τοιμῶν ἐξετευν θελών. Γαῖας ἀράξας, ἔθεα μῆτρες ὑπεται. Grotius also cites Eccl. 20, 31. where hidden wisdom is compared with a treasure buried in the earth. Which reminds one of the Horatian passage, “Paulum sepultæ distant inertias Celata virtus.”

25. καὶ φοβηθεὶς, i.e. “fearing lest, if I should lose the money, thou would severely exact it of me, by taking away all my substance.” Kuin. From whence it should seem that these δούλωι were like the boors of Russia and Poland, who, though adscripti glebae, are yet allowed to hold some property. This was manifestly a mere excuse, for those who place out to interest the money of others, are not supposed to be answerable for its loss. But (as Euthymius observes) the parable puts a weak excuse into the mouth of the slothful servant, in order to show that in such a case no reasonable apology can be made, but that whatever they may offer in justification of themselves, will be turned against them.


26. περὶ δὲ δεῦλε καὶ ἀκμή. Campbell has here an acute and instructive note on the distinction be-
tween words nearly synonymous, exemplified in κάκος, πόνηρος, ἄνομος, ἁδικος, of which the following careful abridgment may not be unacceptable.

There are several words in Greek, and all languages, nearly, but not quite, synonymous: ex. gr. κακος, πόνηρος, ἄνομος, ἁδικος, &c. They are doubtless sometimes used promiscuously, and any one translated by a general term can scarcely be termed mistranslated. Yet there is a difference, and one of them is fitted for marking one species of pravity, and another for denoting another. Thus ἁδικος properly signifies unjust; ἄνομος, lawless, criminal; κάκος, vicious; πόνηρος, malicious. Accordingly, κάκος is opposed to ἑνέρετος, or δίκαιος; πόνηρος to ἀγάλος. Κακία is vice, πονηρία malice, or malignity. This is the use of these words in the Gospel. Thus the negligent, riotous, debauched servant, in ch. 24, 48. is denominated κακος δυσλος, a vicious servant. Here the bad servant is not debauched, but slothful, and, to defend his sloth, abusive. Thus in 20, 32. the inexorable master is called πόνηρος. A malignant, that is, an envious, eye, is πόνηρος, not κακος ὑπαλίμος. The disposition of the Pharisees is termed κακος, and the devil is termed ὁ πόνηρος, not ὁ κακός. Too many, in translating such words as the above, aim at selecting one of the class, as opprobrious as the language affords. Not so our authorized Translators; who, though they do not always exactly hit the original term, rarely fail in preserving the propriety suitable to the speaker. Though our Lord, in rebuking hardened offenders, often expresses himself with sharpness, yet he does it always with justice and dignity. Now some translators make him express himself passionately. Here one version has, "Thou vile and indolent slave;" another, "Thou vile, slothful wretch:" expressions indicative only of rage and passion, which can add no weight to the sentence of a judge. Our Lord speaks the language of reproof, not abuse; and yet there is more of pointed severity in the former than in the latter. Because
in the one the particular evils are touched, in the other only evil in general; and are rather expressions of the rage of the speaker than the demerit of the person thus addressed. Such are the terms, base, vile, slave, wretch, &c. which, like rascal, villain, scoundrel, are properly scurrility. To abound in such appellations is not to be severe, but abusive.

26. ἠθείς κ. τ. λ. Piscator and Weston would read this sentence interrogatively; because they fancy that the common mode of taking it makes our Saviour allow that he reaped where he did not sow; which was not true. But Euthymius* might have taught them, (or even Grotius,) that this is said by a figure called συγχάρησις, "be it as you say, that I am, &c. then ought you to have taken the more care not to deprive me of what is really my own." Though it were true, as you say, that I reap where I sow not, and you durst not risk the money in merchandise; you ought to have put it out to the public money-changers to interest: some exertions should have been made. Properly speaking, God only requires service in proportion to the means, and to the degree of grace granted by him. Lightf. Le Clerc.

27. ἔδει οὖν σε βάλειν τὸ ἀργύριον μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις. So Eurip. Med. 586. χρήν σε κ. τ. λ. Βαλείν, cast, put. Luke (19, 23) says, διδωκαί, elocare, put out, and Kuinoel observes, that ἔδει occurs in this sense, in Levit. 25, 37. Ez. 18, 8. δόσαί was more used by the Classical writers. These are all formulas in re pecuniarid; of which see Salmas. de Usuris, p. 632.

27. τραπεζίταις. These τραπεζίται discharged not only the offices of our bankers, in receiving and giving out money, in taking or giving interest upon it, but also of exchanging coins, and distinguishing genuine from forged money. See Salmas. de Fœnore

* Whose words are these: ἡκοθετικῶς τὸν λόγον προῆγαγεν, ὅτι οἱ καὶ τοιοῦτος ἦμιν, ἄκρω τὸν ἀληθῆς, ὅμως ἔδει σε καταβαλεῖν, κ. τ. λ.
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Trapez. p. 549 seq. and 564. Kuinoel represents them as taking a greater interest for the loan of money, than they gave. But this is no more than our bankers do. We are not, however, to infer from these words (says Lightfoot) our Lord's approbation of usury, since he here merely means to reprove the folly and sloth of the servant; q. d. "If I be, as you say, griping, why did you not put my money to a use suitable to my rapacity." It may not be necessary therefore, with Campbell, to translate τόκω interest, rather than usury, according to our common version. Though anciently, as he rightly observes, the import of the word usury was no other than profit, whether great or small, allowed to the lender for the use of borrowed money. But as this practice (continues he) often gave rise to great extortion, the very name at length became odious. The consideration that the Jews were prohibited, by their law, from taking any profit from one another for money lent, though they were allowed to take it from strangers, contributed to increase the odium. When Christian Commonwealths judged it necessary to regulate this matter by law, they gave to such profit as does not exceed the legal the softer name of interest; since which time, usury has come to signify solely extravagant profit disallowed by law; and which, therefore, it is criminal in the borrower to give, and in the lender to take.

27. ἐκομισάμην ἄν τὸ ἐμὸν, i. e. I should have received back. For, (as Kypke observes,) "it is said generally of receiving back what was before in our possession, and especially of money lent or put out at interest." Of which sense Wetstein and Kypke give many examples; ex. gr. Isocr. in Trapez. κῆρυ τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ κομισμαί. Heracl. Pont. p. 440. ὁ δεδανεικὴς χρέα κομισωμένης. Demosth. adv. Calipp. ὅν ἂν δεὴ κομισοσθαι τὸ ἀργύριον et C. Dionys. ἀφειμένοις τῶν τόκων, καὶ λογισμένοις τὸ δάνειον. Aristot. Eth. 9, 2. ὃ μὲν γὰρ, οἰκείους κομισοθαί, ἐδάνεισθεν.

28. ἀρατε-οὖν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ—τάλαντα. Grotius tells us
that this should be taken, like that verse of the 
Apocal. 3, 11. κράτει δ' ἔχεις, ἵνα μηδεις λάβῃ τὸν 
στέφανον σου. For that similitudes of this sort are to 
be taken παρώτερον, i.e. populariter. Kuinoel ob-
serves that these words, like ver. 21, 25. preceding, 
merely serve for the finishing of the picture. One 
may (with Rosenm.) compare the sentiment with 
that of Cicero de Offic. L. 3. Lex ipsa nature, quæ 
utilitatem hominum conservat et continet, decernit 
profecto, ut ab homine inerti et inutili ad sapientem, 
bonum, fortaleque virum transferantur res ad viven-
dum necessarior.

29. τῷ γὰρ ἔχων. A proverbial sentence, of vari-
ous application; the import of which I have de-
fined, and copiously illustrated, on Matth. 14, 12. As 
the subject of the present discourse is the bestowing 
of money or gifts, it may be interpreted (with Rosen.) 
thus: "The rich may easily increase their riches; 
but the poor, who have little, and do not economize 
that little well, easily lose it." Or rather (with Kuin.) 
"When any one does not properly use gifts be-
stowed, or benefits received, even these are taken 
from him. But to him who rightly uses them, even 
more are bestowed, as rewards of his good manag-
agement." The passage is thus paraphrased by Euthy-
mnus: Παντὶ γὰρ τῷ ἔχωνι σπουδὴν τε καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν, 
δοθῆται τιμὴ καὶ περισσότερα τῆς ἐπιμαλλωσίας αὐτῷ 
ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος, καὶ οὐ ἔχει, ἀφαγεθήσεται, οἰᾳ μὴ 
χρησιμένων αὐτῷ.

30. ἀχρείων δουλω, useless, unprofitable, ἄχρηστων. 
or as we say, good for nothing, and, from the adjunc-
wick. Thus the Latin nequam, which is well ex-
plained by A. Gell. 7, 11. "Et nequam hominem ap-
pellarunt veteres nihil neque rei neque frugis bona." 
This principle extends to many other words of simi-
lar signification. So Thucyd. 2, 9. ἀξίμαφορον δροῦνται, 
noxium; and 8, 50. Ηesiod, Opp. μαλ' ἀξίμαφορος 
ἐστι φυτοί. Plato de Republ. 2. ἀξίμαφορα τῇ τόλει, 
et alibi. Eurip. Suppl. 299. ἀχρεῖων was well ex-
plained by Markland dūnumos. ἀσύμφορος occurs
in this sense very frequently in Dion. Hal. Procopius, Polyb. 2, 7, 48. Joseph. 133, 29. Artem. 2, 57. Onosah. C. 10. Not unfrequently in Xenophon. So also Aristot. Rhet. p. 78. though the sense is there (as very often) unperceived by the Editors; and the Ely MS. reads \( \text{βλασφήμω} \), (a gloss, as is manifest from Pollux, 5, 136. \( \text{ἀχρηστόν βλασφήμων ασύμφορον} \).) This idiom is very well explained by Clarke on the words \( \text{ἀχρηστόν τῶν} \). It has been imitated by the Latin writers. For instance: Horat. Sat. 1, 4, 24. An hoc inhonestum et inutile sit, nec ne dubites? Liban. Orat. p. 889. \( \text{λόγος ασύμφορος πιθάνουσα συνεθείς} \). I conjecture \( \text{συνεθείς} \). I have much more to observe, which I must reserve for some other and more suitable opportunity.

31. \( \text{ἔταν δὲ ἡθη ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου}. \) "In defining the subject of the remaining part of this Chapter, the Commentators differ in opinion. Some refer it to the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the Jewish state. Most think it treats on the \textit{final judgment} to be exercised on the whole human race. Others, however, (as Grotius, Curcell, Gill, and Rosenm.) maintain that the discourse only respects the judgment to be exercised on Christians: and by \( \text{τὰ ἔθη} \) they understand all who anywhere professed the name of Christ. How perplexed and far-fetched is this interpretation, and how little correspondent to the general scope of the passage, needs no long demonstration. It will clearly enough appear from the annotations on the preceding verses." Thus far Kuinoel; who then proceeds to notice a novel hypothesis of Keil; of which he subjoins a satisfactory refutation. "The general instruction here pronounced by Jesus is, that he shall return to the solemn judgment which he shall himself hold over all men, and that he will consign every one, according to his deserts, either to the abodes of bliss or woe. This is the sum of the discourse, when divested of Jewish imagery and Oriental phraseology. It is manifest, however, that \textit{all the expressions} in this pro-
Phætical discourse must not be too much pressed or
dwelt upon. Many Interpreters (proceeds Kuinoel)
have examined the question, whether the Jews in
the age of Christ attributed the office of Judge of
the Nations to the Messiah, or to God; and whether
this notion, that the Messiah will call man to judg-
ment, owes its origin to Christ? That they ascribed
this judgment to God, and not the Messiah, Co-
rodé and others have endeavoured to demonstrate.
Others, as Koken, Flatt, &c. leave the question un-
decided; since, in what they think the deficiency of
clear historical proofs, both the affirmative and nega-
tive may be maintained. Indeed, in some passages
of the Prophets of the Old Testament (as Dan. 7,
10. 22, 26. Joel 2, 7, 17.) the Judgment is ascribed
to God: also in many parts of the Rabbinical
writers, God is called the Judge of the Nations.
(See Schoettg. on Matth. 25, 46.) But it is certain
that the Jews, in process of time, made many addi-
tions to their notions of the Messiah, his kingdom,
and institutions; and in the age of Christ taught
more on this subject than can be proved by the ex-
pressions used in the Old Testament. Why, there-
fore, may not also the common opinion of a judg-
ment to be held by God in the time of the Messiah
be so embellished, that they should believe that God
would exercise judgment upon the Nations by the
Messiah. Even the resuscitation of the dead, which
in the Old Testament is ascribed to God, was by the
Jews, in the age of Christ, attributed to the Messiah,
(Joh. 11, 25 seqq.) and the Rabbinical writings
Teach that the Messiah will recall the dead to life.
See Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on Joh. 6, 31. Schoettg.
Hor. Heb. 1. 2, p. 573. Now, since the Jews thought
the final judgment conjoined with the resuscitation
of the dead, it is probable that they also thought that the
Messiah would be the Judge. Indeed this opinion
seems strongly confirmed by many passages of the Rab-
binical writers brought forward by Schoettgen, Hor.
Heb. 2, 876, 638. And, as the Jews believed that
the Law was promulgated from God, by the ministry of Angels, (of which opinion the Old Testament furnishes no vestige; see Hebr. 2, 2. Gal. 3, 139. Acts 7, 53.) thus might they hold the opinion that God would judge men by the Messiah. Besides, Christ himself (as we learn from Joh. 5, 17) clearly made known that God had committed to him (as Messiah) the office of Judge. The daemonicas, too, (in the person of the daemons,) exclaim, "art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" From all which arises a high probability, that the Jews in the age of Christ believed that God would judge the nations by the medium of Christ. Moreover, all who believe that Jesus was the Messiah, and performed (nay was bound to perform) all that was incumbent on that Personage, must also admit that the above-mentioned opinions made a part of his own doctrine, and are meant for all Christians, of all ages and nations. Some, however, of the Sceptical Theologians of Germany, maintain that Jesus was described under the characters of Son of Man, Son of God, &c. and his new institutions had the appellation of Kingdom, solely in compliance with Jewish opinions, and that therefore all that is read of him as Messiah, and of his Kingdom, is said with accommodation to those times. For these persons reject the resuscitation of the dead by Christ, and the last judgment conjoined with it, as a mere Jewish opinion; and they contend that Jesus only speaks populariter. They refer all that is here said respecting a visible judgment to Jewish images, and not to the capita religionis. They maintain that Jesus retained this (and some other opinions) because he could not reject it without detriment to the establishment of his new doctrines, though he bent it as much as might be for the better, and provided that under it a purer doctrine should be concealed, which would gradually, as the empire of human reason increased, be disclosed tanquam ex involucro. What they are pleased to term this pure and rational
Doctrine is this: "Men will, at some future time, be raised to immortal life, and such good men as have received the religion of Christ will be rewarded, and the bad, who have rejected his doctrine, will be punished; and that this happiness or misery will be immediately consequent on their passage to the other life. It was needful, say they, that this purer doctrine should be thus communicated to the ignorant and superstitious Jews, sub involucro, since, even in our own age, men cannot dispense with all aid from their senses, in their conceptions of religious doctrines, and in using them for the promotion of virtue. Even in our own age, the notion of the resurrection of the body, and the last judgment, has associated with it images extremely serviceable, as excitements to virtue. Jesus (say they) in pronouncing this purer doctrine, did (according to his consummate wisdom) use these Jewish opinions and images as involucra, in order that he might address the multitude with greater effect, and that all hope of a future life (that most powerful incitement to faith in Christ) might not be withheld from them. The Apostles also, when, after the departure of their Master, they had perceived the true notion and complete intent of Christ's doctrine, wisely pronounced those purer truths under familiar images, and thus accommodated it to the rude conceptions of their countrymen; opposing themselves, however, to grovelling superstitions, and purging their own doctrine itself from all grosser images: so fulfilling the real intentions of their Master." Thus do these writers endeavour to make the declarations of Christ concerning the resurrection of the dead, and a future judgment, accordant to the decisions of human reason. Kuinoel and Rosenm. then detail some other novelties broached by certain German Theologians, all equally far-fetched and sophisticated with those just mentioned, and all of them satisfactorily refuted by Kuinoel, Hanmer, Koken, Flatt, Storr, and other distinguished Theologians of the orthodox school in Germany.
31. ἐν θρόνῳ δόξης, i.e. his glorious throne; an Hebraism. Kuinoel observes, that these are images taken from the pomp and splendour of Eastern kings, who administered justice sitting on a lofty and magnificent throne. Rosenmuller remarks, that this is a similitude derived from human judicatures, and must not be taken literally. Doddridge judiciously notices the grandeur with which our Lord here speaks of himself. “It is (says he) one of the noblest instances of the true sublime that I have anywhere read: and indeed few passages, even in the Sacred Writings themselves, seem to equal it. I can imagine no more magnificent image than this: the assembled world distinguished with such unerring penetration, and distributed into two grand classes, with as much ease as sheep and goats are ranged by a shepherd in different companies.”

32. συναχθήσεται—πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, i.e. all the living and all the dead of the whole world. It has by some been vainly feared lest the ample space of the whole globe should not suffice for all that are, or have been, or shall be, in existence. But all the circumstances of this description are not to be taken literally. This one thing is to be kept in mind; that a distinction, evident, immutable, and eternal, between the good and the bad, will at that time be publicly manifested. The particular mode in which all this will be effected we cannot even guess, much less presume to determine.

32. ἀφοριστι αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἄλληλων, ὡσπερ ἀ ποιμήν—ἐρίφων. That this separation was usual, is clear from Liv. 24, 3. "Lucus ibi, frequenti silvâ et proceris abietis arboribus septus, læta in medio pascau habuit, ubi omnis generis sacrum Deæ pacebatur pecus sine ullo pastore: separatimque egressi cujusque generis greges nocte remeabant ad stabula." And Virg. Ecl. 7, 2. "Compltuerantque greges Corydon et Thyris in unum, Thyris oves, Corydon dissentas lacte capellas." This passage of the Evangelist is manifestly to be understood tropically and parabolically. Christ
will separate the good from the bad, the sheep from the goats*; for, as Euthymius observes, νῦν μὲν γὰρ ἀγαθὸς εἰσὶ πάντες· τότε δὲ ἁκαλὰς διαχωρισθήσονται.

33. στήσει τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτῶν, τὰ δὲ ἐξ ἐξωνύμιων. Among the Hebrews the right was thought happy, and of good omen; the left unlucky and evil. Hence the former denoted honour, the latter ignominy. Both the metaphors contained in this sentence are met with in the Rabbinical writings, ex. gr. Ros Hasschana, 1, 2. Mundus judicatur.—Omnes homines transseunt coram eo, ut oves. So Schir. R. 1, 6. (ap. Wets.) Dextri et sinistri, in illis praeponderat justitia, in his culpa. Bemidbar R. 32. Eccles. 10, 2. Dextra, hi sunt justi, qui operam dant legi, quæ est ad dextram S. D. Deut. 33, 2. Ad sinistram, hi sunt impii, qui operam dant divitiis: besides other Rabbinical passages there cited. Nor was this opinion confined to the Jews; we find vestiges of it in the Greek and Roman authors. Wetstein cites Plato de Rep. 10, 761. c. where Erus says, that he saw in the infernal regions judges sitting, who, after pronouncing sentence on those before them, ordered τοὺς μὲν δικαίους πορεύεσθαι τὴν εἰς δεξιὰν καὶ ἀνω διὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ—τοὺς δὲ ἁδίκους τὴν ἐς ἀριστερὰν τε καὶ κάτω κ. τ. λ. So Plut. 2, 192. F. ἐκέλευσε τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ τοῦ βόηματος θείαν, τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ ἀριστερὰ—τοὺς βελτίωνας—τοὺς χείρανας. Virg. AEn. 6, 541. Dextera, quæ Ditis magni sub mœnia tendit, hâc iter Elysium nobis: at læva malorum Exercet poenas, et ad ímpia tartara mittit. So also Statius Theb. 1, 4. cited by Bulkley: In speculis mors atra sedet dominique silentis Adnumerat populos, major supereminent ordo. Arbiter hos durâ versat Gortynius earn. Vera nimis poscens, adigitque expromere vitas Usque retro.

34. δεῦτε οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός: subaud Ῥω. Hebr. רְיוֹם בֵּית הָיוֹם. Glass explains, “a patre meo fe-

* So called from the petulance, lust, and filthy life of that animal. The force of this comparison has been copiously, but too fancifully, illustrated by Euthymius.
licitate ornandi." Εὐλογεῖν, when spoken of God, in reference to man, signifies "beneficiis officere." As Ephes. 1, 3.

34. ητοιμασμένην—ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. Kuinoel compares Job 6, 17. δι’ σοι αὕτη ητοιμασμένη ἢν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος. So the Rabbinical writers speak of the Law, of the Messiah, the Templum superius, &c. as being created before the creation of the world. So Statius Theb. 8, 242. (cited by Wets.) Sic fata mihi nigræque sororum juravere colus: manet hæc ab origine mundi Fixa dies bello. Dr. Campbell, in a prolix note, full of solemn trifling, objects to our common translation, and substitutes, from the formation of the world. The expression κατάβολη proceeds on the old hypothesis, that the world is a plane surface, of course with a foundation.

34. κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡ. ὑ. β. Κληρονομέω is by Kuinoel simply interpreted obtain, occupy. So 19, 29. and Mark 10, 17. Galat. 5, 21. βασιλείαν Θεοῦ γι’ κληρονομήσουσιν, and in other passages collected by Schleusner. But this seems to somewhat curtail the sense, which Euthymius thus illustrates: οὐκ εἴπε δὲ λάβετε, ἄλλα κληρονομήσετε αἰς πατρῶιν, αἰς ὀφειλομένην, κ. τ. λ.

35. Christ now proceeds to show, that those only who had been studious of piety and probity here, shall be partakers of this κληρονομία in a future state: and, as among true virtues, beneficence is eminently distinguished, he puts it in the place of all other virtues, thus showing its necessity and dignity, and recommending it to our practice. He describes it moreover not in the genus, but by its parts, instancing particular sorts of beneficence. (Grot. Rosenm. and Kuin.)

35. συναγάγετε, ye lodged me. Συνάγειν is elliptical. The complete phrase occurs in 2 Sam. 11, 27. συνάγεγεν αὐτὴν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. and Judg. 19, 15. οὐκ ἦστιν ἀνὴρ συνάγων μὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν. It is used by the Sept. to express the Hebrew יִּיהֵנָ. The difference between the Classical and Hellenistic use is
this: σ. is by the Classical writers used of more than one. So, among the examples cited by Kypke, we have Plutarch, 2, 643. ἀνθρώπως συνάγαγων, and 679. πόλεως συνάγειν. But by the Hellenists, of one. So in Justin. l. 38, 4. (cited by Wets.) Expositus fuerat—pater parvum recolligit. Hospitality was a virtue which was considered even by the heathens as highly meritorious. So Hom. Odys. 14, 56, 8. πρὸς γὰρ Δίως εἰσὶν ἄξιόντες Ζεῦν τε πτωχὸν τε: and with the Jews it was regarded as a religious duty. So Jalkut Ruben. f. 42. 2. quicumque hospitalitatem libenter exercet, illius est paradisus. See other Rabbinical citations ap. Wets. This hospitality was in the East an important duty, because there were as yet few or no inns, and even water in the parched countries of the East is sometimes thought to form no contemptible gift.

36. γύμνος. This word, like the corresponding terms in Hebrew, Latin, and some modern languages, denotes not only naked, divested of the outer garment, (as Liban. O. 15. p. 434. ap. Wets. d. τὸ γύμνος ἐν τῷ χιτωνίσκῳ—εἰσήχθαι,) but one slightly clothed, and, by the adjunct, one ill clothed. So Seneca de Ben. 5, 8. (ap. Wets.) Qui malè vestitum et pannosum vidit, nudum se vidisse dicit. Schleusner indeed interprets (from the adjunct) pauper, egenus; but this is receding too far, and destroys the antithesis. Some remarkable instances of this sort of beneficence are given by Wetstein from Athen. 553. b. Corn. Nep. Cim. 9.

36. ἱδέωςω, καὶ ἐπέσκεψασθέ με. The word εἰςκεύτωμαι signifies, first, to look at; secondly, to look after; and, from the adjunct, to take care of, relieve, &c. By the Classics it is used especially to denote the attendance of a physician on the sick. So Herod. 4, 2, 7. λατρεία—ἐπισκέψεμένος τὸν νοσοῦντα: and Galen. Dio Xephil. Tiberii, p. 102. Artemid. 3, 22. Aristid, 290. See other passages in Wets. Though sometimes it notes the attendance of friends or others. See Wets. and Kypk. This the Latin writers ex-
pressed by viso, inviso, et visito. How much merit was assigned to this virtue by the Jewish theologians. may be seen by the Rabbinical citations in Schoettgen and Wetstein. See Wagenseil and Vitring. in Synag. Jud.

36. ἔλεητε πρὸς με, i. e. visited me; but, from the adjunct, solaced and cherished me. Thus in the Latin adire is used for visere, visitare.

37—39. λέγοντες. Kύριε. Here it appears that many circumstances inserted in this description are merely parabolical. It cannot surely be supposed that Jesus on the day of judgment will hold converse with individuals, or even the whole body of the pious. The substance of what we are here taught seems to be this: that the pious will admire the goodness of Christ, in condescending to so kindly interpret, and reward their feeble exertions. (Grot.)

40. εἰμι ἐποιησαμεν, i, e. I shall regard it as done unto me, and reward it proportionably. Just as what is done to a wife, is regarded by the husband as done to himself. So Prov. 19, 17. “He that hath pity on the poor lendeth unto the Lord.” There is a similar sentiment in Cic. Epist, ad Fam. 10, 1. (cited by Bulkl.) “Teque hoc existimare volo, quicquid in eum judicii officiique contuleris id ita me accipere ut in me ipsum te putem contulisse.” See supra, 10, 10. Compare Galat. 5, 6. On this subject Whitby has well treated.

46. ἐπέλεγοντοι—eis καλασιν αἰώνιον. These words are by the ancient fathers urged against Origen, who had introduced into Christianity the Platonic doctrine of certain vicissitudes of rewards and punishments. What Origen thought, it is not, from his writing, easy to say. On this passage his remarks do not recede from the common opinions. Elsewhere he speaks on this subject, but obscurely, and not consistently with himself. Epiphanius reprehends him, not for this, but for holding the pre-existence of souls, and that they are sent out into the body for the purpose of punishment. Augustin, however, ex-
pressly imputes to him the above opinions. Be that as it may, he appears not to have been the first who held that punishments, at least sensible ones, would sometime cease. Similar sentiments were entertained by Justin Martyr, Theophilus, Tatian, and Annobius, with which opinions Grotius has contrasted those of Tertullian, Lactantius, and Minutius. If any one (he adds) would know, I will not say the decided opinions, but the doubts of the ancients, he may consult Jerome, at the end of his Commentary on Isaiah. (Grøtt.) I quite acquiesce in Dr. Owen’s censure of the idle, and indeed impious conjecture of Dr. Mangey, καταλύσω, annihilation! Rosenm. makes the eternal punishment of the wicked consist in their loss of the rewards of virtue, which must needs be eternal. But this is by no means a satisfactory or admissible interpretation. No doubt a consciousness of such a deprivation will form part of the punishment: but these words clearly denote moreover positive inflictions, exquisite in degree, and of a duration which must be determined by God alone. Mr. Weston remarks, “that all men will one day be saved and restored to the favour of their Maker, is, no doubt, an idea which exhibits the mercy of God in a sublime view, without derogating from his justice. Nor does this notion set the wicked upon a par with the righteous, if you consider the fiery ordeal prepared for the former, through which they must pass in order to arrive at forgiveness.” The word may, I admit, signify a limited though exceedingly long duration. But I would say, with Doddridge, “miserable are they who venture their souls on its signifying a limited duration.” The notion of eternity of punishments was held by the Pharisees and Essenes, as we learn from Josephus, B. 2, 8, 11. & 14. and Antiq. 1, 16, 3. I add Joseph. Macc. 12. ταμιεύσεται σε τῇ δίκῃ πυγμάτερῳ καὶ αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ, καὶ βασάνους, αἰ όν διὸ τῶν αἰωνίων οὐκ ἀνήσουσι σε· ετ 9. σοὶ δὲ καρπήσται ὑπὸ τῆς θείας δίκης αἰωνίων βασάνων. As also Clemens, R. Epist. 2, 9. ως αὖ εἰμὲν ἐκι γῆς, μεταν-
ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. XXV. XXVI. 431

οὖσαμεν—μετὰ γὰρ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν ἦμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, οὐκέτι δυνάμεθα ἐκεῖ ἐξομολογήσασθαι ἡ μετανοεῖν ἔτι: and other Rabbinical writings cited by Wets. That the Heathens held this opinion, is clear from the following passages. Virg. Æn. in the description of Tartarus: Sedet aeternumque sedebit Infelix Theseus. Liban. Or. 941. b. ἀντὶ μάκρου χρόνου τοῦ τῆς ἱδώνης, ἀθάνατος ἐπικείσεται ἡμῖν. Lycoph. 907. ἀκτέριστον ἐν πέτραις Αἰώνα κοκυσσωσιν ἡλοχισμένοι—sub. ἐς. and 928. αἰανὴ Θεὸν κυδανόσι. Calvin, on Isaiah 13, ult. and 66, ult. remarks that the fire spoken of is to be metaphorically understood; and, as corporeal fire cannot act upon an incorporeal spirit, it is plain that, under the image of fire, spiritual punishment is adumbrated.

CHAP. XXVI.

VERSE 2. πᾶσχα γίνεται—παραδίδοται. Present for the future. The Vulgate renders fiét—tradetur, delivered up. Put a colon after γίνεται, which, Kuinoel remarks, is for ἔγεται. So 2 Regg. 32, 22. οὐκ ἐγενόθη τὸ πᾶσχα τοῦτο. This is, however, not only a Hebraism, but a Grecism, as Raphel has shown. Πάσχα, from πᾶσσο, to pass, denotes, 1. passing by; 2. the (Passover) Lamb; 3. the (Passover) feast.

3. συνήχθησαν οἱ Ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Γραμματεῖς κ. ὀ. Π. τ. λ. A periphrasis for συνέβη, by which name this assembly is called by John, 10, 47. whose office it was to hold inquisition on false prophets. Grotius.

3. εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ Ἀρχιερέως. The word αὐλή properly denoted an open, airy enclosure. Et. Mag. So, in the Old Testament, and Apoc. 11, 2. it is said of the outer court of the temple. It, secondly, denoted an area, or court, such as encircled the vestibule, door, or entrance to a large house. Thirdly, (as here,) such an edifice as had attached to it an αὐλή. It was also generally applied to the houses of
kings, and powerful or opulent persons. Hence our word court, denoting a king’s palace. So Æschyl. Δίς αὐλή σιχυνέωσι. Seneca, Hipp. 9, 81. Fraus sublimi regnat in aula. Mill, on Cypr. Hier. 185. thinks that this was the palace of the High Priest, in the same manner as the mansion-house is that of the Lord Mayor of London.

4. Ἰνε—κρατήσωσι δῶλον. So 1 Cor. 12, 16. There is an ellipsis of ἐν, which is supplied in 1 Thess. 2, 8. and Mark 14, 1. So ῥυπός in Deut. 27, 24. Here, however, some render it dolose, others clam (which seems preferable). Of this stratagem (say they) there was need: for to take him by day when openly teaching was impracticable; and his nights were spent in secret retirement at Bethany and the mount of olives, known only to his Disciples.

5. μη ἐν τῇ ἐφόρῃ. At which time malefactors were usually executed, for the more general example. So Sanhed. 10, 4. (ap. Wets.) Non occiditur neque a judicibus civitatis suæ, neque a Synedrio, quod est Jafne; sed ad summum Synedrium, quod Hierosolymis est, deducitur, atque istic in custodiâ asservatur usque ad festum, et in festo interficitur. So Maimonides. See Schoettg. Hor. Heb. and Bucher, Antiq. Bib. p. 325. But, in the punishment which they destined for Jesus, they were inclined to recede from this received custom, for they feared the country-people*, especially the Galileans; and with reason, for the present period was very opportune for sedition, by reason of the great concourse of people. But having so fair an offer made by Judas, they embraced the opportunity. (Whitby and Rosenm.) At this time, indeed, the whole Jewish state was in a ferment, and at such festivals tumults frequently arose on slight causes. So Jos. Ant. 17, 9, 3. & 10,

* Theophylact well remarks, that, though about to perpetrate such an atrocity, they only fear man, not God. He suggests, too, that they probably feared lest, if he were put to death at the feast, that death should become more celebrated; now their wish was to obliterate all memorial of him.
2, 20, 5, 3. Jos. B. 5, 5, 8. 1, 4, 3. Nor was this confined to the Jews. So Æneas Poliorc, 22. says: τερ τὰς ἔστρας καὶ τούτους καίρους μᾶλλα σι θεολογεῖν τι νεστερίζειν ἐγγείροντα. Wets.

6. τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γενομένου ἐν Βηθανίᾳ. That John, 12, 1, seqq. relates this history in the same way with Matthew and Mark, 14, 3. but differently from what we read in Luke 7, 36, seqq. cannot be denied; and such trifling diversities as are found in the narrations of Matthew and John, respecting the anointing of Christ (which, however, may easily be removed), the Evangelists have, in common with all other historical writers treating of the same thing. The greatest difficulty in the way of interpretation here is, to determine the order of time which Matthew and John followed, in narrating this history. Now John says that these events happened πρὸ ἐξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα, therefore before Christ's solemn entry into the city. But, according to Matthew and Mark, the anointing took place after the solemn entry, on Wednesday the 13th day of Nisan. Now although, as far as regards chronology, nothing certain can be determined in the writings of the Evangelists, (since they very often pay no regard to it,) and though it cannot be, with certainty, ascertained whether John, or Matthew, has related the event in the order of time; yet, since it is manifest that Matthew, in his narrations, had very frequently more regard to events than the order of time; since Matthew himself has not noted the time accurately, but has used a phrase not indicative of definite time, (τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γενομένου ἐν Βηθανίᾳ, ver. 6.) since John has narrated the event more copiously and elaborately: since, from the general style of composition in this passage of Matthew, it is plain that he is hastening to describe the treachery of Judas, and the last fate of his Master: since, moreover, Mark, especially when hastening to any other subject, is accustomed to write concisely, omit various circumstances, and neglect the order of time (vide ad 4, 23) therefore I
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apprehend that, respecting the order of time, John is to be rather attended to, who seems to have supplied what Matthew had omitted, in order to indicate the motive which impelled Judas to the deed, namely, avarice. (Kuinoel.)

6. ἐν ὅικιᾳ Σιμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ. This person had probably been cured by Jesus*: certainly he was not then affected with leprosy, for in that case there could have been no intercourse; he is merely so called from having been a leper. Thus, in the catalogue of the Apostles, Matthew is called the Publican, because he had been so. (Jerom. Epist. T. 3, 57.) Compare Matth. 11, 5. Of this Simon John makes no mention, but only relates that at the Supper Lazarus sat at table, and that Martha waited. It does not, however, necessarily follow that the Supper took place at the house of Lazarus. Martha might minister, though in the house of Simon, and Lazarus might be of the number of the guests. Perhaps too (as Grotius conjectured) this Simon was one of Lazarus's relations. Now this circumstance, that the Supper took place at the house of Simon, John passes by in silence, as of little moment, thinking it enough to have named Lazarus. Some have thought that Lazarus dwelt in the house of Simon: and others, that Martha was Simon's widow. (Grot. and Kuin.) The two last conjectures merit little attention. It seems to me not improbable that Simon was a widower, and that Martha, as being his relation, superintended the entertainment. Markland and others, to remove the seeming contradiction, place vv. 6—13. in a parenthesis. But I have little faith in the efficacy of this sort of medicine, so often resorted to by Bowyer and his associates. Dr. Doddridge's solution does not materially differ from Kuinoel's and mine. He thinks it more probable that Matthew and Mark should have introduced

* So Theoph. and Euthym. who make this beautiful remark on Mary: that she, leprous in soul, when she saw Simon healed, was emboldened to hope for a cure of her spiritual leprosy.
this story a little out of its place,—that Lazarus, if he made this entertainment, (which is not expressly said by John,) should have made use of Simon’s house, as more convenient for it,—that Mary should have poured the ointment on Christ’s head and body, as well as his feet,—than that, within the compass of four days, Christ should have been twice anointed with so costly a perfume, and that the same fault should be found with the action, and the same value set on the ointment, and the same words used in defence of the woman, and all this in the presence of many and the same persons; all which improbable particulars must be admitted, if the stories be considered as different. Yet many of the ancient Commentators suppose two, and some (as Euthymius) even three different women; a method exceedingly arbitrary and unsatisfactory. For, as Grotius has observed, we are not to multiply stories without good cause.

7. ἀλάβαστρον μύρου ἐχοῦσα. A flask for ointment or oil, of the form of our glass oil-flasks, with a long and narrow neck, made of a sort of marble (of the colour of a human nail) called alabaster. (See Hor. Od. 4, 12, 17. and Mitch. and Kuinoel on Propert. 2, 13, 3.) It was used (says Pliny, 36, 8,) as being thought to preserve the ointment best. Sometimes it was made of gold (Theocr. Id. 15, 114. Συρίῳ μύρῳ χρυσεί ἀλάβαστρα;) sometimes of glass, stone, or wood, &c. Ἀλάβαστρον μύρου, supply πλέων, plenum: which ellipsis is also found in the Greek Classics; as Athen. 268. Λ. ἀλαβάστρον μύρου. Herodot. 3, 20. μύρου ἀλαβάστρον. Also in the Latin Classics; as Petron. 60. “Cum alabastris unguentí.” Servius in Æn. 3, 274. Donatus ab eo unguentí alabastro. Wetstein, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel.

These expressions had a reference to the weight of bullion, not the number of coined money. See note supra, ver. 15. It appears from Matthew and John that this unguent was of nard, which was accounted the most valuable. Heyn. on Tib. 2, 27. informs us that pure nard was a thin and simple oleum, and formed of one particular kind of odour: on the contrary, that unguent was thick, and compounded of various colours. (Wolf. and Kuin.) Weston says it is called green oil in the Psalms, and that it is still made in the East, and sold for about six pounds the phial at Constantinople. Sée Pincinelli; Lumin. reflex.

7. καὶ κατέχειν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν α. α. The Classical construction is κατέχειν τίνος, or κατὰ τίνος. So in Plat. de Republ. 3. (cited by Grotius): μόρον κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς καταχέατες. As a mark of respect, not uncommon: shown by hosts towards their guests. So Hor. Carm. 2, 11, 16. Psal. 23, 5. Luke 7, 46. Matth. 6, 17. Nor were only guests anointed, but also the dead: to which there is a double allusion in the following passage of Martial, 3, 12, 4 (cited by Hammond): Qui non cœnat et ungitur, Fabulle, hic verè mihi mortuus videtur. The rich were anointed with nard, the lower orders with oil, which is still customary in the East. So Artem. 3, 24. Anthol. 2, 47. 2, 27. Anacr. 4. (Wets.) See more in a learned note of Hammond, to whom all the Commentators are much indebted.

8. ἵγανάκτησαν, λέγοντες. It appears from John that only Judas said this: which is here ascribed to all, because all participated in the same indignant feeling at the waste: though the origin of it was very different. In them it was solely regard for the poor; in him sordid avarice. See Joh. 12, 6.

8. εἰς τί ἡ ἀπόλυσα, jactura, prodigality. So Grotius cites: “Perdere sciunt, donare nesciunt.” So Theocr. Idyll. 15, 18. φθόγος ἄργυριον: and thus ἀπόλλυμι, in the sense of spending (money), occurs in Theophr. Ch. 15. and Plut. 1, 369. Thus much
for the word,—it is of more importance to advert to the thing; and here we may observe, with Euthymius, that they were led to this censure from having heard their Master enlarge on the duty of almsgiving. They had been taught that God will have mercy, and not sacrifice. Yet, considered in itself, (says Theophrastus,) honouring God is to be preferred before almsgiving. In truth, there are (as said Epictetus) two handles by which most things may be taken. Thus here (observes Grotius) ointment of a considerable value came to nought. That was superfluously expended for odour by which the poor might have been fed. This was the left handle. The right handle was this. A woman brought to abominate and amend her former evil life, eagerly seeks to show honour to him by whom she had been reformed; sparing neither expense nor labour, to make this manifest to all. Such penitence, humility, and sedulity of observance, must be praised. Such are the handles which Christian charity seizes; interpreting every thing as favourably as may be, and not only loving virtue, but even the semblance of virtue; and if there be any thing reprehensible in the mode of action, excuses it out of regard to the intention of the agent. Now, in actions not forbidden by law, the intention decides on their nature: which intent is here the very best possible, to show honour to Christ. Grotius.

10. τὶ κόπους παρέχετε τῇ γυναικὶ; So Sirach 29, 4. παρέχειν πίνων. Wetstein observes that it would be better Greek if it were πράγματα παρέχειν. But Kypke has produced two passages from Aristot. and one from Is. 7, 13. ἀγάνα παρέχειν, where the phrase occurs.

11. πάντοτε—τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἐαυτῶν, èμε δὲ οὗ πάντοτε ἔχετε. Whenever there is a doubt respecting several things, which of them should be done first, we must not barely weigh the actions themselves, but take also some account of times, and other circumstances. Thus here, the poor could be
relieved at any time, (as Mark expresses,) but any honour done to Christ, at least in his person, must be done speedily. (Grot.) The good work which was to be done soon, or never, was preferable to that of which the opportunities were constant and perpetual. (Whitby.)

12. πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάσαι μὲ ἐνταφίωσεν. There has been some difference of opinion among the Commentators, whether this was said as presaging his death, or whether it regards the intentions of Divine Providence. Some support the former opinion, as Lightfoot and L. Brug. But their reasons seem inconclusive. I rather assent to the latter, which is maintained by Casaubon, Maldonati, Grotius, Hein- sius, Cler. and most recent Interpreters, that there is an ellipsis of οὐκ ἦν, "she has done it as if for my burial." Or, (as Maldonati says,) "she has suited the action as aptly to my situation as if she had done it by Divine impulse." For, as Grotius remarks, it is not unfrequent in the Hebrew for any one to be said to do a thing for this or that end, which, however, is not really intended by him, only his act is consequent upon it, aliunde: as in 1 Reg. 17, 18. Prov. 17, 19. and often elsewhere. Our Lord justifies this, as Whitby observes, (from Grotius,) by an argument à pari, that, had she expended this on his dead body, they who used such ointments could not reasonably object to it, and had, therefore, no ground now to do so, as he was so near death and burial. Ἐνταφία signified whatever was used for the carrying forth and burying the dead, such as vestments, crowns, flowers, and inferiæ. See Kuin. Ἐνταφίδζειν denoted, not so much the act of sepulture itself, as all those arrangements which preceded it, such as washing, laying straight, anointing, and embalming: though it often denoted only a part of such preparation, as either embalming, or (as here) preparing for burial, by anointing with unguent, &c.

18. ὅπου ἐὰν κηρυχθῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τούτο. I cannot
agree with Kuinoel, that ἐν ὅλω τῷ κόσμῳ ought to be taken with the words that follow; but rather with ἀπὸ, which may indeed seem pleonastic, but the words together are equivalent to ubicunque in toto mundo, in quacunque mundi parte. Rosenmuller explains ἐναγγέλων, historia rerum meærum; and so Euthymius. Kuinoel interprets, nuntius de morte med. But I should prefer, "the Christian Doctrine, my Religion."

13. καληθήσεται—εἰς μυθισμὸν αὐτῆς, will be related as a memorial of her, i. e. laudabitur. See Schl. Lex. For this word, and μυθισμὸν, is used, as L. Brug. says, non in vituperationem, sed laudem, and in the Sept. often signifies fame, glory. Yet, I must observe, not always. So Thucyd. 2, 41. πανταχοῦ δὲ μνημεία κακῶν τε καὶ καλῶν ἡγιασμένας ἡγιαστάτες. Phil. Jud. 876. ε. κατὰ τόλμης μνημεία τῆς αὐτῶν ἀκαθαρσίας καὶ μεσανθραπίας ἀπέλιτου. So Acts 10, 4. ἄι προσευχαὶ σω — ἄνθρωπον εἰς μνησιμὸν. Erasmus says, that the word also signifies pignus, &c. i. e. a remembrance, or keep-sake: and indeed in this sense it occurs in Æschyl. Theb. 49. where see the the remarks of the learned Scholiast, as emended, from Heaychius, by Dr. Blomfield. Wetstein here compares a passage of similar complexion in Cic. pro Syllā, 15. "Itaque dico locum in orbe terrarum esse nullum, quo in loco populi Romani nomen sit, quin eodem perscriptum hoc judicium pervenit."

14. τότε πορευέσθαι, about that time, (for it refers to ver. 3.) i. e. when they had resolved to apprehend Jesus, then Judas going, &c. On which Euthymius well remarks, ὅτε καὶ ἀλλοτρία φιλειάθη. τὸ δὲ αὐτῶς τὸν ἐπαυτῶν μετεκληθή. Jerome refers his departure at that time, to sudden pique at this answer, arising from the auri sacra fames, thinking the sum for which the ointment might have been sold his loss; (as he was purse-bearer, and put aside part for his own use,) to repair which, he sold his Master.

14. τοὺς Ἀρχιερεῖς. By these are to be understood only one class of the Synedri, which are by synec-
doche put for the rest. (Kuin.) Or ἀρχιερεῖς may be taken for the heads (or, as we should say at Cambridge, the caput) of the Synedrim, consisting not only of the ἄρχιεροι, properly so called, and then in office, but all those who had held that office, with whom were associated the High Priest’s Vicar, and the heads of the sacerdotal courses. All which has been explained more at large in Matthew 2, 4.

15. ἔστησαν αὐτῷ τ. ἀ. In the interpretation of these words there has been much diversity of opinion. Some of the best Commentators, as Euthymius, Wetstein, Rosenmuller, and Schleusner, explain solvereunt, weighed out. To which it has been objected that coined money was then in use, which needed only to be numbered, not weighed. But it should be remembered, that terms often remain, when the customs to which they owed their rise have ceased. This signification too is confirmed by numerous examples which occur in the Sept. ex. gr. Esdr. 8, 25. καὶ ἔστησα αὐτός το ἄργυρον. Job. 6, 2. 28, 15, 31, 6. and other places, which may be seen in Schl. Lex. on the O. T. This Hellenistic use of the word is founded on that of the Hebr. לום, though it is not unknown to the Classical writers. See Schl. Lexicons on the O. T. and N. T. Some object, that this was too early a season for payment. But this seems frivolous. Rosenm. and Michaelis think that the ἀρχιερεῖς paid the sum here mentioned in hand, as an earnest of more, after the deed should be accomplished, which seems extremely probable. Since, however, Mark 14, 11. says, ἐπηγγέλατο αὐτῷ ἄργυρον δώσαι: and Luke 22, 5. συνέβοτο αὐτῷ ἄργυρον. Therefore Grotius and others* interpret, “promised that they would give.” And they might have cited 1 Macc. 13, 30. καὶ δοσα ἐστήκα μὲν πρὸς υμᾶς ἐστήκα. In this sense I take Athen. 580. d. where Gnathena thus addresses a young butcher: Μεικάκιον ὁ καλὸς, φησὶ, πῶς ἔστη, φάσον; What

* This interpretation is also noticed by Euthymius.
bargains are you making? how are you selling? But in the passage of the Evangelist this sense would require a different construction; and I agree with Kuinoel, that there is no reason to recede from the common interpretation of ἵστημι. As to the discrepancies, they are slight, and easily admit of being reconciled, in the mode above suggested. Kuinoel conjectures, that the priests, &c. then only promised the 30 shekels (which circumstance Matthew omitted); but a little afterwards, perhaps at the very time that Judas was going out accompanied by the soldiery, paid to him that sum of money. This, however, must be admitted to be a mere gratuitous conjecture, and, as I think, devoid of probability.

15. τριάκοντα ἀργύρια. This was (as may be seen from Erach. f. 14, 2. ap. Wets.) the price of a slave’s life, and fixed upon out of contempt, say the older Commentators. This, however, seems doubtful. With respect to the degree of guilt to be attributed to Judas in delivering up his Master, there has been, during the last century, much discussion. That he did by no means suspect that the affair would have terminated as it did, nay, that he fancied that Jesus, who had so often delivered himself from the hands of the Jews, would also now contrive means for his liberation, and that he said what we read in Mark, 14, 44. ludibrii causâ, and intended merely to trifle with the priests, and pocket the reward of treachery, is the opinion of many recent Commentators, and is not disapproved by Kuinoel. (Compare Matth. 27, 3. et seq.) Whether by thus betraying his Master Judas meant to excite, nay, compel him to enter upon and establish his kingdom, in which he might himself hope for greater dignity, honours, riches, &c. Kuinoel leaves undetermined; but refers his readers to several dissertations on the subject of the character of Judas by Niemeyer, Stolz, Paulus, Krummerker, and Leichter, de Culpâ Judæ. The more recent Theologians view the character of Judas in a less unfavourable light than did the Fathers and
the old Commentators. His may have probably been somewhat more of a mixed character than has been sometimes supposed. But the opinion of those Interpreters seems to me inconsistent with the language of strong reprobation used of Judas both by our Lord and the sacred writers.

16. ἀπὸ τοῦ. Τὸ τε is, properly, a noun in the accusative neuter. Here it is treated as a noun; as in Matth. 4, 17. 16, 21. Sirach, 8, 12. which use is, however, censured by Phrynichus.

17. ποῦ βῆλες ἐτοιμάσωμεν σοι φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα; Now follows a description of the Paschal supper celebrated by Christ. In respect to the day on which this took place, the Commentators exceedingly differ, especially on account of some passages of John. Some (as Benedict XIV. Goodwin, Basnage, Bucher, Benzel, Wald, Harenberg, Lenfant, Bengel, Moldenhauser, Baumgarten, Fritz, and so Whitby, Le Clerc, and most Theologians) think that Christ ate the Passover on the same day with the rest of the Jews. Others, whose names I shall presently state, are of opinion, that he anticipated the ordinary Jewish Passover by one day. There are those, too, who altogether deny that Jesus celebrated the Paschal supper (as Calmet, Vetchieti, Deyling, Gudius, Lamy, Du Pin); inasmuch as he was put to death on the very day on which he might and would have celebrated it. Of these some contend, that both in this and in the parallel passages (Mark 14. Luke 22.) it is a common supper that is spoken of. But in the present passage we read ποῦ βῆλες ἐτοιμάσωμεν σοι φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα; and ver. 21. καὶ ἐσθίοντον αὐτῶν. Luke 22, 13. καὶ ἔτοιμασαν τὸ πάσχα; Ib. 15. ἐπεθύμησα τούτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ’ ὑμῶν, πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν. See also the note on Joh. 13, 1. Others have endeavoured to prove, that Jesus, like the Jews of the present day, celebrated only a memorative, not a sacrificial Passover, which was rather voluntary than legal, in which there was no lamb prepared, but only the unleavened bread and bitter herbs. (See Grot.
on Matth. 26, 18. Ham. & Cler. on this place, and Mark 14, 12.) This opinion must, however, be alto-
gether rejected; since it cannot be proved that be-
fore the destruction of Jerusalem a memorative Pas-
sover was in use: and in the Evangelists we have the
plain words θείων and φαγίων. It is certain, therefore,
that Jesus did eat the Paschal lamb, and that in this
passage the Paschal feast is very accurately de-
scribed. There would not surely have been any
need of so much preparation, if he had meant to
make a common supper, or a memorial passover. A
supper of that kind he might have celebrated any-
where; but the Paschal supper was to be celebrated
at Jerusalem. (See Deut. 16, 5, 6.) Those who
maintain that Jesus anticipated the ordinary Jewish
Passover by one day, defend their opinion chiefly by
the following arguments.—I. In Joh. 18, 28. it is
related, that the Synedrii assessors, who on the morn-
ing of the day on which he suffered death (and there-
fore the day after that when he had eaten with
his disciples, which was on Thursday, for on Friday
he was crucified) accompanied him to Pilate, would
not enter the house, that they might not be polluted,
but might eat the Passover after sunset. Now those
who are of opinion that Jesus celebrated the Pass-
over the same day with the generality of the Jews,
explain the phrase, φαγίων το Πάσχα, caenam sacrifi-
ciæm instituere; since Πάσχα not only notes the Pas-
chal lamb, but the victim sacrificed at the feast of
the Passover. To this purpose they quote Deut. 16,
2. and remark, that sacrifices were offered up on all
the days of the Paschal feast. But it is acutely re-
marked by Mosheim, in his Dissertation on the true
notion of the Lord’s Supper, p. 22. “Verum ut hoc
concedatur, haud tamen ex verbis Deut. 1. c. cogere
licebit, nomen hoc absolutè positum, sigillatim sacri-
cicia Chagigah denotare. Nec enim satis validè arbi-
tror illum argumentari, qui sic rationem subducit: quia
Moses uno loco communi Paschæ nomine, et
agnos Paschales, et reliquia sacrificia comprehendit,
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very abundance of business doing, the concourse and bustling among the Jews, especially the Synedrii, oblige us to think not of a holiday, but of the day preceding, and, of course, full of employment. On these arguments, which, it must be admitted, are weighty, and to me appear convincing, rests the opinion maintained by Scaliger, Casaubon, Capellus, Campe, Grotius, Hammond, Hospinian, De Dieu, Cudworth, Carpzob; Kidder, Beausobre, Macknight, Saurin, Rosenmuller, and many others, that Jesus did not eat the Passover on the same day with the rest of the Jews.

The reason why Christ thus anticipated the celebration of the Paschal supper is uncertain. The most probable opinion is that of Ikenius, Bochart, Michaelis, Storr, Heuman, Ernesti, Moschius, Schulz, and, as it seems, Kuinoel, who maintain that the Sadducees, and those who sided with them, did, on the year of Christ's death, as very often, make the month Nisan commence one day sooner than the Pharisees, and most of the Jews, and therefore reckoned the 14th day of this month (on which the Passover was to be celebrated) one day before the rest. The reason for which may be hence discerned, namely, that the Pharisees thought that day to be first of each month on which the moon had appeared in the heavens, and of which, by the order of the synedrium, public proclamation had been made. But the Sadducees, the Karaei (i. e. scriptuarii) adhering solely to the written word of Scripture, maintained that that was the first day of each month on which the novilunium took place according to natural observation. It seems that the Karaei and the Sadducees sacrificed the lamb one day before the Pharisees, namely, on Thursday, since this was to them the 14th of Nisan, because they had determined the novilunium of this month one day sooner*. Now Jesus,

* To the further simplification of this intricate point, the following observations may perhaps be found serviceable. Mathematical and astronomical science had not yet, among so backward a
as on some other occasions he had sided with the
Karaei and Sadducees, so in this (and since he fore-
saw his death to be near at hand) followed their cal-
culation. It is no wonder that the Pharisees and
Sadducees should have differed on this point, since
they disagreed on so many other questions; ex. gr.
the time for sacrificing the Paschal lamb, and the in-
terpretation of Exod. 12, 6. See Mich. and Bynæus.
The opinion above stated has been maintained and
illustrated by Ikenius, Bochart, Storr, and adopted

people as the Jews, been applied to the formation of a calendar
by which the months and days might be regularly fixed and noted
down. But the commencement of each month was determined
chiefly by the inartificial method of observing the first appearance
of the moon’s phasis. Now, from this imperfect mode of accom-
plishing the thing, an aberration from the true reckoning might
easily occur. Yet to this the Scriptuarii (i. e. the Karaei, and also
the Sadducees) adhered. On the contrary, the Traditionarii, i. e.
the Pharisees, perceiving the inaccuracy and uncertainty of the
above method, as depending on the state of the atmosphere, the
credibility of witnesses, &c. introduced the regulation that the
nenomina should be fixed, not by the observation of the phasis
solely, but in conjunction with the suitable astronomical calcula-
tion, and, such was the authority of the Great Synedrium, that to it
they committed the power of determination in this weighty affair.
The state of the case was therefore this: whether the
nomina should be fixed by the observation of the phasis, as testified by
credible witnesses, which the Karaei, the Scriptuarii (appealing to
Exod. 12, 19.) maintained; or by natural observation, conjointly
with astronomical calculation, which the Traditionarii (who
formed the ruling party, and who fixed the nomina) maintained.
Now it is manifest that this difference in the use of the means for
ascertaining the point in question might, under certain circum-
stances, occasion a day’s difference in the result. So that what,
according to one calculation, would be the first of the month,
would, in the other, be the last of the preceding. And it is equally
manifest that such difference, existing at the commencement of
the month, would extend throughout the whole course of it; so
that what to one would be the 14th day, would to the other be
the 13th; or, which is the same thing, the 14th would fall one day
sooner than the other. Hence it might easily take
place (as I think it did) that our Saviour celebrated this his last
passover (πάσχα τονάσιμον) a whole day earlier than the majority
and the ruling party of the Jews; and yet might be said equally
to observe the ritual precept of eating it on the fourteenth day of
Nisan,
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by Rosenmuller and most other recent Commentators. For much of the above details I am indebted to the diligence of Kuinoel, who has also stated the objections to Ikenius's hypothesis advanced by Gabler and Paulus, and subjoins his own answers, into which discussion the limited nature of my present plan will not permit me to enter.

18. τὸς τὸν δείκτη. This idiomatical expression was used by the Classical as well as Hellenistic writers, in much the same manner as our common phrase 'such a one;' meant indeed for a certain person, but whose name we either do not remember, or do not think it worth while to mention. So Sch. Lucian. Vit. Auct. 19. (ap. Wets.) τὸ δείκτη εἰσάγαγοι οἱ παλαιοὶ λέγειν, οὖν ἀφελέως τὸν λόγον περιλάμβανες ἐπὶ τῶν συγκρότητι τὸν Βουλαλάουν τῇ ἄριστῃ τῶν θυρώματος. Grotius compares the Hebrew נְלֹם, Ruth 4, 1. and the Arabic نَفِلَا, from whence (he tells us) the Spanish has its fullano. See Elsner. Many Commentators (as Erasmus, L. Brug, Maldonati, and Castallio) think it is the Evangelist that conceals the name, not Jesus. But others (as Theophylact, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel) maintain that Jesus suppressed the name of the host (who, some say, was Simon the leper, others Nicodemus, others Joseph of Arimathea, others John the Evangelist), and did not clearly indicate the house, lest it should be thereby known to Judas, and thus Jesus be hindered from quietly celebrating this his last paschal feast. Nay, it seems not improbable that Jesus had beforehand arranged the matter with the host as to the providing of a triclinium, and a servant to be ready waiting in the street (known by a certain attitude or sign, such as freemasons are said to use), in order to introduce them to their apartment, &c. The circumstances (on which Kuinoel enlarges) all tend to place this beyond doubt.

18. οἱ καίρος μου ἐγώς ἐστι. Palairét, L. Brug. Grotius, Maldonati, Piscator, Wetstein, Weston, and Kyпк. understand this allegorically, of the time of Christ's passion and death; and Kypke supposes that
καιρός denotes these calamities themselves. For (says Wetstein) the lamb could not be sacrificed except in the court of the Temple, by the ministration of the priests and Levites, and on the evening of the 14th day of Nisan; and cites Jos. B. 6, 9. ὁλοκαυτομαχία. But others (as Schmid, Rosenm. and Kuin.) understand this expression of the time at which Jesus meant to celebrate the Paschal feast, and they observe the propriety of the δ κατέστη δ ἐμοί, since (as was before observed) Jesus celebrated the feast with the Karœi and Scripturœ, on the day before the Traditionœ and the Jews in general.

18. ποιεῖ τὸ πάσχα. This expression, as applied to religious observances, is not only found in the Hebrew and Hellenistic, but also in the Classical writers, as ποιεῖ Ἰσραήλ, ποιεῖ τὸ Ὀλυμπία. See examples in Raphel, Wetstein, and Kypk. It was, I suspect, introduced into the Grecian language by the Phœnician colonists.

19. οἷς σύνταξαν, had prescribed, appointed, ordered, i.e. the particular place, the signals, the words to be used, &c. Examples of this sense of σύνταγμα are given from Diod. Sic. by Munthe. It signifies, properly, to make an arrangement with any one.

19. ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα. The word has here a very extensive signification, and denotes all the previous preparations necessary to the celebration of the Passover; such as providing, examining the lamb, slaying, skinning, and cooking it: nor need we doubt but that the lamb was slain by the disciples themselves; since (as Philo tells us, who is cited by Loesner in this place,) all the other victims were slain by the priests; this one only by each master of a family.

20. ἀνέκειστο, reclined. The first posture at meals was, probably, reclining on the ground; as, perhaps, Gen. 18, 4. שר על שור. Yet sitting at the table was very ancient. Gen. 43, 38. 1 Sam. 20, 25. Tacit. de German. “separativa sedes, sua cuique mensa.” So of the Spaniards and Gauls in Strabo. The Assyrians probably introduced the reclining posture. It is first
mentioned in Scripture by Amos, 2, 8. The Jews yet partly conform to it in eating the Passover. (Grotius.) Though the Passover was directed to be eaten standing, yet the doctors approved of the reclining posture then usual at meals (so Pesachim 10, 1. "etiam pauper in Israeli non comedat nisi inclinatus"); for they regarded it a symbolical action, denoting that they had now attained to that rest in Canaan whither they were then tending.

κατά τὸν ἑδώματας, 23. אֹלַף כְּפִי נֵסָּע וַּאֲכַל. Campbell renders "he whose hand is in the dish with me." I should prefer, "he who is dipping." This action may seem to those who are acquainted only with modern customs to savour of grossness. It must, however, be considered, that this has always been customary in the East, where neither knife, fork, nor spoon are used. Nor is delicacy so much violated, if we consider the frequent ablutions, never omitted, before and after a meal. That the custom is retained to this day, is confirmed from the accounts of various travellers of credibleness, ex. gr. Major Taylor, in his Travels to India, vol. 1, p. 186. narrating a supper at Antioch, says, "Abundance of bread was thrown at the feet of the guests; but there was neither knife, fork, nor spoon. One entertainer helped the company liberally with his right hand, which he had previously washed for that purpose. The mode in which this repast was conducted appeared to us truly laughable. The hearty way in which our friend dived his hand, with the sleeve of his gown tucked up to his elbow, into a large dish, and transferred it to our plates, formed a striking contrast to the delicacy of European manners." He then adds, that "great attention was paid to cleanliness, and that water and towels were served before and after supper." And Jackson, in his Account of Morocco, p. 147. describing the customs of the Moors and Arabs in that country, says, "they wash their hands before every meal, which, as they use no knives or forks, they eat with their fingers. Half a dozen per-
sons sit round a bowl, into which each person puts (i.e. dips) his hand, and, taking up the food, throws it, by a dexterous jerk, into his mouth without suffering his fingers to touch the lips. However repugnant this may be to our ideas of cleanliness, yet the hand being always washed, and never touching the mouth in the act of eating; these people are by no means so dirty as Europeans have sometimes hastily imagined." Similar accounts may be seen in Lucas's Journey from Tripoli to Fezzan, and in Belzoni's Researches in Egypt; and vestiges of this custom, even among the Greeks, may be found in the Classical writers, ex. gr. Anacreon, frag. χείρα τ' ἐν τηγάνω βαλεῖν. Ephippus ap. Athenæum, l. 13. ἐταυ ἄρσ--ἀγώμ.βολον τε χείρα προσθάλη βορᾶ. Philostr. V. Sophist. 1, 21, S. p. 516. ὑ ἐ吸引力, ὑ ἐσθίεσιν. And so Ovid (cited by Mr. Weston): "Carpe cibos digitis, est quiddam gestus edendi, Ora nec immunda tota perunge manu." There is, however, another question connected with this passage which demands our examination. It has been variously debated among the Commentators; whether by thus dipping his hand into the dish Jesus meant to designate the betrayer, and point him out to the rest; or whether it was only a prophetic application of a proverbial saying, not meant to be applied particularly, except by the person himself intended. The former is maintained by Theophylact, Grotius, &c. who think that Judas sat, or reclined, near Christ; so that, though there were more dishes on the table, yet he ate from the same dish. Thus might Jesus more easily (and without the others hearing) have answered the interrogation of Judas with the words "thou hast said:" and thus John, at the instance of Peter, asking who the traitor should be, received a certain sign from Jesus. We may observe the gradation used by Jesus; first, he includes the traitor in the number twelve. Then in the lesser number of those who sat near him. At last he designates, by certain marks, the very man. Thus Grotius; whose arguments are
answered by Piscator, who observes that, especially from a comparison of 14, 20. and Joh. 13, 28, & 24. it appears that the Disciples did not receive the words as any certain indication; and even Judas asked, "Is it I?" Though that may have been, as Maldonati suggests, lest, by keeping silence, he should admit the crimination. Piscator, in fact, thinks that in these words Christ does not designate the traitor, but only complains of his ingratitude. So also Bois. Rosenm. and Kuinoel take ἐρχάσας for "qui consuevit manum intingere, &c. convictor familiaris meus." Kuinoel thus points out the course of the circumstances: "Then John, in an under voice, interrogated Jesus, κώπε τις ἔστιν; and Jesus, also in a low voice, makes the answer which we find in Joh. 13, 26. Which words being caught by Judas, he, also in an under voice, puts the question, μὴ ἔγα ἐιμι, ράβδοι; to which Jesus answers, σὺ εἶμι. Thus on the present occasion it happens (as in many other prophecies, that the words of David (Psal. 41, 9.) were not only to be fulfilled in Christ, according to the proverbial form of speaking, but according to the literal signification of the words.

24. ἠπάγει. Rosenmuller interprets this, "goeth unto the place where he had been accustomed to spend the night;" i.e. the garden. But this lowers the solemnity and dignity of the sentence, and does not suit the words following. Therefore, I would understand it, (with Grotius, Camerarius, Wolf, Kuinoel, &c.) "goeth to death:" by an euphemism common to most languages, where dying is noted by some verb signifying to go, depart, or the like. This has been illustrated by Gattaker, Elsner, Raphel, and Palairct.

24. καλὸν ἤν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη. A formula used, as well by the Hebrew as by the Grecian writers, to denote a lot the most infelicitous and miserable. Examples are adduced by Lightf. Priceus, Schoettgen, Kypke, Wetstein, Alberto, and Gatak. ad M. A. 9, 58. Kuinoel compares Jer. 15, 10. 20, 14. and ob-
serves the use of the positive for the comparative. Bulkley compares Hom. II. 3, 40—43. 'ᾼθ' ὀφελεὶς τ' ἄγονος τ' ἐμεναι, ἄγαμος τ' ἀπολέσθαι. Καὶ κε τὸ βουλομένῃ, καὶ κεν τὸλὶ κέρδιον ἦν, 'Ἡ ὁποῖα λαβθην τ' ἐμεναι καὶ οὐκίον ἀλλα. To which I add the following passages. Synes. 193. Λ. ωμαί δὲ δ' οὐ γινε τα, καὶ καλὼν ἦν τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ εἰ μὲ ἐγένετο. Theogn. ap. Epicur. Epist. (ap. Diog. Laert. 10, 126.) καλὼν μὲν μὴ φύσας Φυτα δ' ὀψες ἀκαθα πολλα ἀδικα περίσσαι. Eurip. Beller. frag. 16, 2. κράτιστον εἶναι φημὶ μὴ φύσας βρέσα. Eccles. 6, 3. (which passage Jesus possibly had in view,) where, speaking of a rich sinner, it is said that "the untimely birth, or abortion, is better than he," i.e. he would have been better unborn.

25. οὐ εἶτα, recte dixisti, ita est. Similar forms of assent and affirmation occur in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin writers. See Wolf, Kuinoel, and Koecher.

26. ἐσθιόταν αὐτῶν. Rosenm. renders, "towards the end of the supper." The best Commentators are agreed that this signifies, "when they had eaten." So 1 Cor. 11, 25. μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι. Kuinoel has satisfactorily proved this in the following words: "Since Jesus intended to institute a new rite, namely, a sacred supper, it is very probable that he distributed the bread and wine at the same time. Besides, in the parallel passages, Mark 14, 22. Luke 22, 19. 1 Cor. 11, 24. the words which Jesus made use of when he presented the cup, immediately follow those which he made use of when he broke the bread; and in Luke 22, 20. it is expressly said: ἀφαίτως καὶ τὸ ποτίσιον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι: whom see further.

26. λαβὼν—τὸν ἄρτον—ἐκλασθε. The loaf, or rather cake: for one, larger or smaller, in proportion to the number of the company, seems to have been prepared in the paschal feast, and in the Lord's Supper of the Apostolic period: (Comp. 1 Cor. 10, 17.) and it must be remembered that this was thin and hard, (like biscuit,) and therefore admitted rather being broken than cut. See note supra 14, 19. Jesus was probably accustomed to break and distribute the
breads, even in their common meals; there was no-
thing, therefore, in this respect, peculiar to the Eu-
charist. Such is the custom at this day in the East.
So in Xenoph. Anab. 7, 3. Σευθής ἀνελόμενος τοὺς
παρακειμένους αὐτῷ ἄρτους, διέκλα μετὰ μικρῶν, καὶ
dιερθύνει οἵς αὐτῷ ἔδοκες καὶ τὰ κρέα ἀσαντίων—καὶ
ἀλλοι κατὰ ταῦτα ἐποίουν.

26. εὐλογήσας, “having given thanks.” From the
writings of Philo, and the Talmudists, we find that
it was customary with the Jews to take no food or
wine, without first offering thanks to God, as the
creator and giver, with the addition of a prayer.

Thus the food, before accounted profane, was
thought to become holy, and lawful to be eaten.
Thus far nothing had been done at all deviating
from the accustomed forms of the Paschal feast.
But now Christ, at the distributing the bread and
wine, employs expressions new and hitherto unheard
of, λάβετε—τὸ σῶμα μου. Rosenmuller; who further
observes, that the formula is similar to that which
Moses has used, Exod. 12, 11. and what the Israelites
were bound to use in celebrating the Paschal feast,
v. 27. Compare Luke 22, 19. 1 Cor. 11, 24. The
ἐστὶ is by some thought to denote, “significat sym-
bolum, signum est.” So Weston; who compares 12, 7.
Thus the Jews answered their children, who asked,
(respecting the Passover,) what is this? This is the
body of the Lamb which our Fathers eat in Egypt;
_i. e._ it is commemorative of, &c. Koecher, indeed,
explains it without the figure. Rosenm. thus para-
phrases: “As I bring forward this loaf to be broken
and eaten by you, so shall I shortly deliver my body
to be wounded, broken up, and slain for you.”

We justly censure the Roman Catholics for mak-
ing the Sacrament of the Eucharist too much of a
mystery. The error, however, is one which may
plead high antiquity in its favour; as is plain from
Procop. de Ædit. 10, 5. ἐς ὅσον δὴ τὸν χαρῶν τὸν ἄβε-
βηλον ἐν ᾧ ἄργῳ τὰ ἄρρητα τελείοι εἶμι, κατὰ τὴν
πλευράν, ἢς πρὸς ἀνάσχοντα ὡλον τέτραχαι, διήκειν
ξυμβαίνει. And de Ædit. 50, 36. ἑρωισμῷ τὰ ἄρρη-
ta, scil. μυστήρια. Every enlightened Protestant will know how to appreciate the following admirable remarks of Wetstein: "After the conclusion of the Paschal Supper, Christ again distributed the bread and the cup before received; not, surely, in order to satisfy the hunger and thirst of his Disciples, but for the purpose of instituting a sort of mystic rite. When his Disciples could not understand with what design he was doing this, the thought could not but arise in their minds, what can this mean, and what does it denote? They did not enquire, whether the bread which they saw were really bread, or whether another body lay unconspicuously hid in the interstices of the bread, but what this action signified of what it was a representation or memorial? See Acts 2, 12, 16. Exod. 12, 26. 13, 8, 14. Esther 4, 5. Jos. 4, 21. Mark 1, 27. Ter. Phorm. 1, 2, 43. (Wetstein.)

27. τὸ ποτήριον. The cup was often handed round during the supper: but the word ποτήριον here refers to the last potation. The reader will remember that the Paschal cups were of wine and water: and so Pesach 10, 7. (ap. Wets.) and Berachoth 8, 5. "Super vinum cui non immiscetur aqua, non benedicunt." See other Rabbinical citations in Wets. Indeed it would seem, from the nature of the climate and the number of the cups, that the wine would not be unmixed. (Rosenm. and Wetstein.) This custom was adopted by the first Christians, and is still continued by the Romanists. See Justin Martyr. Clement. Cypr. cited by Grotius, who rightly takes ἐκχυσάμενον as persons pro proximo futuro; and subjoins as examples of this idiom, Matt. 8, 10. ἐκκόπτεται: and 20, 22. ἐπιτίθηται. Mark 9, 31. παραδίδοται. Luke 17, 12. εἰσερχόμενον: and 24, 49. ἀποστέλλω. John 4, 21. ἐρχέται. We express this idiom in our language by the form is being. Camer. takes the word, not for a participle, but a participial noun of the form of a participle.

28. τοῦτο—ἀμαρτίων. "For this is my blood, by which the new covenant is ratified," &c. The words
of Luke are yet clearer: τὸῦ τοῦ ποτήριον ἡ καλὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου. By the reaching out to you of this cup, I institute a new Religion, to be ratified by my blood. (Rosenm.) It was customary to many nations to drink blood on concluding a covenant. To this purpose Hammond and Grotius refer this to customs of the more barbarous nations. As Plut. in Vit. Publicol. Tacit. Ann. 12. Magellan of the Americans. Of the Assyrians, Val. Max. L. 9, c. 11. Of the Scythians, Solinus and Mela. Of the Saracens, Nicetas Choniates. Of the Danes, Saxo Sialand. Ezech. 39, 19. By the more civilized, wine was substituted. That our Lord had reference to this custom, when he instituted and consecrated the eucharistic cup with these words, is the opinion of Spencer de Leg. Heb. 614. So Cic. pro Sext. 10. “Id autem fœdus meo sanguine ictum sancti posse dicebant.” And Cic. in Pisonem. 12. “Fœdus, quod meo sanguine in pactione provinciarum iceras.” We may easily comprehend how red wine, such as is used in the Eastern countries, may signify blood. So Eustath. in II. β. p. 234, 21. αἷμα δὲ ἡμικυκλώστρα τῶν ὀνων λέγειν ἐγεέναι ἡρτηται. Achilles Tat. 2. p. 67. τὸῦ ἐστὶν ἐκάρας ὦμορ, τὸῦ ἐστὶν αἷμα βασιλέως. Genes. 49, 14. Deut. 34, 14. Sirac. 59, 96. L. 15, 1. Macc. 3, 81, 6, 34. But it is not so easy to perceive what similitude can subsist between a human body and bread. It may however be answered that a bloodless carcass, such as is that of a dead man on the cross, is as dry as bread. Then again, the body of Christ, if it be mystically considered as the blood of the sacrifice, nourishes the mind as bread sustains the body. See Joh. 6, 51. where Christ makes a similar transition from the consideration of bread to that of his body. Wetstein.

28. εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτίαν. This may (thinks Grotius) refer to Dan. 9, 24, 27. and Rom. 5, 15. He further observes, that Christ now passes from the federal sacrifices to those which are piacular; in which the life of the animal is offered as a substitute for the life of the man, who had deserved death. Thus
these victims are said in the Law to bear the sins of the people. But the blood represents the life, which is itself invisible. “The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you for an atonement,” &c. Lev. 17, 11. thus Heb. 9, 22. It is with respect to these piacular offerings, that Lightfoot observes, “Our Lord alluded not only to the bread he broke, but to the daily sacrifices of the lamb in the temple for the sins of the people, cut and broken into many parts, when he said, ‘This is my body, broken for you,’ 1 Cor. 11, 24. and not only to the wine at the Supper, but to the cup of wine daily poured out in the drink offerings, when he named it, ‘this cup which is shed for you.’” Lightfoot on Luke 22, 20. Dr. Owen has observed, that the phrase is never strictly used in the Old Testament, and therefore is peculiar to the New. I must further remark, that the words seem to carry with them an emphasis. Christ (says Rosenm.) denotes that by his death, and the effusion of his blood, he has purchased for the human race benefits far greater than the Mosaic Law had ever afforded to the Israelites; namely, remission of sins, and the inestimable benefits of eternal life.

29. οὗ μη πισι—ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμαξέλου. This is a periphrasis for wine; which occurs in Deut. 22, 9. Is. 92, 12. Hab. 3, 16. So Fuld. Nem. 9, 23. ἀμαξέλου παίς. And Anacr. 50, 7. γόνος ἀμπέλου. Γενήμα is said of things both inanimate and animate. (Kuin.) So Herodot. ἀμαξελίνῳ καρπώ. See Wakef. on Eurip. Alc. 769. See Alberti, Schwartz, and Palairot.

29. καίνον. This is usually explained, vinum prae-stantius: and this interpretation is adopted by Schl. v. διαθήκη and ἑντάλη καίνη. But Kuinoel has well observed, that there is no authority for this in the Old or New Testament. I agree with Camer. Kuin. and Rosenm. in adopting the interpretation of Euthymius and Theophylact, (probably derived from Chrysostom,) who take it for κατὰ καίνον, καίνον τρόπον, a new. See Gataf. Adv. C. 28. The common in-
terpretation seems followed by Wetstein, who compares the novus liquor of Hor. Od. 1, 31.

29. ὅταν πίνω—ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου. On the interpretation of this verse, and especially on the formula ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς, there has been much diversity of opinion. The mode of explanation pursued by Le Clerc, Camer. Rosenm. and Kuinoel, seems most satisfactory; namely, that by this formula is denoted that celestial Kingdom, the Heaven itself, where God is in a peculiar manner supposed to be present. The future felicity to be enjoyed in Christ's Kingdom is frequently adumbrated by images derived from a feast; and was not less frequently used by our Saviour than by the Jewish writers, to designate the felicity of the future life. After removing the imagery, the following sense will arise: "I shall no longer eat and drink with you on this earth; from this time all participation in the affairs of this life will be at an end, and the society which I have hitherto had with you, until finally I shall taste of happiness with you in Heaven, and enjoy everlasting bliss." (Kuin.) It is true, indeed, that after his return to life, our Saviour is said (Acts 10, 41.) to have eaten and drunk with his Disciples. But wine is not there mentioned; and, indeed, he seems to have eaten and drunk with them merely that they might believe him to be really alive, and, as to society, that was short, interrupted, and transient.

30. ὑμνήσαντες. When they had sung the Hymn, called κατ' ἑξοχήν, the Hallel, Ἡλλέλια, which comprised Ps. 113—118, and was divided into two parts: 1, Ps. 113—115, sung before the eating of the Pascha; 2, Ps. 116—118. Whether this hymn (composed of the above portions of Scripture) was sung, or recited, cannot be determined from the word itself; and most of the Oriental versions (together with the Vulgate) partake of the ambiguity. But, from other information, there seems no reason to doubt that it was sung. See Buxtorf and Lightfoot. Wolf refers

31. σκανδαλίσθησεθε εν ἐμοι ἐ. τ. ν. τ. This is well explained by Euthymius, σκαλωθήσεθε τὴν εἰς ἐμὲ πίστιν, ἤγουν φεύγεσθε. (Compare 36.) You will all forsake me, your teacher, (ducem, τὼν ποιμένα,) this night. Ἐν ἐμοί, (like the Hebrew ל, on occasion of what shall happen to me.

31. πατάξω τὼν ποιμένα. There is a reference to Zach. 13, 7. But the words, as they now stand, neither exactly correspond to the Hebrew text nor to the Septuagint. Hence Grotius (with the approbation of Rosenm. and Kuin.) thinks that the expression had become a proverbial dict*: q. d. “The common saying, which you have elsewhere heard, will be made good; that when the shepherd is slain the sheep are scattered abroad.” This interpretation appears to be the most satisfactory, and is confirmed by a passage of Jos. Ant. 8, 15. (adduced by Krebs.) δειξαι τὸν Θεὸν αὐτῷ τοὺς Ἰσραήλίτας φεύγων- τας, καὶ διακομένως ὑπὸ τῶν Σύρων, καὶ διασκορπίζομε- νος ὑπ’ αὐτὸν εἰς τὰ δρή, καθάπερ, ποιμένων ἀνηρμένων, τὰ ποιμνία. So also Simplic. in Epictet. p. 211. (cited by Wets.) στρατηγὸν πεσόντος—οἱ στρατιωτα- τῶς φραγμαίνων εὕός καταπίπτωσι, καὶ οὐς πρόβασα ποιμένος στερηθέντα λύκων ἐπεχεμένων ἄλλος ἄλλαχον πρὸς φυτὴν διασκέερωναι. So Virg. (cited by Grot.) “Rege incolumni, mens omnibus una; Amissa, rupere

* Grotius has rightly observed, that the πατάξω does not designate a certain individual, but that the first person is put for any person; q. d. Let the shepherd be destroyed, (be it so,) then will the sheep be scattered. The words of Zach. continues Grot. have no direct reference to Christ; nay, they seem said of a bad, not a good shepherd. (Vide Chap. 11. sub. fin.) What have place in historical narrations are νομιμα, but when taken out of them they become merely ἀνηρμένοι, nor have they then any reference to the occasion on which they were first said, but may extend as far as the force of the gnome extends.
St. Matthew, Chap. XXVI.

Didem.” Liv. (cit. by Grot.) “Sicut acies funditur, duce occiso, ita dilapsi passim alii alio.”

32. προάξω ἤμας ε. τ. Γ. Jesus intended that the Apostles (whom he foresaw would desert him when apprehended by the Jews) should, after his death, betake themselves to Galilee, which was the native country, at least the residence, of most of them and their followers. He seems to have done this, that he might there more undisturbedly appear to and hold society with them. At that time, it is true, these words of Christ seemed obscure, (see note on 16, 21.) and after his death they indeed remembered his words, but placed no faith in them, they had abandoned all courage, and they delayed departing into Galilee. Hence, for nearly eight days after his resurrection, did Jesus remain in the vicinity of Jerusalem. (See Luke 24. Joh. 20, 26.) Afterwards, however, he took his departure into Galilee. Matth. 28, 16, Joh. 21, 1. We need not, therefore, press the sense of προάξω, (which seems to have been suggested, by association, from the preceding metaphor of a shepherd,) but interpret, “I will see you again in Galilee, expect me in Galilee.” (Rosenm. and Kuinoel.) Christ continues the pastoral metaphor. To perceive the propriety of the term προάξω, (precede,) one must remember that, in the East, the sheep followed the shepherd, (not, as with us, the shepherd the sheep,) attending to the sound of his voice, as dogs with us follow the whistle of their master. So, in Joh. 10, 4. it is said of the shepherd, τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ ἔξαγει αὐτὰ, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ, ὅτι οἶδα ἐγώ τῆν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ. On which passage I have further illustrated this custom, which to us appears strange.

34. τὸν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι. This word φωνεῖν is sometimes used of birds: nay the Scholiast on Theocrit. Id. 2, 109. tells us that this is its proper and primitive use. However that may be, I know of no Classical example of it as applied to cocks: and not many of birds in general. Of cocks, the Classi-
cal writers use ἄδειν, κεκράγεναι, φθέγγεσθαι, &c. of which Wetstein produces examples. See Wolf. A difficulty has been here raised by some, who observe, that cocks were not kept in Jerusalem, and that therefore Peter could not hear one crow. (See Lightf. Hor. Heb. and Bynæus de morte Christi, 2, 6.) Others contend that the fact rests only on the authority of modern Jews, and may be suspected to be false. Some (as Altman and Hoffman) interpret the word not of a cock, but of a praeco, or watchman. But this is cutting the knot, which may, I think, be untied. As to the examples produced by Altman from Greek writers, where ἀλέκταρ signifies a buccinator, Wolf has well remarked, that they are solely from poets, (who perpetually use metaphorical appellations instead of proper ones,) and therefore cannot prove the point. See Kuin. infra ver. 74. The subject has been accurately and fully discussed in a separate dissertation by Reland, of which the sum is given by Schoettgen, Hor. Heb. Reland has proved that the cock might crow, not in the city, and yet be heard by Peter, especially as it was night, the situation elevated, and the distance scarcely four hundred paces from the city walls. Or the cocks might be kept in the city (in coops) by the Romans. The second cock-crowing was usually called the cock-crowing, κατ' ἐξοχήν. Δίς in Mark is for ἐκ δευτέρου, and τρίς is explained, semel iterumque, plus simplici vice, (a certain for an uncertain number,) as in 1 Cor. 12, 8. So Eusth. ap. Schl. Lex. says τρίς is used for πολλάκις. And thus the seeming contradiction between Mark and the other Evangelists may be removed. Ἀπαρνήσῃ, i. e. "thou wilt deny that thou knowest me;" as Luke paraphrases.

35. Καὶ δὲ ὡς μὲ σὺν σοι ἀποδανεῖν. An almost proverbial formula; the force of which is accurately defined and illustrated with examples by Krebs and Wets. Aristæn. 2, 17. οὐδὲ δειλὸς, καὶ ἀποδανεῖν ἃμας δὲν. Jos. Ant. 6, 6, 2. προθύμως ἐφέπεσθαι. Jos. Ant.

36. eis χωρίον λεγόμενον Γεβσμανί. The word χωρίον does not denote (as Grot.) vicus, but a grange, fundus, villa. It derived its name from the ἔντασις, oil-presses, which were, or had been, there. See Reland's Palestine, and Lightf. Hor. Heb. (Kuin.)

37. ἰδράτῳ ἄδημονεῖν. The word ἄδημονεῖν is a very strong expression; it denotes more than λυτεώθαι. It is rendered, summo angore affici, summo mærone horrore tantum non examinari. See Raphel, Elsner, Wets. Kypke, and Schl. Lex. The word is derived by Bos from ἄδος, tædium. It occurs in Hippocrat. Consult Fæsius Æcon. Hippocr. and Schl. Lex.

38. περίλυπος. The πέρι is here intensive, as in very many other compounds, which may be seen by turning to any Lexicon. Several examples are adduced by the Philologists, of which one will suffice. Aristot. Eth. 4, 3. καὶ ωτ’ εὐτοχῶν περικαρῆς ἐσται, ωτ’ ἀτυχῶν, περίλυπος.

38. περίλυπος—ἔως τανάτου, i. e. valde, λίαν, or (with Campbell) deadly. So Jonas 4, 9. λελύπημαι ἔως τανάτου. It is accounted a Hebraism by Vorstius: but it is cited from the Anthol. Gr. by Wetstein; and indeed is found in most languages. On the nature and causes of this feeling of Jesus much has been written, but nothing certain can be determined. It is a most awful subject, which cannot be approached too reverently. Koecher thinks that it has been satisfactorily proved by Kraft to have been a vivid sense of the Divine execration, and of God hiding his face. The reasons of this deadly sorrow are thus stated by Kuinoel: "Causae autem hujus tantæ comotionis animi Christi erant, vario modo aucta et acuta mortis jam ipsi instantis, calamitatumque imminentium præsensio, et cum præsensione conjunctæ cogitationes alia, imprimis cogitatio de amicorum suorum fatis, suoque ab iis discessio, dubitatio etiam an fortiter et constanter, præsentibus omnibus etiam corporis viribus, calamitates mortemque
subire, opusque quod superandum ei erat, superaturus esset.” But this is, I conceive, too confined a view of the subject, on which Mr. Markland has ably treated in the following remarks, found in Bowyer’s Conjectures: “This is generally interpreted of our Saviour’s praying that he might not die. God forbid it should be so, when he knew, and always declared, that he came into the world on purpose to die. The mistake has been owing to interpreters not distinguishing between ποιησις, which is in this place, and βάστισμα. By this latter is meant death, a total immersion in afflictions, as when all thy storms and waves have gone over me: by the former, a smaller portion of distress, less than death. The distinction is made in Matt. 20, 22. and elsewhere; and by all the Evangelists in this place. Now our Saviour hath himself told us (John 11, 42.) that God always heard him; and we know, from Hebr. 5, 17. and Luke 22, 43. that he was delivered from this present terror that was upon him, whatever it was; but we know that he was not delivered from death. It is difficult, perhaps, to know what this ποιησις was. See, however, on Hebr. 5, 7. We may be certain from the circumstances that there was something very terrible in it; and at that time Jesus was no more than one of us, sin only excepted. As it is not clearly revealed what this cup was, it seems not necessary for us to know any further than it was not death: which we may be sure of; at least, to one who is persuaded of the truth of this opinion, it would be blasphemy to say that our Saviour prayed to be delivered from death. It is explained John 18, 11.” Markland.

Certain it is, that the Greek and Latin Fathers, whose opinions may be seen in Suicer’s Thes. Ecl. T. 2, 1449. & 1519. and Euthym. and Theophyl. who admit the fear of death in Christ, resort to distinctions which true judgment cannot admit. Origen, C. C. L. 2. p. 77. would refer it to a tender sense of those punishments which he knew would befall the
Jews in consequence of their bringing him to crucifixion. But this seems too limited. Christ did not (says Calvin) feel a horror at death simply, inasmuch as it was a separation of soul and body; but as a curse to which we were obnoxious, because the formidable tribunal of God was before his eyes, and our sins which were laid upon him, sorely pressed his soul.” I have only to add, that the deadly horror, so pathetically described in the Scriptures, was doubtless a compound feeling produced by a variety of reflections, which it were profane too minutely to scrutinize, though we ought not to doubt that the weight of our sins then pressed heavily upon him who vouchsafed to “become a curse for us.”

39. προελθὼν—ξεσεβέν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον. Pudet enim homines coram aliis, voce alisque ardoris signis adhibitis, orare. (Kuin.) Mos est cum summâ demissione precatantium. (Pole.)

39. ei duname. Kypke, on Luke 19, 42. renders ei by utinam, but (as I agree with Kuinoel in thinking) without good reason. It is, however, of more importance to enquire, (with Grotius,) how this condition may consist with what follows, in the parallel passage of Mark, “to thee all things are possible?” We must (answers Grotius) recur to that well-known distinction of the schools, namely, between what is impossible per se, and what is impossible hoc vel illo pacto. Now per se nothing is impossible with God, except such things as are in themselves inconsistent, or else are repugnant to the Divine nature. Our Saviour therefore, by duname, means to say, “If thy decree permit that thy glory and the salvation of men should, by any other mode, be equally promoted.

39. παρελθέσθω ὡς ἔμω τῷ ποιητῷ τῷ. The word παρελθεῖν is used in a physical sense, of a cup of wine, &c. carried past any one, at a banquet. So Anacreon ap. Beg. Epict. 21. παρέρχεται; μὴ κάτεχε. Plaut. Pers. 5, 2, 42. circumfer mulsum—transeat. Here, however, it is used figuratively; as often in the Hebrew writers, as Jer. 49, 12. Is. 51, 22. and sometimes
the Greek ones. Some examples may be seen in Palairet; to which I add the following noble passage of Æschyl. Agam. 1869. Blomf. ὑπερδικῶς μὲν ὄν 
Τούτων ἡ θυσία ἐν δόμοις κακῶν ὡδὲ Πλήσας ἄραιον, αὐ-
τὸς ἔκκινει μολὰν. What is here designated by ποτή-
ριον has been disputed. Rosenmuller explains it 
“supplicium vitae ultimum et sævissimum, cum omni 
genere contumeliarum gravissimarum acerbissima-
rumque.” That Jesus should on so awful an occasion 
have felt tremor where is the wonder? He had to 
achieve a work of the most momentous nature, from 
which depended the salvation of the whole human 
race, the remission of sins, the future propagation of 
religion, and the institutes of the new economy, &c. 
It seems to have been the intention of the Almighty 
that Jesus should exhale his pure spirit with all the 
present powers of body and mind, that we might 
thence learn that he voluntarily met death. (Rosen.) 
It is well remarked by Kuinoel: “If in enduring ca-
lamities so terrible to him, Jesus had betrayed no 
feeling of anxiety and tremour, they who so irra-
tionally here accuse him of inconsistency, might have 
fastened on him the charge of fanaticism.” It may 
seem doubtful (says Grot.) whether our Lord, by τὸ 
ποτηρίου, adverts to imminent death, or that horror 
which his mind then felt. But I am inclined to pre-
fer the former. It often happens that one does a 
thing ἐκῶν ἀέκοτος θυμῶ, nay, in accomplishing all irk-
some affairs, we may perceive a kind of mixed ac-
tion (as Aristotle terms it), which he exemplifies by 
the case of a man, who, though he may wish to save 
his property, yet chuses to sustain that loss, in order 
to avert a worse evil. If therefore death, conjoined 
with ignominy, were alone considered, Christ, by the 
instinctive feeling of our nature, undoubtedly would 
have wished to decline it. But, considering the de-
crees of his Father, he not unwillingly became obe-
dient even unto death; and thus he, “though a son, learned obedience from the things which he 
suffered.”
39. ὁ γὰρ ἦν δὲστος, ἀλλ' ἦς τί. Gataker Ad. Miser. has given many similar examples of religious acquiescence in the will of God. Mr. Bulkley also has produced one from Epictetus, of which the following is the sense: “I have subjected my will to that of God. Does he will that I should be sick of a fever? I will it too. Does he,” &c.

40. εὐτέρεστοι λογοστατε—ἐμοί; Oi'ros, siccine, like εἰμο, and some other particles, is so joined with interrogatories, as to denote wonder mixed with censure. Euthym. thus paraphrases, “ye promised and engaged to die with me, and can ye not watch an hour with me?” See Glass. Ph. Sac. So Virg. Æn. 4, 560. “Potes hoc sub casu ducere somnum?” Hom. II. 25. cited by Wets.

41. γρηγορεῖτε, καὶ πρ.—πεθανοῦν. Euthymius paraphrases, “Trust not in yourselves, neither make great promises, but be vigilantly attentive to yourselves, and pray that,” &c. He also explains πεθαν-οῦν here, τὸν τῆς ἀρνήσεως, that of denying their master, which, however, seems too limited a sense. It has been well observed by Grotius, that Christ does not direct them to pray to God that no temptation might assault them, (which, considering the situation in which they were to be placed, was impossible), but ἐμπιέσει here denotes (as in 1 Tim. 6, 9.) immersi, succumbere. So Euth. Theoph. and Isidore explain it καταστροφήσας; the last of whom makes some nice, and, as I think, fanciful distinctions between ἐμπιέσει and εἰσελθεῖν. Christ instructs them to pray that some extraordinary spiritual assistance might be extended to them, by whose support they may not give way to the assaults of temptation. So also Piscator, Rosenm. Kuin. See more on the sense of these words in note on Mat. 6, 13.

41. τὸ μὲν πεθανοῦμεν—ἀαθένει, i. e. is too weak for the sustaining of such a weight. A good will I know ye have, and a promptitude to undergo all dangers with me. But the body is weak, the soul sensitive, abhorrent of trouble, and not readily submissive to the do-
minion of reason. Therefore watch and pray for divine succour. See more in the excellent note of Grotius, who very appositely cites Statii Theb. 8, 739. Odi artus fragilemque hunc corporis usum desertorem animi. Lucian. Trag. 66. ψυχή μὲν οὖν μοι καὶ προθυμία παρὰ—Δέμας δὲ καθάρσαν οὖχ ὑπηρετεί τῷ θεῷ. Heliodor. 4, 21. εἶδες ἂν καὶ πρεσβύτου πρὸς τὸ γύρας μάχην, καὶ ἄστερ ἔλκουσαν τὸ σάμα τὴν διάνοιαν, καὶ οὐκ ἑξισομένη τὴν ἀσθένειαν, ὑπὸ τῆς προθυμίας.

43. ὀφθαλμὸν βεβαιμένον. Some say (as Maldonati, L. Brug. and Grotius), with grief: others (as Hammond, Rosenm. and Kuinoel), with sleep; which seems preferable. Of this some examples are produced by Wets. Kypk. and Palairet. It may suffice to state, that the word βαφύνα is in the Classical writers more usually applied to a person than to a thing. Yet in Eurip. Alc. 385. we have σκότεινω ἰμαμα μου βαφύνεται, and in Phil. 1030. πάρεις βεβαιμένως τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς. Livy, Ovid, and Statius, have graves ocules, i. e. somno.

45. καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν, καὶ ἀνακαῦσεθε. Many Interpreters (as H. Steph. Simon, Clark, Markland, Schleusner, and Luther) take the τὸ λοιπὸν for adhuc, and regard the sentence as interrogative. See Kypk. and Krebs. Kuinoel and Rosenmuller account καθεύδετε and ἀν. as what are called imperatives permissive; (see Storr. Obs. ad Anab. 168.) q. d. Per me licet jam dormire et quiescere, vestris vigiliis non amplius opus est. But this seems to curtail the sense. A censure, by sarcasm, is couched under the words, which is very well paraphrased by Euthymius thus: q. d. since you have thus far failed to watch, sleep on the rest of the time, and take your rest, if you can.

45. ἔγγρακεν ἡ ἁρα. This is well explained by Euthymius, ἡ ἁρα τῆς προδοσίας. Then the καὶ signifies in which, or when, by what some term an Hebraism: but so Aristid. 2, 148. B. οὐ τολύς χρόνος διεγένετο καὶ ἐκώλυν; and of this use there are instances in Thucydides.

45. εἰς χεῖρας ἀμαρτωλῶν. These Grotius inter-
pretis, the Romans (as heathens): Kuinoel (less probably), the Jews.

47. ἰδοὺ, Ἰωάδας. ἐ. τ. ὅ. "Res atrociissima ad modum simplicis styli, breviter et nude, sine exaggeratione proponitur." (Wolf.) Similar examples from the Classical writers are produced by Raphael.

47. ἄχλοι πολὺς μετὰ μαχαιρίων καὶ ξύλων. By these are designated tumultuary weapons, such as clubs and poles. See Jos. B. 5, 3, 1. That they who bore them were not Roman soldiers appears (says Kuin.) from these arms. The crowd (as Stolz and Kuinoel think) were ignorant who was to be apprehended.

49. κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν. Wetstein explains, vehementer et arcte deosculatus est, and cites from Xenoph. οὗ τοῦ μὲν καλῶς φιλήσοντος μου, τοῦ δ' ἀγαθῶς κατεφίλησοντος. So Stock, Bucher, Tewater. And, indeed, in the Classical writers the κατὰ often exerts an intensive force. (See Lex. Xen.) But in the Sept. and New Testament it frequently adds little to the sense. Φιλέω often signifies to salute, as in Arr. Ep. 4, 11, 4.

50. ἐταιρε. Spoken ironically, or sarcastically, (as Campbell and Glass think; certainly (as L. Brug.) reproachfully. Many learned men mentioned by Wolf and Koecher take it for disciple; (and so Schl. Lex.) But, however this use may have prevailed among the Classical writers, I do not find it in the Hellenistic. I am inclined to agree with Heuman and Kuinoel, who take it for a common form of address; as in Matth. 20, 13. ἐταιρε, οὐκ ἄδικα σε, where see Kuin.

50. ἐφ᾿ ἓ παρεῖ; Many MSS. read ἓ, which is confirmed by almost all Wetstein’s citations. See Raphael, Elsner, and Loesner. In these few words (says Rosenmuller) Christ both smites the conscience of the perfidious wretch, and shows himself a καρδιογυαλιστής. Πάρει is wrongly translated ades by Erasm. and Schmid. The Vulgate has correctly rendered it venisti. So Thucyd. &c. Wetstein cites an apposite passage from the Anthol. 1, 42, 2. Οὐδὲν ἐν ἀνθρώποις
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φύσις χαλιτάρτηρον εἰρεν ἀνθρακτοῦ καθαρόν ψευδομένου φιλίαν. Οὐ γὰρ ἔδει ἡς ἐχθρὸν προφυλάσσομεθ', ἀλλ' ἀγανάκτοντες ἢν φιλοῦν, ἐν τούτῳ πλείονα βλάπτομεθα.

50. ἐπέβαλλεν τὰς χεῖρας. So Jos. Vit. 50. εἴθος μοι τὰς χείρας ἐπέβαλλον.

51. ἀπέστασε τὴν μάχαιραν, a large knife (as Grot.), or (as Salm. de Cruce, 380, thinks), the ferrum lanceæ latum, planum et utrinque aciem habens; perhaps it may be rendered cutlass or hanger (Æl. V. H. 8, 8. Hom. II. γ. 271.), such as travellers in Judæa used to carry about them for security against the robbers, &c. who then infested the country. See Jos. B. 1, 2, 12. (Michaelis.)

51. ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὀφέλον. The word denotes auferre, but especially amputare. So Judith 13. 8. and 1 Macc. 7, 47. It is not, however, a mere Hellenistic phrase. Classical examples are produced by Crauser and Palair et. So the Latin auferre, as in Cic. Ep. ad Q. Frat. 2, 11. “auriculam auferre mordicus abstulisset.” From a comparison, however, of this passage with that of Luke 22, 51. ἀφαίρεσα τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἱάσατο αὐτῷ, Rosenmuller and Kuinoel think that the signification of the word ἀφαιρέω is not to be too much pressed, for the ear seems to have hung by the skin. Such hyperbolical expressions are perpetually used in popular phraseology, the force of which is perfectly understood.


52. πάντες—ἀκολοῦντες. Some (as Rosenm. Strigel, and Glass) refer these words to Christ's disciples, as a direction to abstain from private avengement, and especially from resistance to the magistrate. (Compare Rom. 13, 1. Matth. 5, 39.) Others to the Jews, q. d. God will punish these sanguinary wretches, who shall themselves be slain. To Him therefore leave vengeance.” So Grot. Euthym. Theophyl. Orig. &c. Kuinoel understands it as a proverb taken from common life, in this sense: “Those who will defend themselves by the sword may perish by the
sword. But this seems too limited an interpretation. I am inclined to accede to the opinion of Grotius, to whose very copious discussion of this question I must refer the reader.

53. διάδεκα λεγεώνας ἀγγέλων. Not twelve only (the number of the Apostles), but twelve legions. In this Camerarius thinks that there is an allusion to the number which, among the Romans, formed a regular army.

54. πῶς—γενέσθαι, q. d. “the Prophets have predicted that I the Messiah must, in order to the promulgation and propagation of true religion, suffer various calamities and death itself. How then can this prediction be fulfilled but by my death.” This was said for the consolation of the disciples, and for their admonition, lest they should be offended at the view of his calamities and death. (Rosenm. and Kuin.)

55. ἐκκαθηγομένη διδάσκαλον. Verbum formæ pro verbo generis. (Kuin.) This is said signanter, for teachers performed their office sitting; which custom is well illustrated from Jewish antiquities by Bucher.

56. καὶ οὐκ ἐκκαθησατέ με, q. d. “Divine Providence then hindering what it now, in its own wise counsels, permits.” (Grot.)

56. πάντες—εἰσυρετεῖ, plerique; as Maldonati, Theophylact, and Bp. Barrington (ap. Bowyer), who cites Xen. Eph. 1. 2, 56. καὶ πάντας τε ἄνεκτενεν δῆλους δὲ καὶ ζωντας ἔλαβε, μόνος δὲ ἡδονή δηαφουσίν, where correct ἡδονή δηαφουσίν. But there seems no reason here to resort to this interpretation. All the Apostles at first fled, though Peter and John almost immediately returned. The Apostles, remarks Ros. were struck with consternation at seeing that take place which they had never supposed could happen. Christ permitted this (says Doddridge), that we might learn not to depend too confidently on the friendship of the very best of men.

56. τούτο δὲ δόλο γέγονεν. τ. π. α. γ. τ. π. “but, I repeat, this all happened,” &c. That these are
the words of Christ, not, as some have thought, of the Evangelist, is clear from Mark. (Kuin.)

57. ἀπέστειλεν Πέτρος Καϊάφω. The verb ἀπέστειλε is a word appropriate to leading any one to trial or execution. See Harpocrat. ap. Wets. It is, however, of consequence to notice what appears a diversity between this passage and that of John 18, 13. where it is said that he was taken first to Haman, the father-in-law of Caiphas. Of the various modes of removing this discrepancy, that, I think, seems the most satisfactory which represents that Jesus was first taken to Haman, to do him honour, and that he was detained at Haman’s house only while the Synedrion was collecting: that Matthew, therefore, Mark and Luke, passed by this circumstance of his being taken to Haman, because nothing took place there worthy of remark. In Joh. 18, 24. ἀπέστειλε should be rendered had sent. (See Matth. 14, 3.) John had forgotten, at 18, 14. to remark that Jesus was led from the house of Haman to Caiphas; but when he afterwards, at ver. 15—23. had related what was done at the house, remembering it, he adds the circumstance at verse 24. Kuinoel.

58. ἀπὸ μακρὸθεν. Of this sort of pleonasm, which often occurs in the O. T. examples are given by Wets. So also ἀπὸ τῆλε et ἀπὸ τῆλοι: and in Latin de longe. So Wets. cites Veget. 3, 17. Imperatorum vel ignovarum est vociferari de longe. So also the Hebrew פֵּרָד.

59. ἠρώτουν ἰεωδομαρτύριαν. Since these things were done in the middle of the night, there was no opportunity to seek out witnesses. But false witnesses were already at hand, suborned for the very purpose of accusing Jesus as a despiser of the Divine Law, and a blasphemer. (Rosenm.) Grotius remarks that the examination was (like the ἀνακρίσις of the Greeks) studiously contrived, that they might elicit from the witnesses something which might criminate Jesus. He observes too that that sort of examination depends much upon the probity of the Judge,
and gives great advantage over the innocent. Amongst the Jews, in prosecuting false prophets, or seducers of the people, it was so far lawful to say any thing, true or false, that no man was permitted to appear in their defence. (Grot.) They did this professedly, (says Hammond) because they had resolved upon his destruction. But I would rather accede to the opinion of L. Brug. who observes, "that the Evangelist says false, though they professed to seek true witnesses." Here we may aptly apply the words of Liv. 88, 46. "Nec accusator apud Judices infensos deerat." On ἰευδοπρομαρτυρία see Pollux, 6, 153.

60. καὶ ὁχ ἐφόν. These words are not superfluous, as many suppose. They have been well defended by Kuinoel; who observes, "Delevit mala grammaticorum sedulitas, qui simplicitatis dictionis N. T. non rationem haberent."

61. δύναμι—Θεω. They had in view the words of Christ (Joh. 2, 19,) λύσατε τὼν ναὸν τῶν, pointing with the finger to his body, but, by suppressing the action, the words might be understood of the temple. The expression Temple of God was an usual periphrasis. So Kuinoel, Theophyl. and Euthym.

61. διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν, after three days, on the third day. See Raphel. Wetstein cites examples of this from the Classical writers. Æl. V. H. 18, 42. 14, 7. Phil. 2, 476. 1, 3025. Isocr. Archidam. and remarks: "Non magis conficitur ex his verbis, Jesum semet ipsum excitasse, quam semet ipsum occidisse."

62, 63. The High Priest used the following form of exorcism, in order to perturb and terrify Jesus, and elicit something from his mouth which might further criminate him. (Kuin.) Jesus was, however, silent; for the charges of the witnesses were such as needed no refutation, especially before judges who had predetermined to find him guilty, and put him to death. Euthymius: βλέπων τὸ δικαστήριον παράνομον, ἐφύγει γὰρ λῃστῶν κρίτην. It was certainly a tumultuary and violent proceeding. They met to-
gether, not to try him, but to find him guilty. Now the High Priest, however, distrusting the testimony of others, and weary of delay, acts at once the part of accuser and judge. (Kuin.) Wetstein cites Origem, C. Ced. 369. ἡ παρὰ ταύτα προτιθεὶ καὶ ταύτα πολλὰς αἰκαίς αὐτοῦ σωτῆς ταῦτα ἐν ἐν ἐξήγη οὶ περὶ τάσεις τυρχάνων φθεγγομένου μᾶλλον ἐνεδεικνυμενον καρτερίαν καὶ ὑπομορφήν.

68. ἐφορκίζεα γὰρ. This signifies to make to swear, to bind by the curse of the Law, or, as we say, to swear a witness. In illustration of these senses, numerous passages may be seen in Wet. and Krebs, taken from the Classical writers; and also from the O. T. by Hammond. The word, therefore, implied an execration, which was thereby denounced against the person if he did not speak and answer truly; and it was thought to bind the person thus adjured, as much as if he had taken an oath, (thus Christ, who had before held his peace, now thinks himself bound to answer,) and the answer thus returned was thought an answer upon oath. A false one was perjury, and a refusal to answer was interpreted as guilt. The accusative of the person adjured is sometimes omitted, as is also the name of the Deity sworn by. When expressed, this latter is either put in an accusative, depending on κατὰ, (which is the case both in the Classical and Hellenistic writers,) or with a κατὰ and a genitive, which is chiefly confined to the latter. It is also quoted from Philo, by Krebs. The word is, moreover, not always to be interpreted in the strict sense of adjuro, obtesto; sometimes only in that of hortor, rega, in which sense I would take it in 1 Thess. 5, 27. ὅριζεν όρασ τῶν κύρων ἀναγκασθήσας τὴν ἐπιστολήν κ. τ. λ. And in Joseph. 929, 36. καὶ δὴ ὅρις όρασ ὁ Γ. μεθὰν ἑκατομμυρίου τῆς ἀλληλεος, λέγεις δὲ κ. τ. λ. In our language, the word entreat is sometimes used in a way very similar to this acceptation.

64. σὺ ἔσται. A form of respectful answer and modest asent. So Euthym. το σὺ λέγεις, καὶ τὸ σὺ
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64. ἐὰς, καὶ ταῦτα ἴσως γίναι τις ὁδὸν ἐνεπιλήστε, καὶ μετὰ μεγαθυμονίαν. See note on 27, 12. The advent is here corroborated with a solemn prediction.

64. ἅστρον. Euthymius has rightly explained this μετὰ μεγαθυμονίαν, and Kuin. possid., non ita multo post, soon: which is confirmed by Luke 22, 69. and τὸ αὐτόν.

64. ἴσως γίναι τις ὁδὸν ἴσως γίναι τις ὁδὸν ἴσως γίναι τις ὁδὸν ἴσως γίναι τις ὁδὸν ἴσως γίναι τις ὁδὸν ἴσως γίναι τις ὁδὸν ἴσως γίναι τις ὁδὸν ἴσως γί

64. ἴσως γίναι τις ὁδὸν ἴσως γίναι τις ὁδὸν ἴσως γί

64. ἴσως γί

64. θεοtheta monitored by the system due to its significant length.
represented Xerxes as rending his vest through grief. So also Philippides ap. Plut. Demetr. 12. Δι’ οὗ ἀσέβωντα ἀ πέταν τιμήγα μέσος. And Appian. T. 2, 806, 73. καὶ τὴν ἐστίν τα καταρθύνον τὸ Πομήνης. See also Barnes on Eurip. Ion. 1208. And so Ovid. Heroic. 15, 192. "Eram lacero pectus aperta sinu." And 6, 27. "Protinus exilui, tunicisque a pectore nuptis." But, in this case, (as we are told by the Rabbinical writers,) the Priest was bound to tear his vest ab imo, and all that heard blasphemy even related were bound to rend their vests from the top to the bottom. These ἱμάτια of the High Priests were a pallium and tunics, which need not, however, be understood as rich Archieratical robes: for Braun de vest. sacer. Hebr. has shown that, out of the temple, and in their private dwellings, the High Priests used a dress not different from that of the other Jews. (Kuinoel Krebs, Wetstein, Wolf, and Koecher.)

66. ένοχος θανάτου ἐστὶ. The word ένοχος, which is derived from a similar sense in ένεχομεν signifies properly held fast, bound; (as in Herodot. 6, 56. crimen teneri;) but secondly, in a metaphorical sense, subject to, obnoxious to. So Hesych. ένεχομεν. It is sometimes used with the dative, as in Matth. 5, 21. & 22. Genes. 26, 11.; at other times with the genitive, as in the present passage, and Mark 3, 29. 14, 64. Thirdly, it denotes ὑπάτης, guilty, with the genitive or accusative, with or without a preposition, where the genitive bears the sense "respecting." Thus Plato de Legibus, cited by Dr. Owen, τῶν βασιλῶν ένοχος ἐσται. Hence may be defended the common reading in Dion. Hal. 1, 310, 35. aitioς τε εἶναι — ἀπλωλέκι, where some conjecture αξίους, but aitioς is there put for ὑπάτης, a signification not unfrequent in the Attic writers, (see Lex. Xenoph.) and also found in Homer.

In criminations which regarded Religion, there was still left to the Jews a power of capital punishments. Yet they were expected to send those whom
the Sanhedrim had condemned to the **Procurator**, in order that he might confirm the sentence*. In crimes, however, pertaining to the *laesa Caesaris majestas*, they had no power of life and death. This the Romans in every province reserved to themselves. Vide Joseph. B. 6, 5, 3. and Michael. on Capital Punishments, in the Syllog. Comment. 4, 231. (Kuin.) The penalty of blasphemy was stoning. But that mode of punishment might, in this instance, have excited a tumult. The Sanhedrim, therefore, resolved to persuade Pilate to let Jesus be crucified, as being equally amenable to the penalty *laesa majestatis*.

67. ἐνεπτυσάμεν εἰς τ. τ. α. A mark this of the extremest contempt, and even abhorrence. From the unnecessarily numerous examples of this custom in Wetstein I need only cite one, and that merely from its presenting some similarity to the case of our Redeemer. Seneca de Consol. 13. Ducebatur Athenis ad supplicium Aristides, cui quisque occurrerat dejiciebat oculos, et ingemiscebat, non tanquam in hominem justum, sed tanquam in *ipsam* justitiam animadverteretur. Inventus est tamen, *qui in faciem ejus inspureret*—ab illi abstersit faciem, et subridens ait, &c. Plutarch, 2, 189. Α. mentions that when Phocion was led to execution, one spat in his face, an indignity which was also offered to Diogenes and to Cato, as we learn from Seneca de Irâ, 8, 38.

67. ἐκολάφισαν—ἐφάπαξαν. See note on Matth. 5, 39. The difference in signification is, that the former designates a thump with the fist, the latter a slap with the palm of the hand. This has been (accurately as well as elegantly) described by Juvenatus, (cited by Heinsius,) "Et palmæ malis, colaphique in vertice crebri." Thus we have in Juvenal, "Nec pugnis cædere pectus Te veto, nec planâ fæ-

* The stoning of Stephen was a mere tumultuary and illegitimate proceeding.
ciens contundere palmæ." On these horrible indignities practised on the sacred person of the Redeemer of the world, Euthymius justly and elegantly observes: οἱ μὲν πᾶσαν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐνθημενόντα κακίαν, καὶ παιδικὰν ἐκιώναν καὶ αὐτὸν μακάλαι, καὶ ἢδειας τῆς λύπης ἐκφοβήσατο, ὥς δὲ πάντα μεγαλοπύχως ὑψέμενε, διδόσκαν ἀδέχεσθαι, καὶ ἦν παρ' ἐκεῖνος μὲν κακίας ὑπερβολῆς παρὰ τύμπαν δὲ ἀνεξίκοις.

68. προφήτευσον ἡμῖν, καὶ. There are many places in the Evangelists which, singly taken, could never have been understood, but must be explained from something which is expressed by another Evangelist; as here, Prophecy to us, thou Christ, who it is that smote thee. They said this after they had blindfolded him, Mark 14, 65. and Luke 22, 64. without the knowledge of which circumstance this part of their ἐμπαίγματος could not have been understood perfectly, and yet it is omitted by St. Matthew. So the High Priest's adjuring our Saviour by the living God is mentioned here (ver. 68.) by Matthew, but is omitted by Mark, who nevertheless gives our Saviour's answer in the same manner as if he had been adjured, 16, 62. So 27, 48. (Markl.) Campbell would translate divine, since there is here a declaration, not of what was future, but past. So Aristot. Rhet. 17. (cited by Grot. and Wets.) says of Epaminondas: περὶ τῶν ἐντολέων ὅπις ἐμὲν τεύετο, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν γεγονότων μὲν, ἀδύνατο δὲ. If any alteration of our common version were thought necessary, I should prefer guess. But these wretched mockers seem, (as Kuinoel has remarked,) to have used the word προφήτευσον like the other, Χειρὶ, ludibrium causis, since they knew that Jesus was commonly called by the Jews a Prophet.

69. wandlorn. This properly signifies girl, but it is used, as our maid, for maid-servant, i. e. ancilla. So Genes. 16, 2. Exod. 2, 5. 2 Kings 5, 2. Is. 24, 2. which is Hellenistic, or later Greek, and is censured by Thomas, Moeris, and Ammonius. This is the janitrix mentioned in Joh. 18, 17. That office was,
among the Greeks and Romans, confined to men, but, among the Jews, was sometimes exercised by women, as in 2 Sam. 4, 6. Acts 12, 18.

69. καὶ σὺ ζητήα μετὰ Ἰησοῦ. Thou also wast with Jesus. So the common Version, Doddridge, and Campbell. But I prefer, with Grotius, L. Brug. Ham. and Wets. "Thou wert one of Jesus's partisans." So 2 Kings 6, 16. 9, 32. This is also confirmed by John 18, 17. μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου; So also just after: καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἰ. On this formula, εἶναι μετὰ τῶν. See note on Matth. 12, 30. This is an interrogation of the maid whom we read of in John, or these words may be understood as spoken affirmatively, in the Hebrew manner, (as Grotius tells us,) or else, as Michaelis prefers, a note of interrogation must be put. I agree with Doddridge in thinking that the maid-servant must have guessed from Peter's countenance that he was one of his friends; unless possibly she had seen them together in the temple, or elsewhere.

70. οὐκ αδελθὲ τι λέγεις. Wets. compares Soph. Aj. 270. τοὺς ταύτ' ἔλεγες; οὐ κάτωθ', ἀκούς λέγεις.

71. ἐξελεύσατα ὅτε αὐτῶ. Accusative absolute. See Matth. Gr. Gr. Kuin. translates, cum exire vellat. Peter, who had been sitting among the apparatus, at the fire kindled in the hall, (which was, however, an open court,) Luke 22, 55. when he saw himself suspected, and feared lest, if he should longer delay, he might be remarked by more persons, and perhaps ill treated, wished to go out; but, when just in the act of moving from his place, he called to mind that perhaps he should thus incur greater suspicion, and be apprehended; he therefore altered his design, and remained. (Kuinoel.)

71. εἶσαι αὐτῶν ἄλλη. In Luke, ἔτερος. Where the person is uncertain, the masculine, ἔτερος, may be used; of which Grotius brings many examples. But St. Luke fixes it, by the reply of Peter: "Man, I am not." Therefore, rather say, the maid spoke to the standers by, on which one of the men accosts
Peter himself, saying, Σὺ, Thou art one of them. (Whitby.)

72. ἤρρησατο μεθ' ὅρκων, Ὁτι. So Hom. Π. ψ. ἤτρειτο στρεφός, ἐπὶ δ' ὅρκων ὁμοστεν. Ὁτι, like the Hebrew particles ὅ and ἄν, after verbs of swearing and affirming, denotes profecto, ἢ μὴν, ὦτας. Thus 1 Reg. 1, 30. where the Sept. has ὅτι, and Genes. 22, 17. 42, 16. where, in the Sept. for ὅ is ἢ μὴν. But in Gen. 28, 16. the Sept. expresses ἄν by ὅτι, and Sym. by ὦτας. In Gen. 44, 28. the Hebrew ἄν is rendered by the Sept. ὅτι. (Kuin.)

73. ἢ λαλία σου δέχων σε ποιεῖ. Not but that they were all Jews (says Jerome), yet every province has invariably its peculiar dialect, idioms, accent, tone of voice, &c. This, we may suppose, would be strongly marked in so remote, rude, and agricultural a province as Galilee; just as we find it the case in the North and West of England. In fact, we learn from Buxt. Lex. T. Pfeiffer, and Lightfoot Chor. that the Galilean dialect was of broad and rustic tone, and affected the pronunciation, not only of letters but of words. This is illustrated, from the Rabbinical writers, by Schoettg. and Wets. The dialect partook much of the Samaritan and Syriac idiom. It was very probably the tone, or what we call the brogue, that discovered Peter to be a Galilean, for the words which he had uttered were too few of themselves to bewray him. There is a very similar passage in Liv. 23, 34. Interrogatosque ser-mo prodit. Instead of bewrayeth thee, Campbell and Doddridge would render, "discovers thee." But that is very flat; besides, I cannot consent to part with so significant and venerable a word, used by many of our early writers, (especially Spencer, and which very well represents the force of the original. Thus in Spencer's Faerie Queene, cant 7. § 1.

"Like as the gentle heart itself bewrayes
   In doing gentle deeds with franke delight;
Even so the baser mind itself displayes
   In canered malice and revengeful spight."
ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. XXVI.

74. ὅπως ὁδὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Grotius remarks on the consternation which must have seized Peter, to have driven him to so incredible a falsehood, which Doddridge observes was unnecessary, and more like to entangle and discover rather than clear him. The expression might, however, be a popular idiom, (similar to one in our own language,) merely denoting that one has no connection with a person.

74. καταθεματίζειν, i.e. diras sibi imprecari. The full force of the word (which often occurs in the O. T.) is, "God do so to me, and more also, if it be so," &c. (Grot.) L. Brug. (less probably) defines it to be an anathema, i.e. excluded from the Synagogue. All the best, and indeed most of the MSS. read καταθεματιζειν, which is adopted by Griesbach. But I confess that I do not see how καταθεματίζειν can either be reconciled to analogy, or yield any sense suitable to the context. It is, besides, destitute of any authority, except that of the Ecclesiastical writers, who took it from their MSS. of the N. T. (See St. Thes.) The ἀνα might easily slip out, or be lost, by an inattention to a mark of abbreviation. In this case the authority of MSS. has little weight. The Fathers too would prefer καταθεματίζειν because it seems to signify less, and therefore does less discredit to Peter. But, if it have any signification, it must be the same as καταναθεματίζειν. Vater has done right in restoring the old reading. We must admit that Peter might well be alarmed, especially when he saw among the bystanders a relation of the very person whose ear he had cut off in the garden.

75. καὶ ἔξελθον. Φοβοῦμενος (says Euthymius) μὴ ἠτὸς κλιαῖν κατακληθῆ καὶ αὐτὸς, i.e. caught or detected as being one of Christ’s disciples (not apprehended, as Hentenius renders it). So also Calvin. But, perhaps, this is scarcely doing justice to the Apostle. He doubtless sought solitude, that he might pour forth his penitential tears. That this is the custom with those who would weep, we need not
be told, though Watts and Grotius give many examples, which it would be trifling to detail.

CHAP. XXVII.

Verse 1. τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς γεμομένης. Many Commentators think that the Sanedrimum, after condemning Jesus, departed to their own houses, in order to take refreshment and sleep, leaving Jesus with the guards. But it is unlikely, that in so short a time so many Senators should have gone to their houses, and so soon again met together from different, and, possibly, remote parts of the city. It seems more probable, that only those who were especially adverse to Christ were present at the examination, and that, at an early hour, the High Priest convoked the rest, in order that all might confirm the sentence, and deliberate how to put Jesus to death, through the medium of Pilate. (Rosenm.) This conjecture, however, to Kuinoel appears not necessary; for in the interval of time, while Christ was being apprehended and taken to Haman, the Council was collecting together at the house of Caiaphas. See 26, 57. and Grotius, who determines the sense of the words to be this: after Jesus had been heard, the Senators deliberated apart among themselves what was to be done; and has well observed, that the formula ἔξω αὐτῶν λαμβάνοις is also found in other passages, so used as to signify the counsel taken.

2. διήθητε αὐτῷ, ἀφεθῇ γὰρ. Kuinoel explains, “ordered him to be bound and led away, to be delivered to,” &c.

2. παρέδοκαν—Περί τοῦ Ἱερουσαλήμ. It must be observed, that in the time of the Republics the provinces were either Consular, i.e. such as had persons sent every year who had been Consuls; or Praetorian, to whom those were sent who had been Praetors. These proconsuls and propraetors had a common jurisdiction, so that they could not only collect the revenue, but administer the laws, exercise
judgment, and decide in trials which concerned life and death. But to these proconsuls was also committed a military power, of commanding armies, and carrying on war. Augustus, however, divided the provinces into two sorts, Cæsarean and Senatorial. And the proprætori (ἀριστοπρατῆγοι), who had also the appellation of Cæsar's Legates, governed the provinces which the Cæsars had, at the suggestion of Augustus, reserved to themselves (ἐπαρχίαις Кαίσαρος), and these were endued with the same authority as the proconsuls in the time of the republic. But proconsuls (ἀριστοκρατοί) presided over the provinces belonging to the Senate (ἐπαρχίαις τοῦ δημοῦ), not possessed of a power equal to that of the old proprætori. To provinces, however, of both kinds were sent persons of senatorial rank. Different from these presidents of the provinces, however, was another order of governors, namely, procuratores, ἐπίτροποι, vice-presidents, men of equestrian rank, though sometimes of the condition of freedmen, who, however, had such a sort of care entrusted to them, that some of them in the lesser provinces were entrusted with the proconsular authority, administered justice, and had power of life and death over the provincials. That this was the case in the province of Palestine we learn from Joseph. A. 8, 1, 1. & B. 2, 7, 1. where Coponius is stated to have possessed the power, which there is no reason to doubt was continued to his successors (and was here, in fact, exercised by Pilate), so however that the Procurator of Judæa was subordinate and subject to, the President of Syria. Thus we may understand how it happened that those who were properly, as Pontius Pilate, only ἐπίτροποι (and so he is called by Philo) might yet, without impropriety, be termed ἡγέμονες. (Krebs, Grot. Kuin. Rosenm. and Fisch.) See Bynkerschoeck's Obs. Jur. Rom. 2, 20.

3. metaplethelis. Grothus, Krebs, Loesner, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, justly reject the frivolous distinction made by some Commentators between μετά-
μελετας and μετανοειν. Whether Judas’s repentance was true, is another question: and this the language of Peter (Act. 1, 25.), of Jesus (Matth. 26, 24. and Joh. 17, 12.) almost forbids us to hope. See Euthym. His sorrow degenerated into despair, because he did not see how he could ever be forgiven. His intentions are, indeed, by most modern (as Whitby, Rosenm. Kuin.), and even some ancient Interpreters (as Theophylact and Euthymius), supposed to have been not so bad as they are commonly supposed. Some think it probable that he expected that Jesus would have delivered himself, miraculously, from his enemies, and that he might hope to be forgiven, from his intention not being corrupt. See Whitby, and others.

4. παραδός αἱμα ἀθανόν, have delivered an innocent man to death. An Hebrew and Hellenistic idiom, which has been copiously illustrated by Kypk. Kuinoel has well observed, that this circumstance is a most decisive testimony to the innocence of Jesus. For if any thing in his intentions, words, or actions, had been censurable, Judas would have readily laid hold on that handle to excuse the deed, and tranquilize his own mind. But, on the contrary, so far from finding any thing to blame, he finds every thing to approve, and he thinks it his bounden duty to evince his repentance by a public avowal of his own guilt, and the innocence of Jesus.

4. σοι δειπνει δει αἰτηθήτων. see thou to that. So Epict. 3, 10 (ap. Bulkley): “My brother ought not to use me so, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μεν ἐκεῖνος ἐπετήρα. Notwithstanding what Olearius and others urge, I am inclined to think, with Krebs, that it is a Latinism, “ tu videris.” So infra, 24. ὑμεῖς ἐπεστῆ. We, too, have the phrase (derived, perhaps, from the same source), “look ye to it;” “let him look to it.” So in Exod. 10, 10. “look to it.” Though, indeed, that is but a literal version of the Hebr. וַיַּעַֽדְנֵנ, by which it seems to have been common to the Hebrew writers. The Greeks (says Grot.) would have said σοι μελέτω. True; but they would
not have rejected the imperative, for which the future is here used, and in which the idiom consists. So Eurip. Iph. T. 502. ὄτε τεῦθ' ὃπα and Aristoph. Conc. 1081. πέρας σκόπει σοῦ.

5. καὶ—ἀνέθηκα. There has perhaps been more written on this passage than on any other in the Scriptures. Volumes (says Mr. Weston) have been published, whose titles may be seen in Wolf's Cur. Phil. and Koecher's Analecta. How unfixed were the opinions of the Fathers may be seen by referring to Suarez's Thesaurus, or even to Euthymius and Theophylact. The older Commentators, with the Vulgate, &c. support the sense, "he hanged himself." As this, however, has been thought inconsistent with Luke (Act. 1, 18.), many methods have been devised of reconciling this contradiction:

I. Pricæus, Vorstius, and others, maintain that ἀνέθηκα is to be explained, "died of grief," or laid violent hands on himself. But most of the passages adduced in support of that interpretation admit of the sense to hang oneself. That it is not necessary to resort to this rare and questionable use, will appear from what I shall have occasion to observe further on.

II. Gron. and Cler. take the word in the common sense, hanged himself: but that his body, when tossed into the barathrum destined for the carcases of suicides, was, in being hurled downwards, dashed upon some sharp stones, and thus the stomach was burst. But Perizonius has truly objected, that there was no such barathrum at Jerusalem, and that the carcasses were left sub dio.

III. Alberti renders ἀνέθηκα, suspendit se; and in the Acts, προῆς γενόμενος, with the Vulgate and Er. Cast. suspendus; and maintains, that the word ἔκδικος denotes that Judas, after he had hanged himself, either from the rope breaking, or being improperly fixed, fell down from on high, and lighting on a sharp stone, or trunk of a tree, was thus burst in the middle. But προῆς always denotes falling on the
face, which cannot here be the sense. Dan. Heins. and Grot. think that it may mean died of grief and the stings of conscience. But this is refuted by the participle ἀπεθανὼν, which plainly indicates that an action is declared by the verb ἀπέθανεν. It is also at variance with what follows. Salmasius takes ἀπεθανεν in the sense of hanging, but maintains, that Matthew means suicide by hanging, and Luke by throwing himself headlong. But Perizonius rightly observes, that that is not untying, but cutting, the knot. Heinrich and Rosenm. however, think that there was a two-fold tradition (see Kuin.), and that vv. 18 & 19. were an addition of Luke *. I need not detail the very frivolous hypotheses of Boltin, Paulus, and Wakefield. Mr. Weston (ap. Bowyer) offers what he calls a new translation, namely, "he strangled himself, or gave himself the bow-string." "Every man (says he) that is hanged is strangled, but every man that is strangled is not hanged." True; but that is taking for granted a sense that ought to be proved, and which, I think, cannot be proved; nay, which, if proved, would not suit the context. As to new, it has no pretensions to novelty. It had been thrown out before, and was adopted by Campbell, whose reasons, however, weigh but light in the balance. Lightfoot (and, since his time, Warneccius, &c.) maintained the wild notion, that Judas was caught up into the air by the Devil (after leaving the Temple); and then strangled, and thrown headlong down; so that his bowels were burst, &c.

After mature consideration, I do not hesitate to acquiesce in the opinion that, after all, the common interpretation, hanged himself, is to be retained, that being the perpetual sense of ἄπανθρακευται. From the proper and usual sense of any word we are not at liberty to recede, unless the context compels us to seek for another signification. Kuinoel, who retains the common interpretation, also argues, that ἄκρον is

* The foregoing statement is chiefly founded on Kuinoel's valuable Collectanea.
may be taken not only of one who falls on his face, or tumbles head foremost, but (impropriè) of one qui è superiori loco præceps delabitur; as in Jos. B. 6, 1, 1. Hom. Od. ε. 374. I add; from Schl. Lex. Hesiod. Clyp. 365. Matthew and Luke may be reconciled, by supposing that Matthew mentions the kind of death, and Luke the event of it. Judas, from grief, and the mental agony caused by a wounded conscience, did suspend himself from a rope; but, from some circumstance (which may be variously conjectured) the rope broke, and he, falling from a high place, his belly burst, &c. So Apulej. 1. p. 12.

In this opinion I must finally acquiesce, since it involves the least difficulty. See more in the note on the passage of Act. 1, 18.

6. βαλεῖν—εἰς τὸν κορβανάν. The word κορβανάν is Syriac, and signifies, properly, a gift*; and was specially applied to gifts offered to the sacred treasury (Mark 7, 11.), and sometimes denoted the treasury itself†, (Jos. B. 2, 9, 4.) which consisted of several chests, deposited in the Court of the Gentiles. It has been thought that Judas, by throwing down the thirty shekels in the ναὸς, among the Priests, meant to cast the money in corban, in order to expiate, in some measure, the atrocity of his crime. They, however, would not receive it, it being prohibited by the law, to deposit in the sacred treasury any money arising from base or unlawful gains; so they interpreted the precept. See Deut. 23, 19. and Talmud. 112. It is true, that there it is only forbidden for the pretium stupri to be put into the sacred treasury: but in the Jewish law idolatry, fornication, and murder, are crimes usually classed together. By so doing, however, (observes Grot.) they condemned them-

* From the Hebr. יר, an offering, from ור, to approach; in Hiphil, to offer. It therefore simply denoted (aliquid) oblatum, these nouns in י or ו having usually the force of participles passive.
† The contrary takes place in θησαυρός, which signifies primarily, the treasury: 2dly, the treasure.
selves, since they execrated that in the seller, of which they were themselves the buyers.

7. συμβούλιον λάβοντες. I assent to Kuinoel, that all this happened after the crucifixion of Jesus, and is here mentioned per prolepsin, on account of its connection with the subject.

7. τοῖς ξένοις. This is explained by Menochius, Grotius, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, foreign Jews, sojourning at Jerusalem for religious or other purposes. For as to Gentile foreigners, Grotius thinks that the Priests would take little care about them: which may be very true; but as they could not refuse them interment, and would not chuse that various places should be polluted by their sepulchres, they would be desirous to confine them to one place. Hence I prefer the exposition of L. Brug. Beza, Piscator, Wagenseil, and Schlesusner, Gentiles, foreigners, (Eph. 2, 12. Hebr. 11. 13. ξένοι καὶ παρειδημοί. So also the Sept. translates Hebrew words denoting an alien, foreigner, &c.) who observe that the Jerusalemites would scarcely have refused to Jews the use of their burying-ground, and that it is so much the more probable that Gentiles should here be spoken of, since we know that their number had, during the reign of Herod and his successors, greatly increased, and there must have been difficulty in disposing of the corpses.

7. ἄγαρος — τὸν ἄγαρον τοῦ κεφαλέως. The article expresses a particular field known by such a name; so called (as is probably conjectured) from having been formerly the site of a pottery. The price may seem small; but this may be accounted for by supposing that the soil had been so entirely exhausted by the potters, that nothing remained but clay, gravel, &c. which, however, would leave it suitable enough for the purposes of a burial-ground.

8. ἔκληθη — ἄγαρὸς αἰῶνας, was commonly called, &c. The field was in the time of Jerome still recognised and pointed out. Wettstein compares Antonin. Liber. Metan. 23. λέγεται δὲ ὁ τόπος παραδειγμάτων
And Bulkley Liv. 8. Sub terram—de fossa scelerato campo. Credo. He observes, that at Athens a place called the Ceramicus (or potter’s field, no doubt from having been once so employed), was used as a burial-place for those who died in the service of their country.

9. τὸ ἐγένετο διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου. On this passage various opinions have been entertained. See Pole, Wolf, and Koecher. These words are not found in Jeremiah: but there is something not dissimilar in Zach. 11, 12. which has induced some to suppose that the name Ἰερεμίου is corrupted by abbreviation for Ζριου (i.e. Ζαχαρίου.) But these abbreviations are not found in the most ancient MSS. and of those extant only one has Ζαχαρίου. Others are of opinion that Matthew simply wrote διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, (as often*), and that the name was afterwards added by those who had found a passage similar in some writing of Jeremiah now lost: which is thought to be confirmed by Jerome†, whose words are these: “Legi nuper in quodam Hebraico volumine, quod Nazarensæ sectæ mihi Hebræus obtulit, Hieremiæ apographum, in quo hæc ad verbum scripta reperi, sed tamen mihi videtur magis de Zacharia sumptum testimonium.” There are vestiges of this passage in Woide’s Coptic Lexicon. This opinion, which seems the most probable, is embraced by Rosenm. Kuinoel thinks that the words are taken from some work of Jeremiah then in being, but now lost. Euthymius says that the passage was written in some unpublished prophecy of Jeremiah. If there were a greater similarity between these words and the passage of Zacharia, I should

* This is confirmed by some MSS. and by the Syriac Version, which has no name. It would seem too, (says Campbell,) from a remark of Augustin, that some copies in his time had no prophet named.

† We know not whether the passage was not derived from the Gospel of St. Matthew. That would depend upon the age of the MSS. and whether the passage was in the margin, or had the appearance of an interpolation.
be inclined to think that the Evangelist wrote Ἰερεὺς for Ἰακείφδ for Mede has proved that the four last chapters of Zachariah were written by Jeremiah; and Dr. Owen says that this is a fact known among the Jews.

9. τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετμημένου, "valued, purchased." Spoken ironically, thinks Cler. The word not only signified to value, set a price upon, but to buy, purchase, by metalepsis. Schl. Lex. gives some examples from the Classical writers. Wetstein adduces one from Thucyd. 1, 39. πρὸ τολλὰν χρημάτων—ἐτμημαθεῖ, where the Scholiast interprets, ἡγοράσατε. So I would explain Herodot. 5, 77. ἔλυσαν σφέας δίμωνας ἀποτιμημένην, where the conjecture of Schweigh is confirmed by a similar passage of Appian, 2, 576, 59. τετρακοσίας ἀνὴρ τετρακόσιαν προϊγκαθού ἀποτιμᾶσθαι τὰ ὁντα, i.e. value the effects at. On the true sense and construction of the passage, there is much acuteness and ingenuity in the observations of Campbell, who thus translates: "The thirty shekels, the stipulated price at which he was valued, I took, as the Lord appointed me from the sons of Israel, who gave them for the potter's field." I entirely approve of the ingenious solution that has been given by Knatchbull, and read ἔδωκαν in the third person plural, not as coupled by the conjunction with ἔλαβον, but as belonging to a separate clause; in which case the version will be literally as follows: "I took the thirty shekels, (the price of him that was valued, whom they valued,) from the sons of Israel, (and they gave them for the potter's field,) as the Lord appointed me." For taking ἔλαβον in the first person there is the authority of the Syriac and Persian Versions, and it is adopted by Reichard. See more in Campbell. Rosenm. however, and Kuinoel, rightly adhere to the old mode of taking ἔλαβον in the third person, and translate: "Accepte-runt triginta siclos, prætium æstimati, quem æstima-verunt Israelitæ, et emptus est ager figilinus, sicut mihi præcepit dominus." After ἀνὴρ τῶν ὦν Ἰσραήλ,
they understand tınes. Compare Euthymiou. One ob-
jection I must make; namely, that Kuin. would sub-
aud oculos lægo at the end of the sentence. But this is
inadmissible as an ellipsis. We may indeed suppose
an aposiopesis: which would, however, be harsh.

11. ἤστως ἔστη ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ ἡγεμόνου. A judicial
term; as in Acts 25, 10. ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος Καίσαρος
ἔστως εἰμι. And 26, 6. ἐστηκε κρίνομενος. So the La-
tin stare, of which Price has examples from Horace
and Gellius.

11. καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν — Ἰουδαίων; The Priest put
this interrogation, because the Jews had accused Je-
sus as a rebel, who had perverted the people by se-
ditious notions, and especially instilled into them
the opinion that he was a King, and to be preferred
to Cæsar. (Kuin.) It has been debated what lan-
guage was used by Pilate in the trial and condemna-
tion. The matter has been diligently examined by
Joha. Eckhard, who has ascertained, from the custom
of the Roman Empire then in use, that it was in the
Latin language, and that he, in addressing both Je-
sus and the people, (who only understood the He-
brew Chaldee dialect,) did it through the medium of
an interpreter.

11. This verse, and the whole of the following
passage, is copiously and judiciously treated by Eu-
thymiou, who has, from a comparison of the other
Evangelists, skilfully adjusted the harmony, and
ably illustrated the series and connexion of events.
Kuinoel observes, that the narrative of Matthew
(which is very brief) must be supplied from John 18,
29. seqq. and he subjoins the following statement of
the circumstances, arranged from both those Evan-
gelists. The Sanhedrim vehemently desired that
Jesus should be put to a capital execution, and that
by the Romans. (See note on 26, 66.) After they
had gone to the prætorium with Jesus, and had
called Pilate out, (see Joh. 18, 29.) they endea-
voured to move him by a tone of authority, and to
induce him, without any further examination of the
case, to condemn Jesus to die, whom the Sanhedrin had adjudged to be deserving of death, and thus be the executor of their sentence. But Pilate lent no very patient ear to these importunate demands. Much had he heard of Jesus, his sanctity and probity, of the hatred with which the Rulers of the people persecuted him; nor was he ignorant of what had happened a few days before. (See Matth. 21, 10—16. C. 23.) The very aspect of Christ, whose face represented the most unruffled internal tranquility, inspired the Roman Procurator with admiration. He indeed regarded Jesus as an imprudent fanatic, yet not at all dangerous to the Romans. As to the Jews, and especially those worst of dissimlers, the Priests, them he despised. Nor did he doubt that, from mere envy and hatred, Jesus had been so furiously accused, and delivered up to death, by those whose corrupt morals he had publicly rebuked. Hence, since he did not care to entangle himself, or take part, in Jewish questions, he ordered them to depart, and, if Jesus was, in their opinion, deserving of castigation and punishment; if he had offended against their institutions and religion, to go and punish him themselves by their own laws. For the Jews could scourge with rods in their synagogues offenders of that kind, (see 10, 17.) but to punish with death, either by stoning or otherwise, they had not the power, unless their sentence were confirmed by the procurator. (See on 26, 66.) But now, when the Sanhedrin saw that they could effect nothing in this way, they began to accuse Jesus as a very dangerous person, who had stirred up tumults in the province: they said he had violated the Roman laws, affected regal power, and called himself the Messiah, the King of the Jews. (See Luke 23, 2.) Pilate, however, smiling; (since he saw that the person present was of the plebeian caste, and knew that he had neither military forces nor strong garrisons,) asked Jesus whether he were the King of the Jews? To this Jesus replied, ςτο λέγεις, recte, summe
rex. (See 26, 64.) Pilate had, it seems, hoped that Jesus would deny that he was affecting regal domination, and if he had denied, he could not have been condemned, unless convicted by the clearest proofs; and thus Pilate would have acquitted him. However, when Jesus had affirmed that he was a King, Pilate, little heeding the clamour and tumults of blood-thirsty accusers, immediately returned to the praetorium, and gave orders for Jesus to be brought to him there. See Joh. 18, 33. (Kuinoel.)

11. σὺ λέγεις. To Theophylact, Camerarius, and Casaubon, there appears an ambiguity in this phrase, which Theophylact thinks a wise ambiguity. For Jesus neither says I am nor I am not, but μέσως τῶν: and he proceeds to observe, τότε γὰρ διδασκαλεί καὶ οὕτω νοηθήναι, ὅτι, εἰμὶ καθὼς λέγεις· καὶ οὕτως, ὅτι, ἐγὼ μὲν τότῳ οὐ λέγω, σὺ δὲ λέγεις. But I rather assent to Grotius, Piscator, L. Brug. Pric. Rosenm. and Kuin. that there is no ambiguity, but that it is a formula of modest assent. So Euthymius: τὸ σὺ λέγεις, καὶ τὸ σὺ ἐλέης, καὶ τὰ τοιαύτα, ἡμολογία τις ἐστὶν ἀνεκπίληστος, καὶ μετὴ μεταφρασθής. Price compares the tu dixit in Plautus; and Casaubon that exquisitely delicate admission in Euripides, (Hippol. 352. Monk.) where the Nurse asks Phaedra if Hippolytus is the person with whom she is in love? She answers, σὸν ταῦτα, οὐκ ἐρωτεῖς. On a principle, similar to this, may be explained the import of our affirmatives aye and yes; which are both, I conceive, derived from the old French ayex. The sense, therefore, is this: "You say right; I am a King." This avowal was made after Jesus had declared that his kingdom was not of the kind that the kingdoms of the world are, i.e. not civil or political. Joh. 18, 36. Since Jesus then (says Grot.) confesses himself to be King, it cannot be denied that his Kingdom commenced at the period when he began to teach. For thus he himself, in John, interprets the word kingdom. (Grot.) This is indeed clear from the sense of the formula βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν,
whose true import I have before explained. This is (adds Grot.) the καλή ὁμολογία mentioned by Paul, 1 Tim. 6, 13.

12. οὖν ἀπεκρίνατο. The cause of the silence, besides the deliberate awaiting for death, was this: that, with a judge of probity and integrity, this whole accusation would have vanished of its own accord. For the circumstance of his lowly condition, and his being destitute of forces and garrisons, was sufficient to exempt him from all suspicion. But if (as it turned out) Pilate chose to gratify the Jews at the expense of his integrity, any defence were superfluous. (Grot.) Euthymius well remarks, that the Sanhedrim had delivered Jesus to Pilate, not for trial, but for condemnation: πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν, οὐ πρὸς ἐξέτασιν.

12. ἐν τῷ κατηγορεῖται α. δ. τ. 'A. This, it must be remembered, was the second and more vehement accusation, and contained a charge of sedition: a dangerous accusation in the reign of the jealous Tiberius, and especially as the Jews were in a state of tumult, and ripe for insurrection.

14. That he might interrogate the accused more freely, and gain a more accurate knowledge of the nature of the case, (or, as Euthymius observes, μυστικατερὸν τι μαθεῖν βουλόμενος,) Pilate ordered Jesus to come to him at the praetorium, and then the repeated avowal of Christ that he was a King, (Joh. 18, 36.) probably brought to the Procurator's mind the stoical dogmas, μόνος ὁ σοφὸς ἐλεύθερος, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἄφρων δοῦλος. Cic. Paradox. 5. αὐτάρκης ἡ ἀρετὴ πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν. Cic. Paradox. 2. μόνος ὁ σοφὸς πλούσιος. Ib. 6. Quisnam igitur liber sapiens, &c. Hor. Epp. 1, 1, 59. add. Carm. 2, 9 ss. So that by this very profession of Jesus, as well as by the rest of his conversation, (see Joh. 18, 36.) Pilate being confirmed in his opinion of the innocence and probity of Jesus, but thinking him nevertheless a fanatic, he departed from the praetorium with Jesus, and testified to the Sanhedrim that he could find in him no cause of
death. (Joh. 18, 33—38. Luke 23, 4. seq.) Now, however, the Sanhedrim, whose hatred was embittered by this testimony of Pilate, strove to extort, by clamours, what they could not obtain by representations, and, with infuriate shouts, demanded his life. (Matth. 27, 12. Luke 23, 5.) He had (exclaimed they) throughout Galilee and Judæa studied to excite disturbances, had tampered with the populace, and strove to excite a general insurrection.

14. οὐκ ἀπεκαθή αὐτῷ πρὸς οὐδὲ ἐν βῆμα, i. e. nullam rem, (ऋ), criminatum. The student will observe, οὐδὲ ἐν is more emphatical than οὐδὲν.

15. εἰδοθεὶ ὁ ἰησοῦν ἀπολύειν ἑνα——κατ’ ἐντού, There are two questions, connected with the determination of the sense of this passage; namely, whether by κατ’ ἐντού, we are to understand any feast, or only the Paschal. Secondly, whence originated the custom? As to the first question, Beza, Simon, &c. think it may denote all the feasts. But Grotius, and nearly all the other Commentators, think that it denotes only the Passover, so called κατ’ ἐξοχήν, as appears also from John 18, 39. who has ἐν τῷ πάσχα, otherwise, indeed, the plural would have been used *. The second question is of more difficult determination. Many Commentators maintain that this was was an ancient custom of the Israelites, introduced in memory of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and preserved (on the subjugation of Judæa) by Augustus and his successors. They refer to Joh. 18, 39. ἐστὶ συνθέεια υἱῶν. But Grotius justly objects, that the Law was χωρὶς οἰκτημων, (Hebr. 10, * The κατά cannot, as some have thought, contribute to determine the question, since its force here is what is called distributive, and is used of what recurs seriatim. Thus it is usual with numerals, and nouns of time, as κατά καιρῶν, κατ’ ἡν τὸν, κατ’ ἐνστρόφον, κατά μήνα, καθ’ ἡμερὰν. Hence it is well adapted to names of festivals regularly recurring. De Dieu thinks it denotes universality. But that is only by the ellipsis of πᾶς or ἐκστρόφος. It may also be observed, that in this idiom the article is invariably omitted, which would otherwise have been here expressed, as it is in Matth. 26, 5. μὴ ἐν τῇ ἐστρέ.
23.) δεῖ γὰρ τὸ ἀσώτητον ἔχει. And this position he copiously illustrates by numerous examples. Others (as Grot. and Rosenm.) think that it originated with the Romans, (who at the Lectisternia loosed the bonds of the captives,) and was granted to the Jews by Augustus. But (as Reland objects) at the Lectisternia not one but all the captives were loosed from chains. See Liv. 5, 18. By Spencer, and some others, this custom has been derived from the Greeks, and something similar to it may be found in the celebration of the Thesmophoria among the Athenians. Far more probable, however, is the opinion of Carpzov, Hottinger, Stock, and others, that the custom was introduced by the Syrian conquerors into Judæa, and that the Romans, finding it firmly established, did not care to abolish it, but continued it. In imitation of which; or of the Lectisternia, the Christian Emperors of Rome released from bonds at Easter all prisoners, except those confined for very flagrant offences. Similar customs among the Gentiles have been remarked and illustrated by Lomeir, Adaim, Lydius, Triller, Fabricius, and others, referred to by Wolf and Koecher.

16. εἰχόν, for εἴχαν, they had, i.e. the people had. A Hebraism, says Kuinoel; who refers to Vorstius and Leusden. But the idiom is common to the popular phraseology in all languages.

16. δέσιμον ἐπισήμα, notorious. Ἐπισήμος signifies, 1. signatus, marked, stamped, as of money; 2. notabilis, remarkable, in a good sense, as opposed to ἄσημος; 3. remarkable, in a bad sense, notorious. Though in the Classical Greek it is seldom used, but with some addition expressive of crime, &c. (So in all the examples of Schl. and Wets.) The Latin use, (as in famosus, nobilis, and inclitus,) corresponds exactly to this idiom. So Wetstein cites from Apuleius, latro inclitus, famosus prædo: and from Cicero vitiiis nobiles. Otius, pressing too much on the primary signification, collects from it, that Barabbas was marked on the face or back with.
a black theta: which I should have thought too absurd to mention, had it not been noticed, with no mark of disapprobation, by Schleusner, in his Lex.

17. συνηγμένως αὐτῶν, i.e. the Sanhedrin, with the people standing by; as we collect from ver. 20. Luke 23, 13.; and, as we find from Josephus, was usual. (Grotius.)

18. ἥδει γὰρ, i.e. as well from his good reputation as from his present moderation, and that no crime had been proved against him. (Grotius.)

19. καθημένου—ἐν τοῦ βήματος. A tribunal, or suggestus, raised several steps, and often formed of stone, sometimes marble, on which the seat or throne, of the president, when exercising judgment, was placed. This was always sub dio. For the Roman custom was, that causes should be heard in the prætorium, or the president’s house, but judgment should be pronounced publicly on a βήμα erected in some lofty and conspicuous spot in the vicinity of the prætorium. (Rosenm. and Kuinoel.) Grotius thinks that this circumstance took place, not in the last examination, at which Christ was condemned to be crucified, but in the former one, which, it seems, was followed by a conference of Pilate with his council, (who sat in a place separated from the βήμα by a veil,) whether scourging (called in Acts 22, 24. μάστιγιν ἀντάξιον) should be resorted to questionis ergo. Of this custom there is a vivid description in Chrys. Or. 13. de statuis. Pilate seems to have hoped that, by this flagellation, the people would have been moved to compassion: it was, however, necessary to veil this injustice under the semblance of legality. As to what some say, that this flagellation formed part of the capital punishment, that does not consist with Roman customs. We learn too from John, that some period intervened after the flagellation before Christ was condemned to be crucified. As to the word φασινησσασ, in ver. 26. it is said per retrogressionem. There is, therefore, no necessity to resort to the improbable supposition
that Christ, in so short a space of time, was twice scourged. (Grotius.)

19. ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέστειλε, λέγουσα. Her name was Claudia Procula. The custom (says Grot.) had arisen from the age of Augustus to the time of Tiberius, that the procurators and presidents should be accompanied by their wives. Tacitus remarks, "ab his negotia suscipi; transigi; duorum egressus coli; duo esse praetoria." A similar story of a wife having a dream, and sending a message to her husband when upon the bench, &c. is related by Appian. B. C. 2, p. 814. and Valer. Max. 1, 7. It has been much debated by Theologians whether this dream was preternatural, or natural. The former is maintained by the Fathers, and most Commentators, as Grotius, L. Brug. Maldonati, Adam, Wolf, and Basnage. Some recent Commentators adopt the latter hypothesis, and account for it from natural causes, as Kuinoel. Ignatius, Beda, Pope Benedict, and Mr. Fleming, ascribe it to the Devil! Risum teneatis amici?

"To laugh were want of goodness and of grace,
And to be grave exceeds all power of face."

Kuinoel thinks, that the woman whom Grotius supposes to have been εἰσεθῆς, had heard narrations of the words and deeds of Christ, of the deadly hatred and base machinations of the Synedrium against him, of his being seized and condemned by the Jews; and that these events so strongly affected her that, while asleep, her disturbed mind had presented to her images which had greatly agitated her.

19. μηδέν σοι—τῷ δικαίῳ, i. e. have nothing to do with the cause of this just person. So Euthymius subauds ἄμφισβητήμων. A formula (says Raphel) used of not implicating oneself in a business that does not belong to one.

19. πολλά—ἐπαθον, many things. E. V. Rather, much. So the Greek Classics frequently; ex. gr. Athen. p. 7. b. πολλά κακοπαθήςας. Then σήμερον signifies this (last) night; as in Mark 14, 13. σήμερον ἐν τῇ νυκτί.
23. ἐπεισάκ τοὺς ὄχυρος. Schleusner well renders, suaserunt populo. The word here denotes suadere, persuadere conari. For πειθω has both those senses, which in Latin are denoted by suadere and persuadere. I must observe, by the way, that πειθω seems to denote, properly, to push, urge, impel, and appears to be cognate with the Hebrew נהנ. As to suadeo, which the Latin etymologists so absurdly derive from suavis, its origin is, I think, not to be found either in the Latin or in the Greek; but must be sought for in the Northern languages, namely, in the A. S. swaegen, Icelandic sweigen, Germ. schweben, North Scotch swigen, to incline, bend, &c. Hence our word to sway, i. e. to bias, of which examples, both in the natural and figuraiive sense, are given by Dr. Johnson in his Dictionary. That the Priests should have been successful in persuading the people, is not to be wondered at, since we learn from Josephus, that great was their influence with them. How inconstant is the aura popularis is proverbial; so that we need not be surprised, that the same people who had just before shouted "Hosanna to the Son of God," should now have exclaimed, "let him be crucified." Rosenmuller and Kuinoel suggest other causes for this change of opinion, whom see. Yet we may suspect that they were not exactly the same persons. The first crowd was composed in a great measure of the better inclined people from the country. This consisted almost entirely of the Jerusalemites, and of those doubtless the very worst picked out, and suborned by the Priests for this very purpose. Such prepared mobs have not been unfrequent in any age.

21. ἀιτεῖνε, not answering them, but addressing them. The true ratio loci is illustrated by the following remark of Euthymius: ἡρωτησε πρῶτον ὦτας ἰεροπρεπῶν, ἀρχιερεῖς πρὸς τὸ μνήμα τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ, πάλιν ἐπανεῖλαβε τὴν ἡρωτήσεως. In fact, he had given them their choice, whether of the two to release,
and while they were considering, he was occupied respecting the message from his wife, after which he, again addressing them, demands to know on which of them their choice had fallen.

21. Τίνα θέλετε ἀπὸ τῶν δύο. The Hellenistic writers use the words τίς and ποτέρον indiscriminately. But not so the Classical authors. Our translation has correctly rendered it whether: but which would have better represented the idiom.

24. τί γὰρ κακῶν ἐ. Krebs tells us, that we may regard the γὰρ, joined with an interrogation, as expressive of surprise and disapprobation, there being, he says, an ellipsis of some words expressing a refusal of the request. It is not (as he tells us) a Hebraism, but is usual in the best Greek writers, from whom examples are produced by Krebs. Our language had formerly this idiom, for why? which is still retained by the vulgar.

24. θάρυσος γινεται. Pilate, perhaps, was rather apprehensive of an insurrection; a fear, indeed, unworthy of a Roman, and a magistrate of firmness, but which considerably lessens his blame in comparison with the blood-thirsty cruelty of the Jews. Grot.; who evidently views the conduct of Pilate in a less unfavourable light than is usually done. I must not omit to observe, that μάλακνος is very wrongly rendered by Beza, Piscator, and some others, majorem tumultum. Our translation has correctly represented the same by rather, a signification which often occurs in Thucydides and the best writers.

24. δίκαιον τοῦτον. The E. Tr. translates, “of this just person.” Campbell, from Casaubon and Le Clerc, renders, “of this innocent person.” “The forensic sense (says he) of the Heb. word מש, and, consequently, of the Gr. δίκαιος, adopted as equivalent, is no more than innocent, or not guilty of the crime whereof he stands accused. This appears, from many places of the Old Testament which relate to judicial proceedings, particularly Deut. 25, 1. and Prov. 17, 15. where it is contrasted with a word
commonly rendered wicked, and which, in its forensic meaning, denotes no more than guilty of the crime charged." The above observations, so far as they respect the forensic sense of ἰδικαίον, may be very true: but I cannot consent to restrain the word to that sense in the present passage. For I can by no means agree with him, "that Pilate does not appear to have had any knowledge of our Lord's character," than which nothing is more improbable. Perhaps the forensic and the common sense are here conjoined, and we may render "this innocent and just person."

24. ἀπενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας. To designate purity by the element water was frequent, and very natural. Hence those who were contaminated by any crime used to be ἱεροφανεῖς ἑρῴασθαι. (Grot.) Washing was usual among the Greeks and Romans, on the commission of any involuntary crime, such as homicide, in order to expiate the offence. So Schol. on Soph. Aug. 663. Wets. refers also to Dion. Hal. 7. Deut. 21, 6. Ps. 26, 6. Act. 20, 26. Susan. 46. To this purpose there is also a very fine passage in Eurip. Hippol. 653. ἀγα τῶν νασμοὺν ἐξομήξομαι, Εἰς ἀτο ἱλίμα. See note on 3, 6. Casaubon, Buxtorf, and Scaliger think he adopted the custom, as prevalent in Judea. But I am rather inclined to suppose, with Spencer and Wolf, that he followed the Gentile custom. For the rite was not frequent in Judea, and was accommodated only to peculiar occurrences. Not that Pilate thought by this he should be pure of the crime: that opinion had already been exploded by the more intelligent heathens. (Wolf.) Heinsius says that he did it, not to testify innocence, but to acquire it. It may most simply, I think, be regarded as a symbolical action (such as I have before remarked), signifying that he would not be answerable for the blame incurred. By this symbolical action the Jews, too, were accustomed to express their being guiltless of, and not participating in, any crime. See Deut. 21, 6. Of this custom, whether it were Gre-
cian or Jewish, Pilate could not be ignorant. See Lomier de Lustrat. 74. and Elsner.

24. ἀθῶς εἰμι ἄρ ν τοῦ αἰματος, q. d. the blame of this enormity is not mine, but yours, who compel me to it. It is yours; see you to it: on you must fall the consequences. That the people so understood Pilate is plain, from the words of their answer, "his blood be upon us. Observe the double Hebraism. Αἷμα is for cædes. 'Αθῶ is like the Hebr. ̀ש. 'Αθῶς too is of recent and Hellenistic use for καθάρος or ἀκατίος (as elsewhere in the N. T. and O. T.), where-as the ancient Classical writers use it for unhurt, άγχος. How far Pilate was blameable, in his present conduct, has been variously maintained. The opinions of ancient Commentators are more favourable than those of the modern. Worthy of attention are the observations of Euthymius and Theophylact. Euthym. p. 1097. καὶ γὰρ ἂν μὲν μισοῦντος ὁ Πιλατος, καὶ σφόδρα ήθικὴν εξελέφθαι τῶν Ἰησοῦν μαλακῶς δε ἀν ἐπείδου ταῖς ἐκείνων ὀρμαίς. Theophyl. ὁ Πιλατος ἐστοϋδαιζεν ἀπολύσαι Χριστον, εἰ καὶ μαλακάτερον τὸ δόμον, ἔδει γὰρ ἐντυμαι αὐτὸν εἰπερ τὸν ἀληθεύς. And on his offering to remit his death (as a criminal), he observes, ὅτε δὲικνυται δι’ μαλακάτερον ἂν εἶπε γὰρ αὐτῷ προκοβινεύσαι τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ. διὰ τούτο ὅν καὶ ἡμιο κατακρίνετο, αἰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν συγκαλυφᾶς.

25. τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς. A form like that which was used among the Jews, both by judges and witnesses, who, holding their hands over the head of the condemned person, said, "your blood be on your own head." 2 Reg. 2, 37. (Wolf.) Similar forms of imprecation are produced by Scheid. ap. Meuschen. N. T. ɔ Talm. illustr. 196. De Rhoer Fer. Dav. &c. ap. Koecher. Blood be upon any one is equivalent to being guilty of that blood or homicide: so here the phrase signifies, "we will hold ourselves and our children accountable for his blood; let the blame and the punishment rest with us." Elsner has noticed (from Demosth.) a similar custom as prevalent among the Athenians, namely, that of devoting
themselves and their children to curses, if they should accuse falsely. And the same form was received elsewhere among the Gentiles. Wets. remarks, that it was a customary form of swearing among the Athenians, and cites Demosth. adv. Aristocr. πρωτον μὲν διεξαγόμενα κατ᾽ ἐξολοθρεῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ γένοις καὶ οἴκιας—ἀλλ᾽ ἔιν ἐξελεγχὸς τὴν ἐπιφορκίαν ἐπενεγκάμενοι τῶν ἑαυτοῦ πατρινή, καὶ τῶ γένει adv. Conon. φασι γὰρ παραστασάμεναι τοὺς παιδίας αὐτῶν κατὰ τούτους ἀμείωθαι καὶ ἄρας τίνας δενῶς καὶ χαλεπάς ἐπαφάσασθαι. Andocides O. 1. καὶ ἐπηευκοῦσαν εὐφορκοῦντι ἔναι καὶ γένος in Fœd. Smyrn. & Magnetum. εὐφορκοῦντι μὲν μοι εὖ εἰς ἐπιφορκώντες δὲ ἐξελεγχοῦν καὶ αὐτῷ καὶ γένει τῶ ἐξ ἐμοῦ. Il. 8. 161. See Spanheim in Arist. Ran. 594. J. Arndt. Misc. 68. and Lomier de Lust. 278. The words are thus elegantly versified by Juvenaus, Hist. Evang. 4. 623. (cited by Kuin.) “Nos, nos, crueur iste sequatur. Et genus in nostrum scelus hoc et culpa redunet.”

25. καὶ ἔπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἁμῶν. The custom of devoting not themselves only, but their children, was ancient. It was the opinion, not only of the Hebrews, but of many other nations, that the children were bound by, and subject to suffer for the crimes of their parents. Of this all history is full of proofs. It was, however, maintained, that they could be released from the piaculum by a serious and solemn protestation against their fathers’ crimes. (Grot.) How awfully were these curses literally fulfilled, and turned on their own heads, and those of their children, myriads of whom perished either by famine, or the sword of the Romans and of their own nation, or, after being miserably scourged, were crucified in such numbers (500 a day, or more), until (says their own historian, most pathetically) ἀνὰ τὰ πλήθος χώρα πε ἐνελείλετο τῶν σταυροῖς, καὶ σταυρὶ τῶν σώμασιν. That Pilate himself did not pass unpunished, appears from Jos. A. 18, 4, 2. Euseb. H. E. 2, 7. (Wet.) See Bishop Newton on the Prophecies, Diss. 31.

26. φραγελλάωσας. A word formed or corrupted,
from the Latin flagellare. The flagella were extremely sharp, mostly interwoven with sheep-bones, sometimes composed of ox-nerves, (see Achmet 90.) and hence termed by Horace, Sat. 1, 3, 119. horrible; "Ne scutica dignum horribili sectare flagello." Flagellation, among the Romans, was a prelude to capital punishment: with this difference, however, that slaves were scourged with these flagella, free persons with virgæ. See Lucian Reviv. 2. Phil. 2, 527. 36. &c. Cic. Ver. 5, 66. pro Rabir 5. Liv. 33, 36. alios (servos) verberatos cruci affixit. See also Valer. Max. 1, 7. (Wets.) See Lips. de Cruce, 2, 2. Heyn's Commentat. Opusc. Acad. 3, 184. (Kuin.) The custom of scourging the criminal (bound to a column) before capital punishment, seems to have been in use among, and was perhaps derived from, the Greeks. So Soph. Ag. 108. πρὶν αὖ δεδεισ πρὸς κίον ἐρείειν στέγας Μάστιγι πρὸςν νῦτα φωνικείς δάνη. Respecting the intention of Pilate in this flagellation, there has been difference of opinion. Many have thought (as Grot.) that Pilate meant by this to move the compassion of the Jews, for he had not then resolved on the crucifixion, (and crucifixion did not necessarily, or always, follow flagellation, being sometimes only used questionis ergo,) and, since we find, from a collation of the parallel passage of John, that Pilate then made another attempt to move the people to spare Jesus. This, I think, is not improbable. That scourging preceded capital punishment is abundantly evident, from the numerous citations produced by Wetstein.

27. εἰς τὸ πραυτάριον. This was a magnificent edifice in the upper part of the city, which had been formerly Herod's palace, and from which there was an approach to the citadel Antonia, which adjoined to the Temple. (See Jos. A. 15, 9, 3. B. 1, 21, 1. 5, 4, 3.) This the Roman procurators (whose ordinary residence was at Cæsarea) occupied, when at Rome. In front of this edifice was the tribunal. Jesus was first led to the interior part of the præto-
rium, namely, the *aula*, an open court. *Σπείρα* denotes, *properly*, a twisted rope, but by a metaphor (similar to that which subsists in the Hebrew יִצְבָּד, and our *band*) it denoted a body or corps of soldiers, and generally signified a *cohort*, the 10th part of a legion, whose number varied, from 525, to 600, or 1,000 men, in the larger legions. See Lips. de Mil. Rom. 1, 4. Jos. B. 3, 4, 2. There were five cohorts at Cæsarea; *one* (somewhat larger) at Jerusalem, during the Passover. See Michaelis ad h. l. (Kuin.)

23. *περιβέθηκαν αὐτῷ χλαμύδα κόκκινην.* A kind of round cloak, which was confined on the right shoulder by a clasp, so as only to cover the left side of the body, and over which the other vestments were worn. It was used by captains, and other officers, and even by the privates, and was called by the Romans *paludamentum, sagum*; on which account the Romans are called *chlamydati* in Plaut. Rud. 2, 2, 9. The *saga* of the generals were made of a superior kind of wool, and were twice dyed in scarlet; the *paludamenta* of emperors were purple, (Flirtius, B. Afric. c. 57.) and were longer than the soldiers' cloaks, the wool of which (of an inferior quality, though of the same colour) was once dyed in scarlet. (See Sil. H. 6, 420. Ferrar. de Re. Vestiar. p. 2. l. 3. c. 4, 8. Ruben de Vest. 2, 7.) The prætor's soldiers, therefore, put on Jesus a shabby and worn-out cloak belonging to a general, or principal officer, for the purpose of mockery, when they heard from the Jews that he had called himself their king. This cloak, which is in this place called *χλαμύδα κόκκινη*, is by Mark, 15, 17, 20. called *πορφύρα*, and by John, 19, 2. *ιμάτιον πορφυρῶν*, and yet the Evangelists mean the same thing. There is, indeed, a difference between the colours purple and scarlet. The scarlet dye was made from a certain *shrub*, the purple from a kind of *sea-shell*. (See Salmas. exercit. Plin. p. 192. ss.) But by *πορφυρῶν* is denoted whatever is of a dazzling red; and these two words, *κόκκινον* and *πορφυρῶν*, are not unfrequently interchanged. See Bocharti Hieroz. 2, 5, 10. Merillius. Obs. c. 28. (Kuin.)
29. πλέοντες στέφανον εἰς ἄκασθον, ἀκάσθαναν. The conjecture of Pearce (ἄκασθον, from ἄκασθος, the bear-foot) is embraced by Michaelis, but solidly refuted by Campbell. Not a single version favours it. The word proposed occurs nowhere in the N. T. or the Sept. The Ital. and Syr. render thorns. The ancient Greek and Latin Fathers (as Clemens and Tertullian) so took it. There is therefore the highest probability opposed to mere conjecture. Bodæus and Theophylact think that it was of acacia; others conjecture otherwise. It was doubtless of some kind of prickly shrub, though what that was cannot be ascertained. Certainly it was not of mere thorns, nor pressed upon his head with an intent to torture him; every thing in this occurrence seems to have been done with a view to mockery and derision, not pain. I also assent to Whitby that all this was done, not to deride Christ's pretensions to the Messiahship, but of his title to be King of the Jews. Doddridge thinks that, had ridicule alone been intended, a crown of straws might have done as well. But crowns were usually made of such shrubs as admitted of being woven, and such are usually more or less prickly. That they meant cruelty he argues from their striking him; but with what? a reed, not a cane, or, as Doddridge thinks, a walking-staff. (See a little further on.) Wetstein remarks: "Omnia per ludibrium: pro paludamento coccineo imperatoris induiter vile sagum militis: pro coronâ ex floribus pulcriis et fragantibus, flectunt coronam spinam; pro sceptro illi dant fraglem calamum: eosque ipsum percutiunt, vestis denique exuunt, ut ostendant talem cum Regem esse, quem ipsi pro habitâ potestate exuere possint." He has compared two instances in Dio Chrys. 69. d. and Philo, 2, 522, 26. where similar ludibia were performed, and cites the following. Cic. de Div. 1, 34. Multis signis Lacedæmoniis Leuctricæ pugnæ calamitas denunciabatur, namque et Lysandri, qui Lacedæmoniorum clarissimus fuit, statuæ, quæ Delphis stabant,

31. ἀπήγαγον. A usual term upon this subject, denoting the leading away of a criminal to execution. The word is of frequent occurrence in the Greek writers, especially the historians. Several examples are here produced by Wetstein.

32. ἄνθρωπον Κυρηναῖος. This pleonastic use of ἄνθρωπος and ἄνθροπος with nouns expressive of office, business, or country, are frequent in the best Greek writers. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 430, 7. There is the same use of homo in Latin, chiefly however with nouns of country; as homo Siculus. Many more examples are produced by Wetstein.

32. Κυρηναῖος. So called either as a native of Cyrene or of Cyrenean extraction, though now resident at Jerusalem. At the flourishing city of Cyrene there had long been numerous Jewish settlers; as we learn from Joseph. C. Apion. 2, 4. Ant. 14, 7, 2, 16, 6, 1, 2 and 5. B. 7, 11, 1. together with several other passages of less importance, cited by Wetstein: from which it appears that the Jews had been originally colonized there by Ptolemy, son of Lagus; and that they were so numerous as to be formidable to the other inhabitants, with whom they had frequent quarrels.

32. ἰγγάρεως, i. e. pressed into the service. The word properly denotes to ride post, to perform the office of a courier: and as the transmitting intelligence by couriers was introduced by the Persians, so was the word ἰγγαρεως of Persian origin, and the ἰγγαρος of the Persians and Romans corresponds to the Tatar of the modern Turks. But as these persons had the power of pressing men, horses, and ships, for the service of the monarch or the state,
hence ἀγγαρεύειν came at length to denote every kind of compulsory service, and in the present passage, and Matth. 5, 41. simply signifies to compel. Grotius thinks that Simon especially had this service imposed on him at the instigation of the Jews, who suspected that he was a favourer of Christ, whose sons were his disciples.

32. σταυρός. On the form of the cross, and the punishment of crucifixion, see Lipsius and Salmasius de Crucie; also Bynæus de Morte Christi. The σταυρός was of the form of a T. So Artemid. 2, 58. ἐκ ξύλων καὶ ἠλέον γέγονεν ὁ σταυρὸς. And about the middle of it was fixed a piece of wood, on which the wretch sat, or rather rode. This was done that the carcass might the longer remain a prey to ravenous birds; which, as I find from Artemid. 4, 49. was usual: ἐδοξε τις ἐσταρωθή, σημαίνοντος — ἐν τοῖς, δια τὸ πολλοὺς πρέπειν οἰκονόμοις. That crucifixion was frequent in the time of Artemidorus, appears from the frequent allusions to it in his work. Some have thought that there was also a similar support for the feet. But this opinion has been refuted by Sagittarius, Salmasius, and Vossius. Of this, indeed, there was no need. The criminal either mounted of himself, or was raised up by the executioners: hence the expression tolli, ascendere, and sometimes insilire in crucem. This last the height of the cross admitted, since it was only such as to raise the crucified person about three feet from the ground. The hands were fastened with nails to the cross piece, but the feet were not nailed, but tied to the cross with ropes. So Artemid. 2, 58. says that to dream of being crucified denotes, to the unmarried, marriage, δια την δέον. See Lucian, 6, 545. Plin. H. N. 28, 11. Wolf on verse 35. and the Interpreters on Joh. 20, 27. Crucifixion (which, as it appears from Diod. Sic. 61. was in use as early as the time of Semiramis) was the punishment of runaway and otherwise delinquent slaves, persons convicted of murder, robbery, treason, &c. and, as it was the most igno-
minious, so it was the most cruel of punishments, since, to use the very apt expressions of L. Brug on verse 22. Confixio fiebat in locis, ut maximē nervosis et sensu acerrimo præditis, ita remotissimus à corde; illinc acerbitas, hinc diuturnitas, doloris. The miserable wretches sometimes lived a considerable time, and were exposed to very lingering torments. Instances, however, are on record, of their being taken down, and, by medical care, recovered; as we find from Joseph. de vitâ sua: and the same historian mentions three persons of his acquaintance taken down, (at his intercession,) of whom, after the most careful medical attendance, two died, but the third recovered. That it was the custom to compel the person to bear his own cross to the place of execution, we find from Artemid. 2, 61. ὁ μείλλων αὐτῶ (σταυρῶ) προσηλθὼν πρότερον αὐτῶν βαστάζει. Val. Max. 1, 7. Plut. 2, 544.

34. Τολυθα—κρανίου τόπος. Calvary; an appellation derived from the Chaldee מִֿנָא, Golgaitha, a skull; softened, euphonix gratid, τὸ Golgatha (as in Babel for Balbel). The place was a small hill on the outside of Jerusalem *. It did not, however, as some think, derive its appellation from any resemblance the hill bore to a skull; but, as places often derive their names from the things done in them, (see Græv. Lect. Hesiod. C. 19. Taylor, Lect. Lys. C. 12. Fisch. Jud. Theoph. δειγμα,) so it was called Golgotha, from being strewed with the skulls of malefactors who had been there executed †. Thus the place bore some resemblance to the Ceadas at Sparta; where, says Thucydides, the Spartans used to cast the bodies of executed criminals.

34. ἕνος. By this we are to understand, not vinegar, but a very inferior wine, used only by the meanest

* Kuinoel thinks it has been proved not to have been in the place now called Calvary; and refers to the works of several German Travellers into Palestine.
† We are told by Kuinoel, that when their bodies were permitted to be buried the skulls were excepted, and left on the ground
persons. It differed from wine in the same manner as small-beer does from ale, and bore some resemblance to the worst of the French vin ordinaire*. So Theocr. 10, 13. ἐν τιθ χαλασμόν ἱερὸν (vinum) ἔγερον ἐκ ἔργων ἀλκοόν ἐξούσ. Plut. p. 396. F. ἐξος ἐκτοσ. The Romans had this same kind of drink, to which they gave the names of acetum and posca. It was called ἐξος from its acidity, on account of which it was generally used well spiced with myrrh, frankincense, and (as we here find) sometimes wormwood (for so χολή here signifies); thus Mark, in the parallel passage, gives this potion the appellation of Ὠνων ἐσμυρνεύων. And so might the potion be termed impropriè. Thus also Tr. Sanhedrim, C. 6. cited by Kuin. "Dixit R. Chasda: Qui ducitur ad mortem, ei datur bibendum granum turis in poculo vini, ut distrahatur mens ejus, qui dictum est Prov. 31. 6. Date siceram perituro, et vinum illis qui sunt amaro animo. It appears from Galen that this drink, with an infusion of myrrh, produced mental turbation. Hence wine, or ἐξος, mixed with myrrh, or with infusions of intoxicating herbs, was, through motives of humanity, (to produce stupefaction, and some mitigation of their torments,) usually administered to those about to endure a painful death. See Hammond. Jesus, however, magnanimously rejects such mitigation of his sufferings; and therefore, after tasting it, rejects the cup.

35. σταυροσκαυτε. On this awful subject Euthymiou has the following beautifully pathetic passage, derived perhaps from Chrysostom, or some eloquent Greek Father: 'Ὅρα δὲ τῶν τάσαν θεαις ὅβρεας διεξῆλθον, τὴν μὲν κεφαλὴν διὰ τοῦ ἀκαθήνου στεφάνου καὶ τοῦ τυπτεσθαι τῷ καλάμῳ, τὸ πρόσωπον δὲ, διὰ τῶν ἐρατυσ-

* Grotrius tells us that the name was extended to all sorts of wines factisii saporis; such as we term made wines. And be instances ἐξος εὐφραίον, the palm-wine mentioned by Xenophon, and the ὄνος κρίθηνα (or ale) spoken of by Herodo, Athenæus, and others. However that may be, it seems generally admitted that we are here to understand ἐξος in the sense which I have adopted.
μάτων τὰς σιαγόνας δὲ, διὰ τῶν βασισμάτων τὸ στῶμα δὲ, διὰ τῆς χολῆς καὶ τοῦ ὄξους τὰς ἀκοὰς, διὰ τῶν βλασφημίων τῶν τράχηλων δὲ, διὰ τῶν κολασισμάτων τὰ κατα δὲ καὶ τὰ στέφνα, διὰ τῶν φραγελλωμάτων, ἦτοι, μαστίγων τὰς χεῖρας δὲ καὶ τοῦ πόδας, διὰ τῶν ἡλιστῶν τῆς πλευράν δὲ, διὰ τῆς λόγχης, ἠστορεῖ καὶ τὰ λυπῆ, διὰ τῆς χλαμύδος καὶ τῆς γυμνάσεως καὶ ἀπλῶς τὸ ὀλον σώμα, διὰ τῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ θραμβεύσεως.

35. διεμερίσαντο. Namely, the four executioners. It strikes us as strange, that soldiers should act in the capacity of executioners; but such was the custom of ancient times. So Sueton. Calig. 32. Miles decollandi artifex quibuscumque e custodiīa caput amputat. We not unfrequently read even of tribunes or centurions appointed as exactores mortis. Still the soldiery sometimes complained of it. So Jos. Ant. 19, 1, 6. διακοσμώμεθα δορυφόροι καὶ δήμου καθεστικότες ἀντὶ στρατιωτῶν. The clothes of male-factors (who were always crucified naked; so Artemid. 2, 58. γυμνός γὰρ σταυρώτατος) were by the Roman Law considered as a perquisite of the executioners, which they either divided, or cast lots upon what (as our Saviour's μάτων) admitted not of being divided; the ticket, or whatever else they might use, being thrown into a helmet. So Virg. Æn. 5, 59. Dejectamque aereā sortem galeā acceptī. Vide Hom. Il. ψ. 382.

36. ἀτηροὺς, watched them, i.e. to see that they were not taken down for recovery, if not dead, or for burial after it. So Petron. 389. "Miles qui cruces servabat, ne quis ad sepulturam corpora detrheherit." Where see Burman. Also Plut. Cleom. 829. E. and Lips. de cruce. 2, 16. (Wets. & Kuin.)

37. αἰτίαν, criminatio, indictment, called the τίθος, which was written in black letters on a white ground, and briefly stated the cause of the punishment, which was also proclaimed by the public crier through the places of concourse. So Dio Cass. 732. διὰ τῆς ἀγγείας μέσης μετὰ γραμμάτων τὴν αἰτίαν θωνατοῦσες αὐτοῦ ὑπολοίπων διαγαγόντας, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνακαταρβ-

űo λησται, robbers, i.e. as we say, highway robbers, sicarii; whole bands of whom now infested Judæa, as we find from Joseph. See Wetstein. These two malefactors were reserved till the time of the Passover, that they might be punished at the greatest concourse of people, for examples. For (as observes Quintilian) “omnis poena non tam ad delictum quam ad exemplum.” (Grotius.)


αλλοις ἐσωσεν, εαυτῶν οὐ δύναται σώσαι. Beza Bengal and others would read the sentence interrogatively, and as spoken sarcastically. But to this I cannot assent. The common reading is confirmed by Aristid. 3, 480. β. (of Palemedes.) πάσας τῶν ἄλλας εὐρίσκων μηγάνας μιᾶν υἱόν εὑρεν, ὅτι οὐ σαθήσεται. And Αἰσχ. Π. Υ. 482, 5. καὶ κάκος οἱ ἱδροὶ ἁς τις, εἰς νόσον τεσσαράκοντα ἀθυμεῖς, καὶ σεαυτῶν oὐκ ἔχεις εὑρεῖν ὑπολοις φαρμάκωις λάσσως.

42. θέλει αὐτῶν, if he love and favour him, θέλει. Hesychius explains θέλει by εὐθυκοῖ, and εὐθυκοί- σαν by ἐγκατησαν. Another instance of this syntax occurs in Psal. 22, 9. which is prophetic of these.
very circumstances. Kuinoel observes, that the Jews thought that God could not but deliver every pious worshipper from calamities, and that he who was borne down by them, could not be such. He cites Sap. 2, 18. Sir. 38, 1. Sap. 5, 16. Sir. 32, 14. Add from Hammond Tobit 18, 6. τις γινώσκει, εἰ δέλησει ὑμᾶς. Pericthyon ap. Stob. ἔθελεν τὸν ἄνθρω. Palaiaret, maintaining the purity of the Greek, contends that it ought to have the sense of amare; and cites from Aristae. 1, 24. θέλω δὲ Αὐστίαν ἀν. Alciph. 2, 11. ὅν θέλω δὸς Τίμαρχον. Charit. 5. ἐξεις ἁμ. δέν ὃν θέλεις. But in all these cases, as well as in those of Matth. &c. there is an ellipsis of ἐγένετο.

44. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ οἱ λησταῖ. Or rather, one of the two, as Luke more accurately states. But the Commentators, both ancient and modern, tell us, that there is a figure of speech, amplification, used both by the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin writers. See Grotius, Glass Phil. Sacr. and Gat. Adv. Mis. 2, 15. It is also thus treated on by Arist. Rhet. 3, 6. εἰς ὅγκον τῆς λέξεως συμβαλλέται καὶ τὸ ἐν πολλά ποιεῖν and Longinus, περὶ ὑψου. S. 23. ἄλλ' ἐκεῖνα μάλλον παρατηρήσεως ἄξια, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἄλογο προσπάτητε τὰ πληθυντικὰ μεγαλοπρέπειατα, καὶ αὐτὸ διεκκομίζοντα τὸ ὄχλον τῶν ἀρίθμων. (Wets.) Euthymius ingeniously supposes that they both at first joined in the revilement, and then that one (on seeing the meek endurance of Jesus, thus praying for his very murderers, &c.) repented, &c. Of the same opinion was Tit. Bost. 888. and Prosper. C. Collect. cited by Hammond, with seeming approbation.

45. σκότος ἐγένετο. That this cannot be attributed to an eclipse of the sun is certain, for it was then full moon (as being the Passover). It may be ascribed to an extraordinary and preternatural obscuration of the solar light, which might precede and accompany the earthquake. For before an earthquake, say the Naturalists, such a mist arises from sulphureous vapours, as to occasion a darkness almost nocturnal. (Compare Apoc. 6, 12. seq. Joel 3, 3. and the Naturalists
cited by Kuin. on Matth. 24, 29.) Such a darkness may extend ten miles round, or further. By this interpretation, there is nothing detracted from the dignity of the occurrence. It is sufficient that many Jews were by it brought back to serious reflection, especially as the darkness came over in the full meridian light. (Rosenm.) Most ancient Commentators maintain that it is extended to the whole world; whose arguments (which, I own, are not to me convincing) the reader will find detailed in Pole’s Synopsis, Wolf, and the mass of authors cited by the diligent Koecher. Phlegon Trallianus indeed, and, after him, Thallus ap. Africanum, mention an eclipse of the sun, which is referred to this time; but neither of them adds the name of the place. Some think it was Rome. But it is impossible that the eclipse could have happened, both at Rome and Jerusalem, from the sixth to the ninth hour. It is therefore highly probable, that Phlegon took this from the relation of the Christians, or from the Scriptures. (Wets.) See Doddrt. 391. b. These solar and lunar obscurations, nay, any long continued darkness or gloom of the sky, obscured by clouds partly ferruginous, partly red, were by the ancients thought signs, and presages of public calamities. See note on 24, 29. So Plin. H. N. 2, 30. (Kuin.) The subject is illustrated by Wetstein, with numerous citations from the Classical writers, of which I can only detail the references. Ovid. Met. 2, 330. & 15, 78. Fast. 2, 497. Virg. Georg. 1, 163. Plut. 1, 34. e. 741. a. 295. a. Augustin. de C. D. 8, 15. Cic. N. D. 2, 15. Somn. Scipion. 7. & 10. Flor. 1, 1. Jos. Ant. 14, 12, 3. Val. Max. 8, 11. Philo ap. Euseb. P. 8, 14. Diog. Laert. 4, 64. Aristid. p. 87. Diod. Sic. 15, 80. Dionys. Hel. A. 2, 56. Val. Fl. 6, 21. Petron. 122. Lucan. 1, 520. Eurip. Iph. T. 193. Senec. Thyst. 879. Med. 28. Hipp. 677. Dio Cass. 15, p. 316.

I add Aristid. 1, 156. ἰ ἀ δὲ φησίν Ἄριστοφάνης τεῷ Αἰσχύλου ἔκειν τεθνηκότος. Thus the eclipse of the sun which preceded the expedition of Xerxes
was supposed to have a reference to it. Dionys. Hal.
ult. μυθολόγου τοῦ δαμόσως—εἰδωλον, ὥ ὁ ἄρα ὄν ἡ
πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα τῇ πάθει δαιμόνια ἐν γῇ ἡλίου τε ἀφάνισ-
μον, καὶ δόφων ἐν οὐρανῷ κατασχέντως, where I conjec-
ture δόφων οὐρανῷ κατασχέντως. By τῶν τῆς γῆς we
must understand (with Erasmus, De Dieu, Casaubon, L. Brug. Kuinoel, Rosenmuller, Bynæus, Camp-
bell, and Heuman) Judæa, namely, that division of
Palestine in which Jerusalem stood, which will
scarcely at all exceed the above-mentioned number.
So it occurs in 24, 30. where see note. Of this ex-
amples may be seen in Schl. Lex.

46. Ὡλ, Ὡλ, λαμ ὧμαρχαβαῖες; The words are
from Psal. 22, 2; but σαβαχθαῖνι has a change adapted
to the Chaldee or Syriac dialect. From this, and
other passages it is collected, that Christ used an He-
brew-Syriac, or rather the Hebrew-Chaldee-Syriac,
which was then prevalent in Judæa. (Rosenm. and
Kuinoel.)

46. ινατ ἐ μέ ἐγκατέληπτες. The by-standers thought
that Jesus was deserted by God, and consequently
not the Messiah, and the Son of God. (Ps. 37, 32 &
38. 71, 11 & 12.) Therefore Jesus entreats his Fa-
ther no longer to suffer him to be thus contumel-
iously set at nought, but rather to snatch him from
their hands, and prove their suspicions to be un-
founded. (Wets.) The words are expressive of de-
precation, not despair. (Rosenm.) In the Hebrew
God is said to forsake any one when he suffers him
to labour under great miseries. (Whitby.) So Ter-
non parcit, sic reliquit, dum tradit; ceterum, non
reliquit Pater Filium, in cujus manibus Filius spiri-
tum suum posuit.” And again: “Ita, reliquii a
patre morti fuit Filio.” This sentiment is copiously
illustrated by Whitby. Rosenmuller and Kuinoel
agree that the words do not imply despair, but grief,
supported, however, with magnanimous composure,
q. d. Suffer me no longer to sustain this agony; but
release me from suffering, by death.
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47. ἐλεγον Ὁτι Ἡλίαν φανεi αὗτος. These were certainly not the Roman soldiers, for they knew nothing about Elias. Some think, that they were Hellenist Jews, who, from Christ’s being raised so high, did not distinctly hear, and therefore mistook, his words. So Grotius, Cradock, and Campbell. But this seems somewhat improbable. The cross was, indeed, not likely to be so high as to hinder the sound of his voice from being heard with sufficient distinctness. I rather agree with Beza, L. Brug. Euthymius, Zorn, Wetstein, Doddridge, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, that it was an intentional and malicious perversion and misrepresentation of Christ’s words, by way of deriding his pretensions to the Messiaship, making them signify an entreaty for Elias to come to his assistance. It was certainly, as Wetstein and Rosenmuller observe, a common opinion among the Jews, that Elias sometimes appeared to deliver men from the peril of death, and that he would return to life at the coming of the Messiah, and prepare the way for his kingdom.

48. ἐπεμάθαν εἰς εἷς αὐτῶν, καὶ λαβὼν σπόγγον. Jesus had said δὴσυ. (Joh. 19, 28.) The person was not a Roman soldier, but a Jew, who, however, reached him the posca, by way of derision. So Euthymius. The rest say, “Stop, let us see whether Elias will come and preserve him;” but he (as Mark, 15, 39. tells us) answered, “Let me administer this refreshment, lest Elias should come too late to save him. (Kuin.) This place alone would show the necessity of comparing all the Evangelists. For this person’s running, and taking a sponge, &c. was not in the account of our Saviour’s saying, Eli, Eli, &c. but of his saying, I thirst, John 19, 28. which Matthew and Mark have omitted, but have related the consequent, as if they had told the antecedent, or the cause. See on 26, 68. Markland.

48. πλήσσας—δέκους. So also John 19; but Mark, 15, 19. has a synonymous, but less elegant, expression, γέμουσας σ. σ. The Scholiast, on Aristoph. 394. ο. has χύτραν φέρουσιν ἐν η σπόγγοισ πεπληρωμένοις μέλιτος.
48. περιβῆς καλάμῳ, a reed, E. Tr.; a stick, Campbell; but I prefer the interpretation of Markland, a stalk, which is, indeed, a not unfrequent sense. Thus will the accounts of Matthew and John be reconciled. For, when the latter writes ὡσοιτὼ περιβέντες, it must be taken for καλάμῳ ὡσοίτω, a stalk of hyssop. For the calamus, caulis, stalk is, in the East, of so considerable a height, that a sponge fixed upon it (especially since, as I have shewn, the cross was probably not very high) might easily reach Jesus.

49. ᾧσε, ἦδαιμ. Markland has observed, that the comma should be omitted after ᾧσε, ηνα being understood. "ᾲσε ἦνα ἦδαιμ" as ᾧσε ἐκβάλω, Luke 6, 42. ᾧσε (or ᾧσε) ἦδαιμ, Mark 15, 36. And so also Rosenmuller. I cannot assent to Grotius, that the ᾧσες and ᾧσε of Mark, are pleonastic. He admits that they are not prohibitory, which is very true; but he might have added, that they are hortatory. "Come, let us see." In exactly the same manner ἄγε is used by the best Greek writers. So also Genes. 11, 3. ἔχετε πλυθείσαμεν, and 4. ἔχετε ἐκθάμβωμεν, and 7. ἔχετε συγκαθαρίσαμεν: in which cases, and in several others, our Version has "go to," a phrase not unfrequent in our early writers.

50. κράζας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ. There has been some diversity in the interpretation of this word. Kuinoel and Gruner take this to indicate the uttering of loud outcries from pain; and the latter, in his Physical tract on the Death of Christ, observes, that those whose heart is oppressed with an excessive congestion of blood, by anxiety, and the palpitation of supervenient suffocation, do, not unfrequently, from agony, utter loud outcries. But this lowers and degrades the sense of the passage, and is, I think, inconsistent with that heroic resolution and firmness previously displayed by our Saviour. Grotius rightly understands the word to denote exclaiming with a loud voice. It is often used in the N. T. for exclamation by words, arising from various passions of the
mind; and is especially employed to signify earnest addresses to the Almighty in prayer. So Rom. 8, 15. εν αυτοις ως απροσκυνητος πατερ. Galat. 4, 6. Psalm. 27, 1. 29, 8. James 5, 4. It is a stronger expression than St. Luke’s, φωνησας, though the latter is the more perspicuous. That Euthymius adopted this mode of interpretation is clear from his exposition: τις δε η φωνη, εδήλωσεν Δωματως οτι ι ε. Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit. He then very judiciously assigns the reason why our Lord uttered these words with a loud voice: ις πάντες ἀνακοινως, και πάντες εἰσόνομα, ὅτι μὲν χερι τῆς τελευταίας ἡμέρας πατέρα τῶν θεῶν ἐνέμιξεν, καὶ αὐτῷ τὸ πάν ἀνακοινώσας, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄντιθετος. The precatory exclamation was what we read in Joh. 19, 28. and Luke 23, 47. τετελεσθεν — πατερ. The circumstance, that a criminal should have uttered such words, and that, as if from the favour of God, death, so anxiously sought, should have been immediately consequent upon them, might well be thought by the centurion something that indicated divine interposition, and, united with the subsequent circumstances, induce him to conclude, that this was certainly a Divine person.

50. ἄφηκε τῷ πνεύμα. Words of a similar import are used, in all languages, to denote death, by a sort of periphrastic euphemism. Αφήνει τῷ πνεύμα is very frequent, of which numerous examples may be found not only in the Sept. and Josephus, but Herodotus, Euripides, Demosthenes, and many other Greek authors cited by Wetstein, Kypke, Alberti, Raphel, Palaiaret, and Wakefield. So the Latin authors have “animam mittere, emittere, dimittere, reddere,” of which examples may be seen in Wakefield’s Silva Critica, 4. 38—40. Euthymius, Theophylact, Terrullian, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, Doddridge, and some other modern Commentators, suppose something preternatural in the mode of expiration, and that it was the immediate effect of Christ’s volition. This, however, seems an opinion utterly unfounded, not to say presumptuous. For it seems to savour of
what St. Paul terms ἀ μὴ ἔπρακαίνες ἐμβατεύειν—καὶ ὑπὲρ ὁ γέγραπται φρονεῖν. That our Saviour should have expired much sooner than was usual with crucified persons, has been thought remarkable; and by many ancient Commentators, and some modern ones (as Grotius), this circumstance has been ascribed to the immediate interposition of Divine Providence. This I would not venture to deny; at the same time it is not difficult, I think, to account for the speedy approach of death (as most recent Commentators do) from natural causes. In truth, death supervened, sooner or later, according to the strength of constitution, or habit of body, or according as the wounds inflicted by the nails came in contact with the larger blood-vessels. But, indeed, the various fatigues recently undergone of journeying, the agitation of his keenly sensitive mind and spirits, (exhausted from the circumstances of his apprehension and trial,) the severe scourging he had just undergone, the fatigue of bearing his cross, may well account for his speedy dissolution. This subject has been admirably illustrated in two treatises De Morte Christi verò, recently published by two learned physicians of the name of Gruner at Jena, and from which the following extracts will, I think, be acceptable to my readers:

"Addictus erat Jesus cruci, infami supplicio, pugnis ac palmis per petulentiam contusus, coronae spineâ in ludibrium cinctus, nudus et ad columnam adstrictus, cæditur loris et flagris. Quæ cum essent aculeata, taxillata, et ossiculis catenata, et miseri ad necem usque flagellati, haud raro perirent, consequens est, ut Christum nostrum, fame ac vigilis lassum, angore fractum, ex vulneribus cutis crebris ægrum, et a sanguine vacuum, summam teneret debilitas. Auxit sine dubio legalis crucis gestatio crudos cutis lacerae dolores, attrivitque ulterius vires, denique perfect est istoc triste malum crux, cui crudeliter affixus et adstrictus erat, clavis per manus actis, pedibus fune constrictis. Hinc vehementissimè exacer-
bati sunt dolores, et ad omne corpus diffusi, hinc post haemorrhagiam loca sugillata, inflammatas et in gangraenam prona, hinc magna circuitus sanguinei turbatio nata, hinc immensa sanguinis ad pulmones et cor congestio facta est, eaque summae anxietatis auctor et effectrix fuit, quam Christus clamores magno prodidisse videtur. — "Grunnerus pater p. 63. Quod de latrone rudi, duro et infami valet, non aequo ad Christum bene moratum et meliori fato dignum applicare licet. Angitur vehementissime, diffuit sudore sanguineo, exponitur hominum ludibrio, caeditur flagellis ac loris, summo pudore suffusus, in conspectu et frequentia spectatorum male animatorum, ad crucem ire cogitur, in crucem actus, sub caelo servido pendens, siti magna excruciatibus, am subito extinguitur. Hae vero res nocentes habeabant vim maximam ad corpus infirmandum et debilitandum, neque rarà mors hominum subita ex illis incidit; plena enim sunt exemplis medicorum scripta. Hae ergo debilitas, ab tantà malorum gravitate orta, non crux, cui suffixus hærebat, id quidem effecit, ut citius mori posset verèque moreretur, sed formam mortis dubiam reliquit."

Many recent critics, however, (as Damm, Bardt, and Paulus,) taking advantage of the early supervision of the signs of death, have endeavoured to prove, and they do not hesitate to maintain, that Christ did not really die, but was only oppressed with syncope, which is usually by the ignorant mistaken for death, and that he revived on being placed in the sepulchre. Such recovery (say they) would be promoted by the pure temperature of the air, and the balsamic exhalations! They hold that he was not mortally wounded by the soldier, but only slightly pricked; and that πλευρὰ signifies the side generally. The whole of this hypothesis (than which none more false and mischievous was ever hatched in the sceptical school of Germany) has been thoroughly examined, and completely refuted, by the learned physicians just mentioned. On so
deeply important a subject every intelligent reader, and every serious believer, will feel much interested in the following extracts from their Dissertations, which are very scarce in this country, and for a knowledge of which I am indebted to the diligent research of Kuinoel. I must preface the extracts by informing my readers, that our two learned Medical Champions seem inclined to believe (though I think upon insufficient grounds) that Jesus was not, strictly speaking, quite dead when pricked with the spear, but that he was excessively weak, and would have shortly died, and immediately after the spear-thrust did actually expire. "Est syncope, si quis alias corporis affectus, omnium longè periculosissima est λύσις τῶν δεσμῶν τῆς εἰς ζωήν δινάμεως, auctore Are-tæo. Debilitas summa præit, lipothymia incipit, syncope sequitur, mors ipsa demum clausulam malorum subitam facit. (Gruner, p. 37.) In loco saxoso frigidissimo repositus, post grave vulner atque syncope ab debilitate ac hæmorrhagiâ copiosissimâ factam (flagellatus enim et in cruce profuderat largam sanguinis copiam) sanguis subitò sisti atque congelari debuit (p. 38). Aeris temperies abest fere a profundis cellis et actis in saxum sepulcris. Neque homini viribus exhausto, aëreque spirabili privato, longum reviviscendi spatium sub terrâ superest (p. 69). Exhalationibus balsamicis, nervos malè incitatos et cerebrum affectum, hinc feminas syncope hystericam passas, hinc homines sanissimos subitò exanimatos esse, probe memini.—Quin ipsa suffimenta, clausis fenestris ac foribus ærem non corrigunt, sed vifiant, i. e. faciunt gas azoticum sine ærem phlogisticatum, hinc ær fixus, et incitat et suffocat (p. 70). Pleura dicitur membrana pectus intus et retrinque circumcincens, communi loquendi usu, quem Johannes sequitur, intelligentur partes sub pectore sitæ, i. e. pulmones, cor cum pericardio, vasa magna, &c. Hæc quidem vitæ sustinendæ continuandæque instrumenta sunt, nec sine vitæ discrimine vel ferro acuto lædi, vel acie haste subtili pertundi possunt.
Sine dubio in sinistro latere lancea militis suffinxit læsit.—Post ictum enim et infictam lateri plagam illicò profluxit sanguis et aqua.—Tale profluvium visseri potuit, nisi a lateri sinistro, sub quo præter pulmonem est pericardium aquæ plenum, si quis post anxiatatem summum mortuus est, et cor cum arcæ aortæ copulatum (p. 81). Lateris vulnus, probabili ter descendit ergo in sinistrum latus, subjectasque pectoris partes læsit (p. 88). Quo demum cuncte latere ac loco pectus internum læsum censueris, modò in rectâ plagâ fuerit satis profunda, homini vita amplius frui non datur (p. 46). Quod demum cuncte latus lanceæ perfoessum recipias, dextrum a sinistrum, an vulnus sursum vel transversè infictum, pro variæ lanceæ directione putes, semper subest summum vitæ periculum et vulnus absolutè mortiferum.—Etenim in latere dextrae patent ferro lædenti pulmo, pericardium, cor, et arteria magna; vulnus ergo in his locis adactum et transmissum debuit inferre mortem inevitabilem atque certissimam, quippe vita non nisi cum harum partium integritate consistere potest.” (p. 50.)

He then proceeds to observe that the words vortæv and keveræ are strong expressions, and that a slight or superficial wound, only skin deep, is not suitable to the description of St. John, who mentions an efflux of blood and water from the side. As to a cautious wound, or commiseration, those (he observes) are not to be looked for from the soldier. Neither (observes he) could the stroke fail of effect, considering the moderate height of the cross, (see above,) the magnitude of a common lance, and the firmness of hand with which it was used. If (says Gruner) a vehement syncope had existed, the body could not have emitted blood, since then the circulation almost wholly ceases. Hence Gruner also argues that Christ could not be quite dead when the soldier thrust the lance into his side. In which I cannot agree with him. Surely we may suppose that a deep lance wound would produce an effusion
of blood in a body so recently dead; and that it would be deep, we may be sure, since it was meant to try whether he were really dead.

51. τὸ κατατέταμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐγερθη. It must be observed that there were two veils: the interior, which concealed the Sanctum Sanctorum, ἱερ, rendered by the Sept. κατατέταμα, the exterior, at the intrance of the temple, ἱερ, rendered by the Sept. κάλυμα, by Philo ἐπιστασθεν, as we learn from Philo de Vit. Mos. 3. p. 140, 30. ἐκ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν τὸ τε κατατέταμα καὶ τὸ κάλυμα—νυσ. And p. 150, 29. Wets. also cites Joseph. A. 8, 8, 8. B. 5, 5, 4. A. 14, 7, 1. B. 7, 5, 7, 6, 8, 3. B. 6, 5, 3. I add a very opposite passage of Pausan. 5, 12, 12. where he is describing the temple of the Olympian Jove: ἐν δὲ Ὀλυμπίᾳ παρατέταμα ἔρων κεκοσμομένου ὁφάμασιν Ἀστυρίοις καὶ βασιλῆ πορφύρας, τῶν φοινικῶν τοῦ τό οὐκ ἐστὶ ἄνω, τὸ παρατέταμα πρὸς τὸν ὀρθὸν ὀψωτερ ἀρτεμίδος τῆς ἑσσάθας, ἀνέκοκκοις, καλεδοῖς δὲ ἐπιχαλὼντες, καθιασίν ἐστὶ ἐδάφος. On the form and the materials of which this veil was composed, there is much information to be derived from the Rabbinical citations in Lightfoot and Schoettg. Hor. Heb. in Wets. and in Scheid. ap. Meuschen. Some particulars, however, have an air of improbability, and all are of apocryphal authority. It is, however, of more importance to enquire whether, or not, the rending of this veil is to be considered as preternatural? The Ancient Interpreters agree in regarding it as preternatural. Most recent Theologians, (as Michaelis, Rosenmuller, and Kuin.) do not hesitate to attribute it to the shock of the earthquake, which they think might, if the veil were old and decayed, be adequate to produce such an effect. But, if the least credit be due to the Rabbinical writers, (and I do not know why they should deceive us,) as to the thickness of its contexture, and the frequency of its removal, it could neither be old nor rotten: neither is it at all probable that, in so august an edifice, the priests would have permit-
ted so interesting a part of its magnificent furniture to become old and rotten. For myself, I cannot conceive how a veil so thick as, from its immense length (sixty feet), and the purpose for which it was intended it must have been, could have been rent in twain by any earthquake, even had it been old and rotten; and to so rend it by human hands would have been a very arduous work, and Rosenm. admits that it was not possible. The language of Euthymius on this subject is not less strongly than truly expressed: Ἰδιαίτερω δὲ τὰ καταστάσεις τῶν ναοῦ σχέσεως, πρὸς ἀνατιθέμενον ἔλεγχον αὐτῶν, ἤσα, πειράματος αἰτιολογεῖν, καὶ ἀνάγειν εἰς τὰ κατὰ φύσιν πάθη, τῶν τε τῶν ἡλίου σκοτασμῶν, καὶ τῆς γῆς τῶν σεισμῶν, καὶ τῶν πετρών τῆς σχίσματος, ἐπιστομίζων τῇ σχεσί τῶν καταπετάσματος, ὀδόντως δυνάμει δεῖξαι τοιούτων γεγομένων. Grotius evidently considers the rending as preternatural, and has a very learned note, to which I can only refer my readers, and I must content myself with one of his observations. Among the Romans, and other nations, (says he,) this same miraculum clearly indicated the atrocity of the crime committed against Christ. So Philippides ap. Plut. Demetr. says of Demetrius, because he had permitted himself to be equalled with the Gods, δὲ ἄσεβον ὁ πέπλος ἐφάρμα μέσος. And the description which he adds of this vest, is very curious: ἢν δὲ τίς υφαινομένη χλαμάς αὐτῷ τολῆς χρῶν τέμνων, ἐφάγω ὑπερφανοῦ, εἰκάσμα τῶν κόσμων καὶ τῶν κατ' ούρανον φαινόμενων. As to the intent of this symbol, the Commentators are not agreed. The most probable opinion is, that the Almighty meant thereby to typically foreshow the impending desecration of the Sanctum Sanctorum by the Romans, and the abolition of the Mosaic economy.

51. ἤ γὰρ ἐσείσθη. The vestiges of this earthquake still remain, in stupendous fissures, which Doddridge considers as a manifest proof of their being torn asunder supernaturally. But an earthquake cannot, I apprehend, be considered, in itself, as a preterna-
tural phenomenon. Yet, when we consider the circumstances which accompanied the one here described,—that it occurred at the very period of our Lord’s crucifixion, and on the very spot, we cannot but regard it as out of the ordinary course of nature, proceeding from the direct agency of Omnipotence, and therefore truly miraculous. The Heathens too had a notion that prodigies, especially earthquakes, sometimes attended the deaths of extraordinary persons. So Liban. parentat. in Julian. 150. ἡ μὲν γε γὰρ καλῶς ἤσθεν τοῦ πάθους, καὶ προσηκούση κωφὰ τὸν ἀνθα ἐτύμησεν, ἂποσεισαμένη, καθάπερ ἤπως ἀναβάτην, πόλεις τόσας καὶ τόσας, ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ πολλὰς.

52. καὶ τὰ μνημεία ἀνεφύγησαν. In consequence, it should seem, of the earthquake (So Grot.) Instances of sepulchres being opened by earthquakes are not without parallel. Grotius cites Aristot. Meteor. 2, 8. and Seneca in Troad. 171. and Wetstein cites Xiphil. in Nerva, p. 185: σεισμὸς ἔζατος ἐγένετο, ὡστε καὶ δόκησαν παρασχεῖν, ὅτι ἐνε γὰρ πάσα διαρρήγγυται, καὶ αἱ τῶν περιομένων ὅπ' αυτῶ τοῦ πασάμα ἄμα ἐπ' αυτῶν ἀναθορμοῦσι*. Ovid, Met. 7, 204. "Jubesque tremescere montes. Et mugire solum, manesque exire sepulcris." Aristides in Rhodum, p. 544. ἀνεβρίπτωντο δὲ σίκλαι, καὶ μνήματα ἀνεβρίπτων, πύργοι δὲ πύργοις ἐνέπτων. To which I add another example, yet more striking, from the same author (Aristides), and on the same subject, namely, the tremendous earthquake at Rhodes: Ἔζαν μὲν τὰ μνήματα ἀνεβρίπτων τῶν κεῖμένων, ἐνδον δὲ ἐκρύπτων οἱ τελευτάτοι εἰς ταῖς ἀνατολάς. This awful visitation of the Almighty was meant to portend the destruction of the temple, the abolition of the Mosaic ritual, and the ruin of the Jewish city and state.

52. τῶν κεκοιμημένων. This is by some accounted a Hebraism. Expressions, however, not dissimilar

* Correct, ἀναθορμοῦσι. The present reading is a mere blunder of an old edition used by Wetstein; which has, however, been faithfully copied by Rosenmuller.
3, 1, 6. τὸν γυλικὸν ἐπιτοι κομψάτας χεῖρας τέμπει με ὑπ’ ἐυτεθείων. (Wets.) I add, Herodian 1, 418. ἀνυπακό-
σατο, where see the example produced by the indefatigable Irmisch.

53. ἐξελθοντες. There has been no little diversity of opinion respecting the construction, and (which
is dependent upon it) the sense of the passage. The
difficulty turns on this pivot: whether μετὰ τὴν ἐγερον
αὐτῶι be connected with the preceding, or with the
following words. They seem, indeed, more natu-
rally to connect with the preceding, and have thus
been construed by the earlier Commentators, and
most modern ones, as Brug. Beza, Piscator, Grotius,
and Whitby. The sense will thus be, that those
Saints returned to life, but waited in their sepulchres
until the resurrection, and then entered the city.
Or that, at the earthquake which accompanied his
death, the graves were opened, and, after his resur-
rection, many bodies of Saints arose, and came out
of their graves. Thus (say they) will be avoided the
otherwise manifest discrepancy with the assurance
of Paul, that Jesus became “the first fruits of them
that slept.” But, on either of these interpretations,
the construction is harsh, and the sense forced,
frigid, and far fetched. I am therefore inclined to
agree with those Commentators who (as De Dieu,
Heuman, Le Clerc, and Kuinoel) join it with the
following words, εἰσῆλθον κ. τ. λ. Thus the sense
will be, that, at the death of Jesus, these Saints rose
indeed from their graves, and after his resurrection
went into the city, and appeared openly unto many.
Nor need we heed any discrepancy with the assertion
of St. Paul (in 1 Cor. 15, 20. and Col. 1, 18.) which
is more apparent than real. Since Christ was in
fact the first who so arose from the grave as not to
return thither, and be again subject to death, but to
ascend to heaven. *Who* these Saints were, must be extremely uncertain. The most probable conjecture is, that they were the bodies of some recently dead, (and perhaps followers of Christ,) for otherwise they would not have been recognized by those to whom they appeared, nor would it have been certainly known that they were really persons raised from the dead. The *purpose* of their temporary resuscitation (for *such* I conceive it was) seems to have been, to convince the unbelieving Jews of the Messiahship of Jesus; since they themselves admitted that some of the dead would be resuscitated at the time of the Messiah: and also, as Euthymius suggests, εἰς ἐνθελεῖν καὶ τοῦτο γέγονε τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ φάσον τῶν Ιουδαίων, ἱνα λογισαμένηται ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὗτος εἰς χερῶς τους νεκροὺς, εὐχερέστερον αὖ ἔδωκεν διακοτήσαι τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ ἐνεφανῆσαι, ἵνα μὴ δεικνύσαι κατὰ φαντασίαν ἢ τε τῶν μνημείων ἀνωτέρως καὶ ἢ τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἐγερθησαί, καὶ εἰ σύμβολον κ. τ. ἡμ. ἵνα εἰ τῶν τούτων ἐγέρθησαν πληροφορηθῶσιν καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐκείνου, λογισμοῖς, ὅτι οἱ τούτως ἀναστήσασιν, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐαυτῶν ἀνέστησαν ἄγιοι δὲ ἡγέθησαν, ἵνα δοξῆσιν ἀξιώσατο, λέγοντες περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔμφασις ἔχουσεντες δὲ, πάλιν ἐκκυμήθησαν. I must not omit to notice, in order that I may strongly reprove and briefly refute two hypotheses respecting these two verses which have been broached by certain German critics. First, they maintain that the two verses are spurious, and foisted in from the Gospel of the Nazarenes, or from tradition. To this I answer, that if it be an interpolation, it must be a very early one; since the verses are found in all the MSS., are acknowledged by all the Versions, and are so alluded to by the early Fathers and Ecclesiastical Historians, that they must have occupied their present situation in their days; and that the interpolation should have taken place at an earlier period is utterly improbable.

Secondly, it is by many maintained that these verses contain a mere *myth*, for which the Evange-
list is not to be considered accountable, since he merely narrates it from common report, in order to show how powerfully the minds of men were agitated by the death of Christ. They task their ingenuity, to account for whatsoever is preternatural in the circumstances, from the operation of causes at once natural and even ordinary. But at last their version of the story is so far-fetched and (I had almost said) puerile, as to make greater demands upon our faith than are requisite on the principle of divine interposition. Both the above hypotheses are so devoid of probability, that (according to my usual custom) I should have passed them by, but that I wished to enter my protest, however insignificant, against the levity and irreverent spirit with which such hypotheses are commonly thrown out by the temerity of the sceptical school, and, (it pains me to add,) sometimes (as on the present occasion) countenanced by those from whom we might expect better things.


54. ἀληθὸς Θεοῦ υἱὸς ἂν ὤντος. Since they were Romans who said this, Grotius, Rosenm. and Kuin. think it plain, that they meant to signify nothing more than that Christ was not only innocent, but altogether a just man, (as in Luke 23, 47.) and (considering the earthquake) as it were a hero, or demi-god, such as Hercules, Bacchus, Castor and Pollux, &c. This interpretation is adopted by Grotius, Markland, and Campbell. The latter of whom renders, "the son of a God," and has a prolix annotation on the article, and its addition or omission, in which the only valuable remark is, "that the article is sometimes omitted when the meaning is definite, but hardly ever used when it is indefinite." This is not the place to enter upon such a subject; it may here be sufficient to refer the student to Dr. Middle-
ton's excellent treatise on the Greek article. As to the import of the formula ιδές Θεοῦ, now before us, Campbell thinks that the expression, as coming from polytheists, could scarcely have been spoken otherwise than indefinitely. To me, I confess, there appears something harsh and far-fetched in the sense assigned by the above learned critics. If I were induced by the arguments of Campbell to lay any great stress on the omission of the article *, I should prefer interpreting ιδές Θεοῦ simply by δίκαιος, a just, i.e. an innocent man; for that is the signification in the parallel passage of Luke. See note on Matth. 27, 28. But this seems too confined a sense, unless we take it as in Matth. 5, 19. ιδέ Θεοῦ κληθεισοντα (where see note): that would, however, be too refined and mystical a signification for Roman soldiers to be likely to use. If, on the other hand, we take it in the sense of Messiah, I see not what serious difficulty this involves. The soldiers must have been quite aware of the pretensions of Jesus to be the Son of God; nay, the celebrated Wasse thinks it highly probable that the centurion was present at the trial of our Lord. The term Son of God, as synonymous with Messiah, must have been familiar to them, as being then in perpetual use. Besides, they had heard Jesus died addressing God as his Father. Neither could they be ignorant that he had in fact been delivered to death for maintaining that claim; though nominally condemned for sedition. Where then is the difficulty of supposing that, on seeing the awful and preternatural circumstances which accompanied his death, that some of them observed, “certainly this was an innocent and just man;” and others exclaimed, “This was truly the personage he affirmed himself to be;” namely, the Son of God. We are not to understand, however,

* Though one should never be unmindful of the Canon of Glossius: “Ex curiosâ et minus necessariâ articuli consideratione, falsae hypotheses et errores facile oriri et invexi possunt.”
that these soldiers comprehended the full force of that expression. They merely used it in the popular sense. On this formula see more on Matth. 14, 38. ἀληθεῖς Θεοῦ uts e.

55. ᾧσαι δὲ—γυναῖκες. This last mark of respect to their departing teacher was paid by these women, which, besides John, none of the disciples dared venture on. For, as observes Euthymius, αἱ μαθηταὶ γὰρ ἑφυγον, αἱ δὲ μαθητριαὶ παρεμένον. Αἱ (adds Theophyl.) μάλιστα πάντων συμπαθεῖτεραι. From these women doubtless Matthew derived the account of the words of the centurion and the soldiers.

55. ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θ. On the pleonastic phrase, as well as on the restricted sense, in which the word μακρόθεν must here be taken, see the note on Matth. 26, 58. Διακονεῖται denotes ministration of every kind, especially the supply of food, clothing, and the other necessaries of life.

57. Ἰσογ. A senator of Jerusalem (thinks Grotius), because he is not called ἄρχων, but βουλεύτης. But Rosenmuller and Kuinoel think Luke, 23, 51. is repugnant to this, where it is said, that he did not consent to the counsel and acts of the others. But to this Grotius had long ago replied, that this was no certain proof, for men often disapprove of measures who have no hand in them. Euthymius says, that he was one of the seventy disciples; which seems extremely probable.

57. ἐμαθητεύετε τῷ Ἰσογ. The student will observe this intransitive sense of the word with the dative, of which examples are produced by Wetstein from Plut. 832. B. 887. c. 840. F. Kypke adds Jamblich. V. P. C. 23. and in Protrep. p. 150. The transitive sense, “to make a disciple” (though rare in the Classical writers), occurs elsewhere in the N. T. thrice: Matth. 13, 52. 28. 19. Act 14, 21. See Dr. Blomefield’s learned Sermon on Matth. 13, 52.

58. ἔγαματο τὸ σῶμα. The bodies of persons executed for treason (and generally of crucified persons) were seldom buried. See Plaut. M. G. 2, 4, 19.
ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. XXVII.

Scio crucem mihi futurum sepulcrum. It was usual, however, to give them for burial to their relations, on application. This was especially done in Judæa, in conformity to the custom of the country, founded on the Divine Law (Deut. 21, 23.), which forbids corpses to be exposed after sunset. So Jos. B. 4, 5, 2. Ἰουδαιαν περὶ τὰς ταφὰς πρόνοιαν ποιομένων, ὥστε καὶ τῶν ἐκ καταδίκης ἀνασταυρομένων πρὸ δύντος ἡλίου καθελεῖν καὶ βάπτειν and 6, 8. So Tob. 1, 20. 2, 10. Jos. 10, 27. Had Theophylact remembered this, he would not (says Markland) have written as he has on p. 178. This was, in the present case, done especially on account of the festival just at hand. That such respect was paid to festivals appears from Philo, 2, 529, 17. ἢδη τίνας οἶδα τῶν ἀνεσκολοπισμένων, μελλόντως ἐνίστασθαι τοιαύτῃ ἐκεχειρίᾳ, καθαρέθεντας, καὶ τοῖς συγγένεσιν, ἐπὶ τῷ ταφῆς ἁξιωθῆναι, καὶ τυχεῖν τῶν νεκρομεμένων, ἀποδοθέντας. (Wets. Rosenm. and Kuin.)

59. ἐνετύλιξεν—σινδόνι. Thus Herodot. 2, 86. (ap. Wets.) λούσατες τῶν νεκρῶν κατειλίσσωσι τῶν αὐτῶ τὸ σῶμα σινδόνος ψυχής τελαμαίοι κατατεμμυρεῖοι. The origin of σινδόνι is by Braun. de Vest. and Forster de Byssos Egypt. p. 85. proved to be Egyptian. So Pollux, 7, 172. σινδῶν ἔστιν Αἰγυπτία μὲν περιβολῶν δὲ ἀν εἶη. See Sturz de Dial. Maced. p. 94. It appears, however, from Martial, 4, 19. Τυριῶ σιν- done, that they were also made elsewhere. It was not so much a garment as a square web of fine linen, like our sheets, (so Galen. de Rat. Med. 10. directs the removal of a patient in a warm sīndon,) only that it was all of one piece, and was used for rolling up corpses, previous to interment, and, indeed, for common coverlids. So Thucyd. 2, 49. ὀστὲ μύτῃ τῶν πάνω λεπτῶν ἰμάτιων, καὶ σινδῶν τὰς ἑπιβολὰς, καὶ τ. λ. Of the cloths rolled round bodies the σινδῶν was the innermost, which is here particularly mentioned. Others, which are mentioned by the rest of the Evangelists were called θόνα. See Matth. 19, 40. & 20, 6. 60. ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτῶν μνημείῳ; laid it in his own new

60. ἐπατόμησαν. It is thus explained by Orig. C. c. 2. p. 103. ἐν μυκαλίω καινῷ ύψους, τούτῳ, οὐκ ἐκ λογιάσαν λίθων αἰκοδομηθέντι, καὶ τὴν ἐνωσιν οὐ φυσικὰν, ἠχοτε, ἄλλο ἐν μιᾷ καὶ δι᾽ ὅλων ἡμωμενή πέτρα λατομοτικὴ καὶ λαξευτη. By which τῇ, Wetstein thinks that the monument was cut out of one rock. The Jewish sepulchres were hewn caves. That the whole country was rocky, we learn from Strabo and Josephus. So Chaterbott ap. Wets. See Jos. Ant. 12, 7, 6. Agatharet, p. 23. Cic. de Leg. 2, 27.

60. προσκυλίζασ. It was an Oriental custom to guard the entrance of sepulchres with large stones (see Nicol. de Sep. Heb. 3, 10, 11.), and of caves generally. So Schol. on Soph. Antiq. 1216. (cited by Weston). Ἀθηνασαυρὸν κράματος λιθοσκαθή Διώνυς τρὸς αὐτὸ στόμιον. So also Arist. Vesp. 199. τὸς βύρας κεκλεισμένης, ὁδικὲ στολοὶ τῶν λίθων πρὸς τὴν βύραν—προσκυλίζει. Grotius says, that there is something similar in Polybius. So Hom. Od. 1, 240—3. Heliocod. I. 2. τὸν λίθον τοῦ στηλαίου τὸ κάλυμμα. Very similar is Jos. A. 464, 3. (of Daniel): καί βλήτην εἰς τὸν λάκκον, σφαγίζασ τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ στομίου κείμενον ἀντὶ βύρας λίθου. So Livy: "eo vinctus dimittitur, et saxum ingens quo operitur machinā superimpositum est." I add Plut. Philop. 19. speaking of a subterranean cavern: οὕτω βύρας ἔχου, ἀλλὰ μεγάλῳ λίθῳ περιαγομένῳ κατακλεισμένῳ where observe the περιαγομένῳ answers to the προσκυλίζασ in Matthew; for such immense stones are not lifted in conveying, but rolled along, or impelled by levers. The word is well adapted to express the conveyance of what is very weighty, and requires great labour. Bos Exercit.
illustrates this from Aristophanes. Add Hom. Od. 13, 570. καθιὸν ὁ ἐφίδιον τῷ χώρῃ, where χώρα means not door, but simply the mouth of the cave; which seems to be the primitive sense of χώρα, whence is deduced our through, and in the common sense a door. These stones were also used instead of doors, to close up wells, as we find from Genes. 29, 3.

62. The whole narration of the watch set over the sepulchre, (27, 61.—28.) has been called in question by Stroth and Paulus, whose arguments are justly pronounced by Kuinoel futile and frigid, and have been refuted by himself and Suskind. I cannot even find room for a compendium of their objections, and the answers; for which I must refer the reader to the works themselves.

62. παρασκευὴν. By this term they denoted the day preceding any Sabbath or feast, as being that on which all the preparations for its celebration were to be accomplished. See Schl. Lex. It was by some called the προσάββατον, as in Judith 8, 11. or προεόρτιον, as in Philo. 616. This παρασκευή, as we learn from Jos. Ant. 16, 62. began at the ninth hour. In Dionc. 2, 328. it is used for Saturday.

62. συνίστασθαι.—πρὸς Πλ. Schleusner renders co-iverunt. I prefer with Kuinoel adibant ad Pilatum. But as, on the Sabbath-day, and so holy a festival, there could be no convocation of the Sanhedrim, I therefore assent to Grotius, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, that by the words oi ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ oi Φαρισαῖοι we are to understand the chief of the Priests and Phariaical faction, who performed this business privato consilio. Notwithstanding what some have thought, it does not appear that these members of the Sanhedrim were polluted by this conference, since it was not forbidden to call upon, or make a request to, a magistrate on the Sabbath-day.

63. πλάνος. A very strong expression, signifying, properly, a vagabond, and, from the adjunct, an impostor, cheat: so vagus circulator, &c. In Athen. 615. it is joined with ἑσεργαστῶν, jugglers. So Diod. 34.

63. μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, i.e. within three days, or, on the third day. Of this idiom examples are produced by Kypke, Wetstein, and others. See note on 16, 21. That the Jews understood it so, is evident (says Dr. Owen) from the next verse, and so it should be translated in Mark 8, 31. It is, however, of more importance to observe, with Markland, this most amazing instance of God's providence, namely, in making Jesus's greatest enemies, and the chiefs of the nation, bear witness, that, before his death, he had foretold his resurrection after three days.

64. μὴ ποτὲ—κλέψωσιν αὐτῶν. They might the rather fear this, since a fraud of that kind had been committed seventeen years before, as we learn from Tacit. Ann. 2, 39. So also Herodot. 4, 95.

64. καὶ ἐσται ὁ ἐχαρτή πλάνη χείραν τ. π. i.e. lest the whole people should account him for the Messiah, and thus a sedition be raised. And there might have been reason for that fear, if Jesus had, on his resurrection, shewn himself publicly to all. The words have the air of a proverb. See 12, 45. Luke 2, 26. 2 Pet. 2, 20. (Rosenm. and Kuin.)

65. ἔχετε κουστωδίαν. In the interpretation of these words the critics are not agreed. There is, indeed, an uncertainty in the word ἔχετε, which admits of being taken either in the imperative, or the indicative. Most Commentators prefer the latter, q. d. "you have a guard; use it." Campbell, who adopts this interpretation, takes the expression to be no more than a civil way of granting a request; as in modern language we should say, "the guard is at your service." But that sense would rather require.
ἐχετε to be taken in the imperative, which, upon the whole (with Euthymius, Erasmus, Vatab. Rosenm. and Markland) I prefer. The sense is, “take a guard.” Upon either interpretation, however, it cannot be reasonably doubted, but that these were Roman soldiers, and not Levites, as some have supposed; which opinion, indeed, has been completely refuted by Campbell, whom see. I cannot, however, agree with him in supposing that this was the band of Roman soldiers, who, during the great festivals, guarded the porches of the outer court, and of which guard extraordinary at their public solemnities mention is made by Jos. A. 8, 4. It was rather, I conceive, the ordinary guard placed over prisoners, consisting of four quaternions. See Veget. 8, 8. So Tertullian: “sepulcro conditum magnâ militari manu custodiæ diligentiae circumseiderunt.”

66. σφραγίσατε. The seal was probably the seal of Pilate, and was affixed to the two ends of a rope brought over the stone. (Rosenm. and Kuin.) Kuinoel refers to Paulsen, Hezel, and Harmer. Of the passages cited by Wetstein, the only apposite one is Diog. Laert. 4, 59. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ προέλθῃ τοῦ ταμείου σφραγισάμενος πάλιν ἔθαν τὸν δακτύλιον διὰ τῆς ὅπης ἐφίπτεται—Μαθαώνα δὲ τοῦτο τὰ ἑρατονικα ἀπεσφραγίζε, καὶ ὅσα ἐβούλετο ἐβάσταζε. To which I add, Pausanias, 6, 26. σφραγίζοντας δὲ ταῖς βουραῖς τοῦ ὀικήματος ὑποβάλλοντο. So also Theophr. Char. Eth. C. 18. characterizes the distrustful man as interrogating his wife, when he has got into bed, whether she has fastened the chest, καὶ εἰ σεσήμανται τὸ κυλικεῖον, and whether the cupboard has been sealed. So the old fellow in Plaut. Casin. 2, 1, 1. exclaims, “obsignate cellas, referte annulum ad me.” See also Lycoth. Cassand. 5.11. and Tzitzes, in locum. This custom was very ancient, since we find, in Daniel, 6, 17. καὶ ἠνεγκαν λίθον, καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα τοῦ λάκκου, καὶ ἐσφραγίσατο ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν τῷ δακτυλίῳ αὐτοῦ.
In narrating the history of the resurrection of Christ there is, upon the whole, a sufficient agreement among the Evangelists. Yet in some circumstances they seem not to correspond. Grotius has, with his usual ability, discussed these discrepancies, both generally and particularly, and has shewn to what they really amount, and how they may be accounted for, or removed.

His general remarks I will subjoin—"There is nothing in the narrations of the Evangelists which amounts to absolute diversity. The only semblance of it is, that John first narrates his own and Peter's going; then the things which Mary Magdalene had seen, though that the order of time was different appears from Luke 24, 22—4. But this has no weight with me, who know that, like other annalists, the Evangelical ones do not always restrict themselves within such narrow limits as to only narrate first what occurred first. In all annalists we may find many πρωτότερα, many πρωτότεραι, many έπαινος. Neither did John, deviate from the natural order without good cause. Well he knew how slight with many would have been the weight of female testimony, on account of the imbecility of judgment usually attributed to that sex. Thus Celsius in the controversy with the Christian Apologists, dexterously parries the force of this testimony, and bestows on Mary Magdalene the appellation of γυναικα πάροικος. Therefore John having to treat of a most momentous affair, at once perfectly true and yet difficult of belief, he paves the way for their narration, by his own and Peter's testimony: and then having laid this foundation he adds that of the inferior sex." (Grot.) These observations may serve to show, that as the story is substantially one and the same in all the four Annalists, their narratives should
not be studiously set in opposition one to another, but employed for the mutual illustration of all.

On the discussion and adjustment of minute discrepancies, the narrow limits of my present plan will not permit me to dwell. But I must observe, that in such enquiries valuable assistance may be derived from the acute and original remarks of Euthymius. These minute discrepancies are exaggerated by a certain anonymous writer, whose fragments were edited about fifty years ago by Lessing. It seems to have been his aim, to throw uncertainty and doubt over the whole of this history. His arguments were however zealously, and successfully, refuted by Doederlein, Less, Samler, Tobler, Maschius, Michaelis, Plessing, Eichhorn, Herder, and others. It is observed by Griesbach (in his excellent Prolusis de Fontibus unde Evangelistae suas de resurrectione Domini narrationes hauserunt, Jena, 1793, 4to.) that these discrepancies are trifling, and not by any means of such moment as to render the narration uncertain, and suspected, to destroy, or even diminish the credibility of the Evangelists; but rather serve to show how extremely studious they were of the truth, and how closely, and even scrupulously, they followed their documents. He further observes, that each Evangelist related the thing in exactly the same way as he had first been informed, and led to believe, that it took place. That Matthew and John indeed saw with their own eyes Jesus restored to life, on the day of his resurrection; but that each received the first tidings of an event so wonderful from the women who had proceeded to the sepulchre. The Apostles were not, on the early dawn of the day on which Christ had risen from the dead, gathered together in one and the same place, but separated, and dispersed in the various quarters of Jerusalem, and divided amidst the hospitia of many friends. Hence Mary Magdalene narrated only to John and Peter what she had herself observed at the sepulchre. (Joh. 20, 20.) As to the other Apostles, she neither
at that time saw them, nor could give them the information of the body of their Lord being taken from the sepulchre. On the contrary, the women went to the Apostles, some one and some another, and related to them what they had themselves seen: (Matth. 28, 8, 9, 10.) Hence it happened that certain circumstances should be omitted by some, and others by others. For the women related the thing exactly as they had observed it, and the diversities of circumstances arose from more vehement commotion of mind, greater or less acumen, or even from the fantasy of the women, who, filled with tremour, related the event hastily, and perhaps (as is the case in all vehement commotions of mind) not very perspicuously. That the Apostles perhaps compared the different narrations, and meant to reduce them to order, and ascertain the exact truth, after they had met together. But when Christ personally exhibited himself alive to them when assembled together, and clearly convinced them that he was really risen from the dead, they believed, not so much on account of the asseverations of the women, but because they had then with their own eyes beheld the Lord returned to life. Yet the narrations of the women, by whom, as it were, the first rays of hope glanced on their minds, however imperfect and confused they might be, seemed to them worthy of lasting remembrance, and consequently they committed them to writing.” (Griesbach.)

Verse 1. ὁ ψε δὲ σαββάτων. Krebs, to whom (and to Casaub. Exerc. Antib. 672, seqq.) the succeeding commentators have been much indebted, observes, that the opinions of learned men, on this passage, have been so various and contradictory, that some were even better unknown. That they have sought out and introduced many more difficulties than they found: and thinks the words of Casaubon very applicable, “Illud animadvertio, doctos viros, dum in scripo nodum quærunt, dum alienis inventis uti reformidant, absurdissima quæque sine pudore pronunciare, ac per sé pe ad illustranda, quæ putant
esse obscura, sepiae atrimentum adhibere." Krebs then proceeds to detail what he conceives is the true interpretation of the passage, in which he has been followed by all the best commentators since his time. 'Oυξ σαββάτων, says he, signifies after the sabbath, or as Mark more distinctly expresses it διεγενομένου του σαββάτου, where we must understand the sabbath-day, with the subsequent night. So Thucyd. 4, 93. τῆς ημέρας ούξ ἡμ. Plutarch ούξ τῶν βασιλέων χρόνων. Philostr. ούξ τῶν τραίκων, post. Philostr. V. Ap. 4, 18. ούξ μουστριῶν, peractis mysteriis. Xenoph. Hist. 2, 1, 14. τῆς ημέρας ούξ ἡμ. Lis. 7, 8. serum erat diei. See Ammon. We may observe, too, that in the two-fold signification of σαββάτων, which at the beginning of this verse stands for the sabbath itself, but just afterwards for hebdomas a week (as σαββ. for week is very frequent in the Scriptures, of which examples are produced by Krebs), μᾶς σαββάτων is the first day of the week. So the Heb. יומ for πρωτη, numeral for ordinal. The Egyptians and Chaldeans called the first day of the week 'day one.' This Hebrew idiom was sometimes adopted by the Sept. Interpreters in Gen. 18, 14. And so the Rabbinical writers. Nor is this idiom without example in modern languages, and, amongst the rest, our own. Reland quotes Diod. Sic. μίας τεσσαρακοστῆς. So Sic. de Sen. 5. "uno et octogesimo;"—an idiom also in perpetual use in our own language; but this expression, as one and eighty, forms a compound word, of which the latter part only is susceptible of inflexion. But this does not exactly correspond to the present idiom of Matthew, which is merely a Hebraism. There is no discrepancy between this and the following phrase, τῇ ἐπίθεσιν, but the latter, and plainer, is meant to illustrate the former, and the more obscure.

1. τῇ ἐπίθεσιν. Here there is an ellipsis both of ημέρα and ἄμα which is supplied in Herodot. 8, 86, ἄμα ημέρας, διαφωσκοῦσι, where see Valckn. and Wesse. So Polyb. ἄτι τῆς ημέρας ἐπιθεσθησι.
Diod. Sic. 13, 18. τὸς ἡμέρας ὑποφωτισμὸν, where see Wassel. Herod. 9, 44. ἀμα ἡμέρας ὑποφωτισμὸν. The word is said by Casaubon, Exerc. Antib. 416. to be used properly of the first appearing of the heavenly bodies, especially the sun and moon. So Job. 31, 26. ἢ ηλιος ἐκφ. But it is used also of the day, and this phrase here signifies the first faint streak indicating the approach of the morning.*

1. Ἡδὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή, καὶ ἡ δαλη Ὁμαία. On this passage Griesbach (in the above-mentioned Dissertation) has the following remarks:

"To Matthew those women had brought the first tidings of the resurrection, who on Mary Magdalene's hastening into the city to fetch Peter and John (see on ver. 5.) had remained at the sepulchre, and first seen the angel, and then beheld the Lord himself. Now the fact that Mary Magdalene had in the early dawn, together with the rest of the women, gone to the sepulchre, came to the knowledge of Matthew, but that she afterwards separated herself from the rest, and was not with them, when Jesus appeared, and addressed them; of that he either was ignorant, or thought it scarcely worthy of mention. It appears that the woman who first had gladdened Matthew with such joyful tidings (whom we may suppose to

* This is indeed the exact sense of day, which is well derived by H. Tooke, from the Anglo-Saxon tagan, lucescere, of which down is but the past participle. The Latin dies, is plainly of a cognate origin. The expression, 'the day daws,' is found in our old English writers, as also the substantive dawing. So Dives and Pauper, "In the dawing and spryngyng of the day." The Gr. ἡμέρα seems to come from ἡμερός, lenis, i.e. the mild faint (light), when the sun just begins to daw and peep above the horizon. So also morrow, morn, and morning, are all truly, by H. Tooke, derived from the Gothic and Anglo-Saxon mer-gan, merr-an, &c. to disperse; denoting the dispersing time, when the darkness is dissipated. Thus the Heb. יָעִי evening, denotes the mixing (time). So in the "Life of our Lady " (ap. H. Tooke), "The night is passed; lo, the morowe grays, her light dameth." And again, "Upon us wretches in the vale of sorrowwe, and Lorde, do dawe the holy glade morowe." The Heb. יָעִי may be compared with the Anglo-Saxon glomung, and the Scottish gloming, i.e. the gray gloom of morning.
have been the τὴν ἀλλήν Μαρίαν, Maith. 28, 1. compared with 27, 56.) had indeed related, that she, with Mary Magdalene (and some others, whose names she seems not to have mentioned), had gone to the sepulchre; but she omitted to tell John and Peter of the departure of Mary Magdalene from the sepulchre; then using the plural, she proceeded to narrate what happened after the departure of Mary Magdalene.

1. θεωρήσαι τίν τάφον. From Mark and Luke it appears that they went to see whether the sepulchres was accessible, in order that they might anoint the body. This ἐνταφιάσματος was indeed usually performed before the bodies were committed to the sepulchre. But in this case, the haste of the funeral had necessarily prevented this observance, which therefore now remained to be accomplished. (Grot.)

2. καὶ ἰδοὺ σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας ἄγγελος Κυρίῳ. Hamm. and Cler. interpret a concussion of the air with thunder: and they tell us that σεισμὸς is so used. But this will not prove the sense of the simple. Markland would take it for trembling, or fear, and quotes Hesych. σεισμὸς, τρόμος. Philo Jud. τρόμος τε καὶ σεισμὸς πάντα αὐτῶ τὰ μέρη συνεκίκα. But then it is accompanied with τρόμος, which qualifies the boldness of the phrase. Philo is, like his prototype, Plato, a very figurative, and almost poetical, writer, and therefore is not good authority in determining the sense of such simple phraseology as that of our Evangelist. Markland says, that of this sense of σεισμὸς, there are innumerable examples. I have not myself met with one instance of σεισμὸς standing alone in the sense of trembling and fear. Nor must I omit to censure the temerity of certain German Theologians, who have ventured to maintain that the angel was not a person, but a thing, namely the lightning, or the flames which sometimes accompany any earthquake; nay even the earthquake itself may (they think) be accounted an angel (as the plague in the time of David is called), 2 Sam. 24, 16. But
that is a poetical, and highly figurative phrase. Here there is only narration in the plainest language; besides the words which follow clearly indicate the personality of this angel. Though indeed the above writers are so far consistent as to suppose that the guard only fancied that something white, glittering on the top of the stone, was an angel, and that the stone was rolled away by him, and that Matthew merely relates what he was told. But surely such hypotheses tend to destroy all reliance on the Evangelists as inspired writers. The purpose for which God sent the angels is thus stated by Heuman ap. Koecher: "It was partly to show peculiar favour to the Apostles and disciples of Christ, partly because it became God and his eternal Son that angels should forthwith be present, and reverently pay their duty." This is however a subject on which, as nothing is clearly revealed, it were vain, and perhaps presumptuous, to curiously speculate. On the circumstances detailed in the 2d, 3d, and 4th verses, Griesbach remarks, that they manifestly happened before the approach of the women, from whom therefore Matthew could not have derived the intelligence. These none could know but the soldiers themselves, and those to whom they might relate them. Therefore, either some soldier, afterwards converted to Christianity, furnished Matthew with the circumstances, or some acquaintance of the soldier related what he had formerly heard from his friend; or some Jewish Senator, afterwards brought to embrace the Christian Religion, communicated the intelligence.

3. ιδέα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀστρατη, form, figure. A signification frequent in the best Classical writers, (see Wetstein, Alberti, and Loesner,) by whom it is not unfrequently applied, as here, to the human form. Dr. Owen takes it for visage, countenance, and says that, to the instances produced by others, i. e. Albert and Kypke, may be added that of Plato, in his Amat. init. εἵνευν αὐτόθι τῶν τε νεών τῶν ἐπιεικεστάτους —τὴν ιδέαν. The most decisive example is one cited
from Arrian, Ind. 6. (by Alberti.) τῶν τε ἀνθρώπων ἀλ ιδεις ὦ πάντη ἀπάθουσιν ἀλ Ἰησοῦν τε καὶ Αἰθίοπαν. Neither is it correct, which Rosenm. tells us, that the word is used more frequently of the images presented to the fancy. This is only true of very modern Greek.

3. ἐνυμα λευκῶν ὁσελ χιᾶν. As black clothing was a sign of mourning, so was white of joy. In proof of which, Wets. cites Hom. II. κ. 437. Ἰησοῦς—λευκότεροι χιᾶν. And 547. ἄκτινες ὁν ἐοικόες ἡλίοιο. Ἡ. 12, 84. "Qui candore nives anteirent." Aelian, Η. Α. 4, 36. λευκὴν δέ' ὄκ ὡς ἐνος εἰσεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ χιόνος ἐπέκειναι, καὶ γαλάκτος πλέουν λευκὴν. Martial 2, 29. "Et toga non tectas vincere jussa nives." Plut. Cons. a. Apoll. p. 119. b. Liv. 45, 20. Whiteness has, says Grotius, ever been a symbol of purity and sanctity. So Daniel 7, 9. Ap. 8, 4, 18, 4, 4, 6, 11, 7, 9, 13. Hence, among all the nations of antiquity, it was customary for those who were celebrating divine worship, to be clothed in white. But to this whiteness of garment there was, in these angels, superadded an undefinable and peculiar splendour, like what is attributed to Christ in the transfiguration. (17, 2.) So Luke says, they were ἐν ἐσθήσεων ἀστραπτούσαις, a sign of celestial glory, such as Herod presumptuously affected; as we find from Acts 12, 22. (Grot.)

4. ἐγένομεν ὁσελ νεκροι. Of this hyperbolical phrase, not unfrequent both in the Greek and Latin, (nor indeed unknown to modern languages,) Wetstein gives examples from Lucian. Nec. 10. Dial. Deor. 2, 1. Demosth. Philipp. 1. τεβναισ τῷ δεῖ. 5—8. The series of events narrated in these verses by Matthew, are, from a comparison of that Evangelist with John, &c. thus arranged by Griesbach, in the Dissertation above mentioned:

"The women now approach to the garden, already (from vehement commotion) fearing that they shall be unable to accomplish the removal of the stone, with which they had perceived the entrance
of the cave to be closed. (See 27, 60, 61.) On entering the garden, they see the stone already rolled from the sepulchre; and, seized with fear, they stop before the entrance of the vault. Looking through the mouth inward, they perceive that the body is not deposited in the place destined for receiving the corpse; and they conjecture that it has been removed. Mary Magdalen returns, with all speed, to the city, in order to fetch Peter and John, and relate to them what she had seen. (Joh. 20, 2.) The rest of the women remain; and, when they have somewhat recovered from their fear, enter into the cave, and there behold the angels. After the departure of the women, Peter and John approach, and having vainly sought for the body of Jesus in the sepulchre, return home: when Mary Magdalen (who had not been able to keep pace with Peter and John, from the speed with which they hastened) now approaches to the sepulchre, and, overwhelmed with a mixture of grief and awe, she makes a slight pause, and soon beholds in the interior of the vault two angels. Shortly after, she falls prostrate at the feet of Christ, who had met her, and then hastens to carry the glad tidings of the resurrection of Christ, first to Peter and John, then also to the others, just as she may meet them. Meanwhile the rest of the women proceed on their way to seek the Disciples. As to the Apostles, it seems that they (excepting Peter and John) had, since the death of their Master, been in concealment in remote quarters of the city, nay perhaps were at Bethany, whither Jesus had been accustomed at night to repair."

6. ἵπτε τὸν τόπον δὲ ἐκεῖνο. Τόπος here signifies the cavity, or cell, hollowed out in the vault, and in which was deposited the corpse*. The word ἐκεῖνος is a vox solennis de hac re. So in the Greek epitaphs,

* This is admirably illustrated by a passage of Maundrell's Travels into Syria, where he thus describes a τρυπειαν, or, near, the antient Arphad. "The chamber is eight feet broad and ten long. In it are seven cells for corpses, which are hewn directly out of the firm rock." He then proceeds to mention another adjoining, which
and Latin ones, hic situs est, hic jacet. (Rosenm.) Wetstein produces an example from Thucyd. 243. τὸν τάφον—ἐν ὑμῖν κεῖται. And Herodot. 2, 197. See also Palaiaret.

6. ὁ Κύριος. Wetstein remarks on this emphatical use (so in Acts 10, 36. 1 Pet. 3, 22. Eph. 1, 21.) as if the angel had said, “Not only your but our Lord.” (Rosenm.)

7. προέχει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. Where was meant to be exhibited the public and formal appearance of Jesus to almost all his disciples, and to many others. But more was performed than was promised. For Jesus appeared first in Jerusalem, then afterwards in Galilee. (Rosenm)

7. ἰδὼν, εἶπον ὑμῖν. The conjecture of Triller and Maldonati, εἶπεν, is supported by the Cod. Cant. and some ancient Latin versions, is embraced by Markland, and is strongly confirmed by Mark 16, 7. καθός εἶπεν ὑμῖν.

8. μνημείον. “The μνημείον, or monumentum, amongst the Greeks and Romans, and perhaps the Jews, consisted of the cave, προέχει, στήλαν, and τὸ οὐπαθρόν, a small inclosure in the open air before it. This whole μνημείον was also situated in a larger space of ground, without the inclosure, called by the Romans tulea monumenti; here the cultivated garden. Thus from an ancient inscription: ‘Huic monumento tutelae nomine cedunt agri puri jugera decem.’ Vet. Inscr. And thus Frontinus: ‘Habent et mausolea juris sui hortorum modus circumjacentes.” See Demosthen. Orat. in Macartatum. Strabo, of the monument of Augustus. Gratus. In the more magnificent sepulchres of the Jews, there was first a square floor within the cave, and on

had eleven cells, and describes another which had no cells, but a bench cut all along its site; and again another sepulchre, which had cells cut into the rock eighteen feet long, so that three corpses might be deposited in each, at the feet of one another. We also find, by the descriptions which modern travellers give us of the Holy Sepulchre, that it consists of a vault, from which there is a descent, by a very low door, into an inner cave. This was not doubt the cell, or depository of the corpse.
each side, deeper than the floor by four cubits, caves, or sepulchres, to deposit the dead bodies, perhaps for six or eight or more corpses in all: is the very place where the corpse is laid." Bava Bathra, cap. 6. ult.


9. αῖς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο ἀπαγγέλλας. Campbell remarks on the indefinite application of the Greek moods and tenses in the Hellenistic use, which renders them equivocal. He (very properly) translates, "when they were gone:" as in Acts 20, 18. αῖς δὲ παρεγένοντα πρῶς αὐτῶν, "when they were gone." The imperfect is used for the pluperfect. So just after, ἡμετέρων αὐτῶν.

9. αὐτῶις. What one associate said, is ascribed to all; as in Matth. 16, 8, 17, 44. compared with John 12, 4, 5, 6, and Luke 23, 39, 40. So here Matthew has contracted into one narration what was seen and heard by the women, but the other Evangelists have detailed the circumstances more distinctly; from whose narrations we collect, that the angel appeared to the women, but in the absence of Mary Magdalen, and that Christ himself appeared to Mary Magdalen only. (Wetstein.)

9. χαίρετε. Campbell renders "rejoice;" others,
“I salute you,” “God save you.” But the common version, “all hail,” is far superior in dignity, and is not deficient in accuracy. The Syriac version has “pax vobis.” Euthymius renders εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.

9. εκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας. In the manner of suppliants, who were accustomed to prostrate themselves and embrace the feet of those from whom they sought protection. L. Brug. Lightfoot, and Rosenm. take it for kissing the feet; a custom which seems to have originated in the East. So 2 Kings 4, 27. Hier. Chetuboth, f. 62, 2. “Cum veneret ad ipsum [R. Akibam uxor ejus] procedit ad pedes ejus, eosque deosculata est.” But this custom extended also to the West; as appears from Dio Xiphilin in Cajo. p. 132. τοῖς γὰρ πλείστοις καὶ τοῖς βουλευτῶν, ἦ τὴν χειρα, ἦ τὸν πόδα προσκυνεῖν ἄρεγεν. Nay, vestiges of it still remain at the present day, in the ceremony of kissing the Pope’s toe. This subject has been also illustrated by Pincinelli, in his Lum. Refl. Grotius observes, that the adoration here mentioned, shows the additional awe with which they were now inspired. They feared (says Kuinoel) lest some harm should happen to them from the vision. For the ancients had a great dread of preternatural appearances. See Luke 5, 8. Jud. 6, 22, 22. 13, 21. 1 Reg. 17, 18. Dan. 10, 7. But this degrades the sense of the passage.

11. τοῖς ἀρχιερεῖσιν, i.e. Ananus and Caiaphas, or the Priests who had set the guard. Πρεσβυτέροι, primores populi. See Euthymius.

12. ἀργύρια λακᾶ ἔκακαν, money. The plural for the singular, as the Commentators tell us, (see Schl. Lex.) which may be thus accounted for: Ἀργύριον properly denotes, 1. silver in bullion and uncoined; 2. coined silver, though more frequently coined metal of any kind, money; in this sense it is chiefly confined to the singular. 3. it signifies any silver coin, but chiefly a stater, tetra-drachm, or shekel, and is in this sense very often used in the plural*, mostly

* This use of ἄ. in the plural is, however, in the purer, and es-
accompanies with numerals, or words that imply number, as many, few, &c. of which class is the term ἱκανος, since it here denotes many; of which the following examples are given by Wets. Menand. ap. Stob. S. 22. τὰ ταλάτα ἱκανα λεγόμενα. Diog. Laert. 4. 41. ἱκανα ἄργυρα ἀπέστηελε. Athen. p. 7. Α. ἱκανάς μωριάδας κατακαλάμας εἰς τὴν γαστέρα.

13. εἶπατε, διε οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ—ἐκλέγειν α. ἦ. κ. The improbability of this story (which could only be meant to impose on the most credulous of the mob) is well exposed by Grot. Brug. and other modern Commentators; but by none more ably than by Euthymius and Theophyl. On this shameless corruption of persons in their dignified stations, who ought to have set a better example, Euthymius strongly remarks: πρῶτον μὲν αὐτῆς οὖν τὸν φώνηυν αὐτοῦ, ὡς δὲ αὐτοῦ (buy off) καὶ τὴν ἀληθείαν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ πατοῦσι τὸ ὀικεῖον συνειδός, καὶ ωδή τοις φύλακας αἰδεύοντα, κακουργώντες καὶ συμπαλάστοντες μὲν τὴν ἀληθείαν, πλάστοντες δὲ τὸ φεῦγος, καὶ χραίμενοι τοῦτον διακόνοι, τοῖς ἐκείνης μάρτυρες. Theophylact says that, by so doing, τῷ ἰδίῳ πάθει, τῇ φυλαγγυρίᾳ, ὑπονοοῦσι τοὺς στραταίτας, they corrupt, and, as it were, infect with their own disorder, avarice. Indeed, not to mention the characteristic timidity and contemptible power of the Apostles, what were they to gain by the falsehood of asserting the resurrection of Jesus. They had nothing to hope from it now; and they afterwards did not hesitate to encounter the most bitter evils, and lay down their very lives, in testimony of its truth.

especially the Attic Classical writers, somewhat rare. Examples are given by Wets. from Lucian. Par. 12. Aristoph. Au. 601. and Nub. 754. where the Scholiasts say that this was frequent in the antient Comic writers, as Phrynichus, Sophron.; and of the same use of χρυσαρι, Wets. furnishes examples. Generally, however, the use of ἄργυρον was exactly like that of our corresponding word money; which, from its origin, does not properly admit of being used in the plural. For moneta, from which it is derived, signifies, primarily, a coining-stamp, or die; secondly, a stamping-place, or mint; thirdly, the metal there stamped or coined, coin, money.

14. πείσομεν αὐτῶν. Not persuade, but appease, conciliate, either by entertainments or gifts, &c. So Erasmus, Vatabl. Grotius, and Wakefield. Kypke produces two examples from 2 Macc. 4, 26. ἐπήγαγεῖλα τὸ χρήματα ἦκαντ τῷ. 2. πρὸς τὸ πείσαι τὸν βασιλέα. And v. 47. and 10, 47. Also from Jos. Ant. 6, 6. τὸ δὲ πνεύματι καὶ παρακαλέσειν τῷ Θεῷ συγκυνώνα τοῖς τούτων αὐτοῖς καὶ πείσειν. Compare Lys. p. 140, 142. 360, et ssepe. I add, that it is nearly the same as the phrase χρήματι πείδοςβαι, which occurs not unfrequently in the Greek historians and orators, as Thucyd. Æschines, Demosth. See Elsner on Galat. 1, 10.

14. ὑμᾶς ἀμερίμνος ποίσομεν. Ἀμερίμνον ποίειν is a law term, corresponding to the Latin indemnum praestare; or rather securus praestabimus, as the Vulg. (Gloss. securus ἀμέριμνος.) So we say, in a similar case, "I will make you safe and sure, I will ensure you."

15. διεφημίσθη ἡ λόγος οὗτος παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις, i.e. (as some interpret) the story about this lie and corruption of the soldiers, &c. Others, more probably, understand it of the story so studiously disseminated by the priests respecting the stealing of the body. Thus all the ancient, and most judicious modern Interpreters. That it was so disseminated we know: for Justin Martyr, in his Dial. with Trypho, SS5. (ap. Kuin.) mentions a message sent by the Sanhedrim to the Jews of the whole world, in these words: "Ὅτι αἱρεσις τις ἄθεος καὶ ἄνωμος ἐπήγερται ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ τίνος Γαλιλαίου πλάνον· ὅπως σταυροῦσαν ἡμᾶς ὁ μάθηματι αὐτῶν ἔμενε· εἰς οἱρανον ἐλημυθέναι. And moreover we meet with
vestiges of this knavish sedulity in the Rabbinical writings, in which we find this very same story.

16. το ἐρέσ. Grotius conjectures that this was Itabyrius. See Elsley. We have no means of attaining to certainty. Rosenm. thinks that not only the place, but the exact time was indicated.

17. προσεχέονσαν αὐτῷ. Compare 9 and 18. Luke 24, 52. Joh. 23, 28. We no where read that Christ before his resurrection was worshipped by the Apostles: whence we may infer that they now perceived something more divine about him than before.

17. οἱ δὲ εὖστασαν. There is some difficulty in the word, which Beza would remove by reading ὀδε. But that conjecture is not supported by any MS. and has been, on other grounds, satisfactorily refuted by Wetstein. Valck. Orat. Critic. 350. says it cuts the knot. In the present case there is no reason to stumble at οἱ δὲ for τινὲς δὲ, which is an idiom used both in the Classical and Hellenistic writers. So Matth. 26, 67. Luke 5, 38. Is. 19, 24. See Raphael, Alberti, and Kypke. Then, with respect to ἐστασαν, many are the attempts made to remove the difficulty. Grotius, Beausobre, and Doddridge, render "had doubted;" with reference chiefly to Thomas, and certainly the plural is sometimes used where one is meant. This method, however, seems here not satisfactory; still less the version proposed by some, even those who had before doubted;" a sense which cannot be fairly elicited from the words as they now stand. Bishop Pearce (and after him Schacht and Kuinoel) supposes those of the disciples who doubted did so, because the distance at which Jesus was first seen by them, did not exhibit him clearly enough to their sight: and he thinks that this is confirmed by the following words, προσέθησαν ὁ Θεός. But this appears to me a very frigid and far-fetched expedient for ridding us of the difficulty, and such as carries with it no solid conviction. Valck. seems to think
that the sense may be, "some of them, (i.e. the eleven) doubted whether he ought to be worshipped or not, thus referring to the preceding word προσελθασαν. But this is exceedingly harsh, and altogether inadmissible. The Apostles did not, could not, (after six or seven previous appearances,) doubt; otherwise they would not have been commissioned to evangelize the whole word. I entirely agree with Whitby, West, Owen, and Kuinoel, in referring the words to the seventy disciples, many of whom would doubtless accompany the Apostles. We may therefore translate, "but there were some (with them) who doubted." I grant that the expressions are not so perspicuous as might have been wished, and that a few more would have been desirable. This brevity Kuinoel attributes to the hurry of a writer just approaching the end. But I see nothing solid in the remark. If even the Apostle Thomas could so long resist conviction, where is the wonder that some, (perhaps only a few,) of the seventy disciples had yet scruples remaining, which doubtless soon vanished? On this subject Euthymius has well observed: Τίνες δὲ αὐτῶν ἠδοτασαν περὶ αὑτοῦ, φαονυμενι τὴν πλάνην, κρη δὲ μὴ ζητεῖν, τίνες ἦσαν αὗτοι σειωήνημα γαρ μόνον δὲ γένοσκειν, δι' καὶ αὗτοι προσελθόντες αὐτοῖς εἰςβαίναντος. There can be no reason for dissembling this fact, which, as Grotius observes, is a part of the story not unimportant. "Nam aequé rem aestimantibus omnem dubitationem de facti veritate admit certa fides illis etiam facta qui ad credendum tam difficiles fuerunt. Dubitatio illorum nostram auxit fidei. Ili omnia indagant et observant, certo et infallibiliter credere gestientes." Διστάσω properly signifies to stand in dívío, not knowing, or determining which road to take; the metaphor may be illustrated from the following elegant passage of Euripides, Or. 625. διστάσῃ μεριμνῇ διστάσως ἰδιόν ἰδοί; Compare Matth. 14, 31. οἰς τι ἠδοτασάς; The Syr. Ver. gives the literal sense, to be divided in mind.
18. καὶ προειλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Matthew comprizes into one compendium the chief heads of those discourses which Christ held with the Apostles, not only on the mount at Bethany, but also at Jerusalem before and afterwards, when about to ascend to Heaven. (Grot.)

18. ἔσθη μοι πᾶσα ἔξωσια, the highest authority, (δοξα προειλθών, Joh. 17, 5 & 24.) i. e. the power of ruling over the souls of men by my doctrine, and of effecting the propagation of my Religion every where, both among Jews and Gentiles, and of binding them to the profession of this Religion by the solemn rite of baptism. (Rosein. and Kuin.) Wetstein produces many citations, which are, however, not very apposite. They apply to the subordination of the Son to the Father, i. e. the person entrusted with power to the giver of power, ex. gr. Plin. Pangenyr. Traj. "Magnus, qui tantum præmium cepit: sed major, qui capienti dedit."

19. μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἐθνᾶ, ἰστίγοντες αὐτῶν. Campbell translates, "convert all the nations;" and justifies this version in a very prolix note. I cannot approve of the introduction of the article. He, however, justly observes, that there are three things here enjoined: "to convert to the faith; to initiate by baptism; and to instruct the baptized in the practical duties of a Christian life." By πάντα τὰ ἐθνᾶ is meant, not, as hitherto, the Jews alone (ch. 10, 5.) but persons of all nations, whether Jews, Samaritans, or Gentiles. The Apostles, however, seem at first to have interpreted this of the Jews only, whether resident in Palestine, or in the other parts of the world through which they were scattered, or of those Gentiles who should embrace the Jewish forms of religion. That the Jews were scattered throughout the known world, appears from Joseph. B. 7, 3, 3. τὸ γὰρ Ἰουδαῖον γένος τολμᾷ μὲν κατὰ τὰς τῶν οἰκουμένην παρέσχεται τοῖς ἐπίχρισιν. Philo, too, (De Legatione ad Caium, p. 1031, 32. edit. Francof.) says, that all the provinces (many of which he enu-
merætes) were full of Jewish colonists. This is well illustrated by the two following passages, cited by Bulkley, from Justin Martyr, in the second part of his Dialogue, p. 388. Οὐδὲ ἐν γὰρ ὅλως ἐστὶν τὸ γένος ἀνθρώπων — ἐν ὦς µῆ, διὰ τοῦ ὑμάτου τοῦ σταυρωθέν- τος Ἰησοῦ, ἐξὰς καὶ εὐχαριστία τῷ πάτρι καὶ ποιητῇ τῶν διαν γίνονται: which is thus translated by Mr. Bulkley: "There are nations where none of you, Jews, ever inhabited: but there is not any nation, or people of mankind, whether barbarian or Greek, or by whatever other name distinguished, whether Hamaxobians, Nomads, or Scenites, where, through the name of a crucified Jesus, prayers and thanksgivings are not offered up to the Father and Maker of all things.

And ib. p. 398: Ὁς ἐν µήδει γένει ἀγνοεῖται αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀπὸ πάντος μετανοίαν πεποιήθαι — καὶ πάσας τὰς ἀγάς — µαθητεύσατε. "Such was the splendour and power of his appearance, that there is no nation ignorant of him; but men of all nations are brought to repentance; daemons are subject to his name, and princes and kingdoms fear and reverence it beyond that of any other person that ever lived upon earth."

It clearly appears, from the Acts of the Apostles, that the disciples, for some time, entertained the opinion that it was forbidden them to preach the Gospel to the heathen nations, and receive them in the Christian society. But in process of time, the Apostles, enlightened by the Holy Ghost, acquired an increase of knowledge, entertained more accurate notions respecting the propagation of the Christian Religion throughout the known world, and more rightly comprehended Christ's intentions. (Rosenm. and Kuin.) We must now turn our attention to the important term µαθητεύω, which here, I think, clearly signifies, to make a disciple of. The sense is, "make disciples (of persons) of all nations." So Vatabl. Beza, Grot. Lightf. Gataker, Wolf, Simon, Wets. Wall, Pearson, Rosenmuller, Kuinoel. Thus the Syriac version: "discipulos effecite." Scott and Wes-
ley, "disciple" all nations; a word formerly in use in our language, and found in Shakspere and Spencer. Bp. Pearce, and Dr. Maltby, in Serm. 2, 527, and Dr. Blomfield, in a Sermon upon Matth. 13, 52. observe, "the word μαθητευομαι occurs thrice in the New Testament, and always in this sense, to make a disciple of." I must, with great deference, remark, that this is not strictly accurate. It occurs four times; Matth. 27, 57. Matth. 13, 52. Matth. 28, 19. Act. 14, 21.; and in Matth. 27, 57. it has the intransitive sense, not unfrequent in the Classical writers, i.e. to be a disciple. And even in Matth. 13, 52. though Dr. Blomfield has assigned to μαθητευομαι the sense of "having been made a disciple of," I am inclined to think that it has the adjunct signification, to instruct: so that τὸς γραμματεὺς μαθητευομαι τῇ βασιλείᾳ there signifies, "every teacher instructed in the doctrines of the Christian Religion." Here we must observe, there is no distinction of age, nor is baptism limited to adults. Hence, not without reason, has Whitby taken the opportunity of defending infant baptism; whose excellent dissertation is well deserving of perusal. Grotius, too, has some valuable matter on this subject, which will be found partly condensed in Mr. Elys's work. To all these notes I can only refer my reader, in order that I may introduce the following admirable defence of infant baptism, from the able pen of Wetstein:

"It is admitted by all, except the Socinians and Quakers, that to as many as may, and ought to be, introduced into the number of Christ's disciples, baptism (as being a public and solemn token of making any one a disciple) may and ought to be administered. But it is not equally agreed to whom we are to apply the appellation of disciples; whether to those only who have already learned and been instructed, or (besides them) to those also who are learning, and are in the course of instruction. A question therefore arises, whether one, or two, or three, classes of disciples may properly be formed, i.e. τῶν μαθητῶν..."
The first is the opinion of Servetus, who, in his book *de Christianismi Restitutione*, stiffly and confidently contends, that no one can legitimately be admitted into the number of Christ's disciples before he has attained his thirtieth year. Nor are there wanting persons at the present day, who maintain that only those that shall have reached the years of puberty ought to be introduced into the number of Christ's disciples, and be baptized. These may properly be termed τελεοβαπτισταί, or ἑφηβοβαπτισταί. The second opinion was formerly held by Greg. Naz. and is at the present day espoused by the Georgians, G. Whiston, &c. who hold, that children of three, or eight, or ten years, excluding all under that age, may be made disciples, and baptized. These are παιδοβαπτισταί. The third class comprehends those who exclude persons of no age from the number of disciples fit to be admitted to Christian baptism (whom we term νεοβαπτισταί): and this is, and has ever been, the opinion of most Churches, and in which I must profess my acquiescence. Certainly, a person may be made any one's disciple, in a twofold manner; either when he, knowingly and voluntarily, of his own judgment and will, commits himself to any one for instruction (which can only be said of the first class); or when, by his parents or guardians, in whose power he is placed, he is so committed and entrusted. But he who is receiving his first lesson is as much a disciple as he who had attended on the whole course of instruction, unto the very last lesson. Nay, he who is committed by his father to the care of any master, is already his disciple, before he has been taught his first lesson; and if the same person be both master and father (as fathers are the masters of their children), then as soon as he has formed his plans, and arranged his measures, for the education of his son (and too soon he cannot form them), from that instant the son is justly accounted the disciple of his father. And since experi-
ence teaches us that the number of disciples who are brought to school, or put to trades, or introduced into merchandize or professions, not by their own will, but by that of their parents, is incomparably the greater, the usus loquendi requires that we should believe the name of disciples to be suitable to them. Nor are examples wanting: Timothy was a disciple of Christ, not at his first becoming an ephebus, or youth, but ἀπὸ βρέφους. 2 Tim. 1, 5, 6, 3, 14, 15. (vide not. in loc.) Thus also in Is. 7, 15, 16. the boy is described as, from his childhood, knowing how to chuse the good and reject the evil. So Justin Martyr. Apol. 1. καὶ πολλὰ τίμει καὶ πολλοὶ ἔξηκοντοταί καὶ ἐβδομηκοντοταί, οἱ ἐκ παιδῶν ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἀφθοροὶ διαμένουσι. Origen, in Judic. H. 6. "Si eat quis puer ad scholam, a magistro qui-dem suspicitur, et fit illius doctoris discipulus, sed non statim discendi ab ipso præceptore sumit exordium, sed cùm ab eo prima tantùm elementa susceperit, traditur aliis erudiendus—ut cùm ab illis, quantum in eis est, fuerit edoctus, et cùm prima apud eos deposuerit rudimenta, tum demum ipsius doctoris perfectiora præcepta suscipiat." Lucian Hermot. 82. καὶ αἱ τίθει τοιοῦτε λέγουσι περὶ τῶν παιδίων, οἱ ἀπεκτέναι αὐτῶν εἰς διδασκάλου, καὶ γὰρ ἂν μισθοῖς μαθεῖν ἄγαθον τι διώκονται, ἀλλ’ ὡς παιδίαις ποιήσωσιν, ἐκεῖ μένωσι. So Cic. de N. D. 3, 3. "Sic aggredior ad hanc disputationem, quasi nihil unquam audierim de diis immortalibus, nihil cogitaverim, rudem me discipulum, et integrum accipe, et ea quæ requiro, doce." Very similar to which is that of Schabb. f. 31, 1. "Dixit Ethnicus Hillelem: proselytum me fac, ut me doceas." I grant, indeed, that though the noun μαθητῆς occurs above two hundred and fifty times in the New Testament, it is no where attributed to children, or infants, except perhaps in 1 Tim. 3, 14, 15. and Act. 15, 10, 1. It does not, however, from thence follow, that infants and boys were not disciples, any more than that the Apostles only were disciples, (who are for the most part designated by this name);
or that youths are not disciples, though that they are any where so called in the New Testament cannot be satisfactorily demonstrated. But whatever may be the determination in other places, certainly in this passage, which contains the institution of baptism, a lax and mild exposition of the word μαθητεύεσθαι is to be preferred to a rigid, straight laced interpretation: and that this kind of interpretation was adopted by the Apostles, I make no doubt. For since they could not be ignorant that the boys and infants of Jews were to be circumcised, so as to become Jews also, and thus to be brought into covenant, (Deut. 29, 10, 11, 12:) and that the boys and infants of Gentile proselytes were not only themselves called proselytes, and circumcised (as the Mischna teaches us), but were also baptized (as I have fully proved from the Gemera, in the note on Matth. 3, 6*), I do not, therefore, see how it could enter into their thoughts to expunge boys and infants from the list of disciples, or from baptism, unless they had been excluded by the express injunctions of Christ, which we no where find. Again, since at the very times of the Apostles (in so extensive a conversion of the world) it could not but often happen, that a Jewish master of a family, having children, both adults and boys, and infants recently born, would unite himself to the Christian Church; now it becomes an important question what was done, or could have been done, with the boys and infants? Was the recently born babe, in order to become a partaker of eternal salvation, to be circumcised, and brought up in his boyhood, as if he were a disciple of Moses, and not of Christ? No, surely! Nay, St. Paul says, “bring them up in the fear and nurture of the Lord.” (See Ephes. 6, 4,) Or was this infant, or boy, as yet neither a disciple of Moses, nor of Christ, but like a tabula rasa? But by this means he would have been in a worse condition, than if his father had never en-

* On this subject there is much important matter to be found in Lightfoot, on Matth. 3, 6.
tered into the Christian Church, since, deprived of
the Jewish rites and privileges, and of every assist-
ance which, as a Jew, he might have expected from
a Jew, he would have received nothing that might
serve to repair the loss. But all intricacy is obviated,
if we lay down the following principle; namely, that
as he who is born of citizen parents is a citizen, and
as a widow, and an orphan of a person enrolled into
any society or body, belong to that same society, and
fall under its protection, so boys and infants are also
disciples of the same society or body. Add, too, that
those who are unwilling to receive boys among the
number of Christ's disciples, manifestly recede from
propriety of language, and have not whereon to fix
their foot, but may be pressed by the same argu-
ments, so as to be compelled to exclude also youths
whose age is not yet confirmed. But if they admit
boys, I must ask them, at what age? That boys at
school can very accurately discern the faults of their
masters, and have a very clear sense of justice and
natural equity, is admitted; nay, even before they
begin to speak, and in the cradle, one may perceive
in them the tokens of benignity and gratitude, and,
as it were, the sparks of the virtues. But whatever
year of childhood they shall have granted to us, they
will, I suppose, approach nearer to infancy than to
adolescence; and they must also necessarily grant,
that what is due to any one by right, may (so that it
injure no one) be anticipated, but must by no means
be procrastinated. Nay, if boys ought to be baptized,
surely it was prudent in those who presided over the
Church (in which all things should be done decently
and in order) to require, that infants, and those who
cannot yet speak, should be baptized, rather than
boys, from whom there might be reason to fear, lest
by the innate levity of mind so perceptible in that
age, a thing so grave and solemn should be turned
into sport. Nor was it necessary that the thing
should be committed to writing, and marked by ex-
press words in the sacred volume, just as neither the
age nor the sex of those who are to be admitted to the Lord's Supper is prescribed *. On the contrary, there was a reason why that should not be done, i.e. lest superstitious persons should stick at the bark only of doctrines, and should dispute about minutiae.

* On this subject very judicious are the following remarks of Dr. Lightfoot. "Hinc etiam patet ratio, cur apud Novum Testamentum, accurationi regulata, non prescribatur quinam baptizandi. Oggerunt Anabaptistae, Non praecipitur ut baptizentur infantes, ergo non sunt baptizandi.—Quibus ergo, Non prohibetur ut baptizentur infantes, ergo sunt baptizandi. Et ratio in aperto.—Nam cum Pædobaptismus in Ecclesiâ Judaica, in admissione Proselytorum, ita fuit notus, usitatus, et frequens, ut nihil feret notius, usitius, et frequentius. I. Non opus erat ut aliquo præcepto robore tur (cum Baptismus jam in Sacramentum evaderet Evangelicum.) Nam Christus Baptismum in manus suas, atque in usum Evangelicum, suscepit qualem inventit, hoc solum addito, quod ad digniorum finem atque ad largiorem usum promoveret.—Novit satis genæ universa parvulos solitos baptizari; illud præcepto opus non habuit; quod communi usu semper invaluaret.—Si prodiert jam edictum regale in hæc verba, Recipiatur semuisquæ Die Dominico ad publicum conventum in Ecclesiâ, insani et ille certe quicunque olim hinc argueret, non celebrandas esse Die Dominico in publicis conventibus preces, conciones, psalmodias, eo quod nulla in edicto de iis mentio; Nam cavit edictum de celebratione Diei Dominici in publicis conventibus in generi, de particularibus autem divini culti speciebus ibidem celebrandis non opus erat ut esset mentio, cùm istæ antedatum edictum, et cùm daretur, semper et ubique notæ essent, et in usu assiduo.—Ipsissimo istic modo res se habuit cum Baptismo; Christus cum instituit in Sacramentum Evangelicum, quo in professionem Evangelii omnes admittererant, ut olim in Proselytismum, ad religionem Judaicam.—Particularia eo spectantia, modus scilicet baptizandi, etas baptizandi, sexus baptizandi, &c. regulæ et definitione opus non habuerant, eo quod hac vel lippines et consorsibus satiæ nota erant ex communi usu. II. Econtræ ergo planæ et apertæ prohibitione opus erat, ut infantes et parvuli non baptizarentur, si eos baptizandos nollet Servator.—Nam, cum per omnia secularia precedentia usitatissimum esset, ut baptizarentur parvuli, si aboleri istam consuetudinem vellet Christus, apertæ prohibuisset : silentium ergo ejus, et Scripturas hac in re, Pædobaptismum firmat, et propagat in omnia secularia.—Ex dictis antea satiæ quæ, quo sensu illud intelligendum in Novo Testamento, quod aliquoties occurrat, quod pater-familias scilicet baptisatus fuerit cum tota familia, Acts, 16, 15, 38, &c. Nec valet, quod cavillantur Antipedobaptista, probari non posse in istia familiis fuisse infantes; nam non tam aliud queritur, an in istis familiis fuerint infantes, quam vere et merito concluditur, si essent, omnes baptizandos."
of ceremonies, and the circumstances of rites and forms, to the neglect of what is principal and essential."

On the baptism of Proselytes among the Jews, see the note on Matth. 3, 6. To be baptized in the name of any one, is, by baptism, to be bound to observe the religious observances instituted by him. In illustration of the form of baptizing in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Wetstein has the following interesting citations: Const. Clem. 3, 17. του πατρος η μνήμη αις αιτίου, και υιού αις ἀποστολέας του πνεύματος συμπαράλγης, αις μάρτυρας. 6, 14. δηλούμεν υμίν θεόν παντοκράτορα ἐνα μόνω ὑπάρχειν, παρὰ δὲν ἄλλος όκ ἔστι, καὶ αὐτῶν μόνων σέβειν καὶ χροσκύνειν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, ἐν τῷ παναγίῳ πνεύματι. 7, 13. Baptistus datur in nomen του ἀποστείλατος Πατρός, του ἐλθόντος Χριστοῦ, του μαρτυρήσατος παραιτήτου. Canon. Apost. 38. δοξασθήσεται ο θεός διὰ κυρίου ἐν αγίῳ πνεύματι. Vide Symbol. Apost. It has been debated among theologians, both of the last and present century, whether the words βαπτ. κ. τ. λ. contain a formula of baptism prescribed by Christ, and used by the Apostles, or whether by them is indicated the end and purpose of baptism. The arguments used in defence of the former use are thus stated by Kuinoel:

I. Those who take this side of the question appeal to Act. 19, 5. compared with ver. 2. and Tit. 3, 4. seqq. and they remark, that in these passages the subject is baptism, and that there are mentioned the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

II. They bring forward this passage of Justin. Apol. 1, 61. p. 79. where he informs us that those who came to profess the Christian doctrine were baptized, εἰς ὑμάτως τοῦ Πατρος τοῦ διὰ καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ, καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου, and adds, τρέχον αὐτοὶ αἰνείσχουσιν, διὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ αἰνεινηθημεν.

III. They notice that in other passages of the N. T. is mentioned only baptism εἰς το ὑμάτα τοῦ
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Κυριοὶ Ἰησοῦ, Ἰ. ἐκ τῷ ὄνοματι, Ἰ. ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι τοῦ Κυρίου, Ἰ. εἰς Χρ. Ἰησοῦν, Act. 2, 38, 8, 16, 10, 48, 19, 5. Rom. 6, 3. Gal. 3, 27. But εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, or ἐν, ἐκ τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ Χρ. i. e. εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, is a shorter formula, which, if we consider the thing, produces the same sense as that fuller one in Matt. 28, 19. (Kuin.) Piscator and Gataker, and in our own day, many German Theologians, especially Kuinoel, maintain the latter opinion. Piscator thinks it quite contrary to the intention of Christ; and Gataker maintains that it is no more to be taken in this sense, than when it is directed in 1 Cor. 10, 51. that all things are to be done in order, and where it is commanded that at each single act we should say, 'I do this to the glory of God.' But this seems a very frivolous objection. The arguments of those who at the present day maintain this side of the question, are thus stated by Kuinoel.

"That we are not to regard the word of any certain form of Baptism is manifest (say they) from this circumstance: that Christ did not command them to go and teach all nations, saying, I baptize thee, &c. but only baptizing them, &c. See Voss. Disp. 2. de baptismo, Thes. 5, p. 262. seqq.

II. No passage is found in the Acts, or in the Apostolic Epistles, where any manifest vestiges are observable of a formula, as prescribed by Christ, being in use. In Acts, 19, 5. and Tit. 3, 4. the subject of the discourse is, the efficacy of the Divine Spirit on the minds of men (See Act. 2, 38. and not. on Joh. 14, 17.): but no baptismal formula is brought forward.

III. If Christ had prescribed any form of baptism, the Apostles would not have receded from it, and used a shorter one. In all those passages however, from the Acts of the Apostles, and Paul. Ep. to the Romans and Galatians, a short formula is not mentioned, but the sense of the words βαπτίσθητε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, or εἰς Χριστὸν, is, "to be bound by the
rite of baptism to the profession of the Christian doctrine, to be received into the Christian society.” To what formula the Apostles joined baptism, may not clearly appear; but that at a very early period the present was introduced into use is certain, from the above cited passage of Justin. Dr. Doddridge, has made the following judicious remarks on this subject: “It is certain that no argument can be drawn from hence to the prejudice of infant baptism. Though I dare not assert that the use of these very words is essential to Christian baptism, yet, surely the expressions must intimate the necessity of some distinct regard to each of the sacred three, which is always to be maintained in the administration of this ordinance; and consequently it must imply that more was said to those of whose baptism we read in the Acts, than is there recorded, before they were admitted to it. The Christian Church, in succeeding ages, has acted a wise and safe part in retaining these words; and they contain so strong an intimation that each of these persons is properly God, and that worship is to be paid, and glory ascribed to each, that I cannot but hope they will be a means of maintaining the belief of the one, and the practice of the other, among the generality of Christians, to the end of the world.”
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Verse 19. δίκαιος δὲ — ἐβολήθη λάθρα ἀπολύσαι αὐτῷ. With the ἀπολ. may be compared the Heb. הוש in Jer. 3, 8. See Deut. 24, 1., where the Sept. has ἐκατοστέλλειν, and by which passage it appears that Joseph could not have sent her away without a writing of divorcement in the presence of witnesses. See Buxt. de Divort. p. 76., Abarbanel ib. p. 123. So that the λάθρα can only denote the suppression of the cause of divorce in the writing. (Kuin.) This, it seems, was optional.

20. καὶ διαρ, like the Heb. וָלַת in Gen. 20, 6. 31, 11., where the Sept. has καθ' ὑπνόν. So Jambl. de Myst. 3, 5. Διανύσον καὶ διαρ ἐπιφανέντος. Υἱὸς, “descendant of David.” Μὴ φοβηθῇς, &c., “Thou must, or needest, not fear.” So the Heb. וָלַת in Gen. 46, 3. Γυναῖκα, betrothed. Παραλαμβάνειν, i.e. literally, “to take home (παρά).” Classical examples, both of the simple and compound, are adduced by Elsner, Kypke, and Wets. Τὸ γεννηθήν. The cause of the neuter I have already stated: but why the participle past should so often be used I know not. Sometimes, however, the present is found, and sometimes the future. See Middleton in loc., or Valpy.

21. καλέσεις, “thou must call.” Future for imperative, after the manner of the Hebrew. On ἑρε. see Esley and Kuinoél, the latter of whom observes, that the words following show it to be a symbolical name, like Ἐμανουὴλ, Is. 7, 14.

21. τοῦτο γὰρ οὕτε τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. Kuinoél's observations are little to the purpose. The connection between sins and their judicial punishment has nothing to do here. It is plain that as the name Saviour would, considering by whom it had been borne, and what were the anxious expectations of the people, suggest the idea of a temporal deliverer; whereas this was to be a spiritual one. Αὐτῶς, καὶ, he, and none but he. By his people Joseph would understand no more than the Jews, who then expected the Messiah as a deliverer; though the Angel's meaning was, “all the faithful throughout the universe;” for, in every nation, he that feedeth him and worketh righteousness is accepted (Acts 10, 35).
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23. ἡ παρθένος. On the force of the article see the learned note of Elsner in loc., who censures Homberg and Wolf for rendering it a virgin. I still think that the article answers to the Heb. ה; but I cannot adopt the opinion of Beza and Elsner, that it denotes any certain virgin. The ה and the ἡ are not ill adapted to the prophetic style; as would have been readily seen, had it been found with an adjective; and yet παρθένος is proper such, as also מJKLM. 25. τὸν νεανίστην, literally, "this her son." Kuin. compares the Heb. ה emphatical, and refers to Jer. 38, 16. and Mark 13, 20. He thinks that Joseph did cohabit with Mary after the birth of Jesus; and therefore the παρθένος may be taken in its proper signification. There is, however, nothing to lead us to suppose so but the use of πρωτος; and that affords a very slight ground, being so easily explicable upon the common opinion, which is confirmed by the earliest records of ecclesiastical history. But it is well observed by Campbell, that "there is this good lesson to be learnt, even from the manner wherein some points have been passed over by the sacred writers; namely, that our curiosity, in regard to them, is impertinent, and that our controversies concerning them savour little of the knowledge, and less of the spirit, of the Gospel."

CHAP. II.

VERSE 1. τοῦ δὲ Ἰσαοῦ γεννηθέντος — βασιλεὺς. The time when the events recorded in this Chapter took place, is not distinctly marked. Hence there has been a diversity of opinion. It is generally supposed that they happened before Jesus's circumcision and presentation in the temple. And this has, of late, been ably supported by Storr, Diss. Exeg. in N. T. Hist. P. 2. p. 2. seqq. Others, on the contrary, in order to reconcile the accounts of St. Matthew and St. Luke, maintain that the Magi came when Jesus was already circumcised and presented at the Temple. The arguments for this opinion are stated by Kuinoel, who himself adopts it. My limits will not permit me to enter into the question: but the former opinion seems to involve the least difficulty. See Hammond, Whitby, and Esley.

Ἐν ἡμέραις is for ἐν χρόνοις or ἐν χρόνῳ. A Hebraism like שָׁמָּה for שֵׁם, as שָׁמָּה in Gen. 14, 1., where compare the Sept.

2. ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ τεχθεῖς β. τ. ἦμ. "where is he that has been (recently) born (to be) King of the Jews?" Kuinoel observes, that they speak " satis definitè, more eujusmodi hominum." On the supposed appearance of stars at the birth of celebrated persons, Wets has adduced many illustrations. But that belief, or superstition, here does nothing towards removing the difficulty of supposing what is meant by star. A question, I apprehend, not easy of determination. Most of the conjectures hazarded are very wild, and quite inadmissible. The most probable opinion is, that it was a luminous meteor, visible by day as well as by night, and, as it resembled a star, is so called; for, as Gerhard ap. Kuin. observes, "juxta usitatam Scripture phrasin, qua res vocantur non quales sunt, αντιστοιχία.
quaes apparent, sicut etiam alias visiones ignitae et lucide propter speculum et apparentiam sumps in Scriptura nominantur stellae, Apoc. 1, 16. 8, 10. 12, I." This hypothesis is, indeed, liable to some difficulties; but when we consider the whole transaction as brought about, supernaturally, by the interposition of God (who, in causing this star-like met or to appear and guide them, accommodated himself to the opinions of men), such difficulties will cease to have any force.

Προσκυνήσας. This, Whitby observes, is no proof of adoration. Indeed, the point cannot be decided without our knowing the opinion they formed of the personage to whom they were come to pay their reverential homage. If they were so well skilled in the prophecies as some suppose, it is possible they might expect something more in the Messiah than the human nature.

3. ἐπαγάγειν. Kuinoel observes, that ἐπαγάγειν is properly used of the troubling of water; as Ἑσσ. fab. 7., Ex. 52, 2., Is. 24, 14. It would have been truer to have said that ἐπαγάγειν comes from ἐπάγω and τάρα, cognate with our to s-lir (for the s is inceptive). In its present metaphorical application it frequently occurs, and is cognate with our horass. Πάνα ἑροσόλημα, "all the inhabitants of Jerusalem," by a common figure. Kuinoel observes, that ἑροσόλημα is elsewhere considered as a neuter; and so it may here, by the subaudition of πόλις. But the use of Hierosolyma as a feminine form in a passage of Cicero, cited by Kuinoel, defends the common mode.

4. ἐπυρβάνειν παρ' αὐτῶν ποῦ ὁ Χριστός, γεννάται. In γεννάται, Kuinoel observes, we have the present for the future tense; as 17, 1. And he compares Mal. 1, 6. 2, 7. And this, Elsner says, is found in the Classical writers. See his references. It may be Englished, i to be born.

6. οἱδαμος ἐλαχίστῳ εἰ. I would render: "thou art not to be." Of the various modes of reconciling the apparent diversity here between the Hebr. and the Greek of the Sept. and the Apostle, Kuin, approves of none; and he thinks the passage of the Prophet was cited from memory. An hypothesis often resorted to, but seldom well founded. The Apostle (I conceive) followed certain copies of the Sept. which then had the negative particle; some having διαγινότος εἰ τιν χιλ. or ἡγεμ.; others, μη διαγινότος εἰ. The τοῦ εἴναι of the present text of the Sept. seems to have had no place there, but arose (I suspect) from the τοῦ εἴναι just after. So that to take the words of the Prophet interrogatively, seems to be the best mode of removing the difficulty. And as this is not strictly a citation, but a report of the sense of the Prophet, perfect agreement is not to be expected.

"Ἐξελένευται, ὥσος "shall derive his origin." The ἡγούμενος is equivalent to βασιλεὺς. See Munt.

7. λάθρα καλέσας τοὺς μάγους. This covert procedure, Kuinoel observes, was adopted by Herod, lest he should seem too anxious about the message, and in order that the report respecting the birth of the King might not be further spread, and so his scheme for making away with the infant be frustrated.
Φωνομένον, Kuin. takes for φανέρον. But this is not necessary. It is well rendered by Campbell, "the time of the star's appearance."

8. πέμψας αὐτοῦ εἰς Βεθλεὲμ. Kuin. renders: "proficiisci eos jussit cum his mandatis Bethleheum." I prefer: "and bidding them go," "giving them leave to go, to Bethlehem." Εξεράσατε. The εκ is intensive; as in ἐξερέων and ἐξέρθειν, 1 Pet. 1, 10. It answers to our out, quite, thoroughly. See Kypke and Munthe.

9. ο ἄντων—προῆγεν αὐτοῦ. Needless difficulties have, I think, been raised on the mode of understanding these words. So Kui- noel's statements. He prefers the interpretation of Heum., Less., Suskind, Thiese, and others, who maintain that it was at Bethlehem the star was finally seen; but that in the journey thither it was not seen. They render προῆγεν had preceded; referring to Matt. 26, 29, 29, 7. Mark 14, 29, 56, 7, 6, 44, and they lay down the following as the sense: "The star which the Magi had seen in the East, and which in the whole way from the East to Jerusalem, and from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, was not visible, immediately on their coming within view of the house became so, and settled over it." (See more in Kuin.) An interpretation extremely ingenious, and which is preferable to any of the others devised by recent Commentators; but this pluperfect sense of προῆγεν is by no means a natural one; and if we bear in mind the extraordinary and supernatural character of the whole transaction, there is nothing in the common interpretation to raise any reasonable scruples.

10. ἐχάρισαν χαράν μεγάλην σφόδρα. A stronger expression than this cannot easily be met with. The addition of a cognate substantive to any verb is found also in the Classical writers; but is a vestige of the Oriental origin of the Greek tongue. The addition, too, of σφόδρα to μεγάλην is a relic of early antiquity, when the superlative was formed (as in the Northern languages) by the addition of particles, which are usually put after the adjective. Kuin. cites μεγάλην σφόδρα from Lucian; and observes, that σφόδρα answers to the Hebr. מְדָמ, from whence Parch. absurdly derives our mad. I should be inclined to think that the מ in מְדָמ, is not radical, but that the word comes from מֵד (where the מ is servile) and the Arabic مد, to extract, whence the Latin magis, the Sax. ma, and mau-er (more), ma-est (most), the Greek μα-λα, μα-κρος, μα-σι. Μαύμω seems to be an antient reduplication formed on the Oriental usage, where the reduplication is intensive.

11. εἰδων. Nearly all the MSS., Versions, and Fathers have εἰδον. which is adopted by most critics, who regard εἰδον as a gloss. But it should rather seem to be a paradiorthosis from ν. 8.

On the custom of never appearing before the great without a present, see Harmer's Obs. in loc. The presenting the spices will not (as Kuin. fancies) prove that the Magi came from Arabia; since such are found in yet greater plenty in the islands of Eastern Asia, from whence they were exported to Hindostan, Persia, Arabia, Egypt, Syria, &c.
On the terms ἀβανον and σφόναν, it may suffice to refer to Schleus. Lex. Δωρα is in opposition.

12. καὶ χρηματισθέντες. Here the καὶ narrative (like the Hebr. 广汽), is for but, which properly has the same sense. See H. Tooke's Ec. Irep. Όν χρηματ. see the excellent note of Campb. 'Ἀνακάμπτειν literally signifies to bend back: 2. to bend one's course back. In this sense it often occurs in the later Classics.

13. παράλαβε τὸ πυδλον. Φαίνεται is a narrative present, for the participle ἐφάνη. Kuin. remarks that παράλαβε must be rendered cum. But this use of verbs of taking (as ἐπι) is a relic of the simplicity of antient diction.

Now Egypt, to which they were directed to take their flight, was little more than an hundred miles distant; and, both from its proximity, and being a Roman province, and the residence of many Jews, was a fit place of refuge. "Ιστὶ ἐκεῖ, be, remain. Euthym., διαρρέει. Kuin. compares the Hebr. אֹּֽמָל in Gen. 29, 15. 24, 7 & 13. Μέλλει often answers to our auxiliaries shall and will. At τοῦ ἀπολέσαι is to be understood ἐνεκα. It is for εἰς τὸ ἀπολέσαι, like the Hebr. יָּֽ֑ב, with an infinitive verb. So 1 Cor. 8, 2. ἐκρίνα τί εἰδέναι.

14. ὃ δὲ ἐγερθείς, "then he arose and," &c. Ἀνεχώρησεν is for ἐφευρεν. An Hellenism.

15. ἦν τὸς τελευταῖος Ἱ. He died in the thirty-seventh year of his reign. See Joseph. Ant. 17, 10. That Jesus remained but a short time in Egypt, is certain; but how long, cannot be determined, since it is not clear in what year of Herod's reign Jesus was born. (Kuin.) Herod died March 751, A. U. C.; and Christ is supposed to have been born Sept. or Oct. 749, A. U. C. "Τὰ πληρωθέν τὸ ῥήθην. The recent Commentators will not allow this to be more than an accommodation of Hos. 11, 1. But Whitby has shown that it is not simply such. See his note, or the abridgment in Eisl. and Valpy.

16. ἀποστελέως ἀνέιλε. An idiom common both to the Greek and Hebrew, but, no doubt, derived from the latter, in which (as Kuin. says) τὴν is coupled with verbs of action, or used with the addition of the person sent. See Gloss Phil. S. p. 36. Now the nature of this expression is adverse to the hypothesis of Eckerm., that the children were destroyed by poison, which, indeed, is on all accounts highly improbable. That the silence of Josephus does not impeach the credit of the gospel narrative, is unquestionable. So many were the enormities of the monster, that Josephus could not be expected to know or chronicle them all. Besides he has omitted other matters of unquestionable truth, and which could not be unknown to him. See the note on Acts 5, 36. And it is truly observed by Kuin., that "many reasons may be imagined why Josephus would chuse to omit the story. The passage of Macrobi. adduced in confirmation of St. Matthew's account, is Saturn. 2. 4. cum enim audisset (Augustus) inter pueros, quos in Syria Herodes rex Judæorum, intra bimatum jussit interfici, filium quoque ejus (Antipatrum) occisum, ut: melius est, Herodis porcum
esse, quam filium."* To this enormity also testimony is borne by a Rabbinical work called Toldith Jesu.

Karà τῶν χρόνων, scil. τού φανομένου ἀστήρος, ver. 7. “The Magi (observes Kuin.) seem to have told Herod that a year had now elapsed since the first appearance of the star; and he therefore, for greater surety, ordered all even of two years old to be butchered.” Some would take the διεριζως to mean a year old. But this is only founded on the authority of Hesych.; διέτης δι᾽ δλον τοῦ ἔτους and διεριζω found in Aristid. Yet there διεριζω does not signify to be a year old, but to live a year through, peranno. And as to the gloss of Hesych., the Editors and Critics read δι᾽ ἔτους. That, however, I can hardly adopt, since I suspect that Hesych. here, as very often elsewhere, compiled from the Scholiast on Thucyd.; as 2, 38. where, speaking of the Athenians, he says: τών πόλων πλείως ανεπάλατα τῇ γνώμῃ ἐπορισάμεθα, ἀγὼς μὲν γε καὶ θυσίας διετήσεις νομίζοντες where the Schol. explains διετήσιος by δι᾽ δλον τοῦ ἔτους. And from this Schol. Pollux has διετήσιος διὰ ταυτός τοῦ ἔτους. I therefore suspect that in Hesych. the true reading is διετήσιος. The termination was probably expressed (as often in MSS.) by an abbreviation written above the word, which had faded away in the archetype of our only MSS., or was neglected by the scribe; for their carelessness was as proverbial as that of printers with us. Thus it appears that the authority for the above mentioned signification of διέτης, of one year old, is baseless, and the common interpretation, which is confirmed by the antient Versions, is to be retained.

17—19. τούτου ἐκληρώθη τὸ βραδύν. It is truly observed by Mr. Valpy, that “passages in the Old Testament, in which there are no prophecies, are sometimes, as here, said in the New Testament to be fulfilled; for anything may be said properly enough to be fulfilled, when it can be pertinently applied.” See more in his note.

Kuin. remarks that the words φωνὴ εν Ῥαβαὶ—πολὺς are not to be referred to Rachel, but to be understood of the lamentations of the Bethlehemites; and that the ως εἰς in Jeremiah signifies, they are gone, hurried into captivity, there is an end of them. In the terms θρήνοις καὶ κλαυθήσαι καὶ ὁμοίῳ, there may be a cli- mas or the terms are accumulated for greater pathos.

20. οἱ ἔστησαν τὴν ψυχήν τοῦ παιδόν. This is formed from the Hebr. שָׁתַּמ הַנֵּפֶץ, in 1 Sam. 23, 15 &c. See Vorst. de Hebr. 731. and Leland. de Hebr. 150. For though the phrase is not unexampled in the Classical writers, yet it is of Oriental origin. I

* The conjecture of Grot. that Macrobi. was a Christian, is very unfounded. That he had borne office under a Christian Emperor, proves nothing. His Saturnalia furnishes strong evidence that he was as much a Pagan as Libanius and Themist. That he has confounded two stories, one related by Josephus, the other by St. Matthew, will not invalidate his testimony, but rather show that, as a Pagan, he cared too little about the matter to avoid this confusion.
have already noticed the use of the plural for the singular in ὥστησε. That it is so used, has been shown (besides others) by Fisch. Prol. de Vit. Lex. p. 175. And Kuin. observes, that the Hebrews often employ the plural for the singular in speaking of Kings and Princes. He adduces 1 Kings 1, 33, 43 & 19. compared with 25. Matt. 9, 8. τοῖς αὐθεντοῖς. Lycurg. p. 195. οἱ τότε βασιλεύοντες, for ὁ βασιλεύς, Codrus.


23. εἰς πόλιν, at. So 2 Chron. 19. Sept. κατάκηκεν εἰς Ἰεροσολύμων, where the Hebr. is ז. “Ὄπως πληρωθη, “Thus was fulfilled the prophecy,” &c. I cannot agree with those Commentators, as Chrysost., &c., who suppose that the words are derived from some lost prophecy, or one never committed to writing, but preserved by tradition (which, in a nation that had so early the use of letters, is highly improbable); I rather assent to the opinion of others, that no particular passage of any Prophet is meant, but all those passages of the Old Testament which were by the Jewish Christians explained of the calamities of the Messiah and his abject condition; as Is. 52 & 53. and Ps. 22, &c. See Dodd.

Nazareth was proverbially a petty town, insomuch that it was said, can any good come out of Nazareth? Bp. Middleton thinks Ναζαρεῖος should be rendered the Nazarene, since the article could not be inserted; the noun being preceded by the nuncupative verb κλήθησαι. That Jesus was so called in contempt, is plain from the Gospels. This is far more rational than to suppose, with some, that Nazarene is equivalent to Nazarite. See more in Wolf, Eln., and Krecher, or Esley.
For the following Genealogical scheme of the Herod Family I am indebted to the excellent and scarce Work of the diligent Hederich, entitled Schul. Lex., Col. 1494.
ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. III.

CHAP. III.

1. ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις. It is plain that this phrase must be taken in an extended signification, and not be referred to the commencement of Christ's residing at Nazareth, but its continuation: like the Heb. יָמִים הָיוּ, in Exod. 2. 11. and Gen. 38. 1. For from the time of Joseph's first coming to Nazareth to John's commencement of his ministry as Baptist, many years had elapsed; nor does John seem to have taught and baptized long before Jesus went to him. (Kuin.) As the thing last mentioned was the residence of Jesus with his parents at Nazareth, the words those days, may be used with strict propriety of any time before he left that city. (Campb.)

John was about six months older than Jesus; and it has been thought that he began his ministry at the Levitical age thirty. But that is mere conjecture; for Scripture is silent.

Παραγίνοντα προφήταν, is taken by Kuin. for ἐκήρυξε. But the sense seems rather to be: "went to preach." Which is (I think) preferable to uniting the προφήταν with τὴν ἡμέραν. 2. The λέγων is equivalent to the Greek ὥστε, thus, in this manner. Μεταν. comprehends both repentance, i.e. sorrow for sin, and such a change of mind as shall produce reformation of life.

3. φωνῇ, &c. These words of the Prophet Isaiah were used by John for the purpose of showing that he was the predicted forerunner of the Messiah. (Kuin.) The sense is: "There is (heard) the voice of one preaching in the wilderness (and exclaiming): "Prepare ye a way for the Lord; make his paths straight." This must, of course, be taken figuratively for preparing themselves for the entrance of the Lord's religion into their hearts, and its reception by a thorough repentance and reformation.

4. It is observed by Kuin., that this ascetic diet and mode of life was adopted by the Baptists after the example of the Prophets of the Old Testament, and the Nazarenes, who used such food and clothing as were the easiest to be procured. He refers to Dayling Obs. 3. p. 200.

5. This verse is rendered by Kuin.: "Then went out to him a great multitude from Jerusalem and the whole of Judea, especially (καὶ) from the plain of Jordan." But this sense of καὶ is precarious; and as no part of Judea is very distant, and the people eagerly followed John, this change is unnecessary. The περιχώρους (sc. γῆ, or χωρὶς) is mentioned, because many came not from Judea proper, but Samaria, Galilee, Perea, &c., and especially the parts about the Jordan.

7."γεννήματα ἔχοντων, "Ye viper-broods, and venomous creatures, rather than followers of your blameless and virtuous forefathers, ye who, under the mask of austerity and sanctity, corrupt those whom ye should edify." That γέννημα is used of animate as well as inanimate bodies, is shown by Kuin.

Τις πρόδειξην υἱὸν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς; Kuin. para-
phrases: “qui tandem vos pietatem simulantes, simulata pietate accedentes, sperare potestis, vos effugituros esse penas post Messia adventum imminentes? nequaquam eas essugitier.” But this is harsh and frigid. Euthymius supplies the answer thus: “plainly nothing but your sagacity.” But that is not so aspicious: for John did not, I conceive (as the antients suppose), mean to mix commendation with censure. It is simply equivalent to, “what has brought you here?” (See note in loc.) The μελλ. ὁργή may be understood (with many eminent Commentators) of the punishments of this life; but that can only be a secondary sense (and indeed the temporal wrath of God afterwards shown in the destruction of the Jewish state, was then little discernible to even the most long sighted politicians); the primary one is, “those punishments to be revealed at the day of judgment.” This is placed beyond doubt by 1 Thess. 1, 10. ἀναμένειν Ἰσραήλ, τὸν ῥαμόνον ἠμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἔρχομένης, to come. Ὡρίζειν is rendered docuit. It rather signifies, suggested, pointed out, admonished. Φύγειν ἀπό is said by Kuin. to be a Hebraism. And he cites Sir. 21, 2. ὃς ἀπὸ προσώπων δήσεως, φεύγε ἀπὸ ἀμαρτιάς. Ὁργή is a frequent euphemism for punishment.

8. The οὖν is not (I conceive) redundant, or transitive, as Kuin. supposes; but signifiles, “since it is your hope to escape that wrath.”

9. μὴ δόξητε λέγετε. The question as to the Hebraism is frivolous. After all, it may be best to consider this as a popular phrase, similar to one in our own language. The εἰ τῶν λίθων τῶν ὑπό, is thought by Kuin. to refer to the stones adjacent to the bank of the Jordan. But as the country is, I believe, low and marshy, so the λίθ. may be understood of the pebbles and shingle deposited by the river on the margin. In my note on this passage for Josephus read Joshua.

Kuinoel assigns the following sense. “God would rather from these stones raise up descendants from Abraham like unto him, than admit you to the happiness of the Messiah’s kingdom, who are so dissimilar to him, and so devoted to vice, merely because you are his posterity. Birth can nought avail to procure such acceptance.” “Now the Jews (observes Kuin.) nourished the prejudice, that none but their nation, as being the posterity of Abraham, could please God, or be accepted by him.”

10. ἡ ἁλίβιν, &c. This figure is used, in order the more aptly to introduce the mention of the fruits expected, and to strike awe by a fearful image of utter destruction and perdition, even the being cut down, and cast into the fire!

Ἐκκόπηται, “is (to be) cut.” Now the term ἐκκόπητειν is the strongest that could have been used; for it signifies not only to cut down at the stock, but to chop up from the roots; so that there can be no hope of future growth. Elainer adduces an example from Αelian H. A. 3, 21. ὃς εἶχε ρύμη τε καὶ χειρῶν ἔξκοπε τὸ δέντρον. And he refers to the description in Joseph. Ant. 18. of the utter destruction of Herod’s army on account of his murder of John the Baptist.
11, 12. The words of these verses appear from Luke 3, 15 and 16. to have been spoken on some other occasion. (Kuin.) But see the note on the verse following.

"Ev, with. The eis meranoia (where eis denotes end, purpose) is a brief phrase, adverting to the solemn engagement entered into by the baptized, to cease to do evil, and learn to do well. This, indeed, was so closely associated to that baptism, that it was called, by Mark 1, 4., the baptism of repentance.

11. o ἥτις μοι ἐξηγομένος, "he who is to encounter me," o ἔλευ- 

σόμενος, Job. 1, 27. This savours of Hebraism. Kuin. renders successor. But that conveys a wrong idea. The sense is; "There is one coming after me (i.e. who will appear later in time), but who will be far greater than, and superior to, me."

12. ὡς τῷ πτώον—αὐτής. The seeming harshness of this metaphor may be softened, by supposing that there is a reference to an image implied in the figure at ver. 10. τὰν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρ-

τίν καλῶν. For it is certain, from Luke 3, 15., that the words were pronounced upon another occasion. Indeed, they may have been pronounced twice or more. It is evident that the words are a completion of the striking image at ver. 10. Πτῶν is from πτώω, "to toss (away)." Διακαθαρίζειν signifies to thoroughly winnow, λυμφάν. See Fisch. Prolus. 53. The ἄλος must denote the corn itself. And so Kuin., who compares the Heb. ιατ at Ruth 3, 2., Job 39, 12., Deut. 15, 14. That the Orientals should have burnt their straw and stubble, may seem strange to Western agriculturists; but it was from that want of fuel which has ever prevailed in the East. See Kyperke and Raphael. The πτῶν αὐτής completes the awful image of total destruction.

14. ἐν χρησι ποιεῖν ἐν ὁσίῳ βαπτισθήναι, "I need rather to be baptized of thee." A sort of parabolical way of saying, "Thou art in wisdom and goodness infinitely my superior."

15. ἰσοποθέτει εἰπὲ πρὸς αὐτόν, "Jesus returned him this answer." A mode of expression frequently occurring both in the Old and New Testament. See Kuin. At ἄφες must be understood either με, as most Commentators supply (and so Kuin., who compares Judg. 16, 26. μή, where the Sept. render ἄφες με, though at Exod. 32, 10. they express by ἐκάσω με), or τοῦτο εἶναι, as the earlier Commentators, who take the ἄφες in sensu χρονικῷ. But I prefer the former mode. Πιλρῶσαν τὰς τὴν δικαιοσύνην Kuin. renders omne laudabile institutum tenere; δικαιοσύνη, being, he observes, equivalent to δικαίωμα, institutum. By either word the Sept. express the Heb. πανσαι and prl. See Tromm. Thus πληροῦν τὴν δικαιοσύνην is equivalent to ποιεῖν τὰ δικαίωμα, Deut. 6, 24. Whithby here ad-

duces the Constit. Apost. L. 7. C. 22., where it is said, that Christ was baptized, not that he needed any purification, ἀλλ' ἐνα καὶ ἑαν πορμαγρυφη, καὶ ἡμῖν ἐπογράφησον πάντα ὑμῖν, but to testify the truth of St. John's baptism, and to be an example to us.

16. καὶ βαπτισθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέβη. Kuin. observes that the Nomina- 

tive is for the Genitive absolute. The expression is, indeed, such as is usual to all simple languages. Now the Baptist exacted
no confession of sins from Jesus, knowing that he would have none to confess.

The opening of the heavens took place, as we learn from Luke 3, 24., while Jesus was engaged in prayer, after leaving the water. The ἀνέφθησαν and of ὄψαροι and the σχιζομένος both denote lightning of the most vivid sort, by which the firmament seems Clint asunder. Similar expressions are used by the Latin writers. See Wets. and Kuin.

16. καὶ εἶδε τὸ πρεσβύτα—αὐτὸν. On these words I purposely omit the speculations of the recent Commentators, since they seem to have yet to learn ἐν τῷ σοφῷ σωφροσίν, especially on subjects of so awful a nature as the present, where a prying spirit is so much the less excusable, as there is no pretence of utility to plead. The coincidences, in some points, between the circumstances accompanying the promulgation of the true religions of Moses and Jesus Christ, and those which were aimed at in Paganism, can very well be accounted for: but to enter into the subject would lead me too far.

17. ἐν σεἰδόκησα. A Hebraism, answering to πρὸς or ὑπὲρ with ἧς, “to be well pleased with.” The σεἰδόκησα is the Aorist for the present.

CHAP. IV.

Verse 1. ἀνέφθη εἰς τὴν ἐρήμον. In the note on this passage, for “various objections,” read “various reasons:” and for use read up. As to the expression, with advantage, there used, I know not how it escaped me; since it does not represent my real opinion. I can as little approve of the hypothesis of the acute and ingenious Farmer, and the very learned Dr. Maltby, as of any others of the recent Theologians: and, until I obtain more light, I must acquiesce in the opinion of the antient Fathers and the generality of Commentators, that the Evangelist records a real transaction; though I confess myself totally in the dark on some points connected with this mysterious subject.

2. σχιζομένος. In conformity to my plan, I here introduced the annotation of Wets.; but a great part of it I consider as fanciful, and little to the purpose. The same will apply to too many of the annotations of that very learned and ingenious, and, in many respects, wonderful scholar, but little solid and useful Commentator, whose erudition and diligence qualified him to be the most laborious of collectors, but whose judgment is too uncertain to be relied on.

3. ὁ πειράζων. A Hebraism for ὁ πειρατής. For, as Grot. remarks, the Hebrew language being destitute of verbals, uses participles in their stead. And Kuin. compares Herod. 1, 120. τοι ἑγνάμενος, and Χρ. Apol. 20., as also Aristoph. Plut. 798. τοι βοηθεῖς, for τοι βοηθεῖς. Eurip. Alc. ἡ τεκωνία, and Χρ. Mem. 3, 15. τοι ἐφεστίωτες, magistrates. The last two examples, however, are scarce in point; and examples from poets prove little.

3. ἄροι γενώνται, “become, or be made loaves.” So Campbell,
who observes, that ἀποκλαίσμα in the plural ought almost always to be rendered loaves, and especially here, as being more picturesquely. Kuinoel remarks, that γενέθλιον is used for μυστέριον; as the Heb. דַּוִּית is used of Moses's rod, Exod. 4, 3., where the Sept. render וַיִּמָּנֵר. It is unnecessary here, and just after, to suppose ἄποκλαίσμα used for any kind of food, as flesh, &c.; though it cannot be denied that δῖνος has sometimes this extensive signification.

4. οὐκ ἐκέκραγε—Θεοῦ. Taken from Deut. 8, 3., where the subject is the various benefits which God had conferred on the Israelites, especially by the sending of the manna. Ζητεῖν ἔκεκραγε (Heb. שָׁמָה) exactly corresponds to our phrase “live upon any thing.” Several Classical examples are adduced by Kuin. It is strange that he should have read ἔκεκραγε; since the ἔκεκραγε is required by the βῶς of the Heb., and by the antithesis. The ἔκεκραγε seems to be a mere paradoorithosis. The ἔκεκραγε παντί βῆμα, Θεοῦ most recent Commentators render, “by whatever thing God is pleased to appoint.” And they remark, that ἐκείνη and βῆμα in the Sept. have often this force. I see no objection to this interpretation, except that βῆμα, in the usual sense (and which is the more natural one here), has reference to the θέλημα of God, by which necessities so urgent as those which the Israelites had laboured under, were supernaturally provided for. And to this sense the expression ἐκπρομνημόνευς is as applicable as to the other. Kuin. compares Sapient. 16, 26. οὖν η δειναί τῶν καρπῶν τρέφοντι διά θερμόω, ἀλλὰ τὸ βῆμα σου τούς σου πιστεύοντες διαγινεῖ.

5. The τῷ τῷ denotes (as often in the New Testament) an interval of time, sometimes long, sometimes short. Here it is well observed by Campbell, that Jesus, having fasted forty days, and being hungry and without food, the question of the tempter is, what is to be done? and he suggests the converting the stones into loaves. The answer (likewise from Scripture) is, that when the Israelites were in like circumstances, God supplied them with food; and thus we are taught that no strait, however pressing, ought to shake our confidence in him.”

Τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ τῷ τῷ is explained, by Kuin., of all the means which Providence uses to preserve the good. And that this is the general application is unobjectionable; but of the methods by which this word ἀγγέλοι is systematically tampered with by the recent foreign Theologians, I can by no means approve. Ἀριστοτ., for βαστάσανει. Ὑπὲρ, “lest (at any time),” E. V., on which it is truly remarked, by Campbell, that “from an excessive solicitude not to say less than the original, words have been explained from etymology rather than from use; in consequence of which practice some versions are encumbered with expletives which enfeeble instead of strengthening the expression.”

7. πάλιν γένεθλιον. Campbell places the comma, not after Ἑγωνίδως, but πάλιν. His reason is, that this was the second answer which Jesus made on this occasion to the Devil. It is not so easy (he adds) to say in what sense the words quoted can be said to have been written again. But I here desiderate the usual good sense of Dr. Campbell. He mistakes the true import of πάλιν, and assigns
a sense which is very frigid. The punctuation he contends for had been before proposed by Alberti; but he assigned to τάλων the sense on the contrary, which is as much too strong as Campbell's is too weak. The common interpretation, after all, seems to be the true one; and Kuin. well renders item, insuper, in which signification the word is elsewhere used. Several Scriptural passages are adduced for proof or illustration; as Rom. 15. 10 & 11. 1 Cor. 6. 20. 12. 21. 2 Cor. 10. 7. Heb. 1. 6.

8. ἰδρος ἣψηλὸν λίαν. On this mode of expressing the superlative see the note supra, 2, 10. Whether the mountain were Nebo, or Moriah, cannot be determined. Some think it was the Mount of Olives.

9. προσκυνήσει must here imply religious worship and adoration.

10. γέφυραται γάρ, namely, in Deut. 6, 13. The whole sentence is thus paraphrased by Kuin. "asbit a me tale flagitium! non nisi Deum dominum supremum agnoesco, a me unice colendum, eique soli ejusque providentiam me measque res committo et commendo." The words ὅτι οἷς μοι, though omitted in some MSS., Versions, and Fathers, are yet rightly retained by Griesbach, as being the more difficult reading. This bears, too, the stamp of genuineness in its Hellenistical idiom.

11. ἀγγελοι. The interpretations of some foreign Commentators, pious meditations, or "kind friends, who brought food," are too frigid and puerile to merit aught but contempt.

12. καταλικῶν τῆς Ναζαρέτ, ἠλθὼν κατῴκησεν εἰς Κατερναούμ, &c. Kuin. thinks that the παραδελασσαίαν is added, in order more exactly to determine the situation of a city which was Christ's residence. There was possibly, he adds, another Capernaum. The lake Gennesareth, he observes, is here, and in Joh. 6, 21., spoken of as a sea, a name given by the Hebrews to every large piece of water. On the other hand, the Greeks called the sea λίμνη.

13. γη, "the region," for its inhabitants. At ὅδον must be understood κατα. So the Heb. ב, and our by, i. e. adjacent to. Πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου is for παρὰ τῆς Ἰορδανῆς; for though both Galilees were, in respect of Judæa, on this side the Jordan; yet the Hebrews used יָם and יָם for both trans and justa. See Deut. 1, 1. 4, 49. Josh. 1, 14., and the note on Joh. 1, 28. (Kuin.)

14. σκότει. A perpetual image of ignorance and the evils thence resulting. Ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ is for ἐν χώρᾳ σκοτεῖν. The θανάτου is explained, by Rosenm., Terrari. But it seems to denote the consequences of ignorance and sin.

15. ἀπό τῆς, "from thence," i. e. that time. Now, both in Greek and English, the adverbs of time are treated as substantives, and joined with prepositions by the subaudition of χρόνος. Ἑγγύει. This term is sometimes (as here) used of any near approach, and may be rendered at hand. The address was much the same as that of John the Baptist; and little was said, because our Lord did not yet choose to publicly announce his Messiahship.

16. ἀμφιβάλλον. This was a very large kind of net, such as would contain a great number of fishes; as Hesiod Sc. H. 215. See Schleus. Lex.
19. δεῦρε is considered as a mere particle of exhortation, like ὧν or ὧερε. So the Heb. יִלְךָ and יֵלָכָה, go to. (Kuin.)

23. περιήγησαι, went about. For περι signifies not only around, but about. And ἄγειν has often, as here, the force of the middle verb. The αἰτῶν has reference to Γαλατιαν, which is contained in Γαλατίαν. An idiom common to both the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and indeed all languages. See Kuinocel's examples. At τοῦ εἰσαγγελίου τῆς βασιλείας supply τοῦ Θεοῦ, i.e. "the doctrine of the Messiah's kingdom."

24. διήν τῆς Συρίας, i.e. the parts adjacent to Galilee. Kuin., however, thinks that as in Mark 1, 26. we read of the fame of Jesus being spread through διήν τῆς περιήγησιν τῆς Γαλατίας, Syria is here put for all the neighbouring regions of Galilee. Κακῶς ἔχονται. The opposite to καλῶς ἔχειν, Mark 16, 18. Βασιλεὺς συνεχόμενος, i.e. literally, "held down, confined to their bed by torturing disorders." Βάσαρος signifies, properly, a trial. The origin of the word (which has perplexed the Etymologists) seems to be βάσις, a step. It is (I conceive) a metaphor taken from those who make trial of ice, or any other slippery, dangerous stepping.

24. δαιμονικόμενος. I cannot but feel surprise that any should have so far mistaken my meaning in the words which I have subjoined to Westein's annotation on this subject (and which I merely introduced in conformity to my plan of inserting all his important annotations) as to infer my approbation of the hypothesis of Mede, Farmer, &c. By calling it an ingenious hypothesis, and engaging to "fairly" represent it, the very contrary inference might have been formed, and this would have been but the truth: for I was then of opinion, and am now decidedly persuaded, that the hypothesis involves far greater difficulties than it professes to remove, and carries with it consequences the most awkward; in short, leaves to those who adopt it little resting-place for the sole of their foot. The subject, however, is so extensive a one, and I have, in the course of the present work, been so overwhelmed with an abundance of important matter, that I have never been yet able to execute the sketch of the case concerning the Demonic records, foreseeing that, to do justice to it, would necessarily require a space such as I could by no means afford; and a brief supplement like the present is no place for such a dissertation as would be requisite. I must therefore defer it to some other occasion.

25. δεκατόλεως. So called from the ten cities or towns contained in its district. There is a district in Hungary with a very similar name, i.e. Pentapolis, and given for a similar reason.

CHAP. V.

VERSE 7. ἰδὼν τοὺς ὑπόλοιπον, "seeing the multitudes which flocked together." Carpzov renders: "seeing so great a confluence," But that requires us to add of people. I prefer, "seeing so great a concourse." Ανέβη εἰς τὸ ὅρος. I am now inclined to abandon the
opinion of Kuinoel, that the τά, like the Heb. נ, stands for the pronoun indefinite τα. I have scarcely ever, in the present work, placed any reliance on this idiom: nor can I now do it. I prefer supposing, with Bp. Middleton, that τά ὄρος denotes, not Mount Tabor, but the mountain district; a ridge of mountains intersecting Palestine from North to South. “Now (observes Bp. Middleton) if our Saviour’s object was to lead his disciples to the nearest place of retirement, he would not conduct them to Mount Tabor, the part of the ridge nearest to Capernaum being so much nearer.” I cannot but regard the discourse in Luke 6 as being the same with the present. And such is the opinion of Mr. Valpy, who observes, that in that the beginning, order of instruction, and conclusion, are the same as in St. Matthew. St. Luke (he adds) passes over those things which were spoken more immediately to the Jews, to correct their false conceptions concerning the kingdom of the Messiah, and the nature and measures of obedience due to the laws of God.”

3. οἱ πειναὶ τῷ πνεύματι. Such, I conceive, is the natural and only legitimate construction. It is remarked, by Knapp, Opusc. p. 400. (cited by Kuin.): “Inter tot μακάριον, qui in V. et N. T. in Apocryphis Judaor. Rabbinorumque scriptis leguntur, nullus reperitur, in quo vel ad Hebraicum et Chaldaicum voc. πνεῦμα vel ψυχή, aut ad Graecum μακάριος vel μακάρως, tale nomen adiiciatur, quo genus aut natura et indoles promissa felicitatis signifcetur, neque id per ingenium linguarum Orientalium sum in modum commode et sine ambiguitate fieri potest.” The τῷ πνεύματι is added to prevent ambiguity.

3. ὡς αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, “to them pertain the blessings to be expected in the Messiah’s kingdom; they are fit to be received into the society of my followers, and to be made partakers of the blessings my religion can bestow on its votaries, both in this world and in the next.” (Kuin.)

4. οἱ πενθοῦντες — παρακληθήσονται. This is usually explained of those who are suffering under calamity. And so Wets. Kuin., however, ably supports the interpretation of Chrysost. Jesus (he observes) is here showing them what are the dispositions of his true disciples. “Now as the fundamental doctrine was repentance, we may therefore (continues Kuin.) suppose that Jesus had reference to Is. 57, 18., where the words are γὰρ οὗτοι ἐκ τῶν πνευμάτων.” The παρακληθήσονται must denote all that consolation which true penitence brings with it, not only by the removal of the burden of a guilty and reproving conscience, but the anticipation of that felicity of which this comfort is an earnest.

5. κληρονομῆσον τήν γῆν. Kuinoel thinks that all notion of inheritance is here to be laid aside. But the term is here, and elsewhere, applied to the obtaining of felicity in heaven, to denote the sureness of the recompence laid up for the just.

6. οἱ πενθοῦντες καὶ διψόντες τήν δικαιοσύνην, ὡς αὐτοὶ χρησαθήσονται. So Sir. 24, 23. οἱ ἐσθίοντες με (scil. τῆν σοφίαν) ἔν πενθάσω, καὶ οἱ πίνοντες με ἔν διψάσουν, qui me gustarunt, porro esuriunt me, et qui me biberunt, porro me sitiunt, disciplinae mes
alumni avidæ me sectantur. (Kuin.) Δικαιοσύνη, true religion, Christianity. So at 10 and 11. the phrases δικαιοσύνη and ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ are interchanged.

7. ἔλεγμονε, ἡσυχὴν, "those who are so moved by the miseries of others as to study, by every means, to remove or diminish them." (Kuin.)

8. καθαρὸς τῆς καρδιᾶς. Noticing the allusion here, as often elsewhere in the New Testament, to the antient ritual maxims, Campb. observes: "The laws in regard to the cleanness of the body, and even of the garments, if neglected by any person, excluded him from the temple. He was incapacitated for being so much as a spectator of the solemn service at the altar. The Jews considered the empyreal heaven as the archetype of the temple of Jerusalem. In the latter they enjoyed the symbol of God’s presence, who spoke to them by his ministers; whereas, in the former, the blessed inhabitants have an immediate sense of the Divine presence, and God speaks to them face to face. Our Lord, preserving the analogy between the two dispensations, intimates, that cleanness will be as necessary in order to procure admission into the celestial temple as into the terrestrial. But as the privilege is inconceivably higher, the qualification is more important. The cleanness is not ceremonial, but moral; not of the outward man, but of the inward:"

9. ἰδου. The phrase ἰδονθεὶς πρόσωπον τίνος, like the Heb. יָדַע, signifies to approach any one, have communication with, or minister to him; as Tob. 12, 19. πᾶσας τὰς δήμας ὑπανόμην ὑμῖν. And so 2 Kings 25, 19. ὄρφον τὸν πρόσωπον τοῦ βασιλέως (Fisch. and Kuin).

9. εἰρήνακοι. The word occurs no where else either in the New or Old Testament, though we have εἰρήνακοι in Col. 1, 20. It is used in Plutarch of the Fetiæs; and in Xenophon, Hist. 6, 3, 4, of ambassadors to negotiate peace. The persons here meant are, in the Greek Classical writers, styled εἰρήνακοι. (Kuin.) See the note of Campbell. The εἰρήνακοι (Kuin, adds) is for ἰδουαῖοι: and he refers to many critical authorities. I do not deny the existence of the idiom; but to introduce it here were to sacrifice the beauty, nay even the propriety of the phrase. The sense may be thus expressed: "they shall merit the glorious title of sons of God." Now on this St. John often treats in his Epistles.

11. Here the preceding sentiment is enlarged on. "Happy (I say) are ye when men shall revile you," &c. ὅτειδιζεῖν is synonymous with βλασφημεῖν, Luke 23, 39. Many eminent Critics, as Beza, Raphel, Campbell, and Kuin., take διώκειν in a forensic sense, to denote prosecute, accuse, denounce, &c. By which, Kuin. observes, a repetition is avoided. But such repetitions are not unfrequent in Scripture, and are usually intended to impress any thing on the mind the more strongly. And though the signification of διώκειν in question is common in the Classical writers, it is no where found in the New Testament. Though, therefore, the context seems to favour it, it cannot be received otherwise than as a secondary sense.

Vol. 1.
11. καὶ εἴπωσι πῶς τοιοῦτον ρῆμα. Kuin. compares Judith 8, 8. καὶ ὥσπερ ὑπερήφανεν αὐτῷ ρῆμα ποιηθῶν.

12. γαρτερα καὶ αἰγαλλάθετε. These, I conceive, are not, as Kuin. says, synonymous terms; but there seems to be a climax. He refers to Is. 66, 10. and Zeph. 3, 14. The sense of μεθοδὸς is not to be pressed upon. This word (on the origin of which the Etymology of which the Etymologists seem totally in the dark) is, I conceive, of Oriental, or Northern derivation; and is, perhaps, cognate with the old word μεθ, a measure; whence our mete. The sense, therefore, will be, “the measure, or return made for labour.” It is no wonder that the e, considering its position, and the long service the word has had, should have been worn out.

12. οὕτω γὰρ—δυνάμιν. The argument is deduced from their having to encounter no other evils than such as were endured by their predecessors, the Prophets. A subject often touched on in St. Paul’s Epistles.

13. εἰ τὸ ἁλας μουραθῆναι. In respect of the disciples of Christ, μουραθῆναι denotes “the not teaching true doctrine, or expressing in the life and conduct.” (Kuin.) Ἔν τίνι answers to the Heb. ἡμᾶς Ἀλεθήσεται, scil. το ἁλας. Εἰς οὐδὲν λογίζεται, “is good for nothing;” at least for the purpose of seasoning any thing.

14. οὕτως εἶστε το θεό του κόσμου, “Ye are (to be) the light of the world,” or the enlighteners of men by my doctrine. This figure, as applied to teachers, was common to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin writers (see Schoettg. Hor. Heb., and Wets. in loc.); though, in the Classical writers, it is rather used of celebrated persons. Οἱ δύναται κρυφθῆναι ἐπάνω δρους κεφαλήν, “As a city situated on a hill cannot be hidden, so neither will your virtues or vices be concealed, but will be known to all.”

15. οὕτως καλοντεὶ λόγινον—οἶκος, “And as men do not light a candle to put it under a bushel, so neither do I intend that your virtues and good works should not be known.” (Kuin.) Λόγινον καλεῖν, which literally signifies to burn a light, is a phrase used by the later writers for that of the earlier ones λόγινον ἀττεῖν (as Luke 8, 16.) and ἀνάτειν. (Kypke.)

16. The sense of the figure is here explained by the Evangelist. The καλὰ and ἄγαθα ἐγγα, Kuin. explains “omnia quae bona, recta, honesta, laude digna legisbusque divinis sunt consentanea, ut Tit. 2, 7 and 14. Eph. 2, 10. al. et h. l. referendum est tam ad doctrinam, quam ad virtutis studium.” He rightly observes, that this exhortation was especially intended for all future teachers of his religion; and that ἐνδεικν διόν τω Θεων here denotes “to so worship God as to live suitably to the Divine precepts, and regulate our lives by that rule.”

17. Our Lord here anticipates an objection, namely, that his doctrines differed, in some respects, from the Mosaic, and that therefore his system could not but destroy that promulgated by God to Moses, and borne testimony to by the Prophets.

By the Law and the Prophets are meant the precepts in the books so called. But by precepts must be understood, καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the
moral precepts, which were of so much more consequence than the ceremony (the latter being only subservient to the better observance of the former), that as long as these remained, the system of religion revealed in the Law and the Prophets could not be said to be completed, and carried into effect: for, as says St. Paul (Rom. 8, 3.) "what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, &c."

Lambda and ἐν καταλθεῖν νόμον, in the sense to annul a law, is frequent. See Heyke, Raph., Elss., Loesn., and others. Kuinoel and Morus say that the opposite ἐλπιδοῦν τὸν νόμον is explained by ver. 19. ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν; and therefore signifies "to explain it aright, and truly practise it." Which may be admitted: but the sense above assigned is the more extensive and natural one.

18. ἀμήν λέγω ἡμῖν. Kuin. compares the ἐστε δει τοῦ of the Greek writers; and he thinks the phrase is equivalent to ἀληθῶς. But it is a much stronger term. Παρερχεσθαί, he observes, properly signifies (like the Hebr.  יָנֶל) to pass by: but, as things which pass by go away, and vanish, so it also signifies to perish and come to nought. Οὐρανός must here denote not the planetary, but the ethereal heaven. And earth is a periphrasis for the world; as Gen. 1, 1.

19. ἀληθ. It is strange that Homberg and Schleus. should render this "explain the law," a sense (as Kuin. observes) at variance with the context. Μίαν τῶν εντολῶν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων, "one of those precepts which are commonly neglected, and accounted the least." So Kuin., who observes that this is levelled against the Pharisees, who were mostly great disssemblers, and distributed the rules of the law into the slighter and the weightier, of the former of which many (they held) might be violated with impunity; but the latter, which chiefly consisted of the ceremonial precepts, were alone of indispensable obligation.

20. εἴν μὴ περισσεύσον—οὐρανόν. Here our Lord fully declares his meaning; openly naming those whom he had before only hinted at. The sentence is, as it were, an answer to a question: "What, will not the righteousness of the law, as exhibited in the lives of such holy persons as the Pharisees, save us?" "No such thing—but I plainly tell you that unless," &c. It is clear that δικαιοσύνη must here denote, like the Hebr. יָנֶל, pieté and virtue as evinced in a life spent agreeably to the Divine command, especially in the observance of the moral virtues.

21. ἑλέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις. Some subaud γράφεται. But ἀνθρώπους is (I think), with reason, adopted by most Commentators. And it is supported by Joseph. S. 338, 39.

22. εἰκ. This Heusch. explains δικαιρῶν, μάρτυς. Τῷ ἀδελφῷ, "one’s neighbour," ἑτέρῳ. A signification derived from the extensive use of the Hebr. יָנֶל, which arose from the Jews being accustomed to regard all Israelites as brethren. "Eνοχός ἐκατο τῷ ἐξερεύνη, Kuin. observes, is to be taken comparativus, not proprius; q. d. "He who is angry with another without a cause, is in my sight as worthy of punishment as he who, for a misdemeanour, is condemned by
the Septuagint." With respect to ὑστατικός or ὑστάτα, it is well observed by Rosenm., that the criminality does not consist in the word (for St. James says, ἀθρόως κατε, 2, 20.; and Christ addresses far harsher terms to the Pharisees); but it is the indulgence of malevolence, and ungovernable, rash, and abusive anger that is censured.

22. ἐνοχος ξυσταὶ—τῷ συνεδρίῳ. This was the supreme court of Jewish judicature, both political and ecclesiastical, which took cognizance only of more heinous offences, and capital causes, and which had the province of awarding death by stoning; while the court of the Septuagint could only condemn to death by the word, the punishment of murder. See Joseph. Antiq. 9, 1, 20, 9, 1. The sense is: "He who hurls on others unmerited reproaches, cannot commit a crime of deeper dye—and will receive a punishment proportionably severe." χρ. δὲ καὶ εἰς ὑσταταὶ. The word ὑσταταὶ properly signifies no more than 'fool'. But as in Hebrew folly and vice are convertible terms, so idolaters were so called, or perhaps κατ' ἐξοχήν. Be that as it may, ἱδρατος and δισπε φιλος of God were terms synonymous; and hence ὑσταταὶ came to have the sense of, and to signify, all that was implied by, the term βαλλων. On Ψεφων see Keuchen.

23, 24. As the former verses treated of ill timed and excessive anger, of hatred, and enmity, so these enjoin love to our neighbour, and a placable spirit. And since the Pharisees reckoned anger, hatred, and calumny among the slighter offences, and thought they did not incur the wrath of God if sacrifices and other external rites were accurately observed; so here we are taught that external worship is not pleasing in the sight of God, unless it proceed from a meek and charitable spirit. (Kuin.)

23. τὰν οὖν προσφέρεις τ. δ. σ. τ. θ. Kuin. renders: "if thou art preparing, or wouldst bring thy sacrifice to the altar;" thus recognising the idiom by which endeavours stands for action. But perhaps that is hardly necessary. Κακοῦ; i.e. "in the temple or altar, while you are preparing to offer." "Εἰ καὶ κατὰ σου. Kuin. compares Acts 19, 38. Λόγον ἐχεῖν πρὸς τινα. Col. 3, 14. Ἐχειν μορφᾶν πρὸς τινα.

24. διαλλαγῆς, "do thou endeavour to be reconciled." This phrase is common in the Classical writers. That the intended offering might be left before the altar for a far slighter cause (though not this), we learn from the Rabbins, whom see in Schoettg. Hor. Hebr.

23, 26. Here is inculcated the general maxim of speedy reconciliation with an adversary. Now this is illustrated by an example derived e re pecuniaria. It is observed by Pott, in his Diss. on the Sermon on the Mount, that "the sentiment of ver. 25. sq. τοθεστοντομεν, &c. is only joined with the preceding because of similarity of subject; though the diversity of the allegory connected with either, and the plan of the whole exhortation, 5, 20—fin. and of Luke 12, 58. sq. where this sentiment is to be taken by itself, require that we should suppose the whole of the admonition not to have been pronounced by Christ at once." But this, though ingenious, is too hy-
pithetical to deserve attention. Διαλλάγησθι, i.e. “settle matters with, either by present payment, or arrangement for the future discharge of the debt.” Εἰς δὲν, scil. χρόνον. So the Hebr. χρόνιον in 1 Sam. 30, 4.

26. οὗ μὴ ἔξελθῃς ἐκείδεν ἐως, “thou wilt assuredly not be dismissed from thence till,” &c. The general sentiment (Kuin. observes) is this: “He who does not seek reconciliation with him whom he is at variance with, only makes his case the worse.”

27, 28. That evil thoughts were blameless was also a tenet of the Jewish Doctors. Hence anything short of the actual crime they held not to be forbidden by the commandment in question. But Jesus teaches that it is violated even by lust in the heart. (Kuin.)

The βλάπτων is for ἐμβλάπτων. Πρὸς is here put for ὅποιος, or εἰς τὸ, so as.

29. The same words are introduced at Matt. 18, 9, as pronounced by Christ on another occasion: but here the connection is clearer and more exact. It appears that the Hebrews were accustomed to compare evil desires, lusts, and pleasures with members of the body; ex. gr. an evil eye denoted envy; so to pluck out the eye, and cut off the hand, is equivalent to crucify the flesh, Gal. 5, 24, and mortify your members, Col. 3, 5. (Kuin.) The sense is obvious. Σκανδάλισεν, “throw a stumbling block in thy way, and cause thee to sin.” Συμφέρει οὐ, like the Hebrew יושר. And so Matt. 18, 8; καλὸν ἔστιν, and Mark 9, 43. καλὸν ἔστι μαλλον. The ἰδα ἀδιπλομεναι is Hellenistical Greek for συμφέρει ἀπολέσθαι. Kuin. observes, that the words of ver. 30 have respect to the same crime as that mentioned at ver. 29.

31. Pott and Kuin. suppose “the words of ver. 31 and 32 to have been said at another time, namely, when the Pharisees proposed to him a captious question (compare Matt. 19, 2.); but that St. Matt. inserted it here from the similarity of subject to what had just preceded.” This, however, is precarious; or at least there is no difficulty in supposing that it might have been pronounced twice. On the subject of divorce it is observed by Kuin., that “we are to bear in mind that the Jews were permitted to divorce wives without assigning any cause; that Jesus neither here, nor at Matt. 19, 3, meant to give political directions; and that he moreover did not contradict Moses, who not even himself approved of the arbitrary divorces of his times (see 19, 8. and the note); finally, that the Jewish Doctors in the age of Christ were not agreed on the sense of the passage of Deut. 24, 1. which treats of divorce. “Now those (continues he) of the school of Hillel, said that the wife might not only be divorced for some great offence, but also רבי בר חלゆ, καὶ πᾶσαν αἵρειαν, for any cause however slight, so that a writing of divorce was given to her. On the other hand, the Shammaei contended that רבי חלュ could only mean something culpable, as adultery. See Selden de Ux. Hebr. 3, 18. Buxt. de Syn. Jud. c. 29. Lightf. Hor. Heb. Wets. in loc. Wolf, and Krebs. From the words of Christ, 19, 3, compared with Matt. 10, 2. sq. it is clear that Moses meant the words to be taken as those of the school of Hillel interpreted them; and yet it is plain from Matt. 19, 8. and Gen. 2,
24. that Moses did not approve of arbitrary divorce. The Jewish Doctors, however, changed a moral precept into a civil institution. Jesus, therefore, who did not intend to give political directions, here teaches in what case, salva religione et conscientid, a wife might be divorced. (Kuin.)

The form ἀποτάσων is rare. We may compare διστάσων, ἰσοτάσων, βουτάσων, εὐπράσων, &c.

32. παρέκτος λόγω πορείας. A Hebraism for παρεκ. πορείας. For the Hebrews use מָרֵי for the simple בָּרֵי, on account of. It is, however, a stronger expression.

33. The Pharisees distributed oaths into the serious, and the slighter, and forbade perjury when the name of God was contained in the oath; but when it was omitted, they held it none, or a very slight offence. Hence neither they nor their disciples abstained from the use of vain oaths. Now it is this evil custom, which directly led to perjury of the worst sort, that Jesus here means to prohibit. He is, therefore, not to be understood as forbidding judicial oaths, but (as appears from the examples subjoined) such oaths as are introduced in common conversation, and on ordinary occasions.

On πάλαρ, see the note on 4, 7. Ἐπαρεκτικι may mean either to swear falsely, and not ex animo; or to violate one's oath. Both are here to be understood. The words ἀποτάσως δὲ—σου, are to be taken (like δὲ ἂν φοβερῇ, &c. at ver. 21.) as an interpretation of the Jewish Doctors. And thus there will be an easier connexion between the doctrine of the Pharisees expressed in these words, and the opposite one of Christ. Ἀποτάσως signifies properly, to give back, repay, and is chiefly used of debts. Here it answers to the Hebr. צֶּהַ, in Job 33, 27, and Ps. 66, 13. (Kuin.) By this use it is hinted that oaths are to be as faithfully performed as debts are to be paid.

34, 35. That Christ does not here forbid oaths in a court of justice, is plain, both from the practice of the Apostles and first Christians, and of holy men in general, (see Exod. 22, 10. Deut. 6, 13. Hebr. 6, 16.) and from the context. He only forbids oaths in common conversation, so severely censured by James 5, 12., who probably has reference to this very exhortation of Christ. (Kuin.)

36, 37. μηρε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὄμοιον, ex. gr. "May I lose my head or life, if I say not the truth." So Cod. Berachoth, p. 32. Elias quintem jurat קַשִּׁי וּתְּפִלְּוָה, per vitam tuam et vitam capitatis tu. See Lightf. ad h. 1. "Ori ὃν δύνασαι μιμᾶν τρίχα λευκήν ἢ μέλαναν σωθῆς, for thou canst not make one hair white or black, much less is thy life at thy own disposal, but it is the gift of God: if, then, thou swearest by thy head, thou swearest by God, the author and preserver of thy life, and makest him as a witness and avenger. Ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἔστιν, i.e. "speech that goes beyond simple affirmation or negation, is sinful." For the Hebrews express the adjective by a substantive with ב, or ב, &c. Bolten thinks it is put for πονηρόν ἔστιν. Others suppose the expression to denote the evil one, Satan; and they take the ἐκ for the efficient cause. (Kuin.) Perhaps the genitive may have a partitive sense, "partaketh of evil."
38. Here is censured the erroneous opinion of the Rabbins, who permitted to individuals the lex talionis. Our Lord, on the contrary, declares that his disciples are to abstain from all private revenge, and to patiently bear the injuries done them, if they could not have them removed by the judges (who were little favourable to Christians), or redressed by some method lawful, and worthy of a Christian. (Kuin.)

39. μη ἀντιστῆναι τῷ θνητῷ. The evil, or injury, itself is put for the author of it. Ἀντιστῆναι, like θηρί, in the Syr. and Arabic, denotes not only to resist, but to retaliate. See Michael. Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr. p. 185. (Kuin.)

40. καὶ τῷ θελοντὶ σοὶ κρίθηναι. Κρίνεσθαι is properly a forensic term, signifying "to go to law," litigare. And in this sense most Commentators here take it. But Jesus is speaking of injuries occurring in common life, and forbids private revenge. Κρίνεσθαι answers in the Sept. to בורא and מנה, which, like this term, are used of contentions of every kind. So Hesych. Κρίνωμεθα, ἀντι τοῦ μαχώμεθα, και διαλεγόμεθα. (Kuin.) So St. James: "Whence come wars and fightings among you?" But it should seem that this injunction and the next καὶ δοτε σε—δῶ, relate to public oppression.

"Αφες αὐτῷ, "give it up to him."

41. ἄγγαρεσσε. The word ἄγγαρεσσε signifies properly, "to be a King’s courier, or ἄγγαρος." And Kuin. thinks the term ἄγγαρος was also used to denote those qui onera portarent publicis, omninoque opus publicum facerent; and finally came to signify comit. He refers to Arrian Epict. 3, 18. Joseph. Ant. 13, 3. Reland Diss. t. 2, 245. Buxt. Lex. Talm. p. 131. Drus. Obs. 274. Fessel Adv. S. p. 505. Rhodig. Ant. Lectt. 10, 8. Meurs. Ex. Critt. p. 2. b. 3. c. 29. Salmas. de Foen. Trap. p. 274. Brisson de regno Pers. p. 238. And he here cites Herodot. 8, 98. οὑρ τοιαυ ἐξερευνετο τοιαυ, λέγουσι γαρ διαν ἣν ἡμεραν ἡ πάσα ὁδός, τοσοῦτοι ἵπποι καὶ ἄνδρες διεστατάκι καθ’ ἡμεραν ἡνδον κατ’ ἡμεραν τεταγμένοι—ὁ μὲν δὲ πρώτος δραμὼν παραδοθείτα καὶ ἐντευκάνα τῷ δευτερῷ,ὁ δε δευτερος τῷ τρίτῳ κ. ὑ. lip. Upon the whole, this bears a strong resemblance to the impress service of our own and foreign countries; except that in antient times, not only couriers had the power of claiming horses for the post, but other public officers could press men, horses, and ships for the public service; which indeed had been partly practised in the times of the Roman republic. Indeed the impress service in this country is a vestige of what once extended to many other departments.

The ἄγγαρεσσε σε, may denote either will claim your personal service, or that of your horses.

42. τὸν θελοντα ἀπὸ σον δανεισασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆ. Δανειζεῖν signifies to lend, whether on usury or not; δανεισασθαι, to borrow; and Kuin. thinks it here signifies to borrow so as to return neither interest nor principal. "For (says he) in the parallel passage of Luke 6, 35. Jesus bids them to lend, hoping not for payment; here the preceding subject was the enduring various injuries. Now to pay back a loan is no injury. At this rate δαν. would here signify not
to borrow, but to *beg* what any one cannot well spare; which were a kind of injury. But this is too harsh, and compels us to explain τῷ αἰρόνας still more harshly: and the discourse is too desultory to warrant any great stress being laid on the context. It should seem that after a meek unresisting placable spirit being inculcated, there is a sort of parenthetical admonition to a *yielding spirit* in general, especially in hearkening to the petitions of those who have to ask a favour; as in the case of those who beg, or borrow. It is to be recollected that the borrowing must here be supposed to be without interest; since to lend on usury was forbidden in the Jewish law.

The μὴ ἀποστραφῆς is an euphemism for *reject not his suit*. There is an ellipsis of πρόσωπον, which is expressed in Tob. 4, 7. μὴ ἀποστραφῆς τὸ πρόσωπον σου ἀπὸ παντὸς πτώχου. Sir. 4, 5. ἀπὸ δεόμενου μὴ ἀποστραφῆς ὁφθαλμόν. See more in Alb., Krebs, and Loesner.

44. ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς υμῶν. It is here elegantly remarked by Wets.: "Per gradus scandit oratio ab affectu ad verba, a verbis ad res. Servate animum amicum et benevolentiam erga eos qui animum hostilem inimicitas vobiscum gerendo prodiderunt; nolite convitia convititis rependere, sed laude virtutem et in hoste." The sense of ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς υμῶν, is explained by the following. Εὐλογεῖν signifies bene dicere, bona et fausta appercari; as 1 Macc. 2, 69. And so it is here taken by most interpreters. But since there follows προσεύχεσθε ὑμῖν, we must look out for another sense of εὐλογεῖν. Now it also signifies laudare, bene aliqui dicere (like our old phrase to speak him well. Edit.), in opposition to καταρασθαί and λαυδορεῖν. (Kuin.) Καλῶς ποιεῖτε, is for ἀγαθοποιεῖτε, Luke 6, 33 & 36. Ἐπηρεάζεσθε is an extensive term signifying to abuse and injure, whether by words or deeds (see Wets., Kypke., Munthe, and Loesn.); and in both these senses, it is clear from the context, the word must here be taken, and denote injury of every kind. I cannot agree with Boe and Eslm., that it is a forensic term. As to διωκ., which follows, it must signify persecute, not prosecute.

45. ὅτες γένησθε νικά ταρδοὺς υμῶν τοῖς ὑπάρχοντις, "in order that ye may be (i. e. show yourselves to be) true sons of your heavenly Father, as imitating the example of his lenity, benignity, and beneficence." This seems to have reference to the whole of the preceding. Now in Scripture those are said to be sons of God who (as true children imitate their parents) imitate the perfections of the Deity. So those are said to be sons of the devil, who have dispositions like unto his. See Joh. 8, 44. and 1 Joh. 3, 10. "Οἱ τῶν ἑλεόν, &c., "Thus he (for example)." &c. So the Hebr. יְהוֹם. "Ἀγαστέλλειν is properly a neuter verb; but it is here used in an active sense; a change common in all languages. Ῥηξεῖν, raineth. Like the Hebr. וַיִּשְׁתָּה, in Gen. 2, 5. where the θεός is supplied, which is here left understood. So Kuin., who observes that the Greeks use τὰς sometimes with, and sometimes without ὁ θεός. See the examples in Kypke, Raphel, and Palaiaret. The phrase with θεῷ may be regarded as a vestige of remote antiquity.

46. ἐὰν ἀγαπῆστε, &c. Here there is the frequent ellipsis of
μόνον. The ἄγαρ. denotes will and affection of every kind and degree. Τινὰ μεσθῶν ἔχετε, "what reward have you a claim for?" Luke 6, 34. τολὴ ἡμῶν χάρις ἐστί; The Vulg. has habebitis; but, I think, from a gloss. Here the Cod. Cant. appears to Latinize, since it has ἔχετε.

47. ἀπάσαρσε. Ἀπάσαρσα—properly signifies to salute, (like the Hebr. יָשָׁיָהו ְמָשָׁה;) ask any one how he does, (see Gen. 43, 27 Sept.) wish any one well; a term used at meeting, and at taking leave. Hence it comes to signify "to address any one kindly, to show obliging and kind treatment to any one." See Munthe, Loesn. and Sturz, Lex. Xenoph. Τοῖς ἄδελφοις ἡμῶν, "your countrymen and friends." (Kuin.) Τί περισσόν ποιεῖτε; "what mighty wonder do ye do?" Here (as often) the Greek and English idioms exactly correspond. This sense of περισσός is found sometimes in the Classical writers (see the references in Schl. Lex.), and in other passages of the New Testament, as Matt. 11, 9. Luke 7, 96. 1 Cor. 19, 23 and 94. Joh. 10, 10. Rom. 3, 1.

48. τέλειον, i.e. in a moral sense holy and pure, υπάρχει, 1 Kings, 8, 62. Col. 1, 28. ἡμῶν, Gen. 6, 9. Deut. 8, 13. (Kuin.) The sense is: "In these and in all other virtues aim at that perfection and holiness which characterise your Father in heaven."

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 1. Our Lord now teaches his disciples, that in the exercise of virtue they must not imitate the example of the Pharisees, who do every thing through ostentation and vanity, and nothing for conscience sake. (Kuin.) This view is chiefly founded on the reading δικαιοσύνη, which is supported by strong authorities, and, as being the more difficult, is thought by most Critics the true one. Yet those who adopt it, differ as to its sense. Some take it to mean liberality, benignity; as 2 Cor. 9, 9. and elsewhere. Others understand it of liberality and beneficence to the poor. And this would seem to be supposed by what follows: but considering what precedes, it seems too limited a sense; and I agree with those who (as Kuin.) assign the general signification "to exercise virtue;" which will include the foregoing; and the phrase δικαιοσύνη ποιεῖν is opposed to ἀμαρτάνειν at 1 Joh. 3, 7 and 8. It may be observed, that after giving the precept generally, Jesus proceeds to particulars, and applies it, specially, to charity to the poor, prayer, fasting, &c. The sense, then, seems to be this: "Mind therefore that ye do not exercise this your virtue before men, for ostentation's sake." The phrase πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτῶις (for ὑπὲρ αὐτῶις) is to be closely connected with ἐμπροσθέν τῶι ἀνθρώπωι, of which it is exegetical. Ἐχετε is for ἔχετε. Yet the sense of habi and plan may be here recognised.

2. ἀνὴν οὖν ποιῆ ἐλεημοσύνην. "Thus, for example, when ye give alms." The phrase ἐλεημ. ποιεῖν occurs in Sir. 7, 10. Tob. 12, 10. Sap. 35, 2. On σαλπ. it is observed by Kuin., that as the people were convoyed by sound of trumpet, so the word was applied to
whenever was done noise and ostentation and boasting. So Cic. has 
_buscinator estimationis_. On the proverb (for such it is) see Schoettg. 

2. _ἐν συναγωγῇ_. Wolf and Kuin. think that by _συναγωγή_, are not 
to be understood the places of worship so called (see the note on 4, 
23.); for praying or giving alms in the synagogues was not 
confined to the hypocrites; but that as _ψέμα_ must signify places, 
so must _συναγωγή_, and it therefore cannot but denote places of public 
resort. Perhaps the squares. "Οὐκ ὁδασθοῦσίν_, " that their piety may 
be extolled." _Ἀνέχων τὸν μισθόν_. The _ἀνέχω_ is emphatic; q. d. 
"they have received their reward, and all that they can expect, even 
the praise of men." Kuin. compares Cic. Tusc. 2, 26. Mihi quidem 
laudabiliora videntur omnia, quæ sine venditaciones, et sine populo 
testis fiunt,—nullum theatrum virtutis conscientiā magis est.

3, 4. See Schoettg. Adag. N. T. p. 11. and Gataker on Anton. 5, 
6. _Ἐλεημοσύνη_, the giving of thy alms. So the 
Hebr. _יָוֶד_, Ps. 139, 15. (Symon.) _Ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυστῷ_. For 
_Splen. τὰ ἐν κρυστῷ_; as 22, 23. (Kuin.) _Ἀπόδοσιν ἐν τῷ πανερῷ_. 
"will reward thee openly, in the sight of all;" namely, in the pre-

cence of assembled multitudes at the day of judgment. Kuin., how-

ever, understands it of _this_ life as well as the next; and he com-


6. From ostentation in alms our Lord proceeds to ostentation in 
prayer. The _ἔσος_, or _ἐσεσθε_; is the future of _injunction_, "thou must 
not be." _Οἱ φιλοσοφοί_ is for _οἱ φιλοσοφοί_. Almost all the recent Com-

mentators render the _φιλοσοφοί_ _solent_. But that sense, though fre-
quent in the Classical writers, is very rarely found in Scripture; 
and the common interpretation is the more natural. It would be 
less objectionable to unite both. _Ἐν ταῖς γυναικὶς_, i. e. angular 
places where streets branch off.

7. _μὴ βαστιλογήσθε_, &c., "use not vain repetitions," If men 
confine themselves to proper prayer matter (of which there are but 
three things), and avoid unnecessary repetitions, no prayer can be 
too long. Dr. Whichcot, Select Serm. No. 4. p. 107. I would 
here direct the attention of the reader to an admirable Discourse of 
Dr. South (on Eccles. 5, 2.) against long extemporary prayer, vol. 
2. p. 81. See also Dr. Popham in loc.

9. _παρέρ ἡμῶν ὃ ἐν ταῖς οὐρανοῖς_, Deus optime Maxime, poten-
tissimè et benignissimè. _Ἀγιάζειν_ signifies to _venerate_, _worship_ (as 
1 Pet. 3, 15.), like the Heb. _יָרָא_, Ps. 8, 13. It is conjoined with 
_μεγαλύνεσθαι_, _δοξάσθαι_. And Chrys. explains, _ἀγιασθῶ_ by 
_δοξάσθην_. _Οὐκομά σου, ὿ _. So in Ex. 36, 23, _ἀγιάσω_ τὸ ὅνεμά 
_μου_ καὶ _ἀγιασθῶ_ναι are interchanged.

10. _Εἰδήσεω_ ἡ _βασιλεία_ σου. On these words I cannot but refer 
the reader to an admirable sermon of Bp. Lownth's, in a recent publi-
cation entitled, "Four Sermons of Dr. Taylor, Bp. Lownth, &c.

11. _τὸν ἄρον_. The term _ἄρον_ is, like the Heb. _עַרֶב_, a general 
one denoting food of every kind, _τὰ ἐκτίθεισα τοῦ ἄρωνος_, James 
2, 16. See 2 Sam. 3, 29. Prov. 12, 9. Ps. 132, 15. _Σῆμερον_ might 
be expressed by a fuller Hebraism, _σήμερον σῆμερον_, i. e. (as Luke 
expresses it) _τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν_. (Kuin.)
12. καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ φαελήματα ἡμῶν. Ὁ φαελήμαα signifies a debt, and also an offense. Ὁ φαελήμαα properly signifies a debtor, or one who is bound to the payment of money. So the Heb. וָנ signifies to owe, and to be a sinner, one who, as the Greeks say, δείκει δίκην, or, as the Latins, pemas debet, i. e. from some sin he has perpetrated. See Dan. 1, 10. (Kuin.) See the note on Luke 15, 4.

13. μὴ εἰσενέγκας ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν. Rosenm. takes the πειρ. to signify a trial of virtue by adversity. But this sense, though it is frequent in the Classical writers, seldom occurs in the Scriptural ones, and cannot here be intended. The phrase εἰσερχόμενα εἰς πειρασμόν, Rosenm. observes, occurs infra 26, 41. And he takes τοῦ πειρασμοῦ to denote adversity and calamity of every kind. But greatly preferable, I think, is the sense evil, i. e. vice and sin, which is supported by Lampe on Joh., vol. 3, 442. The doxology ὅτι σου ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία—διὰ, is rejected by almost all critics as a spurious addition. For though it has place in almost all the MSS., yet it is not found in Origen, Nyssene, Cyril, Max., and other ancient Greek Fathers, who professedly explain the Lord’s prayer, and it is omitted by all the Latin Fathers. It is indeed found in the three Syriac Versions, the ἕθιοι, Armenian, and Gothic ones, the Constat. Ap., and Chrys. But, as Griesb. in Commentar. Critic. ad h. l. observes, none of these authorities, excepting the Syriac Peschito, will prove this clause to have existed before the fourth century. I therefore agree with the learned Commentator that this doxology was, in the fourth century, introduced into the manuscripts of the liturgies, which added both to the present and other forms of prayers sometimes this and sometimes other similar doxologies. It is well observed by Rosenm., that if the doxology be regarded not as a part of the prayer, but an appendix, or antiphon, pronounced by the people, in answer to the priest, who alone repeated the prayer itself, all is plain, and we see the reason for its being added.

The amen was the regular conclusion of all the antient prayers.

14, 15. Repeatedly were the disciples and followers of Jesus, who, in professing and propagating the divine doctrine, had to sustain troubles and persecutions of various kinds, exhorted by their Master to meekness, and the cultivation of peace and concord. These virtues he here inculcates; and to make the exhortation the more impressive, he, after the Hebrew manner (as Is. 38, 1, 3, 9. Jer. 29, 11. Deut. 9, 7.), expresses the same thing both affirmatively and negatively. With the sentiment may be compared Sir. 28, 2. ἄφες ἄδικα ὑπὸ τὴν σκόν σου, καὶ τὰ ἐνεχθέντα σου αἰ̣ ἁμαρτία σου, μυθησότας. (Kuin.) Fritz. compares Plut. 2, p. 15. Ε. μηδε—ἡμεῖς οὖν τὴν ποιήσαν ἁμερία τῶν μουσῶν ἐκπόντωμεν καὶ ἀφανίζωμεν. Wahl and Vater take τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. To which Fritzschew takes a not ill founded exception. He thinks that in cases like the present φαίνεσθαι must be taken as a middle verb: and he regards the dative here as a dativus commodi. In this, however, he seems under a mistake. The dative is here, as often, for an accusative, with a preposition, i. e. τοῖς ἀνθρώποις for εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Which mode, and the middle form of φαίνεσ-
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θαι, is confirmed by Aristoph. Ran. 1063 πρῶτον μὲν τοῖς βασι-
λευτοῖς μᾶς ἀμπίσχων, ἵν' ἔλεειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις φαινοντ' εἶναι,
νυμφό φαίνων'.

17. Σο δὲ νηστεύων άλειψαί σου τὴν κεφαλὴν, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν
σου νύφα. "Do you (says the Lord) act the contrary part to those
dissemblers, and wear the appearance of one rejoicing, or who is
about to sit down to a banquet." For such, as we find from the
Old Testament (see 2 Sam. 12, 20. and 14, 4.), used to anoint them-

...See De Roer ap. Wolf. And that such is the custom to this
day in the East, is testified by travellers. See Harmer.

18. τοῦ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ. Friztche here stumbles at the article,
which he would cancel, were there any authority. If retained, he
thinks it must be referred to an ellipsis of νηστεύων, taken from the
preceding νηστεύων. But this is harsh and inadmissible. The
true ellipsis is ἐντ', and the sense thence arising is sufficiently apt.
Finally, the concluding words of the verse, which are cancelled by
most critics, are, I think, rightly defended by Fritz. supra, ver. 4.
He justly represents the critics, in this and such like cases, as "in-
sequabilitatis impatientes;" which surely, as far as concerns the
Oriental and idiomatic style, is very uncritical.

19. Passing now to another subject, though intimately connected
with the preceding, ver. 19—34., he exhorts his disciples to fix
their affections on heavenly rather than earthly things; employing
two arguments, namely, that heavenly goods are far to be preferred
before earthly ones, ver. 19 & 20, and anxious care about the latter
is foolish, ver. 26. seq. (Fritz.)

It has been doubted what the Evangelist meant by θης. Some
say, stacks, or heaps of corn. Others, stores of vestments; others,
bags of money, or precious metals. Each of which significations is
supported by examples. And if any particular sort of wealth were
intended, it would seem to be vestments, since moths are just after
mentioned. See Cambp., who observes that it was customary for
the opulent in Asiatic countries, where their fashions in dress were
not fluctuating like ours, to have repositories full of rich and splen-
did apparel." But as the most extensive sense any word will bear
is elsewhere in Scripture the truest, so it is, I conceive, here; and
I agree with Kypke, Kuin., and Fritz., that we are to understand
goods and wealth of whatever kind (such as is stored up). And so
the term was taken by Chrys. and Euthymius, the latter of whom,

...after thus tracing the connexion: Ἐξεβαλὼν δὲ ἥδη τῆς κενωδίας
γόνημα, λοιπῶν ἐνεκαίρως περὶ δεκημοσεῖς νομοθετεῖν καὶ γὰρ οὕδεν
αὐτῶν παραπεσάναι χρημάτων ἔργαν, ὡς ἡ κενωδία: with the same
good taste remarks: Ἐπει δὲ οὐκ ἦν εὐπαράδεκτον, τὸ ἀθρόον πα-
ροάζσαι περὶ τῆς ὑπερφύσεως τῶν χρημάτων, σοφότατα κατέμερε
τὸν περὶ ταύτης λόγον, καὶ πρῶτον μὲν εἴπε μακάριοι οἱ ἔλεημονες,
ἐκαίται ταπέων τῷ ἁντιδίκῳ σου εἶπα: ἐὰν τις σου θελεί κριθήσαται,
καὶ τῶν χιτῶν σου λαβεῖν, δὸς αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱματίον τελευατῶν δὲ,
τὸ μείζον ἐκείνων πάντων ἐπήγαγεν. In order (Euthym. continues)
more easily to persuade them, he shows the ill effects of treasuring
up on earth, and the benefit of treasuring up in heaven. Fritz. takes
the ἐπί τῆς γῆς, to be closely connected with θησαυρίζετε, and
would render: nolite in terrâ opes congerere. But this is contrary to the opinion of the antients and most moderns, and inconsistent with the antithetical clause ἐν τῷ ὀφρανῷ. It is strange the Commentators should not have seen that ἐν τῷ γῆς, and ἐν τῷ ὀφρανῷ, are to be taken as dativi commodi, or ἐν τῷ γῆς, and εἰς τὸν ὀφρανῦν, to be taken in the sense, for earthly uses, for heavenly uses and benefits. So Euthym. to the question, τῶν ἰθαυμιζόντω ἐν τῷ ὀφρανῷ, answers: ἐν τῷ ταμιευόντοι ἐκεῖ τὰς ἀντιδόσεις τούτων καὶ τὰς ἀμοιμᾶς, αἱ συλλεγόμεναι καὶ ἰθαυμαζόμεναι φυλάττονται ἀσφαλῶς.

19. δηνοιν οὐς καὶ βρῶσις. This is regarded by Casaub., Bochart, Pric., and others, as an hendiadis for οὐς βρῶσκοντα. See James 5, 2. But this, Elan. and Kuin. say, is refuted by ver. 20. οὔτε οὐς οὔτε βρῶσις. Though Fritz. would overturn the objection by the use of οὔτε—οὔτε in Thucyd. 5, 111. Which, however, seems too refined, as are also some other distinctions which he then makes. The sense is clear. As to βρῶσις, I cannot agree with Kuin., that it signifies the corn-worm: and though he defends this from Mal. 3, 11 Sept., yet see Fritz. Others understand it of the rust of metals. But precious metals are little liable to rust, nor is their virtue affected thereby. The most extensive sense is, I conceive, here, as often, the truest. And I agree with Chrys. and Euthym., of the antients, and, of the moderns, Fritz, in taking it of that corruption to which goods of every kind are subject. So Euthym.: ἕστα δὲ ρῆς μὲν ὁ ἐγγεννώμενος πολλοίς τῶν χρημάτων σκόλως βρῶσις δέ, ἡ σῆς καὶ ἧς καὶ καὶ ἐπεκαίνη τοιαύτη διαιφθορά. Τὸ ρῆς ἐστιν τὸ Ἑβρ. δε. And so it is rendered in Is. 51, 8., but by ὑπὸ in Job 4, 19. 27, 18. It is very probable that St. James (5, 2.) had this very passage in mind.

At οὐ διοφύσατε, Kuin. thinks there is an ellipsis of ὀλίγας, or rather τοῖς. But though such burglaries were usually affected by digging through the wall, yet such was not always the case; and thus the term may mean no more than house-breaking with us, which only implies a forcible entrance, by breaking in somewhere. A similar use of διορ. is adduced by Kuin. from Arist. Vesp. 369.

21. δηνοιν γὰρ ὁ θεαυρὸς ὁμοῦν, ἐκεὶ ἑσταὶ καὶ ἡ καβοὶ ὁμοῦν. Fritz. traces the connexion thus: "It was not for nothing that I just pointed out what true riches are; it was to excite you to seek after them; for where, &c. Euthym. thus: "He means that if this be not the case, yet where a man’s treasure is, there will his heart be also. A no small injury to the soul for the thinking part to be nailed down to earthly treasure, in anxious contrivance for its preservation, and so enslaved by the tyranny of avarice as to be unable to dwell on any other object." Either of these modes may be admissible. The words have the air of an adage.

22, 23. ὁ λόγος τοῦ σωμάτων, &c. The connexion here is said, by Kuin., to be very lax; and he thinks the sentence was pronounced at some other time, &c. But it is unnecessary to suppose that, and his notion of a gnomologia, from which the Evangelists draw in common, is a mere fancy, devoid of proof, and highly ob-
jectionable. The connexion is well traced by Chrys. and Euthym., followed by Olearius, from whom Fritz. thus connects and explains the sentence: Ne opinemini, parum referre, quo inclinatum geras animum, illustrare rem lubet majorem alius minoris similitudine. Lumen corporis est oculus, quo integro lux per totum corpus fusa est, hebetato contra, lumine corpus continuo careat. Quantas jam censes tenebras, ubi lux hominum inhabitans in tenebras vertit? (i. e. si mens, quam rerum divinarum studio erectam luci recto comparens, rerum terrestrium cupiditatem obscuretur?)

24. obidis évaraí, &c. The connexion is thus traced by Fritz.: Neu illud contra dicas, posse te rebus externis inhiare non deposito omni Dei amore. Nam valet regula, quod duobus inservire dominis nemini licet. This sentence also is evidently adagial. Fritz. (rightly, I think,) rejects the évaraí. éviri. of Euthym., as being implied in évai évroui. He compares Hor. Od. 9, 17, and Lucian Tox. §. 53. παίε ἄλον με ποίνη σεαντοῦ, ὑπὲρ σαντοῦ γὰρ ἕπαιρε μέρος ἐν τού διόν ἐν τάσχοντος. He also denies that there is any ellipsis of ἐπερ and ὄνοι, &c. He edits ἦ τοῦ ἐνός, from Chrys. and one MS.; rendering, with Erasmus and Beza, "aut omnium illum spernet, alterum curabit, aut illum omnium curabit, et alterum spernet. And certainly this sense requires the article.

By Ὀμομνά, which is the Chaldee Mamona (i. e. Plutus, the god of wealth), Grecised, is meant riches, wealth being, like many other nouns, personified.

25. The formula διὰ τοῦτο is thus expressed by Fritz.: "quia alterutri tantum, aut Deo, aut Pluto inservire potestis, nec valet objectio ejus, qui utrusque a eodem voluntati satisfici posse arbitretur (v. 24.), nolite Mamona obsequi." And he cites from Chrys. : διὰ τοῦτο, οὖν, τὸ τῆς Ζημίας ἀφανοῦ, and Theophyl.: διὰ τοῦτο, οὖν, διὰ τὸ ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξάλλεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν χρημάτων; Μερίμναι does not, as Kuin. thinks, of itself signify no more than φορτίζειν and ἐγρεί, but always, when used with propriety, denotes to take great care, to feel anxiety and solicitude. In the Sept. it answers to the Heb. יָם, with or without י, which corresponds to the repl. Thus here either ἐν or ἐπὶ must be supplied.

26. ὅνγκι ἡ ψωχῆ παλαιῶν, &c. Chrys. and others have well seen that this is equivalent to, "If God hath given us the greater gift of life and a body, he will not deny us the lesser ones of food and raiment, to support the former." On the sense of μερίμναι see the excellent note of Campbell, of which the following are the chief remarks: "The phrase would have been better rendered, Be anxious about nothing; for, doubtless, we ought not to be careless about whatever is worthy to be the subject of a request to God. To take no thought about what concerns our own support, and the support of those who depend upon us, would inevitably prove the source of that improvidence and inaction, which are, in the New Testament, branded as criminal in a very high degree; see 1 Tim. 5, 8. 2 Thess. 3, 8. There is not only an apparent, but a real contradiction in the Apostle's sentiments to our Lord's precepts, as they appear in the common version, but not the shadow of a repugnance to them as expressed by the Evangelist. To be without anxiety is
most commonly the attendant of industry in our vocation, joined with an habitual trust in Providence, and acquiescence in its dispensations.

Again, there are two extremes, to one or other of which most Interpreters lean in translating the instructions given by our Lord. Some endeavour to soften what to their taste is harsh, and seem afraid of speaking out to the world what the sacred historian has authorized them to say. Others, on the contrary, imagining that moral precepts cannot be too rigorous, give, generally, the severest and most unnatural interpretation to every word that can admit more than one, and sometimes even affix a meaning (whereof με-ρυμνα is an instance) for which they have no authority, sacred or profane. There is a danger on each side, against which a faithful Interpreter ought to be equally guarded. Our Lord’s precepts are, in the Oriental manner, concisely and proverbiaally expressed; and we acknowledge that all of them are not to be expounded by the moralist, strictly according to the letter. But whatever allowance may be made to the expositor or Commentator, this is what the translator has no title to expect. The character just now given of our Lord’s precepts is the character in the original, as they were written by the inspired penmen for their contemporaries; it is the translator’s business to give them to his readers, as much as possible, stamped with the same signature with which they were given by the Evangelists to theirs. Those methods, therefore, of enervating the expression, to render the doctrine more palatable to us moderns, and better suited to the reigning sentiments and manners, are not to be approved. But it must be owned that there is danger also on the other side, to which our translators have, in rendering some passages, evidently leaned. It is in vain to think to draw respect to a law, by straining it ever so little beyond what consistency and right reason will warrant. “Expect no good,” says the Bishop of Meaux, “from those who over-strain in virtue.” Ne croyez jamais rien de bon de ceux qui outrient la vertu,” Hist. des Variations, &c. liv. 3. ch. 60. Nothing can be better founded than this maxim, though it may justly surprise us to read it in that author, as nothing can be more subversive of the whole fabric of monachism. There is not, however, a more effectual method, than by such immoderate stretches, of affording a shelter and apology for transgression. And when once the plea of impracticability is (though not avowedly) tacitly admitted in some cases; it never fails to be gradually extended to other cases, and comes at last to undermine the authority of the whole.”

27. προσθειναι και την ἡλικίαν αυτοῦ πῆχυν ἔνα; The common interpretation of ἡλικία, stature, is supported by the authority of all the antients, and ably defended by Beza, Grotius, Elsner, and recently Fritz, who denies that any apt example has yet been adduced of ἡλικία in the sense ætatis mensura. And he thinks the sentence may be connected thus: “Non debetis vitæ conservandæ anxīte intenti esse, quippe qui per sollicitudinem ne rem quidem aliquanto leviorem possitis perficere.” See the note on Luke 12, 24. I
would compare a similar sentiment in *Xen. Mem.* 2. ἡπείρης μὲν γὰρ
εἰ δέω αὐτὰς πέλον ὤργας διέχωσε ἀμα τοιχῆς, οὐκ ἂν δύνατο.
28. καταμάθεσε τὰ κρίνα τοῦ ἄγρον τῶν αὐξάνει: This punctua-
tion was first proposed by Palaiaret, and has been approved by Cam-
bell, and adopted by Fritz. Campbell urges that it suits the vivacity of
our Lord’s manner throughout this whole discourse. Yet I can-
not but regard it as a δεινότης somewhat frigid, more suited to the
style of Max. Tyr. or Philostratus, than the simple phraseology of
the Gospels.

Euthymius observes that the αὐξάνει is said with reference to
the petals, which are a clothing to the flower; q. d. “Survey (even)
the field lilies how they attain growth in their petals, and in propor-
tion as they grow, become more beautiful.”

29. οὐδε ὁλομᾶς ἐν πάρῃ γῆς αὐτῶν περίβαλετο ὡς ἐν τοῦτον.
Euthymius observes that the example is thus taken, in order to
show the meaness of the herbage so beautified by the great Creator,
and the grace and beauty thus given to the meanest herb.” The
glory here meant is commonly supposed to be that of raiment; as
is suggested by περίβαλετο, a word very applicable to putting on of
apparel; though that sense is, in the earlier Classical writers, rarely
found. Yet it is not unfrequent in περίβολος. Fritz, however,
maintains that it must denote, in a general sense, dignity, splendour.
And that the word is susceptible of that signification is certain.
But the context seems to support the common interpretation. As to
Fritz’s argument, that thus for πάρ we should have had παντοίος, it
is, like many others employed by that Commentator, of little weight.

30. εἰ δὲ τῶν χῶρων τοῦ ἄγροι, &c. It is observed, by Wets.,
that the Hebrews divided all vegetables into ἄργα, trees, and ἀστά, herbs,
the former of which, he adds, the Hellenists call ξυλον, the latter,
χῶρος, under which they comprehend grass, corn, and flowers.
The antients and most moderns take the χῶρα. here of the *lilies.*
Some, however, as Casaub. and Elsner, de stipulis et fruticibus.
Fritz. thinks there is a transition from *species* to *genus.* And he
takes χῶρα. to mean *grass.* But the former method seems the best
founded. The *lilies* (a general name of flowers) are part of the
grass which to-day is (green and herbid), and to morrow is (dried
and become hay, and) cast into the oven. One may conceive,
easily, the speed with which grass, in so hot a country as Palestine,
becomes hay, and how soon, on becoming such, it may be cast into
the oven, since from that scarcity of wood which has, from time
immemorial, prevailed in Syria and all that part of Asia (the earliest
settled part in the world), hay, straw, and stubble are perpetually
used as fuel. It is evident how wrongly ἄδοκος is rendered, by
Kuín., *conjectendum,* since hay is only liable to be so employed, not
necessarily so used.

With the τῷ φάγωμεν, &c. I would compare a passage of a Rabbi-
ὑπερ τοῦ est in lastitia et hilaritate cordis et perpetuo convivio, quia
interdivitias et arrogantiam suam obliviscitur pauperis, nec ad ejus
inopiam attendit. Ideo instituit lex annum Jubilaeum—ut etiam
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dives oculos ad caelum erigeret (conf. comm. 23.) et dicaret: quid comedam, et quid bibam? atque ita recordaretur pauperis."

32. The repetition of γάρ at the commencement of two consecutive sentences Fritz. (referring to some recent Philologists) defends as correct, rather than esteems as elegant. On the force of αὐράνως here Künioel needlessly refines, as if it were for Deus Opt. Max. et potentissimus. It is simply for δὲ καὶ ἦν τοῖς αὐρανωτοῖς supra, ver. 9. For δὲ Paulus and Fritz. both write δὲ, τί; though they differ as to the sense. But no change is necessary.

33. πρῶτον. Some MSS. have πρῶτερον. But the common reading is well defended by Fritz. On the βασιλ. τοῦ Θεοῦ Künioel refines too much. Far preferable is the explanation of Fritz., regnum Messianum. And he adds cujus ut comos fias, elabora per tēn δικαιοσύνην aitō scil. per virtutem, quam Deus imponit. He moreover adds, after Mill, Fabricius, &c., that what Clemens, Origen, and Eusebius cite as a dict of Christ: αἰτεῖτε τὰ μεγάλα, καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προσεθησαται, καὶ αἰτεῖτε τὰ ἐπιφάνεια, καὶ τὰ ἐκπίνεια προσεθησαται ὑμῖν has reference to this passage, and is only an amplification of its simple phraseology.

34. Fritz. stiffly maintains that αὐρανων must be confined to the morrow; and he objects to taking τὴν αὐρανων for τὰ εἰς τὴν αὐρανων. For neither of which is there any foundation. He moreover points: μεριμνησεί. Τα ἐπανίς αὐρανων. And this he attempts to defend sum more.

The correctness of the use of κακία for κακόντης Elsner and Fritz. stiffly maintain. Yet there can be little doubt but that this was chiefly confined to the idiomatic style.

CHAP. VII.

VERSE 1. μὴ κρίνετε. Fritz., perhaps rightly, defends the common interpretation judge, which he supports from Chrys. Hom. 23. οὐκ ἀπλῶς τὰ πάντα τὰ ἀμαρημάτα κελεύεις μὴ κρίνειν, οὐδὲ ἀπλῶς ἀπαγορεύει τὸ τούτον τοιοῦτον, ἀλλὰ τοῖς μυρίων γέμοις κακῶν καὶ ἀλλοις ὑπὲρ τῶν τυχόντων ἐπεμβαίνοντες. And he truly adds: "qui inferius argumentum petit, e. v. 5., ubi apertè qui ipsi multis pilis obruti sunt, practicè denotantur." Hos igitur monit, ne pe-tulania in alios invenendo suorum vitiorum ipsi obliti vicissim ad alios moneantur. Thus, if the sense, the μὴ κακοδικάζετε of Luke must be understood improperly of sitting in severe judgment over (καρά).

2. ἐν γὰρ κριματι, &c. Fritz. rightly, I think, maintains that the εἰν is not (as Kün. would have it) pleonastic, but put for per; referring to Matth. Gr. Gr. p. 842. Yet it savours of Hebraism, a being so used. The best Critics are agreed that μετρηθησαί is the true reading. And, certainly, critical reasons strongly favour it. But those, as concerns the New Testament, are of less weight than as respects the Classical writers. A similar use of αὖρι is cited, by Wets., from Thucyd. Kün. compares Cic. Verr. 3, 1. And Wets. cites from Pausan. Cor. 18. μετρησαί τὴν ἵσην.
3. Fritz directs the two members of this sentence to be closely connected, in order to elicit the true sense. An idiom not unfrequently found in the Scriptural, and sometimes in the Classical writers; but I see not how it can have place here. Neither can I agree with him in rejecting the emphatical sense usually ascribed to βλέπει, which seems required by the context, and is confirmed by the antient Interpreters, and well illustrated from Hor. Serm. 1, 3, §5. Cum tua pervides oculis mala lippus inunctis, Cur in amicorum vitii tam cernis acutum, Quam aut aquila, aut serpens Epidaurus.

The κάψος is rendered, by Wahl and Robinson, a twig; which does not answer to the ξύλον, that requiring it to be rendered a splinter or chip, which is what Hesych. means, when he explains it κεραία ξύλον λεπτή. And so Grot., Kuin., and Schleus. may even Parkh. And, long ago, L. Brug explains it minima ligni particula, quales nonnumquam incurruunt in digitos, aut in oculos involunt. See Num. 33, 35. That the antients so took it is plain, since they understand by ξύλον, not a trunk of a tree, but a beam. So ξύλα παραπτήσιμα are often mentioned in Thucyd. and Xenophon. As to the signification ascribed by Campbell, thorn, it can by no means be admitted. That Commentator proceeded on a wrong view.

To advert to the etymology of the word, it comes from κάψω, which, notwithstanding what Lennep may say, is rightly derived by Parkhurst from the Heb. יָסָר, to dry.

4. Fritz denies that the πῶς is rightly rendered quid formet; and would "beat out" (extender) the sensus indignantis from the future in ἐρεῖς. But it is easier to elicit the sensus indignantis from the force of the interrogation. Such is frequent in our particle how?

4. ἄφες ἐκβάλλω. Conjunctions ἐκβάλλω ab aliis pro futuro tractatur, ab aliis prefixo cogitatione ἐν expletur. Notum bodie est, nudi illum poni aut in interrogando, quid facere debes (vid. Hermann. Doctrin. metric. p. 503.); aut in adhortando, quorum hoc unicum convenit: "permite eximam." (Fritz.) The force of the article here denotes what was just mentioned. Among the parallel passages adduced by the Philologists, the most apposite is Babylon. Bava Bathra, f. 15, 2. dixit ei eximè festucam ex oculo tuo; respondit ei, tu remove trabem ab oculo tuo.

Διαβλέψεις, disjicere. The δια is (as often) intensive.

6. μὴ δώσει τοῦ ἄγιον. I agree with Erasmus, Beza, and Fritz, that by τοῦ ἄγιον is especially meant doctrine of Jesus. "Ev τοῖς ἀπελευθερωμενοῖς is well rendered, by Fritz., "suis pedibus," "with their feet." He rightly objects to the interpretēs of Erasmus and Beza.

6. μὴ παρεις καρακαρίζωσιν, &c. The mode of interpretation I have here adopted is, I find, also supported by Fritz.

7. It is rightly observed, by Fritz., that the precepts now subjoined might, notwithstanding their want of connexion, have been pronounced at the same time with the preceding, and not, as the recent Commentators suppose, at some other.

8. At the ἀφούγησεν there was no need for Fritz. to have stumbled; since it only proceeded from variation. And the force of the present only coincides with that of the future; the present here denoting what is customary, and the future having very nearly the
same sense. The word should be rendered, "it will be opened," Nay, Campbell renders it by the present; but that is too licentious. The διόθεταν just before, may be rendered, "will be given." Jesus is here speaking (as appears from the illustration just after) of what is usual among men, and hints thereby the application of the same reasoning to the dealings of men with Almighty God.

9. The ἄλλως is emphatic. And it is rightly remarked, by Campbell, that it makes the intended illustration of the goodness of the celestial Father, from the conduct of even human fathers, with all their imperfections, much more energetic." The ἡ is thought, by Fritz., to denote contrariety. But that particle rather has the illustrative force, when what follows is meant to elucidate the foregoing by another view of the subject. As to the difficulty involved in the τούς, which is variously explained, I am inclined to agree with Fritz., that Elster rightly supposes an anacoluthon, by which two interrogations are blended together, thus: "An quis est e vobis homo, quem, si filius panem proposcerit, num forte la-pides ci porriget?

11. The interpretation of πουρον, which is introduced first, is embraced by Fritz., who thus paraphrases: "Si contentio fiat, Deus bonus est, mortales mali. And he confirms the interpretation from Chrys.: ταῦτα δὲ εἶπεν οὐ διαβάλλων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῆς φύσιν, ἵνα γε, ὅτι κακίστως τὸ γένος, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῆς ἁγίατος τῆς αὐτοῦ τῆς φιλοσοφίας τῆς πατρίδος πονηρῶν καλῶν.

11. οἴδατέ δὲ μαρτυρεῖν τοις τίς γένοις. Fritz. objects both to the interpretation of Wets. and that of Kuin. (from PalAIret); though he acknowledges that it is strange a verb of knowledge should be used. This is probably an Hebrew idiom; and Kuin, compares the use of γινη, followed by an Infinitive, in Is. 56, 11. and Eccles. 4, 17, 6, 18. Something like it, indeed, is found in our own language.

12. The force of the οὗ is thus explained by Chrys. (cited by Fritz.): τὸ γὰρ οὗ τοῦτο οἷον ἀλλὰ προστέθηκεν, ἀλλὰ αἰνιγμόνως δυνατευθεὶς, φησιν, ἀκούειται μὲτ' ἐκείνων, ὅι δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα ποιεῖται. Fritz. however, traces the connexion thus: "quandoquidem petenibus liberra liberalitatis documenta edere sciatis, vestrum benigittatem eo usque extendite, ut quos vobis praestari velitis cadem praestetis alius. Both modes are perhaps rather ingenious than solid. Fritz. cancels the οὗ οἷον before καί, without authority, or indeed any shadow of necessity, since, in the use of the particles the New Testament writers are not distinguished by the exactness which characterizes the Classical writers. With as little reason he just after reads οὗ τοῖς for οὗ τοῖς; for I cannot but suspect that the οὗ τοῖς arose from the οὗ τοῖς just before. The sense of οὗτος γὰρ οὕτως οὐ νῦν καὶ οὐ προφήται is, "that is what the law and the prophets direct."

13. διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης. The force of the article may be thus expressed: "Enter ye into that one of the two gates which is strait." Fritz. explains: "ingredimi per portam sanè angustam. Nam lata ea est porta, per quam, quum ad pernicem (i.e. ad mortem aternam) perducat, non est ingrediendum." But this is neither a
version nor a paraphrase. The sense is this: "Aim at entering in at the strait gate: though there be a gate that is broad, and the way to it broad, and many are travelling to it; yet it leads to perdition; therefore take it not. And though there be a gate that is strait, and the way to it narrow, and few are they that travel there-to; yet take it, for it leads to life and eternal happiness." In some such way a Western writer would have expressed himself. But the Oriental style is very different; and though simple, unconnected, and apparently inconclusive, yet it produces more effect on an Eastern mind.

11. In common with most recent Critics, Fritz. reads ὁ for δὲ. But he will not admit that it ought to be taken in the sense quan. He assigns to it the signification cur, which is precarious, and here, unsuitable.

15. ἐν εὐδόματι προβάτων. Pric. and Suicer take this of such clothing as the sheep wear, i.e. sheep-skins. And this interpretation Fritz. adopts, as both the simplest and truest. He also explains προβάτων, attendenti eos ex intima parte.

16. Fritz. maintains that ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν ἀείρων ought not to be rendered "by their fruits," but "by their fruits themselves." He would, moreover, understand καρπῶν both of mentis errores and quimi peccata.

17. The ellipsis couched under ὁυρω Fritz. thus explains: "uti falsos doctores detracta persona malos ex ipis eorum facinoribus deprehenditis (v. 16.), ita regula certa fert, ut bona arbor tantum bonos possit fructus edere."

19. πᾶν δὲνδρον, &c. Fritz. thinks that this is not to be (with most Commentators) understood of the punishments of false teachers. For since Jesus, as appears from ver. 20., only meant to confirm and establish the words ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν ἀείρων ἐκγνώσθη ἀείρωσ, he could not mean to interrupt this connexion by the insertion, in so unsuitable a place, of any thing concerning punishments." Something, then, he argues, must be contained suitable to that subject. And he thinks it is this: "quod homines etiam bonus fructus bonam, malos malam arborem ferre certo sibi persuaserint, ut qui malam arborcem, nihil sperantes pristinum ei vigorem restitutum iri, igni absursum.

20. The ἄπαγε Fritz. would explain not, with most Commentators, antient and modern, for πάνω; but he assigns the conclusive force igitur etsi.

21. To the interpretation of Schleusner, &c., by which ὁ τῶς is taken to signify few, Fritz. justly objects. Whenever (he observes) ὁ τῶς and ἔκειν closely cohere, they can only denote those who are not all, whether they be few or many. And he commends the explanation of Elsner, "nemo, nullus clamamium duntaxat, nec facientium patria voluntatem." The ο γῶν, from the force of the present tense, imports what is continual and habitual. See Chrys. and Theophyl.

22. By ἔκειν τῷ θεῷ is meant the day of the kingdom of heaven just mentioned, the day when the Messiah shall enter upon his kingdom, by exercising judgment. Besides, the phrase "that day" is sometimes used absolutely, to denote the day of judgment. See
Matt. 11, 24. and Luke 10, 11. The words τῷ σῷ δόμινῳ are rendered by Olearius, "sub nomine Christianorum a te appellati adeoque ut tui." By Grot., "providendo nos id facere ad testandum potentiam tuam." And by others otherwise. The preference seems to be due to the interpretation of Krebs, Kuin., and Fritz., "by thy order and authority." For, as Fritz. remarks, these meant to predict future events in the name of the Messiah, in order to obtain more authority and influence. As to the προφητία, though, as I have observed, the best Commentators explain it of teaching, and that signification is elsewhere found; yet I agree with Fritz., that the common interpretation, prophecy, is more accommodated to the words following. Though Campbell, with his usual ingenuity, observes that that signification is preferable, since to promote the knowledge of the Gospel is a matter of higher consequence, and would therefore seem more to recommend men than to foretell things future." On the δυνάμεις see the note on 1 Cor. 16, 10.

23. ὤδετορ εὐγνων ἵματι. To the sense approve, Fritz. objects, observing: "Longe enim plus inest hoc: homines istos eurumque studia Jesu plane non innotuisse. Arcentur enim et vilia putantur usque eo, ut etiam memoria animo excidat, que inania et prava sunt." In the ἀποχωρήσει is implied, from the nature of the subject, a kind of excretion, such as Schmid and Elsner recognize. Certain it is, the great Judge will have no occasion to employ those violent expressions to which men resort, to increase the bitterness of condemnation.

24. The οὖν Fritz. refers to ver. 21. where the, &c. And he lays down the following as the ordo sententiarum: Quando demonstratum est, ut quis bona celestis regni indiscipulatur, non effici veno exterior speciei strepitu, sed obsequio divinis decretis præstito, sequitur, ut, qui mihi auscultat, recte possit comparari cum homine edes in firmo rupis fundamento exstruente, qui praecipit mei obsequium deneget, similis sit illi, qui arenæ domum imponat, v. 24—26. He, moreover, conceives that vv. 24—28. are not, upon just grounds, separated by some from the rest, as an apodosis. See his note. The ποιεῖ abvov (i.e. λόγους) is called, by Fritz., a permira locuto for "sententiae meae obsequitur." It is plainly an idiomatic phrase, signifying to do the actions enjoined in the words.

25. ῥεθεμελιώτω. Here the augment is omitted, as often in pluriforms in the New Testament. (See Winer's Gr. p. 37.), and also in the best writers. See Reitz on Lucian, t. 2. p. 70, 485 and 521. Βροχὴ, like the Heb. שֶׁפֶל, denotes that beating rain by which every thing is soaked. Kuinoel remarks that ῥέθμακαταί and ἃλοικια are both used of the rushing course of torrents. See Kz. 47, 9. Is. 59, 19.

26. καὶ, but. So the Heb. יאדו, imprōcident. Ἐκεῖνη τῆν ἁμαρτίαν. This use of the article deserves attention. Luke 6, 49. has ἐκεῖνη τῆν γῆν, χωρὶς θεμελίων. Which last circumstance seems implied here. On the πρώτας μεγάλη Kuin. compares Virg. AEn. 2, 310 & 465. The sum of the similitude, he says, is this: "He who puts in practice my precepts, consults for his own salvation; while, on the other hand, he who neglects them, and practises them not, is wanting to his salvation.
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28. ἔκπλήσσοντο οἱ φίλοι ἐκ τῆς δίδαξαλίας αὐτοῦ. Hanc vero egregiis creberrimam sententiam orationem magnum ad percellendos auditorum animos vim habuisse, eoque legi doctorum preceptionem multum illa superari confessos esse, cuivis credibile videbitur, qui illos jejunis disputationibus districtosuisse e libris rabbinicis intellexerit. (Fritz.)

Kuinoel maintains that καὶ ἐγένετο δὲ corresponds to the Heb. וַיִּהָיָה in Exod. 3, 21., and has the force of δέ. To the former part of his position I assent, but not to the latter. He, moreover, observes that by διδάσχει is here meant both the doctrine itself and the mode of communicating it.

29. Fritz. will not allow that ἦν διδάσκειν is a mere Hebraism for διδάσκαλος, but, with Beza, regards it as a Hebrew periphrasis, familiar also to the Greek language, but which has the force of denoting delay and perseverance in doing anything.

With respect to the phrase ὡς ἐκνοεῖν εἰργῶν, Fritz. thinks it so plain, that it is surprising any doubt could have arisen in the minds of Interpreters. And he adds: "Recte Erasmus et Beza ἦν διδάσκων, ὡς ἐκνοεῖ ἐργῶν τοῦ διδάσκαλου docebat, tanquam cui docendœ data esset copia. Etiam cum dicimus bona artis exercendæ potestatem habere, qui eam scit et periti factit. Priors enim est tempore, ut possis utiliter docere, posterius ut exercæas."

CHAP. VIII.

VER. 1. Κατάδασαν αὐτῷ ἀνέρ τοῦ ἔρους, ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. Est genus dicendi Matthæo frequentatum (exempla vide apud Geradöf, I. 1. p. 531. cum veteribus, v. c. Kypkis adv. v. 23. sentientem), qui etiam non recte priorem dativum absolutum dicit, tamen nec Winerus Gr. p. 151. satis verè pertendit, constructionem in his plane legimine procedere, quod ita esset, nisi constanter αὐτῷ iterum sequeretur. Equidem existimo, quom Pronomen, αὐτῷ subnecteret scriptor, non illud quidem, quod participium procedat, sed quod simul cum eo pronomine, e mente sibi elabrum esse. (Fritz.)

Δεσπός, a leper, a leprous person, one affected with a cutaneous disorder, called in Hebrew יַעַר, of which Celsus, 5, 20. details two sorts. See Bartholin de Morb. p. 39. Rhenferd de lepra ap. Meuschen, and other authorities referred to by Kuin., to which add Mead de Moab. Ribb.

2. προσεύχετε αὐτῷ. The other Evangelists add the mode in which this humble entreaty was made. So Mark 1, 40. γονιμωτῶν αὐτῶν. And Luke 5, 12. πρόσωπον ἐπὶ πρόσωπον.

Κφγε. A compellation, as Grot. says, sometimes addressed to persons unknown. But as it was used by pupils, when addressing their masters, and was doubtless applied to Rabbins, and the leper would regard Jesus at least as such (for the προσεύχετε will not prove any worship properly so called), so it may here be taken. Καθαρίζετε, like the Heb. יְרֵא, to which it answers in the Sept., was used properly of curing leprosy, from the peculiar foulness ascribed to that disorder.

3. ἡψαρο. Kuin. thinks that our Lord touched the leper, to
make the cure evident to all as resulting from that touch. On ἔκτελων τίν χεῖρα, Fritz. observes: "non supervacuanea esse monere tædet pigetique." He adds, that the Evangelist could for καθαρίζων have used ἐκαθαρίζων; yet he adopted the former term, to express the uncleanness of the disorder. He also rightly remarks, that the observation of Kuin., that λέπρα is for λεπτός, is refuted by the addition ἄτρού. It has been questioned whether the άτρού ought to be referred to ἣ λέπρα, or ἐκαθαρίζον. Fritz. thinks it matters not, since the sense is, "lepra expurgando ab eo remotast." But, assuredly there is most connexion with ἣ λέπρα.

4. ὅρα μηδεὶς εἰπη. The opinion of Wets. is objected to by Fritz., who cites Chrys. as applying to it the term σφόδρα ἄνοητος. By the ἰερεῖ, chiefly on the authority of the Vulg. and some MSS. in Mark 1, 44., many Commentators, as Fabric., understand the High Priest. But it appears from Levit. 13, 2., that this function was common to all the Priests. And Kuin. rightly observes, that there is such authority as to compel us to adopt that opinion. We may either, with Elsner, take τῷ ἰερεῖ for any Priest whom he should meet with, or rather any Priest, whether the High Priest or an inferior one, whom he should find discharging that duty. Though we can scarcely suppose that such a duty ever fell to the High Priest.

Εἰς μαρτύριαν αὐτοῦ. Among those who refer the αὐτοῦ to the Priests is Euthymius; among those who refer it to the people, is Theophyl., as cited by Fritz.: Κελεύει δὲ καὶ προσενεχεῖ τὸ δώρον εἰς μαρτύριον τοῖς Ιαυδαῖοις, τούτοις δὲ τῶν μου καθηγορών ὡς τῶν νόμων καταλύοντος ἐπὶ μάρτυρις ὁ γὰρ κελευθεῖς παρ' ἐμοὶ προσκυνεῖται γαγεῖν τὰ παρὰ τοῦ νόμου διαστατήματα. He justly observes, that this seems the preferable interpretation, because the examination was entered into by the Priests for the satisfaction of the people. He, however, would consider the words as a clause proceeding from the Evangelist, and not from our Lord. And Fritz. adduces examples from Cic. de N. T. 1, 7. Σάκχαριν. de falsa leg. c. 12. Thucyd. 1, 87. Xen. Anab. 7, 1, 22. But this is more suitable to the Classical than the Scriptural writers.

5. For τῷ ἦσσον, many MSS. have αὐτῷ. And though it is a somewhat doubtful point which is the preferable reading, yet I agree with Griesb. and Fritz. in fixing on the latter. It is strange that some, as Ravius, should have maintained that the centurion here mentioned was a proselyte. With this notion the words of ver. 12 are quite at variance. There is then, no reason to abandon the opinion of the antients and moderns, that he was a Gentile.

6. ὅ παῖς μου. Fritz. would remove the apparent discrepancy between the ὅ παῖς here, and the δοῦλος of Luke, by supposing that he was really a servant, but is here called ὅ παῖς, as a term of affection, to show how highly his master esteemed him. This, however, is harsh and frigid. It is better to suppose that ὅ παῖς is used in the sense servant; an idiom both Hebrew and Greek, and found in the puer of the Latin (whence our boy), and the garçon of the French and Scotch. See Schlesus. Lex.

Βέβλῃσθαι is rendered by Kuin. decumbit. And he adds, that so the Sept. at Exod. 21, 18. render the Hebr. ברית by βέβλῃσθαι. But the version of Fritz., "lecto affixus est," was confined to his
bed, is more significant, and probably more accurate. Though Fritz. is inclined to prefer, "ita affectus est ut sit παραλυτικός, quippe qui in lectum conjectus sit."

7. Fritz. points, καὶ λέγει—αὐτὸν; and he refers for an illustration of the responsive objective sense of καὶ to Pors. on Eurip. Phoen. 1373. Finally, he takes θεραπεύω for the aorist conjunctive. But this does violence to the words, and yields a rigid sense, which has been resorted to, for the purpose of removing a fancied objection.

8. Fritz. observes, that in order to perceive the right location of the ἐν, we may thus conceive the sentence; "non sum ego idoneus, ut quidquum agas eo consilio, ut in meam te domum conteras." The common reading λόγον, is vainly defended by Wolf and Palairet. Nor can I agree with Kuin., that λόγυς is redundant. It is rightly accounted by Fritz. as a dative of instrument, i.e. mit einem worde (so our at a word); and there is, he says, an ellipsis of ἄλλης ἐν αὐτῷ γέγονε συμπτόματος ἀνασφάλεια.  

9. άνθρωπος εἰμι ἐντὸ εἰνοείαν. It is observed by Fritz. that no example has yet been adduced of this use of the phrase. And he compares Hesych. χαρισσάθαι, παρασχεῖν, λέγοντα γὰρ αἰ γνώσεις χαρισσάθαι αἰ ὑπὸ συνονίαν ἑαυτὰς ἐκδίδουσα. But it may be doubted whether the true reading there be not συνονίας. The same Commentator expresses the sense thus: "vel si verbo voluntatem tuam indices, sanabitur servus obsequentibus tibi facile demonibus, morborum auctoribus: etenim ego quoque illud experior, qui, ipse imperio subjectus, ubi milites meae potestati obnoxios aliquid facere jubeo, statim isti dicto audientes sunt." He then remarks: "Apparet igitur, non καὶ γὰρ seorsim sumendum ut Latinorum etenim, sed καὶ ἐγὼ jungenda esse, ut vulgata: nam et ego, quae interpretatio Bezae sententiam depravare visa censuravit et firmavit, quod neminem fugisset, verborum structura ita composita: καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἀνθρωπὸς ἐξου ὡς ἑαυτὸν σφραγίσεις, εἰ λέγω τοιῷ, παρεξηγητι, παρεῖναι κ. τ. λ." Fritz. inclines to the opinion of Markland on the ἄνθρωπος. But, as I before observed, it seems far-fetched, and, I think, would require the addition of ἐν.

10. τοσαύτην πίστιν, "so great faith (as this man's)."

11. ἀνακληθονταί μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ. These words are to be taken in their literal acceptance, since the Jews made a great part of the felicity to be enjoyed in the Messiah's kingdom, consist in exquisite banquets, to be partaken of by its citizens in conjunction with their renowned ancestors. (See Schoettg. ad h. l. and Bertholdt c. 1. p. 196.) Therefore those who heard these words of Jesus, could not affix to them any other sense. (Fritz.)

12. οἱ νῦν τῆς βασιλείας, i.e. those to whom the right of such belongs, the Jews. For that nation, with its accustomed pride, assigned the felicity of the Messiah's kingdom to itself alone. It may be observed, that the Jews say "son of a thing," when speaking of any one closely connected in any way. (Fritz.) See Fisch Prol. de Vit. Lexx. p. 516., and also Kuin., who compares Luke 10, 6. δ
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"worthy of good and happiness," and Ps. 102, 21. "those destined to death." The use here of the article has somewhat perplexed the Commentators, most of whom make no mention of it, treating it as pleonastic. Some of the most recent ones, who especially attend to the force of the article, ascribe to it a sense, but are not agreed what that is. Bp. Middlet. assigns the following: "there shall they (i.e. the persons just mentioned) weep and gnash their teeth." Without the article (he adds) the proposition would only have been, that some persons should there weep. Fritz. thinks that the article refers to the desert. and that the sense is, that they shall suffer such weeping and gnashing of teeth as they have deserved. But this is surely too arbitrary a sense; and the former explanation is greatly preferable.

13. Kuin. observes, that ἀνα here answers to the Chald. and Syr. ἄν (see Dan. 3, 6 & 15.), which, like the Hebr. פַּה, is often used of a point of time: as στίγμα κρόνου, Luke 4, 5. See Fisch. Prol. p. 102, seqq.

14 seqq. Together with James and John (see Mark 1, 29.) Jesus entered the house of Simon Peter (see at 4, 11.), and there found his wife's mother sick on a bed. (Kuin.) Fritz. has shown that there is no reason to suppose, with Grot., that by the ἄν οἰκίαν Πέτρου is meant the house of Peter's mother-in-law.

15. καὶ θανάτον τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀφθάρτως αὐτῆς ἐκ πυρὸς. It is truly observed, by Fritz., that the Evangelist evidently conceives he is recording a miraculous healing. And I would add, that this is less clear from the words, because of the Hebrew idiom, which deals much in a repetition of the copula. I agree, with Fritz., that the common reading, αὕτως, is preferable to αὐτῆς, which is read by most Critics, as Mill, Bengel, Wets., and Matthæi. He observes that the Evangelist, with good reason, wrote αὕτως, since he never describes Jesus as going unattended, but always as accompanied by a throng of disciples. (See ver. 18.) "Nor is it (continues he) any objection that at ver. 25. he expressly mentions that his disciples went with him in a ship. For he deemed it necessary to notice this, as, in the narration which follows, the disciples bear a principal part (ver. 25. seqq.)."

16. ἐξάλειπται τὰ πνεύματα λόγως. Here there is the common ellipse of μονον and ἐκεί, "at a word only." Kuin. compares Cic. Catel. 2. "ego vehemens ille Consul, qui verbo cives in exiliu ejici." Πάρνας, i.e. all that were brought to him. Fritz. here remarks: "Ita nostrum et si rebus gestis interflusset, et si non interflusset recte scripisses censeo, quia neque singulos αἰγροτια recensere, nec admotam ipsis medelam singulatim persequi, sed quæ e ceteris selecta tradiderat 8, 1. seqq. sic comprehendere constituerat, ut omnibus passim allatis αἰγροτια sanitatem restitutam diceret."

17. δόξαι παραστασις. Fritz. will not allow that this formula is rightly rendered, by Grot. and others, "e eopto ut," &c. And he maintains that the sense intended by the Evangelist is: "to the end that," &c. He observes that St. Matthew translated the passage of Isaiah proprio marite. And he adds that ἐξαλείπται can only signify tuliit, pertulit, not sustulit, or abstulit: nor will it follow, be-
cause we can say βαστάζειν ἀνθρώπον, that we can therefore say βαστάζειν νόσους. Yet I find in Galen, cited by Wets., ψέφας θεραπεύει, καὶ πρώτα, “it heals sores, and removes bruises.” See the excellent explanation of Abp. Magee, cited by Vauly. To advert to the thing itself, it is plain (as Fritz. observes), from many passages adduced by Schoettg. and Wets., that the Jews inferred from the passage in question that the Messiah would benefit men by healing disorders. So Wetstein remarks: “1 Pet. 2, 24. referetur ad remissionem peccatorum: hic vero ad sanationem morborum. Quia ejusdem potentia et bonitatis est, utrumque præstare; et, quia, peccatis remissis et morbi, qui fructus sunt peccatorum, pelluntur. Ps. 103, 3. Barnabas §. 5.”

18. ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πολλούς ὅχλους περὶ αὐτὸν. Here is hinted at the reason why Jesus adopted the measure of crossing to the other side, namely, because he was incommoded by the multitude of applicants for cure.

'Excidius is to be taken rather in the sense of bid or direct, than order. And (though the circumstance is not made very clear) we must suppose the persons directed to be the disciples, not the multitude. Beka explains, “indixit protectionem.” Of this Greek idiom, by which the subject, though it be not in the verb, yet is left unexpressed, an example is adduced, by Fritz., from Είλιαν, V. H. 13, 32. Kuinoel observes that ἀπέρχεθαι, like the Heb. מָתַח, is used of going by sea; as Deut. 30, 13. Joh. 1, 3. Mark 4, 35. The use of the numeral answering to one, for the pronoun indefinite, is found both in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, nay, even in modern languages.

On the diversity of time assigned for this transaction by Luke 9, 57 & 58., it is well observed by Fritz.: “Nollem vehemensius disputatum, utrius sit, Evangelista verosimilior ratio. Quipe neuter habet veritatis, quo alterum superet, prejudiciun, sed videbit, qui nullâ præpeditus opinione leget, utrique, non, ut Christi vocem fama et auditione acciperit, ita tempus et res, qua ille [i.e. legis peritus] incitatus Jesum aduseit, explorata fuisset. Itaque uterque ad ejusmodi tempus rem rejici, quo legis peritus διδάσκαλος, ἀκολούθησον, δν τε γνωστόν ἀπερχύμενος commodo dicere potuisset, Mattheus ad id, quo vellet Jesus mare Galileaeum traiicere, Lucas id illud, quo exclusus e Samaritanorum conciliabulo, quo se converteret, anceps hæret.”

20. Fischer de Vit. Lex. p. 286. (with the approbation of Kuin.) thinks that by the mention of foxes, Jesus meant to hint a charge of craftiness; and by that of birds, one of levity. But it is truly observed, by Fritz., that thus the argument will be lame, and a false sentiment arise. By foxes and birds, he adds, are meant to be expressed the general term animals; which is the truth, but not the whole truth. The argument (which is a fortiori) is this: “The very meanest of the brute creation, the very foxes have their dens, and the birds of the air (which seem least to need any shelter) their nests.” Whether the κατασκηνώσεις shall be rendered nests, or roasts, is a mere question of words.

20. ὁ δὲ νείος τὸν ἀνθρώπον. On this controverted formula Fritz.
has a long note. He has, however, thrown a little additional light on its interpretation. The chief difficulty (he thinks) does not rest with \textit{vivō τοῦ ἀνθρώπου}, but with the \textit{article}. He details, but objects to all the interpretations hitherto proposed; and concludes by asserting that our Lord made use of the term "e co usu, quo suffecto in Pronomini s. Nomine de nobis interdum loquimur, tanquam de altero h. s. filius ille parentum humanorum (nam τοῦ ἀνθρώπου sensu collectivo accipienda), \textit{qui nunc loquitur, homo ille, quem bene nostis i.e. ego.}" He adds, that as Jesus often applied this term to himself, whom they believed to be the Messiah, so they, at length, regarded it as equivalent to that term. Ingenious, however, as this is, it is too precarious, and yields a somewhat frigid sense. I see no reason to abandon the interpretation already adopted, and which has been ably supported by Heinsius, Scholten, Rosenm., Kuin., Schleus., Wahl, and also Bp. Middleton, see whose note on this formula, or the extract in Valpy.

21. \textit{έρεσος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν}. The air of this sentence seems to regard the lawyer as being a disciple. And if so, \textit{oi μαθηταί} must denote, not the \textit{twelve} constant companions of Jesus, but occasional followers. Yet the \textit{antientes}, as being accustomed to interpret the term \textit{μαθήτα} of the \textit{twelve} only, so supposed him to be \textit{one} of them; and an early tradition, preserved by Clem. Alex. p. 592. Pott., fixes it to \textit{Philip}. (Fritz.)

In the manner of this request we may observe something very modest. For under the \textit{πρῶτων} is implied, "and then, in the second place, I will attend on thee." This, however, is omitted verecumde, though, as Fritz. observes, it may very well be supplied \textit{ex coherentia}. And he rightly remarks that our Lord knew when to use the \textit{rein} (as ver. 19 & 20.), and when (as here) the spur. Thus (he adds) \textit{πρῶτον} must neither be cancelled, nor taken for \textit{πρόσερεν}.

In the note on this passage (Part I.) I must now cancel "or very aged," which words proceed on the untenable hypothesis of Clarious, Kyppos, and others, that he requested to go and \textit{take care} of his father till his death.

22. \textit{άφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάφως τοὺς ἔαντῶν νεκροὺς}. Fritz, justly terms the interpretation of some recent Commentators, as Heuman, Moldenhauer, Bolten, &c. (who take the \textit{τοὺς νεκροὺς} to mean the \textit{vespillones, or undertakers}), as mere \textit{agorum somnia}. And he follows that of the antients and most moderns, which I have adopted. I must, however, unite with him in rejecting the notion of some antients, that by \textit{τοὺς νεκροὺς} Jesus meant to point at the unconverted state of the father. This is, on many accounts, very improbable. It is best to take the term in its natural acceptance. I cannot, however, agree with Fritz., that the sense is: "Sine mortuos suas mortuos" (i.e. suas sortis homines) sepelire, i.e. refer hoc officium ad viventes." The \textit{τοὺς ἐαντῶν νεκροὺς} is well explained \textit{τοῖς προϊσκουσαί αὐτοῖς νεκροῖς}. Hence is illustrated Thucyd. 2. 34., where, describing the solemnities at the public funerals of those who first died in the Peloponnesian war, he says: καὶ \textit{επιφέρει τῷ ἐαντῷ} (scil. \textit{νέκρῳ, sub. σώματι}) \textit{ἐκαστός ἕν ὑπὶ βοιθεῖται}. See Campbell.

23. \textit{ἐμβάντι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον}, i.e. the bark which had been procured.
to transport them to the other side; though of this no mention had before been made; and therefore certain librarii chose to cancel the article, which Campbell has well expressed, and Fritz ably defended and illustrated.

24. αὐτὸς δὲ έκάθενε. Palairet renders the δὲ tamen. But this is rightly rejected by Fritz, who well renders it autem. And he says it has a continuative force, thus: "ipsum autem somnus oppresserat, et dormivit Jesus."

25. oϊ μαθηταί αὐτῶ. "By these (explains Fritz.) are denoted the twelve apostles, as being opposed to the oϊ ὁχλοι, ver. 18., who were oϊ μαθηταί in a more extended sense." He also observes that the Evangelist has not made it clear that the twelve accompanied Jesus; though, from ver. 25., it appears that they did. And Mark 4, 36. adds a circumstance which may well be imagined, namely, that many persons followed the bark in other boats.

25. ἄγεραν αὐτῶν. St. Mark and St. Luke use διεγερθεντι where δὲ is intensive. Kuinoel supplies the ellipsis by εξ ἔρνου, citing Hom. II. c. 422. ἐξ ἔρνου—οἰκήσες εὐελπ. With less reason he supposes an ellipsis of δὲ before ἀπολάμβανα. Fritz more judiciously, remarks on the asyndeton so appropriate to extreme fear. But his judgment fails him when, on the strength of this principle, he cancels ἧπας. As that is only omitted in one MSS., it is more reasonable to suppose the omission unintentional, than to introduce such a harsh ellipsis, which would be more allowable in poetry than in prose.

26. ἐστιν ὦ αἰίματος. Fritz. takes exception to the sense compucescit, coeruit; but not, I think, on good grounds. The truth is, such discussions become mere questions of words. Oϊ αὐθρωποι, i.e. (as Fritz. explains the force of the article) the men who had been witness to this miracle. The ποταμός—ἐκατοβουσιν αὐτῷ he renders: "quantus hic vic est! nam (ut ex hoc exemplo appareat) vel venti et undae maris morem ei gerunt."

28—34. Fritz. remarks that this narration of the extraordinary miracle worked by Jesus was introduced, both from its being most remarkable, and as proving the cause of our Lord’s return home. On the var. lect. in ἐργασίαν Fritz. has a long annotation, in which he finally determines the true reading to be Γαρδαρήσι. On the δαμονεύσμενοι he remarks: "Sunt, docente cohærentiā, furibus quorum furor a malis genitis, Satanæ satellitibus repetenslatur." Finally, he objects to Kuinoel’s version of ἐστιν audere. He explains it, "no one could pass by without being attacked by them." And in like manner he would understand 2 Sam. 17, 17. and Gen. 24, 50. (cited by Kuin.) But this is somewhat harsh; and surely if ἐστιν, &c. be taken as a popular and (as is usual with such) somewhat hyperbolical phrase, there is nothing to stumble at.

29. The interrogation here involves a strong negation. The demons address Jesus as Messiah, and naturally dread the suppression of their power from Him who was revealed, to bruise the serpent, and destroy the power of sin and Satan. By the πρὸ καιροῦ is evidently meant the time when the Messiah should hold judgment, and before which period they thought it hard to be restrained. See
Grot. Nothing can be more frigid and far-fetched than the turn which Wetstein gives to the words, whose note I merely inserted in accordance with my plan of giving all the notes of that Commentator.

The query, how could these demoniacs know Jesus? in reality involves no difficulty on the common opinion. For it were absurd to suppose that demons should not know Jesus.

30. ἤν δὲ μακρὰν αὐτῶν ἀγέλῃ. Fritz. objects to the reading ὅν μακρὰν, as being at variance with Mark 5, 11. and Luke 8, 32., and still more to the sense prope, assigned by some Commentators, who compare πρῶτη and προσελ. He observes that neither in this nor in the other passages would the Commentators have resorted to such an interpretation, if they had considered that the notion is relative; so that what one will call near, another will esteem somewhat remote; and we call things far off and near, according as we compare objects nearer.* The βοσκόμενη, he directs to be kept apart from ἤν, and to be rendered "quae pascebatur."

It is not clear whether these swine belonged to Jews or Gentiles. The latter has been thought most probable, because the Jews, it is said, were not allowed to keep swine. In my note I have said that it was not forbidden to the Jews to keep them, i.e. to feed and take care of them. But this seems at variance with what Lightfoot says on Mark 5, 1., who tells us that this was forbidden by the Talmudical canons. Yet the practice of Jews in that age cannot be proved by canons drawn up several centuries after; not to say that such canons would never have any general force. The difficulty, however, may be avoided, by supposing that such canons only forbade the fattening of swine, by keeping them up in sties. For this necessarily supposes such attendance on them as could not but defile the feeders. But it is probable that they were not forbidden to keep them at grazing, in woods or pastures, in large herds like the present (which consisted, as we learn from Mark, of two thousand), since that would not involve any defilement. We may imagine that the swine so kept were sold to the Gentiles in the condition of our store pigs (such as are brought from Ireland), i.e. half fat. It is probable, then, that the herd belonged to Jews; and thus the destruction was either intended to be a punishment, or rather was meant to evince the mighty power of the Lord Jesus, and thereby strike the minds of the Jews.

32. ἔξελθοντες, &c. Nothing, surely, can be more harsh than the interpretation here proposed by Wets.; nothing more at variance with the plain sense of the Evangelist than to suppose, with many recent Commentators, that the maniacs (for so they account them) rushed on the herd of swine, and not the demons. Ἐξελθόντες must signify, "after having departed from the men." That ἀπ'
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θεν εἰς must mean depart and go into (by a common idiom of verba praegnantia), is certain. For that, and no other, must be the sense of ἀπελθαῖν εἰς just before; since it is opposed to the being driven out from their present abode.

On the catastrophe, καὶ ἀπελθανον ἐν τοῖς ὦς ἑδανυ, Fritz. well remarks: "Ut hominibus noceuerant pravi genii, ita porcos quoque perniciem affuerunt. "Hi enim occupatis ab illis corporibus de praecipitio in mare ruunt, ibique suffocantur."

On the conduct of Jesus on this occasion many questions have been agitated, which cannot here be discussed. The right of Jesus to cause this loss to the keepers, cannot reasonably be disputed; since, as Lord of earth as well as heaven, he might do what he would with his own. But indeed it admits of justification on human principles likewise, to which it is not necessary here to advert. Besides, as Euthym. well observes, such a catastrophe was requisite to show that the demons had really been ejected from the men. And, moreover, it is justly observed by Fritz.: Re e scriptoris sitate estimata nihil video, quod jure posit reprehendi. Insunt duobus hominibus in Gardarenarum regione impuri genii, v. 28; hi advenient Messiam, a quo se sciant aliquando in Orcum detrudendos esse, facile cognoscunt, et quoniam metuunt, ne nunc jam eo abiegetur, id sibi expetunt beneficii, ut ipsi liceat in porcis, qui ibi forte pascuntur, sedem collocare, v. 29—32. (Nam primum quidem aine domicilio esse nequeunt, deinde impura porcorum corpora impura naturis percommodam sedem prabere videntur, c. f. Eisenmenger. in 1.: Neu entdecktes Judenthum, v. 2. p. 447 sq.) Satisfacit Jesus pro sua magnâ vi eorum voluntati. Itaque porcorum corpora occupant, quos noli mirari misere periiisse [v. 32.] Nam sic illos revera intrasse porcos certissimum constatbat, quandoquidem perversi genii, quemcumque occupasse, non possent perniciem non afferrer.

Here I cannot but advert to the device of Wets. and others, who would dispose of the question as to the right of Jesus to cause the loss, by denying that there was any material loss. For (says he) the owners could butcher the swine, and salt the pork, and convert it into bacon: nor would the animals having been drowned be an any objection in the opinion of the Gentiles, who did not scruple to eat the flesh of suffocated animals." But this all proceeds on false grounds, and is founded in utter ignorance. It may be questioned whether the flesh of even fat drowned swine would admit of being pickled and dried. Whereas it is pretty certain that these swine (from the great number seemingly feeding at grass) were lean. And few need be told that the flesh of lean drowned animals is worth scarcely any thing.

As to the attempts made by recent interpreters to render the circumstance probable, by sacrificing the miraculous agency, "Sunt (says Fritz.) ejusmodi non homines, qui Matthæum interpretentur, sed histriones, qui suam quandam fabulam doceant, audire tibi videare. "Sunt illa non modo refutatione, sed ne mentione quidem digna."
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VER. 1. ἔμβας εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, i. e. either the bark in which he had before passed over (see 8, 2. and so, I find, Fritz. understood it), or the boat provided for ferrying persons over.

2. παραλυτικόν. Fritz. observes: "Talmudice הושע fuit illæ probabiliter distortis articulari morbo pedibus."

Πίστιν αὐτῶν, i. e. τῶν προσφερόντων, of those who had carried him thither. Πίστιν must, of course, signify faith in the power of Jesus to work the cure. And that this was great, appears from the trouble which (as we find from Mark 2, 4. and Luke 5, 19.) they took in bringing him to Jesus. And thus our Lord most humanely had such respect to the care of these provident friends, as, for their sake, to succour the poor cripple. (Fritz.)

The ἀφέωνται is said to be the Doric form of the Preterite. And he refers to Fisch. de Vit. Lexx. p. 216., Buttm. Gr. Gr. p. 424., and Winer's Gr. p. 42. He assigns to the words ἀφέωνται σοι αὐτῶν the sense, "proseram per me valetudinem recuperabis." And he remarks: "Nam remissis delectis, unde fluxisse crederet morbum, quin sanitas corporis reedita esset, non poterat dubitare sseptus."

3. εἰσαξεν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. This exactly corresponds to our idiom, "said within themselves, i.e. thought. Nay, as we find from Luke 5, 21. some even gave vent to their thoughts in low murmurings.

4. Ἰδὼν τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις. This knowledge of the thoughts was always regarded as an attribute of the Messiah. So that when Barchochaba, the false Christ, could not give this proof of his Messiaship, he was slain. (Wets. and Fritz.) Thus St. Matthew indirecly points at the Messiahship of Jesus.

At ταῦτα Fritz. subaudas γένηται, "ne quid fiat." See Herm. on Vtg. p. 849.

5. ἔγεας. Fritz. regards the ἔγεας which Greisb. has admitted into the text here and elsewhere, as a mere corruption; αὐτὸς and αὐτὸς being frequently confounded.

6. Jesus, now arguing from what was then universally admitted, says that he will plainly evince his power of forgiving sins, by healing the paralytic.

Τὸ ἔργον τῷ παραλυτικῷ. Fritz., in common with many other critics, regards these words as parenthetical. Or for τὸ ἔργον he would read τὸ ἔργον, which few, I believe, will approve. And even the parenthesis seems to do violence to the construction. In ἦπαι δὲ εἰδὴν (of which elliptical use examples are adduced by Kypke and Fritz.) an ellipsis of τοῦ ἐργου, or ἔργω. Euthymius, indeed, recognises the ellipsis; but he supplies ἔθεσαν ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον; which is too arbitrary a subaudition: though, as Fritz. says, it enables us to account the better for τὸ ἔργον.

8. ἔθαυμασαν, "they were amazed at witnessing so plain a miracle as that a miserable cripple carried thither by his friends, should be so restored as to be able to walk home." Kuin, would
read, and Fritz. edits ἐφοβήθησαν, “were struck with awe.” But this, though a stronger and more elegant term, is of too weak authority to be admitted. And the MSS. being chiefly such as are full of glosses, it seems to be an emendation. Which is far more probable than that ἐθαύμασαν should be, as Kuin. thinks, a gloss on ἐφοβ. The τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, is a popular enallage for τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, men, human nature. See Grot.

9. καὶ παράγει ν Τ' ἡμῶν ἔκειθεν, “And as Jesus was departing from thence.” A sense required by the context. So the Hebr. רַע is expressed by עֲּרֵךְסְבֵּא, in Josh. 10, 29 & 31. See note on Job. 9, 1. Τελῶνων, αὐτῶν ἡ, the office of the receivers of customs. Called by Euridy. τὸ των κομμεναρίων παραλύον. The article τὸ points to this office as a place well known to his readers. Ἀκολούθει μοι. Fritz. well renders: “me sequere magistrum.” Compare 4, 19. And he thinks it is reasonable to suppose that Matthew already knew Jesus; as his teaching had excited so much wonder, and consequently drawn such attention to his person. Thus the reproach cast by Julian and Porphyry on Matthew, as needlessly following he knew not whom, will fall to the ground.

10. Fritz. takes the καὶ, in καὶ ὅδε, to have the sense of nempe; referring to 1 Sam. 28, 1. 2 Sam. 13, 1. But it rather seems to be a pleonasm of καὶ, more Hebræo. Or the καὶ ὅδε may be taken parenthetically, “now mind,” as very suitable to what follows; for strange it would seem that Jesus and his disciples should sit at meat with publicans and sinners of the Heathen.

On the use of ἀνακείσθαι for the more proper and usual κατακείσθαι, Fritz. refers to Lobeck on Phryn. p. 307. So (he adds) in Bekker’s Anecd. 1. p. 26. we have the gloss ἀνακείσθαι, κατακείσθαι.

On the ἐν τῷ ὁικείᾳ Fritz. differs from all Commentators, by taking it of the house of Jesus, not that of Matthew. But this is, on all accounts, very improbable. Campb. renders “a house.” But this the article will not permit. Ἐν τῷ ὁικείᾳ, considering what preceded, may (notwithstanding what Fritz. says) be taken of Matthew’s house. And this is supported by the words of ver. 11. ἐσθίεις μετὰ. The accounts, too, of the other Evangelists require it. An argument which indeed Fritz. would evade, but very unsatisfactorily. The τελῶναι καὶ ἀμαρτώλοι, he rightly renders, “puritores et quidem flagitiis homines.”


13. The connexion is thus traced by Kuinoel: You Pharaseesi
severely censure me for associating with persons whom you call inquisitive, such as the tax-gatherers. I therefore remind you of the word of God, as found in the Prophet: external worship of me, with the omission and neglect towards others, is nothing worth, and I take no pleasure therein."

$\pi\omega\nu\theta\epsilon\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\varsigma$ δέ, ἀκ. These words (Fritz. thinks) are addressed by Jesus, turning to the Pharisees. He also rightly maintains that $\pi\omega\nu\theta\epsilon\tau\varsigma$ is not redundant, but either signifies "go and apply yourselves to learn (so the Rabbinical formula cited by Schoettg. τρωλ ἔργ), or rather, "get you gone (trouble me no more) and learn." I must, however, prefer the former.

Fritz. takes exception to the sense of .osgi—όλλα, non tam quam—quam (of which, however, he cites examples from Soph. Οἰδ. Col. 60. and Eurip. 285.), and urges that it appears from the words following, ὁ γὰρ ἢλθον—ἀμαρτάλων, that the formula is to be taken in sensu proprio. I can more readily agree with him, that .Seekov is to be taken (as also ὑπηρεσία in Hosea,) for the whole range of virtue, one of its principal parts (and that in which the Pharisees were especially deficient) being put for the whole. On which figure see Glass. Phil. Sacr. The words ὁ γὰρ ἢλθον—μετανοιαν, he renders, "nam ego veni, ut ad Hosten mentem non bonos quidem, sed malos homines invitarem."

14. τότε, then, i. e. after he had stopped the mouths of the calumnious Pharisees.

Here there is some slight apparent discrepancy between the Evangelists. What St. Matthew here ascribes to John's disciples, is by St. Luke 5. 33. referred to the Pharisees, and by St. Mark 2. 19. to John's disciples and the Pharisees. It was, however, as likely to come from one as from the other, and from both as from either. We have only to suppose St. Mark's account the fullest; and then neither of the others will be at variance with it.

The διαιρι must be rendered not so much why, as how is it? See supra, 7, 3.

15. μὴ διαναφαί, &c. These words are, as Fritz. observes, conjunctive, and involve, like many interrogative sentences, a strong negation. Kuin. supposes here a pleonasm of διαναφαί; referring to Canter. Nov. Lect. 2. 2. Heins. Exeget. S. p. 202, 219. seqq. But I agree with Fritz. that there is, properly speaking, no pleonasm at all, any more than in Gen. 43, 39. (cited by Kuin.), but only an ellipsis of a short clause, i. e. "consistently with the nature of a feast," and in Gen., "consistently with their customs and opinions." The πενθεῖν of Matthew and the πνευτεῖν of Mark very well agree, and denote gloom, austerity, &c.

The ἀποθέε is expressed by Kuin discesserit. And he refers to a similar use of the Hebr. מ in 1 Kings 20, 9. and מ in Gen. 12, 9. But, in fact, it is a stronger term.

On the structure of the sentence Fritz. perplexes himself and his readers to little purpose; and, as it seems, is more anxious to refute Kuin. than satisfactorily to establish any better method of treating the sentence. The ἔλειψοντα is best rendered, "then they will, or may, fast."
Appendix to

16. 17. επιβάλλει ἐπιβλέπω, i.e. literally, "clappeth a patch." Fritz. here observes: "Hec utrāque e vita domesticā deprompta sententia nihil, nisi hoc, indicare Jesus volēbat, sultē discipulos nunc jejunia sibi indirectus esse, ac perperam interpretes singula verba, velut ἄκος ἀγναυὸν animos humanos nondum traditionibus infectos (Erasmus) et ἀσκοῦσι παλαιοῦ (v. 17.) dici discipulos opiniati (Euthymius) ad rem, quæ ageretur, transtulerunt, quum totarum esset sententiarum unice habenda ratio."

Τὸ πλήρωμα αὕτοῦ, scil. τοῦ ἵµατος τοῦ παλαιοῦ, quod supplet detriment vestem. On this confusion of the present and the future Fritz. refers to his note on 2, 4. It may suffice to say, that as the present often denotes what is customary, so sometimes does the future. Fritz., with most Critics, read ἀμφότερος. Which is the true reading is not easy to determine. For MSS., in so minute a difference, are of little authority. Nay, the very same confusion exists in this very word in Thucyd. I, 13, καὶ ἐμφόριον παρέχωτες ἁμφότερα, where the old Editions and some MSS. and Critics read ἀμφότεροι; but ἁμφότερα is the true reading, and is for καὶ ἁμφότερα, which is found in Herod. 7, 10. Here, on the contrary, if ἁμφότερα be, as Kuin. says, the lectio exquisitor, it has the less chance of being the true one.

18. ἀρχων, i.e. as Luke adds, τῆς συναγωγῆς. To the sense assigned by Olear., Wets., and most Critics, "is in the agonies of death," Fritz. takes exception. He objects to the aorist being taken for the present; and makes other animadversions which evince rather captiousness than acuteness. The interpretation in question was doubtless resorted to, in order to reconcile a discrepancy between the Evangelists. But Fritz. seems to think it not worth removing, and admits that Matthew does here vary from Mark and Luke. Chrys., however, is of opinion, that the fact was as Mark and Luke relate, namely, that the maid was struggling with death, and that the father represented her as dead, since he thought most probably she was so by this time, or from an exaggeration natural in such circumstances. The former method is adopted by Grot., Pric. Camph., and Rosenm. And both might be admitted (so Fritz.), if the principle were not too precarious; nay, it may be doubted whether the word be susceptible of the sense assigned by Camph., "by this time." To say, "is even now dying," is somewhat incongruous.

Καὶ ἔχεσα. If the interpretation of Wets., &c. be adopted, this must signify, as Fritz. observes, "she shall continue alive." But he denies that the word any where else has this signification. Though he adduces as examples Acts 22, 92, and compares the Hebr. יָרִ in Num. 4, 19, 14, 38. But the sense is "to receive health;" which must be what Jairus meant; for he would scarcely think it worth while to ask that his daughter might simply live; since "Non vivere sed valere vita."

20. γυνὴ αἰμορροῦσα. Some think this was a bleeding ex ani venis. And others otherwise. But from the verb αἰμορρούσα being used of any flux of blood, nothing certain can be pronounced. Fritz. thinks it was a sort of intermittent flux; and it cannot, he adds, be proved
that it was then upon her. But surely there is every probability that it was, both from the manner of her approach to Jesus, and because, had that not been the case, so great an invalid would scarcely have ventured on such a crowd, as, we find by Mark and Luke, encircled our Lord. Besides, thus the ἐσώθη must be rendered, "the disorder no more attacked her." Which is very frigid.

With the expectation of the women, that the very touch of Jesus's garment would heal her, Fritz compares that of the Jews, who placed themselves within the shadow of Peter passing by. He might have more aptly cited Acts 19, 22, where we are told, that from the body of Paul were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons; and the diseases departed from them. So also Luke, 6, 19. The people, as Kuin. observes, supposed that a sanative power resided in his cloths or touch; though, as the same Commentator also remarks, the Sacred writers say nothing to countenance such a notion. Yet (I would add) a cure was permitted in such cases, as a reward for the steadfast faith which it indicated. It is not, however, necessary, nor perhaps reverent, too minutely to scrutinize the sense of ἓν γὰρ ἐγνών δύναμιν ἐξελθόντων ἀκέμοι. See the note there.

22. In the words ἅ πιστεὶ σου σέωσέ σε there is the use of the preterite for the paulo post future, to show the certainty of the thing.

23. τοῖς αἰληθέσι. Here Kuin. cites Ovid Fast. 6, 560. cantatam maestie tibi funeribus. See Jerem. 9, 17. And consult Grot., Elsn., and Wets. So general was this among the Jews, that (as Lightsfoot tells us) the Rabbin directed, that even at the funeral of a pauper there should be two pipers, and one hired mourner.

The ἰδὼν τοῖς αἰληθέσι, καὶ τὸν ἡχλον ἀρνοῦσαν. Fritz readers: "quum vidisset ister se strepere tibicines et turbam, i. e. the crowd of mourners and friends thronging to the funeral. And this is nearly the common interpretation, which I now see no reason to desert. Certainly the parallel passages do not require this.

24. ἀναγωρεῖτε o ν γὰρ ἄτεθαι εἰς κοράσιον, ἄλλα καθεύδει. Fritz lays down the following as the sense: "Discedite. Nam lugubri strepitu, quem facitis, non opus est. Nimirum puELLam ne pro mortuā habetote, quae esserenda sit, set domire existimatote, quippe in vitam mox rediturn. Ἐξεβλήθη, i. e. had been removed, viz. by the ἀναγωρεῖτε. Examples are adduced by Kuin. from Mark 1, 43. and Acts 16, 37. And he adds, that the term answers to the Hebr. מֵאַה in Exs. 10, 3. and Exod. 12, 123.

25. The αὐτή belongs to κοράσιον, by a synesis generis, than which nothing is more frequent. (Kuin.)

26. ἐξελθέντες ἐφήμην. Some MSS. have ἤ ἐφήμην αὐτῶν. But the common reading is correct; and is explained by Fritz., "the story which I have been relating." He compares Plut. 2, 369 B. Παμπαλαιος αὐτή κάτειν ἐκ θεολογῶν καὶ νομοθετῶν δόξα τὴν ἀρχήν ἀδέσποτον ἄγνωστον ἵνα τὰ πλατύν οὐχράν κ. τ. ἐ.

27. ἔλεγουν ἡμᾶς. An indirect way of entreating him to restore their sight.

Here ὡς Δαβίδ is doubtless the true reading. Some add the article. But that can have no place in the vocative, nor when the nominative is used as a vocative. In the nominative the article is
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indispensable; for the sense is not (as Camph. says), "Son of David," but "the Son of David," which, by common use, was understood to denote that Son of David who, ευθύχως, was called such, namely, the Messiah.

28. εἰς τῷ οἶκῳ. This must mean the house in which Jesus was accustomed to lodge at Capernaum. Τὸῦ τοίχου. Euthymius here supplies διεισθε. Fritz., τῷ οἶκῳ ὑμᾶς. Which is grammatically right, but in reality wrong. Harsher ellipses than the one supposed by Euthymius are found in the New Testament, and are in perpetual use in the popular style of all languages.

31. ἔλεος, having gone forth, i. e. from the house where Jesus abode, or, as Paulus and Kuin. think, from the city. Διαφάνειαν κατέβα. This verb is usually found with an accusative of thing (as λόγον, Mark 1, 45.), very rarely with an accusative of person, as here. The phrase is equivalent to the φανερόν τοίχωμα τινα, Mark 3, 12. signifying "made his fame known."

32. αὐτῶν ἐπιρχομένων, "when they were gone." I would here point, with Vater and Fritz., κυρίον, δειμνοτέρατον. For, as Fritz. observes, the latter word is explanatory of the former, q. d. "who was such by demoniacal influence." And this Rosenm. and Kuin. admit is the sense intended by St. Matthew and St. Luke. Yet, with a strange perversity, they choose to ascribe the dumdness to disorder. Only, they say, the Evangelist thought proper to retain the common expression. But this is very inconsistent, unless they admit that St. Matthew and St. Luke countenanced what they knew to be mere superstition, in order to exaggerate the glory of Jesus; which is neither reconcilable with their general conduct, nor with that firm belief of demoniacal influence which appears everywhere in their writings; and yet be it remembered, that Luke, as a physician, could well distinguish a demoniacal possession from a malady. Besides, I cannot admit that the truth and dignity of the miracle will remain the same. It would not be the same miracle; and the dignity would be far less. Mead, indeed, in his Med. Sac. Pref. p. 7, after indulging in taunting and even insulting language, remarks: "Sepe quidem mirari solem, cur fidei nostrae antistes demonas in scenam producere tantopere contendant, quo scilicet divinum Christi numen de victis hisce infernus hostibus triumphos agat." And then he asks (in fancied triumph), "An divinam Christi virtutem gravissimorum morborum sanationes, jussu illius momento temporis peractae, minus patefaciunt; quam malorum geniorum ex hominum corporibus expulsiones?" But this admits of a ready answer. It was for Dr. Mead to show that the sudden healing of diseases was a not less remarkable proof of divine power than the expulsion of demons. That he could not prove; and few will hesitate to admit, that, à prima facie, the latter must claim the preference. But indeed this was an error into which it was very natural for a physician, and, as may be supposed (and as his writings show), no Theologian, to fall. Inexcusable, however, were it in such scholars as Rosenm. and Kuin., or indeed any well exercised student in Divinity, to suppose such a thing. We may be assured, that in proportion as the mind exceeds in dignity the body, and the soul the life,
so must the suppression of evil from supernatural agents exceed that of evil produced in the regular course of nature. And finally, the exclamation of the people (which the Evangelist cites with manifest approbation,) necessarily supposes the cure of demoniacal possession, not that of disease; for the latter had been very frequently seen in Israel, and evinced by the Prophets; nay, even so far as to raise the dead.

Much more might be urged, which my limits forbid me here to introduce; but I shall, Deo volente, find some opportunity of treating the subject at the length which its importance demands.

With respect to the ἐφάνη οὖσα, it is strange that Fritz. should suppose that τις (to be referred to Jesus) is to be supplied. The ellipsis is indeed a common one, but rather in the Classical than the Scriptural writers; and it can no where be admitted but in passages of a certain cast, of which this is not one. The phraseology here is evidently idiotical. Notwithstanding what Fritz says, the οὖσα must be taken for τοῦτο, or rather τοῦτο τι. So Euthym. well explains: οὐδὲν τι ἐφάνη οὖσα ἀντὶ τοῦ, οὐδὲ ἐφάνη τουταῦτα παράδοσι. There is perhaps a reference not only to the expulsion of the demons, but the extraordinary miracle worked on the woman afflicted with the issue of blood. And the above mode of taking the οὖσα is supported by all the most eminent of the recent Commentators.

36. Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς διαλάλους. It is well observed by Fritz., that no one can stumble at this abrupt mention of τῶν διαλαλούντων, who remembers that Jesus was usually surrounded with crowds of persons, either applicants for cure, or bystanders. See 4, 25. The same Commentator also truly remarks, that ver. 36 is chiefly connected with ch. 10, v. 1.; for by placing what is there with what is here recorded, the Evangelist meant to show, that the want of proper teachers, of which he had complained, Jesus supplied by sending out the twelve disciples to teach." Thus the apparent diversity of Matthew and Luke is removed; and both accounts are consistent with each other; only that of Luke is the fuller. The reason why this has been little seen is, not only the division of chapters being introduced at so improper a place, but the τότε at ver. 37, which is Hebraic. The whole may be paraphrased thus: "Jesus, on seeing the great number and spiritual necessities of the multitudes which continually thronged around him, felt compassion for their destitute condition; and, after warmly expressing to his disciples his concern at the abundance of the spiritual work to be done, and the paucity of the labourers, and bidding them pray to the Lord of the harvest that he would send forth labourers unto his harvest, proceeds himself to remedy the evil by sending forth the twelve Apostles, and also seventy disciples (then probably first selected), for the purpose of extensive evangelization.
Verse 1. Προσεκλεισμένος τούς δώδεκα. Fritz. truly observes, the opinion of many antients and moderns, that Christ here is said to chuse the twelve Apostles, is erroneous. He is merely said to have called them to him; which supposes them to have been already chosen and appointed. Thus (he adds) the parallel passages are not Mark 3, 14. Luke 6, 13. but Mark 6, 7. and Luke 9, 1.

It is strange that Fritz should have edited ἔστε ἑκάσται—μαλακίας, since the καρα is so manifestly, as Griesb. said, a gloss; and perhaps the reasons to the contrary are any thing but conclusive.

The words ἔστε ἑκάσται—μαλακίας are exegetical of the preceding. Fritz. well renders thus: “He gave to them power over impure demons, so as to cast them out, and thus heal all manner of disease and illness.” It has been (he adds) the common opinion of the Rabbins, (see Eisenmenger’s Judaimus detectus, P. II. p. 763.) that the Messiah shall have power over evil demons.

5. εἰς ὅδε τῶν ἔθνων μὴ ἀπελθῆτε, νωλιτέ διεσχέρειν την ἐκκλησίαν, quæ ad gentes barbaras ferat, i.e. ut ex opposita, v. 6. sententia emergit: ne vos conferte ad externas nationes. ’Εθνῶν est genitivus motus (cf. ad 1, 11.) Sic. Genes. 21. ἡ γῆ τῆς γῆς ἀπελευθερωθεὶς, quæ ad arbores sitæ ducit. (Fritz.) See the note on Hebr. 9, 8. Fritz., with reason, rejects the opinion of Erasmus and Kuinoel, that by πόλιν is meant the city of Samaria; since that sense would require the article; and the context shows that it must mean any city or town of the Samaritan territory. Now this prohibition arose out of the former; for the Samaritans were usually accounted as Heathens. On this subject the reader may, with advantage, consult a learned Dissertation of Gesenius de Samaritanis.

6. πορεύεσθε γίνομεν πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀναλαλάτα σαυρῶν Ἡσαρί. This is a resumption of the metaphor at 9; 36. The image is one of being utterly lost to happiness; aptly expressing the state of the vicious, who are, to use the words of Cowper, “lost in errors their vain heart prefers.” By the comprehensive term πρόβατα, &c. is hinted the miserable state of, in a manner, the whole nation. “To the Jews alone (remarks Fritz.) Jesus sends the disciples to preach the commencement of the Messiah’s kingdom (ver. 7.) because to those only belonged the right of dominion. Compare 8, 19. To the Gentiles, who neither expected the Messiah, nor his kingdom, it were of little use to send messengers of a thing so undesired. I would add, that the message and the preaching of the Gospel to the Heathen was most wisely deferred, until, by the report and tidings which reached them of the extraordinary events in Judea, their curiosity should be roused, the advent of a Messiah be made known, and, by information of the blessings to be thereby expected, they should learn to take a lively interest in the thing, and thus be prepared for effectual and extensive evangelization. A lesson this which ought not to be lost on those of every age, who desire to promulgate the Gospel among the Heathen.

8. νεκροίς ἐγείρετε. Towards the end of my note read, “But
no reason, it may be said, can be given, &c. Reasons are assigned," &c. I must here add, that Fritz, (who retains the words, but places them after ἕκαστος ἔκεισεν) observes, more reasons may be imagined for their omission than for their insertion. And he subjoins: "Poterant ab iis omittis, qui aut Jesum mortuos in vitam revocandi tempore discipulis potestatem facisse mirarentur, quo ipse semel Mattheo auctore tale miraculum patravisset, aut nostrum 1. ad 1. Marc. 6, 13. et Luc. 9, 6. castigarent, ubi missi discipuli nihil, nisi docuissent et agrotos sanasse, dicuntur. Quod suspiciari possis, esse 5. ἕκαστος ἔκεισεν ab iis Mattheo obtrusa, qui Jesum voluissent disertis voce Apostolis eam facultatem dedisse, quam Petrum eximia aliquid ro comprobase nossent (Act 9, 40.) et longinquum accessitum vidit."  

8. ἰδρύειτο ἔλαβερε, ἰδρύειτο δότε. It has been disputed whether these words are to be understood of healing disorders, or communicating doctrine. Authorities are not wanting to establish the latter signification. Thus are cited the following passages: Rom. 1, 3. compared with 4, 10. Job 22, 22. 1 Cor. 11, 33. 2 Thess. 2, 15. Prov. 9, 9. 1 Cor. 11, 23. But I agree with Fritz, that the context here limits the sense to the power of healing disorders; and accede to the opinion of Kuin., that the direction was given, lest they should abuse their power for the purposes of lucre and the acquisition of wealth. There may, however, be no objection to include (with some Commentators) the other signification.  

10. οἰς ἄδων must be closely connected with μὴ καθορισθε, so as to pertain to all the things which are then singly enumerated; in this sense: "Provide for your journey neither gold nor silver, nor," &c. (Fritz.) And so also Kuin.  

By the χρυσὸν, ἄργυρον, χαλκὸν, is meant money of every kind. As to the θραπεῖα, I am surprised that no Commentator should have seen that (by an idiomatic use found even in modern languages) it signifies not a bag or wallet only, but also the provisions included in it. The complete phrase occurs in Judith 13, 10. ἔκθειον αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὴν θραπεῖα τῶν θραμμάτων αὐτῆς, "thrust it into her provision-bag." A passage, however, of a different nature to the present. The sense, then, is, that they are forbidden to make a provision of even food for their journey. Thus at Mark 6, 9. after μὴ θραπεῖα is added (by way of explanation) μὴ ἄργυρον.  

It is equally strange, that scarcely any Commentator should have seen that our Lord by μηδὲ δῶν χαρᾶν did not mean (as most suppose) to forbid the wearing two coats, but taking a second χρῶν for a change; and that upon the same principle as he forbade their taking a wallet of provisions. Of the few who have seen the true sense is Fritz., who remarks, that the Grecian or Roman customs respecting dress, as detailed by Wets. and others, are little to the purpose; since the sole purport of the order was, to forbid the taking a change of dress. Upon the same principle, Fritz. takes ἅπαξ ἱπόδημα to mean a change of shoes. But to interpret the word "two pairs of shoes," is exceedingly harsh; and I therefore see no reason to abandon the interpretation before adopted; especially as it is required by the words of Mark 6, 9. ἀλλ' ἐποδειπύρης ἐκανόνα-
λια, of which elliptical passage the sense is, “and take no shoes, but be shod with sandals.” "Ὑποδήματα only means "a pair of shoes." And we have the same idiom in our own language.

Moreover, the mode pursued by Fritz. would require ἁρσὸν to be taken for ἁρσὸν, i. e. a change of staves. And this is indeed found in some MSS., but, I think, came from the margin, and is too frigid to be thought of. Besides that, it would be utterly at variance with St. Mark's words. Thus it seems plain that, according to St. Matthew's account, they are forbidden to take a walking staff, on the same principle as they are forbidden to take walking shoes. It is true that St. Mark says, ἵνα μὴ ἁρσῆν αἷμαν εἰς ὀδὸν, εἰ μὴ ἁρσὸν ὑμὸν. But we may, without much hesitation, leave to the mercy of infidel assailants this petty discrepancy; though it is not wholly incapable of an explanation which would reconcile it with St. Matthew's account. See Heins. and Koecher.

11. ἀλλος ἐστι. Fritz. here adopts the interpretation of Elsner, observing that in elliptical passages of this kind the word to be supplied must be one which squares with the subject treated of; in which case it may very well be left understood. He refers for examples to Apoc. 3, 4. Soph. (Ed. v. 933). Salust, c. 36. quod non dignos homines honore honestatis videbam.

Μὴ ἔχει, i. e. in the house of such a person.

12. ἐλευχρόμενον δὲ εἰς τῆν οἰκίαν, "and when ye enter into the house (of such a person)," i. e. the host recommended to you. The αὐτή, by a diglossia on the term οἰκία, signifies the family of the host. On the Γ νῦν, εἰρήνη σοι, see Joh. 2, 19.

13. ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν. Fritz. explains this pax vestra, quatenus nempe vos eam optatis. He also objects to εὐθεῖα and ἐκπραφὴν being taken (with Kuin.) for futures. And he explains: "Futurum erit ut vestra salus ad familiam pertingat et accidet, ut illa ad vos redate," hi id significant: "volo pacem vestram ad eam quasi pervenire—ejus familiaris componat sieri, et volo eandem ad vos velut redire—eam sine effectu pronuntiatum esse, ut perinde sit, ac si eam nondum voce et sermone protuleritis."

14. Fritz. lays down the following as the true construction of the passage: χαὶ ἐκτίναξε τῶν ποτῶν ὑμῶν τῶν κοινωνίων, ἐλευχρόμενον τῆς οἰκίας ἥ τις πόλεως ἑκείνης (—ἐκείνου), δι' εὰν μὴ δέχηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ—ὑμῶν. And he explains: "et executite pedibus vestras pulvere egessit domo aut civitate illâ (i. e. quae illius sit homina), quicunque vos non exceperit neque audiverit." He, moreover, objects to Kuinol's confounding the particle ἓν (equivalent to ἄν) with the conjunction; as also to his connecting τῶν κοινωνίων with τῶν ποτῶν ὑμῶν; since the genitives depend upon ἀνδρὸν or ἐκ, which some MSS. supply.

"Η τῷ πόλει ἑκείρη, "than that for that city," i. e. such a city, one who so rejects you. Fritz. rightly understands by γῆ the territory of Sodom and Gomorrah, which partook in the punishments of those cities, as it had doubtless done in their crimes.

16. Ἐν μέσῳ most Commentators, as Beza, Gais, and Kuin., take for eis μέσον. But Fritz. thinks this cannot be admitted. Others, as Elsner, Paulus, and Bowyer, take the passage thus: "I send you
out as sheep who will be in the midst of wolves." And this sense Fritz admits, but objects to the construction. He lays down the following as the meaning: "Ecce ego mitto vos missique eritis (inter homines) tanquam oves inter lupos." Be that as it may, μένον is not, as Kuin. considers it, redundant, but contributes to the significance and strength of the phrase.

Γίνεσθε οὖν φόνιμοι δὲ οἱ δῆμοι, καὶ ἄφηραι δὲ αἱ περιστεραί. Chrys. and Euthym., not without reason, think that our Lord means to direct that there should be an union of the two virtues. Ἐκτέρασει ἄμφοτέρας (say they) διὸ οἱ μᾶς ἄμφοτεραι τοιοῦτοι ἐρείην.

17. προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄνθρωπων. Fritz, rightly rejects the interpretation of Lightf., judges, since such do not act as accusers, but administer justice. He adopts, as did Vat., Elsner, &c. the interpretation of Erasmus, which seems to be the best founded. Casaub. denies that the article has any force. But he forgets (Fritz. observes) that by the article is not only comprehended a whole genus, but a certain and indefinite species.

18. καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀρχηγοῦσθε. Erasm. and Fritz. render, "quin ad principes," &c. By the ἡγεμόνας καὶ βασιλεῖς Fritz. would (with Grot.) simply understand generals and kings; because the ἤγ. and βασιλ. separate, might be taken of inferior magistrates, but not, united. His other arguments are of less force.

Εἰς μαρτύρουν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐθέσειον. The varieties of interpretation on this controverted passage Fritz. ably discusses. To the interpretation of Kuin. he objects, that such a sentiment as it yields would be too obvious to need mentioning, and also that it is at variance with τοῖς ἐθέσειοι. On the same ground he rejects that of Chrys., Theophyl., and Euthym. (followed by Luther, Grot. and others), which is as follows: τούτο εἶτιν εἰς ἐλεγχον αὐτῶν τῶν κυρίωντων. Euthym.: εἰς ἐλεγχον καὶ τῶν ἱερατῶν, καὶ τῶν ἑθνῶν, ἵνα μὴ δύνηται λέγειν οὕτων, ὅτι οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ θυρήματος. Finally, he assigns to the words the following sense: "principibus regibusque causam vestram probare debeatis, quo inde sibi testimonium habeant et reges et populi," in testimonium nempe libertatis apostolorum mentisque imperterritit. Both the antients and some eminent moderns, as Grot. and Schulz, observe, that the words are applicable not much more to this first mission, as the one after Christ's resurrection. To which Fritz. only has to say: "Mattheus res quas post multo eventa comprobati vidisset ad hoc tempus conjectit." But perhaps it may be sufficient to observe, with the antients, that the words are meant rather to be prophetic of what should happen in their last solemn mission, than a description of what should take place in this.

19. λαλήσετε. Many MSS. have λαλήσατε. And this reading not a few Critics adopt. On which Fritz. observes: "Quum autem discriminis hoc sit, ut conjunctionis sollicitam curam, futurum temporis, in quod hee cura incidat, rationes nos cogitare jubeat, longe hic praestat conjunctivus non tantum ob potestatem v. μεριμνάς, sed quod optimē λαλήστε prius ad indicandum Apostolorum sollicitudinem, λαλήσετε ad opponendum Jesu securitatem conjuncta videntur."
20. οὐ γὰρ ὑμῖς ἐστὶν οἱ λαλῶντες. The sense is: "For not so much are (i.e. will be) ye the speakers, but," &c. The whole business was not to be the Spirit's, so that nothing should be left to them. At the use of the present Fritz., without reason, stumble. It is here used for the future, by a very common idiom, by which things future are spoken of as present, to indicate their certainty.

21. Fritz. denies that the phrase παραδίωσα εἰς θάνατον here is equivalent to θανάτων. But his criticism seems not well founded. To deliver them to death appears to be a cutting expression for deliver them to judgment, which, it is hinted, is equivalent to death. Fritz., moreover, opposes the interpretation of ἐπαναστηκούσαι, supported by Künz., &c., "rise up in judgment." And certainly the common one, which I have adopted in the note, may very well be defended. And I would add, that similar atrocities are said, by Thucydides, to have taken place during the Peloponnesian war. Yet we can hardly suppose that human nature would be urged to such wolf-like and fiendish deeds by difference of opinion respecting the truth of Christianity; neither do we find, by history, that such private and personal warfare was carried on. And as the words of the preceding sentence are forensic, and this has the appearance of being formed on a parallelism, so it is probable that the terms here are forensic likewise.

22. ἐσεθεὶ μου ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς πάντων. Fritz. objects to the common interpretation of πάντων, multis; though he admits that "sensus non e veritate estus, sed e commotioe Jesu animo metendus." Which, however, comes to much the same thing; though it is formed on a principle which I can seldom approve.

23. ὅ ὅ τὸ ποιεῖται εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται. Fritz. also adopts the interpretation of the antients (which was followed by Beza). And he cites Theophyl.: ὅ ὅ ὅ τὸποιεῖται εἰς τέλος καὶ μὴ ἐν τῷ ἀρχαῖο μόνον, οὗτος τίς αἰώνιον μεθέξει ᾧ ἴδη. He himself explains thus: "Qui vero perseverat (in mandatis meis exsequendis) ad finem horum malorum, is Messiaham consequetur beatitatem." The "ὁτος is regarded, by Fritz., as emphatical; q.d. "He and he only." And he subjoins some Classical examples. Ἐσεθέθει signifies to be admitted to the happiness of the Messiah's kingdom.

23. Fritz. objects to εἰς τὴν ἄλλην being taken for εἰς των ἄλλων. He says that ἡ ἄλλη is urbe proxima quae prima desertam excipit, i.e. the next. And he refers to Matthaei on Eurip. T. V. 2. p. 335., and Sturz. Lex. Xen. in ν. ἄλοι. So Aul. Gell. alia loco erva. This I, think, preferable to the common interpretation, as also to that of Mr. Valpy, who takes εἰς τὴν ἄλλην for εἰς τὴν ἅλειν. Fritz. adopts the construction of σὺ μὴ τελεσθε propyosed by Raphel., &c. But he observes that H. Steph. in his Thea. has rightly denied that that signification of τελειω is any where else to be found. Perhaps, however, this is too bold an assertion, even for a scholar of Stephen's vast memory and immense erudition.

23. ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, &c. This controverted passage is thus explained by Schott ap. Fritz.: "Donec efficaciam meam invisibilem civitate Judaicae evertenda declaraverim." And by Fritz. himself
thus: "Dono videor (reddito) Messias vestris calamitatiis impositurum finem."

24. oii eti μαθητης, &c. Nolite, inquit, tot tantorumque malorum nuntio consternari. Non enim florentiorum, quam que magistri est, fortunam desiderare decent discipulum, quem contentum esse oportet ipsa illa, quam magistro eventi sorte. (Fritz.) It is well observed, by Chrys., that we must not oppose to this adage (for such it is) examples teaching the contrary, but suppose it founded, like all proverbs, on what takes place on the long run.

25. ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ, &c. The words are thus explained by Fritz: ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ, scil. μη ἐναι αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τὸν διδασκαλοῦν, ἵνα κ. τ. ἐ., satis est discipulo, non superare magistrum, ut ei posit, par esse redditus (γένηται, non γίνηται). In the words following, καὶ ὁ δοῦλος, ὁ ὁ Κύριος αὐτῶν there is, he says, no σεγμα; but we may suppose attraction. On the τῶν οἰκειῶν he observes that τῶν οἰκειῶν, edited from some MSS. by Matth., cannot be admitted; since the word is formed, not from οἴκος, but from οἰκία. And he refers to Hermann on Soph. Electr. 1206.

26. μη οὖν φοβηθῆτε αὐτῶν. Fritz, thus connects them with ver. 24 & 25: "because it cannot be that greater persecution from the Jews will arise to the disciples than to the master." And he would not (with Beza) make the reason why (expressed in γῆν), "for thus it will be that the innocency of the Apostles, as well as the improbity of their adversaries, will at length appear," but the following: "quia ipsius doctrina e tenebris utique sit in lucem evocanda."

28. Instead of ἀπεκτεινόντων, which Matth. and Griesbach had edited, Fritz restores the old reading ἀπεκτεινόντων; assigning to the verb the sense "qui interficere soleat;" a not unusual force of the present.

29. Fritz, observes that the προσωπια may mean either little birds, or sparrows. See Wetstein. Yet, on account of the price mentioned, the latter seems more probable. From Buxtorf's Lex. Talm. and Schoettg. H. H. it appears that the Jews used the expression "at an assarium (which was the 24th part of a denarius)," to denote the smallest possible price.

30. οὐ πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τῇ γῆ. The ancient interpret these words not of the death, but the capture of the sparrows. But the other sense seems, on many accounts, preferable. The Commentators have failed to observe that this has reference to the dropping of birds to the ground on being shot with arrows.

32. ἄνευ τοῦ παρόν τιμᾶν. To the other examples here adduced add Thucyd. 2, 70. ἄνευ αὐτῶν ξυνέβησαν.

33. καὶ αἱ γρίξει τῆς κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι ἢμηθημέναι εἰσὶ. It is well remarked, by Chrysost., that the Evangelist says this, not that God does indeed number the hairs of their head, but in order to signify the exact knowledge and extensive providence which He exercises over them. So a Rabbinical writer, cited by Fritz: "Sedet Deus 8. B. et nutrit a cornibus boum unicornium, usque ad ova pedeulumorum.

32. ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ. Fritz denies that the ἐν is redundant,
and that there is a Hebraism. He thinks the phrase is simply equivalent to testimonium edere in aliquo, i.e. alicujus negotio. On the connexion of ver. 32 & 33, see Fritz.

34. μὴ νομίσητε, &c. Fritz. remarks on the spirit communicated to this and the following sentences by the αὐστρογενές. And on the sense he observes, that our Lord said this, not that he designedly disturbed peace and concord, but showing that from his doctrine would necessarily arise great discord among men. For in all languages, we say a thing is done cum consilio, either to show its necessity (as here), or to signify that something happens temere. So also Plin., Epist. 8, 23, 8., bitterly reproaching fortune, says: "accedit lacrimis meas, quod absens, et impendentia mali nescius, pariter aegrum, pariter deceassis, cognovi, ne gravissimo dolori timore consuescerem." So also Amos 2, 7.

On μάχαιρα in the sense dissension, see the note on Acts 18, 2.

35, 36. The sentiment in these verses is formed on Mich. 7, 6.

37. νῦν εἰμὶ, "more than me." Fritz. compares Ps. 95, 3. and Lucian Macrob. c. 5. olie γε φασι διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην διαινὴν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας αἰσθήσεις καθὸ τοῖς ἄλλους ἀνθρώποις ἐφισομένας εἶναι.

38. οἱ λαμβάνει τῶν σταυρῶν αὐτοῦ. By his cross is meant, the cross laid upon him to be borne. To take up a cross signifies to submit to the calamities which come upon one. See Fisch. de Vit. Lex. 374. No one, it is meant, can be a true disciple, unless he fearlessly and zealously follow his master.

39. See the note on Luke 17, 32.

41. εἰς δόναμα προφητῶν, i.e. because he bears the name of a prophet. So the Heb. כֵּן, and Pirke Av. c. 6. qui operam navat legi in ejus nomen intuitus, i.e. because it is called the Law.

42. By ἐν τῶν μικρῶν τοίνυν can only be meant a disciple. For him whom he here calls ἐν τῶν μικρῶν τοίνυν Jesus immediately names μαθητῶν. The whole verse may be rendered: "et quia verum et horum parverorum (i.e. vestrum, quo digito intendo) vel frigida situm restinxerit, discipuli reveritus nomen, non amittet, quod beneficiuo suo in meritum est premiun."
Πέμψας δόν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, Ἐίκεν αὐτῷ. This is a contracted mode of expression for πέμψας τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐίκεν. So Apec. 1, 1. (Fritz.)

4. ἀναγγέλλατε Ἰωάννη, ἀκοῦε καὶ βλέπε, "tell John what you hear is done, and what you see." Καὶ πῶς τοι εὐαγγελίζονται. Fritz. acquiesces in the interpretation, "the poor have imparted to them the joyful doctrine of the founding of the Messiah's kingdom." And he aptly compares εὐαγγελίζονται τινι with the τεστημα τινι of 1 Cor. 9, 17. See Matth. Gr. Gr. p. 581. But he thinks the principle more general than is commonly supposed. Thus at Polyen. 2, 14, 1. he defends the common reading οἱ Ἐφροι, μηνοντες εὐπορεύειν κινάωνω, where Koen and Schoel. conjecture μηνύειτος. He also defends the reading ἄλλα ἀνάβα τόν βασιλέα ἐπεστάλην in Soph. Ëd. c. 739. from Lucian de Merc. Cond. c. 37. καὶ ἐς εὐπορεύει το κάλλιον επελέξατο.

5. καὶ μακρὸς οὐκ εἶν ἃν ἡ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί. Fritz. assigns to these words the following sense: "renuntiate magistro, Messias a me facinora ede benignumque experiri, qui nullâ re offensus Messiam me esse sibi persuaserit; ergo ipse judicet." The learned Commentator then discusses the controverted question (treasured on by me at ver. 3.) whether John sent this message of enquiry for his own sake, or for that of his disciples. He inclines to the former opinion; but he does not, I think, see his way through this perplexing question.

7. ἥτοι δὲ Ἰσαύρας λέγειν. Fritz. objects to taking (as is usually done) ἥτοιο λέγειν for ἤτοι. St. Matthew (he thinks) means that while John's messengers were departing, Jesus began to say, &c.; which imports that he spoke not of John while the disciples were present. This criticism (I would observe) is confirmed by the authority of the antient Commentators. Fritz. points: τι ἐξελθεῖν αἰς τῶν ἔρημων; θεάσασθαι, &c. (as ver. 8 & 9.) And this, because θεάσασθαι would sound offensive if referred to τι. He renders: "With what intent went ye out into the wilderness? to see a reed shaken by the wind." I can more readily agree with him, that θεάσασθαι κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἄνέμων σαλεύομεν (as Grot. and Wets. say) is to be taken in sensu proprio; q. d. "Did ye go to feast your eyes with a spectacle that ye might see any day in the desert near the Jordan. See 1 Macc. 9, 45. Joseph. Ant. 13, 13. Finally, Fritz. details the sense of ver. 7—9. thus: "neque ipsius deserti natura vos pellexit, neque splendidii hominis, qui ibi nunquam degat, desiderium cepit; sed Johanneum, prophetam, qui tum versabatur in deserto, videre volebatis." To the exposition of the antients and many moderns, who suppose that by κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἄνέμων σαλεύομεν he represents the levity and inconstancy of John, Fritz. objects, that "though the mob often flock together to admire a buffoon, yet they never do to behold a sobering person."

8. ἄλλα τι ἐξῆλθεν, &c. Fritz., with reason, objects to Kui-noel's assertion that ἄλλα is for ἦ. And he remarks: "Est h. l. post interrogationes, ut negarentur, propositas obiectentias at (cf. Heindorff. ad Plat. Protag. 71. ἄλλα δὴ θελήσανα ἡμῶν αἰρέσθε; at, si illo desertum adiisse negatis, quo consilio illuc vos consulentis."
I cannot, however, think that it has the objective force. It seems to be merely *continuative*, and serves to the repetition of a former interrogation; q. d. "but now (again) what then went ye out to see?" Consult H. Tooke's *Ew. προερ. vol. 1. sub voce but.*

Οἱ τὰ μαλακὰ φοροῦντες. Fritz, here (after Herman on Soph. Eclect. 715.) lays down this distinction between *φέρειν* and *φορεῖν*, that the former is *inceptive*, and simply signifies *ferre*; the latter is *continuative*, and denotes *ferre solere*. And this satisfactorily shows how *φορεῖν* comes to signify *to wear*, which is the sense here, and therefore the *solente* may very well be passed by.

10. The reason why John was superior to the Prophets is this, that he was the celebrated precursor of the Messiah promised by Malachi 3. The words are taken from the Hebrew, not the Sept. And though in the Prophet the Messiah himself speaks of sending his messenger, Jesus slightly bends the sense to this, that God addresses the Messiah on the sending forward a precursor. (Fritz.)

11. Fritz. objects to the έν γεννητοίς γυναικών being taken for έν γυναικὼν. And he observes, that *γεννητοί* carries with it a genitive, being of the same sense as *liberi* (so the Hebr. *יְנֵי-יָשָׁב* in Job 25, 4., the Greek *τὸν ἐκόσιαν τινός*, and the Latin *natum alicujus*); neither is *γενν. γυν.* to be understood of the Prophets who lived before John. Fritz., moreover, objects to δ. μικροποιούντος being taken for δ. ἐλάχιστος; as also to μικρ. έν τῇ βασιλ. τ. ν. being taken for *teachers of the new religion*. Indeed he objects to the two being united. He notices, with approbation, the remark of Chrys., Theophyl. and Euthym., that the words *έν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τ. ου. μείζων* a. e. are to be joined, and the *μικρ.* to be taken of *Jesse*, who so calls himself, in that manner by which we speak of ourselves as of another. See at 3, 3. He then lays down the following as the sense: " verissimè vobis affirmo, non exitissime inter multum filios majorem Johanne baptista virum; qui ab eo (nunc) vincitum (ego), in Messia regno — condito Messiae imperio eum vincit (—certe vincet; cf. ad v. 3.) (quippe Messias)."

12. ή βασιλεία τῶν ὁμορραγήν βιάζεται. Βιάζεται and *βιάζεθαι* properly signify to use force; *of what kind*, must depend upon the context. After a long and minute discussion of the various significations of the word, and the senses which have been ascribed to this controverted passage, Fritz. lays down the following as the true interpretation: " a Johannis inde ætate usque ad hoc tempus proxime ab futuri regni Messiani nuntius et propagator magnæ contentionis et excipitur."


15. ὃς ἐξων — ἀκούειν! An exclamation requesting attention to something of moment.


18. μήτε ἐκθωμ μήτε πίνων. Fritz. objects to Kuinoel's interpretation, "non victu communi utebatur;" and rightly remarks
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(from Beza) that this is an hyperbole, by which is signified the meagre and slender fare which John allowed himself. Δαμόνον ἔχει, i. e., as a Greek would have said, κακοδαμονή.

19. ἐδικαίωθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τεκνῶν αὐτῆς. After a long and able discussion of the sense of these words, Fritz. finally accquireses in the interpretation of Jensius, who thus takes the words: "Et sapientia causa (scil. quae contrariis Johannis et Jesu institutis cernitur) justa pronuntiata est, ut huic rei occasionem praebuerint," i. e. ut habita hujus calumniam ratione sapientia fauores et dicipulos (virtutis studio plane deditos) intueare. Or it may (he adds) be regarded as a sententia generalis, and thus expressed: "et solet probari sapientia sic, ut hujus rei opportunitatem suppedient ejus alumni."

25. ἀπεκρυψε ὁ Ἱσαῖας ἐκεῖ. Arbitror, esse hunc usum hinc maximè derivandum, quod scriptor antegressam questionem, quae responsam hujusmodi exigat, animo quidem finxit et suo sed brevitates causa omiserit. Quipe sensus illius vel e responso elucet. Nam ne Hebræos quidem adducor, ut credam, adeo inermes suisse, ut sine ullam ratione et consilio in loquuntur. (Fritz.)

"Or: ἀπεκρυψε—γνώσις. Fritz. adopts the following interpretation of Chrys.: οὕτως νῦν διὰ τοῦτο (τὸ ἀπεκρυφῆς ἀπὸ σοφῶν) χάρις, ἀλλ' ὅτι, ἃ σοφοὶ οίκε ἔγνωσαν, ἔγνωσαν οὕτω. And Chrys. cites Rom. 6, 17. χάρις τῇ θεῷ, ὅτι ἔχει δοῦλοι τῆς ἀμαρίας, ἐπηκοούσε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὑπερεξάμενον τοῦ δίδαξισ. At ὅτι ἀπεκρυψε ταῦτα, &c. Fritz. rightly rejects Kuinoel's version, quamquam—tamen. And he renders: "quod decretivi bene subducere sapientibus, ut a prudentibus recedenter s. removerentur, et communicare voluistí hominibus ingenio ac doctrinâ parum florentibus."

26. vae ὁ πατὴρ—σου. Fritz. commends Palaires for supplying from the preceding verse ἐξουσιοδοτοῦμαι σου before ὅτι. And so Euthymius. And he renders: "Sane, o pater, gratias tibi habeo, quod sic maximè, non aliter, tibi placuit!"
AN ENLARGED

LIST OF CORRECTIONS ON PART I.

In the extreme hurry of publishing (at a very late period of the season) Part I., the Author had not sufficient time allowed him to carefully go through his work, in order to form a complete List of Corrections. This he has, however, now done, and hopes that the following (which will supersede the former, and be found to include he trusts every error of the least consequence) will be not unaccept-
able to his readers.

PREFACE.

Page 18, line 18, after place add of residence—21, l. 4. for im-
pressing read oppressive.

VOL. I.

Page 65, l. 29, read εδινυματι—67, line 7, r. verpos—68, l. 14, r.
relieous—71, l. 2, r. ego—71, sub fin. r. μεν—72, for are r. were—
74, l. 12, r. ώς εκείνη—76, l. 9, r. ἤρισ τον ὁ—77, in r. Matthae—78,
l. 12. for but r. and—id. 17, for sentiments r. significations—80, m.
r. Seneca—id. r. ειρετερων—81, l. 3, r. ἀναλούσ—82, l. 29, for
where r. whom—id. f. r. χρωμενων—85, m. r. ἄγκυρο—90, m. r.
Dion. Hal—91, l. 11, r. Σατε—id. l. 9, r. more properly—99, m.
r. dlc—102, s. f. r. She—103, l. 17, r. και—id. l. 35, r. Oppian—
104, l. 11, r. αετος—106, l. 15, for will r. may—107, s. m. for this
r. that—109, l. 30, r. short one—111, l. 6, r. ἡμια—111, l. 11, r.
ηφικτον—111, s. f. for Plaut. r. Plut—118, l. 1, r. ηπειρας—119, l.
19, for of r. with—122, l. 27, for on r. of—128, f. r. ἀσπάσασθαι—
131, m. r. this view—131, f. for in r. i. e.—134, l. 9, r. ἔδεισαν
—id. l. 9, r. ἀναμφίβολος—id. l. 11, r. ἀνειρ—137, l. 7, r.
Syriasm—139, m. for to unto—118, l. 10, r. bear to be—121, m.
for the passage r. the miracle—144, l. 28, for For r. Now—145, l.
13, r. βρέμοντι—146, l. 6, r. ἤυππερ—149, l. 17, r. words—135, f. r. λόγο
—159, l. 10, r. effugant—168, r. with him, they—172, l. 6, for ii
r. i. e.—178, l. 30, r. it is said—181, f. r. Choeph—182, l. 3, for
1 r. ltt—183, l. 25, r. that as before—so here—184, l. 1, for in r.
are—184, f. r. πλεονεξιας—187, l. 29, for there r. these—187, f.
r. εργαλεια—190, l. 3, r. τετράρχη—191, l. 4, after 16, insert we
have—191, l. 34, r. ενεργεια—192, l. 14, r. uses—192, s. f. point
μυνημονεια—193, l. 4, r. Machaerus—193, l. 6, for see r. so, and
for as, and—196, s. f. r. ἀναγκαιον—197, m. r. —199, l. 24,
for persons r. sexes—202, l. 3, r. ἡμιρά—202, l. 17, for ad r.
and, and for note n. not—202, l. 19, for authentically r. emphatically—207, f. for χέλους r. κέλους—308, l. 11, for were r. are—211, l. 25, for took r. take—217, l. 12, after which add was—221, l. 26, for in r. i. e.—325, s. f. r. ἡμών—226, l. 31, r. ἡγεμόνιοι—227, l. 33, r. the death, and could not—233, l. 3, r. διάστροφαι—234, l. 2, after Gentiles add Rosenm. and Kuin., but see my note on 9, l. 29—id. s. f. r. ἑραστείων—238, l. 5, for should r. may—241, l. 3, r. and such this was thought—241, l. 6, r. ἄναγκη, and 18, 17—248, l. 26, r. ἡμών—249, l. 30, r. μακροθυμεῖν—249, f. r. Hemat. on Lucian—251, l. 4, r. idemque, si necesse—252, l. 25, r. popular—253, l. 25, r. β—254, l. 11, r. hac re—256, l. 13, r. Ἑθιοπικ. ver.—257, m. r. ἐκβιβαστο—259, l. 27, for was r. were—259, l. 34, r. ἵστορ—274, l. 29, r. omission—279, l. 7, r. great ones—290, l. 3, r. found it had—305, l. 5, r. sheltered—301, l. 3, r. αἴροντα—305, l. 4, cancel in—301, m. r. maectare—309, l. 27, cancel were—317, f. for may r. might—390, l. 4, r. ἐκεῖ—324, l. 9, for which r. who—id. l. 17, r. moved—327, l. 9, r. ex te—327, l. 15, for incessantly r. intimately—327, l. 22, r. Barnabas—id. l. 34, r. for or r. not—348, l. 19, r. γιμάτε—351, m. r. οὕτως, and ὧδε—id. f. r. ὀνομάζεται—352, l. 8, r. syllepsin—id. m. r. σωφρον—356, for χρόνους r. θέας—364, f. r. παραγγελῷ—365, l. 2, r. μη—367, m. r. αὐθή—368, l. 33, r. προοιμιον—373, l. 16, r. ὑπερ—375, l. 8 & 9, r. νῦν—378, f. r. one will—381, l. 6, r. zelotes—id. l. 23, r. I see—382, l. 3, r. adscuetus—384, l. 33, r. difficulty—385, m. for shown r. shot—387, l. 12, r. almost—389, l. 38, r. motiare—392, l. 5, r. growing—393, l. 25 r. ἐκφύεσι—404, l. 10, cancel as—404, l. 31, r. it is—404, f. r. μερίδα σου—405, l. 9, r. as are—405, l. 10, for whose r. their—406, l. 38, for was r. is—406, f. for virgins r. maidens, and for maidens, virgins—408, l. 37, f. n. que—409, l. 24, r. ἀναλύετερος—411, l. 19, for it r. ιδ—414, l. 8, r. ἔφυσις—416, l. 3, r. ἐγχει—416, l. 10, r. wouldst—416, l. 31, for Af. r. Aj—427, l. 26, for had r. have—428, l. 31, r. ἔπαινετεραι—431, l. 8, r. ἐπικτεῖναι—456, f. for this r. it—461, l. 5, r. μεσία—468, m. r. θείων—472, l. 5, r. Cels.—473, l. 31, r. obtestor—474, l. 4, r. κατερρήσα—474, l. 5, r. rapitis—474, l. 39, r. βύσσων—416, l. 4, r. ἐνεκὲντων—476, l. 27, r. ἐμανενερότα—477, m. r. ἔλεος and δῶς—477, m. r. vellet—480, l. 3, r. προίτεια—490, l. 31, r. republic—483, m. r. ἄψεβα—489, l. 2, for would r. should—494, l. 1, r. ἀντιγενεσίαν—497, l. 35, r. answered, and addressed—502, l. 18, r. Aj—502, l. 25, r. it being—503, m. r. Hirtius—505, l. 15, for are r. is—506, l. 17, r. ἐσταυρωθηύς, and εὑρεῖναι and ἁρφεῖν—510, l. 7, r. example’s sake—523, l. 25, r. ὀλίκαια—524, l. 13, r. is to be—527, f. r. Gallienus—527, l. 26, r. Jesus, in dying, address—549, l. 8, for word r. world.

Vol. II.

Page 1, m. read ἀσάδεις—2, l. 10, r. synchysis—3, f. r. is scindere—6, l. 8, cancel of—9, l. 19, r. Malea—13, l. 3, for obtain r. remain—27, l. 7, r. ἐχε—28, l. 6, r. Laicit—28, m. for second r. first—30, l. 34, r. Geopon—40, f. r. ἧν—46, l. 9, r. σολάζουσα—47, l. 5, for assigned r. ascribed—57, l. 37, r. Beza—58, l. 27, for argue r. agree—64, l. 21, r. seemed—68, l. 28, r. συγχάρησι—69, vol. I.
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f. r. ad Aristoph. Av.—79, l. 13, for assents r. assents—76; l. 61, cancel the words Rosenm. —readers—66, l. 14, r. of a rock—93, m. r. αὐλόνων, and by Joseph—93, l. 29, r. ἀγνοοῦστες—93, l. 31, r. χαλινίδα—95, l. 4, after derived add from—97, l. 15, r. after the fruit—102, f. r. obliqua—104, l. 25, r. Ἀπολλώνιον—106, l. 13, r. among which, that—107, f. r. was not necessary—109, l. 7, r. ἀπερείχε—109, m. r. μειδόν—id. r. or, to the declarations which by—111, m. for ordered r. ordained—113, l. 2, r. his own—114, l. 7, for it r. the requisite knowledge—115, l. 33, for it r. nard—132, m. r. add—128, l. 7, r. Aj.—123, s. f. r. thinks, is plain—131, m. r. made—139, l. 4, r. complete phrase—132, m. r. εἰς ἐρωταν—155, l. 29, r. ἐν χερεί—157, l. 24, r. that in the—162, l. 4, for persons r. people—170, l. 2, r. ἱστορίας—174, l. 31, r. ἡμείς—182, l. 13, for would r. should—182, l. 24, r. signified she concealed—183, l. 2, r. and thinks—183, l. 3, for would r. should—186, l. 26, for should r. would—189, l. 8, r. ἵνα—191, l. 30, r. ἐκβαίνει—192, l. 1, r. ἔσται—199, f. r. θύμα—200, l. 1, r. θύμα—208, l. 14, r. q. d. the youth—217, m. for most r. more—219, m. after further add than the country—231, l. 15, r. sponsa and spouse, and συνεβή—230, m. r. celebrated—239, l. 14, r. βρίσκεται—241, l. 14, r. γεμεσθαι—248, l. 8, r. ἔσται—id. 10, r. ἐστώ—248, l. 16, r. δεικνύστε—255, l. 3, r. προκάτευχε—257, l. 29, r. κελεύσκων—257, l. 29, r. shall be extended—259, l. 5, r. διατάσσει—260, l. 9, r. τρυφίω δολος—260, l. 12, r. ἁρπα—μενος—268, l. 15, r. εἰσπροδέχτω—269, m. r. were well formed—272, l. 1, r. περιπότης—274, l. 24, r. emend—278, l. 19, r. ἔκθεσι—278, l. 28, r. αἰθρείας—285, l. 13, r. would not have—286, m. r. εἰσόρθη—286, l. 26, r. θύμα—286, l. 27, r. θύμα—286, f. r. Witsius’s—290, l. 29, r. θύμα—295, m. r. ἄμφως—295, f. r. benefit collection—298, f. r. ἐστίν—300, l. 4, for or r. i.e.—300, l. 10, for was r. were—306, l. 18, r. Ambrose—307, l. 32, r. had been—308, l. 21, r. Dorvillon—on—310, l. 14, r. προετήσαντι, and βαδίζων—315, m. r. πότε—316, l. 1, for double r. obsé—318, s. f. r. catachresis—326, l. 6, r. ἄγραζα—329, l. 17, r. αἰθρείας—332, l. 23, r. ἀναφέρεσι—342, l. 30, r. ἁμενία—id. 32, r. ἡμεπιδοτος—348, f. r. Hetzchi—352, s. f. r. cancel Campbell—354, m. r. for prayed r. prayer—366, m. r. νομικός—375, l. 6, r. ναβα—381, m. r. άετος—388, m. r. ἐγγείαμεν—393, 10, r. is required—397, r. ἐγγείμας—402, l. 14, r. νοῦς—403, l. 19, r. verify—407, m. r. ἤτοι—407, l. 38, r. after intervening—408, m. r. γέρα—414, l. 3, r. ἐμφανίζεται—414, l. 4, r. ἀναληγόμενος—415, l. 27, r. ἀναληγόμενος—416, l. r. ἡμείς—id. l. 23, r. ἀναληγόμενος—l. 31, l. Ath.—423, l. 15, r. effexis—id. f. r. ὁμοτητα—425, l. 8, r. Harmer’s—428, f. r. basket-maker, and Polluc.—429, l. 2, r. Av. 1432—443, s. m. r. δίλοιν—456, m. r. ναυβάλει—459, l. 17, for subito r. solito—id. l. 19, cancel and—460, m. for aptare r. optare—469, m. r. aἰσχυνθέρεμεν—472, m. for Pharisee r. Publician—482, l. 9, r. ἐνιας—493, s. f. r. δια—498, f. r. γνώναι—511, l. 6, r. ἰππα—521, l. 11, for eum r. eum—524, l. 26, r. ἐνιας—532, f. r. Eum—538, s. f. after singular add occurring—545, l. 34, r. modern Theologians—559, l. 9, for nimirum r. puero—562, l. 15, r. ἔτοιμα—564, l. 4, r. ἢπειρον—568, l. 15, for expletive r. expressive—571, l. 11, r. ἔνθεος—573, l. 8, point nature. The—573, m. for r. τοι—573, l. 25, r. κεχρισθεὶν.
CORRECTIONS.

Vol. III.

PAGE 12, for deprivation read depravation—13, line 28, r. σωκεραξίας—19, l. 29, r. σκπννοῦ—23, l. 3, l. ἐσχήρως—31, l. 4, r. ὑπομνμε—33, a. f. r. ἐλέημον—30, l. 17, r. to live—36, l. 14, r. ἑμεῖς—39, l. 7, r. ὧν ὑπὲρ and ἡμᾶς ἑόρω—39, l. 26, r. Cyrrillus—40, l. 19, r. it was not—41, f. r. ἑγείρω ἐκεῖνοι—46, m. r. not as a—49, l. 6, cancel the—51, m. for need r. must—52, l. 7, r. λεγόμενον—54, l. 31, r. μακαριονεῖται—63, f. r. malevolence—64, l. 21, r. and therefore—64, l. 26, r. of God alone to—65, l. 5, r. Damasus—69, s. f. r. δεύτερον—70, l. 9, r. ὃτι—70, m. r. ἐννοοῦ—87, m. r. involvement—93, m. r. αὐγοειδεστάγοντα—103, l. 1, r. Corp. and Byz.—105, s. f. r. cause—106, l. 3, r. ready—107, m. for See read So also—109, m. for Ephesian r. Ephraimitic—109, f. for Paraphr. r. Peripl.—110, s. f. for fortified r. mortified—111, l. 21, r. inflamed with—215, m. r. Christ, and just after r. of Pharisical, i. e. of Popish—107, m. r. Salire—120, s. f. r. was not generally accounted—126, l. 4, r. are so called—126, l. 15, r. as in everything—130, l. 87, r. admitting that—id. l. 39, r. yet they—132, f. read γε—133, 8, τόνων—140, s. f. r. contemn—144, l. 1, r. early—147, l. 14, r. ἀρακνεῖν—156, l. 14, r. ἀπο—160, f. for mother r. other—171, f. for national r. natural—175, l. 1, r. eminent antient—183, for me r. he—183, r. no stress—184, l. 3, r. truth—188, s. f. r. five thousand—189, m. r. ὅποι—190, l. 4, r. ὃλοι—192, l. 9, r. far less inhabited—198, f. r. be seen whose—201, l. 12, r. ἔτη—211, m. r. στήλη—217, l. 6, cancel of—225, l. 27 r. ἐρείπια—or—237, l. 5, for him r. them—237, f. r. κακοδαιμονία—240, l. 9, r. is used by—240, f. r. use—246, s. f. r. φαίνεσθαι—252, l. 28, r. γνώσις—271, f. r. ἱπτείς—280, l. 50, v. 9—281, f. r. knew—282, l. 34, for so many r. very many—285, l. 14, γελᾶν—288, m. for for r. of—294, l. 9, r. ἠγαθον—296, l. 11, r. disputes—304, m. r. words—307, l. 16, r. ἡμέρας ὁμοιοι—327, 26, r. ἡμέρας—328, l. 25, r. ἄνωθεν—336, m. r. ἡμέρας—341, f. r. ἡμέρας—342, l. 14, r. Essence—353, r. scarcely admissible—353, l. 15, for and r. an—id. m. r. quadratam—id. l. 8, after reading add were most unwarrantable—355, r. from ἀνεφε—368, l. 18, r. nourishes—389, m. r. portam—389, l. 28, r. re- ficit—391, s. f. r. ἄνωθεν—418, l. 16, cancel Tittmann—433, l. 17, r. Alcest—434, f. r. Strigel—442, m. r. the dead man—457, f. r. inconclusive—459, m. r. ἀπεθανόντα—463, l. 23, r. futility—473, l. 28, r. Jesus answers not—478, l. 23, for and r. nor—484, l. 4, for detracted r. subtracted—488, l. 7, r. βάλλει—490, l. 15, r. Camilli—490, l. 18, r. Origen—491, l. 1, r. βάλλει—493, f. for ὐκεῖν ὡς ἰδίαν—503, 19, for ascerts r. alleges—528, m. r. ἄλλως—539, l. 36, r. ἐνθύμουμεν—558, s. f. r. Alcestis—562, l. 35, r. μεμοίησεν—563, l. 9, for formerly r. long ago—563, s. f. r. brings to it—564, l. 31, r. ῥεῖσθαι—576, l. 30, r. deceased—577, s. f. r. παράστασις τὰ παράστασις, and for ἐνθύμεσα τῷ ἐνθύμεσα—577, l. 39, r. ἔφη—589, l. 5, r. ἔτη—592, l. 12, r. núbi—598, l. 5, r. Cassandra—609, m. r. ἐννοοῦ—618, l. 19, r. for recovering r. accomplishing—634, l. 6, r. ἔτη—635, l. 7, for to, nay r. nay to—645, for Judus r. Julius—661, f. r. sometimes, and for has
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r. had—663, m. for ὁ τοῖς τοῖς ὁ τοῖς—663, l. 29, for who r. while
667, l. 16, r. ἐνῶ—673, l. 22, r. multum—683, l. 16, for they r.
—687, l. 7, r. ἐν αὐτῷ—688, 3. r. 7, 699, f. r. autum—724,
l. 10, r. Longinus, and for Leon r. Leyons—718, s. f. r. xirte
725, l. 11. after time add is not probable, for—727, l. 26, r. break
on them—749, s. f. for mere r. mere—749, f. for appeitisti r. or
iiisti—751, f. r. ἐκο and wentest—755, l. 27, r. Fabricius.
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