Recensio Synoptica

ANNOTATIONIS SACRAE,

BEING A

CRITICAL DIGEST

AND

SYNOPTICAL ARRANGEMENT

OF THE MOST IMPORTANT

ANNOTATIONS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT,

EXEGETICAL, PHILOLOGICAL, AND DOCTRINAL:

CAREFULLY COLLECTED AND CONDENSED, FROM THE BEST COMMENTATORS,

BOTH ANCIENT AND MODERN,

AND SO DIGESTED AS TO FORM ONE CONSISTENT BODY OF ANNOTATION,

In which

Each Portion is systematically attributed to its respective Author,

AND THE FOREIGN MATTER TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH;

The whole accompanied with

A COPIOUS BODY OF ORIGINAL ANNOTATIONS.

By the REV. S. T. BLOOMFIELD, M. A.

OF SIDNEY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, VICAR OF BIEBROOK IN RUTLAND, AND CURATE

OF TILTON AND TUGBY IN LEICESTERSHIRE.

Οὐ σοφισταὶ ἔκοιμον, οὐδὲ ἀπιστεῖν ἤτοιμοι, θεαταὶ δὲ μόνον τῶν

γεγραμμένων, ἐξετάζομεν τὴν Γραφήν.


'Ἄλλα τῶν θείων τὰ πολλὰ ἀπιστή διαφυγγάνει μὴ γινώσκεσθαι.


VOL. II.

LONDON:

C. AND J. RIVINGTON,

62, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD; 3, WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;

AND 148, STRAND.

1826.
ST. MARK.

CHAP. I.

VERSE 1. ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Many Critics, as Erasmus, Zeger, Le Clerc, Wetstein, Beza, and Campbell, account this as a sort of title to the work. It was not unusual (says Campbell) with authors to prefix to their performance a short sentence, to serve both as a title to the book, and to signify that the beginning immediately followed. So Ἡσ. 1, 1, 2. In this manner also Ηροδότου Ἀλκικαρνασσῶν ἱστορίας ἀπὸ δειξεῖς ἤδε. Others compare the beginning of the history of Θουκυδίδες. They might have added, the commencement of the history of Procopius. Also of Οκελλοῦς Λυκαῖος: 'Τάδε συνέγραψε Ὅκελλος ὁ Δευκάνδης. And of Τιμαῖος Λοκρησιάς: 'Τίμαιος ὁ Λόκρος τάδε ζήσα. So Ἀντικ. Hist. Ital. script. antiqu. ap. Dion. Hal. I. 1, 10, 34. Ἀντίλοχος τάδε συνέγραψεν. And Παλαιφή. de Incréd. τάδε περὶ ἀπίστων συγγεγραμμένων, where the use of the first person is remarkable. Yet more so is the use of both the first and the third, in the commencement of the history of Ἡκαταίος, as preserved in Νεκτρ. Phal. Ἡκαταίος ὁ Μιλησίος ἄλλο μυθιζόμενο, τάδε γράφει. This custom (says Campbell) probably gave rise to the custom afterwards adopted by transcribers, of putting at the head of their transcript, incipit, followed by the name of the book or subject, and subjoined at the foot explict, with the name repeated, as a testimony to

VOL. II.

144067
the reader that the work was entire. Markland (ap. Bowyer) takes the construction thus: John (v. 4.) "baptising in the wilderness was (v. 1.) a beginning of the Gospel of Christ, according to the Prophets." (v. 2. and 3.) In this he is followed by Rosenmuller. But this method is extremely harsh, and the interpretation which is founded upon it, very precarious. Though I acknowledge that no writer of the New Testament abounds so much in this sort of synchysis as Mark.

2. ἐν τοῖς προφήταις. The best Critics (and especially the recent ones) seem agreed* that the true reading is ἐν Ἡσαίᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ, as being found in the most ancient MSS. and Versions, and confirmed by a passage of Porphyry, where he censures Mark, because in this passage he attributes to Isaiah what is found in another writher, namely Malachi, in whom something similar occurs. Or rather (as Eichhorn and Griesbach have shown) they were compounded out of a passage of Malachi, and another of Isaiah, and they have accounted for the reading ἐν Ἡσαίᾳ by a most ingenious hypothesis, for which I must refer the reader to Kuinoel.

4. Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων. The best Critics, (as Erasmus, Schmid, Grotius, and Kuinoel,) agree in taking this for ἐβαπτίζω, and call it a Hebraism. It however extends, in some measure, to the Greek and Latin; and is a regular principle in many modern languages; as, for instance, our own.

4. κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοιας. Rosenm. interprets: "Publicè professus est, initiandos esse homines baptismo ad penitentiam, qua remissio peccatorum impetretur." He explains βάπτισμα, "the baptism by which those who use it promise and engage amendment of heart and reformation of life."

* Except Campbell, who retains the common reading, which has an immense majority of MSS. in its favour, is supported by the Arab. and Ethiop. Version, and is more conformable to the scope of the passage, where two quotations are brought from different Prophets, and the most similar is not from Isaiah, but Malachi.
5. εν το Ιορδανη ποταμω. Wetstein quotes examples of this mode of expression. He might have more appositely cited Thucyd. 2, 5. ὁ γαρ Ασωτος ποταμος ερρη. Eis is for εν. These prepositions are often used indiscriminately, as in and into.

5. ἐξομολογομενοι τ. ά. On this word see the note on Matth. 3, 6. It may be further observed that ἐξ seems intensive. It denotes a fervent, though perhaps private, confession of sins. So Acts 19, 18. ἐξομολογομενοι και ἀναγγέλλοντες τας πράξεις αυτών. James 5, 16. ἐξομολογεῖτε ἀλληλοις τα παραπτώματα.

7. κύλας λύσαι. Grotius remarks that κύλας expresses the posture of a servant unloosing his master's sandals. Now these, as Schwartz tells us, in his Comment. Ling. Græc. 865. were fastened to the foot by very artificial straps; and, since they could not be loosed without trouble, that operation was by the rich committed to slaves, (as with us servants pull off boots,) though it seems to have been an office which the disciple performed for the Master. See note on Matth. 3, 11. Wetstein compares Tibull. 1, 6, 30. "Vinclaque de niveo 'de-trahit ipse pede." And Lucian, which is cited above on Matth. 3, 11. Ἰμάντα, strap. Wetstein cites Plut. 4, 2. p. 665. β. των ἰπόθημάτων τοῦ Ἰμάντας.

10. και εὐθεω άναβαινων απο το ίδατος, εἴδε. There has been some doubt, whether άναβαινο should be referred to John, or to Jesus. To John, say Brug. Beza, Schmid, Piscator, Pole, &c. To Jesus, (to whom the speech is delivered,) say Erasmus, Ros. and Kuinoel, &c. which I think preferable. The άναβαινος is a nominativus pendens, for the genitive absolute; as in 3, 16. Then the εἴδε must be referred to John. Kuinoel compares 11, 6, 7. where the words εἶπον, ἀφήκαν, ἀγάγαν, are so coupled as to seem to refer to the same person; though that is not the case.

10. εἴδε σχισομένους τως οὐρανος. This is said of lightning, (as in Aristides and Phlegon ap. Wets.) as are scindere, and other words of a similar signifi-
cation, such as absilire, rumpere, discedere, dividere, a\b rpcere; examples of all which are to be found in Wets. Stat. Theb. 10, 373. Sil. 1, 535. 6, 608. Cic. de Div. 1, 43. 2, 28, & 48. 1, 44. Virg. Æn. 9, 20. Liv. 22, 1. Senec. Q. N. 1, 14. 7, 20. Hor. Od. 1, 34, 5, &c. This was a symbol, says Grotius, (somewhat fancifully,) of the celestial kingdom, which was soon to break through all obstacles.

12. ε\kappa\delta\alpha λει, discedere jubet; as in v. 43. & 4, 25. (Grot.) Simon, Wolf, and Raphel, explain, "emisit, sine illatâ vi," of which many examples may be seen in Schl. Lex. in v. § 9. It is certainly very appropriate, as applied to divine or spiritual influence.

13. ἤν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων. Markland thinks that it only signifies that he withdrew from all human society. "The expression (adds he) seems to have something poetical in it." But this I regard as an unjustifiable curtailment of the sense. These words are added, to more fully describe (for the information, it should seem, of the Romans,) the scene, as being one of the roughest and wildest parts of the desert. (Rosenm. and Kuin.) Wetstein compares Virg. Æn. 3, 646. "Quum vitam in silvis inter desertarum Lustra domosque trah." 

15. πεπληρωται ὁ καιρὸς, adest. Νῦν. Time is said πληροφορθῆαι, partly when it has slipped away, partly when any definite period approaches. So Joh. 7, 8. Luke 21, 24, &c. (Schl. Lex.) Wetstein compares Jos. Ant. 6, 4, 1. ἔξεδχεται τῶν καιρῶν γένεσθαι, πληροθέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ κ. τ. ᾧ. Jos. 7, 8, Acts 7, 23, 30. The time here spoken of is that which, according to the predictions of the Prophets, was to intervene between their days, or between any period assigned by them, and the appearance of the Messiah. This had been revealed to Daniel, as consisting of what, in prophetic language, is denominated seventy weeks, that is, (every week being seven years,) four hundred and ninety years; reckoning from the order issued to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem. However much the Jews misunderstood many of the
other prophecies relating to the reign of this extraordinary personage, what concerned both the time and the place of his first appearance seems to have been pretty well apprehended by the bulk of the nation. From the N. T. as well as from the other accounts of that period still extant, it is evident that an expectation of this great deliverer was then general among them. It is a point of some consequence to the cause of Christianity, that both the time and the place of our Lord’s birth coincided with the interpretations then commonly given of the prophecies by the Jews themselves, his contemporaries.

15. *μετανοεῖτε.* The word denotes, properly, *to change one’s opinion:* secondly, to *so change one’s opinion of any thing as to wish it had been otherwise,* i.e. *to repent;* thirdly, it sometimes (as here) has united with it an adjunct notion of *reformation,* and often signifies no more than such reformation. It denotes such a change of mind and heart as may produce a corresponding change in the conduct.

19. *καταρτίζοντας τὰ δικτυα.* Dr. Campbell seems to make a doubt whether the word *κ* should have the sense of *prepare, make,* or *mend.* He however adopts the latter, because a little fishing-bark is a more commodious place to mend than to make nets. In fact, the proper signification of *κ* requires this. It signifies to restore to a former state what has been disarranged, broken, &c.; to repair, restore, refit; and is used of ships, nets, walls, human bones; and sometimes, metaphorically, to restore (to purity), reform, perfect.


21. Mark here (observes Griesbach) having proceeded to Matth. 4, 21. lays aside that Evangelist, and passes on to Luke, (see Luke 4, 31—44.) since he had resolved to omit Christ’s Sermon on the Mount, which seemed to him too long for insertion in so small a work as the one which he intended to
write, and which, moreover, comprised many things that appertained only to the hearers of that discourse. He also omitted what is to be found in Luke 4, 15—30. namely, the discourse which was held in the synagogue at Nazareth, the accommodation of the passage of Isaiah, and the examples deduced from the history of Elijah and Elisha, with which Mark thought that his readers might very well dispense. (Griesbach.) I must observe that all this is obviously founded on hypothetical speculation, and therefore precarious.

23. ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, with an unclean spirit, having an unclean spirit, as Luke expresses it. ἐν is joined to nouns signifying weights, clothing, virtues, vices, &c. and may be rendered by participles of the same nature with the things signified by the nouns. (Kuин.) Rosenm. observes that the man was an hypochondriac, who, however, had lucid intervals, (otherwise he would not have been admitted into the synagogue,) and was also epileptic; as may be collected from ver. 26. compared with Luke 9, 32, 42. Matth. 17, 15.

24. κα. Hebr. הָאָה, ah, heu. A particle of exclamation, indignation, grief, which often occurs in the Classics, especially the Dramatic writers, and Plato. Wetstein has numerous examples.

24. δὲ άγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ. An appellation applied to all persons consecrated to God, as Teachers, &c. Here it is applied κατ' ἐξοχήν to him who is pre-eminently the Holy One.

26. σπαραγήν αὑτῶν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκαθάρτον. Σπαραγήσειν generally signifies only to tear, rend: but in the present passage, and in 9, 20, 26. Luke 9, 39. it denotes those vehement convulsions and spasms of the nerves, distortions of the limbs, &c. which accompany epilepsy. These are by the Classical writers sometimes called σπαραγμοί, though more frequently σπασμοί. All these symptoms are vividly depicted in the following passage of Aretæus, Capp. de Epilepsia de Cur. 5. ἡ δὲ καὶ σπασμα καὶ διασ-
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27. κατ' ἐξουσίαν, pro imperio: as having self-derived power. For the Jewish exorcists used invocations of the Divine name, to dislodge the demons. But no one had yet done it in his own name. (Rosenm.) Wetstein cites Aristot. Pol. τὸ ἐπιτάττειν ἄρχικατερὸν ἐστὶ.

28. ἐξῆλθε δὲ ἡ ἁ. α. ε. εἰς δὴν τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας. I assent to Dr. Campbell, that our common version, "throughout all the region round about Galilee," is incorrect; as is also that of Beza and others. Indeed, De Dieu and Simon long ago pointed out the real sense of περίχωρον (which was by the Vulgate correctly rendered regionem), and they notice that this use of περίχωρον is found in the Sept. i. e. region, tract, &c. There is therefore no occasion for Bp. Pierce's correction, "rather into the whole region of Galilee, which was round about, i. e. about Capernaum." Still less can I approve of Schlesner's interpretation, "by a metonymy, the people inhabiting the region."


32. ὥσι ἐν ὅ τιμοι. These expressions, like ἀνα-
τέλλεις, &c. are supposed to be founded on the an-
cient and common opinion, that the sun on setting
was immerged in the ocean: especially as that is
the primary sense of δῶ, δῶμ, and their derivatives.
The Jews, we may observe, waited till the sun-set,
and the end of the sabbath, before they would bring
their sick to be healed; since even to communicate
medical assistance (unless the disorder were ex-
tremely dangerous) was thought a breach of the sabbath.

34. οὐκ ἢμι λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια, οτι ἢδεισαν αὐτῶν.
Mr. Markland would remove the comma after δαι-
μόια, and translates, "would not permit them that
they knew him." He notices that this mistake of
οτι is frequent, and instances Matth. 16, 17, 26, 17.
21. Ps. 48, 13, 14. This is evident by the sense,
which is more fully expressed in Luke 4, 41. Christ
did not permit them to confess that they knew him
to be the Messiah. He imposed silence on them;
and was not willing to be publicly saluted as Mes-
siah, lest he should thereby afford occasion for poli-
tical tumults.

36. κατοδίωξαν. The word not only signifies per-
sequi fugientem animo lædendi, but also, insequi pro-
euntem, prosequi, for the purpose of acquiring and
obtaining, cupidè, ardenter sequi. See Heupelius ad
h. 1. and Facius ad Eurip. Orest. v. 412. (Kuin.)

38. εἰς τὰς ἐγκρέμας καμπότεις, neighbouring.
This sense of the word is frequent in the best
writers, and is illustrated by Raphael, Els. Krebs,
Kreb. Loes. Wets. &c. It perhaps thus arises: ἔχεσθαι τίνος, signifies properly, to hold oneself by any thing, to adhere to it, keep close to it, to be close to it, be near it, be neighbouring.

38. κομπότολις, unwalled country towns, in German and Dutch flecken, vlecken: so called as being neither πόλεις nor κώμαι, but something between both, approximating to cities in size and population, but unwalled; something like those of remote antiquity, which Thucydides thus describes in his Preface, I. 5. τροστίτων τέσσαρες πόλεις ἀτείχοστοις, καὶ κατὰ κώμας ὀκονίματοι, such as there were many in Galilee, according to Jos. B. 1, 3, 2. Lightfoot takes them to signify villages which had a synagogue, the Πόλεις were walled towns. Yet Joseph, B. 4, 7, 4 and 5. mentions a κώμη which had walls. The word κομπότολις is chiefly used by the later Greek Geographical and Topographical writers, ex. gr. Strabo, Ptolom. J. Malold, Isidore, &c. from whom examples are adduced by Wetstein.

43. ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν. Euthymius has well explained this ἀπέλυσε, “despatched him quickly.” (Doddr.)

45. μὴ δύνασθαι—εἰσελθεῖν, could not, from the press of the crowd, enter without inconvenience and difficulty. Grotius remarks on the moral sense of δύναμα, by which is signified, not what is simply impossible, but what is so secundum quid, &c.
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2. ἐδόλαξε τῶν λόγων. The Commentators for the most part, take the word λόγος here κατ’ ἐξοχήν. Euthymius, however, supplies τῆς δίδασκαλίας, which comes to the same thing.

3. παραλυτικῶν—τεσσάρων. He was conveyed by four persons, one having hold of each limb. Wetstein compares Lucian. D. M. 4, 2. οἰκέταις τετράσιν ἐπικεκυμφώτα—ἐμψυχών τινα τάφου. Thus in the Somnium of Lucian, § 13 (cited by Bulkley.) Φορᾶν ὑπὸ τεττάρων κεκομίσμενον. So also, Galen (ap. Wets.)
where mention is made of a patient carried in a sheet by two persons, one at each end.

3. ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην. In the interpretation of this passage considerable difficulties have been found; to remove which, most recent Commentators have resorted to the mode of interpretation adopted by Dr. Shaw (in his Travels); a statement of which may be seen in Elsley. I must, however, observe, that it appears to me to do some violence to the Greek words, from which I cannot see how any such sense as he inculcates, can be elicited. His hypothesis requires that we should take ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ἐξορύσσαντες of “throwing back and removing a veil or tent cloth, under the shelter of which they were sitting, in the inner court.” But where, I ask, has στέγη the sense of veil, ἀποστεγάζω to withdraw, and ἐξορύσσω to throw back? I would rather encounter any difficulties to be found in the common interpretation, than admit such a violent method of removing them. Doddridge’s paraphrase of ἐξορύσσαντες is quite inadmissible. To the hypothesis of Lightfoot, Whitby, &c. I see no objection, except that what they tell us about the trap-door is gratis dictum; there being no mention, nor even allusion to it in the text: nay the color orationis seems adverse to it. The case seems plainly to have been this; not being able to approach Jesus, because of the crowd, they ascended to the flat roof (see Luke), by the outer stairs; (compare Matth. 24, 7. Mark 13, 15.) and uncovered the roofing, whether of tiling or thatching, including the lath and plaster (about the place where Jesus sat, and having pulled it away, let down the couch by the orifice, διὰ τῶν κεράμων.)

* Ἐξορύσσαντες will imply perfidientes, digging and scooping out an orifice. Διορύσσα, would have been more proper; it is used of digging or scooping out. So Herodot. 7, 23. and 116. D. Cass. 999. Xenoph. ΕΕον. 19, 4. It has often joined to it ὁφαλμοῦς. Wetstein cites Thucyd. 4, 48. διελόντες τὴν ὄροφην. Plut. 264. d. διαί τοῖς τεθνάναι φήμισθέντας ἐπὶ ξένης γεννῆς καὶ ἐνανάλωσιν. οὐ δέχονται κατὰ θύραν, ἀλλὰ τῷ κεράμῳ (the tiling, the roof,)
In all this I see no difficulty; certainly no objection ought to be raised (as is done by Woolston, &c.) at the damage occasioned, which, with any tolerable care, and considering the slight structure and thin roofing (which was chiefly thatch) of the houses in Eastern Countries, could not be great.

8. ἐπιγνώσα — τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ, i. e. by his divine nature as Son of God, and of divine origin, who had authority as well to forgive sins as also to know the human heart. 1 Cor. 2, 10. (Wets.) This opinion was long ago maintained by some ancient interpreters (see Theophyl.) and is learnedly supported by Grotius: yet there seems something harsh and far-fetched in their mode of explication. Hence the best recent Commentators, as Campbell, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, explain ἐπιγνώσα τῷ πνεύματι in himself. I cannot however, agree with Rosenm. and Kuinoel; that the words are redundant. I rather assent to Campbell, who thinks they signify, that our Lord did not, in this case, as in others, derive his knowledge from the ordinary and obvious methods of discovery, which are open to all men, but from peculiar powers he possessed, independently of every thing external.


12. ἐναυτίον πάντων. Lightfoot renders ἐναυτίον contra. I prefer the interpretation of Beza, Piscator, L. Brug. coram, in the sight of. This usage occurs frequently in the O. T.; but it is not, as some think, a mere Hebraism. It is found in Xenoph. ΟΕκ. 3, 1. Thucyd. 6, 25. So Palaiaret cites Isocr. and Polyænus.

14. παράγων, passing by. When he had come to the quarter which bordered on the sea, or lake of
Gennesareth, he had to go out by the maritime gate, at which was undoubtedly situated the custom-house, though the house of the receiver was in the middle of the city. (Rosenm.) See Matth. 19, 9 seq.

14. Λευὶ τῶν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου. I assent to the opinion of most Interpreters, that by this Levi, son of Alpheus, is meant Matthew. (See Matth. 9, 9.) But some MSS. and with them Victor Antiochenus, in his unpublished Commentaries on Mark, cited among the rest, by Cotelerius ad Constit. Apost. T. 1. p. 109. et Millio. read: εἷς Ἰάκωβος τῶν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου. Those who think that Levi and Matthew were two different persons, could scarcely, nay, I shink, by no means determine who the former could be? Various conjectures may be seen in Wolf in curis. Compare Michaelis on this passage, who is of opinion that Levi was one of the seventy Disciples, not the twelve Apostles, and that his father was not the same person mentioned in Matth. 10, 3. Mark 3, 18. Luke 6, 15. Act. 1, 13. (Rosenm.)

16. ίδοντες αὐτῶν ἐσθίοντα, i.e. understanding that he was eating, for they were not present. See Note on the parallel passage of Matth.

18. αἰ σου μαθηταῖ. The dative for the genitive: as in the best writers. See Krebs.

19. μὴ διώναται. Palaiaret regards the διώναται as redundant; and offers several examples. On the force of this phrase Whitby has copiously treated. The result of his dissertation is, that it is used on any reasonable obstacle or hindrance, though far short of impossibility. Thus, first, if the thing requested be incongruous or improper, as Luke 11, 7; 2dly, if it leads to a violation of any rule of law or equity, as Deut. 12, 17. Act. 10, 47; 3dly, if it be not agreeable to the divine counsel, as Matth. 26, 42; 4thly, if any inconvenience arises, or other employment impedes it, as Mark 3, 20; 5thly, if there is any defect or fault in the object, as Christ could no mighty works because of their unbelief, Mark 6, 5; 6thly, if there is a disposition averse to it, Gen. 37, 4.
John 14, 17. (Whitby.) Campbell also well remarks; that in a subject such as this, relating to the ordinary manners or customs which obtain in a country, it is usual to speak of any thing, which is never done, as of what cannot be done; because it cannot, with propriety, or without the ridicule of singularity, be done. (Campbell.)

21. ἐὰν οὖν ἔρχεται τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ κανών τοῦ παλαιοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ κανών τοῦ νέου, ἡ ἐν τῷ νέῳ, ἐπεξεργασμένῳ μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν τῷ κανών, ἢ ἐν τῷ νέῳ, ἢ ἐν τῷ κανών; ἢ ἐν τῷ νέῳ, ἢ ἐν τῷ κανών (Campbell.)

22. καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέων, &c. So, I believe, it should be printed. Εἰκεῖν is to be understood (out of ver. 19.) after καὶ. By the old garment, ver 21. may be meant the Jewish Church; by the piece of new cloth, any ordinance or injunction of Jesus; in this
place, for instance, that of fasting: so that the words, when stript of the allegory, may seem to contain this sense. (v. 21.) "The present established Jewish Church being grown old, and, εἴγος ἄφανσῳ, made to disappear, at this time to make additions, and publish new injunctions concerning particular points of discipline, would be the same thing as if a man should patch an old garment with a piece of new cloth; for as the new cloth, being stronger, would tear the garment, and make it in a worse condition than it was before, so new injunctions from me would at present only hurt your Church, by discovering the weakness of it, and its members, in each particular point, before the proper time. Nor would such injunctions be less hurtful (ver. 22.) to my disciples; for being habituated to a different kind of life, it would be at present as improper to lay upon them the more austere exercises of religion, as it would be to put new wine into old and decayed leathern vessels, or skins; for as the skins would be burst by the fermentation of the wine, and the wine itself be spilt, so my disciples could not undergo these severities, but would leave me, and would be lost, my precepts being rendered ineffectual. But let them stay till they have received strength, and are renewed by the Holy Spirit, and then, when they are become new vessels, the new wine may be put in them without danger." The common interpretation which Commentators give to these two verses together belongs to the latter only. (Markland.)

26. παραπορεύεσθαι — διὰ τῶν σπορίματ. Abresch, Palairet, and Krebs, would render, "to pass by near the corn fields," for to pass thorough them, he thinks, must have done such injury as Jesus would not have permitted. But this sense of διὰ is unheard of: and there is no difficulty in supposing that they passed through the corn fields by regular and appointed paths left for that purpose; as is frequently the case in all the uninclosed parts even of our own country.

28. τῶν πουείν is the same as ἔδωκεν (which is read
in Theophrastus), or ποιεῖται. For the distinction between the use of the active and the middle verb, in this, as well as in many other instances, is not observed by the more recent, and especially the Hellenistic, writers. Ὄδοιοιεῖται is cited from Herodot. 7, 42. by Wetstein.

25. ὅτι κρείων ἐσχε, of food. Mark adds this, on purpose that he might refer a special or particular example to a general order, which is this: "that ritual laws lose all force of obligation, when a necessity sufficiently pressing urges."

26. ἔγι Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως. On this controverted passage there has been much discussion. The opinions of the older Commentators are summed up by Wolf, Kuinoel, and Elsly. I must commence by observing, that those who (as Beza and others) would throw out the passage as an interpolation, cut the knot, which may, I think, be untied. The hypotheses of Macknight and Michaelis are far-fetched, and inadmissible. The solutions founded on some peculiar significations of ἔγι seem to be at best very precarious: that which attributes the sense before to ἔγι is false. I am, at present, inclined to agree with Owen, who renders it, about the time of; which, by a little latitude, may mean a little before, as in Matth. 1, 1. ἔγι τῆς μετωκερίας Βαβ. Drusius and Bolten regard it as a slip of the memory, and indeed it is observed by G. Ashby, ap. Bowyer, "that history was not formerly discriminated so nicely as now, when few wrote or read." But this would be treating the Evangelist as a mere historian, and that neither very intelligent, nor accurate. I do not, however, altogether reject the opinion of those Commentators, (among whom are Kuinoel and Heumann,) who maintain that the father and the son had two names, and that the father was also called Abiathar. For Abiathar is called son of Abimelech in 2 Sam. 8, 17; and in 1 Chron. 18, 16. Abimelech son of Abiathar. That many Jews bore one, or even two surnames, is certain.
This will permit the ἐὰν to be taken in its frequent sense of sub, scil. tempore.

27. τὰ σάββατα—σάββατον. There is a similar gnome ascribed to Solon by Plutarch. Vit. Sol. 22. τοῖς πράγμασι τοὺς νόμους, μᾶλλοι ἴ ἄ τα πράγματα τοῖς νόμοις προσαρμόζειν.

27, 28. Grotius and Campbell would take ὦδο τοῦ ἀνθρώπου for any man. For (says Campbell) as the last words are introduced as a consequence from what has been advanced, the son of man here must be equivalent to men in the preceding, otherwise a term is introduced into the conclusion which was not in the premises.” But he is completely mistaken. I must refer my readers to the note on Matth. 12, 8. Rosenmuller very properly interprets “Messiah,” and thus paraphrases: “The Sabbath is an institution for the recreation of man. But man was not therefore created that he might, on every seventh day, rest from all anxious labour.” This being the nature of the Sabbath, what follows in v. 28. will hold true, namely, that it is placed in the power of the Messiah to dispense with the observance of it. See Olearius, upon Matth. ap. Wolf. in loc. who thus determines the connection. Ὁστε, however, need not be rendered therefore, but thus. So Aristot. ap. Bulkley; so also Bengel ap. Koecher. p. 550. sup.

CHAP. III.

VERSE 1. ἐξηραμμένη ἔχειν τὴν χείρα, in which the vital juices’ radical and natural moisture had evaporated. This was called an atrophy. See the note on Matth. 12, 9.

2. παρετήρειν αὐτὸν. The verb παρατηρεῖν denotes properly to keep one’s eyes fixed upon (παρὰ) any objects, and, from the adjunct, to watch, whether for good, (as in Philo. 781. τ. Theophr. ch. 7, 2. cited by Loesner, and Xen. Mem. 9, 14, 4.) or, for evil, as here, and indeed generally. Abundant examples are produced by the Philologists.
3. ἔγειραι εἰς τὸ μέσον that the very aspect of the poor wretch might soften their hearts. For ἔγειραι the most ancient MSS. have ἔγειρε, where it is necessary to supply ἐκαυτῷ, siste te. (Rosenm.)

4. ἀγαπαῖσαι—κακοποίησαι. "In the style of Scripture, the mere negation of any thing is often expressed by the affirmation of the contrary. Thus, Luke 14, 26. not to love, or even to love less, is called to hate; Matth. 11, 25. not to reveal, is to hide; and here, not to do good, when we can, is to do evil; not to save, is to kill. Without observing this particularity in the Oriental idiom (of which many more examples might be brought), we should be at a loss to discover the pertinency of our Lord's argument; as the question about preference here was solely between doing and not doing. But from this, and many other passages, it may be justly deduced, as a standing principle of the Christian ethics, that not to do the good which we have the opportunity and power to do, is, in a certain degree, the same as to do the contrary evil; and not to prevent mischief, when we can, the same as to commit it." (Campbell.)

5. μετ’ ὀργῆς. Anger is not, as the Philosophers define it, ὁρεῖς ἀντιλυτίζεσον, a desire of revenge, but a displeasure of the mind, arising from an injury done or intended to ourselves or others, with a desire to remove the injury. (Whitby.) Sartorius, in a dissertation whether the ὀργή is here to be taken propriè or impropriè, has proved that Christ was really affected with anger. (Koecher.) Hence we may learn (says Whitby), that anger is not always sinful, being found in him who had no sin. But though Christ was angry with the Pharisees, yet it was not accompanied with a desire to avenge their sin upon them, but rather with compassion and a desire of removing it.

5. συλλυπούμενος. Συλλυπούμενος has not here the same signification as συμπάσχων. It rather signifies commotus (as in Ps. 69, 21.), contristatus. Wetstein cites Plato Apolog. ὀργισθεὶς αὐτοίς τούτοις, θείοι μετ' 
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The sensation was a compound of anger, at their desperate malice and incorrigible wickedness, together with commiseration for the calamities which they would thereby bring on themselves. Thus may we learn, while we feel anger at the offence, to pity the offender. (Grot. & Rosenm.)

5. παρωδεῖ, i. e. at their callous and contumacious hearts. Παρωδία properly signifies hardness, such as is contracted in callous skin; παρωδόνθαι signifies occaescere. These words apply both to dullness of intellect and depravity of mind, perversity, as here. See Koppius, on Rom. 11, 8.

8. ἀτό τῆς Ἰδουμαιάς. This country was, at that time, in a great measure, associated in Religion with Judea, as appears from Jos. Ant. 13, 9, 1. The οἱ περὶ Τύρων καὶ Σιδώνων seem to be not the Tyrians, &c. but the Jews, who inhabited the sea-shore on the confines of Tyre and Sidon, which in Luke 6, 17. is called παράλιοις Τύρων καὶ Σιδώνων.

9. ἐπεὶ—ιδα πλοίαριον προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ, “should wait upon.” The word properly denotes continuing in, persevering in, any thing, and sometimes to wait upon. But it is usually said of a person, as in Act. 8, 15. rarely of a thing, as here. There is here a figure of speech, by which things are expressed for persons. There is the same figure in the following passage of Thucyd. 4, 120. διέπλευσε νυκτὸς ἐς τὴν Σκιαίην, τρίπτει μὲν φιλία προσκεκλητή, αὐτός δὲ ἐν κελητία μείζων πλοίῳ περιτυχόντα, ἡ τριψῆς ἁμών αὐτῷ.

10. θεράπευσεν, i. e. had healed. The words ὁστε ἐπιτίπτειν may be thus translated, “the consequence of which was, that they pressed upon him.” Of this word examples are given by Kypk. Munth. and Loesner. So in the parallel passage of Luke 6, 1. ἐπιτείκουσαν αὐτῷ.

10. εἶχον μάστιγας. The word μάστιξ was used metaphorically of every sort of grief, trouble, calamity, punishment, &c. and especially all the more violent diseases, as leprosy, bloody flux, &c.

11. τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκαθαρτα, persons who were
thought to be troubled with an impure, i. e. evil spirit. (Camer. Rosenm. and Kuin.)

11. πνεύματα—προσέπιπτεν—ἐκραγέ. In many ancient and valuable MSS. we read προσέπιπτων—ἐκραγέν. On which Kuinoel makes the following remark, from Fischer and Weller: "The ancient Greeks made nouns of the neuter plural be followed by verbs both singular and plural. The Attics of the middle and more recent ages, however, added to nouns of this gender, verbs in the singular only; but the new Macedonian and Alexandrian dialect recalled that kind of construction of these words which was used by the ancient Greeks; though in familiar writing and conversation they used plural verbs in preference to singular ones." Fischer on Weller.

14. ἔτοιμες δαίδεκα, chose, constituted, appointed. So the Hebr. לועם, in the Sept. 1 Sam. 12, 6. Job 9, 20. The word is, however, sometimes so used by the Classic writers. Pole has cited examples from Herodian and Dion. Hal. Then ἵνα ὅσι μετ' αὐτοῦ signify, "that they might be his perpetual companions." On this formula see the note on Matth. 12, 20.

16. ἐκθέθηκε τῷ Σίμωνι ὄνομα Πέτρον: A brief mode of expression, since ἔτοιμε preceded, to which Ἰάκωβος (v. 17) is referred. The sense is, "He appointed Simon, whom he afterwards called Peter." Kuinoel.

On the names Boanerges, &c. I must refer the reader to Grotius and the other Commentators, or to Elsley.

21. See the parallel passages of Matth. 12, 22. seqq. Luke 11, 14. seqq. from which, if compared with this place, it is manifest that what we read here did not happen immediately after the election of the Apostles. It appears, too, that Mark in his narration left out many circumstances, which he did not find noted in his archetype, and which he himself knew not. (Kuinoel.)
21. ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ’ αὐτῷ. Who we are to understand by the οἱ παρ’ αὐτῷ has been a subject of much discussion. The various opinions are detailed by Erasmus, Bengel, Tillmont, Theophylact, Euthymius, Pole, Wolf, Koecher, and especially by Kuinoel. Wetzstein remarks: "The Jews said that he was a mad man: his relations heard this. And thus the Apostles, whom Jesus had sent, (v. 14.) would be here understood; which is not suitable, since they are mentioned as different persons. The Vulgate has, sui; the Syriac, cognati ejus." The most probable opinion is that of Grot. Beza, Raphel, Albert, Kypke, Campbell, Rosenm. and Kuinoel; that the οἱ παρ’ αὐτῷ are the kinsmen of Christ: (as the Syriac and Ethiopic:) this appears from v. 31, where the thread of the subject (interrupted by the insertion of the passage καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς—ἀκαθαρτῶν ἐχει) is resumed*. Κρατήσαντες αὐτῶν is said not only of laying hands violently, but with friendly intentions. So 2 Kings 4, 8. Mark 9, 27. In reply to the Critics above mentioned, who agree in referring αὐτῶν, not to Jesus, but the multitude, Campbell undertakes to prove that Jesus is the antecedent, from the following reasons: "The same pronoun occurs before in this verse, where it is admitted by every body to refer to him, and not to the multitude, οἱ παρ’ αὐτῷ εξῆλθον κρατήσας αὐτῶν. The interpretation, therefore, which makes it refer to him, though not absolutely necessary, is the most obvious, and the most conformable to the syntactic order. Further, till of

* Campbell, p. 369. in refutation of the hypotheses of Knatchbull, Macknight, and Pearce, observes, that, by the Evangelist's account, they who went out were persons who had been informed of his situation by others. 'Ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ’ αὐτῷ. "Now, what writer of common sense would speak of men's hearing of a distress which they had seen and felt, and in which they had been partakers? For it is said, not of him alone, but of him and his Disciples, that they were so crowded that they could not so much as eat. Nor can the participle ἀκούσαντες, in a consistency with the ordinary rules of construction, refer to any thing but the distress mentioned in the preceding verse."
late, the pronoun here has been invariably so understood by interpreters. Thus the Vulg. *Cum audissent sui, exierunt tener eum.* It must have been *eam* if they had understood it of the crowd, *turbā*, mentioned in the preceding sentence.—With this agree, in sense, all the other translations I know, ancient or modern, Oriental or European, Le Clerc alone excepted. The ancient Commentators, Greek and Latin, shew, not only that they understood the expression in the same way, but that they never heard of any other interpretation. Though, in matters of abstract reasoning, I am far from paying great deference to names and authorities, their judgment is often justly held decisive in matters purely grammatical.”

21. ἔλεγον γὰρ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. It shocks many persons to think that so harsh, so indecent a sentence, concerning our Lord, should have been pronounced by his relations. Several methods have accordingly been attempted for eluding this sentiment entirely, or at least affixing another meaning to the word ἔξεστη. Some translate, “he has fainted;” others, “he wondered;” others, “he has departed.” That those opinions are not new, appears from Euthymius. They are, however, all equally harsh, and exposed to strong objections, which have been ably stated by Campbell, Kuinoel, and others. I am, after all, inclined to accede to the interpretation of the ancient Commentators, adopted also by Hammond, Doddridge, Rosenm. and Schleusner, “he is beside himself;” i. e. as Doddridge translates, “he is transported too far.” The word is used of vehement commotion. It is opposed in 2 Cor. 5, 15. to σωφρονεῖν. In just the same way is μαίνομαι used, for ἐδούσια. Schleusner would supply τοῦ νῦν, or τοῦ φρένειν, and cites many examples. Several also are produced by Wetstein. The difference between the use of the sacred and profane writers is this. The Classical writers almost always use the complete phrase. As εἰς φρένον, in Eurip. Bacch. 848. Or. 1021. Po-
lyb. 15, 29, 7. Or with ἃναρχη, as Eurip. I. Aul. 136. Or with νοῦ, as Eurip. ap. Valck. Diatr. 13. λ. νοῦ κεῖνος ἐξειτήκε τὰς γὰρ ἐν φύσει ὀρθῶς ὀρέως παρείσας κ. τ. λ. Sometimes, however, though very rarely, the elliptical form is used; as in Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 5. Eurip. Frag. Aug. 8, 1. οἷς ἐξειτήκε με. See the note on 2 Cor. 5, 13. To conclude, in the words of Campbell, p. 371: “According to the above interpretation, no signification is assigned to the words which it is not universally allowed they frequently bear; no force is put upon the construction, but every thing interpreted in the manner which would most readily occur to a reader of common understanding, who, without any preconceived opinion, entered on the study. On the contrary, there is none of the other interpretations which does not, (as has been shown,) offer some violence to the words, or to the syntax; in consequence of which, the sense extracted is far from being that which would most readily present itself to an unprejudiced reader. It hardly admits of a doubt, that the only thing which has hindered the universal concurrence of translators in the common version, is the unfavourable light it puts our Lord’s relations in. But that their disposition was, at least, not always favourable to his claims, we have the best authority for asserting.” See J. 7, 5. seqq. I must observe, however, that by taking ἐξειτή in the sense which I have adopted, the conduct of our Lord’s relations will not appear in the unfavourable light in which it has been viewed by many ancient and some modern Commentators. To use the words of Doddridge, “they seem to have feared lest the present fervency of his spirit should be injurious to his health;” and not without reason, for, as Doddridge also observes, “it appears from Luke 6, 12. seqq. that he had sat up the preceding night, and eaten nothing this day, but spent the morning in giving a charge to his newly-chosen Apostles, and the advance of the day in preaching to a vast auditory, and working many miracles.”
29. ἐλασφημένη εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα. The word ἐλασφημένω signifies, properly, to use ill-omened *, and, from the adjunct, abusive and calumnious expressions; chiefly towards men, sometimes towards God; which latter sense, however, is very rare in the Classics. The only example known to me, is that produced by Wets. from Plato de Rep. 2. εἰς θέου βλασφημεῖν.

29. ἐνοχὸς ἐστὶν αἰωνίου κρίσεως. Many Critics (as Grot. Griesbach, Rosenm. and Kuinoel) are of opinion that the true reading is ἀμαρτήματος, since it is supplied by the best MSS. is the more difficult reading, and is that from which the others might easily arise. Kuinoel rightly observes, that ἀμαρτήμα in the Sept. answers to the Hebr. עון and כע, which not only denote sin, but the punishment of sin. Hence it is manifest that κρίσις and κόλασις are glosses. The sense is thus stated by Rosenm. “Non tantum hic punitur induratione, sēpe et poenis aspectabilius, quod Judæis contigit, sed et post hanc vitam suppliciis aeternis. See the note on Matth. 12, 32.

30. ὅτι ἔλεγον—ἐγεῖ. These are the words of the Evangelist, (not of Jesus,) stating the reason why Christ used this threat, namely, because he saw that they acknowledged a divine power to be in him, but, through envy and hatred, were inventing base calumnies, by which to alienate his hearers; perversely, ascribing what was the work of God, to the Devil.

31. Our Evangelist omits Matth. 12, 33—37. because he had read passages similar to those in the Sermon on the Mount, (Matth. 7, 16—20.) which he thought proper not to insert. He omits also 38—45 v. of Matth. 12, because that discourse referred chiefly to the inhabitants of Palestine, and especially the then hearers of our Lord in person. Besides, passages similar to those of Matth. v. 38,

* It is thus opposed to εἰσφήμων.
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39. recur in Matth. 16, 1—4. from which two passages Mark transferred them to his book, Ch. 8, 11, 12. (Rosenm.)

31. The ὄνων has, like our then, the force of an epanalepsis. I must here notice a mistake of Dr. Whitby, where he says St. Chrysostom pronounces the Mother of Jesus guilty of vain glory and madness. Now surely Chrysostom by ἄνως merely meant folly, a signification very frequent in the best Greek writers.

32. ἐξον. These words were not said by the by-standing crowd, but by those whom the relations of Christ had sent in order to fetch him. See Matth. 12, 17. seqq.

33. τέρματες ἐν κύκλῳ τῶν περὶ αὐτῶν καθημένων. Most Commentators interpret thus: "When he had looked around at those who were sitting around." But De Dieu, in his Anim. 170. thinks that the τῶν περὶ αὐτῶν are not to be construed with καθημένων, but taken absolutely for the disciples of Jesus. See the note on Ch. 4, 10. Vitrinæa infers from this passage, that disciples sat during the time of receiving instruction, and (as he thinks) on lower seats, or rather mats, at the feet of their Master, who was seated higher.

CHAP. IV.

VERSE 1. καθῆκατε ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. He did not (says Faber) sit in the sea, but by the seaside. Matt. 13, 1. Therefore he would omit ἐν, or read ἐν τῇ προμη, as ver. 38. Markland would point thus: ὁς τῶν ἐμβαίνα ἐπὶ τὸ πλοῖον, καθῆκατε, ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, "so that he entered into the vessel on the sea, and sat down." But there is no occasion for the conjectures of Faber, nor even for the change of punctuation proposed by Markland. It is merely a brief, and therefore somewhat obscure, expression, which may be thus understood: "So that ascending into a boat, he went out a little way to sea, and
and there* sat and taught." The τὸ πλοῖον here should be rendered the ship, i. e. the one mentioned supra 3, 9.

7. καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκε, i. e. did not yield fruit. This was not necessary to be said of the former seed sown; but here it was with reason expressed, since the first growth justly afforded a hope of a prosperous increase. (Rosenm.)


10. οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν σὺν τοῖς δέδοκα. The best critics are agreed that this denotes (by a metaphor frequent in the Classical writers) the companions, and regular hearers of our Lord, meaning chiefly the seventy disciples.

11. Τρίτω δεδομαί, Wetstein explains, "Vobis ob-tigit."

11. τὰ πάντα γίνεται. Schmid, Beza, and Grotius, have observed that πάντα must here be taken determinatively to the subject matter, (as in 2 Cor. 4, 15. Phil. 2, 21. Col. 3, 8.) all the preceding, the doctrine concerning the Kingdom of Heaven; i. e. (adds Grot.) such as related to repentance, not the arcanum of the Divine dispensations, nor the event of predictions.

11. τοῖς ἔχω, i. e. persons not admitted to confidence, as being those who rarely attended on his preaching. Wetstein, and others, very aptly compare these to the exoteric disciples of the ancient philosophers; which is admirable illustrated in the following passages, cited by Wetstein. Cic. ad Attic. 4, 16. "Aristoteles in iis, quos ἔγωρευκος vocat." De finib. 5, 5. "Duo genera librorum sunt, unum populariter scriptum, quod ἔγωρευκος appellabant: alterum limatius, quod in Commentariis relique-runt." A. Gell. 20, 5. "Huic disciplinæ, quam dixi ἀκροαματικὴν, tempus exercendæ dabat in Lyceo ma-tutinum, nisi quorum ante ingenium, et eruditionis

* Euthymius observes that he sat thus that he might have them all in front of him, and none behind.
elementa, atque in discendo studium laboremque explorasset: Illas vero ἐξωτερικὰς audience eodem loco vesperti faciebat, casque vulgo juvenibus sine defectu præbebant—librosque suos, eorum rerum omnium commentarios, seorsim, divisit, ut alii ἐξωτερικά dicerentur, partim ἀκροαματικά. Quos quum in vulgus ab eo edī rex Alexander cognovisset, literas ad eum misit—non eum recte fecisse, quod disciplinas ἀκροαματικὰs, quibus ab eo ipse eruditus fōret, libris foras editis invulgasset.” Aristot. Eudemio. 1, 8. καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξωτερικοῖς λόγοις, καὶ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν. And 2, 1. and de Rep. 3, 6. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἐξωτερικοῖς λόγοις διαφιλοξέασθαι περὶ αὐτῶν πολλάκις. And 1. ἄλλα ταύτα μὲν ὅσον ἐξωτερικότερα ἐστὶ σκέψεως. Jamblich. V. Pythag. C. 17. where, speaking of the Pythagorean discipline, he has these similar expressions: ἑντὸς συνδόνος ἐπικουρον—And Ch. 18. τοὺς εἰς αὐτῷ καὶ ἐξω διαφιλοξέασθαι ὡσ ἄλλους ἢ τοὺς εἰρημένους ὑπολαμβάνεις προσθέτει. 1 Thess. 4. 11. 1 Cor. 5, 12, 13. Coloss. 4. 5. 1 Tim. 3, 7. Bemidbar, R. 14. quicumque legit versum, qui non est ex. 24. libris, est acsi legeret in libris extraneis—nec habet partem in mundo futuro.

12. ἵνα, for ὅτι. Kuinoel refers us to Matth. 13, 13. and compares 2 Macc. 6, 24. Luke 8, 10. Sap. 18, 9. Glass Ph. Sac. p. 544. See the note on Matth. 13, 13. Μὴ ποτὲ, ut adeo non. Markland renders it ‘so that,’ because of the parallel passage of Matth. 13, 18. οἵτι βλεποντες οὐ βλέπωσιν. The expression seems to be proverbial; and relates to those who might see, if they would use their faculties, that which they now overlook, through inattention and folly. It is used by the Greeks, as in Λέοχυλ. Prometh. of the rude state of mankind before Prometh. taught them the arts of life: Ὅτι πρῶτα μὲν βλεποντες ἐβλεπον μάτη, Κλάκωντες οὐ ἡκουων, ἄλλα ψευδάτων Ἀλέγκασι μορφαίοι, τὸν μακρὸν χρόνον Ἐφιστο εἰκὴ πάντα. So Demosth. contr. Aristagogiton. Or. 1. § 123. τὸ τῆς παρομίας, ὡραντες μὴ ὡρᾶν, καὶ ἄκουοντες μη ἄκουειν. Le Clerc. (ap. Elsly.)
15. ὡς, wherein, in which. So the Latin, ubi for in quo.

19. αἱ περὶ τὰ λαοῖα ἐπιθυμίαι. Muuth, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, take περὶ τὰ λαοῖα for τῶν λαοῖων. So Vatablus, "et caeterarum rerum cupiditates." Περὶ often makes a periphrasis, as does causa. They ad-duce Phil. 104. B. τὰ εἰκόνα καὶ πίθαρα οὐκ ἔχει περὶ ἀληθείας ἐπιστήμην. There is, however, somewhat of obscurity in the expression, which is, perhaps, occasioned by the guarded modesty of the expression; which I cannot find noticed by any other Commentator, but Grotius. Certainly, by the τὰ λαοῖα, are to be understood gluttony, drunkenness and intemperance, and sensuality of every kind.

20. παραδέχονται. Wetstein adds an example of παράδεχομαι, in this metaphorical sense, from Poly- bius.

21. The six following verses are taken from Luke. The preceding, which were derived from Matth. 13, 1—23. correspond to Luke 8, 1—15. Mark, therefore, had compared them with Matthew. But now, in the next following verse of Luke, i.e. 8, 16. he found a parable which united at once, both neatness and brevity, followed too, in vv. 17 and 18, by some gnomes, also very short, but deserving of notice. These three verses therefore, to which he had been as it were guided by Matthew, Mark inserted in his work.

21. μητὶ ἡ λόγχος ἑχεται, is brought. The readings of some MSS. ἔχεται and καίρεται are glosses. In this sense ἐχομαι often occurs, especially in the later Greek writers. Indeed, many examples of verbs neuter put for passives, from writers of all ages, are adduced by Kypke, Raphael, and Palairret. A similar idiom is used in our own language, which however is confined to some particular words, as a letter, so ἐχεται: ἐξουσίαι, in Greek.

21. ὁτὸ τὴν κλίνη. This must not be understood of the lectus cubicularis, bed, but of the lectus triclini- naris, or sofa, which, as Grotius observes, had such a

22. *ο ἐγέρ.* Rosenm. remarks on the Hebrew custom of repeating the same sentiment with a change of words. I add, that the student may consult the Preface to Bp. Lowth's Isaiah, Blayney's Jeremiah, Newcome's Minor Prophets, and what is *instar omnium* (though with a quaint title). The Dissertation of Schoetgen *de Exergasia sacra*, in the second volume of his Hor. Heb.

22. *ο γιγαρ—ἐξάθη.* Rosenm. repeats ὑ after ἀπόκρυφον, and takes ἐγένετο for ἐστίν. Ἀλλ' ἔνα, nisi ut, but what. He then lays down this as the sense. "As in the experience of life even the most secret things at some time become known, so what is now hidden, will shortly be placed in the view of all." This was *fulfilled* by the universal propagation of Christ's doctrine, shortly after his death. Or it may (he thinks) have *this* sense. There is no doctrine so obscurely and figuratively propounded by me, but what you (my disciples), will explain distinctly, and without the involvements of mystery and parable. In Phil. Jud. 941. τὰ ἀφανή, signify *obscure*.

24. ἐλέπτετε τι ἄκουστε, take heed, mind what you hear. Kuinoel thus paraphrases the following words. "The more attentive you shall be in *hearing*, so much the greater progress will you daily make in the *knowledge* of my doctrine." Or it may be thus expressed: "Whatsoever may be the measure of your
attention such shall be the measure of your knowledge. So also Euthymius, Ἐν τῷ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε τὴν προσοχήν, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μετρηθέντες ὑμῖν ἡ γνώσις. Clericus, however, and some others apply it to the Apostles.

24. τοῖς ἀκούοντις, to you who are attentive: as in many other passages; e. g. Matth. 18, 15, 16. The reading of some MSS. πιστεύοντες is a gloss. Indeed, the words τοῖς ἀκούοντις, seem not genuine.

26. Mark, studious of brevity, substitutes another parable, namely, of the sleeping husbandman, remarkable for its brevity and elegance, and more agreeable to the subject of the context, than the parable in Matth. (Rosenm.)

27. καὶ καθεύδη καὶ ἐγείρηται νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν. This is a proverbial expression for “he passes his days and nights.” A very beautiful image of security and freedom from anxiety. So Ps. 3, 6. ἐκοιμήθην καὶ ὠπνεύσα ἐξηγήρθην.

27. αἷς οὐκ οἶδεν. Campbell renders this, “without his minding it.” I should prefer, “how he knows not.” There is an ellipsis of the other member of the ἀπόθος ἄτος, in such a manner as De Dieu and Kuinoel render cum, and compare Luke 4, 25. for in that place, there is the same ellipsis.

28. αὐτομάθη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ. The word αὐτ. properly signifies self-moved. Examples, in abundance, are produced by Raphel, Kypke, Munth, Loesner and Wets., from which it appears to be often used of trees, fruits, and flowers.* The subject is elegantly illustrated by the following passages, cited by Wets. and Bulkley. Simplic. in Epict. C. 38. (cited by Bulkley.) ἀπὸ πυρὸς καλάμη, καὶ βοτάνη, καὶ ἄσταρχες, καὶ τάλιν πυρὸς. Simplic. in Epict. p. 224. τὸ γάρ σπέρμα φυτῶν καταβαλλόμενον ἐπὶ γῆν, τεγγύσεων ὑδάτι βίζας ἀφίησι καὶ βλαστῶσι, εἶτα καλάμην ὄ χ λάδοσ

* So that I cannot approve of Doddridge’s paraphrase, “by a most curious kind of mechanism produces.” He is quite mistaken in saying, that in good authors it is generally applied to artificial machines.
29. ἄποστελλω τὸ δρέπανον. ἄποστελλω is only properly said of persons: it is here used for ἐσβάλλω, or ἄποβάλλω. It may be rendered, "sends the reapers (into the field);" by a metaphor such as we read...
in Joel 3, 13. Apoc. 14, 14, 15. (Bois.) I add a very similar passage of Liban. Or. 20. A. περὶ τὸ λόγον τὸ βέρος ἀναμείνας, οὕτω προσώπιει τὸ δρέπανον. Herodot. 2, 14. στείρας τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἐσβάλλει ἐς αὐτὴν ὅσ. Liv. 2, 5. desertam cum stramento segetem magna vis hominin immissa. Indeed, our own language is susceptible of a similar idiom. These verses, 26, 27, 28, are thus pointed and explained by Markland. οἴς εἰς ἄνθρωπος βάλλῃ τὸν στόρος ἐκ τῆς γῆς, καὶ καθεδώ καὶ ἐγείρηται. νῦντα καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ ὁ στόρος βλαστάνῃ, καὶ μηκένηται, οἳ οὐκ ἔδει αὐτὸς (αὐτοματὴ γαὖ—ἐν τῷ στάχυι) ὅταν δὲ παραδῷ ὁ καρπὸς, &c. Translate, "as if a man should cast the seed upon the land, and go to sleep; and the seed should rise night and day (i. e. continually), and should sprout, and be lengthened, he knows not how (for the earth spontaneously bringeth forth fruit, first a blade, then an ear, then full corn in the ear); but, after that the ripe fruit offers itself, immediately he sendeth forth the reaper, because the reaping-time is come." The like composition see in Matth. 17, 18. Joh. 7, 25, 26. Acts 2, 3, 4. By καθεδώ is meant, does not concern himself further about it, knowing that nature will do the business. So dormio among the Latins. Those who are offended at ὁ στόρος being fetched from the following part, to be the nominative case to ἐγείρηται, are needlessly offended; this composition being very usual in the Scriptures, and in other writers. Ἐγείρηται is rightly said of corn. (Markland.)


33. καθὼς ἔδύνατο. I cannot approve of the interpretation of Grotius, "as they were worthy of hearing it." I greatly prefer the exposition of Chrys. Theophyl. Brug. Pisc. Rosenm. and Kuinoel, "prout erat capaces." Thus, adapting his instruction to the capacity of his hearers, and accommodating himself to their imbecility and prejudices. Compare Joh. 16, 11. 1 Cor.

34. This and the following verse are from Matth. 13, 34, 35. as there Matthew proceeds to add more parables. Mark, as if fatigued *, abandoned his guidance, and betook himself to Luke. (Rosenm.)

34. ἐπέλυε πάντα, explained, gave solutions. So it is used in Gen. 41, 12. of the interpretation of a dream. Many examples from the Greek Classics are adduced by Wetstein, Palairé, and Loesner. Theophylact thus expounds πάντα: "all things such as they were ignorant of, and asked him; not absolutely all things, even such as were plain and obvious." See the note on Matth. 12, 15.

35. In extracting from Luke, Mark had advanced as far as 8, 18; the narration, ver. 19—21. he omitted, because he had already inserted it in his commentarii (ch. 3, 31—35.) in the place and order that he had found it in Matthew. Therefore he returns to the verse immediately following (Luke 8, 22), and then proceeds.

36. παραλαμβάνων αὐτὸν ὁς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. Upon the sense of this passage, there has been much discussion, which has partly arisen from the use of the idioms ὁς ἦν and ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. Several modes of interpreting the passage have during the last century been proposed, only two of which deserve attention; 1. that of Grotius and Elsner, 2. that of Kypke. These, however, are harsh, and liable to objections. I am therefore inclined to agree with Rosenmuller and Kuinoel, in preferring the old interpretation: and shall first answer the objections of Elsner and Kypke, as they are summed up by Campbell, and then support and illustrate the common interpretation:

I. The words are not εἰς τῷ πλοίῳ, but ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. —Answ. But ἐν is very often used for εἰς, of which Kuinoel gives the following examples: 1, 16. Matth. 14, 8. 1 Cor. 15, 19. Esdr. 7, 10. Sir. 42, 12. Vorst.

* Surely not, rather mindful of the brevity which the purpose of his work required.

II. No example of ως ἄρι in this acceptance has been found.—Answ. Kypke has himself produced two, one from Josephus, and the other from Ach. Tat. The εὐνυ and εὐνοι are perpetually interchanged.

III. It does not suit the humble manner in which our Lord travelled.—Answ. That depends upon how we interpret ως ἄρι. Now this formula does not denote, as Raphel and others explain it, “without any preparation;” nor, as Piscator renders it, “tired as he was.” But it is simply used for ἐδοθ, quam celerrime, as it is well rendered by Schlesner. It occurs in Thucyd. and the best Attic writers. This idiom I shall take some other opportunity of fully illustrating. Campbell objects to the circumlocutory expressions, which suppose (he says) such an ellipsis as he can find no example of. But the formula ως ἄρι, or ως εὐνοι, is not a very elliptical one. How the ellipsis is to be supplied can only appear from a careful examination of the circumstances. Now here we may supply the words, “without giving him time for rest, or for refreshing himself after his labours.”

37. λαῖλαψ. The E. V. and Campbell render, “a great storm of wind. So the Germ. sturmwind. It would be better rendered a whirlwind, hurricane, turbo; for the Lexx. explain it by συστροφη, and Arist. de Mundo, λαῖλαψ, πρώιμα βίαιν, καὶ εἰσοψίμενον κάτωθεν ἄνω. It seems derived from λαῖ, very, and λαῖπτω, to snatch, take off, carry away. Ἐπεβαλλευ, rushed impetuously upon.

38. ἐπὶ τῇ πρώμη, which was the place of the pilot, or steersman, as Grot. remarks. There is no reason to suppose, with Michaelis, that Jesus was himself the steersman. There could be no need (thinks Kuinoel) of a steersman, to a little fishing-bark such as could navigate the lake of Gennesareth. There, however, I can scarcely agree with him.
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38. ἐπὶ τῷ προσκεφάλαιον, on a pillow. (E. T. and Campbell.) The article has a peculiar force, denoting a particular part of the furniture of the ship. It seems to have been a leather stuffed cushion. It is certain that προσκεφάλαιον not only denoted a pillow (for the head), but a cushion (to sit upon).

39. ἐπετίμησε—μεγάλη. See the note on Matth. 8, 26 & 27.

CHAP. V.

The contents of this chapter are found partly in Matth. 8, 28. seqq. but partly in another place and order, and sometimes in fewer words. He who compares the three Evangelists will easily see that Mark derived all this matter not from Matthew, but from Luke. See Luke 8, 26—56. (Rosenm.)

Verse 2. ἐξελόντι αὐτῷ. We may here observe the redundancy of the pronoun. A pleonasm usual both in the ancient, and even the modern, languages.

2. ἀνθρωπος. It is the opinion of Wetstein, that Mark only speaks of one, because a mention of two would have added little to the power of the thing, and would have afforded occasion to dubious questions; since the mad and the blind do not usually associate. (Compare 10, 46.) This, however, seems a very precarious remark.

3. ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις. The best MSS. read μνήμασι. These sepulchral monuments were, according to the Oriental custom, erected singly in solitary places, or at least apart from the public roads. Such vaults, &c. would be no indifferent shelter for maniacs. Indeed, we find from D. Laert. 9, 38. ἐρημόσων ἐνοτε καλ τοῖς τάφοις ἐνδιάτριβον, that they formed no contemptible habitations, and were sometimes used as such.

3. 4. οὗτος ἀλώςεσθαι—δαμάσαι. The sense is, that not even chains and fetters, such as had hitherto been made, were found strong enough to hold him. It seems that strait-waistcoats had not yet been in-
vented. But the reader may consult Beckman. Pedal, properly, denotes fetters, and ἄλωσεις manicae. handcuffs.

5. κατακόπτων ἔωςιν λίθοις. This is very wrongly rendered by some, "lapidibus offendi solitus." In fact, it is usual for maniacs to cut and tear their flesh with whatever they can lay their hands on. So Pau- san. Lacon. (cited by Wetstein), says of one of these poor wretches, ἐτίτρωσκε αὐτὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ διεξῆς τὸ σώμα ἄταν, κόστων τε καὶ λυμαίνομενος. To the circum-
stance of maniacs cutting and tearing their flesh there is an elegant allusion in Justin. 13, 6, 17. (cited by Wetstein): "Macedonia, in duas partes discur-
rentibus ducibus, in sua viscera armatur: ferrumque ab hostili bello in civilem sanguinem vertit, exemplo furentium manus et membra sua ipsa cæsura." It is said κατ. ἐως. λίθοις, because knifes, &c. he would of course be debarmed from using. To maniacs, however, as well as to all who know not the use of iron, sharp stones usually supply its place. So Arrian. Indic. 24,
9. τὰ δὲ ἄλλα τοῖς λίθοις τοῖς ἐξέστιν ἐκοπτόν, στόμος γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὡς ἰν. This, indeed, is general among the American Indians.

7. ὅρκις σε τῶν Θεῶν, I conjure thee. Ὅρκις here, and in some other places, does not imply the exaction of an oath, but only signifies religionem injicio, i. e. obsecro, I entreat you. (Rosenm.) See the note on Matth. 26, 62. and also Grot. ap. Elsley.

7. µὴ µὲ βασανίζῃς, i. e. by compelling me to de-
part from the man. On βασανίζω, and the expression µέγιστον Θεῶν, see Hamm. Whitby, Doddr. and Grot.
ap. Elsly. See also Wets.

9. τί σοι ἴσομαι; Names are only in use amongst creatures who have the gift of speech. Yet good
and bad spirits, have names in Scripture; as given by
men, or assumed by the spirits, to accommodate
themselves to men. (Le Clerc.) Dr. More and Leigh
think that Christ did not ask as being ignorant, but
that from the answer of the demoniac the multitude
of demons with which he was possessed might
appear, and thus the extreme urgency of the case might be made evident, and the dignity of the miracle, and the power of the worker, be thus elevated. Rosenmuller, however, thinks that Jesus addressed the man and not the devils, and merely meant to ask the demoniac his name. Both he and Kuinoel agree that the demoniac did not know his name. To this purpose Wetstein has cited two passages from Plaut. Captiv. 3, 4, 15. Hic homio rabiosus habitus est in Aulide. 28. Suum ipse interdum ignorat nomen; neque scit, qui sit. And ΑΕν. 4, 469. Kuinoel thinks that he answered suitably to the fixed idea which occupied his mind (see the Commentators on Matth. 8, 28); and thus answered λέγεων, by which he meant to say that he was the commander of the legion of devils, i.e. Satan. For the Jews (who derived from the Romans the word legion) not only used it of a considerable number, but of one the chief of many. See Buxt. Lex. Talm. in v. Kuinoel thinks it not necessary to recede from the more usual signification (a great number), on account of what follows.

12. Πέμψων Ἰμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους. Markland would render it, "to, or toward the swine," for otherwise there would be no necessity for adding, "that we may enter into them." Rosenmuller, too, seems to coincide with him in opinion. But circumstances are sometimes added for the purpose of explanation, which are not strictly necessary. See Homberg, in loc.

13. ἐπνιγόντο. The E. V. renders choked, Doddridge suffocated. I should prefer drowned. In fact, our word drown comes from the Sax. drunenian. Parkhurst compares Jos. B. 4, 7, 5. Though here (from the immense number) many were doubtless strangled and squeezed to death. Wetstein appositely cites Plut. 2, 559. Ε. καθάπερ ἀκόλουθα οἰνημένοις ἐπιχειρήσατε βοηθεῖν, περιτελκόμενα καὶ συγκολάβωντες.

14. ἐξηλθον ἴδειν τί ἐστι το γεγονός. Wolf and Wet-
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stein compare Palaephet. 32. ἔδωραςαν τι ἄν εἴη τὸ γεγονός.

15. τοὺς δαίμονίσμους. Markland conjectures δε-

δαίμονίσμους, or δαίμονιστὰ, on account of the ἐρ-

χυκὸτα following. But no change is necessary. The

participle present stands also for the imperfect,

though this is not a frequent use.

15. ἠματισμένον. A very rare word, which also oc-
curs in Luke 8, 35.

15. ἑφαρμίσθησαν. They thought that the presence

of Jesus would occasion some greater calamity. The

present they accounted a punishment inflicted for

their sins, by the Messenger of God. See 1 Reg. 17,

18. (Doddr. and Kuin.)

18. ἑνα ἕ μετ’ αὐτῶ, become his follower and disci-

ple. See Matth. 4, 29, 30. The man too might be

afraid (as Theophylact suggests, with the approbation

of Grotius), lest on the departure of Jesus, he should

again fall under the power of the devils. But Christ

wished to evince, that, whether present or absent,

he can protect those who trust in him.

19. ἄναγγειλαν. Among the Jews, Christ forbid

his works to be told, in order (says Maldonati) to

avoid the envy of the Pharisees. (Matth. 8, 4.)

Here, among Gentiles, who kept swine, he permitted

it. (Wetstein.) Christ wished some report of his

works to extend even to the Gentiles; thereby to

prepare their minds for the admission of the divine

doctrine which was to be announced to them. (Mal-

don. Rosenm. and Kuin.) Hedinger and Koecher

think this was done in order that it might reach the

ears of the Nazarenes, and put them to shame for

their ill-treatment of Jesus.

22. ἀρχισυναγώγων. Hammond has here a very

copious and instructive annotation, to which I can

only refer the reader.

23. ἔσχατως ἔχει, is in great danger. The phrase

ἔσχατως ἔχει, εἴναι, διακεῖσθαι, and ἔσχατος, used of

disorders, occurs in the best writers. See Wets.

Els. Heup. Kypke, and Münth. So the Latin, "in
ultimis esse,” which occurs in Petronius; and Apul. Met. 1. (cited by Wets.) “ultimò affectus;” as we should say, “at the last gasp.”

23. ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς α. τ. χ. Ἐλθὼν is pleonastic, according to the Hebrew idiom. ίνα ἐπιθῆς is well explained by Kypke for the imperative ἐπιθὲς. See Matth. 9, 18. It is not necessary, with Beza and Rosenmuller, to subaud δέομαι σοῦ, or παρακαλῶ σε.

25. οὖσα ἐν ῥόει αἵματος. This use of ἐν seems to savour of Latinism. Thus Wets. cites from Cic. Tusc. 8, 4. “Qui in morbo sunt.” Kuinoel cites from Levit. 12, 7, 20, 18. πηγὴ τῶν αἵματος, where the Hebrew is ריבא ראק. The Hebr. ראק signifies not only a well, but also a fountain, and, metaphorically, an efflux. See J. Damasc. de Idol. I. 3. p. 788. s. f. ἐπείδη δὴ τῶν τάλεως, &c. Mark has πηγὴν. Thus artificial issues are by physicians called fontinells. (Hammond.)

26. καὶ πολλά παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν. Triller cites Cels. 7. Pref. “diu a medicis vexatos.” Reichard (ap. Kuin.) refers this to the ignorance of the physicians, and thinks they had prescribed medicines productive of more torture than the disorder itself. Lightfoot says, that various were the medicines recommended in such a case by the Jewish physicians. That they did harm rather than good, Grotius thinks not strange. For it can hardly be supposed, but that medicines which produce no benefit must be injurious to languid bodies, such as those must be, whose blood is not properly converted to juices. Wetstein thinks that is said, either because they terrified the woman by superstitious remedies, or prescribed bitter potions, &c. There is a sort of paronomasia in πολλὰ and πολλῶν, and to this purpose Wetstein cites the following passages. Plin. H. N. 29, 5. speaking of a monumental inscription: Turba medicorum me perdidit. Menand. πολλῶν ἰατρῶν ἐσόδος μ. ἀπάλεσε. Petron. 42. “At plures medici illum perdiderunt.” It
is archly observed by Æsop. Fab. 31. ἀνδραις τις
πένθος νοσών, καὶ κακαὶς διακείμενος, ἐπειδὴ ἄγελε οὐγίθή
παρὰ τῶν ιατρῶν, διὰ τὸ μηδὲν ἔχειν δόμως αὐτοῖς. See
also Fab. μ. s. and De Furia. in loc.

29. ἐγὼ τ. σ. There is (as Rosenm. observes) a
great emphasis in these words. For, naturally, no
one recovers suddenly from an inveterate malady,
but there will long remain vestiges of the disorder.

30. εἴδεως—ἐξηγοῦσι—δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν. On this
passage there has been much discussion. Some (says
Rosenm.) take the words, as if the power of healing
was diffused over the whole of Christ’s body, so that
it would be little more than a salutare pharmacum.
Le Clerc thought that from this expression, if much
urged, it might be collected that Christ cured the
disorder by an effluvia, which he truly accounts un-
intelligible. In this (continues he) many advert to
what is called magnetism. But he justly observes
that nothing of this sort can be applicable to Christ,
who healed at one touch, &c. I add, that the heal-
ing power in Christ did not depend upon the touch;
since it was often effected without that, and even
when at a distance. Besides, can magnetism raise
the dead? At the same time, it is possible that the
woman fancied that this sanative faculty might re-
side in the body of Jesus, and proceed from thence
on the touch, as a sort of emanation. Rosenm. also
well remarks, that the words are not to be explained
in a physical sense; but imply only that Jesus
knew that he had worked some miracle. Grotius,
Whitby, and others, puzzle themselves, to very little
purpose, in explaining this passage, which, the more
it is pressed, the less intelligible it becomes. The
truth is, that it is a popular mode of speaking, and,
therefore, not to be referred to philosophical prin-
ciples. It simply denotes, that Christ knew that a
miracle had been performed by his power and effica-
cy. Thus there is no occasion to resort to the des-
perate method proposed by Paulus, i. e. to cut out the
words. The story of the statues, said by all, the Ecclesiastical Historians, and J. Damasc. and J. Malela, to have afterwards been erected by the woman, is, now, almost universally rejected. This may, in some measure, be attributed to the arguments produced by Whitby; which, however, are to me not convincing. Nothing can be inferred from the silence of the Evangelists, who omit to mention many things of greater importance, nor from that of Justin Martyr, Origen, Irenæus and Tertullian. How could a woman (he asks), who had spent all that she had, be able to erect two such costly statues, as were sufficient to exhaust the fortunes even of wealthy persons. I answer, we are not told that the woman erected them immediately upon her cure, and afterwards she might (by some means) acquire property sufficient to thus evince her gratitude; for we have no proof that they were so very costly as Whitby represents, i.e. sufficient to exhaust the fortunes even of wealthy persons. His argument, that the unbelieving Jews or Gentiles would have destroyed them before the time of Eusebius, is extremely precarious. As to the story of the miraculously salutiferous herb growing at the feet of the statue of Jesus, I abandon it to the mercy of the critics. I admit that it savours much of Monkish superstition, and is utterly incredible. But I would not therefore disbelieve the story itself, on which the fiction was engrafted.

33. πάσαν τήν ἀληθείαν. The Hebrew יַסִּים, the Greek ἀληθεία, and the Latin veritas, are all used (as the philologists tells us) to denote ipsam rei naturam et rationem. This idiom has been illustrated by Raphel, Schwartz, Hackspan, and especially Wets. who produces numerous examples, of which it will be sufficient to select one or two. Ὅμ. Od. λ. 506. πάσαν ἀληθείαν μυθήσομαι. And II. 407. ἀγε δὴ μοι πάσαν ἀληθείαν κατέλεξα.

34. ἀπεγε εἰς εἰγήνην. A literal translation of the Hebr. דַּלְשֵׁשׁ יַלְשֵׁשׁ, which has been thus rendered by the Sept. in 1 Sam. 1, 17. 2 Sam. 15. but in Jud. 18,
5. and Exod. 4, 18. agreeably to the Greek idiom, εν εἰρήνῃ. (Kuin.)
35. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισωμαχοῦ, (i.e. τίνες,) from the house of. Examples are produced from Joh. 18, 20. Ter. Ph. 4, 6, 5. Heaut. 2, 2, 6. Hec. 5, 1, 8. See Glass. Phil. Sacr. p. 1470.
38. ἀλαλάζωντας. From ἀλάλα, a shout; and to this source we may refer the English hallow. The original Hebrew word, הִלָּה, seems to be an onomatopeiomenon. The word ἀλαλάζω is properly said of the shout uttered by soldiers before the battle, for the purpose of terrifying the enemy, and exciting the courage of their comrades. See Xen. Ages. 2, 10. H. Gr. 4, 8, 10. Not unfrequently, however, the word was used of any shout, or vociferation, whether expressive of joy, or sorrow. See Spanih. on Julian. Cæs. p. 238, seqq. Hutchinson on Xen. Cyr. 3, 2, 9. So ἀλαλάζων, in the sense of lamentare, in Eurip. Electr. 848. ἠποκαίρην, ἠλαλάζη. And Jer. 25, 34. ἀλαλάζεστε τοιμένες. And 47, 2, καὶ ἀλαλάζουσιν ἄγιντες. Therefore there was no occasion for Beza to propose changing ἀλαλάζων to ἀλαλάζειν. It is remarked by G. Ashby (from Chandler and Husselquist) that the Asiatic women have the same shrill voice both for sorrow and joy.
40. ἐκβάλλων ἄγιντας, παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέφα. We may observe that he retained just so many as were sufficient to prove the reality of the cure; to have permitted the presence of more, might have savoured of ostentation. Παραλαμβάνει signifies assumit, takes to him (as witnesses).
42. ἐξέστησαν ε. μ. They were exceedingly astonished. The word is well illustrated by Rosenm. from Phil. p. 515. ἔστασις ἐστὶ ἡ σφόδρα κατάληψις ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐπικυναίως καὶ ἀπροσδοκητώς συμβαίνειν εἰσοδοχιᾷ.
43. διεστελλότοις αὐτῶς, charged them, i.e. the parents, (see Luke 8, 56.) whom he ordered to give food to the maid, that it might be apparent that she had not only returned to life, but was also restored to perfect health. Jesus did not, however, impose
perpetual silence on the parents, for the thing could not be kept secret, since many had heard the father supplicating Jesus, and had heard the tidings of the death of his daughter, and the hired mourners had attended at the very bed on which the maid lay; (Matth. 9, 23,) but he only forbade them to immediately divulge the circumstance, in order that he might avoid the multitude of people that would gather together at the house, and not afford any occasion for political commotion. (Kuin.)

CHAP. VI.

VERSE 1. The six first verses of this Chapter are taken from Matth. 19, 53—58. We before remarked, on Ch. 3, 4. that Mark, finding more parables in Matth. 13. than he could adopt, had recourse to Luke. But since he had especially chosen Matthew as his guide, in committing to paper the memorabilia Christi, he now returns to that Evangelist, indeed to the very place where those parables are concluded, i. e. at Matth. 13, 53, 54. Meanwhile he does not entirely neglect Luke, but diligently compares him with Matthew. Hence some portions are taken from one, and some from the other. (Rosenm.)

5. ο限期 θησαυρεύει ουδεμιαν δυναμιν τοιησαι. There has been not a little discussion on the sense of this passage. Some Commentators (and among the rest Kuinoel) adopt the interpretation first (I believe) proposed by Hornius, and take θησαυρεύει τοιησαι for ο限期 εποιησε, as in Matth. 12, 58. Others, however, (more rightly,) take θησαυρεύει for voluit. In the Greek, δωραθαι is sometimes put for βελειν, as posse for velle in the Latin; and in our own language, shall and will, and should and would, are, in certain idioms, interchanged. Others again (as Le Clerc), pressing more closely on the proper signification of δωραθαι, explain thus: “He could not, consistently with the rules on which he acted in performing miracles, work them then. For (as Whitby observes) Christ
still requiring faith in the patient, where this was wanting, they wanted that condition which only made it fit that he should do the miracles.” Thus, as Hierocles says, in Aurea Carmina, v. 8. (cited by Le Clerc,) τῷ τῆς προαιρέσεως οὐ τῆς φύσεως μέτρω τῆς δύναμιν κανονίζει. So the Greeks use δύνασθαι and ἀδυνάτειν for our making our reason a law to us, which does not permit us to act improperly. The passage is thus explained by Euthymius: Πῶς οὖν ἔστεν, ὥστε οὐκ ἴδονατο; διότι ἀδυνάμιαν ὑμομάζειν εἰσβάλλομεν, οὐ μόνον τὴν ἔλειψιν τῆς δυνάμεως ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἐμποδίσμον τῆς οἰσίν ὅτε τῶν αἰτιῶν, ἀστερ καὶ νῦν; ἐνεποδίζε γὰρ αὐτῷ ἡ ἀπεισία τῶν εὐεργετομένων, οὐκ ἴδονατο οὖν, ἀλλ᾽ τοῦ, ἐνεποδίζετο καὶ οὐκ ἐδει βιαίως εὐεργετεῖν αὐτῶς. Thus Dr. Bentley, at Boyle’s Lectures, Serm. 6. observes, that “our Lord could do no mighty works in a country of unbelievers, because it was not fit and reasonable that he should.” The circumstances of the case are thus judiciously stated by Kuinoel: “Mark shows what a powerful effect the doctrine and language of Christ had on the minds of his adversaries; for they were first struck with wonder; then, however, growing more composed, were actuated by envy, and, in order to bring Christ into contempt, they said, with a malicious smile, τὸδε τωτῷ οὐτάτα, κ. τ. λ. Luke, on the other hand, first shows what an effect the doctrine and language of Christ had on the minds of all his hearers, and then recounts what was said by those that envied him.

6. ἑβαύμαζε. Whitby compares the case of the centurion, Matth. 8, 10. It was certainly (observes he) in their power, as in the centurion’s, to believe or not; and faith was not produced by an omnipotent act of God on those who believe, or Christ would not have had in either case any ground of expressing his admiration. But I conceive that there is here expressed not so much admiration as indignation, in which sense it is used in the best Greek writers, ex. gr. Thucyd. 6, 36. The word is
explained by Reiske in his Index Demosth. "Cum admiratione et indignatione interrogare."

7. ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο. An idiom formed upon the genius of the Hebrew language, in which the distributives are wanting.

8. εἰ μὴ πάδδον μάνων. Matthew says, μηδὲ πάδδον, which Grotius explains of the staff with which they were walking; and that no other should be packed up to supply its place. Wetstein understands it as if one staff only were to be taken for two persons. Le Clerc explains it thus: "You need not provide staves on purpose; but those who usually bear them may take them." But this is very harsh and far-fetched. Bowyer better interprets it: "Go as ye are; take no other coat, shoes, or staff." In fact, it merely denotes, "makes no anxious provision beyond the usual requisites for a journey."

18. ἡλειφον ἡλαι. In the countries of the South and East, the oil is very mild, and was used by the ancients (especially by Jews) for the cure of various disorders. So Cels. de Med. 2, 14. Galen, Comm. 4. in Hippocrates. Cæl. Aurel. See Hieros. Berach, f. 8, 1. and Schabb, f. 14, 8. Wets. on Luke 10, 34. Light. H. H: on Matth. 6, 17. and this passage. See also Jos. Bell. C. ult. Many Interpreters maintain that the oil here mentioned was used as a medicine, with which the Apostle cured the sick. So Kuinoel, Schutz, Michaelis, Paulus, Pott on James 5, 15. and (as it seems) Wetstein. I rather agree with the older Commentators and Rosenm. that the healing was miraculous, and that the anointing was only a symbolical action, typical of the relief and joy imparted by Divine assistance. The first Christians, (says Grotius,) who were accustomed to practise, in visible signs, the allegorical allusions in the Scriptures, used oil in their rites; as at baptism, and on the imposition of hands which succeeded it. Thus St. Paul, 2 Cor. 1, 21. and 1 Joh. 2, 20, 27. speaking of the unction of faith, or of the spirit. The Christians used oil in the ordination of
priests (says Tertullian); and in re-admission of heretics. As the art of medicine (observes Willan ap. Elsley) was practised among the Jews by the priests and prophets, its remedies became partly sacred; and unction in dangerous cases became a religious ceremony, with imposition of hands, and prayers for the sick. See Deyling. Obs. P. 8. n. 48. and Wolf in loc.


19. ἔνείχεν αὐτῷ, was angry with him. So Hesych. ὀργῆτα. So Herodot. 6, 119, 3, 27. where see Wesseling. See Wets. who compares Luke 11, 53.

20. συνερήσας αὐτῷ|. The E. V. renders, “observed him.” Whitby, “observed him, and regarded his sayings.” And so Lamy and Grotius: yet Wets. and Koecher have truly observed, that for this sense there seems no sufficient authority. Grot. thinks it it may be taken in the pluperfect. But this would be somewhat harsh. Rosenm. renders, “coelebat eum,” citing (from De Rhoer) D. Laert. Examples from the Hellenistic writers would be more apposite. I assent to Hamm. Le-Clerc, Campbell, Kuinoel, R. Baxter, and Schleusner, that it signifies, “and kept him close,” i.e. from the resentment of Herodias.

20. ἀκούσας αὐτῷ, πολλὰ ἔτοιει, καὶ ηδέως αὐτῷ ἕκουε. There seems here a tautology, hysteronproteron, or synchysis. This, however, Campbell will not admit. He regards ἀκούσας αὐτῷ as only explanatory of πολλὰ ἔτοιει. An observation, perhaps, of no great solidity. Be that as it may, the following passage of Just. 15. 8. will be found apposite. “Tunc Lysimachus audite Callisthenem (philosophum) et praecepta ab eo virtutis accipere solitus est.” It is not to be doubted (says Grot.) but the holy man,
and one so well affected to his country, gave him wise counsel even in things political, and respecting the public welfare.

21. γενομένης ημέρας εὐκαιρίων. Most Commentators render it, "tempore opportuno," i.e. for slaying John; which seems absurd. Rosenm. therefore (not without reason) prefers the exposition of Kuinoel, who explains ημέρας εὐχαιρίας by a holiday. Glass interprets it σχολεῖον, dies ferialis. Εὐκαιρίων, in the Macedonian and Alexandrian dialect, denoted to be at leisure; and so Glass explains εὐκαίρων, vaco. Phryn. εὐκαιρίων, εὖ σχολής ἔχειν. The credit of the interpretation is, however, not due to Kuinoel, but to that learned and conscientious interpreter, Dr. Hammond.

21. τοὺς μεγιστάσιν. This word seems to have been derived from the Persians* by the Macedonians, and by them introduced into Greece. It has no analogy nor Greek termination, neither is there any example of a word so formed. It is terminated after the Persian model and sound. (Salmas.) See the examples in Wets. and Kypke.

25. εἰς αὐτὴν, scil. αὐτός, immediately. This is rare in the best Classical writers. Wetstein has produced many examples from Philo Jud. Polybius, &c. Or it may signify speedily, (as Rosenm. suggests,) since, if deferred till the morrow, Herod might have repented of his promise.

26. ἀδετησαίω, i.e. to set her at nought, by not fulfilling the promise made to her. In this sense ἀτιμάζειν is preferred by the Classical writers. It is used either absolutely or with an accusative, sometimes alone: more rarely joined with εἰς. See Kyp.

27. σπευδώσασα. It signifies properly a sentinel. Now as these sentinels kept guard at the palaces of kings and the residences of Roman governors, so they were employed in other offices besides guarding, and usually performed that of execu-

tioners, for which office there was as yet no particular persons appointed.

29. καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. Michaelis compares the relations of the Evangelists and of Josephus, which differ chiefly on the motives assigned to Herod. Josephus attributes the execution of the Baptist to the fear that his authority with the people might lead to a rebellion. Exclusive of inspiration, the consistency, the nearness of time to the event related, being contemporary, and, as it were, on the spot, a brother of St. Peter, the friend of Mark, having been, amongst others, John's disciple, the minuteness, the impartiality, and moderation, in showing how Herod was surprised into consent, would, between two Greek or Roman historians, give the preference to the Evangelists. Josephus was born some years after John was beheaded, and was neither known to his disciples, nor interested to inquire minutely into the subject. (Michaelis ap. Els.)

31. ὑμεῖς αὐτὸ, you alone. Of this use of the pronoun see Palairot and Schl. Lex.

31. ἢσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοὶ, i. e. of those who came to implore the aid of Christ, and of those who were departing, after having obtained their wishes.

31. εὐθεῖα ἀποκείμενη πολλῶν. The word εὐθ. (from εὐκαίριος) in the sense explained ver. 21. signifies to be at leisure, as here and in 1 Cor. 16, 12. It is accounted a mean word by the grammarians, but it is used by Polybius, Lucian, Plutarch, and Philo. See Wets. "We may learn from this passage (says Euthymius) that ministers ought not continually to devote themselves to public instruction, but, at proper times, to cultivate retirement, and withdraw their minds ἀπὸ τῆς ἐξού περιφορᾶς." An extremely true, but scarcely apposite remark.

33. This verse, which in the common editions is very corrupt and interpolated, is thus skilfully emended by Griesbach. Καὶ εἶδον αὐτοῦς, ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἐπέγκαταν πολλοὶ. καὶ πεζῇ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν τοῖς
It is thus rendered by Schott. "At quum discendentes eos vidissent, agnovissentque multi, pedestri itinere ex omnibus urbisibus eō congregati sunt. Vater has thus edited the passage. Καὶ εἶδον αὐτῶς ὑπάγοντας [οἱ δὴ λοι], καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν [αὐτῶν] πολλοῖς καὶ πεζῷ ἀπὸ τασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἔκει. Markland thought that αὐτῶ ought to be translated it, i.e. *the place*.


37. ἀπελθοντες ἀγορᾶσῳμεν—φαυεῖν. Here is an interrogation conjoined with wonder and indignation: as when we indignantly deny that we will do any thing. (Rosenm.) Simon thought there was an admixture of *irony*; this, however, is a figure seldom used by the Apostles, and of which there seems to be no trace here discoverable.

37. ἀγορᾶσῳμεν διακοσίων δημορίων ἡ. Grotius, Doddridge, Markland, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, think, that by *this sum* being particularly mentioned, it was the whole stock contained in the bag, which was destined for the reception of what was contributed by his friends, for the use of himself and the twelve. See Joh. 6, 7. This indeed seems probable enough: though we learn from Lightfoot, that it was a common expression, to denote a considerable sum.

39. *sumptus* s. by companies. The word *sumptus*, properly, denotes *comptatio*. (Sir. 81, 86.) Secondly, *convivium*. For, in almost all languages, the *whole of* any thing is signified by the words which express its most *excellent part*. So Cic. ad Fam. 9, 24. Græci *sumptus* aut *sumptus*, id est *comptationes* aut *convivationes*, nos *convivias*, quod tum maxime simul vivitur. See also, Cat. M. 13. (Kuin.) The word has
been illustrated from the Jewish customs, by Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. and Schoet. H. H. The noun is put twice, to denote distribution: an inartificial method, adopted after the model of the Hebrew language, which is destitute of distributive adjectives. So Exod. 8, 10. they collected frogs אַלָּרֶתְו אַמְרִין heaps heaps, i. e. by heaps. The idiom is literally rendered by the Sept. συνήγαγον αὐτοὺς θηραίας θηραίας: (Rosenm.) Wetstein, profiting by a remark of Casaubon, Exerc. Antib. p. 305. observes, that Mark adds Χλωρα, because χρότος, properly signifies hay, or dry grass; and compares Apoc. 8, 7. Es. 15, 6. 37, 23. But to this observation, I can hardly assent. Χρότος does not, properly, signify hay, and has very rarely that sense; it is, indeed, a word of very extensive signification, and denotes herbage of every kind, both grass and corn. See Wets. upon Matth. 6, 30. In the parallel passage of John, it is said, that there was much grass in the place, and that it should be green is not surprising, since (as Doddridge observes), it was before the passover, but not near the feast of pente-cost, when even the corn harvest was concluded.

40. πρασία, is properly, a bed, or plot in a garden. So Theophyl. on this passage: πρασία ἄγγευται τὰ ἐν τοῖς κήποις διάφορα κόμματα, ἐν οἷς φυτεύονται διάφορα πολλάκις λάχανα. (Kuin.) It is of uncertain derivation. Hesychius tells us that it is quasi περασία, a border. Examples of the word are given from Dioscor. 4, 17. Galen de Usu Part. 9. Theophrast. H. Plant. 4, 4. Liban. p. 717. Plut. p. 340. D. It here signifies squares, or squadrons. The ἀνα denotes distribution into equal parts.

44. On the distribution of the multitude, Wetstein has the following remarks. “The number of the guests may easily be attained if we suppose that they were so arranged, that there might be an hundred in rank or depth, and fifty in front or file. Every two hundred sat with their faces towards each other: thus, the twelve Apostles, at one going, or returning through these rows, served four thousand eight hundred men; and there remained but the two mid-
die' rows, which, perhaps, Christ served himself. And in this manner the whole business might be completed in a very short time, without any confusion.” (Wets.)

This had been before satisfactorily shown by Mr. Pierce, in his Fifth Dissertation to the Hebrews. Dr. Doddridge observes, that this was the shortest and exactest way of ranging them, and that it reconciles Mark's account above, with Luke's, who only speaks of their sitting down by fifties. “Thus disposed (he adds), they would wait more patiently, till they were served in their turns; the number would appear at once, and they would see that Christ knew it.” The last observation, however, may seem doubtful. The above method seems to have been adopted to show the Apostles, and especially the multitude, their own number. In a mode not very dissimilar, Thucydides 5, 68. computes the number of the Lacedaemonian army. Δάχοι μὲν γὰρ ἔμαχον ἐπτα, ἐν δὲ ἐκάστῳ λόχῳ πεντήκοστὶς ἦσαν τέσσαρες, καὶ ἐν τῇ πεντήκοστίῳ ἑνωμοτίαι τέσσαρες. ἐπὶ δὲ βάθος ἑτάχαρτο μὲν οὐ πάντες ὅμοιος, ἀλλ' ἀοὶ λοχαγὸς ἐκαστὸς ἔθουλε, ἐπὶ πάν δὲ κατέκτησαν ἐπιλεκτῶ. The arrangement of the multitude on this memorable occasion being thus, as I conceive, truly stated by Pierce and Wetstein, the censure couchèd in the following words of Dr. Campbell, seems peculiarly rash and inapplicable. “That the whole people made one compact body, an hundred men in front, and fifty deep (a conceit which has arisen from observing that the product of these two numbers is five thousand), appears totally inconsistent with the circumstances mentioned both by Mark, who calls them, in the plural, συμπόσια and πρασιαί, and by Luke, who calls them κλησιαί. The whole passage from this verse to chap. 8, 21. is taken from Matth. 14, 22.—16, 12.

46. ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς, i. e. ὁχλῷ, by the figure προσττοσειμόμενον. The formula ἀποτάσσεσθαι τι, which occurs in Luke 9, 61. Act. 18, 18, 22. 2 Cor. 2, 13. Jos. Ant. 8, 18, 7. in the Macedonian dialect, answers to ἀποτάζεσθαι, which, in the Attic dialect, was used of those who so depart from any place, as to
salute and bid it farewell. So Xen. Cy. 6, 4, 4. An. 7, 1, 6. (Fisch. Prol.)

48. εἶν τῷ ἑλαίνειν, scil. ναῦν. The word ἑλαίνειν, properly signifies to push, shove; and when applied in a nautical acceptation, to row, in which, I think, κατη is properly understood. Ἐλαίνειν κατη is sometimes found, as we say to shove, push an oar. I consider ἑλαίνειν ναῦν, as the less proper significations. It is more frequently used, (like our row,) without any addition.

51. λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ—ἐθαύμαζον, q. d. so far were they from ceasing to wonder, when they knew it was not a spectre, that they were more amazed than before, when they saw the winds and sea obey his power. (Rosenm.)

52. οὗ γὰρ συνήκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, for they were not yet become wiser. See infra 8. 17. Matth. 16, 8. Mark 8, 17. Συνήκαμεν is, by the Alexandrians, put for ἧλθεν, Jos. 1, 7. 1 Sam. 18, 14. Krebs observes, that the ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις is briefly said for ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁθαιματi τοῖς ἄρτοις γενομένη, and he takes the ἐπὶ for post; and cites Jos. Ant. 5, 1, 26. ποιήσετε σωφρονήσωντες καὶ ἐπὶ νεαφοῖς μετατιθέμενοι ἁμαρτήμασι. And, if ἐπὶ has that sense, this must be granted. But I prefer taking it in the sense of per, denoting the efficient cause, by; as in Matth. 4, 4. Luke 4. οὐκ ἐπί ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ἤξεσται. So Schleusner. The sense of Mark (who added this de suo), is thus detailed by Kuinoel. "When Jesus had entered into the ship, the winds and waves were suddenly stilled; insomuch that the Disciples were filled with amazement. But if they had been rendered wiser by the recent miracle of the loaves, if they had attended to, and considered that miracle, this quieting of the tempest would not have happened so contrary to their expectations. (Grot. and Kuin.)

52. καβδία—πεπαρωμένη. The word π. properly, signifies callo obducere; and, in the passive, denotes the being overlaid with any hard or dense substance; as callus, or fat, or even what are called scales, which
grow over the eyes in blindness, but most frequently the second; both in a physical sense, as in Ἀelian, V. H. 9, 15. διὰ τῆς πεπωρωμένης σαρκός πιγιεσθαμ, and Athen. 549. Β. ύπο τῆς πεπωρωμένης ἐκ τοῦ στεάτου σαρκός κ. τ. λ. and in a metaphorical sense, as in the present passage; and 8, 17. Ἰο. 12, 40. Rom. 11, 7. 2 Cor. 13, 14. So Παγυνεθαι, in Matth. 18, 15. from the Hebrew פַּעַר of Is. 6, 10. (where see the note.) It therefore here denotes dulness, and stupidity of mind.

53. περισσαρμισθησαν, subaud ἐκεῖ. The verb π. properly signifies to bring a ship into a station, or port, (ἀρμός,) and sometimes only a road, or anchorage; but often, as here, it denotes only to draw a ship on shore, which was all that was usually done, in navigating small barks, by the ancients. The word is used either with the dative, or accusative with a preposition.

54. ἐπιγύνετε αὐτῶν, i. e. recognizing him, subauoi ἄνδρες. On this elliptical idiom I have before treated, Matth. uses the complete phrase, ὡς ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου.

55. περιδραμίωτες διὰν, running about, discurrentes. The word is used in Jer. 5, 1. Ἀμος. 8, 12. Aristoph. Ran. 193. Athen. 208. cited by Wetstein.

55. ὅπως ἦκουν ότι ἐκεῖ ἐστί. Koecher and Schleusner render ὅπως by quoniam, but I am induced rather to argue with Kuinoel, in thinking the word redundant, in the Hebrew manner; as שָׁם after בָּשָׁם, in Jos. 22, 19. Gen. 13, 8. 31, 13. 1 Sam. 9, 10. in which last passage, the Sept. have τολίς ὡς ἦν ἐκεῖ. Though those translators have more frequently followed the genius of the Greek language, by omitting it.

56. ἐκθίζουν τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας. This was indeed an inequivocal proof of their entire faith in the power of Christ; though, it was a sort of custom with some antient nations, to lay sick persons in the market place, or on the roads, in order to receive the benefit of the counsel and suggestions of those who had been.
ill, and had recovered from any disorder. Thus Herodot. 1, 197. \begin{equation} \text{δε ςφις δε \alphaς σφι ςφις κατεστικη των καμυμνας ες \alphaγορην \epsilonκφερονι ςφι ςφις γαρ} \end{equation} \begin{equation} \text{δε χρεων τας ιητροις προσοινας \\ αι των καμυμνα συμ-} \end{equation} \begin{equation} \text{βουλωνις περι της νοσου and Strabo, 234. \alpha of the} \end{equation} \begin{equation} \text{Iberi: των \alphaρατονους, \alphaσπερ \οι Αιγυπτιοι τα\ παλαιν,} \end{equation} \begin{equation} \text{πρατιδε\αις εις των \δων, \τωι \κατειραμενοι \\ των πάδων,} \end{equation} \begin{equation} \text{υποθήκης χαρι. Compare Acts 5, 15. From this} \end{equation} \begin{equation} \text{custom, indeed, Max. Tyr. Diss. 40. p. 477. Davis.} \end{equation} \begin{equation} \text{traces the origin of the medical art. See Dought.} \end{equation} \begin{equation} \text{Anal. Sacr. where may be seen the above cited pas-} \end{equation} \begin{equation} \text{sages, and more, for which I must refer my reader to} \end{equation} \begin{equation} \text{the work itself.} \end{equation}

56. ἵνα καὶ τοῦ κρασπέδου τ. i. a. ἰψανται. This was a mark of the most profound respect, similar to that in Athen. p. 212. where it is said of a certain dema-
gogue, ἐκατον σπευδωνος καὶ προσάσφαιται τῆς ἐσθήτος καὶ denotes saltem, on which see Hoogeve. de Part. Gr. to whose examples I add Schol. in Soph. Elect. 411. οὐχ ῥᾴδιατε ἡμιν κἀν νῦν—ἐπικαλεῖται τοῦς Θέους, \\ εἰ μὴ πρόφερον κἀν νῦν, παριστάναι.

CHAP. VII.

Verse 2. κωνᾶἰς χερῶι, τ. ε. αὐτῶις, ε. α. Kuster thinks the words τ. αὐ, a mere gloss, but without rea-
son. They seem, indeed, to be an explanation of the preceding; though Schulz (referring to Hassei Bibl.) maintains that it is not so. All the other Comment-
tors, however, regard it in that light, and such doubt-
less the Evangelist meant it to be. It is a popular 
way of explaining κωνᾶἰς χερῶι. Though, in strictness, 
κών. χ. does not denote hands unwashed, in the sense 
of dirty, for the hands might be clean, and yet κώνας, 
impure, because not washed according to the ritual 
and form just before the meal. The pollution (says 
Kypke) was not physical but legal. This sense of 
κ. is Hellenistic, and evidently formed from the 
Hebr. נְטָע, which is often so rendered by the Sept. 
and in this sense it sometimes occurs in Josephus.
It denotes what is legally or ritually impure, as being forbidden by the law of Moses, or by the traditions of the Elders.

3. πάντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, i.e. in a manner all; for the Sadducees were comparatively few. On this sense of πᾶς see Schl. Lex. So that there was no occasion for Markland to conjecture (just after) οἱ κρατοῦντες, or to take κρατοῦντες for οἱ κρατοῦντες.

3. εἰς μὴ πυγμὴ νίφωνται τὰς χεῖρας, οὐκ ἐ. There has been much discussion upon the word πυγμὴ (see Koecher and Wolf), the sense of which it is not easy to ascertain. The Vulgate, and most ancient versions, as also the E. T. render sæpe, often. But there is no authority for this version, which is moreover liable to many objections. These are stated by Campbell, whom see. Besides, it seems to have arisen from a confounding of the word (as Erasmus conjectured) with πυκν. Kuinoel adopts the opinion of those who think that πυγμὴ may signify sedulo, accuratè. But this is destitute of authority, and seems frigid. Theophylact, Euthymius, and others, explain, "up to the elbow;" but πυγμὴ merely denotes the contracted hand, the double fist (pignus), which ends at the wrist. Hence there is more probability in the opinion of Hammond, Lightfoot, and Schoettgen, who explain, "up to the wrist;" and this is countenanced by many Rabbinical passages. Others maintain, that one hand, doubled and closed, was rubbed and washed by the other; and Michaelis says that this mode is still retained by the Jews and Mahometans. But of this Wettstein observes, that there seems no vestige in the Jewish writings, and that in this sense Mark would have written πυγμὴ νίφωνται. I would observe, that so the Evangelist may have written. The ϑ adscript and the ν are often interchanged; and the ν might easily be absorbed in the ν following. I am, however, inclined to accede to the opinion of Wettstein, Pearce, Campbell, and Weston, that by πυγμὴ is meant a handful (of water), such as the palm of the hand contracted
will contain. The philosopher (observes Weston) is said to have thrown away his *cup* when he found he could drink out of the *palm of his hand*, "cavis palmis." See Senec. ep. 119. "Utrum sit aureum pociulum, an *manus concava*, nihil refert?" Thus (says Campbell) *foot*, *cubit*, and *span*, in all languages, denote a *measure of length*. That a certain measure, or weight, of water, was defined by the Rabbis, is clear from the passages produced by Pococke in Portam Mosis, 361—5. referred to by Wetstein, and by the Rabbinical passages which he himself cites. This washing, however, extended only up to the wrists.

4. ἀπὸ ᾧρας. Supply ἔδοχες, or γενόμενοι, or ἰστὶς. Krebs, indeed, objects to this mode, as needing confirmation. But this it has already received, from the citations produced by Wetstein, Elsner, Munthe, and Kypke. Besides other passages there is a very apposite one adduced by Loesner from Sirac. 34, 27. βαπτισμών ἀπὸ νεκρῶν, i.e. after returning a *mortuo curando*. He then proposes the following interpretation (which I am surprised that Kuinoel should approve): "They do not eat of articles from the *forum*, till they have been previously washed and purged with water." This is very harsh. For though the ἀγορά does sometimes in Classical Greek denote the *things sold* in the market, yet that sense is chiefly if not entirely, confined to some particular phrases, very different from this. See Lex. Xen. That ἀγορά signifies not only the *market-place*, but also public *streets* and *ways*, has been shown by Fisch. Prog. 277.

4. βαπτισμών ποτηρίων, καὶ ἔστων. These words of measure have been copiously illustrated by Wets. It may be sufficient for the student to consult Schl. Lex. Campbell renders βαπτισμών, not *washings*, but *baptisms*. For (says he) it was not an ordinary washing for cleanliness, but a religious ceremony. That, however, may be questioned. It seems to have been a washing practised from cleanliness, enjoined by their religion. But surely, every thing done under the idea of religious obligation is not therefore a re-
igious ceremony. Nor was this cleanliness confined to the Jews, but extended to the Egyptians, and to most Oriental nations.

4. χαλκίων. This is cautiously said. Earthen vessels are not mentioned; for those, if supposed to be polluted, were broken. (Rosenm. and Kuin.) There is a passage to our present purpose in Herodot. 2, 37. (de Agyptiis), ἐκ χαλκίων τοπιρίαν πίνουσιν, διασμένον· τες ἀνω πάσαι ἡμέρας. Vide et seqq. The ancients universally appear to have been very attentive to this sort of cleanliness. So in a very humourous passage of Crates ap. Athen. 267. ε. where every utensil is ordered to perform its office, οὐτομάτως, ἕγχει κύκλε του σθ' κυλίζε χάνω νήφεσα σεαυτήν. Here Casaubon ingeniously conjectures λιβίου συ σεαυτήν. But his emendation may be improved, by simply writing λιβίου σεαυτήν.

4. καὶ κλίνων, i. e. triclinia, which were something like our sophas. How the impurity which required this purging might be contracted, we are told in a Rabbinical work called Celim (16, 1), cited by Wetstein and Rosenmuller: Omne instrumentum bipartitum est mundum, excepta mensa duplicata. Instrumenta lignea quandam immunditiem contrahunt? lectus et sponda, ex quo fricuerit eâ pelle piscis: quod si ita perfecerit, ut fricare non velit, statim pollutioni obnoxia sunt. 18, 5. Lectus, cui innixus est, seminifluus—immundus est—(add from Rosenm.) in quam vel sederet, vel steterat, vel se reclinaverat aut profluviosa, aut menstruosa, aut puerpera, aut leprosum—immundus erat.

9. καλῶς ἀδετείτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τ. Θ. There is much discrepancy in the interpretations of Commentators on this passage. I cannot approve of Hammond’s method, who takes the words interrogatively, nor of that of Pearce and others, who separate the καλῶς from ἀδετείτε. I rather accede to the interpretation of Glass, Campb. Wakef. Rosenm. and Kuinoel, who take καλῶς per antiphrasin ironically. Still I cannot approve of Campbell’s translation, “ye judge well in
annulling.” In our own language we use a similar word, with a similar antiphrasis; but in phraseology too familiar to be suitable to any translation, though it would be the most literal. Under these circumstances I would adopt the prudent version of Doddridge, “you fairly make void the commandments.” For in the word fairly there is a similar antiphrasis.

11—13. ἐὰν εἴη τὸν ἁπάντος τῷ πατρὶ ἀμητρὶ, Ἐστι, “ὁ ἔστι, ἰδὼν” ὅ ἐὰν εἶ ἐμοῦ ἄνευ λόγου, καὶ ὑπό τοῦ ἀπερετε τοῦ γινώσκω τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, ἦ τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ. Upon this disputed passage Dr. Campbell has a very long and able annotation, in which he has elaborately treated on the subject of corban, and has, I think, satisfactorily proved our common version to be erroneous. I shall select his most important observations, and then subjoin his translation, which represents the true sense of this difficult verse.

“For the illustration of this passage let us first attend to the phrase, it is corban. As corban in the original is not accompanied with the substantive verb, it suits better the import of the passage to supply it in the imperative, be it, than in the indicative, it is. Whatever the man meant to do, it is evident that, by the form of words specified, the thing was done, and he was bound. The expression, therefore, ought not to imply that the obligation had been contracted before. Bezar, who has been followed by most modern translators, erred in inserting the verb est. He ought either, with the Vulgate, to have left the ellipsis unsupplied, or to have said sit, or esto. Ἐστι is a Syriac word, which this Evangelist, who did not write in a country where that language was spoken, has explained by the Greek word ἵδων, and signifies here a gift made to God, or a thing devoted.

“That the doctrine of the Pharisees extended farther than to release the child from the duty of supporting his parents; nay, that it extended so far as to bring him under an obligation not to support them, is still more evident from what is told by St. Mark, “Ye suffer him no more to do ought for his
father or his mother. This plainly expresses, not that he is at liberty to do nothing for them, if he choose to do nothing, but that he must never after do aught for them, if he would. A man is free, who may do, or not do, as he pleases. This was not the case. The same act which superseded the obligation of the commandment brought him under a counter obligation, which, according to Pharisaical doctrine, he was less at liberty to infringe than ever he had been with regard to the former. For my part, I agree with those who think that by the expression which I have rendered, be it devoted, whatever of mine shall profit thee, the son did not directly give, or mean to give anything to God; he only precluded himself from giving any relief to his parents. For if he should afterwards repent of his rashness, and supply them with any thing, he had by (what I may call) eventually devoting it to God, given, according to the Pharisaic doctrine, the sacred treasury a title to reclaim it. Grotius is of opinion, that this chance of eventual profit to the treasury, whereof the priests, and the leading men of the Pharisees had the management, contributed not a little to the establishment of such impious maxims. The words therefore, be it corban, or devoted, involve an imprecation against himself, if he shall ever bestow any thing to relieve the necessities of his parents. By saying so, it was not understood that he devoted any thing to God, but that he bound himself never to relieve his parents. Thus also, if after binding himself never to drink wine, he was induced to drink it, he became both sacrilegious and perjured; sacrilegious, because the wine was no sooner tasted by him than it was sacred; perjured, because he had broken his vow; for such declarations were of the nature of vows. It appears from Maimonides, that the term came at length to denote any thing prohibited. To say, it is corban to me, is to say, I dare not use it; to me it is all one, as though it were consecrated to God.

15. οὐδέν ἐστὶν ἐξωθέν—δύναται αὐτῷ κοινώσαι.
These legal defilements were instituted by God for peculiar purposes, and are arbitrary. They had in part prevailed amongst the Egyptians, Gen. 48, 32. They were now soon to be abolished. Christ here places them in their true light to the Jews. (Le Clerc. ap. Els.)

18. έιςπινεύωμεν. By a similar periphrasis, Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 17. calls food and drink τα εισιοντα, as they are also called by Aristot. Hist. Animi. "Though it is very true, (observes Doddr.) that a man may bring guilt upon himself by eating what is pernicious to his health, or by excess in the quantity of food and liquor; and a Jew might have done it, by presumptuously eating what was forbidden by the Mosaic law, which still continued in force; yet in all these instances, the pollution would arise from the wickedness of the heart, and be just proportional to it, which is all our Lord asserts."

19. καθαριζον. There is no slight variation in the reading of the MSS. and no little diversity in the interpretations of the Commentators. Those of Bp. Pearce and Michaelis are utterly destitute of authority, and require καθαριζοντα to be read. Their interpretations have been already refuted by Campbell, Schulz, and Storr. What then is the construction of καθαριζον? Campbell says it agrees with πανικον, which is to be repeated ατο κοινον, but this cannot be admitted. I rather assent to Kuinoel, Rosenmuller, and others, who take it for δεις καθαριζον, i. e. δ καθαριζει. They interpret also καθαριζον simply remove. But it may more closely be interpreted, purify by removal. It is thus a kind of nominative absolute: though differing from the Classical use, where it is very rare to find a participle active so employed. Schleusner (in his Lex.) translates, "ubi homines se expurgant ex omnibus cibus."

22. πλενεξια. Wetstein explains, "injusta rei faciendae articia, studium habendi et circumventio." Campbell translates, "insatiable desires." I should prefer over-reachings:
daism, were called by the Jews ἡλικιες, and the
whole world was divided by them into ἡλικιες and
Ἰωδαι. Therefore in the Scriptures ἡλικι and
ἐθνικας are synonymous terms. See Acts 14, 1, 5:
(Salmas. ap. Wets.) Thus Christ showed that he
was the Saviour, not only of the Jews, but of the
whole human race, by curing both an idolatrous wo-
man, and just after that (ver. 32.) a deaf and dumb
man, namely an atheist, who, as he was incapable of
receiving instruction, could not be reckoned in
the number either of Jews or Gentiles. (Wets.)

32. κωφων μοιρᾶλον. The best Commentators
agree that it signifies, not one dumb from his birth,
but one who had become so by accident. For other-
wise he could not have spoken, unless we suppose
the faculty of speech imparted by a direct miracle.
This, indeed, I should not hesitate to suppose, were
it necessary; but it is not. The word signifies one
who has an impediment in his speech; now this
might have arisen from what is called a bos, or ulcer,
producing a swelling; or from the tongue being
bound by some membrane having become rigid. We
say tongue-tied. Similar expressions occur in the
Classical writers. Plutarch and Alexander Aph.
(cited by Wets.) join the words κωφως and ἡλικιας.

33. ἐβαλε τως δακτυλως. It has been inquired
why Jesus did not heal him at a word, without
using so many ambages. For it is clear that the
emission of his fingers, and the spittle of his tongue,
contributed nothing to the healing. To this it may
be answered, Jesus wished to show that he was a per-
sonage by whose mighty power the passage of the
ears could be opened, and the bond of the tongue
loosed. But to declare this there was no need of ex-
ternal signs; for it was manifest to the senses, that a
man who had been deaf and tongue-tied suddenly
recovered the faculty of hearing and speaking.
Christ seems to have done what he did with this in-
tent, namely, that he might refute the calumny of
those who had said that he wrought miracles by the
aid of Beelzebub. All might thus see that he who in the sight of the multitude, without the use of any incantation or medicaments, and in sole reliance on the assistance of the Almighty, by one word only, ἐφοαθα, had healed the man, must be the farthest removed from all communication with the Prince of Demons. (Rosenm.) These remedies evidently could not, by their natural efficacy, avail to produce so wonderful an effect. But Jesus accommodated himself to the weakness of those who might not indeed doubt his power, but fancied some internal sign was requisite to healing. (Compare 5, 23, 28. and the note on Matth. 8, 3.) Jesus meant, therefore, by this symbolical action, to support and strengthen the faith of the sick man, and of those who had brought him, and withal to make manifest, that this salutiferous power came from himself, and that healing would certainly follow. (Kuin.) Christ often uses visible signs of the virtue he would exert. As the ears of the deaf appear closed, he applies his fingers, to intimate that he would open them. As the tongue of the dumb seems to be tied, or, (through drought,) to cleave to the palate, he moistens it, to intimate he would loose and give free motion to it. (Grotius ap. Elsley.) Jesus withdrew him from the crowd to avoid attention, ἵνα μὴ δοθῇ θεατρίζειν τὰ θαυμάτα, says Euthymius: also, that, withdrawing him from the crowd, he might render the mode of cure more distinctly visible. The ἐστέναξι signifies, "he breathed forth mental prayer to God, not expressed in words."

35. ὁ δὲ σωμάς τῆς γλώσσης. So Hesiod, cited by Secler. ap. Koecher. It frequently occurs elsewhere in this sense. Schlesner without reason interprets this word metaphorically, referring to Irm. in Herod. 1, 8, 6. If I mistake not, the word must here be interpreted physically. In the disorder here meant there is a real bond, the tongue being tied with a ligature of flesh. The phrase may be farther illustrated by the following passages of the Classics. Justin 13, 7.
"Cui nomen Batto propter linguae obligationem fuit." And just after: "Battus, linguae nodis solutus, loqui primum cepit." Artem. I. 32. τὸ δὲ μὴ δύνασθαι φθεγγεσθαι ἡ τὴν γλώτταν δεδεμένην ἔχειν. Pilosr. Vit. Soph. 21, 2. p. 515. πεπεδήμαιος τὴν γλώτταν καὶ θανὰς ἀδιαφθονέω ἐπὶ αὐτὴν βεβηλημένος. The μήδε εἰς γλώττης was the name given to the ligature or lump, from its form. So the Scholiast on Pind. Pyth. 15. (δὲ τὰς τοὺς θεόν, καὶ θεῶ, τις λόγος εἰς, κ. τ. λ. 36. On the pleonasm μᾶλλον περισσότερον see Matth. Gr. Gr. § 458. and Palairot in h. l.

CHAP. VIII.

Verse 2. σπαγγυζόμαι εἰς τὸν ὄχλον, i. e. did, propter; q. d. "My compassion is excited by," &c.

On the verb see Matth. 9, 36.


11. ἢπέγνων συγκειταί αὐτό. The word properly signifies vicissim interrogare; and because the ancient mode of disputation was by question and answer, hence it denoted to hold disputation. (Rosenm. and Kuin.) Hence Aristotle enumerates among the sophisms, πλεῖον ἐρωτήματα.

12. ἀναστενάζας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτῶ. The Latin poets say, suspiria duxit ab imo pectore. (Rosenm.) Kuinoel, however, regards the words as a Hebrew pleonasm. Ti is for διὰ τί.

12. εἰ δοθῆσεται. The εἰ is used like the Hebrew ל for si, if. For the Hebrews, in denying any thing with an oath, used ל, in affirming ל ל, in which formulas there are omitted non vivam, non ero potens Jova, and such like, to be supplied according to the dignity of the speaker. Ei may, therefore, be very well rendered, no! never! The Syr. has ל, non. See Whitby ap. Elsley.

15. βλέπετε—'Ἡρωῖου. Matthew (16, 6.) names
the Pharisees and Sadducees, without making mention of Herod. Mark, who omits the Sadducees, and names Herod, had doubtless in mind, besides Herod, his courtiers and adherents, the Herodians. It is therefore enquired, why Mark subjoins Herod and the Herodians to the Pharisees? Bengel has well observed, that these had the leaven of hypocrisy. Herod (who is called fox by Luke 16, 31.) hoped that Jesus, when brought captive to him, would exhibit a miracle. (Rosenm.)

17. ὁπῶν νοεῖτε, οὐδὲ συνίετε; Wets. cites Cic. de N. D. 3, 24. “Quae autem in his vis Deorum insit, tum intelligam cum cognoro.”

19. ἀρτοὺς ἐκλάσας, broke and distributed. For in the verb κλάω is inherent a notion of distribution; as in 1 Cor. 11, 24. So Is. 58, 7. Ez. 18, 7. Thus we say, “I have not broken bread,” for eaten it. (Kuin.) There is also an allusion to the thin and brittle loaves of the Jews, which (as I before observed) were broken, like biscuit, not cut.

22. This story Mark has alone noticed. It seems doubtless to have been worth recording, on account of the singular circumstances conjoined with it, which are similar to those found in 7, 31.

23. πτῶσας εἰς τὰ δύματα. See the note on 7, 34. Something similar is narrated of Vespasian, by Suet. Vit. Vesp. 7. (cited by Wolf.) “Ex plebe Alexandrinâ, quidam oculorum tabe notus, genua ejus advolvitur, remedium cæcitatis exposcens gemitu, pre-cabaturque Principem, ut genas et oculorum orbis dignaretur respergere oris excremento. Igitur Vespasianus cuncta fortunæ suæ patere ratus, nec quicum ultra incredibile, laeto ipse vultu, erectâ, quae astabat, multituidine, jussa exsequitur: statim cæco reluxit dies.” The Commentators have observed, that the whole of that affair was made up, and that the spectators were deceived by a collusive fraud of Vespasian and his friends with the priests. See the Commentators ap. Wolf.

24. ἀναβλέψας. Ἀναβλέπω in the N. Test. with or
without ἑις ὀφθαλμῶν, when spoken of those who are not blind, signifies to look up. Matth. 14, 19. Mark 6, 41, 7, 34, Luke 9, 16, 19, 5.; or simply to behold; as Luke 21, 1. Mark 12, 41. But it is generally used of blind persons, and then signifies, as here, recovering the sight. See Matth. 11, 5, 20, 34. Mark 10, 51. Luke 7, 22, 18, 41. John 9, 11, 15, 18. Acts 9, 12, 18, 22, 13. Luke 4, 18. (Elsley.) It here merely denotes looking up, and trying whether he had really recovered his sight, and could see. From these circumstances, it is plain that he had not been blind from his birth. This, indeed, would appear from the word ἀναβλέψας.

24. βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. — ἑις δένδρα—περιπατοῦντας. This is (says Cocquius, in his Phytolog. Sacr. cited by Wolf) an elegant description of cured blindness, which, as Plato says, τῆς αἰσθήσεως σημεία παραλλάττει. It seems to be denoted that the blind mind could perceive persons in motion, but not distinguish their form; q. d. “I see men walking, but tall as trees.” (Rosenm.) Clericus conjectures περιπατοῦντα, “I see men like walking trees.” But there is no need to resort to conjecture. Hammond paraphrases, “I cannot distinguish them from trees, but that they walk.” But perhaps it is not well judged to be too anxious about justifying the exact propriety of the expressions, which seem to partake of the incoherency so natural to a man struck with surprise at recovered sight, and labouring under the dazzling and deceiving effects thence resulting. The same principle ought to be resorted to in interpreting the words of Peter at the Transfiguration of Christ. (Matth. 17, 4.) “Lord, it is good for us to be here. Let us make three tabernacles.” This is, indeed, manifest from Mark 9, 6. ὥσ τα ἔδει τι λαλῆσαι, ἦσαν γὰρ ἐκφόβοι. I would adopt the translation of Campbell: “I see men, whom I distinguish from trees only by their walking.”

26. εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, which it seems, from what follows, was in the country. Jesus not only forbids
ral dominion of the Messiah, and the coming of Elias; they could not comprehend what Christ has said, speaking of his death, and singular and peculiar resurrection on the third day. See Le Clerc ap. Elsley.

11. δει λέγουσιν οἱ Γραμματεῖς, why say the scribes? &c. "Or is here put for διότι. This is by Grotius thought an Hebraism. But Krebs observes that διότι in this sense occurs both in Josephus and other Classical writers, as Aristophanes and Lucian. So also Raphael, Palairet, and Krebs, on ver. 28. (Rosenm. and Kuin.) Mr. Markland would write, διότι, and refers to Hutch. on Xen. Anab. 2. p. 143. Svo. edit. Is. 58, 3. 1 Chron. 17, 6. and on ver. 28.

12. Ἡλιας μὲν ἐλθὼν πρῶτον, ἀποκαλύσατα πάντα. These words have exercised the ingenuity of the Commentators, whose various opinions are diligently detailed by Wolf and Koecher. I am inclined to accede to that of Grot. Rosenm. and Kuinoel, which is confirmed by Euthymius. The sense may thus be expressed: "So then Elias cometh, and restoreth all things. καὶ πᾶς, but how then has it been prophesied that Christ must suffer, and be put to death?" I do not, however, assent to Kuinoel, that Jesus quotes the words of the Jewish Doctors ironically. Irony is a figure very rarely employed by our Lord, and here has no place. It is as much as to say, "Well, taking for granted what you say;" a figure of speech called the concessio, ἐκφθαγός, on which I have before remarked. Bishop Marsh would read καὶ καθὼς, which he has supported with his usual ability. And so reads and explains Dr. Campbell. "This clause (says he) is very generally understood by interpreters as relating to the coming, not to the sufferings of the Baptist. I have, therefore, for the sake of perspicuity, transposed it." I cannot, however, approve of the transposition proposed by the above learned critics, since on other occasions we may observe that the style of this Evangelist is irregular, and sometimes at variance with the received rules of composition. These, and such like anom-
lies are by the critics dignified by the names synchro-
sis, hysteronomproteron, and other grammatical figures.

14. ἔθανον πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς, returning to the discip-
les, i.e. the rest of them, who had not accompanied
him to the mount. The doctors were disputing with
and insulting over them, because they were not able
to cure an epileptic person. See Matth. 17, 16.
(Rosenm. from Euthym.)

15. ἔξεμαβεθή. The sudden and unexpected, but
opportune, approach, of Christ, was the cause of this
astonishment, conjoined with reverence and admira-
tion. (Kuin.) Vater rightly observes, that the ἔθαμ-
βεθή must not be too much pressed. Euthymius ac-
counts for this in two ways, as follows: Ἐξεμαβεθή,
ἡ διὰ τὸ καίζων τὴς ἐπιστημῆς, ἢ προεγνωκότος τὴν ἐπιθεσιν
tῶν γραμματέων, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ταχέως ἐπιστάντος πρὸς
ἐπικοινώνια τῶν μαθητῶν. Ἡ διὰ τὴν φαινομένη τῆς
μορφῆς αὐτοῦ· καὶ γὰρ εἰκὸς ἐφέλκεσθαι τίνα χάριν ἐκ
τῆς μεταμορφώσεως.

16. ἐπηρώτησε—αὐτούς. Rosenmuller and Kuinoel
prefer this to the Vulg. τοὺς γραμματέας. Christ in-
terrogated not only the Jurisconsults, but also his
Disciples.

18. ῥήσει αὐτῶν, dashes him on the ground. By this
verb the Sept. express θόλω, at other times by κατα-
βαλλέω. Hesychius explains ῥήξαι by καταβαλλέω.
Artemid. On. 1, 62. says of a wrestler prostrating
his adversary on the ground, ῥήξαι τὸν ἀντίπαλον, and
5, 78. ῥήξαι τε καὶ κατέξαζι τὸ κεφάλιον. Other ex-
amples are produced by Alberti, Hammond, Loes-
ner, and Segaar. (Kuin.) Euthymius explains ῥήσ-
σει by καταβάλλει εἰς γῆν.

18. τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόντας, gnashes with his teeth; or
rather (with Campbell) grinds with his teeth. A
word formed from the sound, says Euthymius. Wet-
stein cites Schol. Aristop. ad Aves, 1520. ἡ τῶν
ἀποθηκαίων τείμων τοῦ ὀδούσι γενόμενος. To which
I add, Theophyl. Simoc. 91. c. καλεταίνων καὶ τετρι-
γων ὀδοντας. Aristoph. Ran. 927. μὴ πριέ τοὺς
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οδύνασι. Βρυχεῖν τοὺς οδύνασι occurs in the O. T. and in Acts 7, 54.

18. καὶ ξηραῖνται, pines away. See Wakefield on Soph. Phil. 954. who, among other passages, cites Alciphron 3, 8. ήδ' αὖ φθάνοιμι λίμω καταωκλήναι.

20. καὶ ἴδαν αὐτὸν, εὐθείᾳ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐσπάραξεν αὐ-
τόν. Kuinoel commends this remark of Griesbach. "When the poor wretch surveyed the countenance of Jesus, (indignant, and, as it were, threatening,) terrified at the aspect of so august a personage, he felt a considerable accession to his disorder, and was shaken with such vehement convulsions that he fell down headlong (ἴδαν is for ἴδοντα, by a common idiom). This, however, is founded on the hypo-
thesis that he was only an epileptic, not a demoniac. Euthymius, adopting the common hypothesis, gives another turn to the sentence. Bengel and Raphael agree in ascribing ἴδαν to the man, not the demon.

22. ἀλλ' εἰ τι δύνασαι. Kuinoel justly reprehends Homberg, Palairêt, and others, ap. Wolf and Koe-
cher, who contend that the words do not intimate doubt, but are a formula often used by the Greeks in direct prayers and entreaties to those of whose power and good will towards them they are fully assured. The phrase, indeed, as it occurs in the Classical writers, does not always imply doubt, but is sometimes only equivalent to κατὰ δύναμιν, "to the utmost of one's power." Wetstein cites Hom. II. a. 893. ἀλλ' αὐτό τε δύνασαι γε, περίσσεο πείδος ἐγὼ Ἐλδούο. Οὐκιμπάνω δὲ σα λίσα τι ποτε δὴ τι Ἡ ἐνεῖ 

wεσταλ καθιέν Διὸς ἡς καὶ έγὼ. Sophocl. Ajac. 329. ἀλλ' ὁ φίλοι—ἀργίζετι εἰςελθόντες, ἐι δύνασθε τι. So also Thucyd. 6, 25. Dio Chrys. 61. p. 81. δ. ἐκείνης 


remarks) the following words of Christ are quite re-
pugnant, in which he stimulates the father of the 

patient to a complete faith; and even the words of the father himself (ver. 21.) who acknowledges his
fluctuating mind. Dr. Doddridge observes, that "perhaps, observing the fit grow more violent on his approaching Jesus, his faith might begin to fail. This was a very natural manner of speaking, and yet strongly pathetic, and obliquely interesting the honour of Christ in the issue of the affair."

23. Ἰησοῦς εἶξεν αὐτῷ. Ἄρα, ἐὰν δύνασαι πιστεύσαι—πιστεύσῃ. On this verse there is much variety of reading, and much diversity of interpretation. The limited plan of this work will not permit me to state all the hypotheses. It has been well observed by Kuinoel, that the variety of reading has been occasioned by the wish of the grammarians to clear up the obscurity of the passage. L. Capell and Knatch. conjecture, Ti, εἰ δύνασαι, πιστεύσαι, "What sayest thou, if thou canst? Believe, and all things are possible." But πιστεύω does not occur, in the middle form, in the Scriptures. I should prefer Markland's conjecture, Ti, εἰ δύνασαι; δύνασαι πιστεύσαι; But this is not confirmed by any one MS. and the whole air of the sentence to me savours not of the usual dignified simplicity of Christ's phraseology. Camerarius would take this as an interrogation; as in Luke 14, 3. But there a λέγων is interposed between the εἰς and the εἰ, which makes it another construction. Beza and De Dieu would take τὸ for τοῦτο. But this is inadmissible, and properly rejected by Markland and Kuinoel. After all, the present reading must undoubtedly be retained, and the best mode of interpretation seems τὸ to be that supported by Krebs, Loesner, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, who observes that the neuter τὸ is accustomed, both in the sacred and profane writers, to be prefixed to any kind of sentence, and therefore denotes a sentence following. So: Polyb. 3, 9, 11. Philo, 399. n. Aristot. Pac. 695, &c. The sense is: "If thou canst believe that all things are possible to be done for him that believeth, εἰςθύμασαι σοι, or εἰ ξεί. Or, perhaps, we may regard the τὸ as referring to the whole sentence, εἰ δύνασαι πιστεύσῃ. The sense
thus arising will be this. As the father had said \( \epsilon\lambda\,\delta\nu\nu\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota\), so did Christ address to him the \( \epsilon\lambda\,\delta\nu\nu\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota\,\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\tau\iota\). And perhaps this was a usual formula with Jesus. Then there will be no absolute necessity for supplying anything; though it might be thus done. "Canst thou believe; if so, it is well: all things are possible, are in my power, to be done for him that believeth." \( \ Tau\,\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\nu\tau\iota\) is a dativus commodi, as Kuinoel well observes. So Campbell renders for him. It may be proper to notice the modesty of the manner. Jesus does not say, "only do you believe, and I have all the power you can desire to help you." But he omits the words by me. What Jesus assents generally, is meant to be applied particularly, and especially to the present case. A similar instance of delicacy, I have on a former occasion noted, on the words, "There is something here greater than the Temple."

24. \( \beta\omicron\omicron\iota\delta\epsilon\omicron\iota\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\,\tau\omicron\,\dot{\alpha}\iota\iota\sigma\iota\iota\iota\). Campbell's translation, "supply thou the defects of my faith," is rather a paraphrase than a version. He however rightly observes, that \( \dot{\alpha}\iota\iota\sigma\iota\iota\iota\), here signifies a deficient faith, not a total want of faith. Grotius thinks that the man did not ask an immediate and miraculous increase of faith. Piscator wrongly paraphrases, "my faith is very weak, and seems rather to deserve the name of incredulity." Kuinoel however translates, "alta voce inter lacrymas dicebat pater: confido, opitulare mihi cui fiducia deearat." But this is not a very suitable sense, and, I think, cannot be well elicited from the words as they now stand, which form a sententia acuta, in which the sense of \( \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varnothing\), is not to have too much stress laid upon it. It may be thus expressed; "I have a faith, but it is infirm; supply its deficiency, and regard it as complete, and heal my son accordingly." It is a popular way of speaking, and must be interpreted as such.

* The substantive has the force of an adjective; as in Luke 1, 48. \( \delta\iota\,\epsilon\pi\epsilon\beta\beta\lambda\epsilon\nu\epsilon\nu\,\epsilon\pi\iota\,\tau\iota\nu\,\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\sigma\iota\,\tau\iota\,\dot{\epsilon}\iota\,\dot{\delta}\omega\lambda\iota\,\sigma\varphi\omicron\varphi\omicron\omicron\omicron\).
- 25. ἐπειτίμησε. Campbell has an excellent annotation, in which he animadverts on the versions; "in-crepavit, objurgavit, comminatus, menaced," &c. and he demonstrates that the word ἐπειτίμω in the Scriptures, denotes reproving, rebuking. He observes, that the Evangelists often give us the words of the ἐπειτίμησις used by Christ. But where, says he, do we discover aught of menace? That would ill suit the meekness and dignity of Christ. The only term used for threat, in the sacred writers, is ἀπειλη, and ἀπειλεῖν.

25. ἔγα. This is by Wetsstein and others taken emphatically, q. d. "I, who am the Master, and endued with far greater authority than my Disciples." Καὶ μὴ εἰσέλθης εἰς αὐτῶν. Unless he had added this, there might have been room left for suspicion; as if the paroxysm had ceased of its own accord, but would return again, on the completion of the month. (Wets.)

26. The history of this paroxysm is narrated, for this purpose, namely, that the patient might not be said to have been cured before he came to Christ. (Wets.)

29. τούτω τὸ γένος—νοτεία. Dr. Campbell has successfully proved that γένος must refer, not to faith, but to demon. He also truly observes, that by this kind, is not meant this kind of demons, but this kind or order of beings. He has correctly rendered ἐξελθεῖν dislodge; and judiciously observes, that by the declaration, this kind cannot be dislodged, unless by prayer and fasting, we are not by any means to understand, that a certain time was to be spent in prayer and fasting before the expulsion of every demon, but, that the power of expelling was not otherwise to be obtained. Quod est causa cause, say dialecticians est etiam causa causati. This is conformably to the idioms which obtain in every tongue. It was evidently concerning the power of expelling, that the Disciples put the question, why could not we? Now, to the attainment of that power, fasting and prayer were necessary, because they were necessary
for the attainment of that faith with which it was invariably accompanied."

36. ἔναγκαιλισάμενος, took him in his arms. The word is copiously illustrated by Kypke, to whom however I cannot quite assent, when he takes the word for *amanter amplexus est*, and not literally *in ulnis amplexus*. See Koecher, and the passages cited by Wetstein.

37. ἐν τῶν τωιότατοι παιδίων. See the note on Matth. 18, 5.

38. ἐν τῷ ὑψώσει τίσου, "relying on thy assistance." For the formula of the exorcism was, "In the name of Jesus of Nazareth depart from him;" so also in healing. (Rosenm.)

39. ὑψώσει. The word must here be understood *morally*, i.e. *scarce*ly will any be found; it cannot be that, &c. (Rosenm.) Ταχὺ, facile, *radius*.

41. See the note on Matth. 10, 42.

42. Campbell well translates, "whose son *should* he be."

44—48. The words are taken from Is. 66, 24. where the subject is the punishment to be inflicted on the incorrigible in this life, in order to describe (as is usual with the Jewish writers), the judgment of another world. See Sirach 7, 17. Judith 16, 17. Ὅσοι ἐλυθεῖσιν ἐπανισταμένοις τῷ γένει μοι κύριος παντοκράτωρ ἐκδικήσει οὕτως ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, δόθησιν πῦρ καὶ σκαλπήσει ἐἰς σάρκας οὕτως, καὶ κλαίσωσιν ἐν ἀίδιον ἔως αἰώνας, and the Rabbinical citations in Wetstein, from whom the above is derived. The place of the damned is compared to a field where carcasses are thrown out, and are gnawed by worms, or burnt with fire. Such was their Gehenna, or the valley of Hinnom, near Jerusalem; odious by the former sacrifices there to Moloch, and afterwards desecrated by Josiah, by being made a common burying place; and Le Clerc and some others think there is an allusion to the two sorts of funeral rites, burning and burying. "Hence (says Bp. Lowth), the worms which preyed on the carcasses, and the fire
fire which consumed the victims. From these sensible images, continues he, our Saviour described *hell*, as by the sensible images of reclining on Abraham’s bosom, &c. he described *Heaven*.” See Whitby, and Mr. Elsley. Kuinoel refers to Jos. Ant. 18, 2. B. 1, 2, 12. Plato, in his Phædo, 62. tells us, it was the opinion of Socrates, that as there was an eternity of happiness for the good and virtuous in a future state, so there was a variety of punishments, proportioned to the different degrees of crime in the present; but that the *very depraved* were tortured for ever in the burning lake of tartarus. That the Jews, especially the Pharisees, had the belief of *eternal* punishment in a future life is clear, both from the Old Testament, and also from Josephus and Philo; the latter of whom, p. 713. has the forcible denunciation that the wicked man is to live for ever dying, and to live for ever in pain. From which we see that the eternity of punishments denounced against impenitent sinners by Christ, could not appear as a *novelty* to the ancient world.

49. τὰς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀλοιποναί. An exceedingly obscure passage, which has exercised the ingenuity of many learned men. (Kuin.) For the various opinions (many indeed absurd enough), I must refer my readers to Pole, Wolf, and Koecher. I shall content myself with stating those which seem to me to have somewhat of probability, namely, those of Wetstein, Rosenm. and Kuinoel. The words of Wetstein are these: “Qui jacturam membris facit, illud abscondendo et in ignem projiciendo h. e. qui ea, quibus se super alios effere posset, pro stercore habet Phil. 3, 8. potius, quam ut alios offendat, et ipse a doctrinâ Christi recedat; ille salutem suam redimit, evadit damno manus, pedis, vel oculi; hæc constans modestia ipsi vicem praestat, ignis metallà purgantis, vel salis carne a putredine et vermine servantis, et ad sacrificium sanctificantis. Levit. 2, 18. Avoda Sara 5, 12. Si quis utensilia emat ab Idolatrâ, ea quæ ablutione mundari possunt, abluenda sunt—quæ igne pur-
gantur, candentia facienda sunt, verum et craticulum omnino igne mundari necesse est." (Wets.) Rosenm. takes πῶς for quivis; and subauds ωτών, i.e. every one of those concerning whom Christ had thus far treated, namely those who indulge in vicious affections. πῦρ is the fire of hell, an accustomed image of eternal punishments, and ἀλισθησαί πῦρ, is as it were to be sprinkled with salt, i.e. burnt, tortured, &c. He then explains the words καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἀλλ’ ἀλισθησαί, “but every victim will be, must be, pickled with salt;” i.e. every man consecrated to God, ought to be prepared by the salt of true wisdom for eternal felicity. Salt in the Classical Writers often denotes wisdom. In this passage the doctrine of Christ is so called, as being the most consummate wisdom: πᾶσα θυσία will, by metonymy, bear the sense every man, who is consecrated to God, as a victim. Rom. 12, 1. Kuinoel thinks that the verse has no connexion with the preceding; nay that it contains a dict brought forward by Jesus at some other time, and he thus lays down the sense. “Every one of you ought to be as it were salted, emended and prepared by calamities and vexations (in order that he may obtain salvation), as all sacrifices must be pickled and prepared, in order to be accepted with God.” I must observe that there seems something precarious in the above interpretation, especially as it is founded on the dangerous principle, that the passage is here out of place. If so, I do not see how we can ever hope to arrive at its true sense, because we can never have the benefit of any context. Rosenm. also states a new, and what he terms an ingenious interpretation of Schott. This however, to me, seems not to have sufficient probability to deserve being detailed to my readers. Markland offers the following interpretation, which is perhaps as probable as any.

I would point πᾶς γὰρ πῦρ ἀλισθησαί, καὶ πᾶσα θυσία, &c. and translate, for every one shall be salted with fire, as every sacrifice shall be salted
with salt. This seems to have been spoken to the Apostles (ver. 35.) and in them to all Christians. It may give a reason why they should part with an offending eye, hand, or foot, because every one of them was to be endued with the Holy Spirit, and consequently could not be an acceptable sacrifice to God, if they retained any favourite vice, signified by the eye, hand, and foot: such was the love of money in Judas. "For every one of you (says he), will be seasoned with fire (i.e. the Holy Ghost, Matth. 3, 11. Acts 3, 3.) as in the old law the precept was, every sacrifice shall be seasoned with salt. Whence we may gather, that the salt with which every sacrifice under the Old Covenant was commanded be salted or seasoned, was an emblem or type of the Holy Spirit in the Christian sacrifice, without which Spirit no sacrifice can be acceptable to God. The sense seems to be, "As every sacrifice was to be seasoned with salt under the Old Covenant; so, in the New, every Christian shall have a portion of the Holy Spirit; which will enable him, if he be not wanting to himself, to mortify every corrupt appetite and affection, to part with an offending eye, hand, or foot." Kαλ for ας, is very usual. See the note on Matth. 22, 21. On occasion of salt being mentioned, St. Mark goes on to another saying of our Saviour concerning salt, though spoken perhaps at a very different time; ἐχεῖ ἐν εὐαγγέλιο ἡμῶν, have salt in yourselves, which seems to be of uncertain signification. It is likely that the Heathens hail their notion of the sanctity of salt from Leviticus, 2, 13. (Markland.)

Rosenm. details a new, and what he terms an ingenious interpretation of Schott. This however, to me seems not to have sufficient probability to deserve laying before my readers. Indeed, I cannot accede to any interpretation I have yet seen. All are liable to objections. I may use the words of that ancient dict cited in Porson's Append. ad Toup. Emend. in Suid. "Me quod fugiam, habere, quod sequar, non
habere, omnibusque fere in rebus, citius quid non sit, quàm quid sit, dicturum.

50. καλὰς τὸ ἄλας. On the mention of salt, Mark is induced to subjoin this saying of Christ, which, by the way, is another sententia similar to that in Matth. 5, 13. where see the note.

50. ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἄλας. Here again ἄλας denotes wisdom. Ἐχετε is for κατέχετε, retain true wisdom. Kuinoel, however, explains salt as a symbol of constancy and true friendship. So Phil. συμβολον γνησίου φιλιας. And so Tetetzes, on Lykophrón 135. ἄλα δὲ εἴτιδον οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς τῶν ἔναν καταρχαῖς, συμβολικὸς ἐπευχόμενοι—παγημάι καὶ τούτους εἰς μίαν ἰμονολαν καὶ φιλιαν. He cites Plut. 685. c. and 697. d. The sense of the passage (withdrawing the imagery) is, in the opinion of Kuinoel, the following. “If you, who are Apostles and future teachers of my doctrine, affect vain honours, and are studious not of moderation, but of ambition, and fall into alterations, and therefore are not examples of wisdom to others, who will correct and amend you? You must be studious of wisdom, imitate and exemplify my doctrine by your life and deeds, and thus also cultivate peace.” Mr. Weston (ap. Bowyer, 162.) offers the following paraphrase and illustration of the passage. “Keep yourselves from corruption; and, as you have salt, have fire also, and burn out the offending parts, that the whole may be consumed.” Æschylus, in speaking of the punishment of a man whose crimes were unexpiated, says, that he “lived a man forbid;” he could approach no altar, be received in no house, and sit at no table; at length he dies, hated and despised by all, ill seasoned for all-corrupting death.

Mr. Weston’s citation from Æschyl. Choeph. 294. is nothing to the purpose, κακῶς ταραχευθενα παμφθαρτῳ μύρῳ. Tag. is there used in a figurative sense, namely, dried up, withered into wrinkles, as in an embalmed corpse. Κακῶς may mean miserably, very much: or it may refer to the still more haggard
appearance which a mummy would present, if the operation of embalming were ill done. Even the Scholiast might have taught Mr. W. better, who cites Sophron. τὰ γῆρας ἢ μαραίνων ταφικές. The following interpretation, being on the authority of Euthymius, deserves attention. "Ἄλος ἀγάπης, συνέχοι καὶ συφίγγοι εἰς ὅμωνιαν. In illustration of the exposition purification, I add, that a similar metaphor occurs in Lysippus ap. Pollux 7, 41. ὀ δὲ ἀναγκαίας καὶ θείας τὰς ἀληθείας ἐπινοιας, aliorum expurgans sententias.

CHAP. X.

VERSE 1. Καὶ ἤρθεν ἁναστάς. A Hebraism, says Wetstein, citing 1 Reg. 24, 1. And so Beza. But Kypke renders, "inde discedens;" as Mark 7, 24. and subjoins several examples from the Classical writers. I add, that in this sense, it often occurs in Thucydides and other Attic writers.

1. ἔχειται εἰς τὰ δρικα τῆς Ἰουδαίας 8. τ. τ. I. Jesus (says Kuinoel), had repaired from Galilee to Jerusalem, to celebrate the ἐγκαίνια, and when the Jews there plotted against him (see John 10, 22, 40.) he retired to that part of Judea which was called Perea.

5. ἐγράψεν ὑμῖν τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτῃ, he commanded that previously to divorcing your wives, you should give them a writing of divorcement. Ἐντολὴ signifies any laws, chiefly permissive ones. One must, however, principally understand the command, concerning the writing the bill of divorce.

11. ἐν' αὐτῇ. There are those who interpret this of the former wife, against whom the husband may properly be said to commit adultery; which, he cannot strictly be said to do, if he marry another, whether virgin or widow, but only if he espouse one also repudiated by another. This interpretation lies open to the objection, that at this rate, the same sentiment will be inculcated twice, in ver. 11 and 12. Others un-
derstand it of the former wife, to whom, by unjust repudiation, the husband affords a cause of committing adultery, or of embracing second and adulterous nuptials. But those interpretations do not clear up this difficulty, namely, what the words et duxerit aliam have to do with the subject? Since the repudiated woman is equally in danger of adultery, whether the husband who has repudiated her marries another, or not. This occurred to me as a difficulty in Matth. 19, 9. Now, however, δευτέρας φρόντις, I am of opinion that these words are not superfluous, but so cohere with the preceding, as to signify, that the unjust repudiation of the divorced wife gives cause to adultery, and that the second marriage affords cause for repudiation. For if any one, for instance, on meeting with another woman who pleased him more, had, in order to possess her, written a bill of divorce to his first wife, and had thereby conceded to any who might wish it the power of marrying her, what else were this but to give her up to be defiled by adulterers, and basely pander to the lust of others; which, by the laws of Rome, was a crime put on the same footing with whoredom and adultery. (Wets.)

12. €λαν γυνη ἀπολύσῃ τὸν ἄνδρα. There is here a great variety in the reading of the MSS. The Western recension has, εἰ γυνὴ ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄνδρος but this plainly arose from a desire to soften the fancied harshness. Retaining, however, the common reading, the most celebrated Commentators are yet at issue on the sense of the words. Hammond, Clericus, Wolf, Wetstein, Doddridge, and Rosenmuller, maintain that the Jewish wives had not the power of repudiating their husbands. The wife (says Campbell) could do nothing by herself. When the husband thought fit to dissolve the marriage, her consent was not necessary. The bill of divorce which she received was to serve as evidence for her, that she had not deserted her husband, but was dismissed by him, and consequently free:" and therefore Clericus and Wolf would take kal for ὅς, as if, in the
following sense: "he who, divorcing his wife, marries another, is an adulterer, in the same manner as a woman divorcing her husband." &c. There seems, however, something precarious in this interpretation, resting, as it does, on a sense of ἀκραῖος which is rare, and perhaps never occurs in this construction. Hammond, Wetstein, and Rosenmuller, attempt to remove the difficulty by rendering ἀπολύομαι, si deseruerit; and on this subject Wetstein has the following remarks:

"Though there was not the same liberty of divorce permitted to the Jewish wives, as to the husbands, Matthew speaks nine times of a husband divorcing his wife, but of a wife divorcing her husband not once. So Joseph. Ant. 15, 7, 10. 18, 5, 4, Jebra-moth 14, 1. Dixit R. Jochanan f. Nuri, quamobrem uxor, quæ facta fuerit surda, exit, et vir qui factus fuerit, non educet? Responderunt illi: Vir qui repudio non est similis uxori repudiate, quia uxor exit nolens volens, vir autem non nisi volens educit." That the wife could in some cases divorce the husband, appears from Cetuboth, 7, 9. "Si in viro nata fuerint maculae, non cogunt eum, ut dimittat uxor. Dixit Rabban Simeon f. Gamalielis: de quo dicta sunt hæc verba? de maculis parvis; sed si maculae magnæ sunt, cogunt eum, ut dimittat. And 7, 10. Hi sunt, quos cogunt ad dimittendum uxor: qui percussus est ulcere, cui fuerit polypus, stercus col-ligentem, confiantem æs, coriarium, sive ejusmodi fuerint antequam duxerint, sive postquam duxerint; ut de his omnibus dixit R. Meir, etsi pactus fuerit cum eâ, illa tamen poterit dicere, putabam me eum ferre posse, sed jam non possum. Verùm sapientes dixerunt: illa feret nolens, excepto percusso ulcere, quia tabescit caro illius. In some measure, also, the condition of the wife was better than that of the husband: for he who had defiled a virgin was bound to marry her, nor was it in his power even to repudiate her (see Deut. 22, 29.); and he who had falsely accused a wife of corrupted virginity, could not repu-
diate her (Deut. 22, 19). Which privilege of the wife is by Jos. Ant. 4, 8, 23. thus restricted: Κρε-βεων μὲν ἡ κόρη μὴ ἄδικείν, συνοικεῖται τῷ κατηγορήσαντι, μηδεμίαν ἐξουσίαν ἐχεινον ἐκεῖνον ἀποσχέπτεθαι αὐτὴν, τὰν έλ μὴ μεγάλας αἰτίας αὐτῷ παρασχολ, καὶ πρὸς ἁγ οὐδ᾽ ἀντεπεῖν δυνηθείς. But by Philo is given to a falsely accused wife the liberty of putting away her husband. De Leg. Spec. t. 2. p. 313, 17. Yet that the rights of the husband were superior to those of the wife is manifest from this, namely, that by the law and custom of the Jews the wife was in the hands, and under the power of the husband. Moreover, a wife having an illicit connection with a bachelor, was guilty of adultery, and punishable with death. Not so the husband who had connection with an unmarried woman; which law also was in force among the early Christians, as we find from Basil. Canon. 21.” (Wets.)

On this subject Kuinoel offers the following observations: “As far as regards the words καὶ ἐὰν γυνὴ ἀπολύῃ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς, καὶ γαμήθῃ ἄλλον, μοιχᾶται, the word μοιχᾶται: may be referred to the wife, namely, _that wife commits adultery_, or else to the person whom, on repudiating her husband, she married; since the verb μοιχᾶσθαι is commonly used of the man who commits adultery. See the note on Matth. 5, 32. Thomas Mag. μοιχᾶται ὁ ἄνδρος, μοιχεύσας ἐκ τῆς γυνῆς: and this method seems agreeable to the style of Mark. This being admitted, the words under our consideration in some measure correspond to those of Matth. 19, 9. καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένης γυνῆς, μοιχᾶται: and Christ, even in the passage of Mark, did not speak of a wife committing adultery, but wished to show _how any one might fall into the crime of adultery_. (See the note on Matth. 5, 32.) He taught that the crime of adultery is incurred by him who repudiates his wife and marries another; and also by him who marries one repudiated by her husband, or who has herself repudiated her husband. (Kuin.) Wetstein and Rosenmuller maintain that the
words καὶ ἔσε χωρὶ—μοιχεῖαι are not the words of Christ, but an inference of Mark's from what Christ had said of the husband divorcing the wives, namely, that it would then be more wicked if the wife were to desert her husband. But this is very harsh, and perhaps inadmissible. It seems safer to take the words in their plain and manifest sense, namely, of the wife repudiating her husband; especially as Koecher and Kuinoel think that this right has been proved by Danzius, in a Dissertation entitled, Uxor maritum repudios. And so Bereschith R. 18. (cited by Wetstein): Filiis Noachi non sunt repudia. R. Juda f. Simonis et R. Chani en nomine R. Jochananis dixit: non est illis repudium, sed repudiant se communi consensu. Dixit R. Jochanan: idque uxor expellit illum, et dat illi repudium. See also Selden de J. N. et G. 5, 7. p. 790. and his Uxor. Hebr. 8, c. 18, p. 309. seqq. We may admit that it was very unusual among the Jews: yet instances did sometimes occur, and especially from an increased communication with the Romans (among whom it was common), it was likely to grow more into use; Christ might therefore deem it reasonable thus to check it; and Mark, as writing for the Gentile Christians, would think it very suitable to them; though Matthew, writing for the Jews, seems, by omitting it, to have thought it unnecessary for them. In illustration of the shameful frequency of divorce among the Romans, Wetstein cites Seneca de Benefic. 3, 16. Nunquid jam uilla repudio erubescit, postquam illustres quaedam ac nobiles feminæ non consultum numero, sed maritos ornati, annos suos computiant, et exseunt matrimonii causâ, nubunt repudi? Juvenal, 6, 226. Ornatas Paulo ante fores; pendentia linquit Vela domus, et adhuc virides in limine ramos: Si crescit numerus; sic sunt: octo mariti Quinque per autumnos. Martial 6, 7. Similar to this beautiful turn of Juvenal is that of our great dramatic bard: "Within a month, a little month, or ere those shoes were old,
with which she followed my poor father’s body, she hastened to incestuous sheets.”

19. μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς. The word ἀποστερέω has an extensive meaning, signifying, to deprive any one of his property, whether we retain it, or merely fraudulently deprive him of it. Hence it is used generally of rapacious, fraudulent, and unjust conduct, not only by taking what is not one’s own, but by denying to others what they may justly claim, as of wages, debt, &c. and it is sometimes used generally of injurious treatment of any kind, and differs but little from ἀδικεῖν, with which it is united as synonymous, in 1 Cor. 6, 8. (Rosenm. and Kuinoel.) The Jews were not accustomed, in ordinary discourse, or in the commonly published books, to recite the precepts of the Decalogue in the very words in which they were expressed, but in other words, or in another order. Nay, from Jos. Ant. 3, 5, 4. it appears that they scarcely thought it lawful to do so, at least to Gentiles. See Rom. 13, 9. The tenth commandment Matthew thus expresses: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Mark: μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, “do not act fraudulently by him.” So Jos. Maccab. 3. Tranchuma. p. 167. 2. (Wets.)

21. ἐξάπησεν αὐτὸν, i. e. “commended him, was pleased with his answer.” Casaubon explains, “probō quod ais, laudōque,” or, “factum bene.” And so De Dieu, Krebs, and Elsner. In this sense of the word Kuinoel refers to Sept. in 2 Chron. 18, 2. Ps. 78, 36. Cant. 1, 4. Nor is it unknown to the Classics. Rosenmuller refers to Reiske’s index to Demosth. and Kuinoel cites Alciphr. Ep. 3, 26. ἐφίλησε τὴν φιλεργίαν. There is, however, this objection, (which I find occurred to Wolf) ; the sense of acquiescing in, or being content with, is always said with the accusative of the thing, not of the person, as here; though, (if I mistake not, there is a similar idiom in our own language.) for if taken of the person, it cannot be true. Christ did not entirely approve of him. It seems safer, therefore, to have re-
course to some other interpretation, and here we have an ample choice. I will only observe, that of those which have been produced, some are fanciful, and that which refers the words to an expression of approbation by *gesture*, (as Lightfoot and Heupelius,) *subsidi*, is devoid both of authority and probability. The safest opinion seems to be that of Hackspan, Fessel, Wolf, and others, *blanditus est* et al.

22. στυγνάσας. This word (which is rare) is derived from στύγνως, and that from στῦγας, which seems deducible from στύω, στύγα, στύφα, dense. Hence we may see the *ratio metaphorice* by which στῦγας comes to mean hatred. It is used, properly, of a dense, turbid atmosphere, and metaphorically of sadness expressed by the countenance. Or from στῦγα, στῦφω, astringo, constringo, contraho. It denotes contraction, whether as applied to the human countenance furrowed by sorrow, detestation, &c. Of the first there are examples in Eurip. Hipp. 280. στυγνην ὄφην. Alc. 178. στυγνον ὄφρων νέφος. Whence Horace seems to have taken the well-known phrase, *deme supercilio nubem*. D. Laert. 7, 1, 18. αὐτὸν δὲ στυγνὸν τε ἐναι, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον συνεστασμένον. Eurip. Hipp. 290. στυγνην ὄφρων λύσασα. Eustoth. de Ismienia, p. 98: συνέχει τὴν ὄφρων, στυγνάζει τὸ πρόσωπον. In the second sense it occurs in Matth. 16, 3. Eurip. Alc. 777. στυγνῷ πρόσωπῳ καὶ ἐγκαταστάσατο. Aristoph. Nub. 582. τὰς ὄφρας συνήγαμεν. Schol. συνεστασάμεν ἐπεισάμεν, καὶ ἐκαλεπτόμεν, ή ἐστυγνάζομεν. Sophil. 17, 5. γιὰ στυγνήν. Polyb. 4, 21. ἡτίς ἁπτερία— —διὰ τὴν τοῦ περίεχοντος ψυχρότητα καὶ στυγνότητα. So Horat. Ep. 18, 1. Horrida tempestas *caelum contrexit*. So Shakespeare, Rich. 3. cited by Parkhurst: "The sky doth frown, and *lowre* upon our army." It occurs in the Sept. thrice, and answers to the Hebr. סָפָה, *stupere*; and therefore Kuinoel would here interpret *sommotus*. But the common interpretation is the true one, which is also confirmed by Matth. 19, 22. ἀπήλθε λυπούμενος* and Luke 18, 24. *περίλυ-πος ἐγένετο*. Also by the imitation (for such it is) of
Nicetas, cited by Schl. Lex, οἱ δὲ καταφίλουτες καὶ στυγνότυτες ἔβλισθηκαν. For most of the above examples I am indebted to Kypke and Westein,
24. τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ τοὺς χρήματιν. This is more distinctly expressed than in Matth. 11, 23. οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες, an addition necessary to show that the way of salvation was open to all, both to the honourable women, and to those of Caesar’s household, and to the rich in general: and many such there must have been, in a city the mistress of the world. See 1 Tim. 6, 17. (Wets.)
25. διὰ τῆς τρυμαλιᾶς τ. ῥ. ἐ. i. e. foramen; from τρύω, tereo, to bore. It is used in the Sept. for a fissure of rock. Hesychius explains τρυμαλιὰ by τρύπαι. It occurs also in the Classical writers: and to this purpose Schleusner cites Plut. de Ed. 9, 16, 17. I add Sotad. ap. Athen. 621. a. εἰς ὀκ ὄφιν τρυμαλίγια τὸ κέντρον ὧδεισ. τρ. is a verbal of a very rare form. Another example is ἄρμαλιά. The termination has somewhat of a diminutive force.
26. καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι. In vain does Grotius account this a Hebraism. It occurs in the best Greek writers, of which examples are given by Blacknall, Woollius, Raphael, Krebs, Palairet, Elsner, Bosx, Loes, Seggar, and others, and may be rendered “ecquis tandem,” “and who then?” It is frequently (observes Kuinoel) prefixed to interrogatives accompanied with an expression of wonder.” It is, however, proper to notice, that by τίς is meant τίς πλουσιος. See the note on Matth. 19, 24.
30. ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ—μετὰ διαγματῶν. There are, says Dr. Campbell, two difficulties in these words, of which I have not seen a satisfactory solution. The first is, in the promise, that a man shall receive, in this world, a hundred fold, houses, and brothers. The second is in the limitation, with persecutions. As to the first, there is no difficulty in the promise, as expressed by the Evangelists Matthew and Luke. To say barely, that men shall receive a hundred fold for all their losses, does not imply that the compensation
shall be in kind. Nor do I find any difficulty in the declaration, that thus far their recompense shall be in this world. James (1, 2.) advises his Christian brethren, to count it all joy when they fall in divers temptations. Paul (2 Cor. 7, 4.) says, concerning himself, that he was exceedingly joyful in all his tribulations. The same principle which serves to explain these passages serves to explain the promise of a present recompence as expressed by Matthew and Luke. The Christian's faith, hope, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, were more than sufficient to counterbalance all his losses. But if the mention of houses and brothers adds nothing to the meaning of those Evangelists, to what purpose was it mentioned by Mark? Instead of enlightening, it could only mislead, and make a retribution in kind to be expected in the present life. Some things are mentioned, v. 29, of which a man can have only one; these are, father and mother. In v. 30, we have mothers, but not fathers. Wife is mentioned, v. 22, but not wives, v. 30. Hence that profane sneer of Julian, who asked whether the Christian was to get a hundred wives. These differences and omissions also contribute to render the passage suspected. According to rule, if one was repeated, all should have been repeated; and the construction required the plural number in them all. Bishop Pearce suspects an interpolation, occasioned by some marginal correction, or gloss, which must have been afterwards taken in the text. If the text has been in this way corrupted, the corruption must have been very early, since the repetition, in v. 30, though with some variety, is found in all the ancient MSS. versions and commentaries extant. As to the other question about the qualifying words, περὶ διωγμῶν, a promise; according to the letter, regarding things merely temporal, to be accompanied with persecutions, Wetstein considered as insufficient. The more a man has, in that situation, his distress is the greater. I own that, to me, all things do not appear so plain, even after the alteration pro-
posed by Wetstein. If this promise of temporal prosperity be understood as made to individuals, how is it fulfilled to the martyrs, and to all those who continue to be persecuted to the end of their lives? Though there be, therefore, some difficulty in reconciling the words, with persecutions, with what is apparently a promise of secular enjoyments, it is still preferable to the other reading, both because the correction is a mere guess, and because it is less reconcilable than this, to the state of the Church militant, in any period we are yet acquainted with. For it will ever hold, that all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall, in some shape or other, suffer persecution.”

After carefully weighing all that has been written on this controverted passage, it appears to me that it would be great temerity to cut out the sentence, as Pearce, Owen, and others, would do, and to which Campbell seems half inclined: and why? because he does not see how it can be reconciled to the truth of the fact. But that the Apostles and first preachers of the word had a compensation even in kind for what they lost and gave up, is, I think, capable of proof. I will not, however, enlarge upon what will, on reflection, be readily admitted, especially as the reader may see something to that purpose in Theophylact. On this recompense, both corporeal and spiritual, see the note on Matthew 19, 29. founded on Euthymius, Theophylact, L. Brug, Grotius, and Wetstein. As to the disputed reading, μετὰ διωγμὸν, Campbell has shown that the conjecture of Heinsius and Wetstein does not offer a sense so free from difficulty as many suppose. The following remark of Wetstein, however ingenious, is here quite inapplicable: “Qui promittit bona plurima μετὰ διωγμὸν cum imminentibus undiqueaque periculis et adversis, quid aliud fecit Dionysius, qui Damoclem in auro quidem lecto colloquit, mensamque exquisissimis epulis instruxit, in medio autem hoc apparatu gladium ancipitem ἐ setá equinà aptum demitti jus-
sit, ut impenderet illius beati cervicibus? Qui ita dat, quo dat plura, eo majorem metum atque sollicitudinem incutit, qui hominem tranquillum et felicem esse non patitur." Many Critics, and especially the more recent ones, (as Rosenm. and Kuinoel,) interpret μερά by post. But this is a sense comparatively rare, and not supported by any Scriptural authority; neither do I see that that sense is easier. The version of Schl. Lex. propter persecutiones relictos, cannot be fairly elicted from the words as they now stand; and that they are not to be tampered with, every sober-minded critic will admit. I would retain the present reading; and I finally acquiesce in the interpretation, etiam in mediis persecutionibus et calamitatibus, which has been satisfactorily established by Campbell, ubi supra. There may, indeed, yet appear some difficulty in the passage: but, if that were much greater, I would not consent to abandon and cut it out. In such a case, we should rather commend it to the labours of our successors. How many passages are there of which, two centuries ago, no tolerable account had been given, which now, by the successful labours of many generations of philologists and theologians, have been completely illustrated. Finally, in investigating the sense of St. Mark, we should ever bear in mind the irregularity of structure, and peculiar phraseology, so characteristic of that Evangelist. Whenever, therefore, we can be enabled, by examining the context, and comparing the parallel passages of the other Evangelists, to come at the probable sense, we must not be moved by petty objections on the score of grammatical propriety.

32. On this and the following verses consult the note on Mat.th. 20, et seqq. The meaning of the words ἦν προάγαν αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐδαμβούτο, καὶ ἀκολουθοῦτες ἐφοβοῦτο, has been, I think, little understood. They seem to me to refer to a sort of undefinable awe which the Apostles began, they scarcely knew why, to feel for Jesus, the dignity of whose
character they now daily estimated more and more highly: and no wonder, since his mighty miracles, and the air of majesty and authority which he now assumed, was well calculated to inspire it. This seems a far better account than that commonly offered, namely, that which attributes their present feeling to fear for Christ’s person, and their own, at Jerusalem. Still more do I disapprove of that of Heuman (ap. Kuinoel), which is yet more frigid, and depends upon taking καλ for nam. I have, indeed, observed that when violence is to be done to the sense of any passage, it frequently happens that some petty particle is made the tool and instrument of mischief. But surely the sense so wrung from any words, is no more to be depended upon, than the confession of a wretch under torture.

42. οἱ δοκοῦτες. Most Commentators account this a pleonasm, (for οἱ ἄρχοντες, Matth. 20, 25.) of which examples are produced by many Philologists. So Kypke compares Jos. Ant. 19, 6, 3. δοκοῦτες αὐτῶν ἐθέχειν. But it may be doubted whether δοκοῦτες is really pleonastic there. Indeed, the laying down such a principle in this passage of the N. T. and many others in the Scriptures, and Classical writers, is little more than decently evading a difficulty. I rather commend those who, with whatever success, endeavour to explain the idiom; as has been done by Gataker in Cinno, and Kypke; though they both seem to regard it as pleonastic. Beza and Casaubon have, I think, most successfully hit on the true sense, where the former renders quicenestur imperare, the latter, qui habentur, agnoscentur pro principibus gentium. This idiom has much perplexed the editors and critics on several Classical authors, from which I have collected the following examples. Thucyd. 146, 5. εὑροσ δοκῶν εἷναι. Pausan. 1, 25, 4. εἶναι δοκῶν πολέμων ἐπιτειροῖς. D. Hal. 1, 324, 265, & 363, 35, & 393, 42. Xen. Hist. 3, 1, 8, 4, 8, 31, 5, 2, 28, & 3, 22. Cyrop. 7, 1, 31. Diod. Sic. 4, 38, 9, et sepiissime. Dion. Hal. 246. Philost. Vit. Apoll.
tion, in summcd dignitate constitutus sum, it is wholly fictitious. That sense results from ειναι τι or δεξιειν, and similar words, expressed or understood. See the examples of Kypke; who, however, takes δοκιμοι in the common sense seem, as opposed to be, and explains, "Those who seem to reign with absolute do-
minion, are in reality the slaves of their own pas-
sions;" citing a passage of Simplic. p. 283. where δοκειν does seem to bear that sense: also Suet. Claud. 25. Plut. 1, 1047. c. But this, however true as to that passage, does not seem to be the sense here in-
tended.

43. The κατ'α in the verb κατακυριευω and κατεκχω-
σιάζω is intensive. Οι μεγαλα αυτων, the great ones, 
magnates. See the note on the parallel passage of Matthew.

46. Βαρθομαιος, the son of a well-known person of 
the name of Timæus. For Ζ in Syriac denotes son.
Other examples of this sort of patronymic occur in 
the names Bartholomeus, Barnabas, Baræus, Bar-
riona. I need scarcely remind the reader how fre-
quently they occur in Homer and the early Greek 
writers. Wetstein compares Thucyd. 1, 23. (error 
for 1, 29.) Ἰσαρχιδας ὁ Ἰσαρχεο. And 108. Τολμιδου 
tοῦ Τολμαίου. To the Northern nations they have 
been always familiar, and are recognized under the 
terminations son, fitz, vitch, &c.

46. έκάθητο παρα τιν ὃδον προσωπαται. The prepo-
sition παρα often denotes accession or addition. Here 
it is slightly intensive. The προς has the same force
as προσκαλείσθαι, πρόσωδος, &c. There is also an ellipsis either of ὅν, which is supplied by Euripides, or some similar word, as ἡν and βιοτεύεται. But it sometimes occurs absolutely, as here, and in Job 27, 14. In the Classical writers this is less frequent: though we have in Xenoph. Σ. 8, 23. ὁσπερ πτωχὸς —ἀεὶ προσαίτων. Plut. 2, 294. Α. (cited by Wets.) προαίτης ὃν. On the ἐκάθισε παρὰ τὴν ὀδον, Wets. compares Martial 4, 30. "Raptis luminibus repente cæcus Bajonos, sedet ad lacus rogator."

50. ἀποβαλὼν τῷ ἴματιν, i.e. in joy, and to reach Jesus the quicker. Wetstein compares Hom. II. β. 183. βη δὲ θείων, ἀπὸ δὲ χλαίναν βάλε, where Eustath. explains, διὰ τὸ εὐπερίστατον, ἵνα ἐν τῷ θείῳ ῥᾶν τρέχην. The ἴματιν was the cloak, or surtou.

51. Ἱαββου. This, say the Rabbins, implies more than Rabbi, similar to the Italian augmentatives terminating in one.

52. Ὑπαγε, scil. εἰς εἰρήνην, quod est voto annuen-
tis. (Wets.) There is the same ellipsis in 7, 29. The complete phrase, which is a formula of conceding any request, occurs in Mark 5, 34. So 1 Sam. 1, 17. 20, 42. לְקַלֵּם לַעֲלוֹן. It seems, however, to exert little or no force in James 2, 16. ὑπάγετε ἐν εἰρήνῃ. See Grot. on Matt. 8, 18.

CHAP. XI.

VERSE 2. εὑρήσετε πῶλον, a colt. Mark, (says Wets.) making no mention of the ass, called the beast πῶλον, which may signify a colt of a horse or an ass: and this, (he thinks,) lest the ears of the Romans should be offended. So (he adds) Josephus in his Antiquities often substitutes horses for asses, dignitatis gratid; ex. gr. 4, 20. 2 Sam. 19, 26. 2 Reg. 2, 40. & 4. 22, 24. Jud. 10, 4. & 12, 14. So the Alexandrian Interpreters, on Exod. 4, 20. for asses have τὰ ὑπερήψια, whence the Jews remark that it was one of the 18 words changed by Ptolemv's Interpreters. However, in Joseph. 15, 18. they have
where Theodotion has ἵππος ουγιου), and in Jud. 19. four times. I cannot, however, think that the motive here adverted to would be likely to influence St. Mark.

2. ἐφ’ ἐν οὕδες ἀνθρώπων κεκάθικε. Grotius and Wetstein remark, that animals not broken in for human use were thought sacred, both by the Jews and Heathens: and refers to Deut. 21, 3. 1 Sam. 6, 7. Eurip. Phæniss. 644. of a victim: τετρακελής μόσχος, ἀδάμαστον πέσημα. Chæremon, speaking of the victims prohibited in Egypt: τὰ δεδαμασμένα αῖς ἥδη καθισκωμένα τοῖς πῶνοις. Wetstein also cites Seneca, Οἰδιπό 721. Ovid. Met. 3, 12. "Bos tibi, Phœbus ait, solis occurret in agris Nullum passa jugum, curvique immimus aratri." Hom. ll. 8. 94. Hor. Epod. 9, 22. Whitby observes that the Jews themselves applied Zech. 9, 9. to the Messiah.

4. ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφότου. This word properly signifies διόδος, a passage, but in the N. T. denotes a street. This, in the fragments of ancient versions of the O. T. answers to στεγή.

7. ἐπέβαλον—τὰ ἱματια. In illustration of this, Wetstein cites Aristot. πλείστα τῶν ἱματίων ἐπιβαλλόμενοι. I add, Thucyd. 2, 49. ἱματίαν καὶ συνδόναν ἐπιβολας, which seems to have been imitated from Josephus. Hence may be emended Αἰlian, V. H. l. 11, 4. καὶ τὴν εἰς αὐτῶν τῶν τριχῶν ἐπιβολήν ὁκ τοινοῦν. And Irenæus contra Hæres. L. 1. C. 2. ἀγνοοῦτες αὑτὰς δὲ τὴν ἔξοδον τῆς προσατειλοῦν διὸ ἐπιβολὴν: where read ἐπιβόλην. Jos. 324. δυσρηγῆς ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπιβολῆς ἐκ πολλῶν ἱματίων γεωμένης ἀναθερμαίνεσθαι. Polyæn. c. 2, 27, 1. χλανθά ἐπιβαλλέων ἀναθένεν.

8. στειβάδας ἐκοπτὼν. The word properly denotes something strewed on the ground, whether straw, hay, stubble, rushes, reeds, leaves, or the twigs of trees; of all which examples may be seen in Wetstein's note. Here, however, from a comparison with Matth. 21, 8. it should seem to denote frondes, the leafy twigs of trees, such as were used for low couches, or beds on the ground.
10. ἐν ὠβρατι Κυρίω. These words (which interrupt the construction) are omitted in many good MSS. of different recensions, and in the opinion of almost all the Critics are to be expunged. They are not found in Griesbach's text, and in Vater's are included between brackets.

10. τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαβίδ. This name (says a Rabbinical writer cited by Wet. ) they confined to the three patriarchs, as μητρὶ to the four mothers. The Kingdom of David Whitby rightly explains by the Kingdom which God is to erect according to his promise to David. The common people (observes Kuinoel) hoped, and expected, that the Messiah would be a king, like David, whose throne he would restore, and raise to a greater pitch of grandeur, and would bless the people with the most exalted earthly felicity. See Matth. 3, 2. Hence may be understood those exclamations of the people, who then accounted Jesus as the Messiah.

11. περιβλεψάμενος. He looked round, says Euthymius, as master of such a house, and was silent, to give time for reformation; but coming afterwards, he deals more harshly with them, as incorrigible.

11. What we read from verse 11 to 27, occurs in Matth. 21, 10—28. but in a different order. For according to Matthew, Christ cast out the buyers and sellers, who profaned the temple, on the same day as that on which he made his entry into Jerusalem. But according to Mark, Christ drove out this profane multitude on the day after that entry. Moreover, according to Matthew, Christ cursed the fig-tree on the day following that on which he had expelled the profaners of the temple; and immediately, we are told, the fig-tree withered. On the contrary, according to Mark, Christ cursed the fig-tree early on the day on which he afterwards punished the profanation of the temple. But we are told that on the day after the disciples observed the tree dried up; which circumstance afforded our Lord an opportunity of treating on the efficacy of
faith. Perhaps Mark intentionally receded from Matthew, because he had obtained from some other source more accurate information of that affair, than could be derived him. Hence he was enabled in ver. 11—14. and 20—26. to narrate more copiously what Matthew had only briefly mentioned, and in ver. 16 might add some circumstances omitted by Matthew. See ver. 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, 27. But although, in treating this part of the history, Mark has employed more care and accuracy, yet Matthew is not thereby convicted of mistake or ignorance; for that Evangelist nowhere expressly asserts that Christ cast out the profane multitude on the same day as that on which he made his entry into the city. He seems to have wished not to break up, and relate by piece-meal, the story of the fig-tree. But Mark purposely deferred a little the mention of the cursing, until he could also relate its effect. (Rosenm.) who refers to Griesbach’s Dissert. “Quâ Marci Evangelium totum e Matth. et Lucæ commentariis decerptum esse monstratur.”

18. ἧλθεν—καιρὸς σύκων. There has been scarcely any passage in the New Testament that has given rise to more discussion than this, which has been termed an absurditas insolubilis, and on which Schoettgen remarks: “Hæc hactenus interpretare aut conciliare non possum. Malo eum hæc ignorantem profiteri quàm nugas effutiendo me aliis deridiculum exhibere.” Schleusner, in his Lex. seems to suspect καιρὸς to be corrupt. It will be impossible for me to detail all the hypotheses that have been devised; for which I must refer the reader to Witsii in Melettemata, Wolf’s Curæ, and Koecher’s Analecta. I can only state the most important and probable ones. And first, I must premise that the conjectures of Toup and Heinsius deserve no attention. The former would cancel the words και ἤλθαν ἐπ’ αἰώνιαν, ὁδέν εἰσεν εἰ μὴ φύλλα. But however perplexing may be the words as they now stand, yet without them the sentence would not be satisfactory,
and there is no authority whatever for their omission. As to Heinsius’s conjecture, it has been solidly refuted by Hammond, who concludes with these vigorous animadversions: “This is most unreasonable, when the words, as they stand, are regularly a reason of what went next before, to change them, upon conjecture or phantasy, into the direct contrary, and then affix them as a reason of what is farther off, and with which they do not connect, but might with as much reason be farther severed, and connected with any other (yet remoter) passage, to which a fresh conjecture should accommodate them.”

As to Abresch’s method of interpretation, which assigns this as the sense, namely, “for that was not a good fig country,” such a signification of καιρὸς has never yet been produced from any Greek author. Rosenmuller truly observes, that if this signification could be proved, it would be too artificial, and would be repugnant to the sense of the passage. The interpretation proposed by Hammond, and supported by Homberg, Knatchbull, Outren, and Giesgen, is this, “that was not a season for figs,” i.e. not a good fig year. But as Bos and Clericus observe, there has been no example produced of any such sense of καιρὸς, neither would it suit the context, and would be liable to unanswerable objections. The method of Bos, Zorn, and Wollius, who take it for παγ’ ὁδαγ is totally contrary to the words as they now stand.

The interpretation of Mill and others deserves no attention. As to the present reading, it is supported by all the MSS. and versions; and therefore, whatever may be the difficulty which it involves, no alteration must be thought of. But if it be retained, I do not see how it can have any other interpretation than the one laid down by Bp. Kidder, and adopted by Gosset, Markland, Wetstein, Wolf, Rosenm. Kuinoel, Schleusner, and Weston, namely, the fig harvest; as in Matth. 21, 34. ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν, and so Athen. p. 65, (cited by Hammond,) ἀλίσκονται δ’ αὐταὶ τῶ τῶν σύκων καιρὸς. So (says Kid-
der) we say *hopping time, gooseberry time.* "By the time of any fruit (observes Bp. Pearce) must be meant the time of reaping or gathering it." "What (says Campbell) can the time of any fruit be, but the time of its full maturity, and what is the season of gathering, but the time of maturity?" But figs (continues he) may be *eaten for allaying hunger before they be fully ripe;* and the declaration, that the season of figs was not yet come, cannot be, (as the order of the words in the original would lead one at first to imagine,) the *reason* why there was nothing but leaves on the tree; for the fig is of that tribe of vegetables wherein the fruit appears before the leaf. In this, all accounts, from Pliny downwards, agree, that the leaves make their appearance prior to the fruit. Certainly fruit might (says Mr. Weston) be expected of a tree whose *leaves* were distinguished afar off, and whose *fruit,* if it bore any, preceded the leaves. Certainly, in the most backward year, early figs are of a tolerable size at the Passover time: and Mr. Bowyer has observed, (from Holdsworth on Virg. Georg. 2, 149, 150.) that at Naples they have some figs brought from the Levant about May, called *fici de Pascha.* Mr. Elsley observes, that the idea of the early, and the late figs growing on *different species* of the plant, has misled the Commentators, especially Le Clerc and Whitby. But even Julian (as cited by Mr. Bowyer) might have taught them that fig-trees, especially the Damascus, bear figs *all the year round,* the last year’s fruit remaining while that of the next year succeeds. The term applied to those early figs is *bocchore,* Hebr. בּוּכִּי, *early ripe.* It is used in Hos. 9, 10. and so Micah 7, 1. *my soul hath longed for the early fig.* "Nay we have even in our own country (says Dr. Doddridge) a fine sort which are ripe before our harvest, having put out the autumn before, and stood the whole winter." "The *leaves* (continues Campbell) shewed that the figs should not only be formed, but well advanced; and the
season of reaping being not yet come, removed: all suspicion that they had been gathered. When both circumstances are considered, nothing can account for its want of fruit but the barrenness of the tree. If the words had been, ὅπερ ἦν κακὸς σῶκαν, he found nothing but green figs, for it was not the time of ripe fruit; we should have justly concluded that the latter clause was meant as the reason of what is affirmed in the former, but, as they stand, they do not admit this interpretation.

Certainly all will be clear if we consider the words ἐν ἐλθὼν—φίλακα as parenthetical, and admit such a sort of *trajectio* as is not unfrequent in the ancient languages, though in translating into modern ones a transposition ought to be adopted, to adapt any such sentence to the genius of those languages; and such is here employed by Dr. Campbell. Similar inver- sions and trajectories are cited by the Commentators from Genes. 18, 10. Numb. 18, 20, 23. Joh. 21, 26. Joh. 1, 14. and especially Mark 16, 3, 4. "who shall roll us away the stone? And when they looked, the stone was rolled away, for it was very great." See Luke 20, 19. Mark 12, 12. Jos. Ant. 5, 8, 2. Lucian. Zeux. p. 582. Græv. Plut. Pomp. 620. b. This *trajectio* verborum is, says Kuinoel, quite agreeable to the style of Mark, who generally is accustomed to put together his sentences very negligently. Wakefield on Eurip. Trach. 1139. also thinks that the trajectio ought to be admitted, and that thus this disputed question may be decided. He produces similar instances of it from Hom. II. 8. 407. and Ἐλειαν. V. H. 1, 21. Doddr. however, (less probably, I think,) imputes the trajectio here, and at 16, 3 & 4. to the carelessness of some early transcriber, who did not bring in the words, which in the original formed an interlineation, at the proper place. Be that as it may, it is quite certain (to use the words of the same writer), that no interpretation can make the last clause, as we read it, a reason for what stands immediately before it, that he found nothing
but leaves; for it is well known, that if our common fig-trees have no young figs on them in March or April, they can produce none that year. "It is manifest (says Wetstein) that a fig-tree having nothing but leaves, even before the time of ripe figs, can have nothing but leaves at fig gathering. The state of the question is briefly this: "Our Lord (as says Doddridge) at this time might well expect to find fruit on this tree, since the time of gathering even these early figs was not yet come, which if it had, there would have been no room for the expectation, or the curse which followed it." Or, to state the question more clearly and strongly, in the words of Wetstein: "If Christ, when approaching to a tree at ripe fig time, had found nothing but leaves, that would not have supplied any certain evidence of its being barren, and worthy of malediction; for, had it been ever so productive, the whole of the fruit might have been previously plucked off. But since before the fig-harvest it exhibited leaves in abundance, a just expectation might be entertained of meeting with figs also, and therefore a just indignation felt, when nothing but leaves were found." The spiritual application of this to the case of the Jews is too obvious to need being enlarged on. We may however observe, (with Storrs,) that this cursing was a symbolical action, and (with Lightfoot) that it injured no one, since the tree (as we learn from Matthew) grew by the way side, and therefore was common property.

14. μηκές—φάγοι. Wetstein compares Marc. Anton. 7. μήκες σοι μηδές ἄκουση καταμεμφομένω τῷ ἐν ἀκατί βίῳ. Mark narrates first what happened to the fig-tree, before what was done in the temple; Matthew, however, relates this story before that: but from John, who has marked the time more accurately, we learn that these money-changers were expelled much sooner, namely, in the first year of our Lord’s ministry. (Wets.) I however rather assent to those Commentators (as Grotius and Cleri-
cus) who maintain that this was the second time that Christ exercised his authority. The former one was at the first Passover after his baptism.

15. ξηρατο ἐκβάλλειν. Grotius, De Dieu, Morus, Heupel, Wolf, and Kuinoel, take this as a pleonasm for ἐξεβάλε, which occurs in the parallel passage of Matthew, and indeed many such pleonasm arise from the union of ἀρχομαι with another verb. But here we may render, "he proceeded to cast out." This sense is very frequent. See Kypke on 12. 1.

16. καὶ ὁ ἤφιεν ἵνα τίς διενέγηκη σκέυος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. Grotius, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, explain σκέυος any vessel dedicated to profane uses, or by which gain was made; as many such there would be, after the temple came to be made a market-place. This is very true: but I would not have the signification restricted to vessel. It seems to mean, like the Latin vas, utensils of every kind, instrumenta. Thus in the Sept. it is used for working-tools, military arms, &c. We find, too, by the Rabbinical writers, that it was forbidden to carry even a staff, or a bundle of any thing whatever: also to enter the temple with the shoes on, or even with dusty feet, or to spit in it, &c. These rules, however, were little enforced by the priests, and the breach of them is by Whitby ascribed to the vicinity of the fortress of Antonia.

17. σπήλαιον λῃστῶν. This seems to denote that it was the custom in Judæa for robbers to shelter themselves in the dens and caves which abound in Judæa, and which, as we find from Jos. Ant. 1, 4, 27. and 14, 15, 5. were really not unfrequently receptacles for such. Markland tells us that Jesus says this because of the sheep and oxen in the temple, John 2, 14.; for the λῃσταί, robbers, says he, used to drive the cattle they had stolen into σπήλαιον, dens or caves. Such an one was Cacus, whom Virgil mentions, Æneid 8. and Propertius, lib. 4. metuendo raptor ab antro, i. e. λῃστῆς ἀπὸ σπήλαιου. See John 10, 1. Had it not been for that passage of John 2, 14. the
propriety of σπέρματων λῃστῶν in the other Evangelists could not have been understood, it depending upon the words βῶς καὶ πρόβατα, which are mentioned by St. John only. (Markland.) Notwithstanding what the learned critic says, I very much question whether there be any such allusion.

22. ἔχετε πίστιν Θεοῦ. Martineus ap. Wolf, Pearce, and Moller, interpret this a strong faith; of which Pearce has produced many examples. The context (says Campbell), will suit either interpretation. He however prefers the common one, and subjoins the following cogent reasons.—“Firstly, I find that the substantives construed with Θεός when it signifies great, or mighty (for it is only with these we are here concerned), are names either of real substances, or of outward and visible effects. Of the first kind are, prince, mountain, wind, cedar, city; of the second are, wrestling, trembling, sleep; but nowhere, as far as I can discover, do we find any abstract quality, such as faith, hope, love, justice, truth, mercy, used in this manner. When any of these words are thus construed with God, he is confessedly either the subject, or the object of the affection mentioned.—Secondly, the word Θεός, both in the Acts and in the Epistles, is often construed with the genitive of the object, precisely in the same manner as here.” I must acquiesce in the common interpretation; namely, εἰς τὸν Θεὸν, which is supported by Grotius, Raphel, Wolf, Rosenm. and Kue-Noel. Compare Acts 3, 16. Rom. 3, 22. and 26. Gal. 2, 16, 20. 8, 22. Phil. 8, 9. On verse 25. Wetstein compares James 2, 4.


25. ἐὰν τι ἐ. κ. τ. Ei ti is for ὥστιν, which Schleusner rightly renders quicquid. It occurs in Thucyd. L. 1, 17. s. f. Onosand. p. 22. Δοξάγοις καὶ ταξιάρ-

25. οὖν στίχησε προσευχήσεως. For such was the custom with the Jews. See Luke 18, 11, 2 Paral. 6, 12. whence this Hebr. ἥσυχα is not unfrequently put for pray. Thus the series or order of prayers was, by the Jews and early Christians, called προσευχήσεως (Wolf, Kuin.)

29. καὶ. I likewise, in my turn, will ask you one question; whereas ye have asked me two. (Markland.)

29. καὶ ἀποκριθητέ μοι, καὶ ἔδω υμῖν. One might think he wrote καὶ ἀποκριθητέ μοι, from Matth. 21, 24. ἐν (λόγον) ἐδώ εἰπητέ μοι. "And if you answer me, I will tell you," &c. Nothing could be more pertinent than this question of Jesus to them. Answer how they would, this reply must have made against themselves much more strongly when applied to Jesus, than to John; because John did no miracles. Jesus very well knew the reason why they gave him no answer; but they were so stupid and hardened; that no rebuff of this kind made any impression upon them. (Markland.)

32. ἀλλ' ἐδώ εἰπομεν—λαόν. There is here much variety in the reading, which, however, is only to be attributed to the scribes, who stumbled at the apsiopeesis of τι γενήσεται ὑμῖν; or κακῶς ἔξει, and the transition from the oratio recta to the oblique; which, however, is common in the best Greek writers, of which examples may be seen in Kypke, Elsner and Raphael. Thus I would write ἄθεσπτιον. Such apsiopeesis of what is disagreeable are not unfrequent, and supply the place of euphemisms. Finally, I see no reason to suppose (with Knapp)
that ἀν is to be cancelled, or (with Rosenm.) that ἀλλὰ is to be rendered by igitur.

38. οὕτω λέγω ὑμῖν — ποιῶ, by what authority I do these things. “For (to use the words of Doddridge, subjoined in his paraphrase), the other question naturally requires to be determined first, and when you think proper to decide that, you may easily perceive that the same answer will serve for both.”

CHAP. XII.

VERSE 1. ἐχεῖτο ἐν παραβολαῖς λέγειν, speak in parables. Yet one only is mentioned, selected, as it should seem, out of more, which, from Matth. 13, 13. appear to have been delivered. Beza takes it to denote the genus orationis, and to be equivalent to παραθητεύω, and Grotius remarks that the corresponding word ἐσπαθεῖται, is among those that have a plural form, with a singular sense.


4. ἐκεφαλαίωσαν. In the interpretation of these words there has been much diversity of opinion. The explication of Theophylact, from its being probably derived from the Greek Fathers, deserves our first attention. It is this: σοβυτέστως καὶ ἐκορύφωσαν τὴν ὑπὲρν, they wreaked their malice, &c. But this ellipsis of ὑπὲρν is too arbitrary to be admitted. Heinsius and Stock interpret κεφαλάωσαν mulctati sunt, and render sublatum remiserunt. A manifest absurdity. Alberti renders beat him with clubs or sticks (i. e. bastinadoed him). But this wants authority. The interpretation of Lightfoot settled accounts with him, taken sarcastically and ironically, is very frigid. De Dieu explains, cut matters short with him, used a summary mode of proceeding: and so G. Wakefield. But this signification, however it may be confirmed by Classical examples, is here very far-fetched. Camerarius says disfigured him, by shaving,
which is very puerile, &c. Upon the whole, I decidedly prefer the interpretation of the Syr. Vulg. and Arab. followed by Beza, Piscator, and many modern versions, and which is adopted by Casaubon, Rosenm. Kuin. and Schleusner, namely wounded him on the head. The signification is indeed rare, and perhaps no where else to be met with; but it is not repugnant to the analogy of the language. For from γυάδος is formed γυάθω, which is by Hesychius explained εἰς γυάθος τίπτω, and γαστρίζω, in Aristoph. Ep. 178. and 459. Vesp. 15, 19. and Diog. Laert. 7, 172. signifies to strike on the belly. I must further observe, that λιθοβολέω does not here signify to stone to death, but to pelt with stones.

13. ἀγγείωσι. This verb, (which is somewhat rare in the Classical writers,) like the Hebr. יָּפָה, properly signifies to catch, as applied to beasts, birds, and fishes; but since (says Schleusner), in this signification there is always a notion dolosè circumveniendi, et struendi insidias, so it metaphorically denotes to plot, lay snares for one, whether by words or deeds. It may then be rendered ensnare. In the parallel passage of Matth. there is παγιδεύσωσιν ε. λ. where see the note. I add Philostr. V. Ap. 4, 43. τὸν Ἀπολλ. λίων ἀφανος ἀνίχνεων, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐπιηνίμων τί εἰποι, any thing which could be laid hold on, &c.

13. Mark omits the parable found in Matth, 22, 1. 14. and proceeds to ver. 15. of the same chapter, compared with Luke 20, 20. seqq.


19. ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν. This is a term especially appropriate to legislation, as is proved and illustrated by Elsner, Vater, and Kypke.

25. It has been well observed by Erasmus, that the Sadducees erred from ignorance of the Scriptures, the Pharisees not from being ignorant of the
Scriptures, but by being blinded by avarice and ambition.

26. ἐκ τῆς βάτου, οἷς εἴπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς. The best commentators here notice a *trajectio* for οἷς εἴπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ τῆς βάτου, and Wolf, Rosenm. Michaelis, and Kuinoel, agree in adopting the mode of taking the passage proposed by Jablonski, who acutely perceived that this is a *form of citing Scripture*, usual in that age among the Jewish Doctors, who were accustomed to quote any portion of Scripture, by some most remarkable subject there treated on. So that the sense is this: "Have ye not read in the *book of Moses*, in that place which contains the *history of the bush*, that God said," &c. So Rom. 11, 3. I add, that in a similar manner the ancient Greek critics used to cite from Homer, and some other authors of celebrity.

29. Κύριος ἐστι. Mark very properly adds this, as contributing to the illustration of the *following* precept. For religion does not consist in worshiping *any* God, but some *certain Deity* is to be proposed in the mind. (Grot.) It could not be too much inculcated on the Gentiles that there is but *one God*. (Wets.) It appears to have been the purpose of their legislator, to promulgate among the people these two important articles, as the foundation of that religious constitution he was authorized to give them. The first was, that the God, whom they were to adore, was not any of the acknowledged objects of worship in the nations around them, and was therefore to be distinguished among them, (the better to secure them against idolatry,) by the peculiar name Jehovah, by which alone, he chose to be invoked by them. The second was, the unity of the divine nature, and consequently that no pretended divinity (for all other gods were merely pretended), ought to be associated with the only true God, or share with him in the adoration.

33. τὸ ἀγαπᾷν — ὑσιῶν. Wetstein compares
Suæca, f. 49, 2. Dixit R. Eleazer; Longe major est, qui erogat eleemosynam, quàm si offerret omnes oblationes. Prov. 21, 3. Psal. 50, 51. 1 Sam. 15. Hos. 6. Esek. 1. Πλειν, Grotius well explains, prius et potius, Deoque gratius.

34. νουνεχώς ἀπεκρίθη. Wetstein gives examples of this word and νουνεχώντως from various authors, and of the very rare form ἔχοντας νοῦν, from Plat. 3. 810. q.

34. οὖ μακράν εἰ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. Subaud ὄδος. Of those who have not received the Kingdom of God there are many degrees, among whom that is not far removed from the Kingdom which is composed of those persons who comprehend the sum of piety and approve of it. Schoettgen thus explains it. "Parum tibi deest, quin Christianus fieri queas. Nam is non erat ejusmodi Phariseus, qui cultum externum interno praeferebat, aut odium hominum plebeiorum aliis inserere volebat, sed rectè potius in talibus sentiebat. Atqui vero hos Christus servator amabit, regnoque suo aptos et proximos esse judicabat." In illustration of this, Wetstein compares the following exquisitely beautiful passage of Phil. Jud. de Agricult. T. 1. p. 397, 10. Λ. εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ πάντα κάλων ἐστεβείας ἀναστάσεις ἐνεργίζεται τοῖς λιμενίων αὐτῆς ταχυμνωτόταις ἐστοῦδασαν, κατατείχοι οὖ μακρὰν ἀφεστηκὼν, ἀλλ' ἡδη μελλώντων προσόψειν, αἱρεύοντος ἐξεναντίας κατάσχαγεν πνεύμα πλησίων εὐθυδρομῶν τῷ σκάφῳ ἀνέωσεν, καὶ ὑποκείμεν, πολλὰ τοῖς πρὸς εὐπλοίαις συνεργοῦνταν.

38. Mark omits the long discourse of Christ in Matth. 23, 1—39. and now from 38. to 44. follows Luke 20, 45—21, 4.

38. θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν. The στολή was a garment descending to the ankles, worn in the East, by persons of distinction; ex. gr. Kings (1 Paral 15, 27. Jon. 3, 6.) Priests (3 Esd. 1, 1, 5, 81,) and honourable persons. See Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 26. 2, 4, 1. Luke 15, 22. See Raphel, Munth, Wets. on this
place, and Ferrar. de re vest. 3, 24. These οὐσιατα were affected by the Lawyers of the Pharisaical sect. (Kuin.)

38. ἀπαραγμον έν ταις ἁγοραις, that is in the public places; which signification is illustrated by Schl. Lex. who truly remarks, that the reading of the Cod. Cant. ε. τ. πλατειαις, is a mere gloss. The very same expression occurs in Dior. Hal. 1, 264. 42. έν ταις ἁγοραις, where there was no reason for Gelenius and Sylburg, to conjecture ε. τ. ἁγιαις.

40. κατεσθιοντες τας οικιας των χρηστων, devorantes viduarum bona, opes; as those persons mentioned in 2 Tim. 3, 6. The female sex, as being more prone to superstition, so lies more open to such like frauds. That this was done to widows, whom the Divine Law recommended them to defend, rather than plunder, increased their condemnation. (Grot.)

40. προφασει μακρα προσενχομενοι i.e. εις προφασιν πλεονεξιας. So Luke, “Solent cūm isti homines honestas quasdam causas prætendere sub quibus questum faciant.” (Grot.) On the length of the prayers see the note on Matth. 28, 14.

41. γαδουφυλακιον. A word scarcely to be found out of the N. T. except in the Sept. and Josephus. The γαδου (which signifies riches), is by Brisson de Regn. Pers. 1, 181. derived from the Persian.

42. λεωπτα δυο, duo nummiculos. A very minute coin, the half of a quadrans, or farthing. It is in our common translation rendered mite, which (by the way), comes from minute, and farthing from fourthing, formed after the imitation of quadrans. It is, however, of more consequence to remark, that this was the smallest offering which could be received into the treasury. See Schoettg. Hor. Heb. 250. who cites Bava Bathra, fol. 10, 2.

43. λεγω υμιν. Jesus said this to them apart, because it was necessary that the widow, or the bystanders, should hear this. But he wished to teach his disciples what was the true estimation of liberality with God, and the imitators of God. (Grot.)
43. πλείον πάντων βέβληκε. Similar sentences are produced by Wetstein, from Xen. Exped. Cyri 7. οὗ γὰρ ὁ ἄριστος ὁμίλῳ ἕστι τὸ πολὺ καὶ ὅλιγον, ἀλλ' ἡ δύναμις του τε ἀποδιδόντος, καὶ του λαμβάνοντος. Aristot. Ethic. 4, 2. κατὰ τὴν ὁμιλίαν ἡ ἐλευθερίας λέγεται, οὗ γὰρ ἐν τῷ πλῆθει τῶν διδομένων τὸ ἐλευθέριον, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ τοῦ διδόντος ἔχει, αὐτῇ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ὁμιλίαν διδόσιν. Όυδὲν δὲ κωλύει ἐλευθερίατερον εἶναι τὸν τὰ ἐλαττω διδόντα, εἰπὶ ἀπὸ ἐλαττών διδοῦ. Jos. A. 6, 7, 4. πενίας ἢ διὰ τὴν τιμήν, ἢ παρὰ τῶν πλουσιοτάτων δεξιοῦται. Xen. Mem. Socrat. 1. θυσίας δὲ δύναται δὲ νόμους μικρὰς ἀπὸ μικρῶν οὐδὲν ἡγεῖτο μειοῦσθαι τῶν ἄπε πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα θύσιν — ἐπαινεῖτο δ' ἡν καὶ τοῦ ἐπούς τούτου καθόμνοις δ' ἔρθεις ἐρ' ἀδανάτοις θέοις. See Senec. de Benef. 1, 8. Mr. Bulkley compares Ovid de Ponto. 3, 4. Denique opus — bove. Several similar passages are produced from the Jewish writers, by Schoettg. Hor. Heb. and Scheid, ap. Mensch. p. 126. I add the following observation from Wetstein. “We learn from the treatise de Siculis, 13. that in the women’s court there were certain receptacles appropriated for coins, which from their form were called trumpets, from whence, three times a year, just before the three festivals, money was presented to the treasury called Corban; it was expended for the various uses of the temple, such as sacrifices, oil, wine, incense, vases, golden plates, to decorate the sanctum sanctorum, and for wood. (Wets.)

44. περισσεύοντος, many MSS. read περισσεύματος, but the common reading is more agreeable to the usage of the best Greek writers.

CHAP. XIII.

Mark, from the 1st to the 32nd verse, follows Matth. 24, 1—36. and Luke 21, 5. sequ. but he is
much more brief. On this Chapter see the note on Matth. 24.

Verse 1. ποταμοί λίθοι. These, it appears from Jos. Ant. 15, 11, 3. consisted of white free stone, twenty-five cubits in length, and twelve in breadth. They are thus described by Joseph. Ant. 15, 11, p. 702. 1. et seqq. ἀπετίχυξε—ταῖς πέτραις μολύβδων δεδεμέναις πρὸς ἀλλήλας—ἀφὸς ἀροθον (immane) εἶναι τὸ τε μέγεθος τῆς οἰκοδομῆς καὶ τὸ ὑψὸς τετραγώνου γενομένης, ἀεὶ τὰ μὲν μεγέθη τῶν λίθων ἀπὸ μεγαστῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν ὁρᾶται, τὰ δὲ ἐντὸς σιδήρου διαφανσμένα συνέχειν τὰς ἀρμόδια ἀκινήτους παντὶ χρόνῳ. Then follows a description of the temple. Of the prodigious stones employed by the ancients, there is a remarkable example in Jos. 1008. where, speaking of the pier, and Stratos tower, he says: ὅπερ ἤσαν οἱ πλείστοι μήκος ποδῶν πεντήκοντα, βάθος ἐννέα, ἕφος δέκα τίνες δὲ καὶ μεγίστοι.*

11. μελετάτε. This word is often said of an elaborate oration, as opposed to an extemporeous one. To the declamations, rhetoricians were called μελεταῖ. Of this, numerous examples are produced by Wetstein.

* Much has been said of Gothic roofs having been formed in imitation of places of Druidical and other Divine worship, in the woods over-arched by branches of trees. This is confirmed by Pausan. 10, 5, 5. who, speaking of the first temple of Delphi, says, that it was only a chapel made of the branches of laurel growing near the temple. I should rather conjecture, that it was constructed after the manner of the early Gothic temples, the walls being formed by the trunks of trees, and the roof by the branches carefully drawn over and made to meet. There are traces of this also, in a very ancient Egyptian building described by Herodot. 2, 170. παστεία λιθάνη μεγάλη, καὶ ἡσσημένη στύλοις φοινίκες τὰ δέντρα μεμιμηόντος, evidently in imitation of the above very ancient temples of trees. Herodot. 5, 119, 9 ἐς Δίος Σπαριῶν ἑρον μέγα τε καὶ ἄγιον ἀλόσος πλανανήσων. So we may understand the worship of the Groves in the Old Testament. It has been said that the Ancients were ignorant of the art of building arches; but this is refuted by Procop. 192, 5.
19. ἔσωνται γὰρ οἱ ἡμέραι—θλίψις. To time is ascribed the thing done in time; as in 2 Sam. 3, 1. q. d. There will be continued calamity, one calamity succeeded by another. (Wets. and Kuinoel.)

32. τὸς αὐτὸς αὐτοίς αὐτοῖς (οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ ἐν οὐρανῷ, οὐκ ὁ θεός). Since these words, by which a knowledge of the precise period of the destruction of Jerusalem at the final judgment is denied to the Son of God, seem to detract from the dignity and wisdom of our Saviour, they have been by some, (both ancient and modern Theologians,) suspected of having been foisted in by the Arians. So Ambrosius de Fide 3, 3. "Veteres Græci Codices non habent, quod nec Filius scit. Sed non mirum, si et hoc falsarunt, qui Scripturās interpolavere divinas." And, of the modern Theologians), by Hutter and others. But their genuineness has been satisfactorily proved by Glass, More, Hackspan, Mill, and many more. The words are indeed found in almost every MS. and have place in the ancient versions, and citations of the Fathers. If too (as Mill suggests) they had been inserted by those heretics, it must have happened that the post-Nicene Fathers, in their continual contests with the Arians, would have mentioned it. Therefore this expedient to rid us of the difficulty must not be thought of. Neither (as Wolf says) will it be necessary to cut the knot, since it may be untied. There has, indeed, been considerable diversity of opinion among the Commentators as to the exact mode of interpreting the words, for a complete account of which I must refer the reader to Suicer’s Thes. T. 2, 168. seqq. and 268. to Garnier, Sand, Patav. and Markius, referred to by Wolf and Chaumier, and Quenstadt, &c. referred to by Koecher. Gataker. Ado. Posth. c. 26. p. 707. I must content myself with detailing those opinions which seem to have the greatest probability, and have been embraced by any considerable part of the writers who have discussed this knotty question.
Many are there who maintain that Christ professed that he did not know, in the sense of he did not choose to reveal it to them. So Theophyl. and some other ancient writers, and of the modern ones Petavius, Possin, Amelius, Massuet, Bp. Bull, and Wotton. But this opinion has been refuted by Marck, Bernard, Clericus, Hackspan, and Wolf, the last of whom observes that this interpretation, as it cannot be reconciled with the candour of Christ, which would scarcely admit such equivocal phrases, so neither does it suit the context, which plainly shows that in the very sense that this knowledge is denied to men and angels, so is it denied to Christ. Others maintain that Jesus, as a Legate sent from his Father, professed that he himself knew not the period of the destruction of Jerusalem, because he had it not in command to reveal it to others: So Strigel, Leigh, Bengel, Stackhouse, and Hammond, who thus very judiciously explains: "To preclude the curiosity of men, and to engage their vigilance, Christ is pleased to tell them, that no dispensation of God, either by man (as Daniel), or by angel, or, which is the highest, by the Son of Man, had ordered us thus to know the times and the seasons; this being no part of the prophetic office, or within the commission of Christ himself, as a Messiah, to reveal this secret to them." This hypothesis has been most ably supported by Wetstein, in an elaborate annotation, which I think it my duty to lay before my readers without alteration.

Some Commentators simply understand by this that Christ was ignorant of that day and hour, because it did not please the Father to reveal it to him. To me this seems not true. For since, from Matth. and Luke, and from the 38th and the 40th verse of this chapter, it is manifest that the subject here treated of is the destruction of Jerusalem, who can easily believe that Christ was ignorant of the exact time of that destruction? He who knew all
the events which preceded that catastrophe, in the very order in which each happened, disturbances, famine, pestilence, civil war, the approach of the Roman army, &c. was he then ignorant of that to which all these events tended? If you were to ask any one how many miles is the distance from Amsterdam to Utrecht, and he were first to exactly describe, and then enumerate all the villages lying between, and their respective distances, is it credible that when he came to the last, he would answer you that he knew not the distance from the one city to the other? Again, since the Scripture speaks in so exalted a strain of Jesus, as of him in whom all the secrets of the Father are reposed, and who knows more than any of the prophets. (Matth. 11, 27. Joh. 1, 18. Col. 2, 3.) we are warranted in believing that he knew the day of the destruction of Jerusalem more accurately than Daniel, who, however, (9, 26, 27.) was not far from a knowledge of the truth; more exactly too than John, to whom it was afterwards revealed, that the Jewish war would last three years and a half, as we shall see at the Apocalypse. Others, therefore, maintain that Christ is here considered as the Son of God sent into the world: and by men and angels are meant not any men and angels, but the prophets and angels who were sent as messengers to men. Now the office of Legate required that he should only speak what he has in command, the rest of the secrets committed to his faith he must be silent upon and conceal, just as much as if he were altogether ignorant of them. Thus Paul (1 Cor. 2, 2.) says that he knows nothing among the Corinthians except Jesus; not that he did not know more, namely, what he had learned from the mouth of Gamaliel, and from his various peregrinations, but that that only belonged to the office of Apostle. In the same sense Christ, when he was asked, whether at that time he would restore the Kingdom of Israel, replied: "It is not yours to
know the times and seasons which the Father has put into his power." Acts 1, 7. Joh. 15, 15. So also other writers speak. Plaut. Milit. Glorios. 2, 6, 88. "Linguam comprimes post hac: etiam illud, quod scies, nesciveris." Ter. Heaut. 4, 4, 26. "Tu nescis, id quod scis, Dromo, si sapis." Eunuch. 4, 4, 54. "Utrum taceamne an prædicem? Do. Tu, Pol, si sapis, Quod scis, nescis." Apuleij. 2. de Myster. Isiacis. "Ecce tibi retuli, quæ, quamvis audita, ignores tamen necesse est." 4. Esrae 4, 52. "Respondit ad me, et dixit: de signis de quibus me interroga, ex parte possum tibi dicere: de vita autem tuæ non sum missus dicere tibi, sed nescio." Hom. H. in Mercur. 92. καὶ τε ἴδων μὴ ἴδων εἶναι, καὶ καθὼς ἀκόως, καὶ στην. Plut. Lycurg. p. 52. c. άρχιδάμους μεμφομένων τινῶν ἑκαταῖων τῶν σωφρονὶς, διὰ παραληθείς εἰς τὸ συστίτιον οὐδὲν ἔλεγε, ὅ εἰδος, ἐφο, λόγον, καὶ κατὰ ὁμολ. In the same manner the ecclesiastical writers interpret this saying of Christ. So Augustin, Cæsarius, Photius, Hilarius. [For the passages I must refer the reader to the work itself.] From this interpretation it necessarily follows, that we must admit the superiority of the Father to the Son to be indicated; on this principle, namely, that the Father is superior to the Son, and the sender to the sent. So Irenæus 2, 48, 49. Basil, and Amphiloch. Ep. 391. (See the passages in Wets.)

The opinion most generally maintained by theologians is, that Jesus said this in respect of his human nature, that he spoke of himself as the Son of Man, (see on Matth. 8, 20.) who was ignorant of many things. That the divine nature conjoined with the man Christ Jesus impressed on the human mind of Christ its own affections, and also necessary knowledge pro temporum ratione, and therefore, in respect of his human nature, and in the state of inanition in which Christ was then placed, he was ignorant of some things. So Grotius, Chamier, Quenstadt, Gataker, Osiander, Heinius, Capellus, Muller, Scheuzer, Gebhard, Bp. Kidder, Masch.
Bibliander, Moldenhauer. But they (especially Muller, Kidder, and Masch) satisfactorily prove that this ignorance does not detract from the divinity of our Saviour. They refer this ignorance to the human nature of Christ, as if he had voluntarily submitted to it, though he might otherwise have derived it from the plenitude of his divine nature. So Whitby, Marck, More, Gusset, Hackspan. See Dodridge. Upon this most difficult question I dare not venture to offer an opinion. Indeed, it seems best to imitate the prudence of certain ancient writers. Leontius, for instance, (ap. Hammond): ἦμεις δὲ λέγομεν ὅτι οὐ δεῖ πάνω ἀκριβολογεῖν περὶ τούτων σοι γὰρ οὐν οὐδὲ ὁ σύνοδος (the Council of Chalcedon) τοιούτο ἑπολυφραγμόνησε δόγμα. But although Christ, (says Koecher), has here clearly and positively asserted, that to no man is communicated the knowledge of the day of judgment, yet there have not been wanting those who with audacious, though vain, endeavours have strove to seek it out, and define it." See Wolf and Koecher.

33. Mark omits the long discourses of Matthew, and, in their place, exhibits, in v. 33—36. a very short passage, on nearly the same subject with those of Matthew. Kuinoel thinks that Mark, in his archetype, found only the rough sketches of the picture, which in Matthew is filled up.

35. ἀλεκτοροφανίας. The ἀλεκτοροφανία here denotes the third watch of the night, from its limits, i. e. the last cockerowing, which is usually heard equidistantly between midnight and day-break. (Kypke.) Bulkley cites Hor. Sat. 1, lib. 1. Sub gallum cantum consultor ubi ostia pulsat. So also Juvenal, 9. "Quod tamen ad cantum galli fecit ille secundum, Proximus ante diem caupo sciat." See Fischer ap. Kuinoel. The word ἃ. occurs in Æsop. Fab. 44. and Anna Conn. in Ducange. See to this purpose there is a beautiful passage of Theocrit. Idyll. 18, 56.
ST. MARK, CHAP. XIV.

CHAP. XIV.

From this chapter to 16—8, Mark again takes Matthew (26, 1.—28, 8.) as his guide, comparing, however, Luke. (Rosenm.)

3. άλαβαστρόν. Alabaster is a stone remarkable for its whiteness and smoothness, of which the ancients made vases, flasks, &c. and which is so ductile and pellucid, that it is scarcely possible to distinguish these vases from those made of glass. Rosenm.; who refers to Plin. H. N. L. 13, ch. 2.

3. νάρδου πίστικῆς πολυτελοῦς. On the sense of the word πίστις, there has been no little difference of opinion. I must omit all conjectural alterations of the word, or derivations from names of places, as being devoid of probability. Grotius, Erasmus, Camerarius, Beza, Ursinus, and Wetstein, take it for nardus spicata, i. e. ex spicis expressa. This is so used, they think, by a sort of metathesis not unfrequent in the Classical writers, of which they give several examples. But this is mere conjecture, unsupported by any authority, and, indeed, destitute of much probability. Others, as Casaubon, Piscator, Schmid, Beza, Schwartz, Fischer, and Schleusner, derive it from πιθω or πιθω, not, however, that it was drunk, but only to express its fluidity. That it was very liquid, we learn from Dioscorides and Pliny. They also cite Tibull. Eclog. 2, 2, 7. and Æschyl. p. 478. which last passage, however, seems but little to the purpose. Others again, as Erasmus, Vatabl. Capell. Casaubon, Salmasius, Scaliger, Clericus, Suicer, Marck, Bengel, Kypke, Kuinoel, and others, derive it from πίστης, and take it to signify, pure, genuine, unadulterated; for that it was often adulterated, appears from Pliny, H. N. 12, 12. 12. 18, 1. and Dioscorides 1, 6, 7. This opinion is confirmed by the authority of Theophylact and the Greek Fathers cited in Suicer, 1, 391. and upon the whole it is the most probable one. Mr. Weston observes, that the pouring this
costly perfume upon our Saviour seems to have been in honour of his extraordinary character. Princes, in times of prosperity, were anointed with the most precious and fragrant oils. "For, lo, thine enemies, thine enemies, O Lord, shall perish: but my horn shalt thou exalt; I shall be anointed with green oil;" (Psalm 92, 10.) that is, with the finest perfume. The most expensive perfume in use at present in the East (the otter or odour of roses) is of a green colour, or has a greenish cast. (Weston.) From this having been done more than once, (see John 12, 3.) it seems to have been a custom, designed as an honour to the person to whom it was performed. In the heathen nations, it signified something sacred or divine. Plin. Epist. 9, 33. (Markland.) See the note of Le Clerc ap. Elsley.

S. συντριψαν το ἀλάβαστρον. By this expression συντριψαν many ancient Commentators thought it was broken in pieces; which seems by no means necessary, nor indeed suitable to the purpose intended. Others, therefore, as Hammond, Knatchbull, and Wakefield, explain, shaking it together, to bring it to a fluid state. But from what has been said, we may learn that it would scarcely need this. Others, as Kypke, Michaelis, and Schulz, with still less probability, take it to denote fricans, rubbing on. But this is a circumstance not very necessary to be expressed, nor very easily to be elicited from the verb; for that would require εὑρίσκω or προσπίσω, but not συντρίψαν. Upon the whole, I do not hesitate to assent to the interpretation of Drusius and De Dieu, which is adopted by Stark, Ermsch, Krebs, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel. "fregit vasculum foraminem in summo. Aperuisse autem unguentum recte dicitur, quem clauso viam emanandi fecit, fracto alabasti orificio." The word, which seems to have been a vox signata, was appropriated to denoting the opening of oil flasks, that being then done by breaking off the tip end of the narrow neck, which was sealed up, to preserve the nard, and denote its genuineness, (as we learn from Pliny). Thus we m.
compare the phrase συντρίβειν το ἀλάσκωτρον with that which we familiarly employ, when we speak of cracking a bottle together. Thus the Syriac and Ethiop. avoiding the metaphor, simply say, aperuit, i. e. as we say, opened the flask.

8. εἶχεν, i. e. ἔδωκα. Then προέλαβε is learnedly illustrated by Wetstein, Krebs, and Kypke. It will be sufficient for the student to consult Schl. Lex.

13. ἀνθρώπως, servus, say the Commentators, who take occasion to illustrate the servile nature of this office of carrying water. A circumstance not very necessary to be insisted on here. Many are the frivolous conjectures who this person may have been.

18. κεραμίον, scil. ἀγγεῖον, or σκεῦος, an earthen water pitcher, of which idiom examples are given by Wetstein. See Schl. Lex. This ellipsis occurs in Diog. Laert. 6, 2, 586. ἢ δὲ κεραμίον ὥλον ἐκτεμήσει αὐτῷ. The same ellipsis prevails in the Latin Classics, as fictilia for fictilia vasa. So Juv. Sat. 10, 25. Nulla aconita bibuntur fictilibus. Pliny often fills up the ellipsis. (Palairot.) Rosenmuller thinks it certain that many Jerusalemites let out rooms ready prepared to strangers at the time of the feast, and that the master of this man was one of that sort. (Weston compares Hor. Sat. 3, 19. Quo præbente domum.) But Lightfoot asserts, that lodgings were free of charge.

15. ἐστραφέων—ἐστραφέων, an upper room, such as those which the Jews used for the same purposes as those to which our dining-rooms, parlours, and closets are applied. The word ἐστραφέων, which Camp-

* Dr. Campbell has a very prolix annotation on this word, in which, amidst a great deal of trifling, he has stumbled on one opposite remark, namely, that we may strike off the neck of a bottle, or flagon, without spilling the liquor. He translates, broke open the flask, and then justifies this by observing, that it required an uncommon effort to bring out the contents; a circumstance which, he thinks, ought not to be overlooked, being an additional evidence of the woman's zeal for doing honour to her Lord. But perhaps there was not much greater effort required to thus open an oil-flask, than to uncork one of our bottles.
bell renders "carpeted," has a reference to preparation of beds, couches, or sofas, carpets, pillows, stools, &c. such as among the Oriental nations supply the place of chairs, tables, and indeed almost all the other furniture of a room.

19. εἰς καθ' εἰς, in the nominative by an Hebrew enallage, for καθ' ἑνα, as the Attics write, and St. Paul, Eph. v. 33, 1 Cor. 14, 31. Not, as Wetstein supposes, unus et deinque unus, un à un; but exactly agreeable to our English idiom, one by one. One by one comprehends the whole number, all the Twelve: it seems, therefore, superfluous to add, and another. Perhaps, say to him, one, and then another, is it I? and another (i. e. a third), is it I? In the Greek, perhaps, εἰς καθ' (i. e. καὶ εἰςα) εἰς: as in Horace, de-momnum, demet et item unum, i. e. alterum. Martial: expulsit una duos tussis, et una (i. e. altera) duos. But see Grævius on Lucian’s Solœcist, p. 716, where he says, that καθ' εἰς is put, by an Hebrew enallage, for καθ' ἑνα. (Markland.)

20. αὐτῶν, to them, i. e. to one of them, viz. John. Jesus, when he had dipped his sop, gave it to Judas; which was the sign given to John, by which he was to know the betrayer. The discourse between our Saviour and John, previous to giving the sop, is omitted; the answer is retained. This is frequently done, and often causeth some obscurity. (Markland.)

30. τριν ἢ δἰς ἀλέκτωρα φωνησαι. Matthew, Luke, and John omit the δἰς, but there is no more disagreement among the Evangelists than there is between Horace and Juvenal, one of whom says, "sub-cantum galli;" the other, "ad cantum galli secundii." Mark speaks, indeed, more definitely, partly after the manner of the ancients, who, when they terminate a night, generally make mention τῆς δευτέρας ἀλεκτροφωνίας. There is a well known Greek verse thus expressing the morning: τελεμ ἢ τα δευτέραν ἀλέκτραν ἐφέγγυτο. (Heins.) Wetstein, among other passages, cites Heliodor. 7. Aristotelæus, 1, 24. εἰς ἀλεκτρυόναν αἰῶν. Longus, 3. περὶ αἰῶν ἀλεκτρυόναν.

33. ἐκδαμβείσθαι. The preposition has an intensive force, and the expression, which is a very strong one, is thus explained by Alard. in his Pathologia N. Test. p. 69. "animo et corpore perhorrescere, attento stupore percelli, sicut in subita consternatione, aut febrium accessu, fieri solet. A medicum vocatur horripilatio."

36. Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ. There has been much written on these words, but to little purpose. The simplest explanation is that of Schoettgen and Lightfoot, the former of whom observes, that after the Greek language began to be familiar to the Jews, it was not unusual for them to call the same thing by two names at once, one Hebrew and the other Greek; and hence it came to pass, that many persons bore two names, Greek and Hebrew. The latter observes, that as the word is Syriac, Mark might think it proper to add an interpretation of it for the information of his Gentile converts; as St. Paul did, when addressing the Romans and Galatians. If this view of the subject be correct, we should point, Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ, i.e. Ἀββᾶ, ὁ ἐκτει μεθερμηνευμένον ὁ πατήρ. On the import of Ἀββᾶ I need not enlarge. I will only observe, that there seems some reason to suppose it to be cognate with ἀπα, ἀπόρ, and ἱππα.

37. λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, whom he especially addresses, since he had a short time before, with every asseveration, strongly declared, that he would willingly encounter all calamities, nay, even death itself, with Jesus. (Kuin.) Observe, too, he calls him not Peter (i.e. rock, constant), but Simon. (L. Brug.)

41. ἀρέχει. On the interpretation of this word there has been much diversity of opinion; insomuch, that whole tracts (says Koecher) have been written
on it by Seelen and Kraft, and, (I add,) Sommelius. And no wonder, since the phrase is very elliptical, and, as is usual in what is spoken with great agitation of mind, abrupt, and therefore obscure. It is proper to enquire, though it will not be easy to determine, how this ellipsis may be supplied. I am inclined to think that the elliptical word is not καίρος, or ὁσμων as Hammond and Kypke tell us, since that would require ἀπέχει to be taken in a sense which it scarcely admits. One thing seems certain, (though it has been little attended to by the Commentators,) namely, that the word is an impersonal, and therefore we can scarcely expect to find the complete phrase. More, however, than one word seems wanting, and I would propose to fill up the ellipsis thus: τὸ πρῶτον ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος. Thus of all the interpretations the best, I think, is that of De Dieu; res nostra finem suum nacta est. Though he adds such a paraphrase as shows that he did not fully comprehend the import of the phrase, which is this: "the affair is come to a termination; it is enough; it is done; all is over." So Salmusias, "peractum est." It therefore comes to the same sense as ἵκανος ἐστι in Luke 22, 38. and τετέλεσται in Joh. 19, 30. This interpretation is strongly confirmed by the Syriac and Persian versions, the Vulg. sufficit, and the gloss of Hesych. ἀποχρή, ἐξαρκη, which was doubtless derived from the ancient Scholiasts, and by them from the earliest Greek Interpreters. The gloss, (for so it must be considered,) of the Cod. Cant. and some others, which have ἀπέχει τέλος, shows the antiquity of the interpretation. It has, indeed, been objected, that there is not sufficient authority for this signification. But surely, the Greek Fathers may be supposed competent judges of the import of phrases in their own language. Besides, the impersonal use occurs, in this very sense, in Anacr. Od. 28, 33. ἀπέ-χει, βλέπω γὰρ αὐτῶν, cited by Grot. and others; also in Cyrill. in Hagg. 2, 9. (cited by Wets.) ἐκὼ ὡς τὸ ἄργυρον καὶ ἐκὼ τὸ χρυσόν, τοὐτ' ἐστιν ἀπέχει, καὶ τεπ-
aphermon, καὶ δεδεμένη τέως τεσσάρων οὐθέν. We meet with it too in Tabulæ Heracleot. published by Mezochi, referred to in Steph. Thes. 3958. a. edit. Valpy. I know of no other Classical examples that have yet been produced, but perhaps more may hereafter be met with. This being, I think, decidedly the true sense, I am surprised that the recent German Philologists, as Heuman, Thiess, Reichard, Rosenmüller, and Kuinoel, should have here adopted so frigid and far-fetched a sense as the following: “abest, recessit, præterit, anxietas mea, angor ille animi mei; qui me hactenus gravissimè pressit et affictavit.”

44. σώσημα, a signal. It seems to be an Hellenistic, or Alexandrian, word; though Wetstein cites examples from Diod. Sic. Strabœ, and Æneas Poliorcet.

44. ἀπαγάγετε ἀσφαλῶς. I have noticed this use of ἀσφαλῶς in Matthew. Ἄσφ. has reference to the care and diligence to be employed in the seizure. So in Act. 16, 29. the jailor is ordered ἀσφαλῶς τινὲς, and in 24. ἀσφαλιζομαι is used of securely keeping the prisoners; q. d. take him off with the utmost care and diligence, for he has sometimes made strange escapes. Yet many Commentators think that Judas expected that he would do so on this occasion, and in despair went and hanged himself.

51. εἰς τις νεανίσκος. Of the pleonastic use of εἰς examples are given by Wetstein from Thucydides, Aristophanes, and Arrian. The name and condition of this youth has been diligently investigated. Some say that he was John, or James the Less. And so Euthymius: The variety of opinions is (says Markland) a sure sign that nothing certain can be said of the passage. Dr. Owen thinks the young man was a Roman, then on the spot, and had often told the story at Rome, where St. Mark would hear of it. This Mr. M. thinks possible, which is as much as can be said of any conjecture. That he was not of the number of the Apostles, Kuinoel thinks, is manifest; since he was discerned by them when they had taken
flight, and was proceeding in an opposite direction. This, however, seems somewhat precarious. Of conjectures the most probable is that of Grotius (approved by Michaelis), who suspects that this youth, roused from sleep by the noise of the soldiers, had suddenly run from some farm-house near at hand, in order to see what was the cause of this uproar, and that he then was intending to follow Jesus, to see how the affair would terminate, when he was met by the soldiers, and, on their attempting to seize him, he took to flight, leaving his garment in their hands. Grotius, too, supposes, that Mark recorded the circumstance, in order to shew that the soldiers intended, in consequence of the order of the Sanhedrim, to apprehend the Apostles, with whom they confounded this youth, as well as Jesus. This, however, is less probable. Though this incident (observes Campbell) recorded by Mark, may not appear of great moment, it is, in my opinion, one of those circumstances we call picturesque, which, though in a manner unconnected with the story, enliven the narrative, and adds to its credibility. It must have been late in the night, when, (as has been very probably conjectured,) some young man, whose house lay near the garden, being roused out of sleep by the noise of the soldiers and armed retinue passing by, got up, stimulated by curiosity, wrapped himself (as Lasaubon supposes) in the cloth in which he had been sleeping, and ran after them. This is such an incident as is very likely to have happened, but most unlikely to have been invented. The mention of these trivial occurrences (observes Le Clerc) confirms the truth of the history. The Evangelists write without any selection of those events which might prejudice their readers in favour of Jesus Christ, or without almost any praise bestowed on him. They represent things as they are, in the colours of truth, and as they appeared to them at the time, or came to their knowledge.

51. περιβεβλημένος σινόνα. On this word see the
note on Matth. 27, 59. Wetstein here cites Galen: μὴ γυμνὸς κομμιζότω, ἀλλὰ περιβεβλημένος σινδώνα. And Herodot. 2, 95. οὔ μὲν ἐν ἰματίῳ ἐνελιξάμενος εἴθη ἢ σινδών. He (with Casaubon) expounds veste dormitoria, and refers to Am. 2, 16. To which I add D. Kimchi in Libro Radicum (cited by Schl. Lex.) “Sindon est vestis nocturna, quam induunt super carnem, facta ex lino.” These sort of garments are much in use amongst the Eastern nations, especially in the summer and at night time. Very similar to them are the ample and flowing cloaks worn at the present day by the Moors and Arabs, called by them Hyks, as we learn from Shaw, Pocock, Niebuhr, and others. The young man left the σινδών in his hands, as Joseph did his garment in those of the Egyptian woman. So Weston compares Plutarch’s Vit. T. 4, 378. of Tiberius Gracchus: ἀντελάβετο τις τῶν ἰμάτιων, ὡς τὴν Τίβεριν ἀφεὶς, καὶ Φεύγων ἐν τοῖς χίτσωιν ἑσφάλα. Bishop Pearce (says Campbell) supposes this to have been a tunic, or vestcoat, the garment worn next the skin, (for shirts, as necessary as we imagine them, appear to be of a later date, unless we give that name to a linen tunic:) but the words in connection, περιβεβλημένος ἐπὶ γυμνὸς, lead us to think that this was a loose cloth cast carelessly about him. The historian would never have added ἐπὶ γυμνὸ speaking of the tunic, or, as we commonly render it, coat, which was always ἐπὶ γυμνὸ, close to the body. By this, on the contrary, he signifies that the man had no tunic, and was consequently obliged to make his escape naked, when they pulled off his wrapper.

51. ἐπὶ γυμνὸς, scil. σάματος. Lightfoot has well observed, that this expression is to be taken emphatically, for it was very usual to be clothed with a sindon as an exterior garment, as we use a surtout. Many Commentators take γυμνὸς in the sense of “wanting the outer garment.” This indeed it frequently signifies, (see Matth. 25, 31.) but I do not see how it can be admitted in the present passage.
It must surely here be taken in the proper sense of naked.

51. κρατῶσιν αὐτῶν αἱ νεανίσκαι. Piscator, L. Brug, Bosius, Gerhard, Heupel, and Heuman, think that these were wanton youths, who had followed the soldiers from the city. But, as Casaubon observes, the use of the definite article refutes that notion. Casaubon, Grotius, Drusius, Hamm. Wolf, Schwartz, and others, with Rosenm. and Kuinoel, very properly take them to be the Roman soldiers just mentioned; and they remark that νεανίσκ. is so used by the Greek Classical writers, especially Polybius and Aelian V. H. 2, 44. And so juvenius and adolescens by the Latin. Nor is this idiom unknown to the Hebrews. So 2 Sam. 2, 14. Is. 13, 18. 2 Sam. 2, 15, 16. Gen. 14, 24. 1 Sam. 21, 2 & 5. 2 Chron. 15, 3, where the Sept. has πολεμιστέω.

54. θερμαμένον πρὸς τὸ φῶς, i. e. πρὸς τὸ πῦρ, or σοκιν. So Luke 52, 46. καθημένον πρὸς τὸ φῶς. For φῶς, by a metonymy of effect for cause, is transferred to all objects which emit light. This has been, by Hammond*, Gataker, and others, accounted an

* Who has here a very instructive, though prolix, annotation, which I will abridge, simplify, and adapt to the use of the Student. "The Writers of the N. T. and the Greek Translators of the O. T. were Jews who had learned Greek. However, though they write in Greek, they retain the Hebrew idiom in phrases and formulas, and especially in two things:—I. in the conjugations of verbs. There being more in Hebr. than Gr. they express the sense of all the Hebr. conjugations by Gr. words of other conjugations. Thus they express the Hebr. Hiphil simply by a Gr. active verb. ἑφαρμόζειν, 2 Cor. 2, 14. ἀκατέλειν, Matth. 5, 45. σπεύδειν, 2 Pet. 3, 13. καθίζειν, 1 Cor. 6, 4. ἀποστοματίζειν, Luke 11, 53. περισσεύειν, 2 Cor. 9, 8. So ἰδεῖν, Mat. 5, 25. cause him to be friends with them.—II. When an Hebr. word, from the paucity of roots in that language, signifies several things, and these expressed in Gr. by several words of several significations, one of these Gr. words is often, by a dialect peculiar to them, taken for the other. This may indeed be observed in other translations. Nay something of this may be observed among the Gr. authors themselves. Thus, though καρφ signifies both a maid and the apple of the eye, yet the word γλήνη, signifying only the latter of them, is sometimes used for a maid, as εἷς καρφ γλήνη. One may similarly compare ὅργη, and χολή, and τρόπος. As also τιμή and ποιη.
Hebraism; and indeed the word does often, in the Sept. correspond to בז and דרכ. The purity of the Greek has, however, been strenuously defended by Pfoken, Raphel, Fessel. Blackwall, Stock, Westho- vius, Palaiaret, and others. But in nearly all the pas- sages produced by them, this word rather signifies fulgur than ignis or focus, So Eurip. Rhes. Xen. Hist. 6, 2, 17. Cyr. 7, 5, 10. It at most denotes only a blaze of fire, such as is caused by kindled wood.

56. non conveniencia. E. T. agreed not together. Vulg. non convenientia. So Beza, Erasmus, Cam. Vat. Arab. and Æthiop. Versions, St. Thes. and this is preferred by Wolf, whose reasons are these: 1stly, because he had never met with an example of the word in the sense which those who oppose this interpretation maintain: 2dly, because Christ’s judges seem not to have cared how heavy might be the charge made against him, but rather that this procedure might hold out a specious appearance of justice. But that would be accomplished, if the deposi- tions of the witnesses were consistent. This interpretation seems to have been adopted by Wetstein, who cites Apulej. 10. “Cum jam sententiae pares, punctorum stilis ad unum sermonem conguentibus, ex more perpetuo in uram æream dezerent conjici.” Rosch. Haschana 2, 6. “Si verba ipsorum inveniun- tur בזקל, conveniencia, testimonium eorum est firmum.” On the contrary, Hamm. Grot. Whitby, Beud. Heupel, Erasm. Zer. render idonea, and so Le.

Of this there are infinite examples in the Septuagist; ex. gr. though בז signifies both burden and honours, they not only ren- der it by one of those, when it signifies the other, but there being another Hebr. word, חש, which signifies a burden, (i.e. only one part of the signification of בז,) they have rendered חש sometimes by the other signification of בז, as Isaiah 14, 66. Now of this there are many examples in the N. T.; for instance, that now before us, and which gave rise to these general observations on the Hebrewistic idiom. Thus φως is here used after the manner of the Hebr. מש, light, the Sun, (hence Gr. Ἀφως, Apollo,) light- fire, or flaming-fire, (hence, perhaps, Lat. uro,) and in common use, both light and fire.”
Clerc, and some modern versions *. Thus Campbell too translates *insufficient*, and defends this interpretation by the following arguments. "Now there is nothing in the whole narrative that insinuates the smallest discrepancy among the witnesses. On the contrary, in the Gospels, the testimony specified is mentioned as being given by all the witnesses. The differences in Matthew and Mark (one saying, *I will rebuild*, another, *I can rebuild*; one adding, *made with hands*, another omitting it;) are not only of no moment in themselves, but are manifestly differences in the reports of the Evangelists, not in the testimony of the witnesses; nor are they greater than those which occur in most other facts related from memory. What, therefore, perplexed the pontiffs and the scribes was, that, admitting all that was attested, it did not amount to what could be accounted a capital crime. This made the high priest think of extorting from our Lord's mouth a confession which might supply this defect of evidence. This expedient succeeded to their wish. Jesus, though not outwitted by their subtilty, was no way disposed to decline suffering, and therefore readily supplied them with the pretext they wanted." To this argument Wolf would reply: "At ex silentio Evangelistæ in narrandâ fusius hujus causæ circumstantiâ res ipsa, quam in universum tradit, negari satis tutè non potest. Et arduum satis videbatur hoc crimen, Christo impactum, Sacerdotum Præses, Hinc enim ad causam dicendum excitat Dominum. Hujus vero silentium efficiebat, ut ad alium caput se converteret Sacerdotum Præses, quo tandem responsionem ipsi extorqueret." Schleusner holds a cautious, and per-

* Lightfoot translates an even evidence, or testimony, and observes: "The Jewish canons speak of three kinds of testimonies. 1. a vain testimony; 2. a standing testimony, doubtful, yet admitted to be canvassed and scrutinized; 3. the testimony (לשה ברייתו) (סכולית) of the words of them that agreed or fitted together; when the words of two witnesses were to the same purpose. On these see the Tract. Sanhedrin, cap. 5. hal. 3, 4."
haps prudent neutrality. I am, however, inclined to accede to the latter opinion. The objection of Wolf, that the sense sufficientia, idonea, is destitute of authority, seems not very cogent; for the signification in question is so agreeable to the radical force of the word as scarcely to need any.

58. καταλύω τὸν ναὸν τούτον τὸν χειροποίητον. This word χειροποίητον (say Grotius) was added, lest Christ should seem to have spoken parabolically. Wets. gives examples of the word χειροπ. I add a passage of Thucydides 2, 77. yet more apposite, where φλάξ χειροποιητη is opposed to ἀντι ταυτομιᾶτον τῷρ. He cites also the following beautiful passages from the Latin Classics. Apulej. Met. 5. "Prope fontis al- lunchum domus regia est, edificata non humanis manibus, sed divinis artibus." Curt. 5, 1, 34. "Vetus- tas non opera solum manufacta, sed etiam ipsam na- turam paullatim exedendo perimit."

59. οὐδὲ στρατὸς ἴση ἢ ἢ μ. a. i. e. insufficient for the purpose of establishing a capital charge. For (as L. Brug. observes) the offence was a mere empty boast, if he could not effect this, and if he could, there would be no harm done. Beza observes that the testimony was not consistent, because one said he could destroy, &c. (as Matth.) the other that he would destroy (as Mark). But this seems too sub- tile and artificial a mode of interpretation. We must therefore take οἰκ ἴση for insufficient.

65. ἤρειντό—περικαλάπτειν, i. e. by way of con- tumely, and in jest, asking him to divine who struck him. Buxtorf, Stark, and others, observe on this being a sign of condemnation, and compare a cus- tom of the ancients to veil the head of those about to be led to capital execution. (See Esth. 7, 8.) Indeed, as we learn from Cicero, the form of condem- nation was this: "I, lictor, colliga manus, caput ob- nubito, arbori infelici suspendito." But Kuinoel rightly accounts that nothing to the present purpose. Besides, in such a case, the whole head was covered, as it were, with a sack: here there appears only to
have been a handkerchief, or some such thing, bound over the eyes of Jesus, who was, as we should say, blindfolded.


68. ἐξῆλθεν ἐξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον. For that the circumstances mentioned in the following words happened in this hall, is manifest, both from the context, and also from the parallel passages of the other Evangelists. (Kuinocel.)

69. ἡ παράσκη. Professor Michaelis wishes for some MS. where the article ἡ is wanting. But Dr. Owen very truly remarks that this is not necessary. It is apparent, (continues he,) from their own mode of expression, compared with that of St. John's, that the three first Evangelists never attended to the order of the transaction; their point being only to assure us, that Peter denied our Saviour thrice. Hence it seems to me, that the maid here meant is not the same with her that is mentioned ver. 67, but the principal maid; the maid that stood at the porch, ἡ παράσκη εἰς τὸ προαύλιον, ver. 68; or, according to St. John 18, 17. ἡ παράσκη ἡ ὑπεράσκ. The other seeming contradictions the intelligent reader will easily reconcile. (Dr. Owen.) Rosenm. takes it for παράσκη της. That she was the same with the former appears, he thinks, from Matthew.

72. ἐπιβαλον, ἐκλαιε. In determining the sense of this passage, the Commentators are by no means agreed. Campbell has truly said that there are not many words in Scripture which have undergone
more interpretation than this ἐπιβαλὼν, and Koecher has shrewdly remarked: "Obscurior hujus loci brevitas mirum in modum explanatorium ingenia exercuit, eorumque sententias multiplicavit." The interpretation of Theophylact, as being probably founded on Chrys. and other Greek Fathers, deserves our first attention. It is this: ἐγκαλυψάμενος τῷ κεφαλῇ, covering his head, or face. There is an ellipsis of ἰμάτιον, which is found in conjunction with ἐπιβαλὼν in Levit. 19, 19. and indeed it is not unfrequent in the Classical writers. So Ἀeschyl. Choeph. 75. δακρύω δ' ὧν εἰμάτων: where Abresch compares Isoc. Trapez. 714. ἐγκαλυψάμενος ἐκλαίει. And Stanl. cites Hom. Od. Δ. 114. Δάκρυ δ' ἀπό βλεψάραν χαμάδις βαλέ, πατρὸς ἄκουσας, χλαίνας πορφυρὴν άντ' ἀφθαλμοῖς ἀνασχών. And Eurip. Suppl. 110. Σὲ τὸν κατηρή χλαίδιος ἀνιστορῶ, Δέγ', ἐγκαλυπας κράτα, καὶ παρεῖς. To which Bishop Blomfield adds Eurip. 295. Orest. 274. Ἐγγυγον, τί κλᾶεις, ἀμμα θείος εἰσο πτέλαυ; Platon. Phæd. p. 97. Wytenb. ὡστε ἐγκαλυψάμενος ἀπέκλαίων ἐμαυτῶν. Epigr. in Hecubam Anthol. 5, 38. p. 389. φάρος γὰρ ἐπικρέμες ἀμφί προσα- πο Πύρματα μὲν δείκνυσιν ἀπαγγέλουσι δὲ πέπλοι. Πύρ- μος ὑποπρύγιον, κεκλασμένοι ἀχρὶ πεδίλων. Eurip. ap. Aristoph. Ran. 942. Προίτυστα μὲν γὰρ ἐνα γε τινὰ καθεύθεν ἐγκαλύπας ἀχιλλέα τιν’, ἡ Νίσβην, τὸ πρόσωπον οὐχὶ δεικνύς, Πρόσχυμα τῆς προαδίας, γυρίζοντας οὖδε τούτι. The same learned editor compares the following passage of Herodot. 6, 67. κατακαλυφάμενος ἂν ἐκ τοῦ θεῷ του ἢ τὰ ἐνυτού οἰκία. That the ancients were accustomed, in bitter grief, to veil the head is certain, from Jos. Ant. 7, 10, 5. καλυψάμενον δὲ βασιλέως καὶ στένοντος. So also 2 Sam. 15, 30, 19, 4. Esth. 7, 8. Jer. 14, 3 & 4. Campbell admits that the custom of veiling the head in grief has been proved to have existed among the Greeks and Romans, but not among the Jews. Yet that point seems to be established by the examples above cited. Nor can this reasonably be doubted of any civilized nation, especially as he admits that it is very natural
for a man who weeps to hide his face. The above opinion is supported by Salmasius, Elsner, Heuman, Abresch, Krebs, Beza, Schulz, Schwartz, Wolf, Schoetgen, Starck, Lang, Beausobre, Moldenhauer, Selden, Dupont, Suicer, Bos, Vorstius, Keuchen, Arnold, Arndt, and others. This interpretation, however, lies open to very serious objections. Dr. Campbell has remarked, "that a man hides his face in grief, not so much to conceal his emotion, as to conceal the effect of it, the distortion it brings upon his countenance. But (continues he) the matter of consequence to Peter was to conceal his emotion altogether. Now he could not have taken a more effectual method of publishing it to all around him, than by muffling up his head in his mantle. This could not fail to attract the attention of many who had no opportunity of observing the change on his features." The following objections of Kypke and others are still more weighty. This interpretation requires, (say they,) an ellipsis unheard of, (ἐπιβάλω τῷ ἱμάτιον τῇ κεφαλῇ, i.e. τῇ προσώπῳ,) and, until it be confirmed by examples, it is inadmissible. Nor will it be sufficient to prove that the word κεφαλῇ, or πρόσωπο, or ἱμάτιον, is sometimes omitted. A passage must be produced where ἐπιβάλλειν, put simply, signifies to veil the countenance or head, by throwing over it a vest. To which I must add a yet stronger objection, namely, that the reading proposed would be a solecism. Ἐπιβάλ. ἵμ. &c. can only signify to throw a vest, &c. over the head of another, not over one’s own head *, which would require ἐπιβαλόμενος, just as ἐπικαλυπτόμενος and ἐγκαλυπτόμενος. This interpretation must therefore be utterly abandoned. Grotius, Clericus, Heupel, Simon, Petavius, Munthe, and others, interpret addens flevit, he proceeded to weep; as in Theophr. Char. 8. καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἐξατεῖν, and Diod.

* The passage adduced by Wolf from Eurip. Elect. 1921. ἐπιβαλὼν φάνη κοραῖς ἑμαῖς, is nothing to the purpose; because there the circumstance in question is expressed by the added words.
Sic. 345. b. ἔπιβάλλων φησί. So in Hebr. הַלְל, is taken with a verb added. This, however, is justly pronounced by Kuinoel a languid and frigid interpretation. Others, as Beza, Raphel, Rosenm. and Schleusner, take ἔπιβασις for ὄρμα, and they think that ἔπιβαλλων ἐκλαῖε, rushing out of doors, is equivalent to the ἔξελθων ἐξαῖος ἐκλαυστε of the other Evangelists: And indeed ἔπιβάλλω does sometimes, especially in the Sept. signify to rush. But, as Loesner has observed, it does not appear from the passages produced whether ἔπιβασις can be so said without the addition of some place or person as the end of action. Besides, there is something harsh and far-fetched in the sense produced. Others, as Loesner, Heinsius, and Kuinoel, with the authority of the Vulg. Syr. Goth. Pers. Arm. Ital. and Cod. Cantab. render capit fere; and they produce examples. But in them the verb signifies entered upon, making a commencement of, &c. which yields, I think, a very frigid sense; insomuch that Kuinoel, to cover this defect, is fain to take the ἔπιβαλλων as a pleonasm, and simply renders flevit. But what is this but shuffling over the difficulty? The interpretations of Palaiaret, Weston, and others, are too absurd to be noticed. The latter conjectures ἔπιλάβων, which formerly occurred to myself, but this is entitled to no attention. I will conclude by stating what I conceive to be the most probable interpretation; namely, that of Bois, Lydias, Heupel, Casaubon, Kypke, Wets. Frisch, De Rhoer, Koecher, Campbell, (to whose acute observations I must refer the reader,) and some others, among whom are the learned and pious authors of our venerable version. The sense is, cum rem animadvertisset, et altius reputasset, “upon reflecting thereon,” and this I think a very apt sense*, (though it is pronounced by Kuinoel

* That Peter, on the serious recollection of the denial being foretold by our Lord, and of his confident assertions, and of all the consequent circumstances, should be struck with deep compunction, and weep bitterly, is a consonancy in the whole passage sufficient to justify the English translation. Elsley.
far-fetched,) neither does it lie open to any serious objections on the score of grammatical accuracy, especially considering the style of Mark. Examples of the complete ἐπιβάλλειν τῶν νοῶν, or τὴν διάνοιαν, are frequent. Nor are there wanting instances of the elliptical one, of which Wetstein has produced several: ex. gr. Polyb. 1, 80. ἐφ’ ὦς αὐτάρκεια ἡ Γαλάτης ἐπιβάλλειν μίαν ἐφ’ ἱστηρίαν εἶναι τοῖς ἑαυτῶν πράγμασι. To these may be added the four following passages cited by Kypke. Plutarch de placit. philos. L. 4. c. 8. p. 899. μηδὲν γὰρ ἐπιβάλλειν μηδετέραν χαρὰς τῷ προσπίπτοντος εἰδαλόν. Hierocles in Carm. Pythag. p. 14. ἀλλ’ ἀεὶ μὲν γινώσκει, ἄλλως δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ἐπιβάλλει, καὶ μᾶλλον, ἐστὶν γε, καὶ ἵττον. Sext. Emp. p. 213. εἰ ἐπιβαλλων ὁ σοφὸς ἀγαπάει λέγειν ἀδιαπτώτως. Diod. Sic. 20, 44. p. 419. πρὸς οδοὺν ἐπέβαλε τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν παρὰ τοῖς πολεμίοις συντελομένων. So also Polybius figuratively uses the kindred phrase, ἐπιστῆσαι, for ἐπίστησαι τῶν νοῶν, animum advertere, examples of which may be seen in Lex. Polyb. So also Appian 2, 473, 37. ὅων μηδὲν ὁ δήμος ἐπιστήσει. Aristot. de Mundo ap. Steph. Thes. ἐπιστῆσαντες τούτων, and Plutarch, ἐπιστῆσαν τοῖς πολέμασι. In this interpretation, therefore, I must finally acquiesce, though I mean not to contend that it is quite certain. Yet (as Campbell has said) if these authorities do not put the matter beyond all question, they at least give it a greater probability than has been yet given to any of the other hypotheses. I will conclude in the words of Markland: “It is a desirable thing to know the precise meaning of every passage and word in the Scriptures. But where that cannot be, as in this place and many others, we must be contented with this reflection, that the knowledge of such places is never absolutely necessary to us upon any account, except that of curiosity: for which I do not know of any provision that is made in the Christian Religion.”
CHAP. XV.

VERSE 6. ἀπέλευσ, for εἰσδέχεται ἀπολέων, which we find in Matth. 27, 1. and so the Persic version. Beza and Munthe have observed that verbs which denote action or effect, are very often to be understood of a custom of action, and may be rendered in Latin by soleo, and an infinitive. They give an example from Diod. Sic. 182. 3. ἀκτισματι ἀφινω τίτατον περικυλε κατὰ τῶν κρήμνων εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. See also Heupel and Lightfoot.

7. η—μετὰ τῶν συντασσαστῶν διδεμένων. What sedition is here referred to, cannot be ascertained. Josephus has made no mention of any thing corresponding to it. Φώνον πεποιήcores, “had committed slaughter.” A phrase used by the Sept. to express רעש, in Deut. 22, 8. Raphel too has cited it from Polyb. (Kuin.)

8. ἀνασβοηγας κ. τ. λ. This circumstance, namely, (that the people themselves had, of their own accord, demanded that a captive should, in compliance with custom, be released,) Matthew and Luke have omitted; only noticing that Pilate, when they were assembled, or, as Luke relates it, convoking the chief priests and the rulers of the people, asked, whether they would wish Barabbas to be released, or Jesus? Hence Michaelis and Paulus have suspected that some new disturbance of the people had occurred, to occasion this. But of this we find nothing in the words of the text. Perhaps the circumstances of the case may have happened thus. When a multitude of the people, together with Jesus, whom Herod had declared innocent, and ordered to be led back to the Procurator, (see Luke 23, 11 & 15.) had returned to Pilate, some favourers of Jesus cried out loudly, and, supported by the acclamations of the people, demanded that some prisoner should, as usual, be released. They dared not, indeed, name Jesus, but hoped that Pilate, whose wishes they
discerned, would, if the requisitions of the people should prove consentient, dismiss Jesus. Pilate, who was persuaded of the innocence of Jesus, and to whom these clamours were not unacceptable, forthwith convoked the people, and put to them this question: "Whom will ye that I release unto you?"

But at that very moment the Procurator was admonished by a message from his wife, that he should not condemn the innocent Jesus. (Matth. 27, 19.) Now, however, while Pilate was transacting his office with the messenger, the Synedrii stirred up the people, that they should ask the release of Barabbas. Under these circumstances, the mob hearkened not to the saint representation of the friends of Jesus, but, yielding to the loud and pressing instigations of the Synedrii, with loud clamours demanded the death of Christ. (Kuin.:

11. ἀνέσεισαν τῶν ὁχλῶν, instigated. Some MSS. have ἀνέπεισαν, and others ἐσείσαν. The one is a gloss, and the other derived from the parallel passage of Matthew. The textual reading is defended by Luke 23, 5. and this use of the word is confirmed by the examples produced from Diod. Sic. and other authors, by Elsner and Munthe. Hesych. ἀνασεῖν ἀναπείδεσθαι.

15. τῷ ὁχλῷ τῷ ἱκανῷ τοῦρα, satisfy the wishes of the people, or, as Grot. explains it, agreeably to the usage of satis facere in the Latin writers, "efficere ni alter habeat quod queratur." To this Kypke adds as an adjunct, "morem alicui gerere." It is, says Grotius, the satis dare of the Roman law, as λαμβάνειν ἱκανών, in the Acts, answers to the satis accipere. Though examples of this phrase are produced from Polyb. and other authors, yet I assent to Grotius, that it is an idiom introduced, with many others, into Greece from the Latin language, after that nation and the East had fallen under the dominion of Rome.

17. τορφύραν. The same with the χλαμύς κοκκίνη of Matthew. So a vest which Horace, Sat. 2, 6, 102.
calls *rubro coco tinctam*, he in the 106th verse has styled *purpuream*.

21. Ἀλέξάνδρου καὶ Ρούφου. These persons appear to have lived at Rome while Mark was writing this: so that he might very properly appeal to their testimony, who could relate the story as received from their father. For among those who professed the name of Christ, Paul (Rom. 16; 3.) salutes *Rufus*. Wetstein adduces many passages where the name of Rufus occurs.

23. ἐσμυρνισμένον ὄνων. Rosenm. tells us, it was the custom with the Jews to administer to any one going to capital punishment *good* and *generous* wine, with a view to intoxicate the wretch, (Tanch. 1, 26. Sanh. fol. 43.) but that to Christ the soldiers reached acid and bitter *posca* by way of *joke*, as appears (says he) from Matthew. That generous wine was sometimes spiced, we learn from the following passages cited by Wetstein. Galen de facult. Medic. Simplic. 5. ὁ τοῦ μήκους ὄσς, καὶ ἡ σμύρνα, καὶ ὁ στύραξ, καὶ ὁ κρύκος, ταύτα γὰρ εἰ μὲν πλέον ποθεῖν, τὰ μὲν ἐκμαίνει, τὰ δὲ δάνατον ἐπιφέρει· μετὰ συμμετρίας δὲ τινὸς ἐπιμιγνύμενα τοῖς άλλοις ἄργηγε. Theophr. de Odor. διὸ καὶ τῶν ὄνων τισὶ τὰ τοιαύτα μιγνύτες ὀστερὰ κέντρον ἐμποιοῦν· ἔστι δὲ μὲν σμύρνα θερμή καὶ δητική μετὰ στύρανος, ἔχει δὲ καὶ τικρίαν. Athen. 11. p. 464. C. σμύρνης γὰρ καὶ σχίνου καὶ τῶν τοιούτων εἰς τὸ οἴνωρ ἐμβρηκόντων ἐνοταί καὶ παραχεώντων εἰς τὸν ὄνων ἅττον μεθύσκοντων. Plin. H. N. 14, 15. “Lautissima apud priscos vina erant, myrrhæ odore condita.” But this will not prove Rosenmuller’s position. The intoxication, which was all they aimed at, might be produced as *well* by *bad* wine as *good*, especially when strongly medicated with myrrh, or bitter infusions. Wetstein appears, from the following remark, to have been of the same opinion: “At hic non multieres ex sensu misericordiae prebent vinum aromaticum generosum et pretiosum; sed milites per ludibrium porrigunt poscam acescentem et amaram.” See the note on the parallel passage of Matthew.
25. ἦν δὲ ὁρα τρίτη, καὶ ἐστ. α. At the time when they crucified him. This has been termed a Hebraism. Yet I have met with it not unfrequently in the Greek writers; ex. gr. Andoc. 7, 26. καὶ νόλθε τε ἦν καὶ τὸ δεσμωτήριον συνεκκλείστο. Appian, 1, 466. συναντούμενος — ἢδη κατεκρημμέτο, καὶ αἵ νησι οὐφησαν. Soph. Οἰ. R. 718. οὐ διέχυξον ἡμέραι τρεῖς, καὶ νῦν ἄρθρη κείνος ἐνδεύχας ποιῶν. Soph. Phil. 353. ἦν δὲ ἡμαρ ἡδὴ δεύτερον πλέοντι μοι κἀγα κατηγόμην.

25. τρίτη. But John 19, 14. has ἦρα δὲ ὁσεὶ ἐκτη. Various methods have been devised of reconciling this diversity. See Wolf and Koecher on John. Some think (as Semler, Ernestius, Rothen. Mosch, and, of the ancients, Jerome) that the number is to be altered; since 5 and 7 might easily be confounded. Kuinoel thinks that Mark, who does not usually note the chronology very accurately in his narrations, has, however, here rightly fixed the time. As to John, the Commentators urge the ὁσει which he has used, from which they think it manifest that he did not intend to define the time accurately. They also observe that John, although he was a spectator of the passion and death, and stood by the cross, yet, from the perturbation and emotion of his mind, would not exactly note the hours as they passed; neither, when he wrote his Commentaries, could he remember the exact period. See Schulz and Thiess. I am inclined, however, to agree with Markland, that the sense is, “It was between nine and twelve o’clock when they fastened him to the cross, but near twelve.” St John (19, 14.) calls it ὁρα ὁσεὶ ἐκτη, almost the sixth hour, suppose a quarter before twelve. So that it might be called either τρίτη or ὁσεὶ ἐκτη. (Markland.) But ὁσεὶ will surely admit a greater latitude, and may extend as far as eleven, or farther.

25. ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτῶν. E. T. crucified. Campbell alters this to nailed him on the cross. Why? Because, forsooth, to crucify properly denotes to put to death by nailing to the cross. But σταυρωσα here only
means to *fasten to the cross with nails*. In strict propriety, we should not say a man cried out after he was crucified, but after he was nailed to the cross." Was there ever any thing more ludicrously absurd? Such observations are calculated to bring criticism itself into disgrace.

36. ὧξεως, posca. "Solet autem deliquium animi patientibus variè adhiberi acetum, quod etiam facit ad refocillandos fēbri vulneri adjuncta laborantes." (Kuinoel.)

36. καθελεῖν. An appropriate word, as applied to this subject; of which Wetstein, Raphel, Elsner, Kypke, and Loesner, produce examples. The thing is expressed by the Latin *refigere*; as in Jus. 9, 7. "Refigum corpus interfectoris cremavit."

37. ἀφέλε *φωνὴ μεγάλη*. This phrase is explained by Kypke, *vocem emittere articulatam, loqui*. He adduces examples from Jos. Ant. 11, 6. also from Demosthenes, Εἰσχίνε, and Plutarch. Loesner, who produces some from Philo, truly remarks, that it does not of itself denote a loud voice. So Châritò has λεπτὴν ἀφιέναι *φωνή* and in Demosth. Olymp. 695. *φωνὴ μικρα* is opposed to μεγάλη.

39. *παραστήκως εὗ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ*. Supply χαρα. Wetstein illustrates this from Aristot. de Mundo: ὃ μὲν ἱππ ἐὗ ἐναντίας φαίνεται ἤλιον τε καὶ σελήνης. Thucyd. 4, 38. ἐὗ ἐναντίας γὰρ ὅτι καθεστήκεσαν ἐκ πλαγίου δὲ οἱ ψιλοὶ καὶ κατὰ ναόν. I add a similar example of *παριστ.* in Thucyd. 7, 43. *τολμήσας εἰσῆλθε*. By this Mark indicates the danger to which Joseph subjected himself when he asked of Pilate the body of Jesus; and by the phrase *τολμήσας εἰσῆλθε*, for καὶ τολ. εἰσ. he hints that as soon as Joseph had so far overcome fear and tardiness as to approach to the praetorium, he then immediately, and with intrepidity, entered in unto Pilate. (Kuinoel, from Casaubon.)

This, however, seems too artificial and far-fetched. It is truly observed by Doddridge, 396. "that this was, indeed, a courageous act for this rich and noble
senator thus publicly to own his friendship to Jesus, in the midst of his greatest infamy; and a person of such sagacity could not but know that, if a resurrection should happen, nothing would have been more natural than that he should have been brought into question as a confederate in the pretended fraud of conveying him away.

43. εὐσχήμων βουλευτής. The word εὐσχήμων properly denotes one who is of good presence, of decorous action, gesture, and habits. (See Hesychius, and also Xen. Cyr.: 1, 3, 7.) 2dly. It denotes decorous, modest, orderly. 3dly. as here, dignified, honourable, noble, and, from the adjunct, rich. So Jos. de Vit. 9. (cited by Wets.): στάσεις τρεῖς ἦσαν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν, Μία μὲν ἄνδρῶν εὐσχήμων — η δὲ σέβεστα ἡ ἀντιθετάν συνεκτικῶς πολεμεῖν ἔκρινε. In the use of the word, the Evangelist seems to have in mind most of the above significations, which can scarcely be noted by any single term, though the Latin honestus comes the nearest, on which see the examples of Wetstein, and Facciolati’s Lexicon. The word βουλευτής here signifies, Synedrii assessor. See the note on Matth.

44. ἔθαύμασεν εἰ. Beza and others have inaccurately rendered dubitavit an, from inattention to the force of the Greek idiom, by which εἰ, after verbs expressive of admiration, wonder, or commotion of mind, generally, does not indicate a doubtful only, but a certain cause of admiration. See examples in Raphel, Kypke, Krebs, Schl. Lex. and Matth. Gr. Gr. To these examples I add one from Eurip. Ion. ἔθαύμασεν εἰ τις Δ. πλανή κ. τ. ἦ.

45. ἐδωρήσατο. Wetstein seems to suspect, that Pilate in fact sold the body, by previously accepting a present from Joseph. He remarks on the sordid avarice of his disposition (which we learn from Josephus, and other historians), and produces the following interesting illustrations on the subject, of selling what ought to be granted as a matter of right.

46. μυημειρο δ ην λειασμειρέων εκ πετρας. Wolf, Krebs, Schleusner, and others, are mistaken, who take these words to denote a monument constructed of hewn and polished stone. It was, no doubt, a cave hewn out in the rock; that being the custom of the country, and of most of the Eastern nations. Many thousands of such μυημειρια still remain, and are noticed by travellers. By the prep. εκ we are to understand out of. That this is the sense is manifest from Matth. 27, 60. ο ελασμησεν εν τη πετρα, where see the note.

CHAP. XVI.

Verse 1. διαγενομένου τοῦ σάββατου, when the Sabbath was passed, i. e. after the sixth hour. So Luke, 23, 56. speaking of the women: καὶ τὸ μὲν σάββατον ἡσύχασαν κατὰ τὴν ἑντολὴν. For the women could not, by the Jewish laws, buy ointments on the Sabbath-day, but might, when the Sabbath was ended, i. e. after sunset. Here we must understand the Sabbath, which intervened between the day on which Christ was crucified and the day on which he returned to life. The women were ignorant that the body of Christ had been already anointed. (Joh. 19, 40.) But Mark, in recounting the history of Christ's resurrection, seems to have chiefly followed Luke, not however to the utter neglect of Matthew. By ἄρωματα are signified sweet scents of all kinds, with which, after the Jewish custom, the body was embalmed, such as myrrh and aloes, (Joh. 19, 39.) and also ointments (Luke 23, 56). The Evangelists have in this instance followed the dialect of the Alexandrian version. For there the word ἄρωμα corresponds to the Hebr. בָּשַׁר in 2 Reg. 20, 18. Cant. 4, 10, 16; but this same Hebrew noun is expressed by μυρων, in Cant. 4, 14, 16. 5, 1. (Rosenm. and Kuin.)

1, 2. ἡγορασαν—καὶ—ἐρχονται, i. e. ἀγοράσασαι ἐρ- χονται. See Luke, 23, 56. whence it appears, that they had bought these sweet spices on the Friday, not on the Sunday morning, and, therefore, that the word ἡγορασαν is not to be joined to διαγενομένου τοῦ σάββατου. (Markland.)

2. ἀνατέλλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου, when the sun had risen, or rather, when the sun was about to rise. John 20, 1. πρωῆ, σκωτίας ἔτη οὐσίας. There is, however, no discrepancy: for the aorist does not always denote time past, but still continuing. Besides, nothing is
more frequent, both in Greek and Hebrew, than for the future to be put for the present; as when any one is said ἡρεσθαί, who is about to come; and to be born, who is about to be born. When, therefore, ἡνα ρουτ precedes, it is plain that the time just before day-break is signified, which the Romans called ante lucem, or ubi non abiu, nec tamen orta dies. Thus we may render, when the sun was about to rise. (Rosenm.)

3, 4. The women did not know that the sepulchre was guarded by soldiers. See on Matth. 28, 1. p. 757. seqq. τις ἀποκλείει ὑμῖν κ. τ. λ. The Orientals were accustomed to close up their sepulchres with huge stones. See on Matth. 27, 60. The last words, ver. 4. ἢν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα, do not belong to the preceding part of this verse, but to ver. 3. Such sort of trajectious are not unusual to Mark, who writes somewhat negligently. See ver. 11, 18, 12, 12. There is therefore no necessity for supposing γὰρ to be put for δὲ, and for thinking, (with Wolf,) that the Evangelist added this, to indicate that the women beheld the stone afar off, since it was very large; nor indeed for supplying (with Grotius and Rosenmuller), τούτῳ δὲ αὐταῖς εἰκαίρως συμβέβηκεν. (Kuin.) Weston would render, “and looking up they observe with surprise (συνερωστίω) that the stone was rolled away, ἢν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα, for it was very great.” This was the cause (says he) of their looking with surprise, or contemplating with eagerness. But this seems to me a very far-fetched expedient, requiring too 6. to be taken in a very unauthorised, and in an altogether inadmissible sense. There is, doubtless, a trajectio, in the clause ἢν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.

7. εἰπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. By disciples are here meant not only the twelve Apostles, but also the rest of Christ’s followers, most of whom lived in Galilee.

7. καὶ τῶ Πέτρῳ. The καὶ here denotes and especially. Grotius remarks, that there is here a figure of speech not unfrequent; i. e. συνακατάλεγεν τὸ μέγος τῶ διώ, to take the part for the whole, and cites
from Alcman, Κύπρον ἵμερταν λίπωσα καὶ Πάφον πε- 
ρίβρυπαν and Aeschyl. Κύπρου Πάφου τ’ ἔχουσα πάντα 
κλῆρον also Hom. Φονίκην καὶ Σιδωνίως Τρῶας καὶ 
"Εκτορα. "Ἰθῆν καὶ Γάργαρον" Χαλκίδα τ’ Ἐιρετρίην. So 
Virg. Æn. 3. "Delectos populi ad proceres ipsum- 
que parentem." Peter is here especially mentioned, 
as being the head of the Apostolic society, and 
therefore a remarkable example, placed before all, of 
human frailty, sincere penitence, and restored faith. 
Here there seems to be what Christ before spoke of, 
the joy of the angels over one sinner that repenteth. 
(Grotius.)

8. καὶ οὐδὲν οὐδὲν εἶπον. This is not to be un- 
derstood of perpetual silence; otherwise, how would 
Mark have knew what had happened to them. Euthymius 
regards the expression as elliptical, and 
supplies the following words: οὐδέν τῶν ἄλλων ἄθρω- 
pων ἐντύγχανον τῶν αὐταῖς κατὰ τὴν ὅδον. It may be 
thus paraphrased: "they said not a word, either to 
each other, or to any they might meet by the way, 
but went straight to the Apostles."

9. ult. The authenticity of this concluding portion 
of the Gospel has been impugned by many Critics, 
but defended by more. For a complete statement 
of the arguments for and against, and the hypotheses 
devised on this occasion by the German Theo- 
lologists, I must refer the reader to the copious Collec- 
tanea of Kuinoel, from which I have selected the 
following brief sketch:

I. The passage is wanting in the Cod. Vat. It is 
noted with an asterisk in Cod. 137 & 138. The scho- 
lia of several MSS. which contain it, testify that it is 
wanting in many copies, but they add that it is also 
found in many. A scholium in Cod. 1, 206, 209. 
relates, that Eusebius placed his canons only as far as 
that it is wanting in the more accurate copies: and 
Jerome remarks, that almost all the Greek copies 
have not this capitulum. But, on the other hand, 
all the Greek MSS. have the portion, except one,
namely, the Vatican, even the very ancient Evangelistaria; the early versions, as the Jerus. Syriac, Arabic, Vulg. Italic. &c. It is acknowledged by Cl. Rom. Alex. Justin. Dionys. Hippol. Iren. Tatian. in his harmony, &c. The chief, if not only, cause of the omission was, that some ancient Interpreters (as we learn from Euthym.) fancied that Mark was here at variance with the other Gospels; and especially that the words of ver. 9. were contradictory to Matt. 28, I. &c. Because they could not solve these difficulties (which, however, are slight, and admit of ready solution, for which see the notes on Matth. 28, 1—5.), they went so far as to reject the portion in question. That this was the cause of the omission is hence manifest, namely, that those who tell us the words are not found in the MSS. (as Nyssenus, Victor, Severus, and Jerome,) also make mention of the above discrepancy.” Thus far Kuinoel; who, after illustrating the causes of the rejection, and stating some very precarious hypotheses broached by Michaelis and Griesbach (which have been satisfactorily refuted by the orthodox Storr), thus sums up the question: “Therefore, from what has been thus far disputed, the result (unless I am totally mistaken) is this: That some arguments may indeed be brought forward, which might seem to render this clause suspected; yet are they not sufficiently firm and certain: nay, far more may be urged on the other side, from which it would appear that this capitulum, as well as the rest of the Gospel, came from the hand of the Evangelist.” Dr. Campbell coincides with Kuinoel as to the cause of the omission, and offers the following judicious remarks: “It has been conjectured, that the difficulty of reconciling the account here given of our Lord’s appearance, after his resurrection, with those of the other Evangelists, has emboldened some transcribers to omit them. The plausibility of this conjecture, the abruptness of the conclusion of this history, without the words in question, and the want of any thing like a reason for
adding them, if they had been there originally, render their authenticity at least probable. Transcribers sometimes presume to add and alter, in order to remove contradictions, but not, as far as I can remember, in order to make them." The opinion of the learned Wetstein, on the authenticity of this portion of Scripture, is expressed in the following terms: "Quicquid autem sit de veritate, suspicionum tamen istarum effectus est, quod haec scripta non sunt solidae authoritatis ad firmandam fidem, sicut sunt reliqua Marci indubitata."

9. ἀναστὰς—ἐστὰ δαιμόνια. All this is neither found in Matthew nor in Luke. Mark, however, omits what Matthew (28, 9—15.) relates about the guards, and passes by the narration in Matth. 27, 62—66. concerning the watch set over the sepulchre; since he rightly judged, that readers far removed from Jerusalem, to whose ears the rumours mentioned by Matth. 28, 15. had not reached, would no more require such narratiunculae than the account of the death of the traitor Judas, and of the purchase of a field called Aceldama.

9. ἀφ' ἦς ἐκβεβλήκει ἐστὰ δαιμόνια. Markland observes, that this seems to be one of those places of the N. T. of which no satisfactory account has yet been given, viz. what is meant by ἐστὰ δαιμόνια. For my part, I see not in what the difficulty consists, at least according to the common opinion on the subject of demoniacs. The difficulty can only be found by those who adopt the new hypothesis. They are fain to interpret the expression, of curing of a dangerous epilepsy, or melancholy, and refer to Matth. 9, 32. 12, 22. Luke 11, 26. Matth. 17, 15. compared with Mark 9, 17. Luke 9, 39. Or they take it of a person in whose mind an opinion had been fixed, that seven demons had occupied her body (see 5, 9. and Matth. 8, 28.) which is yet more harsh. Neither can I bring myself to admit, with Kuinoel, that seven may be taken, by a certain figure of speech, as a certain for an uncertain number.
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12. ἐν άλλῃ μορφῇ. See Luke 24, 18. Grotius, Beza, Piscator, Lamy, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, interpret, “in another dress than that which he had been accustomed to use.” See 15, 24. Joh. 20, 15. Certainly μορφῇ is sometimes applied to dress, as in 9, 23; but this sense seems less dignified than the subject would seem to require. Others, as Theophylact and Michaelis, interpret it of his visage being altered. Schleusner fluctuates between the two opinions, and Paulus adopts both. I see no reason to the contrary. But on so uncertain a subject it were vain to conjecture; and on so awful a one, it were perhaps temerity to speculate.

13. οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις ἐπιστεύσαν. This seems to be at variance with Luke 24, 34, who says, that before they approached, Jesus had appeared to Simon, and that he had related it to the assembly. For even this they did not sufficiently credit; nay, even when Jesus had come up, Luke adds, ἔτι ἐπιστεύσαν αὐτῶν. All this, however, tends to make us repose a firmer confidence in the testimony of those who themselves so slowly and cautiously admitted belief. (Grot.) In the passage of Luke, the Apostles and Disciples are indeed spoken of, but the word λέγουσι does not denote all the Apostles and Disciples gathered together, but only some of them. Passages of this sort, in which what seems spoken of all, is to be understood only of some, are not unfrequent in the N. T. There is, therefore, no discrepancy between Mark and Luke. Some of the assembly (as Luke tells us) believed that Jesus had returned to life: all the rest denied implicit credit to the narrations concerning that event. Hence, even when Jesus appeared to them, they fancied they saw a phantasm; from which we may conclude, that they were by no means credulous. (Kuin.)

14. The brief narration contained in the fourteenth and following verses, comprises the space of forty days; as appears from the accounts of the other Evangelists. What we read in the fourteenth verse,
happened on the first day of the week in which Jesus had returned to life (see Luke 24, 38. seqq. John 20, 29. seqq.) yet his ascension into Heaven did not take place immediately on the day of his resurrection, as from this passage it might be collected, but forty days after. Luke also (24, 50.) relates that Jesus led the disciples towards Bethany (which Mark omits), and then returned to heaven. Therefore many commentators are of opinion, that by the words of the fourteenth verse, that appearance is meant, which is spoken of by Luke 24, 36. seqq. but that those things narrated in this passage from the fifteenth verse, were said by Jesus, either on that mount in Galilee, where he had shown his disciples that he should meet them, (see Matth. 28, 16.) or a little before his ascent to heaven; and they render καὶ pozzo, postea. But others (as Hezel and Storr) have, more rightly, maintained that all that is mentioned from the fourteenth to the nineteenth verse, was done and said on the first day of the resurrection; since there is no sufficient cause for widely separating what we read in ver. 15. seqq. from what preceded in the fourteenth, and thereby removing it to quite another day; and since between this passage and that of Luke 24, 36. seqq. there is a great similitude, though not in terms, yet in the matter. Nor are the words μετὰ τὸ ἀλήθος aufris, to be taken only of those discourses of Christ, which Mark details in the preceding verses, but of all those which, after his return to life, Jesus had with his disciples; ὁτεροφ may be rendered postea, deinide, as in Matth. 4, 2. 21. 32. John 13, 36. (So Rosenm.) or denique, postremo, which comes to the same thing. (Kuin.)

14. τῶν ἐνδεκα. They are called ως ἐνδεκα, though there were only ten of them; for Thomas was not there, John 20, 24. See 1 Cor. 15, 5. where they are called the twelve, though at that time in reality no more than ten. (Markland.) It is indeed usual to retain the number of colleagues in any body, though that number be not then complete. See Glass Phil. Sacr. p. 381.
14. ἀνακήμενος, as they sat at table, or lay on their couches. Properly, supper was over, because he asked them, Have ye here any thing to eat? Luke 24, 41; and they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, &c. the remains perhaps of a supper. Had they been yet eating, there would have been no need to have asked that question. (Markland.)


16. δύστεσσας. Πιστεύω has here the same sense with μαθητεύεσθαι in Matth. 28, 19. where see the note. It signifies to embrace the Christian doctrine, and to engage by baptism, to obey its precepts. Σωθήσηται, shall be saved, comprises deliverance from the misery and punishment of error and sin, and the attainment of all the blessings here and hereafter, which the Gospel holds out to its faithful votaries. Therefore the contrary term κατακριθήσηται, must be taken in an equally extensive sense, of retention of sins, eternal condemnation, and punishments greater than await those to whom the gospel has not been announced. (Rosenm. and Kuin.) The following translation of this passage by Campbell, has the approbation of Dr. Maltby, in Serm. 2. 548. “He who shall believe, and be baptized, shall be saved; but he, who will not believe, shall be condemned.” This change is thus solidly (as thinks Dr. Maltby), justified. “The change of the future from shall to will, may, to a superficial view, appear capricious; but I imagine the idiom of the language requires this distinction, between a positive and a negative condition. It is accordingly expressed in the same manner, in the old English version, formerly quoted. A sovereign might properly say to his minister, “Publish, in my name, this edict to the people; if they shall obey it, they shall be rewarded; but if they will not obey,
they shall be punished.” In the former part of the declaration, it is not the will that is required, so much as the performance: in the latter part, a threat is annexed to the non-performance, merely on account of the obstinacy, that is, pravity of will, by which it is occasioned. This distinction particularly suits the nature of the present case. The belief that results not from evidence, but from an inclination to believe, is not styled faith, so properly as credulity, which is always accounted an extreme. Nor is that unbelief, or even disbelief, criminal, that is justly imputable to a disinclination to believe, in spite of evidence; which is termed incredulity, and is as much an extreme as the other. “God alone gives light; he requires of us only, that we do not shut our eyes against it.”

* On the subject of the merit of faith, Dr. Maltby has the following masterly observations, p. 390. & seq. “The penalty denounced against unbelief, cannot be applied to involuntary error; but to that depravity of the will, and that consequent misguidance of the understanding, which resist all evidence of Gospel truths, however fairly and however fully they may be proposed to the human mind. The guilt of such depravity and such misguidance must have been more heinous in the Apostolical age, when miracles were wrought for the support of Christianity. But in all succeeding ages, unbelief, proceeding from the causes which I have just now assigned, must be criminal; and, as such, more or less expose the unbeliever to final condemnation. It is not, you will observe, the mere act of unbelief, but the causes of that act, in which we are to look for moral turpitude; and wheresoever such turpitude really exists, there must be guilt, accompanied with danger of retribution in the world to come. Most unquestionably, there is merit in faith. Not in the act of assenting to the evidences which can be produced for Christianity; but in that disposition of the mind, which prepares us for examining these evidences with diligence and seriousness, proportioned to their importance. Unquestionably too, as I said before, there is guilt in unbelief—not merely as an act of the understanding solely, but as an act of the mind, when the understanding is perverted by the will, and leads us to reject, to depreciate, or to deride those proofs, which the providence of God has employed for the illustration and the support of revealed religion. Moreover, the authority and importance, which belong to any one part of Scripture, must extend to the whole. We are not at liberty to reject one doctrine and to admit of another, any more than we can with impunity practise one moral virtue and neg-
On the sense of the word *σωθήσεται*, I must refer the reader to a very copious and instructive annotation of Dr. Hammond, upon Luke 18, 23, and of Dr. Maltby, in vol. 2, 542, seqq. of his Sermons. The word *κατακρίνησεται*, which is rendered in our common translation *damned*, is more correctly rendered by Dr. Campbell *condemned*, and he has the following observations: “The term *damned*, with us, relates solely to the doom that shall be pronounced upon the wicked at the last day. This cannot be affirmed, with truth, of the Greek *κατακρίνω*, which corresponds exactly to the English verb *condemn*. It may relate to the future sentence, and it may not. All the Latin translations, Vulg. Ar. Zu. Er. Cas. Cal. Bez. say *condemnabitur*. But if the word had been *damnabitur*, it would have made no difference, as these two Latin verbs are synonymous. I cannot help observing, that though the Italian and French languages have verbs exactly corresponding, in the difference of their meanings, to the two English verbs, their translators have properly preferred the more general term. In justice, however, to our venerable translators, it should be remembered, that in their times, and still later, the word *damned* was very often used even by grave and decorous persons, without any reference, direct or indirect, to future punishment.” In this sense, of damned, for condemned, Dr. Maltby in his Notes cites two examples from Bishop Barlow and Sir Thomas More. I add Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*, b. 4. cant. 12. § 16. (cited by Bulkley): “To *damn* himself by every evil name.” So Book 5. Cant. 5. § 17. & Cant. 10. § 4. and Cant. 11, § 42. “Even these star-gazers astonished are, and *damn* their lying books.” That the Latin word “*damno*” simply signifies to condemn, is known to every well-read classical scholar. The

lect another. He that believeth, in order to be ultimately saved, must not venture to set up his own reason in opposition to any fact, clearly recorded, or any doctrine, distinctly inculcated, in the word of God.”
reader may consult the examples to this purpose produced, in superfluous abundance, by Mr. Bulkley.

17. Σημεῖα δὲ τοῖς πιστεύσασι ταῦτα παρακολουθήσει.
The sense of the words, which has been somewhat misunderstood, is this: “These signs shall accompany the preachers of my gospel: my legates shall perform these following miracles.” Not, however, that all the signs were given to all, for there are diversities of gifts and graces. (1 Cor. 12, 4.) So however, that to each who believed as he ought, should then be imparted some wonderful faculty, which too should exert itself not always, but as need should require. (Grot. and Kuin.) The power of working these miracles is not promised to all who should believe the Gospel, but to those only of whom mention was made in the fourteenth verse, who before that οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν τοῖς βεασαμένοις αὐτῶν ἔγγυρμένων, but had now not only been convinced of the certainty of the resurrection of Christ, but had also, (as we learn from the twentieth verse,) undertaken the office of announcing the Gospel. But supposing that the words were to be interpreted, of all believers, the promise must be restricted to those times only in which the Church was to be planted; for then there was the utmost need of miracles to lay the foundations of so mighty an edifice. But afterwards, when the writings of the Apostles were in the hands of all Christians, insomuch that followers of Christ were found everywhere, then (as we learn from ecclesiastical history) those miraculous gifts ceased. (Rosenm.) By the τῶν πιστεύοντας are not to be understood all the followers of Christ, for all Christians did not work miracles of the kind here described; but Christ here (as in the parallel passages of Luke 24, 48. and Joh. 20, 19.) treats with his legates, and therefore the Apostles are especially signified, and besides them, the other persons then present, who were undoubtedly of the number of the seventy disciples. See Luke 24, 33. compared with Luke 10, 1. 9, 17. and also infra, ver. 20. By ἐκείνω
are especially meant those disciples of Christ, to whom he addressed what we read in this place, and to whom the συμεία refer. On this important, but much misrepresented and misunderstood text, Dr. Maltby has an admirable Sermon in vol. 2. from which I shall lay before my readers the following instructive passage.

"The text forms a part of one of those most interesting conversations which passed between Jesus and his disciples after the resurrection, and occurred at some period of his forty days' continuance with them upon earth. Now it is observable, that the rest of the discourse recorded by St. Mark refers wholly to those duties and circumstances which were connected with the immediate and peculiar labours of the Apostles in preaching the Gospel. It appears, therefore, that the alternative thus held out to those who believed, and those who believed not, was connected closely, I may say, inseparably, with the miraculous preaching of the Gospel in the apostolic age. This conclusion also is strengthened by considering that the alternative is proposed without any qualification or limitation. Those who believe, and are baptized, are to be saved; those who believe not, to be damned. It is plain, from the manner in which the offer of salvation, and the threat of damnation, are expressed, that they refer to the immediate admission or rejection of the Gospel. The Apostles were furnished with miraculous powers; the gifts of healing, ability to speak divers languages, dominion over evil spirits; all calculated to produce, as the circumstances of the Church indispensably required, an immediate effect in the conversion of those whom they addressed. And that effect was declared by the ceremony of baptism; because baptism was the customary, and, indeed, the only public mode in which the new converts were taught to renounce their former errors and prejudices. We see at once the usefulness of uniformity and publicity in the seal which they thus set upon their belief of a religion,
which every worldly fear, and every worldly hope, must have disposed them to reject. Consequently, they who gave this proof of their sincerity, who believed and were baptized, were pronounced saved, or (as we ought to understand this scriptural word) admitted to all the benefits of the New Dispensation: and not only were pronounced saved, but in many instances received unequivocal testimony of their acceptance with God, being themselves endowed with those same gifts of the Holy Ghost, which the Apostles not only displayed themselves, but were directed and empowered to communicate to others. It should seem, that whatsoever is said of belief in John 14, 12. must be confined to those, of whom, together with their belief, the signs specified by St. Mark, and the works mentioned by St. John, can be affirmed. Such were the privileges promised to those who believed, and they were obviously such as belonged to the Apostolic age exclusively. I think it then highly probable, not only from the circumstances under which the words are recorded to have been uttered, but also from the manner in which the reward and the punishment are severally assigned, that the text referred to the acceptance or rejection of the Gospel, when it was preached by the Apostles themselves, endued with power from on high to preach it. Signs were to follow, or attend, believers; and they who beheld these signs, but were not converted by them, were necessarily and justly excluded from the privileges of Christianity.” (Dr. Maltby.)

This is by no means a proper place to enquire into the proportion between the evidence which was peculiar to the days of the Apostles, and that which is common to our own. But I hope it will be considered, on the one hand, how improbable it is that a divine revelation, introduced as the Gospel was, should ever be left so destitute of proofs in after ages, that an honest man, after impartial consideration, might reject it; and on the other, how fit it was that the danger of neglecting it should be
strongly declared, lest it should seem itself to have left men at liberty to trifle with it. As for the objection which has been urged against the truth of Christianity, from the damnatory sentence which it here, and elsewhere, pronounces on those that reject it, I have considered it at large since the former publication of this volume, and attempted to show that it is so far from being conclusive, that it would rather have been a great difficulty in the scheme of Christianity if it had contained no such sentence. See my Second Letter to the Author of Christianity not founded on Argument, p. 28—47. And I must earnestly entreat any reader who fancies there is any force in what the deists urge on this head, attentively to consider what is there offered, before he presume on the contrary sentiment, which may perhaps be an error as fatal as it is absurd. (Dodd.)

17. δαμόωνι ἐκβαλώσι. On this gift imparted to the first preachers of the Gospel, and, as it should seem, to the primitive Christians in general, see the learned annotation of Grotius, and a Dissertation of Whitby, in his General Preface to the Epistles. Mr. Bulkley too has some curious passages from Irenæus, C. 23, 32, 37, and 43.

17. γλώσσας λαλήσουσι καναϊς, i. e. foreign languages. Euthymius well explains, διαλέκτοις ἀλλαθήνειοιν. On this gift of tongues, various are the opinions of the recent Commentators. Rosenm. refers to several tracts on this subject by German Theologians. I must respectfully beg to recommend to the perusal of my readers the valuable illustrations of the learned and orthodox Storr, in his “Dissertationes Exegeticae.” I assent to those Commentators who interpret this of the miraculous faculty of expressing the thoughts in languages never previously learnt. Some recent Theologians, indeed, interpret this of acquiring languages by study, or intercourse with foreign Jews. But surely this does by no means come up to the notion of σημεῖον, miracle, and is quite contrary to the whole scope of the
passage. Somewhat less improbable is the opinion of others, who compare the words with that promise of Christ which is found in Matth. 10, 19, 20. Luke 21, 12, seqq. μη μειημήσθητε, πως ην τι λαλήσθητε κ. τ. λ. and therefore interpret γλώσσαις λαλήσοντο καυκάως, "novis dicendi rationibus utentur; eloquentia insolita, nec iis antea propria, divino spiritu acti, profitebuntur et prædicabunt meas doctrinam." They observe that tongue was also used by the Jews to signify eloquence, and they refer to 1 Cor. 18, 1. But this interpretation, however learned, is frigid and far-fetched, and quite unsuitable to the plain and popular phraseology of our Evangelist.

18. ὅφεις ἀφοι. It is surprising that, in the interpretation of these plain words, there should have been any difference of opinion amongst learned men; some of whom, as Luther, Heuman, Keuchen, Deyling, and formerly Theophylact, interpret ἀφοι, destroy, kill, and Schleusner does not venture to give an opinion. But the phrase ὅφεις ἀφειν is a formula appropriated to this subject, and signifies to take up poisonous serpents in their hands. Thus Galen. de loc. affect. 2. (cited by Wets.) καὶ τὰς ἐχίδνας ὅ ἐστιν ἱδεῖν την μακαρία, μὴ εἰ τοῖς χερσίν ἀνελὸμεν, ἀλλὰ τὰς δακνούσας. This seems to have been in that age a common test of supernatural power. Thus we find that when St. Paul (as recorded in Acts 28, 5.) shook off the viper, and sustained no hurt, the Meliteans immediately said that he was a god. At the same time, there is no reason to doubt but that this power, so admired by the vulgar, was sometimes pretended to by impostors, and sometimes acquired by the incantations, or other artful devices, of jugglers *, &c. To this purpose

* So Julius Paulus, 1, 15. cited by Wets. In circulares qui serpentes circum ferunt, et proponunt, &c. Such are at the present time frequent in the East, and from Lyon's recent Travels into Tripoli, p. 11, we learn, "that the power of taking up serpents and scorpions is supposed to constitute a Marabout." Yet what is this but an imitation of the Apostolic gift by crafty impostors, or incantators. At all events, there is no foundation for the opinion of Paulus, that some of the primitive Christians un-

derstood the art of depriving serpents of their noxious power by incantation. Jamblicus (Vit. Pythag. cap. 28.) says that Pythagoras could do this. See Bochart. Hierozoic, part 2. lib. 3. cap. 6. and compare Psalm 58, 4, 5; and Eccles. 10, 11. But I assent to Dr. Doddridge that this power was exerted without any such artifice, and included (as in the case of Paul, Acts 28, 3—5.) an ability to heal the most dangerous wounds given by the bite of the most noxious animals.
which is supplied in many passages produced by Kypke, Palairet, Munthe, and Wetstein. The general sense of the passage is thus laid down by Kuinoel: "Res maximè arduas, cum periculo conjunctas, felici successu suscipietis; καὶ θανάσιμον κ. τ. ἀ. omninoque summìa et presentissima vitae pericula, in quae venistis, feliciter evadetis. Sermo est de eo, quod discipuli propter religionis Christianæ propagationem perpessurì, et quod ejusdem promovendæ causa facturi essent, discus, de vitae periculis, quae sponte, et inviti, subituri, feliciter tamen superaturi essent." Mr. Bulkley similarly explains. "Our Saviour assureth his disciples that such shall be the power and efficacy of his Gospel, as that the promoters and professed by them, and gloriously to triumph over, the greatest opposition they could possibly meet with from their most venomous and malignant adversaries. That this is the meaning here is evident from Luke 10, 19. Ιδε, διδωμι υμιν την εξουσιαν του τατειν εκανω οφειν και σκοπιαν, και επι πασαν την δυναμιν του εχθρου και ουδεν υμιν ου μη αδικηηγη. Compare also Isa. 11, 4—9. (Bulkley.) Mr. Bulkley might have more appositely cited the words of the Psalmist (91, 18.) to which there seems a direct allusion in this passage of Luke: "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet." I grant that the passage of Luke may be taken figuratively, for so, it seems, must those of the Psalmist and Isaiah. Not so, however; (I apprehend,) this passage of Mark, which is not one of poetic imagery, and is too minutely particular to admit of that mode of interpretation. Besides, as we must interpret some portions of the passage in the physical sense, for instance, those which relate to casting out devils, healing dangerous disorders, and (as I think) speaking with new tongues, it would surely be harsh to interpret the remaining clauses (οφεις αροτζα καὶ θανάσιμον τί πλιν-
Indeed, I must deprecate the irreverent spirit too manifest in the interpretations of some recent Commentators, who pare down the solid meaning, and explain away the real import of this important passage. Thus, for instance, a recent Commentator, of no mean order, interprets the passage: "Mirificè opitulabor, auxilium meum nunquam vobis deert, felicissimo successu meam doctrinam propagabilis. Hæc notio universalis exemplis specialioribus ad vivum adumbrata est, neque adeò singula nimis premenda sunt; ita, ut demonstretur. quando? et quomodo?" I admit that we are not to confine our view to these special cases of protection, &c. yet I must strenuously contend, that the words imply a promise of miraculous and supernatural protection against all enemies, and support under all obstacles to the propagation of the Gospel. And this the Scripture (ex. gr. Acts 28, 3.) and the records of ecclesiastical history enable us to prove was granted by the Almighty to the first Preachers of the Gospel and the primitive Christians. See the valuable notes of Grotius and the Dissertation of Whitby, the former of whom contends, (but I think on precarious grounds,) that the conversion of barbarous nations these divine helps may yet be expected, and adds: "Sunt enim amentamèlyta του Θεου δώρα, Rom. 11, 29. Sed nos, cujus rei culpa est in nostrà ignavià aut diffidentià; id solemus in Deum rejecere."

19. ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν. Notwithstanding the fine-spun argumentations of the Sceptical School in Germany, it is plain by these words, that our Saviour ascended in a visible manner, and in the presence of his Disciples; whether, (as some say,) with

* Considering to what degrees of cursed refinement the art of poisoning was by this time brought, as well as how frequently execution was done by giving poison to condemned persons in the age and country in which the Apostles lived, such a promise as this will appear more important than the reader might at first apprehend. (Doddridge.)
thunder and lightning, or involved in a cloud*, I would not venture to determine. There are two excellent Dissertations on this side of the question, which deserve attentive perusal, by Seiler; the first entitled, Jesum corpore pariter atque animae in coelum assumptum esse, an argumentis posit probari fide dignis? Erlan. 1798. 4. The second: De corpore Christi glorificato, Erlang. 1803. 4. Also, a very learned Tract of Griesbach, entitled, Sylloge locorum N. T. ad ascensum Christi in coelum spectantium. Jena, 1793, 4. p. 11. from which Kuinoel inserts the following extract: “Si locos omnes à N. T. libris collectos studiosè inter se comparamus, deprehendimus a) historicam de Jesu in coelum ascensu narrationem non repiriri nisi apud Lucam tantùm, atque (si quidem genuina sunt postrema Evangelii Marci commentaria) apud Marcum. Attamen b) Jesus ipse, teste Johanne, cùm ante mortem, tum post resurrectionem suam, prænuntiat, ascensurum esse in coelum et reversurum eò unde (quod illam ϕυσιν θειορεπα, quam Johannes illi tribuit) descendit.—c) Petrus et Paulus publicè docuerunt, Jesum post resurrectionem morti obnoxium hauduisse, sed è sepulcro rediisse in vitam æternam duraturum, eundemque ex hac terrâ profectum esse in coelum, et ibi summâ majestate et gloriâ condecoratum, ad patris dextram consedisse. (Acts 2, 32. f. 1 Petr. 3, 18 seqq. Eph. 4, 10. Hebr. 9, 21, 6, 19, 20. 9, 12. 1 Tim. 3, 16, etc.) His d) Paulus addidit, corpus Christi, quod post resurrectionem verè humanum corpus mansisse Apostoli adspectu non solum, sed tactu etiam edocti noverant, jam immortale esse, cœleste ac spirituale. e) Hæ Christi praedic-

* "Circumfusus nubi in coelum est ereptus, multò melius, quàm apud vos asseverare de Romulis Proculi solent." Tertull. Apolog. For the following sagacious remark I am indebted to Dr. Jennings ap. Doddridge: ‘It was much more proper our Lord should ascend to Heaven in the sight of his Apostles, than that he should rise from the dead in their sight: for his resurrection was proved when they saw him alive after his passion; but they could not see him in heaven while they continued upon earth.
tiones, et Petri Paulique assertiones bene conveniunt cum Luce narratione de Christi vivi raptu in coelum. f] Neque tamen Apostoli historicas illius auctores circumstantias auditoribus vel lectoribus suis studiosiis inculcare consueverant. g] Potius id sedulò agere solebant; ut disciplulis persuaderent, Christum obedientiæ, quam patri prestatiterat, præmia reportásse longè maxima, nostrumque captum superantia; eum apud Deum felicitate non solum frui inenarrabili, sed majestate etiam gaudere tantà, ut major cogitari non possit; dominum eum esse hominum, piè ab his colendum, ecclesiae suæ caput unicum ejusdemque rectorem et defensorem, spiritualem honorem largitorem munificentissimum, cultorum suorum apud patrem patronum indulgentissimum, atque judicem præmia suis olim justissimè distributurum. De his autem omnibus Apostoli diligenter edocuere Christianos, partim, ut hi tanti magistri ac doctoris, ad summum gloriae fastigium evecti, auctoritatem eò magis reverentur, partim, ut alacriès insisterent vestigiis ducis, qui non solùm exempli, quo nobis præevit, excellentiæ, sed etiam præmiorum, quæ consecutus est, amplitudine, ad suæ virtutis imitationem eos incitaret, partim; ut spem atque fiduciam suam in tali suæ senatorias arxèttem, quem pater sùmpserunt, suum esse voluit, firmissimè collocatam esse, pleniès intelligenter. In his substitere Apostoli, in his subsistere, nec nobis nefas erit."

I must add that the phrase ἀναφέρεσθαι εἰς τῶν οὐρανῶν is also employed by the Sept. See 2 Regg. 2, 1, 3. 5, 9, 11. Sirach 43, 9, 49, 16. 1 Macc. 2, 58. Wetstein compares numerous passages from the Classical and Rabbinical writers, of which the following are the most apposite. Artemidor. 4, 74. 

Πλωταρχος εἰς τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀναβαίνειν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐρμοῦ ἀγάμου ἐβδοκεῖ, καὶ τῇ ἐπιουσίᾳ ἀνα ὑπεκρίνοι τῆς αὐτῶ τοῦ ὄνειρον, καὶ ἔφη, μακάριον ἔσεσθαι αὐτῶ, καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ εἰς τῶν οὐρανῶν αὐτῶν ἀναβαίνειν τὴν ὑπερβάλλου- 

Paus. Lacon. 18. Διώνυσων—εἰς οὐρα—
19. Εκάθενεν εκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. In Psalm 110. ver. 1. is this prophecy concerning Christ: The Lord hath said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, &c. St. Mark here makes use of the words of this prophecy, to show that it was now fulfilled by Jesus's ascension. The same reason is to be given for this expression in those other places of the N. T. where it occurs. (Markland.)

20. τῶν λόγων βεβαιώτως διὰ τῶν ἑτακολούθων σημείων, i.e. (as Rosenm. interprets,) confirming the Divine authority of the doctrine by miracles. For (says he) they did not work miracles that the doctrine should be believed, for that, (even had there been no miracles,) stood firm: but that it might be proved and confirmed that the proposed doctrine, in itself true, was divinely communicated. The phraseology of the whole verse is illustrated by a very opposite passage of Plut. 2, 1108. p. (cited by Wets.) φαιναὶ τίνας ἐρήμως πραγμάτων ἀποστολῶν, καὶ μέρη λόγων, καὶ σπαράγματα κατὰ τοῦ βεβαιώτως καὶ συνε-γεύσεως πρὸς νόησιν καὶ πίστιν ἔλληκαν. See Hebr. 2, 4.
ST. LUKE.

CHAP. I.

Verse 1. ἐπειδῆς πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν. It is to be observed that the many are here distinguished from the earliest eye-witnesses. Who these many were cannot, with certainty, be determined. The Commentators (says Koecher) divinant potius quam veri certique aliquid de illis definiunt. It is, however, an important question, whether, among these many, Luke means to include Matthew and Mark. Grotius and others think he does. But there is reason to suppose that the Gospel of Mark was not yet in being: and he would scarcely thus designate that of Matthew, for many reasons; and especially since Matthew was one τῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτῶν. Therefore others, with more probability, refer the words to the compositions of pious and faithful persons, but not sufficiently endowed with the necessary information. Whether by these we are to understand what are called the Apocryphal Gospels, to be seen in Fabric. Cod. Apocr. N. T. has been also much debated: but it seems generally, and with reason, determined in the negative. This, however, is a question of such uncertain determination, and is so unconnected with my plan, of forming exegetical and philological notes, that I may well decline enlarging any further upon it, and refer my readers to Pole, Wolf, Koecher, and the authors there cited. I must not omit, however, to subjoin the luminous illustrations of Wets. “Since, by the doctrine of the Gospel, a mighty moral revolution had taken place
throughout the whole universe, it is not surprising that the minds of all should have been powerfully excited, and earnestly intent on this subject. Whence it is reasonable to suppose, that most persons felt deeply interested in enquiries respecting the persons from whom, and the manner in which, the Religion originated, and that many applied themselves to satisfy this rational curiosity; all of whom, indeed, professed to derive their relations from the testimony of credible witnesses; some truly, as the four Evangelists; but others falsely, either themselves deceived by excessive credulity, or deceiving others by fictitious narrations. (Wets.) There is some similarity to this passage in the preface of Justin to his History: "Cum multi ex Romanis—res Romanas Greco peregrinoque sermone contulissent," &c. Also in that of Pseudo-Isocrates ad Demonic. p. 2. ὃςοι μενούν τῶν προτερτίκων λόγων συγγράφουσι, κάλον ἔργον ἐπιχειροῦσι.

1. ἐπιχείρησαν ἀνατάξεσθαι. Some ancient Interpreters, as, for instance, Euthymius and Theophylact, have, without reason, attributed to ἐπιχείρησαν the sense of "attempt not followed by accomplishment of the purpose," and consequent imperfection. Raphel has, however, well observed, that the word may denote, 1stly, attempt without effect (as in Acts 9, 29.); 2dly, attempt with effect (as in Polyb. and 2 Macc. 3.); 3dly, of effect without respect to attempt, (as here, and in Acts 19, 13.) or, to speak in plainer language, ἐπιχείρησαν must be taken pleonastically. In this view of the subject Palairet, Krebs, Munthe, Loesner, and others, coincide, who give numerous examples. This opinion is adopted also by Rosenm. Schleusner, and Kuinoel. There seems, however, some allusion to the arduousness of such a work, executed, as it were, magno conatu. So Hesych. explains ἐπιχειρεῖν by τολμᾶν, "to venture upon." Ἀνατάξεσθαι signifies to set in order, arrange, compose, express in writing.

1. τεκναροφορημένων. Παντοφορέω is here used in
a neuter sense. It is derived from πλήρης φορα, a full measure, and denotes, “to carry a full measure, either as applied to a ship completely laden, or a tree in full bearing, &c. and so, in the passive, πληροφόρεω signifies to have the sails filled, and, metaphorically, as applied to the mind, πληροφόρεω denotes to offer a full measure of arguments to another; and consequently, in the passive, “to be supplied with arguments or proofs, to be fully persuaded.” So Rom. 4, 21. 14, 5. Wetstein, and the other Philologists, adduce several examples. Secondly, and less properly, (as here,) it is used of a thing, and thus comes to mean res comprobata, certissima, a thing certain, undoubted. (Wets. Schl. Kuin. Ros.) So also Beza, Camerarius, and Erasmus. Some, however, as Luther, Heinsius, Georgius, Hammond, Abresch, Mill, and Campbell, compare πληροφορία with the Hebrew נָבָה, and give it the significance of evenire. Campbell renders, which have been accomplished, and defends this version by a very long annotation, acute, indeed, and instructive*, but not, I think, as to this point, convincing. “It is only of things (observes he) that we can say, they are performed, and of persons that they are convinced.” True; not properly: but such a catachresis as the present, is by no means unusual. Besides, (as Kuinoel observes,) that signification is destitute of examples, and does not suit the context. Pearson, Snicer, and Wolf, seem to unite both the above methods, by rendering, “rerum illarum ut vere gestarum.”

2. αὐτάται καὶ ἵππρόται, eye-witnesses. A word

* From which I select the following judicious remark: “In these histories a simple narrative of the facts is given; but no attempt is made, by argument, asseveration, or animated expression, to bias the understanding, or work upon the passions. The naked truth is left to its own native evidence. The writers betray no suspicion of its insufficiency. This method of theirs has more genuine dignity than the other, and, if I mistake not, has been productive of more durable consequences than ever yet resulted from the arts of rhetoricians, and the enticing words of man’s wisdom.”
used often by the Classical writers. The historians, and especially Polybius, to obtain credit to their narrations, frequently appeal to the αὐτόφιαν and αὐτόπτας. So also Ἀeschyl. S. C. Theb. 41. Stob. Serm. 188. p. 627. τὴς δὲ πράξεως αὐτόπτης γενόμενος Κ. Of the passages cited by Wetstein, the most apposite are the following. Polyb. 3, 4. τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, διὰ τὸ τῶν πλείστων μη μόνον αὐτόπτης, ἀλλ’ ἂν μὲν συνεργός, ἂν δὲ καὶ χειριστὴς γενόνεια. Plutarch de Educ. Lib. p. 9. c. αὐτὸ τῆς τούτων μαθήσεως οὔτε αὐτόπτας γίνονται τὸ παράπαν, οὔτε αὐτήκοοι. Plaut. Truc. 2, 6, 8. "Pluris est oculatus testis unus, quam auriti decem." Ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς signifies, not only from the commencement of Christ’s ministry, but from his birth. Υἱηρέται τοῦ λόγου denotes administrī negotii, those who took part in the affair, and bore a part in the things done; i. e. the relations, friends, and Apostles of Christ, and the seventy disciples. So Xen. Cyr. 1, 9, 10. κρατίστου ὑπηρέται πάντως ἔργων. The λόγος here denotes πράγμα. So the Hebr. דִּבָּר. Examples of this sense are produced from Theophr. Ch. procem. 4. τρέφομαι δὲ ζῷη ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου, and 8, 1. Others may be seen in Kypke. So Beza, Hammond, Erasmus, Grotius, Rosenm. and Kuinoel.

3. ἔδοξε κάμιλ. If Luke had been impelled to write, either by the exhortation of Paul, or the peculiar inspiration of the Holy Spirit, he would by no means have passed over a thing so worthy of notice, and so calculated to procure authority to his work. Therefore what some fancy, (referring to the places of 2 Tim. 2, 8. 1 Tim. 5, 18. and 1 Cor. 15, 4. compared with Luke 10, 7. and 24, 34.) namely, that what is called the Gospel of Luke ought rather to be attributed to Paul as its author, seems to have little probability. (Wets.)

3. παρακολούθηκτι. The word properly denotes “to follow up, trace, examine;” and, metaphorically, “to enquire, scrutinize, search, and hence, after diligent examination, to attain to a knowledge of any thing.” See Schleusner. Examples illustrative of
these senses are produced by Wetstein, Kypke, and, before them, by Raphel, Segara, and by Gataker on Anton. 5, 5. I add, D. Hal. V. 585. τὸ ἐνεσθαι τῇ θεoracle τῶν παρακολουθούντων τοῖς πράγμασιν. Joseph. 939, 12. ὁσα — παρακολούθησας. Demoxenus ap. Athen. 102, 5. τίς παρακολουθεὶ ταῦτα. Æschin. p. 17, 29. ὑμᾶς τε βουλομένην ἀν οἷς ἔγιο μέλλω λέγειν προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν, καὶ παρακολουθεῖν εὐμαθῶς. Plato. p. 537. c. κάλλος τῷ λόγῳ συμπαρακολούθηκας, cognoscendo assecutus es. And 543. c. ὁκ ἐστιν τῶν λεχθεΐν. So also Livy, in the Preface to his History: "Velut desidentes primi mores sequatur animo." "Ἀνωθεν has nearly the same force with ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, and Wetstein produces several examples from Greek authors, and also Virg. Georg. 4, 285. "Altius omnem Expediam primâ repetens ab origine faram." It may here denote, "from the conception of John the Baptist." καθεξῆς, ordine, serie perpetuo, sigillatim. Wetstein cites Thucyd. 2, 1. (rather 1, 2.) γέγραφαι δὲ ἔξης, αἷς ἐκαστα ἐγίγνετο, κατὰ θέρος καὶ χειμῶνα. Aristides in Rhodum, p. 543. τις οὗτος ἢ λόγος ἐστὶν ἱσχυρός ἢ σοφιστής ἄκρος ἢ διαρκὴς, αἷς ἀν ἀξίως καταθραυσθέειν τὰ παράντα, μὴ πολλοστὶν μέρος, αὐν οἰεται λέγειν, παραλιπών, ἀλλ’ ἔξης ἀπαντασ; Tacit. A. 2, 27. "Ejus negotii initium, ordinem, finem curatius disseram." Καθεξῆς here denotes not the order of time, but of events digested into classes, as of Christ’s conception, birth, circumcision, baptism, preaching, death, resurrection, and ascension.

3. κράτιστε Θεόφιλε. This is not, as Epiphanius, Salvin, and Hammond tells us, a feigned name, meant for all pious Christians; for otherwise κράτιστε would not have been added: (though, indeed, Hammond observes that this κράτιστε is only an expression of civility.) The arguments in refutation of this, are thus summed up by Campbell. First, if the Evangelist meant to address his discourse to all pious Christians, and had no one individual in view, he would have put his intention beyond all doubt, by using the plural number, and saying κράτιστοι.
Secondly, this enigmatical manner of addressing all true Christians, under the appearance of bespeaking the attention of an individual, does not seem agreeable to the simplicity of style used in the Gospel, and indeed no where occurs in the Scriptures, and must have appeared to the writer himself as what could not fail to be misunderstood by most readers, proper names of such a form as Theophilus, and even this very name, being common in Greek and Latin authors. Lastly, what is said in the fourth verse, evidently shows, that the author addressed himself to a person with whose manner of being instructed in the Christian doctrine he was particularly acquainted. (Campbell.) It is well observed by J. Haseus ap. Wolf, that κράτους was a title appropriated to princes, and those holding eminent offices and magistracies; and therefore corresponded to the Lat. præstantissime; indeed he regards it as a Latinism. Nay he denies that, before the Greeks had been subjugated by the Romans, and their language, in juridical matters and titles of honour, had been intermixed with the Latin, the word was employed as a title, for vir illustri, but he observes that, in the Augustan age, and afterwards, when the Greeks were already subjugated by the Romans, it was frequently used by them, in imitation of the Latins, who had been accustomed to give the name of optimus to persons in dignified stations. On which accommodation of the Greek language to the Latin see Cassub. Exerc. B. 9. § 3. The word κράτος (says Campbell) occurs only in three places of the N. T. all in the Acts of the Apostles, another work of the same writer. In these places the title is manifestly given as a mark of respect to eminence of station. Accordingly, it is only on Felix and Festus, governors of the province, that we find it conferred. Such addresses, therefore, as ἐγάψε, βασίλειος, κράτος, when they may be considered as adulatory, or complimentary, however usual among the Greeks, do not suit the manner of the sacred writers. When Paul
gave this title to Festus, it appears that it was customary so to address the Roman presidents, or procurators. But of these commendatory epithets, which are merely personal, these writers, alike untainted with fanaticism, and flattery, are very sparing. They well know that where they are most merited they are least coveted, or even needed. (Campbell.) What was the dignity of Theophilus cannot be from hence inferred, nor is it, I think, certain that he bore any dignity at all. That he was a Christian is undisputed, and probably had been converted to the faith by Luke: and that he lived out of Palestine, seems highly probable, since St. Luke brings forward many notices on the situation of places in Palestine, which could not have been unknown to any but to foreigners.

4. ίνα ἐπιγνώσω τερλ ἀν κατηχηθης λόγων την ἀσφάλειαν, that of what thou wert taught before baptism in a general way, thou mightest now attain a more clear and certain knowledge. The λόγοι are here, by some, explained doctrina Christiana, by others res gestae: but well-founded objections may be made to both these interpretations, and I am inclined to assent to Kuinoel, that we are simply to understand words, and by κατηχεῖται, edoceri, vivd voce edoceri, as frequently. Thus Luke opposes γράφειν to κατηχεῖται. For, as appears from the Acts, a principal part of the instruction of those who were training up for admission into the Christian Church, consisted in a brief, and usually vivd voce, narration of the actions and doctrines of Christ, called catechesis, and the person so instructed, catechumenus. Thus Grot. Erasmus, Heu- man, Wolf, Wetstein, and Kuinoel, the last of whom remarks, that this preface contains a polite reprehension of the preceding narratives, as appears from άνωθεν, άκριβος, καλεύει, and ἀσφάλεια. Luke hints at their too great brevity and want of order, and even accuracy and fidelity; so that from them no sufficiently certain, or accurate, account of the life and doctrines of Christ could be derived.
5. ἐφημερίας. An Hellenistic word, which properly denotes an office that lasts a day. It is explained by Hesychius, ἡ τῆς ἡμέρας λειτουργία. But since ἡμέρα, in the Hebrew and Hellenistic phraseology, is used of time in general, hence it came to have the more extended signification of a weekly function, as 2 Chron. 13, 10. and, by metonymy, denoted the class itself of persons discharging such weekly functions, as here, and in 1 Chron. 28, 13. David distributed the priests into twenty-four classes, which each, by terms, performed the sacred offices a week; their function commencing at one sabbath, and ending at another. And this function too extended to the night, as well as the day, because they had to keep the watches. Upon the whole, their duties were sufficiently laborious, since the priests alone had to prepare the victims, to attend to the lamps, adjust the wood for sacrifice, and perform other offices of manual labour. Amongst these, the class of Abias was the eighth. See 1 Chron. 24, 10. Jos. Ant. 7, 15, 7. 2 Chron. 8, 14. Neh. 13, 30. This circumstance is meant to indicate that John was of honourable birth. For from Jos. Vit. 1. and Cant. Ap. 1, 7. also Phil. Jud. 1, 271, 14. & 2, 226, 42. & 228, 8. & 229, 31. we learn, that it was esteemed highly honourable to be descended from a priest, especially on the mother’s side. That Zacharias was not, as some have supposed, the high priest or his vicar, is certain, for the high priest was not reckoned to any particular class. His duty it was to offer the solemn incense. This too is plain from the added τις. And although we just after read that he was offering incense at the altar in the holy place, yet that may well be understood of the daily offering of incense, which would fall to his lot as an ordinary priest in his course. “It is (says Doddridge) so plain that this was only an office of daily ministration, and that Zacharias was one of the ordinary priests, that we cannot but be surprised that any one should ever conclude, from this circumstance of the story, that
Zacharias was Sagan, or assistant, to the high priest, and was now performing his grand office on the day of atonement, and so on this foundation should calculate the birth of John the Baptist, and of Christ, and all the other feasts which depend upon them: yet this is done in the Calendars both of the Roman and Greek Church."

5. ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Ἀαρὼν, i.e. of the posterity of Aaron. A Hebraism. This is also mentioned to show her honourable birth on the mother’s side. The name Ἐλισάβετ is of Hebrew origin, and was that of the wife of Aaron. Exod. 6, 23, where the Greek translation thus renders the Hebr. נָלַשְׁבָּה. (Rosenm.)

6. δίκαιοι ἐνάκτιοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, i.e. were really pious. The phrase ἐνάκτιοι τοῦ Θεοῦ is taken from the Hebrew בנים ידים, or לוחים ידים. It may be rendered "Judice Deo." For what is true, or virtuous, in the sight, or eyes of an omniscient God, must be really so. God says to Noah, in Gen. 7, 1, "I know that thou art truly just." This phrase is not without example in the Greek authors. So Plut. Probl. Rom. p. 274. α. καὶ τὸ ἐν ὑπάθρῳ μάλιστα πῶς ἐναί δόκει τοῦ Διὸς ἐνάκτιον. The following words seem added, by way of explanation, and illustration, πορευόμενοι ἐν τάσις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασι τοῦ Κυρίου ἄμεμπτοι, where the words πορευόμενοι and περισσάρι are figuratively used, of the customary habits of life and action, and ἐντολάι and δικαιώματα are merely synonymous. Therefore the former is supposed to denote the moral, and the latter the ceremonial, precepts of the Mosaic Law. (Wets. Rosenm. and Kuin.) Wets. compares a similar passage from Ovid, Met. 1, 328. (of Deucalion and Pyrrha.) "Innocuous ambos, cultores numinis ambos, "Ἄμεμπτοι, i. e. ἀνεπίληπτοι, blameless, irreproachable. This clause respects their good fame with men, as the antecedent member of the sentence did their internal piety, recognized by God. So Artemid. 2, 12. ἐκείνη διετέλεσεν ἄμεμπτος.
7. προβεβηκότες ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις. This is taken from the Hebrew in Gen. 18, 11. אֶּשָּ֛כְנֹ֖ה, (speaking of Abraham and Sarah,) where the Sept. renders προβεβηκότες ἡμέρας. Thus in Jos. 1, 23. we read προβεβηκότας ταῖς ἡμέραις. The Classical writers, in this phrase, use either a dative without a preposition, or an accusative, with or without a preposition, and sometimes use the verb without any addition. Of all these cases examples may be found in Wetstein and Munthe. To which I add, Machon Athenæi, 580. c. ἐπὶ προβεβή τῶν ἑτέρων ἦ Γ. Hermippus Athenæi, 592. b. προβαίνοντα τῇ ἡλικίᾳ τῶν ἰ. Eurip. Hipp. 795. πρόω μὲν Ἰὼν Βιότος: where the Schol. exp. προβεβήκε τῇ ἡλικίᾳ. Elegantly, Eurip. Alc. 928. πολίδας ἔτι χαῖται Ἡβῃ προκείτης ὁ τὸ, μωτοῦ πρῶτω τε: where the Scholiast has Ἰων προνομενως ἐν ταῖς πολιῶν χαῖται — προβεβηκότας τῇ ἡλικίᾳ. Procop. 101, 2. τόρρῳ Ἰων ἡλικίας ἡκατ. Aristid. 3, 252. b. πόρρῳ τῇ ἡλικίᾳ. So Suidas, προβεβήκοι ταλαιπώροις, "somewhat in years, elderly." So the Latin provecti ætate, and provecti. The Hebraism, therefore, which Vorstius here points out, can only consist in the use of the preposition en similarly to εἰς.

8. ἐν τῷ ιερατείῳ αὐτῶ, while he was engaged in the discharge of his priestly function. Examples of this sense are produced by Wetstein from Aristotle, Pausanias, and Synesius. The ἐν here again has the force of the Hebrew εἰς.

8. ἐν τῇ τάξει τῆς ἐφημερίας. There seems to have been a similar periodical attendance among the Roman priesthood, as would appear from Herodian, 1, 25. (cited by Bulkley.) σὺν τοῖς λατρεύσιν ὁδῷ ἐν περιόδων χρόνῳ ἡ τάξις καλεῖ. Then ἐναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ, signifies coram Deo.

9. ἔλαχε τοῦ ὑμιῶν. Here we must understand τοῦ κλήρου, which is supplied in Acts 1, 17. See Bos. Ellips. Ed. Schaeffer. Since various were the sacerdotal offices, it was agreed among the priests, that all should be assigned, or distributed, by lot. By the first lot was designated, he who should cleanse the
outside of the altar. Secondly, thirteen were taken who should sacrifice the lamb, sprinkle the blood, trim the lamps, and burn and scatter the incense. Fourthly, he who should ascend the high altar, and lay upon it the members of the victim. The most honourable of all the functions was that of burning incense; an office which could only be discharged once. See Joma, f. 26, 1. Thomid 5, 4. 6, 3. 7, 2. (Wets.) By the ναὸν τοῦ Κυρίου we must here understand the sanctuary, which the priests only were allowed to enter (see Ex. 80, 7.); for there was the altar of incense. See Exod. 40, 21 seqq. The whole of this passage is admirably illustrated by the Rabbinical citations in Wetstein, who also cites Philo 1, 869, 42. & 2, p. 150, 34. & 2, 254, 8. & 1, 501, 9.

10. παν τὸ πνεύμα. There were constantly present in the temple, at the hour of prayer, the following classes: 1. the Priests; 2. the Levites; 3. the viri stationis, who represented the whole assembly in the imposition of hands over the head of the victim; 4. those brought thither by spontaneous devotion. These might certainly amount to a considerable number. But the expression παν τὸ πνεύμα seems to denote something more, as if this were a Sabbath day, on which the whole multitude of the city was obliged to attend public worship. When the offering of the Holocaust commenced, the trumpets and horns began to resound, and the whole assembly betook themselves to prayer; and this continued until the end of the oblation. Then the priest took the censer of coals from the high altar, (Levit. 16, 12.) and entering the sanctuary, burned it over the altar, (Exod. 7.) the people meanwhile praying* in the outer court. (2 Par. 29, 29.) But on the day of expiation, while the priest was within the Sanctum Sanctorum, the people were under some apprehension, until he should come forth in peace, when they

* This is, by Doddridge, thought to have been the foundation of that elegant figure, by which prayer is so often compared to incense. See Ps. 141, 2. Mal. 1, 11. Apoc. 8, 3, 4.
were exceedingly rejoiced, because they thus trusted that the prayers for their safety were accepted. When the Priest entered the Sanctuary, and was about to burn incense, it was announced by sound of bell, that the time of worship was at hand. Then all addressed themselves to prayer, but in silence. (To this there is, perhaps, an allusion in Apocal. 8, 1, 3.) The burning of incense and offering up prayer being concluded, the joints of the victim were placed upon the altar; and then the Levites addressed themselves to the singing of psalms, the priests to sounding the trumpets and horns. (Lightfoot.) On this rite see Eccles. 50, 15, et seq. which throws no inconsiderable light on this whole passage.


11. ἀφθή δὲ αὐτῶν ἄγγελος. This passage may be excellently illustrated by Exod. 8, 2, where the flame of fire, from which Moses heard the voice, is called "the angel of God." It must be remembered, that this altar was double; one outward, for ordinary purposes; the other, which was used for the burning of incense, inward. (Rosenm.)

12. φύεσος ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν. An Hebrew phrase, like that in Exod. 15, 16. This angelic appearance, however, was nothing new; for we read that the Hebrew priests not unfrequently saw visions, and heard voices in the sanctuary. (Rosenm.) Wetstein refers to Jud. 13, 22. Dan. 10, 8. Acts 10, 10. 13, 11. 19, 17. Judith 15, 1. Drusius illustrates this from the Rabbinical writings, and Grotius adds Jos. Ant. 13, 18, where God returns an oracle to Hyrcanus, as he is offering incense.

13. εἰσηγούσθη ἡ δέησις σου. Together with the burning of incense the Priest offered up prayers to God, and not the Priest only, but the Israelites, standing without. These prayers were expressed for the welfare of the people of God, (for the Messiah, says Maldonati, and the ancient Commentators,) nay, if we may believe Josephus and Philo, for that of
the whole world. These prayers the Angel says are heard, for that now the advent of the Messiah was close at hand, whose forerunner the son, now to be born to Zacharias, was destined to be. (Grot.) But to this Maldonati objects, that the angel says not a word of the advent of Christ, but only of John, &c.; therefore he maintains that Zacharias had been offering up a prayer for offspring; of which, however, considering his wife's advanced age, he must almost have abandoned all hope, and therefore would scarcely pray for it. Neither (says Lightfoot) would he intermingle public prayers with private petitions. This, however, seems not of itself a strong argument, and, notwithstanding this, Rosenmuller is of opinion that Zacharias had been offering up prayers for offspring, to whom I cannot assent. Kuinoel preserves a prudent silence. I know not why we may not refer this to past prayers for offspring; as in Acts 10, 4. And this opinion is adopted by some ap. Maldonati, as also by Koecher and Van Till. Though Grotius objects, that to this the circumstances of the passage will not suffer us to refer it. For the Priest was accustomed to offer up prayers, together with the burning of incense, and the same learned Commentator alleges the following passage of Hierocles: τῶν συμβολικῶν νοουέταις καὶ τὸ περιφερόμενον φιλάττειν καὶ τὸ εἰσω νοούμενον, and another of similar import from Philo. From Wetstein we have the following interpretation: “Not only have thy prayers been heard, which thou hast uttered for the safety of the people, but even what thou didst not dare to ask, thou shalt receive;” which is extremely ingenious, but fanciful; in truth, I do not see how this sense can be elicited from the words, by any rules of just interpretation.

14. ἐσται χαρά σοι. Rosenmuller and Kuinoel agree, that the name John is to be repeated from the context; thus the syntax will be an opposition familiar to both Greek and Hebrew writers, and in the Latin is expressed by the dative case.
15. μέγας, illustrious, famous, celebrated. Some, however, render "gratiosius Deo." And so Thucyd. 1, 18. γιγνεται παρ' αυτῳ μέγας. On which sense of μέγας see the note on Matthew, 5, 19.

15. οἶνον καὶ σίκερα ὡς μη πίῃ, he shall utterly abstain from wine, and all inebriating drink. From this passage it is plain that the Jews distinguished οἶνος from σίκερα, and this is agreeable to what we learn from other quarters. So the Hebr. ῥῶν is often rendered by the Sept. σίκερα, i.e. σηκυς, a word of Chaldee formation and termination, which is explained by Hesychius, (as I suspect, from some very ancient biblical gloss,) οἶνος συμμιγῆς ὀδύσμασιν, ἢ πάν τόμα εμποιοῦν μὲθην, μὴ ἐκ ἀμπέλου δὲ σκευαστῶν σωκείτων ὑποθοῦν by Euthym. πάν τὸ παρὰ τὸν οἶνον μέθυσε, μαλιστα δὲ, τὸ ἐκ φονίκων ἐσκευασμένων. So Schol. Cod. 34. σήκερα δέ ἐστι τάν τὸ μέθυν μὲν ποιεῖν δυνάμενον, οὐκ ἐν δὲ ἐκ ἀμπέλου. So Theophyl. πάν τὸ μέθυν ἐμποιοῦν δυνάμενον οὐκ ἐκ δὲ ἐπικείμενον. It therefore denotes what we call maid wine, which, as we find from Pliny, was extracted from apples, pears, dates, and other fruit, as also from palms aniseed, and, as Kimchi and some other Rabbinical writers tell us, from honey, barley, &c. (like our ale), or even from herbs. From this, indeed, most of those abstained who affected sanctity and an ascetic course of life. So it was written in the Law of Moses of him who had vowed a vow of Nazar, (Numb. 6, 8.) ἀπό οἶνον καὶ σίκερα ἀγνισθήσεται, where the Targum explains a vino novo et vetere. (Wets. Rosenm. and Kuin.)

15. ἐτι ἐκ κοιλίας μετρὸς αὐτοῦ. So the Hebr. τον ποσον in Is. 48, 8. 49, 1, 5. Ps. 71, 6. So the Classical writers ἐκ παιδος; ἐκ βρέφους. Wetstein compares Philo. 2, 65, 16. σχεδών ἐξ ἐτι νηπίων παιδών and 44, 87. ἐξ ἐτι σπαργάνων. Also Anthol. 5, 25. Στησισα-ρολ δ' ἐνόσα—λύρης δ' ἐδίδαξεν ἀπόλλων ἀρμονίαν, ἐτι μητρὸς ἐν σπαραγχυσιν ἐσται. Ἐτι is for ἐτη, of which examples are given by Raphel, Palairt, and Kypke.

16. τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ ἐπιστρέψει ἐπὶ Κύριον, shall convert them, cause them to obey. The verb is here use in a transitive, or Hiphil sense, like the Heb.
and is here, and also in Jam. 6, 19. Sir. 5, 4, 18, 15. &c. applied to moral emendation and correction. Wetstein refers to Sirach 48, 10. Esdr. 6, 22. By Κύριος some understand the Messiah, others, more justly, the Deus Israelis tutelaris. So Mal. 3, 1, 23. The Jews expected the coming of Elias before the Messiah.

17. προεδρεύων ενακτιαν αυτού. There is here much difference of opinion. Many refer αυτού to Κύριον in the preceding verse, and contend, that the Messiah is thus termed God. Then Θεός must be taken in a lower sense, as when spoken of those who are God’s representatives, such as Kings, Judges, and the Messiah himself. See Ps. 82, 6, 7, 4, 7, 8, 110, 1. Joh. 20, 28. Others (as Euthymius) so understand it as to take the word Κύριον of God, not Messiah, and translate, “Deum et Messiam tanquam legatus praebet, negotii divini per Messiam perficiendi praeceperit.” But this seems too far-fetched, and is not supported by the parallel passage, v. 76. seq. where the words cannot, without violence, be interpreted of God himself. Heuman, more rightly, thinks αυτοῦ put emphatically, for του Χριστοῦ, or του Κυριοῦ, i.e. the Messiah. For the Hebrews were accustomed to use יהוה, the Greeks αυτός, and the Latins ipse and ille of eminent personages. So it is said for Jehovah in Deut. 39, 39. Ps. 37, 5, 102, 28. and αυτός for Χριστός in Luke 5, 17. 1 Joh. 2, 6, 12. But it was especially used by disciples of their masters, with the suppression of the appellative. The Pythagorean αυτός ἐφα is well known. (Kuin.) The idiom extends also to modern languages, and, amongst the rest, to our own.

17. εν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ηλίου. Ἔν here signifies praeditum. Εν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει is put for εν πνεύματι δυνάμεως, and by δυνάμεις must be understood energy, Muth. So Sirach, 48, 12. καὶ Ἐλισαβέτ ἐν εφημερίᾳ πνεύματος αυτοῦ, i.e. of Elias. Others explain δυνάμεις of the virtues and endowments of the mind, or of eloquence. See on Luke 24, 19; and also:
Reiske, in his Animadv. 4, 73. Of the efficacy of Elias's eloquence, Sirach, 48, 1. says, ἀνέστη Ἡλίας προφήτης ὁς πῦρ, καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ὁς λαμπάς ἐκάιετο. (Kuin.)

17. ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας. There is here a manifest reference to Malach. 3, 23, 24. where Dathe has thus excellently rendered the Hebrew: "Is (Elias) operam dabit, ut ad majorum mores posteros reducat, hosque illorum agendi rationi iterum adsuefaciat." But the Vulgate, more accurately, "et convertet cor patrum ad filios, et cor filiorum ad patres eorum." Thus the Syriac version, and Jonathan. So also we read in Sirach, 48, 10. of Elias, who should precede the advent of the Messiah: καταγραφεῖς—eis kairos—ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς γυν, καὶ καταστήσαι φυλὰς Ἰακὼβ. The sense is, "he will, by his doctrine, exhortations, and admonitions, bring it to pass, that the posterity shall have the pious dispositions towards God that their ancestors had." Or, as it is explained by Morus, in his Prelect: "Sensus similes instillabit omnibus, qua religionem, docendo et hortando efficiet, ut omnes simili modo Deum cognoscant et colant." (Kuin.)

17. καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίως. By ἀπειθεῖς is meant disobedient, and (from the adjunct) impious, as often in the Sept. ἐν φρονήσει is for εἰς φρονήσιν. The two prepositions are often interchanged. Φρονήσις some interpret wisdom, i.e. the study of virtue, as being, in the opinion of the Sacred writers, the only true wisdom, as sin is the greatest folly. So Aristot. Nicomach. 6, 5. (ap. Wets.) περὶ δὲ φρονήσεως—δοκεῖ δὴ φρονίμοι εἴναι τὸ καλῶς βουλευσάσθαι περὶ τὰ ἐαυτῷ ἀγαθὰ καὶ συμφέροντα, οὐ κατὰ μέγας, οἷος ποία πρὸς ὑγιείαν καὶ ἱσχὺν, ἀλλὰ ποία πρὸς τὸ εὖ γίνεται. The δίκαιοι and the ἀπείθεις are opposed; the wisdom of the former, to the foolishness of the latter. But this interpretation is not favoured by the parallelism of members. For to Φρονήσις answers in the former member καρδία. But καρδία here, as often, denotes mind, thought. It therefore seems better to here
expound φρονήσει de sentiendi ratione. Thus the words may be rendered, ut paretur domino populus paratus, i. e. ad eum (Dominum, Messiam,) recipiendum. But thus arises a sort of tautology; though, indeed, in the Hebrew and Hellenistic style such pleonasmis abound. Yet there is, perhaps, no occasion to resort to a pleonasm, so that we translate ετωμαζεῖν colligere, congerere, as 12. 20. and Joh. 1, 11. Therefore, the words may be rendered in the following manner: “That thus there may be collected to the Lord (Messiah) a people well prepared (by true piety) for his reception.” So De Rhoer. Fer. Daventr. p. 89. cites Dio. οὐμιλον παρασκευασθένα, multitudinem Cesari paratam, et in ejus partes pertractam. (Kuin.)

18. κατὰ τι γνώσωμαι τούτο; Bos, in his Exerc. supplies σημεῖον, as in Lucian. Scyth. 594. For it seems he sought a sign. The very words are used by the Sept. in Gen. 15, 8. to express the יָרָא הָעֵבָר, but in 1 Sam. 29, 4. Jud. 6, 15. et τίν. The words, considered alone, would seem not to deserve the severe punishment with which they were visited. But it was the diffidence of heart accompanying them which constituted the offence. Zacharias only adverted to his advanced years, and those of his wife (as did Abraham, Rom. 4, 18.), when he ought (says Grot.) to have turned from natural causes to the great First Cause. Grotius then proceeds to compare the two cases, and the nature and degree of offence in Zacharias.

18. πρεσβυτής. The word often denotes one verging towards old age; and therefore not unfrequently has united with it, to denote advanced years, adverbs serving to determine that sense, as μάλα, σφώδρα, &c. It is not possible from this word, nor, indeed, from any other source, to determine the age of Zacharias. (Kuin.)

19. Γαβριὴλ. Rosenmuller observes, that the Jews seem to have learnt in Chaldea the names of angels, which, it seems, were given them according to the
kinds of ministry in which the Jews supposed them to be employed by God. Thus Γαβριηλ denotes δυνάμεις Θεοῦ, power of God. See the copious Rabbinical citations in Wets. and the annotation of Grot.

19. ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐνάπιοι τοῦ Θεοῦ. An image borrowed from the customs of Oriental courts, where he is said to stand before the King, who has always access to the royal presence; it may therefore be interpreted a favourite minister. So 1 Kings, 10, 8, 12, 6. 17, 1. Esth. 4, 5. There is, perhaps, an allusion to the seclusion of Eastern monarchs from their subjects, by which none are permitted to see them but the courtiers, and those introduced by them. That they should stand in the royal presence, is also correspondent to oriental form.

20. ἦσιν σιώπαν, καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι. There appears, at first sight, a tautology in these words, to avoid which, some ancient commentators, as Euthymius, Titus and Theophylact, and several modern ones, as Grotius, interpret σιώπην to be deaf. (Wolf.) A signification, as Rosenm. remarks, unsupported by authority. The words καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι, appear to Kuinoel to be added, in order to explain the preceding, a method frequent with the Hebrew, and even the Greek writers. See Palairet's examples. Rosenm. remarks, that μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι is applicable to one who, either from physical, or from moral incapacity, cannot speak. But both these interpretations enervate the sense. I am inclined to think that the latter phrase is emphatical. There seems a sort of climax, which may thus be expressed: “Thou shalt be silent, may thou shalt not even have the faculty of speech.” Wetstein thus paraphrases it: “Qui auribus et linguâ non. rectè usus fuerat, surdus et mutus redditur.” So 2 Regg. 7. 2. But this, which is derived from Euthymius, is more ingenious than solid.

20. ἀνὴρ ἄν, whereupon. In the Sept. it answers to the Heb. יָשַׁנְתּ, but is not, as some think, a mere Hebraism. Classical examples have been produced
by Pafairet and Munthe. I add, that it occurs frequently in Thucydides.

21. καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ αἱρεῖται προσόντων τῶν Ζαχαρίαν. Most commentators remark that the people waited, as usual, till he should return, to give them a blessing. But Rusius, Hammond, and Erasmus, have, with reason, objected, that this blessing was only to be pronounced at the morning season, and that, if we may believe Maimonides, the priest who burnt the incense in the sanctuary, did not pronounce the blessing, but that this office was committed to another. Nor does there, in the present passage appear, any certain indication of a sacerdotal blessing having been pronounced by Zacharias.

21. καὶ ἐθανάτωσαν ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν αὐτῶν, they wondered that he should tarry so long in the sanctuary, and with reason. For it appears to have been a custom with the priest, not to make any long stay, lest the people, who were awaiting his return, in the outer court, should suppose that the delay was occasioned by his being slain, through the anger of the Deity, for some negligence in the performance of his duty.* The subject is well illustrated by Lightfoot, Schöttingen, Scheid ap. Meuschen, and also by Wetstein, from whom I select the following. Hieros. Joma f. 43, 2. and Babyl. 53, 2. Summus Pontifex fudit orationem brevem in Sancto—Prolitus in oratione non suit, ne formidinem aliquam incuteret populo. Historia est de quodam, qui prolixius sult, et parati erant post ipsum intrare. Ferunt, eum fuisse Simeonem Justum. Dicunt ei: quare tam diu moraris? Respondit; ego supplicavi pro templo Dei vestri, ne excsinderetur. Regerunt: Non convenit tamen, ut tam diu moreris.

* Dr. Doddridge judiciously observes, "All that is here recorded might have passed in a few minutes; it seems probable, therefore, that since the people took notice of his continuing so much longer than ordinary in the holy place, he spent some time in secret devotion, where, in a mixture of holy affections, rising on so great and extraordinary an occasion, he might easily forget how fast the moments passed away."
22. ἐπέγγεσαν ὅτι ὀπτασίαν ἐόρακεν. There is here an obscurity, by reason of the circumstances not being sufficiently unfolded. Theophylact has alone hit on the true method of explication, in the following words: διένευε δὲ τῷ λαῷ Ζαχαρίας, ἵσος ἔρισεν θυόντα τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς σιωπῆς μὴ δυνάμενου γὰρ καληθῆναι, διὰ νεύματος ἐδήλου ταύτην; by the aid of which suggestion, Kuinoel has thus satisfactorily detailed the sequence of circumstances.

"The people had been in alarm, lest Zacharias should have died in the sanctuary; but when he issued forth, and seemed deprived of the faculty of utterance, they, from that circumstance, conjectured that something extraordinary had happened to him, and, as was very natural, asked whether he had seen a vision, and this Zacharias affirmed, by nodding assent. Ὄπτασία corresponds to the Heb. קָנָר in Dan. 9, 23. it is explained by Hesychius φαντασία, a vision."

22. ἃν διανεῖσαν, for διένευε. Supply τοῦτο, "he said this by nods and gestures." For the word διανεῖσαν and its other compounds, when found without any addition, may be understood to mean this, unless the context should determine otherwise. There is indeed an ellipsis of κεφαλῆς, which is supplied in Hom. Ι. 1, 514. Hence, in Artemid. 5, 71. p. 923. τὴν κεφαλῆς, I conjecture τῇ κεφαλῆς. Or of ὠφθαλμῶν, as in Ps. 34, 22. Sir. 27, 22. or of προσώπῳ, as in Herodot. 7, 8, 21. τράχειοι προσώπου νεύματι, and Pausan. 10, 31. οὕματι προσώπου. So Herodian. 7, 8, 4. Also, Hor. Serm. 1, 9, 65. "nutans, distorquens oculos." Sometimes there is an ellipsis of χειρί, as infra 62. ἐνενεύου τῷ πατρὶ τὸ τι κ. τ.  λ. So Zosim. 2, 48, 4. τῇ δεξιᾷ νεύσας. Herodian, 1, 9, 7. χειρὸς νεύματι. Onosand. p. 90. παρασύνθημα γίνεσθαι νεύματι χειρός. Jos. 1273, 46. καὶ τῷ νεύματι τῆς οὗ προσέχων. Herodot. 4, 113, 7. τῇ δὲ χειρὶ ἐφάσατε. Anthol. 2, 46. (cited by Wets.) τῷ χειρὶ τὰ λοιπὰ σολοκίζει διανεῖναι, καλώς δ᾽ αὐτὸν ἴδων, τὸ στόμα μου δεδεται. It is however generally left to be supplied, as infra 62. and so I understand Thucyd. 1, 134. νεύματι ἄφανεν χειραμεν-
and the imitation of that passage in Dio Xiphil. 1978, 60. νεύματι ἀφανεὶ προσχων' and in Clem. Alex. Strom. 33, 8. νεύματι ἀφανεὶ κεχρημένων' and Plutarch Arat. C. 20. διὰ νεύματος ἐθηλωσε τῷ Γίγκραμι φεύγειν, which seems imitated from Aristoph. Babylon. (cited by Priscian, L. 18.) ἐνεθεὶ μὲ φεύγειν οἰκᾶς. See Aristoph. Thesm. 507. Also, Appian. 11, 335, 50. καὶ διέκειν αλλήλοις διαχρήσασθαι κ. τ. λ. besides several other passages collected in the course of my reading, which I cannot here detail.

23. ἡμέρας τῆς λειτουργίας. Dr. Hammond has here a very long annotation, wherein he has fully and satisfactorily treated on the various significations of this word, to which all succeeding commentators have been much indebted. It may suffice, for the present purpose, to state that λειτουργία is derived from the old word λήτος publicus, and signifies properly any public service, whether civil, or military. But in the Scriptures, it is applied to the public offices of religion: First, that of the Priests and Levites, under the Mosaic Law: Secondly, that of Christian Priests, under the Gospel Dispensation, including every branch of the sacerdotal office. Of these various significations, examples may be found in Wetstein: ex. gr. 2 Chron. 31, 4. ἔτος κατασχεσασιν ἐν τῇ λειτουργίᾳ οἴκου Κυρίου. Jos. Ant. 4, 4, 12, 2, 7. B. 1, 1, 10. 2, 17, 2. In the Ecclesiastical writers, it is chiefly applied to the public offices of prayer, performed morning and evening.

24. συνέλαβεν, conceived. This is an elliptical phrase, in which we must understand ἐν γαστρί which is supplied infra, or ἐν κοιλίᾳ, as 2, 22. Besides which, we must understand ἐμβρύων, as appears from ver. 36. συνελήφσια ὑπὸ. Though indeed that may be rather applicable to the period of gestation. Here perhaps we may more properly understand στέμα. So Galen. de Semine 1. (cited by Wets.) καὶ μω καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο συλλαμβάνειν τὸ στέμα, εἶτε τοὺς αὐτὸ τούτων τοῦτο ἡ σύλληψις ἐνετείθην ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐδόκει τεθεῖσθαι. See Gen. 30, 23. Deut. 7, 8, 14.
24. περιεκρύβεν ἑαυτὴν μήνας πέντε. Upon the sense of this passage, there has been much difference of opinion. Somewhat indeed of obscurity and uncertainty attaches to it, produced, I conceive, by the too great brevity of the writer. Many interpret the words περιεκρύβεν ἑαυτὴν, "she concealed her pregnancy," i.e. during the first five months. This might easily be done for that period, or even a longer one, especially by an elderly woman, of whom no one would suppose it. The reason for concealment may, (say they) have been, to avoid the dubious rumours of the vulgar, since few would easily believe that she was pregnant, until, after that period, it would become too manifest to be denied. Others explain, "she kept herself at home, in order to conceal her pregnancy;" and these take the πέντε μήνας of the five last months of pregnancy. For (say they), during these months she could no longer conceal it, and there was reason to fear, lest neither her own asseveration, nor the view of her situation, would overcome the incredulity of the vulgar. To both these interpretations, Kuinoel, with reason, objects. For First, he denies that περιεκρύβεν ἑαυτὴν can properly signify to conceal her pregnancy. Secondly, since the words ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῶν ἐκτῶ must denote the sixth month of pregnancy, the preceding ones can only mean the first five: neither does the context admit such a sense. To his second position I entirely assent; but with respect to his first, I am inclined to hesitate; and especially when he goes on to say, that it cannot be certainly affirmed that she concealed her pregnancy. I admit, that from the words themselves, this is not certain: but the context, and the circumstances of the case, make it highly probable. Thus it is expressed in the Persic Version. The true reason for the concealment, is perhaps that long ago assigned by the Greek interpreters. So Theophyl. 303. c. σωφρονον οὐδα τὴν Ἐλισάβετ, ζηδείτο καὶ διὰ τούτο πε- ριεκρύσσεν ἑαυτὴν, διὰ τὸ ἐν γήρᾳ συμμουθείν. Or as Euthymius phrases it; αἰδομένη τὴν γύραν καὶ
ἐξειρον κοποφοίαν. I cannot therefore assent to Kuí-
nøel, who attributes it to a desire to worship God
more fervently than usual, and that she kept herself
at home, till after the fifth month, it would be so evi-
dent as to be no longer denied. But this seems
somewhat harsh and frigid: neither is it true, that
after that period it would be so certain that it could
not be denied. May we then take περικριβείον in the
sense of "she concealed herself," i. e. concealed her
situation? And, considering her advanced years,
from motives of delicacy, that she might not encoun-
ter the coarse pleasantries of the vulgar. Thus far,
all is simple and probable. Here, however, we are
encountered with a difficulty. What occasion would
there be for doing this in the first five? And I have
admitted that the expression cannot be taken of the
last five. To this, may it not be answered, that per-
haps we are not compelled to take either the first
five, or the last five, but any five? Thus, dating the
commencement of the five months, from the period
when Elizabeth might fancy her situation would be
discerned, before which time, there would be no oc-
casion for concealment. This hypothesis, however,
seems scarcely to be admitted by ver. 36. καὶ οὗτος
μὴν ἐκτὸς ἐστὶν αὐτῇ τῇ καλομενῇ στείρᾳ. There-
fore π. must be interpreted, kept herself close: I
would suggest, that possibly Elizabeth might keep
herself close during her pregnancy, fearing (from her
natural wish for offspring, and her persuasion that
the child would be some extraordinary personage,)
such sort of accidents as produce miscarriage, espe-
cially in the earlier stage. She thought it her duty, it
seems, by the next verse, as the Lord had been so
gracious as to cause her to conceive, and thus take
away her reproach among men, to take special care
of herself, that she might not, by carelessness, frus-
trate his gracious purposes; for this, I conceive, is
the true sense of the twenty-fifth verse. Whether she
concealed her pregnancy, is, I admit, not certain:
she would probably do so, at first, from delicacy, until
after the visit of her cousin, and when it became
manifest that her pregnancy was brought about by Di-
vine will, she would no longer have any motive to
conceal it.

25. πετοίηκεν—ἐπείθεν. Ποιεῖν is, like the Heb.
πᾶσα, taken for εὐ ποιεῖν. So also ἐπείθω is used like
the Hebr. יָפָא, in Gen. 18, 10. (from which is de-
rived the Greek ὑπάω,) in the sense of “to look upon”
(for good), i. e. “to confer benefits upon.” So the
Hebr. יָפָא; with this exception, however, that it
signifies to look upon, both for good, and for evil;
and so the Latin adspectare, which is, however, used
only for good. On which sense see Faccioli’s
Lexicon.

27. παρθένον μαμνηστευμένην ἀ. betrothed. The
verb μνηστευω is used in the Sept. to express ἡμε.
So in Deut. 22, 23. a betrothed maiden is termed
ἵπτομαι ἔνα. (Kuin.)

27. εἰς οἴκου Δαβίδ, of the family of David. Wet-
stein cites Tacit. A. 1, 4, 7. “regnatrix domus.”

28. Χαίρε κεχαριτωμένη. A Greek form of saluta-
tion equivalent to the Hebrew יִלּוֹלַי, in Greek
eἰρήνη σε. In Engl. hail, all hail, peace be to thee.
Campbell renders κεχαριτωμένη favourite of Heaven,
but our common version seems preferable, “hou
art highly favoured.” So Phavor. κεχαριτωμένη,
πεφιλημένη. It is, (says Kuinoel,) explained in v. 30.
eἰρεῖς χάριν παρὰ Θεῶ. So Symmachus, Ps. 18, 26.
µετὰ τοῦ κεχαριτωμένου χαριτωθήτω, where κεχαριτωμέ-
νου denotes worthy of the Divine favour, דָּי. This
signification seems partly Oriental, and, as Pfochen
and Schlesner tell us, has never been produced
from the Classical writers, except by Schneider, in
his Lexicon, from Liban. 4. p. 1071. Wetstein has
several passages from lexicographers and glossog-
raphers, which, however, have in view rather Sirach 9,
8. than the present passage. He also quotes a simi-
lar expression from Isocr. Archid. εἰκός γὰρ τὴν τῶν
θεῶν εὐνοιαν ἐσεβαί μετὰ τούτων. See the authors
cited by Wolf and Koecher. I must also refer the student to the learned annotation of Dr. Hammond.

28. ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ. Some supply ἔστι, but ἔστιν seems far more suitable to the context, and, in this sense, it is a form of salutation frequent to the Hebrews; as in Ruth 2, 4. Jud. 6, 12. On this Euthymius has the following beautiful observation: Ἀυτὴ ἡ χάρα τὴν ἀράν ἔλυσε τῆς εὐας, ἐκεῖνη μὲν γὰρ ἐκελεύσθη λύπην ἐξειν' αὐτῇ δὲ χαρᾶν, τῆς λύπης ἀντίπαλον.

28. εὐλογημένη σὺ εἰς γυναιξίν, “the happiest, most fortunate art thou of women.” Ἑν answers to the Hebr. ἡ, and the Latin inter. So Liv. 23, 44. “Magna memorabilisque fuisset inter paucas.”

29. ιδοὺ. The Vulgate renders cum audivisset, which Kuinoel with reason approves. For verbs of seeing and hearing are, in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, often interchanged, as indeed are all verbs of sense. In διεταράχθη the διὰ seems intensive. Wetstein cites Dionys. Hal. 7, 35.

29. διεταράχθη τοσάτος ἐγὼ ὑ. ὁ. ὁ. “What sort of salutation this might be, i. e. what these formulas of salutation implied, and to what they tended.”

30. εἴρεσ, thou hast obtained. For εὑρίσκω, like the Hebr. הָפַל, has frequently this sense.

32. μέγας. So the Hebr. יָרָא, great, illustrious. ὡς ὑψῖστος κληθήσεται, he shall be the Son of the Most High, i. e. κατ' ἐξής, the Messiah. ὑψῖστος answers to the Hebr. יָרָא. Καλεῖσθαι for εἶναι is frequent both in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.

33. βασιλεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ὀλίκων Ἰσραήλ, the family and nation descended from Jacob, i. e. the Jewish people. The Jewish people is particularly named, because to it was the promised Messiah first sent. Not however to the exclusion of the other nations. See 14, 1. and Is. 44, 5. The words καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ ὁκ ἐσται τέλος are a further explanation of the preceding εἰς τῶν αἰώνας, from Dan. 7, 11. This is to be understood comparatively to the other kingdoms of the universe, which sometimes rise, sometimes fall: q. d. the dominion of Jesus over the
minds of men shall continue, and flourish, when all other empires of the universe are extinct. Since, however, all these expressions were derived from the Old Testament, we are not to suppose that Mary then understood what kind of a dominion the Messiah was to have.

34. τῶς ἔσται τοῦτο. Grotius, Beza, L. Brug. and Kuinoel rightly take the sentence, not as interrogative, but as expressive of wonder and admiration.

35. πνεῦμα ἁγιὸν ἑπελεύσεται — ἐπισκίάσει σοὶ. Spiritus sanctus in te operabitur, et vis altissimi te obumbravit, i.e. interventu divinae virtutis, vel per miraculum concepies. Nam πνεῦμα ἁγιὸν venire dicitur super homines eos, quos Deus agitat, et in quibus majora, quàm quàm a naturæ vi vel expectari vel produci queant, virtutis suæ accessione operatur. (Rosenm.) The words δύναμις Θεοῦ explain it. Wetstein adds the following references. 1 Cor. 6, 14. compared with Ro. 8, 11. 1 Tim. 3, 16. 1 Pet. 3, 18. Acts 1, 8. inf. 24, 49.

35. ἐπισκίάσει. The word denotes, 1st. to overshadow; 2dly. to surround, and, metaphorically, to defend and assist. The sense is therefore this: tibi succurret, interventu potentiae divinae, procreabis. (Kuinoel.)

36. To confirm the truth of these sayings, the Angel appeals to the example of Elizabeth, (who though advanced in years, yet should shortly bring forth a son,) in order that Mary might be taught, that what God had by his power effected in Elizabeth, he would effect in Mary. (Kuin.)

Elizabeth is called Mary’s συγγενής; cognata; and this she certainly might be, although Mary was descended from the tribe of Judah, and Elizabeth from the family of Aaron, and had been married to a priest; for marriages might be formed between persons of different tribes. Nor is there any thing to disprove this in Num. 8, 6. where the subject only refers to heiresses. The mother of Mary might, therefore, have been of the tribe of Levi and the
family of Aaron; or the mother, or grandmother, of Elizabeth, might have been of the tribe of Judah, and thus have been related to Mary by the father's side. See Buxtorf, Catal. 241. Wets. Misc. S. T. 2, 376. and Wolf. Cur. (Kuin.) "Si Maria agnata fuit Elisabetæ, hoc est, si patrem habuit sacerdotem, uti Elisabet, quod Ammonius per singvæn intelliget (vid. ad Marc. 6, 4.) sequeretur Mariam non ex tribu Juda sed ex tribu Levi fuisse orundam. Ita sensit auctor Testamenti 12. Patriarcharum. Simeon. 7. ubi de Judæ et Levi loquesque εξ αυτῶν, inquit, ἀνατελεῖ όμως τὸ σωτηρίου του Θεοῦ ἀναστήσει γὰρ τὸ κύριος εκ του Λευ, αἰ αὐξεῖεα, καὶ εξ Ἰουδα αἰς βασιλέα θεὸν καὶ αὐρατων. And Lev. 2. διὰ σωτέρ καὶ Ἰουδα ὁφθήσεται κυρίος ἐν ἀνθρώποις. (Wets.)


37. οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ πᾶν ρῆμα. Ρῆμα corresponds to the Hebr. רֶשׁ, res. It seems to have been a proverbial expression, founded, perhaps, upon Gen. 18, 14. רֶשׁ גָּדַל נָּאֲרָו, which is rendered by the Sept. μὴ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ρῆμα. Ἀδυνατήσει has the force of the present; or it may thus be expressed: "nothing can take place which shall be impossible with God." It is therefore (as often) a general gnome, intended to be applied to a particular case, namely, the one in hand.

citations in Schlesusner. The following passages will, however, be found more apposite. Jos. 508, 14. ἀπὸ τῆς ὄρεινής Ἰουδαίας. And 1200, 35. κεῖται δὲ αὐτῇ κατὰ τὴν ὄρεινήν.

39. πόλιν Ἰουδα. The name of this city, which has as yet eluded the research of Commentators, cannot, with any certainty, be determined. But as πόλις sometimes signifies the metropolis, or capital, of any country, Camerarius and others interpret it for Jerusalem. As to the reading of one MS. Δαβὶδ, it is doubtless from the margin, and only proves how ancient was the opinion, that it was Jerusalem, yet the accompanying expressions are by no means suitable to Jerusalem. Hence most Commentators have, (with Beza,) conjectured Hebron, which was the capital of the tribe of Judah, as Jerusalem was of the whole country. Yet surely in the former, and perhaps in the latter case, the article is indispensably necessary. It seems better to rest content with being ignorant of what the Evangelist seems to have omitted to record, rather than to resort, on the one hand, to forced interpretations and dubious conjectures, or, on the other, to have recourse to unauthorized alterations, as do Vales. Reland, Harenberg, and Michaelis, who propose to read Ἰουττα, a sacerdotal town in Judah, (see Josh. 15, 55, 21, 16,) which word (as Kuinoel thinks) might easily be altered by the scribes into Ἰουδα, or have been softened into that word, in process of time.

41. αἰς ἡκουσε—ἐσκύρτησε τὸ βρέφος. To this commotio of the infant in utero is sometimes applied σκυρτῶν, as here, and in Gen. 25, 22. ἐσκύρτων δὲ τὰ παιδία ἐν αὐτῇ, or ἀσκαρίσεων. The Latin has salire. So Juvenal, 6, 599. “Vexare uterum pueris salientibus.” So also Nonnus in Dionys. 8, 224. (cited by Triller.) παίς δὲ ἀλόχευτος ἑκέφρων Ἀλμάσιν ἐνδομύχωσε συνεσκύρτησε τεκούσῃ. This is not uncommon, especially in the latter months of pregnancy, and is usually to be attributed to some mental perturbation in the mother, and may here be referred to surprise and joy.
42. καὶ ἀνεβάνησε, &c. The copies here have no other variation than ἀνεβάνησε: otherwise ἀντεφάνησε might have been worth enquiring after; "she answered," namely, Mary's salutation. So Plut. de audiend. Poet. p. 22. l. Τιμοθέω—Κυνηγίας εὐδός ἀντεφάνησε. In Mario, p. 416. d. In Arato, p. 1880. d. (Markland.)


43. καὶ πόθεν μοι τούτο, scil. τὸ πρᾶγμα. Rosenm. has well observed, that this is a formula used by those who would express admiration at any honour unexpectedly done them. Such also seems to have been the opinion of Wetstein, by the following Classical examples, which he here produces. Aristænet. 1, 43. ταύτην ὁ χαρίσιος ἰδὼν, χαίροις, εἶπε, φιλάτηγ. Ἡ δὲ καὶ πόθεν ἂν ἐμοί, φησί, γένοιτο χαίρειν; Virgil, Ecl. 9, 27. "Et quæ tanta fuit Romam tibi causa videndi?" See Matth. 8, 14. 2 Sam. 24, 21. Also Epictet. Enchirid. 29, 44. which is referred to by Wolf. This circumstance, namely, that she should be the mother of the Messiah, was revealed to her by the Holy Ghost. (Wets.)

44. ἐσκίρησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ μου. By this many old Interpreters would prove, in its literal sense, the truth of the words, that John was a prophet from his mother’s womb, of which interpretation we may commend the piety rather than the judgment. Kuinoel thus paraphrases: "Mea lætitia maxima est, quin et ipse fetus in utero meo præ lætitia excultasse videtur." To whom I assent: and I would suggest, that there is here an ellipsis of ὅς, (as if,) which frequently occurs, i. e. ἐσκίρησεν ὅς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει.

45. καὶ μακαρία. The construction, (which is somewhat intricate,) is thus laid down by Kuinoel: καὶ μακαρία ἡ πιστεύσας, τῶν λαλημένοις αὐτῇ παρὰ κυρίῳ, ὅτι ἐσται τελείωσις, nempe παρὰ κυρίῳ, felix quaæ fidem
habet iis, quae dominus illi annuntiavit, nam eventum habebunt. The husband of Elizabeth, i.e. Zacharias, is I think, delicately, alluded to: q.d. (says Wets.) "Ego infelix, cujus maritus non credidit, et ideo mutus est." This circumstance is thus elegantly touched on by Doddridge: "I doubt not but here is an oblique reference to the unhappiness of Zacharias, who had not immediately believed the promise of God to him, and thereby had incurred so sensible a mark of the Divine displeasure. I have gently touched upon it in the paraphrase; but I was cautious of being too express, lest I should violate that great decorum which the Spirit of God, as well as the rules of modesty and piety, taught her to observe, when the faults of a husband were in question." It may be added, that these words shewed her knowledge of Mary's immediate belief of the promise made to her: a knowledge which she could only gain by Divine revelation, and which, therefore, would be a mutual confirmation of the faith of both." The Commentators also remark on the use of the third person for the second. Τελείωσις, an accomplishment. Kuinoel cites Acts 10, 9. and Diod. Sic. 2, 29. ἀποτραπάς κακῶν καὶ τελείωσεν ἀγαθῶν πειράματι πορίσειν. And Wetstein cites Philo de Vit. Mos. p. 178. πίστις τῶν μελλόντων, ἡ τῶν προγενοῦσιν τελείωσις.

46. καὶ εἶπε Μαριάμ. It is observable, that most of these phrases are borrowed from the Old Testament, with which the pious virgin seems to have been very conversant; especially from the Song of Hannah, to which it bears a strong resemblance, and in which there were so many passages remarkably suitable to her own case. Compare 1 Sam. 2, 1—10. Gen. 30, 13. Psal. 103, 17. 118, 1. 49, 10. 107, 9. and Mic. 7, 20. The Hebrews (observes Grot.) were accustomed to express their joy or affliction in irregular hymns without metre. In this beautiful hymn Mary expresses a sense of joy, that she was raised from her lowly estate to such great dignity, and she adds,
that this was the work of the Almighty. She then enlarges on his omnipotence, and proceeds to say, that the benefit will extend to the whole Jewish nation. Thus David, in the Psalms, frequently rejoices in deliverance from evils and dangers, and adds, that for this he is indebted to God; then he enlarges on the mercy, omniscience, and omnipresence of God, and says, that the Lord will at length also afford help to Zion. With respect to the form of the hymn, all the sentences, as in many passages of the Psalms, are, by a sort of parallelism, repeated, especially towards the latter part. (Dodd. & Rosenm.)

48. ἐπέβλεψεν ἐκ τῆς ταπείνωσιν τῆς δύναμις αὐτοῦ, has looked upon, succoured, or favoured, my humble condition. A Hebraism. Others, as most of the ancient Interpreters, render ταπείνωσιν humility; and, in this view, Wetstein cites 1 Sam. 1, 11. Petron. 126. Cœpi—inter monstra numerare, quod ancilla haberet matronæ superbiæm, et matronæ ancillæ humilitatem. Gen: 16, 11. Judith 6, 19. But this is far less suitable to the context.

49. ἐποίησε μοι μεγαλεία. Subaud ἐργα. So the Hebr. לְרָע. It here especially denotes worthy of admiration. So Psalm 70, 21. (from whence the words seem taken,) ἐποίησας μοι μεγαλεία. Tob. 11, 15. Sirach 18, 4. and frequently in the N. Test. Here, and in the former passage, it denotes wonderful benefits; as appears from the preceding expressions. (Kuin. & Rosenm.)

49. ὅ διώκεις. Heb. לְרָע, the powerful, κατ' ἔξοχην, a name of God, derived from his most striking attribute. So the Sept. in Psal. 24, 8. (Kuin.)

50. καὶ τὸ ἐλεός αὐτοῦ εἰς γ. γ. τ. φ. α. towards those: for πρὸς τοὺς φ. Similar examples of this construction are adduced by Kuinoel from Exod. 20, 6. Ps. 89. 2. Sept. Καὶ αὐτῷ is for ὦ, and ἐλεός ἀνάφετο denotes the benignity of God.

51. Mary proceeds to celebrate God’s power, and having laid down this general position, ἐποίησε κράτος ἐν βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ, illustrates it by examples. So Psal.
118, 15. where ἔρχεται δύναμις, and κράτος here answers to μεγαλεία in ver. 49, and βραχίων, like the Hebr. יָרָה, denotes power.

51. διεσκόρπισεν ὑπετεθράνους δ. κ. α. Διασκορπίσαν is often used metaphorically of putting to flight, and defeating an enemy. So Ἀελιαν. V. H. 13, 46. and, from the adjunct, destroying. So Ps. 88, 11. βραχίων τῆς δυνάμεως σου διεσκόρπισας τούς ἔχθρους. The passage is thus excellently paraphrased by Norris ap. Bulkley; "He scatters the imaginations of the proud, perplexes their schemes, disturbs their politics, breaks their measures, sets those things far asunder which they had united in one system, and so disperses the broken pieces of it, that they can never put them together again. And by this he turns their wisdom into folly, their imaginary greatness into contempt, and their glory into shame; so overruling their counsels, in his wise government of the world, as to make all turn to his, not their, praise."

52. καθείλε δυνάστασιν ἄπειριθν. Καθαίρει signifies to take down, destroy, &c. and is used of edifices, fortifications, &c. In this sense it occurs both in the Sept. ex. gr. Sir. 10, 14. θρόνους ἀρχύντων καθείλεν ὁ κύριος, καὶ ἐκάθισε προεῖς ἀντ' αὐτῶν, and also in the Classical writers, from whom examples are produced by Raphel, Wolf, and Wetstein. So Eurip. Ino. 50. ap. Stobæum: ὅς τυράννους δίὰ μακράν ὅσικεμένους ὤς μικρὰ τὰ σφαλλόντα, καὶ με ἥμερας τὸν μὲν καθείλεν ὑψών, τὸν ὃ ἦρ ἀνώ. Philostr. Vit. Ap. 5, 35. καθηρυκέας τὸν τύραννον. Thucyd. 6, 83. τὸν βάρβαρον μόνον καθελόντες εἰκότως ἀρχομεν. Herod. 2, 152. καταρέει τοὺς βασιλέας. Ἀελιαν. V. H. 2, 25. ὅτε καὶ Δαρείον καθείλεν Ἀλεξάνδρος. The δυνάστατι may mean, not only tyrants, or kings, (as the Commentators tell us,) but all who are invested with political power. So Xenoph. Pæd. C. 8. τούτων πάντας ἰπτέας οἱ δυνάσται πεποίηκασι. I add Phavorin. Διώκσαντος ὁ τύραννος, καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς. Pausan. 4, 5, 1. οἱ φακέων δυνάσται. All these aorists must be rendered by solet and the infinitive of the verb.
53. *πεινῶντας ἐνεπλήσσεν—κενοῦς.* The same sentiment appears to be repeated in other words, where *πεινῶντας* merely denotes *inopes, the poor.* *Εξαποτέλεσα κενοῦς signifies to deprive of their riches.* So Job 20, 9. *χήρας δὲ ἐξαποτέλεσας κένας.* So also Epic. tet. 4, 1. (cited by Bulkeley) speaking of him that attends the instructions of the philosophers, *οὐκ ἀπελεύσῃ κένας.* I add Herodot. 7, 131. *οἱ δὲ κηνίκες οἱ ἀποτεμφθέντες—αὐτεὰτο οἱ μὲν κενοὶ, οἱ δὲ φέροντες γῆν καὶ ἑαυτῷ, where see Wesseling. By *τὰ ἄγαθα* are denoted the *bona vite, subsidia vita, whatever is thought desirable.* Wetstein has several Classical examples, and, amongst the rest, a beautiful passage from Cic. Paradox. 1. "In quo equidem continentissimorum hominum majorum nostrorum sæpe requiro prudentiam, qui haec imbecilla et commutabilia pecuniæ membra verbo bona putaverunt appellanda." Also Diog. L. Plato. 3, 101. Aristot. M. Moral. 1, 2.


54. *μνησθήναι ἑλέους.* God is said to be *mindful of his people; when he supports them under oppression,* (Grot.) To be *mindful of his mercy,* here signifies (says Piscat.) *to afford this promised mercy.* Campbell thus explains the idiom, "to incline to mercy, to be merciful." See Ps. 98, 3. Heb. 3, 2. De Dieu compares 2 Par. 6, 42. by a metonymy of the efficient cause. Therefore the sense here may be thus expressed, "to be mindful of, and perform the benefits which he promised, &c. *Δολήσαι,* in this passage, signifies to *promise,* as in ver. 70. and Acts 3, 21. So verbs of speaking have, in the Classical writers, a
notion of promising. There is a parallel passage in Ps. 98, 3. ἐμνήσθη τοῦ ἐλεόους αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἰακωβ, καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἰσραήλ. (Kuin.) It was the Almighty's decree to confer the most excellent benefits on the Israelites; and this he especially evinced, when it pleased him that the Messiah should be born of them, and live amongst them. (Rosenm.)

56. I assent to Theophyl. Euthym. and Grot. who think that Mary continued with Elizabeth until near the time of her delivery. Indeed, it should seem from the words of the passage, that that delivery happened soon afterwards. The expression ἄσει will enable us to interpret the following words with some latitude. It were vain to speculate, as many Commentators do, on the reasons which might induce Mary to leave her relative at so critical a time. This was (think Euthym. Theophyl. and Grotius) to avoid the hurry and bustle of such a season, and possibly from motives of delicacy: ὑποχωρεῖ ἡ παρθένος διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μελλόντων συνδρομεῖν εἰς τὸ τόκον ἀπεχθὲς γὰρ παρθένῳ εἰς τοὺς τοιούτους ἀναστρέφεσθαι.

57. ἐπλήσθη ἡ χεῖρ. Πλήθω, like the Hebr. יָבִא, when it is used of time, indicates not only the consumption, but the approach of any period. It is not, however, merely a Hebraism, as we find from a similar expression of Cic. de Or. 3, 58. (cited by Wetstein): Ego tum gravida, expletis jam ferè ad pariendum mensibus. The ἐμεγαλώσε denotes, insigne beneficium exhibuit. So Gen. 19, 19. (Kuin.) Συνέχασαν αὐτῇ, congratulated her, since she was now freed from the reproach of barrenness. Such congratulations, too, were usual. Wetstein cites Plaut. Truc. 2, 6, 35. Tu cum recte provenisti, cumque es aucta liberis, Gratulor.

59. ἡλίαν, i. e. to the house, which we may suppose was the usual place, as no particular one was prescribed by the law.

59. περιτεμέω—ἀνάματι τ. π. The Jews used to have the boys named immediately after circumcision, the girls not until they were weaned. Among the
Romans, girls underwent the ceremony of lustration on the eighth day, and boys on the ninth, to whom names were then imposed. Hence the day was called lustricus and nominalis. (Kuin.) Ἐκάλονς, they were then naming him, were about to name him, or they would have named him after his father. This is frequently the sense of the imperfect. That the custom was usual with the Greeks and Romans has been proved by Grotius and Elsner. In proof of this Wetstein cites the following passages. Od. τ. 552. Ἰσαῖας pro Pyrrhi Hæred. Eurip. Εἰκ. 983. Dionys. Hal. 4. de Servio Tullio, ὃ τίθεται τραφέντι ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ μεν θεοῦ τε καὶ σύγγενων ὄνομα Τυλλιὼν ἐπὶ τοῦ πατρὸς. Aristot. Η. Α. 8. extr. τὰ πλείστα δὲ ἀναφερόμενοι, πρὸ τῆς ἐφόδους διὸ καὶ τὰ ὄνομα τὸν τίθενται, αἰς πιστεύσαντες ἢδη μάλλον τῇ σωτηρίᾳ. Polyæus. p. 546. Macrobi. Saturn. 1, 16. Aristoph. Nub. 65. Lucian. Contempl. 17. ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ ὁ γαίρων, ὅτι ἄρρενα παῖδα ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή, καὶ Φίλων διὰ τοῦτο ἐστιν, καὶ τούνομα τοῦ πατρὸς τιθέμενος. Demosth. in Bœot. 1. Eurip. Jon. 800. Lucian Macrob. 1.

60. ἐπευ. Οὐχὶ. It seems that Zacharias had signified to Elizabeth in writing, what had occurred in the angelic vision. Thus she opposed the intentions of the relations, and told them that the name was to be John; a name, indeed, very frequent among the Jews, and which was only rejected on account of no one of the family being called by that name. It seems therefore to have been usual to name a child after some one of the family.

62. ἐνέευον. On the signification of this word, see the note on ver. 22. Rosenmuller and Kuinoel think that we must not (as most do) infer from this word that Zacharias was deaf as well as dumb; though the κωφὸς before used often has both senses. Certainly, there is no other word in the passage that even hints this. It is truly observed by those Commentators, that we often use signs and gestures to those who hear us very well. So Joh. 18, 24. νεφις τοῦτο—Πέτρος πυθεθαυ κ. τ. λ. And this is especially done
towards those who have lost the faculty of speech. Nor are we told that they did not also use words; we may therefore suppose that to have been the case.

62. τὰ τί ἔστοι. There is here a pleonasm of τὰ, usual with the best writers, from whom examples are produced by Krebs, Kypke, and Wets.

63. ἔρασκε, λέγων, i.e. expressing, or he wrote in these words. So 2 Regg. 10, 6. Jos. Ant. 11, 3 & 18, 4. cited by Kypke and Krebs.

64. ἀνεισχθη δὲ τὸ στόμα—καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτῶ. There is here some irregularity of construction, which Raphel and others refer to one of those idioms usual in the best writers, by which a verb is joined to two nouns of cognate sense, to one only of which it is properly applicable. So Hom. σίτων καὶ ὁλον ἑδόνες and Cor. 3, 2. Γαλὰ ὑψᾶ ἐπότης καὶ οἱ βραχία. So also ΑEschyl. Prom. 21. οὖτε φανήν, οὖτε μορφὴν βρασὼν ὅψι μ.īrg. Ἀν. 7, 444. Besides, the word ἀνεισχθη may very well be applied to setting free the tongue. Thus, (as De Rhoer observes,) Sophocles and Themistius speak of the tongue being shut, and of the door of the tongue. Now surely there is no more impropriety in speaking of the tongue being opened. Moreover, the Heb. יָד, to which ἀνεισχθη answers, not only signifies to open, but to loose, as in Gen. 24, 32. Is. 5, 27. See the note on Mark 7, 34. The genius of modern languages does not indeed admit this idiom. We may, therefore, translate, “and immediately his mouth was opened, and his tongue loosed.” Some modern Commentators attribute both the loss and the recovery of the faculty of speech to natural causes. It was originally, they think, produced by fright, and removed by agitation of mind arising from anxiety to have the child named John; and they cite, as similar examples of recovered speech from agitation, A. Gell. 5, 9. (on the son of Croesus); Val. Max. 5, 4, & 1, 8. 3 & 4. This, in case of hemiplexia, or being tongue-tied, is (I admit) possible. But here the principle is inapplicable; since, from the context, it manifestly appears, that the calamity
was judicial, and a punishment for his incredulity. In the former case there is surely no similarity between the plain narration of the appearance of this angel, and those passages of the Old Testament where phrensy, or pestilence, are termed God's angels. Besides, those who maintain such an opinion must be compelled to resort to the desperate hypothesis, of supposing the whole narration of this angelic interposition a mere myth (that is to say, fiction), or, at least, as only occurring in a dream or trance, which would be extremely harsh and unauthorised.

65. φόβος. Rosenmuller and Kuinoel unite in explaining admiratio, and they compare the Heb. רוח. And so Euthymius explains φόβος, ἐκ τῶν θαυμάτων. Certainly, these are cognate affections, but such an interpretation unjustifiably lowers the sense. I would interpret awe; or perhaps we may unite both. It, at least, denotes a mixture of awe and wonder, affections which might well be excited, from the preternatural circumstances connected with the whole affair. I find by Euthymius, that it was made a subject of enquiry among the ancient Commentators, why Zacharias did not recover the faculty of speech when the boy was born, rather than when he was named. To this Euthym. gives no satisfactory answer. I would suggest, that this ceremony seems to have been thought necessary, in order to complete the whole of the transaction.

birth Divine Providence has so manifestly evinced its interposition.

67. προφητευσε. On the various significations of this word, I must refer the reader to the learned Annotations of Dr. Hammond and Dr. Whitby on this passage. Many commentators, as Rosenm. here interpret the word, meditari carmen, celebrare laudes Dei carmine. And Wets. admits that the term prophet, is applied to one who breaks forth into the praises of God by divine inspiration, yet he thinks it may here retain its proper signification, since Zacharias predicts what had been divinely revealed to him. So Philo. 2, 173. 1. Canticum maris rubri τῶν ἑστί τῆς κατ ’ ενθουσιασμὸν προφητείας Μωϋσέως άρχη καὶ προοίμιον. Kuin. thinks it certain, that Zacharias did not pronounce this hymn immediately on recovering his speech, and naming the child, but composed and committed it to writing, at a later period. But this seems quite gratis dictum, and not only unsupported by the context, but at variance with what it suggests.

68. Zach. describes the Messiah, as king of the Jews; for it had not yet been revealed to him that the benefits of the Messiah would be imparted to all nations. Hence he calls him the God of Israel, without making any mention of the nations. The language seems accommodated to the opinion which the Jewish nation then entertained, who were the farthest from thinking that the favour of God, would, by the medium of the Messiah, be ever manifested to the whole human race. (Wets.) It may be asked why the Almighty is called God of Israel only, when he is God not only of the Israelites, but of all men, as being the creator of all? To which it may be answered, that he was the God of all men, whether they would or not: but of the Jews only by free will and knowledge. (Euthym.)

69. ἤγειρε κέρας σωτηρίας. On this word I refer the reader to the learned annotations of Hammond and Whitby, and I subjoin the following illustrations of Wets. "A horn is a symbol of power and princi-
pality. Hor. Carm. 8, 21. Addis cornua pauperi Post te nec iratos trementi regum apiçes neque mili-
Euseb. P. I. 10. Ἡ δὲ ἀστάρτη ἐπέθηκε τῷ ἱδίᾳ κεφαλῆ 
βασιλείας παράσημον κεφαλῆς ταύτην. Gittin. f. 57, 1. 
Cornua bellii vocantur duces bellii. Targum 1. Sam-
Cornua vertit regnum et dominationem. Achmet. 83. 
τὰ γὰρ κέρατα τοῖς δεξιώμασιν ἀναλογίζονται. Ovid. 
Metam. 8, 882. Armenti modo dux vires in cornua 
sumo. Valerius M. V. 6. de Genucio Cippo. namque 
in capite ejus subito velut cornua emerserunt, re-
sponsumque est, regem eum fore, si in urbem rever-
tisset. Dan. 7, 6, 8, 8. Ovid. Metam. 15, 566. sua 
fluminea cum vidit Cippus in undâ Cornua—Quid 
sibi significant, trepidantia consulit exta—Rex, ait, 
o salve: tibi enim tibi, Cippe, tuisque Hic locus et 
Latiae parebunt cornibus arces. “By horn (says Eu-
thymius,) must here be understood kingdom; because 
kings were anointed and proclaimed. Or it may 
signify power. For all horned animals have their 
strength in their horns.” So also Theophylact. 
Several opinions, many very absurd, are detailed in 
Wolf and Koecher; the following ones, which are 
more probable, are stated in Ros. and Kuinoel. 
First, that of Noessalt, in his Sacrar. Scriptur. p. 31. 
seqq. who maintains that κέρας σωτηρίας, like the 
Heb. ינש ב in 1 Sam. and Ps. 2. cc. is said of a hel-
met, which affords safety, by defending the head, so 
that there may be nothing to fear from the strokes of 
the enemy. Among the Ancients (says Nossetl,) 
many fastened horns to their helmets, either that they 
might strike terror into the enemy (see Diod. Sic. 5, 
30. T. 1. p. 353. and Wessel,) or that the generals 
might be distinguished the more easily. (See Plutarch, 
in Pyrrho Opp. T. 1. p. 384. v.) Also, David, (Ps. 60, 
9. & 108, 9.) calls the Ephraimites ינש אלה, the 
strength of my head, and when ינש is also spoken of 
strength, there is a great similarity between this and
the other word ἀλυσίς; besides the word ἄριστον, which occurs in Ps. 18, 3. and Is. 59, 17. is joined with helmet. So Eph. 6, 17. David calls the Almighty his rock, bulwark, tower, shield, terms derived from military affairs, and the context requires ἄριστον to be taken in the same military signification. And these are most suitable to Zacharias’s hymn, on account of what we read in ver. 71. (Nosselt.) To this it is replied by Rosenmuller junior, in his Scholia on Ps. I. c. (who there explains ἄριστον from the Arabic vertex montis,) that it cannot be proved by any apposite examples, that helmets of that kind, ornamented with crests or horns, were in use among the Hebrews, and that these crests were fastened to them by the Ancients, not so much for the sake of defence, as ornament; and that there is some harshness, (whatever Noesselt may say to the contrary,) in joining the words ἐγείρεω κέρας. Fischer has pursued another course, and explains the words of this passage thus: “concedet nobis servatorem, auctorem et præsidium salutis hominum. He is of opinion that κέρας σωτηρίας signifies αὐτὸς σωτηρίας, since in ver. 71. there follows σωτηρία, i. e. σωτήρ. Thus he regards the metaphor as derived from the four horns of the altar, which were among the Hebrews, as the ara and foci among the Greeks and Romans, which were places of refuge to suppliants; this opinion was formerly maintained by Bruning, (in a Dissertation on the subject,) by Jensius, Gruner, Harenburg, &c.; it seems however to have little probability, and is justly rejected by Kuinoel. The opinions of Fessel, Lampe, and Homburg, as detailed by Wolf, merit little attention. It is well observed by Koecher, that almost all commentators agree in thinking that by κ. σ. is designated Christ the Saviour, though in what sense, and for what cause he is so termed, they disagree. Still I do not perceive any material diversities; some interpreting it strength and power, others dignity; Schetlg. glory, and Ewald, in a Dissertation on this subject, seems to unite all; as “strength, fortitude, dig-
nity, glory, felicity, and abundance;" and Koecher thus sums up what may seem expressed in this phrase. "Christ is called the horn of salvation, on account of the eminent and royal majesty, power, and fortitude, by which he has prostrated all the spiritual enemies of man, on account of the complete salvation and exquisite felicity which he has thus brought them, finally on account of the refuge which he affords to the wretched and the suppliant." After all, I agree with Kuinoel, in preferring the common interpretation, and that adopted by most commentators, ancient and modern. The image here employed, is taken from horned animals, whose strength is in their horns, and by which they repel assailants. It is one of the numerous images in Scripture, derived from agricultural affairs, or rural economy. Thus the horn generally designated strength. See Ps. 89, 18. 148, 14. Sir. 47, 5. Ps. 75, 5. Jer. 48, 25. Thren. 2, 3 and 17. Ez. 29, 21. It was a symbol of power. So Theophyl. in loc. See 1 Sam. 2, 10. Dan. 7, 7 and 20. 20, 8, 5, 6. and especially Ps. 18, 3. which many commentators suppose Zacharias had especially in view. I am however inclined to think (with Junius, in his Parallella, Michaelis, and Kuinoel,) that there is an allusion to Ps. 132, 16, 17. which Dathe and Rosenm. think was composed at the time of the solemn dedication of Solomon's temple. See Rosenm. in loc. Certainly the two passages bear a strong resemblance to each other. Since therefore (says Kuinoel,) ἰραῶς is an image of strength and power, especially royal power; since it is so taken in the above Psalm, which Zacharias very probably had in view; since an image is here required, derived from military affairs; (for in ver. 71, 74. there is mention made of the enemies of the people) since the Jews, in the age of Zacharias, expected that the Messiah would subdue their enemies—but the subject of the present passage, is the Messiah. We may therefore be warranted in explaining it, "he will raise up and bestow upon us a powerful monarch, who shall exert
himself for our security and welfare." It is thus a poetical expression for βασιλέα σωτηρά. The verb ἔγγραψ, is often so used in the Sept. This term (says Nosselt,) was applied to God, by the Hebrews, since he raised up σωτηρᾶς to defend or settle the state, by their wisdom or their valour; and therefore it is particularly applicable to sending the Messiah.


71. σωτηρίαν for σωτηρᾶ, as in Joh. 4, 22. So λύτρωσις is for λυτρώσῃς, in Luke 2, 38. παράκλησις for παράκλητος, in 2, 25. The latter member of the sentence exactly corresponds to the former, and the οἱ μισοῦντες, are the same with the οἱ ἔχοντες, before rendered the Gentiles, and especially the Romans. Ἠξ is here for ἀπλ. So Jos. Ant. 9, 8, 5. ὁ Θεὸς δίδωσιν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τῶν κινδύνων αἰώνιαν.

72. ποιήσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πάτεραν ἠμῶν, in order to evince his kindness to our forefathers, and show himself mindful of his promise. (Kuin.) who cites Is. 29, 22, and observes, in illustration of this, that the Jews thought their ancestors would, as well as themselves, be partakers of the felicity expected in the Messiah's Kingdom. God therefore, by sending the Messiah, thus demonstrated his kindness to their ancestors. The sense of the passage may be thus expressed: "for the sake of, and regard to our ancestors, he will raise up the Messiah. The phrase ποιεῖν ἔλεος μετὰ, corresponds to the Heb. ḫṣñ ʾhšn.
and διαθήκη, denotes promise, like the Heb. הוב in Ps. 29, 14. (Kuin.)

73. ὁρκον δὲ ὄμοσε πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ. Most commentators subaud κατὰ: but Kuinoel refers ὁρκον to μνησθὺναι, and thus translates the passage: ut se meminisse demonstraret promissionis suae, jurisjurandi Abrahamo dati, i. e. promissionis interposito jurejurando confirmatæ. He also considers πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα, for τῷ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ πατέρι, as a Hebraism. Yet Wetstein cites from Hom. Οδ. τ. 386. ἄμως δὲ πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν, and remarks that the names are here drawn to a mystical sense, that of John to Ελεος, that of Zacharias to μνησθὺναι, and that of Elizabeth to ὁρκον. Thus (says he,) names often correspond to things.

74, 75. Now follows (says Kuinoel,) a full description of the promise made to Abraham. The prophets of the Old Testament, in describing the golden age, and the times of the Messiah, used these very images; namely, that after all the enemies of the Jews should have been happily overcome, there would be peaceful times, true piety and religion would be restored, and the Jews would, without molestation, worship God in their own manner. (Kuin.) That all nations should go to Jerusalem, and worship the same God, with the Jews. These prophecies were obscure to the Jews, before the event. We indeed, taught by history, and by the event, know that under those images was concealed this truth, that the other nations should indeed profess the same religion throughout the universe. Taught by the same history, we learn that by those enemies are to be understood the impediments to true religion; namely, immorality, superstition, idolatry, and infidelity. Although most Jews in the age of Christ expected a temporal kingdom of the Messiah, nor does Zacharias seem to have been free from this opinion (ver. 69-71.), yet he moreover hoped, that it would be accompanied with liberation from spiritual misery,
reformation of morals, and expiation of sin through the mediation of the Messiah. (Rosenm.)

75. ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνη, i.e. the holiness and righteousness which does not consist in burthensome rites, but in that sincerity of mind which approves itself to God, as the inspector of all hearts. This last circumstance is expressed in the words ἐναπίου ἄυτο, which (as Campbell has rightly observed,) are a common Hebraism, to denote that the virtues mentioned are genuine, exact, and strict, as under the eye of God. There is usually observed a distinction in these words, which is thus laid down, by the Scholast on Euripides (cited by Wetstein.) τὸ πρὸς θεοῦ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον δίκαιον διὰ τούτου καλοῦμεν. So Philo de Vit. Mos. 1. T. 2. p. 129, 34. ὑπὲ ἐνσεβείας καὶ ὁσιότητος. Marc. Anton. 12, 1. (cited by Bulkley,) has also those words in conjunction, πρὸς ὁσιότητα καὶ δικαιοσύνην. See Ephes. 4, 24. So also the words were taken by Archbp. Laud, in the following admirable passage cited by Bulkley. “It was the very end of Christ’s coming, to redeem us, that we might serve him in holiness and righteousness.” Luke 1. In holiness towards God, that’s first; and then in righteousness and justice towards man, that’s next. And they stand so, that the one is made the proof of the other; righteousness of holiness. For he that does but talk of holiness, and do unjustly therewhile, is but an hypocrite.”

76. Καὶ σὺ, παιδίον, προφήτης κ. τ. λ. thou child, shalt be a precursor of the Messiah, and a teacher of the people.

77. τοῦ δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας, i.e. ἰδίᾳ τοῦ δοῦναι, in order that you may give. For he now explains in what that preparation consists, namely, in ministering the salutary doctrine of repentance by John, but so that a fuller knowledge should be necessary to be sought from Christ. (Rosenm. Kuin.)

78. διὰ σπλάγχνα ελέους. Θεοῦ, by. the same supreme bounty and kindness of God. So Col. 3, 12. σπλάγχνα οἰκτημῶν, the inmost affections of mercy.
A frequent metaphor in Hebrew, and founded on the notion, that commiseration produces considerable effects on the bowels. See the Commentators on Matth. 9, 36. Rosenm. thinks that the words are to be referred to the whole of the preceding passage, i.e. to the mission both of John and Christ, and the call to repentance enjoined by both of them through the merciful counsels of God. (Grotius.)

78. ἐν οἷς ἐπεσκέψατο ἡμᾶς, ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὄψως. There has been some diversity in the interpretation of the word ἀνατολὴ. Several learned Commentators, as Sculet in his Exerc. Lightfoot, Harenburg, Wetstein, and others, maintain that ἐντολὴ signifies germen, sarcus propollulans, a branch, by which metaphor it must be admitted that the Messiah is not uncommonly designated. For the establishment of this sense, and in refutation of the common interpretation, Wetstein urges that by ἀνατολὴ cannot here be understood the sun rising, for the sun is then in the horizon, (from whence he ascends,) and does not hang over our heads from on high. He therefore contends that it signifies germen; and, metaphorically, filius, of which he subjoins numerous Scriptural, Rabbinical, and Classical examples and illustrations. Zach. 6, 12. Jer. 23, 5. So in the Jewish prayer-books, and frequently in the Rabbinical writers. Thus also in the Classical writers. Hom. Od. § 157. Τρισμάκαρες, μὲν σοίγε πατὴρ καὶ πότιμα μήτηρ—Δευτερόντων τοίονδε θάλας. Od. § 175. Τηλεμάχου τὸν ἐπεὶ ὅθεναθα δει κέφει ἵθον, καὶ μιᾶ ἐφην ἐσφασθα ἐν ἀνδράσιν ὅτι χεριώ πατρὸς ἐστὶ φιλίο τε φιλίως καὶ εἰδος ἁγητόν. Theocrit. 7, 44. Πᾶν ἐκ ἀλαδεῖα πεπλασμένον ἐκ Δίος ἐρως. And 24, 101. Ἦρακλέας δ' ὑπὸ ματηλ νέον φυτόν, αἰς ἐν ἀλαδία ἔτεεφετ'. Plut. Lacon. Apophth. p. 241. λ. ξέτερα Δάκαίνα τὸν υἱὸν λειτουργήσαντα, ἀδικίαν τῆς πατρίδος, ἀνείλεν, εἰσεύραν, οὐκ ἔρων τῷ φύτῳ. And p. 600. ε. ὁ γὰρ ἀνθρώπος, ἡ φύσιν ὁ πλάσας, φύτον οὐκ ἐγεγειν οὐδὲ ἄκινητον, ἀλλ' οὐράνιον ἐστὶν. Themist. 13, 169. βλαστήν—τοῦ καλλος—ὁ ἐγὼ οὗ φήμη φύναι ἀπὸ γῆς, οὐδ' ἀπὸ τοῦ νυμίου
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tokeos, alla anwthen eze oufainou, kal tis stofas tis ekeiden kal futourgias. Oi gar eiokei anordis ge thetou pai eimenei alla theio. Virg. Ecl. 6, 7. "Jam nova progenies caelo demittitur alto." The above interpretation has, however, been opposed by Morus, Arndt, Homberg, Grotius, Hammond, and recently by Campbell, who observes that it is not natural to speak of a branch enlightening those who are in darkness, or directing their feet in the way. But this does not (I conceive) fairly represent the contrary opinion, which does not explain 'branch' naturally, but metaphorically, in the sense of propago, offspring, filius: a signification which the Hebr. does sometimes bear, and to which anatolh often answers in the Sept. Schleusner does not venture to offer any decision of this question: but he evidently inclines to the interpretation just now detailed. But this metaphor, however it may be of itself admitted, is here harsh, and does not suit the context; especially the words following, tois en skotei kal skia thanatoi, and the passages of Prophets alluded to. Is. 160, 1, &c. Besides, the word anatolh is used without addition, and kat' exochyn of the rising of any heavenly body, as sun, moon, stars, &c. This is also suggested by the following word etiphasai, for anatekkw and etiphasw are both frequent in this sense. As to Wetstein's objection, it seems ill-founded; since the phraseology of the passage is popular, and therefore is not to be tried by the rules of strict philosophical accuracy. We need not interpret eze usin, over head. It only denotes a moderate elevation. The day-break seems to arise from on high, especially to any who are situated in a valley or dell, which here appears to be meant. Thus we have in Isaiah the expression, sit in darkness and the shadow of death; and elsewhere, the valley of the shadow of death. Notwithstanding the objections of Campbell, I finally acquiesce in the common interpretation, and must observe that anatolh is most correctly rendered day-spring. This inter-
pretation is also supported by Rosenm. and Kuinoel. I cannot, however, assent to the latter, where he construes εὖ ύψος with ἐπεσκέψατο, and takes it metaphorically for άνωθεν, de cælo; as in Joh. 8, 13. ἵ δὲ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. So Virg. above cited, “Jam nova progenies cælo demittitur alto.” But I question whether this is permitted by the strict rules of syntax, and indeed it produces a confusion, of two metaphors in one and the same member of the sentence. I suspect that Kuinoel resorted to this expedient, to get rid of the objection advanced by Wetstein. That, however, I have already removed in a far more satisfactory manner. I will conclude with a very beautiful passage of Philo Jud. (714. e.) and one of kindred sentiment and metaphor: Καθάπερ γὰρ ἀνατείλαντος ἡλίου, τὸ μὲν σκότος ἀφανὶζεται, φῶς δὲ πληροῦται τὰ πάντα· τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὅταν θεοποιήτω ἡλίος ἀνάσχη καὶ εὐτύλημη ψυχὴν, ο μὲν τῶν κακῶν καὶ παθῶν ἡφαῖσταντα· τῇ δὲ φύσεως ἐσετάτης ἄρετής τὸ καθαρύτατον καὶ ἀξιέραστον εἶδος ἐπιφανεῖται. See also the two very similar passages in 246. c. & 914. a.

79. ἐπιφάνεια. The Gods, and their sons or offspring, are said ἐπιφανεῖ. So Appian, Syr. 187. Herodot. 1, 73. Lucian, Dem. 63. τῶν ἐνοικοῦντων θεῶν τινα ἐπιφάνειαν ἠγουμένων τὸ πράγμα. Polyb. 3. p. 280. τοιούτῳ Ἡρακλίου τε καὶ θεῶν ἐπιφανείᾳ. | Nummi Antiochi θεοῦ ἐπιφανοῦς. Thus ἐπιφάνεια came to have the sense of θεόφανεια. Philo, p. 596, 30. τὸν ἐν Γη ἱεροπολίτιν—μετασχηματιζέων εἰς οὐκείου λεγόν, ἵνα Δίος ἐπιφανοὺς νέου χρηματιζῆ Γαῖος: and of this Luke was well aware. I make these remarks for the purpose of showing that when the Sacred writers every where call Χριστὸν Κύριον, Σωτῆρα, Θεόν, ἐπιφανῆ, the expressions cannot, by an attentive reader, be otherwise understood than of a Deus praesens, and a Son of God, by no means a mere man, but of an origin far more august, and a nature far more divine, than any to which the sons of men can lay claim. (Wets.)

79. του κατευθύναι τοῖς ποδαῖς ἡμῶν. The same metaphor previously employed is continued; q. d. “the
light directs our steps." So in Ps. 119, 105. the word of God is said to be "a light to our paths." There is too the same image in Ps. 43, 8. καὶ εἰστὶ σεν ἑν πεταν τοὺς πόδας μου, καὶ κατεύθυνε τὰ διαβολματά μου. (Brug. Grot. and Kuin.)


80. τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠμέλει καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι. Πνεῦμα here signifies wisdom. The sentence denotes progressive increase of corporeal and mental growth and strength; the youth became daily wiser and holier. There is a very similar passage in Conan Narrat. 44. ap. Phot. Bibl. ἠμέλει δὲ ὁ παῖς τύχῃ κατὰ λόγον, ἀλλὰ βεία τινι τυχῇ.

80. καὶ ἦν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμωσι. There is surely no reason, with many ancient Fathers and Interpreters, to suppose that he was in the Desert from his infancy. It has been well observed by Basnage (ap. Koecher), that he retired thither at an age when he was sufficiently furnished with strength of body to provide food, and of mind to bear solitude. His retirement originated in two reasons: 1st, that by using no teachers, and frequenting no schools, his mind might not be corrupted by Rabbinical errors, but be enlightened only by the Holy Spirit, so that he might appear to the Jews a Teacher sent from Heaven; 2dly, that, remote from all communication with Christ, he might avoid all suspicion of collusion with him, in announcing a new religion, and thereby add greater weight to the opinions he should offer, and the testimony he should bear, respecting Christ. Lightfoot supposes this desert to have been some spot in the hill country near Ziph and Maon, (as in 1 Sam. 23, 14, 25.) not far from Hebron, where he was born. But it has not been satisfactorily determined where John was born. He retired, doubtless,
at about the age of puberty. In this view Wetstein cites a very apposite passage from Justin 23, 1. "Ab initio pubertatis in sylvis inter pastores habebantur sine ministerio servili, sine veste, quam induerent, vel cui incubarent, ut a primis annis duritiae parcimonii-seque assuescerent. Cibus his praeda venatica, potus aut lactis aut fontium liquor erat."

80. ἡμέρας ἀναδείξεος, the period when he commenced his ministry. The word ἀναδείξεις is used by the Greek writers of creation, inauguration, &c. as is proved by numerous examples adduced by Elsner, Raphel, and Wetstein.

CHAP. II.

VERSE 1. εν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις. This expression does not belong to the words immediately preceding, but refers to Ch. 1, 36, 38—57, 58. For, otherwise, it would denote that Jesus was born when John had grown up, contrary to all the history of the times. (Rosenm. and Kuin.)


1. Καῖσαρος Αὐγούστου, i. e. Cæsar Octavianus. He had received the name Cæsar from Julius Cæsar by adoption, and by that name were called, first, all those of the family of Augustus, afterwards the heirs of the empire, and finally the emperors themselves. See Sueton. Aug. 5, 7.

1. ἀπογραφεθαί πάσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. There has been much discussion, and some discrepancy, among Critics, on the meaning of these words. The decision of the point mainly depends on the sense affixed.
to τὴν οἰκουμένην. One thing is clear, that it can mean no more than the Roman world, i.e. the Roman empire: an expression very frequent in the Classical writers. It was probably, (says Campbell,) a title first assumed by the Romans through arrogance, afterwards given by others through flattery, and at last appropriated, by general use, to this signification. "Romanis (says Koecher) qui sese orbis terrarum dominos jactabant, Græci adulantes imperium illorum oïkouμény vocabant.*" Thus it would designate the whole of the Roman empire; which is confirmed by the Syriac and Persian versions, and was the opinion of most of the earlier Commentators, as also some of the more recent ones, such as Fabricius, Heuman, Zorn, Schwartz, Gerorgius, Schoettagen, Krebs, Wetstein, and others. But here we are encountered by a serious difficulty, namely, that no Greek or Latin historian, (though so many have minutely committed to memory the translations of Augustus,) any where mentions or alludes to such a general taxation of the empire, which surely would have been too memorable an event to have been unknown, or to have passed unrecorded. Besides, in verse 2, mention is made, in conjunction with this, of the Proprætor of Syria alone. We must, therefore, either admit (with Campbell) the Evangelist to have been mistaken, or misinformed, or else we must adopt the opinion of Keuchen, Borremaus, Henninius, Bynæus, Wolf, Hardt, Lardner, Lachmacher, Hofman, Zorn, Moldenhauer, Beausobre, L’Enfant, Doddridge, Bp. Pearce, Harenburg, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, who confine it to Judea. A sense which it has in several others parts of the N. Test. as Luke 21, 26. Acts 11, 28. Matth. 4, 5. compared with Deut. 34. et seqq. In the expression πασαν τὴν οἰκουμένην there is so much the less diffi-

* So also Wetstein: "Romani sese orbis terrarum dominos esse jactabant; eos cūm Græci adulatoriā levitate sequentur, factum tandem est, ut in vulgi etiam sermone hæc formula recuperetur."
ulty, since Judea was divided into many regions, parts, or provinces. This ἀναγράφη being so limited, there is the less reason to wonder at no mention of it being made by historians. Another important point is, what the sense of ἀναγράφησαι and ἀναγράφη is here. Our Translation has taxed and taxing. But we have the testimony of the great and faithful Jewish historian, that no tax or tribute was levied from Judea till many years after; and the use of the word will fully authorize us to follow the interpretation adopted by almost all modern Critics, i. e. register-ing and register, taking an account of the population. This signification is frequent, and examples of it are produced by Wetstein, which I will subjoin.

σεις κατὰ φυλὰς τῶν βιῶν ἐνεγκεῖν, προσγράφοντας γυναι-
κῶν καὶ παιδῶν ὑφόματα, καὶ ἡλίκιας έαυτῶν τε καὶ τέκνων.
This, however, seems too limited a sense of ἀπογράφῃ,
for it is difficult to imagine any motive that could
induce Augustus to adopt this measure, except that
of mere curiosity, or with a view to some military
assistance to be derived from a levy of Jewish troops,
or, (as Wetstein conjectures,) for the purpose of ex-
acting an oath of fidelity; all equally improbable.
I would prefer a middle interpretation, between that
of taxing, and that of merely making an enumera-
tion. It is certain that ἀπογράφῃ is frequently used
by the Greek historians to denote the Roman census,
and there seems no reason to suppose that in this case
it materially differed. It may, indeed, be objected
that no such taxing was ever exercised over the sub-
ject kingdoms. But I would reply, that there is
this difference to be made between the usual census,
or ἀπογράφῃ, and the one in question; namely, that
in the former case it was done with an immediate
view to impose and collect taxes; but not so in the
latter. In the present case it seems to have been
a measure out of the usual course, and altogether ex-
traordinary, adopted solely with a view to show He-
rod his subjection. We learn from Jos. Ant. 18, 9.
1—8. that about this time Herod had fallen under
the serious displeasure of Augustus, who concluded
a letter to him with these harsh expressions: ἵπτι
πάλαι χράμενος αὐτῷ φίλω, νῦν ἵππηκῳ χρησταί. It is
truly observed by Campbell that the ἀπογράφῃ was,
in other cases, not always necessarily followed by
taxations. So Inscript. ap. Gruter. (cited by Wets.)
"Claudii——Illi patri meo Druso Germaniam subi-
genti tutam quiete sua securamque a tergo pacem
præstiterunt; et quidem cùm a censu, novo tum
opere et inadsueto Gallis, ad bellum advocatus esset;
quod opus quàm arduum sit, nobis nunc cum maxi-
mè, quamvis nihil ultra, quàm ut publicè notæ sint
facultates nostræ, exquiratur, nimis magno experi-
mento cognoscimus." "One important purpose
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(says Campbell) was attained, that such registers, even when no tax was imposed, enabled those haughty lords of the world to know the state of their dependencies, and to form a judgment, both as to the sums of money which might be reasonably exacted from their respective princes, and as to the number of soldiers which might be obtained in case of war." There is, however, every reason to suppose that the register then made was afterwards used by the Romans, when the measure was finally carried into effect. If this hypothesis be thought too artificial and arbitrary, the reader may weigh and examine that of many learned men; ex. gr. Wetstein, Campbell, and Schlesner, who interpret οἰκονομένην of the whole Roman empire in its largest acceptation, including the subject kingdoms, and take ἀπογραφὴ to denote merely an enumeration. The words of Schlesner are these: "Census causa erat curiositas, aut ambitio, Augusti. Fuit enim caput numeratio absque pecuniae exactione, et, ut videtur, universalis et oecumenica, non solum Judæam, sed omnes adae provincias Romanas complectens. Agebatur hic census Herode M. vivente, tempore nativitatis Christi, et fiebat, ut breviario confecto constaret imperii amplitudo civiumque copia." But this interpretation lies open to many objections. It would seem improbable that a measure of such general operation should not have been recorded or hinted at by some historian, or incidentally alluded to by some other writer, and it will compel us to abandon all hopes of interpreting the next verse so as to preserve the credit of the Evangelist as a faithful historian.

2. αὑτή ἡ ἀπογραφὴ προϊηθ ἐγένετο ἀγεμονεῖσιν τῆς Συρίας Καισαρίου. There are few passages in the New Testament that have caused more difficulty and diversity of opinion than this. For a complete statement of the various hypotheses, (into which the limited plan of my work will not permit me to enter,) I must content myself with referring my readers to
Pole's Synopsis, Wolf's Curæ, Koecher's Analecta, Elsley's Annotations, and Kuinoel's Commentary. I will, however, detail three of those hypotheses, which carry with them the greatest semblance of truth, and which, indeed, do not materially differ from each other: namely, those of Wetstein and Campbell. I will commence with laying before my readers the prefatory remarks of the latter.

"When we attend to this verse, as it lies, without taking into consideration the knowledge we derive from another quarter, we should hardly think there were one in the Gospel about which there is less scope for doubt. That which has principally given rise to the questions that have been agitated on this subject, is a passage in Josephus, (Ant. 6, 18. c. 1.) from which it appears that the tax levied by Cyrenius, which was the first imposed upon the people by the Romans, happened about ten or eleven years after the time here spoken of by Luke; for, according to Josephus, it was after the expulsion of Archelaus, when Judea was reduced to the condition of a Roman province. As, at the time when that historian wrote, the event was both recent and memorable, it having given birth to an insurrection under Judas of Galilee, which, though soon quelled to appearance, became the latent source of a war that ended in the ruin of the nation; it is impossible to think that that historian could either have erred through ignorance, or have attempted wilfully to misrepresent what must have been known to thousands then living. We cannot, therefore, with Maldonati and others, cut short the matter at once, by sacrificing the credit of the historian to the authority of the Evangelist; because this will be found, in the issue, to do a material injury to the Evangelist himself. Let us try then whether, without doing violence to the words of Scripture, which, in cases of this kind, is too often done, we can explain them so as not to be inconsistent with the account given by the historian. As to the various interpretations devised, we
may justly affirm of nearly all of them, that no person ever did or could imagine them, who had not previously heard of an inconsistency which the obvious interpretation bore to the report of the Jewish historian, and who was not in quest of something, in the way of explanation, which might reconcile them."


certè deest particula quæpiam, qua versiculus iste cum superiore connectatur, et simile quiddam factum videtur Marc 12, 42. ut suo loco annotavimus, et fortassìs etiam infra Act. 8, 26. Sed hoc quidem est nodum secare potius quàm solvere. Absit autem, ut vel apicem unum immutem, nedum quicquam detraham. Plerique verò statuunt, duplicis professio
nis a Lucà hic mentionem fieri, quaram prior facta sit vivente Herode, posterior Archelao in exilium pulso: in eo autem dissentient quòd cum vulgò Quirinius utrumque censum egisse existimetur, secundum recentiores interpretes prior census non a Quirinio, sed vel ab Herode Magnò vel a Sentio Saternino actus sit; verba enim Lucea ita vertunt: Hæc descrip\(\)cio facta priusquam Quirinius Præses Syriæ esset; jungentes πριν Κυρηνιαυ, ac si scriptum fuisset προτέρα Κυρηνιαυ, ut Jo. 15, 8, 1, 30. Genes. 26, 1. At Quirinius bis in Judæa censum egisse, nullus Historicorum scriptis, quin ea de ipso refert Tacitus, quæ non videntur cum illâ priori in Judæam profectione consistere posse; ut jam non dicam, alios apud Josephum in Historiâ istius temporis recenséri Syriæ præsides. Neque etiam Censu
sus bis acti fit mentio; contrà et verba Lucea in Actis 5, 37. et verbi Josephi indicant, unum fuisset celebrem censum, et, cùm Quirinius venisset, Judæos rei novitate perculsos tumultuari coeipisse. Imò ex more Romanorum census ibi ne quidem prius agi potuit, cum nonnisi regiones in formam provinciæ redactæ, non verò quæ sub Rege vel a Romanis dato vel Romanorum socio erant, censere solerent: id nos docet Tacitus Ann. 1, 6. c. 41. ubi narrat, Clita
rum nationem Archelao Cappadoci subjectam, post mortem ejus rebellasse, quod nostrum in modum, inquit, deferre census, pati tributa adigebatur: ex quo manifesto colligitur, Rege Cappadoce vivente illos censitos non fuisse. Cur ego, inquis, Lucas scribit Josephum et Mariam Bethlehemi, quo tempore Christus natus est, fuisse censitos, si nullus tunc census fuit actus? Respondco, licet census tunc
nondum ageretur, Augustum tamen diù antea cen-
sum totum orbem Romanum agere decrevisse, et eo
ipso tempore in Judæā aliquid contigisse, quod si
propriè census non erat, censionis tamen future
quasi quædam prolusio et non obscurum indicium
initiumque haberī poterat. Nimirum, uti ex Josepho
vidimus, extremis Herodis temporibus post mortem
Aristobuli et Alexandri filiorum, Judæi ab Herode
per jusjurandum Cæsari fuerunt devincti, quà ra-
tione non minus nomen suum et subjectionem pro-
terī deebant quàm in Censitione, idque Lucam voce
ἀπογεγραμμένος, et commodè potuisse et voluisse etiam
significare existimo. Sota f. 13, 2. R. Chama. f. R.
Chanina: quando quis rem aliquam orditur, neque
eam ad finem perductit, supervenitque alius, eam ab-
solvens, tum scriptura de eo qui eam absolvit ita
loquitur, quasi solus efficisset. Joma f. 10, 1. Vide
Gen. 49, 10."

It is certain (says Campbell) that the verb γίνεσθαι has, in the New Testament, other senses besides
the most common ones, to be, to become, to be made,
to be born, to happen. And of those other mean-
ings, less usual, but sufficiently warranted, the most
applicable here is, to take effect, to produce its ordi-
mary consequences. An example of this sense we
have, Matth. 5, 18. εὼς ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ,
κατὰ έν ἔ μια κεραίᾳ ὃ ὡς παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦνου, εὼς
ἀν πάντα γένηται: rendered in this version, Sooner
shall heaven and earth perish, than one iota or one
tittle of the Law shall perish, without attaining its
end. The last clause is to the same purpose in the
E. T. Till all be fulfilled. From the connection of
the verse with that immediately preceding, it is evi-
dent that the verb γίνεσθαι is used in the one, in
the same sense with πληρώσω, in that passage, see
the note in this version. We have another example
in the same Gospel, 6, 10. γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημα σου,
Thy will be done; that is, take effect, be executed.
The same phrase occurs also 26, 42. Luke 11, 2.
and nearly the same 22, 42. μὴ τὸ θέλημα σου, ἀλλὰ
Again, Matth. 18, 19. our Lord, speaking of the request which two or three of his disciples shall agree in making, says γενήσεται ἡ αὐτοῦ, it shall be accomplished for them, it shall have the desired effect. I shall produce but one other example, 1 Cor. 15, 54. τὸ τε γενήσεται λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, Κατέχοντι ὁ θάνατος εἰς νίκος: Then that saying of Scripture shall be accomplished, Death is swallowed up of victory. Now let it be remarked, that in the most common acceptation of the word γίνεσθαι, a law is made, γίνεται, when it is enacted, not when it is obeyed; a request, when it is presented, not when it is granted; a promise, when it is given, not when it is performed; a prediction, when it is announced, not when it is fulfilled. Yet it is the latter only, though less common meaning, that the verb, in all the instances above produced, is, by the concurrent voice of all interpreters, to be understood. There is only one small point in which this solution appears to differ from that given by Wetstein. He, if I mistake not, retains the ordinary meaning of the verb γίνεσθαι, and, in defence of the expression, argues that it is usual to speak of a thing as done by that person by whom it was finished, although it had been begun and carried on by others. But to say that a business enjoined so long after by Augustus was performed so long after by Cyrenius, or during his government, gives immediate scope for the question, “Where was, then, the necessity that Joseph should make a journey to Bethlehem to be registered, with Mary, his espoused wife, ten or eleven years before?” And even if it should be expressed that the business was at that time completed, it might seem strange that, in a country no larger than Judea, the execution of this order should have required so long a time. In the way I have rendered it both objections are obviated: the register (whatever was the intention of it) was made in Herod’s time, but had then little or no consequences. When, after the deposition and banishment of Archelaus,
Judea was annexed to Syria, and converted into a province, the register of the inhabitants, formerly taken, served as a directory for laying on the census to which the country was then subjected. Not but that there must have happened considerable changes in the people during that period; but the errors which these changes might occasion could, with proper attention, be easily rectified. And thus it might be justly said that an enrolment which had been made several years before, did not take effect, or produce consequences worthy of notice, till then. This solution does not differ, in the result, from that given by Whiston, and approved by Prideaux, but it differs in the method of educating the conclusion. (Campbell.)

I must add the ingenious solution of Lardner; viz. that Cyrenius was sent with an extraordinary commission, indeed, but into Judea only, which was not then annexed to Syria, to assist Herod in making the census; that the decree for registering, πά-σαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, extended no further, over which Herod was king. See Exod. 16, 85.

Wets. observes, that though it was usual to carry on a census through the province, yet we do not find Roman Legates deputed into tributary kingdoms for that purpose, and that such an innovation raised a rebellion among the Clite, after the death of their king. Tacit. Annal. 6, 41. He supposes, then, with Alex. de anno et mense natali, &c. p. 18. that the oath of fidelity to Augustus, at this time exacted of the Jews, (Jos. A. 17, 2—4.) which usually accompanied a census, (see Plat. Praef. in Pænu- lo, v. 35. et seq. and Trinum. 4, 11, 30.) is called ἄνεγραφος, but leaves us in the dark why Cyrenius should now be governor of Syria. The whole verse is thought by many Critics, as Bp. Chandler and Mr. Bowyer, an interpolation. But, if so, it must have occupied a place in the margin of some very early archetype, since it is recognized by the most ancient and venerable of the Versions, the Syriac.
I add, that to the fact, the historical fact, (that a general census was made throughout the Roman Empire, by Augustus,) we have the authority, such as it is, of an anonymous writer in Suidas, T. I. p. 362. Β. ἀπογραφή, ἢ ἀπαρίθμησις, ὁ δὲ Καίσαρ "Ἀυγο- τος ὁ μοναρχής ἐκκοσιν ἄνδρας τοὺς ἁριστους τὸν βίον, καὶ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιλεξάμενος, ἐτε πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν τῶν υπηκόων ἐξεπεμψε. δι’ αὐτὸν ἀπογραφᾶς ἐποιήσαντο τῶν τε ἄνδρων καὶ τῶν υἱῶν.

4. ἐξ ὅλου καὶ πατρίας Δαβίδ. The words ὅλος and πατρία are thus distinguished by Kypke. Joseph was of the house of David, since he traced his origin from that monarch: he was of the πατρια, or family, or tribe of David, since he had the same ancestors with David, whether by πατρια, we understand the posterity of Boaz, or some one else of the progenitors of David. Thus on the preceding words ἰδίαν πόλιν, Grotius explains, "that city which formerly had belonged to their family," &c. (See Euthymius.) The census among the Jews was made by tribes, clanes, and families, which, after the many separations of the Jews, was impracticable, unless each betook themselves to those places which formerly had fallen to the lot of their clan, or family; all which could be known from the genealogical tables, kept by the Jews with such remarkable exactness. Le Clerc produces an instance from Livy, 42. 10. where the Consul is said to have ordered the Roman citizens, i.e. chiefly the Socii Latini nominis, or the allied cities, admitted to the freedom of Rome, to withdraw from to be taxed in their own cities. To which Wet. adds one yet more apposite, from Liv. 38. 28. and 36. and Cic. de Leg. 2. 2. "Numquid duas habetis patrias? — ego — omnibus municipibus, duas esse censeo patrias, unam naturae, alteram civitatis—cum ortu Tusculanus esset, civitate Romanus, habuit alteram loci patriam, alteram juris — et eam patriam ducimus, ubi nati, et illam, qua excepta sumus." Wet. observes, that the servientes might be ἰδιογενεῖς, therefore πατρία is added, as well out of
distinction from servants, as from those who deduced their race from David, in the maternal line. Joseph. A. 6. W. 1.

4. ἀνήφη. The word is used with reference to the situation of Judea, as being a hilly country, in comparison to that of Galilee, which was mostly a level one.

5. σὺν Μαριάμ. The best commentators are of opinion that Mary was an heiress; for otherwise there would have been no necessity for her name to have been registered on the public lists. For the same cause, she was obliged to espouse some man of the same tribe. Luke, just after, uses the μεμνημένη (though in fact, Mary was not only betrothed, but married to him,) out of delicacy, because though his wife, he treated her as a spousa. Now spousae (say the Rabbins,) were interdictae viris, perinde ac menstruatæ. (Grot.)

7. ἑσπαργάσωσαν. The word signifies to bind up in swaddling clothes; which was by the ancients studiously attended to, lest the tender frame of the infant might acquire, through weakness, or an accidental wrench, any distortion. See Hesych. and Suidas, and the citations in Wets. of which the following alone, are of any importance. Etym. Mag. στάργανον—λέγονται δὲ αἱ πρώται φασίναι σταργανόματα, ἐνδα δεσμούνται οἱ παιδες ῥυθμιζόμενοι ἐπὶ τὸ ὀρθότερον. Seneca 7, 24. de benef. Ne membra libertas immatura detorquent, in rectum exitura constringunt. I add Eurip. Ion. 1597. ἔπει δ' ἔτικτες, τῶνδε παιδα, καθέθου ἐν σταργάνοις. Hesych. σπαταλᾶ τρυφᾶ. This is well illustrated by the following passage of Artemid. 1, 13. ἐπεὶ καὶ οἱ ἀποδυνάκουστες σχισμένοις ἐνειλούνται ἤκειν αὖ καὶ τὰ βρέφη. Philostr. Imag. 800. παῖς δὲ ἐπὶ ἐν σταργανοῖς, and infra 801. καὶ σταργανα αὐτίν τρυφιώκουσιν. Αἰσχ. Choeph. 758. παῖς ἐτ' αὖ ἐν σταργανοῖς. Agam. 1615. τυφθὸν ὄντ' ἐν σταργανοῖς. Agam. 1596. The practice of confining the limbs of infants was not peculiar to the ancients, but was in use in this country till the last century, as the
term *swaddling-band* indicates, used by Spenser: "There as thou slepest in tender, swaddling band:" and even by Dryden. Against this practice, Hibbert long ago protested, in some pathetic verses, cited by Dr. Johnson in his Dictionary, and which remind me of a very beautiful epigram in the Greek Anthologia, to which I cannot now turn. The word is derived from the Angl. Sax. *swethen, to bind.*

7. ἀνέκλυνεν αὐτόν ἐν τῇ φάτῃ. In the interpretation of this word, there has been no little difference of opinion. The sense commonly attributed to it is *manger.* But Salmasius, and since his time, the most celebrated scholars, have assigned to it the signification of *stabulum.* So among others, Wets. who cites Virg. *Æn.* 1. 485. Ignavum fucos pecus a præsepibus arcent; 7, 275. Stabant tercentum nitidi in præsepibus altis; and 18. atque in præsepibus uris savire. Servius. *Caveis, ubi aluntur; non enim reversa præsepia habent.* If the manger (argues Wetstein) were a part of the stable, and the stable a part of the inn; it follows, that he who had room in the stable, had room in the inn. Therefore, by saying that there was no room for them in the inn, he indicates that the stable was unconnected with the inn. In fact, the word φάτη signifies an open court enclosed by high wooden pales, and communicating with the house, though no more joined to, or separated from it, than a *farm yard* is joined to, or separated from, a *farm house.* So Pollux 1, 184. ἔκκοι καὶ στάσις ἔκκοι καὶ ἑγκόντασις, καὶ στάθμος, φάτη. Campbell however, battles hard for the common interpretation *manger.* His reasons are, as usual, highly ingenious, but, to me, not very convincing. These I shall briefly examine, and as ἀνέκλυνεν occurs first, in the sentence under our consideration, I shall commence, by animadverting on a strange misconception of Dr. C. arising, it seems, from ignorance of the Greek idiom. To prove φάτη to have been a *crib* or *manger,* he urges that the other sense of ἀνέκλυνεν, proposed by many learned men, seems to lead to an absurdity: "For (says he,)
to mention the laying of a child, without saying where, is a very blank sort of information; and when the place is named, we expect it to be what particularly marks the situation of the child, and not what he has in common with those who thus dispose of him, and perhaps with many others. One might have expected for information, some word (such as in a cradle, or on a couch,) to denote where." I answer, that the word ἄνακλισεν, is frequently, both in the New Testament, and in the Classical writers, put absolutely, so that the place where, such as, seat, bed, couch, &c. is left to be supplied from the context, or from the circumstances of the case. Here we may, I think, most correctly render, "she eradded him." Though the term cradle will be used improprië, as in Dryden's beautiful couplet:

"Or infant's fun'ral from the cheated womb,
Conveyed to earth, and cradled in a tomb."

That mangers were in use among the ancients (which Bp. Pearce had indeed,) Dr. C. proves by a passage of Homer, and one from Herodot. But I should imagine that the φάρν, mentioned by Herodotus, was an utensil chiefly used for military purposes, and cannot serve to prove a general custom. Oriental travellers assure us, that the Eastern nations use no manger, properly so called, but only a coarse hair-bag. Campbell, however, has completely refuted the hypothesis of Bp. Pearce, that the φάρν denotes only a hair-bag, though there seems no reason to question that such a utensil was then, and (no doubt) still is, in use in the East. Dr. Campbell admits the slow change of manners among the Asiatics, but observes, that if we were to conclude that they never change at all, we should err more widely, than if we should believe them as fickle as ourselves. He then subjoins the following very judicious remarks on this subject, and on the proper mode of using such works as Harmer's Observations.

"I have had an occasion, in the Preliminary Dissertations, to indicate and to trace some of the
changes which have obtained in opinions, in manners
and customs, and even in the import of words.
Man, is naturally mutable, and mutability, in some
degree cleaves to every thing that is human. It is
indeed impossible that the revolutions (or changes
affecting whole kingdoms and states,) to which Syria
and the neighbouring countries have been subjected,
should not have produced great and numerous alter-
atations, in all respects abovementioned. Their con-
querrers too, in different ages, have mostly been na-
tions exceedingly different from one another, both in
political principles, and in religious ceremonies; the
Chaldeans, the Persians, the Grecians, the Romans,
the Arabians, and last of all the Turks. Are changes
in government, such as these, compatible with a per-
fected uniformity in their fashions and customs? No,
certainly. Let it not, however, be imagined that I
mean to depreciate such observations as those of
Harmer. This is far from my intention. I know
that, in many cases, they may be very useful, and
several of those made by that learned author, un-
doubtedly, are so: but all observations of that kind,
are then most safely applied, when they throw light
upon a passage of Scripture which, misled by our
own customs, we find obscure; and not when they
serve to darken what is expressed both plainly and
explicitly. If a present custom in the East applied
to any ancient fact recorded, makes a passage clear
which is otherwise inexplicable, it is a very strong
presumption, and in some cases even a proof, that
their present is the continuation of their ancient
practice. But let it not, on the other hand, be
founded on as an axiom, that whatever is used at
present in that part of the world, was always so, or
that whatever was once their fashion, is the fashion
with them still; than both which, nothing can be
more evidently false."

I must not omit to advert to the opinions entertained
by most of the Fathers, as Greg. Nyssen, Theodoret,
Eusebius, &c. and adopted by the ancient interpret-
ers, that the φαῦν was not only removed from the inn, but also from the village, and was formed of one of those natural stables which abound in Palestine, affording shelter to both men and cattle. These are indeed not unknown in other countries. To this purpose Wetstein appositely cites Eurip. Bacch. 509. καθερὼν αὐτῶν ἵππικαις πέλας φάναισιν, οἷς ἄν σκότων εἰσορα κνέφας. Ion. 105. Γαστρὸς διήνεγκ’ ὀχθας, οἷς ὁ ἡλθεν χρόνος, τεκόου’ ἐν οἷκοι παῖδι ἀπήνεγκε βρέφος εἰς ταυτόν ἄντρον, ὅπερ ἡμᾶς θεος. Porphy. p. 262. σπήλαια τοῖς καὶ ἄντρα τῶν παλαιστάτων, πρὶν καὶ ναοὺς ἐπινοῆσαι, θεοὺς ἀφοσιούντων καὶ ἐν Κρήτῃ μὲν κουρήτων Διcheduled, ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ δὲ Σελήνη καὶ Πανι Λυκείᾳ, ἐν Νάξῳ Διονυσῷ, πανταχοῦ δ’ ὅπου τὸν Μίθραν ἐγνωσαν, διὰ σπηλαιοῦ τῶν θεῶν ἱλευρίμενων. Senec. Epist. 41. Si quis specus saxis penitus exesis montem suspenderit, non manu factus, sed naturalibus causis in tantam laxitatem excavatus; animum tuum quadam religionis suspicione percutiet. Ovid. Met. 1, 12. Απολλodor. Bibli. 4. Hesiod. 488. Diodor. Sic. 1, 8. Anton. Lib. 19. Schol. parv. in II. χ. 126. Schemoθ R. 5, 2. Observe Deum praestantissimos populi sui duces et gubernatores ex pastoribus elegisse. Wetstein sees no reason why the testimony of the Fathers should be rejected. On the contrary, the recent commentators, (especially Rosenm. and Kuinoel,) think the narrations of the Fathers, in respect to such circumstances, deserving of little or no credit: which may be very true, but here I see not how to object to the testimony of such an ancient authority and eye-witness, as Justin Martyr. As to Wetstein’s second reason for adopting the tradition: “Imprimis cum antrum nobis aliquid venerandum et divinum: stabulum verò humile et rusticum representet.” I cannot but regard it as very ill-founded, and indeed, (as Campbell observes,) unsuitable to the spirit of our religion. In this view, the following observations of the same learned writer, are equally just and apposite. “Perhaps a strong prejudice against the notion that the mother of our Lord should, on that occasion, have
had no better accommodation than that which a stable could afford. But in all such cases, the reflection ought ever to be present to our minds, that what we are enquiring into is not a matter of theory, but a point of fact; concerning the evidence of which, we shall never be capable of judging with impartiality, if we have allowed our minds to be preoccupied with vain conceptions, in relation to fitness and dignity, of which we are not competent judges. If, along with sufficient evidence of the fact, there be nothing that contradicts the manifest principles of the understanding, or shocks that sense of right and wrong, which is the law of God written on our hearts, we ought to be satisfied. For that there should be things astonishing, or even unaccountable, in transactions so far superior to every other object of our meditations, is what we ought in reason to expect, ever remembering, that God's thoughts are not our thoughts, nor are our ways his ways.” Nay, to use the words of St. Luke, 16, 15. τὸ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὅψηλαν, βδέλυγμα ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. I add the following excellent remark of Theophyl. 315. Β. ἐν φάτνῃ δὲ κατασκευασμένῃ, τάχα μὲν καὶ οὕτω εὐτελειαν ἡμᾶς ἔχει ἀρχὴν παιδείας. Casaubon and Kuinoel, unite in thinking that the article designates that the stabulum appertained to the κατάλυμα, and was consequently in the town, not as the above tradition represents, out of it. So in ver. 11, the Angel says, “to you is born in the city of David,” not near it. But the second argument is weak; for Grotius has truly observed, that among all nations it has been usual for edifices adjoining to small towns, to be reckoned to form a part of them, as it were by right of accession: of which idiom, he subjoins examples from Luke 9, 31. 18, 38. & 5, 12. and that Herod himself understood the prophecy of Micah with this latitude, is evident, from the measures which he took to frustrate the fulfilment of the prophecy. As to the first reason, it has little force; for though the article seems to denote that the φάτνη was adjoining to the κατάλυμα, yet, may not the κατά-
have been in the suburbs, or immediate vicinity, as houses of public entertainment often are; and so near to the cave in question, as to admit of its being used for the purpose of a κατάλυμα, or paled courtyard?. I therefore see no reason to reject, or disbelieve so ancient and well supported a tradition.

7. ἐν τῷ κατάλυματι. This word is explained by the Etymol. Mag. ἔνωδοχεια. It was not (say the best critics,) like our inns, a place of public reception for all comers, (for such were not in use in Palestine,) but privatum diversorium, such as the Jews of that age afforded to their relations and friends. The word is by the Etymol. Mag. derived from κατάλυω, τὸ τελῶ τὴν ὀδὸν. Thus it will exactly answer to our stage, which comes from stayage, i. e. stoppage. Thus κατάλυω, in Luke 9, 12. and 19, 7. diverto, will answer to our phrase put up at an inn, i. e. to put up the luggage, horses, &c. De dieu thinks it was so called "quia ibi jumenta et sarcinæ solvebantur, a νεω;" which comes to much the same thing. L. Brug. however, thinks it means diversorium publicum, and Leigh, domus populi, omnibus patens peregrinus, &c. as we say a public house. Thus also, Campbell translates it, the house allotted to strangers, and he communicates some very instructive information on the subject, derived from Busbequii, Epist. 1. This I shall abridge, and subjoin for the use of my younger readers.

"There are in the East three sorts of houses built for the accommodation of travellers. First, the Caravansary, a very large edifice, meant for the reception of whole caravans. Into this, which is all under one roof, and has no partitions, all travellers, and their cattle, are admitted promiscuously. The only division in it is an area in the middle, for the servants, the beasts, and the baggage, enclosed with a parapet three feet high; which is so broad as to reach the wall of the house on every side, and thus to form a stone bench all along the walls, for accommodating the travellers, and raising them above the level of the
horses, camels, and mules. This bench is commonly from four to six feet broad. There are chimneys, at proper distances, in the walls. Every little party has such a proportion of this bench, with a chimney, as must serve for kitchen, parlour, and bed-chamber. They use the provisions which they bring with them, or which they purchase in the place. At night, the saddle-cloth, and their own upper garments, commonly serve for bed-clothes, and the saddle for a pillow. The public supplies them only in lodging. The second sort, which is the Xenodochium, is found only in a few places. It receives no cattle, nor are the strangers huddled together as in the caravansary, but are decently accommodated in separate apartments, and supplied at the public charge for three days, if they chuse to stay so long, in moderate, but wholesome food. The third is the Stabulum, and some of this kind are very capacious, though not so magnificent as the caravansary. Here also, the travellers and their cattle were under the same roof, and not separated by any partition wall from each other. Only the former possessed the one side, which had at least one chimney, and the latter the other. Now, of the three sorts it is probable that these two only, the xenodochium and the stabulum, were known in the days of the Apostles, and of these two kinds there appear such traces in Scripture as render it at least credible that they were both in common use. The καταλύμα, mentioned twice by this Evangelist, once by Mark, and occurring sometimes in the Sept. answers to the xenodochium of Busbequius: the πανδοχείον of Luke, in conformity to its name, corresponds to the stabulum of the other."

* Dr. Campbell further remarks, that πανδοχείον and καταλύμα, are not synonymous. "As the same distinction, however, does not (says he,) obtain with us, which obtained with them, we have not names exactly corresponding; but there is resemblance enough in the chief particulars, to make the term inn a tolerable version of the word πανδοχείον, but not of καταλύμα; for that cannot be called an inn where the lodgers are at no charges, which was most probably the case of the καταλύμα." Dr. Campbell's remark is
8. ἀγραυλοῦντες. E. T. abiding in the fields, which seems greatly preferable to Campbell’s version. Bochart, Triller, and Kuinoel, maintain, that the word is to be understood de excubiis nocturnis. This they think proved by the following words, and they cite Hesychius, who explains ἀγραυλοῖς by οἱ ἐν ἀγροῖσ διανυκτερεύοντες. But they have failed in their proof. The word properly signifies sub dio agere, to live in the open air, whether by day or night: though it is sometimes (as also ἀγραυλος) used of pernoctatio, even without any addition. The word has been copiously illustrated by Suicer, Thes. Eccl. 66. Casaubon Exerc. Antib. 2, 7. Bochart Hier. Schwartz Comment. Wetstein, Kypke, and others, from whom I subjoin the most opposite examples: Apoll. Rhod. 4, 317. τοιμένες ἁγραυλοί. Strab. p. 843. καὶ τοιμαίνειν δὲ καὶ ἁγραυλεῖν. Parthen. 29. βουκολῶν κατὰ τὴν αἰθήμην χειματοῦς τε καὶ θέρους ἁγραυλεῖ. Hymn. in Mercur. ἁγραυλοὶ μηλοβοτήρες. Etymol. ἁγραυλοὶ, οἱ ἐν ἁγρῷ αὐλίζο- μενοι, ὑπαίθροι ἔρημοι ἄβενοι ποιμένες. These shepherds, who were probably nomades, like the present Bedouins, rather than Bethlehemites, might not, strictly speaking, lie in the open air, but under the shelter of booths: for the word ἁγραυλεῖν is sometimes used of those who, (as the Americans say,) camp out, or tent out, live night and day in tents. Thus Kypke cites Diod. Sic. as using ἁγραυλίθης for military encampment in tents. So Shakspeare has, in a military sense, the expression, “the tented field.” 

true, if we confine the word inn to its common acceptation. But it may be questioned, whether our translators always intended the word to be taken in that sense. Thus, in Exod. 4, 24. ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ ἐν τῷ καταλύματι συνήντησεν αὐτῷ ἄγγελον κυρίου, where the καταλύμα is indeed rendered by them inn, yet they probably meant the word to be taken in the sense of stage. Certainly it is by our old writers merely used in the sense of lodging. Thus in the following passage from Donne, “In thyself dwell; inn any where: continuance maketh hell.” And this use of the word is yet preserved in the appellations given to some Halls at Oxford, and the Law Colleges in London, which are termed inns of court: and no wonder, since the word is derived from the Gothic and Ang. Sax. Inna, denoting a cell, room, habitation, or lodging.
The whole passage is admirably illustrated by the following passage of Busbequius Ep. 1, p. 58. cited by Bulkley: "Qui his gregibus pastores praesunt, noctem et diem degunt in campis, uxor esque et liberes circumvectant in curribus, quibus pro domiciliis utuntur: nisi quod alicuando exigua tabernacula tendant. Longè vero latèque vagantur, modò campos, modò editiora loca, modò valles, ut ratio temporis et pabuli postulet, persequentes." Hence no proof can be with certainty drawn (as has been too rashly done) from this passage, that the time of our Saviour's birth was not in December; though I admit that it may be difficult to prove that it was at that time. On this subject I refer the reader to Grotius. Kuinoel remarks (from Niemeyer, in his Conjecturae ad illustrandum silentium plurimor. N. T. scriptorum de primordiis vitae J. C. p. 12.) that on this point nothing can be determined, since the historical notices which are brought forward are pressed with many difficulties, and since no vestige is found, that the nativity of Christ was solemnly brated by the Christians in the first ages, and in the following ones, when such an observance was instituted, tradition varied.

8. φυλάσσοντες φυλακάς. This phrase is thought a Hebraism, but upon insufficient grounds, since examples of similar pleonasms are frequent in the best Classical writers, and of this one in particular examples are produced by Wetstein from Homer and Xenophon, and by Kypke from Plutarch, Dionysius Hal. and Demosthenes. Νυκτὸς has the force of νυκτερικός, and is added because φυλακή is a word of general sense, denoting watches of all sorts, diurnal and nocturnal, not only military, but civil and religious, and of every kind where there is a succession in turn. This, it seems, was the custom with shepherds, in which view the following citation of Wetstein will be found applicable: Anthol. 104. εὐάλκης ὁ κρῆς ἐπιστάεται μῆλα νομείων.

9. ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς. The word ἐφίστημι denotes not

9. δόξα Κυρίου περιέλαμψεν αὐτούς, a divine splendour beamed around them. See Acts 2, 6, 9, 3. Kuinoel, from Beza and others, explains it lux eximia, magna, for (says he) the Hebrews not frequently join the names of the Deity to other names, to indicate the greatness or excellence of anything. See Ps. 36, 7, 60, 11. Ion. 3, 3. Acts 7, 20. where ἀστεῖος τῶ θεῶ signifies admodum, maximè formosus. (Kuin.) Many of the German Theologians endeavour to account for this from natural causes, but most unsuccessfully and unsatisfactorily. There was evidently something supernatural in the appearance, and in the glorious and brilliant light produced, even if it were a natural phenomenon, brought forward (as Rosenmuller thinks) to produce a strong effect on the minds of the shepherds. Hardt, Wetstein, and others, (absurdly, as I think,) refer this supernatural light to the extraordinary star which appeared at our Saviour’s birth. Wetstein copiously illustrates both the word περιλάμπω and the opinion entertained by the Classical writers concerning the splendour attached to divine appearances. Eurip. Ion. 1549. τίς οἶκων θεοτόκων υπερτελής ἀνθήλιον πρόσωπων ἐκφαίνει θεῶν; Plin. H. N. 2, 33. Lumen de caelo noctu visum est C. Cæcilio et Cn. Papyrio Cosso et sæpe alias, ut diei species—noctu luceret. Theocrit. Id. 24, 22. Hom.
Od. t. 85. μέγα δαίμον τὸ δ' ὑφάλλμαν ὁμώμαι, ἐμφατικοὶ τοῖχοι μεγάρων, καλαί τε μεσοδομαί, εἰλατήρας τε ὅλωκληρος γάρ θυσίας ἐκεῖστε φαίνοντ' ὡφαλουρίους, οἷοι τυρός αἰ-θομένιοι. Ἡ μάλα τις θεὸς ἔνδος, οἱ οὐρανοὶ εὑρόν ἐχοῦσι. Diog. Laert. 8, 68. Jos. B. 6, 3, 6. κατὰ νυκτὸς ἔννο-τήν ὕμνον, τοσότων φῶς περιέλαμψε τὸν βασιλέα καὶ τὸν ναόν, οἳ δοκεῖν ἡμέραν εἶναι λαμπρὰν. We find from Li- ban. Or. 138. a. cited by Wetstein, that it was by the ancients thought lucky to have an heavenly vi-sion in the country, rather than in the town. In an-swer to the obvious question, why God should send an heavenly appearance to shepherds, rather than to the rich and great, Theophyl. answers, διὰ τὸ ἀπαλα-τον τοῦ θούσα καὶ ἄκακον, and adverts to the preference in this respect shewn by God to those pursuing pasto-ral occupations, (see Psal. 73, 70, 71.) and to the patriarchs, and David, &c. There was, too, a similar notion among the heathens, as we find from Servius on Virg. Ecl. 10, 26. Rusticus plerumque numi-ni offerre se solebant. I may add, that this was of a piece with all the rest of the wonderful dispensations promulgated by our Redeemer.

10. εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν χαρὰν μεγάλην. The word χάρα is put by metonymy for the subject of rejoicing, as in James 1, 2. Arist. Phit. 637. λέγεις μοι χαράν. And so Eurip. Suppl. 383. διπλοῦν χάραμα. Εὐαγγελίζεσθαι is here simply for ἀπαγγέλω, as often. (Rosenm. and Kuin.)

11. ἐπέχθη—σαφῆς ὦς ἔστι Χριστὸς Κυρίος. Wet-stein has produced a vast assemblage of citations from Classical authors, by which he has made it mani-fest, that the terms σαφῆς, σαφῆς τοῦ κόσμου, and σα-φῆς σάντων ἀνθρώπων cannot be truly applied to a mere man. Of these passages I shall lay before my readers the most apposite: Diog. Laert. 5, 16. Διὰ Σαφῆς, καὶ θνητὰ Ἀσωτῆρα. Plut. 893. d. σαφῆς ἀνέγραφα αἰώνα θεῶν, & Dio. p. 978. b. τὸν μὲν Διῶνα σαφῆς καὶ τὸν ἀποκαλούσων. Lucian. 62. θεοὺς σαφῆς-σιν. Plut. 864. a. σαφῆς ἀναγράφει τῆς ἐλλάδος. Hom. Epigr. 32. eis Λιοσκύρους. Σαφῆς τε κεφα-
das ἐπιχοθησάμενον ἀνθρώπων, ὁ κυρίως τε νεών. Herodian.
8, 3, 10. σωτῆρας καὶ προμάχους Ἰταλίας πάσης ἀναγρα-
φίγμα. Propert. 4, 6. Dionys. Halic. 10, 46. πατέρα, καὶ 
σωτῆρα, καὶ θεόν, καὶ πάντα τὰ τιμωτάτα οὐκόμαι
Polyb. Exc. 97. Prusias senatum ita salutat: χαῖρετε 
θεό σωτηρε. Schol. Eurip. Hippolyt. 88. ἀνάξ κυρίοις 
σωτῆρ, τοὺς οὕν θεός ἀνακτας καὶ σωτηρας καλοῦμαι: κα-
tαχριστικῶς δὲ καὶ τοὺς δεσπότας ἀνακτας καλοῦμαι, οἷς 
δευτέρους σωτῆρας. Herodot. 7, 192. Ποσειδέων σω-
τῆς εὐξάμενοι.—templum posideewnos σωτῆρος ἐπα-
νωμήν. I add, from Bulkley, Procl. in Plat. Theol. 
5, 29. Τὸ τεῖτον τοῖν τῷ Σωτῆρὶ.—τὴν δημιουργικὴν 
μονάδα νόημαμεν & 6, 19. p. 399. Δημιουργικὸς καὶ ὁ 
Σωτῆρ Ζεὺς. This subject has been admirably treated 
by our very learned countryman Bp. Pearson.
11. ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν, i.e. to you Jews, but for the good 
of the whole world. So Lucan. 2, 383. Non sibi, 
sed, toti genitum se credere mundo. See Cic. Off. 1, 
calls the Angels the superior family of God, men 
the inferior. Here we see the superior rejoicing over 
the good of the inferior family. (Grot. & Wets.)
13. Our translators wrongly render the babe, 
but rightly a manger; for all the best, and indeed most, 
of the MSS. omit the article. In Campbell 
there is just the contrary error. Grotius justifies the 
use of the article by the following learned remark: 
"Ita sæpe scriptores sua verba aliorum directis ora-
tionibus permiscunt. Simillimum est illud apud 
Matth. 26, 18. Tale est et apud Virgil. Et nunquam 
fatis concessa moveri Apparet Camarina procul. But 
to this principle we need not, nay, we must not, re-
sort on the present occasion, since the preponderating 
weight of authority demands the omission of the 
article.
13. στρατιῶν οἰρανίων. The Hebrews called the 
angels by whom the throne of God is surrounded, 
Iran. The Platonic Theology similarly ad-
mitted numerous hosts of inferior Gods correspond-
ing to the Angels of the Hebrew Theology. In this
view Bulkley has cited the following passages from Proclus. in Platon. Theol. 6, 18. τῶν ἐγκοσμίων (scil. θεῶν) στράτευσιν & 19, p. 397. στρατεία θεῶν καὶ δαι-
μόνων κατὰ ἐνδεκα μέρη κεκοσμημένη & p. 398. "Οδο ηγε-
μών τῶν δεδεκα στατίων ἡγεῖται τῆς κατὰ ἐνδεκα μέρη νε-
νευμένης" & chap. 21. Πολὺν στράτον τῶν μεριστῶν
θεῶν.

14. δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις, scil. τόποις, i. e. cælis. The plural is used with reference to the Hebr. דומ, which never occurs in the singular. "As the Jews (says Campbell) reckoned three heavens, the highest was considered as the place of the throne of God. When we find it contrasted with earth (as in the present verse), we have reason to assign it this meaning; the one is mentioned as the habitation of God, the other as that of men. This is entirely in the Jewish manner. "God is in heaven, and thou upon the earth." Eccl. 5, 2.

14. δόξα—ἐν ἁνθρώποις εὐδοκία. On the true reading and interpretation of these words, there has been much diversity of opinion. See Pole, Wolf, and Koecher, and especially Kuinoel, to whom I am indebted for most of the following observations. It has been doubted whether this carmen, or doxology, consists of two, or of three numbers, or sentences. The general opinion has been, and is, that there are three. Some, however, as Rus. Segaar. and Noes- selt, recognise but two, to which the third is but a corollary to, or interpretation of, the preceding; for otherwise, (say they,) καὶ could hardly have been omitted before εὐδοκία ἐν ἁνθρώποις. To this Kraft has replied, that the καὶ is transposed, as is not unfrequently the case. Secondly, it has been debated, whether the ellipsis is here to be supplied by ἐστι or ἐστώ. Those who adopt the latter, remark, that this is more frequent in a doxology, and refer to Matth. 21, 9. Luke 19, 38. where ἐστώ is supplied. But the former ellipsis, which is sanctioned by Theophylact and others, has been defended by Noesselt, who compares 1 Pet. 4, 11. It has been observed too, by
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Kraft: "Angeli dicuntur Deum laudasse, differunt verò laudare et optare, quia laudantur præsentia, quæ tanquam celebratione dignæ denuntiantur, agnoscuntur atque depreedicantur, vel tanquam certa causa inequentium bonorum cum applausu declarantur. Atque hoc in præseni cantico fieri, res ipsa docet." Thirdly, the Commentators have disputed concerning the sense of the words εἰρήνη and εὐδοκία, and some have thought that εὐδοκία is to be altered. Kuinoel proceeds to detail the opinions of several recent critics, which I cannot find room to insert. I must, however, advert to the opinion of those who propose to alter the present reading. Moerlius would read εὐδοκίας, with the Vulgate, Gothic, and Saxon versions, and some Fathers. This reading is defended by Noesselt, who renders, "nunc regnat in terrâ pax inter homines gratiosos Deo." So that ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας may be, "the men who find favour in the sight of God." But there is such very little authority for εὐδοκίας, it is liable to so many objections, and may be so easily accounted for as an error, that I entirely assent to Wetstein and Kuinoel, that the common reading must be retained. The former acutely observes: "Præterquam enim quod in subito et magnó gaudio oratio soleat esse abrupta, non video, quomodo ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίαι intelligi possint: si enim accipias de bonâ voluntate Dei, cogeris duplex hominum genus statuere, alterum, cui favet, alterum, cui non favet; quod contradiceret iis quæ præcedunt, ubi dicitur pax esse in terrâ, adeoque Deum toti humano generi favere: sin accipias de bonâ voluntate hominum, quod etiam Latinus interpres sensisse videtur, illi jam pacem habebant. Et sanè sunt verba Vallæ, quid attinebat precari pacem quasi non habentibus? Ergo precabantur angeli pacem super terram, et in omnibus hominibus bonam voluntatem, et iis præcipue, qui eum non haberent—ergo sit bona voluntas in iis, in quibus non est."

15. καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ποιμένες. The καὶ is used
pleonastically, like the Hebr. ה, with respect to the next words. Grotius, and many others, maintain, that there is a pleonasm of ἀνθρωπος, which some account a Hebraism. Others, however, cite similar pleonasms from the Greek writers, such as ἀντίρ στράτηγος in Herod. 6, 92. ἀνθρωπος μάντις in 6, 83. and Kuinoel refers us to Weiske de Pleon. Gr. But all the Commentators seem to have taken an incorrect view of the phrase, which was long ago shewn by Valk. Adn. Crit. in N. Test. p. 336. not to be a pleonasm. His annotation is very long and erudite, and I must recommend it to the perusal of my critical readers. For the benefit of those who have not the work, I shall select the most important matter. The expression is not ἀνθρωποι ταυτένες (as elsewhere ἄνδρες θυσιάλοι) but each word has the article, which, being repeated, has the same force as in the best Attic writers. So Thucyd. 8, 77. οἱ δὲ πεμφθέντες ἐσμένοι, οἱ δὲκα πρεσβευταίκ. and L. 4. p. 501, 95. τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἤπειροι. Xenoph. Cyr. L. 5. καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες ἀποθνήσκωσι τρεῖς δόντες, οἱ πρεσβεῖς, καταλευκόντες. Aristoph. Pac. 649. οἱ δὲ τὰς πληγὰς δρόμων ὡς ἐτύπωκαν οἱ ἕλποι. There is, therefore, no doubt but that the words of Luke should be thus pointed, οἱ ἀνθρωποι, οἱ ταυτένες, εἰτὸν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, the men (those shepherds I mean, of whom I began to speak at ver. 8.) said to each other, &c. Thus there is no occasion to cancel the words, as Bp. Barrington and Dr. Owen propose.

19. συμβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς, revolving them in her mind, and accurately weighing and considering them, διαλογισμένη, to which verb is also added ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, in Mark 2, 6. Luke 5, 22. So Hom. II. a. 297. οὐ δὲ εἰς φρεσὶ βάλλει σήμερ. & δ. 39. Theocrit. Id. 25, 163. Herodot. 7, 51. 8, 68. See Raphael's Obs. Herodoll. ad h. i. and Valek. Animadv. ad Ammon. p. 76. (Kuinoel.) Others, with Alberti, render, Rerum intelligendarum vim conjectura assequi conabatur. Of this phrase, as used of conjecturers and interpreters of dreams, Wetstein has given upwards of sixty examples. Campbell, however, adopts the first mentioned interpretation, and translates weighing, then adverting to the formidable array of Classical examples on the other side, he takes occasion to make a few observations on the manner in which authorities are sometimes alleged by critics. "They seem (says he) to think, that if the words of a quotation, taken by themselves, make sense, when interpreted in the way they propose, it is sufficient evidence that they have given the meaning of the author in that place. Now this is, in reality, no evidence at all. That such an interpretation yields a sense, is one thing; that it yields the sense, of the author, is another. Of two different meanings, the chief consideration, which can reasonably ascertain the preference, is, when one clearly suits the scope of the author, and the connection of the paragraph, and the other does not. Yet if the sentence be considered independently, it may make sense either way explained. That this is the case with Elsner's examples, (and therefore Wetstein's), wherein the verb συμβάλλειν is equally capable of being translated to guess as to understand, I should think it losing time to illustrate. The judicious critic, when he considers the connection, will find them, if I mistake not, more capable of being rendered in the former way than in the latter. They all relate to dreams and oracles, concerning which, the heathens themselves admitted that there could be no certain knowledge.
I must further observe in passing, that it is not in the manner of the Sacred writers to celebrate the abilities of the Saints, but their virtues. Whenever they commend, they hold forth an object of imitation to their readers. The understanding of this excellent personage was merely an ability or talent; but her weighing every thing that related to this most important subject, and carefully treasuring it up in her memory, was an evidence of her piety, and of the ardent desire she had to learn the things of God. This is a thing imitable by others; but neither natural acuteness of understanding, nor supernatural gifts, can properly be objects of imitation to us."

22. ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν, i.e. of the mother and child. It is well known that child-bed women were, by the Levitical Law, bound to keep at home forty days, during which they were regarded as impure, at the end of which period it was incumbent on them to offer up purificatory sacrifice. See Lightfoot and Schoettgen. Moreover, if the offspring was a first-born, it was to be redeemed by the payment of five shekels. Thus also among the Gentiles women in this situation were accounted impure, and were required to undergo the ceremony of lustration. See Spanheim on Callim. h. in Ion. v. 16. h. in Delum. 5. 111. Barnes on Eurip. Iph. in Taur. 5. 382. Censorin. de die natali, Ch. 2. (Grot. De Dieu, Rosenm. and Kuinoel.) There is here some variety of reading. Some copies have αὐτῶν, others αὐτῆς, but the great majority αὐτῶν. For the first two readings there is little or no authority. Αὐτῆς is justly suspected to be a παραδιόγγεως, and to have proceeded (as did the omission of αὐτῶν) from the superstition of those who were scandalized at the idea of impurity being ascribed to Jesus. But it should be considered that the impurity was only external and ceremonial, not moral, it being merely an obligation and restraint laid on women newly brought-to-bed, till after the performance of certain rites. We must not, there-
fore, connect with the notion of this ceremonial impurity, any degree of moral pravity. And although the law of purification does only specify the mother, yet it cannot be doubted but that the infant at the breast must have been comprehended, since the impurity being communicable by contact, the infant could not but be impure also. Αὕτη, therefore, has been deservedly adopted by most modern Critics.

22. ἀνάγαιον — τῷ Κυρίῳ. For the purpose (it should seem) of thus discharging two duties at once, the purification of the mother and the redeeming of the child. See Campbell. Παραστήμων is here used κατ᾽ εἴσοδὸν, of victims brought to the altar, and offerings consecrated to God, as the Hebr. קְרָנוּ, and the Latin adnovere and sistere. The verb ἀνάγαιον is, however, generally used of sacrifices.

23. ἁγιον—καληθησται, consecratus Domino esto, let him be consecrated. The future has here, as often in Hebrew and Hellenistic Greek, the force of the imperative. Or, καλείσθαι may not have precisely the sense of εἴναι, but may answer to our words held, accounted, considered.

24. θυσίαν, offering. The word θυσίαν is here taken in a general sense: for it includes both the θυσίατωρα and ἐπὶ τερατωτίασι. (Rosenm.)

24. ζεύγος, jugum, a pair, corresponding to the Hebr. צִב. So also the Classical writers, of whom Wetstein cites Herod. 3, 76. εφάνη ορθάς καὶ ζεύγεα, δύο αἰγυπτιῶν ζεύγεα διακαναί.

25. Who this Simeon here mentioned was has been much discussed. See Wolf and Koecher. Wetstein thinks that no other can be meant but Simeon the father of Gamaliel, of whom we read in Acts 5, 34. This point, however, must be acknowledged one of very uncertain determination.

25. εὐλαβῆς. This word has properly the same sense as εὐλαβεῖσθαι, and is explained by Suidas ὅ εἰς λάβην ἐπιτηδεῖος. 1stly, it is used passively of things which may easily be touched or handled, or laid hold of. So Lucian, in Timon. p. 114. ed. Græv.
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η πενία ὤ λευταλιν ἐξωθης τε καὶ εὐλαβης: 2dly, actively of persons, he who handles any thing dexterously, (ἐν) carefully, cautiously, reverently, and, metaphorically, he who is cautious, circumspect, and κατ' ἐξο-
χήν, one who is so towards God, who fears God, a
pious and religious person. This sense of religious extends both to εὐλαβης and its derivatives. So also in the Classical writers, as, for instance, the follow-
ing, cited by Wetstein. Plato de Legg. 6. εὐλαβεῖσθαι
θεον. Demosth. c. Mid. οὔτως εὐλαβως, οὔτως εὐσεβῶς,
ἀλβίου πρὸς τὰ θεῖαν εὐλαβείαν καὶ τιμήν. So metuio in
the Latin. Thus Juven. 14, 141. "Quidam sortitii
metuentem sabbata patrem, Nil praet er nubes et
celli numen adorant, Nec distare putant humana
 carne suillum, Qua pater abstinuit; mox et praepu-
tia ponunt. Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges,
Judaicum ediscunt, et servant, ac metuunt jus. In-
scription. Soteriae matri pientissime, Religionis Ju-
daicæ metuenti." Ovid. M. 5, 100. "Emathion
æqui cultor, timidusque deorum." So that Valckn.
on Eurip. Hipp. 1452. was not justified in saying
that εὐλαβης was never used in this sense by the
ancient Classical writers.

25. προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. As παρα-
kalein, in Hellenistic Greek, denotes to counsel, refresh, &c. So παράκλησις signifies solace, consolation, &c. and here, by metonymy and abstract for concrete, it is used instead of παράκλητος. So in Naham 3, 7. the Hebr. נון פים is rendered by the Sept. παράκλησις, the Vulg. consolatorem. That the name of παράκλητος (consoler) was by the Jews frequently applied to the Messiah, and that the Jews often used the formula προσδεχομαι τὴν παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, and expected from this consoler a deliverance from the calamities which then oppressed them under the Roman yoke, is manifest from the passages produced by Lightfoot, Wetstein, Capellus, and others.

26. ἢν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον. The word κρηματίζω
signifies, properly, to return an answer by divine oracle, and, in the passive, to receive such an answer, or oracle, or revelation, and, generally, to receive any divine communication. This had been divinely revealed to him by oral communication, think Piscator and Stock; by dream, say Mayer, Vitringa, Rosenm. and Kuinoel. Neither by angel nor voice, but δι’ ἐπιστολας, says Grotius. Schoettgen thinks this revelation was first by voice, then by internal conviction, which the Jews reckoned among the kinds of prophecy, and called the Holy Spirit.

26. μὴ ἰδεῖν τὸν θάνατον, see death. So Ps. 89, 49. Hebr. 11, 5. Joh. 8, 9. An Hebraism like γένος θάνατον, &c. which occurs in Ps. 89, 49. Ῥωμ. 15, 20. It is not, however, merely a Hebraism, for a very similar expression occurs in Eurip. Hercul. 516. ἀδήν εἰσεδίων. Anthol. MS. 3, 83. κοιντοι, εὐχόμενος, νοοτρ. εὐκτός, ἰδεῖν ἀδίκαν. (Wets. and Kuinoel.)

27. ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, impellente spiritu, i. e. a thought; not to be suppressed, rose in his mind, that on that very day he must go to the temple. (Ros.)

27. τὸ εἰδομένον. "Ethos properly signifies mos, but in Josephus it is perpetually used, like ἐντολή, and δικαίωμα, of the ceremonial law, and sometimes in the Classical writers for law: just as the Latins use mores for leges. Thus the Hebr. בְּאִדָה is rendered εἰθυμέας in 1 Regg. 18, 28.

29. νῦν ἀπολλεῖς τῶν δοῦλων σου. The word ἀπολλύω properly denotes to loosen, set free, let go to one's country, home, &c. So Polyb. 3, 85. ἀπέλυσε εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν. But it is here, by emphemism, metaphorically used of death; as in Num. 20, 29. Gen. 15, 2. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπολύσατε ἄτεκνος. There is either an ellipsis of ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, which is supplied in Job 3, 13. or τῶν σώματος, as in Porph. de Abst. 4, 9. or τῶν ἔσων, as in Αἰλιαν, V. H. 13, 20. Wetstein cites Plut. 108. c. ἔσω αὖν ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν ἀπολύση τῷ ἡμῖν. Stat. Theb. 7, 366. "Et fessum vitâ dimittite Parce." Ter. Eunuch. 3, 5, 3. "Nunc est profecto, interfici quom perpeti me possum, ne hoc gaudium contaminet vita sēgritu-
dine aliquâ.” Beresichth R. 68, 16. “Melius fuisse illi, ut dimitteretur in pace.” Bulkley cites Lucan 5, 275. “Jam respices canos, Invalidasque manus, et inanes cerne lacertos: Usus abit vitae: bellis consumpturn ævum, Ad mortem dimitte senes.” I add. Æschyl. Agam. 520. where the Herald, out of joy on returning to his native country, exclaims, τεθάναι δ’ ούκ ἐσ’ ἀντερόθθεον. Synes. 231. c. αὐτικα τεθανην τὸ πρῶτον σχήμα τῆς πατρίδος ἀπολαβον. Æschyl. Choeph. 432. ἔπειτ’ ἐγὼ νοσφίς ὀλοίμαν. The word has also been illustrated by Grotius, Gattaker, Palaiet, Munthe, Kypke, Crauser, Krebs, and Loesner. The result of their researches is this, that it is used partly of death, partly of deliverance from prison and bonds, from difficulties of various sorts, dismissal from office or function, &c. &c. In the use of the word, as found in the Scriptures, and the Philosophers, there is a manifest emission of hope in a future state, since the body is supposed to enchain the soul, and detain it from its native home.

30. ὅτι εἶδον ὁ άφθαλμοι μου. In the expression ὁ. μ. my eyes, Wetstein recognizes an emphasis. Beza, Georgius, and Palaiet say that there is here a pleonasm; and they might have cited Gen. 45, 12. “And, behold, your eyes see, and the eyes of my brother Benjamin, that it is my mouth that speaketh unto you.” But in both these passages, there is also an emphasis, of which Wetstein cites examples from Job 19, 27. 42, 5. 1 Joh. 1, 1. Τῷ σωτῆρι σου, thy Saviour. Here again (as in 26) we have abstract for concrete, cause for effect; a figure common to all languages, especially the Oriental ones.

31. κατὰ πρόσωπον π. τ. λ. A formula of similar import with ἐνάτιον, corresponding to the Hebrew ἐνέθη. Many examples, however, of the phrase are here produced by Wetstein from Greek authors. Yet there is a difference between the Classical and Hellenistic use. In the latter there is generally a
pleonasm, in the former the phrase is usually significant.

32. φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν. Repeat ἐδοχὴν ἐν ὑποθαλμῷ. For the wiser among the Jews of that age hoped that the Messiah would restore true religion, that the Gentiles would embrace their ancient Jewish faith, and thus be united with them. An opinion founded on many passages of the Old Testament. Here there seems to be an allusion to Is. 42, 6. "I will give you a light to the nations," ἔρασται ὅμοιοι. φῶς has frequently (as here) the sense of teacher. Thus the consequent is put for the antecedent. (Kuin.) To the examples produced by the Commentators I add Eurip. Iph. Aul. 1502. ἐπερευαία "Ελλαδή μέγα φῶς. Joh. 5, 35. έκεῖνος ὁ λόγος. Liv. 1, 39. "Scire licet — hunc lumen quondam rebus nostris dubius futurum," where see Steuer. In this passage the Commentators, without cause, conjecture column. Pind. Olym. 11, 96. ὅ μὲν πλοῦτος ἀρεταις δεδαιαμένος — ἀστὴρ ἀρίθμος [I conjecture ἀριθμὸς] ἀλαβίνος 'Ανδρι τέγγος.

33. οὖτος κείται εἰς πτώσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν. The phrase κείται εἰς πτώσιν denotes to be destined or appointed to any thing; as in Phil. 1, 17. 1 Th. 3, 8. There is a similar passage in Is. 49, 6. τέθηκεν σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν. See also Is. 8, 14, 15. The destination here is, however, not to be understood as of futurity, but is only to be taken in popular acceptation, and must not be interpreted by the formulas of the schools, or the dicta of philosophers. This is the case generally with Oriental, and especially Scriptural, phraseology, which is, for the most part, popular phraseology. See Mor. cited by Rosenm. who acutely remarks: "Quum igitur quis κείται εἰς τή dicitur, intelligitur, hoc illi quacunque de causâ certum paratumque esse, nec posse aliud de eo exspectari; atque causas cur nunc quidem aliud exspectari nequeat, esse naturam rei, hominum ingenia et mores, consilia Dei omnia moderantis, interdum etiam hoc, quod prænuntiatum sit." The
word πτωσιν and ἀναστάσιν, rise and fall, are to be
taken figuratively of happiness or misery. This is
to be explained, says Kuinoel, from the event: q. d.
Many will acknowledge him as the Messiah, will
approve of his doctrines, and thus promote their
own happiness: but many also will reject him, and
thus bring misery upon themselves. See the excel-
- lent annotation of Grot. as also Wolf in loc. Le
Clerc takes it as a metaphor, from a stone in a path,
against which heedless passengers may stumble.
Matth. 21, 44. Rom. 9, 32, 33. Simeon implies that
Christ will be the occasion of sin and offence to
those who look for a temporal Messiah, and of re-
formation and forgiveness to those who are less pre-
judiced against him.

34. καὶ εἰς σημείων ἀντιλεγόμενον. So Ezekiel 14.
says that he shall be ἡσύχιος, εἰς τέρας. The σημεῖα
Brug. Beza, Maldonati, Flacius, Drs. Macknight
and Doddridge, explain by a butt or mark to shoot
at, which Doddridge thinks finely intimates the deli-
berate malice of Christ’s persecutors. In this view
there is a very apposite citation adduced by Wet-
stein from Philo de Maledictione, T. 21, 431, 80:
προκείμενοι γὰρ σκοτὸς τοῖς ἔθελοιν ἄγειν, φέρειν,
ἀρπάξειν, ὑβεβλήσειν, τιτρῶσειν, εἰς βλάβας, εἰς αἰκίας, εἰς
παναλεβρίαν: ὡς μηδὲν ἀφεθήναι τῶν βλημάτων κατφην,
ἀλλ’ εὐδοκέα καὶ εὐστοχια τάντα. I cannot, however,
find any authority for this signification ἡ σημείων.
It seems, therefore, safer to interpret thus: “That
he should be a monument, and a remarkable ex-
ample, of rejection and contempt.”

35. τὴν ὄχλην διελεύσεται ῥομφαία. Bitter griefs
are by the Hebrew, and even the Greek writers,
termed wounds of the mind, and men’s minds are
said to be transfixed with them, as with arrows,
swords, &c. Of this metaphor Wetstein has pro-
duced examples from Hom. II. λ. 263. 2, 3, & 9. Li-
Virg. AEn. 12, 168. “Et tristi turbatam vulnere
mentis.” Stat. 10, 619. “Non secus ac tortà trajec-
tus cuspidé pectus Accipit exanimis." Diod. Sic. 18, 58. oiovi νυμφοίς εἰς τὴν ψυχήν λαμβάνουσαι περιπαθείς ἐγένοτο, καὶ πολλὰ τὴν ἐαυτῶν ψυχήν καταδύοντο: where see Wessel and Valck. on the Φοῖεν. 1098. I add the following examples. Archil. 67, 3. χαλεπχήσι ἐνώμησι πεπαρμένοι δι᾽ ἀστέαν: where see the passages produced by Jacobs, in which πεφορμά is said to be used with reference to the pains with which the body or mind is tormented. Hom. Π. ι. 269. οῖς δ᾽ ὅταν ἐωθῶσαν ἔχει βέλος ὑπὶ γυναῖκα. Ἀeschyl. Suppl. 475. ἡκουσα μακιστὴρα καρδίας λόγου. Μακιστής is also explained by Hesych. βέλος. Pindar, Nem. 1, 71. Ἐκ δ᾽ ἀρ ἀπλανό δῶς Πλατές γυναῖκας. Hence is confirmed the reading of the MS. βέλος, which Heyn grants is more lyric, and which he ought to have restored. One may appositely cite Hesych. who, among other glosses, has, καὶ τὴν ἀλγηδονα βέλος λέγει. Βέλος may also be interpreted gladius. Zonar. Hist. T. 3, 5, 13. καὶ ὁμοφαία λυπής τὰς τῶν ματέρων διελόουσαι ψυχῆς. And T. 3, 44, 33. νοσήσαντα φάσι περιμνήσεις βαλλόμενον σφοδρόταται. Theocrit. Id. 28, 28. αἰδίνειν τρομέων χαλεπῶν βίλοσ Εἰλείθυιας. Eurip. Ion. 779. where see Wakefield. Wetstein thus unfolds the meaning of this ænigmatical sentence: "Teipsā superstite et spectante, cruci affigetur."

35. ἀπασ αὖ ἀποκαλυφθώσιν ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν ἰδιαλογισμοῖ. These words are to be conjoined with the preceding, σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον. The sense is: "Thus will it be evinced what is the real disposition of every one to the Messiah." For ἰδιαλογισμοῖ is a word of middle signification, and denotes imaginations, whether good, or bad. See Pole's Syn. and Wolf. Wetstein compares Hor. S. 2, 8, 78. "Ducis ingenium res Adversæ nudare solent, celare secundæ."

36. προφήτες. Why Anna is so called the Commentators are not agreed. Some take the word in the sense of "a predictress of future events;" as in the Apoc. 2, 20.; others think she is so called, as being
the wife of a prophet. Others again interpret cantatrix, vates, poetessa, in which sense the word often occurs in the O. T. Kopp explains, "Deo sacra et devota." (Kuin.) But this is very far-fetched, and is not well supported.

66. ἡ γυναῖκα ἔτη μετὰ ἀνθρώπου ἕπτα ἕδη τῆς παρθενίας αὐτῆς. There is a similar passage in Plut. Lucul. 18. ἀδελφοὶ — τεσσαράκοντα ἕτη παρθενικομέναι. The circumstances of her age and long widowhood are particularly mentioned, since widows who did not marry again, were especially honoured among the Jews. Wetstein cites Quintil. Dec. 306. "Mulier quae post amissum maritum per tot annos, qui facere poterat ab infantia virum fortem, sic complexa est viduitatem, tanquam geniis pudicitiae. Jos. Ant. 18, 6, 6. Νέα γὰρ χρείεσθαι παρθένειν, γάμῳ τε ἀπεῖται τῷ πτῶς ἔτεραν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ Σεβαστῷ κελευσαίτος τινι γαμεῖσθαι, καὶ λοιποῖς ἀπηλλαγμένην διεσφαίρατο αὐτῆς τὸν βίον. Val. Max. 2, 1, 3. "Quae uno contentæ matrimonio fuerant, corona pudicitiae honorabuntur — multorum matrimoniorum experientiam quasi illegitimæ cujusdam intemperantis signum esse credentes." (Kuin.)


40. καὶ χαῖρε Θεῷ ἣν ἐπ' αὐτό. Wetstein explains this: "Ea erat venustas, et dignitas formae in puero, ut omnes intelligerent a Deo ita ornatum esse." He
produces examples of χάρις in this sense, of ἐστίνως and προσέκιναι. But in those passages Θεός is not added; from which, and from the preceding words, ὡς ἠκούε—σοφίας, it is plain that we must take χάρις is a moral sense, and interpret it of the favour and assistance of God; as in a very similar passage ver. 52. προέκοπτε σοφίας καὶ ηλικίας καὶ χάριν τι παρὰ Θεῶ καὶ ἀνθρώπων. Campbell, however, has adopted the interpretation of Wetstein, and has defended it with his usual acuteness and ingenuity; yet he has not, I think, succeeded in establishing it.

41. The following narration shows how early the mental faculties, and moral endowments, of Jesus developed themselves. An example of similar precocity of talent, especially as applied to theology, is recorded of Josephus. See his tract de Vitā ejus, p. 905. init. The words may be seen, cited on v. 47.

41. ἐπορεύοντο—καὶ ἔτος—τοῦ πάσχα. It was commanded in the Mosaic Law, that all the males should appear thrice a year before the Lord, at the three solemn feasts of the Passover, Pentecost, and the Tabernacles. Hence some have supposed that the Passover is here particularly mentioned, because, at the time of our Saviour, that law was not exactly observed. It has been supposed that the Jews thought they sufficiently discharged their duty if they appeared once a year at Jerusalem. This, however, is a mere conjecture, devoid of sufficient proof, and inconsistent with the exactitude of piety which distinguished the holy couple. For these reasons, it is rejected by Kuinoel, who agrees with Rosenm. and others, in thinking that the Passover alone is here mentioned, since it was the only festival at which Joseph was accompanied by his wife. It does not appear to have been incumbent on women to attend at any; yet from religious, or from other, motives, they probably visited Jerusalem at one of them, and, we may suppose, the greatest, the Passover. So we learn did Hannah, 1 Sam 1,7.

42. ὅτε ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα. The Law, indeed, or-
dained that all males should attend. But it could not reasonably be thought to belong to any but to such as had attained to understand the nature of religious duties. The custom was, not to take them thither until they should have attained the years of puberty, a period which Rabbins tell us was fixed at the twelfth year, within which they were called בֵּית הָעֵשָׂד, on its completion בֵּית הָעֵשָׂד, when they were held amenable to the law, and were therefore called sons of precept, בְּנוֹת הָעֵשָׂד. Then were they also introduced into the Church, initiated into its doctrines and ceremonies, and consequently were taken with their relations to Jerusalem at the festivals. All this is proved and illustrated by the Rabbinical citations in Lightfoot and Wets. the latter of whom quotes from Ignat. Ep. ad Magn. Σωλομόν διδακτής κρίνει ἐν τάς γυναιξίν ἐποιησάτο. Jos. A. 5, 10, 4. Σαμοῦχλος δὲ πεπληγωκὼς ἔτος ἵκον διδακτὸν προεφῆτευε.

43. ὅπειρευεν—ἐν Ἡ. Some Interpreters, who think they may exempt the parents of Jesus from the charge of negligence or carelessness, have supposed that this was not the first visit of Jesus to Jerusalem. But to this, the mode of narration seems adverse. One might rather conjecture, from v. 44. (where it is said that his parents supposed him to be in the company of their kinsfolks and acquaintance,) that he had been before in their company, so that the parents may the less deserve to be accused of negligence. From the brevity, however, of the narration, nothing certain can be determined. It is a foolish quare too, which some make, whence Jesus then derived his sustenance? since, from the hospitality of those times, he would find no difficulty in obtaining it; especially as some of his relations or friends might also remain behind at Jerusalem. (Kuinobel.)

44. The parents thought that the boy had joined himself to the society of his kinsfolks, friends, acquaintance, and townsmen, some of whom preceded, others followed, (for, according to the Oriental cus-
tom, the travellers made their journeys in large bodies,) and camped out all night in the fields, when any who might have left the company by day usually returned. They therefore proceeded a day's journey without any serious fear. It is not, therefore, necessary to suppose that the males and females went in separate companies, and that Joseph fancied the boy was with his mother's party, and Mary that he was with his father, since the course of the narration plainly shows that they travelled together.

The word συνοδία (from σύνοδος, as εξοδία from ἔξοδος) properly denotes a journey undertaken by many persons together; then, by a metonymy, it indicates the companions of the journey, the company. The Persians and Arabs express this by the word caravan, the Hebrews נַּעַר, Gen. 37, 25. (Kuinoel.) Suidas: συνοδία, τὸ μετὰ τίνος περιμασίαν. Arrian. Epict. 3, 26. p. 362. οὕτω ποιοῦσι καὶ τῶν ἐθνικῶν οἱ ἁπαλεστάτοι, ἀκόμην ότι ληστεύεται η ὁδός, μόνος οὐ τολμᾷ καθεinzai, ἀλλὰ περιέμεινε συνοδίαν ἢ πρεσβευτῷ, ή ταμίς, ἢ ἀνθυπάτου, καὶ προσκαταλέξας ἐαυτὸν παρέσχεται ἁπαλοῖς. — τοῖς συνοδίαις περιμειναι ἁπαλοῖς διέλθη. Simplic. in Epict. 5. p. 122. Plut. p. 1062. Jos. B. 2, 21, 1. Ant. 6, 12, 1. Acts 9, 7. Anthol. 1, 57, 14. (Wets.) Many more passages are produced by Kyriake.

44. ἀνεβητον. The ἀνα is here intensive, as sometimes the re in Latin. So Acts 11, 25. Wetstein has given two examples, one from Isocrates, another from Thucyd. 2, 8. εἰτε τι ἄλλα ἔμνεσθη γένεσθαι πάντα ἀνεβητείν. This interpretation seems here required by the natural anxiety which, as parents, they would feel.

46. μεθ' ᾧμερας τρεῖς, i. e. on the third day. They returned to Jerusalem on the second day, and on the third found him in the Temple. By ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ we are not to understand the ναὸς, or sanctum, into which the priests only were allowed to enter, still less the Sanctum Sanctorum, which was only open to the High Priest, and that once a year; but the
Λοιπόν, comprising the courts, porticos, &c. in which the judges and doctors used to sit and deliver their instructions. We are not, however, to suppose, as some have done, from the words ἐπερωτῶντα αὐτῶν, (interrogating them,) that Jesus acted the part of a teacher, not a disciple, for it appears from the Rabbinical citations in Lightfoot and Wetstein that the Jewish doctors pursued such a plan of instruction as dealt much in interrogation, both on the part of the teachers and the taught. Neither can this be inferred from the doctors admitting him to sit with them*, since it is not unreasonable to suppose, that they would wish to show such indulgence to so extraordinary and highly-gifted a child; and this they might do without compromising their own dignity. Neither does their seem any occasion to explain away the meaning of ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, as does Kuinoel, who renders sat in the same room with them.

47. ἔξισταντο πάντες—ἐπὶ τῷ συνέσει. Wolf takes this to be an hendiadys, but to this Kuinoel objects that the subject of the words is the σύνεσις of Jesus, as shown, not only in his answers, but even in his questions. He therefore interprets σύνεσις intelligencia, prudentia; and cites Philo, p. 85, 8. κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς οὐν ὁ τε συνδιατρίβοντες καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες ἐτεθήσεισαν, ο囡 ἐπὶ καὶνῳ θεάματι καταπληκτώμενοι καὶ τις ἀρά ὁ ἐννοικός αὐτῶν τῷ σάματι καὶ ἀγαλματοφοροῦμενος νοὺς ἐστὶ, πότερον ἀνθρώπειος, ἦ θεῖος, ἦ μικτὸς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν διερευνάμενοι. The word here, I think, de-

* "I have often (says Doddridge) thought it a great injury to the character of our blessed Redeemer to represent this story, whether in pictures or words, as if Christ, at this tender age, went up into the seats of the doctors, and there disputed with them. Not one word is said of his disputing by the Evangelist, but only of his asking some questions and answering others, which was a very usual thing in these assembles, and, indeed, the very end of them. All was, no doubt, conducted with the utmost modesty and decorum. And, if he were with others at the feet of these teachers, (where learners generally sat, see Luke 10, 39. and Acts 22, 3.) he might be said to be in the midst of them, as they sat on benches of a semicircular form, raised above their auditors and disciples.
notes natural sagacity and acumen, ἀγχυμία, (which our old English writers call mother-wit.) So Thucyd. 1, 138. ἢν γὰρ ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς βεβαιώτατα δὴ φύσεως ἱσχὺν δηλώσει—οἰκεία γὰρ ἠφετέετι, καὶ οὕτε προμαθεῖν ἐν αὐτῇ, οὕτε ἐπιμαθεῖν, τοὺς τι παραχρήμα δὲ ἐλαχίστης θουλής κράτιστοι γνώμαι, —ἀριστος εἰκασθής. And 2, 97. ἐς τὴν ἄλλην εὐθυλίαν καὶ ἔφεσιν. Eurip. Troad. 642, 675. καὶ τοῖς τῷ θηριόδες ἀφθονγον τ' ἔφω ἔφεσιν τ' ἀχρήστοι τῇ φύσει τε λείπεται. I subjoin from Wetstein the following interesting citations. Jos. Ant. 2, 9, 6. de Mose. κύσεις δὲ οὗ κατὰ τῇ ἡλικίᾳ ἐφύετο αὐτῷ, τοῦ δὲ ταύτης μέτρου πολὺ κρείττο καὶ πρεσβύτερον διεδείκνυ ταύτης τὴν περιουσίαν ἐν ταῖς παιδείαις, καὶ μειὼναν τῶν ὑπ' ἀνδρός γεννησομένων ἐπαγγελίαν εἶχε τὰ τότε πραττόμενα. Philo de V. Mosis, T. 2. p. 83, 22. ἐπεὶ δ' ἄνθρώπας ἐκδόσεις καὶ παρακατέσεις λαμβάνουσα, οὐ σὺν λόγῳ τῷ κατὰ χρόνον, δαίτην ἀποτίθεσι γίνεται—τελειωτέρον δὲ τῇ ἡλικίᾳ ἴδωσα. Conon. Narr. 44. Jos. Vit. 2. εἰς μεγάλης παιδείας προϊόκτον ἐπίδοσιν, μνήμη τε καὶ συνέσεις ὑπάρχουσι διαφέρειν· έτει δ' ἄλλο πάθης ὅπερ τετασσακαιδέκατω ἐτῶς, διὰ τὸ φιλογραμματον ὑπὸ πάντων ἐπηνούμην, συνάψων δὲ πάντων ἀρχιερέων καὶ πάντως τῆς πόλεως πραττόν, ύστερ τοῦ παλ' ἐρωτήσαντος ὑπὸ καθιστών ἀκριβέστερον τι γνωρίαν. 49. ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου. There has been some difference of opinion as to the sense of these words. The discrepancy has been in some measure occasioned by the ellipsis, which some propose to fill up by πράγματα, affairs. So Piscator, L. Brug. Arndt, Edzard, Kregel, Cartwright, Buxtorf, Loesner, Wolf, Rosenm. and Bolten: and certainly the ellipsis of πράγματα is perfectly legitimate. It would have been (says Rosenm.) no excuse if Jesus had said, I could not return, I was in the temple of God: rather he intended to say, "divine things are always to be preferred to worldly affairs, &c. Others, however, supply τόποι, as Juvenicus, in Hist. Evang. 1, 300. "An nondum sentis genetrix, quod jure paternis sedibus et domibus natum inhabitare necess est?" So Euthymius, Theophylact, Origen, and many of
the Fathers, the Syriac and Persian Versions, Grotius, De Dieu, Capellus, Fuller, Hammond, Bois, Vorstius, Braun, Reland, Bos, Keucher, Spanheim, De Rhoer, Blackwell, Michaelis, Beausobre, Palai- ret, Bengel, Krebs, Moldenhauer, Wetstein, and lastly Kuinoel. The ellipsis has been thoroughly established, and copiously illustrated, by Wetstein's numerous examples. Thus Sir. 42, 10. I entirely assent to Kuinoel, that although the other ellipsis is admitted by the rules of syntax, yet that this seems more agreeable to the context. For Mary had said, "Why hast thou done thus? we have sought thee every where." Therefore she does not speak with reference to business but place. Jesus, however, in naming the temple of his Father, partly had regard to the words of Mary, thy Father, and partly he intended to turn her attention to his intimate conjunction with the Father, and to recall to her memory those singular marks of Divine Providence with which God had distinguished him from his earliest infancy, and thus show her the folly of excessive solicitude for him. We may, moreover, collect from this narration, that Jesus, even when a boy, knew his divine descent, and to what mighty things he was destined; and therefore exercised himself in high and holy meditation. Some have thought the above phrase a common proverb; but if so, it is improbable that neither of his parents should have understood it. That they did not understand it, we are told by the Evangelist. Afterwards, however, they perceived its meaning, when he publicly taught in the Temple, and authoritatively drove out them that bought and sold there.

51. ἰδον ἡμῖν τὴν συνεσχεσίαν κατέστησαν. The word ἡμῖν is used not only of forcible and compulsory, but voluntary, subjection, as that of wives and of children; and therefore it here merely denotes the dutiful obedience which he would be bound to yield to Joseph, both as his reputed father, and his instructor, from whom he learnt his trade of carpenter. Justin Mar-
tyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho, relates that ploughs, yokes, and other τεκτώνια ἔργα, were manufactured by Jesus. So that he was not only a carpenter, but one of inferior sort, and employed on the rougher work. "Thus we are taught (says Grotius), that Jesus, while attending to divine things, did not neglect the duties incumbent on him towards his parents." So (observes Hierocles) the duties towards God and men may both be performed; nor must we, under the idea of virtue, neglect the obedience due to parents."


52. προέκακτε σοφία καὶ ἴλλικα. The word προκάκτεω properly signifies praecidere, praescare, i.e. to cut one's way forward, through thickets, or other impediments, and then, metaphorically, to get forward, make progress, increase, &c. Ἰλλικα may here denote either age, or stature, but the former appears to be most suitable to the context, and is more usual in good authors. So, among Wetstein's citations we have, Vita Ἡςcheinis, προκόπτων δὲ τῇ ἴλλικα. Hesych. Μειλώταις, δ' ἀπ' ἰδίων ἐτῶν προκόπτων ταῖς τῇ ἴλλικαι. Lucret. 3, 448. Nam velut infirmo pueri teneroque vagantur corpore: sic animi sequitur sententia tenuis. Inde, ubi robustis adolevit viribus ætas, Consilium quoque majus et auctior est animi vis. & 747. Vis animi pariter crescit cum corpore toto. I add Herodot. 3, 184, 14, αὐξανομένω γὰρ τῷ σώματι συναὐξόντοι καὶ αἱ φρένες. Wetstein, however, seems to have preferred the signification stature, and observes, "Mirum quidem non erat, eum qui vivere pergit ætate crescere; nec omnino mirum erat, cum ætate
et staturam et sapientiam incrementa sumere: at Christus supra etatem sapiens et procerus et venustus erat." He then cites Jos. Ant. 2, 9, 6. de Mose. kal trietoe men auton gegovnmevo tovaipost tro thes trh ylkias eiphev anastyma* and Philo. 2, 83, 22. Nevertheless, I see not how this sense, supra etatem sapiens, &c. which Wetstein gives, can be elicited from the words. It is different with the passage which he cites from Diod. Sic. 19, 2. where the circumstance polu maallon & kath thn ylkiav is particularly expressed. The sense may be thus expressed: "Jesus increased, not only in age and stature, but in wisdom," &c.

CHAP. III.

VERSE 1. ήγεμονεύων Ποντίων Πιλάτου. Of the Provinces some appertained to the Senate, others to Cæsar. Of the former the Presidents were called Proconsuls, of the latter Legates. Judæa, as being an appendage to Syria, was Cæsar’s province. So Dio, 53. p. 341. The Proconsuls were chosen by lot, the Legates were appointed by Cæsar. In the forty-second year of the Julian period, Sabinus, after the death of Herod the Great, was Procurator, ευρετοσ τω του Καλαγους πραγματων in Syria and Judæa. (Wets.) Since Luke (according to the opinion of most Commentators) has conjoined this year with the thirtieth of Christ’s age, they have endeavoured to elicit hence the year of his nativity, as well as that of his baptism. But various are the modes by which the years of the Cæsars (especially Augustus and Tiberius) are enumerated, and moreover Luke has not informed us of the age of John at the fifteenth year of Tiberius; nay, he seems only to have intended, by mentioning this year of Tiberius, to define the commencement of John’s ministry, and not to indicate at what time after the commencement of
that ministry Jesus went to him to be baptized; nor has he specified the age of Christ, but mentions in a general way that he was about thirty years old. This passage, therefore, will not enable us to exactly define the year of Christ's nativity. Indeed, we may affirm that the Evangelists do not supply any date, from which that period can be exactly and with certainty fixed. Nor are there extant any ancient testimonies of such authority as to remove all doubt. The Ecclesiastical writers themselves did not agree in fixing the year of Christ's nativity. Irenæus adv. Haer. 3, 25. says that it was in the forty-first year of the reign of Augustus: Epiphanius in Haer. 51. that it was in the twenty-second year: Tertullian, that it was in the forty-second year. Hence one may easily account for the diversity of opinion that exists among the Commentators on this subject. Harduin maintains, that Christ was born A. U. 747; Anton. Capellus, Kepler, Anton. Pagius, A. U. 748; Petavius, Usserius, Bengel, A. U. 749; Schroeckhuis, A. U. 750, or in the forty-first year of the reign of Augustus; Baronius, Scaliger, Caloius, A. U. 751.

The author of the vulgar æra, Dionysius Exiguus, a Roman Abbot of the sixth century, who first introduced the numbering of the years from Christ's nativity, fixed that period to A. U. 753. But that the Dionysian æra is not sufficiently exact, has been abundantly demonstrated by recent chronologists, who have, however, differed in this point, namely, how many years are to be added to the Dionysian computation. Some say, three years; many four years at least, and others, even more than that. Nothing, indeed, can be clearly determined. (Kuinoel;) to whom I must refer the reader for some less important matter, which I have not room to introduce.

2. ἐν Ἀγιαπέρεων Ἀμα καὶ Καΐαφα. On this passage there has been much diversity of opinion; for

* That John had already begun to act the part of a public teacher is manifest, because we are told that his fame was spread through all parts of Judea.
the details of which I must refer the reader to Pole's Syn. Wolf, and Koecher. Some maintain, that Annas and Caiaphas then discharged the function of High Priesthood by turns. But this is plainly repugnant to what we learn from Joseph. Ant. 18, 2, 2. Others think that Caiaphas was called High Priest, because at that time he really exercised the functions of the office, and Annas was so called because he had formerly filled that situation. But it does not thus appear, why of those who had before Caiaphas discharged that function, Annas should be particularly named; and why Luke should have this pontifical personage before Caiaphas, and not name any other, for instance, Ismael, Eliazar, or Simeon, who all had served the office more recently than Annas. The most probable opinion is, that Caiaphas was the High Priest, but that Annas was his vicar or deputy, called in the Hebrew, מנה, Sagan. See Lightfoot and Krebs in loc. and also Casaub. Exerc. 13, 8. Nor can that office be thought unworthy of a man who had filled the pontifical functions, since great was also the dignity of the Sagan. Thus, for instance, on urgent necessity he was permitted to enter the Sanctum Sanctorum (see Lightfoot); nor can it seem strange, or unusual, for the Vicar of a High Priest to be himself called by that name. For if (as it appears, those who had once filled the office were ever after, by courtesy, termed High Priests, surely with greater justice might Annas, who was both a Pontifical person and a High Priest's Vicar, be so termed. Nay, the very appellation of High Priest is applied to a Vicar by Jos. Ant. 17, 6, 4. (Kuin.) I must not omit to refer the reader to an excellent annotation of Dr. Hammond, in which he has copiously treated on this subject, and to whom all succeeding Commentators are much indebted.

2. ἐγένετο ἡμα Θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ιωάννη. What was this ἡμα, or order, we learn from the event; namely, that he should act the part of precursor to Christ, should excite the people to repentance and reforma-
tion, and by baptism lay them under a sacred obligation to perform their vows of amendment of life.

4, 5. In this verse are described the various offices of road-making, as it was usually pursued by pioneers sent before great armies to facilitate their progress. On this subject I have copiously treated in the note to Matth. 3, 3. So Strabo, 5, p. 360. L. (cited by Kuinoel): ἔστραβων δὲ καὶ τὰς κατὰ τὴν χώραν ὄδοις, προσβέντες ἐκκοπάς τε λάφων, καὶ ἐγχαίνεις καλάδαν. Heliodor. 1, 6. (cited by Wets.) σκολίαι γὰρ τίνος ἀποφαινόμενοι καὶ πολλοὶ ἐλιγμοῖς πεκλαυμένας. On the words φάραγξ and βοών, see Sch. Lexicon, as also Schwebel on Onosand. It must, however, be observed that the terms employed in this passage are not to be minutely dwelt upon, since they merely serve to dress up the imagery.


6. τὰσα σάφε. By this expression Luke seems to indicate that the mercy and favour of God be extended to the whole human race.

11. Lest they should fancy, that by the ceremonies of ablutions and sacrifices, and rites of that kind, they might evade the divine wrath, the holy Baptist shows them that not merely external observances, but internal virtues, are required, of which the principal is love to our fellow-creatures, which he therefore describes but popularly, i.e. by its most conspicuous effects, enjoining them to supply, from their own superabundance, the wants of others. Thus in βρο-. 
ματα we must understand τα περισσευμα. (Grot.) See also Whitby.

13. μηδεν πλεον παρα το διατηραγμενοι υμιν πράσσετε, exact no more than, &c. This sense of πράσσειν is confirmed and illustrated by Wetstein. Διατάσσειν, which signifies "to order and appoint by law," is especially used of laying on taxes, tributes, &c. See Duker on Thucyd. 3, 70. 41, 65. &c. It is well observed by Rosenmuller, that since many of the Jews accounted it unlawful to pay tribute to a foreign nation, the publicans wanted to see whether John would forbid the farming of the tribute money. But John discriminates the crimes of their life from their way of livelihood, showing that his admonitions did not interfere with the peace of mankind, which, amidst so much corruption and crime, could not be preserved without civil and military force; for the maintenance of which the imposition of taxes is inevitable. Rosenmuller compares Hebr. 3, 3. and Kypke Thucyd. 4, 6. χειμων—μειτων παρα την καθετηκαι αιραν, which passage is, however, not quite opposite. The following examples will be found more so: Appian. 2, 78, 87. πλεονες παρα τους αρχαλοι. Hebr. 1, 4. Παρα signifies compared to, as in the passage of Thucydides: and that is probably the force of our particle than.

14. στρατευμενοι, i.e. στρατιωται, soldiers. This is considered as a Hebraism; for in that language participles are used in the place of nouns verbal. Sometimes, however, this word occurs in the best Greek Classical writers, and here Wetstein has some opposite citations: from Thucyd. 8, 65. δα ευτε μεθοδορυτεν εις αλλους, η τους στρατευμένους. Herodian. 8, 7, 20. σων τους οπω Βαλβίνω στρατευμενους. I add, D. Hal. 8, 68. There is a very long and learned annotation by Grotius, on the military service of the Jews, and first Christians, under the Roman emperors. To this I can only refer the reader, who may, however, see some abstract of its contents in Mr. Elsley's note. I must observe, that the conjecture
of Michaelis, however ingenious, and otherwise probable, is founded on a false distinction, when he says: "These present soldiers in the text are not named στρατιώται, but by the participle στρατεύομενοί, i.e. men under arms, or men going to battle."

14. διασέβητε. On the interpretation of this word the Commentators are by no means agreed. Some translate, "do not extort (money, &c.) by dint of threats or ill-usage;" which, it is well known, was not unusual with soldiers. So Herodian. 11, 14, 2. de Imperatore Pertinace: τοὺς τε στρατιώτας ἐκέλευσε παύσασθαι τὸς πρὸς τὸν ἀμφότερον ὦθεον, καὶ μὴ τε παίειν τίνα τῶν παριστάνων. See the Schol. on Aristoph. 302. a. nd. 306. ac. These Interpreters think that διασέβην was formed on the model of the Latin concusere, after the Roman civil law had become known in the East, and certainly concussio is thus defined the Jurisconsults, si aliquid terrore potestatis illicitē extorquetur et auffertur. But Kuinoel rightly observes, that this signification has never been satisfactorily established. Ἀέω is by the ancient Greek writers, and διασέβω by the later ones, used of all sorts of unjust spoliation *, whether by actual fraud, rapine, and extortion, or by unjust accusation, false information, and calumny, which was especially denoted by συκοφαντεῖν. Thus the Hebr. בְּשֵׁם, to defraud, is by the Sept. rendered sometimes by συκο- φαντεῖν, at other times by ἐκπέζειν, ἀρπάζειν. Thus the Latin extorquere. Therefore extort seems to be the most correct representation of διασέβην †.

14. ἀρκεῖσθε τοῖς ὄψινίσσοις. The word ὄψιν, which is properly προσόψιον, ὄψον, is what we term meat, whe-

* So Vossius, in Vitâ Aureliani, writes thus to one of his Tribunés: "Si vis Tribunus esse, immò si vis vivere, manus militum contine.—Nemo pullum alienum rapiat, ovem nemo contingat, uvam nullus auferat, segetem nemo deterat, oleum, sal, lignum nemo evigat, annona suæ contentus sit.

† I am at a loss to imagine whence Dr. Doddridge could have learnt that διασέβω signifies 'to take a man by the collar and shake him.' It may have sometimes meant 'to harass,' or, as Dr. Doddridge phrases it, 'to bully.'
ther flesh, or fish. (See Thucyd. 1, 188.) In the early ages a soldier's *pay*, ὁμᾶνον, consisted chiefly in the supply of food and other necessaries. See Cæsar. B. Gall. 1, 23, 1. and Stewech. on Veget. 2, 19, p. 201. Hence it retained its signification when money was substituted for the supply of food, and ὁμᾶνον came to designate a soldier's *pay*, including some allowances besides the money. So Pollux, 6, 38. Ὑουκιδῆς δ' ἔφη εἰς ὁμᾶνον ᾦτησε προσβολον, where for Ὑουκιδῆς I conjecture Ἄπεριδῆς, for the words are not to be found in Thucydides. Dio. Cass. 353, 54. (de militibus): τοῖς δὲ διδομένοις ἄρκομενοι, where Fabricius observes: "Et Josephus suos esse voluit ἄρκουμένους τοῖς ἐστών ἐφοδίοις." In Constitutionibus Apostolicis, 4, 6. Inter impios, quorum oblationes rejiciendaræ ab Episcopo, refertur ἀπραβίσχος σουκοφάντης, μὴ ἄρκουμένοις τοῖς ὁμᾶνοις, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πέντεπα διασείων. Compare D. Cass. 53, 88. Joseph. de Vit. s. 47, 928, 24, ἱερουσαληνου (sicl. militibus) πρὸς μὴνεα μὴντε πολεμεῖν μὴτε ἀρταγηλλαμβάνειν τὰς χραμάς, ἀλλὰ σκηνοῦν κατὰ τὸ πέδιον ἄρκουμένους τοῖς ἐστών (I read αἰστών) ἐφοδίοις. It is remarkable, that the earlier writers use the word in the singular, the later ones in the plural; as we do wages, though formerly the singular of our word was in use, and is still retained in the North of England. So the Fr. gage. See H. Tooke's Diversions of Purley *. The thing is illustrated by the above cited passage of Jos. de Vit. 47.

16. ἀπεκρίνατο, addressed them. The words προσδοκῶν τοῦ λαοῦ Rosenmuller and Kuinoel propound by the following apt signification, to fluctuate amid hope and fear, to be in doubt and uncertainty; a signification not unfrequent. So Act. 28. 6. 27, 35.

20. προσέθηκεν καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσι, i. e. πονηροῖς, sce-

* Vol. 2d. p. 375, where, however, I cannot agree with the perspicacious Etymologist in his classification, which would have been more worthy of Mr. Whiter. I see not what affinity Keg and Key can have with Læggan, Ceggian, though cage is obviously from that source. But why not include catch, which can (I think) be referred to no other origin than the above Anglo-Saxon verb.
lera scelere auxit. A similar sense of the word has been produced from Polybius, by Raphel, and by Wetstein from Lucian. de Calumn. 17. ἔθουλῆθη προσθειναι καὶ τοῦτο τῇ λουκῇ μεγαλουργίᾳ. See 1 Sam. 12, 19. On ver. 22, 23. see the notes on Matth. 3, 13. et seq. The σώμα here mentioned is by the ancient Interpreters, and also some of the modern ones, as Rosenmuller, supposed to have been produced by lightening. By this visible sign men were rendered attentive, and might conclude that God had communicated extraordinary gifts to Jesus.

23. καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ωσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχώμενος. This passage has given no little trouble to the Commentators. See Wolf and Koecher. Most of the ancient ones, as also Grotius, Scaliger, and others, refer the participle ἀρχώμενος to ἦν, so that, in conjunction, they may be equivalent to "begun to be, was entering upon." But who ever heard in any good author of such a phrase as ἀρχεσθαι ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, for ἀρχέσθαι ἐτῶς τριάκόσιον.

"Nothing, I think, (says Campbell,) is plainer than that, by no rule of syntax, can the Greek words be so construed as to yield the sense which our translators have given them. Those who imagine that in so plain a case the Evangelist would have expressed himself in so obscure, so perplexed, and so unnatural a manner, have a notion very different from mine, of the simplicity of style employed by these writers. Besides, some Critics have justly remarked that there is an incongruity in saying, in any language, a man began to be about such an age. When we say, a man is about such an age, we are always understood to denote, that we cannot say whether it be exactly so, or a little more, or a little less; but this will never suit the expression, began to be, which admits no such latitude. To combine, in this manner, a definite with an indefinite term, confounds the meaning, and leaves the reader entirely at a loss."

Others take the ἀρχώμενος to be redundant, as in ver. 8. and in many other places; and they translate,
“erat Jesus circiter triginta annos natus.” Casaubon reads ἐρχόμενος, which conjecture is however confirmed by no MSS. The alterations and conjectures hazarded, are not worth mentioning. Others again, form the following construction: ἥν ἦσεν ἐτῶν τρίακοντα, ἐρχόμενος ὁν, ὁς ἐνομιζέτο, ὅς κ. τ. λ. he was about thirty years old, when he began to teach publicly, as it was then usual, being the son, &c. Luke (say they,) mentioned the age, to show that Jesus did not too early enter upon the function of public teacher, and that, according to custom, he did not enter upon this office before his thirtieth year. Such indeed, was the age at which the Levites were admitted to their ministration. See the Rabbinical citations in Wetstein. But this interpretation is very perplexed, and not agreeable to the rules of legitimate construction. Neither can it be proved that the Jewish prophets and Doctors did not enter upon their office before that age, nor that Jesus might not have entered upon it before his thirtieth year. Besides, it would thus have been, not ἐνομιζέτο, but νομίζεται, or νενόμισται. This being the case, I must accede to the opinion of those interpreters cited in Wolf and Koehler; namely, Schmid, Arndt, Starck, Keuchen, Grotius, Le Clerc, Lardner, Alberti, Wollius, Moldenhauer, and several others; to whom may be added, Just. Martyr, Origen, Euthymius, Lang, Heuman, Schulz, Rosenm. Schlesner, Griesbach, Bowyer, and Doddridge, who thus interpret: “Jesus was about thirty years old when he began to teach.” So also in other places, Jesus is said to have commenced his office from his baptism. See Acts 1, 22. 10, 37. The word ἀρχῇ put simply, occurs concerning the beginning of Christ’s ministry, in Joh. 15, 27. There is an ellipsis of διδάσκειν, as in Luke 23, 5. Heuman has cited from Diog. Laert. a passage where ἀρχασθαι is similarly used of the commencement of office. Ἀρχῇ, like the Heb. ג, signifies about. But the very use of the adverb plainly teaches, that nothing certain can be defined, respecting the age of
Christ at his baptism, and commencement of his ministry. Hence it is no wonder that the conjectures of commentators should be so various. See Wolf, Koecher and others. De Dieu, Bengel and Rosenm. are of opinion that the thirtieth year is to be understood, though one or two months be wanting. Allin and Lardner contend that Christ was in his thirty-second, or thirty-third year. Vogel thinks that it was the thirty-first year, Macknight and Paulus, the thirty-third. To the above interpretation adopted by Kuinoel, and to whom I am indebted for nearly the whole of the above matter, I must accede, since I conceive that this exposition involves the fewest difficulties, though I cannot help considering the ellipsis as somewhat harsh, nor are the examples cited, quite opposite; for instance, in that of Luke, δίδασκον immediately preceded, (and upon the whole, that passage bears quite a different construction.) “It does seem harsh (says Campbell,) that here there is no mention of, or even allusion to ministry.” To me, I confess, this sentence appears extremely disjointed and harsh, and much inferior to the usual style of our Evangelist. I cannot help suspecting some corruption: but in sacred criticism, I place little reliance on conjectural emendation. Theologians must wait for further collations of MSS. and the light which may be struck out, by the diligence and erudition of succeeding generations of philologists.

23. αὐτ (αὐς νομίζετο) οἶδα Ἰωσήφ. Examples of this sense of νομίζεσθαι, are produced by Wetstein, from various Greek authors. He then subjoins the following observations, on the intricate question involved in the comparative genealogies of Matthew and Luke. “Many interpreters, in order to reconcile the accounts of Luke and Matthew, think that here the lineage of Mary is detailed, whose father was Eli, and they interpret the article τοῦ, either son-in-law, if it be referred to Joseph, or, descendant, if to Jesus. But there is no reason why, in the same
genealogical series, where it *seventy-five times* denotes *son*, it should, for once, recede from that signification. If Luke had intended this, he would have written more explicitly, ἀν ὑπὸ Μαρίας τῆς Ἡλ. Besides (not to repeat what was before observed on Matthew, that the Jews paid no attention, in genealogies, to the mother,) since Joseph, who had adopted Jesus, was certainly descended from the family of David, it was not likely that Luke would pass over the lineage on the *father’s* side, which was the *more honourable*, to detail that on the *mother’s* side. The limited plan of this work, will not permit me to enter further into the discussion of this interminable question, which is the less necessary, since the reader will find it diligently, if not satisfactorily, treated by Mr. Elsley. I must further observe, that Wetstein quotes several examples of genealogies, detailed in a manner similar to that of our Evangelist, from Herodot. 4, 157. 7, 204. 8, 131. Phlegon. Trallian de Olympiis. Schol. on Pindar. Olymp. 13, 83. Ælian. N. A. 12, 31. Liban. Or. 10. p. 329. b. Suet. Jul. 6. 38. τοῦ 'Αδαμ, τοῦ Θεοῦ. So Virg. Æn. 6, 123. Quid Thesea, magnum quid memorem Alciden? et mi genus ab Jove summo. Ovid. Metam. 4, 688. Seu gloria tangit te generis magni, generis mihi Jupiter auctor. See Val. Flacc. 2, 560. It is to be observed, that though Matthew, writing for the Jews, had referred the origin of Christ to Abraham, Luke has traced it from Adam, the author of the human race, in order to signify that Jesus is the Saviour of the world, and was brought into it for the common welfare of the human race, and when he calls Adam the son of God, he signifies that Christ, born of a virgin, is the second Adam, and that his origin by the Holy Ghost is not less the sole work of Divine power, than was that of Adam. So Philo 1. p. 38. τοιοῦτος μὲν ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος κατὰ τε σῶμα καὶ ψυχήν γεγενηθαι μοι δοκεῖ, τοὺς τε νῦν ἄντας, καὶ τοὺς πρὸ ἡμῶν διεγεγομένας ἀπαυτὰς. 'Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἡμετέρας γενεαῖς ἐξ ἀνθραῖος ἐν, τὸν δὲ θεόν ἐδημιουργησεν' ἐφ’ ὅσον δὲ κρεῖττων
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Verse 1. εὐ τῷ πνεύματι. So Matth. 4, 1. οὕτω τοῦ πνεύματος. Æschyl. Ag. 1260. οὗτος ἀπαλλάσσωσιν εὖ θεῶν κρίσει.

2. ημέρας τεσσαράκοντα πειραζόμενος ύπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου. These words seem to cohere with πειραζόμενος, and express that Jesus was tempted for the space of forty days. Matthew, however, places this temptation at the expiration of forty days. Yet Luke's narration is not repugnant to that of Matthew and Mark, nor does he say that Jesus was tempted for forty days in succession; (see a similar passage in 1 Sam. 17, 16.) but only that Jesus, within the forty days, was exposed to various temptations besides those afterwards mentioned: An observation peculiar to Luke. (Kuin.)

5. These temptations are, by Matthew, placed in a different order: for which various reasons have been assigned. Rosenm. ascribes the variation to the Evangelists having drawn their information from different sources. Matthew (he thinks,) might have heard the history from the mouth of Christ, who, no doubt, often narrated it. But Luke, who was not the companion of Christ, derived his information from the Apostles, and other friends of our Lord: or from commentarii or memoranda of the life of Jesus, written in Syriac. Therefore it might easily happen, that Luke would put that circumstance in the second place, which was third. Such minute discrepancies, however, will not offend any candid reader. In the same light, the matter seems to be viewed by Kuin- noel.
5. On this verse, Wetstein observes: "Matthæus eo ordine tentationes recenset, quo in vitâ humanâ sese excipiunt, juvenes sollicitat voluptas, viros gloria, senes pecunia: at Lucas eum ordinem tenuit, ut gravior tentatio sequeretur leviorem; multi enim qui famem tolerant, paupertatem ferre non possunt, et qui paupertatem tolerant, contemptum ferre non possunt," But this, however ingenious, is somewhat fanciful.


14. ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος, by the influence and impulse of the Spirit.

16. The narration here inserted, teaches how it happened, that Jesus fixed his abode at Capernaum. (Kuin.)

16. καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγινώσκει. For it was a received custom, that the reading of the Scriptures should be performed, the minister and the people standing. See Lightfoot and Wets. and also Vitr. de Synag. p. 185. Not only were the Books of Moses read in the Synagogue on the Sabbath, but also those of the prophets. The five Books of Moses were so distributed for Sabbath reading, that the whole might be gone through in the course of the year. But to the reading of the Books of Moses, was always adjoined some such section of the Prophets as should seem to have an affinity in subject with the Mosaic portion of Scripture. Whether Jesus read the section presented from the Prophecies of Isaiah, or some other portion, cannot be determined: but the latter seems the more probable opinion. For we read that the ἰησοῦς offered the volume to Jesus, still rolled up: but that Jesus himself, unrolled the volume thus reached to him, and the lesson seems to have been selected by Jesus, since it excited an unusual degree of attention.
towards the reader. It cannot, however, be with certainty determined from hence, that prescribed portions of the Prophets were then read. It seems that those who might be endued with any learning (whatever might be their condition,) were called upon by the Master of the Synagogue, and requested to read a portion of Scripture. It is probable that Jesus, at the very time of rising, asked permission of the Ruler of the Synagogue, to read and expound, a request which, considering the extensive reputation of Jesus, would he readily granted. (Kuin.) Thus ἀναγνώσαι will denote not only prælegere but interpretari. So Philo (cited by Rosenm.) speaking of the custom of the Jewish synagogue: ὁμὲν βιβλίου ἀναγινώσκει λαβών, ἐτερος δὲ τὰν ἐμπειροτάταν, ἤσα μὴ γνώριμα παρελθόν ἀναγινώσκει.

17. βιβλίων. These βιβλία of the Hebrews, were rolls fastened to two laths with handles, by holding which in his hand, the reader could roll or unroll the book at his pleasure. See Hammond and Wolf.

18. ἐχρισέ μὲ εἰναγγελίζεσθαι. The word ἐχρισέ, does not denote so much the gift of the Spirit, as the injunctum munus. The Heb. עשה, signifies not only to be anointed, but also to be inaugurated, introduced into an office; which, with eminent persons, as kings, prophets, priests, &c. was always conferred byunction.

18. Sureniums, Vitringa and Griesbach point εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ ἐνεκόν, therefore he hath appointed. Then by πτωχοὺς must be understood persons of the lower rank, as opposed to the magnates.

18. ἱσώσασθαι τοῦς συντερμιμένους. The word συντρίβεσθαι is properly used of broken ships, or fracture and confusion of limbs; but here metaphorically of mental sorrow and anguish. So Wetstein cites Polyb. p. 1130. συντρίβεις τὴν διανοία καὶ δυσελπίσας. Plut. p. 238. Ε. τὸ δὲ τιμωλέουσας πάθος οὕτω κατέκλασε καὶ συνέτριψε αὐτῶν τὴν διανοίαν, and Kypke, Plut. 47. μὴ συντρίβεσθαι μηδὲ ἄδικεν. Αποστέλλειν ἐν ἀφέσει, is put for eis ἀφέσων, dimittere in libertatem, let
go free. Hesych. ἀφετίς, ἀπολύσις. Then τεθραυσμένος, signifies oppressed. So Deut. 28, 33. ἔστιν ἀδικοῦμενος καὶ τεθραυσμένος. The word is somewhat rare in a metaphorical sense; yet Wetstein supplies examples; as Herodot, 3, 2, 4. θραύσαι τὴν ἑλπίδα. Plutarch, θραυσμένος τῶν λογισμῶν. And Plut. 675. β. ἐτεθραυστὸ τῆς τάλμης.

19. There is here an allusion to the year of Jubilee, when, by sound of trumpet, was proclaimed liberty to the slaves, remission of engagements to debtors, and restoration of possessions to those from whom they had been alienated. Ἔνωσις, like the Heb. יָדָע, signifies time generally. Δέκτον denotes ἀρετῶν, acceptable, happy, fortunate. So 2 Cor. 6, 2. καίρος δέκτος. Hesychius explains it ἐπιρροεῖ δέκτον. The word (says Wetstein,) is unknown to the Classical writers. The primary sense of the passage is this: “Jusso divino prædico lætissimum Judæis tempus.” This sentence is in the style of the Hebrew Prophets, dilated by the introduction of examples not containing any new sentiment, but only in illustration of the first. (Rosenm. and Kuin.)

20. ἐκάθιε. As did the doctors: thus rightly claiming the office of doctor, for others, of the common people, even when they took any part in the sacred offices, did it standing. (Grots.)


21. σήμερον — ὑμῶν. That which I have just now read, ye see this day fulfilled by the event: for I, by the Divine command, announce to you times the most felicitous.

22. καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ. This is a phrase which signifies “to bear testimony to any one’s merits, to praise him;” of which, examples are pro-
duced by Kypke, Palairret, Raphel, Elsner, Krebs and Loesner.

22. ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων τῆς χάριτος, at his words of grace, i. e. graceful and eloquent expressions. See Wetstein's examples. Not however that we are to suppose that the people felt interested solely by his eloquence. "The effect (says Grot.) is not to be ascribed to the πειθω of human eloquence; but to the divine efficacy." See 1 Cor. 2, 4 & 7. Ps. 45, 2. Or, as Wolf says, the divine things treated of; or (as Kypke,) the joyful nature of the subject, evangelical truths full of solace and consolation. Kuinoel well observes, that χάρις λόγων is not unfrequently used of grateful and acceptable discourses; as in Ephes. 4, 29. Col. 4, 6. Sir. 21, 19. Prov. 7, 5, 28, 23.

23. Jesus was accustomed to dispel the doubts of his adversaries, even before they were formed; and this he does on the present occasion. Lest the Nazarenes should say that the prophecy was not really applicable to himself, he plainly tells them why, amongst them, he could not do such mighty works: namely, "because (says he) you despise me, and will cast at me the proverb, physician heal thyself." An adage thus common, both to the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew writers, of which Wetstein produces examples from Ἀeschyl. Prom. 463. Κακὸς δὲ ιατρός, δότες ἐς νόσον πέσων ἀθυμεῖς καὶ σεαυτῷ οὐκ ἐχείς εὑρέων, ὅποιος φαρμάκωις ἴασιμος. Plut. p. 71. e. Dio. Chrys. 540. Cic. Epist. 4, 5. Ovid. Met. 7, 561. Simplic. 73. Lucian de Merced. conduct. 7. κεῖνω τῷ φαρμακοπάλη ἔωις, ὃς ἀποκρύπτειν βηγὰς φαρμακον, καὶ αὐτίκα παῦσεν τοὺς πάσαντας ύπισχυόμενο, αὐτὸς μεταξος σηπόμενος ὑπὸ βηγὰς ἔφαινε. "Tanchuma on Genes. p. 61. Medice, sana claudicationem tuam. I add Aristoph. Conc. 402. ὅς δεινὰ τοιμαὶ των αἰ ψηφιογραφεῖν, καὶ ταῦτα περὶ σαρκις προκειμένου. Ὁς αὐτὸς αὐτῷ βλεφαρίδι οὐκ ἐσώσατο. See more in Crauser, Pincinelli and Schottus.

23. ὅσα ἤκουσαμεν γενόμενα εἰς τῇ Καπερναοῦμ. Yet
that Christ was previously at Capernaum, has not been mentioned by the Evangelist, though he relates that he was in Galilee, in which Capernaum is situated. Thus far. Kuinoel, who adds that similar instances of negligence may be found in the best historians, and adduces as an example, Liv. 21, 28. where the orator makes mention of a treaty entered into with the Saguntines, on the part of Asdrubal, by which the Carthaginian Senate denied that it held itself bound. Yet in Ch. 2, where Livy mentions this treaty, he omits that circumstance.

25. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ λέγω. Christ shows, by examples, that God more frequently communicates his extraordinary benefits to those who are capable of receiving them, passing over the unworthy. (Ros.) "As formerly Elijah and Elisha, when the Israelites had no faith in them, conferred their benefits on foreigners, thus (says Jesus) I, the Legate of God, since you despise me, will work no miracles among you, but confer my benefits on others, of whatever country they may be, who are desirous of my doctrine, and readily receive my instructions." Here, however, a difficulty encounters us. For in 1 Kings 18, 1, 45. we read that the rain fell again in the third year. Now, in order to remove this discrepancy, Lightfoot, Wetstein, and others, have remarked, that in Palestine it only rains twice a year, first, in October; secondly, in April; and that we must therefore suppose that, when the rain came, it had failed for three years, and that in the present passage there were added the six preceding months, during which it had not rained. Benson, on James 5, 17. (where there is a similar mention of three years and a half,) thinks that the third year is not to be reckoned from the cessation of the rain, but from the flight of Elijah to Sarapta (1 Kings 17, 8, seqq.) and that the fourth is to be numbered from the punishment of idolatry denounced by Elijah. Yet these hypotheses, however ingenious, are any thing but convincing. Kuinoel thinks that this additional
circumstance was derived from authorities known to
the writers of the New Testament, but which have
not come down to our age. This, indeed, seems the
most rational and satisfactory mode of treating the
discrepancy.

26. πρὸς γυναῖκα χήραν. By this and the following
example, Christ shows that miracles are not dis-
pensed out of private favour or affection, but ac-
cording to the unfettered and supremely wise coun-
sel of God, who knoweth where their exhibition will
produce beneficial effects. So Elijah of old preferred
the woman of Sarapta to his Israelitish country-
women. (Rosenm. from Grot.) On the town of Sar-
repta Wetstein has some long and interesting topo-
graphical details, to which I can only refer
the reader. The phrase γυναῖκα χήραν has the ap-
pearance of a pleonasm, of which Wetstein gives ex-
amples from the Greek and Latin writers. So we
say, a widow woman. Yet there is not so much a
pleonasm, as a plena oratio. For χήρα and vidua are
properly adjectives feminine.

29. ἐξέβαλον. I would render this word, "they
hurried him out of the city." So Schlesner, in his
Lex. compares Αἰlian, V. H. 9, 12. ἐξέβαλον τῆς πό-
λεως. The following word, ἔγαγον, is very tamely
rendered in the Versions led or brought, by Beza
duxerunt, by the Vulg. still worse, deduxerunt. The
word often has an adjunct notion of violence. Thus
Phavorinus explains it ἀρπάζω, rapio, abripio. It is
used especially of involuntary abduction; as, for in-
stance, to judgment, or to punishment. So Matth.
10, 18. Classical examples may be seen in Schl.
Lex. and Kuin. in loc.

29. ἐν ὀφρῶς. The word ὀφρῶς properly sig-
nifies the brow of the human body; but as the an-
cients figuratively applied the parts of the human
body to various objects in nature, so it was used to
denote the vertical prominence of a hill. So Hevych.
ὀφρῶς, τὰ κηπινώθη καὶ πράξα τῶν ὀρῶν. Of this
idiom Wetstein produces examples from Polyb. 7, 6.
Strab. 1172. D. παρειδήσ τις ὅφρος. As also from Galen, Aristotle, Nonnus, &c. Nor was it confined to rocky eminences, but was extended to earthy ones. So Plut. in Num. 57. ὅφρα γεώθης. Or to sandy ones. So Herodot. 4, 181. speaking of the sandy belt which crosses Africa, called the Zahara, ὅφρυς ψάμμης κατήκει. This passage is imitated by Aristid. 352. ὅφρος ἄμμωθης κ. τ. λ. Wetstein ad- duces examples of supercilium from Virgil. Georg. 1, 108. "Et cum exustus ager morientibus aestuat herbis. Ecce supercilio clivosi trami sit undam." This ὅφρος, which is exceedingly steep, from whence they intended to have thrown Jesus, is well described by Husselquist, whose words are cited by Parkhurst in his Lex. See also Pococke, and Reland’s Palestine, p. 907.

29. εἰς τὸ κατακρημνίσας. This was, indeed, a kind of death sometimes legally adjudged, and was in use among the ancient Romans. The hurling from the Tarpeian rock must be familiar to every one of my readers. Here, however, as the power of life and death was taken from the Jews by the Romans, it would have been a mere tumultuary proceeding, (like the stoning of Stephen,) to which sort of illegal violence the Jews of that age were exceedingly prone.

30. διελθαν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν, ἐπορεύετο. By divine power, say most Commentators. Tertullian, Hum- man, and Markland, however, endeavour to account for it without resorting to a miracle.

32. εἰν ἔξωσία ἡν. Periphrasin facit adjectivus. (Schl. Lex.) who has an example from Αelian. I add, Pind. Olymp. 1, 141. εἰν πτεροίσιν τ’ ἀκαμάντας ἴππους.

38. ἱπάτης. 'Εγατάω, like the Latin rogare, denotes to pray, entreat, request.
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To this, indeed, the word seems appropriately applied; (see Liban. ap. Wets.) of which Luke, as a physician, must have been aware: and it is observed by Weddelins, (ap. Wolf,) that he has for that reason related this circumstance more accurately.

41. ἐπείρεσιν. Jesus seems to have prohibited him from speaking, in order to show that he needed not this sort of testimony; rather wishing by his doctrine and miracles to prove his Messiahship. (Rosenm.)

CHAP. V.

Peter and Andrew, John and James, who had chiefly acknowledged our Lord's divine mission, and received his instructions, but, for subsistence, had exercised their vocation of fishing, are now assumed by him as perpetual companions. The present narration does not differ from that of Matth. 4, 18. and Mark 1, 16. seqq. but the thing is more copiously detailed by Luke, more briefly by Matthew and Mark, from whom we learn, that it it took place before those miracles had been performed by Jesus, which are mentioned in Matth. 4, 23. seqq. and Mark 1, 16. seqq. compared with ver. 36, Luke 4, 31. Luke, however, says that it happened after them, and thus he has not followed the order of time so accurately. (Kuinouel.)

Verse 2. ἀξιά. ἐστιώτα παρὰ τὴν λίμνη. Campbell renders this aground, for three reasons, which may, however, be reduced into one, namely, that the vessels were mere boats, and therefore might more easily run aground, or be drawn on shore. But he has not proved that they were mere boats: they appear to have been like our fishing-smacks, of which even the smallest use anchors. The sense for which he contends is not at all more apposite to the context, and is, as far as I can remember, destitute of authority. The word σταύρωμα, and the Latin stare, are frequently put for ships riding at anchor,

2. ἀκτύλινως τὰ δίκτυα, washed off the sea-weed and filth.

3. ἄναγγελεῖν ὀλῖγον, scil. ῥαῦν. The Codex Cant. has ὅσον, which is the more elegant reading, as may be seen by the passage of Herodot. 7, 100. τὸς δὲ νέας ὑπ' ἐναυγαχὸι ἄναγγέλτες ὅσον τε [I conjecture ye'] τέσσερα πλέθρα ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰγμαλῶν. Chariton 5, 18. ὀλῖγον ὅσον, but this ὀλῖγον, perhaps, crept in from an interpretation. So Hesych. ὅσον, ὀλῖγον. On this nautical term, and ἄναγεῖν and καταγεῖν, see Wess. and Valck. on Herodot. 3, 76, 6, 41. The ἐκ here answers to our word ward in composition, as to sea-ward. See Schl. Lex. A similar expedient, and for a purpose not very dissimilar, was made use of by Julian, as we learn from Eunap. p. 161, which passage I thus amend: ἐπιβάς πλοίου, τὸ πλοῖον ἀνέχων ἀξίω ταξιθμάτως, διελέγετο τοῖς βαρβάροις.

4. καλάσταται δίκτυα, let down. A term properly appropriated to fishing: though I find in Æsop καλιέναι δίκτυαν, and in Ælian, H. A. 1, 14. τὸ δίκτυον ἐξαν, βίστη τὸν βόλον. Theocr. Id. 1, 40. δίκτυον ἐς βόλον ἔλεγε, where the Scholiast explains εἰς ἄγραν. Eis ἄγραν. The word ἄγρα properly denotes the action of hunting or fishing; and so Kuinoel here interprets. But it should rather be explained the thing caught, the prey; and so the Latin captura in Pliny, V. N. 10, 40. referred to by Kuinoel.

5. ἑπιστάται. Ἑπιστάτης properly denotes him who is set over any persons or things, and amongst others the office of instruction, and then it is equivalent to Rabbi, teacher, &c. Nor is this a mere Hebrew, or Hellenistic, use of the word, but often
occurs in the Classical writers, as the Etym. Mag. and Eustathius testify. See Grotius.

5. ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ νῷματι τ. χ. τ. δ. ἡ ὁμοιὰ corresponds to the Hebr. נָשָׁה, and signifies mandate. It is not, however, merely a Hebraism, but is found in a monumental inscription in Herodot. 7, 228: κεῖμενα, τοὺς κείνους νῷμασι πειθόμενοι. This passage confirms the opinion that there is an ellipsis of πειθοῦς. The δὲ (but) indicates Peter's hesitation: and it is well observed that this answer implies a modest doubt, since to experienced fishermen it must have seemed hopeless, after having thrown the net all night, (the proper time for fishing,) to cast it in the day-time, in the very sight of the fishes, and in shallow water. (Kuinoel.) See Theophyl. 385. δ.

6. συνέκλεισαν. So the Latin concluserunt. These words are appropriate both to hunting and fishing, and are illustrated by Wetstein with examples. I add, Herodot. 1, 141. περιλαβεῖν πλῆθος πολλῶν τῶν ἱχθῶν. Philostr. Im. 784. s. f. ἀμηχανοῦντες δὲ τι χρῆσονται τῷ πλῆθει. It is well observed by Wolf, that this miraculous draught of fish was partly a compensation for their toil, and partly prefigurative of the success which Peter, the fisher of men, was to have.

6. δεισάργυντο τῷ δίκτυῳ. Here Glass, Raphael, Wolf, Koecher, and Kuinoel, interpret, "began to break," "was now breaking:" for verbs completive (says Glass) are often used as indicative. They object to the interpretation their net broke: "for had that been the case (say they) it would have held no fish: and certainly, in such a case, we need not (with some interpreters) resort to a miraculous suspension of the laws of nature." The above may be admitted; but I question whether it be necessary: for it is possible to suppose the nets to be only broken in a small degree, and in such a part as would not materially affect the draught; and perhaps this is the most natural and satisfactory mode of considering the circumstance. Bulkley
cites Olaus Magnus 20, 3. where that Chronicles tells us that he had seen, upon the Bothnian shore, such a number of salmon taken as to have the effect here spoken of upon the nets. The same, he says, not unfrequently occurs in the herring fishery. See Ch. 22.

7. κατένευσαν, i. e. with their hands, not with their heads, beckoned, probably as being too far off, or perhaps they beckoned and spoke at the same time. See the note on Luke 1, 22. So Thucyd. 1, 134. ἡλικιωτάς χρησαμένην. Jos. 718, 16. ἐνευσα τοῖς νεκροποιεῖσθαι. Eurip. Iph. T. 1330. ἡμᾶς μὲν ἐξέβουσ ἀποστήναι.

7. συλλαβέσθαι. The following statement of the syntax of this verb may prove useful to the student. In complete construction it has a dative of the person governed of σω in composition; a genitive of the thing dependant upon περὶ understood, and an accusative of the thing also dependant on κατὰ understood. But in the regular use of the phrase, as it is found in the best Greek authors, the accusative is found almost always omitted, not unfrequently the genitive, and sometimes all three.

7. ἠστε ἑυβίβασθαι, so that they were sinking, began to sink. It must be observed that this is the participle imperfect.

8. προσέπεσε τοῖς γόναις τ. Ι. After the manner of suppliants, (say Doughty, &c.) who fell at the feet and embraced the knees of those from whom they sought protection: which custom is illustrated by Doughty, Pincinelli, Munthe, and Brunings. But I know not whether it can apply to the present passage, for this seems rather to denote a sort of adoration paid to a Divine person.

8. ἔξελθε ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ. Respecting the scope of these words the Commentators differ. I cannot advert to some absurd fancies detailed by Koecher, and the far-fetched method of interpretation proposed by Elsley. The most rational mode of expounding the words is, I think, that of Euthymius, Capellus, Gro-
tius, Lightfoot, Rosenm. and Kuinoel. “It seems to be an exclamation indicative of profound humility and deep reverence. “Peter could not but conclude (says Doddridge) that there was some peculiar presence of God with a person who could perform such a miracle; and a consciousness of sin made him afraid to appear in the presence of such an one, lest some infirmity or offence should expose him to some more than ordinary punishment.” (Compare Judg. 6, 22. 13, 22. and 1 Kings 17, 18.) The above may have been a proverbial formula; though the Philologists produce nothing in illustration of it.

9. θάμβος γ. π. α. This word denotes not horror, as Kuinoel explains, but rather a sort of extatic won- der and awe. See Schl. Lex. That he should have felt amazement is not surprising, for (says Wetstein) he had indeed seen disorders healed by Christ, but now he discovers that he has dominion over the water and the fish, (Psal. 8.) not, however, to destroy them, as did Moses, but, what is far greater, con- trive, by their capture, to confer benefits on men. (See Exod. 7.) “Peter seems (says Le Clerc) to have been more astonished at the draught of fishes than at the cure of the sick at Capernaum: perhaps from a notion common among the Jews, that the prayers of holy men, with imposition of hands, might have power to heal the sick, and eject evil spirits.”

9. ἐν τῇ ἀγγα τῶν ιχθῶν ἢ συνέλαβον. Homberg would take συνέλαβον for petulati erant. But this Kypke refutes by a passage from Eurip. Or. 1346. φίλοι ξυφηρεῖς, οὗι συλλήψεατ άγγαν. But there the construction is somewhat different, as the accusative depends upon κατὰ understood. The common inter- pretation is, however, sufficiently defended by the context. Kypke has more successfully illustrated άγγαν ιχθῶν from Eurip. Bacch. 1201. οἷς ἁγατε τὴν δ’ ἀγγαν—θρᾶς ἄν ἔγραυμεν. ἤ is put for ἦν by a well-known idiom. Συλλαμβάνω is used as περιβελεῖν
tō πλῆθος τῶν ἰχθύων, cited on verse 6, where one may, not absurdly, conjecture περιλαβεῖν.

10. μὴ φοβοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθράκτως ἐγὼ ἁγγεῖον. The passage may be thus paraphrased: "Fear not me, who am a Divine Messenger: you must hereafter be drawn within the bands of a closer connection with me. You must be my disciple, and a teacher of men." Jesus employed the image which then spontaneously offered itself. Terms of hunting and fishing are, by the Greek and Hebrew writers, sometimes used of those who attach men to themselves, or others. So Sohar ap. Schoettgen, scivit venari venationem hominum. I add, Diog. Laert. 6, 96. ἐθνικὴ δὲ τῶι λόγοις τοῦ M. Diog. Laert. 4, 24. ἐρωτήθησα τίνι θηραθεὶς ὑπὸ Πολέμων, and 4, 16. ἀκοον δὲ τὸ μεσάκιον, κατ’ ὀλίγον ἐθνικῆθη, and C. 17. Socrat. ap. Xenoph. Mem. 2, 6, 29. οὐκ ἀπείρος οἴμαι ἀχεὶν θῆραι ἄνθρακτως. So also Diog. Laert. 4, 16. where a dissolute youth is reformed on hearing the ethic dissertation of Xenocrates on temperance, it is said: ἀκοον δὲ τὸ μεσάκιον κατ’ ὀλίγον ἐθνικῇ. Plut. Cleom. 13. οἰς φόβῳ φίλου διαφεροντα μυθιστόν, ἡ τῶν τῶν καὶ λόγῳ, τῶδε ὑπὸ χρημάτων ἀλίσκεσθαι. Timon Phliasius ap. Plutarch, Num. Πυθαγόρην δὲ γούτας ἀποκλίνοντ' ἐκλ δόξῃς Θῆρα ἐπ' ἄνθρακτως. Delian, V. H. Πλαταίων — παρελθὼν ἦκουσε Σωκράτους, καὶ ἄποιες ἀρέσκεις ὑπὸ τῆς εἰκόνος Σειρήνος κ. τ. λ. Theopomp. ap. Athen. 260. c. πλείον τῶν Θ. ἢρειτο μᾶλλον ἐν ταῖς συνωνταις ἡ ταῖς δωρεάσις, where I would cancel the ἐν, which seems to have arisen from the ὣν of the preceding word. Christ signifies (says Grot.) that the Apostles, not by their own skill, but but by his command and influence, would, on spreading forth the nets of the Gospel, catch so great a number, that they would need the assistance of many ἐναγγέλονται.

14. ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν ἰδίῳ. The Commentators remark on the transition from the oratio directa to the obliqua, which is frequent in the best ancient authors, (see Kypke,) though rejected by the modern
ones. It seems to be a relic of the simple phraseology of the primitive ages and languages.

17. καὶ ἐγένετο — Ἱερουσαλήμ. By Κύριος many Commentators understand Christ Himself, and thus explain: “The power of Christ exerted itself in healing the sick.” Rosenm. and Kuinoel understand by Κύριος God, and interpret, “the Divine power was with him in healing the sick.” After ἰησοῦ must be supplied μετ’ αὐτῶν. By αὐτῶν must not be understood the Pharisees and Lawyers, who are nowhere said to have been healed, and who even calumniated him, but rather by αὐτῶν are meant the sick of that town, such as had been brought to Christ. So Kuinoel, who cites a canon of Glass, namely, that the Hebrew writers use the pronoun relative, when there is no antecedent noun, though it may be easily understood from the context.

19. ἀνασάλλετε εἰς τὸ δώμα. By this the Sept. render the Hebr. ל, roof. Yet it is pure Greek. See Schl. Lex. By κεράμων is meant the tiles. Wetstein cites Thucyd. 2, 48. Herodian, 1, 12, 16. εἰς τῇ δωματίᾳ ἀνασάλλετε λίθοι καὶ κεράμων ἐβαλλόν τοὺς ἰστρεῖς. The singular is used in Thucydides, and other ancient Attic writers, and may be rendered tiling.

20. ἐκστασὶς ἠλάβεν ἄφαντας. So Hom. II. λ. 402. φόβος ἠλάβε τάνατος. Xen. Cyr. 5, 5, 6. ἄλλοι σε ἀτομοὶ λήπνονται. (Wets.) See also Schwartz. Comment. Dr. Mangey conjectures that one of the two words φόβος and ἐκστασὶς is a gloss on the other. But the ideas are very different (observes Grot.) they were struck with wonder, and full of reverence at the Divine power.” On this Euthymius has well remarked: τὰ παράδόξα γὰρ εἰσίδαι; φόβον ἐμποίειν τῶν ἀραπτολοίων, μὴ τὸν τι δεινὸν πάθωσι, διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτιας αὐτῶν.

26. παράδόξα. The word denotes what is παρὰ δόξαν, beyond one’s expectation, and, from the adjunct, unusual, wonderful. These senses are illustrated
in the passages produced by Wetstein, Munthe, Loesner, and others: to which may be added Sirach 43, 25, or 29. παράδοξον καὶ θαυμαστή ἔργα.

29. δοκής μεγάλην. The word δοκή is derived from δέχεσθαι, to receive, entertain, and therefore signifies an entertainment, or feast. It answers to the Heb. בַּרְאֹת, in Gen. 21, 8. ἀποίημεν ἀ. δοκή μεγάλην, and 8 Esd. 3, 1. Diod. Sic. 17, 105. ὑποδοχήν παρισίδον. Sir. 14, 13.

30. Γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν, i.e. the scribes of that place, viz. the Capernaumites or Galileans. So De Dieu, Grotius, Rosem. and Kuinoel. Other less probable expositions may be seen in Wolf. The word αὐτῶν was omitted in some copies, namely, because the interpreters knew not to which it should be referred.

31, 32. οἷς χαῖειν ἡχοῦσιν—μεταναίων. See the note on Matth. 9, 12. to which I add a similar passage of Diogenes, recorded by Dio Chrys., Orat. 8. p. 181. Morell. ἦν ἐν τῷ Κρανίῳ ὄργανον εἶναι γὰρ ἐμπεθεῖν ἐνδοίχαι τοιαῦτα λειτουργεί. Ἰδίᾳ τοις λίμναις καὶ τάσις ἐνταρασσόμενοι εἰς ἄρριψαν ἀλλάξας, τούτων ἡκούσας ξαφνικῶς ἀπετύχθησαν οὕτως ἑκάστῳ εἰς τὸν ἀφροέστερον, ἦκει μάλιστα ἀκούσαν, ἐξελέγχοντα καὶ κολάζοντα τὴν ἀνολαν αὐτῶν.

32. ο '&#130;κ εὐπαθῶς—μεταναίως. So Maimonides de Penit. 7, 4. p. 88. (cited by Bulkley.) "In loco quo stant penitentes stare non possunt perfecte justi, i.e. illorum excellentia horum excellentia qui nunquam peccarunt longe est major, quoniam majore difficultate affectus, sua subigerunt priores quam posteriores."

36. οἷς συμφονεῖ ἐπίθλημα τὸ ἀπὸ καινοῦ. I believe τὸ ἐπίθλημα τὸ, &c. had been better Greek, as Ch. 6, 41. τὸ κατὸς, &c. and τὴν δικαίαν, τὴν, &c. But the word ἐπίθλημα is wanting in so many copies, and is so unnecessary, that it seems to be an ἐπίθλημα. The nominative case to σχίσει: I take to be οἱ ἄνθρωποι, be fetched out of ὑδης, which is ἄνθρωπος οὐ, as nemo
in Latin is often homo non. If τὰ καυὼν be the nominative case, then after σχίζει is to be understood τὰ παλαιὸν. (Markland.)

39. ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστότερός εστίν, i. e. softer, milder, and therefore better. On the subject of the preference to old wine over new, which was proverbial in ancient times, Wetstein has many citations from the Classical writers. So Pind. Olymp. 9, 78. αὐξεῖ ὑπὲρ παλαιῶν μὲν οἶνον, αὖθεα δ' ἡμών νεωτέραν. Lucian, 26. τοῦ ἄλλου ἠδυντόν τε καὶ παλαιότατον οἶνον πινώντων, μόνος σὺ τοσοῦτο τινα καὶ παχὺ πίνεις. Lucian, Amm. 3. οἶνος ἤδη καὶ παλαιὸς ἤν. I add, Stob. 585. from Alexis in his Demetrius: ὁμοιώτατον ἀνθρώπου—διότι ἄλλωσι. And Alexis ap. Athen. 441. d. εἶσαι δὲ (scil. ὁ οἶνος) καὶ μαλὰ Ἡδὺς γ', ἠδυντας οὐκ ἠχον, ἴδῃ σαπρὸν ἄγκαν γέροντα δαιμονίων ἀσπάζομαι γραφέω, σφίγγα κ. τ. λ. In applying this comparison to the case of the Pharisaical and Christian doctrines, Commentators vary. Many (as does Wetstein) say that the austerity of the Pharisees is compared to new wine, the mildness of Jesus to old wine. But (as Kuinoel remarks) Christ’s instruction was just before compared to the new wine and the new garment. Far more probable is the exposition of Euthymius: ὁ τῆς παλαιότητι τῶν νομῶν συνήθισεν, οὐκ εὐθὺς δύναται τὸν καινότητα τῶν ἑαυτῶν ξηραστάχθειν οἴρται γὰρ χρηστότερον ἔκαστον, διὰ τὴν σωφροσύνην. “He who is accustomed to the antiquity of the Law cannot bear the novelty of the Gospel, since he thinks the old preferable, from having been accustomed to it.” For (as L. Brug. well observes) “use forms the taste.” Christ teaches them, therefore, that men are not suddenly to be initiated into austerities.

CHAP. VI.

VERSE 1. εὐ σαββάτῳ δευτεροχραμτί. This is one of those passages to interpret which we must (as Casaubon, on some other occasion, shrewdly remarks) wait for the coming of Elias. What is the exact
meaning of this ambiguous word, δευτ. (which has a very anomalous air,) it is impossible to pronounce with certainty. I cannot enter into the various opinions and conjectures of the Commentators, but must be content with referring the student to Wolf, Koecher, Doddridge, and Elsley. The opinion of Theophylact, Scaliger, Lightfoot, and Whitby, is that which has been embraced by almost all recent critics. They expound πρωτον ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας τοῦ πάσχα the first sabbath after the second day of the Passover, on which the handful of corn was, by Divine command, offered up. For in Levit. 23, 15. God directs the Jews to number the seven weeks of the Pentecost, ἀπὸ δευτέρας τοῦ πάσχα, from the second day of the Passover, from the last sabbath day. Now since the weeks are directed to be numbered to the Pentecost, not from the very day of the Passover, but from the one immediately subsequent, and to the Jews a day of great note, as being that on which they offered the first fruits of the corn, it is no wonder that all the sabbaths from the Passover to the Pentecost, took the appellation ἀπὸ τῆς δευτέρας τοῦ πάσχατος. Therefore the word δευτερόπρωτος is not compounded of δευτέρα and πρωτον, but of δευτέρα and πρωτον, to signify the second first sabbath, that sabbath which immediately follows the second day of the Passover. Wetstein offers the following explanation: “Intelligo erroneas primum sabbatum mensis secundi, quo legebatur Paraschæ 31. Emor. ex Levit. 21, 1. ad 25, 1. in qua reperitur lex de panibus sacris (cap. 24, 9.) de qua Christus hic loquitur. Vidi autem ex Calendario Judaico, intra annos 127 lectionem hujus ipsius Paraschæ sive sectionis vicies septies in terrâ Israelis incidere in primum sabbatum mensis secundi Jiar.” Ezech. 44, 16. Other interpretations have been proposed, for which I must refer the student to Wolf and Koecher, Rees, in his Harm. Evang. and the acute and learned Bp. Marsh on Michaels. But none of these (as Rosenm. observes) rise above probability. See Mr. Horne’s Introduction, vol. 3, 165.
11. ἔπλησθησαν ἀνοίας, ῥαβία, ἀμεντία, συρούρε; as in Thucyd. 3, 48. Diod. Sic. 441. d. 2 Macc. 4, 6. 14, 5. 15, 33. We have this idiom in our own language, in the use of the word mad; though it is confined to the vulgar. See also Acts 26, 11. ἐμμακάνωμενοι αὐτοῖς. Philemon (cited by Grot.) μακανωμενα πάντες ὁπόταν ὀρογιομεδα. See H. Tooke, 341.

12. ἵνα διανυκτερεύαν ἐν τῇ προσεύχῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ. On the interpretation of the word προσεύχῃ, there has been no little diversity of opinion. Some commentators, as Drusius, Mede, Hammond, Olearius, Scheudler, Wollius, Whitby, Markland, Wetstein, Campbell, Watts, Doddridge, and Prideaux, maintain that προσεύχῃ, must here signify a proseucha, or oratory: and that certain Jewish places of worship were so called, has been proved by the numerous passages cited by Wetstein, from Joseph. Ant. 14, 10, 28. and Vit. 53, 54, 56, & 57. 1 Macc. 3, 46, 47. Phil. T. 2. p. 565, 2. and p. 574, 3. d. p. 567, 27. and p. 568, 26. Epiphan. H. 80. Philo de Vit. Mos. p. 168, 3. Cleomeds, in 2. circularis inspectionis libro adversus Epicurum. Juvenal. 3, 296. Ede ubi consistas, in qua te quero prosucha. Acts 16, 18, 16. The arguments adduced by those on this side of the question are, that these proseuchae were out of the towns, (Acts 16, 13.) and that an oratory of that sort, may as well be προσεύχῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ, as ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, in Acts 26, 61. and 2 Thes. 2, 4.: that προσεύχῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ, taken in the sense of prayer unto God, is abhorrent from the simplicity of scriptural diction; and that the word διανυκτερεύειν noctem consumere, vigilare, properly respects some place where the night is spenst. The objections to the common interpretation are, by Campbell, thus speciously and acutely stated. "The common signification of προσεύχῃ is indeed prayer, but both προσεύχῃ and δένσις (a term of nearly the same import,) are always, in the New Testament, construed with the preposition πρὸς, before the object addressed. See Acts 12, 5. Rom. 10, 1. 15, 30. Heb. 5, 7. And when either term is followed by the
genitive of a word, denoting a person, it is invariably the person praying, not the person prayed to. See James 5, 16. Rev. 5, 8. 8, 3. Though the words occur in the Sep. and in the N. T. times without number, the genitive is not, in a single instance, employed to denote the being to whom supplication is made. Such a mode of interpretation would be subversive of the analogy of the language. The only way of avoiding this error here, is by assigning another meaning to the word προσευχή, and translating it a house, or place of prayer, an oratory. That there is undoubted authority for this meaning of the word, is shewn by the examples produced by Wetstein, from Philo, Josephus, and others. Luke uses it again in the same sense, Acts 16, 13, 16. As the word, thus applied, peculiarly regarded the Jewish worship, it was as much appropriated as the word συναγωγή. But these objections seem to have little or no weight, and the common interpretation has been ably and satisfactorily defended by Vitringa Syn. Jud. p. 122. Kypke, Schleusner, and Kuinoel. In fact, διανυκτερέων, signifies "to pass the night," and is not only used of places, but of things and business, about which any one is employed. In this sense, Kypke cites Diod. Sic. 13, 62. διανυκτερεύων εν τοῖς δόλοις ὑπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν. So Appian. Bell. Pun. 130. and several other passages. But δίαλος often denotes situation and place, as castra, and sometimes (as in the two passages above,) armatura, armour, and therefore ἐν δόλοις does not refer to thing, or employment, but has merely the sense of μεθ’ δίαλοι. See Sturz. in Lex. Xen. Wolf more appositely cites Phal. Ep. τῷ λαβων διανυκτερεύει. It must moreover be observed, that τοῦ Θεοῦ is here, as often, a genitive of object,

* In this acception, Latin writers transferred it into their language. That line of Juvenal is well-known, Sat. 3. "Ede ubi consistas, in qua te quæro proseucha." Now, when the meaning is a house of prayer, the expression ἡ προσευχή τοῦ Θεοῦ, is analogous to ὁ οἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ, the house of God, and to ὁ ἱερόν τοῦ Θεοῦ, the temple of God. (Campb.)
i.e. it denotes the object about which any one is occupied; (on this sense, see Glass, Gr. Sacr. 108. and Vorst. Phil. Sacr. 165 and 287,) and in this sense it frequently occurs in the new Testament. See Matth. 9, 35. 10, 1. Acts 4, 9. 1 Joh. 2, 5. So Jos. Ant. 9, 9. ἐπὶ δὲ ἐναὶ καὶ ἱκαίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ κατέφε. Here it must be observed, that the genitive has the force of πρὸς, with an accusative. So Liv. 2, 8. inter precationem Deum. The sentiment therefore intended to be expressed in the present passage, is the same as that in Acts 1, 14. προσκαρτερεῖν τῷ προσευχῆς καὶ τῷ δεησει. Certainly had προσευχῆς been used in the sense of oratory, the article would have been employed, and Campbell and others, in vain cite the expressions ὁ θικός τοῦ Θεοῦ, and τὸ ιερόν τοῦ Θεοῦ since these were applied solely to the Temple at Jerusalem, so called κατὰ ἔξοχην. As to the argument urged by Campbell, namely, that we generally say the church, where there is but one church, I must remark that the idiom is merely modern, and (as far as I can remember) is without parallel in the Greek language. Moreover, the sense arising out of the above interpretation, appears far less apposite, and is indeed, somewhat frigid. By προσευχῆς we are to understand not merely prayer, but holy meditation, and that devout thoughtfulness which usually precedes, accompanies, and follows fervent prayer. In this view, I may appositely cite Artemid, 8, 58. προσευχῆς, καὶ μεταλλω, καὶ πάντες ἀνθρώποι.—πνεύμα λύπην προσγορεύουσι τούτο μὲν γὰρ οὐδές ἀπεισὶς ἐστὶ προσευχῆς, μὴ οὐχὶ φεοντίζον σφόδρα τούτο δὲ κ. τ. λ. Nor must I omit to notice the excellent remark of Schoettgen; “Servator noster alicuius solitus est noctem precipius transigere, quod Judæis non erat insconsuetum. He appositely cites Berachoth, fol. 14, 1. Docuit R. Chijia ex ore R. Jochanan: quicunque satiat se verbis legis, et deinde in oratione pernoctat, illi nemo ferret nuntium malum. The article, from which Mede in vain seeks to fortify the interpretation oratory, is used in this passage of
Luke, as in Matth. 21, 22. πάντα δόμα δὲ αἰτήσατε ἐκ τῆς προσευχῆς, in both which places it is difficult to express the force of the article, though in this of Luke, there seems a reference to προσευχήσωμαι, which precedes. On the difference between the proseuchae and synagogues, I must refer the reader to Mr. Elsley’s annotation, and to Mr. Horne’s Introduct. vol. 3. 238.

13. ἀποστόλους. On this important term, see the note on Matth. 10, 2, to which I now add, that our Saviour here employed the Syriac, or Chaldee Syriac ἀποστόλος, which, as Baronius and Schoettgen observe, was not a new designation, but had been long ago employed by the Jews, to denote any one deputed to act for another, either by the delivery of a message, or the negociation of any affair whatever. It appears, from the Rabbinical citations of Schoettgen, that the term was chiefly confined to persons sent on public business, as ambassadors, nuncios, or envoys. On these ἀποστόλοι, or Legates and Apostles of the Jews, I can only refer the reader to the elaborate note of Vitringa de Syn. Jud. 577, and must content myself with subjoining the following passage of Joma, fol. 18, 2, selected from the valuable Rabbinical illustrations of Schoettgen; where the seniors thus address the priest: Ἀντιπάλους μετὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Ἀποστολίς συμμετέχομεν σὺν τῷ συνεδρίῳ, tu vero es legatus noster et Synedrii: Adjuramus erga te per eum, qui in hoc templo habitat, ne festo expiationis aliter quicquam agas, quam nos tibi praecipimus. On the number, names, dignity, office and authority of the Apostles, I must refer the reader to the above-mentioned tract of Vitringa de Syn. Jud. 577. Ittig. Hist. Eccles. 432. Spanheim Dissertat. de Apostolicis in vol. 2. Book 3. of his works; Suicer’s Thes. in voce, Heins. Exerc. p. 155. Basnage, Annal, Eccles. p. 288. Witchin’s Misc. Sacr. 1, 21. Cav. Antiq. Apost. p. 179. Walchius’s Hist. Eccles. and many others, specified by Wolf and Koecher. The consummate wisdom of our Lord, as evinced, with refer-
ence to the end proposed in this choice of the Apostles, has been judiciously pointed out by Mr. Locke, in his "Reasonableness of Christianity."

17. εν τούτῳ πέδινῳ. The situation was, however, at once that of a mountain, and a plain, i. e. a sort of table-land; and thus (as Keuchen observes,) this account of Luke is reconciled with that of Matth. Ch. 5. For I assent to Keuchen, Rosenm. and others, that the narrations have respect to the same circumstance. And (as Rosenm. observes,) the exordium and the peroratio prove them to be the same, and so much the more, since each writer adds, that Christ, on concluding his discourse, returned to Capernaum, and there healed the Centurion’s servant. That the discourse here recorded by Luke, is substantially the same with the Sermon on the mount, in Matthew, has been fully proved by Kuinoel on Matth. p. 116. Yet, that there still remains some difficulty, cannot be denied. The points of difference, and the probable causes thereof, have been copiously pointed out by Kuinoel on the present passage, to whom I must be content to refer my readers. See also, Mr. Elsley’s note on v. 20. That it was a plain on a mountain, and, as is usually supposed, Mount Tabor, is confirmed by the following citations produced by Wetstein. Hieronym. ad Hos. 5. Est autem Thabor mons in Galilæâ, situs in campestribus, rotundus atque sublimis ex omni parte finitur aequaliter. Adamannus 1, 11. Mons Thabor, in Galilæâ 111. m. a lacu Cinnereth distat, mira rotunditate ex omni parte collectus, a parte boreali respiciens supradictum stagnum, herbosus valde et floridus, in cuius amoenâ summitate ampla planitites silva prægrandi circumsincita habetur, cuius in medio campo Monachorum inest grande monasterium, et plurimæ eorumdem cellæ, nam illius montis campestris vertex non in angustum coarctatur cacumen, sed in latitudinem dilatur stadiorum.

17. τῆς παραλίου. Subaud χαράς, or γῆς: though the ellipsis is scarcely ever supplied, and Segasar has
well observed, that παράλειος is generally used of regions and countries, very rarely of cities, in which case the word παραλαμβάνειν is usually employed.

17. Two sorts of persons are here mentioned; those who came to hear him, which probably included those who came from the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, and who were heathens, and came out of curiosity; and those who came to be healed of their diseases. (Markland.)

18. ὑχλοπέμενοι ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαδέγασεν, vexed. The verbs ὑχλεισθαι and ἐνοχλεισθαι, denote to hinder, trouble, vex, &c. by irksome business of any kind, but especially by painful and chronical diseases, which confine the patient, and hinder him from attending to his usual occupations. Of this sense, many examples are produced by Wetstein, Loesner, and others.

19. ἐξήρχετο, exerted itself, was efficacious. So the Hebr. נָשִׁים in Ruth 1, 19. If the men of those times thought that the potency, by which the sick were healed, proceeded from Jesus by a sort of efflux, it was mere stupid fancy. (Rosenm.) Against this error it is the more necessary to caution the reader, since into it even the judicious Euthymius seems to have fallen, who remarks, Δυνάμει ἀν' αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο βέλα, ἵππη τοὺς μάκαν ἀποτελούσας αὐτοῖς. By the term ἐξήρχετο Grotius understands that this potency was not adventitious, but intrinsic, by his divine nature. (See infra, 8, 46. and Matth. 9, 5, 6.) This opinion, to which I do not hesitate to accede, seems founded on Theophylact, who with equal truth, and elegancy, observes: οἱ μὲν γὰρ προφήται καὶ οἱ ἁγιοὶ οὐκ εἶχον δύναμιν ἐξήρχομεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡς γὰρ ἦσαν αὐτοὶ τοῖς πτωχοῖς δυνάμεις· οἱ δὲ Κύριος, δυνάμειν ἐξήρχεν ἐξήρχομεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἦν πτωχοὶ τῆς δύναμεως· οἱ οἱ γε προφήται, καὶ οἱ ἁγιοὶ εἶδοντο μᾶλλον ἰδιωθεὶς δυνάμεις.

20. μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί. Commentators are divided in their opinion whether what is here related by St. Luke was intended for what is commonly called the Sermon on the Mount, related by St. Matthew in the
fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of his Gospel. If it be the same discourse, it is much shortened by St. Luke, who relates the two first beatitudes (omitting the greatest part of the rest) in the literal sense, whereas St. Matthew relates them in the metaphorical. Both might be spoken by our Saviour, and at the same time; but one Evangelist might choose to mention one part, and the other another; as is done in a hundred other places, where different circumstances of the same thing are related, or omitted. It is to be remembered, that this is spoken to Jesus’s disciples (ver. 20) as such; in which view, though it is impossible for us now to know how the parts were connected by our Saviour when he spoke it, yet it may be supposed to have been something like this: —

Happy are ye, though ye be very poor (Luke); especially those who are poor in spirit. (Matth.) Happy are ye, though ye be hungry now (Luke); especially those who hunger and thirst after righteousness. (Matth.) The reasons given are the same in each Evangelist. The latter parts of the verses in each are quite different in sense, but without doubt were both spoken by our Saviour, whether at the same time and place, perhaps we shall never know for certain; and perhaps it is of no consequence, whether we do or not. Nevertheless, the distinction is carefully to be observed, lest we assign the same meaning to words which are quite different, and which cannot, and never were designed, to express the same sense. Compare Matth. 25, 27. with Luke 11, 44. and see the notes on Luke 17, 6. (Markl.)

22. ἁφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς, put you out of the synagogue, excommunicate you, ἀναδεματίζειν. On this subject I can only refer my reader to the long and learned annotation (or rather dissertation) of Grotius, in which he has fully stated the nature of excommunication among the Jews, and compared it with the similar customs of the Greeks and Romans. The reader will, however, find some of the most important matter, as it respects the Jewish excommu-

22. ἐκβάλλων τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ἀεὶ πονηρῶν. On the interpretation of this word various have been the opinions of Commentators. It properly denotes, to eject, cast out, both in a military and in a civil sense, i.e. to disfranchise or to banish; secondly, to expunge from the military rolls (or, as we say, to drum out of the regiment); thirdly, to hiss actors off the stage, to cashier officers, displace public functionaries, dethrone kings, &c. Hence it may denote, as some think, to reject with scorn and ignominy. This signification is very agreeable to Classical use, and is supported and illustrated with examples from Arrian, Plutarch, Dionys. Hal., Demosth. &c. by Abresch, Raphel, Alberti, Kypke, and others. See also Periz. on Ælian. V. H. 13, 17. Yet (as Kuin. well observes) this sense is frigid, and not suitable to the preceding words. Segaar and others expound ὄνομα σεκτ, and refer to James 2, 7. βλασφημοῦσι τὸ κάλον ὄνομα τῷ ἐπικτῆθαι ἐὰν ὑμᾶς. But to this it may be objected, that the disciples had not yet been distinguished by the name of Christians. Others again (as Le Clerc, Beausobre, and Campbell), interpret, will defame you, rail against you; and they cite Deuter. 22. 19.

The Sept. has ἐξελευκεῖν ὄνομα πονηρῶν ἐπὶ παρθένου. But (as it is well observed by Schulz and Kuinoel) the words of the present passage cannot be illustrated from thence, since the expression here is not ἐκβάλλειν ὄνομα πονηρῶν, but ἐκβάλλειν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ἀεὶ πονηρῶν: for if (says Campbell) πονηρῶν had followed without the aie, there would have been an implicit acknowledgment of the truth of the scandal, and their enemies would have been charged only with publishing it. But I rather think that it is intended as a fuller expression of the sense contained in the preceding word ἀφορίσωσιν. In this
interprētātion I am supported by the authority of Wolf. Kuinoel, however, with less probability (I think), understands it of civil expulsion, namely, being driven into exile.

23. σκιρτήσατε. The σκιρτάω is properly used of the leaping and bounding of animals; adly, is it metaphorically applied to the joy and mental exultation of human beings. This being the case, I cannot but regard the following expression cited by Palaiaret from the Anthol. Gr. 4, 1. Ep. 16. p. 433. as a poetic pleonasm: Ἴδενε, καὶ σκιρτῆσιν, ιδαυ ἐφύτευεν τυλάων. In this sense the Commentators cite Philo. p. 219. καί ἐν τῷ πλῆθῳ καὶ μεγάλῳ χαρῶς ἀνασκηρῶσις.

24. πλουσίως. By these (as the best Commentators tell us) are not meant all the rich, but such as, trusting in their riches, and elate with their dignity, (like many of the chief of the Sadducees and Pharisees), placed their whole dependance upon them, to the utter neglect, and even forgetfulness, of religion and virtue, or of any better portion in a future life. Euthymius elegantly explains, τῶν πλουσίως by τῶν ἀμεταδότων, τῶν πρωτετικῶτας τῷ πλούσῳ, τῶν κάκως πλουτοῦσιν. See Mark 10, 24.

24. ἔσέχετε τ. τ. ὥστε. i. e. ye have (already) received your gratification, or (as Theophylact expresses it) τὴν εὐφροσύνην, and are to expect no other in the world to come. On this sense of ἀσέχω see the note on Matth. 6, 2.

25. εἰδὲ ἡμῖν—οἱ γελῶντες κ. τ. ά. woe unto you. E. V. But Campbell rightly prefers, with Wakefield and others, Alas, for you, &c. and has a very long and instructive note on this idiom, which I shall abridge, for the benefit of my less informed readers.

"The form of expression in both languages, in these verses, so much coincides with what we are rarely accustomed to hear, except in passionate imprecations, that it is no wonder they should be, in some measure, misunderstood by the majority of readers. That such words were often directed
against those who were not only bad men, but the avowed enemies of our Lord, is a circumstance which heightens this appearance of imprecation, and renders it difficult for us to conceive otherwise of the expressions. Some have called them authoritative denunciations of judgments; but this, I am afraid, is but a softer way of expressing the same thing. Our Lord is not here acting in the character of judge pronouncing sentence on the guilty, or dooming them to punishment. The office of judge is part of that glory to which he was not to be exalted till after his humiliation and sufferings. But he speaks here, in my apprehension, purely in the character of prophet, or teacher, divinely enlightened as to the consequence of men's actions, and whose zeal for their good obliged him to give them warning. As the Son of Man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them; he came not to curse, but to bless us, by turning away every one of us from his iniquities. These words, which proceeded out of his mouth were, in every sense, justly denominated full of grace. His example was perfectly conformable to his instructions; and I will venture to affirm, that the more narrowly we examine his discourses, the more we shall be convinced, that nothing he ever uttered against any living being (if candidly interpreted) will be found to bear any, the least, affinity to an imprecation."

This enlightened, and, I think, just, view of the subject is confirmed by the language of Euthymius: Μακαρίσας τοὺς πτώχους κ. τ. λ. λοιπῶν ταλανίζει τοὺς ἐναντίως ἑχοντας, ἵνα διὰ μὲν τοῦ μακαρισμοῦ προτρέψη πρὸς ἑκείνα, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ταλανισμοῦ ἀποτρέψῃ ἐκ τῶν του. Wetstein compares Dionys. Hal. 710. ὁς ἔμαθεν ἐτὶ πλείονα γινόμενόν ἐς αὐτῶν γέλωτα, καὶ φανὰς ἦκουσ ἐνὼν ἐπιχαρακτῆν, καὶ τὴν ὑβρίν ἐπαινοῦντων γελάτε, ἐφησεν, ἐσος ἦς τοῖς ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες ταραντίνοι, γελάτε, τολύν γὰρ μετὰ ταύτα χρόνον κλαύστε. Bulkley still more appositely cites Lucian, Catapl. § 6. Τὰ πράγματα εἰς τὸ ὑματιν ἀνεστράμμενα ἴμεῖσ μὲν γὰρ πένητες γελαϊ-
26. οὖν ὑμῖν ἦταν καλὸς ὑμᾶς εἰπωσί. This was meant for the Apostles and first teachers. Rosenmuller truly observes, that though it is possible that a good man may be praised by many, yet that a teacher of Religion should be praised by all, even the wicked and the superstitious, must by no means be expected. Grotius has appositely cited a narration respecting Phocion, recorded by Plut. t. 2. 187. f. where we are told, that when in his orations he had particularly pleased the multitude, he used to ask his friends whether any thing wrong had escaped him in his address. For, according to the old adage, “obsuecum amicos, veritas odium, parit.” Wetstein quotes Plut. 2, 177 e. Ælian. V. H. 2, 6. Athen. 631. f. Diogen. l. 6, 8. πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα πολλαὶ σὲ ἐπαυνώσα, τί γὰρ, ἐφη, κακὸν ἐποιήσα; Seneca Epist. 29: Quis enim placere potest populo, cui placet virtus? malis artibus popularis favor quæritur. Similem te illis facias oportet, non probabunt, nisi agnoverint. —— Conciliari nisi turpi ratione amor turpium non potest— —Ceterum si te video celebrem secundis vocibus vulgi, si intrante te clamor, plausus, et pantomimica ornamenta obstrepuerint, si tota civitate feminæ te puerique laudaverint, quidni ego tui miserear, cum sciem, quae via ad istum favorem ferat? See Mich. 2, 11.

27. ἄλλων ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἄκοιουσιν. After this ταλαντοσ, our Lord, in these words, turned his discourse again to his disciples. In this verse again Luke omits what gave occasion to the following precept, and retains only the precept, love your enemies, &c. for, as St. Luke writes his Gospel for the use of the Gentiles chiefly, he frequently passes over what concerns the Jews, and often gives the summary of Jesus's doctrine, without mentioning the Law of Moses, though perhaps at the same time Jesus's doctrine was founded upon, or had some relation to, the Law of Moses. (Markland.)

30. παντὶ δὲ τῷ αἰτοῦντι σε, διδοὺ καὶ ἀπαίτει. As
great inconvenience would seem to follow from the common interpretation, Markland would understand by παντὶ any man, a man of any nation or sect, whether Jew, Samaritan, or Heathen; which division (says he) at that time comprehended all mankind; and Jesus himself gave instances of his charity (though silver and gold he had none) to each of the three. The reason why he said παντὶ, to any man, may be seen in the Old Law, Deut. 15, 7—12. where a Jew’s charity is limited to Jews only, but that of Jesus was to all mankind, though even the Apostles themselves did not understand this, for several years. (Markland.) Καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς τὰ σὰ, μὴ ἀπαίτει. If this be so (says Markland), all laws which are made against thieves seem to be unchristian. This difficulty, too, arises from not attending to the signification of the words: ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς is, from him who taketh or receiveth, not forcibly; of which sense of the word ἀληθῶ see Luke 9, 3. Matth. 20, 4. 10, 38. λαμβάνειν τῶν σταυρῶν, and so elsewhere. Then τὰ σὰ, thy things, means thy charity, that which thou hast given him, that which was thy property before thou gavest it to him; and after it is given, it is not to be demanded again at any time, neither in specie, nor in an equivalent, because then it would not be a gift or charity, but a loan. The sense of the whole verse may be thus paraphrased: ‘Give to any kind of man who asketh of thee, Jew, Samaritan, or Heathen, provided thou art able, and that thou thinkest him a proper object of thy charity; and when he hath received thy gift or charity, do not demand it again of him.” (Markland.) With deference to the authority of so distinguished a scholar, I must dissent from his opinion, which requires, at the commencement of the sentence, an unusual emphasis to be laid on παντὶ, and inculcates, in the latter part, an extremely harsh and frigid sense. Equally objectionable are the interpretations of Cler. and Hammond, which may be seen in Elsley. The plain sense of the passage (however liable it may seem to misconception and abuse,
is that given by Kuinoel: “Be disposed to grant even an unreasonable request, and if any one shall wrongfully deprive thee of thy property, do not too severely require it back, whether by law or otherwise. Rather suffer it to be taken away than think of revenge or private enmity.” See on Matth. 5, 39. seqq. 42. The words express, though somewhat more strongly, the same sentiment as that contained in ver. 29. τοῦ τύπτοντι σε ἐαυτόν τὴν σιγάνα, παρέει καὶ τὴν ἀλλην καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αρρητοῦ σου τὸ ἰμάτιον, καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ καλύψῃς. It is, however, manifest, that in these and such like adagial and hyperbolical formulas the words are not, in interpretation, to be too much pressed. The Commentators notice the difference (which, however, has not always been observed) between αἰτεῖν and ἀπαλαλῶν. The former denotes to ask that which may be received, as of favour; the latter, to require, ask back, and severely demand one’s right.

32. τοια ὅμων χάρις ἔστι, what reward will there be towards you? None. Χάρις has here the sense of μισθός in the parallel passage of Matthew, and soJos. Ant. 6, 14, 4. Hesych. χάρις καὶ ἀμοιβὴ κατὰ εὐργεσίαν. See Elsner and Krebs. So Euthymius: Ἀμοιβή γὰρ τοῦτο, καὶ χάρις εὐργεσία. Wetstein compares Dionys. Hal. A. 6, 86. τίς ἔστιν ἢ σὺ χάρις ἢ μὴ καὶ ὀφέλεια;

34. ηδαπολαλῶσι τὰ ἱσα, i.e. (as Salmasius, de Pœn. Trapl. 280. and Suicer, in his Thes. Eccl. on the word δανείζειν, have proved,) the very same sum, without usury or increase: for it denotes the principal. So Theophylact explains: δάνεισμα ως σὸν τὸκε λέγει, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀπλῶς χρησιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ χωρὶς τούτου ἐδάνεισαι. 'Απαλαλῶν is a word appropriated to express the receiving back of money. Similar sentences are produced by Gataker on Anton. 5, 6. (Wolf.) These words have reference to that kind of benefit by the Greeks called ἐπανομός, which has been excellently illustrated by the learned Casaub. on Theophrastus. If any one, for instance, had lost a considerable part of his property by shipwreck, fire,
or any other calamity, it was not unusual for his friends to supply him with money, not to be paid back by any certain day, but when convenient. This, however, they scarcely ever did, except to those whom they had some hope might, (by a more prosperous turn of fortune,) some time or other, not only repay the money, but return the favour, which they termed ἀντεπαγιγέω.

35. καὶ δανείζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες. In determining the sense of these words, Commentators are by no means agreed. The Syriac and Arabic versions express the sense thus: "Do not cut off any one's hope, by being too rigid to the borrower;" and this interpretation has been adopted by De Dieu, Junius, Fessel, Hammond, Knatchbull, Pearce, and others. But this requires μηδὲν to be altered to μηδὲνα, a reading not yet found in any MS. and that requires ἀπελπίζειν to be taken in a sense quite unknown to the Greek writers, and unsuitable to the context. Another interpretation has therefore been propounded by many modern Critics of celebrity (as Homberg, Elsner, Wetstein, and Campbell,) i.e. nowise despairing. This indeed is a signification of ἀπελπίζειν frequent in the Classical writers and the Septuagint; and the sense arising from it is this: "Do not despair lest you might lose your money, and, through fear lest you should yourself come to want, refuse to lend." This, I grant, makes a tolerable sense, but I would prefer that expressed by the Vulg. and adopted by Euthymius, Chrys. Casaubon, Salmasius, Grotius, Beza, Bois, Wolf, Glass. Georg. Abresch, Whitby, Krebs, Rosenmuller, Kuinoel, Schleusner, and the authors of our common version. Thus the sense will be, nihil inde sperantes, hoping nothing from thence. Ἀπολαβεῖν is the same as ἀπολαβεῖν ἀπὸ τίνος: for, as Hackspan, Wolf, and Krebs observe, it is usual with the best writers, on omitting, for brevity's sake, one or two words, to note that omission by the aid of a preposition, which, as it cannot be put alone, is joined to the verb. Of this idiom Casaubon, Salma-
sium, Abresch, and others, produce several examples. Thus Jos. Ant. 11, 6, 2. καὶ τοὺτον ἀπέλαβον ἐπὶ μῆνας ἕξ. Ἀρσύλευν for ἀρσύλευν ἄτῳ τίνος occurs in Athen. 649. So Philo. 237. a. Liv. 1, 12. “Adverterat ea res etiam Sabinos tanti periculo viri.” The sense is therefore this: “Lend even to those from whom there is little or no hope of receiving back your loan.” By lending, however, must be understood (as Campbell well observes), not letting out money at interest, for this is an affair merely commercial, and comes not, unless in particular circumstances, under the class of good offices. What commonly proves the greatest hindrance to our lending, particularly to needy persons, is the dread that we shall never be repaid. It is, I imagine, to prevent the influence of such an over-cautious mistrust, that our Lord here warns us not to shut our hearts against the request of a brother in difficulties. “Lend cheerfully,” as though he had said, “without fearing the loss of what shall be thus bestowed. It often happens that, even contrary to appearances, the loan is thankfully returned by the borrower; but if it should not, remember, (and let this silence all your doubts,) that God chargeth himself with what you give from love to him, and love to your neighbour. He is the poor man’s surety.” (Campbell.) There is a fine passage, which may possibly occur to some of my learned readers (though it has not been cited by the Philologists), and which I will therefore subjoin. Thucyd. lib. 2, 40. where Pericles, in commendation of the Athenians, says: Καὶ τὰ ἐσ ἀφετήρ ψυχανάμεθα τοῦ πολλοῦ, οὐ γὰρ πάρχοντες εὐ, ἀλλὰ δρώντες, κτάμεθα τοῦ φίλου, βεβαιώτερος δὲ ὃ δράσας την χάριν, ὡστε ὀφειλομένην ὅ εἰναις ὧ δέδωκε σῳζειν ὃ δ’ ἀντοφείλων, ἀμβλυτέρος, εἰδὼς, οὐκ ἐσ χάριν, ἀλλ’ ἐσ ὀφείλειμα την ἀρετὴν ἀποδώσαν. Καὶ μόνοι οὐ τοῦ ἐμφέροντος μᾶλλον λογισμῷ, ἣ τῆς ἐλευθερίας τῶ πιστῶ ἅδεως τιν ὀφελομένι i.e. “not with the narrow calculations of self-interest, but with the frank confidence of liberality.” Thus Euripid. frag. Erech. 1. τὰς χάριτας ὅτις εὐ...
ST. LUKE, CHAP. VI.

γενοὺς χαρίζεται, Ηδίστῳ ἐν βροτοῖσιν ὦ ή δύρων μὲν Ἰχθύων ἐν δραίσι, πολλοὶ δυσγενέστεροι. In illustration of which noble sentiment of Thucyd. I will select two or three more passages, out of several which I find noted down in my adversaria. Aristot. Eth. 9, 7. "Οὐτὶ οἱ μὲν ὁφείλουσι τοῖς δὲ ὁφείλεται. Κάθετες οὐχ ἐπὶ τῶν δακτύλων, οἱ μὲν ὁφείλουσι βούλονται μη ἐναι οἱ ὁφείλουσιν, οἱ δὲ δακτυλίοις καὶ ἐπιμέλεσται τῆς τῶν ὁφείλουσιν συντρίπτειν" οὕτω καὶ τοὺς εἰ ἐργαζόμενους βούλεται εἰσιν τοὺς [εἰ] παθόντας, αἷς κομμονεῖόν τις χάριτας, τοὺς δὲ οίκη εἵνει ἐπιμελεῖς το ἀνταποδοθεῖ. Plutarch T. Flam. 1. τοῖς εὐεργετήσεις διακανόντας ὅσοις εὐεργετήσεις εἴποι καὶ πρόθυμοι, αἷς κάλλιστα τῶν κυρίων τοὺς εἰ τετευθοῦσαν ὦν αὐτοῦ περιέπει καὶ σαφένει. Herodian. 2, 3, 15. μεγάλων γὰρ εὐεργετῶν προώραχουσών, τὸ Ἰσότιμον δυσεύκτον ἀλλ᾽ εὐ προῖκας αἰσχρακάς καὶ μικρὰ μὲν λαθοῦσιν ἀντιδοῦναι μείζον οὐκ εἶναι εὐμερεῖς αἰσ ἐγχαῖμων δικαὶ ὁπ ὅτι πρῶτοι τῷ ὀράσας ἀγαθοῦ, ἀνωτέρωτον κατάθηται χάριν, τῷ μὲν καὶ ἀξίων ἀντιδοθεῦν, συχείτωσιν, αἷς ἀκατηθῶσιν ἀμα καὶ ἀχάριστος ἑμομάζεται.

35. ἐσεῦθη υἱὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ, i.e. either "dear and acceptable to God," as in Sir. 4, 10. γίνον ὁφανὸς αἰς πατὴρ—καὶ ἐσεῦθη αἷς υἱὸ υἱότου, or you will be like unto God, as being animated with a spirit similar to that of the Deity. So a Rabbinical writer cited by Schoettgen: "Esto similis Deo. Gratiosus est et misericors: sic tu quoque gratiosus esto et misericors."

36. oiktirion. What is in Matth. 6, 2—4. expressed by beneficence and liberality is here comprehended in the more general idea of mercy, by which is meant not merely compassion and pity to the indigent and wretched, but kindness towards both friends and enemies; to all, in fact, who need our assistance. Schoettgen observes, that these words designate every sort of kind and charitable affection, especially in judging of the actions of others. Thus the Hebr. שומ, which the Sept. render oiktirion, not only signifies mercy, but, very often, benignity,
kindness; and so the corresponding term ὑπολέγει. (Grotius, Rosenm. and Kuin.)

37. καταδικάσετε. This word properly signifies, “to pronounce public sentence against, to condemn,” and here denotes (in a bad sense) to judge against, condemn the innocent; as in Jam. 5, 6. Thus the corresponding term ἀπολέγει signifies to acquit; but is here used in a good sense (as Grot. observes) for interpreting any thing as favourably as possible, judging for the best. Wetstein cites many Rabbinical passages; as also Sirach 6, 2—5. 282. and Seneca de Benefic. 7, 28. ut absolvaris, ignosc.

38. δίδοτε, καὶ—μέτρον καλὸν, i. e. fair, just, full, complete measure. Πεπεσμένον καὶ σεσαλευμένον, pressed down and shaken up, or together. There is in the terms πεπεσμένον and σεσαλευμένον a reference to dry measures, as corn, which yield to compression, and settle down by concussion. Thus Aristot. Probl. § 21. (cited by Grotius) ἀγγεία σαττόμενα. And again, in ὑπερεκχυμένον there is a reference to the measure of liquids. Thus the Hebr. ἐν in Joel 2, 24. ὑπερεκχυμένοις αἰ λαρνο ὅβω καὶ ἐλαῖον. The whole appears, from the Rabbinical citations produced by Buxtorf, Schoettgen, Scheid, Zorn, Le Moyn, Wetstein, and others, to have been a proverbial expression among the Jews, to metaphorically denote abundant and exuberant liberality. The passage is thus judiciously and elegantly expounded by Euthymius: Ἑκατομμυρίοις ἐστιν ο λόγος εἰσθαναί γὰρ οἱ καλοὶ μετροῦντες τὸν στόχον, ἐπιτιθέντες, τῷ μοντῷ τὰς χεῖρας, τιθέντες αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ κάτω, καὶ λακτίζοντες σαλεύειν, ἵνα συμπέσῃ, καὶ ἐπιβάλλειν, ἀχρι χρὸν ὑπερεκχυμή· ἀποδιδόσοις δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτον μέτρον τῆς εὐεργεσίας, τίνες; οἱ εὐεργετηθέντες πάντως τῷ θεῷ γὰρ ἂποδιδόσοις ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, αὐτοὶ δοκοῦσιν ἀποδιδόσοις ἀποδιδόσοι δὲ τούτο, τοῖς ὄου τις φιλοτιμοῦν δασκείσασιν αὐτοῖς.

38. τὸ γὰρ αὐτῶν μέτρον, ὥς μετηπείτε, ἃ ὦ. Wolf quotes from Sota 52. Qua mensurā homo metitur, eā metiuntur ei. “There were,” observes Buxtorf, “among the Jews, measures of various sorts, supernatantes, abrasæ, accumulatæ, pressæ, agitatae,
opertæ," &c. The measure of corn with us is (I believe) the abrusa, i. e. the bushel is heaped up, but not pressed down, or shaken together, and then abraded, or the cumulus is cut off with a lathe. See Vorst. Adag. N. T. Ch. 8. Schoett. Adag. N. T. 74. and Casaubon on Theophr. Ch. 175. By the εἰς τῶν κόλπων ὑμῶν there is an allusion to the Oriental custom, (and, indeed, of all nations of antiquity who wore flowing vestments,) to use the ample bosoms of those garments for carrying various articles, which was thus used for purse, or pocket, or even a kind of bag, large enough to hold a tolerable quantity of corn. See Ruth 3, 15. 2 Kings 4, 39. Neh. 5, 3. Prov. 16, 33. So Hor. S. 2, 3, 171. "Talos, Aule, nucesque ferre sine laxo." Jos. B. 6, 23. See other examples in Wetstein and Raphel. See also Ferrar. de re Vest. 663.

40. οὐκ ἐστις μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τῶν διδάσκαλων. The disciple will not easily excel his master; therefore, if you yourselves neglect your duty, and break the commandments of God, neither will others to whom you recommend and inculcate their performance, observe and follow them. This proverbial expression is found in another sense in Matth. 10, 25. Joh. 13, 16. (Kuin.)

40. κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς. There has been here some diversity of interpretation, arising from a difference of construction, which the brevity of the sentence has left uncertain. One thing seems clear, that πᾶς must not be understood to mean entirely, but quilibet, whoever. I would therefore translate (with Kuinoel): "Every one who is modelled after the same fashion as his master." "For (observes he) the disciple usually follows his master’s example, has the same sentiments and wishes, and acts just like him." The word κατηρτίζω properly signifies to mend, emend, repair, and, in a moral sense, to instruct, make perfect. For ἄρτις has the sense of τέλειος. So Hebr. 13, 21. κατηρτίσαι ὑμᾶς εἴν παντὶ ἐργῷ ἀγαθῷ. And 2 Tim. 3, 17. ἢν ἄρτις γῇ ὃ τοῦ
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theóú ãndrwos, próûs tâv érgov ãgâðov éxærtiðménov. Wetstein cites Polyb. 5. p. 490. tâv Mâkâdâov ãðv tâv ðiæs èfæsâiâs kathêrtiðménov.

48, 44. See the note on Matth. 7, 16—18. The sense of the passage may be thus paraphrased: “The actions of men speak of what disposition they are of.” Grotius here repeats a remark which he had made on some former occasions, namely, that this proverbial expression is to be understood ἡθικῶς, and that its truth is sufficiently established if the thing happens frequently.

45. προφέρει. Wetstein cites Isocrat. ἀπειρ ἐκ ταµείου προφέρειν.

48. ὃς ἔσκαψε καὶ ἔραθυ, i.e. βαθέως ἕσκαψε, by an hendiadis frequent in the Hellenistic style. So Jud. 19, 10. καὶ ἐτάχυν ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἔφραμε, for ταχέως ἔφραμε. Nor is this unfrequent in the Classical writers. Examples are produced by Palairet and Munthe. (Kuin.) This mode of expression appears a relique of the simple phraseology of the primitive languages, and the early ages. The moral here inculcated is, (as Grot. observes,) “that the study of piety should not be superficial, but a principle well founded and deeply rooted in the heart, so as to resist the assaults of passion, temptation,” &c. On the figure here employed Wetstein cites Sext. Emp. ad Log. 2, 129. Ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, for ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρῃ, as in Matth. 16, 18. It is proper to observe this use of the article, which may be thus expressed: “On the rocky ground, in rocky places.”

48. πλημμύρας γ. The word denotes an increase or swell of water, a tide, inundation, &c. See the examples produced by Wetstein and Kypke; as also those noted in Schl. Lex. On this subject Euthymius well observes: Πλημμύρα δὲ τοῦ ποταμοῦ, τὸ πληθοῦς καὶ ἡ σφοδρότης τῶν πειρασμῶν.

49. προσέρήξεν. Ρήσω, and its derivatives, denote the dashing of water against any opposing object.
VERSE 1. εἰς τὰς ἀκάς τοῦ λαοῦ. For these words (says Grot.) were exoteric, not esoteric, or acroamatic, but meant for all who should wish to attain salvation, and not for the Apostles only, and their successors.

2. ὅς ἦν αὐτῷ ἄντειμος, “who was much valued by him, held in much esteem.” Kuinoel refers to Æsch. Socr. 2, 8. and Wetstein cites Artemid. 2, 8. ὁς ἐν τῷμα (δούλους) παρὰ τοῖς δεσπόταις. And 5, 20. ἐδοξε τίς τὸν δούλον αὐτοῦ, ὃν μᾶλιστα παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐτίμη. And Simplic. in Epict. 130. τῶν οἰκετῶν—τιμιάτεροι τοῖς δεσπόταις. I assent to the opinion adopted by almost all critics, that, notwithstanding one or two slight discrepancies, the present miracle is the same as that recorded by Matthew, Ch. 8, v. 5. The contrary, however, has been maintained by some, especially Macknight, whose note may be seen in Elsley. On ver. 3. see Hammond and Whitby, or Elsley.


5. τὴν συναγωγὴν—ημῖν. E. T. “us a synagogue.” Dr. Campbell more correctly, (I think,) our syna-
gogue. Or it might be rendered more literally, *built the synagogue for us*, there being but one.

8. ἵνα ἐξωσωσθῇ. See the note on Matth. 8, 9.

10. ἀσθενεῖντα. Markland thinks that, in strictness, it should have been ἀσθενεύσατα, the slave who had been ill. But this is not necessary, since the word may be taken for the participle imperfect, which is the same as the present.

11. συνεσπορεύσατο—ικανόν. *Icanon* has here the sense of *bene multi*, or, as we say, a good many.

12. ἐξεκομίζετο. This is a term appropriated to funerals, like the Latin efferre, exportare; since the custom of interring *out of the town* extended both to the Eastern and Western nations. Many passages of Greek authors, from Homer downward, are cited by Elsner and Wetstein; as also some Latin ones, so Virg. Georg. 4, 255. "Et corpora luce caretum. Exportant tectis, et tristia funera ducunt." See Kirchman de Funer. Rom. 2, 1. p. 76. The burying-grounds were out of the city, but, as there is reason to believe, not far from the city gate. Among the passages cited by Wetstein, the most apposite and interesting is one from Lucian, Contempl. 22. τὰ πρὸ τῶν τύλεων ἑκείνα τὰ γάματα ὥραις, καὶ τὰς στήλας καὶ τυραμίδας; ἑκείνα πάντα νεκροδοχεία ἡ σωματοψυχίκα ἄστι. And Lex. 12. Tab. in Cic. de Legg. 2, 23.

Grotius remarks on the pernicious custom of burying in churches, or holding public worship in or on the precincts of places filled with putrid carcasses: a custom (as he tells us) first introduced in commemoration of the martyrs; but very unwisely extended to general use.

12. ὡς μονογενῆς. One cannot help observing the simple and pathetic nature of this narration, to which we may compare that of Eurip. Alc. 305. μόνος γὰς αὐτῶς ἠθέτα. And 925. κόσος ἀξιοθάνατος φίλητ' ἐν δόμωι μονοτεῖς. Wetstein has several Classical citations; as Cic. Epist. Fam. 9, 20. "Pattiam ehuxi jam et gravius, et dinius, quam ualla mater unigenitum filium." It must be observed, that the
dative is here put for the genitive; of which idiom, examples are adduced by Homberg and others.

13. μὴ κλαίε. And no wonder that she should; for, (says Cetuboth, f. 8, 2.) “Olim elatio mortui gravior fuit propinquis morte ejus.” It must be observed, that the words uttered by our Lord were not meant to be prohibitory, but consolatory.

14. ἡπατο τῆς σορῶ, i. e. with a view to stop the bearers, which, it seems, they understood by immediately stopping. The word σορῶ often denoted a closed coffin, which was usually of stone or marble. But these, however they may have been in use among the Egyptians, were not used by the Jews. The word here denotes the funeral couch on which the dead was carried forth, the bier, in German ein bahre. That the Greeks and Romans were thus carried forth, we learn from the Classical citations of Wetstein and Grotius; and that the same custom was adopted by the Jews we learn from Josephus. See Geier de luctu. Hebr. Ch. 5. Warnekros Hebr. Antiq. p. 386. and Harmer’s Observations. It appears, however, from Geier and Zorn, Bibl. Antiq. to have been almost confined to the higher classes. (Wolf, Schleusner, and Kuinoel.) Wetstein cites Ovid, Metam. 14, 741.

15. ἀνεκάθισεν, not merely revived, but sat up. He would thus be seen, for probably the bier was nearly flat. In illustration of this, Wetstein cites Xen. (speaking of the hare): διατρέχων γὰρ καὶ ἀνακαθίσαν. Plat. Phaedon. ἰδὲ Σωκράτης ἀνακαθίσας μενος εἰς τὴν κλίνην, συνέκαμψε τὸ σκέφος. Plut. Philipp. p. 368. Λ. συναγαγὼν μόλις έαυτῶν ὑπ’ ἀσθενείας ἀνεκάθισε. See Artemid. 4, 84. and 1 Kings 17, 23.

16. φόβος, awe and amazement. See the note on Mark 4, 41.

16. προφήτης. By this word is meant a Divine Messenger, and one greater than Elisha, (see Exod. 4, 31.) inasmuch as without the use of prayer, or stretching himself on the body, but with a simple order (κέω, &c.) he had, in a manner utterly unex-
amp;ed, restored the very dead to life. (Euthym. Wets. and Rosenm.)

16. καὶ ὁ ἐπεκέφατο Ὁ Ἰσρ. ἀ. ἀ. By sending to them the promised Messiah, or at the least the harbinger and forerunner of the Messiah. On the word ἔπισκ. see the note on Luke 1, 68.

21. ἔχαρισμα το βλέπειν. Χαρίσμα here signifies to give, restore; as in 2 Macc. 3, 39. 4, 32. Kex. Cyr. 8, 6, 11. Herodian, 3, 17, 3. τῶν ἀναφικομένων χαρίσματοι τὰς οὐσίας. And 1, 17, 3. τῶν δὲ πλουσίων τὰς οὐσίας χαρίσμαται ἐμπρόσθεν, μερίσαι τε εἰς τῶν συμμάχων. In Αἰlian, V. H. 9, 1, χαρίσμαται is opposed to λαμβάνειν. (Kuin.) On the following verses see the note on Matth. 11, 2. et seqq.

25. ἦ λατρεύς ἐνδοξ. Ἐνδοξεία signifies glorious, splendid, and τροφή, luxury, pleasure. So Artemid. θ, 60. τῶν ἐν τροφῇ διαγορεύσει. See 2 Pet. 2, 13. This is the common interpretation. Kuinoel, however, thinks that τροφή has especial reference to costly and sumptuous apparel; and cites, from Munthe and others, Isocr. Pan. 41. τὰ μὲν σαματά τροφίμων, and Diod. Sic. 222. β. So also Wetstein cites Eurip. Phæn. 1198. στολά τε κροκόσα σε στραγγίσα τροφας' and Sueton. Aug. 65. "Relegatæ usum vini omnemque delicatiorem vestem ademit." Triller also (ap. Wolf) thinks that by this expression, and the preceding, ἀλακοῖς ἱματίσις, is meant the purple clothing which was worn by royal personages, who were hence termed the purpureati. Thus Gray, in his "Ode to Adversity," "And purple tyrants vainly groan;" which is an imitation of the Horatian line: "Pur- purei metuunt tyranni." But, after all, I see no reason why the common interpretation should not be retained. On this subject see the note on Matth. 11, 8.

28. μεγίστων αὐτοῦ ἐστι, i.e. is of greater consequence, or has greater privileges, than ever John had: for he, like Moses, never entered into the Promised Land, or the state of Christianity; he only prepared...
others for it. See Dr. Whitby on Matth. 11, 11. (Markland.)

29. ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν Θεὸν, praised God. So Matth. 11, 19. and infra ver. 35. Sir. 10, 29, 18, 2. But as here words, not deeds, are spoken of, therefore the sense seems to be, "reverently obeyed the will, and fulfilled the commands, of God," by undergoing baptism at the hands of John, the Divine Messenger. (Kuin.) Apposite to this is the formula in ver. 30. ἀκροτείν τῇ βουλῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ, to set at nought, and disobey, the will of God. So Luke 3, 2. εἴδενο ἐκεῖνα Θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰακόβῳ. And so Mid. 7, 9. whose command it was, that the Jews should, by baptism, be bound to repentance, and initiated into doctrines preparatory to the new ocracy, soon to be established by the Messiah.

30. εἰς ἐκνυτὸς. There has been some difference of opinion respecting these words. Some (as Ambos, De Dieu, Erasmus, and others,) take the words εἰς ἐκνυτὸς for ἐν ἐκνυτοῖς, in themselves. But this is neither agreeable to the usage of the language, nor suitable to the context: for, (as Campbell observes,) "the rejection was open and notorious." Others interpret against themselves, i.e. to their own hurt. This opinion is supported by Erasmus, Beza, Picator, Glass, Leigh, the Authors of our Common Version, Kuinoel, and Schleusner, who cites examples of this use of εἰς from Luke 12, 10, 15, 18. Acts 6, 11. 1 Cor. 8, 12. and of the Lat. ad for adversus in Cicero and Tacitus. That this sense of εἰς is not unknown to the Greek writers has been proved by Palairret, in his Observations. Others again, as Grot. Camerarius, Whitby, Hammond, Rosenm. Kuinoel, Homberg, Wolf, Doddridge, and Campbell, maintain that there is a slight trajectio, and they connect the words εἰς ἐκνυτοῖς with βουλή τοῦ Θεοῦ, and interpret in regard to themselves. Grotius has a very profound note, (or rather dissertation,) on the subject of the Divine decrees, to which I must be content to refer my readers. Upon the whole, I cannot but
regard the last interpretation as the most rational, and most suitable to the context. This too seems to have been the opinion of Wetstein, who cites Prov. 1, 25. and Bemidbar, R. 16. "Omne bonum, quod destinaveram vobis, vilipendistis et rejecistis;"

31. On this and the following verses see the note on Matth. 11, 16—19.


36. γυν. A most difficult and often debated question has here been raised, whether this woman and Mary Magdalen, (out of whom Jesus cast seven devils, Luke 8, 2.) and Mary, sister of Martha and Lazarus, (Joh. 11.) be one and the same person. This has been affirmed by many. Yet the best modern critics, as Buxtorf, Hammond, Basnage, Wolf, Michaelis, Markland, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, as also Theophylact and Euthymius, maintain that these were three different persons. This, indeed, is generally acknowledged to have been satisfactorily proved by Deyling, in his Obss. Sacr. P. 3. p. 22. seqq. whose positions are thus summed up by Wolf:

"He maintains that Mary (the sister of Lazarus and Martha) is altogether a different person from Mary Magdalen, since by no indications of Gospel history, wherever Mary Magdalen is mentioned, does it appear that she was sister of Lazarus and Martha; but on the other hand, it may be demonstrated, from the sacred history, that Mary sister of Lazarus, and Martha, was a person quite distinct from Mary Magdalen. He also evinces that the woman here mentioned (who has been a sinner) was a different person, both from Mary sister of Lazarus and from Mary Magdalen. For (says he) she differs from the sister of Lazarus in name, country, manners, and situation in life; and from Mary Magdalen she is distinguished in this, namely, that the one was of Nain; but the other a harlot from Magdala, a city in the half tribe of Manasseh beyond Jordan."

This history (says Rosenm.) seems to differ from
that recorded in Matth. 26, 6. Mark 14. and Joh. 12. For (not to mention other objections) what Luke relates in ver. 37, 38, 39, 50. is by no means suitable to Mary the sister of Lazarus, who was well known to Christ, and who had not come accidentally, but had been invited. And that Mary Magdalen was not the woman here spoken of, is evident from Luke 8, 2. See Michaelis ad h. 1.

37. ἰη ἀμαρτωλός, i. e. who had been a sinner. So the best interpreters explain it. The word ἀμαρτωλός denotes, not a Gentile, as Hammond and some others suppose, but impudica; a fornicatress, or an adulteress. This idiom was common both to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages. Thus מָפֵר, ἀμαρτάνειν, and peccare, often denote, κατ’ ἐξοχήν, adultery, and even fornication. Wets. cites Ælian, V. H. 4, 1. τὴν δ’ ἀμαρτάνουσαν εἰς ἑτερον, συγγυνόμης τυχεῖν ἀδώνατον. Eurip. Hippol. 507. εἶτο δοκεὶ σοι, χρὴ μὲν οὐ δ’ ἀμαρτάνειν. See also Pric. in loc. Kuinoel refers us to Dovrion Charit. 220. Muncker on Anton. Lib. 337. I add, Hesych. Αλοάται κοναλ ἀμαρτωλαί, πόνοι.

38. στάσα παρὰ τοῦ πόδας αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω, ad pedes ejus stabat. Jesus was, it seems, reclining at table on a couch, leaning on his left elbow, his head and countenance turned towards the food, and his naked feet (the sandals being taken off before the meal) turned the contrary way, towards which the servants bearing the dishes were waiting on the triclinium, or table. Maldonat. and Kuinoel; both of whom are much indebted to the following annotation of Hieronymus Mercurialis, cited by Zorn in his Bibl. Antiq. p. 543. ap. Koecher. “Nimium

in triclinio, quod pedes altos habebat, sive in tribus lectis stratis ita jacent cum convivis ut versus mensam cubitii sinistri innixi dexteram manu uterentur, pedesque in exteriorem partem protenderent, ubi ministri erant, et ubi erecta stetit fœminæ peccatrix.' She stood (said Rosenm.) among the servants, who were stationed behind, i. e. by the feet of those reclining. So Martial: "At illo retro fleexus at pedum turbam." All this (says Wolf) is represented in a plate to be seen in Casalius de Conviviis Veterum, T. 9. Antiq. Graec. p. 139 seqq. See the Appendix of Ursinus ad Ciaconium de Triclinio, p. 223 seqq.*

On this subject Euthymius has the following beautiful observation (probably derived from some eloquent Greek Father): "Óρα δὲ τὴν πόλιν ταυτής εὐλαβείαν· ἔστη γὰρ παρὰ τὰ ἐσχατὰ μέρη τοῦ σῶματος αὐτοῦ, ως ἐσχάτι· καὶ ὑπίσω, ως ἀπαρήθηκατος καὶ ἔκλαιε μὲν, διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῆς ἐβρέχει δὲ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ τοῖς ὀξύρωσι, ως ἕπεκεκυφθην αὐτοῖς.

38. καὶ ταῖς θριῳ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμασο. This also was a mark of deep reverence. Elsner compares a Roman custom, alluded to in Petron. 27. "Aquam poscit ad manus digitosque paululum adspersos in capite pueri tersit." And 57. "Contubernalem meam redemī, ne quis in capillis illius manus tergeret." Where see Burman. Consult also Pincelin. Lum. Reflex.

38. κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. Kissing the feet was a mark of the deepest reverence and most profound humility. So Wetstein cites Adrian, Epict.

* See also Campbell's Diss. p. 3, 4, 5, 6.

† I can hardly approve of Doddridge's version, tresses. For though he says that this is the proper signification of θριῳ, yet in this he is mistaken. He truly, however, observes that the English tresses might be derived from θριῳ. The fact is, from θριῳ is derived the Italian treccia, the French tresse, and the English tress, which, however, came to denote a lock or braid of hair: a signification never (I believe) attributed to θριῳ, and which, therefore, cannot be admitted in the present passage, especially as in other places of Scripture (Joh. 12, 3. 1 Pet. 3, 8. Apoc. 1, 14. 9. 8.) the word in the plural denoted the hair of the head, or (as we say) a head of hair.
3, 26. Eunap. 146. πάντες οι παρόντες οι μεν πόδας, οι δὲ χείρας προσκόνιων οι δὲ θεόν ἐφοσον. Longus, Pastoral 4, p. 160. Parasitus domini: πόδας καὶ χείρας κατεφίλει—οὐκ ἀντέσχε κλαίοντι καὶ αὐθίς τῶν πόδας καταφιλοῦντι: where see the Commentators. Polyb. 15, 1. Xen. Cyr. 7, 5. 32. ἔπειτα δὲ Κύρου κατεφίλου καὶ χείρας καὶ πόδας, πολλὰ δακρύσεις ἀμα χαρὰ καὶ εὐφραίνωμεν. Seneca de Benef. 2, 12. “C. Cæsar dedit vinum Pompeo Penno—deinde absoluto et agenti gratias, porrexit osculandum sinistrum pedem.” Arist. Vesp. 606. καὶ πρῶτα μὲν ἡ δυνάτης μὲ ἀπονιξή, καὶ τὸν πόδα ἀλείφῃ, καὶ προσκύνασα φιλήσῃ. I add, Heliod. 2, 404. προκύψας ἐφίλει τῶν πόδας. And Plut. Cat. Min. 12, 1. προεκάθια ὡς δάκρυσι καὶ περιβολαῖς ἀπλήτως ὑποτιθέντων τὰ ἱμάτια τῶν ποσῶν ἢ θέδεν, καὶ καταφιλοῦντων τὰς χείρας. Hence the custom of kissing the Pope’s foot. The Evangelist indicates (says Wetstein) than a greater honour was due to Christ than to the King of Persia: (see in Matth. 2, 2, 28, 10.) and therefore that he is not a mere man who gave his foot to be kissed, well knowing (as Christ must have done) that by the Greeks and Romans this honour was considered as equal to that which is paid to the Deity.

39. Ὀντός. “Light minds (observes Grotius) easily find something at which to stumble. For neither did the Prophets know all things, but only such as it pleased God to reveal to them.” Wetstein has thus tersely and elegantly paraphrased the passage: “Annon scit, quod omnibus notum est, mulierem esse non integræ existimationis? Annon intelligit, eam quæ non vocata domum alienam intrat, pedesque viri tam liberè contractat, pristinum vitae genus veteremque impudentiam nondum deposuisse? Ita temerè et inconsideratè judicabat Pharisaes.” So also Euthymius: ἢ λείψε ἐν τῷ μόρῳ ἡ τιμωσα τούτων ὑπὲρ ἀνθρωπον, αἷς ὅτα ὑπὲρ ἀνθρωπον.

39. ἀριστή ἢ γυνὴ ἢ τις ἀπετεῖαι αὐτοῦ, what sort of; both in a good and bad sense. The word ἀριστή denotes both qualis and quantus, and sometimes has
both these senses united. So Matth. 8, 27. πονάχος ἐστιν ὦτος. And 2 Petr. 3, 11. πονάχος δει ύπάρχειν ὑμᾶς. It is proper to observe, also, that the Pharisees thought themselves as much contaminated by the touch of immoral persons, as by that of lepers.

40. ἐχω σοί τι εἰπεῖν. This may be understood as a polite way of requesting of the host permission to say something. (Grot.) The Greek and Latin writers have, in like manner, the expressions ἐχω εἰπεῖν, and habeo quid dicere, precari, &c.

43. ἀγαπήσει. Our Lord denotes, not so much what will necessarily, as what will probably follow.

43. υπολαμβάνω. This word is, in the Hellenistic style, often used for existimo; but here it seems (like ὠμοι in the Classical writers) to have little more than the force of a particle. On this verse Wetstein cites Seneca, Ep. 73.

44. Jesus contrasts the incivility of Simon, who had neglected even the common offices of hospitality, with those marks of profound reverence which the woman had evinced. The furnishing of water for washing the feet, &c. before any meal, was, and still continues, in the East, a duty incumbent on every host, who (as we learn from Dr. Shaw’s Travels) is expected to present it in person. See Cæsaub. in loc. and Mr. Horne’s Introd. 3, 401.

45. φιλήμα μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας. A kiss, with the Oriental nations, forms part of the common and regular salutation of friends. See Koppe on 1 Thess. 5, 6, and Mr. Horne’s Introd. 3, 681.

45. ἀφ’ ὑμῶν εἰσῆλθον. I agree with Beza, De Dieu, Grotius, Segaar, Griesbach, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, in preferring εἰσῆλθεν, which Campbell has expressed in his translation, and satisfactorily proved to be the true reading. See his note.

45. οὐ διέλυτε. This word, which answers to the Hebr. שכר, in Jer. 17, 8. denotes repeated action; and is illustrated by Krebs, Loesner, and Wetstein. So Liban. Epist. 168. οὐ δὲ ἀνθρωπος ἑκείνος, ἀφ’ ὑπερ ήκον, οὐ διέλυτε βάλλαν’ εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐπηχνυτο τὰ βέλη.
47. ἀφελέσας ἅ ματικαῖς, her sins have been, i. e. are remitted and forgiven. On this formula, see the note on Matth. 9, 2. Kuinoel has here a long annotation, in which he argues, that, from the whole narration, it is clear that Jesus had, a short time previous to his being invited to 'supper' by the Pharisees, healed the woman of a painful disorder, contracted by her immoral life. This he thinks alluded to in ver. 50, and refers us to Luke 8, 48. Mark 5, 34. Matt. 9, 22. and 29. Luke 18, 42. Therefore, he thinks that by the words ἀφελέσας ἅ ματικαῖς autēs, is meant, she has received the favour of God, and has been liberated from her disorder, which was the punishment of her sins. But this interpretation is extremely frigid, enervates the sense, and is altogether very precarious.

47. ὅτι ἐγένετο πολύ. There has been some difficulty raised about the interpretation of ὅτι, which the Vulg. and Beza render quotiam, or nam; and so Clarims, Grotius; and the authors of our English Version. But this is repugnant to the whole scope of the parable just before propounded; which, (as Campbell observes,) clearly represents the gratuitous forgiveness as the cause of the love, not the love as the cause of the forgiveness. And this, on the other hand, in ver. 50, is ascribed to her faith. "This love, or gratitude, (says Markland,) could not be the cause, but was the effect, or consequence of her forgiveness: the cause was her faith. The Papists indeed, (observes Wolf,) have, from this passage, strenuously contended for love, as the meritorious cause of the remission of sins." But this (as I before remarked) is plainly contrary to the scope of the passage. I entirely assent to Doddrige (p. 120,) that however strenuously Clarius opposes this mode of interpretation, and notwithstanding the immense pains which Grotius has taken to find a sense in that which our translation follows, the connection evidently requires that we should render ὅτι therefore, rather than for, or because. In this indeed almost
all the critics agree; as Mede, Haimond, Wolf, Meisner, Michaelis, Buchen, Bengel, Leigh, Wetstein, Moldenhauer, Doddridge, Markland, Campbell, Rosenm. and Kuinoel. This sense of ἀλάλα, has been satisfactorily established by Hammond and Wolf; as also by the Philologists, cited in their notes. On this subject, Wetstein has the following acute remark. "Love indeed is naturally consequent on remission of sins; that is, she loveth much, because many sins are forgiven her. But it may also be considered as the mark and token of remission; that is, as it was manifest that Christ was much beloved by her, it might certainly be thence concluded that remission of sins had followed. This Christ addresses to the Pharisee, who thought her yet a sinner." Our Lord (says Doddridge) by this answer plainly shewed his knowledge both of their thoughts and of her character.

49. αἱ ταλαί. Here there is an ellipsis of ὁσα, which is supplied in a similar passage of Philostratus, in his Vit. Ap. 1, 15. μεταρρυθμιστε τοις ἀμαρτημασιν πάλλουν δι' αυτων.

50. ῥ πίντις σου σέσωκεν σε. That Jesus might tranquillize and comfort the woman mourning over her sins, and pained and shamed by the harshness and inhumanity of the Pharisee, he again addresses to her what he had just before said: "Be comforted, and fear not those supercilious and censorious persons; thy faith, which hath worked penitence, had already absolved thee from the crimes of thy former life: thou hast recovered the favour of God, and shalt no longer be accounted a sinner." (Rosenm. and Kuinoel.) Great was the trust and confidence evinced by the woman, who entered the house of the Pharisee, not heeding the sinister judgments of men. Not less serious was her penitence, as evinced both by showers of tears, and the defiling of those tresses, which it had been formerly her care to comb and adorn. (Wets.) On this, Koecher has the following pithy animadversion. "Alia sine dubio et nobilior in-
telligitur fiducia, quae mulieri isti saluti fuit, ea nemp, quam in Jesum Servatorem collocaverat.” I know not whether it be worth while to notice the accumulation of sigmas in this passage, which are scarcely less numerous than in the well-known verse of Eurip. Med.

50. παρευον εις ειρήνην. See the note on Mark 5, 33. Kuinoel, by rendering vale, miserably curtails the sense. It was an affectionate form of dismissing those to whom a favour had been granted, especially (as we find,) after healing: still more of those who, as here, had received forgiveness of sins. There is (observes Doddridge) an apparent propriety in the phrase here, considering what had happened to discompose the tender spirit of this humble penitent.

CHAP. VIII.

VERSE 1. Κατὰ πόλιν. Wetstein distinguishes between this phrase and κατὰ πόλιν: the former being said of one, the latter of more than one.

3. ἐπιτρῆσον. By this we must understand, not procurator provinciae, but procurator rei domesticae; as in Xen. Oecon. 12, 2. ἔχω ἐπιτρῆσον ἐν τοῖς ἄγροις. The word was generally used of any office committed to one’s charge, and often signified procurator, tutor, guardian: but especially denoted (as here) Steward, a word derived (as I think) from the Icelandic and Ang. Sax. stie, stee, or stew, (work,) and ward, a guardian. In Scotland, the office of Steward, or Stewart, (like the Lord Lieutenant of an English county,) exactly answered to that of the Greek ἐπιτρῆσος, or governor of a province.

3. διηκόνου, ministered food and other necessaries; as in Theophr. Char. 2, 4. (Kuin.) On this word,* Hammond has a long and instructive annotation, in-

* Some learned persons tell us that διηκόνω, signifies to bustle through the dust. But this is rather to etymologize than to interpret. I should rather conjecture that the Greek κώνω, like the Icl. and Saxon strew, had a double sense, and denoted not only dust, but bustle, trouble, &c.
tended as a key to its right understanding in all other places; to which I can only refer my readers.

5. ὁ σπείρων, the sower, i.e. a sower. For the article is used indefinitely, as the Heb. ה in 2 Sam. 17, 17. So just after, ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν. there is a similar passage in Lib. Or. ap. Fabr. Bibl. 7, 196. ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν ἐσικέευα δοκοῦσι πέτραις, ἐς ὡς ὁ σπείρων μαίνεται, πρόσ- ἀπόλλυσ τὴν σπόραν.

3. δὶδ παραβολῆς. On this parable, see Triller's remarks. A similar comparison, between the nature of men and the situation of various places, occurs in Hippocrates de ære, § 34. and Pausan. Bœot. 9, 21. See Casaub. on Theophr. Char. p. 94.

6. φυῖν. A word appropriated to the growth of grass, herbage and plants.


7. αἱ ἄκανθαι ἀπέπνεαν αὐτό. So Hippocr. (cited by Wolf:) ἀπορήσαντε καὶ ἀποπνέσσεται τὸ σπέμα τῆς πλεονεξίας.

9. τις εἰ τῇ παραβολῇ, i.e. what might be the meaning of this parable. So Cebes, in his Tabula. δήγησαι ἡμῖν — τί πότε ἔστων ὁ μῦθος.


14. ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἴδονων τοῦ βίου πορευομένων συμπνίγονται. Πορευομένως is either redundant, or may, with Wetstein, be interpreted gradually, in process of time; as in 2 Sam. 8, 1. and elsewhere. In μεριμνῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἴδονων, there is an hendiadis, and a sort of pleonasm, with which Wetstein compares Demosth. Epitaph. τῶν κατὰ βίου ἴδονων ἀπολαίφες. Schleusner rightly explains, "the anxieties and cares about obtaining wealth, or avoiding poverty." The sentiment is well illustrated by the following passages. Theocr. Id. 21. ἀ πενία μόχθοια δίδασκα-
καλὰ — σοιδε γὰρ εὐθεῖα ἀθρασία ἐργατὶκος κακὰ παρέχωντι μέριμνα. καὶ ἐλθὼν νικτὸς θὶς ἐπιθαυμασθὴν τῶν ἄνων, ("if one snatches a nap.") αἰφνίδιων δορυφοριῶν ἐφιστάμενοι μελετῶν. Εὐριπ. Μελ. 599, μὴ μοι γένοιτο λυπρὸς εἰθαμὸν βίῳ, μὴ ἄχρον, διὸς τὴν ἐμὴν κυρίον φρένα, let me not have such riches as may be accompanied by trouble and anxiety. Here λύπρος is for πίκρος, and the words μὴ ἄχρον διὸς τὴν ἐμὴν κυρίον φρένα, are added exegetically. Here also, κυρίοι is for λάσποι, and so Hesych. explains κυρίειν by λυπέιν.


15. ἐν καρδίᾳ καλὴ καὶ ἀγαθὴ. Many critics, as Erasmus, Grotius, Wetstein and Rosenm. treat this phrase as a sort of pleonasm for a heart truly good, removed from levity, inconstancy, and the desire of riches. An expression (says Beza) drawn ex adytis Philosophiæ. For so the Greeks have κάλος καὶ ἀγαθὸς, “one who is adorned with all the advantages of body, mind, fortune,” &c. and Grotius cites Aristotle’s Magn. Moral. 2, 9. ἐστι μὲν οὖν οὕτως λεγόμενον τοιοῦτον ἐπὶ τῶν τελέσων σπουδαίων ἡ καλοκαγαθία. — καλὰ τὸς ἀρετῶς, ἀγαθὰ ἀρχῆς, πλούσιων, δόξαν, τιμῆν. — ὡς ἀγαθὰ πάντα ὡσα ἀγαθα ἐστιν, ὁ τοιοῦτος καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς. But this is surely explaining with too great subtily. The expression is (I think) a popular phrase, and is admirably rendered in our common version, by “an honest and good heart,” it may therefore be understood in the sense which would naturally occur to any unlearned reader.

15. καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ. E. T. with patience, to which rendering Campbell, with reason, objects. He translates, continue to bring forth, but this is too paraphrastic. “Patience (says he) in the ordinary acceptance, is a virtue merely passive, and consists in suffering evil with equanimity. The Greek ὑπομονῇ implies much more; and, though the sense
now mentioned is not excluded, it generally denotes an active quality, to wit, constancy in purpose and practice. It corresponds exactly to what is with us called perseverance.” Dr. Campbell has much more to the same purpose, in which he remarks on the use of ὑπομονῇ, in other passages of Scripture, for which I must refer the reader to the work itself. It seems certain that the word denotes constancy and perseverance. The phrase ἐν ὑπομονῇ, may be rendered constanter. So Rom. 2, 7. 1 Thess. 1, 3. Hesych. ὑπομονῇ, καρτερία.

16. ὀδεῖς λόγχων ἀψις. Wetstein compares Serv. on the Æn. 6, 724. de lucernâ: sed si quâ re tecta fuerit.

18. βλέπετε ἄν π. α. The passage is thus judiciously paraphrased by Euthymius. “Take heed that you attend to my words: for they must be listened to studiously and with diligence, since they are symbolical and sublime, and not spoken at random, or by chance.”

18. δοκεῖ ἔχειν. Matt. and Mark, have ὅ ἔχειν. The best critics therefore agree in thinking that there is here a redundancy of δοκεῖν, examples of which are given by Kypke, Munth, Kuinoel, and others. But in most of the passages which they cite, we may, on close examination, find some meaning in δοκεῖν; and I am inclined to think, that St. Luke here intended to express something more than is found in St. Matthew and St. Mark; though it turns upon a distinction perhaps too refined for common apprehension.

19. συντυχεῖν αὐτῶς. E. V. come at him. So Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 4. ὡστε καὶ ἐρυθραίνεσθαι ὅποτε συντυχάναι τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις. Herodot. 4. 14. συντυχεῖν τε οἱ λόγιοι ἐπὶ κυκίκου, καὶ ἐσ λόγοις ἀπίκεσθαι. “Oχλον, the multitude, the press; an ancient word, examples of which are produced by Bulkley from Spenser.

20. λεγόντων. Here there is an ellipsis of τίνων.

20. ιδεῖν σε βέλοντες. The antecedent is put for the consequent, videre for colloqui: examples of which are produced by Wolf, Wetstein, and Kypke. So
Thucyd. 4, 125. καὶ τῶν Περίκλεως τὸ πρῶτον οὐκ αἰσθανόμενον, αἰς ἔγγα, ἡνάγακας πρὶν τῶν Βραυδία ἰδεῖν ἀκουθεῖν γὰρ τολμὸ ἀλλήλων ἐστρατοπεδεύοντο προα- πελθεῖν, where the Scholast explains ἰδεῖν by διαλεγ- θῆναι, and calls this idiom an Atticism. See Duker in loc. So also, Xen. Cyr. 4, 6, 2. εἶπεν, ὃτι Κυρών πρῶτον βουλοντα ἰδεῖν.

22. ἀνήχουσαν. Supply ναῦν. This is a nautical term, and signifies to lose cables, weigh anchor, move to seaward. Examples are produced by Raphel, Wetstein, Munth, and others. The opposite term to this is, κατάγεσθαι.

23. ἀφύπνωσε, obdormivit, fell asleep. This, indeed, is a signification of the word rarely, if ever, occurring in the Classical writers, among whom, it is used in the sense rouse out of sleep. Markland regards this as a provincialism, (i.e. Antiochism,) and then, (inconsistently,) conjectures ἐφύπνωσε. But the word occurs in this sense, in Jud. 5, 27. and is noticed in the ancient Glosses. Thus ἀφύπνω, obdormio.


23. συνεπληγοῦντο so that they were filled, the ship was filled, with the waves. This is a popular expression, and may be explained as a catachresis, frequent in the best authors; by which, what happens to ships is attributed to the sailors. Kypke cites Demosth. p. 366. πρῶτος γεμίζεσθαι τοὺς ὁς ἕμοι πλέοντας. Nor was it merely confined to ships, but extended to other objects, as appears from the following passages cited by Grotius, Kypke, and Kuinoel. Virg. “Jam prox- imus ardet Ucalegon. Thucyd. L. 1. p. 22. Ἀθηναῖοι
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24. ἐπιστάτα, ἐπιστάτα. This repetition is emphatic, and designates the anxiety of the disciples. Wetstein aptly compares Ovid, A. A. 2. 91. Decidit, atque cadens, Pater, o pater, auferor, inquit.

26. κατεπλέωσαν. This word is opposed to ἀναπλέων.

27. ἀνὴρ τις ἐκ τῆς πολέως, a person of the city, i. e. Gergesa. So Matth. 27, 57. Ἰασοῦ Φίλτρον Ἀρμαθαιας. Matth. 24, 35. ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου, and elsewhere in the Old and New Testament. (Wets. Rosenm. and Kuinoel.)

29. πολλοῖς χρόνοις. Grotius and Rosenm. take this for πολλάκις. But, as in ver. 27. we find ἐκ χρόνων ἰκανῶν, so Loesner and Kuinoel here take χρόνοις for anniis, unde a pluribus anniis, and indeed this sense is frequent in the Classical writers. Loesner cites Diod. Sic. 44. a. and Wetstein cites Plut. de Educ. 14, 26. ἐν δεσμοτηρίῳ πολλοῖς κατασάφει χρόνος. I add Thucyd. 1, 96. τοῦτον—τοῖς χρόνοις ὡς ἀκριβῶς ἐπεμνήσθη. The following word συνηρτάτει signifies arriperat. Rosenm. refers it to the convulsions of the epilepsy; but I agree with Kuinoel, who thinks that, from the context, it appears to be here used of insanity.


33. ἀπεπνίψη. The verb ἀποπνίψησθαι, occurs elsewhere also, in the sense of drowning, or suffocation in water; of which, Raphæl produces examples.

39. πόλις. Michaelis conjectures Δέκαπολιν, and some take πόλις for χῶραν, on the authority of Hesy-
chius. But there is no occasion to alter either the common reading, or the usual interpretation. For (as Kuinoel observes) πῶλος is, in the New Testament, often used of towns, and even villages: neither is there any discrepancy between Luke and Mark.


42. ἀπέθανεν, “was dying, was near unto death.” See Markl. on Max. Tyr. 1. 480.
43. οὔτα ἐν ἰώτει αἰματος. A similar construction is cited by Raphel (ap. Wolf.) from Polyb. L. 2. C. 2. p. 188. ὁ Δημήτριος ἐν διαβολαίς οὖν.

43. ἐν ἰώτει αἰματος. See the parallel passages in Matthein. and Mark. I add an interesting citation of Wettstein. from Galen de prænot. Ἡ γὰρ τοῦ Βοσθοῦ γυνῆ τας καλωμένα μω γυναικεία περιποίοντα, καταργάς μὲν οἰδομένη τοὺς ἀξιολόγους ἱατροὺς, ἐν εἰς ἡδη κἀκεῖν κλαίνει ἐνδοκούν εἰς ταῖς συνήθεις μαίαις ἀράταις ὑστέας κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἐκτὸς ἐκτεθηκέναι οἰς τῇ ὁδεγεῖ ὁφελεῖτο, πάντας ἡμᾶς ὁ Βοσθὸς ἁβραίος ἐπεσκόπεσε, τῇ χρηστείᾳ τοιοῦτος δὲ συμπολογῆθη, κατὰ τὴν γεγραμμένην ὑπ' Ἡπακράτους τε καὶ τῶν ἀρίστων μετ' αὐτῶν ἱατρῶν θεραπειαν πάντα πράττειν —— ἕτελ δὲ ταύτα ἐπράττων ἐφαινε εἰς σφυραὶ διάθεσις ἀποτελομένη, κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἁπορία ἅπιστοι ημῖν ἐγκεκριμένοι, καὶ θητοῦντες ἐτέρας ἁγιασμιν θεραπειας, ἐν ἐν μεταβοῦν, οὕτου ἀλογισμοῦ τις ἡπιούσιν, οὕτως ἀτρίσμενος ψέματος αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀριστῶν ἱατρῶν ἀκαλογομενής —— τα γὰρ εκκριμόμενα τοῦ δούλου τοῦ γυναικείου καθ' ἐκαστὴν ἡμέραν.

45. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἡσιών. Τις ὁ ἀφανεμένος μου; “not that he was ignorant who had touched him, says Epiphanius, Anecrat. § 38. (cited by Bulkley,) but that he might not be himself the divulger of the miracle, and that the woman, hearing the question, and drawing near, might testify the singular benefit she had received, and that, in consequence of her declaration, she might presently hear from his lips, that her faith had saved her; and that, by this means, others might be excited to come and be healed of their disorders.”
more elegant Greek if it had been μη πράγματα τῷ διδαχτῇ καὶ ταρεχεῖ. So Theophr. ch. Eth. 15. πράγματα μη μη χρεῦε. See the Commentators. The word σύλλειν properly signifies vellere, vellicare; τλλεῖν, to pinch, nip, snatch at, haggle, and is used metaphorically as our worry, i.e. to harass. See Wets. and Kuin. on Matt. 9, 36. Lennep. Etym. and Blomf. on Æsch. Pers. 5, 83.

52. ἐκστάντω ἀυτῇ. Ἐκστάντω is here in the middle, not the passive voice. The verb κάπτεσθι signifies to beat, strike oneself, and because that is the usual accompaniment of extreme grief, to bewail, grieve for any one. See Geier, de Lectu Hebr. 6, 16, p. 199. It answers to the Hebr. רע, which is followed by γ, for, or ἀν, over, and has sometimes in the Sept. (as here), like a deponent, simply an accusative. Hence Weston is not justified in supposing an ellipsis of διὰ.

55. ἐπέστρεψε τὸ πιέσμα αὐτῆς. See Grotius ap. Elsley.

56. παρῆγγελεν αὐτοῖς μηδὲν εἶπεν τὸ γεγονός. This command does not apply to all ages, but only to that particular time when Herod was lying in wait to take away Christ’s life. For though our Lord was not so ignorant of things, as to suffer his firmness and constancy to be overcome by the desire of life; yet he wished to finish his allotted career, and therefore avoided the snares laid to destroy him before the appointed time. (Strigel. ap Koecher.)

CHAP. IX.

VERSE I. έδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξοικον. So Plut. 1. 478. Α. (cited by Wets.) Μιθριδάτης συμμαχών διδότω καὶ δύναμιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἑξοπληκτοὺς.

3. μήτε ἀνή δύο χιτῶνως ἔχειν. The Jews usually wore two garments. The outer one was the talith, on which was the susith, i.e. the borders, skirts, or fringes sewed on the talith. This was named by them also the kolhon of thread, the κολόφιον for Epi-
phanius, lib. 1. c. 15. describes the κολόβιον, or dalmatic, as woven in with borders of purple, i.e. with the συζίθη. The under garment was a kind of tunic of woollen, named the chalick. Hieros. Schab. fol. 15, 4. Babyl. Schab. fol. 120, 1. Comparing the text with the same expression in Luke 3, 11. “He that hath two coats, let him give one,” &c. It may seem probable that the “two coats” are the chalick and the talith worn at once; and that the poorer ranks in the hot climate of Judæa were wont to go occasionally in the chalick alone. Hence the Baptist does not scruple to enjoin him who weareth both to give his talith to the poor. (Lightfoot.)

7. διήγορει, hesitated. Wetstein thinks that the preposition has an intensive force, q.d. “ he was utterly in doubt what to think of Jesus;” Doddridge considers the word as expressing a mixture of doubt and fear.

8. Ἡλίας ἐφάνη, i.e. ἦλθε, venit. This is not an unusual signification even in the Classical writers. Thus the Scholiast on Theocritus, φάνει, i.e. ἔλθων: Plato, in Protagora, at the beginning, Πάθεν δὲ Σωκράτης φαῖνη; So also in 2 Macc. 7, 22. οὐκ οἷον ὅπως εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἐφάνητε κολίαν. (Hammond.) So also Xen. Mem. 2, 8, 1. There was (says Rosenmuller) at that time an opinion, that before the coming of the Messiah, one of the ancient prophets should return to life. They thought, therefore, that Jesus was one of those prophets, whose office it was to announce the advent of the Messiah as near at hand. To this opinion a prophecy respecting the other Elias, who was to appear, had given occasion, which they so interpreted as to suppose that not only another Elias, but also another prophet, would come; inso much that the attention of the whole nation was fixed on that subject.

12. ημέρα ἔρχατο κλίνειν. The word κλίνειν, and its compounds, ἀποκλίνειν and ἐγκλίνειν, are used of the inclination, or declination, of the sun to the horizon, i.e. evening. So Luke 24, 29. κλίνει καὶ ημέρα. He-
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12. καταλύωσιν. Καταλύσαι (says Hammond) properly signifies among mariners καταψεύδον ἀπὸ τελαγοῦς εἰς τὸν λιμένα, and from thence it is applied to travellers that betake themselves to their inn, which is therefore called κατάλυμα, because the man and the beast there layed down his lading, and so it is generally to refresh oneself." But this opinion is refuted by Le Clerc*, who well remarks on the use of a thorough acquaintance with the best Greek authors, and the genius of the language, in interpreting the New Testament, and that the knowledge of Greek drawn from the Scriptures themselves, and some acquaintance with the Fathers, chiefly read for the study of divinity, with occasionally consulting the lexicons and grammarians, is not sufficient.

12 εὑροσιν ἐπισιτισμόν, "provide food, or obtain food." The word ἐπισιτισμός properly signifies a provisioning, from ἐπισιτίζω, which is chiefly used in a military sense. See Kypke, Wetstein, and Muth.

13. οὐκ εἰσιν—εἰ μὴ τι. Most recent critics adopt the mode of interpretation proposed by Homberg and Kypke, who take εἰ μὴ τι for numquid, and think that there is an interrogation, joined with wonder and indignation. Thus the following words, εἰς πᾶν ταῦτα τῶν λαῶν τοῖσον, will be emphatical. The earlier Commentators, as Beza, Grotius, Piscator, and Wolf, regard the sentence as highly elliptical, and to be thus completed: "We have but five loaves and two fishes, (and cannot therefore give them to eat,) unless we should," &c. Thus the τι will have what

Hoogeveen calls the vis ὀσχιστής, the conjectural force, like εἴ μὴ ταῦ, εἴ γὰρ ἀρχ., and is not ill rendered by Casaubon fortasse: and so the Syriac translator seems to have taken the words. Whichever of these interpretations be adopted, I see no reason to suppose, with Camerarius, Homberg, and Schmidt, that there is here any irony. See the note on Matth. 6, 37. Vater refers to Matth. Gr. Gram. § 617. c.

16. εὐλογησεν αὐτῶς, blessed them, i.e. the loaves and fishes. Αὐτῶς is put for εἴτε αὐτῶς, pronounced a blessing over them. For it was customary with the Hebrews, at every meal, to previously pronounce a prayer, which commenced with the words, "blessed be God," thus praising God, and returning thanks for the food and drink. Hence it came to pass, that γὰρ, and its correspondent word εὐλογεῖν, were transferred to the food itself: so that, with the accusative of the thing, it denoted εὐχαριστεῖν, to return thanks for, as here, and in 1 Sam. 9, 18. 1 Cor. 10, 16. (Kuin.)

22. δεὶ τῶν νῦν τοῦ ἄνθρωπος, i.e. me in my human nature; not τῶν νῦν τοῦ Θεοῦ. (Markland.)
23. καθ ἡμέραν. It has been doubted whether these words are to be adopted or rejected. It is now generally admitted that they are to be retained. See Campbell. I assent to Griesbach and Kuinoel, who think that they were expunged by the grammarians, merely because they are not found in the parallel passages.
28. Many have stumbled at the apparently ungrammatical phrase ἐγένετο—ἡμέρας ἢκτα, where some subaud ἢσαν after ἢκτα: others would read ἐγένετο. But not only the Hebrew writers join verbs singular to nouns plural, both masculine and feminine (as in Ex. 7, 25. and Deut. 19, 10.), but also the Greek
Classical writers make verbs singular follow nouns plural, both masculine and feminine. See Fischer’s Annot. on Weller, and Matth. Gr. Gram.

31. ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον. Various have been the opinions of Commentators on the sense to be attributed to ἔξοδον. Piscator, Montanus, Beza, Camerarius, Lightfoot, and Leigh, take it for an allusion to the ἔξοδος, or departure of the Israelites from Egypt. Others, as L. Brug. Hammond, Clericus, Bolten, &c. understand the expedition which Christ undertook against Jerusalem. But, notwithstanding that this signification is strongly supported, both by Classical, Hebrew, and Hellenistic authorities, yet surely it would here produce a very harsh sense. Besides (as Olearius observes) it is εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, not εἰς Ἱεροσαλήμ. I therefore entirely assent to Grotius, Piscator, Wolf, Schleusner, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, who take it, by a very common euphemism, for death. This use of the word is frequent in the Scriptures, and, also in Josephus and Philo, and is quite agreeable to the context. See the examples in Elsner and Wetstein. So the Latin exitus. Indeed, few languages are without this metaphor, which, as Grotius observes, may be considered as amongst the allusions which have preserved that most ancient tradition, of the immortality of the soul. For the whole of the passage, I must refer the reader to the long and learned illustrations of Kypke, with whom, however, I cannot agree, when he takes it in a wider sense, namely, of all that should befall Christ at Jerusalem, and without the city, though still in its vicinity.

33. μὴ εἴδος ὁ λέγει, not knowing what he said. Mark, adds (ch. 9, 6.) ζησον γὰρ ἐκφοβεῖται. For Peter, being struck with astonishment at the radiance and dazzling brightness of what he had seen, lost, for a time, all power of thought or speech. So Quintilian, 8, 8. Ego illos credo qui (Cicerone caussam Cornelii orante) aderant, nec sponte judicioque plausisse: sed velut mente captos, et quo essent in loco,
ignoros, erupuisse in hunc voluptatis affectum. (Rosenmuller.)

38. ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου ἀνεβάλεν. The expression ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου may (says Wolf) denote one of the lower rank, such as is called by Lucian in his Somn. p. 7. τοῦ πολλοῦ δήμου εἰς, or in the Rabbinical phrase, Σὺ γὰρ ὑμῖν, which exactly answers to the Latin, terrae filius. But I rather assent to Elsner, Wolf, Wetstein, and Rosenmuller, who explain, "a man of the crowd," namely, of those collected together, without reference to his rank in life. Such an assemblage seems usually to have accompanied Christ whithersoever he went.

39. That the boy was epileptic, Kuinoel thinks evident, from the description of the disorder. He is, indeed, called lunatic by Matthew, but by that name the Greeks often designated epileptic patients. So Lucretius, speaking of an epileptic person: Spumas ingemit et tremit artus; Desipit, extentat nervos, torquetur, &c. (Rosem.)

39. συντρίβετα τοῦ, "often wounded him." The word συντρίβετα signifies to dash, bruise, crash, &c. (see the examples in Wetstein,) and is metaphorically applied to those whose strength is utterly broken, worn down, and exhausted by the attacks of some acute disorder, such as epilepsy, which induces a death-like languor, or, in the words of the Evangelist, leaves the patient like one dead. See more in Kypke, who has acutely and elegantly handled this subject.

41. ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, to the disciples, who are the γενεαὶ ἡπιστος: ἀνέχομαι ὑμᾶς, to the scribes, the γενεαὶ διεσπαρμένη, (Mark 9, 19.) who were disputing with the disciples. This would never have been understood, had it not been for the place in Mark; a thing not unusual in the Scriptures. (Markland.)

44. θέσθη ὑμῖν εἰς τὰ ὀντα ὑμᾶν. An expression similar to τιθέναι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, in Luke 1; θε. or εἰς τὰς καρδίας, in Luke 21, 14. or ἐπὶ καρδίαν, in Sir. 50, 28. q. d. "Let these sayings always sound in your ears,
alt d mente reposta tenete hac dicta." (Kuin.) It is by some called a Hebraism; but similar expressions are cited by Georgius from the Classical writers.

45. ηγνώνω—ίναι μή αἰσθάνομαι αυτό. Αἰσθάνομαι is properly used of corporeal sense; nevertheless, it is frequently applied to the mind, as the Latin sentio for mente percipio, intelligo, animadverto, cognosco. So Xen. Παξ. 5. ὢς ἥστερο τὸ γεγονός ὢς αἰσθάνομαι δὲ ταῦτα ἄτας ἔχοντα. Παξ. 1. αἰσθάνομαι τὰ τῶν πολεμίων. Philipp. 1, 9. (Wets.) They understood the words of Christ, but were at a loss how to reconcile them with their preconceived opinions, (founded on their own traditions,) that their Messiah should live for ever, or with the great things they expected from him; and therefore, in after ages, they invented the distinction of Messiah Ben Joseph, who was to die, and Messiah Ben David, who was to triumph, and live for ever. (Whitby.) The ἵνα is here put for ἵστε, on which signification see Schleusner, in his Lex. to whose examples I add Liban. Orat. 472. Α. οὖν ἐστιν ὁ ἱερός τόνηρος, ἵνα κριθῇ τῆς Μακεδονίαν δούλειας ἄξιος· where, without cause, Morell has foisted in οὕτω before τόνηρος.

46. εἰσῆλθε δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς. In order to reconcile this with Mark 9, 3. Beza and Grotius interpret extitit inter discipulos disceptatio, and take ἐν αὐτοῖς for πρὸς ἄλλην. But De Dieu, Price, and others, take a different view of the subject, and understand διαλογισμὸς of cogitatio, since in ver. 47. there follows ἴδιῳ τῶν διαλογισμῶν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, and thought does not exclude discussion, and therefore the words of Luke are not repugnant to those of Mark. It may be rendered, "the disciples thought with themselves." That the Greek writers often use the verbs ἐπιέναι, ἐπελθεῖν, εἰσέναι, and εἰσελθεῖν, in this sense of thought, is well known.

49. ἀκολουθεῖ μὲθ ἡμῶν, i. e. does not belong to our company, take part with, or side with us. So εἶναι μετὰ τῖνος, in Mark 12, 30. This phrase, and ἀκολουθεῖν ὁπίσω, the writers of the New Testament (follow-
ing the example of the Sept.) frequently use. All these idioms seem to savour of Oriental phraseology, though examples have been produced from the Classical writers, by Blackwell, Abresch, Palairet, Kypke, and Wetstein.

51. ἐν τῷ συμπληρωματι τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀνάληψεως, while the time of his ἀνάληψις was being completed, and approached. (See Luke 1, 37. Acts 2, 1.) In the interpretation of ἀνάληψις there has been no little variation of opinion. Some Commentators (as Heinsius) take it to denote "the elevation of Christ on the cross," or, (as Beza and Michaelis,) his ascent to Jerusalem. Both opinions are equally far-fetched and improbable. I agree with the generality of Interpreters, as De Dieu, Beza, Camerarius, Piscator, Grotius, Suicer, Bengel, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, who are of opinion that the word ἀνάληψις properly denotes ascent; and that as ἀναλυμπάνεται is often used of the departure of Christ from earth, and his ascent to, or assumption into, heaven, (see Acts 1, 11. & 22. and Mark 16, 19.) so ἀναλήψις has here the very same sense. I cannot approve of Dr. Campbell's version, "removal," which he adopted (he says) in order to imitate the ambiguity of the original. But, in truth, there is no ambiguity. The ancient versions and Commentators unite in the interpretation which I have adopted. So Euthymius: ἡμέρας τῆς ἁναλήψεως αὐτοῦ λέγει, τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἀφορισθέντα μέχρι τῆς ἁναλήψεως αὐτοῦ, τῆς ἀπὸ γῆς εἰς οὐρανόν ἐγερθῆς γῆρ ἡδη καὶ η ἀνακέρασις αὐτοῦ, καὶ η ἀνάστασις, καὶ η ἁναλήψις. Thus there was no occasion for Markland to conjecture ἁναλύσεως, though the words ἁναλυσεως and ἁναλήψεως are confounded in Cyprian. Ep. 8. Grotius here takes occasion to remark, that this circumstance, as well as many others, is narrated by Luke without any regard to the order of time, the cause of which he conjectures to be as follows:

"When Luke had narrated two remarkable admonitions of Christ, the former of which exhorted them
to avoid ambition, the latter to eradicate envy, he thought it a suitable place for adding a third admonition, against revenge; and that it might be the better understood, he added the circumstances which led to the mention of it. So also the subsequent histories of the three men called by Christ must not be supposed to relate to one and the same time, but were thrown into one place on account of the similitude of the subject, so that it might be readily and clearly understood what impediments would exist to the calling and profession of the Gospel. Having treated of which, Luke resumes the thread of the history at the calling of the Apostles, (with which he had commenced the chapter,) and then subjoins the calling of other persons.” (Grot.)

51. τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐστήριξε τ. π. This expresses the Hebr. וַיְצַו, and so it is often rendered in the Sept. Wetstein refers to 2 Reg. 12, 17. 2, 9 & 10. Jer. 42, 15. Ez. 17, 7. Jer. 31, 10. and Ez. 14. 8. The Commentators, however, are not agreed on the exact sense of the formula. Heinsius and Kypke, interpreting it after the model of some Classical phrases, explain, “componebat vultum, ut proficisceretur Hierosolymam.” But Krebs, Kuinoel, and others, more justly regard it as an Hellenistic phrase formed on the model of the Hebrew, and which is well expressed by the Persic translator propositum firmum fecit, “he firmly determined to go.” See Leusden and Vorst. de Hebr. N. T. So Bemidbar R. 4. cited by De Dieu: “Obsfirmatus vultu ad gehennam sedid.”

52. ἀπέστησεν ἄγγελος. Not wishing to come unto them, without their being apprised of his approach, and also that they might make all necessary preparations for his reception. (Rosenm. & Kuin.)

53. οὐκ ἐδέξατο αὐτῶν, ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευμένων ε. 'I. The phrase ἦν πορευμένων is Hebrew: So in 2 Sam. 17, 11. פָּרָה הַיָּרֹם בִּימְלָה, which is rendered by the Sept. καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον σοῦ πορευμένων ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. The sense therefore is this: “when they knew that he was travelling to Jerusalem,” and
this especially for a religious purpose, in order to the celebration of the Passover. For the denial of the rites of hospitality towards the Jews was chiefly as it regarded the performance of sacred duties; and the chief point of difference in religious tenets between them was in determining the place where God had especially commanded himself to be worshipped, which the Samaritans said was Mount Garisim. Hence, when the Jews were passing through Samaria in their way to the feast at Jerusalem, the Samaritans afforded them no hospitality; nay, sometimes forcibly hindered their progress, as we find by Jos. Ant. 20, 5. seqq.

54. πῦρ—απὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, i. e. lightning. So the Hebr. נִזָח and the Latin ignis. ἀνελῶσαν αὐτοὺς, i.e. to consume and destroy them, a signification perfectly classical, of which Wetstein adduces examples.

55. οὐκ ὑδατε ὧν πνεύματός ἐστε. The word πνεῦμα here denotes mind, affection, sentiments, feelings. Dr. Hammond has an instructive dissertation on the various senses of the word πνεῦμα. To this I must be content to refer the reader, who may also consult the very brief compendium of its contents in Elsley. On the subject of this passage, (namely, persecution,) see the excellent dissertation of Whitby in loc. There is, however, a small point of diversity which remains yet to be determined. Almost all the ancient Commentators take the words without an interrogation, "ye know not by what state of mind ye are affected, and whither it would hurry you: it is a zeal not accompanied with knowledge, and therefore unworthy of my disciples." Many recent Interpreters, however, as Rosenmuller, Schleusner, and Kuinoel, take the sentence interrogatively, thus, "know ye not with what temper of mind ye ought, as my disciples, to be actuated; for I came not to destroy men, but to save them?" This, however, seems somewhat harsh. Schleusner cites Soph. Οἰ. Col. 640. and I add Eurip. Iph. t. 1317. τί πνεῦµα συµφορᾶς κεκτηµένη; But, upon the whole, I prefer the former interpretation.
56. ὁ γὰρ ὁλὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπο—σωσάι, ι. ο. In the times of the Prophets, there was need of severity: but in that of the Messiah, lenity is requisite. The Messiah was sent, not to execute judgment, but to save men, (though sinners, in every way, both in soul and body,) and who should be so far from sparing any labour for this effect, as even to lay down his life to further that benevolent purpose.

60. διάγγελλε. The word is well explained by Wetstein: "circumquaque vel per diversa loca nunciare, divulgare."

61. ἀποταξάσθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον μου. The best Commentators interpret, "bid farewell of my family," in which sense the word sometimes occurs in Philo, Josephus, and other good authors. See the citations in Kypke, who has there refuted Salmasius and Olearius. Some, however, explain, "give my last orders and injunctions to my relations." But (as Kuinoel observes) the word does not occur in the Scriptures in that sense. Heinsius and Doddridge would apply these words to his goods or possessions, because in Luke 14, 33. ἀποτάσσεσθαι is used of things, and render, "that I may settle my domestic affairs, dispose of my property." But this seems open to well-founded objections.

62. οὖδεὶς ἐπιβαλλω τὴν χείρα αυτοῦ ἐπʼ ἀρτον. This is, (by a metaphor borrowed from agriculture,) a proverbial expression for entering upon any undertaking. Similar ones are cited from Classical writers by Lomier de Lustr. 455. and Schoet. in Adag. N. Test. There is a peculiar force and propriety in the allusion. For the plougher must keep his eyes intent on his furrow, and not permit them to deviate, εἰς τὸ ὑψόω, to the right or left, ne deliret*. So Hesiod, Oper. 2, 61. (cited by Grotius and Wets.) ἰδείαν αὐλακ ἐκλαύων, Ἡμεῖς παπταίνων μεθ' ὁμήρικας, ἀλλʼ ἐπί ἔργο θυμόν ἔχον. I add, Theocrit. Id. 10. init. Ἐργατίνα βουκαῖε, τῇ νῦν ὧν ἡ ἕρε πεπόνθης; Οὔτε

* Which is derived from the old word lira, a furrow.
The text is elegantly illustrated, and its allusions traced, both with respect to the natural sense and spiritual application, in a masterly discourse by Dr. Maltby, vol. 2, p. 151, seqq. Grotius remarks that here, (as often elsewhere,) the ἀκροατὴς is mingled with the comparison. He also cites a passage of Seneca, “ambitio non respicit,” and spiritually applies that, and the magnanimous Roman maxim, “Nihil actum videri quantum superest quod agatur,” (which may be compared with that of our Poet, “Think nothing done while aught remains”), also the Pythagorean dict recorded by Simplig. on Epict. 382. (cited by Wets.) ἔσκε δὲ ὁ τοιοῦτος ἄναρ τό παρά τῶν Πυθαγόρεων συμβολικῶν ἐνδείκτην· ἔλεγεν δὲ ἐκεῖνος εἰς τὸ ἔρως ἀπερχόμενος μὴ ἐκπομπὸν ἐνδείκνυμεν; ὅτι τὸν εἰς δεῖν ὀρισθείναι οὐχ ἔγνωμαν τι ἐχειν, καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἀντεχόμενοι. A similar maxim is recorded in Porphyry, of a certain sage called Bardeanes: οὔτε πρὸς γνωμικά, οὔτε πρὸς τέκνα, εἰ τοὺς κεκτημένους, ἐκπομπῆς ἡ τῶν λόγων περιπτείναι. Finally, Wetstein cites Lucian, Cataplus 14. ἐκπομπής τοιῶν εἰς τὸ ἐπιστ. ὥσπερ εἰ δώρα δοτές, which reminds one of the elegant line of our great lyric Poet: “Nor cast one longing lingering look behind.”

CHAP. X.

Verse 1. ἀναδείκτης, appointed. The word ἀναδείκτης properly signifies to exhibit aloft; and as those appointed to any office were sometimes brought forward, and introduced publicly to the people in that capacity, so it came to signify designate, appoint, create, constitute: and was applied to the solemn inauguration of kings, and the appointment of generals, and other eminent official persons, both military and civil. In this sense, indeed, it never occurs in the Old Testament, but it is sometimes found in the Apocrypha, and not unfrequently in
the Classical writers, from whom examples are produced by Raphel, Elsner, Munthe, and Wetstein.

1. ἠδειχθεν δὲ Κύριος καὶ ἑτέροις, ἐβολομάζοντα. Campbell, not without reason, objects to the common version, other seventy, and renders seventy others. For (says he) the expression other seventy implies that there were seventy sent before, which was not the case. So also Markland and Dr. Owen translate others also, namely seventy, whom he sent, &c. The καὶ has a reference to the twelve Apostles previously chosen. "Although (says Wetstein) some (supra 9, 60.) declined the office of legate, yet Christ nevertheless found seventy others, besides the twelve of whom we read in Ch. 9. ver. 1. The number seventy was a favourite one with the Jews. See Gen. 46, 27. Ex. 15, 27. Num. 11, 25. Such was the number of the Judges of the great Synedrium, and of the Greek Interpreters. So Jos. Vit. 11. Bell. 2, 20, 5, 4, 6, 4. (Wets.) See Selden de Syned. 603.

and Meusch. on N. Test. p. 131. The common opinion is, that the number of the Synedrii assessors was seventy-two, and from hence seems to have arisen the reading of some MSS., Versions, and Fathers, seventy-two. (Kuin.) Other Fathers, indeed, read seventy. It was, however, an opinion held even from the earlier ages, even by those Greek Fathers who read seventy, that Christ appointed seventy-two. "And not without reason, (says Rosenm.) for it was customary with the Hebrews to make use of the round number seventy, when the real number consisted of seventy-two." This custom obtained in other numbers besides seventy, and was familiar to the Classical writers. On the seventy disciples, see Fabric. Bibl. Antiq. p. 446. Suic. Thes. 2, 288. Calmet’s Dictionary, and especially Grotius. The reader may also consult, with advantage, the annotation of Mr. Elsley on this passage; and, above all, the very accurate statement of the evidence on this question, to be found in Mr. Horne’s Introd. vol. 2, p. 335.
4. μηδένα κατά τὴν ὅδεν ἀνασάγη εσθ, salute no one by the way. Price and Suicer take this to be an hyperbolical saying; which, however, Wolf thinks not necessary. Be that as it may, Oriental salutations have ever been very ceremonious and prolix, accompanied too with embraces, &c.* So especially the Pharisees. This injunction may be considered as given for the purpose of promoting despatch in the important business which was then to occupy their whole time, and absorb all their attention. And therefore Jesus meant, that not even the smallest portion of their time should be so unprofitably expended. Thus, when Elisha sent Gehazi on a message to be speedily delivered, he enjoins him to salute no one by the way. (2 Kings 4, 29.) That it was usual with the Hebrews, under certain circumstances, to salute no one, either on the way or any where else, has been proved by Lightfoot in loc. Rosenm. however, proposes to render, "nolite adire in via alios salutandi causâ." But this seems to enervate and curtail the sense. It is judiciously observed by Doddridge, that our Lord did not intend by this to forbid his disciples in general, nor even any of his ministers, a decent use of the customary tokens of civil respect to others †, any more than he forbids

* "Serious and taciturn as the natives of the East usually are (says Mr. Horne, Introd. vol. 3. p. 428.) they grow talkative when they meet an acquaintance, and salute him." Where see more on the same subject.

† "Our Lord merely meant by this prohibition, that they should employ the utmost expedition; that they should suffer nothing to retard and impede them in their progress from one place to another; and should not lavish those precious moments, which ought to be devoted to the sacred and arduous duties of their office, in observing the irksome and unmeaning modes of ceremonious intercourse. Not that our Lord intended that his Disciples should studiously violate all common civility and decency, and industriously offend against all the rules of courteousness and decorum, since he commanded them, upon their entrance into any house, to salute it, (Matth. 10, 12.) and observe the customary form of civility in wishing it peace, (Luke 10, 5.) or universal happiness." (Horne's Introd. vol. 3. p. 429. So Euthymius: Τοῦτο προσέτατεν, ὅθεν βουλήμενοι ἀπανθρώπους αὐτοὺς γίνεσθαι καὶ ἀπροσηγόρους, ἀλλὰ ἀνεμποδίστους.
the use of shoes and purses; only while they were employed on this particular message, he required the forbearance of them, that every one who saw them pass by might perceive that their minds were full of the most important business, and that they were earnestly intent on the immediate dispatch of it. “Therefore (observes Schoettgen) Jesus enjoins his disciples not to omit, for the sake of such trifling matters as appertain to the forms of civility, any of those weightier concerns which appertain to their sacred office.

5. εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ. A common form of salutation, in daily use throughout the East, Salam ale-kum. So 1 Sam. 25, 6. That such was the common salutation of Bishops in bestowing their blessing, appears from an anonymous Epigram of the Anthol. 72. of Brunk and Jacobs. Εἰρήνη πάντεσσιν Ἐξισοκτος εἶπεν ἐπελθών.

6. ὅς εἰρήνης. The article appears to be devoid of authority, and is justly rejected by Wetstein, Campbell, Griesbach, Matthæi, and Vater. The sense of ὅς εἰρήνης is, “worthy and capable of receiving that peace and salvation which ye were commissioned to announce.” So Matth. 10, 11, & 13. Wetstein explains, “dignus qui illo voto potiatur;” and refers to 2 Sam. 12, 5. Eph. 2, 3. See Kuin. on Matth. 8, 12. Bulkley compares the θυγατέρας Ἀρείδης in Isocr. Pan. Op. p. 54. applied to the Amazons, which might be intended rather as descriptive of their character and disposition, than of their lineage and descent.


10—12. See the note on Matth. 10, 14, seqq. Kuinoel paraphrases: “We leave you to yourselves, no longer choose to have any intercourse with you, and, lest we should carry with us the dust from your city, we by shaking it off return it to you. On the
use of the verb ἀφημάττεσθαι in the Sacred writers see Spanheim on Callim., and Segaar on this passage.

18. ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ στοδῷ καθήμεναι μετενόησαν. That the rites of mourning and repentance here alluded to were usual to the Hebrews, is well known from Scripture, and that they should also have been common to the Tyrians, may easily be imagined. But that they were in use even among the Western nations, has been thus learnedly proved by Kypke:


16. ὁ ἀνετῶν ὑμᾶς, ἔμε ἀνετεῖ. The sentence is well paraphrased by Euthymius: "The disgrace, though yours, extends to me, who sent you: and from me to my Father, who sent me." "By this rejection, (observes Euthymius,) our Lord has in view incredulity and perversity."

19. διδώμι—ἐχάρον. According to the opinions of almost all Commentators, (and among the rest Rosenm.) their is in πατεὶν ἐπάνω φθεῖν καὶ σκοτοῦν an allusion to Ps. 91, 13. and the words are, by accom-
modation, thought to signify deliverance, by Divine assistance, from the most imminent personal perils. To this, however, Kuinoel objects; and remarks, that the discourse is not so much of what the disciples would suffer for the profession and promulgation of the Christian faith, but rather what they should do for the furtherance of that religion. "For (says he) an image had preceded, which signified, that by the Disciples the power of Satan was diminished; and therefore the formula πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων denotes to trample upon and destroy serpents; and by πατεῖν ἐπάνω σκορπίων is meant weaken the power of Satan, to whom all the impediments and obstacles to the Christian Religion are attributed in the New Testament." This is indeed learnedly conceived, but is to me not quite convincing. I rather assent to the former interpretation. Bos, in his Obs. Crit. p. 108. has well observed, that serpents are otherwise a symbol of whatever is most noxious, and especially of crafty and dangerous adversaries. He aptly quotes Niceph. Oniroc. p. 19. ὄφεις ἀναστρέφων τὸς ἐναντίους νόει. Wetstein cites Hygin. Astron. 2. 2. "(Neptuno Castori et Polluci) dedit potestatem naufragis saluti esse." Astrampsych. Onirocrit. ὄφεις πατεῖν τὰ κέντρα τῶν ἡχόρων λύει. Eustath. on Hom. Od. λ. p. 485, 6. ὅθεν καὶ παρομία ἔτη τῶν οὕτω σκωπτεῖν εὐφρῶν τῶν ἀρχιλόχων πεπότηκασ, ὡς ἐλ τις εἴη η δέη σκόρπιον ἢ ὄφιν, ἢ κακὴν ἀκαρβαν. Medrasch Thehillim. "Totis XII. Mensibus, quibus Noachus fuit in arca, ambulabat super serpentes, et non lædebat eum." Ἕλιαν, Η. Ν. 10, 28. ἀνυποδε- τοι βαδίζωσιν καὶ μόνον οὐ πατοῦσι τῶν σκορπίων, εἴτε μέντοι ἀπαθεῖς διαμένουσι.

19. Οὐδὲν ύμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἄδικηγη, shall by no means hurt you. The three negatives strengthen the negation. So the best Greek writers. See Markland.

20. In order, however, to repress in his followers, all pride and conceit at these preternatural gifts, and to correct the supposition of his Disciples that it was their greatest honour, that they had demons
in subjection to them, he promises much greater things, namely, the power to destroy false religions, and propagate the doctrine of salvation, (v. 18, 19.) and permission to enjoy felicity in the Messiah’s kingdom, and recommend it to others; and adds the following admonition: “rejoice, however, not so much that the very demons obey you, as that your names are written in the book of life.” (Rosenm.) On the idiom μη followed by ἀλλὰ, non tamquam, see Markland ap. Bowyer, and Schl. Lex. The phrase γράφεσθαι εἰς τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, is explained jūs civitatis caelestis accipere. Future life is here (as often elsewhere) brought forward under the image of an earthly πολίτευμα, since the names of civitatis are inscribed in a book, from which are occasionally expunged the names of those persons who are thought unworthy, and who thereby lose the jūs civitatis. The image which attributes, a book, &c. to God, is frequent in the Old Testament, and in the Rabbinical writings, nor is it rare in the new Testament. So Hebr. 12, 23. πρωτότοκοι εἰς οὐρανοῖς ἀπεγεγραμμένοι. Kuinoel refers to Valk. on Herodot. 5, 58. Ernest. on Callim. n. in Cer. 57. and Segaar in. loc. Against those who would from this passage elicit a support to the doctrine of election by an absolute decree, Grotius offers the following remarks: “Nam ad statum presentem, et quidem sub aequa conditione, non ad æterna, eaque pura et peremptoria, Dei decretae, hæc locutio referenda est.” So Whitby observes, that this does not signify an absolute election, but a present right to life eternal, through the obedience of faith. See also Hackspan.

22. ἀποκαλιγαία, “that thou hast revealed.” There is here a reference to the circumstances of times and seasons. First, the Gospel was to be revealed in a limited degree: after the Resurrection more was to be revealed, and most of all after the effusion of the Holy Spirit.

24. καὶ βασιλεῖς, even Kings. The just are elsewhere called kings. See Pincinelli’s Lumin. Reflex.
p. 651. (Wolf.) But I would here (with Theophylact,) take Kings in the common sense, and understand David, Josiah, and those other pious Jewish monarchs who looked forward to redemption by the promised Messiah.

26. Jesus, in order to show that by his instructions the law is not hindered, but rather perfected, refers him to the Divine Law, and enjoins on him the studious observance of it.

27. εἵ ν ὁης τῆς καιδίας. See the note on Matth.

28, 37. Some Commentators (as Danzius ap. Koecher) are too solicitous to seek a particular and distinct idea in each of the words here used. Others (as Abp. Tillotson and Doddridge) are (I think with more prudence) content to acquiesce in the general idea; denoting all the faculties of soul, &c. The expression is not, however, a mere Hebraism, but occurs also in the Classical writers, as appears from the following passage of Plautus, Captiv. 2, 3. (cited by Mr. Bulkley): "Id petam, idque persequar corde et animo atque viribus."

28. ἐρθὼς ἀπεκρίθης. Our Lord says that he has answered rightly, because, in fact, he has mentioned two commandments which are closely connected together. (Euthym.)

29. θέλων δικαιών ἐμοί, wishing to vaunt himself as just, or (as Kuinoel interprets) insontem se declarare, to excuse himself. For the Pharisee (observes Kuinoel) wished to show that he had not proposed a slight or easily solvable question, but one of considerable importance and difficult determination. Since πλησίον is a term of extensive application, he takes occasion, from that ambiguity, to put the question, καὶ τις ἔστι μου πλησίον; Jesus, however, returned an answer quite contrary to the expectation of the lawyer: and by teaching that (after the example of the Samaritan who had deserved so well of the Jew) even to strangers, foreigners, and enemies, were to be extended the offices of humanity and kindness, he left the Pharisee nothing to answer.

z 2
On the word πλησίον see Schl. Lex. I must not omit to subjoin the excellent exposition of Euthymius: Πλησίον λέγεται, πώς ἄνθρωπος, οὐς ἐγγίζωτον ἦμαν ἄλληλοις κατὰ κοινωνίαν φύσεως. Similar to it is that of Theophylact: Πάντες γὰρ οἱ τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως κεκοινωνηκότες πλησίον σοι εἰσί.

30. ὑπολαβὼν. This literally signifies taking him up, answering: a signification common both to the Scriptural and Hellenistic, and also to the Classical writers. (See Wets.) So the Latin excipere and suscipere. (See Faccioliati’s Lex.) It is well observed by Kuinoel, that in the best Classical writers the word ὑπολαβών is joined to ἔφη, when any one interrupts the speaker, and so answers him as to take exception at, reprehend, or at least circumscribe, or correct, any position laid down by the other; in which case the word is not redundant. See Xen. Cyr. 2, 2, 1. 5, 5, 11. Plat. Phæd. 4. Etym. Mag. also Suicer. and Hesychius.

30. ἄνθρωπος τις, i.e. a certain Jew; as is plain from the whole scope of the parable, the intention of which is (as Campbell observes) “to confound those malignant Jewish prejudices which made them confine their charity to those of their own nation and religion. Nor could any thing be better adapted for the purpose than this story, which, as it is universally understood, exhibits a Samaritan overlooking all national and religious differences, and doing offices of kindness and humanity to a Jew in distress. By this means, the narrow-minded Pharisee, who put the question, is surprised into a conviction that there is something amiable, and even divine, in surmounting all partial considerations, and listening to the voice of nature, which is the voice of God, in giving relief to the unhappy.”

30. κατέβαινεν, literally descended; in which word there is a reference to the respective situations of Jericho and Jerusalem: the former being on a level, and the latter in a valley. It was situated by the river Jordan, an hundred and forty stadia from Jeru-
salem, and in population and commercial wealth next in rank to the metropolis; as we learn from Jos. Ant. 15, 7. The road leading from one place to the other lay through a kind of wilderness, and was so beset with robbers that (as Jerome tells us) it was called the bloody way. His words (Jer. 3, 2.) admirably illustrate the present passage: "Arabes—quæ gens latrociniiis dedita usque hodie incurset terminos Palestinæ, et descendentes de Jerusalem in Jericho obsidet vias." There is a very exact description of it in Jos. B. 4, 8, 2. p. 1193, et seqq., where he says that the whole way from Jericho, even to Jerusalem itself, was desert and rocky: τὸ μὲν μεχρὶ Ἱεροσολύμων αὐτῆς ἔρημον καὶ πέτρωδος. Mr. Horne (Intro. v. 3. p. 47.) has truly observed that this chain of mountains is rugged, and has always afforded lurking-places to robbers. "No way (says Mr. Horne) was more frequented than this, both on account of its leading to Peræa, and especially because the classes or stations of the Priests and Levites were fixed at Jericho as well as at Jerusalem; and hence it is that a Priest and a Levite are mentioned as travelling that way." Wetstein cites Euseb. de L. H. "Adonim—Græce dicitur ἀναβάσις πυρρᾶν, Latine autem appellari potest ascensus ruorum, sive rubentium propter sanguinem, qui illic crebro a latronibus funditur, est autem confinium tribus Judæ et Benjamin descendentibus ab Ælia Jerichum, ubi et Castellum militum situm est ob auxilia viatorum."

30. λησταῖς περιέπεσεν. The word περιπίπτω signifies to fall or happen upon, meet with in any way: and might seem to be applicable to good as well as evil. Yet, both in the Scriptures and in the Classical writers, it is invariably found with the addition of a word either expressing or implying evil; sometimes, however, without that addition. That it is not unfrequently used with the addition of λησταῖς is plain from numerous examples cited by Wetstein; to which I add, Diog. Laert. 4, 58. λησταῖς περιέπεσε and Polyæn. 4, 2, 18.
30. ἐκδῦσαντες αὐτῷ, καὶ πληγᾶς ἔπιθεντες. Doddridge has ill rendered, "laid on him wounds;" rather, inflicted many blows. So Acts 16, 28. πολλὰς δὲ ἐπίθετες αὐτοῖς πληγᾶς. 2 Macc. 9, 26. πολλὰς ἐπιβίωσες αὐτῷ πληγᾶς. Wetstein cites Theodoret. H. E. 3, 7. τοῖς μέλεσίν ἀπασιν ἐπίθετες τὰς μάστιγας. Also Basil. Athanas. ἐκεῖνα μὲν οὖν αἱ μάστιγες μένουσι παρὰ τοῦ δικαίου κριτοῦ, τῷ ἱσοὶ μετρίῳ ἀντιμετρηθούσι· μεναί, ἃς αὐτὸς προλαβὼν ἐπέθηκε τοῖς ἁγίοις. Wetstein regards this as a Latinism, and indeed imponere plagas is found in the best authors, as Cicero and Valerius Maximus. "Εκδῦσαντες signifies (says Kuinoel), not only stripped him of his clothes, but despoiled him of his property. It was scarcely necessary to subjoin a circumstance that may well be imagined. Sometimes, however, (as Kuinoel observes,) the verb ἐκδύω, like the Latin exuo, denotes merely a spoliation of property. See Ezek. 23, 26. The injurious treatment inflicted has been circumstantially touched on, in order to show that the condition of the poor sufferer was wretched enough to have moved the pity even of the most obdurate heart. The word ἡμιθνησίς seems to be Hellenistical. At least the Classical writers almost invariably use ἡμιθνησίς; as Lycophron. 511. cited by Wets.; Aristoph. Nub. 504. cited by Schleusner, Lex. I add Thucyd. l. 2, 52. Procop. 73. Liban. Orat. 868. n. Dionys. Hal. frequently. The word ἡμεθνησίς is, indeed, somewhat rare, out of the Scriptures. Yet I have met with it in Hesych. u. ἡμετομπακαίντας, and in Æschin. p. 76. Bekker, where for ἡμιθνησίς some MSS. read ἡμεθνησίς.

31. κατὰ συγκυρίαν, i.e. κατὰ συνυφήν. For so Hesych. explains it. The latter word occurs in Phil. 5, 28. c. Wetstein cites Eustath. προσκυρώσας κατὰ τίνα συγκυρίαν ὤμοι γενόμενον, ἡγοῦν εἰς ἐν ξαθότα. I add Appian. 1, 16, 47. εἰ τί συγκύρουσα συνυφήν. Dr. Campbell has here animadverted on the inaccuracy of our common version, and more correctly renders the passage, "when he came near the place, and saw him," &c.

31. ἀντιπαρῆλθεν, passed by on the other side. De
Dieu (ap. Koecher) explains: "Coram illo, aut contra illum præteriit, ita, ut ipse unum, alter alterum teneret latus, sibique invicem essent oppositi." Wetstein cites Diod. Sic. 17, 102. ὁ δ' οὖν Ἀλέξανδρος τὴν μὲν στρατίαν ἀποσέταξεν ἐπὶ τῶν ποταμῶν ἀντιπαράγειν ταῖς νωμᾶς, in which passage it is used in a military sense. I add two other passages of similar import. Theophr. Ch. Eth. κβ. ἀποκάμψας ἐν τῆς ὦδω, and Polyæn. 29, 1. ἐκελεύετο τοῖς ἰππεῖς προάγειν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ—οἱ μὲν οὖν πολεμοῖο ἀντιπαρήγαγον, drew up their force on the other side of the river. This conduct was so much the more inexcusable, as by the Mosaic Law it was ordered, that not even a fallen beast of burden was to be passed by, even if it were an enemy's. So Jos. 170, 16. μὴ ἐξεῖναι δὲ παρεῖναι κτηνῶν τινι κακοπαθοῦνταν ἑπὶ χείμαρρος πεπτωκότων ἐν πυλήσυνδιασώζειν δὲ. Compare Exod. 23, 4 & 5,

32. ὧμιας δὲ καὶ Λευιτὴς—ἐληλυθαὶ καὶ ἱδαὶ. It is well observed by Raphael, Wolf, and others, that the ἐληλυθαὶ is not (as some suppose) redundant, but indicates that the Levite did not cast a mere passing glance at the wounded person, (as the Priest had done,) but, desirous of knowing more, approached him, and took a nearer view of his situation; yet administered no aid to the poor wretch, but went his way. "Although (says Grotius) it was the principal design of our Lord to teach them that the word "neighbour" had a far more extensive signification than the Jews supposed, yet he intended, at the same time, to show that often, not even towards those whom they called neighbours, did they perform the duty of neighbours, i. e. friends. The excuse is ever ready: they are urging on their journey; or they are not permitted to delay; or they fear for their own personal safety. Something of this sort we may suppose, that the Priest and Levite pleaded in justification of themselves. But if they had had a heart filled with compassion and benevolence, they would have completely hastened to exert all their power to relieve the misery of their half-dead fellow-creatures. As it
was, however, only slightly moved, and simply eja-
culating, "God pity him!" they hasten on to the
discharge of their sacerdotal function, little mindful
that mercy is better than sacrifice! (Grot.)

31. A Priest who had been offering up at Jeru-
salem prayers for the safety of the people is returning
to his residence at Jericho. By accident this poor
wounded wretch meets his view, which, if he had
foreseen, he doubtless would have altered his course,
or turned his eyes from the place where he lay. Yet
there was probably nothing very urgent to so justify
this abandonment. His home is near at hand. Here
the safety, perhaps, of a neighbour, at least of a
countryman, is at stake, yet he renders him no suc-
cour, perhaps lest he should be polluted with his
blood. See Ps. 38, 12. (Wets.)

32. Soon after, a Levite, on his way to Jerusalem
and the Temple, where he was accustomed to sing
the praises of God for his benefits to the Jewish na-
tion, comes thither, stops his course, nay, approaches
more closely to the place where lay the wounded
person, and surveying him with curious eyes, from
head to foot, recognizes him as a Jew; yet, like the
Priest, goes his way, probably regarding his conduct
as not only excusable, but even laudable, since, actu-
ated by the desire of hastening to the discharge of
his religious duties, he has cut off all delays, and suf-
f ered nothing to interrupt his progress. (Wets.)

33. Here was a Samaritan (a man hateful to the
Jews), who, either because he had been suddenly
summoned by Pontius Pilate to plead some cause at
Jerusalem, or because he had a somewhat longer
journey to accomplish, mounted on horseback, passes
along the same way: he is moved by the sad spec-
tacle, and does not, like the Pharisee, urge on his
course, but alights from his beast; nor does he, like
the Levite, stop at a little distance from the bleeding
wretch, but approaches close to him, and affords
him every possible assistance. He feared no danger
from robbers, though in a lonely and desert spot; he
had no suspicions of the Jews, who, if the other had died of his wounds by the way, would, not without some semblance of justice, have accused him of the robbery. (Wets.) The three foregoing annotations of Wetstein are characterised by his usual ingenuity and acumen, yet must be regarded as somewhat hypothetical. To the following judicious, and even beautiful remark of Doddridge*, every reader will be ready to yield unqualified approbation: “It is admirably well judged to represent the distress on the side of the Jew, and the mercy on that of the Samaritan; for self-interest would make them see how amiable such a conduct was, and lay them open to our Lord’s inference, ver. 37. Had it been put the other way, prejudices might more easily have interposed before the heart could have been struck with these tender circumstances.”

34. κατέθησε τὰ τραύματα αὐτοῦ, bound up with bandages, both to staunch the blood, and unite the lips of the wounds. The word κατάθω is appropriate to surgery, and such as we should expect from Luke the Physician. It seems to properly denote bound down, namely, those parts of the flesh of the gashes which would of themselves rise and swell. Wetstein refers to Sir. 27, 21. and cites Xen. Cyr. 5,

* For the whole of which I perceive that he is indebted to Grotius, who concludes a long and excellent annotation in the following impressive words. “Therefore Christ rightly concludes, that if the natural law, and that of perpetual obligation, and common to all, (which was in no respect superseded by the Hebrew civil law, but rather introduced and furthered by it,) be considered, no one of the human race, who can derive benefit from our assistance, should be regarded as estranged from us.” (Grot.) “This,” says Mr. Elsley, “is fully explained in Sherlock, serm. 6, part 2, vol. 4.” “In this parable (says Le Clerc) Christ does not openly describe a Jew doing good offices to a Gentile or Samaritan, which the lawyer would have replied was no where enjoined in the law of Moses; but he indirectly obliges him to confess, that reasons may arise to a Jew to love a Samaritan more than a Priest or a Levite, and to account him his neighbour, though their religions are different. This being granted, the lawyer is obliged tacitly to allow that it is the duty of a Jew to show similar kindness to a Samaritan. ‘Go, and do thou likewise.’” Le Clerc.
That the oil of Samaria was peculiarly generous and abundant, we learn from Hieron. on Hos. 12, 1. cited by Wetstein.

34. ἐπιθέαν ἐλαιόν καὶ ἐλιν, i.e. what was called ὀινέλαιον, says Heinsius. Of the same opinion seems to have been Sir Thomas Brown (in his Miscellaneous Tracts, No. 1. p. 15. cited by Bulkley) who has the following remarks: “That the good Samaritan, coming from Jericho, used any of the Judæan balsam upon the wounded traveller, is not to be made out; and we are unwilling to disparage his charitable surgery in pouring oil into a green wound; and therefore, when it is said he used oil and wine, may rather conceive that he made an oinelaëum, or medicine of oil and wine, beaten up and mixed together, which was no improper medicine, and is an art now lately studied by some, so to incorporate wine and oil, that they may lastingly hold together, which some pretend to have, and call it oleum Samaritanum, or Samaritan’s oil.” With deference, however, to so unexceptionable an authority, I confess that I am inclined to accede to the opinion of L. Brug. and Triller, that he used the oil and wine separately; the wine to wash the wounds, and staunch the effusion of blood, and the oil, after the wounds had been bandaged, to allay the pain occasioned by dressing them. That both oil and wine were in common use, as medicaments, among the ancient surgeons, is manifest from the citations here adduced by Wetstein. That oil and wine were sometimes used separately, is clear from Columella, 7, 5, 18. cited by Wetstein. So also Theophr. H. P. 9, 12. Plin. H. N. 31, 47. and Galen (cited by Wetstein): ἔλαιας φύλλα τὰ ἀπαλωτατα τρίψας παραχεὶ ἐλαιόν καὶ ὀλιν μέλαινος καὶ κατάμασε.—ἔστ’ ὅν ἔτε τραυμάτων, ἤ δια μικρότητα, ἤ ἂλων, οίκ ἔνεστι βαφαίς χερσοθαί, τελμάτων μετ’ ὀξυελαίου ἐπιτίθει, ἤ σπόγγω κένων [v. kainō] ἐν ὀξυελαιῳ δεύσας ἐπίθες. Yet it is clear from this last passage, that the ancient surgeons used a composition of vinegar and oil. See also Cels. (ap Wolf) 5, 26. and Pincinelli
in his Lum. Reflex. 651. Wetstein and Doddridge trifle egregiously, when they urge that the Samaritan genium suum defraudavit by dressing the wounds with the oil* and wine which he had provided for his own comfort and support, and enlarge on the roughness of the road, and the tearing of his own clothes to bind up another’s wounds; all which must be considered as at least very uncertain. Schoettgen compares the following story, found in Midrash Cihel: “A certain Rabbi, on the evening before the Sabbath, left the house where he dwelt, about dusk, with a bundle on his shoulders. On the way he found a man stretched out and wounded, who said to him, ‘Do me the kindness to carry me to the town.’ The Rabbi considered thus with himself: If I leave my bundle, wherewithal can I support myself and my family? And if I leave this wounded person, I sin against my own soul. What then did he do? Why, he carried him to the city, and afterwards returned, and seeking his bundle, took it up, and entered the city [i.e. Jerusalem]. Then (we are told) the people were surprised that so pious a man should break the Sabbath. But a voice from Heaven thus addressed him: ‘Go and eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with gladness; for thy work is accepted by God.’”

34. ἐπιβιβάσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ θησαυρὸς, having set him on his own beast. For it seems that the wounded man either had none, or it had been stolen. By κτῆνος Wetstein understands a horse. But these animals were little, if at all in use in Judæa, (except for the purposes of war,) neither are they so at the present day. See the note on Matth. 21, 5. and Mark 11, 2. The Syriac version renders it asinum.

* The oil was (as Schoettgen conjectures) taken for the purpose of anointing the limbs; since in the hot countries of the East, it is found particularly comfortable and refreshing. The antiquity of the custom is shewn by the case of Jacob (noticed by Schoettgen) who, though travelling only with his staff, yet had taken oil with him, since we are told that he anointed the stone which he used for a pillow.
I agree with Kuinoel, who thinks that the κτήνος here mentioned was probably an ass. He cites Xen. Cyr. 8, 2, 8. εἰδαίμωνα τὰ κτήνη. The asses of the East are certainly of a particularly fine breed, and sometimes little less valuable than horses.

34. παιδοχεῖον. This word is explained by the ancient glosses cauponium, diversorium, stabulum. Here, however, it must not be understood to denote (as in Luke 1.) a private, but a public, hostelry (to use an old English word). In the most ancient times, when hospitality yet prevailed, there were either no inns, or very few; and indeed, except in this passage, we find no mention of them made in the New Testament. Yet there were doubtless some in Judæa, which seem to have been established for the accommodation of Samaritans, Gentile travellers, especially on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho. (Rosennm.) On the form of these diversoria and stabula see the note on Luke 2, 7. I add the following beautiful passage of Æschyl. Choeph. 649. Σκοτεινῶν, ἀρὰ δ' ἐμπόροις μεθισμαί ἀγκώραι ἐν δόμωσι παιδόχειος ἐξένων.

35. ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον, scil. ημέραν. So the old English expression, on the morrow day. These phrases have been illustrated in a former note.

35. ἐκβαλὼν, having thrown down, i.e. laid down two denaria. So Matth. 12, 35. These two denaria, it must be remembered, were probably equivalent to two days' wages of a labourer.

35. ἐπιμεληθῇ, "take care of him." Bos, in his Animad. p. 66, has well observed, that ἐπιμελεῖθαι is especially used of care bestowed on the sick or wounded; and cites Lucian. Fugit. 594. ἐντείλαμενος ἐπιμεληθῆαι. See Symp. 655. So also Prov. 3, 8. Consult Cranser Phosph. 666. Those who in war attended on the wounded were called ἐπιμεληται. See Hesychii Lex.

35. προσδαπανήσῃς*. So προστελέω in Thucyd. 6,

* i.e. whether for medical attendance, or food. For those who went to caravansers had to supply themselves with provisions, and other necessaries, nothing being provided at the caravansera but lodging; a custom which prevails in the East to the present day.
31. The word is rare, but examples of it are cited by Wets. and De Rhoer, from Lucian and Themistius. The Samaritan, moreover, engages that whatever further expenses, (in surgical aid and nourishing food,) should be incurred, he would make good on his return.


36. πλησίον γεγονέναι, i. e. fulfilled the office of a neighbour. (Grot. and L. Brug.) Storr, however, explains, "which of these three thought himself a neighbour to him," &c. as in James 4, 9. ταλαντωρεῖν, to think himself miserable. But this interpretation seems harsh.

37. οἱ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ᾽ αὐτῷ, i. e. showed mercy towards. An Hebraism. It must be observed, that ποιεῖν, in Hellenistic Greek, has all the variety of senses which we find in the Hebrew יְשָׁע.

37. καὶ σὺ ποίει ὄμολος, i. e. afford assistance to him that needs it. For he that doth not this loveth not his neighbour as himself: and he that loveth not his neighbour as himself, doth not love God with all his heart, with all his mind, with all his soul, and with all his strength, by which is evinced an intensity of love. (Euthym.)

38. Μάρθα. A name common among the Jews; as appears from the Rabbinical writing. So also Plut. Mar. 414. ε. τίνα Σύραν γυναίκο, Μάρθαν ἴναματι, μαντεύεσθαι λεγομένην.

38. ὤχεδέξατο. The best Commentators are of opinion that the word does not merely denote lodged him, or received him into her house, but hospitably entertained him. Examples of this sense are produced by Wetstein and Kuinoel; to which I add, Artem. 3, 14. περὶ τῶν Θείων ὀποδεξέσθαι. Grotius conjectures that Martha was a widow, with whom her brother and sister dwelt. Kuinoel thinks that the house might properly be termed hers, if she dwelt in it. But here I cannot agree with him in opinion.
That the village where she resided was Bethany, is evident from Joh. 11, 1.

39. ἤ καὶ παρακαθίασα παρὰ τοῦ πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.
The καὶ is not redundant, but has a reference to the Disciples. For (as Wetstein observes) both the Disciples and Mary sat at Christ’s feet. An usual posture of Oriental scholars and learners, which I have before illustrated. See Grot. and also Vitring. de Syn. 1, 2, 6. and Doughty’s Annal. p. 53. where, among other passages, he cites Plut. Mar. Σύρα γυναῖκα μαντείσθαι λεγομένη, ἡ παρακαθίζομεν παρὰ τῶν πόδας τοῦ Μαρίου. See also Schoettg. H. H. p. 280. Ernesti, however, in his Opusc. Phil., less properly, takes it to mean no more than that Mary sat near Jesus. That neither the phrase nor the custom, was quite unknown to the Greeks and Romans, appears from the citations adduced by Wets. from Suet. Claud. 82. Val. Max. 2, 1. Isidor. Orig. 20, 11. Suet. Aug. 64. Apulej. 1. Petron. 64. & 68. D. Chrys. p. 112. A. and Aristoph. Vesp. 608. See Luke 2, 46.

40. περισσάτο ηεξί τολῆν διακονιαν. As to the word διακονία, it here denotes preparing the meal. The word περισσάω signifies properly to draw around, draw aside, draw out of course. Thus those are, by an elegant metaphor, said περισσάωσι, who distra-huntur, are distracted, and whose minds are drawn aside, in various directions, by anxious cares and harassing solicitudes*. The copious citations of Raphael, Krebs, Wetstein, Munthe, and others, may serve to illustrate these various significations. Thus Diod. Sic. p. 82. A. ἀπῆλθε περισσάωσι εἰς βιοτοκίας χρείας. Hor. Sat. 8, 6, 7. “Omni sollicitudine distractum?”

* Our translators have rendered it cumbered; of which word no tolerable account is given by the Etymologists. It occurs in a sense nearly approaching to the primitive one in “Barnaby Riche’s Allarme to England,” 4to, 1578: “I was combered with many hedges, ditches, &c. The word cumber often in our own writers signifies trouble. So the German kummer, and the Dutch kommer.
40. συναντιλάβεται. The word literally signifies to lend a hand with one, and metaphorically, to cooperate with any one in a work. So Exod. 18, 22. καὶ κουφιῶσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ συναντιλήψεται σοι. This use of the word is copiously illustrated by Hammond.

41. μερίμνας καὶ τυρβάζῃ. On the former word see the note on Matth. 13, 22. Τυρβάζω is by the Scholiast on Aristoph. Eg. 3, 11. said to properly signify raise up the mud, as by trampling in a river, or otherwise. The word τυρβίζω, (from whence comes τυρβάζω,) and turba, are (I suspect) cognate with the Icelandic and Anglo-Sax. stour, sturr, and the Engl. stir, i.e. commotio, a tumult, war, &c. So our old English writers use stir and upstir in that sense. As it is no unusual thing to see an inceptive added to a τ, as in τέγος, στέγος, these words may all have originated from τύρως, (cognate with τάρω, ταράω, and ταράσσω,) which signifies to stir, and hence the substantive τύρως. Nor does τύρω (from whence τύφη and turba) admit of any other derivation. Hence also τύρω, whence came θύρως. Here τυρβάζῃ may be rendered, thou art troubled, harassed, distracted with a multiplicity of cares, or (as Rosenm. translates it) you distract yourself; (in the middle voice,) which comes to the same thing.

42. ἔνδε δὲ ἔστι χρεία. On the interpretation of these words there has been no little difference of opinion. The modern Commentators refer them to Mary, the ancient ones to Martha: which (as Wetstein observes) is confirmed by the following δὲ, which indicates that Mary is then addressed, and not before. But a more important question remains yet to be decided, namely, what is meant by ἔνδε. Many ancient Commentators, (as Theophylact and Basil,) and some modern ones, (as Mill, Macer, L. Brug. Hardt, Pistophilus, Bengel, Moldenhauer, Wetstein, and Rosenm. would supply βραχυφόρος, ferculo, dish: in which sense μερίς occurs in Gen. 43,
34. 1 Sam. 1, 5. & 9 & 23. It was (urges Wets.) not altogether unworthy of Christ, the teacher and the exemplar of all virtues, to commend frugality also both by words and deeds; as in ver. 1 & 8.* So (continues Wetstein) the Philosophers had done before him. He then cites Cic. Tusc. 3, 20. 5, 9. So Pythagoras and Epicurus. Athen. p. 419. B. τῶν δείπνων δὲ πολλοί τὰ μέτρα ἀσπάζονται, οἷς Ἀλέξις ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ παραδόθαι ἀλλ’ ἔγαιγε τοῦ τὰ δέον’ ἕχειν τὰ περιττὰ μισᾶ, τοῖς ὑπερβάλλοις γὰρ τέρψις μὲν οὐκ ἔνεστι, πολυτέλεια δὲ ἐν δὲ ψευδομένω τὰ περιττὰ μισῶ, τοῖς υπερβάλλοις γὰρ Δαπάνη παρέστι, ἠδονὴ δ’ οὐ δ’ ἡτίς οὐ. Justin. 20, 4. “Pythagoras — ad usum frugalitatis revocavit, laudabat quotidie virtutem, — velut genetricem virtutem frugalitatem omnibus in-gerebat.” Seneca, Ep. 95. “Multos morbos multa fercula fecerunt.”

Those who maintain this interpretation also remark, that Christ was accustomed to illustrate his divine doctrines by things obvious to the senses: and thus what is usually said of the dishes of a feast is applied to divine knowledge. Hence Rosenm. thinks that there is here a dilogia or acute dictum, which will hold true both ways. But this interpretation, though very acutely conceived, and learnedly supported, seems to me rather specious than true. I entirely assent to the common interpretation, which is supported by Euthymius, Grotius, Wolf, Campbell, Doddridge, and others. For (observes Kuinoel) as after περὶ πολλὰ must be understood μέρη or πράγματα, so after ἐνὸς must be supplied (by all the rules of legitimate construction) μέρους or πράγματος, negotio. Grotius thus paraphrases:

* The words here mentioned will doubtless admit of that sense; but, from the context, it seems far more probable that our Saviour meant to express the following sense, namely, “You may conscientiously, and without scruple, accept of the support offered you, since, by ministering to them in spiritual things, you may fairly claim a right to their support in carnal things, “for the labourer is worthy of his hire.”
“Various and multiplied are the cares and occupations of this life: one thing there is, which (if we would be saved) is altogether indispensably necessary to us, namely, the care of religion and piety, and the study of divine things.” Theophylact after ἕνος supplies τοῦ προσέχειν τῷ διδασκαλίᾳ, attention to my instruction. And so Euthymius: Τῆς ἀκροάσεως τῶν ἑμῶν λόγων οὐ γὰρ τρυφήσων ἡλθον, ἀλλὰ διδάξων ὑμᾶς, to hear my words: for I came not to feast with you, but to teach you.

The above interpretation is strongly confirmed by the words which follow; upon the whole, I would adopt the observation of Doddridge, which is equally energetic and true: “This is one of the gravest and most important apophthegms that ever was uttered; and one can scarce pardon the frigid impertinence of Theophylact and Basil, who explain it as if he only meant, one dish of meat is enough.”

42. Μαρία δὲ τὴν ἀγάπην μερίδα ἔξελέξατο. By those who adopt the interpretation dish, it is no wonder that this word μέρις should be considered as an allusion to the custom of sending the best portion of the feast to the guest who was intended to be most highly honoured. See the numerous examples in Wetstein. Others, as Keuchen, Amelius, and Wolf, endeavour to trace an allusion to those portions of land unalienably assigned to the Levites. Both interpretations are equally frigid and far-fetched. The common mode of explanation is doubtless the true one, and it is satisfactorily proved and illustrated by Grotius, Elsner, Kypke, and Kuinoel. Μερίς signifies business, or occupation; as in Xen. Cyr. 3, 8, 5. Anab. 7, 6, 25. So the Latin pars in Cic. Quint. Trat. So Julian, p. 259. (cited by Elsner.) οὐ μικρᾶς μερίδος ὁ Φιλόσωφος πριονίστηκεν, i.e. non exiguus muneri praefectus est Philosophus. See also Arrian ap. Bulkley. It may further be observed, that the positive is put for the superlative. The passage is thus paraphrased by Grotius: “Of many cares, Mary has chosen and attached herself
to that whose fruits will endure to eternity.” The remaining part of his annotation is far less deserving of commendation, as it savours of mysticism, and would, indirectly, tend to recommend Monocracy.

42. ἦτε οίκ άφαιρεθήσεται ἐκ' αὐτῆς. Wetstein thus paraphrases: “Mary, by hearing me, feeds her soul, not her body. The soul is unquestionably more excellent than the body. The food with which the body is nourished may be snatched away from a guest, but of spiritual instruction no one can be deprived.” (Wets.) So also Aristot. ad Nicom. 1. τάγαθον δὲ οἴκειον τε καὶ διασφαίρετον εἶναι μαντεύμεθα. And Max. Tyr. p. 22. (cited by Bulkley.) Ἀρείη διασφαίρετον.

CHAP. XI.

verse 1. On the form of prayer here given to the Disciples see the note on Matth. 8, 9. Grotius, Mede, Lightfoot, and Doddridge, think that Jesus here (as John the Baptist had done) has given his followers a short form of prayed, as a specimen of the things to be prayed for. Of these set forms, there were some in the Jewish ritual; as Num. 6, 23—6. Deut. 26, 13. I cannot, therefore, assent to Dr. Doddridge, when he says: “In this view only can we suppose the Disciples could now ask Jesus to teach them to pray; for it is not to be thought that in the three preceding years of his ministry he had not given them instructions, both as to the manner and matter of prayer.” See the notes on Matth. 6, 9. I however entirely assent to the following observations of Doddridge: “Dr. Guyse has excellently shown, in his note on Matth. 6, 13. that this prayer, in its original sense, was peculiarly suited to the dispensation then present, as introductory to the Messiah’s Kingdom, and has given a just and expressive paraphrase of it in that particular view. But there is not a clause in it which will not bear a more extensive sense, and express what ought to be our
daily temper, and the breathings of our heart before God. No doubt thousands of Christians have daily refreshment and edification in the use of it; and it is astonishing that any should venture to condemn their brethren for it. But I would hope there are few of any profession now remaining, who have so much the spirit of opposition and censoriousness.”


4. See the note on Matth. 6, 10. and Elsley on this passage.

5. τῆς ἐξ ὑπάρχ. Doddridge judiciously introduces this short story by the following words: “Who is there of you that has not observed the efficacy of importunate requests?” Wetstein and Bulkley both cite Martial 4, 15. but the latter justly remarks, how flat and insipid is the epigram, when compared with the variety and heightened imagery of the parable.

6. ἐξ ὀδοῦ, ex itinere, from off his journey. This circumstance is to be explained from the customs of the Orientals, as the Arabs, Turks, &c. who on account of the excessive heat of the day, often, in travelling, set forward about the cool of the evening. (Rosenm.) See the story cited above in Ch. 10, supra. As to the three loaves, which might seem far more than was necessary for a single traveller, we must remember that bread (which is, in the East, always home-made) is formed into cakes, like biscuits. See the note on Matth. 14, 19. See also Warnekro’s Hebr. Antiq. cited by Kunoel.
7. κεκλεισται. See Hammond.
7. τὰ παιδία μου μετ᾽ ἑμοῦ εἰς τὴν κοίτην εἰσίν. There seems no reason (as some do) to understand by the word παιδία servants. The word may, and here unquestionably does, mean children. So the Syriac version, and almost all the interpreters. Dr. Campbell animadverts on the inaccuracy of our common version, in which I admit there is (to say the least) an ambiguity. The sense cannot be, that he and his children were in the same bed. Dr. Campbell therefore translates, “I and my children are in bed.” It might even literally be rendered, “My children are, together with myself, (i.e. as well as myself, ) in bed.” That it was not usual to admit travellers by night, appears from a Rabbinical passage cited by Wetstein.
8. διὰ γε τὴν ἀναδείαν. The word ἀναδεία denotes importunity: for (as Schleusner observes) the word importunatus denotes, 1st, one who is regardless of time, place, and persons; 2dly, one who is trouble-somely urgent, and will take no denial. He therefore renders, “ob flagitantis importunam pertinaciam.”
9. καίγω ύμῖν λέγω. The comparison is not à simili, but à majori: q. d. “If the importunate teazer obtains so much from men, what will not he that offers up fervent and assiduous prayers obtain from his Creator. All good things necessary to your situation, and the duties of your station, you may entreat of God by fervent and constant prayer, and may expect to receive.” The comparison must be extended no farther. The remaining part of the narration merely serves for ornament. For to suppose that God can be so far overcome and subdued by importunity, as to grant what perhaps might prove pernicious both to the petitioner and to others, that were to overlook the nature of God, and all his attributes. (Rosenm. and Kuinoel.)
9—15. See the notes on Matth. 7, 7. & 12, 24.
14. ἔθαυμασαν οἱ ὀχλοί, the people wondered, i.e.
expressed their admiration in a favourable manner, (see Matth. 9, 88.) and with marks of approbation. Upon which the Pharisees were immediately alarmed, (ver. 15.) and, in order to stifle the good disposition which they perceived in the populace, they foolishly, and absurdly, impute to the Devil a kind and humane miracle. It is evident, from several passages in these writings, that the δυσλογοί generally were well disposed towards our Saviour and his doctrines; the great opposition he met with being from those chiefly to whom wealth, power, and authority, had furnished occasions of pleasure, pride, and a stupid inconsiderateness. This was the case then; and it is exactly the same now, mankind being the same in all ages. (Markland.)

17. ἵκος ἐπὶ ὁκον πιπτει. Dr. Campbell here attacks our common version, which he thinks hardly intelligible; and translates, one family falling after another. Now this is surely still less intelligible, and contains a sense exceedingly far-fetched. Dr. C. is indeed entirely mistaken, when he says that the version of Beza, Erasmus, Casaubon, and the E. T. is solely founded on the parallel passages in Matthew and Mark: and observes that no one, without reference to those passages, would think of so translating. He entirely mistakes the construction, which, (from the parallelism,) absolutely requires that διαμερισθέντως should be taken ἀπὸ κοίνων from the preceding member of the sentence. It is not a mere repetition of a word, but (as often) a slight adaptation of it to change of gender. Dr. Campbell seems to have been led into the error by the Vulgate, which here, (as frequently,) by aiming at being extremely literal, and keeping close to the words, without filling up any ellipsis, often represents the sense very incompletely, and sometimes totally mis-represents it. There are, indeed, two passages from Aristides, Rhodiace. 5. 544, and Ammian. Marc. 17, 7. cited by Wetstein, which may have influenced his judgment. These, however, only have ἐπιπτειν,
and concidere alius supra alium, in a physical sense. In order to make them at all opposite, the reading of Luke should have πίπτων, with the subaudition of ἐφυμωταί, which is supported by no MS. and would offer a harsh construction. Grotius and Beza remark, that ὅκιος ἐτὶ ὅκων is an Hebraism for ὅκως ἐφ' ἐμωτόν, the antecedent word being repeated instead of the relative. The words are thus elegantly paraphrased by Chrysander (ap. Koecher): "Non solum regnum divisum contra se, sed etiam familia discordiis scissa, ruinam sibi adsciscit." This sense, which is supported by the Syriac Version, Euthymius, Theophylact, Grotius, De Dieu, Gataker, Schmid, Wolf, Koecher, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, is illustrated from the Rabbinical writers by Scheid ap. Meuschen, and from the Classical ones by Pincinelli, in his Lum. Reflex. 652.

22. ἔπαν δὲ ὁ ἱσχυρότερος, &c. Another instance of the inverted manner of writing: "But when another cometh upon him, or attacketh him, and taketh from him his arms on which he depended, and divideth his spoils, it is demonstrating that the other is more powerful than," &c. (Markland.)

22. τὰ σκόλα αὐτῶν διαδίδωσιν. Vorstius and Kuinoel observe, that the σκόλα, which properly signify spoils, (see Periz. on Ξηλ. V. H. 6, 6.) 2dly, signify effects, moveable property, σκόλη, as in the parallel passage of Matthew. Thus the Hebr. יָשׁוֹ, which properly signifies prey, booty, &c. is also used for moveables, or goods which may be plundered. Thus the Sept. sometimes renders it τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, at other times τὰ σκόλα. The word διαδίδωσιν evidently alludes to the distribution of spoil, which, among the ancients, regularly followed conquest. See Wets.

27. μακαρία ἡ κοιλία ἡ βαστάσωσά σε. This expression is copiously illustrated from the Greek writers by Wetstein, Palaiaret, Georgius, Raphel, and Elsner. The most opposite passages are, Musæus, 138. de Herone: ἀλβιος ὅς σε φύευες καὶ ὀλβιος, ἡ τέκε μητρ, Γαστὴρ τ' ἡ σ' ἐλόχευες μακαρτάτη. Petron.
94. "O felicem, inquit, matrem tuam, quae te talem peperit!" So also Callimach. in Cerer. (cited by Bulkley): Κλαίε μὲν ἀ ματέρι, βάρυ δ’ ἔστενον αἰ δυ’ ἀδελφοι, Χαὶ μάστος, τὸν ἔπνευ. I add, Eurip. Ion. 322. οὐ ταχύτερ’ ἔγνων μάστος, ἦδ’ ἔθρευε με. It is also illustrated from the Rabbinical writers by Schoettgen, Buxtorf, Hottingen, and others.

33. οὕτως λύχνον ἄμας. Morus and Rosenm. thus point out the connection: "Our Saviour had shown them that he was neither a magician nor an imposter; that there was no necessity for him to prove his Divine mission by a sign from Heaven; both because he had already worked many other miracles, and also because he should hereafter return to life. Now, he adds, this evidence is to be no longer concealed; and that it were vain to require a sign from Heaven at any other time."

36. The Commentators have objected that there is here the same in the apodosis as in the prothesis, i.e. εἰ τὸ σῶμα σου ὃλον φωτεινὸν—ἔσται φωτεινὸν ὅλον. Hence various modes have been devised by which the difficulty may be removed, and the verse freed from tautology. Maldonati, Erasmus, and Grotius, for σῶμα conjecture ὅμα, and ver. 34. in the apodosis subaud σῶμα. But if this conjecture were admitted, the verse contains the very same sense which was expressed in ver. 34. in these words: ὅταν οὖν ὁ φθαλμὸς σου ἀπλοὺς ἔν, καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα σου φωτεινὸν ἔστω. (Kuin.) Michaelis conjectures φωτεινὸν τὸ ὅλον, (as Markland had done before him,) and for ὅλον conjectures ὅλον. This, however, has been satisfactorily refuted by Kuinoel, whom see. Morus explains: "If thy whole body shall be lucid, if all the members rightly perform their office, nor have any dark part, if no member be impeded in performing its office, because thy eye is sound, the whole will be as lucid as if lightning darted its rays upon them: thy whole life will proceed rightly, if thy mind be endued with competent knowledge." This interpretation, however, Kuinoel pronounces languard
and frigid. He confesses that no interpretation has as yet pleased him, and he doubts whether any such can be brought forward. He suspects that the verse, (which is not contained in some MSS.) is made up of glosses and interpretations formed by the Grammarians on ver. 34.

37. ἀνέπεσεν. The word ἀναπίπτω properly signifies to fall back, recline; and 2dly, (by an allusion to the recumbent posture then adopted at meals,) discumbere ad mensam, or (as we should say) sit at table.

38. πρῶτον. Rosenm. explains the word, ante omnia, vor allen dingem, before all things. But it is probably pleonastic. Grotius remarks that ἐβαπτίσθη is used for ἐνυψάτο τὰς χεῖρας, washed his hands; because the whole hand, and part of the arm, up to the elbow, was not slightly sprinkled with water, but was immersed in it, lest any particle of dirt should adhere to it. Pole, however, and Pococke, regard this explanation as not sufficiently agreeable to the customs of the Jews. They therefore prefer, with Beza, to take βαπτίζεσθαι in the same sense as λούσθαι and χερνίπτειν, if it may be permitted to so interpret as to hint that the washing might be either by immersion or effusion. And since the word might be applied in either way, it seems to have been so used as to comprehend one as well as the other. See the notes on Mark 7, 3, 1. and Pole in loc.

39. νῦν ὑμεῖς oι Φαρισαῖοι. There has been some difference of opinion as to the interpretation of νῦν, which Beza and others treat as an expletive, or interpret vero, as vos vero, or vos quidem. Raphel thinks that it indicates wonder, or rather indignation. Others again think that it signifies igitur. Wetstein and Kuinoel, far from regarding it as enclitic or pleonastic, assign the sense of now, jam, in præsente. Wetstein explains, “Now, indeed, your hypocrisy brings you authority and base lucre; afterwards, however, it shall fare ill with you;” and
refers to ver. 42. and 6, 21. But this would seem to require νῦν γε. I am inclined to think (with Schleusner) that it is an affirmative particle, having the sense of sæpe, probatì, in which sense nunc is sometimes used in our own language. It is well observed by Euthymius and Kuinoel, that Jesus, who was accustomed to seek an illustration of his precepts from trifling circumstances of ordinary life, laid hold of this favourable opportunity which offered itself, when he saw with what care the cups and dishes brought in by the servants were scoured and polished, pointing to them he exclaimed: Ὅνυν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φασισταῖοι, &c.

40. οὐκ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἐξωθεν, καὶ τὸ ἐσωθεν ἐποιήσε; On the interpretation of this verse there has been much difference of opinion. Most modern Commentators agree in thinking that the exposition pronounced by Elsner has all the marks and characteristics of truth. That learned Commentator takes τὸ ἐξωθεν and τὸ ἐσωθεν for the internal and external parts of vessels. He takes ποιήσας for purifies, adorns, of which sense Kuinoel gives many examples. Cancelling, therefore, the mark of interrogation, the sense will be this: “Not he who purifies the outside (i.e. of cups, &c.) does also (by that means) purify the inside, namely, the meats. Thus it is not so much external as internal purity that must be aimed at.” Elsner appositely cites Porph. de Abst. p. 88. ἀποσχίζοντι τῶν ἀκαθαρτῶν βρωσεών, μεστοὶ οὖν ἀκαθαρσίας. Others (as Rosenm.) understood by the τὸ ἐξωθεν the body, whatever is visible; by ἐσωθεν the mind. Thus Euthymius explains: “By ἐξωθεν is meant the body, as being visible; by ἐσωθεν the mind, as being hidden.”

41. τιθώ τὰ ἐνώντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην. There has been here again no little diversity of interpretation. The most ancient Commentators assign to τὰ ἐνώντα the sense, according to your ability, by a subaudition of κατὰ and χειματα. So Theophylact, Euthymius, Grotius, Rosenm. and Schleusner. But to this it has been objected by Raphel, Heuman,
Kypke, Segaar, and others, that examples of τὰ ἐννοτα for ἐὰν τῶν ἐννοταν are wanting. Many, therefore, adopt the sense, "what is within the cup," of which numerous examples are given by them, and especially by Wetstein. Thus Xen. Ages. 2, 19. Hist. 2, 3, 6. where τὰ ἐννοτα, whatever is within the walls and fortifications, &c. is distinguished from the walls themselves. So here what is in the cups, dishes, &c. is distinguished from the cups and dishes. Thus in the parallel passage of Matt. 23, 26. καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐν τοῦ τοτηροῦ καὶ τῆς παραφίδου. Here, however, these Interpreters differ. Some explain: "Ye rather, from what is within the cups and dishes, confer benefits upon others, and all things (which words they refer either to the meats only, or to the externals and internals, to the vessels and the meats) shall be pure to you. And by these words they are of opinion that Jesus meant to exhort the Pharisees to serious repentance, and to restore, as much as might be, what had been taken from others by fraud and rapine, and compensate for their injustice by almsgiving. But to this Kuinoel objects that we read nothing in this place of serious repentance, nor of restoring ill-gotten gains: a sense would therefore arise the contrary to that which Jesus always inculcated, but which was common enough to the Pharisees. Therefore Drusius, Erasmus, Lightfoot, Markland, Paulus, Ecker man, and Kuinoel, think that the words are to be understood ironically: "Only relieve the poor with what is within the cups and dishes, (i.e. give alms to the poor,) and then all things are, in your opinion, pure." The connection of this verse with the preceding ones is thus laid down by Kuinoel: "About the purity of your cups and dishes you are very studious, but utterly unconcerned are you that your daily food is obtained by injustice and rapine. Fool is he who cleanses the cups and dishes, but does not also purify the food itself, and become approved in the sight of God; as neither he who takes food with washed hands is therefore approved by God. Do
but give alms to the poor, and then, according to your opinion, you may be little solicitous about food unjustly acquired, then to you all things are pure." This interpretation is extremely ingenious, and is in some measure confirmed by the parallel passage of Matthew; but it lies open to not a few objections. Irony is very rarely employed by Christ. Then, the interpretation is far-fetched, and does not bear the stamp of truth. It is (as Schleusner says) magis arguta quam vera. Upon the whole, I must acquiesce in the common interpretation, which seems to involve the fewest difficulties. The ellipsis in τὰ ἐνῶτα needs little establishing. As it is an Hellenistic phrase, we must not expect to find it in the Classical writers. Upon the whole, enough has (I think) been offered by Bos, Exerc. p. 36, and Schleusner, to establish it. It has been well observed by Rosenm. that πάντα ought not, in interpretation, to be extended beyond what the intent of the speaker, and the connection of the sentence, requires; as if all things were lawful to him who gives alms. This seems to have been the opinion of Euthymius, who has the following solid and acute remark:* Οἰκονομικῶτα δὲ τούτο εἶπεν, ἀπαλλάξαι τούτων τοῦ ἑπτασίλαζοντος τέως πάθους βουλόμενος εἰλάσαι γὰρ οἱ εὐμήχανοι διδάσκαλοι ἐξαιρέω τὴν ἀρετὴν, ἐφ' ἣν προτέρως τῶν ἀκροφομένων, ἄλλως τε καὶ τῶις παντελῶς ἑσκοτισμένοις μέγα καὶ τὸ μικρὰ φατισθῆναι. Markland observes, that it can scarcely be supposed that our Saviour could say in earnest that alms-giving could really compensate for rapine and wickedness; but that he speaks according to their own maxims and notions. The passage is not amiss rendered by Dr. Owen: Πλὴν, contrary to what you now do, purify your hearts, rectify your dispositions, make clean (τὰ ἐνῶτα) all within; give alms from

* I must here observe, that the learned Hentenius, the translator of Euthymius, has completely mistaken the sense of οἰκονομικῶτα, which (as Stephens in his Thee. observes) is a metaphor taken from provident stewards, who know when to transact business, and when to incur expenses.
right motives; and behold, take notice, all things are clean unto you." Katà tà ènónta must signify, according to, in proportion to your ability, or in proportion to what thou hast laid up, ènàtòkeímena, as Euthymius explains. So Tobit 4, 7, & 8. (cited by Grot.) Ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων σοι ποιεῖ ἑλεμοσύνην: and further on, ὃς σοι ὑπάρχει κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τοιῶν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἑλεμοσύνην. The scope of the whole passage is excellently illustrated by the following observations of Campbell: "Our Lord, in discoursing on this topic, took a two-fold view of the subject, both tending to the same end. The first, and subordinate, view was, that the cleanness of the inside of vessels is as of as much consequence, at least, as that of the outside. The second, and principal view, was, that moral cleanness, or purity of mind, is more important than ceremonial cleanness, resulting from frequent washings. These views are sometimes blended in the discourse. Under the metaphor of vessels, human beings are represented, whereof the body answers to that which is without, the soul to that which is within. Body and soul, argues our Lord, had both the same uthor, and the one, (especially the more ignoble part,) ought not to engross our regards, to the neglect of the more noble; and even as to vessels, the genuine way of cleansing them, in a moral and spiritual sense, is by making them the instruments of conveying relief to the distressed and needy."

The limited plan of this work will not permit me to enter into further explanations, which the reader may readily obtain, by consulting the annotations of Grotius, Hammond, and Whitby, or the abstract of them to be found in Elsley.

44. ὃς τὰ μυημεία τὰ ἄδηλα. How is it possible to make these words the same in sense with those of St. Matth. 23, 27? Luke's graves that appear not, with Matthew's whited sepulchres, which appear beautiful outward? And yet great pains have been taken to this purpose by learned men, not consi-
dering that our Saviour made use of both the similitudes: but St. Matthew related one, and St. Luke another. See on chap. 6, 20. Markland.

44. οἱ ἀνθρώποι οἱ περιπατοῦντες—οὐκ οἶδασιν. The last letters of the word ἀνθρώποι, οἱ, being repeated, have hurt an elegant expression, οὐκ οἶδασι περιπατοῦντες ἐπάνω, that is, οὐκ οἶδασιν έαυτοὺς περιπατεῖν ἐπάνω, and the men (the Jews) know not that they walk over them: and by that means are unawares defiled. So 2 Cor. 10, 12. συγκρίνοντες έαυτούς έαυτοίς οὐ συμμοίρουσιν. (Markland.) I can by no means, however, assent to the learned critic, since I consider the article as almost necessary, though I would not exclude the idiom which he inculcates. The construction is as follows: οἱ ἀνθρώποι οἱ περιπατοῦντες (περιπατοῦντες) οὐκ οἶδασιν, i. e. the persons who walk over them, know not that they are walking over them. The article in οἱ ἀνθρώποι seems to require this construction. The reading proposed by Markland, though, strictly speaking, it may be grammatical, has far less of perspicuity and elegance. In illustration of this scrupulousness of the Jews, Wetstein cites Jos, Ant. 18, 2, 3. speaking of the founding of the city of Tiberias: εἰδὼς παράνομον τὸν οἰκισμὸν ὑντα, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰουδαίων πατρίου, διὰ τὸ, ἐπὶ μνήμασιν, καὶ πολλὰ τῇδε ἦν, ἀνηρμένους τὴν ἱδρυσιν Τιβερίαδι γένεσθαι μιαροῦ οἱ ἐπὶ τῷ ἱμέρας εἶναι τοὺς οἰκτοφασ εἰσαγορέουσιν ἡμῖν τὸ νόμμου. And that this was not confined to the Jews appears from Theophr. in his Charact. 16, who thus designates the superstitious man: οὔτε ἐπιθύμησιν μνήματι, οὔτε ἐπὶ νέκρων ἐλθεῖν, οὔτε ἐπὶ λέξει. Wetstein also cites Lucan. 8, 805. Servius on the Ἀεν. 8, 64. Gell, 10, 5. Arnob. 6.

45. τῶν νομικῶν. That the νομικοί (lawyers) were distinct from the γραμματεῖς (scribes) many commentators maintain. We are not to understand this, as though any part of the guilt lay in building or adorning the tombs of the Prophets, considered in itself; but in their falseness in giving this testimony of respect to the Prophets, whilst they were actuated
by the spirit, and following the example of their persecutors and murderers; insomuch that they appeared to erect those sepulchres, not to do honour to God's prophets, but to serve as eternal monuments of the success of their progenitors in destroying them.

Camerarius thinks that the γραμματεῖς were the public teachers and expounders of the divine laws: but that the νομικοὶ or νομοδιδάσκαλοι were the private teachers of those laws. This distinction, however, Kuinoel thinks unauthorized by any evidence of antiquity. Others are of opinion that the γραμματεῖς were legis periti, persons skilled in the law, of the sect of the Pharisees. On the contrary, that the νομικοὶ, and νομοδιδάσκαλοι, were legis periti, of the sect of the Sadducees: since in this passage the νομικοὶ are plainly distinguished from the γραμματεῖς and Φαρισαῖοι mentioned in ver. 44. (which words are, however, omitted in the best MSS.)

Other opinions are detailed in Wolf's Curæ and Koecher's Analectæ. Kuinoel is of opinion, that by the words γραμματεῖς, νομικοὶ, and νομοδιδάσκαλοι, are denoted the legis periti, or διδάσκαλοι, both of the sect of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and that therefore the terms may be regarded as synonymous. For (says he) the legis peritus of the sect of the Pharisees, who in Matth. 22, 35. is termed νομικοὶ, is by Mark, 12, 28. called γραμματεῖς. Of the doctors of either sect the name γραμματεῖς is used in Matth. 2, 4. and in Luke 5. 17. are mentioned νομοδιδάσκαλοι καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, who in ver. 21. are termed γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι. Kuinoel thinks it plain, that the person who is here introduced as speaking was a lawyer of the sect of the Pharisees. This lawyer, as long as our Lord censured the corrupt morals of the Pharisees in general terms, remained silent: but when Jesus had proceeded to reprehend the lawyers themselves, and compared them to whitened sepulchres, could no longer contain himself; and, in a rage, exclaimed, Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα λέγειν καὶ ἡμᾶς ὀβρίζεις, Master, by saying these things, you even insult us.
46. ἐπηκεῖτε τοῖς φορτίοις. On this syntax (where the dative is governed by the preposition πρὸς in composition) see Abresch, Annot. on the N. Test. 584. The word προσταίων signifies to touch ἀκροβυγώς, i. e. with the tips of the fingers. On the rest of the verse see the note on Matth. 23, 4.

47. οὐ σιδείν, ἀνεκδομεῖτε. We are not to understand this, as though any part of the guilt lay in building or adorning the tombs of the prophets, considered in itself; but in their falseness, in giving this testimony of respect to the prophets, whilst they were actuated by the spirit, and following the example of their persecutors and murderers, insomuch that they appeared to erect those sepulchres, not to do honour to God's prophets, but to serve as eternal monuments of the success of their progenitors in destroying them.

48. μαρτυρεῖτε, καὶ σ. τ. ε. τ. π. ὅ. This passage is to be explained from the parallel place in Matth. 23, 29—31. Kuinoel, who here diligently discusses the sense, offers the following interpretation: "Sanè laudatis et approbatis majorum facinora, quamquam illi quidem eos trucidarunt, vos verò eorum monumenta instauratis." This mode of taking the passage is, he thinks, the simplest, and observes, that if it be admitted, the words of the sentence may retain their usual sense, nor will there be any contrariety, either in the context or the parallel passage of Matthew.

49. ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπεν. See the note on Matth. 23, 24. By the wisdom of God many Commentators understand the λόγος, or Son of God, Jesus himself; a dignified (and, indeed, Oriental) mode of expressing, I say: and so in the parallel passage of Matthew we have ἐγὼ. But I assent to Camerarius and Kuinoel, that ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ is a periphrasis for God, the wise God; as the power of God is used for the powerful God. See 1 Cor. 1, 30. Acts 8, 10.

51. τοῦ οἴκου, i. e. the Sanctum Sanctorum. See the note on the parallel place of Matthew, to which
I add a similar passage of Artemid. 4; 4. γυνὴ ἐδόξειν εἰς τὸν νέαν ἣ ὀδοὺ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Ἑφεσίας. See Elmsl. on Eurip. Med. 865.

52. ἢπατε τὴν κλείσα τῆς γνώσεως. See the note on Matth. 23, 13. The Christian doctrine (observes Kuinoel) is compared to an edifice closed up, inaccessible; as in Matth. 7, 13. the felicity to be enjoyed in the Messiah’s Kingdom is compared to a fortress. I add a similar passage of Pind. Pyth. 8, 1—5. where he thus commences a fine Ode to Tranquillity: Φιλοφρον Ἀσυχία, Δίκαιος Ὁ μεγιστότολοι Θεο-γατες, βουλᾶν τε καὶ πολεμῶν ἑχόνωσα κλαῖδας ὑπερτάτας.

53. δεινῶς ἐνέχειν. See the note on Mark 6, 19, to which I add, that Dr. Doddridge is quite mistaken, who renders, hung upon him, and supposes that there is an allusion to a dog fastening his teeth into his prey. I am inclined to think, that ἐνέχειν has here simply the sense, to have in; keep in, foster; and that there is an ellipsis of χόλον, which is supplied in Herodot. 6, 119. ἐνέχει σχότεινον χόλον and 1, 118. κρυπτων τον οι ἐνέχειν χόλον and 8, 27. αἰτε σφι ἐνέχουντες αἰελ χόλον. It occurs without the χόλον in Gen. 49, 23. The sense therefore is, ἐγκοτον ἐχειν τιν, to nourish anger and spite against, to harbour resentment against any person.

53. ἀποστοματίζειν αὐτὸν. The word ἀποστοματίζειν is a rhetorical term borrowed from the schools, and signifies, to repeat memoriter, bring forward any thing from memory, or ex tempore. See Timaei Lex. Plat. and especially Suidas and Hesych. So λέγειν ἀπὸ στόματος, and ἀποστοματίζειν, of which numerous examples are given by Wetstein. Sometimes, however, it is used in an active, or transitive, sense, to make any one speak memoriter; of which examples are produced from Plato, 216. c. & 217. a. This is plainly the sense of the word in the present passage. The Pharisees essayed to draw from Jesus extemporary effusions, and cause him ἀποστοματίζειν, in order that they might catch up from his mouth something hastily and inconsiderately uttered, from
which they might elicit matter for public and formal accusation; as is well expressed in the terms ἐνέδρεωσις and δηρεύσαι. Similar to which are the passages produced by Wetstein from Plato Euthyd. Κάμοι ἦγαν αὐτῶν, οτι μοι χαλεπαίνιν διαστέλλοντι τὰ λεγόμενα, βουλόμενον με δηρεύσαι. The word ἀποστοματίζειν is thus excellently explained by Euthymius: τὸ ἀπαιτεῖν αὐτοσχεδίος καὶ ἀνεπισκέπτως ἀποκρίσεις ἐφανερώσαν δόλειν.

CHAP. XII.

VERSE 1. See the note on Matth. 10, 26. seqq.

2. οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν, δ’ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται. Wetstein compares Ἀeschyl. Prom. Vinct. 513. ἀλλιώ λόγου μέμηθε τόνδε δ’ οὐδαμῶς καιρὸς γεγονὼς, ἀλλὰ συγκαλυπτέος” and on verse 3. he compares 2 Kings, 6, 12.


4. λέγω δὲ ὅμιν τοῖς φίλοις μου. Wetstein compares Galen. 2. δέν γὰρ οἷς ἰστε, πρὸς γὰρ ὡμάς ἐρῶ τοὺς ἐκτιρουσ, οἷς μᾶλιστα γράφεται ταῦτα. See Athen. p. 608.

5. ἐφοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτείναι—γεγονὼ. Wetstein cites Seneca in Sap. non cadere injuriam 9. maximum illud, ultra quod nihil habent sēvissimi Domini, quod minentur. See the note on Matth. 10, 28—32. and on 10—12. and also on Matth. 12, 32. The words are, however, supposed by Kuinoel to have been uttered by Christ on some other occasion.

6. οὐχὶ πέντε στροφία πωλεῖται—Θεοῦ. Wetstein refers to Is. 49, 15.

11. τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας. Schleusner and VOL. II. 2 B
Wetstein produce many examples of these two words used conjointly; to which I add Onosand, p. 104, where he distinguishes between the ἐξουσία and the ἀρχή: τῶν μὲν ἰδιωτῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐξουσία τῶν ἰδιωτῶν τῶν ἀριστεύσαν αὐτῷ μείζων ἡ ἀρχή. In this sense ἀρχή is almost always used in the plural. Thus Thucyd. 5, 27, & 48. Eur. Phoen. 980 & 1580. Eur. Ion. 1111. Hel. 1516. It is, however, used in the singular in Theog. 1961 and Liban. Orat. 369. ἀγγειλε πρὸς τὴν ἀρχήν. These two words, ἀρχή and ἐξουσία, signify rulers and magistrates. Thus Rom. 1. Schleusner observes, that potestas is so used by Juvencus, Suetonius, and Ammianus. I add, that so the Italian podesta signifies a magistrate.

13. εἰτε τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου. It is probable that the Jews were accustomed, in order to avoid the delays of judicial processes, to take certain persons of acknowledged wisdom and integrity as referees, or arbitrators, and we may suppose that disciples readily abided by the decisions of their masters. "This appellant (observes Doddridge) probably thought, that, as the Messiah, he would act in the character of a prince, who would decide controversies relating to property."

14. τῖς μὲ κατέστησε δικαστὴν ἢ μεριστήν ἐὰν ὑμᾶς; Jesus plainly alludes to Exod. 2, 14. He does not chuse to have the same sentence cast at him which the perverse Israelite used against Moses. Christ is content to give general precepts, which may be accommodated to affairs of every kind. (Grot.) The distinction between δικαστής and μεριστής is thus stated by Grotius: "Δικαστής seems equivalent to δικάστης, arbitrator, or referee; μεριστής denotes a divider of an inheritance among the heirs." The reader may profitably consult the notes of Grotius, Le Clerc, and Whitby, on this passage, or the

* This is confirmed by Appian. 1, 64, 96. μὴ ἤγεισθας Ρωμαίου.

δικαστὴν ἡ δικαιία.
ST. LUKE, CHAP. XII.


15. After Jesus had declined the entreaties of a man who had implored his aid to obtain what, he affirmed, was unjustly withheld from him, our Lord takes occasion to warn his hearers (among whom might possibly be the brother in question) against avarice and worldly-mindedness; and excites them to the desire of divine attainments and heavenly felicity. This (I repeat) was probably said in the presence of both. For I entirely assent to the excellent remark of Wetstein, (for which he was indebted to Menochius and L. Brug.) that the connection here indicates the true cause of the contention between the brothers to have been the desire which equally animated both of obtaining the greater portion. We learn from Seneca Decl. 10, 8. that it was the law, in his time, for the elder brother to divide the inheritance, and the younger to take his choice of the portions. On this point of the civil law, Grotius has a long and instructive annotation, to which I can only refer my reader. The subject of the following parable is not so much avarice, as excessive trust in wealth, which is, however, closely connected with the other.

15. Ὀρᾶτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε. Wetstein compares Heliodor. 5, p. 236. ὅτα δὲ οὖν, φυλάττων, καὶ λογίζου, τί ἐν τοῖς ποιεῖ. The force of the expression is thus copiously illustrated by Doddridge: “See to it, and with your utmost care be on your guard against.”

15. φυλάσσεσθε ἀπὸ τῆς π. Wetstein observes, that this construction occurs in the Sept. and in Xenoph. cited by Stephens in his Thes. The passage to which he alludes is probably Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 5. See Sirach. 12, 2. and 1 Kings 21. In Thucyd. 7, 64, 4. we find the somewhat uncommon construction, φυλάσσεσθε ἐνδ αὐτοῦ, guard against. Πλε-
oneξία signifies *rapacity*, excessive desire of wealth, *auri sacrae janes.* This exhortation bears a most striking similarity to the following one, recorded in Liban. Orat. ἀκούσαντας παρὰ τοῦ Πολίου, φωλάττεσθαι τὴν φιλοχρήματος αἰς ὀλέθρον ἔχουσαν, where Morell would read φιλοχρηματίαν. I should, however, prefer τὸ φιλοχρήματος, cancelling ἔχουσαν, which seems to have arisen from a gloss. This use of τὸ φιλοχρήματος for φιλοχρηματία is frequent in the best writers; ex. gr. Herodian. 1, 6, 25. 3, 8, 14.

15. ωκ ἐν τῷ περιστερεῖν τινὶ ἡ γαίη αὐτοῦ ἐστιν. On this passage Maldonati has well observed, that the words are more difficult than the sense. To this Campbell assents, and observes, that all Interpreters are agreed about the meaning, however much they may differ about the construction. After complaining of the obscurity of the E. T. he offers the following version: “In whatever affluence a man may be, his life dependeth not on his possessions.” Various modes of interpretation have been proposed, which may be seen detailed in Pole, Wolf, Koecher, and Kuinoel: all of which are by Kuinoel justly pronounced perplexed and far-fetched. As to Dr. Campbell’s version, it is far less perspicuous than our common one, and seems to imply merely that longevity is not produced by wealth; and in this way the passage was taken by many ancient Commentators. So Euthymius explains: διὸν ωκ ἐκ ταύτης προστίθεται μέτρον γαϊής and proceeds to observe, that the parable inculcates ὅτι ἡ πλεονεξία μερίμνας μὲν καὶ λύπας προέρχεται χωθη δὲ προσθέναι αὐτοῦ δυνάται. Thus Theophylact 347. c. in a very eloquent passage: οὐ γὰρ ὅτι ὁ ἐχὼν πολλὰ, ἢ ὅτι ποὺ καὶ ἐς μακρὸν ἐπι- στεται ἐπεὶ η εγὼ ὁ φιλόλωτος δόκουσιν ὅσις φιλόλωι περιέπειν τὸν πλοῦτον, καὶ αὐτὸ μακρὸν μελλόντες βιώσαται, πανταχόθεν συνάγει, φησίν. Of this opinion, too, seems to have been Wetstein, since he cites, in illustration of the sentiment, Manil. 4, 89. Et neque

* See the excellent note of Whitby on this passage.
paupertas breviore excipit annos, Nec sunt immensis opibus venalia fata. Hor. Ep. 1, 2, 47. Juvenal. Sat. 14, 156. Menand. ap. Stob. Anthol. Græc. 2, 50, 21. and 47, 1. But this sense is neither in itself sufficiently important, to be thought the true one; nor is it suitable to the scope of the parable. The true interpretation of the words in question seems to me to depend upon the right understanding of the word ημαρίον, which here signifies felicity. See numerous examples of this in Schl. Lex. Some Commentators have indeed perceived this, and thus detail the sense of the verse: "The happiness obtained by riches does not consist solely in the possession of much wealth, but in its use:" a sentiment which, however true in itself,* cannot be elicited from the words, and is not suitable to the parable. I entirely assent to Schleusner and Kuinoel, that the sense is simply this: "For when a man abounds in wealth, yet his happiness does by no means depend on his riches. There is no need of abundance of wealth in order to be truly happy." "This interpretation (observes Kuinoel) the following parable not only requires, but demands." Thus our common version will sufficiently express the sense, if we only take life, metaphorically, for happiness.†


† So Aristotle, in his Ethics, l. 10, cap. 8. is thus translated by Mr. Bulkley: "It is not to be thought (says that profound Philosopher) that a great abundance of outward goods is necessary to happiness, for no man can ever think, that a competency requires superfluity. And it is evident, that a man, without being lord of sea and land, may act the honourable and worthy part in life; and that those in moderate circumstances have it in their power to regulate their manners according to the principles of virtue: and we see, in fact, that men in private stations are not less attentive to moral propriety than those in authority; nay, that they are more so. Now, says he, this is enough. For the happy life, according to the essential idea and notion of it, is the life of one acting upon the principles and maxims of virtue.
16. ἀνθρώπου τινὸς πλούσιου. By πλούσιου is here to be understood a rich man, who places his sole reliance on his wealth, who is thus abstracted from the study of virtue, and who abuses his wealth to the purposes of luxury. (Kuin.) εὐφορεῖν is explained by Hesych. καλὸς φερεῖν. The word is somewhat rare; but it occurs in Jos. B. 1, 2, 48. The derivatives εὐφορὸς and εὐφορία are far more frequent, and examples are produced by Kypke, Wetstein, and Crauser, in his Phosph. The word χαῖρα has here the sense which we find assigned to it in Hesychius, namely, ἄγγος, i. e. ʃurм. A signification frequent in the Sept. and not unknown to the Classical writers. See Kypke.

17. τί ποιήσω; Wetstein compares Aristoph. Vesp. 318. τί ποιήσω; τηροῦμ' ὑπὸ τοῦδ' and Terent. Eun. ch. 5, 2, 9. Sed eatne hae Thais, quam video? sa est. Hæres, quid faciam? “He would wish says Euthymius,) to include in his barns all his fruits, but cannot, on account of the abundance of them; therefore he is tormented with care and anxiety, as if he were very poor, though, in fact, he is exceedingly rich: for the rich man often feels the pinch of want, as well as the poor man.” (Euthym.)

17, 18, 19. Observe the word my, so often repeated; my fruits, my barns, my goods, my soul: as if all these had been in his own disposal. Thus, Philo Judæus, Alleg. p. m. 65. says that it is for God alone, to say τοῦ ἑων, mine. Τὴν ψυχὴν σου. He alludes to the rich man’s own expression (ver. 19, my soul,) and turns it against him, sarcastically. Thou fool, that which thou callest thy soul, is demanded of thee (ἀπαιτῶσιν) as a thing not thine own: and whereas thou sayest for many years, thou shalt not outlive this very night. (Markland.) The former part of this criticism (for which he was indebted to Theophylact,) has more of solidity than the latter part.

18. καθελὼ μοῦ τὰς ἀγαθὰς. So Horace: "diruit, sediáscat, nutat quadrata rotundis. (Grot.)
18. συνάξω ἐκεὶ πάντα τὰ γεννήματά μου. Gennēma has here a sense frequent in the Sept. and the Hellenistic and later Greek writers; namely produce, ἀνάβησιν produce, usually rendered by καρφῶν, fruits.
18, τὰ ἀγαθὰ μου, bona mea, fruges meas. Thus in the Latin, bona denotes whatever is necessary for food and clothing, and especially the fruits of the earth, like the Heb. ובש. So Xen. Cyr. 4, 4. καρπα μεστὴ οἶνον — καὶ σίτου, καὶ πάντων ἄγαθῶν. (Kuin.)
Grotius has here a very learned note (in which the term is philosophically considered,) of which some abstract may be seen in Elsley.
19. ἐφιάζοντας με. I assent to Kuinoel, that H. Steph. Kyuke, and others, have vainly laboured to show how the wine should excite not his body but his mind to eating and drinking. Euthymius, and since his time, L. Brug. long ago pointed out that it was to be rendered to myself; as in Matt. 10, 99. So Liban. Or. p. 463. s. (cited by Wetstein :) διαφοράν ἐκατοπτρήσεϊ τὴν ἐκατοπτρίαν ἅνεγε ἐκατοπτρήσεϊν ἀναγνώστεισθαι, Δημοσθένους ἀκούσσομαι ἄγνωστος. As I add Αelian, V. H. 1, 32. On the future ἐφιάσατο, &c. Grotius thus paraphrases. “Then will I enjoy my acquisitions, when I shall have enlarged my barns;” and remarks, that the rich man might have done so without waiting for that period; and quotes the well-known sentence, “Cras serum est vivere; vive hodie.”
19. ἀγαθὰ καίμενα: i. e. ἀτακείμενα. Wetstein cites Hom. II. ii. 194. Οὐδὲ τί πατὶ ἀμεν ἧπινης καίμενα πόλα. Hor. Sat 1, 1, 30. hac mente laborem sese ferre, senes ut in otia tuta recedant, Ajunt, cum sibi sint congesta cibaria.
19. αἰσθαίνω. This word extends to sensual gratifications of every kind. Wetstein cites Eurip. Alcest.
788. εὐφραίνει σαυτῷ, τίνε πλὴν καθ ὁμέραν Βλευ λογίζειν σιώ. Theophylact observes that there is here an euphemism: and I need only remind my readers of the Epitaph on Sardanapalus. But perhaps it may be sufficient to understand the phrase, generally (with Schlesner,) vitam mollem age.

20. εἰπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς. Not by revelation, but a silent decree; which however, is here, by way of ornament, expressed per apostrophem. See Prov. 1, 26. (Grot. & Kuin.)

20. ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀτέ σου. Casaubon, Gataker and Wolf, distinguish between ἀπαιτεῖν and αἰτεῖν, inasmuch as the latter denotes to require a volenti; ἀπαιτεῖν, a nolenti. So Theophyl. 409. b. Price, Raphel, and Crauser, however, have shown that it denotes “to require any thing as one’s due, or as having been lent for a time,” But neither of these distinctions are always observed: the latter may however here have place. So Sapient. 15, 8. τὴν ψυχήν ἀπαιτηθῆς χρέως. There life is compared to a loan granted for a time, and then to be required back. See Theophyl. 409. c. By ἀπαιτοῦσι, most recent commentators, as Grotius, Glass, Keuchen, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, understand a personal for impersonal, active for passive, “it shall be required,” &c. But I am inclined rather to agree with Elsner, Wolf, and Schoettgen, who think, that by the plural, there is an allusion to an opinion of the Jews, that the Angel of death sometimes, by means of other angels, his legates, required back the debt of life. Schoettgen cites the Rabbinical writers, and Elsner quotes a passage from Plato Phæd, from which it appears to have been the opinion of Socrates, that good men sometimes were taken by the ministration of some supernatural being. Wetstein cites Pindar. Olymp. 10, 106. Πλοῦτος ὁ λαχῶν τομέαν ἐπακώ ξέλλοτρον θνάσκοντι στυγερότατος. With this whole parable compare Sirach 11, 18—25.

20. τίν ἔσται, i. e. not thine, for thou canst carry nothing away with thee: (Kuinoel cites Prop. 3, 5,
13. Sil. Ital. 5, 267.) the possessions will be seized by the greedy heir. So Horace frequently. See Pincinelli Lumin. Reflex. 652.

21. οὐκές ὁ θησαυρίζων ἐαυτῷ, κ. μ. ε. Θ. π. This shall be the lot of, &c. Εαυτῷ, for his advantage. Wetstein compares numerous passages of the Classical writers, of which, the most apposite, are Ἀelian. V. Η. 1, 12. δεινῶς εἰς φιλότατοι πρὸς τὸ θησαυρίζω, καὶ ἐαυτῷ ἐπιταμευόμασθαι. Publ. Syri sentent. In nul- lum avarus bonus est, in se pessimus. Anthol. 2, 50, 12. Πλούτων μὲν πλούτωτος ἔχεις, ψυχὴν δὲ πένητος, ὅ- τις κληρονόμως πλοῦσις, σοὶ δὲ πένης. Cic. de Offic. 3, 15. neque enim solum nobis divites esse volumus, sed liberis, propinquis, amicis, maximeque Reipublicae. Juvenal 5, 118. Esto, ut nunc multi, dives tibi, pauper amicis.

21. εἰς Θεόν πλούτων. Commentators are not agreed on the interpretation of this formula. Theophylact explains it in a very vague and unsatisfactory manner. Beza, Grotius, Elsner, Wolf, Marius, and Rosenm. regard πλούτων, as equivalent to θησαυρίζων; and therefore regard εἰς Θεόν, as synonymous with παρὰ Θεόν. Riches towards God, they interpret "the works of compassion, mercy, and beneficence," which Christ, in Matt. 6, 20. calls treasures in heaven. Bengel, Kypke, Moldenhauer, and others, explain to be rich for the use, honour, and glory of God. Markland interprets thus: is rich with no regard to God, or not towards God, i. e. with no regard to God the giver, nor to his will and design in giving them: but who looks upon them all as his own, and calls them my fruits, my barns, &c. and accordingly shuts them all up for his own use only. See Phil. Jud. pp. 836, 837. οἰ δὲ λαβόντες μὴ ἐαυτοῖς, ἀλλὰ Θεῷ, &c." Kuinoel thinks εἰς Θεόν equivalent to εἰς οὐρανός, in Matt. 6, 20. Schleusner and Krebs explain to so use his riches, as God wishes and requires. To me it appears, that the expression includes the sense contained in the interpretations of Grotius and Schleusner; namely, the acquirement of merit with God, and consequently of
reward from him, by the performance of all such good works of every kind (especially works of benevolence,) as are commanded by God. Thus Euthymius: κατὰ Θεόν δὲ πλούτος ἡ κτήσις τῶν ἄρτων.

21, 23. See the note on Matt. 6, 25. seqq.

24. τῶν κόρακας. Matthew, 6, 26. uses the more frequent term τὰ πτερύγα, fowls. Yet this expression of Luke seems more special and exact, since the providence of God, in respect to crows, is especially observable, and, as such, is noticed by the writers. See Job. 38, 41. Ps. 147, 149. (Grot.) Thus, in Aristot. H. A. 9, 31. Philo 10, 12. and Ælian. H. A. 2, 49. remark that the young crows are driven away from the nest as soon as they are able to fly, and are afterwards supported, we scarce know how, by a remarkable providence of God. Philo also observes that crows are naturally very forgetful, and often fail to return to their nests: yet by the wise and merciful providence of God, they instinctively heap together in their nests whatever may create worms, from which, their abandoned young, are nourished and preserved. (Bochart.)

24. ὁ ἄπειρον ἄποθηκη. So Philostr. Timag. 840. speaking of the Cyclops. ὁτε ἐφισάν ὁτε ἐφεύ-

25. τὴς —— μεριμνῶν δύναται προσθείναι εἰς τ. ἡ. π. ἡ. η. τ. 

* Ῥχύς, as denoting a measure of length, may be thought in-

* applicable to time; but few tropes are more familiar than those wherein such measures are applied to the age or life of man. See Ps. 39, 5. “Behold, thou hast made my days an handbreath.” So Minnemus ap. Hammond has the expression a cubit of time, for a very short time. Analogous to this is the following comparison of life to a race, or to a journey. Thus there is no violence
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μοι μέριμνα αφεραστίς ἐστιν ἐν φρεσίν διπλά.
29. μὴ μετεωρίζετε, i. e. do not suffer yourselves
done to the words of the Evangelist, in making them relate to a 
man's age, or term of life, and not to his stature. But whether 
they actually relate to the one or the other, is best determined 
from the context. It is evident that the warnings which our Lord 
gives here, and in the parallel passage in Matthew, against 
anxiety, particularly regard the two essential articles of food and 
raiment, which engross the attention of the much greater part of 
mankind. Food is necessary for the preservation of life, and rai-
ment for the protection of our bodies from the injuries of the wea-
ther. Anxiety about food is, therefore, closely connected with 
anxiety about life; but, except in children, or very young per-
sons, has no connection with anxiety about stature. Accordingly, 
it is the preservation of life, and the protection of the body, which 
our Lord himself points to as the ultimate aim of all those perplex-
ing cares. Is not life, says he, a greater gift than food, and the body 
than raiment? And if so, will not God, who gave the greater 
gift, life, give also food, which, though a smaller gift, is neces-
sary for supporting the other? In like manner, will not he who 
gave the body, give the raiment necessary for its defence? All 
this is entirely consequential, and our Lord, in these warnings, 
touches what occupies the daily reflections and labour of more-
than nine-tenths of mankind. But, if what is said were referred to 
stature, he would appear to start aside from what employs the 
time and attention of the people in every age and country, to what 
could be an object only to children, and a few very foolish young 
people. In the verse immediately following, we have an addi-
tional evidence that the word is employed here metaphorically, 
and that the discourse still concerns the same subject, food and 
raiment, or the preservation of life, and the accommodation of the 
body. If ye cannot, says he, thus effect even the smallest thing, 
τλαίκειου, why are ye anxious about the rest? In respect of stature, 
would a cubit be called the smallest thing, which is more than 
one-fourth of the whole? This would have been more suitable if 
the word had been an inch. In every view, therefore, that we 
take of the matter, it is extremely improbable that there is here 
any mention of stature. The idea is foreign to the scope of the 
discourse; the thing said is ill-suited to the words connected with 
it, and ill-adapted to the hearers, as it proceeds on the hypothe-
sis, that a sort of solicitude was general among them, which can-
not reasonably be supposed to have affected one hundredth part 
of them. (Campbell.) Thus far I assent to this enlightened Theo-
logian, from whom, however, I must venture to dissent in respect 
to the conjecture of Wetstein, Hammond, and Pearce, that life is 
here considered as a stadium or race-course: for although agonis-
tic comparisons are not unfrequent in the Scriptures, and Đr-
to anxiously fluctuate between hope and fear, as to the acquirement of the necessaries of life. That the care of providing food and clothing forms the subject of the passage, is evident, from ver. 28. & 30. Since however, many commentators have doubted whether μετεωρίζεσθαι be ever used in the above sense, and have therefore devised others, somewhat perplexed, and far less intelligible; it will be proper to treat at large on the various significations of the verb in question, which occurs but once in the Scriptures, and has on that account given occasion for no little Philological debate. Μετεωρός primarily signifies elevated, high, and sometimes aerial, heavenly. Hence μετεωρίζειν denotes "to lift up on high," or in the air; and in the passive, "to be raised or elevated," whether as birds in the air, or as smoke and dust raised, or the waves of a swelling sea, or of ships tossed aloft, or of vessels navigating the high sea. Here it is proper to notice the passage of Xen. Cyne. 4, 1, where to dogs is ascribed ὄμματα μετέωρα, vague, wandering and fluctuating eyes. So Sirach 26, 9. μετεωρισμοὶ ὀφθαλμῶν. Secondly, μετεωρίζειν metaphorically signifies, "to elevate the mind, inflate, or raise the hopes;" and in the passive, First, "to be puffed up, to become proud," &c. Secondly, "to be raised, or impelled by hope or expectation:" and therefore it aptly denotes the fluctuation of a mind doubtfully suspended between hope and fear, by a metaphor derived from ships tossed about in the high sea by the wind and waves. So Philo 817, ά. (cited by Loesner.) γνωσθεῖ δὲ σεαυτὸν καὶ μὴ συμπεριφέρου ταῖς υπὲρ δύναμιν ὀρμαῖς καὶ ἐπιθυμίαις, μηδὲ σὲ τῶν ἀνεφίκτων ἔρως αἰζέτω καὶ μετεωρίζετω τῶν γὰρ ἔφικτων

Campbell quotes Acts 13, 25. 20, 24. 2 Tim. 4, 7. James 3, 6. yet in those passages the words παρόν and τελεῖν and τρόχος, afford a far more direct allusion to agonistic exercises than I can trace in the passage in question. I rather accede to the opinion of Alberti; that there is here an allusion to the life of man, considered as a continuous thread, and therefore capable of measurement.
νῦνεν αὖμιρήσεις. For the substance of the above, I am chiefly indebted to Wetstein, Schlesus, and especially the copious Collectanea of Kuinoel, who produces many examples of μετέωρος, in the sense of dubious, fluctuating, &c. which is indeed very frequent. Out of these passages which I have myself collected, I select the following. Thucyd. 6, 10. ἀοστε χρή μη μετεώρο τε πόλει ἀξίων κινουμεν, where the Scholiast tells us that the term is derived from ships not yet come to port, but still on the high sea: which reminds me of a beautiful passage of Sophocles, in his Αἰδ. Τυρ. πόλις γὰρ, ἀγαν ἡτο σαλετε. This passage seems to have been imitated by Pseud. Eurip. in his Ρης. 2, 46. ἄταν η δυσάλιος (I read δυσάλιος,) ἐν πελάγει καὶ σαλετη πόλις. The passage has also been imitated by D. Cass. 254, 19. μετεώρον της πόλεως ὠσις. Compare Αἰσχυλ. Θεσ. 795. et seqq. Kuinoel cites Soph. Αἰδ. Τυρ. 914. ὕψω γὰρ αἰρει μιμάν Οἰδίπους ἀγαν λύταιςι παντοίαςι where the Scholiast remarks: ὕψω γὰρ αἰρει, ἀντι τοῦ μετεωρίζεται τῆν ψυχήν, καὶ ἑπεβαλλόντας ἀγαν. Virg. Αἰν. 8, 19. magno curarum fluctuat æstic. Hor. Ep. 1, 18, 110. The above interpretation is also adopted by Strigel, Castalio, Grotius, Elseer, Hammond, Price, Wolf, Krebs, Alberti, Locke, Bengel, Fabricius, and Schlesus.

32. μη φοβου το μικρον πόλιν. The sense has reference to the then small number of Christ's disciples. Or we may explain (with Grot.) "poor, contemptible, ignoble, and little supported by the safeguards in which others confide." It must be observed too, that the article has here the force of a pronoun possessive; as L. Brug. seems to have long ago perceived, since he remarks, that in the article is contained the chief momentum of consolation. Dr. Campbell has well rendered, "my little flock." I have only to observe, that as a double diminutive is used (of which Wetstein gives examples from Aristoph. Plut. 147. 240. σμικρῶν ἄργυριοι. Athen. 15: p. 666. γ. το μικρον πινακίσκων. Xen. Παρ. 8. μάλα
perhaps it may be more accurately rendered, “my poor little flock.” For (as Dr. Campbell has well observed,) it is an expression of tenderness, at the same time that it suggests the actual smallness of the number.

32. εὐδόκησεν δὲ π. There is little solidity in the laboured interpretation of this word brought forward by Doddridge in loc. He translates, “takes pleasure in the thought of.” But that would require εὐδόκησε, to be followed by εἰ, as in 2 Cor. 12, 10. Heb. 10, 6, 8. and elsewhere. Here it simply signifies, “hath thought good, hath chosen, decreed to give you;” as in 1 Thess. 2, 8. Rom. 15, 26, 27. Gal. 1, 15. Col. 1, 18. visum est illi, constituit. Grotius has well observed, “benevolentiae significatio ex re natū, non ex vi vocis, hic locum habet.”

33. παλαισταὶ. These precepts, from ver. 82—40. were not intended for all times and seasons, but only meant for the persons whom Jesus, in ver. 32, calls “little flock.” On all, or most of these, it was incumbent to bestow their time and labour on preaching the Gospel, and with that design to traverse various and remote regions of the world. Wherefore it was not possible for them to bestow their thoughts on either accumulating wealth, or even preserving it. These, therefore, our Lord charges to rather sell all they have, and give to the poor, than be hampered with the care of providing for their subsistence. The admonition, however, connects with ver. 32. where Jesus had promised to his Disciples blessings greater than all earthly wealth. So that this precept must be understood comparatively, not literally. (Rosenm.) But this, perhaps, is refining too much; and I rather agree with Kii-noel, that the words are to be understood literally, though, in their application, they must be confined to the Apostles and Disciples then present.

38. ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς βαλάντια µὴ πολασόμενα. The word βαλάντια is said by metonymy for the money contained in the purse. It signifies the same as
θησαυρὸς in the other member of the sentence, except that by θησαυρὸς is meant a greater, and by βαλάντιον a lesser portion of wealth. (Rosenm. and Grot.)

33. θησαυρὸν ἀνέκλειπτον. Ἀνέκλειπτος is a somewhat rare word, but occurs in Diod. Sic. 111. b. ἀνέκλειπτος ἔχετε τὰς τῆς τροφῆς δαιμόνες. And 529. c. So Protagoras ap. Stob. Eel. 607. θησαυρὸν ἀνέκλειπτον. So also Sap. 7, 14. θησαυρὸς ἀνέκλειπτος. And 8, 18. πλοῖος ἀνέκλιμης. (Wolf, Loesner, and Kuin.)

35. οἱ δομφίες περιεχομέναι. These words allude to the similitude which follows. For Oriental servants who wait for their Lord, prepare for his reception by having their vests girded about their loins, and, if it be by night, keep lamps burning, that there may be no delay or confusion at his return. See Pignor de Servis, 256 & 271. Nor was this girding of the loins confined to military, but it extended to civil occupations; of which numerous examples are produced by Grotius, Wetstein, and others. Euthymius refines too much, when he says that περιεχομέναι refers to practical virtue, and having the lamps burning to theoretical and contemplative virtue. See Pincinelli, Lum. Reflex. 652. and a long and excellent annotation of Hammond on this subject, (to which all succeeding Commentators have been much indebted,) or the abstract of it in Elsley.

36. ἄδορατος, i.e. men servants who wait. So the Hebr. תַּכָּת, is rendered in 2 Paral. 24, 6. So Phil. 2, 8. 1 Tim. 6, 11. 2 Tim. 3, 17. So also Xen. Pol. 4, 14. Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 15. Æl. H. A. 728. Thus the Latin home in Petron. C. 63. (Wolf and Koecher.) In this sense we frequently used the word man in our own language.

36. ἀναλώσει, shall return. A nautical metaphor, used both in the Sept. and the Classical writers, of which numerous examples are adduced by Elsner, Wetstein, and others. It will be sufficient to refer the student to Schl. Lex.
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37. περισσεύει, καὶ ἀνακλίνει αὐτῶς, κ. π. δ. α. i. e. he will show them new and unaccustomed honour. Whitby agrees with Grotius, in comparing it to the Roman Saturnalia, the Cretan Hermæ, and the Babylonian Saccas—feasts, where the servants sat at table. Others think that there is an allusion to the forms which succeeded manumission among the Romans, one of which was, that the manumitted servant should sit at table with his late master. But Kuinoel has justly objected, that, at the Saturnalia, all servants, whether good or bad, were waited on by the master: but here the subject is the reward assigned to faithful and diligent servants. He proceeds to remark, (from Heuman,) that, for the more accurate understanding of this image, we must remember, that the condition of servants, or slaves, among the Hebrews, was by no means hard, or their treatment unkind: nay, that at solemn festivals their masters assigned them a portion of the banquet, that they might be partakers of their own good cheer and jollity. The image therefore here employed by Jesus is this: "A master, on returning in good humour from a feast, finds his servants on the alert, and ready for his reception; he feels satisfaction in their alacrity and vigilance, and, in order to reward their meritorious conduct, himself distributes among them certain provisions which were usually sent home with the guest, and bids them feast themselves thereon with hilarity. The sense of the passage is therefore this: "So conduct yourselves that, whenever I return, I may find you ready to welcome me with alacrity and joy, when you shall receive rich rewards of your fidelity and constancy, by having conferred on you the height of felicity." The rewards of a future state are often (says Kuinoel) compared to an earthly banquet.

37. περισσεύει. An Hebrew pleonasm.

39—41. See the note on Matth. 24, 42, 43.

41. πῶς ἠμᾶς—πάντας: It is plain from this that Jesus often conversed with the Disciples apart, thus
expounding to them the principal parts of his doctrines, and of their office, and, at the same time, giving them orders. (Rosenm.)

42. τις δὲν ἔστιν. Jesus does not directly answer to the question proposed by Peter. But from the following parable it is manifest that he here adverts only to the Apostles, who are compared to house-stewards, or dispensers, who, in large families, distributed at certain times the allotted portion of food to the servants. See the note on Matth. 24, 45, et seq. See Pignor de Servis, C. 18. and Horne’s Introd. 2, 531. It seems that the Jews followed, in this respect, the customs of the Greeks and Romans, which, we may suppose, were gradually becoming more prevalent among them. On the following verse see the note on Matth. 24, 50.

47. 48. ὁ γὰρ διὰ τῆς καθαρεύσεως. See Casel. and Simson on Cebes, p. 8. So Thucyd. 3, 40. ξυγγαμόν δ' ἐστι τὸ ἀκούσιον. Dionys. Hal. 1, 47, 32. ἀπάν δὲ ξυγγαμνησίας ἄξιον τὸ ἀκούσιον: which passage seems to have been imitated by Thucyd. 3, 40. Philo Jud. 46. εἰ μὲ τὰ ἀκούσια καὶ τὰ κατ' ἀγνοίαν οὖθε ἀδικημάτων λόγον ἔχειν, φαντάζονται. And 311. e. ἀληθεύσατον ἐκεῖνο, δει, τὰ μὲν ἀκούσια τῶν ἀδικημάτων, καὶ ἑπιμηκάστα ὑτα, ἄνωπτα καὶ καθαρά. And 687. e. Aristot. Rhet. p. 70. ἐστι δὲ τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι, τὸ ὑπὸ ἑκὼν τὰ ἄδικα πᾶσχειν. τὸ γὰρ ἀδικεῖν ὀριστάτην πρὸτερον ἐκόσιον εἶναι. Aristot. Nich. Eth. 111. & 237. See Boisson. on Nicetas, L. 9, 9. So also Aristid. 111, 709. d. Hence may be illustrated the true punctuation and interpretation of a disputed passage of Eurip. Phoeniss. 95. Καμάνδι μὲν ἐλθεῖ φαῖλος, αἰς δοῦλας, ψόγος, Σοὶ δ' αἰς ἀνάσσῃ—where we must understand an aposiopesis*. Gro-

* These verses of Luke are by Bp. Jebb (in his Sacred Literature, pp. 201, 204.) placed among the six stanzas of Hebrew poetry. Nor can I withhold from my Readers the following beautiful remarks of that eloquent and learned Prelate: “The antithesis in this passage has prodigious moral depth: he who sins against knowledge, though his sins were only sins of omission, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he who sins without knowledge, though his sins were sins of commission, shall be beaten only
tius too has some apt illustrations of this sentiment from Salvian, Tertullian, and Philo. From the citations of Wetstein upon the words διαφέσται πολλάς, (some of which exemplify the frequent ellipsis of πλήγμας; as Arist. Nub. 968.) it appears that slaves were among the ancients sometimes cruelly scourged. So Liban. Chriae. 12. λ. πάρεστιν ιμάς, ἥσαν κατά τοῦ νάτου πολλάς. That the stripes were severe we have reason to suppose, and on the authority of Lightfoot, we learn that it was allowable for a master to inflict any number of them on his servant.

49. On this and the following verses Kuinoel observes that the sentiment is pregnant with pathos, and therefore that the words, separately considered, are not to be too much urged or strained. Fire is here opposed to peace and concord, and is interchanged with διαμερισμός, dissension. Under this is adumbrated a general image of great discord and divisions, which is then described by its parts.

49. καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἡδή ἀνήφη; It is difficult to establish the precise import of this phrase, which, being uttered amidst extreme agitation of mind, must partake of the obscurity which ever attaches to such pathetic exclamations. Knatchbull and Grotius labour to prove that εἰ may have the sense of O that. See Elsley. To this interpretation Whitby and Doddridge accede; the latter of whom translates: “And what do I wish? O that it were already kindled?” Campbell and Le Clerc, however, prefer the Vulg.

with few stripes. Mere negligence, against the light of conscience, shall be severely punished, while an offence, in itself comparatively heinous, if committed ignorantly, and without light, shall be mildly dealt with. This merciful discrimination, however, is full of terror: for, whatever may be the case, respecting past, forsaken, and repented sins of ignorance, no man is entitled to take comfort to himself from this passage, respecting his present or future course of life: the very thought of doing so, proves that the person entertaining that thought has sufficient knowledge to place him beyond its favourable operation.” Here the following passage of Eurip. Hipp 1831. will be found extremely apposite: τὰν ἐγ. σὴν ἀμάρτιαν τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι—ἐκλατε κάκης, absolves from guilt.
to any modern version: "Quid volo nisi ut accendatur." Rosenm. and Kuinoel explain: "Quam velim ut jam accensus sit! And how wish that it were already kindled! Ti, like πῶς, may be rendered quam, quantopere, how much! So the Hebr. יָד, as in Cant. 7. 6. where the Sept has τί. See Ps. 8, 1, 2. El signifies ut, that, like the Hebr. עָנ. So 1 Sam. 24, 7. Acts 8, 22.

50. βάπτισμα ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι, I have to be, I must, shall be baptized. The image may be thus unfolded: "I must be immersed in dire calamities." On this figurative expression see the notes on Matt. 20, 22, and Mark 10, 39.

50. καὶ τὸς συνέχομαι ἐως ὅ τε λειτοῦτοι. These difficult words are thus explained by Kuinoel: "Calamitates mihi sunt subeundae, et quām graves atque atroces mihi sunt perferendae, usque dum exaustulata fuerint, usque dum mors eas finierit, paucis gravissimè mihimet ipsi calamitates sunt subeundae."

51—3. See the note on Matth. 10, 31, seqq. 'Ἀλλ' signifies nay rather, or but only, as Wetstein explains, who cites Aristoph. Ran. 1161. and Pac. 475. It should rather seem that there is an ellipsis of οὐδὲν, and that ἀλλὰ is put for ἀλλο, "nothing else but." The following words (observes Kuinoel) were probably formed upon those of the prophet Micah, 7, 6.

57. ἀφ’ ἐαυτῶν οὐ λιπετε τὸ στάτομαι; The Jews surveyed and examined the face of the heavens, in order to predict what weather might be expected, (which in an agricultural country must have been especially interesting,) and thus to take their measures accordingly. It was therefore not unreasonable to suppose, that they would, with equal care, attend to the signs of the Messiah's advent; and regulate their moral conduct accordingly. By στάτομαι we must here understand (with Grotius), quod fieri convenit, what is reasonable; as in Phil. 1, 7. and elsewhere.

58. Kuinoel aptly cites Maimonides on Sanhedr.
C. 6. "Nam, si dicat mutuo dans debitori, sumus, ut de causâ nostrâ judicetur a Synedrio summo, debitorem cogunt illuc cum eo ascendere. Parîmodo, si incusat quis alterum de aliquâ re sibi ab eo ablatâ, vel de damno aliquo illato, velitque qui accusat, ut a superiori Synedrio de ipsorum lite dejudicetur, debito rem cum illo illuc ascendentere cogunt. Atque ita fit in rebus aliis omnibus istius modi." He then determines the sense of the passage to be this: "Be reconciled, while thou art on the way to the magistrate, with thy creditor who demands of thee the money due, settle the business with him on fair terms, promising at the same time that thou wilt, at a certain time, or by instalments, pay the money; for the magistrate will sentence thee to pay down the whole sum at once, and if thou dost not obey this order, the creditor will take thee before the judge, and thou wilt be cast into prison, until thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." Ἄσε ἐργάζον, ἐν ἄρτω μόν, ἐν γὰρ ὑμῖν. This is evidently a Latinism. Ἀπαλλάττεσθαι ἀπὸ τῖνος signifies, "to be rid of any thing, to be dismissed or let go by any person." It is used, (says Schl.) in a forensic sense, of a criminal who is dismissed, when an adversary does not follow up an accusation, or of a debtor who receives an acquittance from his creditor by paying the money due, or making an agreement. Many examples are produced by Kypke, Krebs, Loesner, and Wetstein; ex. gr. Xen. Mem. 2, 9, 6. πάντες ἐποίησεν ἂν ἀπαλλαγήν τοῦ Ἀρχεδήμου. Phleg. Miser. 1. κελεύει ἀπαλλάττεσθαι αὐτῆς τὰχέως. Κατασύγευς signifies, properly, to pull, drag down (κατὰ), or off; but here, to drag or haul away, and is often used of those who are hurried away to judgment or to execution. So Philo. 1010.

58. πράττειν. The words πράττειν and ἐκπράττειν signify to require or exact, and especially to exact the payment of a mulct, or sometimes to put in execution a corporal punishment. So that πράκτωρ denotes the exactor pænae; as in Æsch. Eum. 315. (cited
by Kuinoel): πράξωμεν αὐτοῖς. Hence it came to denote the appætitor of the magistrate, whose office it was to see carried into execution the sentence of the magistrate. Hence he is called, in Matth 5, 25. ἐπήρετος. But πράξωμεν is the more special term. On the word λέπτον, mile, see the note on Mark 12, 42.

CHAP. XIII.

Verse 1. On the occasion and scope of this para-
ble, which is most elaborately detailed by Kuinoel, see Mr. Horne's Introd. 2, 621.

1. περήσαν δὲ τίνες—Γαλιλαίων. See the notes of
Grotius and Whitby ap. Elsley.

1. ἂν τὰ ἀλμα Πιλάτος ἐμιζε μετὰ τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν.

A negligent way of expressing that “their blood was mingled with the blood of the sacrifices, since Pilate sent his soldiers to slay them while sacrificing.” A bold trope, not, however, without parallel; for I find a very similar one in Theophyl. Tim. 127, λ. οἱ μὲν οὐν ἐκκεντησαντες τὰν δειπνιον, ἀναμε-

μαγμένον τοιν τοῦ δειπνον καὶ αἵματιν. Wetstein ap-

positely cites Philo, 791. B. (T. 2, 315, 1.) where, giving a reason why God ordered that a homicide who had fled to an altar for refuge should be deli-

vered up for punishment, says: ἁματί γαρ ἀνδροφόνον

ἀλμα λυσιῶν ἀνακεφαθήσεται. It was thought, indeed,

most atrocious to slay any one at an altar. In this view Wetstein cites Liv. 10, 39. “Nefando sacro mixta hominum pecudumque cæde respersus.” The Jews regarded grievous disorders, or heavy calamities, as sent by God to punish former sins committed by the sufferer. Now reason teaches us that the good or evil arising from external circumstances de-

pends on various causes, far removed from right or

wrong action, and therefore frequently occurs, with-

out being preceded by either good or evil deeds.

Consequently neither can properly be termed either

rewards or punishments. (Rosenm.) This error in

opinion, and temerity of judgment, our Lord here
takes occasion to reprove. For further information on this subject I must refer the reader to Grotius.

Josephus, indeed, has not mentioned any Galilæans slain in the temple by Pilate; but sufficient matter may be found in that historian to induce any one to credit this narration; for from the same source we learn, that of all the nations of Palestine the Galilæans were the most seditious, and that tumults frequently arose among the Jews even while assembled at the solemn festivals, and were not unusual in the very temple itself. For which reason Herod erected the fortress Antonia, and garrisoned it with a military force. In confirmation of the above, Wetstein cites Jos. A, 15, 4 & 7. 17, 9, 8. & 6. 17, 10, 2. He has, however, omitted the following (776, 18.) μαλίστα δὲ τὴν σφαγὴν τῶν περὶ τὸ ιερὸν εἰδείναυ — οὐς ἑόρησε τε ἀνεστηκών, καὶ ιερεῖων ἐν τρόπῳ σφακθοῖεν. It has been denied that the Galilæans assembled at the feasts with the rest of the Jews; but that they did so is proved by Jos. 778, 17. On the same authority, we learn that this double prediction (for a prediction it was, as well as an admonition) not long after attained its fulfilment; for since they would not learn wisdom, but, despising the instruction of Christ, clung to a seditious disposition, it often happened that in the very temple itself an innumerable multitude of Jews were slain. See Ant. 20, 5, 3. Nay, after the civil commotion had broken out, the temple became the seat of war. See Bell. 2, 17, 5. & 9, 4, 3, 12. 4, 5, 1. & 4. 4, 10, 12. 5, 1, 3. 5, 3, 1. 6, 2, 1. & 3, 6, 2, 4, 6, 2, 6. 6, 5, 1. 6, 8, 5, 6, 9, 4, 7, 5, 4. See Leigh ap. Koecher.

4. Σιλωὰμ. On this proper name see Lightfoot, Wetstein, Reland, and other writers on the topography of Palestine, including Mr. Horne's Introd.

4. οὐκείμενοι, sinners. A Chaldee idiom, by which debts and sins, and debtors and sinners, are alternately inchochted. The Syriac and Persian versions have peccatores. In this sense ἠλαθοῖν often occurs in the Chaldee Paraphrases, and in the Rabbinical
writings. See Buxtorf, in his L. Chald. and Rabb. See also the note on Matth. 6, 12.

6. ἔλεγε ταύτην τὴν παραβολὴν. He spoke this parable in order to teach them how dangerous it was to abuse the lenity of God to a license of sin. (Rosenm.) And to show them that, unless they averted the wrath of God by timely repentance, the judgments already threatened must be fulfilled, in the destruction both of their civil and religious polity.

6. συχῆς εἰς ἐν τῷ ἀμπελώνι αὐτῶν πεφυτευμένη, had a fig-tree planted in his vineyard. It is objected that in Deut. 22, 9. men are forbidden to plant vineyards with other sorts of trees. But דַּעַל there denotes not vineyard, but field; and vineyards are by the Hebrews rather said to be planted than sown; neither do trees seem to form the subject of the passage in Deut. Or we may suppose the prohibition to have extended solely to uniting the vine in growth with any other tree; which is called by Columella and others vites maritare. (Kuoioel.) Here my learned readers will readily call to mind the beautiful lines of Horace, "Ergo aut adulta vites propagare Altas maritat populos," where Mitch. cites Columella, 11, 2. 79. "Ulmi quoque vitibus maritantur." It was customary (says Wetsstein) to unite trees, especially the vine and fig, which therefore above twenty times in the Old Testament are found conjoined.

7. τριά ετη. Kuinoel takes this to denote a long time, a certain for an uncertain number. But fig-trees that bear at all, will, by that time, produce fruit, before which time (as we learn from Theophr. C. P. 3, 17. and Colum.) they were not to be pruned. So Maimonid. More Nevoch. 8, 37. (cited by Wets.) "Summum tempus, per quod ea, quæ plantantur, in terrâ Israelis fructus ferre differunt, est triennium. Here, however, the three years must not be dated from its being planted, but from its having become fruit-bearing.
7. τὴν γῆν κατασχεῖ, ἵνα ἐργὸν ποιεῖ; (as in Eadtr. 6, 21. 6, 8.) makes sterile, or (as is said provincially in the North of England) beggars the ground. Wetstein cites Aristot. Econ. 2. χαρὰς ἄργου γενομένη. Diod. Sic. 19, 42. Polyb. p. 615. Theophr. did τὴν ἄργιαν τῆς χαρᾶς. See also Kypke.

8. σκάψει περί αὐτῆς. So Æschyl. F. ἕσσε, περισκάφος ποὺς ἀμυδαλόνας (vites) καὶ τοὺς βότρυκας εὑρετεῖς ποιήσαι. See Append. ad St. Thees. on φυτοσκαφος. And Theocr. Id. 24, 36. The word περισκάπτων occurs also in Phil. Jud. So Hom. Od. 24, 242. (cited by Bulkley.) Ἡταν ό μὲν κατ᾽ ἔχας κεφαλήν, φυτῶν ἀμφιλαχθεῖσαν. Wetstein has many Classical citations, from which it appears that three things were necessary to the cultivation of the fig-tree, digging, dunging, and watering, and especially the first. We are told that fig-trees exhaust the soil.

9. καὶ μὲν ποιήσῃ κάρπον—εἰ δὲ μηγε. Here there is the apodosis wanting. For (as Kuinoel observes) in hypothetical sentences, i. e. those before the former member of which are placed the particles εἰ ή ἡ, and such like, the latter member is often omitted even by the best Greek writers, when either the tone of voice, countenance, motions, or gestures of him who employed such expressions, indicates what is wanting, and what must be understood; and this figure of speech the Grammarians and ancient Greek Scholiasts called ἀνακτασθοτον. This carelessness of expression was not confined to colloquial phraseology, but is found in the best authors, and especially the Attic ones. Examples are produced by Raphel, Kypke, and Wetstein, and by many Editors of the Greek Classics. I cannot, therefore, approve of Doddridge and Campbell's version, "perhaps it may bear fruit." It is better to complete the sentence, by supplying the ellipsis thus, ἄγαθον ἐστιν ορ καλῶς εἴει. A similar ellipsis is found in Thucyd. L. 3, 3. So Thucyd. T. 1, 418, 8. Lips, καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐμφάνι η πείρα—εἰ δὲ μή, &c. So also Eurip. Antioch. Frag. 29. εἰ νῦν ἐνεστί—εἰ δὲ μή κ. τ. λ. Theog. op. Athen.
36. c. Liban. 1872. & 1451. Dio Cass. 626, 18. It is supplied in Ruth, C. 3, 13. ἐὰν ἀχμιστεύῃ σε, ἀγαθὸν ἀχμιστεύετο, εὰν δὲ μὴ κ. τ. λ. There is reason to think that the ancient Greek Fathers perceived the ellipsis, for Euthymius thus supplies it, εἰ ἔχει.

11. πνεύμα ἐρυγματίζειν ἀσθενείας, i.e. labouring under, not merely (as Heinsius, Rosenm. and others, maintain) an infirmity or disorder, but one inflicted by an evil spirit. So Euthymius: Δαιμόνιον ἀρραστήσας, μη ἐάν αὐτὴν ὑγιάναι. The sense too required by the following words, ἢν ἐδησεν ἡ Σατανᾶς. Elsner compares Eurip. Iph. Taur. 1317. τί πνεύμα συμφοράς κατηστήσῃ; But there the sense is widely different; and Markland rightly renders it, "Quid, sibi volens? quam mentem rei habens?" The phrase corresponds to the Hebr. נְפָר בְּלָד, as in Is. 29, 30. where the Sept. has πνεύμα κατανύσεως. This expression is also employed by Paul in his Ep. to the Romans 11, 8. That the Hebrews, especially the Rabbins and Talmudists, attributed presiding spirits and genii to almost every thing, especially water, food, air, war, pestilence, conception, generation, matrimony, ardent desire, felicity, calamity, dreams, health, sickness, death, &c. has been shown by Wagensiel ad Sota. And that much the same opinion was entertained by the Greek philosophers, as Thales, Pythagoras, Plato, Plotinus, Chalcidius, Max. Tyr. Alcinous, Apuleius, and others, appears both from Diod. Laert. 8, 32. and the writings of the above-mentioned philosophers. That diseases were especially inflicted by demons, is recorded by Josephus, and the Jewish Interpreters on Ps. 91, 6. The cases of Saul and Job will readily occur to any one. This too was the opinion of Pythag. and of Homer, Od. v. 394. seqq. But in the more violent disorders did they especially recognize demoniacal potency. So Galen somewhere remarks that apoplexy was called (δαιμώνιον) a demon; and that many attributed something of the kind to epilepsy, is observed by Hippocrates de morbo sano, § 14. See C. Aurelian
de Morb. Chron. 1, 4. (Triller) Hardt and Moldenhauer observe, that the Evangelist speaks according to the opinions of his countrymen.

11. ἄνευ συγκύπτουσα. This verb is to be taken in a passive, or rather intransitive or reflected sense, with the subaudition of ἐμαυτῶν. So Job. 9, 27. συγκύψας τῷ προσώπῳ. Such a person was called in Greek κυφός, and in Latin cernuus; and the disorder (which affected not only the neck, but the spine and loins,) was termed κύφωσις. Of the appropriate term ἀνακύπτειν, which occurs just after, many examples are adduced by Wetstein and Kypke.

11. εἰς τὸ παυτελές, i. e. παυτελῶν, prorsus. So Hebr. 7, 25. The phrase occurs both in the Sept. and in the Classical writers, as Ἑlian. and Aristid. ap. Wets. It is plain that this was not (as Michaelis and Paulus suppose) a mere melancholy. Respecting the name of the disorder medical writers are not agreed. Triller thinks that it was Tetonus Emprosthenon, which, in hot countries, is sometimes chronic.

See Hippocr. Epidem. 5, 12. and Foes. p. 91. For further information on this subject I must refer the reader to Weddel, Johren, Dr. Mead, Bartholin, Ader, and other writers de Morbis Biblicis.

priate, since the disorder in question was connected with a contraction of the sinews and muscles.

14. Ἀργισυνάγαγος. See the note on Matt. 9, 18. See also Doddridge in loc. and Mr. Horne’s Introd. 3, 241.

15. ἵπποκριτα, “thou dissembler,”—as pretending to reverence the Sabbath, though, in fact, intending to vent the malice which arose from envy at the performance of an innocent, and even meritorious, action!

15. έκαστος—λας τον βού, lose his ox, for the purpose of watering, &c. That the Jews did not hesitate to take care of animals on the Sabbath has been evinced from the Rabbinical writers by Danzius, in his Dissertation on Christ’s healing on the Sabbath. See Wets. and Capell. Obs. p. 30. So also Schoettgen, in his Hor. Heb. and Lightfoot show that the laborious work of drawing water for cattle was permitted. “Even Pagan superstition (says Mr. Bulkley) permitted, as lawful, various employments of husbandry, on the solemn festivals.” In proof of this he cites Virg. Georg. 1, 268—271.

18—21. See the notes on Matth. 31—34. Mark 31 seq. Several Classical citations are produced by Elsner from Porphyry, 284. and by Triller from Max. Tyr. D. 23. p. 238. as also from Plato and Plutarch.

28. εἱ ἐλεγοι oi σαρκόμενοι. Whether this was a cautious question, as some say, may seem doubtful. From Lightfoot and Schoettgen we learn, that the point was a controverted one, and by no means decided: some Rabbins maintaining that all should attain future salvation; others, on the other hand, contending that it would fall to the lot of comparatively few. Necessary, however, as it might seem, it was to a certain degree, a question merely of curious speculation, * and to such questions (as Euthymius,

* That it is so, will appear on reflection; and it is well observed by Grotius, that it rather concerns us to know what sort of persons, than how few will be saved. I must not, however, omit to
Grotius, and Markland, truly observe) our Saviour never gave a direct answer. See Acts 1, 7. Joh. 21, 21. 12, 34 & 35.

24. ἀγανίζεσθε, strive, strain every nerve. The word is properly an agonistic term. So Xen. Mem. 3, 12, 1. τῶν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ ἀγανίζεσθαι and so 1 Cor. 9, 25. πᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀγονίζομενος — ἐγκρατεύεται. But perhaps there may here be no more allusion to the games, &c. than in our word strive. So Dan. 6, 14. περὶ τοῦ Δανηλ ἡγονίζατο τοῦ εξέλεσθαι αὐτὸν. See Keucher and Loesner. Dr. Doddridge has here too fancifully enlarged on the sense of the word, which, however, is naturally a very significant one. Thus Epict. Enchir. c. 65. (cited by Bulkley): τὰν τὸ βέλιτον φαινόμενον ἔστω σοι νόμοι ἀπαράβατος. Καὶ ἐπιπώντων τι, ἢ ἴδου, ἢ ἐνδοξοῦν, ἢ ἂδοξον προσάγηται, μέμνησο, ὅτι νῦν ὁ ἄγαν, καὶ ἤδη πάρεστι τὰ Ὁλυμπία, καὶ σὺκ ἐστὶν ἀναβαλλέσθαι.

25. ἐρεβη, has got up, i. e. from his seat; as Grotius, Markland, and Kuinoel, most naturally explain. And indeed it is usual for the master of a family to go and see that the doors are fastened before he retires to bed. Rosenmuller, however, thinks the word redundant.

25. ἀπεκλείσῃ τὴν θύραν, “hath barred the door.” There is here a metonymy. For (as Price observes) doors are said κλείσθαι, men ἀπεκλείσθαι. Schlesner cites Aristot. Lys. 485. τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἠμῶν ἀπεκλείσατε μοικὸς. I add Thucyd. 5, 80. ἀπεκλείσῃ τὰς τύλας, shut the gates against them.

25. κρούειν τὴν θύραν, to knock at the door. So the best Greek writers, and, among the rest, Plat. Most. 2, 1, 56. sedes pultabit senex. Thus also the observe, that Dr. Hammond has a long, elaborate, and luminous annotation, (an abstract of which may be seen in Elsley,) showing that the term σωζέναι here denotes being put into the way, or into a state of salvation. (See the note on Matth. 1, 21.) Of this opinion seems to have been Wetstein, who cites Jos. B. 5, 13, 5. And so Rosenmuller and Kuinoel. I am, however, inclined to prefer the common interpretation, which seems confirmed by the words of our Saviour’s reply.
word ἔστειλεν is used. See the numerous examples produced by Wetstein. I have only to observe, that there seems to be an ellipsis of ἐν, which is supplied in Judg. 19, 22. ἐκρουσάν ἐν τὴν θύραν.

26. ἐφύγομεν ἐνάπτιον σου, καὶ ἐπιομεν, “in thy presence, with thee.” The whole is a popular form of expression, by which it is usual to rouse any one’s recollection, and denotes familiar intercourse and intimate acquaintance with any person. So in the Psalms: “mine own familiar friend who did eat of my bread,” &c. On vv. 28—30. see the notes on Matt. 8, 11. and 20, 16.

27. ἔργαται τῆς ἀσκίας. Grotius and Simon have noticed that this expression denotes the living in habitual sin, and being given up to it. Schleusner cites Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 27. καλῶν καὶ σεμνῶν ἔργατης. I add Menand. Hist. 1, 145. λ. χαλεπῶν ἔργων καὶ ἀνυπόλοιμου ἔργων: and 163. κ. ἔργαται εἰρήνης.

31. προσῆλθον τινες Φαρισαίοι, &c. Since we read of no such attempts on the part of Herod, Euthymius, and L. Brug. think that this was a falsehood invented by these Pharisees, in order to rid themselves of a severe censor of their immoralities [see Amos 7, 10. Nehem. 6, 10. Sir. 37, 7, 8.], who by his miracles was drawing away much people after him. In this view, Wetstein observes, that if the Pharisees had really believed that Christ was in imminent peril of his life, they would not have apprised him of his danger; and that it was all a mere pretence that they came out of good-will to Christ, in order to persuade him to flee. Wetstein paraphrases the passage thus: “He who could not bear John, a man of the greatest authority among all, a son of a Priest, a Jerusalemite, not a Galilean, will he bear your freedom of speech?” Grotius, Rosenmuller, and Kuinpel, however, think that from the answer of Christ they appear to have come at the suggestion and instigation of Herod, and therefore Jesus bade them deliver this message to Herod, thus hinting that he is not ignorant of the craft of the tetrarch,
who seems to have contrived this stratagem, in order thus to drive away from his territories a person whom he could not venture to put to death, and by whose freedom of speech he was annoyed.

32. ἐπατε τῇ ἀλάσκῃ ταιύτη, astute, cunning. A proverbial expression common to all languages, of which examples, in superfluous abundance, are heaped together by Schoettgen, Bochart, Palaiaret, Barth, Wetstein, and others. I add a remarkable passage of Aristoph. Thesm. 1133. μίαρος ἀλάσκης οὖν ἐπιβήκομεν μοι. See Mr. Horne’s Introd. 3, 492. Kuenen observes, that the Hebrew prophets were accustomed very freely and publicly to reprehend the vices even of kings and magistrates, and other principal persons. So that there is no reason to wonder that our Saviour should here compare Herod to a fox. Yet he did not (as Wetstein observes), apply this appellation to him by way of contumely, nor as having any injury to complain of, but that he might characterise the disposition and manners of that tetrarch, and show that he distinctly perceived his artifice. The character of Herod is thus accurately and elegantly depicted by Wetstein (p. 749. a.): “Hic enim, ut plerique ejus temporis principes et præsides, mores ad exemplum Tiberii Imperatoris, qui nullam ex virtutibus suis magis quàm dissimulationem diligebat, composuit; tunc autem erat annosa vulpes, cum jam 30 annos principatum gessisset, et diversissimas personas egisset, personam servi apud Tiberium, domini apud Galilæos, amici Sejano, Antabano, fratibus suis Archelao, Philippo, Herodi alteri, quorum studia erant diversissima et interse et a studiis Herodis ipsius.”

32. ἐκβάλλω δαιμόνια, καὶ ἰάσεις ἐπιτελῶ, q. d. “I do nothing that can be called in question: I injure no one: I cast out devils, I perform various preternatural cures, nor shall I long weary him by my presence, but shall soon take my departure. Why then should he threaten me with death? On the expression σῆμερον καὶ αὔριον, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι Com-
mentators are not quite agreed. The most enlightened Critics regard it as a proverbial formula, denoting any short period of future time. Wetstein cites Hos. 6, 2, 1. Arrian. Epict. 4, 10. τὸ ὅστε γὰρ οὐκ ἐλευθεροποιήσεις μόνον ἔτι αὐριόν ἡ εἰς τὴν τρίτην δεί πᾶσιν αὐτῶν ἀποθανεῖν ἔκεινον; Ἐπιτελέω, accomplish, effect. So Galen ap. Wets. ἀπαιτεῖ τοῖς ἱατροῖς ἐπιτελεῖσθαι τὴν ἱασίαν. Τελειώμαι most of the earlier Commentators regard as being the first middle contracted, in a passive sense. So it is explained by Fischer, Schleusner, and Wetstein. "I shall be brought to my end, shall die." Thus there would seem to be a sort of antithetical opposition, or paronomasia, between ἐπιτελέω and τελειώμαι. Heuman, Kypke, and Kuinoel, however, object that this sense has not been established by suitable examples, and thus render, I shall finish, namely, these works, &c. But this interpretation is far less probable.

33. οὐκ ἐνδέχεται, fieri non potest, it cannot be. A signification frequent both in the Hellenistic and Classical writers. See Kypke and Wetstein. "Nothing more severe (says Wetstein) could be pronounced against the Jerusalem Synedrium: q. d. that holy tribunal is the throne of every sort of injustice: those venerable judges condemn the innocent, just as if they were discharging a sacred duty, and were appointed for that very purpose. Hitherto they have slain the prophets: soon, however, will they nail their very Lord and Messiah to the cross. These are their works, which are suitable only to the vilest wretches, who would be grieved, indeed, if they did not surpass all in malice, cruelty, and contumacy." See 1 Thess. 2, 15. (Wets.) The expression, however, need not (observes Kuinoel) be too much pressed: since examples are not wanting (as in that of John the Baptist) of prophets slain out of Jerusalem; though, as we learn from the Rabbinical citations in Drusius and Lightfoot, it was a custom with the Jews to bring all criminal accusations
against doctors and prophets for determination, before the great Synedrium.

34, 35. See the note on Matth. 28, 37.

CHAP. XIV.

1. σαββατός διαγεὶς δρτον. An expression formed on the Heb. לילך, which often signifies cænare, epulaire. So in the story of Joseph and his brethren in Gen. That it was not unusual with the Jews to have entertainments, and enjoy themselves with hilarity, on the Sabbath, is proved from numerous Rabbinical passages produced by Lightfoot and Wetstein. See Buxtorf. de Syn. Jud. C. 15. and Spencer de Leg. 1, 4, Compare Neh. 8, 10. Tob. 2, 1. So Philo. 2, 166. τὴν ἱερὰν ἑβδομὴν ἐσέμυμεν ὁ προφήτης—ἐδικαίωσε—πανηγυρίζειν, ἐν ἱλαρίναις διάγοναις ἐσθήμασι. Thus in Plut. Symp. p. 672. l. (cited by Wetstein and Kuinoel.) we have a comparison between the Jewish feasts and the Heathen ones in honour of Bacchus: Οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν σαββάτων ἐορτὴν μὴ πανταταπαθῶν ἀπροσδίδοντον εἶναι—αὐτὸ δὲ τῷ λόγῳ μαρτυροῦσιν, ὅτι σάββατον τιμᾶται, μάλιστα μὲν πίνειν καὶ οἰνώθειν, παρακαλοῦντες ἀλλήλους.

2. ἦν. Euthymius explains ἦν ἰστάμενος. For (says he) he did not dare to petition for a cure, because it was the Sabbath-day, and he feared, by so doing, to incur the censure of the Pharisees: he merely placed himself in view, that Jesus seeing him, might of his own accord take pity on him, and cure him of his disease.

2. ἀδραπότης. See the writers de Morbis Biblicis, et Schleus. Lex. It is truly observed by Wetstein, that Luke, as being a physician, describes diseases more accurately than the other Evangelists. Gro- tius also remarks: “Appositè autem Christus hydropicum submergendae pecedi, ut τὴν συγκύκτωσαν pecedi vincæ, comparavit.” Both these observations, however, seem fanciful. Most Commentators sup-
pose (with some probability) that the host and the guests secretly, and with a treacherous intent, introduced this person in order to entrap Jesus into breaking the sabbath, by healing him, but that the man himself was ignorant of their treachery: hence Jesus does not reprove him, but restores him. Jesus, however, instructed their ignorant superstition, and withal showed that he was not unaware of their plot, by interrogating him εἰ ἔστι.

3. ἴσω χασαν, were silent. For (as Euthymius well observes,) they could not bring themselves to say that the law prohibited them from doing good on the Sabbath.

4. ἠσατο αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀπέλυσε, sent him away healed.

5. ἀποκαθίστει, i.e. addressing himself to them. For so it should be rendered; by synedoché of species, in many other passages of the New Testament and Sept. where the word has no reference to any interrogation, or words which preceded: This is evidently a Hebraism, for the same use exists in the corresponding word of the Hebrew language. And perhaps it may be refining too much, to suppose in such cases, (as does Dr. Whitby,) that there is an answer to some λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, some inward conception, or some action expressive of their sentiments concerning him. Of this, he produces many examples, which may be seen in Elsley.

5. ὅνος ἦ βούς. Many MSS. including the Syriac, Sahidic, and Slavonic versions, as also those of the Constantinopolitan and Alexandrian recensions, have οὖς, which is, by most critics, considered the true reading. And so Euthymius and Theophylact. This indeed, seems satisfactorily determined on critical principles. Whitby, however, and Campbell, demur; the latter of whom has an elaborate note, which the reader may consult; though it does not, to me, appear convincing. Wetstein cites Anthol. 9, 9, 1. Plat. p. 821. f. and Macrob. Sat. 1. 16.

7. ἥλεγε — παραβολήν. The word here denotes, simply a precept, in which sense it often occurs. See vol. II.
Euthym. 509. It is so called (says Grot.) because they were thus shown, by the example rei convivialis, what was their duty under all circumstances of life, not only towards men, but God. Our Lord (says Rosenm.) preferred thus obliquely to admonish the guests, rather than disturb the harmony of the banquet by austere objurgation. Kuinoel remarks, that Jesus addressed his discourse not to all the guests, but to one in particular, who had not affected any principal seat. Wetstein however observes, "Hi erant Christi sermones conviviales, ad convivias, et convivatorem comm. 12.

7. ἑπέχου, observing. Here we must supply τῶν νῦν, or rather (as Wolf thinks,) τῶν ἀφθάλμων. Examples, both of the complete and elliptical form, are produced by Wets. in loc. Wessel. on Herodot. 1, 32. and Reiz on Lucian. 2, 212.


9. δὸς τούτῳ τότον. It appears from Schoettgen, Hor. Hebr. in loc. that this was the very form of expression employed on such occasions by the Jews, and used as often as any stranger approached to those at a feast. The phrases δὸς τότον and κατέχειν τότον, not unfrequently occur in the Classical writers, (see the examples in Kypke,) but only in a metaphorical sense. That there were, among the Jews of those times, many disputes about seats at a banquet, we learn both from Josephus and from the Rabbinical writers. Nor were these matters unattended to by the Greeks and Romans. In this view, Wetstein aptly cites Val. Max. 2, 1. Ἐνισταί ἀδ coenam diligenter quaerebant, quinam ei convivio essent interfuturi: ne seniores adventum discubitu praecurrerent. Triller compares Plaut. 5, 4. abi tu sane superior, and 5, 5. date mihi locum. Similar admonitions to this of our Lord, occur in the Rabbinical writings, some of which may be seen in Wets.
10. πορευθεὶς ἀνάτησον ε. τ. ἐτ. See Plutarch Flam.

11. πᾶς ὁ υἱός — ὑπωθήσεται. The Rabbinical writers have a similar gnome. Thus Hallel, “my humility is my exaltation, and my exaltation is my humiliation.” It is better (continues he,) that they should say to a man ascend higher, than descend lower. There is (says Grot.) a similar parable to this, in the Electuarium Gemmarum. Other similar sentences are produced from the Rabbinical writings, by Hackspran de usu Rabbinicorum, p. 456. I add Liban. Or. 161. β. where, on some one asking what Jupiter is doing, Chilo answers: τὰ μὲν υἱηλα ταξινομοῦν, τὰ δὲ τάξεινα υψοῦν. Hor. Carm. 3, 16, 21. quantoque quisque sibi plura negaverit, a diis plura feret. See the note on Matt. 23, 12. to which, I add the following extract from a beautiful discourse of Norris on this subject, (cited by Bulkley.) “To verify this, it is not necessary that it should be so among all sorts of men. Neither I think is it. For among ordinary people, humility is not so much regarded, and a man may humble himself long enough before they will exalt him. On the contrary, they, perhaps, shall be the first that will put him down lower; and keep him down, when he is so. Thus it is very often among vulgar people, upon whom the pearl of humility is but ill bestowed. They know not the value of it, and will many times tread it even in the very dirt: but among those of better quality, and of more refined education, and who have a juster and more rectified sense of things, it is far otherwise. There the jewel is understood, and valued according to its worth. There the humble finds his due respect, and the lower he depresses himself, the more will he be exalted. Neither is this without reason. For humility, besides the excellency of its temper, and the greatness of the virtue, shews a good understanding, and a right judgment of a man’s self; and so intitles him to respect; which men are also more
willing to pay to the humble man, because he is so little just to himself."

12. μὴ φῶλει τοὺς φίλους. This is not to be understood as an entirely negative sentence, but must be taken comparatively, and with limitation. The negative particle is to be rendered non tam quam; as in Ex. 16, 8. 1 Sam. 15, 22. Joel 2, 13. Jer. 7, 22 & 25. Prov. 17, 12. Matth. 9, 13. and Luke 10, 20. Christ does not prohibit a reciprocation of hospitality among the rich; but he prefers those acts of beneficence which are performed without any hope of reward. Numerous parallel passages are produced by Wetstein from Classical writers, which illustrate the opinions and principles of their times. Thus Demochares, χαριστικὸς οὐχ οἱ βλέπων πρὸς τὴν ἀμαίνη, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐδραμ προσημεῦος. Aristot. Nicom. 8, 15. καλὸν δὲ τὸ εὖ ποιεῖ, μὴ ἵνα ἀντιτάθη, and 9, 1. D. Chrys. 116. d. Xen. Conviv. οὗτε μὲν οἷς ἀντικληθησόμενοι καλεῖ μὲ τις. Ammian. Marc. 14, 6. Cum autem — convivia — coeperint apparari — anxia deliberacione tractatur, an exceptis iis, quibus vicissitudo debetur, peregrinum invitatari conveniet. Lucian. paras. 22. Hom. Od. p. 382. Τής γὰρ δὴ ἕξειν καλεῖ ἀλλοθεν ἄλλος ἐπελθὼν ἀλλον γ', εἰ μὴ τὼν οἱ δημιουργοι ἔασιν, Μάντιν, ἥ ἴησαν κακάν, ἥ τέκτονα δούρον, ἥ καὶ βέστιν άλοιν, οἳ τέρπησιν αἰείαν; οὕτω γὰρ κλητοίγε βροτον ἐπ’ ἀπειρον γαίαν. Πτωχὸν δ’ οὐκ ἂν τις καλεῖ πρόσωπα ἐναντίων. Plut. 530. d. Plin. Epist. 9, 30. (cited by Grotius.) Volo eum qui sit verè liberalis tribuere amicis, sed amicis dico pauperibus; non ut isti qui iis potissimūm donant qui donare maximè possunt. φῶνείν has the force of καλεῖν, invite. The word properly signifies to utter a sound, to call, call for, send for, invite; all which senses perpetually occur in the New Testament, and are not unfrequent in the Greek Classics. See Schl. Lex.
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φίλους ἄξιον παρακαλεῖν, ἀλλὰ προσαίτοιτες καὶ τοὺς δεμένους πλησίαν. — Οὐκ ἐλαχίστην χάριν εἶσονται, καὶ πολλὰ ἄγαθα αὐτῶι εὑροῦνται. 'Ἀνάστασις properly denotes one who has suffered the loss of a limb, or some one of whose limbs is mutilated. By the feasts here mentioned, Michaelis and Rosenm. understand the religious feasts so usual among the Jews, and so different from our secular ones. Such were, by Moses, enjoined on the rich towards their poor neighbours. Compare Deut. 26, 12 & 13. 12, 5—22. (See Mr. Horne's Introd. 3, 292. note.) Here however, I cannot agree with them. Jesus did not, I think, merely advert to religious feasts; hence the precept belongs to Christians of every age; though it must be understood with due limitations, arising out of the peculiar turn of the Hellenistic idiom, and is to be applied, with due reference, to the circumstances of different ages and countries. 'Ἀναστάσις is an Hellenistic word.

14. ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων. So ἀναστάσει τῆς ζωῆς, in Joh. 5, 29, to which is opposed ἀνάστασις κρίσεως. The Jews ascribed a resuscitation of the dead to the Messiah. Hence the Pharisee, on hearing from Jesus the words τῇ ἀνάστασει τῶν δικαίων, exclaims, Μακάριος, &c.

15. βασιλεία τ. Θ. Dr. Campbell contends that βασιλεία must be rendered reign, and refers it solely to the reign of the Messiah on earth. "For (says he,) the following parable evidently refers only to the Christian Dispensation. The obvious intention of that parable is, to suggest the prejudices which, from notions of secular felicity and grandeur, the nation in general, entertained on that subject; in consequence of which prejudices, what in prospect they fancied so blessed a period, would, when present, be exceedingly neglected and despised; and in this view, nothing could be more apposite."

17. τῇ ὁρᾷ τοῦ δεῖπνου. For the guests, who had been previously invited, were then summoned to the feast, sometimes while the dishes were on the point of being brought in. See Athen. 244. See also Adami. Obs. 152. and Arndii Miscell. Sacra, p. 80. (Wolf.) On this subject I have before treated.

18. ἀπὸ μιᾶς. There is here manifestly an ellipsis, in filling up which, Philologists differ. Some understand ὅρας, others γνώμης, others again φωνῆς, which is supplied in Jos. 2, 509. and Diod. Sic. 515. d. They might have proposed ὁμής, as in Thucyd. 7, 71. but I prefer γνώμης. The phrase implies, that though the excuses were various, yet in one thing these persons all agreed, namely to allege excuses. Παραιτεῖσθαι signifies to excuse oneself, to offer excuses. So Jos. Ant. 8, 8, 2. παρεκάλει τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἑλθεῖσι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐφ’ ἑστίασιν. παραιτησαμένου δ’ ὡς ἀν μὴ βαρὺς αὐτῷ γένοιτο. Some however explain recusare, refuse, examples of which sense are numerous. (See Wets. and Schl.) But this seems less opposite, on account of the following ἔχε μὲ παρενμένον, which is plainly a Latinism, to be thus expressed, excusatum me hubeas rogo. See Martial 2, 79. Vide Loesner. The sense is, “procure my excuse, get me excused.” So Tacit. Agr. 42. operam suam in approbandâ excusatione offere. So also Philostr. V. Α. 6, 2. ἀλλ’ ὦ μὲν θυγατέρα σκητήμενος ἐν ὁρᾷ γάμον οἴει ύπον ἥπα τελουντα ἐς ἄνδρας, ὁδὲ ἐράνου πληρεσθεῖν, ὁδὲ ὡς οἰκοδομεῖτο οἶκιαν, ὁδὲ ὡς αἰσχυνότο χρηματιστής ἦττον τοῦ πάτρος δόξαι.

18. ἀγρόν ἡγόρασα. It is a beautiful circumstance (says Doddridge,) that our Lord here represents both these bargains as already made; so that going to see the farm, and to prove the oxen that evening, rather than the next morning, was merely the effect of rudeness on the one hand, and of a foolish impatient humour on the other: and could never have been urged, had they esteemed the inviter, or his entertainment. Accordingly it is commonly found in fact, that men neglect the blessings and demands of the
gospel, not for the most important affairs of life, with which they seldom interfere, but to indulge the caprice and folly of their own tempers, and to gratify the impulse of present passions, sometimes excited on very low occasions.*

* This may perhaps be a just view of the subject, but recent commentators are inclined to consider the purchases not as already made. Thus Glass, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, render emere volo, I mean to buy. But however this principle may be admitted on other occasions, it would here seem harsh. I should prefer (with Wetstein,) to suppose that the purchase was conditional, formed on the representation of the seller, and accepted on his warranty; therefore subject to examination on the part of the buyer. Indeed, Columella (cited by Rosenm.) says, on the authority of Cato, that ground before it be bought should be frequently viewed. "Nam primâ inspectione neque vitia neque virtutes abditas ostendit: quae mox retractantibus facilis apparent." In this mode of buying land, there seems something harsh: though we know not enough of ancient manners to be able to pronounce with confidence on the point; I would venture to suggest, that possibly, ἕγορασσα may be taken for a present tense (on which, see Matth, Gr. Gr. 506) and thus we may translate, "I am buying, I am in treaty for." If this interpretation be admitted, we may easily account for the circumstances of going, and seeing, i. e. trying and proving. That such was sometimes done, in treating for cattle, is plain, from a passage of Avoda Sara, 15. 1. (cited by Schoettgen.) Accidere nonnullum potest, ut Judæus vendat ethinico pecudem paullo ante occasum solis, sub ingressum Sabbathi, dicatque ad eum: ἦδρας ἐρι, age tenta illum. Thus Wetstein paraphrases. "Emi agrum, sed sub conditione, si talem reperero, qualis esse dicitur." So Alfen (cited by Wetstein,) "Quidam boves vendidit et lege, uti daret experiendo. I add Theogn. Sentent. 126. ὃς γὰρ ἄν εἰδείς ἄνδρα νόν, οὗτο γνυαίκος, πρὶν πειραθέσας ὅπερ ἄτοξυγοῦ. Other passages may hereafter be discovered, illustrative of this custom of proving articles during a treaty for their purchase. It seems, that at the time of being summoned, these persons previously formed an engagement to examine the lands and prove the oxen: and, as some period often intervened, between accepting the invitation, and being summoned, the last excuser might have, in the meantime, married a wife. Now by the laws and customs of most nations, any omission in the duties of life, was thought venial in newly married persons; hence military men were usually gratified with a furlough for a year. See Arrián Exp. Alex. and Q. Curt. In this view, the two following passages, cited by Wetstein, will be found apposite. Herodot. I, 26. παῖδος μὲν περὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ μὴ μνήσθητε ἐτε, οὗ γὰρ ἄν ὑμῖν συντέμψαμεν νεόγαμος γὰρ ἔστι, καὶ ταῦτα οἱ γὺν μέλει. Heliod. 7, 11. κηρυμονός
23. ἔξελθε εἰς τὰς ὄδοις καὶ φραγμοὺς. Of this word φραγμοὺς, I have never yet seen any satisfactory account. The best commentators interpret it places fenced, as vineyards, orchards, &c. But this seems little satisfactory. I venture to suggest, that being joined with ὄδοις, it may denote another kind of road: and as φραγμὸς signifies a hedge, or hedge-row, so it may have been used for a hedge-row path, such paths being usually carried by hedge-sides. This interpretation is confirmed by the parallelism: for, as in the former part of the story the servant is sent out into the streets and lanes of the city, so in the latter, he is sent into the high-roads and bypaths of the surrounding country.

23. ἀναγκασον εἰσελθεῖν, “compel them to come in.” The word must here (as very often) be understood of moral compulsion, i.e. strong and urgent persuasion. This idiom has been illustrated by many philologists, and recently by Mr. Bulkley, who has some original matter. It is, too, of no unfrequent occurrence in the Rabbinical writers; for, by some passages cited by Schoettgen, we learn that it was considered the duty of every good Jew, ναζηρεύς, ἀναγκάζειν, by urgent invitation to press others to take refuge under the wings of the Law. See Dodd. Grot. and Le Clerc, ap. Elsley.

26. μισεῖ τὸν πατέρα, hateth his father, &c. Since (as Rosenm. observes,) it would be impious to hate one’s parents, and impossible to hate oneself, it is obvious that we must recur to that interpretation which critics have laid down, and which is founded on the genius of the Hebrew language; μισεῖ often signifies

συγγενῶν αἰτοῦντος, εἰ μὴ συμπορεύοντο, νεοπτούντος ἐτοῦ τοῦθαλαμοῦ ἔχων. Wetstein thus paraphrases: “Non possum venire. Nam nisi officio meo deesse velim, omnibus relictis uxorii adhererem debeat.” Specious however as all these excuses may seem, none of them availed: which may serve to teach an important, but obvious truth. I will only add, that a very similar passage to the one now under our consideration, occurs in Philostr. Vit. Ap. C. 6, 2. ἄλλ ὁ μὲν θυγατέρα αἰκτότεμον ἐν ὑπα γάμου ὅσε νίν ἡπ τελοῦτα ἐκ ἀνδρας, ὅσε δούλου πληρων ὅσε ὅσε οἰκοδομεῖ τοίοις, ὅσε ὅσον ἀνθρωποῦντες ἑττῶν τοῦ πατρὸς δόκσαι.
minus amare, postponere; and so the Heb. מֵאָם. Kuinoel refers to Noesselt, Op. T. 1, 182. On this sense see the citations in Bulkley, to which I add Eurip. Alcest. 339. where Admetus declaring the love which he bore to Alcestes, says: Στυγών μὲν ἡ μ’ ἔτικεν, ἐξοντός δ’ ἐμὸς Πάτερα, λόγῳ γὰρ ἦσαν, οὐκ ἔργῳ, φίλῳ, Σὺ δὲ κ. τ. λ. where Heinsius rightly renders minus amare. Æschyl. Choeph. 899. Ἀπάντας ἔχθρους τῶν Θεῶν ἥγος πλέον. Hence may be defended the common reading in Eurip. Erech. Frag. 2, 10. δυσὶ παράντων παραγμάτων, πρὸς θάτερον Γνώμην προφαίτων, τὴν ἐναντίαν μυσεὶν where many learned critics take unreasonable offence at the word μυσεῖν, for which Salmasius would read μέθεις, and Musgrave proposes to read μέθεϊς. But the μυσεῖν may well be defended on the above-mentioned principle, and if any change were necessary, I would conjecture μυσεὶ, though indeed the Infinitive may be taken for the Imperative.

26, 27. Τὴν ἡφίξων is explained by Campbell, Schwartz, Casaubon, and Diodati, himself. But the common interpretation is confirmed by the parallel passage of Matth. 10, 37.

28. θέλων πόργον οἰκοδομῆσαι. The best Philologists agree that πόργος here signifies a large and splendid mansion, as in the preceding chapter. See Schl. Lex. Therefore, Doddridge (as cited by Mr. Elsley.) seems mistaken in supposing it a lofty building, though of slight materials, merely to lodge those who had the care of vineyards or flocks, built high, in order to command a more extensive prospect. Such indeed, there were, but here the context requires some building of far more consequence.

28. κατίσεις ψηφίζει τὴν δαπάνην. The word ψηφίζεω, from ψῆφος, a pebble, signifies properly, to count, or number by pebbles: Secondly, as in the primitive ages, reckoning was carried on by dropping stones or pebbles.* Thus, ψηφίζεω came to signify calcu-

* Of this, our Travellers amongst the American Indians made frequent mention.
late, reckon up, and then compute the cost. So Ἀπο. 18, 18. Ψηφισάτω τὸν ἄριστον. In the same manner, the Latin has subducere rationes. Wetstein compares Demosth. λογίζεσθαι δαπάνας. Anthol. 2, 50, 7. Ψηφίζων δ' ἀνέκειτο, πόσον δέσσει διεγερθείσι Ἰπτεροῖς μισθοῖς, καὶ τὶ νοσῶν δαπανᾶ. The subject is thus illustrated in Vitruv. 10. præf. ipsique architecti poenae timore coacti diligentius modum impensarum ratiocinantes explicarent, uti patres familiarum ad id, quod comparassissent, sed paulo amplius adjectentes, aedificia expedirent—nam qui adjectione dimidiō aut ampliora sumptu moderantur, amissā spe et impensa abjectā fracta rebus animis absistere coguntur. The word καθίσας, is used graphicè, descriptively, i. e. sits down to a table, or desk. The application is obvious. So Plato Repub. 10. (cited by Bulkley,) δεῦσιν ὑπὲρ οἱ δρομεῖς πρῶτον οὔεσι ἀποτίθωσι, τελευτῶντες δὲ καταγελαστοὶ γίγνονται—Ἐὰν νεοὶ δότες πάθους, ἐμὶ τέλους τοῦ δρόμου αἱρέσκετε καταγελάστου εἰσι—Διὰ ταῦτα μάλιστα ἐστιμηλητέον, &c.

31. συμβαλεῖν ἐτέρῳ βασιλεῖ εἰς πόλεμον. The construction συμβαλεῖν εἰς πόλεμον ἐτέρῳ βασιλεῖ, frequently occurs in the best Classical writers. So Polyb. 8, 56. (cited by Wets.) τὸι πολέμοισι συμβαλεῖν εἰς μάχην. Strabo 8. p. 540. c. συμβάλλουσι εἰς μάχην. Jos. B. 1, 7. συμβάλλει τοὺς λαίτους Ἀιγυπτίους εἰς μάχην. It is more frequently however, found without the addition of εἰς μάχην, or πόλεμον.

31. καθίσαι, sitting down, i. e. to the council table. This also, is said graphicè, or descriptively. The word καθίζων, and sedere, are often joined with expressions denoting to take counsel. Thus Wetstein cites 2 Sam. 9, 5. Virg. Æn. 10, 159. Magnus sedet Æneas, secumque volutat eventus belli. On this subject, namely of taking counsel previous to engaging in war, Wetstein appositely cites Philo 2, 16, 10. τῆς ἀρετῆς—ἡ ἐγκεκριμένη φασίν εἰναι ἐπὶ οἰς χειρῶν ἀμιλλαν ἵναι μέλλη, τῆς ἵδιας δυνάμεως ἀπονειράθαι πρῶτον, ἢ, εἰ μὲν ιγκεῖοι καταγωγίζεσθαι, συμποτέται· εἰ δὲ άσθενεστέρα χρώτα, τὴν δυνάμει, μηδε
32. ἐρωτά τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην, he beggeth peace. (Doddr.) Ἐρωτάω, though it primarily denotes to *ask a question*; yet in the Sept. and N. T. (after the example of the Heb. מִלֹה) signifies rogō, *to ask for, to supplicate, entreat*, and is used of begging *alms*, or entreating a cure, &c. See Schl.

32. τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην, for εἰρήνην. An elegant pleonasm, common to the best authors. Thus Wetstein cites Polyb. p. 524, παρακαλέσας τοὺς ἀνθρωποίας τῶν σώματων οὐ τὰ πρὸς τὰς διαλογίςεις εἰς πράσειν, ἀλλὰ τὰ πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον.

33. ἀποτάσσεται πάσι — ὑπάρχουσιν. The word signifies, 1st, to range into parts; 2dly, to take part; 3dly, to bid farewell; 4thly, to renounce (like ἀπαρνέσθαι, in Matth. 16, 24,) abstain from the enjoyment of their society. Thus Kuinoel cites Jos. Ant. 11, 6, 8. Εὐθὺς δὲ ικέτευς τὸν Θεον — τροφὴ καὶ ποτῶ καὶ τοῖς ἡδέσιν ἀποτάσσεται τρισίν ἡμέραις. Philo, 105. οὗτοι — οὗ θυρσί — ἀποτάσσεται τοῖς κατὰ τὸ σῶμα. Wetstein cites Plin. Ep. 10, 26. omnibus advocatibus — renuntiavi, ut toto animo delegato mihi officio vacarem. By the τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, whatever is in one’s possession, not only things (as life, wealth, &c.) but persons, including parents and relations. So Epict. L. 4, 4. p. 386. (cited by Bulkley,) ἀφείναι σε δεῖ πάντα, τὸ σῶμα, τὴν κτίσιν, &c. “would you be free, you must withdraw your inclination from outward things; you must give up everything, body, wealth, fame, books: popularity and command on the one hand, the sweets of privacy and retirement on the other.”

34. εἰ ἔδε τὸ ἄλας μωρανθῆ, *if the salt hath lost its savour*. It is thought by some that this parable is *unphilosophical*, and contrary to the nature of things, because, say they, *salt* cannot lose its savour, or become *infatuated*. But our Saviour seems to speak
only upon supposition, if the salt hath lost its savour, not affirming or implying either that it can or cannot. (Markland.) There was no need for Mr. M. to resort to this mode (which had been before devised) of removing the difficulty. For it is now well known to the naturalists that not only the bituminous, but the sea-salt, sometimes loses its savour. There is therefore no occasion to suppose (with Le Clerc) that the word here means a *lixivium* of wood-ashes; nor (with Hammond) that this second ἀλας denotes any mixed body wherein salt abounds. See the note on the parallel passage of St. Matthew.

35. οὕτε εἰς γῆν, οὕτε, &c. This seems to be a kind of rustic proverb, signifying the same as *good for nothing*: and that it signifies no more, seems evident from the parallel place of Matth. 5, 13. (Markland.) The sense may be thus expressed: “it is neither fit for domestic nor agricultural purposes.” So Menander ap. Athen. 6. p. 248. B. (cited by Wetstein.) Μένανδρος δὲ τὸν ἀχρηστὸν, καὶ μάτην τρεφόμενον συτόκουρον εἰς ηκεῖν ἐν θρασυλέοντι οὕτως ἀκνηρὸς πάντα μέλλων, συτόκουρος, άθλιος, ἀχρηστὸς εἰς γῆν. But there the phrase is metaphorical, like the Horatian “fruges consumere nati.”

**CHAP. XV.**

**Verse 2.** διεγόγυγε. The διὰ is here intensive, or may signify “among themselves.” This was quite contrary to the custom of the Pharisees, who held no commerce or communication with tax-gatherers, or sinful persons. See Buxtorf’s Lex. T. p. 1146. and Synag. Jud. 251. and Schoetg. Hor. Heb. p. 93 and 292.

2. ἀμαρτωλοὺς προσδέχεται, “admits them to his society.” Wetstein compares Aristoph. Equit. 785. τούς μὲν καλοὺς τε κρίγαθοὺς οὐ προσδέχει: and observes that the word is used of those who are received as friends. Some render amat, probat. The ἀμαρτωλοὶ are here not Gentiles, but Jews of the order of tax-
gatherers, and other persons of bad reputation. Now although Jesus said on a similar occasion, “the whole need not a physician, but those that are sick;” yet, even supposing that any such were converted, to *associate* with them was directly contrary to the custom of the Pharisees; which is excellently illustrated by the words of Tanchuma, fol. 3, 2. (cited by Schoettgen.) “There is a story of a certain thief who wished to repent: but his wife said unto him, Thou fool, if thou repent, the very belt with which thou art girded will not be thine. By this the man was dissuaded from his purpose; and our Doctors promulgated this law: “Thieves and usurers, even though they repent, are not to be received; whoever receiveth them, in him the spirit of wisdom dwelleth not.”

4. See Matth. 18, 12 & 13. and the notes.

4. *καταλείπει* τὰ ἐννηκοτιενέα. A similar story occurs in Bereschith, sect. 86. fol. 84, 3. though with a different application.

4. *πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον*, goeth in quest of it. For ἐπὶ, joined with verbs of going, sending, &c. indicates what Dialecticians term the final cause for which any one goes or is sent. (Kypke;) who gives several examples, and amongst the rest Diog. Laert. 1, 10, 2. *περιβέλεις παρὰ τοῦ πατέρος εἰς ἀγρόν ἐπὶ πρόβατον*. I add Thucyd. 4, 18. ἐπὶ ἔνα ἐς μηχανάς παρέπεμψαν τῶν νεών τινας ἐς Ἄσινν. This idiom occurs frequently in Xenophon, and numerous examples are produced by Sturz, in his *Lex. Xen.* on ἐπὶ, vol. 1, 267. See also Matth. Gr. Gr. p. 903.

have been usual to the Jewish shepherds to carry their sheep on their shoulders.

7. χαρά ἦσσιν ἐν τ. ο. Wetstein cites Mechilta on Ex. 15, 1. "Non erat laetitia coram eo super interitu impiorum: si super morte impiorum non est gaudium in excelsis, quanto minus super justis, quorum unus universo mundo æquiparatur S. D. justis fundabit mundum." By μετανοία must be understood reformation, or a literal change. See Dr. Hammond’s excellent note. Rosenm. here remarks: “Hoc igitur dicitur: gaudium existere in cælo ob unius Peccatóris conversionem, magis quàm ob 99 illos justos, quibus scilicet non est opus de toto vitæ genere migrare. Dicitur autem majus gaudium fore, ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, quia insperata, ut prope desperata magis non afficiunt. Est in his implicata argumentatiuncula a majore: Si in celis datur occasio gaudii; convertente se peccatore, quo magis in terris-id fieri par est, atque decet?"

7. There is here an ellipsis of μᾶλλον, on which the student may consult Bos. Ellips. and Matth. Gr. Gr.

7. ὀρίνες οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσι μετανοίας. Apud Judæos distinctio erat inter βασιλεύως, illos, qui pœnitentia opus habebant, et αὐτοπαθῶς, justos perfectos. Priores sunt, qui nonnunquam in peccata graviora relabuntur, e. g. David: posteriores, qui auxilio Spiritus S. in bono quotidian confirman tur, ut ejusmodi pœnitentiam primam agere non debeant, sed tantum continuatam et quotidianam. (Schoettg.)

8. The next story has the very same scope as the preceding, on which Wetstein compares Theophrast. Char. 10. τῆς γυναικὸς ἀποθαλάσσεις τρίχαλκον, ὅσο μεταφέρει τὰ σκεύη, καὶ τὰς κλίνας, καὶ τὰς κιβωτίους, καὶ διάφαν τὰ καλύμματα. As also the following story, which occurs in a Rabbinical writer, where, speaking of wisdom, (see Prov. 2, 4.) it is said: "So it is with a man who, if he lose any thing in his house, lights some torches till he finds it. If then we are
so anxious about the things of this world, how much more ought we to be about those of a future state.”

12. By another example derived from common life, Jesus shows that the Pharisees, who prided themselves on their sanctity, had no just cause for reprehending him, because he admitted to his society penitent sinners. For that God would have no one perish, but most readily and willingly receives all repentant and reformed offenders, and grants them pardon of their sins. By the elder son the Pharisees are designated, by the younger the publicans and sinners. The parable is among the most beautiful, but particular expressions are not to be dwelt upon, especially such as serve only for ornament; the scope and intent of the parable ought solely to be kept in view. (Kuin.)


12. διείλειν. The father divided the patrimony between his sons; with this proviso, however, that he should reserve for himself the landed property, family, servants, &c. (compare ver. 22, 29, 31.) and

* It will not seem strange that the woman should have needed to light a candle, in order to search for the coin, when we consider how exceedingly ill-lighted were the houses of the lower ranks in ancient times. This is manifest from the relics of Herculaneum and Pompeii, where many of the smaller houses have no windows at all, and in such as have them they are rather loop-holes (like those found in our barns) than windows.
that the eldest son should remain in his father’s family, and live on his father’s property. (Compare ver. 29, 21.) Therefore there is no occasion (with some) to raise a question about the property of the deceased mother, which the eldest son might claim. See the note on ver. 30, seqq. Among the Hebrews, the eldest received a double portion of all the property, the younger only a single one. Compare Deut. 21, 17. See Michaelis Mosaich Recht, § 79. Οὐσία and βίος both signify the same thing, i.e. property, possessions, such as corn, flocks and herds, &c. (Kuinoel.) It was not unusual for fathers to divide all their substance even in their life-time. This custom is alluded to by Theophr. Char. Eth. 2. § 3. περὶ μεθυσμορίας — καὶ πρὸς τὸν εὐαγγελιζομένον ὅτι υἱὸς σοὶ γέγονεν, εἶπειν ὅτι ἀν προσθῆκεν, καὶ τῆς οὐσίας τὸ ἐμὸν ἀπέστην, ἀλήθε ἔρεις. So D. Hal. T. 1, 9, 32. οὐκ ἀρκοῦμενος τῇ μοίρᾳ — δύο γὰρ καὶ εἴκοσι παιδῶν Δυκαίων γενομένων εἰς τοσοῦτος ἐδεί κληρός νεμηθήναι κ. τ. λ.


13. διεσκόρπισε τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ, dissipated his property. So the Latin dilapidare. The force of this very strong expression is copiously illustrated by Crauser, Phosph. p. 821. Wolf observes, that a man ὁ τὸ πατριῶ σκέπημος ὡς was among the Athenians accounted ἀτὸμος, infamous, and he refers to Meursii. Them. Alt. 2, 10. Ἀσωματον properly signifies ἀσωματος, i.e. what cannot be preserved. So Soph. Aj. 190. where the Scholiast explains, ἀσωματον γενεᾶς: τῆς ἐξελάθους καὶ σώσεσθαι μὴ δυναμετη. I add an elegant passage of Jos. 1177, 46. τὰ καθάρματα τῆς χώρας, καὶ κατασταυρωμένα τὰς ἱδίας οὐκαίας. Hence our words sot, sottish, &c. The word is copiously illustrated by Wetstein. Thus Alexis ap. Athen. 4. p. 165. δ. speaks of one who ἐν ἑτερί δύο σφαίραιν
And he gave them fowls, and fishes, and other such wild beasts. So we should say made ducks and drakes of his money. Aristot. Nic. 4, 1, 2, 3. τὴν δ’ ἀρσωτὰν ἐπιφέρομεν ἐνιότε συμπλέκοντες τοῖς ἀκολάστοις. Τοὺς γὰρ ἀκράτους καὶ εἰς ἀκολασίαν δαπανῶσαν ἀφάτους καλούμενοι διό καὶ φαυλότατοι δοκούσιν εἶναι, πολλὰς γὰρ ἄρα κακίας ἔχουσιν. Aul. Gell. 7, 11. “Et nequam hominem nihil neque rei, neque frugis bona, quod genus Graeci fere ἀσωτὸν ἢ ἀκολαστὸν ἢ ἄχρειον ἢ κακότροπον, ἢ μισφάν. Simplic. in Epict. 39. οἱ ἀσωτοὶ ἐνδείξει τὸντας πενετέροι τῶν προσαίωντας εἰσιν. Cic. de fin. B. & M. 2, 8. “Nolim enim mihi fingere asotos, ut soletis, qui in mensam vomant, et qui de conviviis auferantur, crudique postridie se rursus ingurgitent, qui solem, ut ajunt, nec occidentem unquam viderint nec orientem; qui consumptis patrimonii egeant, nemo nostrum istius generis asotos jacunde putat vivere: mundos, elegantias, optimis coccis, pistoribus, piscatoribus, aucupio, venatione, his omnibus exquisitis, vitantes cruditatem, quibus Vinum Defusum e pleno sid hir siphon ut ait Lucilius, cui nihil demsit Jus et sacculus abstulerit, adhibentes ludos et quæ sequuntur illa, quibus destractis Epicurus clamet se nescire, quid sit bonum: addint etiam formosi pueri, qui ministrent: respondat he vestis, argentum, Corinthium, locus ipse, ædificium. Hos ego asotos bene vivere ac beatè nunquam dixerim.”

14. δαπανήσαντος αὐτοῦ πάντα, when he had consumed. The word δαπανάω (which comes from δάπω, δάπτω) signifies simply to expend, but is capable (like many other words of middle signification) both of a good sense, (as in Acts 21, 24. 2 Cor. 12, 15. and also in the Sept. and Classical writers,) and of a bad sense, when it denotes to consume, waste, in luxury and extravagance, as here, and in James 14, 3. So διασκέπαστον, which occurs just before. Schlesner, in his Lex. cites Aelian, V. H. 9, 9. This very signification Suidas seems to have had in view, when he explains it σπαλάν. I add Thucyd. 4, 3. δαπανάω.
πὴν τὸν, to throw the state into heavy expenses.
There is a similar passage in Eurip. Troad. 990. τὴν
φεργοῦν τολμεῖν — ἕλπισας κατακλύσειν δαπάναις, over-
whelm. Thus Thucyd. 6, 47, 3. τῆς πόλείς δαπανῶντας.
And 8, 45, δαπανῶντες ἐς τοίαῦτα.
14. λιμές ἴσχυσα, vehement, extreme. An ex-
pression not unfrequent in the Classical writers, of
which Wetstein produces examples.
14. κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἐκείνην, at, in that country. A
signification found chiefly in the later Greek writers.
See Munthe.
15. ἐκολλήθη ἐν τῷ π. attached, engaged, hired
himself to. See the note on Matth. 19, 5. Some
Commentators have run into error by dwelling too
much on the etymological sense of the word.
15. βόσκειν χοίρους. An employment contemptible
among the Jews, as it had been with the Egyptians.
Thus Herodot. 2, 47, So Sota, f. 49, 2. “Malicid-
tus sit homo qui alit porcos.” Equally contemptible
was it among the Greeks. So Martial 10, 11. (cited
by Wets.) “Dispeream, si tu Pyladi præbere matel-
lam Dignus ea aut porcos pascere.”
16. ἀπὸ τῶν κερατίων. It now seems admitted, on
the authority of the Syriac version, Grotius*, Brown,

* Our learned countryman, Sir Thomas Brown, was perhaps
the first who discovered what sort of vegetable is here meant. As
his details are, upon the whole, the most complete and interesting,
and the work itself is not of frequent occurrence, I shall subjoin
the following extract: “That the prodigal son desired to eat of
husks given unto swine, will hardly pass in your apprehension for
the husks of pease, beans, or such edulious pulses; as well under-
standing that the textual word κερατίων, or ceration, properly in-
steadeth the fruit of the siligna tree, so common in Syria, and fed
upon by men and beasts; also, by some, the fruit of the locust-
tree, and Panis Sancti Johannis, as conceiving it to have been
part of the diet of the Baptist in the Desert. The tree and fruit
is not only common in Syria, and the Eastern parts, but also well
known in Apuglia and the Kingdom of Naples, growing along the
Via Appia, from Fundi unto Mola; the hard code, or husks,
make a rattling noise in windy weather, by beating against one
another; called by the Italians carobbe, or carrobole, and by the
French carouges. With the sweet pulp hereof, some conceive
that the Indians preserve ginger, mirabolas, and nutmegas. Of
Saubert, and Bochart, that the word denotes not peas and beans, but the fruit of the ceratonia, or carob-tree, common in Spain, Italy, Turkey, and the East, where the fruit still continues to be used for the same purpose. Campbell tells us (from Miller) that it is mealy, and has a sweetish taste, and is eaten by the poorer sort. So Vajikra Rabbi, cited by Schoettgen. R. Acha, said a Jew must eat husks, for thus he will be brought to repentance. Galen (as cited by Wetstein) speaks of it as a woody kind of food, creating bile, and necessarily hard of digestion. So Theophr. H. P. 1, 18. & 23, 4, 1. Tanchuma, p. 258, 1. says, “Even if I had nothing else to eat in the land of Israel but the meanest husks, I should prefer it.” Hor. 2 Ep. 1, 123. “Vivit siliquis et pane secundo.” Pers. 3, 55. “Siliquis et grandis Pasta polenta.” See Reland, Palæst. p. 379. and Salmisii. Exerc. Plin. p. 429.

16. καὶ ἑκατώμεις γ. τ. κ. α. ἀ. τ. κ. — ἐδίδων αὐτόν.

The sense here offered by almost all versions is very unsatisfactory. There is an ellipsis, which many supply from ἐκατόμων preceding. But the answer is obvious: why then did he not fill his belly with them? which, as being the swineherd, he had an opportunity of doing. Kuinoel, indeed, maintains that the herdsman drove the swine, not into a wood, but into fields, and that he might there have satisfied his hunger as he could with herbs; that when in the evening the swine returned home, the pinching farmer distributed the carobs among the swine liberally enough, so that they might fill their belly, but gave none of them to the herdsman. L. Brug. thinks that the carobs were served out in a certain measure, both to the swine and to himself, but so sparingly to him that he could not fill his belly. These

the same (as Pliny delivers) the ancients made one kind of wine, strongly expressing the juice thereof; and so they might after give the expressed and less useful part of the pods, and remaining pulp, unto their swine; which, being no goutless or unsatisfying offal, might be well desired by the prodigal in his hunger.”
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interpretations, however, offer so far-fetched and frigid a sense, that not even the plainest laws of construction would induce me to admit them: I see no reason why the ellipsis may not be filled up as well with τι scil. φάγειν, (and so the ancient Commentators,) meaning the usual food of men, not (as the Anthol. 2, 17, 1.) βρῶματα χοίρων. Kuinoel, indeed remarks, that his master was bound to furnish him with food. But this circumstance is extremely uncertain. It should seem rather that he was paid in money; but that so scanty were his wages that they could not, in a season of such extreme scarcity, and consequent dearness, provide him with sustenance; so that he was fain to eat the swine's food. For to me it seems certain that ἐπιθυμεῖν must here denote, as ἀγαπᾶν frequently does, to be fain, to be glad: and the aorist γεμίσαι has (as Véchner observes in his Hellenolexia, p. 244) the sense of the present tense. By οὐδεῖς is meant no one, neither his master nor any one else. The καὶ οὐδείς may thus be paraphrased: "And this pinching misery was not alleviated by any charitable assistance," &c.

17. εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἑλθὼν. The formula is properly used of those who, after fainting away, revive again, (thus Hippocrates ap. Kypke) or to those who, after a fit of insanity, return to their right mind. So Hor. Ep. 2, 2, 136. "Expulit ellaboro morbum bilemque meraco, et reedit ad sese." Or again to those who, after a deep sleep*, are roused from torpor. So Lucret. 4, 1016. "Exterrentur, et ex somno quasi mentibus capti, Vix ad se redeunt." It is also used in a metaphorical sense, as in the present passage of Luke: and so Diod. Sic. 13, 95. τοῖς γὰρ λόγισμοῖς εἰς ἑαυτῶς ἐρχόμενοι. Arrian, Epict. 3, 1. ὅταν εἰς σεαυτὸν ἠλθὼς. Lucret. 4, 994. "Donec discussis redeant erroribus ad se." To the above examples, (which are derived from Wets. and Kypke,) I add Liban. Or. 743. Ei

* So Euthymius; Εαυτὸν γενόμενος, ὁ ἑστιν, ἀνανήψαι, ὡς ἐκ μέθης καὶ κάρου ἀφόναντο γὰρ αὐτὸν ἡ καυσώθεια.
17. μίσθω. This is an adjective, as appears from Jos. 11:27, 24. ο μίσθως ὄχλος. And 12:15. οι μίσθοι.

17. λίμω ἀπόλλυμαι, and I perish with hunger. This was considered by the ancients as the most miserable of all deaths. This Wetstein illustrates by many Classical citations. Hom. Od. μ. 342. λίμω δ' οἰκτιστὸν δανεῖν. Lysias c. Andocid. οὗτοι οὖν ταῦτα ποιήσας θανάτον τὸ ἀλγὸς διαφθαρήσεις τῶν μορφῶν. I add, D. Hal. T. 1, 407, 46. τῷ κακίστῳ τῶν μόρφων ἀναλυθείς λίμω. Hence is illustrated Soph. Antiq. 885. οὐν λοίδεια καὶ κάκιστα δὴ μακρὸ κάτειμι.

18. ἡμαςτὸν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ἐνατιον σου. Οὐρανός is here put for Θεός, God, as often both in the O. T. and the Rabbinical writers. Rosenm. thinks that the phrase owes its origin to the Chaldee idiom, as appears from Dan. 4, 28. See also Hackspan, p. 388. Gataker, Adv. 185. and others, cited by Wolf in loc. 'Εν σοῦ, in thy sight, towards thee. In εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν the εἰς corresponds to ὅ, for so the Hebrews have ה הנע. The ה is moreover equivalent to ה ב, in the sight of. (Kuin.)

19. ποιήσων με αἰς ἐνα τῶν μισθίων σ. i. e. treat me as one, &c. So the Hebr. רוח. Others (less properly) explain conduce, engage, hire me.

20. καὶ ἀναστάς, i. e. (says Theophylact) εκ τοῦ πτώματος τῆς ἁμαρτίας. But I rather think that there is a reference to the speed with which he put his good resolution into practice. For (as Theophyl. and Euthymius remark) δει ἡμᾶς μὴ μόνον βουλεύεσθαι καλῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πράττεων τὸ βεβουλευμένα.
20. ἐτί—ἐλθεν αὐτῶν ὑπὸ παθήρα αἱ. Rosenmüller observes, that ἐλθεν expresses not only the act of seeing, but quickness in recognising; and cites Quintilian. in Declam. Parentum, affectus nunquam in tantum vincuntur odio, ut non ad naturam suam revertantur. On this Euthymius has the following beautiful remark: Ὡσ συμπαθετάτης οὐκοπιώς! ἀμα τὶς ἐνεργητική μετανοήσαι, καὶ ἁρὰ τῶν ἐλθεν αὐτῶν, ἑτοιμος ὕπιπ τὸ πρὸς ὑποδοξὴν τῶν ἐπιστρεφόντων.

20. The haste of the father to rush into the embraces of his son is beautifully opposed to the tardiness and hesitation of the son. Wetstein; who illustrates this tardiness (so natural to one who is conscious of blame, and is going to ask pardon, &c.) from Heraclid. on Hom. II, 1, 498. καὶ γὰρ τε λιταί ἐσι; Διὸς κοῦραι μεγάλοι χωλαίτε ρυσαι τε παραβλάβατε τῷ ὑφαλλωτι, where Heraclides remarks, ἐν ὑπ citing τοιοῦτος ὑπεστὶ τοῖς ἱκετεύωντος σχῆμα διαστέπλασται, πάσα γὰρ ὁν συνείδησις ἀμαρτάνοντος ἀνθρώπου βραδεία, καὶ μόλις οἱ δεόμενα τοῖς ἱκετεύομένως προσέχουται, τὴν αὐτῶ κατὰ βήμα [read βῆμα] μετροῦντες. See Gen. 37, 18. 2 Sam. 14, 39.

20. ἐπέκεκρεν ἐπὶ τὸν τραχίλος αὐτοῦ, fell on his neck. According to the Oriental custom. So Gen. 45, 14. Tob. 11, 8. This was not, however, confined to the Eastern nations. See Hom. Od. Ψ. 208. & 240. It is of more importance, however, to observe, that this embrace implied reconciliation, and indicated, as Euthymius observes, ὅτι ἀφήκεν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν ἀμαρτίαν.

21. ἐπί. He made (we may observe) this confession, and acknowledgment, which he had meditated, notwithstanding that he had received the embrace of reconciliation and forgiveness. Yet it may be worth while to remark that he does not finish his intended speech*, the words being, as it were, smothered by the kisses, and suppressed by the embraces of the parent, who immediately ordered his servants to treat him not only as a free man, by investing him

* It may therefore not be improper in the text to express this in punctuation thus: εἰληθήναι υἱὸς σου —
with the robe, but to put on him the best robe. This sense of πρῶτος savours of Hebraism. So Ezra 27, 22. μετὰ πρῶτον ἀνυμάτων. Nor are any of the Classical passages compared by the Commentators at all apposite, except Athen. 197. β. ταύταις δ' ἀμφιτάκται ἀλωγησεν ὑπεστρωντε τῆς πρώτης ἑρέας. Joseph. Ant. 13, 5, 4. τὰ πρώτα μῦρα χρίομενα. Kuinoel observes, that primus is so used, and cites Ter. Ad. 5, 2, 4. Justin. 2, 9. By the ring must here be understood a gold ring, for servants sometimes wore iron rings, as we find from Apulej. Met. p. 326. See Elsner, and especially Kirchman, de Annulis, ch. 16. The gold ring has ever been in the East an ensign of dignity, or mark of opulence. So Plaut. Casin. (cited by Bulkley): Si efflixis hoc, soleas tibi dabo et annulum in digito Aureum et bona plurima. Compare Gen. 41, 43. 1 Macc. 6, 16. James 2, 2. See Mr. Horne's Introd. vol. 3, 403. and Calmet's Dictionary. The ὑποδήματα, sandals, are added, since servants went unshod. See Ferrar. de Re Vest. 1, 11. It is not necessary to anxiously scrutinize (as many old Commentators have done) what is denoted by the several parts of the similitude, as the robe, ring, and shoes.

23. ἐνεγκαρσε τὸν μόσχον τ. σ. τ. Casaubon tells us, that veal* was by the ancients reckoned among the dainties. It may be observed, too, that the article, especially as it is repeated, denotes one particular calf, και ἐξοχος, known to the servants, and; we may reasonably suppose, the best. So Hor. Ep. 1, 4, 36. Pascitur in vestrum reditum votiva juvenca. Hom. Od. 14, 414. seqq. (cited by Bulkley): "Ἀξίων τῷ δριττῷ, ἵνα ἕξετέρα τηλεδρού. ᾿& 14, 214. Δεπνυόν τ' αἴσχα ἐνόν ἱερεύσατε δοτις ἄριστοι. Θεοντας some Commentators render sacrifice, and Elsner has written much in defence and illustration of this ver-

* Michaelis observes, that with us veal is exceedingly tough when eaten immediately on being killed, but not so in the hot climates of the East. Indeed, in all hot climates meat rapidly tends to putridity, i.e. grows tender, and is therefore eaten on the same day.
sion, which, however, has been completely refuted by Raphel and Wolf, who observe, that the passages cited by Elsner have respect to Classical rather than Oriental or Jewish customs, which in all Christ's parables, are alone to be considered. It is plain, from the context, that θεϊν must here be taken in the sense of mactare, to butcher; as in Matth. 22, 4. τὰ σιτωτὰ τεθυμένα: and Acts 10, 13. θύων καὶ φάγε. So the Hebr. יְהֹוָה. On the primary sense of θεϊν see the note on Matth. 22, 4.

23. εὐφραυθάμεν, let us feast and enjoy ourselves. See Schl. Lex.

24. νεκρὸς ἦν, καὶ ἀνέζησε. Heuman and Rosenmuller would explain, "I thought my son was dead, but now I know him to be alive." Rosenmuller cites from Kypke, Ach. Tat. 7, 6. and this Kuinoel thinks may be the sense. I am surprised that these Commentators should have resorted so frigid a conceit, and so improbable an interpretation. The ancient Commentators, and most modern ones, more rightly explain these words metaphorically. Thus Euthymius and Theophylact: Νέκρωσιν μὲν καὶ ἀπάλειαν φησι, τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀναβάλωσιν δὲ καὶ εἰρετιν, τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς μετανοίας. This is, indeed, clear from ver. 32. On this sense see Dr. Hammond's excellent note, or the abstract of it in Elsley. Wetstein cites Menander ap. Eusth. ἄνθρωπε, πέρυσι πτωχὸς ἦσαν καὶ νεκρῶς, Νῦν δὲ πλουτεῖς. Cic. post Redit. in Senatu 9. Qui me a morte ad vitam, a desperatione ad speiem, ab exitio ad salutem revocavit. I add, from Kypke, Lysis Pyth. where Pythagoras, reproving Hipparchus, who had accustomed himself to the luxury of the Sicilians, says: εἰ μὲν ὦν μεταβάλλων χαρῆσομαι, εἰ δὲ μὴ τέθνακας μοι· and Jamblich. Vit. Pyth. p. 80. τὸν τῆς ἀρετῆς τέθνηκε βίον. Examples of ἀπολύω may be seen in the note on ver. 7—10. Matth. 10, 6, 15, 24. Luke 19, 10.

25. ξύκουσε συμφωνίας καὶ χορῶν. Wetstein has on this passage copiously illustrated the subject of dancing and singing among the ancients. But the details would
here be somewhat out of place. It may be sufficient to observe, that it is an Oriental custom to have concerts of music at entertainments. So Hom. Od. 17; 358, 359. (cited by Bulkley,) where Ulysses’s meal is accompanied with music: Ἡσθιε δ᾽ ἀοις ὅτ᾽ ἀοίδος ἐν μεγάρωσιν ἀείδεν. 'Eved' oδ' ἐδεικνύει, δ' ἐπαύσατο θείως ἀοίδος, &c 21. sub fin. μολὴν καὶ φόρμαν—τὰ γὰρ τ’ αναβήματα διαιτοῦ. See Homer’s Obs. though from Pincinelli Lum. Refl. 655. we find that it was also in use among the Greeks and Romans.

27. ὅτι ὑγιαίνοντα ἀ. ἂν. Some Commentators interpret the word ὑγιαίνοντα in the physical, others in the moral sense. I prefer the latter; of which Kypke has given several examples. Perhaps it may be permitted to conjoin both senses.


31. Rosenmuller explains, "Thou art my heir, and therefore κύριος πάντων. Hence in Plautus Trin. we have Herus minor. Wetstein cites Philo. p. 200, 40. παίδων γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔδων δὲ μὴ γονέων ἐστὶ. Eurip. Androm. 585. οὐκοῦν ἐκείνου τ᾽ ἀμα, τακείνον τάμα, Π. ἔδων εἰς κακῶς σ᾽ οὖ. Kuinoel, however, denies that this is the sense, and lays down the following one:
"Thou may'st use mine as thy own." "For (says he) the eldest son had remained in the family of his father, who had reserved for himself a part of the property (see the note on ver. 12.) and therefore had every thing in common with his father, and lived on his father's property; and the younger son, on his father's death, also received a part of the inheritance." Christ here shows, that there is no just cause of complaint to those who have led a life of uninterrupted piety, because the penitent are received into favour. For, (observes Doddridge,) as the joyful welcome that the father gave his younger son did not incline him to disinherit the elder brother, so neither will God, out of partial fondness for remarkable penitents, raise them to a state of glory superior to that of those who have on the whole made a greater progress in holiness, and done him more constant and faithful services." I will conclude by placing before my readers a very fine passage from Philo Jud. 826. c. shewing the advantages of virtue over repentance: μένουσι γὰρ οὐδὲν ἤττον ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς τῶν μετανοοῦντων οὐλαί καὶ τόπως τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀδικημάτων.

CHAP. XVI.

In determining the subject of the following parable, Commentators widely differ. There are those who think that by this similitude is signified reception into the Christian Church. This force, (with little attention to the usus loquendi,) they attribute to the formula δέχεσθαι εἰς σκηνάς κινεῖσθαι. Others are of opinion, that the subject of the parable is the restitution of ill-gotten gains (τοῦ μαμύνα τῆς ἀδικίας), or a bestowing of them on pious uses. Others, again, contend, that the parable treats of the true use of the perishable treasures of this world (τοῦ μαμύνα τῆς ἀδικίας); not to mention many other interpretations, which may be seen in Kuinoel's Commentary, and especially in Schreitter's Dissertation on this subject, Lips. 1803, 8vo. Rosenmuller and Kuinoel think
that the parable was delivered at the same time with the last, and that Christ addresses himself not to the Apostles, nor disciples properly so called (i.e. the seventy), but to his followers generally, and especially the Publicans and Pharisees, many of whom were rich, and to whom the admonition contained in it would be very suitable, which inculcated the true use of riches, and how they are to be employed, so that we may receive advantage from them in a future state. That μαθηταί is often in the N.T. taken in this under sense is certain. So Matth. 24, 1. 28. 19. Luke 6, 13. Joh. 6, 60. & 66. Kuinoel thinks that there is a strong connection and similitude between the last parable (ch.15.) and this, to shew which he proceeds to compare the scope of both; for whose details I must refer my readers to the work itself, and other opinions to be seen in Koecher. Wetstein, however, with many others, thinks that Jesus, turning from the Scribes and Pharisees whom he had been addressing from ch. 15, 3. addresses himself to the disciples.

1. οἰκονόμον. The word denotes a house steward, one who administered the affairs of the family, especially purchased provisions, and saw them served out in regular shares to the domestics. See a passage of Kimchi cited by Lightfoot, and translated by Elsley.

1. δεσποτης, insimultatus, in invidiam adductus est. Non erat dispensator iste conditione servus, ut patet ex comm. 3. Wets.; who cites several examples. But this was unnecessary, since that signification has never been doubtful. As, however, the accusation was true, I rather assent to Munthe, Kypke, Krebs, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, that δεσποτης is to be explained delatus erat. They observe, that διαβάλλω is a word of doubtful, or middle, signification, and denotes generally to denounce, or accuse, whether truly or falsely. So Diod. Sic. 269. n. of Themistocles respecting Pausanias, οὗτε προσεπεξάτο τὴν ἐνεψιν, οὗτε διαβάλλειν ἔκρινε δειν ἄνδρα φίλον. Joseph. Ant. 6, 10, 2.
speaking of Michel the daughter of Saul: διαβάλθη-
ναι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.

2. ἀπόδος τῶν λόγων τῆς οἰκονομίας. I would render,
"Give the account of thy stewardship, for thou must
be no longer steward," i.e. unless thou shalt have
given a satisfactory account. The not keeping this
ellipsis in view has led to no little error in the in-
terpretation. It must be observed, too, that the δυ-
νήσις is not (as Kuinoel thinks) redundant. Of the
phrase διδόναι τῶν λόγων see a passage of Galen cited
by Wets. on Matth. 18, 23. I add Zosim. 4, 40, 10.
συμπηράγει Ι. καὶ λόγου τῆς α. ἀπήτευ. Appian. 1, 615,
38. ἦτει λογισμοὺς χειρισμάτων τε καὶ κτημάτων. Euseb.
Eccl. Hist. p. 114, 43. ἐγὼ χριστοὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ λόγου ὑπὲρ
σοῦ.

3. σκάπτειν οὐκ ἵσχυον, "perform the work of a day-
labourer in cultivating:" a condition in antient times
reckoned among the lowest, as well as most laborious.
On this subject Raphel, Wetstein, Elsner, and Kypke,
pour forth copious stores of Classical illustration,
from which I shall select the most apposite passages:
It seems that captives in war were sometimes set to
this employment. So Pausan. Arcad. 695. (cited by
Elsner): Δακεδαιμονίαι οἱ αἰχμάλωτοι τὰ πεδίαν Τεγέα-
tαις ἔσκαπτον. Lucian. Timon. 7. (cited by Raphel):
φεῖ δ’ ἄλλαγής ὁ καλὸς ἐκεῖνος, ὁ πλούσιος, ἐπι τὰς
τοιούτως φιλοί; τι παθάν οὐν τοιούτοι εἰσίν αὐχηροῖς,
ἄθλοι καὶ σκαπανεῖς καὶ μισθαντοῖς, ὡς ἑοκεῖν, ὡς ταῦτα
καταφέρων τὴν δίκηλλαν *. Eurip. Rhes. κακαί γεωργεῖν
χεῖρες εἰ τεθραμμέναι. Quintilian. D. 9. Quid vis porro
faciam? agrestia opera? dedicator, quod a fortunâ
non didici? I add Phocyl. 13, 157. εἰ δὲ τις οὐ δέ-
dakke τέχνην, σκάπτοτο δικελλὴν. "Εστὶ βιω 
πάν ἐχθεῖ 
ἐπὶ μολεθεὶς ἐθέλησιν. Eurip. Electr. 252. σκαδεῦς
τίς ἡ βουφορὸς ἀξίων δόμων. Archipp ap. Pollus: Σκα-
 κεῦ, κηπωφοίτι τοῖς τ’ ὑπηλαῖναι. See Arist. Trag.
Δαιτάλ. 8. The expression σκάπτειν γὰρ οὐκ ἵσχυον.

* To this little narration the well-known story of the basket-
makers bears a strong resemblance, whether by actual imitation, I
am not able to say, and cannot find time to examine.
seems to have been proverbial. Thus in a very similar passage of Aristophanes, v. 1482. (cited by Wetstein): τί γὰρ πάθω, σκάπτειν γὰρ οὐκ ἑπισταμαι' and so Athen. p. 184. κ. (cited by Wets.) ὅσις δ' αὐτὴν αὐτοῖς καὶ λύραις κατατέρμημαι χρήμανοι, εἶτα με σκάπτειν κελεύεις.

4. ἔγναν τι ποιήσω, I am resolved what to do. E. T. This signification is illustrated by Munthe. Kui-noel, however, explains, "I know, (a thought has occurred to me,) what to do;" to which our English idiom is exactly parallel.

4. οὐκ μετασταθω τ. ο. The verb μεθισθήμι is often used of removal from office. Of this Wetstein cites many examples. See Schl. Lex. Δέξανται, receive me to their houses and afford me sustenance; antecedent for consequent, as in Joh. 19, 27. Δέξανται is also impersonal for personal, i. e. "that I may be received."

5—7. Calling to him each one of his Lord's debtors, of whom two only are mentioned, exempli gratia. All these minor circumstances must not (as Enthymius and Theophyl. truly observe) be dwelt upon, since they merely serve for ornament.

6. δέξασθαι τὸ γράμμα, your hand-writing, obligation, engagement, bond. The Vulg. renders cau-

Blmonem. So Joseph. Ant. 18, 6, 3, where Marsyas requests Protus αὐτῷ γονὸν παρατείνῃ ἐπὶ γράμματι καὶ πώτερ τῇ αὐτῷ. It seems, that these bonds were kept in the hands of the steward; and of this (says Gro-tius) we have instances in the Roman law. I formerly was of opinion, that these γράμματα were contracts for annual rent, or leases, (which would confer a lasting advantage on the tenants); and so, I find, thought Dr. Macknight: but this conjecture, which is somewhat improbable, has nothing to con-

firm it. There is, too, a wide difference between a bond and a contract. I cannot agree with Doddrige that this bill was equivalent to a note under his hand, acknowledging the receipt of so much oil, and promising payment for it. He truly, however,
observes, that Dr. Clarke is mistaken in supposing the steward did no wrong to his master in this affair, but only gave the debtors the value of what he set off out of his own stock, himself undertaking to pay his lord. For, (continues Doddridge,) not to say how improbable it is that this bankrupt should be able, or willing, to make such a considerable present, it is plain that, if he had intended it, he would have let the account remain unaltered. But by the exchange of bills, he cunningly made each of the debtors an accomplice with him in defrauding his lord, and thereby provided against a discovery."

7. γράφων ὑγούσαντα. Wetstein cites Hor. 2, Sat. 3, 69. Scribe decem a Nerio, where the Scholiast explains, "Scribe verbum juris est, pro mutuum sume. Apulej. Apologet. Non prius discendent, quam ali- quid scribentes. Andocides in Alciabd. Αγάπαρχον—τὴν οἰκίαν ἀπηνάγκασε γράφειν" δεμένον δὲ, καὶ προφέτης ἀληθεὶς λέγοντος, ἀν ὅκ αὐτοὶ δύναται τὰν τάτα πράττειν, ἠδὲ, ὅτι τὸ συγγράφες ἔχει παρ᾽ ἑτέρων, προεῖπεν αὐτῷ δήσεως, εἰ μὴ πάνω ταχέως γράφαι. The passage is thus translated and paraphrased by Doddridge: "Take thy bill, in which thou hast acknowledged the receipt of it, and sit down directly and write another, in which thou shalt acknowledge the receipt of but fifty, and I will alter my book agreeable to that."

8. καὶ ἐπήνευεν ὁ κύριος τὸν οἰκονόμον. By ὁ κύριος is not meant (as the Syriac Version expresses, and some Commentators suppose,) Christ, but the master, as in ver. 8.

8. ὅτι οἱ σιω—σιω. Owen thinks that these words came not from the Evangelist, and Markland believes them to be an interpolation. Both suspicions are utterly unfounded. The words are genuine, and are undoubtedly to be ascribed to Christ, who meant by them to explain the parable, and show his opinion on a most important subject. Kuinoel has well observed, that the altered tone of voice, countenance, and gesture of the speaker must have clearly indicated to the hearers that the words were not a refléc-
tion of the lord, but were an admonition of Christ. Φρονιμάτωρ, more prudent, provident. So Matth. 7, 24 & 25. 25. 2. where see the note. "Or: signifies verily, providence, utique, (like the Hebr. וְ) Mark-land is mistaken in thinking that Φρονίμως means as-
tute, cunning.

8. It is plain from the whole narration, that the lord was a very rich man, and that relying on the probity and integrity of his steward, he neglected, and was quite ignorant of his own affairs. Hence the steward, with whom the bonds were kept, might hope that his fraud would not easily be detected. But when the lord had afterwards heard that his debtors received and supported the steward, after his removal from his office, might easily conjecture, and perhaps ascertain the crafty fraud which had been practised upon him. (Kuin.) When it is said, however, that he praised him, we are only to understand, that he praised the prudent foresight with which he timely provided for his future wants, and had thus acted Φρονίμως. He praised ingenious contrivance, though in a bad cause; for in this consists the force of the similitude, not in the knavery of the deed. There is an argument drawn a minore. If prudent and well-contrived knavery be praised, how much more pru-
dence conjoined with virtue? In this view Wetstein cites Eusth. on Hom. II. π. p. 611, 10. οἰκ. ζηταῖ δὲ ὀφελός τῷ ἀμφοτερῷ, εἰ μάνοι φρεσκ. κέχρηται ἀγάθως. καὶ κληρον. γὰρ ἄν πάντα καὶ μαχαῖ φρεσκ. χρείας ἀγα-
θῶς αἰσ. μὲν τοιοῦτοι ἑπαυνότο ᾧ, αἰ. δὲ φροῦλος κολάζοντες.

and Kuinoel observes, that he praised him as Chre-

mes. ap. Ter. Heauton. 8, 2, 26. does a fraudulent

servant. Syrus: Eho! laudas, quasi, qui heros fal-


8. οἰ νιῶ τοῦ αἰῶνος. By αἰῶν is here meant this:

dae, the world, and the things of it, its business,

pleasures, vices, &c. and οἰ νιῶ τοῦ αἰῶνος signify those

who are, given up to, and absorbed in its avocations.

And as αἰῶν is here taken in a metaphorical sense, so:
is φῶς, which, by a very frequent figure, denotes
true religion, as especially enlightening the minds of men. Therefore the υἱοὶ τῶν φωτῶν denote those who are studious of true religion, and, especially the Christian. So 1 Thess. 5, 5. Both phrases frequently occur in the Rabbinical writings; (see Lightfoot, Schoettgen, and Wetstein); ex. gr. Jalkut Rubeni, fol. 89, 4. Filii mundi non intelligunt, neque student in verbis Legis Taamith. fol. 22, 1. Filii mundi futuri. Berachoth. fol. 4, 2. Quis est filius seculi futuri? Bava Bathra, fol. 10, 2. Interrogarunt aliquando Salomonem, quisnam esset filius mundi futuri? respondit, omnes qui senes honorant. Of a similar sense in the Latin seculum. Wetstein produces some Classical examples, of which the following are the most apposite. Tacit. Germ. 19. Nemo illic vitia ridet, nec corrumpere et corrupti seculum vocatur. Pedo, Albinov. 1, 45. Quid tibi nunc mores prosunt? —Quid tenuisse animum contra sua secula rectum?

8. εἰς τὴν γένεσιν. These words are variously explained. Grotius renders, “in doing their business,” and Campbell, “in conducting their affairs;” Beza, and the authors of our E. V. “in their generation.” Rosenmuller renders, “towards the men of their age, their contemporaries;” and so Kuinoel, who remarks, that εἰς is for ἐν, and thinks there is here an irony, in which I cannot agree with him. Schleusner explains, in suo genere, i.e. quality, condition, &c, which, upon the whole, I prefer, though this interpretation is somewhat precarious. Perhaps the sense may be, in respect to, compared with their generation, persons of their class or condition.

9. ποιήσατε εαυτοῖς—σκηνᾶς. Jesus, who had (as in Luke 18, 6.) taken occasion, from an example of wrong action, to excite them to right action (which is by the rhetoricians called a contrario) then proceeds to urge on them a most weighty consideration. (Kuin.) On the former part of this verse, Wetstein refers to Micha 6, 10. Es. 58, 6. Job 3, 6. 4, 8. Eurip. Phoeniss. 406.
9. \( \mu \alpha \mu \alpha \omega \nu \tau \iota \varsigma \ \theta \acute{\iota} \varsigma \ \dot{\eta} \dot{\omicron} \kappa \iota \lambda \alpha \varsigma \) *. In the interpretation of these words there is some difference of opinion. Many Commentators explain, \textit{riches unjustly acquired}; but this is quite unsuitable to the context. The best modern Commentators, as Mede, Le Clerc, De Dieu, Elsner, Schwartz, Campbell, Rosenm. Kuinoel, and Schlesus, \textit{divitias fallacae, caduces et petrituras}. Thus also Wetstein explains \textit{fallacious, deceitful, which do not render to their possessors what they promise}. He cites, among many other passages, the following: Sil. 7, 60. Dives ea et nunquam tellus \textit{mentita} colono. Petron. 117. Loquat tur aurum et argentum, fundosque \textit{mendaces}, et perpetuam terrarum sterilitatem. Hor. Od. 3, 1. Non verberatae grando ine vineae, fundosque \textit{mendax}. I add Persius (in his Prologue (cited by Bulkley): Quod si dolosi spes refulerit nummi, Corvos poetas, et poetrias picas, Cantare credas Pegaseium melos. Kuinoel adduces several examples of this sense of \( \mu \alpha \mu \alpha \omega \nu \) from the O. T. and the Classical writers. He adds, that Christ himself, when he makes mention of riches, describes them as uncertain, fallacious, and soon to perish. See Matth. 6, 19. 19, 21. Luke 12, 38. He then, after a long investigation, determines the following to be the sense: “Deum vobis amicum reddite, Dei favorem vobis bis comparate.” But this is manifestly curtailing the sense.

9. \( \delta \tau \alpha \nu \ \varepsilon \kappa \lambda \lambda \lambda \nu \tau \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \). Here we must supply \( \tau \delta \nu \ \beta \lambda \nu \) (as in D. Hal. Ant. 1, 54. 2, 3. 4, 54. Lucian Macrobr. 12. Lysias pro milite); or \( \tau \delta \ \xi \eta \upsilon \) (as in Polyb. 2, 41. 3 Macc. 2, 22.) or \( \tau \delta \nu \ \psi \nu \chi \epsilon \lambda \nu \), as in Aelian, V. H. 13, 20. So the Latin \textit{deficere}, which occurs in Justin. It is one of the many \textit{euphemisms} expressive of death. The elliptical phrase occurs in Jos. Bell. 4, 1, 9. and not unfrequently. Dr. Campbell translates, “after your discharge.” For the word \( \varepsilon \kappa \lambda \lambda \lambda \nu \tau \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \) bears, he thinks, some analogy to the dismissal of

* Mamona was the Syriac name for the God of riches, as Plutus of the Greeks and Romans.
the steward from his office, and is quite applicable to our removal out of this world. The phrase he has adopted partakes of the *equivoque*. Casaubon, more properly, renders, "quum defuncti fuissetis." However that may be, few will approve of Dr. Campbell's version. On this subject Grotius cites from Martial, "Rape, congrere, aufer, posside: relinquendum est." He renders, "cum destituemini, sub. τῶ ἀθανῶν. And so Kypke and others explain, "when your riches forsake you," by a change common both in passive and neuter verbs. But this does not (as far as I can remember) take place in ἔκκλησιν: neither is this so suitable to the context; though it may, in a popular sense, come to much the same thing. But the first interpretation is doubtless the true one, and indeed it is supported by the authority of the ancient Greek Commentators, and almost all modern ones.

9. δέξανται ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν σο. On the interpretation of these words there has been no little discussion. It has been enquired *who* are meant by they? Some say, "the Angels appointed to receive the pious departed spirits. (See Matth. 24, 31.) This opinion too is adopted by the ancient Commentators, as also by Piscator, Strigel, Blackwall, Glass, Georgius, Hardt, Stock, Wolf, &c. and they might have cited Luke 12, 20. τὴν παρθένων σωμάτων ἀποτάσσων ἀπὸ σου. Others (as Grotius, Mede, De Dieu, Maldonati, L. Brug. and Schoettgen,) think that by δέξανται there is an allusion to the Jewish opinion, as recorded in the Rabbinical writers, namely, "Divites auxiliantur pauperibus in hoc mundo divitiis suis, pauperes vero divitibus, in mundo futuro, corporibus et animabus suis:" and Mede cites a passage of Jerome: "Non memini me legere malâ morte mortuam qui libenter opera charitatis exercuit; habet enim multos intercessores, et impossibile est multorum preces non exaudiri." But one can by no means suppose that our Saviour would countenance so superstitious an opinion. Dr. Hammond, however, brought for-
ward another mode of interpretation, which has been adopted by almost all recent Critics, (as Rosenmüller) namely, to take ἰδώνται as an impersonal, (as in 12, 20.) “that you may be received.” But I agree with Kuinoel that this is not necessary. The word must be referred to φίλοις preceding, and I assent to the same Commentator, who renders ποιήσατε καυτοῖς φίλοις, “Deum vobis amicum reddite, Dei favorem vobis comparate,” which I would thus express in English: Make friends with God by the right distribution of the riches entrusted to your stewardship. This is indeed a remarkable idiom, perhaps confined to the Hellenistic style; though we have one nearly parallel to it in our own language, namely, to be friends with, to make friends with any one. For properly (observes Kuinoel) it should have been φίλοι, which would have taken after it ἰδώνται. If this be not admitted, I would recommend the first interpretation. By the “ever-lasting habitations” are meant Heaven, everlasting felicity, habitations not temporary, as were those into which the debtors received the steward. Markland professes that he does not understand the expression αἰωνίαι σκήναι, which he thinks a contradiction in terms. “For σκήναι (says he) denote only temporary conveniences.” He would therefore read σκία. But σκία means any habitation or dwelling, not merely a tent; nay even a palace, as in Acts 15, 16. ἁνωκοδωμήσω τὴν σκίνην Δαβίδ. In this sense the word sometimes occurs in the Classical writers; and Schleusner refers to Polyb. 12, 9, 4. 31, 22, 2. It seems derived from the Hebr. נְש, which signifies generally to dwell. Dr. Owen very properly cites 2 Esdr. 2, 11. dabo eis tabernacula aeterna, which in the Greek must have been δῶσω αὐτοῖς αἰωνίους σκηνάς. He thinks it was a common phrase among the Hellenistic Jews. Munthe cites Diodor. Sic. 33. where the ancient Egyptians are said to have called the seats of the dead αἰῶνοι ὀίκους: τὰς μὲν τῶν ἡμῶν ὀίκησεις καταλύσεις ὑμοῖς ὑμῶν, καὶ ὀίκον 2 F 2
In the same manner, you, too, in the normal course of events, therefore, do not consider yourselves superior to the sages of old, nor disregard their teachings, on account of the difference in time between us. So Jos. Ant. 8, 4, 2. (cited by Wets.) "οὐ γὰρ, ἐπειδὴ ἀικονὸς μὲν αἰώνιον ἔχεις, δὲτὰ τοιαῦτα. Inscript. in Gruter. "Domum æternum vivus sibi posuit." Cic. de N. D. 3, 16. "Non video, quo pacto ille, cui in monte Oeteo inlatæ lampades fuerint, ut ait Accius, in domum æternam patris ex illo ardore pervenerit." Rosenm. refers to various explanations of Nitzsch and others, which are reviewed and summed up by Hulse, in a Dissertation on this passage, who himself thus translates: "Ego vero vobis hoc consilium do: Compare vobis, incertarum divitiarum ope, amicos, ut, quam defeceritis, opibus omnibus, illi vestram in æternâ domiciliâ receptionem adjuvent." He also refers to a Commentatio in Henke's Promptuarium, and observes that no one need stumble at this parable, who considers its scope and intent, which is this: that the votaries of religion ought to imitate the provident conduct of the steward, in attaining friends who should, after his removal from office, support him for the remainder of his days; but not provide for the future in the manner that he (one of the sons of this world) did; but rather, as becomes children of light and religion, who look forward and provide, not so much for their temporal and perishable, as for their eternal felicity. Thus may a lesson be learned even from bad men.

10. ῥπιστός ἐν ἐλαχῖστῳ, καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστὸς ἐστι. This seems to be a proverbial saying, (see Schoett. Adag. N. T. p. 81.) and therefore is to be only understood of what generally, though not always, happens. The sentiment has been illustrated from the Rabbinical writings by Rhenferd and Schoettgen. Ἐλαχῖστῳ denotes a thing of small moment, and then πολλῷ must, like the Hebr. בַּן, be taken in the sense of praestans, which is found also in the Classical writers. See Budæi Comment. and Steph. Thes. Consult Kuinoel on Matth. 5, 12. Thus Euthymius
explains: ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ὁλίγῳ, καὶ πολλοῦ ἄξιος ἢτιν. ὁ δὲ ἐν ὁλίγῳ ἀδίκος, καὶ πολλοῦ ἄναξίος ἢτιν. To the servant (observes Rosenm.) who faithfully attends to small matters committed to his trust, will be confided much more important ones. Masters often try the fidelity of their servants in unimportant matters, and thence form a conjecture of greater ones. So Philo, p. 344. (cited by Wetstein.) μηδὲ τὴν ἐν ὁλίγοις πιστὶν φύλαττε, θύρας τῆς ἐν πλείου πίστεως ἀνέεσθαι δὴ μηδεὶς ὁλιγοχρημάτων παρακαταθήκης ἀπόδοσιν εἰς ἄργα μείζονος προσφερέτα. So also Schemoth, R. 2. “Deus nunquam res magnas largitur hominibus, nisi eos prius per res parvas exploraverit; postea vero rebus magnis eos admovet. Ecce duos habemus viros magnos in hoc mundo, quos per rem parvam prius exploravit, postquam autem eos fideles invent, rebus quoque magnis admovit.”

11. Now follows the application of the adage: “If ye do not evince fidelity in the administration of perishable wealth, God will not commit to you spiritual trusts, nor confer true and eternal benefits?” Τὸς denotes God. The word ἁληθίως (says Wets.) elegantly denotes what is naturally, intrinsically, and really, that which it is said to be; and is opposed to what is fictitious, and rather specious than real.” He then subjoins numerous examples, in which the significature real is opposed to what is imitative. Bulkley cites Demophilus: Ἡ τῶν ὄντως ὄντων κτῆσις διὰ βραστάνης ὡς περιγίνεται. I add, Liban. Orat. 814. ἐν. ὅπε ἁγαθὸς τῶν ὡς ἁληθιῶς κτημάτων φύλαξ. And Schoettgen quotes Jalkut Simeoni, f. 31, 1. where there is a similar story of a certain king who appointed two ἐπιρέτους, one to superintend the care of his gold and silver, the other of his straw. The latter incurred the suspicion of dishonesty, and some time after was angry, because he had not been set over the gold and silver. Therefore men said, “Fool, if in the care of straw thy honesty was called in question, how couldst thou expect to be trusted with gold and silver?”
12. καὶ εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ — δόςει; Wetstein remarks, that by propria are meant bona aeterna, and by the aliena those of this life only. The latter are so called because they are not, strictly speaking, our own, but committed to our trust, being foreign to the true nature and destination of our being, and not depending on our own will, and can by no means be called our own, as being uncertain, transitory; and perishable. In this view, Wolf cites Hor. Ep. 2, 2, 170. “Tamquam sit proprium, pucento quod mobilis horae nunc prece, nunc pretio, nunc vi, nunc sorte supremâ Permutat dominos, et cedat in altera jura.” Among the numerous passages here compared by Wetstein, the following are the most apposite. Phaedrus 1, 4. “Amitit merito propria, qui aliena adpetit.” Ovid. Met. 13, 140. “Et genus et proavos, et quae non fecimus ipsi, vix ea nostrâ puto.” Pub. Syr. “Nil proprium duucas, quod amitti potest.” See Philo 2, 77, 38. Eurip. Phæniss. 558. Hor. Serm. 2, 11, 134. Clem. Rom. 2, 5. τὰ κορικὰ τῶν ὡς ἀλλοτρίοις ἡγεῖται, καὶ μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν αὐτῶν; Mr. Bulkley compares Lucian, T. 1. p. 313. ἀπείρων οἰκεῖων τινῶν στερεσκομένων, καὶ οὐκ ἂ πρὸς ὅλην ἑξερχόμενο ἀποδίδοται. By ἡμέτερον (says Rosenm.) are meant those eternal blessings which will be the fruit and reward of a life well spent here on earth, and therefore the sense of these two verses (which are explicative of the preceding, and are closely connected with them) is this: “If you have been unfaithful in administering the blessings of this life, how can greater and more excellent ones be entrusted to you. Drs. Owen and Doddridge commend the following version: “If ye have embezzled what another gave you in trust, how can he give you a state in perpetuity?” The former observes that there is a similar sentiment in the Anthol. Gr. but inverted: “Ἔγνω δ’ ὡς οὐκ ἔστι κακῶς κεκριμένου ἄνδρα τῶν ἰδίων, εἶναι πιστὸν ἐν ἀλλοτρίοις. 13. See the note on Matth. 6, 24. 14. ἐξεμικτήριζον αὐτῶν. Campbell renders ridiculed
him; which, however, is not sufficiently significant or dignified*. I prefer our version, derided him. The word literally means, sneered at him, snuffed at him. So the Hebr. יָלוּ (from whence comes our laugh, and the Greek χλευ-άζω), which the Sept. frequently render μυκτηρίζειν and ἐκμυκτηρίζειν, which rarely occur in the Classical writers. The ἔκ is intensive, and Camerarius remarks, that here the greatest derision is denoted, namely, by raising, or curling up, the nose. So the Latin writers say, “Adunco naso suspendere;” as Horace, 1 Serm. 6, 5. and 2 Serm. 8, 6, 4. Rosenm. compares the German die nase rumpfen†. It must be remembered too that from μύκτηρ comes μύζω, musso, to snuff, and that the above phrases bear a strong similarity to some in our own language, such as to turn up the nose at, to snuff at; as in Malach. 1, 13. “Ye have snuffed at it, saith the Lord of hosts.” So μυκτηρίζειν is sometimes used by the Attic writers. Thus Pollux 2, 78. (cited by Wets.) observes that Lysias uses μυκτηρίζειν for μυζάττεσθαι. To turn from the consideration of words to things, we may observe, with Euthymius, ἐφαύλιζον αὐτόν, οἱ φαύλοι καὶ κατάπτυστοι. The opinions of the Fathers on this subject are detailed in Suid. Thes. 1, 676. I must also refer the reader to an excellent note of Grotius on this passage.

15. ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ δικαιοῦτες ἐ. ἐ. τ. ἀ. i. e. by a pretended virtue and sanctity, make yourselves seem just before men. The word ἄρω, in Kal, signifies to be just, and in the conjugations Piel and Hiph, to be accounted just: to which δικαιοῦν answers in the Sept. So Kuinoel, and Storr in his Opusc. T. 1, 289.

* Doddridge very properly observes, that there was a gravity and dignity in our Lord’s discourse, which, insolent as they were, would not permit them to laugh out; and that by some scornful air they hinted to each other their mutual contempt.

† It is curious that the corresponding Hebrew term denotes, not contempt or derision, but anger and rage.
Others, however, (as Schleusner in his Lex.) explain, "You magnify yourselves, and pride yourselves for your sanctity. So Luke 10, 29. δὲ δὲ λεγέτων δικαιούν εαυτῶν. Sirach 7, 4, 10, 32. 13, 1. and elsewhere. But Kuinoel rightly thinks that the former interpretation is more agreeable to the words following. This justification (says Rosenm.) was effected by the pomp and parade of ceremonies, which attracted the admiration of the ignorant multitude: q. d. "But God, who is a καρδιογνωστής, knoweth all hearts, knoweth how little true sanctity there is in them." For many things are there which, though highly esteemed among men, are held in abomination in the sight of God, who (as Doddridge remarks) observes the vile purposes from which it often proceeds, and cannot be imposed upon by any glittering misrepresentation or disguise.

Βδέλυγμα is for βδελυκτών, abstract for concrete; on which figure Wolf refers us to Glass, Vorst. Phil. Sacr. Vechner in his Hellenolexia, and Gataker in his Adv. Ch. 18. Cinn. L. 2, 4. The figure is common in the Greek Classical writers, (see Matth. Gr. Gr.) and is not unfrequent in the Latin ones. It is manifest that the sentence must be restricted to what went before, namely, things done with dissimulation, and with a view to the praise of men, not all things which are held in admiration by men.

16-18. See the note on Matth. 11, 12, 13. Commentators have been exceedingly puzzled to trace the connexion between these three verses and the preceding ones. The method adopted by Doddridge seems the least liable to objection. Hammond, Heuman, Pott, Kuinoel, and others, think that the verses neither have mutual coherence, nor are they connected with the preceding. From the parallel passages in Matth. 11, 12. 13, 5. 18, 5, 31. it should seem that these sententiae were brought forward at another time, and in a closer connection. Kuinoel endeavours to account for this. But I have here (as on other occasions) designedly passed over all
his fine-spun deductions, and cobweb speculations, founded on the precarious, and, indeed, utterly untenable hypothesis, of a Gnomologia, which formed (he thinks) the basis of St. Luke’s Gospel.

19. Here our Lord (says Rosenm.) returns to the subject with which he had commenced his discourse, namely, the use of riches. Or we may suppose (with Mr. Horne, Introd. 2, 62) that as the parable of the unjust steward was propounded in order to show the proper use of wealth, so was this to show the danger of abusing it.

19. ἀνδρόνιος. It has been much disputed, both amongst ancient and modern Commentators, whether the following story be a real history, or merely a fable, or a parabolhistoria; i.e. something compounded of both, founded on fact, but adorned with colouring and imagery. Some maintain that a Sadducee is here characterized; others, a Pharisee. Others again suppose that it was Caiaphas, or Hanan: nor are there wanting those who conjecture Herod Antipas. Wetstein thinks it plain that a Sadducee is here described, from the riches, sumptuous fare, costly clothing, and the request that he made. For the Pharisees (observes he) believed that the soul survived the body; they fasted often, put on humble apparel, and were poorer than the Sadducees. For the various hypotheses which have been devised, and the supporters of them, I must refer the reader to Pole’s Synops. Wolf’s Curæ, and Koecher’s Analecta. Rosenmuller and Kuinoel observe, that there are many things in this narration which indicate a parable; as, for instance, (say they,) the name Lazarus from the Hebr. לֵאָזָר (destitute of assistance), which seems a feigned name. This, however, appears to me a very precarious argument; for (granting the derivation, which is questionable) the story might be true, though the name were fictitious. And, moreover, Lazarus was a very common name, as may be seen by the numerous passages cited by Wetstein. I admit, however, that it does appear to
be a fable or parable, properly so called; since all the circumstances seem parabolical, and especially as one very similar to it has been produced by Lightfoot from the Babylonian Gemara, where we are told that a certain king made a great feast, and invited all the strangers; and there came one poor man and stood at his gate, and said unto them, Give me one bit, and they heeded him not; and he said, My Lord the King, of all the great feast thou hast made, is it hard in thy eyes to give me a fragment? The ancient Commentators too (as Theophylact) maintain that it was a parable, not a true history. On this subject I must refer the reader to a long and admirable note of Dr. Whitby. Rosenm. and Kuinoel observe, that Christ here had in view any rich man whose habits were similar to those of the person described in the parable. By this narration (say they) Jesus intended to teach his hearers, and especially the Pharisees, (compare ver. 14.) that transitory and perishable riches are to be faithfully administered, and especially that beneficence and liberality are to be exercised towards the poor, that the inhuman and illiberal are abominable in the sight of God; and are not admitted into the habitations of the blessed, nor will they (as having on earth received their comforts) attain to perpetual and celestial blessings. On the contrary, that the pious poor enjoy the especial favour of God, and, after death, will obtain celestial and perpetual rewards. That Jesus in the present parable has especial reference to the Pharisees, is, for many reasons, very probable.

19. ἐνεδίδυσκετο πορφύραν καὶ βύσσων. It must be observed, that the πορφύρα here denotes purple garments, by an idiom common even in our own language. Purple clothing, which we may suppose had originally been worn only by royal and noble personages, were in the time of our Saviour in general use among the rich and opulent. See Mr. Horne's Introd. p. 4. ch. 2. on the dress of the Jews, vol. 3. p. 392. et seqq. So Eurip. Sthenobæa, b.
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βλος δὲ πορφυρός θαλάσσιος, ουκ εὐτράπεζος: which passage is injudiciously altered by Barnes to περίφορος, by Musgrave to δὲ οὐ περίφορος. The true reading I believe to be δὲ οὐ πορφυρός. The sense will thus be, this life is not like that of the purpurati, i. e. divities, but is θαλάσσιος, not εὐτράπεζος. Hor. Carm. 3, 1, 42. "Nec purpurarum sidere clarior delinit usus." So Liv. 9, 17. "Quum inter purpuram atque aurum, oneratum fortunae apparatibus." That the use of these purple garments was considered as a mark of luxury, appears from Athen. 516, b. τοῦ μὲν Μίδου ὅπ' ἀναδείας καὶ τρωφῆς καὶ ἐν πορφύρα κεμένου. The word βύσσος is derived by Reland from the Persian or Arabic Byz, which he rightly derives from the Hebr., ψῆ, whose origin Forster (in his Tract de Byssio) thinks must be sought for in the Egyptian language, which, after the age of Solomon, began to be in use among the Hebrews; since before that time they had employed the term ψῆ. It denotes extremely fine and high-priced cloth, of which various kinds are mentioned, namely, the Indian, Egyptian, (including the Phoenician,) and the Grecian. The Indian, which seems to have been cotton, is mentioned by Philostr. Vit. Apollon. 2, 9, c. (cited by Wet.) βύσσω τὸν φανερωτέρος αὐτῶν φασίν ἑστάλθαι. And is thus noticed by Pollux 7, 17. § 75. ἡ βύσσος λίνου τὶ εἴδος παρ' 'Ινδοῖς, ἦδη δὲ καὶ παρ' Ἀιγυπτίοις ἀπὸ ἄμωλον τὶ ἔριον γίγνεται, ἐκ οὗ τὴν ἐσθήτα λίνῳ ἀν τις μάλλον φαίνεται πλὴν τοῦ πάχους. The Egyptian is thus described by Pausan. Eliac. 5, 5. θαυμάσια δ' ἐν τῇ γῆ τῆς Ἡλείας τῆς βύσσων, οἵτι εὖ ταύτα μόνον, ἐτέρωθε δὲ οὐδαμοῦ τῆς ἐπίλαθος φύσεως — ἡ δὲ βύσσος ἐν τῇ Ἡλείᾳ λεπτότητος μὲν ἐνεκα οὐκ ἀποδείκνυται τῆς Ἑβραίας, ἐστὶ δὲ οὐχ ὁμοίως ξανθῆ. And Achaic. βίος δὲ αὐτῶν ταῖς πόλεισι ἐστίν ἀπὸ τῆς βύσσου τῆς ἐν τῇ Ἡλείᾳ φυσικῆς: κεκρυφάλους τε γὰρ ἐπὶ αὐτῆς καὶ ἐσθήτα φαίνουσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. See Plin. H. N. 19, 1, Salm. Exerc. Plin. p. 701. and Reland, in his Dissertat. Misc. p. 1, 212. It appears from the passage of Pollux, that in his time the Byssus of Egypt was
composed of linen and cotton, like our *Linsey-woolsey*. These linens, or cottons, were of various colours, and amongst others *purple*; hence there is no reason for supposing (with some) that there is here an *hendiadis*. That these garments were chiefly confined to women, and therefore effeminate, Triller attempts to prove from Theocr. Idyl. 2, 78. *βιστοι καλὸν σύροισα χυτάνα.*

20. *πτωχὸς—ἐβέβλητο πρὸς τὸν πυλῶνα αὐτοῦ ἢλκωμένος.* A frequent resort of beggars was the portal or porch of a rich man’s house. Thus Wetstein cites Hom. Od. ῥ. 336. *Ἰέ σ’ ἐπὶ μελίνου οὐδοῦ ἐντοσθε θυράων.* K. 62. *ἐλάμβανες ὦ ἐς δῶμα παρὰ στάθμοισιν ἐπὶ οὐδοῦ ἐξομή.* where Eustathius observes: *πτωχίκων ἣν καὶ δυσατικών.* We are not therefore to suppose (with Pistophilus, and, as it seems, Beza, Montanus, &c.) that, on endeavouring within the house to obtain the scraps, he was repulsed and thrown there violently. Beggars doubtless stationed themselves at these porches, in order to fall more under the view, and excite the compassion, of the master of the house.

*Ηλκωμένος, full of sores, as persons of this condition often are; cutaneous disorders being induced by their dirt and wretched fare. So Pea 8. (cited by Wets.) “Rogabatur a mendico quodam ulceroso.” The case is considered in a *medical* view by Weddelius and Saubert. I must here adduce an apposite passage of Homer, Od. ῥ. 221. which I am surprised should have escaped all the Commentators: *Πτωχὸν ἀνηρὸν διατῶν ἀπολυμαντῆρα, ὅς πολλῆς φλῆς παράστας φθίνεται αἴμος, Αἰτιζῶν ἀκόλου: where the Scholar well explains, ἀπολυμαντῆρα, τὸν τὰ καθάρματα ἀποφερόμενον τῶν εὐωχίων.*

21. *ἐπιθυμῶν χορτασθῆναι ἀ. τ.* desiring to be fed. So the ancient, and almost all modern Commentators. Elsner, however, renders, “*contentus erat, magni estimabat,*” and says that such is the sense of the word in a passage of Lysias, Orat. 24. p. 31. This interpretation is adopted by Konigsman and
Melchior, as also by Campbell, who translates, "was fain to feed on:" which he supports in a very ingenious note, the substance of which I shall lay before my readers: "There is no foundation for supposing, neither does ἐπιθύμων imply, that he was refused the crumbs. That he did not obtain them, is inconsistent with the circumstances. The word ἐβἐβλητὸ too does not mean that he was once laid there, but that he was usually so placed*, which would not have happened if he had got nothing at all. Moreover, we find that he was known to the rich man. Besides, Abraham does not upbraid him with inhumanity, but only luxury." In all this, however, there appears nothing very convincing. It does not (I grant) appear that he was refused the crumbs; though Grotius and others suppose so. For ἐπιθύμων has merely the force of ἐπαίτων, i. e. humbly praying, i. e. if it were only for the crumbs, by an ellipsis of μόνον, as in a thousand other passages. Indeed his being laid there expressed as much. I must maintain too that the crime of the rich man was not only luxury, and gross sensuality, but that, absorbed in selfish gratification, he had no thought or care for the miseries of his poorer brethren: otherwise, so deplorable an object must have obtained more than the crumbs or scraps from his table. For (as Kuinoel observes) according to the command of the Law (Deut. 15, 7 & 8. Is. 58, 7. Prov. 3, 27.) it was his duty to have afforded more hospitable fare, medical attendance and nursing, to so deplorable an object.

21. τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης, which fell by chance, says Bochart. D'Outrin here notices a maxim of Pythagoras, τὰ πιπτοντα ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης μη ἀναίρεσθαι, which, he says, signifies that

* The word rather seems to indicate that, from infirmity of body, he was laid there by his friends. This word is especially used of sick persons. So Matth. 8, 6. ὁ παῖς μον βέβληται παραλυτικόν. And 14. εἶδε τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν.
they are to be left for the poor. But I see no reason why we should not here interpret Ψίχου σκραπς rather than crumbs, and take ἄξον τίτωντα, not so much for what accidentally fell from the table, as the leavings, the broken meat. This interpretation is confirmed by the passage of Homer just before cited, and the Scholiast.

21. ἄλλα καὶ οἱ κύκλες ἐ. ἀ. τ. ἡ. ἀ. nay the dogs came and licked his sores. Out of pity, say some. Thus Justin 1, 4, 11. (cited by Wets.) Motus et ipsa misericordia, quà motum etiam canem viderat. This however seems uncertain: for (as Doddridge very properly observes,) however lenient and healing the tongue of a dog may be in such cases, the circumstance is surely recorded to shew that his ulcers lay bare, and were not (as Isaiah in another case expresses it, ch. 1. 6.) either closed, or bound up, or mollified with ointment." That dogs are fond of blood, is known. See 1 Kings, 21, 19. and Compare Boyle’s Nat. Philos. pa. 2. p. 230. These circumstances, however, are only ornamental, and are meant to shew the wretchedness of Lazarus, and the barbarous neglect of the rich man.

22. άπενεχθήνας αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τ. ἄ. ἐ. τ. κ. τ.’Α. Αὐτῶν, him, i. e. his soul. For the soul is called by the name borne by the person whose body it occupied; which Grotius illustrates both from the customs of the Hebrews, Greeks, and Latins. Rosenm. and Kuinoel remark, that the simple notion of Lazarus being removed to a state of supreme felicity is dressed up with imagery agreeable to the opinions of the Jews,* who thought that the souls were after death conveyed to their destination, whether to heaven or hell, by Angels, and no doubt (observes Doddridge,) with the utmost propriety, considering how suitable

* On this occasion (observes Rosenm.) as on many others, Jesus did what popular teachers ought, and usually do, who, for the purpose of instruction, accommodate their discourse to the manners of the age, and the opinions of their auditors. This principle will also apply in the following part of this narration.
it is to their benevolent nature, and to the circumstances of a departed spirit. They also represented the joys of heaven under the images of a banquet. All this is illustrated by Schoettgen and Wetstein, from several Rabbinical passages: ex. gr. Targ. Cant. 4, 12. Non possunt ingredi paradisum nisi justi, quorum animae eo feruntur per angelos. This is also illustrated by Capellus Op. p. 254. Hackspan Not. p. 339. Hardt ap. Winckler in Tempe Anecd. p. 537. and Hoffman in a Dissertation on this subject, in his Van. Sacr. p. 81. See also Hieron. Mag. Musc. Vol. 2. p. 1421. of Gruter's Thesaurus Criticus. That this notion had extended to the Greeks and Romans, we may collect from many passages of the Classical writers, and was especially held by the Pythagoreans and Platonists. See Walch's Obs. on N. Test. p. 31. and Munthe's Obs. 171. as also Elsner's Obs. and Drusius. Thus Plato Phæd. 398. (cited by Wets.) ψυχὴν καθαράς τε καὶ μετείχαι τῶν βίων δὲ ξειλθοῦσαν ἐνεμπόρευν καὶ ἠγεμόνων δεινων τυχεῖν. Elsner has well observed that the Greeks and Romans entertained a similar opinion, who thought that Mercury was the ἄγγελος, who, for that reason, is often called πομπαῖος; as in Soph. Aj. 843. (cited by Wets.) καὶ δ' ἁμα Πομπαίοις Ερμῆν χθόνον εἰ μὲ κόμισαν κ. τ. λ. So also Hor. Od. 1, 10, 17. (speaking of Mercury,) Tu pias laetis animas reponis sedibus.

22. εἰς τῶν κόλπων τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ. Here again the imagery is accommodated to the Jewish opinions, and can only be understood, by bearing in mind the Oriental manner of sitting, or rather reclining, at table: by which, the head of one person was necessarily brought almost into the bosom of the one that sat above him, or at the top of the triclinium: and (as Grotius well observes,) the guests were so arranged, that the most favoured should be so placed as to bring them into that situation, with respect to the host. See Joh. 13. 23. 21, 20. This is illustrated by Wetstein, from the Rabbinical writers: ex. gr. Kidduschin, fol. 72, 1. Ada, f. Ahava hodie sedet

23. ἐν τῷ ἄδη. This (says Grotius) is the only passage in the Scriptures, where ἄδης denotes Hell, or the place of torment. That it does so here, has however been denied by many commentators of great name. The limited plan of my work will only permit me to give the valuable matter to be found in Wetstein; and for a fuller consideration of the question, I must refer my readers to Grotius, and to Dr. Campbell's elaborate Dissertation on Hades, not omitting some valuable matter to be found in the 2d. Vol. of Dr. Maltby's Sermons, p. 562. and Schl. Lex. "The word ἄδης (says Wet.) which answers to the Heb. הַדָּעָם, and the Latin infera, denotes the common repository of departed men. So Plaut. Qui nunc abierunt hinc in communem locum. It never signifies either sepulcrum, or heaven. For those who speed their way to heaven, are said to ascend, but those who depart to hell, to descend; and we read of those persons being there deposited, who neither have received the rites of sepulture, nor have tasted the joys of heaven. The rich man in the parable, was apud inferos, in torment, what is suitable neither to the sepulchre, nor to heaven. Joseph is said by his father, to be apud inferos, though he supposed him to have been worried by a wild beast. See Gen. 37, 35. Anthol. 1, 37, 19. 3, 6, 33. Sil. Ital. 18, 525.*
24. ἐκα δέ λαβάς τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου. Wetstein comple-}

νὴ ἐν νῆ ἄνδρων καὶ δικαιῶν—ἐκεῖθεν ἵνα διαλεγόμεθα
πολλοί, καθάπερ εἰς ἀπολογίαν τίνα πέμποντι εἰς τὸ Ἡλίωνον τέκνα
ἀν τίνας τῶν ποιήσων λάβωσι, εἰς τῶν ἄνδρων χώρων ἐκτέμπους κολασθοῦσιν. Hippolyt. c. Plat. peri δὲ δόνων ἐν
ἑωσχοντι πυχαὶ δικαίων καὶ ἁθάνατων—ὅτως ἐστὶν εἰς τὴν κίνη
dιατακτικαστος, χαρὸν ἐπόγειον,—ἐν γὰρ χάριν μὴν ἐπιλάβεται
τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον ὡς φωσσίν ἀνεμοθείᾳ πυχαῖς, ἐν γὰρ κατάσβηθ
που ἄγγελος φωνεῖ—ἐν τούτῳ δὲ χωρίῳ τῶν ἄφορων μει
dήμην πυρὸς ἀβυσσοῦ, ἐν γὰρ πυχαὶ πάντων ποιητῶν ἁμαρτήσων. Theor-
phabetes, Ἡ. 8. ᾿Αλλη λέγεται ἢ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαϊων πρὸς τὸ ἄθικτο καὶ
αἴσχος κατάσβηθ τῆς πυχῆς· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὴν δοξήν,
thανατική γραφὴ σημαινεῖ τὸ δυναμικό τοῦτο, ἐν γὰρ πυχῆς
γίνεσθαι λέγουσιν ἀπολυθεῖσαν τῶν ἁμαρτῶν. Lactantius, 7, 31.
4 Nec tamen quisquam putet, animas post mortem pronitus judici-
ari. Omnes in una communiqui custodiā detinentur, donec tem-
pus adveniat, quo maximus judex meriturum faciat examen." Greg.
Nyssen. de Anima et Resurrect. eis δόνων πάντες σώζοντι
cathare δοχεῖον ἐνθνεῖ τὰς πυχαὶς μετανικασται. Fulgentius ad
Thrasymund. 3. "Christus secundum solam animam ad infernum
descendit." Vigilius, lib. 2. "Ergo dicimus, dominum jacentem
in sepulcro, sed in sola carne; et Dominum descendisse in infer-
num, sed in sola anima." Athanasius τὸ μέγαν [τὰμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ]
μέχρι τάφου φθάσαν, ἢ δὲ (πυχὴ) μέχρι δόνων διαβάσα. Διαἱρεῖ,
τοι ὄντων τῶν τῶν πολλὰ τῆς μέτρης, καὶ τοῦ μέν τῶν σωμάτων
ἐπίδειχομένων τὴν ἐπίβασιν, ἐκεῖσε παρα ὁ τόσµα τοῦ δόνων
ἀσφαλῶν πως, ἐκεῖ παρα ὁ κύριος ἀσφαλέως, ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐνορμήθ
πό τὸν θανάτον. Diphilus. καὶ γὰρ καθὰ δόνων δὸς τρίσους νομίζω
μεν, μιᾶν δικαίων, χατέραν ἄσφαλῶν δόνων. Λ. 6, 540. "Hie le-
ous est, partes ubi se via findit in ambas; Dextera, que Ditis
magni sub menia tendit. Hac iter Elysium nobis: at iugua malo-
rum Exercet ponens, et ad impia tardata mitit." Sophocles ap.
Plut. de aud. Poet. p. 21. f. ὑς τρισόλβες κεῖνον βροτῶν, οἱ ταῦτα
Διορφέτες τῆς Μόλος τοῦ δόνων τοῖς ἐγα μόνος εἰκε τὴν ἔτη,
τοῖς δὲ ἄλλους πάντα τίκε κακα. Dioec. Sic. 1, 98. τὴν ἐν δόνω
ροθοντοίς—ἄσφαλῶν τιμριας καὶ ἄξεστοι λειψίων. Plato; τοῖς
ταῖς τελεία παραδεικνύεται εἰρηκέναι φανεί, τοι δι ὁμόται καὶ
ἀνέλεος εἰς δόνως ἁρίσεται, ἐν ὁξυραθρέ φασται τὸ δὲ κεκαθαρίσως
ἐκεῖνο ἀφικέναι μετὰ θέσιν ὁικέσει. Jos. B. 2, 8, 14. de Soudo-
ceis; τὰς καθὰ δόνων τιμρίας καὶ τιμάς ἁναφιοῦντ. De Pharisais.
A. 18, 13. ἄδρατων τοῦ ἑγκύρ ταις ψυχαῖς πιστοῖς αὐτοῖς εἶναι, καὶ ἐν ὁ
χθονὸς δικαίωσε ταὶ καὶ τιμὰς, οἰς ἀρετῆς ἡ κακίας ἑπιτήδεουσιν εἰς
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24. καταψίξη τὴν γλῶσσάν. Thus (says Wolf,) the glutton is punished in the delinguent member: and he refers to Spanheim on Callim, p. 702 & 718. and of the same opinion is Gregory Mag. in his Pastor. Cur. Part 3. Admon. 20. This however is only hinted, for (as Gregory has there prettily observed,) a skilful musician will so artfully manage the strings of an instrument, as by striking one, to cause another, at the distance of many intermediate chords, to vibrate. So the sacred writers touch on the virtues and vices of men: they specify one, and insinuate praise or censure on another. Rosenm. however remarks, that this circumstance is mentioned, since persons who are burning in flames suffer a most dreadful thirst, and consequently their tongues are parched. The rich man is here represented as supplicating from the poor wretch whom he had before despised, for even the smallest boon, a drop of water; which seems said just as a cup of cold water is on another occasion.

24. ὅδονωμαι, tormented. Wetstein cites Severi Ætna, 271. Torquentur flamma terræ, ferroque

τῷ βίῳ γέγονεν. Tertullian de Animâ: “penes inferos—tormentum et refrigierium—puniri et foveri interim animam in inferis sub expectatione utriiique judicii, in quod usurpatione et candidâ ejus.” Ambrosius de bono mortis, 10. “Satis fuerat dixisse illis, quod liberate animæ corporibus ἐγνή pectoris, i.e. locum qui non videtur, quam locum Latine infernus dicimus. Denique et Scriptura habitacula illa animarum promptaria nominavit.” (Wets.) The Rabbinical writings represent Paradise and Gehenna as so placed, that from the former there is a prospect of the latter. On the words ἐκφαίρας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς Rosenm. observes, that not only the ancient Greeks, but Hebrews, were of opinion that the shades, or souls, of departed persons, when separated from the body, were in all things similar to the body, but were subtiliores. They are represented as τρίζουσαι, i.e. gibbering, to use a Shakspieran word, though in a very faint voice. So Hom., Od. 24. (cited by Bulkley.) τῷ ἰγε κυνήσας, ταὶ δὲ τρίζουσαι ἐποντὸ. Thus (says Rosenm.) Jesus acted the part of a most wise teacher, by accommodating himself to the capacities of his countrymen, who would not have understood him, if he had disputed with them on the nature of the soul with philosophical accuracy. Caput rei est, animas humanas post mortem corporis esse superstites, esse sibi sui conscias, aut male aut bene iis esse, etc. quæ omnia a Jesu in hac parabolâ confirmantur.

25. ἀπέλαβες σου τὰ ἁγαθὰ σου. So it is similarly said in Matth. 6, 2. ἀπέκουσι τῶν μισθῶν αὐτῶν. The passage may therefore be paraphrased thus: “thou hast received what thou accountedst good things, in which thou didst place thy happiness, as riches, luxury, pleasure.” “This is (says Hammond,) confirmable to the Hebrews, who use the phrase “receiveth his world,” for a course of secular felicity; they say, “he who shall pass forty days without chastisements, hath received his world, a full abundant reward for the good he hath done here.” This is illustrated from the Rabbinical writings, by Schoettgen and Scheid, ap. Meuschen, as also by Wets. who likewise produces some Classical passages, as Anthol. 1, 80, 15. εἰ τέτις εὐπερίης πλούσιος τούχοι ηδὲ καὶ ἄρχης, οὐκ ἐστὶ γιγαντιαίη, τὸς πέλειον πρότερον. Τὴν ποτὲ γὰρ ψιλὴν ἀπαναίνεται, ἀφρονέων δὲ τέρνην ὀλισθηρῆς οὐ δεδάκτα τούχης. Ἡς ποτὲ γὰρ πτωχῶς ταλαπείροις, οὐκ ἐθέλεις δὲ αὐτῷ ἀκόλουθος υἱὸν ἑτερος παρέχειν. Πάντα, φίλος, μερίστησον παρέχεται. Εἰ δ’ ἀπίσθετοις, ἐκμαλὼν αὐτῶν, μάρτυρα σωτήρον ἔχοις.

25. παρακάλεται. The word π. properly denotes to console (by words), to comfort, recreate, by words, or deeds, to bless, make happy, as here. This sense is illustrated from the Rabbinical writers by Schoettgen.

26. ἐστὶ πάσι τοῖς, besides, super hæc omnia, denique. Wetstein and Kypke produce numerous examples from the Classical writers.

26. μεταξъ ἡμῶν — χάσμα μεγά ἐστημενται, i. e. a chasm, rupture, hiatus, gap. The word is especially used (says Wetstein,) of a space which is extended from an upper to a lower situation, particularly fissures and ruptures of the earth, produced by earthquakes. So Philo 2, 17, 13. χάσματα γῆς ὁρῶ διηνογμένης ἐτὶ 2 6 2
mōkriton eφυνάμενα. Longi Pastoral, 1. p. 13. Plin. H. N. 2, 66. fit et celi ipsius hiatus, quod vocant χάσματα. Lucian. Dial. Mort. 91, 1. calls the deep and dark hiatus, through which lay the descent to the infernal regiona χάσμα and Heisiod, Theogon. 740. makes mention of a χάσμα in Tartarus, on which passage, see Grevius. Herodot, 4, 85. ἄκα αἰόσων ἐστι χάσμα γῆς ὡς ἄβαλλαιν ἀφανίζεται. In Plutarch, p. 565. θ. Theophrastus sees in the infernal regions, χάσμα μεγά καὶ κάτω διήκον. Thus also Plato in Phaed. χάσματα γῆς, and especially in a very curious passage de Repub. L. 10. ἄφιη δὲ, ἐπείδη οἱ ἐκβιομεν τῶν ψυχῶν, περεύσθαι μετὰ πολλῶν, καὶ ἀφυμενοσθαι σφαῖρ ἐν τόπων τινα δαίμονοι, ἐν τῆς τε γῆς διὸ ἐναι χάσματα ἐχομένα ἀλλήλαν, καὶ τοῦ ὁμαντοῦ ἐν τῶ ἄνω ἀλλὰ καταντήσας, δικαστάς δὲ μεταξὺ τῶν κάθησατο—οἰρόν δὴ ταύτῃ μὲν ἐκάτερον τὸ χάσμα τοῦ ὄμαντο καὶ γῆς ἀκούσας τὰς ψυχὰς, ἐπείδη αὐτῷ δικασθείσης—ἐκείνω τε καταδομέν ἐξαίφνητο καὶ ἄλλος, σχεδὸν τι αὐτῶν τῶν πλεῖστοι τυράννοι, ἦσαν δὲ καὶ ἢτανται τιμῶν μεγάλα ἑμπαθητάτων, καὶ ὁμολογοὺς ἢν ἀναβάθησθαι, οὐκ ἐδέχετο τὸ στόμα, ἀλλὰ ἐμπικοτό, ὡς τε τῶν ὄμεν ἀνάκτωσ ἐχότων εἰς πανθήσας ὁ μὴ ἱκάνως διακόμης δικη διπρεποί αἰνέως. Consult also Kypke, who has much matter illustrative of the notion of the Ancients concerning Tartorus; see also Crantor, in Phosph. 1054. Some vain speculations on the nature of this χάσμα, are brought forward by several critics, referred to by Pole, Wolf, and Koecher. Ἑντηρίμεναι, means formed, constituted. The Hebrews, and perhaps the Greeks, thought that Orcus was divided into two parts, by a deep (but, as it seems, not very wide,) chasm.

26. ὡς oί δὲλοντες — διαπερασάν. Wetstein compares a similar expression in Plin. H. N. 2, 67. Maria circumfusa undique diviendo globo partem nobis aequaerunt orbis, nec inde huc nec hinc illo pervio tractu; and in Lucian Dial. Mort. 17. οὐχ ὃρα ὕπα ἄλλον μετὰ τούτων ὀδην, ὃς θάνατον ἐնτευθεν εἰς ἑτερον τόκων. 27. ἵνα περεύθην αὐτῶν, i. e. restored to life, and
clothed with a human body, lest any should suspect that it was merely an optical deception. It must be observed, that the number five is mentioned, because in a story, such circumstances are usually expressed, in order to give an air of reality to the narrative. Doddridge remarks, that his having five brethren living in his father's house, implies that he must have died young: a circumstance (says he,) meant doubtless, to read an impressive lesson to young and rich sensualists.

28. δόξω διαμαρτύρηται ε. The best modern commentators explain διαμαρτύρηται, "may testify, teach, manifest, what things he has here seen." Compare 1 Sam. 21, 2. Eg. 16, 2. So Plato de Republ. L. 10. (cited by Grotius,) where Erus the Armenian, after death, approaching to the Judges, έαυτον δε προσελθώντα εἰσείν οτι δει αυτων αγγελον ανθρώπων γενόσαν τον έκει και διεκελεύωντο αε ακοιν τε και βεβαίαι πάντα τα εν τοι τόπο. But I prefer, with Schleusner in his Lex. and Campbell, warn, admonish; seriously exhort; or we may conjoin both senses, and render seriously admonish, by bearing witness of these truths. It must be observed that the δόξω, is not, as many suppose, redundant.

29. ἔχοντο Μωσέα καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, i. e. they have those venerable personages in their books, bearing testimony to a future existence, and admonishing them to lead a life agreeable to the precepts of virtue.† Lightfoot remarks that the Hagiographa is omitted, "because (he suggests, with the approbation of Wetts,) it was not read in the public service of the Synagogue." But it nevertheless formed part of that Scripture which was given for doctrine and in-

* It is true (observes Doddridge,) Moses no where expressly asserts a future state of rewards and punishments; yet the facts recorded by him, strongly enforce the natural arguments in proof of it; and the prophets speak plainly of it in many places.

† Euthymius paraphrases. "They have Moses and the Prophets, and surely thou cannot pretend to feel more solicitous for their welfare, than the God who made them, and gave them so many teachers."
struction, &c. I assent to the opinion of Wolf, Hackspan, and Kuinoel, that the Hagiographa is here included, and that by the formula Moses and the Prophets, are to be understood the sacred books of the Jews, as in Matth. 17, 5.

30. ὦχι, πάτερ Α. The construction is elliptical. We must supply ἀκόνωσιν, “they will not attend to them, they will slight them, as I did.”

30. ἔν τις ἄπο νεκρῶν ποιεῖ ἡ π. α. μ. but if one went unto them from the dead. From him truth might be expected, since he could have no motive to deceive. Euthymius thus paraphrases the passage: “They disbelieve the books of the law, as written by the living, who had not yet seen the things of a future state; but if any one went unto them from the dead, they would believe, because they would suppose that he had seen all.” Wetstein compares Artemidor. 2, 74. ἐτί τῶν ἄξιοπιστῶν εἰσὶ καὶ οἱ νεκροί, ἔτει πάντως ἄληθεύοντι: διὰ γὰρ δόε ταῦτα οἱ ψευδόμενοι ἀκα-
tωσιν, ᾧ διὰ τὸ ἐλπίζειν τι, ᾧ διὰ τὸ φοβεῖσθαι· οἱ δὲ μὴ ἐλπίζοντες τι μὴ ἐφοβοῦντοι, εἰκότως ἄληθῆ λέγου-
σιν, μάλιστα δὲ οἱ νεκροὶ εἰσὶ τοιῶντι.

31. εἰ Μωσέας καὶ τῶν προφητῶν — πεισθήσονται. The Jews themselves confessed that the law was delivered to them by God, and confirmed by manifest and signal miracles, the report of which, as handed down to them from their ancestors, they had received. Yet they led a life contrary to the plain injunctions of the law. Nothing, therefore, hindered their reformation but a perverse mind unwilling to embrace, as true, what they could not prove to be false. (Rosenm.) Theophylact observes, that since God will not raise any from the dead to inform us of the things of another world: οὐδὲν οὐτῶς ἁφελεί αὐς ἡ τῶν γραφῶν ἀκριβῆς ἔρευνα, nothing is so profitable as an accurate examination and scrutiny into the Scriptures. The passage may be thus paraphrased: “Occasions of repentance and reformation are not wanting to them. If, therefore, they will not embrace these, not even miracles could move their perverse and stubborn
wills.” In point of fact, the truth of this assertion was evinced in the case of Christ himself. For (as Euthymius observes) when Lazarus, the brother of Martha and Mary, was raised by our Lord from the dead, and spoke concerning the place of departed spirits, the Jews would have put him to death.” “The impenitence (says Doddridge) of many who saw another Lazarus raised from the dead (Joh. 11, 4.) and the wickedness of the soldiers who were eye-witnesses to the resurrection of Christ, and yet that very day suffered themselves to be hired to bear a false testimony against it, (Matth. 28, 4, 5.) are most affecting, and astonishing, illustrations of this truth; for each of those miracles was far more convincing than such an apparition as is here referred to would have been; which, though it might indeed alarm them for a time, the same prejudices and lusts which led them to despise those methods of instruction that God had given them, would also lead them long, to slight and forget such an awful apparition. (Doddridge.) In this view Wetstein cites Alcipp. Ep. 2, 4. οὐδ’ εἰ θεός μου (το λεγόμενον) φθέγξατε, πεισθήν αὐ. I add D. Cass. 880, 12. οὐδ’ ἀν εἰ σαφώς θερός τεί προέλεγεν ὅτι τοσαύτη ὁι ὑλίγου μεταβολή γενή- σσαι, ἐπιστευν ἀν τείς. See, on this subject, an admirable Discourse by Bishop Atterbury, vol. 2. Serm. 2. and Bishop Sherlock, vol. 2. Serm. 15. *

* I cannot conclude the notes to this most important parable, without recommending to the attention of my reflecting readers the following admirable observations of Dr. Campbell on the scope of the parable, and the degree of criminality to be attached to Di- ves. “Much injury has been done to our Saviour’s instructions by the ill-judged endeavours of some expositors to improve and strengthen them. I know no better example for illustrating this remark than the story of the rich man and Lazarus. Many, dissatisfied with its simplicity, as related by the Evangelist, and desirous, one would think, to vindicate the character of the Judge from the charge of excessive severity in the condemnation of the former, load that wretched man with all the crimes which can blacken human nature, and for which they have no authority from the words of inspiration. They will have him to have been a glutton and a drunkard, rapacious and unjust, cruel and hard-hearted, one who spent in intemperance what he had acquired by extortion
Many various and different discourses of Christ are here brought together, as is shown in the notes on Matth. 18, 7. 15, 21.

Verse 1. άνενδεκτον, scil. χρήμα. "Ανενδεκτον is here put for δώσατον, as in Diog. Laert. δώσατον, εἴρει, εἰ μή τε ἐστιν αὐτὸς κ. τ. λ. So Matth. 18, 7. ἀνομίας ἐστιν ἐυλογία τὰ σκάνδαλα. The necessity here mentioned is not (says Rosenmuller, from Theophylact) to be understood of physical or absolute impossibility, but of condition, and consequence.

2. λυτρελείον αὐτῷ. This is as much as to say that the crime is even greater than sacrilege, which was punished in the manner here mentioned; as we learn from Diodor. Sic. t. 7. p. 93. where see Wesseling. To the examples produced by Schleusner, I add Eurip. Phcen. 600.

4. ἐσπάνια. Wetstein observes, that Symmachus sometimes translates the Heb. יִכְשׁ by πλεονάκις, and sometimes πλεονάκις for ἐσπάνια, and that Euthymius, on Psalm 119, 64. remarks on the Hebrews using ἐσπάνια for τολλάνις. To this purpose Wetstein cites several Rabbinical passages, ex. gr. Bemidbar R. 19.

and fraud. Now, I must be allowed to remark, that by so doing they totally pervert the design of this most instructive lesson, which is, to admonish us, not that a monster of wickedness, who has, as it were, devoted his life to the service of Satan, shall be punished in the other world, but that the man who, though not chargeable with doing much ill, does little or no good, and lives, though not perhaps an intemperate, a sensual life, who, careless about the situation of others, exists only for the gratification of himself, the indulgence of his own appetites, and his own vanity, shall not escape punishment. It is to show the danger of living in the neglect of duties, though not chargeable with the commission of crimes; and, particularly, the danger of considering the gift of Providence as our own property, and not as a trust from our Creator, to be employed in his service, and for which we are accountable to him. These appear to be the reasons for which our Lord has here shewn the evil of a life which, so far from being universally detested, is, at this day, but too much admired, envied, and imitated.
5. 6. See the note on Matth. 17, 19. The passage is thus paraphrased by Wetts. "Thou hast given us much excellent instruction about charity and benevolence towards men, now teach us also concerning faith towards God, by whom we believe thee to have been sent. What thou hast already propounded to us we believe; but we desire to have more communicated to us, concerning the time and the manner in which thou wilt restore the kingdom of Israel." (Wetts.) In the two narrations of Matthew and Mark the hyperbole is varied: in Matthew it is, "say to this mountain," &c. in Luke, "say to this sycamore tree," &c. by which latter word is designated the Egyptian fig, brought from Egypt into Palestine, which, from its similarity both to the ficus and the morus, was called sycamore, as we learn from Dioscorid. 1, 182. cited by Wetstein, who has a vast number of other passages on this subject, from Athenæus, 115. v. Pliny, Theophrastus, Solinus, and Galen. See Mr. Elsley’s instructive note on this passage. Wetstein produces from the Rabbinical writers many very similar hyperboles to that of tearing up trees by the root. He also subjoins some examples of similar hyperboles (which merely mean physical impossibilities) from the Classical writers: ex. gr. Virg. Æn. 4, 490. Mugire videbis sub pedibus terram, et descendere montibus ornos. Lucian. Contempl. 3. Virg. Ecl. 6, 71. Cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos. Philostrat. de Orpheo: οἷον ἔλεται δὲ τι καὶ μείζον, δένδρα γὰρ ἀναστάσιν ἐκ βίβων, ἄκρων ἄγει ταῖρα. He also cites Ælian. V. H. 5, 55. and Oppian de Venet. 2, 533. who assert, that elephants have been known to tear up trees by the roots. The answer of our Lord is thus paraphrased by Wetstein: "Why do ye ask an increase of faith and knowledge, seeing that ye boast of having what ye use not? First shew me your faith by your works. Unless ye do this, in vain will ye say ye have faith, and in vain would a larger portion of faith be committed to you."
7, 8. The following parable (which does not cohere with the preceding) Kuinoel thinks was brought forward at some other time: probably when the Apostles asked, "what reward shall we have, who have left all, and followed thee?" Euthymius, however, thus ingeniously traces the connection: "After having, in the preceding discourses, inculcated on the disciples the necessity of good works, he now, by this example, intends to check that vaunting spirit which is so apt to accompany them, and teaches," &c. The remaining part of the same note of Euthymius is well deserving of attention.

7. δουλον ἔχων. Kuinoel observes, that by δούλος we are here to understand not a hired servant, whether plower or herdsman, but a slave. Παρέλθων is put for εἰσελθών, as in Xen. Symp. 9, 3. Anab. 2, 4, 6. Arrian. Exp. A. 1, 8, 2. See Suidas and Hesychius, and also Raphel. Bengel and Matthias read ἀνάστεσαι, but Griesbach and Kuinoel prefer the less common word ἀνάστησαι, the authority of which is proved by the examples of Krebs and Abresch.

10. δοῦλοι ἀρχεῖοι—πεποιηκαμεν. Many Interpreters think that the words of Christ are to be applied to all men without exception, even the very best. But the usage of Scripture, and the connection with the preceding and following words, require a very different interpretation. First, the Scripture plainly makes two classes of servants, useful and useless. (Matt. 25, 30. Rom. 3, 12. 2 Tim. 2, 21. Philem. 11.) To the latter the master gives neither praise nor thanks, nay, he reproves them sharply, and at length punishes them severely; but on the former he bestows praise, honour, and favour. (1 Pet. 2, 19, 20. Apoc. 19, 9. Luke 12, 37. & 22, 30. Joh. 13, 14.) There are, indeed, servants who serve serviliter, who do nothing but what they are ordered to do: others serve freely, as sons who, without waiting for orders, voluntarily and zealously perform such things as they think will be useful, and likely to please their master. The former Christ here
glances at, and reproves, to the end that he may lead them on to a higher degree of holiness; namely, that they may serve God with their whole heart, and with entire confidence. Hence in the following verses he praises the faithful attachment of the Samaritan, who returned (not because he was commanded, but of his own accord) that he might publicly and audibly return thanks to Christ, a deed which would have lost all its praise, if it had been ordered.*

11. ἐν τῇ παρεκκλησίᾳ—διάφρυτο ὑμ. Σ. κ. Γ. The Commentators here enquire how Luke, in speaking of a journey to Jerusalem, could place Samaria before Galilee; since that province was in the middle between Judæa and Galilee. Wetstein thinks (as De Dieu had done before him) that Jesus did not pass by the direct route and shortest way to Jerusalem, i.e. through Samaria, but when he had come to the confines of Samaria and Galilee, bent his course towards the East, so as to have Samaria on the right, and Galilee on the left. Thus he seems to have passed the Jordan at Scythopolis (where there was a bridge), and to have descended along the bank on the Phæan side, until he again crossed the river, when he came opposite to Jericho. The reason which induced our Lord to take this route was (as Wetstein conject.

non omisit, sed fecit illud. Hoc consilium domini et filii et amici ejus comprobaret, ut fieret scilicet hic servus coheres filio. Post dies delende non multas convocatis amicis paterfamilias misit de eàm sae servio illi cibos complures. Quos cum accipisset illis, sustulit ex eis, quod sufficiebat sibi, reliquum autem conservis suis distribuit. Quibus acceptis illi tætati sunt, et coeperunt illi aptare, ut majorem gratiam apud dominum inveniret, ob ea que fecerat ipsis. Hec omnia cum audisset dominus ejus, perceptit iterum maximum gaudium, et convocatis rursum amicis et filio, exponit factum servi sui de cibis suis, quos ei miserat. Illi itaque tantó magis assenserunt patrifamilias, ipsum servum coheredem filio debere sieri.” Origenes in Rom. And 3, 12. “Donec enim quis hoc facit tantum, quod debet, i.e. ex quâ praecipitam sunt, inutilis est servus; si autem addas aliquid praecipis, tum non jam inutilis servus eris, sed dicetur ad te: Euge serve bone et fidelis. So also Origen on Ps. 119, 6. εὐφυσα δὲ τὰ περὶ ἃν ὁ πρὸσετάγμην ἴσως, ἀλλὰ τοιοῦτον τῇ προηρέσει—δὲ τινα μὲν τοιούτων ὁποιοῦ τοσοτοῦν δοῦλα, τινὰ δὲ πρᾶσομεν ἐκνομίζω. So also Chrys. T. 8. p. 36. Ambros. de viduis. Augustin de Virginitate 14. Plaut. Sticho. 1, 2, 1. Qui manet, ut moneatur, semper servus homi officium suum non voluntate id facere meminit, servus is habitus hauud probus est. Seneca Controv. 2, 13. Non est beneficiuin, sed officium, facere quod debes. Ter. Adelph. 4, 3, 2. I add Hor. Ep. 1, 16. 46. nec furtum feci, nec fugii, si mihi dicas servus: Habes pretium, loris non ucrrias, aio, &c. Many similar passages are produced from the Rabbinical writers, by Buxturf in his Lex. Talm. 791. and Scheid, ap. Menschen, p. 143. See also Dr. Hammond and Dr. Whitby’s notes, or the abridgment of them, in Mr. Elstey.
tures) both to avoid any molestation from the Samaritans, and at the same time to make a greater number of Jews partakers of his benefits. He cites a similar case from the Rabbinical writers. But Michaelis, Hezel, and others, contend that Luke here (as often) has not observed the order of time. See Campbell. Dr. Clarke adopts the method proposed by De Dieu and Wetstein. Elsley, however, thinks that the text may denote no more than that he passed through part of Galilee and Samaria.

12. εἰσεγχομένου. Since lepers were excluded from cities and towns, we must explain the word εἰσεγχο-
μένου as he was entering, or about to enter, &c. See the Persic version ap. Koecher. They therefore met him on the outside of the gate; and when it is said, they stood afar off, we must understand that they did what was ordered by the law. See the Rabbinical passages cited by Schoettgen and Wetstein, from which it appears that the Rabbins were not agreed as to the distance within which lepers might approach to others. Some said four cubits; others extended the distance to an hundred. See Lightfoot.

14. εἰπειδὲ ἐπέστη τοῖς λεπτοῖς. Euthymius has well illustrated the circumstances of the case in the following words: Μὴν καθαρίσας αὐτῶν πέμψει ἐμ-
φανισθησόμενους τοῖς λεπτοῖς, ὡς ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι μὲν-
λος καθαρισθήναι τούτα δὲ πεποίηκε, δικαίος ἔστιν τὴν ἔλεην αὐτῶν ἵνα διεστειλάτως, ἐτὶ διὰ τοῦ πορεύμα-
τος αὐτῶς καθαρίσαι, ἑπιστάκτως ἐξάδιδεν, “Jesus did not immediately cleanse them, but sent them to show themselves to the priest, intending that they should be healed on the way. This he did, to try their faith. They, believing that he could heal them, even when already gone, turned their steps forward without entertaining any doubts with respect to what was commanded them.” (Euthymius.) It was usual for a leprous person to go to the Priest, either that he might know whether he were affected with the disorder (which was here manifest), or that he might make known his restoration to health; and perhaps
in order to receive from the Priest a certificate of his recovery, which would enable him to be received back into society. Thus Luke meant to say, that health was restored to the lepers. This we learn from the words καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὕπάγειν αὐτοῖς, ἑκατέρους. On the reason which induced our Lord to send the men to the Priests, see the note on Matt. 8, 8. seqq. Why Jesus used the plural, ἰησοῦ, has been acutely discussed by Wetstein in the following words: "There was no need for one person to show himself to many priests (Matt. 8, 4.); but Jesus orders the Jews to go to Jerusalem, and the Samaritans to Mount Gerizim. For although our Lord did not approve of the Samaritan form of worship, (Joh. 4, 22.) yet in a question which concerned not the worship of God, but was merely a medical and political one, he could not but send each to their own judges. So Kiddushin, fol. 75, 2. R. Akiba judicavit sacerdotes Cutnæos—esse legitimos. Tertullian, however, comes to a contrary conclusion, namely, that Christ here decided the question in favour of the sanctity of the Temple at Jerusalem, against the Samaritans and Mount Gerizim, by sending this Samaritan to the Temple.

16. ἦσσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον παρὰ τῶν πάθων αὐτῶν. Triller observes, that it was customary for sick persons, (especially the poor,) on recovery, to cast themselves down, and embrace the knees of their physicians; as we find from Hippocrates Præcept. § 6. and Seneca de Brev. Vit. 6, 8. (cited by Wolf): At eodem ægros vide, si mortis periculum admotum est proprius, medicorum genua tangentes.

18. οὐχ εὐφέβησαν ὑποθεραπεύσαντες. The best philologists agree that εὑρίσκω is here to be taken for ἐλναί, esse. Wetstein gives several examples from the Latin writers; as other philologists have done from the Greek.

18. ᾧ ἀλλογένης. So the Hebr. י. Thus Josephus names the Samaritans ἀλλοεθνεῖς. They were formed
from a colony of Cuthæans, (2 Kings 17, 24, &c.)
and are yet called by the Jews, in reproach, Cuthim;
yet they had the Pentateuch; and many Jews who
had offended against the law of meats, or of the
Sabbath, fled to Sichem, says Josephus, and dwelt
there. Hence partly the hatred expressed in Ecclus.
1, 26. (Grot. ap. Elsley.) I add a passage of Schek-
alm, fol. 46, 4. (cited by Wets.): Rabbi dixit: Sam-
maritanus est sicut Ethnicus. R. Simeon Gama-
lielis dixit: Cuthæus est sicut Israelita ad omnia. R.
Lazar, traditio est de Ethnicis, non de Cuthæis.—
At traditio contra dicit R. Lazarus. By many of the
Rabbins it was accounted a doubtful question. But
Wetstein observes that this must be understood of
the earlier ages, for (says he) from the time in which
the dove’s head was found in Mount Gerizim, and wor-
shipped by the Cuthæans, they were reckoned Gen-
tiles. Here, therefore, Christ speaks after the op-
inion and estimation of the more rigid Jews; but, in
the following verse, his discourse is characterised
with far greater mildness and lenity. See Zach. 9,

19. ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκε σε. And yet their faith
had saved the rest also. But it must be remembered,
that though the ten had faith, he alone had both
faith and gratitude. (Euthymius.)

20. ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. The expression “King-
dom of God” is here to be taken in the Jewish sense
for the appearance and manifestation of King Mes-
siah, which they expected would take place with
great pomp and signal victories. (Wets.) Euthy-
mius thinks this was said in derision of the humble-
ness of his appearance.

20. οὗ ἔχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρή-
σεως. On the interpretation of this word Commen-
tators are not quite agreed. Michaelis says there is
no Classical example of the word: but Kypke has
produced three, from Plutarch, Antoninus, and Lon-
ginus, to which Bishop Marsh adds a fourth from
Arrian. The sense prevailing in those passages is
attention, observation; which does not seem suitably here. I therefore prefer the interpretation of others; namely, splendour, pomp, what falls under observation, or, by its appearance, particularly strikes the senses. Euthymius explains, μετὰ παραφανείας ἡρωϊκής, μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας, splendour, riches, triumpha, &c. So also Doddridge and Campbell, the latter of whom renders parade. I do not, however, disapprove of the interpretation, ut observari posset, so that it may be observed and known. See Elsner and Kypke. Koecher thinks that both these interpretations may be omitted, or might very well be conjoined. That some Jews were wiser, and maintained that the heavenly King would not come with noise and pomp, but with silence, has been shown from the Rabbinical writings by Scheid ap. Meuschen, p. 144.

21. οὐδὲ ἐρωτησάται Ἡσαῦ οδε, η Ἡσαῦ ἐκεῖ, i. e. there shall be no one who shall say "he is here, his camp, standard, &c. are in that mountain, in Cyrene, in the city of Bitter," as the false Christ used to say, (Rosenm. and Kuin.) as is usual (observes Euthymius,) with respect to earthly monarchs.

21. ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῶν ἐστιν. There has here been some difference of interpretation, arising from the uncertainty of the word ἐν, which some render among, others in. The former interpretation is adopted by the best critics, both ancient and modern, who observe that ἐν is sometimes used for ἐν, inter, among, in the Classical writers; as Xen. Anab. 1, 19, 2. Aelian, V. H. 9, 3. The other interpretation is however supported by Dr. Campbell, in a long annotation. He takes βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, for the doctrine of the kingdom of God; and by ἐν ἡμῶν, understands the whole Jewish nation. This may be admitted; but it seems by no means so apt a sense. The whole of the criticism in his note is very frivolous, and unsatisfactory. See Grot. and Whitby, or Elsley.

22. ἔλευσον τῇ ἡμέρᾳ — ἐνέσθε, i. e., "the time
will come when you shall, with sorrow, regret me when you can no longer behold me, and shall long for that intercourse which you now enjoy. Then shall men say, "Lo he is here, or there." Jesus alludes to those times of public calamity, when impostors will be ready to seduce and draw over to their party, not only the bad and seditious, but even the good and pious. See the note on Matth. 24, 29. So also Le Clerc, whom see ap. Elsley. Wetstein compares Dionys. Hal, 6, 71. εἰ δὲ παρήσετε τῶν καιρῶν τούτων, εὑρεῖσθε ἃν πολλάκις ὡμοιον εὑρεῖν ἑτέρον: and 7, 24. εἰ δὲ ἀφῆσετε καὶ τούτων ἐκ τῶν θειρῶν τῶν καιρῶν, πολλάκις εὑρέσθε τοιούτων τυχεῖν ἑτέρον. Aristides de Pace, 2. ἦν μὲν ἐκ πολλῶν παντες ἡμέραν ἰδεῖν ἐπεθυμοῦμεν, ῥής ἐστιν. Jamblich. Vit. Pyth. 35. Cic. Tuscul. 5, 19. Stat. Silv. 2, 7. Propert. 4, 7, 26. Διαίξητε, follow them. Matth. 24, 6.


26—29. The sentiment, laying aside the imagery, is simply this: "Calamity the heaviest hangs over the Jews, and will overwhelm them, when they least expect it." See the notes on Matth. 24, 37, 38. (Kuinoel.) And the note on Matth. 24, 38. The example of Sodom, is often brought forward by the sacred writers both of the Old and New Testament, to describe impiety the most heinous, and divine vengeance the most exemplary. In this view, the Rabbins frequently instance the deluge. See Wets.

29. ἐβρεθέν τῷ καὶ θεῖον ἀπ' οὕρανοι, rained down. After ἐβρεθέν, must be supplied θεῖος, which is a very
frequent ellipsis. See Matth. 5, 45. 

πῦρ denotes lightning; and such is the proper signification of βείων, i.e. divine fire. Thus, places struck with lightning, were said to be βείων, and were set apart from human use. Since however, in such places, there are (to use the words of Lucret. 6, 219.) inusta vapore signa, notaeque graves, halantes sulphuris auras, and since lightning has a sulphureous smell, hence it is often used for sulphur, as here, and in Apoc. 14, 10, 19, 20. Thus Euthymius explains it θείαφίων. Therefore, by τὸ τοῦ βείων, is denoted a sulphureous fire, i.e. lightning. The plain in which Sodom and Gomorrah were situated, being struck with lightning, was full of bitumen; and fountains of naptha, were also there found. But bitumen and naptha, are extremely combustible, and, when the overwhelming flames had raged far and wide, the glebarum compages being destroyed, the whole tract gradually subsided, and the soro from the adjacent parts settling into it, it presented the appearance, first of a marsh, and then of a low stagnant pool. See Michaelis, in his Dissertation on the nature and origin of the Dead Sea, in Comment. Gotting. 1758—1762.

32. μνημονεύετε τὴν γυναῖκας Λωτ, "remember what happened to Lot's wife." See Gen. 19, 26. On that memorable occurrence, there has been some difference of sentiment. The opinions, upon the whole, may be said to form two classes. First, that adopted by the Ancients, as Josephus, Philo, and the Christian Fathers in general, and of the modern Commentators, by Grotius, Beza, Heinsius, Ottius, Beausobre, Bengel, Wolf, Bartholin, and the English Theological School in general; namely, that Lot's wife, when she had turned back, contrary to the command of the Angel, became suddenly and really changed into a solid pillar of mineral salt, which is as hard as marble, and admits of being hewn and shaped for architectural purposes, since it never liquefies by exposure to wet. Rauwolf tells us that it is yet seen; but more recent, and more
judicious travellers, contradict this assertion. Secondly, it is maintained by Lé Clerc, (on Genes.) Heuman, Hardt, Weddelius, Aaron Karæus, (a learned Jew;) Schoettgen, Rambach, Gudius, Nagel, Dath; Kriegel, Rosenm. Kuinoel, and others, that Lot’s wife turned round, meaning to return back into the city to fetch some σκέυη, or article of household furniture, and sticking fast in the salsuginous earth, was suffocated by the smoke, and the corpse indurated in the sulphureous vapour: which Heuman and Starck think might be effected by natural causes. They maintain too that this interpretation is more suitable to the preceding words ὃς ἔσται — ἀνίσω, from which it appears that Lot’s wife did turn back to fetch away some σκέυη. Kuinoel, Dath, and Rosenm. on the passage of Gen. affirm that Ἰνοί never signifies a statue or monument: but that Ἰνοί διά denotes hasit in sinza. Wetstein cites LycoPhron, 826. καὶ πέμπετο γραφὴν μαρμαρωμένην ἐκάρα. Callimach. H. in Apollin. 24. Πέτρος ὁ Ορτίς ἐν Φρυγίᾳ διερῶ λαθὸς ἑστηρίκται Μάρμαρον ἀντὶ γυναικὸς. Propert. 3, 8, 8. “Et Niobæ lacrymas supprimat ipse lapsis.”

33. ὃς εἰπὶ ἔτης — ἀπολέει αὐτῆς. Christ here applies a general gnom, which he pronounced on another occasion. See the note on Matth. 10, 39. to which I add Isocrat. Archid. 44. p. 211. ἐαν μὲν γὰρ ἑπέλαμνεν ἀπολυθροομένων ὑπὲρ τῶν δικαίων, οὐ μόνον εὐκολο-μύσμοις, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐπίλοιπον πρὸνον ἀσφαλῶς ἡμῖν ἐξεσται ὡς and Tyrtæus frag. 1, 18. μηδὲ φιλοφύ-κετε.

34. ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ ἐσοντο δὺ δεὶ κλίνῃς μιᾶς. By the term night the best Commentators tells us is here designated that advent of the Messiah which shall be ushered in by dire calamities; for that the term night has often the figurative sense of calaimit and trouble. So L. Brug. and Groti, as also Rosennm. and Kuinoel. But this would here be extremely harsh. I prefer therefore to interpret νυκτὶ of the final close and catastrophe of things temporal; for as the
word is used of death, so it may very well denote the end of the world. Thus Joh. 9, 4. "The night cometh, when no man can work." Nor can any objection be founded on the word κλίνη, which (as Markland and Kuinoel have observed) may be taken in the sense of lectus tricliniaris. Still less will it be necessary (with Dr. Owen) to render κλίνη bedchamber: which he was induced to do, in order to remove the objection, that it is not customary in the East for two men to lie in one bed. See Harmer's Obs. vol. 1. p. 165.

On verse 37 see the note on Matth. 24, 38.

CHAP. XVIII.

The parable with which this Chapter commences is clearly connected with the preceding discourses of our Lord. The intent of it was, that the Disciples should be excited to constant prayer, and implicit reliance on Divine assistance. An exhortation especially necessary, in order that they might understand how to overcome, or alleviate, the impending evils which should precede the destruction of Jerusalem.

Verse 1. προς, with verbs of speaking, denotes the object or subject of the discourse. So Plutarch, p. 894. (cited by Kypke.), προς δι' ἐν Πνεαρσ εἴρηκεν, de illo. Thus the Hebr. ג and כ. Πάντοτε denotes unceasingly, constantly. The word is here not opposed to those intervals which must necessarily arise from the interruptions of worldly business or innocent recreation; but the intermissions proceeding from weariness or despondency. This is expressed by the ἐκκακεῖν, which signifies "to grow sluggish," or, (as Euthymius explains) ἀποκάμεν, examples of which sense are here given by Wetstein and Kypke. See Hammond, Whitby, and Macknight, or the abstract of their notes in Elsley. See also Schl. Lex.

2. τὸν Θεόν μὴ φοβοῦμεν, καὶ ἀνθρωπον μὴ ἐντρεπομενος. A proverbial expression, denoting the most

3. ἕκδικησάν. This word has a very extensive sense, and signifies to assign what is just to a plaintiff, and thereby deliver him from the attacks of his adversary. Our English version renders, "avenge me of mine adversary." But I prefer the translation of Doddridge and Campbell, "do me justice upon mine adversary." Doddridge well observes, that the version ought not to express any idea of revenge.

5. ἵνα μὴ εἰς τέλος ὁν. The word ὑποτιάζειν is an agonistic term, and signifies to give one a blow on the face. So Aristoph. Vesp. 1377. where the Scholiast explains ὑποτία, τὰ εἰς ὁσιν πλήγματα. See also Eustath. ap. Wetstein. It properly denotes to strike one under the eye, to give one a black eye: and as this is, more than any thing else, galling to a pugilist; so it came to express whatever is irksome
and weariesome. Thus it denotes to *stun, din, dun, teaze, harass, vex, weary.* This metaphorical sense is indeed somewhat rare, but an example has been produced by Wetstein from Diog. Laert. 2, 136. ἐν δὲ ταῖς ζητήσεσι' οὐκώ, μάχιμω ἦν, ἀσθ' ἱππότω ζέραν ἀπῆ. And of the Latin *obtundere* from Ter. Andr. 2, 2, 11. "Obtundis, tanetsi intellego." Heautont. 5, 1, 6. "Ohe jam desine deos uxor gratulando obtundere." Adelph. 1, 2, 38. "Ausculta, ne me obtundas de hac re sepius." Liv. 2, 15. "Quando id certum atque obstinatum est, inquit, neque ego obtundam, sepius eadem nequidquam agendo." And 26, 38. "Nec Blattius ante obstitit tamen tam audaci incepto, quam, idem obtundendo pervicit." Εἰς τέλος is here by some rendered, "at the end, at last." But it may be more properly explained "perpetually," of which sense several examples are found in Wetstein. It has much the same sense as *aελ* in a restricted signification. Thus in Judith 7, 30. ἀπέω is rendered by Aquila *aελ*, by Symmachus εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, and by Theodotio εἰς τέλος. I add a passage of Herodot. 3, 119, 12. where *aελ* has this sense: ἔν δὲ γυνὴ—φοιτέωσα ἐκ τὰς θύρας τοῦ Βασιλέως, κλαίεισκε καὶ ἀποφέρειντο ποιέωσα δὲ αελ τοῦτο, τοῦτο τὸν Δαρείον ἔπεισε οικτείσα μ. ην. See the learned notes of Hammond; not omitting Le Clerc and Macknight ap. Elsley.

7. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς—νυκτὸς. There is a similar comparison in Matth. 7, 9. Luke 11, 11, seqq. After ὁ Θεὸς must be supplied ὁ δικαίος κριτὴς, which is opposed to the κριτῆς τῆς ἀδικίας. All the terms are emphatical: q. d. "God the just, the merciful, will he not repel injury from those whom he does not despise, but love?" So Deberim Rabbi, fol. 257. and Ps. 27. "Ora atque iterum ora; veniet hora quâ tibi dabitur." Ἐκδίκησιν ποιεῖν has the force of ἐκδικεῖν, as in Judg. 11, 36. On the ἐκλεκτοῖ, i. e. choice and approved Christians, see the note on Matth. 20, 16, 24, 22. (Rosenm. and Kuinoel.) It must be observed that καλ is here for καίπερ, *although,* of which
Wetstein produces several examples. On this it may be sufficient to consult Schl. Lex.

8. λέγω ὑμῖν—τάχει, i. e. God will not suffer his faithful followers to be afflicted with impunity, but he will either take from bad men the power of hurting them, or he will remove his servants (snatched from all evils) into eternal rest. It has been disputed (see the details in Wolf's Curæ) whether these words are to be referred to what immediately precedes, or to what is said in the last Chapter about the final advent and judgment of Christ. The recent Commentators (as Wetstein, Rosenm. Doddridge, Campbell, and Kuinoel) adopt the former opinion; and they interpret the words of the advent of Christ to execute judgment on the Jewish nation. They take γῆ* for Palestine; and Doddridge observes, that the context here limits it to that less extensive signification. "The believing Hebrews (says he) were evidently in great danger of being wearied out with their persecutions and distresses." By πίστις they understand a firm reliance and implicit confidence in God and Christ. At his first advent (says Wetstein) Christ found few who steadfastly believed in his Messiaship (17, 18, 19.); in the second yet fewer (ver. 27, 29.) namely, when admonished by the Divine warnings, the faithful votaries of Christ retired from Judæa.

9. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ πρὸς, i. e. concerning, with respect to; as in ver. 1. Our Lord had already treated of the necessity of constant prayer; he now treats of a modest estimation of our own merits. (Wets.) He here censures that excessive confidence, and overweening self-complacency, in which some men indulge; and by which they are hindered from fleeting

* Markland thinks that the words ἐλθὼν, τὴν πίστιν, and τῆς γῆς, are so ambiguous, that it is impossible for any one to be certain of the sense of the passage. He regards the following interpretation as the most obvious: And yet, when the Son of Man cometh, will he find the belief of this in the Land? That is, he will not find.
with devout humility to the throne of mercy. In
illustration of ἐκτοιδῶτες ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ, Wetstein cites
Plat. οὐτε γὰρ χαίρων οὐτε κυρωμένος ἄγαν φανήσεται διὰ τὸ ἑαυτῷ πεποιθέναι. And Cic. Tusc. 5, 12. "Quod
semper in se ipso omnem spem reponet sui." So 2
Cor. 1, 9. οὐδ' ἐκτοιδῶτες ὀμνὲν ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ. See
more in the excellent note of Grotius on this
passage.

11. σταθεὶς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν τ. π. There has been some
difference of opinion as to the construction, and con-
sequently the interpretation, of these words. Some,
as L. Brug, Capellus, Olearius, Leigh, Heinsius,
Beza, Camerarius, Bishop Pearce, Whitby, Doddr.
Campbell, and others, take πρὸς ἑαυτὸν with σταθεὶς,
and interpret (comparing the Hebr. וָלַפִי) "apart," (as if he feared being polluted by the touch of the
Pharisee*) or in his place, i. e. in a conspicuous
place, in order to be seen of the people. But this
mode of interpretation was long ago refuted by
Arndt in his Misc. Sacr. p. 97. who there observes,
that Beza and Camerarius confound πρὸς ἑαυτὸν and
κατ' ἑαυτὸν. By the latter the Sept. translate the
Hebr. יָלֶפָה. The former denotes secum, with him-
And L. 8. ταῦτα πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν λαλοῦντος. Aristæn.
1, 6. πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν ἐφ' ὑμῖν. Thus do πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν and
κατ' ἑμαυτὸν differ. So the Vulg. apud se orabor.
The formula πρὸς ἑαυτὸν is not unfrequently joined
with verbs signifying reflection, thought, or speech.
The preference must therefore be given to the inter-
pretation adopted by Euthymius, Theophyl. Arndt,
De Dieu, Grotius, Le Clerc, the authors of our
common version, Vitringa, Wolf, Lakemacher, Wet-
stein, Rosenm. and Kuinoel, who join πρὸς ἑαυτὸν
with προσημένον. Σταθεὶς is by some rendered con-
sistens. Wetstein and others explain πρὸς ἑαυτὸν

* But this Grotius has satisfactorily refuted, and observes that
the Pharisees prayed in a court distinct from the Publicans. On
this subject see Mr. Elesley's note.
secum tacitus: and cites the Horatian "labra mo-
vet metuens audiri." (Ep. 1, 16, 60.) So Quintil.
Declam. (cited by Bulkley.) "In templo verò, in
quo, verbis parcimus, in quo animos componimus, in
quo tacitam etiam mentem nostram custodimus."
He prays thus silently, since the rest of the congre-
gation, who might have supposed that he was praying
for the welfare of the people, would have taken um-
brage, if they had discovered that he was only speak-
ing evil of all others*. On the contrary, the Publican
speaks clearly and audibly, smites his breast, and
casts down his eyes. The expression (says Dr.
Maltby) refers to what passed in the man's heart,
and was not openly pronounced. Σταθεὶς is by Wet-
stein and others rendered consistens. Kuinoel, how-
ever, thinks it not necessary to press the sense of
the word, which (says he) seems added for orna-
ment. Yet the Jews were accustomed to pray stand-
ing, as has been proved by Lightfoot on Matth. 6, 5.
See 2 Chron. 6, 12. Mark 11, 26. Nor, indeed,
(says Schoettgen,) was it permitted to pray in any
other posture: none but persons of the blood royal
being allowed to pray sitting. In illustration of
such extemporaneous prayer as is here alluded to,
Wetstein cites R. Becchæi: "A temporibus Mosis
usque ad viros synagogæ magnæ nulla certa forma
precandi fuit, sed unus quisque sibi ipsimet peculi-
ariter conficietem orationem pro suas scientiâ, sapien-
tiâ et eloquentiâ."

11. Ἀρκαζ, denotes one who injures another by
force; ἀδικος, one who overreaches him by fraud,
and a semblance of justice and equity. (Wets.) No
great praise, truly, to be better than the worst; but
a great offence to judge harshly of men whom he
could not generally know.

12. δις τοῦ ψαββάτου, twice in the week; i. e. on

* By praying thus (says Euthymius) he did nothing else but
praise himself, and deprecate others, especially the Publican;
though it is written (Prov. 27, 2.) "Let another man praise thee,
and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips."
the second and fifth day; as appears from the Rabbinical citations in Drusius and Wets. So also Epiph. ad Hær. 16. ἐνύστευν δὲ διὸ τοῦ σαββάτων, δευτέραν καὶ τέρτῃν. By fasts are here meant not public, but private ones, enjoined by no Divine law, but voluntarily observed by the Pharisaical devotees. See Buxtorf's Syn. Jud. c. 14. p. 279.

12. ἀπὸδεκατῶ, “I pay tithe.” See the note on Matth. 23, 23.

13. τελαίνης. It is observed by the Commentators, that Maimonides and the Talmudists use the word τελαίνης in conjunction with scortatores. I add, that it is sometimes so used in the Classical writers; ex. gr. Artem. 1, 23. χάλκεων δὲ — μετώπων δοκεῖν ἔχειν τελαίναις καὶ κατάλοις καὶ τοὺς μετὰ αναιδείας γίνοντας, μονοίς συμφέρειν, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς μέσος ἐγγέβεται.

13. μακριθεὶν ἐστῶς, afar off; namely, in the court of the Gentiles, if he was a Pagan; or if a Jew, (and many such were Publicans,) removed from the Pharisees, who had approached nearer to the interior part of the temple. (Rosenm. and Kuinoel.)

13. οὐκ ἠθέλεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐ. τ. ἐπάρατοι. An exquisite picture of real contrition, and aban-donment of all self-love and self-conceit. (Calvin.) For, as raising the eyes is a sign of confidence and joy, so is casting them downward indicative of sorrow, contrition, humility, &c. (Keuchen, Kypke, and Kuin.) See an excellent note of Grotius on this subject, or the abstract of it to be found in Elsley. Schoettgen has illustrated this subject from the Rabbinical writers, with whom it was a frequent maxim, that he who prays should cast down his eyes, but raise his heart to God. So also Synopsis Sohar (ap. Schoett.) and Maimonides, cited by Wolf: “Qui orat, necesse habet aptare pedes suos, unum justa alterum, et demittere oculos suos deorum, ut qui aspicit terram, cor autem convertere sursum, quasi consistat in cælo: deinde manus suas reponere super cor, ut dextram sinistræ imprimat. Stabit ita veluti servus coram domino suo, Cum tre erre, trepidatione, et ti-
more: neque manus suas relinquet in lumbis."
Thus the Jews at the present day, while praying in
the synagogue, usually cover their heads. See Bux-
torf, Syn. p. 270. and especially Allen’s Modern
Judaism.

13. ἔτυπτεν εἰς τῷ στήθος α. An action perfectly
suitable to grief, self-accusation, and all the more
violent emotions; and which is a custom common
to all nations. It is copiously illustrated with ex-
amples from the Greek and Latin Classics by Wet-
stein; as also by Arndt in his Misc. Sacr. p. 84. and
Geier de Luctu Hebr. p. 199. And yet, amongst
all these examples, I can find none that sufficiently
justify the construction, which appears Hellenistic.
The Hellenism consists in the omission of the pro-
noun: though the phrase, even with the pronoun, is
very rare, and indeed I know of no other example of
it but in the passage of Xen. cited by Wetstein:
τόπτω σε εἰς τὸν ἄρμον.

13. τῷ ἀμαρτωλῷ. Wetstein and Rosenm. think
the article emphatical, i.e. to me the sinner, κατ’
ἐξοχήν. But it rather seems to be pleonastic; or it
may be explained, as in Matth. 26, 45. ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου
παραδίδοται εἰς χειρὰς ἀμαρτωλῶν, i.e. of Pagans,
Gentiles.

14. κατέβη ὅποις δ. ε. τ. ο. α. ἦ. ἐ. went down, went
back. Here there is a reference to the high situa-
tion of the temple, with respect to the rest of Jeru-
usalem; as in the preceding ἀνεβησαν*. It is of more
consequence, however, to remark on the significa-
tion of δεδικαιωμένος, and on that of ἦ. Δεδικαιωμένος
here denotes, absolved, treated as just, accepted, ap-
proved†, as in Rom. 3, 20. where see the note, and

* We may compare a similar passage of Theognis Sentent. 566.
ὁφρα εἰς ὅλον κέρδος ἔχων, ἀνίμη.
† Schoettgen tells us that it is a well-known formula among the
Jews, that those who have offered up sacrifices depart from the
temple justi. He cites Schemoth Rabba, fol. 139, 3, where it is
said, that whosoever approached the temple full of sins, and offers
up sacrifices, his sins are then remitted to him, nor can he receive
greater joy than to depart justus.
Koppe's fourth Excursus on the Ep. to the Gal. In 
there is an ellipsis of μᾶλλον, which is not un-
frequent in the Classics. Grotius determines the sense
to be this: that the humble deprecation of the Pup-
licau, though he had fallen into sins, was more ap-
proved by God than the external sanctimony of the
Pharisee, conjoined with proud confidence. Rosenm.
and Kuinoel observe, that the Hebrews often ex-
press a simple negation by a comparative, (as in
Gen. 38, 26. 1 Sam. 24, 18.) and that here also the
sense meant to be inculcated is, that the Publican
went away justified, but not the Pharisee. And
this seems to have been the opinion of Euthymius,
who remarks: Παρά έκείνου, ἥγον, ούκ ἔκείνου. For
(as he well observes) τοιτών μὲν πάντα τὰ προτερήματα
ἐξεκένωσεν ἡ θύσις· ἐκείνου δὲ πάντα τὰ ἐλαττώματα
ἐξεφόρησεν ἡ ταπείνωσις. On the words πᾶς ὁ ὦν—
ὑψωθήσεται; see the note on Matth. 23, 12.
15—30. On these verses consult the notes on
31. καὶ τελεσθήσεται π. This word is (like the
Hebr. נלך) especially used of predictions. Thus
Esd. 1, 1. So also Apollod. Bell. 2, 4, 4. χρησμὸς
tετελεσμένος.
34. καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν—λεγόμενα. Wetstein remarks,
that the Evangelist repeats the same thing thrice,
that even the most stupid persons might see how
dull the Disciples were of comprehension, since they
did not even understand what was thrice repeated.
And he refers to Joh. 1, 20. and cites Ennius 9.
"Qui tum vivebant homines; atque œvum agita-
bant." And Virg. Æneid, 1, 546. "Quem si fata
virum servant, si vescitur aurâ æthereâ, neque adhuc
crudelibus accubat umbris." But the first passage
is merely a poetical periphrasis. As to the second,
Servius (cited by Wetstein) well observes, that
the sense is distributed among the three clauses,
and that the speaker purposely dwells on these, by way
of pathos. Besides, it may be observed, with respect
to the present passage, that the reiteration is not
unsuitable to the Hellenistic, and Eastern style, which deals much in pleonasm and repetition. The preference must therefore be given to the interpretation of Rosenm. who explains, "they did not completely comprehend." The words were (he adds) easy of comprehension, but how those words agreed with the prophecies respecting the Messiah, they could not see; and probably doubted whether they were not said allegorically.

CHAP. XIX.

VERSE 2. ὀνόματι καλούμενος Ζ. Some MSS. omit καλούμενος, which Mill, Price, and Abresch, think is to be cancelled. The common interpretation is however defended, not only by nearly all the MSS. but by Soph. Phil. 605. ὄνομα ὁ ἄνωμάζετο Ἑλεος, And also by Ennius, in Med. "Quae nunc nominatur nomine Argo." It is a pleonasm not unsuitable to the Oriental style. The ἀρχιτελωνίς should not be rendered (as it is in our common version,) "the chief of the Publicans," but, (as most recent Commentators think,) a chief tax-gatherer*, who had under him inferior persons to collect the taxes. Thus Kuinoel renders "magister portitorum" a master tax-gatherer, and refers to the note on Matt. 5, 46. The ἀρχιτελώναι (says Wetstein) were appointed by the societies of publicans out of their own body, for the purpose of superintending the concerns of the society, of which they were thus presidents. To this Rosenm. accedes, and adds that they were not the publicani, properly so called; for those were Roman knights of noble extraction and immense wealth, who farmed the taxes of a whole province. Every one of these (who might be called ὁ ἀρχιτελωνίς) appointed, he says, a deputy,

* Campbell has here truly observed, that though the Greek article renders the noun to which it is prefixed perfectly definite, the want of it does not render a noun so decisively indefinite as the indefinite article does in modern languages.
or vice-master, to keep the general account-book of the province or district. From the imperfect knowledge we possess on this subject, it is not possible to exactly determine between these somewhat differing opinions. I am inclined to prefer the former. Certainly the publicani, though of the rank of Roman knights, were sometimes Jews, or of Jewish extraction; as appears from Jos. Bell. 2, 14, 9. cited by Wetstein himself.

3. ἐξῆτει ἰδεῖν τὸν Ἰσσών τίς ἐστι. An idiom common both to the Hebrew and Greek languages, and put for ἴδειν τίς ἐστιν ὁ Ἰσσών. See Viger. de Idiotsm. and Matth. Gr. Gr. By τίς is meant quis, "what sort of person" he was. Rosenm. pithily observes, "bene notum vultu noscere cupiebat." Ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔχλου, propter, ob, for the press. So the Heb. n. See Schl. Lex. in v. § 17.

4. προδραμαν ἐμπρόσθεν. A pleonasm common both to the Scriptural and Classical writers. See the examples in Blackwell and Wetstein. Προδραμαν should not be rendered running forward, but hastening before them.

4. ἀνέβη ἐπὶ συκομογαλαν, ἵνα ἵπη αὐτῶν. This mode of viewing any object, i. e. from a tree, seems to have been not unfrequent, inasmuch that it appears to have given rise to a proverbial expression. Thus Libanius: οὐδὲ ἐκοινωνίσει τῶν παρατάξεων—οὕτε ὡς στράτηγος, οὕτε ὡς στρατιάτης ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀπὸ δένδρου ποιεῖν ὑψήλου τὴν θέαν ἰνέγκα αὐ.

4. δἰ ἐκείνης ἥμελλε διέχεσθαι. Supply ὅδοι. Wetstein, Matthias, and Griesbach, agree that δἰ, which is omitted in almost all the MSS. (and I add Euthymius,) is to be cancelled. It was evidently introduced from the margin; for there is an ellipsis of δἰ as well as of ὅδοι. Examples of this syntax are given by Wetstein from Hesiod and Homer, Ι. β. 801. ἔρχονται πεδίων, where the Scholiast explains δἰ τοῦ πεδίου. The reading of the Cod. Cant. ἐκείνη, is a gloss.

4, 5. The knowledge of the name and circum-
stances of Zaccheus L. Brug. and others refer to the
divine knowledge of Christ. And so Euthymius, who
finely remarks: "He now, indeed, saw him with the
eyes of his human nature, but he had before seen him
with those of his divine." Others suppose that Je-
sus had been informed by the other tax-gatherers
that Zaccheus believed in his Divine mission, and
that Jesus, on being informed who and what he
was, resolved to sojourn with and instruct so well-
disposed a person, and add him to the number of
his disciples. Rosenm. observes, that this honour
Zaccheus could scarcely have expected: for Jesus
on no occasion appointed to sojourn with any one
uninvited, except with him who through modesty
did not venture to invite him.

7. παρὰ ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἀνδρὶ εἰσῆλθε καταλύσαι. Κατα-
λύσαι is wrongly rendered by Doddridge refreshed
himself, or (as he explains in a note) baited at.
Whatever may be the case in some other passages,
it here (as in Luke 9, 12.) simply signifies cum diver-
tisset, as it is rendered by the Vulgate *. And so
the Classical writers. See Schl. Lex. and the note

7. ἀμαρτωλῷ, i. e. one who by his occupation
might be presumed to be such, and who perhaps had
been an unjust and immoral person †. For though
some Commentators seem to regard the word as im-
plying little more than a publican, yet from the con-
test it should appear that Zaccheus was not without
his faults, and therefore needed moral reformation.
In this view Euthymius observes; that our Saviour
despises the censures of those who took offence at
his sojourning with a publican and sinner? "For
(says he) one must not mind incurring a slight scan-
dal, when there is an opportunity of effecting great
spiritual good."

* So Euthymius explains it καταχθὴνα, μείναι.
† This too seems to have been the opinion of Euthymius, who
prettily remarks: 'Ω ταξιας μεταβολὴς δωλάργουσι εὔμετα-
δορος' ἀδικῶτας, δεικαίωτας.
8. σταθεῖς δὲ Ζακχαῖος ἔλεγε. Kuinoel thinks that here several circumstances are omitted by the Evangelist, such as occurred between Zaccheus's getting down from the tree and receiving Jesus, and addressing him in the words Ἰδοῦ, &c. and he (as usual) speculates on the hypothesis of this being omitted in Luke's Archetype. But this is by no means necessary. The construction is, σταθεῖς δὲ πρὸς τὸν Κυρίον ἔλεγε (πρὸς αὐτὸν), i.e. after Zaccheus had been introduced into the presence of Jesus, (and had thereby an opportunity of addressing him,) he said, &c. So Acts 5, 20. σταθέντες λαλεῖτε: and Acts 27, 22.

8. δίδωμι. Grotius, Wetstein, and others, here take the present for the future; and Wetstein paraphrases: "Moved by the counsels and precepts of Christ, I will give." Kuinoel remarks, that the present tense is put for the future, in order to denote a firm and certain intention. It rather signifies: "I do (hereby) give," &c. For (observes Theophylact) he does not say, "I will give to-morrow," but "I give to-day," and therefore Christ says to him, "This day is salvation come to thee." So also Euthymius.

8. καὶ εἶ τινος τι ἐσωκοφάντησα, and whatsoever I may have unlawfully wronged any one of, &c. On the word ἐσωκοφάντησα see the note on Luke 3, 14. This signification of εἶ τι is by no means unfrequent. See Schl. Lex.

8. ἀποδίδωμι τετραπλοῦν. See Dodd. ap. Elsley.

9. εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Some Interpreters (as also do the authors of our English version) take the sense to be, "Jesus said unto him." Others, as Grotius, L. Brug, Beza, Glass, and almost all the recent Commentators, as Markland, Campbell, Rosenm. Kuinoel, and Schlesner, explain concerning him. The thing (says Campbell) shews clearly that our Lord spoke, not to Zaccheus, but to the people concerning Zaccheus, who is mentioned in the third person, καθοτι καὶ αὐτὸς, inasmuch as he also. Of this sense of πρὸς there are examples in Ch. 20, 19.
and Hebr. 1, 7. Many other examples may also be seen in Sch. Lex. Wolf, on the contrary, takes the words in the common sense, (as do Hammond and Whitby,) on account of the preceding words, σταθεῖς δὲ Ζακχαῖος πρὸς τὸν Κύριον, which he thinks, when compared with the present ones, indicate a dialogue. He moreover observes, that it is not probable that Christ would pronounce such words to any one but to Zaccheus himself. Yet he acknowledges that Christ’s answer is so worded as, though directed to Zaccheus, it might be meant also for the by-standers. The arguments of Wolf, however, appear to me somewhat weak, and upon the whole I prefer the former opinion. Doddridge paraphrases it as if directed to both Zaccheus and those about him. By οἶκος is meant the whole family, and especially the master of it, by whose example and precepts it would be converted to Christianity, and brought to salvation. The word αὐτὸς was probably said δείκτικώς. The sense may be thus expressed: “He who, through his own sins, was unworthy of being called a descendant of Abraham, has now, by penitence and faith in me, been restored to his birthright with God, and may henceforth be reckoned a true Israelite.” See Rom. 2, 28.

10. Ἡλθε γὰρ ὁ ὅπως τῷ ἀνθρώπου — ἀπολυμίκως. See the note on Matth. 18, 11. By these words Christ hints at his dignity of Messiah, and that in this sense they were understood by the by-standers, seems evident from their interrogating him, whether the Kingdom of Heaven, or the reign of the Messiah, would commence on his reaching Jerusalem *, i. e. whether he would assume his proper character,

* For (as Euthymius observes) some of the Jews having frequently heard him say that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand, suspected that he was now going up to Jerusalem for the purpose of reigning therein. But our Lord, knowing what they are thinking of, corrects their erroneous opinion by the parable, in which he shows that his kingdom is not of this world, but heavenly and eternal.
and appear with majesty and royal splendour, as
the public assertor of the liberties of the oppressed
Jewish nation. To this Christ replies in the fol-
lowing parable, where he hints that he shall first
depart from the earth, and finally, after many ages
return from Heaven.

12. eγερετις, denotes one of noble birth, like the
Roman patricians or magnates: and so the Heb.
ירם, in Job 1, 3. which is rendered by the Sept.
εγερετις. This opinion is supported by Wetstein,
Rosenm. and Kuinoel, the substance of whose notes
is derived from Le Clerc, whom see ap. Elsley. But
I must observe, that the return here alluded to by
Christ refers not so much to his first advent, to take
vengeance on the Jewish nation, as his final one,
namely, to judge the world, and distribute eternal
rewards or punishments. In the application εγερετις
has reference to the divine dignity of Christ as Son
of God.

12. καβείν εαυτῷ βασιλείαν. I entirely agree with
Campbell, whose opinion is adopted by Schleusner,
that this should be rendered, procure for himself
royalty. For (as he rightly observes) it is plain
from ver. 14. that it was not, as the common version
implies, a different kingdom from that wherein he
lived. It is evident too (says he) that there is, in
this circumstance, an allusion to what was well
known to his hearers, the way in which Archelaus,
and even Herod himself, had obtained their rank
and authority in Judea by favour of the Romans.
When this reference to the history of the times is
kept in view, and βασιλεία is understood to denote
royal power and dignity, there is not the shadow of
a difficulty in the story. (Campbell.) Thus also,
observes Mr. Horne, (Intro. 2, 623.) "those who
by hereditary succession, or by interest, had pre-
tensions to the Jewish throne, travelled to Rome in
order to have it confirmed to them. Herod the
Great first went that long journey to obtain the
kingdom of Judea from Antony, in which he suc-
and having received the kingdom, he afterward travelled from Judea to Rhodes, in order to obtain a confirmation of it from Caesar, in which he was equally successful. Archelaus, the son and successor of Herod, did the same; and to him our Lord most probably alluded. Every historical circumstance is beautifully interwoven by our Saviour in this instructive parable."

13. The number ten is (as Euthymius observes) only ἐπιθετόν ἴμματικον, and therefore must not be attended to in application. It merely denotes the great abundance of gifts and graces vouchsafed to some Christians.

13. πραγματεύομαι, e. i. e. do business with it, trade with it. This word refers to the investment of money in traffic and merchandize. Among the Classical writers, it is chiefly used of business in general. Πραγματευτής is often found in the sense of a merchant, or trader. See the examples produced by Wetstein from the Classical and Rabbinical writers. In the parallel passage of Matthew we have εὐπάρχω ἐν αὐτοῖς. The application is obvious; see the note on ver. 16.

14. οὗτος ἐπὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. The Commentators think that Christ here adverts to the case of Archelaus, who was appointed by Herod heir of his kingdom, yet could not enter upon the Royal functions until his dignity was confirmed by Augustus. At Herod's death, he went to Rome to obtain the necessary confirmation. The Jews, however, sent fifty ambassadors thither, in order to entreat of Augustus that Archelaus might not be set over them; which request they failed to obtain. The circumstance, however, seems ad ornatum. (Kuin.) The application is obvious: Our Lord evidently adverts to the obstinacy of the Jews, in refusing to admit him as the Messiah.

16. προσμετάδωτα: Εἰρήνη, like πραγματεύω, is used of making money by trade, merchan-
dize, agriculture; &c. ἐργα, or πρᾶγμα, being thus said καὶ ἐργα, as we sometimes use business. Money so employed was said to be ἐργαζόμενον or ἐργαζόμενος productive. On the contrary, what was kept at home unemployed was said to be ἄργον. See Beza and Olearius de Styl. N. Test. 127 & 412. and also Fessel Adv. S. 1, 326. Thus the Sept. in Prov. 31, 18. render ἁνα by ἐργαζόμενον, the other Greek versions by ἔμπαιρα.


17. ἐπάνω δ. τ. over, i.e. in dignity and authority. Compare Joh. 3, 31. So the Hebr. יִו in Gen. 41, 33. &c. As examples of this sense, which is rarely found in the Classical writers, Schleusner cites Jos. Ant. 4, 18, 14. and Arrian. Diss. Eph. 1, 12, 34. There is here an allusion to the custom formerly (as it seems) prevalent in the East, of assigning the government, or revenues, of a certain number of cities or towns, as a reward to a meritorious officer. So Athen. p. 29. fr. ο ὁ ὁ ἐν Ἐλλήνω μέγας, Πυθάρχων Κυρικής τιθο ἐν Εχαρίταο ἐπὶ τίς πόλεις, Παλαια, Ὀλυμπιαν, Κυμαν, Τιον, Σκηπτρα, Άρτεμις, Τυρτη. Thus also Artaxerxes assigned to Themistocles two cities, or, as some say, five. On the word πόλεω, which exactly corresponds to our term make money, see the note on Matth. 25, 16.

20. σουδαρίῳ. A word of Latin origin, denoting properly, a linen cloth used by the Romans for the same purposes as those to which our handkerchief is employed; but which was occasionally used as a napkin, or wrapper; and indeed in the Greek and Syriac languages (into which the word was introduced) it had chiefly that sense. Examples are produced by Schoettgen and Wetstein (both from the Classical and Rabbinical writers). Thus Apulej. Apol. "quædam sudariolo involuta." Gloss. Græc. Du-
cang. σουδάριον, κεφαλοδέσμιον, where κεφαλοδέσμιον answers to our old word kerchief (covering for the head). So also, in an anonymous writer cited by Wetstein, τὰ σουδάρια ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐπιβάλλεται. And so Nonius 14, 15. says, that the rica, which was a female kerchief, was in his time called sudorium; and thus it is often used by the Rabbins. Not unfrequently, however, it is (as here) employed to denote a linen cloth to wrap money in. Thus Chetuboth. pecunias in sudorio legavit. Vajikra R. 6. fol. 150, 1. denarios in sudorio reposuit. Our word napkin is a corruption of maappa, a wiper, or towel (like the Greek ἐκμαγεῖον), and therefore properly denotes a little wiper.

21. ἀπρεπῶς. The word primarily signifies dry, (see Etym. Mag.) hard, harsh; and sometimes sour, crabbed. Examples of its metaphorical senses may be seen in Wetstein and Kypke; to which I add D. Chrys. Orat. 12, p. 207. ἀνάπα αὐστηρον. Hor. Ep. 1, 7, 91. Durus nimis attentusque videris esse mihi: & 1, 5, 13. parcus nimiusque severus: & Serm. 2, 6, 82.asper et attentus quaesitis.


22—24. See Matth. 25, 26. and the notes. Τράπεζα denotes a money-table, counter, or desk; and, indeed, that is all that our word bank originally denoted, it being derived from ἄφαξ, a desk, or counter; nor has τράπεζα any reference to bench, a seat, as Park-
hurst supposes. Sometimes (as here) it denotes the nummularius. See Matth. 21, 12.

29. δῶμαι here signifies deliper, pay in, of which sense the Commentators offer no examples. There is one, however, to be found in Plut. Pel. 8. δίωμαι τινι τῶν συνήθων, where, without cause, Reiske conjectures δῶναι καὶ κρατεῖ τινι.

28. αὐτῷ εἰπάσκει, Ἡράκλεως has here the sense of exigere. And so it is sometimes used in the Classical writers.

25. See the note on Matth. 25, 28. seqq.

26. Kuinoel thinks (as do many Commentators, and, among the rest, Doddridge,) that this verse contains the words of the King, not of Christ, as many suppose. This (says he) is evident from ver. 27. compared with ver. 14; and, therefore, at the beginning of the verse we must subaud οὐ δίωμαι εἰπάσκει, and besides these words also δότε, which Jesus may be supposed to have expressed by his countenance or gesture of body. See Bos Ell. 899. Schæf.

27. αὐτῷ εἰπάσκει, καὶ κατασφάξατε ἐμπροσθέν μου. A custom, it seems, not unusual to the generals of old; in illustration of which Wetstein refers us to 1 Sam. 11, 12. and cites Plut. Sulla. p. 476. p. Αὐτῷ εἰπάσκει δι' ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀποστάξατε, Justin. 46, 4, 4. in conspectu suo eum trucidari jussit. Cæsar. B. C. 3, 28. in ejus conspectu—intercipientur: et 109. quos ille, cum in conspectum ejus venissent: corripi ac interfici jussit.

28. ἐπορεύετο ἐμπροσθέν. Beza, Grotius, and some others, including the E. V. explain preceded, i.e. as a leader does a multitude. But I assent to Kypke and others, that it rather signifies he went forward on his journey. See Kypke.

29. seqq. See the notes on Matth. 21, 1. seqq.

33. ἐκ τῶν κύριοι αὐτῶν, the owners of it said. Qui could the colt have more owners than one? St. Mark, in the parallel place (chap. 11, 5.) has τινες τῶν ἔκει ἐστικότων. Perhaps St. Luke meant to inform:
us that those persons who stood skere and interrogated the disciples, were members of that family to which the coft belonged. And if so, the text is not only right, but is also a proof how much one Gospel contributes to the illustration of another. (Dr. Owen.) By κώσι we may understand those who had a right or power over it, including even the servants of the owner. So the word occurs in Xen. 4. 6. (cited by Schleusner): κώσος διαλόειν & 8. 4. κώσι έκπράττειν και κατάπαυσαι. So also in Thucyd. and the Classical writers.

87. μαθητῶν i. e. (says Rosenm.) those who had been excited by his miracles to follow him from Galilee. Kuinoel observes, that μαθηταί is taken in a more extensive sense, to denote, not the Apostles or Disciples only, but all the followers of Christ.

88. εἰρήνη εν οὐρανῷ. Dr. Owen doubts the integrity of the whole verse. He regards βασιλεύς as an interpolation, and would alter, or rather (which he prefers) cancel the following words, which have (he observes) nothing like them in the other Gospels. But can any thing be more uncritical or irreverent towards the Evangelist? From such tenuity Heaven defend the sacred text! The words are thus rendered by Rosenmuller: “Prosperitas Regis Messiæ regnique ejus in ceelo procuretur, a Deo, quī summīs laudibus celebretur.” Kuinoel well observes, that it is a formula, and is to be explained; “felicitas in ceelo parata est.”

40. ο θεος κεκράζωνται. A proverbial and hyperbolical expression, says Grotius (ap. Elsley), to show that it was impossible but that the kingdom of the Messiah would be glorified, a miracle should rather be wrought; as Matth. 3, 9. Drusius observes, that it is said of what cannot be concealed. Wetstein gives numerous examples, of which I shall subjoin the most apposite, Chagiga, fol. 16, 1. Ne dicas, quis testabatur contra me? Lapides domūs ejus et trabes domūs hominis illius testabantur contra eum. Habakkuk, 2, 11. “For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the
beam out of the timber shall answer it:” where Jerome remarks, “Hæc expression et verior est intelligentia: etiam si homines taceant, et signorum medium multitudinem lingua invidens non loquatur, tamen lapides ipsi et fundamenta murorum, et parietum sedificatio, meam poterunt magnitudinem personare.” Philo. t. 2. p. 460, 25. Plato, p. 1253. A. Liban. D. 6. p. 309. Juvenal. Sat. 9, 102. O Corydon, Corydon, secretum divitis ullah Esse putas? Servi ut taceant, jumenta loquentur, et canis, et postes, et marmora. Eurip. Hipp. 417. οὐδὲ σκότων φρίσσωσι τῶν ἐνεργάτων, τέρεμα τ’ οἶκων, μὴ τοὺς φθογγὺς ἀφῆ. Virg. Eclog. 5, 28. Montesque feri sylvaque loquentur; where Servius observes, “hyperbolicè dictum, cum res ejusmodi est, ut nullâ ratione celari, aut occulta manere possit.” I add Ἀeschyl. Agamem. 36. οἶκος δ’ αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὺς λάβοι, σαφέστατα ἂν λέξεις, ὁς ἔκαν ἐγὼ μαθοὺσιν αὐτός, καὶ μαθοῦσι λάβομαι. 41. ἐκλαυσεν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ, wept over it, was deploring its future devastation. Wetstein compares 2 Sam. 15, 30. (of David.) So Jos. A. 7, 9, 2. Elisha. and 2 Kings 8, 11, 12. I add Herodian, 6, 4, 3. τῆς Ρώμης ἁτήρειν, ἐκπαιδευόμενοι αἱ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν καὶ δακρύν. Plut. Demosth. 27. καὶ πρὸς τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἀποξείτων δεδακτομένας—καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀκύρωταν ἀνατεινας τῆς χείρας εἰσίν ὁ δεσποῦνα πόλιας κ. τ. λ. Some over scrupulous and ill-judging persons of former times, thinking tears unworthy of our Saviour’s character, cancelled this verse, insomuch that, as we learn from Epiphanius, these words in his time were not to be found in the generally received MSS. But with how little reason the words were cancelled, has been shown by Grotius, in a long and learned annotation, which he thus concludes: “Quod si affectus per se, aut etiam affectuum ubertas, honestis in rebus occupata, nihil habet vitii, certe nec eorum affectuum signa in quibus est fetus.” That he (one so benevolent) should have felt commiseration cannot be wondered at, for, as Euthymius observes, Γινώσκων αὐτὴν δι’ ὑπερβολὴν ποιησιάς ἐκτριβησιμότης, ἀνθρωποτρεπών κλαίει
ST. LUKE, CHAP. XIX.

42. καὶ σὺ, and thou, the metropolis of this country to which I was especially sent. (Beza & Kuin.)

42. In the interpretation of these words there has been no little diversity of opinion. Many Commentators (as Camerarius, Erasmus, Raphel, Stock, Kypke, Doddridge, and Campbell,) take εἰ for utinam, and explain, "oh! that thou hadst considered." It frequently, indeed, has this force in the Greek authors, especially the Poets. See Viger. and Steph. Thes. Others, as the authors of our English Version, Beza, Grotius, Piscator, Price, Whitby, and most recent Commentators, as Rosenmuller and Kuinoel, more properly (I think) suppose there is an aposiopesis of εἰ αὐτός, or the like. So also Euthymius, who supplies ὥσ αὐτόματον, and very properly, observes, that those, who weep are frequently interrupted in their words by the violence of their feelings. Rosenmuller thus supplies the aposiopesis: "For then thou wouldst not so securely sleep in the lethargy of sin," or, "then thou wouldst repent in dust and ashes:" and cites Ter. Eun. 8, 3. Conceditur secum loquentibus multa transcendere, quae tacite intelligunt. Even Doddridge does not disapprove of this method, but acknowledges that the broken manner of speaking is very emphatical, and that our Lord will thus seem to pause in silent reflection on the happy consequences that would have attended their obedient regard to his invitation and addresses. Whitby takes this opportunity of urging, that the Jews were not under any irreversible decree of destruction from the Almighty. But, perhaps, this is pressing a formula loquendi too far.

42. καὶ σὺ, and thou, the metropolis of this country to which I was especially sent. (Beza & Kuin.)

42. In the interpretation of these words there has been no little diversity of opinion. Many Commentators (as Camerarius, Erasmus, Raphel, Stock, Kypke, Doddridge, and Campbell,) take εἰ for utinam, and explain, "oh! that thou hadst considered." It frequently, indeed, has this force in the Greek authors, especially the Poets. See Viger. and Steph. Thes. Others, as the authors of our English Version, Beza, Grotius, Piscator, Price, Whitby, and most recent Commentators, as Rosenmuller and Kuinoel, more properly (I think) suppose there is an aposiopesis of εἰ αὐτός, or the like. So also Euthymius, who supplies ὥσ αὐτόματον, and very properly, observes, that those, who weep are frequently interrupted in their words by the violence of their feelings. Rosenmuller thus supplies the aposiopesis: "For then thou wouldst not so securely sleep in the lethargy of sin," or, "then thou wouldst repent in dust and ashes:" and cites Ter. Eun. 8, 3. Conceditur secum loquentibus multa transcendere, quae tacite intelligunt. Even Doddridge does not disapprove of this method, but acknowledges that the broken manner of speaking is very emphatical, and that our Lord will thus seem to pause in silent reflection on the happy consequences that would have attended their obedient regard to his invitation and addresses. Whitby takes this opportunity of urging, that the Jews were not under any irreversible decree of destruction from the Almighty. But, perhaps, this is pressing a formula loquendi too far.
42. τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην σου. Supply ἀνήκοντα. It is, indeed, a similar pleonasm to τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης, i.e. εἰρήνη. Εἰρήνη here denotes (as a little before) felicity, salvation. Wetstein thus paraphrases the passage: “Utinam, quae diceris Jerusalem, re ipsa esses Jerusalem, ac videres ea, quae pacem tibi praestare possent; Vel tu, quae tot jam prophetas occupasti, et in me tam graviter peccasti; Vel hodie, quod tot annos neglevisisti, emendares.” Each of these words, he thinks, has a peculiar emphasis. But this seems a very fanciful and precarious interpretation.

42. νῦν δὲ ἐκράβη ἀνὴρ ἄφθαρμον, q. d. “But now, by an inexcusable ignorance, thou rejectest light offered and pressed upon thee: and therefore perish thou must.”

43. περιθαλώσιν—χάρακα σῶι, i.e. bank, rampart. In this sense the word occurs both in the Sept. and the Classical writers. This military term is copiously illustrated by Wetstein who thus accurately describes a χάραξ: “First they dug a ditch; then from the earth thrown up they constructed a mound called a χώρα; finally, the wooden pales (χάρακες) were driven down at the bottom part of the mound near the ditch, in order to prevent the earth from falling back, and to preserve the mound in due form. The whole was called agger.” This he illustrates from Greek and Latin authors, and observes, that there is here a manifest prediction of the siege of Jerusalem, of which all the circumstances are adverted to as they really took place: as appears from Jos. Bell. 6 & 6. and many other passages which he cites. Thus Euthymius observes, that it is both a prophecy and a description. On the words περικυκλώσωσι—συνέξωσι, &c. Kuinoel well observes, that this accumulation of terms is meant to paint in more lively colours the severity of the blockade, and the horrors of the siege. See the notes of Hammond and Whitby.

44. καὶ ἐδαφιστῇ σε, καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου ἐν σοι. Some commentators, as Grotius and Rosenm. think that there is here a syllepsis in ἐδαφιστῇ, which is used in two very different ways: 1st. of demolishing the
buildings: and of dashing the children on the ground. But De Dieu, Buxtorf, Moldenhauer, Olearius, Bois, Starck, Wolf, Schleusner, Kuinoel, and others, follow the Vulgate version, "ad terram proternt te et filios tuos." This sense is more apposite, since the word will suit both, and moreover, it is confirmed by many passages of the Sept. ex. gr. Isa. 3, 25. Ez. 31, 12. Ps. 137, 9. Hos. 14, 1. By τέκνα may either be understood literally the children, which sense the term ἐδαφισθεὶσι seems to suggest, and in which it is frequently employed; (see Wets.) or it may be understood, metaphorically, of the inhabitants. 44. οὐκ ἐκφησον ἐν σοὶ λίθων ἐπὶ λίθω, "shall not leave in thee one stone upon another." Euthymius judiciously interprets this σώβεσιν λίθων, a course of stones, or οἰκοδόμησιν, a building.

45. οὐκ ἐγγυαῖς τὸν καϊρὸν τῆς ἑπισκοπῆς σου. There has been some difference of opinion on the sense of ἑπισκοπῆς, which, as being a word of middle signification, admits both a good, and a bad sense. Some commentators take it here in the latter, which may be defended: but the former seems more apposite, and is maintained both by Theophylact and Euthymius, and the best modern commentators. See Theophyl. ap. Schleusner. Euthymius judiciously explains: Διότι οὐκ ἐγγυαῖς τὸν καϊρὸν τῆς ἑπιμελείας σου ὅν καὶ καῖρος τῆς ἑπισκοπῆς μου, καὶ καῖρος ἐν τῆς ἑπιμελείαις καὶ στοιχεῖας σου.

45, 46. See the note on Matth. 21, 12. seqq.

48. ἡ λαῷς ἄγας ἐξεκριματο α. ἀ. i. e. hung on his words, heard him with deep interest and attention. This sense of ἐκκριμασθαυ, and the Latin pendere, is copiously illustrated by Abresch, Wetstein, Price, Olearius, Suicer, and Bulkley. It may be sufficient to refer the student to Schl. Lex.

CHAP. XX.

VERSE 6. πᾶσι λαῷς καταλιθάσει ἤμας, the people will stone us. They had themselves accustomed the peo-
ple to that violence. When they could not legally convict their enemies, they incited the populace to stone them. It was called the judicium seli. See Joh. 10, 31. Acts 14, 19. (Grot. ap. Elsley.)

8. See the notes on Matth. 21, 23. seqq. Exerc.-
sav. The word is used of those who come upon any one unexpectedly in order to overpower him. This signification is illustrated from Philo, by Krebs and Loesner.

9—11. See Matth. 21, 33. seqq. and the notes.

13. ἵππος. It may be observed, that this word, which implies uncertainty, is not to be found in the Gospels, except in this place, and here too in a para-
ble. The Spirit of Truth could be under no doubt in any thing: and therefore perhaps and probably, have not room in these writings, as they have in those which are merely human. Hence I suppose; Beza, on the Epist. to Philem. ver. 15. will not allow ὁδα to signify perhaps, as of a person doubting, sed affirmationem duntaxat emollientis; as ὁδα and ἰστας, he says, are often used in Aristotle, and as nimirum and utique, by the Latins. We should express it by it seems. But it is certainly otherwise, Rom. 5, 7.; for there a casual thing is spoken of; and in other places, where the Apostles speak of things merely human, as other men do; for the nature of things was not altered by being under the direction of the Holy Spirit. (Markland.) ἰστας means here, not perhaps, but surely. It bears the same sense in the Sept. 1 Kings, 25, 21, Xenoph. Cyr. Anab. lib. 3, pp. 199, 201. ed. Hutch. 4to. Αἰλίαν 5. H. 11, 8. The other Evangelists express no doubt. (Bp. Pearce.) I assent to the interpretation of the learned prelate, which is also confirmed by the authority of Schleusner, who tell us that in Jer. 5, 4. it expresses the Hebr. utique profecto. That the Greeks (see Plat. Gorg. 7, 39, 52.) used this particle not only when speaking of any thing doubtful, but even certain, we learn from Munker on Anton. Liberal. Métam. C. 6. p. 46.
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20. παρατηρήσεις. On this word, see the note on Matt. 1, 2.

20. παρατηρήσεις. They sent out spies, emissaries. The word properly denotes "one who sets himself down (subsidet), or is planted in a lurking place, to watch, spy another's motions, or to attack any one unawares, or for any other purpose, (see Job. 31, 9.) a spy, one suborned to watch another's words and actions, and take an occasion of injuring him." In this sense, the Greek Classical writers use ἐγκαθίστηκεν. The word is copiously illustrated by Wetstein, Kypke, and Krebs. It will be sufficient for the student to consult Schl. Lex. and the authorities there referred to.

20. ἐκδιδόμεναι αὐτοῦ λόγου. This form of expression is common in the best Greek writers. So the Latin ones use arripere. See Raphel, Elsner, and Wets. Rosenmüller observes, that as controversies on religious questions are not likely to afford occasions of entrapping innocence, they therefore have recourse to political ones.

21. οὗτος λέγει, q. d. "What you just now said against the Priests and Scribes is true, and cannot be denied, there you were right, we are entirely of your opinion." So Herodot. 1, 71. ἐπιγέραται Ἀκεδαμικοί παμένων εἶναι ἀνάθημα, οὐκ ὢντι στὰ χρήκα χαῦτο ἡρώτισαν: καὶ ὅτι τότε Κρίσιον καὶ, 8, 45. λέγοντες, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, οὐκ ὢντι-εἰς 2, 184. οὐκ ὢντι λέγοντες. (Wets.)

21. οὗ ταμείον τρόφων. A formula used in the Greek versions of the O. Test. to express the Hebr. תְּמוֹן. It signifies to shew particular attention to any person, to be moved by partiality in his favour. So Sirach, 42, 1. μεταλάμβανε πρόσωπον τού ἄμβλαμα. Here therefore it denotes "thou art not moved by human power, dignity, or authority."

22. κατανεμεῖς αὐτῶν τὴν πανουργίαν. The Cod. Cant. has ἐπιγνῶι, which is certainly a more elegant expression. So in a similar passage of Xen. Αναβ. 7, 5, 11. ὅ χρηστὸν τοῦ Η. τῆν πανουργίαν. Joseph. 463,
29. So St. Luke, who has connected his own Evangelical narrative with that of St. Mark. The common reading must however be retained.

30. See Matth. 22, 23, and the note. Οἱ ἀντιλογίσται ἰδιαίτερα τὸν εἶχον. The student will remember, that the best Greek writers repeat the negative after verbs of denying, of which, examples are given by Raphel, Wetstein, and Kypke: ex. gr. Thucyd. 3, 41. ἀντιλογίσται τὸν ἰδιαίτερα.

31. οἱ τῶν οἰκονόμων ταύτων. The signification of these words, is here somewhat more extensive than in Ch. 16, 8: and they simply denote those who live on earth, lead an animal life, here in this world. By αἰωνίων εἰκόνα, is meant the future life, after the resurrection, and the happiness to be there expected. Jesus meant to correct the notions of the Pharisees, who maintained, that those who participated in the Messiah’s kingdom, would abound in all sensual pleasures, and that marriages would also take place in the future life.

32. οἱ κατακαθάθετες τοῦ ἀ. εἰ τυχεῖν. There is an elegance in this use of τυχεῖν, which hints signifies contendere, attain, obtain. Κατακαθάθετες is both elegant and emphatical. The turn of expression is usual both in the Greek and Rabbinical writers, of which, examples are produced by Schoettgen and Wetstein. I add a very similar passage of Aeschyl. Prom. Vinct.

33. ὅπερ ἐπ τῶν παραδόκεσθε, τῶν τυχεῖν εἰς θεοσκοπίαν ἀυτῶν, where θεοσκοπία is for κατακαθάθεται; as in Pind. Nem. 10, 78. where the Scholiast explains: θεοσκοπίαν, by κατακαθάθεται.

34. οὕτω γὰρ οὐκ ἦσαν αὐτῶν ἐν δύνασιν. So Artemid. 3.

15. ἀναπάντως γὰρ — καὶ οἱ ἀποκλινόμενοι, ὦ τε καὶ ἑπεξηγήσατε. By this, Jesus meant to impugn the doctrine of the metaphysics; an opinion (as we find from Josephus,) held by the Pharisees. There is a similar passage in Philostr. V. Ap. 8, 7. p. 358. γεγοναυσα θεοσκοπία γείτονα, ὦτε μὴν ἀνθρώπων ἰδοὺ.
but similar to the angels, (i. e. immortal,) as in the parallel place of Matt. 28, 30. where we have ὁ θεός
ἀγγελια. So Lycophron. κλείον δ' σοι μαγιστων ἐκ τριών
μεροι. Αὐτοῖς καὶ ἰωάννως ἐφαβείν ιδίων. Mr. Bulkle
appropriately cites a passage of Hierocles, who in speak-
ing on the same subject, has the same expression:
Τοις ἐν τίς θείος γένεσι θυσίαν ἀνδρόν καὶ
ΣΩΒΕΙΝ ἐν λόγος παραινεῖ τοὺς ἰσοδομίαν, καὶ ἰσογέια
καὶ τοῖς θείοις ἱροσυν ὑμεῖς. The angels are called sons of God, on account of their participa-
tion in his Divine felicity and glory. See Matth. 22:
30. By sons of, are meant those who are like unto God, i. e. in immortality, &c. The expression
μη τῆς ἐναστάσεως, is equivalent to οί ἀναστάταις.
37. ἐν τῆς θείᾳ, i. e. in the history, or story of the
burning bush. On this brief mode of citation, see
the note on Mark 12, 26. Μηνὶέν here simply sig-
nifies to declare.
38. αὐτῷ ἔσων. The phrase signifies to depend
upon God for life, who can both continue their mortal
being, and when dead, recal them again to existence.
Wetstein adopts the interpretation of T. Beza:
"quod ad ipsum attinet, cui omnia futura sunt pre-
sentia." Origen on Ps. 119, 50. ὁ κόρος τοῦ τεθνεωτας
θεού ἐσων, ὡς αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐχων, κλείς ἀθανασια
ἐν δύναμις θεού σου ἔκαστο πάντες τοῖς ἑπταπεινοῖς, καὶ ἐκα
tαι εἰς τῆς ἐναστάσεως τοῦ θεοῦ. Jos. Maccab. 10,
extr. καὶ τοῖς εἴδοτες, ὅτι οἱ διά τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκα
τακτήκατε τοῖς θεοῖς. Ἡσαῦ καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ πάντες οἱ πατριάρχαι. Cic. Lael. 27.
Kescher, and Kypke. On ver. 41—42. see Matth.
22, 41. seqq. and at ver. 43—7. see Matth. 23, 6,
and 14.
46. See Lightfoot, ap. Elsley.

CHAP. XXI.

VERSE 1—4. See the notes on Mark 12, 41—44.
2. πλείον πάντων ἔθαλεν. hath cast in more than they
496

ST. LUKE, CHAP. XXI.

all; i.e. estimating her merit by her intention. In this view, Mr. Bulkley appositely cites Simplic. p. 231, 232. where he mentions the case of one, who being upon a journey with a friend, and both of them attacked by thieves, in endeavouring to repel the assault, killed his friend upon the spot. Upon which occasion, going to consult the oracle, but afraid to enter the temple, the oracle thus addressed him: The blood has not defiled thee: thou art purer than thou wast before: thou hast killed thy friend; but it was in endeavouring to defend him. From whence our philosopher infers, that, if he was so far from being polluted by killing his friend, as to be even purer than he was before on that account, our actions are not to be judged of in point of moral worth, by the event, but by the principle they proceed from.

4. εἰς τὰ δόμα. Some explain the treasury, by a metonymy of the contained, for the containing. But it may also be taken in the ordinary sense, and the passage may be thus rendered: "They out of their abundance cast, or contributed towards the gifts of God, cast in their contribution."

5. ὅστεριματος. Non nisi e LXX. laudatur: est tamen secundum analogiam factum. (Wets.)

5. λίθως καλώς—κεκόσμηται κ.τ.λ. Our Lord seems to have meant to somewhat reprehend their excessive admiration of the architecture of the temple: if he had admonished them in the words of Aristid. 11, 332. d. τού θαυμάζειν τοὺς λίθους ἀνήτε μικρον τι. We may however say of such magnificent edifices, as the temple of Jerusalem, and St. Peter's at Rome. (with Livy 1, 58.) "Concepit animo eam amplitudinem Jovis templi quae digna Deōm hominumque rege, quae Romano imperio, quae ipsius etiam loci majestate esset."

5. ἀναθήματι. That the words which follow, were not spoken by Jesus in the temple, but when he had

* To this, one may add a similar passage of Apollonius, 32. λίθων ἐν πόλει, καὶ γραφῶν πολλῶν, καὶ περιπάτων, καὶ θεάτρων οὐδὲν ὀφθαλμον, εἰ μή τοῖς ἐνείη καὶ νόμοις...
gone out of it, is plain from Matth. 24, 1. Mark 13, 1. where see the notes. ἀνάθημα denotes any thing repositorum, laid up, laid aside, or apart, separated, dedicated, consecrated to God. These ἀνάθηματα were usually displayed conspicuously in the temple, either by being hung up, or otherwise serving to adorn it. These the devotees used to bring thither, not only in the hope of future blessings from heaven, but from their gratitude for past benefits. These offerings varied, according to the taste, intention, or the ability of the giver, and consisted of crowns, golden and silver vases, pictures, arms, &c. All which is copiously illustrated by Wetstein, from the following passages. Herodot. 1, 188. et seq. Thucyd. 4, 68. κλήνας κατασκευασαντες ἀνέθεσαν τῇ Ἡρώ. Jos. Ant. 6, 9, 5, 7, 58. 12, 2, 7. 12, 5, 4. 15, 11, 8. 17, 10, 2, 17, 10, 3, 19, 6, 1. That the Temple of Jerusalem was splendidly adorned with such offerings, is certain, as well from the passages of Josephus just referred to, as from others, among which, is particularly specified the golden vase presented by Herod to the temple. See also Kypke in loc. and many other authors referred to by Koecher.

6. ταῦτα ἀπεμφείτε. Here we may observe the nominative pendens, or absolute: (See Matth. Gr. Gr.) i. e. as for these things. "In the words (remarks Wetstein) of Matthew and Mark on this subject, all is plain. On the contrary in Luke, who wrote after them, the style seems ἀνακάλυψας and perplexed. This however, proceeded not so much from accident, as from intention. For Matthew and Mark, who relate that the disciples viewed the temple from Mount Olivet, and broke out into expressions of admiration at its stones, proceed to speak of these very stones. But Luke, who places the scene of action in the Temple itself, speaks not so much of the stones, as of the offerings suspended in the temple: q. d. "These things which you see, these gifts presented by your kings, by the Roman Emperor, and others, will not (as ye suppose) remain, but will be taken
down δαίρεται; nay the walls themselves will be demolished, and the whole temple utterly destroyed, καταλυται. Writers are accustomed to suppress words of ill omen, and, in order to live-
lily express the grief thence conceived, frequently break off the discourse in the middle. (Wets.) High
wrought emotion delights in ellipses; as the ancient
Critics and Scholiasts often tell us.

6. ἐλεύθωται ἡμέραι, &c. Wetstein appositely
comparis Hom. II. 8. 164. ἔστεται ἡμαρ, ἡταν τοι
ὅλοῐ Ἰλιος ἵππ.

7—9. See Mark 13, 4. By ἀκαταστασία is meant
that unsettled and turbulent state which espe-
cially arises from sedition and civil dissentions,
when, through the prevalence of faction, the laws
cease to be efficient, and things are carried on by force
and violence. The word ἄκ. is copiously illustrated by
Wetstein. Thus Polyb. Exc. p. 1405. τὰ δὲ κατὰ
τὴν Ἑπειρον ἔτι ἐν ἀκαταστασίαις ἡν καὶ ταραχαῖς.
Dionys. Hal. 6, 31. ἐν τοιαύταις ἀκαταστασίαις τῆς
σώλεως οὕσης. So Tob. 4, 17. James 3, 16. See the
note on Matth. 24, 6.

11. φόβητρα, terriculamenta, fearful sights. The
word answers to the Hebr. צרכ, in Is. 19, 17. What
is meant by it is plain from the following σημεῖα ἀτρο
ουρανοῦ μεγάλα ἔσται, prodigies, fearful sights. These
verbals in -τρον have all an active force, and the ter-
mination -τρον is equivalent to productive of; as, for
instance, μισθοτρον. See the Schol. on Eurip. Phæn.
1266. Wetstein cites Plat. Axioch. καὶ νυκτιῶν ὡς
άληθεὶς φόβητρα. Σημεῖα, i. e. phenomena such as
appear in the air, and which have, in all ages, been
a terror to the superstitious, who have regarded them
as portentous and ominous. Compare the parallel
passages of Matthew and Mark. See Philostr. 5 Ag.
So Virg. Aen. 8, 523. “Ni signum improviso vibrat-
tus ab aethere fulgor Cum sonitu venit: et ruere
omnia visa repente Tyrhenusque tubæ mugire per
aethera clangor. Suspiciunt: iterum atque iterum
fragor intonat ingens; Arma inter nubem cœli in
regione serenâ Per sudum rutilare vident, et pulsa
tonare."

12, 18. ἀποβησόται, scil. αὐτοῖς, which is added in
the parallel place of Mark. The sense is, "these
things shall happen to you." See Matth. 10, 18.
Euthymius thus paraphrases: Εἰς διαμαρτυρίαν, εἰς
ἔλεγχον τῶν μὴ πιστευόντων, ἵνα μὴ δύναμαι λέγειν
ἐν ἡμέρα κρίσεως, ὅτι οὐκ ἴκονται ὑπὸ κηρύγματος.
Observe this force of ἀποβαίνω, i.e. to happen for
evil; which is illustrated with examples by Wetstein;
ex. gr. Artemidor. 3, 67. χρησταὶ φανεῖσαι ἐπὶδεῖς εἰς
evadet in aliquod magnum malum."

15. στόμα καὶ σοφία, i.e. by a metonomy, the fa-
culty of speaking. There is too an hendiadis Ros-
semm. observes, that Christ’s promise is very season-
able, to console the Disciples under the perils by
which they were environed. Euthymius, however,
says that by στόμα is meant the words, and by σοφία
the thoughts which produce the words. It is called
a Hebraism: but it occurs in the Classical writers,
especially the Tragedians. Thus Hesych. ἀστόμος,
ὁ μὴ δυνάμενος λέγειν.

15. ἢ οὐ δυνάστων ἀντεπεῖν, i.e. they shall not be
able to make any suitable reply, that shall carry with
it any semblance of truth. With this verse Wetstein
compares Corn. Nep. Alcibiad. 1. "Tanta erat com-
mandatio oris atque orationis, ut nemo ei dicendo
possit resistere."

17. ζεσθεὶς μισοῦμεν τ. π. That not only the
Apostles, but all the primitive Christians, were in
general more hated and persecuted than any other
religious sect of men, is most notorious to all who
are at all acquainted with ecclesiastical history: a
fact which might seem unaccountable, when we con-
sider how inoffensive and benevolent their temper
and conduct was, and how friendly an aspect their
tenets on the security of any government under
which they lived. The learned Dr. Warburton has
shown, beyond all contradiction, in his masterly
manner, that the true reason of this opposition was, that while the different pagan religions, like the confederated demons honoured by them, sociably agreed with each other, the Gospel taught Christians not only, like the Jews, to bear their testimony to the falsehood of them all, but also with the most fervent zeal to urge the renunciation of them as a point of absolute necessity; requiring all men, on the most tremendous penalties, to believe in Christ, and in all things to submit themselves to his authority: (see Dr. Warburton’s Legation of Moses, vol. 1. book 2. § 6. p. 278—295.) a demand which bore so hard, especially on the pride and licentiousness of their princes, and the secular interests of their priests, that no wonder they raised so violent a storm against it. (Doddridge.)

18. ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν. κτήσασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν. Some would read (with many MSS. Versions, and Fathers,) κτήσεσθε. But Kuin. remarks, that as futures preceded in yer. 7 & 18. the imperative κτήσασθε may have the force of a future. See the note on Matth. 10, 22. & 24, 13. Wetstein renders “colligite vos ipsos,” and gives several Classical examples. But in all of them there is the compound ἀνακτάσαι, not, as here, the simple κτάσαι. “That the words (says Campbell) may have a relation to a temporal, as well as an eternal salvation, is not to be doubted; but as the whole discourse is a prophecy, a translator ought not, from the lights afforded by the fulfilment, to attempt rendering it more explicit than it must have appeared to the hearers at the time.” See also Kypke. The force of the phrase perhaps cannot be determined with any certainty.

20. ἐταῦ ἃ ὑπε κυκλομένη ὑ. σ. τ. Ἰ. By κυκλο-σθαι (as Wolf observes) the Evangelist speaks not of a thing which is done, but of what has begun to be accomplished, and is continued, since for the flight recommended in ver. 21. there would have been no longer any place, if the siege had been completed and perfected. The participle is here put for the
infinitive; as in Ch. 24, 39. and Mark 2, 16. The word στρατοπέδα here signifies armies, legions; of which see Wets. and Fischer, Prolus. de Vit. Lex. 148, seqq.

23. ἐσται ἀνάγκη μεγάλη, i.e. great calumny, misery; in which sense it answers to the Hebr. מַעֲלָה. Thus in the parallel passage of Matthew we have θλίψις. In this sense the word occurs in Tob. 3, 7, & 11. 2 Macc. 6, 7. So also in the Classical writers, from whom examples are produced by Wetstein, Krebs, and Loesner: ex. gr. Xen. Mem. 3, 12, 12. εἰς τὰς ἀνάγκας τὰς ἀλγειοντάς ἐμπεσοῦντες. AEl. V. H: 12, 24. ἐπικουφίσας τοῖς ἀπορουμένοις τὴν ἀνάγκην τῆς πενίας. Diodr. Sic. Ex. p. 557. σπείραν ἀπολύσας πότε τῆς ἀνάγκης. I must add, that this signification often occurs in Thucydides.

24. πεσοῦται στόματι μαχαίρας. The edge of the sword is by the Hebr. called יָדִּים, the mouth of the sword; as in Deut. 13, 16. where the Sept. renders στόμα μαχαίρας. The expression is, however, not without example in the Classical writers. Thus Soph. Ajac. 660. Theophr. Simoc. 129. A. Both words, however, may be thought pleonastic.

24. αἰχμαλωσωθέσονται, “shall be led away captive.” A word of the Alexandrian and Macedonian dialect, for αἰχμάλωτον γίγνεσθαι. The prediction is fully verified by the writings of Josephus, and especially the following passage of that historian, (B. 6, 9, 2.) cited by Wetstein: Τού δὲ λοιπὸν πληθύνως τοὺς ὑπὲρ μου ἐτή δήσας ἐσπεμβας εἰς τὰ κατ’ Αἰγαπτοῦ ἔργα, πλείστους δ’ εἰς τὰς ἐπαρχίας διεδωρήσατο Τίτους ἁβαθ- σομένους ἐν τοῖς δεάτοις σιδήρω καὶ θηρίοις, οἱ δὲ εὐτεύς ἢτων ἐπέζησαν.

24. Ἑρωσύνημ γίνεται πατωμένη ὑπὸ ἔθνων. Πα- τωμένη is by some explained occupied, and (consequently) profaned: and they cite Apoc. 11, 3. 1 Macc. 3, 52. τὰ ἁγία σου καταπετάτηται καὶ βεβηλώ- ται. And so also the Classical writers use the word. Others explain, “shall be ignominiously treated.” Thus Wetstein cites Cic. ad Attic. 8, 11. “Concul-
cari miseram Italian videbis proxima æstate, et quati utriusque vi, mancipiis ex omni genere." I add, Æschyl. Eum. 110. καὶ πάντα ταῦτα λαβὼ ἥρω πατοῦμενα. And Choeph. 699. where see the Commentators.

24. ἀρχι πληρωθος καιροι ἐνων, i. e. even until the end of human things, when the nations shall no longer exist. (Rosenm.) I prefer, however, the interpretation of Kuinoel, "until the time when they themselves (the nations) shall suffer the punishment of their impiety and vice."

25. ἦσται σημεῖα. So Appian 11, 535, 72. seqq. τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα ἐν Ρωμη ἀναλα καὶ φθερά δή. And a little further on are mentioned ἄμφι τε τὸν ἡλιον ἀμάν σημεῖα πολλα. So also Artemid. On. 1, 2. p. 9. where he says that dreams which regard ἡλιον τε καὶ σκῆνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἄστερων ἀφάντων, ἡ τελείαν ἐκκειψιν πάθη προαγορεύει (foreshow) κόσμικα.

25. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συνοχὴ ἐνων. The word συνοχῇ denotes a contraction, or constrictio, and is thus used by the medical writers. Hence it frequently denotes angustia, anxiety, distress, and solicitude, which hold the mind enchained. So Gray, in his Ode to Adversity:

"Bound in thine adamantine chain,
The proud are taught to taste of pain."


25. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Some recent Commentators think that by ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is denoted Palestine. Yet Dr. Campbell defends (perhaps rightly) the common interpretation, namely, "the earth." For this preference he assigns the following reasons: "First, though what precedes seems peculiarly to concern the Jews, what follows appears to have a more extensive object, and to relate to the nations, and to the habitable earth in general. There we hear of συνοχή
and of the things ἐπερχομένων τῇ ἐκκομίᾳ; not to mention what follows, to wit, that the Son of Man shall be seen coming on a cloud, with great glory and power. Nor is it at all probable that, by the term ἔθνων, nations, used thrice in the preceding verse, manifestly for Gentiles, are meant, in this verse only, Jews and Samaritans. Secondly, the prediction which the verse under examination introduces, is accurately distinguished by the historian; as not commencing till after the calamities which were to befall the Jews should be ended; after their capital and temple, their last resource should be invested and taken, and the wretched inhabitants destroyed, or carried captive into all nations." The word ἀπορία is copiously illustrated by Wetts. and Munthe. It denotes consilii inopia, i. e. literally, the not knowing what to do, or whither to turn oneself. So Herodian 4, 14, 1. ἀπορία τοῦ πρακτοῦ. And 2, 12, 5. καταλαμβανόμενος ἀφθονία τε καὶ ἀπορία.

25. ἡχοῦσης θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου. The word σάλος denotes not only the sea, but the tossing and commotion of its waves. See Hesych. and the examples in Wetstein. Or we may suppose an hendiadis. The word ἡχεω is especially applied to the roaring of the sea. "The Prophets (says Le Clerc) paint the heavens, earth, and sea, in dreadful commotion, and the nations in immediate expectation of a final dissolution, when they wish to describe any uncommon change that is impending; as we see in Isa. 13, on the destruction of Babylon." Here then the roaring of the waves is meant (as earthquakes sometimes are) to paint images of dire calamity; as is frequent in the Hebrew poets. Kuinoel observes, that there seems denoted a sort of congeries malorum, by which the inhabitants should be swept away quasi gurgite. See the note on Matth. 24, 29. "The sea and the waves roaring (observes Dr. Owen) symbolically represent a collection or multitude of people in commotion: and frequent commotions there were
in several parts of Judea, before the destruction of Jerusalem.” Some MSS. read ηχους βαλάσωσις, which Bengel and others prefer. Then ηχους will be a genitive of object; as in the similar expression of Job 24, 17. ταραχαὶ σκιᾶς βαλαντοῦ.

26. ἀποψιχώτων. The word not only signifies to expire, die, but is equivalent to our common expression to die away, to faint; with which may be compared the Greek ἐκβιάσκω, which has the same sense. So Arrian, Epict. 3, 26. The word προσδοκία (as also ἔλεισ) is very often (as here) used of the fear of imminent calamity. See Elsner, Kypke, Munthe, Krebs, and Loesner. Bulkley compares Senec. Thyest: “Trepidant, trepidant pectora magno. Percusla metu, ne fatali cuncta ruina quassata labent.”

26. τῶν ἐπερχομένων, are coming up, i. e. happening. The word is generally used of evils, or at least sudden and unexpected events. And so in general the Latin supervenio, which is used in a good sense by Hor. Ep. (cited by Wetstein.) “Grata superveniens, quae non sperabitur, hora.”

28. ἀνακάλυπτε, καὶ ἐπάφατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν. So Markland points: for he doubts whether ἀνακάλυπτειν κεφαλὰς be good Greek. And with reason: for ἀνακάλυπτειν, of itself, signifies to raise up the body, or any member of it. But I have no where seen the word accompanied with an accusative expressive of any member of the body. See Wetstein, Kypke, and Loesner. It is opposed to. συγκάλυπτειν in Luke 13, 11. The Philologists compare the use of ἐπαίρεσθαι with the Latin erigi animis, erigi ad spem.

28. ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν, your redemption, i. e. from the Jewish persecution. For after the suppression of the Synedrium the Gospel was far more extensively propagated. The Apostles indeed, except John, did not live to see this utter destruction of the Jewish government. But the prediction was uttered with the intent that the Apostles should communicate the prophecy to others.

28. See the note on Matth. 24—32, seqq.
30. οὖν προβάλλωσιν. Supply κάρτον, (as in Jos: and Arrian, Epict. 1, 15. cited by Price,) or φύλα, or κλάδους, and the like. See Krebs and Kypke. Grotius cites from Dioscorid. προβάλλειν ἁνθώς. So the Hebr. נְשׁוֹ is used of the budding, shooting forth, and branching of trees.

31. ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, i. e. the general spread of the Gospel, which took place after the destruction of Jerusalem. See the note on Matth. 34, 33, seqq.

34. προσέχετε δ. ε. mind, be on your guard, φυλάττε. Μη βαρωθάσθε, i. e. be weighed down, rendered dull, and unfit for serious thought or religious watchfulness. This sense of βαρωθαι, and of the Latin gravari, is common also in the Classical writers. See the examples of Wets. and Kypke.

34. εν κραυτάλη, καὶ μέθη. Properly speaking, these words differ in this, namely, that μέθη denotes the drunken fit itself, and κραυτάλη the stupid sensation, headache, and heavy depression, which supervenes after the excessive excitement has worn off: both equally indisposing the mind to serious reflection; and therefore are very properly joined. They seem however to be put, by synecdoche, for all sorts of sensual excess. Thus Euthymius judiciously remarks: Οὐ μόνον ἡ μέθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ βίου βαστάζουσι τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ καταποντίζουσι τὸν νοῦν.

34. καὶ μερίμναις βιαστικάς. Sunt curae vitales, ad hanc vitam pertinentes de acquirendo victu et amicatu, rebusque aliis, ad sustendandam vitam necessariis, comparandis. (Koecher.) Wetstein copiously illustrates both the expression and the subject. Of the passages which he has cited the most opposite are the following. Galen. de tuend. val. 5. ξηράτης ἰν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐξεισῶν οἰκιοτάτου ἢ τεσσάρων ἢ ἀγρυπνίαν, ἢ μέρισμα βιατικήν, ἢ πολλὰ τρίψιν ἢ γυμνάσιοι ἀμέτρων ἐπιβείναται. Philo de V. Mos. p. 159, 15. ημοττε γὰρ ταῖς ὑπὰτει ἀφθαρτικοτέραν οὐσίαν ἀπουνεμενήθαι πυρὸς, τὴς πρὸς τὰς βιατικὰς χελέας ὑπερτείνῃσις. Diod. Sic. 2, 29. Sext. Emp. c. Logic. 1, 30. κατὰ ἀνάγκην
The substantive is sometimes omitted. 35. *os παγις γρα ἐπελεύσεται, i. e. unexpectedly. See Eccl. 9, 12. The words παγις and σκάνδαλον are frequent images expressive of calamity, (as the Heb. בְּעֵית, in Ps. 39, 4. and 1 Macc. 1, 39. 5, 4.) especially such as are sudden and unexpected, (as here and in Rom. 11, 9.) by which men are taken (like a beast in a trap) before they are aware.

35. ἐτι π. τ. καθημένος ἔτι π. τ. τ. γ. Καθημαί here denotes versor in aliquo loco, reside, live. So in Jer. 25, 29. the Hebr. יָשָׂר הָעָל, which the Sept. render ἐτι πάντας τοὺς καθημένους ἐτι τῆς γῆς. This seems to be the sense here; and, indeed, there seems to be an allusion to the above passage. Thus also Matth. 4, 16. Luke 1, 29. Joh. 6, 3. Acts 2, 2. In this sense the word sometimes occurs in the Greek Classical writers, and sedere in the Latin ones. See Schl. Lex. in v. § 8. Kuinoel, however, explains it of those who are otiosi, slothful, secure, &c. and this signification is so natural and common, that he needed not to have fortified it with such numerous Greek and Latin citations. Yet here it would seem harsh, and little suitable to the context.

36. ἀγρυπνεῖτε, watch and keep up continual prayer, that you may be accounted worthy of being delivered from these evils, and finally of being introduced with honour to the Messiah, and being accepted by him. The word σταθήμα is properly a judicial term: but it here seems to be used as in Luke 19, 8. σταθεὶς δὲ Ζαχαρίας πρὸς τὸν Κύριον, where see the note. Koecher illustrates this from the Oriental custom of courtiers standing before their monarch to expect his commands. Rosenm. (with less probability) explains it, "to stand with humble confidence, to be absolved," &c. It comes, however, to much the same thing.

37. τὰς δὲ νήκτας — ἐλαίων. This was done both
to avoid the snares of the Pharisees, and to give no room for sedition: and also, as Euthymius observes, διὰ τὸ ἀπερίστατον καὶ ἑπτάδειον εἰς τροσκηνὺς οὐκ ἢττον δὲ καὶ εἰς μυστικώτεραν διδασκαλίαν τῶν μαθητῶν δῆλον γὰρ, ὅτι μετ' αὐτῶν ἐξηρχέτο ἐκεῖ καὶ ἁμαρτέτο, that his mind might be the more disengaged and fitted for devotion, and that he might attend to the more mystical instruction of his Disciples; for it is evident that he took up his lodging there with them.

38. ὁ λαὸς ἀρθήκη πρὸς αὐτόν. This word, which is thought to be of the Alexandrian dialect for ἀρθῆκε, denotes properly to rise early; 2dly, to go about any business early; 3dly, to go any where early; in imitation (as some think) of the Hebr. בָּנָה. It here signifies, “resorted to him early in the morning.”

CHAP. XXII.

VERSE 1, 2. See Matth. 26, 2, seqq. and Mark 14, 1. 9, 23.

3. εἰσηλθεν ὁ Ζαρανᾶς εἰς Ἰωάνναν. Rosenm. deems it unnecessary to suppose a local and physical entry into the body of Judas; but thinks the sense is, that Judas conceived and meditated in his mind a most diabolical and heinous crime. For (observes he) as those who obey the divine motion, are said to receive the Spirit as a divine guest; so Satan is said to enter into those who consent unto criminal suggestions. See Joh. 13, 2. Acts 5, 9. Ephes. 2, 2. Consult the note on Matth. 3, 16. 4, 1. Luke 2, 27. He thinks that the following words, ὅτα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα, are meant to mark the heinousness of his offence; and he further observes, that so atrocious was the crime, that it could scarcely be accounted for on natural principles, and therefore seemed to require the supposition of demoniacal agency. In this opinion, Kuinoel, and other recent commentators, coincide. It is difficult, however, to reconcile this interpretation (which is liable to many serious objections) with various passages of Scripture.
See Joh. 13, 27. I must refer the reader to an excellent note of Grotius, which it will not be necessary for me to translate and adapt to its use, as that has already been done (though without any acknowledgment) by Dr. Whitby. The following observation of Euthymius (which seems derived from Chrys.) is not unworthy of attention: Πρότερον μὲν γὰρ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἀποπείραν ἐποίησατο καὶ διεκώλυσε τὸν ἀβλιτόν οὐστερον δὲ γνώς αὐθαυσθεντα, ὡς ἀδιόρθωτον, βαρνήσας ἐπετήθησεν.

4. στρατηγοὶ, officers. These were not military officers, but presidents of the Temple. (See infra, 52.) According to the Jewish custom, the Levites and Priests kept (by turns) a nightly watch in the Temple, over which one presided who was called κατ' ἔξοχην, the prefect of the Temple. With these were also associated persons of rank, who were likewise called officers, or prefects. Of this guard of the Temple mention is made in 2 Kings 25, 18. These prefects were therefore Jews, not Romans. Thus Achan, who was prefect of the Temple, and is joined with the High Priest, is simply called στρατηγὸς, officer, in Jos. Ant. 20, 6, 2. And no wonder; for the word στρατηγὸς at that time denoted among the Greeks, not only a military, but a civil officer, i. e. magistrate, any person set over others; all which is illustrated by Deyling, in his Obs. S. P. 3, p. 237. seqq. See also Lightfoot in loc. (Rosenm.) Consult Krebsii Comment. in Decret. Athen. pro Hyrcano, p. 326.

5. συνέβηντο αὐτῷ ἀρχηγὸν δοῦναι. Συντίθημι signifies to engage or promise on condition; as in Jos. Ant. 13, 4, 7. Xen. Hist. 3, 5, 6. & ΣΕconi. 7, 2.

6. ἐξομολογήσε. The word ἐξομολογεῖω signifies, properly, "to say the same with any person, to agree with him, to agree, engage to do any thing," as here. This interpretation is confirmed by a passage of Lysias (cited by Wetstein): εἶπον οὖν ὅτι τάλαντον ἀργυρίου ἐτοίμος εἶνα δοῦναι. 'Ο δ' ὑπομολογεῖε ταύτα τοι-
7—14. See Matth. 26, 17. seqq. and Mark 14, 22. seqq. and the notes.

15. ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τ. τ. π. φ. An Hebraism. So Gen. 31, 30. ἐπιθυμία γὰρ ἐπεθύμησα ἐπεθύμειν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατέρας. Blackwall, indeed, and others, produce what they think similar phrases from the Greek writers, but which, in fact, are not similar. For in Hebrew this idiom has an intensive force; but scarcely ever so in the Greek Classics, as, for instance, ἀγοράς ἀγορεύειν, &c. on which expression see Matth. Gr. Gr.

16. ἔως ὅτου πληρωθῇ. A thing is said to be consummated, when it is perfect or complete. The expression implies, that he will have no further society with them on earth, as a fellow-man.

17—20. See the notes on Matth. 26, 27, & 28.


19. τούτο ποιεῖτε. e. τ. ἦ. d. Schoettgen here cites various Rabbinical passages, which testify in a remarkable manner, that the ancient Jewish Church, in celebrating the Paschal feast, always had in view the sufferings of the Messiah. "Who, therefore, can doubt (says he) but that the ancient Jews always acknowledged Christ as the scope and intent of this feast. Much is it to be lamented their posterity should labour under such mental blindness, as that
they will rather neglect their salvation than acknowledge this truth."

21. ἡ χερὶ—ἐπὶ τῆς πρατέργης. An Oriental figure, for "the person who shall betray me is with me at table."

22. πορεύεται, goeth (unto death). The Hebrew, Greek, and Latin writers use verbs of departing by euphemism, to denote death. See Palaiaret. Of this the best writers are full of examples.

24. ἐγένετο φιλονεκία ἐν αὐτοῖς. Markland would translate, "now there had been a contention by the way." "For (observes he) Matthew and Mark tell us, that this contention happened in the way, before they came to Jerusalem; nay, further, before they came to Jericho. (Matth. 20. Mark 10.) It does not seem probable that there should be a dispute concerning priority at this time." In this view of the subject almost all the recent Commentators (as, for instance, Campbell, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel) coincide. Doddridge, too, admits that we cannot suppose such a contention for superiority should have occurred immediately after so affecting a lesson of humility; and he grants, that Luke seems to be less exact in noting the order of time than the other Evangelists.

25. See Matth. 20, 25. Εὐεργέται καλοῦνται. The word εὐεργέτας was among the Greeks a title of honour, assigned to all who had deserved well of the monarch or state, defended its liberties, or increased its honour. So the Latin pater patriae. Thus Onias in 2 Macc. 4, 2. is styled ὁ εὐεργέτας τῆς πόλεως. But the cognomen was given κατ' ἐξοχήν, to kings (as Ptolemy Εὐεργέτας), and to chief citizens as a title of honour.* See Schl. Lex. and the Critics there re-

* It seems (says Campbell) to be our Lord's view, in these instructions, not only to check in his Apostles all ambition of power, every thing which savoured of a desire of superiority and dominion over their brethren, but also to restrain that species of vanity which is near a kin to it, the affectation of distinction from titles of respect and dignity. Against this vice particularly, the clause under consideration seems to be levelled. The reflection naturally suggested by it is, How little are any the most pompous epi-
ferred to. So Thucyd. 1, 129. κείσεταί σοι εὐεργεσία ἐν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ οἶκῳ ἵστατι ἀνάγκαστος.

26. ὁ μείζων — νεώτερος. The word νεώτερος has here, by the force of the opposition, the sense of inferior, which is an Alexandrian idiom. For the Sept. express the Hebr. גַּם (little) and בֶּן (boy) by this very word. (Kuín.) Kypke has shown that this idiom is found in the Greek Classical writers.

27. ἁς ὁ διακονῶν. Jesus adverts to his having washed the feet of his disciples; by which symbolic action he most emphatically commended to them the observance of mutual humility and condescension.

28. υἱὲς δὲ ἔστε οἱ δ. μ. ἐετ. πεισασμοῖς μοι. Πεισασμὸς is well rendered by Doddridge and Campbell trials, since the word is appropriately used of those afflictions and adversities which are sent to try us, See Schl. Lex.

29. διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν. Alberti and Kypke take the word to signify bequeath. But this sense, however well established, does not suit the context, since there follows καθὼς διέθετο μοι ὁ πατήρ μου. Kuinoel, Rosenmuller, and Schleusner, give it the sense of promised; and so the Syriac version, and Euthymius. The E. T. has appoint. But that is too indefinite a signification. The word denotes, properly, to dispose any thing, dispose of, bequeath, and was used, not only of testamentary bequests, but of solemn engagements in general. Hence it comes to mean (as here) to engage for, to promise, which is, indeed, a sort of granting, and thus the word is rendered by Markland and Campbell.* I should prefer bestow. See Doddridge.

31. See Matth. 26, 31, 33 seqq. Jesus now addresses himself to Peter; yet so that his words may

thets which men can bestow worthy the regard of a good man, who observes how vilely, through servility and flattery, they are sometimes prostituted on the most undeserving.

* Markland and Campbell, not without reason, adopt the punctuation of Theophylact, which is, διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν (καθὼς διέθετο μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλείαν) ινα, &c.
have reference also to the other Apostles. Some confident speeches seem to have been uttered by Peter, to which our Lord makes answer in the words following. See Joh. 13, 36. seqq. (Kuin.)

31. ἵνα παλάτησα εἰς πάντα ὑ. Wetstein and Kuinoel refer to Job 2, 6. and Kuinoel thinks that there is here an allusion to the story of Job’s temptation. This was the opinion, too, of Euthymius, who observes: “Εδος γὰς αὐτῷ τοὺς δοκιμαστέους ἐξαιτεῖον ἔπος πάλην, οἰς τὸν Ἰακ. The words ἐξαιτεῖν and ἐξαιτεῖον signify, to require any one to be delivered to us, whether for good (as in Xen. An. 1, 1, 3. Demosth. p. 546. cited by Schl. to which I add Eurip. Bacch. 347.) or (as here) for evil, i.e. whether for trial, or for punishment. Of this sense many examples are produced by Raphel, Wetstein, and Irmisch on Herodian, 1, 12, 12. It must here be understood to metaphorically denote expetit vos.

31. τὸν κινήσας ὑς τὸν σιτον. The word κινήσας; from κινούν, a sieve, signifies to sift, or winnow, and as that supposes agitation, commotion, and separation, so most Commentators agree, that it denotes “perturb, loosen, undermine, and overthrow your fidelity.” But perhaps the sense suggested by our common version is more apt, namely, “sift you, scrutinize, or try your fidelity, faith, and constancy.” Thus Hesych. πεῖσαι. πειράσας. See Bois and Wolf.

32. σὺ πάντε ἐπιστρέψας σ. τ. ἀ. σ. There has been some difference of opinion in the interpretation of this sentence. Some Commentators (as Theophylact, Euthymius, L. Brug. De Dieu; Price, Beza, Piscator, Casaubon, Wolf, Hackspan, Schleusner, and others, interpret resipiscere, repent; as in Matth. 13, 15, and many more passages to be seen in Schl. Lex. Others, as Grotius, Maldonati, Bengal, Rosenmuller, and Kuinoel, take it, by a Hebraism, to denote vicissim; a sense which it sometimes bears, but which I think not so suitable to the context as the former interpretation. Wetstein renders, converting thy brethren, which seems very harsh.
34. See the note on Matth. 26, 34.

36. ἵνα ἐλθήσῃ ὁ θεός, ἀναπαύσῃ, φέρω, let him take it away with him. On this passage see Euthymius. De Dieu takes μὴ ἐλθῇ for ὁ δὲν ἐλθή, he who is poor. Consult the note on Matth. 18, 12. It is well remarked by Wetstein, that these phrases contain nothing but a prediction of instant perils, which are opposed to the quiet and security of former times. "The Prophets (says he) are accustomed to metaphorically signify perilous times by representing what men then commonly do, in order to guard against danger." The same view of the subject Grotius seems to have taken, who observes, that the words μὴ ἐλθή, παλαιστήρια must be taken comparare, i.e. "let him buy a sword at any rate, if he even has to sell his coat." Wolf aptly compares Maimonides, C. 4. "Let him that has nothing to eat but what he can get by charity even sell his coat, that he may provide himself

* In this view of the subject, Campbell offers the following admirable observations: "In the animated language of the prophets, their predictions are often announced under the form of commands. The prophet Isaiah, in the sublime prediction he has given us of the fate of the King of Babylon, thus writes the destruction of his family (14, 21.): 'Prepare slaughter for his children, for the iniquity of their fathers, that they do not rise, nor possess the land.' Yet the instruments by which Providence intended to effect the extirpation of the tyrant's family, were none of those to whom the prophecy was announced. The prophet Jeremiah, in like manner, foretells the approaching destruction of the children of Sion, by exhibiting God as thus addressing the people (9, 17, 18.): 'Call for the mourning women, that they may come; and send for cunning women; and let them make haste, and take up a wailing for us, that our eyes may run down with tears, and our eye-lids gush out with waters.' There matter of sorrow is predicted, by commanding the common attendants on mourning and lamentation to be gotten in readiness; here warning is given of the most imminent dangers, by orders to make the customary preparation against violence, and to account a weapon more necessary than a garment." Hence it is astonishing that a man of Bishop Pearce's abilities should have been so puzzled to reconcile this clause to our Saviour's intention of yielding, without resistance, that, rather than admit it, he would recur to an expedient, whose tendency is but too evidently to render Scripture precarious and uncertain.
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with oil and candles for the feast of the Encenia." The words (says Rosenmuller) are not to be understood as a *command*, but a *prediction* of what would necessarily happen. Grotius truly observes, that it was the custom with many nations of antiquity (and especially the Jews) to designate any remarkable fact not by *words* only, but also by *things conspicuous*. Hence arose the imposition of hands, and many other symbols of human invention. This was especially in use with the Prophets; as in 1 Kings 22, 4. Is. 20, 2. Jer. 9, 17. & 27, 2. Ez. 4, 2. 12, 7. Hos. 1, 2. Acts 21, 11. &c. Schoettgen observes, that Christ permits them the use of a sword; not, however, for offence *, but for defence. Nay, he hints at the necessity for it, by employing a parabolical phrase, meaning that they must even sell their coat to buy one. Similar proverbial expressions are used by the vulgar in our own country.

37. ἐτι τοῦτο. Grotius thus paraphrases the passage: "After the many other evils endured by me, the last now remains, namely, that I should be brought to an ignominious death. And my lot will extend to you also; for the ignominy and hatred encountered by the master will be visited on you his disciples."

37. τὰ περὶ ἐμοὶ τέλος ἐχει. This phrase τέλος ἐχει is synonymous with the preceding τελεσθηναι, and is used by the best Classical writers to denote the completion of oracles. Wetstein cites Ἀeschyl. Prom. Vinct. 12. Dionys. Hal. 9, 12. Athen. 941. c. Pausan. Arcad. 7. Kypke cites several passages from Dionys. Hal. and Demosth. and τέλος λαμβανει from Josephus †.

* By this (judiciously observes Euthymius) our Lord merely shows that the time for combat is at hand, since their enemies were almost upon them; not meaning that they should defend themselves by swords; for a little after he forbade Peter to so defend himself.

† The whole verse is thus excellently paraphrased by Schoettgen: "Adest enim hoc tempus, quo ego cum celestis crucifi-
38. How it happened that they had the swords, and for what purpose, the Commentators are not agreed. Euthymius thinks that they took them to sacrifice the Paschal lamb. Grotius, more rationally, supposes that as the road from Galilee to Jerusalem was infested with robbers, many (and especially the Galileans, who were sufficiently pugnacious,) took swords. That the Essenes, too, did so, we may collect from many passages of Josephus; and Cyril informs us that this was customary in his time. The Apostles so far followed this custom * as to have two only amongst them. It is, however, of more importance to decide the sense of the difficult and controverted phrase ἵκανόν εἶτι. Casaubon, Castellio, and others, think there is an irony; a figure used by our Lord in Mark 7, 9, 14, 4. This, however, seems harsh. Grotius thinks that the sense may be sufficient for a symbol of hostility." But this would be too ænigmatical. I assent to the opinion of Heinsius, Schoettgen, Krebs, Basnage, Heuman, Markland, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Schleusner, and others, which seems to have been adopted by Euthymius and Theophylact, and which cannot be better expressed than in the words of Markland.

"They quite mistook our Saviour's meaning. He made use of a proverbial form of speech, only to signify to them the danger and trial they were likely to fall into upon his being given up, which he foretold them was very near. They took him in the literal sense, and thought they had gratified him even beyond his desire; he asking, as they thought, only for a sword, and they telling him, with a kind of triumph and joy, 'Lord, here are two swords.'

* Schoettgen tells us, that in Judæa even Priests at that time went armed; and he cites Sohar. Gen. "There is a tradition that a traveller should prepare for three things; a present to appease enemies whom he may meet with; 2dly, for combat; 3dly, for prayer." In this we may instance the example of Jacob.
their misapprehension he did not think fit to rectify, because it would have been of no service to them, but gave them such an answer as a mild and humane master would have done to a well-meaning servant of great stupidity, It is very well."

It appears from Schoettgen that the phrase is frequent in the Rabbinical writings, from which he cites numerous examples. Rosenmuller produces a similar phrase from the German, Es est gut! Genug von dieser Sache! Schoettgen tells us that the Scholiast on Lucian notices the idiom.

41. ἀπεστάθη. Many Interpreters, as L. Brug. Piscator, Kypke, Alard, and Schwartz, retain the full force of the word, and render proripuit se. But I rather assent to Casaubon, Tremell, Raphael, Bois, Wolf, Rosenmuller, Kuinoel, and Schleusner, who explain, abstraxit se ab illis, i. e. abscessit, abstitit ab iis. So also the Syriac and Arabic versions. Schleusner and Kuinoel compare 2 Macc. 12, 10 & 17. Many other examples may be seen in Schl. Lex. See also Sturzii Lex. Xen. Hence I cannot but be amazed that so excellent a scholar as Markland should have stumbled at the word, and thought it necessary to adopt the reading of one MS. ἀπεστάθη, which is a manifest gloss, or παραδιορθώσει, as are many of the peculiar readings of that MS. (the Codex Cantab.) Kuinoel here quotes an excellent remark of Fischer de Vit. Lex. p. 386. seqq. namely, that the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, were accustomed to use many words, in which, properly, some force and imetus is signified, with a considerable diminution, and sometimes absence from all notion of violence." I have myself made similar remarks on the use of various words.

41. ὁσεὶ λίθου βολήν, about a stone's throw. Of this phrase Wetstein cites several examples, to which I add a far more apposite one from Procop. 236, 17. διεστήκει γὰρ αὐτῷ ὁσοὶ λίθου βολήν. So also Appian: 2, 98, 35. ἀποστράπος ὁσοὶ βέλους ὀρμήν.

42. See the note on Matth. 26, 39.
49, 44]. These verses are not found in some MSS, and in others are marked with an asterisk. Their genuineness has therefore been called in question; and Epiphanius, Hilary, and Jerome, bear testimony to their not being found in some Greek and Latin MSS. For the particulars of the evidence on this question I must refer my readers to Mill, Wetstein, Matthias, and Krebs. Suffice it to say, that they are found in the fur greater number, and those the most ancient and valuable MSS. They are recognised, too, by Just. Mart. Hippolyt. Epiphanius, Chrysost. Jerome, Theodorus Mopsuest, and all the ancient versions. See Rosenmuller. The causes for their omission are obvious. They were thrown out, as seeming too favourable to the Arians. In this view Grotius censures the scrupulosity and temerity of those who have cancelled these two verses for no stronger reason than they did that which bears testimony to the weeping of Christ. "For (continues Grot.) now that he was deprived of the Divine virtue that dwelt in him, and left to his human nature, and consequently made less than the angels, he needed the angelic consolation. The same is observable in the other trials and temptations of our Lord, as Matth. 4, 11. So also in Joh. 14, 28. we are told that he was comforted by a voice from Heaven." Kuinoel cites as apposite the following words of Cler. in Art. Crit. p. 3. p. 232: "Falsarii qui pro sua imperitiâ, historiae Christi emendabant, ha sustulerunt, quasi indigna Christo, quæ tamen cæteri Christiani genuina esse agnoverunt. Quæ narrabantur de nonnullis martyribus, qui quasi alienatâ mente, nec cruciatus ullos patientes, illudebant carnificibus, effecerant, ut extremum illud certamen imperiti homines non satis concoquerunt. At multa major est constantiâ ejus, qui sui compos, et acerrimis doloris ac ignominiae stimulus confessus, virtutem et veritatem tuetur, quam ejus, qui instar furentis clamitat, se nihil sentire doloris, ac ridet, si vera quidem sunt quæ narrantur, in mediis flammis, aut in candente
crate.” Kuin. finally comes to this conclusion, that these two verses are certainly genuine. As to the fact itself, and the mode of the angelic appearance, the German Theologians here (as often) run into many wild (not to say presumptuous) speculations, which I cannot find room to state, and which, if detailed, would prove little instructive to the reader. Wetstein refers to A. Gell. 12, 5. and observes, “Corpus debile curis et vigiliiis consecutum refecti angelus.” Tob. 6, 6—10. Joh. 5, 4. The word ἐνοχή is frequent in the Sept. both in an active and neuter sense.

44. καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνία. Here Kuinoel renders καὶ nam, for, like the Hebr. †, and refers to Schl. Lex. For (says he) these words contain the cause of the angelic appearance. The word ἀγωνία is generally used of contest, as ἀγών and ἀγώνισμα (see the ancient Greek Lexicons): but it is sometimes (as here) used of angor, animi perturbatio, and exactly corresponds to our word agony. Of this signification Wetstein, Kypke, and Loesner, give many examples. ἐν ἀγωνία ἐλθαῖ is a formula. So Hesych. ἐν ἀγωνία: ἐν μερίμνῃ. See Doddridge.

44. ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ ἱδρώς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος, and his sweat was, as it were, clots of blood. Many Commentators (says Kuinoel), both ancient and modern, (see Pole, Wolf, Koecher, and Thiess,) have thought that the sweat of Christ was really blood, or at least mixed with particles of blood, and have diligently collated other examples of this phenomenon, as Sagittarius, in his Hist. Passion., Bartholin de Cruce, Richter, Eschenbach, Scrip, Mede, and Bill, cited by Gruner in his Comment. de J. C. Morte, and Wetstein’s note, where most of them may be found. See the notes of Whitby and Doddridge. So Lucan. 9, 812 (cited by Bulkley): “Sic omnia membra emiseretur simul rutilum pro sanguine virus. Sanguis erant lacrymæ, quae cumque foramina novit Humor, ab his largus manat cruora redundat, et patulæ nares: sudor rubet: omnia plenis membra fluunt venis:
totum est pro vulnere corpus.” Mr. Bulkley also refers to Boyle’s Nat. Phil. p. 2, p. 225. Others, however, as Theophylact, Euthymius, Grotius, Scaliger, Hammond, Price, Clericus, Markland, and almost all recent Commentators, as Rosenmuller and Kuinoel, more properly explain, “his sweat became like clots or cakes of blood.” This interpretation, indeed, the words themselves demand; for (as Euthymius and Theophylact observe) it is not written ἐγένετο ἰδραίς αἷματος, which the other would require, but ἐγένετο ὃ ἱδραὶ αὐτοῦ ἀεί ἁρμάν οἱ αἷματος. There is a similar passage in Acts 9, 19. καὶ εὐθέως ἀπέστειλεν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ ἀεί λεπίδες. Theophylact, too, remarks, that it is a sort of proverb applied to any one who labours excessively, ὃ τι αἷμα ἰδρωσεν, he sweated blood*, as also to those who weep bitterly; αἷματα κλαεῖν, that they weep blood. Thus Ulysses, when in an agony of fear, is said by Homer to shed tears of blood†. These proverbs are cited from Zenodot and Diogenianus by Photius in his Epist. 138. who has there ably supported this interpretation. There is (says he) an allusion to these proverbs in the words of Luke, who was not τῶν τοιοῦτων μαθημάτων (Graecian literature) ἀνύκοσ. That this sense (continues he) is the true one is manifest, from the expression ἀεί ἁρμάν οἱ. From the same Epistle it appears that the words were rejected by some as not-genuine; which, we may suppose, arose from a false interpretation. Theodoret, indeed, and Titus Bostrensis defend the common interpretation (whom see ap. Suic. Thes. p. 115.) but not, as I think, satisfactorily.

45. οὕτων ἀυτοῦ κοιμαμένως ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης, sleeping stupified with sorrow, says Doddridge. Schleusner and Kuinoel explain ἀπὸ λύπης πρὸς tristitiam, agritudine; and the latter refers to Is. 1, 5. where ἡν, lan-

* There is, indeed, a phrase similar to this in the mouths of the vulgar in our own country.
† This is alluded to in Eurip. Hecub. Ὀμμάτων τ’ ἀπὸ Φῶνον σταλαγμοὶ ἡν κατέστασον μένων;
guor, is translated λύτη. But the expression is best illus-
trated by the following parallel passages adduced
by Alberti and Wets.: Hom. Od. µ. 310. κλάοντες
δὲ τοῖσιν ἐκτήλυε νύφωμα ἅπνος. Plut. p. 323. c. αὐτὸν ὡς
 eius ὑπὸν ἐκ δυσθυμίας καὶ λύτης ἀτεκλιδήμην. Heliodor.
2, 15. καὶ πρὸς ἣδον καμῖα διὰ τὸ ὑπερβάλλει τῆς λύτης
ἐπιστήνατο & 5, p. 203. καὶ ἡ τῶν συμφορῶν ὑπόθεσις
παραλύωσι τὴν διάνοιαν, εἰς ὑπὸν καταθέρει. Longus
Pastoral. 2, p. 67. ταῦτα λέγουσα αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν δικήρων
καὶ τῆς λύτης ὑπὸς βαθὺς καταλαμβάνει. Curt. 14, 13,
17. Τανδεμ gravatum animi anxietate corpus altior
somnus oppressit. See also Pincinelli Lum. Reflex.
658.

47, 48. See Matth. 26, 47. seqq.
49—51. See the note on Matth. 26, 51, seqq.
The expression πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ savours of a
Hebraism (2): yet a similar use of the preposition
is found in passages cited from good Greek authors
by Wetstein. On eι in the sense of num, see the
note on Mark 8, 25.

51. εἶτε ἐως τούτου. Commentators are somewhat
divided in opinion about the sense of these words;
which will assume a different interpretation, as they
may be supposed addressed to the disciples, or to the
multitude. Those who adopt the latter opinion, as
Hammond, Kypke, Doddridge, and many others,
interpret desistite hac tenus, “leave me free, until I
shall have healed the man whose ear is wounded;
afterwards lead me away captive.” They subaud
ἐγε, and after ἐως τούτου understand the word χῶνο
or πράγματος. Therefore, according to their opinion,
Jesus made no answer to the interrogation of his
disciples, eι πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ, nor reprehended
Peter, who had struck the servant. Those who
think the words addressed to the disciples, place a
stop after εἶτε, supply αὐτῶς, and thus explain:
“Let them do what they please, do not hinder them,
be content with this violence, strike no more, desist.”
So Wetstein, who explains: “Satis est vos hucusque
progressos. Desilite nunc a pugnà et eam omitte.
Sinite teneritatem vestram hucusque, non ulterior, procredi." This latter interpretation is adopted by Rosenm. Kuinoel, and Schleusner, and seems the preferable one.*

53. άλλα αυτη όμων εστιν ή άρα, και εξωσια του σκότους. There is some difference of opinion as to the interpretation of these words, which many thus explain: "This is the time most opportune for your purpose." So Philo 1016. β. σο, ελε, νον ο καιρος εστιν Ελικων, εκενιερε ευατον. Martial, Epigr. 10, 19. "Hac hora est tua eum furt Lyceus." Sil. It. 12, 198. "Dexter deus, horaque nostra est." Thus και αεξωσια του σκότους is taken for αυτη αεξωσια του σκότους. "This is the hour in which darkness rejoices: such deeds as you commit are best done in the night; now is the time in which those who avoid the light may perpetrate their crimes:" by a sort of irony. But, as I have before observed, this is a figure rarely employed by our Lord. I agree with Kuinoel in preferring the following interpretation, which is adopted by Grotius and Wetstein. "This is the time destined, appointed and conceded to you by God: and this is the power of iniquity." i.e. iniquity has obtained this power. "This is the hour in which that power is granted you, in order that the prophecies might

* Campbell, with reason, objects to our common version, which he observes is obscure, and susceptible of very different interpretations. All Antiquity seems agreed in understanding our Lord's expression as a check to his Disciples, by intimating that they were not to proceed further in the way of resistance, as it was not to such methods of defence that he chose to recur. What is recorded by the other Evangelists, (Matth. 16, 52, 53. Joh. 18, 11.) as likewise said on the occasion, strongly confirms this explanation. Another, indeed, has been suggested; namely, that the words were spoken to the soldiers, who are supposed before now to have seized his person; and that our Lord asked of them that they would grant him liberty to go to the man whose ear had been cut off, that he might cure him; the only instance wherein Jesus needed the permission or the aid of any man in working a miracle. An explanation this every way exceptionable; but it is sufficient here to take notice that it is totally destitute of evidence.
be fulfilled.” See Matth. 26, 56. This interpretation is confirmed by the parallel passage of Matth. 26, 45. ἡγγικεν ἁρα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπον παραδίδεται εἰς χείρας ἄμαρτολοι. And 56. τοῦτο δὲ δέλων γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν. "Ωρα often denotes a fixed, appointed time. See Schl. Lex. And σκότος is frequently used metaphorically for iniquity. So Col. 1, 13. ἐφροσυνα τίμας ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκοτούς.

54—58. See the notes on Matth. 26, 57, 58, 69, 71. Φῶς here signifies fire. See Mark 14, 54.

56. ἀτενίζασα αὐτῷ. So Luke 4, 20. οἱ ἡφασμοὶ ἴσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ. The word ἄτενιζω signifies to fix oneself intently; and, with ἔμμασθαι, or ἡφασμοῦ, to fix one’s view intently. But the words ἔμμασθαι or ἡφασμοῦ, are almost always left to be understood, and the object of view is expressed either by an accusative with εἰς, (as in Acts 1, 10. 8, 4.) or with a dative without a preposition, as here, and in Luke 4, 20.

58. Στέφος. Matthew says ἄλλη, another maid-servant. But this discrepancy may be removed on the principle suggested by Wetstein, who observes that the word Στέφος may denote a female, so that it matters not to the sense whether the masculine or feminine gender be used. For (as says Dionys. Hal.) πρὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἀποτείνεται ὁ λόγος. Examples of this are innumerable; ex. gr. Hom. II. γ. 455. πληγεῖνε κεραυνῷ, Juno and Minerva. Pausan. 2, 21. speaking of two women, τούτοις δὲ φάσιν. Sophocles, Electr. 980. ταῦτα τῷ κασιγνήτω. Eurip. Hec. 652. speaking of a man and his wife, δοεῖν γὰρ δυτιῶν, ὃς ὦ τῆς τιμῆς, ὅτ' ὦ. Eurip. Hecub. 511. Ion. 955, and 1361. Thus ἄρας is sometimes used of a woman; which it may well bear, since it properly denotes a human being, without reference to sex.

58. ἀνθρωπε. This expression is one of expostulation. Wetstein cites Ter. Heaut. 5, 8, 1. tu homo, where the Scholiast remarks, “cum contemtus et stomacho pronunciandum est.” Also Ter. Adelph.
1, 2, 31. "Proh Jupiter, tu me homo adigis ad insania."
"Why, man, you drive me mad." The idiom is common even in our own language.

59—62. See Matth. 26, 73, seqq. Διυγχυριζω, asseverated, strongly asserted. The δια is intensive. Many examples of the word are produced by Wetstein and Kypke. See also Schl. Lex.


66. τὸ προσβυτέριον τοῦ λαόν. This Evangelist is the only Sacred writer who gives this denomination to the Sanhedrim; for there can be no doubt that it is of it he is speaking. This is the only passage in the Gospel where it occurs. The same writer (Acts 22, 5.) also applies the title προσβυτέριον, without the addition τοῦ λαόν, to this court, or at least to the members whereof it was composed, considered as a body. (Campbell.) Wetstein refers to Susan. 50. Acts 22, 5, 1. Tim. 4, 13.


68. εὰν δὲ καὶ ἐρασίσαμεν, οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθήτε μοι, ἢ ἀπολύσητε. Kuinoel thus paraphrases the passage: "If I simply tell you that I am the Messiah, you will not believe me. If I propose questions to you, by which I may teach you that I am the Messiah (see 20, 3, seqq.) you will not answer me; nor will you, though convinced by the weight of my arguments, interrogations, and proofs, release me: nevertheless, I plainly declare, that from this time I shall sit at the right hand of God." It must be observed that the Hebrews (like the Greeks) were accustomed to follow up arguments by interrogation.

**CHAP. XXIII.**

**VERSE 1. τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν.** Dr. Owen refers this to the 60th verse of the foregoing chapter, and interprets, "the whole collected body of elders, priests, scribes," &c. and not the common people. Rosenm. explains,
caetum senatorum. On this and the following verse compare Matth. 27, 2, seqq. and Mark 15.

2. ἔρχεται κατηγορεῖν αὐτὸν. See the notes on Matth. 27, 11, seqq. where Kuinoel has shewn that the narrations of Matthew and Luke, concerning what took place in the presence of Pilate, are very brief and succinct, and to be supplied from that of John. The judicial authority properly rested with the president; though the procurator (as was Pilate) had the office of collecting the taxes. But it seems that in the smaller provinces, (like Judæa,) which were not of sufficient consequence to have a president, the procurator fisci, or collector of taxes, discharged also the judicial functions of the president.

2. τὸτων εὑρόμεν διαστρέφοντα τ. ἓ. The word εὑρίσκον (says Kypke) is a judicial expression, and denotes that, on examination and investigation in their assembly, they had found him what they represented; and had not brought him there as one accused or suspected, but confessedly guilty and convicted. This interpretation is supported by the authority of Schleusner, who explains εὑρίσκειν, "to convict and find guilty of an offence, after diligent examination." So Matth. 26, 60. Acts 4, 21. See Xen. Cyr. 1, 27.

2. διαστρέφοντα. Διαστρέφω, like the Hebr. הה, signifies to pervert, seduce, excite to sedition. So 1 Kings 18, 17. διαστρέφων τῶν λαῶν. (Elsner.)

2. καλώντα Καίσαρι φόρους δίδοναι, forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar. Nothing was more intolerable to the Jews than to render tribute to Cæsar. Hence a sedition had been before raised by Judas, a Galilaean. (See Acts 5, 37. Luke 13.) They therefore confidently make this charge against Christ, as one especially atrocious in the eyes of the Romans, and so much the more credible, as being brought against a Galilaean.

3. σὺ λέγεις. Jesus confesses the thing, but adds a distinction: "I am indeed King, but not, as ye
suppose, of an earthly kingdom." as John 8, 33. explains. (Rosenm.)


5. ἐπίσχυον, λέγοντες. The word ἐπίσχυω properly signifies to strengthen, both in an active and neuter sense (to make strong, and to become strong); and sometimes metaphorically denotes, (as here,) to persevere, to attempt the more vigorously. So the Hebr. פְּלָח, in Ex. 12, 33. The Syriac version has vociferated. It must be observed too, that the ἐπι has an intensive force, and denotes addition, or (as Kypke tells us) pervicacem instantiam.


6. As to the Galileans, it is certain that they were prone to sedition, and desirous of change. See Jos. A. 8, 2. B. 2, 8. Hence the accusers purposely make mention of Galilee. Pilate, however, though persuaded of the innocence of Jesus, yet being unwilling to give umbrage to the Jews, caught at the word Galilee, which had fallen from the accusers; and, after having said what we read here, devised a method of ridding himself of the whole business; which was no other than to refer the cause to the decision of Herod, under pretence of not intermeddling with his jurisdiction, and thus withal conciliate an enemy. See Luke 23, 6—12. He therefore sent Jesus to Herod, who at that time, on account of the feast, was sojourning at Jerusalem. Herod, however, sent him back to Pilate without any punishment, and with a message that he found no fault in him. (Kuin.)

7. ἐπιγνον ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας Ἰ. understanding that he was ex ditione Herodis. For Jesus, though
born in Judæa, had been brought up in Galilee, and spent most of his life there.

7. ἀνέστημησαν αὐτὸν Ἡ. The corresponding term in the Roman Law is remitto. Thus (observes Grotius) Vespasian transferred the trial and judgment of the Tarichæans to King Agrippa (Jos. B. 3. c. ult.) It was the regular practice of the Roman law to transmit or remove the prisoner to the governor of the province or district to which he belonged, though they had the right of trying all offences within their own province. Wetstein refers to Dionys. Hal. A. 3, 22.


8. ἔλεγε τι σημείον ἦδεν ὃ. a. The reason for this (says Grotius) was, that he might gratify his sight with novelty, so attractive to a court. But the Almighty was not so prodigal of his power as to choose that it should be subservient to the gratification of mere human curiosity. Wetstein refers to 2 Paral. 9, 25. Acts. 25, 22.

9. οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο α. The reason for this refusal is thus judiciously stated by Euthymius: “He answered him nothing, since he considered Herod as merely tempting, or trying him, and therefore unworthy of an answer: knowing too that he was desirous of seeing a sign, not for the sake of utility, or conviction, but only for amusement, and that he did not look for any thing proceeding from divine power, but merely conjuration, or magic. Therefore our Lord did not vouchsafe to give him any sign.” Why Jesus returned no answer, (say Kuinoel,) may easily be conjectured. He foresaw that, if he had seriously returned answer to the proposed questions, he should only be mocked and derided by Herod, who was actuated by no desire of knowing the truth. Indeed the questions were of such a nature, that they scarcely claimed a serious answer.

11. σὺν τοῖς στρατεύμασιν αὐτῶ. It is not probable that Herod should have brought an army with him; nor would Pilate have permitted it. We must there-
fore interpret τὰ στρατεύματα, satellitium, his guards; as in Acts 23, 10. (Kuin.) The plural is used dignitatis gratid. An idiom usual in the Classical writers.

11. ἐξουθενήσας, setting him at nought. See Luke 6, 48. It would have been more elegant if it had, been παρ' οὐδὲν τιθεμένος, of which idiom Valck. in his Diatrib. Eurip. gives examples. Grotius is of opinion that he did so, as deeming it unworthy of his greatness to be thought to have feared a man neither furnished with arms, endowed with political knowledge, nor exercised in the arts of government.

11. περιβάλαν αὐτὸν ἐσθήτα λαμπρῶν. Various have been the opinions of the learned on the sense here to be affixed to the word λαμπρῶν, which, being derived from λάμπω, signifies bright, lucid, splendid, and especially white: though it is sometimes used of red, purple, or scarlet, or any bright or glaring colour. See Raphel and Wolf. Hence some Commentators take it in the sense of splendid, without any reference to the particular colour. Others interpret (with the Syriac version) scarlet or purple; and contend (though without reason) that with this same robe Jesus was also insultingly clothed by Pilate's soldiers. Others again are of opinion that the robe was white: which mode of interpretation Kui-noel thinks carries with it all the marks of truth. For (says he) λαμπρῶν generally denotes white, very rarely purple, or scarlet; and is especially used of white vests; as in Acts 10, 30. Apoc. 15, 6. Diod. Sic. 1, 90. Theoph. Ch. 21. Philo, p. 541. See Loesner on James 2, 2. Generals too wore white cloaks. So Val. Max. 1, 6, 11. "Pullum ei (Casso) traditum est paludamentum, cum in prælium exentibus album aut purpureum dari soleret." Wets. too seems to have been of this opinion, who appositely cites Phaed. 5, 7. "Princeps ligato crure nivea fascia, niveisque tunicis, niveis etiam calceis superbiens honore divinæ domus Ab universis capite est protrusus foras." Plut. p. 144. ὁι προσίωντες ἐλεφασίν ἐσθήτα


12. εὐέρωτο φίλοι, i. e. they were reconciled. So we say to be friends with any one. Thus Euthymius on Matthew explains ἵσθι εὐρωτὰν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ by γένος δὲν. So much for the phrase: as to the thing, there is an observation of Aristotle in Nich. Ethic, very applicable to the present purpose. "It contributes much (says he) to the formation of friendship, or to the recovery of it, to either love or hate the same person; to be engaged, no matter how, as colleagues in the same business. Schoettgen well observes, that the wicked, though enemies to each other, often join together to destroy the good. In this view Mr. Weston appositely cites Ἀeschyl. Agam. 659. Ἐκπαιδεύουν γὰρ, ἐντες ἐκείνως τὸ πρὶν Πῶς καὶ δόλασα, καὶ τὰ πιστὲς ἐδεικτήν Φθεῖοντες τὸν δόλον.

12. ἐν ἐχθρ., at enmity. In the causes of the enmity which had existed between Pilate and Herod, Commentators variously speculate. Most of them
attribute it to the well-known cruelty exercised by Pilate towards some Galilæans. But Grotius well observes, that many other causes of enmity would be likely to arise between a vassal monarch and a Roman governor. I therefore agree with Saurin, that, considering all circumstances, their reconciliation is more wonderful than their enmity.

14. ἀνακρίνας. Judicium est, pro potestate, reos vel testes interrogantium. (Wets.) A judicial term, denoting "to examine the criminal by question, or the witness by interrogation." In illustration of this, Wetstein subjoins numerous examples. It may be sufficient for the student to consult Schl. Lex.

15. πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ. Not "is done unto him;" but "nothing worthy of death hath, in Herod's estimation, been done by him." (Bp. Pearce.) It is put for πεπραγμένον ἐν αὐτῶ, or πεπραχθεὶν αὐτῶς, of which Raphel and Wetstein produce numerous examples. The E. T. renders, nothing worthy of death is unto him, which Campbell justly pronounces unintelligible, though it is a literal version from the Vulg. and Erasmus, Nihil dignum morte actum est ei, and which, interpreted by the ordinary rules, is downright nonsense. Campbell, adopting the interpretation of Casaubon and Beza, renders, "he hath done nothing to deserve death." So also Le Clerc, Doddridge, and others. With respect to the peculiar idiom, πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ, (justified, however, by the Classical writers,) Campbell truly observes that, "though Luke abounds in Hebraisms, as much as any sacred writer, yet he has, oftener than the rest, recourse to words and idioms which he could acquire only from conversing with the Gentiles, or reading their authors; and has, upon the whole, greater variety in his style than any other of the Evangelists."

16. παιδεύωςας. The word signifies properly to instruct as children, which must be accompanied with correction. Hence it denotes to chastise, and must be explained according to the circumstances of the case. Here it must be understood of corporal
chastisement, according to the usual mode in which it was administered, namely, by flagellation. In this sense παιδείω occurs in the O. Test. and the Sept. It appears to be an Alexandrian, or Hellenistic, idiom; since it does not occur in the Classical writers. On the thing itself see Dr. Hammond’s note, or the abstract of it to be found in Elsley.

17. See the note on Matth. 27, 15, 18.

17. ἀνάγκην δὲ ἔχειν. This is a formula equivalent to opus habere. The peculiar sense of it will depend upon the context. It must here denote a necessity arising from custom. So the Syriac renders, “it was the custom.” Thus in the parallel passage of John: “For ye have a custom,” &c. And the Jews were tenacious of customs, especially such as had grown into privileges. Doddridge observes, that there was no law to oblige him to this; but as acts of grace are generally popular things, this seems to have been first freely used by the Romans to please their tributaries, and now, by custom, was in a manner established. The phrase ἀνάγκην ἔχειν is not unexampled in the Classical writers. See Palairet.


19. ἐπιφώνειν. The word ἐπιφώνειν signifies to shout out one after another, in acclamation; which may be done either in applause, or censure. Here it merely denotes responsive shouting. See Acts 22, 24. The word is illustrated with examples by Wetstein.

23. ἐτέκειντο, pressed upon him, urged him. The ἐτι is intensive. See the examples produced by Kypke, Krebs, and Munthe, the most opposite of which is Aristoph. Plut. 252. ἀλλὰ ταῖε, καὶ δίωκε, καὶ τάραττε, καὶ κύκα, καὶ βδελύηττο — καϊκελέμενος βίοι.

24. ἐτέκραυε, judicio suo approbavit. The word properly signifies to adjudge. It here denotes the
final adjudication, decree, or sentence of a judge, of which signification Wetstein and Munthe give several examples. So Plut. 864. b. ἔκταχαν τοὺς μαρτυροὺς καὶ ἐπικρίνας ἔκλεισε τινὶ ψήφοι τῶν δικαστῶν.

26, 27. See Matth. 37, 32. Ἐκτάτουρα, beat themselves, i. e. their breasts. Compare Luke 8, 32. and see Wakef. on Herc. Fur. 537.

27. ἰμαλωθεὶς δὲ αὕτη τολὸ πλήθος. That such executions were frequently attended by a great crowd of people, is evident from several examples produced by Wetstein.


"Quid me fletis, et non magis de pestilentia et communi morte cogitis?" Triller observes, that even the heathens believed that God's wrath was sometimes visited on the children. Our Lord (says Grot.) regards the custom of men, who weep rather for their own evils than for those of others: q. d. "If you could see the calamities which await you, you would find no leisure to expend your tears on me." (Grot.) There is here an allusion to the final destruction of Jerusalem, and the total ruin of the Jewish state: an evil associated with so many miseries, that sterility, which had otherwise been considered
an opprobrium to the Hebrew women, was accounted a circumstance most felicitous.

28. εἴπ. ἐμ. Many MSS. read ἐπ. ἐμ. which is a construction usual in the Classical writers. The other however, is confirmed by the usage of the Sept. which often has κλαίειν ἐπὶ τινα. See Num. 11, 13. Jud. 11, 37, 38. 14, 17. Luke 19, 41.


abound, and in which, in time of war, the fugitive Jews were accustomed to take refuge; and in which, many did conceal themselves during the war with the Romans.* See Jos. B. 6, 8, 3. and 4, 9, 4. See the note on Matth. 24, 16. Thus the phrase, though proverbial, may here be considered as a prediction literally fulfilled.

31. ἐν τῷ υχρῷ ξύλῳ — γένηται; Grotius rightly accounts this a proverbial phrase. For the Hebrews called holy and virtuous men, green trees, and the wicked, dry ones. So Ps. 1, 3. Thus in Ez. 20, 47. God threatens that he will cut off both the ξύλον χαλαρόν, and the ξύλον ἕπαρν, i. e. both the righteous and the wicked. (Grotius.) Compare 21, 3. So also Sirach, 6, 3. καὶ ἀφήσεις σεαυτόν ὡς ξύλον ἕπαρν. (Kuin.) Schoettgen and Wetstein appositely cite the following passage from Sanhedrin, f. 98, 1. There is a story, that a certain High Priest called Josua, being cast by Nebucadnazar into a fiery furnace, together with Zedelsia and Echabo, who, though these two were burnt to ashes, sustained no injury, except that his clothes were burnt. Nebuchadnezzar thus interrogated him: “I know that thou art a just man, why therefore did the fire do thee any harm, when not even a spark did any injury to Hananias, Misaelis, and Azaria, whose clothes even were not burnt?” He answered: “Because they were three in number, and I only one.” But (retorted Nebucadnazar,) Abraham was only one, and he escaped the fire unhurt. Upon which Josua replied, there were not two wicked persons with Abraham, but with me there were, and for that reason, the fire was permitted to burn. Here then the common saying holds good: If there be two pieces of dry wood, and one piece of green, the dry will burn the green.” Ῥημέω, which properly signifies moist, denotes when applied to a tree, sappy, juicy, and therefore green. Thus in the Sept. it answers to הַבַּד green, in Jud. 16, 7, 8. and בַּדַּר in Job. 8, 16.

* This was the case also in the long contests between the Moors and Christians in Spain, during the 13th and 14th centuries.
This sense is sometimes found also in the Classical writers. Thus Wetstein cites from Theophr. 5, 10. ἄγεσα δὲ ύπρα τὰ ἐλεια. Galen de Virib. Med. Simp. 3. οὐν ύπραν τε καὶ χλαρών ἕλλαν. In τοιούτων, there is an ellipsis of ἄνθρακι, like the German man. Or it may (as Grotius suggests,) be taken impersonally. But, after all, such impersonals must be explained by the subaudition of some nominative. The passage is thus judiciously paraphrased by Glass, in his Phil. Sacr. “If I, who am innocent, and like a green and fruit-bearing tree, am so heavily afflicted, and am cut down like a dry trunk: how much more heavily will a righteous God sometime afflict, and severely punish, you Jews, who are incorrigible sinners, and fit only to be destroyed, as dry and unfruitful trees are cut down.” Or (as Schoetgen explains,) using the words of a Rabbinical writer, “if it be so with those that do his will, how much more with those that transgress it.” So 1 Pet. 4, 18. “If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?” See also Scheid, sp. Meusch. p. 146. and Drus. de Proverb. N. T.

32. ἢγοντο ἔτεροι δώδε κακοῦργοι. Some commentators remark, that Christ is here reckoned among malefactors, not in the sense that he was really so, but only δοξολογούμενος (i. e. as the Jews thought,) and as being led to execution, like a malefactor. But I prefer, with H. Steph. Markland, Kypke, Rosenm. Storr, and Kuinoel, to point thus, ἔτεροι δώδε κακοῦργοι, σὺν αὐτῷ. The complete phrase is ἔτεροι δώδε εἰκόνες, of which I subjoin the following examples. Aristoph. Ran. καὶ γὰρ ἁλυτρία γε σοὶ "Ὥς ἤδη ἔνδον ἔνθ' αἰρετατε, καρχιστρίδες ἔτεραι δοῦ ἣ τρεῖς" and 782. μετ' Αἰσχύλου δ' ὁκ ἡσαν ἔτεροι, ἔμμαχοι.

32. κακοῦργοι. These are by Matthew and Mark called κρόσταλ, as Barabbas is termed by John. The word denotes malefactors in general, not only highway robbers, or house-breakers, or pilferers, but also brigands, rebels, pirates, or any who carry on unauthorized hostilities. Nay, these were sometimes irregular troops, like the Spanish guerillas, or the
Russian Cossacs, persons who carried on petty devastations, pillagers in regular war. This signification is frequent in Thucydides. Among other passages here cited by Wetstein, there is one from Thucyd. 4, 53. καὶ ἀνήστη τὸν ἀνακύκλωσεν ἔλεγον ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας, ἵππος μένον ὀλίγῳ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κακουργεῖσθαι. See also Kypke. To which of these classes Barabbas and the κακουργοὶ here mentioned are to be referred, it is not possible exactly to determine; but it seems probable that they were lawless insurgents.*

94. πάτερ, ἀφες αὐτῶμ, ὡ γὰρ ἔδωκεν τοις παιδίσι, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do. This is (says Doddridge,) one of the most striking passages in the world. While they are actually nailing him to the cross, he seems to feel the injury these poor creatures did to their souls, more than the wounds they gave him; and, as it were, to forget his own anguish in a concern for their salvation. I render τί ποιοῦσιν, what they are doing, as thinking that version most expressive of the present circumstance; and indeed, it is the exact import of what grammarians call the present tense. We may add too, that our Lord here rose superior to all other human beings, by practising what even the most enlightened sages had not even attained to in theory: though Menander, ap. Diog. Laert. comes nearest, when he says "Οὔτας καταπεφτός ἐσθι ἄνδρα, ὡς Γοργών, ἀδικείσθαι τὰλοι ἐπιτεφάνερα μορφῶν." Grotius remarks, that Christ here does what is usual to those who deprecate the punishment of an offender; omitting whatever was most culpable in the conduct.

* This is the opinion of the most enlightened commentators and Theologians. Thus Dr. Maltby, in an eloquent Sermon on this subject, observes that these κακουργοὶ, malefactors, were not house-breakers or highwaymen, who rob all for profit, but men who had taken up arms on a principle of resistance to the Roman oppression, and especially to what they thought an unlawful burthen, the tribute money; though they made no scruple to rob all the Romans they met with; and when engaged in these unlawful courses, no doubt made afterwards less difference between Jews and Romans, than they at first meant to do.
of the Jews, he touches only on what tends to extenuate their guilt. Deep and supine (continues he) was their ignorance, both originating in, and productive of, many vices. Yet their offence was not utterly inexcusable, since they had not a clear knowledge against whom they sinned. Aristotle distributes offences into three sorts, ἀτυχήματα, ἀμαρτήματα, ἀδικήματα. Now the first, rather calls forth condolence and pity: the second, requires reproof and correction: to the last alone belong condemnation and punishment. Now, as the offence of the Jews was not a mere ἀτυχήμα, nay exceeded the common sort of ἀμαρτήματα: yet it carried with it somewhat of the ἀτυχήμα, because of the ignorance conjoined with it. See Acts 3, 17. 1 Cor. 2, 8. Thus many were afterwards brought to serious repentance. The case is different with those who bribed the soldiers, or intercepted the Apostles from exhibiting signs of heavenly power. It is observed by Aristot. de Moribus, εἰ τὸ δὲ ἀγιόλαν πράττειν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ στοιχεῖ. Some err ignorantly,* but not by ignorance, of which, the evident proof will be this, whether, on acquiring the requisite knowledge, they repent, or not, of their crimes. Thus for those who ascribed his mighty works to the devil, Jesus did not pray; and St. John does not bid us pray for those who sin unto death, i.e. sin wilfully, knowingly, presumptuously, and who may be presumed incorrigible. (Grot.) A similar view of the subject is taken by Benedict, Muller, Gebhard, Glass, Mayer, Stackhouse; &c. and they observe, that the Jewish priests and doctors rejected the claims of Jesus to the Messiahship, because they were blinded by prejudice, and led away captive, by

false, but deep rooted, opinions concerning the earthly nature of the Messiah's kingdom: and that their influence weighed so strongly with the lower ranks, as to cause them also to reject the claims, and refuse even to recognize the innocence of Jesus, who intreats from his Father to grant his enemies time and opportunity for repentance; and vouchsafe them pardon on their forsaking error, and embracing the truth. That these prayers were heard, appears (say they) from Acts 2, 37, 41, 42. 6, 7, 13, 46. 14, 1. 8, 17. and 1 Cor. 2, 8. Here however, we are assailed by the specious cavils, and artful objections, of an acute Jewish writer, who in a work entitled Chissuk. Em. P. 2. C. 40. argues that Christ interceded with his Father for the Jews, and yet, says he, according to the Christians, they were heavily afflicted for the murder of Christ, whose prayer produced no effect with God, and therefore could not be what the Christians pretend." This difficulty had indeed occurred to the Ancients, as I find from Euthymius, whose ingenious, but little satisfactory, solution, the reader may consult. The objection of the Jew is indeed specious, but, without pushing the sense of a popular phrase into the inextricable mazes of metaphysical speculation, it may be satisfactorily answered on the principles suggested by Grotius in his annotation. But, after all, I am not disinclined to adopt the interpretation of Gusset, Pfaffius, Bp. Kidder, and Kuin. (which had been adopted by some ancient commentators mentioned by Euthymius, namely, that Christ's words had reference not to the Jews, but to the Roman soldiers who had insulted him, and crucified him: and these indeed might deserve pardon; partly because in crucifying him they had done no more than obey the orders of their superiors, and partly because they were by no means aware of the supreme dignity of our Lord's person and character: for (as Euthymius observes,) they were utterly ignorant of the predictions concerning the Messiah contained in the Law and the Prophets. See
Pfaff's Diss. on the prayer of Christ for his crucifiers.

34. οὐ γὰρ οἴδας τι θαύμα; So Xen. Anab. 1, 5, 16, οὐκ ιστε ὅτι τοιεύετε. Joseph. p. 139, of Moses, with respect to the Israelites, where see Hudson. Seneca de benef. 6, 9. Quare fers ægrí rabiem? puerorum protervas manus? nempe, quia necire videntur, quæ faciunt.

35—38. See the notes on Matth. 27, 39, 42, 34, 40, 37.

36. See the notes on Mark 15, 36. Matth. 27, 48.

38. γράμματαν Ἑλληνικὰς καὶ Ρωμαίικὰς καὶ Ἑβραῖκας. The Greek for the Hellenists, the Latin for the majesty of the Emperor, and the Hebrew for the information of the populace. These too were the most perfect and most generally used of all languages in the world, into every part of which the fame of this transaction would thus be carried. That it was then the custom to promulgate the edicts of the Roman emperors throughout Asia, both in Greek and Latin, we find by Jos. Ant. 14, 10, 2 and 3. and 12, 5. B. 6, 2, 4. cited by Wetstein, who also notices a saying of the Rabbins; “There are three languages (i.e. three good ones): the Roman for battle; the Greek for conversation; the Assyrian (i.e. Syriac,) for prayers.” It must be remarked, that by Hebrew we are to understand the Chaldean-Syriac, then in vernacular use in Judæa.

39. εἰς τῶν κρεασθέντων. Matthew (27, 4,) says both. Some commentators (as Theophylact,) suppose that the penitent thief first joined with the other in abusing and reviling our Lord, and afterwards repented, and acknowledged his offence. But this is a solution very unsatisfactory, and evidently “made for the nonce;” nor would Luke have omitted so remarkable a circumstance. I therefore agree with Schleusner, Doddridge, and many others, who take it for an enalidge of number, plural for singular, frequently in the Hebrew. Rather than adopt the former solution, I would admit a trifling discrepancy in a matter of so little consequence. As to the solution of Eichhorn, founded on the ambiguity of sense in a certain word
of the Syriac Archetype, it is too hypothetical and precarious to deserve serious attention.

40. ἔστη τῷ αὐτῷ, rebuked him. Various and contradictory have been the opinions of commentators respecting this narration of the penitent thief, which have been examined by Wolf, Koecher, and Thiess. Many commentators suppose that he had been a wicked and abandoned wretch previous to the period of his crucifixion, had had no communication with Jesus, and by a miraculous call at the very cross, repented, and acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah. Others, as Whitby, Pearce, Maltby, Kuin, and many able commentators, think it clear from the whole narration, that the man was not a robber properly so called, nay rather that, before his imprisonment, he had attended on Christ’s preaching, and acknowledged his Messiahship. He had committed, they think, no greater crime than insurrection, and perhaps participation in the tumult with Barabbas. They think λῃστὴς very susceptible of that milder interpretation. For as Barabbas, who διὰ στατικῆ καὶ φόνου for sedition and homicide was committed to prison, is called λῃστὴς, so might the two λῃσταῖ under our consideration. That they were companions with Barabbas, may be collected from Mark 15, 7, where they are called συντασσαντες.

Perhaps both of the above hypotheses are carried too far. The former is supported with great ability by Tillemont, Heinsius, Mayer, Sulzer, Doddridge, and others. The latter by Heuman, Bernard, Bp. Pearce, Puffer, Whitby, Schmidt, Le Clerc, and many other recent Commentators, including Rosenm. Kuinoel, and Dr. Maltby. Koecher tells us it is a very ancient opinion, that the thief was not converted at the cross, but was previously imbued with the doctrines of the Gospel. The truth, perhaps, lies somewhere between the above two hypotheses. The question is, however, only a theological, not a philological one, and the limited nature of my plan will not permit me to enlarge further upon
it. Yet I cannot leave it without recommending to the attention of my readers, the excellent note, or rather dissertation, of Dr. Whitby, an elegant and argumentative Sermon of Dr. Maltby, vol. 1. and the following pithy remark of Leigh: "Although true repentance is never too late, yet late repentance is rarely true. One example is afforded us, lest any one should despair, and one only, lest any one should presume."

40. oôdê fôsâ sô tòv Theôv. However familiar the terms here employed may be, their sense is susceptible of more than one interpretation. The words may, I think, be best paraphrased thus: "Dost not thou fear God, but offend him by insulting over the wretched, when now thou art thyself undergoing the same punishment; though with this difference, that he is innocent, and thou art guilty, and deserve punishment, like myself." Many examples of κρίμα in the sense of punishment are produced by Schlesner, in his Lexicon.

41. oôdên àtòcôv ëpake. "Àtòcôs denotes "what has no place, is nought, or nothing," and therefore may well denote what is evil, or, to use the old English word, naught. This sense is frequent in the Scripture, and also in the Classical writers, and may be exactly paralleled by our old word naughty."

42. μυσθῆτι μου, Kúrië. These words (thinks Kuinoel) clearly show that the man had formerly been a hearer of Jesus, and had acknowledged him as the Messiah: and the learned commentator thus enlarges on the probable sense which the penitent malefactor intended to express: "Remarking the discourses of Christ respecting his kingdom; re-

* This word naughty, and naughtiness, are both used in a moral sense in our common translation; though (as Dr. Johnson says) "they are now only used as terms of ludicrous censure. The Doctor has omitted to give the physical sense of naughty, (from the Saxon naphhr, i.e. not a whit,) which occurs in our common translation, in Jerem. 24, 2. "The other basket had very naughty figs."
marking too that Christ had very frequently announced pardon of sins to those who came unto him with repentance, the man said, Receive me, I entreat thee, sinful though I be, but now penitent, into thy kingdom, which, after thou hast returned to this world, and hast raised the dead to life, thou wilt establish, in order to hold judgment over them, and to reward the righteous with a participation in the happiness of thy kingdom." This Kuinoel thinks is the purport of the prayer in question: "It may however, (he adds,) be enquired how this man could account Jesus (even though now crucified and near unto death) as the Messiah, when even the Apostles, as often as Jesus spoke to them of his death, did not comprehend his meaning, as being persuaded that the Messiah would not die. But, as was observed on Matth. 20, 28. many Jews believed that dire calamities would precede the commencement of the Messiah's reign, and the wiser of them, especially the Essenes, (see the note on Matth. 20, 28. & 3, 2.) regarding the Messiah as the author of every kind of felicity, hoped also from him the expiation of the sins of the people, and conjectured that the Messiah would indeed die, but would return to life, revisit this lower world, and finally receive all virtuous men and pious worshippers into his earthly kingdom. Now if we grant that the man in question was not altogether ignorant of these opinions, and also not uninformed of the doctrines of Christ, we may more clearly perceive the force and purport of his prayer; and withal understand how he might account him as the Messiah, whom in ver. 41. he pronounces innocent. Others take the words to mean, "Remember me, when thou hast attained the happiness of another life." But it is little probable that the man (a Jew who regarded Jesus as the Messiah) should have had any such thought; neither would the answer of Jesus be thus sufficiently apt. Grotius thinks that the man had heard Christ declare that he was to have a kingdom,
though not of this world; and that viewing the patience and resignation with which our Lord supported his acute sufferings, accompanied with those manifest signs of divine virtue which then shone forth, was led to bear this testimony. But Grotius rightly attributed the greatest effect to the efficacy of divine grace on the heart of this man, who was meant to be a memorable example to all future ages; so that in him may be seen an image of that extraordinary and sudden calling, which took place frequently in the Apostolic age, but which has few parallels in our own times.

43. σήμερον μετ’ ἑαυτοῦ ἐστή ἐν τῷ παραδίσῳ, to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise. After the time of Esdras, when the things of a future life, formerly obscurely indicated, began to be called by appropriate and distinct names, the future felicity of pious souls separated from the body, and awaiting the Resurrection, was called by the Hebrews יִשְׂרָאֵל, the Garden of Eden, or Paradise. Thus in the Rabbinical writers, and in the prayers of the Jews, it is said, “Let him have part in Paradise, and also in the future world,” &c. So Jacobides distinguishes the state of Eden, or Paradise, from that of the resurrection. The Rabbinical writers sometimes term this middle state the Lower Eden, and Heaven the Upper Eden. Hence also the Hellenists speak of the Lower Paradise, i.e. Hades, and the Upper Paradise, or Heaven. The Jews too thought that only the souls of those who departed from this life thoroughly purified (πνεύματα δικαίων τετελειωμένων) were received into Paradise. That the soul might not be tortured with a long and tedious expectation, they supposed that there were certain intermediate solaces granted to the pious, called the rest of Eden, or Paradise, or consolation; as Lazarus is said to be παραχάλησθαι, consoled. Nor did the Hebrews use the name Paradise to express only these joys, but also brought forward the thing itself; under the image of a garden; thus accommodating themselves
to the capacities of the people, who would scarcely have comprehended τὰ νοητὰ (things intellectual), except under the figure of τῶν σαρκικῶν (sensible objects). Hence we may understand Diodorus Siculus, when he says that the Greek opinions, ἵππος ἄθρων, were introduced thither from the Barbarians. Moreover, those who introduced into the Creed the words κατάθυτα καὶ ἄθρων, might very well defend that position from these words of Christ. For as the words Paradise and Gehenna signify that the lot of the good and the evil was distinct, so does ἄθρως designate the state of souls separated from the body, and is opposed both to this life and to the resurrection. To little purpose, therefore, does St. Augustin here puzzle himself in enquiring how Christ could be at the same time ἐν ἄθρω καὶ in Paradise; since the one is comprehended in the other. Great, however, as were thought the joys of Paradise, (in the above sense,) yet they were not supposed to be complete and perfect. The plenitude of the promise was to be expected only at the resurrection. This middle state the ancient Christians did not call by the name of Heaven; as may be collected from Justin, who, in disputing with Trypho, reckons among other erroneous opinions this, that there is no resurrection of the dead, but an immediate reception of their souls after death into Heaven. This state is described by the Divine Apocalypse, 7, 15—17. Thus far Grotius, who concludes his learned dissertation with the following observation, which, in an age like the present, may supply seasonable admonition: “Quibus finibus modestè nos continentes, nihil necesse habemus penetrare in ea quae curiosius hac super re inter Graecos et Latinos disputantur.” Many Commentators, ancient and modern, have been puzzled to comprehend how Jesus could say, “to-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise,” i.e. Heaven, when yet on that and the following day the body of Christ was in the sepulchre, and his soul descended ad inferos. See 1 Pet. 3, 18, 19.
Hence many ancient Critics rejected the verse, and some modern ones would alter the punctuation. But, Kuinoel justly observes, that the sense thus arising would be very frigid, and that the construction too of the words, and the formula ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, refute this conjecture. That learned commentator then proceeds to maintain, that Παράδεισος here does not denote (as some think) Heaven, but "Αδής, or the intermediate place of departed spirits. This opinion was held by many ancient Commentators, and, of the modern ones, by Grotius, Whitby, Wetstein, Pearce, Rosenm. and most recent Theologians, and among the rest Dr. Maltby. Wetstein has here a very long and learned note, or rather dissertation, from which I shall select the most important matter, intermixing all the additional information which I could collect from other writers who have treated on this subject.

The word Παράδεισος is not (as some tell us) of Greek derivation, but of Persian origin, and introduced from thence, like many other words, into the later Hebrew, (or Chaldee Syriac,) and the Greek languages. It denoted a garden, orchard, pleasure-ground, or park. In this sense it often occurs in Xenophon, and by this term is expressed in the Sept. the Garden of Eden. Lucian, τόο, in his Var. Hist. 2, 5, 6, 13. employs this term to describe the fabled islands of the blessed. The word was, we may observe, transmitted from the Persian to the Hebrew language, and it occurs (i.e. הַרִים) in Nehem. 2, 8. Eul. 2, 5. Cant. 4, 13. The term, however, came afterwards to denote, among the Jews, a pleasant place* appointed for the reception of the pious dead, until they should be again united to their bodies in a future state. So Jos. B. 3, 8, 4. καθαραλ δὲ καὶ ἐπήκοοι μένονυν αἵ ψυχαί χώρων οὐρανοῦ λαχοῦσαι τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν, ἔθεν ἐκ περιτροπῆς αἰώνων ἁγνοῖς πάλιν ἀντενοικισθεὶς σώμασιν ὅσως δὲ καθ’ ἐαυτῶν ἐμάνησαν αἱ

* This was known to the Greeks under the name of the Elysian Fields.
This was the opinion of Josephus, and that of the Pharisees. The Essenes, however, denying the resurrection of the body, thought that the souls of the virtuous would live for ever in Paradise. So Jos. B. 2, 8, 11. *επειδήν δὲ ἁνεθώσι τῶν κατὰ σάρκα δεσμῶν, ὤλα δὴ μακρὰς δουλείας ἀπηλλαγμένας τὸτε χαίρειν καὶ μετεώρους φέρεσθαι, καὶ ταῖς μὲν ἀγαθαῖς, ὁμοδοξοῦντες παιόν Ἑλλήνων, ἀποφαίνονται τὴν ὑπὲρ ὁκεανοῦ διαταν ἀποκεῖσθαι, καὶ χῶρον οὕτε θύμβοι, οὕτε νυφεῖς οὕτε καυμάτοι βαρυνόμενοι, ἀλλ' ὃν ἐξ ὁκεανοῦ πραῦς ἀεὶ ὄρφη-
ρος ἐπιπεδών ἀναψύχει ταῖς δὲ φαύλαις ὕπαθος καὶ κειμέ-
ρων ἀφορίζονται μοῦγον, γέμοντα τιμώριαι ἀδιάλειπτον.
That this dogma continued among the Jews, is plain from the copious Rabbinical citations adduced by Wets. (chiefly from Lightfoot,) which I cannot find room to detail. He subjoins the following observations: “The question now is, what did Christ intend the thief to understand by the Paradise promised? Certainly by this word he did not give his approbation to the Jewish fables, nor to the opinion entertained by the Essenes of the eternal felicity only of the soul, nor of the sensual pleasures designated by the Pharisical paradise; but his meaning is simply this: that the thief might expect optima queque, far greater than any thing he had heard of from his Doctors, or had himself formed any conception of, namely, a secure and quiet retreat for the intermediate time between death and resurrection, and finally eternal felicity after this resurrection.” Wetstein proceeds to remark, that though almost all Theologians regard the παραδείσος here as equivalent to Heaven, yet that by the ancient Theologians were carefully discriminated the regions of Paradise from those of Heaven. He cites Tertullian, Apolog. “Si Paradisum nominemus, locum divinæ amœnitatis recipiendis sanctorum spiritibus, non cœlum intelligimus.” Method. ap. Epiph. H. 64. Origen de Principiis, 1, 2. 11, 6. “Puto enim, quod sancti quique discendentes de hac vita perma-
nebunt in loco aliquo in terra posito, quem Paradisum dicit scriptura divina, velut in quodam eruditionis loco.” Chrysost. T. 5, 7. relates that by Paradise the Manichaeus understood Heaven, but not so (says he) the Orthodox. So also Ephrem, Philoxenus, and Severus Caesarius, Q. 141, 142, 143. Paulin. in Martyrio Felicis: “Quæ regione venis, ccelo datus, an Paradiso?” See also Augustin de Tempore, 120.

The Jews used the word Paradise to denote two different places: 1st, the upper Paradise, or Paradise of God,* (see Apoc. 2, 7.) the celestial Paradise, Heaven. So 2 Cor. 12, 4. 2dly, the "Abyss, or place appointed for the souls of the pious after death, (see the note on Luke 16, 23.) who, they maintained, would there remain until the resurrection. Certainly Jesus spoke according to the common opinion, and as he knew he should be understood by the thief. To the interpretation of Grotius, Wetstein, and others, I accede; and must further observe, that to the ancient critics, who are mentioned as having maintained this opinion, may be added Euthymius, who has the following acute and instructive annotation on this passage, (probably founded on Chrysostom,) with which I shall conclude this dissertation.

“How is it that, in answer to the thief who entreats to be remembered in the Kingdom of Christ, our Lord grants something so very different from what is petitioned? Answer: Because the thief made his request with an ignorance of what the

* Schoettgen illustrates this, by observing that the Jews compared eternal life to a paradise, because in it they believed they should enjoy a most splendid banquet. Nor need any one (continues he) here object, that these inferences ought not to be drawn from the stupid fables and traditions of the Jews. For it must be observed that most of these traditions were relics of the true and ancient Jewish theology, which was indeed made up of symbolical, allegorical, and metaphorical words; and these forms of expression are retained in the New Testament, and especially in the Apocalypse of St. John. (Schoettgen.)
Kingdom of Christ was, and did not petition for any thing determinate and definite, but by such a sort of request he only entreated to obtain some benefit. But Christ, knowing his intention, promised what might seem to him (i.e. the thief) the most desirable of all things,* (for he must have been acquainted with the nature of the Jewish Paradise,) and therefore he promises him a place in this Paradise, which might be considered as an earnest of that heavenly kingdom which is the enjoyment of ineffable and eternal bliss, such as eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive.”

44—46. See the note on Matth. 27, 45—50. Πάτερ, εἰς χειράς σου παραθησόμαι τ. π. μ. Εἰς χειράς seems to imply protection; as in Sap. 3, 1. δικαίων ἰδὲ ψυχαὶ ἐν χειρὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀφήσῃ αὐτῶν βάσανος. Παραθησόμαι is (by an Hebraism) the future for the present: though the reading of some MSS. παραστῆθη is not undeserving of attention. (Kuin.) I add an apposite passage of Dionys. Hal. 1, 472, 14. where Marcus Coriolanus, when on the point of going into exile, bids farewell to his wife and female relatives, and says, “To you I commend my children.”

47. ἄντων ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὦτός δίκαιος ἢν. In Matth. 27, 54. Mark 15, 37. this centurion testifies that Jesus is the Son of God; how is it that in Luke he declares him only a just man? Grotius endeavours to assign a reason for this difference; but none is sufficient without adding the article, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὦτός ὁ δίκαιος ἢν. This man was the just one, agreeably to the expression of this very writer, Acts 7, 52. 22, 14. and to James 5, 6. Wasse, Biblioth. Literar. 1722. No. 1. p. 25. &c. It does not appear that the heathen centurion had any such thoughts of Jesus.

* Christ promises more than he was asked. "Thou entreatest me (says he) to remember thee, when I take possession of my Kingdom; I will not delay thy wishes so long, but will give thee a primitival foretaste of the hoped for felicity this very day. (Ros.)
as to imagine him to be the Christ, the Son of God. If he had, probably he would have been a convert to his doctrine; and this would have been so remarkable a thing, that the Evangelists would scarcely have omitted the mentioning it. All that the centurion meant seems to be, that Jesus was an innocent person, or, as St. Matthew expresses it, (for the centurion spoke both,) a son of a God; by which the heathens signified their opinion of an extraordinary person: Credo equidem, nec vana fides, genus esse Deorum, as Dido saith of Æneas. But our translation, the Son of God, goes beyond what is written, and makes this heathen speak like an Apostle, or like a converted Jew. Theophylact speaks of him as a convert, which seems to be a probable fiction. (Markland.)

47—49. See Matth. 27, 54. Ἐξελειφθήνει τά ταρτήρια, i. e. to see this spectacle.

48. ἰεροπλανήματα, i. e. the preternatural eclipse, or at least obscuration, of the solar rays, the earthquake, and the spectacle of a man dying, as it were, suo arbitrio, after uttering the words, “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.” (Grot.)

48. τύπτοντες ἐκυπτύον τὰ στήθη, beating their breasts, already feeling those stings of conscience afterwards infixed still deeper by the preaching of the Apostles. For all that they had seen were signs of the innocence of Jesus, and of the wrath of the Deity. (Grot.)

49. γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ, the women which came with him. “I hope I shall give no offence by saying what I am sure I say very seriously, that the frequent mention which is made in the Evangelists of the generous and courageous zeal of some pious women in the service of Christ, and especially of the faithful and resolute constancy with which they attended him in these last scenes of his suffering, might very possibly be intended to obviate that haughty and senseless contempt which the pride of men, often irritated by those vexations to which their
own irregular passions have exposed them, has in all ages affected to throw on that sex, which probably, in the sight of God, constitute by far the better half of mankind, and to whose care and tenderness the wisest and best of men generally owe and ascribe much of the daily comfort and enjoyment of their lives.” (Doddridge.)

50. ἀνήρ ἅγαθος καὶ δίκαιος. The words are thus defined and distinguished by Westhoivius, in his Diatribe in Historiam Passionis, p. 239: “Niminum vir justus est, qui nihil contra leges facit, suum cuique tribuit, neminique nocet; bonus verò, qui facit etiam ea, quae legibus non precepta sunt, atque, facilitate et munificentia præditus, omnibus prodest, quibus potest.” But the words are, in popular use, (as here,) nearly synonymous, and opposed to κακός. So Æscchin. Socr. 1, 2, 3. (cited by Kuinoel,) where ἅγαθος and δίκαιος are also conjoined as synonymous, and opposed to κακός. Wetstein refers to Acts 11, 24. and cites Cic. de Offic. 3, 19. & Lælio, 5. Qui ita se gerunt, ita vivunt, ut eorum probetur fides, integritas, æqualitas, liberalitas, nec sit in illis ulla cupiditas, vel libido, vel audacia, sintque magna constantia—hös vinos bonos appellandos putemus. Hor. Ep. 1, 16, 57. Aristot. de Rep. 3, 4. τὸν δ’ ἅγαθον ἄνδρα φάμεν ἐναί κατ’ ἀρετὴν τελείαν, which reminds one of the well-known line of our great Poet: “An honest man’s the noblest work of God.”

51. οὐκ ἦν συγκατατηθεμένος τῇ βουλῇ. The word συγκατατεθημι properly signifies, to lay down together, and, in the middle voice, to lay or range oneself with any others, to vote with, act with them: so that we need not, with most philologists, suppose a subaudition of ψήφον. It is used with the same sense, and with the same construction, in Exod. 23, 1 & 32. Susan. 20. and also in the Classical writers; ex. gr. Jos. A. 20, 1, 2, 8, 6, 5. Plato, Pindar, Dionys. Hal. and other authors cited by Wetstein, Alberti, Krebs, Munth, and De Rhoer.

51. προσεδέχετο καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.
Some Commentators explain, "who was expecting that the kingdom of the Messiah would be established by Jesus," i. e. who was a disciple of Christ. But although it may be true that Joseph had this expectation, yet I see not how that sense can be elicited from these words. I prefer the common interpretation, "who also himself expected the kingdom of God," i. e. who also anxiously looked forward to the kingdom which God should establish by the Messiah.

So in a similar passage of Luke, 2. 25. προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τού Ἰσραήλ, waiting for the consolation of Israel, i. e. the Messiah.

53. ὡς ὤκ ἥν ὀνειδεῖν ὀνείδεις. One may here remark the accumulation of three negatives, and four ὡς. In Greek many negatives strengthen the negation.

53, 54. See Mark 27, 9, 60. Διακεῖται, hewn out in the rock. On the word ταφασκενη see the note on Matth. 27, 62.

54. ἐπέφωσκε, i. e. was just dawning, just drawing on, commencing. As the Sabbath commenced in the evening of the preceding day, the expression ἐπέφωσκε requires to be taken by a metaphor which really seems very strange. The difficulty has been fully and ably considered by Dr. Campbell in a very long note, the substance of which I shall compress, and, to save room, throw into a note.* I have

* The Jews, in their way of reckoning the days, counted from sun-set to sunset, thus beginning the natural day, τον νυκτήμερον, with the night. This had been the manner from the earliest ages. Moses, in his history of the creation, concludes the account of the several days in this manner. "And the evening and the morning were the first day;" and so of all the six, always making mention of the evening first. There is some reason to think, that the same method of counting had, in very ancient times, prevailed in other nations. It was not however, the way that obtained in the neighbouring countries in the time of the Apostles. Most others seem, at that time, to have reckoned as we do, from midnight to midnight; and, in distinguishing the two constituent parts of the natural day, named the morning first. Had the Jewish practice been universal, it is hardly possible that such a phrase as σαββατον ἐπέφωσκε, sabbatum illucescebat, to signify that the sabbath was drawing on, had ever arisen. The expression, then, might have been
only to add, that an elaborate explication of this peculiar idiom is offered by Michaelis in his Introd. I, such as Lightfoot supposes, εἰς σάββατον ἐκκορίσθη, and obtenescebat in sabbatum; the sabbath being, as every other day, ushered in with darkness, which advances with it for several hours. The conjecture of Grotius, that Luke in this expression, refers to the light of the stars, which do not appear till after sun-set, and to the moon, which gives at least no sensible light till then, is quite unsatisfactory. That the coming of night, should on this account, be signified by an expression which denotes the increase of light, is not more natural than it would be to express the progress of the morning, at sun-rise, by a phrase which implies the increase of darkness, and which we might equally well account for by saying that, in consequence of the sun’s rising, the stars disappear, and we no longer enjoy moon-shine. I am no better pleased with the supposition to which Wetstein seems to point, that there is an allusion here to a Jewish custom, of ushering in the sabbath by lighting lamps in their houses. The transactions spoken of in this chapter, were all without doors, where those lights could have no effect; besides, they were too inconsiderable to occasion so flagrant a deviation from truth, as to distinguish the advance of the evening by an expression which denotes the increase of the light. Lightfoot’s hypothesis is, as usual, ingenious, but formed entirely on the language and usages of the modern Rabbis. He observes, that with them, the Hebrew יָמָה, answering to the Greek φῶς, is used for night; and, taking it for granted that this use is as ancient as our Saviour’s time, the approach of night would naturally, he thinks, be expressed by ἐν φωσκεῖ, ἀλλυσσο. But let it be observed, that as the Rabbinical works quoted, are comparatively recent, and as their language is much corrupted with modernisms, from European and other tongues, it is not safe to infer, merely from their use, what obtained in the times of the apostles. As to the word in question, certain it is, that we have no vestige of such a use in the Old Testament. There are not many words which occur oftener than יָמָה, but never means night, or has been so rendered by any translator whatever. The authors of the Sept. have never used φῶς in rendering יָמָה, the Hebrew word for night, nor וָלָכָה in rendering יָמָה. The word φῶς never signifies night, in the Jewish Apocryphal writings, nor in the New Testament. The way therefore wherein I would account for this expression of the Evangelist (a way which has been hinted by some former interpreters,) is very simple. In all the nations round (the Jews perhaps alone excepted,) it was customary to reckon the morning the first part of the day, and the evening the second. Those who reckoned in this manner, would naturally apply the verb ἐκφωσκεῖ, to the ushering in of the day. Luke who was, according to Eusebius, from Antioch of Syria, by living much among Gentiles, and those who used this style, or even by frequent occasions of conversing with such, would insensi-
196. seqq. who accounts it a Syriasm. But his hypothesis (which was afterwards abandoned by himself) has been completely refuted in some powerful strictures by his very acute and learned translator, Bp. Marsh, to which, as they are too long for insertion, and will not admit of abridgment, I can only refer my readers. Kuinoel adopts the explication of Wetstein, who justly observes, that however incongruous it might sound to Greek and Roman ears, when they heard of the evening or approach of night expressed by ἐπιφωσκω, yet to Jewish ones it was familiar, and by no means harsh. After all, Campbell accounts for it most satisfactorily by attributing it to the confusion of Oriental with Classical ideas and phrases so likely to occur in an Hellenist (as was our Evangelist) by no means slightly tinctured with Classical erudition. See Gesenius in Rosenmuller’s Repertorium, vol. 1, 133.

56. ἧτοίμασαν ἅρματα καὶ μύρα· καὶ τὸ μὲν σάββατον ἔσυχασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν. In Mark 16, 1. we have διαγενεμένου τοῦ σαββάτου. This trifling discrepancy the Commentators try various methods to remove. The most probable opinion is that supported by those who suppose that the women, after their return home into the city, prepared spices, &c. (Joh. 12, 7.) But since the quantity provided did not prove sufficient for the anointing of the body, and yet, as the Sabbath had meanwhile begun, they could not purchase the required spices, (see Exod. 20, 10.) they took the earliest opportunity of doing this on the expiration of the Sabbath. Hence in Mark we bly acquire a habit of using it. A habit of thus expressing the commencement of a new day, contracted where the expression was not improper, will account for one’s falling into it occasionally, when, in consequence of a difference in a single circumstance, the term is not strictly proper. And this, by the way, is at least a presumption of the truth of a remark I lately made, that this Evangelist has, oftener than the rest, recourse to words and idioms which he must have acquired from the conversation of the heathens, or from reading their books. This is an expression of that kind which, though it might readily be imported, could not originate among the Jews. (Campbell.)
have διαγεννητέου σαββάτου ἡτοίμασαν ἄραματα. The discrepancy is, however, (as Rosenmuller observes,) so trifling, that it is not worth mentioning. Such diversities have arisen from the accounts being received from different persons. In narrations of this kind, which are delivered by word of mouth, some diversity may easily arise. Therefore, nothing can be more irrational than to dwell upon such slight discrepancies, in order to diminish the credit of the Evangelists."

CHAP. XXIV.

VERSE 1. See the notes on Matth. 27, 1. and Mark 16, 1. Griesbach (in his Diss. de Font. p. 7.) thinks that these circumstances, which Luke alone records, and which Matthew has neglected to mention, were derived from the information of Joanna, whom he alone mentions in ver. 10. That she was known to him one may conjecture, from ch. 8, 3. where also Luke alone makes mention of this female. From her mouth, or from that of some friend of Joanna, he thinks that Luke derived his information of what befall the women at the sepulchre.

1. ἡφθανον βαθέος. The word βαθέος is an epithet frequently applied to words denoting time, especially night, or the deep grey dawn of morning. Numerous examples are produced by Wetstein, Kypke, and Palæret.

5. κλινουσῶν τὸ πρόσωπον εἰς τὴν γῆν. In aude. So Apollon. 4, 1315. (cited by Wets.) αὐτὰρ δ' ἐς ἐτέρωσε ταλιμπετές ὄμματ᾽ ἐνεικτ' Δαίμονας αἰδεόθεις. Senec. Epist. 11. Artifices scenici, qui imitantur affectus, qui metum et trepidationem exprimunt, qui tristitiam representant, hoc indicio imitantur verecundiam: dejiciunt vultum, verba submittunt, sigunt in terram oculos, et deprimunt. The words κλινουσῶν τὸ πρόσωπον εἰς τὴν γῆν (says Doddridge) do not intimate their prostrating themselves before the angels, but a respectful and reverential declining their heads, and looking downwards, that they might not
appear to gaze; which is well known to have been forbidden to the Jews upon the sight of a celestial vision. (See Exod, 19, 21. and compare Judg. 13, 20.) And it was also considered as dangerous by the heathen, when their deities, or any celestial messengers from them, were supposed to make themselves visible. See Elsner. (Doddridge.)

6. ἔδειτε τὸν ζώντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν; why seek ye the living among the dead. A popular adage for “why seek ye a live person in a sepulchre,” as appears from the Rabbinical citations in Lightfoot and Wetstein. So Shemoth. R. 5. “Fool, is it customary to seek the dead among the living, or the living among the dead?” Vajekra, R. 6. “A certain person lost his son, and looked for him among the tombs. A certain wise man saw him, and thus interrogated him: ‘Is thy son whom thou hast lost alive or dead?’ The father answered, ‘he is alive.’ ‘Fool, resumed the other,) is it customary to seek the dead among the living, or to seek the living among the dead?’” The adage also occurs in Plaut. Menachm. 2, 1, 15. (cited by Wets.) Hominem inter vivos quærítamus mortuum. Nam invenissem jamdiu, si viveret.

11. ἐφάνησαν ἐνάκτην αὐτῶν ἀσέλαρος τ. ρ. α. i.e. a mere fable, idle tale. Wetstein appositely cites Lucian. Timon. 1. ἀπαντὰ ταύτα λάρος ἦν ἀνακέφαλος, καὶ κατὰς πολιτικῶς. Thucyd. 6, 33. καὶ γιγνόμενοι, ὅτι οὖ τὰ μῆ πιστὰ δοκοῦντα εἶναι ἢ λέγοντες ἢ ἀπεγγέλλοντες, οὐ μόνον οὐ πείθοντι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄφρονες δοκοῦσιν εἶναι. Toupin, in his Cur. Nov. thinks λάρος primarily denoted the fringe or trimming of a robe or cloak. This may be considered doubtful, as the origin of the word is uncertain.* That it properly denoted

* The derivations of Eustathius and of Lennep are puerile, and deserve no attention. If I am not mistaken, the origin of this, as well as many other Greek words which puzzle the etymologists, must be sought for in the Northern languages. Now in those languages there is the word “leeran, leeren,” which signifies to tell, to teach, &c. Thus λάρος will denote a tale, which, by the way, is similarly formed from Anglo-Saxon, tell-en, and denotes simply something told.
"a trifle, toy," &c. is plain, from Plautus, cited by Valck. ap. Lenep. Etym. in v. "Tuae blanditiae sunt gere germanae, atque aeepol lirae, lirae." Valckn. then adds, that it sometimes signifies res ficta, as in Athen. 117. and so indeed Plato in Phaed. C. 17. ληρον των 'Ενδυμιων αποδείξειν. By 'Ενδυμιων is meant the myth concerning Endymon. So Hor. Ep. 1, 13, 8. Et fabula fias. Juvenal. Sat. 10, 167. Ut nimis places et declamatio fias. Perhaps ληρος may be exactly paralleled by our word trifle, which seems derived from the Latin tricæ, of which it is, perhaps, a diminutive, tricula. Trica (from ὅρξας) denotes hair, straw, &c. and our trick comes from the same source, though it is now rarely found in its original sense, but of which we have an example in Shakespeare: "a trick not worth an egg."

10. ἡ Μαργαρίτα. That Mary Magdalene was not present at this conversation with the angels (ver. 4—8.) but, before the angels had been seen by the women, had gone to fetch Peter and John, has been already observed in the note on Matth. 28, 5. compared with Joh. 20, 2. seqq. But the credit of the Evangelist is unimpeachable. For Joanna did not think there was any need for a scrupulously minute enumeration of what women had been present from the beginning to the end; nor regarded it as necessary to mention, in plain words, that Mary Magdalene had left the other women. Luke, therefore, did not receive the names of Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James from Joanna, but derived them from Matthew's Gospel, and to these he added the name of Joanna. Indeed he has already, in ch. 23, 40. & 55. made mention of certain women who had accompanied Christ out of Galilee, but omits the names: and in 24, 1. he tells us that these same women, together with some others, proceeded, on the Sunday, to the sepulchre. And now, in v. 9, having finished the narrative of those things which, on the authority of Joanna, are stated to have happened to the women at the sepulchre, he adds, from Matthew,
the names of the women who had brought the first news to the Apostles of Christ’s resurrection, omitting the rest of the circumstances narrated in Matthew’s Gospel, which he did not think proper to transfer into his own work. (Rosenm.)

12. ὅ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἐδραμεν—τὸ γεγονός. If this verse (says Rosenmuller) be genuine, (though it is wanting in the Cod. Cant. and some ancient Latin versions,) it is either out of place, or (as Paulus would prefer) the verbs are to be rendered in the pluperfect, had run, had seen, &c. And thus the verse may so connect with ver. 11. as to express, that though the narration of the women found no credit with the disciples, yet some hope still lingered in their bosoms, inasmuch as Peter also had not found the body of Jesus in the sepulchre.” To this, however, Kuinoel rightly objects, that in the 11th verse we simply read ἡπίστων ἀντίς, and that, moreover, this interpretation is irreconcilable with what we read in ver. 23. & 24. As to the genuineness of the verse, no reasonable doubt can be entertained. Its absence from one Greek and two Latin MSS. can have no weight against the united testimony of all the other MSS. and ancient versions. I would certainly prefer supposing that Luke has here (as in some other passages) neglected the order of time, and has made an insertion somewhat out of place.

12. παρακίνησ. The word παρακίνησ proper signifies to stoop to any thing, and especially to stoop to (look at) any thing, and is usually said of those who look out at a window, or survey any thing attentively. It may often be rendered peep out at, or peer at. All these senses are illustrated by the examples produced by Wetstein and Kypke. In the Sept. however, it sometimes answers to the Hebr. נָשָׁה, prospicere, which implies a view from a higher place (Gen. 26, 8.); and this seems to be the sense in the present passage, i.e. to stoop down and look into the sepulchre. The word rarely occurs in this signification in the Classical writers. I have, however,
found an example in Theocr. Id. 3, 7. τοῦτο κατ’ ἄν-
τρον παρακύπτοισα.

12. ἀπῆλθε, πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τ. γ. There has
here been some doubt raised as to the punctuation
and construction, since the words πρὸς ἑαυτὸν may be
taken either with ἀπῆλθε or with θαυμάζων. Most
Commentators adopt the former, and assign this as
the sense, “he departed, wondering with himself
at the event.” So Theophylact, L. Brug. Price,
Erasmus, Beza, Casaubon, Montanus, E. V. Dod-
dridge, and others. They compare, as similar forms,
dιελευγόντο πρὸς ἑαυτῶς, in Luke 20, 14. and προσεύ-
χον ἔμπνευσεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν in Luke 11, 11. and thus it would
seem to be more suitable to the style of the Evange-
list. Campbell, too, argues that it appears more pro-
able from what we are told, verse 24 of this chap-
ter, and from the account given by Joh. chapter 20.
that Peter did not go directly home, but returned to
the place where the Apostles, and some other disci-
pies were assembled. Others, however, as Erasmus,
Hammond, Heuman, Homberg, Kypke, Bengel,
Beausobre, R. Steph. Ader, Schacht, Markland, Kui-
noel, and others, take the word with ἀπῆλθε. They
urge, that the above passages are not quite to the
point, and that it is necessary to produce one where
θαυμάζων πρὸς ἑαυτὸν occurs. Meanwhile, they for-
tify their construction from Joh. 20, 10. ἀπῆλθον οὖν
πρὸς ἑαυτὸς οἱ μαθηταὶ, and ΑΕlian. V. H. 3, 19.
Plaut. Men. 5, 2, 4. Filia expetit ad se sin a me ut
irem. Markland refers to Jos. Ant. 1, 19. 9. 5, 2, 8.
See more examples in Kypke. And so the Coptic
and Arabic version of Erpenius, and also Euthymius.
Kypke determines the sense of ἀπῆλθε τ. ἐ. to be,
that Peter returned to the diversorium, or inn, where
he resided. This is confirmed by Euthymius, who
interprets πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτὸν διαγωγὴν.

13. δόει ἐξ αὐτῶν. These words must be referred
to ver. 9. where we read ἀπήγγειλαν ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς
ἐνδέκα καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς λοιποῖς. The two persons here men-
tioned are supposed by most Commentators to have been of the number of the seventy disciples, which, however, Kuinoel thinks not very probable, since they would otherwise, he thinks, have recognised Jesus sooner. The name of one of these persons the Evangelist has recorded; that of the other, he has omitted to mention, and has thereby exercised the vain ingenuity of many Commentators, some of whom conjecture Nathaniel, others Bartholomeus, or Luke himself, or even Peter, which is least of all probable. It should rather seem to have been some obscure person, whose name therefore seemed to the Evangelist not worth recording. At all events, it seems that neither of these persons accounted Jesus to have been any thing more than a prophet.

13. εἰς κοιμήσα.—Εμμαωος. There were two places of that name in Judæa; one a respectable town, or city, distant 160 or 170 stadia from Jerusalem. See Reld's Pal. p. 309, 427. It is often mentioned in Maccabees, Josephus, and the Rabbinical writings. So Joseph. 637, 17. τέσσαρας πόλεις ἡκατέρος ἔχουσα καὶ ἑπτάεταί η άνθρωποι καὶ Ἐμμαωος. The other (which is the one here meant) was a village distant only 70 stadia; as we find from Joseph. B. 7, 6. 6. See Schl. Lex. Grotius thinks it possible that these persons dwelt at Emmaus, and were returning thither after having discharged the religious duties of the Passover.

14. ἀριστος περὶ ἄλλως, were conversing with each other. A signification rare in the Classical writers, but not unfrequent in the Alexandrian dialect. Hence the Hebr. הַוָה is in Gen. 44, 65% rendered by Symmachus λαλάμ, by Aquila ὄρνικνα. So also Jos. 10, 11. et seq. See Elsner, Krebs, Loeper, and Abreash.

14. περὶ πάντων τῶν συμβεβηκότων ποιμών, i.e. the life and death of Christ, and what the women had seen and heard.

15. συγκεκρισθήσεται. See the note on Mark 8, 11. The men, after Christ's death, seem no longer to have
regarded him as the Messiah; nor had they even now any faith in the relations of the women; though their minds had been so far struck with those relations, that they were, it seems, discussing their probability, and hesitated to give credit to them, since the disciples had not seen Jesus. Hence they were, not without reason, σκυθομένοι.

16. οἱ δὲ ἀφελμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκπατῶντο τ. μ. ἐ. κα. Many commentators, as Euthymius, Theophylact, Grotius, Hammond, L. Brug, Beza, Schacht, Vogel, and others, take the expression ἐκπατῶντο in a literal sense to mean that they were hindered by some divine power from knowing Jesus. On the peculiar mode in which this hindrance was exerted, Schacht dilates, and Triller compares the words of Minerva in Soph. Α. 85. ἐγὼ σκότωσα βιλέ̄φαρα καὶ διέπεσα, as also similar passages in Homer and Callimachus. The more recent commentators, however, as Heman, Kypke, Rosenm. Kuinoel, and Schlesner, understand the expression metaphorically. Campbell thus renders: "were so affected that they did not see." These commentators refer the hindrance to natural causes. The men (say they) were inattentive, taking little notice of their companion, as being a stranger. Besides Jesus might walk behind, and they could have had no expectation of any thing of this kind; not to mention the change of apparel adverted to by Mark 16, 22.

For my own part, if I merely had in view the expression before us, I should not hesitate to consider it as a Hebraism, or Oriental and popular phrase, implying no more than that they were (somehow) prevented from recognising him, failed to recognise him. But, when coupled with the words of the 31st verse, (which none of the Commentators seem to have noticed,) αὐτῶν δὲ δημοίχθησαν οἱ ἀφελμοὶ, καὶ ἐνέγαγον αὐτῶν, I cannot venture to exclude the idea of divine agency, and am ready to admit, with Doddridge, that there was some particular agency of God, to divert their eyes from looking steadfastly.
upon him, or so to affect their memories as to render them incapable of recollecting who he was; though the natural impediments above-mentioned, (as, for instance, a different habit, and their having no expectation of seeing him,) might not be without their effect.

17. οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῖ, ὡς ἀντιβάλλετε π. ἡ. The word ἀντιβάλλειν signifies properly to toss backwards and forwards, as a ball: but is here used metaphorically of the interchange of arguments, to which there is an allusion, in one of our idioms, when we talk of keeping up the ball of disputation. So 2 Macc. 11, 3. πρὸς έαυτὸν ἀντιβάλλειν, το reason with himself: Thus Suidas, (ap. Wetstein,) in the word ἔτος. ἀντιβάλλειν καὶ φιλονεκείν. Wetstein here compares D. Chrys. p. 43. ἀντιών πύτε Διογένης ἐκ Κορινθίου ἀδύνατε συνέβαλε κατὰ τὴν ἐδων ἐν τῶν γυναικῶν, καὶ ἤρεντο, ποῖ ἄπεισι; οὐχ ἄτροποι ΟΙ παλλοῦ τὰ θεωρείτα ἐπέρρωσιν εἰπενεκύμενοι, ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολούθησιν αὐτοῖς περὶ τῶν φίλων, ἐπειτα ἀκούσαντες μόνον ἄνθρωπον ἄιηλλάγησαν ἀλλ’ ἀντρεῖοι ἐνεκαρκίνουσα τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας, ὅτι μέλῳσι ποιεῖν, ενεκα τῶν συμβουλεύσει καὶ τὰ μὲν κελέσθωσι, τὰ δὲ ἀπαγορεύσοις. οὕτως ἀνέκρινεν τῇ Διογένῃς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι πράττοιεν.

18. σοῦ μόνος παροικεῖς. There has been some difference of opinion as to the interpretation of these words. There are (says Campbell) two ways where-in the words of Cleopas may be understood by the reader: one is a method of accounting for the apparent ignorance of this traveller; the other as an expression of surprise, that any one who had been at Jerusalem at that time, though but a stranger, should not know what had made so much noise amongst all ranks, and had so much occupied, for some days, all the leading men in the nation, the chief priests, the scribes, the rulers, and the whole Sanhedrim, as well as the Roman procurator and the soldiery. The word παροικεῖν in the Sept. answers to the Hebrew יָשַׂה and יָשָׂה, and may denote both to sojourn and to dwell. Hence many interpret the passage thus:
"Art thou the only resident in Jerusalem who art ignorant of these things?" So Theophylact and Euthymius. Others explain: "Art thou the only one among the sojourners at Jerusalem who art ignorant of these things?" Whitby, Wolf, Kuinoel, and (as it should seem) Wetstein, more properly take παροικεῖν for peregrinari, and think that the words are a formula applied to those who are ignorant of what is doing around them, and are thus like strangers in their own city. In illustration of this sense, Wetstein adduces numerous Classical citations, of which the most apposite are the following. Marc. Antonin. 3. ἥνως κόσμου ὄ μη γνώριζον τὰ ἐν κόσμῳ ὄντα. Cic. pro Milone, 12. "An vos, judices, vero soli ignoratis, vos hospites in hac urbe versa-
mini? vestrae peregrinantur aures, neque in hoc per-
vagato civitatis sermone versantur?" Cic. pro Rabir.
28. "Adeone hospes hujusce urbis, adeone ignarus es discipline, consuetudinisque nostræ, ut hæc nesci-
cias." Liv. 4, 3. "Ne ea quidem scimus, quæ omnes peregrini etiam sciunt." Cic. Acad. 1, 8. "Nos in nostrâ urbe peregrinantes, errantesque, tanquam hospites, tui libri quasi domum deduxerunt." Kui-
noel very truly observes, that the phraseology is here abrupt and concise, as is usual with those who are labouring under sorrow, and are therefore impa-
tient of interruption.

19. ἀνὶρ προφήτης. The word ἀνὶρ is here elegantly pleonastic. On this idiom see Raphel, Kypke, and Matth. Gr. Gr.

19. δυνατός ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ. The word δυνατός, which properly signifies powerful, sometimes denotes efficacy, superiority, excellence, or dignity of any kind, and is especially applied to power of elo-
quence: of which Wetstein has adduced numerous examples. In the present passage is added ἐν ἔργῳ: nor is it unusual in the Classical writers to find both phrases united: ex. gr. Thucyd. 1, 139. says of Pericles, λέγειν δὲ καὶ πράττειν δυνατός: and Aristotle observes, that this embraces all the virtues which
compose a perfect man, according to Homer. So Cic. de Orat. 8, 15. (cited by Wets.) "Ut illum efficeret oratorem ver borem, actoremque rerum." Cebes Tab. p. 6. ἄνὴρ ἐφαρμος, καὶ δεινὸς περὶ σοφίας λόγω τε καὶ ἔργω: which last passage comes the nearest. I add Cebes' Tab. p. 4. λόγω δὲ καὶ ἔργῳ Πυθαγόρεων ἐξηλοκαίς βλαν. The first of these phrases (δυνατός ἐν λόγῳ) relates (says Kypke) to the wisdom and eloquence of our Lord; the other relates to the mighty miracles which he performed.

Ἐναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ signifies Dei hominumque judicio. See the note on Luke 1, 6. Consult Euthym. and Grot.

20. παγεδωκαν αὐτῷ—εἰς κρίμα βανατοῦ, i.e. κρίμα βανατικῶν. Alberti compares Ἀείλιαν, V. H. 13, 28. ἐπὶ κρίσεων βανατικῶν. "Οὐκ is here for ὅτι, like our particle how in narrations.

21. ἡρεῖς δὲ ἁλείζωμεν — Ἰσραήλ, i.e. one who should have established an earthly kingdom, and delivered his countrymen from the Roman yoke. Here we have a description of the Messiah according to the received notions of those times. Though this earthly kingdom, they believed, would be conjoined with mental and moral improvement and reformation, they had, however, no notion that the Messiah would offer himself up as a ransom for many. (Grotius.)

21. σὺν πάσιν. The σὺν is here for ὅτι, like the Hebr. יִו for יִו. Markland refers to Luke 3, 20. 16, 26. Col. 3, 14. and of the Classical writers, Athen. 9, 6. p. 373 and so, he says, the Vulgate seems to have read. This, however, is doubtful. The expression exactly corresponds to our particle withal.

21. τρίτην τούτην ἡμέραν ἔχει σήμεραν. Philologists are not agreed as to the mode of taking this sentence, which it must be confessed has a somewhat anomalous appearance. Most Commentators think that there is in ἔχει a nominative left understood; as Θέος, οὐρανός, or ἔλιος. Triller and Schacht form
the following construction, ἵμεραν ἄγει ταῦτην τὴν ἡμέραν τρίτην, which is, however inadmissible. Beza, Kypke, and Mosch, supply Ἰησοῦς, and render, "Je-

sus tertium agit diem, vel in morte, vel in sepulcro." It is a frequent idiom with the Greeks, when they wish to show that any thing has been done on a certain day, to attribute what denotes the day to the person. See Viger, and Matth. Gr. Gr. And this occurs not only in the Classical, but even the Scrip-
tural writers; as Joh. 11, 39. τεταρταῖος ἦστι. Thus τρίτην ταῦτην ἡμέραν ἄγει will be for τριταῖος ἦστι. This, upon the whole, seems the most probable way of explaining the anomaly; for such it is. Kuinoel observes, that no example has yet been produced of the phrase, and that the following words would then seem useless. But this objection is not fatal: for it must be observed that there are phrases ἄκαμπτε λεγό-

μενα, as well as words. Yet it is not so devoid of example; for the two following passages, cited by Wetstein, seem to very nearly prove the point. Luc-
cian, D. Mort. 13. ἐπὶ ἐν Βαβυλώνι κεῖμαι τρίτην ταῦ-

την ἡμέραν. Diog. Laert. 10, 23. τελευτάτου τετρα-

κοστοῦ τρίτου ἐτος ἄγοντα. It seems an Hellenistic phrase for the other more Classical expression: nor are the following words useless; though they might have been omitted. Doddridge and Grotius take the ἄγει in a passive sense. But this is devoid of authority, and involves far more difficulty than the former method. As to the expression ἄγειν τὴν ἡμέραν, it is as frequent as the Latin agere diem.

22. ἀλλὰ καὶ γνωσίκες τινες ἐν ἡμῶν ἐξεστησαν ἡμᾶς. Euthymius explains: "Some of our women, who were followers of Jesus with ourselves, ἐξέστησαν, have thrown us into amazement, by asserting what seems incredible." It must be observed, that ἐξέστημι is one of those verbs which are used not only intransitively, but transitively. In ἐξέστησαν subaud τοῦ νυ. See the note on Matth. 12, 22, and Mark 3, 21. So Eurip. Aug. Frag. 7. ἤνως ἐξέστησε

με. The word, however, is not here to be under-
stood only in the notion of surprise; but, as Zorn and Wolf well remark, it denotes a state of "vehement agitation and hesitation, a fluctuation between hope and fear." So in Acts 2, 12. ἐξέσταστο πάντες καὶ διητόρουν.

22. γενομεναι ὤρθριαι ε. τ. μ. ὸρθριαι is here to be taken adverbially; as in Job. 29, 7. οτε ἐξεπορευόμην ὤρησ. So Virg. AEn. 8, 465. "Ἀνεάσες se matutinus agebat." (Kuin.) I add, Jos. 185, 32. ὤρηροσ τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐμπίπτει. Indeed this is a frequent idiom in the Classical writers, and especially in this word, of which Wetstein gives many examples.

25. ὁ ἀνωτᾶτοι καὶ βραδεῖς. Christ here justly comprehends the ignorance and slowness of belief shown by these men; since he had while alive predicted his own resurrection.

Luke here (as it seems) only brings forward the sum of Christ's discourse. The term ἀνωτᾶτοι, fools, (as it is rendered in our translation,) has been, not without reason, objected to by Doddridge and Campbell, who render thoughtless, which, however, is not significant enough, and is every way improper. Schleusner justly complains of the vague manner in which the word is defined by lexicographers, and himself explains it, "one who either has not, or uses not, the faculty of knowing the truth." Thus Jos. Ant. 6, 3, 6. calls the Jews ἄνωτον τὸ πλῆθος πρὸς προφήταις τῶν συμβησσόμενων. It should therefore seem to answer to our word misjudging, stupid. The sentence is introduced in Aesop. Fab. τ. ν. ἀναστενάξας ἀνέκραγε ὁ ἀνώτατοι καὶ βραδεῖς.* The word ἀνωτός (and even μάταιος and μαρτός) is sometimes, however, used in a middle sense. Thus Eurip. Suppl. 549. ἀλλ' ὁ μάταιοι, γνώτε τ' ἀνθρώπων κακὸλ. The words βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ were added κατ' ἐξήγησιν, and denote inertness of intellect. The word καρδία, which corresponds to the Hebr. ליה, is

* This proves that the fable is the production of a later period. It was probably the fabrication of some monk in the middle ages.
added, to show that it is to be taken metaphorically. That it is not (as Price thought) a Latinism, appears from the citations in Wetstein. ἑραδός is opposed to ἀγχίνως, ready-witted. So Aristoph. Nub. 129. ἐπιλησμαίν καὶ ἑραδός, &c. It is often associated with words indicating stupidity, dullness, &c. The Latin bardus is evidently derived from the Æolic ἑραδός.

26. οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει πάθειν τ. Χ. q. d. “Did ye doubt whether Jesus were the Messiah, because he died? Now his very sufferings and death may show you clearly that he is the promised Messiah. Did ye not know that it was decreed (ἔδει) that the Messiah should attain to honour and glory through much tribulation. (Rosenm. and Kuin.) See Acts 14, 22. Schoettgen appositely cites Synopsis Sohar. p. 51. “If a man undergoes objurygation and tribulation from philanthropic motives, he thus prepares for himself an entrance into the future world.” Jesus now proceeded to enumerate and recite various prophecies of the Old Testament, and to explain the true nature of the Messiah’s kingdom, in order to show how vain and futile were the opinions respecting the earthly kingdom of the Messiah; and, moreover, that by the periods promised by the Prophets were meant those in which an accurate knowledge of the Deity, and of the mode of worshipping him, should be disseminated throughout the universe; and that it was necessary for the Messiah to suffer death, in order to effect these important ends.

27. ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μαωέως. Even in the Books of Moses there are prophecies, as, for instance, those respecting Esau and Dan, &c. There are also types and symbols, as of the serpent erected by Moses: and also some connected with the affairs of David, the explanation of which Christ delivered to the Apostles, and the Apostles to us. It seems probable too that a similar mystical explication of other prophecies was delivered by Christ, or by the Holy Spirit, and handed down by tradition in the Church;
as of the affairs of Isaac. But many such applications were in after ages drawn to a mystical purport, rather with piety than judgment. So arduous a work is it, ἄναγγειλέν τῷ σοφίτῃ τῶν πάντων. (Grot.) The ancient Greek commentators, and especially Theophylact, (who preserves much of the old mystical interpretation, styled the ἀναγγελία,) will supply perpetual examples of the lamentable abuse adverted to by Grotius. The principal prophecies of the Old Testament, which Jesus may have cited on this occasion, are brought forward by J. Capellus in his Obss. and especially by the profoundly erudite Bp. Huet, in his Demonstr. Evang. Prop. 7. p. 568. and Prop. 9. p. 668. where all the prophecies concerning the Messiah in the Old Testament are copiously detailed and learnedly illustrated.

28. προσεποιεῖτο παραβάτερον πορεύεσθαι. The word προσεποιεῖται properly denotes to appropriate to any one, and, in the middle voice, to appropriate to oneself, to make one's own, to take to oneself, and often, metaphorically, (as here,) to make as if*. It is frequently used in the Classical writers, and sometimes in the Sept. as 1 Sam. 21, 41. See also 2 Sam. 13, 5. Campbell and Doddridge render, “he seemed as if he,” &c. But I prefer our common version, “he made as though he would,” which is an elliptical phrase for “he made (a motion) as though.” And so Euthymius seems to have taken it, who explains ἐκχυματίζεται, and Hesych. προσεποιεῖται σχηματίζεται. It seems probable that this προσεποιήσις consisted in motion and gesture; and, at all events, it affords no ground for founding a charge of dissimulation against our Saviour, or affording any encouragement to the practice of dissimulation in others. Besides (as Grotius remarks) there was not a shadow of dissimulation; for Jesus was directing his steps as if to go onwards, and would really

* The student will observe the more elegant, though rare form, in which this is expressed in Athen. 270. εὐς οἶνος τῆς ἀπαντασθεί.
have gone, had he not been withheld by their friendly importunities. Grotius has here considered the subject of dissimulation both theologically and morally, in a very long and profound philosophic dissertation, into which the nature of my plan will not permit me to enter.

29. ταραξάσατο αὐτὸν, i.e. importuned him. This word, and others of a similar sense, are often used, not of physical but moral compulsion; and so the word occurs in Gen. 33, 11. Judg. 19, 7. See the note on Matth. 14, 22. "The expression, in such cases, (says Campbell,) must always be interpreted according to popular usage. Usages such as this, of expressing great urgency of solicitation by terms which, in strictness, imply force and compulsion, are common in every tongue."

29. πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἐστὶ. Wetstein remarks that πρὸς with nouns of times denotes the proximity of it (answering to our towards); and he then cites Thucyd. 4, 135. πρὸς ἐκείνη. Kuinoel adds, Jos. Ant. 5, 5. ἐστὶ δὲ πρὸς ἐσπέραν, &c. In the τῶν μείναι subaud ἐνεκα.

31. κλάσας. See the note on Matth. 14, 19. This was contrary to the custom of guests: since that office belonged to the entertainer, (as we find from Xenophont, Homer, and Apuleius,) except when the host, out of respect, chose to resign it to the guest. (Grot. and Price.) From all the circumstances, it is plain that this was a common meal, and not, as some pretend, the Eucharist.

31. αὐτῶν δὲ διηνικθεὶσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ. On the impediments being removed, and on a nearer approach, they began to perceive and recognise Christ. So Gen. 21, 19. Rosenm. observes, that the expression of the eyes being opened is used by the Hebrews, not only of those whose eyes are physically, but morally closed, of those who at length perceive what they before failed to discern. See Gen. 3, 5—7. 21, 19—22. 1 Kings, 6, 17—20. But see the note on
ver. 16.* I assent, however, to Doddridge, that the Evangelist seems to intimate that the miraculous influence, which before prevented their knowing him, was removed, though other circumstances might awaken them to more attentive observation.

31. ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν. There has been some difference of opinion as to the construction and (which depends upon it) the interpretation of the passage. Some, as Kypke and Rosenm. assign to ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν the sense of departed from them. Others refer the ἄφαντος to ἐγένετο, and at ἀπ' αὐτῶν understand πορευόμενος. But this seems too arbitrary a mode of construction. I agree with Beza and Kuinoel, that the ἀπ' αὐτῶν has the sense of αὐτοῖς, only it is more expletive, and is (as Grot. observes) a sort of Hebraism, since the ὑ is often put pleonastically in the place of the dative. Thus ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν is the same as ἔφαγεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, and the sense will be, "he suddenly disappeared, or departed from them." The word is often, by the Greek writers, used of those who, in any way, and especially abruptly or suddenly, withdraw from any one's company, and are no longer visible to them. Examples are produced by Abresch in loc. 595. and Wetstein. Thus Eurip. Or. 1495. ἐγένετο διὰ σποδομον̣ ἄφαντος. Apoll. 4, 1330. καὶ ἄφαντοι ὑ ἐσταθεν ἐνθ' ἄρα ταὐγε φθογγον̣ ὅμολο ἐγένεντο παρασχεδον̣. Arat. 899. Τίνες ἄφαντος. Theocrit. Id. 4, 5. ἄφαντος ὁ βωτάδος ὅχετο. Diod. Sic. 3, 60. ἄφαντον γενέσθαι. And 4, 65. ἄφαντος ἐγένεσθαι. Ann 4, 82. Flor. 1, 1. "Ε con spectu ablatus est." I add, Polyæn. 4, 6, 15. p. 388. ἄφανες πάντες ἐγένοντο. Æschyl. Ag. 607: ἀνήρ ἄφαντος ἐξ Ἀχαϊκῶν στρατοῦ. Thucyd. T. 3, 189. 5. ἀποτελεόν ἐν κέλητι ἄφανεσται. Plut. 9, 92. Παραξενιμα ἄφανες ἐγένετο. Herodian 1, 11, 5. de Ganymede. Ἐνθα καὶ τῶν Γανυμήδου ἄρσασθέντα ἄφανη γένεσθαι λύγος. Soph. Ædip. Tyr. 37, 560. ἄφαντος

* Cradock, Brennius, and Schoettgen, suppose that his undertaking the office of breaking bread, or some peculiar action or gesture in performing it, was the thing that made the discovery.
Sophocles (Œdip. Tyr. 331. spoken metaphorically of dying. ἄλλ' ἐκ βροτῶν βαῖν ἄφαντος πρώτευν. Xen. Ages. 9. where ἄφανι-


able: αὐτὸς δὲ ἀπολίπαν μελαθῶν, οὐκ οἶδ' ἐκο ἄφανης ὄχετο ἀπιστῶν. Most commentators agree that we are not to suppose that our Lord vanished as a spectre might be supposed to do. As to the manner in which this disappearance was effected, Grotius very prud-

dently professes that he knows nothing more applicable than the saying of Basil, τὸ ὅπως μὴ περιεργάζεσ-

θαι, not to busily scrutinize the how. Of the three modes, continues he, in which it might have happened, two are easier of comprehension: but the third, I would not venture to pronounce impossible. For, continues he, while we are encrusted with this earthly clay, we cannot attain unto aught that regards the nature of angels, or that which St. Paul calls the spiritual body, except by very faint conjectures; which should put a check on our vain curiosity. The reason (says Euthymius,) for this abrupt and hasty departure was, that they might tarry no longer, but return to the disciples: for he intended on the same day to appear to all. After all, I do not see how it can be concluded from the words of the Evangelist, or from any of the passages with which they have been compared, whether the removal in question was natural, or preternatural. The words simply imply that he was withdrawn, or withdrew himself from them.

32. οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καὶ σπώκῃ, did not our hearts burn within us. Kypke observes that the word κάισ-

θας, is often used of vehement commotion and affection of the mind, especially joy. So both the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin writers. Thus Ps. 39, 4. ἐθερμάνῃ
qui Cordia.  Jer. 20, 9. Cic. de fin. 4, 3. Incendit igitur eos qui audiunt—Quid ille incendat? restinguat citius, si ardentem acceperit. So in other passages of Cicero, produced by Wetstein. I add from the Psalms, "My soul is athirst for God, yea even for the living God;" which is beautifully imitated by Cowper in his Task. "His very soul athirst for Nature in her green attire." Kypke has here well observed that the Evangelist does not add with what particular affection their hearts were filled: since it was a compound feeling, made up partly of respectful affection towards one who had so ably expounded the oracles of the prophets; of desire to longer enjoy his society and instruction; of joy, since they anxiously longed that what he had taught them of the resurrection of the Messiah should prove true, and (though with some fluctuation of mind,) rejoiced in the anticipation of that truth. (Kypke.) Unless (say they) our minds had been veiled by ignorance, we should have recognized him even before he sat to meet with us, by his manner of instruction. For, besides the weight of his arguments, and the courtesy of his address, there was added a divine efficacy warming our hearts, such as we were wont to perceive in his former instructions. (Grot.)

36. Ἐν τῷ πόθῳ αὐτῶν. John adds ἐν τῷ πόθῳ αὐτῶν. John adds ἐν τῷ πόθῳ αὐτῶν. From which, many have inferred that Jesus entered the closed doors without stirring them on their hinges. But then it would have been written διὰ τῶν ποθῶν. Indeed, the last words have solely a reference to the preceding διὰ τῶν ποθῶν. But (ask some) has not John noted that the doors were opened? True: but such minutiae as this, (i.e. whether Jesus himself opened the door, or ordered it to be opened,) the Evangelists are not accustomed to touch on. Besides, had the disciples from Emmaus also entered by the closed doors? The word ἔστη, indicates that Jesus appeared suddenly and
unexpectedly. The εἰς ἡμᾶς ἵνα, was a customary form of salutation. (Kuin.)

37. πτωθέντες. Wetstein cites Poccok, in his Porta Mos. p, 214. a. Aaron Levita, referente Juda Zabara, corporis in mundum futurum admissi quatuor statuit excellentiæ gradus. 1. ut oculi visum fugiat, quandocunque latere cupiat. 2. quemlibet locum etiam occlusum ingrediatur non secus ac spiritus. 3. brevi temporis spatio a loco suo ad locum longè remotum transferratur, vel alia indutum forma ἢ ἄλλα, quoties cuncte personam mutare liben- rit. The expressions πτωθέντες and ἐμφασοι, are synonymous, but joined for the sake of stronger emphasis. The fear too arose from the suddenness of Christ's appearance. In this view Wetstein refers to Acts 12, 9. and cites Quintilian, D. 9. Inopinata subito amici mei species effulsit: obstupui, totumque corpus perfudit frigidus pavor: neque aliter, quam si vana objiceretur oculis imago, mente captus steti. Among many other opinions respecting spirits, and their power over men, the Jews thought, that there were spectres and empty appearances brought forward by dæmons, and that the soul of a dead person could appear clothed in a visible, though very subtile, body. See Jos. Ant. 1, 20. 2, 5, 6, 1. (Kuinoel.) See Bp. Pearson on the Creed, p. 452.

38. διατὰ διαλογισμὸν ἀναβαίνοντι. Wetstein compares this expression with a similar one in Eustath. p. 669. 11. ὑπονολα ἀναβαίνοντις εἰς νῦν. Virg. Æn. 1, 582. Nasc Dea, quæ nunc animo sententia surgit? Bereschith, R. 24, 4. quæ ascenderunt in cogitationem. He also refers to 1 Cor. 2, 9. Schleusner is wrong in saying that this is a mere Hebrew formula. It is found in the Classical writers, as appears from the above-cited passages: and is not wanting in the modern tongues. I cannot therefore agree with Mr. Horne (Intro. 2. p. 25.) who explains it, "why are thoughts in our hearts." A mode of interpretation that (I think) utterly destroys the beauty of the
metaphor, which is very common even in the modern languages.

39. Ἰδετε τὰς χεῖρας μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου. Our Lord intended to show them that he was their very master who had been crucified, and not a spectre; (whence he adds αὐτὸς ἦν ὑμῖ) and that they did not behold only the soul of their master, endued with a subtle body; hence he says, “Ye see the scars,” &c. q. d. “Where the testimony of things are at hand, what need of words? handle me,* feel me.” The feet are mentioned, not that they were perforated, (which was not the case.†) (See the note on Matth. 27, 32.) though we may suppose that they were bruised and wounded from the violent compression of the rope.

39. πειθα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει. This passage has been imitated by Philostr. Vit. Ἀρ. 9, 12. λαβοῦ μοι, καὶ μὲν διαφύγω σε, εἰδολον εἰμι — εἰ δὲ υπομείνασαι καὶ — ἔν με, καὶ μὴ ἀποβεβληκέναι τὸ σῶμα. So Lucian, Ἔρ. V. 2, 12. εἰ μὴ ἀκατάρτις, οὐκ αὖ ἐλέγεγε, μὴ σῶμα ἐναι τὸ ὁμομοιον. Max. Ῥυγ. 15, 1. οὐ γὰρ σάρκες αἱ δαίμονις φύσις, οὐδὲ ὀστὰ οὐδὲ αἴμα. This was spoken according to the universal opinion of all nations. Wetstein compares several Classical passages: ex. gr. Hom. Od. λ. 217. ἀλλ' αὐτή δίκη ἐστὶ βροτῶν, ὅτε κέντε ἄνωσιν, οὐ γὰρ ἐτὶ σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα ἑνε ἔχουσιν. Οὐ. Μετ. 4, 448. Errant excangues sine corpore et ossibus umbre. Cic. Tusc. 1, 11. Quintilian. D. 10. Virg. Æn. 6, 700. Ter conatus ibi collo dare brachia circum, Ter frustra comprensae effugit imago, Par levibus ventis, volucrique simillima somno. He also cites several Rabbinical passages. I can only refer

* Wetstein gives many examples of ψηλαφάω, which exactly corresponds to our word feed, of which indeed it is the radix.

† Yet from the following passage of Plantus Mostell. 2, 12, (cited by Wets.) it appears that the feet were sometimes nailed. “Ego dabo ei talentum, primus qui in crucem excucurrerit. Sed ea lege, ut affigantur bis pedes, bis brachia.
my readers to the able note of Grotius on this passage.

39, 40. Christ thought that the readiest mode of extirpating this superstitious fear from their minds, was to desire them to survey the scars of his hands and feet.

41, 42. ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς. This is founded in nature, the disciples yet doubted; as is sometimes the case in the occurrence of events very felicitous, and which happen suddenly and unexpectedly. We think the news too good to believe; and fancy we are dreaming. Thus Kuinoel cites Ovid. "Tarda soleat magnis rebus inesse fides:" and Wetstein cites Liv. 39, 49. vix sibimet ipsi præ necopinato gaudio credentes. Liban. Or. 21. p. 528. c. καὶ ὡ μὲν οἷς ἤκουσε πιστεύων, μεθ' ἥδωνις ἔτεον ἐδίδοσκε ὡ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγέθους τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπιστῶν.

42. ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου, a piece of honey-comb, called in 1 Sam. 14; 27. τοῦ κηρίου τοῦ μέλιτος. A frequent food with the ancients. The ordinary aliment of the disciples (says Dr. Owen,) was nearly a kin to that of John the Baptist. This (I add) was also used by Pythagoras. So Porphy. Vit. Pyth. 34. (cited by Wetstein,) τῆς δὲ διαίτης τὸ μὲν ἀριστον ἢν κηρίον ὣ μέλι: δεῖπνον δ' ἀρτός ἐκ κέκχριον.

44—47. οὐτοὶ οἱ λόγοι (scil. elsi,) οἷς ἐλάλησα π. ὦ i. e. "the words uttered by me, when I was with you, imported that all things written of me (my death, burial, and resurrection,) should be fulfilled." The Old Testament was by the Jews divided into three volumes: the Law (of Moses); the Prophets; and the Hagiographae. Now, instead of the last, the Psalms are here mentioned, as being the most eminent book of the Hagiographa, and that in which, are contained most part of the Prophecies of the Messiah; of which Wetstein gives numerous examples. It must be remembered, that the Jews did then, and long before had been accustomed, to consider many of the Psalms which treated of the tribulations and calamities of David, as symbols and types
and were cheered with the great promise of the Holy Spirit.

58. καὶ ἰσαυρ διασαυντῆς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, i.e. assidue, at all fit times, for (as Euthymius explains κατὰ τοῦς καιροὺς τῶν συνάξεων, ὅτε εἶναι ἐν αὐτῷ ἔζην, whenever the people had assembled, and they had permission to be in it. They repaired to the temple in preference to any other place; since there the Jews were accustomed to pray, and return thanks to God, especially on momentous occasions.

END OF VOL. II.