winds should mean three distinct kinds of  
temptation ; but the ROCK, as signifying  
Him who spoke this, is of too frequent use  
in Scripture for us to overlook it here:  
ef. 2 Sam. xxii. 2 [Ps. xviii. 2], 82, 47;  
xxiii. 3: Ps. xxviii. 1; xxxi. 2, al. fr.;  
lxi. 2: Isa. xxvi.4 (Heb.); xxxii. 2; xliv.8  
(Heb.): 1 Cor. x. 4, &c. He founds his  
house on a rock, who, hearing the words  
of Christ, brings his heart and life into  
accordance with His expressed will, and is  
thus by faith in union with Him, founded  
on Him. he who merely hears  
His words, but does them not, has never  
dug down to the rock, nor become united  
with it, nor has any stability in the hour  
of trial.

In the *rock*,—the *sand*,—  
the articles are categorical, importing  
that these two were usually found in the  
country where the discourse was delivered ;—in the *rain*, the *floods*, the *winds*,  
the same, implying that such trials of the  
stability of a house were common. In  
the whole of the similitude, reference is  
probably made to the Prophetic passage  
xxviii. 15—18.

**27. great**] All  
the greater, because such an one as here   
supposed is a *professed disciple—hearing  
these sayings*—and therefore would have  
the er to fall in case of apostasy.

**29**.] Chrysostom’s comment is, “For He did not say what He said on the  
authority of others, quoting Moses or the  
prophets, but every where alleging Himself to be the One who had the power.  
For when giving the law, he ever added,  
‘ *But I say to you*,’ shewing that He him-  
self was the Judge.”

**CHAP. VIII. 1—4**.] HEALING OF A LEPER. Mark i.40—46. Luke v.12—14.  
We have now (in this and the following chapter), as it were, a *solemn procession of miracles*, confirming the authority wi  
which our Lord had spoken.

**2**.] This  
same miracle is related by St. Luke with-  
out any mark of definiteness, either as to  
time or place,— “ *And it came to pass,  
when he was in a certain city* .-..” In  
this instance there is, and can be, no doubt  
that the transactions are identical: and  
this may serve us as a key-note, by which  
the less obvious and more intricate harmonies of these two narrations may be ar-  
ranged. The plain assertion of the account  
in the text requires that the leper should  
have met our Lord on His descent from the  
mountain, while great multitudes were  
following Him. The accounts in St. Luke  
and St. Mark require no such fixed date.  
This narrative therefore fixes the occurrence. I conceive it highly probable that  
St. Matthew was himself a hearer of the  
Sermon, and one of those who followed  
our Lord at this time. From St. Luke’s  
account, the miracle was performed in, or  
rather, perhaps, in the neighbourhood of,  
some city: what city, does not appear.  
As the leper is in all three accounts related  
to have *come* to Jesus (“*And behold*” implying it in Luke), he may have been outside the city, and have run into it to our  
Lord.

**a leper**] The limits of a note  
allow of only an abridgment of the most  
important particulars relating to this dis-  
ease. Read Leviticus xiii. xiv. for the  
Mosaic enactments respecting it, and its  
nature and symptoms. See also Exod. iv.  
6: Num. xii. 10: 2 Kings v. 27; xv. 5:  
2 Chron. xxvi. 19, 21. The whole ordinances relating to leprosy were symbolical  
and typical. The disease was *not contagious*: so that the view which makes *them*