*collected at the door*; from St. Luke, that  
*the daemons cried out and said, ‘Thow  
art Christ the Son of God*.’ And from  
both, that *our Lord permitted them not to  
speak, for they knew Him*. They brought  
sick in the evening, either because it  
was cool,—or because the day’s work was  
over, and men could be found to carry  
them,—or perhaps because it was the sabbath (see Mark i. 21, 29, 82), which ended  
at sunset.

**17**.] The exact sense in  
which these words are quoted is matter of  
difficulty. Some understand **took** and **bare**  
as merely ‘took away,’ and ‘healed.’ But  
besides this being a very harsh interpretation of both words, it entirely destroys  
the force of **Himself**, and makes it expletive. Others suppose it to refer to the  
personal fatigue, (or even the spiritual exhaustion, [Olshausen,] which perhaps is  
hardly consistent with sound doctrine,)  
which our Lord felt by these cures being;  
long protracted into the evening. But  
believe the true relevancy of the prophecy  
is to be sought by regarding the miracles generally to have been, as we know so  
many of them were, lesser and typical outshewings of the great work of bearing the  
sin of the world, which He came to accomplish ; just as diseases themselves, on  
which those miracles , are all so  
many testimonies to existence, and  
types of the effect, of sin. Moreover in  
these His deeds of mercy, He was ‘touched  
with the feeling of our infirmities :’ witness His tears at the grave of  
and His sighing over the deaf and dumb  
man, Mark vii. 84. The very act of compassion is (as the name imports) a *suffering with* its object; and if this be true  
between man and man, how much more  
strictly so in His case who had taken upon  
Him the whole burden of the sin of the  
world, with all its sad train of sorrow and  
suffering.  
  
**18—IX. 1.**] JESUS CROSSES THE LAKE. INCIDENTS BEFORE EMBARKING. HE STILLS THE STORM. HEALING OF TWO DAEMONIACS IN THE LAND OF THE GADARENES. Mark iv. 35—v. 20: Luke ix.  
67—60; viii. 22—39, on which passages  
compare the notes. 18.) It is obviously the intention of St. Matthew to  
bind on the following incidents to the occurrence which he had just related.

**19**.] Both, the following incidents are  
laced by St. Luke long after, during our  
Lord’s last journey to Jerusalem. For it  
is quite impossible (with Greswell, Diss.  
iii. p. 155 sq.) in any common fairness of  
interpretation, to imagine that two such  
incidents should have twice happened, and  
both times have been related together. It  
is one of those cases where the attempts of  
the Harmonists do violence to every principle of sound historical criticism. Every  
such difficulty, instead of being a thing to  
be wiped out and buried up at all hazards  
(I am sorry to see, e. g., that Dr. Wordsw.  
takes no notice, either here or in St.  
Luke, of the recurrence of the two narratives), is a valuable index and guide to  
the humble searcher after truth, and is  
used by him as such (see Introduction).

**20. the Son of man**] “It is  
thought that this phrase was taken from  
Daniel vii. 13, to which passage our Saviour  
seems to allude in ch. xxvi. 64, and probably Stephen in Acts vii. 56. It appears from John xii. 34, that the Jews  
understood it to mean the Messiah: and  
from Luke xxii. 69, 70, that they considered the *Son of Man* to mean the same  
as *the* *Son of God*.” Dr. Burton. It is  
the name by which the Lord ordinarily  
in one pregnant word designates Himself  
as the Messiah—the *Son of God manifested in the flesh of man*—the *second*  
*Adam*. And to it belong all those con-  
ditions, of humiliation, suffering, and exaltation,