setting its seal to my truth, the  
harder word, Arise and walk. By doing  
that, which is capable of being put to the  
proof, I will vindicate my right and power  
to do that which in its very nature is incapable of being proved. By these visible  
tides of God’s grace I will give you to  
know in what direction the great under-currents of His love are setting, and that  
both are obedient to My word. From  
this, which I will now do openly and before you all, you may conclude that it is  
‘no robbery’: (Phil. ii. 6, but see note  
there) upon my part to claim also the  
power of forgiving men their sins.” Trench  
on the Miracles, p. 206.

**6. the Son of man**] The Messiah: an expression regarded by the Jews as equivalent to “*the  
Christ, the Son of God,”* ch. xxvi. 63.  
See also John v. 27. “The Alexandrian  
Fathers, in their conflict with the Nestorians, made use of this passage in proof  
of the entire transference which there was  
of all the properties of Christ’s divine  
nature to His human; so that whatever  
one had, was so far common, that it might  
also be predicated of the other. It is quite  
true that had not the two natures Been  
indissolubly knit together in a single Person, no such language could have been  
used; yet I should rather suppose that  
‘Son of Man’ being the standing title  
whereby the Lord was well pleased to  
designate Himself, bringing out by it that  
He was at once one with humanity, and  
the crown of humanity, He does not so  
use it that the title is every where to be  
pressed, but at times simply as equivalent  
to Messiah.” Trench, p. 208.

**on earth**] Distinguished from “*in heaven,*”  
as in ch. xvi. 19; xviii. 18. Bengel finely  
remarks, “ This saying savours of heavenly  
origin.” The Son of Man, as God manifest in man’s flesh, has on man’s earth  
that power, which in its fountain and  
essence belongs to God in heaven. And  
this not by delegation, but “because He  
(being God) is the Son of Man.” John  
v. 27.

**then saith he**] See a similar  
interchange of the persons in construction,  
Gen. iii. 22, 23.

**8. unto men**] Not  
plur. for sing. ‘*to a man,*’ nor, ‘*for the  
benefit of men;*’ but **to mankind**. They  
regarded this wonder-working as something by God granted to men—to mankind; and without supposing that *they*  
had before them the full meaning of their  
words, those words were true in the very  
highest sense. See John xvii. 8. In  
Mark they say, “*We never saw it in this  
fashion:*” in Luke, “*We have seen strange  
things to-day.*”

**9—17.**] THE CALLING OF MATTHEW: THE FEAST CONSEQUENT ON IT: ENQUIRY OF JOHN’S DISCIPLES RESPECTING FASTING:—AND OUR LORD’S ANSWER.  
Mark ii. 13–22: Luke v. 27–39. Our  
Lord was going out to the sea to teach,  
Mark, ver. 13. All three Evangelists connect this calling with the preceding miracle, and the subsequent entertainment.  
The real difficulty of the narrative is the  
question as to the identity of Matthew in  
the text, and Levi in Mark and Luke. I  
shall state the arguments on both sides.  
(1) There can be no question that *the  
three narratives relate to the same event*.  
They are identical almost verbatim: inserted between narratives indisputably  
relating the same occurrences. (2) The  
almost *general consent* of all ages has supposed the *two persons the same*.

On the other hand, (3) *our Gospel makes not  
the slightest allusion to the name of Levi*,  
either here, or in ch. x. 3, where we find  
“*Matthew the publican*” among the Apostles, clearly identified with the subject of  
this narrative: whereas the *other two Evangelists*, having in this narrative spoken of  
Levi in their enumerations of the Apostles (Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15), *mention Matthew without any note of*