*identification with the Levi called on this occasion*.  
This is almost inexplicable, on the supposition of his having borne both names.  
(4) *Early tradition separates the two  
persons*. Clement of Alexandria, quoting  
from Heracleon the Gnostic, mentions  
Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, and many  
others, as eminent men who had not suffered martyrdom from a public confession  
of the faith. (5) Again, Origen, when Celsus has called the Apostles publicans and  
sailors, after acknowledging Matthew the  
publican, adds, “And there may be also Levi  
a publican among Jesus’s followers. But  
he was not of the number of His Apostles,  
except according to some copies of Mark’s  
Gospel.” It is not quite clear from this,  
whether the copies of Mark substituted  
Levi’s(?) name for Matthew’s, or for some  
other: but most probably the latter. (6)  
It certainly would hence appear, as if  
there were in ancient times an idea that  
the two names belonged to distinct persons. But in the very passages where it is  
mentioned, a confusion is evident, which  
prevents us from drawing any certain conclusion able to withstand the general  
testimony to the contrary, arising from  
the prima facie view of the Gospel narrative. (7) It is probable enough that  
St. Matthew, in his own Gospel, would  
*mention only his apostolic name*, seeing  
that St. Mark and St. Luke also give him  
this name, *when they speak of him as an  
Apostle*. (8) It is remarkable, as an indication that St. Matthew's frequently  
unprecise manner of narration did not  
proceed from want of information,—that  
in this case, when he of all men must have  
been best informed, his own account is the  
least precise of the three. (9) With regard to the narrative itself in the text, we  
may observe, that this solemn and peculiar  
call seems (see ch. iv. 19, 22) *hardly to  
belong to any but an Apostle*; and that,  
as in the case of Peter, it here also *implies  
a previous acquaintance and discipleship*.  
(10) We are told in Luke v. 29, that Levi  
*made him a great feast in his house*; and,  
similarly, Mark has “*in his house.*” The

narrative in our text is so closely identical  
with that in Mark, that it is impossible to  
suppose, with Greswell, that a different  
feast is intended. The arguments by  
which he supports his view are by no  
means weighty. From the words **the  
house**, he infers that the house was not  
that of Matthew, but that in which our  
Lord usually dwelt, which he supposes to  
be intended in several other places. But  
surely the article might be used without  
any such significance, or designating any  
particular house,—as would be very likely  
if Matthew himself is here the narrator.  
Again, Greswell presses to verbal accuracy  
the terms used in the accounts, and attempts to shew them to be inconsistent  
with one another. But surely the time is  
past for such dealing with the historic  
text of the Gospels; and, besides, he has  
overlooked a great inconsistency in his  
own explanation, viz. that of making in  
the second instance, according to him,  
Scribes and Pharisees present at the feast  
given by a Publican, and exclaiming  
against that which they themselves were  
doing. It was not *at*, but *after* the feast  
that the discourse in vv. 11—17 took  
place. And his whole inference, that the  
*great feast* must be the great meal in the  
day, and consequently in the evening,  
hangs on too slender a thread to need  
refutation. The real difficulty, insuperable  
to a Harmonist, is the connexion here of  
the raising of Jaeirus’s daughter with this  
feast : on which see below, ver. 18.

**11.**] These Pharisees appear to have been  
the Pharisees *of the place*: Luke has  
“*their Scribes and Pharisees.*” The very  
circumstances related shew that this remonstrance cannot have taken place *at* the  
feast. The Pharisees say the words to the  
disciples : our Lord hears it. This denotes  
an occasion when our Lord and the disciples were present, but not surely intermixed with the *great company of publicans.*

**12. whole . . . sick**] Both  
words, in the application of the saying,  
must be understood *subjectively* (an ironical  
concession, as Calvin, Meyer): as referring