her to eat. She was an *only* daughter,  
Luke viii. 42.

**21—31.**] HEALING OF TWO BLIND  
MEN. Peculiar to Matthew.

**27.**] **departed thence** is too vague to be taken as a  
fixed note of sequence ; for “*thence*” may  
mean the house of Jaeirus, or the town  
itself, or even that part of the country,—  
as ver. 26 has generalized the locality, and  
implied some pause of time.

**son of David**] a title of honour, and of recognition as the Messiah. It is remarkable that, in all the three narratives of  
giving sight to the blind in this Gospel,  
the title **Son of David** appears.

**28. the house**] perhaps, as Euthymius,  
the house of some disciple. Or, the house  
which our Lord inhabited at Capernaum ;  
or perhaps the expression need not mean  
any particular house, merely, as we sometimes use the expression, *the house*, as  
opposed to *the open air.*

**to do this**]  
i.e. the healing, implied in “*have mercy  
on us.*”

**29.**] *Touching*, or *anointing* the eyes, was the ordinary method  
which our Lord took of impressing on the  
blind the action of the divine power which  
healed them. Ch. xx. 34: Mark viii. 25:  
John ix. 6. In this miracle however we  
have this peculiar feature, that no direct  
word of power passes from our Lord, but  
a relative concession, making that which  
was done *a measure of the faith* of the  
blind men: and from the result the degree  
of their faith appears. Stier remarks,  
“We may already notice, in the history of  
this first period of our Lord’s ministry,  
that, from having at first yielded immediately to the request for healing, He  
begins, by degrees, to prove and exercise  
the faith of the applicants.”

**30. straitly charged**] The word is said to  
mean “*to command with threatening,*”  
“*to enjoin austerely.*” The purpose of  
our Lord’s earnestness appears to have  
been twofold: (1) that He might not be  
so occupied and overpressed with applications as to have neither time nor strength  
for the preaching of the Gospel: (2) to  
prevent the already-excited people from  
taking some public measure of recognition,  
and thus arousing the malice of the Pharisees before His hour was come.

No doubt the two men were guilty of an act  
of disobedience in thus breaking the Lord’s  
solemn injunction: for obedience is better  
than sacrifice; the humble observance of  
the word of the Lord, than the most laborious and wide-spread will-worship after  
man’s own mind and invention. Trench  
(Miracles, p.197) well remarks, that the fact  
of almost all the Romish interpreters having  
applauded this act, “is very characteristic,  
and rests on very deep differences.”

**32—34.**] HEALING OF A DUMB DÆMONIAC. *Peculiar to Matthew*. The  
word **as they went out** places this miracle  
in direct connexion with the foregoing.  
This narration has a singular affinity with  
that in ch. xii. 22, or still more with its  
parallel in Luke xi. 14. In both, the same  
expression of wonder follows; the same  
calumny of the Pharisees; only that in ch.  
xii. the dæmoniac is said (not in Luke xi.)  
to have been likewise blind. These circumstances, coupled with the immediate  
connexion of *this* miracle with the cure of  
the blind men, and the mention of ‘the  
Son of David’ in both, have led some to  
suppose that the account in ch. xii. is a  
repetition, or slightly differing version of  
the account in our text, intermingled also  
with the preceding healing of the blind.  
But the supposition seems unnecessary,—  
as, the habit of the Pharisees once being  
to ascribe our Lord’s expulsion of devils  
to Beelzebub, the repetition of the re-  
mark would be natural:–and the other