dominions of Herod Antipas.

for every cause ;— i.e. *is any charge which a man may choose to bring against his wife to justify him in divorcing her?*

**4—6.]** On these verses we may remark, (1) that our Lord refers to the Mosaic account of the Creation as *the historical fact* of the first creation of man; and grounds his argument on the *literal* expressions of that narrative.

(2) That He cites both from the first and second chapters of Genesis, and in immediate connexion ; thus shewing them to be consecutive parts of a continuous narrative,— which, from their different diction, and apparent repetition, they have sometimes been supposed not to be.

(3) That he quotes as *spoken by the Creator* the words in Gen. ii. 24, which were actually said by Adam; they must therefore be understood as said in prophecy, by divine inspiration, which indeed the terms made use of in them would require, since the relations alluded to by those terms did not yet exist. As Augustine says, ‘God said by man that which man foretold.’

(4) That the force of the argument consists in the *previous unity* of male and female, not indeed organically, but by implication, in Adam. Thus it is said in Gen. i, 27, **He made them** (man, as a race) **male** (not a male) **and female** (not, *man and woman*) : but *then* the male and female were implicitly shut up in one ; and therefore after the creation of woman from man, when one man and one woman were united in marriage they should be *one flesh,* *because* woman was taken out of man. The answer then is, that *abstractedly,* from the nature of marriage, *it is indissoluble.* The words **they twain** are in the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch, but not in the Hebrew.

**5. one flesh]** Stier remarks, that the essential bond of marriage consists *not in unity of spirit and soul,* by which indeed the marriage state should ever be hallowed and sweetened, but without which it still exists in all its binding power :— the wedded pair are ONE FLESH, i. e. ONE MAN *within the limits of their united life in the flesh,* *for this world :* beyond this limit, the marriage is broken by the *death of the flesh.* And herein alone lies the justification of a *second* marriage, which in no way breaks off the unity of love in spirit with the former partner, now deceased.

**7—9.]** {7} In this second question, the Pharisees imagine that they have overthrown our Lord’s decision by a *permission* of the law, which they call a *command* (compare ver. 7 with ver. 8). {8} But He answers them that this was done by Moses *on account of their hardness and sinfulness, as a lesser of evils,* and belonged to that dispensation which *entered,* Rom. v. 20; *was added because of transgressions,* Gal. iii. 19. This He expresses by the **your** and **you,** as opposed to the general terms used before. {9} Only that **fornication,** which *itse[f breaks marriage,* can be a ground for dissolving it. The question, whether demonstrated *approaches* to fornication, short of the act itself, are to be regarded as having the same power, must be dealt with cautiously, but at the same time with full remembrance that our Lord does not confine the guilt of such sins to the outward act only: see ch. v. 28. St. Mark gives this last verse (9) as spoken *to the disciples in the house ;* and his minute accuracy in such matters of detail is well known. This enactment by our Lord is a formal repetition of what He had said before