near the site only a miserable village, Richa or Ericha.

**30, 31.]** {31} The multitude appear to have silenced them, lest they should be wearisome and annoying to our Lord; not because they called Him the Son of David,—for the multitudes could have no reason for repressing this cry, seeing that they themselves (being probably for the most part the same persons who entered Jerusalem with Jesus) raised it very soon after: see ch. xxi. 9. I have before noticed (on ch. ix. 27) the singular occurrence of these words, ‘Son of David,’ in the three narratives of healing the blind in this Gospel.

**32.] called them** = (literally) *“said, call ye him”* Mark, *“commanded him to be brought”* Luke.

**34.] touched their eyes,** not mentioned in the other Gospels. In both we have the addition of the Lord’s saying, *“thy faith hath saved thee.”* The question preceding was to elicit their faith.

**CHAP. XXI. 1—17.]** TRIUMPHAL ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM: CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE. Mark xi. 1—11, 16. Luke xix. 29—44. John. xii. 12—36. This occurrence is related by all four Evangelists, with however some differences, doubtless easily accounted for, if we knew accurately the real detail of the circumstances in chronological order. In John (xii. 1),— our Lord came six days before the Passover to Bethany, where the anointing (of Matt. xxvi. 6—13) took place: and on the morrow, the triumphal entry into Jerusalem was made. According to Mark xi. 11,— on the day of the triumphal entry He only entered the city, went to the temple, *and looked about on all things,*— and then, when now it was late in the evening, returned to Bethany, and *on the morrow* the cleaning of the temple took place. The account in Luke, which is the fullest and most graphic of the four, agrees chronologically with that in the text.  
  
I would venture to suggest, that the supposition of the triumphal entry in Mark being related *a day too soon,* will bring all into unison. If this be so, our Lord’s first entry into Jerusalem was *private:* probably the journey was interrupted by a short stay at Bethany, so that He did not enter the city with the multitudes. That this was the fact, seems implied in Mark xi.11. Then it was that, *“when He had looked round about upon all things,”* He noticed the abuse in the temple, which next day He corrected. Then in the evening He went back with the twelve to Bethany, and the supper there, and anointing, took place. Meantime the Jews (John xii. 9) knew that he was at Bethany; and many went there that evening to see Him and Lazarus. (Query, had not Lazarus followed Him to Ephraim ?) Then on the morrow multitudes came out to meet Him, and the triumphal entry took place, the weeping over the city (Luke xix. 41), and the cleansing of the temple. The cursing of the fig-tree occurred early that morning, as He was leaving Bethany with the twelve, and before the multitude met Him or the aases were sent for. (On Matthew's narrative of this event see below on ver. 18.) According to this view, our narrative omits the supper at Bethany, and the anointing (in its right place), and passes to the events of the next day. On the day of the week when this entry happened, see note on John xii, 1,

1. Behphagé = Heb. *the house of figs :* a considerable suburb, nearer to Jerusalem than Bethany, and sometimes reckoned part of the city. No trace