**notes on Matthew.**

**8.**] If the words  
*“Get thee behind me, Satan”* had been  
here, as in A. V., St. Luke could hardly  
have left the record as it stands: this  
being the first direct recognition by our  
Lord of His foe, after which, and in  
obedience to which command, he departs  
from Him.

**10.**] **to keep thee** is  
wanting in Matthew. The LXX, following the Hebrew, adds *“in all thy ways.”*

**13.**] for **a season** : see on Matthew,  
ver. 11, and note on ch. xxii. 53.

**14—82.**] CIRCUIT OF GALILEE. TEACHING, AND REJECTION, AT NAZARETH. Peculiar to Luke in this form : but see Matt.  
iv, 12—25; xiii. 53—58, and the parallel  
place in Mark, and note below.

**14.**] **in the power** of that full anointing **of the  
Spirit** for His holy office, which He had  
received at His baptism: and also implying that this power was used by Him in doing mighty works.

Here the chronological order of St. Luke’s history begins to  
be confused, and the first evident marks  
occur indefiniteness in arrangement,  
which I believe characterizes this Gospel,  
And in observing this, I would once for  
all premise, (1) that I have no bias for  
finding such chronological inaccuracy, and  
have only done so where no fair and honest  
means will solve the difficulty; (2) that  
where internal evidence appears to me to  
decide this to be the case, I have taken  
the only way open to a Commentator  
who would act uprightly by the Scriptures, and fairly acknowledged and met  
the difficulty; (8) that so far from considering the testimony of the Evangelists to be weakened by such inaccuracies, I  
am convinced that it becomes only so  
much the stronger (see Introduction to  
the Gospels).

These remarks have been occasioned by  
the relation of this account, vv. 14—30,  
to the Gospels of Matthew and John.  
Our verses 14 and 15 embrace the narrative of Matthew in ch. iv. 12—25. But  
after that comes an event which belongs  
to a later period of our Lord’s ministry.  
A fair comparison of our vv. 16—24 with  
Matt. xiii. 53–58, Mark vi. 1—6, entered  
on without bias, and conducted solely  
from the **narratives** themselves, surely can  
hardly fail to convince us of their identity.  
(1) That *two such visits should have happened, is of itself not impossible;* though (with the sole exception of Jerusalem for  
obvious reasons) our Lord did not ordinarily revisit the places where He had been rejected as in our vv.28, 29. (2)  
That He should have been thus treated at His first visit, and then *marvelled at their unbelief* on His second, is *utterly  
impossible.* (3) That the same question  
should have been asked on both occasions,  
and answered by our Lord with the same  
proverbial expression, is in the highest  
degree improbable. (4) Besides, this narrative itself bears *internal* marks of belonging to a later period. The **whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum** must refer to *more than* one miracle done  
there: indeed the whole form of the sentence points to the plain fact, that our Lord