here, which is unaccountable if St. Luke  
saw St. Matthew’s account, as also the  
omission of the *crucifying,* this being the  
*first* announcement of it; see a similar  
omission in ch. ix. 45.

**34.**] Peculiar to Luke. **none of these things**—i.e.neither the Sufferings nor the Resurrection. **All was as** yet hidden from them, and it  
seems not to have been till very shortly  
before the event itself that they had any  
real expectation of its happening.

**35—43.**] HEALING OF A BLIND MAN AT THE ENTRANCE INTO JERICHO. Matt.  
xx. 29—84, Mark x. 46—52, where see  
notes.

I have on Matthew spoken of  
the discrepancy of his narrative from the  
two others. The supposition that they  
were two miracles is perfectly monstrous:  
and would at once destroy the credit of  
St. Matthew as a truthful narrator. If  
farther proof of their identity were wanting to any one, we might find it in the fact that so many expressions are common  
to Mark and Luke: compare the wording of the two accounts. In Matthew of  
course they are in the plural, as he has  
*two* blind men.

**39.**] **they which went before:** in Matthew, *“the multitude ;”*in **Mark, *“many.”***

**43.**] Peculiar (except **followed him,** which three relate) to St. Luke ;—his usual way of terminating such narrations, as it certainly was  
the result of such a miracle—see ch. xiii.  
17; ix. 48; v.26. He, of the three evangelists, takes most notice of the glory given to God on account of the miraculous  
acts of the Lord Jesus.

**CHAP. XIX. 1—10.**] ZACCHÆUS THE  
PUBLICAN. Peculiar to St. Luke, and indicating that though in the main his narrative is coincident with, yet it is wholly  
independent of those of St. Matthew and  
St.Mark.

**2.**] **Zacchæus** signifies in  
Hebrew, ‘pure ;’ the name occurs in Ezra