1 Sam. x. 2) was ‘*in the way to Bethlehem;*’ and from that circumstance, perhaps, the inhabitants of that place are  
called *her children*. We must also take  
into account the close relation between  
the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, which  
had long subsisted. Ramah was six miles  
to the *north* of Jerusalem, in the tribe of  
Benjamin (Jer. xl. 1: “Er-Ram, marked  
by the village and green patch on its  
summit, the most conspicuous object from  
a distance in the approach to Jerusalem  
from the South, is certainly ‘Ramah of  
Benjamin.’” Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, p. 213; so that neither must this  
part of the prophecy be strictly taken.

**20. for they are dead**] The plural  
here is not merely idiomatic, nor for  
lenity and forbearance, in speaking of  
the dead; but perhaps a citation from  
Exod. iv. 19, where the same words are  
spoken to Moses, or betokens, not the number, but the category. Herod the Great  
died of a dreadful disease at Jericho, in the  
seventieth year of his age, and the thirty-eighth of his reign, A.U.C. 750.

**22.**] ARCHELAUS was the son of Herod by  
Malthace, a Samaritan woman: he was  
brought up at Rome; succeeded his father,  
but never had the title of king, only that  
of Ethnarch, with the government of Idumæa, Judæa, and Samaria, the rest of his  
father’s dominions being divided between  
his brothers Philip and Antipas. But,  
(1) very likely the word *reign* is here used  
in the wider meaning :—(2) Archelaus did,  
in the beginning of his reign, give out and  
regard himself as king: (3) in ch. xiv. 9,  
Herod the Tetrarch is called *the King*.—  
In the ninth year of his government Archelaus was dethroned, for having governed  
cruelly the Jews and Samaritans, who sent  
an embassy to Rome against him, and he was  
banished to Vienne, in Gaul. This account  
gives rise to some difficulty as compared  
with St. Luke’s history. It would certainly, on a first view, appear that this  
Evangelist was not aware that Nazareth  
had been before this the abode of Joseph  
and Mary. And it is no real objection to  
this, that he elsewhere calls Nazareth “*His  
country,*” ch. xiii. 54,57. It is perhaps just  
possible that St. Matthew, writing for  
Jews, although well aware of the previous  
circumstances, may not have given them  
a place in his history, but made the birth  
at Bethlehem the prominent point, seeing  
that his account begins at the birth (ch. i.  
18), and does not localize what took place  
before it, which is merely inserted as subservient to that great leading event. If  
this view be correct, all we could expect  
is, that his narrative would contain *nothing inconsistent* with the facts related in  
Luke; which we find to be the case.—I  
should prefer, however, believing, as more  
consistent with the fair and conscientious  
interpretation of our text, that St. Matthew himself was not aware of the events  
related in Luke i. ii., and wrote under the  
impression that Bethlehem was the original  
dwelling-place of Joseph and Mary. Certainly, *had we only his Gospel*, this inference from it would universally be made.

**turned aside** must not be pressed into the  
service of reconciling the two accounts by  
being rendered ‘*returned;*’ for the same  
is used (ver. 14) of the journey to