these words, compare the declaration in

the synagogue at Nazareth, Luke iv. 16–30.

**24. Syria**] Answering to “*all the region round about Galilee*,” Mark i. 28. On the possessed with devils, see note on ch. viii. 29. The lunatick were probably *epileptics*: see an instance in ch. xvii. 14 and parallels.

**25. Decapolis**] A district principally east of the Jordan, so called from ten cities, some of the names of which are uncertain.

**beyond Jordan**] Peræa. The country east of the Jordan, between the rivers Jabbok and Arnon. See Jos. B. J. iii. 3. 3.

**CHAPP. V. VI. VII.**] THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. In this form peculiar to Matthew.

Without attempting a solution of the many difficulties which beset the question of time, place, and arrangement of our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount, I shall state the principal views of these subjects, and make some remarks upon them. One of the weightiest questions is, as to *the identity or otherwise of the Sermon with that given in Luke* vi.

20—49. There is (I) the view that they  
*are identical*. This is generally taken by  
ordinary readers of Scripture, from their similarity in many points. It is also taken by most of the modern German Commentators, who uniformly reject every attempt at harmonizing by supposing the same or

similar words to have been twice uttered.  
This view is, however, beset by difficulties.  
For (*a*) the Sermon in Luke is expressly  
said to have been delivered *after* the  
selection of the Apostles: whereas that in  
the text is as expressly, by continual consecutive notes of time extending to the  
call of Matthew (before which the  
Apostles cannot have chosen,) placed  
*before* that event. And it is wholly  
unlikely that St. Matthew, assuming him  
to be the author of our Gospel, would  
have made a discourse, which he must  
have heard immediately after his call as  
an Apostle, take place that call.—  
Then (*b*) *this* discourse was spoken on *a  
mountain*,—*that*, after descending from a  
mountain, in the *plain*. Possibly this  
may be got over, by rendering St. Luke's  
expression “on a level place.” See note  
on Luke: and the citation from Stanley  
below. And again (*c*), the two discourses  
are, though containing much common  
matter, *widely different*. Of 107 verses  
in Matt., Luke contains only *thirty*: *his  
four* beatitudes are balanced by as many  
*woes*: and in his text, parts of the sermon  
are introduced by sayings, which do not  
precede them in Matt. (e.g. Luke vi. 39  
ff., 45 ff.), but which naturally connect  
with them. (II) St. Luke *epitomized*  
this discourse, leaving out whatever was  
unsuitable for his Gentile readers, e.g. ch:  
v. 17–38. But this is improbable: for  
Luke in several verses is *fuller* than  
Matthew, and the whole discourse, as  
related by him, is connected and consecutive. (III) The two discourses are  
*wholly distinct*. This view is maintained  
by Greswell, vol. ii, Diss. xi., and principally from the arguments above noticed.  
But it also is not without grave difficulties, especially if we suppose, as most  
do, that Luke had the Gospel of Matthew  
before him. That two discourses wholly  
distinct should contain so much in common, seems unlikely and unnatural. It is  
hardly credibly that two great public special  
occasions should be selected by the Lord  
near the commencement of His ministry,  
and two discourses delivered to the same  
audience, not *identical*, which might have  
been very probable, and impressive from  
that very circumstance,—nor consecutive,  
nor explanatory the one of the other, but,  
only coinciding in fragments, and not even  
as two different reports at the distance of  
some years might be expected to do. Add