15—26. ST. LUKE. 813   
   
 ™about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) " the ™Nam,Wv.   
 son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli, % which was the a Mice as,   
 A. 42,   
 son of Matthat, which was the son of Levi, which was the   
 son of Melchi, which was the son of Jannz, which was   
 the son of Joseph, % which was the son of Mattathias,   
 which was the son of Amos, which was the son of Naum,   
 which was the son of Esli, which was the son of Nagge,   
   
 %6 which was the son of Maath, which was the son of   
 Mattathias, which was the son of Semei, which was the   
   
 23—38.] Gexzatoay or ovg Loxp. successful; see Dr. Mill’s vindication of   
 Peculiar to Luke. 28.) Jesus was the Genealogies, p. ff., the history   
 about thirty years old when He began of this opinion. (2) St. Luke appears to   
 (His ministry): not, as A. ‘began to be have taken this entire some   
 about,’ &c., is un; matical. This authority before him, in the expres-   
 is the interpretation Grigen, Euthymius, sion Son of God, as applied Christ, was   
 and the best commentators. See Acts. i. made good by tracing it up, as here,   
 This about thirty admits of con- through a regular ascent Progenitors till   
 siderable latitude, only in one direc- we come to Adam, who was, but here   
 tion ; viz. thirty years. He could not inexactly, son of God. This seems   
 well be under, seeing that this was the more probable than that St. should,   
 appointed for the commencement of for his readers, have gone up to the   
 public service of by the Levites; see origin of the human race instead of to   
 reference to Numbers. If no other Abraham. I cannot imagine any such pur-   
 proof were in existence the total inde- Pere definitely in the mind of the   
 pendence of the Gospels of St. vangelist. This view is confirmed   
 thew and St. Luke, their would the entirely situation of   
 farnish what I conceive to be an unde- here, between ver. 23 and ch. iv.   
 niable one. Is it possible either of Ohne Points of divergence between the   
 these Evangelists could have set his geneal are,—in Matthew the father of   
 genealogy with that of the other before Joseph is Jacob—in Luke, Heli; this gives   
 im? Would no remark have been made rise to different (except two common   
 on their many, and (on such a names, Zorobabel and Salathiel) up to   
 unaccountable variations? It is quite David, where the accounts coincide again,   
 side the purpose of the present Commen- and remain identical up Abraham, where   
 tary to attempt to reconcile the two. It Matthew ceases. (4) Here, elsewhere, I   
 has never yet been accomplished; and believe that the accounts might be recon-   
 every endeavour to do it violated ciled, or at all good reason might   
 ingenuousness or common sense. I shall, be assigned for their differing, we were   
 as in similar cases, indicate the land. in posseasion of on which to proceed ;   
 marks which may serve to guide us to but here, as elsewhere, we are not. For   
 that is possible us to discover concern- who shall reproduce the endless   
 ing them. (1) The two genealogies are tions of elements confusion, which   
 both the line of Joseph, and not Mary. creep into a genealogy of this St.   
 Whether Mi were an heiress or not, Matthew’s, we know, is equared so as to   
 ronal words here preclude idea of the form three groups of fourteens, by the   
 being hers; for the descent of omission of several generations how can   
 fhe is transferred to Joseph we tell that some similar unknown to   
 by the a8 was su before the genea- us, may not have been taken with the one   
 logy begins; and it would be unnatural to before us? It was common among the   
 that the reckoning, which began Jews for the same man to bear di tt   
 the real mother, would, after such names; how do we know how often this   
 Transference pase back through Aer to her may occur among the immediate progeni-   
 father again, as must do, if genealogy torsof Joseph? ‘The marriage ofa brother   
 be hers. The attempts of many to with a brother’s wife to raise up seed   
 make it appear that the genealogy is (which then might be accounted to either   
 of Mary, readi: ‘the son (as sup- husband) was common; how do we   
 posed of Toreph, in reality) of Heli, know how often this may have contri-