THE ACTS.   
 15—19. 65.   
   
 asunder in the ¥ midst, and and falling headlong, he burst tatat x0   
 Bas   
 Wand it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem;   
   
 4 render, his iniquity.   
   
 pare the two, that of St. Matthew is the probable, and will only be assumed by   
 more particular, and more likely to give those who take a very low vi   
 rise to this one, as @ general inference aceuracy of the Evangelists.   
 JSron the buying of the field, than vice then this solution, let us compare   
 versd. Whether Judas, as Bengel sup- accounts themselves. In this case, that in   
 poses, began the purchase, and so gave Matt. xxvii. is geueral,—ours particular.   
 oceasion for its being completed by the That depends entirely on the   
 Chief Priests, we eannot s: such a thiug to be assigned to ihe word which we   
 is of course possible, but i certainly not render “hanged himself?’ whereas this   
 contemplated by St. Matthew’s account, directly assigns the manner of his death,   
 where the priests settle to buy the field, without stating any cause for the falling   
 on deliberation, what they should do with on his face. It is obvious that, while the   
 the money. At all events we hence clearly general term used by Matthew points   
 see that St. Ike could not have been mainly at self-murder, the account given   
 acquainted with the Gospel of St. Matthew here does not preclude the catastrophe   
 at this time, ov surely this apparent dis- related having happened, in some   
 crepancy would not have been found. divine judgment, during the eae at-   
 The various attempts to reconcile the two tempt. Further than this, with our pre-   
 narratives, which may be seen in most of sent knowledge, we cannot go. Aa aceurute   
 our English commentaries, are among the acquaintance with the actual circumstances   
 saddest exainples of the shifts to which would account for the discrepancy, but   
 otherwise high-minded men are driven by nothing else-—Another kind of death is   
 an unworthy system. A notable example assigned to Judas by @cumenius, quoting   
 occurs in a solution lately proposed, that. from Papias: “ Papias, the disciple of the   
 as the Jews are said to have crucified Apostle John, relates, that Judas, as he   
 our Lord when they were only the ocea- walked about, was a great example of God’s   
 sion of his being erucified, so may be judgments on impiety in this world; for   
 said to have bought the field when he only that he swelled up to a fearful size, and   
 ion to its being bought by the onee on attempting to pass through (a   
 I need hardly say to any gateway) at the same time with a waggon   
 intelligent and ingenuous reader, that this which left ample space, he was crushed by   
 is entirely precluded here by the words the waggon, so that his bowels gushed   
 with the reward of his iniquity, which out.” This tradition may be in accordance   
 plainly bind on the purchase to Judas with, and may have arisen from an ex-   
 us his personal act. and falling aggerated amplification of, our text. See   
 headlong] The connexion of this with more in the note in my Greek Test.   
 the former clause would seem to point to he burst asunder: the word implies burst-   
 the death of Judas having taken place ing with a noise. It is quite possible that   
 inthe field which he bought. See also this catastrophe happening in the field,   
 yer. 19. falling headlong will hardly as our narrative implies, may have sug-   
 bear the meaning assigned to it by those gested its employment as a\_burial-place   
 who wish to harmonize the two accounts, for strangers, as being defiled. 19.]   
 —viz. that, having hanged himself, he fell It is principally from this verse that it   
 by the breaking of the rope. It would been inferred that the two verses 18, 19 are   
 vather point, as the word used is ex- inserted by St. Iuke. But it is   
 plained, to a sudden fall forward on the to separate it from ver. 18; and I am   
 face by a stroke from God, or by an acci- disposed to regard both as belouging to   
 dent. Nor again is it at all that Peter’s speech, but freely given “by” St.   
 the Apostle would recount what was a Luke, inserting into the speech itself the   
 mere accident accompanying his death, explanations, “ein their proper tongue,”   
 when that death itself was the aecursed one and “ that is to say, the field blood,” as   
 of hauging. What then are we to decide if the speech had been spoken in Greck   
 respecting the two accounts? That there originally. This is much more nat:   
 should have been a double account actually than to parenthesize these clauses ; it is,   
 current of the death of Judas at this fact, what must be more or less done by all   
 early period, is ix the highest degree im- who report in a language different from