PREFACE

THERE is a lack of critical commentaries in the English language on the Gospel of Mark, and especially of commentaries based on the more recent criticism of the sources, and of the history contained in the book. Commentaries corresponding to those of Meyer, Weiss, and Holtzmann, not in ability, but in critical method and results, are wanting. This volume is an attempt to supply this lack. This criticism is based on the evident interdependence of the Synoptical Gospels, unmistakable proof of which is found in the accumulated verbal resemblances of the three books. The generally accepted solution of this Synoptical problem makes Mark the principal source of Matthew and Luke, his account being supplemented and modified by material taken from the Hebrew *Logia* of Matthew. This critical result is accepted by many English and American scholars, but no commentary based on it has appeared among us. A modification of this theory makes the *Logia* the older source, which Mark uses to a limited extent, the principal source of his information being the Apostle Peter. A few passages in which this dependence is probable have been noted and discussed. The critical theme of this volume is thus the interrelation of the Synoptics.

In carrying out this plan, the relations of the Synoptical Gospels, their harmonies and divergences, and especially their interdependence, have been made a special study, and, where the fourth Gospel is parallel to Mark, their relation has been discussed.

An important part of the critical question is the historicity of the miracles. This doubt — for the question has grown into a widespread doubt — I have attempted to meet on the general ground of the credibility of the narrative as contemporaneous history, and of the verisimilitude of the miracles.

But after all, since the result of criticism has been to establish the historicity of the Synoptical accounts of the ministry of our Lord, the main attempt has been to interpret him in the light of this history. I have not attempted to make this book a thesaurus of opinions, though the more recent critical literature has been cited and discussed. Nor have I sought to collect curious information of any kind for its own sake; but, by historical and literary methods, I have endeavored to arrive at the meanings of the life of Jesus as here set forth. It is recognized that this account is supplemented, and valuable additions made to it, by the other Gospels. But the use of it as the principal source of the other Synoptical accounts gives it an importance which it is hard to overestimate. What it has to say, therefore, about the life and character of the founder of Christianity, it has been the main endeavor of this volume to set forth. Other things have been used, but not for their own sake. Everything has been pressed into this service.

The volume contains, besides the Notes, an Introduction, stating the Synoptical problem, a discussion of the characteristics of Mark, and an analysis of events; a statement of the Person and Principles of Jesus in Mark; a discussion of the Gospels in the second century; a review of Recent Literature; and a statement of the Sources of the Text. There are also Notes on Special Subjects scattered through the book.

E. P. GOULD.

PHILADELPHIA, *January*, 1896.

A COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF MARK

INTRODUCTION

THE main question in a study of any one of the Synoptical Gospels is its relation to the others. This is especially true of the questions belonging to Introduction. If writings are independent, the matter of their origin can be considered separately; but where an analysis shows intimate relations between them, the question must be discussed with reference to this relation. Now, our study of the Synoptical Gospels shows both interdependence and independence. There are two parts of the story where the independence amounts to divergence. In the account of the early life of Jesus given by Matthew and Luke, Bethlehem is in Matthew not only the birthplace of our Lord, but also the residence of his parents. Nazareth is introduced only as the place to which they turned aside after their return from Egypt, because Judæa was rendered unsafe for them by the succession of Archelaus. But in Luke, Nazareth is their residence, from which they go to Bethlehem only on account of the Roman census, and to which they return after the presentation in the Temple. And these marks of independent origin are found in the entire story of the infancy in Matthew and Luke. And in the account of the events from the resurrection to the ascension, Matthew and Mark, omitting the closing verses of the latter, make the scene of Jesus' appearance to his disciples to be Galilee; whereas Luke places them all in the vicinity of Jerusalem, and on the day of the resurrection. In fact, one of the great arguments for the omission of the closing verses of Mark is that the scheme of appearances is that of Luke, and plainly out of gear with that of the previous part of Mark. Evidently, here, then, in the beginning and end of the Gospel

narrative, the Gospels are quite independent of each other. And in the body of the history, containing the account of our Lord's public ministry, there are not wanting evidences of the same independence. The general arrangement of events is the same, but individual events are scattered through this general scheme with a decided independence. Luke distributes discourses which Matthew collects into connected discourse, *e.g.* the parts of the Sermon on the Mount. And single events, such as the call of Peter, Andrew, James, and John, are given with differences of detail, which show marked independence. But, after all, the general impression made in this body of the narrative is that of interdependence. One of the most striking features of this is the selection of events and discourses out of the great body of material open to writers. The matter peculiar to either of the Gospels is very small, compared to the common material, and yet the whole is very small, compared with all that Jesus said and did. There is some individuality shown in this selection, especially of the discourses of our Lord, but it is not considerable. And we have noticed already the similarity in the general arrangement of events. We can imagine that in the interval of a generation between the close of our Lord's life and the appearance of the Gospels, the oral tradition, which was for the time the chief source of knowledge of that life, may have acquired something like a fixed form in both these particulars. And so we may use the oral tradition, perhaps, to account for these items in the general account of interdependence. But when we come to the verbal resemblances existing between the Synoptical Gospels, our dependence on this solution of the Synoptical problem ceases. It is enough to say in this connection, that the oral tradition must have been in Aramaic, the language of Palestine, while these resemblances are in Greek Gospels, and *verbal resemblances disappear in translation.* But it is unnecessary to introduce this consideration even, in the face of such striking resemblances as these. Oral tradition does not tend to fix language to this extent. This verbal similarity is found in the Synoptics, wherever they give parallel accounts of the same event. Good examples of it are the accounts of the call of Peter, Andrew, James, and John, Mt. 4^{18-22} Mk. 1^{16-20}; and of the healing of the demoniac in the synagogue, Mk. 1^{21-28} Lk. 4^{31-37}. The effect of this verbal resemblance is very

much enhanced, of course, when the words common to two or more accounts of the same thing are themselves uncommon words. *E.g.* the words πρωτοκαθεδρίας and πρωτοκλισίας in Mt. 23^{6}, and the parallel passage, Lk. 11^{43}; Mk. 12^{39}, and the parallel passage, Lk. 20^{46}; and in a similar connection in Lk. $14^{7.8}$; do not occur elsewhere outside of ecclesiastical writers. ἐκολόβωσε, Mk. 13^{20}, and the parallel passage, Mt. 24^{22}, is a rare Greek word, and is used in these passages, moreover, in an unusual sense. τέρατα, Mk. 13^{22}, and the parallel passage, Mt. 24^{25}, does not occur elsewhere in the Synoptics. ἀγρυπνεῖτε, Mk. 13^{33}, and the parallel passage, Lk. 21^{36}, does not occur elsewhere in the Synoptics, and only twice in the N.T. ἐμβάπτω and τρυβλίον, Mk. 14^{20}, and the parallel passage, Mt. 26^{23}, are not found elsewhere in the N.T. These verbal resemblances can be explained only by the interdependence of the *written accounts*. Either the Gospels are drawn from each other, or from some common written source.

These phenomena of the Synoptical Gospels have given rise to a most protracted and intricate discussion, in which various theories, *e.g.* of original writings from which our Gospels were drawn, and of the priority of one Gospel or another, from which the rest were drawn, have been presented and thoroughly sifted. Fortunately, we are at the end of this sifting process, for the most part, and are in possession of its results. Tradition and internal evidence have concurred in giving us two such sources, one of which is the translation into Greek of Matthew's *Logia*, or discourses of our Lord, and the other our present Gospel of Mark. There is ample evidence that the *Logia* cannot be our present Gospel of Matthew, and on the other hand, there is no evidence that there is any original Mark, distinct from our second Gospel. Papias, writing about 130 to 140 A.D., says that Matthew wrote his *Logia* in Hebrew, and each man interpreted them as he was able. Irenæus, Pantænus, and Origen all testify to the same, and in fact, there is no early tradition of Matthew's writing which does not record also its Hebrew character. It is also against the identification of the *Logia* with our present Matthew, that the latter contains matter that does not come under the head of *Logia*. It is, moreover, dependent in its narrative portions on Mark, which is scarcely within the range of possibility, if it was itself the work of an eye witness. Papias tells us also that Mark, having become

Peter's interpreter, wrote down accurately all that he remembered, not however in order, both of the words and deeds of Christ. And tradition is consistent also in regard to this dependence of Mark on Peter. Moreover, this account agrees with the character of the second Gospel. It bears evident marks of the eye-witness in its vividness, and in the presence of those descriptive touches which reproduce for us not only the event, but the scene and surroundings as well.

Is there any evidence that Mark's Gospel was in part a compilation? Did he draw upon the *Logia* in his account of discourse and conversation? Does not the supposition of the entire independence of Mark imply two sources of the Synoptical narrative in certain cases, in which the matter of the different Gospels would suggest only one? In the parables, *e.g.*, we have a larger group in Matthew, and a smaller group in Mark. And of course, if Mark is independent here, as elsewhere, this supposes two sources. But the parables themselves, by their homogeneousness, would suggest rather one source, from which both drew. Moreover, Mark's statement that Jesus used many such parables, in this connection, is another hint of a longer account containing more parables, from which he made selections. And the one parable peculiar to himself would show that this was a third source, independent of either Matthew or Mark. Turning now to the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, Mk. 12^{1-12}, we find Mark supplemented by Matthew in the same way. Mark says that Jesus spoke to them in parables, and proceeds to cite one parable, while Matthew gives us three parables in the course of the same controversy; that is, Mark implies in the plural παραβολαῖς, a source giving more abundant material than he uses, and Matthew apparently gives us that more abundant material. Moreover, the traditional source of Mark's Gospel is unfavorable to the production of long discourse. And accordingly, we find only one example of such discourse in this Gospel, the eschatological discourse in ch. 13. Whereas, we find frequent examples of such discourse in Matthew and Luke, and it is a natural inference that it is characteristic of the *Logia* from which they both drew. It seems probable, therefore, that this one discourse in which Mark follows their example comes from the written *Logia*, and not from his transcription of Peter's oral discourse.

INDIVIDUALITY OF THIS GOSPEL. ANALYSIS OF EVENTS

Mark has a way of his own of handling his material. Whatever may be his reason, the fact is, that he dwells on the active life of our Lord, the period from the beginning of the Galilean ministry to the close of his natural life. The introduction to this career, including the ministry of John the Baptist, the baptism and the temptation, he narrates with characteristic brevity. But it is not brevity for the sake of brevity; it comes from a careful exclusion of everything not bearing directly on his purpose. The work of John the Baptist is introduced as the beginning of the glad tidings about Jesus Christ, and the material is selected which bears on this special purpose. The baptism is told as the inauguration of Christ into his office, and only the baptism, the descent of the Spirit, and the voice from heaven are narrated. And the temptation is merely noted in passing. All of these things have a value of their own, but they are evidently regarded by the writer as introductory to his theme, the active ministry of Jesus, and are abbreviated accordingly.

But beginning with the Galilean ministry, our Gospel is as full in its narrative of separate events as either Matthew or Luke. He omits events and discourses, but what he does tell he tells as fully as they. In the matter of discourse, especially, still more of prolonged discourse, this Gospel is resolutely either brief or silent. As regards the general distribution of material, there is an earlier group of narratives, in which Matthew and Luke are parallel to each other; another further along, in which Matthew and Mark are parallel; and then a third, in which Luke stands alone. But what Mark tells in this period he narrates with pictorial fulness.

When we come, however, to the account of the resurrection, and of the appearances to the disciples after the resurrection, this Gospel returns to its policy of brevity regarding what precedes and follows the period of the public ministry. These appearances are to the disciples alone, they are mainly mere appearances, and Mark gives merely the announcement of the resurrection to the women by the angels, and closes with this. This, instead of being strange, and requiring explanation, is quite in accordance with the character of Mark disclosed in the narration of the early events.

Those were introductory, these are supplementary of the subject, and both are treated therefore with the same conciseness.

We have discovered a like parsimony in the choice of material for this main theme, the public ministry. But this is for the sake, evidently, of sharpness of impression, and, for this purpose, Mark joins with it an effective grouping of his matter. He is not telling a number of disconnected stories of our Lord's work, but the one story of his public ministry, and he selects and groups his material in order to show the progress of events, their division into separate periods, and their culmination in the final catastrophe. The first period is one of immediate popularity, and of a corresponding reserve. The effect of Jesus' miracles in spreading his fame, and in drawing a multitude after him, is emphasized, and at the same time Jesus withdraws from the multitude, and forbids the spreading of the report of his miracles. We are not told about the subjects of his teaching, but of its impression, and its effect in increasing his popularity.

The second period, beginning with Jesus' return from his first tour in Galilee to Capernaum, is marked by the contrast between this continued popularity and the growing opposition of the Pharisees. We are shown in a series of rapid sketches the causes of this opposition in the revolutionary character of Jesus' ministry, and his quiet disregard of Pharisaic traditions and customs. He calls a publican to the inner circle of his disciples, and eats with publicans and sinners; he decries formal fastings, heals on the Sabbath, defends eating with unwashed hands, and denounces all traditionalism. There can be no doubt that this rapid succession of events, all of the same character, is intended to produce the effect described, and to show us how, early in the ministry of Jesus, he was forced into opposition to the ruling sect, and so the way was prepared for the end. But the picture has lights as well as shadows, and the mixture with these conflicts of other events, such as the appointment of the twelve, the sending of them on a separate mission, the teaching in parables, and sundry miracles, produces the biographical effect.

But at last this short ministry in Galilee comes to an end, and is followed by a period in which Jesus journeys with his disciples into the Gentile territory about Galilee, and there prepares them for his death at the hands of his enemies. There is added to this

the confession of his Messianic claim, the story of his Transfiguration, a few miracles in the strange places where these travels take him; but the characteristic mark of the whole period is this secret conference with his disciples about the crisis in his life.

The succeeding period, beginning with his final departure from Galilee, and ending with his entry into Jerusalem, is one into which Matthew and Luke have put much of their characteristic material, and in which Mark is unusually brief. And the matter selected by him is of an unusually mixed kind. It begins with one of those disputes between him and the Pharisees which mark these last days. It proceeds with various conversations and instructions, in which different aspects of the kingdom of God are shown; it gives a strange picture of the impression of fear produced on Jesus' disciples by his manner on the road to Jerusalem; and it tells of one miracle at Jerusalem. In brief, this is a period of waiting, in which the events themselves, and the turn given to them, foreshadow and prepare for the final crisis. Then comes the last week, with its story of the final conflicts between Jesus and the authorities at Jerusalem, of his trial and death. The entry into Jerusalem is evidently intended to be his announcement of himself as the Messiah, and the cleansing of the Temple a manifestation of his authority. This authority is immediately challenged by the Sanhedrim, and in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, Jesus makes his charge against them. Then they ply him with their legal puzzles, attempting to discredit his teaching, and their discomfiture only hastens the end.

This brief analysis will show the principle on which Mark selects his material and groups it. Both contribute to the one object of sharpness of impression. The different periods are marked off, and the effect is not blurred by the introduction of confusing or voluminous detail. The life of Jesus has not made on him the effect of mere wonder which he seeks to reproduce in disconnected stories, but of a swift march of events toward a tragic end, and he marks off the stages of this progress.

But Mark's effectiveness as a story-teller is due not only to his selection and grouping of material, but also to his pictorial fulness. He gives us the scene of events more frequently than the other writers, whether in the house, or by the sea, or on the road. On

one occasion, this vividness, where he tells of the *green* grass on which the five thousand reclined, gives us an invaluable mark of time, telling us what we should not know from the other Synoptics, that there was a Passover during the Galilean ministry. He tells us of the multitudes about Jesus, and gives us a lively description of the way in which they ran about as he entered one village after another, bringing the sick to him on their pallets. He tells us of the astonishment and fear of the disciples, as Jesus went before them to Jerusalem. His style lends itself to the same purpose. He uses the imperfect, the still more effective ἦν with the participle, and the historical present. But he does it all in the rapid and effective way characteristic of him. It is by a stroke here, and a bit of color there, that the effect is produced.

ACCOUNT OF MARK

The places in which Mark's name occurs in the N.T. are Acts $12^{12.\ 25}$, $13^{5.\ 13}$, 15^{37}, Col. 4^{10}, 2 Tim. 4^{11}, Philem.^{24}, 1 Pet. 5^{13}. From these we learn that he was the son of Mary, to whose house Peter went after his release from imprisonment, and cousin of Barnabas. His original Hebrew name was John, and to this was appended a Roman surname Mark. Peter includes him in the salutation of his first epistle, and calls him his son (in the faith). He makes his first appearance in the history as the companion of Barnabas and Saul, whom they took back to Antioch with them on their return from Jerusalem, where they had been to carry the offerings of the churches on the occasion of a famine. And when they start, immediately after, on their first missionary journey, Mark accompanies them, but only to turn back again after the completion of their mission to Cyprus. Then, at the beginning of their second missionary tour, he becomes the source of contention to his superiors, Barnabas wishing to take his cousin along with them again, and Paul refusing his company on account of his previous defection. But in the epistle to the Colossians he appears again as the assistant of Paul, being mentioned by him as one who sends greetings to that church. And in 2 Tim., Paul writes Timothy to bring Mark with him as one who is useful to him in the ministry. Again, in the epistle to Philemon he is with Paul, and is included in the salutations of that letter.

DESTINATION OF THE GOSPEL. TIME OF ITS WRITING. PLACE

Mark was evidently written for Gentile readers, as it contains explanations of Hebrew terms and customs.[1] Tradition says that it was written after the death of Peter and Paul. There is one decisive mark of time in the Gospel itself. In the eschatological discourse attention is called to the sign given by Jesus of the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, which leads us to infer that the Gospel was written before that time, but when the event was impending. This would fix the time as about 70 A.D. Tradition says also that it was written at Rome. And there is a certain support given to this by the use of Latin words peculiar to this Gospel.[2]

---

[1] *E.g.* the explanatory τῆς Γαλιλαίας after Ναζαρέτ; the translation of Βοανεργές; of Ταλιθά, κούμ; the explanation of κοιναῖς χερσί as = ἀνίπτοις; the translation of Ἐφφαθά; the statement of the Jewish custom of ceremonial washing; of the Sadducees' denial of the resurrection; of the custom of killing the Paschal lamb on the first day of the feast; the translation of Γολγοθᾶ, and of Ἐλωΐ, Ἐλωΐ, λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί; and the explanation of παρασκευή as = προσάββατον.

[2] *E.g.* κράβαττον, Lat. *grabatus*, where the other Synoptists use κλίνη, κλινίδιον; σπεκουλάτωρ, Lat. *speculator*; κεντυρίων, Lat. *centurion*.

THE PERSON AND PRINCIPLES OF JESUS IN MARK'S GOSPEL

MATTHEW begins his account of Jesus' public ministry, as Mk. does, with the statement that Jesus came into Galilee after the imprisonment of John, and began to proclaim the good news of the coming kingdom, accompanying this with miracles of healing. But he follows this immediately with the Sermon on the Mount, which serves as a basis for all the subsequent teaching, and gives us as the subject of that teaching the Kingdom of God. Lk. introduces this in another place, giving first some of the detached sayings, and so preparing the way for the connected discourse, instead of making the connected discourse an introduction to the detached sayings. But the effect of the discourse, and its relation to the teaching as a whole, are the same. Mk., on the other hand, gives only detached sayings, unrelated to any central group of teachings, and in his gospel, therefore, we have to study out the problem of our Lord's life and teaching after a different fashion.

He appears in the first place as a herald of the kingdom, taking up the work of John. Then he calls four men into personal association with himself. His first Sabbath in Capernaum is a memorable one. It is evident that he is regarded as a teacher, for he is asked to preach in the synagogue, and his hearers are impressed with the note of authority in his teaching, so different from the manner of the Scribes, the recognized authorities. But they are still more impressed with a miracle performed by him, and as soon as the law allows, they bring all the sick of the city to him, and the whole town is in an uproar. The two things together stamp him as a prophet, making a decided advance on the character of teacher, in which he appears at first. But so far as he is recognized at all, the popular voice after this accords to him these two titles, rabbi and prophet.

But Jesus evidently sees elements of danger in this popular uprising. The emphasis is on the wrong side of their lack, and of his power. If his message had reached them, and they had clamored to hear more of that, and especially had shown any disposition to follow his teaching, he might have stayed to preach, instead of going out to pray. But he did not wish to pose as a miracle-worker, and to have the inference "Messiah" follow from that in the popular imagination. And so he retires to pray, he refuses the clamorous call to return, and when a man whom he has healed disobeys his command to keep it silent, he retires into the wilderness to escape the inevitable effect of this publicity.

Now Mk.'s method begins to appear. Jesus does not lay down a programme of the Messianic kingdom in a set discourse, but the principles regulating his activity are slowly evolved by the occasions of his life. And after the same fashion Jesus himself begins to appear on the canvas — a herald of the kingdom of God, a teacher, a prophet, a miracle-worker, who represses and deprecates the impetuous desire of the multitude to emphasize the miracle-worker rather than the prophet. This is the picture so far, and it is full of promise and suggestion.

Then in connection with another miracle, Jesus claims the power as the Son of Man to forgive sins. The way it happened was this: the man's disease was occasioned by some vice, and Jesus announces the cure therefore as a forgiveness of the sins which had caused it. Then, this being challenged by the Scribes as blasphemy, he adduces the cure itself as an example of the power which he had to remove the evils caused by sin. Here is another step forward, for here is a real, but veiled claim of a Messianic title, and the authority coupled with it is that of forgiveness, which forgiveness consists in the removal of the various ills of mankind wrought by sin. The Messianic claim is there, but it is veiled, for we do not find that the people understood him to make the claim, though after this he uses the title familiarly. And the title chosen, *Son of Man*, is such as to show that Jesus emphasized that side of his work which allied and identified him with man.

This intimation that his work has to do with sin, as a physician has to do with disease, is repeated when he calls the tax-gatherer into the circle of his disciples, and defends himself by the state-

ment that he came to call not righteous men, but sinners. And when they charge him with collusion with Satan in his expulsion of demons, his answer is substantially that his attitude is opposition to Satan, and that his power to cast out demons can have been obtained only as the result of a conflict, in which he had overmastered Satan. Here, as in the case of the paralytic, this aspect of his work as a conflict with sin comes out in connection with his cures, and this is really the only chance that he has to present it, as he has had as yet very little opportunity to deal with sin as sin, only in its occasional intrusion into other than the moral sphere. But he deals with it as already master of the situation. He can despoil Satan of his instruments, because he has already met him and bound him. He can deal with sin in others victoriously, because he has met and mastered it in himself.

But meantime, another element in the situation is making itself felt. In dealing with the people, Jesus has to contend against a sudden and superficial popularity, and is able only to cure their diseases, not to cope with their sins. But the necessary and unavoidable conspicuousness of his work bring him under the notice of their leaders, and here he encounters active opposition. It develops only gradually. It is evident that the Scribes and Pharisees are watching him at first, as it is always possible that religious enthusiasm may play into the hands of the religious authorities. But the elements of opposition accumulate at every step. The first is the evident lack of sympathy or affiliation with them, and Jesus' association with men at the other end of the social and ecclesiastical scale, the despised people whose ignorance of the law made them dangerous company for the scrupulous Pharisee, with the remote and insignificant Galilean, and even finally, the hated servant of a foreign government, the Jewish collector of Roman tribute. Jesus' answer, that, as a physician, his business is with the sick rather than the well, is complete, but like all such answers, it only increased the irritation. The next question is more vital, as it has to do not with themselves, but with their system. Pharisaic Judaism was the climax and *reductio ad absurdum* of religious formalism. For ethics it substituted casuistry, for principles rules, for insight authority, for worship forms, for the word of God tradition, for spirituality the most absolute and intricate externalism. Jesus did not seek to break

with it, but it was inevitable that the break should come. The law prescribed an annual fast, but they had multiplied this into two a week, whereas, it is recorded of Jesus that he came eating and drinking, and himself called attention to this characteristic. When he is challenged about this practice of his disciples, he shows that fasting, like everything else that has a proper place in religion, is a matter of principle, and not of rule. Men are not to fast on set days, but on fit occasions. And in general, he shows the absurdity of attempting to piece out the old with the new, or to pour his new wine into their old wine-skins. The next place where they made a stand against Jesus' innovating views was in the matter of their absurd Sabbatarianism. That it was absurd, the occasions of their attack show; first, plucking ears of corn to eat on the spot, and secondly, healing. These things, forsooth, were expressly forbidden on the Sabbath. In answer, Jesus does not attempt to meet them on the ground of casuistry, but, as usual, lays down principles. First, the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; and secondly, to refuse to confer a benefit in case of need is to inflict a positive injury, on the Sabbath as well as any other day.

Here the narrative pauses, and passes over to other matter. But it is evident that Mk. has grouped this material for a purpose. He wishes to show how, with one occasion after another, the teaching of our Lord acquired substance and shape, and encountered a sharp and well-defined opposition. And how boldly and greatly the figure of Jesus himself begins to stand out. How it is becoming evident that sanity, breadth, insight, ethical and spiritual quality, are in this man not relative, but absolute. And as he faces the gathering storm, how steadfast he is, and regardless of everything but truth.

It needs only a little reading between the lines to see how the next events come in. The evidence is accumulating that our Lord's own career is to last not very long, and that he must have followers, successors, to whom he can commit his work, and that these must be men whose close attendance on himself will familiarize them with his message. Hence the twelve are appointed. And it is expressly stated that his family had started out to restrain him, at the time when he pointed out that his real family were the disciples who did the will of God. His own family was not to be

classed among his enemies, but it is evident that they sought to protect him against what they considered his own extravagance.

And the parables also grew out of the immediate situation. They are the first direct statement of the nature of the kingdom of God. The postponement of the subject, and the veiled presentation of it, both show it to be a matter that Jesus approached with extreme caution. But what he treated with so much reserve in the presence of the others, he explained frankly to his disciples. This means that the time had come when the situation, even among the disciples, needed clearing up. They were not repelled by his differences with the Pharisees; the indications are rather that they were in sympathy with him. But their difficulty, which the parables were intended to meet, came from their sharing the national expectation, that the kingdom was to be set up by a *tour de force*, an expectation which Jesus' methods and delay, if not defeat, discouraged. This is the immediate occasion of the parables. But their immense importance appears from the fact that they are the only direct statement of the nature of the kingdom, which otherwise we should have to gather from side-lights and inferences. The kingdom is seed; it is subject to all the vicissitudes of seed sown broadcast into all kinds of soil; it is nevertheless sure of success because it is native to the soil; humanity as such is hospitable to it, and its small beginnings do not interfere with ultimate greatness.

The next event requiring special notice is Jesus' visit to Nazareth, where he encounters his first rejection. Other places have known only the greatness of his public life, Nazareth, unfortunately, knows the obscurity of his private life, and they reject his greatness as spurious. Here, therefore, he finds even his miracles impossible, whereas in other places, cut off from everything else, he does find a place for these. Jesus marvelled at their unbelief, and no wonder. It was here that this perfect life had matured, grown into an unmatched beauty and power, and yet they had missed it all because it lacked outward greatness. But one is reminded by this episode of a singular fact in our Lord's life — that he appears largely as a miracle-worker. It was not a role that he coveted, but, for the most part, it was all that he could do. We have some record of the way in which he dealt with the other and larger half of human ill and need. We have the story of

Matthew and Zacchæus, and the sinful woman, and the rich young man, and Peter; we know that he was the friend of publicans and sinners. But, for the most part, he was shut out from all this, and shut up to physical healings. Even here, he found a unique field for the display of his greatness. His possession of a divine power he shared with other men, but his divine use of that power is his own; he shares it with no one. But if he had had an equal chance to show us the other side of his power, what a story there might have been.

But the time has now come for Jesus to try his disciples in the work. They have heard his message and seen his miracles, and he sends them out to carry forward both the preaching and the healing. His instructions to them are, briefly, to pay no attention to outfit nor entertainment, but to be occupied solely with their ministry.

On Jesus' return to Capernaum, the opposition to him comes to a head. His enemies are there on the watch for him, and in that apparently careless and unscrupulous life they soon find their opportunity. To be sure, it seems only a slight thing that the disciples should be eating with unwashed hands. But to those men it meant liability to every defilement mentioned in the law. It is their opportunity, but then it is Jesus' opportunity too. It gives him his chance to strike at traditionalism and ceremonialism, the twin foes of spiritual religion. Over against tradition, he sets the word of God, — against the idea that a thing is true because it is handed down, he posits the word of God, which becomes more true as humanity grows. And against ceremonialism, the idea that man's spirit can be reached for either good or evil from the outside, he puts the eternal truth, that it is reached and affected only from within, by things akin to itself.

This really marks the end of Jesus' work in Galilee. It has resulted in proving the inaccessibility of the people to his spiritual work, in the unsympathetic attitude of his family, in his total rejection at Nazareth, and in active hostility on the part of the religious leaders. But his work with his disciples is not ended, and he accordingly departs with them to Syrophœnicia. Here, he desired to keep his presence unknown, as his work was not with Gentiles, but Jews. But the extraordinary faith of the Syrophœnician woman overcame his scruples, so that he healed her

daughter. This confinement of his work on earth to his own nation, while evidently announcing the broadest universalism, is easily explained. He was laying foundations, and the human material for that, such as it was, existed in only one nation.

On the occasion of only a brief return to Galilee, during this *Wanderjahr,* the Pharisees make another attack on him, demanding a sign from heaven. They want something plainly and indisputably of heavenly origin, not open to the suspicion of collusion with Satan, nor of originating in the lower air, and plainly nothing more nor less than an attestation by God of our Lord's claim. Something merely a sign, not complicated with other characters and purposes which might obscure the plain issue, was their demand. Jesus refused it. He would do his work, including cures and miracles, and let that tell his story, but a mere sign he refused to give. We must pause again to notice Mk.'s method, and to say now that it bears all the appearance of being the method of Jesus himself. He meets questions as they arise, instead of projecting discourse from himself. But the wisdom and completeness of his answer anticipates the controversies of Christendom. This question of signs, *e.g.*, of external evidence, our Lord answers by refusing a sign, and he emphasizes it by his allusion to the generation which had seen *him.* He was his own sign, and needed no other. The question belonged to that age, but no age nor any other man has arrived at the wisdom of the answer.

We are coming now to the close of Jesus' ministry, and his method has not yet led him to any declaration of himself nor of his mission. It would almost seem as if he had no consciousness of a mission of any definite sort, so content has he been to let things merely happen, great as has been his use of these happenings. But now the time has come, not for him to declare himself, but to bring the thought of men about him into expression. And first of all, his own disciples. He asks them what men say about him, — what they call him. They say briefly, a prophet. Then he asks them if that is all they have to say. *No,* Simon Peter says; *we call you the Messiah.* The value of this is in the fact, that it is not their assent to his claim, but their estimate of his greatness. They, as Jews, had inherited an idea, an expectation of a man in whom human greatness was to culminate. As far as

Jesus' activity went, the answer of the people was enough. But the feeling of the disciples was, it may describe his activity, but is inadequate to describe his own greatness. The race has culminated in him, and he is therefore the Messiah whom we are to expect.

There are two things noticeable here: first, the title itself, and then the manner of its assumption. It is no wonder that Jesus was dissatisfied with the title prophet, when his real title was king, king of men. And when we examine what he says in elucidation of this claim, we find that there are just two things which he emphasizes as involved in this, viz. love and obedience. Careless of everything else, he proposes to himself just this, to conquer for himself the love and obedience of all men everywhere and in all things. There is no lack of definiteness nor adequacy in this. And yet, though Jesus is very explicit in this, we are altogether missing the point, as usual. We are very busy organizing his church, devising the ways and means of his worship, defining his person, and meantime the world, the flesh, and the devil are dictating terms not only to government and society, but to the church. They are well satisfied to have the church scatter its fire, instead of concentrating its energy upon doing the will of its Lord, and getting that will done. But besides the title, and of almost equal importance with it, is the manner of its assumption. Jesus waits for men to give it to him. This does not mean any lowering of his claims, any disposition to meet men half-way, and accept some compromise with them. It means just the opposite of this, the most absolute and apparently extravagant claim that he could make. It means mastery, not from without, but from within, — a mastery of convictions, affections, and will, and from that centre controlling the whole of life. He will have, not the enforced obedience of men who would throw off the yoke if they could, or any part of it, but the self-devotion and homage of those who come voluntarily to him, — the unforced mastery of man over man. By this means, and in this sense, he will rule the world. To be sure, since it is included in his programme that he is to die and still be king, that rule is to be exercised from heaven, that centre from which the network of law and self-enforcing order overspreads the world. But that universal law leaves one domain free, and within the sphere of human action it exercises no com-

pulsions but those which leave the spirit free. And yet within that province, it is meant that God shall exercise absolute control.

This is the meaning of our Lord's words in the light of all that he said and did, and of all that has happened since. But at present, he has said only that he is king, — the Messianic king, and he has said it to men sure to misunderstand it if he leaves it in its present unconditional form. Hence he immediately puts over against it the prediction of his own fate. He is to be rejected and put to death. Their idea of the Messianic king was that through him righteousness was to be victorious. God had been holding off for his own wise purposes, not asserting himself, but in the times of the Messiah, he was to intervene with his almightiness, and sin was to be put down, and righteousness established. And this power to put down all enemies was to be lodged in the Messiah. This was the Jewish Messianic programme. We have seen already that Jesus, in all probability, did not, at any time before his death, predict his violent death and his resurrection with any definiteness. The utter dismay of the disciples over the actual event, their hopelessness between the death and the resurrection, and their failure to accept the fact of the resurrection, make such a prediction psychologically impossible. But it is equally evident that he did make statements which, in the light of the later events, they saw implied and involved those events. And this means Jesus' repudiation of the Jewish Messianic programme. His enemies were not to be in his power, but he in theirs. God was not to intervene in his behalf, nor was his own divine power to be used in this way.

But Jesus is not satisfied with the statement about himself, which might make it appear that his fate was unique, and that his case stood by itself. But he goes on to state that any one who wishes to follow him must deny himself and take his life in his hands in the same way. In his kingdom, to save is to lose, and the only way to save is to lose. Instead of getting God on his side so that he is saved from the ordinary mishaps of life, the disciple only multiplies indefinitely the chances of mishap without adding anything to the safeguards. Any one can see that if righteousness was to become a spiritual power in the world, it could only be by such a sacrifice of safety. A padded and steel-clad righteousness protects the person, but its power to propagate

is gone. And as we have seen, the Transfiguration itself was not a revelation of the glory that was covered up and concealed by this human weakness of our Lord, but of the glory of the sacrifice itself. It is as much as to say that gentleness, self-effacement, and weakness, instead of power, are in themselves glorious, and are to be crowned.

But the disciples themselves give Jesus an opportunity to define himself still further. They were disputing who among their number was greatest. He does not deny that there is such a thing, nor that it is to be coveted, but it is the greatness of humility and service. In the world, greatness is the power to make others tributary to yourself, but in the kingdom of God, the greatness even of the king is service, the power to contribute to the common weal.

At last, then, Jesus has declared himself. He is the divinely appointed king of men, and as such demands obedience, and finds greatness in service. But the obedience is to be voluntary and unenforced, and his own road to kingship is through repudiation and death. This absolute self-effacement is, moreover, the principle of the kingdom, and required of all its members.

From this, he passes over again to more incidental matters. John brings to his attention the case of a man whom they had caught casting out demons in his name, but who had not attached himself to the circle of disciples. Jesus' reply is, virtually, that they ought to have inferred from his casting out the demons that he really belonged with them, instead of from his not associating with them that he had no right to cast out the demons. This shows that whatever exclusiveness has grown up since then among his followers did not originate with Jesus. He did not organize a society, though his principles justify the later organization; but those principles exclude a hierarchy.

With the beginning of Jesus' ministry in Judæa, begins a series of discourses occasioned by the attempt of the Pharisees to put his authority as a teacher to the test, and, if possible, to discredit it. In general, the questions propounded were either in dispute between the different schools, or the standing puzzles of the schoolmen. It is significant, as showing that Mk.'s development of Jesus' position in occasional, rather than set, discourse, is the method of Jesus himself, that some of his most important teach-

ing is occasioned by these questions. And it shows his position as a teacher that these answers are final, revealing in every case the principles involved. His treatment of divorce is one of the safeguards of civilization. His answer to the question about paying tribute to the Roman government shows that citizenship in the kingdom of God does not conflict with citizenship in the State. The one, as the other, is based on fundamental facts. Their question is an inference from their political conception of the kingdom of God. His answer is a corollary from his spiritual conception. His answer to the Sadducees about the resurrection not only puts that question to rest, but establishes the right to argue from fundamental conceptions of God, the right of reason in matters of faith. In what he says about the two great commands, he establishes fundamental principles and sentiments instead of rules, in control of life. But more than this, he selects the one principle that does contain in itself all righteousness, and which still condemns the essential parts of life. And still more, he shows the final and conclusive reason why the kingdom is spiritual. Outward conduct can be controlled by civil authority, but love is capable of only inward enforcement.

Meantime, other things have been happening by which his position is still further defined. The scene with the rich young man whose wealth alone kept him from following our Lord leads him to say that his difficulty is not peculiar to him, but belongs to his class. The difficulty that all men have in accepting the principle of the kingdom becomes, in the case of wealth, a human impossibility to be overcome only by God. This means only that the principle of the kingdom is self-sacrifice and love, and that the acquisition and possession of wealth, on the other hand, tend almost certainly to selfishness.

Christ's entry into Jerusalem is his public claim of the Messianic kingship. This is followed immediately by his one act of authority, the cleansing of the temple. But the power is only that of a masterful personality, — the power of a prophet or righteous man. But he not only claims authority for himself, he denies the authority of the constituted authorities to judge his claim. He puts them to the test, as they have put him, by putting them a question in regard to John the Baptist, which will show whether they can judge such a case or not. The question of authority in

the kingdom of God is a question of fitness, of ability to do the thing.

Jesus has one more word to say to his disciples. It is the prediction of the destruction of the temple, city, and nation, and the transfer of the kingdom from them to others. He sees that their rejection of a spiritual Messiah, and their insistence on political independence and greatness, will certainly lead to destruction. That, moreover, will be a coming of the Son of Man in clouds, clothed with power. Not that that will be the beginning of his reign, for he is to be seated at the right hand of power, and to come in the clouds, immediately. But this is to be his first great appearance as the arbiter of human affairs. The overthrow of the nation will come directly, as for the divine side of it, not by force, but by the inevitable operation of cause and effect, from the denial of his principle of a spiritual kingdom. And so, by the operation of the same inexorable law working in human affairs, his principles are to be everywhere vindicated. And at the same time, the spiritual power accumulated in his life and death are to be wielded by him in the spiritual sphere, until finally, in the exercise of both powers, his kingdom becomes universal.

Two things remain to be spoken of: the death of Jesus, and his enshrinement of that in a memorial rite. The way has been opening ever since that time for a right understanding of that event, and yet even now one needs to weigh his words to speak with even partial truth about it, let alone adequacy. In the first place, then, looked at simply as a matter governed by the ordinary conditions of human life, it was natural and necessary. Nothing else could come of the opposition that he encountered from the religious and civil authority. There were two ways of escape morally possible to any other man, but not to him. One was to compromise in some way with the authorities, or to make some alliance with the people, that should neutralize the opposition of the Sanhedrim. His insight, his grasp of principles, his mastery of the situation, his influence with the people, might have given him political power, to which his instinct for righteousness would have given the last touch of greatness. But that was the way of compromise, which was demanded at every turn of the perplexing situation. And that admits us to one secret of the uniqueness of Jesus' death. It was entirely for righteousness' sake. The oppo-

sition to him was purely on that account, unmixed with any other oppositions or repugnances, growing out of the ordinary weakness or disagreeableness of men. But Jesus died because his righteousness was uncompromising and absolute, not because its manner was hard and obtrusive. Another way of escape was by the use of his supernatural power. Both friends and enemies saw this. The Jews did not expect deliverance, except supernaturally, and the hope of the people was that Jesus, who evidently possessed this power, would use it in the appointed way. And the Jews taunted him, because at the last moment his power had forsaken him. But Jesus died because he would do his work as a man, and under the ordinary conditions and limitations of humanity.

In other words, Jesus' death crowned the complete self-surrender of his life. All of us know that just here is where ordinary righteousness is lacking. It is righteousness with a saving clause. We follow it just so far as it does not involve a complete sacrifice of self-interest. Some draw the line in one place, and some in another, but everybody somewhere. Jesus seeing more clearly than any other the sacrifice involved, undertook the task of absolute righteousness, and carried it out to the end. And he would accept no immunity, wield no power, and exercise no self-defence, that would mar the completeness of that ideal.

But he was, nevertheless, king. He did not propose to himself simply to be righteous, in which case men *might* have let him alone. He proposed to establish this complete, and principled, and radical righteousness in the world as its supreme law. Men felt in his first words the note of authority, and he did not attempt in any way to disguise the uncompromising nature of his demand. He told them that if any one would follow him, he must deny himself *as he did.* And in his own life, he showed them how, at every turn, the acceptance of this principle involved the hostility, not of the vicious and degraded, but that opposition of the constituted authorities, and of the higher class, which means loss of caste.

But we must not think of Jesus' death as simply sacrifice to a principle. He died primarily because he loved men supremely. He was the Son of Man, whose life was bound up with the life of the world, who was identified with humanity. Here was where the danger came of abating any of the demand that he made upon

men, since in the law which he sought to enforce is the only true life of man, and any abatement meant something less than his highest good. Nay, more, it meant the admission somewhere of the opposite principle to sap and undermine the whole fabric, and the danger also of abating any of the rigor of his demand upon himself, since his own righteousness was the foundation of his authority, and loss of power here meant loss of power to confer this highest good.

And here is where the bitterness of his death came in. Here was a man who loved men supremely, to whom any evil or lack of men was known so surely and felt so deeply, and to whom in his own death was revealed the whole depth and bitterness of that human ill which was to find its only cure in him.

And, finally, it is this self-surrendering love which makes the cross to-day the very seat and secret of his power. For love is Lord of life, and love culminated here. It is the constraint and inspiration of his love that makes him king of men. A clear-sighted and far-seeing love which chose for himself the thorn-crowned road to power and kingship, and that leads men over the same long and hard way to ultimate and complete good.

And, as we have said, he enshrines this death in a memorial rite. He bids men take the bread, which is his body, and the cup, which is his blood, and find in them the food and drink of their souls. It is in his death that he wishes especially to be remembered. But, above all, it is in his death that he wishes to be understood, and to have himself brought intimately into the life of men, until the things that made him die have become the material and substance of man's spiritual life.

THE GOSPELS IN THE SECOND CENTURY

THE reason that this subject is given a large place in N.T. Introduction is the fact that prominent and influential literature will leave its traces upon other writings just as soon as that literature has time to circulate, and so the later literature becomes a witness to the earlier. Especially is that the case with what is called Scripture. Scripture is a court of appeal in regard to religious matters to which other writers on the same subject necessarily refer, and that a thing is written, that is, a part of Scripture, establishes its authority. In turn, other religious literature becomes thereby a test by which we may determine whether any particular writing which claims to be Scripture is put in that category at any period, or is extant even. For instance, if we found Paul's writings generally accepted as Scripture, and, at the same time, lack of reference to Galatians, it would raise doubts about that epistle. However, Scripture is not in a class by itself in this matter; it presents only an extreme case of a general fact which applies to all prominent and influential literature. The question whether the Gospels were in existence early in the second century — a really vital question — is one to be answered by the second-century literature. Considering the unique position of Jesus in Christianity, no writings of any account telling the story of his life are going to be ignored, — and this entirely apart from the question whether they are classed as Scripture. But there is another still more vital question, whether the Jesus of the Synoptical Gospels is a true, historical figure. Now, supposing that we found no special reverence attached to the Gospels themselves, and yet nothing else quoted in the earliest succeeding Christian literature in regard to him, the inference would be conclusive that these were regarded at the time as the only standard books on the subject, which would go far toward establishing the historical character of the writings themselves and of the person-

age presented in them. But, on the other hand, supposing that this earliest succeeding literature quoted from other, extra-canonical sources freely and without apology, and yet the historical figure remained unchanged, the additional matter, whether meagre or abundant, being almost entirely in keeping with the account in the canonical Gospels, the historicity is more triumphantly established by the corroborative testimony than by the absence of other witness. In fact, this state of things in the second-century literature would be the most favorable possible for historicity. And the historical character of these Gospels — not whether they are the only Gospels, nor even whether they are Scripture — is the main question in Apologetics.

What, then, is the relation of the second-century literature to the Synoptical Gospels? We have, in the first place, two epistles bearing the name of Clement of Rome. The second of these is wrongly attributed to Clement, but belongs to the same period. In the genuine epistle, then, the O.T. is quoted frequently and at great length. But the N.T. quotations are very few and meagre. With one exception, too, the writers are not mentioned. The words of our Lord are quoted as his, but not the writer who reports them. In one case, 1 Cor. is quoted as St. Paul's, but this stands alone.[1] The quotations from the Gospels are only two, and these are so inexact as to make it doubtful whether the writer had before him at the time our present Gospels.[2]

In the spurious writing, the number of quotations from the Gospel history is considerably greater, and the comparison with the amount of O.T. matter much more favorable. But, on the other hand, the mixed origin and uncertain character of these citations are equally noticeable. Four of them are quoted with considerable exactness.[3] Five are quoted *ad sensum*, but so as to indicate that the passages in our Gospels were in the writer's mind, but were cited by him from memory.[4] But three, which Lightfoot assigns to the Gospel of the Egyptians(?), contain strange matter. In one, our Lord says, "If you are gathered

---

[1] Par. XLVII.

[2] Par. XIII. Mt. 5^{7} 6^{14} $7^{1.2}$ Lk. $6^{31.\ 36-38}$; XLVI. Mt. 26^{24} 18^{6} Mk. 14^{21} 9^{42} Lk. 22^{22} $17^{1.2}$.

[3] II. Mt. 9^{13} Mk. 2^{17}; III. Mk. 12^{30}; VI. Mt. 6^{24} Lk. 16^{13} Mt. 16^{26} Mk. 8^{36}.

[4] III. Mt. 10^{32} Lk. 12^{8}; IV. Mt. 7^{21}; VIII. Lk. $16^{10.\ 11}$; IX. Mt. 12^{50}; XIII. Lk. $6^{32.\ 35}$.

with me in my bosom, and do not my commands, I will cast you out, and say to you, Depart from me, I know you not whence you are, workers of lawlessness."[1] In another, after Jesus' statement, "You will be as lambs in the midst of wolves," Peter says, "If then the wolves scatter the lambs?" and Jesus answers, "Let not the lambs fear the wolves after their death. And you, fear not those who kill you, and can do nothing to you, but fear him who, after you die, has power over soul and body to cast into the Gehenna of fire."[2] Then, as to the coming of the kingdom, he says that it will be "whenever the two (things) are one, and the outside as the inside, and the male with the female, neither male nor female."[3]

In the seven epistles of Ignatius, quotations are infrequent, but the N.T. is treated quite as generously as the O.T. There are, however, only three unimportant passages from the Gospels, but, in these, the language is significantly preserved.[4] But, in a fourth, our Lord's language, "Handle me, and see. For a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me have," becomes, "Handle me, and see that I am not a bodiless spirit" — *δαιμόνιον*. This use of *δαιμόνιον* is foreign to the N.T. vocabulary.[5]

The Epistle of Polycarp, belonging to the same period, bristles with quotations, mostly from the N.T. Of these, however, only five are from the Gospels. Of these, four preserve the language so as to show undisputed acquaintance with our Gospels, and without mixture of matter derived from other sources.[6] The fifth presents such a resemblance to the mixed quotation in Ep. of Clem. XIII. as to suggest a common extra-canonical source.[7]

In the Teaching of the Apostles, which belongs apparently to the very beginning of the century, there are sixteen quotations from the Synoptics.[8] In these, the words of our Lord are quoted quite exactly, the supplementary matter attached to them being evidently the writer's own reflections. But the title, which gives the

---

[1] IV. [2] V. [3] XII.

[4] Eph. XIV. Mt. 12^{33}; Smyrn. I. Mt. 3^{15}; VI. Mt. 19^{12}; Poly. II. Mt. 10^{16}.

[5] Smyrn. III.

[6] II. Mt. $5^{3.10}$; V. Mk. 9^{35}; VII. Mt. 6^{13} 26^{41} Mk. 14^{38}; XII. Mt. 5^{44}.

[7] II. Mt. $7^{1.2}$ Lk. 6^{36-38}.

[8] I. Mt. $22^{37.39}$ $5^{44.46}$ Lk. $6^{27.28.32.33.35}$ Mt. 5^{39-42} Lk. $6^{29.30}$ Mt. 5^{26}; III. Mt. 5^{5}; VII. Mt. 28^{19}; VIII. Mt. $6^{5.9-13}$ Lk. 11^{2-4}; IX. Mt. 7^{6}; X. Mt. 24^{31}; XII. Mt. 21^{9} Mk. 11^{9} Lk. 19^{38} ? XIII. Mt. 10^{10}; XVI. Mt. 25^{13} Lk. $12^{35.40}$ Mt. $24^{10.24.30}$ Lk. 21^{12} Mt. $24^{13.30}$.

authority of the apostles to an inferior and frequently trivial writing of the second century, is an instructive commentary on the way in which great names may be misused for pious purposes.

The Epistle of Barnabas — not, however, the companion of Paul, and possibly no Barnabas at all — is rich again in O.T. quotations, but poor in N.T. sayings, there being only four quoted from the Synoptics.[1]

The Shepherd of Hermas contains infrequent reflections of scriptural language rather than quotations. The one quotation, therefore, of the language of Mk. in regard to the difficulty obstructing a rich man's entrance into the kingdom, is the more noteworthy.[2]

Justin Martyr is rich in quotations, which are not scattered, as in the other writers of this period, but collected mostly in a group in the first Apology, for the purpose of showing for apologetic purposes what our Lord's teaching was. The variations from the synoptical accounts would be more difficult to deal with, if we did not find the same freedom of quotation in the passages from the O.T. As it is, we have to find a common cause, and that is to be found in Justin's idiosyncrasy, which makes him more than usually independent and individual in his handling of quotations. *E.g.* he quotes our Lord thus: "If ye love them that love you, what new thing do you? For even fornicators do this."[3] This same "new thing" appears again just below in regard to lending with hope of return, and coupled with a like inexactness in regard to the sinners who do the same thing.[3] Again, "Whosoever shall be angry is in danger of the fire."[4] This is quoted quite out of its connection, and in the original, he who is angry is liable only to the judgment (of the local tribunal which tries minor offences), while only he who calls his brother a fool is liable to the Gehenna of fire. In the great commandment he makes our Lord require the worship of God alone, instead of love, and in this, and other places, he calls attention to God as the Creator, a pure interpolation.[4] Another singular variation is in his quotation in regard to those who claim association with Christ, but whom he has to turn away as disobedient. He has mixed together here sayings from Mt.

---

[1] IV. Mt. 22^{14}; V. Mt. 9^{13}; VI. Mt. 20^{16}? XII. Mt. 22^{45}.
[2] XX. Mk. $10^{23.\ 24}$.
[3] 1 Apol. ch. 15.
[4] 1 Apol. ch. 16.

and Lk., and made the men say, "Did we not eat and drink in thy name?" instead of "in thy presence?"[1] On the whole, it is remarkable that with all this variation in form Justin quotes only two extra-canonical sayings of our Lord. As for the peculiarities of these sayings, the combination of the different accounts in the Synoptics, a habit of free quotation, an evident eye for the point of a saying, which allows freedom of detail — in other words, the strong individuality of the writer — will account for these phenomena. But, on the other hand, Justin introduces several extra-canonical incidents. These are the birth of Jesus in a cave,[2] the miraculous fire in the Jordan at the baptism,[3] and the statement in regard to his work as a carpenter, that he made plows and yokes.[4] These can be traced directly to their sources in uncanonical Gospels. The birth in a cave we find in the Protevangelium of James, and the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy;[5] the fire in the Jordan in the Gospel according to the Hebrews; and the plows and yokes in the Gospel of Thomas.[6] This settles the fact that Justin used such writings. By parity of reasoning, if we trace the sayings, in spite of certain difficulties, to the Synoptics as the main source, these incidents are to be credited to uncanonical Gospels. Moreover, he quotes the Acts of Pilate in confirmation of the miracles, evidently referring to the testimony of those healed by Jesus at the time of his trial before Pilate.[7] On the whole then, the testimony is conclusive, that Justin used the Synoptics, but also other Gospels.

Athenagoras, in his Apology, makes two quotations from Mt.,[8] and two in which he combines Mt. and Lk.[9] It has been doubted whether these are quotations, but the freedom of quotation is slight, certainly not greater than the N.T. writers use in quoting from the O.T.

In the fragments preserved to us from Papias, the statements in regard to Mk.'s Gospel and the *Logia* of Mt. are the most important, and they occupy the same rank among the second-century witnesses to the canonical Gospels.[10] We should not expect to find

---

[1] Apol. ch. 16.
[2] Dial. with Trypho, ch. 78.
[3] Dial. with Trypho, ch. 88.
[4] Dial. with Trypho, ch. 89.
[5] Protev. of Jas. par. 18, 19; Arab. Gos. of Inf. par. 2, 3.
[6] Gos. Thos. par. 13.
[7] Apol. ch. 48; Acts of Pil. ch. 6, 7, 8.
[8] Mt. 5^{28} Mt. 19^{9}.
[9] Mt. $5^{44.45}$ Lk. $6^{27.28}$ Mt. 5^{46} Lk. $6^{32.34}$.
[10] Euseb. *Ch. His.* III.

much in the way of quotation, as he says expressly that he prefers the oral testimony of men who had associated with the disciples to anything that he could get from the books.[1] But he does make one quotation from Mk.[2] He is one writer who gives us distinctly strange, apocryphal matter in regard to Jesus' life and teachings, the general absence of which is so noteworthy and important in this second-century literature.[3]

In Tatian, a heretical writer of the last part of the century, before the discovery of the Diatessaron, there was little contributing to our subject. The only complete work of his, at that time, an oration to the Greeks, contains several quotations from J., but none from the Synoptics. But, in a few fragments preserved in other writings, we find two quotations from the Synoptics.[4] The Diatessaron of Tatian, however, a compilation of the four Gospels made some time in the third quarter of the century, is one of the most important of the recent discoveries. It was partly known before through a commentary of Ephræm the Syrian. The only important omissions are the genealogies of our Lord in Mt. and Lk., and the account of the woman taken in adultery from J. 8. The genealogies were omitted, not as a matter of evidence, but of opinion. The Appendix to Mk. is inserted, but this is not important, as we already have the testimony of the versions to its existence in the early part of the century, and the real question of its authorship remains untouched. But the real value of the Diatessaron is in the fact, established at last, that it was compiled from the four canonical Gospels, and from no other source. The importance of this is unmistakable.

In the Clementine Homilies, an Ebionite production of the latter part of the century, falsely ascribed to Clement of Rome, there are over seventy quotations from the Synoptics, and thirteen either entirely strange, or very considerably modifying the synoptical account. Our Lord is represented as exhorting his disciples to become good money-changers, which obtains a significant meaning from the mixed quality ascribed to the Scriptures in the Homilies, making it necessary to discriminate carefully between the good

---

[1] *Jerm. de vir illust.* 18; Eus. III. 39; Georg. Hamartolus. Chron.
[2] Mk. $10^{38.39}$.
[3] Iren. *Her.* V. 33, 3, 4; Cramer, *Catena ad Acta S. S. Apos.* p. 12 sq.
[4] Clem. Alex. III. 12, 86; Mt. 6^{19} Lk. 20^{35}.

and bad, between the genuine and counterfeit coin of Scriptures.[1] In the same connection occurs several times a serious modification of the text in which our Lord charges the Sadducees with not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God, where, for "the Scriptures" is substituted "the true things of Scripture," distinguished from the false.[1] In the account of the Syrophœnician woman, her name is given as Justa, and the account of the conversation is paraphrased.[2] But this is a part of the romancing of this work, and does not need to be treated seriously. Several times the saying, "The tempter is the wicked one," is attributed to our Lord.[3] The idea of the money-changers is extended into this saying: "It is thine, O man, to prove my words, as silver and money are proved among the exchangers."[4] The blessing which Jesus pronounces on the faithful servant is changed to a blessing on "the man whom the Lord shall *appoint* to the ministry of his fellow-servants."[5] His prediction that many shall come from the east and west, and recline with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God, is changed to "many will come from the east, west, north, and south, and will recline on the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob."[6] "Gold and silver, and the luxury of this world," are added to the things promised to Jesus by Satan in the temptation.[7] Different parts are run together in the saying about false teachers, so that it reads: "Many will come to me in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."[8] So also Justin, *Apol.* i. ch. 16. And Satan is made to promise to "send apostles from among his subjects to deceive."[8] As an offset to the statement that stumbling-blocks must come, but woe to him through whom they come, Jesus says that "good things must come, and blessed is he through whom they come."[9] And then we have the entirely strange exhortation, "Give no pretext to the evil one,"[10] and this enlargement of the idea of the μυστήριον in our Lord's remarks on his parabolic teaching, "Keep the mysteries for me and the sons of my house."[11]

The apocryphal Gospels are of interest, not because they contain important matter, most of it being quite trivial and impossible, but because they are the only writings outside of the canonical

[1] II. ch. 51; III. ch. 50; XVIII. ch. 20.
[2] II. ch. 19.
[3] III. ch. 55.
[4] III. ch. 61.
[5] III. ch. 60.
[6] VIII. ch. 4.
[7] VIII. ch. 21.
[8] XI. ch. 35.
[9] XII. ch. 29.
[10] XIX. ch. 2.
[11] XIX. ch. 20.

Gospels which carry that name. Their date is very uncertain, but one of them, the lately discovered Gospel of Peter, is assigned a place in the second century. The Protevangelium of James, the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and the Gospel of Thomas contain the apocryphal matter of Justin, whether they are the source of it or not; and the Acts of Pilate are quoted by Justin by name.[1] Now, it is evident all through this second-century literature that the writers had and used other sources of information, in regard to the Gospel history, outside of the canonical Gospels, and Lk. himself speaks of many such accounts. The interest that attaches to these apocryphal Gospels, therefore, is that they are the only literary remains of this kind that have come down to us. What are they therefore? They are mostly incredible accounts of the birth and infancy of Jesus himself, of his mother, of Joseph, of the trial of our Lord before Pilate, of his descent into Hades, and finally a docetic account of his death. The only extra-canonical matter in the second-century literature which can be traced to them is what relates to the infancy, the private life, and the baptism of Jesus, and possibly the rehearsal of the miracles in the Acts of Pilate. The unwritten sayings, and unfamiliar forms of the written sayings, are not to be found in them. While there are, therefore, extra-canonical sources quoted by the second-century writers, these Gospels can figure only slightly among these sources.

The earliest attempt at a canon, or authoritative list of N.T. writings, did not come from an orthodox source, but was published by Marcion, a Gnostic heretic of the latter half of the century. He declared war against Judaism, and, since he believed the original apostles to be Judaistic in their tendency, he rejected them, and, with them, all the extant N.T. writings, except ten epistles of Paul (omitting the pastoral epistles) and a Gospel.[2] What this Gospel was, we have to gather from Tertullian, who wrote at length against him, and this question has been one of the most debated critical problems, opinion wavering between a mutilated Lk., and an earlier Gospel on which Lk. was based. Either theory makes Marcion a witness for Lk.'s Gospel, and certainly no

[1] See paragraph on Justin Martyr.
[2] Tertullian *vs.* Marcion V. 21, IV. 2, 3.

other theory is possible in view of the Pauline universalism that characterizes this Gospel.

When we come to the close of the century, we are at last in the presence of a canon, not the same as our present canon, nor a definitely settled list, but still a selection of Christian literature regarded as Scripture, and put on the same footing as the O.T. Among the witnesses to this is the canon of Muratori. This was discovered in Milan during the seventeenth century; the manuscript belongs to the eighth or ninth century, and the writing claims for itself a second-century date. Though this latter date is in dispute, it is probable if we make it late in the century. Unfortunately, there is a gap at the very beginning, so that Lk. is the first Gospel mentioned. But as the mention begins with the title, "Third book of the Gospel according to Lk.," it becomes a witness to the four Gospels, and to an acceptance of these among the rest as authoritative.

What, then, is the conclusion of the whole matter? Clement makes two quotations, the canonical source of which is doubtful. Pseudo-Clement gives twelve, — nine of them canonical but free, and three extra-canonical; Ignatius, four, — one of them probably uncanonical; Polycarp, five, — four canonical but free, and one probably extra-canonical; the Didache, sixteen, quite canonical; Pseudo-Barnabas, four, canonical; Shepherd of Hermas, one, normal; the rest mere reflections of Scripture. Justin quotes largely but freely, and introduces incidents from apocryphal sources, one of which, the Acts of Pilate, he cites by name as authority for the miracles of our Lord; Athenagoras, four, quoted freely; Papias, one from Mk., with distinctly apocryphal matter. The Clementine Homilies give us canonical and uncanonical matter in the proportion of about seventy to thirteen. One of these, about good money-changers, is a distinct addition to the probable sayings of our Lord. Finally, we have the testimony of Papias to the composition of Mk., and of the *Logia*, the probable witness of Marcion to Lk., the more than probable testimony of the Canon of Muratori to the canonical Gospels, and the Diatessaron of Tatian, with its unmistakable use of the four Gospels as the exclusive source of information about the Gospel history. The conclusions are inevitable: first, that the second-century literature certainly uses extra-canonical sources of information about our Lord, and does it freely

and without apology; secondly, that the four Gospels were the main stream to which the rest was tributary, — the standard writings on the subject; thirdly, they were not Scripture in the sense which we attach to that word, — they were not separated from other writings by any such line; fourthly, that the amount and importance of extra-canonical matter is after all small. Substantially, the Jesus of the second-century literature is the Jesus of the Gospels. This fact is, as we have seen, the most important and favorable result to be obtained, more important in every way than the attempted exclusion of extra-canonical sources. The unrestricted use of extra-canonical sources, without any important change of the record or of the historical figure, is an ideal result.

RECENT CRITICAL LITERATURE

WHAT we may call the newer criticism of the Gospels accepts the historical character of those writings as being substantially contemporaneous history. It receives our present Gospel of Mk., and the *Logia* of Mt., both of them coming from the inner circle of the disciples, as the basis of our Synoptical Gospels. Criticism thus confines itself at present — and this may be taken as an ultimate position — to the details of these documents, and has ceased to attack, or even to minimize, the historicity of the documents themselves. But there is one reservation which some of the critics feel themselves justified in making as one of the axioms, — the accepted data of historical criticism, — the axiom, namely, *that miracles do not happen.* How plausible this position is becomes evident when we consider how universally, and as a matter of course, we apply it outside of the Biblical history. And, in general, we can say with perfect confidence that the grounds on which it rests are such as to establish the *a priori* improbability of any miracle, and to justify historical criticism in scrutinizing with extreme care any story of supernatural happenings. If we ask, then, in this matter, for an ultimate result, an accepted conclusion, we shall not find it. But, on the other hand, the acknowledged historicity of the Gospels, we believe, carries with it a strong presumption of the verity of the miraculous element in their story. And when we add to this the verisimilitude of these miracles, we are convinced that the inherent improbability is, in the case of these miracles, quite overcome. It is a modification of this adverse criticism when the miracles are reduced, as they are by some critics, to those cures which can be explained by the extraordinary action of Jesus' unique personality on the minds of men, and the reaction of this on their bodies.

This review of the literature is confined to the writers representing conspicuously this newer criticism. This is done with

more confidence because they are, for the most part, trustworthy exegetical guides, and in this department, as in that of criticism, give a largely antiquarian or historical interest to the preceding literature.

The first of these is Meyer, whose commentary on the entire N.T. — that part of it written by himself, including everything from Mt. to the pastoral epistles — being easily first among commentaries. He had the exegetical faculty beyond all other commentators, so that you can omit any other in studying a book, but Meyer no scholar can omit. He represents the school of which we are speaking, accepting the history, criticising the details with combined freedom and caution, and, as for miracles, accepting the general fact while criticising single cases.

The next is Weiss, the posthumous editor of Meyer, with a commentary of his own on Mk. and its Synoptical parallels, a *Life of our Lord*, an *Introduction to the N. T.*, and a *Biblical Theology of the N. T.* Like Meyer, he is a conservative critic, but far behind Meyer in the keenness and sureness of his exegetical sense. In his treatment of the Gospels especially, we have to deal with idiosyncracies of opinion that make one forget the real value of his contribution to biblical learning. At the very outset, he denies that our Lord's teachings form an independent, and especially a superior, source of Christian doctrine. This is not of so much consequence, but the reason for it betrays a singular lack of discernment, and involves a far-reaching and destructive theory of the Gospels. It is that the source of both these and the other N.T. writings is apostolic, and that therefore you cannot expect any different view of the Gospel in the one and the other. This is to forget several essential things. First, the act of reporting is distinct from that of original presentation; and my ability to keep myself out of a report is a test of my fitness. Just how far it is done has to be decided in each case; and there are decisive proofs that the Synoptical writers have made a considerable success of it. In the first place, while the Synoptics are not independent, there are two distinct sources of their account, viz. Mk.'s apostolic authority and the *Logia* of Mt. But the unity of the matter drawn from these sources — the impress of one strongly differentiated and individual personality upon it all — is the most marked impression left by the three accounts. Furthermore, the

person and teaching of our Lord in them make a distinct type, with individual characteristics that make them stand out as clearly as the figure of St. Paul. To take one instance of the way in which the apostolic source has reported teaching different from the apostolic teaching about the same, — it taught the immediateness of the second visible coming of our Lord, but it does not report him as teaching the same. Another example of the way in which the Christ of the apostolic source is differentiated from its representation of the same thing in other persons is its story of his miracles compared with the morals of the apostolic miracles. Again, Weiss maintains that Jesus upheld the entire Jewish law, — ceremonial and moral alike, — but without the traditions of the Pharisees. It is enough to say, in reply to this, that Jesus abolished the distinction between clean and unclean, and denied the possibility of external defilement of the inner man. But the difficulty lies deeper. It involves forgetfulness of the conflict between priest and prophet in the O.T. itself, and of the impossibility that any man should maintain both sides of an irrepressible conflict. It represents our Lord, of all men that ever lived, as unable to distinguish between things that differ. Finally, Weiss asserts that it was the intention of Jesus to set up a political kingdom in Judæa in accordance with the national expectation, and in fulfilment of the natural and obvious meaning of the prophecies; only, it was to be a righteous kingdom; — it required as the indispensable condition the conversion of the nation, and it was to be established as the voluntary act of the people, not by violence. The point is, however, that the kingdom was to come by a Divine *tour de force*. The form which it ultimately took, involving the final overthrow of the national hope, was due to the final refusal of the people to repent. Here is a place in which definitions and discriminations are absolutely necessary. If by a political kingdom is meant an enforced rule, — and this is the only meaning that accorded with the national expectation, — then Jesus did not intend nor expect any such kingdom. All that he says implies a spiritual kingdom, with worldly power arrayed against it, and no Divine power to meet this hostile power on its own ground. All the subsequent history is of such a spiritual kingdom, and what our Lord says implies that this was not an afterthought, but the permanent policy of God in ruling his kingdom.

As for the miracles, Weiss admits them, and does not attempt any reasoned discrimination among them. But he does show his sense of the strength of the unbelief in the supernatural by insisting on leaving a way of escape to the naturalistic explanation of at least some of them, lest the unbelief in the miraculous involve the whole history in a common ruin.

Beyschlag, in his *Leben Jesu*, is another example of the same school, which combines acceptance of the apostolic source and historical character of the Synoptical accounts with free critical handling of the details. He modifies the theory of Meyer and Weiss, and before them Weisse, in regard to the origin of the Synoptics, by relegating our Mk., as well as Mt. and Lk., to the rank of secondary documents, and making the sources of all three to be an original Mk., and the *Logia* of Mt. But this does not materially alter the general conclusion. His work does not show the abundant learning of Weiss, and it is not so carefully orthodox, but it is more sympathetic; it has a finer historical sense and a sounder judgment. Its point of view is expressed in the author's repeated statement that the Jesus of our faith is identical with the Jesus of history, and is not a product of Aberglaube. Beyschlag's theory of miracles includes the most of those performed by our Lord, but omits those in which the law of cause and effect is manifestly broken, such as the miracle of the loaves and fishes. The cures of our Lord he traces to his marvellous personality, its power over other men's spiritual natures, and the well-known reaction of a powerfully moved mind on the bodily condition. But where the process and connection of events is plainly lacking, and there is only a word, — a command, — he rejects the miracle as a violation of natural law; that is, to him, as to the ordinary unbeliever in the supernatural, the miraculous, in the sense of the inexplicable, does not happen. The difference is that the ordinary anti-supernaturalist proceeds from this denial to a disbelief in religion generally, and especially in Jesus. Beyschlag, by explaining the miracles, putting them in the ordinary sequence of nature, defends the historicity of the Gospels even from the point of view of the anti-supernaturalist. The particular sequence in our Lord's miracles — the reaction of mind on body — is common enough, only in Jesus' unique personality it is raised to the *n*th degree.

Holtzmann, in his Commentary on the Synoptical Gospels, and in his Introduction, is the clearest and cleverest of the exponents of this now accepted theory of the Synoptical Gospels. It would be hard to find a more transparent or convincing piece of critical work than his discussion of the Synoptical problem in the Introduction to his commentary. He wavers somewhat in his consideration of the question whether our Mk. is the original Mk., but is decided in his statement that the two are for substance identical, and that for all practical purposes, it is our Mk. which may be taken as the basis of Mt. and Lk. These Gospels were formed by the combination of Mk. with the *Logia*. This Mk.-hypothesis he characterizes strongly, but justifiably, as no longer hypothesis, but established and accepted critical fact. Moreover, he regards both of these sources as historical, and all the Synoptical Gospels, therefore, as having a historical basis. They are not historical in their purpose, since what we may call their apologetic aim is evident in all three. They are intended to represent Jesus as the Messiah, and to show that his death, so far from defeating his purpose and disproving his claim, was foreseen by him, and included in his purpose. But the events and teachings used in this showing are, substantially, facts. The miracles Holtzmann rejects, however; and, while the obvious reason for this is his acceptance of the critical assumption that miracles do not happen, and are therefore to be set aside simply as miracles, nevertheless, his showing up of them as echoes of O.T. miracle-stories is very clever, although fallacious. That a writer of his unusual clearness and judgment should not see the contradiction between the general historicity of these books and the spuriousness of the miracles is wonderful. And that the absolute verisimilitude of the miracles should escape him is even stranger still. But that Holtzmann, with his evident skepticism, and his absolute and unqualified rejection of mere traditionalism, should accept the general historicity of the Synoptics, is the most noticeable element in the whole situation.

It would be unfair to close this review of the literature which combines criticism and faith without mentioning an admirable American contribution to it by Dr. Orello Cone.[1] He says that the total result of criticism is, "that the divine doctrine of Jesus

[1] *Gospel Criticism*, G. P. Putnam's Sons.

stands forth clearly defined, and of his personality there emerge not only 'a few ineffaceable lineaments which could belong only to a figure unique in grace and majesty,' but the figure itself emerges in its majesty and grace." For a balanced statement of the predominance of the Jewish outlook in Mt., and of the Pauline universalism in Lk., which, however, does not prevent either writer from introducing material which shows the true middle ground of fact, we can commend this book. And this is only a sample of the careful and judicious spirit characterizing the whole. His estimate of the legendary and dogmatic element in the Gospels is exaggerated, to say the least, but his acceptance of their historical kernel is hearty and important.

Of a very different sort is the commentary of Dr. James Morison, to which the present writer has had frequent recourse, and gladly acknowledges indebtedness. There is an abundance of helpful information in it, especially in regard to the various English translations. And his summarizing of different views is, in many passages, exhaustive, and his archæological information extensive. But, while his exegetical sense is sometimes fine, it is far from that on the whole. In his criticism of the text, he is free, and his textual conclusions agree with those of the established critical texts in the main. But in the higher criticism, he seems to lack judgment and fairness. He is as well informed in this as in other departments. But when, after a long review of the literature in regard to the Synoptical problem, he concludes that all the theories are alike baseless, and that there is really no problem there; that the resemblances are not uncommon, nor such as may not be accounted for mostly by the growing fixity of the oral tradition, his case becomes hopeless. And his conclusion, after a minute examination of the last twelve verses of ch. 16, that the omission is probably due to an accidental omission in some early copy, and that the "whole fabric of opposition and doubt must, as biblical criticism advances, crumble into dust," is amazing.

In view of the universal discarding of this critical theory of the Synoptics by English commentators, it is well to call attention to the cumulative nature of the proof. The phenomena of verbal resemblance, on which the traditional view of independence goes to pieces, are not isolated, but prolonged and repeated. And the

same is true of the verbal peculiarities of the last twelve verses, which many English textual critics reject, but which English commentaries defend with unanimity and spirit.[1] Dr. Morison thinks that he answers this objection by citing with each case a parallel instance from some other author. But the real question is whether he can match the *accumulation* of these in the same space elsewhere.

[1] I should note one exception, — a commentary by Dr. W. N. Clarke, published in Philadelphia by the American Baptist Pub. Soc., who shows here the admirable judgment characteristic of his general work.

THE TEXT

THE text followed in this commentary is not either of the critical texts, the author preferring to choose in each case between the several texts on the strength of the evidence. His authority for the texts has been Scrivener's edition of the text of Stephens, with the various readings of Beza, Elzevir, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and the Revised Version, Cambridge, 1887. The text of Treg. is based too entirely on the older authorities for independent use, while that of the Revisers is too conservative to satisfy a critical judgment. Either the text of Tischendorf's edition, or of WH., would be satisfactory, but an independent text, based on both, but following neither without exception, seems still better. The authority for the sources is Tischendorf's *magnum opus*, the *Editio Major* of his eighth edition.

An analysis of the various readings adopted shows something like 650 variations from the Tex. Rec., and in these the several sources appear as follows:

WHOLE NUMBER, 657[1]

ℵ	604	T^d	4	16	1	59	2	108	6	209	58	258	4	301	1
B	626	U	29	18	1	60	1	115	8	218	1	259	1	340	1
A	99	V	23	22	2	61	5	116	2	225	2	262	3	346	55
C	325	W	2	27	2	63	3	118	30	229	5	271	3	406	2
D	270	W^b	6	28	114	64	2	121	1	237	2	282	1	433	2
E	32	X	37	30	1	66	1	122	2	238	8	299	7	435	3
F	23	Γ	43	33	148	67	4	124	50	239	1	Lat. Vet.			303
G	30	Δ	440	40	5	69	102	127	7	240	3	Vulg.			152
H	24	Π	68	42	2	71	1	131	17	241	1	Memph.			293
K	52	1	117	46	1	73	2	150	1	242	1	Theb.			53
L	520	2	1	51	1	78	1	157	6	244	4	Pesh.			115
M	57	6	2	53	2	91	5	171	1	245	2	Harcl.			50
N	30	10	2	56	2	104	1	201	2	248	1	" *mg.*			30
P	5	11	5	57	1	106	5	205	1	251	9	Jer. Syr.			25
S	18	13	85	58	1			206	1	253	3				

[1] Numbers approximate only.

It changes somewhat the proportions of the above statement, that in C, about three chapters are wanting, in L 32 verses, in F 86 verses, in G 19 verses, in H 19 verses, in N some 7 chapters, in P all but fragments, T^d the same, in X the first 6 chapters, and in Γ nearly 3 chapters. The Theb. version is also in fragments only.

From this analysis, it appears that substantially the critical text of to-day, as it appears in Tisch. and WH., is that of ℵ and B, the two oldest *mss.* of the N.T., both of which belong to the fourth century. It is, moreover, strongly supported by C and D of the fifth and sixth centuries, by L of the eighth, and Δ of the ninth century. The only first-rate authority that can be excepted from this convergent testimony is A of the fifth century. The testimony of the versions is to the same effect, the older versions furnishing strong support to the readings of these oldest *mss.* The Old-Latin version, *e.g.*, concurs with them twice as frequently as the Vulgate, and the Peshito, the oldest Syriac version, twice as frequently as the later versions in the same language. And one of the strong supports of these readings is the Memphitic, which is of about the same age as these oldest Latin and Syriac versions. As far as the material now in hand goes, then, it points strongly to the conclusion of the textual critics that the oldest texts extant are comparatively pure. If ℵ and B stood by themselves, we might say that possibly they had been more open than usual to corrupting influences, and that a purer form of the text was to be found in some later text of a purer strain. But, as a matter of fact, as we get back towards the fourth century, we find the text converging towards the form of these oldest extant sources, which shows conclusively that they belong in the main current of the text, and not in some side-stream more or less impure. A, which stands nearest to ℵ and B in point of time, furnishes us with a convenient comparison. Here is a text different from the combination ℵ B, and very much nearer the later texts. Does this represent the main stream, and ℵ B the divergence, or the reverse? The fact that, as we go back, the text converges towards ℵ B, and not towards A, proves conclusively that the older *mss.* are comparatively pure. We have, in the oldest versions, and in the Fathers, some traces of the state of the text in the first two centuries, and these confirm the type of text found in ℵ B. There is a distinct type of text in these and in their cognates which lacks the smoothness and orthodoxy of the later

texts: *e.g.* the omission of Καὶ νηστείᾳ in 9^{29} is contrary to second-century and later orthodoxy; and, to take a more important case, the omission of 16^{9-20}, with its account of the resurrection and ascension, subtracts not from the creed, but from confirmations of the creed. The onward movement of the text is toward smoothness and conformity, the later text supplying here and there the apparent deficiencies of the earlier type. Now, as we get still further back, going from the fourth century to the third and second, we find the reverse movement toward a certain roughness and non-conformity still kept up, which shows still further, and more strongly, that the great textual critics have not been lacking in critical judgment in giving to ℵ B and their cognates the preference naturally due to the oldest known type of text.

THE PRINCIPAL MSS. AND VERSIONS

Necessarily, the information in regard to the sources of the text possible in a volume like this is very slight. The student is referred to the Prolegomena of Tischendorf's *Editio Major*, edited by Dr. C. R. Gregory, and to Scrivener's Introduction to *The Criticism of the N. T.*, London, 1894.

Uncials

ℵ = *Codex Sinaiticus*, discovered by Tischendorf in the convent of St. Catharine, Mt. Sinai, 1859, and now at St. Petersburg. A manuscript of the fourth century.

B = *Codex Vaticanus*, in the Vatican Library at Rome, where it seems to have been brought very soon after the founding of the Library in 1448. Also of the fourth century, and slightly older than ℵ.

A = *Codex Alexandrinus*, in the British Museum from its foundation in 1753. Brought from Constantinople, in 1528, as a present from the patriarch Cyril Lucar to Charles I. Belongs to the fifth century.

C = *Codex Ephraemi*, in the Royal Library of Paris. Brought from the East by the Medici family in the sixteenth century, and into France by Catharine de Medici. A valuable palimpsest of the fifth century.

D = *Codex Bezae*, a Græco-Latin manuscript of the Gospels and Acts, presented to the University Library at Cambridge by the reformer Theodore Beza in 1581. Previously in the monastery of St. Irenæus, Lyons. Belongs to the sixth century. A singularly corrupt text, but bearing important witness to the accepted critical text. The corruptions are largely interpolations, and the text on which these are inlaid contains abundant confirmation of the purer form of the text.

L = *Codex Regius*, in the Royal Library at Paris. Belongs to the eighth century. Contains the four Gospels, with some omissions. Those in Mk. are 10^{16-20} 15^{2-20}. Though of this late date, it is so evidently a copy of an early manuscript that it acquires great value in the criticism of the text.

Δ = *Codex Sangallensis* of the four Gospels, in the great monastery of St. Gall, Switzerland, where it probably originated. It is evidently, like L, a copy of an old manuscript, and of great critical value.

Other uncials of less importance are:

E = *Codex Basiliensis*, of the eighth century.
F = " *Borelli*, of the ninth century.
G = " *Wolfii* A, of the tenth century.
H = " " B, of the ninth century.
K = " *Cyprius*, of the ninth century.
M = " *Campianus*, of the ninth century.
N = " *Purpureus*, of the sixth century.
P = " *Guelpherbytanus* A, of the sixth century.
S = " *Vaticanus* 354, of the tenth century.
T^d = fragment of Lectionary, containing in Mk. only 1^{1-3} 12^{35-37}.
U = *Codex Nanianus* I.
V = " *Mosquensis*, of the eleventh century.
X = " *Monacensis*, of the tenth century.
Γ = " *Tischendorfianus*, of the ninth century.
Π = " *Petropolitianus*, of the ninth century.

Cursives

1 = *Codex Basiliensis*, of the tenth century.
13 = " *Regius* 50, of the twelfth century.
28 = " " 379, of the eleventh century.
33 = " " 14, of the eleventh century, called "The Queen of the Cursives."
69 = *Codex Leicestrensis*, of the fourteenth century.
102 = " *Bibliothecae Mediceae.*
209 An unnamed, valuable manuscript.
346 = *Codex Ambrosianus* 23, of the twelfth century.

Versions

Latin:

Vetus, or *Itala*. This version itself belongs to the very beginning of the second century, though there are no copies earlier than the fourth century.

Vulgate, the Latin version of Jerome, made in the latter part of the fourth century.

The Egyptian versions are:

1. Memphitic, or Bohairic, in the dialect of Lower Egypt, and belonging to the second century.
2. Thebaic, or Sahidic, in the dialect of Upper Egypt; belonging also to the second century. Extant only in fragments.

The Syriac versions are:

1. *Peshito*, of the second century.
2. Harclean, which contains itself a statement of its date = 508. Value largely due to Thomas of Harkel, from whom it derives its name, and who collated it with the aid of three Greek *mss.* These marginal additions give this value.
3. Jerusalem Syriac, a lectionary of the sixth century.

ABBREVIATIONS

The Fathers are quoted in the manner usual in critical commentaries (Amb., Aug., Chrys., Jer., Orig., etc.).

Egyptt.	Egyptian Versions.
Memph.	Memphitic.
Theb.	Thebaic.
Aeth.	Ethiopic Version.
Latt.	Latin Versions.
Lat. Vet.	*Vetus Latina.*
Vulg.	Vulgate.
Syrr.	Syriac Versions.
Pesh.	*Peshito.*
Harcl.	Harclean.
Hier.	Jerusalem Lectionary.
AV.	Authorised Version.
RV.	Revised Version.
RV. *marg.*	Revised Version *marg.*
Tisch.	Tischendorf.
Treg.	Tregelles.
WH.	Westcott and Hort.
Beng.	Bengel.
De W.	De Wette.
Mey.	Meyer.
Bib. Dic.	Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (1st or 2d edition).
Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*	Thayer's Grimm.
Win.	Winer's *Grammar of N. T. Greek.*

THE GOSPEL OF MARK

BEGINNING OF THE GLAD TIDINGS

I. 1–8. *Beginning of the glad tidings concerning Jesus in the authoritative proclamation of John the Baptist. Prophecies of this preliminary work in the Old Testament, the appearance of John, his proclamation of repentance, his baptism, and his announcement of the coming One mightier than he.*

It is evident that the key to this paragraph is found in this announcement of the One mightier than John. Who and what the man was who made it, the general character of his mission to the nation, into the course of which it was introduced, and the way in which it fulfilled prophecy in regard to the preparation for the Messianic advent, we are told of course, but the theme itself is the announcement. That is the beginning of the good news about Jesus which is the title of the section. There are two renderings of our EV. which obscure this intention of the paragraph, viz., the translation *gospel* for εὐαγγελίου, v.[1], and *preach* for κηρύσσω, v.[4. 7]. The technical meaning which both these words have acquired in our language renders them frequently unfit to translate the Greek words, but especially in this passage, the character of which is such as to make a close adherence to the specific meaning of the original words quite necessary. The statement is, that with the proclamation, κηρύσσειν, of the coming One by John began the glad tidings, εὐαγγέλιον, concerning Jesus. Furthermore, it is stated that this beginning is in accordance with prophecy, which foretold the sending of a messenger, ἄγγελος, to prepare the way of the Lord. The prophecy is further identified with the event by the description of the messenger in the second part of the prophecy as *a voice crying in the wilderness*, corresponding to the statement about John that he *made his appearance*

in the wilderness. The general work of John is shown to consist in his baptism of the crowds (including mostly the people of Judaea) who came to him, his proclamation being that of a baptism of repentance for remission of sins. That is, he performed a rite of outward purification, and explained that it meant an inward purification looking to the forgiveness of sins. This message would be understood by the people to foreshadow the coming of the expected deliverer, since repentance was the acknowledged condition of national deliverance, and this public call to it would naturally therefore create expectation of his advent. As for John's appearance, his wilderness life and food and his rough dress recall Elijah, as they are evidently intended to do, the item about the *leather girdle* reproducing the language of the LXX. in regard to Elijah's dress (2 K. 1^{8}). It is obviously the picture of a man who has revolted from the evil world and prefers hardness to the unclean associations of its comforts. It is a significant commentary on the manners of the place and time that they should lead to such revolt not in Greece or Rome, but in Judaea. It is such a man as this, who in the midst of his own great work of impressing on the nation his sense of its sin, and issuing to it the old prophetic cry, *Wash you, make you clean,* interjects the beginning of the evangel, the first news that the Messiah is actually at hand. This announcement takes the form of a comparison between himself and the personage announced by him. There *comes one stronger than he,* with whom he is not to be compared. So far, the announcement is in line with Jewish expectation, but there is an absence of the material, and an emphasis of the spiritual element in what follows, which does not spring from Jewish Messianism, and would not have led to John's later doubt. It is a comparison between his baptism and that of Jesus, making the latter to be the spiritual reality, of which John's was merely the ritual expression. It was to be a baptism in the Holy Spirit, the element of spiritual purification, while John's baptism was in the material element of water, which could only represent that purification in a figure.

1. This verse is a title or heading of the paragraph in regard to the work of John the Baptist.[1] That work, but especially the

[1] Hence the absence of the article before Ἀρχὴ. Win. 19. 1. *a.*

announcement of the coming of the one mightier than he, is the beginning of the εὐαγγέλιον, *the good news about Jesus Christ.*

εὐαγγελίου. — This word, which in the later Greek means *glad tidings*, is in the N.T. restricted to the good news about Jesus, or of the kingdom which he came to establish, or of the salvation accomplished by him. It is under this last head, that it comes to have the technical sense of the scheme of truth relating to him and to his saving work, which has come to be so associated with the word *gospel* as to render that a misleading translation in a passage like this. This word is also associated with the written accounts of our Lord's life, the Gospels, which is also confusing here.[1]

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. — This gen. may be either subj. or obj., the good news brought by him, or that concerning him. Here it is evidently the latter, as John is the bearer of the εὐαγγέλιον. Ἰησοῦς is the personal name of our Lord (Mt. 1^{21}). It is a descriptive name, as the passage in Mt. indicates, meaning *Saviour.* It is used once in the N.T. as the Greek form of Joshua (Heb. 4^{8}).[2] Χριστοῦ — the official title of Jesus, denoting him as the Messiah, the Anointed. The word itself is of frequent occurrence in the O.T., where it is applied to kings as anointed of God. But as a title of the coming King, the hope of the Jewish nation, it does not occur. It is first used of him in the Book of Enoch 48^{10} 52^{4}, about the close of the second century B.C.,[3] and afterwards frequently in the uncanonical literature. It appears from this literature, that the general national expectation of deliverance and greatness characteristic of the O.T. period had at this time taken the definite shape of an expected deliverer in the Davidic line. And the N.T. furnishes abundant evidence that this expectation was common at the coming of Jesus, and during his life. The title Χριστός became a personal name later, and the absence of the art. would indicate that this is the use here.

υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ — *Son of God.* RV. puts this into the text, and omits it in the margin, which seems a good statement of the critical evidence. This term, Son of God, like the title Messiah, is applied to the Messianic King in the uncanonical Jewish literature. But its use is purely theocratic and official, corresponding

---

[1] In Homer, it means a reward given to the bearer of good news; in Attic Greek, a thank-offering for the same. The LXX form of the word seems to be εὐαγγελία, Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

[2] Ἰησοῦς is the Greek form of the Heb. יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, יֵשׁוּעַ, or according to a still later form, יְשׁוּעָה. The first two mean Whose *help* is *Jehovah.* The last means simply *help*, or *deliverer*, and it is probably this later form to which this use is to be referred.

[3] On this book, see Schürer, *N. Zg.* Div. II., Vol. III. § 32, V. 2. On the Messianic hope of the people in the time immediately preceding the life of Jesus, see Schürer II. II. § 29; and on the name Messiah, see II. II. 29, 3. The Heb. form is מָשִׁיחַ, Chald. מְשִׁיחָא, Messiah.

to the O.T. use to denote any one whose office specially represents God among men, such as kings and judges (see J. 10^{36}). Its use to denote the relation to God springing from the miraculous conception is confined to Lk. 1^{35}, and its application to Jesus' metaphysical relation to God is not found in the Synoptics. The term is applied by Jesus to himself in his discourse without any explanation, whereas it would require explanation if it was intended to convey any other meaning than the historical sense with which the people were familiar. It is applied to him in the theophany at the baptism, where the aor. *εὐδόκησα*, meaning *I came to take pleasure in thee*, limits the title and statement to his historical manifestation, his earthly life. It is used by Peter in his confession, where its association with the title Christ, or Messiah, — *thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God*, — also indicates the theocratic sense. In the question of the High Priest at the trial of Jesus, whether he is the Christ, the Son of God, the same collocation involves the same conclusion. In fact, there is nowhere in the Synoptics any indication that the title is used so as to involve any departure from the current theocratic sense; and indications, such as the above, are not wanting, that the title does retain its common meaning at the time. When we get outside of these historical books, we come upon the metaphysical sonship as possibly the prevalent meaning of the term. *Son of God* means here, then, that the Messianic kingdom is a theocracy, in which God is the real ruler, and the Messianic king represents God. Only, with the new meaning that the life and teaching of Jesus had put into all these current phrases, it would signify to a Christian writer that this representation was real, and not merely official, that in Christ the ideal of the theocratic king had been realized, a prince who really represented the mind and spirit of God, and established the Divine law among men after the Divine method.

υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ T. R. AEFGHKM etc. and Versions generally. *υἱοῦ Θεοῦ* RV. Treg. WH., *marg.* $\aleph^{a}$ BDL 102. Omit Tisch. WH. RV. *marg.* $\aleph^{*}$ 28, 255. Omission confirmed also by passages in Iren. Epiph. Orig. Victorin.

2. *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις.* — There is no doubt that this is a correction of the original, to meet the difficulty of ascribing the double quotation from Malachi and Isaiah to Isaiah alone. The reading of all the critical texts is *ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ.*

ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. $\aleph$ BDL Δ 33 Latt. Memph. Pesh. Hier. Harcl. *marg.*

This quotation is intended to prove from prophecy that the good news about Christ had its appointed beginning in the proclamation of a forerunner who was thus to prepare the way for him. The first part is from Mal. 3^{1}, the second from Is. 40^{3}. In the

original, the passage from Mal. reads, *Behold, I send my messenger who shall prepare the way before me.* Jehovah is the speaker, and he is not addressing some one else, whose way is to be prepared by God's messenger; but he declares that he is coming himself to his temple to purge it of the profanations of the priests, and that he sends his messenger to prepare the way for him. Moreover, the messenger is the prophet himself, *my messenger* being in the Heb. מַלְאָכִי, *Malachi,* the traditional name of the prophet. The prophecy has thus a distinct historical sense. The evil of Malachi's time, as is evident from the entire prophecy, was this abuse of their office by the priests, and the prophet announces that God is coming to do away with this abuse, and the prophecy is to announce this coming, and make ready for it. Here, it is adapted to Messianic use by the change of *my* and *me* to *thy* and *thee,* and is applied to the mission of the forerunner to prepare the way for the Messiah. This Messianic use of a passage having another primary sense is the rule, and not the exception, in Messianic prophecy. The principle underlying it is, that the Messianic kingdom founded by Jesus is the real culmination of Jewish history, and that its prophecies of near events somehow all point forward also to him. And especially, in this case, the underlying fact is that the Jewish nation is a theocracy, and that the crises in its history are due to a Divine appearance and intervention; a coming of God, moreover, for which way is made by his messengers the prophets. This common feature being shared by the culminating intervention, gives the Messianic turn to the original prophecy.

ἐμπροσθέν σου is omitted by Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. It is supported by few good authorities, and is an evident emendation. The quotation is a free translation from the Heb. The LXX. reads *Ἰδοὺ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου.* The form in which it is quoted by Mk. is also that of the other places in which it is cited in the N.T. (Mt. 11^{10} Lk. 7^{27}), pointing to some common Greek source, not the LXX. with which the evangelists had become familiar. See Toy, *Quotations in N.T.,* p. 31.

3. *φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ* — *The voice of one crying in the wilderness.* This passage is quoted directly from the LXX. of Is. 40^{3}.[1] Here, as in the quotation from Mal., the coming to be prepared for is that of God to his people. The purpose of his coming is to deliver his people from their captivity in Babylon by the hand of Cyrus.[2] It is the note of deliverance which is common to this with the Messianic advent and intervention, and the preparation for this by the prophetic message is shared by this with the passage from Mal.

---

[1] *αὐτοῦ* is substituted for *τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν* after *τρίβους.*

[2] See Is. 41^{25} 43^{14} 44^{26}–45^{4} $46^{1.2}$ 47^{1-15} 48^{20}.

ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ in the Heb. belongs with ἑτοιμάσατε. See Is. 40^3, RV. But it is evident that Mk. intends to join it with βοῶντος, as this makes the prophecy anticipate the appearance of John in the wilderness.

Κύριον — *the Lord*, stands for *Jehovah*, or *Yahweh*, in the original, this being the LXX. rendering of that name of God. But it is probable that Mk. understands it to refer to Jesus, this being one of his familiar titles. In this way, the passage becomes more directly adapted to his purpose, making the advent, and the mission of the forerunner both figure in prophecy.

4. In this verse, the art. should be inserted before βαπτίζων, without any doubt. Whether καὶ should be dropped before κηρύσσων, on the other hand, admits of much doubt. If it is dropped, the passage reads, *John the Baptizer came preaching.* If it is retained, it reads, *John came, who baptized and preached*, RV. On the whole, the reading without καὶ is preferable.

ὁ βαπτίζων Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 33, Memph. καὶ κηρύσσων Treg. (καί) Tisch. RV. ℵ ADLP Δ, Verss. generally. Omit καὶ WH. Treg. *marg.* B. 33, 73, 102.

In order to get at the right connection of this verse, we must read it as if the preceding quotations were omitted — *Beginning of the good news of Jesus Christ . . . John came*, etc. ἐγένετο — *there came*, or *appeared.* The verb is used to denote the appearance of a person on the stage of history. The wilderness in which he made his appearance is the wilderness of Judaea, on the southern banks of the Jordan, just before it empties into the Dead Sea. κηρύσσων — *proclaiming.* The word means to exercise the office of a herald, to proclaim officially, and with authority. John is not represented as preaching, taking baptism for his text, but as making public proclamation, calling men to his baptism.[1]

βάπτισμα μετανοίας — *a baptism of repentance.* This rite of immersion in water signified the complete inward purification of the subject. It took up into a symbolical rite the figurative washings of such passages as Is. 1^{16} 4^4 Jer. 4^{14} Ez. 36^{25} Zech. 13^1 Ps. 51^2. Outwardly, it had its counterpart in the Levitical washings of the law (Ex. 29^4 Lev. $14^{8.9}$ $15^{5.8.10.13.16.21.22.27}$ $16^{26.28}$ 17^{15} etc.). But its use by John was quite unique.[2] μετανοίας — *of repentance.* The gen. denotes the significance of the rite, the inward act of which it is the outward sign and pledge. The word denotes primarily a change of mind, such as comes from an afterthought. A person

[1] This word is one of several, such as καταγγέλλω, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, having different shades of meaning, but all translated *preach* in the EV., whenever sacred matters are spoken of.

[2] The question of the outward form of this rite has been discussed so thoroughly that it is unnecessary to go over it again in this place. In this passage, the indications corresponding to the common usage of the word itself are the river, the immersion into the river, the going up out of the water, but especially, the entireness and completeness of μετάνοια, which is expressed by the rite.

does something from failure to consider certain things necessary to wise action, and when afterwards these neglected things come to him, there comes the corresponding change of attitude and purpose. It denotes in the N.T. a change, arising from such reconsideration, from a life of sin to rectitude and holiness. Such a call to repentance was not unexpected by the Jews, who believed that it was the sin of the nation which delayed the coming of the Messianic King. The call to repentance therefore, by one wearing the prophetic appearance and authority, would signify to the nation that the deliverer was at hand, and that they must prepare for his coming. εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν — *for remission of sins.* This states the purpose of the baptism of repentance. It is the repentance evidently which is the real cause of the remission, repentance being the normal and constant Scriptural condition of forgiveness.[1] Baptism is related to the repentance as the outward act in which this inward change finds formal expression. Baptism is an act of profession, and is related to repentance as the declaration of forgiveness is to forgiveness itself. It is contended sometimes (so Meyer and Weiss) that this is an anticipation of the significance of Christian baptism, in which the forgiveness of sins was first realized. But surely, if this was a baptism of repentance, it would result in forgiveness, since repentance and forgiveness are necessarily connected.

5. πάντες should be removed from its position after ἐβαπτίζοντο, so as to follow Ἱεροσολυμῖται, and the verse reads, . . . *and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and were baptized.* . . .

Ἱεροσολυμῖται πάντες καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 28, 33, 102, Latt. Memph. etc.

πᾶσα . . . πάντες — *all.* These words are to be taken rhetorically. We know that John's severity must have turned many away (Mt. 3^{7-10} Lk. 3^{7-14}). And the leaders of the people did not believe in him (Mk. 11^{27-33}). But the λαός, *the people,* all recognized John as a prophet (Mk. 11^{32}). This general outpouring was to be expected from the nature of John's proclamation, since a prophetic call to national repentance would be hailed as a call to national deliverance. ἐξομολογούμενοι — *confessing.*[2] This confession of sins gave reality to the baptism, making it a baptism of repentance.

6. τρίχας καμήλου — *camel's hair.* Since it says *camel's hair,* and not *skin* or *fur,* we are to understand probably a coarse cloth

[1] On the relation of repentance to forgiveness, see Is. 1^{16-18} Ez. 33^{14-20} Hos. 14 Amos 5^{10-15} Jon. 3^{4-10}. In fact, the whole burden of prophecy is, that the nation is afflicted because of its sins, but that it needs only to repent.

[2] In its compound form, this is a Biblical word. The later language, Win. says, loves compound verbs which bring out something implied in the principal verb, 16. 4. B. *b.* The preposition here denotes that what is hidden comes *out* in confession.

made of the hair. There are examples moreover of the cloth, but not of the skin, being used in this way. ζώνην δερματίνην — *a leather girdle.* This is selected to describe Elijah's general appearance in 2 K. 1[8]. And it is a distinguishing mark of coarse dress, the girdle gathering in the loose robe about the waist being generally a place for luxury and display in dress. There is some reason to suppose, too, that the description, *hairy man,* may refer to Elijah's dress, which would be another correspondence. So RV. *marg.* καὶ ἔσθων ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον — *and was eating locusts and wild honey.*[1]

ἔσθων Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BL* Δ 33.

This food was wilderness food, and corresponds to the coarse dress. Together, they represent the spirit of the man, his contempt of ease and luxury, his revolt against a sinful generation, everything which caused him to dwell apart from men, and to contemn their manners. Locusts were an article of food especially allowed by the Levitical Law, and they are still eaten, prepared in various ways, by Eastern peoples. By *wild honey* may be meant that made by wild bees, and deposited in hollow trees, and other places in the woods; but as a matter of fact, the term μέλι ἄγριον seems to be applied generally to the sweet sap of certain trees.[2]

7. ἐκήρυσσε — *he was proclaiming.* The translation *preached* is especially out of place here, since what follows is not the general subject of the Baptist's preaching, but only that particular announcement of the coming of the Messiah which has led the writer to say that the proclamation by John in the wilderness was the beginning of the good news about Jesus Christ. He was making proclamation by virtue of his office as κήρυξ, the *herald* of the Messianic King. The whole work of the Baptist in this Gospel is treated as this ἀρχὴ εὐαγγελίου, a peculiarity which is obscured in our version.

ἐκήρυσσε continues the impfs. ἦν ἐνδεδυμένος and ἔσθων, denoting John's habit of life and speech in the wilderness.

ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου[3] — *he that is mightier than I* (RV.). This description of the coming one is common to all the Synoptics, but in Mt. and Lk. it is introduced between the statement of John's baptism and that of Jesus' baptism in such a way as to show more distinctly than in Mk.'s account that in these different baptisms is contained the point of the ἰσχυρότερος. Jesus is mightier than John by reason of his baptizing in the Holy Spirit. Mk.'s order shows this also, but not so distinctly. ὀπίσω μου — *after*

[1] ἐσθ(ί)ων is in the same construction as ἐνδεδυμένος, *was clothed . . . and was eating.* ἔσθων is a poetic form of the participle.
[2] See Meyer's Note.
[3] The art. indicates the definite person had in mind.

me.[1] οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς — *of whom I am not fit.* . . . This is a rhetorical statement of John's depreciation of himself by the side of the coming one. *He was not fit to tie his shoes.*

ἱκανός denotes any kind of sufficiency or fitness. *Fit* is a good translation in this case.

ἱμάντα τ. ὑποδημάτων — *the thong of the sandals.* The sandals protected the soles only, and were bound to the feet by a thong. κύψας. — This apparently superfluous addition about *stooping* serves to heighten the impression of the menial character of the act.

8. ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὕδατι — *I baptized you with water.*

Omit μὲν after ἐγὼ Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL 33, 69, 124, Lat. Vet. *mss.* Vulg. Memph. Pesh. etc. Omit ἐν before ὕδατι Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. ℵ BH Δ 16, 33, 56, 58, 258½ Vulg. etc.

Without the prep. the element ὕδατι becomes the instrument with which the act is performed. See Win. 31. 7. *d.*

ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ — *in Holy Spirit.* We are not to look for Christian terms, nor Christian uses of terms, in John's teaching. The line that divides them in this matter of the Holy Spirit is fine, but distinguishable. In the Jewish conception, personality is ascribed to the Holy Spirit only figuratively. In the Christian use, on the other hand, the impersonal sense is the figurative one, *e.g.* where it speaks of a pouring out of the Holy Spirit (Tit. 3^5 Acts $2^{17.\ 18}$). But the Spirit of God, or of Yahweh, or the Spirit of holiness, figures more or less largely in the O.T. as the animating power in the universe, as the inspiration of the prophet, the soldier, the king, and even the workman. And the possession of this Spirit by all men is prophesied as one of the marks of Israel's golden age. See Job 26^{13} 33^4 Ps. 104^{30} Is. 42^1 61^1 Mi. 3^8 Jud. 3^{10} 6^{34} Is. 11^2 Joel 2^{28} Is. 59^{21} Ex. 31^3. John's reference to the Holy Spirit, the רוּחַ קֹדֶשׁ, would not therefore be strange to his Jewish hearers. The absence of the art. indicates that the Spirit is regarded here as an element, a pervading presence, like the air, in the ocean of which we are submerged. The epithet *holy* would not in itself suggest moral quality, as it denoted what is invested with awe or reverence, and only secondarily and rarely, moral purity. But in the connection, since the Spirit is regarded here as the purifying element, it is evidently holiness in the moral sense that is predicated of it. The contrast between the work of the Baptist, and that of the Messiah, amounts to this, that the mightier one who is to follow John will do the real work of which the Baptist is able to perform only the sign. Water cleanses only the body, and represents figuratively the inward cleansing of the man. But the Holy Spirit is the element in which man is cleansed

[1] On the use of the adverb as a preposition, see Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*; Win. 54. 6.

inwardly and really, and it is this real baptism which the coming one was to perform. So far as it is given us in the Gospels, John's annunciation of the Messiah includes only the spiritual side of his anticipated work, and thus corresponds with the historical fact. But John's later doubt could have arisen probably only from the failure of Jesus to carry out the kingly part of the Jewish Messianic expectation. See Mt. 11^{2-19}. And it would be quite improbable that John would be so far separated from his time as to expect a purely spiritual Messiah.

In this paragraph, the signs of Mk.'s use of the Logia are not wanting. In the first place, O.T. citations are not common in Mk., but are quite characteristic of the Logia. And especially, the first part of the double quotation is, in Mk. $1^{2.3}$ Lk. 7^{27}, taken unquestionably from that source. The somewhat clumsy junction of the two passages is due apparently to bringing together what was separated in the original source. And Mt. 3^{12} Lk. 3^{17} show signs of being connected with what precedes in the original source. Mk. omits this, but gives what precedes with the identity of language that shows a common source for all three. For the verbal resemblance, implying the interdependence of the Synoptics, cf. Mk. 1^{8} Mt. 3^{8} Lk. 3^{4}, especially the change of τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, LXX, to αὐτοῦ in them all (Mk. 1^{4} Lk. 3^{3} Mk. $1^{5.6}$ Mt. $3^{4.5.6}$ Mk. $1^{7.8}$ Mt. 3^{11} Lk. 3^{16}).

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS

9–11. *Jesus is baptized by John. The Holy Spirit descends upon him, and the voice from heaven attests his Divine mission.*

Among the rest, Jesus comes to John's baptism. As he comes up out of the water, the Spirit descends on him in the form of a dove, preparing him for the work into which baptism has inaugurated him and signifying the gentleness of his reign; and a voice out of heaven proclaims him to be the Messianic Son of God who has won the special Divine favor.

With this paragraph begins the story of Jesus' life, but as it treats of events preceding his public ministry, the story of the baptism and of the temptation conforms to Mk.'s plan outside of that ministry, and is given briefly. *E.g.* Mk. does not consider it necessary to explain the evident difficulty attending the baptism of Jesus, as Mt. does, but gives only the fact. The visible form taken by the Spirit in its descent upon Jesus is evidently intended to be, like the voice, a theophany, attesting his mission. But the Spirit itself is intended to prepare him for his work, and so descends upon him now at the beginning of that work; cf. v.[12].

9. καὶ ἐγένετο ἦλθεν[1] — ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις — *in those days.* This is a general designation of time, and denotes here the period of John's ministry. Ναζαρὲτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας — *Nazareth of Galilee.* The explanatory τῆς Γαλιλαίας is for the information of the uninformed, and is a sign therefore, that this Gospel was written for Gentile readers. This is the only place in Mk. where Nazareth is mentioned, though Jesus is called a Nazarene in several places (1^{24} 10^{47} 16^{6} 14^{67}). It was the home of Jesus during his private life.

According to Lk. 1^{26} $2^{4.\,39.\,51}$ 4^{16}, this was owing to the previous residence of his parents in Nazareth. Mt., however, tells us that they took up their abode there after their return from Egypt, because they were turned aside from Bethlehem by the succession of Archelaus to his father's throne, which made Judæa no longer a safe place for them (2^{23}).

Nazareth was in the interior about midway between the Lake of Galilee and the Mediterranean. It is at present a town of about 5000 inhabitants, going by the name of En Nazira.[2]

εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην — *into the Jordan.* The prep. here coincides with the proper meaning of the verb, indicating that the form of the rite was immersion into the stream. The prep. ἐκ in the next verse, — going up *out of* the water, — implies the same.

10. καὶ εὐθὺς — *And immediately.*[3] ἀναβαίνων ἐκ — *going up out of.*

ἐκ (instead of ἀπὸ) Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL 13, 28, 33, 69, 124.

σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανούς — *the heavens opening,* not *opened.* The pres. part. denotes action in its progress, not completed action.[4]

ὡς περιστερὰν — *as a dove.* Lk. 3^{22} says that this resemblance was in bodily shape. And the language itself implies that. The dove was the emblem of guilelessness (Mt. 10^{16}). It was not a bird of prey. The appearance accords with the gentleness of Christ's reign. The descent of the Spirit was moreover a real event, while the appearance was only a vision. It was not merely a sign that here was a person endued with the Spirit, but a special influence beginning at the time, and preparing him for his new work. It was like the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost, preparing the disciples for their new work. Neither event implied in any way that the Spirit was not present in their lives before.[5] And

---

[1] This circumlocution for the simple verb is a translation of the Heb. וַיְהִי, and is foreign to the Greek idiom. The absence of a conj. between the two verbs is also a solecism.

[2] See Bib. Dic. On the form of the Greek name, see Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

[3] This adverb is one of the marks of the style of this Gospel. It is used by Mk. nearly twice as often as by Mt. and Lk. together. εὐθύς is substituted for εὐθέως in the critical texts in most of these passages in Mk. See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

[4] See Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses,* 125.

[5] On this office of the Spirit, cf. Is. 11^{2}.

we find in all the Synoptics mention that Jesus began his ministry under the impulsions of the Spirit. See Mt. $1^{2^{8}}$ Mk. 1^{12} Lk. $4^{1.14.18}$. This descent of the Spirit is moreover indicative of the meaning of our Lord's baptism. It has already been indicated that the real baptism, of which that in the water is only the sign, is a baptism in the Holy Spirit, and it is this which is signified by the baptism of Jesus, but without the accompanying repentance which belongs to the baptism of the rest of the people.

11. καὶ φωνὴ (ἐγένετο) — *And a voice (came).*

Omit ἐγένετο Tisch. (WH.) ℵ D ff.^{2}.

Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός — *Thou art my beloved Son.* This is one of the passages in the Synoptics which indicate that the Synoptical use of υἱός (τοῦ Θεοῦ) applied to Jesus, conforms to current Jewish usage, omitting the metaphysical Sonship, and including only the theocratic, or figurative meaning of the word. The aor. εὐδόκησα, *I came to take pleasure,* denotes the historical process by which God came to take pleasure in Jesus during his earthly life, not the eternal delight of the Father in the Son. The title here would denote one, therefore, who has been received into special love and favor by God, as Paul calls Timothy his son (1 Tim. 1^{2}). It accords with Lk.'s statement, that Jesus grew in favor with God and man (Lk. 2^{52}).[1] ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα — *in thee I came to take pleasure.*

ἐν σοὶ (instead of ἐν ᾧ) Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDLP 1, 13, 22, 33, 69, Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh.

THE TEMPTATION

12, 13. *Jesus retires into the wilderness, where he remains forty days, tempted by Satan, and attended by angels.*

Immediately after the baptism, Jesus is impelled by the Spirit who has taken possession of him into the wilderness. He remains there forty days, surrounded by the wild beasts, attended by angels, and tempted by Satan.

It is especially the story of the temptation, in the period preceding the public ministry, which is abbreviated by Mk. He gives us simply the fact of the temptation, the place, the wilderness, the time, forty days, and the descriptive touch, that he was with the wild beasts.

12. Καὶ εὐθὺς — *And immediately,* viz., *after the baptism.* This event, with its accompaniments, is of the nature of an inaugural

[1] On this use of the aor., see Win. 40, 2; Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses,* 55.

act. And it is followed immediately by his retirement into the wilderness. The time, the circumstances, and the nature of the temptations, all point to the probability that this retirement was for the purpose of meditation upon the work into which he had been inaugurated. Moreover, the Πνεῦμα, *the Spirit*, connects this with the account of the baptism. He begins now immediately to act under the impulsions of the Spirit which he has just received. ἐκβάλλει — *thrusts him out.* Mt. and Lk. both use the milder ἄγειν, *to lead*, to describe this. τὴν ἔρημον — *the wilderness.* This is the same general region in which the baptism took place. But, inasmuch as it was from the wilderness into the wilderness, and Mk. adds that he was with the wild beasts, it must mean that he penetrated still further into its solitudes.

13. Καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσεράκοντα ἡμέρας — *And he was in the wilderness forty days.* This period is given by both Mk. and Lk. as that of the temptation, though Mt. and Lk. both give us the three special temptations following the forty days. Mt. makes these the only temptations. πειραζόμενος — *tempted.* Used here of an actual solicitation to evil.

> The proper meaning of πειράζειν is *to try*, in the sense both of *attempt* and *test.* It is through the latter meaning that it comes to be applied to the test of character, whether by trial, or by solicitation to evil.

Σαταν**ᾶ** — *Satan.*[1] The name is Hebrew, but the personage does not figure much in O.T. narrative or discourse (1 Chr. 21^{1} Zech. $3^{1.2}$ Job 1^{6-9} $2^{1\text{sqq.}}$). In the N.T., he is represented, in accordance with current Jewish ideas, as the ruler of a kingdom of evil, having subjects and emissaries in the shape of demons, corresponding to the angels who act as God's messengers. His special function is to tempt men to evil. μετὰ τῶν θηρίων — *with the wild beasts.* The desert of Judæa is in parts wild and untamed, and abounds in beasts of the same description, such as the leopard, the bear, the wild boar, and the jackal. This descriptive touch, in which, just as with a word, the wildness and solitariness of the scene are brought before us, and equally, the omission of details of the temptation, are characteristics of Mk. The omission accords with the plan of his Gospel, but, also, with a certain objective quality belonging to it. See Introduction. διηκόνουν — *were ministering.*[2] This ministry, like the temptations, is represented in Mt. as taking place after the forty days. In our account, it is evidently an offset to the presence of the wild beasts. The visible things figuring in the scene were these beasts, but there were invisible presences as well, and these were ministering to him. Mk. does not tell us what the ministrations were. (Nor Mt.)

---

[1] A Heb. word, meaning the *Adversary.*
[2] The impf. describes the act as taking place during his stay in the wilderness.

The historicity of the account of the temptation is attacked with some plausibility. There are certain things about it on which a just historical criticism throws some doubt. There is a concreteness about the appearance of Satan, and of the angels, an air of visibility even, an impression of actual transportation through the air, and the introduction of a typical number (forty),[1] which can, however, easily be eliminated without touching the essential history. The account which has been preserved is evidently the pictorial and concrete story of what really took place within the soul of Jesus. But the temptations themselves, just because they represent the actual temptations of his later life, are a portrait, and not an imaginative picture. Holtzmann, in his Note on the passage, gives an admirable statement of the way in which the story corresponds to the real temptations of Jesus' life. But his argument that some one made up this story from those falls to the ground. It implies that some one understood that life better than any contemporary did understand it.

BEGINNING OF JESUS' MINISTRY

14–20. *After John's imprisonment, Jesus goes to Galilee, where he begins his ministry with the proclamation of the kingdom of God.*

After the imprisonment of John, Jesus departs into Galilee, where he begins his ministry with the proclamation of the good news of the kingdom of God, announcing the completion of the time for it. He finds Peter, Andrew, James, and John fishing in the lake of Galilee, and calls them to follow him and become fishers of men.

The order of events in the Synoptics is as follows:

MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
Delivering up of John (mere mention).	Delivering up of John (mere mention).	Delivering up of John (account), $3^{19.20}$.
Departure into Galilee.	Departure into Galilee.	Departure into Galilee.
Change of residence from Nazareth to Capernaum.		Beginning of teaching. Rejection at Nazareth. Coming to Capernaum. First miracles.
Beginning of Jesus' teaching.	Beginning of Jesus' teaching.	General teaching in synagogues in Galilee.
Call of first disciples.	Call of first disciples.	Call of first disciples.

The general order of events is the same. The evident intention of all is to connect the beginning of Jesus' ministry with the close

[1] Moses was in the mount forty days and forty nights (Ex. 24^{18}, 34^{28}), Elijah was in the wilderness forty days and forty nights (1 K. 19^{8}), and the Christophanies after the resurrection covered a period of forty days (Acts 1^{3}).

of John's work, though this is more evident in Mt. and Mk. than in Lk. They also mark at the beginning that it is a Galilean ministry. Mt. and Mk. tell us that it was the good news of the kingdom of God which was proclaimed by Jesus. Lk. also brings this in incidentally. He also introduces the rejection at Nazareth, evidently to account for the removal to Capernaum, and inserts the first miracles and a tour of preaching in Galilee before the call of the first disciples.

14. Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην — *And after the delivering up of John.* Mt. and Mk. assume this as a well known fact. Lk. tells the story of it (3^{18-20}). The others tell it later (Mk. 6^{17-29}). εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν — *into Galilee.* The connection of events is lost here in the brevity of the narrative. We are not told whether Jesus came into Galilee because of the imprisonment of John, and being there, began his ministry; or whether he began his ministry because John's ministry was ended, and chose Galilee as the scene for it. But, inasmuch as Jesus is represented by the Synoptics as continuing his work in Galilee until the end, it is evidently the latter. It is the demands of his work that take him to Galilee, and John's imprisonment is the occasion of his beginning his work, and only indirectly of his coming to Galilee. Moreover, they do not tell us why Galilee became the scene of his ministry. But the reason is evident. It was not the headquarters of Judaism; and events showed that Jesus' work would have been impossible in the stronghold of that unsympathetic faith. The fourth gospel tells of a preliminary work of eight months in Judæa, but the Synoptics are not only silent about it, but exclude it by their evident intention to represent this as the beginning of Jesus' work.

Galilee, Heb. גְּלִיל, *circle*, was originally the name of only a small circuit in one of the tribes inhabiting the northern section of Palestine. But in the time of our Lord, it had come to be applied to the Roman province including the whole territory of the four northern tribes. It was inhabited by a mixed population of Jews and Gentiles. See Jos. 20^{7} 21^{32} 1 K. 9^{11} 2 K. 15^{29}.

τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ — *glad tidings of God.*

Omit τῆς βασιλείας before τοῦ Θεοῦ Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BL. 1, 28, 33, 69, 209, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph.

The glad tidings of God is here the glad tidings from God, who is the author and sender of the message (subj. gen.). The good news itself, as the next verse shows, is that of the kingdom.

15. The words, καὶ λέγων, *and saying*, at the beginning of this verse, are to be omitted.

Omit καὶ λέγων Tisch. WH. (καὶ λέγων) ℵ one *ms.* of Lat. Vet., *Orig.* The insertion of καὶ λέγων is caused probably by the interpolation of τῆς βασιλείας in the preceding verse. The two go together.

πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός — *the time has been filled up, or completed. Fulfilled*, EV. is etymologically correct, but misleading, on account of its technical use to denote the accomplishment of expectation, promise, or prophecy. What is denoted here is the filling up of the time appointed for the coming of the Kingdom. This idea of an appointment of times, as well as of events, is thoroughly Jewish, referring all things to God. But to Jesus, who read the signs of the times (Mt. 16[3]), the language signified not only a theology, but a philosophy of events. The time revealed itself to him as ripe for the event.

ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ — *The kingdom of God has come near.* This message assumes evidently the existence of the idea of a kingdom of God among the Jews as a familiar thought. The announcement is, that this expected kingdom is at hand. Jesus does not announce a new fact, nor does he enter here upon any exposition of the nature of the kingdom, such as belonged to his later teaching, but simply announces the expected kingdom. He does not enter into the question of the difference between his spiritual kingdom, and the earthly kingdom of Jewish expectation. It is enough for his present purpose to announce it as a kingdom of God, and so to prepare the way for his call to repentance.

This announcement has to be located first, in the life and teaching of Jesus; secondly, in its relation to John's message; and thirdly, in current Jewish thought. In Jesus' own thought it is central; the kingdom of God is the subject of his teaching, and his object is to revolutionize the current idea; but that necessary change comes later. And moreover, in its connection with his later activity, it constitutes the announcement that the object of that was the establishment of the kingdom of God, and not merely the instruction of the people as to its nature. He was in his earthly work prophet, but also king. In its relation to John's message, this announcement of Jesus was the continuation and development of that, repeating his call to repentance, but substituting for his announcement of the coming One, that of the coming Kingdom. This is in accordance with Jesus' impersonal manner of treating his work. In its relation to current Jewish thought, this announcement fulfilled national expectations. This is evident from the reception given to Jesus by the nation, and from the uncanonical Jewish literature. This literature shows that the idea of Jewish deliverance and greatness, started in the prophetic books of the O.T., had not been allowed to lapse, but had gradually taken shape in the idea of a universal kingdom ruled by God himself, with the Messiah as his earthly vice-gerent, having Palestine as its centre and Jerusalem as its capital, and including in itself the righteous dead, who had been raised to

share its glories. And the attitude of the people during the life of Jesus shows that this had become at this time a subject of fervid popular hope and expectation.

μετανοεῖτε — repent. This is a continuation of John's message. *Καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ — and believe in the good news,* is, however, a distinct addition to that message. The *εὐαγγέλιον, good news,* is that the expected kingdom is at hand. Our word *gospel,* with its acquired meaning, is again singularly out of place here, as it inevitably obscures this obvious reference to the *εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ* just mentioned. *πιστεύετε, believe,* is another word that has to be evacuated of its theological sense. It is purely and simply belief of the message brought by Jesus, that the kingdom of God is at hand. If a crisis is coming, and men are to be prepared for it, the first requisite is, that they believe in its coming.[1]

16. *Καὶ παράγων παρὰ — And going along by.*[2]

Καὶ παράγων, instead of *περιπατῶν δὲ,* is the reading of Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL 13, 33, 69, 124, 346, Latt. Memph. Harcl. *marg.* etc.

τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας — sea of Galilee. This lake was the scene of Jesus' ministry. On its NW. shore were the towns of Capernaum, Magdala, Chorazin, and Bethsaida, referred to by Jesus himself as the district in which his mighty works were done. And its eastern shore, being uninhabited, was the place to which he used to retire to escape the multitudes. It was a lake 12 miles long, and 6 miles wide at the place of greatest width. The Jordan river enters it about 20 miles from its source. The use of *θάλασσα* in its name is uncommon in Greek.

In Lk., it is called commonly *ἡ λίμνη the lake;* once, Lk. 5^1, the *lake of Gennesareth,* from the district on its W. shore. J. 21^1, calls it *the sea of Tiberias,* from the principal city on its shore. The Heb. name is יָם כִּנֶּרֶת or כִּנְרוֹת sea of Chinnereth, or Chinneroth. See Nu. 34^{11} Jos. 13^{27} 12^3.

Σίμωνα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Σίμωνος, ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ — Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon casting a net in the sea.

(*τοῦ*) *Σίμωνος* instead of *αὐτοῦ,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BAE^{2}LM 1, 69, Lat. Vet. (a) Memph. A number of other texts read *αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σίμωνος. ἀμφιβάλλοντας* without *ἀμφίβληστρον,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BE*FGHKLSUV.

The repetition of the noun *Σίμωνος* in a case like this is characteristic of Mk. *ἀμφίβληστρον* is a thing thrown round another,

[1] The regular construction after *πιστεύειν* is the simple dat. In the N.T. we find this, but also *εἰς* with acc. and *ἐπὶ* with acc. or dat. This construction with *ἐν* is found only here, and in John 3^{15}.

[2] The common construction after *παράγων* is the simple dat. This repetition of *παρά* is not found elsewhere.

as a net about fish, clothes about a person. Hence ἀμφιβάλλοντας, used absolutely here, and suggesting the ἀμφίβληστρον, *the net*, as it certainly does, means to throw the net about the fish.[1]

17. δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου — *Come after me.*[2] *Following* is in the N.T. a figurative expression for discipleship, especially for that which involved personal attendance upon Jesus. This use of *follow* belongs to a general use by which it is applied to any personal attendance, as of a soldier. ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων — *fishers of men;* cf. Jer. 16^{16}. This is the first instance of the use of parabolic language, so common in the discourse of Jesus. The parable is not necessarily drawn out into a story, or a stated comparison; it may be expressed in a word as here. In it, Jesus simply brings together things of the outer and inner world, expressing the unfamiliar in the terms of the common and familiar. The effectiveness of it depends on the general likeness of the two worlds.

18. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα — *And immediately having left their nets.*

εὐθύς, instead of εὐθέως, Tisch. WH. ℵ L 33. Omit αὐτῶν after τὰ δίκτυα Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL, some *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph.

This immediate following is due probably to a previous acquaintance with Jesus and his teaching. They had been attracted to him before, and so were prepared to heed this apparently abrupt call to become his personal followers. John $1^{35\text{-}43}$ tells us that they became disciples a year before this, during the ministry of John the Baptist.

19. Καὶ προβὰς ὀλίγον — *And having gone forward a little.*

Omit ἐκεῖθεν *thence*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BDL 1, 28, 118, 124, 131, 209, Lat. Vet. (some *mss.*) Memph. Pesh. etc.

Ἰάκωβον — *James* — the O.T. *Jacob.* He is named commonly before John, implying that he was the older brother. Ζεβεδαίου — *Zebedee.* Known only as the father of his two sons, and mentioned only in connection with the present event (Mt. 4^{21}). The mother was Salome.[3] καὶ αὐτοὺς — *who also*, EV., gives the sense of these words. They express the identity of the occupation of these two with that of Peter and Andrew. They were also in their fishermen's boat, though they were mending their nets, instead of casting them. καταρτίζοντας — *mending.*[4]

---

[1] Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* explains the word as meaning *to throw about*, first in one place, and then in another.

[2] Δεῦτε is a plural imperative, formed from the adv. δεῦρο. The use of the adv. as a prep., ὀπίσω μου, is a sign of the Hellenistic Greek of the N.T. (Win. 54, 6).

[3] Cf. Mt. 27^{56} with Mk. 15^{40}.

[4] Καταρτίζειν means in general to put in complete order, and may be applied either to the original fitting out, or to repairs.

20. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς — *And immediately he called them.* The immediateness here attaches to the call itself, in the former case to the response. He called them immediately, *i.e.*, without any preliminary or preparatory act on his part.

εὐθὺς is here again substituted for εὐθέως. In brief it is so substituted in most of the cases where it is used in Mk. It is unnecessary to cite the authorities in each case.

ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω μου — *they went away after him.* This is a very good illustration of the way in which this act of following acquires its figurative meaning, and in which also the original and figurative meanings may be combined. Here the outward act was going away after Jesus, but the meaning of it was following in the sense of discipleship.

The accounts of this call in the Synoptics furnish a good example of the varying relations of these gospels. Between Mt. 4^{18-22} and Mk., there is the close verbal resemblance which can be explained only by their interdependence. Lk., on the other hand, presents a different version, evidently from an independent source, and it differs from the others just as we should expect independent accounts of the same event to differ. The points of difference in Lk.'s account are: (*a*) he found the boats empty; (*b*) the fishermen belonging to both were washing their nets; (*c*) the different occasion of the promise about catching men, which is in this case addressed to Peter alone; (*d*) the introduction of the discourse to the multitude from the boat, and of the miraculous draught of fishes, which can be brought into the account of Mt. and Mk., but not in the connection given by Lk.; (*e*) he makes the whole a single event in which all four men participated, while Mt. and Mk. give two calls addressed successively and independently to the men in each boat.

THE FIRST MIRACLE

21–28. *Healing of a demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum.*

Jesus comes to Capernaum, and teaches in the Synagogue in such a way as to impress the people with the authority of his utterance, and with the marked difference in this respect between himself and the Scribes. The impression is deepened by his authority over demons displayed in healing a demoniac in the synagogue, and his fame travels over the surrounding country.

This is the first miracle recorded in Mk. and Lk. And it is significant that the miracle selected, the casting out of demons,

is the representative miracle in Mk.[1] The scene is in the Synagogue at Capernaum. This is another beginning, the synagogue being the chosen place for Jesus' teaching in the early part of his ministry. The journey through Galilee, which immediately followed this event, is described as a preaching tour in the synagogues. The synagogue is again the scene in 3^1, and in 6^2. After that it drops out, and probably this means that the freedom of the synagogue was allowed him only at first. The effect of the miracle on the people, and Jesus' refusal to follow up this effect, his evident desire to avoid the notoriety accompanying it, are beginnings of a more important character. They show us at the very outset the kind of success which he had, and the estimate which he placed upon it. And we also get the impression which Jesus' teaching made upon the people from the very start, in which it is expressly contrasted with that of the Scribes. He was without outward authority, while they were the acknowledged teachers of the nation; and yet the impression which his teaching made and theirs failed to make, was that of authority. Holtzmann remarks that the sketchiness peculiar to Mk.'s opening verses ends here, and gives place in this account to greater amplitude of narration.

21. Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ — *And they enter into Capernaum.*

Καφαρναούμ Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD 33, 69, Latt. Memph. WH. App. p. 160, say that Καπερναούμ is a distinctly Syrian corruption of the name. Καφαρναούμ is substituted by Tisch. Treg. WH. in every place in which the name occurs.

Mk. does not tell us that Capernaum became the residence of Jesus at this time. He does not even tell of his leaving Nazareth, though he has implied, v. 9, that that was his home at the time of the baptism. See Mt. 4^{13} Lk. $4^{16\text{-}31}$. Mt. and Lk. have very much more the appearance of ordered narration, locating what is introduced into the narrative. Capernaum is on the NW. shore of the Lake of Galilee, though there is a dispute as to its more exact location. It does not appear in the O.T.

The general opinion identifies Capernaum with Tell Hum, about three miles S. of the place where the river enters the lake. Some three miles further S., is Khan Minyeh, the site defended by Dr. Robinson. The only considerable ruins are at Tell Hum.

---

[1] See v.[39] 6^7; cf. Mt. 10^1 Lk. 9^1.

Καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν[1] — *And immediately on the Sabbath.* Immediately on his coming into Capernaum, on the first Sabbath, he began his teaching in the synagogue. ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν[2] — *he was teaching in the synagogue.*

Omit εἰσελθών, *having entered*, before εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν Tisch. (Treg.) WH. *marg.* ℵ CL 28, 69, 346, Memph. (2 edd.) Pesh. etc. The external evidence is not conclusive, but εἰσελθών seems to be an emendation of a form of expression characteristic of Mk.; cf. v.[39] (Tisch. Treg. WH. RV.). The construction ἐδίδασκεν εἰς is very nearly equivalent to the dat. of indir. obj., and denotes the direction of the act. See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*, εἰς, I, A, 5, b.

The provision of the synagogue service, which made it available for Jesus' purpose, and caused him to choose that as one of his means of obtaining access to the people, was the freedom of its service. The performance of public worship or instruction was not committed to any officials, but to any one selected for the purpose by the ἀρχισυνάγωγος, *the ruler of the synagogue.* For an example of the way in which Jesus connected this teaching with the Scripture reading, see Lk. 4[16-30].

The synagogue was the formal assembly in Jewish towns, or in the Jewish quarters of the Gentile cities, for instruction in the law. No provision for such an institution was made in the law itself, and it dates probably from the exile. The service consisted of prayer, reading of Scripture, and exposition by any rabbi, or other person present and competent to teach. There was a body of elders, generally the civic authorities in Jewish towns, who had charge of the general affairs of the synagogue. The special officers were an ἀρχισυνάγωγος, or *synagogue ruler*, who had charge of the synagogue worship, appointing readers and exhorters; the alms-receivers; and the ὑπηρέται, whose chief function was to bring forth the Scriptures for public worship, and to return them to their place, but who, in general, were the subordinate functionaries, the beadles of the congregation.

22. Καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο — *And they were astonished.* A strong descriptive word for amazement, meaning strictly *to strike a person out of his senses* by some strong feeling, such as fear, wonder, or even joy. διδαχῇ — *teaching* (RV.) not *doctrine* (AV.). The reason given for their astonishment concerned the manner of his teaching, not its substance. ἐδίδασκεν — *he was teaching*, not *he taught* (EV.). ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων — *as having authority* (RV.).

---

[1] Heb. שַׁבָּת, a rest-day. This dat. plur. of the third declension is frequent in the N.T., not in the Sept. The plural is used frequently in the N.T. for a single Sabbath, a use either corresponding to the plur. of festivals, τὰ ἐγκαίνια etc., or coming from the emphatic Chald. form שַׁבְּתָא.

[2] This use of συναγωγή to denote an assembly, or the place of assemblage, belongs to the N.T. In the Gr., it denotes the act of assembling.

What this authority was, the contrast with the Scribes indicates. They had, and constantly cited, external authority for their teaching. They said, *Rabbi — says this.* His authority then, which they did not have, was internal, proceeding from vision. The difficulty with the Scribes, and with men of their class, is that they carry external authority into the realm of intuitive truth.

οἱ γραμματεῖς — *the Scribes.*[1] These were the men with whom Jesus had his chief controversy. They were the authors of the tradition, which he claimed made void the word of God. $7^{9,13}$. The Pharisees were the party of adherents to this traditional law, whom they gathered about themselves. Their function was that of interpreters and expounders of the law, and especially the decision of difficult cases under its different commands. They sought in this way to apply such a general law as the Sabbath, *e.g.* to all possible cases that could arise under it, in such a way as to safeguard it against possible violation. They were ignorant of the modern historical interpretation, and of Jesus' spiritual exposition, and they systematized the allegorical method. To this body of casuistry and essentially false interpretation they gave an authority equal to that of Scripture, and even superior to it. The consequence was that they built up a system, in which the spiritual element of the O.T. was minimized, and the external, formal, positive element was emphasized. See Schürer on Scribism, II. 1, 25.

23. Καὶ εὐθὺς — *And immediately.*

Insert εὐθὺς between Καὶ and ἦν Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL 1, 33, 131, 209, Memph. etc.

εὐθὺς — *immediately*, here and in v.[21], shows the rapid sequence of events after he entered Capernaum. He was no sooner in the city than he entered the synagogue, and no sooner in the synagogue than this demoniac appeared.

ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ — *in an unclean spirit.* The prep. is used to denote possession by the evil spirit, in the same way as ἐν Χριστῷ, *in Christ*, ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ, *in the Holy Spirit*, denote the intimate connection between the Christian and Christ, or the Holy Spirit. The two beings are conceived as somehow ensphering each other, and sometimes one, sometimes the other, is said to enclose the being identified with it. The demon, *e.g.*, is said to be in the man, or the man in the demon. In this case, the man is said to be in the unclean spirit, and v. 27, the unclean spirit is said to

[1] In the Gr., γραμματεύς denotes a *clerk* or *recorder*, and is applied to an official class whose general function corresponds to that of the clerks of judicial and representative bodies. Among the Jews, it meant a *lettered man*, one acquainted with the sacred writings. They are called also νομικοί, *lawyers*, or men versed in the law; νομοδιδάσκαλοι, *teachers of the law;* ἱερογραμματεῖς, because they dealt with the sacred writings; and Rabbis, *great ones*.

come out of him. πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον is used interchangeably with δαιμόνιον, *demon* (AV. *devil*), to designate these spirits.[1] Beelzebul is their chief, or Satan. See $3^{22.23}$.

The reality of demoniacal possession is a matter of doubt. The serious argument against it is, that the phenomena are mostly natural, not supernatural. It was the unscientific habit of the ancient mind to account for abnormal and uncanny things, such as lunacy and epilepsy, supernaturally. And in such cases, outside of the Bible, we accept the facts, but ascribe them to natural causes. Another serious difficulty is that lunacy and epilepsy are common in the East, as elsewhere, and yet, unless these are cases, we do not find Jesus healing these disorders as such, but only cases of demoniacal possession in which these were symptoms. The dilemma is very curious. Outside the N.T., no demoniacal possession, but only lunacy and epilepsy; in the N.T., no cases of lunacy and epilepsy proper, but only demoniacal possession. See, however, Weiss, *Life of Jesus*, III. 6.

24. καὶ ἀνέκραξε — *and he cried out.*[2] (Ἔα) τί ἡμῖν καί σοι; — *What to us and to thee*, literally. *What have we in common which gives you the right to interfere with us?*

Omit Ἔα Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* BD 157, Latt. Pesh. Memph. etc.

ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; — *did you come to destroy us?* The demons were afraid that Jesus was not only going to cast them out, but to remand them to the torments of Gehenna. See Mt. 8^{29} Lk. 8^{31}. οἶδά σε τίς εἶ — *I know thee who thou art.* The change from the plural ἡμῖν, *to us*, to the sing. οἶδα, *I know*, simply brings us back to the person speaking for himself, whereas in the ἡμῖν, the demon speaks for his class. The question is, what have *we demons* to do with you? The statement of the demoniac, *I know thee*, is inspired by the demon, and is so explained in v.[34].

οἴδαμεν is substituted for οἶδα by Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. *marg.* ℵ L Δ Memph. etc. A probable emendation to make this agree with the plur. ἡμῖν.

ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ — *the holy one of God.* The one consecrated to God, and employed in his service.[3] See J. 10^{36}. It gives here the reason why the demon feared that a part of Jesus' mission (ἦλθες) was to dismiss them to their place.

25. Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, φιμώθητι — *And Jesus charged him sharply, Be still.*[4]

Omit λέγων, *saying*, T. (WH.) ℵ A*. It is inserted apparently to get over the roughness of ἐπετίμησεν alone.

---

[1] This use of πνεῦμα belongs to Biblical Greek.
[2] The first aor. is "rare and late." Sec. aor. ἀνέκραγον common.
[3] The only other place in which this term is applied to Jesus is John 6^{69} (Tisch. Treg. WH. RV.).
[4] For other examples of this meaning of ἐπιτιμᾷν, see Mk. 8^{30} 3^{12} Mt. 12^{16}.

φιμώθητι — literally, *be muzzled.*[1] Its metaphorical use to denote putting to silence in other ways belongs to later Greek.

26. σπαράξαν — *having convulsed him.* It is used in medical writers of the convulsive action of the stomach in retching. And it is evidently in this secondary sense of *convulsing* that the word is used here, not of actual *tearing* or *lacerating.* φωνήσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ — *having cried with a great cry.*

Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL 33, etc. φωνήσαν instead of κράξαν.

27. ὥστε συζητεῖν αὐτούς — *so that they discussed.*

αὐτούς, instead of πρὸς αὐτούς (ἑαυτούς) Tisch. WH. ℵ B and *mss.* of Lat. Vet.

συζητεῖν — *to discuss, or question.*[2] Τί ἐστι τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν· καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι, etc. — *What is this? A new teaching according to authority. And he commands,* etc.

διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν is the reading of Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL 33, 102.

The critical texts which adopt the above reading, with the exception of Tisch., punctuate differently. They connect κατ' ἐξουσίαν with what follows, so that it reads, *a new teaching; with authority he commands even the unclean spirits.* But according to v.[22], this new element of authority resides in the teaching itself, so that κατ' ἐξουσίαν belongs more naturally with διδαχὴ καινὴ. This new, authoritative teaching makes the first ground of their astonishment. And in addition to this, not a part of it, is their astonishment at the submission of the spirits to his command.

28. εὐθύς, *immediately.* This is the third instance of this word in this short paragraph. Lk., in spite of his general verbal resemblance to Mk., omits it in every case. Here it shows the immediateness of the fame which followed such exhibitions of authority. πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον — *everywhere, into all the neighborhood.*[3]

Insert πανταχοῦ Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BCL 69, Lat. Vet. (some *mss.*), Memph.

τῆς Γαλιλαίας is partitive gen., denoting the part of Galilee that lay about Capernaum.

Lk. is parallel to Mk. here (4^{31-37}), and the minute verbal resemblance again shows obvious interdependence. The secondary character of Lk.'s account appears unmistakably in the report of the popular discussion that followed the miracle.

---

[1] For instances of the literal meaning, see 1 Cor. 9^{9} 1 Tim. 5^{18}.

[2] This is a Biblical meaning. In Greek, it is restricted to its proper sense, *to search together.* The N.T. meaning is a legitimate derivation from that.

[3] The proper ending with verbs of motion is οι, not ου. The N.T. Greek does not observe this distinction, but invariably uses the ending ου. Our confusion of *where* and *whither.* The use of ἡ περίχωρος with γῆ understood is Biblical.

A POPULAR UPRISING

29–34. *Healing of Peter's wife's mother, followed by a popular uprising, bringing all the sick of the city to him, at the close of the legal Sabbath.*

This story is a continuation of the account of this first Sabbath in Capernaum. The miracle in the synagogue is followed by the healing at Peter's house, and at evening, the whole population, who have been restrained only by their fear of breaking the Sabbath, gather at the house, bringing all their sick to him.

29. Καὶ εὐθὺς — *And immediately.* The characteristic use of this word continues in this paragraph. See v.[30]. It is omitted in the parallel accounts. The whole series, taken together, shows how straight events marched from his first appearance in Capernaum to the climax of v.[32. 33]. These two, v.[29] and [30], show more particularly the immediateness with which the miracle at Peter's house succeeded that in the synagogue. One miracle follows another, until finally the whole city bring their sick to him. ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον — *having gone out, they came.*

ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον Tisch. WH. *txt.* RV. *txt.* ℵ ACL ΓΔΠ Vulg. Memph. Pesh. Harcl. *txt.* ἐξελθὼν ἦλθεν, *having gone out, he came,* Treg. WH. *marg.* RV. *marg.* BD 1, 22, 69, 124, 131, 209, 346, Lat. Vet. 2 *mss.* of Vulg. Harcl. *marg.*

ἦλθον — *they came.* The subj. remains the same as in v.[21], viz. Jesus and his disciples, whose call to follow him is given in v.[16-20]. But, since Simon and Andrew are mentioned, the writer adds James and John specifically, in order to avoid the possible inference that only Simon and Andrew are meant. The touch of the eyewitness, Peter, is seen here.

Holtzmann, by coupling this with Jesus' instruction to his disciples (6[10]), that they should stay in any house that they entered, infers that Peter's house became Jesus' residence. But that injunction does not apply here, as it belongs to Jesus' instructions about their conduct when they entered a town for only a short stay during a missionary journey.

30. κατέκειτο πυρέσσουσα — *was lying prostrate with a fever.* The language is descriptive, the prep. in κατέκειτο denoting the prostration of disease, and the part. the fire of fever. The imperf. denotes that this was her state at the time.

31. ἤγειρεν — *raised her,* i.e. *he made her sit up.*[1] καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός — *and the fever left her.*

Omit εὐθέως Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL 1, 28, 33, 118, 131, 209, Memph. etc.

[1] The vb. in Greek means to *rouse,* not to *raise.*

διηκόνει αὐτοῖς — *she served,* or *waited on them.* This is added to show the reality and completeness of her recovery.

32. Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης — *And evening having come.* The Jewish day closed at evening, and as this was the Sabbath, this became the signal for the people, who had been restrained before by the strict Rabbinical interpretation of the Sabbath law, to bring their sick to him.[1] Mk. adds ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος, *when the sun set,* in order to make it more definite that the day was closed, ὀψία being a general term including time before sunset, whereas the day closed with the going down of the sun. It is significant that Mt., who does not mention the Sabbath, omits also the sunset.

τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους — *those possessed with demons,* not *devils,* AV.[2] διάβολος is the word for *devil,* and it is never applied to the evil spirits, though they are represented as subjects of the devil; cf. on v.[23]. In the Gospels, demoniacs are placed in a class by themselves, separate from those afflicted with ordinary diseases. In this case, the people brought demoniacs especially, because it was the healing of a demoniac that had so excited them.

δαίμων is not a word of bad omen in Greek. In the earlier language, it is used interchangeably with θεός, though more commonly it denotes the abstract notion of deity. In the later language, it denotes inferior deities, beings between God and man.

33. ἦν ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη — *all the city was gathered.*[3] It was all the sick that were brought, and all the city that gathered at the door. The miracle in the synagogue caused a popular uprising.

34. πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας . . . δαιμόνια πολλὰ — *many sick,* and *many demons.* It is held by most (Meyer, Weiss, Holtzmann, and others) that the *many* here is in contrast with the *all* of v.[32]. But it does not mean necessarily that it was only many, out of the all who were brought to him, who were healed. It may mean equally well that the number included in the all was not few but many. *Many sick* is not necessarily the same as *many of the sick.* The latter requires the partitive gen. for its exact expression. Such a partial healing would not be inexplicable, since the condition of faith required by Jesus might not be present in all cases. But the explanation is unnecessary.

Mt. 8[16] says that they brought many demoniacs, and he cast out the demons, and healed all the sick. Lk. says that all who had sick persons brought them, and he healed them, laying his hand on each one; and that demons went out of many. In Lk.'s account certainly, it is not intended to contrast the cure of many demoniacs with that of all the sick.

---

[1] See Lk. 13[14].

[2] RV. text retains *devils,* marg. *demons.* American Revisers substitute *demons* in text in all passages where δαίμων, δαιμόνιον, or δαιμονίζομαι occurs.

[3] The double compound ἐπισυνηγμένη is not found in classical Greek, though the simple compound συνάγειν is common. ἐπι adds to the word the idea of gathering *upon* or *towards* some point.

Καὶ οὐκ ἤφιε λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια, ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτόν[1] — *And he did not suffer the demons to speak, because they knew him.* λαλεῖν is used in the N.T. with a direct obj., but not with ὅτι. Where the words follow, they are introduced with λέγων, *saying;* cf. Mt. 23[1] Mk. 6[50] Lk. 24[6]. Where ὅτι is used, without any intervening word, it is causal.[2] The demons are said to speak, instead of the man, because the knowledge of Jesus is attributable to the demon, and not to the man. The man is represented as inhabited by an alien spirit, who used his organs of speech.

Χριστὸν εἶναι — *to be the Christ*, after ἤδεισαν αὐτόν, *they knew him*, (WH.) RV. *marg.* ℵ[c] BCGLM 1, 28, 33, 69, 124, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. and Vulg. Memph. Harcl. etc. Omitted by Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. text, ℵ* ADEFKSUV Latt. Pesh. etc. Probable insertion from Lk. 4[41].

This knowledge is one of the arguments for the supernaturalism of these cases, and one of the difficulties in the way of the naturalistic explanation of them. And it is not to be set aside lightly. But the reflections of the evangelists are to be distinguished from their statement of facts. And a supernatural cause once posited naturally gathers supernatural phenomena.

JESUS' POLICY OF SILENCE

35–45. *Jesus makes a tour of Galilee, preaching and healing. Cure of a leper.*

After the popular uprising following Jesus' first day's ministry in Capernaum, he withdraws to a solitary place to pray. His disciples beseech him to return to take advantage of his popularity, but Jesus refuses, saying that he came out to proclaim the kingdom elsewhere. In pursuance of the same policy, he enjoins silence on a leper whom he heals during this tour of Galilee, and the man's disobedience forces him to retire from the towns and synagogues to uninhabited places, whither the people follow him. This section is of first-rate importance in this narrative of the beginning of Jesus' ministry. He appears at the beginning as a miracle worker, and maintains that character consistently to the end of the Galilean ministry. But here, at the very beginning, he is represented as maintaining whatever secrecy is possible about his miracles, and avoiding the notoriety attaching to them. And

[1] ἤφιε is a rare form of the impf. of ἀφίημι, from ἀφίω, with the augment on the prep. See Win. 14. 3. b.

[2] Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* explains this as equivalent to περὶ τούτου ὅτι, *concerning this, that.* But it supposes a difficulty requiring an explanation, whereas the causal sense of ὅτι leaves nothing to explain.

the only account of a miracle in this first missionary journey is that of one in which disobedience to this injunction of secrecy made it impossible for him to continue his work in the towns, so that he was forced to retire into solitary places. The reason for this secrecy about what was nevertheless a prominent feature of his work is to be found in the fact that he sought from men a faith which was hindered, not helped, by external signs.

The miracles lent themselves also to false, outward conceptions of himself and his work. And evidently they had their raison d'être in themselves, and not in any effect which they were intended to produce. They are primarily works of benevolence, not of supernaturalism.

35. πρωὶ ἔννυχα λίαν — *in the morning, a great while before day.* RV. Literally, *very much at night.*[1]

ἔννυχα, instead of ἔννυχον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL 1, 28, 33, 131, 209, etc.

πρωΐ denotes the last watch of the night from three to six, and ἔννυχα λίαν, the part of this watch which reached back very much into the night. ἔρημον τόπον — *a solitary place.* The story points to some place of this kind near Capernaum. προσηύχετο — *he was praying.* The imperf. denotes what he was doing when Simon and the rest pursued and found him. We are not told the subjects of Jesus' prayers, except in Gethsemane. But the occasions are significant. The only other in Mt. and Mk. is after the miracle of feeding the 5000, where the fourth Gospel explains the urgency of Jesus to get rid of both disciples and multitude by the statement that they are about to force him to be a king. Lk. adds to these three, which are all of which we have an account in Mt. and Mk., several others of less significance. But he gives one of the same character. After the healing of the leper, Jesus is represented in that Gospel as not only retreating before the sudden access of his popularity, but as praying. One of these cases might not be enough to warrant the conclusion, but taken together they indicate that Jesus was praying that he might not be ensnared by this popularity, or in any way induced to accept the ways of ease instead of duty.

36. κατεδίωξεν αὐτόν — *pursued him closely.* See Liddell and Scott, Gr. Lex. The EV., *followed after*, is inadequate. κατά, as in our expression, *to hunt down*, gives the idea of hard, persistent search. The word occurs only here in the N.T. καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ

[1] ἔννυχος is properly an adj. meaning *nocturnal.* This is the only place where it occurs in the N.T., and its adverbial use is quite late.

— and those with him. Andrew, James, and John are meant. See v.[29].

37. Καὶ εὗρον αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν — *And they found him and say.*

εὗρον αὐτὸν καὶ, instead of εὑρόντες αὐτόν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL one *ms.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. etc.

ὅτι πάντες ζητοῦσί σε — *that all are seeking for thee.*[1] All the people of Capernaum, which he has just left, are meant. The disciples bring him the news that the excitement of the previous day is not abated, and are anxious evidently that he should not fail to follow up so notable a success.

38. Ἄγωμεν ἀλλαχοῦ — *let us go elsewhere.*[2]

ἀλλαχοῦ, *elsewhere,* is inserted by Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC*L 33, Memph. etc.

ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις — *neighboring towns.* The noun denotes something between a village and a city, approximating a city in size, but unwalled.[3]

εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον — *for for this did I come out.* The context shows plainly that he refers to his coming out of Capernaum, which has been mentioned just before, v.[35]. Not out of heaven, an expression and idea which belong to the fourth Gospel, and are not found in the Synoptics. Moreover, the purpose to preach to other towns than Capernaum is singularly inapposite as a statement of the object of his coming into the world. It is commensurate with his leaving Capernaum, but not with his leaving heaven. He did not wish to confine himself to one place, and his coming out as he did, early, would enable him to escape the importunity of the people, who sought to confine him to this.

39. Καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν — *And he came, preaching to their synagogues, into all Galilee, and casting out demons.*

ἦλθεν εἰς, instead of ἦν ἐν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Memph. The construction with this reading is not without difficulty, especially the use of εἰς with κηρύσσων, to denote those to whom the proclamation is made. And probably, this original form of the text was changed to avoid this roughness. But, while the Lexicons consider it necessary to explain this use of εἰς, they admit it. This leaves the second εἰς with ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν to depend on ἦλθεν.

καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων — *and casting out the demons.* Before, vv.[32-34], this miracle is separated from the rest. Here it is mentioned by itself without the rest in such a way as to represent

---

[1] σε, *thee,* turns this into direct discourse. An incongruous blending of direct and indirect discourse, more or less common in N.T., as in other Greek.

[2] On this termination, ου instead of οι, see footnote on πανταχοῦ v.[28]. This word does not occur elsewhere in N.T.

[3] κωμόπολις does not occur elsewhere in N.T. It belongs to the later Greek.

them. Although it is the only miracle mentioned, it was evidently not the only one performed. It is selected as the great and representative miracle. And it is not improbable that it was, so to speak, our Lord's favorite miracle, because here the physical and spiritual parts of his work coincided.[1]

40. λέπρος — *a leper.* The reason for introducing this one miracle, among the many belonging to this journey, is told in v.[45]. It turned him aside from his original purpose of visiting the neighboring towns, and forced him into retirement. παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν, λέγων αὐτῷ — *beseeching him and kneeling, saying to him.*[2]

Omit αὐτὸν after γονυπετῶν, Tisch. WH. ℵ L 1, 209, some *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. etc. Omit καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτὸν Treg. *marg.* (Treg.) RV. *marg.* (WH.) BDG Γ 124, some *mss.* of Lat. Vet. etc. Omit καὶ before λέγων Tisch. WH. ℵ* B 69* Memph. etc.

With this reading, λέγων, saying, is not co-ordinate with παρακαλῶν and γονυπετῶν, but subordinate to them. ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι — *if thou wilt, thou canst.* He does not doubt the ability, but the willingness of Jesus. This willingness is the point that all petition seeks to carry, the doubt that it seeks to remove. καθαρίσαι — *cleanse.* Leprosy was not only a repulsive and dangerous disease, but it made a man unclean ceremonially, so that lepers were cut off from intercourse with their fellows, and assigned a place by themselves outside the gates.[3] It was a part of Jesus' disregard of the merely ceremonial part of the law that he allowed these unclean persons to approach him. It did not accord with his nature to obtrude this disregard, but he had no scruples whenever the law interfered with higher things.

41. Καὶ σπλαγχνισθείς, ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα — *And having been moved with compassion he stretched out his hand.*[4]

Καί, instead of Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. etc.

ἥψατο αὐτοῦ — *he touched him.* The touch, or laying on of the hand, was the natural symbolical action accompanying the cure, being the sign of any benediction, common to Jews and Christians.[5]

42. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν . . . ἡ λέπρα — *And immediately the leprosy departed.*

Omit εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ before εὐθὺς Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL 16, 69, 102, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh. etc.

---

[1] See $3^{11.\ 15.\ 22.\ 67.\ 13}$.

[2] γονυπετῶν belongs to later Greek.

[3] See Lev. $13^{45.\ 46}$.

[4] The meaning and form of σπλαγχνίζομαι are late. σπλαγχνεύω is the proper form, and its meaning is to eat the inwards of a victim after sacrifice, or to obtain auguries from them. The meaning *compassionate* comes from the Heb., which regarded the σπλάγχνα, the inwards, as the seat of pity and tenderness.

[5] See 10^{16} Acts 8^{18} 9^{17} 13^{3} 1 Tim. 4^{14} 2 Tim. 1^{6}.

εὐθὺς denotes the immediateness, and so the miraculousness of the cure. Mt. tells of twelve cures, in two of which he specifies immediateness; Mk. of thirteen, in six of which he describes the cure as immediate; and Lk. of fourteen, in seven of which he uses the word παραχρῆμα, *on the spot*. This includes only the cases in which either this word or εὐθύς is used. There are others, in which such a phrase as *from that hour* is used. And not only the immediateness, but the completeness, of the cure is frequently dwelt upon.[1]

43. ἐμβριμησάμενος — AV. *he straitly charged him*. RV. *strictly charged him*. Either of these is an inadequate translation. The N.T. meaning of the word is *to be angry*, but the difficulty is to find any cause for anger. Weiss finds it in the fact that the man had broken the wholesome law forbidding persons with this dangerous disease from coming into contact with their fellows, and attributes Jesus' urgency to get rid of him to the same cause. Consistently with this, he supposes that the cure was only gradual, and that the leper was still liable to infect others when he left Jesus. Mk.'s story becomes secondary of course, as it is plainly inconsistent with this hypothesis. Weiss thinks that Mk. introduces this word inadvertently, as it shows plainly a different version of the whole affair. The original account he finds in Mt. 8^{2-4}. But it is Mk. himself who betrays this by his inadvertent ἐμβριμησάμενος. Verily, this is to hang much on a small peg. If anywhere, Mk. shows here the indubitable marks of originality. And how much more probable is his account of Jesus' urgency to get rid of the man than Weiss's, who lays it to the danger of infection, and so to an imperfect cure. Mk., on the other hand, attributes it to our Lord's dread of the notoriety caused by his miracles. Weiss's whole theory of the gradualness of Jesus' cures, and of his regard for the Levitical law, of which this makes a part, is unsupported. But neither is Meyer's explanation, that he foresaw the man's disobedience, quite probable. It puts its finger on the source of the trouble, but it mistakes in making it foresight on the part of Jesus. Our Lord is vexed at the whole situation of which the man makes a part, at the clamor over the mere externals of his work, and this is expressed in some sharp word, with which he accompanies the thrusting of him out of the house (or synagogue). It may be translated, *having spoken sternly to him*.[2] It does not denote the tone with which Jesus spoke the words given here, as the action of the verb and participle are apparently distinct. But it denotes some utterance accompanying the ἐξέβαλεν, and partaking of its spirit.

---

[1] See $1^{31.44}$ 2^{12} Mt. 12^{18} Mk. 5^{29} Mt. $9^{32.33}$ Mk. 7^{35}.

[2] See Mt. 9^{30} Mk. 14^{5} J. $11^{33.38}$ for the other instances of N.T. use of word. Of these, Mt. 9^{30} shares the ambiguity of this passage. The original meaning is *to snort*, which certainly makes room for it to denote an expression of feeling, as well as the feeling itself.

ἐξέβαλεν — AV. *sent him away.* RV. *sent him out.* Both inadequate again. *Thrust,* or *put him out,* conveys the idea. This, as well as ἐμβριμησάμενος, indicates the urgency of Jesus' action. He wishes to repress the natural, but misguided, impulse of the leper to stay and contribute to the adulation and excitement gathering about Jesus.

44. Ὅρα, μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς — *Take heed lest you say anything to anybody.*[1] The reason for this prohibition is not the urgency of his performance of the legal requirements, with which nothing must be allowed to interfere, but the danger in which Jesus stood of just the results which followed his disobedience. His spreading the story prevented Jesus' work in public, and forced him into retirement, and so Jesus forbade his telling it. And the words in which he warned him off this dangerous ground are made as sharp as possible. σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκε — *show thyself to the priest, and offer.*[2] εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς — *for a testimony to them.* These words are to be connected with δεῖξον and ὑπένεγκε — *show thyself to the priest, and make the prescribed offering, for a testimony to them. Take this official way, authorized and prescribed by the law, of testifying to your cure.* This case, taken by itself, would be one of subservience to the law. And Weiss makes it the text of a discourse on Jesus' strict conformity to the law, ceremonial as well as moral.[3] But this is an evident overstatement, to say the least. Jesus' general position is that of a Jew, conforming himself, as any sane man would, to Jewish law and custom. And yet, sometimes he acts as if there was no such law. But in both observance and non-observance, he acts simply as a rational spirit, bound by definite principles, but conforming to fixed rules only so far as they do not interfere with the principles. Take, *e.g.,* what he says about the higher law in its relation to the Sabbath, and about the principle of fasting. In this very case, his touch of the leper made him unclean, so that his action combined both observance and non-observance. And in his discourse about eating with unwashed hands, he abrogates the distinction between clean and unclean. No, to judge of his action here in a large way, it is apparent that Jesus would not have encouraged the man to disregard the law, and might very likely have bidden him observe it, just as he would himself. But this insistence on it can scarcely be attributed to Jesus' anxiety or scrupulosity about ceremonial law. But the provision for official announcement of the cure to a single person in Jerusalem, by taking the place of publishing it abroad in Galilee, gave Jesus an opportunity to sup-

[1] See Win. 56, 2, *b*, β. On the double negative, *nothing to nobody,* see Win. 55, 9, *b*.

[2] The prescribed ceremonial and offerings for the cleansing of a leper are found in Lev. 14.

[3] *Life of Jesus,* II. ch. 11.

plement his prohibition with a reminder of what the law provided in such cases.

45. ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον — *began to publish much (extensively) and to spread abroad the event.* τὸν λόγον — is the object of both verbs. ἤρξατο — calls attention to the beginning of this action. He no sooner went out than he began to publish the affair. ὥστε μηκέτι αὐτὸν δύνασθαι — *so that he was no longer able.* An inability arising from the condition and principles of Jesus' work. εἰς πόλιν — *into a city.* Jesus was on a tour, going about from place to place, and εἰς πόλιν has therefore the proper meaning of the anarthrous noun. ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις — *in solitary, uninhabited places.* πάντοθεν — *from all sides.*

πάντοθεν, instead of πανταχόθεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDL, etc. 1, 33, etc. ἐπ' ἐρήμοις Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BL Δ 28, 124.

The command not to tell the story of the cure was not confined to this case, but was so frequent as to justify us in saying that it was the custom of Jesus. And this account gives the result of disobedience to it in an extreme case. It made a turning-point in the history of this mission, producing a change in our Lord's plans, which is apparently the reason for introducing it here.

But why should Jesus try to preserve this secrecy about his miracles? Evidently, his thought about them was different from the ordinary thought of the Church, as it was different from that of his own time. But the reason is very simple. The miracles were sure to be treated as external signs, whereas Jesus relied on internal signs. As external, moreover, exhibitions of a supernatural power, they confirmed the people in their expectation of a national, worldly Messiah, and raised in them just the false hopes which Jesus was seeking to allay. And finally, by the excitement which they created, they interfered with the quiet methods of Jesus' spiritual work.

THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

Holtzmann rationalizes this miracle by explaining καθαρίσαι, the cleansing of the leper, as a removal of his ceremonial uncleanness by Jesus. The man was cured already before he came to our Lord, and he wishes Jesus to pronounce him clean, in order to save him the journey to Jerusalem. He admits that the evangelists do not mean this, but intend to tell the story of a miraculous cure. But he contends that this simply shows how the story of

natural events grew into supernatural form in their hands. Unfortunately for his hypothesis, he accepts the theory of the Synoptical Gospels which traces them to apostolic sources, and especially makes Mk. the rehearser of Peter's story. This does not give the required time for myths to grow. This first-hand testimony is the starting-point in establishing the credibility of the miracles. Then, they stand or fall with the historicity of the whole account of Jesus, which is not generally denied. One of the first principles of a true criticism is, that any attempt to patch out a story with unreal details will betray itself by the incongruities of the addition. But you cannot separate the miracles from the rest of the story in this way. They are part of the texture of the story. Especially, they have a uniqueness which belongs to the character of Jesus, and to the principles of his action, and which makes invention an impossibility. A scheme of miracles which rigorously excludes everything but works of beneficence — all miracles of personal preservation, of punishment, of mere thaumaturgy, never occurred to any one but Jesus. The moment we go forward or back from him in Jewish history we find all these. And yet, the same generation tells us the story of Ananias and Sapphira, and of Elymas the Sorcerer, and, with entire unconsciousness of the difference, the story of Jesus' miracles. His miracles are signs, not because of their power, but because of this divine uniqueness of their spirit. Jesus' reticence about them, his endeavor to push them into the background, is another feature of this uniqueness. It is a revelation in action of his deep spirituality, the story of which is told by his contemporaries with evident unconsciousness of its significance. In fact, the grounds of Jesus' solitary greatness are to be found in the miracles, as in the rest of the life, and in the teaching, and they are of the same kind.

THE PERIOD OF CONFLICT

With the second chapter begins the period of conflict in the life of our Lord. It is apparent in the preceding chapter that Jesus is not at all satisfied with the situation created by his sudden popularity, regarding it as a serious hindrance to his work. But now, instead of the superficial enthusiasm of the people, he has to encounter the growing opposition of their leaders. At first, this is aroused

by his extraordinary claims, then by his revolutionary act in calling Levi, the tax-gatherer, to become his personal disciple, and finally by his revolutionary teaching in regard to fasting and Sabbath observance. Mk. produces this impression as plainly by his selection of events as if he had given this section the title *Period of Conflict.* Lk. gives the same grouping, while Mt. distributes these events.

THE CHARGE OF BLASPHEMY

II. 1–12. *Jesus' return to Capernaum. Healing of a paralytic. Jesus announces the cure as a forgiveness of the sins which have produced the disease. The Scribes protest against this blasphemy. Jesus defends his claim to forgive sins, and proves it in this case by the cure.*

Immediately after the return of Jesus to Capernaum, the crowd gathers again in such numbers as to prevent access to him. But four men bringing to him a paralytic, not to be turned back, gain access to the roof of the house in which he was, tear up the roof, and let the paralytic down. In healing him Jesus says, *Thy sins are forgiven,* meaning the sins that have produced the disease. The Scribes, who make their first appearance here, protest against this as blasphemy. Jesus meets their charge by showing that forgiveness is here only another name for cure. But he asserts his right to forgive sins, and proves it by the cure.

1. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν πάλιν . . . ἠκούσθη — *And having entered again . . . it was heard.*

εἰσελθών, instead of εἰσῆλθεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD^{gr} L 28, 33, 124, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. etc. Omit καὶ before ἠκούσθη Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL 28, 33, 124, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. etc.

πάλιν — *again.* See 1[21]. It is a peculiarity of Mk. that he notes the recurrence of scenes and places in his narrative. Lk. uses this word only twice, and Mt. uses it almost entirely to denote the different parts of discourse, not the recurrence of the same, or similar occasions. δι' ἡμερῶν — *after (some) days.*[1] ἐν οἴκῳ — *in the house, or at home.*[2]

ἐν οἴκῳ, instead of εἰς οἶκον, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BDL 33, 67, most *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg.

[1] See Win. 47, 1. 64, 5.
[2] The prep. with the anarthrous noun constitutes a phrase.

2. *καὶ συνήχθησαν πολλοί — and many were gathered together.*

Omit *εὐθέως* Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL 33, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh.

ὥστε μηκέτι χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν — so that not even the parts towards the door (on the outside) would hold them any longer. Not only was the house too small for the crowd, but not even outside, near the door, was there room for them.[1] *καὶ ἐλάλει — and he was speaking.* The imperf. denotes what he was doing when the bearers of the paralytic came. AV. *preached.* RV. *spake.* *τὸν λόγον — the word.* The word of the Gospel, or glad tidings of the kingdom of God, with the accompanying call to repentance. See $1^{14.\ 15}$.[2]

3. *παραλυτικὸν — a paralytic.*[3]

4. *Καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι προσενέγκαι — And as (they saw that) they were unable to bring him to him.* *μὴ* shows that their inability is not viewed simply as a fact, but in their view of it, as it influenced their minds.[4]

προσενέγκαι, instead of *προσεγγίσαι*, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. *marg.* ℵ BL 33, 63, 72 *marg.* 253, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Harcl. etc.

ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην — they unroofed the roof. *Uncovered*, EV., does not render the paronomasia of the Greek.[5] *ἐξορύξαντες — having dug it out.* This describes the process of unroofing. It would imply probably some sort of thatched roof. *χαλῶσι τὸν κράβαττον — they let down the pallet.* The noun denotes any slight bed, such as might be used to carry the sick about the streets, *a stretcher.*[6] *ὅπου — where(on).*

ὅπου, instead of *ἐφ' ᾧ* Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BDL two *mss.* Lat. Vet.

The roofs of Eastern houses were flat. Access to the roof would be easy by an outside stairway or ladder. The description, moreover, implies that this house had only one story, according with what we know of the humble position and means of Jesus and his followers.

5. *τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν — their faith.* That is, the faith of the paralytic and his friends. That it was their faith, and not simply his faith, would show several things. First, that faith is not the psychological explanation of the cure, through the reaction of the mind on the body, in which case, the faith of the others would

---

[1] *χωρεῖν* is transitive and has *τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν* for its subject. On the repetition of the negative, see Win. 55, 9, *b*. On the construction of *ὥστε* with *μή* and the inf. — always so in N.T. — see Win. 55, 2, *d*.

[2] For other instances of this use of *ὁ λόγος* to denote in a general way the subject of Christian teaching, see 4^{14-33} Lk. 1^{2}.

[3] This word belongs to Biblical Greek. The Greeks said *παραλελυμένος*.

[4] See Win. 55, 5, *g*, *β*.

[5] This is the only case of the use of this verb in the N.T.

[6] *χαλῶσι* commonly means *to slacken*, or *relax*, and *to let down*, when this involves slackening. *κράβαττον* is a late Greek word copied from the Latin *grabatus*. The Greeks said *σκίμπους*.

have nothing to do with it, — but the spiritual condition of the miracle. This is also shown by the cure of demoniacs. Secondly, that Jesus meant here by the forgiveness of the man's sins only this removal of the physical consequences of some sin affecting the nervous organization. The removal of the spiritual penalty would be conditioned on the faith of the man himself. However, this is simply the reflection of the writer on the facts. *And it is in the narration of facts, that the value of contemporaneous witness appears.* In the historical judgment of the Gospels, this distinction between facts and reflections has frequently to be remembered. Τέκνον, ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι — *Child* (EV. *Son*), *thy sins are forgiven.*

ἀφίενται, instead of ἀφέωνται, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ B 28, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Pesh. Harcl.

6. τῶν γραμματέων — *of the Scribes.*[1] This is the first encounter of Jesus with the formalists and dogmatists of his time. So also in Mt. and Lk. And the matter in controversy, the extraordinary claims of Jesus, was sure to become an issue between them. The opposition to Jesus is easily explained. διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις — *debating in their hearts.* καρδία, in the N.T., does not denote, like our word *heart*, the seat of the affections, but the inner man generally, and more specifically, the mind. This corresponds to the Homeric use, the common Greek use being like ours.

7. Τί οὗτος οὕτω λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ. — *Why does this one speak thus? he blasphemes.*

βλασφημεῖ, instead of βλασφημίας, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph.

βλασφημεῖν is used of any speech derogatory to the Divine majesty. The generic sense of the word is *injurious speech*, among men, *slander.* In this case, the supposed blasphemy consists in the assumption of the Divine prerogative. εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ Θεός; *except one, God?* This is a good example of the ill usage that good principles receive at the hands of men who deal only with rules and formulas. As a general proposition, this statement of the Scribes is undeniable. The difficulty is, that they ignored the possibility of a man's speaking for God, and the fact that they had before them one in whom this power was lodged preëminently.[2]

8. τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ — *in his spirit.* This is contrasted with the knowledge acquired through the senses, *e.g.* in this case, by hearing what was said. Without their saying anything, he knew inwardly, intuitively, what was going on in their minds. Jesus knew generally their intellectual attitude, and their position towards

[1] See on 1[22]. [2] In J. 20[23], Jesus extends this power to his disciples.

any attempt to live according to the spirit, instead of the letter of things, and the mere look of their faces would put him on the track of their thoughts. *λέγει αὐτοῖς — says to them.*

λέγει, instead of εἶπεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL 33, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg.

9. *Τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον; Which is easier?*[1] Jesus does not make the contrast here between healing and forgiving, but between saying *be forgiven* and *be healed.* The two things would be themselves coincident, and the difference therefore would be only between two ways of saying the same thing. The disease being a consequence of the man's sin, the cure would be a remission of penalty. *Ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι — Thy sins are forgiven.*

Ἀφίενται, instead of Ἀφέωνται, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ B 28, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Pesh. Harcl. σου instead of σοι, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BEFGHKL, etc. ὕπαγε, instead of περιπάτει, Tisch. ℵ LW^{c} Δ, and ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου, D 33, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. A difficult case to decide, as περιπάτει may be taken from Mt. and Lk., and ὕπαγε from v. 11.

10. *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε — but that ye may know.* Here was an opportunity to put his power to a practical test. As a general thing, the power to forgive sins admits of no such test, but only of those finer inward tests by which a change of spiritual condition and relation becomes known. But here the forgiveness was manifested in an outward change, making itself known in cure, as the sin had discovered itself in disease. *ἐξουσίαν — authority, or right.* This is the proper meaning, rather than *power,* and it evidently fits this case.

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου — the Son of Man. This is a Messianic title, the use of which is to be traced to the Messianic interpretation of Dan. 7$^{13\text{-}27}$. In the post-canonical Jewish literature, it appears several times in the Book of Enoch.[2] It is the favorite title applied by Jesus to himself in the Synoptical Gospels, *Son of God* being used by Jesus himself only in the fourth Gospel.[3] In the passage in Dan., the prophet sees in vision a fifth power succeeding the four great world-powers, only this is in his vision like a son of man, while the preceding powers have been represented as beasts. And in the interpretation that follows (see especially v.$^{18.\ 22.\ 27}$) this power is said to be the kingdom of the saints of the Most High. But later, when the hopes of the people were concentrated finally on a Messianic king, this passage was given Messi-

[1] εὐκοπώτερον is a late word, and is used in the N.T. only in this phrase, εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστι. The Greek word for *which of two* is πότερον. τί means strictly *what,* not *which.*

[2] For passages, see Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* For a discussion of the date of the allegories in which the Messianic portion of the book occurs, see Schürer, *N. Zg.* II. III. 32. 2. Schürer, on the whole, favors the pre-Christian date.

[3] *Son* alone is used by Jesus in Mt. 11^{27} 21^{37} 28^{19}, referring to the Divine Sonship in the theocratic sense.

anic interpretation, and Son of Man came to be a Messianic title, though not so distinctive, nor so commonly accepted, as the name Messiah. The choice of it by Jesus was partly for this reason. To have called himself plainly the Messiah would have precipitated a crisis, forcing the people to decide prematurely on his claim. And it is evident from the doubt of the people, not only about what he was, but in regard to this very point, what he himself claimed to be, that the title used by him familiarly was indecisive. However, there can be little doubt, that the reason for the choice of the name Son of Man lay deeper than this, and is to be found in the significance of the name itself, aside from its historic sense. Everywhere, Jesus uses the Messianic phraseology of his time, but rarely limits himself to its current meaning. This name, Son of Man, was to the Jews a Messianic title, only that and nothing more. But Jesus fastens upon it because it identified him with humanity, and owing to the generic use of the word Man in it, with the whole of humanity. His chosen title, as well as his life, showed that his great desire was to impress on us his brotherhood with man.

ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς — *upon the earth.* Contrasted with the power of God to forgive sins in heaven. Of course, the power to forgive sins, involved in the mere cure of diseases resulting from them, is in itself small. But the significance of these words lies in the unity of our Lord's work implied in them. As the redeemer and deliverer of mankind, he is appointed to cope with the whole power of evil among men, to strike at its roots, as well as its twigs and branches, and at its effects, as well as its causes. And the whole is so far the one power trusted to him, that one part becomes the sign of the other.

11. σοὶ λέγω —This is to be connected with ἵνα εἰδῆτε, the clause λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ being parenthetical. This is what he says in order to put his power to forgive sins to a test. ἔγειρε, ἆρον — *arise, take up.*[1]

Omit καί before ἆρον Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCD^{gr}L 13, 28, 33, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh.

12. Καὶ ἠγέρθη, καὶ εὐθὺς ἄρας . . . ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν — *And he arose, and immediately having taken . . . went out before.*

καὶ εὐθὺς, instead of εὐθέως, καί Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC*L 33, Memph. ἔμπροσθεν, instead of ἐνάντιον, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. ℵ BL 187 *marg.*

The ἔμπροσθεν πάντων, *before all,* is introduced to show the publicity attending Jesus' proof of his power. There was a great crowd

[1] ἐγείρω is transitive, and the active is used here in the sense of the passive or middle. On the meaning of the verb, see on I^{81} footnote. In the passive or middle, in the sense peculiar to the N.T., the meaning is *to rise from a reclining position.*

of people, Jesus had performed his miracle in distinct answer to a challenge of his authority, and the cure was therefore purposely public. It contrasts therefore with Jesus' ordinary reserve in the performance of his miracles, and with his depreciation of their testimony to his mission. And one significance of the event lies in this indication of his varying method, and of his power to include all the facts in the broad range of his action. ἐξίστασθαι — *were amazed.*[1] δοξάζειν τὸν Θεόν — *glorified God.*[2] εἴδαμεν — *we saw.*[3]

εἴδαμεν, instead of εἴδομεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. CD. The unusual form determines the probability of this reading.

CONSORTING WITH SINNERS

13–17. *The call of Levi the tax-gatherer. Jesus answers the charge of consorting with this and other obnoxious classes, many of whom had eaten with him.*

This is the second cause of offence. The scene changes from the house to the shore of the lake, where Jesus finds Levi, a tax-gatherer, at the customs station. He calls this representative of a despised class into the inner circle of his disciples, and follows this up by entertaining at his house many of the same, and of the class of open sinners generally. Again it is the scribes who attack him for this open association with outcasts. Jesus answers that he is a physician, and his business is with the sick.

13. παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν — *to the side of the sea.* This differs from περιπατεῖν παρά, which denotes motion *by the side of*, whereas this is motion *to the side of.* πάλιν — *again.*[4] The only previous event at the lakeside had been the call of the four disciples, 1[16] sq. The week following, Jesus had gone on a tour through Galilee; and now, on his return, he resorts to his usual place again. Capernaum and the shore of the lake were the scenes of his ministry. ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ἐδίδασκεν — *resorted to him, and he was teaching them.* The impfts. here denote the acts in their progress, the gradual gathering of the crowd, and Jesus' discourse as they came and went.[5]

---

[1] In Greek, ἐξίστημι means *to displace* or *alter*, and sometimes by itself, but generally with φρενῶν, or τοῦ φρονεῖν, *to put one beside himself, to derange.* In the N.T., it is used always in the sense of *amaze*, or *be amazed*, except 3[21] 2 Cor. 5[13], where the stronger meaning, *to be distraught*, reappears.

[2] δοξάζειν means properly *to think, to have an opinion. To praise*, or *glorify*, is the only N.T. use. [3] εἴδαμεν is sec. aor., with the vowel of the first aor.

[4] See note on Mk.'s use of πάλιν, v.[1]

[5] Note the difference from the aor. ἐξῆλθε which denotes the momentary past act.

14. Λευεὶν τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου — *Levi, the son of Alphæus.* So Lk. 5^{27}. In Mt. 9^{9}, however, where the same event is told in almost identical language, Ματθαῖον, Matthew, is substituted for Levi. The two are to be identified, therefore, as different names of the same person.

Alphæus is also the name of the father of James the less. But as Matthew and James are not associated in any list of the apostles, there is no sufficient reason for identifying this Alphæus with the other.

ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, not *in the toll-house,* but *near it.* See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* τελώνιον denotes the place in which the customs were collected. It is a late Greek word.[1] Ἀκολούθει μοι — *follow me.* This is the common language of Jesus in summoning disciples to personal attendance on himself, which is evidently the meaning here. The apparent abruptness of the call, and the immediateness with which it is answered, are relieved of their strangeness by the fact that Jesus had now been teaching long enough to call the attention of men to himself, so that the summons probably brought to a crisis and decision thoughts already in Levi's mind.

15. Καὶ γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι — *And it comes to pass that he is reclining (at table).*[2]

γίνεται instead of ἐγένετο, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BL 33. Omit ἐν τῷ before κατακεῖσθαι — Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL 13, 33, 69, 102, 124, Memph.

Κατακεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ — *he was reclining at table in his house.* Meyer, Holtzmann, and others say that this was the house of Jesus. This is contrary to the statement of Lk., who says expressly that Levi made him a great feast at his house. But the recurrence of the pronoun αὐτὸν . . . αὐτοῦ makes it reasonably certain that they refer to the same person. Mt. does not insert any pronoun after τῇ οἰκίᾳ, and that makes his language point in the same direction. And the fact that Mt. and Mk. use different language, which nevertheless points to the same conclusion, makes that conclusion doubly certain. The connection between this event and the call of Levi is thus simply that both show Jesus' revolutionary attitude towards the despised classes of his time.

τελῶναι — *tax-gatherers.* The name *publicans,* given them in our English Bible, comes from the Latin *publicani,* but in English it has become practically obsolete in that sense. Moreover, the Latin *publicani* does not apply to the whole class of tax-gatherers, but only to the Roman knights to whom the taxes were farmed out in the first instance.

---

[1] The repetition of the somewhat peculiar ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον in Mt. and Lk. is a strong sign of the interdependence of the Synoptics.

[2] γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι, *it comes to pass, that,* is a periphrase not unknown to the Greek, but its frequent recurrence in the Synoptics is probably due to Hebrew usage.

ἁμαρτωλοὶ — *sinners; i.e.* here, those guilty of crimes against society and law, the degraded and vicious class.[1]

συνανέκειντο — *were reclining at table with.*[2]

μαθηταῖς — *disciples.* The common word used to describe the followers of Jesus, corresponding to the title διδάσκαλος applied to him. It is significant, that the names *teacher* and *pupil* are chosen by Jesus and the disciples to describe the relations between them. It is probable, according to the best text, that the last two clauses of this verse are to be separated, so that the verse ends with πολλοί.[3] The statement is, that there were many of this class of open sinners. It does not denote the number present, which would be superfluous, but the number of the class. Holtzmann calls attention to the situation of Capernaum on the borders of the territory of Herod as the cause of the number of tax-gatherers, as this made it an important customs station. οἱ γραμ. τῶν Φαρισ. — *the Scribes of the Pharisees.* The Pharisees were the sect that adhered not only to the Law, but to the rabbinical interpretation of the Law, which gradually formed a traditional code by the side of the written Law. Their scribes, therefore, would be the rabbis of the party that specially believed in the rabbis. Morison is right in calling them the arch-inquisitors, the genus inquisitor being the Pharisees.

In the N.T., the use of μαθηταί is confined to the Gospels and Acts. In the Gospels, it is applied to the twelve, who formed the inner circle of disciples, as well as the larger group outside. In the Acts, it is the general name for Christians, the official title *apostles* being given to the twelve.

ἠκολούθουν instead of ἠκολούθησαν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg.

16. Καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ (οἱ) γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων, καὶ ἰδόντες ὅτι ἐσθίει (ἤσθιεν) μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν, ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, Ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει; (καὶ πίνει)—*And there followed him also (the) Scribes of the Pharisees, and having seen that he eats with the sinners and tax-gatherers, they said to his disciples, Why does he eat (and drink) with the tax-gatherers and sinners?*

καὶ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων, καὶ ἰδόντες instead of καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, ἰδόντες, Tisch. ℵ L Δ 33. τῶν Φαρισαίων is the reading also of Treg. WH. RV. *txt.* Insert καὶ before ἰδόντες also Treg. ὅτι ἐσθίει, instead of αὐτὸν ἐσθίοντα, WH. RV. B 33, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Pesh. Memph. some *edd.* ὅτι ἤσθιεν Tisch. Treg. ℵ DL *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. *edd.* Harcl. ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν, instead of the reverse order, Treg. WH. RV. BDL 33, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. and of Vulg., Memph. *edd.* Omit τί before

---

[1] The word ἁμαρτωλοί is rare in Greek writers.

[2] The double compound συνανέκειντο is found, outside of Biblical Greek, only in Byzantine and ecclesiastical writers. ἀνακεῖμαι itself belongs to later Greek, the earlier writers using κεῖμαι and κατακεῖμαι. See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

[3] The insertion of καὶ before ἰδόντες in v.[16] makes it necessary to connect ἠκολούθουν with ἔλεγον, instead of with ἦσαν.

ὅτι Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BL 33, 108, 246.*. Omit καὶ πίνει (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. *marg.* ℵ BD *mss.* of Lat. Vet. etc.

ὅτι . . . ἐσθίει (καὶ πίνει) — *why does he eat* (*and drink*) . . .?[1] This charge of eating with tax-gatherers and sinners was fitted to discredit Jesus' claim to be a rabbi, or teacher. For the Scribes and their followers would not even associate with the common people for fear of ceremonial defilement; much less with the vicious class, to eat with whom was an especial abomination. The tax-gatherers were classed with sinners, that is, with the vile and degraded, not only by the Jews, but all over the Roman Empire. The secret of this was, that the taxes were collected, not by the paid agents of the government, but by officers who themselves paid the government for the privilege, and then reimbursed themselves by extortion and fraud. They let it out to others, and these to still a third class, who were selected generally from the inhabitants of the province, because their knowledge of the people would expedite the work. This last is the class called τελῶναι in N.T., and the unpatriotic nature of their employment was added to its extortionate methods, placing them under a double ban.

17. οἱ ἰσχύοντες — *they that are strong.* EV. *whole.* The contrast expressed figuratively by *strong* and *sick* is given literally in the latter part of the verse in the terms *righteous* and *sinners.* Jesus justifies his conduct in associating with sinners, from the point of view of the Pharisees themselves. Admitting them to be righteous and the publicans to be sinners, his office of physician put him under obligation to the sick rather than the strong. But he shows elsewhere that he does not admit this distinction. The Pharisees were extortionate as well as the publicans; they devoured widows' houses; but they added to their wickedness by assuming a cloak of respectability, and thanking God that they were not as other men. The publicans, on the other hand, had the grace of honesty, and by their acknowledgment of sin, fulfilled the first condition of cure.

ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς — *but sinners.*

Omit εἰς μετάνοιαν, *unto repentance,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABDKL *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh. Harcl. etc.

This omission leaves καλέσαι to be explained. It means *to invite* or *summon;* but to what? The answer is to be found by following out the terms of the figure. As a physician, Jesus summons sick souls to be cured. Or, dropping this figure, as a Saviour, he summons sinners to be saved. Owing to the blindness of men, the ordinary relation between them is reversed. Instead of the sick summoning the physician, it is here the physician who has to call the sick.

[1] ὅτι is here the indirect interrogative, taking the place of the direct, a usage unknown to earlier Greek, but occurring a few times in the Sept. and N.T.

NONCONFORMITY IN MATTER OF FASTING

18–22. *Jesus answers the complaint of the Pharisees and of the disciples of John that his disciples do not fast.*

The third ground of complaint is the failure of the disciples, under the influence of the free spirit of Jesus, to observe the frequent fasts prescribed by the Pharisees as a part of their formalism, and by the disciples of John as a part of their asceticism. Jesus' answer is divided into two parts. The first shows the incongruousness of fasting at a time when joy, and not sorrow, was the ruling feeling of the disciples, v.[18-20]. The second shows the incongruousness of such observances as fasting with the new dispensation set up by our Lord. It is the incongruity of new and old.

18. οἱ μαθηταὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι — *the disciples of John and the Pharisees.*

οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, instead of τῶν Φαρισαίων, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCD *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Harcl. *txt.* etc.

ἦσαν νηστεύοντες — *were fasting.*[1] Fasting, as a religious observance, was prescribed in the Law only once in the year, on the great day of atonement. But the traditional code of the rabbis had multiplied this indefinitely. Twice in the week was the boast of the Pharisee. And the importance attached to this empty piece of religiosity made it a part of the formal religion of the period. καὶ ἔρχονται — *and they come, viz.* the disciples of John and the Pharisees.

Mt. 9[14] names only the former. Lk. 5[33] makes this a part of the preceding controversy with the Pharisees and Scribes, in which they call attention to the practice of the disciples of John and of the Pharisees.

οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων — *the disciples of the Pharisees.*

Insert μαθηταὶ before τῶν Φαρισαίων Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BC* L 33, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Harcl. *marg.*

The disciples of the Pharisees is a singular expression, much as if one should speak of the disciples of the Platonists. The Pharisees were themselves disciples of the Scribes, or Rabbis. The disciples of John and of the Pharisees were at one in regard to the

[1] ἦν with the part. is a stronger form of expressing the idea of the impf. than the tense. It is characteristic of Mk., and belongs to the picturesqueness of his style.

act of fasting, but not in the spirit of the act. The Pharisees fasted in a formal, self-righteous spirit, and the teaching of John was directed against this spirit. So far as the fasting of his disciples reflected the teaching of John and his spirit, it would be a part of the asceticism, the mortification of the body, characteristic of him.

19. *υἱοὶ τ. νυμφῶνος*[1] — *sons of the bridechamber.* A Hebraistic form of expression by which *υἱός*, with the genitive of a thing, denotes a person who stands in intimate relation of some kind to that thing. The sons of the bridechamber were friends of the bridegroom, whose duty it was to provide for the nuptials whatever was necessary. The principle contained in this analogy is that fasting is not a matter of prescription, but of fitness. If you set times for fasting, the circumstances of the set time may be such as to produce joy, instead of sorrow, and so make your fasting out of place. Fasting, *i.e.*, is an expression of feeling, and is out of place unless the feeling is there which it is intended to express. But it is a matter, not only of feeling, but of fitness. If the circumstances of the time are such as to make sorrow the fit feeling, then it is a fit time for fasting also. *οὐ δύνανται νηστεύειν* — *they cannot fast.* This is said, of course, not of the outward act, which is possible at any time; but of fasting in the only sense in which it becomes a religious act, or the expression of the feeling to which it is appropriated. It is as much as to say, in a time of gladness it is impossible to mourn.

20. *ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος* — It is evident here that Jesus, still keeping to the figure, points forward to the time when he shall be taken away from the disciples, and then, he declares, will be the time for them to fast. This is the first time that he has prophesied of his taking away, but we can see that even as a premonition it is not premature, because of the revolutionary character of his teaching. He had already brought on himself the charge of blasphemy, consorted with publicans, one of whom he had introduced into the immediate circle of his disciples, and shown his indifference to the strict law of fasting. And he knew that there was much more of the same kind in reserve. *ὅταν* — *whenever.* The expression leaves the time of the taking away indefinite. *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* — *in that day.* *Days* and *that day* in this verse are simply a case of oratio variata, both denoting in a general way a period of time.

ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ instead of the plural, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCD KL *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Pesh. Harcl. etc.

21. *οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου ἐπιράπτει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μή, αἴρει τὸ πλήρωμα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ* — *no one*

[1] *νυμφών* is a Biblical word.

sews a patch of undressed cloth on an old garment; otherwise the new filling of the old takes from it.

Omit καὶ before οὐδεὶς Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCKLS Δ 1. 13, 33, 69, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. Vulg. Pesh. Harcl. etc. ἱμάτιον παλαιόν, instead of dat., Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL 33. ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, instead of αὐτοῦ, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ BL, also A 33.

The RV. translates *else that which should fill it up taketh from it, the new from the old.* But this seems to require a repetition of the prep. ἀπὸ before τοῦ παλαιοῦ. τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ is in apposition with τὸ πλήρωμα, so that it would read literally, *the filling takes from it, the new of the old.* The substitution of *unfulled* for *new* is necessary to make the parable an exact fit. It is the shrinking of the undressed cloth that strains and tears the old cloth to which it is sewed.

22. καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νεὸν εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκούς, καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί — *and no one puts new wine into old skins; else the wine will burst the skins, and the wine is destroyed, and the skins.*

ῥήξει instead of ῥήσσει, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL 33, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Omit ὁ νεὸς after ὁ οἶνος, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL 13, 69, 242, 258, 301, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh. etc. ἀπόλλυται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί, instead of ἐκχεῖται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται, after ὁ οἶνος, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BL. Memph. Omit the clause ἀλλὰ . . . βλητέον Tisch. (Treg. WH.) D *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Omit βλητέον only (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ* B. The omission is more in Mk.'s manner, and it looks as if the clause was borrowed from Lk., where it is undoubted.

The substitution of *skins* for *bottles*, AV., is necessary to make the parable tell its story. The skins rot with age, and the new wine, as it ferments, bursts them.

These analogies, among the homeliest and aptest used by our Lord, are a further answer to the question why his disciples do not fast. For this is evidently the part of the question which it is intended that he should answer, not why the disciples of John do fast.[1] Nor is it simply a repetition of the preceding, showing the incongruity of fasting at this time under another figure.[2] But it generalizes, showing the incongruity of the class of things with which fasting belongs with the new life of Christianity. The general teaching is that the new teachings and the old forms do not belong together. But this is expressed in the two parables in different ways. In the first, it is the unfitness of piecing out the old religion with the new, like a new patch on an old garment. In the

[1] So Weiss. [2] So Morison.

second, it is the unwisdom of putting the new religion into the old forms. The whole is an anticipation of St. Paul's teaching that Christianity is not a mere extension of Judaism, and that Jewish laws are not binding upon Christians. Dr. Morison sees in the figures employed by Jesus only an expression of the incongruity of fasting at a time better adapted to feasting. But this would be simply a repetition of the preceding teaching contained in the figure of the wedding, and not so apt an expression of it either. The principle of this interpretation is a good one, that it is well to seek in each parable the single point of comparison, and there stop. Here the single idea is that of incongruity. But surely the figure of the wedding has brought out not simply the idea of incongruity, but the special unfitness of this particular act. And it is no violation, therefore, of the rule of interpretation to make these other comparisons not merely suggest the general idea of incongruity, but show also the special incongruity involved. In the figure of the wedding, it is the incongruity of fasting and joy that is pointed out; in these figures, it is the incongruity of new and old. The old religion attempted to regulate conduct by rules and forms, the new by principles and motives, and these are foreign, the one to the other. It is not fasting to which objection is taken, but fasting according to rule, instead of its inherent principle. As a piece of legalism, or asceticism, in which fasting per se becomes of moral obligation, it is incongruous with the free spirit of Christianity.

ALLEGED VIOLATION OF THE SABBATH

23–28. *Jesus defends his disciples for plucking ears of grain on the Sabbath.*

The fourth ground of complaint is the violation of the law of the Sabbath. Jesus and his disciples are going through the grain-fields on the Sabbath, and the disciples, careless of the strict Sabbatism of the Pharisees, pluck the ears of grain and eat them. Evidently there was the usual crowd following him, and the Pharisees attack this act as unlawful. In the first part of his reply, Jesus argues from an analogous case the admissibility of infringing the law to satisfy hunger. In the second part, he shows the nature

of the law itself, that it is the servant of man, and not man the servant of the law, involving the lordship of the Son of Man over the law.

23. σπορίμων — *sown fields.* ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες — *began, as they went, to pluck,* EV. This is the translation naturally suggested by the context, as it prepares the way for Jesus' explanation of their conduct by the parallel case of David. But the phrase ὁδὸν ποιεῖν does not mean *to make way* in the sense of *merely going along* or *advancing,* but *to make a road.* The middle, however, has the former sense. Moreover, this translation makes the participle, instead of the verb, express the principal thought. On the other hand, the translation, *to make a road by plucking the ears,* besides making Jesus' answer quite unintelligible, presents an absurd way of making a road. You can make a path by plucking the stalks of grain, but you would make little headway, if you picked only the ears or heads of the grain. There are two ways of explaining this. We can take ὁδὸν ποιεῖν in its proper sense, but make the participle denote merely concomitant action, not the means or method. *They began to break a path (by treading down or plucking up the stalks of grain that obstructed their path), meanwhile plucking and eating the ears that grew on them.* Or we can minimize the difficulties in the way of the ordinary interpretation, without doing much violence to the laws of speech. Surely, in a language so careless of nice distinctions as the N.T. Greek, it is not difficult to suppose that an active may be substituted for the middle. And there seems to be no doubt that the active is used in this sense in Judg. 17 : 8. And as for making the principal and subordinate clauses exchange places, in this case the peculiarity is not so great. *They began to go along, plucking the ears* is not so very different from *they began, going along, to pluck.*

24. ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστι — *what is not lawful.* The Sabbath law is meant, which forbids work on that day. The casuistry of the rabbinical interpreter found here its most fruitful field in drawing the line between work and not-work, and managed to get in its most ingenious and absurd refinements. But the great difficulty, as with all their work, is that they managed so to miss the very spirit and object of the law, that they made its observance largely a burden, instead of a privilege. Whenever they speak of that which is lawful, or unlawful, their standard is not simply the written law, but this traditional interpretation of it. In the same way, we can conceive of men now accepting the Bible as their standard, and yet admitting to an equal authority an interpretation of it contained in creed or confession, and really referring to this when they use the terms, *Biblical* or *unbiblical.*

25. Καὶ λέγει — *And he says.*

Omit αὐτὸς Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL 33, 69, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. etc. λέγει, *says*, instead of ἔλεγεν, *said*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ CL 33, 69, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. etc.

26. οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ — *the house of God* is a generic term that would apply either to the tent or tabernacle in which the Jews at first worshipped, or to the later temple. Here, of course, the former. It was called *the house of God*, because in a sense God dwelt there, manifesting his presence in the inner shrine, the Holy of Holies.

ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέως — *in the high-priesthood of Abiathar.*

Omit τοῦ before ἀρχιερέως Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BL Γ etc.

In the account of this in 1 Saml. 21^1, sqq., Abimelech was high-priest, and Abiathar, his son, does not become high-priest until the reign of David. See ch. 22^{21}. To be sure, other passages in the O.T. make the same confusion of names, making Abimelech, the son of Abiathar, high-priest in David's time. But this does not explain our difficulty; it only shows that there is the same difficulty in the O.T. account. Nor does it relieve it to suppose that this means simply that the event took place during the lifetime of Abiathar, not during the high-priesthood. For the transaction took place between David and the high-priest; and the object of introducing the name would be to show in whose high-priesthood it took place, not simply in whose lifetime. The impropriety would be the same as if one were to speak of something that took place between the Bishop of Durham and some other person in the time of Bishop Westcott, when, as a matter of fact, Lightfoot was bishop, and it was only during the lifetime of Bishop Westcott. And the phrase itself means strictly, *during the high-priesthood of Abiathar.* If such disagreement were uncommon, it would be worth while to try somewhat anxiously to remove this difficulty; but, as a matter of fact, discrepancies of this unimportant kind are not at all uncommon in the Scriptures.

τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως — *the bread of setting forth.* It is a translation of the Hebrew, לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים *bread of the face*, or *presence*, given to twelve loaves of bread set in two rows on the table in the holy place of the tabernacle, or temple, and renewed by the priests every Sabbath. S. Lev. $24^{5\text{-}9}$. The Greek name, taken from the Sept., denotes the *bread set forth before God.* The Hebrew name, about which there has been naturally much curious writing, seems to mean that the bread, in some way, symbolized God's presence. τοὺς ἱερεῖς — *the priests.*

τοὺς ἱερεῖς, instead of τοῖς ἱερεῦσι, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. ℵ BL.

τοὺς ἱερεῖς is the subject of φαγεῖν. The priests were allowed to eat the bread after it had been replaced by fresh loaves. In this case, there was no other bread, and when David and his hun-

gry men appeared, it became a case of physical need against ritual law. Jesus cites it as a case decided by a competent authority and accepted by the people, showing the superiority of natural law to positive enactment, the same principle involved in the alleged illegal action of his disciples. And he evidently upholds the correctness of the principle, and not simply the authority of this precedent.

27. τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον — *the Sabbath was made on account of man, not man on account of the Sabbath.* This is introduced to show the supremacy of man over the Sabbath. The statement that the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath follows directly from this. If the law antedates man, having its seat in God, as the moral law does, it becomes a part of the moral constitution of things, resident in God, to which man is subservient. But if it is something devised by God for the uses of man, then the subserviency belongs to the law, and man can adapt it to his uses, and set it aside, or modify it, whenever it interferes with his good. The law of the Sabbath, if not moral, is either natural or positive. Regarded as natural law, the principle involved is that of rest, and this places it in the same category as the law of day and night. As positive, it is a matter simply of enactment, and not of principle. And in both aspects it is liable to exceptions. It is only moral law which is lord of man, and so inviolable.

28. κύριος — the noun is emphatic from its position. καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου — *also of the Sabbath*, as well as of other things belonging to the life of man. This lordship, as we have seen, is true of everything else except moral law. Of that he would be administrator and interpreter, but not Lord. He would be ruler under the supreme law, but without the power to modify or set aside, as in the case of that which is made for man.

> Weiss, Life of Jesus, contends that Jesus did not here, nor in fact anywhere, assume an attitude of independence towards the Jewish Law, but only towards the current traditional interpretation of it. But surely, the statement that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath, puts the Sabbath law in a separate class, and subordinates it to the moral law. Whereas, the O.T. throughout, not only makes the Sabbath a matter of moral obligation, but of the highest moral obligation. Judaism is a system of rules, Christianity of principles. And so far forth as the Sabbath is a rule, that is, so far as it is Jewish, Jesus does abrogate it in these words. Weiss confuses matters by neglecting this distinction.

This early statement of Jesus' lordship, and its use of the term *Son of Man* as his official title, is a good specimen of the way in which he tacitly assumed his Messianic character under this title, while the doubt in which the whole nation stood of his claim shows that he was not understood to make it formally.

THE PERIOD OF CONFLICT CONTINUED

The third chapter continues the account of the Period of Conflict. It contains matter, however, which belongs to the period, but not to the conflict. It shows us Jesus attended by larger crowds than ever, drawn by the report of his deeds from the whole country, as far south as Jerusalem, and as far north as Tyre and Sidon. The growth of hostility against him is thus shown to be accompanied by an access of popularity with the people. The combination of these two features seems to his family to make the situation so dangerous, and his own action so unwise, that they think him distraught and seek to restrain him. In the midst of this is introduced the account of the appointment of the apostles, evidently in the connection, as assistants to him in his increasing work. The occasions of conflict are, first, the healing of a man with a palsied arm on the Sabbath, causing a renewal of the Sabbath controversy, and secondly, the charge of the Scribes that he casts out demons through Beelzebul, and that he himself is possessed by that prince of the demons. He himself brings on the controversy about the Sabbath by his question whether the Sabbath is a day for good or evil deeds, for killing or healing. And the charge of collusion with the devil he meets with the question whether Satan casts out Satan.

HEALING ON THE SABBATH

1–6. *Jesus heals a withered hand in the synagogue on the Sabbath, and stirs up fresh opposition against himself.*

The fifth offence of Jesus against the current Judaism is a case of healing on the Sabbath. It belongs evidently to a period when the freedom of Jesus' treatment of this sacred day had created considerable notoriety, for his enemies are on the watch for him to give them a fresh charge against him. The scene is the synagogue, and the case is that of a man with a withered hand. Jesus himself is the challenger this time, as he calls the man out into their midst, and meets their scruple with the question, whether it is allowable to confer the good of healing, or to inflict the injury of refusing to heal.

1. *πάλιν εἰς συναγωγήν — again into the synagogue.*[1]

Omit *τὴν* before *συναγωγήν* Tisch. Treg. (Treg.) WH. ℵ B. The art is an apparent emendation.

The *πάλιν, again,* keeps up the connection with preceding visits to the synagogue, after the manner of Mk. See 1^{21-28}. *ἐξηραμμένην τὴν χεῖρα — the hand withered.* The article is the possessive article.[2] The participle, *ἐξηραμμένην* instead of the adjective, denotes a process, and not simply a state, and hence, an effect produced by disease, and not an original defect.

2. *παρετήρουν — they were watching.* The imperfect denotes the act in its progress. There is no subject expressed here, but it is easily supplied from our knowledge of the class who insisted on these rigors of Sabbath observance. And v.[6] tells us that it was the Pharisees who went out and conspired with the Herodians against him.

3. *τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ξηράν* (or *τὴν ξηρὰν χεῖρα ἔχοντι* Tisch.), Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 33, one *ms.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. Harcl. etc.

3. *Ἔγειρε*[3] *εἰς τὸ μέσον — Arise (and come) into the midst.*

Ἔγειρε instead of *Ἔγειραι*, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ ABCDL Δ etc.

This is a pregnant construction. The action begins with *ἔγειρε* and ends with *εἰς τὸ μέσον*; but between these, there is an intermediate act, of *coming* or *stepping*. By this act, Jesus challenged the attention of the carpers to the miracle that he is about to perform. Not as a miracle, however, but as a case involving the principle in dispute between himself and them in regard to healing on the Sabbath.

4. *Ἔξεστι ἀγαθοποιῆσαι*[4] *— Is it allowable to do good? ἀγαθοποιῆσαι,* and its contrasted verb *κακοποιῆσαι,* may mean to do good or evil, either in the sense of *right* and *wrong,* or of *benefit* and *injury*. The connection here points to the latter meaning.

Mt. says that the Pharisees began by asking him if it was lawful to heal on the Sabbath; Lk., that he knew their thoughts, and so asked them the question about doing good and evil. Both are attempts to explain the apparent abruptness of Jesus' question.

This question of Jesus not only suggests the general principle that makes healing permissible on the Sabbath, but is aimed

---

[1] The omission of the art. is probably due to the fact that *εἰς συναγωγήν* had passed into a phrase, like *εἰς οἶκον*, or our *to church*.

[2] Lk. 6^{6} says *the right hand.* Dr. Morison contends that this is the reason for the use of the art. But evidently, the art. is insufficient for this discrimination, as the other use, allowing it to apply to either hand, is so much more obvious.

[3] On the use of *ἔγειρε*, see on 2^{11}.

[4] *ἀγαθοποιῆσαι* is a Biblical word. *εὐεργετεῖν* is the Greek word, or *εὖ ποιεῖν, κακοποιεῖν* is a good Greek word.

directly at the specious distinction made by the Scribes. They admitted no healing, except where life was in danger, on that day. The point of Jesus' answer is found in the substitution of the positive for the negative in the second part of the contrast. They regarded the *not healing* as simply an omission of ἀγαθοποιῆσαι; Jesus treats it as a positive κακοποιῆσαι. Not to do good to a person needing it is the same as to do him evil; to withhold a good is to inflict an injury. But he deals more directly and boldly with their fallacy in the second part of the question, showing that not to heal is in any case to be classed with killing. The case in which life is in danger is not therefore a case by itself, but includes in itself a principle applicable to all cases of sickness. To weaken life is not the same thing in degree as to end life, but of the same kind notwithstanding, and therefore morally in the same class. The principle is analogous to that stated in the Sermon on the Mount, where Jesus shows that the law against murder is directed equally against any manifestation of anger. In all these discussions, beginning with 2^{13}, Jesus appears as the emancipator of the human spirit, revealing principles, instead of rules, as the guide of human conduct, and so delivering all men possessed of his spirit from the fetters of conventional morality.

5. ἐσιώπων — *they kept silence.* This is a case in which the imperfect denotes the continuance of a previous state. μετ' ὀργῆς — Anger is legitimate in the absence of the personal element. Anger caused by wrong done to me, and seeking to retaliate on the person doing it, is clearly wrong. But anger against wrong simply as wrong, and without evil design or wish against the perpetrator, is a sign of moral health. συλλυπούμενος — The preposition in composition may denote merely the inwardness of the act, as in σύνοιδα, *to be conscious, i.e.* to have inward knowledge; or it may denote what is shared with others, as the same word σύνοιδα may mean *to know with others, to be privy to.* Probably it is the latter here, denoting the sympathetic character of his grief. He was grieved because they hurt themselves. ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας — *at the hardness of their heart.* The expression does not denote, as with us, the callousness of their feelings, but the unsusceptibility of their minds. They were hardened by previous conceptions against his new truth. The collocation of anger and sympathetic grief excited by the same act is significant of the nature of Christ's anger, showing how compatible it was with goodwill. ἀπεκατεστάθη[1] — *it was restored.*

ἀπεκατεστάθη instead of ἀποκατεστάθη, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ ABL etc. Omit σου after τὴν χεῖρα Tisch. (Treg.) WH. *marg.* BEMSUV Γ Π², 126, etc. Doubtful. Omit ὑγιὴς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABC* D etc. *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Syrr. etc.

[1] On the double augment, see Win. 12, 7 *a*.

6. *εὐθὺς* — The immediateness of this act is noted by Mk. only, and is quite characteristic of his style, hitting off a situation with a word. The immediateness is here a sign of the violence of the feeling excited against Jesus. To estimate their fanatical zeal, we must remember that they valued the Sabbath far beyond any mere morality, and reacted with corresponding violence against any supposed violation of its sacredness. Fanaticism is always busy and eager over the mere outworks of religion.

τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν — *the Herodians.* The adherents of Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee. The Pharisees were zealous patriots, and as such were generally opposed to any foreign yoke. But here was an opportunity to use the foreign power against a common enemy. The common opinion ascribed Messianic pretensions to Jesus, and on more than one occasion attempted to force him to play the role according to the popular conception of the Messiah. This would be the argument by which the Pharisees excited the temporal power against him, as they did finally at Jerusalem. The preceding paragraphs have given us a view of Jesus in his work of undermining one after another of the Pharisaic positions, and this conspiracy is the natural result.

συμβούλιον ἐποίησαν (or *ἐδίδουν*)[1] — *they took counsel.*

ἐποίησαν, instead of *ἐποίουν*, Tisch. ℵ C Δ 238 etc. *ἐδίδουν*, Treg. WH. BL 13, 28, 69, etc.

GROWTH OF POPULARITY

7–12. *Jesus departs to the sea of Galilee, followed by a great multitude.*

The narrative of opposition is interrupted here, and we are introduced to a scene of another kind. The multitude about Jesus heretofore has been from Galilee, with a sprinkling of hostile Scribes and Pharisees (from Jerusalem?). But now we see it swelled by people from Judæa, and from the Gentile districts both north and south. It is an eager crowd, moreover, who fall upon him and threaten to crush him in their attempt to obtain his healing touch, so that Jesus has to procure a boat to be in attendance on him. The meaning of it all is, that the period of conflict does not signify a loss of popularity, but rather that the great access of favor with the people swells the tide of opposition.

7. *ἀνεχώρησεν* — *withdrew.* The verb is used of such retirement from public view as would be natural in such a position of

[1] *συμβούλιον* belongs to later Greek.

danger as Jesus found himself in. Mt. uses the same verb, 12^{15}. It does not seem probable, in these circumstances, that he would choose the part of the lake near to Capernaum which was the scene of his usual work, because it was a place of resort. This time, he was seeking retirement, and he would find it in some more secluded part of the lake.

8. The last clause of v.[7] should be included in this verse. As it stands in the T.R., the first statement, with *ἠκολούθησεν* as its verb, goes as far as *πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*; the second, with *ἦλθον* as its verb, begins with *οἱ περὶ Τύρον*. But with the omission of *οἱ* before *περὶ Τύρον*, we can make the break where we please. Tisch. makes it at the end of v.[7], transferring *ἠκολούθησεν* to the end of the verse. But this separates Judæa and Jerusalem in an unwarrantable way. Most probably, the first statement is about Galilee, the district near at hand, and the second includes all the remote districts beginning with Judæa. Those from the neighboring Galilee are represented as following him, and those from the remote districts as coming to him. Read, *And a great multitude from Galilee followed. And from Judæa, and from Jerusalem, and from Idumæa, and beyond Jordan, and about Tyre and Sidon, a great multitude, hearing what things he is doing, came to him.*

ἠκολούθησεν, instead of *ἠκολούθησαν*, Treg. WH. ABGL Γ etc. *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. *ἠκολούθησαν* Tisch. ℵ CEFK etc. *mss.* of Lat. Vet. This verb is transferred to the end of v. 7 after *τῆς Ἰουδαίας* by Tisch. WH. *marg.* ℵ C Δ 238 Lat. Vet. Vulg. Placed after *τῆς Γαλιλαίας* by Treg. ABL Γ etc. Memph. Syrr. After *Ἱεροσολύμων* by WH. 235, 271. The separation of Judæa and Jerusalem caused by the transfer is clearly against it. Omit *αὐτῷ* after *ἠκολούθησεν* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Memph. etc. Omit *οἱ* before *περὶ Τύρον* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* and c BCL Δ *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Pesh. etc. *ἀκούοντες* instead of *ἀκούσαντες* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ B Δ 1, 13, 69, etc. *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. *ποιεῖ*, instead of *ἐποίει*, Treg. WH. BL. Internally probable.

Idumæa is the Greek name for Edom, a district situated E. of the Jordan, between Southern Palestine and Arabia. Tyre and Sidon were the two great cities of Syro-Phœnicia on the Mediterranean Sea, NW. of Galilee.

9. *εἶπε* — *he told*, i.e. *he gave orders*. *προσκαρτερῇ* — *should be in constant attendance*. The verb expresses this idea of assiduous waiting. It was rendered necessary by the crowd, which was in danger of crushing him.

10. *ὥστε ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ* — *so that they were falling upon him*. Not in a hostile sense, but the verb is a strong word, like *προσκαρτερῇ* and *θλίβωσιν*, and is intended to bring before us vividly the turbulent eagerness and excitement of the crowd. *ἅψωνται* — *touch him*. They believed that there was some virtue in his touch, and that it made no difference whether he touched them, or they him. See 6^{19}. *μάστιγας* — *scourges*, a strong figurative term for diseases.

11. τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα — *The unclean spirits* are here put by metonymy for the men possessed by them, because the action is directed by them. ὅταν ἐθεώρουν[1] — *whenever they beheld him.*

ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον, . . . ἔκραζον, instead of the singular, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ ABCDL etc. λέγοντες, instead of λέγοντα, Tisch. WH. *marg.* ℵ DK 61, 69 etc.

προσέπιπτον καὶ ἔκραζον — *would fall down before him and cry out.* The impf. denotes repeated action. Ὅτι σὺ[2] — ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ — *the Son of God.* This title was a Messianic title, denoting theocratic sonship, and there is nothing here to indicate that it is used in any other than this common sense. The onus probandi is not on those who deny the use of the term in the Synoptical Gospels, of metaphysical sonship, but on those who claim this use. Unless it was accompanied by language pointing out the metaphysical sonship, no Jew would have understood it.

APPOINTMENT OF THE TWELVE

13–19. *Jesus goes up into the mountain, and chooses the twelve.*

The appointment of the twelve is put in different connections in the Synoptics. But in them all, the connection is such as to point to the growth of our Lord's work as the occasion of the appointment. They are to aid him in his work of proclaiming the kingdom, and of healing. But after all, the other purpose named, the association with himself, is the one most in evidence in the subsequent history.

13. τὸ ὄρος — *the mountain, i.e.* the one in the neighborhood. οὓς ἤθελεν αὐτὸς — *whom he himself wished.* The pronoun is emphatic, the form of the verb being enough to indicate the person. Those who came to Jesus at this time came not of their own accord, but in accordance with his desire.

14. ἐποίησε δώδεκα — *he appointed twelve.* This use of the verb comes under the head of making one something, — king or priest, for instance. Only here, that to which they were appointed is expressed, not as an office, but as the purpose of the appointment. This purpose is expressed under two heads, the first being

[1] ὅταν ἐθεώρουν is a rare construction. Generally, ὅταν is used with conditions belonging to the future, or with general conditions belonging to any time, and is construed with the subjunctive. The indefiniteness in the time of past conditions expressed in our *-ever* is denoted by -ποτε.

[2] On this use of ὅτι to introduce direct quotation, see on 1[15].

association with himself, and the second, to act as his messengers in the work of proclaiming the good news of the kingdom and of healing the sick. Apparently, the former was the only one fully carried out during our Lord's life, the second becoming their work when they were made necessarily independent of him by his death. And in accordance with this, the name generally given in the Gospels is *disciples*, and afterward, in the Acts and Epistles, they are called *apostles*.

οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν, *whom he also named apostles*, is inserted after ἐποίησε δώδεκα by WH. RV. *marg.* ℵ BC* Δ 13, 28, 69, 124, 238, 346, Memph. Harcl. *marg.* Tisch. thinks it has been copied from Lk. 6[13]. But on the whole, considering the strength of the testimony for it, it seems at least equally possible that Lk. found it in the original Mk.

κηρύσσειν — *to herald*, or here, where it is used absolutely, *to act as heralds*. The word conveys the idea of authority, a herald being an official who makes public proclamation of weighty affairs. The proclamation which they were to make was the coming of the kingdom of God.

15. ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν — *to have power to cast out.* This is in the same construction as κηρύσσειν, and denotes one of the objects of sending them forth.

Omit θεραπεύειν τὰς νόσους, καὶ, *to heal diseases, and*, Tisch. Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ Memph.

With this omission, the casting out of demons is taken as the representative miracle. So frequently.[1]

16. καὶ ἐπέθηκε.

Καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα, *and he appointed the twelve*, is inserted before καὶ ἐπέθηκε by Tisch. WH. RV. *marg.* ℵ BC* Δ.

καὶ ἐπέθηκε interrupts the structure of the sentence, which is resumed in the next verse. The names that follow are in apposition with τοὺς δώδεκα in the inserted clause, and the enumeration is interrupted to give the descriptive names assigned to some of them by Jesus.

Πέτρον — *Peter.* Mt. gives the only explanation of this name given to Simon, in ch. 16 : 18. But neither in this passage nor in that, is there any definite indication that it was at either time that the name was given him. J. 1[42], however, assigns the giving of the name to a time much earlier than either, immediately after the Baptism. Πέτρον means a *rock*. The masculine form, instead of Πέτρα, is due to its being appropriated as the name of a man.

17. καὶ Ἰάκωβον — This resumes the structure of v.[14], as if v.[16] read Σίμωνα ᾧ ἐπέθηκε.

Βοανεργές. This is a modified form of the Heb. בְּנֵי רֶגֶשׁ. רֶגֶשׁ properly means *tumult* or *uproar*, of any kind, and *thunder*. as a

[1] See on 1[39].

secondary meaning, is not improbable, though we have no example of it in Hebrew literature. The name probably describes a fiery, vehement temperament, rather than a thunderous eloquence, or a sonorous speech. The little that is told us about the disciples makes it impossible to follow out these hints about their character and temperament. These four, Peter, James and John, and Andrew, always stand first in these lists of the twelve, and among them, Peter is always first. Mt. calls him πρῶτος. But Mt. and Lk. put Andrew into the second place, evidently to associate him with his brother. Mk.'s order is the order of their rank, Peter, James, and John being the three disciples chosen by Jesus to attend him on special occasions, *e.g.* the Transfiguration, the raising of the daughter of Jairus, and the scene in the garden of Gethsemane.

18. Φίλιππον — Philip heads the second group in all the Gospels, as Peter the first. The name is a Greek name. We hear nothing more about him in the Synoptics, though he is mentioned several times in the fourth Gospel.

Βαρθολομαῖον — This name does not occur in the Gospels outside of these lists, and elsewhere only in Acts 1^{13}. And in the passage in Acts, Bartholomew's name is associated, as it is here, with those of Philip and Thomas. In the fourth Gospel, on the other hand, we find that Nathanael is associated with Philip and Thomas, as Bartholomew is in the Synoptics and the Acts. In J. 1^{46-50}, Nathanael is the one whom Philip introduces to Jesus, while in J. 21^{2}, Nathanael's name is associated with Thomas. This, together with the fact that so important a personage as Nathanael appears to be in J. is not mentioned in the list of the twelve, has led to the quite reasonable supposition that the two are to be identified. In that case, Bartholomew, which means *Son of Tolmai*, would be a patronymic, and Nathanael would be the real name.

Ματθαῖον — On the identification of this disciple with Levi the publican, see on 2^{14}. He is not mentioned after this, except in Acts 1^{13}. Θωμᾶν — This disciple, who is a mere name in the Synoptics and the Acts, becomes a personage in the fourth Gospel. J. 11^{16} 14^{5} 20^{24-28}. This group of four is the same in all three Synoptics, but in Mt., Thomas precedes Matthew.

Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου — This James is probably the same as Ἰάκωβος ὁ μικρός, *James the little*, the son of Mary and Clopas. See 15^{40} 16^{1} J. 19^{25}. The supposition, however, that in this passage from J., Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ is in apposition with ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, and that thus the brothers of our Lord were his cousins and included in the list of apostles, is decisively negatived, first, by its giving us two sisters having the same name, Mary; secondly, by the fact, that in Lk. 2^{7}, Jesus is called the firstborn son of Mary, implying that there were other sons; thirdly, by Acts 1^{14},

in which the brothers of our Lord are distinguished from the apostles; and finally, by J. 7^5 which states distinctly, that at the Feast of Tabernacles, six months before the death of Jesus, his brothers did not believe in him.

Θαδδαῖον — This must be the same as Lebbæus, Mt. 10^3 (AV. Tisch.), and Jude the son of James, Lk. 6^{16}.

τὸν Καναναῖον — *the Zealot.*

Καναναῖον, instead of Καναν*ί*την, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 33, Latt. Memph. (Pesh.) etc.

If this name meant *an inhabitant of Cana,* it would be Καναῖον. Probably, it comes from the Heb. קַנָּא, Chald. קַנָּאָן, with the termination αιος which denotes a party (Φαρισαῖος, Σαδδουκαῖος), and is the same as Ζηλώτης zealot, the name given to him in Lk. 6^{15}. This was the name of a party of fanatic nationalists among the Jews, leaders of the national revolt against the foreign yoke.

19. Ἰσκαριώτην — Heb., אִישׁ קְרִיּוֹת, Man of Kerioth. Judas is designated thus as an inhabitant of Kerioth, a village of Judæa. παρέδωκεν — *delivered up.* The word for betrayal is προέδωκεν.

There can be no doubt what significance Mk. means to give to the appointment of the twelve. It is preceded and followed in his account by the gathering of the importunate crowds about our Lord. And the connection points plainly to the conclusion that Jesus appoints them to be his helpers in the work thus growing on his hands. This is indicated in the purpose, *that he may send them forth to preach, and to heal;* that is, to share in the work which has been described before as done by him.[1] But we do not find that much of this active work was done by them during Jesus' lifetime. The purpose which was more fully carried out was that of permanent association with himself, expressed in the words, *that they may be with him.* Instead of the fluctuating attendance on his person of the ordinary disciples, he desired for these twelve such constant association that they could afterwards be his witnesses, and carry forward his work. Mt. 9^{35}–10^4 gives the same general reason, but the immediate occasion is a missionary tour made by Jesus through Galilee, in which he is impressed by the greatness of the spiritual harvest, and the small number of laborers. Lk. 6^{17-19} places the concourse of people after the appointment of the twelve. The inclusion of Judas in the number of the apostles is a certain indication that he was at the time

[1] See 1^{34}.

a genuine disciple. In his case, as in that of all the apostles, there was a failure to understand our Lord's purely spiritual programme, but the personal equation, the faith in Christ himself, overcame this doubt at first. Later, the doubt predominated in the case of Judas, and even in the rest of the apostles it led to the temporary desertion of the ten, and to the denial of Peter.

CHARGE OF DIABOLISM

20–35. *Jesus, at home again, is met by the opposition of the Scribes, and by the attempt on the part of his family to restrain him.*

It is evident that there is both a logical and a chronological relation between this attitude of our Lord's family and this new phase of the opposition of the Scribes. The logical relation is found in the language of the two. His family said, *he is beside himself;* the Scribes said, *he is possessed by the devil himself.* The close juxtaposition of these in the narrative shows that Mk. had this logical relation in his mind. On the other hand, the interruption of the story of his family's attempt to restrain him by the introduction of the other account, and the resumption of the former in v.[31], is not explained so well by any other assumption as that there was really such an interval between the family's original purpose and their arrival on the scene of action, which was filled up by the controversy with the Scribes. Jesus makes this opposition the occasion of teaching, of which it is easy to miss the point, and which has been badly misunderstood. In regard to the charge that he is in collusion with Satan in casting out demons, his point fully stated would be, that such collusion is possible up to the point where it involves an actual arraying of Satan against himself. And Jesus turns their charge against themselves by his counter-claim that his whole action is hostile to Satan, making such collusion impossible. And this is the acumen of his statement about the sin against the Holy Ghost. In the case of the Scribes, their charge had been very close to that sin, when they said that the Spirit in Jesus was the Devil instead of the Holy Spirit, involving a complete upsetting of all moral values, and a stupendous and well-nigh irrecoverable moral blindness in

themselves. That is, their whole error lay in their failure to value the moral element in Jesus' works. It is not implied at all that his family was in sympathy with the Scribes, their apprehension being simply that his mind was unsettled, and that he needed to be put under restraint. This lack of sympathy with him on the part of his human family led Jesus to point out the higher reality of spiritual relationship and association.

20. ἔρχεται — *comes.* εἰς οἶκον is here probably the colloquial anarthrous phrase, equivalent to our *home.* The gathering of the Scribes from Jerusalem and the visit of his family would probably both of them be at Capernaum, and this points to his own house as the one meant here, RV. margin.

ἔρχεται instead of ἔρχονται, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ B Γ *mss.* of Lat. Vet. etc.

Καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν (ὁ) ὄχλος — *And (the) crowd gathers again.*

ὁ before ὄχλος Tr. (WH.) RV. ℵ ABDL$^{corr.}$ Δ 209, 300, Memph.$^{edd.}$ The article is rather favored by Mk.'s habit of correlating persons and things with previous mentions of the same in his account.

πάλιν — *again.* This refers to $2^{1.2}$, and denotes a repetition of what occurred then in the same place. μὴ δύνασθαι μηδὲ — *not able even.*

μηδὲ, instead of μήτε, Treg. WH. RV. ABKLU Δ 28, 33 etc.

ὥστε μὴ.[1]

21. οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ — *his family.* v.[31], which is evidently a resumption of this part of the narrative, says *his mother and his brothers.* Literally, this phrase would denote *those descended from him,* but it has come to have this modification of its strict meaning. Κρατῆσαι — *to lay hold of him, to get possession of him.* They wanted to protect Jesus against his own madness. For they said that *he is beside himself,* ἐξέστη.[2] ἀκούσαντες has for its object the preceding statement. Jesus' permitting the multitude to gather about him in this tumultuous way and to engross him so entirely, seemed to them an unwarranted absorption in an entirely visionary work. This absence of prudence and of care of himself seemed to them misplaced.

Weiss, with some show of reason, makes the subject of ἔλεγον the persons from whom the family received their account. But the more natural subject is the same as that of ἐξῆλθον, unless a different one is pointed out. And it is just as probable that the family inferred the ἐξέστη from what they heard, as that it made a part of the report.

---

[1] Where the inf. is used with ὥστε, the N.T. invariably employs the neg. μή, even when the result is stated as a fact. See Win. 55, 2 *d.* [2] See on 2^{12}.

Καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες — *And the Scribes who came down from Jerusalem.*

This delegation is introduced here with the article, as if it had been mentioned before. But the article may be taken as meaning the Scribes who were present, and οἱ καταβάντες as an incidental statement of the reason of their presence. This slight change of meaning would be indicated by a comma, — *and the Scribes, who came down from Jerusalem.*

22. Καταβάντες — It was down from Jerusalem, which was situated on high land, to most other parts of the country. This is the first mention of the presence of Scribes from Jerusalem, and it is an indication of an increased activity and hostility of the religious leaders against Jesus.

Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει — *he has Beelzebul.* This is a modification of a Heb. name, and is one of their names for Satan.[1] One is said to have a demon, or here, the *prince of demons*, as he is said to have a disease, that is, to be afflicted with it.

The particular form of this charge, that he is possessed, not with an ordinary demon, but with the devil himself, is in order to account for his power over demons, as representing their prince. But we may suppose that they took a malicious pleasure in making his an exaggerated case. ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων — *in the prince of the demons.* The preposition has the same force as in the phrases *in Christ, in the Holy Spirit.* It is a local designation of intimate union, as if the two were so absorbed in each other, that they dwelt, one in the other. The charge is, that Jesus cast out demons by virtue of this connection with their prince. It is not merely an attempt to explain these miracles, so as to do away with the effect of them, but a distinct charge on the strength of them. They said, *this man is in collusion with the devil. It is evident all through his course, but this assumed miracle is distinct proof of it. How else does this insignificant person coming among us without any credentials, get this extraordinary power over demons, unless there is some connection between him and their ruler. The devil has power to order them round, and has authorized this man to act for him, and so further the dangerous delusion about himself which is spreading among the people.* There is no connection between the attitude of the religious leaders, and of Jesus' own family here. Rather, the hostility of the Scribes was one of the dangers of the situation, to which Jesus himself seemed rashly indifferent, and which led his family to seek to restrain him.

Mt. 12[22. 23] and Lk. 11[14] give us a more immediate occasion for this charge in their account of the casting out of a demon at this time. In this Gospel, the connection is general, the charge being occasioned by Jesus' frequent performance of this most prominent of all his miracles.

[1] The Heb. is זְבוּל, בַּעַל זְבוּל being a rabbinical form of בַּעַל זְבֻל. The whole means *god of filth.*

23. *ἐν παραβολαῖς* — A parable is an analogy. It assumes a likeness between higher and lower things, such that what is true in one department holds good in another. It serves the purpose not only of illustration and of figurative statement, but also of proof. Here the apologetic purpose is evident. The analogy may be drawn out into a story, or description, as in most of Jesus' parables, but this is not essential. In this case, Jesus begins with an abstract statement of his position, and then gives several analogous cases proving the general principle.

Σατανᾶς Σατανᾶ ἐκβάλλειν — Satan is the Heb. name of the devil, the prince of the demons. It means the Adversary, and except in this passage, and Lk. 22^3, the name is written with the article.[1] Jesus shows the fallacy of the scribes' position by calling their attention to one essential element in his casting out of demons, which makes it impossible to account for it in their way. And that is, that his action toward the demons is hostile action. To be sure, his ordering them round, in itself considered, may be merely an exercise of the power which their ruler exercises over them. But when his authority is exercised, not for them, but against them, and against everything for which they and their ruler stand, he must be representing, not some friendly power, but a distinctly hostile force. They are so identified with their ruler, that what he does to them he does virtually to himself, and he does not cast himself out from one of his principal vantage points, possessing a special strategic value for his cause.

24. *καὶ ἐὰν βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῇ* — *And if a kingdom is divided against itself.* This is the analogy which lies nearest at hand. Indeed, it may be called the generic statement of the preceding principle. Satan and his subjects constitute a kingdom, and what is true of any kingdom is applicable to them. There is no difference between human kingdoms and this kingdom of evil spirits, which would invalidate this common truth. In the form in which this analogy is stated, it contains the reason why it is morally impossible for Satan to cast out Satan. It is, that such division leads to destruction. The condition is here a general one, not confined to any time.

25. The second analogy is that of a house. The word is used by metonymy for the family inhabiting a house. Here, too, division ends in destruction. *οὐ δυνήσεται* — *will not be able.* The form of the conditional statement in this case belongs to the future, and not to a general condition.

δυνήσεται, instead of *δύναται*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ *mss.* of Lat. Vet. and of Vulg. *δύναται* is an evident emendation, to correspond to v.[24].

[1] See on 1^{18}.

26. καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ' ἑαυτόν, ἐμερίσθη καὶ οὐ δύναται στῆναι — *And if Satan arose against himself, he was divided and cannot stand.*[1]

ἐμερίσθη, καὶ instead of καὶ μεμέρισται, Tisch. ℵ* C* Δ *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. καὶ ἐμερίσθη Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ^{c} BL. καὶ ἐμερίσθη is a probable emendation to bring the aorists ἀνέστη and ἐμερίσθη together, instead of ἐμερίσθη and the pres. οὐ δύναται. στῆναι, instead of σταθῆναι, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCL.

This verse applies the principle to the case in hand, and the form of conditional statement corresponds. It states the condition as belonging to past time, and says of an event actually past, *if it was of such a character.* In the conclusion, the aor. states what *was* involved, the pres. what *is* involved.

27. οὐ δύναται οὐδεὶς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ εἰσελθὼν τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ διαρπάσαι — *no one can enter into the strong man's house, and plunder his tools.*

εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ εἰσελθὼν τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ, instead of τὰ σκεύη τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 33, Memph. Pesh.

In what precedes, Jesus has simply taken the negative attitude towards their charge that he is in collusion with Satan, showing that that is impossible. But in this verse he shows what is the real relation to Satan involved in his casting out demons. What it does mean is conflict with Satan, and victory over him. This also is stated in the form of an analogy, that no one can enter a strong man's house, and despoil his tools, except he first bind the strong man. σκεύη is here not possessions or goods, but utensils, and denotes the demons as Satan's instruments, or tools. What Jesus says is not simply an inference from his casting out of demons, though that is the proof of it to others. But this victory over Satan is a part of his self-consciousness. He knows that he has met Satan here on his own stamping ground, where he has been accustomed to take advantage of the weakness of men for their undoing; moreover, that Satan has approached him on this same side of his human weakness, and for once, has met his master. Instead of mastering, he has been himself mastered, and the mastery has been followed up by crippling; he has been bound. Here we come upon one of the deepest truths of Jesus' life, that the real basis of his power, which is a spiritual power, is to be found in his own righteousness under difficulties, and those difficulties the same which are inherent in human nature, and due to the exposure of that nature to a subtle and victorious power of evil which had so far dominated the world.

---

[1] ἀνέστη and ἐμερίσθη are aorist, and it preserves the flavor of the original better to translate them as simple pasts, *arose*, and *was divided*, instead of perfects.

28. Ἀμὴν — *Verily.*[1] This has the effect of solemn emphasis. πάντα ἀφεθήσεται . . . τὰ ἁμαρτήματα — *all sins shall be forgiven.* The statement that all the sins of men shall be forgiven is not to be taken of individual sins, but of classes, or kinds of sin. αἱ βλασφημίαι — *the blasphemies.* This word means primarily *injurious speech,* and, as applied to God, speech derogatory to his Divine majesty. ὅσα ἂν βλασφημήσωσιν — Literally, *whatsoever things they blasphemously utter.*[2]

αἱ before βλασφημίαι Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCEFGHL Δ Memph. etc. ὅσα, instead of ὅσας, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDE* GH Δ etc.

Blasphemy is not here regarded as that into which all sins may be resolved,[3] but it adds to the general term *sins,* the special class to which the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit belongs.

29. εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον — *against the Holy Spirit.*[4] What is meant by the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit? The difficulty on one side, has been the consideration of this question without reference to the case in hand, and on the other hand, so superficial an explanation of this case as to leave what Jesus says about the enormity of the sin involved practically unexplained. Plainly, the Holy Spirit is not to be considered here in his independent action, but as the inward source of Jesus' acts. What Jesus says is occasioned by their charge that he had an evil spirit; that is, that the power acting in him was not good, but bad. Now, the Holy Spirit is the Divine power to which the acts of Jesus are attributed. The Spirit is represented as descending on him at his baptism, and driving him into the wilderness, and Jesus is said to have begun his ministry in Galilee in the power of the Spirit. Especially, Jesus ascribes his expulsion of evil spirits to the Holy Spirit. Hence, a distinction is to be made between his other acts, and those which manifestly reveal the Holy Spirit in him, and between slander directed against him personally, as he appears in his common acts, and that which is aimed at those acts in which the Spirit is manifest. Just so far as there is in the man who utters the slander any recognition, however vague, of this agency, or so far as there is in the person against whom it is directed so manifest a revelation of the Spirit as should lead to this recognition, so far, there is danger, to say the least, of this blasphemy

---

[1] Ἀμήν is the Heb. particle of affirmation from אָמַן, *to be firm, sure.* Its proper place is at the end of the sentence, and disconnected with it, like our *Amen.* This adverbial use of it, placed at the beginning of the sentence, belongs to the report of our Lord's discourses in the Gospels. Elsewhere in the N.T. it is used after the Heb. fashion.

[2] ὅσα is the cognate acc. after βλασφημήσωσιν, and independent of both βλασφημίαι and ἁμαρτήματα. See Col. 3^{14}, where ὅ is used in the same way.

[3] See Morison's singular note.

[4] In this use of a preposition after βλασφημήσῃ, there is a return to the earlier construction, for which the N.T. employs the simple acc.

against the Holy Spirit. Moreover, this act of driving out evil spirits was the act in which the holiness of the Spirit operating in Jesus specially appeared. It is not in the power shown in the miracles that the operation of the Holy Spirit is most evident, but in their moral quality. There is the moral uniqueness about the miracles of Jesus which appears in the rest of his life, only there, it is, if anything, most conspicuous. And this quality appears specially where he not only cures the bodily diseases of men, but frees them from an evil spirit which deranges their inner life. To call that evil, instead of good, and especially to ascribe it to the very prince of evil, is the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The only alleviation of it is the failure to recognize fully these facts. οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα — *hath never forgiveness,*[1] ἀλλὰ ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος — *but is guilty of an eternal sin.*

ἁμαρτήματος, instead of κρίσεως, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 28, 33 (C* D 13, 69, 346, ἁμαρτίας), Latt. Memph.

An eternal sin may be one subjecting the person to an eternal punishment, eternal in its consequences, that is.[2] But certainly it is equally allowable to suppose that it describes the sin itself as eternal, accounting for the impossibility of the forgiveness by the permanence of the sin, — endless consequences attached to endless sin. This is the philosophy of endless punishment. Sin reacts on the nature, an act passes into a state, and the state continues. That is, eternal punishment is not a measure of God's resentment against a single sin, which is so enormous that the resentment never abates. It is the result of the effect of any sin, or course of sin in fixing the sinful state beyond recovery. This is more accordant with the inwardness of Jesus' ordinary view of things.

30. πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει — *he has an unclean spirit.* The report of their saying above is, *he hath Beelzebul,* and it is changed here in order to make the contrast between πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον and Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, *the Holy Spirit.*

31. καὶ ἔρχονται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες . . . καλοῦντες αὐτόν — *and there came his mother and his brothers, and standing outside . . . calling him.*

Καὶ ἔρχ(ονται), instead of Ἔρχονται οὖν, Treg. WH. RV. (Tisch. Καὶ ἔρχεται) ℵ BCDGL Δ 1, 13, 28, 69, 118, 124, 209, Latt. Memph. Pesh. etc. ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, instead of οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDGL Δ Latt. Memph. Pesh. στήκοντες, instead of ἑστῶτες, Tisch. Treg. WH. BC Δ 28. καλοῦντες, instead of φωνοῦντες, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL 1, 13, 28, 69, 118, 124, etc.

---

[1] Literally, *hath not forgiveness forever.* The Heb. form of the universal negative, joining the negative with the verb, instead of with the adverb.

[2] So Meyer, Weiss, Holtzmann, etc.

Though the resumptive οὖν is omitted, it is plain that this is a resumption of what is said about his family coming out to restrain him in v.[21]. The preliminary statement is put there, in order to connect ἐξῆλθον with its cause in the tumultuous gathering of the people. Then it is interrupted by the story of the dispute with the Scribes, because that event precedes in the order of time. It is this unsympathetic attitude of his family in this visit which gives force to what Jesus says about his true family. On the brothers of Jesus, see on v.[18]. ἀδελφοί is used sometimes to denote less intimate relationship, but it is not at all common, and aside from usage, the supposition that the ἀδελφοί of Jesus were anything else than brothers is quite against the evidence. The names of these brothers are given in Mt. 13[55] as James, Joseph, Simeon, and Jude. καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες — *and standing outside.* Evidently on account of the crowd surrounding the house.[1]

32. περὶ αὐτόν — *around him.*[2] καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ — *and they say to him.*

καὶ λέγουσιν, instead of εἶπον δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 13, 69, 124, 346, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh. Harcl. *marg.*

ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου — *thy mother, and thy brothers, and thy sisters.*

καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου —Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. *marg.* ADEFHMSUV Γ 22, 124, 238, 299, 433, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Harcl. *marg.* Omitted probably to accord with v.[33. 34], and with Mt. and Lk.

33. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς[3] λέγει — *And answering, he says.*

ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει, instead of ἀπεκρίθη, λέγων, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ Vulg. Memph. Harcl. καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου, *and my brothers,* instead of ἤ, *or,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCGL Δ 1, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh.

Jesus does not wish, in this question, to deny or underrate the human relations. But he feels with a strength, not common among men, the Divine relation and the human relations to which this gives rise. Moreover, the present errand of his family has made him feel that they come short of the real connection which alone gives worth to the family relation.

34. τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν καθημένους — *those seated around him.* v.[32] has stated that the crowd was seated about him. But evidently from what follows, this was made up in this case of his disciples.

35. τοῦ Θεοῦ — Mt. 12[50] says τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ, which defines more closely the nature and reason of this relation. It is a common relation to the heavenly Father, and not to an earthly

---

[1] See v.[20], and especially Lk. 8[19].

[2] With the acc., περί is used locally, with the gen., of subject matter — *around* a person or thing, and *about* a subject.

[3] The Greeks used the middle, instead of the pass. of ἀποκρίνω, in the sense of *answer.* This use is peculiar to N.T. Greek.

father, that is at the basis of the kinship acknowledged by him. Moreover, the relation to God is of the moral kind, shown by doing His will. It is due to a new nature begotten in the man by God, but it shows itself in obedience. Jesus' own relation to God, making it his meat and drink to do his will, is the uppermost and central thing in his life, and those who share with him this relation come nearest to him. Spiritual kinship surpasses the accidents of birth.

ὃς ἂν ποιήσῃ — *whoever does.*

Omit γάρ, *for*, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. B *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. γάρ is an emendation. Omit μου, *my*, after ἀδελφή Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABD L Δ *mss.* of Lat. Vet.

The order of Mk. here, connecting this paragraph with the teaching in parables which follows, is also the order of Mt., and the latter marks this as a chronological order by the use of ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, 12^{46}, and ἐν τῇ ἐκείνῃ ἡμέρᾳ, 13^{1}. On the other hand, Lk. 11^{37} connects this attack of the Pharisees with Jesus' denunciation of them by another definite chronological mark, ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι. And Mt. puts this denunciation among the events of the passion week, and fixes it there by his introductory Τότε. This is a specimen of the disagreement of the Evangelists in their attempts to give chronological sequence to their narratives. Dr. Gardiner, Harmony, p. 70, explains this by the supposition that such expressions as ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος and ἐν τῷ λαλῆσαι may be used by the Evangelist to indicate that an event took place, not necessarily in the midst of that particular discourse, but simply of some discourse or other; that is, while he was talking, instead of walking, or healing or something. This is a good example of the ingenuities and curiosities of harmonizing interpretation. Such use of language by the Evangelists would discredit them equally with the inconsistencies that it is intended to remove.

THE PARABLES OF JESUS

IV. With one exception, the prophetic discourse of ch. 13, the parables are the only connected discourse in Mk. And it is the only specimen of teaching without any statement of the circumstances in which it originated. Indeed, it follows from what Jesus says about the object of his teaching in parables, that it would be without any such ground in events or questions, as would furnish a key to the meaning of the parable. Like all our Lord's teaching, it grew out of the conditions of the time, but the connection is not indicated, except as one reads the riddle of the parable itself. And in this way, it serves his purpose of veiling the truth, except to the initiated. But when one understands the μυστήριον, the secret of the kingdom, the occasion is obvious. That secret, not known at the time by any one but Jesus, and not to be communicated to outsiders, was that the kingdom is a seed

which grows, and not an authority to be externally set up and enforced. The occasion is thus the hindrances to the work of Jesus, the opposition of the rulers, the dulness and superficiality of the multitude, and the question even of the disciples, why he does not brush these obstacles away and set up the Messianic kingdom.

THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER

1–9. *Jesus comes again to the shore of the lake, where he is followed by the usual multitude, whom he teaches from a boat in parables.*

1. *πάλιν — again* connects this with the events by the shore of the lake, 3^{7} sq.; cf. 2^{13} 1^{16}. *καὶ συνάγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος πλεῖστος — and there gathers to him a very great multitude.*

συνάγεται, instead of *συνήχθη*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 13, 28, 69, 124. *πλεῖστος* instead of *πολύς*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ.

The great multitude repeats the scene of the previous gathering at the shore of the lake, and the boat is apparently the boat which he ordered the disciples to have in readiness for him at that time, $3^{7.9}$.

εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα (omit *τὸ*), *having entered a boat*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCKLM 1, 33, 118, 131, 209 etc.

πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦσαν — were towards the sea upon the land.[1]

ἦσαν, instead of *ἦν*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 33, *mss.* of Lat. Vet.

Lk. 8^{1-4} gives a different setting to the parable. According to him, it was spoken during a journey in the cities and villages of Galilee.

2. *ἐδίδασκεν — he was teaching.* The impf. describes the act in its progress. *ἐν παραβολαῖς — in parables.*[2] Here we have the parable drawn out into a story. *ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ — in his teaching.* The word denotes the act of teaching, not the doctrine, or thing taught. *ἀκούετε — hear*, or *listen*. It calls attention to what follows, after a manner common to our Lord.

3. *ὁ σπείρων — the sower*, not *a sower*.[3]

---

[1] Mt. gives the same mark of the size of the multitude in this case. But it is one of the characteristic marks of this Gospel to emphasize the crowds that followed Jesus by some graphic touch. See 1^{33} 2^{2} $3^{7.20}$.

[2] See 3^{23}, note.

[3] This is the generic use of the article, an individual being taken to represent the class. See Win. 18, 1.

4. ὃ μὲν — *some.* σπέρμα, *seed* is understood.[1] παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν — *by the side of the road.* We are not to think here of a wide road, with a fence or wall separating it from the field, but of a path traversing the unenclosed fields. The unproductiveness is due of course to the hardness of the trodden soil. Jesus adds that the birds devoured the seed, and this is due to its lying on the surface without penetrating it.

Omit τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, *of heaven,* after τὰ πέτεινα, *the birds,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCL Δ *mss.* of Lat. Vet. and of Vulg. etc.

5. Καὶ ἄλλο — *and other.*[2]

καὶ ἄλλο, instead of ἄλλο δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC(D)L Δ two *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. etc.

τὸ πετρῶδες — *the rocky ground,* not *stony.* A place where the rock came up near the surface, leaving room for only thin soil overlying it, is meant.

καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξανέτειλε — *and it came up immediately.* The thin soil had two effects; first, the grain came up quickly, because it lay near the surface, and was more exposed to the generous influence of the sun and rain; and secondly, it was scorched and withered by the sun, because there was no room for the roots to penetrate.

6. Καὶ ὅτε ὁ ἥλιος ἀνέτειλεν — *and when the sun arose.*

This reading, instead of ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph.

ἐκαυματίσθη — *was scorched.*[3]

7. εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας — *i.e.* among the seeds of thorns or briers, which afterwards came up, ἀνέβησαν, and choked the grain.

8. καὶ ἄλλα — *and others;* σπέρματα is understood, the word being taken individually, instead of collectively, as in the other parts of the parable.

ἄλλα, *others,* instead of ἄλλο, *other,* Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ * and cb BCL 28, 33, 124, one *ms.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. etc.

ἐδίδου καρπον — *gave fruit.* Probably, in this case, as in v.[7], this means the grain itself, and not the stalks, but in this case, the participles ἀναβαίνοντα and αὐξάνοντα must agree with ἄλλα, and not with καρπὸν. The reading αὐξανόμενον favored by T Tr. forces the agreement with καρπόν. That of WH. RV. αὐξανόμενα, forces the agreement with ἄλλα. The internal evidence thus confirms the latter reading; cf. καρποφοροῦσιν v.[20].

αὐξανόμενον, instead of αὐξάνοντα, Tisch. Treg. ADL Δ 238. αὐξανόμενα WH. RV. ℵ B.

---

[1] On this use of the relative in antithetical statements, see Win. 17, 1 *b.*
[2] The proper correlative of ὃ μὲν is ὃ δὲ. [3] This verb belongs to later Greek.

εἰς τριάκοντα — *up to thirty*, denoting the degree of fruitfulness.

εἰς τριάκοντα, instead of ἓν τριάκοντα, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 28 etc. εἰς ἑξήκοντα, and εἰς ἑκατον Tisch. Treg. WH. *marg.* RV. ℵ C* Δ 28 etc. ἐν with the last two WH. BLEFGKMUV Π etc.

9. Καὶ ἔλεγεν, ὃς ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω — *And he said, He who hath ears to hear, let him hear.* This is a familiar expression of our Lord's used by him to call attention to what is especially worth hearing. *Ye who have ears, prepare to use them now.*

Omit αὐτοῖς, *to them*, after ἔλεγεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDL Δ Latt. Memph. Syrr. etc. ὃς ἔχει, instead of ὁ ἔχων, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* D Δ.

10–25. *Explanation of the parable.*

10. καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας[1] — *And when he came to be alone, i.e.* after the departure of the crowd, which, however, followed probably the telling of the other parables. This is certainly so, if we adopt the reading τὰς παραβολάς at the end of the verse.

οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν — The disciples generally, as distinguished from the multitude on the one hand, and the twelve on the other. Disciples, because he separates them from those outside, as those to whom the mystery of the kingdom is entrusted. τὰς παραβολάς — the parables uttered by him on this occasion, including those following the explanation of the Parable of the Sower.

Καὶ ὅτε, instead of Ὅτε δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ Latt. Memph. etc. ἠρώτων, instead of ἠρώτησαν, Treg. WH. RV. ABL Δ 33. ἠρώτουν, Tisch. ℵ C. τὰς παραβολάς, instead of Sing., Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ one *ms.* of Lat. Vet. *mss.* of Vulg. Memph. some edd.

11. Ὑμῖν δέδοται τὸ μυστήριον — *To you has been given the mystery.* The mystery has been put into your hands.

Omit γνῶναι, *to know*, after δέδοται, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCKL one *ms.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. some edd. etc.

A mystery in the N.T. is not something hard to understand, but something hidden, revealed only to the initiated, like the Greek mysteries. The secret of the Kingdom of God set forth in these parables is the fact of its only partial success in this early stage. This fact seemed to those outside, not possessed of the secret of the kingdom, to be inconsistent with its nature as a heavenly kingdom. They thought, when God really set out to establish his Kingdom, its success would be speedy and sure. Supernatural powers would supersede natural processes, and everything would yield to them. The mystery, the hidden thing, set

[1] The separation of καταμόνας into κατὰ μόνας is simply a matter of interpretation. χώρας is to be supplied with μόνας.

forth by Jesus, in this group of parables, is that the kingdom belongs to living, growing things, and is subject thus to the same laws as grain, leaven, mustard seed, and the like. Gradualness therefore belongs to its nature.

ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω—*to those outsiders.* The EV. translates τοῖς ἔξω by *them who are without.* And we need to add something to this to indicate the presence of the demonstrative. This can be done by emphasizing the word *them* (*those*), or by translating τοῖς ἔξω *outsiders.* Jesus has in mind probably the multitude just gone from them, whom he points out in ἐκείνοις, and describes by τοῖς ἔξω; cf. Mt. 13^{11}, where ἐκείνοις alone is used. The connection with τ. βασιλείας τ. Θεοῦ in the preceding clause indicates that it is the kingdom of God outside of which he places them. Those inside the kingdom know its secrets, those outside do not know them. τὰ πάντα—*all things.* It is defined by the context as all things pertaining to the mystery of the kingdom.

ἐν παραβολαῖς—*in parables.* Instead of being stated in terms belonging to itself, the mystery of the kingdom is so stated in terms belonging to another realm, as to veil it. The parable, *i.e.* by itself, without its key. If the truth is stated first abstractly, and then in terms of the analogy, the two help to the understanding of each other by showing that the phenomenon is not special, but common, a general fact belonging to the related realms of matter and spirit. But without this key, the parable remains a riddle, which is one of its meanings.

12. ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσι, καὶ μὴ ἴδωσι—*in order that seeing, they may see, and not perceive.* It is evident that ἴδωσι expresses a more inward and real sight than βλέπωσι. The idea is expressed thus, *in order that in the act of seeing, there may be merely outward seeing and not perception.* The contrast is more exactly expressed by the difference between ἀκούωσι and συνιῶσι, *hearing* and *understanding.* μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς—*lest perchance they may turn, and it be forgiven them.* ἀφεθῇ is used impersonally.

Omit τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, *their sins,* after ἀφεθῇ Tisch. Treg. *txt.* WH. RV. ℵ BCL 1, 22, 118, 209, 251, 340,* one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

The whole verse is a translation of Is. 6^9, adapted freely from the Sept. It takes these phrases ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε κ. οὐ μὴ συνῆτε, κ. βλέποντες βλέψουσιν κ. οὐ μὴ ἴδητε and μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν κ. ἰάσομαι αὐτούς out of their connection and pieces them together.

In explaining this difficult passage, it is to be noticed, first, that the difference between the form of the quotation in Mk. and Lk. on the one hand, and Mt. on the other, corresponds to a like difference between the original Hebrew and the LXX. In the Hebrew, God says to his prophet, "Go, . . . make the heart of this people fat and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes, lest

they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn again and be healed." That is, God is represented as sending his prophet to harden the heart of the people by his prophetic message, as if Rubinstein should have been told to deaden people's musical sense by his playing, or Bishop Brooks to stifle their religious sense by his preaching. In the LXX., on the contrary, the hardening is the cause, not the purpose. The people will not hear the prophet's message because their heart is hardened, and they have shut their eyes. So in Mt., following the LXX., Jesus speaks to them in parables because their heart is waxed gross, and their ears dull of hearing. And especially, the obnoxious *μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν κ. ἰάσομαι αὐτούς* is included in the result of their own conduct, and not in the Divine purpose. Mk. and Lk., however, follow the original in making the failure to hear and see to be the purpose of the parable. But Lk. omits the obnoxious *μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν κ. ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς*. And yet, there is no doubt, from the identity of language, that Mk., and following him, Lk., quote from the LXX., while modifying it for some reason. That reason would seem to be, that Mk. had in mind the form in which Jesus quotes the passage, and that this was conformed to some Targum, preserving the spirit of the original. This confirms what is otherwise probable, that Mk., rather than Mt., preserves the original form of Jesus' saying. But while Mk., and according to the above, Jesus himself, conforms to the original Hebrew, he does not preserve the irony which is the saving element of the passage in Isaiah. It is only ironically that God commands the prophet to harden the people by his pungent preaching, because he sees that this will be the inevitable result. Whereas, it is evidently in all seriousness, that Jesus describes this as the result of the parable. The parable is evidently regarded by Jesus as a form of teaching intended to veil the truth conveyed, and adapted, therefore, to esoteric teaching. Moreover, the teaching is esoteric; it concerns the mysteries of the kingdom of God, not the ordinary facts in regard to it, but certain things intended not for the common ear, but only for the disciples. And the parable does so veil the meaning that it has to be explained even to them. There is a key to each of the parables, some fundamental analogy, which is necessary to its explanation. In the Parable of the Sower, this is found in the statement that the seed is the word. Without this, the meaning is obscure. That is, the language of Isaiah, applied to the teaching of Jesus as a whole, would have the irony of the original; but applied to the parables, it is to be taken seriously. This makes all plain sailing until we come to the obnoxious *μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν κ. ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς*. There the irony reappears, for it would evidently be only ironically, and not earnestly, that Jesus would say of any of his teaching, that it was intended to prevent the forgiveness and conversion of the

people. It makes the proper climax to the original passage, but is out of place in Jesus' use of it. But, after the mechanical fashion, which often marks the reporting of discourse, Mk., remembering only that Jesus used this quotation, reproduced the passage as he found it in the original, without omitting its irrelevant clauses. Mt., on the other hand, quoting from the LXX., without the modification introduced by Mk., has not involved himself in the same difficulty, but has not reproduced for us what Jesus said. Lk., seeing the difficulty involved in Mk.'s report, has omitted the obnoxious clause, giving us probably the genuine form of the quotation. Our Lord's statement, then, is simply this, that the mystery of the kingdom, or its secret, is not intended for those outside of it, and that therefore he uses in conveying it to his disciples the contrivance of the parable, so that outsiders who have not the clue may hear without hearing.

13. *οὐκ οἴδατε κτλ.* This is treated by some of the critics and commentators as a question, and by others as a statement. Of course, the original text contained no intimation in which of these two ways it is to be taken, and there is little choice in the meanings obtained. Taken as a statement, the succeeding question is an inference from the fact that they do not know this parable. As a question, it already expresses surprise at the fact that they do not know this parable, and then follows the inference. *Καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε;* — *and how will you know all the parables?* The argument is from the similarity of the parables. This is not an unusual instance, but a good example of its class. The lack of perception shown in this case would extend to all similar cases.

14. *τὸν λόγον σπείρει.* *τὸν λόγον* is emphatic, and contains the key to the parable. He is speaking of the sowing of the word, and pointing out the analogies between this and the sowing of seed.

15. *οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν* — *And these are they along the road.* The seed and the soil are here confounded. The seed is the word, the soil is the mind of the hearer. The exact statement would be, *these are the road.*

ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς — *Satan comes.* One would say naturally that the birds in the parable were merely a part of the picture, and had no counterpart in the spiritual fact represented by it. One main principle in the interpretation of the parables is that only the one truth represented in the comparison is to be seized upon, and the details are to be treated as mere incidents, on the ground that things in the spiritual and material worlds correspond only in generals. And it is evident that Jesus generally treated the parables with this largeness and sobriety. But in this case, an opportunity is given Jesus to introduce into his account of obstructions to the fruitfulness of the seed the agency of that kingdom of evil which complicates the whole problem The primary result of sowing on this hard soil is that the seed remains on the surface,

the secondary result is, that it is snatched away from the mind by the influences represented by Satan.[1] The road, or path, represents those whose spirits are impervious to the truth, into whom it finds no entrance at all.

τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον ἐν αὐτοῖς (εἰς αὐτούς), the word which has been sown in them. *ἐν αὐτοῖς*, instead of *ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, in their hearts*, T. ℵ CL Δ Memph. Harcl. *marg.* *εἰς αὐτούς*, Treg. WH. RV. B 1, 13, 28, 69, 118, 209.

16. *ὁμοίως — in like manner,* — by virtue of the same general resemblance. *οἱ . . . σπειρόμενοι* — There is the same confusion of seed and soil as in the preceding case. *εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς* — This corresponds to the *εὐθὺς ἐξανέτειλε* of the parable, and denotes one side of the resemblance, the superficial readiness with which they receive the word. They have been attracted by the pleasant things, and have not stopped to count the pains and oppositions that constitute the other side of the kingdom in this evil world.

17. *ῥίζαν — root.* The analogy is so close, that the various terms belonging to the physical process and material have become familiar designations of the corresponding spiritual facts, such as seed, soil, root, fruit, and the like. Root denotes the hold which the truth has upon the spirit, securing its permanence. The absence of it designates the superficiality of this class of hearers. *πρόσκαιροι — transient.* This describes the merely temporary effect of the word upon them, owing to their superficiality. *θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ — affliction or persecution.* We may suppose that this is not an exhaustive statement of the things destructive of the truth in the superficial hearer, that it simply represents them by the one thing operative in that early period of conflict. Only deeply rooted discipleship can withstand persecution. *εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται — immediately they stumble.* Immediateness is characteristic of this class on both sides. They receive the word immediately, and fall away immediately. Haste and superficiality go together. They do not wait to see if there is any other side to religion than the glad side, nor, on the other hand, whether affliction is a sufficient reason for giving it up. *σκανδαλίζονται* — is found only in the N.T., and means *to cause to fall or stumble*, and in the pass., *to fall or stumble.* It is the opposite of *to stand.* The translation of the AV., *they are offended*, gives a wrong idea of the word. RV. *they stumble.*

18. *καὶ ἄλλοι — and others.*

Καὶ ἄλλοι, instead of *καὶ οὗτοι, and these*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* BC* DL Δ *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph.

οἱ σπειρόμενοι εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας — those sown among the thorns. The confusion of seed and soil is repeated here. *οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες — who heard the word.*

---

[1] See 3[23], note.

ἀκούσαντες instead of ἀκούοντες, *hear*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 13, 69, 124, 346, Memph. Pesh.

19. αἱ μέριμναι — *the cares*. Literally, *the distractions*. They are the things that divide the unity of the spirit, drawing it off different ways. τοῦ αἰῶνος — *the age*. EV. *world*. There is only one passage, Heb. 1^2, in which there is any call to render this word *world* instead of *age*. Here it means the present evil time. It is contrasted with the αἰὼν μέλλων, the coming time, in which good, instead of evil, will predominate.

Omit τούτου, *this*, after τοῦ αἰῶνος Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 1, 102, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. etc.

ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου — *deceit of wealth*, the power which it has to deceive men with its enticements, representing itself as the great good. τὰ λοιπὰ — not *other things*, but *the remaining things*. The article renders it definite. The other things of the same character as wealth are meant. συμπνίγουσι — the compound represents the completeness of the process, *choke utterly*.[1] ἄκαρπος — *unfruitful*. The test of genuine appropriation of the truth is, that it produces effects of life and character corresponding to itself. The characteristic of this class of hearers is prepossession of the soil by alien things, which have not been weeded out. The warning against wealth in the ἀπάτη τ. πλούτου is characteristic of our Lord's teaching.[2]

20. Καὶ ἐκεῖνοι — *and those*.

ἐκεῖνοι instead of οὗτοι, *these*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ Pesh.

We have three different pronouns, or adjectives, used in pointing out the various classes of hearers. οὗτοι, then οὗτοι ὁμοίως, indicating a general resemblance; then ἄλλοι, denoting a specific difference; and finally ἐκεῖνοι, denoting contrast with all that precede. οἱ σπαρέντες — *that were sown*. The part. in the other cases has been present, denoting the general fact about seed sown in such places. The aor. here confines it to the particular case of the parable. οἵτινες — differs from the simple relative in that it generalizes the statement; *whoever, or such as*. παραδέχονται — Always, in the N.T., this denotes a favorable reception, *to accept*, the opposite of *reject*. καρποφοροῦσιν — *bear fruit*. This is what distinguishes the good soil from all others. What is planted in it bears fruit; truth becomes virtue in that soil. It does not denote the labors or success of this class of laborers in propagating truth. Our Lord distinguishes between this kind of fruit and the obedience which is the real test of discipleship, in Mt. 7^{21-23}. ἐν τριάκοντα

[1] συμπνίγουσι belongs to later Greek.

[2] See 10^{23-25}. But this depreciation of wealth is specially a trait of Lk.'s Gospel. See $6^{20.\ 24}$ 12^{15-21} $16^{9-12.\ 19-31}$.

— literally *in thirty*. The preposition denotes the number as that in which the fruit-bearing is accomplished.

The choice between ἐν and ἓν is a matter of interpretation, not of text, as the original had neither breathings nor accents. But all the accented uncials give ἐν, also 1, 33, 69, 124, Syrr.; so Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. Latt. Memph. read ἓν. Before the other numerals, WH. bracket ἐν, on account of its omission by BC*. ἐν gives the better construction, and is the probable reading, as the neuter ἓν has nothing with which to agree.

GENERAL REFLECTIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF THE PARABLE

Jesus is led on by the necessity of fruitfulness emphasized in the parable to present this under another analogy, of giving light. And this leads him to speak still further of the provision against hiding, or secrecy, in the Divine economy. Finally, to enforce what he has said of the way in which men treat the word, he enjoins on them to consider what they hear. It will be seen that there is a certain appositeness in the connection of these detached sayings. But in the case of the statement about secrecy, another connection is possible, at least.

21–25. 21. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς — *And he said to them.* This indicates a change of subject. Μήτι differs from μή, in strengthening the negative answer implied. *The lamp does not come at all, does it?* ὑπὸ τ. μόδιον — *under the peck measure.*[1] λυχνία — *lamp-stand.*[2] It corresponds to λύχνος, *lamp*, in the preceding part of the statement.

Mt. introduces this proverb in the Sermon on the Mount, 5^{14-16} with the meaning, *The light that is in you is not meant to be hidden, but to shine forth in good deeds in the sight of men.* And here, it is probably put into connection with the preceding statement about fruit-bearing, in order to enforce anew, under another figure, the fact that the ultimate end of truth in man is to come out into manifestation as virtue. Truth considered as seed, bears fruit; considered as light, it shines, but the one fact expressed in both figures is that it results in character and conduct.

22. οὐ γάρ ἐστί τι κρυπτόν, ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ — *for there is nothing hidden, except that it may be manifested.*

Omit the relative ὃ before ἐὰν μή, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCKL Δ 1, 13, 28, 33, 69, 209. D 49, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. ἀλλ' ἵνα, *but that.*

---

[1] The word μόδιος comes from the Latin *modius*, which denotes a peck measure. EV. *bushel.*

[2] λυχνία is a later Greek form for λυχνεῖον.

The ultimate end of the hiding is manifesting This is a case of the argumentum a minori. Even what is hidden is hidden only for the purpose of ultimate manifestation, and how much more is this true of anything that is in its nature light, instead of dark. κρυπτόν is emphatic. The progress of all knowledge is the manifestation of this principle. The earth is full of secrets, hidden treasures and forces, but they have been hidden away, only in order that man may bring them forth out of their hiding, and enrich his life with them.

οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον — *nor did it become hidden away.* This differs from the former by the difference between ἐγένετο and ἐστί. It points to the act of hiding, as that does to the state. Both are for the same purpose. God has secrets, mysteries, but they are not permanent secrets, only held in reserve for future revelation.

This statement about hiding for the sake of revealing is connected immediately by γὰρ with the preceding statement about hiding the light. But it would seem more natural to connect it with the μυστήριον, the secret of the kingdom, the preservation of which is said to be the object of the parable. With this addition, the statement about secret things becomes complete. It is only temporarily that the secret is kept by the parable. Ultimately, it becomes a means of revealing that which it temporarily hides. And this brings it under the great law stated by Jesus.

24. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς — *and he said to them.* See note on v.[21]. βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε — *Consider what you hear.* Not *beware what you hear, be on your guard against hearing anything prejudicial to others.* This meaning has been given to the words, because of a misunderstanding of the proverb which follows, which has been taken to mean here, as in Mt. 7[2], *that men will treat you as you treat them.* But this leaves the whole thing without any connection with the rest of the discourse, utterly irrelevant. Whereas it is evident that ἀκουέτω and ἀκούετε go together. And v.[25] is connected with this by γὰρ. Some meaning must be found for this, therefore, that will justify this connection. The meaning *Consider what you hear* is apposite to the connection with a parable which shows the consequences of inconsiderate hearing.

ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν — *in what measure you measure it will be measured to you.* As we have seen, the meaning of this familiar proverb in Mt. 7[2] does not fit here. In this passage, it means, *Whatever measure you use yourself will be the one in which truth will be measured out to you.* If a man accustoms himself to small measures of truth, small measures will be dealt out to him, and *vice versa.* καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν — *and it shall be increased to you.* This is commonly interpreted to mean that not only the same, but a larger measure will be dealt out to them. But this is inconsistent with the statement that in what measure they measure it will be measured to them. προστεθήσεται

as well as μετρηθήσεται is modified by ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε. *In what measure you measure it shall be measured and increased to you.* The measure and increase of their knowledge will both be proportioned to their own measures. Whatever they present will be filled.

Omit τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, *who hear*, after ὑμῖν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 102, etc. Latt. Memph.

25. ὃς γὰρ ἔχει—*for he who hath.*

ἔχει, instead of ἂν ἔχῃ (*who*, instead of *whoever*), Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 13, 28, 69.

This again is a general proverb, applicable to many things, made to do duty in this high and homely discourse. It means in this connection, *If a man has a well-stored mind, he will be continually adding to that store, and on the contrary, small knowledge tends to decrease.* However, this does not apply to mental ability, but to the use that one makes of his ability, or, as it stands here, to the attentiveness with which he hears. It all depends on the principle that knowledge is a series of successive steps, in which each step depends on the preceding. On the other hand, if a man does not acquire knowledge, the disuse of his faculties implied in that will render them unfit for use.

PARABLE OF THE LAND PRODUCING BY ITSELF

It is significant that this most fundamental of all the parables is given by Mk. alone, who omits so many given by the other evangelists. It is fundamental, because it contains the truth about the adaptation of seed and soil, which underlies all these analogies drawn from the growth of the seed.

26–29. 26. ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ. The omission of ἐὰν renders the construction difficult, which probably accounts for its introduction by some copyist. Two constructions are possible; either ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὃς βάλλει; or ὡς ἐὰν ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ. The omission of ἐὰν in the original is probably a slip.

Omit ἐὰν after ὡς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD$^{gr.}$ L Δ 13, 28, 33, 69, 118, 124, one *ms.* of Vulg. Memph.

τὸν σπόρον—*the seed;* the generic use of the article.

27. καθεύδῃ κ. ἐγείρηται νύκτα κ. ἡμέραν—*sleeps and wakes during night and day.* The acc. differs from the gen. in such designations of time by denoting duration, instead of periods of time at which the action occurs. The statement connects the two

verbs, instead of separating them, and putting each with its appropriate time. *βλαστᾷ καὶ μηκύνηται*[1] — *sprouts and grows.* *ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός* — *αὐτός* is emphatic; how, *he* knows not. This does not exclude the processes of cultivation, but refers to the power of growth in the plant itself, beyond the reach or knowledge of the sower.

28. *αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ*[2] — *the earth of itself.* The absence of the connective *γὰρ* gives force to the statement by the abruptness of its introduction.

Omit *γὰρ*, *for*, before *ἡ γῆ*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCL, etc. Memph.$^{edd.}$ Harcl.

This statement, that the land bears fruit of itself, is the fact underlying all these analogies of seed and soil. The land contains in itself the elements needed for the nourishment and growth of the plant, and hence the great thing for man to do is to bring together these mutually adapted things, the seed and the soil. And in the spiritual realm, there is the same adaptation of the truth to the spirit of man. The mind of man is related to the truth as the soil to the seed. There may be minor differences of soil, as set forth in the Parable of the Sower, but the prime fact is this generic fitness. All the trust of man in the greatness and prevalence of the truth is warranted by this fact alone. The mind is adapted to the truth, as the eye to the light. This single fact creates the confidence shown by Jesus in the ultimate establishment of his kingdom, in spite of the obstacles which obstruct its progress. *πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶτεν στάχυν, εἶτεν πλήρης σῖτος*[3] — *first blade, then ear, then full grain.*

εἶτεν, instead of *εἶτα*, Tisch. WH. ℵ* B* L Δ. *πλήρης σῖτος*, nom. instead of acc., Tisch. Treg. BD Memph. C* 271 read *πλήρες σῖτον*.

χόρτον — literally, *grass*, *i.e.* the part of the grain which is like grass, before the grain heads out.

29. *ὅταν δὲ παραδοῖ ὁ κάρπος* — *but whenever the fruit permits.*[4]

παραδοῖ, instead of *παραδῷ*, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ* BD Δ.

---

[1] *βλαστᾷ* is subj. from the form *βλαστάω*. *μηκύνηται* means literally to *lengthen*. It is used only here in N.T., and Is. 44[14] in the O.T. In both cases, it is used of the growth of plants, an unfamiliar use of the word.

[2] *αὐτομάτη* occurs only twice in the N.T. On its adverbial use, see Win. 54, 2.

[3] The nom. makes this statement independent of the preceding structure, and so calls attention to it.

[4] So Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* Meyer, Weiss. The intrans. meaning, *presents itself*, is not attested. *παραδοῖ* is an irregular form of the sec. aor. subj., instead of *παραδῷ*.

εὐθὺς ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον—*immediately he sends forth the sickle. Sickle* is here put by metonymy for *the reapers. Immediately* serves to mark vividly the time when man's inaction ceases. No sooner does the fruit allow, than he puts in the sickle.

TEACHING OF THE PARABLE

The meaning of the parable is, that direct agencies, human or divine, are employed only at the beginning and end of the process of establishing the kingdom of God. At the beginning, there is the sowing of the seed, the dissemination of the word among men. And at the end, there is the gathering of the fruit, of men in whom the processes of spiritual growth have reached completion, into his kingdom. During the intervening time, the result is left to the moral and spiritual self-action of humanity, which of itself acts vitally upon the word, turning it into truth of character and conduct. The emphasis of the parable is thus laid on the αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, *the earth of itself bears fruit.* So Meyer. Weiss and Holtzmann and others maintain that the parable is only an adaptation of the Parable of the Tares, with the tares left out, and the note of gradual growth introduced, in order to introduce this element into the parabolic teaching. But this is to omit the very point of the parable, the reason for the inactivity during the intermediate period, which is found in the self-activity of the soil, the human spirit. Moreover, this is one of the places where, even more than usual, our Lord lays bare the *roots*, the essential principles of things. Morison also shows an equal ability to miss the mark, in his statement, that it is the seed which acts αὐτομάτη. It is not the seed which fructifies the earth, but the earth which fructifies the seed.

PARABLE OF THE MUSTARD SEED

There is one lesson of the analogy of the growth from seed sown in the earth which remains to be shown. And the Parable of the Mustard Seed is introduced to teach this—that the small beginning and gradual growth is not inconsistent with a great result.

30–34. 30. πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θῶμεν;[1] — *How shall we liken the kingdom of God, or in what parable shall we set it forth,* or *place it?*

Πῶς, instead of Τίνι, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Harcl. *marg.* ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θῶμεν, instead of ποίᾳ παραβολῇ παραβάλωμεν αὐτήν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

31. ὡς κόκκῳ σινάπεως — *as to a grain of mustard.*[2] ὃς, ὅταν . . . , μικρότερον ὂν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων . . . , καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ[3] — *which, whenever it is sown upon the earth, being (is) smaller than all the seeds upon the earth; and whenever it is sown,* etc.

μικρότερον ὂν (omit ἐστί), Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ (L ὤν) two *mss.* Lat. Vet. μικρότερόν ἐστι D* M etc.

μεῖζον πάντων τῶν λαχάνων — *greater than all the garden-herbs,* or *vegetables.*

μεῖζον, instead of μείζων, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ ABCELV 33.

This comparison is intended to denote the superiority of this plant to others of the class λάχανα to which it belongs, which have no woody fibre, like trees and shrubs, so that it even passes over into the latter class, making great branches under which the birds can find shade. And this is contrasted with the unusual smallness of the seed. Mk. and Lk. say directly that it becomes a δένδρον.[4]

ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκίαν αὐτοῦ τὰ πέτεινα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν — *so that the birds of heaven can lodge (tent, or camp down) under its shades.*

This is a different account from that given in Mt. and Lk., where the birds are said to lodge in the branches. Here its greatness is described by saying that it affords shade for the birds. The parable means that the kingdom is like growing things in having small beginnings and a great ending.

---

[1] The subj. in these verbs is the subj. of deliberative questions, in which the questioner consults another about the matter in hand. See Win. 41 *a*, 4.

[2] This retains in the answer the construction of the question; supplying the omitted word, it would read, ὡς κόκκῳ σινάπεως ὁμοιώσομεν, *as to a grain of mustard seed we will liken it.*

[3] There is a double anacoluthon here; first, the neuter, as if the antecedent were σπέρμα; and secondly, the participle, instead of the indicative. The whole sentence is thrown into confusion by this, so that a literal translation would read, *which, whenever it is sown, being less than all seeds, and whenever it is sown, comes up,* etc.

[4] See Hackett, *Illustrations of Scripture,* p. 131.

COMMON FEATURES OF THE PARABLES

In order to understand the significance of this group of parables, we have to learn not only their separate meanings, but their common features. They have a mystery of the kingdom to unfold, namely, the gradualness of its establishment, in opposition to the prevalent notion of its immediate setting up by a Divine, supernatural power. And they give one common reason for this, that the kingdom belongs to the class of things that grow subject to natural laws, not to those that are set up full-grown by external force. More particularly, the Parable of the Sower shows that the present slow growth is due to the differences of soil; that is, of spirit in the hearers. It is a matter of the Word and of hearers of the Word, and the result is largely influenced by the different classes of hearers. The Parable of the Ground Producing by Itself shows that the growth depends on forces hidden in the soil itself, that is, on the adaptation of the spirit to the truth, and that this common fitness underlies all differences of soil. The mind of man and the word of God are at bottom adapted to each other. The Parable of the Mustard Seed shows that small beginnings belong to the nature of the kingdom, but not less, large and complete results.

33. καὶ τοιαύταις παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τ. λόγον — *and with many such parables he spoke to them the word.* That is, the mystery of the kingdom which he was teaching them on this occasion. He did not confine himself to parables on other subjects and occasions.

καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν[1] — *as they were able to hear.* This modification of the statement that he spoke to them in parables, does not mean that he spoke to them in such parables as they were able to hear, not going beyond that limit; but that he spoke to them in parables, as being the form of speech to which they were able to listen. He was not restricted by their only partial ability to hear to some parables, instead of others, but to parables in general, instead of some other mode of address. The mystery of the kingdom itself they were not able to hear, except in this veiled form.

34. τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς — *to his own disciples.*

τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς, instead of τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ.

[1] The earlier classical form of καθώς is καθό or καθά. See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* Win. 2, 1, *d*, *e*.

THE STILLING OF THE STORM ON THE LAKE

35–41. *Jesus and his disciples cross to the eastern side of the lake, and are overtaken by one of the sudden storms produced by the situation of this inland sea, which Jesus stills with a word.*

35. ἐκείνῃ τ. ἡμέρᾳ — *that day*, viz. the day on which Jesus uttered the parables. Mt. connects this stilling of the storm with the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, and the gathering of the multitude about him at that time. Cf. Mt. 8^{14-27}, and Mk. 1^{29-34}. However, the mark of time in Mt. is not definite enough to create positive disagreement. Lk. says simply *on one of the days*. ὀψίας[1] — *evening*. It is either the time between three and six, or that between six and dark. Probably the former is meant here, as the latter time would not allow for the events that follow. Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν[2] — *Let us cross over to the other side*. Jesus' frequent crossing to the other side of the lake was due to its unpopulated condition, and to the comparative ignorance of himself there, giving him an escape from the wearing ministries to the crowd on the populous west shore, and also frequently from his enemies.

36. παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τ. πλοίῳ — *they take him along as he was in the boat*. This refers evidently to the boat from which Jesus taught the multitude, v.[1]. The explanations of the parables, therefore, v.[10] sq.[34], must have been made at some other time. It seems, according to this statement, that the disciples dismissed the multitudes without Jesus leaving the boat, and then, without further delay or preparation, took him along in the boat where he had remained all the time. Mt. makes the different statement, that Jesus embarked in the boat, and his disciples followed him.

καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ — *And other boats were with him.*

Omit δὲ after ἄλλα, Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ Latt. etc. πλοῖα, instead of πλοιάρια, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDKM Δ 1, 13, 33, 69, etc.

μετ' αὐτοῦ, *with him*, settles the fact, that the other boats were in their company. Jesus was followed about from place to place, not only by the twelve regularly and by appointment associated with him, but by other disciples more or less intimately attached to his person. These would follow him in boats across the lake. Mk., with his usual eye for a picture, adds this to complete the scene, and to be carried in the mind when the story of the storm is reached.

---

[1] ὀψίας is used as an adjective only, outside of Biblical Greek. It means *late*.

[2] Δι- in διέλθωμεν, like our word *over*, refers to the space to be passed through or over in reaching the point designated.

37. λαῖλαψ — a storm marked by frequent great gusts of wind. Mt. uses σεισμός, which means properly *earthquake*, but denoting here the turbulence of the storm.

καὶ τὰ κύματα ἐπέβαλλεν[1] — *and the waves were beating into the boat.* εἰς — *into*, not *against.* ὥστε ἤδη γεμίζεσθαι τ. πλοῖον — *so that already the boat was filling.* Not *full*, AV. The verb is present, and denotes the act in its progress, not its completion.

ἤδη γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλοῖον, instead of αὐτὸ ἤδη γεμίζεσθαι, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* BCDL Δ most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

This repetition of the noun, instead of the pronoun, is quite in Mk.'s style.

38. καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ — *And he was in the stern.* The pronoun is emphatic.

ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ, instead of ἐπὶ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDL Δ etc.

This sleep is noticeable, because it shows the fatigue of Jesus after his day's work, and his unconsciousness of the violent storm. Διδάσκαλε — *Teacher*, not *Master*, by which the word is persistently mistranslated in the EV. The title used by the disciples was probably Rabbi. οὐ μέλει σοι; *carest thou not?* This question implies that they thought of Jesus as waking sufficiently to know what was going on, but going off to sleep again regardless of their fate.

39. ἐπετίμησε — *he rebuked.* The verb contains in itself not only the notion of chiding, but also of restraint by that means. Probably, all that Jesus said was Σιώπα, πεφίμωσο, so that the chiding would be expressed in the tones of his voice. πεφίμωσο — *be silent, be muzzled.* Cf. 1 Cor. 9[9], TR. The latter is not only a strong word in itself, but the perf. imp. strengthens the command, like our *have done with it.* It means not only *be still*, but *stay so.*[2] ἐκόπασεν — *ceased.* This again is a descriptive word, denoting not only ceasing, but the ceasing of a tired person. γαλήνη μεγάλη — *a great calm*, contrasted with the great storm. Cf. v.[37].

40. Τί δειλοί ἐστε; οὔπω ἔχετε πίστιν; — *Why are you fearful? have you not yet faith?* The lack of faith is in himself, in his power and disposition to care for them, and, as implied in the οὔπω, after so many attestations of both. Their appeal to him while he was asleep had not been the calm invocation of a trusted power, but the frightened reproach of those whose faith is defeated by danger.

οὔπω, instead of οὔτω; πῶς οὐκ, Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph.

41. ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν — *they were frightened a great fright.*[3] The subject is the disciples, who alone are mentioned

[1] On this intransitive use of βάλλω and its compounds, see Win. 38, 1.
[2] See Win. 43, 4. [3] See Win. 32, 2.

here. Mt., on the contrary, says οἱ ἄνθρωποι. Τίς ἄρα — *who then*, a question inspired by what they had seen. ὅτι — *that*. But the conj. is causal, denoting the reason of their fright, and of the question that is forced from them. καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος κ. ἡ θάλασσα — *even the wind and the sea*. Not only diseases and demons, but the elements themselves. Their wonder in this case took the form of fear, corresponding to the feeling with which they regarded the power of the elements against which Jesus matched himself. ὑπακούει — *obeys him*. The wind and the sea are looked at collectively here, as making one great whole.

ὑπακούει, instead of ὑπακούουσιν, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ* BCL Δ 1, 13, 28, 69, etc.

Weiss and Beyschlag rationalize this miracle after the same general fashion. The rebuke of the disciples grows into a rebuke of the elements, and the confidence of Jesus in his Father's deliverance into an assertion of his own power to still the waves. Holtzmann adds to this the presence in the narrative of O.T. material, which has been used in building up the account. Weiss is not so rationalistic in this as the others, as he is contending only against the notion that Jesus performs the miracles himself, instead of the Father. The command given to the elements, he thinks, would be an assumption of power over them by Jesus himself. But any more so than the commands given to the demons? He acts throughout as God's agent, but such an agent can order about demons and storms. Holtzmann is prepossessed against miracles in general; Beyschlag against miracles in the sphere of inanimate nature, where spirit does not act upon spirit. But the apostolic source of the narrative renders this rationalizing futile. The general fact of the miracles is established by this, and by their absolute uniqueness, conforming them to the unique quality of Jesus' whole life in the moral sphere. This leaves room to exclude individual miracles for special reasons, or even to discriminate among kinds of miracles, as Beyschlag does. But Beyschlag's principle excludes, *e.g.* the miracle of feeding the multitude, the best attested of all the miracles. And there is no other special improbability about this miracle of stilling the storm — on the contrary, a certain congruousness, a manifestation of the fact that the power resident in nature is in the last analysis spiritual, and that Jesus was the Agent of that Power.

RELATION OF THE SYNOPTICAL ACCOUNTS

V. All of the Synoptics agree in correlating the three miracles narrated in this chapter. And Mk. and Lk. agree in general in the relation of these to events preceding and following. But

Mt. places them in an entirely different connection. According to him, the occasion of Jesus' crossing to the other side was the gathering of the multitude about him owing to the miracles accompanying the healing of Peter's mother-in-law. And the parables are said to be delivered on a day following, not preceding, the sending forth of the twelve, and removed from these events by a considerable interval. According to our account, the evident intention is to connect Jesus' departure with the failure of Jesus' mission to the Galileans marked by the veiled teaching of the parables. The recurrence of the same language in various places marks the interdependence of the Synoptics, as also the correlation of the events. But Mk.'s fulness of detail, in which he is followed to some extent by Lk., is characteristic.

HEALING OF THE GERGESENE DEMONIAC

1–20. *Jesus crosses the lake into Decapolis on the south-eastern shore, and heals a man said to be possessed of a host of demons. The demons, driven out of the man, enter with Jesus' permission into a herd of swine, and the maddened beasts rush into the lake and are drowned.*

1. εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν — *into the country of the Gerasenes.* Γαδαρηνῶν is the probable reading in Mt., and Γεργεσηνῶν in Lk. The country of the Gadarenes designates the district generally by the name of a principal city. Γεργεσηνῶν is probably derived from the name of the town in whose immediate vicinity the event occurred, which must have been on the shore of the lake. Γερασηνῶν is more difficult to dispose of, as Gerasa is too far away to be the scene of the incident, or even to become a familiar designation of the general locality. And the similarity of name indicates that it has been confused with the nearer Gergesa.[1]

Γερασηνῶν, instead of Γαδαρηνῶν, Tisch. Treg. ℵ* BD Latt. Γεργεσηνῶν Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ^{c} LU Δ 1, 28, 33, 118, 131, 209, Memph. Harcl. *marg.* Internal, as well as external, evidence favors Γερασηνῶν.

2. ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ — The TR. gives the proper construction of the part., putting it in agreement with αὐτῷ after ὑπήντησεν. This improper use of the gen. absolute is a specimen of the inaccuracy of Mk. in dealing with the part., like the μικρότερον ὄν of 4[31]. The

[1] See Thompson, *Land and Book, Bib. Dic.*

TR. is an evident correction of this mistake by some copyist. Mt.'s repetition of the inaccuracy is one of the proofs of the interdependence of the Synoptics. Mt. 8^{28}, Critical Text.

ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ, instead of *ἐξελθόντι αὐτῷ*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 1, 13, 33, 69, 118, 124, 131, 209, 346, two *mss*. Lat. Vet. (Memph. Syrr.). *ὑπήντησεν*, instead of *ἀπήντησεν*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDGL Δ 1, 13, 28, 69, etc.

ἐκ τῶν μνημείων — out of the tombs. These were natural or artificial excavations in the rocks, frequently cut laterally in the hills, and often left uncovered, which, like other caves, would be resorts for wild men and beasts. *ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ — in an unclean spirit.*[1]

3. *μνήμασιν.* This, like *μνημείων*, v.[2], means properly *monuments. Tombs* is a Biblical meaning. This adds to the previous statement that the man came from the tombs, that he had his home there.

μνήμασιν, instead of *μνημείοις*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCL ΔΠ etc.

οὐδὲ ἁλύσει οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο — literally, *and not even with a chain could no one no longer bind him.* The RV. manages, by an ingenious arrangement of the negatives, to hide their barbarism. But the original couples them together without any mitigation of their effect. The TR. evidently omits *οὐκέτι* to get over this roughness.

οὐδὲ, instead of *οὔτε*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 33, etc. *ἁλύσει*, instead of *ἁλύσεσιν*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BC* L 33, two *mss*. Lat. Vet. *οὐκέτι* before *οὐδεὶς* Tisch. Treg, WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL Δ 13, 28, 69, 124, 346, Lat. Vet. (most *mss*.) Vulg.

4. *διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν πολλάκις πέδαις καὶ ἁλύσεσι δεδέσθαι — on account of his having been bound often with fetters and chains.*[2] The perf. inf. here, and in *διεσπᾶσθαι* and *συντετρίφθαι* is used to denote the relation of these past acts to the present inability.[3] *πέδαις καὶ ἁλύσεσι* — bonds for the feet and other parts of the body. *διεσπᾶσθαι κ. συντετρίφθαι — rent asunder*, and *crushed together.* Breaking by pulling, and by the opposite motion of crushing, are denoted severally.

καὶ οὐδεὶς ἴσχυεν αὐτὸν δαμάσαι — and no one had strength to tame him. The statement of reasons for their inability to bind him ends with *συντετρίφθαι*, and this introduces another independent statement.

5. *ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν κ. ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι — in the tombs and in the mountains.* Probably, these are specific and general designations of place — *in the tombs and in other parts of the hills. ἦν κράζων κ. κατακόπτων — he was crying and cutting.* This vivid circumlo-

[1] See on 3^{22}, 1^{24}. [2] On this use of *διὰ* with the inf. and art., see Win. 44, 6.
[3] See Win. 44, 7.

cution for the impf. is characteristic of Mk. The forcible descriptions of the violence and frenzied strength of the demoniac are also peculiar to Mk. Mt. tells us simply that no one could pass that way, and Lk. that he went about naked. Two qualities in Mk. lead to this: first, his vividness of narration, and secondly, his desire to emphasize the greatness of Jesus' miracles.

6. ἀπὸ μακρόθεν — *from a distance.*[1] προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ — *he made obeisance to him.*[2] The verb in the N.T. denotes prostration before another in token of reverence, but properly it denotes reverence by kissing the hand towards another.

This act of homage seems inconsistent with the expostulation which follows. It is evident, throughout the narrative, that Jesus has to deal with a hostile attitude in the man, dominated, as he is, by the demon. But the demons, nothwithstanding, recognize Jesus' mastery over them, and adopt a suppliant rather than a defiant attitude. The προσεκύνει is not inconsistent with the ὁρκίζω, or παρεκάλει, v.[10. 11].

λέγει, *says.* The historical present, characteristic of Mk.

This reading, instead of εἶπε, *said,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCKLM Δ Harcl. etc.

7. Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί; —*What have I to do with thee?* This reproduces the language of 1[24], a more or less suspicious imitation. The language of the expostulation is exactly the same as in Lk. In Mt. it is Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, υἱὲ τοῦ Θεου; As this is probably a reproduction of what was spoken originally in Aramaic, the resemblance points strongly to the interdependence of the Synoptics. The man speaks here under the influence of the demons possessing him, identifying himself with them, but not so as to represent their plurality stated in v.[9]. It was such addresses as this which led Jesus to prevent the recognition of himself by the demoniacs.

μή με βασανίσῃς — *torment me not.* This would easily imply that Jesus' command to them to vacate the man implied remanding them to the place of torment. And Lk.'s account follows this out in the ἄβυσσον, 8[31]. Also Mt. in πρὸ καιροῦ, 8[29]. But Mk. is not constructed on that basis, as he substitutes ἔξω τῆς χώρας for εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον. According to him, this would represent therefore the man's insane terror of being driven out of his haunts.

8. ἔλεγεν γὰρ — The reason of the protest of the demons against Jesus' interference with them was his command to them to vacate. It is difficult to find a place to put this in, as the man's action and words in the preceding verse seem to succeed each other

[1] μακρόθεν. The prep. expresses the same relation as the termination of the adv. On this redundancy, belonging to later Greek, see Win. 65, 2. The adv. itself belongs to the same period.

[2] This use of the dat. is peculiar to later authors, the regular construction being the acc. See Win. 4, 31, 1 *b*.

immediately in such a way as to make one act, occasioned apparently by his sight of Jesus at a distance. But evidently this sequence must be interrupted somewhere to introduce this.

αὐτῷ — *to him.* Only the man has been mentioned before, which would lead us to refer this to him. But the command is evidently addressed to the demon. The confusion is due to the identification of the two.

Ἔξελθε, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον — *Come out, thou unclean spirit.*[1]

9. Τί ὄνομά σοι; — *What is thy name?*[2] It is a curious question, why Jesus asked this question of the demoniac, and it has been curiously answered; *e.g.* that Jesus saw the state of the case, and wished to bring it out in order to impress on the witnesses the greatness of the miracle. This ostentation we know to be far from the spirit of Jesus, who performed his miracles for beneficent purposes alone, and with secrecy, instead of ostentation. We are in the region of conjecture here, but we can guess at it somewhat after this fashion. May it not be, that the purpose of Jesus was hindered by this identification of the man with the demons, leading him to resist the cure? In that case, Jesus might ask the question in order to bring before the man the nature of the power holding him in thrall, so as to make some break in the terrible sympathy and alliance of the two. But it is all mixed up with the question as to the nature of this possession, and how far the account of the cure has been modified by the view of it taken by the narrators. It is comparatively useless to discuss details where the main facts are so much in doubt.

καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Λεγιὼν — *And he says to him, Legion.*

λέγει αὐτῷ, instead of ἀπεκρίθη, λέγων, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCKLM ΔΠ *text*, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Syrr.

Λεγιὼν, instead of Λεγεὼν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* B* CDL Δ Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Syrr.

Legion is the Roman name for a body of soldiers numbering, when full, 6000 men. Of course, it is a rhetorical and exaggerated statement by the man of his state, as if he had said, *I feel as if I were possessed by a thousand devils.*

ὅτι πολλοί ἐσμεν — *because we are many.* Lk. puts this statement into the mouth of the Evangelist, saying himself that it was because many demons entered into the man. But it seems that Mk. is more correct, as he is certainly more effective, in making the demoniac say this; for it traces back to the man himself the hallucination which gives shape to the story. In Lk. the plurality, which formed a part of the man's delusion, is transferred to the statement of facts.

---

[1] On the use of the nom., instead of the voc., see Win. 29, 2.
[2] On the omission of the art. with ὄνομα, see Win. 19, 2 *b*.

10. καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλὰ ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ — *And he besought him much that he would not send them.*

αὐτὰ, instead of αὐτοὺς, Tisch. Treg. WH. BC Δ etc. But αὐτὰ looks like an emendation.

Here, again, the man identifies himself with the demons, but not so as to protest any longer against their expulsion. Only one demon has been mentioned before, vv.[2. 8]. But with v.[9], it begins to be assumed that there is a host of them, and the plural is used.

ἔξω τῆς χώρας — *out of the country.*[1] Lk. says εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον, *into the abyss, i.e.* into Gehenna, the place of evil spirits. And it has been supposed that our phrase means out of the earth, making it equivalent to this. But plainly, χώρα does not mean the earth as distinguished from the under world, but one part of the earth as distinct from another. γῆ is the proper word for earth, or world. But just as plainly, the translation, *out of the country* (put into the mouth of the demons, so to speak), creates another difficulty. What preference they should have for one country over another is one of the mysteries connected with these stories of demoniacal possession. It can be explained only as part of the hallucination of the demoniac, to be referred possibly to his terror of city or town, and his unwillingness to be driven out of the solitary wild district haunted by him. Lk.'s statement is probably an attempt to remove the difficulty.

11. πρὸς τῷ ὄρει — *on the mountain side.*[2]

τῷ ὄρει, instead of τὰ ὄρη, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. and about all the principal sources.

χοίρων — *swine.* The presence of these unclean animals, so abhorrent to the Jews, indicates, what we know from other sources, that the region was inhabited by a mixed population, in which Gentiles predominated.[3]

12. καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν — *and they besought him.*[4] Here the subject changes from the man speaking for the demons to the demons speaking through the man.

πέμψον — Lk. says, ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ, *that he would permit,* a modification which Mk. introduces in his account of Jesus' answer.

Omit πάντες οἱ δαίμονες with παρεκάλεσαν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 1, 13, 28, 69, 118, 131, 209, 251, 346, Memph.

13. Καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν — *and he permitted them.*

Omit εὐθέως ὁ Ἰησοῦς, *immediately Jesus,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 1, 28, 118, 131, 209, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh.

---

[1] On the use of ἔξω as a prep., see Win. 54, 6.
[2] On the use of πρός with dat., see Win. 48 *e.* The art. denotes the mountain in the vicinity.
[3] See Schürer, *N. Zg.* II. 1, 121.
[4] The meaning *beseech* belongs to παρακαλεῖν only in later Greek.

εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους — *entered into the swine.* It is evidently the intention of the writer that the man was possessed by a host of demons, and that this host of demons — no less would be required — entered into the herd of (two thousand) swine. This literalizing of the demoniac's *Legion,* the multiplication of the difficulty of possession by the thousands, and the addition of the difficulty of demoniac possession of swine, makes this part of the story a tax upon our belief. Demoniacal possession is in itself such a tax, but this story shows whereto such belief in a credulous age tends. The facts in this case are the cure and the rush of the frightened swine. The traditional account connects them in such a way as to make Jesus responsible for one as well as the other. Leave out now the elements of the story contributed by the idea of possession, and substitute the theory of lunacy, and the rational account of the fright and destruction of the swine is that it was occasioned by some paroxysm of the lunatic himself.

Καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ὡς δισχίλιοι — *and the herd rushed down the declivity into the sea, about two thousand (of them).*

Omit ἦσαν δὲ, *and there were,* before ὡς δισχίλιοι, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL Δ 1, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh.

κρημνοῦ, a perfectly good Greek word, occurs in the N.T. only in the parallel Synoptical accounts of this event, and the verbal resemblance is an important item in the proof of the interdependence of the Synoptics.

ὡς δισχίλιοι in the reading adopted is in apposition with ἡ ἀγέλη — *the herd, about two thousand (of them).*

14. Καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοὺς ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν — *And those feeding them fled and brought the news.*

Καὶ οἱ, instead of Οἱ δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDLM Δ two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Syrr. αὐτοὺς, instead of τοὺς χοίρους, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 13, 69, 124, 346, Latt. Memph. Pesh. ἀπήγγειλαν, instead of ἀνήγγειλαν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDKLM Π etc.

εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς — *to the city and to the farms.* πόλιν is the city Gergesa (Gerasa) in the neighborhood.[1] ἀγρούς denotes the farms or hamlets in the vicinity. καὶ ἦλθον — *and they came,* viz. the inhabitants generally.

ἦλθον, instead of ἐξῆλθον, *they came out,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ^{c} ABKLMU Π* 33, etc. Memph. Harcl.

15. καὶ θεωροῦσι τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον καθήμενον ἱματισμένον — *and they behold the demoniac sitting clothed.* θεωροῦσι, *they behold,* expresses the kind of sight directed towards notable objects.[2]

[1] See on v.[1].

[2] See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* Synonyms of θεωρεῖν.

δαιμονιζόμενον is timeless. The temporal relation would be expressed by the aor. δαιμονισθέντα.[1] ἱματισμένον — *clothed.* This implies what Lk. states, that the man in his previous state had torn his clothes from him. Lk. 8[27]. τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγιῶνα — *who had the legion.* We have already seen how it is implied that Mk. accepts the man's account of himself in telling the story of the swine. Here he does it expressly. καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν — *and they were frightened.* The thought of the miracle alone produced this effect.

16. καὶ διηγήσαντο — *and . . . reported in full, rehearsed.* The verb denotes the fulness of the account — *they went through it all.*

17. THEY BESEECH HIM TO DEPART

This is the only case in our Lord's ministry in which his miracles operated against him in this way, and it is to be accounted for by the strange element in this case, the mixture of gain and loss in the result. Men welcome a beneficent power, and so we find the multitudes following Jesus. But they are repelled from a destructive power, and all the more, if it is supernatural. This explains the singular treatment, but the infraction of our Lord's rule, to use his power only for beneficent purposes, is itself to be accounted for. And it enforces the question already raised, if this is not one of the cases in which we have to separate between the facts and the explanations and inferences of the Evangelists. The facts are the cure of the man and the destruction of the swine. But is Jesus responsible for the destruction? The whole idea of possession is beset with serious difficulties, and in this case, the substitution of lunacy for possession removes not only these, but also this anomaly in the action of Jesus.

18. ἐμβαίνοντος — *As he was entering.* The present part. denotes action contemporaneous with that of the principal verb.

ἐμβαίνοντος, instead of ἐμβάντος, *was come*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDKLM ΔΠ 1, 33, 124, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg.

ὁ δαιμονισθείς — *He who had been possessed with demons.* The aor. part. denotes a state preceding the action of the principal verb.[2]

ἵνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ᾖ — *that he may be with him.*[3]

19. Καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν — *and he did not permit him.*

καὶ, instead of ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCKLM ΔΠ 1, 33, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Syrr.

---

[1] See Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, 123. [2] See on τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον, v. 15.

[3] On the use of ἵνα with subj. after a verb of asking, see Win. 44, 8. Clearly, the clause with ἵνα expresses the contents of the petition, not its purpose.

Καὶ ἀπάγγειλον ὅσα ὁ Κύριός σοι πεποίηκεν — *and report how much the Lord hath done for thee.*

ἀπάγγειλον, instead of ἀνάγγειλον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC Δ etc. πεποίηκεν, instead of ἐποίησε, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCL Π etc.

This command, the exact opposite of the injunction of secrecy usually enforced by Jesus, is due to the fact that this was a region not frequented by him, and in which, therefore, the ordinary reasons for such silence were inoperative. His enemies were not here, nor his injudicious friends, nor the people to be blinded by his miracles to his more spiritual work. But it was a region rarely visited by him, and out of which he himself had just been driven, where therefore the story told by this man would be the only message of glad-tidings brought to the people. Moreover, the message which Jesus gives him does not concern our Lord himself, but God, to whom ὁ Κύριος evidently refers. The effect produced would thus be, not a false Messianism, as in Galilee, but a sense of God's presence and pity. The demoniac's story would counteract the impression made by the destruction of the swine. And it would be kept in Decapolis, where it would do no harm, and away from the already excited Galilee.

ὅσα ὁ Κύριός σοι πεποίηκεν, καὶ ἠλέησέ σε — *how much the Lord hath done for thee, and pitied thee.*[1]

ὁ Κύριος — is evidently used of God, as neither the man himself nor his friends would understand its application to Jesus. And besides, this is a case in which Jesus would especially desire to call attention to what God had done for him. Lk. says ὁ Θεὸς, 8^{39}.

20. τῇ Δεκαπόλει — *Decapolis,* the ten city district, is the name applied to the cities, east of the Jordan, liberated by Pompey from Jewish rule, which united in the ten city alliance. These cities had been Hellenistic since the Syrian conquest, had been conquered and subjected to Jewish rule by the Maccabees, and were finally liberated by Pompey. Schürer, II. 1, 23, 1.

RAISING OF THE DAUGHTER OF JAIRUS, AND HEALING OF THE WOMAN WITH AN ISSUE OF BLOOD

21–43. *Jesus, repelled by the people of Decapolis, returns to the western shore of the lake, and there raises the daughter*

[1] The translation gives just the slight irregularity of the Greek; "how much" is the object of the first verb; and an adverb modifying the second, which is precisely the double use of ὅσα. So Meyer, who calls it *zeugmatisch.* On the conjunction of the perf. and aor., see Win. 40. 4. The perf. suggests the present condition as well as the past act, while the aor. denotes only the past action.

of a synagogue ruler by the name of Jairus. On his way to the house of Jairus, he is approached in the crowd by a woman with an issue of blood, who is healed at the touch of his garment.

21. εἰς τὸ πέραν πάλιν συνήχθη — *having crossed over to the other side, again there was gathered.*

εἰς τὸ πέραν πάλιν, instead of πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν, Tisch. ℵ D *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Syrr. It is more in Mk.'s manner to connect πάλιν with συνήχθη.

καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν — *And he was by the sea.* According to Mt., Jairus came to Jesus while he was in the house. He places the events after the crossing of the lake in the following order: first, the healing of the paralytic, and the dispute about forgiveness of sins; then, the call of Matthew; then, the question of John's disciples about fasting; and then, while he was saying these things, the coming of Jairus. And these events are connected all the way through by marks of time, fixing the chronological connection. Mt. 9^{1-18}.

22. Καὶ ἔρχεται εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγώγων[1] — *And there comes one of the synagogue-rulers.*

Omit ἰδού before ἔρχεται, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 102, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh.

According to Schürer, the ἀρχισυνάγωγος is to be distinguished from the ἄρχων, the officer having general direction of the affairs of the synagogue; and he is not an official conducting the worship, for which no special appointment was made; but he is the officer entrusted with the care of public worship, including the appointment of readers and preachers. Mt. calls Jairus an ἄρχων, and Lk. uses the two names interchangeably, which is explained by the fact, that the two offices, though distinct, might be combined in one person. Generally, there was only one ἀρχισυνάγωγος in each synagogue, and εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγώγων may mean one of the class simply. S. Schürer, II. 2. 27.

23. παρακαλεῖ — *beseeches.*

παρακαλεῖ, instead of παρεκάλει, *besought*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ACL 33, etc.

ἔχει ἐσχάτως — *is at the point of death.*[2]

Mt. says ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν, *just died*, evidently confounding this

---

[1] ἀρχισυνάγωγος is found in profane writings only in Inscriptions.

[2] ἐσχάτως is found in the N.T. only here. Its use to denote *at the point of death, in extremis*, is condemned by Atticists. See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

with the message brought later by members of his household. Lk. says ἀπέθνησκεν, *was dying.* ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς — *that you may come and lay.*[1] ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ — *that she may be saved and live.*

ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ, instead of ὅπως . . . ζήσεται, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 13, 69, 346, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph.

24. ἠκολούθει . . . ὄχλος . . ., καὶ συνέθλιβον—*a crowd followed, and they pressed.*[2]

THE WOMAN WITH AN ISSUE OF BLOOD

There is a peculiar turn given to this story by the statement of Mk. and Lk. that Jesus *recognized that power had gone forth from him.* Mt. treats it as an ordinary miracle, in which Jesus consciously exercises his healing power. But Mk. and Lk. represent it as a miracle in which the woman herself, unknown to Jesus, draws upon his healing power, and Jesus knows it only by the departure of the power, of which he becomes conscious as he would be of any bodily change happening to him. It would seem that this is a case in which the miracle was performed directly by God, without the intervention of Jesus, of which Jesus becomes aware by the touch of the woman, but not by the loss of power. This makes an opening, as Mt.'s account does not, for the explanation of Mk. and Lk. The fact for which they try to make way in their account is the cure of the woman without the intervention of Jesus. But here again, we have to distinguish between the fact which they preserve for us, and their explanation, arising from reflection on the fact. The one is a matter of testimony, and the other of judgment.

25. Καὶ γυνὴ οὖσα — *And a woman being.*

Omit τις, *a certain,* before οὖσα, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCL Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Harcl.

οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος ἔτη δώδεκα — *being in an issue of blood twelve years.*[3] There is nothing in the language, which is quite

---

[1] This is explained by Win. as a weakened form of imp. 43, 5 *a*. *My prayer is, that you may come.* On the laying on of hands, see on 1[41].

[2] συνέθλιβον is found in the N.T. only in this passage. The change from the sing. ἠκολούθει to the plur. is due to the crowding being thought of, not as the act of the crowd collectively, but individually.

[3] The prep. denotes the state of the woman. The pres. part. οὖσα is used here of a past state continuing into the present, a temporal relation properly expressed by the perf. Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses,* 131 *c*.

general, not technical, to denote the nature of this hemorrhage, but it was probably menstrual.

26. *πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν — having suffered many things at the hands of many physicians.*[1] *δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' ἑαυτῆς πάντα — having spent all that she had.*[2]

μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα — seeing that she was no way benefited.[3] *μηδὲν* is used, instead of *οὐδὲν*, because of the writer's way of conceiving what is nevertheless stated as a fact. He is giving here not only the facts, but the facts as they lay in the woman's mind and became her reasons for coming to Jesus. He suggests that she knew all this, and reasoned it out this way, and this subjective view is implied in the use of *μηδὲν*. Win. 55, *g*, *β*.

27. *ἀκούσασα τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ — having heard the things concerning Jesus.*

τὰ is inserted before *περὶ* by Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ* BC* Δ etc.

The things concerning Jesus were the reports of his miracles. So far, the participles have denoted the particulars of the woman's state, previous to her coming to Jesus, and this identity of relation has led to the use of *καὶ* or *ἀλλά* to connect them. Now, the narrative passes over to a new relation, and the conjunction is dropped. *ἐλθοῦσα — having come.* Here, the long line of participles ceases to be elegant, and should have been replaced by *ἦλθε καὶ, she came and.*

28. *Ὅτι ἐὰν ἅψωμαι κἂν τῶν ἱματίων — If I touch his garments only.*[4]

ἐὰν ἅψωμαι κἂν τῶν ἱματίων, instead of *κἂν τῶν ἱματίων . . . ἅψωμαι*, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ etc.

The woman seeks to be cured in this surreptitious way because of her uncleanness.[5]

29. *ἔγνω τῷ σώματι — she knew in her body.* The changed condition, like the disease itself, would make itself known physically. *ὅτι ἴαται ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγος — that she has been healed of the*

---

[1] *ὑπὸ* differs from *ἀπὸ* in such cases as denoting *under*, or *at the hands of*, an efficient cause, while *ἀπὸ* means merely *from*, an occasional cause. Win. 47 *b*. p. 364, 368, Thayer's Translation.

[2] *παρ' ἑαυτῆς* is a case of attraction, the prep. taking the gen. after it, instead of the dat., as if it were connected with *δαπανήσασα*. See Win. 47 *b*. 66, 6.

[3] On the absurd medical treatment of such cases, see Geikie, *Life of Christ*, chap. 42.

[4] Literally, *if I touch if even his garments*. It is a case of condensed structure, with *ἅψωμαι* repeated after *κἂν*, understood. *ὅτι* introduces a direct quotation. In translating the clause, *only* or *even* belongs with garments, not with touch. — *If I touch his garments only.*

[5] See Lev. 15[25–27].

scourge.[1] μάστιξ is used in Greek writers to denote any calamity providentially, a μάστιξ θεοῦ. But the providential view does not appear in the N.T. use, but only a figurative designation of the effect of disease.

30. ἐν ἑαυτῷ — *in himself.* Denotes the inwardness of his knowledge, proceeding from his own feelings, not from his knowledge of what the woman had done. This feeling is where Jesus' knowledge of the facts began, and signifies that he had no conscious part in the miracle. Also the expression τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν, *the power gone out from him,* indicates that the writer conceives of the cure as effected not by the conscious exercise of power by Jesus, but by power that went out from him involuntarily, and of which he became conscious only afterwards. Lk. relates the story from the same point of view. Mt. tells us that the woman expected to be cured in that way, but that Jesus felt the touch, and sought the woman out, after which the miracle proceeded in the ordinary way. It is possible that the cure took place without Jesus' intervention, but by a direct Divine act, as in the other cases in which the throng about him sought to touch even the hem of his garment, and as many as touched were healed. Only, in this case, Jesus knew in some way that there had been a touch on him different from that of the crowd, and chose to trace it and bring himself into personal contact with the person from whom it proceeded, instead of allowing it to remain in the impersonal form which was necessary in the case of numbers doing the same thing. This has been interpreted by Mk. and Lk. into a miracle done not by Divine intervention, but coming from a spring of power in Jesus, which could be drawn on, but not without his feeling the efflux, the loss of power. While Mt. has reduced it to a miracle of the ordinary kind.

32. τὴν τοῦτο ποιήσασαν — *her who did this.* This is anticipating the result of his search. Jesus was ignorant who had done it, and so of course, whether it was man or woman.

33. φοβηθεῖσα κ. τρέμουσα — the aor. pass., denoting a past act, and the pres., denoting a present state; *having been frightened and trembling.*

34. ὕπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην — *go in health.* An exact translation of the Heb. לֵךְ לְשָׁלוֹם, the salutation used by them in saying *farewell.* εἰρήνη does not have its Greek meaning, *peace,* but one imported directly from the Heb., *general wellbeing,* or in this case, *health.* This is the primary meaning of the Heb. word, and *peace* only a secondary meaning, whereas *peace* is the only meaning of the Greek word. Our version translates it always *peace,* which is misleading.

---

[1] ἴαται is a perfect pass. of the deponent verb ἰάομαι, which has a passive signification in the perf., aor. pass., and 1 fut.

καὶ ἴσθι ὑγιὴς — *and be well.* This must not be taken to mean that the cure was performed now for the first time, as everything in the story points to the fact that the cure was effected when she touched Jesus, v.[29].

THE DAUGHTER OF JAIRUS.

This is the only case of raising of the dead related by all the Synoptics. Only Lk. tells of the case at Nain, 7[11–17]. The words, *she did not die, but sleeps,* lend themselves so readily to the supposition that this was not a case of raising the dead, that it is no wonder that they have been so used. Beyschlag treats it as a case in which the state ordinarily called death has been reached, but in which there has been no final separation of soul and body, so that there is a possibility of awakening, which there would not be, if the connection between the two had been actually severed. Holtzmann treats the language more rudely as a contradiction within the story itself of its miraculous intention. Everything else in the three accounts favors the hypothesis of death. The announcement in Mt. is that the child is dead, in Mk. and Lk., that she is dying, and later, that she is dead. Lk. says that they knew her to be dead, an expression which is inappropriate, if it was their mistaken supposition. And Jesus signifies his sense of the momentousness of the occasion by taking with him only the three, a selection reserved for the critical periods of his life. On the other hand, the explanation of Jesus' words, which makes *she did not die, but sleeps* mean that this was not an ordinary case of death, though really death; but resembling sleep, since the child was to be raised, does not seem quite adequate. And Beyschlag's explanation is worthy of serious consideration. But it is purely an exegetical consideration. His general objection to miracles of resurrection is a question by itself, and the theory of miracles to which it belongs discredits many of Jesus' miracles without sufficient reason. He attributes the genuine cases to the immense influence of Jesus' personality on other men, with its reaction on the body, and of course excludes all miracles on nature, and of actual reanimation of a dead body. When once the soul and body are finally severed, the possibility of reanimation ceases. Meantime, it seems quite certain that the narratives themselves treat this as a case of raising the dead.

35. ἔρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου — *they come from the synagogue's ruler's house.* The Greek says *from the synagogue ruler,* but he was with Jesus, and they bring the message to him.

ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπέθανε· τί ἔτι σκύλλεις τὸν διδάσκαλον; — *thy daughter has died; why troublest thou the teacher further?*[1]

36. Ἰησοῦς παρακούσας — *Jesus having overheard, i.e.* heard what was not addressed to him.

Omit εὐθέως before παρακούσας, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 1, 28, 40, 209, 225, 271, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh. etc. παρακούσας, instead of ἀκούσας, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* et cb BL Δ one *ms.* Lat. Vet.

μόνον πίστευε — In accordance with the ordinary use of the present imp., this means, *hold on to your faith, do not lose it.*[2]

37. μετ' αὐτοῦ συνακολουθῆσαι — Literally, *to accompany with him.* The ordinary construction is the dat.

μετ' αὐτοῦ, instead of αὐτῷ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Pesh.

Πέτρον, κ. Ἰάκωβον, κ. Ἰωάννην — The prominence here given to these three is repeated at the Transfiguration and in Gethsemane (9^2 14^{33}). The reason for admitting only these in this case is the same which led him to enjoin secrecy in regard to his miracles generally, but which is enhanced by the extraordinary nature of this miracle. His miracles generally earned him an undesired notoriety, but this would startle even one accustomed to them, and would excite a furor among the people. Note on 1^{45}.

38. καὶ ἔρχονται . . . καὶ θεωρεῖ θόρυβον καὶ κλαίοντας — *and they come . . . and he sees a tumult and persons weeping.*

ἔρχονται, instead of ἔρχεται, *he comes,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDF Δ 1, 33, some *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh. καὶ before κλαίοντας, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCLMU ΔΠ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Syrr. B* πολλάς.

ἀλαλάζοντας — *wailing,* is an onomatopoetic word, coming from ἀλαλά, a cry uttered originally by soldiers going into battle, but afterwards adapted to other cries expressing various feelings. Elsewhere, in the N.T., it is used only in 1 Cor. 13^1, to denote the clanging of a cymbal. It is used very appropriately of the monotonous wail of hired mourners.

39. Τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε; — *Why do you make a tumult and weep?* Mt. also speaks of the crowd as θορυβούμενον, and introduces αὐλητάς, *flute-players.* There was the exaggerated noise and ostentation of hired mourners.

---

[1] σκύλλεις means properly *to flay,* and is used in the weakened sense, *to trouble,* only in the Biblical and still later Greek. In the N.T. it is a rare word, and its use here and in the parallel passage, Lk. 8^{49}, is one of the strong indications that the Synoptical Gospels are interdependent.

[2] See Win. 43, 3 *b*.

τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει — *the child did not die, but sleeps.* This may be said from the standpoint of Jesus, who knows that she is to be raised, so turning her death into sleep. But see note at beginning of paragraph.

καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ — *and they laughed him down.* They understood him literally, and Lk. says that they knew the child to be dead.

40. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας — *but he, having put out all.*

αὐτὸς δὲ, instead of ὁ δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 33, Lat. Vet. except one *ms.* Vulg. Memph.

καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ — *and those with him,* viz. Peter, James, and John.

ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον — *where the child was.*

Omit ἀνακείμενον, *lying,* after παιδίον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 102, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

41. Ταλιθά, κούμ — *Maiden, arise.* Ταλιθά is the Chaldaic טְלִיתָא, fem. of טָלְיָא, *a youth.* κούμ is the Heb. imp. קוּם. κοῦμι of the TR. is the proper fem. form. κούμ is the masc. used as an interjection. The language of Jesus reproduced here is an indication that he spoke in Aramaic, the language of Palestine at the time.

Κούμ (Κοῦμ, Treg.), Tisch. WH. ℵ BCLM 1, 33, 271, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. ἔγειρε, instead of ἔγειραι, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDL ΔΠ etc.

Τὸ κοράσιον — *Maiden.*[1]

42. ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα — *for she was twelve years old.* This is introduced to explain the walking, nothing having been said about her age before. ἐξέστησαν εὐθὺς ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ — *they were amazed immediately with a great amazement.*[2]

εὐθὺς after ἐξέστησαν, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 33, Memph.

43. διεστείλατο — *he commanded.*[3] ἵνα μηδεὶς γνοῖ — *that no one know.*

γνοῖ, instead of γνῷ, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BDL.

Weiss contends that the words of Jesus, *maiden, arise,* do not mean that she is to awake from the sleep of death, but that the

---

[1] In the earlier writers, this word is used disparagingly, belonging, as it does, only to colloquial speech. It is a rare word in the N.T., and its use here and in the parallel account, Mt. 9^{24}, points in the same direction as the use of σκύλλεις, v.[35].

[2] This is a weakened sense of both noun and verb, which denote the actual putting one out of his senses, beside himself, and it belongs to later Greek. On the use of the dat. akin to the acc. of kindred signification, see Win. 32, 2, at end.

[3] The nearest approach to this meaning in earlier Greek is *to decide* or *determine.* This meaning belongs in the main to Biblical Greek.

maiden already raised from the dead by the power of God, is to rise from her couch. But this is pure assumption, there being nothing in common linguistic usage to justify this distinction. And it leaves out of sight the plain fact that the words of Jesus on such occasions are the signal for the performance of the miracle. Weiss is theory-bound in his treatment of the miracles.

REJECTION AT NAZARETH

VI. 1–6. *Jesus visits Nazareth, and teaches in the synagogue. His countrymen express their surprise at the wisdom and power displayed by one so obscure in his origin, and Jesus is prevented by their unbelief from the usual exercise of his healing gifts.*

1. Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν — *And he went out thence.* With these words Mk. connects this visit with the events of the preceding chap.

Mt. places this visit after the parables, saying expressly that it was after he had ended these parables[1] (13^{54-58}). Lk. tells us of a visit to Nazareth at the beginning of his ministry, 4^{16-30}, in which Jesus quotes the same parable as in this visit, of the prophet not without honor except in his own country. And the position in which he places this rejection at the beginning of the ministry in Galilee, and just before the record of the beginning of Jesus' residence in Capernaum, seems to indicate a connection between these events in the author's mind. However, Lk. inserts in v.[23] a reference to works done in Capernaum, which is inconsistent with the place which he assigns to the visit, previous to the settlement in Capernaum. Mt. also notes the leaving Nazareth and settling in Capernaum, but places this present event after the parables. The accounts cannot be harmonized, except on the supposition of a repetition of the visit to Nazareth, and his rejection there. It is easy enough to suppose that Jesus visited his family several times, and met this ungracious reception at the hands of his countrymen, but it is also quite evident that the Evangelists have got hold of one story, marked by the same details throughout, and have placed this one rejection in different parts of the Gospel. Two things are evident in regard to the chronological arrangement of the Gospels; first, that the Evangelists intended

[1] See Note on Relation of Synoptical Accounts at beginning of ch. 5, for the place of the parables in Mt.'s account. And notice how Mt. thus connects the visit to Nazareth with the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, which Mk. and Lk. put at the beginning of the Galilean ministry, while Mt., though connecting the two events as they do, puts them both at a late period.

to make such an arrangement, and secondly, that their several arrangements do not always agree.

τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ — his own country. Nazareth is the place meant, the residence of his family, and where he had lived himself up to the beginning of his public ministry.

ἔρχεται comes, instead of *ἦλθεν came,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCLD Harcl. *marg.*

2. *ἤρξατο διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ.* There was no regularly appointed person to perform this office in the synagogue, but the ἀρχισυνάγωγος might select any one to read the lessons and to preach.[1] If any Rabbi was present, they would avail themselves of him for the purpose. Jesus used this opportunity as long as it was open to him, but he seems to have been denied the synagogue after a time.

καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες — and the many hearing him.

Insert οἱ before πολλοί, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. *marg.* BL 13, 28, 69.

The many means here *the multitude, all except a few.*[2]

Πόθεν τούτῳ ταῦτα; — Whence to this man these things? The demonstratives bring into sharp contrast the man and the things done by him; *this man of whom we know everything and nothing great, and these wonderful things.* The same thing is repeated in the next clause, where τούτῳ replaces αὐτῷ in the Crit. text. They imply by their question, which is evidently contemptuous in its tone, that these things are unaccountable, and their inference is not creditable to him, as it might easily be, from such facts. They reason that anything legitimate of this kind would have shown itself in his early life. *καὶ δυνάμεις τοιαῦται . . . γινόμεναι.* With this reading, the question in this v. resolves itself into three, or rather two questions and an exclamation. The substitution of the participle γινόμεναι for the verb in the last part makes it an exclamation. The picture is of several groups of objectors, of which one throws out the sneer, "*Whence to this one these things?*" another takes it up in the same tone, "*And what is the wisdom given to this one?*" and a third exclaims, "*And such miracles done through his hands!*"

τούτῳ, instead of *αὐτῷ,* after *δοθεῖσα,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ Memph. (most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. *illi*). Omit *ὅτι* before *καὶ δυνάμεις* ℵ* et c ABC² EFGHLMSUV Δ 1, 13, 28, 33, 69, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. *γινόμεναι,* instead of *γίνονται,* Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* et c BL Δ 33, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

3. *ὁ τέκτων — the wood-worker.* Mt. says *ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός, — the son of the carpenter,* 13[55]. The word *τέκτων,* which is found in

[1] See Note on ἀρχισυνάγωγος, 5[22].

[2] See Win. 18, 3, end of section.

the N.T. only in these two parallel passages, means any worker in wood, rarely in any other substance. ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας — *the son of Mary.* The dropping out of Joseph in the gospel narrative probably indicates his death before this time of Jesus' ministry. καὶ ἀδελφὸς — *and brother.* On the nature of this relation, see on 3^{18}. It should be added, in proof of the improbability that these ἀδελφοί were anything else than brothers of Jesus, that Lk. 2^{7} speaks of Jesus as the first-born son. There is no more baseless, nor for that matter, prejudiced theory, in the whole range of Biblical study, than that which makes Jesus the only child of Mary.

καὶ ἀδελφὸς, instead of ἀδελφὸς δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh.

ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ — *they were made to stumble in him,* prevented from proper action by what they saw in him. On the meaning of the verb, see on 4^{17}. The prep. denotes the person in whom the stumbling block is found. But its use in such a connection is unusual in Greek. And the repetition of the exact language in Mt. 13^{57} furnishes another item in the linguistic proof of the interdependence of the Synoptical Gospels.

4. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς — *And Jesus said to them.*

Καὶ ἔλεγεν, instead of ἔλεγεν δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 33, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh.

προφήτης — *a prophet.* The word means in classical Greek an interpreter of the gods, or of their oracles, and then in general, a seer. In the Biblical usage, it denotes an inspired teacher.

συγγενεῦσιν — *kinsmen.*[1]

συγγενεῦσιν, instead of συγγενέσι, Tisch. Treg. WH. B* D^{2} EFGHLUV Δ 1, 33, 69, 124, 209, 262, 271, 346. Insert αὐτοῦ after συγγενεῦσιν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BC* KLM^{2} (Δ ἑαυτοῦ) 28, 71, 218, 235, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Syrr.

This proverb has various forms, among them the one stating the principle on which they are all based being *Familiarity breeds contempt.* It applies exactly to the case of our Lord at Nazareth, where he was brought up, and in that early private life showed no signs of the supernatural powers of his public ministry. There is always some difference that separates public from private life, a man not being called upon for the same exercise of his powers in the one as in the other. And to the unthinking person, this is a defect, because it seems to indicate something unreal, put on for the occasion, in the greatness of the man in whom it appears. And of course, if there is any real descent, the charge is true. But in the case of our Lord, there was only the difference that

1 "A barbarous declension," Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

naturally belongs to the difference of the two spheres. In the same way, a statesman does not continually air his wisdom in private, which may be a sign of his greatness.

5. οὐκ ἐδύνατο — *he could not.* Of course, this was a moral inability. Jesus required faith for the performance of his miracles, and that was wanting here; nay, there was a positive disbelief, no mere doubt. He found elsewhere a poor wavering faith, but not enough lack to hinder his work of physical healing, though it kept him out of men's souls. But here the general unbelief of the nation reached its climax, and prevented even this one good that his countrymen generally permitted him to do them.

εἰ μὴ ἐθεράπευσε — *except that he healed.*[1] ἀῤῥώστοις — *sick folk* EV.[2]

6. ἐθαύμασεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν — *he marvelled at their unbelief.*[3]

ἐθαύμασεν, instead of ἐθαύμαζε, Tisch. WH. ℵ BE*.

Jesus' wonder was a part of his humanity. He had a wonderful intuitive knowledge of men, and his proverb shows that he traced this unbelief to its source; he could account for it, that is to say: but it exceeded his expectations, and excited his wonder.

περιῆγε τὰς κώμας — *he went round about the villages.* Jesus had left Capernaum for a time, and being rebuffed at Nazareth, he does not return to the former place, but makes a tour of the villages about Nazareth.

MISSION OF THE TWELVE

7–13. *Jesus sends out the twelve to aid him in his more extended work. His instructions to them.*

Jesus is now engaged in one of those journeys through Galilee, in which he branches out from his more restricted work in the neighborhood of Capernaum, and instead of keeping the twelve with him after his ordinary custom, he sends them out in groups of two to help him in his work of proclaiming the kingdom, and preaching repentance, and healing the sick. His instructions, which are evidently practical in their nature, not ascetic, nor

---

[1] The regular construction would require the inf. here, this verb being in the same construction as ποιῆσαι, and not ἐδύνατο.

[2] This is exactly our word *invalid*, or *infirm*.

[3] διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν is an unusual construction with ἐθαύμασεν, in fact, the only case of it in the N.T. (It seems quite improbable, both from the position and from the course of thought, that διὰ τοῦτο in J. 7[22], belongs with v.[21].)

involving any important principle, are that they should not encumber themselves with any unnecessary outfit, nor spend their time in finding better entertainment than that which first offers itself in any place that they enter.

7. *καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα* — This statement belongs immediately with the preceding *περιῆγε τὰς κώμας κύκλῳ διδάσκων*. Evidently, this mission of the twelve is for the purposes of this wider work undertaken by him. In this going around from place to place, this attempt to cover more ground than usual, he calls in the aid of his disciples. *ἤρξατο ἀποστέλλειν* — Since the appointment of the apostles, this is the first mention of such a general circuit as this, and hence this is designated as the beginning of Jesus' sending them forth. So Meyer and others. Morison treats it as an idiosyncrasy of Mark's, a part of his vividness of style. And I am inclined to agree with him, that the general use of this verb in the Gospels is periphrastic and peculiar, many of the cases not yielding to treatment. But it is not peculiar to Mk., and this is a case in which there is evidently a beginning pointed out.

δύο δύο — *two by two*.[1] *ἐξουσίαν τ. πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων* — *authority over the unclean spirits*. This is to Mk. the representative miracle, being mentioned by him frequently as if it were by itself, where it is evident that it must have been accompanied by other miracles. See 1^{39} 3^{15}, Tex. Crit. It was so accompanied in this case. See v.[13]

8. *εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον* — This was to be the only addition to their home outfit, the only thing that they were to take for the road. Mt. and Lk. do not make this exception, but expressly include the stick among the prohibited things. *μὴ ἄρτον, μὴ πήραν* — *no bread, no wallet* (or *haversack*). This order, adopted by Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. is the natural order. The words belong together, as do *ζώνην* and *χαλκόν*. *πήραν* is a leather sack, haversack, used to carry provisions. *ζώνην* is the girdle or belt, in which they carried money. *χαλκόν* means *brass*, or *copper*, and secondarily, *money* of any kind.

' *ἄρτον μὴ πήραν*, instead of *πήραν μὴ ἄρτον*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 33, Memph.

9. *ὑποδεδεμένους* — The participle is put in the acc. as if to agree with a preceding acc. with an inf. The command to wear sandals seems superfluous, but it is really a part of the injunction against any luxury in their outfit, being contrasted with shoes protecting the upper part of the feet as well as the soles. There is

[1] *δύο δύο* — is a Hebrew fashion of expressing the distributive idea, where the Greeks would say *ἀνὰ* or *κατὰ δύο*.

no contradiction between this and the command not to buy sandals for the journey, Mt. 10[9], the latter being directed against the purchase of extra sandals over and above what they were wearing. But, while there is no contradiction, there is a difference; they are two orders about this same matter of sandals. All that we can gather about it is, that Jesus gave some direction about sandals in connection with the general direction for simplicity of equipment, of which the several Gospels have preserved different accounts. *μὴ ἐνδύσησθε δύο χιτῶνας — do not wear two tunics.*[1] Mt. and Lk. say that they were not to have or provide two tunics. But this forbids their wearing two, referring to a custom of dress belonging to persons of distinction, who wore two *χιτῶνας*, an inner and an outer. See *Bib. Dic.*, article Dress, and *Dic. of Antiq.*, article Tunica. In general, these directions are against luxury in their equipment, and also against their providing themselves with what they could procure from the hospitality of others. Evidently, if they took no food and no money, this dependence on others would be their only resort. See Mt. 10[10].

Treg. *marg.* WH. read *ἐνδύσασθαι*, which is also the reading of Beza and Elzevir, with B[2] S II*. L and some others read *ἐνδεδύσθαι*. Improbable and unsupported.

10. *ἐκεῖ . . . ἐκεῖθεν — there . . . thence.* The first of these refers to *οἰκίαν* in the preceding, and the second to *ὅπου*. They were to remain in the one house until they left the place. This injunction is directed evidently against a restless and dissatisfied changing from one house to another. They were to be satisfied with the hospitality offered them. See Lk. 10[7].

11. *ὃς ἂν τόπος μὴ δέξηται, μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν* — With this reading, the subject changes in the second clause, so that it reads, "*whatever place does not receive you, and they do not hear you.*"

ὃς ἂν τόπος μὴ δέξηται, instead of *ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέξωνται*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ[gr] 13, 28, 69, 124, 346, Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν — This was a symbolical act, signifying that the actor considered even the dust of the place as defiling. See Lk. 10[11]. *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς — for a testimony unto them*, not *against them.* It was to testify to the men themselves what the act signifies, viz. that these heralds of the Kingdom of God shook off all association with them as defiling. The rest of the verse is to be omitted. It is evidently copied from Mt. 10[15].

Omit *ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, Verily I say unto you*, to end of verse, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 17, 28, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg.

---

[1] On this change from the indirect to direct discourse, see Win. 63, II. 2. The RV. indicates the change of structure by inserting *said he*. And the change in *ὑποδεδεμένους* by inserting *to go*.

12. *ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοῶσιν—they made proclamation that men should repent.* On the meaning of the verbs, see on 1[4]. *ἵνα* with the subj. denotes the contents of their proclamation, the same as the inf., not its purpose. See Win. 44, 8, *a*.[1]

ἐκήρυξαν, instead of *ἐκήρυσσον*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ Pesh. Harcl. *marg.*

13. *ἤλειφον ἐλαίῳ — they anointed with oil.* This is the only place in the N.T., except James 5[14], in which anointing and healing are mentioned together. Anointing was a frequent specific, however, in ordinary medical treatment, and this would suggest its use in the symbolism of supernatural healing. *ἀῤῥώστους* — this word occurs only four times in the N.T., and two of these, the only ones in Mk., are this and v.[5] In this account of what the disciples did, we have the purpose of their mission, which is only implied in v.[7].

HEROD'S CONJECTURE

14–16. *Herod hears of the miracles performed by the disciples, and explains them by the supposition that Jesus is John the Baptist, whom he has beheaded, and who has risen from the dead.*

Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee, from his residence at Tiberias on the southern shore of the lake, would not hear much of Jesus. Our Lord never went there himself, owing probably to the unsympathetic attitude of the court, and its corrupting influence on the Jewish element of the population.[2] But it is possible that the disciples, in this more extended tour, had come near enough to attract the attention of Herod, who was usually careless of the religious, or even of the possible political aspects of Jesus' work. And the king, so called by courtesy, conscience stricken by his execution of John the Baptist, thinks that these miracles of which he hears are the work of the resurrected prophet.

14. *ἤκουσεν* — the object of this verb is evidently the things just narrated, the work accomplished by the twelve. *φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα* — this explains the preceding statement, showing how the works of the disciples led to these conjectures of Herod and others in regard to Jesus himself. Jesus became known

[1] Morison makes a curious mistake in supposing that the aor. subj. of the TR. means *might*, while the pres. sub. means *may*. This difference is expressed in Greek by a change of moods, not of tenses. [2] See Schürer, II. I. 23, 33.

through the works of his disciples, and hence Herod found it necessary to account for him in some way.

The Herod who beheaded John was Herod Antipas, son of Herod the Great and Malthace, and in the partition of his father's kingdom, he was made tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa.[1]

καὶ ἔλεγεν ὅτι Ἰωάννης . . . ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν — *and he said that John . . . has risen from the dead.*

Καὶ ἔλεγον, *and they said*, Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. *marg.* BD 6, 271 *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Improbable, as it makes Herod take up a common rumor, v.[16], whereas it is evident that this strange conjecture started with the king's conscience. ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν, instead of ἐκ νεκρῶν ἠγέρθη, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 33, Latt. Memph. Pesh.

Herod's superstition and his guilty conscience raised this ghost to plague him. It has been suggested that Herod makes the statement in regard to John's resurrection in order to account for the difference between his natural life, in which he performed no miracles, and this report of wonderful works. But it seems doubtful if Herod went so curiously into the matter as this. Rather, he wishes to account for these phenomena, and he does it by attributing them to a man who had proved himself so far above mortal man by his own resurrection, that any other wonders seemed natural for him. ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ — *the powers work in him, are active in him.* In conjunction with a verb like ἐνεργοῦσιν, δυνάμεις returns to its proper meaning of *powers.*

15. Ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον — *And others said.*

Insert δὲ after ἄλλοι Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDEHKLS ΔΠ Latt. Memph. Harcl.

Ἠλίας — Referring to the expectation that Elijah would return to the earth before the great day of the Lord (Mal. 4[5]). ὅτι προφήτης ὡς εἷς τῶν προφητῶν — *that it is a prophet like one of the prophets.* The words do not express the idea that he was just a prophet, like one of the ordinary prophets, in distinction from the great prophet Elijah. This would require the idea of ordinariness to be more definitely expressed. It is the likeness to the old prophets, rather than unlikeness to some special one of them, that is meant to be emphasized. We do not need to suppose that these different opinions were expressed by people in conversation with each other, which would lead us to dwell on the points of contrast. But it is quite probable that they were isolated statements, uttered at different times, and brought together here.

Omit ἐστὶν after προφήτης, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ 1, 28, 33, 209. Omit ἢ, *or*, before ὡς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCL Π *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh.

---

[1] On the genealogy of the Herodian family, see *Bib. Dic.*

16. ὁ Ἡρώδης ἔλεγεν, Ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα — *Herod said, John, whom I beheaded.*

ἔλεγεν, instead of εἶπεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 33, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Omit ὅτι before ὃν, Tisch, Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL 1, 28, 33, 67, 124, 209, Latt. Syrr.

Herod's conjecture does stand in contrast with these others, of which he has heard. ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα — Herod dwells upon the thought, that this prophet who has now risen from the dead was beheaded by himself. Hence the relative clause, which contains this statement of the beheading, is placed first and ἐγὼ is expressed.

Ἰωάννην, οὗτος ἠγέρθη — *John, this one was raised.*[1]

Omit ἐστιν· αὐτὸς, after οὗτος, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* et c BDL Δ 69, 106, 346, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. (Memph.). Omit ἐκ νεκρῶν, *from the dead*, after ἠγέρθη, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33, Memph. Hier.

οὗτος ἠγέρθη — *this one was raised.* The pronoun, which is not necessary to the construction, is introduced in order to continue the solemn emphasis of the whole statement. Lk. 9[7-9] says that Herod was perplexed by the report that John had risen from the dead, and said, "*John I beheaded, but who is this?*" exactly reversing the positions of Herod and of the other parties to this discussion in our account.

IMPRISONMENT AND EXECUTION OF JOHN

17–29. *Mk. tells the story of John's imprisonment and death at the hands of Herod, in order to explain Herod's allusion to his beheading of John.*

Mk. has alluded to the fate of the Baptist, and now proceeds to tell the story of it. Herod Antipas had been married to a daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia, but on a visit to Jerusalem he had become enamoured of Herodias, the wife of his disinherited brother, and herself a member of the Herodian family, and had contracted an adulterous marriage with her. Here is where Mk. takes up the story, with John's reproof of this adultery. It incensed Herodias especially, and though Herod imprisoned the brave prophet, he was so impressed with John's saintliness, and even a sort of superstitious fear of him, that he protected him against his wife's fury.

[1] This is a case of the noun being attracted from the principal into the relative clause, and taking its construction.

But Herodias, who was biding her time, took advantage of a birthday feast given by Herod, and sent her daughter to dance before the king, and when the gratified king swore to give the girl anything she might ask, Herodias instructed her to ask for the head of John. The king was fairly trapped, and though sorely against his will, he sent a soldier and beheaded John in prison.

Philip, commonly known as Herod, was son of Herod the Great and Mariamne, the daughter of the high priest Simon, and was disinherited by his father, living as a private citizen in retirement. Secular history tells of only one Philip, the tetrarch of Gaulanitis and other districts E. of Galilee, and Volkmar and Holtzmann contend that the Evv. have confounded him with the disinherited brother, who was known only as Herod. Winer, Meyer, Weiss, and others answer that there may have been two Philips, as there were two Antipaters, especially as they were only half-brothers. Herodias was niece of both her husbands, being daughter of Aristobulus, another of Herod's sons. It was on the occasion of a feast given by Philip to his brothers at Jerusalem, that Antipas became enamoured of the beauty of Herodias, and she of his power, and they began the intrigue which ended in their adulterous marriage. Antipas became involved in a war with Aretas, king of Arabia, his father-in-law, on account of his desertion of his first wife for Herodias. The marital relations of the Herodian family were a most extraordinary mixture, though belonging to the general license of the age. This is one of the places where the Gospels bring us into contact with the Gentile world, the Herodians being Gentile in their extraction and spirit, though nominally Jews in their religion, and the note of that Gentile world was open vice and profligacy, while of the Jewish leaders it was hypocrisy.

17–29. 17. Αὐτὸς γὰρ Ἡρώδης — *for Herod himself.* αὐτὸς serves to keep up in Mk.'s account the emphasis which Herod had put on the ἐγὼ, v.[16]. ἐκράτησε — *seized.*[1] ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν — *for he had married her.* This states more particularly the connection between Herodias and the imprisonment of John, already denoted by διὰ Ἡρωδιάδα. It is an independent statement of cause, usually introduced by γάρ.[2] But strictly, the causal conjunction is out of place, except in connection with John's

[1] On the use of the aor. for the plup. in Greek, see Win. 40, 5 *a*. Burton, 52. Both of these, however, fail to account for the infrequency of the plup. in the N.T.
[2] See Burton, 232.

rebuke, of which it is the cause, and not of John's imprisonment. Properly, this is one of the steps leading up to the imprisonment, and would be denoted by a relative clause, *ἣν ἐγάμησεν.*

18. *Ἔλεγε γὰρ Ἰωάννης — for John had said.*[1] *Ὅτι οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι — it is not lawful for thee.* See Lev. 18^{16} 20^{21}. But John would emphasize not so much the departure from Jewish law, for which Herod had slight regard, but the broader ground of common morals.

19. *ἐνεῖχεν αὐτῷ* — AV. *had a quarrel against him.* But it is doubtful if the words had this meaning. It requires the ellipsis of *τὸν χόλον* to explain it, and it is unusual to leave so specific a word to be implied, though the use of *τὸν χόλον* with the verb is quite frequent. On the other hand, it would be quite common to supply a word like *τὸν νοῦν* with the verb, and that would give us the meaning, *she kept her eye (mind) on him.* But the phrase, though quite natural, does not seem to occur. A third supposition is, that the verb may be used, like the Latin *insto*, intransitively, *she followed him up, did not relax hostility against him.* On the whole, this seems the best rendering. Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* *καὶ ἤθελεν . . . καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο — and wished . . . and could not.* This representation, that Herodias was restrained from her vengeance by Herod is not borne out by Mt., who says that Herod wished to put John to death, but feared the people (14^{5}). Verse[9] says that he was grieved by Salome's demand, but this was evidently, in Mt.'s account, for the same reason, viz. that he feared the people.

20. The statement of Mk. is that John's righteousness made Herod afraid, and what John said both perplexed and delighted him, so that he preserved him. *ἐφοβεῖτο — feared.* The kind of fear that Herod had of John is shown by the superstitious idea that he had of John's resurrection. The prophet's righteousness and holiness made him seem, even to Herod's worldly sense, a man of God, and his fear therefore was of the God back of the righteous man. *καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν — and guarded him*, viz. from the hostile intentions of Herodias. RV. *kept him safe.*[2] *πολλὰ ἠπόρει — was much perplexed.* The perplexity arose from the conflict between his fear of John and his entanglement with Herodias. *καὶ ἡδέως* — The peculiarity of the Hebraistic use of *καί* to tie together variously related statements is here curiously exemplified.[3] The gladness with which Herod heard John is the trib-

[1] See Burton, 29. In this case, the impf. contains an element of repeated action, not expressed by the plup. We combine both in *he had kept saying.*

[2] AV. *observed him.* This comes probably from the meaning *keep in mind*, but it is not a legitimate derivation, nor is the meaning consonant with the context. See Morison's Note. Also Meyer.

[3] Win. 53, 3 *b*. It is to be said, however, that while *καί* itself is never strictly adversative, it is used to connect statements more or less adverse. Only *καί* does not express the opposition.

ute which the moral sense, even in bad men, pays to the truth, and to boldness and freshness in the utterance of it.

πολλὰ ἠπόρει, *was much perplexed*, instead of πολλὰ ἐποίει, *did many things*, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BL Memph.

21. ἡμέρας εὐκαίρου — *an opportune day*, viz. for Herodias' purposes. τοῖς γενεσίοις — *on his birthday feast.* This word is used in Greek for a service in commemoration of a dead friend. γενέθλια is the word for a birthday celebration.[1] μεγιστᾶσιν — *grandees.* A later Greek word. χιλιάρχοις — *chiliarchs.* If we render the word literally, it means *commander of a thousand*, and its equivalent in our military phraseology is *colonel.* τοῖς πρώτοις τ. Γαλιλαίας — *the first men of Galilee.* His retainers, and especially his military officers, would be foreigners. These would be the men of the province.

ἐποίησεν, instead of ἐποίει, after δεῖπνον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 13, 28, 69, 124, Latt.

22. τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τ. Ἡρωδιάδος — *the daughter of Herodias herself* (RV.).[2] The intensive pronoun is used here because such dancing was an almost unprecedented thing for women of rank, or even respectability. It was mimetic and licentious, and performed by professionals. ἤρεσεν — *it pleased*, rather than *she pleased.* The latter would require the subject of the verb to be the noun of the preceding gen. abs., a quite unnecessary grammatical irregularity.

ἤρεσεν, instead of καὶ ἀρεσάσης, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L 33, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. αὐτοῦ, instead of αὐτῆς, after θυγατρὸς, WH. RV. *marg.* ℵ BDL Δ 238. This means that it was Herod's daughter Herodias, who performed the dance, and involves a curious historical error. But this is no reason for rejecting a reading so well attested. Meyer and Tisch. slight the evidence. Weiss and Holtzmann condemn it as an exegetical impossibility, since Herodias with the art. must be the Herodias of v.[19]. But in spite of all this, the reading itself is not to be lightly set aside.

ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν — *and the king said.* This reading is necessary with the change from the part. to the indicative in ἤρεσεν.

ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν, instead of εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ 33.

κορασίῳ — *girl.* See on 5[41].

23. ὤμοσεν — *he swore.* This oath of Herod is the same that Ahasuerus made to Queen Esther, the ἕως ἡμίσους τ. βασιλείας μου, *to the half of my kingdom*, being the exact language of the Sept. in the O.T. story (Esther 5[3. 6] 7[2]).

24. Καὶ ἐξελθοῦσα — *And having gone out.*

---

[1] See Win. 2, 1 *d.* Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

[2] *Of the said Herodias*, AV., would require the art. before αὐτῆς.

Καὶ, instead of Ἡ δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33, Memph. αἰτήσωμαι,[1] instead of αἰτήσομαι, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDGL Δ 28, 33, 124, 346. βαπτίζοντος, instead of βαπτιστοῦ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 28, Harcl.

25. εὐθὺς μετὰ σπουδῆς — *immediately with haste.* Evidently, this haste was lest the king's ardor should cool. She and her mother both knew that nothing but the king's oath would make him do a thing so contrary to his own desires. This urgency is shown also in her request that it be done ἐξαυτῆς, *forthwith.* πίνακι — *a platter.* The word *charger* used to transiate it in the EV. is practically obsolete in this sense.

26. περίλυπος γενόμενος — the part. is used here concessively, *though he was grieved, yet.* καὶ τοὺς ἀνακειμένους — *and those reclining at table.*

Omit συν — *with,* in συνανακειμένους, *reclining with him,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BC* L Δ 42, Pesh.

ἀθετῆσαι αὐτήν — *to refuse her.* The verb belongs to later Greek.

27. σπεκουλάτορα — this is a Latin word, and means *a scout,* or secondarily, *a member of the body-guard.*

σπεκουλάτορα, instead of -τωρα, ℵ ABL Π 1, 108, 124, 131, 157, Harcl. *marg. grk.*

ἐπέταξεν ἐνέγκαι — *commanded him to bring.*

ἐνέγκαι, instead of ἐνεχθῆναι, *to be brought,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC Δ etc.

28. Καὶ ἀπελθὼν — *And having gone out.*

Καὶ, instead of ὁ δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BCL Δ 1, 28, 124, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. *ed.* Pesh.

ἀπεκεφάλισεν — *beheaded,* a later Greek word. φυλακῇ — *prison.* Josephus tells us that John was beheaded in the castle of Machærus, and as this was one of Herod's favorite resorts, it may well be that the feast, which was the occasion of the tragedy, took place there. And the whole story is framed on the supposition that the prison was near enough to the banquet hall to have the head brought immediately. Machærus was a ridge a mile long, overlooking a deep ravine, at one end of which Herod had built a great palace, while at the other end was the citadel in which John was confined. It was situated at the southern end of Peræa, and east of the northern end of the Dead Sea. Some have supposed that Tiberias was the scene of both the feast and the execution, and others that the feast was there, and the execution at Machærus. But there does not seem to be any sufficient reason for setting aside Josephus' testimony about the beheading of John, and in that case the narrative favors the supposition that the feast was in the

[1] This is the subj. of deliberative questions, in which advice is asked.

same place. It is a piece of poetic justice that Aretas, the father of Herod's rejected wife, made war upon his faithless son-in-law, and defeated him, so that Herod was saved only by the intervention of the Roman Emperor.

29. πτῶμα — means *a fall,* or secondarily, *something fallen,* and with νεκροῦ, — *a corpse.* But the omission of νεκροῦ in this sense belongs to the later Greek. Mt. 14^{12} adds to this the statement that the disciples of John came and told Jesus.

RETURN OF THE TWELVE. FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND

30–44. *Mk. now resumes his narrative of the mission of the twelve with an account of their return, and of their report to Jesus. On their return, probably to Capernaum, they are so beset by the multitude that they have no leisure even to eat, and Jesus seeks retirement with them on the other side of the lake. But the multitudes see them and follow on foot around the head of the lake. Jesus allows his compassion to get the better of his original purpose, and begins to teach the crowd which he found gathered when he landed. It is already late when it is brought to his attention by the apostles, that the multitude, in their eagerness to hear him, have failed to provide themselves with food. Whereupon, Jesus himself feeds them out of five loaves and two fishes which the disciples have brought for themselves.*

30. ἀπόστολοι — it is noticeable that the twelve, who are generally called disciples, are here given the name which describes their official work instead of their discipleship, and that the occasion, the only one in which the name is used in Mk., is one in which they were returning from that apostolic work. ὅσα ἐποίησαν, κ. ὅσα ἐδίδαξαν — *whatever they did, and whatever they taught.*[1]

Omit Καί, *both,* before the first ὅσα, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDELV Δ 1, 28, 33, 13^{1}, Latt. Memph. Pesh. etc. Tisch. omits second ὅσα with ℵ* C* 1, 271, Latt. It is more in Mk.'s manner to retain the ὅσα.

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς — *And he says to them.*

[1] See footnote v.17. This is one of the cases, where, owing to the close conjunction of this with the principal verb, the absence of the plup. is most marked. But in relative clauses, the Greek rarely uses the plup. Win. 40, 5 *a*, *β*.

λέγει, instead of εἶπεν, *said*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 33, etc. ἀναπαύσασθε,[1] instead of ἀναπαύεσθε, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ABCM Δ 40, 69, 108, 238, 346, 435, etc.

31. ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν — *you yourselves apart.* The language is selected to emphasize as much as possible the privacy which Jesus wished to secure for them. εὐκαίρουν — This verb belongs to the later Greek. It means *to have opportunity or leisure* for anything. As to the occasion of this departure, Mt. gives another account. According to him, Jesus took the disciples away to a solitary place across the lake when he heard the death of John the Baptist. Here, it is to give the disciples rest after their missionary journey, which it was impossible for them to get with the multitudes crowding about them and preventing even their eating.

εὐκαίρουν, instead of ηὐκαίρουν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABEFGHLV ΓΔ, etc.

32. καὶ ἀπῆλθον — *and they went away.* The point of departure was probably Capernaum, as it was on the lake, and it would be the most likely place for a rendezvous after their journey. εἰς ἔρημον τόπον — Lk. says that they went to Bethsaida, meaning the city on the east side of the lake. But when he comes to tell the story of the feeding of the multitude, he also says that it was a desert place (Lk. $9^{10.12}$).

33. καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας, κ. ἔγνωσαν πολλοί — *and they saw them going, and many knew (them).*

Omit οἱ ὄχλοι, *the multitudes*, after ὑπάγοντας everything except a few cursives. ἔγνωσαν, instead of ἐπέγνωσαν, Treg. WH. B* D 1, 118, 209. Omit αὐτὸν, *him*, after ἔγνωσαν Treg. WH. RV. BD 1, 13, 28, 118, 131, 209, Vulg. Substitute αὐτοὺς, Tisch. ℵ AKLMU ΔΠ two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Syrr.

πεζῇ — *on foot.* They went around the head of the lake, and crossed the river at some ford. συνέδραμον — *they ran together.* The prep. describes the coming together of the crowd from the many starting-places to the point for which they saw the boat heading. προῆλθον αὐτούς — *outwent them.* The verb means properly *to go forward, to advance*, or with the gen. *to go before another.* This use with the acc., meaning *to reach a place before another*, belongs to later Greek. The rest of the verse is to be omitted.

Omit Καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 13, Vulg. Memph.

34. καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον — *And having come forth, he saw a great multitude.* The part. refers to the disembarking from the boat. J., who is here parallel to the Synoptics for the only time between the account of the ministry of the Baptist and

[1] The aor. differs from the pres. imp. here, as denoting beginning, instead of continuance. *Get rest* expresses it.

the final coming to Jerusalem, says that Jesus spent some time in the mountain with his disciples before the multitude came to him.

Omit ὁ Ἰησοῦς after εἶδεν Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL 1, 20, 33, 69, 124, 209, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. αὐτούς, instead of αὐτοῖς, after ἐπ' Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDF 245, 253, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg.

ἐσπλαγχνίσθη — *had compassion.*[1]

μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα — μή is used here, instead of οὐκ, because it denotes Jesus' conception of the people, his thought about them. It is the fact, but the fact transferred to his mind.[2] This expression is used also by Mt. 9[36], in the passage which leads up to the account of the appointment of the twelve, and the sending them forth to supply the lack. It seems as if this feeling of Jesus towards the multitude had somehow impressed itself on the minds of the disciples especially at this period of his life, the period just preceding the close of the ministry in Galilee. The figure itself denotes the lack of spiritual guidance. Then, as always, there was no lack of official religious leadership, but the officials, the priests, and rabbis, were blind leaders of the blind. Notice also the human quality of Jesus' action here. He seeks a quiet place to escape from the crowd for a time; is defeated in his purpose by the multitude invading his retreat; and he yields to their importunity and to his own exacting pity. It is a distinctly human change of purpose, such as foreknowledge would have prevented, and as an attestation of his humanity it brings him blessedly near to us.

35. ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης — *much time of day having passed.* The only other instance in the N.T., in which ὥρα is used to denote *daytime* is the parallel passage in Mt. 14[15]. See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

Tisch. WH. *marg.* read γινομένης, *coming to be a late hour*, with ℵ D Latt.

οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον — *his disciples said.*

ἔλεγον, instead of λέγουσιν, *say*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33, Memph.

ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος — *the place is desert;* and so there is no place here for them to procure food. ἤδη ὥρα πολλή — *already it is a late hour,* and so there is short time for them to supply their wants. In their haste and eagerness to follow Jesus, they had neglected to bring anything with them, and in their absorption in his teaching, they had forgotten their ordinary wants. According to J. 6[5], this conversation was started by Jesus.

36. ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν — *they may buy for themselves somewhat to eat.* The subj. is that of a deliberative question.

---

[1] On the form and meaning of this verb, see on 1[41]. [2] See Win. 55, 5*g*, *β*.

Omit ἄρτους after ἀγοράσωσιν Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 28, 102, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. γὰρ and οὐκ ἔχουσιν after τί are to be omitted on substantially the same authority.

37. δηναρίων διακοσίων — *two hundred shillings' worth.* The Revisers do a somewhat curious thing in translating this word *penny*, and then explaining in the margin that it means *eight pence halfpenny* (RV. Mt. 18[28]). The actual paying power was much greater than our shilling, as it represented a day's wages. The sum is evidently suggested here as their hasty guess at the amount required to purchase a frugal supply for the crowd. It would also be a sum quite beyond their means, so that the question is meant to imply the absurdity of the whole thing. This question is not given in the other Synoptics, and in the fourth Gospel it takes the form of a statement that what is absolutely a large sum is quite inadequate for even a small supply of so big a crowd.

δώσωμεν αὐτοῖς — *give them.*

δώσωμεν, instead of δῶμεν, Tisch. ℵ D 13, 33, 69, 124, 229**, 346. δώσομεν Treg. WH. RV. ABL Δ Latt. External evidence balanced between δώσωμεν and δώσομεν, internal slightly favors δώσομεν, owing to the change of mood, which makes subj. an apparent emendation.

38. ὑπάγετε, ἴδετε — *go, see.*

Omit καί, *and*, between ὑπάγετε and ἴδετε Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL 1, 33, 102, 118, 240, 244, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh.

καὶ γνόντες — *and having ascertained.* The verb is used here in its inchoative sense *to learn*, instead of *to know*. The EV., *and when they knew*, leaves out the process which the Greek expresses.

39. ἀνακλιθῆναι — *to recline.*[1]

ἀνακλιθῆναι, instead of ἀνακλίναι, WH. RV. ℵ B* G 1, 13, 28, 69.

συμπόσια συμπόσια — *by parties.* The repetition of the noun to express the distributive idea is Hebraistic. The word itself means a drinking party, *i.e.* the entertainment, not the guests. This present use belongs to the later Greek. ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ — *on the green grass.* This is a characteristic touch given by Mk. alone, with his eye for pictorial details, but it is more important than that to us; for the grass is green in Palestine, especially in this hot Jordan valley, only at the time of the Passover. And so, here is one intimation in the Synoptics of more than one year's ministry. And this is also the place where the fourth Gospel inserts a passover between the first and the last.

40. καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαί, κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα — *and they reclined in (regular companies like) garden beds, by hundreds, and by fifties.*

[1] In this sense of reclining at meals, the use of compounds with ἀνά belongs to later Greek. Win. 2, 1 δ.

ἀνέπεσαν, instead of ἀνέπεσον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BEFGHMV Δ 1, 28. κατὰ, instead of ἀνὰ, before ἑκατὸν and πεντήκοντα Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BD Memph.

This descriptive word πρασιαί, *garden beds*, gives an admirable picturesque touch. The disposition of the people in orderly groups was for the more convenient distribution of the food.

41. εὐλόγησε — *he blessed.* This word in Greek means *to praise*, and only in Biblical Greek does it signify *to invoke a blessing* on a person or thing, copying from the Heb. use.

καὶ κατέκλασε — *and he broke in pieces.*[1] καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς — *and gave to his disciples to set before them.*

Omit αὐτοῦ after μαθηταῖς Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33, 102, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. παρατιθῶσιν, instead of παραθῶσιν, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. ℵ* BLM* ΔΠ* 42, 63, 122, 229, 251**, 253.

πᾶσι — *to all.* In this, and the πάντες ἐχορτάσθησαν, *all were filled*, and δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα, *fillings of twelve baskets*, and finally the πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες, *five thousand men alone*, are enumerated the several things that point to the greatness of the miracle.

42. ἐχορτάσθησαν — *they were filled*, or *satisfied.*[2] κλάσματα (-των) δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα — *fragments* (or *of fragments*), *fillings of twelve baskets.* κλάσματα is put in an emphatic position, drawing attention to the quantity of fragments even. It is noticeable that κόφινοι is used in all four accounts of this miracle, while in both accounts of the feeding of the four thousand, σπυρίδες is used. There does not seem to be much difference, if any, between the kind of basket, and the identity of language in the Gospels in each account is the more remarkable.

κλάσματα, instead of κλασμάτων, Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. BL Δ. κλασμάτων ℵ 13, 69, 124, 209, 346. κοφίνων, instead of κοφίνους, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ B 1, 13, 69, 124, 209, 346. πληρώματα, instead of πλήρεις, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 1, 13, 69, 124, 209, 346.

44. πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες — *five thousand men alone.* ἄνδρες is the Greek word for *men*, distinct from women and children. See Mt. 14[21]. The whole number then was much greater.

This is, with the exception of the raising of the dead, the most remarkable of all the miracles recounted in the Gospels, being the one in which secondary causes are out of the question, making it a purely creative act, a creation out of nothing. The rest of the provision did not come somehow out of the five loaves and two fishes, but was added to it by the mere creative word. All talk

[1] The prep. in composition denotes the separation of the bread into parts by the breaking. See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

[2] Properly χορτάζειν is used of the feeding of animals.

about acceleration of natural processes is mere talk, because there is here nothing to start from in such a process. Of course, this has led to all kinds of rationalizing. Paulus, and after him Holtzmann, suppose that Jesus set the example of utilizing such provisions as they had, those who had sharing with those who had not. And even Weiss, in order to preserve the historicity of the account in the face of an increasing skepticism in regard to so stupendous a miracle, admits the possibility of this explanation, only insisting that we have here a miracle of providence in bringing together such supplies even in a natural way, and that Jesus relied with serene confidence upon it. Schenkel explains it as a materialization of Jesus' feeding of the multitude with spiritual food. But fortunately, we have here, as Weiss points outs, a concurrence of three eye witnesses, the Logia of Mt., the oral testimony of Peter, and the witness of John being all represented in the several accounts, and there is no doubt whatever of the fact that they represent it as an actual feeding of the multitude with five loaves and two fishes, after which there remained twelve baskets of fragments.

OUR LORD WALKS ON THE WATER

45–52. *Immediately after the feeding of the multitude, and probably owing to the excitement caused by that, Jesus dismisses his disciples with some urgency to embark in the boat for Bethsaida on the west shore of the lake, while he himself dismisses the multitude. Having taken leave of them, Jesus goes up into the mountain in the neighborhood to pray. Meantime, the disciples were having a hard time with a contrary wind on the lake, and it was past three o'clock in the morning, when Jesus came to them walking on the water. They thought that it was a ghost, but were reassured by his announcement of himself. With his coming, the wind ceased, and they were filled with an unreasonable amazement, not being prepared even by the miracle of feeding the multitude for this fresh wonder.*

45. εὐθὺς ἠνάγκασε — *immediately he compelled.* This language expresses haste and urgency, for which, however, Mt. and Mk.

give no reason. But the fourth Gospel states a fact, which would certainly account for this urgency, telling us that the people were about to come and seize him to make him a king (J. 6^{15}). According to this, Jesus knew that his disciples would side with the multitude in this design, and therefore dismisses them with this abruptness and imperativeness. Βηθσαϊδάν — Lk. 9^{10} tells us that this was the name of the place where the miracle was performed. There were two places of the name, one on each side of the lake. See *Bib Dic.* ἕως αὐτὸς ἀπολύει — *while he himself dismisses.* The αὐτὸς emphasizes the fact that Jesus himself, having forced his disciples away, dismissed the multitude. It was an emergency in which he would trust no one but himself.

ἀπολύει, instead of ἀπολύσῃ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL 1. E* K Γ 28, 69, etc. read ἀπολύσει.

46. ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς — *having taken leave of them.* The verb is not used in this sense in the earlier Greek writers, who said, instead, ἀσπάζεσθαι. τὸ ὄρος — *the mountain,* viz. in that place. προσεύξασθαι — *to pray.* Mt. adds to this only the scene in Gethsemane as an occasion when Jesus retired to pray. This Gospel gives, besides these two, the occasion of his first day's work in Capernaum (ch. 1^{35}). Lk. gives several others. The two mentioned in Mt. and the three of Mk. were crises in his life, two of them growing out of a sudden access of popularity, and the third out of the impending tragedy of his life. Prayer with Jesus was real, growing out of his human needs.

47. ὀψίας — *evening.*[1] It was already evening (Mt.), or late (Mk.), or the decline of day (Lk.), when the question of feeding the multitude came up. That was, therefore, the early evening, from three to six o'clock, and this the late evening, from six o'clock till night.

48. ἰδὼν . . . ἔρχεται — *And seeing them . . . he comes . . .* instead of *he saw them . . . and comes.*

ἰδὼν, instead of εἶδεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Omit καί, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ.

βασανιζομένους — *distressed.* This is one of the words in which the notion of trial or testing has run over into that of distress, since difficulty and hardship are so frequent forms of testing. The verb is formed from βάσανος, *a touchstone.* ἐλαύνειν — literally, *driving.* But the word is used frequently of rowing or sailing a boat. τετάρτην φυλακὴν — *the fourth watch.* The Jews at this time divided the night into four watches of three hours each, and this was therefore the last watch, from three to six o'clock. They had been having a hard time therefore, having been, at a moderate estimate, some eight hours in rowing three miles. Cf. J. 6^{19}.

[1] See on 1^{32}.

ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης — *on the sea.* It is one of the absurdities of rationalizing exegesis, that this has been made to mean on the shore of the sea, or in view of the obvious fact that the author cannot possibly have meant that, that the story, as it stands, is supposed to have arisen from a mythical handling of so commonplace an event as walking on the shore. The miracle is one of those, moreover, that cannot, in our present state of knowledge, be explained away. Jesus' miracles of healing can, most of them, be attributed to his extraordinary influence over the minds of those healed, though it may be doubted if the exceptional cases, such as the raising of the dead and the healing at a distance, do not so give the law to the rest as to turn even this possibility into an improbability. But here is a miracle upon inanimate matter, overcoming the difference in specific gravity between water and the human body, so that the water will support the heavier body. This miracle will yield to no rationalizing treatment, and in it, therefore, we are confronted with the problem of the miraculous without any alleviation. Nor does it yield any more to a legitimate historical criticism, which leaves our Lord's miracles untouched, unless we accept it as an axiom of that criticism that the miraculous does not happen. And so it is with the problem of the miraculous as a fact, with which the life of our Lord confronts us.

καὶ ἤθελε παρελθεῖν αὐτούς — *and he purposed to pass by them,* or *was on the point of passing by them.* See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* *Would have passed by them,* EV., would be expressed by the aor. ind. of παρέρχομαι, with ἄν. This was what he was on the point of doing when he was interrupted by their cry. His purpose at the time was that, and he waited for some demonstration on their part to change it.

49. ὅτι φάντασμά ἐστιν — *that it is an apparition.* The lack of substance, or material reality, is emphasized by the word. In the dark, they did not recognize Jesus, and they could attribute the appearance on the water to nothing solid.

ὅτι φάντασμά ἐστιν, instead of φάντασμα εἶναι, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33.

50. πάντες γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶδαν — *for all saw him.*[1]

εἶδαν, instead of εἶδον, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ B. D and *mss.* of Lat. Vet. omit the clause.

ὁ δὲ εὐθὺς ἐλάλησε — *and he immediately spoke.*

ὁ δὲ, instead of καὶ, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. εὐθὺς, instead of εὐθέως, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ.

ἐγώ εἰμι — *I am it,* where we say, *it is I.* The language of Jesus is reported in the same words by all the evangelists, except that J. omits θαρσεῖτε.

[1] On this use of the vowel of the first aor. in the sec. aor., see Win. 13, 1 *a.*

51. καὶ ἀνέβη . . . εἰς τ. πλοῖον — *and he went up . . . into the boat.* J. says, 6^{21}, that they purposed receiving him into the boat, but were prevented by the boat's immediate arrival at the land. ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος — *the wind abated.* This is evidently to be taken as a part of the miracle, as it is connected immediately with his coming to them.

καὶ λίαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο — *and they were exceedingly amazed*[1] *in themselves.* Their amazement was inward; they kept it to themselves.

Omit ἐκ περισσοῦ, *beyond measure* (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 1, 28, Pesh. Omit καὶ ἐθαύμαζον, *and wondered,* Tisch. Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 1, 28, 102, 118, 209, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph.

52. ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις — this does not denote, as in RV., the object of the verb, *concerning the loaves,* but the ground of understanding, *on the ground of the* (*miracle of the*) *loaves.* The miracle of the loaves and fishes should have led to an understanding of the present miracles, but it did not have this effect.[2] ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη — *but their heart was hardened.* This hardness of heart is something quite different from our use of the same words, denoting blunted feelings and moral sensibilities. The Biblical καρδία denotes the general inner man, and here especially the mind, which is represented as so calloused as to be incapable of receiving mental impressions.

ἀλλ' ἦν, instead of ἦν γὰρ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BLM^2 S Δ 33, Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

JESUS CROSSES THE LAKE AGAIN TO GENNESARET, AND MEETS AN IMPORTUNATE AND ENTHUSIASTIC MULTITUDE WHEREVER HE GOES

53–56. *On their return to the western side, Jesus and his disciples land in the district of Gennesaret, and are no sooner landed, than the people recognize them, and there is a popular uprising throughout the region. Those who first recognize him spread the report from village to village, and wherever Jesus goes, they bring their sick to him, and beg that they may as much as touch the hem of his garment as he passes. And as many as touched were healed.*

53. ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἦλθον εἰς Γεννησαρέτ — *they came upon the land to Gennesaret.* Gennesaret was a fertile plain on the west side

[1] On the meaning of this verb, see on 2^{12}.

[2] Win. 48 *c*, Mey. explain this by the German *bei*, as a temporal adjunct — *in connection with, at the time of.*

of the lake, about three miles long and a mile wide, lying just south of Capernaum. See *Bib. Dic.* This landing place was several miles south of Bethsaida, for which they had started originally, showing how much they had been driven out of their course. προσωρμίσθησαν — *they moored.*

ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἦλθον εἰς, instead of ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν Γεννησαρέτ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 28, 33.

55. περιέδραμον ὅλην τὴν χώραν ἐκείνην, καὶ ἤρξαντο — *they ran about all that country, and began.*

.περιέδραμον . . . καὶ, instead of περιδραμόντες, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 1, 13, 33, 69, Memph. Pesh. Omit ἐκεῖ in clause ὅπου ἤκουον ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐστι, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 102, Pesh.

κραβάττοις — *pallets.*[1]

56. καὶ ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο εἰς κώμας ἢ εἰς πόλεις ἢ εἰς ἀγρούς[2] — *and wherever he entered into villages, or into cities, or into hamlets.*

Insert εἰς before πόλεις and ἀγρούς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDFL Δ most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Harcl. ἐτίθεσαν, instead of ἐτίθουν, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BL Δ. ἥψαντο, instead of ἥπτοντο, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD[gr] L Δ 1, 13, 28, 33, 69, 124, 346.

κρασπέδου — *the fringe* or *tassel* appended to the hem of the outer garment, which served to remind Jews of the Law. But probably this ceremonial use is not in mind here, and it means just the edge of the garment, as if that slightest touch would be healing. J. gives a different account of what followed the storm on the lake, viz. that he landed at Capernaum, and delivered the discourse on the bread of life in the synagogue (J. 6^{22}).

DISPUTE WITH THE PHARISEES ABOUT EATING WITH UNWASHED HANDS

VII. 1–23. *Certain Scribes and Pharisees from Jerusalem, seeing the disciples eating with unwashed hands, complain of the violation of tradition. Jesus denies the force of tradition, and the possibility of material defilement of the spirit.*

This dispute is occasioned by the disregard of the disciples for the ceremonial law about eating with unwashed hands. But the Pharisees, who make the attack, signalize it by complaining of

[1] See on 2^4.

[2] The N.T. uses ἄν to denote indefiniteness in a relative clause with a past tense of the ind., where the Greek uses the opt. without ἄν. Burton, 315.

this unconventional act as a violation of the tradition of the fathers. And Jesus' answer is at first directed towards this feature of their complaint. It is a case, he says, of the commandments of men versus the commandments of God, of tradition against law. They even set aside the law of God, in order to keep their tradition. But then, taking up the more immediate question of unwashed hands, Jesus strikes at the root not only of traditionalism, but of ceremonialism, saying that it was not what a man took into his stomach, but what came out of his heart, that defiled him. And this, Mk. says, had the effect of cleansing all foods. And of course, as the distinction between clean and unclean belonged not to tradition, but to the written law, this made a breach in the law itself. It released men from the obligation of a part of the law said to have been given by God to Moses. And it affirmed the distinction between outward and inward in religion. It was no wonder that Jesus' fate hastened to its end, and that the next record of him marks practically the end of his Galilean ministry.

1. συνάγονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι — *there gather together to him the Pharisees.*[1] The distinction made between *the Pharisees* and *certain of the Scribes* would seem to mean that the Scribes were not so well represented.

This renewed activity of the Scribes and Pharisees against Jesus is another indication that there was a Passover at some time just before this, at which either the presence of Jesus himself, or the reports brought from Galilee, drew fresh attention to him. It would not be enough of itself, but it adds to the strength of other indications of the same thing. See on 6^{39}.

2. καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὅτι κοιναῖς χερσί, τουτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτοις, ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους — omit ἐμέμψαντο — with this omission it reads, *they gather to him, having come from Jerusalem, and having seen that certain of his disciples are eating with common hands, that is, unwashed.*

ὅτι . . . ἐσθίουσιν, instead of ἐσθίοντας, Tisch. Treg. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33 (Memph. Pesh.). Omit ἐμέμψαντο, *found fault*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABEGHLVX ΓΔ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

κοιναῖς — literally, *common*. In the Greek, it denotes simply what is common to several people, as common property. It is only in later Greek, that it comes to denote what is ordinary, or vulgar, or profane, as distinguished from select or sacred things. Under this general head, it comes to mean *ceremonially unclean.*

[1] *Are gathered*, RV., would require the perf. pass. This is the historical present.

The Pharisees did not seek by these washings to remove dirt, but the defilement produced by contact with profane things.

3. Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι — *The Pharisees and all the Jews.* This custom had become general among the Jews, though it originated with the Pharisees. πυγμῇ — this means *with the fist.* But the awkwardness of the process has led to doubt from the very first, whether this is the meaning intended. But the doubt has not led to the substitution of any justifiable alternative rendering. The meanings, *up to the wrist,* or *elbow,* RV. *marg.* are both linguistically and grammatically disallowed. *With a fist full of water* needs too much read between the lines, and, besides, the word denotes the closed fist. Finally, *frequently,* or *diligently,* RV., was probably taken in the first instance, in the Lat. Vet. and Syrr., from the reading πυκνὰ. The supposition that πυγμῇ had come to have this figurative meaning, seems forced, and besides, there is no warrant for it in actual usage. Edersheim quotes from the Jewish ordinance the provision that the hands should be held up in order that the water might run down to the wrist, and says that the provision that washing should be performed with the fist is not found in the Jewish law. This is, of course, a serious consideration, but does not seem to compare in importance with the other fact, that the Greek word does not mean this, nor the Greek case. The custom was not necessarily a part of the law, and may have been merely a usage arising from a desire for scrupulous observance. The very fact that the reading πυγμῇ occasions this difficulty, makes the strong external evidence for that reading still more convincing, and with this reading the only translation possible seems to be *with the fist.*

πυκνὰ, Tisch. ℵ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Syrr.

τὴν παράδοσιν — *the tradition.* It is the Greek etymological equivalent of *tradition,* and denotes what is passed along from one to another, and among the Jews, the body of Rabbinical interpretation of the written law, preserved by oral transmission from one generation to another. The word occurs in the Gospels only in this account and in the parallel passage in Mt. In attacking this, Jesus was assailing the very citadel of the Judaism of his time.[1]

τῶν πρεσβυτέρων — *the elders.* The word is used here in the sense of *fathers,* or *ancestors.*

4. ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται — *unless they bathe,* Amer. Rev. The contrast between this and the preceding case is indicated by the ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς, *from the market place.* These words are put first, in order to indicate that this is a special case, inasmuch as in the market place they would contract special defilement, owing to its

[1] See Schürer, *N. Zg.* II. I. 25, on Scribism.

being a place of public resort, where they would meet all sorts and conditions of men. This case would require special treatment, denoted by the difference between *νίψωνται τ. χεῖρας*, and *βαπτίσωνται*, *they wash their hands*, and *they wash themselves all over*. This case required the washing of the whole body. For instances of such washings, see Lev. $14^{8.9}$ $15^{5.6.8.10.11.13.16.21.22.27}$ $16^{4.24.26}$ 22^{6}. Moreover, Edersheim says that immersion of the things washed was the Jewish ritual provided in such cases. Dr. Morison contends that sprinkling was the ritual method provided in such cases, and attempts to overthrow the plain meaning of the word by the supposed custom. But he does not prove the custom, only the supposed impossibility of wholesale bathing. Moreover, the contrast would be a very lame one in that case, since the custom required careful washing of the hands, and so an actual removal of defilement, but in the case of extreme defilement, only a sprinkling of the body for form's sake is supposed. And his argument, that words constantly undergo such changes, amounts to nothing, as it is unaccompanied by proof that this word has gone through the process of change.

WH. *non marg.* RV. *marg.* *ῥαντίσωνται*, *sprinkle*, instead of *βαπτίσωνται*, with ℵ B 40, 53, 71, 86, 237, 240, 244, 259. A manifest emendation.

παρέλαβον — the counterpart of *παράδοσιν*, denoting the process of receiving a thing by transmission, as the latter does its giving. *ποτηρίων κ. ξεστῶν κ. χαλκίων* — *cups, and wooden vessels, and brazen vessels.* *κ. κλινῶν*, — *and of beds*, is omitted.[1] Edersheim shows that the Jewish ordinance required immersions, *βαπτισμοὺς*, of these vessels.

Omit *καὶ κλινῶν*, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 102, Memph.

5. *καὶ ἐπερωτῶσιν* — *and they question.* *περιπατοῦσιν* — *walk;* the figurative use of this word to denote *manner of life, conduct*, is Hebraistic.

καί, instead of *ἔπειτα*, *then*, before *ἐπερωτῶσιν*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL 1, 33, 209, Latt. Pesh. Memph.

κοιναῖς χερσὶν — *with unclean hands.*

κοιναῖς, instead of *ἀνίπτοις*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD 1, 28, 33, 118, 209, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

6. *καλῶς* — *well; i.e.*, in this case, *truly.* *τῶν ὑποκριτῶν* — *the hypocrites.* This is the only passage in Mk. in which this word occurs. It means properly a *play-actor*, and hence a person who is playing a part in life, whose real character is not represented by what men see. This secondary meaning belongs to Biblical Greek.

[1] AV. *tables*]

Omit ἀποκριθεὶς, *answering*, at the beginning of this verse, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33, 102, Memph. Pesh. Omit ὅτι before καλῶς, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. ℵ BL Δ 33, 102, most *mss*. Lat. Vet. Vulg. Pesh. ἐπροφήτευσεν, instead of προεφήτευσεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ B* DL Δ 1, 13, 33, 124, 346.

ὡς γέγραπται ὅτι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος — literally, *as it has been written, that this people.*

Insert ὅτι before ὁ λαὸς, Tisch. WH. ℵ BL Pesh.

This quotation is from Is. 29[13], and conforms for the most part to the LXX., which reads Ἐγγίζει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χείλεσιν αὐτοῦ τιμῶσί με, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ; μάτην δὲ σέβονταί με διδάσκοντες ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων κ. διδασκαλίας — *This people draws near to me with its mouth, and with their lips they honor me, but their heart is far from me. But in vain they honor me, teaching commandments and teachings of men.* The Heb. is translated in the RV., *Forasmuch as this people draw nigh to me, and with their mouth and with their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear of me is a commandment of men which hath been taught them.* The principal difference is in this last clause, which in the original charges them with fearing God only in obedience to a human commandment; while in our passage and in the LXX., it states the vanity of their worship, owing to their substitution of human commands for the Divine law. It is this misquoted part which makes the point of the quotation, and it is the misquotation which makes it available.

7. διδάσκοντες — the part. gives the reason for the vanity or uselessness of their worship, and may be translated, *while teaching.* διδασκαλίας — is in apposition with ἐντάλματα, and may be translated *for teachings.* ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων[1] — *commandments of men.* These two words contain the gist of the charge, and it is this inculcation of human teachings for the Divine law that is developed in what follows.

8. Ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ — *Leaving the commandment of God.*

Omit γὰρ after ἀφέντες, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ* 124, Memph.

This statement, that the Scribes and Pharisees leave Divine commands for human, is a singular comment on their attempt to build a hedge about the Law. The oral tradition was intended by them to be an exposition of the Law, and especially of the application of its precepts to life. They devised it so that men should not by ignorance and misunderstanding come short of the

[1] ἐντάλματα belongs to Biblical Greek. ἐντολή is the Greek word.

righteousness prescribed in the Law. But, in the first place, their method of interpretation was fitted to bring out anything except the real meaning of the Scripture, being to the last degree fanciful and arbitrary; and then in the second place, they proceeded to make this interpretation authoritative, so that really a human word got to be substituted for the Divine in most cases. Their mistake does not stand by itself; it has been repeated in every age. Everywhere, the same fatality attends authoritative exposition, nay, is involved in its very nature. The human exposition gets substituted for the Divine word, and so the worship of man becomes vain.

Omit last part of this verse, beginning *βαπτισμούς*, *washings*, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 1, 209, 251, Memph.

9. *καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε*[1] — *well do you set aside.* *καλῶς* is used here ironically, like our word *bravely.*

10. For quotations, see Ex. 20^{12} and 21^{17}. *θανάτῳ τελευτάτω* — *let him surely die* (RV. *marg.*), a rendering of the Heb. inf. abs. which simply intensifies the meaning of the verb. This last command, affixing the capital penalty to the sin of reviling parents, is adduced by our Lord to show how seriously the Law takes this fifth commandment.

11. With the omission of *καὶ*, *and*, at the beginning of v.[12], the two verses belong together, and read, *But you say, "If a man say to his father or his mother, 'Anything in which you may be profited by me is Corban (that is, an offering),'" you no longer permit him to do anything for his father or his mother.*[2]

Omit *καὶ*, *and*, at beginning of v.[12], Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD Δ 1, 13, 28, 69, 102, 346, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

κορβᾶν is the Hebrew word for an offering. It is the predicate, having the antecedent of the relative for its subj. The meaning is, that a man had only to pronounce this word over anything, setting it aside to a Divine use, in order to escape the obligation of giving it for the relief or comfort of his parents. Even when said in good faith, this contravenes the Divine Law, since the duty to the parent takes precedence of the obligation to make offerings. The choice in such cases is not between God and man, but between two ways of serving God, the one formal and the other real. Offerings belong to the formal side of worship, whereas God is really served and worshipped in our human duties and affections. But it was not necessary that the banning should be carried out on its positive side. The word having once been uttered, the

[1] *ἀθετεῖτε* is a later Greek word.

[2] This is an anacoluthon, as the condition belongs to the saying of the Jews, and the conclusion to the statement of Jesus.

man was freed from the human obligation, but needed not to make the offering. Nay, he was positively forbidden to use the article any longer for the human purpose with reference to which the Korban had been uttered. The regulation was not invented for this purpose, but was intended to emphasize the sacredness of a thing once set apart, even by a thoughtless word, to Divine uses. But it failed, as the uninspired mind generally does, to define Divine uses, and left out what was of real importance, while emphasizing and retaining the unimportant.

Omit *αὐτοῦ* after *πατρί*, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BDL Δ 28, 69, 240, 244, 245, 346, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Omit *αὐτοῦ* after *μητρὶ* ℵ BDL 1, 13, 28, 56, 69, 240, 244, 346, Latt.

13. *ἀκυροῦντες* — *invalidating* is an exact translation of the Greek word, which means to deprive a thing of its strength. *παραδόσει ὑμῶν ᾗ παρεδώκατε* — *the tradition which you handed down.* It is impossible to render into English the paronomasia here. The verb describes the handing along from one generation to another which constitutes tradition. *παρόμοια* — *nearly like.*[1]

14. *προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον* — *Having called up the crowd again.* It seems that the previous conference has been held with the Scribes and Pharisees alone. But Jesus wishes what he says now about the matter to be heard by the people. It is a matter, not of private conference or debate, but of the utmost importance for the popular understanding of true religion.

πάλιν, again, instead of *πάντα, all,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

Ἀκούσατέ μου πάντες κ. σύνετε — This is no formal introduction, but calls on his hearers to lend him not only their ears, but their understandings, in view of the special importance of what follows. He may well do so, since what he says abrogates the distinction between clean and unclean, which forms so essential a part not only of tradition, but also of the Levitical part of the Law itself.

ἀκούσατε, instead of *ἀκούετε,* Tisch. Treg. WH. BDHL. *σύνετε,*[2] instead of *συνίετε,* Tisch. Treg. WH. BHL Δ 238.

Οὐδέν ἐστιν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτόν, ὃ δύναται κοινῶσαι αὐτόν — *There is nothing outside the man entering into him, which can defile him.* The reason that Jesus gives for this statement shows that he meant to make the distinction between outward and inward in the sense of material and spiritual. The things from outside cannot defile, because they enter the belly, and

[1] This word, which is common in classical Greek, is found only here in the N.T.
[2] This form, sec. aor. imp., occurs only here in N.T. The aor. imperatives here are appropriate to the beginning of discourse.

not the heart, while those from within are evil thoughts of all kinds. This has nothing to do, therefore, with the question, whether, among spiritual things, it is only those from within the man himself that can hurt him. Inwardness in this sense belongs to things within the man himself and within others, and externality is to be taken in the same sense. ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενά ἐστι τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον — *but the things coming out of the man are the things which defile the man.* The repetition of the noun *man,* instead of using the pronoun, which here amounts to inelegance, is quite in Mk.'s manner.

ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενα, *coming out from the man,* instead of ἐκπορευόμενα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, *coming out of him,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 33, Latt. Memph. Omit ἐκεῖνα, *those,* Tisch. (Treg.) WH. ℵ BL Δ 102, Memph.

Verse 16 is omitted by Tisch. WH. RV. (bracketed by Treg.) ℵ BL Δ 28, 102, Memph.

17. τὴν παραβολήν — *the parable* (*riddle*). From the use of this word to represent the Heb. word מָשָׁל, it loses sometimes its proper sense of similitude, and comes to be used of any sententious saying, or apothegm, in which the meaning is partly veiled by the brevity, but especially by the material and outward form of the saying. Here, *entering from the outside,* and *coming out,* are used to express the contrasted ideas of material and spiritual, and what the saying gains in pungency and suggestiveness it loses in exactness. Hence it is called a παραβολή.

τὴν παραβολήν, *the parable,* instead of περὶ τῆς παραβολῆς, *concerning the parable,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 33, Latt.

18. καὶ ὑμεῖς — *You too,* as well as the multitude. Jesus' saying was a riddle to them, not only because of the concrete form of statement, but also because of its intrinsic spirituality. They had been trained in Judaism, in which the distinction between clean and unclean is ingrained, and could not understand a statement abrogating this. It was all a riddle to them.

πᾶν τὸ ἔξωθεν . . . οὐ δύναται . κοινῶσαι — *nothing outside can defile.*[1]

19. This verse gives the reason why outward things cannot defile. They do not enter the inner man, the καρδία, but the κοιλία, *belly,* belonging to the outward man, and are passed out into the ἀφεδρών, *the privy.*[2]

καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα — RV. *This he said, making all things clean.* The part. agrees with the subj. of λέγει, *he says*

[1] πᾶν οὐ δύναται, *everything cannot,* is the inexact, Hebrew form of the universal negative; the logical, Greek form being οὐδὲν δύναται, *nothing can.* Win. 3 *c,* 1.

[2] τὴν καρδίαν is *the heart,* in the broad, Scriptural sense of *the inner man.* ἀφεδρῶνα is a barbarous word, probably of Macedonian origin, the proper Greek equivalent being ἄφοδος.

(v.[18]). That is, the result of this statement of Jesus was to abrogate the distinction between clean and unclean in articles of food. The use of quotation marks would show this connection as follows: *He says to them, "Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive that nothing which enters into the man from without can defile him; because it does not enter into the heart, but into the belly, and goes out into the privy," so making all foods clean.*

With the reading καθαρίζον, the part. agrees with the preceding statement; that is, the going out into the privy purifies the food, as that receives the refuse parts which have been eliminated in the process of digestion. With the masc., it is possible to connect it with ἀφεδρῶνα, but the anacoluthon involved is rather large-sized and improbable, as only a single word separates the noun from its unruly adjunct. The only probable connection is with the subject of λέγει (v.[18]).

καθαρίζων, instead of καθαρίζον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABEFGHLSX Δ 1, 13, 28, 69, 124.

20. τὸ ἐκ τ. ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμεν, ἐκεῖνο κοινοῖ — *what cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. Coming out* is used here to denote the spiritual, as *entering in* is to denote the material. Spiritual things can defile the man, and these only, not such material articles as food. And of course, this means that the real man is the spiritual part, and that defilement of the physical part does not extend to the spiritual part, which constitutes the real man. That can be reached only by spiritual things akin to itself. This principle, that spiritual and spiritual go together, and that the material cannot penetrate the spiritual, which is impervious to it, is needed in the interpretation of Christianity, as well as in the reform of Judaism.

21. οἱ διαλογισμοὶ — The article denotes the class of things collectively, whereas the anarthrous noun denotes them individually. This is the general term, under which the things that follow are specifications. The noun denotes the kind of thought which weighs, calculates, and deliberates. It is used here of designs or purposes. It is in accordance with our Lord's whole course of thought here, that he designates the evil as residing rather in the thought than in the outward act. The order of the first four specifications is as follows: πορνεῖαι, κλοπαί, φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι, *fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries.* The arrangement of the TR. is an attempt at a more studied order, bringing together things that are alike. The only principle of arrangement in Mk.'s enumeration is the distinction between these grosser, more outward forms of sin, and the more subtle, inward manifestations which follow in v.[22].[1]

πορνεῖαι, κλοπαί, φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι, instead of μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι, φόνοι, κλοπαί, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ Memph.

[1] On the use of the plural of the abstract noun to denote the forms or manifestations of a quality, see Win. 27, 3.

22. πονηρίαι — In general, this is a generic term for *evil.* Where it is used specifically, as here, it probably denotes *malice* as a distinct form of evil. δόλος — *deceit* does not convey the flavor of this word, which, starting from the idea of *bait,* comes to denote any *trick,* and abstractly, *trickery, cunning, craft.* ἀσέλγεια — Here also, the EV. *lasciviousness,* fails to convey the meaning. The word denotes in a general way the absence of self-restraint, unbridled passion, or cruelty, and the like. *License,* or *wantonness,* may be used to translate it. ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός — *an evil eye* — a Hebrew expression for *envy.* βλασφημία — a general word for *evil* or *injurious speech,* either of God or man. Toward the former it is *blasphemy,* toward the latter, *slander.* In this connection it is probably *slander.* ὑπερηφανία — a common Greek word, but found only here in the N.T. It includes pride of self and contempt of others, *arrogance.* ἀφροσύνη — *folly* translates this better than *foolishness,* as it denotes the morally foolish.

23. ἔσωθεν — *from within.* These things are morally unclean, while only the physically unclean comes from without.

What Jesus says here is directed specially against the traditional law, but the thing condemned, the distinction between clean and unclean, belongs also to the written law. Plainly, then, the distinction between the word of God and the word of man has to be carried within the Scripture, and used in the analysis of its contents. The thing that Jesus calls a word of man here is found also in the O.T. itself, and is fundamental in the Levitical law.

HEALING OF THE SYROPHŒNICIAN WOMAN'S DAUGHTER IN THE VICINITY OF TYRE AND SIDON

24–30. *Jesus leaves Galilee and comes into Syrophœnicia. A woman of the place asks him to heal her daughter, and overcomes Jesus' apparent reluctance by her shrewd wit and faith.*

The account reads simply that Jesus departed from that place into the borders of Tyre, where he wished to remain unknown, but could not hide his presence. For a Gentile woman, a Syrophœnician, found him out, and begged him to cast the evil spirit out of her daughter. Jesus was not there for the purposes of his work, and in general confined himself to the Jews in his ministrations. But he feels the irony of the situation that makes the Jew plume himself on his superiority to the Gentile, and reflects it in

his answer, that it is not a good thing to cast the children's bread to the dogs. The quick wit of the woman catches at these words, and her faith feels the sympathy veiled in them, so that she answers, *yes, and the dogs eat the crumbs.* That word is enough; Jesus assures her of her daughter's cure, and she goes home to find the evil spirit gone. So far the account. But when we find in the succeeding chapters that Jesus' excursion into the Gentile territory is not confined to this case, but that he continues there in one place and another, rather than in Galilee, that his teaching is restricted mostly to his disciples, and that he begins to warn them of his approaching fate, it is evident that this journey marks practically the close of our Lord's ministry in Galilee, and that this dispute with the Pharisees about clean and unclean marks a crisis in his life. These are not missionary journeys, but are undertaken to enable Jesus to be alone with his disciples.

24. Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς[1] ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια Τύρου — *And from thence he arose and went into the coasts of Tyre.*

Ἐκεῖθεν δέ, instead of Καὶ ἐκεῖθεν, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ Harcl. *marg.* ὅρια, instead of μεθόρια, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BDL Δ 1, 13, 28, 61 *marg.* 69, 209, 346. Omit καὶ Σιδῶνος, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.* WH.) RV. *marg.* DL Δ 28 *mss.* Lat. Vet. It is a case in which a copyist, used to the conjunction of the two places, might easily insert the words, but the omission is improbable for the same reason. And Mk. evidently meant to discriminate, since he says afterwards that Jesus left the region of Tyre, and came through Sidon, v.[31] (Tisch. Treg. WH. RV.).

τὰ ὅρια — The word denotes primarily the boundaries of a territory, and then the country itself included within those limits. It has been contended that the original meaning of the word is to be retained here, and that Jesus did not penetrate Gentile territory, but only its borders, that part of Galilee which bordered on Syrophœnicia. But this would be the single case of this restricted meaning in the N.T., and the universally accepted reading, διὰ Σιδῶνος (v.[31]), shows that he did penetrate the Gentile territory. Mt., however, in accordance with the plan of his Gospel, seems to represent this event as taking place on Jewish soil (15[22]). Tyre and Sidon belonged to Syrophœnicia, a strip of territory on the Mediterranean, noted for its antiquity, wealth, and civilization,

[1] This use of ἀναστὰς corresponds to the Heb. וַיָּקָם, and belongs to Oriental fulness, if not redundancy, of speech. Win. 64, 4, Note at end, contends that it is not redundant in all cases, but admits its redundancy here. Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* denies its redundancy altogether. And it is not redundant in one sense, since it is included in the action. But so is the straightening out of the limbs. It is so far redundant that the Greek, with its finer sense of the needful in speech, would omit it.

which had remained practically independent of Jewish, Greek, and Assyrian rule, though subject to the Romans since the time of Augustus.

καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς οἰκίαν, οὐδένα ἤθελε γνῶναι, καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη λαθεῖν — *And having entered a house, he wished no one to know it, and he could not be hidden.*

Omit τὴν before *οἰκίαν*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABLNX ΓΔΠ Pesh. ἠδυνάσθη,[1] for ἠδυνήθη, Tisch. WH. ℵ B.

οὐδένα ἤθελε γνῶναι — *he wished no one to know it.* This was in accordance with his purpose in resorting to this unaccustomed place. Morison makes a foolish distinction here between the wish of Jesus and his purpose, evidently with the idea that a purpose of Jesus could not be defeated. But aside from the fact, that N.T. usage does not bear out such a distinction, it would be difficult to draw the line between a wish that one is at pains to carry out, and a purpose. No, this is one of the cases in which the human uncertainty belonging to action based on probabilities, not certainties, appears in the life of Jesus. οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη λαθεῖν — *he could not be hid.* The inability is put over against the wish. This statement, which prepares the way for what follows in regard to Jesus' unreadiness to perform the miracle, is peculiar to Mk.

25. ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἀκούσασα — *but immediately having heard.* Jesus had no sooner arrived than this took place.

This reading, instead of ἀκούσασα γὰρ, *for having heard*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. *edd.* Harcl. *marg.*

ἧς εἶχε τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς — *whose daughter had.*[2]

Tisch. reads εἰσελθοῦσα, *having entered*, instead of ἐλθοῦσα, *having come*, with ℵ L Δ most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. A very probable reading.

26. Ἑλληνίς, Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει — *a Greek, a Syrophœnician by race.* That is, she was in general a Gentile, and more particularly a Syrophœnician.

Ἑλληνίς is literally, *a Greek*, but used by the Jews to designate any Gentile, owing to the wide diffusion of the Greek race and language. Syrophœnician is a more particular designation of the race to which she belonged. The prefix denotes that part of Phœnicia which belonged to Syria, in distinction from Libophœnicia, or the Carthaginian district in the north of Africa.

Συροφοινίκισσα, instead of Συροφοίνισσα, Tisch. WH. *txt.* ℵ AKLS *marg.* V *marg.* ΔΠ 1.

---

[1] On the form, see Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

[2] This is a literal translation of the Heb. idiom, which inserts the personal pronoun after the relative.

καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα . . . ἐκβάλῃ — *and she asked him to cast out.*[1]

ἐκβάλῃ, instead of ἐκβάλλῃ, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ ABDE, etc.

27. καὶ ἔλεγεν — *and he said.*

This reading, instead of ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, *and Jesus said*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33, Memph.

Ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα — *let the children be fed first.* In this word, *first*, Jesus hints that the time of the Gentiles is coming, as he frequently does in the course of his teaching, while he restricts his own work to the Jews. Mt. omits this, and makes Jesus' refusal to be much more definite and positive. τ. τεκνων . . . τ. κυναρίοις — By these terms, Jesus distinguishes between the Jews, who are the children of the household, and the Gentiles. *Dogs* is a term expressing the contempt of your true Jew for the heathen, and sounds strange in the mouth of our Lord. Weiss denies the contemptuous use of the term *dog*, and makes it merely a parable, in which an arrangement of the kingdom of God is expressed in the terms of household economy, in which the contempt for dogs plays no part. But this is to ignore the fact that "dog" is always a term of contempt, especially in the East; that as such, it was applied by Jews to Gentiles; and that, if Jesus did not mean to express contempt, his language was singularly ill-chosen, as the woman would be sure to understand him so. See *Bib. Dic.* But I am inclined to believe that Jesus did not use the term seriously, but with a kind of ironical conformity to this common sneer, having felt in his own experience how small occasion the Jews of his time had to treat any other people with contempt. He had good reasons for confining his work to the Jews, but they did not arise from any acceptance of their estimate of themselves or of others. It is as if he had put in a "you know," to indicate a common opinion.

28. Ναί, κύριε· καὶ τὰ κυνάρια . . . ἐσθίουσιν — *Yes, lord; and the dogs . . . eat.*

Omit γὰρ before τὰ κυνάρια, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BH Δ 13, 28, 33, 69, Memph. Pesh. ἐσθίουσιν, instead of ἐσθίει, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BDL Δ.

This use of Jesus' own words to neutralize the force of his seeming rebuff has been regarded rightly always as a unique combination of faith and wit. But it is not simply a trick of words; the beauty of it is, that it finds the truth that escapes superficial notice in both the analogy and the spiritual fact represented by it. It means, there is a place for dogs in the household, and

[1] There is a double irregularity here: first, in the use of ἠρώτα to denote a request, instead of a question; and secondly, in the use of ἵνα with the subj., instead of the inf., to denote the matter of the petition. Burton, 200, 201.

there is a place for Gentiles in God's world. And further, her faith was quickened by what she saw of Jesus. She knew intuitively that he was a being to take a large and sympathetic view of things, not the hard and narrow one, and that he had really prepared the way for her statement. This is of the essence of faith, to hold fast to what your heart and the highest things in you tell of God, in spite of all appearances to the contrary.

30. *τὸ παιδίον βεβλημένον ἐπὶ τ. κλίνην — the child thrown upon the bed.* Probably the cure had been attended by violent convulsions, as in other cases of the same kind in the Gospels.[1]

τὸ παιδίον βεβλημένον ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην, καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐξεληλυθός, instead of *τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐξεληλυθός, καὶ τὸ παιδίον βεβλημένον ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh.

CURE OF A DEAF AND DUMB MAN IN THE REGION OF DECAPOLIS

31–37. *From the region of Tyre, Jesus went still further north, through Sidon, and then south again to Decapolis, on the SE. shore of the lake. Here they bring him a deaf man, whose speech has been impaired by his deafness, to be cured. Jesus is not here for the purposes of his mission, and in order to call as little attention to the cure as possible, he takes the man aside from the multitude. And as the man is deaf, and Jesus needs to establish communication with him in some way in order to draw out his faith, he employs signs, thrusting his fingers into his ears, and putting spittle on his tongue, and casting his eyes to heaven. The man is cured, and then Jesus enjoins silence in regard to the cure. But in vain, as they are more eager to tell the story of his beneficent power, the more he tries to prevent it.*

31. *ἦλθεν διὰ Σιδῶνος εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν — he came through Sidon to the sea.*

διὰ Σιδῶνος εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, instead of *καὶ Σιδῶνος, ἦλθε πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν, and of Sidon, he came to the sea*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 33, Latt. Memph.

This reading establishes the fact that Jesus entered Gentile territory in this visit, and also that Mk. does not mean by *τὰ ὅρια*

[1] See 1^{26} 9^{26}.

Τύρου (v.[24]), the Galilean territory adjoining Syrophœnicia. The two statements taken together show that he means to distinguish between two districts of Syrophœnicia, the one about Tyre, and the other about Sidon.

ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως — *into the midst of the region of Decapolis*[1] (*through the midst*, EV.). But plainly Jesus came to, not through, Decapolis, as he went by boat to the west shore of the lake after the feeding of the multitude (8^{1-10}). Jesus had been in this district before, at the time when he healed the Gadarene demoniac, and had been driven away. He meets with a different reception now.

κωφὸν καὶ μογιλάλον, *deaf and having an impediment in his speech.* μογιλάλον is a Biblical word, found in the Sept., but only here in the NT. Literally, it means speaking with difficulty; but in the LXX., it is used to translate the Hebrew word meaning *dumb.* In this case the cure is said to have resulted in the man's speaking rightly, implying that before he had spoken, but defectively.

Insert καὶ before μογιλάλον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD Δ Latt.

33. καὶ ἀπολαβόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου κατ' ἰδίαν — *and having taken him aside from the crowd by himself.* The AV. gives the meaning of κατ' ἰδίαν better than the RV., which translates it *privately.* It means *apart, by himself.* ἔβαλεν — *he thrust. Put,* EV. does not give the force of the word. Our Lord's symbolic action here is intended to convey by signs to the deaf man's mind what Jesus means to do for him, and so to give him something for his faith, as well as his intelligence, to act upon.

In explaining Jesus' action in taking the man apart from the multitude, we have to consider two things: first, the condition of the man, and the necessity of concentrating his attention on what Jesus was doing. It goes along with the other signs employed by our Lord to convey his purpose to the man, cut off from other means of communication. And secondly, Jesus' unusual reasons for desiring secrecy. He was engaged with his disciples on this journey, not with the multitude, and he did not want the one miracle to grow into his ordinary engrossing work. The peculiar methods of this miracle have to be coördinated with those of 8^{22-26}, and it is evident that, in both cases, this motive of secrecy is strong. Jesus avoided publicity in all his miracles, but especially in this period of retirement.

καὶ πτύσας ἥψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐστέναξε — *and having spit, he touched his tongue* (*with the spittle*), *and having looked up to heaven, he groaned.* This is a part of the language of signs employed by our Lord, and is

[1] On Decapolis, see on 5^{1-20}.

intended to convey to the man's mind, first the help that he is to receive, the loosening of his tongue, and secondly, the heavenly source from which his help was to come. The groan was an expression of his own feelings, stirred to sympathy by the sight of human suffering, of which there was so much that he could not relieve. Ἐφφαθά[1] — *Be opened.* This is addressed to the man, who was himself to be opened to sound and speech through the opening of his organs.

35. καὶ ἠνοίγησαν[2] αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀκοαί — *And his ears were opened.*

Omit εὐθέως, Tisch. Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 33, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. ἠνοίγησαν, instead of διηνοίχθησαν, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BD Δ 1, etc.

ἀκοαί — literally, hearings, but applied by metonymy to the organs of hearing. δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης — *bond of his tongue.* Probably, as this was a case in which deafness and dumbness went together, the dumbness was occasioned by the deafness, and δεσμός denotes figuratively whatever stood in the way of his speech, and not necessarily a defect in the organ of speech itself. The bond in this case would be the deafness which tied his tongue. ὀρθῶς — *rightly.* This confirms the view, that the defect has been primarily in his hearing, and that this had resulted in partial, but incomplete loss of speech. See on μογιλάλον, v.[32].

36. καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν· ὅσον δὲ αὐτοῖς διεστέλλετο, αὐτοῖ μᾶλλον περισσότερον ἐκήρυσσον — *and he commanded them to tell no one. But the more he commanded them, the more exceedingly they heralded it.*[3]

λέγωσιν, instead of εἴπωσιν, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BL Δ 28, 33. Omit αὐτὸς after ὅσον δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ ABLX Δ 1, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Insert αὐτοὶ before μᾶλλον, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ B(D)LN Δ 33, 61, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh.

Jesus accompanies this miracle with the ordinary injunction of secrecy, but it only inflamed their zeal to publish it.[4] The conduct of the multitude is a good example of the way in which men treat Jesus, yielding him all homage, except obedience.[5]

37. ὑπερπερισσῶς — a word not found elsewhere, and expressing, like the double comparative μᾶλλον περισσότερον, the excessive feeling and demonstration of the people. ἐξεπλήσσοντο — another strong word, meaning literally *were struck out of their senses.*[6]

καὶ ἀλάλους λαλεῖν — *and dumb to speak.*

Omit τοὺς before ἀλάλους, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33.

---

[1] Ἐφφαθά represents the Aramaic אֶתְפַּתַּח, the ethpael imper. of the verb פָּתַח, Heb. פָּתַח.

[2] Both the augment on the prep., and the sec. aor. in ἠνοίγησαν belong to later Greek.

[3] The regular form of stating this proportion is τοσούτῳ ὅσον, with a comparative in each member. μᾶλλον strengthens a comparative with which it is joined.

[4] See on 1[44]. Cf. 5[19. 43], Note; 6[45], Note. [5] See 1 Sam. 15[22. 27]. [6] See on 1[22].

MIRACULOUS FEEDING OF THE FOUR THOUSAND

VIII. 1–9. *The report of the miracle performed on the deaf and dumb man seems to have gathered a multitude about Jesus in Decapolis, reproducing the effects of his Galilean ministry. They had been with him three days, enough to exhaust whatever provisions they had brought with them, when Jesus proposes to his disciples, as in the preceding miracle, that they feed them. They meet his proposition with the same incredulity as before, but he simply inquires how many loaves they have. They answer seven, and with these and a few fishes, Jesus proceeds to feed the multitude, numbering four thousand men alone.*

The objection to the repetition of this miracle seems to be based on a misconception of our Lord's miracles. If they were acts of thaumaturgy, intended to reveal Jesus' power, the repetition of this miracle would seem improbable, and the similarity of the two accounts would point with some probability to their identity. But if the real object of the miracles was to meet some human need, then the recurrence of like conditions would lead to a recurrence of the miracle. And, in the life of Jesus, with its frequent resort to solitary places, and the disposition of the multitude to follow him wherever he went, the emergency of a hungry crowd in a place where supplies were not to be obtained would be certain to recur. Weiss objects that there was nothing to bring the multitude together, and that the miracle occurred at a time when Jesus had definitely closed his ministry in Galilee. But both Mt. and Mk. lead up naturally to this event, the one stating directly that he was healing the sick of all kinds of a great multitude that had resorted to him (Mt. $15^{30, 31}$), and the other narrating the report of his healing of the deaf and dumb man circulated by his friends throughout the region, and the excitement created by it. Moreover, we have here, as Weiss himself admits, the results of Jesus' previous visit to this region, and of the cure of the Gadarene demoniac, which the healed man had spread abroad in accordance with Jesus' express command. Do we not have here a solution of the real difficulty underlying Weiss' objection?

It is true that we have in the gathering of the multitude, and the stay of three days, in which Jesus must have taught and healed, an episode in this period of retirement that is out of harmony with its evident character and design. But is not the exception justifiable? Here was a region where Jesus had been prevented from exercising his ministry by the opposition of the people, and now, on his first return to it, he finds the people in a different mood. This causes him to deflect from his purpose of retirement for a time, in order to exercise the ministry from which their previous unbelief had kept him. This seems more natural than to suppose that the evangelists created a second miracle out of certain minor variations in telling the story of the first, and then, having a miracle on their hands, proceeded to make a place for it in their narrative.

This account is found only in Mt. and Mk. The verbal resemblance of the two accounts is remarkable, the following words being identical. *προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς . . . σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἤδη τρεῖς ἡμέραι προσμένουσί μοι, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι τί φάγωσι . . . ἀπολύσ(ω) αὐτοὺς νήστεις, ἐκλυθ(ήσονται) ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ . . . οἱ μαθηταὶ . . . πόθεν . . . χορτάσαι ἄρτ(ων) . ἐρημί(ας) . . . πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; οἱ δὲ εἶπον, ἑπτά. καὶ παρήγγειλε τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους, εὐχαριστήσας, ἔκλασεν, καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς . . . τῷ ὄχλῳ . . . ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα, καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν . . . περισσεύ(ματα) κλασμάτων ἑπτὰ σπυρίδας . . . τετρακισχίλιοι.* Among these words, *νήστεις, ἐκλυθήσονται, ἐρημίας*, and *ἰχθύδια* are peculiar, and especially the construction of *ἡμέραι τρεῖς*. Indeed, the occurrence of this peculiar nominative in both accounts would be enough to prove their dependence or interrelation.

1. *πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος* — *there being again a great multitude.* The reference is to the previous feeding of the five thousand (6[34]); and the representation is that in this respect, the circumstances were similar. In both cases, there was a great multitude. *κ. μὴ ἐχόντων τί φάγωσι*[1] — *and not having anything to eat;* this is another circumstance in which the two events were similar.

πάλιν πολλοῦ, instead of *παμπολλοῦ*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDGLMN Δ 1, 13, 28, 33, 69, etc. Latt. Memph.

προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγει — *having called his disciples, he says.*

---

[1] The participle here is plural, because it belongs with a noun of multitude, which is taken distributively. In *τί φάγωσι*, we have the pronoun and the mood of direct discourse. *τί* is irregularly substituted for *ὅτι*, the indirect interrogative. The mood is quite regular. See Win. 25, 1. Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, 71. *μὴ* relates this not only as a fact, but as it lay in Jesus' mind and influenced his action.

Omit ὁ Ἰησοῦς after προσκαλεσάμενος, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABDK LMN ΔΠ 1, 33, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Syrr. Omit αὐτοῦ after τοὺς μαθητὰς, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ DLN Δ 1, 28, 209, Latt. Memph. Harcl.

2. Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσί μοι[1] — *I have compassion on the multitude because already they remain with me three days.*

ἡμέραι, instead of ἡμέρας, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ALNX ΓΠ etc. B ἡμέραις τρισὶ.

This three days' stay of the multitude means of course that Jesus had been deflected from his purpose of retirement during this time, and had been drawn into his ordinary work of teaching and healing. And the sequence of events would indicate that the gathering was caused by the report of the miracle upon the deaf and dumb man.

3. νήστεις — *fasting.* ἐκλυθήσονται — *they will be exhausted.*[2] καί τινες αὐτῶν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν[3] ἥκασι[4] — *and some of them have come from a distance.* This is an additional reason for not sending them away, not the reason of their exhaustion, as in TR.

καί τινες, instead of τινὲς γὰρ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 1, 13, 28, 33, 209, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Insert ἀπὸ before μακρόθεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 1, 13, 28, 33, 69, 209, 346 (Latt.).

4. Ὅτι πόθεν τούτους δυνήσεταί τις ὧδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐπ' ἐρημίας; — *Whence will any one be able to feed these with bread here in the wilderness?* This failure of the disciples to recall the previous miracle is one of the really strong reasons for doubting the repetition of the miracle. The objection is valid; the stupid repetition of the question is psychologically impossible. But this does not disprove the repetition of the miracle, only this incident in it. All things considered, it is very much more probable that the accounts got mixed in this particular, than that one miracle should be multiplied into two. So Meyer. χορτάσαι[5] ἐπ' ἐρημίας — literally, *on a desert place; i.e.* an uninhabited place, where there are no supplies to be bought.

5. Καὶ ἠρώτα — *And he asked.* Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν — *And they said.*

ἠρώτα, instead of ἐπηρώτα, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BL Δ. εἶπαν, instead of εἶπον, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BN Δ.

---

[1] On σπλαγχνίζομαι, see on 1[41]. ἡμέραι τρεῖς is an elliptical construction for the acc. of duration of time. We say, "it is three days, they remain with me." Win. 62, 2.

[2] Both these words are peculiar. νήστεις is a good Greek word, but is found in the N.T. only here and in the parallel passage, Mt. 15[32]. The same is true of ἐκλυθήσονται in this sense of exhaustion.

[3] This adverb itself belongs to later Greek, and the combination of prep. and adverb is also late. With an adverb of this ending, moreover, the prep. is superfluous. Win. 54, 1. 65, 2. [4] This perf. from ἥκω is late. Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

[5] See on 6[42].

6. Καὶ παραγγέλλει — *And he gives orders for the multitude to recline.* The verb is used to denote the transmission of orders through subordinates.[1]

παραγγέλλει, instead of παρήγγειλε, *gave orders*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ one *ms.* Lat. Vet.

εὐχαριστήσας — *having given thanks.* We have in this word one side of the invocation at meals, and in εὐλογήσας below, the other, the invocation of blessing on the food.[2]

ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν — *to set before them.*

παρατιθῶσιν, instead of παραθῶσι, ℵ BCLM Δ 13, 33, 69, 346.

7. Καὶ εἶχαν ἰχθύδια[3] ὀλίγα καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ εἶπε καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι — *And they had a few little fishes; and having blessed them, he commanded to place these before them also.*

εἶχαν, instead of εἶχον, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BD Δ. Insert αὐτὰ after εὐλογήσας Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 6, 10, 28, 116, Memph. καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι, instead of παραθεῖναι καὶ αὐτά, Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ, also DM *marg.* παρατιθέναι, and C 115, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. καὶ ταῦτα.

8. Καὶ ἔφαγον — *And they ate.*

καὶ ἔφαγον, instead of ἔφαγον δέ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 1, 28, 33, 40, 124, Latt. Memph. Pesh.

περισσεύματα κλασμάτων — literally, *remnants of fragments; i.e.* consisting of fragments. σπυρίδας — On this, and the κόφινοι used to collect the fragments in the feeding of the five thousand, see on 6[43].

9. ἦσαν δὲ ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι — *and they were about four thousand.*

Omit οἱ φάγοντες, *those eating*, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33, Memph.

JESUS CROSSES TO THE WEST SHORE OF THE LAKE TO DALMANUTHA, AND THE PHARISEES RENEW THEIR ATTACK ON HIM, DEMANDING A SIGN FROM HEAVEN

10–13. *After finishing his work in Decapolis, Jesus gets into the boat kept for his use by the disciples, and crosses to the region of Dalmanutha, several miles south of his usual resort. But he does not escape the hostile vigilance*

---

[1] Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*, under κελεύω. [2] See on 6[41].
[3] On the form εἶχαν, see Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* ἰχθύδια is found in the N.T. only here and in the parallel (Mt. 15[34]).

of the Pharisees (Mt. says, Sadducees also), who gather about, demanding a sign from heaven, different from the terrestrial signs to which he has confined himself. Jesus asks merely, why this generation (of all generations) asks for a sign, and solemnly declares that no sign shall be given it.

10. τὸ πλοῖον — *the boat* constantly in attendance on him, 3^{9} 4^{36} 6^{32}. Δαλμανουθά — Nothing is known of this place, which is not mentioned elsewhere. Probably, it was a small village near Magadan (Magdala), which is the place mentioned in the parallel account, Mt. 15^{39}. This would make it on the west shore of the lake, and in the southern part of the plain of Gennesareth.

11. ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι — *the Pharisees came out.* Jesus has been absent in Gentile territory since his dispute with the Pharisees about the washing of hands, 7^{1} sqq., and now, immediately on his return, they are on his track again. They *came out,* Meyer says, from their residences in the neighborhood. But see Morison's Note. All explanations are conjectural and uncertain. Mt. couples together Pharisees and Sadducees, and the same in the warning against their leaven which follows. This is ominous of the final situation in Jerusalem, when the combination of the party of the priests and of the Scribes brought about his fate. συνζητεῖν αὐτῷ — *to discuss with him.*[1]

σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ — *a sign from heaven.* This was one of their cavils, like their attributing Jesus' casting out of demons to the power of the prince of demons, by which they sought to discredit the miracles performed by him. They made a distinction between miracles that might be explained by reference to some supernatural power operating here in the world, and distinct from God, and those which came visibly from heaven, *i.e.* from the sky. The kind of signs demanded by them we find in the eschatological discourse, ch. 13, this being what they had been led to expect in connection with the Messianic period. See $13^{24.25}$. The miracles performed by Jesus were none of them, they thought, from this source. They were walking on the water, creating earthly food, healing human diseases, and so confined to this world. What they wanted was a voice from heaven, or anything coming from above. πειράζοντες αὐτόν — *testing him.* They wanted to put his power to perform miracles, or to produce them, to the test, and to see if he was able to give them a sign in which there should be no possibility of collusion with the powers that rule this lower

[1] The proper meaning of συζητεῖν is to search or inquire in company. This meaning *discuss* is peculiar to the N.T.

world. The uniform use of *tempt* to translate this verb is very misleading.

12. ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι — *having groaned in spirit, i.e.* inwardly, not audibly. Τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σημεῖον; — *Why does this generation seek a sign?*

ζητεῖ σημεῖον, instead of σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 1, 28, 33, 118, 209.

εἰ δοθήσεται . . . σημεῖον — *if a sign shall be given* ——! This is a case of suppressed apodosis, and is a common Hebrew form of oath or asseveration.[1] By σημεῖον is meant a work which has either for its object, or result, the proof of the Divine presence and power. This is a denial that his own miracles had this purpose. All of them were uses of Divine power, but not displays of it. Any self-respecting man will refuse to show himself off, but he will constantly do things having other legitimate objects, which do show incidentally his intelligence, or strength, or goodness. This is the attitude of Jesus. He refuses to do anything merely as a sign, and yet his life was full of signs; nay, it was a sign, he himself was the sign. Indeed, the only element about his miracles which will save them from the general disbelief of the miraculous is the consonance of their objects with the character of Jesus. No one could have devised the story of a miracle-working person, and have kept the story true to Jesus' principles and character. The wonderful thing about the miracles is that the Divine power shown in them is kept to uses befitting the Divine Being. τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ — *to this generation.* Jesus refuses especially to give a sign to that generation. It was an age full of signs; it was the period of the Incarnation, and yet its leaders went about asking for signs, and refused to believe the self-witness of the Son of God.

WARNING AGAINST THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES AND OF HEROD

13–21. *Jesus does not remain in this hostile region, but crosses again to the east side. On the way, he warns the disciples against the unspiritual influences of the Pharisees — men who ask* him *for a sign — and, in order that they may not go from formalism to irreligion, also against the leaven of Herod. The disciples, who had forgotten to take bread, think that he is speaking of literal leaven. Where-*

[1] See Win. 55, Note at end.

upon, Jesus asks them if they are as dull as the rest to his spiritual meanings, and if they have forgotten how easily he provided for the lack of material food.

13. ἐμβὰς πάλιν, ἀπῆλθεν — *having embarked again, he departed.*

Omit εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, *in the boat*, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ *mss.* of Latt.

Ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης — *Take heed, beware of the leaven.*[1] The word ζύμη is used figuratively in Bib. Greek for a pervasive influence, either good or bad, though generally the latter, owing to the ceremonial depreciation of leaven among the Hebrews. The leaven of the Pharisees is their general spirit, including hypocrisy, ostentation, pride, formalism, pettiness, and the like; cf. Mt. 23. Here, where Jesus is fresh from his controversy with them about signs, the thing specially in his mind would be the spirit that leads them to ask for a sign, when his whole life and teaching was a sign. It would be, in a word, their unspirituality, their blindness to spiritual things, which led them to seek outward proof of inward realities. The leaven of Herod, on the other hand, was worldliness. The Herods were professed Jews, who sought to leaven Judaism with the customs of heathenism. They represented the escape from the rigors and scruples of Pharisaism into the license and irreligion of the world, instead of into the freedom of a spiritual religion. But the escape from spiritual blindness does not lie that way.

16. Καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχομεν (ἔχουσιν) — *And they reasoned with each other, (it is) because we have (or they have) no bread.* Probably, with either ἔχομεν or ἔχουσιν, ὅτι is causal, and there is an ellipsis of the principal clause.

Omit λέγοντες, *saying*, after πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BD 1, 28, 209, *mss.* Lat. Vet. ἔχουσιν, instead of ἔχομεν, Treg. WH. RV. *marg.* B 1, 28, 209, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph., also D *mss.* Lat. Vet. (*quod panes non haberent*).

The disciples were themselves so blind spiritually, that they attributed a material sense to Christ's spiritual sayings. They thought that he was warning them, in the very spirit of the Pharisees themselves, against food contaminated by them. Their thoughts were on their neglect to take bread, and so leaven, or yeast, suggested to them bread.

17. Καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί διαλογίζεσθε, ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; — *And perceiving it, he says to them, Why do you reason (it is), because you have no bread?*

Omit ὁ Ἰησοῦς, before λέγει, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. ℵ B Δ* one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

---

[1] This meaning of βλέπειν is foreign to the verb in earlier Greek, and the construction with ἀπό is borrowed from the Heb. It is a pregnant construction, and is resolvable into *look to yourselves, and so keep from.* Win. 32, 1, note.

πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; — *have you your understanding dulled?*[1]

18, 19. Tisch. punctuates these verses so that they read, *Having eyes do you not see, and having ears do you not hear, and do you not remember, when I broke the five loaves among the five thousand, and how many baskets full of fragments you took up?* WH. read, *Having eyes do you not see, and having ears do you not hear? And do you not remember, when I broke the five loaves among the five thousand, how many baskets full of fragments you took up?* This latter punctuation is the most probable.

Insert καὶ before πόσους, Tisch. ℵ CDM Δ 1, 33, *mss.* of Latt.

By his reference to the miracles of feeding the five thousand, and the four thousand, Jesus means to remind them that he has shown them his ability to provide for their lack of bread in an emergency, so that they need not fix their thoughts on that, nor think that his mind is occupied with it. The question about the baskets of broken pieces is intended to suggest the bounty of the provision made. It is noticeable that the distinction between σπυρίδες and κόφινοι in the two miracles is kept up here in Jesus' allusion to them.

20. Καὶ λέγουσιν (αὐτῷ), Ἑπτά — *And they say (to him), seven.*

καὶ λέγουσιν, instead of Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, *and they said*, Tisch. ℵ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Pesh. καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. BCL Δ 115, two *mss.* Latt. Memph.

21. Οὔπω συνίετε; — *Do you not yet understand?*

Omit πῶς, *How*, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ CKL ΔΠ 1, 118, 127, 209, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. οὔπω, instead of οὐ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ACD[ET] LMNUX ΔΠ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Syrr.

HEALING OF A BLIND MAN AT BETHSAIDA

22–26. *Jesus and his disciples land at Bethsaida, on the east side of the lake. There a blind man is brought him to be healed with the usual touch. But Jesus, still in quest of retirement, and so more than ever anxious to avoid the notoriety attending his miracles, takes the man outside of the village. He employs the same signs to tell him what is being done for him as in the case of the deaf and dumb man in Decapolis. But here, for the first and only time, there is something to obstruct the immediateness of the cure,*

[1] On the meaning of πωροῦν τὴν καρδίαν, see on 3[5].

and at first, the man sees only men looking like trees walking about. Jesus laid his hands again upon his eyes, and the man saw clearly. Then Jesus, in order to prevent the story spreading, ordered him not even to enter the village where he is known.

22. Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν — *And they come to Bethsaida.*

καὶ ἔρχονται, instead of ἔρχεται, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 13, 28, 33, 69, 124, 346, Latt. Memph.

23. ἐξήνεγκεν αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς κώμης — *he brought him outside of the village.* In the only other miracle recorded by Mk. alone (7^{31-37}), there is this same privacy observed. The two coming together at the same period of our Lord's life would seem to indicate that there was some reason for the peculiarity common to them both, arising from the critical character of the period in his life. It was not the period of his miracles, nor of his public teachings, but of retirement with his disciples; and hence the even unusual secrecy attending such miracles as he did perform. πτύσας — *having spit.* This also is peculiar to this pair of miracles.

ἐξήνεγκεν, instead of ἐξήγαγεν, *he led him out*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL 33.

ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν εἴ τι βλέπεις; — *he asked him, do you see anything?*[1]

This reading, instead of *εἴ τι βλέπει, if he sees anything*, Treg. *marg.* WH. *non marg.* RV. BCD*$^{gr.}$ Δ Memph.

24. βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὅτι, etc. — The AV., *I see men as trees walking*, ignores this ὅτι. RV., *I see men; for I see them as trees walking.* That is, what would otherwise be taken by him for trees he knows to be men by their walking around. This indistinctness of vision is due not to the confusion of his ideas arising from his previous blindness, but to the incompleteness of his cure. This is the single case of a gradual cure in our Lord's life, and the narrative gives us no clue to the meaning of it. But we have no right to argue from this single case that gradualness was the ordinary method of Jesus' cures.[2]

25. Εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκε (ἔθηκεν) — *then again he laid.*

ἔθηκεν, instead of ἐπέθηκε, Treg. WH. BL.

---

[1] This use of εἰ in direct questions is not found in classical Greek, but belongs to the N.T. period. Win. 57, 2.

[2] So Weiss, *Life of Jesus*, 2, 97. 3, 23.

καὶ διέβλεψεν, καὶ ἀπεκατέστη, καὶ ἐνέβλεπεν δηλαυγῶς ἅπαντα — *and he looked fixedly, and was restored, and saw all things clearly.*

διέβλεψεν, instead of ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἀναβλέψαι, *he made him look up*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ 1, 28, 209, 346 (one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.). ἀπεκατέστη, instead of ἀποκατεστάθη, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCL Δ. δηλαυγῶς, instead of τηλαυγῶς, Tisch. WH. *marg.* ℵ* CL Δ (33 δήλως). ἅπαντα, *all things*, instead of ἅπαντας, *all men*, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BC* DLM ? Δ 1, 13, 69, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Syrr. Memph.

διέβλεψεν denotes the act of fixing his eyes on things, by which he would be able to distinguish them. δηλαυγῶς is compounded of δῆλος and αὐγή, and denotes clearness of vision. τηλαυγῶς, TR., denotes *distant sight.*[1]

26. Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσελθῇς — *do not even go into the village.* The man was to return to his house, which was outside of the village, and so far from publishing his cure in the village, he was not even to enter it.

Omit μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν κώμῃ, *nor tell it to any one in the village*, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) RV. WH. ℵ* and c BL 1, 209, Memph.[2]

Attention should be called to the characteristics of the two miracles narrated by Mk. alone, both of which, moreover, belong to the period of Jesus' retirement, and to localities inhabited by a mixed Jewish and heathen population, and unfrequented by him in his previous ministry. In both the healing of the deaf and dumb man in Decapolis, and that of the blind man at Bethsaida, Jesus takes the man aside before performing the cure, and uses spittle on the parts affected. In the second, the healing of the blind man, the cure is gradual. As to the withdrawal from the multitude, the purpose is obvious. The miracles belong to the period of retirement, and Jesus takes more than usual pains to guard against notoriety. A secondary effect, if not purpose, in the case of the deaf and dumb man, would be to fix his attention on what Jesus was about to do for him. As to the use of the spittle, it is commonly regarded as extraordinary, and naturally so, as these are the only cases in the Synoptical Gospels in which Jesus employs any other means than the laying on of hands. In the case of the deaf and dumb man, the reason for this exceptional treatment appears in the condition of the man. The thrusting of the hands into the man's ears, the spitting into them,

[1] δηλαυγῶς is a rare word.

[2] The translation of μηδὲ . . . μηδὲ, *neither . . . nor*, AV., is wrong. μηδέ is disjunctive, and the first μηδέ is to be rendered *Not even*. Win. 55, 6 *a*).

the looking up to heaven, are the language of signs, by which Jesus seeks to awaken the faith of the man necessary to his cure. Certainly the thrusting of the hands into his ears is that, and the rest goes along with this symbolical act. In the case of the blind man, extraordinary conditions are not lacking, though not of the same kind. Jesus is in an unfamiliar region, and the man's blindness withdraws him more or less from even the knowledge that those about him would have of this extraordinary personage. In these circumstances, Jesus uses something more than the ordinary laying on of hands, which would tell its story so quickly to a Jew accustomed to his ordinary procedure, and substitutes what we may call a more elaborate and significant ritual of cure. The gradualness of the cure in this case would arise out of the same extraordinary conditions. Jesus is contending here against a dull, slow-moving faith, which hinders the ordinary immediateness of the cure. This explanation matches the extraordinary methods and process of the cure with the extraordinary conditions of the case.

On the other hand, Weiss, ignoring the peculiar conditions, treats both the process and the gradualness of the cure as representing Jesus' ordinary method and the rationale of the miracles. These are the two cases, he says, in which Mk. goes into details in telling the story of the miracles, and the matter contained in them, therefore, is to be read into the other accounts. The difficulty in this is to account for the choice of these two isolated cases for the introduction of these details. It is easy to account for them as peculiarities belonging to an exceptional period in the life of Jesus, but not at all easy to account for the choice of these, the very last of the miracles, to bring out material belonging to them all, but hitherto unrelated by Mk., and omitted altogether in the other evangelists. Moreover, it is very singular that this gradual cure occurs in the Gospel which emphasizes most the immediateness of the cures. Out of the eleven miracles of healing recorded in Mk., five speak directly of the immediateness of the cure, and of the rest three give circumstances implying the same. And yet, we are told that in this Gospel, the one account of gradual cure establishes the form to which the others must be conformed. As for the use of the spittle, that is treated as an actual means of cure, not as a symbol or sign. So Meyer. How-

ever, it is allowed that the curative power infused into this came from above. And this again is normal, telling us what really happened in the other cases. A means, which yet has no power in itself, only what is infused into it supernaturally. This is truly a *tertium quid*, and as long as it introduces into the miracles nothing of the nature of a secondary cause, it may be ranked among the curiosities of religious speculation.

JESUS GOES WITH HIS DISCIPLES INTO THE REGION OF CÆSAREA PHILIPPI. PETER'S CONFESSION OF JESUS AS THE MESSIAH

27–30. *Jesus having landed at Bethsaida, proceeds to Cæsarea Philippi, at the foot of Mt. Hermon, a region hitherto unvisited by him. On the journey here he gains the privacy for which he had been seeking, and questions the disciples as to what men say about him. They tell him that he is called variously John the Baptist, Elijah, and one of the prophets. Then comes the question for which all his life with them had prepared the way, what title they are ready to give him. Peter, speaking for the rest, says,* Thou art the Messiah. *But Jesus, having drawn this confession from them, charges them to tell no one else.*

27. εἰς τ. κώμας Καισαρίας τῆς Φιλίππου — *into the villages of Cæsarea Philippi.* Mt. says, *into the parts of Cæsarea Philippi.* The district is called here by the name of its principal city, and the villages were those belonging to that district. The city is near the sources of the Jordan, about 25 miles north of the lake of Galilee. Panium was the original name of the city, from the god Pan, who had a sanctuary here. The town was enlarged and beautified by Herod Philip, tetrarch of Trachonitis, to whose territory it belonged, and was given its new name in honor of the emperor and of himself. *Philippi* distinguishes it from Cæsarea on the coast. It marks the most northern part of our Lord's journeyings, except Tyre and Sidon. His coming here was for the general purpose of his later Galilean ministry, to talk with his disciples in retirement of the approaching crisis in his life. Τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι; — *Who do men say that I am?* This is the first time that Jesus has approached this question, even in the circle of his disciples. The characteristic of his teaching has been its imper-

sonality. His subject has been the Kingdom of God, its law, the conditions of membership in it, but not the person of its King. He has made approaches to this personal subject in the announcement of the coming of the kingdom, implying the presence of the King, and has made a veiled claim to the title in calling himself the Son of Man, but these hints and suggestions have been all. We should be inclined to call his styling himself the Son of Man something more than a veiled claim, if it were not that the people and rulers were manifestly in doubt, as this very event shows, as to the nature of his claim. This constitutes the great difference between the Synoptical Gospels and the fourth Gospel, since in the latter, Jesus discourses principally about himself and his claim.

28. εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες — *they told him, saying.* The verb and the participle are so nearly identical in meaning, that their juxtaposition here is quite difficult to account for. On the different answers to the question of Jesus, — John the Baptist, Elijah, one of the prophets, see on 6^{14}.

εἶπαν instead of ἀπεκριθησαν, *answered,* Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. εἶπον RV. ℵ BC* and 2 L Δ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh. Insert αὐτῷ λέγοντες, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL Δ 13, 28, 69, 124, 282, 346, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. ὅτι εἷς τῶν προφητῶν, instead of ἕνα τ. π. Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Memph.

29. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς — *And he asked them.*

ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς, instead of λέγει αὐτοῖς, *he says to them,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL Δ 53 *mss.* Lat. Vet.

Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; — *But who do you say that I am?* Ὑμεῖς is emphatic in itself, and by its position.[1] When the announcement of Jesus' Messianic character is made, it does not come from himself, but is drawn out of the disciples by this question. He would have them enjoy the blessedness of not receiving it from flesh and blood, *i.e.* by oral communication, even from himself, but of that inward reception by silent communication from the Father which is the only source of true knowledge of spiritual things. See Mt. 16^{17}. He manifested himself to them, admitting them to an intimate companionship and intercourse with himself; and when he had made his impression on them, he drew from them the confession made under the guidance of the Spirit, that he was no inferior and preparatory personage in the Messianic Kingdom, but the King himself. Here, as everywhere, Jesus' method is the truly spiritual one, that depends very little on external helps, but on the silent movings of the Spirit of God. ὁ Πέτρος λέγει — This is the first time in the Gospel that Peter appears as the spokesman of the disciples. Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός — *thou art the Christ.* On the meaning of Χριστός, see on 1^{1}.

[1] Win. 22, 6.

30. ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν — *that they tell no one.* The silence that Jesus enjoins on them is due to the same reasons as his own silence up to this time, and his breaking it only when he was alone with them. It was esoteric doctrine as yet, that only those could receive, who knew something about the Messianic office on the one hand, and about the person of Jesus on the other. In the prevalent misconception of the Messiah, such an announcement would work only disaster. The time was coming for it, but when it did come, the tragedy of Jesus' life followed immediately.

JESUS PREDICTS HIS CRUCIFIXION. PETER REBUKES HIM, AND JESUS REPELS THE EVIL SPIRIT WHO SPEAKS THROUGH HIM

31–33. *After drawing out from his disciples the confession of his Messianic claim, Jesus proceeds to tell them how that claim will be treated by the authorities. In general, it will bring him much suffering, and finally his rejection and violent death at the hands of the Sanhedrim, from which, however, he will be raised after three days. Peter, who evidently regards this as a confession of defeat, and as vacating the claim just made, takes Jesus aside, and begins to rebuke him. But Jesus, recognizing in this the very spirit of the Temptation, meets rebuke with rebuke, telling Peter that he is acting the part of the Tempter, and that he reflects the mind of men, not of God.*

31. ἤρξατο διδάσκειν — *he began to teach.* This is a true beginning, being the first teaching of this kind.[1] δεῖ — *it is necessary.* The necessity arises, first, from the hostility of men; secondly, from the spiritual nature of his work, which made it impossible for him to oppose force to force; and thirdly, from the providential purpose of God, who made the death of Jesus the central thing in redemption. But in order to take its place in the Divine order, his death must come in the human, natural order. That is to say, his death is the natural result of the antagonism of his holy nature to the world; it is the martyr's death. But it has also a Divine purpose in it, and it is necessary to the accomplishment of that purpose. The Divine purpose can use, however, only the death that results from the human necessity, the martyr's

[1] Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

death. Jesus must be put to death by man. *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*[1] *πολλὰ παθεῖν — that the Son of Man suffer many things.* This is the general statement, under which the rejection and death are specifications. *ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων κ. τῶν γραμματέων — by the elders and the chief priests and the Scribes.*

ὑπὸ, by, instead of *ἀπὸ,*[2] Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDGKL Π. Insert *τῶν, the,* before *ἀρχιερέων* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDEHMSUVX, and before *γραμματέων* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDEFHLSMUV Γ.

Elders was the general term for the members of the Sanhedrim, and when used as it is here, with the names of classes comprised in that body, it denotes, of course, the other members outside of these classes. The chief priests were members of the high-priestly class, *i.e.* either the high priest himself, those who had held the office, or members of the privileged families from which the high priests were taken. The three classes together constituted the Sanhedrim, or supreme council of the Jews, by which Jesus predicts that he is to be rejected and put to death.[3] *καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι — and after three days rise again.* This is one of the psychological problems with which we are confronted in a history generally answering with considerable exactness to such tests. For when we come to the account of the resurrection, this prophecy plays no part. The event, when it takes place, does not recall the prophecy, and is met with a persistent unbelief which does not seem in any way consonant with the existence of such a prophecy. It would seem as if Jesus must have used language here, which the disciples did not understand, until after the resurrection itself, to refer to that event. That Jesus predicted the crucifixion and resurrection, there does not seem to be any reasonable doubt. But we find variations in the details, which suggest that these were supplied by the writers, *post eventum,* and that the prediction itself was general in its character. Moreover, we find in the eschatological discourse, that Jesus' language needs a key, and we seem forced to the supposition that the utter failure of the disciples to understand the present prophecy must have been due to a like enigmatical use of language. *παῤῥησίᾳ — without any reserve,* using entire frankness of speech. Now that the time had come for Jesus to speak about this, he spoke out frankly.

32. *προσλαβόμενος αὐτόν — having taken him aside.* Peter could not understand plain speech about a matter to be spoken of only under his breath. Metaphorically, he puts his finger on his lips, and says *Hush.* He does not wish further open discussion of so dangerous a topic, and so he takes Jesus aside even to

---

[1] See on 2[28].
[2] On the distinction between *ὑπό* and *ἀπό* after passives, see Win. 47 *b*) Note.
[3] See Schürer, *N. Zg.* II. I. III. IV.

remonstrate with him. ἐπιτιμᾷν — *to rebuke.* Such an idea as his master had announced was not only to be refuted, but rebuked as unworthy of him. This would be the way in which he would reconcile it with his sense of his Lord's dignity to rebuke him; a thing that he would not think of doing except as he thought that Jesus was himself underrating that dignity. He had just allowed the Messianic claim made for him by the disciples, and now he seemed to be predicting defeat, whereas it belonged to the Messiah not to be defeated.

33. ἐπιστραφείς — *having turned,* that is, upon Peter. But as he turned on him, it brought the rest of the disciples to view, and having seen the effect of Peter's action on them, he was moved to special plainness of speech. ἐπετίμησε Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει — *he rebuked Peter and says.* Notice the repetition of the ἐπιτιμᾷν of v.[32]. Peter had assumed to rebuke him, and now he rebukes Peter.

καὶ λέγει, instead of λέγων, *saying,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh.

Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου — Ὕπαγε denotes withdrawal, *get away.* And the whole phrase means, *Get out of my sight.* Σατανᾶ — *Satan.* Our Lord is not calling names here, but indicating in strong language the part that Peter is playing. He is putting temptation in our Lord's way, and is so acting the rôle of Satan. Jesus recognizes that it is not Peter *in propria persona* that is speaking, but the Spirit of evil speaking through him, just as he recognized the invisible Tempter in the wilderness (Mt. 4[10]). φρονεῖς — *thou thinkest not, thou dost not regard.* φρονεῖν τά τινος means *to side with one.*[1] Peter did not keep in mind God's purposes, but men's. He did not look at things as God looks at them, but as men regard them, and hence he played the part of the Adversary, the Tempter. And it was not a minor and incidental temptation, but the great thing that separates God's ways and man's, the temptation to consider himself, instead of imitating God's self-sacrifice.

JESUS TEACHES THE MULTITUDE THAT THE SELF-SACRIFICE PRACTISED BY HIMSELF IS THE NECESSARY CONDITION OF DISCIPLESHIP

34–IX. 1. *Jesus now calls up the multitude, having closed the purely esoteric part of his teaching, relating to his own fate, and teaches them that the condition of disciple-*

[1] Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

ship is self-denial, and following him even to death. He bases this on the general principle that to lose life is to save it, and to save it is to lose it. And there is no profit in gaining the whole world and losing one's life, because that is an irreparable loss. Nothing will buy it back. These ultimate gains and losses follow a man's attitude towards Him because the Son of Man is to return in the glory of his Father, and will then be ashamed of the man who is now ashamed of Him.

34. τὸν ὄχλον — *the multitude.* It seems from this, that in spite of his being away from his usual place of work, and in heathen territory, Jesus was surrounded by a crowd of people. And his language implies that they had some knowledge of him. Εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν — *If any one wishes to follow after me.* A figurative expression of discipleship.[1]

Εἴ τις, instead of ὅστις, Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL Δ Latt. Harcl. *marg.* ἀκολουθεῖν, instead of ἐλθεῖν, Tisch. Treg. C* DX 1, 28, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. The rare combination, found elsewhere only Mt. 10^{38}, is fairly conclusive of the originality of the reading.

ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν — *let him deny himself.* The person is made here the direct object of the verb, not the indirect. He is not to deny something to himself, but he is to renounce himself. He is to cease to make himself the object of his life and action. The verb is the same that is used to denote Peter's denial of his Master, and means to deny that one stands in a supposed relation to another, and hence to reject, or renounce. To deny self is therefore to deny the relation of self-interest and control which a man is supposed to hold to himself, in the interest of humanity and of God; in other words, to renounce himself. It is the negative side of the command to love, and like that, does not refer to special acts, but to a change of the fundamental principle of life. κ. ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ — *and take up his cross.* This is a phase, the extreme phase of the self-denial which Jesus has just demanded. Let him deny himself, and carry out that self-denial even to death. The cross does not mean here any disagreeable thing, but the instrument of death. The criminal carried his own cross to the place of execution, and so, to take up the cross means to go to the place of death. The equivalent of it in our language would be *to go to the gallows or the stake.*

[1] See on 1^{17-20}. The use of ὀπίσω after ἀκολουθεῖν is a Hebraism. Win. 33, Note. Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

The idea is, that a disciple is to follow the example of Jesus in giving up everything, even life itself, that belongs to the selfish interests, sooner than anything belonging to the higher purposes of life. κ. ἀκολουθείτω μοι — *and follow me.* This is not a third thing added to the self-denial and cross-bearing, but a repetition of the ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν of the conditional part of the sentence. The meaning is, that in these two things, self-denial and cross-bearing, is to be found the way to follow him.

35. Ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ—*For whoever wishes.*[1] ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει — *but whoever shall lose.*[2] σώσει αὐτήν (omit οὗτος, *this one*) *will save it.*

ἐὰν before θέλῃ, instead of ἄν, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCKM ΔΠ 1, 28, 33. ἀπολέσει, instead of ἀπολέσῃ, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCD[2] ΓΔ. Omit οὗτος before σώσει, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABC* DLM* X ΔΠ Latt. Memph. Syrr.

Jesus has just bidden them to sacrifice even their lives, and this gives the reason for that bidding, showing them that this is really the way to save their lives. The paradox consists in the two meanings of the word *life.* In the first clause, it means the bodily life, and in the second, the true life of the spirit, which is independent of that bodily condition. The general principle is, that there is no such thing as ultimate loss in the kingdom of God. And in this case, a man loses his life only to receive it again enriched and multiplied. He sacrifices himself so far as he is identified with lower interests, only to become absorbed in higher and larger interests, in righteousness and love, in God and man. ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου—*for the sake of me and of the Gospel.* Here we have the higher objects stated, for which a man sacrifices himself, and in which the merely personal life is absorbed. He becomes absorbed, in the first place, in a higher personality, that of Jesus, the Redeemer, and the head of the Messianic kingdom, who represents interests human and universal. And all personal interests become merged in those of the Gospel, the glad-tidings that Jesus brings, that the kingdom of God is coming. This coming is involved in the advent of its king.[3] It is as a man loses himself in so great and high things, that he finds himself, and as he sacrifices his life in their behalf, that he saves it. Only in such things is there any true life.

---

[1] On the use of ἐὰν for ἄν after relatives, see Win. 42, Note at end. Also footnote[2], p. 158.

[2] On the fut. ind. with ὃς ἄν, see Burton, 308, who notes it as a N.T. use. Win. 42, 3 *b*, cites only LXX. passages, as the N.T. passages occur only in the various critical texts. There is a use of the future indicative in classical Greek with ἄν, but not in conditional or relative clauses. And there is a use of the future in conditional relative clauses, but without ἄν. This construction is therefore anomalous. See Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, 61, 3, Note; 50, 1, Note 1; 37, 2, Note 1.

[3] See on 1[1. 14. 15]; cf. Mt. 4[23] 9[35] 24[14].

36. *τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖ ἄνθρωπον κερδῆσαι . . . καὶ ζημιωθῆναι . . . ;* —*for what does it profit a man to gain . . . , and to forfeit . . . ?*

ὠφελεῖ, instead of *ὠφελήσει*, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ BL *mss.* Lat. Vet. Pesh. *κερδῆσαι*, instead of *ἐὰν κερδήσῃ*, and *ζημιωθῆναι*, instead of *ἐὰν ζημιωθῇ*, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ BL.

ζημιωθῆναι — *to forfeit.* The word commonly means to lose by way of penalty, to forfeit. The argument is carried forward here no longer in the contrast between the two lives, the *ψυχή* in its two senses, but in the contrast between the *ψυχή* and the *κόσμος*. And this is pertinent, because the earthly life is measured generally by outward gains, while the spiritual life is valued for itself. In the one, a man is worth dollars and cents, in the other, his worth is a matter of his own excellence, the quality and range of his being. The question is thus between that life which consists mainly in having, and that which consists in being. And to be, in the true sense, means to have the life of God in us. The contrast is made as strong as possible by making the gain the *κόσμος*, the sum total of things.

37. *Τί γὰρ δοῖ*[1] — *For what shall a man give?* *ἀντάλλαγμα* — *as an exchange.* The questions means, if a man has forfeited his life, by what price or ransom can he buy it back? It is the rhetorical form of saying that the loss is irrevocable. It is the irrevocableness of the loss that makes the gain to be nothing by its side. The whole world, if a man had it, would not buy back his life, if he lost it.

τί γὰρ, instead of *ἢ τί*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 28, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. *δοῖ*, instead of *δώσει*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* B (ℵᶜ L *δῷ*) *ἐὰν*, instead of *ἄν*, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCEFLMVX ΓΔ.

38. *ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν* — *for whoever.*[2] The argument does not connect this with the special statement that immediately precedes, but with the entire statement of which that forms a part. It shows how these general statements are to be applied to man's relations to Christ; how these relations can affect their lives so profoundly — a question that might easily be suggested to his listeners by the amazing character of his assumptions. The present situation, he says, is to be changed. He who seems to them now so easily to be set aside is to appear eventually as the Son of Man, coming in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels. Now, they are ashamed of him, it may be; then he will be ashamed of them. The announcement of Jesus' Messiahship (v.[29]) is followed immediately by the prophecy of his humilia-

[1] An irregular form of sec. aor. subj. for *δῷ*. The mood is that of deliberative questions. Win. 41 *a*, 4 *b*.

[2] This use of *ἐὰν* for *ἄν* is due to the use of *ἄν* as a contracted form of *ἐάν*, leading to a mistaken use of the two as interchangeable. See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

tion and death; and that by the statement that life and death hang upon the acceptance and imitation of him; now this is justified by the prophecy of his reign. Verily, Jesus' reticence about himself, that has been so characteristic of his teaching so far, is here broken. μοιχαλίδι — *adulterous*. The figure represents sin as unfaithfulness to the close relation in which God seeks to put man to himself. It is a favorite figure of the prophets.

IX. 1. This verse belongs with the preceding discourse by the most obvious connection of thought. He has spoken of the coming of the Son of Man in the glory of his Father; and here he states the time of that coming. For the coming of the Son of Man is everywhere identified with the coming of the kingdom. Cf. Mt. 16^{28}, where this coming is spoken of as the coming of the Son of Man in his kingdom. The reason for placing the verse in the ninth chapter is that those who made the division supposed that the glorifying of Jesus in the Transfiguration was the event referred to here. But that would not be described as a coming of the Son of Man in power; nor would an event only a week distant be spoken of as taking place before some of those present should die. That language implies that most of them would be dead, while a few would live to see the great event. No, this coming of the kingdom is to be identified with the coming of the Son of Man. Nothing else will satisfy the context. And this coincides with everything that Jesus says about the time of that coming. See ch. 13^{30}, and parallel passages in Mt. and Lk. This then lets in a flood of light upon the meaning of that coming, as it declares that it was to be before some of those before him should taste of death. If his words are to stand therefore, it was to be events belonging to the generation after his death which fulfilled the prophecy of his coming, and of the establishment of his kingdom. And in this case, the kingdom was to be spiritual, and the agencies in its establishment were to be the Spirit of God and the providence of God in human affairs.

Here, as in the eschatological discourse, ch. 13, the coming is referred to as an understood thing, whereas there has been no teaching in regard to it. The same remark applies here as in the teaching about the death and resurrection. We cannot account for the expectation, which colored the whole life of the early church, without some prophecy of it. But on the other hand, the absence of expectation in the period between the death and resurrection is unaccountable if the prophecy was of this definite character.

THE TRANSFIGURATION

IX. 2–8. *Jesus goes up into a mountain, with Peter, James, and John, and is transfigured before them. The heavenly visitors. The voice from heaven.*

A week after the conversation with the disciples in regard to his death, Jesus goes, with the three disciples who stood nearest to him, up into the neighboring mountain, and was transfigured before them. As it is described, this transfiguration consisted in an extraordinary white light emitted from his whole person. Accompanying this was an appearance of Moses and Elijah talking with him. Peter, frightened out of his wits by the amazing scene, proposes to fix and retain it by building huts for Jesus and the heavenly visitors up there on the mountain side. But a cloud came over them, and a voice proceeded from it, as at the baptism, *This is my beloved Son; hear him.* And suddenly, looking around, they saw no one but Jesus.

2. ἡμέρας ἓξ — *six days.* Lk. says, *about eight days.* We can easily get rid of one of the two days which separate these two accounts, as the Jews confounded *after seven days* with *on the seventh day* by reckoning both the *dies a quo* and the *dies ad quem* in the former expression, as in the account of the resurrection. But the other day needs the ὡσεὶ of Lk., *about* eight days, to remove the discrepancy.

τ. Πέτρον κ. τ. Ἰάκωβον κ. (τ.) Ἰωάννην — These three formed the inner circle of the twelve, whom Jesus took with him on three great occasions, the raising of the daughter of Jairus, the Transfiguration, and the scene in the garden of Gethsemane. εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν — *into a high mountain.* What mountain is meant, we do not know, except that it was probably in the vicinity of Cæsarea Philippi, and so belonged to the Hermon range. See 8^{27}.

κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους — *apart alone.* This account gives no reason for this privacy, and Mt. is equally silent. But Lk. tells us that Jesus went up into the mountain to pray. This gives a rational turn to the whole occurrence, leaving us to suppose that the transfiguration was incidental to it, and not the purpose of our Lord's going up into the mountain. He was glorified before the disciples, but it is quite out of character for him to deliberately set about such a transaction. This opens the way for another suggestion as to the real character of the event. Jesus would be led to special prayer at this time by the events on which it seems that his mind was fixed, and which formed the subject of conversation

between himself and his disciples. The subject of his discourse at this period was the approaching tragical end of his life. And it is Lk. again, who tells us that this was the subject of conversation between himself and the heavenly visitants at this time. It looks then, as if this was a case in which the mind of the writer was fixed on the surface of things, who has told his story too in such a way as to fix our attention on the mere physical accompaniments of the scene, the shining of Jesus' garments, rather than the glory of his countenance, while at the same time, he has himself given us the suggestions for a deeper reading of it. According to the ordinary view, arising from this emphasis of the physical side of it, the transfiguration was a gleam of our Lord's true glory in the midst of the surrounding darkness, showing that he was divine in spite of his humiliation and death. But, according to our Lord's own view, which he came into the world to set up, over against its superficial worldliness, his glory was essentially in his humiliation and death, not in spite of it. And here, his spirit was glorified by dwelling in the midst of these high purposes and resolves until its glory broke through the veil of flesh, and irradiated his whole being.

καὶ μετεμορφώθη[1] — *and was transfigured before them.* All the particulars given are, in our account, the shining whiteness of his garments, and in Mt. and Lk. this with the shining or (Lk.) the change of his face.

3. καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ἐγένετο στίλβοντα,[2] λευκὰ λίαν (omit ὡς χίων) — *and his garments became shining, exceedingly white.*

Omit ὡς χίων, *as snow*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 1, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. one *ms.* Vulg.

οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι — literally, *such as a fuller upon the earth cannot so whiten.*

Insert οὕτως, *so*, before λευκᾶναι Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCLN Δ 13, 28, 33, 69, 116, 124, 346, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt.

4. Ἠλείας σὺν Μωϋσεῖ — *Elijah with Moses.* Elijah is generally said to be the representative of O.T. prophecy, Moses of the Law. But this distinction is more apparent than real. Moses was a prophet, and the law that he gave was a part of his prophetic utterance; while Elijah had nothing to do with the predictive, certainly with the Messianic side of prophecy, according to the record, but it was his province to reveal to men the Divine law and make real to them the Divine lawgiver. But these were two men in the O.T. history who made a mysterious exit

[1] This Greek word is the exact equivalent of the Latin-English words *transfigure* and *transform.*

[2] This word does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.

from this world, and they are the ones selected for a mysterious return in the N.T.[1] The subject of their conversation with Jesus is not given in Mt., or Mk., but Lk. tells us that it was "his decease which he was to accomplish at Jerusalem" (9^{31}).

5. ἀποκριθεὶς — *answering.* That is, responding not to something said, but done. What he said was drawn out not by the words of another, but by the occasion. Μωϋσεῖ . . . κ. Ἠλείᾳ — *Moses and Elijah.* Peter would gather from the conversation who the men were. What he proposed to build was three huts, such as could be constructed out of the material found on the mountain. σκηνάς — is the word for any temporary structure.

6. οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ — *for he did not know what to answer.* This implies the strangeness of his proposition. If he had known what to say, he would not have said any so foolish thing. The situation was not one to be prolonged. Heavenly visitors do not come to stay. ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο — *for they became completely frightened.*[2]

This reading, instead of ἦσαν γὰρ ἔκφοβοι (*became*, instead of *were*), Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 33, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. ἀποκριθῇ, *answer*, instead of λαλήσῃ, *say*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ 1, 28, 33, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός — *And a voice came out of the cloud, This is my beloved Son.* These same words were uttered by the heavenly voice at the baptism, and they are repeated in 2 Pet. 1^{17}, in referring to the transfiguration. See Mt. 3^{17} 17^{5} Mk. 1^{11} Lk. 3^{22} 9^{35}. For the meaning of *Son*, see note on 1^{11}.

ἐγένετο, instead of ἦλθε, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV, ℵ BCL Δ Memph. Pesh. Harcl. *marg.* Omit λέγουσα, *saying*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCN X ΓΠ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

8. ἐξάπινα — *suddenly.*[3] The vision vanished suddenly, and things returned to their natural condition. There is a difference of opinion whether the adverb belongs with the participle or the verb. It can make little difference, since both denote parts of the same act, looking and seeing. But this very fact shows that the adv. belongs with the part., since to put it with the verb separates the two closely related parts of the same act. In accordance with this principle, we should say, *suddenly they looked around and saw*, not, *they looked around and suddenly saw.* And for the same reason, the Greek joins the adverb and

---

[1] See Deut. 34^{6} 2 K. 2^{11}.

[2] The prep. in ἔκφοβοι denotes completeness. (English, *out and out.*) Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* under ἐκ.

[3] ἐξάπινα is a rare, late word for ἐξαίφνης.

the part. ἐξάπινα denotes the quick transition from the heavenly vision to ordinary conditions.

εἰ μὴ before τὸν Ἰησοῦν, instead of ἀλλὰ, WH. RV. ℵ BDN 33, 61, Latt. Memph. ἀλλὰ is adversative, not meaning *except*, and irregular here, so that internal probability favors that reading.

ELIJAH AND THE SON OF MAN

9–13. *Conversation with the disciples on the way down the mountain. They question him about the coming of Elijah.*

On the way down the mountain, Jesus charges the disciples not to tell any one what they had seen, until the Son of Man is risen from the dead. This strange saying about the resurrection of the Messiah they seized upon, and debated its meaning. Then this appearance of Elijah suggests the question, why the Scribes put that appearance before the Messianic advent, and this question they put to Jesus. He answers that it is true, Elijah does come first, and that this is a fulfilment of prophecy which points to the fulfilment of the other prediction in regard to the suffering and rejection of the Son of Man. And to clinch the matter, he says that John's fate is only carrying out another writing.

9. καὶ καταβαινόντων ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους — *And as they were coming down out of the mountain.*[1]

Καὶ καταβαινόντων, instead of καταβαινόντων δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDLN Δ 33, Latt. Memph. Pesh. ἐκ, instead of ἀπὸ, Treg. *marg.* WH. BD 33.

ἵνα μηδενὶ, etc. — *that they tell no one.* This command is given for the same reason as the injunction of secrecy in regard to his miracles. These external things are misleading to one who has not attained something like the inner point of view of Jesus. It coincided also with the charge to keep silence about his Messiahship. The misconception of the Messianic idea among the people led them to misunderstand everything that might point to his Messiahship. The people were excited with false hopes, which this marvellous story would only intensify. After the resurrection, when his death had put an end to false expectations, and the resurrection had pointed to his true glory, then, in that new time, stories of his earthly glory and power would help forward the truth.

[1] We say *out of the mountain* in Eng., thinking of it as something to be penetrated.

εἰ μὴ ὅταν — *except whenever.* ὅταν, *whenever,* is intended to leave the time of the resurrection indefinite and contingent.

10. τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν — not to be connected with πρὸς ἑαυτούς, — *they kept the saying to themselves,* which does not give ἐκράτησαν a proper meaning, and does not accord with the fact that Jesus restricted his announcement of the resurrection only to the twelve, not to the three; nor is it to be translated, *they kept the saying,* in the sense of obedience; but the meaning is, they seized this word about the resurrection, it clung to them, they did not let go of it.[1] πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συνζητοῦντες τί ἐστι τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι,[2] — *questioning among themselves what the rising from the dead is.* Not what the resurrection means in general, which they as orthodox Jews at this time would know well enough; but what it meant in the case of Jesus, involving, as it did, his death.

11. Ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς — *why do the Scribes say . . . ?* The difficulty with this rendering is, that the direct question, rendered necessary by the introduction of λέγοντες, is introduced by the indirect interrogative ὅτι. An alternative rendering is, *the Scribes say,* the demonstrative ὅτι being used to introduce a direct quotation. The difficulty with this is, that it is a statement, instead of the question required by ἐπηρώτων. But the question is easily implied. However, the rendering of it as a question is on the whole more probable.[3] It is suggested by this appearance of Elijah on the mountain, which leads them to ask how it is, that Elijah's appearance is treated by the scribes as a sign of the advent of the Messiah, while this appearance follows the advent, and Jesus commands them to keep his appearing silent. πρῶτον — *first,* that is, before the manifestation of the Messiah.

12. Ὁ δὲ ἔφη — *And he said.*

ἔφη, instead of ἀποκριθείς, εἶπεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ Memph. Pesh.

Ἠλείας μὲν — The particle here is concessive; *I grant you Elijah does come;* and ἀλλὰ introduces the modifying statement about the manner of his coming, which was not in keeping with their expectation. He comes, to be sure, but not as a mere appearance that keeps him out of the hands of men and the grasp of fate, but in such a way that men do as they please with him. ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα — *restores all things.*

ἀποκαθιστάνει, instead of ἀποκαθιστᾷ, Tisch. Treg. ℵ[c] AB[3] L Δ 1, 28, 33, 118. ἀποκατιστάνει, WH. B*. ἀποκατάστανει, ℵ* D.

This is Jesus' brief rendering of the prophecy (Mal. $3^{5.6}$), that Elijah will turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and of the

---

[1] See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*
[2] See Win. 18 *a*, 3, for the use of the art. with the inf.; also Burton, 392, 393.
[3] See Burton, 349; Win. 24, 4.

children to the fathers. His coming, too, is put in connection with an injunction to remember the law of Moses, meaning that it signifies an enforcement of the Divine law. Such a restoration, bringing things back to their standard in the law, was accomplished in the work of John the Baptist, to whom evidently Jesus refers. Mt. 17[13] says that the disciples understood him to refer to the Baptist. κ. πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τ. υἱὸν τ. ἀνθρώπου; — the question probably ends here — *and how has it been written about the Son of Man?* The answer is given in ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ κ. ἐξουδενωθῇ, — *that he suffer many things and be set at naught.*[1] Jesus matches their prophecy quoted by the scribes with another in regard to the Son of Man, meaning to imply that the fulfilment of the one makes probable the fulfilment of the other. The prophecy that the Messiah should suffer (in the prophecy itself it is the Servant of Jehovah) is found in Is. 53. ἐξουδ(θ)ενω(η)θῇ[2] — *be set at naught.*

13. ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι κ. Ἠλείας ἐλήλυθεν — *but I say unto you, that also Elijah has come.* καὶ before Ἠλείας means *also*, he too, as well as the Messiah. This contains the minor premise of the argument, which runs as follows: *The fulfilment of the prophecy in regard to Elijah makes probable the fulfilment of that in regard to the Son of Man; the former prophecy has been fulfilled, therefore look for the fulfilment of the other.* κ. ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ, etc., — *and they did to him whatever they pleased, as it has been written in regard to him.* Here is another fulfilment in regard to the same man, which increases the probability just named. Moreover, this prophecy in regard to his fate puts his case on precisely parallel lines to that of the Messiah. He too, like the Messiah, is the subject of expectation on the one hand, and of prophecy on the other, which are entirely inconsistent. In his case it is the adverse event of prophecy that has been accomplished, which strengthens the conviction that the like will happen to the Messiah. ὅσα ἤθελον — *whatever they wished.* This might seem an inconclusive statement, without the addition of what it was that men wished. But in reality, this is a striking statement of the way in which the Divine plan differs from the human, which made the fate of John and of Jesus certain. Men expected it as a part of the Messianic programme that God would interpose in behalf of his servants, so that men could not do to them what they pleased. But in God's spiritual kingdom, force is not opposed to force, and so men did to John what they pleased. The inference is, they will do to the Son of Man likewise. Only now, with the introduction of this

ἤθελον, instead of ἠθέλησαν, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BC* DL.

---

[1] The answer in full would be, *It has been written that he suffer*, as if it said, *it has been decreed, that he suffer.* It is this idea of decree that explains the use of ἵνα. Burton, 212 (*a*), 223.

[2] A Biblical word.

ὅσα ἤθελον, it becomes no longer a mere fulfilment of prophecy, but an application of the immutable Divine principle to parallel cases.

καθὼς γέγραπται — *as it has been written.* This might refer to the general statements in regard to the maltreatment of the prophets. But it is personal, something written about him, and this makes it more probable that the reference is to Elijah, who suffered for righteousness' sake in the same way. It is this concrete case of such maltreatment that becomes a prophecy of the fate of the man who has succeeded to his spirit, and so to his fate. See 1 K. 18^{17} sqq. 19^{1} sqq. This becomes thus a good example of the broad way in which Jesus treats prophecy.

A DEMONIAC HEALED

14–29. *Healing of a demoniac, on the return from the mountain, whom the disciples left behind had failed to heal, owing to their lack of faith.*

On his return from the mountain, Jesus finds a multitude gathered, and a dispute going on between his disciples and some Scribes about a failure of the disciples to heal a demoniac boy, whom his father had brought to them. Jesus cries out against the unbelief which had caused this failure, and orders the boy to be brought to him. After some inquiries about the case, prompted apparently only by his interest in it, Jesus assures him that all things are possible to faith, which draws from the father the pathetic plea that he believes, but begs for help even in case of his unbelief. Whereupon Jesus orders the unclean spirit to leave his victim, which he does with a final convulsion, which seemed like death. But Jesus took him by the hand, and raised him up.

14. καὶ ἐλθόντες . . . εἶδον (-δαν) — *and having come, they saw.*

ἐλθόντες . . . εἶδον (WH. -δαν), instead of ἐλθὼν . . . εἶδεν, *having come, he saw*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ one *ms.* Lat. Vet.

καὶ γραμματεῖς συνζητοῦντας πρὸς αὐτούς — *and Scribes disputing against them.* The prep. denotes the hostility of the Scribes better than the dat.

πρὸς αὐτούς, instead of αὐτοῖς, *with them*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. $\aleph^{*\,\text{et c.}}$, BCGIL Δ 1, 28, 118, 124, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg.

This incident of the Scribes is introduced by Mk. alone, who, as usual, brings the scene before us, and not the bare event.

The cause of the dispute was the failure of the disciples to cure the demoniac, which gave the Scribes a chance to throw doubt on their healing power.

15. πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἰδόντες αὐτόν, ἐξεθαμβήθησαν — *all the crowd, having seen them, were utterly astonished.*[1]

ἰδόντες ἐξεθαμβήθησαν, instead of ἰδὼν, ἐξεθαμβήθη Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCDIL Δ 1, 13, 27, 28, 33, 69, 124, 209, 346, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh. Harcl. *marg.*

Different reasons are given for this astonishment. Either Jesus' person still retained some of the glory of the transfiguration, or the people were astonished at his sudden and opportune appearance. Against the former it seems conclusive that he treats the transfiguration as an esoteric event, which would not have permitted him to make his appearance among the people until the effect had entirely passed away. Their surprise was a joyous surprise at this unexpected coming, so that they ran and greeted him.

16. ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτούς — *he asked them.* The pronoun evidently refers to the multitude just mentioned.

αὐτούς, instead of τοὺς γραμματεῖς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 1, 28, 209, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph.

Τί συνζητεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς; — *What are you disputing with them?* αὐτούς here refers to the disciples.

17. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἷς — *And one . . . answered him.* εἷς — *one* made answer, though the question was addressed to the crowd. εἷς is not like the indefinite τις, but calls attention to the number.

ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ, instead of ἀποκριθεὶς . . . εἶπε, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 28, 33, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

πνεῦμα ἄλαλον — *a dumb spirit.* For other instances of this accompaniment of the disease, see Mt. 9^{32} 12^{22}.

18. ὅπου ἐὰν — *wherever.*

ἐὰν,[2] instead of ἄν, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ^{c} ABK ΔΠ.

ῥήσσει — *convulses.* This meaning of the word is not very well established, but in σπαράσσω, the meaning *tear* passes over into that of *convulse,* and it is so used in v.[20]. This establishes a precedent for the like transformation in this word. The congenital relation of these two verbs makes it improbable that they would be employed in a different sense about the same matter, and is so far against the Revisers' Translation, *dasheth him down.* ξηραίνεται — *is wasting away.* The symptoms mentioned are those of

[1] See on ἔκφοβοι, v.[6]. [2] On this use of ἐὰν, instead of ἄν, see on 8^{38}.

epilepsy. The ῥήσσει, κ. ἀφρίζει κ. τρίζει are connected with ὅπου ἐὰν καταλάβῃ; but ξηραίνεται is a general symptom of the disease. The Eng. Ver. connects ἀφρίζει, κ. τρίζει, κ. ξηραίνεται, and puts ῥήσσει by itself. It should read, *whenever it seizes him, it convulses him, and he foams and gnashes his teeth; and he is wasting away.* τοῖς μαθηταῖς — As the man did not find Jesus, he brought him to the disciples. See v.[17].

Omit αὐτοῦ after ὀδόντας, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL Δ 1, 13, 33, 59, 69, 73, 209, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg.

καὶ εἶπα τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου ἵνα αὐτὸ ἐκβαλῶσι — *and I spoke to thy disciples that they should cast it out.*[1]

εἶπα, instead of εἶπον, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BFL 1, 28, 209.

19. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς, λέγει — *And he answering them, says.*

αὐτοῖς, instead of αὐτῷ, *him*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABDL ΔΠ* 1, 28, 33, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Syrr.

αὐτοῖς — *to them.* Jesus' reply is not addressed to the man, who seems not to have shown any lack of faith, but to the disciples, who have just been mentioned by the father, and to whom the words specially apply, since it was their unbelief that led to the fiasco. Later, the man seems to have lost heart over the failure of the disciples, so that he puts an *if you can* into his appeal to Jesus (v.[22]).

Ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος, ἕως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι; ἕως πότε ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; — *O unbelieving generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you?*

γενεὰ — It is possible to translate this *race*, meaning men of a certain stock or family; but it is more in accordance with almost invariable N.T. usage to translate it *generation, men of that time.* ἄπιστος — the translation *faithless*, EV., means generally *unfaithful, perfidious*, and is therefore ambiguous. It should be translated *unbelieving.* ἕως πότε — literally, *until when.*[2] πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι; — *shall I be with you?* The question, as appears from the next question, arises from the almost intolerable nature of his intercourse with a generation so spiritually dull and unsympathetic. It is the question of one who feels that his surroundings have become almost unbearable, and who wonders how long they are going to last. ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν;[3] — *shall I bear with you?*

20. ἰδὼν — *having seen.* Regularly, the part. agrees with neither τὸ πνεῦμα, nor αὐτόν after συνεσπάραξεν. According to the sense,

[1] On the use of ἵνα after a verb of entreaty, see Burton, 200.
[2] This use of ἕως with a temporal adverb is rare in classical Greek. Win. 54, 6.
[3] The acc. is the regular construction after ἀνέχομαι.

since the action of the verb belongs to the spirit, and is occasioned by the action denoted by the participle, it would be the spirit which is described as having seen Jesus. But he does this with the eyes of the man, and hence the masc. form of the part.

In all these stories, the man and the evil spirit get mixed up in this way. The outward acts belong to the man, but the informing spirit is sometimes that of the man, and sometimes the evil spirit. *συνεσπάραξεν — convulsed him.*[1]

συνεσπάραξεν, instead of *ἐσπάραξεν*, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* ℵ BCL Δ 33, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Syrr.

ἐκυλίετο — he rolled around. Wallow suggests things not implied in this verb.

21. *ὡς τοῦτο γέγονεν αὐτῷ — since this has come to him.* This conversation with the father has been preserved by Mk. alone, with his customary fulness in the narration of events. All attempts to discover special motives for this question of Jesus, aside from the general interest of a sympathetic person in the case, are unavailing. It has no special bearing on the cure to be performed. *Ἐκ παιδιόθεν — from childhood.*[2]

Insert *ἐκ* before *παιδιόθεν*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDGILN Δ 1, 33, 118, 209.

22. *καὶ εἰς πῦρ . . . κ. εἰς ὕδατα — both into fire and into waters.* The plur. = *bodies of water.* *εἴ τι δύνῃ — if you are at all able.* There is no inf. implied here, the pronoun being construed with the verb immediately according to the Greek idiom.[3]

23. *Τὸ εἰ δύνῃ*[4] — (omit *πιστεῦσαι*). *If thou canst.* Jesus repeats the father's words in order to call attention to them, and to the doubt expressed in them, which would stand in the way of his petition. The art. adds to the emphasis with which he points to these words, as we say, *That "if you can."* *πάντα δυνατὰ τῷ πιστεύοντι* — Over against the father's doubt, the Lord puts the omnipotence of faith, which places at man's disposition the Divine power.

Omit *πιστεῦσαι*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ 1, 118, 209, 244, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

24. *Εὐθὺς κράξας ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδίου ἔλεγε, πιστεύω, βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ — Immediately the father of the boy cried out and said, I believe; help my unbelief.* This does not mean "help me to turn my unbelief into belief," but "help me out of my trouble, in spite

[1] See on v.[18]. The compound verb is found elsewhere only in Maximus Tyrius, a writer of the second century B.C.

[2] On the pleonasm, see Win. 65, 2. *παιδιόθεν* is a late word. The Greeks said *ἐκ παιδός*.

[3] See Win. 64, 4. *δύνῃ* is a rare poetical and later form for *δύνασαι*.

[4] On the use of the art. with *εἰ δύνῃ*, see Win. 18 *a*, 3.

of any unbelief that you may find in me." He claims at first, that he does believe, notwithstanding any appearance to the contrary in his language. And yet, he does not rest his case there, but pleads with Jesus to show him mercy in any case. He pleads the compassion of Jesus, instead of his own faith, and so unconsciously showed a genuine faith.

Omit καὶ Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ^{c} BL Δ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Omit μετὰ δακρύων, *with tears*, ℵ A* BC* L Δ 28, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Omit Κύριε, *lord*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABC* DL 346 *mss.* Lat. Vet. one *ms.* Vulg. Syrr.

25. ὅτι ἐπισυντρέχει (ὁ) ὄχλος — *that a (the) crowd is running together besides (those already gathered)*. The evidence for the insertion or omission of the art. is evenly divided. The anarthrous noun is more consistent with the meaning of ἐπισυντρέχει. ἐπι— adds to συντρέχει, *is running together*, the meaning *besides, i.e.* in addition to those already collected.[1] The part. ἰδὼν is causal; it was because Jesus saw this, that he rebuked the demon. He did not wish to attract a larger crowd by prolonging the scene, and so, without any further delay, he proceeded with the cure. It is his usual avoidance of any notoriety in his miracles. τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα — *thou dumb and deaf spirit.* The story has grown by so much, since the first mention of the spirit. Then it was dumb, which was more than the other Gospels tell us, now it has become deaf and dumb.

τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα, instead of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BC* DL Δ 1, 33, 73, 118, Latt. Memph.

26. καὶ κράξας καὶ πολλὰ σπαράξας, ἐξῆλθε — *And having cried out and convulsed (him) violently, he came out.*

κράξας καὶ . σπαράξας, instead of the neuter, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL(Δ). Omit αὐτόν, *him*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ$^{corr.}$ BC* DL Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet.

κράξας κ. σπαράξας — The masc. gender shows that the writer thought of the spirit as a person.

ἐγένετο ὡσεὶ νεκρός — *he became as if dead.* It is impossible to account for this final convulsion. If Jesus, *e.g.*, were restoring a drowned person, would the horrible feelings attending a natural restoration be avoided? And whether any such violent wrench of mind and body would attend a sudden cure of insanity, we do not know.

ὥστε τοὺς πολλοὺς λέγειν[2] — *so that the most said.*

Insert τοὺς before πολλοὺς Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABL Δ 33.

---

[1] This compound occurs only here in the N.T. and nowhere in profane authors.

[2] On the preference of N.T. Grk. for the inf. to express result after ὥστε, see Burton, 235, 369–371.

27. κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ — *having taken his hand.*

τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, instead of αὐτὸν τῆς χειρός, *him by the hand,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 1, 13, 28, 53, 69, 118, 209, Latt. Memph.

28. καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ[1] — *And he having entered.*

εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ, instead of the acc., Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 1, 13, 28, 69, 118, 209, 346 (Latt.).

ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν — *Why could not we?* On the use of ὅτι, see on v.[11]. There seems to be no reason whatever here for supposing that this is a statement, instead of a question. There is a kind of challenge in the statement, that is evidently not in their minds. They mean simply to ask the question, why they could not perform this miracle, when Jesus had given them power over unclean spirits.

29. τοῦτο τὸ γένος — *this kind of thing, i.e.* the genus evil spirit; not this kind of spirit, as if this was a specially vicious kind of spirit, that it took a good deal to exorcise. ἐν προσευχῇ — *in prayer.* καὶ νηστείᾳ, *and fasting,* is an evident gloss. It is one of the things that a later asceticism imported into the spiritual teaching of Jesus. It seems to be implied in the question of the disciples that they had expected to cast out the demon, so that their lack of faith in the matter had not taken the shape of doubt of their power. But what was lacking was prayer, which is the expression of faith considered as dependence on the Divine power and confidence in that. It is the sense of God that conveys all kinds of spiritual power. But this power was not subjective, it did not reside in themselves, but was power to move God, and this precludes the idea that a special degree of this power was necessary in the case of so stubborn a demon as this. But it is a general statement that miracles of any kind are possible only to him who prays.

Omit καὶ νηστείᾳ, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ* B one *ms.* Lat. Vet. It is one of the things that would stand no chance of omission, if found in the original. Evidence shows that it was interpolated in a like passage (1 Cor. 7[5]).

SECOND PREDICTION OF DEATH

30–32. *Jesus returns through Galilee, and again seeks to hide his presence, in order to convey to his disciples the esoteric teaching about his death. The same particulars are*

[1] On this use of the gen. abs., instead of the participle agreeing with its noun or pronoun found elsewhere in the sentence, see Win. 30, 11, Note.

given as in the previous announcement, that he will be delivered up, and put to death, and will rise again after three days. But they did not know what he was saying, and were afraid to question him.

30. κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες (παρ)επορεύοντο — *and having gone out from that place, they were coming.* The place which they left was the vicinity of Cæsarea Philippi. Their journey through Galilee to Capernaum would take them on the west side of the Jordan.

ἐπορεύοντο, instead of παρεπορεύοντο, Treg. WH. B* D$^{gr.}$ *mss.* Lat. Vet.

καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ — *and did not wish that any one should know it.*[1] Jesus' desire to escape notice is a continuation of the policy pursued by him since his departure to Tyre and Sidon (7^{24}). Since that time, he has been mostly in strange places, accompanied by his disciples alone, and preparing them for the approaching crisis in his life.

γνοῖ, instead of γνῷ, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCDL.

31. ἐδίδασκεν γὰρ etc. — *for he was teaching his disciples.* This esoteric teaching was the reason of his desire to escape observation. Prediction of things to be done by men is apt to prejudice the event. It was necessary that the disciples should be prepared for so startling an issue, but the world is left wisely to the tutelage of unforeseen events. παραδίδοται — *is delivered over.* The present is used to denote the certainty of the future event.[2] μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας — *after three days.* The resurrection was really on the third day. But the usage of speech allowed this to be spoken of in either way.

32. ἠγνόουν τὸ ῥῆμα — *they did not understand the word.* This passage and the parallel (Lk. 9^{45}) are the only ones in which this verb is used with the meaning *understand,* and the peculiar use in passages relating to the same event is strongly corroborative of the interdependence of the accounts. ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι — *they feared to question him.* They were afraid that further questions would not alleviate, but only aggravate, the situation, and they feared to know the worst.

---

[1] γνοῖ is an irregular form of the sec. aor. subj. ἵνα with the subj. after ἤθελεν is one of the signs of the degeneracy of the language, in which the distinctive meaning of words is gradually weakened, and finally disappears. Burton, 191, 203; Win. 44, 8.

[2] See Burton, 15; Win. 40, 2. Win. admits the use of the historical present, but inconsistently denies the use of the pres. for the fut., which involves the same principle. Future is still future, though conceived as present.

MEANING OF GREATNESS

33–37. *Dispute among the disciples over the question of precedence among them. Jesus defines true greatness for them.*

The journey from Cæsarea Philippi brings them to Capernaum, where Jesus begins to question them about a dispute which they had had on the road, and which they evidently desire to conceal from him. We learn elsewhere that James and John actually asked him for first and second place among his followers, when the time should come to distribute these honors (10[35]). And probably, this was an outcropping of the same spirit. The first three places were conceded to these two and to Peter. But which was to be primus? Jesus answers this question by putting before them the paradox of the kingdom, that last is first, and service is greatness. Then he takes a child, and teaches them that the spirit of the child is the mark of the king, to receive one such is to receive him, and to receive him is to receive God.

33. καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρναούμ — *And they came to Capernaum.*

ἦλθον, instead of ἦλθεν, *he came*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ B(D) 1, 118, 209, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Pesh.

γενόμενος — *being* (AV.), *and when he was* (RV.), do not translate this verb, which denotes *becoming* not *being*. *Having come to be*, or *having come*, translates it. Τί ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ διελογίζεσθε — The verb is impf. and means *were disputing*.

Omit πρὸς ἑαυτούς, *among yourselves*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph.

34. ἐσιώπων — *were silent.* But *kept silent* is better, which is another meaning of the impf. The merging of all these different shades of meaning into the simple past tense is one of the imperfections of the AV. This silence was due to their shame. They knew Jesus' opinion of such disputes. διελέχθησαν — *they had disputed.*[1] τίς μείζων — *who is greatest?* That is, *which of them?* Winer contends, that the compar. is used here with perfect regularity, since the object with which the comparison is made is really only one.[2] But this would make it possible to substitute the compar. for the superl. in all cases, since the greatest is always greater

[1] On the plup. element in the aor., see Burton, 48, 52. [2] 35, 4.

than all the rest, the comparison being made always not with individuals, but with all taken together. But this confusion is one of the signs of degeneracy in a decadent language.

35. *πάντων ἔσχατος καὶ π. διάκονος — he shall be last of all, and servant of all.* This is the way to be great among the disciples of Jesus. It does not point out the penalty of ambition, as we might gather from the certain disapproval of the ordinary ambition by Jesus, but the way of satisfying Christian ambition. But the method is a paradox, like the beatification of sorrow. The Christian way to be first is to be last, to fall to the rear, to efface yourself. But it is not only humility that is demanded, but service. This again is a paradox, since primacy means dominion, the faculty not of serving, but of levying service on others. But these things, humility and service, in the kingdom of God, not only lead to greatness, they are greatness, *i.e.* they are the supreme marks of the Christian quality. And it is one of the signs that the world is becoming a seat of the kingdom of God, that rulers, leaders, employers, and others, are beginning to recognize this idea of service as the meaning of their position.

36. *ἐναγκαλισάμενος* — a Biblical word, corresponding exactly to our *embrace, en bras*, for which the Greeks said *ἐν ἀγκάλαις λαμβάνω*.

37. *ἓν τῶν παιδίων τοιούτων — one of such little children.* The child meant by our Lord is not a child in years, but in spirit, a person possessed of the childlike quality. The child is the best example of the type just held up before the disciples by our Lord, and he is himself the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. When he says then, that to receive such a childlike person is the same as to receive him, he is affirming again, in his striking way, that humility and service are the marks of greatness in his kingdom; they are, that is, the things that identify a man with him.[1]

ὃς ἄν, instead of *ὃς ἐὰν*, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ ABCDL Δ 1, 13, 28, 69. In the second clause the same, Tisch. Treg. WH. BDL Δ.

ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου — upon my name, i.e. *on the strength of my name.* The prep. denotes the basis, the ground of the reception. This use of the word *ὄνομα* to denote the various things about a person recalled by his name, especially in the phrase *ἐν* or *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι*, is not Greek, but Hebrew. The phrase indicates that a person is so connected with another, that he receives whatever consideration belongs to that other. The connection of thought, however, shows that, just as the personal consideration is excluded by this phrase, showing that the man is not received for himself, but because of Jesus; so it cannot be a mere outward connection with our Lord, but because the man's childlikeness makes him

[1] Cf. Mt. 18[2-5].

like Jesus, so that men are reminded of Jesus when they see him. οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχεται, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με — *receives not me but him who sent me.* Christ did not represent himself in the world, but the Father, a fact developed at great length in the fourth Gospel. This representative character belongs to him as the one sent by the Father into the world. But in this case also, the connection is not outward, but inward. To be sent by God is to be inspired by him, to be filled with His Spirit, and so the spirit of humility and service, in the disciple, and in Jesus himself, is here carried a step farther back, and is shown to be that of the Father. In such a child, Jesus says, you see me, yes, and God himself.

EXCLUSIVENESS CONDEMNED

38–50. *The disciples tell Jesus of their interference with one casting out demons in his name, but not following them. Jesus' reply.*

The belief of the disciples in the near approach of the kingdom seems to have wrought in them other effects than ambition. So far, the power to work miracles had been confined to themselves. And it seemed to them a mark of superiority to which they had the exclusive right. So we find John, apparently in the course of this same conversation, telling Jesus of the case of an outsider who had used his name in casting out demons, and had been forbidden by them any further exercise of a power appropriated to them. Jesus' answer is substantially that they are right, that the work of a disciple does belong to a disciple; but that they have turned this the wrong way. It does not lead to officialism, but just the opposite. It follows, not that any one who is outside their circle should be forbidden their work, but that the doing of the work shows that he is like them inwardly, though not outwardly. Their complaint is, that he is doing their work. Very well, Jesus says, that shows that he is on your side. It is not necessary to do a miracle to show this; a cup of water given to them because they are disciples shows the same thing. But if any one causes the fall of one of the humblest of these disciples, it would be better for him to be cast into the sea, with a millstone round his neck. And since to fall away is so grievous an evil, they would better cut off hand, or foot, or eye, than have any member cause their fall, since this means Gehenna and its fires to

them. Fire is to salt them all, either the fire of affliction here, or the fire of Gehenna there. Fire is salt, and salt is good; but if any salt loses its flavor, how is salt to be salted? Hence they must have salt in themselves to render these outward purifiers effective, and especially must be at peace among themselves, an injunction which their jealousies and rivalries rendered necessary.

38. Ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης, Διδάσκαλε, εἴδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια, καὶ ἐκωλεύομεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν — *John said to him, Teacher, we saw one casting out demons in thy name, and we forbade him, because he was not following us.*

Ἔφη, instead of ἀπεκρίθη δὲ . . . λέγων. *And . . . answered, saying,* Tisch. Treg. (who, however, retains λέγων) WH. RV. ℵ B L Memph. Pesh. Insert ἐν before τ. ὀνόματι Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDLN Δ 1, 69, etc. Omit ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν, *who does not follow us*, WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 10, 115, 346, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh. ἐκωλύομεν, instead of -λύσαμεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD$^{gr.}$ L Δ 1, 209. ἠκολούθει, instead of ἀκολουθεῖ, after ὅτι οὐκ, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ B Δ.

Διδάσκαλε — *Teacher*, not *Master*. The word in the vernacular used by him would be *Rabbi*. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου — *in thy name*. See on v.^{37}. In this case, it means, by the authority of Jesus. ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει — *because he was not following*. The impf. takes us back to the time of the transaction, when the disciples saw him casting out demons. They were right in assuming this to be an abnormal case, because the proper place for the disciple assuming such powers was with Jesus. The Master kept such in his immediate company for instruction, and even his immediate disciples he sent out on such errands only very rarely. But all such restrictions are themselves limited by the method of the Spirit's working, which is like the wind, blowing where it will. The disciples had a right to expect that one who had come under the influence of Jesus would, like them, desire to be with him. But they did not take into account the fact that one might, under the influence of such a life, be awakened himself to the want and wretchedness of the world, and wish to put the mysterious power that he felt within him to the test, and that this might overpower even the desire for the companionship of the Lord.

39. κακολογῆσαι — *to speak evil.*[1] Jesus puts the matter immediately upon its proper footing, showing the disciples that, reasoning from the facts within their possession, they ought to have drawn a favorable conclusion. To be sure, it was so far against the man, that he did not company with them; but that was not conclusive. Whereas it was conclusive, that he was able to perform the miracle. The test whether one is fit to perform an act

[1] κακολογῆσαι comes within the classical period, but κακῶς λέγειν is more usual.

is the performance of the act. A man's fitness to write poetry, to preach, to paint, to perform miracles, is proved by his performance in each case. Can he do the thing? But here there was a further question involved, whether the man really belonged to the disciples of Jesus, and so had a right to use the name that he had used in casting out the demons. The fact, that he did not follow the disciples, seemed to be against his own right as a disciple, but this was entirely overborne by the effect that followed his use of the name. He could not cast out demons, actually cast them out, in the name of Jesus, and then turn around and revile it. Or, as Jesus says, he could not do it *ταχύ*, *quickly*. The two things are incongruous, so that they could not follow each other rapidly.

40. *ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* — *he who is not against us is for us.* This is not the opposite of "he that is not with me is against me," but its complement (Mt. 12[30]). There Jesus is talking about this same matter of casting out demons, which he had been accused of doing in the name of Beelzebub. But he answers that the act is one of hostility to Satan, and cannot therefore proceed from Satan himself. One cannot be for and against at the same time. Then he applies the same principle to himself, saying that he who is not for him is against him. Here, he shows that this same act of casting out demons is friendly to himself, as it is hostile to Satan, and that he who shows himself thus friendly, cannot be at the same time hostile. The use which is often made of Mt. 12[30], to show that there is no such thing as indifference to Jesus, but that seeming indifference is real hostility, is unwarrantable. The real meaning of both passages is, that friendliness and hostility are incongruous, and cannot therefore exist together.

ἡμῶν, *us*, instead of *ὑμῶν*, *you*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCΔ 1, 13, 69, 209, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

41. *ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε* — *For whoever gives you a cup of water to drink on the ground that you belong to Christ.* *ὀνόματι* is used here like the Latin *nomen* to denote cause or season. RV. *because ye are Christ's.* This confirms the preceding by showing that even a small service done in his name will be taken as showing friendliness to him, and so will not lose its reward. It gets its character from its motive of attachment to him.

Omit *τῷ* before *ὀνόματι* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCLNX ΓΠ. Omit *μου*, *my*, after *ὀνόματι* Treg. WH. RV. ℵ[c] ABC* KLN Π* 1, 229, 238, 435, Pesh. Harcl. *text.* Insert *μου* Tisch. ℵ* C[3] DX ΓΔΠ[2] Latt. Memph. Harcl. *marg.* The pleonasm favors this reading, as Tisch. says. Insert *ὅτι*, *that*, before *οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. one *ms.* Vulg. Syrr. Memph.

42. *καὶ ὃς ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τούτων τῶν μικρῶν τῶν πιστευόντων, καλόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον, εἰ περίκειται μύλος ὀνικὸς* — *And whoever*

causes the fall of one of these little ones who believe, it is well for him rather, if an upper millstone is hung around his neck.

Insert τούτων, *these*, before τῶν μικρῶν, *little ones*, Tisch. Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ ABC* and 2 DLM² N Δ 1, *mss.* of Lat. Vet. Memph. Harcl. Omit εἰς ἐμέ, *in me*, after τῶν πιστευόντων, *who believe*, Tisch. WH. RV. (Treg. *marg.*) ℵ Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. also C* D one *ms.* Lat. Vet., which read πίστιν ἐχόντων, *have faith*, without εἰς ἐμέ. μύλος ὀνικὸς, *upper millstone*, instead of λίθος μυλικὸς, *a millstone*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ Latt. Pesh.

This presents the other side, the result of injuring one of his disciples. But it is noticeable that the injury is a spiritual one. Not that other hurts inflicted on them would not be taken as indicating hostility to him, but that Jesus, when he thinks of such injuries, singles out those inflicted on their spiritual nature as the only ones that will really harm them, though others show the disposition to harm them. καλόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον — *it is well for him rather.*[1] Regularly, the form of conditional sentence employed would correspond to the assumption that the condition is contrary to the fact; *i.e.* past tenses of the ind. would be employed. The English Version indicates this by its translation, *it were better, were hung*, and *were cast.* The present construction, making it a pure condition, leaves out of sight that the clause ὃς ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ has already assumed σκανδαλίζειν, — *causing to fall*, as the actual case. μύλος ὀνικός — *an upper millstone.* Both words are Biblical, and ὀνικός is found only here and in the parallel passage (Mt. 18[6]). This is another case, therefore, in which only the interdependence of the written accounts will account for the identity of the language. The grist was ground in a mill between an upper and under stone, the under one being stationary, and the upper one turned by an ass, whence the name ὀνικός.

43. καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίσῃ σε ἡ χείρ σου, ἀπόκοψον αὐτήν· καλόν ἐστίν σε κυλλὸν etc. — *and if your hand causes you to fall, cut it off; it is well for you to enter into life maimed*, etc.

σκανδαλίσῃ, instead of -ζῃ, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. ἐστίν σε, instead of σοι ἐστὶ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 13, 28, 69**, 346.

σκανδαλίσῃ — This word forms the connection between this and the preceding discourse. Jesus has begun by speaking of what it is to be identified with him, and incidentally has introduced the subject of the injury inflicted on him by causing the fall of one of his disciples. And in connection with this has come up the question of comparative values, spiritual and material. This leads him to speak of the things in the man himself that would lead to his fall, and to continue the subject of comparative values in connec-

[1] The comp. of καλός (or καλῶς) is found only once in the N.T. (Acts 25[10]).

tion with that. It is well to cut off hand, or foot, or eye, sooner than run the risk through either of them of absolute spiritual loss. *εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τ. ζωήν — to enter into life.* Life is the word used in the Bible to express the reward of righteousness. And it is the word which expresses the natural, instead of the imposed consequence of conduct. Conduct reacts on the life, the being of the man, and right conduct conduces to health and fulness of life. *εἰς τ. Γέενναν — into Gehenna.* This is the Græcized form of גֵּי הִנֹּם the Vale of Hinnom, which is the valley on the SE. side of Jerusalem. This valley had been desecrated by the sacrifice of children to Moloch, and had been used as an accursed place, for the refuse and garbage of the city. Here worms consumed the dead matter, and fires were kept burning to destroy the refuse. Hence it came to be used as a name for the place of future punishment. *εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον — into the unquenchable fire.* This is borrowed from the continual fires of Hinnom spoken of above. And the material figure expresses the idea of destruction, as life denotes the opposite side of retribution. The contrast with *ζωήν* would indicate that this is the meaning of the figure here, rather than torment. Jesus follows here his usual habit of borrowing current language, which lends itself, however, to the expression of more radical spiritual ideas than it conveyed to the common understanding. This is not a necessary deduction from the language, but its aptness for the expression of the deeper thought, and the aptness of Jesus for the deeper thought, combine to create a strong probability of its correctness.

Omit v.[44], Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 1, 28, 118, 251.

45. *καλόν ἐστίν σε — it is well for you.*

ἐστίν σε, instead of *ἐστί σοι*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCEFGHKLVX ΔΠ. Omit *εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον, into the unquenchable fire*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 1 28, 118, 251, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Pesh.

Omit v.[46], same authorities as v.[44].

47. *καλόν σέ ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν, ὅπου*, etc. — *It is well for you to enter one-eyed into the kingdom of God, than having two eyes to be cast into Gehenna, where*, etc.

σέ ἐστιν, instead of *σοι ἐστί*, Tisch. Treg. WH. (RV.) ℵ B; *ἐστίν σε* of L Δ. Omit *τοῦ πυρός, of fire*, after *γέενναν* (*Gehenna of fire*, not *hell fire*), Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 1, 28, 118, 209, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

Kingdom of God is substituted in this case for *life*. The contrast with *γέενναν* shows that it is the future, rather than the present form of the kingdom, that is strictly meant. But in the mouth of Jesus, such a term as kingdom of God has a permanent

meaning, which is never lost among the minor changes. To him it meant simply the realm in which the will of God is done. It is well,[1] he says, to enter that realm at any cost.

48. *ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται — where their worm dies not, and the fire is not quenched.* Both worm and fire are here destructive forces, and belong in the same category as life and death, denoting natural and not imposed penalties. Of course, it is the soul that undergoes punishment, and the punishment consists in the forces that prey upon it and destroy it. *ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν — their worm;* the worm, *i.e.* that preys upon the inhabitants of this dread realm.

οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ . . . οὐ σβέννυται — dies not, and . . . is not quenched. It is the permanence of the retribution that is expressed in these material figures. This is characteristic of natural penalties as distinguished from imposed penalties. Whippings and imprisonments are subject to limitations of time, but the wounds inflicted on the man himself by his sins, the degradation and deterioration of his being, have no such limitation. The worm that gnaws, and the fire that burns inwardly have no limits. They propagate themselves.

49, 50. *πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται. καλὸν τὸ ἅλα(ς) — For every one shall be salted with fire. Salt is good.*

> Omit *καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt,* Tisch. Treg. *marg.* (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 1, 61, 73, 118, 205, 206, 209, 229, 251, 258, 435, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. edd.

This is confessedly one of the most difficult passages to interpret in the N.T. In the first place, it seems necessary to connect *πυρὶ* with *πῦρ*, v.[48], and *ἁλισθήσεται* in v.[49] with *ἅλας* in v.[50]. And it is this connection with what precedes and follows that makes trouble. For *πυρὶ* is also connected with *ἁλισθήσεται*, and *ἁλισθήσεται*, from its connection with *ἅλας*, gets a good meaning, and *πυρὶ*, from its connection with *πῦρ*, gets a bad meaning. That makes the crux of the situation. Meyer is about the only one who faces this, and gives us a key that fits into all the wards of the lock. This he does by obtaining his interpretation of *ἁλισθήσεται* from Lev. 2[13], where it is called the salt of the covenant. To be salted would mean, therefore, for any one to have the covenant fulfilled on himself. *πᾶς* would refer thus to those who suffer the doom of Gehenna, and the meaning would be that every one of these shall have the covenant fulfilled on him by its fires. And on the other hand, every sacrifice, such as those make who cut off hand or foot, or eye, to preserve themselves from spiritual loss, will have the covenant fulfilled on them by the

---

[1] On this use of the pos. instead of the comp., *well*, instead of *better*, see Win. 35. 2. *c.*

salt of purifying wisdom. The difficulty with this very ingenious, and otherwise satisfactory interpretation is, that it involves a recondite allusion to the usages and meanings of ceremonial law, which is entirely foreign to our Lord's manner of speech. And then, it gives also a double meaning to ἅλας, one in the verb ἁλισθήσεται, and another in the noun itself. This breaks up the connection made by the recurrence of the same keywords, not so badly, to be sure, as when different meanings are assigned to πῦρ in v.[48. 49], but still enough to constitute a difficulty. Another very serious difficulty is, that it requires the retention of the second clause of v.[49], κ. πᾶσα θυσία, etc. This clause is, to say the least, extremely doubtful. And yet, it furnishes the only use of ἅλας giving us a transition to the ἅλας of v.[50], as the meaning of ἁλισθήσεται makes no connection with that. No, we shall have to find an interpretation that will enable us to pass right over from the first clause of v.[49] to v.[50], and that at the same time will preserve the connection with v.[48]. Salt in that case will have to denote a purifying element, to connect [49] and [50], and fire will have to denote a destroying element, to connect [48] and [49]. That is, we have brought together in this v.[49] the purifying element salt, and the destroying element fire, and the statement is that the destructive element performs a purifying part. The object of all retributions, even of the penal retributions of Gehenna, is to purify. They serve, like sickness in the physical being, to warn man against violations of the law of his being. But the statement is not restricted to these, but is extended, as the unlimited πᾶς naturally suggests, to the cutting off of hand and foot and eye also. Every one shall be purified either by the loss of parts, self-inflicted to preserve the whole, or by the destroying fires of Gehenna. This is the law of our being, and every one has to submit to it, in one form or another.

καλὸν τὸ ἅλας[1] — *salt is good.* The special form of purification meant is that of affliction. But the statement is general — *that which purifies is good.* ἄναλον — literally *saltless.* ἀρτύσετε[2] — *will you season?* The meaning of the proverb is, that there are certain things in the world having special qualities which they can impart to other substances; and if they lose these qualities, what can impart them to the very things which possess them as their special character? In other words, what can perfume the rose? what can salt salt? spice spice? or restore grace where it is lost? So, if loss loses its power to chasten, what will chasten loss? τὸ ἅλα.

---

[1] ἅλα in the last clause is formed regularly from ἅλς, which is regular, but not found here; also from ἅλα, the reading of Tisch. in the first two clauses, and a later form. But it is not to be formed regularly from ἅλας, though the two are conjoined in the authorities followed by Treg. WH. ἅλας is also a later form.

[2] This word means strictly *to prepare food*, and only in comic writers and the Bible, *to season* it.

ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἅλα — *have salt in yourselves.* Our Lord's injunction is that they have the purifying element in themselves, instead of being dependent on outside agencies, such as loss and retribution, for it. This is the condition of purifying power in the outward agencies. Taste in the man himself is necessary to the savor of salt, feeling to the heat of fire, faith to the grace of God. εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις[1] — *cultivate peace,* or *be at peace, among yourselves.* This injunction is the special form of the previous general admonition fitted to the present case. They had been disputing about precedence among themselves, and about rights with another man, whose place among themselves they ought to have recognized.

ἅλας in the first two clauses of v.[50], ABCDNX Π etc. ἅλα, Tisch. ℵ* L Δ. ἅλα in last clause, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ* AB* DL Δ 1, 28, 209.

This discourse is evidently one in which the connections of thought have been obscured, and interpretation hindered, by the imperfectness of the report. But our Gospel has preserved for us, however imperfectly, thoughts and connections both characteristic and valuable. In Mt. the setting of the discourse is the same, in Capernaum after the return from the mountain of Transfiguration. And the connections of thought in the conversation are the same, until we come to Mk.'s peculiar ending. Instead of this, we have the parable of the lost sheep, and from that it runs on into different discourse. Lk. introduces the discourse in the same way, but carries it on only through the part relating to the man healing in his name. The danger of leading astray a disciple he introduces elsewhere. But Mk.'s ending, however peculiar and difficult, has an air of verisimilitude, not in form, but in matter.

JUDÆA. MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

X. 1–12. *Jesus departs from Galilee, and comes to Judæa and Peræa. The Pharisees try him with one of their test-questions, in regard to divorce. Jesus' answer.*

Jesus' ministry in Galilee is at an end, and he goes into the region of Southern Palestine. Between this beginning and the controversy about divorce which Mk. introduces immediately, there is a gap, which Lk. fills in with his most characteristic matter. This question of divorce was one of the puzzles of the

[1] To make this phrase consistent, either the pron. should be changed to the reflexive, or the prep. to μετά.

schools, arising from the ambiguity of the law. Jesus, in his answer, interprets the law in accordance with the liberal school, which allowed laxness of divorce; but says that this license was due to their spiritual dulness. From the beginning, *i.e.*, originally and essentially, marriage, being based on the sexual distinction and act, and therefore a Divine institution, is indissoluble, and divorce involves adultery.

1. Καὶ ἐκεῖθεν — *And from this place.* The place meant is Capernaum. See 9^{33}. καὶ πέραν τ. Ἰορδάνου — *and across the Jordan.* The general district, τὰ ὅρια, into which he came was Southern Palestine, including the region on both sides of the river. πάλιν ὄχλοι — *multitudes again.* During the last part of the time in Galilee, he was alone with his disciples. See 9^{30-32}. But now, in Judæa, he is entering on a new phase of his general mission, the multitudes gather around him again, and he is teaching them as usual. The Impf. ἐδίδασκεν denotes not a single act, but a course of action, and should be translated, *was teaching.*

Καὶ, instead of διὰ τοῦ, before πέραν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Memph.

2. Καὶ προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν — *And Pharisees came to him and asked him.* πειράζοντες αὐτόν — *testing him.* This was a test, not a temptation. He claimed to be a Rabbi, and they proposed to put him to a test by propounding to him one of their puzzles. The law of divorce itself allowed it in case of the wife's coming into disfavor with her husband because of his finding something unseemly in her. The school of Shammai, which was in general the stricter school, interpreted this to apply only to cases of adultery, while the opposite school of Hillel licensed divorce under it for any cause. See Deut. 24^{1}. The ambiguity of the passage, and the disputes of the Rabbis, made it a cause célèbre, fitted to test, and possibly to discredit, the superior wisdom claimed by Jesus.

Omit οἱ, *the,* before Φαρισαῖοι, Treg. WH. RV. ABL ΓΔΠ, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. ἐπηρώτων, instead of ἐπηρώτησαν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDLM Δ.

3. Τί ὑμῖν ἐνετείλατο Μωϋσῆς; — *What did Moses command you?* Jesus recognizes that this is to them primarily a question of the Mosaic Law, and so, in order to get the matter properly before them, he asks for the law.

4. βίβλιον[1] — means a roll, the form in which all written documents were prepared at the time. ἀποστασίου[2] — *of divorce.* This

[1] βίβλιον is a diminutive from βίβλος, which denotes primarily the papyrus plant, the bark of which was prepared for writing.

[2] This word is rare, and in the sense of divorce it is peculiar to the Bible.

reply does not contain the condition of the divorce in the original, which made the subject of dispute between the two schools, viz., that the wife had come into disfavor because the husband found something unseemly in her (Deut. 24^1). This is an indication that Jesus' questioners belonged to the school of Hillel, which found in it practically no barrier to absolute freedom of divorce, so that in citing the law, they would ignore this as having no bearing on the case. Mt. 19^{3-7} gives a different version of the affair, which, however, defines their position still more distinctly as the liberal position. According to that, their question is, whether it is lawful for a man to divorce his wife for every cause. Jesus answers this by defining his own position forbidding divorce, when they ask, why Moses allowed it then. The order is unimportant, and there is nothing to choose between the two accounts.

5. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πρὸς τ. σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην· — *And Jesus said to them out of regard to the hardness of your heart,*[1] *he wrote you this command.* σκληροκαρδία[2] — *coarseness of spirit.* σκληρός means *hard*, in the sense of *rough* or *coarse*, rather than *unimpressible*. καρδία is the common word for the inner man generally, in the N.T. The whole word denotes the rude nature which belongs to a primitive civilization. This principle of accommodation to the time in Scripture is of inestimable importance, and of course limits finally the absoluteness of its authority. We find that the writers were subject to this limitation, as well as their readers. See also J. 16^{12}. This answer of Jesus admits the correctness of the interpretation of Hillel and his school, as far as it was a matter of interpretation.

Ὁ δὲ, instead of Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ, *And answering*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ Memph.

6. ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως — *But from the beginning of creation.* Jesus goes back from the Mosaic Law to the original constitution of things, for which he cites Gen. 1^{27}, in connection with 2^{24}. This connection, instead of basing marriage on the taking of woman from man, puts it on the much broader and more rational ground of their sexual relation.

ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς — *male and female he made them.*[3]

Omit ὁ Θεός, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. This conforms to the original, in which ὁ Θεός belongs to the preceding part of the statement, and is omitted here.

7. ἕνεκεν τούτου — *on this account*, viz., because of the physical relation, pointing to an even closer union than that between parent and child. Both belong to the perpetuity of the family,

[1] On this meaning of πρός, see Win. 49 *h*, *c*). It is not common Greek usage.
[2] σκληροκαρδία is a Biblical word.
[3] Gen. 1^{27}.

but the relation of husband and wife is, in the nature of things, more intimate and compelling. With the omission of the last clause, *and shall cleave to his wife*, stress is laid on the separation from father and mother, and so on the superiority of the other union.

Omit καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. *marg.* ℵ B.

8. κ. ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν — *and the two shall become one flesh.*[1] οἱ δύο is not found in the Heb., but was introduced into the Sept. It adds nothing to the meaning, though it strengthens the expression of it. ἔσονται εἰς is a Hebraism, denoting the coming into a state.[2] The union pointed out is a physical one, being that to which the sexual relation points — *they shall become one flesh.* The sexual act unites them, makes them one, the same as the junction of two streams make one river, the union of hydrogen and oxygen in certain proportions makes one substance, water, the mechanical joining of different parts fitted to each other makes the one structure. ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶ δύο, ἀλλὰ μία σάρξ — *so that they are no longer two, but one flesh.* This is our Lord's inference from the preceding quotation. The duality no longer exists; it has been replaced by this structural unity. Before, there had been two beings structurally fitted for each other; now, their union makes this new structural unity. If they had remained two, they would be separate; but being now structurally one, they belong together.

9. ὃ οὖν ὁ Θεὸς συνέζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω — *what therefore God joined together, let not man separate.* The act of joining together is God's, since the constitution that underlies it is His; divorce, on the other hand, is a matter of human legislation; and the human is not to set aside the divine. God has not only created this structural unity in the original creation of man; he has made man himself to recognize this purpose of his structure, and has written this law of his physical being in his spiritual nature, so that what tends in brutes to indiscriminate intercourse, tends in man to the indissoluble and sacred bond of marriage. Jesus nowhere shows the absolute rationality and verity of his thought more than here. Spirituality is the very core of that thought, but it never misleads him so that he misses the material facts. And it is the insistence on these here, that saves him from an immoral sentimentality. Whatever may underlie marriage in the realm of the feelings, it is itself physical, and produces structural unity. And about that, for the profoundest reasons, God gathers all the holiest feelings, and by solemn sanctions, confines them within that circle. Except for that confinement, the feelings themselves lose their sacredness, and become unhallowed and profane.

---

[1] Gen. 2^{24}. [2] Heb. לְ הָיָה.

LITTLE CHILDREN BLESSED

13–16. *Jesus blesses little children, and rebukes his disciples for repelling those bringing them.*

Jesus meets with opposition here, but also with trust. They bring to him little children, that they may receive that wonderful touch which has healed so many. The disciples, whose thoughts are busy now with the important affairs of the kingdom, which seemed to them so near, rebuke them for intruding so slight matters on the Messiah. But Jesus became very angry, and bade the children to be brought to him, as representing the very spirit to which the kingdom belongs.

Mt. and Mk. are parallel in their account from the close of the Galilean ministry to the final entry into Jerusalem. Lk. introduces, between the departure from Galilee and this point, much of his most characteristic matter. But beginning here, with the events immediately preceding the entry into Jerusalem, the three accounts become parallel. The following is a synopsis of these events:

MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.
Question of Divorce.	Same.	
Blessing of Children.	"	Same.
Rich Young Man.	"	"
Parable of Householder.		
Prophecy of Death.	Same.	Same.
Petition of James and John.	"	
Blind Men at Jericho.	"	Same.

13. ἵνα ἅψηται αὐτῶν — *that he may touch them.* The symbolic action accompanying the blessing was the laying on of hands. See v. 16. *Touch* gives the rationale of that conventional form. The mere touch of that wonderful being had cured, restored, raised. His method in conveying these blessings had been the laying on of hands, and they saw in this the effect of contact with so marvellous a man. ἐπετίμων αὐτοῖς — *rebuked them.* This rebuke was directed against the presumption of those persons in bringing mere children to the attention of so great and busy a person as Jesus.

αὐτοῖς, instead of τοῖς προσφέρουσιν, *those bringing them*, Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ two *mss.* Lat. Vet. It is against this, that αὐτοῖς is the reading of Mt. and Lk.

14. ἠγανάκτησε — *was indignant.* Or rather, in accordance with the use of aor. to denote the entering on a state denoted by the verb, *became indignant.*[1] The composition with ἄγαν makes this a strong word.

[1] Burton, 41.

Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός με· μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά — *Suffer the little children to come to me; forbid them not.* The omission of the conjunction between the two clauses gives abruptness and force.

Omit καὶ, *and*, before μὴ κωλύετε Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BM* NX ΓΔΠ Memph.

τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία, etc. — *for to such belongs the kingdom of God.* The gen. is possessive, which is not denoted by *of such is*, AV. and RV. τῶν τοιούτων denotes those possessing the childlike spirit of docility and humility. Cf. Mt. 18[4]. The spirit is one that belongs to them as children, and is the result of their position of dependence and subordination, the same as the discipline which belongs to the condition of a soldier. But those who show that disposition, when it is no longer the effect of position, but a manifestation of character, belong to the kingdom of God. In children therefore, as children, appears the very quality of the kingdom, and this gives them a special distinction in the eyes of its members. They are not to be turned away as unworthy the attention of its king. The kingdom of God in the world consists of those who substitute for self-will and independence the will of God, and trust in his wisdom and goodness. And this is the attitude of childhood. What children feel towards their parents man should feel towards God.

15. ὃς ἂν μὴ δέξηται τ. βασιλείαν τ. Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῇ εἰς αὐτήν — *whoever does not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall not enter into it.* The kingdom of God is in its idea, its essence, the rule and the authority of God, and then the sphere in which he bears rule, either the spirit of the individual man, or the assemblage of its subjects, the society constituted by them. When Jesus speaks of its acceptance, it is the rule itself which is meant; that is to be accepted with unquestioning obedience, as the child accepts the parental rule. And on the other hand, when he speaks of entrance into it, he means the society of its subjects, the perfect state and order which results from doing the will of God.

ἂν, instead of ἐὰν, after ὃς Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCDL Δ 1.

16. Καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος[1] αὐτά, κατευλόγει[2] τιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτά — *And having taken them in his arms, he blessed them, putting his hands on them.*

κατευλόγει τιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτά, instead of τιθεὶς τᾶς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτά, ηὐλόγει αὐτά, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ Memph.

---

[1] See on 9[36]. The word occurs only in these two passages, and in the Sept.

[2] κατευλόγει is a compound found only here in the Bible, and not at all outside. On the Hebraistic meaning of εὐλογεῖν, *to invoke blessings on*, see on 6[41]. On the augment of verbs beginning with εὐ, see Win. 12, 3.

THE STUMBLING BLOCK OF WEALTH

17–31. *Jesus is asked the way to obtain life by a rich young man, and points him the way of the commandments. The young man professes to have kept these, and then Jesus shows him the way of self-renunciation. His disappointment leads Jesus to speak of the danger of wealth, and of the reward of renunciation.*

The young man addresses Jesus as *Good Teacher*, and asks what he shall do to inherit eternal life. Jesus takes up this address first, and asks why he calls him good, when only God is good. And he points him to the commands of God for the answer to his question. The young man claims to have kept these, and as Jesus looks at him, he loves the evident feeling for righteousness that leads a man of manifestly moral life to dissatisfaction with himself, and seeing that it is his wealth that stands in the way, he bids him sell out, give to the poor, and follow him. It is evident that he has probed the difficulty, for the man has too much to give up and sadly turns away. Jesus then turns to his disciples, and shows them that riches are a stumbling block in the way of life. This excites their astonishment, as wealth and respectability go together. Whereupon, Jesus tells them that it is no easy thing to enter into the kingdom of God anyway, and for a rich man next to impossible; in fact, impossible with men, and only possible with God. Peter, conscious (perhaps a little too conscious) that this demand of self-renunciation has been complied with by the disciples, asks what their reward will be. Jesus answers, rewards in kind here, with persecution; and in the future eternal life. But, lest they should think of themselves as having any exclusive right, or even necessary preëminence in the kingdom, he warns them that many first shall be last, and last first.

17. Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ[1] εἰς τὴν ὁδόν — *And as he went forth into the road.* See v.[10], where he is said to have gone into the house. εἷς — The numeral is used sometimes, especially in late writers, in the sense of the indef. τις. The usage is so rare, however, as to warrant its rejection, except in sure cases. Here, it means that

[1] On this use of the gen. abs., where the noun or pronoun belongs to the structure of the sentence, see Win. 30, 11, Note.

one man came by himself to consult Christ.[1] γονυπετήσας[2] — *having kneeled to him.* ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω — *to inherit eternal life.*[3] Eternal life was the term in common use among the Jews to denote the blessings of the Messianic kingdom, both here and hereafter.

18. Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; — *Why do you call me good?* με is not emphatic, as is shown by the use of the enclitic form. The reason of this question, and of the denial of goodness to any one but God which follows it, is that God alone possesses the absolute good. He is what others become. Human goodness is a growth, even when there is no imperfection. It develops, like wisdom, from childhood to youth, and then to manhood. And it was this human goodness which was possessed by Jesus. See Lk. 2^{52}, Heb. 2^{10} 5^{8}. This has a bearing, too, on the question propounded by the young man, since it was not to the good teacher as such, but to the absolutely good God, that questions in regard to the real good that brings the promised reward should be addressed. And this is the form in which question and answer are put in Mt. 19^{17} as follows: "What good thing shall I do to inherit eternal life?" "Why do you ask me concerning the good thing? One is good, God."

19. Τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας — *You know the commandments.* This is connected immediately with the preceding statement about God. These commands belong to the law of the one only absolutely good Being, and it is therefore in these commands that the young man is bidden to look for the answer to his question. Moreover, he is familiar with these commands, and why therefore seek any further for his answer. There is, however, an answer to this seemingly unanswerable question of Jesus. Though the commands are divine, and as divine would be a ne plus ultra, they were revealed through men, and this human element in them makes it possible for men belonging to a more spiritual time, or themselves more spiritual, to go further in revealing the ways of God to men. That is what Jesus himself did in the Sermon on the Mount, setting in contrast the imperfect commands of the ancients and his own perfect injunctions. This is one of the cases therefore, in which Jesus suggests more than appears on the surface, viz., that there is a chance that even so-called divine commands may not be ultimate. The suggestion itself is pertinent to a time of transition from one era of divine revelation to another, and the method of suggestion is not absent from the teaching of Jesus, who frequently gave men something to think of, some riddle to solve, instead of always throwing so much light himself as to save them

---

[1] Win. 18, 9. [2] γονυπετεῖν is a later Greek word.
[3] In classical Greek, this verb is restricted to the meaning, to obtain by inheritance, and it governs the gen.

all trouble. In this very case, Jesus proceeds to add something to what he has cited as the divine commands, showing that these do not contain the last words in the matter. The commands cited by him are those of the second table of the law, except the tenth, and with the command *defraud not*, added. This addition is not to be referred to a single passage like Deut. 24^{14}, but is a reminiscence of many such passages, besides being a self-evident part of the law of righteousness.[1]

20. Καὶ ἔφη, ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξάμην — *And he said, all these I kept.* This claim of innocence on the part of the young man was evidently not intended to be absolute, but was simply that this had been the general course of his life, viz., a course of observance of the divine law. The cause of his dissatisfaction with himself was not that his obedience to these commands was not perfect, a perfection which was not expected by Judaism, as their system of sacrifices showed, but a secret feeling that this was not enough. ἐφυλαξάμην — *I kept.*[2]

Omit ἀποκριθείς, *answering*, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ B Δ Memph. ἔφη, instead of εἶπεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC Δ Memph.

21. ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ, ἠγάπησεν αὐτὸν — the look was evidently to confirm the impression made by the words of the young man. Here was a constant observer of the law, who yet was not satisfied with himself. Would his looks bear out the impression created by this? Would sincerity, purity, and thoughtfulness appear in his face and bearing? Yes, for Jesus having looked on him, loved him. Ἓν σε ὑστερεῖ — *One thing you lack.*

σε, instead of σοι, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BCM II* 28.

The commands of the law which had been cited were mostly negative; they forbade a man's doing any harm to his neighbor, and in the matter of his goods, they forbade stealing and defrauding. And so far in the path of righteousness the young man had gone. The thing which was lacking in him was the positive side, to contribute to his neighbor's good, and for this purpose, to sacrifice his own. This was not enjoined by Jesus as an extraordinary goodness, not required of other men (supererogation, counsels of perfection), nor was it intended to apply a test to him, which should reveal to him an entirely different righteousness (Pauline doctrine of faith); but it was just what it purported to be, the discovery to him of a serious defect in an otherwise lovable character. Jesus saw that he clung to his wealth in a way quite incompatible with any just estimate of the higher good; that there was

[1] See Mal. 3^5, Ex. 21^{10} LXX.

[2] This sense of *keeping*, by way of *observing*, is in classical Greek confined to the active, and is attached to the middle only in Biblical Greek.

hidden in that love of riches a luxurious self-love and a lack of sympathy with the want of men, that made it endanger the very roots of character. The counsel that he gives him, therefore, is adapted to his individual case. There are evidently two grounds for it: one the need of the man himself, and the other the desire of Jesus to attach this choice spirit to himself, to have him in the inner circle of his disciples attending immediately upon himself. He needed to cut away all his attachments to the world, all his temptations to luxurious, self-indulgent living, for his own good, but specially in order to follow the hard and self-denying life of Jesus. This requirement of personal discipleship was what the first disciples had met themselves of their own motion, but they did not have the temptation of wealth to overcome. See 1^{16-20}, 2^{14}. δὸς (-τοῖς) πτωχοῖς — Without the art. it means, *give to poor people*, individualizing it. This meets another side of the young man's lack, his want of sympathy with the poor. ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ — This is related, first, to the question, what he should do to inherit eternal life, with which he approached Jesus; and secondly, to Jesus' requirement; he should sell earthly possessions in order to obtain treasure in heaven. καὶ δεῦρο, ἀκολούθει μοι — *and come, follow me.* This means in this case, evidently, *become my personal follower*, attached to my person. Here was a lovely but weak character, not inured to self-sacrifice nor heroic living; and it needed, on the one hand, to be initiated into such living, and on the other, the companionship of the strong and sympathetic Master.

Omit τοῖς before πτωχοῖς, Treg. (WH.) RV. ABNX ΓΔ. Omit ἆρας τὸν σταυρόν, *having taken up the cross*, after ἀκολούθει μοι, *follow me*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCD Δ 406, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. *edd.*

22. Ὁ δὲ στυγνάσας[1] — *And his countenance fell*, RV. The word denotes the outward sign of sorrow, *gloom.*

ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά — *for he had great wealth.* The grief was caused by his having to go away without obtaining his object; the going away was caused by what seemed to him the impossibility of Jesus' conditions. It might be comparatively easy for a man having only small or moderate possessions to give them up, but it involved too great a sacrifice in his case.

23. Πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τ. βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελεύσονται; — *With what difficulty will those having wealth enter into the kingdom of God?* Jesus generalizes here, and the case in hand goes far to confirm what he says, because there is nothing to complicate the conditions; we can see the working of wealth by itself. Here is a lovely character, with no other adverse conditions, and yet just the possession of wealth is enough to undermine it. He

[1] στυγνάσας is a rare word, even in the Bible, and is found outside only in Polybius, 120 B.C.

had gone along through life, choosing purity instead of lust, honesty instead of fraud, truth instead of falsehood, but in all this he had not been called upon to make the supreme choice, his wealth had not stood in the way. But now, he is confronted with a wisdom that is able to show him what is for him the supreme good, and there wealth gets in its deadly work. The lower good proves to be stronger than the higher, and the latter is set aside. There is the difficulty; the kingdom of God does not consist in the practice of this or that separate virtue, but in the choice of the highest good, which regulates individual acts; and wealth has the power, beyond most other things, of making itself appear the greatest good.

24. Οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ[1] — *And the disciples were astonished at his words.* The disciples were amazed at these words, the same as every one is amazed now; or rather, their amazement then corresponds to the entire disuse into which sayings of this class have fallen now. Then, as now, there was an established religion, in which wealth enabled its possessor to come to the front, and occupy the most prominent positions. So far from disqualifying them, it gave its possessors prestige, and always wealth leads to culture and respectability, while poverty is the parent of vice and crime. The ordinary condition of the world is that of routine morals, and it has no ear for revolutionary words like these.

25. πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστιν εἰς τ. β . . . εἰσελθεῖν — *how difficult it is to enter into the kingdom of God.* The internal evidence is quite in favor of the shorter reading, because it is short, and because it is one of those cases in which a brief and somewhat puzzling saying is a constant temptation to copyists and commentators to introduce something explanatory and alleviating. The longer reading would be intended to modify the preceding statement by showing that it was not the possession of wealth, but the trust in it, confidence in its power to procure all the necessary satisfactions and goods of life, that prevented entrance into the kingdom. The shorter reading generalizes still more the preceding statement, making the difficulty of entering the kingdom to be inherent in its nature, and so universal, instead of locating it in the class, rich men. It involves the choice of the highest good, which in various ways, and not merely on the side of wealth, interferes with what men consider the more immediate and practical good.

Omit τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν, *those who trust in riches*, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. *marg.* ℵ B Δ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. *ed.*

εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστι κάμηλον διὰ τρυμαλίας ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν[2] — *It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye.* The proverb is an

[1] On the use of ἐπί to denote the cause of emotion, see Win. 48 *c*, *c*).
[2] εὐκοπώτερον and τρυμαλίας are both Biblical words.

exaggerated rhetorical statement of the difficulty. In the parallel accounts in Mt. and Lk., some mss. have the reading *κάμιλον*, meaning *a cable*, which is much more apposite. Using the shorter reading in v.[24], as on the whole more probable, the whole would mean, *it is hard for any man to get into the kingdom of God, and for a rich man next to impossible.* He is in the position of having the lower good which other men want, and this is more of an obstacle to the perception and choice of the higher good.

Omit *τῆς* before *τρυμαλίας* Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ACDFKMNU ΓΔΠ. Before *ῥαφίδος* Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ACDGKMNU ΔΠ Memph. *διελθεῖν*, instead of *εἰσελθεῖν*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BC(D)K II, 1, 13, 124, 346, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Syrr.

26. *περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο* — before, they had been astonished; now, *they were excessively beside themselves with amazement.* This making the difficulty of entering the kingdom universal, and increasing it in the case of rich men to almost an impossibility, fairly took away their breath. For one of the promises in regard to that kingdom had been, that prosperity and righteousness were to become common in Israel, and even to be extended to the Gentiles. And Jesus seemed to be making it more and more inaccessible than ever.

λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς (αὐτόν) — *saying to themselves (him).*

αὐτόν, instead of *ἑαυτούς*, Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BCD Memph. Tisch. urges against this the usage of Mk., who never says *λέγειν πρὸς*, except with *ἑαυτούς* or *ἀλλήλους.*

Καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; — *Who then (And who) can be saved?* *καὶ*, with interrogatives, makes an abrupt rejoinder to what has been said.[1]

27. *Παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατον* — *With men it is impossible.* Salvation is impossible with men; but in salvation, we are dealing not with men, but with God. The incarnation and the Holy Spirit are not within the category of human agencies, but of the Divine, and given these, even the impossibilities of human nature have to give way. *πάντα γὰρ δυνατὰ.* *πάντα* is emphatic. *All things are possible with God*, not because he can travel outside the ordinary agencies, and bring things to pass by a simple fiat, but because he has limitless command of all the forces in any department. In the moral and spiritual sphere, he brings things to pass, not by recourse to other than moral and spiritual agencies, but by the word, the Spirit, and the Christ, all of them agencies charged with spiritual power.

Omit *δὲ*, *and*, after *ἐμβλέψας*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* Δ 1, Memph. Omit *τῷ* before *Θεῷ* Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCNX ΓΔ. Omit *ἐστι* after *δυνατά* Tisch. Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. ℵ BC.

[1] Win. 53, 3 *a*. Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* I. 2 *g*

28. Ἤρξατο[1] λέγειν ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ, Ἰδού, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν[2] πάντα, καὶ ἠκολουθήκαμέν[2] σοι — *Peter began to say to him, Lo, we left all, and have followed thee.*

Omit Καί, *And,* before ἤρξατο, *began,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCX ΓΔ. ἠκολουθήκαμεν, instead of -σαμεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BCD.

ἡμεῖς — *we* is emphatic, contrasting their conduct with that of the rich young man. Mt. adds what is implied in the other accounts, τι ἄρα ἔσται ὑμῖν; *what shall we have therefore?* This seems to be a most incongruous and unspiritual question to ask in the religious and moral sphere. *What we shall get for our self-denial,* is a question which shows that the disciples were entirely unable to understand their leader's ruling ideas. And yet from their position, the question was inevitable. Because their Scriptures and ecclesiastical writings, which they regarded as authoritative in these matters, are full of descriptions of the prosperity and bliss of the Messianic kingdom, of the temporal and material rewards of the faithful. And so far they had met with nothing in their association with the man whom they believed to be the Messianic king, but privation; instead of adding to their worldly good, this association had diminished, if not destroyed it. They had borne everything for him; what return would he, in his greatness, make them?

29. Ἔφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν, ἢ ἀδελφούς, ἢ ἀδελφάς, ἢ μητέρα, ἢ πατέρα, ἢ τέκνα, ἢ ἀγρούς, ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου — *Jesus said, Verily I say to you, there is no one who has left house, or brothers, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children, or fields, for my sake, and for the sake of the glad-tidings* (of the kingdom).

Ἔφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, instead of ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, *and Jesus answering said,* Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ B Δ Memph. μητέρα ἢ πατέρα, instead of the reverse order, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BC Δ 106, *mss.* Lat. Vet. one *ms.* Vulg. Memph. Omit ἢ γυναῖκα, *or wife,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD Δ 1, 66, 209, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Insert ἕνεκεν before τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Tisch. Treg. (WH.) RV. ℵ $B^{2 \text{ or } 3}$ CDNS² X ΓΔΠ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Syrr.

It is misleading, here as most everywhere, to translate εὐαγγελίου, *gospel.* It means *glad-tidings,* and the special message intended is that of the kingdom of God. Men who make sacrifices for the benefit of the Messianic king, and of the news of the kingdom, will receive the blessings of the kingdom. ἑκατονπλασίονα — *a hundredfold;* there is a reminiscence in this word of the

[1] *Began to say,* instead of merely *said,* is best explained here as a mere fashion of speech, into which the writer falls, without any special reason for it.

[2] The aor. and perf. are here to be distinguished from each other, the aor., *we left,* as denoting simple past action, the perf., *we have followed,* as denoting action continuing into the present.

apocalyptic character of the familiar descriptions of the blessings of the Messianic kingdom. But Jesus uses such language from the religious idiom of this time only to idealize it. To be sure, his words imply that the reward will be in kind; they will give up these things only to receive a hundredfold of the same. But, evidently, hundreds of brothers and sisters and mothers is meant to be taken ideally, and means that he will receive what will replace the lost relatives in that degree. The relationships of the kingdom take the place of natural kindred.[1] And the member of the kingdom is an heir not only of heaven, but of earth.[2] Jesus had nowhere to lay his head, and yet he was conscious of a lordship and possession of the earth, into which every true follower of his can enter. They have nothing, and yet possess all things.[3] μετὰ διωγμῶν — *with persecutions.* These, Jesus had already predicted in his talks with his disciples previous to leaving Galilee. The new element introduced by him here is the other side belonging to this ideal life, the compensations and rewards even in this life, belonging to the Christian. ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ — *in the coming age.* There is only one passage, Heb. 1[2], where αἰών is used by metonymy, of space, instead of time. The reference is to the future life, in which the world, as well as the time, is new, but there is no reason why the meaning of αἰών should be changed, any more than that of καιρός, *time*, in the corresponding clause. ζωὴν αἰώνιον — on the use of this term among the Jews, see on v.[17]. But it is evident that Jesus, in adopting, spiritualized it. Only, in this case, he found the word made ready to his use which expressed in itself just the state intended by him, though encumbered with alien meanings in common use. It is characteristic of his method, that he used the word without any explanation, leaving it to clarify itself as men got into the drift of his teaching.

31. πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι — *but many first shall be last.* This is a warning to the disciples that the mere fact, that they were the earliest disciples and nearest his person, does not necessarily give them preëminence, nor any exclusive right to the blessings promised by him. The parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard, each of whom received his shilling without regard to the time that he had worked, is inserted by Mt. to enforce this saying.

THIRD PREDICTION OF DEATH

32–34. *On the journey to Jerusalem, Jesus again foretells his death and resurrection.*

---

[1] See 3[35]. [2] See Mt. 5[5]. [3] See 2 Cor. 6[10].

They are now on their way to Jerusalem. And there is evidently some feeling of fate overhanging them. It is evident enough that they had not understood Jesus' predictions of the violent death awaiting him in the city. But on their own construction of events, the approach to Jerusalem meant the crisis in their fate, the decision of the Messianic claim. They were a mere handful, and the authorities were against them. Would the people be with them? And if they were, what of the Roman power? It is no wonder that they were astonished as Jesus put himself at their head, and that some turned back, while others followed with fear. Then Jesus takes the twelve aside, and repeats, with some additional details, the prophecy of his death and resurrection. The prophecy is given here with clearness and particularity, describing the whole course of events. And then follows the clearly impossible request of James and John for the first places in the Messianic kingdom. It is evident that the subsequent history has been read into what must have been at the time distinctly veiled prophecy.

32. *ἦν προάγων — was preceding them.* The introduction of this apparently commonplace item shows that attention is drawn to it as something out of the common. And in connection with *παραλαβὼν πάλιν*, in the following clause, it evidently means that Jesus was not mingling with his disciples as usual, but was going before them. *καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο — and they were amazed.* We are not told by what, but the very simple *προάγων* is evidently put forth by the writer as containing the key of the situation. Something in the manner of that invested the whole proceeding with mystery, and brought to their minds the fateful character of this progress to Jerusalem, the tremendous issues to be decided, and the odds against them. And somehow, with all their confidence in Jesus, the question might arise, whether it was confidence for such a crisis.

οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες — and those following. Without the art., this would refer to the disciples. But with the art., it picks out some from among them, who followed Jesus, while the rest were left behind, too much perplexed to follow him. The statement is, that those who followed him did it with fear. *καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν — and having taken to himself again.* This is opposed to *προάγων* (v.[32]), which represents him as separating himself from them. But it is only the twelve, not the multitude generally, to whom he joins himself, as the teaching that follows is esoteric. He joins himself to them again, after he sees the effect produced on them by his

going on before them, and explains to them what it is that has produced the strangeness of his manner.

Οἱ δὲ, instead of καὶ, before ἀκολουθοῦντες Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ 1, Memph.

33. ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα — *we are going up to Jerusalem.* This is what makes this journey so fateful. In Jerusalem, they will be confronted with the authorities, both Jewish and Roman. ἀρχιερεῦσι . . . γραμματεῦσι — *the chief priests and the scribes.* These two classes represented the Sanhedrim, the Great Council among the Jews, before which were tried all the more important cases coming under their own law, though the Roman government reserved to itself the right of capital punishment. καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τ. ἔθνεσι — This delivering him over to the Gentiles, *i.e.* the Roman government, has not been mentioned in the account of the preceding predictions of his death. It was rendered necessary by the determination to put him to death, a power which the Roman government reserved to itself. They could not execute him, they had to procure his execution.

τ. ἔθνεσι — *the nations.* The term by which the Jews designated all foreign nations. They were the nation; all others were just the nations.

34. ἐμπαίξουσιν . . . ἐμπτύσουσιν . . . μαστιγώσουσιν — *they will mock . . . spit upon . . . scourge.* These details correspond exactly to what we are told of the event. The scourging was an invariable accompaniment of crucifixion. The general fact of mocking was to be expected, since his supposed claim to be a king would naturally excite the ridicule of Roman soldiers. Jesus might easily, therefore, have put these into his prophecy in a general way; but the exact form which the prophecy takes, and which is reproduced for substance by the other accounts, is in all probability a reflection of the event, put in by the original narrator. κ. μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται — *and after three days he will rise.* The prediction of the crucifixion would rest on something more than ordinary foresight, since the action of the Roman governor must have remained an incalculable element in any such forecast. And the resurrection, in the form in which it actually took place, and on a set day, was necessarily a revelation. This precise prediction, moreover, makes the total want of preparation for the event on the part of the disciples a curious psychological problem.

καὶ ἐμπτύσουσιν αὐτῷ, καὶ μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτόν, instead of the reverse order, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 237, 259, 406, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Harcl. Omit αὐτόν after ἀποκτενοῦσιν Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 1, 209, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, instead of τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

GOD'S IDEA OF GREATNESS

35–45. *James and John ask for first and second places in his kingdom. Jesus assures them that they will share his lot, but that the decision of precedence does not rest with him, but with the Father. He shows that the conditions and nature of greatness in the kingdom are exactly the reverse of the earthly conditions.*

The noticeable thing about this event is not only the generally extraordinary character of the request, coming from the disciples of Jesus and just after his prediction of his death, but its ignoring of the claims of Peter, who was given the precedence, so far as there was any, by Jesus himself and by the disciples. This shows a painful state of things among the disciples, who exhibit not merely a desire for the material rewards of discipleship, such as was exhibited in Peter's question — *what shall we have?* but the rivalries and jealousies that spring up as the natural fruit of such desire. Our Lord's method, on the other hand, is conspicuous, not only for the careful and consistent elimination of any such unspiritual element from his kingdom, but equally for the patience with which he dealt with the unspirituality of his disciples, until he had refined it into something like his own spirituality. In this case, he asks them first, if they know what they are asking, and shows them that to be next to him means to share the conspicuous dangers and sacrifices of his position. Then he shows them again, as in their previous dispute over the same matter, that greatness in the kingdom of God is the reverse of earthly greatness, the great one being he who serves, just as the Messianic king serves and is sacrificed.

35. λέγοντες αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσῃς ἡμῖν.[1] — *Saying to him, Teacher, we wish that you do for us whatever we ask you.*

Insert αὐτῷ after λέγοντες Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh. Insert σε after αἰτήσωμεν Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ^{c} ABCL Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Harcl.

[1] This use of ἵνα with the subj., instead of the inf., after verbs of desire and command, is common in Hellenistic Greek, but not in the classical writers. See Win. 44, 8. Burton 304.

36. Τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν; — *What do you wish me to do for you?* Literally, *what do you wish, shall I do for you?*[1]

ποιήσω, instead of ποιῆσαί με, Treg. WH. CD, 1, 13, 69, 209. Add με Tisch. WH. *marg.* ℵ^{c} B. Versions also favor the subj.

37. Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Δὸς ἡμῖν ἵνα[2] εἷς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς[3] ἐξ ἀριστερῶν καθίσωμεν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου[4] — *and they said to him, give us to sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy glory.*

ἀριστερῶν, instead of εὐωνύμων, Tisch. Treg. WH. BL Δ. Omit σου in this place, Treg. WH. RV. BD Δ 1, *mss.* Lat. Vet.

ἐκ δεξιῶν . . . ἐξ ἀριστερῶν — these are the positions of honor next to the throne itself, the right hand having the precedence. This leaves Peter out. ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου — *in thy glory.* The glory, that is, of the Messianic king.

38. Οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε — *You know not what you ask.* They did not know how absolutely this is a question of being first, and not of standing first, which makes it a question, not of appointment, but of achievement. Nor did they know that it meant suffering, instead of honor, and that this would increase with the advanced position attained. πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον — *drink the cup.* The figurative use of the phrase to denote a man's portion in life, his hard or easy lot, belongs to other languages than the Greek. See Is. 51^{17}, Jer. 49^{12}, Ps. 16^{5}, 23^{5}. Christ means to ask them if they are able, if they have the necessary fortitude and proper appreciation of values, to share the sacrifices of his position. Being baptized with his baptism is another figurative expression of the same thought, coming from the power of calamity to overwhelm. *Can you,* he asks, *be immersed in that which has overwhelmed me?* They have looked at only the glory of the coming kingdom. Jesus directs their attention to the sacrifices incurred in establishing that kingdom.

ἤ, *or,* instead of Καί, *and,* before τὸ βάπτισμα, *the baptism,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DLN Δ 1, 13, 28, 69, 124, 346, Latt. Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

39. Τὸ ποτήριον . . . πίεσθε· καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα . . . βαπτισθήσεσθε — *The cup . . . you will drink; and with the baptism . . . you will be baptized.* Of this Jesus can assure them, that they will share his sufferings.

Omit μὲν before ποτήριον Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ *mss.* Vulg. Memph. Pesh.

---

[1] Here, we have the subj. without ἵνα, which is still more anomalous, being an elliptical combination of two constructions. See Win. 41 *a*, 4 *b*. Burton 171. The subj. is probably in this case the deliberative subj. [2] See note [1], p. 199.

[3] The Greeks use εἷς μέν, εἷς δέ, to express this correlation. Win. 26, 2 *a*.

[4] δόξα is confined in Greek writers to its proper subjective meaning, *opinion, praise.* The meaning, *glory, majesty,* as an objective state, comes from the Heb.

40. τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἢ ἐξ εὐωνύμων[1] οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι — *But to sit on my right hand, or left hand, is not mine to give.*

ἤ, instead of Καί, before ἐξ εὐωνύμων Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 73. Lat. Vet. Memph. Omit μου after ἐξ εὐων. Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. and almost everything.

This statement of Jesus it is very easy to interpret superficially, as if it meant simply that the bestowment belonged not to one person, but to another — not to himself, but to the Father. But there is little doubt that Mk. has preserved for us the true form of statement in omitting mention of the Father, and so the contrast between persons. They cannot have position in his kingdom by applying to either, as if it were a matter of personal preference. Position, it is not in his power to bestow; it belongs to those *for whom it has been prepared.* The meaning is, that this is a matter already disposed of, and so no longer in his power. The verb expresses nearly the idea of *ordained.* But it adds to this the thought of the preparation of the place. Each one is to have a place prepared and adapted for him. It is not therefore a question that can be settled as they were trying to settle it, by influence used with him personally. Fitness, and not influence, decides it. This becomes especially clear, when we consider the definition of greatness that follows. It consists in service, and he who serves most is greatest, a greatness already determined by the service, and not to be changed by any personal equation.

41. οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν[2] — *the ten began to be indignant.* There was reason for this strong feeling on the part of the other disciples. The condition seems to have been, that Peter, James, and John were singled out by Jesus himself for such eminence among the twelve, as the twelve had among the other disciples. If there was any jealousy caused by this, it would be allayed by the fact that the Master selected those manifestly fit, and that it was unaccompanied by any outward advantage. But, now, there was an attempt to secure places in the coming kingdom and its glory, and Peter, the real leader of the twelve, was left out of the scheme. It was the introduction of political methods, such as invariably go with the materializing of ideas, the use of principles to secure power, and of power to advance principles in the world.

42. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς — *And Jesus having called them.*

This reading, instead of ὁ δὲ Ἰησους προσκ. αὐτούς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* et c. BCDL Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh.

---

[1] εὐωνύμων is used in the taking of auguries to denote euphemistically those of evil origin, the word itself meaning just the opposite. And so it comes to denote the left hand, that being the hand of evil omen, the sinister hand.

[2] See on v.[14].

οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν — *those who seem to be chief.* Jesus has in mind evidently the difference between their primacy and the ideal. ἄρχειν is a word that lends itself to such ideal treatment, as it contains in itself the notion of leadership, which is the only proper basis of rule. Men rule by force, by heredity, by fickle choice, by flattery, but how few are real leaders, ruling because possessing the qualities of leadership. κατακυριεύσουσιν — *lord it over them* (RV.). They become κύριοι, *lords or masters*, and the people become their servants, doing their will, and ministering to their pleasure. κατεξουσιάζουσιν[1] — *exercise authority over them.*

43, 44. οὐχ οὕτω δέ ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν, ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος· καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος, ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος — *But it is not so among you; but whoever wishes to become great among you, shall be your servant; and whoever wishes to be first among you, shall be bond-servant of all.*

ἐστιν, *is*, instead of ἔσται, *shall be*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL Δ most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. ἂν, instead of ἐὰν, after first ὃς Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BDL Δ 33, 69, 299. ἐν ὑμῖν, instead of ὑμῶν, before εἶναι πρῶτος Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ Latt. Memph. εἶναι πρῶτος, instead of γενέσθαι πρῶτ., Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ Latt. Memph.

οὐχ οὕτω δέ ἐστιν — *but so it is not.* This is not the state of things that obtains, as a matter of fact, among you as members of the kingdom of God. The ideal is the essential principle of that kingdom. μέγας γενέσθαι — *to become great.* There is such a thing as ambition, the desire for greatness, in the kingdom of God, but it is the exact opposite of what goes by that name. διάκονος — *servant.* The word denotes the performer of services, without indicating his exact relation to the person served. δοῦλος — *bond-servant.* There is a climax in the statement. To be great requires service, to be first requires bond-service, and this δουλεία is to πάντων, all. Here is the paradox of the kingdom of God. Instead of being lords, its great ones become servants, and its chiefs the bond-servants of all. One has only to watch the progress and present condition of things, to see that this state of things is coming to pass, but that it is yet far from accomplishment; and furthermore, that in this respect at least, the field is the world, and not the church.

45. καὶ γὰρ — *for also.* The Son of Man himself is not exempt from this rule. His kingship is also that of service, and not that of lordship. He is the Head of humanity, and yet he serves men, and not men him. οὐ διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι — *not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom in exchange for many.* The vicarious idea is expressed here, but it is not strictly

[1] This is a Biblical word, and is not found in the N.T. outside of this and the parallel passage in Mt., making another strong proof of the interdependence of the written accounts.

that his life takes the place of other lives that would have to be sacrificed otherwise in expiation of their sins. All that is required by the statement, not in the way of minimizing it, but to fill out its meaning, is that his life becomes the price by which men are freed from their bondage. The soldiers in the American civil war gave their lives as a λύτρον for the slaves, and every martyr's death is a λύτρον. There may be more than this involved in the death of the Redeemer, but more than this is not involved in his words here. In this, he carries his service of men to the utmost, and becomes their Head.

HEALING OF A BLIND MAN NEAR JERICHO

46–52. *In the course of his journeys in Judæa, Jesus comes to Jericho, and Bartimæus, a blind man, asks him to take pity on him. The crowd around Jesus seek to repel him, but Jesus calls him and heals him. The blind man follows him.*

This is the only visit of Jesus to Jericho. The connection of the narrative makes this a stage in the journey to Jerusalem, begun v.[32], and ended in the next chapter. The cry of the blind man, *Jesus, Son of David,* is the first note of the Messianic acclaim with which Jesus enters the city. And his healing at this crisis brings Jesus as the wonder-worker freshly before the minds of the multitude, and raises still higher their excited Messianic hopes.

46. καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἰερειχώ — *and as he was coming out from Jericho.* Lk. says, *as he was approaching Jericho,* and in the account of Zacchæus which follows, that *he entered, and passed through Jericho.* Mk. says *that they come to Jericho,* and that this happened *as he was coming out from Jericho.* It breaks up the continuity of both accounts to try to reconcile them in this trivial detail. καὶ ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ — *and a considerable crowd.* There is, probably, this deviation from the meaning *great* given to it in the EV.[1] ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου, Βαρτίμαιος, τυφλὸς προσαίτης,[2] ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν — *the Son of Timæus, Bartimæus, a blind beggar, was sitting by the side of the road.* ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Τιμαίου, *the Son of Timæus,* is a translation of Bartimæus = בַּר טִמְאִי; but it is evi-

[1] This use of ἱκανός in the sense of *great,* rather than *sufficient,* is characteristic of Lk. (Lk. and Acts). The only other instance is 1 Cor. 11[30]. Mt. 28[12] is at least doubtful.

[2] προσαίτης belongs to later Greek. Plutarch, Lucian.

dently not introduced here for that reason. Bartimæus is the name, and *Son of Timæus* denotes the relation. There was probably some reason for noting this relation, as that Timæus was a disciple.

Insert ὁ before υἱὸς Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDLS Δ. Omit ὁ before τυφλὸς Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 124, Memph. προσαίτης after τυφλὸς, instead of προσαιτῶν after ὀδὸν, *a blind beggar*, instead of *a blind man . . . begging*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ B²L Δ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

47. Καὶ ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνός ἐστιν, ἤρξατο κράζειν καὶ λέγειν, υἱὲ Δαυείδ, Ἰησοῦ, ἐλέησόν με — *And having heard that it is Jesus the Nazarene, he began to cry, and to say, thou Son of David, Jesus, have mercy on me.*

Ναζαρηνός, instead of Ναζωραῖος, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BL Δ 1, 118, 209, most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. υἱὲ, instead of ὁ υἱὸς, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCLM *marg.* Δ.

Jesus of Nazareth, and *Son of David* are both unfamiliar titles, the former occurring now for the first time since 1[24], and the latter only here. *Jesus of Nazareth* is intended by the multitude to identify him. *Son of David* is a distinctly Messianic title, the use of which here, however, we must not suppose is individual and peculiar. It reflects the sentiment of the multitude, who mean to make this a triumphal progress to Jerusalem, though as yet they are preserving a policy of silence.[1]

48. ἵνα σιωπήσῃ — *that he keep silent.* It does not seem probable that they would want to prevent the miracle. Rather, they wanted to enforce silence about this premature *Son of David*, which they meant to reserve for the entry into Jerusalem.

49. φωνήσατε αὐτόν — *call him.*

φωνήσατε αὐτόν, instead of αὐτὸν φωνηθῆναι, *that he be called*, ℵ BCL Δ 7, 209, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

ἔγειρε — *rise.*

ἔγειρε, instead of ἔγειραι, ℵ ABCDLX ΓΠ.

50. ἀποβαλὼν τὸ ἱμάτιον — *having thrown off his garment.* The outer garment, or robe, is meant. ἀναπηδήσας — *having leaped up.*[2] Both these acts are introduced to show the man's eagerness.

ἀναπηδήσας, instead of ἀναστὰς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDLM *marg.* Δ Latt. Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

51. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω; — *And Jesus answering said to him, What do you wish me to do for you?*[3]

εἶπεν, instead of λέγει, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 115, *mss.* Lat. Vet. one *ms.* Vulg. Memph.

---

[1] See 12[35]. [2] A common Greek word, but not found elsewhere in N.T.
[3] See on v.[35. 36].

Ῥαββουνί,[1] ἵνα ἀναβλέψω[2] — *Rabboni, that I may recover my sight.* Rabboni is apparently a more dignified title than Rabbi.

52. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέβλεψε, καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ[3] — *And immediately he recovered his sight, and followed him in the way.*

αὐτῷ, instead of τῷ Ἰησοῦ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDLM *marg.* Δ Latt. Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

JESUS' ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM

XI. 1–11. *Jesus comes to Bethany, where he procures a colt, on which he rides into Jerusalem. The multitude strew their garments and layers of leaves in the road, and shout Hosanna, invoking blessings on the coming kingdom. Jesus goes immediately to the temple, and satisfying himself for the present with a look at things, goes out to Bethany for the night.*

Jesus has told his disciples that he is going to Jerusalem only to meet his fate, and be put to death by the authorities, and yet he enters it amidst the acclaims of the multitude, who hail him as the coming King. This acknowledgment, repelled before, he now accepts. But, the claim once made, he proceeds as before, with his merely spiritual work. The key to these apparent inconsistencies is to be found in the splendid self-consistency of Jesus' procedure, and in its absolute inconsistency with worldly ideas and policies. Jesus knew that the Messianic claim in Jerusalem meant death, and that death meant the ultimate establishment of the claim, not defeat. Every part of his life, but especially its end, means that he aimed to establish the ideal as the law of human life, and that he would use only absolutely spiritual means in the accomplishment of his end.

Meantime, everything points to the fact that Jesus deliberately used the enthusiasm of the multitude for the purposes of his entry into Jerusalem, intending to make it the means of a public proclamation of his Messianic claim. That proclamation was neces-

[1] Apparently, there is a confusion of two Chaldee words in this title, רִבּוֹן and רַבָּן, both of them meaning about the same, *lord* or *chief.*

[2] ἀνα- in composition has the sense of the Latin *re.*

[3] The distinction between the momentary action of the aor. and the continued action of the impf. is preserved in these verbs.

sary, because men must understand definitely the issue that he made. The acceptance of him as King, and not merely as Prophet, was what he demanded. And in the events which followed, it immediately became apparent that the question thus raised was not only a question of his personal claim, but of the nature of his kingdom. The multitude who followed him thought that, with the announcement of the claim, the programme would change. But the unchanged programme meant that Jesus, just as he was, claimed kingship, and would be king only by spiritual enforcements.

1. Καὶ ὅτε ἐγγίζουσιν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, καὶ εἰς Βηθανίαν — *And when they draw near to Jerusalem, and to Bethany.*

καὶ εἰς Βηθανίαν, instead of εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ Βηθανίαν, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. *marg.* D Latt. The shorter reading seems probable, the longer reading having crept into the text from Lk.

καὶ εἰς Βηθανίαν — We have here a case of abbreviated expression, which obstructs clearness. The exact statement is, that they approached Jerusalem, and had come on the way as far as Bethany on the other side of the Mount of Olives. Bethany is mentioned here for the first time in Mk. In fact, according to this account, Jesus is now approaching Jerusalem for the first time. And hence places enter into the account which have not appeared before. Bethany was a small village on the other side of the Mount of Olives, about fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem. In approaching it, therefore, they would be on the way towards the Mount, πρὸς τὸ ὄρος.

2. τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι[1] ὑμῶν — *the village that is over against you.* Bethany is the village meant here, as Bethphage is the one designated in Mt. 21[1]. In both cases, the village named is the only one mentioned. The implication evidently is that the road did not pass through the village, but was off one side. πῶλον — *a colt.* Mt. specifies a she-ass and its colt, and as the ass was the more common beast used for domestic purposes, there is no doubt that the colt here was an ass's colt.[2] ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς οὔπω ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν — *on which no one of men yet sat.* Lk. also has these words. But they are extremely improbable in the mouth of Jesus. They evidently belong to the narrator, who very likely took a fact that he had discovered about the colt, and which had an undesigned significance, and made it a part of Jesus' design, an intentional effect in the pageant. There is no indication that

[1] κατέναντι is not found in profane writers. In the N.T., it is found in the Synoptics, and in the epistles of Paul.

[2] Mt. 21[2].

Jesus cared for the ceremonious trappings of an event. Such care belongs to homage, not to the person receiving it. On this demand of newness for sacred purposes, see Num. 19^2, Deut. 21^3, 2 Sam. 6^3. It is evidently the intention of the writers of the Gospels here to imply a supernatural knowledge on the part of Jesus.

Insert οὔπω before ἀνθρώπων Treg. WH. RV. ABL Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. After ἀνθρώπων, Tisch. ℵ C 13, 69, Egypt. (Pesh.). ἐκάθισεν, instead of κεκάθικε, Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ. λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ, instead of λύσαντες αὐτὸν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCD Latt. Egypt. (Syrr.). φέρετε, instead of ἀγάγετε, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Latt. Egypt. (Syrr.).

3. Ὁ Κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει, καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὧδε — *the Master has need of it, and will send* (*sends*) *it here again immediately.*

Omit Ὅτι before ὁ Κύριος Tisch. Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. B Δ 239, 433, *mss.* Lat. Vet. ἀποστέλλει, instead of ἀποστελεῖ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. and most authorities. Insert πάλιν, *again*, after ἀποστέλλει Tisch. Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL Δ.

ὁ κύριος — *the Master.* This title was so frequently applied to Jesus by himself and others, that there is little reason to suppose that there is any special significance in its use here. It indicates in general his relation to his disciples, and not any special phase of that relation. It would not be used here, *e.g.*, to indicate that he has assumed his Messianic position, since it is a title common to this with the time before. καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὧδε — *and will send* (*sends*) *him here again immediately.* With this insertion of *again*, these words make a part of Jesus' message to the owner of the animal, instead of his announcement to the disciples of what the owner will do in response to the message. He promises to return the animal immediately.

4. Καὶ ἀπῆλθον, καὶ εὗρον πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς (τὴν) θύραν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου — *And they departed, and found a colt tied at a* (*the*) *door upon the street outside.*

Καὶ ἀπῆλθον, instead of ἀπῆλθον δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Omit τὸν, *the*, before πῶλον, *colt*, Treg. WH. RV. ABDLX ΓΠ Memph. Omit τὴν, *the*, before θύραν, *door*, Treg. WH. BL Δ Egypt.

πρὸς (τὴν) θύραν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου — These details are evidently the report of an eyewitness. The first part, *at the door outside*, is easy of explanation. The better class of houses were built about an open court, from which a passageway under the house led to the street outside. It was at this outside opening to the street, that the colt was tied. But the ἀμφόδου is more difficult. Probably, it differs from ὁδοῦ simply in denoting a *roundabout road.* The AV. *where two ways met*, confounds the prep. ἀμφί

and ἄμφω meaning *both*.[1] The village may have been built on such a rounding road, that lay off from the straight highway, and the narrator places this in the story of the event in his ἀμφόδου. Such a descriptive touch is quite in Mk.'s manner.

5. Τί ποιεῖτε λύοντες τ. πῶλον; — *What are you doing, loosing the colt?* This τί ποιεῖτε we use very frequently in asking the meaning of an action; only we leave it by itself. *What are you doing?* we say. It asks the question, what the act really is, the outward form of which appears in the participial clause. Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς — *And they told them, as Jesus said.*

εἶπεν, *said*, instead of ἐνετείλατο, *commanded*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 1, 28, 124, 209, one *ms*. Lat. Vet. Egyptt.

6. καὶ ἀφῆκαν αὐτούς — *and they permitted them*, put no hinderance in their way. The expression is elliptical, the full statement including the thing permitted.

7. Καὶ φέρουσιν τὸν πῶλον . . . , καὶ ἐπιβάλλουσιν αὐτῷ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτόν — *And they bring the colt . . . , and put their garments on him, and he seated himself on him.*

φέρουσιν, instead of ἤγαγον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ^{c} BL Δ. ἐπιβάλλουσιν, instead of ἐπέβαλον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 1, 28, 91, 201, 299, *mss*. Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. αὐτὸν, instead of αὐτῷ after ἐπ', Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ.

τὰ ἱμάτια — *the outer garments*. On this form of royal homage, see 2 K. 9[13].

8. ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδας κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν — *and others layers of leaves, having cut them out of the fields*. στιβάδας is the object of the preceding ἔστρωσαν.

στιβάδας, instead of στοιβάδας,[2] Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDEGHKL MU ΔΠ. κόψαντες, instead of ἔκοπτον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ B(C) L Δ, Theb. ἀγρῶν, instead of δένδρων, *trees*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ B (C)L Δ Theb. Omit last clause of v., same authorities.

στιβάς is any layer of leaves, twigs, rushes, and the like, used for bedding, or to make a road easy of travel. This throwing their garments on the horse, and strewing the road with garments and layers of leaves, is all in the way of smoothing the road as a part of the homage rendered.

9. ἔκραζον, Ὡσαννά — cried *Hosanna*.

Omit λέγοντες, *saying*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 115, *mss*. Lat. Vet. Egyptt.

Ὡσαννά — *Hosanna*.[3] This cry is not an acclamation, but a prayer, meaning, *save now*, and it means either that Jehovah

---

[1] Vulg. *bivium*.

[2] στιβάδας is the proper form. στοιβάδας is a case of mis-spelling.

[3] The full form of the original is הוֹשִׁיעָה־נָּא, the Hiph. of יָשַׁע, with the suffixed particle נָא = *now*.

shall be propitious to some one else, conspicuous in the scene, or in connection with him, to the people uttering the cry. In the Ps. $118^{25.26}$ from which this invocation is taken, it is probably a prayer that Jehovah will be propitious to his people. While in Mt. 21^{9}, where it reads, Ὡσαννὰ τ. υἱῷ Δαυείδ — *be propitious now to the Son of David*, the prayer is for the one whom the multitude recognize as the coming Messiah. Probably, here it is the prayer of the people that the expected salvation may be accomplished now. εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόμ. Κυρ. — *Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.* It is a question of feeling, whether ἐστί or ἔστω is to be supplied here; whether it invokes a blessing on the coming king and his kingdom, or pronounces him blessed. Either is grammatically allowable. On the whole, I incline to the latter view. See RV. Κυρίου is a translation of יהוה, *Yahweh*, in Ps. 118^{26}, from which all this acclaim is taken. ἐν ὀνόμ. Κυρίου, *in the name of the Lord*, means that the kingdom of the Messiah is to be a vicegerency, in which the Messiah represents and takes the place of Jehovah.

10. εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυείδ — *Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David. The coming kingdom* represents it as already on the way, and drawing near. It is no longer in a postponed and indefinite future, but in sight. It is represented as the kingdom of David, because the promise of it was made to him as a man after God's own heart, and the king was to be in his line and to succeed to his spirit. The kingdom was to be a reproduction, after a long collapse, of the splendors of the Davidic kingdom.[1]

Omit ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, *in the name of the Lord*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDLU Δ 1, 13, 69, 115, 124, 209, 238, 346, Latt. Egyptt. Pesh.

Ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις — *Hosanna in the highest (places).* τὰ ὕψιστα is a translation of a Heb. word for *heaven.*[2] This addition indicates that Hosanna is not here a mere acclaim, a sort of Hurrah! It is a prayer for God to save them in the highest places, where he dwells.

This entry into Jerusalem, with its accompaniments of shouting multitudes and spontaneous homage, can have only one meaning in our Lord's life. It is his public announcement of himself as the Messiah, or rather his public acceptance of the title that his disciples had been so long anxious to thrust upon him. And yet, after it, his life lapses again into its quiet ways, and he

[1] Messianic prophecy proper starts with the promise of the perpetuity of the kingdom in the Davidic line. 2 Sam. 7^{8-16} Zech. 12^{10} 13. One of the Rabbinical titles of the Messiah was David.

[2] The Heb. word is מְרוֹמִים. Job 16^{19}, Is. 57^{15}, LXX.

becomes once more the teacher and benefactor. And so, the distinct claim to be a king is followed immediately by the revolutionizing of the whole idea of kingship. But then, this is only in accordance with what he has already said to his disciples who wished to occupy the places in the kingdom next to the king. "He who desires to be first, let him be least and servant of all." His teaching and life needed the distinct announcement of his Messianic claim in order that men might understand that this is what is meant by the claim to be *king of men.*

11. Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα, εἰς τὸ ἱερόν — *And he entered into Jerusalem, into the temple.*

Omit ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ before εἰς τὸ ἱερόν Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ Lat. Vet. Memph.

Jesus makes his way immediately, not only into the Holy City, but into the Holy Place, where his claim to lordship over the place can be put to the test.

Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντα, ὀψὲ ἤδη τῆς ὥρας — *And having looked round upon all things, the hour being already late.*

ὀψὲ, instead of ὀψίας, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. ℵ CL Δ.

This look took in those things which were to receive the next morning so sharp attention from him, but as the hour was already so late, he went out to Bethany. This differs distinctly from Mt., who places the cleansing of the temple immediately after the entrance into the city, and mentions the cursing of the fig tree as on the morning after the cleansing. This is the first time that Bethany appears in the Synoptical narrative, but the appearance is of such a kind as to imply a previous history, or rather a previous appearance of the place in the life of our Lord. John gives us the clue to Jesus' freedom of the place in the story of the raising of Lazarus, but at the same time, he places the intimacy further back by calling Lazarus the one whom Jesus loved.

THE BARREN FIG TREE

12–14. *Jesus leaves Bethany the next morning, and on his way to Jerusalem, he sees a fig tree, whose leaves give promise of fruit. But when he comes to it, he finds only leaves. He dooms the tree to perpetual fruitlessness.*

12. Καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον[1] . . . ἐπείνασε[2] — *And on the morrow . . . he became hungry.*

Jesus' leaving Bethany in the morning and coming to Jerusalem indicates his habit during this last week. His place of action during the day was Jerusalem, his place of rest at night was Bethany.

13. καὶ ἰδὼν συκῆν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν[3] — *and having seen a fig tree at a distance.*

Insert ἀπὸ before μακρόθεν Tisch. Treg. WH. RV., and most authorities.

ἔχουσαν φύλλα — *having leaves.* This presence of leaves constituted the false appearance of the tree, as on the fig tree these are the sign of fruit. εἰ ἄρα τι εὑρήσει — (to see) *whether then he will find anything on it.*[4] ἄρα is illative, and means here, "since he saw leaves, whether the fruit that accompanies leaves was there."[5] ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων — *for the season was not that of figs.* This gives the reason why there were no figs, in spite of the presence of leaves. It was about April, whereas the season of figs was not until June for the very early kind, or August for the ordinary crop.

ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων, instead of οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σύκων, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ Memph. Pesh.

14. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῇ — *And answering, he said to it.*

Omit ὁ Ἰησοῦς before εἶπεν Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 1, 33, 91, 124, 238, 346 *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg.

Μηκέτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐκ σοῦ μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι — The position of the words and the double negative make this curse weighty. The reason of it is to be found in the false pretence of leaves without fruit on a tree in which leaves are a sign of fruit. The apparent unreason is in cursing a fig tree for anything. The principle that you must not only judge a person by his acts, but sometimes judge his acts by the person, applies here. The act appears wanton and petulant, but what we know of Jesus warrants us in setting aside this appearance. Jesus was on the eve of spiritual conflict with a nation whose prime and patent fault was hypocrisy or false pretence, and here he finds a tree guilty of the same

---

[1] τῇ ἐπαύριον — this use of ἐπαύριον as a single word is Biblical. Properly, it is ἐπ' αὔριον, which means *on the morrow* by itself. The art. is out of place therefore, much as if we should say, *on the to-morrow.* If anywhere, it belongs between ἐπ and αὔριον. See Lk. 10[35] Acts 4[5].

[2] The aor. denotes the entrance upon the state denoted by the vb. Burton, 41.

[3] μακρόθεν is itself late, and the prep. redundant, as the adv. itself means *from a distance.* Win. 65, 2.

[4] On the mood of indirect questions, see Burton, 341 (*b*), 343.

[5] See Win. 53, 8 *a*.

thing. It gives him his opportunity, without hurting anybody, to sit in judgment on the fault. He does not complete the parable by pointing out the application, but leaves this, as he does his spoken parables, to suggest its own meaning, and so to force men to think. Such acted parables were not without precedent among the Jews. See Hos. 1^{1-3} John 4^{6-11} Mt. 13^{10-15}. And in Jesus' own teaching, the recourse to enigmatical methods that should force men to think, was not uncommon.

CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE

15–18. *On arriving in Jerusalem, Jesus goes to the temple again, and finds the customary traffic in animals for the Passover sacrifices, and in small change for the purposes of this traffic, going on. Jesus drives out the traffickers, and overturns their tables and chairs.*

15. καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας — *and having entered into the temple, he began to cast out those selling and those buying.*[1]

Omit ὁ Ἰησοῦς after εἰσελθὼν Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 1, 33, 91, 124, 238, 346 *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Insert τοὺς before ἀγοράζοντας Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCKLMNU Π.

This buying and selling went on in the Court of the Temple, and the merchandise consisted of the animals, incense, oil, and other things required for sacrifice, the demand for which was very great at the time of the annual feasts. τῶν κολλυβιστῶν — this is a word found in the N.T. only in these accounts of the cleansing of the Temple. The word, like its companion κερματίστης, denotes one who changed money for the convenience of the buyers and sellers, of course for a consideration — a dealer in small coin. It is supposed by some that these money-changers exchanged for the foreign coin brought by the pilgrims the shekel in which alone the Temple tax could be paid. But the words used both denote dealers in small coins, which is more consonant with the above explanation. The doves were the offering of the poor, who were not able to offer sheep and oxen.[2]

16. Καὶ οὐκ ἤφιεν[3] ἵνα τις διενέγκῃ σκεῦος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ — *and would not allow any one to carry a vessel through the temple.*[4]

---

[1] There is no sufficient reason for emphasizing the beginning of the act in this case. It belongs to the Heb. idiom of the writer.

[2] Lev. 5^{7} 12^{6-8} $15^{14.29}$ Num. 6^{10}.

[3] See on 1^{34}, for form ἤφιεν.

[4] On this use of ἵνα with subj., see Win. 44, 8. Burton, 210.

σκεῦος — *vessel.* Used generally for utensils or gear of any kind, even the sails of vessels. The outer Court, and especially the Court of the Gentiles, where this traffic went on, was looked on as a kind of common ground which men might use as a short cut, carrying across it various σκεύη.

17. καὶ ἐδίδασκε, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς — *and he taught and said to them.*

καὶ ἔλεγεν, instead of λέγων, *saying*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 6, 13, 69, 346, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh.

οἶκος προσευχῆς[1] πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν — *a house of prayer for all nations.* The quotation is from Is. 56[7], a passage which predicts the admission of strangers who worship God, as well as Jews, to the privileges of the Temple. The rebuke is specific therefore, denouncing not only the misuse of the Temple, but of that part which made it the seat of a universal worship. It was the Court of the Gentiles which they had thought just good enough for these debased uses. σπήλαιον λῃστῶν — *a cave of robbers*, not *thieves.* These words are quoted from Jer. 7[11]. The context in Jer. shows that the name is given there not because of the desecrating uses to which the Temple was put, but because of the character of those who used it. Their use of the Temple was legitimate, but they themselves defiled it by their character and conduct outside. Here, on the contrary, it is their illegitimate use of the Temple which is condemned. The use of this term *robbers* by our Lord adds an unexpected element to the denunciation of their practice. Evidently trade as such desecrates the Temple, making its precincts and sacrifices the place and occasion of personal gain. It is the incongruous and unhallowed mixture of God and mammon that Jesus elsewhere condemns. But when he calls it *robbery*, it is evident he means more than the condemnation of trade in itself in the Temple precincts. And yet, we have no reason to suppose that there was anything extraordinary in this traffic. Jesus would need only to see the opposition of all actual trade in principle to the Golden Rule, to condemn it in this strong language, when it invaded the courts of the Temple. It is the principle of trade to pursue personal advantage alone, and leave the other man to pursue his interests, in other words, competition, which makes trade robbery.

πεποιήκατε, instead of ἐποιήσατε, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BL Δ.

This was an exercise of Messianic authority on the part of Jesus; but it did not transcend his rule of purely spiritual kingship, since the power that he used was simply that of his personal

[1] προσευχῆς — It is significant of the changes in the language, that this word is not found in the classics, and that the good Greek word εὐχή is found in the N.T. but once.

ascendency. It was an impressive example of the authority of truth and goodness. Men are easily overawed by the indignations of righteousness. We should expect such an access of authority in the action and speech of Jesus after the announcement of his Messianic claim, but the element of force, which is the idea of government, is left out.

18. οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς κ. οἱ γραμματεῖς — *the chief priests and the scribes.* These were the constituted authorities, who had licensed this desecration of the Temple. They sold these rights to the traders, and they resented this invasion of their constituted rights. Together, they constituted the main body of the Sanhedrim.[1] The overthrow of evil everywhere, which was the evident mission of this daring innovator, menaced them.

οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, instead of the reverse order, ℵ ABCDKL ΔΠ Latt. Memph. Pesh. πῶς ἀπολέσωσιν, *how they may destroy,* instead of πῶς ἀπολέσουσιν, *how they shall destroy,* Tisch. Treg. WH. and most sources.

ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ αὐτόν· πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ὄχλος ἐξεπλήσσετο[2] ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ[3] — *for they were afraid of him; for all the multitude was amazed at his teaching.*

πᾶς γάρ, instead of ὅτι πᾶς, *because all,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC Δ 1, 13, 28, 69, 346, Memph.

The power that Jesus had to carry the multitude with him, so that they stood amazed at the strength and authority of his teaching, made the rulers fear him. τῇ διδαχῇ — *his teaching. Doctrine* is a poor translation, first because it omits everything belonging to the manner, and secondly, because it has acquired a technical meaning that does not belong to διδαχή.

THE FIG TREE WITHERED

19–26. *The morning of the third day, as they are passing by, they see the fig tree which Jesus had cursed, withered. Jesus commends faith to them, as able to remove not only trees, but mountains. Mk. introduces here the irrelevant matter of forgiveness as the condition of answer to prayer.*

19. Κ. ὅταν ὀψὲ ἐγένετο — *And whenever it came to be evening.* This may be taken in two ways, either of which involves an irregularity. (1) It may be, *And whenever evening came* (R V.), *every*

[1] See on 8[31]. [2] See Win. 33 *b*, for this use of ἐπί. [3] See on 1[22].

evening; involving the irregularity of the aor. for the impf. Or (2) it may be, *And when it came to be evening,* referring to a single evening, involving the irregularity of ὅταν for ὅτε. The latter use is found in Byzantine writers. See Win. 42[5]. But in judging an irregular style like this, the anomalous use of the aor. seems more easily accountable than that of the more striking ὅταν. Moreover, the translation *whenever* is more accordant with the impf. in the principal clause.

ὅταν, instead of ὅτε, *when,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCKL ΔΠ* 28, 33. ἐξεπορεύοντο, *they would go,* instead of ἐξεπορεύετο, *he would go,* Treg. WH. RV. *marg.* ABKM* ΔΠ 124, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Pesh. Harcl. *marg.*

21. ἣν κατηράσω — *which you cursed.*[1]

22. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἔχετε πιστιν Θεοῦ[2] — *and answering, Jesus says to them, Have faith in God.*

Insert ὁ before Ἰησοῦς Tisch. Treg. WH. and most authorities.

Jesus answers here to the wonder expressed in Peter's statement, pointing out the source of the wonderful thing, and showing how they too may attain the same power. τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ — *this mountain.* Primarily, this would be the Mount of Olives, which was in their sight all the way. Jesus' statement is climacteric. The faith in God by which he has dried up this tree can remove mountains too, and, for that matter, can accomplish all things. But in the language of Jesus, who repudiated all mere thaumaturgic use of miraculous power, *moving a mountain* is not to be taken literally, but stands for any incredible thing, as stupendous as such moving, but not so out of line with the miracles to which Jesus confined himself. It is enough to say that neither Jesus nor his disciples ever removed mountains, except metaphorically.

καὶ μὴ διακριθῇ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ,[3] ἀλλὰ πιστεύῃ[4] ὅτι ὃ λαλεῖ γίνεται, ἔσται αὐτῷ[5] — *and does not doubt in his heart, but believes that what he speaks comes to pass, it will come to him.*

Omit γὰρ, *for,* at the beginning of this v. Tisch. (Treg). WH. RV. ℵ BDN 1, 28, 51, 106, 124, 157, 225, 251, Latt. Pesh. πιστεύῃ, instead of πιστεύσῃ, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ. ὃ, instead of ἃ, before λαλεῖ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BLN Δ 33, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh. λαλεῖ, *speaks,* instead of λέγει, *says,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BLN Δ two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Omit ὃ ἐὰν εἴπῃ, *whatever he says,* after ἔσται αὐτῷ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 1, 28, 209, 346, three *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph.

---

[1] In earlier Greek, καταράομαι takes the dat. Win. 32, 1 *b*, β. Win., however, fails to note the irregularity. [2] Θεοῦ is obj. gen. Win. 30, 1.

[3] διακριθῇ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ — *Doubt* is a Biblical sense of διακρίνομαι, but comes naturally from the proper meaning, *to be divided.* This is a good example of the use of καρδία to denote the seat of the intellect rather than the affections. On the evil of doubt, see Jas. 1[6].

[4] The aor. διακριθῇ and pres. πιστεύῃ are to be discriminated something in this way — *does not entertain a doubt, but holds fast to his faith.*

[5] See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* εἰμί IV. *e.*

24. διὰ τοῦτο — *on this account*, referring to what he has just said of the efficacy of faith. He generalizes from the extreme case of the mountain. πάντα ὅσα προσεύχεσθε κ. αἰτεῖσθε, πιστεύετε ὅτι ἐλάβετε — *all things whatever ye pray and ask for, believe that you received them.* The aor. is a rhetorical exaggeration of the immediateness of the answer: it antedates even the prayer in the mind of the petitioner.

προσεύχεσθε καὶ, instead of ἂν προσευχόμενοι, *pray and ask*, instead of *praying ask*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Pesh. ἐλάβετε, instead of λαμβάνετε, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ Memph.

It is noticeable that here, and in the case of the demoniac following the Transfiguration, Jesus seeks to turn the thought of the disciples to faith, as a matter of dependence on God, and to the absoluteness of the power thus invoked by them. If we add to this the desire to impress on them the reality of prayer as a means of securing for themselves the exercise of that power, we shall have the substance of Jesus' teaching on the subject. The power that we invoke is not an impersonal cause, that grinds out its results with the absoluteness of a machine, but a Person whose limitless power is available for him who fulfils the conditions implied in faith.

25. Καὶ ὅταν στήκετε[1] προσευχόμενοι, ἀφίετε — *And whenever you stand praying, forgive.*

στήκετε, instead of στήκητε, Tisch. Treg. WH. ACDHLM[2] VX 1, 124, etc. The subj. is an apparent emendation. Omit v. 26 Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BLS Δ 2, 27, 63, 64, 121, 157, 258, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. edd.

This injunction to forgive can be joined logically with the injunction about faith in prayer, since the Divine forgiveness of sins, of which it is the condition, is itself the condition of the Divine favor, without which answer to prayer becomes impossible. But it is, notwithstanding, inapposite and diverting here, where the subject is not prayer, but faith in God, prayer being adduced as an instance of the places in which faith is needed. It is found in its proper place in the discourse on prayer, Mt. 6[14] sq. Moreover, it is still further limited here, being placed in connection with the special prayer for forgiveness, and not with prayer in general, which removes it still further from the general subject. This limitation of the Divine forgiveness is not as if God limited himself by the imperfections of our human conduct. But forgiveness is a reciprocal act. In its very nature, it cannot act freely, but is conditioned on the state of mind of the offender. And the

[1] On the use of ὅταν with the ind. see Win. 42, 5; Burton, 309 *c*. On the attitude in prayer, see Mt. 6[5] Lk. 18[11].

unforgiving spirit is specially alien to that state of mind. It shows the offender to be lacking in the proper feeling about sin and forgiveness, which can alone warrant his asking forgiveness. This is an important text in the discussion of justification by faith.

JESUS' AUTHORITY QUESTIONED BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SANHEDRIM

27–33. *On Jesus' return to the city, he comes again to the temple, where the representatives of the Sanhedrim question him as to his authority to cleanse the temple. Jesus answers them with a counter-question, whether John's baptism was human or divine in its origin, which will test their authority to decide such questions. This puts them in a dilemma, as they had discredited John, making it necessary for them either to sacrifice consistency or to put themselves out of favor with the people, who believed in John. They are unable to answer, and so Jesus refuses to recognize their authority to sit in judgment on him, and remains silent.*

27. πρεσβύτεροι — *elders.* The word denotes the other members of the Sanhedrim, outside of the chief priests and scribes. It is the general word for a member of that council. The whole expression means *the chief priests and scribes and other members of the Sanhedrim.*[1]

καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ — *and said to him.*

ἔλεγον, instead of λέγουσιν, *say*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 1, 209, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

28. Ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ. — *By what kind of authority.*[2] It is more specific than simply *what authority.* They knew that Jesus claimed a certain kind of authority, but it seemed to them just the vague and uncertain thing that personal, as distinguished from official authority, always seems to the members of a hierarchy. ταῦτα ποιεῖς; — *do you do these things?* things, such as the cleansing of the temple, which took place only the day before. ἢ τίς σοι τ. ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἔδωκεν, ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῇς;[3] — *or who gave you this authority, to do these things?*

ἤ, instead of καί, *and*, before τίς, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 124, Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

---

[1] Schürer *N. Zg.* II. I. § 23, III.
[2] On the instrumental use of ἐν, see Win. 48, 3 *d.*
[3] On the use of ἵνα with subj., for the inf., see Win. 44, 8. Burton 216 (*a*).

The second question, *who gave thee this authority?* is different in form, but substantially the same. The idea of a divine authority, communicated directly to the man by inward suggestion, and showing its warrant simply in his personal quality, was outside the narrow range of men who recognized only external authority.

29. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐπερωτήσω ὑμᾶς ἕνα λόγον — *And Jesus said to them, I will ask you one question* (*word*, literally).

Omit ἀποκριθείς, *answering*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 33, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh. Omit κἀγώ, *I also*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BCL Δ, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

30. Τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἦν, ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; — *Was the baptism of John from heaven, or from men?* This question of Jesus was not meeting their question with another harder one, as if he were matching his wits against theirs. But the question is on the same line as theirs, and is intended to show whether they have the same standards as he for testing the question of Divine authority. It is as if he had asked, *How do you judge of such things? If Divine authority is communicated externally and through regular channels in your judgment, I have no such credentials. But if it comes inwardly and is attested by its fruits in your opinion, then you are in a condition to judge fairly of my authority.* The case of John is a test of this fitness to judge the matter of Divine authority. His authority came out of the clouds, so to speak, having only an inward, not an external warrant; and his influence was owing to his restoration of the spiritual note in a fossilized, external religion. Worshippers of the external and regular see in this the mark of subjectivity, and self-constituted authority, and reject it, and the hierarchy seek to destroy it, whether in John, or Jesus, or Paul. Recognition of it on the part of the scribes and chief priests would have shown their fitness to judge the claim of Jesus.

31. Καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτούς, λέγοντες — *And they deliberated among themselves, saying.*

διελογίζοντο, instead of ἐλογίζοντο, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ^{ca} BCDGK LM ΔΠ.

Διατί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; — *Why then did you not believe him?* On this rejection of John by the rulers, see Mt. 3^{7} sq. 11^{18} J. 5^{35}.

32. ἀλλὰ εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν λαόν. — *but shall we say, From men? they feared the people.*[1]

Omit ἐὰν, *if*, before εἴπωμεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCL Δ 33.

[1] The structure here is very rugged, and without the excuse, or the capacity for hiding defects that belongs to a long sentence. Having started with a question, the only way to state the conclusion is to include it in the question, *e.g.* Shall we say, *from men, and so bring upon us the dislike of the people?* Instead of which the writer proceeds with a statement in his own words. Win. 63, 11. 2. 6o, 9.

Lk. says, *the people will stone us.*[1] Herod seems to have had the same wholesome fear of John's popularity.[2] ἅπαντες γὰρ εἶχον ὄντως τὸν Ἰωάννην, ὅτι προφήτης ἦν — *for all verily held John to be a prophet.*[3] A prophet is in Greek an interpreter of oracles, in the Biblical language a speaker of Divine oracles, an inspired man. This dilemma of the authorities was owing to the fact that the case cited by Jesus was one in which their verdict did not agree with the popular verdict. The authority of John was approved by the people, and disallowed by them, and the popular feeling was too strong about it for them to defy.

ὄντως ὅτι, instead of ὅτι ὄντως, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ[c] BCL 13, 69, 346. Δ ὄντως ὡς προφήτην.

33. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς, Οὐδὲ[4] ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ — *And Jesus says to them, Neither do I tell you by what authority I do these things.*

Omit ἀποκριθεὶς, *answering,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCLN ΓΔ 33, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt.

We must remember just what is involved in this refusal. These were the constituted authorities in both civil and religious matters, and Jesus' refusal to submit his claim to them is a denial of their authority. He refuses because they have confessed their inability to judge a precisely similar case, which involved an abdication of their authority. It is well to carry this in mind in considering Jesus' silence at his trial.

PARABLE OF THE VINEYARD

12. 1–12. *Jesus, having denied the authority of the rulers, proceeds to show them in a parable the unfaithfulness to their trust which has lost for them their authority. The story is that of a vineyard let out on shares to cultivators, who maltreat the servants sent by the owner to collect his share, and finally kill his son, and whom the owner destroys, and turns over the vineyard to others. He also cites the proverb of the stone rejected by the builders which becomes the corner stone. The rulers see that the parable is aimed at them, but fear of the multitude holds them in check for the present.*

---

[1] Lk. 20[6]. [2] Mt. 14[5].

[3] On the attraction of Ἰωάννην from the subordinate to the principal clause, see Win. 66, 5 *a*.

[4] On the use of οὐδέ without a preceding negative, see Win. 55, 6, 2.

1. Καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν — *And he began to say to them in parables.*

λαλεῖν, instead of λέγειν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BGL Δ 1, 13, 69, 118, 124, 346, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt. Pesh. Harcl. *marg.*

αὐτοῖς evidently refers to the representatives of the Sanhedrim, the parable being a continuation of Jesus' conversation with them.[1] Mt. says that the chief priests and the Pharisees knew that the parable was directed at them; but he also represents Jesus as saying that the kingdom is to be taken from them, and given to a *nation* producing its fruits.[2] But this confusion of rulers and people must not obscure the plain fact that in Mt. the parable is against the rulers. Lk. says that the parable was spoken to the people, but that the rulers knew that it was spoken against them, two things that are not at all inconsistent.[3] ἐν παραβολαῖς — *in parables.* This use of the plural indicates that Mk. had other parables in mind, though he gives only one. Mt. gives three, all bearing on the same general subject. Mk. states the general fact of teaching in parables, and selects one from the rest. This is one of the facts which seem to indicate that Mk. had the same collection of the teachings of Jesus as Mt. and Lk. to draw upon, *viz.* the Logia. Ἀμπελῶνα ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν — *A man planted a vineyard.* This figure of the vineyard is taken from Is. $5^{1.2}$. Even the details are reproduced. In the LXX. we find φραγμὸν περιέθηκα . . . ᾠκοδόμησα πύργον . . . προλήνιον ὤρυξα.

φραγμόν — is any kind of fence, or wall, that separates lands from each other. ὑπολήνιον — is the receptacle for the juice of the grapes, placed under the ληνός, or winepress, in which the grapes were trodden.[4] πύργον — is the tower from which the watchman overlooked the vineyard. It was also used as a lodge for the keeper of the vineyard. γεωργοῖς — means *tillers* or *cultivators.* ἐξέδετο[5] — ἀπεδήμησε — *went abroad. Far country,* AV. is an exaggeration.

ἐξέδετο, instead of -δοτο, Tisch. WH. ℵ AB* CKL.

2. τῷ καιρῷ — *at the season, at the proper time.* As this vineyard was equipped with a winepress, this would not be at the grape harvest, but any time following the winemaking. λάβῃ ἀπὸ τ. καρπῶν — The vineyard was let out on shares, the owner receiving a certain part of the product.

τῶν καρπῶν, instead of τοῦ καρποῦ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCLN Δ 33, 433, three *mss.* Lat. Vet. Pesh.

---

[1] See 11^{28} 12^{12}. [2] Mt. $21^{43.45}$. [3] Lk. $20^{9.19}$.
[4] AV. *wine-fat. Fat* is an old English word for *vat.* RV., *pit for the winepress.*
[5] This vb. is common in Grk., but occurs in N.T. only in this parable in the Synoptics. The irregular form, ἐξέδετο for -δοτο, is also repeated.

3. Καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἔδειραν[1] — *And they took (him), and beat him.*

καί, instead of οἱ δέ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 33, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

4. κἀκεῖνον ἐκεφαλίωσαν[2] καὶ ἠτίμασαν — *and that one they beat about the head, and insulted.*

Omit λιθοβολήσαντες, *having stoned,* before ἐκεφαλίωσαν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 1, 28, 33, 91, 118, 299, Latt. Egyptt. ἐκεφαλίωσαν, instead of -αίωσαν, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ BL. ἠτίμασαν, instead of ἀπέστειλαν ἠτιμωμένον, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. ℵ BL 33, Latt. Egyptt. ἠτίμησαν Treg. RV. D.

5. Καὶ ἄλλον ἀπέστειλε — *And he sent another.*

Omit πάλιν, *again,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 33, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt. οὓς before μὲν instead of τοὺς, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BDL Δ 1, 33, and before δὲ same except D.

καὶ πολλοὺς ἄλλους, οὓς μὲν δέροντες, οὓς δὲ ἀποκτέννοντες — *and many others (they maltreated), beating some, and killing some.* The verb to be supplied here has to be taken from the general statement of the treatment of the messengers by the cultivators of the vineyard, as the participles must agree with οἱ γεωργοί understood, and denote the several kinds of maltreatment.

There is no doubt that Jesus has in mind here the treatment of the prophets by the rulers and people, of which there is frequent mention by the O.T. writers.[3] The parable is thus not an analogy, but an allegory.

6. Ἔτι ἕνα εἶχεν, υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἀπέστειλε αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτούς — *Still (after losing all these), he had one (other to send), a beloved son: he sent him last to them.* ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου — *they will respect my Son.*[4] The Son in the allegory represents Jesus himself. The nation, which had rejected God's servants, the prophets, will finally put to death the Son himself, the Messianic King.

εἶχεν υἱὸν, instead of υἱὸν ἔχων, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC[2] L Δ 33, Harcl. (Pesh.). Omit αὐτοῦ *his* after ἀγαπητόν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt. Vulg. Pesh. Omit καὶ after ἀπέστειλε Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BLX[2] Δ 13, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Pesh.

---

[1] ἔδειραν means *they flayed him,* literally. This modified meaning, *they beat him,* does not belong to the best usage, though it is found sometimes from Aristophanes down.

[2] ἐκεφαλίωσαν is evidently a corrupt form of ἐκεφαλαίωσαν, and that word is treated as if it came from κεφαλή, instead of κεφάλαιον. Properly, it means *to bring under heads, to summarize,* but here, apparently, *to wound in the head.* It occurs only here in the N.T. Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

[3] 2 Chr. 36[15. 16] Neh. 9[26] Jer. 25[3-7].

[4] On the use of the acc., instead of the regular dat., see Win. 32, 1 *b*, *a*.

8. καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος[1] — *and threw him out of the vineyard.* They put this indignity on his body, as this followed the killing.

Insert αὐτον after ἐξέβαλον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDMN ΓΠ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Syrr.

9. Τί ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος; — *What will the master of the vineyard do?*

Omit οὖν, *then*, after τί, Tisch. WH. BL one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀπολέσει — *he will come and destroy.* According to Mt. 21[41], Jesus drew this answer from the chief priests and scribes themselves.

10. Οὐδὲ[2] τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε; — *And did you not read this Scripture?*[3]

In the original, this stone, rejected by the builders, but become the head of the corner, is Israel itself, rejected by the nations, defeated and exiled, but destined by God for the chief place among them all. The Psalm was sung probably after the return from the exile, when everything indicates that the hopes of the nation were raised to the highest pitch; when it seemed as if God was taking the first step towards the aggrandizement of the chosen people.

ἐγενήθη εἰς[4] κεφαλὴν γωνίας[5] — *became the head of the corner,* denoting the corner stone, which binds together the two sides of the building, and so becomes architecturally the most important stone in the structure. The story that there was a stone in the building of the Temple which had such a history, is unnecessary to account for so natural a metaphor, and evidently arose from the metaphorical use here.

11. παρὰ κυρίου ἐγενέτο αὕτη — *this (corner stone) came from the Lord.* αὕτη evidently refers to κεφαλὴν γωνίας. In the original, the feminine is used, but obviously according to Hebrew usage, for the neuter, referring to the event itself as ordered by Jehovah. But the use of the fem. to translate this Heb. fem. is quite without precedent in the N.T., and is unnecessary here, as we have a grammatical reference to the fem. κεφαλήν. The meaning is "*This corner stone came from the Lord, and is wonderful in our eyes.*"

This use of the passage from the Ps. by Jesus is a very good illustration of the Messianic application of O.T. writings. There

---

[1] On this use of the adv. as a prep., see Win. 54, 6.
[2] On the meaning of οὐδέ without a preceding negative, see Win. 55, 6, 2.
[3] The passage is Ps. 118[22. 23].
[4] A translation of the Heb. הָיָה לְ. Win. 29, 3 *a*.
[5] A translation of the Heb. רֹאשׁ פִּנָּה.

can be no doubt from the context that the historical reference is to the people of Israel. But what is said of Israel was a common and proverbial happening, that might come true of any one whose being contained within itself the promise of better things than belonged to his start in life, and is especially true of the truly religious person or nation. Cf. the parable of the mustard seed, and Is. 53. As a principle, therefore, it would apply especially to the Messiah. The question, whether Jesus used the passage according to a common view of his time as directly Messianic, or only as a statement of this principle, depends on our view of him. It seems to be a rational inference, from what we know of Jesus, that he had derived his idea of the Messianic office partly from the O.T., and that that idea is possible only with a rational treatment of the O.T., while the current view of his time would be derived from a literalistic and irrational treatment of it. And in general, we know that he so far transcended his age as to take a spiritual view of the O.T., and there is no reason to suppose that this would not include the rational treatment of a passage like this. That is, Jesus would see in it not a direct reference to himself, but only the statement of a principle applicable to himself.

12. ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπε—*for they knew that he spoke the parable against them.* This is the reason for their seeking to take him, not for their fear of the people. But as the latter statement is the last made, Meyer makes the subject of ἔγνωσαν to be the ὄχλος just mentioned, in which case this would be a reason for their fear of the people. But there is a total absence of anything to indicate such a change of subject in ἔγνωσαν, and this is a greater difficulty than the one which Meyer seeks to remove. Meyer's view also deprives the statement of its appositeness.[1]

The statement that they knew that Jesus spoke this parable against them is conclusive in regard to the meaning of it, and falls in with the parable itself, and with its context, placed as it is in the midst of a controversy between himself and the authorities. It is directed against the Jewish hierarchy, pointing out their sin in rejecting one after another of the prophets, culminating in their murder of the Messiah himself, and predicting their fate in consequence. But Mt., while he makes the same statement, v.[45],

[1] See Win. 61, 7 *b*.

about the reference of the parable, makes Jesus say, v.[43], that the kingdom shall be taken from them, and given to a *nation* producing its fruits. This would seem to make the parable apply to the nation, and not to the hierarchy. Everything else, however, in Mt., as in Mk. and Lk., points to the hierarchy. It seems probable that Mt. therefore, in v.[43], adds to the parable, *post eventum*, that the nation was to share the fate of its rulers, and be superseded in their theocratic position by another (Gentile) nation. It plainly does not belong here, as the effect would be to bring rulers and people together against Jesus, whereas the statement is repeatedly made that, so far, it is Jesus and the people against the rulers.

THE QUESTION OF PAYING TRIBUTE TO ROME

13–17. *Jesus is approached by Pharisees and Herodians with the question whether it is authorized under the theocracy to pay tribute to the Roman emperor, hoping to draw from him an answer, compromising him either with the Roman government or with the people. Jesus answers by pointing to the image and inscription of the emperor on the coin as a proof of their obligation to him, and bids them pay to Cæsar what belongs to him, and to God what belongs to him.*

13. Φαρισαίων κ. τ. Ἡρωδιάνων — These emissaries were chosen, because they occupied different sides of the question proposed to him. The Pharisees owed their popularity partly to their intense nationality and their hatred of foreign rule. The Herodians, on the other hand, were adherents of the Herods, who owed what power they possessed to the Roman government. Neither party, however, took an extreme position. The Pharisees are not to be confounded with the Zealots; they submitted to the inevitable. Nor is it to be supposed that the Herods had any particular love for the government that had helped them to power, to be sure, but had taken advantage of their weakness to make themselves supreme, and the Herods only their tributaries. Still, as to the question of the paying of tribute, with all the corollaries, they would be divided, and Jesus must offend one, or the other, by his answer. ἀγρεύσωσι λόγῳ — *they may catch him with a word.* The word is to be not his own, but their question, artfully contrived to

entangle him. The figure is that of the hunter with his net or snare.[1]

14. Καὶ ἐλθόντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ — *and coming, they say to him.*

καὶ instead of οἱ δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 33, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt.

This address of his artful enemies is well described in the ἀγρεύσωσι. The question which they have to propose is one bristling with dangers, *but then*, they tell him, *that is just what you do not care for. You have a sole regard for the truth, not for consequences nor persons.* Διδάσκαλε — *Teacher.* They said *Rabbi.* ἀληθὴς — *true, i.e. truthful.* καὶ οὐ μέλει σοι περὶ οὐδενός — *and carest not for any one.* This shows the particular kind of regard for the truth which they had in mind. It was one which did not stand in fear of man, would not be hindered by awe of kings, not even of the Roman emperor. οὐ γὰρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον — *for thou dost not look at the person of men;* dost not pay attention to those things which belong to outward condition, such as rank or wealth. This is a widening of the meaning of πρόσωπον, belonging to the Heb. τὴν ὁδὸν τ. Θεοῦ — *the way of God*, the course prescribed for men by God.[2] ἔξεστι κῆνσον[3] Καίσαρι[4] δοῦναι ἢ οὐ; — *Is it right to give tribute to Cæsar or not?* This question took on a special form among the Jews, who claimed to be the members of a theocracy, so that paying tribute to a foreigner would seem like disloyalty to the Divine government. The question of policy, or necessity, is kept in the background, and the problem is confined to the rightfulness of paying such tribute. ἢ οὔ — ἢ μή.[5]

15. Ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς (ἰδὼν) αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν — *But he, knowing (seeing) their dissimulation.*

ἰδὼν, instead of εἰδὼς, Tisch. ℵ* D 13, 28, 69, 346, *mss.* Lat. Vet.

ὑπόκρισιν — this word has been transliterated into our word *hyprocrisy* at a great loss of picturesqueness and force. It means *acting*, from which the transition to the meaning *dissimulation* is easy. What Jesus knew about these men was, that they were playing a part in their compliments, and their request for advice. They were acting the part of inquirers; really, they were plotters. They were trying to compromise him either with the government or the people. In his trial before Pilate we see what use they in-

---

[1] Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

[2] This use of ὁδός is familiar in the Heb. but uncommon, though not unknown, in the Greek.

[3] κῆνσον is the Latin word census, meaning a registration of persons and property on which taxation is based. In the N.T., it denotes the tax itself.

[4] Καίσαρι — there is a mixture here of the personal and the titular use of this name. As a title of the Roman emperors, it takes the article properly.

[5] οὐ is used in the first question, because it is one of objective fact. μὴ in the second, because it is a question of proposed action, subjective. Win. 55, 1 *a.*

tended to make of one of the two answers to which they thought he was reduced. Lk. 23[2]. τί με πειράζετε; — *why do you try me?* Our word *tempt*, in the sense of *solicit to evil*, is out of place here.[1] What they were doing was to put him to the test maliciously. δηνάριον — *a shilling*.[2]

The point of Jesus' reply is, that the very coin in which the tribute is paid bears on its face the proof not only of their subjection to the foreign government, but of their obligation to it. Coinage is a privilege claimed by government, but it is one of the things in which the government most clearly represents the interest of the governed. Tribute becomes in this way, not an extortion, or exaction, but a return for service rendered.

17. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τὰ Καίσαρος ἀπόδοτε Καίσαρι — *And Jesus said to them, The things belonging to Cæsar pay to Cæsar.*

Ὁ δὲ, instead of Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 33, Theb.

ἀπόδοτε — *pay*. They had said, δοῦναι, *give*. Jesus makes it a matter of payment. τὰ Καίσαρος — *the things of Cæsar*. Strictly speaking, this means, *Pay to the Roman government Roman coin.* They themselves were tacitly recognizing the government, and availing themselves of their privileges under it by using its coin, and that left them no pretext for denying its rights. The coin represents simply the right of the government. The image and superscription on it show the government maintaining to the people the position not only of power, but of rights. It is in this, as in all things, the defender of rights. This gives to the government itself rights, of which tribute is representative. But our Lord's reply is entirely characteristic. It suggests, rather than amplifies or explains. κ. τὰ τ. Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ — *and the things belonging to God to God.* The way in which they had presented the question implied that there was a conflict between the claims of the earthly and heavenly governments. But Jesus shows them as each having claims. Cæsar has claims, and also God; pay both. The difficulty with the Jews, and with all bodies claiming to represent God, is that they are zealous for him in a partisan way, jealous of his prerogatives, dignities, and the like, and make that do service for a real loyalty to him. These men were eager to assert God's claim against a foreign king. Jesus was anxious that they should recognize his real claims, those that involved no real conflict, but belonged in the wider sphere of common duties. κ. ἐξεθαύμαζον — *and they wondered.* Well they might. Jesus

[1] See RV. American readings. Classes of Passages.

[2] *Penny*, EV. is specially misleading, since the denarius had not only the nominal value of our shilling, but a far greater relative value, as it was a day's wages. The denarius was a Roman coin, equivalent to ten asses, a ten as piece.

had not only parried their attack, which was a small matter, but had thrown light on a very difficult question. The conflict of duties is one of the perplexities of life, and the question of the relation of the Christian to civil government is often one of the most trying forms of the general problem. Jesus' answer is practically, *Do not try to make one duty exclude another, but fulfil one so as to consist with all the rest.* As far as the special matter is concerned, it recognizes the right of civil government, the obligation of those who live under a theocracy to be subject to civil authority, an obligation not abrogated, but enforced by their duty to God; that the Divine obedience does not exclude, but include other obediences; and finally, that human government, as included thus within the Divine scheme of things, is among the economies to be conformed to its perfect idea.

ἐξεθαύμαζον, instead of ἐθαύμασαν, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ B.

JESUS ANSWERS THE PUZZLE OF THE SADDUCEES ABOUT THE RESURRECTION

18–27. *The next attack on Jesus comes from another source. The Sadducees, the priestly class, being disbelievers in the resurrection, bring to him what is apparently their standing objection, of a woman having seven husbands here, and ask him whose wife she will be in the resurrection. Jesus' answer is in two parts: first, that there is no marriage in the resurrection state; and secondly, that when God calls himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, their continued life is implied. Anything else is inconsistent with that relation.*

18. Σαδδουκαῖοι — The word denotes the sect as Zadokites. There is little doubt that the word itself comes from this proper name Zadok, and not from צַדִּיק, meaning *righteous*. Probably, the particular Zadok meant is the priest who distinguished himself by his fidelity in the time of David. 2 Sam. 15^{24} sq., 1 K. 1^{32} sq. After the return from the exile, among the different families constituting the priesthood, the sons of Zadok seem to have occupied the chief place. They were the aristocracy of the priesthood, and Ezekiel assigns them exclusive rights to its functions. Ez. 40^{46} 43^{19} 44^{15} 48^{11}. The Sadducees, that is to say, were the party of the priests, and especially of the priestly aristocracy. As a school of opinion, they were characterized by the denial of the

authority of tradition, maintaining the sole authority of the written Scriptures. As corollaries of this, they denied the resurrection, and the existence of angels or spirits.[1] καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν, λέγοντες — *and they questioned him, saying.*

ἐπηρώτων, instead of ἐπηρώτησαν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 33, Latt. Pesh. Memph.

19. καὶ μὴ ἀφῇ τέκνον, ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα — *and leave no child, that his brother take the woman.*

τέκνον, instead of τέκνα, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ^{ca} BL Δ 1, 18, 241, 299, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Omit αὐτοῦ after τὴν γυναῖκα, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCL Δ 1, 61, 209, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

This quotation is from Deut. 25$^{5.6}$. It is introduced in order to show that the law itself provides for these successive marriages, thus expressly legalizing these successive relations, which the resurrection would make simultaneous. Their question is, therefore, whether the same Scriptures teach this, and the resurrection, which is inconsistent with it. The quotation does not attempt to reproduce the language.

21. μὴ καταλιπὼν σπέρμα[2] — *not having left seed.*

μὴ καταλιπὼν, instead of καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἀφῆκε, *and neither did he leave,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL 33, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt.

22. καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ οὐκ ἀφῆκαν σπέρμα — *and the seven left no seed.*

Omit ἔλαβον αὐτὴν . . . καὶ before οὐκ ἀφῆκαν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ* 28, 33, Memph.

This childlessness is specified as the chief element in the indeterminateness of the question, since if either of them had had children, that might have decided the question to whom the woman belonged.

ἔσχατον πάντων[3] καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν — *last of all the woman died also.*

ἔσχατον, instead of ἐσχάτη, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCGHKL ΔΠ 1, 13, 28, 33, 69, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt. Pesh.

23. ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή; — *In the resurrection, whose wife shall she be of them?* This was probably the standing puzzle of the Sadducees, in which they sought to discredit the resurrection by reducing it to an absurdity.

Omit οὖν, *therefore,* before ἀναστάσει, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* EF HLSUVX ΓΠ two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Omit ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν, *whenever they arise.* Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 28, 33, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt. Pesh.

---

[1] See Schürer, II. 2, 26, II.

[2] μὴ is used here, instead of οὐ, because the denial is in some way subjective. μὴ gives it something the tone of "so the story goes."

[3] ἔσχατον is here an adv. and denotes the last of a series of events, and its conjunction with πάντων denoting persons is therefore incongruous. Hence the substitution of ἐσχάτη by some copyist. Cf. 1 Cor. 15^{8}.

24. Ἔφη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς, μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ; *Jesus said to them, Is it not on this account that you err, because you know not the Scriptures, nor the power of God?* διὰ τοῦτο points forward to the μὴ εἰδότες,[1] the part. being used causally. What follows in v.[25. 26], develops these two defects in their consideration of the matter. Their ignorance of the power of God is taken up first, in v.[25].

Ἔφη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, instead of Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 33, Memph. Pesh.

25. This verse contains Jesus' statement of the power of God in the resurrection. He has power not only to raise, but so to change the body, that marriage ceases to be one of its functions. It was because they were ignorant of this, that the Sadducees thought their case of seven husbands would be an argument against the resurrection.

ὅταν . . . ἀναστῶσιν — *whenever they arise.* ὅταν leaves the time of the resurrection indefinite. γαμίζονται — denotes the act of the father in bestowing his daughter in marriage.[2] ὡς ἄγγελοι — the angels come as a race, not from procreation, but directly from creation. The power of God appears in this, in the transformation and clarifying of the resurrection body, so that marriage is not a part of the future state.

γαμίζονται, instead of γαμίσκονται, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCDGLU Δ 1, 124, 209. Omit οἱ after ἄγγελοι, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ CDFKLMU ΔΠ Memph. Harcl.

26. This verse shows their ignorance of the Scriptures, which speaks of God as the God of their ancestors, language which is inconsistent with their mortality.

ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ[3] Μωϋσέως, ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου[4] — *in the book of Moses, at the place concerning the bush.*

τοῦ, instead of τῆς, before βάτου, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ ABCLX ΓΔΠ. πῶς, instead of ὡς, before εἶπεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCLU Δ 108, 131. Omit ὁ, *the*, before Θεὸς Ἰσαάκ, and Θεὸς Ἰακώβ, Treg. WH. RV. BD, two passages in Origen.

27. Οὐκ ἔστιν Θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων — Without the art., Θεὸς becomes the pred., not the subj., and νεκρῶν is also anarthrous, so that it reads, *He is not a God of dead men, but of living.*

---

[1] μὴ is the negative used, because the statement is made by Jesus as a conjecture, of which he asks their opinion.

[2] See 1 Cor. 7[38]. γαμίζονται is a Biblical word.

[3] βίβλος is originally the name of the papyrus plant, from which paper was made, and then a book or scroll. The quotation is from Ex. 3[6].

[4] The use of ἐπὶ is analogous to that with the gen. of persons or things to locate an event by its connection with some person or thing; *at the passage which tells about the bush.* Win. 47, *g*, *d*.

As this is commonly explained, it is made to hinge on the use of the present, instead of the past. The statement is, he *is* their God, not he *was;* and hence, they are still living. But this is a *non sequitur*, since it is a common expression in regard to both dead and living, and would be taken in the same sense, or used in the same sense, by either Pharisees or Sadducees. But it follows from the nature of God that, when he calls himself the God of any people, certain things are implied in the statement about these people, *e.g.* that they are righteous, not sinners; blessed, not wretched; and here living, not dead. That is, immortality may be inferred from the nature of God himself in the case of those whom he calls his. But Jesus applies it to the resurrection of the dead generally, and not simply of the righteous dead. What the Sadducees denied was the possibility of the resurrection on materialistic grounds; at the basis of their denial of the resurrection was the other denial of spiritual being.[1] But Jesus proves the possibility of the resurrection by examples.[2] Notice that Jesus does not reveal the fact of the resurrection, but argues it from acknowledged premises. Given, he says, the fact of God, and the resurrection follows. He recognizes the rational ground of immortality. And what is of more importance, he recognizes the validity of our intuition about God. We can say that certain things may be assumed about him on first principles.

Omit ὁ before Θεὸς, Treg. WH. RV. BDKLM *marg.* ΔΠ. Omit Θεὸς before ζώντων, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDFKLM *marg.* UX ΔΠ Latt. Egypt. Pesh.

πολὺ πλανᾶσθε — *you make a great mistake.* This concise statement at the close makes an abrupt, but for that reason, forcible ending of the conversation.

Omit ὑμεῖς οὖν, *you therefore*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

A SCRIBE QUESTIONS JESUS CONCERNING THE FIRST COMMANDMENT

28–34. *A Scribe, apparently without the usual prejudices of his class, and impressed by his answer to the Sadducees,*

[1] See Acts 23^{8}.
[2] Compare Paul's proof of the resurrection by the case of Jesus. 1 Cor. 15^{12} sqq.

approaches Jesus with an honest question as to the first of the commandments of the Law. Jesus answers with the quotation from Deut. used at the beginning of morning and evening prayer, affirming the unity of God, and the consequent duty of loving him with an undivided heart. He adds a second command from Lev., bidding the people of God to love their neighbors as themselves. The Scribe assents to this, and adds that obedience to this law of love is a greater thing than all sacrifices. Whereupon, Jesus assures him that he is not far from the kingdom of God. But his enemies are evidently satisfied — they do not dare to question him further.

Judging from the fact, that he was led to put this question by seeing how well Jesus had answered the Sadducees, and from his commendation of our Lord's reply to himself, as also from our Lord's commendation of his answer, it seems probable that the Scribe did not ask this question in a captious spirit. He thought, *Here is possibly an opportunity to get an answer to our standing question, about the first commandment.* Mt. states the matter differently, making him one of a group of Pharisees, who gathered about Jesus with the usual purpose of testing him. He also omits the mutual commendation of Jesus and the Scribe.[1] Lk. puts this scene at the beginning of Jesus' ministry in Southern Palestine. He coincides with Mt. in regard to the purpose of the question, saying that the lawyer ἀνέστη ἐκπειράζων.[2]

28. ἰδὼν (εἰδὼς) ὅτι καλῶς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν, Ποία ἐστὶ ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων[3] — *seeing* (*knowing*) *that he answered them well, asked him, What* (*sort of*) *commandment is first of all?*

ἰδὼν, instead of εἰδὼς, Tisch. Treg. ℵ* CDL 1, 13, 28, 69, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων, instead of πρώτη πασῶν τῶν ἐντολῶν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCLU Δ 33, 108, 127, 131, Memph. Syrr.

ποία asks about the quality of command, as if the scribe had in mind the different classes of laws. This is indicated also by his reply, v.[33].

---

[1] Mt. 22[34-40]. [2] Lk. 10[25-37].

[3] On the gender of πάντων, see Win. 27, 6. On this use of πάντων with superlative, the only case in N.T., see Win. 36, note.

29. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὅτι πρώτη ἐστίν — *Jesus answered, The first is.*

Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, instead of Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίθη, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33, Memph. Pesh. Omit αὐτῷ, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. on same authority. ἐστίν, instead of πασῶν τῶν ἐντολῶν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ Memph.

Ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, Κύριος εἷς ἐστί — *Hear, O Israel, The Lord our God, the Lord is one.*[1] These words, calling the attention of Israel to the oneness of Jehovah, were used at the beginning of morning and evening prayer in the temple, as a call to worship. Κύριος, *Lord,* is the translation of the Heb. Yahweh, and it is probable therefore that the second Κύριος is subject instead of predicate.[2] This unity has for its conclusion, that worship is not to be divided among several deities, but concentrated on one.

30. ἀγαπήσεις — *thou shalt love.* Love is the duty of man toward God, and this is in itself a revelation of the nature of God. It is only one who loves who demands love, and only one in whom love is supreme demands love as the supreme duty. He requires of men what is consonant with his own being. ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας — *from all the heart.* The preposition denotes the source of the love. It is to be from all the heart on the same principle of the unity of God. Being one, he requires an undivided love. This is added to the Sept. statement, which includes only the διανοίας, ψυχῆς, and ἰσχύος. The Heb. includes the καρδίας, but omits διανοίας. καρδία is the general word for the inner man; ψυχή is the soul, the life-principle, διανοία is the mind, and ἰσχύς is the spiritual strength. There is no attempt at classification, or exactness of statement, but simply to express in a strong way the whole being.

Omit αὕτη πρώτη ἐντολή, *this is the first commandment,* Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BEL Δ Egyptt.

31. Δευτέρα αὕτη — *The second is this.*

Omit Καὶ, *And,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Omit ὁμοία, *like,* Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ Egyptt.

The Scribe did not ask for the second commandment, but the statement is incomplete without it. Our Lord wished to show that this first commandment did not stand at the head of a long list of heterogeneous commands, among which it was simply *primus inter pares,* but that it was one of two homogeneous commands, which exhausted the idea of righteousness. This second commandment does not stand in the O.T. in the commanding position of the first, but is brought in only incidentally in Lev.

---

[1] Deut. 6[4. 5]. This is quoted just as it stands in the Sept.
[2] See Deut. 6[4], RV. *marg.*

19^{18}, where, moreover, *neighbor* is evidently restricted to a brother Jew. Jesus puts it in a commanding position, and widens the meaning of *neighbor* to *fellowman*. ὡς σεαυτόν — the degree of the love to God is expressed by "from all thy heart"; the degree of human love is "as thyself." The love of God includes in itself all other affections, but this love of the neighbor has over against it a love of self, with which Jesus allows it to divide the man. This self-love is already there, monopolizing the man, and the command is to subordinate it to the love of God, and to coördinate it with the love of man.

32. καλῶς, διδάσκαλε· ἐπ' ἀληθείας εἶπες, ὅτι εἷς ἐστί — *Well, teacher! you said truly that he is one.* AV. *Well, Master; thou didst speak the truth; for*, etc. This is not wrong, but what follows ὅτι is so nearly what Jesus said, that it seems more natural to make it a repetition of that, than a reason for the scribe's approval of it. RV. *Of a truth, Master, thou hast well said, that*, etc. The distribution of the words and of emphasis is against this. It would read ἐπ' ἀληθείας καλῶς εἶπες.

Omit Θεός, *God*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABKLMSUX ΓΔΠ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. many *mss.* Vulg. Pesh.

οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ — *there is no other but he.* This addition to Jesus' words is taken by the Scribe from Deut. $4^{35.\,39}$. His enumeration of the parts of man entering into the love of God differs again from that of Jesus. The following table shows them all together.

Heb.	καρδία, ψυχή, ἰσχύς.
Sept.	διανοία, ψυχή, ἰσχύς.
Jesus.	καρδία, ψυχή, διανοία, ἰσχύς.
Scribe.	καρδία, σύνεσις, ἰσχύς.

But of course, this is a matter of no importance, the two latter representing only the *oratio variata* of the writer.

33. Omit καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς, *and from all the soul*, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 1, 118, 209, 299, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. περισσότερον, instead of πλεῖον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ 33. Omit τῶν before θυσιῶν, Treg. WH. ABDX ΓΠ.

περισσότερον — *a more eminent thing.* The positive expresses the idea of eminence, of surpassing other things, and the comparative denotes a higher degree of this quality. ὁλοκαυτωμάτων[1] — *whole burnt offerings.*[2] These words of the Scribe are an addition to what Jesus says about the superiority of these two commands. Jesus had compared them simply with other laws. The Scribe compares them specially with the laws of sacrifice, after the manner of the prophets.

---

[1] The classical Greek has the verb ὁλοκαυτόω, *to burn whole*, but this word is confined to the Bible and to Philo. [2] See Ps. 40^{6} 51^{16} $50^{8\text{-}15}$ Is. 1^{11} Hos. 5^{6}.

34. νουνεχῶς — *intelligently.*[1] οὐ μακρὰν εἶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τ. Θεοῦ — *You are not far from the kingdom of God.* The evident enthusiasm with which the Scribe received the statement of Jesus, and his ability to enter into the spirit of it so as to develop it in his own way, showed that he himself could not be far from the kingdom, with whose law he has shown himself to be in sympathy. To be friendly to its ideas, and sympathetic with its spirit, was the next thing to actual submission to it. οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι — *no one dared to question him further.* The question of the Scribe was friendly, but the whole series of questions to which it belonged was far from friendly; it was captious and hostile, having for its object to destroy the authority of Jesus by showing that he was no more than any other teacher when he came to face the real puzzles of the learned men. But Jesus had shown in his answers no mere mastery of the usual weapons of debate, but a grasp of the principles involved in each case, so that the purpose of his enemies was foiled, and his authority stood stronger than ever. It was no use to ask him questions therefore, which only recoiled on the questioners.

JESUS' QUESTION, HOW THE MESSIAH CAN BE BOTH SON AND LORD OF DAVID

35–37. *Jesus now raises a question himself. Their questions have been really a challenge of his Messianic claim. His question is a criticism of their Messianic idea. They call the Messiah Son of David, and Jesus asks how the exalted language of the Psalm in which David calls him Lord can be applied to one who is only David's son.*

35. ἀποκριθεὶς — Answering their questions now by propounding one in his turn. πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς; — *How do the Scribes say . . . ?* According to the statement of Mt., he asked the Scribes, *What do you think about the Messiah? whose son is he?* And when they answered *David's,* then he raises his difficulty. This simply emphasizes what is stated also in our account, that this title is treated by him as Rabbinical rather than Scriptural.

This is not a conundrum, a Scriptural puzzle, but a criticism of the Messianic teaching of the Rabbis. By emphasizing his descent from David as the essential thing about him, they were in danger of passing over the really important matter, which made him not

[1] This word does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.

so much David's son, but his Lord. He felt that the title, Son of David, into which the Scribes compressed their conception of the Messianic position, misrepresented by its narrowness the prophetic statement of the Messianic kingdom, and involved in itself all the errors of current Jewish Messianism. And he was conscious himself of a greatness that could not be ascribed to his descent from David, but was the result only of his unique relation to God. Hence his question, which does not intend to match their riddles with another, but is intended to expose the insufficiency of the Messianic idea taught by the Rabbis. For this purpose he selects a passage from Ps. 110, which was currently ascribed to David and was classed as Messianic. In this Psalm, so interpreted, David is made to address the Messianic king as his Lord. And the argument is made to hinge on this address — *How can David call him Lord, when he is David's son?* Right here, then, we have the gravest difficulty to be encountered anywhere in regard to the N.T. acceptance of the traditional view of the O.T. For criticism rejects the Davidic authorship of this Psalm. It does not allege plain anachronisms, as in many Psalms, *e.g.* the mention of the temple, or of the destruction of Jerusalem, in Psalms ascribed to David. But there are other signs which point plainly to the great improbability of Davidic authorship. In the first place, it belongs to a group of Psalms, Books IV. and V., of the Psalter, which is evidently of late date; and the reasons would have to be special and obvious which would lead us to detach it from the rest. Whereas, it bears all the marks common to the class. Moreover, if it was written by David, then we have to suppose that there was some person occupying his own position of theocratic king, but so much more exalted than he that he calls him Lord. And this could only be the Messiah, the final flower of the Davidic line, whom David sees in vision. But the Psalm in that case would stand entirely by itself as being simply a vision of an indefinite future, having no roots in the circumstances of the times, whereas all O.T. prophecy is of an immediate future growing directly out of the present. This leads immediately to the conclusion that the Psalm is addressed by the Psalmist to some reigning king, who is also somehow a priest, and that the writer cannot himself be a king. And, finally, the Messianic conception in the time of David had reached no further than this, that his

royal line was not to fail, even if his sons and successors proved sometimes unworthy. But the idea of a Messianic king, who was to be the ideal and climax of the Davidic line, and whom David himself could call Lord, was the fruit only of a long period of national disaster, creating the feeling that only such a unique person could restore the national hopes. The idea of a personal Messiah belongs to the period succeeding the close of the canon. This is the essential reason for rejecting the Davidic authorship. How, then, if David did not write the Psalm, can we account for our Lord's ascription of it to him? The explanation that will account for all the other cases of this kind, viz., that the authorship is of no account, leaving him free to accept the current view as a mere matter of nomenclature and identification, without committing him to an endorsement of it, will not do here, since the argument turns on the authorship. But the real explanation of all the cases is, that inspiration, which accounts for whatever extraordinary knowledge belonged to Jesus in his earthly life, does not extend to such matters of critical research as authorship. Inspiration belongs to the sphere of the moral and religious intuitions, and did not keep even Jesus from ignorance of matters outside of its sphere. And here, in its proper sphere, it gave him a view of the deeper meaning of Scripture, that led to his declaration that *Son of David* would come very far from adequately stating their view of the Messianic king. That would include the universalism of the prophets, and the suffering servant of Jehovah of Isaiah. Moreover, it would include a unique relation to God, and to universal manhood, that would place him in a different class from David, and an exalted position, which would be indicated by the titles chosen by himself, Son of Man and Son of God, rather than Son of David.

36. αὐτὸς Δαυεὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ, Εἶπεν (ὁ) Κύριος[1] τῷ κυρίῳ μου — *David himself said in the Holy Spirit, the Lord said to my lord.*

Omit γὰρ, *for*, after αὐτὸς, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BLT^{d} Δ 13, 28, 59, 69, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Omit ὁ before Κύριος, Treg. WH. BD. B omits it in Sept.

ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ — *in the Holy Spirit.* This phrase denotes inspiration. David said this with the authority that

[1] On κύριος without the art. See Win. 19, 1 *a*.

belongs to an inspired man.[1] (ὁ) Κύριος — in the original, this is Yahweh (Jehovah), of which ὁ Κύριος is the translation in the Sept.[2] ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου — *a footstool of thy feet.*

ὑποκάτω, *under*, instead of ὑποπόδιον, WH. RV. *marg.* BD^{gr} T^{d} 28, Egyptt.

37. Αὐτὸς Δαυεὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν Κύριον — *David himself calls him Lord.* This makes the difficulty of their position — how lordship and sonship go together.

Omit οὖν, *therefore*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDLT^{d} Δ 28, 106, 251, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt.

ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος — *the great multitude* present at the feast, the multitude being distinguished from the leaders. This statement is parallel to those which represent Jesus, all through this controversy, as carrying the people with him.

WARNING AGAINST THE SCRIBES

38–40. *Somewhere in the course of his teaching on this last day of public instruction, Jesus introduces a warning against the Scribes, the religious teachers and leaders of his time. He charges them with ostentation, an unhealthy craving for position and flattery, and a fearful inconsistency between the profuseness of their worship and the cruel meanness of their lives. Their condemnation, he says, will be greater than if they had been consistently wicked.*

38. ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ — *in the course of his teaching.* Mk. does not place this warning exactly. Nor Lk. Mt. says *then.* All of them introduce it in this place. But the warning is not against those qualities of the Scribes that would be suggested by their misconception of the Messianic idea.

βλέπετε ἀπὸ — *Beware of*[3] ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν — *to walk about in long robes.* These στολαί were the dress of dignitaries, such as kings and priests — long robes reaching to the feet. ἀσπασμοὺς — *salutations* of respect.

39. πρωτοκαθεδρίας[4] — *first seats.*

---

[1] Mt. says ἐν πνεύματι. This is the only case of the use of this phrase in the Gospels.

[2] This passage is quoted from the Sept. without change.

[3] See on 8[15].

[4] This word is found only here and in the parallel passages from Mt. and Lk. in the N.T., and elsewhere, in ecclesiastical writings.

πρωτοκλισίας[1] — *chief (reclining) places*, not *rooms*, AV. What this chief place at table was, the varying custom prevents our saying.

40. οἱ κατεσθίοντες — If this is a continuation of the preceding sentence, the nom. is an irregularity, as its noun is in the gen.[2] It is better, therefore, to begin a new sentence here, making οἱ κατεσθίοντες the subj. of λήμψονται — *those who devour*, etc., *shall receive*.[3] This devouring of widows' houses would be under the forms of civil law, but in contravention of the Divine law of love. προφάσει — *for a covering*. That is, they tried to hide their covetousness behind a show of piety. See 1 Thess. 2[5], where the meaning is, that the apostle did not use his preaching of the Gospel as a mere cloak of covetousness. περισσότερον κρίμα — *more abundant*, or *overflowing condemnation*. The adjective is strong. The comparison is with what they would receive if they made no pretence of piety. Notice that the show, as it is commonly with men, is of religion, while the offence is against humanity. The warning is addressed to the people, and bids them beware of religious leaders who affect the outward titles and trappings of their office, and offset their lack of humanity by a show of piety.

The exact verbal correspondence of Mk. and Lk. in this warning is proof positive of their interdependence.

JESUS' COMMENDATION OF THE WIDOW'S OFFERING

41–44. *The day closes with a scene in the treasury of the temple. Jesus is watching the multitude casting their offerings into the trumpet-shaped mouths of this receptacle, and among them many rich men casting in much. But there is one poor widow, who casts in two small coins, worth about a third of a cent, and Jesus commends her as having given more than all the rest. They, he says, gave out of their excess; she, out of her lack, gave all her living.*

41. Καὶ καθίσας κατέναντι τοῦ γαζοφαλυκίου — *And having taken a seat over against the treasury.*

Omit ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

---

[1] This word is also found only in the parallel accounts of this discourse, and in ecclesiastical writings.

[2] See Win., who treats it as an annex with an independent structure. 59, 8 *b*, 62, 3.

[3] So Grotius, and following him, Bengel, Meyer, and others.

γαζοφυλακίου — *treasury.*[1] The treasury meant is probably that in the outer court of the temple, having thirteen openings shaped like trumpets, for the reception of temple offerings and of gifts for the poor. χαλκὸν — literally, *brass*, but, like the Latin *æs*, a general word for all money. ἔβαλλον — *were casting*, denoting the repeated act.

42. μία χήρα — *one widow;* contrasted with the many rich. δύο λεπτά, ὅ ἐστι κοδράντης — the λεπτόν was the eighth part of an as, the value of which was one and two-thirds cents, so that two λεπτά were about two-fifths of a cent. κοδράντης is the Latin word *quadrans*, meaning a quarter of an as. But the real value appears only from the fact that the denarius, or ten asses, was a day's wages.

43. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἡ χήρα αὕτη ἡ πτωχὴ πλεῖον πάντων ἔβαλεν τῶν βαλλόντων εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον — *said to them, Verily I say to you, that this poor widow cast in more than all who are casting into the treasury.*

εἶπεν, instead of λέγει, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABDKLU ΔΠ, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt. Syrr. ἔβαλεν, instead of βέβληκε, Treg. WH. RV. ℵ^{c} (ℵ* ἔβαλλεν) ABDL Δ 33. βαλλόντων, instead of βαλόντων, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABDLX ΓΔΠ.

. . . πλεῖον πάντων ἔβαλεν τῶν βαλλόντων — *cast in more than all who are casting.* This is a case where the use of the comp., instead of the superl., is misleading, as the superl. means *most of them all*, whereas the comp. strictly means *more than all together.*

44. ὑστερήσεως — This expression is the exact opposite of περισσεύοντος, one meaning *more than enough*, and the other *less than enough; excess* and *deficiency.* RV. *superfluity* and *want.* ὅλον τὸν βίον — *all her living, her resources.* The idea of περισσευεύοντος is that they did not trench on their resources, but gave a part only of what they had over and above that, while the poor widow gave all her resources. Hence, while the real value of their gifts was many times greater than hers, the ideal value of hers was the greatest of them all. Money values are not the standard of gifts in the kingdom of God, but only these ideal values. It is only as the gift measures the moral value of the giver, that it counts with him who looks at the heart.

It is noticeable that Mk. closes his account of this stormy scene in the Temple with this idyl. The connection is not the verbal and superficial relation to the *widows* of v.[40], but the contrast between the outward meagreness and inward richness of the widow's service, and the outward ostentation and inward barrenness of the Pharisees' religion.

[1] A Scriptural word, of which the first part is a Persian word for treasure.

JESUS' DISCOURSE ABOUT THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE

XIII. 1–37. *As they are coming out of the temple, the disciples call Jesus' attention to the greatness of the stones, and of the building itself. Jesus predicts its complete destruction. They ask him the sign of this, and Jesus shows them first, the danger that they will be deceived by false Messiahs, and by premature omens. They are not to be disturbed by these, but are to look out for themselves, exposed to great dangers, and burdened with the great responsibility of making known their message to all nations* (v.[1-13]). *But when they see the desolating abomination, the Roman army, standing where it ought not, before the city itself, then they are to get out of the city, and not stand on the order of their going. That is to be a time of unparalleled distress, of false and specially plausible Messiahs, and is to be followed immediately by the coming of the Son of Man with the usual Divine portents* (v.[14-27]). *As to the time of these events, it is to be within that generation, but no one, not even the Son of Man, knows the exact time. They need to be on the watch, therefore* (v.[28-37]).

There have been, up to recent times, two interpretations of this discourse. Both of them separate it into two principal parts: the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, and the prophecy of the consummation of all things with the advent of the Messiah in glory. But one of them, the traditional interpretation, postpones the latter part indefinitely, and is still looking for the world-catastrophe which its advocates suppose to be predicted here. The difficulties in the way of this interpretation are grave and insuperable. It ignores the coupling together of the two parts in the discourse, as belonging to one great event. Mt. v.[29], says that they will follow each other immediately. Mk., that they belong to the same general period. It passes over also, or attempts to explain away, the obvious notes of time. All of the accounts wait until they have come to the end of the prophecy, including both

parts, before they introduce the statement of the time of all these events, and the statement itself is, that that generation was not to pass away till all these things came to pass. Further, it leaves unexplained the expectation of an immediate coming which colors all the other N.T. books, and all the life of the Church in the subsequent period. But especially, it runs counter to the historical interpretation of prophecy, which gives us the only key to its rational exegesis, by postponing to an indefinite future events which the prophecy itself regards as growing out of the present situation.

The other interpretation, the common one at present, interpreting the prophecy itself in the same way, places the time of its fulfilment in that generation. That is, they involve Jesus himself in the evident error of the other N.T. writings and of the Church in the subsequent period. The error of this interpretation, exegetically not so serious as the other, is that it takes literally language which can be shown to be figurative. But the other and more serious difficulty is, that it commits Jesus to a programme of the future which is directly counter to all his teachings in regard to the kingdom of God.

A third interpretation, the one adopted here, holds that the event predicted in the second part did take place in that generation, and in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem. The event itself, and the signs of it, it interprets according to the analogy of prophecy, figuratively. It finds numerous instances of such use in O.T. prophecy. God coming in the clouds of heaven with his angels, and preceded or announced by disturbances in the heavenly bodies, is the ordinary prophetic manner of describing any special Divine interference in the affairs of nations. See especially Dan. $7^{13.\,14.\,27}$, where this language is used of the coming of the Son of Man, *i.e.* of the kingdom of the saints, to take the place of the world-kingdoms. The prophecy becomes thus a prediction of the setting up of the kingdom, and especially of its definite inauguration as a universal kingdom, with the removal of the chief obstacle to that in the destruction of Jerusalem.

1. Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ — *And as he was coming out of the temple.* The previous scene was in the court of the temple. ἱερόν denotes the whole temple-enclosure. εἷς τῶν μαθητῶν — *one of his disciples.* We are not told who it was. Mt. says, *his*

disciples; Lk., *certain people.*[1] ποταποὶ λίθοι — *what manner of stones.*[2] Josephus gives the dimensions of these stones as 25 cubits in length, 12 in breadth, and 8 in height. Ferguson, in *Bib. Dic.*, gives the measurements of the temple proper, the ναός, as about 100 cubits by 60, with inner enclosure about 180 cubits by 240, and an outer enclosure 400 cubits square, the enclosures being adorned with porticoes and gates of great magnificence.

2. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον, ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ — *And Jesus said to him, Seest thou these great structures? There will not be left here stone upon stone, which will not be destroyed.* This is a rhetorical statement of utter destruction. It would not be a non-fulfilment of this prophecy to find parts of the original structure still standing.

Omit ἀποκριθεὶς, *answering,* after Ἰησοῦς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL 33, 115, 237, 255, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt. Pesh. Insert ὧδε, *here,* after ἀφεθῇ, Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDGLM[2] U Δ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Pesh. Tisch. objects to this insertion as being taken from Mt., where it occurs without variation. λίθον, instead of λίθῳ, after ἐπὶ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BGLMUX ΓΔΠ 1, 13, 28, 33, 69, etc. D and a number of *mss.* of Lat. Vet. add here, *and after three days, another will rise up without hands!* See J. 2[19].

3. καὶ καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τ. ἐλαίων[3] — *And he seating himself on the Mount of Olives.* Mk. alone adds, *over against the temple,* as the situation would recall the previous conversation on coming out of the temple. ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος κ. Ἰωάννης κ. Ἀνδρέας — *Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him privately.* Mk. retains here the order of these names given by him in the account of the appointment of the twelve.[4]

ἐπηρώτα, instead of ἐπηρώτων, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL 13, 28, 33, 69, 229, Harcl. *marg.* εἰπὸν, instead of εἰπὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BDL 1, 13, 28, 33, 69, 346.

4. Εἰπὸν[5] ἡμῖν, πότε ταῦτα ἔσται — *Tell us, when these things will be.* ταῦτα refers to the destruction of the temple just mentioned.[6] But in giving the answer of Jesus, Mk. introduces false Messiahs in such a way as to seem to imply a previous reference to his own reappearance, so that Mk.'s report taken as a whole would imply more than this single reference of the ταῦτα. But this appearance

---

[1] Mt. 24[1] Lk. 21[5].

[2] ποταποί is a later form for the Greek ποδαποί. On the etymology of the word, see Liddell and Scott, Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* Properly, the word denotes origin — *from what country?* — but from Demos. on, it has also the meaning, *of what sort?* Here, it is exclamatory, calling attention to the greatness of the temple buildings.

[3] On this use of εἰς with a verb of rest, see Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

[4] See 3[16-18].

[5] The imper. εἰπόν is from sec. aor. εἶπα.

[6] The plural is used because this event is complex, including in itself a multiplied series of events.

of false Messiahs in Mk.'s account may easily be explained as one of the premature signs of the catastrophe which makes the single subject of the prophecy so far. Moreover, the way in which the destruction of the temple, the reappearance of Jesus, and the consummation of the age are introduced in Mt. ($24^{2,3}$) shows conclusively that in that Gospel the three are all treated as parts and titles of the one event.

5. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἤρξατο λέγειν αὐτοῖς, Βλέπετε μὴ[1] — *And Jesus began to say to them, Beware lest.*

Omit ἀποκριθείς, *answering*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL 33, Egyptt. Pesh.

6. πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου — *Many will come in my name.*

Omit γάρ, *for*, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ* B Egyptt.

This warning against false Messiahs coming in his name is occasioned apparently by a part of their question, given by Mt. alone, who states their inquiry thus — *what is the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the age?* Nothing has been said by Mk. to lead up to this warning. The prophecy has been the destruction of the Temple, and the question of the apostles has been when that is to take place. But nothing has been said of his coming. The account of the previous conversation in Mt. would seem necessary therefore to supplement the account of Mk. But see note on ταῦτα, v.[4]. Moreover, the παρουσία, *the coming*, of Mt. has no antecedents, and yet it is introduced as something well understood by the disciples, of which they inquired only the time. Before this, the Gospels have taken us only as far as the resurrection of Jesus predicted by himself. And even that prediction they tell us that the disciples did not understand. And yet, here they are talking of his coming again as an understood fact. If it was, then their dismay at his death, and their unbelief of his resurrection, are unaccountable. ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, *in my name.* Not his personal name, but his official title. They would not assume to be Jesus returned to the earth, but they would claim his title of Messiah.

7. πολέμους κ. ἀκοὰς πολέμων — *wars and rumors of wars.* Jesus speaks first of false Messiahs, against whom he warns them. Now, he comes to those commotions which are apt to be taken by men living in critical times and looking forward to great events, as signs of the future. μὴ θροεῖσθε — *be not alarmed.*[2] The reason of this injunction is given in what follows, δεῖ γενέσθαι, *they have to come*, although γὰρ after δεῖ is to be omitted.[3] These wars and

[1] On this unclassical use of βλέπειν, see Thay-Grm. *Lex.*
[2] A late meaning of the word, which means properly, *do not make an outcry.*
[3] Notice the asyndetic character of the entire discourse, so peculiar to Mk.'s abrupt style.

rumors of wars are necessary, being involved in the nature of things; they are always happening, and so men are not to be disturbed by them as if they were things out of the ordinary course to be construed as signs. They are necessary, but they are not signs of the end; the end is not yet.

Omit γὰρ, *for*, after δεῖ, *it is necessary*, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ* B Egyptt.

8. Ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος — *For nation will rise against nation.* A confirmation of the preceding statement, that wars must be. ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους[1] — *there will be earthquakes in divers places.* ἔσονται λιμοί — *there will be famines.* The statement gains in impressiveness by the omission of καὶ before these clauses; it reads, *For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; there will be earthquakes in divers places; there will be famines.*

Omit καὶ, *and*, before ἔσονται σεισμοὶ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL 28, 124, 299, Egyptt. Omit καὶ before ἔσονται λιμοί, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ^{c} BL 28, Memph. Omit καὶ ταραχαί, *and tumults*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* and ^{c} BDL *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph.

ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα — *these things are a beginning of travails.* The word ὠδίνων was in popular use to denote the calamities preceding the advent of the Messiah, and the reason of the figure is to be found not only in the pains, but in the joyous event which they ushered in. But they do not mark the end, but the beginning of that process of travail by which the new birth of the world is to be brought about. The whole paragraph, so far, is a statement of things which need not alarm them, since they are not, as men take them to be, signs of the end.

ἀρχὴ, instead of ἀρχαὶ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDKLS* U ΔΠ* *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg.

9. βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτούς. ὑμεῖς is emphatic. *But do* ye *take heed to yourselves.* They are not to go about after false Messiahs nor studying portents; they will have their work to do in looking after themselves. παραδώσουσι ὑμᾶς — *they will deliver you up.* συνέδρια — *councils.* The word is used of the local tribunals to be found in Jewish towns, modelled somewhat after the Sanhedrim, the great council of Jerusalem. καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς — *and into synagogues.* The words belong to the preceding παραδώσουσιν, and δαρήσεσθε stands by itself. It reads, *They will deliver you up to councils and to synagogues. You will be beaten.*[2] The

[1] On this distributive use of κατὰ, see Win. 49 *d*, *b*).

[2] So Erasmus, Tyndale, Meyer, Treg. Morison. The more common interpretation makes εἰς συναγωγὰς a pregnant construction after δαρήσεσθε — *you will be (taken) into synagogues (and) beaten.* Meyer points out that to leave δαρήσεσθε standing disconnected agrees admirably with the general asyndetic character of the discourse.

synagogues were the ecclesiastical tribunal of the town, as the συνέδρια were the municipal court. ἡγεμόνων — the word used in Greek to denote the Roman provincial governors. To sum up, συνέδρια and συναγωγαί were Jewish tribunals,[1] and ἡγεμόνες and βασιλεῖς were Gentile rulers. They were to be brought before both. ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ — *for my sake.* It was to be because of their attachment to him, that they were to be brought to trial. εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς — *for a testimony to them.* This was the Divine purpose of their appearance before earthly tribunals. They were to stand there to testify to Jesus.

Omit γὰρ after παραδώσουσι, Tisch. (Treg.) Treg. *marg.* WH. BL Memph.

10. Κ. εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη — *And in all the nations must the glad tidings first be heralded.* This is suggested by the mention of Gentile rulers in the preceding. It is a part of that, moreover, which makes it necessary for them to look out for themselves during this period. They are to be subject not only to private persecutions, but to governmental oppositions, and under that pressure they are nevertheless to become heralds of the good news of the kingdom of God in every nation, before the end comes. Hence they have themselves to look out for, and not rumors and portents and signs. Moreover, this shows what he means by the care of themselves that he enjoins upon them. It is not care for their safety, but for their spiritual condition in the face of such opposition, and of so difficult a work.

11. Καὶ ὅταν ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδίδοντες — This is difficult to render. It means, *whenever, in the act of delivering them up, men are leading them to the authorities.*

Καὶ ὅταν, instead of Ὅταν δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL 33, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. ἄγωσιν, instead of ἀγάγωσιν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABDGHKLMUX ΓΠ.

μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε[2] τί λαλήσητε, ἀλλ' ὃ ἐὰν δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, τοῦτο λαλεῖτε — *do not be anxious beforehand what to say; but whatever is given you in that hour, this speak.* The etymological sense of προμεριμνᾶτε fits in here; *do not be distracted beforehand;* do not let your attention be divided and drawn off from the more important matters before you. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ — what to speak will be given you at the time of your trial, contrasted with προμεριμνᾶτε. The fact, that it is the Holy Spirit which is to speak in them, shows that it is not their defence of which Jesus is thinking, but of the testimony to the kingdom, v.[9], which is the Divine purpose in bringing them there. This title, Holy Spirit, which

[1] See Schürer II. 1, § 23, II.; II. 2, § 27.

[2] This verb is found only here in the N.T., and elsewhere only in ecclesiastical writings.

became so common in Christian phraseology, is found already in the Jewish writings (not the O.T.) Sap. 1^{5}. See note on 1^{8}.

Omit μηδὲ μελετᾶτε, *nor rehearse*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL 1, 33, 69, 157, 209, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Egyptt.

12. Καὶ παραδώσει ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον — *And brother will deliver up brother to death.*

Καὶ παραδώσει, instead of παραδώσει δὲ, ℵ BDL *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt.

They will be subject not only to governmental opposition, but to private persecution, and this will extend even to members of their own families, so bitter will be the hostility awakened against them.

13. ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος — *But he who has remained steadfast to the end.* ὑπομένω denotes steadfastness under trial and opposition. This closes Jesus' statement of the reason for their taking heed to themselves. They will be persecuted by the powers of the world, and hated by everybody, even in their own families, and in the face of this opposition will have to carry the Gospel to all nations, and the price of their salvation will be steadfastness under it all, even to the end.

14. Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἑστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ — Jesus comes now to the real cause of alarm, the sign of the end. It is the βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, *the abomination of desolation*, or *the desolating abomination, standing where it ought not.* This title is taken directly from the Sept. of Dan. 11^{31} 12^{11}, where it refers probably to the idol altar placed on the altar of burnt offerings by Antiochus Epiphanes. But it seems probable here, that the words, as is frequently the case in N.T. quotations from the O.T., are to be taken not in their historical sense, but in a sense more applicable to the N.T. occasion, and easily contained within the words themselves. Lk. supplies us with this interpretation, when he makes Jerusalem surrounded by armies to be the sign of the end. Jerusalem would be the holy place (Mt. 24^{15}) where the abomination of desolation ought not to stand, and the abomination of desolation would be the abhorred and devastating armies of Rome. Wars and rumors of wars, as long as they keep away from the holy place, are not signs of the end, but when they attack the holy city, then beware. ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω — *let him that reads understand.* There has been much debate whether these words belong to Jesus' discourse, or have been interpolated by the writer. The use of ἀναγινώσκων, instead of ἀκούων, decides this, as the omission of the words τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ, τ. προφ, *which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet*, leaves nothing for ἀναγινώσκων to refer to, except what Jesus himself says, and it is only after that has been committed to writing, that ἀναγινώσκων can be used in reference to it. Mk. intends to call special atten-

tion to this part of Jesus' prophecy. And evidently this is because his readers stood in the shadow of this approaching event, and it became them therefore to read intelligently what Jesus has to say about it. If it is asked why attention is called to this particular part of the prophecy, it is because Jesus himself calls attention to it as containing the key to the situation; this is the sign of the end. When that takes place, they need expect no other result of the siege, than that predicted. εἰς τὰ ὄρη — *into the mountains.* Mountains are mentioned as the natural places of refuge.

15. ὁ (δὲ) ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω, μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω[1] ἄραί τι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ — (*And*) *let not him who is upon the house descend, nor go in to take anything out of the house.* They are not to descend, but flee immediately by the external approach to the roof, instead of going down into the house for any purpose. The whole is an expression of the haste necessary to escape the impending event.

Omit δὲ (Treg. *marg.*) WH. BFH, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Omit εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, *into the house,* Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ BL two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt. Pesh. εἰσελθάτω, instead of -θέτω, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ ADL Δ 13, 28, 346.

16. Καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἆραι τὸ ἱμάτιον — *and let not him who is in the field turn back to take his outer garment.* The picture is of a man who has left his outer garment in the house for work in the field.

Omit ὢν after ἀγρὸν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ 1, 28, 209, 245, 299, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

18. προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται χειμῶνος — *And pray that it may not take place in the winter time.* The catastrophe is meant, and not their flight. The reason given, viz. the unheard-of greatness of the calamity, shows this.

Omit ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν, *your flight,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* and ca BDL most *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg.

19. ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκ. θλίψις — *for those days will be tribulation,* instead of *a time of tribulation.* Wetstein translates the expression, *one prolonged calamity.* οἵα οὐ γέγονε τοιαύτη — literally, *such as there has not been such.*[2]

ἣν, instead of ἧς, after κτίσεως, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BC* L 28.

20. Καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολόβωσεν[3] κύριος τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ — *And if the Lord had not shortened those days, no flesh would have been saved.* The aor. tenses put this action in the

[1] On this form, see Win. 13, 1. [2] On this redundancy, see Win. 22, 4 *b*.
[3] ἐκολόβωσεν is used in the Greek only of physical mutilation. In the N.T., it is used only here and in the parallel passage in Mt., of cutting short time. A striking instance of the interdependence of the Synoptics.

past — *if the Lord had not shortened the time, no flesh would have been saved.* The language is proleptic, stating the event as it already existed in the Divine decree.[1] It is needless to say that ἐσώθη is used of physical deliverance, though it has been interpreted of the deliverance from temptation to unfaithfulness in such an hour of trial. τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο — *the elect, whom he elected.*[2] There will be some among that multitude given over to destruction who are God's own chosen ones, and on their account he shortened (in the Divine decree) these days. It would be the number, and not the length of those days, that God would shorten.

21. Καὶ τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ, Ἴδε, ὧδε ὁ Χριστός, ἴδε, ἐκεῖ, μὴ πιστεύετε — *And then, if any one says to you, See, here the Messiah, see, there, believe it not.* τότε, *then,* is added to the warning against false Messiahs appearing in the preceding period (v.[6]).

Ἴδε, instead of the first ἰδού, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BL. Ἴδε, instead of second Ἰδού, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BDL 28. Omit ἤ, *or,* before it, Tisch. WH. ℵ LU 40, 69, 127, 131, 157, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. πιστεύετε, instead of πιστεύσητε, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ ABCDEFHLV Δ.

22. ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ (δὲ) ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται,[3] καὶ δώσουσι (ποιήσουσι) σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα,[4] πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανᾶν, εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς — *for* (*and*) *false Messiahs and false prophets will arise, and will give* (*do*) *signs and prodigies, in order to deceive, if possible, the elect.*

δώσουσι belongs especially to σημεῖα, rather than τέρατα. A sign is something given in proof of one's claim. τέρατα denotes miracles as wonders, abortive, unearthly, and portentous phenomena, and thus corresponds most exactly to our word *miracles.* πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανᾶν[5] may denote result, as well as object.[6] But εἰ δυνατόν, *if possible,* points to the signification of object. ἐκλεκτούς, here and in v.[20], does not have its dogmatic sense, but the literary sense of *choice or picked men* seems to accord with the spirit of the passage. They are distinguished from the common crowd.

This manifestation of false Messiahs and prophets is to be distinguished from the one in v.[6], in the time before the end, being accompanied by these miracles and signs, so that the danger of deception is greater.

Tisch. reads δέ, instead of γάρ, at the beginning of the verse with ℵ C, regarding γάρ as copied from Mt., where it is the invariable reading. Also

---

[1] Win. 42, 2 *b*; Mey. on Mt. 24[22].

[2] On this redundancy, and the similar fulness of expression in κτίσεως ἣν ἔκτισεν, *creation which he created,* v.[19], see Meyer's Note.

[3] Words compounded with ψευδο- are common in later Greek, but not in the classical period. ψευδόμαντις is the Greek word for *false prophet.*

[4] τέρατα occurs only here and in the parallel passage in Mt., in the Synoptics. Its most frequent use is in the Acts.

[5] ἀποπλανᾶν occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in 1 Tim. 6[10]. [6] Win. 49 *h.*

ποιήσουσιν, instead of δώσουσι, with D 13, 28, 69, 91, 124, 299, 346, two *mss.* Lat. Vet., for the same reason. Omit καὶ before τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BD$^{gr^k}$.

It is singular to see David George (1556), Lodowick Muggleton (1746), John Cochran (1868), enumerated among the Messiahs foretold in this prophecy. (Morison.) Whatever opinion is held as to the contents of the prophecy, whether it refers simply to the destruction of Jerusalem with whatever significance may be attached to that, or includes also the visible coming of the Lord and the final judgment, there is general consent now that the prophecy is restricted in time to that generation, v.[30]. In general, the historical interpretation of prophecy is fairly settled.

23. ὑμεῖς δὲ βλέπετε — *But do you be on the lookout.* The effect of the insertion of the pronoun is to emphasize it. The purpose of the false prophets and Messiahs is to deceive even the elect. But they, the elect, are to take heed. They do not belong to the unprepared multitude, but have been prepared by their Master. Those who divide the prophecy into two parts, one referring to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the other to the end of the world, make the division at v.[20]. But this ὑμεῖς βλέπετε is strongly against any interpretation which makes the warning refer to a time when none of the disciples to whom it was addressed were living. The warning might include others besides these, but should certainly include them.

Omit ἰδού, *lo*, before προείρηκα, *I have told you beforehand*, Tisch. Treg. WH. BL 28 one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

We come now to the coming of the Son of Man, with its accompanying portents, v.[24-27]. It is placed after the destruction of Jerusalem, but in the same general period: *in those days, after that affliction.* The portents, the darkening of the sun and moon, and the falling of the stars, belong to that event, and not to the destruction of Jerusalem. This separation of the two events which might seem to belong together, means that the fall of Jerusalem is a preparation for the Advent, which cannot take place without it. It is that end of the old order which must precede the beginning of the new.

24. ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις — *in those days.* These words denote the general period which he is describing, the fall of Jerusalem. This coming of the Son of Man belongs to that epoch. μετὰ τὴν θλῖψιν ἐκείνην — *after that calamity.* The θλῖψις referred to is that of v.[19]; so that what follows is included in the period, but

placed after the calamity. ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται — *the sun will be darkened.* This disturbance of the heavenly bodies, and the prediction of the coming of the Son of Man, have been supposed to be decisive of the view that this prophecy looks beyond the fall of Jerusalem to the end of the world. But this darkening and fall of the heavenly bodies is so common an accompaniment of O.T. prophecy, and its place is so definitely and certainly fixed there, as belonging to the Apocalyptic imagery of prophecy, and not to the prediction of events, that it presents no difficulty whatever, and does not even create a presumption in favor of the view that this is a prophecy of the final catastrophe. In Is. 13^{10}, it reads, "For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine. . . . I will make the heaven to tremble, and the earth shall be shaken out of her place." But this is a part of the prophecy of the destruction of Babylon by the Medes. In Is. 34^{4}, it reads, "And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll, and all their host shall fade away as the leaf fadeth from off the vine, and as a fading leaf from the fig tree," where the event predicted is the judgment of Edom. In Ez. $32^{7.8}$, similar language is used of the judgment of Egypt, and in Amos 8^{9}, of the northern kingdom. In Joel $2^{30.31}$, 3^{15}, where the subject is the judgment of the nations in connection with the return of Judah from captivity (see 3^{1}), it says: "I will show wonders in the heavens above, and in the earth blood and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come. . . . The sun and the moon are darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining." That is to say, this language is intended to portray the greatness of the doom of such nations as come under the judgment of God. When he comes in judgment, the earth and even the heavens dissolve before him. But it is needless to minimize these words into eclipses, or earthquakes, or meteoric showers, or to magnify them into actual destruction of sun and moon and stars. They are not events, but only imaginative portrayal of what it means for God to interfere in the history of nations. αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τ. οὐρανοῖς. δύναμις is used frequently in Greek writers of armies, hosts, and hence it is used to translate the Heb. צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם *the host of heaven*, a phrase used of the stars (2 K. 17^{16} 23^{4} Is. 34^{4}). See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, instead of τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCU Π* *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt. Pesh. πίπτοντες, instead of ἐκπίπτοντες, same editors, and ℵ BCDL Π* *mss.* Lat. Vet.

26. καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τ. ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφελαῖς — *And then they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds.* This

language is not to be taken literally, any more than that about the heavenly bodies. That is, usage makes it unnecessary, and in this case, the immediate connection with the destruction of Jerusalem makes it impossible. In Ps. 97^{1-5}, the reign of God on earth has the same accompaniment of clouds, darkness, and fire. In Is. 19^{1}, Yahweh is represented as coming on a swift cloud to Egypt. In Zech. 9^{14}, when God stirs the sons of Zion against the sons of Greece, he, himself, is seen above the combatants, sending forth his arrows like lightning, blowing the trumpet, and coming in the whirlwinds of the south. And in Ps. 18^{8-16}, is the *locus classicus*, where all the powers of nature are made to contribute to the pomp of Yahweh's coming to the rescue of his servant. But the passage from which this language is taken is Dan. 7^{13}, in which one like a Son of Man comes with the clouds of heaven, and the Ancient of Days gives him an everlasting and universal kingdom. The writer has seen a vision of four beasts, which are four kingdoms, and then he has a vision not of a beast, but of a Son of Man, to whom is given not a perishable kingdom like that of the beasts, but an everlasting kingdom. And when he explains this kingdom like the others, it appears to be the kingdom of the saints of the Most High. But the point is, that in this vision, the clouds are not to be taken literally; they make a part of the picture, intended to represent that this kingdom to be set up on the earth is after all not an earthly kingdom, but one coming down out of heaven, a theocracy. If any one had suggested to the writer, that it was to have a literal fulfilment, he would have said that that was not in his mind. Jesus then, in adopting this language, meant that this prophecy out of the O.T. was to be fulfilled in himself at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. Then the kingdom of God is to be set up in the world, that unworldly and everlasting kingdom of which the sign is not a beast, but one like a Son of Man coming in the clouds. But here, we face the question, what there was in this catastrophe of the Jewish nation which can be described as a coming of the Son of Man in the clouds with power and great glory. All the marks of time in the chapter point to that one time and confine us to that; and, as we have seen, the language, which seems to point to a world-catastrophe and the consummation of all things, does not take us beyond that, since it is used elsewhere of events, such as the destruction of Babylon and the judgment of Edom, which have the same general character as this destruction of Jerusalem. But what is there about this event that can be called a coming of the Son of Man with power and great glory? The answer to this is to be found in the fact that Christ is said in the N.T., to have assumed the seat of power at the right hand of God, and especially that the government of the world has been committed to him. The same language that has been used in the

O.T., therefore, to represent a Divine intervention in the affairs of the world, especially in great national crises, is now applied to the Messianic King, who rules, not on an earthly but a heavenly throne. And neither in the one case nor the other is a visible coming implied. But Mt., in the account of the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrim, uses a word which is decisive of the way in which the coming of the Son of Man is to be taken. Jesus says, Mt. 26^{64}, ἀπ' ἄρτι ὄψεσθε τ. υἱὸν τ. ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τ. δυνάμεως, κ. ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τ. νεφελῶν — *Henceforth, from this time on, you will see the Son of Man seated on the right hand of the Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.* This settles two things: first, that the coming is not a single event, any more than the sitting on the right hand of Power; and second, that it was a thing which was to begin with the very time of our Lord's departure from the world. Moreover, the two things, the sitting at the right hand of Power, and the coming, are connected in such a way as to mean that he is to assume power in heaven and exercise it here in the world. The period beginning with the departure of Jesus from the world was to be marked by this assumption of heavenly power by the Christ, and by repeated interferences in crises of the world's history, of which this destruction of Jerusalem was the first. With it, there was to be a consummation of that age, συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, a winding up of the Jewish period, and with it the removal of the great obstacle at that time to the setting up of the kingdom of God in the world.

27. κ. τότε ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, κ. ἐπισυνάξει τ. ἐκλεκτοὺς, etc. — *And then he will send forth the angels, and will gather (his) elect.* This gathering of the elect is the process of establishing the kingdom, and has been going on from the beginning. All the processes by which men are brought to the acknowledgment of Christ and the obedience of the kingdom belong to the gathering of the elect. The angels represent the invisible heavenly agencies in an earthly event. The introduction of them means that there is that invisible, Divine side to a human transaction. Back of all that men are doing for the conversion of the world, is the Lord Christ with the hosts of heaven, see J. 1^{51}. As for the time, it begins then, at the time of the consummation of the Jewish age, because Judaism was the great obstacle at that time to the universal spread of the kingdom. Under its influence, Christianity threatened to become a mere appendage of Judaism, to have the particularism, formalism, and legalism of that religion grafted upon it in such a way that it could never become a universal religion. With the removal of this obstacle, could begin, not the gathering of the elect, but the gathering of them from the four quarters of the world, the universal gathering.

Omit αὐτοῦ, *his*, after τοὺς ἀγγέλους, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BDL *mss.* Lat. Vet. Omit αὐτοῦ after ἐκλεκτοὺς, Tisch. Treg. (WH.) DL 1, 28, 91, 299, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Tisch. regards αὐτοῦ as taken from Mt. 24^{31}.

28. τὴν παραβολήν — *the parable*, the illustration or analogy to be drawn from the fig tree. ὅταν . . . ὁ κλάδος . . . ἁπαλὸς γένηται — *whenever its branch has become tender.* When the young branches, or twigs, that produce the leaves are softened by the sap flowing through them. These things are a sign of approaching summer, and signs are just as reliable in the world of events as in the physical world. But they are signs of the same kind. Causes are to be found in effects, and effects in causes in both spheres.

29. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς — the pronoun is emphatic, distinguishing the restricted ὑμεῖς, addressed only to his disciples, from the general ὑμεῖς implied in the preceding γινώσκετε. *You know, and so does everybody, the natural sign; and you disciples are to know in like manner these signs of coming events.* ταῦτα — *these things*, the besieging armies, and the sufferings of the siege, see v.[14]. ἐγγύς ἐστιν — *it is near;* the subject is taken for granted as being in all their minds. ἐπὶ θύραις — *at the doors*, a common figurative expression of nearness.

30. ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη — *this generation.* The word is always used by Jesus to denote the men living at that time. This use is sufficient against the supposition that it means the Jewish race, or the human race, devices introduced to make it possible to interpret the prophecy as applying to the end of the world. But what meaning would either have as marks of time for the general winding up of human affairs? No, the statement means that these events are to take place during the lifetime of Jesus' contemporaries, and the events are, therefore, what the whole prophecy surely indicates, those connected with the fall of the Jewish state and the destruction of Jerusalem. πάντα ταῦτα — Here is the answer to those who suppose that the prophecy is to be divided into two parts, one predicting the Jewish catastrophe, and the other the world-catastrophe. All these things, and not the minor part of them, are to take place within that generation.

31. A proverbial statement of the inevitableness of his words. The most stable and enduring of all physical things, in fact the whole physical frame of things, will pass away, *i.e.* will perish and come to naught; but his words are imperishable.

παρελεύσονται, instead of παρελθῶσι, Tisch. Treg. WH ℵ BL. Omit μὴ, WH. BD*.

32. περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας — Jesus has given them the signs by which they may recognize the event when it comes, and has told them generally that it will be within that generation, but more specifically, the day, or the hour, no one knows. οὐδὲ . . . οὐδὲ. The use of οὐδέ forbids our translating this *neither, nor.* The first means *not even* and the second *nor.* οὐδέ is disjunctive, whereas *neither, nor*, is conjunctive. The preceding verses have

10. Καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν[1] πάλιν, οἱ μαθηταὶ περὶ τούτου ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν — *And (having come) into the house again, the disciples asked him about this.*

εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, instead of ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Δ. Omit αὐτοῦ, *his*, after οἱ μαθηταί, *the disciples*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 28. τούτου, *this*, instead of τοῦ αὐτοῦ, *the same*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCLMNX ΓΔ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh. ἐπηρώτων, instead of ἐπηρώτησαν, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ.

11. Ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ — *Whosoever puts away his wife.*

ἂν, instead of ἐὰν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ.

Jesus states now what takes place in case of a second marriage following a mere formal divorce. It is to be inferred from the previous statement of the indissolubility of the marriage bond. Any formal sundering of the tie leaves it really whole; the union being of this natural, physical kind, not accomplished by any formal procedure, but in the sexual act uniting man and woman, no formal procedure can break it, but simply leaves it as it was. And so, if any man divorces his wife and marries another, the second marriage goes for naught and the connection is an adulterous one, simply because the divorce is nil; it does nothing towards dissolving the marriage.

12. κ. ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τ. ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον — *and if she, having put away her husband, marries another.* Under the Jewish law, the wife could not put away her husband, and while Jesus goes outside of Jewish law and develops general principles in his teaching, he does not travel outside of Jewish custom in finding the occasion of that teaching. This is one of the things that point to the Gentile surroundings and destination of this Gospel. Though evidently written by a Jew, it grew up in Gentile soil, and there this appendix to Jesus' own teaching became perfectly natural. The exception to this prohibition of divorce — *except for the cause of adultery* — stated in Mt. 19[9] is really implied in our Lord's statement of principles as recounted in our Gospel, because adultery is the real dissolution of the marriage tie, as distinguished from the formal divorce. Precisely as divorce does not break the marriage tie, adultery does break it. But the statement is not full and clear without this, and in this respect the account of Mt. is to be followed.

αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα, instead of γυνὴ ἀπολύσῃ . . . καὶ, *a woman puts away . . . and*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ Memph. γαμήσῃ ἄλλον, instead of γαμηθῇ ἄλλῳ, *is married to another*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL Δ 1, 13, 28, 69, 124, 346, Latt. Memph.

[1] This use of εἰς without even any verb like *sit* or *stand*, implying previous action, or motion to a place, is to be noticed. The return to the house is implied without any verb to suggest it.

fixed the time; this declares it to be unknown. And from this an inference has been made favorable to the view that the prophecy is divided into two parts, the fixed and near time being assigned to the near event, and the unknown time to the far event of the general catastrophe. But the conjunction of *day* and *hour* in the statement serves to call attention to the *exact* time, and to the greater or less approximateness of knowledge which Jesus disclaims in regard to it. This is emphasized, rather than a certain period contrasted with another. Moreover, here as elsewhere in the discourse, there is an absence of everything to mark off the two periods from each other.

οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός — This denial of omniscience to the Son has caused all manner of theological tinkering. It means, say some, that he did not know it on his human side; or by a refinement, he did know it as man, but the knowledge was not derived from his human nature, but from the Divine; or he had no knowledge of it that he was authorized to impart, he was not supposed to know it; or the knowledge lay within his reach, but he did not choose to take it up into his consciousness; and some go so far even as to make the passage an Arian interpolation. But the statement need create no surprise in those who accept the statement of our Lord's humanity, especially when it is accompanied by statements of this particular limitation of his humanity; cf. Lk. 2^{52} Mk. $11^{12.13}$. εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ — literally, *except the Father*. This belongs with οὐδείς οἶδεν, and should follow it immediately — *no one knows, except the Father*. The intervening clauses make an adversative statement more normal. This limitation corresponds to what we know of the nature of inspiration. It increases human knowledge, but does not alter the nature of it. It conveys a knowledge of the future as contained in the present, and so an approximate knowledge of the time, *e.g.* that the fall of the Jewish nation would come in that generation. But it would not enable a man to predict the exact time, the day, or the hour.

ἢ, instead of καὶ, before τῆς ὥρας, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ABCEGHK LMS^2 UVW^b X ΓΔΠ *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Harcl. Omit οἱ before ἐν οὐρανῷ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ DK* LUW 11, 28, 115, 262, 299, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh.

33. Βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε[1] — *Take heed, be watchful.* This duty of watchfulness arises from the uncertainty of the time. Knowledge of it would leave time for them to be off their guard.

Omit καὶ προσεύχεσθε, *and pray*, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. *marg.* BD 122, *mss.* Lat. Vet. one *ms.* Vulg.

[1] ἀγρυπνεῖτε is compounded of α privative and ὕπνος, and means literally *be sleepless*. This and the parallel passage, Lk. 21^{36}, are the only places where the word occurs in the Gospels, so that this is another instance of the quite certain interdependence of the Synoptical Gospels.

34. ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος . . . καὶ τῷ θυρωρῷ ἐνετείλατο ἵνα γρηγορῇ, γρηγορεῖτε — There is nothing to be supplied before ὡς like ἐστίν, but the correlative of ὡς is γρηγορεῖτε. It reads — *As a man away from home, having left his house, and having given the charge to his servants, also gave orders to the porter to watch, watch ye therefore.* The full statement of the comparison would be, *so I say to you, watch.* The abruptness of the statement in its present form makes it more forcible.

Omit καὶ before ἑκάστῳ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL 238, 248, *mss.* Lat. Vet.

ἢ ὀψέ, ἢ μεσονύκτιον, ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας,[1] ἢ πρωΐ — *either in the evening, or at midnight, or at cock-crowing, or in the morning.* These words denote the four watches of the night, from six to six.[2]

Insert ἢ before ὀψέ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Harcl. *marg.* μεσονύκτιον,[3] instead of -τίου, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCL Δ.

36. μὴ ἐλθὼν ἐξαίφνης εὕρῃ ὑμᾶς καθεύδοντας — *lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping.* This clause depends on γρηγορεῖτε, v.[35] — *watch, lest he find you sleeping.* The last clause of v.[35] is parenthetical.

37. ὃ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω, πᾶσι λέγω, Γρηγορεῖτε — *and what I say to you, I say to all, Watch.* What Jesus had said before applied especially to the apostles, whose duties, like those of porter in a house, required special watchfulness. But in the kingdom of God, this watchfulness is required of all, though it is specially necessary in those left in charge of things. It is not intended to carry out the comparison any further than this, that the apostles, like a doorkeeper in a house, needed specially to be on the watch.

CONSPIRACY AND ANOINTING

XIV. 1–11. *The Sanhedrim plan to arrest Jesus stealthily, and to put him to death. He is anointed by a woman at the house of Simon the leper. Judas conspires with the Sanhedrim to deliver him up to them.*

Jesus spends the last two days in Bethany. During his absence, the authorities consult about the ways and means of putting him to death, and decide to postpone it till after the feast, when the people, whom they know to be friendly to Jesus, will have left Jerusalem. At some time during these two days, Jesus is entertained at the house of Simon the leper, and during the supper, a

[1] This word belongs to later Greek. [2] See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* ἀλεκτροφωνία.
[3] On this use of the acc. to denote approximately the time of an event, see Win. 36, 2.

woman (John says, Mary, the sister of Lazarus) anoints him with a costly ointment, worth upwards of three hundred denaries (shillings nominally, really more nearly dollars). Some of those present (Mt. says, disciples) were indignant at this waste. But Jesus justifies her act as befitting the time when he is about to be taken away, and when the act therefore acquires the unconscious significance of an anointing for his burial. And he prophesies that the beauty of the act will keep it alive in the memories of men wherever the glad tidings is proclaimed. Apparently from this very feast, Judas goes to the authorities, and conspires to deliver him up to them, causing another change in their plans, so that the intended delay till the close of the feast is given up.

1. τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα — Both of these words are used originally to denote the things entering into the feast of the Passover, the sacrifice of the paschal lamb and the eating of unleavened bread, and then they came to be used, one or the other, to denote the feast itself. The unusual thing here is the use of the two terms to denote with fulness the character of the feast by the mention of both its characteristic marks.

This is the first mention of the Passover in connection with these events. Probably, it is introduced to explain the conclusion of the authorities to postpone the execution of their plot till after the feast, as it was only two days to the beginning of it (v.[2]). οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς — *the chief priests and the scribes.* A designation of the Sanhedrim by the two principal classes composing it. ἐν δόλῳ — *by cunning;* not openly.

2. ἔλεγον γάρ — *for they said,* etc. This is intended to prove the preceding statement that they plotted to take him by cunning, not openly. The determination not to take him during the Passover, with the almost necessary publicity which would attend that, shows the secrecy which made a part of their plan. Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ — *Not during the feast.* The reason for this is given in what follows. They feared an uprising of the people, whom they knew to be favorable to Jesus, especially the Galilean pilgrims, and so they postponed their attempt till after the feast, when the multitudes attending the feast would be gone, and they could accomplish their purpose quietly. This part of their plan they gave up afterwards, owing to the opportunity which Judas put in their way. μήποτε ἔσται θόρυβος[1] — *lest perchance there shall be an uproar*[2] *of the people.*

---

[1] On the use of the future with μήποτε, see Burton, 199. The meaning, *lest perchance,* belonging to μήποτε in the N.T., is characteristic of later Greek.

[2] θόρυβος is used properly of the noise and disturbance of an excited crowd.

γάρ, instead of δέ, after ἔλεγον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL, *mss.* Latt. Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

3. **Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ** — The circumstances differ too much to permit the identification of this anointing with that at the house of Simon the Pharisee in Lk. 7^{36-50}. The points of likeness are simply the anointing and the name of the host. But in Lk.'s account the salient features are, that the woman was a sinner, that Simon was lacking in ordinary courtesy to his guest, and Jesus' answer to the charge of permitting such attentions from a woman of this character. Here, the extravagance of the act is the thing complained of. On the other hand, there is every indication that the event is the same as that in J. 12^{1-8}. The only difference is, that the Synoptists (Mt. and Mk.) give the name of the host, which is omitted in J., and J., on the other hand, gives the name of Mary, and connects her with Lazarus and Martha. But in case of the identity of these accounts, there is a difference of four days in the time, J. putting it six days before the Passover, and the Synoptists two days. This Simon the leper is not mentioned elsewhere. Evidently, his leprosy had been healed, and so he may have been one of those healed by Jesus. **γυνὴ** — J. says that this was Mary, the sister of Lazarus. **ἀλάβαστρον**[1] **μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς** — *an alabaster box of costly ointment of pure nard,* or *spikenard.* This word πιστικῆς has caused much dispute. Our English version, *spikenard,* comes from the Vulg., *nardi spicati,* and that is probably a modification of the Old Latin, *nardi pistici,* which is merely a transliteration of a term which puzzled the translators. Fritzche and others translate it *potable,* deriving it either from πίνω or πιπίσκω. But while this etymology is defensible, the word does not occur in that sense. But the word is used in the sense of *persuasive,* or in the latter language, *trustworthy,* which as applied to things, would come to mean *genuine.* This is, on the whole, the accepted opinion now, being supported by Grimm, Robinson, Meyer, DeWette, Morison, and others. There was a *pseudo-nard,* with which the genuine nard was often adulterated. **τῆς κεφαλῆς** — *the head.* J. says, *the feet,* following in this particular the account of the anointing at the house of Simon the Pharisee, Lk. $7^{38.\,46}$. It is not unlikely, though the two events are distinct, that the accounts have become a little mixed. **συντρίψασα τὴν (τὸν) ἀλάβαστρον κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς** — *having broken the alabaster box, she poured it upon his head.*

Omit καὶ before συντρίψασα, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BL Memph. τὸν before ἀλάβαστρον, Tisch. ℵ* ADEFHKSUVW^{b}X ΓΠ. τὴν, Treg. WH. ℵ^{c} BCL Δ. Omit κατὰ[2] before τῆς κεφαλῆς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL Δ 1, 28, 435.

[1] The proper form of this word is ἀλάβαστον, without the ρ. The usage seems to vary between the masc. and fem.

[2] On this omission of κατά after verb compounded with it, see Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

4. ἦσαν δέ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς, Εἰς τί ἡ ἀπώλεια αὕτη — *And there were some indignant to themselves.* — "*Why this destruction,*" etc.? πρὸς ἑαυτούς means probably that they kept their indignation to themselves, though it may mean *among themselves,* denoting an indignation which they expressed to each other.[1] The omission of καὶ λέγοντες, *and saying,* adds to the force of the statement, while detracting from its smoothness.

Omit καὶ λέγοντες, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BC* L, one *ms.* Lat. Vet.

Mt. 26[8] says that it was the disciples who expressed this indignation. J. says it was Judas Iscariot, and attributes it to his peculating habits, which this interfered with. It is a part of J.'s evident attempt to belittle Judas. Obviously, the true account is given by Mt., who gives us the ugly form of the fact.

5. δηναρίων τριακοσίων — *300 denaries,* or *shillings.* Or, since the real value of the denarius at the time was a day's wages, it would amount to more than as many dollars. This explains the indignation. The act was extravagant, certainly. Here and in v.[3], in the description of the ointment, J. betrays his dependence on the Synoptical source, by the same identity of language which shows the interdependence of the Synoptists. ἐνεβριμῶντο — *were very angry.*[2] Both of the words used to express their feelings are very strong.

Insert τὸ μύρον, *ointment,* after τοῦτο, *this,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ABCKLU ΔΠ, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

6. καλὸν ἔργον ἠργάσατο ἐν ἐμοί — *it is a good work that she wrought on me.* καλὸν ἔργον is emphatic, contrasted with their depreciation of what she had done. It is not estimated by our Lord according to a utilitarian standard, by which it would have little or no value. But he was at a crisis of his life when it was of the utmost value to him to know that he had won a place in a human heart. And for any one to be reckless or even extravagant, not calculating, in the expression of this was to him a good turn. It was the fragrance of a loving heart that was brought to him by the costly nard. Generally, Jesus would have men serve him in the persons of his poor. But such a vicarious transfer always involves reflection, and sometimes spontaneousness is worth more than reflection.

ἠργάσατο, instead of εἰργάσατο, Tisch. WH. ℵ* B* D 69, 150. ἐν ἐμοί, instead of εἰς ἐμέ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. and almost all sources.

7. πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς . . . ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε — *for the poor you have always . . . but me not always.*[3] This was the reason, not why the woman anointed him, but why such anointing was a

[1] Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* gives both meanings. [2] See on 1[43]. [3] Deut. 15[11].

good work, which he therefore encouraged. The whole transaction, as appears also from the προέλαβε μυρίσαι that follows, is given a special meaning and value in the mind of Jesus by the approach of his death. If it had not been for that, if they could have had him always with them, as they had the poor, this would not have touched so tender a spot, would not have been so good a work on him. οὐ πάντοτε is a case of language gaining force from extenuated expression.

8. ὃ ἔσχεν ἐποίησε — *She did what she could.*[1] προέλαβε μυρίσαι — *She anticipated the anointing.*[2] This is an unintended meaning which the act gains from its place so near our Lord's death. Unconsciously, she has rendered to him, while still living, the honors of burial. ἐνταφιασμόν[3] — *preparation for burial.* J. says, "Suffer her to keep it for the day of my preparation for burial,"[4] a decided lowering of the meaning.

Omit αὕτη, *this* (*woman*), Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL 1, 13, 28, 69, 209, 346, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Harcl. ἔσχεν, instead of εἶχεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. and most sources.

9. Ἀμὴν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, Ὅπου ἐὰν κηρυχθῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ὃ ἐποίησεν αὕτη λαληθήσεται — *And verily I say to you, Wherever the glad tidings is proclaimed in all the world, also what this woman did will be spoken.* Not *shall be spoken of*, as if Jesus meant to procure this mention himself in some way; but *will be spoken of*, a thing that he foresees. He sees that the beauty of this act, unappreciated now by his disciples, is such that it will win its way to this universal mention. μνημόσυνον — *a memorial.*[5] Holtzmann treats the use of εὐαγγέλιον in this verse as an instance of the meaning *Gospel* in the sense of an account of Jesus' life. But the use of κηρυχθῇ is against this.

Insert δὲ after Ἀμὴν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD[gr] EGKLSVW[b] ΓΔΠ, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. ἐὰν, instead of ἂν, after ὅπου, Tisch. WH. ℵ ABCLW[b] X ΓΔΠ. Omit τοῦτο, *this*, after εὐαγγέλιον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL 13, 28, 69, *mss.* Lat. Vet.

10. Καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώθ[6] . . . ἀπῆλθε πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς, ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδοῖ αὐτοῖς — *And Judas Iscariot . . . went away to the chief priests, to deliver him up to them.* εἷς τῶν δώδεκα — *one of the twelve.* This is simply a necessary part of the story, and this accounts sufficiently for its insertion, without supposing any rhetorical purpose in the writer. But its effect is tremendous.

It does not appear from Mk.'s account that there was any connection between this and the preceding event, as if Judas was led

[1] On the use of ἔχω in the sense of *possum*, see Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*
[2] Win. 54, 4. [3] A Biblical word. [4] J. 12[7].
[5] A rare word, found only once besides in the N.T. The occurrence of it therefore, here, in both Mt. and Mk., confirms again the interdependence of the Synoptics. [6] See on 3[19].

by it to what he did, though J. does tell us that Judas was specially aggrieved by the waste of the ointment. But the council of the Sanhedrim, the feast and the anointing, and the conspiracy of Judas, are simply put together as the events of this day. It has been assumed that we must find a logical connection of these events, and considerable ingenuity has been expended in accounting for the anointing on this ground. But the chronological connection explains everything. Notice that the chief priests become the leading actors in the proceedings against Jesus after his entry into Jerusalem, instead of the Scribes.

Omit ὁ before Ἰούδας, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDELM ΓΔΠ. Omit ὁ before Ἰσκαριώθ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ* BC* D. Ἰσκαριώθ, instead of -ώτης, Tisch. WH. ℵ BC* L *mss.* Lat. Vet. παραδοῖ, instead of παραδῷ, Tisch. Treg. WH. BD.

11. ἀργύριον — *money.* Mt. mentions the amount as τριάκοντα ἀργύρια, *thirty shekels*, or twenty dollars. For curious parallels to this price, see Ex. 21^{32} Zech. 11^{12}, cf. Mt. 27^{9}. εὐκαίρως — *opportunely.* Lk. states more exactly how he sought to deliver him up, viz. ἄτερ ὄχλου, *in the absence of the multitude.*

παραδοῖ is substituted for παραδῷ in this verse, on the same authority as in v.[10].

PREPARATION FOR THE PASSOVER

12–16. *On the first day of the Passover feast, the disciples ask for instructions in regard to their preparations for the Passover meal. Jesus tells two of them to go to the city and to follow a man whom they will meet there carrying a jar of water. At the house which he enters, they will find the owner prepared to show them a large room ready for their purpose. And there they will prepare for the feast. They follow his directions, and find everything as he tells them.*

12. τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων — *the first day of unleavened bread.* Strictly speaking, the feast did not begin till six o'clock of the afternoon, *i.e.* not until the beginning of the next day, the fifteenth of the month.[1] ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον — *when they sacrificed the paschal lamb.*[2] The killing of the paschal lamb was done by the priests at the temple, originally by the head of the family.[3] θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμεν — *do you wish us to prepare?*[4] This celebration of the Passover among themselves, instead of with their families,

[1] Ex. 12^{6}. [2] The impf. denotes a customary act. [3] Ex. 12^{21} Deut. 16^{5}.
[4] On this use of the subj. without ἵνα after θέλειν, see Win. 41 *a*, 4 *b*; Burton, 171.

shows how their association with Jesus had come to take the place of ordinary ties with the twelve.

13. δύο τῶν ἀποστόλων — Lk. 22[8] names Peter and John as the two. κεράμιον — Etymologically, this word denotes any earthenware vessel, but in use, it is restricted to a jar or pitcher. It is a question, whether this sign of a man bearing a jar of water on his head had been prearranged between Jesus and the οἰκοδεσπότης, or whether this is an instance of Jesus' supernatural knowledge of events. The manner of narration seems to imply that the evangelist meant us to understand the latter. There can be little doubt that the rest of the matter had been arranged with the host.

14. οἰκοδεσπότῃ — *master of the house.*[1] Ποῦ ἐστι τὸ κατάλυμά[2] μου . . . ; Where is my *dining room . . . ?*

Insert μου after κατάλυμα, Tisch. Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 1, 13, 28, 69, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Harcl. *marg.*

15. καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνάγαιον[3] μέγα ἐστρώμενον ἕτοιμον· καὶ ἐκεῖ ἑτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν — *and he will show you a large upper room furnished and ready; and there prepare for us.*

ἐστρωμένον — *spread* or *strewn.* It is used of making up a bed or couch, and here of making up, or furnishing a room with couches. καὶ ἐκεῖ ἑτοιμάσατε — καὶ connects ἑτοιμάσατε with ὑπάγετε, ἀκολουθήσατε, and εἴπατε.

ἀνάγαιον, instead of ἀνώγεον, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ AB* CDEFGHKLPV Π. Insert καὶ before ἐκεῖ, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCDL 346, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg.

Καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ ἦλθον — *And the disciples went out, and came.*

Omit αὐτοῦ, *his,* after μαθηταί, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ Egypt.

AT THE PASSOVER, JESUS PREDICTS HIS BETRAYAL

17–21. *As they were reclining at the Passover meal, Jesus announces that one of them, a disciple who eats with him, and is near enough to dip into the same dish with him, will deliver him up to the authorities. This is only fulfilling his destiny, but just the same it is woe to the man who betrays him. He had better never have been born.*

---

[1] The common Greek usage separates this word into its parts, οἰκου δεσπότῃ.

[2] κατάλυμα is etymologically, *a place to relax;* hence *an inn,* or *a dining-room.* The word belongs to Biblical Greek. See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.,* καταλύω (*c*).

[3] This word is variously spelled — ἀνάγαιον, ἀνώγαιον, ἀνώγεον, ἀνώγεως, ἀνώγεων. But these are all variant readings, as here. Liddell & Scott, ἀνώγεον.

18. παραδώσει — *will deliver up*, to the authorities. The word for betrayal is προδιδόναι. ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ — *he who eateth with me.* This is not a specification of the one of the twelve who was to do the deed, but of that which he does in common with the rest. It is this which has led to the reading τῶν ἐσθιόντων, WH. *marg.* This is shown first, by the act itself, as they all ate with him; and secondly, by the questions which follow, which show that the traitor is still unknown. The designation points out not the traitor, but the treachery of the act.[1]

τῶν ἐσθιόντων, (*one of you*) *who eat*, instead of ὁ ἐσθίων, (*one*) *who eats*, WH. *marg.* B Egyptt.

19. Ἤρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι, καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἷς κατὰ εἷς,[2] Μήτι ἐγώ;[3] — *And they began to grieve, and to say to him, one by one, Is it I?*

Omit Οἱ δὲ at beginning of verse, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BL Memph. κατὰ, instead of καθ', before εἷς, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BL Δ. Omit καὶ ἄλλος, Μήτι ἐγώ; *and another, Is it I?* Tisch. Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BCLP Δ, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Egyptt. Syrr.

20. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρυβλίον[4] — *And he said to them, One of the twelve, who dips with me in the dish.* This comes nearer to pointing out the betrayer than the preceding ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ, as this would be shared in only by those in his immediate vicinity. It adds to the sitting at table with him, nearness to him at the table. Mk. and Lk. do not relate that the traitor was more closely indicated than this. Mt., on the other hand, says that Judas was told himself that he was the betrayer. And in Mt., the ὁ ἐμβάψας . . . οὗτος is evidently intended to point him out to the rest, by indicating the one who dipped his hand into the dish with Jesus at a particular time. This difference between the two accounts is evidently intentional. Mk. does not mean to indicate the traitor, but only to emphasize the treachery of the act. Mt. means to relate the discovery of the betrayer. The individual handling of common material is evident. τρυβλίον is the dish containing the sauce of figs, dates, almonds, spice and vinegar, which is called in the Mishna חֲרוֹסֶת, charoseth.

Omit ἀποκριθεὶς, *answering*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt. Pesh. Omit ἐκ before τῶν δώδεκα, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. ℵ BCL 38, 60, 78, 127, Egyptt.

21. ὅτι ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει — *because the Son of Man goes.* This confirms the statement of the betrayal by that of his

---

[1] Cf. Ps. 41[9].

[2] On this construction, common in later Greek, see Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* εἷς, 4 *c*; Win. 37, 3.

[3] On the distinction between μή and μήτι, see on 4[21].

[4] Both ἐμβαπτόμενος and τρυβλίον in this statement occur only in this account in the N.T., and their use by both Mt. and Mk. is thus another strong confirmation of the interdependence of the Synoptics.

departure from this world, doubt of which would render the other doubtful. It is the general fact, the admission of which opens the way for belief in the betrayal.

Insert ὅτι, *because*, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL Egypt.

καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ — *As it is written of him.* Lk. says, κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον — *according to the decree.* The O.T. prophecy to this effect is Is. 53. The primary reference of the passage is to the suffering servant of Yahweh, who is defined in the prophecy itself to be the righteous Israel. But, as in the case of many of these prophecies, the principle involved makes it applicable to the fate of our Lord. This principle, that it is the fate of righteousness to suffer in this evil world, makes Jesus predict also the persecution of his followers as well as of himself. The O.T. prophets, himself, and his followers are involved in a like fate. οὐαὶ δὲ — *but woe.* This is not a malediction, in the sense of a wish or prayer that this vengeance may follow the traitor, but a solemn announcement of the Divine judgment. It differs in this respect from the comminatory Psalms.

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει — ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται — οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ — εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος — *The Son of Man goes — The Son of Man is delivered up — woe to that man — if that man had not been born.* The repetition of the title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is emphatic, and serves to bring it into tragic conjunction with παραδίδοται. ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος is repeated on the same principle, and with the same effect. Καλὸν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη — *well for him, if . . . had not been born.* This puts the condition in the past, and the conclusion in the present. The expression is evidently rhetorical, rather than exact.

Omit ἦν, *it would be*, after καλὸν, Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. BL, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

22–25. *In the course of the Passover meal, Jesus takes a portion of the bread from the table, and gives it to the disciples after the ordinary blessing or giving of thanks, saying,* This is my body. *And the cup of wine he blessed in the same way, and gave it to them, saying,* This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many. *This is the last time, he says, that he will drink with them, until they share with him the new wine of the kingdom.*

22. Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν — *And as they were eating.* In the course of the meal, therefore. But none of the evangelists state

the time more exactly. λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε — *he took bread, and having blessed he broke it.* The object of εὐλογήσας may be God, in which case, it means *having praised,* its ordinary sense; or it may be the bread, in which case, it means, *having invoked a blessing on;* a Biblical use. The former meaning is suggested by the use of εὐχαριστήσας in Lk. 22^{19}, and 1 Cor. 11^{24}. As a matter of fact, the invocations at meals among the Jews intermingled thanksgiving and blessing. λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου. Lk. adds τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, *which is given for you,* and 1 Cor. the same without διδόμενον. Both add τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. As to the meaning of the words, *this is my body,* it is enough to say that any insistence on their literal meaning is entirely contrary to linguistic laws and usage. They may mean, *this represents my body,* just as well as, *this is literally my body.* Meyer refers for examples of this use of εἶναι to Lk. 12^{1} — *the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy;* J. 10^{7} — *I am the door of the sheep;* 14^{6} — *I am the way, the truth, and the life;* Gal. 4^{24} — *these* (two sons of Abraham) *are two covenants;* Heb. 10^{20} — *the veil, that is his flesh.* But it is useless to multiply instances of so common and evident a usage. And yet, the one that evidently disproves the literal meaning, not merely establishing the possibility of the symbolic use here, but making the literal meaning impossible, is right at hand. For in the account of the consecration of the cup, Lk. 22^{20}, 1 Cor. 11^{25}, it reads τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, *This cup is the new covenant in my blood.* No one would contend for the literalness of the language in this case, and yet it is perfectly evident that the copula is used in the same sense in both cases, giving the meaning of the bread in the one case, and of the cup in the other, but not saying that the bread is actually flesh, nor the cup a covenant. All this without taking into account our Lord's manner of speech. We have some right to judge what any person says in a particular case by his habit of thought and speech. This warrants us in saying that the literal meaning is impossible to Jesus. It would pull down all that he had been at pains to set up throughout his ministry — a spiritual religion.

Omit ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ^{a} BD, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Omit φάγετε, *eat,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDKLM * PU Π 1, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Egyptt.

23. καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον — *And having taken a cup.* εὐχαριστήσας — *having given thanks.* Like εὐλογήσας, v.^{22}, it denotes some form of thanksgiving for the good things of God.

Omit τὸ, *the,* before ποτήριον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDLW^{b} X Δ 1, 11, 13, 28.

24. Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης — *this is my blood of the covenant.* διαθήκη in classical Greek means *a will,* or *testament.*

But in the N.T., the only examples of this use are in Heb. $9^{16.17}$, where by a play upon the double meaning of the word, the writer justifies his statement that a covenant (διαθήκη) is ratified by blood by showing that a testament (διαθήκη) comes into force only with the death of the testator. Everywhere else it has the purely Biblical and ecclesiastical meaning, *a covenant.* These words, *the blood of the covenant,* are borrowed from the institution of the Law, regarded as a covenant between God and the Jews (Ex. 24^{8}, Lev. 17^{11}). Moses sprinkled the people with the blood of sacrifice, as a seal of the covenant between God and them in the giving of the Law. And now, the new covenant, see Lk. 22^{20} 1 Cor. 11^{25}, in which the law is written in the heart, Jer. 31^{31-35}, is established, and that is sealed with the blood of him who died to bring it about. It is through his blood that the law of God is written inwardly in the heart, and so it becomes the blood of the new covenant. τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν — *which is poured out for many.* This fixes the sacrificial meaning of the flesh and blood. The pouring out of the blood signifies a violent death, and ὑπὲρ πολλῶν denotes that this death was suffered in behalf of others. ὑπέρ may be used to express the vicarious idea, *instead of,* but it does not necessitate it, as ἀντί does. Christ leaves this whole question of the exact part played by his death quite open. He does not anticipate any of the later lines of N.T. treatment of this subject. But one more element needs to be considered in estimating the meaning of the Eucharist, as it came from the hands of our Lord. The bread and wine were to be eaten and drunk. The meaning is thus a partaking of the Lord, the feeding of our spirit with the crucified Jesus. That is to say, it is Jesus our life, rather than the externally atoning aspect of his death, that is imparted to us in the sacrament (cf. J.[6]).

Jesus' use of the language of sacrifice in connection with his death does not indicate that he means to give to that death the current idea of sacrifice, but that he means to illumine the idea of sacrifice by his own death. As if he had said, "Here is the true meaning of sacrifice." The Gospels do not give us any command for the repetition of the supper, nor for its continuance as a church institution. That is implied in 1 Cor. 11^{25}.

Omit τὸ before τῆς (καινῆς) διαθήκης, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ BCD² ELVW^{b} X 11, 157. Omit καινῆς, *new,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.$^{ed.}$ Theb. ὑπὲρ, instead of περὶ, before πολλῶν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL Δ 13, 69, 124.

25. γενήματος τοῦ ἀμπέλου — *fruit of the vine.*

γενήματος, instead of γεννήματος, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ ABCEFHLMSU VW^{b} X ΔΠ. The form γένημα is rare, not occurring outside of Biblical Greek, and γεννήματος becomes thus an obvious correction.

ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν etc. — *until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.* Lk. 22[15-18] makes Jesus say this in general of the Passover meal at the beginning, before the institution of the sacrament. καινόν is not the word for new wine, for which νέον is used, but καινόν denotes a new kind of wine. In the making of all things new, the ἀνακαίνωσις, there is to be a new festal meeting and association of Christ and his disciples, a realization of these earthly feasts and symposia, which are brought to an end in this last supper. There is thus a note of sadness, a word of breaking up, closing these human associations, but a more solemn note of gladness, looking forward to the new spiritual associations and joys of the Messianic kingdom.

JESUS PREDICTS THE SCATTERING OF THE DISCIPLES, AND THE DENIAL OF HIM BY PETER

26–31. *After singing the Hallel, they go out to the Mount of Olives. On the way, Jesus warns the disciples that they will all fall away from him that night. He quotes a passage from Zechariah, showing that scattering of the sheep follows the smiting of the shepherd. After his resurrection, he will go before them into Galilee. Peter protests that he at least will not prove unfaithful, whereupon Jesus predicts that before the second crowing of the cock, he will deny him thrice. Peter again protests vehemently that he will sooner die with him, than deny him, and the rest of the disciples join him.*

26. ὑμνήσαντες — The hymn sung by the Jews at the Passover supper was the Great Hallel, consisting of Ps. 113–118, 136. It was the second part of this, 115–118, according to the school of Shammai 114–118, which they sang at this time, after the Passover meal. τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαίων — the name of the hill covered with olives, lying east of Jerusalem, and about half a mile from the city.

27. Ὅτι πάντες σκανδαλίσεσθε·[1] ὅτι γέγραπται, Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται — *All of you will fall away. For it is written,* I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered. The quotation is from Zech. 13. In the original, it reads, *smite the shepherd.* But since it is Jehovah who invokes the sword against the shepherd in the original, this πατάξω

[1] See on 4[17].

renders the sense of the passage. The whole passage in the original is involved in obscurity, but there is the same indication as in all the O.T. prophecies of the application to an immediate, and not a remote future; cf. v.[8]. The application to this event in the life of Jesus is because the relation between shepherd and sheep leads to the same result in both cases. Probably the shepherd in Zech. is the king, and the sheep are the people.

Omit ἐν ἐμοὶ, *because of me*, after σκανδαλισθήσεσθε, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DHLSVW^{b} X ΓΔΠ^{2}, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.$^{edd.}$. Omit ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ, *this night*, about the same. διασκορπισθήσονται, instead of -σεται, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ ABCDFGKLN Δ.

28. ἐγερθῆναι — this is the common word for the resurrection, but it acquires here a special meaning from the preceding πατάξω, denoting his rising from the earth to which he has been smitten. προάξω — this word also gets its special sense here from the figure of the sheep and shepherd. He will go before them, as a shepherd leads his flock, *i.e.* he will resume toward them his office of shepherd, and go before them to the familiar scenes of his earthly ministry. See J. 10[4]. The fact that there is no appearance to the disciples in Galilee in Mk. 16[9-20], in connection with this prediction, is one of the conclusive proofs that that passage is from another hand.

29. Εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ — *Even if all fall away, yet not I.* Strictly speaking, εἰ καὶ does not strengthen the statement as much as Καὶ εἰ. But the difference is too minute for a style like that of the N.T. Greek.[1]

Εἰ καὶ, instead of καὶ εἰ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCGL 1, 13, 69.

30. ὅτι σὺ σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ, πρὶν ἢ δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ — *that you to-day, this night, before the cock crows twice, will thrice deny me.* Peter in his boast emphasizes the πάντες. Jesus in his rebuke emphasizes the σύ — *you who feel so confident.* Peter had singled himself out as the one to be faithful in the midst of general defection. Jesus singles him out as the one out of them all to deny him. σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ — *to-day, this night*, the very day in which you have shown such self-confidence. δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι — This is the only gospel in which this δίς occurs, both in the prediction of Jesus, and in the account of the denials. Those two fatal cock-crowings had stuck in Peter's memory, and so find their way into the Gospel which gets its inspiration from him. φωνῆσαι — this is a general word for sounds of all kinds. But the instances are rare in profane authors of its use for animal cries. ἀπαρνήσῃ — *thou wilt deny.* As applied to persons, it means denial of acquaintance or connection with them.

[1] See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* εἰ, III. 6, 7.

Insert σὺ before σήμερον, Tisch. Treg. WH. ABEFGHKLMNSUVW^b X ΓΠ, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Egyptt. Syrr. ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ, instead of ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL, *mss.* Lat. Vet.

31. ὁ δὲ ἐκπερισσῶς ἐλάλει — *But he spoke with utter vehemence.* περισσῶς by itself means *inordinately,* and is used of anything that exceeds bounds. ἐκ adds to it the sense *completely, utterly.*[1]

ἐκπερισσῶς, instead of ἐκ περισσοῦ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCD 56, 58, 61. ἐλάλει, instead of ἔλεγε, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Omit μᾶλλον, *more,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Egyptt. Harcl.

ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον — *and so said also all.* Peter, according to this, did not occupy a singular position, but simply took his place of leader and spokesman, speaking out what was in the minds of all, to which they all assented.

THE AGONY IN GETHSEMANE

32–42. *Jesus comes with his disciples to Gethsemane, an olive orchard on the western slope of the Mount of Olives. Here he leaves the rest of them, and retires with Peter, James, and John, to pray. Beginning to be oppressed with the approaching trial, he bids them watch, and retires still further, where he prays that his impending fate may be averted, submitting himself, however, to the Divine will. Returning to the three disciples, he finds them asleep, and again bids them watch, adding as a reason this time that they themselves need to pray that they may be delivered from temptation. A second time, he prays, and returns to find them sleeping. The third time, finding them still asleep, he bids them at first sleep on; and then announces the approach of the betrayer.*

32. χωρίον — a diminutive from χώρα, denoting a small enclosure, a field. Γεθσημανεί — Greek form of a Hebrew name, meaning *oil-press.* It indicates that the place was an olive orchard, with an oil-press as one of the appurtenances, like a sugar house in a maple grove. J. 18[1] locates it on the farther side of the brook Kedron. καθίσατε ὧδε — *sit here.* The scene was one of those sacred things in a man's life, in which his best instincts bid him be alone. The other cases in our Lord's life of which we are told

[1] ἐκπερισσῶς occurs only here.

were the temptation, the raising of the daughter of Jairus, and the transfiguration. Peter, James, and John were taken nearer to the scenes of his soul's wrestling with impending fate, but even they were to remain outside, and watch.

Γεθσημανεί, instead of Γεθσημανή, Tisch. WH. (Treg. -νεῖ) ℵ ABCDEFG HLMNSV Theb.

33. Καὶ παραλαμβάνει τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην μετ' αὐτοῦ — *And he takes with him Peter, and James, and John.*

Omit τὸν before Ἰάκωβον, Tisch. Treg. WH. *marg.* ℵ CDEFGHMNSU VW^{b}X ΓΔΠ^{2}. μετ' αὐτοῦ, instead of μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCD 57, 69, 346.

34. ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν—*to be utterly amazed and troubled.* One derivation makes ἀδημονεῖν from ἄδημος, *homesick*, and the other from ἀδεῖν, *to be sated.* Either derivation makes it very expressive. The strong statement of his amazement opens before us a curious problem. His fate, as he comes to face it, is not only troubling, but amazing. His rejection by men, their fierce hatred of him, his isolation of spirit, even among his own — all these things coming to the Son of Man, the lover of his kind, whose whole life was wrought by love into the fibre and tissue of the common human life, and was individual in no sense — amazed him utterly. περίλυπος — *encompassed by grief.* ἕως θανάτου — *unto death. My sorrow is killing me*, is the thought; *it is crushing the life out of me.* καὶ γρηγορεῖτε — *and watch.* It is possible to take these words in a merely external sense. He knew that his enemies were at hand, and he might want some one to be on the watch for them. But it seems more probable that, as Mt. puts it (26^{38}), he wanted them to watch *with him*, to share his vigil, not against human foes, but against the flood of woes overwhelming his soul. If possible, he would have companionship in his extreme hour. See also v.^{38}.

35. ἡ ὥρα — *the hour;* the time used for the event with which it was big. There is a theologizing attempt to minimize it, as if it referred not to the sacrificial death, which our Lord had no desire to escape, but to the unnecessary incidents of it, from the denial by Peter, and the betrayal by Judas, to the crucifixion itself, as if these were not the very things that made his death sacrificial. It was the bitterness put into death by human sin that gave it its significance as a sin-offering. εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι — *if it is possible.* This possibility is limited only by the accomplishment of his work. If it is possible for him to do his work of redemption without that sacrificial death, he would escape that tragic fate. But it is not the bitterness of death itself, nor even the agonies of crucifixion, that he would escape, but the bitterness poured into it by the sin of men, which makes his cross to be the place where all the horror

of sin gathered itself together to strike him down, and made his torn and bleeding heart to become then and there the sin-bearer for the race.

ἔπιπτεν, instead of ἔπεσεν, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ BL Memph. *edd.*

36. Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ. This combination of the Greek and Hebrew words would not of course appear in the speech of our Lord, who used only the Hebrew. Neither is the ὁ πατήρ explanatory of the Ἀββᾶ, as the Evangelists employ for this the formulas, ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, or simply ὅ ἐστι, Mt. 1^{23} 27^{33} Mk. 3^{17} 5^{41} $15^{16.34}$. But this is a combination of the two, belonging to the later usage, and put here by the evangelist into the mouth of Jesus. πάντα δυνατά σοι — *all things are possible to thee.* Here the condition, *if it is possible,* is changed into the statement, *all things are possible to thee,* and so, as for the matter of possibility, the prayer is left unconditioned, *remove this cup from me.* But the condition is made now the will of God. This is Jesus' wish and prayer, to have the cup removed. But, after all, he knows that not his will, but that of the Father, will be carried out, and with that he is content.

37. καὶ ἔρχεται — *and he comes.* Jesus is not concerned about himself alone in this critical hour, but about his disciples as well. And so he interrupts even this agony of prayer, in order to see after their watchfulness. This is the one attitude of mind necessary in them from this time on, — see his prophetic discourse, ch. 13, — and now, in the crisis of his fate and theirs, he is anxious to impress the lesson on them. He has just predicted that they will desert him, and that Simon will deny him this very night. But this prediction, like all prediction, is intended to avert whatever evil it foretells. If it could only become a warning to them, they would be aroused past all danger of sleeping, and might have watched past all danger of desertion and denial.

38. γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ ἔλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν[1] — *watch and pray, that you come not into temptation.* In v.[34], he has enjoined watching on them in connection with his own awful sorrow. Now, without emphasizing the change, he enjoins it as necessary for themselves. And so now he adds prayer, and makes the object of both to be, that they enter not into temptation. The temptation is located not in external conditions, which constitute only a trial or test, but in the internal conditions, the evil desires of the heart, the weakness of the flesh. The outward attack on their steadfastness was right on them, and was not to be averted. They were to pray that this might not be an occasion of inward weakness, which would lead them into sin. Τὸ μὲν

[1] πειρασμόν is a Biblical word.

πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής — *The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak.* The πνεῦμα and the σάρξ are not contrasted elsewhere in this Gospel, nor in the teachings of Jesus. They denote the two extremes of human nature, πνεῦμα being the highest word used to describe the spiritual part of man, and hence, where distinctions are made within the soul itself, being the word used to denote the higher part; and σάρξ being used to denote the animal nature with its passions, and hence everything that belongs to the lower nature, everything that is debased and weak, whether proceeding from the flesh or not. The two terms cover much the same ground in this popular use as our terms *higher and lower nature.* Jesus is not pleading this as an excuse for his disciples' sleepfulness, but as a reason why they should watch and pray. The spirit is πρόθυμον, *eager, ready,* to stand by me, even to death, as you have just shown in your protestations; but the flesh is weak, the lower nature fears death and danger, and that exposes you to temptation.

ἔλθητε, instead of *εἰσέλθητε, enter,* Tisch. WH. ℵ* B 346, one *ms.* Lat. Vet.

39. τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον — *the same word.* λόγον is used here collectively of the language used by Jesus in his prayer. Mt. changes the prayer here, making it one of submission. *Father, if it is not possible that this cup pass from me, except I drink it, thy will be done.*

40. καὶ πάλιν ἐλθὼν εὗρεν αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας· ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καταβαρυνόμενοι[1] — *and again, having come, he found them sleeping; for their eyes were (being) weighed down.* The present part. καταβαρυνόμενοι denotes the process, not the completed state. καὶ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν — this belongs with the principal clause, not with the subordinate introduced by γάρ. *He found them sleeping; for their eyes were heavy; and they knew not what to reply to him.* So in the AV. and the RV., though the Greek is pointed the other way. Both their shame and their drowsiness would make them dumb.

καταβαρυνόμενοι, instead of βεβαρημένοι, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ^{c} ABKLNU ΔΠ* 1, 11, 13, 69, 106.

41. καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν κ. ἀναπαύεσθε — *sleep on now, and rest.* This is a free, but not at all a bad translation. *On* expresses very well the meaning of the pres. imp., which does not command the beginning of an action, but the continuance of an action already begun. τὸ λοιπὸν means the rest of the time, and is contrasted with the preceding time, when he has bidden them keep awake. *Now* is thus not a bad translation of it. As for the feel-

[1] καταβαρυνόμενοι is found only here in the N.T., and is rare in Greek writers.

ing with which Jesus would say this, it is impossible to keep out of it a certain kind of sad bitterness. ἀπέχει — *it is enough.*[1] This meaning is found in only one, possibly two other passages. But the other meaning, *to be distant,* is always used with some measure of distance. Morison supposes that the English version dates from the Vulgate, and that most everybody who has adopted it, has taken it from the Latin without much thought. But where did the Vulg. get it, and how does it happen that a mere hit, like that, should be justified by two recondite passages? It is shown to be a meaning of the word, it fits here, and it does not have against it the objection that Morison's own translation has. This apparently abrupt disturbance of their sleep after he had just told them to sleep, would imply that there was some time between it and that permission. ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα — literally, *the hour came.* The hour is that of the delivering up of the Son of Man, the announcement of which immediately follows. παραδίδοται — *is delivered up.*[2] The word for betrayal, προδιδόναι, is not used anywhere in connection with this event. τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν — *the sinners.* The article denotes the class, not individuals of the class. The signal thing about the career of Jesus had been his non-assumption of the power associated with his position, while yet he claimed to be the Messianic king; not simply a king, but the ideal king. And it seemed to be a sufficient answer to his claims to be a king, that he was not a king. But so far, he had at least kept out of the hands of his enemies, owing to their fear of the people and of Jesus' influence over them. Now, the crisis of his fate had come; the hour had struck; and the Son of Man, personating as he does in the prophecy, the kingdom of the saints of the Most High, an everlasting kingdom, and an endless dominion, is actually to be delivered up into the hands of the opposing party, the sinners. To our ears, it has a familiar sound, and we are accustomed to the whole train of ideas associated with it. But to the disciples, it must have sounded like the stroke of doom. And Jesus does not even try to escape it; he goes forth to meet his fate.

CAPTURE OF JESUS BY AN IRREGULAR FORCE SENT OUT BY THE SANHEDRIM, PILOTED BY JUDAS ISCARIOT

43–52. *The party that captured Jesus is represented as a crowd from the Sanhedrim armed with swords and clubs. Judas had given them a sign by which they would recognize*

[1] Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

[2] The pres. used to denote a certain future event. In this case, it is actually beginning with the advent of his captors, v.[42].

Jesus, arranging that the one to whom he gave the kiss of salutation they were to take and hold fast. This meant simply that the one whom he saluted as master was the leader whom they were sent out to capture, and this programme was carried out. One of the disciples (John says, Peter), not yet convinced that all was lost, and carrying out his purpose to die with his lord, if necessary, drew his sword, and with a random blow cut off the ear of the high priest's servant. But Jesus says to his captors, Why do you use force against me, as if I were a highwayman? Why did you not take me quietly when I was teaching every day in the temple? But this treatment of me as a malefactor is only a fulfilment of the fate marked out for me by the Scriptures. *At this, the disciples, seeing that Jesus does not mean to defend himself, and in that the destruction of all their hopes, forsook him and fled. One, however, a young man, who had been roused from his bed by the tumult, and had thrown a sheet about him, was taken by them, and escaped only by leaving the sheet in their hands.*

43. καὶ εὐθύς, ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, παραγίνεται Ἰούδας (ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης), εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων, παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ (τῶν) πρεσβυτέρων— *And immediately, while he was still speaking, there comes a crowd with swords and clubs, from the chief priests, and the scribes, and (the) elders.*

Insert ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης after Ἰούδας, Tisch. (Treg.) ADKMUW^{b} Π Latt. Syrr. Omit ὤν, *being*, after εἷς, *one*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDKLN SUW^{b} Π Latt. Egyptt. Pesh. Omit πολὺς, *great*, after ὄχλος, *crowd*, Tisch. Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BL 13, 69, *mss.* of Latt. Egyptt. Pesh. Omit τῶν, *the*, before πρεσβυτέρων, *elders*, Tisch. ℵ* AU 1, 69, 115, 131, 251, 282, 346, Orig.

εἷς τῶν δώδεκα—*one of the twelve.* This is repeated from v.[10], to keep this tragic element of the situation before us. ὄχλος—*a crowd.* The apprehending force is shown by this word ὄχλος to have been of the nature of a mob, an irregular and unorganized force. J. 18[3], on the contrary, says that it was the σπεῖρα, the Roman cohort, or a detachment representing it, under the command of the chiliarch, its commanding officer, together with the official attendants of the Sanhedrim. ἀρχιερέων . . . γραμματέων

. . . πρεσβυτέρων — *chief priests, scribes, elders.* This is the complete designation of the Sanhedrim by the classes composing it.

44. σύνσημον[1] — *a sign between them,* a concerted signal. The need of this does not appear, as Jesus was a well-known figure. But in the darkness and confusion, there was the possibility of escape, and there was an evident desire to make everything sure. ὃν ἂν φιλήσω — This sign given by Judas had nothing unusual about it, but was the ordinary form of salute. κρατήσατε αὐτὸν κ. ἀπάγετε ἀσφαλῶς — These directions were given by Judas to the crowd of which he had constituted himself the leader. ἀσφαλῶς — *securely,* giving no chance for escape. Judas, having once entered into this affair, did not want a fiasco made of it. The motives of Judas in this extraordinary treachery are difficult to understand. In judging of them, we have to remember that he was one of the twelve chosen by Jesus to be his most intimate companions, and we must not undervalue that choice by ascribing to Judas motives of such utter and irredeemable vileness as would make him an impossible companion for any decent person. It may be that he had for his purpose in this extraordinary move to force Jesus to assume the offensive against his enemies. This is, at least, vastly more probable than the mercenary motive hinted at in the Fourth Gospel. But, whatever his motive, whether he actually turned against Jesus, or only seemed to, in order to compel him to assume his power, he would want to make sure that his plan succeeded.

ἀπάγετε, instead of ἀπαγάγετε, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BDL 28, 40, 69.

45. ἐλθὼν . . . προσελθὼν — *having come, he came up to.* The first of these participles denotes an act precedent to that of the principal verb and the other participle taken together.[2] κατεφίλησεν — *he kissed.* The prep. denotes a certain profuseness in the act.[3]

46. Οἱ δὲ ἐπέβαλαν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ — *And they laid their hands on him.*

ἐπέβαλαν, instead of -λον, Tisch. WH. ℵ B. τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ, instead of ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ^{c} BDL 1, 11, 13, 69, 118, 346, *mss.* Lat. Vet.

47. Εἷς δὲ. It is probable that the numeral is used here, as it is commonly, to call attention to the number, not like the indefinite τις. The probability of this is increased if τις is retained in the text. Only one of the disciples resorted to this extreme action, involving, as it did, a certain courage, and also blindness. There was in it also an element of tentativeness, an initiative, in which all the prejudices of the disciples pointed to success, but in which the words of the Master must have raised bewilderment and doubt.

---

[1] A word belonging to Biblical Greek. [2] Win. 45, 3 *b*. [3] Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

Lk. 22^{49} says that the disciples generally asked if they should strike with the sword, and that one of them, without waiting for an answer, sought to precipitate matters by taking the offensive. J. 18^{10} gives the name, Simon Peter, and the incident is entirely characteristic. He also names the servant, Malchus. Lk. 22^{51} adds the interesting fact, that Jesus healed the man.

Omit τις, *a certain*, after εἷς, *one*, Treg. (WH.) ℵ ALM, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt. Harcl. ὠτάριον, instead of ὠτίον, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BD 1, Harcl. *marg.*

48. λῃστὴν — *a highwayman.* The word for *thief* is κλέπτης. Force would be unnecessary in capturing a mere thief. Jesus mildly resents the idea of lawlessness, implied in sending out an armed force to capture him. He is no highwayman, prepared to resist the law that he has violated.

ἐξήλθατε, instead of ἐξήλθετε, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BD 1, Harcl. *marg.*

49. καθ' ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων — *I was daily with you in the temple teaching.* This protests against the secrecy which they have used in his arrest. There is in it again, the idea that they have a dangerous character to deal with. He had not sought to hide himself, nor to cover up his teachings. He had mingled with them daily, and taught in the temple. He implies that there must be some secret reason, involving the weakness of their cause, not of his, for their proceeding against him with both force and secrecy. ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί — The Scriptures that would be fulfilled in this instance were those that presaged his treatment as a malefactor, *e.g.* Is. $53^{6-9.\,12}$. Our Lord must have entered very deeply into the inner meaning and heart of the Scriptures, to find them presaging his fate; just as the Scriptures themselves nowhere vindicate their inspired quality as in that presentiment.

50. καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον πάντες — They had stood by him until his words and acts made it evident that Jesus was committed to a policy of non-resistance. After that, to stay was simply to involve themselves in his fate, and for that, not courage, but faith was lacking. This is the explanation of their conduct during this crisis; their faith had suffered an eclipse. To the rest of the Jews, his non-resistance and the failure of heaven to interfere in his behalf were conclusive proof of the falseness of his Messianic claim. To the disciples, whose simpler and less sophisticated mind was deeply impressed with the varied proof of greatness afforded in their intimate association with him, but who had the same Jewish ideas of the Messiah, these untoward events were an occasion of profound doubt and perplexity, but not of actual unbelief. But doubt removes courage; the disciples fled because their faith wavered.

51. *νεανίσκος τις συνηκολούθει — a certain young man accompanied him.* This is a singular episode in the tragedy of our Lord's betrayal, and it is still more singular that it should have found its way into the account, forming, as it does, a picturesque incident, but not an essential of the event. The linen cloth was a sheet which he had thrown around him, when he got out of his bed, probably aroused by the stir which the crowd made when it passed by his house. Evidently he was a disciple, but his hasty dress shows that he was not one of the twelve. The failure to mention his name does not show that it was unknown to Mk.; see v.[47]. Rather, this, together with the mention of an event otherwise so trivial, might easily point to Mk. himself as the person.

νεανίσκος τις, instead of *εἷς τις νεανίσκος*, Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Egypt. Pesh. *συνηκολούθει, accompanied*, instead of *ἠκολούθει, followed*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL.

52. *καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ καταλιπὼν τὴν σινδόνα γυμνὸς ἔφυγεν — and they seize him; but he, having left the linen cloth, fled naked.*

Omit *οἱ νεανίσκοι, the young men*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* DL Δ, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh. Omit *ἀπ' αὐτῶν, from them*, Tisch. Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BCL, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egypt. Pesh.

JESUS BEFORE THE SANHEDRIM

53–65. *Jesus is carried before the Sanhedrim, who examine him in regard to his standing before Jewish law. This is necessary in order to vindicate their procedure as a national tribunal. But in this examination, they proceed as a prosecuting body, seeking testimony by which they may put him to death, instead of sitting as judges on the question of his guilt. They found, however, only false witness, and that not self-consistent, to the effect that he had threatened to destroy the temple built with hands, and to build another in three days, without hands. The first part of this was the only one containing any offensive matter, and that was false. The high priest then questioned Jesus in regard to this testimony, and Jesus by his silence implied that there was nothing to answer. Then the high priest asks him directly if he is the Messiah, which is the real question at issue. Jesus sees in this a question which he has no desire to evade, the matter about which he wants no mistake nor*

doubt, especially before the highest tribunal, and he answers, I am. *He prophesies also that they will see the Son of Man occupying the position of Divine vicegerent, and exercising his authority here on earth. This is taken as convicting him of blasphemy out of his own mouth, and he is condemned guilty of this capital crime. Then they begin to abuse him, spitting on him, and casting ridicule on his prophetic claims by vailing his face, and then after buffeting him, saying,* Prophesy, who struck you. *Meantime, while this sorry business is going on, Peter, not wishing to identify himself with his Master, and yet unwilling to remain ignorant of his fate, seats himself in the court with the under-officers of the Sanhedrim.*

53. τὸν ἀρχιερέα — *the high priest,* who was *ex-officio* the president of the Sanhedrim. Mt. gives us the name of the high priest, viz. Caiaphas.[1] J. tells us of a preliminary examination before Annas, the father-in-law of Caiaphas, for which the Synoptics leave no room, and with which it is difficult to keep the consistency of John's account.[2] οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς κ. οἱ πρεσβύτεροι κ. οἱ γραμματεῖς — These were the three classes composing the Sanhedrim. This trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrim as the judicial body of the nation, was to ascertain his guilt under the law of the land. Probably, that would not be enough to procure his condemnation before the Roman procurator, who would not be likely to put him to death except for some offence against the imperial government. But they knew that they would not be justified before the nation for procuring his death, unless they could find him guilty of some capital sin against the Jewish law. This meeting of the Sanhedrim must have been arranged in expectation of Jesus' arrest.

Omit αὐτῷ, *to him,* after συνέρχονται, *gather,* Tisch. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. ℵ DL Δ 13, 64, 69, 124, 346, Latt. Memph.

54. ἀπὸ μακρόθεν[3] ἕως ἔσω, εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν — literally, *as far as inside, into the court.* It seems better here to retain the proper meaning of αὐλήν, viz. the open space, enclosed by the walls of the palace, the court, though it probably has the meaning *palace* in some places.[4] ὑπηρετῶν — *the attendants,* or *officials* of the Sanhedrim, like the Roman lictors, or our sergeants-at-arms, or doorkeepers. πρὸς τὸ φῶς — *at the light of the fire.* R V. Pos-

[1] Mt. 26[57]. [2] J. 18[13. 24]. [3] On the pleonastic use of the prep., see Win. 65, 2.
[4] Mt. 26[3. 58] Mk. 15[16] Lk. 11[21] J. 18[15].

sibly, the light, instead of the fire itself, is named, because it calls attention to the fact that Peter was in sight, not hid away in the darkness.

55. ἐζήτουν μαρτυρίαν . . . εἰς τὸ θανατῶσαι — *sought witness . . . to put him to death.* They did not act as judges, but having formed the purpose to put him to death, they sought witness against him. Nominally, they were judges; really, they were prosecutors.[1]

56. πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐψευδομαρτύρουν — *for many bore false witness.* This confirms the statement that they found no witness to put him to death. Such testimony, *i.e.* as would answer their purpose, since, though many bore false witness, their testimony did not agree.

58. Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, etc. — *I will destroy this temple made with hands, and after three days I will build another without hands.* The nearest approach to this is found in J. 2^{19}, "*Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it.*" This omits the only damaging part of the testimony, the "*I will destroy this temple.*" ἀχειροποίητον[2] — *not made with hands.*

WH. *marg.* has the singular reading ἀναστήσω, *I will raise another not made with hands.* It is found in D and four *mss.* Lat. Vet.

59. καὶ οὐδὲ οὕτως — *and not even so,* implying that this was the nearest approach to definite and consistent testimony that they found, but that even in this, the testimony of different witnesses disagreed in essential particulars. Mk. calls it ψευδομαρτυρία, but evidently in the sense that it misrepresented a saying of Jesus, not that there was no such saying. According to Mt., there were two witnesses who testified to this.

60. Failing to find testimony, the high priest proceeds to question Jesus, as if the testimony itself had been of such a nature as to require an answer from him. The silence of Jesus is due to this fact. It is as much as to say, "There is nothing to answer."

Omit τὸ before μέσον, *midst,* Tisch. Treg. WH. and about everything, except DM Memph. οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν, instead of οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCL 33, Egyptt.

The high priest then puts a leading question, seeking to make Jesus criminate himself. And the question is put in the form expecting assent, *Thou art, art thou?* ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ — *the Son of the blessed.* This addition to the simple ὁ Χριστός, *the Messiah,* is intended to bring out the solemnity of the claim, and thus the blasphemy that would be involved in the false claim. It was not something added to the claim of Messiahship by Jesus, involving blasphemy, whereas the claim of Messiahship by itself would not involve that: but it was a legitimate part of the Jewish description of the Messiah. εὐλογητός is not found elsewhere in

[1] See v.[1].

[2] A word found only in the N.T.

the N.T., except as a predicate of θεός in doxologies. It means the one who is worshipped.

62. Now, the high priest gets an answer. The time has come for Jesus to make his confession before the highest tribunal of the nation. To be silent now would wear the look of abdicating his claim at the critical moment of his life. And he proceeds to add to it even more of august and solemn circumstance than the high priest had maliciously invested it with. κ. ὄψεσθε τ. υἱὸν — *And you will see the Son of Man seated on the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.* He cites here again the language of Dan. 7^{13}, applying it to himself. It is as if he had said, *you will see fulfilled in me the most august of the Messianic prophecies.* καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως — occupying, *i.e.* the throne of God's vicegerent, the position next to the throne itself. This again is a legitimate part of the Messianic claim, according to Jewish expectation, but it shows, as the language of the High Priest had done, the blasphemy of a false claim. In the mouth of Jesus, it denotes the place that he was to occupy in heaven. Mt. adds, ἀπ' ἄρτι, *from this very time on*, and Lk. ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, *from now on;* and with this addition, it points evidently to the earthly evidences of this heavenly power. They were to see with their own eyes the advancing kingdom of the Son of Man in the world. With this limitation of time, the language cannot refer to what was to take place at the end of the world, but to what was to take place continually in the world from that time on. It was to become immediately the scene of the Messianic kingdom, in which the Son of Man was to rule over its affairs from his throne in heaven. κ. ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν. See on 13^{26}. This denotes more specifically the intervention of the Son of Man, the Messianic King, in the affairs of the world. The whole statement means, in connection with Jesus' confession of the Messianic claim, that they would see him exercising the Messianic power.

63. διαῤῥήξας τ. χιτῶνας — *having rent his garments.* χιτῶνας is used here of garments in general, not restricted to inner garments. Mt. says ἱμάτια (26^{65}).

64. ἠκούσατε τ. βλασφημίας — *you heard the blasphemy.* The blasphemy did not consist in the terms in which he claimed the Messianic dignity, since he used simply the language of prophecy, but in what the high priest considered to be his false claim to so august a position. ἔνοχον θανάτου — *liable to (the punishment of) death.* The high priest has named the crime of which they find him guilty under the Jewish law. This is the penalty of that crime of blasphemy.

65. Καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ — *And some began to spit on him.* Lk. says, *those who held him.*[1] But he puts this in another

[1] Lk. 22^{63}.

place. According to him, the Sanhedrim did not assemble till the next morning, and this reviling was done by those who held Jesus in custody during the interval. Προφήτευσον — *Prophesy.* The subject of prophecy was to be, *who smote him.*[1] οἱ ὑπηρέται — *the attendants,* the officers of the Sanhedrim.[2] ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον — *received him with blows.* This marks the end of the present procedure before the Sanhedrim, when he would be turned over to the officials for custody. And this is the reception which they gave him.

ἔλαβον, instead of ἔβαλλον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCIKLNSV ΓΔΠ. DG 1, 13, 69, Memph. Harcl. ἐλάμβανον.

PETER'S DENIAL

66–72. *While the trial is going on, Peter is at the fire in the court of the palace. One of the maid-servants of the high priest sees him there, and charges him with being a follower of Jesus. Peter denies it, and pretends not even to understand what she says. But he sees that the situation is becoming dangerous, and goes out into the vestibule, leading from the court into the street, when a cock crowed. There the servant repeats her charge, and Peter his denial. Finally, after a short time, the bystanders detect the Galilean burr in Peter's speech, and renew the charge. Then Peter begins to protest with oaths that he does not know whom they are talking about. It is the third denial, and the cock crowed a second time, which brought to his mind Jesus' warning, and having thought on it, Peter wept.*

67. Καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ ἦσθα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ — *You too were with the Nazarene, Jesus.* καὶ adds σὺ to the rest of the disciples, who have kept away from the place of danger. *You too, who take your place so boldly here.* The position of Ναζαρηνοῦ, and its separation from τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, makes it emphatic. *The Nazarene* concentrates in itself their notion of the absurdity of his claim.

ἦσθα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, instead of Ἰησοῦ ἦσθα, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BCL. Also ℵ D Δ Latt. Syrr. insert τοῦ before Ἰησοῦ.

68. οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι — *I neither know, nor understand what you say.* Peter makes his denial as explicit as possible. It

[1] Mt. 26[68] Lk. 22[64]. [2] See on v.[54].

is a denial of all knowledge, or even understanding of what, the woman is saying. προαύλιον[1] — the vestibule, or covered way, leading from the street into the inner court. καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε — *and a cock crowed,* not *the cock.*

οὔτε . . . οὔτε, instead of οὐκ . . . οὐδέ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Egyptt. Omit καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε, *and a cock crowed,* WH. RV. *marg.* ℵ BL, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

69. καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη — *and the maid,* the same who had made the former charge. Mt. 26[71] says ἄλλη, *another maid.* L. 22[58] says ἕτερος, *another man.* J. 18[25] says ἔλεγον, *they said.*

τοῖς παρεστῶσιν, instead of τοῖς παρεστηκόσιν, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCIKL ΔΠ*.

70. ἠρνεῖτο — *denied.* Mt. says μετὰ ὅρκου, *with an oath.* The answer of Peter varies also in the several accounts. μετὰ μικρὸν — L. says διαστάσης ὡσεὶ ὥρας μιᾶς, *about one hour having intervened.* J. says that the person making this third charge was a kinsman of Malchus, whose ear Peter had cut off at the arrest, and that he asks if he did not see Peter with Jesus in the orchard. The Synoptists agree in their account of this charge, all of them inserting ἀληθῶς, *Verily* (L. ἐπ' ἀληθείας), and giving substantially the same reason, viz. that he was a Galilean. Mt. adds, ἡ λαλιά σου δηλόν σε ποιεῖ — *thy speech makes thee known.* The best texts omit these words in Mk.

Omit καὶ ἡ λαλιά σου ὁμοιάζει, *and your speech is like,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL 1, 118, 209, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt.

71. ἀναθεματίζειν — *to curse.*[2] It does not denote, any more than ὀμνύναι, vulgar swearing, but the imprecation of divine penalties on the person, if he does not speak the truth.

ὀμνύναι, instead of ὀμνύειν, Tisch. Treg. WH. BEHLSUVX Γ.

72. Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε — *And immediately, a second time, a cock crowed.* τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς[3] — *the word, how.* κ. ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιε — *and having thought on it, he began to weep.* This meaning of the verb is clearly established now, and it is clearly the best rendering, if allowable.[4] The impf. denotes the act in its inception, he began to weep. Peter had lost his faith for the time, but that was no reason why he should lose his courage and honesty. But his courage was supported by his faith, and fell with it. Why should he run any risks for a hope that had failed him? This was his thought while he was under press-

[1] A rare word, found in the N.T. only here.
[2] A purely Biblical and ecclesiastical word, found in the N.T. only here, and Acts 23[12. 14. 21].
[3] See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* ὡς, I. 6.
[4] See Morison for best statement of different views.

ure. But now he remembers the warning of Jesus, and with it recalls all that Jesus had been to him, whatever might become of the hope that they had all associated with him, and he weeps over his own baseness. But he does not take back his denial.

τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς, instead of τοῦ ῥήματος οἱ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCL Δ Egyptt. Insert εὐθὺς before ἐκ δευτέρου, Tisch. Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) WH. RV. ℵ BDGL 13, 69, 124, 346, Latt. Pesh.

JESUS BEFORE PILATE

XV. 1–15. *The Sanhedrim have found in Jesus' claim to be the Messiah a basis of procedure against him under Jewish law. The claim they judged to be blasphemy. It appears now that they made use of the same before Pilate. For the first question that Pilate asks is whether Jesus is king of the Jews, evidently reflecting in this the charge on which Jesus has been brought to him. Jesus assents to this, but Pilate is well enough informed about the affairs of his province to know that the claim as made by Jesus does not amount to treason, and involves no harm to the state. Otherwise, the case would have been complete. The chief priests, seeing that it is not, proceed to make various charges, to which Jesus makes no reply. Just how the next step is brought about we are not told, but probably it is a device of Pilate's to use the sympathy of the people against the malice of the authorities, and so justify himself in releasing Jesus. In a case like this, it would be the policy of the empire not only to decide the question on its merits, but to conciliate the people. At any rate, the question of releasing to the people a political prisoner being brought up, he asks them if he shall release to them the king of the Jews. But the chief priests, knowing that the hope of the people had been for a political Messiah, and that Jesus had disappointed that hope, found it easy to stir up the crowd to demand the release of Barabbas, who had been in a political plot, and even the crucifixion of Jesus. And Pilate following the Roman policy, acceded to their demand.*

1. Καὶ εὐθὺς πρωὶ συμβούλιον ἑτοιμάσαντες — *And immediately in the morning, having made ready a concerted plan of action.* It is evident that their formal procedure had been the night before, resulting in the condemnation of Jesus, 14^{64}. On the contrary, this morning meeting was an informal gathering to decide on a plan of action before Pilate. συμβούλιον with ἑτοιμάζειν denotes not a consultation, but the result of the consultation, a concerted plan of action.[1] This is the reverse of Jewish legal process, which would have allowed the informal gathering at night, but a judicial procedure only during the day.[2] Lk. makes this trial in the morning to be the one in which they extract from Jesus the confession that he is the Messiah. In fact, in Mt. and Mk. the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrim is at night, in Lk., on the contrary, it is in the morning.[3] κ. ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον — The AV. translates here so as to make these words a part of those dependent on μετὰ, *with.* But they belong with οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς. The RV. translates properly; *The chief priests with the elders and scribes, and all the council.* τῷ Πιλάτῳ — this is the first time that Pilate has been mentioned in Mt. or Mk. Lk. tells us that he was procurator of Judæa at the time that John the Baptist began his work,[4] and we know from other sources that he had been procurator for three years at that time. Judæa had been a part of the Roman province of Syria since A.D. 6, and was governed by a Roman procurator, whose residence was Cæsarea. Pilate was sixth in the line of these. His presence at Jerusalem was on account of the Passover, and the danger of disturbance owing to the influx of Jews at the feast.

Omit ἐπὶ τὸ before πρωΐ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDL 46, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egypt. ἑτοιμάσαντες, instead of ποιήσαντες, Tisch. WH. *marg.* ℵ CL. Internal evidence favors this more difficult reading.

2. σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; — *Art thou the king of the Jews?* The pronoun is emphatic, and probably disdainful. Pilate ridicules the charge. Σὺ λέγεις — *Thou sayest.* A Jewish form of assent. In Lk. $22^{70.71}$, this formula is treated by the Sanhedrim as assenting to their questions. And in Mk. 14^{62}, ἐγώ εἰμι is given as the equivalent of σὺ εἶπας in Mt. 26^{64}. Nevertheless, the ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι of Lk. 22^{70}, and Jn. 18^{37}, ὅτι βασιλεύς εἰμι, show that it is not the same as if he had merely assented, that the form of assent is such as to admit of adjuncts inappropriate to mere ordinary assent. On the other hand, it does not seem in any of the N.T. passages quoted to differ essentially from assent.[5] Here, as in the trial before the Sanhedrim, this is the one question that Jesus answers. It is the only question on which his own testimony is important, and absolutely necessary. Left to the testimony of others, and of

[1] See Holtzmann. [2] See Edersheim, *Life of Jesus*, II. ch. 13, 3.
[3] Lk. 22^{66-71}. [4] Lk. 3^{1}. [5] See Thayer, Art. in *Journal Bib. Lit.* 1894.

his own life, this essential thing, which is the key to the whole situation, would be subject to the ridicule with which Pilate treats it. In spite of all appearances to the contrary, he says, *I am King*. It is another and entirely different question, whether his kingship interfered with the State, and so made him amenable to its law. And just because that question would have to receive a negative answer, and so would seem to deny kingship in any accepted sense, he had to affirm that claim.

αὐτῷ λέγει, instead of εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCD Memph. 1, 127, 209, 258, read λέγει αὐτῷ.

3. Καὶ κατηγόρουν αὐτοῦ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς πολλά — *And the chief priests brought many accusations against him.* This was evidently because Pilate was not convinced by their statement that he claimed to be a king. Under the Roman system, the governor of a province was supposed to keep the central government informed of whatever was going on in his jurisdiction, and this system was so perfected that there would be little chance for a work like that of Jesus to go on without the cognizance of the Roman deputies. Pilate's whole attitude shows that he understood the case, so that he was not alarmed by a charge, which in any other circumstances he could not have treated so cavalierly. Lk. tells us something about these charges.[1] Of course, the principal one was his claim to be a king, the Messianic King, which Jesus admits. To this they added that he stirs up the people, and forbids to pay tribute to Cæsar. This is what is needed to give a treasonable character to the main charge. If these acts could be proved, they would be overt acts of treason. And the fact that Pilate pays so little attention to them, and does not treat Jesus' silence in face of them as an evidence of guilt, proves conclusively that he understood the facts.

4. ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν, (λέγων) . . . πόσα σου κατηγοροῦσιν — *asked him, (saying) . . . how many charges they bring against you.*

ἐπηρώτα, instead of -τησεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. BU 13, 33, 69, 124, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Harcl. *marg.* Omit λέγων, Tisch. (WH.) ℵ* 1, 209, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Theb. κατηγοροῦσιν, instead of καταμαρτυροῦσιν, *bear witness against*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCD 1, Latt. Memph.

οὐκέτι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη — *no longer answered anything;* viz. after the first question. Jesus' silence is due to the fact that his life is a sufficient answer to these charges. The fact of his kingship would seem to men to be denied or rendered doubtful by the events of his life, and to that, therefore, he needed to testify. But as to these questions, involving the interference of his kingdom

[1] Lk. 23^{5}.

with the State the facts were enough. And Jesus knew, moreover, that Pilate was cognizant of these facts. As to stirring up the people, he had done just the opposite, he had repressed them, and one of the significant facts given to us in the Synoptists is his wise silence in regard to his Messianic claim, lest the people should be stirred up by false hopes. And as to forbidding the payment of tribute to Cæsar, he had, instead, commanded it. That is, he had used his authority to enforce that of the State, not to overthrow it. Pilate's course throughout shows that he appreciated the situation, and that at no time in the trial did he consider the charges against Jesus of any weight whatever. *θαυμάζειν* — No wonder that Pilate wondered. It is one of the places where the heavenly way seems not only unaccountable to men, but also somehow admirable. The Sanhedrim, knowing that they were weak on the side of facts, added to these protestations and clamor, and wily personal appeal, intent only on carrying their point. Jesus, strong in his innocence, brings no pressure to bear, beyond that of simply the facts, which he allows to do all the talking for him. There is no doubt which method secures immediate ends in this world. Jesus says about the men who use the worldly way, *Verily I say unto you, they have their reward.* But neither is there any doubt which secures large ends, and wins in the long run. It is not only the truth, but the method of truth that prevails at last.[1]

6. Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν ἀπέλυεν — *Now at the Feast he was in the habit of releasing.* The AV. obscures everything here. This custom is quite probable, and is in line with what we know of Roman policy. It was a part of the Roman administration of conquered provinces, a policy of conciliation. But there is no mention of it elsewhere.

ὃν παρῃτοῦντο, instead of ὅπερ ᾐτοῦντο, Tisch. Treg. *marg.* WH. RV. ℵ* AB*.

7. στασιαστῶν . . . στάσει — *insurgents . . . insurrection.* These words tell the story of Barabbas. He was just what the Jews accused Jesus of being, a man who had raised a revolt against the Roman power. He was a political prisoner, and it was only such that the Jews would be interested to have released to them. Their interests and those of Rome were opposed, and a man who revolted against Rome was regarded as a patriot. The fact that they asked for Barabbas shows that they were insincere in bringing charges against Jesus.

στασιαστῶν, instead of συστασιαστῶν, *fellow-insurgents*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDK 1, 13, 69, Theb.

---

[1] Cf. Is. 53[7].

8. καὶ ἀναβὰς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι, καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς — *and the crowd, having come up, began to ask (him to do) as he was wont to do for them.*

ἀναβάς, instead of ἀναβοήσας, *having cried out*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Egyptt. Omit ἀεί, *always*, Tisch. WH. RV. ℵ B Δ Egyptt.

9. θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων — *Do you wish me to release to you the king of the Jews?* Pilate has been informed evidently by the chief priests, that it is the people themselves who have invested Jesus with this title, on his entry into Jerusalem. And he uses the term here, expecting their sympathy.[1]

10. διὰ φθόνον — *on account of envy.* He knew that it was the popularity of Jesus with the multitudes that had aroused the jealousy of the rulers against him, and he hoped that he could make use of that now to secure his release.

11. οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς — *but the chief priests stirred up the multitude, that he should rather release Barabbas to them.* This was the first time in the life of Jesus that the people had turned against him. And while, of course, the fickleness of the crowd is always to be taken into account, there were other elements at work here, which made the people especially pliable. It was a case of regulars against an irregular, of priests against prophet, and popular preference is always evenly balanced between these. But the great thing was the cruel disappointment of the people after the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem. He had raised their hopes to the highest pitch then, only to dash them to the ground again by his subsequent inaction and powerlessness. It was no use for them to ask for the release of a king who had just abdicated.

12. ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Τί οὖν (θέλετε) ποιήσω (ὃν) λέγετε τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων; — *said to them, What then shall I do (do you wish me to do) with him whom you call the king of the Jews?* Or, *What then do you tell me to do with the king of the Jews?* The reading ὃν λέγετε τ. βασιλέα τ. Ἰουδαίων so evidently preserves to us an element of the situation, which a copyist would not think of, that it is to be retained. The fact that it was the people themselves who had invested Jesus with this title Pilate would be certain to use here, so that the ὃν λέγετε evidently belongs to this transaction. But it is just the thing that a copyist would lose sight of, as out of harmony with the present hostile attitude of the people. It is because Pilate remembered this, that he still hoped that he might find in the people, if not a demand for the release of Jesus, at least some manifestation of indifference that would show him that

[1] So Weiss.

the cry for his death was not a popular demand, and then he could afford to go against the rulers. He was evidently determined to yield to nothing except popular pressure, and that he hoped Jesus' previous popularity might avert.

ἔλεγεν, instead of εἶπεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BC Harcl. Omit θέλετε, WH. RV. ℵ BCD 1, 13, 33, 69, Egypt. Omit ὃν before λέγετε, WH. B. Omit ὃν λέγετε, Treg. (Treg. *marg.*) AD 1, 13, 69, 118, Latt. Theb.

13. Σταύρωσον αὐτόν — *Crucify him.* An extreme probably to which they would not have gone except for the instigation of the priests. But having lost their confidence in Jesus, they were ready to follow their accustomed leaders.

14. Τί γὰρ ἐποίησεν κακόν; — *Why, what evil did he do?*[1] Pilate still hoped that by this unanswerable question he might confuse the people, and stop their clamor. περισσῶς ἔκραξαν — *they cried vehemently.* The previous statement is, *they cried.* Now, the cry becomes vehement. Pilate's endeavor to check it only adds vehemence to it.

περισσῶς, instead of περισσοτέρως, *more vehemently*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDGHKM ΔΠ.

This verse defines exactly the state of the case. Pilate insists so far that the people shall give him some ground for proceeding against Jesus, and even hints that he does not think that there is any good reason for it. That is, up to this point, he acts as the judge. The people, on the other hand, confess judgment by their refusal to answer Pilate's question, implying that they have no case. And they fall back on popular clamor, simply reiterating their demand that Jesus be put to death.

15. βουλόμενος τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι — *wishing to satisfy the multitude.* The AV., *willing to content the people*, is weak, especially in its translation of βουλόμενος. φραγελλώσας[2] — *having scourged him.* This was a part of the procedure in case of crucifixion, and whether its object was merciful or not, its effect was certainly to mitigate the slow torture of crucifixion, by hastening death.[3]

This statement of Pilate's reason is again a reflection of the Roman policy in dealing with the provinces. As a matter of policy, — and this would be the Roman method of dealing with

[1] On this use of γάρ in questions, see Win. 53, 8 *c*). The answer to the question in such cases is causal with reference to what precedes, here with reference to Σταύρωσον αὐτόν. [2] The Lat. verb *flagellare.* The Grk. verb is μαστιγόω.
[3] Edersheim, *Life of Jesus*, p. 579.

such a case, — there would be no reason against the crucifixion of Jesus, now that the people had joined hands with the rulers against him; whereas, the popular clamor would constitute a reason of state which Pilate, under the Roman policy, would be obliged to consider. Pilate, that is to say, lays aside judicial considerations, and deals with it as a matter of imperial policy. So, substantially, Mt. and Lk. According to J. the Jews returned to the political charge, and insisted on the treasonable nature of Jesus' claim to be a king.[1] The two accounts are inconsistent. According to one, the charges are given up. According to the other, while the attempt to prove them is given up, the political effect of them is insisted on, and it is this which turns the scale against Jesus.

JESUS MOCKED BY THE ROMAN SOLDIERS

16–21. *Jesus is delivered up to the Roman soldiers for the execution of the sentence against him. They have learned the nature of the charge against him, and proceed to make sport of it. For this purpose they take him to the palace, and gather the whole cohort on duty in the city at the time. There they clothe him in mock purple, and put a crown made of the twigs of the thorn bush on his head, and pay him mock homage, saying "Hail, King of the Jews." Then they put on him his own garments, and lead him out to the place of crucifixion. As Jesus has been exhausted by the scourging, they press into the service one Simon a Cyrenian, the father of Alexander and Rufus, — probably names that afterwards became familiar in the circle of disciples, — and make him carry the cross.*

16. τοῦ ἡγεμόνος — *the procurator.* Properly, it is the title of the "legatus Cæsaris," the governor of an imperial province. But in the N.T., it is used of the procurator, Grk. ἐπίτροπος, διοικητής, a subordinate officer of the province, who became practically the governor of the district of the larger province to which he was attached. Judæa, being part of the province of Syria, Pilate was properly procurator, or ἐπίτροπος, but the N.T. gives him the

[1] J. 19[12-16].

title ἡγεμών, which belongs strictly to the governor of the whole province.[1]

ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς — *within the palace,* which is the residence of the procurator during his stay in Jerusalem. The explanatory clause, *which is the prætorium, i.e.* the residence of the Roman governor, makes that meaning certain here.[2] σπεῖραν — this word is used exactly for the Roman cohort, or tenth part of a legion, numbering six hundred men. It accords with this, that χιλίαρχος, tribune, is used in the N.T. to denote the commander of the σπεῖρα.

17. ἐνδιδύσκουσιν — *they put on.*[3] πορφύραν — Mt. says χλαμύδα κοκκίνην — *a scarlet cloak,* and this is probably the more correct account, owing to the military use of the chlamys.[4] πορφύραν represents the spirit of the act, to invest Jesus with the mock semblance of royalty: χλαμύδα tells us what they used for the purpose. ἀκάνθινον — made of the twigs of the thorn bush, not of the thorns themselves exclusively.

ἐνδιδύσκουσιν, instead of ἐνδύουσιν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BCDF Δ 1, 13, 69.

18. ἀσπάζεσθαι — *to salute.* This word, in itself, does not contain the idea of homage, but of greeting. It depends on circumstances what the greeting is. Here, they greeted him with a *Hail, King of the Jews.*

19. They varied their abuse, sometimes paying him mock homage, and sometimes marks of scorn and abuse. προσεκύνουν αὐτῷ — *they did him homage.* They paid him mock homage as a king, not mock worship as a God.

20. Καὶ ὅτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ — *And when they had mocked him.*[5] τὰ (ἴδια) ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ — *his (own) garments.*

αὐτοῦ, instead of τὰ ἴδια, WH. RV. BC Δ. τὰ ἴδια ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, Tisch. ℵ (282, without αὐτοῦ). σταυρώσουσιν, instead of -σωσιν, Tisch. Treg. ACDLNP Δ 33, 69, 245, 25? Omit αὐτόν, Tisch. ℵ D 122** two *mss.* Lat. Vet.

ἀγγαρεύουσι — *they impress.*[6] Κυρηναῖον — Cyrene is the city in the north of Africa, opposite Greece, on the Mediterranean. There was a numerous colony of Jews there, and the name Simon shows this man to have been a Jew. It adds nothing to our knowledge of him to call him the father of Alexander and Rufus,

---

[1] See Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*, *B.D.* Procurator.

[2] On this use of αὐλή, see Thay.-Grm. *Lex.* [3] A biblical word. [4] Mt. 27[28].

[5] See Burton, 48, 52. This seems to belong to the cases in which B. considers the plup. necessary to the Grk. idiom. The earlier event is necessarily thought of as completed at the time of the subsequent event. Goodwin, *Gr. Moods and Tenses,* says that the aor. is used, instead of the plup., after particles of time.

[6] A Persian word, meaning to press into the service of the royal couriers, ἄγγαροι. See Mt. 5[41].

except to indicate that these were names known to the early church. It is the height of foolish conjecture to identify this Rufus with the one in Rom. 16[13], and especially to take Paul's *τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ κ. ἐμοῦ* as literal, and so make him the brother of Paul. The criminal carried his own cross to the place of execution, but in this case, Jesus was probably so weakened already by his sufferings, as to be unable to carry it himself.

THE CRUCIFIXION

21–41. *Arrived at the place of crucifixion, called Golgotha, they gave Jesus wine flavored with myrrh to drink, which he refused. The wine was probably given as a stimulant in his exhausted condition. After the Roman custom, his garments were distributed by lot among the four executioners. The crucifixion took place at nine o'clock in the morning. An inscription, "The King of the Jews," was placed upon the cross as a statement of the charge against him. Two robbers were crucified with him, one on each side, and joined the crowd and the rulers in taunting him. The people wagged their heads derisively, and challenged him, who was going to destroy and rebuild the temple, to save himself. The rulers taunted him with his miracles, bidding him who had saved others to save himself, and to prove his Messianic claim by coming down from the cross. At twelve o'clock, darkness fell over the land until three o'clock, when Jesus cried, "My God, why didst thou forsake me?" The resemblance of the Heb.* My God *to* Elijah *led certain to think that he was calling upon Elijah, and one man, having filled a sponge with sour wine which he gave Jesus at the end of a reed, cried out, "Let us see if Elijah comes to take him down." Jesus expired with a great cry, and the vail of the temple, which separates between the holy place and the holy of holies, was rent in twain. The centurion in charge of the crucifying party, seeing the portents accompanying his death, said, "Truly this was a son of God." The account ends with a statement of the women at the cross.*

22. *τὸν Γολγοθᾶν τόπον — the place Golgotha.* The Hebrew word means, *a skull,* not *the place of a skull.* The name probably comes from the shape of the place.

τὸν Γολγοθᾶν τόπον, instead of *Γολγοθᾶ τόπον,* Tisch. WH. *(τὸν) Γολγοθά,* Treg. *τὸν,* ℵ BC² FLN Δ 13, 33, 69, 124, 127, 131, 346. *Γολγοθὰν,* ℵ BFGKLMNSUV ΓΔ.

23. *Καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ ἐσμυρμισμένον οἶνον — And they gave him wine flavored with myrrh.*

Omit *πιεῖν, to drink,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC* L Δ, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

ἐσμυρμισμένον — mingled with myrrh. Mt. says, *with gall.* Myrrh seems to have been used by Greek and Roman women to remove its intoxicating quality. But that could not have been its intention here. The common account seems to be that the myrrh was used as a stupefying drug, but no evidence for this appears. The wine was evidently used as a stimulant, and the myrrh adds to this effect, bracing and warming the system.[1]

24. *Καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ διαμερίζονται — And they crucify him, and divide.*

σταυροῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ, instead of *σταυρώσαντες αὐτόν, having crucified him,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. BL, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Egyptt. *διαμερίζονται,* instead of *διεμέριζον, divided,* Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCDLPX ΓΔΠ.

On the method of crucifixion, see *B.D.* The cross was generally just high enough to raise the feet above the ground. In this case it must have been higher. See v.[36]. The victim was placed upon it before the cross was elevated, his hands and feet being fastened to it by nails, and his body being supported by a peg fastened into the wood between his legs. The dividing of the garments among the soldiers who acted as executioners was customary. J. 19[23. 24] tells the story of the lot differently. According to that, it was only the inner garment, the *χιτών,* over which they cast lots, instead of dividing it, as they did the other garments.

25. *ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη, καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν — and it was the third hour, and they crucified him.*[2] *ὥρα τρίτη* — 9 o'clock. Mk. is the only one who gives this hour of the crucifixion.

---

[1] See Art. Myrrh, *Encyclopædia Brit.*

[2] Meyer cites passages from Xen. and Thuc. to show that it was not uncommon to join a statement of time with the statement of what took place at the time by *καί.* But in all the passages which he cites, both the time and the event are additional matter, and may easily be connected in this way, the statement being the same as, *when the time came, the event happened.* But in this case, the time only is additional matter, the event, the crucifixion, being just mentioned in v.[24], so that this is the same as, *it was three o'cl. when they crucified him.* And for this, the independent statements connected by *καί* are not an idiomatic expression.

26. ἐπιγράφη . . . ἐπιγεγραμμένη — *the inscription was inscribed.* The prep. does not denote the position of this over his head, but its inscription on the tablet. The EV. conveys a wrong idea, not of the fact, but of the meaning of the words. Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων — *The king of the Jews.* Verse [14] shows that Pilate's verdict was that Jesus was innocent of any crime, and that he only yielded finally to the clamor of the people in sentencing him. But v.[2. 9. 12. 18] show that this claim to be king was the charge on which the authorities asked for sentence. It was, that is to say, a charge of treason.

27. λῃστάς — *robbers,* not *thieves,* AV. Men who plundered by violence, not by stealth.

28. Omit. The quotation is from Is. 53[12]. Such quotations are not after Mk.'s manner.

Omit v.[28], Tisch. WH. RV. (Treg.) ℵ ABC* and 3 DX, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Theb.

29, 30. These taunts that follow have all the single point that now is the time to test all of Jesus' pretensions, especially to supernatural power and aid, and that his powerlessness now at this supreme moment makes these pretensions absurd. Οὐα,[1] ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναόν, καὶ οἰκοδομῶν (ἐν) τρισὶν ἡμέραις, σῶσον σεαυτόν, καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ — *Ha, you that destroy the temple, and build it in three days,*[2] *save yourself by coming down from the cross.* The part. καταβὰς denotes the manner of σῶσον. The populace seize on this claim, the only one that Jesus ever made of the same kind, and match its seeming pretentiousness against his powerlessness now.

καταβὰς, instead of καὶ κατάβα, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD[gr.] L Δ, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph.

31. Ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους — *Likewise also the chief priests mocking to each other.* RV. *among themselves.* The prep. denotes how the mocking was passed from one to another.

Omit δὲ, *and,* after ὁμοίως, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABC* LPX ΓΔΠ, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Harcl.

These mocking priests and scribes were touching here upon what to all his contemporaries was the great mystery in the life of Jesus, but was really its crowning glory. The great obstacle in the way of human obedience to Divine law is the sacrifice which it involves, especially in a world where everything works the other

[1] An onomatopoetic word belonging to Biblical Greek, and not found elsewhere in the N.T. [2] See 14[58].

way. And on the other hand, the value and importance of obedience are enhanced by this sacrifice. But our Lord's sacrifice for righteousness' sake is magnified again by the contrast stated here. His miracles were a standing proof of his power to save others and himself. But while he used that power in the behalf of others, when the crisis of his own fate came, he was apparently powerless. Evidently, there was no limitation of the power, and so, there must have been a restraint imposed upon himself. He not only would not compromise with evil, he would not resist evil by opposing force to force. The taunt of his enemies meant that here was the final test of his miraculous power, and the proof of its unreality. When that test came, it showed, as they thought, that God was not on his side, else how could his enemies triumph over him? Whereas, everything pointed the other way. His miracles were real, God was on his side, and yet neither he nor God would lift a hand to save him. And the evident reason was that he would not cheapen his righteousness by making it safe. If he lived the righteous life, but did not incur the risks of other men in such living, his righteousness would lose the power to produce righteousness in other men which he sought. And, instead of revealing and furthering God's ways among men, it would obstruct them by introducing an alien principle at cross purposes with them. God's way is to establish righteousness by the self-sacrifice of righteous men, and for the one unique and absolute saint to avoid that sacrifice would destroy the self-propagating power of his righteousness.

32. ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ. These titles were intended to bring out the contrast between his claims and his situation, and the certainty that if his claims were real, he would be saved from the incongruity and absurdity of that situation. *A crucified Messiah, forsooth! Let us hear no more of it. If he is really the Messianic King, let him use his Messianic power, and deliver himself from his ridiculous position by coming down from the cross. He wants us to believe in him, and here is an easy way to bring that about.* They could see the apparent absurdity of Jesus' position, but not the foolishness of their idea that an act of power is going to change a Pharisee, a narrow-minded, formal, and hypocritical legalist, into a spiritual man, in sympathy with Christ's principles and purposes. Here was the irreconcilable opposition; on the one hand, that power can create the Kingdom of God; and on the other, that power is absolutely powerless to

do anything but hinder spiritual ends. Καὶ οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι σὺν αὐτῷ . . . — *And those crucified with him reviled him.* So Mt. Lk., however, 23^{39-43}, says that only one took part in this railing, while the other by his confession of Jesus on the cross performed the most notable act of faith of that generation.[1]

Insert σὺν before αὐτῷ, Tisch. WH. ℵ BL.

33. Καὶ γενομένης ὥρας ἕκτης, σκότος ἐγένετο — *And the sixth hour having come, darkness came.* This darkness was not an eclipse, since it was full moon, but like the earthquake and the rending of the vail of the temple, a supernatural manifestation of the sympathy of nature with these events in the spiritual realm. All the Synoptists relate this darkness.

Καὶ γενομένης, instead of γενομένης δὲ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDGLMS Δ 1, 28, 33, 69, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh.

34. Καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὥρᾳ ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Ἐλωΐ, Ἐλωΐ, λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί; [2] — *And at the ninth hour, Jesus cried with a loud voice, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* The historical meaning of σαβαχθανεί is not *to leave alone*, but *to leave helpless*, denoting, not the withdrawal of God himself, but of his help, so that the Psalmist is delivered over into the hands of his enemies. So that, while it is possible to suppose that Jesus is uttering a cry over God's withdrawal of himself, it is certainly unnecessary. Such a desertion, or even the momentary unconsciousness of the Divine presence on the part of Jesus, makes an insoluble mystery in the midst of what is otherwise profound, but not obscure. Interpreted in the spirit of the original, of the withholding of the Divine help, so that his enemies had their will of him, it falls in with the prayer in Gethsemane, "remove this cup from me," and becomes a question, while the cup is at his lips, why it was not removed.

Omit λέγων, *saying*, before Ἐλωΐ, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

35. Ἴδε, Ἠλείαν φωνεῖ — *See, he is calling Elijah.* Ἴδε is used here as an interjection, calling attention to what is going on. As Jesus used Aramaic, and as Elijah was unknown to them, this cannot have been the soldiers, but some of the bystanders. And the misunderstanding was impossible, if they heard anything more than merely the name, or even that in any but the most indistinct

---

1 Notice how exactly the language of v.$^{29-32}$ corresponds to Mt. $27^{39-42, 44}$.

2 These words are from Ps. 22^{1}. Ἐλωΐ is the Syriac form for the Heb. אֵלִי, Ἠλεί, which is the form given by Mt. 27^{46}. σαβαχθανεί is the Chaldaic form for the Heb. עֲזַבְתָּנִי *azabtani*. Mk. reproduces the language of Jesus, which translates the Heb. into the current language. The Grk. ὁ θεός μου, ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί (ἵνατί) ἐγκατέλιπές με; is from the Sept.

fashion. The prophetic association of Elijah with the day of the Lord would help this misunderstanding.[1]

36. Δραμὼν δέ τις, γεμίσας σπόγγον ὄξους, περιθεὶς καλάμῳ, ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν, λέγων, Ἄφετε, etc. — *And one ran, and filled a sponge with sour wine,*[2] *which he put on a reed, and gave him drink, saying, Let be;* etc. This is evidently a merciful act, and the Ἄφετε indicates that there was some opposition to it offered or expected, which this supposed call upon Elijah gave the man a pretext for setting aside. He said virtually, *Let me give him this, and so prolong his life, and then we shall get an opportunity to see whether Elijah comes to help him or not.* As Mt. tells it,[3] these are probably the words with which the bystanders try to restrain his gracious act. They say virtually, *Don't interfere; let Elijah help him.*

τις, instead of εἷς, the indef., instead of the numeral *one*, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BL Δ. Omit καὶ, *and*, before γεμίσας, WH. RV. BL, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Omit τε after περιθεὶς, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD$^{gr.}$ L 33, 67, Memph.

37. ἀφεὶς φωνὴν μεγάλην[4] — *having sent forth,* or *uttered a great cry.* The final cry of his agony, with which he expired.

38. τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ — *the vail,* or *curtain of the sanctuary.* ναός is the shrine of a temple, and in the Jewish temple, the Holy of Holies, in which was the Ark of the Covenant. The curtain was that which separated this from the Holy Place. The ναός was the place where God manifested himself, into which the High Priest only had access once a year. The rending of the vail would signify therefore the removal of the separation between God and the people, and the access into his presence. It is narrated by all the Synoptists.

39. κεντυρίων[5] — *centurion.* οὕτω ἐξέπνευσεν — *so expired.* The only thing narrated by Mk. to which the οὕτω can refer is the darkness over all the land. So Lk. Mt. adds to this an earthquake. The portent(s) accompanying the death of Jesus convinced the centurion that he was υἱὸς θεοῦ, not *the Son of God,* but *a son of God,* a hero after the heathen conception. Lk. says δίκαιος, *a righteous man.*

Omit κράξας after οὕτω, Tisch. WH. ℵ BL Memph. It changes the statement from *he expired with this cry* to *he so expired.* The former would really give no reason for the centurion's exclamation.

---

[1] See Mal. 4[5].

[2] The translation *vinegar*, EV., is incorrect, as it denotes the wine after it has passed the acetous fermentation; but this is simply the ordinary sour wine of the country, which would be procured probably from the soldiers.

[3] Mt. 27[48. 49].

[4] Lat. *emittere vocem.*

[5] κεντυρίων is the Latin name of the officer in charge of the execution. Mt. and Lk. give the Greek name ἑκατοντάρχης. The centurion commanded a maniple, or century, sixty of which made up the legion.

40. ἡ Μαγδαληνή — *the Magdalene*, the same as we say, *the Nazarene*. It denotes an inhabitant of Magdala, a town on the W. shore of the Lake of Galilee, three miles north of Tiberias. The only identification of her given in the Gospels is in Lk. 8^2, where she is said to be one out of whom Jesus had cast seven devils. There is absolutely no support for the tradition that she was the sinful woman who anointed the feet of Jesus (Lk. 7^{36} sq.). Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ κ. Ἰωσῆτος — *Mary, the mother of James the little, and of Joses*. In the list of the apostles, James is called the son of Alphæus, while in J. 19^{25}, the name of one of the women standing by the cross is given as Mary, the wife of Clopas. These coincidences have led to the conjecture that Alphæus and Clopas are identical, both being Greek forms of the Aramaic חַלְפַי, and that, therefore, this Mary was the mother of the second James in the list of the apostles. The further conjecture that she was the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, is based on the unnecessary supposition that Μαρία in J. 19^{25}, is in apposition with ἡ ἀδελφὴ. It involves the further difficulty of two sisters of the same name. It is connected, moreover, with the theory that the brothers of Jesus were cousins, the sons of this Mary, and apostles. This theory has against it, the fact that it is in the interest of the dogma of the perpetual virginity of Mary, the mother of Jesus. It also makes the brothers of Jesus apostles, which is clearly against the record.[1] Σαλώμη — the mother of James and John. This is not directly stated, but it is inferred from a comparison of Mt. 27^{56} with this passage. A further comparison with J. 19^{25} has led to the conjecture that she is the sister of the mother of Jesus mentioned there. This might account for Jesus' commending his mother to John, but it is conjecture only, and will remain so. James is called ὁ μικρός, *the little*, to distinguish him from the other "celebrities" of the name. But whether it designates him as less in stature, or in age, or of less importance, there are no data for determining.

Omit ἦν after ἐν αἷς, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ BL, *mss.* Vulg. Omit τοῦ before Ἰακώβου, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BCKU ΔΠ* 1, 11. Ἰωσῆτος, instead of Ἰωσῆ, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ^c BD$^{gr.}$ L Δ 13, 33, 69, 346, two *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph.

41. αἳ, ὅτε ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ — *who, when he was in Galilee, followed him*. These three had been associated with Jesus in his Galilean ministry, and the διηκόνουν, *ministered*, shows that they had been the women who attended to his wants, the women of the family-group surrounding him. Besides these, there were others who had attached themselves to him in the same way, when he came up to Jerusalem.

Omit καὶ after αἱ, Tisch. (Treg.) WH. RV. ℵ B 33, 131, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Memph. Pesh.

[1] For statements of the two sides of this question, see *B. D.* Art. James and Brother

THE BURIAL OF JESUS

42–47. *Jesus died at about three in the afternoon, and as the Sabbath began with the sunset, it was necessary that whatever was done about his burial be accomplished before that time. So Joseph of Arimathea, who is represented in this Gospel, not as a disciple, but as somehow in sympathy with him, summoned up courage to go to Pilate, and beg the body of Jesus. Pilate wondered at the short time which it had taken the usually slow torture of crucifixion to do its work, and asked the centurion if he had been dead any length of time. Having got this information, he gave the body to Joseph. He removed the body from the cross, wrapped it in linen, and placed it in a sepulchre hewn out of the rock. As the women were intending to embalm the body after the Sabbath, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses saw where it was laid.*

42. ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή — *since it was preparation day* (for the Sabbath). This gives the reason why Joseph took this step at this time. The removal of the body would have been unlawful on the Sabbath. ὅ ἐστι προσάββατον[1] — *which is the day before the Sabbath.* We are told by Josephus that this preparation for the Sabbath began on the ninth hour of the sixth day. It is not mentioned in the O.T.

43. ἐλθὼν Ἰωσὴφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας — *Joseph of Arimathea, having come.* Arimathea, the Heb. Ramah, was the name of several places in Palestine. Probably, this was the one mentioned in the O.T. as the birthplace of Samuel in Mt. Ephraim.[2] Mt. tells us about this Joseph that he was rich, and a disciple of Jesus. Lk., that he was a righteous man, and not implicated in the plot of the Jews against Jesus, and that he was expecting the kingdom of God. J., that he was a secret disciple. εὐσχήμων[3] βουλευτής — *an honorable member of the council* (Sanhedrim). τολμήσας — *having gathered courage.* Having laid aside the fear of the odium which would attach to his act. ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ — This language is inconsistent with the supposition that this account regards him as a disciple of Jesus. It evidently means that he was in sympathy with the dis-

---

[1] A Biblical word, found in the N.T. only here.
[2] 1 S. 1[1. 19].
[3] εὐσχήμων means primarily *elegant in appearance.*

ciples in this element of their faith. He was not a follower of Jesus, but in common with him he was awaiting the kingdom of God, and wished to do honor to one who had suffered in its behalf.

ἐλθὼν, instead of ἦλθεν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ ABCKLMU ΓΔΠ, Memph. Insert τὸν before Πειλᾶτον, Tisch. Treg. WH. ℵ BL Δ 33. Πειλᾶτον, instead of Πιλάτον, Tisch. WH. ℵ AB* Δ.

44. ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος ἐθαύμαζεν (-σεν) εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκε· καὶ . . . ἐπηρώτησεν εἰ πάλαι (ἤδη) ἀπέθανε — *And Pilate was wondering (wondered) if he is already dead, and . . . asked him if it is any while since he died.* Generally, death was more lingering, the great cruelty of crucifixion being in its slow torture. The question which Pilate asked of the centurion who had charge of the execution was intended to remove the doubt by showing that sufficient time had elapsed to establish the fact of Jesus' death.

Πειλᾶτος, instead of Πιλᾶτος, same authorities as in v.[48]. ἐθαύμαζεν, instead of -σεν, Tisch. ℵ D *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. The impf. is more in Mk.'s manner, the aor. more common. ἤδη, instead of πάλαι, Treg. WH. RV. *marg.* BD Memph. Hier. πάλαι is the more difficult reading to account for, if not in the original.

45. Καὶ γνοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κεντυρίωνος, ἐδωρήσατο τὸ πτῶμα[1] τῷ Ἰωσήφ — *And having found out from the centurion, he gave the body to Joseph.* The information that he obtained from the centurion was the official confirmation of Jesus' death, necessary before the body could be taken down.

πτῶμα, instead of σῶμα, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL.

46. Καὶ ἀγοράσας σινδόνα, καθελὼν αὐτόν, ἐνείλησε τῇ σινδόνι, καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνήματι — *And having bought a linen cloth, he took him down, wrapped him in the linen cloth, and put him in a tomb.* There was no time before the Sabbath for any further preparation of the body for burial.[2] J., however, says that he was embalmed at this time.[3] The synoptical account is evidently correct.

Omit καὶ before καθελὼν, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BDL Memph. ἔθηκεν, instead of κατέθηκεν, Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BC[2] DL. μνήματι, instead of μνημείῳ, Tisch. WH. ℵ B.

47. Ἡ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία Ἰωσῆτος ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται — *And Mary (the) Magdalene, and Mary the mother of Joses, were observing where he was laid. Beheld,* EV., is inadequate to translate the verb here, as it leaves out the idea of purpose. It is evident that they constituted themselves a party of observation.

τέθειται, instead of τίθεται, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ[c] ABCDL ΔΠ 33, 69, 131, 229, 238.

---

[1] For this word, see on 6[29]. [2] See 16[1]. [3] J. 19[39. 40].

AN ANGEL ANNOUNCES THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS

XVI. 1–8. *With the end of the Sabbath, the women, who are the only ones left to perform the service, bought the spices necessary, and came at sunrise to the tomb to anoint the body of Jesus. On the way, they discussed among themselves whom they should get to roll away the heavy stone from the entrance of the tomb. But they found it removed, and on entering, they saw a young man seated at the right clothed in a long white robe. Naturally, they were amazed, but he tells them that there is no reason for their amazement; that Jesus whom they are seeking, the Nazarene, the crucified, is not there, he is risen! And he points them to the place where they had put him, in proof. But he bids them announce to the disciples, and especially to Peter, that he is going before them into Galilee, and that they will see him there, as he had told them on the night of the betrayal. The effect of this on the women was fear and amazement, such that they fled from the place and were restrained by their fear from telling any one.*

1. ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα — *they bought spices.* Lk. says that they bought the spices on the day of his crucifixion, and rested on the Sabbath. As the day closed at sunset, they may have bought the spices that evening. They went to the tomb at sunrise, which would not allow time to buy them in the morning. ἀλείψωσιν — *anoint.* The process was not an embalming, which was unknown to the Jews, but simply an anointing.

2. Καὶ λίαν πρωΐ (τῇ) μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων[1] ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου — *And very early, the first day of the week, they come to the tomb, the sun having risen.* Not *at the rising of the sun.* AV.

τῇ μιᾷ, instead of τῆς μιᾶς, Tisch. RV. (Treg. *marg.* WH.) ℵ L Δ 33, Memph. μιᾷ, without τῇ, Treg. WH. B 1. Insert τῶν before σαββάτων, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BKL Δ 33, 69.

3. ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς — *they were saying to each other.*[2] The impf. denotes what they were saying on the way.

---

[1] τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων is a purely Hebrew phrase, using the cardinal for the ordinal, and the plural σαββάτων for the week. Win. 37, 1.

[2] On this reciprocal use of the reflexive pronoun, see Thay.-Grm. *Lex.*

4. ἀνακεκύλισται ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα — *the stone has been rolled back; for it was very great.* The greatness of the stone is really the reason of their question, but he adds to the question the way that it turned out, as a part of the one event, before he introduces the explanation.

ἀνακεκύλισται, instead of ἀποκεκύλισται, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. and practically all sources.

5. εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τ. μνημεῖον — *having entered into the tomb.* Mt. says that the angel was sitting on the stone outside.[1] Lk., that there were two angels, who appeared to the women, not on their first entrance into the tomb, but in the midst of their perplexity at not finding the body of Jesus.[2] J. speaks of only one woman, Mary Magdalene, who came to the sepulchre, and got no farther than to see the stone rolled away, when she turned back and told Peter and John, who came immediately and found the tomb empty. Mary meantime had returned and saw two angels in the sepulchre, and then Jesus himself.[3]

νεανίσκον — *a young man.* This is the form which the angel took. ἐξεθαμβήθησαν — *they were utterly amazed.* ἐκ in composition means *utterly, out and out.*

6. Ἰησοῦν . . . τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τ. ἐσταυρωμένον — *Jesus the Nazarene, the crucified.* Mt. omits τὸν Ναζαρηνόν.[4] Lk. makes the angels ask, *why seek the living among the dead?*[5] The exact language is not preserved in such cases. The statement common to all the narratives is, that the one whom they are seeking is not there, but is risen. ἴδε, ὁ τόπος — *see, the place.*[6]

7. ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε, εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ — *but go, tell his disciples and Peter.* Peter's name is not mentioned separately because his denial puts him out of the group of disciples, but it specifies him among the disciples as the one whose faith, having been most shaken, needs most the restoring effect of this announcement. προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν — *he goes before you into Galilee.* This is in accordance with our Lord's prediction in 14[28]. καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν — *as he told you.* He has not told them directly that they will see him, but that is implied in the rest of the statement, that he will rise and will go before them into Galilee. This does not absolutely rule out the appearances in Jerusalem, which are narrated in v.[9-20], but it makes it probable that they were not included in the scheme of this book. We can scarcely think of a writer recording this language who had in his mind several appearances in Judæa before they went into Galilee. And especially, it is quite improbable that the promise should be

---

[1] Mt. 28[2]. [2] Lk. 24[4]. [3] J. 20[1-14]. [4] Mt. 28[5]. [5] Lk. 24[5].
[6] On this use of ἴδε as an interjection, — in this case not governing the noun which follows, — see on 15[35].

of appearances in Galilee, and that the appearances themselves in the same account should be all in Judæa.

8. καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου· εἶχε γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος κ. ἔκστασις — *and having gone out, they fled from the tomb; for trembling and amazement possessed them.* ἔκστασις is a transport of wonder, and amazement that carries men out of themselves, makes them beside themselves. ἐφοβοῦντο — *for they were afraid.* This shows the state of mind that produced the τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις. Mt. says that great joy, as well as fear, entered into their feelings.[1] Here probably our Gospel ends. What follows comes evidently from a later hand, and is intended to remove the abruptness of the ending of the original. All that Mk. tells us therefore of the resurrection is the announcement of it by the angel, and the promise that Jesus would appear to his disciples in Galilee, showing that this appearance is included in the scheme of this book, though not narrated by it. The appendix contains no account of this appearance in Galilee, but only of appearances in Jerusalem and its vicinity. This confinement of the appearances of Jesus to Galilee is common to this Gospel with Mt.[2] Lk., on the other hand, records only appearances in Jerusalem and its neighborhood, and while his narrative does not so definitely exclude appearances in Galilee, as Mt. and Mk. do appearances in Judæa, it certainly leaves that impression.

Omit ταχύ, *quickly*, before ἔφυγον, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. and most sources. γὰρ, *for*, instead of δὲ, *and*, after εἶχε, Tisch. Treg. WH. RV. ℵ BD, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Memph. Pesh.

THE APPENDIX

Verses[9-20] are omitted by Tisch., double-bracketed by WH., inserted in the Revisers' Text, but with a space between it and the preceding passage, and Treg. inserts in the same space κατὰ Μάρκον. WH., in their Notes on Special Passages, pronounce against the genuineness. This is done primarily on the authority of ℵ B, one *ms.* Lat. Vet. and *mss.* of the Arm. and Æth. versions. L, 274 *marg.*, the *ms.* of Lat. Vet. mentioned above, Harcl. *marg.* and Æth.[mss. m and s] give what is known as the Shorter Conclusion, as follows: Πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον συντομῶς ἐξήγγειλαν· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἄχρι δύσεως ἐξαπέστειλεν δι' αὐτῶν τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτον κήρυγμα τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας — *And they reported briefly to Peter and those in*

[1] Mt. 28[8]. [2] Mt. 28[10. 16-20].

his company all the things commanded. And after these things Jesus himself also sent forth through them from the east even to the west the holy and incorruptible message of eternal salvation. L virtually closes the Gospel with v.[8], and gives this shorter ending as current in some places, and then the longer ending as also current. The testimony of Eusebius, Victor, and Jerome is that these verses were to be found in some *mss.*, but not in the oldest or best. They are not recognized in the Ammonian sections nor the Eusebian canons. And there is an ominous lack of reference to them in those passages of the Fathers which treat, for instance, of baptism, the resurrection, and the ascension. It is very true that this external evidence is not enough by itself, though it is always to be remembered that ℵ B are the most important witnesses to the text.

But the internal evidence for the omission is much stronger than the external, proving conclusively that these verses could not have been written by Mk. The linguistic differences alone are enough to settle this, — enough to show, even if we had Mk.'s autograph, that they were not original with him, but copied directly from another source. ἐκεῖνος is used in the passage five times in a way quite unknown to the Synoptics, but common to the fourth Gospel. πορεύομαι is used three times, but does not occur elsewhere in the Gospel. This is the more remarkable, as it is in itself so common a word, and the occasions for its use occur on every page. In this section, it is the favorite word for *going*. τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις, as a designation of the disciples, is another unfamiliar expression. θεάομαι, as a verb of seeing, does not occur elsewhere in Mk., and is infrequent elsewhere, but is used twice in this passage. In fact, it is the only verb for *seeing* in the passage. ἀπιστέω also occurs twice in this passage, but not elsewhere in this Gospel. Μετὰ (δὲ) ταῦτα is a phrase not found in Mt. or Mk. It occurs a few times in Lk., and constantly in Jn. Ὕστερον is another expression used to denote succession of events, not found elsewhere in Mk. θανάσιμον occurs only here in the N.T. βλάπτω occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in Lk. 4[35]. συνεργοῦντος is a good Pauline word, and is found once in Jas., but only here in the Gospels. βεβαιοῦν is found in Paul's epistles and in Heb., but not elsewhere in the Gospels. ἐπακολουθεῖν occurs twice in 1 Tim., and once in 1 Pet., but not elsewhere in

the Gospels. To sum up, there are in all 163 words in this passage, and of these, 19 words and 2 phrases are peculiar, not occurring elsewhere in this Gospel. There are 109 different words, and of these, 11 words and 2 phrases do not occur elsewhere in this Gospel. Of these, the use of *πορεύομαι*, *ἐκεῖνος*, and *θεάομαι*, would of themselves constitute a case, being, from the frequency of their use, characteristic and distinctive in this vocabulary, while the entire disuse of these common words is a peculiarity of the rest of the Gospel.

But the argument from the general character of the section is stronger still. In the first place, it is a mere summarizing of the appearances of our Lord, a manner of narration entirely foreign to this Gospel. Mark is the most vivid and picturesque of the evangelists, abbreviating discourse, but amplifying narration. But this is a mere enumeration. The first part of the chapter, relating the appearance of the angels to the women, is a good example of his style, and is in marked contrast to this section.

But a graver objection arises from the character of the *σημεῖα* that are promised here to follow believers. The casting out of demons, and the cure of the sick, belong strictly to the class of miracles performed by our Lord. They are miracles of beneficence performed on others. And in the speaking with tongues, possibly we do not get outside of that sphere. But we do have an anticipation of the new conditions of the apostolic era and of the charismata which distinguish its activity from our Lord's, that is, to say the least, unexampled in the teaching of Jesus. Moreover, this refers either to the speaking with foreign tongues of the day of Pentecost, or to the ecstatic speech which St. Paul calls speaking with tongues in 1 Cor. If the former, then it is not repeated. And if the latter, then St. Paul depreciates it, and for good reasons. Either would be against our Lord's selection of it here as a representative miracle. But the taking up serpents, and the drinking of deadly things without harm, belong strictly to the category of mere thaumaturgy ruled out by Jesus. Our Lord does not exempt himself nor his disciples from the natural consequences of their acts. The very principle of his kingdom is, that he and they shall take their place in the ordinary conditions of human life, and shall there be exposed, not only to the ordinary dangers of that life, but to the extraordinary perils incident

to an uncompromising righteousness in an evil world, and *without any miraculous safeguards*. But here, that miraculous safeguarding is promised as the condition distinctly supplanting the ordinary.

But the most serious difficulty with this passage is, that it is inconsistent with the preceding part of the chapter in regard to the place and time of the appearances to the disciples, following Lk.'s account, whereas the first part accords with Mt.'s very different scheme. The angels tell the women that Jesus precedes them into Galilee, and will be seen by his disciples there. But the appearance to Mary Magdalene was on the day of the resurrection, and near the tomb. The appearance to the two on their way into the country was evidently that to the disciples going to Emmaus, also on the day of the resurrection. And that to the eleven as they were reclining at table, was evidently also identical with that recorded in Lk. 24^{36} sq., and was therefore in Jerusalem, and on the evening of the resurrection. Immediately after this, in both accounts, comes the ascension, and leaves no time for appearances in Galilee. In St. Matthew, on the other hand, there are no appearances in Judæa, except that to the women on their way from the sepulchre. They have received from the angels the same message as in Mk. 16^{7}, that Jesus precedes them into Galilee, and in accordance with this, the disciples go there, and Jesus appears to them on the mountain. Plainly, then, the first verses of our chapter are framed on Mt.'s scheme of the Galilean appearances, and $v.^{9-20}$ on Lk.'s scheme of appearances in Judæa. And the two are mutually exclusive. On the other hand, the ending of the Gospel, with these verses omitted, is abrupt. But if this abruptness were foreign to Mk.'s manner, it would not show that this ending is genuine, only that the difficulty was felt by copyists, one of whom supplied this ending, and another the shorter ending. The existence of the two is presumptive proof of the original omission. But really, the brevity of this ending is quite parallel to the beginning of the Gospel, the beginning and ending being both alike outside the main purpose of the evangelist. It is not strange therefore, but rather consonant with Mk.'s manner.[1]

[1] See Introduction.

VARIOUS APPEARANCES TO THE DISCIPLES

9–20. *The first appearance is said to be to Mary Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons. Then there is the appearance "in another form" to two of the disciples on their way into the country. Both of these reports were brought to the disciples, and were received with incredulity. The third appearance is to the eleven as they were reclining at table, when Jesus rebukes their lack of faith and their spiritual obtuseness, and gives them his final instructions and promises. They were to go into all the world, and proclaim the glad-tidings to all creation. He who believes their message and is baptized will be saved; and he who disbelieves will be condemned. Moreover, believers were to be accredited by certain signs done in his name. They were to cast out demons, speak with tongues, handle serpents and drink poisons with impunity, and heal the sick with the laying on of hands. After this discourse, the Lord was taken up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And the disciples went out everywhere with their message, the Lord helping them, and confirming their word with the promised signs.*

9. Ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωῒ πρώτῃ σαββάτου ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, παρ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια — *And having arisen early on the first day of the week, he appears first to Mary Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons.* This is not a *callida junctura*, and could scarcely have been written by Mk. himself, with what he had just written in mind. The identification of Mary Magdalene, after she had been mentioned three times in the preceding narrative, is especially inconsistent. παρ' ἧς — this is the only case of the use of this prep. in describing the casting out of demons, and it is as strange as it is unexampled. This appearance to Mary Magdalene is given in J. 20^{14}. The story of the different appearances, in this paragraph, though taken from different gospels, is told by the compiler in his own manner, with some marked variations, and in all cases in a condensed form. The incident of the seven demons is from Lk. 8^{2}.

παρ' ἧς, instead of ἀφ' ἧς, Treg. WH. RV. CDL 33. It should be remembered that ℵ B do not contain this paragraph.

10. ἐκείνη — this unemphatic use of ἐκεῖνος reminds us of the fourth Gospel, but is foreign to Mk. And yet, in this paragraph, it is found in v.[10. 11. 20]. The use in v.[13], while it is more or less emphatic, is foreign to Mk.'s style. πορευθεῖσα — Here is a more striking anomaly. For this word, though it occurs here three times, v.[10. 12. 15], — in fact, is the staple word for *going*, — is not found elsewhere in Mk., though it is so common a word, and the occasions for its use are so frequent. This makes the striking feature, that this common word is dropped from Mk.'s vocabulary, and suddenly appears here. The other evangelists use it constantly. τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις — *to those who had come to be (associated) with him.* This paraphrase for *his disciples* is also unknown to Mk., and to the other evangelists. πενθοῦσι — *weeping.* This word πενθοῦσι is also a word occurring only here in this gospel, but that does not count, as it is about the rate of its use in the other books of the N.T.

11. Mark agrees with Luke that the first report of the resurrection was disbelieved.[1] Mt., however, states that the message of Jesus was acted upon, and so implies their belief in the report of the resurrection.[2] This appearance to Mary Magdalene is condensed from J. 20[11-18]. The verbal anomalies are in the use of ἐκεῖνοι, ἐθεάθη, and ἠπίστησαν. ἐθεάθη is used twice in the paragraph here, and in v.[14], and nowhere else in Mk. ἠπίστησαν is found here and in v.[16] (twice in Lk.), and nowhere else in Mk.

12, 13. This appearance to the two on their way into the country is condensed from Lk.'s account of the appearance to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus.[3] It differs from that in its account of their non-recognition of Jesus, and of the reception given to their story. Instead of the ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ, *in another form*, Lk. attributes their failure to recognize him to the fact that their eyes were restrained from knowing him. And instead of the unbelief of their story told here, Lk., on the contrary, says that the eleven met them with the story of Christ's actual resurrection (ὄντως) and his appearance to Peter.[4] The verbal peculiarities are in the use of μετὰ ταῦτα and πορευομένοις. μετὰ ταῦτα is found in Lk., is very frequent in J., but is not found in Mt. and Mk.

14. This appearance to the eleven on the evening following the resurrection is given in both Lk. and J.[5] It differs from both accounts again in the matter of Jesus' reproach of their unbelief of the stories of his resurrection. In Lk. it is not this for which he chides them, but for their idea, in spite of their acceptance of those stories, that his present appearance was that of a ghost. J. records only their gladness.[6] The verbal peculiarities are in the

---

[1] Lk. 24[11].
[2] Mt. 28[10. 16].
[3] Lk. 24[13-34].
[4] Lk. 24[16. 34].
[5] Lk. 24[36-49] J. 20[19].
[6] Lk. 24[34. 37] J. 20[20].

use of ὕστερον, and θεασαμένοις. ὕστερον is found in the other gospels, but not elsewhere in Mk.

Insert δὲ after ὕστερον, Treg. (Treg. *marg.* WH.) RV. AD, *mss.* Latt. Memph. Syrr. Add ἐκ νεκρῶν, *from the dead* (Treg. *marg.* WH.) AC* X Δ Harcl.

15. These last words in Mt. are given on the mountain in Galilee.[1] In Lk., the farewell is said at Bethany.[2] These instructions in Lk. are given, the same as here, at the supper in Jerusalem, but they are separated from the ascension and the final words.[3] πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει — *to all creation. Every creature,* AV., would require the omission of the article. The two elements prominent in these instructions, the preaching and the baptizing, are common to Mt. and Mk.

16. We have here a group of things common to the apostolic teaching, but new to the Gospels. This is the first mention of baptism since the baptism of John. In the fourth Gospel even, it is not mentioned after the early Judæan ministry of our Lord.[4] Then, while faith is enjoined in Jesus' teaching, it is nowhere, in the Synoptics, singled out as the condition of salvation, as, of course, baptism is not, since it is not mentioned at all. In fact, if one should gather up into a single statement our Lord's teaching about the condition of salvation, the necessary attitude of men towards the word, it would be *obedience.* This statement inaugurates and prepares the way for the apostolic teaching.

17, 18. Of the signs promised here, the healing, and the casting out of demons, are characteristic of our Lord's activity; the speaking with tongues is new, and belongs to the apostolic period; and the taking up of serpents and drinking poisons with impunity is absolutely foreign to our Lord's principle.[5] The verbal peculiarities are in the use of παρακολούθησει(?), and θανάσιμον, the former occurring only here in Mk., and the latter only here in N.T.

ἀκολουθήσει, instead of παρακολουθήσει, Treg. WH. CL. παρακολουθήσει, AC² 33 (Δ ῥακολουθήσει). There is a meaning of *closeness of attendance* which makes παρακολουθήσει much more individual and probable. Omit καιναῖς, *new,* after γλώσσαις, Treg. WH. RV. *marg.* CL Δ Memph. Insert καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν, *and in their hands,* before ὄφεις ἀροῦσι, Treg. (Treg. *marg.* WH.) C* and ² LM *marg.* X Δ *Grk.* 1, 22, 33, Memph. Cur. Harcl.

THE ASCENSION

19. μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς — *after speaking to them.* This can refer only to the words spoken by our Lord at the supper in Jerusalem. If it had been after the entire event, and not a part

[1] Mt. 28[16-20]. [3] Lk. 24[47-49]. [5] See Note on the Appendix.
[2] Lk. 24[50. 51]. [4] J. 3[26] 4[1. 2].

of the event coming after the discourse, something less specific than this μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι would have been given as the mark of time. The ascension therefore, according to this, was on the evening after the resurrection. So Lk., even supposing that the omission of καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (Tisch. omits, and WH. RV. *marg.* double bracket) is accepted.[1] Mt., however, gives the appearance to the disciples on a mountain in Galilee.[2] καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ — *and sat down on the right hand of God.* This belongs to the creed, not to history.

Insert Ἰησοῦς after ὁ Κύριος, Treg. (Treg. *marg.* WH.) RV. CKL Δ 1, 22, 33, 124, *mss.* Lat. Vet. Vulg. Syrr. Memph.

20. *The Lord helps the disciples in their subsequent work.* This statement is introduced to show how both command and promise were fulfilled in the missionary activity of the disciples. The verbal peculiarities are in the use of ἐκεῖνοι, πανταχοῦ, συνεργοῦντος, βεβαιοῦντος, and ἐπακολουθούντων. πανταχοῦ is not found elsewhere in Mk. (once in Lk.). συνεργοῦντος, βεβαιοῦντος, ἐπακολουθούντων, are not found elsewhere in the Gospels. They belong to the vocabulary of the Pauline Epistles.

Omit Ἀμήν at the end, Treg. WH. (Tisch.) AC[2] 1, 33, *mss.* Latt. Syrr.

THE RESURRECTION

Mk. does not himself recount any appearance of the risen Lord. But he makes the angel at the tomb announce the resurrection, and promise that the Lord would meet his disciples in Galilee. The difficulty with this part of the history is that Mt. and Mk. give one version of it, Lk. another, the Acts still a third, and 1 Cor. a fourth. The account in Acts coincides with Lk. in regard to the final appearance, but, in regard to the time, differs from it more radically than either of the others, while Paul differs from them all in regard to the persons to whom Jesus appeared. But these differences of detail do not invalidate the main fact. The testimony of Paul is invaluable here. He writes his account about A.D. 58, and we know that he had had intercourse with both Peter and John, and James, who are named by him as among those to whom Jesus appeared after his resurrection. This first-hand testimony to the fact of the resurrection entirely outweighs any discrepancy in the details. It puts the latter in the class of varieties

[1] Lk. 24[51-53]. [2] Mt. 28[16-20].

of account which do not invalidate nor weaken the historicity of any record. There is a false impression made by the unusual consistency of the Synoptical Gospels which weakens unduly their testimony in the parts where they show more independence and variety. Of course, Mt. and Mk., on the one hand, and Lk., on the other, give independent and varying accounts of the resurrection. But the variety is caused by the independence; it is no greater than the ordinary variations of independent narratives, and it does not therefore invalidate the main fact of the resurrection. But the Synoptical Gospels, in the main, in their record of the public ministry of Jesus, are interdependent, and so there is an unusual sameness about them. This should not weaken their testimony, when they become independent, and so variant.

THE ASCENSION

The result of textual criticism is to render it doubtful if there is any account of the ascension of our Lord in the Gospels. Mt., Mk., and J. contain no account of it. And the passage in Lk. which gives it is put in the column of doubtful passages, being omitted by Tisch., and double-bracketed by WH. RV. On the other hand, there is no doubt that Lk. means by the διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν, *he was parted from them*, a final separation from the disciples on that first day following the resurrection. And this brings it directly into conflict with the account of the forty days in Acts. Moreover, the story in Acts is the only one that relates, or even implies, a visible ascent. The ἀνεφέρετο in Lk., and ἀνελήφθη in Mk., though their presence in the originals is impossible in Mk., and doubtful in Lk., can be traced back to first century sources through the old Latin and Syriac versions, so that they can be taken as witnesses to the event. But neither of them can be taken as independent witnesses to a visible ascent. That is supplied by the account in Acts.

INDEX[1]

Abiathar, 2^{26}.
Allegory, 12^{5}.
Anointing, 6^{13}.
Antiochus Epiphanes, 13^{14}.

Bartholomew, 3^{18}.
Bartimæus, 10^{46}.
Beelzebul, 3^{22}.
Beginning of Sabbath, 1^{32}.
Bethany, 11^{1}.
Bethsaida, 6^{45}.
Beyschlag, *Life of Jesus*, 4^{41g} *et passim*.
Boanerges, 3^{17}.
Brothers of our Lord, $3^{18.\ 31}$.
Burton, *N.T. Moods and Tenses*, 1^{10} *et passim*.

Cæsarea Philippi, 8^{27}.
Camel's hair, 1^{6}.
Capernaum, 1^{21}.
Chief priest, 8^{31}.
Children and dogs, 7^{27}.
Cleansing all foods, 7^{19}.
Cure by touch, 3^{10}.
Cyrene, 15^{20}.

Dalmanutha, 8^{10}.
Decapolis, 5^{20}.
Disciples of Pharisees, 2^{18}.

Edersheim, *Life of Jesus*, 7^{8} *et passim*.
Elder, 8^{31}.
Elijah, 1^{6} 6^{15} 15^{35}.
Evidence of a passover, 6^{39} 7^{1}.

Fasting, 2^{18}.
First last, 10^{31}.
Four watches, 13^{34}.

Galilee, 1^{14}; Sea of, 1^{16}.
Galilean ministry, 1^{14g}.
Gardiner, *Harmony*, 3^{35g}.
Gehenna, 9^{43}.
Gennesaret, 6^{53}.
Gerasenes, 5^{1}.
Gethsemane, 14^{32}.
Giving to him who hath, 4^{25}.
Golgotha, 15^{22}.

Hackett, *Illustrations of Scripture*, 4^{31}.
Hardness of heart, 6^{52}.
Hebrew inf. absolute, 7^{10}.
Herod Antipas, 6^{14}.
Herodians, 3^{6}.
Herodias, 6^{17g}.
Hillel, 10^{2}.
Holtzmann, *Commentary*, 1^{29} *et passim*.
Hosanna, $11^{9.\ 10}$.

Idumæa, 3^{8}.
Inner circle of disciples, 9^{2}.
Inscription on the cross, 15^{26}.
Interpolation, *καὶ νηστείᾳ*, 9^{29}.
Iscariot, 3^{19}.

Jairus, 5^{22}.
James of Alphæus, 3^{18}.
Jesus' humanity, 6^{14} 7^{24} 8^{2} 11^{18} 13^{32}; prayers, 6^{46}; anger, 3^{5}; silence, 14^{60}.

[1] In these lists, g denotes matter of a general character preceding or following a verse.

Jewish criminal procedure, 15[1].
Joseph of Arimathæa, 15[43].

Kingdom of God, 1[15] 9[47] 10[14. 15]; of David, 11[10].

Lamp, 4[21].
Laying on of hands, 1[41].
Leaves on fig tree, 11[8].
Legion, 5[9].
Leper, 1[40. 44].
Levi, 2[14].
Liddell and Scott, *Lex.*, 1[36] *et passim.*
Locusts, 1[6].

Mark, manner, 2[1. 13] 4[3] 5[5] 6[7] 15[28].
Mary, mother of James and Joses, 15[40].
Meyer, *Commentary*, 1[4. 43] 2[15] *et passim.*
Miracles kept secret, 1[45] 5[37] 8[23].
Mission of twelve, 6[7 and g].
Morison, *Commentary*, 3[28] *et passim.*
Mount of Olives, 14[26].
Moving a mountain, 11[22].
Myrrh, 15[23].

Nathaniel, 3[18].
Nazareth, 1[9] 6[1].
Nazarene, 10[47].

O.T. parallels, 14[11].

Passover hymn, 14[26].
Philip, 3[18].
Place of eating with publicans, 2[15].
Principle of accommodation, 10[5].
Prophet, 11[32].
Publicans, 2[15].

Relation of Synoptics to each other, 1[9. 13. 20. 28. 34] 2[6. 18] 3[16. 22. 35g] 4[1. 31. 35. 36] 5[1g. 2. 5. 7. 9. 10. 13. 21. 25g] 6[1. 3. 8. 9. 19. 32] 8[1g] 9[32. 50] 10[13. 46] 11[11] 12[1. 28g. 35] 13[1] 14[9. 20. 47. 53. 59. 65. 69. 70] 15[1. 3. 17. 32. 36. 39. 43] 16[1. 5. 6].
Relation of John to Synoptics, 3[16] 6[34. 39. 45] 11[11] 14[43. 44. 47. 53. 58. 69] 15[15. 24. 43. 46] 16[5].
Repetition of miracle of feeding multitude, 8[1g].
Representative miracle, 1[39].
Roadside, 4[4].
Roman policy, 15[6. 15].

Salome, 15[40].
Sanhedrim, 8[31].
Satan, 3[24].
Saving by losing, 8[35].
Scene of Jesus' ministry, 2[13].
Scribes, 1[22]; of Pharisees, 2[15].
Self-denial, 8[34].
Shammai, 10[2].
Sidon, 3[8] 7[24].
Sign from heaven, 8[11].
Simon the Cyrenian, 15[20].
Son of David, 10[47]; of God, 1[1. 11] 3[11] 15[39]; of man, 2[28].
Supernatural darkness, 15[33].
Synagogue, 1[21 and g].
Syrophœnicia, 7[24].

Taking up cross, 8[34].
Thaddæus, 3[18].
Thayer-Grimm, *Lex.*, 2[14] *et passim.*

Veil of temple, 15[38].

Watches of night, 6[48].
Weiss, *Commentary, Life of Jesus*, 5[42] *et passim.*
Wife putting away husband, 10[12].
Wild honey, 1[6].
Winer, *N. T. Gram.*, 1[5] *et passim.*
Woman with issue of blood, 5[25g].

Young man who followed Jesus after arrest, 14[51].

Zebedee, 1[19].

GREEK WORDS

Αββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, 14[36].
ἀγαθοποιέω, 3[4].
ἀγγαρεύω, 9[32].
ἀγνοέω, 9[32].
ἀγρός, 5[14].
ἀγρυπνέω, 13[33].
ἀδημονέω, 14[34].
ἄζυμα, 14[1].
αἰὼν ἐρχόμενος, 10[30].
ἀκολουθέω, 2[14].
ἀλαλάζω, 5[38].
ἁλιεῖς, 1[17].
ἁμαρτωλός, 2[15].
Ἀμήν, 3[28].
ἄμφοδος, 11[5].
ἀναβλέπω, 10[51].
ἀνάγαιον, 14[15].
ἀναθεματίζω, 14[71].
ἀναπηδάω, 10[50].
ἀπέχει, 14[41].
ἀπὸμακρόθεν, 14[54].
ἀποκρίνομαι, 3[33].
ἀπόστολος, 6[30].
ἀποτάσσομαι, 6[46].
ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως, 2[26].
ἀρχισυνάγωγος, 5[22].
ἀσέλγεια, 7[22].
ἀσπάζομαι, 15[18].
αὐλή, 15[16].
ἀφροσύνη, 7[22].

βαπτίζω, 7[4].
βάπτισμα, 1[4].
βασανίζομαι, 6[48].
βίβλιον, 10[4].
βλαστᾷ, 4[27].
βλασφημέω, 2[7] 3[29].
βλασφημία, 7[22].
βλέπω εἰς πρόσωπον, 12[14]; μή, 13[5]; τί ἀκούετε, 4[24].

γαζοφυλάκιον, 14[21].
γεμίζεσθαι, 4[37].
γενεά, 9[19].
γενέσια, 6[21].
γέννημα, 14[25].
γεωργός, 12[1].
γίνομαι, 9[33]; εἰς, 12[10].
γονυπετέω, 1[40] 10[17].

δαιμονίζομαι, 1[32].
δέρω, 12[3].
δεῦτε, 1[17].
δηλαυγῶς, 8[25].
δηνάριον, 6[37] 14[5].
διαβλέπω, 8[25].
διαθήκη, 14[24].
διακρίνομαι, 11[22].
διαλογισμός, 7[21].
διδαχή, 4[2] 11[18].
δόλος, 7[22].
δύναμις, 13[25].

ἐγείρω, 1[31] 2[12].
ἐγένετο ἤλθεν, 1[9].
εἰ in oaths, 8[12]; in direct questions, 8[23].
εἰμὶ εἰς, 10[8].
εἰρήνη, 5[34].
εἰς, 12[10]; οἶκον, 3[20].
εἷς, 12[10]; κατὰ εἷς, 14[19]; — καὶ εἷς, 10[37]; for πρῶτος, 16[2].
ἐκβάλλω, 1[43].
ἐκλεκτός, 13[22].
ἐκπερισσῶς, 14[31].
ἐκπλήσσω, 1[22].
ἔκφοβος, 9[6].
Ἑλληνίς, 7[26].
ἐμβάπτω, 14[20].
ἐμβριμάομαι, 1[4. 43] 4[41g] 14[5].
ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, 1[23]; ὀνόματι, 9[41].
ἐναγχαλίζομαι, 9[36].
ἐνδιδύσκομαι, 15[16].
ἐνέχω, 6[19].
ἔννυχα, 1[35].

ἐξάπινα, 9[8].
ἐξέδετο, 12[1].
ἐξομολογέω, 1[5].
ἐξουσία, 1[22].
ἔξω τῆς χώρας, 5[10].
ἐπαύριον, τῇ, 11[12].
ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, 9[37].
ἐπιβάλλω, 14[72].
ἐπισυντρέχω, 9[25].
εὐαγγέλιον, 1[1. 14].
εὐδόκησα, 1[11].
εὐθύς, 1[23. 28. 29. 42] 3[6].
εὐκαιρόω, 6[31].
εὐκοπώτερον, 2[9].
εὐλογεῖν, 6[41].
εὐλογητός, 14[60].
εὐχαριστέω, 8[6].
Ἐφφαθά, 7[34].
ἔχω = possum, 14[8].

ζημιόω, 8[36].
ζύμη, 8[13].
ζωή, 9[43] 10[17].

ἡγεμών, 13[9] 15[16].
ἤρξατο, with inf., 6[7] 10[28].
ἤφιεν, 11[16].

Ἰησοῦς, 1[1].
ἱκανός, 1[7] 10[46].
ἱμάς, 1[7].
ἵνα, after verbs of desire, 10[35].

καθώς, 4[33].
καί with interrogative, 10[26].
Καῖσαρ, 12[14].
κακολογέω, 9[39].
Κανανταῖον, 3[18].
καρδία, 2[6].
καρπός, 4[8].
καταβαρύνω, 14[40].
κατακυριεύω, 10[42].
κατάλυμα, 14[14].
καταφιλέω, 14[45].
κατέναντι, 11[1].
κατεξουσιάζω, 10[42].
κατευλογέω, 10[16].
καυματίζω, 4[6].
κερματίστης, 11[15].
κεφαλαιόω, 12[4].
κεφαλὴ γωνίας, 12[10].
κῆνσον, 12[14].
κηρύσσω, 1[4. 7] 3[14].
κληρονομέω, 10[17].
κοδράντης, 12[42].
κοινός, 7[2].
κολλυβίστης, 11[15].
κολοβόω, 13[20].
Κορβᾶν, 7[11].
κράββατον, 2[4].
κράσπεδον, 6[56].
κρατεῖν λόγον, 9[10].
κρημνός, 5[18].
κυλίω, 9[20].
κύριος, 1[3] 5[19] 11[3. 9].

λαῖλαψ, 4[37].
λαλέω, 1[34].
λάχανον, 4[31].
λεπτόν, 12[42].
λῃστής, 14[48].
λόγος, 2[2].

μαθητής, 2[15].
μάστιξ, 3[10].
μεγιστάν, 6[21].
μετάνοια, 1[4].
μή, 2[4].
μηκύνομαι, 4[27].
μήτι, 4[21].
μνῆμα, 5[3].
μογιλάλος, 7[32].
μόδιος, 4[21].
μύλος ὀνικός, 9[42].
μυστήριον, 4[11].

νουνεχῶς, 12[33].

ὁδὸν ποιεῖν, 2[23].
οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ, 3[21].
οἰκοδεσπότης, 14[14].
οἶκον Θεοῦ, 2[26].

ὁλοκαύτωμα, 12[33].
ὄξος, 15[36].
ὃς ἐάν, 8[35].
ὅταν ἐγένετο, 11[19].
ὅταν with impft. 3[11].
ὅ τι in direct questions, 2[16].
οὐά, 15[29].
οὐαί, 14[21].
ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός, 7[22].
ὀψία, 6[47].

πάλιν, 2[1. 13] 3[1. 20] 4[1].
παντὰχοῦ, 1[28].
παράβασις, 7[17].
παραβολή, 3[28].
παραδέχομαι, 4[20].
παραδίδωμι, 14[18].
παραδοῖ, 4[28].
παράδοσις, 7[8].
παραλυτικός, 2[3].
παρασκευή, 15[42].
πάσχα, 14[1].
πειράζω, 1[13] 8[11] 12[15].
πειρασμός, 14[38].
περιπατέω, 7[5].
περιστερά, 1[10].
Πέτρος, 3[16].
πετρῶδες, 4[5].
πιστεύω, 1[15].
πιστικός, 14[3].
πληρόω, 1[15].
πνεῦμα, 14[38]; ἅγιον, 1[8]; ἀκάθαρτον, 1[23].
ποιεῖν δώδεχα, 3[14].
πρασιά, 6[40].
πρεσβύτερος, 7[3] 11[27].
προέρχομαι, 6[33].
προμεριμνάω, 13[11].
προσάββατον, 15[42].
προσαίτης, 10[46].
προσαύλιον, 14[68].
προσκαρτερέω, 3[9].
προσκυνέω, 5[6] 15[19].
πρόφασις, 12[40].
προφήτης, 6[4].
πρωΐ, 1[35].
πρωτοκλισία, 12[39].
πτῶμα, 6[29].
πυγμῇ, 7[3].
πώρωσις τῆς καρδίας, 3[5].

Ῥαββουνί, 10[51].
ῥήσσω, 9[18].

σάββατα, 1[21].
Σατανᾶς, 1[13].
σκανδαλίζειν, 4[17] 6[3].
σκεῦος, 11[16].
σκληροκαρδία, 10[5].
σκύλλω, 5[35].
σπαράσσω, 1[26].
σπεῖρα, 15[16].
σπεκουλάτωρ, 6[27].
σπλαγχνίζομαι, 8[2].
στιβάς, 11[8].
στολή, 12[39].
στρώννυμι, 14[15].
στυγνάζω, 10[22].
σὺ λέγεις, 15[2].
συλλυπέω, 3[5].
συμβούλιον, 15[1].
συμπνίγω, 4[19].
συμπόσιον, 6[39].
συναγωγή, 1[21] 13[9].
συνανακεῖμαι, 2[15].
συνέδριον, 13[9].

τέκτων, 6[3].
τελώνιον, 2[14].
τελώνης, 2[15].
τι δύναμαι, 9[22].
τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί; 1[24].
τῷ πνεύματι γινώσκειν, 2[8].

υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, 2[19].
υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1[11].
ὑπερηφάνια, 7[22].
ὑπόκρισις, 12[15].
ὑποκριτής, 7[6].
ὑπολήνιον, 12[1].
ὑπομένω, 13[13].

φιμόω, 1[25] 4[39].
φοβεῖσθαι φόβον, 4[41].

φραγελλόω, 15[15].
φρονεῖν τά τινος, 8[33].
φυλάσσω, 10[20].

χαλκός, 12[41].
χιλίαρχος, 6[21].
χορτάζω, 6[41].
Χριστός, 1[1].
χωρέω, 2[2].

ψευδοπροφήτης, 13[22].
ψευδοχριστός, 13[22].

ὠδίνος, 13[8].

NOTES ON SPECIAL SUBJECTS

Beginning of the Glad Tidings, 1[1g].
Messianic use of O.T. prophecy, 1[2. 3].
Baptism of John and Jesus, 1[8].
Mark's use of the *Logia*, 1[8].
Baptism of Jesus, 1[9g. 10].
Temptation of Jesus, 1[12. 13].
Beginning of the Ministry, 1[14g].
Announcement of the Kingdom, 1[15g].
The First Miracle, 1[21g].
Scribes, 1[22].
Demoniacal possession, 1[23. 34].
Injunction of silence about miracles, 1[35g. 45].
Prayers of Jesus, 1[35].
Jesus' relation to ceremonial law, 1[43. 44].
Miracles of Jesus, 1[45g].
Period of conflict, 2[1g] 3[1g].
Relation of faith to miracles, 2[5].
Son of man, 2[10].
Flexibility of method, 2[12].
Eating with tax-gatherers (publicans), 2[16. 17].
Nonconformity in matter of fasting, 2[18g].
Principle of fasting, 2[19].
New and old, 2[22g].
Alleged violation of Sabbath, 2[23g].
Rabbinical treatment of Sabbath law, 2[24].
Jesus' treatment of Sabbath, 2[27] 3[4].
Growth of popularity, 3[7g].
Appointment of twelve, 3[13g. 14. 19].
Charge of diabolism, 3[20g. 22. 24. 27].
Blasphemy against Holy Spirit, 3[29].
An eternal sin, 3[29].
Parables of Jesus, 4[1g].
Mystery of kingdom, 4[11].
Reason of parables, 4[11. 12].
Satan in parable of sower, 4[15].
Parable of earth producing automatically, 4[26g. 28. 29g].
Common features of parables, 4[33g].
Difficulties in story of Gergesene demoniac, 5[18].
Woman with issue of blood, 5[25g. 30].
Daughter of Jairus, Miracle, 5[34g].
Prophet without honor, 6[4g].
Imprisonment and execution of John, 6[17g].
Herod Philip, 6[17g].
Scene of execution of John, 6[28].
Miraculous feeding of multitude, 6[44g].
Walking on the water, 6[48].
Eating with unwashed hands, 7[1g].
Baptisms, 7[4].
7[6. 7] in Sept. and Heb. 7[6].
Traditionalism, 7[8].
Korban, 7[11].
Without and within, 7[16. 20].
Peculiarity of Miracles, 7[31-37] 8[22-26] 8[26g].
Feeding of four thousand, 8[1g].
Signs, 8[11].
Leaven of Pharisees and of Herod, 8[13].
Impersonality of Jesus' teaching, 8[27].
Manner of making Messianic claim, 8[29].
Esoteric teaching, 8[30] 9[9. 31].
Necessity of suffering, 8[31].

Prediction of death and resurrection, 8^{31}.
Silence about himself broken, 8^{38}.
Coming of Son of Man, 9^{1}.
Transfiguration, 9^{2}.
Return of Elijah, 9^{18}.
First last, 9^{35}.
Exclusiveness condemned, $9^{38.\ 39}$.
For and against, 9^{40}.
Permanence of retribution, 9^{48}.
Salted with fire, 9^{49}.
Different views of divorce, 10^{2}.
Forbidding divorce, $10^{9.\ 11.\ 12}$.
The childlike spirit, 10^{14}.
Rich young man, $10^{17.\ 21}$.
Human goodness of Jesus, 10^{18}.
Ultimateness of the commandments, [10^{19}.
Danger of wealth, 10^{23}.
Reward of self-denial, $10^{28sq.}$.
Prediction modified by event, 10^{34}.
Rivalry among disciples, $10^{35g.}$
Position in kingdom decided by fitness, 10^{40}.
Greatness in kingdom, 10^{44}.
Christ a ransom, 10^{45}.
Entry into Jerusalem, $11^{1g.\ 10g}$.
Barren figtree, 11^{14}.
Cleansing of temple, 11^{17}.
Forgiveness the condition of answer to prayer, 11^{25}.
Jesus' test of authority of Sanhedrim, $11^{27g.\ 30.\ 33}$.
Jesus' use of O.T., 12^{11} $14^{21.\ 27.\ 49}$.
Attitude of people to Jesus, 12^{11} $15^{11.\ 12.\ 13}$.
Pharisees and Herodians, 12^{13}.
Things of Cæsar, 12^{17}.
Conflict of duties, 12^{17}.
Sadducees, 12^{18}.
Power of God in resurrection, 12^{25}.
Jesus' proof of resurrection, 12^{27}.
First two commandments, 12^{30}.
Criticism of title "Son of David" for Messiah, 12^{35}.
Eschatological discourse, $13^{1g.}$
Abomination of Desolation, 13^{14}.
Various false Messiahs, 13^{22}.
Coming of Son of Man, $13^{24g.\ 26}$ 14^{62}.
Apocalyptic imagery, $13^{24g.}$
Gathering of elect, 13^{27}.
Time of coming, 13^{30}.
Limitation of Jesus' knowledge, 13^{32}.
Anointing in Mk., Lk., and J., $14^{3.\ 4}$.
Meaning of the eucharist, 14^{22}.
New covenant, 14^{24}.
Flesh and Spirit, 14^{38}.
Jesus' non-resistance, $14^{42.\ 50}$ 15^{31}.
Motive of betrayal, 14^{44}.
Jesus before the Sanhedrim, 14^{53} and g.
Son of the Blessed, 14^{60}.
Jesus' confession before Sanhedrim, 14^{62}.
Peter's denial, $14^{66g.}$
Jesus before Pilate, $15^{1g.}$
Jesus' confession before Pilate, 15^{2}.
Pilate's understanding of Jesus' case, $15^{3.\ 4}$.
Barabbas's offence, 15^{7}.
The crucifixion, $15^{21g.\ 24}$.
Taunts of rulers and others, 15^{31}.
Jesus' cry on the cross, 15^{34}.
Brothers of our Lord, 15^{40}.
Burial of Jesus, $15^{42g.}$
Appendix, $16^{9g.}$
Resurrection } Notes following Ap-
Ascension } pendix.