

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
COMMENTARY
ON
THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY
HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, TH.D.,
OBERCONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

From the German, with the Sanction of the Author.

THE TRANSLATION REVISED AND EDITED BY
WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D.,
AND
WILLIAM STEWART, D.D.

PART I.—SECOND DIVISION.
THE GOSPELS OF MARK AND LUKE.
VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
MDCCCLXXX.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, . . . HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, . . . ROBERTSON AND CO.

NEW YORK, . . . SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
HANDBOOK
TO THE
GOSPELS OF MARK AND LUKE.

BY
HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, TH.D.,
OBERCONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIFTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN BY
REV. ROBERT ERNEST WALLIS, PH.D.

VOL. I.

THE TRANSLATION REVISED AND EDITED BY
WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
MDCCCLXXX.

PREFATORY NOTE BY THE EDITOR.



THE translation of the Commentary on the Gospels of Mark and Luke has been made from the fifth edition of the original—the last form in which the work had the advantage of Dr. Meyer's own corrections and additions. In the case of the Commentary on St. Matthew, the materials for a sixth edition had been carefully prepared by Dr. Meyer before his last illness; and the work was issued by its editor, Dr. Ritschl, substantially as the author had left it. The present portion has likewise been given forth since the author's death in what professes to be a "sixth edition worked up anew" by Dr. Bernhard Weiss; but it is so considerably changed in form and substance, that, whatever may be its value on its own account, it can no longer be regarded as the proper work of Meyer; and I have had no hesitation in deeming it my duty to present to the English reader the last form of the book as it came from the great master of exegesis, rather than to reproduce the manipulation which it has undergone at the hands of its new editor. A few sentences will suffice to explain the state of the case, and I should hope sufficiently to justify the course which I have taken.

In the preface to the first volume that was issued of this translation (Romans, vol. I.), when speaking of the marked advantage which Meyer's work possessed in having undergone successive revisions *at the hands of its author*, as compared with the rival work of de Wette, the revision of which passed early into other hands, I took occasion to remark on the strange and, as it appeared to me, unwarrantable procedure of Dr. Overbeck in overlaying de Wette's book on the Acts of the Apostles with a running commentary largely devoted to the combating of de Wette's views. Dr. Weiss can hardly

be charged with anything so unseemly as this; but he contrasts unfavourably with Dr. Overbeck in another respect. The latter, even at the distance of twenty years after de Wette's death, was careful to distinguish by brackets his own additions, though forming two-thirds of the whole, from the original author's text; but a strangely different course has been adopted with the great work of Meyer. Within less than five years after his death the Commentary on Mark and Luke has been re-issued under his name; but he is spoken of throughout in the *third* person; his arrangement is discarded; his critical verdicts are recast to a considerable extent on other principles; his exegetical views are freely controverted; the statements of the author are often superseded by those of the editor; and, what is more, the character and complexion of the Commentary are materially altered by the superinducing on it of Dr. Weiss's special theories regarding the structure of the Gospels and the relations of their parallel passages. In other words, the work is no longer such as Meyer left it; it is to a considerable extent a new book by another author, and from a standpoint in various respects different.

Now, it may be at once granted that—if such a course were allowable at all in the case of an author so recently removed from us as Meyer, and of such a masterpiece of exegesis as his Commentary—Dr. Weiss might well be chosen to carry it out, for his investigations as to the relations of the Synoptic Gospels, as well as his contributions to Biblical Theology, have given him a foremost place among the critics and theologians of the day. In his preface he suggests some more or less plausible grounds for the course he has pursued, while indicating no small misgivings as to its legitimacy and its success. The plan has met with partial approval in Germany; but its propriety, as it seems to us, may well be questioned, on account both of the respect due to so great a name, and of the desirableness of permitting a reader, who buys a book on the faith of the writer's reputation and of the title-page, to have—with whatever else—at any rate the *entire* work of the author in the form in which he left it. Weiss himself states with regard to the work of Meyer, that “it contains such treasures

of erudite research, philological, archaeological, and bibliographical; so laboriously collected and carefully grouped a summary of all different views on every passage of importance, drawn from the whole domain of the history of exegesis; and lastly, so exemplary a model of sober and strictly methodical exegesis, that generation after generation may learn from it." As the case stands with the re-issue of it, the reader has no security that he gets more of the views of Meyer, or their grounds, than the subjective judgment of Weiss may have deemed worthy of reproduction; while he does get a good deal for which, it is safe to say, Meyer would not have held himself responsible. I shall only add, that the plan of entrusting the revision of the several portions of the work to *different* editors, whose methods of procedure and standards of judgment are necessarily various, breaks up the unity and consistency of the Commentary as stamped throughout with the impress of its author; and introduces a confusion, which cannot but materially interfere with the pertinence of the numerous references from one portion of the Commentary to another (introduced by "see on," or "comp. on"), that form a main element of its value. I have therefore had little difficulty in coming to the conclusion that, having undertaken to issue the Commentary of Dr. Meyer in an English form, I ought to give it in its final shape as it came from himself, and not as it has been since transformed by another hand.

The translation, on which Dr. Wallis has expended a good deal of time and care, has been revised and carried through the press, in the case of the first volume, by myself, and, in that of the second, by my colleague and friend Dr. Stewart, who tells me that he has, as he went along, inserted [in square brackets] the readings of Tischendorf's *editio octava major*, which, as Dr. Meyer explains in his Preface (p. xi.), had not been carried beyond the earlier chapters of Mark's Gospel at the time of his sending to the press the fifth edition of the Handbook.

THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE.



THE investigations as to the origin and mutual relations of the first three Gospels have again been pursued of late years with much vigour. A series of still unsettled questions has stimulated their prosecution; and the Christological discussions of the day, in which the authority of the evangelic records is of decisive importance, have imparted a peculiar and diversified interest of their own to the controversy, which has thus come to be of a more intensified and partisan character. That this critical ferment will last for some time longer, no one can doubt, who has given special attention to even the most prominent of the writings on the subject and compared their results with one another. And if, at the same time, we glance—as the two fields of inquiry, in fact, are not to be separated—from the Synoptic into the Johannine domain, in which very recently a valiant Swiss has raised the flaming sword, as if for a war of extermination, against the more popular¹ than strictly theological

¹ Of apologetic writings for cultivated non-theologians our day has produced many, and several that are excellent. Such writings—because their problems of themselves belong primarily and preponderantly to the province of professional theology—always occupy, in presence of the latter, a dubious position. For along with all the value of opportune and clever popularizing, there necessarily clings to them a certain incompleteness of proof and presentation, which may provoke the adversary at times to unfairness in his claims and in his criterion of judgment. It is indeed a material defect, when—as often—they deal with critical extravagances merely *in the way of repelling*, and leave untouched, or with a dubious mincing word evade, the necessary *concessions*, which in various important points are not to be refused to a sound, judicious, and thorough criticism. In this way there is no attempt to meet a justifiable requirement, and no clearness even as regards insight into the *status causae*.

work of a highly meritorious Saxon theologian whose laurels belong to another field of criticism [Tischendorf], we cannot but lament much impetuosity and even bitterness, which are the more apt to come into play when the contest is a contest of principles. Conflict in and by itself, indeed, over such critical problems as belong to the exciting questions of the present day in theology, is inevitable, and has its justification in the end at which it aims,—the separating the dross of error from the truth. But the sharpness of passion should not interpose to banish the charitable belief that an opponent, even where he is chargeable with error, has been seeking the truth and striving to serve it. In so speaking we cannot mean and desire that men should cry peace when there is no peace. But as we *cannot avail* aught against the truth, so we ought never to *will* anything that is not pure—free from selfish or even indecorous zeal—for the truth.¹

Various as are the critical opinions of the present day on the question of the Synoptic Gospels, *the* view seems ever more evidently to be approaching final triumph, that among the three Gospels (apart from the “Logia-collection” of Matthew) Mark is the first. The unfair judgments,² that may still be heard about him, will gradually be put to silence; just like Augustine’s “*pedissequus Matthaei*,” Griesbach’s “copyist of Matthew and Luke” will disappear from the arena of ancient error. This view derives special confirmation from the critical contributions—some of them entering very thoroughly into the subject—that have appeared since the publication of the fourth edition of this Commentary, or, in other words, since 1860, when we survey their aggregate results. It will easily be

¹ The extravagance of criticism, which in various productions of the day far transcends the boldness of Baur, does not advance the matter, bursts all the ties even of historical possibility, turns things upside down, promotes the convenient aversion—already, alas! so widely diffused—to criticism generally, as if it were an affair of unbelief, and works involuntarily into the hands of the *Jews*, who gladly accept the alleged negative results as if they were settled matters, as may be sufficiently seen from several writings of modern Jewish scholars.

² No one can pronounce a judgment of rejection over Mark more decidedly than has been done, with *French* frivolity, by Eichthal (*les Évangiles*, 1863, I. p. 51 ff.).

seen that I have sought¹ to give due heed to them, as well as generally to the latest literature relative to the subject, in their bearing on my purpose.

In reference to the critical remarks, I must call attention to the fact that only for the first four chapters of Mark could I take the readings of the text of Tischendorf from the new large edition (*editio octava*), which had only appeared up to that point; and for the sequel I had to quote them from the second edition of the *Synopsis Evangelica*. For I might not fall back on the *editio septima* (1859), because after issuing it Tischendorf modified essentially his critical procedure, and reverted to the principles of Lachmann, constituting in accordance with these the text of the second edition of the *Synopsis* (1864), and, of course, diverging much from that of the *editio septima*. I am

¹ Some minor works reached me too late for a consideration of their suggestions: e.g. Hilgenfeld, *Markus zwischen Matth. und Luk.*, in his *Zeitschr.* 1866, p. 82 ff.; Zahn, *Papias von Hierapolis*, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 649 ff.; Stawars, *üb. d. Ordnung Abia*, in the *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1866, p. 201 ff.; also Volkmar, *Urspr. uns. Evangelien*, Zürich 1866, but chiefly in reference to John. The *Christologie des Neuen Testamentes* of Beyschlag, Berlin 1866, I have, to my regret, only been able to take into consideration here and there supplementarily, during the later progress of the printing. As I no longer had any fitting opportunity to express in the Commentary my view as to Beyschlag's development of the idea of the *Son of man*,—which he regards as the *Ideal man*, as the *ideal* of humanity,—I may here be allowed, on account of the Christological importance of the subject, frankly to state that the deductions of the author—however attractive they are, and however considerable the names of authority that may range themselves on the side of their result—have not been able to convince me. I cannot but think that the notion of the *Ideal man*, as well in Daniel as in the Gospels, is one brought to them and introduced, and not the one there given. I find that the only Synoptic passage which appears to favour this interpretation is Mark ii. 28. But even here it is, as I believe, only an appearance. For, firstly, the fundamental thought in this passage is not that of the *ideal*, but that of the *representative* of humanity, which is a different idea; secondly, even this conception does not attach to *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in itself, but to the whole conception of the *Messiah*, and would be the leading thought of the argument, even if quite another appellation of the Messiah were used. That Christ, although without prejudice to His personal pre-existence, was and is the Ideal of humanity, is accordant with Scripture; but it is not contained in *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, as, indeed, this expression in itself does not lexically contain the very slightest hint thereof.—We may add, that it is much to be wished that the antagonism, which the work of Beyschlag will still abundantly encounter and must needs encounter, may be kept clear of the passionate vehemence which it has already so largely experienced.

not quite free from hesitation as to this change of principles, whereby, instead of simply steering for the ideal goal as such, we are again directed, as in the case of Lachmann, only to an intermediate station, the actual reaching of which, especially if it is to be the text of the *second* century, must withal in numberless cases be uncertain.

In conclusion, may I be allowed, simply for those at a distance interested in my personal circumstances, to mention that since last autumn I have retired from my position as a member of the Royal Consistory here. "*Deus nobis hanc otia fecit*,"—this I have (in another sense, indeed, than the Roman poet meant it) to acknowledge with humble thanks to the everlasting Love, which has in great long-suffering and grace upheld me during many most laborious and, in part, momentous years, and has at length helped me to get over the difficult step of retiring from the vocation bound up with my very inmost life. As nothing else than considerations of health, which I might not and could not withstand any longer, gave occasion to this change, and as for me especially it has been deeply painful to separate from the circle of the dear colleagues highly and gratefully esteemed by me,—with all of whom, amidst manifold diversity of our gifts and powers, I was bound in unity of spirit to the service of the one Lord, and, I venture to hope, may still continue bound,—it is a fervent joy to my heart, that in the partial co-operation which still remains assigned to me, especially by my continuing to take part in the theological examinations, there is not yet wholly dissolved the official bond of fellowship, which has always been to me so high a blessing in my position here.

Let the future, which is to be developed out of the blood-stained seed-sowing of the present not only for the fleeting existence of this world, but also for the eternal kingdom of the Lord, be committed to God, who turns the hearts of men as water-brooks, and will turn all things for the best to His people—the unknown and yet well known, the sorrowful and yet always rejoicing, the dying, and behold they live !

DR. MEYER.

HANNOVER, 10th August 1866.

EXEGETICAL LITERATURE.

[For Commentaries embracing the whole New Testament, the Four Gospels as such, or the three Synoptic Gospels (including the chief Harmonies), see the list prefixed to the Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew. The following list contains Commentaries on the Gospel of St. Mark or on that of St. Luke, along with a few works of historical criticism relative to these Gospels. Works mainly of a popular or practical character have, with a few exceptions, been excluded, since, however valuable they may be on their own account, they have but little affinity with the strictly exegetical character of the present work. Monographs on chapters or sections are generally noticed by Meyer *in loc.* The editions quoted are usually the earliest; *al.* appended denotes that the book has been more or less frequently re-issued; † marks the date of the author's death; c. = *circa*, an approximation to it.]

ALEXANDER (Joseph Addison), D.D., † 1860, Prof. Bibl. and Eccl. Hist. at Princeton : The Gospel according to Mark explained.

8°, New York, 1858, *al.*

AMBROSIOUS, † 397, Bishop of Milan : *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam.* [Opera.]

BAUR (Ferdinand Christian), † 1860, Prof. Theol. at Tübingen : *Das Markusevangelium nach seinem Ursprung und Charakter.*

8°, Tübing. 1851.

BORNEMANN (Friedrich August), † 1848, Pastor at Kirchberg : *Scholia in Lucae Evangelium ad supplendos reliquorum interpretum commentarios.* . . .

8°, Lips. 1830.

CATENAE. See CORDERIUS, NICETAS, and POSSINUS.

- CORDERIUS [CORDIER] (Balthasar), † 1650, Jesuit: *Catena sexaginta quinque Patrum Graecorum in S. Lucam. . . . Latinitate donata et annotationibus illustrata. . . .* 2°, Antv. 1628.
- COSTA (Isaac Da), Pastor at Amsterdam: *Beschouwing van het Evangelie van Lucas.* 8°, Amst. 1850-52.
- ELSNER (Jakob), † 1750, Consistorialrath at Berlin: *Commentarius critico-philologicus in Evangelium Marci. . . .* Edidit Ferd. Stosch. 4°, Traj. ad Rhen. 1773.
- FORD (James), M.A., Prebendary of Exeter: *The Gospel of St. Mark [and of St. Luke], illustrated from ancient and modern authors.* 8°, Lond. 1849-51.
- FRITZSCHE (Karl Friedrich August), † 1846, Prof. Theol. at Rostock: *Evangelium Marci recensuit et cum commentariis perpetuis edidit D. Car. F. A. Fritzsche.* 8°, Lips. 1830.
- GODET (Frédéric), Prof. Theol. at Neuchâtel: *Commentaire sur l'Evangile de saint Luc.* 2 tomes. 8°, Neuchâtel, 1871. [Translated from the second French edition by E. W. Shalders and D. W. Cusin. 2 vols. 8°, Edin. 1875.]
- HEUPEL (Georg Friedrich), Theological Tutor at Wittenberg: *Marci Evangelium notis grammatico-historico-criticis illustratum.* 8°, Argent. 1716.
- HILGENFELD (Adolf), Prof. Theol. at Jena: *Das Markusevangelium nach seiner Composition, seiner Stellung in der Evangelien-Litteratur, seinem Ursprung und Charakter dargestellt.* 8°, Leip. 1850.
- HOFMANN (Johann Christian Konrad von), † 1877, Prof. Theol. at Erlangen: *Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht. Achter Theil. Das Evangelium des Lukas. Cap. i.-xxii. 66. . . .* 8°, Nördlingen, 1878.
- JUNIUS (Franciscus) [FRANCOIS DU JON], † 1602, Prof. Theol. at Leyden: *Analytica expositio Evangelii Marci. [Opera.]*
- KLOSTERMANN (August), Prof. Theol. at Kiel: *Das Markusevangelium nach seinem Quellenwerthe für die evangelische Geschichte.* 8°, Götting. 1867.
- MICHELSSEN (Jan Hendrik Adolf): *Het Evangelie van Markus. I gedeelte.* 8°, Amst. 1867.


- MORISON (James), D.D., Prof. Theol. to the Evangelical Union, Glasgow : A Commentary on the Gospel according to Mark. 8°, Lond. 1873.
- MORUS (Samuel Friedrich Nathan), † 1792, Prof. Theol. at Leipzig : *Praelectiones in Evangelium Lucae*. Ed. K. A. Donat. 8°, Lip. 1795.
- NICETAS Serrariensis, c. 1150, Bishop of Heraclea : *Catena veterum Patrum in Lucae Evangelium, colligente Niceta*. . . [Mai, *Scrip. Vet. Coll.* ix.]
- PAPE (Heinrich), † 1805 : *Das Lucas-Evangelium umschrieben und erläutert*. 2 Theile. 8°, Bremen, 1777-81.
- PAREUS [WAENGLER] (David), † 1622, Prof. Theol. at Heidelberg : *Adversaria in S. Marcum, S. Lucam*. . . [Opera.]
- PETTER (George), Min. at Bread, Sussex : A learned, pious, and practical commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark. 2 vols. 2°, Lond. 1661.
- PISCATOR [FISSCHER] (Johann), † 1626, Conrector at Herborn : *Analysis logica Evangelii secundum Lucam*. 8°, Sigenae, 1596, *al.*
- POSSINUS (Peter), † c. 1650, Jesuit at Rome : *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Marcum Graece et Latine*. Interprete P. Possino. 2°, Romae, 1673.
- REINHARD (Lorenz), † 1752, Superintendent at Büttstadt : *Observationes philologicae et exegeticae in Evangelium Marci selectissimae*. 4°, Lips. 1737.
- SCHLEIERMACHER (Friedrich Daniel Ernst), † 1834, Prof. Theol. at Berlin : *Ueber die Schriften des Lukas kritischer Versuch*. 8°, Berl. 1817.
[Translated with an introduction by Connop Thirlwall, D.D. 8°, Lond. 1825.]
- SCHOLTEN (Johan Hendrik), Prof. Theol. at Leyden : *Het oudste Evangelie ; critisch onderzoek naar de samenstelling, de onderlinge verhouding, de historische waarde en den oorsprong der Evangelien naar Mattheus en Marcus*. 8°, Leid. 1868.
Het Paulinisch Evangelie ; critisch onderzoek van het Evangelie naar Lucas, en seine verhouding tot Marcus, Mattheus, en die Handelingen. 8°, Leid. 1870.
- SEGAAR (Carolus), † 1803, Prof. Theol. at Utrecht : *Observationes philologicae et theologicae in Evangelii Lucae capita xi priora*. 8°, Utrecht, 1766.

- STEIN (Karl Wilhelm), Pastor at Niemegk : *Commentar zu dem Evangelium des Lucas, nebst einem Anhang über den Brief an die Laodicäer.* 8°, Halle, 1830.
- STELLA [ESTELLA] (Diego), † 1578, Spanish monk : *In Evangelium secundum Lucam enarrationes.* 2 voll. 2°, Compluti, 1578, *al.*
- TITUS Bostrensis ? † c. 370 : *Commentarius in Lucam.* [Bibl. Max. Patrum. iv.]
- TROLLOPE (William), M.A. : *Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel.* 12°, Lond. 1849.
- VICTOR, Antiochenus, c. 400, Bishop of Antioch : *Exegesis in Evangelium Marci.* Ex codd. Mosq. edidit Chr. F. Matthaei. 8°, Mosquae, 1775.
- VINKE (Hendrik Egbert), † 1862, Prof. Theol. at Utrecht : *Het Nieuwe Testament met ophelderende en toepasselijke aanmerkingen.* 8°, Utrecht, 1852-54.
- WEISS (Bernhard), Prof. Theol. at Berlin : *Das Markusevangelium und seine synoptischen Parallelen erklärt.* 8°, Berl. 1872.
Das Matthäusevangelium und seine Lucas-Parallelen erklärt. 8°, Halle, 1876.
- WILLES (Bartus van), † 1844, Pastor at Niewland : *Specimen hermeneuticum de iis quae ab uno Marco sunt narrata aut copiosius et explicatius ab eo exposita.* 8°, Traj. ad Rhen. 1812.

THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.—ON THE LIFE OF MARK.

 HE evangelist Mark, a Jew by birth (Col. iv. 10 f.), is the same¹ who, in the Acts of the Apostles, is sometimes called *John Mark* (xii. 12, 25, xv. 37), sometimes *John* only (xiii. 5, 13), sometimes only *Mark* (xv. 39; comp. Col. iv. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Philem. 24; 1 Pet. v. 13). His original name, therefore, was *John*;² and the name *Mark*, adopted probably on his passing into the service of the apostles, became the prevailing one in Christian intercourse. *Mary* is named to us as his mother, who, at the time of the execution of James the Elder, was an esteemed Christian dwelling at Jerusalem, and in friendly relations with Peter (Acts xii. 12). Jerusalem may therefore be regarded as the birthplace of Mark. According to 1 Pet. v. 13, he was converted by Peter (*υἱός μου*); he entered, however, into the service of Barnabas and Paul, when they commenced their missionary journeys (Acts xii. 25), but subsequently became the occasion of a difference between them and of their separa-

¹ The supposition that there were *two different* Marks (Grotius, Calovius, and several others, including Schleiermacher in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, p. 760) is absolutely without any sufficient foundation. It is nevertheless again taken up by Kienlen in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 423 ff., and in opposition to the tradition of the church further made use of for ascribing the Gospel not to the Petrine, but to the Pauline Mark, whom Papias had already confounded with the former.

² Thence Hitzig (*üb. Johannes Markus u. seine Schriften*, Zürich 1843) could hold him to be the author of the Apocalypse, which, however, is decidedly incorrect. See Lücke, *Einl. in d. Offenb.* p. 781.

tion from one another, when he accompanied Barnabas, whose sister's son he was (see on Col. iv. 10), on his journey to Cyprus (Acts xv. 36 ff.). It is probable that a want of dauntless perseverance (Acts xiii. 13, xv. 38) had withdrawn from him Paul's favour, without, however, hindering their subsequent reunion. Of his further life and work nothing is known to us in detail from the N. T. beyond the fact that during Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea—according to the usual view, at Rome (see on *Eph.*, Introd. § 2)—he was with that apostle to his comfort (Col. iv. 10 f.; Philem. 24; comp. 2 Tim. iv. 11), and was at that time contemplating a journey to Asia Minor (Col. iv. 10). At 1 Pet. v. 13 we find him again with his spiritual father Peter in Babylon. His special relation to Peter is specified by the unanimous testimony of the ancient church as having been that of *interpreter* (ἐρμηνεύτης; Papias, in Eus. iii. 39; Iren. iii. 1, iii. 10, 6; Tertull. *contr. Marc.* iv. 5; Eusebius, Jerome, *et al.*); and there exists absolutely no valid reason for *doubting* the statement, if only the notion of ἐρμηνεύτης be taken not as meaning that Peter, being himself insufficiently versed in Greek, caused what he delivered in Aramaic to be reproduced in Greek by Mark (Kuinoel and many others), or that Peter made use of him as *Latin* interpreter (Bleek), but rather as denoting the service of a *secretary*, who had to write down the oral communications of his apostle, whether from dictation or in a more free exercise of his own activity, and thus became his interpreter *in writing* to others. This view is plainly confirmed by Jerome, *ad Hedib.* 11: "*Habebat ergo (Paulus) Titum interpretem* (in drawing up the second Epistle to the Corinthians) *sicut et beatus Petrus Marcum, cujus evangelium Petro narrante et illo scribente compositum est. Denique et duae epistolae quae feruntur Petri, stilo inter se et caractere discrepant structuraque verborum, ex quo intelligimus, pro necessitate rerum diversis cum usum interpretibus.*"

The tradition, that Mark was with Peter in *Rome*, is not yet attested, it is true, in the fragment of Papias, but is still very ancient, as it is designated by Clem. Al. *Hypotyp.* 6, in Eus. vi. 14, as *παράδοσιν τῶν ἐνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων*. It is not, however, free from the suspicion of having arisen out of

1 Pet. v. 13, where Babylon was taken as a designation of Rome (Eus. ii. 15; Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 8). From Rome, after the death of that apostle (not so early as the eighth year of Nero, as Jerome states), he is said to have gone to *Alexandria*, and there—where, according to Eus. iii. 39, he is alleged to have founded the church¹—to have died as bishop (Eus. ii. 16; Epiph. *Hacr.* li. 6; Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 8), and, according to later tradition, in the character of a martyr (Niceph. ii. 43, *Martyrol. Rom.*, 25 Apr.).

§ 2.—ORIGIN OF THE GOSPEL.

It is related, first of all by *Papias* (in Eus. iii. 39), and then unanimously by the entire ancient church, that Mark wrote his Gospel under the special influence of Peter, whose *ἑρμηνεύτης* he was. This account is, according to Papias (see on Matt., Introd. p. 41 ff.), to be understood as amounting more precisely to this, that Mark made notes for himself after the discourses of Peter which he heard, and subsequently employed these in the composition of his Gospel. This original relation to the authority of Peter² could not but receive more precise delineation by tradition, as there grew up an increasing desire to see the non-apostolic writing invested with apostolic validity. Already, at a very early date, our Gospel was regarded directly as the Gospel of *Peter*, as even Justin, *c. Tryph.* 106, quotes it as *τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου* (see on John, Introd. p. 9 f.; Ritschl in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 499 f.; Köstlin, *Urspr. d. synopt. Evang.* p. 368 f.; Weiss in

¹ That this occurred before the composition of the Epistle to the Romans, Thiersch concludes (*d. Kirche im apost. Zeitalt.* p. 104 f.) from Rom. xv. 19 ff. Certainly it is in itself probable that even at that early date Christianity existed, as in Rome, so also in Alexandria, where there was a very numerous body of Jews. Still the expression in Rom. *l.c.* is too indefinite as respects its geographical limits for any one to be able to maintain that Egypt belongs to the regions whereof Paul says that there is nothing more in them for him to do.

² Which, however, most of the later critics (comp. on Matt. p. 39), without sufficient warrant either from the testimony of Papias, or from other testimonies, or from internal grounds, refer back to a lost primitive Mark, from which our Mark first took its rise. So, too, Schenkel and Weizsäcker, *üb. d. Evang. Gesch.* 1864. Recently Weiss and Tischendorf have decidedly declared themselves against the hypothesis of a primitive Mark [*Urmarkus*].

the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 677); and Tertull. *c. Macc.* iv. 5, says: "Marcus quod edidit evangelium, *Petri adfirmatur, cujus interpres Marcus*" (comp. Iren. iii. 1: τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε, similarly Origen in Eus. vi. 25). Still, however, there is no mention of any special *recognition* of the book on the part of Peter. Nothing can with any certainty be concluded from the fragmentary initial words of the Muratorian Canon (as has especially been attempted by Volkmar on Credner's *Gesch. d. Kanon*, p. 351 f.); and Clement, *Hypotyp.* 6, in Eus. vi. 14, expressly states that the publication of the Gospel, composed after the apostle's discourses, experienced at the hands of the latter neither a *κωλύσαι* nor a *προτρέψασθαι*. But in the course of tradition the apostolic confirmation also¹ does not fail to appear, and even Eusebius himself,² ii. 15, relates: γνόντα δὲ πραχθέν φασι τὸν ἀπόστολον . . . κυρῶσαί τε τὴν γραφὴν εἰς ἔντευξιν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Comp. Epiph. *Hacr.* li. 6; Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 8.

In the dependence—to which Papias testifies—of Mark on Petrine discourses and on notes made from them, there is not implied essentially and necessarily his independence of Matthew and Luke; for if Mark, when he composed his Gospel, found already in existence the writings of Matthew and Luke, even although he rested on the testimony of Peter, the comparison of that testimony with those other two evangelists might still be of the highest importance to him, inasmuch as it might furnish to him partly confirmation, partly, in the event of want of accord between Matthew and Luke, decision, partly inducement for omissions, partly additions and modifications. And thus the matter would have to be conceived of, if the hypothesis of Griesbach (see *Introd. to Matt.* p. 35), which is still in substance upheld by many (including Saunier, Fritzsche, de Wette, Bleek, Baur, Delitzsch, Köstlin, Kahnis,

¹ The view which finds mention of the literary services of Mark even by Paul, namely at 2 Cor. viii. 18 (Storr, Hitzig), is a pure fancy.

² Eusebius does not here quote *Clement's* words, so that Clement would have here, compared with the previous passage, contradicted himself (Strauss, de Wette, and others), but he is narrating in his own person. See Credner, *Einl.* I. p. 113; Thiersch, *Hist. Standp.* p. 212 f.

and others), were the correct one.¹ But it is not the correct one. For, apart from the fact that in any case Luke closes the series of the Synoptics and is only to be placed after the destruction of Jerusalem, our existing Gospel of Matthew cannot have taken its present shape until *after* Mark (see Introd. to Matt. p. 39 f.); and *prior* to Mark, as far as concerns the relation of the latter to Matthew, there can only have existed the *apostolic collection of Logia*, which became also the first foundation of our Matthew. Mark must have made use of *this*, although in general the presentation of the discourses of Jesus has been with him so subordinate a feature, that we may reasonably assume that he has taken for granted in his readers an acquaintance with the teaching (comp. Holtzmann, p. 385). But every kind of procedure in the way of epitome and compilation (according to the hypothesis of Griesbach, there would only be left to Mark as his own peculiar portions, iv. 26–29, vii. 32–37, viii. 22–26, xi. 1–14, xiii. 33–37, xvi. 6–11) is absolutely incompatible with the creative life-like freshness and picturesqueness of detail, with the accurate designation of the localities and situations in his description,² with his taking no account of all the preliminary history, with the clear objectivity and simple, firmly-knit arrangement of his narratives, with the peculiar character of that which he gives either in greater brevity or in greater detail than the others. See especially, Ewald, *Jahrb.* II. p. 203 f.;

¹ The best conjoint view of all that can be said on behalf of this hypothesis is given by Bleek in his *Beiträge*, p. 72 ff., and *Einl.* p. 243 ff. The most forcible refutation is found in Holtzmann, *Synopt. Evang.* p. 113 ff., 344 ff. Comp. Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 652 ff., 680 ff.

² Baur, *Markusevang.* p. 41, does Mark injustice, when he sees in his vividness of description merely the habit of seizing first of all on the most sensuously-concrete conception. Köstlin and others speak of Mark's "mannerism." Weisse, *Evangelienfr.* p. 73, rightly says: "in fact, nothing can be more dangerous to the 'criticism of tendency' than any kind of acknowledgment, be it ever so limited, of the independence of Mark." Nevertheless, Eichthal (*les Evangiles*, Paris 1863) has found in the pictorial description of Mark a proof of subsequent elaboration; he is held to be the epitomizer of Matthew, whose Gospel nevertheless, as it now stands, is full of interpolations. And so Luke too is in many ways interpolated. In this Eichthal goes to work with very uncritical licence, and regards Mark as being much less interpolated, merely because he was from the first looked on as of far less consequence (I. p. 267 ff.).

Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 67 ff., 646 ff.; Holtzmann, p. 284 f., 448 f. Besides, we do not find in Mark the *peculiar* elements which Matthew and Luke (the latter especially, ix. 51–xviii. 14) respectively have in matter and manner; indeed, precisely in the passages where Mark does not stand by their side (as in the preliminary history and in discourses of Jesus), those two diverge even the furthest from one another, while they in the main go together where Mark presents himself as the intervening link. Such an intervening link between the two Mark could not be as a subsequent worker and compiler, but only as a previous worker in the field, whose treatise—freshly moulded from the apostolic fountainhead in simplicity, objectivity, homogeneity, and historical continuity—furnished a chief basis, first, in the gradual formation of our Matthew, and then also for Luke. It is simply inconceivable that Mark could have passed over, in particular, the rich materials which Luke has peculiar to himself (as is still the opinion of Köstlin, p. 334), merely from the endeavour after brevity and a laying aside of everything anti-Jewish. As regards the origin of the Gospel of Mark, we must accordingly abide simply by the testimony of Papias: it is primarily to be traced back to the communications of Peter, and with this view admirably agrees the characteristic discourse of the latter in Acts x. 36; in fact, this discourse may be regarded as a *programme* of our Gospel. Other special sources are not sufficiently recognisable,¹ apart from the primitive evangelic tradition in general, under the influence of which the companion of Paul, Barnabas, and Peter of necessity came, and from the collection of *Logia* of Matthew, which, as the most ancient (see on Matthew, Introd. p. 12 ff.) document intended for the natives of Palestine, could not have remained unknown to Mark, the inhabitant of Jerusalem. Rightly have not only Weiss and Wilke, but also Lachmann, Hitzig, Reuss, Ewald, Ritschl, Thiersch, Volkmar, Tobler, Plitt, Holtzmann, Weiss, Schenkel, Weizsäcker, and others

¹ According to Fritzsche and Bleek, Mark is alleged to have used not merely Matthew and Luke, but even the Gospel of John. The state of the case is directly the reverse.

(see also Güder in Herzog's *Encykl.* IX. p. 47 f.), maintained the *primitive evangelic* character of Mark in relation to the rest of our Gospels, and thus there is taken "a great step towards finding our way in the labyrinth of Gospel-harmony" (Thiersch, *Kirche im Apost. Zeitalt.* p. 102), however strongly Baur and his school (Köstlin, in the most complex fashion) contend against it with their hypothesis of a special "tendency" (see § 3), and with the aid of a Papian primitive-Mark; while Hilgenfeld withal, following Augustine and Hug, insists upon the priority of Mark to Luke, and consequently on the intermediate position of Mark between Matthew and Luke.¹ According to the opinion of Delitzsch (*neue unters. üb. d. Entsteh. u. Anl. d. kanon. Evang.* I., 1853), in connection with his mistaken discovery (see on Matt. Introd. p. 36) that the writing of the evangelic history, proceeding in the footsteps of the Thora, was created by Matthew, the dependence of Mark on Matthew would appear as so great, that even the *possibility* of the converse relation vanishes before it,—a dependence which, we may add, Hilgenfeld thinks to explain by the dubious hypothesis, opening the door to much that is arbitrary, of a Gospel of Peter or of the Petrine-Roman tradition as an intermediate step (see on the other hand Baur, *Markusevang.* p. 119 ff.; Ritschl in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 482 ff.; Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 691 ff.; Holtzmann in his *synopt. Evang.*).

The Gospel has *three main divisions*, of which the first goes as far as the choice of the Twelve (iii. 13), and the last begins from the setting out for Judaea (chap. x.).

REMARK 1.—Although Mark was chiefly dependent on the communications of Peter, still the Petrine *tendency* is not to be attributed to his Gospel (in opposition to Hilgenfeld), as appears by the very fact, that from his Gospel there is actually absent the saying of Jesus concerning the Rock of the church (Matt. xvi. 17). See generally, Baur in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 56 ff., and *Markusevang.* p. 133 ff. Comp. on viii. 29; also Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 674 f.

¹ Especially since 1850, then in his long controversy with Baur, and once more in his *Kanon u. Kritik d. N. T.* 1863, and in his *Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 287 ff.

REMARK 2.—In making use of *particular passages* of Mark to prove his independence or dependence on the other Synoptics, the greatest caution is necessary, not to educe from our reading of them what is already in our own mind as the critical view of the relation. The experience of the most recent criticism is a warning against this, for in it very often what one takes to be *in his favour* is by another turned *against* him, according to the colouring imported by the subjectivity of each. Even from the O. T. citation in Mark i. 2, 3, compared with Matt. iii. 3, xi. 10, we cannot draw any inference either for (Ritschl) or against the dependence of Matthew on Mark; see Baur in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 89 f. Comp. on i. 2 f.

§ 3.—PURPOSE, TIME, PLACE.

Like all the canonical Gospels, ours also has the *destined purpose* of historically proving the Messialship of Jesus: it seeks to accomplish this especially by setting forth the *deeds* of Jesus, but in doing so does not bear any special dogmatic colour.¹ It leaves out of consideration the doctrinal differences that agitate the subsequent apostolic period, and goes to work quite objectively. We must not on this account, however, assume a *mediating* aim in the interest of the idea of catholicity, and consequently a neutral character accordant with that tendency² (Schwegler, Baur, Köstlin, and others, with more precise definitions various in kind), or a mediating between the Jewish-Christian Matthew and the Pauline Luke (Hilgenfeld), for assumptions of which sort it was thought that a welcome external support was to be found in the very fact, that Mark's place was from old assigned to him only after Matthew, and relatively (according to Clem. Al.) even only after Luke. The omission of a genealogy and preliminary history does not betray the design of a neutral attitude (Schwegler alleges even that a Docetic reference is implied), but simply points to a time for

¹ Not even the character of artistic construction, which (according to Hilgenfeld) is designed to turn on the contrast of light and shade. But the alternation of light and shade is involved in the course of the history, not in the artistic premeditation of a literary plan.

² According to Baur, even the name for this neutral and mediating Gospel is significantly chosen: "Mark," the interpreter of *Peter* and the companion of *Paul*.

its origin, in which, among Gentile Christians, such matters as these had not yet attained the importance of being regarded as elements of the Gospel.¹ And the work is composed for *Gentile Christians*, as is evident beyond any doubt from the total absence of proofs drawn from the O. T. (excepting only i. 2 f., see *in loc.*) and of Judaistic elements of doctrine (Köstlin, p. 314), as also from the comparison of many points of detail with the parallel passages in Matthew (see Holtzmann, p. 385 ff.). Comp. on x. 12, vii. 1 ff., xi. 17, and others.

With respect to the *time* of composition, the Gospel must, in accordance with the eschatological statements in chap. xiii. (see especially, vv. 13, 24, 30, 33), and because it preceded our Matthew, have been written at all events before the destruction of Jerusalem, although Weizsäcker concludes the contrary from the parable iv. 26–29 (see *in loc.*). This is more precisely defined by the statement of Irenæus, iii. 1 (in Eus. v. 8), that Mark published the Gospel after the death (ἐξόδου, not: departure, as Mill, Grabe, Aberle, and others will have it²) of Peter and Paul. By this we must abide; and as there is not historical ground for going back to an earlier period (Hitzig: years 55–57; Schenkel, 45–58), the treating of that assertion of Irenæus with suspicion, as if it might have flowed from 2 Pet. i. 15 (Eichhorn, Hug, Fritzsche), and were too much of a doctrinal nature (Weizsäcker), is unfounded. See Credner, I. p. 118. The account of Clement, *Hypotyp.* 6 (in Eus. *H. E.* vi. 14), that Mark published his Gospel while Peter was *still alive* in captivity at Rome, makes indeed but an inconsiderable difference in the definition of the time, yet was so welcome to the interest felt in its apostolic authority, that Eusebius not merely added the *confirmation* of the

¹ The opinion of Volkmar (*d. Relig. Jesu u. ihre erste Entwicklung*, 1857, and *geschichtstreue Theol.* 1858)—that the Gospel of Mark as an Epos is a *Pauline treatise with a set purpose* in opposition to the Judaistic reaction, and has as its presupposition the Judaistic *Apocalypse*, and that, having come into existence under Titus, it became the foundation for the rest of the Gospels—is a critical extravagance. See in opposition to it, Hilgenfeld in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 387 ff., and in his *Zeitschr.* 1859, p. 252 ff., 1861, p. 190 ff., also in *Kanon u. Kritik*, p. 175 ff.

² See Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 224.

treatise on the part of Peter (see § 2), but also transferred the apostle's sojourn at Rome in question to the very earliest time possible, namely, to the third year of Claudius (ten years after the death of Christ), when Peter was said to have been there together with Philo and Simon Magus (Eus. *H. E.* ii. 14, 15, 17), which incorrect determination of the date of our Gospel was in consequence adopted by Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, and others. Later critics, who place Mark in point of time after Matthew and Luke (Griesbach's hypothesis), or at least after Matthew (Hilgenfeld), do not make it come into existence till after the destruction of Jerusalem (de Wette, Bleek, and others; Hilgenfeld: under Domitian), to which view Weisse also ("under the influences of the lively impression of the conquest") is inclined; Köstlin, assigning to the alleged older Mark of Papias the date 65-70 A.D., makes the canonical Gospel appear in the first decade of the second century. Baur puts it down still lower in the second century, as indeed he assigns to the canonical Gospels in general no earlier date than 130-170.

The *place* of composition is not known with certainty, but the preponderant voice of ecclesiastical tradition (Clement, Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, and many others) names *Rome*, which is not necessarily connected with the supposition that Mark wrote his Gospel while Peter was still alive, and has no internal reasons against it, but still is not to be made good by the Latin expressions which occur, as at vi. 27, vii. 4, 8, xv. 39, 44, and explanations such as xv. 16, xii. 42, or by x. 12, xv. 21. Most of the later critics have declared themselves in favour of the Roman origin (Gieseler, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Köstlin, Schwegler, Guerike, and several others), and the evidence in its behalf can only gain in weight from the fact that even at a very early period Alexandria was assigned to Mark as a sphere of labour. It is true that Chrysostom names *Alexandria* as the place of composition, but to this the less value is to be attached that no Alexandrian confirms it. Hence the *combination* of Rome and Alexandria by the assumption of a *twofold* publication (Richard Simon, Lardner, Eichhorn) is unnecessary, and

cannot be made good, not even by the statement of Jerome: "Assumpto itaque Evangelio, quod ipse confecerat, perrexit Aegyptum."

§ 4.—PRIMARY LANGUAGE, ORIGINALITY, INTEGRITY.

Mark wrote *in Greek*, as the Fathers are unanimous either in presupposing or in expressly testifying. It is true that there occurs in the Peshito as a subscription, and in the Philoxenian on the margin (comp. also Ebedjesu, in *Assem. Bibl. Or.* III. 1, p. 9), the remark that at Rome he preached in the *Roman tongue*; and several manuscripts of the Greek text (see Scholz, p. xxx.; Tisch. p. 325) distinctly affirm that he *wrote* in Latin, but this entire statement is a hasty inference from the supposition that Mark wrote at *Rome* and for *Romans*. Nevertheless, to the Roman Catholics, in the interest of the Vulgate, it could not but be welcome, so that it was defended by Baronius (*ad ann.* 45, No. 39 ff.) and others. Since the days of Richard Simon, however, it has been again given up even among Catholic scholars. It was even given out that the Latin autograph was preserved in Venice, but that has long since been unmasked as a portion of the Vulgate (see Dobrowsky, *fragment. Pragense ev. St. Marci vulgo autographi*, Prag 1778; Michaelis, *orient. Bibl.* XIII. 108, *Einkl.* II. p. 1073 ff.).

The *originality* of our Gospel has found *assailants* only in recent times, and that, indeed, on the ground of the account of Papias, on which its originality was formerly *based*. It was thought to be discovered that what Papias says of the Gospel of Mark does not suit our Gospel (see Schleiermacher in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, p. 758 ff.; Credner, *Einkl.* I, p. 123), and it was further inferred (see especially, Credner, *l.c.* and p. 205¹) that the Gospel in its present form could not be the

¹ Subsequently Credner (see his work, *das neue Test. nach Zweck, Ursprung, Inhalt*, 1843, II. p. 213 ff.) has declared *in favour of the genuineness* of our Gospel, and has looked upon the testimony of Papias as affirming that the order of events in the three Synoptics does not correspond to the reality. But even this does not follow from the words of Papias rightly apprehended.

work of Mark, but that another had worked up the notes which Mark had made without regard to arrangement, and thereby the *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον* had come into existence. In the further progress of criticism, the hypothesis was developed of a *pre-canonical* or *primitive-Mark* [*Urmarkus*] which had been an *Evangelium Petri*, a hypothesis variously elaborated in particular by Baur, Köstlin, and others. According to Köstlin, this primitive Gospel (which is held to form the basis of Matthew also) was composed in Syria, and formed, along with Matthew and Luke, a chief source for our canonical Mark, which is alleged to be a later product of the idea of catholicity. But the assumption of an original treatise that has been lost would only have a historical point of support, in the event of the contents of the fragment of Papias—so far as it speaks of the treatise of Mark—not really suiting our canonical Mark. But since, upon a correct interpretation (see on Matt. Introd. p. 41 ff.), it contains nothing with which our Mark is at variance, and therefore affords no ground for the assertion that it is speaking of another book ascribed to Mark, it remains the most ancient and the most weighty historical testimony for the originality of our second Gospel, and at the same time for the high historical value of its contents. With this view, no doubt, the much asserted dependence on Matthew—or on Matthew and Luke—cannot subsist, because this runs directly counter to the testimony of Papias; and to get rid of that testimony is a proceeding which amounts to peremptory dogmatism (de Wette), to arbitrary conjecture (Baur, *Markusevang.* p. 131 f., who alleges that Papias has combined things not connected with each other, namely, the existence of the Gospel of Mark, which, perhaps, had not been even known to him, and the tradition of the discourses which Peter is alleged to have delivered on his apostolic journeys), and to contradiction of history (as opposed to the testimonies of Irenaeus, Clement, Eusebius), as if the Fathers, to whom at any rate our Mark was very well known, would have only thus blindly repeated the story of Papias.

On the supposition of the originality of our Mark, the com-

parison of Matthew and Luke, who made use of him, presents no constraining reason *for the view*, that the Gospel, in the form in which we possess it, has been preserved merely in a recension modified by various omissions, additions, and alterations (Ewald, comp. Hitzig, Weisse, Holtzmann, Schenkel, Weizsäcker, also Reuss, Köstlin, and others), or, indeed, that that form, in which his Gospel has been made use of in our Gospel of Matthew, as well as by Luke, was preceded by one still earlier (Ewald), especially as Mark has not always followed the most original tradition, and in accordance with the peculiar character of his book abstains from giving the longer discourses of Jesus, with the special exception of the eschatological in chap. xiii.; hence, also the Sermon on the Mount is not found in his Gospel,¹ and need not have stood between iii. 19 and iii. 20 (together with the narrative of the centurion at Capernaum). See on iii. 20, Remark.

As to the *integrity* of the Gospel, the only question to be considered is that of the genuineness of the concluding section, xvi. 6-20. See, regarding this, the critical remarks on chap. xvi.

¹ On the hypothesis of the Gospel being prepared with *a special purpose*, this discourse is regarded as having been omitted by Mark, because he did not wish to bring into remembrance the continuing obligation of the law, Matt. v. 17. See especially, Baur, *Evang.* p. 565. As if this would have been a sufficient reason for the exclusion of the entire discourse! Just as little as the alleged Ebionitic commencement of the discourse.

Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον.

B F 8 have merely κατὰ Μάρκον. Others: τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον ἄγιον εὐαγγέλιον. Others: ἐκ τοῦ κ. Μ. ἀγίου εὐαγγελίου. Comp. on Matt. p. 45.

CHAPTER I.

Ver. 2. The *Recepta* has ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, following A E F G** H K M P S U V r, min. and other Fathers and vss. Defended by Rinck on account of Matt. iii. 3; placed by Lachm. in the margin. But Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. have ἐν (ἐν τῷ, Lachm. Tisch.) 'Ησαΐα (in Lachm. always with the spiritus lenis) τῷ προφήτῃ. So B D L Δ 8, min. and many vss. and Fathers. Rightly; the *Recepta* was introduced because the quotation is from *two* prophets.—After ὁδὸν σου Elz. has ἔμπροσθέν σου, from Matthew and Luke.—Ver. 5. πάντες] which in Elz. Scholz, and Fritzsche stands after ἐβαπτίζοντο, is rightly placed by Griesb. Lachm. and Tisch. after 'Ιεροσόλ. (B D L Δ 8, min. vss. Or. Eus.). If καὶ ἐβαπτ. πάντες had been the original arrangement and πάντες had been put back, it would, conformably to usage (πᾶσα ἡ 'Ιουδαία), have been placed before οἱ 'Ιεροσόλ.. The *Recepta* is explained from the circumstance that πάντες was omitted (so still in min. and Brix.), and that it was then restored beside ἐβαπτίζοντο, because in Matt. iii. 5 also 'Ιεροσόλυμα stands alone.—Ver. 10. ἀπό] So also Scholz. But Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. have ἐκ, which also Griesb. approved of, following B D L Δ 8, min. Goth.; ἀπό is from Matt. iii. 16.—Ver. 11. ἐν ᾧ] Lachm. Tisch. have ἐν σοί, following B D L P 8, min. vss. The latter is right; ἐν ᾧ is from Matt. iii. 17.—Ver. 13. Elz. Scholz, Fritzsche have ἐκεῖ after ἦν. It is wanting in A B D L 8, min. vss. Or.; it was, however, very easily passed over as superfluous (K. min. omit ἐν τ. ἐρ.) between ἦν and ἐν.—Ver. 14. τῆς βασιλείας] is not found in B L 8, min. vss. Or. It is regarded as suspicious by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. It is an addition in accordance with what follows. Comp. Matt. iv. 23.—Ver. 16. περιπατῶν δέ] Lachm. and Tisch.

read *καὶ παράγων*, which Griesb. also approved, following B D L **8**, min. Vulg. It. *al.* The *Recepta* is from Matt. iv. 18, from which place also came subsequently *αὐτοῦ*, instead of which *Σιμωνος* (Lachm.: *τοῦ Σιμωνος*) is with Tisch. to be read, according to B L M **8**. — *ἀμφιβάλλ.*] Elz. has *βάλλοντας*, contrary to decisive evidence. From Matt. iv. 18. — Ver. 18. *αὐτῶν*] is, with Lachm. and Tisch., following B C L **8**, min. vss., to be deleted as a familiar addition, as also in ver. 31 *αὐτῆς*. — Ver. 19. *ἐξεῖθεν*] is wanting in B D L, min. vss. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Fritzsche and Tisch., bracketed by Lachm. From Matt. iv. 21. — Ver. 21. The omission of *ἐισελεθῶν* (Tisch.) is attested indeed by C L Δ **8**, min. Syr. Copt. Colb. Or. (twice), which assign various positions to *ἐδιδ.* (Tisch.: *ἐδιδ. εἰς τ. συναγωγὴν*), but might easily be produced by a clerical error on occasion of the following *εἰς*, and it has the preponderance of the witnesses against it. — Ver. 24. *ἔα*] is wanting in B D **8***, min. Syr. Perss. Arr. Aeth. Copt. Vulg. It. Aug. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. The exclamation, which only occurs again in Luke iv. 34, and is there more strongly attested, was the more easily introduced here from that place. — Ver. 26. *ἔξ αὐτοῦ*] Lachm.: *ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*, without preponderating testimony. From Luke iv. 35. — Ver. 27. Instead of *πρὸς αὐτούς*, read with Lachm., in accordance with decisive evidence, *πρὸς ἑαυτούς*. Tisch., following only B **8**, has merely *αὐτούς*. — *τί ἐστι τοῦτο; τίς ἡ διδασχὴ ἡ καινὴ αὐτῆ; ὅτι κατ' κ.τ.λ.*] Lachm.: *τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; διδασχὴ καινὴ κατ' κ.τ.λ.* Just so Rinck and Tisch., who, however, connect *διδ. καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσ.* together. The authority of this reading depends on B L Δ **8**, min.; it is to be preferred, since manifestly the original *διδασχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν* was conformed to the question in Luke, *τίς ὁ λόγος αὐτος, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*, and thus arose *τίς ἡ διδασχὴ ἡ καινὴ αὐτῆ, ὅτι*. — Ver. 28. Instead of *ἐξῆλθε δέ*, preponderating attestation favours *καὶ ἐξῆλθεν* (Lachm. Tisch.). — After *εὐθύς* Tisch. has *πανταχοῦ*.¹ So B C L **8**** min. codd. It. Copt. Rightly so; the superfluous word, which might easily be regarded as inappropriate (**8*** min. omit *εὐθύς* also), dropped away. — Ver. 31. *εὐθέως*] after *πυρ.* is wanting in B C L **8**, min. Copt. Arm.; and D, Vulg. Cant. have it before *ἀφῆκεν*. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Tisch. But it was easily omitted, since Matt. viii. 15 and Luke iv. 39 have not this defining word. — Ver. 38. After *ἀγωνμεν*, B C L **8**, 33, Copt. Aeth. Arm. Arr. Tisch. have *ἀλλաχοῦ*. To be adopted (comp. Bornem. in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 127); being unnecessary and without corresponding element in Luke iv. 43, it was very easily

¹ In the text of the *Synops.* of Tisch. it is omitted by mistake.

passed over; comp. on πανταχοῦ, i. 28. — Instead of ἐξελήλυθα, B C L 8, 33 have ἐξῆλθον, which Griesb. and Scholz have approved, and Tisch. has adopted. Rightly; the explanation of procession *from the Father* suggested the Johannine ἐλήλυθα, which, moreover, Δ and min. actually read. — Ver. 39. εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς] So also Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. on preponderant attestation. The *Recepta* ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς is an emendation. — Ver. 40. καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτόν] is wanting in B D G r, min. Cant. Ver. Verc. Colb. Germ. 1, Corb. 2. Deleted by Lachm.; omission through the homoeoteleuton. Had any addition been made from Matt. viii. 2, Luke v. 12, another expression would have been used. Tisch. has deleted αὐτόν, but following only L 8, min. vss. — Ver. 41. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς] B D 8, 102, Cant. Verc. Corb. 2 have merely καί. So Lachm. and Tisch. But comp. Matt. viii. 3; Luke v. 13. From these passages comes also the omission of εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ, ver. 42, in B D L 8, min. vss. Lachm. Tisch. — Ver. 44. μηδέν] deleted by Lachm., following A D L Δ 8, min. vss. Vict. Theophyl. The omission occurred in conformity with Matt. viii. 4; Luke v. 14. — Ver. 45. Elz. reads πανταχοῦθεν. But πάντοθεν is decisively attested.

Vv. 1-4. As our canonical Matthew has a *superscription of his first section*, so also has Mark. This, however, does not embrace merely ver. 1, but ὡς γέγραπται . . . τὰς τριβύβους αὐτοῦ *belongs also to the superscription*, so that with ver. 4 the section itself (which goes on to ver. 8, according to Ewald to ver. 15) begins. It is decisive in favour of this view, that with it there is nothing either to be supplied or to be put in parenthesis, and that it is in the highest degree appropriate not only to the simplicity of the style, but also to the peculiar historical standpoint of the author, seeing that he places the beginning of the Gospel, *i.e. the first announcement of the message of salvation as to the Messiah having appeared*—leaving out of view all the preliminary history in which this announcement was already included—in strictness only at the emergence of the Baptist; but *for this*, on account of the special importance of *this* initial point (and see also the remarks on vv. 21-28), he even, contrary to his custom, elsewhere appends a prophetic utterance, in conformity with which that ἀρχή took place in such a way and not otherwise than is related in ver. 4 ff. Moreover, in accordance with this, since

the history of that ἀρχή itself does not begin till ver. 4, the want of a particle with ἐγένετο, ver. 4, is quite in order. Comp. Matt. i. 2. If, with Fritzsche, Lachmann,¹ Hitzig, Holtzmann, we construe: ἀρχὴ . . . ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων, then ὡς γέγραπται κ.τ.λ. becomes a parenthetical clause, in which case the *importance* of the Scripture proof has not due justice done to it, and the structure of the sentence becomes too complicated and clumsy for the simplicity of what follows. If we take merely ver. 1 as the superscription either of the first section only with Kuinoel and others, or of the entire Gospel with Erasmus, Bengel, Paulus, de Wette, and others, then ὡς γέγραπται becomes protasis of ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ., but thereby the citation, instead of being probative of the ἀρχή laid down by Mark, becomes a Scripture proof for the *emergence of John in itself*, and in that way loses its important bearing, seeing that this emergence in itself did not need any scriptural voucher at all, and would not have received any, in accordance with Mark's abstinence from adducing Old Testament passages. Finally, if we supply after ver. 1: ἦν, the *beginning . . . was, as it stands written* (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Vatablus, Maldonatus, Jansen, Grotius, and others), doubtless the want of the article with ἀρχή is not against this course (see Winer, p. 113 [E. T. 154]), nor yet the want of a γάρ with ἐγένετο—an asyndeton which would rather conduce to the lively impressiveness of the representation (comp. John i. 6); but it may well be urged that the supplying of ἦν is *unnecessary*, and even injurious to the vivid concrete representation. Moreover, in the very fact that

¹ The conjecture of Lachmann (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 84, and *praefat.* II. p. vi.), that vv. 2, 3 are a later interpolation, is critically quite unwarranted. According to Ewald and Weizsäcker, p. 105, ver. 2 f. is not from the hand of the first author, but is inserted by the second editor; in opposition to which, nevertheless, it is to be remarked that similar O. T. insertions, which might proceed from a second hand, are not found elsewhere in our Gospel. According to Holtzmann, p. 261, only the citation from Isaiah appeared in the primitive-Mark, and the evangelist further added the familiar passage of Malachi. In this way at all events,—as he allowed simply ἐν Ἡσαΐᾳ to stand,—he would have appropriated to Isaiah what belongs to Malachi; and the difficulty would remain unsolved. There is therefore no call for the appeal to the primitive-Mark.

Mark just commences his book with the emergence of the Baptist, there is ingenuously (without any purpose of contrast to other Gospels, without neutral tendency, or the like) exhibited the original type of the view which was taken of the Gospel history,—a type which again, after the *terminus a quo* had been extended in Matthew and Luke so as to embrace the preliminary histories, presents itself in John, inasmuch as the latter, after his general introduction and even in the course of it (ver. 6), makes his historical commencement with the emergence of the Baptist. Undoubtedly, traditions of the preliminary history were also known to Mark; in leaving them unnoticed he does not reject them, but still he does not find in them—lying as they do back in the gloom prior to the great all-significant epoch of the emergence of John—the ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγ.—[Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] See on Matt. i. 1. When the genitive with εὐαγγ. is not a person, it is always genitive of the *object*, as εὐαγγ. τῆς βασιλείας, τῆς σωτηρίας κ.τ.λ. (Matt. iv. 23; Eph. i. 13, vi. 15, *al.*). If Θεοῦ is associated therewith, it is the genitive of the *subject* (i. 15; Rom. i. 1, xv. 16, *al.*), as is the case also when μου stands with it (Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25; 1 Thess. i. 5, *al.*). But if Χριστοῦ is associated therewith (Rom. i. 9, xv. 19; 1 Cor. ix. 12, *al.*), it may be either the genitive *subjecti* (*auctoris*) or the genitive *objecti*, a point which must be determined entirely by the context. In this case it decides (see vv. 2–8) in favour of the latter. Taken as genitive *subjecti* (Ewald: “how Christ began to preach the gospel of God”), τοῦ εὐαγγ. Ἰ. Χ. would have reference to ver. 14 f.; but in that case the non-originality of vv. 2, 3 is presupposed. — υἱοῦ τ. Θεοῦ] not as in Matt. i. 1, because Mark had primarily in his view Gentile-Christian readers;¹ see Introd. § 3. This designation of the *Messiah* is used in the believing consciousness of the *metaphysical* sonship of God (comp. on

¹ The absence of υἱοῦ τ. Θεοῦ in **8**, two min., and some Fathers (including Iren. and Or.) has not so much critical importance as to warrant the deletion of these words by Tischendorf (ed. maj. viii.). In his *Synopsis*, Tischendorf had still rightly preserved them. The omission of them has just as little dogmatical reason as the addition would have had. But ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγ., as in itself a complete idea, was taken together with the following ὡς γίγρ.; and thence all the genitives, Ἰ. Χ. υἱ. τ. Θ., which could be dispensed with, were passed over the

Matt. iii. 17), and that in the Pauline and Petrine sense (see on Matt. p. 65 f.). The supernatural generation is by *υἱοῦ τ. Θεοῦ* neither assumed (Hilgenfeld) nor excluded (Köstlin); even vi. 3 proves nothing.—*ἐν 'Ησαΐα*] The following quotation combines Mal. iii. 1 and Isa. xl. 3. In this case, instead of all sorts of hypotheses (see them in Fritzsche), we must abide by the simple admission, that *by a mistake of memory* (of which, indeed, Porphyry made a bitter use, see Jerome, *ad Matt.* iii. 3) Mark thought of the whole of the words as to be found in Isaiah,—a mistake which, considering the affinity of the contents of the two sayings, and the prevalence of their use and their interpretation, is all the more conceivable, as Isaiah was “copiosior et notior” (Bengel). A different judgment would have to be formed, if the passage of Isaiah stood first (see Surenhusius, *καταλλ.* p. 45). Matt. xxvii. 9 was a similar error of memory. According to Hengstenberg, *Christol.* III. p. 664, Mark has ascribed the entire passage to Isaiah, because Isaiah is the auctor *primarius*, to whom Malachi is related only as auctor *secundarius*, as expositor. A process of reflection is thus imputed to the evangelist, in which, moreover, it would be sufficiently strange that he should not *have placed first* the utterance of the auctor *primarius*, which is held to be *commented on* by that of the minor prophet.—As to the two passages themselves, see on Matt. iii. 3, xi. 10. The essential agreement in form of the first citation with Matt. xi. 10 cannot be used, in determining to which of the two evangelists the priority is due, as a means of proof (Anger and others, in favour of Matthew; Ritschl and others, in favour of Mark); it can only be used as a ground of confirmation, after a decision of this question has been otherwise arrived at. Just as little does the quotation form a proof for a *primitive-Mark*, in which, according to Holtzmann and

more readily by reason of the homoeoteleuta. So still in Ir. int. and Epiph. Others allowed at least *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* to remain, or restored these words. Besides, *υἱοῦ τ. Θεοῦ* is precisely so characteristic of Mark's Gospel in contradistinction to that of Matthew, that it could scarcely proceed from a transcriber, as, in fact, the very oldest vss. (and indeed *all* vss.) have read it; for which reason merely a sporadic diffusion is to be assigned to the reading without *υἱοῦ τ. Θεοῦ*.

others, it is alleged not to have held a place at all. — ἐγένετο] *might* be connected with βαπτίζων (Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Kuinoel, and others), see Heindorf, *ad Plat. Soph.* p. 273 f.; Lobeck, *ad Aj.* 588; Kühner, II. p. 40. But the mention of the *emergence* of the Baptist is in keeping with the *beginning* of the history.¹ Hence: *there appeared John, baptizing in the desert.* Comp. John i. 6; 1 John ii. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Xen. *Anab.* iii. 4. 49, iv. 3. 29, *al.* Comp. παραγίνεται, Matt. iii. 1, and on Phil. ii. 7. As to the *desert* (the *well-known* desert), see on Matt. iii. 1. — βάπτισμα μετανοίας] *a baptism involving an obligation to repentance* (see on Matt. iii. 2), genitive of the characteristic quality. — εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτ.] Comp. Luke iii. 3. The aim of this baptism, in order that men, prepared for the purpose by the μετάνοια, should receive forgiveness of sins from the Messiah. Comp. Euthymius Zigabenus. This is not an addition derived from a later Christian view (de Wette, comp. Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 61), but neither is it to be taken in such a sense as that John's baptism itself secured the forgiveness (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 606; Ewald). This baptism could, through its reference to the Mediator of the forgiveness who was approaching (John i. 29, 33, iii. 5; Acts ii. 38), give to those, who allowed themselves to be baptized and thereby undertook the obligation to repentance, the certain *prospect* of the ἄφεσις which was to be received only through Christ—promising, but not imparting it. Matthew has not the words, the passing over of which betrays an exercise of reflection upon the difference between John's and the Christian baptism.

Vv. 5–8. See on Matt. iii. 4, 5, 11; Luke iii. 7 ff. Matthew enters more into detail on John the Baptist; Mark has several particulars in a form more original. — πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδ. κ.τ.λ.] Ἰουδ. is an adjective (see on John iii. 22), and χώρα is in contrast to the metropolis (see on John xi. 54 f.), the *whole Judæan region, and the people of Jerusalem collectively.*

¹ Ewald (comp. Hitzig) connects ἐγένετο with κρύπτων, reading ὁ βαπτίζων in accordance with B L Δ Ν (comp. vi. 14), and omitting the subsequent καὶ with B, min. "John the Baptist was just preaching," etc. The critical witnesses for these readings are not the same, and not sufficiently strong; there has evidently been an alteration in accordance with Matt. iii. 1. Tischendorf has rightly reverted to the *Recepta*.

In *πάσα* and *πάντες* there is a popular *hyperbole*. — Ver. 6. Instead of *ἐσθίων*, we must write, with Tischendorf, *ἔσθων*.¹ — Ver. 7. *ἔρχεται*] *present*: “ut Christum intelligas jam fuisse in via,” Beza. — *κύψας*] belongs to the graphic character of Mark, whose delineation is here certainly more original than that of Matthew. — *ἐν πνεύμ. ἁγίῳ*] The *fire*, which Matthew (and Luke also) has in the connection of his more comprehensive narrative, is not yet mentioned here, and thus there is wanting a characteristic point, which, nevertheless, appears not to be original. Comp. John i. 33 (in opposition to Ewald, Köstlin, Holtzmann, and others). It would not have been “abrupt” (Holtzmann) even in Mark.

Vv. 9-11. See on Matt. iii. 13-17; Luke iii. 21 f. — *εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην*] Conception of *immersion*. Not so elsewhere in the N. T. — *εὐθύς*] usual form in Mark; we must, with Tischendorf, read it here also. It belongs to *ἀναβ.*: *immediately* (after He was baptized) *coming up*. A hyperbaton (Fritzsche refers *εὐθ.* to *εἶδε*) just as little occurs here as at Matt. iii. 16. — *εἶδε*] Jesus, to whom also *ἐπ’ αὐτόν* refers (see on Matt. *l.c.*). Mark *harmonizes* with Matthew (in opposition to Strauss, Weisse, de Wette), who gives a further development of the history of the baptism, but whose *ἀνεψύχθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ οὐρ.* presents itself in Mark under a more directly definite form. In opposition to the context, Erasmus, Beza, Heumann, Ebrard, and others hold that *John* is the subject. — *σχιζομένους*, conveying a more vivid sensuous impression than Matthew and Luke. — Lange’s poetically naturalizing process of explaining (*L. J.* II. 1, p. 182 ff.) the phenomena at the baptism of Jesus is pure fancy when confronted with the clearness and simplicity of the text. He transforms the voice into the sense of God on Christ’s part; with which all the chords of His life, even of His life of hearing, had sounded in unison, and the voice had communicated itself sympathetically to John also. The dove which John saw is

¹ See on this poetical form, which occurs also in the LXX. and Apocrypha, Duncan, *Lxx.*, ed. Rost, p. 457; Winer, p. 79 [E. T. 105]; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 51 [E. T. 58]. Also at xii. 40, Luke vii. 33 f., x. 7, xxii. 30, this form is to be read.

held to have been the hovering of a mysterious splendour, namely, a now manifested adjustment of the life of Christ with the higher world of light; the stars withal came forth in the dark blue sky, festally wreathing the earth (the opened heaven). All the more jejune is the naturalizing of Schenkel: that at the Jordan for the first time the divine destiny of Jesus dawned before His soul like a silver gleam from above, etc. See, moreover, the Remark subjoined to Matt. iii. 17.

Vv. 12, 13. See on Matt. iv. 1–11; Luke iv. 1 ff.—ἐκβάλλει] *He drives, urges Him forth*; more graphic than the ἀνέχθη of Matthew and the ἤγετο of Luke iv. 1. The sense of force and urgency is implied also in Matt. ix. 38. Observe the frequent use of the vividly realizing *præscens historicus*.—*And He was there* (ἐκεῖ, see the critical remarks) *in the desert* (whither the Spirit had driven Him), *i.e.* *in that region of the desert, during forty days, being tempted by Satan*,—a manifest difference of Mark (comp. also Luke) from Matthew, with whom it is not till *after* forty days that the temptations begin. Evasive interpretations are to be found in Krabbe, Ebrard, and others.—καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων] *and He was with the wild beasts*. This is usually¹ taken as merely a graphic picture (according to de Wette: “a marvellous contrast” to the angels) of the awful solitude (Virg. *Aen.* iii. 646, and see Wetstein *in loc.*); but how remote would such a *poetic* representation be from the simple narrative! No, according to Mark, Jesus is to be conceived as *really surrounded by the wild beasts of the desert*. He is threatened in a twofold manner; Satan tempts Him, and the wild beasts encompass Him. The *typical* reference, according to which Christ is held to appear as the renewer of Paradise (Gen. i. 26; Usteri in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1834, p. 789; Gfrörer, Olshausen, comp. Bengel, and also Baur, *Evang.* pp. 540, 564; Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 126; Schenkel, Holtzmann), is not indicated by anything in the text, and is foreign to it. The desert and the forty days remind us of *Moses* (Ex. xxiv. 48, xxxiv. 28; Deut. ix. 9, 18), not of *Adam*.—οἱ ἄγγελοι] The article denotes the category.—διηκόνουν αὐτῷ]

¹ So also von Engelhardt (*de Jesu Christi tentatione*, Dorp. 1858, p. 5).

There is no occasion at all, from the connection in Mark, to understand this of the ministering *with food*, as in Matthew; nor does the expression presuppose the representation of Matthew (Weiss). On the contrary, we must simply abide by the view that, according to Mark, is meant *the help which gives protection against Satan and the wild beasts*. There is in this respect also a difference from Matthew, that in the latter Gospel the angels do not appear until after the termination of the temptations. — The narrative of *Christ's temptation* (regarding it, see on Matt. iv. 11, Remark) appears in Mark in its oldest, almost still germinal, form. It is remarkable, indeed, that in the further development of the evangelic history (in Matthew and Luke) the wonderful element *ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων* (which, according to Hilgenfeld, merely serves to colour and embellish the meagre extract), should have remained unnoticed. But the entire interest attached itself to Satan and to his anti-Messianic agency. The brevity¹ with which Mark relates the temptation, and which quite corresponds² to the still undeveloped *summary beginning of the tradition*, is alleged by Baur to proceed from the circumstance that with Mark the matter still lay outside of the historical sphere. Against this we may decisively urge the very fact that he narrates it at all, and places the *ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγ.* earlier. Comp. Köstlin, p. 322.

Ver. 14 f. See on Matt. iv. 12, 17; Luke iv. 14 f. — *εἰς τ. Γαλιλ.*] in order to be more secure than in the place where John had laboured; according to Ewald: "He might not allow the work of the Baptist to fall to pieces." But this would not furnish a motive for His appearing precisely *in Galilee*. See Weizsäcker, p. 333. In Matthew also the matter is conceived of as *ἀναχώρησις*. — *κηρύσσω*] *present*

¹ For the idea that κ. οἱ ἀγγ. διὰ αὐτῶν is only the closing sentence of an originally longer narration (Weisse, *Evangelienfr.* p. 163) is fanciful. Only the short, compact account is in harmony with all that surrounds it. Weissé supposes that something has dropped out also after ver. 5 or 6, and after ver. 8.

² How awkwardly Mark would here have epitomized, if he had worked as an epitomizer! How, in particular, would he have left unnoticed the rich moral contents of the narrative in Matthew and Luke! Schleiermacher and de Wette reproach him with doing so. Comp. also Bleek.

participle with ἦλθεν. See Dissen, *ad Pind. Ol.* vii. 14, p. 81; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Anab.* vii. 7. 17; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 116 C. — τὸ εὐαγγ. τοῦ Θεοῦ] See on ver. 1. — ὅτι] recitative. — ὁ καιρὸς] *the period*, namely, which was to last until the setting up of the Messiah's kingdom, ὁ καιρὸς οὗτος, x. 30. It is conceived of as a *measure*. See on Gal. iv. 4. — πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ.] *Believe on the gospel*. As to πιστ. with ἐν, see on Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 13; frequently in the LXX. The *object* of faith is conceived as that in which the faith is fixed and based. Fritzsche takes ἐν as *instrumental*: "per evangelium ad fidem adducimini." This is to be rejected, since the object of the faith would be *wanting*, and since τὸ εὐαγγ. is just the *news itself*, which Jesus gave in πεπλήρωται κ.τ.λ.

Vv. 16–20. See on Matt. iv. 18–22 (Luke v. 1 ff.). The narrative of Mark has the brevity and vividness of an original. Observe, however, how, according to all the evangelists, Jesus begins His work not with working miracles, but with teaching and collecting disciples.¹ This does not exclude the assumption that miracles essentially belonged to His daily work, and were even from the very beginning associated with His teaching, ver. 21 ff. — παράγων (see the critical remarks), *as He passed along by the sea*. This as well as ἀμφιβάλλ. ἐν τ. θαγ. (*casting around*) is part of the peculiar

¹ Comp. Weizsäcker, p. 364. But the teaching begins with the announcement of the kingdom, which has as its presupposition the Messianic self-consciousness (Weizsäcker, p. 425). Without reason Schenkel maintains, p. 370, that Jesus *could* not at all have regarded Himself at the beginning of His work as the Messiah. He might do so, *without* sharing the political Messianic hopes. See Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 250 f.; Keim, *Geschichtl. Chr.* p. 44 f. But the view which makes the beginning of the teaching and miracle-working even precede the baptism (Schleiermacher) has absolutely no foundation in the N. T., not even in the history of the marriage feast at Cana. Nor yet can it be maintained, with Keim (p. 84), that the conviction of being the Messiah gained strength in Jesus gradually from His first emergence up to the decisiveness, which first makes itself manifest at Matt. xi., where He announces the *present* kingdom, no longer merely that which is *approaching*. For the *approaching* kingdom is throughout—only according to a relative conception of time—from the beginning onward to Luke xxi. 31 to be taken in an *eschatological* reference; and it presupposes, therefore, a Messianic self-certainty in the Son of man, who with this announcement takes up the preaching of the Baptist.

vividness of representation that Mark loves. — Ver. 19. *καὶ αὐτοὺς*] *et ipsos in nave, likewise in the ship*. It does not belong to *καταρτίζοντας* (the *usual* view, in which there is assumed an imperfect comparison, which contemplates only the fishers' occupation generally, comp. on Matt. xv. 3), but merely to *ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ*, so that *καταρτ. κ.τ.λ.* then subjoins a further circumstance. The former explanation in the sense assigned to it would only be possible, if *ἀμφιβάλλ.*, in ver. 16, and *καταρτ.* were included under *one* more general idea. — Ver. 20. *μετὰ τ. μισθωτ.*] peculiar to Mark. Any special purpose for this accuracy of detail is not apparent. It is an arbitrary supposition that it is intended to explain how the sons might leave their father without undutifulness (Paulus, Kuinoel, de Wette, Bleek, and others), in reference to which de Wette charges Mark with taking away from their resolution its nobleness.¹ It may, moreover, be *inferred*, that Zebedee carried on his business not altogether on a small scale, and perhaps was not without means. Comp. xvi. 1; Luke viii. 3; John xix. 27. Only no comparison with the "poverty of Peter" (Hilgenfeld) is to be imported.

Vv. 21-28. Comp. Luke iv. 31-37, who in substance follows Mark; in opposition to the converse opinion of Baur, see especially Weiss, p. 653. Matthew, freely selecting, has not the history, but has, on the other hand, the more striking casting out of demons contained in Mark v. 1 ff. Mark lays special stress on these healings. — It is only with ver. 21 that Mark's peculiar mode of handling his materials begins,—the more detailed and graphic treatment, which presents a very marked contrast to the brevity of outline in the annalistic record of all that goes before. Perhaps up to this point he has followed an old documentary writing of this character; and if this comprised also in its contents vv. 1-3, the introduction of the Bible quotation in vv. 2, 3, contrary to the usual custom

¹ With greater truth, because more naturally, it might be said that that trait places in so much stronger a light the *resignation* of those who were called, seeing that they forsook a business so successfully prosecuted. Comp. Ewald, p. 192. We may more surely affirm that it is just a mere feature of the detailed description peculiar to Mark. Comp. Weiss, *l.c.* p. 652.

of Mark elsewhere, is the more easily explained. And the fact that now for the first time an independent elaboration begins, is explained from the circumstance that precisely at this point Peter entered into the service of the Lord—from which point of time therefore begins what Peter in his doctrinal discourses had communicated of the doings and sayings of Christ, and Mark had heard and recorded (fragment of Papias).

Ver. 21. *εἰσπορεύονται*] Jesus and His four disciples. According to Mark, they go *away from the lake* to Capernaum, not from *Nazareth* (thus Victor Antiochenus, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, and others, following Luke), and not *away from the mount* (according to Matt. viii. 5). Matthew and Luke have differently restored the right historical sequence, the absence of which was felt in the abrupt report of Mark, ver. 21. They thus found here something of the *ἐνια*, which the fragment of Papias pronounced to be wanting in *τάξις* (see on Matt. Introd. p. 42 f.). — *εὐθέως τοῖς σάββ.*] *i.e. immediately on the next Sabbath*, not: on the several Sabbaths (Euthymius Zigabenus, Wolf, and many others), which is forbidden by *εὐθέως. σάββαρα*, as in ii. 23; Matt. xii. 1; Luke iv. 6; Col. ii. 16. — *ἐδίδασκε*] *What*, Mark does not say, for he is more concerned with the powerful *impression*, with the marvellous *deed* of the teaching, the general tenor of which, we may add, ver. 14 f. does not leave in any doubt. This synagogue-discourse has nothing to do with the sermon on the Mount, as if it were intended to occupy the place of the latter (Hilgenfeld).

Ver. 22. Comp. Matt. vii. 28 f., where the notice of Mark is reproduced unaltered, but placed after the sermon on the Mount; and Luke iv. 32, where the second part of the observation is generalized and divested of the contrast. It is very far-fetched, however, in Hilgenfeld, who in ver. 22 sees a sure indication of dependence on Matthew, to find in the fact, that Mark already here makes *Capernaum* appear as the scene of the ministry of Jesus just as in ver. 29, the *Petrine* character of the Gospel. See, on the other hand, Baur in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 56 ff. — As to *ἦν διδάσκ.* and *ὡς ἔξουσ. ἔχων*, see on Matt. vii. 28 f.

Ver. 23 f. Ἐν πνεύμ. ἀκαθάρτῳ] to be connected closely with ἄνθρωπος: *a man in the power of an unclean spirit*. See on ἐν Matthiae, p. 1141. Comp. v. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 2; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 84 [E. T. 96]. As to the *demoniacs*, see on Matt. iv. 24; and as to the miracles of Jesus in general, see on Matt. viii. 4. — ἀνέκραξε] *he cried aloud* (see Winer, *de verbos. cum prae-posit. compos. usu*, III. p. 7), namely, the man, who, however, speaks in the person of the demon. Comp. Matt. viii. 29, where also, as here, the demon *immediately* discerns the Messiah. — ἡμᾶς] *me and those like to me*. "Communem inter se causam habent daemonia," Bengel. — ἀπολέσαι] by relegation to Hades, like βασανίσαι in Matt. l.c. — ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ] *the hallowed One of God* (John x. 36) κατ' ἐξοχήν (see Origen and Victor Antiochenus in Possini *Catena*), a characteristic designation of the *Messiah*, which here proceeds from the consciousness of the unholy demoniac nature (Luke iv. 34; Acts iv. 27; Rev. iii. 7; John vi. 69). In a lower sense priests and prophets were ἅγιοι τοῦ θεοῦ. See Knapp, *Opusc.* I. p. 33 f. The demon does not name Him thus as *κολακεύων αὐτόν* (Euthymius Zigabenus, and before him Tertullian), but rather by way of giving to His ἡλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς the impress of hopeless certainty.

Ver. 25 f. Αὐτῷ] *to the demon*, who had spoken out of the man.¹ — The demon, before he goes forth, once more gives vent to his whole fury on the man by tearing (σπαράξαν) him. Comp. ix. 26; Luke ix. 42.

Ver. 27. Πρὸς ἑαυτούς] is equivalent to πρὸς ἀλλήλους (Luke iv. 36). The *reason* why the *reflexive* is used, is the conception of the *contradistinction to others* (they discussed *among one another*, not with Jesus and His disciples). See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 6. 20. Fritzsche explains: *apud animum suum*. But συζητεῖν stands opposed to this, designating as it does action *in common*, ix. 10, xii. 28; Luke xx. 23,

¹ To refer *φωμώθητι*, with Strauss, II. p. 21, following older expositors, merely to the demon's declaration of the Messiahship of Jesus, is, in view of the general character of the word, arbitrary. It is the command of the victor in general: Be silent and go out! Strauss appeals to i. 34, iii. 12. But these prohibitions refer to the time *after* the going out.

xxiv. 15, *al.*; so also in the classics. — τί ἐστὶ τοῦτο;] a natural demand in astonishment at what had happened *for more precise information as to the circumstances of the case.*—In what follows we must read: διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν· καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις . . . αὐτῷ! See the critical remarks. They give vent by way of exclamation to what has thrown them into such astonishment and is so incomprehensible to them, and do so in the unperiodic mode of expression that is appropriate to excited feeling: *a doctrine new in power! and He commands the unclean spirits*, etc.! They marvel at these *two* marked points, as they have just perceived them in Jesus. Lachmann attaches κατ' ἐξουσίαν to καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι κ.τ.λ. But this is manifestly opposed to the connection, according to which κατ' ἐξουσίαν looks back to the foregoing ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων. This applies also in opposition to Ewald, who reads διδαχῇ καινῇ: “with new teaching He powerfully commands even the devils.” A confused identification of the teaching with the impression of the miraculous action is here groundlessly discovered by Baur,¹ and used as a proof of dependence on Luke iv. 36. Even with the *Recepta* ὅτι the two elements of the exclamation would be very definitely correlative to the *two* elements of the ministry of Jesus in the synagogue respectively.—κατ' ἐξουσίαν] defines the reference of καινὴ: *new in respect to power*, which has never yet occurred thus with the impress of higher authorization.

Ver. 28. Εἰς ὅλην τ. περίχ. τ. Γαλιλ.] not merely therefore into Galilee itself, but also *into the whole region that surrounds Galilee.* Comp. Luke iii. 3, viii. 37. This wide diffusion, the expression of which is still further strengthened by πανταχοῦ (see the critical remarks), is not at variance with the εὐθύς (Köstlin finds in the word “a mistaken fashion of exaggeration”), which is to be estimated in accordance with the lively popular mode of expression. Criticism becomes

¹ Who holds that Mark has not been able to enter into Luke's mode of view, but has kept to the διδασκία of Jesus in the sense of Matthew, without himself rightly understanding in what relation the καινὴ διδασκία stood to the ἐπιτίσεις κ.τ.λ. Baur, *Markusevang.* p. 11; comp. *theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 69 f. See, on the other hand, Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 128.

confused by the stress laid on such points. — πανταχοῦ] with the verb of motion, as is often the case among the Greeks: *every-whither*. Comp. on ἀλλαχοῦ, ver. 38.—It is to be observed, we may add, that this first miracle, which Mark and Luke relate, is not *designated* by them as the first. Hence there is no inconsistency with John ii. 11 (in opposition to Strauss).

Vv. 29-39. In connection and narrative, Luke iv. 38-44 is parallel. But compare also Matt. viii. 14-17, which proceeds by way of abridgment.

Ver. 29 ff. See on Matt. viii. 14 f. — ἐξελθόντες] Jesus, Peter and Andrew. James and John are thereupon specially named as accompanying.—The short narrative is condensed, animated, graphic,¹ not subjected to elaboration, against which view the mention of *Andrew*, whom Matthew and Luke omit as a secondary person, cannot well be urged. Comp. Weiss, p. 654.

Ver. 32 f. Ὁψίας . . . ἥλιος] an exact specification of time (comp. Matthew *and* Luke) for the purpose of indicating that the close of the Sabbath had occurred. "Judæos religio tenebat, quominus ante exitum sabbati aegrotos suos afferrent," Wetstein, and, earlier, Victor Antiochenus. — πρὸς αὐτόν] presupposes that before the evening He has returned again to His own dwelling (ii. 1, 15). It is not *Peter's* house that is meant. — πάντας τοὺς κ.τ.λ.] all whom they had.—Here and at ver. 34, as also at Matt. viii. 16, the naturally sick are *distinguished* from the demoniacs; comp. iii. 15. — ἡ πόλις ὅλη] comp. Matt. iii. 5. So also in the classical writers (Thuc. vii. 82. 1; Soph. *O. R.* 179); comp. Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 103.

Ver. 34. πολλοὺς . . . πολλά] therefore not *all*, which, nevertheless, does not presuppose attempts that were without result. It was already *late*, and in various cases, moreover, the *conditions* of healing might be wanting. — ἤφιε] as in xi. 16.

¹ In this point of view the sickness is denoted by the words κατίκιτο πυρίσσ. as severe enough not to allow the event to be treated as a simple soothing of the over-excited nervous system (Schenkel). Mere psychological soothing of this kind would simply stand in utter disproportion to the sensation produced by Jesus as a worker of miracles.

Imperfect, from the form ἀφίω, with the augment on the preposition; see Winer, p. 74 [E. T. 97]. — λαλεῖν . . . ὅτι] He allowed them not *to speak*, enjoined on them silence, *because* they knew Him. They would otherwise, had they been allowed to *speak*, have *said* that He was the Messiah. Kuinoel, Bleek, and others erroneously take it as if the expression was λέγειν . . . ὅτι. The two verbs (comp. on John viii. 43; Rom. iii. 19) are never interchanged in the N. T., not even in such passages as Rom. xv. 18; 2 Cor. xi. 17; 1 Thess. i. 8; hence “*to say that*” is never expressed by λαλεῖν, ὅτι. — As to the *reason* of the prohibition, see on v. 43 and Matt. viii. 4.

Vv. 35–39. Luke iv. 42–44 is less characteristic and more generalized. — ἐννυχον λῖαν] *when it was still very dark*. ἐννυχον is the accusative neuter of the definition of time, as σήμερον, αὔριον, νέον, etc. The word itself is often found also in classical writers, but not this adverbial use of the accusative neuter (3 Macc. v. 5; see, however, Grimm *in loc.*). Comp. ἐννυχώτερον, Aesop, *Fab.* 79. The plural form ἐννυχα (in Lachmann and Tischendorf, following B C D L s, min.) is, however, decisively attested, although likewise without sanction from Greek usage;¹ in Soph. *Aj.* 930, πάννυχα is adjective. — ἐξῆλθε] *out of his house*, ver. 29. Comp. ii. 1. — κατεδίωξαν] only occurring here in the N. T., more significant than the simple form, expressive of the following *up till they reached* Him; Thuc. ii. 84. 3; Polyb. vi. 42. 1; Ecclus. xxvii. 17; Ps. xxii. 18. — καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ] Andrew, John, and James, ver. 29. Under this expression is already implied the conception of the historical prominent position of Peter. But such an expression does not betray any special *Petrine tendency* of the Gospel. — πάντες] puts Jesus in mind of the multitude of yesterday, vv. 32, 34. — ἀλλαχοῦ] with a verb of direction, comp. ver. 28 and on Matt. ii. 22. The following εἰς τὰς ἐχομ. κωμοπ., *into the nearest* (Herod. i. 134; Xen. *Anab.* i. 8, iv. 9; Joseph. *Antt.* xi. 8. 6, and frequently; comp. Acts xiii. 44, xxi. 26) *villages*, is a more precise definition of ἀλλαχοῦ. See Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* iv. 23, v. 35, and

¹ Hesychius has the adverb νύχα, equivalent to νύκτωρ.

in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 127; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 22. — *κωμοπόλεις*] *villages*, only used here in the N. T., but see the passages in Wetstein. — *εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον*] *for that* (namely, to preach abroad also) *is the object for which I have left the house*, ver. 35. Schenkel invents here quite a different connection. In opposition to the context, others understand *ἐξῆλθον* of having come forth *from the Father*. So Euthymius Zigabenus, Maldonatus, Grotius, Bengel, Lange, and others; comp. Baumgarten-Crusius. A harmonizing with Luke iv. 43.

Ver. 39. *Κηρύσσω εἰς τὰς συναγωγ. αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.*] There is the conception of *direction* in *εἰς*: announcing (the Gospel) *into their synagogues*. He is conceived of as coming before the assembly in the synagogue and speaking to them. Comp. the well-known modes of expression: *ἐς τὸν δῆμον εἰπεῖν*, Thuc. v. 45, *εἰς τὴν στρατίαν εἰπεῖν*, Xen. *Anab.* v. 6. 37; John viii. 26, *ταῦτα λέγω εἰς τὸν κόσμον*. Comp. xiv. 10; Rom. xvi. 26. The following *εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν* specifies the geographical field, *into which* the *κηρύσσειν εἰς τὰς συναγωγ. αὐτ.* *extended*. Comp. xiii. 10; Luke xxiv. 47. We may add that this tour is not invented by Mark as a happier substitute for the Gadarene journey of Matt. viii., as Hilgenfeld assumes it to be, which is a vagary in the interest of antagonism to the independence of Mark. Holtzmann appropriately observes that vv. 35-39 is one of the most telling passages in favour of Mark's originality.

Vv. 40-45. Comp. on Matt. viii. 2-4, where this history follows immediately after the sermon on the Mount, and that in a shorter, more comprehensive form in accordance with Mark. In Luke (v. 12 ff.) the narrative of the draught of fishes is previously inserted. — *γουνπετῶν αὐτόν*] see on Matt. xvii. 14. — Ver. 41.¹ *σπλαγχνισθ.*] subordinated to the participle *ἐκτείνας*; see Winer, p. 308 [E. T. 433]; Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 249. — Ver. 42. *ἀπήλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*]

¹ If the leper had come to Jesus when he was already substantially healed, as Schenkel in spite of ver. 45 thinks probable, what charlatanry would the Lord have been practising at ver. 41 f.! And yet, even according to Schenkel (p. 373), Mark is assumed to have had the narrative from the mouth of Peter.

so also Luke. But he has omitted the following *κ. ἐκαθαρ.*, to which Matthew has adhered. — Ver. 43. *ἐμβριμησάμ. αὐτῷ*] *after He had been angry at him*, wrathfully addressed him (comp. xiv. 5, and on Matt. ix. 30). We are to conceive of a vehement *begone now! away hence!* With this is connected also the forcible *ἐξέβαλεν*. Observe the peculiar way in which Mark depicts how Jesus with very earnest zeal desired and urged the departure of the man that was healed. Moreover, the statement that the cure took place *in a house* (*ἐξέβαλεν*) is peculiar to Mark, who in the entire narrative is very original and cannot be following the colourless narrative of Luke (Bleek). It is true that, according to Lev. xiii. 46, comp. Num. v. 2, lepers were forbidden to enter into a house belonging to other people (see Ewald *in loc.*, and *Altorth.* p. 180); but the impulse towards Jesus and His aid caused the sick man to break through the barrier of the law, whence, moreover, may be explained the hurried and vehement deportment of Jesus. — Ver. 44. As to the prohibition, see on Matt. viii. 4, and on Mark v. 43. — The prefixing of *σεαυτόν* (*thyself*) is in keeping with the emotion, with which the withdrawal of the *person* is required. — *περὶ τοῦ καθαρ. σου*] *on account of thy cleansing, i.e. in order to become Levitically clean.* — Ver. 45. Comp. Luke v. 15 f. Mark has peculiar matter. — *ἐξελθών*] *from the house.* Comp. ver. 43. — *ἤρξατο εὐγνώμων ὦν ὁ λεπρὸς, οὐκ ἠνέσχετο σιγῇ καλύψαι τὴν εὐεργεσίαν*, Euthymius Zigabenus. The *beginning* of this breach of the imposed silence is made prominent. — *τὸν λόγον*] Euthymius Zigabenus: *ὃν εἶρηκεν αὐτῷ ὁ Χριστὸς, δηλαδή τὸ θέλω, καθαρίσθητι.* So also Fritzsche. But Mark, in order to be intelligible, must have led men to this by a more precise designation pointing back to it. It is *the story*, i.e. *the narrative of the occurrence* (Luther appropriately has *the history*), not: *the matter* (so usually; even de Wette and Bleek), which *λόγος* in the N. T. never directly means (not even at ii. 2, viii. 32; Luke i. 4; Acts x. 36); as, indeed, also in classical writers (see Wolf, *ad Decm. Lept.* p. 277) it never absolutely means the matter in itself, but the point *spoken of*, the state of things that is *under discussion*, or the like.

As to the distinction between λόγος and φήμη, see Bremi, *ad Isocr. Pancg.* p. 32. — μηκέτι] no longer, as He could hitherto. — δύνασθαι] moral possibility, if, namely, He would not occasion any tumult. — καί] not: *and yet* (Kuinoel, de Wette, Bleek, and others), but the simple *and*. Instead of going publicly into the city, He was outside in solitary places, and people came to Him from all quarters. A simple account of what was connected with His sojourn in the solitude; He did not withdraw from *this* concourse, but He would not excite any sensation *in the city*.

CHAPTER II.

VER. 1. The *order* εἰσῆλθε πάλιν (Fritzsche, Lachm. Scholz) would need to be adopted on decisive evidence. But Tischendorf has εἰσελθὼν πάλιν without the subsequent καί, which Lachm. brackets. Rightly; the attestation by B D L \aleph , min. vss. is sufficient; the *Recepta* is an attempt to facilitate the construction by resolving it. — εἰς οἶκον] Lachm. Tisch. have ἐν οἴκῳ, following B D L \aleph , min. An interpretation. — Ver. 4. ἐφ' ᾧ] Lachm.: ὅπου, according to B D L \aleph . So now also Tisch. Mechanical repetition from the foregoing. — Ver. 5. ἀφείωνται] B 28, 33 have ἀφίενται. So Lachm. and Tisch. here and at ver. 9 (where also \aleph has the same reading). But B has the same form at Matt. ix. 2. An emendation. — Elz. Scholz, Lachm. have σοὶ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου, the latter bracketing σου. But B D G L Δ \aleph , min. have σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (Griesb. Fritzsche, Tisch.). This reading is in Matt. ix. 2 exposed to the suspicion of having been taken up from ver. 5, where the *Recepta* has but very weak attestation, and from Matthew it passed easily over into our passage. There is the same diversity of reading also at ver. 9, but with the authorities so divided that in ver. 5 and ver. 9 only the *like* reading is warranted. — Ver. 7. λαλεῖ βλασφημίας] Lachm. Tisch. read λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ, following B D L \aleph , Vulg. It. Rightly; the *Recepta* has smoothed the expression in accordance with Luke. — Ver. 8. οὕτως] is deleted by Lachm. upon too weak evidence. — αὐτοί is adopted after οὕτως by Bengel, Matt. Griesb. Fritzsche, Scholz on very considerable evidence (A C Γ Δ , etc.). Being unnecessary and not understood, it was passed over. — Ver. 9. ἔγειρε] Elz. Rinck have ἔγειραι (1st aorist middle). The former is here quite decisively attested, and, indeed, in *all* places ἔγειρε is to be written, the active form of which the transcribers did not understand (see on Matt. ix. 5), and converted it into the middle forms ἔγειραι and ἐγείρου (B L 28 have here the latter form). The middle form ἐγείρεσθε is in stated use only in the *plural* (Matt. xxvi. 46; Mark xiv. 42; John xiv. 31), which affords no criterion for the singular. — After ἔγειρε Elz. Lachm.

Tisch. have *καί*, which C D L, min. vss. omit. An addition in accordance with Matt. ix. 5; Luke v. 23. — Instead of σου τὸν κρα33. we must read, with Lachm. Scholz, Tisch., in accordance with decisive testimony, τὸν κρ. σου. — *παριπάτει*] Tisch. ed. 8: ὕπαγε, but against such decisive weight of evidence, that *παριπάτει* is not to be regarded as derived from the parallel passages, but ὕπαγε is to be referred to a gloss from ver. 11. — Ver. 10. Elz. has ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς after ἀφίεναι. So A E F G *al.* But B has ἀφ. ἀμ. ἐπὶ τ. γ.; C D L M Δ Σ, *al.* min. vss. have ἐπὶ τ. γ. ἀφ. ἀμ. So Griesb. Fritzsche, Lachm. Scholz, Tisch. ed. 8. The latter is a reading conformed to Matthew and Luke. The various readings have arisen through omission (Augustine) and diversity in the restoration of ἐπὶ τ. γ. The *Recepta* is to be restored, as there was no reason, either in the passage itself or from the parallel passages, for separating ἀφίεναι and ἁμαρτίας from one another by the insertion of ἐπὶ τ. γ. — Ver. 15. The reading κ. γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι (Tisch.) is based on B L Σ, and is to be preferred; ἐγένετο is from Matthew, and ἐν τῷ is explanatory. — Ver. 16. κ. οἱ γραμμ. κ. οἱ Φαρισ.] Tisch.: κ. γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων, following B L Δ Σ, Lachm. in the margin. Rightly; the *Recepta* arose from the usual expression. But we are not, with Tisch. (following the same testimony), to insert *καί* before ἰδόντες, as this *καί* owes its origin to the erroneous connection of *καὶ γραμμ.* with ἠκολούθ. — The simple ὅτι (Tisch.), instead of τί ὅτι, is too feebly attested. — *καὶ πίνει*] is wanting, no doubt, in B D Σ, min. Cant. Ver. Ver. Corb. 2 (bracketed by Lachm.), but was omitted on account of Matt. ix. 11, from which place, moreover, C L D Σ, min. vss. Fathers have added ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν. — Ver. 17. After ἁμαρτ. Elz. has εἰς μετάνοιαν, which on decisive testimony is deleted as an addition from Luke v. 32 by Griesb. and the later editors. — Ver. 18. Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. Fritzsche have rightly adopted οἱ Φαρισαῖοι instead of the *Recepta* οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων. The former has decisive testimony in its favour, the latter is from Luke v. 33. — οἱ τῶν] Tisch.: οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν, following B C* L Σ, 33. Rightly; the superfluous word was passed over. — Ver. 20. Instead of the *Recepta* ἐκεῖναις ταῖς ἡμέραις (which Fritzsche maintains), ἐκεῖνη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ is received by Griesb. Lachm. Scholz, Tisch. according to decisive evidence. The plural is from what precedes. — Ver. 21. The *Recepta* is καὶ οὐδείς, against decisive witnesses, which have not *καί*. — ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν, according to B C D L Σ, 33. Rightly; it was altered in conformity with Matt. ix. 16. — αἶρει τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ] Many variations. A K Δ, min. Syr.

p.: αῖρει ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ πλ. τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλ.; B L 8 (yet without the first τὸ), min. Goth.: αῖρει τὸ πλ. ἀπ' αὐτοῦ (B: ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ) τὸ καιν. τοῦ παλ. (so Lachm. and Tisch.); D, min. vss.: αῖρει τὸ πλ. τὸ καινὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ παλ. (so Rinck). The *Recepta* is to be rejected no less than the reading of D, etc. Both are from Matthew. Of the two readings that still remain, that of A, etc. is to be preferred, because in that of Lachm. and Tisch. the collocation of αῖρει τὸ πλ. likewise betrays its being shaped according to Matthew. Hence we read: αῖρει ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ πλήρωμα τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ. — Ver. 22. ῥήσσει] Lachm. ῥήξει, following B C D L 8, 33, Vulg. codd. of It. So also Tisch. ed. 8. From Luke v. 37, whence also subsequently has come ὁ νέος, which Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted. — καὶ ὁ οἶνος . . . βλητέον] Instead of this there is simply to be read, with Tisch., following B L D, codd. of It.: καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί (B 8 leave out of ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ. only βλητέον). The *Recepta* is from the parallels. — Ver. 23. παραπορ.] Lachm.: διαπορ., following B C D. But comp. Luke vi. 1. — ὁδὸν ποιεῖν] Lachm.: ὁδοποιεῖν, only after B G H. — Ver. 24. ἐν] is on decisive evidence condemned by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. From ver. 23. — Ver. 25. ἀντί] after the first καί is suspected by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Fritzsche and Tisch. It is wanting indeed in B C D L 8, min. vss., but it was very easily mistaken in its reference, and passed over as cumbrous and superfluous, the more especially as it does not appear in the parallels. — Ver. 26. ἐπὶ Ἀβιάδαρ τοῦ ἀρχιερ.] is wanting in D, 271, Cant. Ver. Verc. Vind. Corb. 2. Condemned, after Beza, by Gratz (*neuer Versuch, d. Entst. d. drei erst. Ev. z. erkll.* p. 196), and Wassenbergh in Valckenaer, *Schol.* I. p. 23. An omission on account of the historical difficulty and the parallel passages. Only τοῦ before ἀρχ. has decisive evidence against it, and is rightly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch.

Vv. 1-12. Comp. on Matt. ix. 1-8; Luke v. 17-26. At the foundation of both lies the narrative of Mark, which they follow, however, with freedom (Matthew more by way of epitome), while not only Matthew but Luke also falls short of the vivid directness of Mark. — According to the reading εἰσελθὼν (see the critical remarks), this participle must be taken as anacoluthic in accordance with the conception of the logical subject of the following: *it was heard that He*, etc. See Buttman, *neut. Gr.* p. 256 [E. T. 298]. — δι' ἡμερῶν] *interjectis*

diebus, after the lapse of intervening days. See on Gal. ii. 1. — εἰς οἶκον ἔσται] just our: "He is into the house." The verb of rest assumes the previous motion; xiii. 16; John i. 18; Herod. i. 21, *al.* See Buttmann, p. 286 [E. T. 333]. Comp. even εἰς δόμους μένειν, Soph. *Aj.* 80, and Lobeck *in loc.*; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. 537. The house where Jesus dwelt is *meant* (but not expressly designated, which would have required the use of the article). — Ver. 2. μηκέτι] from the conception of the *increasing* crowd. — μηδέ] *not even* the space at the door, to say nothing of the house. Köstlin, p. 339, arbitrarily finds exaggeration here. — τὸν λόγον] κατ' ἐξοχήν: the Gospel. Comp. viii. 32; Luke i. 2, *al.* — Vv. 3, 4. Here also Mark has the advantage of special vividness. Jesus is to be conceived of as in the *upper chamber*, ὑπερῶον (where the Rabbins also frequently taught, Lightfoot *in loc.*; Vitranga, *Synag.* p. 145 f.). Now, as the bearers could not bring the sick man near¹ to Him through the interior of the house by reason of the throng, they mounted by the stair, which led directly from the street to the roof, up to the latter, broke up—at the spot under which He was in the ὑπερῶον—the material of which the floor of the roof consisted, and let down the sick man through the opening thus made. The conception that Jesus was in the *vestibule*, and that the sick man was lowered down to Him after breaking off the parapet of the roof (Faber, Jahn, Köster, *Imman.* p. 166), is at variance with the words (ἄπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην, comp. Luke v. 19), and is not required by ver. 2, where the crowd has filled the fore-court *because* the house itself, where Jesus is tarrying, is already occupied (see above on μηδέ, ver. 2); and a curious crowd is wont, if its closer approach is already precluded, to persevere stedfastly in its waiting, even at a distance, in the hope of some satisfaction. Moreover, the fact of the unroofing is a proof that in *that* house roof and upper chamber were either *not connected by a*

¹ Προσεγγίσαι, *active* (Aquila, 1 Sam. xxx. 7; Lucian, *Amor.* 53), hence the reading of Tischendorf, προσεγγίξαι, following B L N, min. vss., is a correct interpretation of the word, which only occurs here in the N. T. This view is more in keeping with the vivid description than the usual intransitive *accidere*.

door (comp. Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 15. 12), or that the door was too narrow for the passage of the sick man upon his bed (Hug, *Gutacht.* II. p. 23); and it is contrary to the simple words to conceive, with Lightfoot and Olshausen, only of a *widening* of an *already existing* doorway. Mark is not at variance with Luke (Strauss), but both describe the same proceeding; and the transaction related by both bears in its very peculiarity the stamp of truth, *in favour of* which in the case of Mark the testimony of Peter is to be presumed, and *against* which the assertion of the danger to those who were standing below (Woolston, Strauss, Bruno Bauer) is of the less consequence, as the lifting up of the pieces of roofing is conceivable enough without the incurring of that risk, and the whole proceeding, amidst the eager hurry of the people to render possible that which otherwise was unattainable, in spite of all its strangeness has no intrinsic improbability. — As to *κράββατος*, or *κράβατος*, or *κράβαττος* (Lachmann and Tischendorf), a *couch-bed*, a word rejected by the Atticists, see Sturz, *Dial. Mac.* p. 175 f.; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 62 f. — ἀφέωνται κ.τ.λ.] See on Matt. ix. 2. — Ver. 6. τῶν γραμματ.] So correctly also Matthew. But Luke introduces already here (too early, see in Mark ii. 16) the Pharisees as well. As to *διαλογιζ.* comp. on Matt. xvi. 7. — Ver. 7. According to the reading *βλασφημεῖ* (see the critical remarks), this word *answers* to the question, *What speaketh this man thus?* by saying *what He speaks.* — οὗτος οὕτω] *this man in this manner*, an emphatic juxtaposition. The former is contemptuous (Matt. xiii. 54); the latter designates the special and surprising manner, which is immediately pointed out in what follows. — Ver. 8. Observe the intentional bringing into prominence of the immediate knowledge of the thoughts. — αὐτοί] is not the unaccented *they*, but designates with ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, *ipsi in semet ipsis*, the element of *self-origination*, the *cogitationes sua sponte conceptas*. — As to vv. 9–12,¹ see on

¹ Respecting the *Messianic designation*—which presupposes *Messianic consciousness*—coming from the mouth of Jesus: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, see on Matt. viii. 20, and the critical exposition of the different views by Holtzmann in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 212 ff., and Weizsäcker, p. 426 ff. Observe, however, that the

Matt. ix. 5-8, 33. — σοὶ λέγω] σοί prefixed with emphasis, because the speaker now turns to the sick man. Comp. Luke v. 24. According to Hilgenfeld, the "awkward structure of the sentence," ver. 10 f., betrays the dependence on Matt. ix. 6. Why, then, not the converse? — καὶ ἄρας κ.τ.λ.] Thus the assurance of the remission of sins, according to Schenkel, must have stimulated the paralyzed *elasticity of the nerves!* A fancy substituted for the miracle. — οὕτως . . . εἶδομεν] not equivalent to τοιοῦτο εἶδ. (see on Matt. ix. 33), but: *so we have never seen*, i.e. *a sight* in such a fashion we have never met with. Comp. the frequent ὥς ὀράτε. It is not even requisite to supply τί (Fritzsche), to say nothing of mentally adding *the manifestation of the kingdom of God*, or the like.

Vv. 13-17. See on Matt. ix. 9-13; Luke v. 27-32. Matthew deals with this in the way of abridgment, but he has, nevertheless, retained at the end of the narrative the highly appropriate quotation from Hos. vi. 6 (which Luke, following Mark, has *not*), as an original element from the collection of *Logia*. — ἐξῆλθε] out of Capernaum. Comp. ver. 1. — πάλιν] looks back to i. 16. — Mark has peculiar to himself the statements παρὰ τ. θάλασσαν as far as ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς, but it is arbitrary to refer them to his *subjective conception* (de Wette, comp. Köstlin, p. 335). — Ver. 14. παράγων] *in passing along*, namely, by the sea, by the place where Levi sat. Comp. ver. 16. — On *Levi* (i.e. Matthew) and *Alphacius*, who is not to be identified with the father of James,¹ see Introd. to Matthew, § 1. Hilgenfeld, in his passage before us, where Jesus thus early and in the face of His enemies, before the people and before His disciples, and in the exercise of a divine plenary power, characterizes Himself by this Danielic appellation, does not admit of the *set purpose of veiling* that has been ascribed to His use of it (Ritschl, Weisse, Colani, Holtzmann, and others). For the disciple especially the expression, confirmed as it is, moreover, by John from his own lively recollection (see on John i. 41), could not but be from the outset clear and unambiguous, and the confession of Peter cannot be regarded as the gradually ripened fruit of the insight now for the first time dawning. See on Matt. xvi. 13, 17. How correctly, moreover, the people knew how to apprehend the Danielic designation of the Messiah, is clearly apparent from John xii. 34.

¹ A confusion that actually arose in very early times, which had as its consequence the reading Ἰάκωβον (instead of Λευί) in D, min., codd. in Cr. and Vict. and codd. of It.

Zeitschr. 1864, p. 301 f., tries by arbitrary expedients to make out that Levi was not an apostle. — Ver. 15. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ] is understood by the expositors of the house of *Levi*.¹ Comp. Vulg.: “in domo illius.” In itself this is possible, but even in itself improbable, since by αὐτόν just before Jesus was meant; and it is to be rejected, because subsequently it is said of those who sat at meat with Him, just as it was previously of *Levi*: ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. Moreover, the absolute καλέσαι (to invite), ver. 17, which Matthew and Mark have, while Luke adds εἰς μετάνοιαν, appears as a thoughtful reference to the host, the καλεῖν on whose part will transplant into the saving fellowship of His kingdom. Accordingly, the account in Matthew (see on Matt. ix. 10) has rightly taken up Mark’s account which lies at its foundation, but Luke has not (v. 29). It is not indeed expressly said in our text that Jesus went again into the city; this is nevertheless indirectly evident from the progress of the narrative (παράγων . . . ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ . . . κατακεῖσθαι κ.τ.λ.). — ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ κ.τ.λ.] A statement serving to elucidate the expression just used: πολλοὶ τελῶναι κ.τ.λ., and in such a way that ἦσαν is prefixed with emphasis: *for there were many* (τελ. κ. ἀμαρτ.); there was no lack of a multitude of such people, and they followed after Jesus. Against the explanation of Kuinoel, Fritzsche, de Wette, Bleek: *aderant*, it may be at once decisively urged that such an illustrative statement would be unmeaning, and that ἠκολούθησαν may not be turned into a pluperfect. And mentally to supply with ἦσαν, as Bleek does: *at the calling of Levi*, is erroneous, because the narrative lies quite beyond this point of time. — Ver. 16. The corrected reading (see the critical remarks) is to be explained: *and Pharisaic scribes when they saw, etc., said to His disciples*. To attach this κ. γραμμ. τ. Φαρισ. to the previous ἠκολούθ. (Tischendorf) is unsuitable, because ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοί, taken by itself alone, would be absolutely pleonastic, and because ἠκολούθ., in accordance with the context, can only mean the following of

¹ Yet Bleek and Holtzmann have agreed with my view, and also Kahnis, *Dogm.* I. p. 409 f.

adherents. — Respecting *ιδόντες κ.τ.λ.*, comp. on Matt. ix. 11. Here the *direct* seeing (coming to Him) of the *γραμματ.* is meant, not: *cum intelligent* (Grotius and others, de Wette). — *τί ὅτι*] *quid est, quod*, so that there needs to be supplied after *τί*, not *γέγονεν* (Schaefer, *ad Bos. Ell.* p. 591), but the simple *ἐστί*. Comp. Luke ii. 49; Acts v. 4, 9.

Vv. 18-22. See on Matt. ix. 14-17. Comp. Luke v. 33-38. — *καὶ ἦσαν . . . νηστεύοντες*] considered by Köstlin, p. 339, as meaningless and beside the question, is taken by the expositors as an "archaeological intimation" (de Wette, comp. Fritzsche). There is nothing to indicate its being so (how entirely different it is with vii. 3 f.); we should at least expect with *νηστεύοντες* some such general addition as *πολλά* (Matt. ix. 14). It is to be explained: *And there were the disciples of John*, etc., *engaged in fasting* (just at that time). This *suggested* their question. This view is followed also by Bleek and Holtzmann, the latter thinking, in the case of John's disciples, of their fasting as mourners on account of the loss of their master,—a view for which ver. 19 does not serve as proof. — *ἔρχονται κ.τ.λ.*] *Both*, naturally by means of representatives from among them. The text does not yield anything else; so we are neither to understand the questioners of ver. 16 (Ewald, Hilgenfeld), nor mentally to supply *τινές* (Weisse, Wilke). In Matthew the *disciples of John* ask the question, and this is to be regarded as historically the case (see on Matt. ix. 17, Remark). — *οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου κ.τ.λ.*] Not inappropriate, but more definite and more suited to their party-interest than *ἡμεῖς* (in opposition to de Wette). — *σοί*] *might* be the dative (the disciples belonging to Thee), see Bernhardt, p. 89; Kühner, II. p. 249. But in accordance with the use—frequent also in the N. T.—of the emphatic *σός*, it is to be taken as its plural. Comp. Luke v. 33. — Ver. 19. *ὅσον χρόνον κ.τ.λ.*] superfluous in itself, but here suited to the solemn answer. Comp. Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. xxxix. — *μεθ' ἑαυτῶν*] *in the midst of themselves*. — Ver. 20. *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*] Not a *negligence* (de Wette) or *impossibility* of expression (Fritzsche), but: *τότε* is the *more general* statement of time: *then*, when, namely, the case of the taking away shall have

occurred, and ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ is the *special* definition of time subordinate to the τότε: *on that day*, ἐκεῖνος having demonstrative force and consequently a *tragic* emphasis (on that *atra dies*!). Comp. Bernhardt, p. 279. If the *plural* were again used, the time previously designated by ἐλεύσ. δὲ ἡμέραι would be once more expressed *on the whole and in general*, and that likewise with solemnity, but not the definite particular day. Aptly, moreover, Bengel remarks: "Dies unus auferendi sponsi, dies multi ejusdem ablati et absentis." The Lord from the beginning of His ministry had made Himself familiar with the certainty of a violent death. Comp. John ii. 19. — Ver. 21. εἰ δὲ μή] *In the contrary case*, even after a negative clause, Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 336 [E. T. 392], and see on 2 Cor. xi. 16.—The correct reading: αἶρει ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ πλήρωμα τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ (see the critical remarks), is to be explained: *the new patch of the old (garment) breaks away from it*. See on Matt. ix. 16 f. The *Recepta* signifies: *his new patch* (that which is put on by him) *breaks away from the old garment*. According to Ewald, αἶρεῖ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ought to be read (following B, which, however, has the ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ after τὸ πλήρωμα), and this is to be interpreted: "thus the new filling up of the old becomes of itself stronger." He compares the phrase ὁ λόγος αἶρεῖ (*ratio evincit*, Polyb. vi. 5. 5; comp. also Herod. ii. 33; Plat. *Crit.* p. 48 C, *al.*), the meaning of which (*reason teaches it*) is, however, here foreign to the subject.—Ver. 22. A combination from Matthew and Luke is here contained only in the interpolated *Recepta*. See the critical remarks.—As to the form ῥήσσω instead of ῥήγνυμι, see Ruhnken, *Ep. crit.* I. p. 26.

Vv. 23–28. See on Matt. xii. 1–8. Comp. Luke vi. 1–5, who follows Mark in the order of events, which in Matthew is different. — παραπορεύεσθαι] not: *to walk on, ambulare* (Vulgate, Luther, and many others, including de Wette), so that παρά would refer indefinitely to *other* objects, but *to pass along by*. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 39; Mark xi. 20, xv. 29. Jesus passed *through* the corn-fields *alongside of these*, so that the way that passed through the fields led Him on both sides along by them. Just so ix. 30, and Deut. ii. 4. — ὁδὸν

ποιεῖν κ.τ.λ.] is usually explained as though it stood: ὁδὸν ποιούμενοι τίλλειν τοὺς στάχυας, *to pluck the ears of corn as they went*. Against the mode of expression, according to which the main idea lies in the participial definition (see Hermann, *ad Aj.* 1113; *Electr.* 1305; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 136; *Phil.* p. 58), there would be in itself nothing, according to classical examples, to object; but in the N. T. this mode of expression does not occur (Winer, p. 316 [E. T. 443 f.]), and here in particular the active ποιεῖν is opposed to it, since ὁδὸν ποιεῖν is always *viam sternere*, and ὁδὸν ποιεῖσθαι (as also πορείαν ποιεῖσθαι) is *iter facere*. See Viger. ed. Herm. p. 116; Kypke, I. p. 154; Krebs, p. 81; Winer, p. 228 [E. T. 320]. Comp. also ὁδοποιεῖν (Xen. *Anab.* v. 1. 14; Dem. 1274, 26, frequently in the LXX.) and ὁδὸν ὁδοποιεῖν; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 8. 8. The assumption that Mark had missed this distinction is wholly without exegetical warrant, as is also the recourse to a Latinism (Krebs). The only correct explanation is: *they began to make a way* (to open a path) *by plucking the ears of corn*; not, as Bretschneider and Fritzsche alter the meaning of the words: “evellisse spicas et factum esse, ut projectis, quum iis essent demta grana, spicis exprimeretur via.” We must rather conceive of the field-path on which they are walking—perhaps at a place where it leads through a field of corn which it intersects—as overgrown with ears, so that they must of necessity, in order to continue their journey, *make a path*, which they do by *plucking the ears of corn* that stand in their way. According to Matthew and Luke, the chief point lies in the fact that the disciples pluck the ears *and eat* them; and the Pharisees find fault with their doing this—which *in itself is allowable*—on the *Sabbath*. According to Mark, however, who has not a word¹

¹ Mark has been blamed on this account. See Fritzsche, p. 69. But the very evangelist, who knew how to narrate so vividly, should by no means have been charged with such an awkwardness as the omission of the essential feature of the connection—which is just what the latest harmonizing avers. It ought to have been candidly noted that in Mark the object of the plucking of the ears is the *ἐσθίσαι*; while in Matthew it is the *eating on account of hunger*. The occasions of the necessity, in which the disciples were placed, are *different*: in the former case, the *ἄδωροια*; in the latter, the *hunger*.

of the disciples eating, their act consists in this, that by the plucking of the ears of corn they *open a way through the field*; and the Pharisees, ver. 24, find fault that they do that, which *in itself is already unallowable*,¹ on the *Sabbath*. The justification of Jesus amounts then, ver. 25 ff., to the two points: (1) that according to David's precedent the proceeding of the disciples, as enjoined by *necessity*, is *by no means unallowable*; and (2) that the *Sabbath* makes no difference in the matter.—The origin of this difference itself is easily explained from the fact, that Jesus adduces the history of the *eating* of the shew-bread, by means of which also the *eating* of the ears of corn came into the tradition of this incident. Mark betrays by his ὁδὸν ποιεῖν abandoned by Matthew and Luke, and by the less obvious connection of it with the eating of the shew-bread, the original narrative, which perhaps proceeded from Peter himself. — τοὺς στάχυν] the article designates the ears of corn *that stood in the way*. — Ver. 24. They do not ask, as in Matthew and Luke, why the disciples do what is unallowable on the Sabbath, but *why they do on the Sabbath something (already in itself) unallowable*. — Ver. 25. αὐτός] and *He on His part*, replying to them. He put a *counter-question*. — ὅτε χρεῖαν ἔσχε] *In this lies the analogy*. The disciples also were by the circumstances compelled to the course which they took. The demonstrative force of this citation depends upon a conclusion *a majori ad minus*. David in a case of necessity dealt apparently unlawfully even with the shew-bread of the temple, which is yet far less lawful to be touched than the ears of grain in general. — Ver. 26. ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ ἀρχιερ.] *tempore Abiatharis pontificis maximi, i.e. under the pontificate*

¹ To this view Holtzmann and Hilgenfeld have acceded, as also Ritschl, *altkath. K.* p. 29; Schenkel, *Charakterbild*, p. 86; and as regards the ὁδὸν ποιεῖν in itself, also Lange. The defence of the usual explanation on the part of Krummel in the *allgem. K. Zeit.* 1864, No. 74, leaves the linguistic difficulty which stands in its way entirely unsolved. He should least of all have sought support from the reading of Lachmann (*ὁδοποιεῖν*); for this also never means anything else than *viam sternere*, and even in the middle voice only means *to make for oneself a path*. Weiss (*Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1865, p. 363) calls my explanation "somewhat odd;" this, however, can matter nothing, if only it is linguistically correct, and the usual one linguistically erroneous.

of Abiathar. Comp. Luke iii. 2; Matt. i. 11. According to 1 Sam. xxi. 1 ff., indeed, the high priest at that time was not Abiathar, but his father (1 Sam. xxii. 20; Joseph. *Antt.* vi. 12. 6) *Ahimélec*. Mark has erroneously confounded these two, which might the more easily occur from the remembrance of David's friendship with Abiathar (1 Sam. xxii. 20 ff.). See Korb in Winer's *krit. Journ.* IV. p. 295 ff.; Paulus, Fritzsche, de Wette, Bleek. The supposition that father and son both had *both* names (Victor Antiochenus, Euthymius Zigabenus, Theophylact, Beza, Jansen, Heumann, Kuinoel, and many others), is only apparently supported by 2 Sam. viii. 17, 1 Chron. xviii. 16, comp. xxiv. 6, 31; as even apart from the fact that these passages manifestly contain an erroneous statement (comp. Thenius on 2 Sam. *l.c.*; Bertheau judges otherwise, *d. Bücher der Chron.* p. 181 f.), the reference of our quotation applies to *no other* passage than to 1 Sam. xxi. Grotius thought that the son had been the *substitute* of the father. Recourse has been had with equally ill success to a different interpretation of ἐπί; for, if it is assumed to be *coram* (Wetstein, Scholz), 1 Sam. *l.c.* stands historically opposed to it; but if it is held to mean: *in the passage concerning Abiathar*, i.e. there, where he is spoken of (xii. 26; Luke xx. 37), it is opposed by the same historical authority, and by the consideration that the words do not stand immediately after ἀνέγνωτε (in opposition to Michaelis and Saunier, *Quellen d. Mark.* p. 58). — Ver. 27 f. καὶ ἔλεγ. αὐτοῖς] frequently used for the introduction of a further important utterance of the same subject who is speaking; Bengel: "Sermonem iterum exorsus." Comp. iv. 9. As Jesus has hitherto refuted the reproach conveyed in ὁ οὐκ ἔστι, ver. 24, He now also refutes the censure expressed by ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν, ver. 24. Namely: *as the Sabbath has been made* (brought into existence, i.e. ordained) *for the sake of man*, namely, as a means for his highest moral ends (Gen. ii. 3; Ex. xx. 8 ff.), *not man for the sake of the Sabbath*,¹ it follows thence: *the Messiah has to rule*

¹ Comp. *Mechilta* in Ex. xxxi. 13: "Vobis sabbatum traditum est, et non vos traditi estis sabbato." According to Baur, ver. 27 belongs to "the rational explanations," which Mark is fond of prefixing by way of suggesting a motive

even over the Sabbath, so that thus the disciples, who as my disciples have acted under my permission, cannot be affected by any reproach in respect of the Sabbath. The inference ὥστε depends on the fact that the υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, i.e. the Messiah (not with Grotius and Fritzsche to be taken as *man* in general), is held *ex concessio* as the representative head of humanity.¹ On the mode of inference in general, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 9; 2 Macc. v. 19. — κύριος] emphatically at the beginning: is not dependent, but *Lord*,² etc.; whereby, however, is expressed not the prerogative of absolute *abolition* (see against this Matt. v. 17 ff., and the idea of the πλήρωσις of the law makes its appearance even in Mark vii. 15 ff., x. 5 ff., xii. 28 ff.), but the power of putting in the place of the external statutory Sabbath observance—while giving up the latter—something higher in keeping with the *idea* of the Sabbath, wherein lies the πλήρωσις of the Sabbath-law. Comp. Lechler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 811; Weizsäcker, p. 391. — καί] also, along with other portions of His κυριότης.

for what is historically presented. To the same class he would assign ix. 39, vii. 15 ff. Weizsäcker finds in the passage before us a later reflection. This would only be admissible, if the idea *facilitated* the concluding inference, which is not the case, and if Mark were not in this narrative generally so *peculiar*. The connecting link of the argumentation preserved by him might more easily have been *omitted* as something foreign, than have been *added*.

¹ For Him, as such, in the judgment to be formed of the obligatory force of legal ordinances, the regulative standard is just the relation, in which man as a moral end to himself stands to the law. Comp. Ritschl, *allkathol. Kirche*, p. 29 ff.

² With this the *freedom of worship* is given as well as assigned to its necessary limit, but not generally "*proclaimed*" (Schenkel).

CHAPTER III.

VER. 2. Instead of *παρετήρουν*, read with Lachm. *παρετηρῶντο*, following A C* D Δ, min. The middle here and at Luke vi. 7 (comp. also Acts ix. 24) was not attended to. — *κατηγορήσουσιν*, instead of *κατηγορήσωσιν*, is not sufficiently attested by C D (Lachm.). — Ver. 3. Lachm. has τῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι *ξηράν*, following B L 102, Verc. In favour of *ξηράν* C also tells, which has τῷ τ. *ξηράν* ἔχ. χ., and Δ 8, which have τῷ τ. *ξηράν* χ. ἔχ. So Tisch. ed. 8. The *Recepta* τῷ ἐξηραμμένῃν ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα is from ver. 1. — Ver. 5. At the end Elz. has ὑγιῆς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη. This is indeed defended by Matthiae, but in opposition to decisive evidence. It is from Matt. xii. 13. — Ver. 7. The order of the words: μετὰ τῶν μαθητ. αὐτοῦ ἀνεχώρ. (Griesb. Lachm. Tisch.), instead of the *Recepta* ἀνεχώρ. μ. τ. μαθ. αὐτ., has in its favour B C D L Δ 8, min. vss., and is on this evidence to be adopted, the more especially as the *Recepta* easily presented itself from the connection, according to which the important element for the progress of the narrative lies in ἀνεχώρ. — Instead of πρὸς (Elz. Scholz), Griesb. Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. have εἰς, which is attested, indeed, only by D H P, min. Theophyl., but was explained by πρὸς (in some min. by παρά) as a gloss. — ἡκολούθησαν] ἡκολούθησεν, in favour of which D, min. also concur by ἡκολούθει, is considerably attested, partly with, and partly without αὐτῶ (which Lachm. brackets). Approved by Griesb., adopted by Fritzsche and Lachm. The plural flowed mechanically from the conception of the multitude; αὐτῶ is supplied, and is with Tisch. to be deleted. — Ver. 8. ἀκούσαντες] Lachm. and Tisch. read ἀκούοντες, following only B Δ 8, min. — Ver. 11. Instead of ἐθεώρει, προσέπιπτεν, and ἔκραζε, Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch. have the plurals, which also Griesb. approved. The evidence preponderates in favour of the latter, and the singulars are a grammatical but inappropriate correction. — Ver. 15. θεραπεύειν τὰς νόσους καὶ] is wanting in B C* L Δ 8, 102, Copt. Deleted by Tisch. An addition, in recollection of Matt. x. 1. — Ver. 16. Fritzsche has πρῶτον Σιμῶνα before καὶ ἐπέθηκε, following only 13, 39, 124, 346. An addition from

Matt. x. 2, with a view to supply a construction.¹ — Ver. 18. Here, too (comp. on Matt. x. 4), must be read in conformity to decisive evidence, with Lachm. and Tisch., not Κανανίτην, but Καναναϊόν. — Ver. 20. μήτε] Read with Fritzsche and Lachm. μηδέ, which is sufficiently attested and necessary as respects the sense. — Ver. 27. The *Recepta* is: οὐ δύναται οὐδεὶς. So also Fritzsche and Tisch., the latter having, in accordance with B C (?) L Δ Σ, min. vss., adopted ἀλλ' previously (a connective addition). But οὐδεὶς δύναται (Griesb. Matth. Scholz, Lachm.) is the more to be retained, since the mechanical repetition of the οὐ δύναται was so readily suggested from what precedes. — Ver. 28. The verbal order: τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ ἁμαρτήματα (sanctioned by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.), has, with A B C D L Δ Σ, min. vss., the balance of evidence in its favour, and is also to be accounted genuine, as being the more unusual.—The *article* before βλασφ. is adopted by Griesb. Fritzsche, Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. on decisive evidence; it became absorbed through the preceding καί. — ὅσα] Lachm. and Tisch. read ὅσα, following B D E* G H Δ Π* Σ, min. The *Recepta* is a correction. — Ver. 29. Elz. Fritzsche, Scholz have κρίσεως (A C** E F G, etc. Syr.), instead of which Griesb. approved ἁμαρτήματος (B L Δ Σ; D has ἁμαρτίας), and this Lachm. and Tisch. have adopted. κρίσεως (al. κολάσεως) is a gloss.—Ver. 31. The reading καὶ ἔρχονται (Lachm.) certainly has preponderant evidence (D G Σ, Tisch. ed. 8, have καὶ ἔρχεται), but is a mechanical alteration, in which the retrospective reference of the οὖν was not attended to.—The *Recepta* is οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ. But B C D G L Δ Σ, min. vss. have ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ κ. οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ (Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. ed. 8), with which also the reading ἔρχεται is connected. Still the *Recepta* (and that with αὐτοῦ repeated) is to be sustained, for it became changed in consideration of the rank of the mother, of ver. 32, and of the parallel passages. — φωνοῦντες] Lachm. and Tisch. have καλοῦντες, following B C L Σ, min. (A: ζητοῦντες). Rightly; the meaning of καλοῦντες was more precisely defined by φωνοῦντες. — Ver. 32. The verbal order περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος (Lachm. Tisch.) is preponderantly attested, as also is καὶ λέγουσιν (Lachm. Tisch.) instead of εἶπον δέ. — The addition καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ σου is rightly adopted by Griesb. Matth. Scholz, Lachm. and Tisch. It certainly has important evidence against it (B C G K L Δ Π Σ,

¹ From the same design, moreover, we may explain the placing of καὶ ἰποίησεν τοὺς δάδια at the beginning of the verse. So B C* Δ Σ. Defended by Hitzig and Ewald; adopted by Tisch. In such awkwardly constructed passages "correctio parit correctionem: alter enim alterum cupit antecellere ingenio" (Matthiae, ed. min. ad h. l.).

Vulg. Copt. Arm. Aeth. Syr. utr.), and is rejected by Fritzsche ; but the words were omitted, because neither in ver. 31 nor in ver. 34 nor in the parallel passages are the sisters mentioned. Had it been interpolated, the addition would have been found already in ver. 31. — Ver. 33. Instead of *ἡ*, Lachm. and Tisch. ed. 8 have *καί*, following B C L V Δ 8, min. vss. A mechanical repetition from ver. 32 ; and comp. Matt. — Ver. 34. The verbal order : τοὺς περὶ αὐτ. κύκλῳ (Lachm. Tisch.), which is found in B C L Δ 8, min. Copt., arose from the fact, that the κύκλῳ, which with περιβλεψ. was superfluous, was omitted (so still in min. vss.), and then restored in the place that appeared fitting. — Ver. 35. The omission of γάρ (Lachm. Tisch.) is too weakly attested. On the other hand, μου after ἀδελφῇ is, with Lachm. and Tisch., following A B D L Δ 8, min. vss., to be deleted.

Vv. 1-6. See on Matt. xii. 9-14 ; comp. Luke vi. 6-11. The brief, vividly and sharply graphic account of Mark is in Matthew partly abridged, partly expanded. — *πάλιν*] see i. 21. — *εἰς τ. συναγωγὴν*] at *Capernaum*. See ii. 15. — *ἐξηραμμένην*] “non ex utero, sed morbo aut vulnere ; haec vis participii,” Bengel. More indefinitely Matthew (and Luke) : *ξηράν*. — *παρετηροῦντο*] of *hostile* observing, *spying* (comp. Luke vi. 7, *al.* ; Polyb. xvii. 3. 2 : *ἐνεδρεύειν καὶ παρατηρεῖν*), which, however, is implied, not in the middle, but in the context. — Ver. 3 ff. *ἔγειρε εἰς τ. μέσον*] *arise* (and step forth) *into the midst*. Comp. Luke vi. 8. — *ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι*] *to act well* (Tob. xii. 13), *or to act ill* (Ecclus. xix. 25). Comp. *καλῶς ποιεῖν*, Matt. xii. 12 ; *Ep. ad Diogn.* 4 : God does not hinder *καλὸν τι ποιεῖν* on the Sabbath day. The alternative must be such that the opponents cannot deny *the former* proposition, and therefore must be dumb. On this account it is not to be explained : *to render a benefit* (1 Macc. xi. 33), *or to inflict an injury* (Erasmus, Bengel, Beza, de Wette, Bleek, and others) ; for the former might be relatively negated on account of the Sabbath-laws, the observance of which, however, could not be opposed to the idea of *acting well* (*i.e.* in conformity with the divine will). We can only decide the question on this ground, not from the *usus loquendi*, which in fact admits of either explanation. The reading in D : *τι ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι*,

is a correct gloss of the late Greek word (Lobeck, *ad Phrygn.* p. 200), comp. 1 Pet. ii. 15, 20, iii. 6 ; 3 John 11. — *ψυχὴν σῶσαι*] *to rescue a soul*, that it be not transferred to Hades, but, on the contrary, the man may be preserved in life. Comp. viii. 35, often also among Greek writers. This likewise could not be denied, for “*periculum vitae pellit sabbatum*,” *Joma*, f. 84, 2. See the passages in Wetstein, *ad Matth.* xii. 10. — *ἀποκτείνειν*] *to be taken by itself*, not to be connected with *ψυχὴν*. At the foundation of the question of Jesus lies the conclusion from the general to the special ; He carries the point in question about the Sabbath healings back to the *moral category*, in consequence of which a negative answer would be absurd. The adversaries feel this ; but instead of confessing it they are *silent*, because they are *hardened*. — *συλλυπούμενος*] *feeling compassion over*, etc., Herod. ix. 94, vi. 39 ; Polyb. vii. 3. 2 ; Aelian, *V. H.* vii. 3. Anger and compassion alternated. The *preposition* denotes not the emotion of the heart collectively, but the fellowship, into which the heart enters, with the misfortune (in this case moral) of the persons concerned. Comp. Plato, *Pol.* v. p. 462 E. — *ἀπεκατεστάθη*] with double augment (Winer, p. 67 [E. T. 84]) is, in accordance with Lachmann, to be read. Comp. on Matt. xii. 13. — Ver. 6. *εὐθέως κ.τ.λ.*] “*crevit odium*,” Bengel. *They instituted a consultation, in order that*, etc. Comp. on Matt. xxii. 5. That the *Herodians* are introduced into this place erroneously from Matt. xxii. 16 (see *in loc.*) is not to be maintained (de Wette, Baur, Hilgenfeld). The sensation produced by the working of Jesus (see vv. 7, 8) was sufficiently fitted to induce their being now drawn by the Pharisees into the hostile effort. Hence the mention of them here is no meaningless addition (Köstlin).

Vv. 7–12. Comp. Matt. xii. 15 f., Luke vi. 17–19, who with their difference of historical arrangement make but brief use of the description in Mark, which is more accurate and more fresh and does not blend heterogeneous elements (Hilgenfeld). — *εἰς*] *direction whither*. — Ver. 8. *Ἰδουμαία*] *on the south-eastern border of Palestine*.—A *point* is not to be placed, as by Beza, Er. Schmid, and Fritzsche, after *Ἰορδάνου*, but—as

is required by the two distinct predicates based on the local relations, ἠκολούθησεν and ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν—*before καὶ ἀπὸ τ. 'Ιουδαίας*. It is first of all stated, who *followed* Jesus from Galilee, where He Himself was, to the sea, and then, from καὶ ἀπὸ τ. 'Ιουδ. onward, who *came to Him* from other regions. Namely: *and from Judaea, and from Jerusalem, and from Idumaea and Peruea (καὶ πέραν τοῦ 'Ιορδ. ; observe that here ἀπό is not repeated), and those (the Jews) about Tyre and Sidon, in great multitudes (πλῆθος πολὺ belongs to the whole as a more precise definition of the subject), they came to Him.*—Observe, moreover, the different position of πλῆθος in vv. 7 and 8; in the one case the *greatness* of the mass of people preponderates in the conception, in the other it is the idea of the *mass of people itself*.—ἐποίει] *imperfect*, used of the *continuous* doing.—Ver. 9. ἵνα] *What* He said to them is conceived of as the design of the speaking (comp. on Matt. iv. 3); *in order that a vessel should be continually at His service.*—διὰ τὸν ὄχλον κ.τ.λ.] *therefore not for the purpose of crossing over; ἔμελλε γὰρ ἐμβὰς εἰς αὐτὸ μὴ ἐνοχλεῖσθαι*, Euthymius Zigabenus. Comp. iv. 1; Matt. xiii. 2. It is not said, however, that He wished to *teach* out of the vessel (Kuinoel and others).—Ver. 10 f. Information regarding this pressing towards Him.—ἐθεράπευσεν] *not sanaverat* (Castalio, Kuinoel, Fritzsche), but *He healed* just at that time. The ὥστε ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ, *so that they fell upon Him*, depicts the impetuous thronging unto Him of those seeking aid. “Admirabilis patientia et benignitas Domini,” Bengel. προσέπιπτ. αὐτῷ in ver. 11 is different: *they fell down before Him* (v. 33, vii. 25).—μάστιγας] *plagues*, v. 29, 34; Luke vii. 21; Ps. xxxv. 15; Eccus. xl. 9; 2 Macc. vii. 37. In accordance with the context: *plagues of sickness*.—τὰ πνεύματα κ.τ.λ.] *a statement in conformity with the appearance; the sick people identified themselves with the demons.*—ὅταν] *with the praeterite indicative: whenever they saw Him, i.e. as soon as ever they got sight of Him.* See Winer, p. 276 [E. T. 388]. This rare and late linguistic phenomenon is to be explained to the effect, that the conception of the uncertain (ἄν) has become completely blended with ὅτε, and the whole emphasis

rests upon this *whenever*. See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 690. It does not mean: if they *ever* saw Him. — Ver. 12. ἵνα] design of the πολλὰ ἐπετίμα αὐτοῖς (the demons). How colourless is Matt. xii. 16! According to Hilgenfeld, Mark has *exaggerated*. As to the prohibition itself of their making Him known as Messiah, comp. i. 43, and on Matt. viii. 4; Mark v. 43.

Vv. 13–19. Comp. Matt. x. 2–4; Luke vi. 12–16. — τὸ ὄρος] upon the mountain there. See on Matt. v. 1. — οὕς ἤθελεν αὐτός] so that no one might come forward of his own will. Jesus first of all made a wider selection, and then out of this, ver. 14, the narrower one of the Twelve. To raise a doubt of the actual selection of the latter (Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 370), as if they to some extent had become apostles with less of assent on Christ's part, is at variance also with John vi. 70. — Ver. 14 f. ἐποίησε] *He made*, that is, *He ordained, appointed*. Comp. Acts ii. 36; 1 Sam. xii. 6. On the clause ἵνα ᾤσι μετ' αὐτοῦ, comp. Acts i. 21. — ἀποστέλλη αὐτούς] namely, subsequently. See vi. 7. — καὶ ἔχει] conjoined with the κηρύσσειν as an aim of the sending forth, in which it was contemplated that they were *to preach and to have power*,¹ etc. Comp. vi. 7. The simple, naive detail of the appointment and destination of the Twelve bears the stamp of originality, not of elaboration after Matthew and Luke (Zeller in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1865, p. 396 ff.). — Ver. 16 ff. Inexactly enough Mark relates, instead of Simon's *appointment*, only his *being named*; but he leaves his appointment to be thence understood of itself, and then, as if he had narrated it in connection with ἐποίησε, continues by καὶ Ἰάκωβον, which still depends on ἐποίησε,—an awkwardness which is scarcely to be attributed to a reflecting reviser.—As to the *arrangement*—generally according to rank, but in Mark and Acts i. 13 giving precedence to the three most intimate disciples—of the twelve

¹ Observe the *correctness* of the expression ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν. κ. τ. λ. (in opposition to de Wette). For the destination of the apostles in fact was not: to teach *and to drive out the demons*, but to teach and in so doing to possess the *power* of driving out demons, in order that they might apply this power on appropriate occasion for the confirmation of their teaching. Comp. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xii. 12.

names in three quaternions, see on Matt. x. 2 ; Ewald, p. 205 f. — Mark narrates the naming of Peter as having taken place *at that time*, which is not incompatible with Matt. xvi. 18 (see *in loc.*), although it is doubtless with John i. 43. — Ver. 17. *And He assigned to them names*, (namely) *Boanerges*. The plural *ὀνόματα* (for which D reads *ὄνομα*) depends on the conception that the names bestowed on the *two* brothers are

included in Boanerges. *Boanepyrés*] *בְּנֵי רִנָּת, חֲסִידֵי*. The

Sheva, according to Aramaic pronunciation (see Lightfoot): *oa*. *רִנָּת*, in the Hebrew, *a noisy crowd*, Ps. lv. 15 ; in the Syriac,

thunder ; comp. the Arabic *رجس, tonuit*.¹ The *historical*

occasion of this appellation is altogether unknown. It has been sought in the *mighty eloquence* of the two (Victor Antiochenus, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Calvin, Wetstein, Michaelis, and others, comp. Luther's gloss) ; but it may be objected to this view that such a quality could hardly have appeared *at that time*, when the men had not yet taught ; and also that in the case of John at least, a *thundering* eloquence (as in Pericles ; Cic. *Orat.* 29) is not to be supposed. Others (Heumann, Kuinoel, comp. also Gurlitt in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, p. 715 ff.) have understood it to be a name of *reproach*, and referred it to Luke ix. 54, so that the meaningless, destructive power (Gurlitt) would be the point of comparison ; but the *time* of the giving this name is not in accordance with this view, as it is also in itself improbable, and at variance with the analogy of *Peter's* name, that Jesus should have converted a *reproach* into a *name* and thereby have made it the signature of their character ; to which we may add, that in Luke, *i.e.*, there is nothing at all said about *thunder*. Moreover, it is historically demonstrable that the disciples were of *impetuous, ardent temperament* (ix. 38 ; Luke ix. 54 ; comp. Matt. xx. 20 ff., and Mark x. 35 ff.), and it is therefore not arbitrary to conjecture that some special exhibition of this peculiarity at the time suggested the name, of which, however, it is absolutely

¹ Jerome's reading (in Dan. i., Isa. lxii.) : *Benereem*, is an emendation (*רעם, thunder*).

unknown for what reason it did not become *permanent*, like the name of Peter, and in fact is no further mentioned elsewhere, although it was given by *Jesus*. — *Θαδδαῖον*] see on Matt. x. 3. As to *ὁ Καναναῖος*, see on Matt. x. 4.

Vv. 20,¹ 21. Peculiar to Mark, but in unity of connection with ver. 22 f. — *καὶ ἔρχ. εἰς οἶκον*] The choice of the disciples, and what had to be said to them concerning it, was the important occasion for the preceding ascent of the mountain, ver. 13. Now they come back again to the house, namely, in *Capernaum*, as in ii. 2, to which also the subsequent *πάλιν* points back. De Wette is in error when he says that the following scene could by no means have taken place in the house. See, on the other hand, ver. 31 and Matt. xii. 46. Hilgenfeld finds in *εἰς οἶκον* even a misunderstanding of Matt. xiii. 1.—The accusation *ὅτι ἐξέστη*, ver. 21, and that expressed at ver. 22, *ὅτι Βεελζεβούλ ἔχει*, are analogous; and these accu-

¹ Before *καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς οἶκον* would be the place where Mark, if he had desired to take in the Sermon on the Mount, would have inserted it; and Ewald (as also Tobler, *die Evangelienfrage*, 1858, p. 14) assumes that the Gospel in its original form had actually contained that discourse, although abridged, in this place,—which Weiss (*Evangelienfrage*, p. 154 f.) concedes, laying decided stress on the abridgment on the ground of other abridged discourses in Mark. Nevertheless, the abrupt and unconnected mode of adding one account to another, as here by the *καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς οἶκον*, as well as the omission of longer discourses, are peculiar to Mark and in keeping with the originality of his work; further, it would be quite impossible to see why the discourse, if it had originally a place here, should have been entirely removed, whether we may conceive for ourselves its original contents and compass in the main according to Matthew or according to Luke. Ewald's view has, however, been followed by Holtzmann, whom Weiss, in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1864, p. 63 ff., and Weizsäcker, p. 46, with reason oppose, while Schenkel also regards the dropping out as probable, although as unintentional.—In respect of the absence from Mark of the history of the *centurion at Capernaum* (Matt. viii. 5 ff.; Luke vii. 1 ff.), the non-insertion of which Köstlin is only able to conceive of as arising from the neutral tendency of Mark, Ewald supposes that it originally stood in Mark likewise before *καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς οἶκον*, and that in Matthew and Luke it still has the tinge of Mark's language, in which respect *ἰκανός* and *συνάλλειν* are referred to (but comp. Matt. iii. 11, ix. 36; Luke iii. 16, viii. 49). Weiss, p. 161, finds the hypothesis of Ewald confirmed by the affinity of that history with the narrative of the Canaanitish woman, vii. 24 ff. Holtzmann appropriates the reasons of Ewald and Weiss; they are insufficient of themselves, and fall with the alleged disappearance of the Sermon on the Mount.

sations are the significant elements in Mark,¹ with whom ver. 22 still lacks the special historical information that is furnished by Matt. xii. 22 f. (comp. ix. 33 f.); Luke xi. 14. In the connection of Mark alone the retrospective reference to vv. 10-12 is sufficient; hence it is not to be supposed that in the primitive-Mark that cure of demoniacs given by Matthew and Luke must also have had a place (Holtzmann). See, moreover, Weiss, *l.c.* p. 80 ff. Mark, however, does not represent the mother and the brethren as "*confederates of the Pharisees*" (Baur, *Markusevang.* p. 23); their opinion ὅτι ἐξέστη is an error (not malicious), and their purpose is that of care for the security of Jesus. — αὐτούς] He and His disciples. — μηδέ] *not even*, to say nothing of being left otherwise undisturbed. Comp. ii. 2. According to Strauss, indeed, this is a "palpable exaggeration." — ἀκούσαντες] that He was again set upon by the multitude to such a degree, and was occupying Himself so excessively with them (with the healing of their demoniacs, ver. 22, and so on). — οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ] *those on His side*, i.e. *His own people*. Comp. Xen. *Anab.* vi. 6. 24; *Cyrop.* vi. 2. 1; Polyb. xxiii. 1. 6; 1 Macc. ix. 44. See Bernhardt, p. 256. By this, however, the *disciples* cannot here be meant, as they are in the house with Jesus, ver. 20; but only, as is clearly proved by vv. 31, 32, *His mother, His brethren, His sisters*. — ἐξῆλθον] namely, not from a *place in Capernaum* (in opposition to ver. 20), but from the place where they were sojourning, from *Nazareth*. Comp. i. 9, vi. 3. It is not to be objected that the intelligence of the presence and action of Jesus in Capernaum could not have come to Nazareth so quickly, and that the family could not have come so quickly to Capernaum, as to admit of the latter being already there, after the reprimand of the scribes, vv. 23-30; for Mark does not say that that ἐξῆλθον, and the coming down of the scribes from Jerusalem, and the arrival of the mother, etc., happened *on the same day* whereon Jesus and the disciples had returned εἰς οἶκον. On the contrary, that intelligence arrived at Nazareth, where

¹ It is a hasty and unwarranted judgment that vv. 21, 22 appear in Mark as quite "misplaced," and find a much better place just before ver. 31 (so Weiss, *Evangelienfr.* p. 162).

His relatives were setting out, etc.; but from Jerusalem there had already—when Jesus had returned to Capernaum and was there so devoting Himself beyond measure to the people—come down scribes, and these said, etc. This scene, therefore, with the scribes who had come down was before the arrival of the relatives of Jesus had taken place. — *κρατῆσαι αὐτόν*] *to lay hold upon Him*, to possess themselves of Him. Comp. vi. 17, xii. 12, xiv. 1; Matt. xxvi. 4; Judg. xvi. 21; Tob. vi. 3; Polyb. viii. 20. 8, *al.* — *ἔλεγον*] namely, *οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ*. After *ἐξῆλθον* it is arbitrary to supply, with others (including Ewald): *people said*, which Olshausen even refers to “the malicious Pharisees.” So also Paulus, while Bengel thinks of *messengers*. Let it be observed that *ἔλεγον*, ver. 21, and *ἔλεγον*, ver. 22, correspond to one another, and that therefore, as in ver. 22, so also in ver. 21 there is the less reason to think of another subject than that which *stands there*. — *ἐξέστη*] *He is out of his mind*, has become frantic; 2 Cor. v. 13; Arist. *H. A.* vi. 22: *ἐξίσταται καὶ μαίνεται*, and see Wetstein. Comp. Xen. *Mem.* i. 3. 12: *τοῦ φρονεῖν ἐξίστησιν*. This strong meaning (erroneously rendered, however, by Luther: *He will go out of his mind*) is contestably required by the forcible *κρατῆσαι*, as well as by the subsequent still stronger analogous expression *Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει*. Hence it is not to be explained of a *swoon* or the like, but is rightly rendered by the Vulgate: *in furorem versus est*. To the relatives of Jesus, at that time still (John vii. 3) unbelieving (according to Mark, even to *Mary*, which certainly does not agree with the preliminary history in Matthew and Luke¹), the extraordinary teaching and working of Jesus, far transcending their sphere of vision, producing such a profound excitement among all the people, and which they knew not how to reconcile with His domestic antecedents, were the

¹ It is entirely arbitrary for Theophylact, Beza, Maldonatus, Bisping, and others to desire to exclude *Mary* from sharing in the judgment *ὅτι ἐξίστη*. No better is the evasion in Olshausen, of a moment of weakness and of struggling faith. Similarly Lange finds here a moment of eclipse in the life of *Mary*, arising out of anxiety for her Son. If her Son had already been to her the Messiah, how should she not have found in His marvellous working the very confirmation of her faith in Him, and the begun fulfilment of the promises which had once been so definitely made to her!

eccentric activity of the phrenzy which had taken possession of Him. Comp. Theophylact (who regards ἐξέστη as directly equivalent to δαίμονα ἔχει), Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Maldonatus, Jansen, and others, including Fritzsche, de Wette, Bleek (according to whom they considered Him as "at the least an enthusiast"), Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, *et al.* The omission of the surprising historical trait in Matthew and Luke betrays a later sifting process.

REMARKS.—To get rid of this simple meaning of ver. 21, placed beyond doubt by the clear words, expositors have tried very varied expedients. Thus Euthymius Zigabenus, who in other respects is right in his explanation, arbitrarily suggests for the ἔλεγον the subject τινὲς φθονεροί, and adduces, even in his day, two other but unsuitable explanations.¹ According to Schoettgen and Wolf, the *disciples* (οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ) heard that so many people were outside, and went forth to *restrain the multitude*, and said: *the people* are frantic! According to Griesbach and Vater, the *disciples* likewise went forth after having heard *that Jesus was teaching the people outside*, and wished to *bring Jesus in*, for people were saying: "*nimia eum omnium virium contentione debilitatum velut insauire!*" According to Grotius, the relatives of Jesus also dwelt at *Capernaum* (which, moreover, Ewald, Lange, Bleek, and others suppose, although Mark has not at all any notice like Matt. iv. 13); they come out of *their* house, and wish to carry Jesus away from *the* house, where He was so greatly thronged, for the *report*² had spread abroad (ἔλεγον γάρ) that He had *fainted* (according to Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 334: "had fallen into a phrenzy from exhaustion"). According to Kuinoel, it is likewise obvious of itself *that Jesus has left the house again and is teaching outside*; while the mother and the brethren who are at home also go forth, in order to *bring Jesus in to eat*, and they say, with the view of pressing back the people: *maxime defatigatus est!* Comp. Köster, *Imman.* p. 185, according to whom they wish to *hold* Him on account of *faintness*. So again Linder in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 556. According to Ebrard, § 70, notwithstanding the εἰς οἶκον and the

¹ 1. ἐξῆλθον οἱ οἰκίῳ αὐτοῦ κρατῆσαι αὐτὸν, ἵνα μὴ ὑποχωρήσῃ, ἔλεγον γὰρ τινες, ὅτι ἐξίστη, ἤγουν ἀπίστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν διὰ τὸν ἔχλον. 2. ἐξῆλθον . . . παραβουλεύσασθαι, ἔλεγον γὰρ, ὅτι . . . παρελύθη τὸν τόνον τοῦ σώματος, ἄγαν κοπιῶσας.

² Even Schleiermacher (*L. J.* p. 190 f.) presents the matter as if they had learnt by rumour that He was in an *unsettled condition*, and that they thought it better to *detain* Him (κρατῆσαι) in domestic life.

παλιν, Jesus is not in Capernaum, but *at the house of a host*; and in spite of vv. 31, 32, οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ are *the people in this lodging*,¹ who think, as they hear Him so zealously *teaching* (?), that He is out of His mind, and go out to seize upon Him, but are at once convinced of their error! According to Ammon, *L. J.* II. p. 155, the people have gathered together round His dwelling, while He is sitting at meat; He hastens into the midst of the people, but is extricated by His friends out of the throng, because in their opinion He has fallen into a *faint*. Lange, *L. J.* II. 2, p. 834, takes ἐξίστη rightly, but regards it as the presupposition of the *popular judgment*, into which the kinsfolk of Jesus had *with politic prudence* entered, in order on this pretext to rescue Him from the momentary danger, because they believed that He did not sufficiently estimate this danger (namely, of having broken with the hierarchical party). In this way we may read everything, on which the matter is to depend, *between the lines*. Schenkel also reads between the lines, that the relatives of Jesus had been *persuaded* on the part of His enemies that He Himself was a person possessed. It is aptly observed by Maldonatus: "Hunc locum difficiliorem pietas facit . . . ; pio quodam studio nonnulli rejecta verborum proprietate alias, quae minus a pietate abhorrere viderentur, interpretationes quaesiverunt. Nescio an, dum *pias* quaerent, *falsas* invenerint." According to Köstlin, p. 342, Mark has, "after the manner of later pragmatists," taken the λέγον ὅτι ἐξίστη, which originally had the less exceptionable sense of enthusiasm, as a malicious calumny. Thus, indeed, what appears offensive is easily set aside and laid upon the *compiler*, as is done, moreover, in another way by Baur, *Evang.* p. 559.

Vv. 22-30. See on Matt. xii. 24-32, who narrates more completely from the collection of Logia and historical tradition. Comp. Luke xi. 15-23, xii. 10. — And the scribes, etc., asserted a still worse charge. — Ver. 23. προσκαλεσίμ. αὐτούς] De Wette is of opinion, without warrant, that this could only have taken place in *the open air*, not in the house (ver. 20). They were in the house along with, but further away from, Jesus; He calls them to Him to speak with them. — σατανᾶς σατανᾶν] not: one Satan . . . the other, but: Satan . . . himself; see on Matt. xii. 26. Comp. ὁ σατανᾶς . . . ἐφ' ἑαυτόν,

¹ Kahnis (*Dogm.* I. p. 428 f.) also explains it of the *hosts* and *disciples* (not of the mother and the brethren). He thinks that they wished to bring Him into the house by saying that He was in the *ecstatic* state like the *prophets*.

ver. 26. The want of the article with the proper name is not opposed to this. — Ver. 24. Now, in order to make good this *πῶς δύναται* (*i.e.* οὐ δύναται κ.τ.λ.), there come, linked on by the simple *and* (not γάρ), two illustrative analogues (ἐν παραβολαῖς), after which at ver. 26, but likewise by the simple *and*, not by a particle of inference, is added the point, *quod erat demonstrandum*. This symmetrical progression by means of *καί* is *rhetorical*; it has something in it impressive, striking—a feature also presenting itself in the discourse as it proceeds *asyndetically* in vv. 27 and 28. — Ver. 28. The order of the words: *πάντα ἄφεθ. τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ ἁμαρτήματα*, places them so apart, as to lay a great emphasis on *πάντα*. See Bornemann and Herbst, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 10. 2. The expression *τοῖς υἱοῖς τ. ἀνθρ.*, not a singular reminiscence from Matt. xii. 32 (Weiss), is rather a trait of Mark, depicting human weakness. — *αἰωνίου ἁμαρτ.*] namely, in respect of the *guilt*, “nunquam delendi,” Beza. — Ver. 30. *ὅτι ἔλεγον*: (He spake thus) *because they said*. Comp. Luke xi. 18. — *πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον*] not again as at ver. 22: *Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει*, because of the contrast with *πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*. The less is it to be said that Mark places on a par the blasphemy against the *person* of Jesus (Matt. xii. 31 f.) and that against the Holy Spirit (Köstlin, p. 318), or that he has “already given up” the former blasphemy (Hilgenfeld). It is included, in fact, in ver. 28.

Vv. 31–35. See on Matt. xii. 46–50. Comp. Luke viii. 19–21. — *ἔρχονται οὖν*] *οὖν* points back, by way of resuming, to ver. 21. See Krüger, *Cyrop.* i. 5. 14; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 718. *ἔρχονται* corresponds with *ἐξῆλθον*, ver. 21, where Bengel pertinently observes: “Exitum sequetur τὸ *venire*, ver. 31.” Ebrard resorts to harmonistic evasions. — *οἱ ἀδελφοί*] They are named at vi. 3. Of a “position of *guardianship* towards the Lord” (Lange), which they had wished to occupy, nothing is said either here or at John vii. 3, and here all the less that, in fact, the mother was present. — *ἔξω*] outside, *in front of the house*, ver. 20, Matt. xii. 47. — Ver. 32. The mention of the sisters *here for the first time* is an inaccuracy. — Ver. 34. *περιβλεψ. κύκλῳ*] Comp. vi. 6; Hom. *Od.* viii. 278;

Herod. iv. 182 ; Plat. *Phaed.* 72 B, and the passages in Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* II. p. 803 f.—The expressive looking round was here an entirely different thing from that of ver. 5. Bengel: “suavitate summa.” How little did His actual mother and His reputed brothers and sisters as yet comprehend Him and His higher ministry !

CHAPTER IV.

VER. 1. *συνήχθη*] Lachm. and Tisch. read *συνάγεται*, following B C L Δ Σ, min. Rightly; the alteration was made from Matt. xiii. 2, partly to *συνήχθησαν* (so A, min.), partly to *συνήχθη*. — Instead of *πολύς*, according to the same evidence, *πλεῖστος* is to be adopted, with Tisch. — Ver. 3. *τοῦ σπεῖραι*] Lachm. and Tisch. have merely *σπεῖραι*, following only B Σ* 102. — Ver. 4. After *πετεινά* Elz. has *τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, in opposition to decisive evidence. It is taken from Luke viii. 5. — Ver. 5. Instead of *ἄλλο δέ* read, with Lachm. and Tisch., *καὶ ἄλλο*, according to B C L M** Δ Σ, min. vss. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xiii. 5. — Ver. 6. *ἡλίου δε ἀνατείλαντος*] Lachm. and Tisch. read *καὶ ὅτε ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος*, following B C D L Δ Σ, Copt. Vulg. Cant. Vind. Corb. 2, Rd. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xiii. 6. — Ver. 8. *ἄλλο*] B C L Σ, min. have the reading *ἀλλά* (Fritzsche, Rinck, Tisch.). It is from Matt., and was favoured by the tripartite division that follows. — *αὐξάνοντα*] A B C D L Δ Σ, 238 have *αὐξανόμενον*. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly, because the *intransitive* *αὐξάνειν* is the prevailing form in the N. T. — Instead of the threefold repetition of *ἐν*, Tisch. has *εἰς* three times, following B C* L Δ, min. Yet B L have *ΕΙΣ* once and *ΕΝ* twice. The reading of Tisch. is to be regarded as original; the *ἐν*, which is likewise strongly attested, was a gloss upon it, and that reading then became easily taken and interpreted, in comparison with Matt. xiii. 8, as the numeral *ἐν*. In ver. 20 also the *ἐν* is not to be written three times, but with all the uncials, which have breathings and accents: *ἐν*, as also Tisch. has it. — Ver. 9. *ὁ ἔχων*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *ὁς ἔχει*, following B C* D Δ Σ*. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xiii. 9; Luke viii. 8. — Ver. 10. *ἠρώτησαν*] Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἠρώτων*¹ on preponderant evidence (D has *ἐπηρώτων*). To be adopted. If the

¹ In ed. 8 Tisch., following C Σ, has the form *ἠρώτουν*, which probably is only a transcriber's error, as with still stronger evidence in its favour is the case in Matt. xv. 23. The Ionic form of the verb in *τω* is entirely foreign to the N. T.

imperfect had been introduced from Luke viii. 9, ἐπηρώτων would be more diffused. — τὴν παραβοήν] Tisch. has τὰς παραβοήας, following B C L Δ S, vss. The singular is a correction; comp. Luke. — Ver. 11. γινῶναι] is wanting in A B C* K L S, min. Copt. Corb. 1. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. An addition from Matt. xiii. 11; Luke viii. 10. With Tischendorf the words are to be arranged thus: ἡ μυστ. δέδ. τ. βασ. — Ver. 12. τὰ ἀμαρτήματα] is wanting in B C L S, min. Copt. Arm. Cr. (twice); condemned by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Fritzsche and Tisch. An addition, instead of which is found also τὰ παραπτώματα (min.). — Ver. 15. ἐν ταῖς καρδ. αὐτῶν] C L Δ S, Copt. Syr. p. (in the margin) Colb.: ἐν αὐτοῖς (so Tisch.), and in favour of this B and min. testify by the reading εἰς αὐτούς. The *Recepta* is explanatory after Matt. xiii. 19, comp. Luke viii. 12, but at the same time its testimony is in favour of ἐν αὐτοῖς, not of εἰς αὐτούς. — Ver. 18. καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν] Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. read καὶ ἄλλοί εἰσιν, following B C* D L Δ S, Copt. Vulg. Cant. Ver. Colb. Vind. Germ. Corb. Rightly; the *Recepta* originated by mechanical process after vv. 15, 16, comp. ver. 20. When this οὗτοι came in, there emerged at once an incompatibility with the subsequent οὗτοι εἰσιν, therefore this *latter* was omitted (A C** E G H K M S U V π, min., Copt. Syr. p. Goth. Slav. Brix. Theophyl. Matth. and Fritzsche), while others removed the *first* οὗτοι εἰσιν (min. Arm.). — Ver. 19. τούτου after αἰῶνος is rightly deleted by Griesb., Fritzsche, Lach. and Tisch. in conformity with very considerable testimony. A current addition. — Ver. 20. οὗτοι] Tisch. has ἐκεῖνοι, following B C L Δ S; οὗτοι is a mechanical repetition, and comp. Matt. and Luke. — Ver. 21. The order ἔρχεται ὁ λούγιος is to be adopted, with Lachm. and Tisch., according to B C D L Δ S, min. vss. — ἐπιτεθῆ] τεθῆ is attested by B C L Δ S, min. (so also Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch.; recommended, moreover, by Griesb.). The compound word is more precise in definition, and came in here and at Luke viii. 16. — Ver. 22. The τι (which Lachm. brackets) was easily omitted after ἐστι as being superfluous. — ὃ ἐὰν μὴ] many variations, among which ἐὰν μὴ has the strong attestation of A C K L, min. It is commended by Griesb., and is to be adopted. The apparent absurdity of the sense¹ suggested partly the addition of ὃ, partly, in conformity with what follows, readings with ἵνα, namely, ἀλλ' ἵνα (D, vss.) and ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα (so Lachm. Tisch., following B D S), εἰ μὴ ἵνα (min.). — Ver. 24. After the second ἡμῶν, Elz. Fritzsche,

¹ The reading ἐὰν μὴ is in no wise absurd (Fritzsche, de Wette), but it gives the same logical analysis as x. 30. See *in loc.*

Scholz have τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, which also Lachm. and Tisch. on decisive evidence have deleted (it is a gloss), while Griesb. strikes out the whole καὶ προστεθ. ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀκ. (only in accordance with D G, Codd. It.), and Fritzsche places these words after ἀκούετε (according to Arm.). The course followed by Griesb. and Fritzsche must be rejected on account of the very weakness of the evidence; the reading of Griesb. arose from the fact that the eye of the transcriber passed from the first ὑμῖν directly to the second. — Ver. 25. ὅς γάρ ἂν ἔχῃ] Lachm. and Tisch. have ὅς γάρ ἔχει, following B C L Δ S, min., to which, moreover, D E* F, al. are added with the reading ὅς γάρ ἂν ἔχει. According to this, ἔχει alone is to be read; ἂν was added probably in recollection of Luke viii. 18, and then ἔχει was transmuted into ἔχῃ. — Ver. 28. γάρ is to be deleted, with Lachm. and Tisch., following very important authorities. A connective addition, instead of which D has ὅτι αὐτ. — πλήρη σίτον] Lachm. and Tisch. read πλήρης σίτος, following B, to which D falls to be added with the reading πλήρης ὁ σίτος. πλήρης σίτος is the original, which it was thought necessary subsequently to help by a structural emendation. — Ver. 30. τίνι] B C L Δ S, min. Ver. have πῶς, which Griesb. has recommended, Fritzsche and Tisch. have adopted. τίνι is from Luke xiii. 18. — ἐν ποίᾳ παραβολῇ παραβάλλωμεν αὐτήν] Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. have ἐν τίνι αὐτήν παραβάλῃ θῶμεν, following B C* L Δ S, min. Ver. Or. Rightly; ποίᾳ came in as a gloss upon τίνι, after the analogy of the preceding πῶς; and the more difficult θῶμεν was explained by παραβαλλόμεν. — Ver. 31. κόκκον] Elz. Fritzsche, Tisch. read κόκκῳ, following B D Δ Π S. As after the second half of ver. 30 the accusative (Griesb. Scholz, Lachm.) more readily suggested itself (in connection with θῶμεν or παραβάλλωμεν), the dative is to be preferred as the more difficult reading, which was the more easily supplanted by comparison of the different connections in Matt. xiii. 31; Luke xiii. 19. — μικρότερος] Lachm. reads μικρότερον, following B D L M Δ S, min. He adds, moreover, ὅν according to B L Δ S, omitting the subsequent ἐστὶ, and encloses τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, which is wanting in C, Ver., in brackets. Tisch. also has μικρότερον ὅν, omitting ἐστὶ. The *Recepta* is to be retained; μικρότερον is a grammatical correction¹ that has originated from a comparison with Matt., and the added ὅν, having arisen from the writing twice over of the ON which had gone before, or from the marginal writing of ON over the final syllable of μικρότερος, dislodged the subsequent ἐστὶ, whereupon, doubtless,

¹ μίζων, too, ver. 32, became changed in codd. into μίζον. So A C E L V S, min. Tisch.

the connection was lost. — Ver. 34. *τ. μαθ. αὐτοῦ*] Tisch. reads *τ. ἰδίοις μαθ.*, following B C L Δ N. Rightly; the *Recepta* is the usual expression. — Ver. 36. The reading *πλοῦτα* instead of *πλοῦτάρια* (as Elz. Fritzsche, Scholz have it) is so decisively attested, that but for that circumstance the more rare *πλοῦτάρια* would have to be defended. — Ver. 37. Instead of *αὐτὸ ἥδη γεμίζεσθαι*, Griesb. approved, and Lachm. and Tisch. read, *ἥδη γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλοῦτον*, following B C D L Δ N** Copt. Syr. p. (in the margin) Vulg. It. This latter is to be preferred; the simple mode of expression was smoothed. — Ver. 38. Instead of *ἐπὶ* before *τ. πρ.*, Griesb. Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. read *ἐν* on decisive evidence. — Ver. 40. *ὅπω*] is deleted by Lachm., following B D L Δ N, Copt. Aeth. Vulg. It., and subsequently, instead of *πῶς ὥς*, he has, with Griesb., *ὅπω* according to the same and other authorities. But the *Recepta* is, with Tisch., to be maintained. For in accordance with Matt. viii. 26 *ὅπω* was very easily dropped, while *ὅπω* just as easily crept in as a modifying expression, which at the same time dislodged the *πῶς*.

Vv. 1–9. See on Matt. xiii. 1–9. Comp. Luke viii. 4–8. Matthew has here a group of parables from the collection of Logia to the number of *seven*,—a later and richer selection than Mark gives with his *three* similitudes, the second of which, however (vv. 26–29), Matthew has not, because it probably was not embraced in the collection of Logia. See on ver. 26 ff. Matthew has worked by way of amplification, and not Mark by way of reducing and weakening (Hilgenfeld). — *πάλιν*, see iii. 7. — *ἤρξατο*] For from *καὶ συνάγεται* onward is related what happened *after the commencement* of His teaching. — Ver. 2. *ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ*] *in His doctrinal discourse*. Of the many (*πολλά*) Mark adduces some. — Ver. 7. *συνέπιξεν*] *choked* the germinating seed, *compressing* it. Comp. Theophylact, *c. pl.* vi. 11. 6: *δένδρα συμπιγόμενα*. — Ver. 8. *ἀναβαίνουντα καὶ ἀξάνόμενον* (see the critical remarks) is predicate of *καρπὸν*, hence *ἐδίδου καρπὸν* (and consequently also *καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκε*, ver. 7) is to be understood not of the grains of corn, but of the *corn-stalks* ascending and growing (shooting upward and continuing to grow). The produce of the grains is only mentioned in the sequel: *καὶ ἔφερεν κ.τ.λ.* In the classics also *καρπός* means generally that which grows in the field (Hom. *Il.* i. 156; Xen. *de venat.* v. 5; Plat.

Thiact. p. 149 E, *Crat.* p. 410 C), as in the German *Frucht*, *Früchte*. Comp. *καρποφορεῖ*, ver. 28. — With the *Recepta ἐν τριάκοντα* is to be taken as: *one bore thirty* (neuter: nothing to be supplied), *i.e.* according to the connection: one grain, which had been sown, bore thirty grains, another sixty, and so on. On the *usus loquendi*, comp. Xen. *Hell.* vii. 4. 27: *ἐν μέρος ἔλαβον Ἀργεῖοι, ἐν δὲ Θηβαῖοι, ἐν δὲ Ἀρκάδες, ἐν δὲ Μεσσήνιοι*, Arist. *Eth. Nic.* vi. 1. 5; Ecclus. xxxi. 23 f. With the reading *εἰς τριάκοντα* (see the critical remarks) we must render: it bore *up to thirty*, and up to sixty, etc. If *ἐν τριάκοντα* be read, the meaning is: it bore *in* (at the rate of) thirty, etc., so that the fruit-bearing was consummated in thirty, and so on. Observe, further, how ver. 8 has changed the primitive form of the Logia-collection still preserved in Matthew, especially as to the climax of the fruitfulness, which in Matthew is descending, in Mark ascending. — Ver. 9. *καὶ ἔλεγεν*] “*pausa frequens, sermonibus gravissimis interposita*,” Bengel. Comp. ii. 27.

Vv. 10-20. See on Matt. xiii. 10-23. Comp. Luke viii. 9-15. — *καταμόνας*] therefore, according to Mark, no longer in the ship, ver. 1. — *οἱ περὶ αὐτόν*] they who besides and next after the Twelve were the more confidential disciples of Jesus. A more precise definition than in Matthew and Luke. Of the *Seventy* (Euthymius Zigabenus) Mark has no mention. We may add that Matthew could not have *better* made use of the expression *οἱ περὶ αὐτόν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα* (Holtzmann, who therefore pronounces it not to belong to the primitive-Mark), nor could he *not use it at all* (Weiss in the *Zeitschr. f. D. Theol.* 1864, p. 86 f.). He has only changed the detailed description of Mark into the usual expression, and he goes to work in general less accurately in delineating the situation. — *τὰς παραβ.*] see ver. 2. — Ver. 11. *δέδοται*] of the spiritual giving brought about by making them capable of *knowing*; hence *γινῶναι* (which here is spurious) in Matthew and Luke. — *τοῖς ἔξω*] that is, to those who are outside of our circle, *to the people*. The sense of *οἱ ἔξω* is always determined by the contrast to it. In the Epistles it is the *non-Christians* (1 Cor. v. 12 f.; Col. iv. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 12; 1 Tim. iii. 7). We are the less

entitled to discover here, with de Wette, an unsuitable *ὑστερον πρότερον* of expression, seeing that the expression in itself so relative does not even in the Talmud denote always the *non-Jews* (Schoettgen, *ad* 1 Cor. v. 12 f.), but also those who do not profess the doctrine of the *הכנים*—the *היצונים*; see Lightfoot, p. 609. — *ἐν παραβ. τὰ πάντα γίνεται*] *ἐν παραβ.* has the emphasis: *in parables the whole is imparted to them*, so that there is not communicated to them in addition the abstract doctrine itself. All that is delivered to them of the mystery of the Messiah's kingdom—that is, of the divine counsel concerning it, which was first unveiled in the gospel—is conveyed to them under a veil of parable, and not otherwise. On *γίνεται*, comp. Herod. ix. 46: *ἡμῖν οἱ λόγοι γηγόνασι*, Thucyd. v. 111, *al.* — Ver. 12. *ἵνα*] not: *ita ut*, as Wolf, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, and others would have it, but, as it *always* is (comp. on Matt. i. 22), a pure *particle of design*. The unbelieving people are, by the very fact that the communications of the mystery of the Messiah's kingdom are made to them in parables and not otherwise, *intended* not to attain to insight into this mystery, and thereby to conversion and forgiveness. This idea of the *divine Nemesis* is expressed under a remembrance of Isa. vi. 9, 10, which prophetic passage appears in Matthew (less originally) as a formal citation by Jesus, and in an altered significance of bearing attended by a weakening of its teleological point. Baur, indeed, finds the aim expressed in Mark (for it is in nowise to be explained away) absolutely inconceivable; but it is to be conceived of as a mediate, not as a final, aim—a "*judicium divinum*" (Bengel), which has a *paedagogic* purpose. — Ver. 13. After Jesus, vv. 11, 12, has expressed the *right* of His disciples to learn, not merely, like the unbelieving multitude, the parables themselves, but also their meaning—the *μυστήριον* contained in them—and has thus acknowledged their question in ver. 10 as *justified*, He addresses Himself now, with a new commencement of His discourse (*καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς*, comp. vv. 21, 24, 26, 30, 35), to the purpose of *answering* that question, and that with reference to the particular concrete parable, ver. 3 ff. To *this* parable, which is conceived as having suggested the

general question of ver. 10 (hence τ. παραβολὴν ταύτην), He confines Himself, and introduces the exposition to be given with the words: *Know ye not this parable, and how shall ye (in general) understand all parables?* These words are merely intended to *lead back* in a lively manner, after the digression of vv. 11, 12, to the *point of the question* at ver. 10, the *reply* to which then begins at ver. 14 with respect to that special parable. A *reproach* is by some found in the words (*since unto you it is given*, etc., ver. 11, *it surprises me*, that ye know not, etc.). See Fritzsche and de Wette, the latter accusing Mark of placing quite inappropriately in the mouth of Jesus an *unseasonable* reproach. But Mark himself pronounces decisively against the entire supposition of this connection by his καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, whereby he *separates* the discourse of ver. 13 from what has gone before. If the assumed connection were correct, Mark must have omitted this introduction of a *new* portion of discourse, and instead of οὐκ οἶδατε must have used perhaps καὶ ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἶδατε, or some similar *link of connection* with what precedes. Moreover, ver. 13 is to be read *as one question* (comp. Lachmann and Tischendorf), and in such a way that καὶ πῶς κ.τ.λ. still depends on οὐκ οἶδατε (comp. Ewald); not, as Fritzsche would have it, in such a way that καὶ indicates the consequence, and there would result the meaning: “*Ye understand not this parable, and are ye to understand all parables?*” But this would rather result in the meaning: *Ye understand not this parable; how is it, consequently, possible that ye shall understand all parables?* And this would be a strange and unmeaning, because altogether self-evident consequence. Usually ver. 13 is divided into *two questions* (so, too, de Wette), and πᾶσας is taken as equivalent to: *all the rest*; but this is done quite without warrant, since the idea of λοιπὰς would be precisely the *point* in virtue of the contrast which is assumed. — γνώσεσθε] *future*, because the disciples were not aware how they should attain to the understanding of the whole of the parables partly delivered already (ver. 2), partly still to be delivered in time to come. — The following interpretation of the parable, vv. 14-20, is “so vivid, rich, and peculiar, that there is good reason for finding in it words of Christ Himself,”

Ewald. — Ver. 15. Observe the difference between the local *ὅπου* and the temporal *ὅταν*, in connection with which *καί* is not adversative (Kuinoel, de Wette), but the simple conjunctive *and*: *The following are those (who are sown) by the way-side: then, when the teaching is sown and they shall have heard, cometh straightway Satan, etc.* — Ver. 16. *ὁμοίως*] *in like manner*, after an analogous figurative reference, in symmetrical further interpretation of the parable. Translate: *And the following are in like manner those who are sown on the stony ground: (namely) those who, when they shall have heard the word, immediately receive it with joy; and they have not root in themselves, etc.* It is more in keeping with the simplicity and vividness of the discourse not to take the *καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι* along with *οἱ*. — Ver. 18 f. *And there are others, who are sown among the thorns; these are they who, etc.* If *ἀκούοντες* be read, —which, however, would arise more easily from the similar parallel of Matthew than *ἀκούσαντες* (B C D L Δ 8, Tisch.) from the dissimilar one of Luke,—the course of events is set forth *from the outset*, whereas *ἀκούσαντες* sets it forth from the standpoint of the result (*they have heard, and, etc.*). — *τὰ λοιπά*] besides riches: sensual pleasure, honour, etc. — *εἰσπορ.*] namely, into that place whither the word that is heard has penetrated, into the heart. The expression does not quite fit into the parable itself; but this does not point to less of originality (Weiss). De Wette wrongly observes that *εἰσπορ.* is probably an erroneous explanation of the *πορευόμενοι* in Luke. — Ver. 20. *ἐν* (not *ἐν*; see the critical remarks on ver. 8) *τριάντα κ.τ.λ.* is, it is true, so far out of keeping, that by retaining the numbers the discourse falls back from the interpretation into the figure; but the very repetition of the striking closing words of the parable, in which only the preposition is here accidentally changed, betokens the set purpose of solemn emphasis.

Vv. 21–23. Comp. Luke viii. 16 f. *Meaning* (comp. Matt. v. 15, x. 26): “the light, *i.e.* the knowledge of the *μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας*, which ye receive from me, ye are not to withhold from others, but to bring about its diffusion; for, as what is concealed is not destined for concealment, but rather for

becoming manifest, so also is the mystery of the Messiah's kingdom."¹ These sayings, however, as far as ver. 25, have not their original place here, but belong to what (according to Papias) Mark wrote οὐ τάξει. Holtzmann judges otherwise, p. 81, in connection with his assumption of a primitive-Mark. The collection of Logia is sufficient as a source. Comp. Weiss in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1864, p. 88. — ἔρχεται] *Doth the lamp then possibly come, etc.?* ἔρχεσθαι is used of inanimate things which are brought; very frequently also in classical writers. — ὑπὸ τὸν μόνδιον] See on Matt. v. 15. — κλίνην] a *table-couch*. Comp. vii. 4. After κλίνην there is only a comma to be placed: the question is *one* as far as τεθῆ. — According to the reading ἐὰν μὴ φανερ. (see the critical remarks), the rendering is: *nothing is hidden, if it shall not* (in future) *be made manifest*.² So surely and certainly does the φανέρωσις set in! — ἀλλ' ἵνα εἰς φαν. ἔλθῃ] The logical reference of ἀλλ' is found in a pregnant significance of ἀπόκρυφον: nor has there anything (after οὐδέ, τι is again to be mentally supplied) taken place as secret, *i.e.* *what is meant to be secret, but what in such a case has come to pass, has the destination, etc.*

Vv. 24, 25. Comp. Luke viii. 18. — βλέπετε] *Be heedful as to what ye hear*; how important it is rightly to understand what is delivered to you by me! — ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ κ.τ.λ.] A ground of encouragement to heedfulness. It is otherwise in Matt. vii. 2. In our passage *the relation of heedfulness to*

¹ According to others, Jesus gives an allegorical exhortation to *virtue*: "ut lucerna candelabro imponenda est, sic vos oportet, discipuli, non quidem vitam umbratilem sine virtutis splendore agere; sed," etc., Fritzsche, comp. Theophylact, Grotius, and others. But the kindled light would, in fact, be already the symbol of virtue, and Jesus would forbid the exercise of it in secret! Moreover, this view is not required by ver. 20, since with ver. 21 a *new* portion of the discourse commences; and our view is not forbidden by ver. 11 (comp. ver. 34), since in ver. 11 Jesus is only speaking of the then unsusceptible multitude, and, if pushed to consistent *general* application, these words spoken at ver. 11 would quite annul the apostolic calling. *History* has refuted this general application. Erasmus, *Paraphr.*, aptly says: "Nolite putare me, quod nunc secreto vobis committo, perpetuo celatum esse velle; . . . lux est per me in vobis accensa, ut vestro ministerio discutiatur tenebras totius mundi."

² "Id fit successive in hoc saeculo, et fiet plene, quum lux omnia illustrabit, 1 Cor. iv. 5," Bengel.

the knowledge thereby to be attained is described. Euthymius Zigabenus well says: ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε τὴν προσοχήν, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ γνῶσις, τουτέστιν ὅσην εἰσφέρετε προσοχήν, τοσαύτη παρασχεθήσεται ὑμῖν γνῶσις, καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλέον. — Ver. 25. Reason assigned for the foregoing καὶ προστεθήσεται. The application of the proverbial saying (comp. Matt. xiii. 12, xxv. 29) is: For if ye (through heedfulness) have become rich in knowledge, ye shall continually receive still larger accession to this riches (that is just the προστεθήσεται); but if ye (through heedlessness) are poor in knowledge, ye shall also lose even your little knowledge. Euthymius Zigabenus erroneously refers δοθήσεται only to the γνῶσις, and ἔχῃ to the προσοχήν. So also Theophylact.

Vv. 26–29. Jesus now continues, as is proved by ver. 33 f. (in opposition to Baur, *Markusevang.* p. 28), His parabolic discourses to the people; hence ἔλεγεν is here used without αὐτοῖς (vv. 21, 24), and vv. 10–25 are to be regarded as an inserted episode (in opposition to de Wette, *Einkl.* § 94b, who holds ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο καταμόνας as absurd). — Mark alone has the following parable, but in a form so thoughtful and so characteristically different from Matt. xiii. 24 f., that it is without sufficient ground regarded (by Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Köstlin) as founded on, or remodelled¹ from, Matt. *i.e.*, and therefore as not originally belonging to this place,—a view with which Weiss agrees, but traces the parable of Mark to the primitive form in the collection of Logia, and holds the enemy that sowed the tares, Matt. xiii., to have been brought into it by the first evangelist; while Strauss (in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 209) has recourse to the neutral character of Mark, in accordance with which he is held to have removed the ἐχθρὸς ἀνθρώπου (by which Paul is meant!). See, on the other hand, Klöpffer in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1864, p. 141 ff., who, with Weizsäcker, discovers the point aimed at in the parable to be that of antagonism to the vehement expectations of a speedy commencement of the kingdom,—which, however,

¹ A "tame weakening," in the opinion of Hilgenfeld, comp. Strauss; "of a secondary nature," in that of Weizsäcker.

must have been directly indicated, and is not even implied in Matt. xiii. (see ver. 37 ff.). Without foundation, Weizsäcker (p. 118) finds in the parable a proof that our Gospel of Mark was not written till after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the delaying of the Parousia had become evident. Here the establishment of the kingdom is not at all depicted under the specific form of the *Parousia*, and there is nothing said of a *delaying* of it. — ἡ βασιλεία τ. Θεοῦ] The *Messianic kingdom*, conceived of as *preparing* for its proximate appearance, and then (ver. 29) *appearing* at its time. — τὸν σπόρον] the seed concerned.—Observe the *aorist* βάλῃ, and then the *presents* which follow: *has* cast, and then *sleeps* and *arises*, etc. — νύκτα κ. ἡμέραν] With another form of conception the genitives might also be used here. See on the distinction, Kühner, II. p. 219. The prefixing of νύκτα is here occasioned by the order of καθεύδῃ καὶ ἐγείρ. See, further, on Luke ii. 37. Erasmus erroneously refers ἐγείρ. to the *seed*, which is only introduced as subject with βλαστ. — μηκύνεται] *is extended*, in so far, namely, as the *shoot* of the seed comes forth and mounts upwards (*increscat*, Vulgate). Comp. LXX. Isa. xlv. 14. In the shoot *the seed extends itself*. — ὥς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός] *in a way unknown to himself* (the sower); he himself knows not how it comes about. See the sequel. — αὐτομάτῃ] *of itself*, without man's assistance.¹ Comp. Hesiod, ἔργ. 118; Herod. ii. 94, viii. 138; and Wetstein *in loc.* — εἶτα πλήρης σίτος ἐν τ. στ.] the *nominative* (see the critical remarks) with startling vividness brings before us the result as *standing by itself: then full* (developed to full size) *grain in the ear!* See on this nominative standing forth in rhetorical relief from the current construction, Bernhardt, p. 68 f. — Ver. 29. παραδῶ] is usually explained *intransitively*, in the sense: shall have delivered *itself* over, namely, by its ripeness to the harvesting. Many transitive verbs are confessedly thus used in an intransitive signification, in which case, however, it is inappropriate to supply *ἑαυτόν* (Kühner, II. p. 9 f.). So, in

¹ Hence there is no inconsistency with ver. 27 (Weiss). The germinative power of the seed is conditioned by the immanent power of the earth, which acts upon it.

particular, compounds of διδόναι (see Viger, ed. Herm. p. 132; Valckenaer, *Diatr.* p. 233; Jacobs, *ad Philostr.* p. 363; Krüger, § 52. 2. 9); and see in general, Bernhardt, p. 339 f.; Winer, p. 225 [E. T. 315]. But of this use of παραδίδοναι there is found no quite certain instance¹ (not even in 1 Pet. ii. 23, see Huther); moreover, the expression itself, "the fruit has offered itself," would be foreign to the simplicity of the style, and has a modern sound. Hence (comp. Kaeuffer, *de ζωῆς αἰών.* not. p. 49) παραδιδ. is rather to be explained as *to allow*, in accordance with well-known usage (Herod. v. 67, vii. 18; Xen. *Anab.* vi. 6. 34; Polyb. iii. 12. 4): *but when the fruit shall have allowed, i.e. when it is sufficiently ripe*. Quite similar is the expression: τῆς ὥρας παραδιδούσης, Polyb. xxii. 24. 9: *when the season permitted*. Bleek assents to this view. — ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον] Comp. Joel iv. 13; Rev. xiv. 15. — The teaching of the parable is: *Just as a man, after performing the sowing, leaves the germination and growth, etc., without further intervention, to the earth's own power, but at the time of ripening reaps the harvest, so the Messiah leaves the ethical results and the new developments of life, which His word is fitted to produce in the minds of men, to the moral self-activity of the human heart, through which these results are worked out in accordance with their destination (to δικαιοσύνη — this is the parabolic reference of the πλήρης σίτος), but will, when the time for the establishment of His kingdom comes, cause the δίκαιοις to be gathered into it (by the angels, Matt. xxiv. 31; these are the reapers, Matt. xiii. 39). The self-activity on which stress is here laid does not exclude the operations of divine grace, but the aim of the parable is just to render prominent the former, not the latter. It is the one of the two factors, and its separate treatment, keeping out of view for the present the other, leaves the latter unaffected. Comp. ver. 24. Bengel aptly observes on αὐτομάτη, ver. 28: "non excluditur agricultura et coelestis pluvia solesque." Moreover, Jesus must still for the present leave the mode of bringing about the δικαιοσύνη (by means of His ἰλαστήριον and faith*

¹ In Josh. xi. 19 the reading varies much and is doubtful; in Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 250 E, παραδούς is not necessarily reflexive.

thereon) to the later development of His doctrine. But the letting the matter take its course and folding the hands (Strauss) are directly *excluded* by *αὐτομάτη*, although the parable is opposed also to the conception of a so-called *plan* of Jesus.¹

Vv. 30—32. See on Matt. xiii. 31 f. Comp. Luke xiii. 17 f. — *πῶς*] *how* are we to bring the Messianic kingdom into comparison? — *ἢ ἐν τίνι αὐτ. παραβολῇ θῶμεν* (see the critical remarks): *or in what parable are we to place it, set it forth?* The expression *inclusive of others (we)* is in keeping with the *deliberative* form of discourse. The *hearers* are formally taken into the consultation. The deviation from the normal order of the words places the principal emphasis on *τίνι*. — *ὡς κόκκῳ σιν.] ὡς* is correlative to the *πῶς* of ver. 30: *so as it is likened to a grain of mustard seed.* — The following² is not a parable in the stricter sense (not a history), but a comparison generally, the representation of the idea, borrowed from the region of sense. Comp. iii. 23, vii. 17. See on Matt. xiii. 3. — Observe the twofold *ὅταν σπαρῇ*, vv. 31, 32. In the first the emphasis is on *ὅταν*, in the second on *σπαρῇ*. “*Exacte definit tempus illud, quum granum desinit esse parvum et incipit fieri magnum,*” Bengel.

Ver. 33 f. Comp. Matt. xiii. 34. — From *τοιαύταις* it follows that Mark knew yet more parables that were spoken at that time. — *καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν]* *As they were able* (in virtue of their capacity) *to take in* the teaching. Not as though they could have apprehended the inner *doctrinal contents* of the parables (ver. 11), but they were capable of apprehending the narrative *form*, the parabolic narrative *in itself*, in which the teaching was veiled, so that they were thus qualified only *in this form* (*καθὼς*) to hear the doctrine. Accordingly, *ἀκούειν* here is neither: *to understand*, nor equivalent to *βαστάζειν*, John xvi. 12 (Bengel, Kuinoel, and others), but the simple *to hear, to perceive.* — *οὐκ ἐλάλει]* *at*

¹ Comp. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 348 ff.

² From the collection of Logia, and in a shape more original than Matthew and Luke, who *add* the historical form. Mark would least of all have divested it of this, if he had found it in existence. Comp. (in opposition to Holtzmann) Weiss in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1864, p. 93.

that time. See on Matt. xiii. 34. Baur indeed (see *Markus-evang.* p. 24 f.) will not allow a limitation to the teaching *at that time*, but would draw the conclusion that Mark has perhaps not even regarded the Sermon on the Mount, such as Matthew has it, as being historical, and has given the foregoing parables as a *substitute* for it. But Mark himself certainly has doctrinal utterances of Jesus enough, which are not parabolical.

Vv. 35–41. See on Matt. viii. 18, 23–27. Comp. Luke viii. 22–25. — ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ] ver. 1 f.; a difference in respect of time from Matt. viii. 18. Luke viii. 22 is altogether indefinite. — ὥς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ] to be taken together; *as He was in the ship* (comp. ver. 1) without delay for further preparation they take possession of Him. For examples of this mode of expression, see Kypke and Fritzsche. — καὶ ἄλλα δέ] *but other ships also* (Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 182; Ellendt, *Lcx. Soph.* I. p. 884) were in His train (μετ' αὐτοῦ) during the voyage; a characteristic descriptive trait in Mark. — Ver. 37. On λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου, comp. Hom. *Il.* xvii. 57; Anthol. Anacr. 82. On the accent of λαῖλαψ, see Lipsius, *gramm. Untersuch.* p. 36 f. — ἐπέβαλεν] *intransitive* (comp. on ver. 29, Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 248 A, and frequently) not *transitive*, so that the *storm* would be the subject (Vulgate, Luther, Zeger, Homberg, and several others). The τὰ δὲ κύματα, for this purpose prefixed, indicates itself as the subject. — Ver. 38. *And He Himself was at the stern*, laid down on the *pillow* that was there, *asleep*. It was a part of the vessel intended for the sailors to sit or lie down, Poll. x. 40; more strictly, according to Smith (*Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, p. 296 ff.), the cushion of the rowers' bench. — Ver. 39. σιώπα, πεφίμωσο] *be silent! be dumb!* asyndetic, and so much the more forcible (Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 247, 359), Eur. *Hec.* 532. The sea is *personified*; hence the less are we to conjecture, with Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 230, that Jesus has addressed *the disciples* (ye shall see that it will immediately be still). — ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος] Herod. vii. 191. Comp. Mark vi. 51; Matt. xiv. 32, from which passage de Wette arbitrarily derives the expression of Mark. — Ver. 40. πῶς]

how is it possible, etc.? They had already so often been the witnesses of His divine power,¹ under the protection of which they needed not to tremble. — Ver. 41. ἐφοβήθησαν] not *the people* (Grotius and others), which agrees with Matthew but not with the context, but *the disciples*, who were thrown (psychologically) into *fear* at the quite extraordinary phenomenon, and were not yet clear as to the divine *causa efficiens* in Jesus (τίς ἄρα οὗτος, etc.). As to φοβεῖσθαι φόβον μέγαν, comp. on Matt. ii. 10. On τίς ἄρα, in which the perplexity is not expressed by the ἄρα, but is implied in the context (in opposition to Hartung), and ἄρα means: *igitur, rebus ita comparatis*, see Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 176. Comp. Nägelsbach, *Ann. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 10 f.

REMARK.—The weakness of faith and of discernment on the part of the disciples (ver. 40 f.) appears in Mark most strongly of the Synoptics (comp. vi. 52, vii. 18, viii. 17, 18, 33, ix. 6, 19, 32, 34, x. 24, 32, 35, xiv. 40). Ritschl in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 517 ff., has rightly availed himself of this point on behalf of Mark's originality; since a later softening—yet without set purpose and naturally unbiassed, and hence not even consistent—is at any rate more probable than a subsequent aggravation of this censure. The remarks of Baur in opposition (*theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 88 f.) are unimportant, and would amount to this, that Mark, who is assumed withal to be neutral, would in this point have even outstripped Luke. Comp. Holtzmann, p. 435 f.

¹ With this agrees neither the half-naturalizing view of Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 314, that the *immediate* causes of the calm setting in lay in the atmosphere, and that so far the threatening word of Jesus was *prophetical* (comp. Schleiermacher); nor the complete breaking up of the miracle by Schenkel, who makes the matter amount simply to this, that Jesus by virtue of His confidence in God and foresight of His destination exercised a peaceful and soothing sway among the disciples, although these were possessed of nautical knowledge and He was not. Keim, p. 123, adds, moreover, a prayer previous to the command of Jesus, assuming that then *God* acted, and Jesus was only His interpreter. Of all this, however, there is nothing in the text. See rather ver. 41, which also testifies against the resolution of the natural miracle suggested by Weizsäcker.

CHAPTER V.

VER. 1. *Γαδαρηνῶν*] Here also, as in Matt. viii. 28, occur the various readings *Γερασσηνῶν* (B D *Σ** Vulg. Sax. Nyss., so Lachm. and Tisch.) and *Γεργεσηνῶν* (L *Δ* *Σ*** min. Arr. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Or.). The *Recepta* is to be retained, according to A C E, etc., with Fritzsche and Scholz. See on Matt. — Ver. 2. *ἐξελεύοντος αὐτοῦ*] is here more strongly attested (B C L *Δ* *Σ*, min. Ver. Brix., to which D also with *ἐξελεύοντων αὐτῶν* falls to be added) than in Matt. viii. 28. To be adopted, with Lachm. and Tisch.; *ἐξελεύοντι αὐτῷ* (Elz.) is from the parallel passages. — *εὐθέως*] which Lachm. has deleted, is only wanting in B, Syr. Arm. Ver. Brix. Vind. Colb. Corb. 2. The omission is explained from the parallels, from which also has arisen the reading *ὑπήντησεν* (B C D L *Δ* *Σ*, min. Lachm.). — Ver. 3. *οὕτε*] B C D L *Δ* *Σ* 33 have *οὕδε*. So Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch.; and of necessity rightly. — *ἀλύσει*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἀλύσει*, following B C L 33, Colb.; the *Recepta* is from what follows. — *οὐδεὶς*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς*, following B C* D L *Δ* *Σ*, min. Vulg. It. Arm. Looking to the peculiarity of this notice and the accumulation of the negatives, we must recognise this as correct. — Ver. 7. *εἶπε*] *λέγει* has preponderating evidence; approved by Griesb., adopted by Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch.; *εἶπε* is from Luke viii. 28. But Mark is fond of the historical present. In ver. 9 also the simple *λέγει αὐτῷ* (instead of *ἀπεκρίθη λέγων* in Elz.) is rightly adopted by Griesb. on preponderant evidence. — Ver. 9. *Λεγεῶν*] B* C D L *Δ* *Σ** 69, Syr. Copt. It. Vulg. have *Λεγιών*, and this Lachm. and Tisch. have adopted. The *Recepta* is from Luke. — Ver. 11. Instead of *πρὸς τῷ ἔρει*, Elz. has *πρὸς τὰ ἔρη*, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 12. After *αὐτόν* Elz. Matt. have *πάντες*, which Lachm. brackets and Tisch. deletes. It is wanting in B C D K L M *Δ* *Σ*, min. vss. Afterwards Elz. Matth. Scholz, Lachm. have *οἱ δαίμονες*, which Griesb. rejected, and Fritzsche and Tisch. have deleted, following B C L *Δ* *Σ*, min. Copt. Aeth. The *Recepta* *πάντες οἱ δαίμονες* is to be maintained; these words were omitted in accordance with the parallels; but they are quite in keeping with Mark's

graphic manner. — Ver. 13. ἦσαν δὲ] is on considerable evidence to be deleted as supplied (Tisch.). — Ver. 14. Instead of ἀπήγγ. Elz. has ἀνήγγ. But the former is decisively attested. — ἐξῆλθον] has come in from Matt. and Luke instead of the genuine ἦλθον (A B K L M U **8**** min. vss.), which Griesb. approved, Lachm. and Tisch. have adopted. — Ver. 15. The omission of the καί before ἵματ. (Tisch.) proceeded from Luke. — Ver. 18. ἐμβάνουσ] A B C D K L M Δ **8**, min. Vulg. It. have ἐμβάινουσ. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch. The *Recepta* is from Luke viii. 37. — Ver. 19. Instead of καὶ οὐκ, Elz. has ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ, against decisive evidence. — ἀνάγγειλον] Lachm. Tisch. have ἀπάγγειλον, following B C Δ **8** 50, 258. A mechanical change in conformity to ver. 14. — Instead of πεποίηκε, Elz. has ἐποίησε, contrary to decisive evidence. — Ver. 22. ἰδοὺ] before ἔρχ. is wanting in B D L Δ **8** 102, vss. (also Vulg. It.). Suspected by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Fritzsche and Tisch. From Luke viii. 41, contrary to the usage of Mark. — Ver. 23. παρακάλεσι] A C L **8**, min. have παρακαλεῖ. Recommended by Griesb. and Scholz, adopted by Fritzsche and Tisch. The imperfect is from Luke viii. 41; the present is in keeping with Mark's manner. — The reading ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ has preponderant attestation by B C D L Δ **8**, min. (adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.); ὁπωρ (Elz. Fritzsche, Scholz) instead of ἵνα may be suspected of being an amendment of style, and the more current ζήσεται flowed easily from Matt. ix. 18. — Ver. 25. τις] is wanting in A B C L Δ **8**, min. Vulg. Ver. Vind. Colb. Corb. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Fritzsche and Lachm., and justly so; the weight of evidence is too strong against it, to admit of the omission of a word so indifferent for the sense being explained from the parallels. — Ver. 26. Instead of αὐτῆς, Elz. Tisch. have εἰαυτῆς, against so preponderant evidence that it is manifestly the result of a gloss, as also is the omission of παρ' (D, min. Syr. utr. Vulg. It.). — Instead of περὶ, Tisch. has τὰ περὶ. So B C* Δ **8**. τὰ, being superfluous, dropped out after the preceding syllables. — Ver. 33. ἐπ' αὐτῇ] ἐπ' is wanting in B C D L **8**, min. Syr. Copt. Verc. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. That **ARTH** is not the *nominative* belonging to the following verb (as it is understood in Cant. Corb. Vind.) was noted in the form of gloss, sometimes by ἐπ', sometimes by ἐν (F Δ). — Ver. 36. εὐθέως] deleted by Tisch. following B D L Δ **8**, min. Syr. Arr. Perss. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. It. But regarded as superfluous, nay, as disturbing and incompatible with the following reading παρακούσας, it became omitted the more easily in accord-

ance with Luke viii. 50. — ἀκούσας] B L Δ Σ have παρακούσας. So Tisch. and Ewald also. Rightly; although the attestation of the vss. is wanting (only one Cod. of the It. has *neglexit*). The difficulty of the not understood compound occasioned the substitution for it of the current simple form. — Ver. 38. ἔρχεται] A B C D F Δ Σ, min. vss. have ἔρχονται. So Lachm. and Tisch. The plural might just as well have been introduced from what precedes, as the singular from what follows and Matt. ix. 23. But the preponderance of the witnesses is decisive in favour of the plural. — After θύρῳζον Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. have, on preponderant evidence, added καί. Being superfluous, it was the more easily absorbed by the first syllable of κλειόντας. — Ver. 40. ὁ δέ] Lachm. has αὐτὸς δέ, on evidence considerable doubtless, but not decisive. From Luke viii. 54. — After παιδίον Elz. and Scholz have ἀνακείμενον, which Lachm. has bracketed, Tisch. has deleted. It is wanting in B D L Δ Σ, min. vss. An addition by way of gloss, instead of which are also found κείμενον, καπακείμενον, and other readings.

Vv. 1-20. See on Matt. viii. 28-34. Comp. Luke viii. 26-39. The narrative of the former follows a briefer and more general tradition; that of the latter attaches itself to Mark, yet with distinctive traits and not without obliteration of the original. — Ver. 2. ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ . . . ἀπήντησεν αὐτῷ] The *genitive absolute* brings the point of time more strongly into prominence than would be done by the dative under the normal construction. See Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 307, 135; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Med.* 910; Winer, p. 186 [E. T. 259]. — ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἁκ. See on i. 23. — Ver. 3. οὐδὲ ἰλύσει οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς κ.τ.λ. (see the critical remarks): *not even with a chain could thenceforth any one*, etc. So fierce and strong was he now, that all attempts of that kind, which had previously been made with success, no longer availed with him (οὐκέτι). On the accumulation of negatives, see Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 57 f. — Ver. 4. διὰ τὸ αἰτὸν κ.τ.λ.] *because* he often . . . was chained. See Matthaei, p. 1259. — πένδαι are *fetters*, but ἰλύσεις need not therefore be exactly *manacles*, as the expositors wish to take it,—a sense at variance with the general signification of the word in itself, as well as with ver. 3. It means here also nothing else than *chains*; *let them be put upon any part of the body whatever*, he rent them asunder;

but the *fetters* in particular (which might consist of cords) he *rubbed to pieces* (συντετριφθαι, to be accented with a circumflex). — Ver. 5. *He was continually in the tombs and in the mountains, screaming and cutting himself with stones.* — Ver. 6. ἀπὸ μακρόθεν] as in Matt. xxv. 58. — Ver. 7. ὀρκίζω σε τὸν Θεόν] not *inappropriate* in the mouth of the demoniac (de Wette, Strauss), but in keeping with the address υἱὲ τ. Θεοῦ τ. ἰψ., and with the *desperate* condition, in which the πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον sees himself to be. On ὀρκίζω as a Greek word (Acts xix. 13 ; 1 Thess. v. 27), see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 361. — μή με βασανίσ.] is not—as in Matthew, where πρὸ καιροῦ is associated with it—to be understood of the torment of *Hades*, but of *tormenting generally*, and that by the execution of the ἔξελθε, ver. 8. The possessed man, identifying himself with his demon, dreads the pains, convulsions, etc. of the going forth. Subsequently, at ver. 10, where he has surrendered himself to the inevitable going forth, his prayer is different. Observe, moreover, how here the command of Jesus (ver. 8) has as its result in the sick man an immediate consciousness of the necessity of the going forth, but not the immediate going forth itself. — Ver. 8. ἔλεγε γάρ] *for he said*, of course *before* the suppliant address of the demoniac. A subjoined statement of the reason, without any need for conceiving the imperfect in a pluperfect sense. — Ver. 9. The demoniac power in this sufferer is conceived and represented as an aggregate—combined into unity—of numerous demoniacal individualities, which only separate in the going forth and distribute themselves into the bodies of the swine. The fixed idea of the man concerning this manifold-unity of the demoniac nature that possessed him had also suggested to him the name: *Legion* (the word is also used in Rabbinic Hebrew לֵגִיּוֹן, see Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 1123 ; Lightfoot, p. 612),—a name which, known to him from the Roman soldiery, corresponds to the paradoxical state of his disordered imagination, and its explanation added by the sick man himself (ὅτι πολλοί ἐσμεν ; otherwise in Luke), is intended to move Jesus the more to compassion. — Ver. 10. ἔξω τῆς χώρας] According to Mark, the demons desire not to be sent *out of the Gadarene region*, in which hitherto

they had pleasure ; according to Luke (comp. Matt. : *πρὸ καιροῦ*), they wish not to be sent *into the nether world*. A difference of tradition ; but the one that Luke followed is a remodelling in accordance with the result (in opposition to Baur), and was not included originally also in the account of Mark (in opposition to Ewald, *Jahrb.* VII. p. 65). — Ver. 13. *ὡς δισχίλιοι*] without *ἦσαν* δέ (see the critical remarks) is in apposition to *ἡ ἀγγελ.* Only Mark gives this *number*, and that quite in his way of mentioning particulars. According to Baur, *Markusevang.* p. 43, it is a trait of his “ affectation of knowing details ;” according to Wilke, an interpolation ; according to Bleek, an exaggerating later tradition. — Ver. 15. *ἦλθον*] the townsmen and the possessors of the farms. Here is meant generally the coming of the people to the place of the occurrence ; subsequently, by *κ. ἔρχονται πρὸς τ. Ἰησοῦν*, is meant the special act of the coming *to Jesus*. — *καθήμε.*] He who was before so fierce and intractable was sitting peacefully. So transformed was his condition. — *ἰματισμένον*] which in his unhealed state would not have been the case. This Mark leaves to be *presupposed* (comp. Hilgenfeld, *Markusevang.* p. 41) ; Luke has expressly *narrated* it, viii. 27. It might be told in either way, without the latter of necessity betraying *subsequent elaboration* on the narrator’s part (Wilke), or the former betraying an (*inexact*) use of a precursor’s work (Fritzsche, de Wette, and others, including Baur), as indeed the assumption that *originally* there stood in Mark, ver. 3, an addition as in Luke viii. 27 (Ewald), is unnecessary. — The verb *ἰματίζω* is not preserved except in this place and at Luke viii. 35. — *τὸν ἐσχηκ. τ. Λεγ.*] contrast, “ ad emphasin miraculi,” Erasmus. — Ver. 16. *καὶ περὶ τ. χοίρ.*] still belongs to *διηγήσ.* — Ver. 17. *ἤρξαντο*] The first impression, ver. 15, had been : *καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν*, under which they do not as yet interfere with Jesus. But now, after hearing the particulars of the case, ver. 16, *they begin*, etc. According to Fritzsche, it is indicated : “ Jesum *statim* se sivilisse permoveri.” In this the correlation of *καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν* and *καὶ ἤρξαντο* is overlooked. — Ver. 18. *ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ*] *at the embarkation*. — *παρεκάλει κ.τ.λ.*] entreaty of grateful love, to remain with his

benefactor. Fear of the demons was hardly included as a motive (μὴ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ τοῦτον εὐρόντες πάλιν ἐπιπηδήσωσιν αὐτῷ, Euthymius Zigabenus; comp. Victor Antiochenus, Theophylact, Grotius), since after the destruction of the swine the man is cured of his fixed idea and is σωφρονῶν. — Ver. 19. οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν] *He permitted him not. Wherefore?* appears from what follows. He was to abide in his native place as a witness and proclaimer of the marvellous deliverance, that he had experienced from God through Jesus, and *in this way* to serve the work of Christ. According to Hilgenfeld, Mark by this trait betrays his Jewish-Christianity, which is a sheer figment. — ὁ κύριος] God. — καὶ ἠλέησέ σε] *and how much He had compassion on thee* (when He caused thee to be set free from the demons, *aorist*). It is still to be construed with ὅσα, but zeugmatically, so that now ὅσα is to be taken *adverbially* (Kühner, II. p. 220). On ὅσος, *quam insignis*, comp. Ellendt, *Lxx. Soph.* II. p. 377. — Ver. 20. ἤρξατο] a graphic delineation from the starting-point. — Δεκαπόλει] See on Matt. iv. 25. — ἐποίησεν] *aorist*, like ἠλέησε. On the other hand, in ver. 19, πεποίηκε, which is conceived of from the point of time of the speaker, at which the fact subsists completed and continuing in its effects. — ὁ Ἰησοῦς] ὁ μὲν Χριστὸς μετριοφρονῶν τῷ πατρὶ τὸ ἔργον ἀνέθηκεν ὁ δὲ θεραπευθεὶς εὐγνωμονῶν τῷ Χριστῷ τοῦτο ἀνετίθει, Euthymius Zigabenus. — The circumstance, moreover, that Jesus did not here forbid the diffusion of the matter (see on v. 43; Matt. viii. 4), but *enjoined* it, may be explained from the locality (Peraea), where He was less known, and where concourse around His person was not to be apprehended as in Galilee.

Vv. 21—24. See on Matt. ix. 1, 18. Comp. Luke viii. 40—42, who also keeps to the order of events. — παρὰ τὴν θάλ.] a point of difference from Matthew, according to whom Jairus makes his appearance at Capernaum at the lodging of Jesus. See on Matt. ix. 18. — Ver. 23. ὅτι] recitative. — τὸ θυγάτριόν μου] Comp. Athen. xiii. p. 581 C; Long. i. 6; Plut. *Mor.* p. 179 E; Lucian, *Tox.* 22. This diminutive expression of paternal tenderness is peculiar to Mark. Comp. vii. 25. It does not occur elsewhere in the N. T. — ἐσχάτως ἔχει] a late

Greek phrase. See Wetstein and Kypke, also Lobeck, *ad Phrym.* p. 389. — *ἵνα ἐλθῶν κ.τ.λ.*] His excitement amidst grief and hope speaks incoherently. We may understand before *ἵνα*: *this I say*, in order that, etc. This is still simpler and more natural than the taking it *imperatively*, by supplying *volo* or the like (see on xii. 19).

Vv. 25–34. See on Matt. ix. 20–22; Luke viii. 43–48. — Ver. 26. Mark depicts with stronger lines than Luke, and far more strongly than Matthew. — *τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ*] *what was of her means*. How manifold were the prescriptions of the Jewish *physicians* for women suffering from haemorrhage, and what experiments they were wont to try upon them, may be seen in Lightfoot, p. 614 f. — Ver. 27. *ἀκούσασα*] subordinated as a prior point to the following *ἐλθοῦσα*. Comp. on i. 41. — The characteristic addition *τοῦ κρασπέδου* in Matt. ix. 20, Luke viii. 44, would be well suited to the graphic representation of Mark (according to Ewald, it has only come to be omitted in the existing form of Mark), but may proceed from a later shape of the tradition. — Ver. 28. *ἔλεγε γάρ*] without *ἐν ἑαυτῇ* (see the critical remarks) does not mean: *for she thought* (Kuinoel, and many others), which, moreover, *רַחֵם* used absolutely never does mean, not even in Gen. xxvi. 9, but: *for she said*. She *actually* said it, to others, or for and to herself; a vivid representation. — Ver. 29. *ἡ πηγὴ τ. αἵμ. αὐτ.*] like *מַיִם חַיִּים* (Lev. xii. 7, xx. 18), not a euphemistic designation of the *parts themselves* affected by the haemorrhage, but designation of the seat of the issue of blood in them. — *τῷ σώματι*] *διὰ τοῦ σώματος μηκέτι ῥαινομένου τοῖς σταλαγμοῖς*, Euthymius Zigabenus. Still this by itself could not as yet give the certainty of the *recovery*. Hence rather: through the feeling of the being strong and well, which suddenly passed through her body. — *μάστιγος*] as at iii. 10. — Ver. 30. *ἐπιγινούς*] stronger than the previous *ἔγνω*. — *ἐν ἑαυτῷ*] in His own consciousness, therefore immediately, not in virtue of an externally perceptible effect. — *τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύν. ἐξελθ.*] *the power gone forth from Him*. What feeling in Jesus was, according to Mark's representation, the medium of His discerning this efflux of power that had occurred, we are not informed. The tradi-

tion, as it has expressed itself in this trait in Mark and Luke (comp. on Matt. ix. 22), has disturbed this part of the narrative by the view of an efflux of power independent of the will of Jesus, but brought about on the part of the woman by her faith (comp. Strauss, II. p. 89), the recognition of which on the part of Jesus occurred *at once*, but yet not until *after it had taken place*. This is, with Weiss and others (in opposition to Holtzmann and Weizsäcker), to be conceded as a trait of *later* origin, and not to be dealt with by artificial explanations at variance with the words of the passage (in opposition to Ebrard and Lange), or to be concealed by evasive expedients (Olshausen, Krabbe, and many others). It does not, however, affect the simpler *tenor* of the history, *which we read in Matthew*. Calovius made use of the passage against the Calvinists, "*vim divinam carni Christi derogantes*." — τίς μου ἥψατο τῶν ἱμ.] *who has touched me on the clothes?* Jesus knew that by means of the clothes-touching power had gone out of Him, but not, *to whom*. The disciples, unacquainted with the reason of this question, are astonished at it, seeing that Jesus is in the midst of the crowd, ver. 31. In Olshausen, Ebrard, Lange,¹ and older commentators, there are arbitrary attempts to explain away that ignorance. — Ver. 32. περιεβλέπετο ἰδεῖν] *namely, by any resulting effect that might make manifest the reception of the power*. The *feminine* τὴν τ. ποιήσασαν is said from the standpoint of the already known fact. — Ver. 33. πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν] *the whole truth*, so that she kept back nothing and altered nothing. Comp. Plat. *Apol.* p. 17 B, 20 D; Soph. *Trach.* 91; and see Krüger on *Thuc.* vi. 87. 1. — εἰς εἰρήνην] εἰρήνη, 1 Sam. i. 17; 2 Sam. xv. 9; Luke vii. 50, *al.*: *unto bliss*, unto future happiness. In ἐν εἰρήνῃ (Judg. xviii. 6; Luke ii. 29; Acts xvi. 36; Jas. ii. 16) the happy state is conceived of as combined with the ὑπαγε, as simultaneous. — ἵσθι ὑγιᾶς κ.τ.λ.] *definitive confirmation* of the recovery, which Schenkel indeed refers merely to the woman's "religious excitement of mind" as its cause.

¹ According to Lange, for example, the conduct of Jesus only amounts to an *appearance*; "He let His eyes move as if (?) inquiringly over the crowd" (περιμβλίσκ. ἰδεῖν κ.τ.λ.).

Vv. 35-43. See on Matt. ix. 23-25. Comp. Luke viii. 49-56. The former greatly abridges and compresses more than Luke, who, however, does not come up to the vivid originality of the representation of Mark. — ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυν.] τουτέστιν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκείας τοῦ ἀρχισυν., Euthymius Zigabenus. — ἔτι] since now there is no longer room for help. — Ver. 36. According to the reading παρακούσας, this (comp. Matt. xviii. 17) is to be taken as the opposite of ὑπακούειν, namely: *immediately He left this speech unnoticed*; He did not heed it for one moment, but let it remain as it was, and said, etc. In this way is set forth the *decided certainty*.¹ He has heard the announcement (ver. 35), but at once let it pass unattended to. Ewald is incorrect in saying that He *acted* as if he *had failed to hear* it. That He did *not* fail to hear it, and, moreover, did *not act* as if He had, is in fact shown just by the μὴ φοβοῦ κ.τ.λ. which he addresses to Jairus. The Itala in the Cod. Pal. (e. in Tisch.) correctly has *neglexit*. — μὴ φοβοῦ κ.τ.λ.] as though now all were lost, all deliverance cut off. — Ver. 37. According to Mark, Jesus sends back the rest (disciples and others who were following Him) *before* the house; according to Luke viii. 51, in the house. — Ver. 38. θόρυβον καὶ κλαίοντας κ. ἀλαλ.] *an uproar and (especially) people weeping and wailing*. The first καί attaches to the general term θόρυβον the special elements that belong to it, as in i. 5, and frequently. ἀλαλάζω not merely used of the cry of conflict and rejoicing, but also, although rarely, of the *cry of anguish and lamentation*. See Plutarch, *Luc.* 28; Eur. *El.* 843. — Ver. 39. εἰσελθὼν] into the house. A later point of time than at ver. 38. — Ver. 40. ἐκβαλὼν] irritated, commanding; He *ejected* them. Among the πάντας, those who are named immediately afterwards (παραλαμβ. κ.τ.λ.) are *not* included, and so not the three disciples (in opposition to Baur). — Ver. 41. ταλθα, κοῦμι] תהי נקמה, *puella, surge*. It is a feature of Mark's vivid concrete way of description to give significant words *in Hebrew*, with their interpretation, iii. 18, vii. 12, 34, xiv. 36. On the Aramaean נקמה, see Buxtorf, *Lcx. Talm.* p.

¹ Which, however, all the more precludes the thought of a mere *apparent* death of the maiden (such as Schleiermacher and Schenkel assume).

875. — τὸ κοράσιον] nominative with the article in the imperative address, Bernhardt, p. 67; Kühner, II. 155. — σοὶ λέγω] a free addition of Mark, "ut sensum vocantis atque imperantis exprimeret" (Jerome). — ἔγειρε] out of the sleep, ver. 39. — Ver. 42. ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα] not as giving a reason for the word κοράσιον (Euthymius Zigabenus, Fritzsche), but in explanation of the previous remark, that the maiden arose and walked about; she was no longer a *little* child. Bengel appropriately observes: "rediit ad statum aetati congruentem." The circumstance that she was just in the *period of development* (Paulus) is certainly in keeping with the thought of an apparent death, but is alien to the connection. — Ver. 43. διεστείλατο] He gave them urgently (πολλά) injunction, command. See on Matt. xvi. 20. — αὐτοῖς] those brought in at ver. 40. — ἵνα] the purpose of the διεστείλ. πολλά. Comp. Matt. xvi. 20; Mark vii. 36, ix. 9. — γινῶ¹] τοῦτο: namely, this course of the matter. The *prohibition itself*, as only the three disciples and the child's parents were present (ver. 40), has in it nothing unsuitable, any more than at i. 44, vii. 36, viii. 26. When Jesus heals publicly in presence of the multitude there is not found even in Mark, except in the cases of the expulsion of *demons*, i. 34, iii. 12, any prohibition of the kind (ii. 11 f., iii. 5, v. 34, ix. 27, x. 52). Mark therefore ought not to have been subjected to the imputation of a tendency to make the sensation produced by the healings of Jesus "appear altogether great and important" (Köstlin, p. 317; comp. Baur, *Markus-evang.* p. 54) by His design of wishing to hinder it; or of the endeavour to leave out of view the unsusceptible mass of the people, and to bestow His attention solely on the susceptible circle of the disciples (Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 135). In our history the quickening to life again in itself could not, of course, be kept secret (see, on the contrary, Matt. ix. 26), but probably the more detailed circumstances of the way of its

¹ The subjunctive form γινῶ (like δοῶ, etc.), which Lachmann and Tischendorf have (comp. ix. 30; Luke xix. 15), has important codices in its favour (A B D L) and against it (including N), but it is unknown to the N. T. elsewhere, and has perhaps only crept in by error of the transcribers from the language of common life.

accomplishment might. Jesus, although He was from the outset certain of being the promised Messiah (in opposition to Schenkel), by such prohibitions did *as much as on His part He could* to oppose the kindling of precipitate Messianic fanaticism and popular commotion. He could not prevent their want of success in individual cases (i. 45, vii. 36); but it is just the frequent occurrence of those prohibitions that gives so sure attestation of their historical character in general. Comp. Ewald, *Jahrb.* I. p. 117 f. It is quite as historical and characteristic, that Jesus never forbade the propagation of His *teachings*. With His *Messiahship* He was afraid of arousing a premature sensation (viii. 30, ix. 9; Matt. xvi. 20, xvii. 9), such as His miraculous healings were calculated in the most direct and hazardous way to excite among the people. — καὶ εἶπε δοθῆναι κ.τ.λ.] not for dietetic reasons, nor yet in order that the revival should not be regarded as only apparent (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus), but in order to prove that the child was delivered, not only from death, but also *from her sickness*.

CHAPTER VI.

VER. 1. Instead of ἡλθεν, we must read with Tisch., following B C L Δ Σ, ἔρχεται. ἡλθεν was introduced in accordance with the preceding ἐξῆλθεν. — Ver. 2. After αὐτῷ (instead of which B C L Δ Σ, as before, read τοῦτω; so Tisch.) Elz. has ὅτι, which Fritzsche defends. But the evidence on the other side so preponderates, that ὅτι must be regarded as an inserted connective addition, instead of which C* D K, min. give ἵνα (and then γίνωνται), while B L Δ Σ have changed γίνονται into γινόμεναι, which is only another attempt to help the construction, although it is adopted (with αι before διὰ upon too weak evidence) by Tisch. — Ver. 3. ὁ τέκτων] The reading ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός (and then merely καὶ Μαρίας), although adopted by Fritzsche, is much too weakly attested, and is from Matt. xiii. 35. — Ἰωσὴ] The form Ἰωσῆτος (Lachm. Tisch.) has in its favour B D L Δ, min. vss. Ἰωσήφ (Σ, 121, Aeth. Vulg. codd. of the It.) is here too weakly attested, and is from Matt. xiii. 55. — Ver. 9. The *Recepta*, defended by Rinek, Fritzsche, is ἐνδύσασθαι. But ἐνδύσασθε (so Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch.) has decisive attestation; it was altered on account of the construction. — Ver. 11. ὅσοι ἄν] Tisch. has ὅς ἄν τύπος (and afterwards δέξεται), following B L Δ Σ, min. Copt. Syr. p. (in the margin). A peculiar and original reading, which became altered partly by the omission of τύπος (C* ? min.), partly by ὅσοι, in accordance with the parallels. — After αὐτοῖς Elz. Matth. Fritzsche, Scholz, have: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται Σοδόμοις ἢ Γομορρῶις ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ, which is not found in B C D L Δ Σ, min. vss. An addition in accordance with Matt. x. 15. — Ver. 12. ἐκήρυξαν (Tisch.), instead of the *Recepta* ἐκήρυσον, is still more strongly attested than μετανοῶσιν (Lachm. Tisch.). The former is to be adopted from B C D L Δ Σ; the latter has in its favour B D L, but easily originated as the shorter form from the *Recepta* μετανοήσωσι. — Ver. 14. ἐλεγεν] Fritzsche, Lachm. have ἔλεγον only, following B D, 6, 271, Cant. Ver. Verc. Mart. Corb. Aug. Beda (D has ἐλέγασσαν). An alteration in accordance with ver. 15; comp. ver. 16. — ἐκ νεκρ. ἠγέρθη]

Lachm. Tisch. have ἐγὼ γερταὶ ἐκ νεκρ., following B D L Δ 8, min.; but A K, min. Theophyl. have ἐκ νεκρ. ἀνέστη. The latter is right; ἀνέστη became supplanted by means of the parallel passages and ver. 16. — Ver. 15. δέ after the first ἄλλοι is wanting in Elz. Fritzsche, but is guaranteed by decisive evidence. Decisive evidence condemns the ἡ read before ὡς in Elz. and Fritzsche. — Ver. 16. οὗτος ἐστίν, αὐτὸς ἡγ.] B D L Δ, min. Vulg. Cant. Colb. Corb. Germ. 1, 2, Mm. Or. have merely οὗτος ἡγ. So Griesb. Fritzsche, Scholz, Tisch. (Lachm. has bracketed ἐστ. αὐτ.). Certainly the *Recepta* might have arisen out of Matt. xiv. 2. But, if merely οὗτος ἡγ. were original, it would not be at all easy to see why it should have been altered and added to. On the other hand, the transcribers might easily pass over from οὗτος at once to αὐτός. Therefore the *Recepta* is to be maintained, and to be regarded as made use of by Matthew. — ἐκ νεκρῶν] is, in accordance with Tisch., to be deleted as an addition, since in B L Δ 8, vss. it is altogether wanting; in D it stands before ἡγ.; and in C, Or. it is exchanged for ἀπὸ τ. νεκρ. — Ver. 17. The article before φυλακῇ is deleted, in accordance with decisive evidence. — Ver. 19. ἤθελεν] Lachm. has ἐζήτει, although only following C* Cant. Ver. Verc. Vind. Colb. An interpretation. — Ver. 21. ἐποίησεν] B C D L Δ 8, min. have ἐποίησεν. So Lachm. But the reading of Tisch. is to be preferred: ἠπόρει; see the exegetical remarks. — Ver. 22. αὐτῆς] B D L Δ 8, min. have αὐτοῦ. A wrong emendation. — καὶ ἀρεσάσ.] B C* L Δ 8 have ἤρεσεν. So Lachm. and Tisch., the latter then, upon like attestation, having ὁ δὲ βασις εἶπεν (Lachm., following A, has εἶπε δὲ ὁ βασις.). Rightly; the *Recepta* is a mechanical continuation of the participles, which was then followed by the omission of δέ (Elz. has: εἶπεν ὁ βασις.). — Ver. 24. αἰτήσομαι] αἰτήσωμαι is decisively attested; commended by Griesb., and adopted by Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch. — Ver. 30. πάντα καὶ] This καὶ has evidence so considerable against it that it is condemned by Griesb. and deleted by Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch. But how easily might the quite superfluous and even disturbing word come to be passed over! — Ver. 33. After ὑπάγοντας Elz. has οἱ ὄχλοι, in opposition to decisive evidence; taken from Matt. and Luke. — After ἐπέγνωσαν (for which Lachm., following B* D, reads ἔγνωσαν) Elz. Scholz have αὐτόν, which is not found in B D, min. Arm. Perss. Vulg. It., while A K L M U Δ 8, min., vss. have αὐτούς. So Tisch. But αὐτόν and αὐτούς are additions by way of gloss. — ἐκεῖ] Elz. Scholz have: ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτοὺς καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν. Griesb.: καὶ ἦλθον ἐκεῖ. Fritzsche: ἐκεῖ καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν. Lachm. Tisch.: ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς. So, too, Rinck, *Lucubr.*

crit. p. 298. The latter reading (B L Σ) is to be regarded as the original one, and the variations are to be derived from the fact that προσῆλθον was written instead of προῆλθον. Thus arose the corruption καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτούς (so still L, min.). This corruption was then subjected to very various glosses, namely, καὶ προσῆλθον πρὸς αὐτούς (220, 225, Arr.), καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτοῖς (Δ), καὶ συνῆλθον αὐτοῦ (D, Ver.), καὶ συνέδραμον πρὸς αὐτόν (A), καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν (Elz.), *al.*; which glosses partly supplanted the original καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς (D, min. vss.), partly appeared by its side with or without restoration of the genuine προσῆλθον. The reading of Griesb. has far too little attestation, and leaves the origin of the variations inexplicable. For the reading of Fritzsche there is no attestation; it is to be put on the footing of a conjecture.—Ver. 34. After εἶδεν Elz. and Scholz have ὁ Ἰησοῦς, which in witnesses deserving of consideration is either wanting or differently placed. An addition.—ἐπ' αὐτοῖς] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἐπ' αὐτούς, following important witnesses; the *Recepta* is from Matt. xiv. 14 (where it is the original reading).—Ver. 36. ἄρτους· τί γὰρ φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν] B L Δ , min. Copt. Cant. Verc. Corb. Vind. have merely τί φάγωσιν, which Griesb. approves and Tisch. reads. D has merely τι φαγεῖν, which Fritzsche reads, adding, however, without any evidence: οὐ γὰρ ἔχουσιν. Lachm. has [ἄρτους·] τί [γὰρ] φάγωσιν [οὐκ ἔχουσιν]. The reading of Griesb. is to be preferred; ἄρτους was written in the margin as a gloss, and adopted into the text. Thus arose ἄρτους, τι φάγωσιν (comp. Σ : βρώματα τι φάγωσιν, Vulg.: “cibos, quos manducant”). This was then filled up from viii. 2, Matt. xv. 32, in the way in which the *Recepta* has it. The reading of D (merely τι φαγεῖν) would be preferable, if it were better attested.—Ver. 37. δώμεν] Lachm. has δώσωμεν, following A B (?) L Δ 65, It. Vulg. Comp. D Σ , min., which have δώσωμεν. The future is original; not being understood, it was changed into δῶμεν, and mechanically into δώσωμεν (Tisch.).—Ver. 38. καὶ before ἴδετε is wanting in B D L Σ , min. vss., and is an addition which Griesb. has condemned, Lachm. has bracketed, and Tisch. has deleted.—Ver. 39. ἀνακλῖναι] Lachm. has ἀνακλιθῆναι, not sufficiently attested from Matt. xiv. 19.—Ver. 40. Instead of ἀνά, Lachm. and Tisch. have κατά both times, in accordance with B D Σ , Copt. Rightly; ἀνά is from Luke ix. 14.—Ver. 44. Elz. has after ἄρτους: ὡσεὶ, in opposition to decisive evidence.—Ver. 45. ἀπολύσῃ] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἀπολύει, following B D L Δ Σ 1. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xiv. 22.—Ver. 48. εἶδεν] B D L Δ Σ , min. Vulg. It. Copt. have ἰδών. So Lachm. and Tisch., omitting the subsequent καὶ before περὶ. Rightly; the

participle was changed into *εἶδεν*, because the parenthetical nature of the following *ἦν γὰρ . . . αὐτοῖς* was not observed. — Ver. 51. *καὶ ἐθαύμαζον*] is wanting, it is true, in B L Δ Σ, min. Copt. Vulg. Vind. Colb. Rd., and is condemned by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm., cancelled by Tisch.; but after *ἐξίσταντο* it was, as the weaker expression, more easily passed over than added. — Ver. 52. The order *αὐτῶν ἡ καρδ.* is, with Scholz, Lachm. Tisch., to be preferred on far preponderating evidence. — Ver. 54. After *αὐτόν* Lachm. has bracketed *οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου*, which A G Δ, min. vss. read; from Matt. xiv. 35. — Ver. 55. *ἐξεῖ*] is not found in B L Δ Σ, 102, Copt. Vulg. Vind. Brix. Colb. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. Passed over as superfluous. — Ver. 56. *ἤπτοντο*] Lachm. reads *ἤψαντο*, following B D L Δ Σ, min. Matt. xiv. 36.

Vv. 1–6. See on Matt. xiii. 54–58, who follows Mark with slight abbreviations and unessential changes. As respects the question of *position*, some advocates of the priority of Matthew have attributed to Mark an unthinking mechanism (Saunier), others a very artistic grouping (Hilgenfeld, who holds that the insusceptibility of the people was here to be represented as attaining its climax). — The narrative itself is not to be identified with that of Luke iv. 16 ff. See on Matt. — *ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν*] from the house of Jairus. Matthew has an entirely different historical connection, based on a distinct tradition, in which he may have furnished the more correct *τάξις*. — *ἦρξατο*] for the *first emergence* and its result are meant to be narrated. — After elimination of *ἔτι*, the words from *πόθεν* to *αὐτῷ* are to be taken together as an interrogative sentence, and *καὶ δυνάμεις* on to *γίνονται* forms again a separate question of astonishment. — *δυνάμεις τοιαῦται*] presupposes that they have *heard* of the miracles that Jesus had done (in Capernaum and elsewhere); these they now bring into association with His teaching. — *διὰ τῶν χειρ. αὐτοῦ*] that is, by *laying on of His hands*, by *taking hold of*, *touching*, and the like; ver. 5. Comp. Acts v. 12, xix. 11. — Ver. 3. *ὁ τέκτων*] According to the custom of the nation and of the Rabbins (Lightfoot, p. 616; Schoettgen, II. p. 898; Gfrörer in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1838, p. 166 ff.), Jesus Himself had learned a handicraft. Comp. Justin. c. *Tryph.* 88, p. 316, where

it is related that He made¹ ploughs and yokes; Origen, *c. Celsus*, vi. 4. 3, where Celsus ridicules the custom; Theodoret, *H. E.* iii. 23; *Evang. infant.* 38; and see generally, Thilo, *ad Cod. Apocr.* I. p. 368 f. The circumstance that Mark has not written *ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός*, as in Matt. xiii. 55, is alleged by Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 135 ("Mark tolerates not the paternity of Joseph even in the mouth of the Nazarenes"), Baur, *Markusevangel.* p. 138, and Bleek, to point to the view of the divine procreation of Jesus. As though Mark would not have had opportunity and skill enough to bring forward this view otherwise with clearness and definitely! The expression of Matthew is not even to be explained from an offence taken at *τέκτων* (Holtzmann, Weizsäcker), but simply bears the character of *the* reflection, that along with the mother the *father* also would have been mentioned. And certainly it is singular, considering the completeness of the specification of the members of the families, that Joseph is not also designated. That he was already dead, is the usual but not certain assumption (see on John vi. 42). In any case, however, he has at an early date fallen into the background in the evangelical tradition, and in fact disappeared: and the narrative of Mark, in so far as he names only the mother, is a reflection of this state of things according to the customary appellation among the people, without any special design. Hence there is no sufficient reason for supposing that in the primitive-Mark the words ran: *ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱός Ἰωσήφ* (Holtzmann).—*Ἰωσήφ*] Matthew, by way of correction, has *Ἰωσήφ*. See on Matt. xiii. 55. The brother of James of Alphaeus was called *Joses*. See on Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40.—Ver. 4. The generic *προφήτης* is not to be

¹ Whether exactly "with an *ideal* meaning," so that they became *symbols* under His hand, as Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 154, thinks, may be fitly left to the fancy which is fond of inventing such things. No less fanciful is Lange's strange idea that the brothers of Jesus (in whom, however, he sees sons of his brother Alphaeus adopted by Joseph) would hardly have allowed Him to work much, because they saw in Him the glory of Israel! Comp., on the other hand, iii. 21; John vii. 5.—We may add that, according to the opinion of Baur, Mark here, with his *ὁ τέκτων*, "stands quite on the boundary line between the canonical and the apocryphal" (*Markusevang.* p. 47).

misapplied (so Schenkel) to make good the opinion that Jesus had not yet regarded Himself as the *Messiah*. — καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγ. κ.τ.λ.¹] graphic fulness of detail; native town, kinsfolk, house, proceeding from the wider to the narrower circle; not a glance back at iii. 20 (Baur, p. 23). — Ver. 5. οὐκ ἠδύνατο] neither means *noluit* (Verc. Vind. Brix. Germ. 2), nor is ἠδύν. superfluous; but see on Matt. xiii. 58. Theophylact says well: οὐχ ὅτι αὐτὸς ἀσθενὴς ἦν, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐκεῖνοι ἄπιστοι ἦσαν. — Ver. 6. διὰ τὴν ἀπιστ. αὐτῶν] on account of their unbelief. Διά is never thus used with θαυμάζειν in the N. T. (not even in John vii. 21) and in the LXX. But the unbelief is conceived not as the *object*, but as the *cause* of the wondering. Comp. Ael. V. H. xii. 6, xiv. 36: αὐτὸν θαυμάζομεν διὰ τὰ ἔργα. Jesus Himself had not expected such a degree of insusceptibility in His native town. Only a few among the sick themselves (ver. 5) met Him with the necessary condition of faith. — καὶ περιῆγε κ.τ.λ.] seeking in the country a better field for His ministry. — κύκλῳ] as iii. 34, belonging to περιῆγε.

Vv. 7–13. Comp. Matt. x. 1–14; Luke ix. 1–6. Mark here adopts, with abridgment and sifting, from the collection of Logia what was essentially relevant to his purpose; Luke follows him, not without obliteration and generalizing of individual traits. — ἤρξατο] He now began that sending forth, to which they were destined in virtue of their calling; its continuance was their whole future calling, from the standpoint of which Mark wrote his ἤρξατο. — δύο δύο] *binos*, in pairs. Ecclus. xxxvi. 25. A Hebraism; Winer, p. 223 [E. T. 312]. The Greek says κατὰ, ἀνά, εἰς δύο, or even συνδύο (see Valckenaer, *ad Herod.* p. 311; Heindorf, *ad Plat. Parm.* p. 239). *Wherefore* in pairs? “Ad plenam testimonii fidem,” Grotius. Comp. Luke vii. 19, ix. 1. — Ver. 8. ἀρῶσιν] *should take up*, in order to carry it with them, 1 Macc. iv. 30. — εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον] The variation in Matthew and Luke

¹ The form *συγγιγνῆσαι*, which, though erroneous, had been in use, is here recommended by Buttman, *neut. Gr.* p. 22 [E. T. 25]; and it is so adequately attested by B D** E F G, *al.* (in N* the words *κ. τ. λ. συγγ.* are wanting) that it is, with Tischendorf, to be adopted. In Luke ii. 44 the attestation is much weaker. Mark has not further used the word.

betokens the introduction of exaggeration,¹ but not a misunderstanding of the clear words (Weiss). There is an attempt at a mingling of interpretations at variance with the words in Ebrard, p. 382; Lange, *L. J.* II. 2, p. 712. It ultimately comes to this, that εἰ μὴ ῥ. μ. is intended to mean: *at most* a staff. Even Bleek has recourse to the unfounded refinement, that the staff in Mark is meant only for *support*, not as a *weapon of defence*. — Ver. 9. ἀλλ' ὑποδεδεμ. σανδάλ.] There is no difference from μηδὲ ὑποδήματα, Matt. x. 10, not even a correction of this expression (Bleek, comp. Holtzmann). See on Matt. *l.c.* The meaning is, that they should be satisfied with the simple light foot-covering of *sandals*, in contrast with the proper *calceus* (ὑπόδημα κοῖλον), which had upper leather, and the use of which was derived from the Phoenicians and Babylonians (Leyrer in Herzog's *Encykl.* VII. p. 729). Comp. Acts xii. 8. The construction is *anacoluthic*, as though παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς πορεύεσθαι had been previously said. Then the discourse changes again, going over from the *obliqua* into the *directa* (ἐνδύσθητε). See Kühner, II. p. 598 f., and *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 4. 15, iii. 5. 14, iv. 4. 5. A lively non-periodic mode of representing the matter; comp. Buttmann, *ncut. Gr.* p. 330 [E. T. 384 f.]. — Ver. 10. καὶ ἔλεγ. αὐτ.] a new portion of the directions given on that occasion. Comp. on iv. 13. — ἐκεῖ] in this house: but ἐκεῖθεν: from this τόπος (see the critical remarks). — Ver. 11. εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς] *which is to serve them for a testimony*, namely, of that which the shaking off of the dust expresses, *that they are placed on a footing of equality with heathens*. Comp. on Matt. x. 14. — Ver. 12 f. ἵνα] the aim of the ἐκήρυξαν. — ἡλειφον ἐλαίῳ] *The anointing with oil* (the mention of which in this place is held by Baur, on account of Jas. v. 14, to betray a later date) was very frequently applied medically in the case of external and internal ailments. See Lightfoot, p. 304, 617; Schoettgen, I. p. 1033; Wetstein *in loc.* But the assumption that the apostles had healed *by the natural virtue of the oil* (Paulus, Weisse), is at variance with the context, which narrates their

¹ Inverting the matter, Baur holds that the "*reasoning*" Mark had modified the expression. Comp. Holtzmann and Hilgenfeld.

miraculous action. Nevertheless it is also wholly unwarranted to regard the application of the oil in this case merely as a *symbol*; either of the working of miracles for the purpose of awakening faith (Beza, Fritzsche, comp. Weizsäcker), or of the bodily and spiritual refreshment (Euthymius Zigabenus), or of the divine compassion (Theophylact, Calvin), or to find in it merely an *arousing of the attention* (Russwurm in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 866), or, yet again, a later magical mingling of the supernatural and the natural (de Wette). In opposition to the latter view the pertinent remark of Euthymius Zigabenus holds good: *εἰκὸς δὲ, καὶ τοῦτο παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου διδαχθῆναι τοὺς ἀποστόλους.* Comp. Jas. v. 14. The anointing is rather, as is also the application of spittle on the part of Jesus Himself (vii. 33, viii. 23; John ix. 6), to be looked upon as a *conductor of the supernatural healing power*, analogous to the laying on of hands in ver. 5, so that the faith was the *causa apprehendens*, the miraculous power the *causa efficiens*, and the oil was the *medians*, therefore without independent power of healing, and not even necessary, where the way of *immediate* operation was, probably in accordance with the susceptibility of the persons concerned, adopted by the Healer, as Jesus also heals the blind man of Jericho *without* any application of spittle, x. 46 f. The passage before us has nothing to do with the *unctio extrema* (in opposition to Maldonatus and many others), although Bisping still thinks that he discovers here at least a *type* thereof.

Vv. 14–16. See on Matt. xiv. 1, 2. Comp. Luke ix. 7–9. Mark bears the impress of the original in his circumstantiality and want of polish in form.—ὁ βασιλεύς] in the wider sense ἀδιαφόρως χρώμενος τῷ ὀνόματι (Theophylact): *the prince* (comp. the ἄρχων βασιλεύς of the Athenians, and the like), a more popular but less accurate term than in Matthew and Luke: ὁ τετράρχης. Comp. Matt. ii. 22.—φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγέν. τ. ὄν. αὐτοῦ] is not to be put in a parenthesis, since it does not interrupt the construction, but assigns the reason for the ἤκουσεν, after which the narrative proceeds with καὶ ἔλεγεν.—As *object* to ἤκουσεν (generalized in Matthew and Luke) we cannot, without arbitrariness, think of aught

but the contents of vv. 12, 13. Comp. ἀκούσας, ver. 16. Antipas heard that the disciples of Jesus preached and did such miracles. Then comes the explanation assigning the reason for this: *for His name became known*, i.e. for it did not remain a secret, that these itinerant teachers and miracle-workers were working as empowered *by Jesus*. Comp. also Holtzmann, p. 83. According to Grotius, Griesbach, and Paulus (also Rettig in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 797), the object of ἤκουσεν is: τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, so that φαν. γ. ἐγέν. would be parenthetical. This is at variance with the simple style of the evangelist. According to de Wette, Mark has been led by the alleged parenthesis φανερόν . . . αὐτοῦ to forget the object, so that merely something indefinite, perhaps ταῦτα, would have to be supplied. But what carelessness! and still the question remains, to what the ταῦτα applies. Ewald (comp. Bengel) takes φανερόν . . . προφητῶν as a parenthesis, which was intended to explain *what* Herod heard, and holds that in ver. 16 the ἤκουσεν of ver. 14 is again taken up (that instead of ἔλεγεν in ver. 14 ἔλεγον is to be read, which Hilgenfeld also prefers; see the critical remarks). But the explanation thus resorted to is not in keeping with the simple style of the evangelist elsewhere (in the case of Paul it would create no difficulty). — ὁ βαπτίζων] substantival (see on Matt. ii. 20). Observe with what delicacy the set evangelic expression ὁ βαπτιστής is not put into the mouth of Antipas; he speaks from a more extraneous standpoint. Moreover, it is clear from our passage that *before* the death of John he can have had no knowledge of Jesus and His working. — διὰ τοῦτο] πρότερον γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης οὐδὲν σημεῖον ἐποίησεν· ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐνόμισεν ὁ Ἡρώδης προσλαβεῖν αὐτὸν τῶν σημείων τὴν ἐργασίαν, Theophylact. — αἱ δυνάμεις] *the powers* κατ' ἐξοχὴν, i.e. the *miraculous* powers, the effluence of *which* he saw now also in the working of the disciples. — Ver. 15. The difference between these assertions is that *some* gave Him out to be *the Elias*, and so to be *the* prophet who was of an altogether special and distinguished character and destination; but others said: *He is a prophet like one of the prophets*, i.e. (comp. Judg. xvi. 7, 11), a *usual*,

ordinary prophet, one out of the category of prophets in general, not quite the exceptional and exalted prophet Elias. Comp. Ewald, p. 258 f. The interpolation of ἡ before ὡς could only be occasioned by the expression not being understood.¹ — Ver. 16. ἀκούσας] namely, these different judgments. Mark now relates the *more special* occasion of the utterance of Herod. — ὃν . . . Ἰωάννην] a familiar form of attraction. See Winer, p. 148 [E. T. 205]. — ἐγώ] has the stress of an evil conscience. *Mockery* (Weizsäcker) is, in accordance with ver. 14 f., not to be thought of. — οὗτος] anaphorically with emphasis (Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 1. 19): *this* is he. — αὐτός] the emphatic *He, precisely he*, for designation of the identity. Observe the urgent expression of certainty, which the terror-stricken man gives to his conception: *This one* it is: *He* is risen!

Vv. 17–29. See on Matt. xiv. 3–12. Mark narrates more circumstantially² and with more peculiar originality; see especially ver. 20, the contents of which, indeed, are held by Baur to rest on a deduction from Matt. xiv. 9. — αὐτός] is a commentary upon the ἐγώ of ver. 16. Herod *himself*, namely, etc. — ἐν φυλακῇ] *in a prison*, without the article. At ver. 28, on the other hand, *with* the article. Comp. 1 Macc. ix. 53; Thuc. iii. 34; Plut. *Mor.* p. 162 B; Plat. *Leg.* ix. 864 E: ἐν δημοσίῳ δεσμῷ δεθείς. — Vv. 19, 20. The θέλειν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι is here, in variation from Matthew, denied in the case of Herod. It is not merely an *apparent* variation (Ebrard, p. 384; Lange), but a real one, wherein Mark's narrative betrays a later shape of the tradition (in opposition to Schneckenburger, *erst. kan. Ev.* p. 86 f.); while with Matthew Josephus also, *Antt.* xviii. 5. 2, attributes to Herod the intention of putting to death. Comp. Strauss, I. p. 396 f. As to ἐνεῖχεν (*she gave close heed to him*), see on Luke xi. 53. —

¹ The *Recepta* ὅτι προφ. ἵστιν, ἢ ὡς εἰς τῶν προφ. would have to be explained: *he is a prophet, or (at least) like to one of the prophets.*

² Mentioning even the name of *Philip*. Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 5. 4, names him by the family name *Herodes*, which does not necessitate the supposition of a confusion as to the name on the part of Mark (Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 51). Only we may not understand Philip the *tetrarch*, but a half-brother of his, bearing a similar name. See on Matt. xiv. 3.

ἐφοβέϊτο] *he feared him*; he was afraid that this holy man, if he suffered him to be put to death, would bring misfortune upon him. From this fear arose also the utterance contained in vv. 14, 16: "Herodem non timuit Johannes," Bengel. — συνετήρει] not: *magni eum faciebat* (Erasmus, Grotius, Fritzsche, de Wette), which the word does not mean, but *he guarded him* (Matt. ix. 17; Luke v. 38; Tob. iii. 15; 2 Macc. xii. 42; Polyb. iv. 60. 10; Herodian, ii. 1. 11), *i.e.* he did not abandon him, but took care that no harm happened to him: "*custodiebat eum*," Vulg. Comp. Jansen, Hammond, Bengel, who pertinently adds by way of explanation: "contra Herodiadem;" and also Bleek. According to Ewald, it is: "*he gave heed to him*." Comp. Ecclus. iv. 20, xxvii. 12. But this thought is contained already in what precedes and in what follows. The compound strengthens the idea of the simple verb, designating its action as entire and undivided. — ἀκούσας] when he had heard him. Observe afterwards the emphasis of ἡδέως (and *gladly* he heard him). — πολλὰ ἐποίη] namely, which he had heard from John. Very characteristic is the reading: π. ἡπόρει, which has the strongest internal probability of being genuine, although only attested by B L S, Copt.¹—We may add that all the imperfects apply to the *time of the imprisonment*, and are not to be taken as *pluperfects* (Grotius, Bolten). The ἦκουε took place when Herod was actually present (as was now the case; see on Matt. xiv. 10 f.) in Machaerus; it is possible also that he had him sent for now and then to his seat at Tiberias. But in any case the expressions of Mark point to a longer period of imprisonment than Wieseler, p. 297, assumes. — Ver. 21. ἡμέρας εὐκαιρου] εὐκαίρος, in reference to time, means nothing else than *at the right time*, hence: *a rightly-timed, fitting, appropriate day* (Beza, Grotius, Jansen, Fritzsche, de Wette, Ewald, Bleek, and many others). Comp. Heb. iv. 16; Ps. civ. 27; 2 Macc. xiv. 29; Soph. O. C. 32; Herodian, i. 4. 7, i. 9. 15, v. 8. 16; and see Plat. Def. p. 413 C. Mark makes use of

¹ Comp. Buttmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, p. 349. It is to be explained: *he was perplexed about many things*; what he heard from John was so heart-searching and so closely touched him. On ἀπορῶν τ. as equivalent to περὶ τινος, see Krüger on *Thuc.* v. 40. 3; Heindorf, *ad Plat. Crat.* p. 409 D.

this predicate, having before his mind *the purpose of Herodias*, ver. 19, which hitherto had not been able to find any fitting point of time for its execution on account of the tetrarch's relation to John.¹ Grotius well says: "opportuna insidiatrici, quae vino, amore et adulatorum conspiratione facile sperabat impelli posse nutantem mariti animum." Others (Hammond, Wolf, Paulus, Kuinoel) have explained it contrary to linguistic usage as: *dies festivus* (יִום טֹב). At the most, according to a later use of εὐκαιρεῖν (Phrynich. p. 125; comp. below, ver. 31), ἡμέρα εὐκαιρος might mean: *a day, on which one has convenient time, i.e. a leisure day* (comp. εὐκαίρως ἔχειν, to be at leisure, Polyb. v. 26. 10, *al.*, εὐκαιρία, leisure), which, however, in the connection would be inappropriate, and very different from the idea of a *dies festivus*. — On μεγιστάνες, *magnates*, a word in current use from the Macedonian period, see Kypke, I. p. 167; Sturz, *Dial. Mac.* p. 182; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 197. — καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις τῆς Γαλ.] The first two were the chief men of the civil and military service of the tetrarch. Moreover, the principal men of Galilee, people who were not in his service ("status provinciales," Bengel), were called in. — Ver. 22. αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρώδ.] of Herodias herself. The king was to be captivated with all the greater certainty by Herodias' own daughter; another dancer would not have made the same impression upon him. — Ver. 23. ἕως ἡμῖς κ.τ.λ.] in accordance with Esth. v. 3. See in general, Köster, *Erläut.* p. 194. It is thus that the unprincipled man, carried away by feeling, promises. The contracted form of the genitive belongs to the later manner of writing. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 347. The article was not requisite. Heindorf, *ad Phaed.* p. 176. — Ver. 25. Observe the pertness of the wanton damsel. As to θέλω ἵνα (x. 35: *I will that thou shouldst*, etc.), see on Luke vi. 31. — Ver. 26. περίλυπος] on account of what was observed at ver. 20. — διὰ τοὺς ὅρκους κ. τ. συνανακ.] emphatically put first, as the determining motive. — αὐτὴν ἀθετῆσαι] *eam repudiare*. Examples of ἀθετεῖν, referred to persons (comp.

¹ The appropriateness of the day is then stated in detail by ὅτι Ἡρώδης κ.τ.λ. Hence I do not deem it fitting to write, with Lachmann (comp. his *Prolegom.* p. xliii.), ὅ, τι.

Heliod. vii. 26 : εἰς ὄρκους ἀθετοῦμαι), may be seen in Κυρκε, I. p. 167 f. The use of the word in general belongs to the later Greek. Frequent in Polybius. — Ver. 27. σπεκουλάτωρα] a *watcher*, i.e. one of his *body-guard*. On them also devolved the execution of capital punishment (Seneca, *de ira*, i. 16, *benef.* iii. 25, *al.*; Wetstein *in loc.*). The Latin word (not *spiculator*, from their being armed with the *spiculum*, as Beza and many others hold) is also adopted into the Hebrew רוטרספ. See Lightfoot and Schoettgen, also Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 1533. The spelling σπεκουλάτορα (Lachm. Tisch.) has decisive attestation.

Vv. 30-44. See on Matt. xiv. 13-21. Comp. Luke ix. 10-17. The latter, but not Matthew, follows Mark also in connecting it with what goes before; Matthew in dealing with it abridges very much, still more than Luke. On the connection of the narrative in Matthew, which altogether deviates from Mark, see on Matt. xiv. 13. Mark has filled up the gap, which presented itself in the continuity of the history by the absence of the disciples who were sent forth, with the episode of the death of John, and now makes the disciples return, for whom, after the performance and report of their work, Jesus has contemplated some rest in privacy, but is hampered as to this by the thronging crowd. — ἀπόστολοι] only used here in Mark, but “*apta huic loco appellatio*,” Bengel. — συνάγονται] returning from their mission, ver. 7. — πάντα] *What?* is told by the following καί . . . καί: *as well . . . as also*. — Ver. 31. ὑμεῖς αὐτοί] *vos ipsi* (Stallb. *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 63 C; Kühner, § 630, A 3), *ye for yourselves*, *ye for your own persons*, without the attendance of the people. Comp. on Rom. vii. 25. See the following ἦσαν γὰρ κ.τ.λ. — καὶ οὐδὲ φαγεῖν] Comp. ii. 2, iii. 20. — Ver. 33. *And many saw them depart and perceived it*, namely, what was the object in this ὑπάγειν, whither the ὑπάγοντες wished to go (vv. 31, 32), so that thereby the intention of remaining alone was thwarted. πολλοί is the subject of both verbs. — περὶ] emphatically *perfixed*. They came partly round the lake, partly from its sides, *by land*. — ἐκεῖ] namely, to the ἔρημος τόπος, whither Jesus with the disciples directed His

course. — *προῆλθον αὐτοῦς*] *they anticipated them*. Comp. Luke xxii. 47. Not so used among the Greeks, with whom, nevertheless, *φθάνειν τινά* (Valck. *ad Eur. Phoen.* 982), and even *προθεῖν τινά* (Ael. *N. A.* vii. 26; Oppian. *Hal.* iv. 431) is analogously used. — Ver. 34. *ἐξελθών*] not as in Matt. xiv. 14, but *from the ship*, as is required by the previous *προῆλθον αὐτοῦς*. In ver. 32 there was not as yet reported the *arrival* at the retired place, but the *direction of the course* thither. — *ἤρξατο*] His sympathy outweighed the intention, under which He had repaired with the disciples to this place, and He *began* to teach. — Ver. 35 ff. *καὶ ἤδη ὥρας πολλὰ γενομ.*] *and when much of the day-time had already passed* (comp. subsequently: *καὶ ἤδη ὥρα πολλή*), that is, when the day-time was already far advanced, *τῆς ὥρας ἐγένετο ὀψέ*, Dem. 541 *pen.* *Πολύς*, according to very frequent usage, applied to *time*. Comp. Dion. Hal. ii. 54: *ἐμάχοντο . . . ἄχρι πολλῆς ὥρας*; Polyb. v. 8. 3; Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 4. 3. — *λέγουσιν*] more exactly in John vi. 7. — *δυναρ. διακοσ.*] Comp. John vi. 7, by whom this trait of the history, passed over by Matthew and Luke, not a mere addition of Mark (Bleek, Hilgenfeld), is confirmed. That the *contents of the treasure-chest* consisted exactly of two hundred denarii (Grotius and others) is not clear from the text. The disciples, on an approximate hasty estimate, certainly much too small (amounting to about £7, 13s., and consequently not quite one-third of a penny per man), specify a sum *as that which would be required*. It is otherwise at John vi. 7. Moreover, the answer of the disciples bears the stamp of a certain irritated *surprise* at the suggestion *δότε αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.*,—a giving, however, which was afterwards to be realized, ver. 41.—With the reading *δώσομεν*, ver. 37 (see the critical remarks), the note of interrogation is to be placed, with Lachmann, after *ἄρτους*, so that *καί* is then the *consecutive*; *and so shall we*, etc. The reading *ἀπελθόντες* on to *φαγεῖν* together *without interrogation* (Ewald, Tischendorf), is less in keeping with the whole very vivid colouring, which in vv. 37–40 exhibits a very circumstantial graphic representation, but not a paraphrase (Weiss). — Ver. 39 f. *συμπόσια συμπόσια*] *Accusatives: after the fashion of a meal*, so that the

whole were distributed into companies for the meal. The *distributive* designation, as also *πρασιαὶ πρασιαί* (*areolatim*, so that they were arranged like beds in the garden), is a Hebraism, as at ver. 7. The individual divisions consisted *partly of a hundred, partly of fifty* (not 150, Heupel, Wetstein). — *χλωρῶ*] Mark depicts; it was *spring* (John vi. 4). — *εὐλόγησε*] refers to the prayer at a meal. It is otherwise in Luke. See on Matt. xiv. 19. — Ver. 41. *καὶ τ. δύο ἰχθ.*] also the two fishes. — *ἐμέρισε πᾶσι*] namely, *by means of the apostles*, as with the loaves. — Ver. 43. *And they took up of fragments twelve full baskets*, in which, however, *κλασμάτων* is emphatically prefixed. Yet probably Mark wrote *κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα* (so Tischendorf), which, indeed, is only attested fully by B, and incompletely by L, Δ, min. (which read *κοφίνους*), as well as by K, which has *κλασμάτων δώδ. κοφίνων πληρώματα*, but was very easily subjected to gloss and alteration from the five parallel passages. This reading is to be explained: *and they took up as fragments fillings of twelve baskets, i.e. they took up in fragments twelve baskets full.* — *καὶ ἀπὸ τ. ἰχθ.*] also of the fishes, that it might not be thought that the *κλάσματα* had been merely fragments of bread. Fritzsche without probability goes beyond the twelve baskets, and imports the idea: “and further in addition some remnants of the fishes,” so that *τί* is supplied (so also Grotius and Bleek). — Why ver. 44 should have been copied, not from Mark, but from Matt. xiv. 21 (Holtzmann), it is not easy to see. — *τοὺς ἄρτους*] These had been the principal food (comp. ver. 52); to their number corresponded also that of those who were satisfied.

Vv. 45-56. Comp. on Matt. xiv. 22-36. The latter abridges indeed, but adds, probably from a tradition¹ not known to Mark, the intervening scene xiv. 28-31. The conclusion has remained peculiar to Mark. — *ἠνάγκασε κ.τ.λ.*]

¹ According to Hilgenfeld, Mark purposely suppressed the incident under the influence of a Petrine tendency, because Peter had shown weakness of faith. In this case he would have been inconsistent enough in narratives such as at viii. 33. Weizsäcker rightly recognises in Matt. *l.c.* the later representation, which, however, is merely a further embellishment not belonging to history.

remaining behind *alone*, He could the more easily withdraw Himself unobserved from the people. — τὸ πλοῖον] *the ship*, in which they had come. — Βηθσαϊδάν] The place on the western coast of the lake, in *Galilee*, is meant, Matt. xi. 21. See ver. 53, viii. 22; John vi. 17. In opposition to Wieseler and Lange, who understand the *eastern* Bethsaida, see on Matt. xiv. 22, Remark. As to the relation of this statement to Luke ix. 10, see *in loc.* — ἀπολύει (see the critical remarks) is to be explained from the peculiarity of the Greek in introducing in the direct mode of expression in oblique discourse, by which means the representation gains in liveliness. See Kühner, II. p. 594 f., and *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 3. 14; Bernhardt, p. 389. — ἀποταξάμ. αὐτοῖς] *after He had taken leave of them* (of the people), an expression of later Greek. See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 24; Wetstein *in loc.* — Ver. 48. A point is to be placed, with Lachmann and Tischendorf, after θαλάσσης, and then a colon after αὐτούς; but ἦν γὰρ ὁ ἄνεμ. ἐναντ. αὐτ. is a parenthesis. *When He had seen them in distress* (ιδών, see the critical remarks), this induced Him about the fourth watch of the night to come to them walking on the sea (not upon its shore). His purpose therein was to help them (ver. 51); but the initiative in this matter was to come from the side of the disciples; therefore He wished to pass by before the ship, in order to be observed by them (ver. 49). — περὶ τετάρτ. φυλακ.] The difficulties suggested by the lateness of the time at which they were still sailing, after having already ὀψίας γενομένης reached the middle of the lake (Strauss, B. Bauer), are quite explained by the violence of the contrary wind. Comp. Ebrard, p. 392; Robinson, *Pal.* III. p. 527, 572. — παρελθεῖν αὐτούς] The Vulgate rightly has: *præterire eos* (Hom. *Il.* viii. 239; Plat. *Alc.* i. 123 B), not: “to come over (the lake) to them,” Ewald (yet comp. his *Gesch. Chr.* p. 365). This is at variance with the New Testament usage, although poets (as Eur. *Med.* 1137, 1275) join παρέρχεσθαι, to come to any one, with the accusative; moreover, after ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτούς the remark would be superfluous. It might mean: He wished to overtake them (*antervertere*, see Hom. *Od.* viii. 230; Sturz, *Lxx. Xen.* III. p. 453; Ameis and Nägelsbach on Hom. *Il.* i.

132), but the primary and most usual meaning is quite appropriate. — Ver. 51. ἐκ περισσοῦ] is further strengthened by λίαν: *very much above all measure*. Comp. λίαν ἄγαν (Meineke, *Menand.* p. 152), and similar expressions (Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 62), also λίαν βέλπιστα, Plat. *Eryx.* p. 393 E. — ἐν ἑαυτοῖς] *in their own hearts*, without giving vent to their feelings in utterances, as at iv. 14. — ἐθαύμαζον] The imperfect denotes (comp. Acts ii. 7) the continuance of the feeling after the first amazement. — Ver. 52. γάρ] *for they attained not to understanding in the matter of the loaves* (on occasion of that marvellous feeding with bread, ver. 41 ff.); otherwise they would, by virtue of the insight acquired on occasion of that work of Christ, have known how to judge correctly of the present new miracle, in which the same divine power had operated through Him,¹ and they would not have fallen into such boundless surprise and astonishment. Bengel says correctly: “Debuerant a paue ad mare concludere.” De Wette unjustly describes it as “an observation belonging to the craving for miracles;” and Hilgenfeld arbitrarily, as “a foil” to glorify the confession of Peter. — ἦν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] informs us of the internal *reason* of their not attaining insight in the matter of the loaves; their heart, *i.e.* the seat of their internal vital activity (Beck, *Seelenlehre*, p. 67; Delitzsch, *Psych.* p. 248 ff.), was withal in a state of hardening, wherein they were as to mind and disposition obtuse and inaccessible to the higher knowledge and its practically determining influence. Comp. viii. 7. — Ver. 53. διαπεράσ.] points back to ver. 45. — ἐπὶ τ. γῆν Γεννησ.] not: *into* the country, but *unto* the country of Gennesareth; for the landing (προσωρμίσθ.) and disembarking *does not follow till afterwards*. — Ver. 55. περιδραμόντες] in order to fetch the sick. — ἤρξατο] belongs to the description of the quick result. *Immediately* they knew Him, they ran round about and began, etc. — περιφέρειν] is not inappro-

¹ Mark therefore regarded the walking on the sea quite differently from Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 287 f., for this latter finds the pith of the miracle in the complete divine *equanimity* of the mind of Jesus, and in respect of that even says: “the dog falls into the water and swims, but the man falls into it and is drowned,” namely, by his alarm, instead of poising himself amidst the waves in the triumphant equanimity of his mind. This is an extravagance of naturalizing.

pritate (Fritzsche), which would only be the case, if it were necessary to suppose that the *individual* sick man had been carried *about*. But it is to be understood *summarily* of the sick; these were *carried about*—one hither, another thither, wherever Jesus was at the time (comp. ver. 56).—Hence ὅπου ἤκουον, ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐστὶ cannot mean: *from all the places, at which (ὅπου) they heard that He was there* (in the region of Gennesareth), but *both ὅπου and ἐκεῖ*, although we may not blend them after the analogy of the Hebrew עַם-רַחֲמָנָא into the simple *ubi* (Beza, Grotius, Wetstein, and many others), must denote the (changing, see ver. 56) abode of Jesus. They brought the sick round about *to the places, at which they were told that He was to be found there*. We may conceive that the people before going forth with their sick first make inquiry in the surrounding places, whether Jesus is there. Wherever on this inquiry they hear that He is present, thither they bring the sick.—Ver. 56. εἰς κώμ. ἢ πόλεις] therefore not merely limiting Himself to the small district of Gennesareth, where He had landed. The following ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς, however, is not in keeping with ἀγρός (country-places). A want of precision, which has suggested the reading ἐν ταῖς πλατειαῖς in D, Vulg. It. The expression is zeugmatic.—καὶ τοῦ κρασπ. κ.τ.λ.] comp. v. 28. As to the mode of expression, see Acts v. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 16.—ὅσοι ἂν ἤπτοντο] *all whosoever*, in the several cases. Comp. above: ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο. See Hermann, *de part. ἂν*, p. 26 ff.; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 145; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 186 f. [E. T. 216].—ἐσώζοντο] analogously to the case of the woman with an issue of blood, v. 29, 30, yet not independent of the knowledge and will of Jesus. And αὐτοῦ refers to *Jesus*, no matter *where* they touched Him.

CHAPTER VII

VER. 2. ἄρτους] Lachm. and Tisch. read τοὺς ἄρτους, following B D L Δ, min. Rightly; the article was passed over, because it was regarded as superfluous. The reading ἄρτον (Fritzsche) has in its favour only Σ, min. and vss., and is from Matt. xv. 2. — After ἄρτους Elz. and Fritzsche have ἐμέμψαντο, which, however, is absent from witnesses so important, that it must be regarded as an addition; instead of it D has κατέγνωσαν. — Ver. 5. ἔπειτα] B D L Σ, min. Syr. Copt. Vulg. It. have καί (Δ has ἔπειτα καί). Recommended by Griesb., and adopted by Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; ἔπειτα was written on the margin on account of the construction, and then displaced the καί. — κοιναῖς] Elz. Scholz have ἀνίπτοις, in opposition to B D Σ, min. vss. An interpretation. — Ver. 8. γάρ] is wanting in B D L Δ Σ, min. Copt. Arm. It. Goth. Lachm. Tisch. A connecting addition. — βαπτισμοὺς . . . ποιῆτε is wanting in B L Δ Σ, min. Copt. Arm. There are many variations in detail. Bracketed by Lachm. *ed. min.*, deleted by Fritzsche, and now also by Tisch. Rightly restored again by Lachm. *ed. maj.* For, if it were an interpolation from vv. 4 and 13, there would be inserted, as at ver. 4, ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν, and, as in ver. 13, not ἄλλα; moreover, an interpolator would certainly not have forgotten the washing of hands. The explanatory comment of Mark, vv. 3, 4, tells precisely in favour of the genuineness, for the joint-mention of the ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν in that place has its reason in these words of Jesus, ver. 8. And why should there have been an interpolation, since the reproach of the Pharisees did not at all concern the pitchers and cups? This apparent inappropriateness of the words, however, as well as in general their descriptive character, strikingly contrasting with the conciseness of the context, might have occasioned their omission, which was furthered and rendered more widespread by the circumstance that a church-lesson concluded with ἀνθρώπων. — Ver. 12. καί] deleted by Lachm. and Tisch., following B D Σ, min. Copt. Cant. Ver. Verc. Corb. Vind. Colb. Omitted as confusing, because the apodosis was found here. — Ver. 14. πάντα] B D L Δ Σ, Syr.

p. (in the margin) Copt. Aeth. Sax. Vulg. It. have *πάλιν*. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. Rightly; *πάντα* was written in the margin on account of the following *πάντες*, and the more easily supplanted the *πάλιν*, because the latter finds no definite reference in what has preceded. — Instead of *ἀκούετε* and *σύνετε*, Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἀκούσατε* and *σύνετε*, following B D H L Δ. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xv. 10. — Ver. 15. The reading *τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενα* (Lachm. Tisch.) has in its favour B D L Δ Σ, 33, Copt. Goth. Aeth. Pers. p. Vulg. It. The *Recepta* *τὰ ἐκπορ. ἀπ' αὐτοῦ* appears to have originated from the copyist, in the case of the above reading, passing over from the first *ἐκ* to the second (*ἐκπορ.*). Thus came the reading *τὰ ἐκπορευόμενα*, which is still found in min. Then, after the analogy of the preceding *εἰς αὐτόν*, in some cases *ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*, in others *ἐξ αὐτοῦ* (min. Fritzsche) was supplied. — Ver. 16 is wanting in B L Σ, min. Copt. Suspected by Mill and Fritzsche as an interpolation at the conclusion of the church-lesson; deleted by Tisch. But the witnesses on behalf of the omission, in the absence of internal reasons which might occasion an interpolation (in accordance with iv. 23; comp., on the other hand, Matt. xv. 11), are too weak. — Ver. 17. *περὶ τῆς παραβ.*] B D L Δ Σ, min. It. Vulg. have *τὴν παραβολήν*. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. The *Recepta* is a gloss. — Ver. 19. *καθαρίζον*] A B E F G H L S X Δ Σ, min. Or. Chrys. have *καθαρίζων* (D: *καταρίζει*). So Lachm. and Tisch. Not a transcriber's error, but correct (see the exegetical remarks), and needlessly emended by the neuter. — Ver. 24. *μεθόρια*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *ὄρια*, following B D L Δ Σ, min. Or. But *μεθόρια* does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., and was supplanted by the current *ὄρια* (comp. Matt. xv. 22). — *καὶ Σιδῶνος*] is wanting in D L Δ 28, Cant. Ver. Verc. Corb. Vind. Or. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Fritzsche and Tisch., comp. Ewald. Rightly; the familiarity of the collocation "Tyre and Sidon" and Matt. xv. 21 have introduced the *καὶ Σιδῶνος*, which also came in at ver. 31, and there supplanted the original reading *ἦλθε διὰ Σιδῶνος* (approved by Griesb., adopted by Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch., in conformity with B D L Δ Σ, 33, Arr. Copt. Aeth. Syr. hier. Vulg. Sax. It.), and changed it into the *Recepta* *καὶ Σιδῶνος ἦλθεν*. — Ver. 25. *ἀκούσασα γὰρ γυνή*] Tisch. has *ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἀκούσασα γυνή*, following B L Δ Σ, 33, vss. The witnesses are very much divided (D: *γυνή δὲ εὐθὺς ὡς ἀκούσασα*); but the reading of Tisch. is, considering this division, sufficiently attested, and in keeping with the character of Mark; it is therefore to be preferred. — Ver. 26. Instead of *ἐκπάλη* (Griesb. Scholz, Lachm.

Tisch.) Elz. has ἐκβάλλῃ. The evidence for the aorist is not decisive, and the present is in keeping with Mark's manner. — Ver. 27. Instead of ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Lachm. and Tisch. have καὶ ἔλεγεν, following B L Δ Σ, 33, Copt. Cant. (D has καὶ λέγει; Vulg.: *qui dixit*). The *Recepta* is an alteration arising from comparison of Matt. xv. 26. — Ver. 28. ἐσθίει] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἐσθίουσιν, following B D L Δ Σ, min. The *Recepta* is from Matthew. — Ver. 30. Lachm. and Tisch. have adopted the transposition: τὸ παῖδιον βεβλημένον (instead of τὴν θυγατρ. βεβλημένην) ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην κ. τὸ δαιμόν. ἐξέληλυθός, following B D L Δ Σ, min. vss. (yet with variations in detail). The *Recepta* is to be retained; the above transposition is to be explained by the fact that the transcriber passed over from the καὶ after ἐξέληλυθός immediately to the καὶ in ver. 31. Thus καὶ τὴν θυγατρ. down to κλίνης was omitted, and afterwards restored at the wrong, but apparently more suitable place. From the circumstance that θυγ. . . κλίνης, and not τὸ δαιμόν. ἐξέληλ., is the clause omitted and restored, may be explained the fact that all the variations in detail are found not in the latter, but in the former words. — Ver. 31. See on ver. 24. — As in iii. 7, so also here, instead of πρὸς we must read, with Griesb. Fritzsche, Lachm., following evidence of considerable weight, εἰς. — Ver. 32. After κωφόν Lachm. and Tisch. have καί, following B D Δ Σ, vss. A connecting addition. — Ver. 35. ἐδίδως] is wanting in B D Σ, min. vss. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; the more frequent in Mark, and the more appropriate it is in this place, the more difficult it was of omission, and the easier of addition; here also in a different order. — Instead of διανοίχθσαν Lachm. and Tisch. have ἡνοίγησαν, following B D Δ Σ, 1 (L has ἡνοίχθησαν). The *Recepta* arose from the previous διανοίχθητι. — Ver. 36. αὐτός] is wanting in A B L X Δ Σ, min. Vulg. Lachm. Tisch.; but superfluous as it is in itself, how easily it was absorbed by the following αὐτοὺς! — Before μαλλόν Lachm. and Tisch. have αὐτοί, following B D L Δ Σ, min. Copt. Goth. Syr. Arm. To be adopted; correlative to the αὐτός, but passed over, as not being recognised in this reference and so regarded as superfluous.

Vv. 1-16. See on Matt. xv. 1-11. The occasion of the discussion, only hinted at in Matt. ver. 2, is expressly narrated by Mark in vv. 1, 2, and with a detailed explanation of the matter, vv. 3, 4. Throughout the section Matthew has abridgments, transpositions, and alterations (in opposition to Hilgenfeld and Weiss). — συνάγονται] is simply: *there come together*, there

assemble themselves (ii. 2, iv. 1, v. 21, vi. 30). The suggestion of a *procedure of the synagogue* (Lange), or of a formal deputation (Weizsäcker), is purely gratuitous. — ἐλθόντες] applies to both; on the notice itself, comp. iii. 22. — With the reading καὶ ἐπερωτῶσιν, ver. 5 (see the critical remarks), a full stop is not to be placed after ver. 1, as by Lachmann and Tischendorf, but the participial construction, begun with ἐλθόντες, runs on easily and simply as far as ἄρτους, where a period is to be inserted. Then follows the explanatory remark, vv. 3, 4, which does not interrupt the construction, and therefore is not, as usually, to be placed in a parenthesis. But with καὶ ἐπερωτῶσιν in ver. 5 a new sentence begins, which continues the narrative. — ἰδόντες] not in Jerusalem (Lange), but on their present arrival, when this gave them a welcome pretext for calling Jesus to account. — τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτοις] Mark explains for his Gentile readers (for whom also the explanation that follows was regarded by him as necessary) in *what sense* the κοιναῖς is meant. Valckenaer, Wassenbergh, and Fritzsche without ground, and against all the evidence, have declared the words a gloss.¹ See, on the other hand, Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. xl. The ἀνίπτοις (Hom. *Il.* vii. 266; Hesiod, *Op.* 725; Lucian. *Rhet. pracc.* 14) stands in contrast with the *prescribed* washing. Theophylact well says: ἀνίπτοις χερσὶν ἡσθιον ἀπεριέργως καὶ ἀπλῶς. — Ver. 3. πάντες οἱ Ἰουδ.] A more popular expression — not to be strained — indicating the general diffusion of the Pharisaic maxims among the people. — πυγμῇ] Vulg.: *crebro* (after which Luther: *manchmal*); Gothic: *uſta* (often); Syr.: *diligenter*² — translations of an ancient reading πυκνά (as in *8*) or πυκνῶς (*heartily*), which is not, with Schulz and Tischendorf (comp. Ewald), to be regarded as original, but as an emendation (comp. Luke v. 33), as indeed πυγμῇ itself cannot be made to bear the meaning of πυκνά (in opposition to Casaubon). The only true explanation is the instrumental one; so that they

¹ Wilke holds the entire passage, vv. 2-4, as well as καὶ . . . ποιεῖτε, ver. 13, to be a later interpolation.

² Some Codd. of the It. have *pugillo*, some *primo*, some *momento*, some *crebro*, some *subinde*. Aeth. agrees with Syr.; and Copt. Syr. p. with Vulgate.

place the closed fist in the hollow of the hand, rub and roll the former in the latter, and in this manner wash their hands (*νίψονται*) *with the fist*. Comp. Beza, Fritzsche. Similarly Scaliger, Grotius, Calovius, and others, except that they represent the matter as if the text were *πυγμὴν . . . ταῖς χερσίν*. The explanations: *μέχρι τοῦ ἀγκῶνος* (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus), and: "*up to the wrist*" (Lightfoot, Bengel), correspond neither with the case nor with the signification of the word. Finally, had some peculiar *ritual form* of washing been meant ("in which they take the one fist full of water, and so pour it over the other hand *held up, that it runs off towards the arm*" (Paulus); comp. Drusius, Cameron, Schoettgen, Wetstein, Rosenmüller), Mark would with the mere *πυγμῇ* have expressed himself as unintelligibly as possible, and a ritual reference so precise would certainly have needed an explanatory remark for his Gentile readers. — Ver. 4. *καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς*] The addition in D, *ἐὰν ἔλθωσι*, is a correct interpretation: *from market* (when they come from the market) *they eat not*. A pregnant form of expression, which is frequent also in classical writers. See Kypke and Loesner; Winer, *Gr.* p. 547 [E. T. 776]; Fritzsche *in loc.* In this case *ἐὰν μὴ βαπτισ.* is not to be understood of *washing the hands* (Lightfoot, Wetstein), but of *immersion*, which the word in classic Greek and in the N. T. everywhere denotes, *i.e.* in this case, according to the context: *to take a bath*. So also Luke xi. 38. Comp. Ecclus. xxxi. 25; Judith xii. 7. Having come from market, where they may have contracted pollution through contact with the crowd, they eat not, without having first *bathed*. The statement proceeds *by way of climax*; before eating they observe the washing of hands *always*, but the *bathing, when they come from market* and wish to eat. Accordingly it is obvious that the interpretation of Paulus, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Lange, Bleek: "they eat not *what has been bought* from the market, *without having washed it*," is erroneous both in linguistic usage (active immersion is always *βαπτίζειν*, not *βαπτίζεσθαι*) and in respect of the sense, to which the notion of special strictness would have required to be *mentally supplied*. — *βαπτισμούς*] is likewise to be understood of the

cleansing of things ceremonially impure, which might be effected partly by *immersion*, partly (*κλινῶν*) by mere *sprinkling*; so that *βαπτισμ.* applies *by way ofzeugma* to all the four cases. — By the *cups* and *jugs* are meant vessels of wood, for mention of the *copper vessels* (*χαλκίων*) follows, and *earthen vessels*, when they were ceremonially defiled, were *broken into pieces* (Lev. xv. 12). See Keil, *Archäol.* I. § 56; Saalschütz, *Mos. Recht*, I. p. 269. — *κλινῶν*] not *couches in general* (de Wette), for the whole context refers to *eating*; but *couches for meals, triclinia* (iv. 21; Luke viii. 16; Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 2. 6; Herod. ix. 16), which were rendered unclean by persons affected with haemorrhage, leprosy, and the like (Lightfoot, p. 620 f.). — Ver. 5. With *καὶ ἐπερωτ.* a new sentence begins. See above on vv. 1, 2. — Ver. 6. Mark has not the counter-question recorded in Matt. xv. 3, and he gives the two portions of Christ's answer in inverted order, so that with him the leading thought precedes, while with Matthew it follows. This order of itself, as well as the ironical *καλῶς* prefixed to both portions, indicates the form in Mark as the more original. Comp. Weizsäcker, p. 76. The order in Matthew betrays the set purpose of placing the law before the prophets. The agreement of the quotation from Isa. xxix. 13 with Matt. xv. 8 f. is wrongly adduced in opposition to this view (Hilgenfeld); it is to be traced back to the collection of Logia, since it belongs to the speech of *Christ*. — Ver. 8. *ἀφέντες* and *κρατεῖτε* (2 Thess. ii. 15) are intentionally chosen as correlative. — *ἀλλὰ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλά*] Such accumulations of *homocotyleduta* were not avoided even by classical writers. See Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 53 f. *τοιαῦτα* defines *παρόμοια* as respects the category of quality. — Ver. 9. *καλῶς*] *Excellently, nobly*, — ironical. 2 Cor. xi. 4; Soph. *Ant.* 735; Arist. *Av.* 139; Ael. *V. H.* i. 16. Not so in ver. 6. — *ἵνα*] “*vere accusantur, etsi hypocritae non putarent, hanc suam esse intentionem*” (Bengel). — Ver. 11. *κορβάν*] *קרבן* = *δῶρον*, namely, to the temple.¹ See on Matt. xv. 5. — The construction is altogether

¹ The following is Luther's gloss: “is, in brief, as much as to say: Dear father, I would gladly give it to thee. But it is Korban; I employ it better by giving it to God than to thee, and it is of more service to thee also.”

the same as that in Matt. *l.c.*, so that after ὥφελ. there is an aposiopesis (*he is thus bound to this vow*), and ver. 12 continues the reproving discourse of Jesus, setting forth what the Pharisees do in pursuance of that maxim. — Ver. 12. οὐκέτι] *no more*, after the point of the occurrence of the κορβᾶν; *previously* they had nothing to oppose to it. — Ver. 13. ἢ παρεδώκ.] *quam tradidistis*. The tradition, which they receive from their predecessors, they have again transmitted to their disciples. — καὶ παρόμοια κ.τ.λ.] a repetition of solemn rebuke (comp. ver. 8). — Ver. 14. πάλιν (see the critical remarks) has no *express* reference in the connection. But it is to be conceived that after the emergence of the Pharisees, ver. 1, Jesus sent away for a time the people that surrounded Him (vi. 56); now *He calls them back to Him again*. Comp. xv. 13. — Ver. 15. There is no comma to be placed after ἀνθρώπου. — ἐκεῖνα] emphasizing the contrast to that which is εἰσπορευόμενον. Observe, further, the *circumstantiality* of the entire mode of expression in ver. 15, exhibiting the *importance* of the teaching given.

Vv. 17-23. See on Matt. xv. 12-20; the conversation, which is recorded in this latter vv. 12-14, is by him inserted from the Logia here as in an appropriate place. — εἰς οἶκον] peculiar to Mark in this place: *into a house*. Jesus is still in the land of Gennesareth (vi. 53), where He is wandering about. — ἐπηρώτων κ.τ.λ.] According to Matt. xv. 15, Peter was the spokesman, the non-mention of whose name in the passage before us is alleged by Hilgenfeld to betoken the Petrinism of Mark, who prefers to divert the reproach upon *all* the disciples in general; but it in truth betokens the *older* representation of the scene. — Ver. 18. οὕτω] *siccine*, *accordingly*, since you must ask this question. Comp. on 1 Cor. vi. 5. — καὶ ὑμεῖς] like persons, who have not the benefit of my guidance (οἱ ἔξω, iv. 11). — Ver. 19.¹ οὐκ εἰσπορ. αὐτοῦ εἰς τ. καρδ.] *it enters not into his heart*. — The word ἀφεδρών does not

¹ The contents of ver. 19, very appropriate as they are for popular argument in the way of naive sensuous representation, are unfairly criticised by Baur, *krit. Unters.* p. 554, and *Markusev.* p. 55, as awkward and unsuitable; and in this view Köstlin, p. 326, agrees with him.

occur among the Greeks, but ἄφοδος. — The reading καθαρίζον (see the critical remarks) would have to be explained: *which* (i.e. which ἐκπορεύεσθαι εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα) *makes pure the whole of the food* (that is eaten), inasmuch, namely, as thereby every impurity passes away from it (by means of the excrements). Thus καθαρίζον would be an appositional addition, which contains the judgment upon the εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται. See Kühner, II. p. 146; Winer, p. 549 [E. T. 778]; Fritzsche *in loc.* But the latter arbitrarily changes καθαρίζον into the meaning: “*puros esse declarat*,” in so far, namely, as all food, clean and unclean, would come digested into the ἀφεδρῶν. With the reading καθαρίζων we must explain: *which* (the draught) *makes pure the whole of the food*, inasmuch as it is the place destined for the purpose of receiving the impurities therefrom (the excretions). Thus καθαρίζων refers to τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα, and is put not in the accusative, but in the nominative, as though καὶ ὁ ἀφεδρὼν δέχεται or something similar had been said previously, so that the ἀφεδρῶν appears as the *logical subject*. Comp. the similar application of the anacoluthic nominative participle among the Greeks (Richter, *de anacol.* I. p. 7; Bernhardt, p. 53; Krüger, § 56. 9. 4), according to which it is not necessary, as with Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 68 [E. T. 78], to assume the abbreviation of a relative clause. Comp. also Stallb. *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 81 A. Moreover, the connection of the course of the matter presented from ὅτι onward requires that καὶ εἰς τ. ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορ. should still be dependent on ὅτι (in opposition to Fritzsche). — Ver. 21 f. *διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοί*] is specialized by all that follows, which therefore is to be taken as the *thoughts* actually presenting themselves, as the *prava consilia* realized. — The following catalogue betrays later enrichment when compared with that of Matthew, and there is not manifest any *principium dividendi* beyond the fact that (with the exception of ἀσέλγεια, *excess*, especially unchaste excess; see on Rom. xiii. 13; Gal. v. 19) matters approximately homogeneous are placed together. — *πονηρίαι*] *malignities, ill-wills*, Rom. i. 29; Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 8. — *ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρ.*] *an envious eye*, as at Matt. xx. 15. — *ἄφροσύνη*] *unreason, morally irrational conduct*,

Wisdom. xii. 23. Foolishness of moral practice. Comp. on Eph. v. 17; Beck, *Seelenl.* p. 63 (its opposite is *σωφροσύνη*), not merely *in loquendo*, to which, moreover, *ὑπερηφανία* (*arrogance*) is arbitrarily limited (in opposition to Luther's gloss; Fritzsche also, and de Wette, and many others). — Ver. 23. As of all good, so also of all evil, *the heart* is the inmost life-seat. See Delitzsch, *Psych.* p. 250.

Vv. 24-30. See on Matt. xv. 21-29, who in vv. 23-25 has added what is certainly original. — *ἐκείθεν*] out of the land of Genesareth, vi. 53. — *εἰς τὰ μεθόρια Τύρου*] *into the regions bordering on Tyre* (Xen. *Cyr.* i. 4. 16; Thuc. ii. 27. 2, iv. 56. 2, iv. 99; Herodian, v. 4. 11; Lucian, *V. H.* i. 20). It is not, withal, said even here (comp. Matt. xv. 21) that Jesus had now left Galilee and betaken Himself into Gentile territory. He went into the Galilean regions bordering on Tyre (the tribe of Asher). According to Mark, it was only in further prosecution of His journey (ver. 31) that He went through Phoenicia, and even through Sidon, merely, however, as a traveller, and without any sojourn. The explanation of Erasmus and Kypke: *into the region between Tyre and Sidon*, is set aside by the spuriousness of *καὶ Σιδῶνος*. — *εἰς οἶκον*] *into a house*. Comp. ver. 17. It was doubtless the house of one who honoured Him. — *οὐδένα ἤθελε γινῶναι*] not: *He wished to know no one* (Fritzsche, Ewald), but: *He wished that no one should know it*. See the sequel. Matthew does not relate this wish to remain concealed; the remark is one of those peculiar traits in which Mark is so rich. But he has no purpose of thereby explaining the subsequent refusal of aid on the part of Jesus from another ground than that mentioned by Matt. xv. 24 (de Wette, Hilgenfeld), since Mark also at ver. 27 narrates in substance the same ground of refusal. — *ἠδυνήθη*] corresponds to the *ἠθέλε*: *He wished . . . and could not*. — *ἥς αὐτῆς*] See Winer, p. 134 [E. T. 184]. On *θυγάτρ.*, comp. v. 23. — Ver. 26. *Ἑλληνίς*] *a Gentile woman*, not a Jewess, Acts xvii. 12. — *Syrophenice* means *Phoenicia* (belonging to the province of Syria), as distinguished from the *Λιβοφοίνικες* (Strabo, xvii. 3, p. 835) in Libya. The (unusual) form *Συροφονίκισσα* is, with Wetstein, Griesbach, Scholz, and Lachmann, to be received on account

of the preponderance of the witnesses in its favour, with which are to be classed those which read *Συραφοινίκισσα* or *Σύρα Φοινίκισσα* (so Tischendorf), which is explanatory (*a Phœnician Syrian*). The *Recepta Συροφοίνισσα* (so also Fritzsche) is an emendation, since *Φοίνισσα* was the *familiar* name for a Phœnician woman (Xen. *Hell.* iii. 4. 1, iv. 3. 6; Herodian, v. 3. 2). But the form *Συροφοινίκισσα* is not formed from *Συροφοίνιξ* (Luc. *D. Concil.* 4), but from *Φοινίκη*. The *Χανααία* of Matthew is substantially the same. See on Matt. xv. 22. — *ἐκβάλλῃ*] (see the critical remarks) *present subjunctive, makes* the thought of the woman *present*, and belongs to the vividness of the graphic delineation; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 618. — Ver. 27. *πρώτον*] certainly a modification in accordance with later tradition, intended to convey the meaning: it is *not yet* competent for Gentiles also to lay claim to my saving ministry; the *primary* claim, which must be satisfied before it comes to you, is that of the Jews.¹ It is the idea of the *Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρώτον καὶ Ἑλληνι*, Rom. i. 16, which has already come in here, added not exactly in a doctrinal sense (Keim), but out of the consciousness of the subsequent course of things and without set purpose—to say nothing of an anti-Judaistic purpose in opposition to Matthew (Hilgenfeld), which would rather have led to the omission of the entire narrative. But in general the presentation of this history in Matthew bears, especially as regards the episode with the disciples, the stamp of greater originality, which is to be explained from a more exact use of the collection of Logia through simple reproduction of their words. Ewald finds in that episode another genuine remnant from the primitive document of Mark. Comp. also Holtzmann, p. 192. — Ver. 29. *διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὑπαγε*] *on account of this saying* (which gives evidence of so strong a confidence in me), *go thy way*. In *ὑπαγε* is implied the *promise of compliance*, hence it is fittingly associated with *διὰ τοῦτον τ. λ.* Comp. Matt. viii. 13; Mark v. 34. — Ver. 30. *εὔρε κ.τ.λ.*] “*Vis verbi invenit cadit potius super participium quam super nomen*”

¹ According to Schenkel, indeed, Jesus was *not* at all *in earnest* with this answer of harsh declination, and this the woman perceived. But see on Matt., and comp. Keim, *geschichtl. Chr.* p. 61 f.

(Bengel). — βεβλημ. ἐπὶ τ. κλίνην] weary and exhausted, but *κειμένην ἐν εἰρήνῃ*, Euthymius Zigabenus, which the demon did not previously permit.

Vv. 31—37. A narrative peculiar to Mark. Matthew, at xv. 30, 31—here foregoing details, of which he has already related many—only states in general that Jesus, having after the occurrence with the Canaanitish woman returned to the lake, healed many sick, among whom there were also *deaf* persons. Mark has preserved a special incident from the evangelic tradition, and did not coin it himself (Hilgenfeld). — *πάλιν ἐξελθών*] his reference to *ἀπῆλθεν εἰς*, ver. 24. — *διὰ Σιδῶνος*] (see the critical remarks): He turned Himself therefore from the region of Tyre first in a northern direction, and went *through Sidon* (we cannot tell what may have been the more immediate inducement to take this route) in order to return thence to the lake. If we should take *Σιδῶνος* not of the city, but of the *region* of Sidon (*Σιδονία*, Hom. *Od.* xiii. 285; Ewald, Lange also and Lichtenstein), the analogy of *Τύρου* would be opposed to us, as indeed both names always designate *the cities themselves*. — *ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων τ. Δεκαπόλεως*] He came (as he journeyed) *through the midst* (Matt. xiii. 25; 1 Cor. vi. 5; Rev. vii. 17) *of the regions belonging to Decapolis*, so that He thus from Sidon arrived at the Sea of Galilee, not on this side, but on the farther side of Jordan (comp. on Matt. iv. 25), and there the subsequent cure, and then the feeding the multitude, viii. 1, occurred, viii. 10. — Ver. 32. *κωφὸν μογιῶλον*] is erroneously interpreted: *a deaf man with a difficulty of utterance* (see Beza, Grotius, Maldonatus, de Wette, Bleek, and many others). Although, according to its composition and according to Aëtius in Beck. *Anecd.* p. 100, 22, *μογιῶλος* means *speaking with difficulty*, it corresponds in the LXX. to the *ὄψ*, *dumb*. See Isaiah xxxv. 6. Comp. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, Ex. iv. 11. Hence it is to be understood as: *a deaf-mute* (Vulgate, Luther, Calovius, and many others, including Ewald), which is also confirmed by *ἀλάλους*, ver. 37, and is not refuted by *ἐλάλει ὀρθῶς*, ver. 35. The reading *μογγιῶλον*, *speaking hollowly* (B** E F H L X Γ Δ, Matthaei), is accordingly excluded of

itself as inappropriate (comp. also ver. 35). — Ver. 33. The question *why Jesus took aside the sick man apart from the people*, cannot without arbitrariness be otherwise answered than to the effect that He adopted this measure for the sake of an entirely undisturbed *rapport* between Himself and the sick man, such as must have appeared to Him requisite, *in the very case of this sick man*, to the efficacy of the spittle and of the touch. Other explanations resorted to are purely fanciful, such as : that Jesus wished to make no parade (Victor Antiochenus, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, and many others); that in this region, which was not purely Jewish, He wished to avoid attracting dangerous attention (Lange); that He did not wish to foster the superstition of the spectators (Reinhard, *Opusc.* II. p. 140). De Wette conjectures that the circumstance belongs to the *element of mystery*, with which Mark invests the healings. But it is just in respect of the two cases of the application of *spittle* (here and at viii. 23) that he relates the withdrawing from the crowd; an inclination to the mysterious would have betrayed itself also in the presenting of the many other miracles. According to Baur, Mark wished to direct the attention of his readers to this precise kind of miraculous cure. This would amount to a fiction in a physiological interest. The *spittle*¹ (like the oil in vi. 13) is to be regarded as the *vehicle* of the miraculous power. Comp. on John ix. 6. It is not, however, to be supposed that Jesus wished in any wise to *veil* the marvellous element of the cures (Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 282), which would amount to untruthfulness, and would widely differ from the enveloping of the truth in parable. — *πτύσας*] namely, on the tongue of the patient;² this was *previous* to the touching of the tongue (comp. i. 41, viii. 22, x. 13), which was done with the

¹ According to Baur, there is betrayed in the narrative of the *πτύσας*, as also at vi. 13, “the more material notion of miracle in a later age.” But it cannot at all be shown that the later age had a more material conception of the miracles of Jesus.

² As in viii. 23 He spits into the eyes of the blind man. It is not therefore to be conceived that Jesus spat on His own fingers and so applied His spittle to the tongue of the sick man (Lange, Bleek, and older commentators), for this Mark would certainly in his graphic manner have *said*.

fingers, and not the mode of the touching itself. — Ver. 34 *ἐστέναξε*] Euthymius Zigabenus well says: *ἐπικαμτόμενος τοῖς πάθεσι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* (comp. Grotius and Fritzsche). Certainly (see *ἀναβλ. εἰς τ. οὐρανόν*) it was a sigh of *prayer* (de Wette and many others), and yet a *sigh*: on account of painful sympathy. Comp. viii. 12, also iii. 5. It is reading between the lines to say, with Lange, that in this half-heathen region duller forms of faith rendered His work difficult for Him; or with Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 352), that He saw in the deaf-mute an image of His people incapable of the hearing of faith and of the utterance of confession (comp. Erasmus, *Paraphr.*). — *ἐφθαθά*] *ⲉⲩⲁⲑⲁ*], imperative Ethpael. — *διανοίχ-
θητι*] *be opened*, namely, in respect of the closed ears and the bound tongue. See what follows. — *αἱ ἀκοαί*] *the ears*, as often in classic use (Eur. *Phoen.* 1494; Luc. *Philop.* 1; Herodian, iv. 5. 3; comp. 2 Macc. xv. 39). — *ἐλύθη κ.τ.λ.*] The tongue, with which one cannot speak, is conceived as *bound* (comp. the classical *στόμα λύειν, γλώσσας λύειν*, and see Wetstein), therefore the expression does not justify the supposition of any other cause of the dumbness beside the deafness. — *ὀρθῶς*] consequently, no longer venting itself in inarticulate, irregular, stuttering sounds, as deaf-mutes attempt to do, but *rightly*, quite regularly and normally. — Ver. 36. *αὐτοῖς*] *to those present*, to whom He now returned with the man that was cured. — *αὐτός*] and the subsequent *αὐτοί* (see the critical remarks) correspond to one another: *He on His part . . . they on their part.* — *ὅσον . . . μᾶλλον περισσότερον*] *however much He enjoined* (forbade) *them, still far more they published it.* They exceeded the degree of the prohibition by the *yet* far greater degree in which they made it known. So transported were they by the miracle, that the prohibition only heightened their zeal, and they prosecuted the *κηρύσσειν* with still greater energy than if He had not interdicted it to them. As to this prohibition without result generally, comp. on v. 43. — *μᾶλλον*¹] along

¹ Here in the sense of “*only all the more.*” See Stallb. *ad Plat. Rep.* iii. p. 397 A; Nägelsbach’s note on the *Iliad*, cd. 3, p. 227.

with another comparative, strengthens the latter. See on Phil. i. 23; Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 719 f.; Stallbaum, *ad Phaed.* p. 79 E; Pflugk, *ad Hecub.* 377. — Ver. 37. *καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκε*] Let *πεποίηκε* be distinguished from the subsequent *ποιεῖ*. The former relates to the miraculous cure at that time, which has taken place and is now accomplished (*perfect*); and *καὶ (even) τοὺς κωφούς ποιεῖ κ.τ.λ.* is the general judgment deduced from this concrete case. In this *judgment*, however, the *generic* plurals *κωφούς, ἀλάλους* are quite in their place, and do not prove (in opposition to Köstlin, p. 347) that a source of which Mark here availed himself contained *several* cures of deaf and dumb people. — *τ. ἀλάλ. λαλ.*] *the speechless to speak.* On *ἄλαλος*, comp. Plut. *Mor.* p. 438 B; Ps. xxxvii. 14, xxx. 22.

CHAPTER VIII.

VER. 1. *παμπόλλου*] B D G L M N Δ Σ, min. Arr. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Goth. Vulg. It. have *πάλιν πολλοῦ*. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. But the former being an *ἄπαξ λεγόμεν*, in the N. T., might very easily have been changed into *πάλιν πολλοῦ*, as *πάλιν* was used in Mark so frequently, and in this place (it is otherwise at vii. 14) was so appropriate. — Ver. 2. Instead of *ἡμέραι*, Elz. has *ἡμέρας*. A correction, in opposition to decisive evidence, as is Matt. xv. 32. — *μοί*] is, according to B D, with Lachm., to be deleted as a supplementary addition. It is from Matt. xv. 32. — Ver. 3. *ἡκουσιν*] As A D Σ, min. have *ἤκασιν* (so Lachm.), and B L Δ Copt. have *εἰσίν* (so Tisch.), *ἡκουσιν* is condemned by preponderant counter-evidence. But as, moreover, almost all the versions deviate from the simple *εἰσίν*, we must abide by the reading of Lachm. If *εἰσίν* had been glossed by a verb of *coming*, the praeterite *ἤκα*, not elsewhere found in the N. T., would hardly have been the word chosen for that purpose. Mark has the verb *ἤκειν* only in this place. — Ver. 6. *παρήγγειλε*] B D L Δ Σ have *παραγγέλλει*. So Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; the historical present was lost in the connection with the praeterite. — Ver. 7. *εὐλογήσας εἶπε παραθεῖναι καὶ αὐτά*] Many variations. Griesb. regards merely *εὐλογ. εἶπε παραθεῖναι* as genuine. Lachm. has *ταῦτα εὐλογ. εἶπεν παρατεθεῖναι καὶ αὐτά*. Fritzsche: *εὐλογ. εἶπε παραθ. αὐτά*. Tisch.: *εὐλογ. αὐτὰ παρέθηκεν*. It may be urged against Griesbach, that a reading without any pronoun has not been preserved at all in the Codd. In the midst of the confusion of readings that has arisen from the double pronoun, that one is to be retained which has in its favour the relatively greatest agreement of the most important uncials. And this is: *εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ* (B C L Δ Σ, min. Copt.) *εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι* (B L Δ Σ**, to which, on account of the pronoun and its position, C also falls to be added with: *εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παράθετε*). This consensus is more important than that which Lachm. has followed (principally relying upon A). The reading of Tisch., simple as it is, and not giving occasion to variation, is too weakly attested by Σ*. —

Ver. 9. οἱ φαγόντες] is wanting in B L Δ S, min. Copt. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Tisch. It is from vi. 44. — Ver. 12. σῆμ. ἐπιζήτει] Schulz, Lachm. Tisch. read ζητεῖ σῆμ., in accordance with B C D L Δ S, min. vss. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xvi. 4. — Ver. 13. ἐμβάς πάλιν] B C D L Δ S, min. Copt. Arm. have πάλιν ἐμβάς. This is to be adopted, with Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch., as the better attested order. — εἰς τὸ πλ.οῶν] Lachm. reads εἰς πλ.οῶν, following A E F G M S V X, min. Fritzsche and Tisch. have entirely deleted it, following B C L Δ S, Corb. Germ. 1, Tol. The latter is right; ἐμβάς had its notion completed. — Ver. 16. λέγοντες] is wanting in B D S, min. It. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch.; the former has subsequently, with B, min. It., ἔχουσιν (comp. D: εἶχον). As well λέγοντες as the first person of the verb was introduced in accordance with Matt. xvi. 7. — Ver. 17. ἔτι] is wanting in B C D L Δ S, min. Copt. Verc. Lachm. and Tisch. As well the omission as the addition might have been occasioned by the last syllables of συνίετε; but more easily the addition, as the connection (οὐπω) so readily suggested an ἔτι. — Ver. 21. πῶς οὐ] Lachm. has πῶς οὐπω, following A D M U X, min. Syr. utr. Perss. Goth. Vulg. It. Theophyl. Tisch. has merely οὐπω, following C K L Δ S, min. The latter is to be regarded as the original. To this οὐπω, πῶς was added (Lachm.) from Matt. xvi. 11; and in accordance with the same parallel, πῶς οὐπω passed into πῶς οὐ (B, Elz.). — Ver. 22. ἔρχεται] ἔρχονται is rightly approved by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. See on v. 38. — Ver. 24. ὡς δένδρα] Lachm. and Tisch. read ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὀρῶ, following decisive evidence. The *Recepta* is an abbreviation to help the construction. — Ver. 25. καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἀναβλέψαι] Many various readings; but not such as to warrant the total condemnation of the words (Griesb.), since they are only wanting in a few vss. The most fully attested is καὶ διέβλεψεν, and this is adopted by Tisch., following B C* L Δ S, min. Copt. Aeth. καὶ διέβλεψεν, not being understood, was variously glossed. — ἐνέβλεψεν] Lachm. Tisch., following B L S** min. (Δ, min. have ἀνέβλεπεν), read ἐνέβλεπεν, which is to be adopted, as the aorist was easily introduced mechanically from what preceded. — Instead of ἅπαντα (approved by Griesb., adopted by Fritzsche, Scholz, Lachm. Tisch.), Elz. has ἅπαντας. But the former is attested by B C D L M Δ S, min. vss., also Vulg. It. (It has πάντα). ἅπαντας is to be regarded as an emendation, on account of τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ver. 24. — Ver. 26. μηδὲ εἰς . . . κώμῃ] very many variations, arising out of the apparent inappropriateness of the meaning; but not such as to justify the striking out of

the second half of the sentence (μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τ. κώμῃ), with Tisch. (B L 8, min. Copt.). In this way it was sought to help the matter by abbreviation. Others amplified (Vulg. It.) and altered (D). — Ver. 28. ἐνα] Lachm. Tisch. have ὅτι εἶς, following B C* L 8, Copt. The *Recepta* is an alteration on account of the construction. If ὅτι εἶς had come in in accordance with Luke ix. 19, ἀνέστη would also be found in Codd. — Ver. 29. λέγει αὐτοῖς] B C D* L Δ 8, 53, Copt. Cant. Vere. Corb. Colb. have ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς. Recommended by Griesb., approved by Schulz, adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.; the *Recepta* is from Matt. xvi. 15. — Ver. 31. ἀπό] B C D G K L 8, min. have ἰπó. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch.; ἀπό is from the parallel passages. — Ver. 34. Instead of ἀκολουθεῖν (which Griesb. Scholz, and Tisch. have adopted), Elz. Fritzsche, Lachm. read ἐλθεῖν. Both readings have weighty attestation; but ἐλθεῖν is from Matt. xvi. 24. — Ver. 35. Instead of τ. ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν in the second half of the verse (Griesb. Scholz), Elz. Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. have τ. αὐτοῦ ψ., again following A B C* L Δ 8. From the preceding clause, and in keeping with the parallel passages. — Ver. 36. ἀνθρώπων] read, with Lachm. and Tisch., following A C* D, min. Or.: τὸν ἀνθρώπον. As well the omission of the article as the reading ἀνθρώπος (E F G H L M X Γ Δ 8* min.) is from the parallels. — Ver. 37. ἢ τί] Tisch. reads τί γάρ, following B L Δ 8, 28, Copt. Or.; ἢ τί is from Matt. xvi. 26.

Vv. 1-10. See on Matt. xv. 32-39. — ἐν ἐκ. τ. ἡμέρ.] An unessential difference from Matthew, but still a difference. — παμπ. ὄχλου ὄντος] *when very many people were there*. The presence of such a crowd is intelligible enough after the miraculous cure that has just been related (in opposition to Holtzmann, p. 85). On εἶναι, equivalent to παρῆναι, comp. xv. 40; John vii. 39; Dorvill. *Charit.* p. 600. On πάμπολυς, only found in this place in the N. T., see Wetstein. Comp. Plato, *Legg.* vii. p. 819 A (πάμπολυς . . . ὄχλος), *Polit.* p. 291 A; Lucian, *Herm.* 61. — Ver. 2. In the nominative ἡμέραι τρεῖς, Hilgenfeld finds an indication of dependence on Matt. xv. 32. Why not the converse? — Ver. 3. τινὲς γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] information peculiar to Mark concerning the previous ἐκλυθ. ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, but still belonging to the words of *Jesus*: hence ἦκασιν (Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 744), *have come*; not: *had come* (Luther). — Ver. 4. πόθεν] *With surprise* the disciples thus ask, as on the

desert surface (ἐπ' ἐρημίας) there is no place *whence* loaves for their satisfaction were to be obtained. — Ver. 7. Mark (it is otherwise in Matthew) narrates in this place (otherwise at vi. 41) two separate actions in respect of the loaves and the fishes.—According to the reading: καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι (see the critical remarks), we must translate: *and after He had blessed them, He bade set these also before them.*—With the small fishes thus, according to Mark, Jesus performs a special *consecration* (comp. on Matt. xiv. 19), as to which, however, in εὐλογ. there is nothing to be found of itself higher than in εὐχαρ. (Lange: “the pre-celebration of the glorious success”). The thanksgiving of Jesus *was* a prayer of praise (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 16). On εὐλογεῖν, with accusative of the object, comp. Luke ix. 16, 1 Cor. x. 16,—in the sense, namely, of uttering over the object a prayer of praise (ברכה), blessing it. — Ver. 8. περισσ. κλασμ. ἐπὶ τὰ σπυρ., *remains left over in pieces seven baskets.* The definition of *measure* is added, according to the Greek usage, in the form of an *apposition*; Kühner, II. p. 117. — Ver. 10. Δαλμανουθά, named nowhere else, was doubtless (comp. Matt. xv. 39) a village or hamlet on the *western side* of the lake, in the neighbourhood of Magdala (or else Magada; see on Matt. xv. 39). See Robinson, III. p. 530 f. Ewald, indeed, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 376 (comp. Lightfoot), conjectures that in *Dalmanutha* we have the Galilean pronunciation of the name of the town דלמנא, where, according to the Mishna, many Jews dwelt. But comp. on Matt. xv. 39. The present village *Delhemija* (Robinson, III. p. 514, 530) lies too far to the south, immediately above the influx of the Hieromax, *eastward* from the Jordan.—The specification of a *better-known* place in Matthew betrays itself as *later*; although Baur thinks, that by such variations Mark probably only wished to give himself a semblance of being independent.

Vv. 11–13. See on Matt. xvi. 1–4, who narrates more fully out of the collection of Logia, and from the tradition adds the Sadducees. — ἐξῆλθον] namely, from their dwellings in the district there. A trait of graphic circumstantiality. Lange imports the idea: as spies out of an ambush. But it is not

easy to see why ver. 11 should fitly attach itself, not to the history of the miraculous feeding (which could not but serve to enhance the sensation produced by Jesus), but to vii. 37 (Holtzmann). Between Dalmanutha and the place of the feeding there lay in fact only the lake. — ἤρξαντο συζ. αὐτῷ] *How* they made the beginning of disputing with Him, is told by ζητοῦντες κ.τ.λ.: *so that they asked*, etc. — Ver. 12. ἀναστενάξας] *after that He had heaved a sigh* (comp. vii. 34), namely, at the hardened unbelief of those men.¹ A picturesque feature here peculiar to Mark. Comp. vii. 34. — τί] *why*—in painful certainty of the *want of result*, which would be associated with the granting of their request. “Tota hujus orationis indoles intelligitur ex *pronuntiatione*,” Beza. — εἰ δοθήσεται] a thoroughly Hebraistic expression of asseveration (*never* shall, etc.), by the well-known suppression of the apodosis. See Köster, *Erläut.* p. 104 ff.; Winer, p. 444 [E. T. 627]. According to Mark, therefore (who has not the significant saying as to the sign of Jonas adopted by Matthew from the collection of Logia already at x. 39 ff., and in this case at xvi. 4), a σημεῖον is altogether refused to this generation of Pharisees.² *For them*—these hardened ones, for whom the signs already given *did not suffice*—*none* should be given; the σημεία, which Jesus gave everywhere, were in fact sufficient even for their conversion, if they had only been willing to attend to and profit by them. — πάλιν ἐμβάς] without εἰς τὸ πλοῖον (see the critical remarks), which is, however, by means of πάλιν obvious from ver. 10. Comp. Xen. *Cyrop.* v. 7. 7: ὥστε ἐμβαίνειν, ὁπότεν Νότος πνέη, Dem. 29. 26, and many other places in the classical writers. — εἰς τὸ πέραν] to the *eastern* side of the lake (comp. ver. 10). Holtzmann is wrong in saying that Jesus here passes over for the *second* time to the *western* side; see on ver. 22.

Vv. 14-21. See on Matt. xvi. 5-11, whose narrative is

¹ This is all that is shown by the following painful question. Lange arbitrarily holds that Jesus sighed on account of the commencement of His separation from the dominant popular party; that there was, at the same time, a forbearing reservation of His judicial power, and so forth.

² By passing over the sign of Jonas, Mark has effaced the *point* of the answer, which Matthew and Luke have furnished.

less concise and more explanatory. — ἐπελάθοντο] quite as in Matt. xvi. 6, and therefore not: *viderunt se oblitos esse* (Fritzsche, Kuinoel). *The disciples* (ver. 15) form the subject, as is evident of itself; for they ought to have taken care as to the provision of bread, but *forgot* it. — εἰ μὴ ἓνα κ.τ.λ.] a statement, which is quite in keeping with the peculiarity of Mark, and perhaps proceeds from Peter (in opposition to Hilgenfeld). — Ver. 15. ὁρᾶτε is *absolute*; and ἀπὸ τῆς ζ. κ.τ.λ. belongs only to βλέπετε, the construction of which with ἀπό (comp. xii. 33) is not, with Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 114, and Kuinoel, to be analysed: *avertere oculos*, but: take heed *on account of*, etc. Comp. προσέχειν ἀπό (Matt. xvi. 6); φόβος ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων (Xen. *Cyr.* iii. 3. 53), *al.* — τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων] According to Matthew (see on xvi. 6), ζύμη is a figure for pernicious *doctrine*, and there appears no reason for assuming any other reference here, such as to the *mali mores*, the *character* (Bleek, Holtzmann), the *mental tendency* (Schenkel), and the like. See on Matt. xvi. 6. Jesus warns against the soul-perilling *doctrines*, which at that time proceeded as well from the leaders of the *hierarchy* (the Pharisees) as from the *political* head (Herod Antipas). Herod was a frivolous, voluptuous, unprincipled man (see Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 47 f.); and the *morally vile principles and maxims*, given forth by him, and propagated by the Jews who adhered to him (the Herodians, iii. 6; see on Matt. xxii. 16), are the ζύμη Ἡρώδου. A wrong attempt at harmonizing will have it that Herod is mentioned (Heupel) as a *Sadducee* (which, however, he never was; see on Matt. xiv. 2), because Matt. xvi. 6 has καὶ Σαδδουκαίων. — Ver. 16. According to the correct reading (see the critical remarks): *and they considered with one another, that they would have no bread.* With respect to the indicative present ἔχουσι, comp. on vi. 45, and Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 203. — Vv. 19, 20. This *dialogue* form is characteristic of Mark's *vivid mode of representation*. — πόσων σπυρίδ. πληρώματα κλασμάτων] See on vi. 43. Observe here, also, as well as in Matthew, the alternation of κοφίνους and σπυρίδων, in accordance with vi. 43 and viii. 8. — By the fact that, after those two miraculous feedings, they still could take thought

one with another about *want of bread*, they show how much they still lack discernment. The reproach of vv. 17, 18¹ refers to this. But in οὐπω συνίετε, ver. 21 (see the critical remarks), the οὐπω applies to the instruction that has just been catechetically conveyed vv. 19, 20, and is therefore a *later οὐπω* than that in ver. 17, standing related thereto *by way of climax*. Schenkel regards as incorrect all that is said of this reference to the miraculous feedings, in consistency with his view that these did not happen at all in the manner narrated.

Vv. 22-26 are found in Mark only. — It is not the Bethsaida situated on the *western* shore of the lake (vi. 45) that is here meant (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Heumann, Heupel, Köstlin, Holtzmann; comp. Bleek and several others), but the north-eastern Bethsaida, completed by the tetrarch Philip (called also *Julias*, in honour of the daughter of Augustus; see Josephus, *Bell.* ii. 9. 1, iii. 3. 5; *Antt.* xviii. 2. 1, xviii. 4. 6; Plin. *N. H.* v. 15; Wieseler, *chronol. Synopse*, p. 273 f.; Robinson, *Pal.* III. p. 566 f.; Ritter, *Erdk.* XV. p. 280; Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 46), from which Jesus goes forth and comes northwards into the region of Caesarea-Philippi (ver. 27); see ver. 13. The weakly-attested reading *Βηθανίαν* (D, Cod. It.) is an ancient alteration, from geographical ignorance of any other Bethsaida than the western one. Ewald, indeed, following Paulus, has again (*Gesch. Chr.* p. 378) preferred this reading, because Bethsaida Julias was not a *κώμη*, ver. 26; but it was Philip who first *raised* it to the rank of a city, and hence its designation as a village may still have been retained, or may have been used inaccurately by Mark.—The blind man was not *born* blind. See ver. 24. — Ver. 23. ἐξήγαγεν] see on vii. 33. — The *spitting* is to be apprehended as at vii. 33. As in that place, so here also, Jesus held it as necessary to do more than had been prayed for. — Ver. 24. ἀναβλέψας] *after he had looked up* (vi. 41, vii. 34). Erasmus erroneously interprets it: *to become seeing again* (x. 51), which

¹ On the thought of ver. 18, comp., besides Isa. vi. 9 f., Xen. *Cyr.* iii. 1. 27: ὦ θαυμασιώτατι ἄνθρωπε, σὺ δὲ γε οὐδὲ ὀρνῶν γινώσκεις, οὐδὲ ἀκούων μίμνησαι, Dem. 797. 3: οὕτως ὀρῶντες . . . ὥστε τὸ τῆς παροιμίας ὀρῶντας μὴ ὀρᾶν καὶ ἀκούοντας μὴ ἀκούειν.

is only conveyed in καὶ ἀποκατεστ. κ.τ.λ. — According to the reading ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ περιπατοῦντας (see the critical remarks): I see the men, *for like trees I perceive persons walking about*, I observe people walking who look like trees (so unshapely and large). This was the first stage of seeing, when the objects appeared in vague outline and enlarged. More harsh is Ewald's construction, which takes ὅτι as the *recitative*, that indicates a new commencement of the discourse.— We cannot decide *why* Jesus did not heal the blind man perfectly at once, but gradually. But it is certain that the agency does not lose, by reason of its being gradual, the character of an instantaneous operation. Comp. Holtzmann, p. 507; Euthymius Zigabenus: ἀτελῶς δὲ τὸν τυφλὸν τοῦτον ἐθεράπευσεν ὡς ἀτελῶς πιστεύοντα· διὸ καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν, εἴ τι βλέπει, ἵνα μικρὸν ἀναβλέψας ἀπὸ τῆς μικρᾶς ὄψεως πιστεύσῃ τελεώτερον, καὶ ἰαθῇ τελεώτερον· σοφὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἰατρός. Comp. Victor Antiochenus and Theophylact. So usually. According to Olshausen, a process too much accelerated would have been *hurtful* to the blind man. This is an arbitrary limitation of the miraculous power of Jesus (see, on the other hand, Strauss, II. p. 66). According to Lange, Jesus desired in this quiet district, and at this momentous time, "to *subdue* the powerful effect of His miracles." As though the miracle would not even as it occurred have been powerful enough. According to Strauss, the gradual character is merely part of *Mark's* effort after *vividness* of representation.¹ A notion unwarranted in itself, and contrary to the analogy of Mark's other narratives of miracles. — Ver. 25. καὶ διέβλεψεν (see the critical remarks): *and he looked stedfastly* (Plato, *Phaed.* p. 86 D; comp. on Matt. vii. 5), and was restored. This stedfast look, which he now gave, so that people saw that he fixed his eyes on definite objects, was the result of the healing influence upon his eyes, which he experienced by means of this second

¹ In fact, Baur, *Markusev.* p. 58, thinks that thereby the writer was only making a display of his physiological knowledge on the theory of vision. And Hilgenfeld says, that Mark desired to set forth the gradual transition of the disciples from spiritual not-seeing to seeing primarily in the case of one corporeally blind. Thus the procedure related by Mark would be *invented* by Mark!

laying on of hands, and which the restoration immediately followed. — καὶ ἐνέβλεπεν (see the critical remarks) τηλαυγῶς ἅπαντα] Notice the *imperfect*, which defines the visual activity from this time *continuing*; and how keen this was! *He saw everything from afar*, so that he needed not to come close in order to behold it clearly. ἐμβλέπειν, *intueri*, see Xen. *Mem.* iii. 11. 10, *al.* In the classical writers used with τινί (*Cyrop.* i. 3. 2; Plat. *Pol.* x. p. 609 D), but also with τινά (*Anthol.* xi. 3). τηλαυγῶς (*far-shining*) with ἐμβλέπειν denotes that the objects at a distance shone clearly into his eyes. Comp. Diod. Sic. i. 50: τηλαυγέστερον ὄραν, Suidas: τηλαυγές, πόρρωθεν φαῖνον. — Ver. 26. εἰς οἶκον αὐτοῦ] He did not dwell in Bethsaida, but was from elsewhere, and was brought to Jesus at Bethsaida. See the sequel. — μηδὲ εἰς τ. κώμην κ.τ.λ.] This μηδέ is not wrong, as de Wette and Fritzsche judge, under the impression that it ought to be μὴ only; but it means: *not even*: so now Winer also, p. 434 [E. T. 614]. The blind man had come with Jesus *from the village*; the healing had taken place outside *in front of the village*; now He sends him away to his house; He desires that he shall not remain in this region, and says: *not even into the village* (although it is so near, and thou hast just been in it) *enter thou*. The second μηδέ is: *nor yet*.—The second clause, μηδὲ εἵπης κ.τ.λ., is no doubt rendered quite superfluous by the first; but Fritzsche pertinently remarks: “Jesu graviter interdicentis cupiditatem et ardorem adumbrari . . . Non enim, qui commoto animo loquuntur, verba appendere solent.” Grotius, Calovius, Bengel, Lange, and various others take τινὶ ἐν τ. κώμῃ to mean: *to one of the inhabitants of the village* (who may meet thee outside). A makeshift occasioned by their own addition. And why should not Mark have simply written τινὶ ἐκ τῆς κώμης? As to the prohibition in general, comp. ou v. 43.

Vv. 27-38. See on Matt. xvi. 13-27. Comp. Luke ix. 18-26. — ἐξῆλθεν] from Bethsaida (Julias), ver. 22. — εἰς τ. κώμας Καισαρ.] into the villages belonging to the region of Caesarea. — Ver. 28. With the reading ὅτι εἰς τῶν προφητῶν (see the critical remarks), εἰ is to be supplied. Matthew was the more careful to insert the name of *Jeremiah* from the collection

of Logia, because he wrote for Jews.—Ver. 29. Mark and Luke omit what Matthew relates in vv. 17–19. Generally, Matthew is here fuller and more original in drawing from the collection of Logia. According to Victor Antiochenus and Theophylact (comp. Wetstein, Michaelis, and others), Mark has omitted it on purpose: *ὥνα μὴ δόξῃ χαριζόμενος τῷ Πέτρῳ κ.τ.λ.* According to B. Bauer, the narrative of Matthew has only originated from the consciousness of the hierarchy. Both these views are arbitrary, and the latter rests on quite a groundless pre-supposition. As the remarkable saying of Jesus to Peter, even if it had been omitted in the collection of Logia (Holtzmann), cannot have been unknown to Mark and cannot have its place supplied by iii. 16, it must be assumed that he purposely abstained from including it in this narrative, and that probably from some sort of consideration, which appeared to him necessary, for Gentile-Christian readers.¹ Thus he appears to have foregone its insertion from higher motives. To Luke, with his Paulinism, this passing over of the matter was welcome. The omission furnishes no argument against the Petrine *derivation* of our Gospel (in opposition to Baur, *Markus-evang.* p. 133 f.), but it is doubtless irreconcilable with its subserving a *special* Petrine *interest*, such as is strongly urged by Hilgenfeld and Köstlin. Comp. Baur in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 58 f. And to invoke the conception of a *mediating* Petrinism (see especially, Köstlin, p. 366 f.), is to enter on a field too vague and belonging to later times. Observe, moreover, that we have here as yet the *simplest* form of Peter's confession. The confession itself has not now for the first time come to maturity, but it is a confirmation of the faith that has remained unchangeable from the beginning. Comp. on Matt. xv. 17.—Ver. 31.² *τῶν πρεσβ. κ. τῶν ἀρχ. κ. τῶν*

¹ Beza, however, justly asks: "Quis crediderit, vel ipsum Petrum vel Marcum praeteriturum fuisse illud *Tu es Petrus*, si ecclesiae Christianae fundamentum in his verbis situm esse existimasset?"

² The view that Jesus Himself now for the first time clearly foresaw His death (Weizsäcker, p. 475; Keim, *geschichtl. Chr.* p. 45), conflicts, even apart from the narrative of John, with ii. 20. Comp. on Matt. xvi. 21. Moreover, we cannot get rid of the mention of the Parousia, Matt. x. 23, and the interpretation of the sign of Jonah, Matt. xii. 39 f. (comp. on Luke xi. 30).

γραμμα.] Although these three form one corporation (the Sanhedrim), still each class is *speciallly* brought before us by repetition of the article, which is done *with rhetorical solemnity*. — μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρ.] *after the lapse of three days*. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 63. More definitely, but *ex eventu*, Matt. and Luke have: τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, with which μετὰ τρ. ἡμ., according to the popular way of expression, is not at variance. See Krebs, *Obs.* p. 97 f. — Ver. 32. καὶ παρῥησίᾳ κ.τ.λ.] a significant feature introduced by Mark, with the view of suggesting a still more definite motive for Peter's subsequent conduct: *and openly* (without reserve, frankly and freely) *He spoke the word* (ver. 31). παρῥησίᾳ stands opposed to speaking in mere hints, obscurely, figuratively (John xi. 14, xvi. 25, 29). — ἐπιτιμ.] *to make reproaches*, namely, ὡς εἰς θάνατον ῥίπτοντ ἑαυτὸν ἐξὸν μηδὲν παθεῖν, Theophylact. But "Petrus dum increpat, increpationem meretur," Bengel. Comp. ἐπετίμησε, ver. 33. — Ver. 33. καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ] when He had turned Himself towards him *and beheld His disciples*. The latter clause gives more definitely the reason for the stern outburst of the censure of Jesus; He could not *but set an example* to the disciples, whom He beheld as witnesses of the scene. Moreover, in ἐπιστραφεῖς there is a different conception from that of στραφεῖς, Matt. xvi. 23. — Ver. 34. Jesus now makes a pause; for what He has to say now is to be said *to all* who follow Him. Hence He calls to Him the multitude that accompanies Him, etc. Mark alone has clearly this trait, by which the ὄχλος is expressly brought upon the scene also (Luke at ix. 23 relates after him, but with less clearness). Comp. vii. 14. This is to be explained by the originality of the Gospel, not by the πρὸς πάντας of Luke ix. 23 (which de Wette thinks Mark misunderstood). Comp. Hilgenfeld, *Markusevang.* p. 61. — ὅστις] *quicumque*, not at variance with the sense (Fritzsche), but as appropriate as εἴ τις. — ἀκολουθ.] both times in the *same* sense of discipleship. See, moreover, on Matt. x. 38. — Ver. 35. See on Matt. x. 39. τ. ἑαυτοῦ ψ.] expression of *self-sacrifice*; His *own soul* He spares not. — Ver. 37. τί γάρ (see the critical remarks) gives the reason for the negative sense of the previous question. —

Ver. 38. γάρ] proves from the law of the retribution, which Jesus will fully carry out, that no ransom can be given, etc. *Whosoever shall have been ashamed to receive me and my doctrines—of Him the Messiah shall also be ashamed* (shall not receive him for His kingdom, as being unworthy) *at the Parousia!* As to ἐπαισχυνθ., comp. on Rom. i. 16. — τῇ μοιχαλίδι] see on Matt. xii. 39. This bringing into prominence of the contrast with the Lord and His words, by means of ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ . . . ἁμαρτωλῶ, is only given here in the vivid delineation of Mark; and there is conveyed in it a *deterrent* power, namely, from making common cause with this γενεά by the denial of Christ. The comparison of Matt. xii. 39, xvi. 4, is not, on account of the very dissimilarity of the expressions, to be used either for or against the originality of Mark, against which, according to Weiss, also σώσει, ver. 35 (Matt.: εὐρήσει, which Luke also has), is supposed to tell. Nevertheless, κ. τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ver. 35, is an addition of later tradition. — ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀνθρώπ.] Bengel aptly says: “Nunc non *ego*, sed *filius hominis*, quae appellatio singularem cum adventu glorioso visibili nexum habet.” Comp. xiv. 62. — And as to this mighty decision, how soon shall it emerge! ix. 1. What warning and encouragement in this promise!

CHAPTER IX.

VER. 1. The arrangement: ὡς τῶν ἐστηκ., in Tisch., following B D* and one codex of the It., is correct; τῶν ὡς ἐστηκ. is from the parallels. — Ver. 3. ἐγένετο] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἐγένοντο, following a considerable amount of evidence. The singular is a correction in recollection of Matt. xvii. 2. — ὡς χιῶν] is wanting in B C L Δ 1, Sahid. Arm. Aeth. Cant. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Tisch. But had it been interpolated, it would not have been ὡς χιῶν (comp. Matt. xxviii. 3), but ὡς τὸ φῶς, that would have been supplied from Matt. xvii. 2, as Or. min. actually have. — Before λευκᾶναι, B C L Δ 8, min. vss. Or. have οὕτως, which Tisch. has adopted. Rightly; as it was found to be superfluous and cumbrous, it was omitted. — Ver. 6. Elz. Fritzsche, Scholz, Lachm. have λαλήσῃ. But a preponderance of evidence favours λαλήσει, which, with Matth., is the more to be preferred, as the future seemed objectionable to copyists lacking nice discernment; hence also in 8, Or. the reading ἀπεκρίθη (according to ver. 5), whence again proceeded, as an emendation, ἀποκριθῇ (Tisch., following B C* L Δ, min. Copt.). — ἦσαν γὰρ ἐκφοβοί] is, with Lachm. and Tisch., following B C D L Δ 8 33, Copt. Sahid. It. Chrys., to be changed into ἐκφ. γ. ἐγίνοντο. — Ver. 7. ἦλθε] B C L Δ 8, Syr. in the margin, Copt. Arm. have ἐγένετο. Recommended by Griesb. It is from Luke ix. 35. — After νεφέλης Elz. Lachm. have λέγουσα, in opposition to very considerable witnesses (yet not to A D L Δ; the latter has λέγων). From Matt. xvii. 5. — αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε] Lachm. Tisch. have ἀκ. αὐτ. The *Recepta* is from the parallels. — Ver. 8. ἀλλά] B D 8, min. vss. have εἰ μὴ, which Lachm. has adopted. From Matt. xvii. 8. — Ver. 10. τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι] D, min. Syr. Perss. Vulg. Jer. have ὅταν ἐκ ν. ἀναστῇ. So Fritzsche (retaining τὸ); already recommended by Griesb., following Mill and Bengel. A gloss, for the sake of more accurate definition. — Ver. 11. Before οἱ γραμμ. Tisch. has οἱ Φαρισ. καί, only following L 8, Vulg. codd. It. It would, with stronger attestation, require to be adopted on account of Matt. xvii. 10. — Ver. 12. ἀποκρ. εἴπεν] B C L Δ 8, Syr. Perss. p. Copt. have ἐφη. Commended by Griesb.,

adopted by Tisch. Rightly; the more prevalent expression crept in from Matth.; ἔφη is only further found in the *Text. rec.* of Mark at xiv. 29. — ἀποκαθιστᾷ] on decisive evidence read, with Lachm. Tisch., ἀποκαθιστάνει. — Ver. 15. ἰδὼν αὐτ. ἐξεθαμβήθη] B C D I L Δ Σ, min. vss. have ἰδόντες αὐτ. ἐξεθαμβήθησαν. Rightly approved by Griesb., adopted by Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. Not the plural, but the singular had its origin in correction. — Ver. 16. Instead of ἐπηρ. αὐτούς Elz. Scholz have ἐπηρ. τοὺς γραμματεῖς, which Lachm. has in the margin. But B D L Δ Σ, min. Copt. Arm. Aeth. Vulg. It. have αὐτούς; τοὺς γραμματεῖς is plainly an interpretation in accordance with ver. 14. — Ver. 17. Following B C D L Δ Σ, 33, Copt. Cant. Ver. Verc. read, with Lachm. and Tisch., καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκ. τ. ἡζλ. — Ver. 18. After ὁδόντας Elz. Scholz have αὐτοῦ; it is wanting in B C* D L Δ Σ, min. Vulg. It. By Lachm. it is only bracketed, by Tisch. deleted. A familiar addition. — Ver. 19. Instead of αὐτοῖς Elz. has αὐτῶ, which Rinck, *Lucubr. crit.* p. 300, defends. But αὐτοῖς has preponderant attestation, and was changed, as the Father has just spoken, into the singular. — Ver. 20. ἐσπάραξεν] B C L Δ Σ, 33 have συνεσπάραξεν. So Lachm. Tisch. It is from Luke ix. 42. The reading ἐσπάραξεν in D also tells in favour of the *Recepta*. — Ver. 21. ἐκ παιδιόθεν (Lachm. Tisch.) is found in B C G I L Δ Σ, min., and is, moreover, supported by D, Chrys., which have ἐκ παιδός. The pleonastic ἐκ was passed over. — Ver. 22. πῦρ] Griesb. Fritzsche, Scholz have τὸ πῦρ, following A E F G K M V r, min. From Matth. — δύνασαι] Lachm. and Tisch. have δύνῃ here and at ver. 23, following B D I L Δ Σ, min. To be adopted; the usual form was substituted. — Ver. 23. πιστεῦσαι] is, with Tisch. (comp. Ewald), following B C* L Δ Σ, min. Copt. Arm. Aeth. Arr., to be deleted. An addition to the simple εἰ δύνῃ, which was not understood. — Ver. 24. μετὰ δακρ.] is wanting in A* B C* L Δ Σ, 28, Copt. Aeth. Arm. Rightly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. It is a gloss on κράξας. — After πιστεύω Elz. Fritzsche have κύριε, in opposition to preponderant evidence. — Ver. 26. κράξαν . . . σπαράξαν] Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. have κράξας . . . σπαράξας, following B C* D L Σ, min. (Δ has κράξας . . . σπαράξαν); the neuter is a correction. — αὐτόν] is, in accordance with nearly the same witnesses and vss., to be deleted, with Griesb. and Tisch. (Lachm. has bracketed it). — πολλοὺς] Lachm. and Tisch. have τοὺς πολλοὺς, following A B L Δ Σ, 33. The article, in itself superfluous, was more easily omitted than added. — Ver. 27. αὐτὸν τῆς χειρὸς] Lachm. Tisch. have τῆς χειρ. αὐτοῦ, following B D L Δ Σ, min. Copt. Arm. Vulg. It. Vict. A gloss (comp. i. 31, v. 41, viii. 23; Matt. ix. 25; Luke viii. 54).

— Ver. 28. The genitives *εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ* (Lachm. Tisch.) are found in B C D L Δ 8, min.; they are, however, to be regarded as an emendation (it is otherwise at ver. 2) on account of the double *αὐτόν*. — Ver. 29. The omission of *κ. νηστεία* (Tisch.) is sufficiently attested by B 8* and one codex of the It., since the addition from Matthew so very easily suggested itself. — Ver. 30. *παρεπορεύοντο*] Lachm. has *ἐπορεύοντο*, following only B* D, Verc. Brix. Colb. The compound, not being understood, was set aside. — Ver. 31. *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*] B C* D L Δ 8, vss. have *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας*; approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. From viii. 31. If *τ. τρίτῃ ἡμ.* had been introduced from the parallel (in this case, Luke), this would rather have been done at viii. 31 (from Matt. and Luke), where it has but very weak attestation. — Ver. 33. *ἦλθεν*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἦλθον*, following B D 8, min. Syr. Pers. W, Vulg. It. (exc. Brix.). Not sufficiently attested for adoption, since at any rate the plural, after ver. 30, occurred more readily to the transcribers. — Before *διελογ.* Elz. Fritzsche, Scholz have *πρὸς ἑαυτούς*, which Griesb. condemned, Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted. It is wanting in B C D L Δ 8, vss., also in Vulg. It. (exc. Brix.), while several cursives place it *after* *διελογ.*, and it is to be regarded as added for more precise definition. — Ver. 34. *ἐν τῇ ἰδῶ*] is wanting in A D Δ, Goth. Cant. Ver. Verc. Brix. Vind. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Fritzsche. But, if it had been added from ver. 33, it would appear *before* *διελέχθ.* Understood of itself, it was easily overlooked. — Ver. 38. *ἀπεκρίθη δέ*] B L Δ 8, Syr. Copt. Tisch. have merely *ἔφη*. Rightly; comp. on ver. 12. — The *Recepta*, Lachm. Tisch. read: *ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. σου*. Griesb. Scholz have deleted *ἐν*. The witnesses on both sides are strong. The simple dative was more precisely defined partly, in accordance with the usual conception “in the name,” by *ἐν*, partly, in accordance with vv. 37, 39, by *ἐπί* (so Fritzsche, although following only U, min.). — After *δαίμονια* Elz. Scholz, Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. have: *ὅς οὐκ ἀπολουθεῖ ἡμῶν*. But this is wanting in B C L Δ 8, min. Syr. Arr. Perss. Aeth. Copt. Brix., while D X, min. vss., including Vulg. It. (exc. Brix.), omit the following *ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολ.* *ἡμῶν* (so Schulz, Fritzsche, Rinck). Accordingly Griesb. regards both as an addition from Luke. But both are to be retained. The former dropped out, because Luke has it not; witnesses, which had the former reading, left out the latter as superfluous and cumbrous. If it had been a gloss from Luke, *μεθ’ ἡμῶν* would have been written instead of *ἡμῶν*; but this only occurs in L. — *ἐκωλύσαμεν*] B D L Δ 8, min. have *ἐκωλύομεν*. So Rinck and Tisch. The aorist is from Luke. —

Ver. 40. Elz. Fritzsche, Tisch. have both times ἡμῶν. But A D E F G H K M S V r, min. and most of the vss., including Vulg. and It., read ὑμῶν; ἡμῶν is an emendation, as it is also in Luke ix. 50. — Ver. 41. Elz. has: ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. μου. But τῷ and μου are wanting in very considerable witnesses, which condemn, although not unanimously, both readings as additions. — Before οὐ μὴ, ὅτι is to be adopted, following B C* D L Δ 8, min., with Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch. — Lachm. and Tisch. read ἀπολ.έσει, following only B D E, min. — Ver. 42. After μικρῶν Fritzsche, Lachm. have τοῦτων, in accordance, doubtless, with A B C** D L N Δ 8, min. vss., including Vulg. It.; but from Matt. xviii. 6, whence also has come the reading μύλος ὀνίκος (Lachm. Tisch., following B C D L Δ 8, min. vss., including Vulg. and It.). — Ver. 43. καλὸν σοὶ ἐστίν] Lachm. and Tisch. rightly read: καλὸν ἐστίν σε, following B C L Δ 8, min. Ver. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xviii. 8; but to derive thence the order εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τ. ζ. (Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch.) is forbidden by its decisive attestation. — Ver. 45. σοὶ σε is still more strongly attested here than at ver. 43, and is likewise to be adopted (with Scholz, Lachm. and Tisch.). — εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον] is wanting in B C L Δ 8, min. vss. Condemned by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. Even in ver. 43 the words are wanting in some, although far weaker witnesses. They are to be retained in ver. 43 (had there been an interpolation, we should have expected εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον, in accordance with Matt. xviii. 8), but in ver. 45 they are to be struck out as a mechanical repetition from ver. 43. — The words ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυσται are only found in all witnesses at ver. 48, whereas in vv. 44 and 46 they are wanting in B C Δ 8, min. Copt. Arm. They are, with Tisch., to be deleted in vv. 44 and 46. They were written on the margin from ver. 48. — Ver. 47. τοῦ πυρός] falls, according to B D L Δ 8, min. Arr. Copt. Arm. Slav. Cant. Ver. Colb. Corb., with Lachm. and Tisch., to be struck out. From Matt. xviii. 9. — Ver. 50. Instead of the third ἄλ.α there is to be adopted ἄλ.α, with Lachm. and Tisch., following A* B D L Δ 8, 1, 28, 209. ἄλ.α is a mechanical repetition.

Ver. 1. See on Matt. xvi. 28. Comp. Luke ix. 27. — εἰσὶ τινὲς ὧδε κ.τ.λ.] see the critical remarks: *there are some here among the bystanders.* — ἐληλυθ.] *having come*; otherwise conceived of in Matthew: ἐρχόμενον. — ἐν δυνάμει] *in power*; comp. Rom. i. 3. When, moreover, in this place the coming of the *kingdom* is spoken of, it is the same nearness of the

Parousia that is meant (comp. on Matt. vi. 10), as at Matt. xvi. 28 (in opposition to Schwegler, I. p. 467; Baur, *Evang.* p. 561; Köstlin, p. 383); not the constituting of the church (Bleek), nor the emergence of the *idea* of the kingdom of God into historical realization (Weisse, *Evangelienfr.* p. 232), the triumph of the gospel (Schenkel), and the like. See viii. 38. With interpretations of this nature the specification of time *εἰς τινὲς κ.τ.λ.*—pointing as it does to the term of the existing generation—is not at all in keeping.

Vv. 2¹-13. See on Matt. xvii. 1-12, where on the whole the narrative is presented in its most original form; Matthew has followed a tradition mostly more accurate (in opposition to Schenkel and Weizsäcker) than Mark, and altogether more so than Luke ix. 28-36 f. — τὸν Ἰάκ. κ. Ἰωάνν.] The one article embraces the *pair of brothers*.—Ver. 3. ἐγένοντο] *plural* (see the critical remarks), indicates the *different* articles of clothing, which became white (a vivid delineation), see Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* I. 2. 33. — οἱ αὖτε γυμνασθέντες κ.τ.λ.] *i.e.* of such nature (they became) as that a fuller on earth is not able to furnish such a whiteness (οὕτως λευκᾶναι, see the critical remarks). ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is added with reference to the *heavenly* nature of that lustre. Bengel well says, moreover: “*χρῶν natura, λευκᾶναι arte.*”—Ver. 6.² τί λαλήσει] *what he shall say* (*future*, see the critical remarks), not inappropriate (Fritzsche); but ἥδει has reference to the point of time, when Peter was just desiring to begin the utterance of what is said at ver. 5; and τί λαλήσει expresses the unknown more strongly and more vividly than the deliberative τί λαλήσῃ

¹ A definite specification of time, similar to μισ’ ἡμέρας ἕξ in this case, is only found again in Mark at xiv. 1, and there, too, of a very important turning-point of the history.

² In this remark (by way of excuse) about Peter Hilgenfeld finds Petrinism; and Baur, a dependence of the writer on Luke ix. 33. As to the latter, the converse is the case. The former springs from the endeavour to discover *tendency* everywhere, even when, as here, it is the most innocent explanatory remark, in which indeed Baur only sees (*Markusev.* p. 68) the character of incompleteness in the writer’s combination of the other two Gospels. In opposition to such unfairness, however, Holtzmann, p. 88 f. 194, goes too far in his defence of Mark, inasmuch as he does not even acknowledge the excusing character of the οὐ γὰρ ἥδει κ.τ.λ., which even Bleek, Weiss, and Hilgenfeld have recognised.

(what he *should* say). — *ἐκφοβοὶ γὰρ ἐγένοντο* (see the critical remarks): *for they became full of terror* (Heb. xii. 21; Deut. ix. 19; Plut. *Fab.* 6; Arist. *Physiogn.* 6), namely, by reason of the *appearances*, vv. 3, 4. — Ver. 7. *καὶ ἐγένετο*] *and there became* (there arose, came into manifestation) a cloud. Comp. Luke ix. 34. — Ver. 8. *And of a sudden*, having looked around, *they saw*, etc. *ἐξάπινα* occurs only here in the N. T., frequently in the LXX., but elsewhere is rare and late. — *οὐδένα*] applies to the *persons who had appeared*; hence *ἀλλά* is: *but, on the contrary*, not equivalent to *εἰ μὴ* (Beza, and many others), which Matthew has. — The *fear* of the disciples is presented by Matt. xvii. 6 with more of psychological accuracy as only *subsequent* to the voice (this is the climax of the event), but in such a manner that they fall down, and Jesus Himself delivers them from it. The saying about building tabernacles does not bear the impress of confusion, as Mark presents it, but that of a still fresh ingenuous joy at the ravishing spectacle; nor yet does it bear the impress of drowsiness, as Luke designates it, whose expression, according to Baur's opinion (see *Markusevang.* p. 69), Mark has only wished to modify; comp. Baur's very unfavourable judgment on the narrative of Mark in general in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 82 f. In Luke the later tradition betrays itself; see on Luke ix. 28 ff., and Holtzmann, p. 224 f. But all three narratives in this particular, as also in their other features, stand opposed to the boldness of Schenkel, who (following Weisse) reduces the whole matter to this, that Jesus had by His *instructive teaching* made the two representatives of the old covenant *appear* to the three confidential disciples on the mountain *in a right light*, in the light of His *own Messianic destination*; while, on the other hand, Weizsäcker abides by a vision as the culmination of a deeper process of faith. And assuredly a visionary element was combined with the marvellous event. See on Matt. xvii. 12, Remark. — Ver. 10. *τὸν λόγον*] what Jesus had just said to them, ver. 9, not the occurrence of the glorification (Beza); see the following question. — *ἐκράτησαν*] *kept the saying fast*; did not let it go out of their consideration, "*non neglectim*

habuerunt" (Bengel). Comp. Test. XII. patr. p. 683 : ἐν ψυχῇ σου μὴ κρατήσης δόλον, Ecclus. xxi. 14 : πᾶσαν γνώσιν οὐ κρατήσει. Comp. Bar. iv. 1 ; Cant. iii. 4 : ἐκράτησα αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκα αὐτόν. To explain it in harmony with the ἐσίγησαν in Luke ix. 36, we must neither attach to the κρατεῖν in itself the meaning: *to keep concealed* (on behalf of which Theodotion, Dan. v. 12, and the Scholiast *Aesch. Choeph.* 78, have wrongly been appealed to), nor bring out that meaning by the addition to it of πρὸς ἑαυτούς (Vulg.: *continuerunt apud se*; comp. Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Lachmann, Ewald, and many others, including even Euthymius Zigabenus; see, on the other hand, ver. 16, i. 27; Luke xxii. 23; Acts ix. 29; comp. Schulz); but simply explain it with Fritzsche, comp. Bretschneider: *they held fast to the prohibition of Jesus*, that is, they were silent on the matter. But this entire explanation does not agree with πρὸς ἑαυτούς συζητοῦντες κ.τ.λ., wherein is contained the accompanying more precise definition of the κρατεῖν τὸν λόγον. — πρὸς ἑαυτούς prefixed with emphasis: *among themselves discussing*, not questioning Jesus thereupon. To *Him* they have another question, ver. 11. Comp. on i. 27. — τί ἐστὶ τὸ ἐκ νεκρ. ἀναστ.] relates not to the resurrection of the dead in general (which was familiar as a conception, and expected in fact as a *Messianic* work), but to the rising just mentioned by Jesus, namely, that the *Messiah* would rise from the dead, which, in fact, presupposed His *dying*, and on that account was so startling and enigmatical to the disciples. Comp. ver. 32; John xii. 34. And in reference to the historical character of the prediction of the resurrection, see on Matt. xvi. 21. — Ver. 11. ὅτι λέγουσιν κ.τ.λ.] *wherefore say*, etc.; that, indeed, is not in keeping with thy prohibition! It is, with Lachmann, to be written: ὅ, τι ("quod est διὰ τί, simillimum illi notissimo εἴ interrogativo," Praefat. p. xliii.); and the indirect character of the question (Thucyd. i. 90. 4) lies in the thought that governs it: *I would fain know*, or the like. See Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Euth.* p. 271 A; Lücke on John viii. 25, p. 311 f.; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 218 [E. T. 253]. Comp. ver. 28, and Homer, *Il.* x. 142: ὅ, τι δὴ χρεῖώ τόσον ἴκει,

Barnab. 7, and Dressel *in loc.* Ewald likewise appropriately takes ὅτι as the *recitativum*, so that the question would be veiled in an affirmative clause (but at ver. 28: *wherefore*). Comp. Bleek. Still the *bashful* expression, which according to our view the *question* has, appears more in keeping with the circumstances. — Ver. 12. Ἡλίας . . . πάντα] a concession of the correctness of the doctrinal proposition (comp. on Matt. xvii. 11), the theoretical form of which (hence the *present*) is retained.¹ Bengel appropriately says: “Praesens indefinitum uti Matt. ii. 4.” — What follows is, with Heinsius and Lachmann, to be punctuated thus: καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ κ. ἐξουδ.: and how stands it written as to the Son of man? He is to suffer many things, and be set at nought. The truth of that proposition of *Elias* as the theocratic restorer, who is destined to precede the Messiah, has side by side with it the Scriptural testimony of the *suffering of the Messiah*. καί is the simple *and*, linking what stands written of the *Messiah* to what was said of *Elias*. Mark ought, after beginning the construction of the discourse with μέν, to have followed it up by δέ; but he passes over in an anacoluthic fashion from the form of *contrast* with which he began into the *subjunctive*. See Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, Exc. i. p. 173; Maetzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 257; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 659. The answer follows in ἵνα κ.τ.λ., and that conceived under the form of the design of the γέγραπται ἐπὶ τ. υἱὸν κ.τ.λ. The entire καὶ πῶς . . . ἐξουδ. is usually regarded as a question, containing an *objection* against the prevailing way in which that doctrine regarding *Elias* was understood: *But how does it agree with this, that it is written of the Messiah that He is to suffer many things?* The solution would then be given in ver. 13: “Verum enim vero mihi credite, *Elias venit*, non est talis apparitio expectanda, qualem expectant Judaei, *jam venit Elias*, Johannes baptista . . . et eum tractarunt, etc., neque ergo mihi meliora sunt speranda,” Kuinoel. Comp. Euthymius Zigabenus, Theophylact, Grotius, Bengel, and many others,

¹ The conjecture of Hitzig in the *Züricher Monatsschr.* 1856, p. 64: ἀποκατε-
ταίναι, is quite as unnecessary as it is grammatically clumsy.

including de Wette. In substance so also Hofmann, *Weissag. und Erfüll.* II. p. 80 f. In opposition to this entire view, it may be decisively urged that it would need an *adversative* particle instead of καί, and that, in ver. 13, instead of ὅτι καὶ Ἠλίας ἐλήλυθε, the expression would have run: ὅτι καὶ ἐλήλυθεν Ἠλίας. Fritzsche, following the reading¹ καθὼς too weakly attested (instead of καὶ πῶς), says: "Quod Judaici doctores perhibent, venturum esse Eliam, non minus certum est, quam e V. T. oraculis illud, fore ut ego Messias multa exantlem." But Fritzsche himself does not fail to see the want of internal connection herein, and hence he conjectures as to vv. 12, 13: Ἠλίας μὲν ἐλθὼν πρῶτον, ἀποκαθιστᾷ πάντα· ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα πολλὰ κ.τ.λ. Ewald also, with whom Holtzmann agrees, comes ultimately to a conjecture that in Mark, ver. 13, there is wanting before καθὼς γέγραπται the clause of Matt. xvii. 12: οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν. He supposes the discourse to have proceeded thus: "*What is said in Malachi iii. of Elias—that, coming before the Messiah, he shall restore all things—retains, doubtless, its truth; but also what the Holy Scripture says about a suffering of the Messiah (as in Isa. liii. 7 f.) must be fulfilled; if, thus, both are to be true, the Elias who is to precede the historical Messiah must in fact have come already, and have been mistaken and set at nought by men, just in the same way as, according to the Holy Scripture, this destiny awaits the Messiah Himself.*" [In this view it is at the same time assumed that the clause, ver. 12, καὶ πῶς γέγραπται κ.τ.λ. is omitted in Matthew.] According to Mark, however, as his narrative lies before us,² the discourse of Jesus rather contains a *sylllogism with a suppressed conclusion*,—in such a way, namely, that the *major proposition* is conveyed in ver. 12, and the *minor*

¹ Which Linder also follows in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 558, arbitrarily enough supplying a *fict.*

² Which does not exhibit a *distinction* between Scripture and fulfilment, as Weizsäcker judges, but the *harmony* of the two. Weizsäcker is also mistaken in his extending the question from πῶς to ἵνα. Accordingly it is assumed to have the meaning, that the Messiah's suffering, according to the prevailing view, is *not* treated of.

in ver. 13: "the doctrine of the prior advent and the prior work of *Elias* is correct, and of the *Messiah* it is written that He has to endure much suffering and setting at nought (ver. 12). But I say unto you, that *Elias* also (before the *Messiah*) has come, and they have done to him everything that they have pleased, according to the Scripture (ver. 13)." The suppressed conclusion is: "consequently there is now impending over the *Messiah* the Scriptural destiny of suffering, since the fate of the *Elias* is already fulfilled." The suppression of this sad closing inference, to which Matthew, ver. 12, gives expression, is dictated by tender forbearance towards the disciples, whom, after so transporting a vision, the Lord will not now introduce any further into the gloomy future. This is assuredly an original feature, in which Mark has the advantage over the narrative of Matthew, who in this history has, on the whole, the more original account.¹ — ἐξουδενωθῇ] The form ἐξουδενηθῇ (Lachmann), as being that which is less prevalent in the LXX., is to be preferred. On the later Greek character of the word in general (only used here in the N. T. —not in 2 Cor. x. 10), see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 182. The signification may be either: *to be esteemed as nothing* (contemnatur, Vulgate, and most expositors), as Ps. xv. 4, liii. 6; 1 Macc. iii. 14; Ecclus. xxxiv. 22; or: *to be annihilated*, as Ps. xlv. 6 (5), lx. 14, cxix. 117; Judith xiii. 17; Ecclus. xlvii. 7. The latter is here most in harmony with the context after πολλά παθῇ. — Ver. 13. ἀλλά] is the continuative jam vero, atque, which introduces a new thought in contrast with the previous one. If the continuation of the discourse were formed purely syllogistically (consequently without λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι), the classical language would have chosen ἀλλὰ μὴν (Becker, *Anecd.* II. p. 839). — καὶ Ἑλίας] *Elias* also, not merely the *Messiah*. That the latter had come, was to the disciples undoubted; but as to the advent of the *Elias* they had scruples. The second καὶ therefore is *and*. De Wette

¹ Holtzmann thinks that in the question and answer *Mark* lays the stress upon the *resurrection of the dead*, while *Matthew* emphasizes the *appearance of Elias*. But in *Mark* too the disciples ask no question whatever about the rising from the dead, but only have their difficulties about it among themselves.

wrongly considers the two uses of *καί* as corresponding, *et . . . et*; in that case *καί ἐλλήλ. 'Ηλίας* must have been read. — *καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν*] has reference to the immediately preceding *καὶ ἐποίησαν κ.τ.λ.*, not to *'Ηλίας ἐλλήλ.*, as Euthymius Zigabenus, Robert Stephens, Heinsius, Clericus, Homberg, Wolf, Bengel, and many others ambiguously connect it. But in these words Jesus does not *mean* what is written of the unworthy treatment of the prophets in general (Kuinoel), against which may be urged the definite *ἐπ' αὐτόν*, but what the Scripture relates of the fate of *Elias* (1 Kings xix.) as type of the fate of *John*. Comp. Grotius, Wetstein, Fritzsche. See also Hengstenberg, *Christol.* III. 2, p. 89. The reference to a lost writing (a conjecture of Bleek) is very unnecessary.

Vv. 14-29. See on Matt. xvii. 14-21. Comp. Luke ix. 37-43. The narrative of Mark is more original, characteristic, fresher, and, for the most part, more detailed than the other two. — *συζητ.*] according to vv. 16-18, on occasion of the circumstance that the disciples had not been able to perform the cure, and so concerning their power of miracles which was now so doubtful. — *ἐξεθαμβ.*] *they were very much amazed* (Orph. *Arg.* 1217; Ecclus. xxx. 9; Polyb. xx. 10. 9: *ἐκθαμβοι γεγονότες*; in the N. T., used by Mark only). But *at what?* Euthymius Zigabenus leaves the open choice between two explanations: *either* at the approach of Jesus so exactly opportune, *or* at the brightness of His countenance (*καὶ γὰρ εἰκὸς ἐφέλκεσθαί τινα χάριν ἐκ τῆς μεταμορφώσεως*, comp. Bengel, de Wette, Bisping). But the *latter* must have been *expressed*; moreover, this cause of astonishment would rather have been followed by a remaining at a distance than a *προστρέχειν* and *ἰσπάζειν*. Hence (comp. also Bleek) the *first* explanation of Euthymius Zigabenus (comp. Theophylact and Victor Antiochenus) is, in accordance with the connection, to be preferred. It was the *amazement of joyously startled surprise*, that, whilst the disciples, who had not been able to help, were in so critical a situation, as was also the father with his unfortunate son, just at that moment the mighty miracle-worker Himself came to their aid. According to Fritzsche, there is denoted generally: "*quanta fuerit Jesu . . . et admiratio in plebe et*

veneratio." Much too general and aloof from the context. According to Lange, what is meant is, "the *starting back* of a multitude, that had become somewhat *profanely* disposed, at the sudden emergence of a manifestation of *punishment*." But Mark has nothing of these psychological presuppositions, and *προστρέχοντες κ.τ.λ.* is not in keeping therewith. According to Baur, *Markusev.* p. 70, Mark has only attributed to the people the impression, "with which *he himself* accompanied the Lord, as He descended from the mount of transfiguration." With such modes of dealing all exegesis is at an end. — Ver. 16. *ἐπηρώτ. αὐτούς*] This *αὐτούς* cannot without arbitrariness be referred to any but those mentioned immediately before—therefore to the *people*,¹ who are accordingly to be conceived, ver. 14, as likewise taking part in the *συζητεῖν*, so that there *συζητοῦντας* also applies jointly to the *ὄχλον πολύν*. So also Bleek; comp. Ewald. The usual reference to the *γραμματεῖς* is consequently to be rejected (although Fritzsche adopts this, and Lange, who, however, assumes a *sympathetic* participation of the people); and so, too, is the reference to the *disciples and scribes* (Griesbach, Paulus, Kuinoel), or merely to *the disciples* (Mill, Bengel). From the above reference it is plain at the same time that in what follows there must be written, not *πρὸς αὐτούς* (so *usually*; hence also the readings *πρὸς ἑαυτούς*, A N*, and *ἐν ὑμῖν*, D, Vulg.), but *πρὸς αὐτούς* (with Bengel, Fritzsche, Lachmann, Tischendorf), since *αὐτούς*, like *αὐτοῖς* in ver. 14, applies to the *disciples*. — Ver. 17. The *father*, included among this *ὄχλος*, begins to speak *in the natural impulse of the paternal heart*, not as if no other would have ventured to do so (Euthymius Zigabenus, Bengel, de Wetze). He is designated, in apt delineation of what occurred, as *εἰς ἐκ τ. ὄχλου*, since it is by his utterance that he first shows himself as father. — *πρός σε*] that is, thither, where I might presume Thy presence, because Thy disciples were there. — *ἄλαλον*] according to the point of view, that the condition of the sick man is the effect of the same condition in the demon. Comp. Luke xi. 14; Wetstein *in loc.* — Ver. 18. *καὶ ὅπου ἂν κ.τ.λ.*] *and wherever he has taken hold*

¹ To whose *ἑστάζοντο αὐτόν* Jesus replies with His question.

of him. The possession (ver. 17) is *not* conceived as constant, but as such that the demon leaves the sick man (epileptic) at times, and then again returns into him (Matt. xii. 44), and lays hold of him, etc. Hence ver. 35: *μηκέτι εἰσέλθῃς εἰς αὐτόν*. The *ἔχοντα* of ver. 17 is not opposed to this (de Wette), for the son *had* the demon—even although at intervals the latter left him—so long as the *μηκέτι εἰσέλθῃς* was not yet realized. — *ρήσσει*] *he tears him*, which convulsive effect is not more precisely to be defined (Euthymius Zigabenus and many others: *καταβάλλει εἰς γῆν*). See on the word, Rulinken, *cr. crit.* I. p. 26; Duncan, *Lxx.*, ed. Rost, p. 1016. Comp. *ῥάσσειν* (of the gladiators); Salmasius, *ad Ach. Tat.* p. 657; and Jacobs, p. 821. — *ἀφρίζει*] change of the subject; Winer, p. 556 [E. T. 787]. The permanent effect of these paroxysms is: *ξηραίνεται*, *becomes withered*, wasted away. Comp. iii. 1. See generally the description of the *morbus comitialis* in Celsus, III. 23. — *εἶπον . . . ἵνα*] *I told it . . . that they*. — Ver. 19. *αὐτοῖς*] the disciples, ver. 18. See, moreover, on Matt. xvii. 17. — Ver. 20. *ἰδὼν αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ.*] when the demoniac (not: the demon, Bleek) had looked upon Jesus, the demon tore him (the patient). On the anacoluthic use of the *nominative participle*, see Matthiae, *ad Eurip. Phoen.* 283; Bernhardt, p. 479; Winer, p. 501 [E. T. 711]. Comp. also Nügelbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 385 f. — *ἐπὶ τ. γῆς*] belongs to *πεσών* (comp. xiv. 35; Xen. *Cyr.* iv. 5. 54). — Vv. 21-24. It is only the specially graphic Mark that has this dialogue. — Ver. 21. *ὥς*] Particle of time: how long ago is it, *when this fell upon him?* — Ver. 22. *καὶ εἰς πῦρ*] *even into fire*. In John xv. 6 also the article is not necessary (in opposition to Fritzsche), although critically attested. — *εἴ τι δύνῃ*] Euthymius Zigabenus rightly says: *ὁρᾶς, πῶς οὐκ εἶχε πίστιν ἀδιστακτον*. Hence the answer of Jesus at ver. 23; hence also the utterance of the father at ver. 24, who felt his faith not to be sufficiently strong. On the form *δύνῃ* instead of *δύνασαι*, see Lobeck, *ad Phrygn.* p. 359. — *ἡμῖν*] the father of the family speaks. — Ver. 23. After deletion of *πιστεῦσαι* (see the critical remarks), *τὸ εἰ δύνῃ* is to be regarded (Winer, p. 163, 506 [E. T. 225, 718]) as *nominative absolute*: *The "if thou canst"*

... "*Everything is possible to him that believeth*," i.e. as far as concerns thy just expressed "*if thou canst*," the matter depends on the *faith*; the *believer* is able to attain *everything*. The article embracing the εἰ δύνῃ substantively (Kühner, § 492) takes up the word just spoken by the father, and puts it with lively emphasis without connecting it with the further construction, in order to link its fulfilment to the petitioner's own faith. Griesbach, Tischendorf, Ewald take τὸ εἰ δύνῃ *interrogatively*, and πάντα δύν. τ. πιστ. as answering it: "Tunc dubitans *si potes* aiebas? Nihil non in ejus, qui confidat, gratiam fieri potest," Griesbach. Comp. Ewald: *Askest thou that: if thou canst?* etc. But the assumption of a *question* is not indicated by the non-interrogative address of the father (whence we should have expected τί τὸ εἰ δύνῃ, or the like), and so we are not warranted in mentally supplying an *aiebas* or *askest thou?* Comp. Bornemann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 122. With the *Recepta πιστεῦσαι* or δύνῃ the explanation is: *if thou canst believe* (I will help thee); *everything is possible*, etc., in which interpretation, however, the τό is without warrant disregarded, as if it were of no significance (but comp. Matt. xix. 18; Luke xxii. 37), and taken only "as a sign of quotation of the direct discourse" (de Wette). So also Linder in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 559. Lachmann¹ places no point at all after πιστεῦσαι, and we might accordingly explain it thus: *if thou art in a position to believe that everything is possible to him that believeth* (so in my second edition). But even thus the τό causes difficulty, and the thought and the expression would be too diffuse, not in keeping with the concise representation of Mark, especially in so impassioned a connection. Lange takes it thus: "the *if thou canst* means: *canst believe*." How enigmatically would Jesus have so spoken! Bleek takes εἰ *interrogatively*. But neither the deliberative character of this question (see on Matt. xii. 10) nor the τό would be appropriate. Bengel's interpretation also

¹ Who nevertheless, *Præf.* II. p. vii., conjectures ΠΙΣΤΩΣΑΙ: "Istud si potes," in quo dubitatio est, facito ut certum et confirmatum des, ut fiat "potes." Ingenious, but very artificial; and πιστῶν only occurs in the N. T. at 2 Tim. iii. 14.

is impossible: "Hoc, si potes credere, res est; hoc agitur." But he well observes on the state of the case: "Omnipotentiae divinae se fides hominis quasi organon accommodat ad recipiendum, vel etiam ad agendum." Fritzsche has *conjectured* either: εἶπεν αὐτῷ εἰ δύνασαι; πίστευε πάντα δυνατὰ κ.τ.λ., or: εἶπεν αὐτῷ τί ἐστὶ τὸ εἰ δύνασαι; πίστευε πάντα κ.τ.λ., and Bornemann, *l.c.* p. 123: εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ πάντα δυνατὰ τῷ πιστ. — Ver. 24. βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ] *help me unbelief*; refuse me not Thy help, notwithstanding my unbelief. Calovius, Bengel,¹ and many others render: *assist my unbelief*, strengthen my weak faith, which, however, is at variance with the contextual meaning of βοήθει (ver. 22). Moreover, the answer of the father, who has just said πιστεύω, but immediately afterwards, in consideration of the greatness of the issue made to depend on his faith, designates this faith in respect of its degree as ἀπιστία, is quite in keeping with the alternation of vehemently excited feeling. Victor Antiochenus rightly says: διάφορός ἐστιν ἡ πίστις ἡ μὲν εἰσαγωγικὴ, ἡ δὲ τελεία. — The substantive τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ brings more strongly into prominence the condition than would have been done by an adjective. See Winer, p. 211 [E. T. 296]. And the prefixed μου represents at the same time the *mihi* of interest (v. 30; Rom. xi. 14, and frequently Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 117 A): *render for me to my unbelief Thy help*. — Ver. 25. ὅτι ἐπισυντρέχει ὄχλος] *that people were thereupon running together*. He wished to avoid still greater publicity. — ἐγώ] emphatically, in contrast to the disciples. — μηκέτι] *no more*, as hitherto. See on ver. 18. — Ver. 26. κράξας . . . σπαράξας] *criying out*, not speaking. The *masculines* belong to the *constructio κατὰ σύνεσιν*; Mark has conceived to himself the πνεῦμα as a *person* (as δαίμων), and has used the attributive participles accordingly, not therefore by mistake (Fritzsche, de Wette). Comp. Xen. *Cyr.* vii. 3. 8: φεῦ, ὦ ἀγαθὴ καὶ πιστὴ ψυχὴ, οἷχῃ δὴ ἀπολιπὼν ἡμᾶς; see in general, Matthiae, p. 975; Bornemann in the *Sächs. Stud.* 1846, p. 40. — τοὺς πολλοὺς] the multitude. The entire description is true and lifelike, and does not aim, as Hilgenfeld thinks, at attaining a very great

¹ Who, however, also admits our view.

miracle. — Ver. 28 f. εἰς οἶκον] as vii. 17. — ὅτι] is to be written ὅ, τι, and, as at ver. 11, to be explained as *wherefore*. — τοῦτο τ. γένος] *this kind of demons* — a view of the words which Ewald also, in his *Gesch. Chr.* p. 385 (not in his *Evangel.* p. 78, 277), recognises “in the present Mark,” but not in Matthew. — ἐν οὐδενί] *by nothing*, by no means. That prayer (κ. νηστ. is not genuine) is meant as a *means of increasing faith* (Matt. xvii. 20), Mark does not *say* indeed, but it follows from ver. 19; hence it is not to be concluded that the utterance contains in his case the sense of a *reproach* that the disciples had not prayed (and fasted) enough (de Wette).

Vv. 30–32. Comp. Matt. xvii. 22 f., who abridges, and Luke ix. 43–45. — ἐκείθεν] out of the region of Caesarea Philippi, viii. 27. — παρεπορεύοντο] *they journeyed along through Galilee*, i.e. they passed through in such a way, that (until Capernaum, ver. 33) they never tarried anywhere. Comp. Deut. ii. 4, 14; Bar. iv. 43; also Mark ii. 23. The travelling *along by-ways* (Lange) is not implied in the verb. — καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν, ἵνα τὶς γνῶ (Lachmann, Tischendorf read γνοί; see on v. 43): similar to vii. 24. But here (ἵνα) the contents of the wish is conceived as its *design*. The *reason* why Jesus wished to journey unknown is given by ἐδίδασκε γὰρ κ.τ.λ., ver. 31, for which deeply grave instruction He desired to be entirely undisturbed with His disciples. This ἐδίδασκε was the continuance of the ἤρξατο διδάσκειν of viii. 31; hence there is no reason for understanding in the passage before us not the Twelve, but the scattered adherents in Galilee (Lange). Moreover, αὐτούς in ver. 33 is decisive against this. Comp. ver. 35. — παραδίδοται] the near and certain future realized as present. — καὶ ἀποκτανθεὶς] has in it something solemn. Comp. Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 25. — Ver. 32. The instructions of Jesus were so opposed to their Messianic expectations, that they not only did not comprehend them, but they, moreover, shrank from any more precise disclosure concerning the inconceivable gloomy fate before them.

Vv. 33–37. See on Matt. xviii. 1–5. Comp. Luke ix. 46–48. Only Matt. xvii. 24 ff. has the history of the stater. Of subordinate importance, perhaps also belonging to

a more local tradition, it seems to have remained unknown to Mark, with which view κ. ἡλθ. εἰς Καπ. in ver. 33 is not at variance (in opposition to de Wette).—Mark is more original in the historical introduction of the point in question, ver. 33 f., whereas Matt. xviii. 3, 4 has rightly completed the narrative from the collection of Logia, but has, on the other hand, withdrawn from the conclusion in ver. 5 its completeness, as it appears in Mark ver. 37 (Matthew has the thought already at x. 40).—ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ] See ver. 30.—ἐσιώπων] from being conscience-struck.—πρὸς ἀλλήλ.] emphatically prefixed: *with one another*, so that they *one against the other* claimed the higher place. It was not the *general* question τίς μείζων in abstracto, but the *concrete* question of *personal* jealousy in their own circle of disciples.—τίς μείζων] This brief, certainly primitive, interrogation is in Matthew more precisely defined by ἐν τῇ βασιλ. τ. οὐρ. from the answer (ver. 3). This more precise definition, however, is not, with Beza, Heupel, and many others, to be imported also here, but it stands simply: *who is of higher rank*, although it is self-evident that they had *also* included in their view their position in the kingdom of heaven.—καθίσας ἐφ' αὐτ. τοὺς δώδεκα] by way of solemn preparation.—*If a man desires to be of the first rank, he must*, etc. This ἔσται expresses the *result* (comp. on Matt. xx. 26 f.),—the state of things that will arise in consequence of that wish,—and thereby defines the *right* θέλειν πρῶτ. εἶναι.—Ver. 36 does not come in unconnectedly (Weisse, Holtzmann), but the progression is: “Of all servants, even of the *least*, the affectionate reception of whom is a service shown to myself,” etc.—ἐναγκαλισ.] *after he had embraced it*. Comp. x. 16. An original trait, which is only found in Mark. The verb occurs only in Mark, but is frequent in the classical writers.—Ver. 37. οὐκ . . . ἀλλά] not *non tam . . . quam*, but with conscious rhetorical emphasis the ἐμὲ δέχεται is *absolutely* negatived (comp. Matt. x. 20), which is intended to denote in the strongest degree the *importance* of the reception of such a child (a child-like unassuming believer, see on Matt. xviii. 5) to fraternal loving fellowship. See Winer, p. 439 ff. [E. T. 623 ff.]; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 9 f.

Vv. 38-40. Comp. Luke ix. 49, 50 (not in Matthew). The *connection of thought* lies in ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόμ. μου . . . τῷ ὀνόμ. σου; the disciples had done the opposite of the δέχεσθαι in the case of one, *who had uttered the name of Jesus*. Comp. Schleiermacher, *Luk.* p. 153 f.; Fritzsche, Olshausen, Ebrard, p. 447 f. So *John* came to his question. Bengel well says: "dubitationem hanc videtur in pectore aliquamdiu gessisse, dum opportune eam promeretur." But Strauss, I. p. 642, and de Wette (comp. also Bleek), attribute this connection of thought merely to the *reporter* (*Luke*, whom Mark follows), who, on the ground of the ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόμ. μου, has inserted just *here* the traditional fragment. This is improbable; such casual annexations are more natural in real living dialogue, and the reflection of the reporter would have found more appropriate places for their insertion, such as after vi. 30. — τῷ ὀνόμ. σου.] *by means of Thy name*, by the utterance of it. Comp. Matt. vii. 22; Acts iii. 6, xix. 13. The exorcist in our passage was not an impostor, but a believer; yet not one belonging to the constant followers of Jesus, although his faith was not perhaps merely elementary, but, on the contrary, even capable of miracles. What he had done appeared to the disciples as a privilege still reserved for the narrower circle, and as an usurpation outside of it. — ὃς οὐκ ἀκολ. ἡμῖν, and then again ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολ. ἡμῖν] John brings this point *very urgently* forward as the motive of the disciples' procedure (it is no "intolerabilis loquacitas," of which Fritzsche accuses the *textus receptus*). — ἐκωλύομεν (see the critical remarks): the *imperfect*, following the aorist, makes us *dwell on the main point* of the narrative. See Kühner, II. p. 74. — Ver. 39 f. *Application*: Of such a man, who, even without belonging to our circle, has nevertheless attained to such an energetic faith in me as to do a miracle on the basis of my name, there is no reason to apprehend any speedy change into reviling enmity against me. His *experience* will retain him for us, even although he has not come to his authorization, as ye have, in the way of immediate fellowship with me. It is obvious, moreover, from this passage how powerfully the word and work of Jesus had awakened in individuals even beyond the

circle of His constant followers a higher power, which even performed miracles; thus sparks, from which flamed forth the power of a higher life, had fallen and kindled beyond the circle of disciples, and Jesus desires to see the results unchecked. Some have found in this man who followed not with the company of the Twelve the *Pauline Christians*, whom Mark makes to be judged of by Jesus only with more tenderness and tolerance than at Matt. vii. 21 f. (Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 140¹); this is more than exaggerated ingenuity; it is the invention of a criticism, the results of which are its own presuppositions. — The construction is regular, and *δυνήσεται* designates the *ethical* possibility. — *ταχύ*] soon (Matt. v. 25, *al.*; Eccus. vi. 18, xlviii. 20; Plato, *Conv.* p. 184 A; *Tim.* p. 73 A; Xen. *Cyr.* i. 1. 1), not: *lightly*, which might be signified by *τάχα*, Rom. v. 7; Philem. 15.

Ver. 41. See on Matt. x. 42. There is nothing opposed to the assumption that Jesus uttered such a saying *here also*, and generally on several occasions. — *γάρ* refers, by way of assigning a reason, to what immediately precedes, in so far, namely, as the *high significance of their position in the world* is contained in *ὅς οὐκ ἔστι καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν*. "For ye are such important persons as the Messiah's disciples in the world, that he who shows to you the smallest service of love," etc. — *ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*] so that this rendering of service *has its impelling reason* in the name, in the characteristic designation, that ye are Messiah's disciples, *i.e. for the sake of the name*. Comp. Winer, p. 346 f. [E. T. 484]. On *εἶναί τινος*, *addictum esse alicui*, see Bremi, *ad Dem. Phil.* III. p. 125, 56; Seidler, *ad Eur. El.* 1098; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 621.

Vv. 42-48. See on Matt. xviii. 6-9. Comp. Luke xvii. 1-4. Jesus now reverts to the demeanour towards the lowly modest believers, as whose lively type the little child was still standing before Him (ver. 36), and administers the

¹ See also his *Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 317 f., where likewise quite untenable grounds are adduced for the above opinion. In the answer of Jesus, Eichthal sees even a specimen of good but *not moral tactics*, and holds that the narrative is an interpolation.

warning that none should give offence to such child-like ones (ver. 42). To comply with this, we need the most decided sternness towards ourselves and self-denial, so as not to be seduced by ourselves to evil and thereby to incur everlasting torment (vv. 43-48). This simple course of the address is often mistaken, and even de Wette (comp. Saunier, p. 111, Köstlin, Baur) thought that Mark had allowed himself to be drawn out of the connection by Luke. The source from which Mark draws is the collection of Logia. — καλόν . . . μᾶλλον] namely, than that he should have accomplished such a seduction. — περίκειται and βέβληται bring vividly before us the state of the case, in which he *is* sunk with the millstone round his neck. — Ver. 43 ff. Observe, according to the corrected text (see the critical remarks), how in the three references to the everlasting torment (which, indeed, according to Köstlin, p. 349, are alleged to be in the taste of a later time) it is only at the end, in the case of the third, ver. 47, that the awful ὅπου ὁ σκόληξ κ.τ.λ., ver. 48, comes in and affectingly winds up the representation. — Ver. 48. A *figurative* designation of the extremely painful and endless punishments of hell (not merely the terrors of conscience), in accordance with Isa. lxvi. 24 (comp. Eccus. vii. 17; Judith xvi. 17). Against the *literal* understanding of the worm and the fire it may be urged that in reality (in opposition to Augustine, *de civit.* xxi. 9) the two together are incompatible, and, moreover, that ἀλί, ver. 49, the counterpart of πυρί, is to be understood *figuratively*.

Ver. 49. Without any parallel; but the very fact of its enigmatical peculiarity¹ tells in favour of its originality (in opposition to de Wette, Weiss, and many others). See on the passage, Schott, *Opusc.* II. p. 5 ff., and *Dissert.* 1819; Grohmann in the *bibl. Stud. Sächs. Geisl.* 1844, p. 91 ff.; Bähr in

¹ Baur judges very harshly on the subject (*Markusev.* p. 79), holding that Mark in this independent conclusion, ver. 49 f., gives only a new proof how little he could accomplish from his own resources, inasmuch as the thought only externally annexed is obscure, awkward, and without unity of conception. By Hilgenfeld the discourse is alleged to be a mitigation of the harsh saying as to cutting off the hand and the foot, and so to confirm the later position of Mark after Matthew. According to Weiss, vv. 49, 50 are "an artificial elaboration"

the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 673 ; Lindemann in the *Mecklenb. Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 299 ff. In order to its correct interpretation the following points must be kept closely in view: (1) The logical connection (*γάρ*) is argumentative, and that in such a way that *γάρ* is related to the *πῦρ* in ver. 48 (because to this the *πυρί* must correspond), not to the entire thought, ver. 43 ff. (2) *Πᾶς* cannot be *every disciple* (Lindemann), nor yet can it be *every one* in general, but it must, in accordance with the context, be limited to those who are designated in the 48th verse by *αὐτῶν* (comp. Luke vi. 40), because afterwards with *πᾶσα θυσία* another class is distinguished from that meant by *πᾶς*, and something opposed to what is predicated of the latter is affirmed of it. (3) *Πυρί* and *άλί* are contrasts; like the latter, so also the former can only be explained *instrumentally* (not therefore: *for* the fire, as Baumgarten-Crusius and Linder in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 515, will have it), and the former can, according to the context, apply to nothing else than to the fire of *hell*, not to the fire of trial (1 Cor. iii. 13), as Theophylact and others (including Köstlin, p. 326 f.) would take it, nor yet to the sanctifying fire of the *divine word* (Lindemann). (4) *Καί* may not be taken as: *just as* (*ὡς, καθὼς*), to which, following the majority, Lindemann also ultimately comes, but which *καί* never expresses; but rather: *and*, joining on to those who are meant by *πᾶς* and its predicate *others* with another predicate. (5) *The two futures* must be taken in a purely temporal sense; and in accordance with the context (vv. 43–48) can only be referred to the time of the Messianic decision at the establishment of the kingdom. Hence, also, (6) it is beyond doubt that *πᾶσα θυσία* cannot apply to *actual* sacrifices, but must denote *men*, who in an *allegorical* sense may be called sacrifices. (7) The meaning of *ἀλυσθήσεται* may not be apprehended as deviating from the meaning (presupposed by Jesus as well of Matt. v. 13. But how specifically different are the two utterances! And what would there have been to *elaborate* in the plain saying of Matt. v. 13? and to elaborate *in such a way*? According to Weizsäcker, ver. 49 f. is only added here “on account of the assonance as respects the figure.” This would amount to mere mechanical work. Holtzmann, however, justly maintains the independent conception of the (primitive-) Mark.

known) which the application of salt in sacrifices had (see Lev. ii. 13, where meat-offerings are spoken of; comp. in respect of the animal offerings, Ezek. xliii. 24; Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 9. 1; and see in general, Lund. *Jüd. Heiligh.*, ed. Wolf, p. 648; Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 37; Bähr, *Symbol. d. Mos. Cult.* II. p. 324; and *Stud. u. Krit.* l.c. p. 675 ff.; Knobel on Lev. p. 369 f.). It was, namely, salt of the covenant (מלח ברית) of God (comp. also Num. xviii. 19; 2 Chron. xiii. 5), i.e. it represented symbolically the covenant with Jehovah as regarded its imperishableness,—represented that the sacrifice was offered in accordance therewith, and for the renewing thereof. Comp. Pressel in Herzog's *Encykl.* XIII. p. 343 f. — Consequently we must translate and explain: "With warrant I speak of their fire (ver. 48); for every one of those who come into Gehenna will be salted therein with fire, i.e. none of them will escape the doom of having represented in him by means of fire that which is done in sacrifices by means of salt, namely, the imperishable validity of the divine covenant, and (to add now the *argumentum e contrario* for my assertion concerning the fire, ver. 48) every sacrifice, i.e. every pious man unseduced, who, as such, resembles a (pure) sacrifice (comp. Rom. xii. 1), shall be salted with salt, i.e. he shall at his entrance into the Messianic kingdom (comp. εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τ. ζωὴν, ὡν. 43–47), by reception of higher wisdom (comp. ver. 50; Col. iv. 6; and as to the subject-matter, 1 Cor. xiii. 9–12), represent in himself that validity of the divine covenant, as in the case of an actual sacrifice this is effected by its becoming salted." Accordingly, it is in brief: for in every one of them the ever-during validity of the divine covenant shall be represented by means of fire, and in every pious person resembling a sacrifice this shall be accomplished by the communication of higher wisdom. It is to be observed, further: (1) that the figure of the salt of the covenant refers, in the case of those condemned to Gehenna, to the threatening aspect of the divine covenant, in the case of the pious, to its aspect of promise; (2) that Jesus does not accidentally set forth the pious as a sacrifice, but is induced to do so by the fact He has just been speaking of ethical self-sacrifice by

cutting off the hand, the foot, etc. And the conception of sacrifice, under which He regards the pious, suggests to Him as a designation of its destined counterpart the sacrificial expression *ἀλιξέσθαι*. (3) Analogous to the twofold distinction of *ἀλιξέσθαι* in the passage before us, although different in the figurative conception, is the *βαπτίζειν πυρί* and *πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*, Matt. iii. 11. — Of the many *diverging* explanations, which in the light of what has just been stated are opposed to the context, or to the language of the passage, or to both, we may note historically the following:—(1) Euthymius Zigabenus: *πᾶς πιστὸς πυρὶ τῆς πρὸς θεὸν πίστεως, ἢ τῆς πρὸς τὸν πλησίον ἀγάπης ἀλισθήσεται, ἡγοῦν τὴν σηπεδόνα* (corruption) *τῆς κακίας ἀποβαλεῖ . . . πᾶσα θυσία πνευματικὴ, εἴτε δι' εὐχῆς, εἴτε δι' ἐλεημοσύνης, εἴτε τρόπον ἕτερον γινομένη, τῷ ἁλατι τῆς πίστεως ἢ τῆς ἀγάπης ἀλισθήσεται, εἴτουν ἀλισθῆναι ὀφείλει*. (2) Luther: "In the O. T. every sacrifice was salted, and of every sacrifice something was burnt up with fire. This Christ here indicates and explains it spiritually, *namely, that through the gospel, as through a fire and salt, the old man becomes crucified, scared, and well salted; for our body is the true sacrifice*, Rom. xii." He is followed by Spanheim, Calovius, L. Cappel, and others: a similar view is given by Beza, and in substance again by Lindemann.¹ (3) Grotius: "Omnino aliqua desumptio homini debetur, aut per modum saliturae (extirpation of the desires), aut per modum incendii (in hell); haec impiorum est, illa piorum;" the godless are likened to the whole burnt-offerings, the pious to the *mincha*. He is followed by Hammond, comp. Clericus and Schleusner. (4) Lightfoot: "Nam unusquisque eorum ipso igne salietur, ita ut inconsumibilis fiat et in aeternum duret torquendus, prout sal tuetur a corruptione: . . . at is, qui vero Deo victima, condietur sale gratiae ad incorruptionem gloriae." Wolf and Michaelis follow this view; comp. also Jablonsky, *Opusc.* II. p. 458 ff. (5) Rosenmüller (comp. Storr, *Opusc.* II. p. 210 ff.): "Quivis enim horum hominum perpetuo igni cruciabitur; . . . sed quivis homo Deo consecratus sale

¹ "As every sacrifice is salted by salt, i.e. by the word of God is made a holy offering, so also every disciple is to be salted by fire [of the divine word]."

verae sapientiae praeparari debet ad aeternam felicitatem." (6) Kuinoel (taking $\pi\upsilon\rho$, with Flacius and others, as a figurative designation of *sufferings*): "Quilibet sectatorum meorum calamitatibus (these are held to be the pains that arise by suppression of the desires) veluti saliri, praeparari debet, quo consequatur salutem, sicuti omnes oblationes sale condiri, praeparari debent, quo sint oblationes Deo acceptae." (7) Schott: "*Quivis illorum hominum (qui supplicio Gecnnae sunt obnoxii) nunc demum hoc igne sale (quod ipsis in vita terrestri versantibus defuit) imbuctur, i.e. nunc demum poenis vitae futurae discet resipiscere. Alio sensu illi salientur, quam victimae Deo sacrae, de quibus loco illo scriptum legitur: victima quacvis sale est conspergenda. His enim similes sunt homines in hac vita terrestri animis suis sapientiae divinae sale imbuendis prospicientes.*" (8) According to Fritzsche, $\gamma\acute{\alpha\rho}$ assigns the reason of the exhortation to suffer rather the loss of members of their body than to let themselves be seduced, and the meaning is (in the main as according to Kuinoel, comp. Vatablus): "Quippe omnes (in general) aerumnis ad vitae aeternae felicitatem praeparabuntur, sicut omnes victimae e Mosis decreto sale sunt ad immolationem praeparandae." So in substance also Bleek. (9) Olshausen: "On account of the general sinfulness of the race every one must be salted with fire, whether by entering voluntarily upon self-denial and earnest cleansing from sins, or by being carried involuntarily to the place of punishment; and therefore [in order to be the symbolical type of this spiritual transaction] every sacrifice is (as is written) to be salted with salt."¹ Similarly Lange. (10) According to de Wette, $\pi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is nearly (?) tantamount to "the receiving by purification the holy seasoning and consecration (of purity and wisdom)," and $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ is comparative. (11) Grohmann takes the first clause in substance as does Olshausen, and the second thus: "as every sacrifice shall be made savoury with salt, so also shall every one, who desires to offer himself as a sacrifice to God, be salted,—that is, shall from without, by sufferings, privations, and the like, be stirred up,

¹ According to Olshausen, we are to find here an authentic explanation as to the significance of the sacrifices, and of the ritual of their salting.

quickened, and pervaded by a higher, fresh spiritual power." (12) Bähr: "As according to the law there must in no sacrifice be wanting the symbol of the covenant of sanctification that consecrates it the salt; so also must every one be purified and refined in and with the sacrifice of self-surrender; . . . this refining process, far from being of a destructive nature, is rather the very thing which preserves and maintains unto true and eternal life." (13) According to Ewald, the meaning is that every one who yields to seductive impulses, because he allows the salt—wherewith from the beginning God has seasoned man's spirit—to become insipid, must first be salted again by the fire of hell, in order that this sacrifice may not remain without the salt which, according to Lev. ii. 13, belongs to every sacrifice; no other salt (no other purification) is left save the fire of hell itself, when the salt in man has become savourless. (14) By Hilgenfeld the *fire* is alleged to be even that of internal desire, through which (this is held to mean: by *overcoming* the desire!) one is said to be salted, *i.e.* led to Christian wisdom; thereby one is to offer a sacrifice of which the salt is Christian discernment. — This great diversity of interpretation is a proof of the obscurity of the utterance, which probably was spoken by Jesus in an explanatory connection which has not been preserved.—The second clause of the verse has been held by Gersdorf, p. 376 f., on linguistic grounds that are wholly untenable, to be spurious; and, as it is wanting also in B L Δ 8, min. and some vss. (on account of the twice occurring ἀλισθήσ. by transcriber's error), it is declared also by Schulz to be a gloss.

Ver. 50. Καλὸν . . . ἀρτύσετε] a maxim of experience drawn from common life, in which τὸ ἅλας is to be taken *literally*. Then follows with ἔχετε κ.τ.λ. the *application*, in which the *spiritual* meaning of the salt (*wisdom*, see on ver. 49, and Buxtorf, *Lxx. Talm.* p. 1208) emerges. The *connection with what precedes is*: In order to experience in yourselves on the establishment of the kingdom the truth: πᾶσα θυσία ἀλὶ ἀλισθήσεται, ye must—seeing that salt, which in itself is so excellent a thing, when it has become insipid, can in no wise be restored—*preserve* in your hearts the salt of

true wisdom¹ and withal be *peaceful* one with another. Against both the disciples had sinned by their dispute about precedence (ver. 34), from which the entire discourse of Jesus, ver. 35 ff., had started, and to which He now again at the close points back. This contest about precedence had been *foolish* (opposed to the *ἄλας*) and *unpeaceful*. — ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἄλας ἀναλον κ.τ.λ.] Comp. on Matt. v. 13. — ἀντὶ ἀρτύσετε] *wherewith shall ye restore it?* so that it shall again be provided with saline efficacy (comp. on Col. iv. 6). — ἔχετε] emphatically placed first: *keep, preserve*, which is not done, if the analogue of the *ἀναλον γίνεσθαι* sets in with you. — ἐν ἑαυτοῖς] *in yourselves*, correlative to the subsequent ἐν ἀλλήλοις (*reciprocally*). Comp. Bengel: “prius officium respectu nostri, alterum erga alios.” — ἄλα (see the critical remarks) from ὁ ἄλς. See Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 93. — καὶ εἰρήν. ἐν ἀλλ.] The annexing of this exhortation was also suggested by the conception of the salt, since the salt was *symbol of a covenant*. Hence the course of thought: *And*—whereof ye are likewise reminded by the symbolic significance of salt—*live in peace one with another*.

¹ Comp. Ignat. *ad Magnes.* 10: ἀλίεσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ (Χρ.στῷ), ἵνα μὴ διαφραγῇ τ.ε. ἐν ὑμῖν.

CHAPTER X.

VER. 1. *διὰ τοῦ*] is wanting in C** D G Δ, min. Syr. Pers. Aeth. Goth. Vulg. It. On the other hand, B C* L S, Copt. have *καί*. So rightly Lachm. and Tisch. This *καί* was, in some cases, deleted in accordance with Matt. xix. 1; in others, more precisely defined by the description contained in *διὰ τοῦ*. — Ver. 4. With Lachm. and Tisch. the order *ἐπέτρεψεν Μωϋσῆς*, following B C D L Δ, min., is to be preferred. — Ver. 6. *ὁ Θεός* is wanting in B C L Δ S, Copt. Colb. Corb. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. An addition by way of gloss, which appeared necessary here, although not at Matt. xix. 4. — Ver. 7. *πρὸς τ. γυν.*] Lachm. has *τῇ γυναικί*, following A C L N Δ, min. codd. It. Jer. From Matthew. Tisch. has now again deleted *κ. προσκολλ. πρὸς τ. γυν. αὐτοῦ*, nevertheless only following B S, Goth. It lies under a strong suspicion of being an addition from Matthew. — Ver. 10. *εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν*] So also Lachm. and Tisch., following B D L Δ S, min. Cant. Ver. The *Recepta ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ* (Fritzsche, Scholz) is an emendation. — *αὐτοῦ περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ*] On decisive evidence we must read, with Fritzsche, Lachm., and Tisch., merely *περὶ τούτου*. The first *αὐτοῦ* is a current addition to *οἱ μαθηταί*; by *τοῦ αὐτοῦ* (D: *τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου*) *τούτου* was glossed for the purpose of more precise definition. — Ver. 12. Tischendorf's reading: *καὶ ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ* (B C L S and Δ, which, however, has *καί* before *γαμ.*), is a stylistic emendation. — *γαμηθῇ ἄλλῃ*] Lachm. Tisch. have *γαμήσῃ ἄλλον*, following B C* D L Δ S, min. A mechanical repetition from ver. 11 (whence Δ has even *ἄλλην* instead of *ἄλλον*!). — Ver. 14. Before *μή* Elz. Fritzsche, Lachm. have *καί*, which is wanting in witnesses deserving consideration, and is added from the parallels. — Ver. 16. Instead of *ηὐλόγει* Lachm. (as also Scholz) has *εὐλόγει*. But B C Δ S, min. Vict. have *κατευλόγει* (L N: *κατηγλ.*). It is to be adopted, with Tisch.; this compound, which does not elsewhere occur in the N. T., was unfamiliar to the transcribers. Its position *before* *τιθεῖς* (omitting the last *αὐτά*) is attested by B C L Δ S, min. Copt. Syr. p. ms. Vict. (Fritzsche, Tisch.). But it was precisely the threefold *αὐτά* that gave occasion to error and correction. — Ver. 19. The

arrangement *μή φον., μή μοιχ.* (Lachm. Tisch.), is found in B C Δ 8** min. Copt. Ar. Colb.; but it is from Matt. xix. 18. — Ver. 21. The article before *πτωγῶς* is wanting in witnesses of such preponderating character (condemned by Griesb., deleted by Fritzsche, Lachm.) that it appears (as also in Matt. xix. 21) as an addition. — *ἄρας τὸν σταυρόν*] is wanting in B C D Δ 8, 406, Copt. Vulg. It. Clem. Hilar. Aug. Ambr. Other witnesses have it before *δεῦρο*. Bracketed by Lachm. But how easily the words were passed over, as the parallels have nothing of the kind! — Ver. 24. *τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ τοῖς χρέμ.*] is not found in B Δ 8, Copt. ms. Deleted by Tisch. But if it had been added, the addition would have been made in accordance with the text of Matt. or Luke, or according to ver. 23. The omission was meant in the interest of stricter morality, which regarded the *πεποιθότας*, etc., as quite excluded. — Ver. 25. *διελθεῖν*] The *εἰσελθεῖν*, commended by Griesb., adopted by Tisch., has indeed considerable attestation, but it is from Matt. ix. 24, and in this case the significant change of the verbs in Mark was not observed. — Ver. 28. *ἠκολουθήσαμεν*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἠκολουθήκαμεν*, following B C D. A mechanical similarity of formation with *ἠφῆκαμεν*, occurring also in some witnesses in Matthew and Luke. — Ver. 29. Only B Δ 8 (*ἰ. αὐτῶ ὁ ἰ.*), Copt. have the simple *ἔφη ὁ ἰησ.* (Tisch.) instead of *ἀποκρ. ὁ ἰ. εἶπεν*, but they are correct. Comp. on ix. 12, 38. — *ἡ πατέρα ἡ μητέρα*] The reverse order is found in B C Δ 106, Copt. Goth. Colb. Brix. Lachm. and Tisch. It is to be preferred. *ἡ πατέρα* was in some cases placed first, in accordance with the natural relation; in some cases also, in consideration of ver. 30, it was altogether omitted (D, Cant. Vere. Corb. Harl.). On account of ver. 30 *ἡ γυναῖκα* has also been omitted (B D Δ 8, min. Copt. Arm. Vulg. It. Or. Lachm. Tisch.). — After *καί* the second *ἐνεκεν* is added by Griesb. and Tisch., following preponderating evidence. The omission is explained from viii. 35. — Ver. 30. *μητέρα*] Lachm. has *μητέρα*, following A C D, Verss.; the plural was objectionable. — Ver. 31. The article before the second *ἔσχατοι* is indeed deleted by Griesb. Lachm. Tisch.; but following Matt. xix. 30 it dropped out so easily, and, moreover, it is found still in such important testimonies, that it must be restored. — Ver. 32. *καὶ ἀκολούθ.*] B C* L Δ 8, 1, Copt. have *οἱ δὲ ἀκολούθ.* This is rightly followed by Ewald, and is now adopted by Tisch. The *οἱ δὲ* not being understood was set aside by *καί*. But the attestation is to be the more regarded as sufficient, that D K, min. Vere. Ver. Chrys. are not to be reckoned in favour of the *Recepta*, because they altogether

omit κ . ἀπολ. ἐξο3., of which omission the homoioteleuton was manifestly the cause. — Ver. 33. The article before γραμμ. (Elz.) is, with Scholz and Tisch. (in opposition to Griesb. Matth. Fritzsche, and Lachm.), to be maintained. The testimony in favour of its omission is not preponderating, and comp. Matt. xx. 18. — Ver. 34. The order ἐμπτύσουσιν αὐτ. κ . μαστιγ. αὐτ. (Lachm. Tisch. Rinck) is found in B C L Δ Σ , min. vss., including Vulg. and codd. It. But the ἐμπαιξ. and ἐμπτύς. were considered as *belonging together*. Comp. Luke xviii. 33. — Elz. has τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ; so also Fritzsche, Scholz. But B C D L Δ Σ , vss. have μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας. Approved by Griesb. Schulz, adopted by Lachm. Tisch. The *Recepta* is to be maintained. See on ix. 31. — Ver. 35. After αἰτήσ. Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. have σε, following A B C L Δ Σ ** min. vss. To be adopted. It was easily passed over as being superfluous. D K have it *before* the verb. An incorrect restoration. Σ * has entirely omitted ὃ ἐάν down to δις ἡμῖν. — Ver. 36. ποιῆσαί με ὑμῖν] Lachm. Tisch. have ποιήσω ὑμῖν, which was also approved by Griesb. An alteration in remembrance of passages such as x. 51, xiv. 12, Matt. xx. 32, in which also the bare subjunctive was sometimes completed by ἵνα ποιήσω. — Ver. 38. Instead of καί (in Elz. Scholz, Fritzsche) read, with Rinck, Lachm. and Tisch., ἥ, which Griesb. also approved, following B C* D L Δ Σ , min. Copt. Arm. Ar. Vulg. It. Or.; καί came from ver. 39. — In ver. 40 also ἥ is to be adopted on almost the same evidence (with Rinck, Lachm., and Tisch.); καί is from Matt. xx. 23. — After εὐων. Elz. has μω, which is deleted on decisive evidence. — Ver. 42. Read καὶ προσκαλ. αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, with Lachm. and Tisch., following B C D L Δ Σ , 406, Syr. Copt. codd. It. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xx. 25. — Ver. 43. Instead of the first ἔσται, Lachm. and Tisch. have ἐστίν, which Schulz also approved, in accordance with B C* D L Δ Σ , Vulg. It. The future came in from Matt., and on account of what follows. — Ver. 44. ὑμῶν γενέσθαι] Lachm. has ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, following important evidence, but it is from Matt. xx. 27. — Ver. 46. After τυφλός read with Tisch. προσαιτης, omitting the subsequent προσαιτῶν. So B L Δ Copt. Comp. Σ , τυφλός καὶ προσαιτης. The *Recepta* is from Luke xviii. 35. — Ver. 47. ὁ υἱός] Lachm. has υἱέ, following B C L Δ Σ , min. From Luke. Comp. ver. 48. — Ver. 49. αὐτὸν φωνηθῆναι] B C L Δ Σ , min. Copt. have φωνήσατε αὐτόν. So Fritzsche and Tisch. And rightly; the accusative with the infinitive was introduced through the fact of ἐκέλευσεν being written instead of εἰπεν, after Luke xviii. 40 (so still Ev. 48, It. Vulg.), and remained, after εἰπεν was restored, the more easily because Luke has it also.

—ἐγείρει] See on ii. 9. — Ver. 50. ἀναστᾶς] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἀναπηδήσας, according to B D L Δ 8, min. vss. (including Vulg. It.) Or. The *Recepta* is a "scriptorum jejunitas" that mistakes the peculiarity of Mark (Tisch.). — Ver. 51. The form ἰαββουρί (Elz. ἰαββουρί) has decisive evidence. — Ver. 52. Instead of τῷ Ἰησοῦ (Elz., Scholz, Rinck), A B C D L Δ 8 have αὐτῷ (Tisch.), which attestation is decisive.

Vv. 1–9. See on Matt. xix. 1–8. — καὶ κεῖθεν] points back to ix. 33. — καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου] see the critical remarks. He came to the borders of Judaea, *and that* (see Fritzsche, *Quaest. Luc.* p. 9 ff.; Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 145) *on the further side of Jordan*, "ipsa Samaria ad dextram relicta" (Beza). At Jericho He came again to this side, ver. 46. See, moreover, on Matt. xix. 1. — καὶ συμπορ. κ.τ.λ.] *And there gather together to Him again crowds of people.* πάλιν, for previously, at ix. 30 ff., He had withdrawn Himself from the people. — Ver. 2. Mark has not the properly *tempting element* in the question, but it is found in Matt.: κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν (see on Matt. xix. 3). That this element was not also preserved in the tradition which Mark here follows, may very naturally be explained from the *reply* of Jesus, which ran *unconditionally* (even according to Matt. vv. 4–6). Mark therefore has not the *original* form of the question (Bleek, Weiss, Holtzmann, Schenkel, Harless, *Ehescheid.* p. 30), nor does he make the question be put more *captiously* (Fritzsche), nor has he made use of Matthew incorrectly, or with alterations consonant to his own reflection (Saunier, Baur), because the Jewish points of dispute as to divorce were to him indifferent (Köstlin); but he follows a defective tradition, which in this particular is completed and corrected in Matthew. De Wette's conjecture is arbitrary, that Mark presupposes that the Pharisees had already heard of the view of Jesus on divorce, and wished to induce Him to a *renewed* declaration on the subject. The perilous element of the question does not turn on the divorce of *Herod* (Ewald, Lange). See on Matthew. — Ver. 3. Here also the tradition, which Mark follows, deviates from Matthew, who represents that the commandment of Moses is brought into question not by

Jesus, but by the Pharisees, and that as an objection against the answer of Jesus. But it is more natural and more forcible that the reply of Jesus should start immediately from Deut. xxiv. 1, and should first elicit this Mosaic ἐντολή—on the right estimation of which depended the point at issue—from the mouth of the questioners themselves, in order thereupon to attach to it what follows. — Ver. 4. ἐπέτρεψε] emphatically prefixed (see the critical remarks): Moses *permitted*, in saying which their ἔξεστιν, ver. 2, is present to their minds. See, moreover, on Matt. v. 31. They prudently refrain from saying ἐνετείλατο. — Ver. 5. τ. ἐντολὴν ταύτ.] the commandment of the putting forth a writing of divorcement. — Ver. 6. The *subject* (as ὁ Θεός is not genuine) is to be taken out of κτίσεως (ὁ κτιστής). See Kühner, II. p. 36, 4. — Ver. 7. Christ makes Adam's words at Gen. ii. 44 *His own*. It is otherwise, but less directly and concisely, given in Matthew. — ἔνεκεν τούτου] because God created men as male and female—in order to correspond with this arrangement of the Creator. — The *futures* indicate what *will happen* in cases of marrying according to God's ordinance.

Vv. 10-12. See on Matt. xix. 9. The two evangelists differ from one another here in respect of the place, of the persons to whom Jesus is speaking, and partially of the contents of what He says. Certainly Matthew has furnished the original shape of the matter, since what Mark makes Jesus say only in the house and merely to His disciples (ver. 11 with the not original amplification of ver. 12) is withal an essential element of the reply to the Pharisees, and does not bear the character of a special private instruction, whereas the private communication to the disciples, Matt. xix. 10-12, which as such is just as appropriate as it is original, is indeed "the crown of the whole" (Ewald). — εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν] *having come into the house* (in which at that time they were lodging). The same brevity of expression occurs at xiii. 9. — πάλιν οἱ μαθηταί] *again the disciples*, as previously the Pharisees. — περὶ τούτου] (see the critical remarks): *upon this subject*. — Ver. 11. ἐπ' αὐτήν] *in reference to her*, the woman that is put

away.¹ — Mark has not the *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* (Matt.), which makes no essential difference, as this ground of divorce is obvious of itself as such. See on Matt. v. 32. Comp. also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 410. — Ver. 12. *καὶ ἐὰν γυνὴ ἀπολύσῃ κ.τ.λ.*] Matthew has quite a different saying. The narrative of Mark is certainly not original (in opposition to Schenkel), but puts into the mouth of Jesus what was the custom among the *Greeks* and *Romans*, namely, that the wife also might be the divorcing party, and very often actually was so (see on 1 Cor. vii. 13, and Wetstein *in loc.*; also Danz in Meuschen, *N. T. ex Talm. ill.* p. 680 ff.), which was not competent to the *Jewish* wife (Deut. xxiv. 1; Josephus, *Antt.* xv. 7. 10), for the instances of *Michal* (1 Sam. xxv. 41), of *Herodias* (Matt. xiv. 4 f.), and of *Salome* (Josephus, *Antt.* xv. 7. 10) are abnormal in respect of their rank; and the cases in which, according to the Rabbins, the wife might require that the husband should give her a writing of divorcement (see Saalschütz, *Mos. R.* p. 806 f.) do not belong to the question here, where the wife herself is the party who puts away. The proposition in the passage before us is derived from an *Hellenic* amplification of the tradition,² which, however, in Matthew is again excluded. Comp. Harless, p. 25 f. According to Kuinoel (comp. Lange), Jesus purposed to give to the apostles, as future teachers of the *Gentiles*, the instruction requisite for judging in such a case. But He must have *said* as much, as the *question* had reference to the *Jewish* relation of divorce. — *μοιχᾶται*] the subject is the *woman* (comp. v. 11), not the *ἄλλος*. Moreover, Grotius appropriately says: “Mulier ergo, cum domina sui non sit . . . omnino adulterium committit, non interpretatione aliqua aut per consequentiam, sed directe. Ideo non debuit hic addi *ἐπ’ αὐτόν*.”

¹ Observe that Jesus here of necessity presupposes the acknowledgment of the principle of *monogamy*. Theophylact and many others, including Lange, Ewald, and Bleek, have erroneously referred *αὐτήν* to the *second* wife. Erasmus appropriately says: “in injuriam illius.” Comp. Calvin and Bengel: “in illam.” It is only thus that its emphatic bearing is brought out; the marrying of the *second* wife makes him an adulterer towards the *first*.

² According to Baur, from a *reflection* of Mark on the equal rights of the two sexes.

Vv. 13-16. See on Matt. xix. 13-15, who gives the narrative only by way of extract. Comp. Luke xviii. 15-17. — *ἄψεται*] From the mere *touch* on the part of the holy man, who assuredly was also known as a friend of children, they hoped to derive blessing for their children. So too Luke. It is otherwise in Matthew, in whose account, instead of the *touch*, there is already introduced here the more definite *laying on of hands*, which was performed by Jesus at ver. 16. — Ver. 14. *ἡγανάκτησε*] “propter impedimentum amori suo a discipulis oblatum” (Bengel). — Ver. 15 is also adopted by Luke xviii. 17, but not by the abbreviating Matthew. *Whosoever shall not have received the kingdom of the Messiah as a child, i.e. in the moral condition, which resembles the innocence of childhood* (comp. Matt. xviii. 3); Theophylact appropriately says: *τῶν ἔχοντων ἐξ ἀσκήσεως τὴν ἀκακίαν, ἣν τὰ παιδιά ἔχουσιν ἀπὸ φύσεως*. — In *δέξεται* the kingdom (which the coming Messiah establishes) is conceived as *coming* (ix. 1; Matt. vi. 10; Luke xvii. 20, *al.*). It is erroneous to explain the *βασίλ. τ. Θεοῦ* as *the preaching* of the kingdom (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Kuinoel, and many others). — Ver. 16. *ἐναγκαλ.*] as at ix. 36. — *κατηνύλογ.*] only occurs in this place in the New Testament; it is stronger than the simple form, Plut. *Amator.* 4; Tob. xi. 1, 17. It expresses here the *earnestness* of His interest. *How much more* did Christ do than was asked of Him!

Vv. 17-27. See on Matt. xix. 16-26. Comp. Luke xviii. 18-27. As well in the question at ver. 17, and in the answer of Jesus vv. 18, 19, as also in the account of the address to the disciples ver. 23 f., and in several little peculiar traits, the narrative of Mark is more concrete and more direct. — *εἰς ὁδόν*] out of the house, ver. 10, in order to prosecute His journey, ver. 32. — *γουνυετ.*] not inappropriate (de Wette), but, in connection with *προσδραμών*, representing the earnestness of the inquiry; both words are peculiar to the graphic Mark. With an accusative, as at i. 40. See on Matt. xvii. 14. — Ver. 18. The variation from Matthew is so far unessential, as in the latter also the predicate *ἀγαθός* is attributed to God only. But in Matthew it has become necessary to give to it, in the relation to the question, a turn which

betrays more a later moulding under reflection¹ than the simple and direct primitive form, which we still find in Mark and Luke. — τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς κ.τ.λ.] Ingeniously and clearly Jesus makes use of the address διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, in order to direct the questioner to the highest moral Ideal, in whose commands is given the solution of the question (ver. 19). He did this in such a manner as to turn aside from Himself and to ascribe to God only the predicate ἀγαθός, which had been used by the young man in the customary meaning of holding one in esteem (*excellent teacher*, Plat. *Men.* p. 93 C; comp. the familiar Attic ὦ ἀγαθέ or ὦ ἡγαθέ; and see Dorvill. *ad Charit.* p. 642), but is taken up by Jesus in the eminent and absolute sense. “Thou art wrong in calling me good; this predicate, in its complete conception, belongs to none save One,—that is, God.” Comp. Ch. F. Fritzsche in Fritzschor. *Opusc.* p. 78 ff. This declaration, however, is no evidence against the *sinlessness* of Jesus; rather it is the true expression of the necessary moral distance, which the human consciousness—even the sinless consciousness, as being human—recognises between itself and the absolute perfection of God.² For the human sinlessness is of necessity relative, and even in the case of Jesus was conditioned by the divine-human development that was subject to growth (Luke ii. 52; Heb. v. 8; Luke iv. 13, xxii. 28; comp. Ullmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1842, p. 700); the absolute being-good, that excludes all having become and becoming so, pertains only to God, who is “*verae bonitatis canon et archetypus*” (Beza). Even the man Jesus had to wrestle until He attained the victory and peace

¹ This primitive form is alleged, indeed, by Hilgenfeld (in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 414 ff.; comp. in his *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 364 f.) to have been no longer preserved even in Mark and Luke. He finds it rather in the form of the words which has been preserved in Justin, c. *Tryph.* 101, and among the Marcosians (similarly in Marcion): τί με λέγ. ἀγαθόν; εἰς ἵστιν ἀγαθός, ὁ πατήρ μου, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; and holds these words to have been altered, in order to deprive them of their probative force in favour of the Gnostic distinction between the perfect God and the imperfect Creator of the world. But the Gnostic exegesis might find this probative force just as suitably in our form of the text (in behalf of which Justin, *Apology.* i. 16, testifies), if it laid stress, in the εἰς ὁ θεός, on the reference to the supreme God, the Father of Christ. See also on Luke xviii. 19.

² Comp. Dörner, *Jesu sündlose Vollkommenh.* p. 14.

of the cross.¹ This is overlooked from dogmatic misunderstanding in the often attempted (see as early as Augustine, *c. Maxim.* iii. 23 ; Ambros. *de fide*, ii. 1) and variously-turned makeshift (see Theophylact, Erasmus, Bengel, Olshausen, Ebrard ; comp. also Lange, II. 2, p. 1106 f.), that Jesus rejected that predicate only from the standpoint of the questioner (if thou regardest me as only a human teacher, then thou art wrong in calling me good, etc.). Wimmer (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, p. 115 ff.) thinks that the young man had been ambitious, had said διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ as *captatio benevolentiae*, and presupposed the existence of ambition also in Jesus ; that, therefore, Jesus wished to point his attention by the τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν to his fault, and by the οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς κ.τ.λ. to bring to his knowledge the unique condition of all being-good, in the sense : “ Nobody is to be called good, if the only God be not called good, *i.e.* if He be not assumed and posited as the only condition of all goodness.” In this explanation the premisses are *imported*, and the interpretation itself is *incorrect* ; since with οὐδεὶς κ.τ.λ., λέγεται cannot be supplied, but only ἐστί, as it so frequently is in general propositions (Kühner, II. p. 40), and since οὐδεὶς εἰ μὴ means nothing else than *nemo nisi*, *i.e.* according to the sense, *no one except* (Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 524). — Ver. 19. The certainly original position of the μὴ φονεύς. is to be regarded as having at that time become traditional. Comp. Weizsäcker, p. 356. — μὴ ἀποστερ.] is not a renewed expression of the *seventh* commandment (Heupel, Fritzsche), against which may be urged its position, as well as the unsuitableness of adducing it twice ; neither is it an expression of the *tenth* commandment, as far as the coveting applies to the plundering another of his property (Bengel, Wetstein, Olshausen, de Wette), against which may be urged the meaning of the word, which, moreover, does not permit us to think of a *comprehension of all the previous commands* (Beza, Lange) ; but it applies to Deut. xxiv. 14 (οὐκ ἀποστερήσεις μισθὸν πένητος, where the Roman edition has οὐκ ἀπαδικήσεις μ. π.), to which also Mal. iii. 3, Eccclus. iv. 1, refer. Comp. also LXX. Ex. xxi. 10. Jesus, however, quotes the originally

¹ Comp. Keim, *geschichtl. Chr.* p. 39 ff., and, moreover, at p. 108 ff.

special command according to its *moral universality*: *thou shalt not withhold*. According to Kuinoel, He is thinking of Lev. xix. 13 (οὐκ ἀδικήσεις κ.τ.λ.), with which, however, the characteristic ἀποστερήσης is not in accordance. Least of all can it be taken together with τίμα κ.τ.λ., so that it would be the prohibitory aspect of the commanding τίμα κ.τ.λ. (so Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 391), against which may be decisively urged the similarity of form to the preceding *independent* commands, as well as the hallowed and just as *independent* τίμα κ.τ.λ.; moreover, Mark must have written μὴ ἀποστερ. τιμὴν τὸν πατέρα κ.τ.λ., in order to be understood. In Matthew this command does not appear; while, on the other hand, he has the ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον κ.τ.λ., which is wanting in Mark and Luke. These are various forms of the tradition. But since ἀγαπήσεις κ.τ.λ. (which also occurred in the Gospel of the Hebrews) is most appropriate and characteristic, and the μὴ ἀποστερήσης is so peculiar that it could hardly have been added as an appendix to the tradition, Ewald's conjecture (*Jahrb.* I. p. 132) that the original *number* of these commandments was *seven* is not improbable. That which did not occur in the Decalogue was more easily omitted than (in opposition to Weizsäcker) added. — Ver. 20. διδάσκαλε] not ἀγαθέ again. — Ver. 21. ἡγάπησεν αὐτόν] means nothing else than: He *loved him*, felt a love of esteem (*dilectio*) for him, *conceived an affection for him*, which impression He derived from the ἐμβλέπειν αὐτῷ. He read at once in his countenance genuine anxiety and effort for everlasting salvation, and at the same time fervid confidence in Himself. The conception of *meritum de congruo* is altogether foreign to the passage. Grotius appropriately remarks: “amat Christus non virtutes tantum, sed et semina virtutum, suo tamen gradu.” The explanation: *blandiscum compellavit verbis* (Casaubon, Wolf, Grotius, Wetstein, Kuinoel, Vater, Fritzsche, and others), is founded merely on the passage in Homer, *Od.* xxiii. 214, where, nevertheless, it is to be explained likewise as *to love*.¹ — ἐν σοι ὕστερεῖ] see on John

¹ Penelope in this passage says to her husband: be not angry that *I loved thee not thus* (ὥδ' ἀγάπησα) as soon as I saw thee,—namely, thus as *I do now*, when I have embraced thee, etc., v. 207 f.

ii. 2. Yet, instead of σοι, according to B C M D 8, min., σε is, with Tischendorf, to be read. Comp. Ps. xxiii. 1. The σοι occurred more readily (comp. Luke) to the transcribers. — ἄρας τ. σταυρ.] Matt. xvi. 24; Mark viii. 34. It completes the weighty demand of that which he still lacks for the attainment of salvation; which demand, however, instead of bringing salutarily to his knowledge the relation of his own inward life to the divine law, was the rock on which he made shipwreck. — Ver. 22. στυνάσας] *having become sullen, out of humour*. Except in the Schol. *Aesch. Pers.* 470, and Matt. xvi. 3, the verb only occurs again in the LXX. at Ezek. xxvii. 35, xxviii. 19, xxxii. 10. — ἦν γὰρ ἔχων] *for he was in possession of much wealth*. — Ver. 23. On the significant and solemn περιβλέπειν, comp. iii. 5, 34; Luke vi. 10. Comp. also ἐμβλέψας, vv. 21, 27. — οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες] The article τὰ is to be explained *summarily*. The possessions are regarded as an existing whole, which is possessed by the class of the wealthy. — Ver. 24. The repetition of the utterance of Jesus is touched with emotion (τέκνα) and milder (τοὺς πεποιθότας κ.τ.λ.), but then, at ver. 25, again declaring the state of the case with decision and with enhanced energy,—an alternation of feeling, which is to be acknowledged (in opposition to Fritzsche), and which involves so much of what is peculiar and psychologically true, that even in τοὺς πεποιθότας κ.τ.λ. there is not to be found a *modification* by tradition interpreting the matter in an *anti-Ebionitic* sense, or a *mitigation* found to be necessary in a *subsequent* age (Baur, Köstlin, p. 329, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann). These words, which are intended to disclose the moral ground of the case as it stands, belong, in fact, essentially to the scene preserved by Mark in its original form. — Ver. 25. διὰ τῆς τρυμαλ. κ.τ.λ.] *through the eye of the needle*. The two articles are *generic*; see Bernhardt, p. 315. Observe also the vivid change: *to go through . . . to enter into*. — Ver. 26. καὶ] at the beginning of the question: “cum vi auctiva ita ponitur, ut is, qui interrogat, cum admiratione quadam alterius orationem excipere ex eaque conclusionem ducere significetur, qua alterius sententia confutetur.” Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 3. 10; Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 146 f. Comp. John ix. 36, xiv. 22.

Vv. 28–31. See on Matt. xix. 27–30 ; Luke xviii. 28–30. Matthew is in part more complete (ver. 28 coming certainly under this description), in part abridging (ver. 29), but, even with this abridgment, more original. See on Matt. xix. 29. — ἡρξάτο] “spe ex verbis salvatoris concepta,” Bengel. — The question in Matthew, τί ἄρα ἔσται ἡμ., is obvious of itself, even although unexpressed (not omitted by Mark in the Petrine interest, as Hilgenfeld thinks), and Jesus understood it. — Ver. 29 f. The logical link of the two clauses is: *No one has forsaken, etc., if he shall not have (at some time) received, i.e. if the latter event does not occur, the former has not taken place; the hundredfold compensation is so certain, that its non-occurrence would presuppose the not having forsaken.* The association of thought in iv. 22 (not in Matt. xxvi. 42) is altogether similar. Instead of the ἡ, there is introduced in the second half of the clause καί; which is: *and respectively.* The *principle of division* of ver. 30 is: He is (1) to receive a hundredfold now, in the period prior to the manifestation of the Messiah, namely, a hundred times as many houses, brothers, etc.; and (2) to receive in the coming period (“jam in adventu est,” Bengel), after the Parousia, the everlasting life of the Messiah’s kingdom. — The *plurals*, which express the number a hundred, plainly show that the promised compensation in the καιρὸς οὗτος is not to be understood literally, but generally, of *very abundant compensation.* Nevertheless, the delicate feeling of Jesus has not said γυναῖκας also. So much the more clumsy was Julian’s scoff (see Theophylact) that the Christians were, moreover, to receive a hundred wives! The promise was *realized*, in respect of the καιρὸς οὗτος, by the reciprocal *manifestations of love*,¹ and by the wealth in *spiritual* possessions, 2 Cor. vi. 8–10; by which passage is illustrated, at the same time, in a noble example, the μετὰ διωγμῶν (comp. Matt. v. 10 ff.,

¹ Comp. Luther’s gloss: “He who believeth must suffer persecution, and stake everything upon his faith. Nevertheless he has enough; whithersoever he comes, he finds father, mother, brethren, possessions more than ever he could forsake.” See, e.g., on *μητίνας*, Rom. xvi. 13; on *τίνα*, 1 Cor. iv. 14 ff.; on *ἀδελφούς*, all the Epistles of the New Testament and the Acts of the Apostles (also ii. 44).

x. 23, xiii. 21, xxiii. 34). The latter does not mean: *after persecutions* (Heinsius conjectured *μετὰ διωγμόν*, as also a few min. read), but: *inter persecutiones* (in the midst of persecutions, where one "omnium auxilio destitui videtur," Jansen), designating the *accompanying* circumstances (Bernhardy, p. 255), the shadow of which *makes prominent* the light of the promise. — Ver. 31. *But many*—so independent is the greater or lower reception of reward in the life eternal of the earlier or later coming to me—*many that are first shall be last, and they that are last shall in many cases be first* (see on Matt. xix. 30, xx. 16); so that the one shall be equalized with the other in respect of the measuring out of the degree of reward. A doctrine assuredly, which, after the general promise of the great recompense in ver. 29 f., was quite in its place to furnish a wholesome check to the ebullition of greediness for reward in the question of the disciples, ver. 28 (for the *disciples*, doubtless, belonged to the *πρῶτοι*). There is therefore the less reason to attribute, with Weiss, a different meaning to the utterance in Mark from that which it has in Matthew.

Vv. 32-34. See on Matt. xx. 17-19. Comp. Luke xviii. 31-33. Mark is more detailed and more characteristic than Matthew. — *ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ*] The occurrence with the rich young man had happened, *while they went out εἰς ὁδόν*, ver. 17; now they were *on the way* (*ἀναβαίνοντες* is not to be taken with *ἦσαν*). Jesus moves on before "more intrepid ducis" (Grotius), and the disciples *were amazed; but they who followed were afraid*,¹ for the foreboding of a serious and grave future had taken hold of them, and they beheld Him thus incessantly *going*, and themselves *being led*, to meet it! See vv. 24-26, the *μετὰ διωγμ.*, ver. 30, and the declaration, ver. 31. Comp. John xi. 7-16. — *πάλιν*] refers neither to xi. 31 (de Wette), where there is nothing said of any *παραλαμβάνειν*, nor to ix. 35 (Fritzsche), where the *ἐφώνησε*

¹ According to the reading *οἱ δὲ ἀπολ. ἰφοβαῦντο*; see the critical remarks. The matter, namely, is to be conceived in this way, that the majority of the disciples *stayed behind* on the way in perplexity, but those among them who *followed* Jesus as He went forward did so only *fearfully*. As to this use of *οἱ δὲ*, see on Matt. xxviii. 17.

τοὺς δώδεκα, which happened *in the house*, is withal something entirely different; but to—what is just related—the *partial separation of Jesus from His disciples* on the way, after they had previously gone *together*. Only in part had they followed Him fearfully; most of them had remained behind on the way amazed; He now made a pause, and took again to Himself all the Twelve (hence in this place there is put not merely αὐτούς, but τοὺς δώδεκα). — ἤρξατο] so that He broke the previous silence. — Ver. 34. The *Gentiles* are the subject of ἐμπαίξ. as far as ἀποκτ. (comp. Matthew). Instead of ἀποκτενοῦσιν Matthew has the definite, but certainly later, *crucifying*.

Vv. 35–45. See on Matt. xx. 20–28. Luke has not this scene. — As to the variation from Matt. xx. 20 f., where the peculiar putting forward of the mother is (in opposition to Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, and others) to be regarded as the historically correct form, see on Matthew. — θέλομεν, ἵνα] as at vi. 25; John xvii. 24; and comp. on Luke vi. 35. — Ver. 37. ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου] not: *when thou hast attained to Thy glory* (de Wette), but: *in Thy glory*, which will surround us then, when we sit so near to Thee. — Ver. 38. ἢ] *or*, in other words. — The presents πίνω and βαπτίζομαι picture the matter as being realized. The cup and baptism of Jesus represent martyrdom. In the case of the figure of baptism, however (which latter Matthew by way of abridgment omits; it is alleged by Baur that Mark has taken it from Luke xii. 50), the point of the similitude lies in the being *submerged*, not in the *purification* (forgiveness of sins), as the Fathers have apprehended the baptism of blood (see Suicer, I. p. 627), which is not appropriate to Jesus. Comp. the classical use of καταδύειν and βαπτίζειν, *to plunge (immergere)* into sufferings, sorrows, and the like (Xen. *Cyrop.* vi. 1. 37; Wesseling, *ad Diod.* I. p. 433). On the construction, comp. Ael. *II. A.* iii. 42: ὁ πορφυρίων λούεται τὸ τῶν περιστερῶν λουτρόν, *al.* See in general, Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 520. — Ver. 40. ἢ] *or else* on the left, not put inappropriately (Fritzsche); the disciples had desired *both* places of honour, and therefore Jesus now says that *none* depends on Him, whether the sitting be on the right hand *or*

else on the left. — ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται] Matthew has added the correctly explanatory amplification: ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου. — Ver. 41. ἤρξαντο] Jesus, namely, at once appeased their indignation. — Ver. 42. οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν] peculiar to Mark and original, denoting the *essential* basis of the Gentile rule, — the *having the repute of* rulers, — not equivalent to οἱ ἄρχοντες (Gataker, Raphael, Homberg, Kypke, Rosenmüller, and many more), but: “qui censentur imperare, *i.e.* quos gentes habent et agnoscunt, quorum imperio pareant” (Beza, comp. Casaubon and Grotius). Comp. Gal. ii. 9; Winer, p. 540 [E. T. 766]; Möller, *neue Ansichten*, p. 158 ff., who, however, as Fritzsche also, explains: *who imagine themselves to rule*, which in itself (as τῶν ἐθνῶν refers to the *Gentiles*, whose rulers were no shadow-kings) and in respect of the context (which requires the general idea of *rulers*) is unsuitable. Compare, moreover, the close echo of the passage before us in Luke xxii. 25 from tradition. — Ver. 43. The reading ἐστίν is as little inappropriate (in opposition to Fritzsche) as Matt. xx. 26. — Ver. 45. καὶ γάρ] *for even*. As the master, so the disciples, Rom. xv. 3.

Vv. 46-52. See on Matt. xx. 29-34. Comp. Luke xviii. 35-43. Matthew has abridged the narrative, and, following a later tradition (comp. on Matt. viii. 28), doubled the persons. Only Mark has the *name* of the blind man, which is not interpolated (Wilke), and certainly is from trustworthy tradition. — Βαρτίμαῖος] *The patronymic* בֶּרֶךְ בָּרְכַי, as was often the case (comp. Βαρθολομαῖος, Βαρησοῦς, Βαρσαβᾶς), had become altogether a proper name, so that Mark even expressly prefixes to it ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου, which, however, may be accounted for by the fact of Timaeus being *well known*, possibly as having become a *Christian* of note. — τυφλὸς προσαίτης] (see the critical remarks): *a blind beggar*. — Ver. 47. “Magna fides, quod caecus filium Davidis appellat, quem ei Nazaraeum praedicabat populus,” Bengel. — Ver. 49. θάρσει, ἔγειρε, φωνεῖ σε] *a hasty asyndeton*. Comp. Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 80. — Ver. 50. ἀποβαλ. τὸ ἱμάτ.] depicts the joyous eagerness, with which also the ἀναπηδήσας is in keeping (see the critical remarks). Comp.

Hom. *Il.* ii. 183 : βῆ δὲ θέειν, ἀπὸ δὲ χλαῖναν βάλε, Acts iii. 8 ; Dem. 403, 5. — Ver. 51. ῥαββουνί] רבִּוּנִי, usually : *domine mi.* See Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 2179. Yet the *god*, as in רבִּי, may also be only *paragogic* (Drusius, Michaelis, Fritzsche); and this latter view is precisely on account of the analogy of רבִּי more probable, and is confirmed by the interpretation διδάσκαλε in John xx. 16. The form רבִּוּנִי is, we may add, more respectful than רבִּי. Comp. Drusius.

CHAPTER · XI.

VER. 1. Lachm. and Tisch. read (instead of εἰς Βηθφ. κ. Βηθ.) merely καὶ εἰς Βηθανίαν; but the evidence is not sufficient (D, Vulg. codd. It. Or. (twice) Jer.) to entitle us to derive the *Recepta* from Luke xix. 29. An old clerical error, occasioned by the similar beginnings of the two local names; and καὶ was inserted to connect them. C S have εἰς Βηθφ. κ. εἰς Βηθ. If this were the original form, the omission would occur still more easily. — The form Ἱεροσόλυμα is to be adopted, with Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch., following B C D L Δ S, min. Sahid. Or. Ἱεροουαλήμ does not occur elsewhere in Mark, and only in Matthew at xxiii. 37 (see *in loc.*); in Luke it is the usual form. — ἀποστέλλει] Lachm. reads ἀπέστειλεν, in opposition to decisive evidence. It is from the parallels. — Ver. 2. οὐδεὶς] Lachm. has οὐδεὶς οὖπω; Fritzsche: οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς. The latter is much too weakly attested. The former has considerable attestation, but with a different position of the οὖπω (Tisch. οὐδ. ἀνθρ. οὖπω), instead of which A has πώποτε (from Luke). The *Recepta* is to be defended; the idea expressed in *adhuc* was very variously brought in. — λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε] B C L Δ S, Copt. Sahid. Vulg. It. Or. have λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ φέρετε. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Tisch. (Lachm. has λύσατε αὐτ. κ. ἀγάγετε). Rightly; the *Recepta* is from Luke xix. 30; comp. Matt. xxi. 2, whence also originated the reading of Lachm. — Ver. 3. ἀποστέλλει] Elz. Fritzsche have ἀποστελῆ, in opposition to decisive evidence. Comp. on Matt. xxi. 3. — πάλιν, which B C* D L Δ S, min. Verc. Colb. Or. (twice) read, although it is adopted by Tisch., is an addition from misunderstanding; the reader probably being misled by ὡς, and taking the words as being still a portion of what was to be said by the disciples. — Ver. 4. The article before πάλιν (Elz.) is, in accordance with decisive evidence, deleted. — Ver. 6. Instead of εἶπεν (so also Lachm. and Tisch.) Elz. Scholz have ἐνετείλατο. But εἶπεν is so weightily attested by B C L Δ S, min. Or. Copt. Aeth. Sahid. Arm. Or. that ἐνετείλατο appears a gloss. D has εἰρήξει, which likewise tells in favour of εἶπεν, and is only a change into the pluperfect. — Ver. 7.

ἡγαγον] B L Δ S** Or. have φέρουσιν; approved by Griesb., adopted by Tisch. The *Recepta* is from the parallel passages. — ἐπέβαλον] B C D L Δ S, min. Vulg. Cant. Ver. Corb. Vind. Or. have ἐπιβάλλουσιν. Adopted by Griesb. Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. The *Recepta* was derived from the reading ἡγαγον. — ἐπ' αὐτῷ] B C D L Δ S, min. have ἐπ' αὐτόν, which Griesb. approved, Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. adopted. The *Recepta* is a mechanical repetition of the previous αὐτῷ. — Ver. 8. ὁδόν] B C L Δ S, Syr. p. (in the margin) Or. Sahid. have ἀγρῶν, which Fritzsche and Tisch. have rightly adopted. With Tisch., however, instead of the whole passage ἐκοπτον . . . ὁδόν we must read briefly and simply: κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν. The *Recepta* is an expansion from Matthew, whence also came λέγοντες in ver. 9. This is wanting in B C L Δ S, min. Copt. Sahid. Colb. Corb. Or., is regarded as suspicious by Griesb. and Lachm., and is deleted by Tisch. — Ver. 10. After βασιλεία Elz. has ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, against preponderating evidence. An awkward repetition from ver. 9. — Ver. 11. καὶ εἰς τ. ἱερόν] καὶ is wanting in B C L M Δ S, min. Syr. Arr. Copt. Perss. Arn. Vulg. It. Or. Lachm. Tisch.; inserted by way of connection. — Ver. 13. To μακρόθεν, with Griesb., Fritzsche, Lachm. Scholz, Tisch., there is to be added ἀπό, upon preponderating evidence. Comp. v. 6. — Ver. 14. The arrangement εἰς τ. αἰ. ἐκ. σ., as well as μηδεὶς (instead of οὐδεὶς in Elz.), is decisively attested. — Ver. 17. λέγων αὐτοῖς] B C L Δ S, min. Copt. have καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς. So Tisch. The *Recepta* is from Luke. — ἐποιήσατε] B L Δ, Or. have πεποιήκατε. Adopted by Tisch. The aorist, in itself more familiar, came from Luke. Comp. on Matt. xxi. 13. — Ver. 18. The arrangement οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς κ. οἱ γραμμ. is decisively attested (Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch.), as is also the subjunctive ἀπολέσωσιν (Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch.) instead of ἀπολέσουσιν. — Ver. 19. ὅτε] B C K L Δ S, min. have ὅταν. Wrongly adopted by Tisch. Comp. his *Proleg.* p. lvii. Unsuitable (otherwise at iii. 11), and to be regarded as an ancient clerical error. — ἐξεπορεύετο] A B K M Δ, min. vss. have ἐξεπορεύοντο. So Fritzsche, Lachm. But how natural it was here to bring in the same number, as in the case of παραπορ., ver. 20! — Ver. 20. The order πρῶτὶ παραπορ. is not necessary (in opposition to Fritzsche), but suggested itself most naturally after ver. 19, on which account, however, παραπορ. πρῶτὶ (B C D L Δ S, min. Ver. Cant.) is precisely to be preferred, with Lachm. and Tisch. — Ver. 23. γάρ] is wanting in B D U S, min. vss. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. A connective addition. — λέγει] Lachm. and Tisch. have λαλεῖ, following B L N Δ S, min.; the more familiar λέγ. slipped in

involuntarily. — ὁ ἐάν ἐπ[η] is wanting in B C D L Δ S, min. Copt. Vulg. It. Deleted by Fritzsche and Tisch., condemned also by Griesb. A confusing gloss, following the foregoing ὁ ἐάν ἐπ[η]. — Ver. 24. ὁ] is wanting in B C D L Δ S, min. An addition from Matt. xxi. 22. — προσευχόμενοι] B C D L Δ S, Cant. Verc. Coll. Corb. Cyp. have προσεύχασθε καί. So Lachm. and Tisch. The participle is an emendation, because it was thought necessary (comp. Matt. xxi. 22) to make ὁσα dependent on αἰτεῖσθε. — λαμβάνετε] B C L Δ S, Copt. have ἐλάβετε. Commended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; the aorist was not understood, and was changed partly into the present, partly into the future (D). — Ver. 25. στήκετε] A C D H L M, min. have στήκετε. So Lachm. and Tisch. The *Recepta* is an emendation introduced from ignorance. — Ver. 26.¹] is wanting in B L S Δ S, min. Copt. Arm. codd. It. Suspected by Fritzsche, deleted by Tisch. But the evidence in favour of omission is the less sufficient for its condemnation, that the words do not closely agree with Matt. vi. 15, from which place they are said to have come in, but present deviations which are in no wise to be attributed to the mechanical transcribers. The omission is explained from the homoeoteleuton of vv. 25 and 26. But what M., min. further add after ver. 26 is an interpolation from Matt. vii. 7, 8. — Ver. 28. Instead of καὶ τίς read, with Tisch., ἡ τίς, which is considerably attested and is supplanted by καὶ τίς in Matthew. — Ver. 29. καὶ γὰρ] Tisch. has deleted this, in accordance with B C ? L Δ; and Lachm., following A K, min. Arm. Germ. 2, Goth., has placed it *before* ἐμας. It has come in from the parallels. — Ver. 30. Before Ἰωάν. here, as in Matt. xxi. 25, τὸ is to be adopted, with Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch., in accordance with important testimony. It was passed over as superfluous; in Luke it is too weakly attested. — Ver. 31. ἐλογίζοντο] B C D G K L M Δ S** min. read: διελογίζοντο, which Griesb. has commended, Schulz has approved, Fritzsche, Lachm. have adopted. With this preponderance of evidence it is the less to be derived from Matt. xxi. 25, in proportion to the facility with which the syllable ΔΙ might be lost in the two last letters of the preceding ΚΑΙ. S* has the manifest clerical error προσελογίζοντο, which, however, does not presuppose the simple form. — ὁ] is wanting in A C* L M X Δ, min. vss. Deleted by Fritzsche, Lachm. It is from the parallels. — Elz. and Fritzsche have afterwards at ver. 32: ἀλλ' ἐάν ἐπ[η]. But ἐάν has against it decisive evidence, and is an addition easily misunderstood.

¹ Ver. 26 is wanting in all the original editions of Luther's translation.

— ὅτι ὕπνωσ] Tisch. has ὕπνωσ ὅτι, following B C L **8**^{**} min. The *Recepta* is a transposition for the sake of facility.

Vv. 1–11. See on Matt. xxi. 1–11. Comp. Luke xix. 29–44. Mark narrates with greater freshness and particularity than Matthew, who partly abridges, but partly also already comments (vv. 4, 5) and completes (ver. 10 f.). — εἰς Βηθφ. κ. Βηθ.] a more precise local definition to εἰς Ἱεροσ.: *when they come into the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, (namely) into the neighbourhood of Bethphage and Bethany, which places are situated on the Mount of Olives.* Comp. the double εἰς, ver. 11. — Ver. 2. εἰς τὴν κώμην κ.τ.λ.] Bethphage, which was first named as the nearest to them. See also Matt. xxi. 1 f., where Bethany as explanatory is omitted. — πῶλον] without more precise definition, but, as is obvious of itself, the foal of an ass. Judg. x. 4, xii. 14; Zech. ix. 9; Gen. xlix. 11. — ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς κ.τ.λ.] This notice, which in Matthew is not adopted¹ into the narrative, is an addition supplied by reflective tradition, arising out of the sacred destination of the animal (for to a sacred purpose creatures as yet unused were applied, Num. xix. 2; Deut. xxi. 3; 1 Sam. vi. 7; Wetstein *in loc.*). Comp. Strauss, II. p. 276 f. — On φέρετε (see the critical remarks), comp. Gen. xlvii. 16: φέρετε τὰ κτήνη ὑμῶν, Hom. *Od.* iii. 117. Therefore it is not unsuitable (Fritzsche); even the *change of the tenses* (λύσατε . . . φέρετε) has nothing objectionable in it. See Kühner, II. p. 80. — Ver. 3. τί] *wherefore*; to this corresponds the subsequent ὅτι, *because*. — καὶ εὐθέως κ.τ.λ.] this *Jesus* says; it is not the *disciples* who are to say it (Origen; comp. the critical remarks), whereby a paltry trait would be introduced into the commission. — ὧδε, *hither*, Plato, *Prot.* p. 328 D; Soph. *Trach.* 496; *O. T.* 7; *El.* 1149. Not yet so used in Homer. — Ver. 4. εὖρον . . . ἀμφόδου] a description characteristic of Mark; τὸ ἀμφοδον and ἡ ἀμφοδος (comp. ἀμφόδιον in Lucian, *Rhet. prae.* 24, 25) is not simply *the way*, but the *way that leads round* (*winding way*). Jer. xvii. 27, xlvii.

¹ By no means obvious of itself, moreover, in the case of the ass's *colt* in the narrative of Matthew, since it was already large enough for riding,—in opposition to Lange and others.

27; Aristot. *de part. ani.* III. 2, p. 663, 36 (codd., see Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 248), and the examples in Wetstein, also Koenig and Schaefer, *ad Gregor. Cor.* p. 505. — Ver. 5. τί ποιείτε κ.τ.λ.] Comp. Acts xxi. 13. — Ver. 8. On the only correct form *στιβάς*, not *στοιβάς*, see Fritzsche. The meaning is: *litter*, ἀπὸ ῥάβδων καὶ χλωρῶν χόρτων στρώσις καὶ φύλων, Hesychius. Very frequent in the classical writers. Litter (branches and leaves) was cut from the fields that were near (ἀγρῶν, see the critical remarks). — Ver. 10. ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρ. ἡμ. Δ.] i.e. the coming kingdom of the Messiah. Its approaching manifestation, on the eve of occurring with the entry of the Messiah, was seen in the riding of Jesus into Jerusalem. And it is called *the kingdom of David*, so far as it is the fulfilment of the type given in the kingdom of David, as David himself is a type of the Messiah, who is even called David among the Rabbins (Schoettgen, *Hor.* II. p. 10 f.). Mark did not avoid mention of the “Son of David” (in opposition to Hilgenfeld; comp. x. 47, xii. 35), but Matthew added it; in both cases without special aim. The personal expression, however (comp. Luke: βασιλεύς, which Weizsäcker regards as the most original), easily came into the tradition. — Ver. 11. εἰς Ἱεροσ. εἰς τὸ ἱερόν] After the rejection of καί (see the critical remarks) the second εἰς is to be understood as a more precise specification, similar to that in ver. 1. — ὀψίας ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ὥρας] as the hour was already late. ὀψίας is here an adjective. Taken as a substantive, τῆς ὥρας (evening of the day-time) would not be applicable to it; expressions with ὀψέ (as Dem. 541, ult. ὀψὲ τῆς ὥρας ἐγίγνετο, Xen. *Hell.* ii. 1. 14, *al.*) are different. On the adjective ὀψιος, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 51. It was already the time of day, which in the classical writers is called ὀψία δειλη (Herod. viii. 6; Thuc. viii. 26; Polyb. vii. 16. 4; Ruhnken, *Tim.* p. 75). According to Matthew and Luke, it was immediately after His entry, and not on the next day (Mark, vv. 12, 15 ff.) that Jesus purified the temple. A real difference; Matthew has not only narrated the cleansing of the temple as occurring at once along with the entry, but assumed it so (in opposition to Ebrard, Lange, and many others); Mark, however, is

original ; the day's work is completed with the Messianic entry itself, and only a visit to the temple and the significant look round about it forms the close. What the Messiah has still further to do, follows on the morrow. This at the same time in opposition to Baur (*Markusevang.* p. 89), who sees in the narrative of Mark only the later work of sober reflection adjusting the course of events ; and in opposition to Hilgenfeld, who accuses Mark of an essential impropriety. — περιβλεψάμ. πάντα is a preparatory significant statement in view of the measure of cleansing purposed on the morrow. The look around was itself deeply serious, sorrowful, judicial (comp. iii. 5, 34), not as though He Himself had now for the first time beheld the temple and thus had never previously come to the feast (Schenkel).

Vv. 12-14. Comp. on Matt. xxi. 18-20, whose more compressed narrative represents a later form taken by the tradition. — εἰ ἄρα] *whether under these circumstances* (see Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 178 f.)—namely, since the tree had leaves, which in fact in the case of fig-trees come *after* the fruits. Comp. on Matt. xxi. 19. — οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σύκων] not inappropriate (Köstlin), but rightly giving information whence it happened that Jesus found nothing but leaves only.¹ If it had been the time for figs (*June*, when the *Boccôre* ripens, comp. Matt. xxiv. 32) He would have found fruits also as well as the leaves, and would not have been deceived by the abnormal foliage of the tree. The objections against this logical connection—on the one hand, that figs of the previous year that had hung through the winter might still have been on the tree ; on the other, that from οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρ. σύκ. the fruitlessness of the tree would appear quite natural, and therefore not be justified as an occasion for cursing it (comp. de Wette, Strauss, Schenkel ; according to Bruno Bauer, Mark made the remark on account of Hos. ix. 10)—are quite irrelevant ; for (1) *Figs that have hung through the winter* were

¹ Not as to the point, that only a symbolical demonstration was here in question (Weizsäcker, p. 92). Nobody could have gathered this from these words without some more precise indication, since the symbolical nature of the event is wholly independent of them.

not at all associated with a tree's *being in leaf*, but might also be found on trees without leaves; the *leafy* tree promised *summer figs*, but had none,¹ because in the month Nisan it was not the time for figs, so that thus the presence of foliage which, in spite of the earliness of the time of year, justified the conclusion from the nature of the fig-tree that there would be fruit upon it, was only a deceptive anomaly. (2) The tree presents itself as deserving a curse, because, having *leaves* it ought also to have had *fruit*; the οὐ γὰρ ἦν κ. σ. would only make it appear as blameless if it had had no *leaves*; hence even with our simply literal apprehension of the words there in no wise results an over-hasty judicial sentence. It is almost incredible how the simple and logically appropriate meaning of the words has been distorted, in order to avoid representing Jesus as seeking figs out of the fig-season. Such explanations, however, deserve no refutation; e.g. that of Hammond, Clericus, Homberg, Paulus, Olshausen, Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 321: for it was *not a good fig-year* (see, on the other hand, Strauss, II. p. 220 f.); that of Abresch, *Lect. Arist.* p. 16, and Triller, *ad Thom. M.* p. 490: for it was not a *place suitable for figs*; the *interrogative* view of Majus, *Obs.* I. p. 7: "*nonne enim tempus erat ficuum?*;" that of Heinsius and Knatchbull: "*ubi enim fuit, tempus erat ficuum*" (so that οὐ would have to be read); the notion of Mill, that Jesus only *feigned* as if He were seeking figs, in order merely to do a miracle (Victor Antiochenus and Euthymius Zigabenus had already taken even His hunger as simulated; compare recently again Hofmann, p. 374); the view of Kuinoel (comp. Dahme in Henke's *Magaz.* I. 2, p. 252): for it was *not yet* (οὐ = οὐπω) *fig-harvest*; compare also Baumgarten-Crusius. Fritzsche has the correct view, although he reproaches Mark with having subjoined the notice "*non elegantissime*," whereas it very correctly states why Jesus, *notwithstanding the leaves of the tree*, found no *fruits*. Toup (*Emendatt. in Suid.* II. p. 218 f.), Tittmann (*Opusc.* p. 509), and Wassenbergh (in Valekenauer, *Schol.* I.

¹ No fruit indeed, even that had hung through the winter; but this Jesus had not sought, since the presence of leaves had induced Him to expect fruit—namely, fruit before the time (comp. Tobler, *Denkbl. aus Jerus.* p. 101 ff.).

p. 18) have even declared themselves against the genuineness of the words in spite of all the critical evidence! Bornemann (in opposition to Wassenbergh) in the *Schol. in Luc.* p. xlix. f., and in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 131 ff., comes back again essentially to the interpretation of Hammond, and explains: "for it was *not favourable weather* for figs." But *καιρός* could only acquire the meaning of "favourable weather" by more precise definition *in the context*, as in the passage quoted by Bornemann, Eur. *Hec.* 587, by *θεόθεν*, and hence this interpretation is not even favoured by the reading *ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων* (B C* L Δ 8, Copt. Syr.; so Tischendorf), *for the time was not fig-time*, which reading easily originated from an *ὁ καιρός* written on the margin by way of supplement, whence also is to be derived the reading of Lachmann (following D, Or.): *οὐ γ. ἦν ὁ καιρὸς σ.* De Wette finds the words "*absolutely incomprehensible*."¹ Comp. also Baur, *Markusev.* p. 90, according to whom, however, Mark here only betrays his poverty in any resources of his own, as he is alleged by Hilgenfeld only to make the case worse involuntarily. — Ver. 14. *ἀποκριθεῖς*] Appropriately Bengel adds: "*arbori fructum neganti*." — *φάγοι*] According to Mark (it is otherwise in Matt. xxi. 19) the cursing is expressed in the form of a *wish*, as *imprecation*, Acts viii. 20. — *καὶ ἤκουον οἱ μαθ. αὐτοῦ*] a preparation for ver. 20.

Vv. 15–19. See on Matt. xxi. 12–17. Comp. Luke xix. 45–48. Matthew deals with this partly by abbreviating, partly also by adding what is peculiar and certainly original (vv. 14–16). — *ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν*] but afterwards: *κατέστροφε*, so that thus the latter occurred after the beginning and before the ending of the expulsion. — Ver. 16. *ἵνα*] The object of the permission is conceived as its *purpose*. The form *ἤφιε*, as i. 34. — *διενέγκη σκεῦος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ*] In the estimation also of the Rabbins it was accounted a desecration of the temple, if anybody carried the implements of common life (*σκεῦος*, household furniture, pots, and the like) through

¹ Nay, they even compelled Bleek to the conjecture that the event had occurred *at another time of year*, possibly in the previous year at the Feast of Tabernacles (John vii.).

the temple-enclosure, διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ (not ναοῦ), in order to save himself a circuit; they extended this even to the synagogues. See Lightfoot, p. 632 f.; Wetstein *in loc.* Olshausen is mistaken in explaining διαφέρειν as *to carry to and fro*; and Kuinoel and Olshausen, following Beza and Grotius, arbitrarily limit σκεῦος to implements used *for the purpose of gain*. — Ver. 17. ἐδίδασκε] on what subject? What follows leaves no doubt as to the principal theme of this teaching. — πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] *Dativus commodi*: (destined) *for all nations*,— which has reference in Isa. lvi. 7 to the fact that even the strangers dwelling among the Israelites were to return with them to the Holy Land (Ezra ii. 43 ff., vii. 7; Neh. iii. 26, xi. 21), where they were to present their offerings in the temple (according to the Israelitish command, Lev. xvii. 8 ff., xxii. 19 ff.; Num. xv. 14 ff.). Only Mark (not Matthew and Luke) has taken up the πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν from Isaiah, which probably has its reason not only in more careful quotation (Fritzsche, de Wette, Holtzmann, Bleek), but, inasmuch as it is an *honourable* mention of the Gentiles, in the *Gentile-Christian* interest, without, however, thereby indicating that Jesus had desired to announce the *new spiritual temple* of His church (Schenkel), which *point* of the action does not emerge in any of the evangelists, since they had failed to perceive it, or had suppressed it. — Ver. 18. ἀπολέσωσιν] (see the critical remarks): how they *were to destroy* Him, deliberative. The *future* of the *Recepta* (how they *should destroy* Him) would designate the realization as indubitable (the question only still remaining as to the kind and manner of the destruction). See Kühner, II. p. 489 f.; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 225 C. — ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ αὐτόν] The reason why they sought to destroy Him. — ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκῇ, αὐτοῦ] which He, namely, had just set forth, ver. 17, after the cleansing of the temple. Baur arbitrarily suggests that Mark has dexterously inwoven the διδάσκειν from Luke. — ὅτε ὁψὲ ἐγένετο] on that day, ver. 12; hence not ὅταν (see the critical remarks).

Vv. 20-24. Comp. on Matt. xxi. 20-22. But according to Matthew the tree withered away *forthwith after the cursing*, so that the following conversation *immediately* attached itself

thereto. A later form moulded in accordance with the immediate result in other miracles. If Mark had separated the miracle into two acts in order to give to it the more importance (see Köstlin, p. 335) he would have reckoned erroneously, as the immediate result is the greater and therefore the more in keeping with a "later reflection" (Hilgenfeld). But this variation of the tradition has nothing to do with the view that the entire history is only a legendary formation from Luke xiii. (in opposition to Schenkel). — παραπορευόμενοι πρωῒ] Fritzsche is wrong in rejecting this order, because "πρωῒ is opposed to the preceding ὁψέ." In fact παραπορ. is the leading idea (and *passing by* in the morning), pointing out the modal definition to the following εἶδον κ.τ.λ. — Ver. 22. πίστιν Θεοῦ] *confidence in God*; genitive of the object. Comp. Acts iii. 16; Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 20, iii. 22; Eph. iii. 8; Dem. 300, 10; Eur. Med. 414. — Ver. 24. διὰ τοῦτο] because the confidence has so great effect. — ὅτι ἐλάβετε] (see the critical remarks): The *practerite* is not "*ineptum*" (Fritzsche), but the *having received*, which one believes has its ground in the counsel of God. Comp. xiii. 20. The real *de facto* bestowal is future (ἔσται ὑμῶν).

Vv. 25, 26. Comp. Matt. vi. 14 f. To the exhortation to *confidence* in prayer, according to Mark, Jesus links on another principal requisite of being heard—namely, the necessity of *forgiving* in order to obtain forgiveness. And how appropriate is this to guard against a false conclusion from the occurrence with the fig-tree! Nevertheless (in opposition to Holtzmann) it is hardly here original, but introduced¹ into this connection by Mark from the collection of Logia in the way of thoughtful redaction, not of unadjusted insertion (Hilgenfeld). — στήκετε] Comp. on ἐστῶτες, Matt. vi. 5. The *indication* is not incorrect, but ἄν has its relation merely to the particle ὅτε, and does not affect the verb; see on iii. 11. — Ver. 26. Observe the *antithesis*, in which οὐκ (not μή, as

¹ Which, however, is not, with Weiss in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1864, p. 63, to be supported by the argument that Mark has nowhere else the expression: ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρ. For Mark has no place at all, in which this designation would have been applicable instead of another that he has used.

in Matthew) is closely associated with ἀφίετε and constitutes with it *one* idea (Hermann, *ad Vig.* p. 831 ; Winer, p. 423 f. [E. T. 597 f.] ; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 297 [E. T. 346]).

Vv. 27-33. See on Matt. xxi. 23-27. Comp. Luke xx. 1-8. Matthew abridges little, but yet remains not so directly vivid. — περιπατοῦντος] According to Matthew and Luke Jesus *taught*, which, however, is not excluded by Mark's statement. — Ver. 28. ταῦτα] the *cleansing of the temple*, comp. on Matt. xxi. 23. — ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῇς] not a paraphrase of the infinitive, but: *in order that thou mayest do these things*, purpose of τὴν ἐξουσίαν τ. ἔδωκεν. — Ver. 29. ἐπερωτήσω] not: *post interrogabo* (Fritzsche), but, as always in the N. T.: *to inquire of*, so that ἐπί expresses the direction. Comp. Plat. *Soph.* p. 249 E: δικαίως ἂν ἐπερωτηθεῖμεν ἅπερ αὐτοὶ τότε ἠρωτῶμεν (be *inquired of*, as we ourselves *asked questions*). — Ver. 31. οὖν] *therefore*, since it comes from heaven. — Ver. 32. ἀλλ' εἶπωμεν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων] Here is to be placed a note of interrogation (Complutensian, Lachmann, Tischendorf) ; *but are we to say: of men?* a question of doubtful reflection! Rinck, *Lucubr. crit.* p. 306, aptly remarks on what follows: "Respondet Marcus suo nomine, idque elegantissime fecisse videtur, quoniam haud facile quisquam sibi ipse aperte timorem adscribere consuevit." Comp. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 330 [E. T. 385]. — εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάννην ὄντως, ὅτι προφ. ἦν] (see the critical remarks): *they really perceived* (perspectum habebant, see Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 873) *that John* (in his lifetime) *was a prophet.* Ἰωάννην . . . ὅτι is to be taken according to the well-known attraction ; see Winer, p. 551 [E. T. 781] ; Buttmann, p. 322 [E. T. 376].

CHAPTER XII.

VER. 1. λέγειν] B G L Δ Ν, min. Syr. Vulg. It. have λαλεῖν. So Lachm. and Tisch. The testimony of the codd. in favour of λέγειν remains doubtless strong enough, nevertheless λαλεῖν is to be preferred, because there immediately follows *what* Jesus said, and therefore the change into λέγειν was readily suggested. Comp. iii. 23. — Ver. 3. οἱ δέ] Lachm. Tisch. have καί, following B D L Δ Ν, min. Copt. Cant. Ver. Verc. Vind. It is from Matt. xxi. 25. — Ver. 4. λιθοβολήσ.] is wanting in B D L Δ Ν, min. Copt. Arm. Vulg. It. Almost all the above witnesses have afterwards instead of ἀπέστ. ἡτιμωμ.: ἡτίμησαν. Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. have followed the former omission and this reading, and rightly; λιθοβολ. is a gloss on ἐξεφελ. from Matt. xxi. 35, and ἀπέστ. ἡτιμωμμένον is a reading conformed to the conclusion of ver. 3. — Ver. 5. καὶ ἄλλον] Elz. Scholz have καὶ πάλιν ἄλλ., in opposition to preponderating evidence; πάλιν is a mechanical repetition from ver. 4. — Instead of τοὺς is to be written οὓς both times, following B L Δ Ν, min. with Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. — The Aeolic form ἀποκέννοντες is on decisive evidence to be adopted, with Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. Comp. the critical remarks on Matt. x. 28. — Ver. 6. The arrangement ἔνα ἔχων υἱόν is required by decisive evidence (Fritzsche, Lachm., comp. Tisch.), of which, however, B C** L Δ Ν, 33 have εἰχεν instead of ἔχων (so Tisch. rightly, as ἔχων is an emendation of the construction). Almost the same witnesses omit the οὗ after ἔτι; it is, with Tisch., to be deleted as a connective addition, as, moreover, αὐτοῦ after ἀγαπ. is a decidedly condemned mechanical addition. — Ver. 8. Such preponderating evidence is in favour of the superfluous αὐτόν after ἐξέβαλ., that it is to be adopted with Lachm. and Tisch. — Ver. 14. οἱ δέ] B C D L Δ Ν, 33, Copt. codd. of the It. have καί. So Fritzsche, Lachm. From Luke xx. 21, whence also many variations with ἐπηρώτων have come into our passage. — Ver. 17. The arrangement τὰ Καίσαρος ἀπὸδ. Καίσαρι (Tisch.) is to be preferred, in accordance with B C L Δ Ν, 28, Syr. Copt. The placing of ἀπόδοτε first (Elz. Lachm.) is from the parallels. — ἐθαύμασαν] Lachm. has ἐθαύμαζον.

But among the codd. which read the imperfect (B D L Δ Σ), B Σ have ἐξεθαύμαζον (D* has ἐξεθαυμάζοντο). This ἐξεθαύμαζον (Tisch.) is to be preferred. The simple form and the aorist are from the parallels. — Ver. 18. ἐπηρώτησαν] Lachm. Tisch. have ἐπηρώτων, following B C D L Δ Σ, 33; the aorist is from the parallels. — Ver. 19. τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ] αὐτοῦ is wanting in B C L Δ Σ, min. Copt., and is from Matthew. — Ver. 20. After ἐπτά Elz. Fritzsche have οὖν, against decisive evidence; it is from Luke xx. 29; instead of which some other witnesses have δέ (from Matthew). — Ver. 21. καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἀφῆκε] B C L Δ Σ, 33, Copt. have μὴ καταλιπών. Approved by Bornemann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 133, adopted by Tisch. But if the *Recepta* had originated from what precedes and follows, it would have run simply καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκε; the καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτός does not look like the result of a gloss, and might even become offensive on account of its emphasis. — Ver. 22. ἔλαβον αὐτήν] is wanting in B M, min. Colb., also C L Δ Σ, min. Copt., which, moreover, omit καὶ before οὐκ. Fritzsche has deleted ἔλαβον αὐτ., Lachm. has merely bracketed it; Tisch. has struck out, besides ἔλαβ. αὐτ., the καὶ also before οὐκ. Rightly; the short reading: καὶ οἱ ἐπτά οὐκ ἀφῆκαν σπέρμα, was completed in conformity with ver. 21. — ἐσχάτη] Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. have ἔσχατον, certainly on considerable attestation; but it is an emendation (comp. Matthew and Luke: ὑπερῶν), on account of the difference of the genders (ἐσχ. feminine, πάντ. masculine). — The order καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθ. is, with Fritzsche, Lachm., Tisch., to be adopted. The *Recepta* is from the parallels. — Ver. 23. After ἐν τῇ Elz. Lachm. Scholz have οὖν, which important witnesses omit, others place after ἀναστ. From the parallels. — ὅταν ἀναστῶσι] is wanting in B C D L Δ Σ, min. vss. Condemned by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm. It is to be maintained, for there was no occasion for any gloss; its absolute superfluity, however, the absence of any such addition in the parallels, and the similarity of ἀναστάσει and ἀναστῶσι, occasioned the omission. — Ver. 25. γαμίσκονται] A F H, min. have ἐκγαμίσκονται. B C G L U Δ Σ, min. have γαμίζονται. Consequently the testimonies in favour of the *Recepta* are left so weak (even D falls away, having γαμίζουσιν), and γαμίζονται has so much the preponderance, that it is, with Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch., to be adopted. Comp. on Matt. xxii. 30. — Before ἐν Elz. has οἱ. The weight of the evidence is divided. But since this οἱ after ἀγγελ.οι was more easily dropped out than brought in (by being written twice over), and is wanting also in Matthew, it is to be maintained. — Ver. 26. Instead of τοῦ βάτου Elz. has τῆς βάτου, in opposition to decisive evidence. —

Decisive evidence condemns in ver. 27 the article before Θεός, and then Θεός before ζώντων; just as also ὑμεῖς οὖν before πολλοὶ πλανᾶσθε is, following B C L Δ Σ, Copt., to be struck out, with Tisch., as being an addition to these short pithy words. — Ver. 28. εἰδώς] Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. have ἰδών (Fritzsche: καὶ ἰδών). So, with or without καί (which is a connective interpolation), in C D L Σ* min. vss., including Syr. Arm. Vulg. It. Aug. But these witnesses are not preponderating, and εἰδώς might easily seem unsuitable and give way to the more usual ἰδών; comp. ver. 34. — The order ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς has been preferred by Schulz, Fritzsche, and Tisch. (following Gersd. p. 526), in accordance with B C L Δ Σ, min. Copt. Theophylact. But it was just the customary placing of the pronoun after the verb that occasioned the inversion of the words, in which the *intention* with which αὐτοῖς was prefixed was not observed. It is otherwise at xiv. 40. — Instead of πάντων Elz. has πασῶν, contrary to decisive evidence. — Ver. 29. The *Recepta* is ὅτι πρώτη πασῶν τῶν ἐντολῶν. Very many variations. Griesb. and Fritzsche have ὅτι πρώτη πάντων ἐντολῇ, following A, min. Scholz reads ὅτι πρ. πάντων τῶν ἐντολῶν, following E F G H S, min. Lachm. has ὅτι πρ. πάντων [ἐντολῇ ἐστίν]. Tisch. has ὅτι πρώτη ἐστίν, following B L Δ Σ, Copt. The latter is the original form, which, according to the question of ver. 28 and its various readings, was variously amplified, and in the process ἐστίν was partly dropped. — Ver. 30. αὕτη πρώτη ἐντολῇ] is wanting in B E L Δ Σ, Copt. Deleted by Tisch. An addition in accordance with Matthew, with variations in details, following vv. 28, 29. — Ver. 31. Instead of καὶ δευτ. read, with Tisch., merely δευτ. — Elz. Griesb. Scholz have ὁμοία αὕτη; Fritzsche, Lachm. have ὁμ. αὐτῇ; Tisch. merely αὕτη. The last is attested by B L Δ Σ, Copt., and is to be preferred, since ὁμοία very readily suggested itself to be written on the margin from Matthew. — Ver. 32. After εἰς ἔσσι Elz. has Θεός; a supplement in opposition to preponderant evidence. — Ver. 33. καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς] is wanting in B L Δ Σ, min. Copt. Vere. Marcell. in Eus. Condemned by Rinck, bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. But if it were an addition, it would have been inserted after καρδίας (comp. ver. 30). On the other hand, the arrangement different from ver. 30 might easily draw after it the omission. — The article before οὐσιῶν (in Elz.) is decisively condemned. — Ver. 36. γάρ] is wanting in B L Δ Σ, min. Copt. Vere., while D, Arm. read καὶ αὐτός, and Colb. Corb. have *autem*. Lachm. has bracketed γάρ, and Tisch. has deleted it. The latter is right. The connection was variously supplied. — Ver. 37. οὖν] is wanting in B D L Δ Σ, min. copt. Syr. p. codd. It. Hil. Bracketed

by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. An addition from the parallels. — Ver. 43. εἶπεν] instead of the *Recepta* λέγει (which Scholz, Rinck, Tisch. defend), is decisively attested, as also is ἔβαλε (Lachm.) instead of the *Recepta* βέβληκε. In place of βαλόντ. (Elz.), βαλλόντ. must be written on decisive attestation.

Vv. 1-12. See on Matt. xxi. 33-46. Comp. Luke xx. 9-19. Matthew makes another kindred parable precede, which was undoubtedly likewise original, and to be found in the collection of Logia (vv. 28-32), and he enriches the application of the parable before us in an equally original manner; while, we may add, the presentation in Mark is simpler and more fresh, not related to that of Matthew in the way of heightened and artificial effect (Weiss). — ἤρξατο] after that dismissal of the chief priests, etc. — αὐτοῖς] therefore not as Luke has it: πρὸς τὸν λαόν, to which also Matthew is opposed. — ἐν παραβολαῖς] *parabolically*. The plural expression is *generic*; comp. iii. 22, iv. 2. Hence it is not surprising (Hilgenfeld). Comp. also John xvi. 24. — Ver. 2. According to Mark and Luke, the lord receives *a part* of the fruits; the rest is the reward of the vine-dressers. It is otherwise in Matthew. — Ver. 4. Observe how compendiously Matthew sums up the contents of vv. 4, 5.¹ — κακῆϊνον] The conception of *maltreatment* lies at the foundation of the comparative *also*, just as at ver. 5. Comp. on Matt. xv. 3. — ἐκεφαλαίωσαν] *they beat him on the head*. The word is not further preserved in this signification (Vulg.: *in capite vulnerarunt*), but only in the meaning: *to gather up as regards the main substance, to set forth summarily* (Thuc. iii. 67. 5, viii. 53. 1; Herod. iii. 159; Eccus. xxxv. 8); but this is wholly inappropriate in this place, since it is not, with Wakefield, *Silv. crit.* II. p. 76 f., to be changed into the meaning: "*they made short work with him.*"² We have here a

¹ All the less ought the several δούλοι to be *specifically* defined; as, for instance, according to Victor Antiochenus, by the first servant is held to be meant *Elias* and the contemporary prophets; by the second, *Isaiah*, *Hosea*, and *Amos*; by the third, *Ezekiel* and *Daniel*. That the expression in vv. 2-4 is in the *singular*, notwithstanding the *plurality* of prophets, cannot in a *figurative* discourse be surprising, and cannot justify the conjecture that here *another* parable—of the *three years of Christ's ministry*—has been interwoven (Weizsäcker).

² This explanation is set aside by αὐτόν, which, moreover, is opposed to the

veritable *solccism*; Mark confounded κεφαλαιόω with κεφαλίζω, perhaps after the analogy of γναθόω and γνιόω (Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 95). — ἡτίμησαν (see the critical remarks): *they dishonoured him, treated him disgracefully*, the general statement after the special ἐκεφαλ. The word is poetical, especially epic (Hom. *Il.* i. 11, ix. 111; *Od.* xvi. 274, *al.*; Pind. *Pyth.* ix. 138; Soph. *Aj.* 1108; Ellendt, *Lcx. Soph.* I. p. 251), as also in *this* sense the later form ἀτιμόω, of frequent use in the LXX. (Eur. *Hel.* 462, *al.*), which in the prose writers is used in the sense of inflicting dishonour by depriving of the rights of citizenship (also in Xen. *Ath.* i. 14, where ἀτιμοῦσι is to be read). — Ver. 5. κ. πολλοὺς ἄλλους] Here we have to supply: *they maltreated*—the *dominant* idea in what is previously narrated (comp. κακείμενον, vv. 4, 5, where this conception lay at the root of the καί), and to which the subsequent elements δέροντες and ἀποκτεννόντες are subordinated. Comp. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 252 [E. T. 293]. But Mark does not write “in a disorderly and slipshod manner,” as de Wette supposes, but just like the best classical writers, who leave the finite verb to be supplied from the context in the case of participles and other instances. See Bornemann, *ad Xen. Sympos.* iv. 53; Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 770; Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 179. — Ver. 6. The ἔτι ἓνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἁγ. (see the critical remarks), which is peculiar to the graphic Mark, has in it something touching, to which the bringing of ἓνα into prominence by the unusual position assigned to it contributes. Then, in vivid connection therewith stands the contrast of vv. 7, 8; and the trait of the parable contained in ver. 7 f. certainly does not owe its introduction to Mark (Weiss). — Ver. 8. Not a *hysteron proteron* (Grotius, Heumann, de Wette), a mistake, which is with the greatest injustice imputed to the vividly graphic Mark; but a different representation from that of Matthew and Luke: *they killed him, and threw him (the slain) out of the vineyard*. In the latter there is the tragic element of outrage even against the

view of Theophylact: συντίλεισαν καὶ ἐκορύφωσαν τὴν υβρίν. The *middle* is used in Greek with an accusative of the person (τινά), but in the sense: *briefly to describe any one*. See Plat. *Pol.* ix. p. 576 B.

corpse, which is not, however, intended to be applied by way of special interpretation to Jesus. — Ver. 9. ἐλεύσεται κ.τ.λ.] not an answer of the *Pharisees* (Vatablus, Kuinoel, following Matt. xxi. 41); but *Jesus Himself* is represented by Mark as replying to His own question.¹ — Ver. 10. οὐδέ] What Jesus has set before them in the way of parable concerning the rejection of the Messiah and His divine justification, *is also prophesied in the Scripture*, Ps. cxviii. 22; hence He continues: *have ye not also read this Scripture, etc.?* On γραφή, that which is drawn up in writing, used of *individual passages of Scripture*, comp. Luke iv. 21; John xix. 37; Acts i. 16, viii. 35. — Ver. 12. καὶ ἐφοβ. τ. ὄχλ.] καί connects adversative clauses without changing its signification, Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 147 f.; Winer, p. 388 [E. T. 545]. It is an emphatic *and* in the sense of: *and yet*. Especially frequent in John. — The words ἔγνωσαν γὰρ . . . εἶπε, which are not to be put in a parenthesis, are regarded as illogically placed (see Beza, Heupel, Fritzsche, Baur, Hilgenfeld, and others), and are held to have their proper place after κρατῆσαι. But wrongly. Only let ἔγνωσαν be referred not, with these interpreters, to the chief priests, scribes, and elders, but to the ὄχλος, which was witness of the transaction in the temple-court. If the people had not observed that Jesus was speaking the parable in reference to (πρός) them (the chief priests, etc., as the γεωργούς), these might have ventured to lay hold on Him; but, as it was, they might not venture on this, but had to stand in awe of the people, who would have seen at once in the arrest of Jesus the *fulfilment* of the parable, and would have interested themselves on His behalf. The chief priests, etc., were cunning enough to avoid this association, *and left Him and went their way*. In this manner also Luke xx. 19 is to be understood; he follows Mark.

Vv. 13-17. See on Matt. xxii. 15-22. Comp. Luke xx. 20-26. Mark is more concise and vivid than Matthew. — ἀποστέλλουσι] the chief priests, scribes, and elders (xi. 27),

¹ That the opponents themselves are compelled to pronounce judgment (Matthew), appears an original trait. But the *form* of their answer in Matthew (πακοὺς κ.τ.λ.) betrays, as compared with Mark, a later artificial manipulation.

whereas Matthew inaccurately refers this new and grave temptation to the Pharisees as its authors. — *ἵνα αὐτ. ἀγρεύσ. λόγῳ*] *in order that they* (these messengers) *might ensnare Him by means of an utterance, i.e. by means of a question, which they were to address to Him.* See ver. 14. Comp. xi. 29. The *hunting* term ἀγρεύω is frequently even in the classical writers transferred to *men*, who are got into the hunter's power as a prey. See Valckenaer, *ad Herod.* vii. 162; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VII. p. 193. In a good sense also, as in Xen. *Mem.* iii. 11. 7: τὸ πλείστον ἄξιον ἄγρευμα φίλους θηράσειν. — Ver. 14. ἐπ' ἀληθείας] equivalent to ἀληθῶς, Luke iv. 25, xx. 21, xxii. 59, iv. 27, x. 34. See Wetstein *in loc.*; Schaefer, *Melet.* p. 83; Fritzsche, *Quaest. Luc.* p. 137 f. — δῶμεν, ἢ μὴ δ.] The previous question was theoretical and general, this is practical and definite. — Ver. 15. εἰδώς] as knowing hearts (John ii. 25). Comp. Matt. xii. 25; Luke vi. 8, xi. 17. — τ. ὑπόκρισιν] "Discere cupientium praeferebant speciem, cum animus calumniam strueret," Grotius. — Ver. 17. Observe the more striking order of the words in Mark: *what is Caesar's, pay to Caesar*, etc. — ἐξεθαύμαζον] see the critical remarks. The *aorist* would merely narrate historically; the *imperfect* depicts, and is therefore not inappropriate (in opposition to Fritzsche); see Kühner, II. p. 73, and *ad Xen. Anab.* vii. 1. 13. Comp. v. 20, vi. 6. The compound ἐκθαυμ. strengthens the notion; Eccclus. xxvii. 23, xliii. 18; 4 Macc. xvii. 17, also in the later Greek writers, but not further used in the N. T.

Vv. 18–27.¹ See on Matt. xxii. 23–33, who narrates more briefly and smoothly. Comp. Luke xx. 27–40. — ἐπηρώτων] Imperfect, as at ver. 17. — Ver. 19. ὅτι is recitative, and ἵνα is the *imperative* to be explained by the *volo* that lies at the root of the expression (see on 2 Cor. viii. 7; Eph. v. 33). Comp. on ὅτι before the imperative, Plat. *Crit.* p. 50 C: ἴσως ἂν εἴποιεν (the laws), ὅτι . . . μὴ θαύμαζε τὰ λεγόμενα. — The

¹ Hitzig, *Joh. Mark.* p. 219 ff., places the *Pericope of the adulteress*, John vii. 53 ff., after ver. 17, wherein Holtzmann, p. 92 ff., comparing it with Luke xxi. 37 f., so far follows him as to assume that it had stood in the *primitive-Mark*, and had been omitted by all the three Synoptists. Hilgenfeld (in his *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 317) continues to attribute it to John. It probably belonged originally to one of the sources of Luke that are unknown to us.

ἐπιγαμβρεύσει, which Matthew has here, is a later annexation to the original text of the law. Anger, *Diss.* II. p. 32, takes another view (in favour of Matthew). — Ver. 20. ἐπτά] emphatically prefixed, and introduced in a vivid way without οὖν. — Ver. 21. καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτός] *and also not he.* — καὶ ὁ τρίτος ὥσαύτ.] namely, he took her and died without children; comp. what has gone before. — Ver. 23. ὅταν ἀναστῶσι] *when they shall have risen*, not an epexegetis of ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει: but the discourse goes from the general to the particular, so that *the seven brothers and the woman* is the subject of ἀναστῶσι. — Ver. 24. διὰ τοῦτο] does not point back to what has gone before (“ipse sermo vester prodit errorem vestrum,” Bengel), which must have been *expressed*, but *forward* to the participle which follows: do ye not err *on this account*, because ye do not understand? See Maetzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 219; Bornemann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 137 f.; Winer, p. 146 f. [E. T. 201 f.]. — Ver. 25. ὅταν . . . ἀναστῶσιν] generally, not as at ver. 23. — γαμίζονται] The form γαμίσκω (Arist. *Pol.* vii. 14. 4) is not indeed to be read here (see the critical remarks), but neither is it, with Fritzsche, altogether to be banished out of the N. T. It is beyond doubt genuine in Luke xx. 34 f. — Ver. 26. ὅτι ἐγείρονται] *that* they, namely, etc.; this is the conclusion to be proved—the *doctrinal position* denied by the interrogators. — ἐπὶ τοῦ βάλτου] belongs to what has preceded (in opposition to Beza) as a more precise specification of ἐν τῷ βιβλ. *M.*: *at the* (well-known) *thorn-bush*, *i.e.* there, where it is spoken of, Ex. iii. 6. See on quotations of a similar kind, Jablonsky, *Bibl. Hebr.* praef. § 37; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* xi. 2. Polybius, Theophrastus, and others have βάτος as *masculine*. It usually occurs as *feminine* (Luke xx. 37; Deut. xxxiii. 16), but at Ex. iii. 2-4, likewise as *masculine*. — Ver. 27. According to the amended text (see the critical remarks): *He is not God of dead men, but of living! Much ye err!*

Vv. 28-34. See on Matt. xxii. 34-40. — Mark, however, has much that is peculiar, especially through the characteristic and certainly original amplification in vv. 32-34. — The *participles* are to be so apportioned, that ἀκούσας is subordinated

to the *προσελθών*, and *εἰδώς* belongs to *ἐπηρώτηρεν* as its determining motive. — *εἰδώς*] not inappropriate (Fritzsche, de Wette); but the scribe *knew* from his listening how aptly Jesus had answered *them* (*αὐτοῖς*, emphatically placed *before ἀπεκρ.*); and therefore he hoped that He would also give to him an apt reply. — *πάντων*] *neuter*. Compare Xen. *Mem.* iv. 7. 70 : ὁ δὲ ἥλιος . . . πάντων λαμπρότατος ὢν, Thucyd. vii. 52. 2. See Winer, p. 160 [E. T. 222]; Dorvill. *ad Charit.* p. 549. — Vv. 29, 30. Deut. vi. 4, 5. This principle of morality, which binds all duties into unity (see J. Müller, *v. d. Sünde*, I. p. 140 f.), was named pre-eminently *יהוה אחד*, or also from the initial word *יהוה*, and it was the custom to utter the words daily, morning and evening. See Vitranga, *Synag.* ii. 3. 15; Buxtorf, *Synag.* 9. — *ἰσχύος*] LXX. *δυνάμεως*. It is the *moral strength*, which makes itself known in the overcoming of hindrances and in energetic activity. Comp. Beck, *bibl. Scelenl.* p. 112 f., and on Eph. i. 19. Matthew has not this point, but Luke has at x. 27.¹ — Ver. 32. After *διδάσκαλε* there is only to be placed a comma, so that *ἐπ' ἀληθείας* (comp. on ver. 14) is a more precise definition of *καλῶς*. — *ὅτι εἷς ἐστι*] *that He is one*. The subject is obvious of itself from what precedes. As in the former passage of Scripture, ver. 29, so also here the mention of the unity of God is the premiss for the duty that follows; hence it is not an improbable trait (Köstlin, p. 351), which Mark has introduced here in the striving after completeness and with reference to the Gentile world. — Ver. 33. *συνέσεως*] a similar notion instead of a repetition of *διανοίας*, ver. 30. It is the moral intelligence which comprehends and understands the relation in question. Its opposite is *ἀσύνητος* (Rom. i. 21, 31), Dem. 1394, 4 : ἀρετῆς ἀπάσης ἀρχὴ ἡ σύνεσις. Comp. on Col. i. 9. — *ὀλοκαυτ.*] “Nobilissima species sacrificiorum,” Bengel. *πάντων τῶν* applies inclusively to *θυσιῶν*. Krüger, § 58. 3. 2. — Ver. 34. *ἰδὼν αὐτὸν, ὅτι*] Attraction, as at xi. 32 and frequently. — *νουνεχῶς*] *intelligently*, only here in the N. T.

¹ The variations of the words in Matthew, Mark, and Luke represent different forms of the Greek tradition as remembered, which arose independently of the LXX. (for no evangelist has *δύναμις*, which is in the LXX.).

Polybius associates it with *φρονίμως* (i. 83. 3) and *πραγματικῶς* (ii. 13. 1, v. 88. 2). On the character of the word as Greek, instead of which the Attics say *νουνεχόντως* (its opposite: *ἀφρόνως*, Isocr. v. 7), see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 599. — *οὐ μακρὰν κ.τ.λ.*] The (future) kingdom of the Messiah is conceived as the common *goal*. Those who are fitted for the membership of this kingdom are *near* to this goal; those who are unfitted are *remote* from it. Hence the meaning: There is not much lacking to thee, that thou mightest be received into the kingdom at its establishment. Rightly does Jesus give him this testimony, because in the frankly and eagerly avowed agreement of his religious-moral judgment with the answer of Jesus there was already implied a germ of faith promising much. — *καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι κ.τ.λ.*] not inappropriate (de Wette, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Bleek); but it was just this peculiar victory of Jesus—that now the result of the questioning was even agreement with Him—which took from all the further courage, etc.

REMARK.—The difference, arising from Matthew's bringing forward the scribe as *πειράζων* (and how naturally in the bearing of the matter this point of view suggested itself!), is not to be set aside, as, for instance, by Ebrard, p. 493,¹ who by virtue of harmonizing combination alters ver. 34 thus: "When Jesus saw how the man of sincere mind quite forgot over the truth of the case the matter of his pride," etc. The variation is to be explained by the fact, that the design of the questioner was from the very first differently conceived of and passed over in different forms into the tradition; not by the supposition, that Mark did not understand and hence omitted the trait of special temptation (Weiss), or had been induced by Luke xx. 39 to adopt a milder view (Baur). Nor has Matthew remodelled the narrative (Weiss); but he has followed *that* tradition which best fitted into his context. The wholly peculiar position of the matter in Mark tells in favour of the correctness and originality of his narrative.

¹ He follows the method of reconciliation proposed by Theophylact: *πρῶτον μὲν αὐτὸν ὡς πειράζοντα ἱρωτῆσαι· εἶτα ὠφελήντα ἀπὸ τῆς ἀποκρίσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ νουνεχῶς ἀποκριθὲντα ἰταινεῖσθαι*. Comp. Grotius and others, including already Victor Antiochenus and the anonymous writer in Possini *Cat.*; Lange, again, in substance takes the same view, while Bleek simply acknowledges the variation, and Hilgenfeld represents Mark as importing his own theology into the conversation.

Vv. 35–37. See on Matt. xxii. 41–46. Comp. Luke xx. 41–44.—Mark is distinguished from Matthew in this respect, that the latter represents Jesus as laying the theological problem before *the assembled Pharisees*, and then relates that they were *thereby* brought to silence, so that they put no further questions to Him; whereas Mark relates that *the conversation as to the most important commandment* had had this result, and thereafter Jesus had thrown out *before the people*, while He was teaching (vv. 37, 35), the question respecting the Son of David. — ἀποκριθεῖς] The following question to the people is a reply—publicly exposing the theological helplessness of the scribes—to the silence, to which they had just seen themselves reduced by the very fact that one of their number had even given his entire approval to Jesus. The scribes are still present. But it is not to *themselves* that Jesus puts His question; He utters it before the *people*, but in express *reference* to the γραμματεῖς. They may therefore give information also before the people, if they can. If they cannot, they stand there the more completely vanquished and put to shame. And they cannot, because to them the divine lineage of the Messiah, in virtue of which as David's descendant He is yet David's Lord, remained veiled and unperceived;—we may conceive after πόθεν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστίν the *pause* of this silence and this confusion. So peculiar is this whole position of the matter in Mark, that it appears to be (in opposition to Hilgenfeld and Baur) original. — πῶς] *how then?* “Quomodo consistere potest, quod dicunt,” Grotius.—The twofold emphatic αὐτὸς Δαυ. places the declaration of *David himself* in contrast to the point held by *the scribes*. — καὶ πόθεν] breaking in with surprise. Comp. Luke i. 43. πόθεν is the *causal* unde: *whence comes it that*.¹ Comp. Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 269 D.; Dem. 241, 17; Wolf, *ad Lept.* p. 238. — ὁ πολὺς ὄχλ.] *the multitude*

¹ In opposition to the whole N. T., the question is, according to Schenkel (comp. Strauss), intended to exhibit the Davidic descent of the Messiah as a *phantom*. This descent in fact forms of necessity the *presupposition* of the words καὶ πόθεν κ.τ.λ., the *concessum* on the part of Jesus Himself. And it is the postulate of the whole of the N. T. Christology, from Matt. i. 1 to Rev. xxii. 16. Comp., moreover, the appropriate remarks of Beyschlag, *Christol. d. N. T.* p. 61 f. But the *pre-existence* of Jesus, which certainly must have

of people, which was present. — ἤκουεν αὐτοῦ ἡδέως] a triumph over those put to silence.

Vv. 38-40. Comp. on Matt. xxiii. 1, 6, 7 (14). Mark gives only a short fragment (and Luke xx. 45-47 follows him) of the great and vehement original speech of severe rebuke, which Matthew has adopted in full from the collection of Logia. — βλέπετε ἀπό] as viii. 15. — τῶν θελόντων] *quippe qui volunt*, desire, i.e. lay claim to as a privilege. "Velle saepe rem per se indifferentem malam facit," Bengel. — ἐν στολαῖς] i.e. in long stately robes, as στολή, even without more precise definition, is frequently used (1 Macc. vi. 16; Luke xv. 22; Marc. Anton. i. 7). Grotius well remarks that the στολή is "gravitatis index." — καὶ ἀσπασμούς] governed by θελόντων. See Winer, p. 509 [E. T. 722]. — Ver. 40. οἱ κατεσθίοντες κ.τ.λ.] is usually not separated from what precedes, so that the nominative would come in instead of the genitive, bringing into more independent and emphatic prominence the description of their character. See Bernhardt, p. 68 f.; Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* p. 69 [E. T. 79]. But it is more suited to the vehement emotion of the discourse (with which also the asyndetic form of ver. 40 is in keeping), along with Grotius, Bengel, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Ewald (doubtfully also Winer, p. 165 [E. T. 228]), to begin with οἱ κατεσθίοντες a new sentence, which runs on to κρίμα: *the devourers of widows' houses . . . these shall* (in the Messianic judgment) *receive a greater condemnation!* — καί] is the simple copula: *those devouring widows' houses and* (and withal) *by way of pretence uttering long prayers* (in order to conceal under them their pitiless greed). — τῶν χηρῶν] ὑπείσῃρχοντο γὰρ τὰς ἀπροστατεύτους γυναῖκας ὡς δῆθεν προστάται αὐτῶν ἐσόμενοι, Theophylact. — καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσευχ.] προσχήματι εὐλαβείας καὶ ὑποκρίσει ἀπατώντες τοὺς ἀφέλεστέρους, Theophylact. — περισσότερον κρίμα] ὅσω δὲ μᾶλλον τετίμηνται παρὰ τῷ λαῷ καὶ τὴν τιμὴν εἰς βλάβην ἔλκουσι,

been in His consciousness when He asked the question, is not expressed (in some such way as in John viii. 58), nor is the recognition of it claimed for the Psalmist by ἰν πνύματι. The latter merely asserts that David, as a prophet, designated his Son as his Lord.

τοσοῦτῳ μᾶλλον καταδικασθήσονται· δυνατοὶ γὰρ δυνατῶς ἐτασθήσονται, Victor Antiochenus.

Vv. 41-44. Comp. Luke xxi. 1-4. It is surprising that this highly characteristic and original episode, which according to Eichthal, indeed, is an interpolation and repeated by Luke, has not been adopted in Matthew. But after the great rebuking discourse and its solemn close, the little isolated picture seems not to have found a place. — τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου] comp. Josephus, *Antt.* xix. 6. 1, where Agrippa hangs a golden chain ὑπὲρ τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον. According to the Rabbins it consisted of thirteen trumpet-shaped brazen chests (תריסין), and was in the fore-court of the women. It was destined for the reception of pious contributions for the temple, as well as of the temple-tribute. See, generally, Lightfoot, *Hor.* p. 539 f.; Reland, *Antt.* i. 8. 14. The treasure-chambers (γαζοφυλάκια) in Josephus, *Bell.* v. 5. 2 and vi. 5. 2, have no bearing here. Comp. Ebrard, p. 495. The word itself (comp. John viii. 20) is found also in the Greek writers (Strabo, ii. p. 319), and frequently in the LXX. and the Apocrypha. — χαλκόν] not *money in general* (Grotius, Fritzsche, and others), but *copper money*, which *most of the people* gave. See Beza. — ἔβαλλον] *imperfect*, as at vv. 17, 18. The reading ἔβαλον (Fritzsche) is too weakly attested, and is not necessary. — Ver. 42 f. μία] in contrast with the πολλοὶ πλούσιοι: *one single poor widow*. A λεπτόν, so called from its smallness (Xen. *Cyr.* i. 4. 11: τὸ λεπτότατον τοῦ χαλκοῦ νομίσματος), was $\frac{1}{8}$ th of an as in copper. See on Matt. v. 26. It is the same definition in the Talmud, that two פרוגין make a ענטס רירר; see Lightfoot, p. 638 f.—On the fact that it is not “a quadrans” but λεπτὰ δύο, that is mentioned, Bengel has aptly remarked: “quorum unum vidua retinere potuerat.” The Rabbinical ordinance: “Non ponat homo λεπτόν in cistam eleemosynarum” (*Bava bathra* f. 10. 2), has no bearing here (in opposition to Schoettgen), for here we have not to do with *alms*. — προσκαλεσάμ.] “de re magna,” Bengel. — πλεῖον πάντων] is said *according to the scale of means*; all the rest still kept back much for themselves, the widow nothing (see what follows),—a sacrifice which Jesus

estimates in its *moral* greatness; τὴν ἑαυτῆς προαίρεσιν ἐπεδείξατο εὐπορωτέραν τῆς δυνάμεως, Theophylact. — The *present* participle βαλλόντων (see the critical remarks) is not inappropriate (Fritzsche), but designates *those who were throwing*, whose βάλλειν was *present*, when the widow ἔβαλε. — Ver. 44. ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσ. αὐτῆς] (not αὐτῆς) is the antithesis of ἐκ τοῦ περισσ. αὐτ. in ver. 43. Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 14; Phil. iv. 12. Out of her want, out of her destitution, she has cast in all that (in cash) she possessed, her whole (present) means of subsistence. Observe the earnest twofold designation. On βίος, *victus, that whereby one lives*, comp. Luke viii. 43, xv. 12, 30; Hesiod, *Op.* 230; Xen. *Mem.* iii. 11. 6; Soph. *Phil.* 919, 1266; Dem. 869, 25; Plat. *Gorg.* p. 486 D; and Stallbaum *in loc.*

CHAPTER XIII.

VER. 2. ἀποκριθεῖς] is, with Tisch., to be deleted, as at xi. 33, following B L 8, min. vss. — Ver. 2. ὡδε is adopted before λίθος by Griesb. Fritzsche, Scholz, Lachm., in accordance doubtless with B D G L U Δ 8, min. vss., but it is an addition from Matt. xxiv. 2. It is genuine in Matthew alone, where, moreover, it is not wanting in any of the codices. — Ver. 4. εἰπέ] B D L 8, min. have εἰπόν. So Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. This rarer form is to be adopted in accordance with so considerable testimony; εἰπέ is from Matthew. — With Tisch., following B L 8, we must write ταῦτα συντελ. πάντα; different attempts to rectify the order produced the variations. — Ver. 8. Before the second ἔσονται we must, with Tisch., delete καί, in accordance with B L 8**. — καὶ παραχαί] Suspected by Griesb., struck out by Lachm. and Tisch., in accordance with B D L 8, Copt. Aeth. Erp. Vulg. It. Vict. But wherefore and whence was it to have been introduced? On the other hand, it was very easily lost in the following ἀρχαί. — Ver. 9. ἀρχαί] B D K L U Δ 8, min. vss. Vulg. It. also have ἀρχή, which is commended by Griesb., adopted by Fritzsche, Scholz, Lachm. Tisch.; from Matt. xxiv. 8. — Ver. 11. Instead of ἄγωνιν Elz. has ἀγάγωνιν, in opposition to decisive evidence. — μηδὲ μελετᾶτε] is wanting in B D L 8, min. Copt. Aeth. Ar. p. Erp. Vulg. It. Vigil. Condemned by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. But the Homoioteleuton the more easily occasioned the omission of the words, since they follow immediately after τὶ λαλήσητε. Luke xxi. 14, moreover, testifies in favour of their genuineness. — Ver. 14. After ἐρημώσεως Elz. Scholz, Fritzsche (Lachm. in brackets) have: τὸ ῥήθην ἐπὶ Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου, which words are not found in B D L 8, Copt. Arm. It. Vulg. Sax. Aug. They are from Matthew. — ἐστῶς] Lachm. has ἐστηκός, following D 28; Tisch. has ἐστηκότα, following B L 8. Fritzsche: ἐστός, according to A E F G H V Δ, min. Under these circumstances the *Recepta* has preponderant evidence against it; it is from Matt. xxiv. 15. Of the other readings ἐστηκός is to

be adopted, because B L S also testify in its favour by ἐστηκότα;¹ while ἐστὺς likewise betrays its origin from Matthew (var.; see the critical remarks on Matt. xxiv. 15). — Ver. 16. ὤν] is wanting in B D L Δ S, min. Lachm. Tisch. But how easily it dropt out after ἀγρὸν! the more easily, because ὤν stood also in ver. 15. — Ver. 18. ἡ φυγὴ τῶν ὡν] is wanting in B D L Δ S* min. Arm. Vulg. It., and in other witnesses is represented by ταῦτα. Condemned by Griesb. and Rinck, deleted by Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. Rightly so; it is from Matt. xxiv. 20, from which place also codd. and vss. have after χεῖμωνος added: μηδὲ σαββάτω, or μηδὲ σαββάτου, or ἡ σαββάτου, and the like. — Ver. 19. ἡς] Lachm. Tisch. have ἡν, following B C* L S, 28. A correction. The omission of ἡς ἔκτ. ὁ Θεός in D 27, Arm. codd. It. is explained by the superfluousness of the words. — Ver. 21. The omission of ἡ, which Griesb., following Mill, commended, and Fritzsche and Tisch. have carried out, is too weakly attested. In itself it might as well have been added from Matthew as omitted in accordance with Luke. — Instead of πιστεύετε Elz. has πιστεύσητε, in opposition to preponderant evidence; it is from Matt. xxiv. 23. — Ver. 22. Although only on the evidence of D, min. codd. It., ψευδόχριστοι καὶ is to be deleted, and ποιήσουσιν is to be written instead of δώσουσι. Moreover (with Tisch.), καὶ is to be omitted before τοὺς ἐκλ. (B D S). The *Recepta* is a filling up from Matthew. — Ver. 23. ἰδοὺ] is wanting in B L 28, Copt. Aeth. Verc. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. An addition from Matthew. — Ver. 25. τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται] A B C S, min. vss. have ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. So Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. Instead of ἐκπίπτ. B C D L S, min. codd. It. have πίπτοντες (so Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch.). Thus the most important codices are *against* the *Recepta* (D has οἱ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται πίπτοντες), in place of which the best attested of these readings are to be adopted. Internal grounds are wanting; but if it had been altered from Matthew, ἀπό would have been found instead of ἐκ. — Ver. 27. αὐτοῦ] after ἀγγέλ. is wanting in B D L, Copt. Cant. Verc. Vind. Corb. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch.; it is from Matthew. — Ver. 28. The verbal order ἡδὴ ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς (Fritzsche, Lachm.) has preponderating evidence, but it is from Matthew. The manifold transpositions in the codices would have no motive, if the reading of Lachm. had been the original, as in the case of Matthew no variation is found. — γινώσκεται] A B** D L Δ, min. have γινώσκεται, which is approved by Schulz and adopted by Fritzsche and Tisch. The

¹ The masculine was introduced by the reference, frequent in the Fathers, to the statue (τὸν ἀνδριάντα) of the conqueror.

Recepta is from the parallels. — Ver. 31. Instead of *παρελεύσεται*, Elz. Lachm. Tisch. have *παρελεύσονται*. The plural (B D K U Γ 8) is to be maintained here and at Luke xxi. 33; the remembrance of the well-known saying from Matth. suggested *παρελεύσεται* in the *singular*. Moreover, it tells in favour of the *plural*, that B L 8, min. (Tisch.) have *παρελεύσονται* again afterwards instead of *παρέλθωσι*, although this is a mechanical repetition. — Ver. 32. Instead of *ἡ* Elz. has *καί*, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 33. *καὶ προσεύχεσθε*] is wanting in B D 122, Cant. Verc. Colb. Tolet. Deleted by Lachm. Rightly; an addition that easily occurred (comp. Matt. xxvi. 41 and the parallels). — Ver. 34. *καί* is to be deleted before *ἐκάστω* (with Lachm. and Tisch.), in conformity with B C* D L 8, min. codd. It. — Ver. 37. Between *αὐ* in Elz. Scholz, and *ο* which Griesb. has approved, and Fritzsche, Lachm. have adopted, the evidence is very much divided. But *ο* is an unnecessary emendation, although it is now preferred by Tisch. (B C 8, etc.). D, codd. It. have *ἐγὼ δὲ λ. ὅμ. γρηγ.*

Vv. 1–8. See on Matt. xxiv. 1–8. Comp. Luke xxi. 5–11. Mark has preserved the *introduction* in its original historical form. But Matthew *has the discourse itself*, although more artistically elaborated, in its greatest completeness from the collection of Logia and with some use of Mark; and that down to the consummation of the last judgment.¹ — *ποταποὶ λίθοι*] *quales lapides!* ἀκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς ἐκ λίθων μὲν λευκῶν τε καὶ καρτερῶν, τὸ μέγεθος ἐκάστων περὶ πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι πηχῶν ἐπὶ μῆκος, ὀκτὼ δὲ ὕψος, εὖρος δὲ περὶ δώδεκα, Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 11. 3. See Ottii *Spicileg.* p. 175. *Who* uttered the exclamation? (Was it Peter? or Andrew?) Probably Mark himself did not know. — On the *ποταπός* belonging to later usage, see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 56 f.; Fritzsche, p. 554 f. — Ver. 2. *ὅς οὐ μὴ καταλ.*] for *οὐ μὴ* in the relative clause, see Winer, p. 450 [E. T. 635 f.] The conception here is: there shall certainly be no stone left upon the other, which

¹ Weizsäcker, p. 125, conjectures from Barnabas 4 (8), where a saying of Enoch is quoted about the shortening (*συντίμην*) of the days of the final offence (comp. ver. 20; Matt. xxiv. 22), that the properly apocalyptic elements of the discourse as to the future are of Jewish origin, from an Apocalypse of Enoch; but the conjecture rests on much too bold and hasty an inference, hazarded as it is on a single thought, which Jesus Himself might very fairly share with the Jewish consciousness in general.

(in the further course of the destruction) would be secure from being thrown down. Comp. Luke xviii. 30. — Ver. 3. As previously, Mark here also relates more vividly (*κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ*) and more accurately (*Πέτρος κ.τ.λ.*) than Matthew. According to de Wette (comp. Saunier, p. 132; Strauss, Baur), Mark is induced to the latter statement by the *κατ' ἰδίαν* of Matthew—a specimen of the great injustice which is done to Mark as an alleged compiler. — *εἰπόν*] Thus, and not *εἶπον*, is this imperative (which is also current among the Attic writers; see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 348) to be accented in the N. T. See Winer, p. 49 [E. T. 58]. — *τὸ σημεῖον*] *scil. ἔσται*: *what will be the fore-token* (which appears), *when* all this destruction is to enter on its fulfilment? — *ταῦτα συντελ. πάντα*] (see the critical remarks) applies not to the *buildings* of the temple (Fritzsche, who takes *συντελεῖσθαι* as *simul excindi*, comp. Beza), but, just like *ταῦτα*, to the *destruction* announced at ver. 2. To explain it of “*the whole world*” (as *ταῦτα* is well known to be so used by the philosophers, Bernhardt, p. 280) or of “*all things of the Parousia*” (Lange), is a forced course at variance with the context, occasioned by Matt. xxiv. 3¹ (in opposition to Grotius, Bengel). Moreover, the state of the case is here *climactic*; hence, while previously there stood merely *ταῦτα*, now *πάντα* is added; previously: *ἔσται*, now *συντελεῖσθαι* (*be consummated*). — Ver. 5. Jesus now begins His detailed explanation as to the matter (*ἤρξατο*). — Ver. 7. *τὸ τέλος*] the end of the tribulation (see ver. 9), not the end of *the world* (so even Dorner, Lange, Bleek), which only sets in *after* the end of the tribulation. See on Matt. xxiv. 6. — Ver. 8. *καὶ ἔσονται . . . καὶ ἔσονται*] solemnly. — *καὶ παραχαί*] Famines and (therewith connected) *disturbances*, not exactly *revolts* (Griesbach), which the context does not suggest, but more general. Plat. Legg. ix. p. 861 A: *παραχὴ τε καὶ ἀξυμφωνία*. Theact. p. 168 A: *ταρ. καὶ ἀπορία*, Alc. ii. p. 146, 15: *ταρ*,

¹ Nevertheless, between the passage before us and Matt. *l.c.* there is no essential diversity, since the disciples conceived of the destruction of Jerusalem as immediately preceding the Parousia. See on Matt. xxiv. 3. Comp. also Dorner, *de orat. Chr. eschatologica*, p. 45.

τε καὶ ἀνομία, 2 Macc. xiii. 16. Comp. *τύραχος*, Acts xii. 18, xix. 23.

Vv. 9–13. See on Matt. xxiv. 9, xiv. 10–13; Luke xxi. 12–18. Mark has here interwoven some things from the discourse which is found at Matt. x. 17–22. — *ἀρχαί*] prefixed with emphasis: *beginnings* of sorrows (comp. τὸ τέλος, ver. 7) are these. — *βλέπετε δὲ κ.τ.λ.*] *but look ye* (ye on your part, in the midst of these sorrows that surround you) *to yourselves*, how *your own conduct* must be. Comp. on βλέπ. *ἐαυτ.*, 2 John 8; Gal. vi. 1. — *συνέδρια*] *judicial assemblies*, as Matt. x. 17. — *καὶ εἰς συναγωγ.*] attaches itself, as *εἰς συνέδρια* precedes, most naturally to *this* (Luther, Castalio, Erasmus, Beza, Calovius, Elz., Lachmann), so that with *δαρήσεσθε* begins a further step of the description. The more usual connection with *δαρήσεσθε*, preferred also by Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 287 [E. T. 333] and Bleek, is inadmissible, because *εἰς* cannot be taken in the pregnant meaning (instead of *ἐν*; for the element of “motion towards” is not implied in *δαρήσ.*), and because the explanation (see my first edition): *ye shall be brought under blows of scourges into synagogues* (comp. Bengel, Lange), is not accordant with fact, since the scourging took place *in* the synagogues; see on Matt. x. 17; Acts xxii. 19. That *δαρήσ.* comes in asyndetically, is in keeping with the emotional character of the discourse. — *εἰς μαρτύρ. αὐτοῖς*] *i.e.* in order that a testimony may be given to them, the rulers and kings, namely, regarding me (comp. previously *ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ*), regarding my person and my work (not: “intrepidi, quo causam meam defendatis, animi,” Fritzsche)—which, no doubt, involves their inexcusableness in the event of their unbelief; but it is arbitrary to explain the dative here just as if it were *εἰς κατηγορίαν κ. ἔλεγχον αὐτῶν* (Euthymius Zigabenus, Theophylact, and many others). Comp. on Matt. x. 18. — Ver. 10. And this your vocation fraught with suffering will not soon pass away; *among all nations* (*πάντα* has the emphasis) *must first* (before the end of the sorrows appears, comp. *ἀρχαὶ ὠδίνων*, ver. 9), etc. These words are neither disturbing nor inappropriate (as Köstlin judges, p. 352, comp. Schenkel and Weiss); they substantially agree with Matt. xxiv. 14, and do

not betray a "more advanced position in point of time" on Mark's part (Hilgenfeld), nor are they concocted by the latter out of κ. τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Matt. x. 18 (Weiss). — Ver. 11. μελετᾶτε the proper word for the studying of discourses. See Wetstein. The opposite of extemporizing. Comp. Dem. 1129, 9 : μελετᾶν τὴν ἀπολογίαὺν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν. — δοθῇ] has the emphasis. — οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς] of them it is absolutely denied that they are the speakers. Comp. on Matt. x. 20. — Ver. 12. See on Matt. x. 21. From that hostile delivering up, however (comp. παραδιδόντες, ver. 11), neither the relationship of brother nor of child, etc., will protect my confessors. — Ver. 13. ὑπομείνας] according to the context here: in the confession of my name. See above, διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. See, moreover, on Matt. xxiv. 13. The τέλος is that of the ὠδίνων, ver. 9, not that "of the theocratic period of the world's history" (Schenkel).

Vv. 14-23. See on Matt. xxiv. 15-26. Comp. Luke xxi. 20-24, who, however, has freely elements that are peculiar. — ὅπου οὐ δεῖ] thoughtful, but more indefinite designation of the sacred temple-area than in Matthew, where the more definite expression, as well as the reference by name (not merely suggested by the use of the set expression τὸ βδέλ. τ. ἔρημ.) to Dan. ix. 27, betrays a later manipulation. — Ver. 16. ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν ὦν] he who is (has gone) into the field. See on ii. 1. — Ver. 18. Mark has, with a view to his Gentile-Christian readers, passed over the μηδὲ σαββάτῳ, which was in the collection of Logia, in Matt. xxiv. 20. — Ver. 19. ἔσονται . . . θλίψις] "Tempori adscribitur res, quae in tempore fit; una et continua erit calamitas," Wetstein. — οἷα οὐ γέγονε κ.τ.λ.] Comp. Plato, *Rep.* vi. p. 492 E : οὔτε γὰρ γίγνεται, οὔτε γέγονεν, οὔτ' οὖν μὴ γένηται. — τοιαύτη] after οἷα. See Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 14; Kühner, II. p. 527. — κτίσεως ἥς ἔκτισ. ὁ Θεός] Comp. ver. 20 : διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο, Herod. iii. 147 : ἐντολὰς τε, τὰς . . . ἐνετέλλετο, Philostr. *V. Arp.* iv. 13. 150 : τῆς μήνιδος ἦν ἐμήρισας. The mode of expression has for its object "gravius eandem notionem bis iterari," Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 522. A contrast with the Jewish state as a human κτίσις (Lange) is fanciful. κτίσις, that

which is created, see on Rom. viii. 19. — ἀποπλαν.] 1 Tim. vi. 10. — Ver. 23. In Matthew at this point the saying about the lightning and the carcase, which certainly belongs originally to this place, is added (vv. 27, 28).

Vv. 24–27. See on Matt. xxiv. 29–31. Comp. Luke xxi. 25–28. — ἀλλ’] breaking off and leading over to a new subject. Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 34 f. — ἐν ἐκείναις τ. ἡμέρ. μετὰ τ. θλίψ. ἐκ.] Thus in Mark also the Parousia is predicted as setting in *immediately* after the destruction of Jerusalem, since it is still to follow *in those days*¹ (comp. vv. 19, 20). The εὐθέως of Matthew is not thereby *avoided* (de Wette, Bleek, and others), but this εὐθέως is only a still more express and more direct definition, which tradition has given to the saying. To refer ἐν ἐκ. τ. ἡμ. to the times of the church that are still continuing, is an exegetical impossibility. Even Baur and Hilgenfeld are in error in holding that Mark has conceived of the Parousia as *at least not following so immediately close* upon the destruction. — Ver. 25. οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κ.τ.λ.] *the stars of heaven* shall be, etc., which is more simple (comp. Rev. vi. 13) than that which is likewise linguistically correct: *the stars shall from heaven*, etc. (Hom. *Od.* xiv. 31, *Il.* xi. 179; Soph. *Aj.* 1156; Aesch. ii. 34; Gal. v. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 17). — ἔσονται ἐκπίπτ.] more graphic and vividly realizing than the simple πεσοῦνται (Matt.). — Ver. 26. Mark has not *the order of sequence* of the event, as Matthew depicts it; he relates *summarily*. — Ver. 27. ἀπ’ ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ] *From the outmost border of the earth* (conceived as a flat surface) shall the ἐπισυνάγειν begin, and be carried through even to the opposite end, *where the outmost border of the heaven* (κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον of the horizon) sets limit to the earth. The expression is *more poetical* than in Matthew; it is the

¹ It is, in fact, to impute great thoughtlessness and stupidity to Mark, if people can believe, with Baur, *Markusev.* p. 101, that Mark did not write till after Matthew and Luke, and yet did not allow himself to be deterred by all that had intervened between the composition of Matthew's Gospel and his own, from speaking of the nearness of the Parousia in the same expressions as Matthew used. This course must certainly be followed, if the composition of Mark (comp. also Köstlin, p. 383) is brought down to so late a date.

more arbitrary to think (with Bleek) in the case of γῆς of those still living, and in that of οὐρ. of those who sleep in bliss.

Vv. 28-32. See on Matt. xxiv. 32-36. Comp. Luke xxi. 29-33.—*αὐτῆς*] prefixed with emphasis (see the critical remarks) as the subject that serves for the comparison: When *of it the branch* shall have already become tender, so that thus *its* development has already *so far* advanced. The *singular* ὁ κλάδος, *the shoot*, belongs to the *concrete* representation.—τὸ θέρος] is an image of the Messianic period also in the *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 725.—Ver. 30. ἡ γεγενῆσθαι αὐτῇ] *i.e.* the *present generation*, which γεγενῆσθαι with αὐτῇ means throughout in the N. T., Matt. xi. 16, xii. 41, 42, 45, xxiii. 36; Mark viii. 12, 13; Luke vii. 31, xi. 29, 30, 31, 32, 50, 51. Comp. Heb. iii. 10 (Lachmann). Nevertheless, and although Jesus has just (ver. 29) presupposed of the disciples in general, that they would *live to see* the Parousia—an assumption which, moreover, underlies the exhortations of ver. 33 ff.—although, too, the context does not present the slightest trace of a reference to *the Jewish people*, there has been an endeavour very recently to uphold this reference; see especially Dörner, p. 75 ff. The word never means *people*,¹ but may in the signification *race, progenies*, receive possibly by virtue of the *connection* the approximate *sense* of *people*, which, however, is not the case here. See, moreover, on Matt. xxiv. 34.—οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός] Observe the *climax*: the *angels*, the *Son*, the *Father*. Jesus thus confesses in the most unequivocal words that the day and hour of His Parousia are *unknown*² to *Himself*, to *Him the Son of God* (see subsequently ὁ πατήρ),—

¹ The signification “people” is rightly not given either by Spitzner on Homer, *Il.* Exc. ix. 2, or in Stephani *Thez.*, ed. Hase, II. p. 559 f.; in the latter there are specified—(1) *genus, progenies*; (2) *generatio, genitura*; (3) *aetas, seculum*. Comp. Becker, *Anecd.* p. 231, 11; also Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 353.

² Matthew has not οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός; according to Köstlin, Holtzmann, and others, he is held to have omitted it on account of its dogmatic difficulty. But this is to carry back the scruples of later prepossession into the apostolic age. Zeller (in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 308 ff.) finds in the words, because they attribute to Christ a nature exalted above the angels, an indication that our Mark was not written until the first half of the second century; but his view is founded on erroneous assumptions with respect to the origin of the Epistles to the Colossians,

a confession of non-omniscience, which cannot surprise us (comp. Acts i. 7) when we consider the human limitation (comp. Luke ii. 52) into which the Son of God had entered (comp. on x. 18), — a confession, nevertheless, which has elicited from the antipathy to Arianism some strange devices to evade it, as when Athanasius and other Fathers (in Suicer, *Theol.* II. p. 163 f.) gave it as their judgment that Jesus meant the not-knowing of His *human nature* only (Gregor. *Epist.* viii. 42: “*in natura quidem humanitatis novit diem et horam, non ex natura humanitatis novit*”); while Augustine, *de Genesi c. Manich.* 22, *de Trinit.* i. 12, and others were of opinion that He did not know it *for His disciples*, in so far as He had not been commissioned by God to reveal it unto them. See in later times, especially Wetstein. Similarly Victor Antiochenus also and Theophylact suggest that He desired, as a wise Teacher, to keep it concealed from the disciples, although He was aware of it. Lange, *L. J.* II. 3, p. 1280, invents the view that He *willed* not to know it (in contrast with the sinful wish to know on the part of the disciples), for there was no call in the horizon of His life for His *reflecting* on that day. So, in his view, it was likewise with the angels in heaven. The Lutheran orthodoxy asserts that *κατὰ κτήσιν* He was omniscient, but that *κατὰ χρῆσιν* He had not everything *in promptu*.¹ See Calovius. Ambrosius, *de fide*, v. 8, cut the knot, and declared that *οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς* was an interpolation of the Arians. Nevertheless it is contained *implicite* also in the *εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ μόνος* of Matthew, even although it may not have stood originally in the collection of Logia, but rather is to be attributed to the love of details in Mark, whose dependence not on our Matthew (Baur, *Markusev.* p. 102, comp. his *neut. Theol.* p. 102), but on the

Ephesians, and Philippians, and of the fourth Gospel. Moreover, Paul places Christ above the angels in other passages (Rom. viii. 38; 2 Thess. i. 7), and even as early as in the history of the temptation they *minister* to Him. Zeller believes that he gathers the like conclusion in respect of the date of the composition of our Gospel (and of that of Luke also), but under analogous incorrect combinations, *from the fact* that Mark (and Luke) attaches so studious importance to the narratives of the expulsion of demons.

¹ See, on the other hand, Thomasius, *Chr. Pers. u. Werk.* II. p. 156 f.

apostle's collection of Logia, may be recognised in this more precise explanation.

Vv. 33-37. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 42, 44 ff., xxv. 14. By way of an energetic conclusion Mark has here a passage, which has been formed by the aggregation of several different portions—belonging to this connection, and most completely preserved in Matthew from the collection of Logia—on the part of tradition or of the evangelist himself into a well-adjusted, compact, and imposing unity.—Ver. 34. ὥς] an *anantapodoton*, as at Matt. xxv. 14. See *in loc.* With ὥς the plan of the discourse was, after ver. 34, to subjoin: *so do I also bid you: watch!* Instead of this, after ἵνα γρηγορή, with an abandonment of the plan of sentence introduced by ὥς, there follows at once, with striking and vivid effect, the exhortation itself: γρηγορεῖτε, which now, just because the ὥς is forgotten, is linked on by οὖν. — ἀπόδημος] is not equivalent to ἀποδημῶν (Matt. xxv. 14), but: *who has taken a journey.* Pind. *Pyth.* iv. 8; Plut. *Mor.* p. 299 E. At the same time ἐνετείλατο is not to be taken as a *pluperfect*, but: “*as a traveller, when he had left his house, after having given to his slaves the authority and to each one his work, gave to the doorkeeper also command, in order that he should watch.*” In this we have to observe: (1) the ἐνετείλατο took place after the ἀπόδημος had gone out of his house; (2) καὶ δοὺς κ.τ.λ., in which καὶ is *also*, is subordinate to the ἀφείς κ.τ.λ., because *prior* to the leaving of the house; (3) ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημ.] forms *one* notion: *a man finding himself on a journey, a traveller*; comp. ἄνθρωπος ὁδίτης, Hom. *Il.* xvi. 263; *Od.* xiii. 123; ἄνθρ. ἔμπορος, Matt. xiii. 45, *al.*; (4) the ἐξουσία, the authority concerned in the case, is according to the context the control over the household. This He gave to *all in common*; and, moreover, to *every one in particular* the special business which he had to execute. Fritzsche is wrong in making the participles ἀφείς . . . καὶ δοὺς dependent on ἀπόδημος: “*homo, qui relicta domo sua et commissa servis procuratione assignatoque suo cuique penso peregre abfuit.*” Against this may be urged, partly that ἀφείς τ. οἰκ. αὐτοῦ would be a quite superfluous definition to ἀπόδημος, partly that δοὺς κ.τ.λ. would need to stand

before ἀφ' οὗ κ.τ.λ., because the man *first* made the arrangement and *then* left the house. — Ver. 35. *γρηγορεῖτε οὖν*] the apostles thus are here compared with the *doorkeeper*. — As to the *four watches of the night*, see on Matt. xiv. 24. They belong to the *pictorial effect* of the parable; the *night-season* is in keeping with the figurative *γρηγορεῖτε*, without exactly expressing “a dark and sad time” (Lange). Singularly at variance with the text as it stands, Theophylact and many others interpret it of the four ages of human life. — Ver. 37. The reference to *one* thought is not at variance with the use of the plural *ἄ* (see the critical remarks). See Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iii. 5. 5. — *πάντοι*] to all who confess me.

CHAPTER XIV.

VER. 2. $\delta\epsilon$] B C* D L Σ , vss. have γάρ. So Lachm. and Tisch. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xxvi. 5. — Ver. 3. καί before συντρ. is, with Tisch., following B L Σ , Copt., to be deleted. A connective addition. — τὸ ἀλλάβ.] Fritzsche, Lachm. read τὸν ἀλλάβ., which is attested by A D E F H K S U V X r, min. Tisch., following B C L Δ Σ **, has τὴν ἀλλάβ., and this is to be preferred. The ignorance of the transcribers brought in τό and τόν. — κατὰ] is wanting in B C L Δ Σ , min. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. A supplement, instead of which D has ἐπί. — Ver. 4. καὶ λέγοντες] is with Tisch., in accordance with B C* L Σ , Copt., to be deleted. It is a gloss after Matthew, instead of which D reads καὶ ἔλεγον. — Ver. 5. τὸ μῦθον] is wanting in Elz., but is decisively attested. The omission is explained from Matt. xxvi. 9 (where τοῦτο alone is genuine). The preponderance of evidence forbids the supposition that it is an interpolation from John xii. 5. D, min. have it before τοῦτο, and in Σ τοῦτο is wanting. — Ver. 6. Instead of ἐν ἐμοί Elz. has εἰς ἐμέ, in opposition to decisive evidence. It is from Matthew. — Ver. 8. αὕτη] is only wanting, indeed, in B L Σ , min. Copt. Syr. utr. (bracketed by Lachm.), but is rightly deleted by Tisch. It is an addition, which is not found till after ἐποίησεν in Δ . Comp. Matt. xxvi. 12. — Ver. 9. After ἀμήν very considerable evidence supports $\delta\epsilon$, which Lachm. has bracketed, Tisch. has adopted. It is to be adopted; the omission occurred conformably to the usual expression of Mark, in accordance with Matt. xxvi. 13. — τοῦτο] is wanting in B D L Σ , min. Cant. Verc. Vind. Corb. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. It is from Matt. xxvi. 13. — Ver. 14. After κατάλυμα Griesb. Fritzsche, Lachm. (in brackets) Tisch. read μου, following B C D L Δ Σ , min. Sax. Vulg. It. (not all the codices). As μου has this strong attestation and yet is superfluous, and as it does not occur at Luke xxii. 11, it is to be held as genuine. — Ver. 15. The form ἀνάγαιον (Elz.: ἀνώγειον) is decisively attested. — Before ἐστὶ is to be read with Tisch. καί, in accordance with B C D L Σ , 346, vss. It dropped out in accordance with Luke xxii. 12. — Ver. 19. καὶ ἄλλως μῆτις ἐγώ] is wanting in B C L P Δ Σ , min. vss., including Syr., utr. Vulg. After the example of earlier

editors, suspected by Griesb., rejected by Schulz, struck out by Fritzsche and Tisch. But the omission might just as easily have been brought about by means of the preceding *μήτι ἐγώ* as by reason of the startling and even offensive superfluity of the words, which, moreover, are not found in Matthew, whereas no reason for their being added can at all be conceived of without arbitrary hypotheses. — After *λάβετε*, ver. 22, Elz. has *φάγετε*, in opposition to decisive evidence. From Matthew. — Ver. 23. The article before *ποτήριον* (deleted by Lachm. and Tisch.) has in this place even stronger evidence against it than in Matt. xxvi. 27, and is, as there, to be struck out. — Ver. 24. *τὸ τῆς*] This *τό* is, as in Matt. xxvi. 28, to be deleted on considerable evidence with Tisch. (Lachm. has bracketed it). — *καινῆς*] is wanting in B C D L Σ , Copt. Cant. Deleted by Tisch., and rightly, as also at Matt. xxvi. 28. — *περί*] B C D L Δ Σ , min.: *ὑπέρ*. So Lachm. and Tisch. *περί* is from Matthew, from whom also *codd.* and vss. have added *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτ.* — Ver. 27. *ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ*] So Elz. and the editors, except Fritzsche and Tisch., read after *σκανδαλ.* Yet Mill and Griesb. condemned the words. They are decisively to be rejected as an addition from Matt. xxvi. 31, as they are wholly wanting in preponderant witnesses, while others merely omit *ἐν ἐμοί*, and others still *ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ*. Lachm. has the latter in brackets. — *διασκορπισθήσεται* is an emendation (comp. on Matt. xxvi. 31), instead of which, with Lachm. and Tisch., *διασκορπισθήσονται* is to be read, and that with Tisch., *after πρόβατα* (B C D L Σ , min.). — Ver. 29. *καὶ εἰ*] Fritzsche, Tisch. read *εἰ καί*. Either is appropriate, and with the evidence divided no decision can be arrived at, even if *εἰ καί* was introduced in Matthew. — Ver. 30. *ὅτι* after *ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ*] B C D L Σ , min. Lachm. Tisch. have *ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί*. Rightly; if this order of words were from Matt. xxvi. 34, the *ἐν* also would not be left out in it. — In what follows *τρίς με ἄπ.* is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be written. The received order is from Matthew. — Ver. 31. *ἐκ περισσοῦ*] B C D Σ , min. have *ἐκπερισσῶς*. So Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; the unusual word was partly exchanged for the simple *περισσῶς* (L, min.), partly glossed by *ἐκ περισσοῦ*. — *ἔλεγε*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἐλάλει*, following B D L Σ . The *Recepta* is a correction. Comp. on xi. 23. — *μᾶλλον*] is wanting in B C D L Σ , vss., including Vulg., It. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. A gloss on *ἐκ περισσοῦ*; hence min. have it also *before* these words (comp. vii. 36), and this course Fritzsche has followed. — Ver. 35. As at Matt. xxvi. 39, so here also *προσελθών* is strongly attested, but it is to be

rejected. — Ver. 36. τὸ ποτήρ. ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τοῦτο] D, Hil.: τοῦτο τ. π. ἀπ' ἐμοῦ; K M: ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τ. π. τ.; A B C G L U X Δ 8, min. Or. vss., including Vulg.: τ. π. τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. In this variety of readings the last is so preponderantly attested that it is, with Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch., to be adopted. — Ver. 40. ὑποστρέψα] Lachm. has πάλιν ἐλθών, following B L 8, Copt. Pers. w. Ar. p. (D and cod. It. have merely ἐλθών). πάλιν ἐλθών is the more to be preferred, seeing that Mark is fond of the word πάλιν, and that he nowhere has the word ὑποστρέφω. But transcribers referred and joined the πάλιν to εὔρ. αὐτοῦς καθεύδ., in accordance with which ἐλθών then became glossed and supplanted by ὑποστρέψ. Accordingly the subsequent πάλιν, which by Elz. Scholz, Tisch. is read after αὐτοῦς, and is not found in B D L 8, min. vss., is, with Lachm., to be deleted. — Instead of καταβαρυνόμενοι, Elz. Scholz have βεβαρημένοι, in opposition to preponderant evidence. It is from Matthew. — Ver. 41. Elz. Scholz, Tisch. have τὸ λοιπόν. But the article has come in from Matthew, in opposition to considerable evidence. — Ver. 43. After 'Ιουδας Fritzsche has 'Ισκαριώτης, Lachm. and Tisch. ὁ 'Ισκαρ.; and this addition, sometimes with, sometimes without the article, is found in witnesses of weight (but not in B 8). Rightly; the omission is explained from the parallels. — ὧν] after εἰς has against it such decisive evidence that it cannot be maintained by means of the parallels, nor even by ver. 10. It is to be deleted, with Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. — πολὺς] is wanting in B L 8, min. vss. Condemned by Rinck, bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. From Matthew. — Ver. 45. Lachm. only reads βαβί once, following B C* D L M Δ 8, min. vss., including Vulg., codd. It. But this reading is from Matt. xxvi. 49, whence also χαῖρε has intruded into codd. and vss. — Ver. 46. ἐπ' αὐτὸν τ. χεῖρας αὐτῶν] Many various readings, of which Lachm. has τ. χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτ.; Tisch.: τ. χεῖρας αὐτῶ. The latter is attested by B D L 8** min. vss., and is to be preferred as the less usual (see on Acts xii. 1, the exegetical remarks), which was altered in accordance with Matt. xxvi. 50. — Ver. 47. τις] has, it is true, important evidence against it; but, as being superfluous, and, moreover, as not occurring in Matt. xxvi. 51, it might have been so easily passed over, that it may not be deleted, with Lachm. and Tisch. — Instead of ὥτιον read, with Lachm. and Tisch., following B D 8, 1, ὡτάριον. The former is from Matthew. — Ver. 48. The form ἐξήλατε (Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch.) is decisively attested. — Ver. 51. εἰς τις νεανίσκ.] Lachm. Tisch. read νεανίσκ. τις, following B C L 8, Copt. Syr. It. Vulg. (D: νεανίσκ. δὲ τις, without καὶ). The *Recepta* is to be maintained; νεανίσκος τις is the most prevalent mode of

expression. — Instead of *ἡκολούθει*, read, in accordance with B C L Σ , *συνηκολούθει* (so Lachm. and Tisch.). The current simple form has crept in also at v. 37. — *οἱ νεανίσκοι*] is wanting in B C* D L $\Delta \Sigma$, Syr. Arr. Pers. Copt. It. Vulg. Theophylact. Rightly condemned by Griesb. (but see his *Comm. crit.* p. 179) and Rinck, deleted by Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. It came in by means of the gloss *τὸν νεανίσκον*, which was written in the margin beside *αὐτόν*, as Slav. still renders *τὸν νεανίσκον* instead of *αὐτὸν οἱ νεανίσκοι*. The *τὸν νεανίσκον* written in the margin was easily changed into *οἱ νεανίσκοι*, since the absence of a fitting subject for *κρατοῦσιν* might be felt. — Ver. 52. *ἀπ' αὐτῶν*] bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch., has considerable testimony against it; yet, as being quite superfluous, it was more easily passed over than added. — Ver. 53. *αὐτῷ* after *συνέρχ.* is wanting in D L $\Delta \Sigma$, Vulg. It. Or. Deleted by Tisch. An omission from misunderstanding. — Ver. 65. *ἔβαλλον*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἔλαβον* on decisive evidence. *ἔλαβον* not being understood, was variously altered. — Ver. 67. *Ἰησοῦ ἡσθα*] B C L Σ have *ἡσθε τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*. So Lachm. and Tisch. D Δ , min. vss., including Vulg. and codd. It., have *τοῦ Ἰησ. before τοῦ Ναζ.* The latter is in accordance with the usual mode of expression, and with Matt. xxvi. 69. *ἡσθα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* is to be adopted; this *τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* following was omitted (so still in min., Fritzsche), and was then variously restored. — Ver. 68. *οὐκ . . . οὐδέ*] Lachm. has *οὔτε . . . οὔτε*, following B D L Σ , Eus. So now Tisch. also; and rightly. See Matthew. — *τί σὺ λέγεις*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *σὺ τί λέγεις*, following B C L $\Delta \Sigma$, min. Rightly; *σὺ* was omitted (so still in D, Vulg. It.), and then was restored at the place that first presented itself after *τί*. — *καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε*] is wanting, indeed, in B L Σ , Copt. Colb. (bracketed by Lachm.); but the omission is manifestly caused by comparison with Matthew. — Ver. 70. *καὶ ἡ λαλία σου ὁμοιάζει*] So Elz. Scholz, Fritzsche, after Gal. i. 17. But the words are wanting in B C D L Σ , min. Copt. Sahid. Vulg. codd. It. Eus. Aug. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. An interpolation from Matt. xxvi. 73, in accordance with the very old reading in that place (D, codd. It.), *ὁμοιάζει*. If the words were genuine, they would hardly have been passed over, containing, as they do, so familiar and noteworthy a particular of the history; the appeal to the homocoteleuton is not sufficient. — Ver. 71. Instead of *ὁμνῶειν* (comp. Matthew), *ὁμνῶναι* is sufficiently vouched for by B E H L S U V X r, min. — Ver. 72. *εὐθέως* after *καὶ* is wanting in Elz., but it is attested by B D G L Σ (which, with L, has not *ἐκ δευτ.*), min. Syr. Arr. Aeth. Arm. Vulg. codd. It. Eus., and adopted by Griesb. Fritzsche,

Scholz, Lachm. Nevertheless it was far easier for it to be introduced from Matt. xxvi. 74 than for it, with its prevalent use and appropriateness, to be omitted. Hence, on the important evidence for its omission (including A C), it is, with Tisch., to be struck out. — Instead of τὸ ῥῆμα εἰ, the *Recepta* has τοῦ ῥήματος οἰ, in opposition to decisive witnesses, among which, however, A B C L Δ S, min. Copt. Sahid. read τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς. Lachm. and Tisch. have the latter; and with this preponderant attestation, it is to be regarded as original (followed also by Luke xxii. 61).

Vv. 1, 2. See on Matt. xxvi. 2-5. Comp. Luke xxii. 1, 2. Including this short introduction of simple historical tenor (in which Luke follows him), Mark is, in the entire narrative of the passion, *generally* more original, fresh, and free from later additions and amplifications of tradition than Matthew (comp. Weiss, 1861, p. 52 ff.), although the latter again is the more original in various details. — τὸ πάσχα κ. τὰ ἄζυμα] *the Passover and the unleavened* (ΠΑΣΧΑ), i.e. the feast of the Passover and (which it likewise is) of the unleavened. Comp. 3 Esdr. i. 19: ἡγάγουσιν . . . τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν τῶν ἀζύμων. On τὰ ἄζυμα as a designation of the feast, comp. 3 Esdr. i. 10: ἔχοντες τὰ ἄζυμα κατὰ τὰς φυλάς. — ἔλεγον γάρ] This γάρ (see the critical remarks) informs us of the reason of the ἐξήτουν πῶς previously said; for the feast was in their way, so that they could not at once proceed, but believed that they must let it first go quietly by, so that no tumult might occur. Victor Antiochenus remarks: τὴν μὲν ἑορτὴν ὑπερθέσθαι βούλονται οὐ συγχωροῦντο δὲ, ἐπειδὴ τὴν προφητείαν ἔδει πληροῦσθαι τὴν ἐν τῇ νομικῇ διατυπώσει, ἐν ᾗ τὸ πάσχα ἐδύετο, μὴνὶ πρώτῳ τεσσαρεσκαδικῇ ἡμέρᾳ· ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ τῷ μηνὶ καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τὸ ἀληθινὸν πάσχα ἔδει θυτῆναι. A view right in itself; not, however, according to the Synoptic, but according to the Johannean account of the day of the death of Jesus. — ἔσται] *shall be*, certainty of what was otherwise to be expected. Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 140.

Vv. 3-9.¹ See on Matt. xxvi. 6-13. Comp. John xii. 1-8,

¹ Holtzmann, p. 95, attributes to this episode the significant purpose of introducing the attitude of the betrayer, whose psychological crisis had now set in,

who also has the peculiar expression *πιστικῆς*, either directly from Mark, or from the form of tradition from which Mark also adopted it. Luke has at vii. 36 ff. a history of an anointing, but a different one. — *μύρου νάρδου*] On the costliness of this, see Pliny, *H. N.* xiii. 2. — *πιστικῆς*] See on this word, Fritzsche *in loc.*, and in the *Hall. Lit. Z.* 1840, p. 179 ff.; Lücke on John xii. 3; Winer, p. 89 [E. T. 121]; Wichelhaus, *Leidensgesch.* p. 74 f.; Stephani *Thes.*, ed. Hase, VI. p. 1117. *πιστικός*, in demonstrable usage, means nothing else than (1) *convincing, persuading* (Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 6. 10: *πιστικωτέρους . . . λόγους*, Plato, *Gorg.* p. 455 A: *ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐστὶ . . . πιστικὸς μόνον*), thus being equivalent to *πειστικός*; (2) *faithful, trustworthy* (Artemidorus, *Oncir.* ii. 32, p. 121: *γυνὴ πιστικὴ καὶ οἰκουρός*, comp. *πιστικῶς*, Plut. *Pel.* 8; Scymn. *orb. descr.* 42), thus equivalent to *πιστός*. The latter signification is here to be maintained: *nard, on which one can rely*, i.e. unadulterated *genuine* nard, as Eusebius, *Demonstr. ev.* 9, calls the gospel the *εὐφροσύνη τοῦ πιστικοῦ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης κράματος* (where the contextual reference to the drinking lies not in *πιστικοῦ*, but in *κράματος*). The opposite is "*pseudonardus*" (Plin. *H. N.* xii. 12. 26), with which the genuine nard was often adulterated (comp. also Dioscor. *mat. med.* i. 6 f.). This is the explanation already given by Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus (both of whom, however, add that a special *kind* of nard may also be intended), and most of the older and more recent commentators (Lücke is not decided). But Fritzsche (following Casaubon, Beza, Erasmus Schmid, Maldonatus, and others of the older expositors quoted by Wolf, who deduce it from *πίνω*) derives it from *πιπίσκω*, and explains it as *nardus potabilis*. Certainly anointing oils, and especially oil of spikenard, were *drunk* mingled with wine (Athen. xv. p. 689; Lucian, *Nigrin.* 31; Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 303; Hirtius, *de bell. Hisp.* 33. 5; Plin. *H. N.* xiv. 19. 5; and see in general, Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § 26. 8, 9); but the actual

in making advances to meet the Sanhedrim. But this could only be the case, if Mark and Matthew had *named* Judas as the murmurer. Now Mark has *τινίς* in general, and Matthew designates *οἱ μωμεταί* as the murmurers. John is the first to name Judas.

usus loquendi stands decidedly opposed to this view, for according to it πιστός doubtless (Aesch. *Prom.* 478; Lobeck, *Technol.* p. 131) has the signification of *drinkable*, but not πιστικός, even apart from the facts that the *context* does not point to *this* quality, and that it is asserted not of the *ointment*, but of the *nard* (the plant). The *usus loquendi*, moreover, is decisive against all other explanations, such as that of the Vulgate (comp. Castalio, Hammond, Grotius, Wetstein, Rosenmüller): *spicati*; ¹ and that of Scaliger: *pounded nard* (equivalent to πιστικής), from πίσσω, although this etymology *in itself* would be possible (Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 31). Others have derived πιστικής from the proper name of some unknown place (*Pistic nard*), as did Augustine; but this was a *cutting* of the knot.² — πολυτελούς] belongs to μύρου, not to νάρδου, which has its epithet already, and see ver. 5. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 7. — συντρίψασα] neither: *she rubbed it and poured*, etc. (Kypke), nor: *she shook* the vessel (Knatchbull, Hammond, Wakefield, *Silv. crit.* V. p. 57), but: *she broke it* (Ecclus. xxi. 14; Bar. vi. 17; Dem. 845, 18; Xen., *et al.*), namely, the narrow (Plin. *H. N.* ix. 35) neck of the vessel, for she had destined the *entire* contents for Jesus, nothing to be reserved. — τὴν ἀλάβ.] ἀλάβαστρος occurs in all the three genders, and the codices vary accordingly. See the critical remarks. — αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς] (see the critical remarks) *on him upon the head*, without the preposition usual in other cases (Plato, *Rep.* iii. p. 397 E), κατὰ before τῆς κεφαλῆς (Plato, *Leg.* vii. p. 814 D; Herod. iv. 62). — Ver. 4. *But there were some, who grumbled to one another* (uttered grumblings to one another). πρὸς ἑαυτ., as at xi. 31, x. 26, *al.* *What they*

¹ Mark having retained the Latin word, but having given to it another form. See also Estius, *Annot.* p. 892.—Several codd. of the It., too, have the translation *spicati*; others: *pistici*, *Verc.*: *optimi*.

² Still the *possibility* of its being the adjective of a local name may not be called in question. In fact, the Scholiast, Aesch. *Pers.* 1, expressly says: τὰδ' μιν Περσῶν πιστὰ καλεῖται . . . πόλις ἐστὶ Περσῶν Πίστιρα καλουμένη, ἣν συγκόψας ὁ ποιητὴς Πίστα ἔφη. Lobeck, *Pathol.* p. 282, remarks on this: "Somnium hoc est, scilicet ntitur observatione licentiae popularis, qua nomina peregrina varie et multipliciter interpolantur." On the taking of it as a local designation depends the translation *pistici*, which the Vulgate also, along with codd. of It., has in John xii. 3, although in the present passage it gives *spicati*.

murmured, is contained in what follows, without *καὶ λέγοντες*. Comp. the use of *θαυμάζειν*, *mirabundum quærere*, in Sturz, *Lcx. Xen.* II. p. 511 f. — Ver. 5. *ἐνεβριμ. αὐτῇ*] *they were angry at her*. Comp. i. 43. — Ver. 7. *καὶ ὅταν θέλητε κ.τ.λ.*] certainly an amplifying addition of tradition, found neither in Matthew nor in John. — Ver. 8. *What she was able (to do) she has done; the greatest work of love which was possible to her, she has done*. Comp. *Xen. Mem.* ii. 1. 30: *διὰ τὸ μηδὲν ἔχειν, ὃ τι ποιῆς*. — *προέλαβε κ.τ.λ.*] *Beforehand she hath anointed my body on behalf of embalming* (in order thereby to embalm it). A classical writer would have said *προλαβοῦσα ἐμίρσε* (*Xen. Cyr.* i. 2. 3; *Thuc.* iii. 3; *Dem.* 44, 3, *al.*). Passages with the *infinitive* from Josephus may be seen in Kypke, I. 192. We may add that the expression in Mark already betrays the *explanatory* tradition. — Ver. 9. *εἰς ὅλου τ. κόσμου*] as in i. 39. The relation to *ὅπου* is as at Matt. xxvi. 13.

Vv. 10, 11. See on Matt. xxvi. 14–16. Comp. Luke xxii. 3–6. — *εἰς τῶν δώδεκα*] has a tragic stress.

Vv. 12–16. See on Matt. xxvi. 17–19. Comp. Luke xxii. 7–13. The *marvellous* character of the ordering of the repast, which is not as yet found in Matthew with his simple *πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα*, points in Mark and Luke to a later form of the tradition (in opposition to Ewald, Weiss, Holtzmann, and others), as Bleek also assumes. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 18. This form may easily, under the influence of the conception of our Lord's prophetic character (comp. xi. 2 f.), have originated through the circumstance, that the two disciples met the servant of the *δεῖνα*, to whom Jesus sent them, in the street with a pitcher of water. Assuredly *original*, however, is the sending of only *two* disciples in Mark, whom thereupon Luke xxii. 8 *names*. — *ὅτε τ. πάσχα ἔθνον*] *on which day they killed the paschal lamb* (*Ex.* xii. 21; *Deut.* xvi. 2; 3 *Esdr.* i. 1, vii. 12), which occurred on the 14th Nisan in the afternoon.¹ See on Matt. xxvi. 17. — Ver. 13. *ἄνθρωπος*] The

¹ Neither here nor elsewhere have the Synoptics expressed themselves *ambiguously* as to the day of the Last Supper. See Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 96 ff. (in opposition to Aberle in the *theol. Quartalschr.* IV. p. 548 ff.).

connection (see ver. 14) shows that the man in question was a *slave*; his occupation was the carrying of water, Deut. xxix. 10; Josh. ix. 21; Wetstein *in loc.* — κεράμιον ὕδατος] *an earthen vessel with water.* Comp. ἀλάβαστρον μύρου, ver. 3. "The *water pitcher* reminds one of the beginning of a meal, for which the hands are washed," Ewald. — Ver. 14. τὸ κατάλυμά μου] *the lodging destined for me*, in which (ὅπου) I, etc. The word *κατάλ.*, *lodging*, *quarters*, is bad Greek, Thom. M. p. 501. But see Pollux, i. 73, and Eustathius, *ad Od.* iv. 146, 33, Rom. — Ver. 15. αὐτός] *He himself*, the master of the house. On the form ἀνάγαιον instead of ἀνώγαιον (Xen. *Anab.* v. 4. 29), which is preserved in the old lexicographers, see Fritzsche *in loc.*; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 12 [E. T. 13]. In signification it is equivalent to ὑπερφῶν, ἡλὺ, *upper chamber*, used as a place of prayer and of assembling together. Comp. on ii. 3, and see on Acts i. 13. — The attributes which follow are thus to be distributed: *he will show you a large upper chamber spread, i.e. laid with carpets, in readiness.* — ἐτοιμάσ. ἡμῖν] *arrange for us, make preparation for us.* Comp. Luke ix. 52.

Vv. 17-25. See on Matt. xxvi. 20-29. Comp. Luke xxii. 14-23. — μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα] Those two are to be conceived as having returned after the preparation. — Ver. 18 f. ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ] *not said for the purpose of making known the fact, but the expression of deeply painful emotion.* — εἰς καθεῖς] *man by man.* See on this expression of late Greek, wherein the preposition is adverbial, Wetstein *in loc.*; Winer, p. 223 [E. T. 312]; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 27 [E. T. 30]. — καὶ ἄλλος] *an inaccuracy of expression, as though there had been previously said not εἰς καθεῖς, but merely εἰς.* Mark in particular might be led into this inaccuracy by his *graphic* manner. — Ver. 20. ὁ ἐμβαπτ.] *not at this moment*, and so not a definite designation of the traitor (as Bleek will have it), for after ver. 19 it is certain that the eating was not immediately proceeded with (comp. on Matt. xxvi. 23); but neither is it generally: "qui mecum *vesci consuevit*," Beza; but, like ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ, ver. 18, *referring generally to this meal*, and withal more precisely indicating the traitor to this extent, that

he was one of those who reclined nearest to Jesus, and who ate with Him *out of the same dish*. According to Lange, indeed, the hand of Judas made a "movement playing the hypocrite," and met the hand of the Lord, while the latter was still in the dish, in order with apparent ingenuousness to receive the morsel. A harmonistic play of fancy, whereof nothing appears in the text. — Ver. 24. εἶπεν] namely, *while they drank*, not *before* the drinking. A deviation from Matthew and Luke, but not inappropriate, as Jesus gives the explanation not *afterwards* (in opposition to de Wette), but *at the time of* the drinking¹ (ἐστί). A very immaterial difference, to be explained not from Mark's mere love for alteration (de Wette), but from a diversity of the tradition, in respect to which, however, the greater simplicity and independence on the form of the ecclesiastical observance, which mark the narrative in Mark, tell in favour of its originality (in opposition to Baur). — τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης] *my covenant-blood*, as Matt. xxvi. 28. The definition, "the *new* covenant," came in later; as also "*for the forgiveness of sins*" is a more precise specification from a further stage of development.² Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 28. And the direction, "*Do this in remembrance of me*," is first added in Paul (twice over) and in Luke. See on 1 Cor. xi. 24.

Vv. 26–31. See on Matt. xxvi. 30–35. — Ver. 29. καὶ εἰ] *even if*. On the difference between this and εἰ καί (which here occurs as a various reading), see Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 519 f. — ἀλλ'] in the apodosis of a connecting sentence, *at certe*; see Heindorf, *ad Plat. Soph.* p. 341 f.; Klotz, p. 93. — Ver. 30. σύ] has the emphasis of the contrast with ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ. — σήμερον ταύτη τῇ νυκτί] (see the critical remarks) impassioned climax: *to-day, in this night*. As to πρὶν ἢ, see on Matt. i. 18. — δὲ] a later form assumed by the utterance than in Matthew. Comp. vv. 68, 72. Even John xiii. 38 has it not. There was no occasion for a later simplification (Weiss), if the

¹ Comp. also Rückert, *Abendm.* p. 72.

² But observe how the *idea of reconciliation* is already in the case of Mark implied in the simple ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. Even Baur (*neut. Theol.* p. 102) acknowledges this, but thinks that these very words contain a later modification of the narrative.

characteristic *δὲς* was there from the first. — Ver. 31. *ἐκπερισσῶς ἐλάλει*] (see the critical remarks): but *he was speaking exceedingly much*. Observe the difference between this *ἐλάλει* and the subsequent *ἔλεγον* (comp. on i. 34); the latter is the simple, definite *saying*; the former, with *ἐκπερισσῶς*, is in keeping with the passionate nature of Peter not even yet silenced by ver. 30. The word *ἐκπερισσ.* is not preserved elsewhere. — *ἀπαρνήσομαι*] *οὐ μὴ*, with the future (see Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 410 ff.), denotes the right sure expectation. Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 35.

Vv. 32-42. Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 36-46. Comp. Luke xxii. 40-46. — Ver. 33. *ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι*] used in this place of the *anguish* (otherwise at ix. 15). The word occurs in the N. T. only in Mark, who uses strongly graphic language. Comp. xvi. 5, 6. Matthew, with more psychological suitableness, has *λυπεῖσθαι*. — *ἔως θανάτου*] See on Matt. xxvi. 38, and comp. Eccus. xxxvii. 2; Clem. 1 Cor. 4: *ζήλος ἐποίησεν Ἰωσήφ μέχρι θανάτου διωχθῆναι*, *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 520. — *παρέλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*] Comp. *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 527: *ἡὔξατο . . . ἵνα παρέλθῃ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἡ ὀργὴ κυρίου. — ἡ ὥρα*] *the hour κατ' ἐξοχήν, hora fatalis*. It passes over from the man, when the latter is spared from undergoing its destiny. — Ver. 36. *Ἀββᾶ*] *Ἐἱ*; so spoke Jesus in prayer to His Father. This mode of address assumed among the Greek-speaking Christians the nature of a *proper name*, and the fervour of the feeling of childship added, moreover, the *appellative* address *ὁ πατήρ*, — a juxtaposition, which gradually became so *hallowed by usage* that here Mark even places it in the very mouth of Jesus, which is an involuntary *Hysteron proteron*. The *usual* view, that *ὁ πατήρ* is an addition by way of interpreting, is quite out of place in the fervent address of prayer. See on Rom. viii. 15. Against the objections of Fritzsche, see on Gal. iv. 6. — *παρένεγκε*] *carry away past*. Hahn was wrong, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 209 f., in deducing from the passage (and from Luke xxii. 24) that Jesus had been tempted by His *σάρξ*. Every temptation came to Him from without. But in this place He gives utterance only to His purely human feeling, and that with unconditional subordination to God,

whereby there is exhibited even in that very feeling His *μὴ γινῶναι ἁμαρτίαν*, which is incompatible with incitements to sin from His own *σάρξ*. — ἀλλ' οὐ] The following interrogative τί shows how the utterance emotionally broken off is here to be completed. Hence somewhat in this way: *but there comes not into question*, not: ἀλλ' οὐ γενέσθω. — Ver. 41. *καθεύδετε λοιπὸν κ.τ.λ.*] as at Matt. xxvi. 45, painful irony: *sleep on now, and take your rest!* Hardly has Jesus thus spoken when He sees Judas approach with his band (vv. 42, 43). Then His mood of painful irony breaks off, and with urgent earnestness He now goes on in hasty, unconnected exclamations: *there is enough* (of sleep)! *the hour is come!* *see, the Son of man is delivered into the hands of sinners!* *arise, let us go* (to meet this decisive crisis)! *see, my betrayer is at hand!* It is only this view of ἀπέχει, according to which it refers to the *sleep* of the disciples, that corresponds to the immediate connection with what goes before (*καθεύδετε κ.τ.λ.*) and follows; and how natural is the change of mood, occasioned by the approaching betrayers! All the more original is the representation. Comp. Erasmus, Bengel ("suas jam peractas habet sopor vices; nunc alia res est"), Kuinoel, Ewald, Bleek. Hence it is not: *there is enough of watching* (Haramond, Fritzsche). The *usus loquendi* of ἀπέχει, *sufficit* (Vulgate), depends on the passages, which certainly are only few and late, but certain, (pseudo-) Anacreon, xxviii. 33; Cyrill. in Hagg. ii. 9, even although the gloss of Hesychius: ἀπέχει, ἀπόχρη, ἐξαρκεῖ, is critically very uncertain.¹ Others interpret at variance with linguistic usage: *abest*, sc. *anxietas mea* (see Heumann, Thies), or *the betrayer* (Bornemann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 103 f.); ἀπέχειν, in fact, does not mean

¹ See Buttmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 506. He would leave ἀπέχει without any idea to complete it, and that in the sense: *it is accomplished, it is the time of fulfilment, the end is come*, just as Grotius, *ad Matt.* xxvi. 45 (*peractum est*), and as the codex Brixienensis has, *alest finis*, while D and min. add to ἀπέχει: τὸ τέλος. The view deserves consideration. Still the usual *it is enough* is more in keeping with the empirical use, as it is preserved in the two passages of Anacreon and Cyril; moreover, it gives rise to a doubt in the matter, that Jesus should have spoken a word equivalent to the *τετέλεισται* of John xix. 30 even *now*, when the consummation was only just beginning.

the being removed *in itself*, but denotes the *distance* (Xen. *Anab.* iv. 3. 5; Polyb. i. 19. 5; 2 Macc. xi. 5, xii. 29). Lange also is linguistically wrong in rendering: "*it is all over with it,*" *it will do no longer*. The comparison of οὐδὲν ἀπέχει, *nothing stands in the way*,—in which, in fact, ἀπέχει is not intransitive, but active,—is altogether irrelevant.

Vv. 43-52. See on Matt. xxvi. 47-56. Comp. Luke xxii. 47-53. The brief, vivid, terse narrative, especially as regards the blow of the sword and the young man that fled (which are alleged by Wilke to be interpolated), testifies to its originality. — δεδώκει] without augment. See Winer, p. 67 f. [E. T. 84 f.]. — σύσσημον] *a concerted signal*, belongs to the later Greek. See Wetstein and Kypke, Sturz, *Dial. Al.* p. 196. — ἀσφαλῶς] *securely*, so that He cannot escape. Comp. Acts xvi. 23. — Ver. 45. ῥαββι, ῥαββί] The betrayer himself is under excitement. — Ver. 49. ἀλλ' ἵνα κ.τ.λ.] *sc.*: ὡς ἐπὶ ληστὴν ἐξήλθατε κ.τ.λ., ver. 48. Comp. John ix. 3, i. 8, xiii. 18. — Ver. 50. It would have been more exact to name the subject (the disciples). — Ver. 51 f. συνηκολούθει αὐτῷ] (see the critical remarks): *he followed Him along with*, was included among those who accompanied Jesus in the garden. — συνδῶνα] *a garment* like a shirt, made of cotton cloth or of linen (see Bast, *cp. crit.* p. 180), in which people slept. "Atque ita hic juvenis lecto exsilierat," Grotius. — ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ] not to be supplemented by σώματος, but a neuter substantive. Comp. τὰ γυμνά, the *nakedness*, and see in general Kühner, II. p. 118. — If οἱ νεανίσκοι were genuine, it would not have to be explained as *the soldiers* (Casaubon, Grotius, de Wette), since the context makes no mention of such, but generally: *the young people*, who were to be found in the ὄχλος, ver. 43. — *Who the young man was*, is not to be defined more precisely than as: *an adherent of Jesus*,¹ but not one of the Twelve. The latter point follows not from ver. 50 (for this young man also, in fact, had fled), but from the designation εἰς τις νεανίσκ. in itself, as well as from the fact that he already had on the night-dress, and therefore had not been in the company at the

¹ Not possibly *Saul* (the subsequent Apostle Paul), who had run after Him from curiosity, as Ewald, *Gesch. der apost. Zeit.* p. 339, conjectures.

table. There was no justification, therefore, for guessing at *John* (Ambrose, Chrysostom, Gregory, *Moral.* xiv. 23), while others have even concluded from the one garment that it was *James the Just*, the brother of the Lord (Epiphanius, *Hæc.* lxxxvii. 13, as also in Theophylact). There are other precarious hypotheses, such as: a youth from the house where Jesus had eaten the Passover (Victor Antiochenus and Theophylact), or from a neighbouring farm (Grotius), or *Mark himself* (Olshausen, Bisping). The latter is assumed also by Lange, who calls him a "premature Joseph of Arimathea;" and likewise by Lichtenstein, who, by a series of combinations, identifies the evangelist with a son of the master of the house where the Passover took place. Casaubon aptly remarks: "quis fuerit hic juvenis quaerere curiosum est et vanum, quando inveniri τὸ ζητούμενον non potest." Probably Mark himself did not know his name. — It must be left undetermined, too, whence (possibly from Peter?) he learned this little episode,¹ which was probably passed over by Matthew and Luke only on account of its unimportance. — γυμνός] "pudorem vicit timor in magno periculo," Bengel.

Vv. 53, 54. See on Matt. xxvi. 57 f. Comp. Luke xxii. 54 f. — τὸς τ. ἀρχιερ.] *i.e.* Caiaphas, not Annas, as appears from Matthew. — συνέρχονται αὐτῷ] is usually explained: *they come together to Him* (the high priest), in which case the dative is either taken as that of the direction (Fritzsche), or is made to depend upon συν: *with him*, *i.e.* *at his house*, they assemble. But always in the N. T. (Luke xxiii. 55; Acts i. 21, ix. 39, *al.*), even in John xi. 33, συνέρχεσθαι τινι means: *to come with any one, una cum aliquo venire* (comp. Winer, p. 193 [E. T. 269]); and αὐτῷ, in accordance with the following ἡκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, is most naturally to be referred to *Jesus*. Hence: *and there came with Him* all the chief priests,² *i.e.* *at the same time, as Jesus is led in, there come also all the*

¹ According to Baur, only a piquant addition of Mark; according to Hilgenfeld, it is connected with Mark's conception of a more extended circle of disciples (ii. 14?).

² *Whither?* is clearly shown from the context, namely, to the ἀρχιερεῖς. This in opposition to Wieseler, *Synops.* p. 406.

chief priests, etc., who, namely, had been bespoken for this time of the arranged arrest of the delinquent. This view of the meaning, far from being out of place, is quite in keeping with the *vivid* representation of Mark. — *πρὸς τὸ φῶς*] *at the fire-light*, Luke xxii. 56. See Raphel, *Polyb.* p. 151; Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* IV. p. 519 f. According to Baur, indeed, this is an expression unsuitably borrowed from Luke.

Vv. 55-65. See on Matt. xxvi. 59-68. — Ver. 56. *καὶ ἴσαι κ.τ.λ.*] *and the testimonies were not alike*¹ (consonant, agreeing). At least *two* witnesses had to agree together; Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15; Lightfoot, p. 658; Michaelis, *Mos. R.* § 299; Saalschütz, p. 604. The *καί* is the simple: *and*. Many testified falsely and dissimilarly. — Ver. 58. *ἡμεῖς*] *we*, on our part: the *ἐγώ* also which follows has corresponding emphasis. — *χειροποίητον . . . ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον*] peculiar to Mark, but certainly (comp. on xv. 29) a later form of the tradition resulting from reflection (at variance with John's own interpretation) as to the meaning of the utterance in John ii. 19, according to which there was found in that saying a reference to the new spiritual worship of God, which in a short time Christ should put in the place of the old temple-service. Comp. Acts vi. 14. Matthew is here more simple and more original. — *ἀχειροσπ.*] is an appositional more precise definition to *ἄλλον*. See van Hengel, *Annotat.* p. 55 ff. Comp. on Luke xxiii. 32. — Ver. 59. *οὐδὲ οὕτως*] *and not even thus* (when they gave *this* statement) was their testimony consonant. The different witnesses must therefore have given utterance to not unimportant variations in details (not merely in their mode of apprehending the saying, as Schenkel would have it). It is plain from this that one witness was not heard in the presence of the other. Comp. Michaelis, *Mos. R.* § 299, p. 97. Others, like Erasmus, Grotius, Calovius, in opposition to linguistic usage and to the context (see ver. 56), hold that *ἴσος* is here and at ver. 56: *sufficiens*. — Ver. 60. *Two* questions, as at Matt. xxvi. 62. If we assume only one,

¹ It is not to be accented *ἴσος*, as in Homer, but *ἴσος*, as with the Attic and later writers. See Fritzsche *in loc.*; Bentley, *ad Menandr. jragm.*, p. 533, ed. Meinek.; Brunck, *ad Arist. Plut.* 1113; Lipsius, *grammat. Unters.* p. 24.

like the Vulgate, and take $\tau\acute{\iota}$ for $\delta\acute{\iota}\tau\iota$: *answerest thou nothing to that, which*, etc. (Bornemann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 120 f.; Lachmann, Tischendorf, Ewald, Bleek, and various others), it is true that the construction $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\iota$ is not opposed to it (see on Matthew), but the address is less expressive of the anxiety and urgency that are here natural to the questioner. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 217 [E. T. 251], harshly suggests that "hearing" should be supplied before $\delta\acute{\iota}\tau\iota$. — Ver. 61. Well known *parallelismus antitheticus*, with emphasis. Inversely at Acts xviii. 9. — $\acute{\omicron}\ \epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$] $\kappa\alpha\tau'\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\chi\acute{\eta}\nu$, קט' עֲשׂוּנָה , *God*. Used absolutely thus only here in the N. T. The *Sanctus benedictus* of the Rabbins is well known (Schoettgen, *ad Rom.* ix. 5). The expression makes us feel the *blasphemy*, which would be involved in the affirmation. But it is this affirmation which the high priest *wishes* (hence the form of his question: *Thou art the Messiah?*), and Jesus *gives* it, but with what a majestic addition in this deep humiliation! — Ver. 62. The $\acute{\alpha}\pi'\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota$ in Matt. xxvi. 64, which is wanting in Mark, and which requires for what follows the *figurative* meaning, is characteristic and certainly original. On $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \tau.\ \nu\epsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda.$, comp. Dan. vii. 13 (ענף); Rev. i. 7. That *figurative* meaning is, moreover, required in Mark by $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \delta\epsilon\chi\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\ \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\mu.\ \tau.\ \delta\upsilon\nu.$, although Keim finds in this interpretation "arbitrariness without measure." Luke only, xxii. 69, while abbreviating and altering the saying, presents the *literal* meaning. — Ver. 63. $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \chi\iota\tau\omega\acute{\nu}\alpha\varsigma$] a more accurate statement, in accordance with the custom of rending the garments, than the general $\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \acute{\iota}\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\alpha$ in Matt. xxvi. 65; see *in loc.* People of rank wore *two* under-garments (Winer, *Realw.*); hence $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \chi\iota\tau.$ — Ver. 64. $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\rho\iota\nu\alpha\nu\ \kappa.\tau.\lambda.$] *they condemned Him, to be guilty of death*.¹ On $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\rho.$ with an infinitive,

¹ This was the result, which was already from the outset a settled point with the court, and to the bringing about of which the judicial procedure had merely to lend the form of legality. The defence of the procedure in Saalschütz, *Mos. R.* p. 623 ff., only amounts to a pitiful *semblance* of right. Against the fact as it stood, that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, they had no law; this claim, therefore, was brought into the sphere of the *spiritual* tribunal under the title of blasphemy, and before the *Roman* tribunal under that of high treason. And into the question as to the ground and truth of the claim—although in the confession of Jesus there was implied the *exceptio veritatis*—they prudently did not enter at all.

comp. Herod. vi. 85, ix. 93; Xen. *Hier.* vii. 10. — Ver. 65. ἤρξαντο] when the “guilty!” had been uttered. A vivid representation of the sequel. — τινές] comp. previously οἱ δὲ πάντες, hence: some of the *Sanhedrists*. *The servants*, i.e. the servants of the court, follow afterwards. — προφῆτευσον] usually: who struck thee, according to the amplifying narratives of Matthew and Luke; Mark, however, does not say this, but generally: *prophecy!* which as Messiah thou must be able to do! They wish to bring Him to *prophecy* by the *κολαφίζειν!* The narrative of Mark, regarded as an *abbreviation* (Holtzmann), would be a singularity without motive. Matthew and Luke followed another tradition. The veiling of the face must, according to Mark, be considered merely as *mocking mimicry*. — And after some of the Sanhedrists had thus mocked and maltreated Him, *the servants received Him with strokes of the rod*. To them He was delivered for custody until further orders. This is the meaning according to the reading ἔλαβον (see the critical remarks). On the explanation of the reading ἔβαλλον, *they struck Him*, see Bornemann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 138. As to ῥαπίσμασιν, see on Matt. xxvi. 67. The *dative* denotes the form, the accompanying circumstances, with which on the part of the servants the ἔλαβον took place. Bernhardy, p. 100 f. Comp. the Latin *accipere aliquem verberibus* (Cic. *Tusc.* ii. 14. 34).

Vv. 66-72. See Matt. xxvi. 69-75. Comp. Luke xxii. 56-62. — κάτω] *below*, in contrast to the buildings that were situated higher, which surrounded the court-yard (see on Matt. xxvi. 3). — Ver. 68. οὔτε οἶδα, οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι] (see the critical remarks) *I neither know nor do I understand*. Thus the two verbs that are negatived are far more closely connected (conceived under *one* common leading idea) than by οὐκ . . . οὐδέ. See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 706 f. On the manner of the denial in the passage before us, comp. *Test. XII. patr.* p. 715: οὐκ οἶδα ὃ λέγεις. The *doubling* of the expression denotes *earnestness*; Bornemann, *Schol. in Luk.* p. xxxi. f. — προαύλιον] Somewhat otherwise in Matt. xxvi. 71. See *in loc.* — καὶ ἄλ. ἐφ.] *and a cock crew*; peculiar to Mark in accordance with xiv. 30. — Ver. 69. ἡ παιδίσκη] consequently the

same; a difference from Matt. xxvi. 71. It is still otherwise in Luke xxii. 58. — πάλιν] would, if it belonged to ἰδοῦσα αὐτόν (as taken usually), stand before these words, since it would have logical emphasis in reference to ἰδοῦσα, ver. 67. Comp. subsequently πάλιν ἡρνεῖτο. Hence it is, with Erasmus, Luther, Grotius, and Fritzsche, to be attached to ἡρξατο, on which account, moreover, C L Δ Σ have placed it only after ἡρξ. So Tischendorf. Still the word on the whole is critically suspicious, although it is quite wanting only in B M, vss.: the addition of it was natural enough, even although the λέγειν here is not addressed again to Peter. — ἡρξατο] graphic. — Ver. 70. ἡρνεῖτο] *Tempus adumbrativum* (as so often in Mark). The second πάλιν introduces a renewed address, and this, indeed, ensued *on the part of those who were standing by*. Hence it is not: πάλιν ἔλεγον οἱ παρ., but: πάλιν οἱ παρ. ἔλεγον. — καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλ. εἶ] *for thou art also a Galilean; i.e. for, besides whatever else betrays thee, thou art, moreover, a Galilean*. They observed this from his dialect, as Matthew, following a later shape of the tradition, specifies. — ἐπιβαλὼν] not: *coepit flere* (Vulg. It. Goth. Copt. Syr. Euthymius Zigabenus, Luther, Castalio, Calvin, Heinsius, Loesner, Michaelis, Kuinoel, and others), as D actually has ἡρξατο κλαίειν, which certainly also those versions have read; expressed with ἐπιβάλλειν, it must have run ἐπέβαλε κλαίειν, and this would only mean: he threw himself on, set himself to, the weeping (comp. Erasmus and Vatablus: “*prorupit in fletum*,” see also Bengel); nor yet: *cum se foras projecisset* (Beza, Raphel, Vater, and various others), since ἐπιβαλὼν might doubtless mean: when he had rushed away, but not: when he had rushed out,—an alteration of the meaning which Matt. xxvi. 75, Luke xxii. 62, by no means warrant;¹ nor yet: *veste capiti injecta fleuit* (Theophylact, Salmasius, *de foen. Trap.* p. 272; Calovius, L. Bos, Wolf, Elsner, Krebs, Fischer, Rosenmüller,

¹ Lange: “he rushed out thereupon,” namely, *on the cock crowing* as the awakening cry of Christ. “First a rushing out as if he had an external purpose, then a painful absorption into himself and weeping. . . . Outside he found that the cry went inward and upward, and now he paused, and wept.” A characteristic piece of fancy.

Paulus, Fritzsche, and others ¹), which presupposes a supplement not warranted in the context and without precedent in connection with ἐπιβάλλειν, and would, moreover, require the middle voice; neither, and that for the same reason, is it: *after he had cast his eyes upon Jesus* (Hammond, Palairot); nor: *addens*, i.e. *præterea* (Grotius), which is at variance with linguistic usage, or *repetititis vicibus flevit* (Clericus, Heupel, Münthe, Bleek), which would presuppose a weeping as having already previously occurred (Theophrastus, *Char.* 8; Diodorus Siculus, p. 345 B). Ewald is linguistically correct in rendering: *Breaking in with the tears of deep repentance upon the sound of the cock arousing him.* See Polyb. i. 80. 1, xxiii. 1. 8; Stephani *Thes.*, ed. Hase, III. p. 1526; Schweighäuser, *Lcx. Polyb.* p. 244 f. Thus we should have to conceive of a loud weeping, answering, as it were, to the cock-crowing. From a linguistic point of view Casaubon is already correct (κατανοήσας); then Wetstein, Kypke, Glöckler, de Wette, Bornemann (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 139), Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 127 [E. T. 145]: *when he had attended thereto*, namely, to this ῥῆμα of Jesus, when he had directed his reflection to it. See the examples for this undoubted use of ἐπιβάλλειν with and without τὸν νοῦν or τὴν διάνοιαν, in Wetstein, p. 632 f.; Kypke, I. p. 196 f. The latter mode of taking it (allowed also by Beza) appears more in accordance with the context, because ἀνεμνήσθη κ.τ.λ. precedes, so that ἐπιβαλὼν corresponds to the ἀνεμνήσθη as the further mental action that linked itself thereto, and now had as its result the weeping. *Peter remembers the word, reflects thereupon, weeps!*

¹ So also Linder in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 562 f., inappropriately comparing περιβάλλειν, and appealing to 2 Kings viii. 15 (where the word, however, does not at all stand absolutely) and to Lev. xiii. 45 (where the middle voice is used).

CHAPTER XV.

VER. 1. ἐπὶ τὸ πρῶτ'] B C D L 8 46, Or. Lachm. Tisch. have merely πρῶτ. But why should ἐπὶ τό have been added? The omission is easily explained from the fact that the transcribers had the simple conception *mane* (Vulg.; comp. Matt. xxvii. 1). — Instead of ποιήσ. Tisch. has ἐτοιμάσ., following only C L 8, without min. vss. and Fathers. But it is worthy of consideration, as ποιήσ. might easily come from iii. 6. — Ver. 4. καταμαρτ.] B C D 8, Copt. Aeth. It. Vulg. have κατηγοροῦσιν. So Lachm. and Tisch.; the *Recepta* is from Matt. xxvii. 13. — Ver. 7. συστασιαστῶν] Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. have στασιαστῶν, following B C D K 8, min. Sahid. But how easily the syllable στ dropped away before ΣΤ, even although no scruple might be felt at the unusual συστασ. ! ΣΤ has scarcely been added to make it undoubted that Barabbas was himself an insurgent with the others (Fritzsche), which assuredly apart from this every transcriber found in the words. — Ver. 8. ἀναβοήσας] Lachm. Tisch. have ἀναβάς, following B D 8* Copt. Sahid. Gofh. Vulg. It. Approved also by Schulz and Rinck. The ἀναβάς was not understood, and, in accordance with what follows (vv. 13, 14), it was awkwardly changed into the ἀναβοήσας, which was as yet in this place premature. — Ver. 12. ὃν λέγετε] Lachm. has deleted this, on too slight evidence. If it had been added, it would have taken the form τὸν λεγόμενον from Matt. xxvii. 22. But τόν is to be adopted before βασιλ. (with Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch.), according to A B C Δ 8, min., to which also D may be added as reading τῷ βασιλ. Out of the swerving from ὃν to τόν is explained the omission of ὃν λέγετε, which happened the more easily after ver. 9. — Ver. 14. The reading περισσῶς (Lachm.), instead of the *Recepta* περισσοτέρως, is so decisively attested that it may not be derived from Matt. xxvii. 23. Somewhat more weakly, but still so considerably, is ἔκραζον (Lachm.) in the sequel attested (A D G K M, min.; Δ: ἔκραζαν), that this also is to be adopted, and ἔκραζαν is to be regarded as a repetition from ver. 13. — Ver. 17. ἐνδύουσιν] Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. have ἐνδιδύσκουσιν, which Griesb. also recommended, and Schulz

approved, following B C D F Δ s, min. Rightly; the familiar verb supplanted the unusual one. — Ver. 18. The *Recepta* βασιλεῦ is to be maintained; ὁ βασιλεὺς (Griesb. Scholz) is from Matthew and John. The evidence is divided. — Ver. 20. σταυρώσασιν] Lachm. and Tisch. have σταυρώσουσιν, following A C D L P Δ, min. (B has not got ἵνα σταυρ. αὐτ. at all). With this preponderant attestation, and as the subjunctive so easily intruded itself, the future is to be adopted. — Ver. 22. Before ρολγ. Fritzsche and Tisch. have τόν, following B C** F L Δ s, min. Rightly; the article, superfluous in itself, was left out in accordance with Matthew. — Ver. 23. πειν] is with Tisch., following B C* L Δ s, Copt. Arm., to be struck out as being an addition from Matt. xxvii. 34. — Ver. 24. Instead of διαμερίζονται Elz. has διμερίζον, in opposition to all the uncials. — Ver. 28. The whole of this verse is wanting in A B C D X s, min. Cant. Sahid. Condemned by Griesb., Schulz, and Fritzsche, deleted by Tisch. It is an ancient, but in the case of Mark a foreign, interpolation from a recollection of Luke xxii. 37 (comp. John xix. 24). — Ver. 29. ἐν τρισὶν ἡμ. οἰκοῦ.] Lachm. and Tisch. have οἰκ. τρ. ἡμ. As well the omission of ἐν as the putting of οἰκ. first, is sufficiently well attested to make the *Recepta* appear as an alteration in accordance with Matt. xxvii. 40. — Ver. 30. καὶ κατὰβα] Lachm. Tisch. have καταβάς, following B D L Δ s, Copt. Vulg. codd. It. The *Recepta* is a resolution of the participle; comp. P, min.: καὶ κατὰβηθι (in accordance with Matthew). — Ver. 33. καὶ γενομ. (Lachm. and Tisch.) is to be adopted instead of γενομ. δέ on preponderating evidence; but in ver. 34 the *Recepta* τῇ ὥρᾳ τῇ ἐνάτῃ is, following A C E G, etc., to be maintained. — Lachm. Tisch. read τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὥρᾳ, which suggested itself in accordance with Matt. xxvii. 46. — Ver. 34. The words ἐλωτ κ.τ.λ. are very variously written in codd. and vss. The *Recepta* λαμμῶ is in any case rejected by the evidence; between the forms λιμά (Lachm.), λαμά (Tisch.), and λεμῶ (Fritzsche), in the equal division of the evidence, there is no coming to a decision. — Ver. 36. τε] has important but not preponderating evidence against it; it is deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. But if it had been added, καὶ περιθ. would have been written (Matt. xxvii. 48), which, however, is only found in a few cursives. On the other hand, previously instead of εἰς, τις is to be read with Tisch., and the following καὶ to be deleted with Lachm. The *Recepta* is moulded after Matthew. — Ver. 39. κράζας] is wanting only in B L s, Copt. Ar. (deleted by Tisch.), and easily became objectionable. — The arrangement οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος. in Lachm. and Tisch. is attested by B D L Δ s, min. The *Recepta* is from Luke

xxiii. 47. — Ver. 41. αἱ καὶ] Lachm. and Tisch. have merely αἱ. So also Kinck. But the collocation of the two almost similar syllables was the occasion of the dropping away partly of αἱ (A C L Δ, min. vss.), partly of καὶ (B K, min. vss.). — Ver. 42. The reading πρὸς σάββατον in Lachm. (instead of προσάββατον) is nothing but a clerical error. — Ver. 43. ἤλθεν] Decisive evidence gives ἐλθών. So Matthaei, Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch., approved also by Griesb. ἐλθών . . . τοῦ. εἰσῆλθε was resolved into ἤλθεν . . . καὶ τ. ε. This καὶ before τοῦ. occurs still in min. Syr. utr. Vulg. Euthym. — Ver. 44. πάλαι] Lachm. has ἥδη, in accordance with B D, Syr. hier. Arm. Copt. Goth. Vulg. It. Theophyl. A repetition of the previous ἥδη. — Ver. 45. σῶμα] B D L K: πτωμα. So Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; σῶμα appeared more worthy. — Ver. 46. καὶ before καθελ. is wanting in B D L K, Copt. Lachm. Tisch. A connective addition. — κατέθηκεν] B C** D L K, min. have ἔθηκεν. So Fritzsche, Lachm. But how easily the syllable κατ dropped out after καὶ, especially since Matthew and Luke also only have the simple form! — Ver. 47. τῆςται] In accordance with decisive evidence read, with Lachm. and Tisch., τίδειται.

Ver. 1. See on Matt. xxvii. 1, 2. Comp. Luke xxiii. 1. — ἐπὶ τὸ πρωῒ] *on the morning* (xiii. 35), i.e. *during the early morning*, so that ἐπί expresses the duration stretching itself out. Bernhardt, p. 252. Comp. Acts iii. 1, iv. 5. As to συμβ. ποι., comp. on iii. 6. They made a consultation. According to the more significant reading ἐτοιμάσ. (see the critical remarks), they *arranged* such an one, *they set it on foot*. On what subject? the sequel informs us, namely, on the delivering over to the Procurator. — καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδρ.] *and indeed the whole Sanhedrim*. Mark has already observed, xiv. 53 (πάντες), that the assembly was a *full* one, and with manifest design brings it into prominence once more. "Synedrium septuaginta unius seniorum non necesse est, ut sedeant omnes . . . cum vero necesse est, ut congregentur omnes, *congregentur omnes*," Maimonides, *Sanhedr.* 3 in Lightfoot, p. 639.

Vv. 2–5. See on Matt. xxvii. 11–14. Comp. Luke xxiii. 2 f. Matthew has here inserted from the evangelic tradition elsewhere the tragical end of Judas, just as Luke has the discussion with Herod; Mark abides simply and plainly by the main matter in hand; nor has he in the sequel the dream of

Pilate's wife, or the latter's washing of his hands. Doubts, however, as to the historical character of these facts are not to be deduced from this silence; only the tradition had narrower and wider spheres of its historical material. — Ver. 4. *πάλιν*] See ver. 2. — Ver. 5. *οὐκέτι*] At ver. 2 he had still answered.

Vv. 6-14. See on Matt. xxvii. 15-23. Comp. Luke xxiii. 13-23. — Ver. 6. *ἀπέλυνεν*] “Imperfectum ubi *solvere* notat, non nisi de re ad certum tempus restricta dicitur,” Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 746. — *ὅνπερ*] *quem quidem* (Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 724), *the very one whom they*, etc. — Ver. 7. *μετὰ τῶν συστασιαστ.*] *with his fellow-insurgents.* *συστασιαστής* occurs again only in Josephus, *Antt.* xiv. 2. 1. In the classical writers it is *συστασιώτης* (Herod. v. 70. 124; Strabo, xiv. p. 708). — *ἐν τῇ στάσει*] *in the insurrection in question*, just indicated by *συστασιαστ.* It is hardly assumed by Mark as *well known*; to us it is entirely unknown.¹ But Bengel well remarks: “crimen Pilato suspectissimum.” — Ver. 8. What Matthew represents as brought about by Pilate, Mark makes to appear as if it were suggested by the people themselves. An unessential variation. — *ἀναβάς*] *having gone up* before the palace of Pilate (see the critical remarks). — *αἰτεῖσθαι, καθώς*] *so to demand, as, to institute a demand accordingly, as, i.e. according to the real meaning: to demand that, which.* See Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 427; Schaef. *O. C.* 1124. — Ver. 9. *τὸν βασιλέα τ. Ἰουδ.*] not inappropriate (Köstlin), but said in bitterness against the chief priests, etc., as John xviii. 39. — Ver. 10. *ἐγίνωσκε*] *he perceived*; Matthew has *ᾔδει*, but Mark represents the matter *as it originated*. — Ver. 11. *ἵνα μᾶλλον*] *aim of the ἀνέσεισαν* (comp. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 204 [E. T. 236]), *in order that he* (Pilate) *rather*, etc., *in order that this result might be brought about*. — Ver. 13. *πάλιν*] supposes a responsive cry already given after ver. 11 on the instigation of the chief priests. An inexact simplicity of narration.

Vv. 15-20. See on Matt. xxvii. 26-31. Comp. Luke

¹ If it was not the rising on account of the aqueduct (comp. on Luke xiii. 1), as Ewald supposes.

xxiii. 24, 25. — τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι] *satisfacere*, to do what was enough, to content them. See examples from Diog. Laert., Appian, and so forth, in Wetstein and Kypke. Comp. λαμβάνειν τὸ ἱκανόν, Acts xvii. 9. — Ver. 16. Matthew has: εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον; the vividly descriptive Mark has: ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς, ὃ ἐστὶ πραιτώριον, *into the interior of the court, which is the praetorium*, for they did not bring Him into the house and call the cohorts together thither, but into the inner court surrounded by the buildings (*the court-yard*) which formed the area of the praetorium, so that, when people went from without into this court through the portal (πυλῶν, comp. on Matt. xxvi. 71) they found themselves *in the praetorium*. Accordingly αὐλή is not in this place to be translated *palace* (see on Matt. xxvi. 3), but *court*, as always in the N. T. Comp. xiv. 66, 54. — On the ὃ attracted by the predicative substantive, comp. Winer, p. 150 [E. T. 206]. — πορφύραν] *a purple robe*. Matthew specifies the robe *more definitely* (χλαμύδα), and the colour *differently* (κοκκίνην), following another tradition. — Ver. 18. ἤρξαντο] after that investiture; a new act.

Ver. 21. See on Matt. xxvii. 32. Comp. Luke xxiii. 26. — ἴνα σταυρώσουσιν] See the critical remarks. On the *future* after ἴνα, see Winer, p. 257 f. [E. T. 360 f.]. — Only Mark designates Simon by his *sons*. Whether *Alexander* be identical with the person named at Acts xix. 33, or with the one at 1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 17, or with neither of these two, is just as much a matter of uncertainty, as is the possible identity of *Rufus* with the person mentioned at Rom. xvi. 13. Mark takes for granted that both of them were known, hence they doubtless were *Christians* of mark; comp. x. 46. But how frequent were these names, and how many of the Christians that were *at that time* well known we know nothing of! As to ἀγγελ., see on Matt. v. 41. The notice ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ, which Luke also, following Mark, gives (but not Matthew), is one of the traces which are left in the Synoptical narratives that the day of the crucifixion was not the first day of the feast (see on John xviii. 28). Comp. Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 137; Ebrard, p. 513. It is not, indeed,

specified *how far* Simon had come from the country (comp. xvi. 12) to the city, but there is no *limitation* added having reference to the circumstances of the festal Sabbath, so that the quite open and general nature of the remark, in connection with the other tokens of a work-day (vv. 42, 46 ; Luke xxiii. 56 ; Matt. xxvii. 59 f.), certainly suggests to us such a work-day. The ἀγγαρεύοντες being the Roman soldiers, there is the less room on the basis of the text for thinking, with Lange, of a *popular jest*, which had just laid hold of a *Sabbath-breaker* who happened to come up.

Vv. 22-27. See on Matt. xxvii. 33-38. Comp. Luke xxiii. 33 f., who here narrates summarily, but yet not without bringing in a deeply vivid and original trait (ver. 34), and has previously the episode of the daughters of Jerusalem. — τὸν Γολγοθᾶ τόπον] Γολγ. corresponds to the subsequent κρανίου, and is therefore to be regarded as a *genitive*. According to Mark, the place was called the “*place of Golgotha*,” which name (ὄ) interpreted is equivalent to “*place of a skull*.” — Ver. 23. ἐδίδουν] *they offered*. This is implied in the *imperfect*. See Bernhardt, p. 373. — ἐσμυρνισμ.] See, on this custom of giving to criminals wine mingled with μυρρῆ or similar bitter and strong ingredients for the purpose of blunting their sense of feeling, Wetstein *in loc.* ; Douglæus, *Anal.* II. p. 42. — Ver. 24. ἐπ’ αὐτά] according to Ps. xxii. 19 : *upon them* (the clothes were lying there), as Acts i. 26. Whether the *casting of the lot* was done by dice, or by the shaking of the lot-tokens in a vessel (helmet), so that the first that fell out decided for the person indicated by it (see Duncan, *Lcx.*, ed. Rost, p. 635), is a question that must be left open. — τίς τί ἄρῃ] *i.e. who should receive anything, and what he was to receive*. See, on this blending of two interrogative clauses, Bernhardt, p. 444 ; Ellendt, *Lcx. Soph.* II. p. 824 ; Winer, p. 553 [E. T. 783]. — Ver. 25. This specification of time (comp. ver. 33), which is not, with Baur and Hilgenfeld, to be derived from the mere consideration of symmetry (of the third hour to that of ver. 33), is in keeping with Matt. xxvii. 45 ; Luke xxiii. 44. As to the difference, however, from John xix. 14, according to which, at about the

sixth hour, Jesus still stood before Pilate, and as to the attempts at reconciliation made in respect thereof, see on John. — *καὶ ἐστ. αὐτ.*] *ἐστ.* is not to be translated as a pluperfect (Fritzsche), but : and it was the third hour, *and they crucified Him*, i.e. *when they crucified Him*;¹ as also in classical writers after the specification of the time the fact is often linked on by the simple *καί*. See Thuc. i. 50, iii. 108; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 1. 7, vii. 4. 12. Comp. on Luke xix. 43. Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 220 C.

Vv. 29–41. See on Matt. xxvii. 39–56. Comp. Luke xxiii. 35–49. — *οὐά*] the Latin *vah!* an exclamation of (here ironical) amazement. Dio Cass. lxiii. 20; Arrian, *Epict.* iii. 23. 24; Wetstein *in loc.* — *ὁ καταλύων κ.τ.λ.*] gives us a glimpse of the *original* affirmation of the witnesses, as it is preserved in Matt. xxvi. 61 (not in Mark xiv. 58). — Ver. 31. *πρὸς ἀλλήλ.*, *inter se invicem*, belongs to *ἐμπαίζ.* — Ver. 32. *Let the Messiah the King of Israel come down now*, etc.,—a bitter mockery! The *ὁ Χριστός* applies to the confession before the supreme council, xiv. 61 f., and *ὁ βασιλ. τ. Ἰσρ.* to that before Pilate, ver. 2. Moreover, we may attach either the two forms of address (Lachmann, Tischendorf), or the first of them (Ewald), to what precedes. But the customary mode of apprehending it as a *double* address at the head of what follows is more in keeping with the malicious triumph. — *πιστεύσ.*] namely, that He is the Messiah, the King of Israel. *καὶ οἱ συνεσταυρ.*] agrees with Matthew, but not with Luke. See on Matt. xxvii. 44. It is to be assumed that Mark had no knowledge of the narrative of Luke xxiii. 39 ff., and that the scene related by Luke belongs to a later tradition, in which had been preserved more special traits of the great

¹ Euthymius Zigabenus here gives a warning illustration of forced harmonizing : *ἦν δέ, φησιν, ὥρα τρίτη, ὅτε δηλονότι ἤρξατο πᾶσιν ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν τοῦ Πιλάτου. Εἶτα τὸ ἐξῆς ἀναγνωστίον καθ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἰσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν, ἢ ἐκτῇ δηλαδὴ ὥρᾳ.* So also Luther in his gloss, and Fr. Schmid; comp. Calovius : “*hora tertia inde a traditione Pilato facta.*” With more shrewdness Grotius suggests : “*jam audita erat tuba horae tertiae, quod dici solebat donec caneret tuba horae sextae.*” In the main even at this day Roman Catholics (see Friedlieb and Bisping) similarly still make out of the third hour the second quarter of the day (9 to 12 o'clock).

event of the crucifixion, but with which the historical character of the exceedingly characteristic scene is not lost. See on Luke, *l.c.* — Ver. 34.¹ ἐλωί] the Syriac form for ܐܠܐ (Matthew), which latter appears to have been what Jesus uttered, as is to be inferred from the scoff: Ἡλίαν φωνεῖ. — Ver. 36. λέγων] a difference from Matt. xxvii. 49, whose account is more original (in opposition to Holtzmann), because to *remove* the aspect of *friendliness* must appear more in keeping with the *later* development. In consequence of this difference, moreover, ἄφετε is to be understood quite otherwise than ἄφες in Matthew, namely, *allow it*, what I am doing, *let me have my way*,—which has reference to the scoffing conception, as though the proffered draught would preserve the life till Elias should come. The view that in ver. 35 f. *friends* of Jesus are meant who misunderstood His cry of ἐλωί, and one of whom had wished still to cheer Him as regards the possible coming of Elias (Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 490), is in itself improbable even on account of the well-known cry of the Psalm, as indeed the ἄφετε, ἴδωμεν κ.τ.λ., comp. ver. 30, sounds only like malicious mockery. — Ver. 37. ἐξέπνευσε] *He breathed out, i.e. He died.* It is often used in this meaning absolutely in the Greek writers (Soph. *Aj.* 1025; Plut. *Arist.* 20). — Ver. 39. According to Mark, the centurion concluded from the fact of Jesus dying *after having cried out in such a manner*, i.e. *with so loud a voice* (ver. 37), that He was a hero. The extraordinary power (οὕτω δεσποτικῶς ἐξέπνευσε, Theophylact, comp. Victor Antiochenus: μετ' ἐξουσίας ἀπέθανε) which the Crucified One manifested in His very departing, made on the Gentile this impression—in which his judgment was naturally guided by the circumstance that he had heard (Matt. xxvii. 40) of the charge brought against Jesus, that He claimed to be Son of God. According to others (as Michaelis, Kuinoel, de Wette), the *unexpectedly*

¹ Mark has only this one of the sayings of Jesus on the cross, and Schenkel regards only this one as absolutely undoubted,—in which opinion he does great injustice specially to John. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 451, takes offence at this very saying, and only finds it conceivable as a *reference to the whole twenty-second Psalm.*

speedy dying of Jesus, who had just before emitted a vigorous cry, made that impression upon the Gentile, who saw in it a *favour of the gods*. But in order to express this, there would have been necessary under the circumstances before ἐξέπνυ an accompanying definition, such as ἤδη or εὐθέως. Baur, *Markuser.* p. 108 f., illustrates the remark even from the crying out of the *demons* as they went forth (i. 26, v. 7, ix. 26); holding that Mark correspondingly conceived of the forcible separation of the higher spirit, through which Jesus had been the Son of God,—therefore after a Gnostic manner. Comp. also Hilgenfeld and Köstlin. Wrongly; because opposed to the doctrine of the entire N. T. regarding Christ the *born* Son of God, as indeed the heathen centurion, according to the measure of his conception of sons of God, could not conceive of Him otherwise. We may add that the circumstantial and plain statement of motive, as given by Matthew and Luke for the centurion's judgment, betrays the later manipulators (Zeller in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 385 ff., gives a contrary opinion), to whom Mark in this place seemed obscure or unsatisfactory. — ἦν] in His life. — Ver. 40. ἦσαν] *aderant*; comp. viii. 1. — καὶ Μαρίαν] among others *also* Mary. — τοῦ μικροῦ] cannot according to the meaning of the word be without arbitrariness explained as: *the younger*, although the James designated is the so-called Younger, but as: *the little* (of stature, comp. Luke xix. 3). Hom. *Il.* v. 801: Τυδεύς τοι μικρὸς μὲν ἔνν δέμας, Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 4. 20. An appeal is wrongly made to Judg. vi. 15, where in fact μικρός is not the youngest, but the least, that is, the weakest in warlike aptitude. — Mark does not name *Salome*, but he *indicates* her. According to John xix. 25, she was the sister of the mother of Jesus. Comp. also Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 171. Thus there are *three* women here recorded by Mark. So also Matt. xxvii. 56. To *distinguish* the Mary of James from the mother of Jesus, so that *four* should be adduced (Ewald, *l.c.* p. 324), there appears to be no sufficient ground (comp. the Remark after ver. 47); on the contrary, Mark and Matthew would have here expressed themselves in a way very liable to be misunderstood; comp. on Matthew. — Ver. 41. αὶ καὶ κ.τ.λ.] as they were *now* in the

company around Jesus, so *also* they were, while He was in Galilee, in His train. *αἱ* applies, we may add, to the three who were *named*. Beside these there were among the women present yet many *others*, who had gone up with Him to Jerusalem.

Vv. 42-47. See on Matt. xxvii. 57-61. Comp. Luke xxiii. 50-56. — *ἐπεὶ* as far as *προσάββ.* gives the reason why Joseph, when the even had come, etc. With the commencement of the Sabbath (on Friday after sunset) the business of the taking away, etc., would not have been allowable.¹ Hence the words are *not* to be put in parenthesis. Mark has not *ἐπεὶ* elsewhere, and it is noteworthy that John also, xix. 31, has it here precisely at the mention of the *παρασκευή*, and in his Gospel the word only occurs elsewhere in xiii. 29. Certainly this is no accidental agreement; perhaps it arose through a common primitive evangelic document, which John, however, worked up differently. — *ὁ ἐστι προσάββ.*] *which*—namely, the expression *παρασκευή*—*is as much as Sabbath-eve*, the day before the Sabbath. On *προσάββ.*, comp. Judith viii. 6. — Ver. 43. The breaking of the legs, John xix. 31 ff., preceded this request for the dead body, and it is to be supposed that Joseph at the same time communicated to Pilate how in the case of Jesus, because He was already dead, the breaking of the legs was not applied. — *ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθ.*] The article designates the *well-known* man. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iii. 1. 5, iv. 6. 20. — *εὐσχήμων βουλευτ.*] is usually explained: *a counsellor of rank*. See on the later use of *εὐσχήμ.*, in contrast with the *plebeians*, Wetstein *in loc.*; Phryn. p. 333 and Lobeck thereupon; Acts xiii. 50, xvii. 12. But, as the characteristic of *rank* is already involved in *βουλευτής*, there is the less reason to depart from the old classical meaning of the word. Hence: *a seemly, stately counsellor*, so that the nobleness (the *σεμνότης*) of his external appearance and deportment is brought into prominence. — That by *βουλευτής* is

¹ Here, therefore, is no trace that that *Friday itself* was already a festal day, although it was really so according to the narrative otherwise of the Synoptics—also a remnant of the original (Johannine) conception of the day of the death of Jesus. Comp. on ver. 21. Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 115 ff.

meant a *member of the Sanhedrim*,¹ may be rightly concluded from Luke xxiii. 51. This is in opposition to Erasmus, Casaubon, Hammond, Michaelis, and many others, who conceive of him as a *member of a council at Arimathea*. — καὶ αὐτός] *on his part also*, like other adherents of Jesus. Comp. John xix. 38. — προσδεχόμε.] comp. Luke ii. 25, 38; Acts xxiii. 21, xxiv. 15. — τὴν βασιλ. τοῦ Θεοῦ] *the kingdom of the Messiah*, whose near manifestation—that subject-matter of fervent expectation for the devout ones of Israel—Jesus had announced. The idea of the kingdom is not *Petrine* (Lange), but one belonging to primitive Christianity generally. — τολμήσας] *having emboldened himself*, absolutely; see Maetzner, *ad Antioph.* p. 173. Comp. Rom. x. 20. — Ver. 44. εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκε] *he wondered if He were already dead* (*perfect*; on the other hand, afterwards the historic *aorist*: *had died*). It is plain that Pilate had had *experience*, how slowly those who were crucified were accustomed to die. εἰ after θαυμάζω denotes that the matter is not as yet assumed to be beyond a doubt. See Boissonade, *ad Philostr. Her.* p. 424; Kühner, II. p. 480 f.; Frotscher, *Hier.* i. 6; Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 195. — πάλαι] the opposite of ἄρτι. *Whether He had died* (not just only now, but) *already earlier*. He wished, namely, to be sure that he was giving away the body as actually dead. See on πάλαι, *dudum*, as a relative antithesis to the present time, Wolf, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 20; Stallbaum, *ad Apol. Socr.* p. 18 B. — Ver. 45. ἐδωρήσατο] *he bestowed as a gift*, without therefore requiring money for it. Instances of the opposite (as Cic. *Verr.* v. 46; Justin, ix. 4. 6) may be seen in Wetstein. — Ver. 46. καθαιρεῖν] the proper word for the taking away from the cross, Latin: *detrahere, reficere*. Comp. ver. 36. See Raphel, *Polyb.* p. 157; Kypke and Loesner *in loc.* — λελατ. ἐκ πέτρας] *hewn out of a rock*. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 60. The same fact is expressed in Mark according to the conception

¹ The participation of Nicodemus in the action (John xix. 39) forms one of the special facts which John alone offers us from his recollection. But the attempt to identify Joseph with Nicodemus (Krenkel in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 438 ff.) can only be made, if the fourth Gospel be regarded as non-apostolic, and even then not without great arbitrariness.

from whence; and in Matthew, according to the conception wherein. Of the fact that the grave belonged to Joseph, Mark gives no hint, neither do Luke and John; see on Matt. xxvii. 60. — ποῦ τέθειται] The perfect (see the critical remarks) indicates that the women, after the burial had taken place, went thither and beheld where He has been laid, where He lies. The present would indicate that they looked on at the burial.

REMARK.—In ver. 47, instead of Ἰωσὴ Lachmann and Tischendorf have adopted ἡ Ἰωσῆτος, following B Δ (L has merely Ἰωσῆτος) N**, as they also at ver. 40 have Ἰωσῆτος, following B D L Δ N** (in which case, however, B prefixes ἡ). This is simply a Greek form of the Hebrew name (comp. the critical remarks on vi. 3), and probably, on the strength of this considerable attestation, original, as also is the article ἡ, which is found in A B C G Δ N**. Another reading is ἡ Ἰωσήφ, which occurs in A, 258, Vulg. Gat. Prag. Rd., and is preferred by Wieseler, *chronol. Synopsis*, p. 427 f., who here understands the daughter or wife of the counsellor Joseph of Arimathea, and so quite a different Mary from the Mary of James. But (1) this reading has the very great preponderance of evidence opposed to it; (2) it is easily explained whence it originated, namely, out of the correct reading of Matt. xiii. 55 (Ἰωσήφ, see *in loc.*), from which place the name of Joseph found its way into many of the witnesses (including Vulg. and codd. It.), not only at Mark vi. 3, but also at xv. 40 (Aeth. Vulg. It. Aug.) and xv. 47; while the underlying motive for conforming the name of Joses to that of Joseph the brother of Jesus, Matt. xiii. 55, might be found as well in the assumption of the identity of the brethren of Jesus with the sons of Alphaeus, as in the error, which likewise was already ancient (see Theophylact), that the mother of Jesus is meant and is designated as the stepmother of James and Joses. (3) A Mary of Joseph is never named among the women of the Gospel history. But (4) if Joseph had been the counsellor just previously mentioned, Mark would have written not merely M. ἡ Ἰωσήφ, but M. ἡ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ., and would, moreover, assuming only some accuracy on his part, have indicated the relation of kinship, which he has not omitted even at ver. 40, where, withal, the relation of Mary to James and Joses was well enough known. Finally, (5) the association of Mary of Magdala in the passage before us of itself entitles us to suppose that Mary would also have been one of the women who followed Jesus from Galilee (ver. 41), as indeed at xvi. 1 these two friends are again named. On the whole we must

abide by the *Maria Josis* at the passage before us. Mark, in the passage where he mentions her for the first time, ver. 40, names her *completely* according to her *two* sons (comp. Matt. xxvii. 56), and then—because she was wont to be designated both as *Maria Jacobi* (comp. Luke xxiv. 10) and as *Maria Josis*—at ver. 47 in the latter, and at xvi. 1 in the former manner, both of which differing modes of designation (ver. 47, xvi. 1) either occurred so accidentally and involuntarily, or perhaps were occasioned by different sources of which Mark made use.

CHAPTER XVI.

VER. 2. τῆς μιᾶς] Lachm. has μιᾶ τῶν, following B 1. From John xx. 1, as is also τῆς μιᾶς τῶν in L Δ 8, Eus. Tisch. — Ver. 8. After ἐξελθ. Elz. has ταχὺ, in opposition to decisive evidence, from Matt. xxviii. 8. — Ver. 9. ἀφ' ἧς] Lachm. has παρ' ἧς, following C D L 33. Rightly; ἀφ' is from Luke viii. 2. — Ver. 14. After ἐγγεγραμ. Δ C* X Δ, min. Syr. p. Ar. p. Erp. Arm. have ἐκ νεκρῶν, which Lachm. has adopted. A mechanical addition. — Vv. 17, 18. The omission of καιναῖς, as well as the addition of καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσίν before ὅφεις, is too feebly attested. The latter is an exegetical addition, which, when adopted, absorbed the preceding καιναῖς. — Instead of βλάψῃ Elz. has βλάψει, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 19. After κύριος read, with Lachm. and Tisch., Ἰησοῦς, which is found in C* K L Δ, min. most of the vss. and Ir. As an addition in the way of gloss, there would be absolutely no motive for it. On the other hand, possibly on occasion of the abbreviation ΚΣ., ΞΣ., it dropped out the more easily, as the expression ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς is infrequent in the Gospels.

The entire section from vv. 9–20 is a non-genuine conclusion of the Gospel, not composed by Mark. The external grounds for this view are: (1) The section is wanting in B 8, Arm. mss. Ar. vat. and in cod. ~~Κ~~ of the It. (in Tisch.), which has another short apocryphal conclusion (comp. subsequently the passage in L), and is designated in 137, 138 with an asterisk. (2) Euseb. *ad Marin.* qu. 1 (in Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* I. p. 61 f.), declares that σχέδον ἐν ᾧ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις the Gospel closes with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. Comp. qu. 3, p. 72, where he names the manuscripts which contain the section only *τινα τῶν ἀντιγράφων*. The same authority in Victor Ant. ed. Matth. II. p. 208, states that Mark has not related any appearance of the risen Lord that occurred to the disciples. (3) Jerome, *ad Heb.* qu. 3; Gregor. Nyss. *orat. 2 de resurr. Chr.*; Vict. Ant. ed. Matth. II. p. 120; Sever. Ant. in Montfauc. *Bibl. Coisl.* p. 74, and the Scholia in several codd. in Scholz and Tisch., attest that the passage was wanting in very many manuscripts

(Jerome: "omnibus Græciæ libris pæne"). (4) According to Syr. Philox. in the margin, and according to L, several codd. had an entirely different ending¹ of the Gospel. (5) Justin Martyr and Clem. Al. do not indicate any use made by them of the section (how precarious is the resemblance of Justin, *Apol.* I. 45 with ver. 20!); and Eusebius has his Canons only as far as ver. 8, as, indeed, also in codd. A U and many min. the numbers really reach only thus far,² while certainly in C E H K M V they are carried on to the very end. These external reasons are the less to be rejected, seeing that it is not a question of a single word or of a single passage of the context, but of an entire section so essential and important, the omission of which, moreover, deprives the whole Gospel of completeness; and seeing that the way in which the passage gradually passed over into the greater part of the codd. is sufficiently explained from Euseb. *ad Marin.* qu. 1, p. 62 (ἄλλος δέ τις οὐδ' ὅτι οὖν τολμῶν ἀνετεῖν τῶν ὁπωσοῦν ἐν τῇ τῶν εὐαγγελίων γραφῇ φερομένων, διπλῆν εἶναι φησι τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις πολλοῖς, ἑκατέραν τε παραδεκτέαν ὑπάρχειν, τῷ μὴ μᾶλλον ταύτην ἐκείνης, ἢ ἐκείνη ταύτης, παρὰ τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ εὐλαβέσιν ἐγκρίνεσθαι). See Credner, *Einkl.* I. p. 107. And when Euthymius Zigabenus, II. p. 183, designates those who condemn the section as τινὲς τῶν ἐξηγητῶν, not, however, himself contradicting them, the less importance is to be attached to this after the far older testimonies of Eusebius, and others, from which is apparent not the exegetical, but the *critical* point of view of the condemnation. Moreover, this external evidence against the genuineness finds in the section itself an *internal confirmation*, since with ver. 9 there suddenly sets in a process of excerpt-making in contrast with the previous character of the narration, while the entire section in general contains none of Mark's peculiarities (no εὐθέως, no πάλιν, etc.,—and what a brevity, devoid of

¹ Namely: πάντα διὰ τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον συντόμως ἐξηγγυλῶν μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἄχρι δύσεως ἐξαπίστιλι δὲ αὐτῶν τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτον κήρυγμα τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας. After that L goes on: ἵστην δὲ καὶ ταῦτα φερόμενα μετὰ τὸ ἰφιοβῶντο γὰρ ἀναστὰς διὰ κ.τ.λ.

² Vv. 15-18 occur in the Evang. Nicod. 14, in Thilo, p. 618; Tischendorf, p. 242 f. They *might* therefore have already appeared in the Acts of Pilate, which composition, as is well known, is worked up in the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. Ritschl, in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 527, would infer this from Tertullian, *Apol.* 21. But scarcely with warrant, for Tertullian, *i.e.*, where there is contained an excerpt from the Acts of Pilate, is founded upon the tradition in the *Acts of the Apostles*, foreign to the Synoptics, regarding the *forty days*.

vividness and clearness on the part of the compiler¹); in individual expressions it is quite at variance with the sharply defined manner throughout of Mark (see the notes on the passages in detail, and Zeller in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1843, p. 450); it does not, moreover, presuppose what has been previously related (see especially ver. 9: ἀφ' ἧς ἐξῆλθεν. ἐπτα δαίμ., and the want of any account of the meeting in *Galilee* that was promised at ver. 7), and has even apocryphal disfigurements (ver. 18: ὁφείας . . . βλάψῃ). — If, in accordance with all this, the section before us is decidedly to be declared spurious, it is at the same time evident that the Gospel is *without any conclusion*: for the announcement of ver. 7, and the last words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ themselves, decisively show that Mark did not intend to conclude his treatise with these words. But whether *Mark himself* left the Gospel unfinished, or whether the conclusion has been *lost*, cannot be ascertained, and all conjectures on this subject are arbitrary. In the latter case the lost concluding section may have been similar to the concluding section of Matthew (namely, xxviii. 9, 10, and 16–20), but must, nevertheless, after ver. 8 have contained some incident, by means of which the angelic announcement of ver. 6 f. was still, even in spite of the women's silence in ver. 8, conveyed to the disciples. Just as little with reference to the apocryphal fragment¹ itself, vv. 9–20,—which already in very early times (although not by Mark himself, in opposition to Michaelis, Hug, Guericke, Ebrard, and others) was incorporated with the Gospel as a conclusion (even Syr. has it; and Iren. *Hæc.* iii. 10. 6 quotes ver. 19, and Hippol. vv. 17, 18),—is there anything more definite to be established than that it was composed independently of our Gospel, in which case the point remains withal undecided whether the author was a Jewish or a Gentile Christian (Credner), as indeed at least πρώτη σαββάτων, ver. 9 (in opposition to Credner), might be used by one who had been a Jew and had become conversant with Hellenic life. — *Against* the genuineness the following have declared themselves: Michaelis (*Auferstehungsgesch.* p. 179 ff.; *Einkl.* p. 1059 f.), Thies, Bolten, Griesbach, Gratz, Bertholdt, Rosenmüller, Schulthess in Tzschirner's *Anal.* III. 3; Schulz, Fritzsche, Schott (*Isag.* p. 94 ff., contrary to his *Opusc.* II. p. 129 ff.), Paulus (*exeg. Handb.*), Credner, Wieseler (*Commentat. num. loci Marc.* xvi. 9–20 *et Joh.* xxi. *genuini sint*, etc., Gott. 1839), Neudecker,

¹ That it is a *fragment*, which originally stood in connection with matter preceding, is plain from the fact that in ver. 9 the subject, ὁ Ἰησοῦς, is not named.

Tischendorf, Ritschl, Ewald, Reuss, Anger, Zeller, Hitzig (who, however, regards Luke as the author), Schenkel, Weiss, Holtzmann, Keim, and various others, including Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 4). *In favour of the genuineness*: Richard Simon (*hist. crit.* p. 114 f.), Mill, Wolf, Bengel, Matthaei, Eichhorn, Storr, Kuinoel, Hug, Feilmoser, Vater, Saunier, Scholz, Rinck (*Lucubr. crit.* p. 311 ff.), de Wette, Schwarz, Guericke, Olshausen, Ebrard, Lange, Bleek, Bisping, Schleiermacher also, and various others.¹ Lachmann, too, has adopted the section, as according to his critical principles it was necessary to do, since it is found in most of the uncials (only B 8 have it not), Vulg. It. Syr., etc. We may add that he did not regard it as genuine (see *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 843).

Vv. 1-8. See on Matt. xxviii. 1-8. Comp. Luke xxiv. 1-11. — *διαγενομ. τοῦ σαββ.*] *i.e.* on *Saturday after sunset*. See ver. 2. A difference from Luke xxiii. 56, which is neither to be got rid of, with Ebrard and Lange, by a distortion of the clear narrative of Luke; nor, with Beza, Er. Schmid, Grotius, Wolf, Rosenmüller, and others, by taking ἡγόρασαν as a *pluperfect*. For examples of διαγίνεσθαι used of the lapse of an intervening time (Dem. 541. 10, 833. 14; Acts xxv. 13, xxvii. 9), see Raphel, *Polyb.* p. 157; Wetstein *in loc.* — They bought aromatic herbs (ἀρώματα, Xen. *Anab.* i. 5. 1; *Polyb.* xiii. 9. 5) to mingle them with ointment, and so to anoint the dead body therewith (ἀλείψ.). This is no contradiction of John xix. 40. See on Matt. xxvii. 59. — Ver. 2 f. *πρωτῇ*] with the *genitive*. Comp. Herod. ix. 101, and see generally, Krüger, § 47. 10. 4. — τῆς μιᾶς σαββ.] *on the Sunday*. See on Matt. xxviii. 1. — ἀνατειλαντ. τοῦ ἡλίου] *after sunrise*; not: when the sun rose (Ebrard, Hug, following Grotius, Heupel, Wolf, Heumann, Paulus, and others), or: *was about to rise* (so Krebs, Hitzig), or: *had begun to rise* (Lange), which would be ἀνατέλλοντος, as is actually the

¹ Küstlin, p. 378 ff., ascribes the section to the alleged second manipulator of the Gospel. Lange conjectures (see his *L. J.* I. p. 166) that an incomplete work of Mark reached the Christian public earlier than that which was subsequently completed. According to Hilgenfeld, the section is not without a genuine groundwork, but the primitive form can no longer be ascertained; the evangelist appears "to have become unfaithful to his chief guide Matthew, in order to finish well by means of an older representation."

reading of D. A difference from John xx. 1, and also from Luke xxiv. 1; nor will it suit well even with the *πρωτὶ* strengthened by *λίαν*; we must conceive it so, that the sun had *only just* appeared above the horizon. — *πρὸς ἑαυτούς*] in communication with each other. But of a Roman watch they know nothing. — *ἐκ τῆς θύρας*] The stone was rolled *into* the entrance of the tomb, and so closed the tomb, John xx. 1. — Ver. 4. *ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα*] Wassenbergh in Valckenaer, *Schol.* II. p. 35, would transpose this back to ver. 3 after *μνημείου*, as has actually been done in D. Most expositors (including Fritzsche, de Wette, Bleek) proceed thus *as respects the meaning*; holding that *γὰρ* brings in the reason for ver. 3. An arbitrary view; it refers to what immediately precedes. *After they had looked up* (their look was previously cast down) *they beheld* ("contemplabantur cum animi intentione," see Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 120 f.) *that the stone was rolled away*; *for* (specification of the reason how it happened that this perception could not escape them after their looking up, but the fact of its having been rolled away must of necessity meet their eyes) *it was very great*. Let us conceive to ourselves the very large stone *lying close by the door of the tomb*. Its rolling away, however, had not occurred while they were beside it, as in Matthew, but previously; so also Luke xxiv. 2, 23; John xx. 1. As to *σφόδρα* at the end, comp. on Matt. ii. 10. — Ver. 5. *νεανίσκον*] Mark and Luke (who, however, differ in the number: *ἄνδρες δύο*) relate the angelic appearance as it *presented* itself (*κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον*); Matthew (who, however, places it not in the tomb, but upon the stone), as that which it actually *was* (*ἄγγελος κυρίου*). On the form of a *young man* assumed by the angel, comp. 2 Macc. iii. 26; Joseph. *Antt.* v. 8. 2 f., and Gen. xix. 5 f. — *ἐν τ. δεξιῇ*] on the right hand in the tomb from the entrance, therefore to the left hand of the place where the body would lie. — Ver. 6. Simple *asyndeta* in the lively eagerness of the discourse. — Ver. 7. *ἀλλ'*] *breaking off*, before the summons which suddenly intervened, Kühner, II. p. 439; Eilendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 78 f. — *καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ*] to His disciples *and*

(among these especially) *to Peter*. Comp. i. 5; Acts i. 14; and see Grotius. The special prominence of Peter is explained by the ascendancy and precedence, which by means of Jesus Himself (Matt. xvi. 18) he possessed as *primus inter pares* ("dux apostolici coetus," Grotius; comp. also Mark ix. 2, xiv. 33), not by the *denial* of Peter, to whom the announcement is held to have given the assurance of forgiveness (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Victor Antiochenus, Calovius, Heumann, Kuinoel, Lange, and others), which is assumed with all the greater arbitrariness without any indication in the text, seeing that possibly Peter might have concluded just the contrary. — *ὅτι*] recitative, so that *ὑμᾶς* and *ὑμῶν* apply to the *disciples* as in Matthew. — *καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῶν*] xiv. 28. It relates to the *whole* of what precedes: *προάγει ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ. and ἐκεῖ αὐτ. ὄψ.* The latter was *indirectly* contained in xiv. 28.—The circumstance that here *preparation is made for* a narrative of a meeting together in Galilee, but no such account subsequently *follows*, is an argument justly brought to bear against the genuineness of ver. 9 ff. That the women did not execute the angel's charge (ver. 8), does not alter the course of the matter as it had been indicated by the angel; and to explain that inconsistency by the fact that the ascension does not well agree with the Galilean meeting, is inadmissible, because Mark, according to our passage and xiv. 28, must of necessity have assumed such a meeting,¹ consequently there was nothing to hinder him from representing Jesus as journeying to Galilee, and then again returning to Judaea for the ascension (in opposition to de Wette). — Ver. 8. *δέ*] explicative, hence also *γάρ* has found its way into codd. and vss. (Lachmann, Tischendorf). — *οὐδενὶ οὐδέν*

¹ It is characteristic of Schenkel that he assumes the Gospel to have *really* closed with ver. 8, and that it is "mere unproved conjecture" (p. 319) that the conclusion is lost. Such a supposition doubtless lay in his interest as opposed to the bodily resurrection; but even ver. 7 and xiv. 28 ought to have made him too prudent not to see (p. 333) in the absence of any appearances of the risen Lord in Mark the weightiest evidence in favour of the early composition of his Gospel, whereas he comes to the unhistorical conclusion that Peter did not touch on these appearances in his discourses. See Acts x. 40 f., and previously ii. 32, iii. 15.

εἶπον] The suggestion that we should, with Grotius, Heupel, Kuinoel, and many more, mentally supply: *on the way*, is devised for the sake of Luke xxiv. 9; rather is it implied, that from fear and amazement they left the bidding of the angel at ver. 7 unfulfilled. It is otherwise in Matt. xxviii. 8. That subsequently they *told* the commission given to them by the angel, is self-evident; but they did not *execute* it. — εἶχε δὲ αὐτὰς κ.τ.λ.] Hom. *Il.* vi. 137; Herod. iv. 15; Soph. *Phil.* 681; also in the LXX.

Vv. 9, 10. Now begins the apocryphal fragment of some other evangelical treatise (doubtless written very much in the way of epitome), which has been added as a conclusion of our Gospel. In it, first of all, the appearance related at John xx. 14–18 is given in a meagre abstract, in which the remark, which in Mark's connection was here wholly inappropriate (at the most its place would have been xv. 40), πὰρ ἧς ἐκβεβλ. ἐπτά δαιμ., is to be explained *by the fact*, that this casting out of demons was related in the writing to which the portion had originally belonged (comp. Luke viii. 2). — πρῶτῃ πρώτῃ σαββ.] is joined by Beza, Castalio, Heupel, Wolf, Rosenmüller, Paulus, Fritzsche, de Wette, Ewald, and others with ἀναστὰς δέ, but by Severus of Antioch, Gregory of Nyssa, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Victor, Grotius, Mill, Bengel, Kuinoel, Schulthess, and others, with ἐφάνη. We cannot decide the point, since we do not know the connection with what went before, in which the fragment originally occurred. If it were an integral part of our Gospel, it would have to be connected with ἐφάνη, since ver. 2 already presupposes the time of the resurrection having taken place, and now in the progress of the narrative the question was not about *this* specification of time, but about the fact that Jesus on the very same morning made His first appearance. — As well πρώτῃ as the singular σαββάτου (comp. Luke xviii. 12) is surprising after ver. 2. Yet it is to be conceded that even Mark himself *might* so vary the expressions. — παρ' ἧς] (see the critical remarks): *away from whom* (French: *de chez*). See Matthiæ, p. 1378. The expression with ἐκβάλλειν is not elsewhere found in the N. T. — Ver. 10. Foreign to Mark is here—(1) ἐκείνη,

which never occurs (comp. iv. 11, vii. 15, xii. 4 f., xiv. 21) in his Gospel so devoid of emphasis as in this case. As unemphatic stands *κακῆνοι* in ver. 11, but not at ver. 13, as also *ἐκείνους* in ver. 13 and *ἐκείνοι* at ver. 20 are emphatic. (2) *πορευθεῖσα*, which word Mark, often as he had occasion for it, never uses, while in this short section it occurs *three* times (vv. 12, 15). Moreover, (3) the circumlocution *τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις*, instead of *τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ* (the latter does not occur at all in the section), is foreign to the Gospels. The *μαθηταί* in the *more extended* sense are *meant*, the apostles and the rest of the companions of Jesus; the apostles *alone* are designated at ver. 14 by *οἱ ἔνδεκα*, as at Luke xxiv. 9, 33; Acts ii. 14. — *πενθοῦσι κ. κλαίουσι*] who *were mourning and weeping*. Comp. Luke vi. 25, although to *derive* the words from this passage (Schulthess) is arbitrary.

Ver. 11. Comp. Luke xxiv. 10, 11; John xx. 18. — The fact that *θεᾶσθαι* apart from this section does not occur in Mark, forms, considering the frequency of the use of the word elsewhere, one of the signs of a strange hand. By *εθεάθη* is not merely *indicated* that He had been *seen*, but that He had been *gazed upon*. Comp. ver. 14, and see Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 120 f. — *ἀπιστεῖν* does not occur in Mark except here and at ver. 16, but is altogether of rare occurrence in the N. T. (even in Luke only in chap. xxiv.)

Vv. 12, 13. A meagre statement of the contents of Luke xxiv. 13–35, yet provided with a traditional explanation (*ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ*), and presenting a variation (*οὐδὲ ἐκείνους ἐπίστευσαν*) which betrays as its source¹ not Luke himself, but a divergent tradition. — *μετὰ ταῦτα*] (*after what was narrated* in vv. 9–11) does not occur at all in Mark, often as he *might* have written it: it is an expression *foreign* to him. *How long* after, does not appear. According to Luke, it was still on the same day. — *ἐξ αὐτῶν*] *τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων*, ver. 10.

¹ De Wette wrongly thinks (following Storr, Kuinoel, and others) here and repeatedly, that an interpolator would not have allowed himself to extract so *freely*. Our author, in fact, wrote not as an *interpolator of Mark* (how unskillfully otherwise must he have gone to work!), but *independently of Mark*, for the purpose of completing whose Gospel, however, this fragment was subsequently used.

— *περιπατοῦσιν*] *cuntibus*, not while they stood or sat or lay, but *as they walked*. More precise information is then given in *πορευομένοις εἰς ἀγρόν*: *while they went into the country*. — *ἐφανερώθη*] ver. 14; John xxi. 1, *He became visible to them*, was brought to view. The expression does not directly point to a “ghostlike” appearance (in opposition to de Wette), since it does not of itself, although it does by *ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ*, point to a supernatural element in the bodily mode of appearance of the risen Lord. This *ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ* is not to be referred to other clothing and to an alleged disfigurement of the face by the sufferings borne on the cross (comp. Grotius, Heumann, Bolten, Paulus, Kuinoel, and others), but to the *bodily form*, that was *different* from what His previous form had been,—which the tradition here followed assumed in order to explain the circumstance that the disciples, Luke xxiv. 16, did not recognise Jesus who walked and spoke with them. — Ver. 13. *καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι*] *these also*, as Mary had done, ver. 10. — *τοῖς λοιποῖς*] to the others *γενομένοις μετ’ αὐτοῦ*, vv. 10, 12. — *οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνοι ἐπίστ.*] *not even them* did they believe. A difference of the tradition from that of Luke xxiv. 34, not a confusion with Luke xxiv. 41, which belongs to the *following* appearance (in opposition to Schulthess, Fritzsche, de Wette). It is boundless arbitrariness of harmonizing to assume, as do Augustine, *de consens. evang.* iii. 25, Theophylact, and others, including Kuinoel, that under *λέγοντας* in Luke xxiv. 34, and also under the unbelievers in the passage before us, we are to think only of *some*, and those *different* at the two places; while Calvin makes the distribution in such a manner, that they had doubted *at first*, but had *afterwards* believed! Bengel gives it conversely. According to Lange, too, they had been believing, but by the message of the disciples of Emmaus they were led into new doubt. Where does this appear? According to the text, they believed neither the Magdalene nor even the disciples of Emmaus.

Ver. 14. *ἴστερον*] not found elsewhere in Mark, *does not mean*: *at last* (Vulgate, Luther, Beza, Schulthess, and many others), although, according to our text, this appearance was the last (comp. Matt. xxi. 37), but: *afterwards, subsequently* (Matt.

iv. 2, xxi. 29; John xiii. 36), which certainly is a very indefinite specification. — The narrative of this appearance confuses very different elements with one another. It is manifestly (see ver. 15) the appearance which according to Matt. xxviii. 16 took place on the mountain in Galilee; but *ἀνακειμένους* (*as they reclined at table*) introduces an altogether different scenery and locality, and perhaps arose from a confusion with the incident contained¹ in Luke xxiv. 42 f., or Acts i. 4 (according to the view of *συναλιζόμενος* as *convescens*); while also the reproaching of the unbelief is here out of place, and appears to have been introduced from some confusion with the history of Thomas, John xx., and with the notice contained in Luke xxiv. 25; for which the circumstance mentioned at the appearance on the mountain, Matt. xxviii. 17 (*οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν*), furnished a certain basis. — *αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἑνδεκα*] *ipsis undecim*. Observe the ascending gradation in the three appearances—(1) to Mary; (2) to two of His earlier companions; (3) *to the eleven themselves*. Of other appearances *in the circle of the eleven* our author knows nothing; to him *this* was the *only one*. See ver. 19. — *ὅτι*] equivalent to *εἰς ἐκεῖνο ὅτι*, Luke xvi. 3; John ii. 18, ix. 17, xi. 51, xvi. 9; 2 Cor. i. 18, xi. 10.

Ver. 15. Continuation of *the same* act of speaking. — *πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει*] *to the whole creation*, i.e. *to all creatures*, by which expression, however, in this place, as in Col. i. 23, all *men* are designated, as those who are created *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, as the Rabbinic *הבריית* is also used (see Lightfoot, p. 673, and Westein *in loc.*). Not merely the *Gentiles* (who are called by the Rabbins contemptuously *הבריית*, see Lightfoot, *l.c.*) are meant, as Lightfoot, Hammond, Knatchbull, and others would have it. This would be in accordance neither with ver. 16 f., where the discourse is of *all* believers without distinction, nor with *ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ*, ver. 20, wherein is included the *entire* missionary activity, not merely the preaching to the *Gentiles*. Comp. on *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, Matt. xxviii. 19. Nor yet is there a pointing in *τῇ κτίσει* at the *glorification of the whole of nature* (Lange, comp. Bengel) by means of the gospel (comp.

¹ Beza, Calovius, and others wrongly explain *ἀνακειμ.* as: *una sedentibus*. Comp. xiv. 18.

Rom. viii.), which is wholly foreign to the conception, as plainly appears from what follows (ὁ . . . ὁ δέ). As in Col. *l.c.*, so here also the designation of the universal scope of the apostolic destination by *πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει* has in it something of *solemnity*.

Ver. 16. *He who shall have become believing* (see on Rom. xiii. 11), *and have been baptized, shall attain the Messianic salvation* (on the establishment of the kingdom). The *necessity* of baptism—of baptism, namely, regarded as a necessary *divinely ordained consequent* of the having become believing, without, however (as Calvin has observed), being regarded as *dimidium salutis causa*—is here (comp. John iii. 5) expressed for all *new converts*, but not for the *children of Christians* (see on 1 Cor. vii. 14). — ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας] That in the case of such *baptism* had not occurred, is obvious of itself; refusal of faith necessarily excluded baptism, since such persons despised the salvation offered in the preaching of faith. In the case of a baptism *without* faith, therefore, the necessary subjective *causa salutis* would be wanting.

Ver. 17. *Σημεῖα*] marvellous significant appearances for the divine confirmation of their faith. Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 22. — τοῖς πιστεύουσιν] *those who have become believing*, generically. The limitation to *the teachers*, especially the apostles and seventy disciples (Kuinoel), is erroneous. See ver. 16. The *σημεῖα* adduced indeed actually occurred with the *believers* as such, not merely with the teachers. See 1 Cor. xii. Yet in reference to the serpents and deadly drinks, see on ver. 18. Moreover, Jesus does not mean that *every one* of these signs shall come to pass in the case of *every one*, but in one case this, in another that one. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 4. — παρακολου.] *shall follow* them that believe, *shall accompany* them, after they have become believers. The word, except in Luke i. 3, is foreign to all the four evangelists, but comp. 1 Tim. iv. 6; 2 Tim. iii. 10. — ταῦτα] *which follow*. See Krüger, *Xen. Anab.* ii. 2. 2; Kühner, *ad Anab.* ii. 5. 10. — ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου] *in my name*, which they confess, shall *the ground* be, that they, etc. It refers to *all* the particulars which follow. — δαιμ. ἐκβαλ.] Comp. ix. 38. — γλώσσ. λαλ. καινῶς] *to speak with new languages*. The ecstatic *glossolalia*

(see on 1 Cor. xii. 10), which first appeared at the event of Pentecost, and then, moreover, in Acts x. 46 and xix. 6, and is especially known from the Corinthian church, had been converted by the tradition with reference to the Pentecostal occurrence into a speaking in *languages* different from the mother-tongue (see on Acts ii. 4). And such is the speaking in *new* languages mentioned in the passage before us, in such languages, that is, as they could not previously speak, which were new and strange *to the speakers*. Hereby the writer betrays that he is writing in the *sub-apostolic* period, since he, like Luke in reference to the Pentecostal miracle, imports into the first age of the church a conception of the *glossolalia* intensified by legend; nay, he makes the phenomenon thereby conceived as a speaking in strange languages to be even a common possession of believers, while Luke limits it solely to the unique event of Pentecost. We must accordingly understand the *γλῶσσ. λαλεῖν καινᾶς* of our text, not in the sense of the speaking *with tongues*, 1 Cor. xii.-xiv., but in the sense of the much more wonderful speaking *of languages*, Acts ii., as it certainly is in keeping with the two strange particulars that immediately follow. Hence every rationalizing attempt to explain away the concrete designation derived, without any doubt as to the meaning of the author, from the Acts of the Apostles, is here as erroneous as it is in the case of Acts ii., whether recourse be had to generalities, such as the newness of the utterance of the Christian spirit (Hilgenfeld), or the new formation of the spirit-world by the new word of the Spirit (Lange), the ecstatic speaking on religious subjects (Bleek), or others. Against such expedients, comp. Keim in Herzog, *Encykl.* XVIII. p. 687 ff. The ecstatic phenomena of Montanism and of the Irvingites present no analogy *with the passage before us*, because our passage has to do with *languages*, not with *tongues*. Euthymius Zigabenus: *γλώσσαις ξέναις, διαλέκτοις ἄλλοεθνέσιν.*

Ver. 18. *"Οφεις ἀρούσι]* *They shall lift up serpents* (take them into the hand and lift them up). Such a thing is not known from the history of the apostolic times (what took place with the adder on the hand of Paul in Acts xxviii. 2 ff.

is different); it would, moreover, be too much like juggling for a *σημεῖον* of believers, and betrays quite the character of apocryphal legend, for which, perhaps, a traditional distortion of the fact recorded in Acts xxviii. 2 f. furnished a basis, whilst the serpent-charming so widely diffused in the East (Elsner, *Obs.* p. 168; Wetstein *in loc.*; Winer, *Realw.*) by analogy supplied material enough. The promise in Luke x. 19 is specifically distinct. Others have adopted for *αἶψιν* the meaning of *taking out of the way* (John xvii. 5; Matt. xxiv. 39; Acts xxi. 36), and have understood it either of the *driving away, banishing* (Luther, Heumann, Paulus), or of the *destroying* of the serpents (Euthymius Zigabenus, Theophylact, both of whom, however, give also the option of the correct explanation); but the expression would be inappropriate and singular, and the thing itself in the connection would not be sufficiently marvellous. The meaning: "*to plant serpents as signs of victory with healing effect*," in which actual serpents would have to be thought of, but according to their symbolical significance, has a place only in the fancy of Lange excited by John iii. 14, not in the text. The singular thought must at least have been indicated by the addition of the essentially necessary word *σημεῖα* (Isa. v. 26, xi. 12), as the classical writers express *raising a signal* by *αἶψιν σημεῖον* (comp. Thuc. i. 49. 1, and Krüger thereon). — *κὰν θανάσ. τι πῶσιν κ.τ.λ.*] Likewise an apocryphal appendage, not from the direct contemplation of the life of believers in the apostolic age. The practice of condemning to the cup of poison gave material for it. But it is not to be supposed that the legend of the harmless poison-draught of *John* (comp. also the story of *Justus Barsabas* related by Papias in Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39) suggested our passage (in opposition to de Wette and older expositors), because the legend in question does not occur till so late (except in Abdias, *hist. apost.* v. 20, and the *Acta Joh.* in Tischendorf, p. 266 ff., not mentioned till Augustine); it rather appears to have formed itself on occasion of Matt. xx. 23 from our passage, or to have developed itself¹ out of the same

¹ Lange knows how to rationalize this *σημεῖον* also. In his view, there is symbolically expressed "the subjective restoration of life to invulnerability."

conception whence our expression arose, as did other similar traditions (see Fabricius *in Abd.* p. 576). On *θανάσιμον*, which only occurs here in the N. T., equivalent to *θανατηφόρον* (Jas. iii. 8), see Wetstein, and Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 610 C. — *καλῶς ἔξουσιν*] the sick.¹ Comp. Acts xxviii. 8 f.

Vv. 19, 20. *The Lord Jesus therefore* (see the critical remarks). *οὖν* annexes what now emerged as the final result of that last meeting of Jesus with the eleven, and that as well in reference to the Lord (ver. 19) as in reference also to the disciples (ver. 20); hence *μὲν . . . δέ*. Accordingly, the transition by means of *μὲν οὖν* is not incongruous (Fritzsche), but logically correct. But the expression *μὲν οὖν*, as well as *ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς*, is entirely foreign to Mark, frequently as he had occasion to use both, and therefore is one of the marks of another author. — *μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς*] cannot be referred without harmonistic violence to anything else than the discourses just uttered, vv. 14–18 (Theophylact well says: *ταῦτα δὲ λαλήσας*), not to the *collective discourses of the forty days* (Augustine, Euthymius Zigabenus, Maldonatus, Bengel, Kuinoel, Lange, and others); and with this in substance agrees Ebrard, p. 597, who, like Grotius and others, finds in vv. 15–18 the account of all that Jesus had said in His several appearances after His resurrection. The forty days are quite irreconcilable with the narrative before us generally, as well as with Luke xxiv. 44. But if Jesus, *after having discoursed to the disciples*, vv. 14–18, was taken up into heaven (*ἀνελήφθη*, see Acts x. 16, i. 2, xi. 22; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Luke ix. 51), it is not withal to be gathered from this *very compendious* account, that the

Christ is held to declare that the poison-cup would not harm His people, primarily in the symbolical sense, just as it did not harm Socrates in his soul; but also in the typical sense: that the life of believers would be ever more and more strengthened to the overcoming of all hurtful influences, and would in many cases, even in the literal sense, miraculously overcome them. This is to put into, and take out of the passage, exactly what pleases subjectivity.

¹ Not the believers who heal (Lange: "they on their part shall enjoy perfect health"). This perverted meaning would need at least to have been suggested by the use of *καὶ αὐτοί* (and they on their part).

writer makes Jesus pass *from the room where they were at meal* to heaven (Strauss, B. Bauer), any more than from *ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἐξελθόντες* it is to be held that the apostles immediately after the ascension departed into all the world. The representation of vv. 19, 20 is so evidently limited only to the *outlines* of the subsequent history, that between the *μετὰ τὸ λαλήσαι αὐτοῖς* and the *ἀνελήφθη* there is at least, as may be understood of itself, sufficient space for a *going forth of Jesus with the disciples* (comp. Luke xxiv. 50), even although the forty days do not belong to the evangelical tradition, but first appear in the Acts of the Apostles. *How* the writer conceived of the ascension, whether as visible or invisible, his words do not show, and it must remain quite a question undetermined. — *καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τ. Θεοῦ*] reported, it is true, not as an object of sense-perception (in opposition to Schulthess), but as a *consequence, that had set in*, of the *ἀνελήφθη*; not, however, to be explained away as a merely *symbolical* expression (so, for example, Euthymius Zigabenus: *τὸ μὲν καθίσαι δηλοῖ ἀνάπανσιν καὶ ἀπόλαυσιν τῆς θείας βασιλείας* τὸ δὲ ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκείωσιν καὶ ὁμοτιμίαν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Kuinoel: “cum Deo regnat et summa felicitate perfruitur”), but to be left as a *local fact*, as actual occupation of a seat on the divine throne (comp. on Matt. vi. 9; see on Eph. i. 20), from which hereafter He will descend to judgment. Comp. Ch. F. Fritzsche, *nova opusc.* p. 209 ff. — As to the ascension generally, see on Luke xxiv. 51.

Ver. 20. With the ascension the evangelic history was at its end. The writer was only now concerned to add a *conclusion* in keeping with the commission given by Jesus in ver. 15. He does this by means of a *brief summary of the apostolic ministry*, by which the injunction of Jesus, ver. 15, had been fulfilled, whereas all unfolding of its special details lay beyond the limits of the *evangelic*, and belonged to the region of the *apostolic* history; hence even the effusion of the Spirit is not narrated here. — *ἐκεῖνοι*] the *ἐνδεκα*, ver. 14. — *δέ*] prepared for by *μέν*, ver. 19. — *ἐξελθόντες*] namely, forth from the place, in which at the time of the ascension they sojourned. Comp. *πορευθέντες*, ver. 15; *Jerusalem* is meant. — *πανταχοῦ*]

By way of popular hyperbole; hence not to be used as a proof in favour of the composition not having taken place till after the death of the apostles (in opposition to Fritzsche), comp. Rom. x. 18; Col. i. 6. — τοῦ κυρίου] nor *God* (Grotius, and also Fritzsche, comparing 1 Cor. iii. 9; Heb. ii. 4), but *Christ*, as in ver. 19. The σημεῖα are wrought by the exalted One. Comp. Matt. xxviii. 20. That the writer has made use of Heb. ii. 3, 4 (Schulthess, Fritzsche), is, considering the prevalence of the thought and the dissimilarity of the words, arbitrarily assumed. — διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθ. σημείων] *by the signs that followed* (the λόγος). The article denotes the signs *spoken of*, which are promised at vv. 17, 18, and indeed promised as accompanying those *who had become believers*; hence it is erroneous to think, as the expositors do, of the miracles *performed by the apostles*. The confirmation of the apostolic preaching was found in the fact that *in the case of those who had become believers by means of that preaching* the σημεῖα promised at vv. 17, 18 occurred. — ἐπακολουθ. is foreign to all the Gospels; it occurs elsewhere in the N. T. in 1 Tim. v. 10, 24; 1 Pet. ii. 21; in classical Greek it is very frequently used.

REMARK.—The fragment before us, vv. 9–18, compared with the parallel passages of the other Gospels and with Acts i. 3, presents a remarkable proof how uncertain and varied was the tradition on the subject of the appearances of the Risen Lord (see on Matt. xxviii. 10). Similarly ver. 19, comp. with Luke xxiv. 50 ff., Acts i. 9 ff., shows us in what an uncertain and varied manner tradition had possessed itself of the fact of the ascension, indubitable as in itself it is, and based on the unanimous teaching of the apostles.

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

LUKE.

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.—ON THE LIFE OF LUKE.

EXCEPTING what the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles contain as to the circumstances of Luke's life, — and to this Irenaeus also, with whom begins the testimony of the church concerning Luke as the author of the Gospel, still confines himself, *Hacr.* iii. 14. 1, — nothing is historically certain concerning him. According to Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 4, Jerome, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, and others, he was a native of Antioch, — a statement, which has not failed down to the most recent times to find acceptance (Hug, Guericke, Thiersch), but is destitute of all proof, and probably originated from a confusion of the name with *Lucius*, Acts xiii. 1. Luke is not to be identified either with this latter or with the Lucius that occurs in Rom. xvi. 21 (in opposition to Origen, Tiele, and others); for the name *Lukas* may be abbreviated from *Lucanus* (some codd. of the Itala have “secundum *Lucanum*” in the superscription and in subscriptions), or from *Lucilius* (see Grotius, and Sturz, *Dial. Mac.* p. 135), but not from *Lucius*.¹ Comp. Lekebusch, *Composit. d. Apostelgesch.* p. 390. Moreover, in the *Constitt. ap.* vi. 18. 5, Luke is expressly distinguished from Lucius.

¹ How freely the Greeks dealt in different forms of the same name, may be seen generally in Lobeck, *Patholog.* p. 504 ff. — The notion of Lange (*L. J.* p. 153, 168), that Luke is the person named *Aristion* in the fragment of Papias, quoted by Eusebius, iii. 39 (*ἀριστίων* = *lucere!*), is a preposterous fancy.

Whether he was a Jew by birth or a Gentile, is decided by Col. iv. 11, 14, where Luke is distinguished from those whom Paul calls *οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς*.¹ But it must be left an open question whether he was before his conversion a Jewish proselyte (Isidorus Hispalensis); the probability of which it is at least very unsafe to deduce from his accurate acquaintance with Jewish relations (in opposition to Kuinoel, Riehm, *de fontibus Act. Ap.* p. 17 f., Guericke, Bleek). As to his civil calling he was a *physician* (Col. iv. 14); and the very late account (Nicephorus, *H. E.* ii. 43) that he had been at the same time a *painter*, is an unhistorical legend. When and how he became a Christian is unknown. Tradition, although only from the time of Epiphanius (*Hacr.* li. 12; also the pseudo-Origenes, *de recta in Deum fide*, in Orig. *Opp.*, ed. de la Rue, I. p. 806; Hippolytus, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Nicephorus Callistus, and others), places him among the *Seventy disciples*,² whereas Luke i. 1 f. furnishes his own testimony that he was *not* an eye-witness. Comp. Estius, *Annot.* p. 902 f. The origin of this legend is explained from the fact that only Luke has the account about the Seventy (in opposition to Hug, who finds in this circumstance a confirmation of that statement). He was a highly esteemed assistant of Paul and companion to him, from the time when he joined the apostle on his second missionary journey at Troas, where he, perhaps, had dwelt till then (Acts xvi. 10). We find him thereafter with the apostle in Macedonia (Acts xvi. 11 ff.), as well as on the third missionary journey at Troas, Miletus,

¹ This passage tells against everything with which Tiele in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 753 ff. has attempted to make good that Luke was a Jew by birth. His reasons are based especially on the Hebraisms occurring in Luke, but lose their importance partly in view of the like character which, it is to be assumed, marked the writings made use of as sources, partly in view of the Jewish-Greek nature of the evangelic language current in the church, to which Luke had become habituated. The passage in the Colossians, moreover, has its meaning wrongly turned by Tiele, as is also done by Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 99, who starts from the postulate, which is utterly incapable of proof, that *all* the N. T. writings are of Israelitish origin. See on Col. iv. 11, 14.

² According to some mentioned by Theophylact, he is alleged to have been one of the two disciples going to Emmaus, which Lange, *L. J.* I. p. 252, considers probable. See on xxiv. 13.

etc. (Acts xx. 5—xxi. 18). In the imprisonment at Caesarea he was also with him (Acts xxiv. 23; Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24), and then accompanied him to Rome, Acts xxvii. 1—xxviii. 16 (comp. also 2 Tim. iv. 11). At this point the historical information concerning him ceases; beyond, there is only uncertain and diversified tradition (see Credner, I. p. 126 f.), which, since the time of Gregory of Nazianzus, makes him even a martyr (*Martyrol. Rom.*: 18 Oct.), yet not unanimously, since accounts of a natural death also slip in. *Where* he died, remains a question; certainly not in Rome with Paul, as Holtzmann conjectures, for his writings are far later. His bones are said by Jerome to have been brought from Achaia to Constantinople in the reign of Constantius.

§ 2.—ORIGIN OF THE GOSPEL.

On the origin of his Gospel—which falls to be divided into three principal portions, of which the middle one begins with the departure for Jerusalem, ix. 51, and extends to xviii. 30—Luke himself, i. 1—4, gives authentic information. According to his own statement, he composed his historical work (the continuation of which is the Acts of the Apostles) on the basis of the *tradition of eye-witnesses*, and having regard to the *written* evangelic compositions which already existed in great numbers, with critical investigation on his own part, aiming at completeness and correct arrangement. Those earlier compositions, too, had been drawn from apostolic tradition, but did not suffice for his special object; for which reason, however, to think merely of Jewish-Christian writings and their relation to Paulinism is unwarranted. One of his principal documentary sources was—although this has been called in question for very insufficient reasons (Weizsäcker, p. 17; see on vi. 14 f.)—the Gospel of Mark. Assuming this, as in view of the priority of Mark among the three Synoptics it must of necessity be assumed, it may be matter of doubt whether Matthew also in his present form was made use of by him (according to Baur and others, even as principal source) or not (Ewald, Reuss, Weiss, Holtzmann, Plitt, Schenkel, Weizsäcker, and others). At any rate he has

worked up the apostle's collection of *Logia* in part, not seldom, in fact, more completely and with more critical sifting withal than our Matthew in his treatise. As, however, this collection of *Logia* was already worked up into the Gospel of Matthew; and as the Gospel invested with this authority, it is *a priori* to be presumed, could hardly remain unknown and unheeded by Luke in his researches, but, on the contrary, his having regard to it in those passages, where Luke agrees with Matthew in opposition to Mark, presents itself without arbitrariness as the simplest hypothesis;¹ our first Gospel also is doubtless to be reckoned among the sources of Luke, but yet with the limitation, that for him Mark, who represented more the primitive Gospel and was less Judaizing, was of far greater importance, and that generally in his relation to Matthew he went to work with a critical independence,² which presupposes that he did not measure the share of the apostle in the first Gospel according to the later view (comp. Kahnis, *Dogm.* I. p. 411), but on the contrary

¹ If a use of our Matthew by Luke is quite rejected, recourse must be had to the hypothesis (see especially, Weiss in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsch. Theol.* 1865, p. 319 ff.) that the apostolic collection of *Logia* already contained very much *historical matter*, and thereby already presented the type of the later Gospels. But in this way we again encounter the unknown quantity of a written primitive Gospel, while we come into collision with the testimony of Papias. And yet this primitive collection of historical matter in connection with the *λογία* is held to have excluded not only the history of the birth and childhood, but also the history of the Passion from Matt. xxvi. 6-12 onward; which latter exclusion, if once we impute to the *λογία* an historical framework and woof in the measure thought of, is hardly conceivable in view of the importance of the history of the Passion and Resurrection. I am afraid that by following Weiss, instead of the *συγγραφὴ τῶν λογίων*, which Papias claims for Matthew, we get already an historical *ἱστορίαις*—even if only dealing aggregately—oddly breaking off, moreover, with the history of the Passion; instead of the unknown primitive-Mark, an unknown primitive-Matthew.

² As decisive against the supposition that Luke knew our Matthew, ii. 39 is cited (see especially, Weiss and Holtzmann), and the genealogy of Jesus, so far as it goes by way of Nathan,—ii. 39 being held to show that the preliminary history of Matthew did not lie within the horizon of Luke. Certainly it did not lie within it; for he has *critically eliminated* it, and given *another*, which lay in *his* horizon. And the fact that he gave a genealogical table not according to the royal line of descent, in which, nevertheless, Christ remained just as well the Son of David, is likewise entirely accordant with the *critical* task of the *later* work; for genealogies according to the royal line were certainly the *most*

had no hesitation¹ in preferring other sources (as in the preliminary history). And other sources were available for him, partly oral in the apostolic tradition which he sought completely to investigate, partly written in the Gospel literature which had already become copious. Such written sources may in general be sufficiently recognised; they are most readily discernible in the preliminary history and in the account of the journeying (see on ix. 51), but not always certainly definable as respects their compass and in their original form, least of all in so far as to assume them to be only Jewish-Christian, especially from the south of Palestine (Köstlin, comp. Holtzmann, p. 166). The arrangement which places Mark only after Luke involves us, when we inquire after the sources of the latter, in the greatest difficulty and arbitrariness, since Luke cannot possibly be merely a free elaboration of Matthew (Baur), and even the taking in of tradition and of written sources *without* Mark (de Wette, Kahnis, Bleek, and others) is in no wise sufficient. The placing of Mark as intermediate between Matthew and Luke, steadfastly contended for by Hilgenfeld in particular, would, if it were in other respects allowable, not raise up such invincible difficulties for our question, and at least would not require the hypothesis of Hilgenfeld, that our Matthew is a freer *revision* of the strictly Jewish-Christian writing which formed its basis, or even (see the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1864, p. 333) a *tertiary* formation, any more than it would need the insertion of a Petrine gospel between Matthew and Mark (Hilgenfeld, Köstlin).

To carry back our Gospel in respect of its origin to *apostolic authority* was a matter of importance to the ancient church in the interest of the canon; and the connection of Luke with *Paul* very naturally offered itself. Hence even Irenaeus, *Hær.*

ancient. Only people should be in earnest in attributing to him the *critical* procedure, which he himself, i. 3, affirms of his work, also in relation to the Gospel of Matthew. Schenkel in particular (p. 345) lightly pronounces judgment over the criticism of the third Gospel.

¹ We may dispense with the hypothesis, improbable even in itself, that Luke made use of Matthew according to an older and shorter redaction (de Wette and others), which is alleged to derive support especially from the gap between ix. 17 and 18 compared with Matt. xiv. 22-xvi. 12.

iii. 1, quoted by Eusebius, v. 8, states : Λουκᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο (comp. iii. 14. 1 f.); and already Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome find our Gospel of Luke designated in the expression of Paul τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου. See the further testimonies in Credner, I. p. 146 ff. As regards this ecclesiastical tradition, there is to be conceded a general and indirect influence of the apostle, not merely in reference to doctrine, inasmuch as in Luke the stamp of Pauline Christianity is unmistakably apparent, but also in part as respects the historical matter,¹ since certainly Paul must, in accordance with his interest, his calling, and his associations, be supposed to have had, at least in the leading points, a more precise knowledge of the circumstances of the life of Jesus, His doctrine, and deeds. Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 23 ff., xv. 1 ff. But the generality and indirectness of such an influence explain the fact, that in his preface Luke himself does not include any appeal to this relation; the proper sources from which he drew (and he wrote, in fact, long after the apostle's death) were different. As a *Pauline* Gospel, ours was the one of which *Marcion* laid hold. How he mutilated and altered it, is evident from the numerous fragments in Tertullian, Epiphanius, Jerome, the pseudo-Origen, and others.

REMARK 1.—The view, acutely elaborated by Schleiermacher, that the whole Gospel is a stringing together of written documents (*krit. Versuch über d. Schriften d. Luk.* I. Berl. 1837), is refuted at once by i. 3, and by the peculiar literary character of Luke, which is observable throughout. See H. Planck, *Obs. de Lucae evang. analysi critica a Schleierm. propos.*, Gött. 1819; Roediger, *Symbolae ad N. T. evangelia potiss. pertin.*, Hal. 1827. And this literary peculiarity is the same which is also prominent throughout the Acts of the Apostles. See, besides the proofs advanced by Credner and others, especially Lekebusch, *Composit. d. Apostelgesch.* p. 37 ff.; Zeller, *Apostelgesch.* p. 414 ff.

REMARK 2.—The investigation recently pursued, after the earlier precedents of Semler, Löffler, and others, especially by

¹ In reference to this, Thiersch, *K. im apost. Zeitalt.* p. 158, 177, is bold enough arbitrarily to assume that Paul had procured for Luke written records in accordance with 2 Tim. iv. 13.

Ritschl (formerly), Baur, and Schwegeler,¹ in opposition to Hahn (*d. Evang. Marcions in s. urspr. Gestalt.*, Königsb. 1823), to prove that the Gospel of Marcion was the *primitive-Luke*, has reverted—and that indeed partially by means of these critics themselves, following the example of Hilgenfeld, *krit. Unters.* 1850, p. 389 ff.—more and more to the view that has commonly prevailed since Tertullian's time, that Marcion abbreviated and altered Luke. Most thoroughly has this been the case with Volkmar (*theol. Jahrb.* 1850, p. 110 ff., and in his treatise, *das Evangel. Marcions, u. Revis. d. neueren Unters.*, Leip. 1852), with whom Köstlin, *Urspr. u. Composit. d. synopt. Ev.* 1853, p. 302 ff., essentially agrees. Comp. Hilgenfeld in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 192 ff.; Zeller, *Apostelgesch.* p. 11 ff. The opinion that the Gospel of Marcion was the pre-canonical form of the present Luke, may be looked upon as set aside; and the attacks and wheelings about of the Tübingen criticism have rendered in that respect an essential service. See Franck in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, p. 296 ff.; and on the history of the whole discussion, Bleek, *Einl.* p. 126 ff. For the Gospel of Marcion itself,—which has been *ex auctoritate veter. monum. descr.* by Hahn,—see Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.* I. p. 401 ff.

§ 3.—OCCASION AND OBJECT, TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

The historical work consisting of two divisions (Gospel and Acts of the Apostles), which Luke himself characterizes as a critico-systematic (ver. 3) presentation of the facts of Christianity (ver. 1), was *occasioned* by the relation, not more pre-

¹ Ritschl, *d. Evang. Marcions u. d. kanon. Ev. d. Luk., e. krit. Unters.*, Tüb. 1846; Baur, *krit. Unters. üb. d. kanon. Evangelien*, Tüb. 1847, p. 393 ff.; Schwegeler, *nachapost. Zeitalt.* I. p. 261 ff. See, on the other hand, Harting: *quaestiones de Marcione Lucani evang. adulteratore, etc., novo examini submitit*, Utrecht 1849.—Ritschl has subsequently, in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 528 f., confessed: "The hypothesis propounded by me, that Marcion did not alter the Gospel of Luke, but that his Gospel is a step towards the canonical Luke, I regard as refuted by Volkmar and Hilgenfeld. Any one who considers the onesided exaggeration with which Hahn has defended the customary view, will know how to excuse my being led by him to an opposite onesidedness." According to Baur, *Markusevangel.* 1851, p. 191 ff., Marcion had before him at least an older text of Luke, in many respects different from the canonical one. Certainly the text of Luke which was before Marcion may have had individual readings more original than our witnesses exhibit; and it is in general, so far as we can distinguish it, to be regarded as tantamount to a very ancient manuscript. But still Volkmar and Hilgenfeld often overestimate its readings.

cisely known to us, in which the author stood to a certain *Theophilus*, for whom he *made it his aim* to bring about by this presentation of the history a knowledge of the trustworthiness of the Christian instruction that he had received. Sec vv. 1-4. Unhappily, as to this Theophilus, who, however, assuredly is no merely fictitious personage (Epiphanius, Heumann, and the Saxon Anonymus), nothing is known to us with certainty; for all the various statements as to his rank, native country, etc. (see Credner, *Einl.* I. p. 144 f.), are destitute of proof, not excepting even the supposition which is found as early as Euty chius (*Annal. Alex.*, ed. Selden et Pocock, I. p. 334), that he was an *Italian*, or, more precisely, a *Roman*¹ (Hug, Eichhorn, and many others, including Ewald and Holtzmann). It is, although likewise not certain, according to Acts xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3, xxvi. 25, probable, that the address *κράτιστε* points to a man *of rank* (comp. Otto in *Ep. ad Diogn.*, ed. 2, p. 53 f.); and from the Pauline doctrinal character of the historical work, considering that it was to serve as a confirmation of the instruction enjoyed by Theophilus, it is to be concluded that he was a *follower of Paul*; in saying which, however, *the very point* whether he was a Jewish or a Gentile Christian cannot be determined, although, looking to the Pauline author and character of the book, the latter is probable. The Clementine *Recognitiones*, x. 71, make him to be a man of high rank in *Antioch*; and against this very ancient testimony² there is nothing substantial to object, if it

¹ Whether this follows from the passage of the Muratorian Canon as to the Acts of the Apostles (Ewald, *Jahrb.* VIII. p. 126; *Gesch. d. apost. Zeitalt.* p. 40) is, considering the great corruption of the text, very doubtful. At least the very indication, according to which Theophilus would appear as living in Rome, would be introduced into the fragment only by conjecture, and that, indeed, as daring a conjecture as Ewald gives. The text, namely, is, in his view, to be thus restored: "*Acta omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scripta Lucas optimo Theophilo comprehendit, omittens quae sub praesentia ejus singula gerebantur, sicut et non modo passionem Petri evidenter decerpit (or decollat), sed et profectionem,*" etc.

² With which the circumstance is easily reconcilable that in the *Constitut. Ap.* vii. 46. 1 he is adduced as the third bishop of *Caesarea*. And that in that place *our* Theophilus is meant, is more than probable from the context, where almost none but New Testament names are mentioned.

be conceded that, even without being an Italian, he might be acquainted with the localities named in Acts xxviii. 12, 13, 15, without more precise specification. The idea that Luke, in composing the work, has had in view other readers also besides Theophilus, not *merely* Gentile Christians (Tiele), is not excluded by i. 3 f., although the treatise was *primarily* destined for Theophilus and only by his means reached a wider circle of readers, and then gradually, after the analogy of the N. T. Epistles, became the common property of Christendom. The *Pauline* standpoint of the author generally, and especially his *universalistic* standpoint, have been of essential influence on the selection and presentation of the matter in his Gospel, yet by no means to such an extent that we should have to substitute for the objectively historical character of the work,—according to which it had to pay due respect to the Judaistic elements actually given in the history itself,—a character of *subjective set purpose shaping* the book, as if its aim were to accommodate the Judaizing picture of the Messiah to the views of Paulinism and to convert the Judaistic conceptions into the Pauline form (Zeller, *Apostelgesch.* p. 439), or to exalt Paulinism at the expense of Jewish Christianity and to place the twelve apostles in a position of inferiority to Paul (Baur, Hilgenfeld). See especially, Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 708 ff.; Holtzmann, p. 389 ff. If the author had such a set purpose, even if taken only in Zeller's sense, he would have gone to work with an inconsistency that is incomprehensible (not in keeping with that purpose, as Zeller thinks); and we should, in fact, be compelled to support the hypothesis by the further assumption that the original work had contained neither the preliminary history nor a number of other portions (according to Baur, iv. 16–30, v. 39, x. 22, xii. 6 f., xiii. 1–5, xvi. 17, xix. 18–46, xxi. 18, also probably xi. 30–32, 49–51, xiii. 28–35, and perhaps xxii. 30), and had only been brought into its present form by the agency of a later *rédacteur* taking a middle course (Baur, *Markusevang.* p. 223 ff.). Baur regards this latter as the author of the Acts of the Apostles. See, on the other hand, Zeller, *Apostelgesch.* p. 446 ff.

The composition of the Gospel, placed by the Fathers as early as fifteen years after the ascension, by Thiersch, *K. in apost. Zeitalt.* p. 158, and by various others as early as the time of Paul's imprisonment in Cæsarea, is usually (and still by Ebrard and Guericke) referred to the time soon after the apostle's two years' sojourn in Rome, which is narrated at the conclusion of the Acts of the Apostles. But as this conclusion is not available for any such definition of time (see *Introd. to the Acts of the Apostles*, § 3), and as, in fact, Luke xxi. 24 f. (compared with Matt. xxiv. 29) already presupposes the destruction of Jerusalem, and places between this catastrophe and the Parousia a period of indefinite duration (ἄχρις πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἐθνῶν), Luke must have written within these καιροὶ ἐθνῶν, and so not till *after the destruction of Jerusalem*, as is rightly assumed by Credner, de Wette, Bleek, Zeller, Reuss, Lekebusch (*Composit. d. Apostelgesch.* p. 413 ff.); Köstlin, p. 286 ff.; Güder in Herzog's *Encykl.*; Tobler, *Evangelienfr.*, Zürich 1858, p. 29. See especially, Ewald, *Jahrb.* III. p. 142 f.; Holtzmann, p. 404 ff. With this also agrees the reflection, which so often presents itself in the Gospel, of the oppressed and sorrowful condition of the Christians, as it must have been at the time of the composition. Comp. on vi. 20 ff. Still xxi. 32 forbids us to assign too late a date,—as Baur, Zeller (110–130 after Christ), Hilgenfeld (100–110) do, extending the duration of the γενεά to a Roman *seculum* (in spite of ix. 27),—even although no criterion is to be derived from Acts viii. 26 for a more precise definition of the date of the Book of Acts, and so far also of the Gospel (Hug: during the Jewish war; Lekebusch: soon after it). John wrote still later than Luke, and thus there remains for the latter as the time of composition the decade 70–80, beyond which there is no going either forward or backward. The testimony of Irenæus, iii. 1, that Luke wrote after the death of Peter and Paul, may be reconciled approximately with this, but resists every later date,—and the more, the later it is. The *Proterangelium Jacobi*, which contains historical references to Matthew and Luke (Tischendorf: “*Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?*” 1865,

p. 30 ff.), fails to give any more exact limitation of time, as the date of its own composition cannot be fixed with certainty. Whether in its present form it was used by Justin in particular, is very questionable. Still more doubtful is the position of the *Acta Pilati*. In the *Epistle* of Barnabas 19, the parallel with Luke vi. 30 is not genuine (according to the Sinaitic).

Where the Gospel was written is utterly unknown; the statements of tradition vary (Jerome, *præf. in Matth.*: "in *Achaïac Bocotiaecque partibus*;" the Syriac: in *Alexandria magna*, comp. Grabe, *Spicileg. patr.* I. p. 32 f.); and conjectures pointing to *Cæsarea* (Michaelis, Kuinoel, Schott, Thiersch, and others), *Rome* (Hug, Ewald, Zeller, Lekebusch, Holtzmann, and others), *Achaia and Macedonia* (Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1858, p. 594; 1851, p. 179), and *Asia Minor* (Köstlin), are not capable of proof.

§ 4.—GENUINENESS AND INTEGRITY.

The author does not name himself; but the unanimous tradition of the ancient church, which in this express statement reaches as far back as Irenæus (*Hæc.* iii. 1, i. 27. 2, iii. 14. 3 f., iii. 10. 1), designates *Luke* as the author (see also the Syriac and the Canon of Muratori); in opposition to which there does not arise from the book itself any difficulty making it necessary to abide merely by the general view of a Pauline Gentile-Christian (but not Luke) as the author, as Hilgenfeld does on account of its alleged late composition. Papias, in Eusebius, iii. 39, does not mention Luke, which, however, cannot matter much, since it is after all only a *fragment* which has been preserved to us from the book of Papias. Moreover, the circumstance that Marcion appropriated to himself this very Gospel, presupposes that he regarded it as the work of a disciple of the Apostle Paul; indeed, the disciples of Marcion, according to Tertullian, *c. Marc.* iv. 5, attributed it directly to Paul himself, as also the Saxon Anonymus preposterously enough has again done. The unanimous tradition of the church is treated with contempt by the precarious assertion, that the authorship of Luke was only

inferred from the narrative of travel in the Book of Acts at a time when there was a desire to possess among the Gospels of the church also a Pauline one (Köstlin, p. 291). That our Gospel—which, we may add, was made use of by Justin (see Semisch, *Denkw. Justins*, p. 142 ff.; Zeller, *Apostelgesch.* p. 26 ff.¹), and in the Clementine Homilies (see Uhlhorn, *Homil. u. Recognit. des Clemens*, p. 120 ff.; Zeller, p. 53 ff.)—is not as yet quoted in the Apostolic Fathers (not even in the Epistle of Barnabas), is sufficiently to be explained on the general ground of their preference for oral tradition,² and by the further circumstance, that this Gospel in the first instance was only a private document.

REMARK.—That the person who, in the narrative of travel in the Book of Acts, speaks in the first person (*we*) is neither Timothy nor Silas, see *Intro. to Acts*, § 1.

The *integrity* of the work has, no doubt, been impugned, as far as the genuineness of i. 5 ff. and ch. ii. has been called in question; but see the critical remarks on ch. ii.

¹ Comp. also Credner, *Gesch. d. Kanon*, p. 45. He, nevertheless, in this, his last work, calls in question Justin's direct *use* of our Gospels, and only concedes that he *knew* them, and in particular that of Luke.

² See Gieseler, *Entsteh. d. schriftl. Evangelien*, p. 149 ff.

Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Λουκᾶν.

B F Σ have only κατὰ Λουκᾶν. Others: τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν ἅγιον εὐαγγ. Others: ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Λ. Others: ἐκ τοῦ κ. Λ. (ἀγίου) εὐαγγελίου. See on Matthew.

CHAPTER I.

Ver. 5. ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ] B C* D L X Σ , min. codd. It. Jer. Aug. Beda have γυνὴ αὐτοῦ. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. The *Recepta* is an exegetical alteration—which also holds true of the order of the words at ver. 10 in Elz. τοῦ λαοῦ ἦν, instead of which ἦν τοῦ λαοῦ is preponderatingly attested. — Ver. 14. Instead of γενέσκει, Elz. has γεννήσει, in opposition to decisive evidence. From γεννήσει, ver. 13. Comp. on Matt. i. 18. — Ver. 20. πληρωθῇσονται] D, Or. have πλησθῇσονται. If it were more strongly attested, it would have to be adopted (comp. on xxi. 22). — Ver. 27. The form ἐμνηστευμ. (Lachm. Tisch.), instead of the reduplicated μεμνηστευμ., has in this place, and still more at ii. 5, such important codd. in its favour, that it is to be preferred, and μεμνηστευμ. must be attributed to the transcribers (Deut. xxii. 23, xx. 7). — Ver. 28. ὁ ἄγγελος] is wanting in B L, min. Copt. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Tisch.; the more rightly, that in F Δ Σ , 69, Syr. Arm. Brix. Rd. Corb. it is placed after αὐτῇν, and was more easily supplied than omitted. — εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυν.] is wanting in B L Σ , min. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Syr. hier. Damasc. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Tisch. An addition from ver. 42, whence, also, in some witnesses there has been added, καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου. — Ver. 29. Elz. Scholz, Lachm. have ἡ δὲ ἰδοῦσα διεταράχθη ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ. Griesb. and Tisch. have ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ διεταράχθη. So B D L X Σ , min. Arm. Cant. Damasc. (D: ἐταράχθη). This reading is to be preferred. From Δ E the transcriber passed immediately to ΔΙΕταράχθη (hence, also, in D, the mere simple form), by which means ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ dropped out, and this is still wanting in C* min. The bare ἡ δὲ διεταράχθη was then glossed by ἰδοῦσα (comp. ver. 12)

(another gloss was: *cum audisset*, Vulg. *al.*), which, being adopted *before* *διεταρ.*, was the cause of *ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ* being placed *after* *διεταρ.* when it was restored (in which case, for the most part, *αὐτοῦ* was inserted also). — Ver. 35. After *γεννώμ.* C, min. and many vss. and Fathers (see especially, Athanasius), as also Valentinus in the *Philos.*, have *ἐκ σοῦ* (yet with the variations *de te* and *in te*), and this Lachmann has adopted in brackets. A more precisely defining, and withal doctrinally suggested addition (comp. Matt. i. 16; Gal. iv. 4). — Ver. 36. The form *συγγενίς* is to be adopted, with Lachm. and Tisch., following A C*** D E G H L Δ Σ, min. *συγγενής* is a correction. — Instead of *γῆρει*, Elz. has *γῆρα*, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 37. *παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ*] Tisch. has *παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, following B D L Σ; the dative suggested itself as being closer to the prevailing conception (Gen. xviii. 14). — Ver. 41. The verbal order: *τὸν ἀσπασμὸν τῆς Μαρ. ἡ Ἑλισ.* (Lachm. Tisch.), is attested with sufficient weight to induce us to recognise *ἡ Ἑλισ. τ. ἀσπ. τ. Μαρ.* (Elz.) as a transposition. — Ver. 44. Following B C D I* F L Σ, Vulg. It. Or., the verbal order of the *Recepta ἐν ἀγαλλ.* *τὸ βρέφος* is to be maintained (Griesb. Scholz have *τὸ βρεφ. ἐν ἀγαλλ.*). — Ver. 49. *μεγαλεῖα*] Lachm. Tisch. read *μεγάλα*, in accordance with B D* L Σ 130. So also probably Vulg. It., *magna* (not *magnalia*, as at Acts ii. 11). To be preferred, since *μεγαλεῖα* might easily have been introduced as a more exact definition by a recollection of Ps. lxxi. 19. — Ver. 50. *εἰς γενεάς γενεῶν*] Very many variations, among which *εἰς γενεάς καὶ γενεάς* (Tisch.) is the best attested, by B C* L Syr. Copt. codd. It. Vulg. ms. Aug.; next to this, but far more feebly, *εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεάν* (commended by Griesb.). The former is to be preferred; the *Recepta*, although strongly attested, arose out of the current expression *in saccula sacculorum*. — Ver. 55. The Codd. are divided between *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (Elz. Lachm. Tisch.) and *ἕως αἰῶνος* (Griesb. Scholz). The former has the stronger attestation, but is the expression so current in the N. T. that *ἕως*, etc., which does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., but is in keeping with the usage of the LXX. after *τ. σπέρμ. αὐτοῦ* (Gen. xiii. 15, etc.), here deserves the preference. — Ver. 59. *ὁ γδοή ἡμέρα*] B C D L Σ, min. have *ἡμέρα τῇ ὁγδοή.* Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. Preponderantly attested, and therefore to be preferred. — Ver. 61. *ἐν τῇ συγγενείᾳ σου*] Lachm. and Tisch. read *ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου*, following A B C* L Δ Λ Σ, min. Copt. Chron. Pasch. The latter is to be preferred, in place of which the former more readily occurred to the pen of the copyists. — Ver. 62. *αὐτόν*] B D F G Σ, min. have *αὐτό*. So

Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; the reference to τὸ παιδίον, ver. 59, was left unnoticed, and the masculine was mechanically put in κατὰ σύνεσιν. — Ver. 66. καὶ χεῖρ] Lachm. Tisch. have καὶ γὰρ χεῖρ, following B C* D L 8, Copt. Aeth. Vulg. It. Goth. Approved by Rinck also, who, however, rejects ἦν on too slight evidence. γὰρ is the rather to be adopted, because of the facility with which it may have dropt out on occasion of the similarly sounding χεῖρ which follows, and of the difficulty with which another connective particle was inserted after the already connecting καί. — Ver. 70. τῶν ἀγ. τῶν] the second τῶν, deleted by Tisch., is wanting in B L Δ 8, min. Or. Eus. An omission by a clerical error. — Ver. 75. After ἡμέρας Elz. has εἰς ζωῆς, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 76. καὶ οὐ] Tisch. has καὶ οὐ δέ (so also Scholz, following Bornem. in Rosenm. *Repert.* II. p. 259), on very considerable evidence; καὶ . . . δέ was often mutilated by copyists lacking discernment.

Ver. 1.¹ Ἐπειδήπερ] *Quoniam quidem, since indeed*, not found elsewhere in the N. T., nor in the LXX., or the Apocrypha; frequent in classical writers, see Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 342 f. Observe that ἐπειδή denotes the fact, assumed as known, in such a way “ut quae inde evenierint et secuta sint, nunc adhuc durent,” Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 640. — πολλοί] Christian writers, whose works for the most part are not preserved.² The apocryphal Gospels still extant are of a later date; *Mark*, however, is in any case meant to be included. The Gospel of *Matthew* too, in its present form which was then already in existence, cannot have remained unknown to Luke; and in using the word πολλοί he must have thought

¹ According to Baur and others, this preface, vv. 1-4, was only added by the last hand that manipulated our Gospel, after the middle of the second century. Thus, the Gospel would bear on the face of it untruth in *concreto*. Ewald aptly observes, *Jahrb.* II. p. 182 f., of this preamble, that in its homely simplicity, modesty, and brevity, it may be called the model of a preface to an historical work. See on the prologue, Holtzmann, p. 243 ff. Aberle in the *Tüb. Quartalschr.* 1863, I, p. 84 ff., in a peculiar but untenable way makes use of this prologue as proof for the allegation that our Gospel was occasioned by the accusation of Paul (and of the whole Christian body) in Rome; holding that the prologue must therefore have been composed with the intention of its being interpreted in more senses than one. See, on the other hand, Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 443 ff. The whole hypothesis falls to the ground at once before the fact that Luke did not write till after the destruction of Jerusalem.

² There is not the remotest ground for thinking of non-Christian books written in hostility to Christianity (Aberle in the *theol. Quart.* 1855, p. 173 ff.).

of it with others (see Introd. § 2), although not as an *apostolic* writing, because the πολλοί are *distinct* from the eye-witnesses, ver. 2. The *apostolic collection of Logia* was no διήγησις περὶ τῶν κ.τ.λ., and its author, as an apostle, belonged not to the πολλοί, but to the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται. But the *Gospel to the Hebrews*, if and so far as it had then already assumed shape, belonged to the attempts of the πολλοί. — ἐπεχείρησαν] *have undertaken*, said under a sense of the loftiness and difficulty of the task, Acts xix. 13. In the N. T. only used in Luke; frequently in the classical writers. Comp. also Ulpian, p. 159 (in Valckenacr): ἐπειδὴ περ περὶ τούτου πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀπολογήσασθαι. Neither in the word in itself, nor by comparing it with what Luke, ver. 3, says of his own work, is there to be found, with Köstlin, Ebrard, Lekebusch, and older writers, any indication of *insufficiency* in those endeavours *in general*, which Origen,¹ Ambrosius, Theophylact, Calovius, and various others even referred to their *contrast* with the *inspired* Gospels. But for *his special purpose* he judged none of those preliminary works as sufficient. — διήγησιν] *a narrative*; see especially, Plato, *Rep.* iii. p. 392 D; Arist. *Rhet.* iii. 16; 2 Macc. ii. 32. Observe the *singular*. Of the πολλοί each one attempted a narrative περὶ τῶν κ.τ.λ., thus comprising the evangelic whole. Loose leaves or detached essays (Ebrard) Luke does not mention. — ἀνατάξασθαι] *to set up according to order*, Plut. *Moral.* p. 968 C, εὐτρεπίσασθαι, Hesychius. Neither διήγησ. nor ἀνατάσσ. occurs elsewhere in the N. T. — περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορ. ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμ.] *of the facts that have attained to full conviction among us* (Christians). πληροφορεῖν, to bring to full conviction, may be associated also with an accusative of the thing, which is brought to full acknowledgment (2 Tim. iv. 5); hence in a passive sense: πληροφορεῖται τι, something attains to full belief (2 Tim. iv. 17), it is brought to full conviction (πληροφορία πίστεως, Heb. x. 22) among others. So here (it is otherwise where πληροφορεῖσθαι is said of a person, as Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5; Col. iv. 12; Ignat. *ad Magnes.* viii. 10; Eccles.

¹ In Jerome: "Matthaeus quippe et Marcus et Johannes et Lucas non sunt conati scribere, sed scripserunt." Comp. Euthymius Zigabenus.

viii. 11; Phot. *Bibl.* p. 41, 29). Rightly so taken by the Fathers (Theophylact: οὐ γὰρ ἀπλῶς κατὰ ψιλὴν παράδοσιν εἰς τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ πίστει βεβαίᾳ καὶ μετὰ πάσης πληροφορίας), Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Valckenaer, and many others, including Olshausen and Ewald. The explanation: "quae in nobis completae sunt" (Vulgate), which have fully *happened*, *run their course* among us (Luther, Hammond, Paulus, de Wette, Ebrard, Köstlin, Bleek, and others), is opposed to usage, as πληροφορεῖν is never, even in 2 Tim. iv. 5, equivalent to πληροῦν, and therefore it cannot be conceived as applying, either, with Schneckenburger (comp. Lekebusch, p. 30), to the *fulfilment of God's counsel and promise* through the life of the Messiah, which besides would be entirely imported; or, with Baur, to the *idea of Christianity realized* as regards its full contents, under which the Pauline Christianity was essentially included.

Ver. 2. Καθώς] neither *quatenus*, nor belonging to πεπληροφ. (in opposition, as respects both, to Kuinoel, as respects the latter also to Olshausen), but introducing the *How*, the *modal definition* of ἀνατάξ. διήγησιν. — παρέδωσαν] *have delivered*. It is equally erroneous to refer this merely to *written* (Königsm. *de fontibus*, etc., in Pott's *Sylloge*, III. p. 231; Hug), or merely to *oral communication*, although in the historical circumstances the latter was by far the preponderating.¹ Holtzmann appropriately remarks: "The subjects of παρέδωσαν and the πολλοί are not distinguished from one another as respects the categories of the oral and written, but as respects those of primary and secondary authority." For the πολλοί, as for Luke himself, who associates himself with them by κάμοί, the παράδοσις of the αὐτόπται was the proper source, in accordance with which therefore he must have critically sifted the attempts of those πολλοί, so far as he knew them (ver. 3). — ἀπ' ἀρχῆς] namely, of those πραγμάτων. But it is not the time of the *birth of Jesus* that is meant (so most commentators, including Kuinoel and Olshausen), but that of the *entrance of Jesus on His ministry* (Euthymius Zigabenus, de Wette); comp.

¹ Of the *written materials* of this παράδοσις of the αὐτόπται we know with certainty only the λόγια of Matthew according to Papias.

John xv. 27; Acts i. 21 f., which explanation is not "audacious" (Olshausen), but necessary, because the *αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου* are the *same* persons, and therefore under the *αὐτόπται* there are not to be understood, in addition to the first disciples, Mary also and other members of the family. ἀπ' ἀρχῆς therefore is not to be taken absolutely, but relatively. — ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου] *ministri evangelii* (the doctrine κατ' ἐξοχὴν, comp. Acts viii. 7, xiv. 25, xvi. 6, xvii. 11). These were the Twelve and other μαθηταί of Christ (as according to Luke also the Seventy), who were *in the service* of the gospel for the purpose of announcing it. Comp. iii. 7; Acts vi. 4; Col. i. 23; Acts xxvi. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 1. Others (Erasmus, Castalio, Beza, Grotius, Maldonatus, *al.*, including Kuinoel) take τοῦ λόγου in the sense of the *matter* concerned, of the *contents of the history* spoken of (see on Acts viii. 21); but it would be just as inappropriate to ὑπηρέται as it would be quite superfluous, since τοῦ λόγου must by no means be attached to αὐτόπται also. Finally, it is a mistake to refer it to *Christ* in accordance with John i. 1. So Origen, Athanasius, Euthymius Zigabenus, Valla, Calovius, and others, including Stein (*Kommentar*, Halle 1830). It is only *John* that names Christ ὁ λόγος. — Theophylact, moreover, aptly observes: ἐκ τούτου (namely, from καθὼς παρέδωσαν ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.) δῆλον, ὅτι οὐκ ἦν ὁ Λουκᾶς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μαθητῆς, ἀλλ' ὑστερόχρονος· ἄλλοι γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μαθητευθέντες . . . οἱ καὶ παρέδωκαν αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ. By ἡμῖν the writer places himself in the *second* generation; the *first* were the immediate disciples of Christ, οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται. This ὑπηρέται, however, is not chosen for the sake of placing the Twelve on an equality with *Paul* (Acts xxvi. 16). As though the word were so characteristic for *Paul* in particular! Comp. John xviii. 36; 1 Cor. iv. 1.

Ver. 3. Apodosis, which did not begin already in ver. 2. — ἔδοξε καί μοι] in itself neither excludes nor includes inspiration. Vss. add to it: *et Spiritui sancto*. By the use of καί μοι Luke places himself in the same category with the πολλοί, in so far as he, too, had not been an eye-witness; "sic tamen ut etiamnum aliquid ad ἀσφάλειαν ac firmitudinem

Theophilo conferat," Bengel. — *παρηκολουθ.*] *after having from the outset followed everything with accuracy.* Παρακολ., of the mental tracing, investigating, whereby one arrives at a knowledge of the matter. See the examples in Valckenaer, *Schol.* p. 12; Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 344 f. Comp., moreover, Thucyd. i. 22. 2: ὅσον δυνατόν ἀκριβείᾳ περὶ ἐκάστου ἐπεξελθών. — *πάσιν*] namely, those *πράγμασι*, not *masculine* (Syr.). — *ἄνωθεν*] not: *radicitus*, fundamentally (Grotius), which is comprised in ἀκριβ., but: *from the first*, see on John iii. 3. From the beginning of the history it is seen that in his investigation he started *from the birth of the Baptist*, in doing which, doubtless, he could not but still lack the authentic tradition of ver. 2. Nevertheless the consciousness of an advantage over those πολλοί expresses itself in *παρηκ. ἄνωθεν.* — *καθεξῆς*] *in orderly sequence*, not out of the order of time, in which they occurred one after the other.¹ Only Luke has the *word* in the N. T. (viii. 1; Acts iii. 24, xi. 4, xviii. 23); it occurs also in Aelian, Plutarch, *et al.*, but the older classical writers have ἐφεξῆς. — *κράτιστε Θεόφιλε*] See Introd. § 3. That in Acts i. 1 he is addressed merely ὦ Θεόφιλε, proves nothing against the titular use of *κράτιστε*. See on the latter, Grotius.

Ver. 4. *Ἰνα ἐπιγνῶς*] *ut accurate cognosceres*; see on Matt. xi. 27; 1 Cor. xiii. 12. — *περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων*] The attraction is not, with the Vulgate and the majority of commentators, to be resolved into: *τῶν λόγων, περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης*, as the contents of the instruction is put with *κατηχεῖσθαι* in the accusative (Acts xviii. 25; Gal. vi. 6), and only the more remote object to which the instruction relates is expressed by *περί* (Acts xxi. 21, 24), but into: *περὶ τῶν λόγων, οὓς κατηχήθης*: that thou mightest know *in respect of the doctrines, in which thou wast instructed*, the unshaken certainty. Comp.

¹ In the case of this *καθεξῆς* the Harmonists of course make the reservation, that it will be "conditioned at one time more by a chronological interest, at another time more by that of the subject-matter," Lichtenstein, p. 73. Thus they keep their hand free to lay hold now of the one, now of the other, just as it is held to suit. The assertion, often repeated, in favour of the violences of harmonizers, that in Luke the arrangement by subject-matter even predominates (Ebrard, Lichtenstein), is absolutely incompatible with that *καθεξῆς*.

Köstlin, p. 132, and Ewald. The λόγοι are not the πράγματα, *res* (comp. ver. 2), as is usually supposed; but it is just the specifically Christian *doctrines*, the individual parts of the λόγος, ver. 2 (τῶν λόγων τῆς πίστεως, Euthymius Zigabenus), that stand in the most essential connection with the *history* of Jesus and from it receive their ἀσφάλεια; in fact, they are in great part themselves essentially history. — κατηχήθης is to be understood of *actual instruction* (in Acts xxi. 21 also), not of hearsay, of which, moreover, the passages in Kypke are not to be explained. *Who* had instructed Theophilus—who, moreover, was assuredly already a Christian (not merely interested on behalf of Christianity, as Bleek supposes)—we know not, but certainly it was not *Luke* himself (in opposition to Theophylact). — τὴν ἀσφάλειαν] *the unchangeable certainty*, the character not to be shaken. Comp. τὴν ἀσφάλειαν εἶναι λόγου, Xen. *Mem.* iv. 6. 15. The position at the end is *emphatic*. According to Luke, therefore, by this historical work, which he purposes to write, the doctrines which Theophilus had received are to be set forth for him in *their immovable positive truth*; according to Baur, on the other hand, the ἀσφάλεια which the writer had in view was to be this, that his entire representation of primitive Christianity sought to become conducive to the conciliatory interest (of the second century), and always kept this object in view. This is purely imported. Luke wrote from the dispassionate consciousness that Christianity, as it subsisted for him as the Pauline contents of faith, had its firm basis of truth in the evangelical history of salvation.

Ver. 5. The periodic and Greek style of the preface gives place now to the simple Hebraizing mode of presentation in the preliminary history,—a circumstance explained by the nature of its Jewish-Christian sources, which withal were not made use of without being subjected to manipulation, since Luke's peculiarities in expression pervade even this preliminary history. How far, however, the lofty, at times truly lyrical beauty and art of the descriptions are to be reckoned due to the sources themselves or to Luke as working them up, cannot be decided. — Observe, moreover, how the evangelical tradition gradually

pushes back its beginnings from the emergence of the Baptist (Mark) to the *γένεσις* of Jesus (Matthew), and even to the conception of His forerunner (Luke). — ἐγένετο] *exitit*, emerged in history. Comp. on Mark i. 4. — ἱερέυς τις] therefore not high priest. — On the twenty-four *classes of priests* (תִּשְׁבָּעִים, in the LXX. ἐφημερία, also διαίσεις, in Josephus also ἐφημερίς), which, since the time of Solomon, had the temple-service for a week in turn, see Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 315; Keil, *Archäol.* I. p. 188 f. — Ἀβιά] 1 Chron. xxiv. 10. From this successor of Eleazar the eighth ἐφημερία had its name. — The *chronological employment* of this notice for the ascertaining of the date of the birth of Jesus would require that the historical character of the narratives, given at ver. 5 ff., ver. 26 ff., should be taken for granted; moreover, it would be necessary withal that the year and (as every class came in its turn *twice* in the year) the approximate time of the year of the birth of Jesus should already be otherwise ascertained. Then, in the computation we should have to reckon, not, with Scaliger (*de emendat. tempor.*), forward from the re-institution of the temple-service by Judas Maccabaeus, 1 Macc. iv. 38 ff., because it is not known which class at that time began the service (see Paulus, *exeg. Handb.* I. p. 83; Wieseler, *chronol. Synopse*, p. 141), but, with Salomon van Til, Bengel, and Wieseler, backward from the destruction of the temple, because as to this the date (the 9 Abib) and the officiating class of priests (Jojarib) is known. Comp. also Lichtenstein, p. 76. — καὶ γυνὴ αὐτῷ] (see the critical remarks) *scil.* ἡν. — ἐκ τῶν θυγατρ. Ἀαρ.] John's descent on both sides was priestly. Comp. Josephus, *Vit.* v. 1. See Wetstein. — Ἐλισάβετ] Such was also the name of Aaron's wife, Ex. vi. 23 (עֲלִזָּבֶת, *Deus juramentum*).

Ver. 6 f. Δίκαιοι] *upright*, such as they ought to be according to God's will. — ἐνώπιον τ. Θεοῦ] a familiar Hebraism: עֲנִי לְפָנֶיךָ, characterizing the ἀληθὴς δικαιοσύνη (Euthymius Zigabenus), which is so not perchance merely according to human judgment, but *before the eyes of God*, in God's presence, Gen. vii. 1; Acts viii. 21; Judith xiii. 20. Comp. Augustine, *ad Marcell.* ii. 13. — πορευόμενοι κ.τ.λ.] a more precise expla-

nation of the foregoing, likewise in quite a Hebraizing form (1 Kings viii. 62, *al.*), wherein *δικαίωμα* is *legal ordinance* (LXX. Deut. iv. 1, vi. 2, xxx. 16; Ps. cxix. 93, *al.*; see on Rom. i. 32, v. 16), *ἐντολή* joined with *δικ.* (Gen. xxvi. 5; Deut. iv. 40) is a *more special* idea. The distinction that *ἐντολή* applies to the *moral*, *δικαίωμα* to the *ceremonial* precepts, is arbitrary (Calvin, Bengel, and others). We may add that the popular testimony to such *δικαιοσύνη* does not exclude human imperfection and sinfulness, and hence is not opposed to the doctrine of justification. — *ἄμεμπτοι*] not equivalent to *ἀμέμπτως*, but *proleptic*: so that they were blameless. Comp. 1 Thess. iii. 23; Winer, p. 549 f. [E. T. 778 f.]. — The Attic *καθότι*, here as at xix. 9, Acts ii. 24, Tobit i. 12, xiii. 4, corresponding to the argumentative *καθώς*: *as then, according to the fact that*, occurs in the N. T. only in Luke. — *προβεβηκότες ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις*] of advanced age, מִבְּיָבָה מִיָּשָׁר, Gen. xviii. 11; Josh. xxiii. 1; 1 Kings i. 1. The Greeks say *προβεβηκώς τῇ ἡλικίᾳ*, Lys. p. 169, 37, τοῖς ἔτεσιν (Machon in *Athen.* xiii. p. 592 D), also *τὴν ἡλικίαν*, and the like (Herodian, ii. 7. 7; comp. 2 Macc. iv. 40; Judith xvi. 23), see Wetstein, and Pierson, *ad Moer.* p. 475. Observe that *κ. ἀμφ. προβ. κ.τ.λ.* is no longer connected with *καθότι*, but attached to *οὐκ ἦν αὐτ. τέκν.* by way of further preparation for the marvel which follows.

Ver. 8 f. *Ἐγένετο . . . ἔλαχε*] thus without interposition of *καί*. Both modes of expression, with and without *καί*, are very frequent in Luke. See generally, Bornemann *in loc.* — *κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἱερατ.*] according to the custom of the priesthood, does not belong to what precedes (Luther, Kuinoel, Bleek), to which *ἔθος* would be inappropriate, but to *ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιάσαι*; the *usual custom*, namely, was, that the priest of the class on service for the week, who was to have the honourable office of burning incense, *was fixed* every day by lot, just as in general the several offices were assigned by lot. See Tr. *Tamid*, v. 2 ff.; Wetstein, and Paulus, *exceget. Handb.*; Lund, *Jüd. Heiligh.*, ed. Wolf, p. 804 f. How the casting of lots took place, see Gloss. *Joma*, f. 22, 1, in Lightfoot, p. 714. — The *genitive* τοῦ θυμιάσαι (not to be accented

θυμιάσαι¹) is governed by ἔλαχε. See Matthiae, p. 800; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 2. On the *mode* of burning incense, see Lightfoot, p. 715; Lund, *l.c.* p. 618 ff.; Leyrer in Herzog's *Encykl.* XII. p. 506 ff. With this office specially divine blessing was conceived to be associated (Deut. xxxiii. 10 f.); and during it John Hyrcanus received a revelation, Josephus, *Antt.* xiii. 10. 3. — Whether, we may ask, are we to understand here the *morning* (Grotius) or the *evening* (Kuinoel) burning of incense? The *former*, as the casting lots has just preceded. — εἰσελθὼν κ.τ.λ.] can neither be something that *follows after* the ἔλαχε τ. θυμ. (so Luther and others, de Wette and Bleek), nor can it belong *merely* to θυμιάσαι (so Winer, p. 316 [E. T. 443], and Glöckler, following the Vulgate), in which case the words would be quite idle. Rather must they be, in the same relation as the following καὶ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος . . . ἔξω τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ θυμιάματος, an essential portion of the description. It is, namely, the moment *that preceded* the ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιάσαι: the duty of burning incense fell to him, *after he had entered into the temple of the Lord*. After his entrance into the temple he received this charge. — εἰς τὸν ναόν] not εἰς τὸ ἱερόν (see on Matt. iv. 5), for the altar of incense, the *θυσιαστήριον*, ver. 11, stood in the *sanctuary* (between the table of shewbread and the golden candlestick).

Ver. 10. And now, while this burning of incense (symbol of adoration; see Bähr, *Symbol.* I. p. 463-469; Leyrer, *l.c.* p. 510 f.) allotted to him was taking place in the sanctuary, the entire multitude of the people (which expression does not exactly presuppose a festival, as Chrysostom, Chemnitz, and Calovius hold) was found (ἦν) in the forecourts, silently praying. This was implied in the arrangements for worship; see Deyling, *Obs.* III. p. 343 f.; Leyrer, *l.c.* p. 509. — τοῦ θυμιάματος] not: *of burning incense* (θυμιάσις), but: *of incense* (see ver. 11; Rev. v. 8, viii. 3, 4; Wisd. xviii. 21; Eccclus. xlv. 6; 1 Macc. iv. 49; 2 Macc. ii. 5; Plat. *Pol.* ii. p. 373 A, *Legg.* viii. p. 847 C; Herod. i. 198, iv. 71, viii. 99; Soph. *O. R.* 4), namely, *at which this was burnt*.

V. 11, 12. "Ὁφθῇ] not a *vision*, but a real *angelic appear-*

¹ Comp. generally, Lipsius, *Gramm. Unters.* p. 38 ff.

ance, xxii. 43. — ἐκ δεξιῶν] on the propitious side of the altar, at which Zacharias was serving. See Schoettgen, and Wetstein, *ad Matt.* xxv. 33; Valckenaer *in loc.* — ἄγγελος] *an angel.* Who it was, see ver. 19. — φόβος ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτ.] Comp. Acts xix. 17; Ex. xv. 16; Judith xv. 2; *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 592. Among the Greeks usually found with a *dative*, as Eur. *Andr.* 1042: σοὶ μόνῳ ἐπέπεσον λῦπαι.

Vv. 13, 14. Εἰσηκούσθη κ.τ.λ.] By ἡ δέησίς σου cannot be meant the petition *for offspring* (yet so still Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek, Schegg, following Maldonatus and many others); for, as according to ver. 7 it is not to be assumed at all that the pious priest *still* continued *now* to pray for children, so least of all can he at the burning of incense in his *official* capacity have made such a *private* matter the subject of his prayer; but ἡ δέησίς σου must be referred to the prayer just made by him at the priestly burning of incense, in which also the whole of the people assembled without were associated (ver. 10). This prayer concerned the highest solicitude of all Israel, namely, the *Messianic deliverance of the people* (Augustine, Euthymius Zigabenus, Erasmus, Jansen, Calovius, Ewald, and others), ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου. The context which follows is not opposed to this, but on the contrary the connection is: "Has preces angelus dicit exauditas; jam enim prae foribus esse adventum Messiae, cujus anteambulo destinatus sit is qui Zachariae nasciturus erat filius," Grotius. — καλέσεις κ.τ.λ.] see on Matt. i. 21. — Ἰωάννης is the Hebrew יְהוֹנָתָן or יְהוֹנָי (*God is gracious*, like the German *Gotthold*). The LXX. have Ἰωνά (2 Kings xxv. 23), Ἰωνάν (Neh. vi. 18), Ἰωανάν (Neh. xii. 13; 2 Chron. xvii. 15, xxiii. 1), Ἰωάννης (2 Chron. xxviii. 12). — γένεσις here is *birth* (often so in the Greek writers and in the LXX.); Xen. *Ep.* 3: ὁδοῦ ἀνθρωπίνης ἀρχὴν μὲν γένεσιν, τέλος δὲ θάνατον.

Ver. 15. Μέγας ἐνώπ. τ. κυρ.] A designation of a *truly* great man; "talīs enim quisque *vere* est, qualis est coram Deo," Estius. Comp. on ver. 6. — καὶ οἶνον κ.τ.λ.] Description of a נָזִיר, as those were called, who had for the service of God bound themselves to abstain from wine and other intoxi-

cating drinks (Num. vi. 3), and to let the hair of their head grow. John was a Nazarite, not for a certain time, but for life, like *Samson* (Judg. xiii. 5) and *Samuel* (1 Sam. i. 12). See in general, Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 96 ff.; Saalschütz, *Mos. R.* p. 361 f.; Keil, *Archäol.* I. § 67; Vilmar in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, p. 438 ff. — τὸ σίκερα (רִצְצָה), which does not occur in the Greek writers, is any exciting drink of the nature of wine, but not made of grapes; Lev. x. 9 and frequently in the LXX. It was prepared from corn, fruit, dates, palms (Pliny, *H. N.* xiv. 19), and so forth. Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* vi. 10, has the genitive σίκερος. — ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας κ.τ.λ.] ἔτι never stands for ἡδὲ, but: *of the Holy Spirit*¹ *he shall be full even from his mother's womb*, so that thus already in his mother's womb (see Origen) he shall be filled with the Spirit. A pregnant form of embracing the two points. Comp. Plutarch, *consol. ad Apoll.* p. 104: ἔτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἡκολούθηκεν (having therefore already followed ἐν ἀρχῇ). Doubtless the leaping of the child in the mother's womb, ver. 41, is conceived of as a manifestation of this being filled with the Spirit. Comp. Calovius and Maldonatus.

Vv. 16, 17. Working of John as a preacher of repentance, who as a moral reformer of the people (comp. on Matt. xvii. 11) prepares the way for the Messianic consummation of the theocracy. — ἐπιστρέψει] for through sin they have turned themselves away from God. — κύριον τ. Θεὸν αὐτ.] not the *Messiah* (Enthymius Zigabenus, and many of the older commentators), but *God*. — καὶ αὐτός] He will turn many to God, and *he himself* will, etc. — προελεύσεται] not: *he will emerge previously* (de Wette), but: *he will precede* (Xen. *Cyr.* vi. 3, 9), go before Him (Gen. xxiii. 3, 14; Judith ii. 19, xv. 13). — ἐνώπ. αὐτοῦ] can only, in accordance with the context, be referred to *God* (ver. 16), whose preceding herald he will be. The prophets, namely, look upon and depict the setting in of the Messianic kingdom as the entrance of Jehovah into the midst of His people, so that thereupon *God Himself* is repre-

¹ It is quite arbitrary in Olshausen to support the rationalistic opinion that the expression here is to be understood not of the distinctive *Holy Spirit*, but of the holy *power of God* in general.

scnted by the Messiah; Isa. xl.; Mal. iii. 1, iv. 5 f. Comp. Tit. ii. 13. In the person of the entering Messiah Jehovah Himself enters; but the Messiah's own personal divine nature is not yet expressed in this ancient-prophetic view (in opposition to Gess, *Pers. Chr.* p. 47). Incorrect, because in opposition to this prophetic idea, is the *immediate* reference of αὐτοῦ to the *Messiah* (Heumann, Kuinoel, Valckenaer, Winer), as regards which appeal is made to the emphatic use of ἄνθρωπος, αὐτός, and ἴψα (comp. the Pythagorean αὐτὸς ἔφα), whereby a subject not named but well known to every one is designated (Winer, p. 152 [E. T. 182 f.]). — ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει. Ἡλ.] furnished therewith. Spirit and power (power of working) of Elias (according to Mal. iii. 23 f.) is, as a matter of course, *God's Spirit* (comp. ver. 15) and *divine power*, but in the peculiar character and vital expression which were formerly apparent in the case of *Elias*, whose antitype John is, not as a miracle-worker (John x. 41), but as preacher of repentance and prophetic preparer of the way of the Lord. — ἐπιστρέψαι κ.τ.λ.] according to Malachi, *i. e.*: *in order to turn fathers' hearts to children*; to be taken literally of the restoration of the *paternal love*, which in the moral degradation of the people had in many grown cold. Comp. Eccus. xlviii. 10 and Fritzsche *in loc.* Kuinoel incorrectly holds that πατέρων means the *patriarchs*, and that the meaning is (similar to that given by Augustine, *de civit. D.* xx. 29; Beza, Calovius, and others): "*efficiet, ut posteri erga Deum eundem habeant animum pium, quem habebant eorum majores.*" Comp. also Hengstenberg, *Christol.* III. p. 674, and Bleek. The absence of any article ought in itself to have warned against this view! — καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρον. τ. δικ.] *sc. ἐπιστρέψαι*. The discourse passes over from the special relation to the general one. ἀπειθεῖς is the opposite of τῶν δικαίων, and therefore is not to be understood of the *children* (Olshausen), but of the *immoral* in general, whose characteristic is *disobedience*, namely towards God. — ἐν φρονήσει] connected immediately in a pregnant way with the verb of direction, in which the thought of the *result* was predominant. See Kühner, II. p. 316. "Sensus eorum, qui justi sunt, in

conversione protinus induitur," Bengel. φρόνησις (see Arist. *Eth. Nic.* vi. 5. 4), *practical intelligence*. Comp. on Eph. i. 8. The *practical clement* follows from ἀπειθεῖς. — ἐτοιμάσαι] *to put in readiness*, etc. Aim of the ἐπιστρέφει κ.τ.λ., and so *final aim* of the προελεύσεται κ.τ.λ. — κυρίῳ] *for God*, as at vv. 16, 17. — λαὸν κατεσκευασμ.] *a people adjusted, placed in the right moral state* (for the setting up of the Messianic kingdom), is related to ἐτοιμάσαι as its *result*. "Parandus populus, ne Dominus populum imparatum inveniens maiestate sua, obterat," Bengel.

Ver. 18. Like Abraham's question, Gen. xv. 8. — κατὰ τί] *According to what*. Zacharias asks after a σημεῖον (ii. 12), *in conformity with which* he should know that what had been promised (τοῦτο)—in other words, the birth of a son, with whom the indicated destination of Elias should associate itself—had really occurred.

Vv. 19, 20. The angel now discloses to Zacharias *what angel he is*, by way of justifying the announcement of penalty which he has then to add. — Γαβριήλ] גַּבְרִיֵּאל, *vir Dei*, one of the seven angel-princes (סִרְיָא) or archangels (comp. Auberlen in Herzog's *Encykl.* IV. p. 634¹), who stand for service at the throne of God (ἐνώπιον τ. Θεοῦ), as His primary servants (ὁ παρεστηκώς, comp. thereon Rev. viii. 2, and see Valckenaer), Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21. Comp. Fritzsche on Tob. xii. 15. "*Nomina angelorum ascenderunt in manum Israelis ex Babylone*," *Ros Hassana*, f. 56, 4; Enoch 20. See later Jewish fictions in respect to Gabriel, set forth in Eisenmenger, *entdecktes Judenth.* II. p. 363 ff., 378 ff., 390, 874. — σιωπῶν] It is only the subsequent κ. μὴ δυνάμ. λαλῆσαι that defines this more precisely as *dumbness*, which, however, is not apoplectic caused by the terror (Paulus), nor the consequence of the agitating effect of the vision (Lange), which consequence he himself recognised as a punishment; but it is a *miraculous* penalty. — ἀνθ' ὧν] *for the reason* (by way of retribution) that; xix. 44; Acts xii. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 10; Hermann, *ad*

¹ Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 343 f., makes some unimportant objections against the accuracy of the explanation of *archangels*. See in opposition to him, Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 286.

Viger. p. 710; *Ellendt, Lex. Soph.* I. p. 170. The difficulties felt on account of the *harshness* of this measure (Paulus, Strauss, Bruno Bauer, comp. also de Wette), with which the impunity of others, such as Abraham and Sarah, has been compared, are, when the matter is historically viewed, not to be got rid of either by the assumption of a greater guilt which the Omniscient recognised (Calvin, comp. Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 65, and even as early as Augustine), or by an appeal to the lesser age of Zacharias (Hoffmann), and the like; but to be referred to the counsel of God (Rom. xi. 33 f.), whose various measures do not indeed disclose themselves to human judgment, but at any rate admit of the reflection that, the nearer the dawn of the *Messianic* time, the more inviolably must the requirement of *faith in the promise*—and the promise was here given through an *angel* and a *priest*—come into prominent relief. — οὔτινες] qualitative (Kühner, II. p. 407), *ita comparati ut*, wherein is implied a reference that *justifies* the penal measure. — εἰς τ. καιρὸν αὐτ.] denotes the space of time appointed for the λόγοι, till the completion of which it is still to hold that their fulfilment is setting in. Comp. the classical ἐς καιρὸν, εἰς χρόνον, εἰς ἐσπέραν, and the like, Bernhardy, p. 216. See also xiii. 9.

Ver. 21. The priests, especially the chief priests, were accustomed, according to the Talmud, to spend only a short time in the sanctuary; otherwise it was apprehended that they had been slain by God, because they were unworthy or had done something wrong. See *Hicros. Joma*, f. 43, 2; *Babyl.* f. 53, 2; Deyling, *Obss.* III. ed. 2, p. 455 f. Still the unusually long delay of Zacharias, which could not but strike the people, is sufficient *in itself* as a reason of their wonder. — ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν αὐτόν] not *over* (ἐπί, iv. 22, *al.*), or *on account of* (Mark vi. 6, διὰ), but *on occasion of* his failure to appear. So also Ecclus. xi. 21; Isa. lxi. 6. Rightly, Gersdorf, Ewald, render: *when he*, etc.

Vv. 22, 23. Ἐπέγνωσαν, ὅτι ὀπτασίαν κ.τ.λ.] by the inference *ab effectu ad causam*; and very naturally they recognise as the latter an appearance of God or an angel, since, in fact, it was *in the sanctuary* that the dumbness had come

on, and the agitating impression might even cause death, Judg. vi. 23, *al.* In spite of the οὐκ ἠδύνατο λαλῆσαι, Olshausen thinks that this ἐπέγνωσαν does not refer to the silence of Zacharias, but probably to the excitement in his whole appearance, which Bleek also mixes up. — αὐτός, *he on his part*, corresponding to that which *they* perceived. — ἦν διανεύων αὐτοῖς] he was employed in making signs to them (Ecclus. xxvii. 22; Lucian, *V. H.* 44), namely, that he had seen a vision. — ὡς ἐπλήσθ. κ.τ.λ.] namely, the week in which the class of Abia (see ver. 5) had the temple service. On the verb, comp. ver. 57, ii. 6, 21 f.; also Gal. iv. 4; Eph. i. 10. — εἰς τ. οἶκ. αὐτοῦ] ver. 39 f., also ver. 56: εἰς τ. οἶκον αὐτῆς.

Ver. 24 f. Μετὰ δὲ ταύτ. τ. ἡμέρ.] in which this vision had occurred, and he had returned at the end of the service-week to his house. Between the return and the conception we are not to place an indefinite interval. — περιέκρυβεν ἑαυτήν] *she hid herself*, withdrew her own person completely (περί, see Valckenaer) from the view of others. — μῆνας πέντε] is of necessity to be understood of *the first*, not of *the last* five months of pregnancy (in opposition to Heumann). See vv. 26, 36, 56, 57. — λέγουσα· ὅτι κ.τ.λ.] the *reason* which was uttered by her for this withdrawal; hence ὅτι is not recitative, but to be rendered *because*, as at vii. 16: *because thus hath the Lord done to me in the days, in which He was careful to take away my reproach among men.* Her reflection, therefore, was to this effect: "seeing that her pregnancy was the work of God, whose care, at the setting in of this state of hers, had been directed towards removing from her the reproach of unfruitfulness, she must leave to God also the announcement of her pregnancy, and not herself bring it about. God would know how to attain His purpose of taking away her reproach." And God knew how to attain this His purpose. After she had kept herself concealed for five months, there occurred in the sixth month, ver. 26 ff., the annunciation to Mary, in which the condition of Elizabeth was disclosed to Mary, so that she rose up (ver. 39 ff.), etc. Hence the opinions are not in accordance with the text, which represent Elizabeth as having kept herself concealed from *shame* at being with

child in her old age (Origen, Ambrose, Beda, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus), or in order that she might first *assure herself* of her condition (Paulus), and might in the meantime apply herself to devotion (Kuinoel), or to afford no handle to curiosity (Schegg), or “quo magis appareret *postea repente* graviditas” (Bengel), or even because it was necessary to keep herself *quiet* during the first months of pregnancy (de Wette). No; it was because with resignation and confidence she awaited the emerging of the divine guidance. — αἷς] without repetition of the preposition. See Bernhardt, p. 203; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 5; Kühner, *ad Luc. Mem.* ii. 1. 32. — ἐπεῖδεν] *looked to it*, i.e. *took care for it*. So more frequently ἐφοράω is used of the providence of the gods in the classical writers; Herod. i. 124; Soph. *El.* 170. Comp. Acts iv. 29. — τὸ ὄνειδος μου] Comp. Gen. xxx. 23. Unfruitfulness was a *disgrace*, as being a token of the divine disfavour (Ps. cxiii. 9; Isa. iv. 1, xlv. 3, xlvii. 9; Hos. ix. 11); the possession of many children was an honour and blessing (Ps. cxxvii., cxxviii.). Comp. the view of the Greeks, Herod. vi. 86; Müller, *Dor.* II. p. 192. — ἐν ἀνθρώποις] belongs to ἀφελεῖν; *among men* she had dishonour.

Vv. 26, 27. Τῷ ἔκτῳ] see ver. 24. — Ναζαρέτ] According to Matthew, *Bethlehem* was the dwelling-place of Joseph and Mary. See on Matt. ii. 23, Remark, and Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 51 ff. — ἐξ οἴκου Δαβὶδ] applies not to Mary and Joseph (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Beza, Calovius, and others, including Wieseler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, p. 395), but merely to the latter, ii. 4, iii. 23 ff. The descent of Mary from David cannot at all be proved in the N. T. See on Matt. i. 17, Remark 2. Comp. on ver. 36, ii. 4 f.

Vv. 28, 29. Εἰσελθὼν] namely, ὁ ἄγγελος (see the critical remarks). Paulus erroneously puts it: “*a person who came in* said to her.” — κεχαριτωμένη] *who has met with kindness* (from God).¹ Well remarks Bengel: “non ut mater gratiae, sed ut

¹ Observe the ingenious similarity of sound in the words χαῖρς κεχαριτωμένη. Plays on words of a like kind are found among Roman Catholics with the contrasts of *ave* and *Eva*.

filia gratiae." See ver. 30; and on *χαριτόω* in general, see Eph. i. 6. — On *εὐλογ. σὺ ἐν γυναιξ.* in the *Textus receptus* (but see the critical remarks), see Winer, p. 220 [E. T. 308]. It would be not a *vocative*, like *κεχαριτωμένη*, but a *nominative*, as the added *σύ* indicates: *The Lord is with thee, blessed (κατ' ἐξοχήν) art thou among women.* — Ver. 29. The *Recepta* (but see the critical remarks) would have to be explained: *but she, when she looked upon him, was terrified at his saying*, so that *ἰδοῦσα* only appears as an accessory element of the narrative, not as jointly a reason of her terror (in opposition to Bornemann, de Wette, and others), which would rather be simply *ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ*, as is shown by the text which follows *καὶ διελογίζετο κ.τ.λ.* — *ποταπός*] *qualis, what sort of a*: a question of wonder. Comp. on Mark xiii. 1 f. In accordance with its *whole tenor* raising her to so high distinction the greeting was to her enigmatical.

Ver. 31. See on Matt. i. 21.

Ver. 32 f. *Μέγας*] Comp. ver. 15. And *what* greatness belonged to *this* promised One, appears from what is said in the sequel of His future! — *υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσ.*] Description of His recognition as *Messiah*, as whom the angel still more definitely designates Him by *καὶ δώσει κ.τ.λ.* The name Son of God is not explained in a metaphysical reference until ver. 35. — *τὸν θρόνον Δαυ. τοῦ πατρ. αὐτοῦ*] *i.e.* the royal throne of the Messianic kingdom, which is the antitypical consummation of the kingdom of David (Ps. cxxxii. 11, ex.), as regards which, however, in the sense of the angel, which excludes the bodily paternity of Joseph, David can be meant as *ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ* only according to the *national theocratic* relation of the Messiah as David's son, just as the *historical* notion of the Messiah was once given. The mode in which Luke (and Matthew) conceived of the Davidic descent is plain from the genealogical table of ch. iii., according to which the genealogy passed by way of Joseph as *foster-father*. — *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*] from Isa. ix. 6; Dan. vii. 13 f. The conception of an *everlasting* Messianic kingdom (according to Ps. cx. 4) is also expressed in John xii. 34; comp. the Rabbins in Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 156. The "*house of Jacob*" is not to

be idealized (Olshausen, Bleek, and others: of the *spiritual* Israel); but the conception of the kingdom in our passage is Jewish-national, which, however, does not exclude the dominion over the Gentiles according to the prophetic prediction ("quasi per accessionem," Grotius). — βασιλ. ἐπί] as xix. 14; Rom. v. 14.

Ver. 34 f. *How is it possible that this shall be the case?*¹ namely, τὸ συλλαβεῖν ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τεκεῖν υἱόν, Euthymius Zigabenus. — οὐ γινώσκω] comp. Matt. i. 18; Gen. xix. 8; Judg. xi. 39; Num. xxxi. 17, *since I have sexual intercourse with no man*. In this sense the pure maiden *knows* no man. As, however, she is betrothed, ver. 27, her reply shows that she has understood the promise of the angel rightly as soon to be fulfilled, and not to be referred to her impending marriage with Joseph, but as independent of the marriage that was soon to take place. The ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω is thus simply the confession of the *immaculate virgin conscience*, and not (a misunderstanding, which Mary's very *betrothal* ought to have precluded) the *vow of perpetual virginity* (Augustine, *de virgin.* 4, Gregory of Nyssa, Grotius, Jansen, Maldonatus, Bisping, and others), or the *resolution* to that effect (Schegg). — πνεῦμα ἅγιον] In accordance with the nature of a proper name, without the article. Moreover, see on Matt. i. 18. — ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ] *will descend upon thee* (Acts i. 8). This, as well as ἐπισκιάσει σοι, *will overshadow thee* (Acts v. 15), is—the former without figure, the latter figuratively—a designation of the connection producing the pregnancy, which, however, is not conceived of in the form of copulation, for which the words are euphemistic expressions (Paulus, von Ammon, and older commentators), or yet under the notion of a bird which covers its eggs (Theophylact, comp. Grotius).² Certainly the ex-

¹ This question is only appropriate to the virgin heart as a question of *doubt* on the ground of conscious impossibility, and not as an actual wish to learn the *how* (τὸν τρόπον τοῦ πράγματος, Theophylact); comp. already Augustine: "*inquiendo dixit, non desperando*," whereas the meaning of the question of Zacharias, ver. 18, is the converse.

² Approved also by Delitzsch, *bibl. Psychol.* p. 116 f., and Bleek. But this conception is here very much out of place, and is not implied even in מְרַחֵם, Gen. i. 2, which, besides, has nothing to do with the passage before us.

pressions are correlates of *γινώσκω*, but as regards the *effect*, not as regards the *form*, since *ἐπελεύσ.* expresses simply the *descent* of the Spirit, and *ἐπισκιάσ.* the *manifestation* of divine power associated therewith in the form of a cloud (after the manner of the Old Testament theophanies, Ex. xl. 45 ; Num. ix. 15 ; 1 Kings viii. 10 ; comp. also Luke ix. 34). Augustine and other Fathers have quite mistakenly laid stress in *ἐπισκ.* on the notion of *coolness* (in contrast to procreation in lust) ; comp. *σκιάζειν τὸ καῦμα* in Alciphr. iii. 2. — *δύναμις ὑψίστου*] without the article : *power of the Highest* will overshadow thee, will be that, which shall overshadow thee. This will set in in immediate consequence (*καί*) of the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ*. Strict dogmatic expositors, such as Theophylact, Calovius, have rightly (comp. xxiv. 49) *distinguished* between the Holy Spirit and the power of the Highest, but in doing so have already imported more precise definitions from the dogmatic system by explaining the power of the Highest of the *Son of God*, who with His majesty filled the body that had been formed by the Holy Spirit, and thus have, by a more precise description of the formation of the body, broken in upon the delicate veil which the mouth of the angel had breathed over the mystery.¹ — *τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον*] *the holy thing that is being begotten* shall (after His birth) be called Son of God. Most interpreters take *τὸ γεννώμενον* as *that which is to be born* (comp. ver. 13), which view, moreover, has drawn after it the old addition *ἐκ σοῦ* from Matt. i. 16. But the context which immediately precedes points only to the *begetting* (Bengel, Bleek) ; and to this also points the *neuter*, which applies to the embryo (comp. on Matt. i. 20, and see Fritzsche, *ad Aristoph. Thesm.* 564), as well as the parallel Matt. i. 20. The subject, we may add, is *τὸ ἅγιον*, not *τὸ γεννώμ.* (Kuinoel :

¹ Calovius : "Supervenit Spiritus non quidem *σπερματικῶς* sed *δημιουργικῶς*, *guttulas sanguineas Mariae*, e quibus concipienda caro Domini, *sanctificando, eisdem foecundas reddendo, et ex iisdem corpus humanum efformando.*" Justin, *Apol.* I. 33, already rightly gives the simple thought of the chaste and delicate representation : *κυοφοῦνσαι παρένον οὐσαν τιποῖνης*. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 62, erroneously affirms that the representation of Luke admits the possibility of Jesus being thought of as conceived with the participation of Joseph. It absolutely excludes any such notion.

"proles veneranda" = τὸ γεννώμ. τὸ ἅγιον), as also Bornemann assumes, when he (comp. de Wette) takes ἅγιον predicatively : "proles tua, cum divina sit." Not as *holy*, but as *begotten by God's power* (διδό), is the fruit of Mary called the Son of God. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 117, explains : it shall be called holy, *Son of God*, so that those two appellations are to correspond to the two members of the preceding promise. So already Tertullian, as also Bengel and Bleek. But the asyndetic form, in which υἱὸς Θεοῦ would be subjoined, tells against this view all the more, that we should of necessity, in direct accordance with what precedes (καὶ δύναμις κ.τ.λ.), expect καὶ υἱὸς Θεοῦ, especially *after* the verb, where no reader could anticipate a second predicate without καί. Comp. Justin, *c. Tryph.* 100 : διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἐξ αὐτῆς ἅγιόν ἐστιν υἱὸς Θεοῦ.

Ver. 36 f. Confirmation of the promise by the disclosure of Elizabeth's pregnancy, which, in fact, was also a deviation from the order of nature (ἐν γήρει), and so far presented an analogy, although only in an inferior sense. "En domesticum tibi exemplum!" Grotius. After ἰδοὺ κ.τ.λ. an ἐστὶ was as little needed as an εἰμί at ver. 38. — συγγενίς] The *nature* of this relationship, which is not at variance with John i. 36, although questioned by Schleiermacher and others, is wholly unknown. It is, however, possible that Mary was of the stock of *Levi* (so Faustus the Manichean in Augustine, *c. Faust.* xxiii. 9 ; and recently, Schleiermacher, *Schr. d. Lnk.* p. 26 ; Hilgenfeld, Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 177, and others), as the *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 542 makes the Messiah proceed from the stock of Judah (Joseph) and (comp. p. 546) from the stock of Levi.¹ — On the late form συγγενίς, see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 451 f.; and on the Ionic form of dative γήρει, Winer, p. 60 [E. T. 73 f.]. — οὗτος] subject : *and this is the sixth month*. — ὅτι οὐκ ἄδυνατ. κ.τ.λ.] Confirmation of that which

¹ Thus the descent from the Davidic and priestly race might have been used for the glorification of Jesus. But from the height of the history of Jesus so little importance was attached to things of this nature that only the *Davidic* descent, as it was necessary in the case of the Messiah, had stress laid on it, and the family of *Mary* was not expressly specified at all. Comp. Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 177 f.

has just been said of Elizabeth by the omnipotence of God. It is to be observed (1) that οὐκ . . . πᾶν do not belong to one another, but of πᾶν ῥῆμα it is said: οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει (Fritzsche, *Diss.* II. in 2 Cor. p. 24 f.); further, (2) that the proposition is a *general* one; hence the *future*, which, however, is purposely chosen with a view to what was announced to Mary; see Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 369; (3) that there exists no reason for abandoning the purely Greek meaning of ἀδυνατεῖν, *to be unable* (Rettig in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 210), any more than of ῥῆμα, *utterance* (ver. 38), especially with the reading παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ (see the critical remarks). Hence the meaning is not: "*With God nothing is impossible*;" but rather: *not powerless* (but of success and efficacy) *shall any utterance on the part of God be*. So also Gen. xviii. 14. Comp. Beza: "ῥῆμα, i.e. quicquid Deus semel futurum dixerit."

Ver. 38. *Behold the handmaid of the Lord!* without a verb. Comp. ver. 36, v. 12, 18. — γένοιτο] λοιπὸν οὐ μόνον ἐπίστευσεν, ἀλλὰ ἠῤῥατο γενέσθαι αὐτῇ, καθὼς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶρηκε, Euthymius Zigabenus; "eximio fiduciae exemplo," Grotius.

REMARK.—The natural explanation of the annunciation to Mary (Paulus) is at variance with the evangelic account; and as the latter unfolds simply, clearly, and delicately an external procedure, the objective is not to be rendered subjective and transferred, as a reciprocal operation of the theocratic Spirit of God and the emotional feeling of the Virgin, by means of poetic colouring to the soul of the latter (Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 67). As history, believed even as it is related, the narrative arose, and that too independently of the preliminary history of Matthew, and even incompatibly with it,¹—in consequence of the circumstance that the divine sonship of Jesus was extended to His bodily origination (see on Matt. i. 18), an idea, which gave shape to legends dissimilar in character and gaining currency in different circles. Thus, *e.g.*, it is clear that the history, adopted at Matt. i. 19 ff., of Joseph's perplexity and of the angelic message which came to him does not presuppose, but excludes the annunciation to Mary; for that Mary after such a revelation should have made no

¹ Comp. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 59 ff.

communication to Joseph, would have been not less psychologically unnatural, than it would have been a violation of the bridal relation and, indeed, of the bridal duty;¹ and to reckon on a special revelation, which without her aid would make the disclosure to her betrothed, she must have been expressly directed by the angelic announcement made to her, in order to be justified in deferring the communication of her pregnancy to her betrothed. We make this remark in opposition to the arbitrary presuppositions and shifts of Hug (*Gutacht.* I. p. 81 ff.), Krabbe, Ebrard, and others. According to the view invented by the last-named, it is assumed that Joseph had learned Mary's pregnancy, immediately after the appearance of its earliest signs, from the *pronubac* ("suspicious women"); that *immediately* there ensued the appearance of the angel to him, and *forthwith* he took her home; and that for all this a period of at most fourteen days sufficed. Mark and John have rightly excluded these miracles of the preliminary history from the cycle of the evangelical narrative, which only began with the appearance of the Baptist (Mark i. 1); as, indeed, Jesus Himself never, even in His confidential circle, refers to them, and the unbelief of His own brothers, John vii. 5, and in fact even the demeanour of Mary, Mark iii. 21 ff., is irreconcilable with them.² — *The angelic announcement made to Zacharias*, which likewise withdraws itself from any attempt at natural explanation (Paulus, Ammon), appears as a parallel to the annunciation to Mary, having originated and been elaborated in consequence of the latter as a link in the chain of the same cycle of legends after the analogy of Old Testament models, especially that of Abraham and his wife. As in the case of the annunciation to Mary the metaphysical divine Sonship of Jesus, so in the announcement to Zacharias the extraordinary divine destination and mission of John (John i. 6) is the real element on which the formation of legend became engrafted; but to derive the latter merely from the self-consciousness of the

¹ Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 83 f., rightly acknowledges this, but, following older writers, thinks that Mary made the communication to Joseph before her journey to Elizabeth, but that he nevertheless ("the first Ebionite") refused to believe her. This is not compatible with Matthew's narrative, especially i. 18. And what Lange further (p. 89) adds, that during Mary's absence a severe struggle arose in his soul, and this state of feeling became the medium of the revelation made to him, is simply *added*.

² Schleiermacher is right in saying, *L. J.* p. 71: "These occurrences have been entirely without effect as regards the coming forward of Christ or the origination of faith in Him."

church (Bruno Bauer), and consequently to take away the objective foundation of the history, is at variance with the entire N. T. and with the history of the church. For the formation of the legend, moreover, the historical circumstances, that John was the son of the priest Zacharias and Elizabeth, and a son born late in life, are to be held fast as *premisses actually given by history* (in opposition to Strauss, I. p. 135), all the more that for these simple historical data their general notoriety could not but bear witness. This also in opposition to Weisse and B. Bauer, who derive these traditions from the laboratory of religious contemplation. Further, as to what specially concerns *the late birth* of John, it has its historical precedents in the history of Isaac, of Samson, and of Samuel; but the general principle deduced from such cases, "*Cum alicujus uterum claudit, ad hoc facit, ut mirabilis denuo aperiat, et non libidinis esse quod nascitur, sed divini muneris cognoscatur*" (*Evang. de Nativ. Mar.* 3), became the source of unhistorical inventions in the apocryphal Gospels,¹ as, in particular, the apocryphal account of the birth of Mary herself is an imitation of the history of John's birth.

Ver. 39. The angel's communication, ver. 36, occasions Mary to make a journey to Elizabeth, and that *with haste* (*μετὰ σπουδῆς*, comp. Mark vi. 25; Ex. xii. 11; Herod. iii. 4, iv. 5); for how much must her heart have now urged her to the interchange of the deepest feelings with the friend who, in like manner, was so highly favoured! Thus it is not merely "*ne negligeret signum,*" etc., Grotius. From Elizabeth she receives the confirmation of that which the angel had announced to her concerning Elizabeth. But before her departure the great promise of ver. 35 is already fulfilled to herself. With extraordinary delicacy the promised conception is not related in its realization (comp., on the other hand, ver. 24), and the veil of the unparalleled marvel is not attempted to be raised; but vv. 41-44 and the whole triumph of Mary, ver. 46 ff., presuppose that she appears before Elizabeth already as the mother of the Messiah, bearing Him in her womb. She herself is only made certain of the miracle, which has already occurred in her case, by the

¹ See, in general, R. Hofmann, *das Leben Jesu nach d. Apokr.* 1851; also Gelpke, *Jugendgesch. des Herrn*, 1842 (who, moreover, gives the *Jewish legends*).

inspired communication which at once meets her from the mouth of her friend. Bengel is singularly arbitrary in transferring the conception, which in any case lies between vv. 38 and 39, to the moment when the child leaped in the womb of Elizabeth, which he concludes from γάρ in ver. 44. — εἰς τὴν ὄρεινὴν] *into the mountain-region*—κατ' ἐξοχὴν, Aristot. *H. A.* v. 28; Judith i. 6, ii. 22, iv. 7, *al.*; Plin. *H. N.* v. 14. The mountainous country in the tribe of *Judah* is meant. See Robinson, *Pal.* II. p. 422 ff., III. p. 188 ff. — εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα] *into a city of the tribe of Judah*. Luke does not give any more precise definition, and therefore it is to be assumed that he himself had no more precise knowledge. Jerusalem, the capital, is certainly not meant (in opposition to Ambrose, Beda, Camerarius); which is clear, not indeed from the want of the article (comp. ii. 4, 11; Bornemann *in loc.*), but from the unprecedented designation itself (in 2 Chron. xxv. 28 the reading is very doubtful, see the LXX.), and from the εἰς τὴν ὄρεινην [less] appropriate to Jerusalem. It *may* have been the priestly city of *Hebron*, Josh. xxi. 11 (Baronius, Beza, Grotius, Lightfoot, Wolf, Rosenmüller, and others); but that it is meant *as a matter of course* under the “city of Judah” (see Ewald, p. 182), is not to be assumed, because in that case πόλιν could not dispense with the article (to the *well-known* city of Judah). Others (Valesius, *Epp.* 669; Reland, *Pal.* p. 870; Wetstein, Paulus, Kuinoel, Crome, *Beitr.* p. 45, *et al.*; comp. also Robinson, *Pal.* III. p. 193, and Ritter, *Erdk.* XV. p. 641) have regarded *Juda* as itself the name of the city: holding that it was the priestly city הַיְדֵא or הַיָּדָא (Josh. xxi. 16, xv. 55; comp. Robinson, II. p. 417), so that the name is wrongly written. We should have to refer this inaccuracy to Luke himself; but the whole hypothesis is an unnecessary makeshift.

Ver. 41. Τὸν ἀσπασμ. τ. Μαρ.] *the greeting of Mary*. See vv. 40, 44. This greeting on the part of Mary (not the communication of the angelic announcement, ver. 26 ff., as Kuinoel and others import) caused *the leaping of the child* (comp. Gen. xxv. 22), and that as an exulting expression of the *joy* of the latter (ver. 44, vi. 23) at the presence of the

Messiah¹ now in the womb of His mother. Elizabeth immediately *through the Holy Spirit* recognises the cause of the leaping. Comp. Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erfüll.* II. p. 251 f. Calvin, Michaelis, Paulus, Olshausen, and many others reverse the matter, holding that the *mental agitation* of the mother had operated on the child (comp. also Lange, II. 1, p. 86), and that this circumstance had only afterwards, ver. 44, become significant to the mother. Analogous to the conception in our passage is *Sohar Ex. f. xxiii. 91 f., xxv. 99*: "Omnes Israelitae ad mare rubrum plus viderunt quam Ezechiel propheta; imo etiam *embryones, qui in utero matris erant, viderunt id, et Deum S. B. celebrarunt.*" A symbolical significance, expressive, namely, of the thought, that at the appearance of a higher Spirit the ideas that lie still unborn in the womb of the spirit of the world and of the people are quickened (Weisse), is foreign to the narrative,—a modern abstraction.

Ver. 42 f. *Ἀνεφώνησε*] *She cried out* (only occurring here in the N. T.; comp. 1 Chron. xv. 28, xvi. 5; 2 Chron. v. 12; Polyb. iii. 33. 4; frequent in Plutarch), expressing the *outburst* of the being filled by the Spirit. — *ὁ καρπὸς τ. κοιλ. σου*] Designation of the *embryo*, that Mary bears in her womb. For the expression, comp. Gen. xxx. 2; Lam. ii. 20. — *καὶ πόθεν κ.τ.λ.*] *sc. γέγονεν.* After the first outburst now follows a certain *reflection*, a humble pondering, from what cause (*πόθεν*, comp. on Mark xii. 37) she was deemed worthy of this great happiness: *ἀναξίαν ἑαυτὴν τῆς τοιαύτης ἐπιδημίας τῆς δεσποίνης ὁμολογεῖ*, Euthymius Zigabenus. — *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*] not equivalent to *τὸ ἐλθεῖν τὴν μητ. κ.τ.λ.*, but *telic*: *that the mother of my Lord* (the Messiah, comp. Ps. cx. 1) *should come to me*,—this is the *τοῦτο*, in reference to which she asks *πόθεν μοι*. Comp. on John vi. 29, xvii. 3.

Ver. 44 f. *Γάρ*] specifies the ground of knowledge, on which she declares Mary as the mother of the Messiah. She had

¹ Older Lutherans (see Calovius) have wrongly used this passage as a proof of the *fides in jumentum*. There is, in fact, here something unique in character and miraculous. The child of Elizabeth has already in the womb the Holy Spirit, ver. 15.

the discernment of this connection *through the Holy Spirit*, ver. 41. — ὅτι] may either be the specification of the reason attached to μακαρία (Vulgate, Luther, Erasmus, Beza, Lange, and others), or the statement of the contents to πιστεύσασα (Grotius, Bengel, Paulus, Kuinoel, Bornemann, de Wette, Ewald, Bleek, and others). The latter is the correct view, since the conception—the chief point of the λελαλημένα, which Elizabeth has in view—is no longer future, but has already taken place. Hence: *for blessed is she who has believed, that there shall be a fulfilment to all* (ver. 31 ff.), etc. As to τελείωσις, comp. Judith x. 9; John xix. 28.

Ver. 46 ff. An echo of the lyrical poetry of the Old Testament, especially of the song of praise of Hannah the mother of Samuel (1 Sam. ii.). This psalm-like effusion from the heart of Mary (the so-called *Magnificat*) divides itself into four strophes, namely, (1) vv. 46–48 (as far as αὐτοῦ); (2) ver. 48 (from ἰδοὺ onward) as far as ver. 50; (3) vv. 51–53; and (4) vv. 54, 55. Each of these four strophes contains three verses. See Ewald, p. 181. — ἡ ψυχὴ μου] the mediating organ between πνεῦμα and body (Beck, *bibl. Seelenl.* p. 11 ff.; Delitzsch, *bibl. Psychol.* p. 222) which receives the impressions from without and from within, and here expresses by means of the mouth what has taken place in the πνεῦμα (hence ἡγαλλίασε in the *aorist*). The πνεῦμα is “the highest and noblest part of man, whereby he is qualified to grasp incomprehensible, invisible, eternal things; and is, in brief, the house within which faith and God’s word abide,” Luther (*Aust.* 1521). Comp. Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 411 ff. That the spirit of Mary exulted full of the *Holy Spirit*, was self-evident for the evangelist after ver. 35; an observation, such as that of ver. 41, concerning Elizabeth: ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγ., would now have been inappropriate in reference to Mary. ἡγαλλιάω, in the *active*, is only found here and at Rev. xix. 7 (Lachmann, Tischendorf), which reason, however, does not warrant the conjecture of ἡγαλλιάσεται (Valckenaer, Bretschneider). — σωτήρι] *benefactor*. “Is est nimirum σωτήρ, qui salutem dedit,” Cicero, *Verr.* ii. 63. — ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τ. ταπ. τ. δούλ. αὐτ.] as at 1 Sam. i. 11. Comp. Ps. xxxi. 8;

also Luke ix. 38. The expression of the adjectival notion by means of the substantive (comp. 2 Kings xiv. 26 ; Ps. xxiv. 18) places the quality in the foreground. See Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 367 f. ; Bernhardt, p. 53. Mary means the lowliness of her person, in spite of which she is chosen of God to such greatness. She was in fact only an insignificant maiden from the people, an artisan's betrothed bride. — ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν] *from henceforth* ; for *now*, after Elizabeth's inspired words, no further doubt could remain to Mary respecting her condition as mother of the Messiah ; *from henceforth*, therefore, she could not but be the object of the general congratulation, whereof Elizabeth herself had just made a beginning. — πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί] *all generations*.

Ver. 49 f. *Because the Mighty One did to me great things*, in making me the mother of the Messiah. — καὶ ἅγιον κ.τ.λ.] not for οὐ τὸ ὄν. ἅγιον (Luther, Castalio, Bengel, and many, including Kuinoel), but lyrically unperiodic : *and holy is His name!* Hence, also, a full stop is not to be placed after δυνατός (Lachmann, Tischendorf, Bleek), but only a comma. To the *might* the *holiness* attaches itself. — εἰς γενεὰς κ. γενεάς] Comp. Isa. li. 8 ; 1 Macc. ii. 61 ; *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 568 : *unto generations and generations*, i.e. ever onward from one generation to the following. The *Recepta* εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν would mean : *to the uttermost generations* ; these would be conceived of as forming a *superlative*. Analogous Greek superlative designations, especially from the dramatic writers, may be seen in Brunck, *ad Oedip. R.* 466 ; Bernhardt, p. 154. — τοῖς φροβουμ. αὐτ.] *sc. ἐστι*. It denotes the essence of theocratic piety. Comp. Ex. xx. 6 ; Ps. ciii. 7.

Ver. 51 ff. Mary now sees the Messianic catastrophe, which God will bring about by means of her son, and she announces it prophetically *as having already happened* ; for she bears in fact the accomplisher of it already in her womb, and thus the work of God, which He is to execute, is before her enlightened gaze *already as good as completed* ; in that way she sees and describes it.—The *catastrophe itself* is the restoration of the state of things to the divine rightful order, *the overthrow of the Gentiles and the exaltation of the deeply-oppressed theocratic*

people (comp. vv. 68, 71, 74); the former are set forth by the words *ὑπερηφάνους, δυνάστας, πλουτούντας*; the latter, by *ταπεινούς* and *πεινῶντας*. This intended concrete application of the general expressions is put beyond doubt by *ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 54 f. — *ὑπερηφάνους*] such as are *arrogant in the thoughts of their heart*; *διανοία* is the dative of more precise definition; and on the notion (thinking and willing as directed outwards), comp. Beck, *Seelenl.* p. 58; on *καρδία* as the centre of the spiritual and psychic life, Delitzsch, *bibl. Psychol.* p. 248 ff.; finally, in *διεσκόρπ.* the haughty are conceived of as *congregated* and keeping together; comp. Matt. xxvi. 31; Acts v. 37; Ps. lxxxix. 10. "That through Christianity the proud were humbled" (de Wette), is not the thought expressed by Mary, but a generalization of it, as is also the "*confusio diabolicæ superbiæ*" (Calovius and others), and the like. Comp. Eccus. x. 14 ff. — Ver. 52. *He has cast down rulers from thrones*, does not apply to the demons and Pharisees (Theophylact), but to the Gentile holders of power. Comp. on the idea of the overthrow of thrones in the times of the Messiah, Wisd. v. 23; Enoch xxxviii. 4, and Dillmann thereon. — Ver. 53. *ἀγαθῶν*] not merely *means of subsistence* (Valckenaer, Bornemann, de Wette), but *earthly possessions* in general, among which the means of subsistence are included. Comp. xii. 18 f. De Wette, moreover, is in error in saying (comp. Olshausen) that it is *spiritual* hunger and *spiritual* satisfying that are to be thought of, and that the rich are a type of the *wise men of this world*. The whole is to be taken literally; the idealizing is not warranted according to the context. Comp. Ps. xxxiv. 11. — *ἐξαπέστ. κενούς*] So that they *retain* nothing of their possessions, and have *received* nothing from the Messiah. On the expression, comp. xx. 10 f.; Job xxii. 9; Judith x. 11; Hom. *Il.* ii. 298, *Od.* xiii. 214.—For descriptions of the divine inversion of relations from the classical writers, see Wetstein and Bornemann.

Ver. 54 ff. What was expressed *descriptively* in vv. 51–53, and that by means of antitheses, is now definitely and particularly condensed in *ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ* (comp. Isa. xli. 8 f.), which is the *summary* of what has been

previously said. The *aoiist* is to be taken quite like the previous *aoiists*. — ἀντελάβετο] *He has interested Himself for Israel His servant* (יִצְחָק). Comp. on ἀντελάβ., Acts xx. 35; Thuc. iii. 22; Diod. Sic. xi. 13. Euthymius Zigabenus explains it: ἐπεσκέψατο τὸν Ἰσραηλιτικὸν λαὸν, τὸν δούλου αὐτοῦ. Others, including Paulus, Glöckler, Kuinoel, take παιδός as *fili*i (comp. Ex. iv. 22; Hos. xi. 1). But the *theocratic* notion of *sonship* is never expressed by παῖς (not even in Acts iii. 13). — μνησθῆναι ἐλέους] not: “*ita ut perpetuo memor sit,*” etc. (Kuinoel, Bleek), but: *in order to be mindful of mercy*. We have to note the connection with the ἕως αἰῶνος emphatically put at the end. God has interested Himself for Israel, *in order to be mindful of mercy even to eternity*, in order never again to forget mercy. — καθὼς ἐλαλ. πρὸς τ. πατ. ἡμ.] not indeed a parenthesis, but an inserted clause, which makes one feel that the telic μνησθῆναι ἐλέους takes place in consequence of the divine truthfulness. — τῷ Ἀβραάμ κ. τ. σπέρμ. αὐτ.] Dativus *commo*di to μνησθῆναι. Comp. Ps. xcviii. 3; Xen. Cyr. i. 4. 12; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 14 f. It might belong to ἐλάλησε (Euthymius Zigabenus, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Kuinoel), since λαλεῖν may be joined as well with πρὸς as with a dative; but against this may be urged κ. τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, which denotes¹ the whole posterity of Abraham without limitation, and therefore cannot be included in apposition to πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν. — Observe, moreover, that here (comp. ver. 72) Abraham, the progenitor of the race, is conceived of as jointly affected by and interested in the destiny of his descendants; Isa. xxix. 22 f.; Mic. vii. 20. Comp. John viii. 56; *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 587. Abraham *liveth* unto God, xx. 38. — ἔμεινε δὲ κ.τ.λ.] but not until the delivery of Elizabeth (in opposition to Calvin, Maldonatus, and others); see ver. 57.

REMARK 1. — The harmonizers, even the most recent, have adopted very different ways for the fitting of this history into the narrative of Matthew. According to Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 84 ff., Mary is driven to Elizabeth by her grief at being

¹ In what manner it was the σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ that actually received the compassion (Rom. iv., Gal. iv.), was not here the question.

Ecceitically misjudged and discarded by Joseph; according to Hug, *Gutacht*. I. p. 85, Ebrard, Riggenbach, and others, she made the journey immediately after her marriage, which took place a few days after the beginning of her pregnancy! Luke says and knows nothing of either view.

REMARK 2.—The historical character of the Visitation of Mary stands or falls with that of the Annunciation. But the psychological and moral impossibility, that Mary, after the certainty as to her condition acquired while she was with Elizabeth, and after the theocratic inspiration with which she declares herself blessed on account of that condition, should not have made any communication at all to Joseph on the subject (as must nevertheless, according to Matthew, be assumed, so that thus our narrative and that of Matt. i. 18 ff. exclude one another); further, the utter want of any trace elsewhere of such an intimate and confidential relation as, according to our history, must have subsisted between the two holy families; moreover, the design of the narrative to invest Jesus with a singular glory, according to which even the yet unborn John signifies his rejoicing homage before the Messiah when but just conceived in His mother's womb; the circumstance, not to be explained away (see the untenable suggestion of Lange, p. 92), that it is only after the leaping of the babe that Elizabeth receives the Holy Spirit, and by means of this Spirit recognises from that leaping the mother of the Messiah as such; the hymnic scene annexed thereto, the *poetic* splendour and truth of which lifts it out of the *historical* sphere, in which subsequently the house of Mary was not the abode of the faith that is here proclaimed from the mouth of the Virgin with so lofty a triumph (Mark iii. 31; John vii. 3),—all this is not adapted to support or to uphold its historical character, even apart from the fact that tradition has not even conveyed to Luke the name of the mountain-town. The apocryphal poor and pale copy of the Annunciation and the Visitation may be seen in the *Protevangel. Jacobi*, c. xi., xii.; according to which, moreover,—quite differently from the course followed by the modern Harmonists,—it is not till after the visitation, only in the sixth month of pregnancy, when Mary is recognised as in this condition and called to account by Joseph, that she asserts her innocence, and then the dream-revelation of the angel is imparted to Joseph (ch. xiii. f.).

Ver. 57 f. Τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτ.] genitive governed by ὁ χρόνος: the time, which had to elapse until her delivery. Comp. ii. 7,

22; Gen. xxv. 24. — ἵτι ἐμεγάλυνε κ.τ.λ.] *that He has magnified* (Matt. xxiii. 5; 2 Cor. x. 15; 1 Sam. xii. 24), namely, by this birth still bestowed, contrary to all expectation, in which they saw a proof of especially great divine compassion. The expression is quite as in Gen. xix. 19. — συνέχαιρον] *they rejoiced together with her*. Others, like Valekenaeer (following the Vulgate): *they congratulated her* (see on Phil. ii. 17). The former is more appropriate on account of ver. 14; and comp. xv. 6, 9.

Ver. 59 f. With the circumcision was associated the *giving of the name*, Gen. xxi. 3. See Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 110. Among the Greeks and Romans it took place on the *dies lustricus*. See Douglæus, *Anal.* II. p. 44 f.; Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § 32. 17. — ἦλθον] The subject is evident of itself, namely, the persons pertaining to the circumcision: "amici ad eam rem vocati," Grotius. Any Israelite might be the circumciser (in case of necessity even a woman, Ex. iv. 25). See Lund, *Heiligth.*, ed. Wolf, p. 949; Keil, *Archäol.* I. p. 307 f. — ἐκάλουν] They actually uttered this name (this took place immediately after the circumcision was performed; see Lund, *l.c.*, Buxtorf, *Synagog.* 4): but the mother (for the father was still dumb) took exception to it, ver. 60. "Vere enim incipit actus, sed ob impedimenta caret eventus," Schaefer, *ad Phoen.* 81; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 178 [E. T. 205]. — The naming of the child after the *father* (Tob. i. 9; Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 1. 3) or after a *relative* (ver. 61; Lightfoot, p. 726) was very common, as it was also among the Greeks (Hermann, *l.c.* 18). On ἐπί, comp. Neh. vii. 63; Plut. *Demetr.* 2. The idea is: *in reference to*. — οὐχί, ἀλλὰ κληθ. Ἰωάνν.] The usual supposition (Paulus, Kuinoel, Ebrard, Bleek, following Calvin and others), that Zacharias after his return from the temple made known to Elizabeth by writing the words of the angel, ver. 13, is the more arbitrary, the less it is in keeping with the miraculous impress of the whole history. Theophylact is right in saying: ἡ δὲ Ἐλισάβετ ὡς προφήτης ἐλάλησε περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος; and Euthymius Zigabenus: ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ αὐτὴ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ παιδὸς μεμάθηκε (comp. Origen and Ambrose), and this, indeed, at the moment

of that *ἐκάλουν*, ver. 59, else it would not be easy to perceive why she should not at the very beginning have carried out the giving of the divinely-appointed name.

Ver. 62 f. *Ἐνένευον*] They conveyed by signs to him the question (*τό*, see Krüger, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 4. 17; Kühner, II. p. 138), how (*τί* = *τί ὄνομα*, comp. Aesch. *Ag.* 1205) he perchance (*ἄν*, see Winer, p. 275 [E. T. 386]) would wish that the child (*αὐτό*, see the critical remarks) should be named. The *making signs* does not presuppose *deafness and dumbness* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Jansen, Maldonatus, Lightfoot, Grotius, Wolf, and others, including Ewald), against which may be urged ver. 20; nor is it to be explained by the fact, that we are inclined to communicate by means *of signs* with dumb people as with deaf people (Bengel, Michaelis, Paulus, Olshausen, de Wette), which can only be arbitrarily applied to Zacharias, since he had only been dumb for a short time and people had previously been accustomed to *speak* with him. Probably it was only from the wish *to spare the mother* that the decision of the father, who had all along been listening to the discussion, was called for not aloud, but by signs. — *αἰτήσας*] *ὁμοίως διὰ νεύματος*, Euthymius Zigabenus. — *πινακίδιον*] probably a little tablet covered with wax. Tertullian, *de idolol.* 23: "Zacharias loquitur in stylo, auditur in cera." — *ἔγραψε λέγων*] *scripsit hæc verba*. Comp. 2 Kings x. 6; 1 Macc. viii. 31, xi. 57. A Hebraism (*כִּתְּבָהּ*). On the same usage in the Syriac, see Gesenius in Rosenmüller's *Rep.* I. p. 135. An example from Josephus is found in Kypke, I. p. 211; Krebs, p. 98. The return of speech does not occur till ver. 64. Comp. vv. 20, 13. — *Ἰωάννης ἐστὶ τ. ὄν. αὐτοῦ*] Shortly and categorically, in the consciousness of what had been already divinely determined: *נָשָׂא קוֹלָא*. "Non tam jubet, quam jussum divinum indicat," Bengel. — *ἐθαύμ.*] because Zacharias agreed with Elizabeth in a name foreign to the family.

Ver. 64. *Ἀνεψύχθη . . . γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ*] *a zeugma*; in the case of the tongue *ἐλύθη* may be mentally supplied; comp., on the other hand, Mark vii. 35. This recovery of speech is to be regarded not as the effect of lively emotion (Gell. v. 5;

Val. Max. i. 8. 3), or of the deliverance of his soul from the reproach that had oppressed it (Lange), or of his own will (Paulus), but of *divine causation* (ver. 20).

Ver. 65 f. An historical digression, narrating the impression which these marvellous events at the circumcision produced in wider circles. — φόβος] not *amazement*, but *fear*, the first impression of the extraordinary (comp. Mark iv. 41; Acts ii. 43). — αὐτούς] applies to Zacharias and Elizabeth. On περιρικεῖν τινα, comp. Herod. v. 78; Xen. Anab. v. 6. 16; Plut. Crass. 34. — διελαλεῖτο] were mutually talked of, Polyb. i. 85. 2, ix. 32. 1. — τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα] these utterances, which had occurred with such marvellous significance at the circumcision of the child from ver. 59 to ver. 64; ii. 19. — ἔθεντο . . . ἐν τῇ καρδ. αὐτῶν] Comp. חָזַן לֵב דָּוִד (1 Sam. xxi. 12), and the Homeric τίθημι ἐν στήθεσσι, ἐν φρεσὶ, and see Valckenaer *in loc.* They made those utterances the subject of their further reflection. Comp. ii. 19. — τί ἄρα] *quid igitur*, under these circumstances, according to these auspices, what *then* *now* will, etc.; see Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 176; Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 10 f. Comp. viii. 25, xii. 42. On the neuter τί, which is more in keeping with the uncertainty and the emotion of the inquirers than τίς, comp. Acts xii. 18; Schaefer, *Melet.* p. 98; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 15. — καὶ γὰρ χεὶρ κυρίου ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ] An observation of Luke, in which he would indicate that the people *rightly* asked this question, expecting something unusual of the child: *for also* (καὶ γάρ, see the critical remarks) *the hand of the Lord was with him*. The emphasis rests on χεὶρ κυρίου, which, with καί, makes known to us the mighty help of God (so χεὶρ κυρίου very frequently in the O. T.; comp. also Hermann, *ad Vig.* p. 732) as *in keeping with* the ominous phenomena. Others, like Storr, Kuinoel, Paulus, Ewald, place these words too in the mouth of those asking the question (so also Rettig in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 219, who, following the *Recepta*, places a colon after καί: *and others said*). But this reflective specifying of *a reason* would have been superfluous in the mouth of those people, and little in keeping with the emotion of their question. And instead of ἦν they would have said ἐστί, in-

ferring, namely, the help of God from the events at the circumcision; while the *καί* would be but tame and cumbrous.

Ver. 67. After the historical episode of ver. 65 there now follows, in reference to *εὐλογῶν τ. Θεόν*, ver. 64, the hymn itself (the so-called *Benedictus*) into which Zacharias broke forth, and that on the spot (Kuinoel erroneously suggests that it was only composed subsequently by Zacharias). At the same time the remark *ἐπλήσθη πνεύμ. ἁγ.* is repeated, and the hymn is in respect of its nature more precisely designated as *prophecy*. It is, like that of Mary, ver. 46 ff., constructed *in strophes*, containing five strophes, each of three verses. See Ewald. — *προεφήτευσε*] denotes not merely prediction, but the utterance of revelation generally stimulated and sustained by the Spirit, which includes in it prediction proper. See on 1 Cor. xii. 10.

Ver. 68 f. Zacharias' hymn of praise concerns the great *cause*, which his new-born son is to serve — the *Messianic deliverance* and *blessing* of the people, which he now at once looks upon *as already accomplished*, for in his new-born son there has, in fact, already appeared the preparer of the way for the Messiah (ver. 16 f.). Comp. on ver. 51. The entire hymn bears the *priestly* character, which even the apostrophe to the infant, ver. 76, does not efface. — *εὐλογητὸς κ.τ.λ.*] *sc. εἴη*. Comp. Ps. xli. 14, lxxii. 18, cvi. 48. — *λύτρωσιν* (comp. ii. 38) applies primarily to the Messianic deliverance under its *political aspect*. Comp. vv. 71, 51 ff.; Plut. *Arat.* 11: *λύτρ. αἰχμαλώτων*. With this, however, Zacharias knew (comp. also ver. 16 f.) that the religious and moral regeneration of the people was inseparably combined, so as to form the one Messianic work, vv. 75, 77, 79.¹ The *ἐπεσκέψ.* is absolute, as in Ecclus. xxxii. 17: *he has looked to*, he has made an inspection. Comp. Acts xv. 14. — *ἤγειρε*] still dependent upon *ὅτι*. — *κέρας σωτηρίας*] *a horn of deliverance* (genitive of apposition), *i.e. a strong, mighty deliverance*, according to the

¹ Hofmann appropriately remarks, *Weissag. u. Erfüll.* II. p. 253 (in opposition to Olshausen), that the purity of the Messianic views of Zacharias consists in the unadulterated reproduction of *Old Testament* knowledge.

figurative use of the Hebrew קַרְנֵי, 1 Sam. ii. 10 ; Ps. xviii. 3, lxxxix. 18, cxxxii. 16 f., cxlviii. 14 ; Ecclus. xlvi. 5, 7, 11, *al.* ; Gesenius, *Thes.* III. p. 1233 ; Grimm on 1 Macc. ii. 48. See Rabbinical passages in Schöttgen, *Hor.* p. 258 f. κέρασ· ἡ ἰσχὺς παρὰ τῇ θεῖᾳ γραφῇ, ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ζώων τῶν καθωπλισμένων τοῖς κέρασι καὶ τούτοις ἀμυνομένων, Suidas. Comp. the Latin *cornua addere*, *cornua sumere*, and the like. It is true that Jensius (*Fere. lit.* p. 34), Fischer (*de vit. Lex.* p. 214), and Paulus find the reference in the *horns of the altar of burnt-offering* which served as an asylum (1 Kings i. 50, ii. 28 ff. ; Bähr, *Symbol.* I. p. 473 f. ; Knobel on Ex. xxvii. 2). But apart from the inappropriate relation to the frequent use of the O. T. figure elsewhere, how inadequate for the due and distinct expression of the Messianic idea would be the conception of the mere protection, which was afforded by the laying hold of the horns of the altar ! — ἡγείρε] *excitavit*, *i.e.* according to the context, *he has made to grow up* (ἐξανατελῶ, Ps. cxxxii. 17). — τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ] Acts iv. 25.

Ver. 70. No parenthesis. — τῶν ἀγίων] not used substantively (Bornemann), but see Bernhardt, p. 322 ; Krüger, § 50. 9. 7. — ἀπ' αἰῶνος] not *absolutely*, as though there had been prophets even *ab orbe condito* ("imo per os Adami," Calovius), but *relatively* ; when the *oldest* prophets emerged (and Moses already was such an one), was the commencement of prophecy *since the beginning of the world*. Comp. Gen. vi. 4 ; Acts iii. 21 ; Longin. 34 : τοὺς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ρήτορας.

Ver. 71 f. Σωτηρίαν] might be attached to ἐλάλησε, ver. 70 (Beza, Grotius, Ewald, and others), but it is simpler to retain καθὼς κ.τ.λ. as a parenthetical clause, like ver. 55, so that κέρασ σωτηρ., ver. 69, is resumed by σωτηρίαν (yet only as to the fact, without the figure) for the sake of adding the more precise definition. Such a resumption may occur with δέ (Rom. iii. 22) and without it (Rom. iii. 26). See generally, Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 1. Without δέ the expression is more rhetorical. — The *enemies* and *haters* are the *heathen*, as in ver. 51 ff., not the demons, sin, and the like. — ποιῆσαι] Infinitive of the *aim*, as at ver. 54. In this our deliverance God designed to show mercy to (μετά, *μετ'*, ver. 58, x. 37) our

fathers (comp. ver. 55, deeply afflicted by the decline of their people), and to remember (practically, by the fulfilment of what was therein promised) His holy covenant. Euthymius Zigabenus: *διαθήκην γὰρ λέγει τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν μνήμην δὲ αὐτῆς τὴν περάτωσιν.*

Vv. 73–75. "*Ορκον*] neither accusative of more precise definition (Calvin, Beza, L. Bos, Rosenmüller), nor governed by *μνησθῆναι* (Euthymius Zigabenus, Olshausen, Bleek¹), but climactic apposition to *διαθήκης ἁγ. αὐτοῦ*, in which the accusative is attracted by *ὅν*, Matt. xxi. 42; 1 Cor. x. 16; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 247 [E. T. 288]; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 16 f. — *πρός*] denotes the *swearing to*. Comp. Hom. *Od.* xiv. 331, xix. 288. The expression with the dative is more usual. See the oath itself in Gen. xxii. 16–18. — *τοῦ δοῦναι κ.τ.λ.*] *in order to grant to us*, the purpose, on account of which God swore the oath. — *ἐκ χειρὸς κ.τ.λ.*] more precisely defines the previous *ἀφόβως*, and that as regards its *objective* relation. On the *accusative ῥυσθέντας* (not dative), see Bornemann, *l.c.*; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Med.* 815; Krüger, *Gramm. Unters.* III. § 148. — Ver. 75. Religious-moral restoration of the people of God. As to the distinction between *ὁσιότης* and *δικαιοσύνη* (Plat. *Prot.* p. 329 C), see on Eph. iv. 24. *Holiness* is the divine consecration and inner truth of *righteousness*, so that the latter without the former would be only external or seeming; both together constitute the *justitia spiritualis*.

Ver. 76 f. "*Ἐπειτα μεταβαίνει τῇ προφητείᾳ καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ παῖδα Ἰωάννην*, Euthymius Zigabenus. — *καὶ σὺ δέ*] *but thou also* (see the critical remarks). See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 181 f.; Ellendt, *Lex Soph.* I. p. 884. The *καί* places the *παιδίου*—for *even of him* he has only what is great to say—on a parallel with the subject, to which hitherto in his song of praise to God his prophetic glance was directed (with the Messiah), and *δέ* is the continuative *autem*. — *προπορ. γὰρ πρὸ προσώπου κυρ.*] as at ver. 17, hence *κύριος* is *God*.

¹ *Μνημόσκειν* is not seldom joined with an accusative by the classical writers (Hom. *Il.* vi. 222; Herod. vii. 18; Soph. *O. R.* 1057), but never in the N. T., although it is so in the LXX. and Apocrypha.

— ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ] see on Matt. iii. 3. — τοῦ δοῦναι κ.τ.λ.] Aim of ἐτοιμάσαι κ.τ.λ., and so final aim of προπορεύση . . . κυρίου. — ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτ. αὐτ.] In *forgiveness of their sins*, which is to be imparted to them through the Messiah (see ver. 78 f.) for the sake of God's mercy (which is thereby satisfied; διὰ σπλ. ἐλ. Θεοῦ), they are to discern deliverance; they are to discern that salvation comes through the Messianic forgiveness of sins (comp. on Mark i. 4), and to this knowledge of salvation John is to guide his people. Accordingly, ἐν ἀφ. ἁμ. αὐτ. does not belong to σωτηρίας alone (τῆς γινομένης ἐν τῷ ἀφεθῆναι κ.τ.λ., Euthymius Zigabenus, Beza, Bengel, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Bleek, and others), but to γνῶσιν σωτηρίας (Theophylact) = γνῶναι σωτηρίαν ἐν ἀφ. τ. ἁμ. αὐτ. So also Luther, Ewald, and others. Calvin aptly remarks: "Praecipuum evangelii caput nunc attingit Zacharias, dum scientiam salutis in remissione peccatorum positam esse docet."

Ver. 78 f. Διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους κ.τ.λ.] is not to be separated from what precedes by punctuation, but to be immediately connected with ἐν ἀφ. ἁμ. αὐτ.: ἐν ἀφέσει δὲ ἁμαρτιῶν . . . τῇ διδομένῃ διὰ τὴν συμπάθειαν τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ, Euthymius Zigabenus. Comp. Theophylact. The reference to all that is said from προπορεύση onwards, ver. 76 (Grotius, Kuinoel, de Wette, and others), is the more arbitrary, in proportion to the natural and essential connection that subsists between the forgiveness of sins and God's compassion. — διὰ] not *through*, but *for the sake of*, see on ver. 77; σπλάγχνα is not merely, according to the Hebrew רַחֲמִים (see Gesenius), but also in the Greek poetical language, the seat of the *affections*, as, for instance, of anger (Arist. *Ran.* 1004) and of *sympathy* (Aesch. *Ch.* 407). So here. Comp. Col. iii. 12; Phil. ii. 1. ἐλέους is genitivus *qualitatis*, and Θεοῦ ἡμῶν depends on σπλάγχνα ἐλέους: *for the sake of the compassionate heart of our God*. — ἐν οἷς] *instrumental: by virtue of which*. — ἐπεσκέψατο ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψ.] *to be taken together: has visited us, etc., has become present to us with His saving help* (comp. Xen. *Cyr.* v. 4. 10; Ecclus. xlv. 14; Judith viii. 33; Luke vii. 16). It is

appropriate to ἀνατ. ἐξ ὕψ., as the latter is personified. The figurative designation of the Messiah: *Dayspring from on high*, is borrowed from the rising of the sun (Rev. vii. 2; Matt. v. 45; Hom. *Od.* xii. 4; Herod. iv. 8), or as is more in keeping with the ἐξ ὕψιστου, from the rising of a bright-beaming *star of the night* (Num. xxiv. 17; Valek. *ad Eur. Phoen.* 506), not (in opposition to Beza, Scultetus, Lightfoot, Wetstein) from an ascending *shoot* (חֲצִיץ, Isa. iv. 2; Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15; Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12), against which may be urged ἐξ ὕψ. and ἐπιφάναι.¹ Comp. Isa. ix. 2. — ἐπιφάναι] Infinitive of the aim. On the form see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 25 f. — τοῖς ἐν σκότει κ. σκ. θαν. καθημ.] *those who sit in darkness and (climactic) the shadow of death*—a picturesque delineation of the people totally destitute of divine truth and the true ζωή (ἡμῶν, ver. 79). — *The shadow of death* (חַלְמוֹת) is such a shadow as surrounds *death* (personified), and they are sitting *in* this shadow, because death is ruling among them, namely, in the *spiritual* sense, the opposite of the true life whose sphere is the light of divine truth. Moreover, comp. Isa. ix. 2, and on Matt. iv. 16; on καθημ. also, Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 65. — τοῦ κατευθύναι κ.τ.λ.] The aim of ἐπιφάναι κ.τ.λ., and so the final aim of ἐπεσκέψατο κ.τ.λ. Comp. on τοῦ δοῦναι, ver. 77. “Continuatur translatio, nam lux dirigit nos,” Grotius. Observe also the correlation of τοὺς πόδας with the preceding καθημένοις. — εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήν.] *in viam ad salutem* (Messianam) *ducentem*. εἰρήνη = εἰρήνη, opposite of all the misery denoted by σκότος κ.τ.λ. (hence not merely *peace*). It has another sense in Rom. iii. 17. But comp. Acts xvi. 17.

Ver. 80. A summary account (comp. Judg. xiii. 24) of the further development of John. More particular accounts were perhaps altogether wanting, but were not essential to

¹ Bleek wishes to combine the two senses, and infers from this that the source whence Luke drew was Greek and not Hebrew, because חֲצִיץ would not have admitted a reference to the rising of the sun. But the whole mixing up of two incongruous figures is excluded by ver. 79; hence the inference drawn by Bleek (see also his *Einleit.* p. 277 f.), and approved by Holtzmann, falls to the ground. The source may have been Greek; but if it was Hebrew, חֲצִיץ need not have stood in it.

the matter here. — *ἡϋξανε*] the *bodily* growing up, and, connected therewith: *ἐκρατ. πνεύμ.*, the *mental* gaining of strength that took place *εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπ.* (Eph. iii. 16). Comp. the description of the development of Jesus, ii. 40, 52. *ψυχῇ* is not mentioned, for the *πνεῦμα* is the *ἡγεμονικόν*, in whose vigour and strength the *ψυχή* shares. Comp. Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 217. — *ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἐρήμοις*] in the well-known desert regions. It is *the desert of Judah κατ' ἐξοχήν* that is meant (see on Matt. iii. 1). In that desert dwelt also the *Essenes* (Plin. *N. H.* v. 17). How far their principles and *askesis*, which at least could not have remained unknown to John, may have indirectly exercised an influence on his peculiar character, cannot be determined; a true Essene this greatest and last phenomenon of Israelitish prophecy certainly was not; he belonged, like some God-sent prophet higher than all partisan attitudes in the people, to the whole nation. — *ἀναδείξεως αὐτοῦ πρὸς τ. Ἰσρ.*] *His being publicly made known to Israel*, when he was announced to the Israelites as the forerunner of the Messiah. This was done on the command of God by John himself. See iii. 2–6. *ἀνάδειξις* is the making known (*renuntiatio*) of official nomination; Polyb. xv. 26. 4; Plut. *Mar.* 8; see Wetstein, Comp. x. 1.

CHAPTER II.

VER. 3. *ιδίαν*] Lachm. Tisch. have *ἑαυτοῦ*, following B D L \aleph^{**} Eus. An interpretation, which is further found completely in D (*ἑαυτοῦ πατρίδα*). \aleph^* has *ἑαυτῶν*. — Ver. 5. *μεμνηστ.* See on i. 27. — *γυναικί*] is wanting in B C* (F) D L Ξ \aleph , min. vss. Fathers. Deleted by Lachm., and now also again by Tisch. An addition; *ἐμνηστευμένη* was objectionable, hence *γυναικί* was added, and in part *ἐμνηστευμ.* was even deleted (Ver. Verc. Colb.). There was less probability that offence might be taken after Matt. i. 24 at *γυναικί*. Cyril of Jerusalem expresses himself too obscurely in this respect. — Ver. 7. *τῇ φάτνῃ*] *τῇ* is wanting in preponderating witnesses. It is deleted by Lachm. Tisch. The article was added here and at ver. 12, in order to designate the *definite* manger, *i.e.* the well-known manger of the Saviour. — Ver. 12. *κείμενον*] B L P S Ξ \aleph^{**} min. Syr. utr. Vulg. codd. It. Eus. Arnob. and Tisch. have *καὶ κείμεν.*; *καί* was easily inserted to connect the two participles. — Ver. 14. *εὐδοκία*] A B* D \aleph , Goth. Sax. Vulg. It., Fathers, have *εὐδοκίας*. So Lachm. and Tisch. Recommended by Beza, Mill, Bengel, and others. There is considerable evidence on both sides, but it preponderates in favour of the genitive. Now, as the unfamiliar expression *ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας* is not to be put down to the account of the transcribers, but, on the contrary, these, not apprehending the symmetry of the passage, had after the analogy of *δόξα* and *εἰρήνη* sufficient inducement to put instead of *εὐδοκίας* the nominative likewise, *εὐδοκίας* is to be preferred. — Ver. 15. *καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι*] is wanting in B L Ξ \aleph , min. Syr. Perss. Ar. p. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Vulg. It. Eus. Aug. Bracketed by Lachm. Deleted by Tisch. But the homoeoteleuton (*ἄγγελοι . . . ἄνθρωποι*) the more easily gave occasion to the omission, as the words are superfluous and there was no motive for their addition. — Ver. 17. *διεγνώρισαν*] Lachm. Tisch. have *ἐγνώρισαν*, following B D L Ξ \aleph , min. Eus. But the syllable *ΔΙ* after *δέ* was more easily passed over than added, especially as the simple form was present in ver. 15. — Ver. 20. Instead of *ὑπέστρεψαν*, Elz. has *ἐπέστρεψαν*; and at ver. 21, instead of *αὐτὸν*: *τὸ παιδίον*,

in opposition to preponderant evidence. — Ver. 33. Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ] B D L S, min. vss. (also Vulg.) Or. and several Fathers have ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ. So Griesbach and Tisch. (who after μήτηρ retains αὐτοῦ). The mention of the *father* gave offence, and in *this place* the name might be introduced instead of it, but not appropriately also at ver. 48. — Ver. 37. ὥς] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἕως, in accordance with A B L Ξ S* min. Copt. Sahid. Ar. p. Vulg. codd. It. Aug. Rightly; the ὥς, frequently used in the case of numbers, intruded itself. — Ver. 38. αὐτῇ] on preponderant evidence, and because καὶ αὐτῇ presented itself mechanically from ver. 37, is to be deleted, with Lachm. and Tisch. — ἐν Ἱερουσ.] ἐν is wanting in B Ξ Π S, min. vss. (including Vulg. ms. and codd. It.) and Fathers, and is condemned by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. An addition from misunderstanding. — Ver. 39. τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν] Lachm. and Tisch. have πόλιν ἑαυτῶν. In accordance with decisive evidence ἑαυτῶν is to be adopted; but the omission of τὴν is only attested by B D* S 1. — Ver. 40. πνεύματι] has testimonies against it of such weight, and it can so little conceal its origin from i. 80, that with reason it is condemned by Mill and Griesb., excluded by Lachm. and Tisch. — Ver. 42. ἀναβάντων] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἀναβαινόντων, in accordance with A B K L X Π S, min. Vulg. codd. It. A copyist's error; the aorist is necessary. — εἰς Ἱεροσ.] is wanting in B D L S, min. vss. Tisch. It betrays itself by the form Ἱεροσόλυμα as an addition of another hand. — Ver. 43. ἔγνω Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ] B D L S, min. vss. (including Vulg. and codd. It.) Jerome have ἔγνωσαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. Comp. also Rinck on Matt. xxiv. 36. I regard οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ as written in the margin from ver. 41. Comp. on ver. 33. Were it original, and had Ἰωσ. καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ been subsequently put for it, why should not this alteration have been already undertaken before at ver. 41 (where only codd. It. have: *Joseph et Maria*)? and why should ἔγνωσαν (which would have stood originally) not have been left? This plural so naturally suggested itself, even with the words of the *Recepta*, that some witnesses for the *Recepta* (Δ, for instance) actually read it. — Ver. 45. After εὐρόντες Elz. Scholz have αὐτὸν (Lachm. in brackets), in opposition to B C* D L S, min. Arm. Aeth. Vulg. codd. It. A current addition. — ζητοῦντες] nearly the same witnesses have ἀναζητοῦντες. So Lachm. and Tisch. From ver. 44.

The genuineness of the portion from ch. i. 5 to the end of ch. ii. has been contested by Evanson (The Dissonance of the

four generally received Evangelists, etc., Ipswich 1792), J. E. Chr. Schmidt (in Henke's *Magaz.* vol. III. p. 473 ff.), Horst (Henke's *Museum*, I. 3, p. 446 ff.), C. C. L. Schmidt (in the *Repert. f. d. Literat. d. Bibel*, I. p. 58 ff.), Jones (*Sequel to Ecclesiastical Researches*, etc., London 1803), Eichhorn, *Einl.* I. p. 630 f. Baur reckons the section among the portions which have been introduced into our Gospel by the agency of a reviser (the author of the Acts of the Apostles). See his *Markusevang.* p. 218 ff. But the genuineness was defended by Ammon (*Nova Opusc.* p. 32 ff.), Süskind (*Symbolae*, II. p. 1 ff.), von Schubert (*de infantiae J. Ch. historiae a Matth. et Luc. exhibitae authenticæ atque indole*, Gripeswald. 1815), Reuterdahl (*Obs. crit. in priora duo cv. Luc. capita*, Lond. 1823), Bertholdt, Paulus, Schott, Feilmoser, Credner, Neudecker, Kuinoel, Volkmar, Guericke, and almost all the more recent writers. In opposition to Baur, see also Köstlin, p. 306 ff. — The genuineness is rendered certain by the external testimonies without exception. It is true that the section was wanting in the Gospel of Marcion (see Tertullian, *c. Marc.* iv. 7); but Marcion mutilated and falsified the Gospel of Luke in accordance with his dogmatic aims, and thus formed his Gospel, which, according to Tertullian, Epiphanius, Origen, and others, began: 'Εν ἔτει πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ὁ Θεὸς κατήλθεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ, πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἦν διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς σάββασιν (iii. 1, iv. 31). And the internal character of the section, much as it differs from the preface by its Hebraic colouring in accordance with the sources made use of, contains the same peculiarities of Luke as are apparent in the other portions of the Gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles (see Gersdorff, p. 160 ff.; Credner, I. p. 132 ff.), and betrays in the whole peculiar character of the representation documental sources, whose characteristic and in part highly poetic stamp Luke with correct tact has known how to preserve in working them up. We may add, that a reason against the genuineness can as little be derived from Acts i. 1 as a conclusion in its favour can be gathered from Luke i. 3. For there mention of the Gospel is made *only as regards its main contents*; and the ἀνωθεν at Luke i. 3 would, even if i. 5–ii. 52 were not genuine, find warrant enough in the beginning of the history from the emergence of John and in the genealogy contained in the third chapter.

Vv. 1, 2. See especially Huschke, *üb. den z. Zeit d. Geburt J. Chr. gehalt. Census*, Breslau 1840 (Hoeck, *Röm. Gesch.* Bd. I. Abth. II.); Wieseler, *chronol. Synopse*, p. 73 ff.; von Gumpach

in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1852, p. 663 ff., where also the older literature is specified, and in his *Kritik und Antikritik*, Heidelb. 1853; Zumpt, *Commentatt. epigraph.* II. p. 73 ff.; Köhler in Herzog's *Encykl.* XIII. p. 463 ff.; Aberle in the *theol. Quartalschr.* 1865, p. 103 ff.; Gerlach, *d. Römischen Statthalter in Syr. u. Judäa*, 1865, p. 22 ff., 44 ff.; Strauss, *die Halben u. d. Ganzen*, 1865, p. 70 ff.; Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 408 ff.

Ver. 1. *Ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκ.*] approximate specification of time in relation to the principal contents of what precedes, the birth of the Baptist. — *δόγμα*] *an ordinance, an edict.* Acts xvii. 7; Theodotion, Dan. ii. 13; Dem. 278. 17, 774. 19; Plat. *Legg.* i. p. 644 D; and the passages in Wetstein. — *ἀπογράφεσθαι*] *that there should be recorded*, cannot at all be meant of a mere *registration*, which Augustus had caused to be made (if also with the *design* of regulating in future a taxing of the Jews) for a statistical object, possibly with a view to the *Breviarium imperii* which he wrote with his own hand (in which “*opes publicae continebantur; quantum civium sociorumque in armis; quot classes, regna, provinciae, tributa aut vectigalia et necessitates ac largitiones*,” Tacitus, *Ann.* i. 11), as is held by Kuinoel, Olshausen, Ebrard, Wieseler, Ewald, and older expositors, but must, on account of ver. 2, be placed on the same footing in respect of its nature with the *census Quirini*, and is therefore to be regarded as the direct *registration into the tax-lists*, belonging to the *census* proper (*ἀποτίμησις, τίμημα*) and forming its essential element, as, in fact, *ἀπογράφειν, ἀπογράφεσθαι, ἀπογραφή* (Acts v. 37) are the standing expressions for the *recording of estate*, whether in affairs of law-procedure (see Reiske, *Ind. Dem.* p. 63 f.; Hermann, *Staatsalterth.* § 136. 13), or in those of taxing (Plato, *Legg.* vi. p. 754 D; Polyb. x. 17. 10; and see Elsner and Wetstein). On the subject-matter itself, see Huschke, *üb. d. Census u. d. Steuerverfuss. d. frühern Röm. Kaiserzeit*, Berl. 1847. — *πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκονμ.*] *not: the whole of Palestine* (Flacius, *Clavis*; Paulus, Hug, and others), to which the expression is never limited,¹ not even in Josephus, *Antt.*

¹ Justin, c. *Tr.* 78, has: *ἀπογραφῆς οὕσης ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ τότε πρώτης.* But this ἐν τῇ Ἰουδ. manifestly has its reference to *πρώτης.* Comp. *Ap.* i. 34, p. 75 E.

viii. 13. 5, but, as the context by *παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου* imperatively requires, *the whole Roman empire* (*orbis terrarum*). See the passages in Wetstein, and comp. Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 215; Maetzner, *Lycurg.* p. 100. Hence the Roman emperors were called *κύριοι τῆς οἰκουμένης* (Franz, *Corp. Inscr.* III. p. 205). Luke narrates a general *census of the empire* (Huschke); and even *the limitation of the meaning merely to a general provincial census* (Wieseler) has no foundation at all in the text, any more than the fanciful suggestion of Lange (*L. J.* II. 1, p. 93), that Mary, who is assumed as the source of information for the history of the infancy, had, "in accordance with the policy of a lofty feminine sentiment," referred the determination of *Herod*, to undertake a census in *Palestine*, back to the Emperor Augustus as its originator, and that Luke, "in his kindly truth," had not wished to alter the account, and hence had "by way of gentle correction" inserted ver. 2. See, in opposition to this, Ebrard, p. 169 f. Comp. also Auberlen, *Daniel u. d. Apok.* p. 248 f.

Ver. 2. In a critical respect no change is to be made. Lachmann has, indeed, struck out the article before *ἀπογρ.* (in which Wieseler, and now also Tischendorf agree with him), but the witnesses which omit it are only B D (the latter having *ἐγένετο ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη*), & (?) 131, Eus.; and how easily might *ἡ*, which in itself is superfluous (see Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 105 [E. T. 221]; Bremi, *ad Lys.* Exc. II. p. 436 ff.), be merged in the last letter of *αὕτη*! If *ἡ* is not read, *αὕτη* is the subject, and *ἀπογρ. πρ.* is the predicate (*this became the first ἀπογραφὴ*). Beza, ed. 1, 2, 3, Pfaff, Valckenaer have declared the entire verse to be an interpolated scholion; but this is a violent suggestion opposed to all the evidence. *Conjectures* are given by Huetius: *Κυῖν-τιλίου*; Heumann: *Κρονίου* (= Saturnini); Valesius: *Σατουρ-νίου*; Michaelis: *πρώτη ἐγένετο πρὸ τῆς ἡγεμονεύοντος κ.τ.λ., αλ.*; see Bowyer, *Conject.* I. p. 117 ff. — The observation contained in ver. 2, which, moreover, is not to be put in a parenthesis, is intended to tell the reader that this census was the first of those held under the presidency of Quirinius, and

consequently to guard against confounding it with that which was held about eleven years later (Acts v. 37). The words signify: *This census was the first while Quirinius was praeses of Syria.*¹ There was known, namely, to the reader a *second* census of Quirinius (Acts, *l.c.*); but the one recorded at present was the *first*, which occurred under the Syrian presidency of this man.² It is true that history is at variance with this clear meaning of the words as they stand. For at the time of the birth of Jesus, according to the definite testimony of Tertullian (*c. Marc.* iv. 19), *Q. Sentius Saturninus* was governor of Syria; *Publius Sulpicius Quirinius* did not become so till about ten years later.³ But this variance does not entitle us to have recourse to explanations inconsistent with linguistic usage or with the text. Explanations of this

¹ Not: it took place *first, when*,—came to be carried out *not earlier than* when Quirinius, etc. Lichtenstein, p. 81 f., comes ultimately to this meaning. How can this be expressed by *πρώτη*? Instead of *πρώτη* Luke must have written precisely the opposite, namely, *ὑσπερ*, or *ὑσπερ δὲ ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ.* Hofmann is similarly mistaken, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 120 f.

² Quite definitely Justin also says, in agreement with Luke, that Christ was born *ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου* (*Apol.* i. 46), and even that His birth was to be seen *ἐκ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν τῶν γενομένων ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου τοῦ ὑμπερίου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ πρῶτου γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου*, *Apol.* i. 34; so that he in another erroneous manner (see Credner, *Beitr.* I. p. 230) makes the man to be Roman procurator in *Judaea*. This was *Coponius*, Joseph. *Bell.* ii. 8. 1.

³ Between these two *Quintilius Varus* had been invested with this dignity, Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 5. 2. But the position that Quirinius had not been already *governor* of Syria at an earlier date (according to Zumpt, from 4 to 1 before Christ) must be adhered to, according to all the accounts given of him by Josephus (especially *Antt.* xviii. 1. 1). Comp. Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 140 f. The words *ITERVM. SYRIAM.* of the Tiburtine inscription are of too uncertain interpretation, if the inscription applies to Quirinius, precisely to prove his two-fold *praesidium Syriae*, since we know neither what stood after *Syriam*, etc., nor whether *iterum* is to be referred forward or backward. Comp. Strauss, p. 75. What still remains of the whole damaged inscription runs thus (according to Mommsen in Bergmann):—

GEM. QVA. REDACTA. POT
AVGVSTI. POPVLIVQE. ROMANI. SENATV
SVPLICATIONES. BINAS. OB. RES. PROSP
IPSI. ORNAMENTA. TRIVMPH
PRO. CONSVL. ASIAM. PROVINCIANOP
DIVI. AVGVSTI. ITERVM. SYRIAM. ET. PH

See Bergmann, *de inscript. Latina ad P. Sulp. Quir. Cos. a 742 ut videtur refer.* 1851.

nature, which must, nevertheless, leave untouched the incorrect statement about the taxation as an *imperial* census, are (1) that of Herwart (*Chronol.* 241 f.), Bynaeus, Marek, Er. Schmid, Clericus, Keuchen, Perizonius (*de Augustæ orbis terrar. descript.*, Oxon. 1638), Ussher, Petavius, Calovius, Heumann, Storr, Süskind, and others, including Tholuck (*Glaubwürdigk. d. evang. Gesch.* p. 184), Huschke, Wieseler, who holds that *πρώτη ἡγεμ. κ.τ.λ.* means: *sooner than Quirinius was praeses.* Comp. also Bornemann, *Schol.* p. lxvi., and Ewald (*Gesch. Chr.* p. 140), who compares the Sanscrit and translates: "this taxation occurred *much earlier* (superlative) *than* when Quirinius ruled." But instead of citing passages in which, as at John i. 15, xv. 18, *πρώτος τινος*, according to the real meaning, is *sooner than some one* (Bernhardy, *ad Dionys. Perieg.* p. 770, and Eratosth. p. 122; Wesseling, *ad Herod.* ii. 2, ix. 27; Schaefer, *ad Dion. Hal.* c. v. p. 228; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 421), proofs ought to have been adduced for such a *participial* connection as in the passage before us; but certainly not Jer. xxix. 2, where *ἐξελθόντος κ.τ.λ.* is a genitive *absolute*, even apart from the fact that the use of *ὑστερον* there cannot vouch for our *πρώτη*. In a similarly erroneous manner Wieseler has adduced Soph. *Ant.* 637 f., 701 f., 703 f. Luke would have known how to express the meaning: *sooner than*, etc., simply, definitely, and accurately, by *πρὸ τοῦ ἡγεμονεῦν κ.τ.λ.* (comp. ver. 21, xii. 15; Acts xxiii. 15), or by *πρίν*, or *πρὶν ἢ*.¹ (2) The expedient of Beza, Casaubon (*Exercitatt. Antibar.* p. 126 f.), Jos. Scaliger (*de emend. temp.* 4, p. 417), Grotius, Wernsdorf (*de censu, quæm Cæs. Oct. Aug. fecit*, Viteb. 1720), Deyling (*Obs.* I. ed. 3, p. 242 f.), Nahmmacher (*de Augusto ter censum agente*, Helmst. 1758), Volborth (*de censu Quir.*, Gott. 1785), Birch (*de censu Quir.*, Havn. 1790), Sanclemente (*de vulg. acrac Dionys. emend.*, Rom. 1793), Ideler (*Handb. d. Chronol.* II. p. 394), Münter, (*Stern d. Weisen*, p. 88 ff.), Neander, Hug (*Gutacht.*), and others: that *ἡγεμονεύοντ.* is here to be taken in a wider meaning, and that Quirinius had held that first *ἀπογραφή* in

¹ "Profecto mirandum est, homines eruditissimos in ejusmodi interpretationum ludibria a praejudicatis opinionibus perductos labi," Valckenacr, p. 68.

Syria as *extraordinary commissioner* of the emperor, as to which appeal is made, partly in general to the imperial favour which Quirinius enjoyed, partly to Tac. *Ann.* iii. 48, according to which he was nearly about that time in the East with extraordinary commissions, partly to the analogy of the Gallic census held by Germanicus (Tac. *Ann.* i. 31), and so forth. This expedient would only be possible, if ἡγεμον. stood *by itself* in the passage, and not τῆς Συρίας beside it. And if ἡγεμον. were meant *proleptically*: under the *subsequent* praeses (Lardner in Bowyer, *Conject.* I. p. 120; Münter), Luke could hardly have proceeded more awkwardly than by thus *omitting* the point whereon his being understood depended (it must have been expressed in some such way as Κυρηνίου τοῦ ὕστερον ἡγεμ. τῆς Συρίας). (3) Gerlach thinks that at the time of Christ's birth Varus, indeed, was ἡγεμών of Syria, but Quirinius was placed by his side as *legatus Caesaris proconsulari potestate* for the purpose of making war upon the Homonades, and had at that time—consequently likewise as ἡγεμών—undertaken the census, which, however, he brought to no right conclusion, and only carried out subsequently under his second *praesidium*. But granted that the Tiburtine inscription (see upon that subject Gerlach, p. 25, 39 ff.), which Huschke refers to *Agrippa*, Zumpt to *Saturninus*, is rightly referred, with Sanclemente, Nipperdey, Bergmann, and Gerlach, to Quirinius, and that a twofold legatio of the latter to Asia took place: how could Luke with his simple and plain words intend to designate that complicated historical relation and leave the reader to guess it? To the latter Quirinius presented himself only as ordinary and single praeses of Syria. Compare, moreover, what is said afterwards in opposition to von Gumpach. (4) At variance with the text is the expedient of Paulus, who substantially is followed by Gersdorf, Glöckler, Krabbe, Mack (*Bericht üb. Strauss, krit. Bearb. d. Lcb. J.* p. 84 ff.), Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erf.* II. p. 54, Ebrard, Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 94 (comp. also Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigk.* p. 184 ff., and Olshausen): that the word is to be accented as ἀντή (*ipsa*): *the first recording itself took place while Quirinius*, etc.; the issuing of the edict ensued at the time of the birth

of Jesus, but *the census itself* did not occur till under Quirinius.¹ This is erroneous, as in fact ver. 3 relates the very *carrying out*² of the ἀπογράφεισθαι, and this ver. 3 ff. must be conceived as following immediately upon the edict. (5) Von Gumpach lays stress on ἐγένετο,³ whereby he regards Luke as indicating that in ver. 1 he has spoken only of the *placing on the register*, and would not have the same confounded with the actual *levying of taxation*, which was *not carried into execution until* under Quirinius. Against this it may be urged that Luke would have known how to express the *realization*, as contrasted with *what was intended*, otherwise than by the simple ἐγένετο, or that he would at least have placed this word, and that with a more precise definition (ὅντως δὲ ἐγένετο, or the like), at the head of the sentence; as well as that he, in order to have the ἀπογραφὴ recognised as something different from and later than the mere registration, must have made use of *another* word, and not again of ἀπογραφὴ so similar to the ἀπογράφεισθαι. (6) Aberle seeks by learned combination to show that even before the death of Herod Quirinius had actually become *praeses Syriae*, but that as *rector juventutis* to the emperor's grandson Caius, he was still temporarily detained in Rome by Augustus,⁴ and his governorship remained

¹ Glückler, Krabbe, Mack, and Tholuck, however, do not hold the accentuation αὐτῇ as requisite, and Köhler rejects it.

² Ebrard, p. 177, wishes to set aside this difficulty by the explanation that while an ἀπογράφεισθαι in the sense of a *registration* already occurred at the time of the birth of Jesus, Luke availed himself of the double meaning of ἀπογραφὴ, which also signifies the actual *census*, "in an *easy and unrestrained manner*" to set forth how the work *begun in the registration* was *completed in the taxation* of Quirinius. This is a makeshift, which imputes to Luke a very *enigmatical and awkward* use of the word ἀπογραφὴ.

³ So also does Köhler, who besides, with Hofmann and Ebrard, lays stress on the fact that the passage runs not as ἡ πρώτη, but simply πρώτη. Luke is thus made to say: *this taxation was completed as the first taxation*, etc.; it was, namely, *begun* doubtless, but was soon *stopped* and was only *carried out* under Quirinius. Comp. already Calvin and Gerlach above. Nothing of this appears in the text, and the article with πρώτη would make no difference at all, since, as is well known, the ordinal numbers may stand with or without an article (Poppo, *ad Thucyd.* ii. 70. 5, iv. 90. 3, Goth.).

⁴ Varus having in the meanwhile continued still to exercise the powers of governor. As well according to Gerlach as according to Aberle, Varus is held to have already, at the time of Christ's birth, filled the office of governor in

virtually unknown in the east and west, but is to be assigned to the year 749. But while there is certain attestation that he was *rector juventutis* to Caius (Tacitus, *Ann.* iii. 48), in which post he was succeeded by Lollius (see Zumpt, p. 102), there is no evidence at all for the assumption of a contemporary *praesidium Syriae*, which he must have held nominally (thus somewhat like an *episcopus in partibus*). And how should this state of things, which had remained unknown and was only noticed by jurists and notaries for the sake of the dating of documents, have become known to Luke in particular, and have been left by him without any explanation, in such a way that from his words we can only understand the *praeses Syriae* in the primary and usual sense, according to which the *praeses* resides in his province and administers the same?—It is not to be inferred, moreover, from the ignorance which Luke betrays at Acts v. 36 ff., that the addition *πρώτη* proceeds not from Luke, but from an older Jewish-Christian writer (Köstlin, p. 245); for that ignorance concerned not the census of Quirinius, but the time of the insurrection of Theudas. — *ἡγεμον*.] the general word for the post of a chief, here shown by the context (*τῆς Συρίας*) to be used of the provincial chief, *praeses* (proconsul). Comp. Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 4. 2: *Συρίας τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἔχων*. In Luke iii. 1, used of the Procurator. — *Κυρηναίου*] *P. Sulpicius Quirinius* previously in the year 742 consul, *praeses* of Syria in the years 6–11 after Christ, died in Rome in the year 21 after Christ. See Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 18 f.; Gerlach, *l.c.* His name is usually written *Quirinus*; by others (so Wetstein, Valckenaer, Ewald, Gerlach, *al.*), *Quirinius*. In the case of the Roman writers (especially Florus, iv. 12. 41; Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 30, iii. 22. 48) the manuscripts vary; from a coin and inscription, which have *Quirinus*, nothing can be decided in view of the great doubt as to their genuineness.¹ But it is certain that among the Greeks (Strabo, xii. 6, p. 569; Syria, which, moreover, Norisius, *Cenotaph. Pis.* II. p. 82 f., and others maintained. But this is at variance with Tertullian, *l.c.*, comp. c. 7, where it can only be regarded as a very arbitrary assumption that Saturninus is no longer meant as *governor*.

¹ See Gerlach, p. 37, who cites another inscription, which actually reads *Quirinio*, from Marini, *Act.* II. 782.

Josephus, Justin Martyr) the name is written with the termination *ΙΟΣ*; and, as this manner of writing is at all events decidedly correct in our passage (C D E F, etc., including *Σ*, likewise Eusebius, Chrysostom, etc.), whereas among the codices only B reads *Κυρείνου* (hence Lachmann reads *Κυρίνου*), the form *Quirinius*, which easily became confounded with the familiar Roman word Quirinus (= *Quirinalis*), is to be preferred. The confusion occurred the more easily, as *Quirinus*, *Κυρίνος* (Plutarch), or *Κυρίνος* (Leon. phil. 1) was also a Roman name. At all events, *Luke himself* had in his mind the name *Quirinius*.

REMARK.—The statement of Luke, so far as it affirms that at the time of the birth of Christ an imperial census was taken, and that it was the first that was provincially carried out by the Syrian praeses Quirinius, is manifestly incorrect. For (1) the *praesidium* of Quirinius is placed about ten years too early; and (2) an imperial census, if such an one should have been held at all at the time of the birth of Jesus (which, however, cannot from other sources be proved, for the passages of Christian authors, Cassiodorus, *Var.* iii. 52, Suidas, s.v. ἀπογραφή, plainly depend on the narrative of Luke, as also does the chronologically erroneous statement of Isidor. *Orig.* v. 36. 4), cannot have affected Palestine at all,¹ since it had not yet become a Roman province, which did not happen till 759. And, indeed, the ordaining of so abnormal and disturbing a measure in reference to Palestine—a measure, which assuredly would not be carried through without tumultuary resistance—would have been so uncommonly important for Jewish history, that Josephus would certainly not have passed it over in absolute silence (*Antt.* xvii. 1. 1 does not bear on it); especially as it was not the *rex socius* himself, Herod, but the Roman governor, who was, according to Luke (in opposition to Wieseler), the authority conducting it. But (3) the holding withal of a general census of the empire under Augustus is historically altogether unvouched for; it is a matter of history (see the *Monum. Ancyran.* in Wolf, ed. Sueton. II. p. 369 ff.; comp. Sueton. *Aug.* 27) that Augustus thrice, in 726, 746, and 767, held a *census populi*, i.e. a census of the Roman citizens, but not also of the whole provinces of the empire (see, in opposition to Huschke, Wieseler, p. 84 ff.). Should we, on the

¹ See Mommsen in *Bergm.* p. iv. B.

other hand, assume, with Wieseler, that the census had only the *provinces* in view and had been taken up in the different provinces in different years, and with the utmost indulgence to provincial peculiarities,—the object aimed at being the settling of an uniform system of taxation (comp. Savigny in the *Zeitschr. für geschichtl. Rechtswiss.* VI. p. 350),—the text of Luke would stand opposed to it. For, according to that text, (a) the *whole Roman empire is subjected to a census*; (b) this quite universal census is ordained *at once in the edict*, which, on Wieseler's hypothesis of the gradual and indulgent mode of its execution by the politic Augustus, would have been imprudent; and (c) it is represented as an *actual tax-census*, as was the well-known (according to Luke, *second*) census Quirinii, in which case the alleged indulgence is *imported*.

Nevertheless, criticism pronounces judgment on itself, when it designates the whole account as to the census as an invention of legend (Strauss; comp. Kern, *Urspr. des Evang.* p. 113 ff.; Weisse, I. p. 236), or even of Luke (B. Bauer), which is made in order to bring Mary with Joseph to Bethlehem. Comp. the frivolous opinion of Eichthal, II. p. 184 f. What a strange and disproportionate machinery for this purpose! No; *something of the nature* of a census, and that by command of the emperor, must have taken place in the Roman empire¹—a registration, as regards which it is quite an open question whether it was taken with or without a design to the future regulation of taxation, or merely had for its aim the levying of statistics. The consolidating aims of the government of Augustus, and, in reference to Palestine, the dependence of the vassal-king Herod, take away from it all historical improbability, even apart from the analogous measure—that had already preceded it—of the survey of the whole Roman empire instituted by Augustus (Frontinus in the *Auct. rei agrar.*, ed. Goes. p. 109; Aethicus Ister, *Cosmogr.*, ed. Gronov. p. 26). Further, as Quirinius was not at that time praeses, he can only have acted in this statistical measure as extraordinary commissioner, which is the less improbable, because apart from this he was then in the East by order of the emperor (see above), and because the politic Augustus very naturally as to that business put more confidence in an approved impartial commissioner than in the

¹ Possibly of the population, of the civil and military resources, of the finances, etc., as, according to Tacitus, *Ann.* i. 11, the *Breviarium totius imperii* (Sueton. *Octav.* 28, 101) of Augustus contained columns of that kind. See above on ver. 1.

reges socii themselves or in the interested proconsuls. And this action of *Quirinius* enables us to understand how tradition, in the gradual obscuring and mixing up of its recollections, should have made him *praeses Syriae* at that time, since he was so *subsequently*, and how the registration in question was made into a *census*, because *subsequently* he actually as Syrian governor¹ had charge of a census; and from this mixing up of times and matters resulted at the same time the designation of the ἀπογραφὴ as πρώτη, which occurred ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηναίου. Thus Luke has narrated what actually happened in the *erroneous form* which it received from the tradition. But if we conceive of the ἀπογραφὴ as merely a *revision of the genealogical family registers* (Schleiermacher, Olshausen, ed. 1, Bleek), which probably was ordained only by the spiritual authorities, and perhaps had reference merely to the family of David, it is no longer easy to see how Luke, or the source from which he drew, could make out of it something thoroughly and specifically different. According to Schweizer in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1847, p. 1 ff., Luke has really in the passage before us, at variance with iii. 1, made Jesus be born in the year of the taxing of Quirinius, Acts v. 37, and thus long after the death of Herod,—in spite of his own distinct statement, i. 5!—The hypotheses, moreover, that Luke intended by the enrolment of Jesus (?) in the register of the Empire to point to the *universal destination* of the Redeemer (Wieseler; comp. Erasmus, Bengel, and already Theophylact and Euthymius Zigabenus), or to the *coincidence* of the birth of the Messiah and the redemption of Israel *with the political bondage of the people* (Ebrard), or to the manner in which Jesus in His mother's womb was most surprisingly dealt with *as a Roman subject* (Hofmann), are purely arbitrary creations of that subjectivity, which has the utmost delight in discovering a mystical reference behind every simple historical statement.

Ver. 3 ff. Πάντες] in the Jewish land, for which ver. 2 has prepared, and see ver. 4. Obviously only all those are meant, who did not dwell in their *ιδία πόλις*; ἕκαστος is a

¹ Aberle, indeed, calls this in question, holding that Quirinius was at the later census merely a simple Legatus Caesaris. Although Josephus does not expressly name him ἡγεμόν, he is still, in *Antt.* xviii. 1. 1, sufficiently indicated as such. Comp. Hilgenfeld, p. 413 ff. Apart from this, the expression ἡγεμονεύοντος in the passage before us is only an erroneously anticipating reflex of that, which *subsequently* Quirinius was *in fact*, and *notoriously*, as respects his real census attended by consequences so grave.

distributive apposition (Ameis on Homer, *Od.* x. 397). — εἰς τ. ἰδίαν πόλιν] the more precise definition is furnished by ver. 4. This statement, too, does not suit a *census* proper; for to this every one was required to subject himself at his *dwelling place*, or at *the* place where he had his *forum originis* (see Huschke, p. 116 ff.), whereas in our passage the Jewish principle of *tribe* is the basis. And if the matter were not a census, but a mere registration (see above), there was no reason for departing from the time-hallowed division of the people, or for not having the matter carried out in *Jewish form*. The actual historical state of the case shines here through the traditional dress of a census. — πόλιν Δαυ.] The city where David was born, 1 Sam. xvii. 11. — Βεθλεέμ] see on Matt. ii. 1. — ἐξ οἴκου κ. πατριᾶς Δαυ.] The tribes proceeding from the sons of Jacob were called φυλαί (תִּימָנָה); the branches proceeding from the sons of these patriarchs, πατριαί (תִּימָנָה); the single families of such a tribal branch, οἴκοι (בֵּית אֲבִי). See Kypke, I. p. 213; Winer, *Realwörterb.* s.v. *Stämme*; Gesenius, *Thes.* I. p. 193, III. p. 1463. Joseph was thus of the family descending from David, and belonged to the same branch of the tribe to which David had belonged. A circumstantial designation of this important relationship. As to πατριά, moreover, see on Eph. iii. 15. — σὺν Μαριάμ] does not belong to ἀνέβη (Paulus, Hofmann, Ebrard), but to ἀπογράψ. beside which it stands: *in order to have himself enrolled with Mary*, etc. But that Mary had of necessity to share the journey with him (which was not requisite in the case of a *census*, when only the *names* of the women and children had to be specified, Dion. Hal. iv. 14; see Strauss, I. p. 235, and Huschke, p. 121, in opposition to Tholuck, p. 191) is the less to be supposed, as in the main the form of the execution of the ἀπογραφή was the *Jewish* one, ver. 3. Nevertheless, wives (in this case Mary as one *betrothed*, who according to Jewish law was placed on the same footing as the wife) had to be likewise *entered in the register*, which must have been a matter of Roman enactment, but for which it was not necessary that they should come personally with their husbands to the spot. We have consequently to

abide by the view that Mary undertook the journey with her husband *voluntarily*, according to her own and Joseph's wish, in order to remain under the protection of her betrothed (not exactly on account of the troublous times,—an idea which Ebrard imports). There are various arbitrary hypotheses, such as: that she travelled with him on account of the *poll-tax* (Huschke); that she wished still as a maiden *to represent her father's house*, and *longed* after Bethlehem in *the theocratic feeling of maternity* (Lange); that the command for the taxing extended also to the *children* and contained a *definite point of time*, just about which Mary expected her delivery (von Gumpach). And the hypothesis that Mary was an *heiress*, who had an estate in Bethlehem (Michaelis, Kuinoel, Olshausen; with hesitation Bleek and Köhler), is utterly unfounded as regards Luke in particular, since he has not the smallest trace of any earlier connection with Bethlehem and makes Mary in her travail not find even friendly lodging there. — τῇ ἐμνηστ. αὐτῷ] Thus, according to Luke, she was still only his *betrothed* (i. 27; Matt. i. 18), and the marriage was not yet completed. At variance with Matt. i. 24. A different form assumed by the tradition of the virgin birth. Evasive suggestions are resorted to by Beza, Grotius, and others, including Schegg and Bisping (that Luke expresses himself thus, because Joseph had only *conducted* himself as one betrothed towards Mary). — οὗσα ἐγκύω] not: *because* she was pregnant (von Gumpach), but: *who* was pregnant (Acts xxiv. 24; Rom. i. 16, and frequently). The observation forms the transition to what follows.

REMARK.—From Mary's sharing in the journey we are not to conclude that she likewise was of the family of David (Grotius, Kuinoel, and others). She journeyed voluntarily with Joseph *as his future wife*, and Joseph journeyed as a member of the house of David. If Luke had had in his mind the thought that Mary shared the journey as a descendant of David, he must have written, and that at the end of ver. 5, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ. But comp. on i. 36, and on Matt. i. 17, Remark 2.

Ver. 6 f. Ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν] comp. i. 57. The supposition (see as early as *Protervang. Jac.* 17)

that Mary was surprised by the pains of labour *on the way*, is set aside by the ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ. And probably she had hoped to be able to finish the journey before her delivery. "Non videtur scisse, se vi prophetiae (Mic. v. 2) debere Bethlehemi parere, sed providentia coelestis omnia gubernavit, ut ita fieret," Bengel. — That Mary was delivered *without pain and injury* is proved by Fathers and expositors, such as even Maldonatus and Estius, from the fact that she herself swaddled the child and laid it in the manger! — τὸν πρωτότοκον] See on Matt. i. 25. The evasive suggestion resorted to, that this word is used without reference to later born children, appears the more groundless in view of the agreement of Matthew and Luke. — ἐσπαργάν.] She *swaddled* him; frequently used in Greek writers. — ἐν φάτνῃ] without the article (see the critical remarks): she deposited him *in a manger*. Many, including Paulus and Kuinoel, have, contrary to linguistic usage, made of it a *stable*.¹ See, on the other hand, Gersdorf, p. 221; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 18. — ἐν τῷ καταλύματι] *in the inn* (x. 34), where they lodged—probably on account of the number of strangers who were present on the same occasion. If we should wish to understand it as: *the house of a friendly host* (for the signification of καταλύμα is generally a *place of shelter, lodging*, comp. xxii. 11), it would remain improbable that a *friendly host*, even with ever so great restriction of room, should not have made a chamber in the house available for *such* an exigency. The text suggests nothing indicative of an inhospitable treatment (Calvin).

Ver. 8 f. Ποιμένες] not οἱ ποιμένες. — ἀγραυλοῦντες] *staying out in the open fields*; Plut. *Num.* 4; Parthen. *Erot.* xxix. 1, and the ποιμένες ἀγραυλοι already in Homer, *Il.* xviii. 162. —

¹ That a *stable* (in opposition to Ebrard) was the place of the birth, follows from ἐν φάτνῃ, διότι κ. τ. λ. It is possible that the stable was a *rock-cave*, which an old legend (Justin. c. *Tryph.* 73; Orig. c. *Cels.* i. 51; *Protevang. Jac.* 18) designates as the place of the birth, not without suspicion, however, by reason of its appeal to Isa. xxxiii. 16, LXX. Moreover, that tradition transfers the cave expressly only to the *neighbourhood* of the little town, and states withal of Joseph: οὐκ ἔχιν ἐν τῇ κώμῃ ἐπιήνη τοῦ καταλύσαι, Justin, l.c. Over this grotto designated by the legend Helena built the church *Mariae de praesepio*. Comp. also Robinson, *Pal.* II. p. 284 ff.; Ritter, *Erdk.* XVI. p. 292 ff.

φυλάσσω. φυλακάς] often conjoined also among the Greek writers; Plat. *Phædr.* p. 240 E; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 6. 10, and the passages in Kypke. Comp. מִרְמָצִי מִרְמָצִי, Num. i. 53, *al.* The plural applies to the different watch-stations.—τῆς νυκτός] not belonging to φυλακάς, but: *by night*, definition of time for ἀγρῶν. and φυλάσσω.—According to this statement, Jesus cannot have been born in *December*, in the middle of the rainy season (Robinson, *Pal.* II. p. 505 f.), as has been since the fourth century supposed with a probable joining on of the festival to the *Natales solis invicti* (see Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* I. 2, p. 287 f. ed. 4). Just as little can He have been born on the sixth day of January, which in the East was even earlier fixed as the festival of the birth and baptism (still other times fixed as the day of birth may be seen in Clement Al. *Strom.* I. p. 339 f. Sylb.). According to the Rabbins, the driving forth of the flocks took place in March, the bringing in of them in November (see Lightfoot); and if this is established at least as the *usual course*, it certainly is not in favour of the hypothesis (Wieseler) that Jesus was born in *February* (750), and necessitates precarious accessory assumptions.—ἐπέστη] Comp. xxiv. 4; Acts xii. 7, xvii. 5. In the classical writers it is used also of theophanies, of appearances in dreams, and the like, frequently since Homer (*Il.* xxiii. 106, x. 496), denoting their *sudden* emergence, which nevertheless is implied not in the word in itself, but in the text.—δόξα κυρίου] הִרְאָה בְּבוֹרָה, radiance by which God is surrounded. Comp. Ewald, *ad Apoc.* p. 311. *God's* glorious radiance (comp. Acts vii. 2) had streamed down with the angel. “In omni humiliatione Christi per decoram quandam protestationem cautum est gloriæ ejus divinæ,” Bengel.

Ver. 10 ff. Παντὶ τῷ λαῷ] *to the whole* (Israelitish) people.—ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν] *that* (that, namely) *there was born to you this day*, etc. The ὑμῖν, in reference to the shepherds, is *individualizing*.—σωτήρ κ.τ.λ.] *a deliverer*—and now comes His special more precise definition: *who is Messiah, Lord!* Χριστὸς κύριος is not to be taken *together*, as it never occurs thus in the N. T.—ἐν πόλ. Δαυ.] belonging to ἐτέχθη. “Hæc periphrasis remittit pastores ad prophetiam, quæ tunc imple-

batur," Bengel. Mic. v. 2. — τὸ σημεῖον] the appointed sign of recognition.¹ — βρέφος] not: *the child* (Luther), but: *a child*. The word denotes either the still unborn child (as i. 41; Hom. *Il.* xxii. 266), or, as in this case (comp. xviii. 15; Acts vii. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 2; also as a strong expression of the thought, 2 Tim. iii. 15) and very often in the classical writers, the new-born child. — ἐσπαργ.] adjectival: *a swaddled child*, ver. 7.

Ver. 13 f. Πλήθος στρ. οὐρ.] *a multitude of the heavenly host* (מַלְאָכֵי שָׁמַיִם), a multitude of angels. The (satellite-) host of the angels surrounds God's throne, 1 Kings xxii. 19; 2 Chron. xviii. 18; Ps. ciii. 21, cxlviii. 2; Matt. xxvi. 53; Rev. xix. 14, *al.* On γίνεσθαι σύν τινι, *to be associated with any one*, comp. Xen. *Cyr.* v. 3. 8. On στρατιά, comp. Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 246 E: στρατιά θεῶν τε καὶ δαιμόνων. — δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις κ.τ.λ. According to the reading εὐδοκίας (see the critical remarks, and Nösselt, *Exercitatt.* p. 171 ff.): *Glory (is, comp. 1 Pet. iv. 11) in the heaven to God, and on earth salvation among men who are well-pleasing!* The angels declare to the praise of God (ver. 13) that on account of the birth of the Messiah God is glorified in heaven (by the angels), and that on the earth there is now salvation among men, to whom in and with the new-born child has been imparted God's good pleasure.² They thus contemplate the Messiah's work as having already set in with His birth, and celebrate it in a twofold manner in reference to heaven and earth (comp. Isa. vi. 3). Their exclamation is not a wish, as it is usually rendered by supplying ἔστω or εἴη, but far stronger, — a triumphant affirmation of the existing blessed state of things. The ἐν ἀνθρώπ. εὐδοκίας (genitive of *quality*, see Winer, p. 211 f. [E. T. 296 f.]) adds to the scene of the εἰρήνη the *subjects*,

¹ According to the notice *σήμερον*, and in view of the smallness of Bethlehem, the sign specified by *κείμενον ἐν φάτῃ* was *sufficiently certain* at once to guide inquiry to the child in the village. Olshausen, but not the text, adds to this the *secret impulse of the Spirit*, which led the shepherds to the right place.

² Olshausen (following Alberti, *Obs.*, and Tittmann, *Diss.*, Viteb. 1777) places a stop after γῆς, so that the first clause says: "God is now praised as in heaven, so also in the earth." This is erroneous, because, according to the order of the words in Luke, the emphatic point would be not ἐπὶ γῆς, as in the Lord's Prayer, but ἐν ὑψίστοις.

among whom it prevails (comp. Plat. *Symp.* p. 197 C); these, namely, are those who believe in the Messiah, designated in reference to God whose grace they possess, as *men who are well-pleasing* (to Him). Comp. *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 587: *καὶ εὐδοκήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς αὐτοῦ ἕως αἰώνων.* Observe, moreover, the correlation which exists (1) between *δόξα* and *εἰρήνη*; (2) between *ἐν ὑψίστοις* and *ἐπὶ γῆς*; and (3) between *Θεῷ* and *ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας*. By *ἐν ὑψίστοις* (*in regions, which are the highest of all*, xix. 38) the angels declare what takes place in the highest heaven, whence they have just come down. Comp. Matt. xxi. 9; Wisd. ix. 17; Ecclus. xliii. 9; Job xvi. 19; Heb. i. 3. — By *εἰρήνη* they mean not only *peace* (usually understood of the peace of reconciliation), but the entire *salvation*, of which the new-born child is the bearer; comp. i. 79. — With the *Recepta εὐδοκία*, the hymn would also consist of only *two parts*, divided by *καί*,¹ which is not *for* (Bengel, Paulus, Kuinoel, and others, comp. Theophylact), but *and*. And the second part would consist of two parallel clauses, of which the first lays down the state of things in question after a purely objective manner (*ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη*), while the second designates it from the point of view of God's subjectivity (*ἐν ἀνθρ. εὐδοκία*): *on earth is salvation, among men is* (God's) *good pleasure*; *ἐν ἀνθρ.*, namely, would not be *in the case of men* (Matt. iii. 17; so usually), but *local*, as previously *ἐν ὑψίστ.* and *ἐπὶ γῆς*. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 372, takes *εὐδοκία* as *delight*; "in genere humano (Messia nato) *voluptas est et luctitia*." But *εὐδοκία* nowhere expresses this strong idea, but only the state of well-pleased satisfaction (as Ps. cxliv. 16, LXX.), and the latter idea

¹ Nevertheless Ebrard (on Olshausen) still defends the *threefold division*. According to him, the angels exult (1) that *in heaven* honour is given to God for the redemption now brought about; (2) that *upon earth* a kingdom of peace is now founded; (3) that *between heaven and earth* the right relation is restored, that God's eye may again rest with good pleasure on mankind. This alleged third clause of necessity contains somewhat of tautology; and the text itself by its *καί* and by its contrast of heaven and earth yields only *two clauses*. Lange also, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 103, understands it in a threefold sense, but very arbitrarily takes *εὐδοκία* of the divine good pleasure manifested in a Person, referring to passages such as Eph. i. 5, 6.

would in this place be too weak; we could not but expect *χαρὰ καὶ ἀγαλλίασις*, or the like. Moreover, according to ver. 13 (*αἰνούντων τ. Θεόν*) it is more in harmony with the text to understand *εὐδοκία on the part of God*, in which case the quite usual meaning of the word (*ἐπανάπαυσις τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Theophylact) is retained; "quod sc. Deus gratuito suo favore homines dignatus sit" (Calvin). The opposite: Eph. ii. 3. Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 19 ff., considers the whole as affirmed of Christ: "*Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος δόξα ἐσται ἐν ὑψίστοις ὄντι Θεῷ κ.τ.λ.*, h. c. *Messias celebrabit in coelis Deum et in terram deduct pacem divinam, documentum* (in apposition) *benevolentiae divinae erga homines.*" But Luke himself specifies the contents as praise of God (ver. 13); and the assumption of Bornemann (after Paulus), that Luke has given only a small fragment of the hymn, is the more arbitrary, the more the few pregnant words are precisely in keeping with a heavenly song of praise.

Ver. 15 f. *Καὶ οἱ ἄνθρ.*] This *καί* is not *also*, but the simple *and* after *ἐγένετο*; see on v. 12. — *οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ποιμένες*, not: the *shepherd people* (Grotius, Paulus, and others), against which the second article is decisive (comp. Matt. xviii. 23, xxii. 2, *al.*; see Bernhardt, p. 48; Kühner, II. p. 120), but a contrast to *οἱ ἄγγελοι*, in which case, however, we must not lay upon the expression a stress which is foreign to the connection ("totum genus humanum quodammodo repraesentantes," Bengel), but rather must adhere to the simple and artless mode of representation: after the departure of the *angels the people too, the shepherds*, said, etc. — *διέλθωμεν*] through the fields as far as to Bethlehem, Acts ix. 38, xi. 19. — *δῆ]* denotes what is *definitive*, without more *ado*. See Klotz, *ad Deut.* p. 395; Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 433 f. — *τὸ ῥῆμα]* which has been said; *ὁ ὁ κύρ. ἡμ.* is an epexegetis of it. — *ἀνεῦρον]* they discovered (after previous search, in conformity with the direction at ver. 12). The word only occurs in the N. T. again at Acts xxi. 4, comp. 4 Macc. iii. 14; more frequently among Greek writers.

Ver. 17 f. *Διεγνώρισαν]* they gave exact information (*διά*). The word is only found besides in Schol. in Beck. *Anecd.*

p. 787, 15, but in the sense of accurate *distinguishing*, which it cannot have in this place (Vulg.: *cognoverunt*); comp. rather ἐγνώρισεν, ver. 15. At the birthplace to the parents and others who were present they made accurate communication of the angelic utterance addressed to them, and all who heard this communication marvelled, but Mary (ver. 19), etc. — περὶ τῶν λαληθ.] does not belong to ἀκούσαντες (Gersdorf), but to ἐθαύμ., with which indeed περί is very rarely associated elsewhere; but the thought is: they fell into amazement *in consideration of that, which*, etc. Comp. Plat. Tim. p. 80 C: τὰ θαυμαζόμενα ἡλέκτρων περὶ τῆς ἑλξεως.

Ver. 19 f. Δέ] leading over to the special thing, which Mary amidst this general amazement did — she, who, in accordance with the revelations made to her, was more deeply struck with the tidings of the shepherds, and saw matters in a deeper light. She *kept* all these utterances (τὰ ῥήματα) of the shepherds. Observe in the narrative the emphasis of πάντα, as well as the purposely chosen adumbrative tense συνετήρει (previously the aorist). On συντηρεῖν, *alta mente repositum servare*, comp. Dan. vii. 28; Ecclus. xiii. 12, xxxix. 2, xxviii. 3. — συμβάλλουσα κ.τ.λ.] The Vulgate well renders: *conferens*, inasmuch as she *put them together*, i.e. in silent heart-pondering she compared and interpreted them to herself. Comp. Plat. Crat. p. 348 A: συμβαλεῖν τὴν Κρατύλου μαντείαν, p. 412 C; Soph. Oed. C. 1472; Pind. Nem. xi. 43; Eur. Or. 1394. — ὑπέστρεψ.] to their flocks, ver. 8. — δοξάζοντες καὶ αἰνοῦντες] Glorifying and giving approval. The latter is more special than the former. — ἐπὶ πᾶσιν κ.τ.λ.] *over all things, which they had just heard and seen* in Bethlehem after such manner as was *spoken to them* by the angel at vv. 10–12.

REMARK.—To make of these angelic appearances a *natural* (phosphoric) *phenomenon*, which had first been single and then had divided itself and moved to and fro, and which the shepherds, to whom was known Mary's hope of bringing forth the Messiah, interpreted to themselves of this birth (Paulus; comp. Ammon, L. J. I. p. 203, who likewise assumes a meteor), is a decided and unworthy offence against the contents and purpose of the narrative, which is to be left in its charming, thoughtful,

and lofty simplicity as the most distinguished portion of the cycle of legend, which surrounded the birth and the early life of Jesus. The truth of the history of the shepherds and the angels lies in the sphere of the idea, not in that of historical reality, although Luke narrates it as a real event. Regarded as reality, the history loses its truth, as a premiss, with which the notorious subsequent want of knowledge and *non-recognition* of Jesus as the Messiah, as well as the absolute silence of evangelic *preaching* as to this heavenly *evangelium*, do not accord as a sequel, — apart from the fact, that it is not at all consistent with Matthew's narrative of the Magi and of the slaying of the children, which is to be explained from the circumstance that *various* wreaths of legend, altogether independent one of another, wove themselves around the divine child in His lowliness.¹ The contrast of the lowliness of Jesus and of His divine glory, which pervade His entire history on earth until His exaltation (Phil. ii. 6 ff.), is the great truth, to which here, immediately upon the birth, is given the most eminent and most exhaustive expression by the living and creative poetry of faith, in which with thoughtful aptness members of the lowly and yet patriarchally consecrated class of shepherds receive the first heavenly revelation of the Gospel outside the family circle, and so the *πρωτοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται* (vii. 22) is already even now realized.

Ver. 21. *Τοῦ περιτεμεῖν αὐτόν*] The genitive, not as at ver. 22, i. 57, ii. 6, but as genitive of the *aim*: *in order to circumcise Him*, that He might be circumcised. Comp. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 230 [E. T. 267]. — *καὶ ἐκλήθη*] *was also named*, indicating the naming as *superadded* to the rite of circumcision. See Nägelsbach, *z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 164. And the Son of God had to become *circumcised*, as *γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενος ὑπὸ νόμον*, Gal. iv. 4. This was the divine arrangement for His appearing as the God-man in necessary association

¹ In opposition to Schleiermacher, who in the case of our passage lays stress, in opposition to the mythical view, on the absence of lyrical poetry, failing to see that precisely the most exalted and purest poetry is found in the *contents* of our passage with all its simplicity of presentation; see the appropriate remarks of Strauss, I. p. 245. Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 103, in his own manner transfers the appearances to the souls of the shepherds, which were of such elevated and supramundane mood that they could discern the joy of an angelic host; and holds that the appearance of the angel and the glory of the Lord, ver. 9, point to a vision of the Angel of the Covenant.

with the people of God (Rom. ix. 5). There is much importation of the dogmatic element here among the older commentators.¹ — τὸ κληθὲν κ.τ.λ.] See i. 31. Comp. Matt. i. 21, where, however, the legend quite differently refers the giving of the name to the angel.

Ver. 22. Women after childbirth, when the child was a boy, were unclean for seven days, and had besides to stay at home thirty-three days more (at the birth of a girl these periods were doubled). Then they were bound to present in the temple an offering of purification, namely, a lamb of a year old as a burnt-offering, and a young pigeon or turtle-dove as a sin-offering; or else, if their means were too small for this, two turtle-doves or young pigeons, the one as a burnt-offering, the other as a sin-offering. See Lev. xii. 2 ff.; Lund, *Jüd. Heiligth.*, ed. Wolf, p. 751; Michaelis, *Mos. R.* § 192; Ewald, *Altenth.* p. 178 f.; Keil, *Archäol.* I. p. 296. Accordingly αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμ. αὐτῶν: *the days, which (i.e. the lapse of them) were appointed for their legal cleansing (καθαρισμός, passive, comp. ver. 14).* Mary brought the offering of the poor, ver. 24. — αὐτῶν] applies contextually (ἀνήγαγον αὐτόν) not to the *Jews* (van Hengel, *Annot.* p. 199), but to *Mary* and *Joseph*. Comp. Euthymius Zigabenus, also Bleek. The purification in itself indeed concerned only the mother; but in the case before us Joseph was, and that by means of the presentation of the first-born son associated therewith, also directly interested; hence the expression *by way of synecdoche*, which is usually referred to the mother and the child (so also by Kuinoel, Winer, de Wette). — κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μ.] applies to ἐπλήσθησαν κ.τ.λ., indicating the *legal* duration thereof. — ἀνήγαγον, like ἀναβαίνειν of the journeying to Jerusalem. — παρυστήσαι] All first-born sons were the property of Jehovah, destined to the temple-service originally and before the institution of the Levites (Num. viii. 14 ff.); hence they had to be *presented* in the temple to God as His special property,

¹ Calovius says that Christ allowed Himself to be circumcised "tum ob demonstrandam naturae humanae veritatem . . . tum ad probandam e semine Abrahae originem . . . tum imprimis ob meriti et redemptionis Christi certificationem."

but were redeemed from Him for five shekels, Ex. xiii. 2; Num. viii. 16, xviii. 15 f.; Lightfoot, p. 753; Lund, *l.c.* p. 753; Michaelis, *Mos. R.* § 227, 276; Saalschütz, *Mos. R.* p. 97.

Ver. 23. Not to be put in a parenthesis. — A very free quotation from Ex. xiii. 2. — *διανοίγον μήτραν*] *הִנָּחִי מִצְרָתָהּ*; comp. LXX. Hardly according to the passage before us has Luke conceived, with Ambrosius and many others, that Mary brought forth *clauso utero* and only voluntarily subjected herself to this law (as Bising still holds).

Ver. 24. *Καὶ τοῦ δοῦναι*] continues the narrative after the interposed sentence ver. 23: *and in order to give* an offering. — *κατὰ τὸ εἶρημ. κ.τ.λ.*] Lev. xii. 8. — *νεοσσούς*] On the later form rejected by the Atticists, *νοσσούς* (so Tischendorf), see Sturz, *Dial. Mac.* p. 185; Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 206 f.

Ver. 25 f. Who this *Simcon* was ("primus propheta, qui diceret Christum venisse," Bengel), is utterly unknown. The supposition that he was son of Hillel, and father of Gamaliel (Michaelis, Paulus, and older commentators), who became president of the Sanhedrim in A.D. 13, does not agree with vv. 26, 29, where he appears as an *aged* man; and there is generally the less ground for entertaining it, in proportion to the frequency of the name *יִשְׁמָעֵאל*. — *δίκαιος κ. εὐλαβής*] Comp. Plat. *Polit.* p. 311 B: *τὸ δίκαιον κ. εὐλαβές*, and shortly before: *ἦθ' εὐλαβὴ καὶ δίκαια*. The word *εὐλαβής* is only used in the N. T. by Luke. It denotes religious conscientiousness.¹ — *παράκλησιν*] The Messianic *blessing* of the nation, as its practical *consolation* after its sufferings (comp. *λίτρωσιν*, ver. 38), is called, according to prophetic precedent (Isa. xl. 1), in the Rabbinical literature also very often *נחמה*. See Vitranga, *Obs.* V. p. 83; Lightfoot and Wetstein *in loc.* The Messiah Himself: *משיח*. See Schöttgen, *Hor.* II. p. 18. The same in substance is: *προσδεχόμε. τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Mark xv. 43. — *ἐπ' αὐτόν*] having come upon. — *κεχηρηματισμ.*] a divine *responsum*, see on Matt. ii. 12. There is no hint of a *dream* (Kuinoel). — *πρὶν ἢ*] See on Matt. i. 18. — *τὸν Χριστὸν κυρίου*] comp. ix. 20: *the Messiah of God* (whom God has destined and sent as Messiah). — For

¹ Comp. Delitzsch on Heb. v. 7 f., p. 191.

the expression *to see death*, comp. Heb. xi. 5 ; John viii. 51 ; Ps. lxxxix. 48. On the classical use of ὁρᾶν in the sense of *experiundo cognoscere*, Dorvill. *ad Char.* p. 483 ; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VII. p. 108.

Ver. 27 f. Ἐν τῷ πνεύματι] *by virtue of the Holy Spirit*, "instigante Spiritu," Grotius ; comp. Matt. xxii. 43. — The expression τοὺς γονεῖς (procreators) is not appropriate to the *bodily* Sonship of God, which Luke narrates, and it betrays an original source resting on a different view. Comp. ver. 41. On the *form* γονεῖς, see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 69. — κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου] According to the custom prescribed by the law. — καὶ αὐτός] *also on His part*, for the *parents* had just carried Him in, ver. 27. The reference to the *priest*, "qui eum Domino sistendum amplexus erat" (Wolf ; Kuinoel also mixes up this), is erroneous, since it is *in the bringing in* that the child is also taken into his arms by Simeon. — Simeon has *recognised the Messiah-child immediately through the Spirit*. He needed not for this "the august form of the mother" (in opposition to Lange).

Ver. 29 ff. *Now* (after I have seen the Messiah, vv. 26, 30) *Thou lettest Thy servant depart, O Ruler, according to Thine utterance* (ver. 2), *in bliss* (so that he is happy, see on Mark v. 34) ; now the time is come, when Thou lettest me die blessed.¹ — ἀπολύεις] *present*, of that which is nearly an^d certainly impending. There is no need to supply τοῦ ζῆν, or ἐκ τῆς γῆς, or the like (as is usually done), as the absolute ἀπολύειν is at all events used (comp. Soph. *Ant.* 1254 ; Gen. xv. 2 ; Num. xx. 29 ; Tob. iii. 6), but Simeon conceives of his death figuratively as an *emfranchisement from service*, as is signified by the context in τ. δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα. The servant of God *dies* and is thereby *released* from his service. — εἶδον prefixed with emphasis, in retrospective reference to ver. 26. — τὸ σωτήριόν σου] *the deliverance bestowed by Thee*, the Messianic deliverance, which has begun with the birth of the Messiah. Comp. iii. 6 ; Acts xxviii. 28. — κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντ. τ. λαῶν] *in the face of all peoples*, so that this deliverance is set forth

¹ Euthymius Zigabenus well remarks : μηκέτι λυπούσινον ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

before all peoples, is visible and manifest to them. Comp. on *κατὰ πρόσωπ.*, Jacobs, *ad Ach. Tat.* iii. 1, p. 612. The prophet sees the *σωτήριον* already in its *unfolded manifestation to all*. This is then, in ver. 32, further specially characterized as respects the two portions of the *πάντων τῶν λαῶν*, in which *φῶς* and *δόξαν* are appositional definitions to *τὸ σωτήριόν σου*: *light, which is destined to bring revelation to the heathen, and glory of Thy people Israel*. The progression of the climax lies in *φῶς* and *δόξα*. For the heathen the *σωτήριον* is *light*, when, namely, they come in accordance with the time-hallowed promise (Isa. ii. 2 ff., xi. 10, xlv. 5, lx. 1 ff., and many other passages), and subject themselves to the Messianic theocracy, whereby they become enlightened and sharers in the unveiling of the divine truth. For the people Israel the *σωτήριον* is *glory*, because in the manifestation and ministry of the Messiah the people of God attains the glory, through which it is destined to be distinguished above all peoples as the seat and possessor of salvation. *Δόξαν* might be included as still dependent on *εἰς* (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Luther, Bleek, and others), but by taking it independently, the great destination of the *σωτήριον* for the people of Israel is brought into more forcible prominence. — Ver. 33. *And there was* (on the singular *ἦν* and the plural participles that follow, see Kühner, § 433, 1; comp. Matt. xvii. 3) *His father and His mother in amazement*, etc. In this there is no inconsistency with the earlier angelic revelations (Strauss). The thing was great enough *in itself*, and they learned it here in *another* form of revelation, the *prophetic*.

Ver. 34. *Αὐτούς*] the parents, ver. 33. — After he has blessed them (has in prayer promised them God's grace and salvation), he again specially addresses the *mother*, whose marvellous relation to the new-born infant he has, according to Luke, recognised *ἐν πνεύματι*. — *κεῖται*] *He is placed there*, i.e. *He has the destination*, see on Phil. i. 16. — *εἰς πᾶσιν κ.τ.λ.*] designates, in reference to Isa. viii. 14 (comp. Matt. xxi. 22, 44; Acts iv. 11; Rom. ix. 33; 1 Pet. ii. 6), the *moral judgment* (John iii. 19 ff.), which is to set in by means of the appearance and the ministry of the Messiah. Accord-

ing to divine decree many must take offence at Him and *fall*—namely, through unbelief—into obduracy and moral ruin; many others must *arise*, inasmuch as they raise themselves—namely, through faith in Him—to true spiritual life. The fulfilment of both is abundantly attested in the evangelic history; as, for example, in the case of the Pharisees and scribes the *falling*, in that of the publicans and sinners the *rising*, in that of Paul *both*; comp. Rom. xi. 11 ff. — καὶ εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμεν.] What was previously affirmed was His destination *for others*; now follows the *special personal* experience, which is destined for Him. His manifestation is to be a *sign*, a marvellous token (signal) of the divine counsel, which *experiences contradiction* from the world (see on Rom. x. 21). The fulfilment of this prediction attained its culmination in the crucifixion; hence ver. 35. Comp. Heb. xii. 3. But it continues onward even to the last day, 1 Cor. xv. 25.

Ver. 35. Since the construction does not indicate that καὶ . . . ῥομφαία is to be made a parenthesis, and since the importance of this prophetic intimation in the address directed to Mary is not in keeping with a mere intercalation, ὅπως κ.τ.λ. is to be referred to καὶ . . . ῥομφαία, not to σημεῖον ἀντιλεγ. (Kuinoel, de Wette, Ewald, and many others). — καὶ σοῦ δέ.] See on i. 76. This καί and αὐτῆς places the anguish *of the mother herself* on a parallel with the fate *of her Son* intimated by σημεῖον ἀντιλεγ.; and σοῦ δὲ αὐτῆς is a bringing of the contrast into stronger relief than σεαυτῆς δέ. See Schaefer, *ad Dem. de Cor.* 319, 6. — ῥομφαίαν δὲ ὠνόμασε (not the martyr-death of Mary, as Epiphanius and Lightfoot hold, but) τὴν τμητικωτάτην καὶ ὀξεῖαν ὀδύνην,¹ ἥτις διῆλθε τὴν καρδίαν τῆς θεομήτορος, ὅτε ὁ υἱὸς αὐτῆς προσηλώθη τῷ σταυρῷ, Euthymius Zigabenus. Similar figurative designations of pain may be seen in Wetstein. Bleek is mistaken in referring it to *doubts of the Messiahship of her Son*, which for a while were to cause division in Mary's heart. For this thought the forcible expression would be quite out of proportion, and, moreover, unintelligible; and the thought itself would be much too special and subordinate, even apart from the consideration that there is no

¹ Comp. Hom. *Il.* xix. 125 : τὸν δ' ἄχος ἐξὺ κατὰ φρίκα τέψι βαλίσαν.

direct evidence before us of *temporary* unbelief on the part of Mary (at the most, Mark iii. 21). — ὅπως κ.τ.λ.] a divine aim, which is to be attained by οὗτος κεῖται . . . ῥομφαία; a great crisis in the spiritual world is to be brought to light, John ix. 39, iii. 19, v. 22; 1 Cor. i. 23 f.; 2 Cor. ii. 15. The conditional ἄν expresses: in order that, *when that which is just predicted to thee sets in*. — ἐκ πολλ. καρδ.] *forth from many hearts*. Comp. Rom. i. 17. — διαλογισμοί] not οἱ διαλογ.; *thoughts*, consequently what is otherwise hidden. The revealing itself takes place through declared belief or unbelief in Him who is put to death.

Ver. 36 ff. Ἦν] *adcrat*, as at Mark viii. 1, xv. 40; also 1 Cor. xiv. 48. — After αὕτη, ver. 36, the copula ἦν is not unnecessarily to be supplied, in which case (so usually, as also by Lachmann and Tischendorf) a point is placed after ver. 37; but this αὕτη is the subject to which ἀνθωμολογεῖτο belongs as verb, so that all that intervenes contains accompanying definitions of the subject, namely thus: *This one, being advanced in great age, after she had lived with a husband seven years from her virginity, she too a widow up to eighty-four years, who departed not from the temple, with fastings and prayers rendering service to God night and day and having come forward at that same hour, offered praise to the Lord, etc.* Observe as to this— (1) that ζήσασα . . . αὐτῆς, ver. 36, is subordinate to the προβεβηκ. ἐν ἡμ. πολλ.; (2) that at ver. 37 there is to be written, with Tischendorf and Ewald, καὶ αὐτή (not as usually, καὶ αὕτη), so that the definition καὶ αὐτὴ χήρα . . . ἐπιστᾶσα, vv. 37, 38, contains a further description of the woman *co-ordinated* with the προβεβηκ. ἐν ἡμ. πολλ.; (3) that καὶ αὐτὴ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐπιστᾶσα (see the critical remarks) without any separation links itself on continuously to the preceding participial definition; finally, (4) that καὶ αὐτή, ver. 37, *she too*, places Anna on a parallel with Simeon; as the latter had come forward a pious aged man, so *she also* a pious aged woman. — προφήτης] Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 244 A; Eur. *Ion.* 42, 321; LXX. Ex. xv. 20; Isa. viii. 3, *al.* Hebrew נְבִיאָה, *an interpretrcss of God*, a woman with the gift of *apocalyptic discourse*, Rev. ii. 20; Acts xxi. 9, ii. 17. She makes use of this gift, ver. 38. — ἐπτά]

consequently a *brief* and (ἀπὸ τ. παρθεν. αὐτ.) her *only* marriage, after which she remained in widowhood, which among the ancients was accounted very honourable. See Grotius and Wetstein on 1 Tim. iii. 2, v. 9.

Ver. 37. "Εως (see the critical remarks) ἐτ. ὀγδοήκ.: *even to eighty-four years*, she had come even to this age of life in her widowhood. Comp. Matt. xviii. 21 f. Rettig is mistaken in his judgment upon ἕως in the *Stuhl. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 221. Comp. Dem. 262, 5. — οὐκ ἀφίστατο κ.τ.λ.] a popular description of *unremitting* zeal (comp. Hom. *Od.* ii. 345, *Il.* xxiv. 72) in the public worship of God. Comp. xxiv. 53. — νύκτα κ. ἡμέρ.] Thus also at Acts xxvi. 7; Mark iv. 28; 1 Tim. v. 5. Elsewhere the order is inverted. Instances of both arrangements may be seen in Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 27; Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 62 f., and from the Latin: Heindorf on *Horat. Sat.* i. 1. 77. In this place νύκτα is *prefixed* in order, as in Acts, *i.e.*, and 1 Tim. v. 5, to make the *fervecy of the pious temple-service* the more prominent. The case is otherwise, where it is simply a question of definition of time, at Esth. iv. 15.

Ver. 38. Αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ] in which occurred the previously described scene with Simeon. — ἐπιστάσα] *having made her appearance*, namely, to speak. Comp. Aeschin. p. 65, 5; Xen. *Anab.* v. 8. 9, *Sympos.* ii. 7. The suddenness and unexpectedness in the demeanour of the aged widow is implied also here (comp. on ver. 9) in the context. On ἀνθομολογεῖσθαι (comp. LXX. Ps. lxxix. 13; 3 Macc. vi. 33), in the case of which ἀντί "referendi reprehendendique sensum habet," see Winer, *de verbos. compos. usu*, III. p. 18 ff. The *tenor* of her utterance of praise to God (τᾷ κυρίῳ) is after what was related of Simeon obvious of itself, and is therefore not more precisely specified. — περὶ αὐτοῦ] ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ λυτρωτής, Euthymius Zigabenus. *Jesus* is the subject still present, as a matter of course, in the conception of the narrator (from ver. 34 f. onwards), although not mentioned in the context (Winer, p. 132 [E. T. 180 f.]). — τοῖς προσδεχομ. λύτρωσιν] Comp. ver. 25. With the reading Ἱερουσα. *without ἐν* (see the critical remarks), *deliverance of Jerusalem* is not essentially

distinct from *παράκλησις τοῦ Ἰσρ.*, ver. 25, comp. i. 68, since Jerusalem is the theocratic central seat of God's people. Comp. Isa. xl. 2. We may add, the *ἐλάλει κ.τ.λ.* took place on her part likewise *αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ*, namely, after she had presented her praise to God. The pious ones waiting for the Messiah are with her in the temple, and to them all she makes communication about the child that is present. But this is not to be conceived of as a *public utterance*, for which the limitation *τοῖς προσδεχ.* would not be appropriate.

Ver. 39. *Ναζαρέτ*] therefore not in the first instance again to Bethlehem. Of the Magi, of the slaughter of the children, of the flight to Egypt, Luke has nothing. They belong to quite another cycle of legend, which he has not followed. Reconciliation is impossible; a preference for Luke, however, at the expense of Matthew (Schleiermacher, Schneckenburger, Sieffert, and others), is at least in so far well founded, as Bethlehem was not, as Matthew reports (see on Matt. ii. 23, Rem.), the original dwelling-place of the parents of Jesus, but became the birth-place of the latter on occasion of the *ἀπογραφή*. If Bethlehem had been the original dwelling-place, it was natural, considering the Davidico-Messianic tendency of the legend, that no change should be made under these circumstances. But, in opposition to the bold assumption of the more recent exponents of the mythical theory,¹ that Jesus was born in Nazareth, so that both the earlier residence of the parents at Bethlehem (Matthew) and their journey thither (Luke) are held to be the work of tradition on the basis of Mic. v. 1 (but only Matthew bases his statement upon this prophecy!), see on Matt. *l.c.* Even de Wette finds this probable, especially on account of John vii. 42, comp. i. 46 ff., where John adds no correction of the popular view. But to infer from this that John knew nothing of the birth in Bethlehem is unwarranted, since the tradition of Matthew and Luke,

¹ See also Weiss, *Evangelienfr.* p. 181 f., who holds that the reference to the Lord's place of birth by the name of *Bethlehem* is to be understood *πνευματικῶς*. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 56 f., leaves the birth-place altogether doubtful; holding that the question is wholly indifferent for our faith, which remark, however, is inappropriate on account of the prophetic promise.

agreeing in *this* very particular, certainly suggests the presumption that the birth at Bethlehem was generally known among the Christians and was believed, so that there was not at all any need for a correcting remark on the part of John.

REMARK.—As the presentation of Jesus in the temple bears of itself in its legal aspect the stamp of history, so what occurred with Simeon and Anna cannot in its general outlines be reasonably relegated to the domain of myth (see, in opposition to Strauss and B. Bauer, Ebrard, p. 225 ff.), although it remains doubtful whether the prophetic glance of the seers (to whose help Paulus comes by suggesting, in spite of the remark at ver. 33, communications on the part of Mary; and Hofmann, p. 276, by the hypothesis of acquaintance with the history of the birth) expressed itself so definitely as the account about Simeon purports. The hypothesis that Luke received his information from Anna's mouth (Schleiermacher, Neander) hangs on ver. 36 f., where Anna is so accurately described, and consequently on so weak a thread, that it breaks down at once when we take into account the lesser degree of vividness and fulness of detail in the narrative of what Anna did.

Ver. 40. Similar to i. 80, but more distinctive and more characteristic, in keeping with the human development of the *Son of God*, who was to grow up to be the organ of *truth* and *grace*. Comp. ver. 52. — πληρούμ. σοφ.] the internal state of things accompanying the ἐκραταιοῦτο; He became a *vigorous* child (ἐκρατ.¹), while at the same time He became *filled*, etc. — χάρις Θεοῦ] not to be taken of distinguished *bodily gracefulness* (Raphel, Wolf, Wetstein), but as: the *favour of God*, which was *directed* upon Him. Comp. ver. 52. Οὐ ἐπ' αὐτό, comp. Acts iv. 33.

Ver. 41 f. Τῇ ἑορτῇ] Dative of *time*. Comp. Winer, p. 195, 193 [E. T. 273, 269]. The three great festivals (Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles) were according to the Mosaic law to be celebrated, although with the gradual dispersion of the people this could not strictly be adhered to, by every male Israelite at the national sanctuary,—an excellent means of

¹ Cyril of Alexandria says: σωματικῶς γὰρ πύξαι καὶ ἰκραταιοῦτο, τῶν μιλῶν συναδρνομένων τῇ αὐξήσει. Observe that in our passage πνεύματι is not added as at i. 80; the *mental* development follows in πληρ. σοφ.

maintaining and elevating the common theocratic spirit; Ex. xxiii. 14 ff., xxxiv. 23; Deut. xvi. 16. See Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 406 ff.; Saalschütz, *M. R.* p. 421 ff. The annual *passover-journey* was shared also by Mary, doubtless independently of Hillel's precept to that effect (*Tanchuma*, f. 33, 4), and in virtue of her piety (comp. 1 Sam. i. 7; *Mechilta*, f. 17, 2). As to the *Passover*, see on Matt. xxvi. 2. — δάδεκα] At this age in the case of the boy, who now was called בן התורה, began the instruction in the law, the accustoming to worship, fasting, and the like, see Lightfoot, p. 739; Wetstein.

Ver. 43 f. Τὰς ἡμέρας] the well-known seven days of festival, Ex. xii. 15; Lev. xxiii. 6 f.; Deut. xvi. 2. — How it happened that the parents knew nothing of the staying behind of their son, is not expressly narrated by Luke. The charge, however, of negligent *carelessness* (Schuderoff in the *Magaz. von Festpred.* III. p. 63 ff., and in his *Jahrb.* X. 1, p. 7 ff.; Olshausen) is unwarranted, as νομίσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ συνοδίᾳ εἶναι presupposes a circumstance unknown to us, which might justify that want of knowledge. In the case of Jesus it was an irresistible impulse towards the things of God, which carried Him away to postpone His parents to the satisfaction of this instinct, mightily stimulated as it was on this His first sojourn in Jerusalem,—a momentary premature breaking forth of that, which was the principle decidedly expressed and followed out by Him in manhood (Mark iii. 32 f.). — συνοδία] *company sharing the journey*. See Kypke, I. p. 220 f. The inhabitants of one or more places together formed a *caravan*; Strabo uses the word also of such a company (iv. p. 204, xi. p. 528). — ἀνεξήτουν] when they assembled together to pass the night.

Ver. 45 f. Ζητοῦντες] *present* participle: "ubi res aliqua nondum quidem peragitur, sed tamen aut revera aut cogitatione instituitur paraturve," Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 3. 16. Comp. Dissen, *ad Pind. Ol.* vii. 14, p. 81. — μεθ' ἡμέρας τρεῖς] is reckoned, in most accordance with the text, from the point at which the search meant by ζητ. αὐτοῦ began, consequently from their return to Jerusalem, the day of this return being counted as the first, and that of the finding as the third. Comp. the designation of the time of Christ's resurrection as "after three days."

Others explain it otherwise. "Grotius: Diem unum iter fecerant, altero remensi erant iter, tertio demum quaesitum inveniunt." So also Paulus, Bleek, and others, following Euthymius Zigabenus. — ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ] We are to think of the *synagogue*, which "erat prope atrium in monte templi," *Gloss. Joma*, f. 68, 2; Lightfoot *in loc.*; Deyling, *Obs.* III. ed. 2, p. 285 f. — καθέζομενον] The Rabbinic assertion: "a diebus Mosis ad Rabban Gamalielem non didicerunt legem nisi *stantes*," *Megillah*, f. 21, 1 (Wagenseil, *ad Sotah*, p. 993), according to which Jesus would thus already appear as a teacher, is rightly rejected as unfounded in the N. T., by Vitranga, *Synag.* p. 167, and more recent expositors. — ἐν μέσῳ] has its reference to the *seeking* of the parents; Jesus was not hidden, but He sat there *in the midst among the teachers*. We may conceive of Him at the feet of a teaching Rabbi, sitting in their circle (comp. on Acts xxii. 3). In this there is nothing extraordinary to be discerned,¹ since Jesus was already a "*son of the law*" (see on ver. 42). But to find here a sitting *on an equality* with the teachers² (Strauss, comp. de Wette) is not in accordance with the text, since the report would not otherwise have limited the action of the child to the ἀκούειν and ἐπερωτ. — ἐπερωτ. αὐτούς] The Rabbinical instruction did not consist merely in teaching and interrogating the disciples, but these latter themselves also asked questions and received answers. See Lightfoot, p. 742 ff.; Wetstein *in loc.* The questioning here is that of the pure and holy desire for knowledge, not that of a guest mingling in the conversation (in opposition to de Wette).

Ver. 47 ff. Ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει καὶ κ.τ.λ.] *over* His understanding in general, and especially over His answers. — ἰδόντες] Joseph and Mary. They *were astonished*; for they had not expected

¹ Lange, II. 1, p. 130, invents the idea that "the genius of the new humanity soared above the heroes of the old decorum."

² So also older dogmatic writers. "Cui doctor doctorum," says Calovius, who specifies the fourfold aim: ob *gloriae templi posterioris illustrationem*, Hag. ii. 10; ob *adventus sui manifestationem*; ob *sapientiae divinae demonstrationem*; ob *doctorum informationem*.—Into what *apocryphal* forms the conversation of Jesus with the doctors might be fashioned, may be seen in the *Evang. infant.* 50 ff. Even by Chemnitz He is said to have discoursed already "*de persona et officiis Messiae, de discrimine legis et evangelii*," etc.

to find Him either *in this place*, or *so occupied*. — ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ] not merely because maternal feeling is in general more keen, quick, and ready to show itself, nor yet because Joseph had not been equal to this scene (Lange), but rightly in accordance with Luke's view of the maternal relation of Mary. Bengel: "non loquebatur Josephus; *major erat necessitudo matris*." — τί ὅτι] *wherefore?* See on Mark ii. 16. — ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου] *i.e. in the house of my Father*. See examples of this well-known mode of expression in Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 100. So, following Syr. and the Fathers, most modern commentators. Others, such as Castalio, Erasmus, Calvin, Maldonatus, Jansen, Wolf, Loesner, Valckenaer, Rosenmüller, Bornemann, de Wette, Ewald, *al.*: *in the affairs of my Father*. This also is linguistically correct. See 1 Tim. iv. 15; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 29; Bernhardt, p. 210; Schaefer, *Melct.* p. 31 f. But as Jesus in His reply refers expressly to the *search* of the parents, which He represents as having been made *needlessly*, it is most natural to find in this answer the designation of the *locality*, in which they ought to have known that He was to be found, without seeking Him in *rebus Patris*. He might also be *elsewhere*. To combine both modes of taking it (Olshausen, Bleek) is *a priori* inappropriate. — δεῖ] as *Son*. This follows from τοῦ πατρὸς μου. This breaking forth of the consciousness of Divine Sonship¹ in the first saying which is preserved to us from Jesus, is to be explained by the power of the impressions which He experienced on His first participation in the holy observances of the festival and the temple. According to ver. 50, it must not have previously asserted itself thus amidst the quiet course of His domestic development ("non multum antea, nec tamen nihil, de Patre locutus erat," Bengel on ver. 50), but now there had emerged with Him an *epoch* in the course of development of that consciousness of Sonship,—the first bursting open of the swelling bud. Altogether foreign to the ingenuous, child-like utterance, unnatural and indeli-

¹ At all events already in Messianic presentiment, yet not with the conception fully unfolded, but in the dawning apprehension of the child, which could only very gradually give place to clearness, ver. 52.

cate, is the intention of drawing a contrast which has been imputed to Him: τῆς γὰρ παρθένου τὸν Ἰωσήφ πατέρα εἰπούσης αὐτοῦ, ἐκεῖνος φησὶν οὐκ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀληθὴς μου πατήρ, ἡ γὰρ ἂν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ἦμην, ἀλλ' ὁ Θεὸς ἐστὶ μου πατήρ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ εἰμί, Theophylact. Erroneous in an opposite manner is the opinion of Schenkel, that the boy Jesus named God His Father, "*just as every pious Jewish child might do.*" Such a conclusion could only be arrived at, if He had said τ. πατὴρς ἡμῶν; but with Jesus in the connection of His entire history τ. πατὴρς μου points to a higher individual relation. And *this* too it was, which made the answer unintelligible to the parents. What every pious Jewish child might have answered, they would have understood. See, besides, Keim, *geschichtl. Chr.* p. 48 f.

Ver. 50 f. If the angelic announcement, i. 26 ff., especially vv. 32, 35, and ii. 10 ff. (comp. especially ver. 19), be historical, it is altogether incomprehensible how the words of Jesus could be unintelligible to His parents. Evasive explanations are given by Olshausen, and even Bleek and older expositors (that they had simply not understood the deeper meaning of the unity of the Son and the Father), Ebrard (that Mary had no inner perception of the fact that the Father's word could become so *absolutely exclusive* a comfort of souls, and be so even in the boy), and others. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 78, gives a candid judgment. — ὑποτασσόμ. αὐτοῖς] That mighty exaltation of the consciousness of divine Sonship not only did not hinder, but conditioned with moral necessity in the youthful development of the God-man *the fulfilment of filial duty*, the highest proof of which was subsequently given by the *Crucified One*, John xix. 26 ff. — ἡ δὲ μήτηρ κ.τ.λ.] significant as in ver. 19; διατηρεῖν denotes the careful preservation. Comp. Acts xv. 29; Gen. xxxvii. 11.

REMARK.—The rejection of this significant history as a myth (Gabler in *Neuest. theol. Journ.* III. 1, 36 ff.; Strauss, Weisse,¹

¹ Weisse interprets it *allegorically*: that the youthful spirit of Christianity withdrew itself from the care and the supervision of its parents, i.e. from the restrictions of Jewish law and from the wisdom of the ancestral schools, etc.

I. p. 212 ff.), as regards which the analogies of the childhood of Moses (Joseph. *Antt.* ii. 9. 6; Philo, *de vita Mos.* II. p. 83 f.) and of Samuel (1 Sam. iii.; Joseph. *Antt.* v. 10. 4) have been made use of, is the less to be acquiesced in, in proportion to the greatness of the impression that must naturally have been made on the Son of God, in the human development of His consciousness of fellowship with God, at His first taking part in the celebration of the festival in the grand sanctuary of the nation,¹ and in proportion to the unadorned simplicity of the narrative and its internal truth as contrasted with the fabulous disfigurements of it in the apocryphal *Evangelium infantiae*, and even with the previous portions of the history of Luke himself. Comp. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 80 f. The objection of an unnatural mental precocity applies an unwarranted standard in the case of Jesus, who was κατὰ πνεῦμα God's Son.

Ver. 52. Comp. 1 Sam. ii. 26. — ἡλικία] not *age* (so Vulgate, Luther, Erasmus, and most expositors), which would furnish an intimation altogether superfluous, but *growth, bodily size* (Beza, Vatablus, Grotius, Er. Schmid, Bengel, Ewald, Bleek, and others). See on Matt. vi. 27; Luke xix. 3. Comp. ἤϋξανε καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο, ver. 40. "Justam proceritatem nactus est ac decoram," Bengel. Luke expresses His *mental* (σοφία) and *bodily* (ἡλικία) development.² In favour of this explanation we have also the evidence of 1 Sam. *l.c.*: ἐπορεύετο μεγαλυνόμενον, which element is here given by ἡλικία. — χάριτι] *gracious favour*, as at ver. 40. But here, where one twelve years old is spoken of, who now the longer He lives comes more into intercourse with others, Luke adds καὶ ἀνθρώποις. Comp. 1 Sam. *l.c.*: וַיִּשְׁׁנָה־עִם־יְהוָה וַיִּהְיֶה־עִם־יְהוָה וַיִּבֹרֶךְ; *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 528. Observe, moreover, that the *advancing* in God's gracious favour assumes the sinless perfection of Jesus as *growing*, as in the way of *moral development*. Comp. on Mark

¹ Comp. Beyschlag, *Christol. d. N. T.* p. 45.

² In this place he prefixes σοφία, because he has just related so brilliant a trait of the mental development of Jesus. — What shifts, moreover, have been resorted to, especially since the time of Athanasius and Ambrose, to fence with reservations the *progress* of Jesus in wisdom in such a way as to leave no progress, but merely a successive *revealing* of His inherent wisdom, or else only a growth in the wisdom to be attained *through human experience* (scientia acquisita)!

x. 18. But this does not exclude child-like innocence, and does not include youthful moral perplexities. Comp. Keim, *geschichtl. Chr.* p. 110 ff. It is a *normal* growth, from child-like innocence to full holiness of the life. Comp. also Bey-schlag, *Christol. d. N. T.* p. 47 ff.

END OF VOL. I.