more than once: it was the burden of to be an  
John’s exhortations to him.

**20.] kept him safe**, or **preserved him**; not, as in  
A.V. *observed him*, or *‘esteemed him highly*’:—kept   
him in safety that he  
should not be killed by Herodias. Whether  
Herod heard him only at such times as  
he happened to be at Machaerus, or took  
him also to his residence at Tiberias, is  
uncertain.

**21.]** **a convenient day,** not, a *festal*   
day, as Hammond and others  
interpret it,—but, a day suitable for the  
of Herodias: which shews that  
the dance, &c. *had been all previously  
contrived by her*.

**30—44.]** FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND.   
Matt. xiv.13–21. Luke ix.10–17.  
John vi.1–13. This is one of the very few  
points of comparison between the *four*  
*Gospels* during the ministry of our Lord.  
And here again I believe St. Mark’s report  
to be an original one, and of the *very  
highest* authority. Professor Bleek believed  
that Mark has *used the Gospel of John*  
—on account of the 200 denarii in our  
ver. 37 and John, ver. 7: and that he   
generally compiles his narrative from Matthew  
and Luke, which has been elsewhere shewed  
to be utterly untenable. I believe St. Mark’s  
to be an *original full account*; St.   
Matthew’s a compendium of *this same account*,  
but drawn up independently of St. Mark’s:  
—St. Luke’s a compendium of *another ac-  
count*:—St. John’s an *independent narrative  
of his own as eye-witness*.

**30.]** Mentioned by Luke, *not* by Matthew.

**31—34.**] One of the most affecting descriptions in the  
Gospels, and in this form peculiar to Mark.  
St. Matthew has a brief compendium of it.  
Every word and clause is full of the rich  
recollections of one who saw, and felt the  
whole. Are we mistaken in tracing the