unexpressed: see next verse. The **leaven of Herod**  
here seems to answer to the  
*leaven of the Sadducees* in Matthew. But  
we must not infer from this that Herod  
was a Sadducee. He certainly was a bad  
and irreligious man, which would be quite  
enough ground for such a caution. We  
have a specimen of the morals of his court  
in the history of John the Baptist’s   
martyrdom. In the *last* **not yet**, ver. 21, Meyer  
sees a *new* climax, and refers the *not yet*  
to the moment even after the reminiscence  
of vv. 18–20. It doubtless be so,  
and the idea would well accord with the  
graphic precision of St. Mark.

**22-26.]** HEALING OF A BLIND MAN  
AT BETHSAIDA. Peculiar to Mark. This  
appears to have been Bethsaida Julias, on  
the N.E. side of the lake. Compare ver.  
13. See however against the idea that  
there were two Bethsaidas, “The Land  
and the Book,”’ pp. 373, f.

**23.]** The leading of this blind man out of the town  
appears as if it had been from *some local  
reason*. In ver. 26 we find him forbidden  
expressly to enter into or tell it *in* the  
*town*, and with a repetition of **town**, which  
looks as if the place had been somehow  
unworthy of such a work being done there.  
(This is a serious objection against Meyer’s  
reason, that the *use of spittle* on both occasions  
occasioned the same privacy here and in ch. vii 33.)  
Or we may perhaps  
find the reason in our Lord’s *immediate*  
*departure* to such a distance (ver. 27);  
and say, that He did not wish multitudes  
to gather about and follow Him.

**when he had spit on his eyes, and put his  
hands upon him...** see above on ch. vii. 33.

We cannot say what may hare  
induced our Lord to form this miracle   
*at twice*—certainly not the reason assigned  
by Dr. Burton, “that a blind man would  
not, on suddenly recovering his sight, know  
one object from another, because he had  
never seen them before,” and so would  
require a double miracle;—a second to  
open the eyes of *his mind also*, to   
comprehend what he saw. This assumes the man  
to have been *born* blind, which he was not  
from ver. 24; for how should he know  
*how trees appeared?* and besides, the case  
of the man born blind in John ix. required  
no such double healing. These things  
were *in the Lord’s power*, and He  
them as He pl from present   
circumstances, or for our instruction.

**24.]** **I see men, for I see them walking «5  
trees;** i.e. not distinct in individual   
peculiarity, but **as trees in the hedge-row flit**