not so know it as then to indicate it to  
the disciples.” Of such a sense there is not a hint   
in the context: nay, it is   
altogether alien from it. The account given  
by the orthodox Lutherans, as represented  
by Meyer, that our Lord knew this by  
*possession*, but not by *use*, is right enough,  
if at the same time it is carefully   
remembered, that it was this possession of which  
He emptied Himself when He became man  
for us, and which it belongs to the very  
essence of His mediatorial kingdom to hold  
in subjection to the Father.

**33–37.]** {34} Peculiar to Mark, and containing the   
condensed matter of Matthew, vv. 43–47, and  
perhaps an allusion to the parable of the  
talents in Matt. xxv.

The **porter** is the **door-porter**, whose office it would be  
to look out for approaching travellers,—  
answering especially to the ministers of  
the word, who are (Ezek. xxxiii.) *watchmen* to God’s church.

**CHAP. XIV. 1,2.]** CONSPIRACY OF THE  
JEWISH AUTHORITIES AGAINST JESUS.  
Matt. xxvi.1–5. Luke xxii.1, 2. The  
account of the events preceding the   
passion in our Gospel takes a middle rank  
between those of St, Matthew and St. Luke.  
It contains very few words which are not  
to be found in one or other of them; but  
at the same time the variations from both  
are so frequent and irregular, as in my  
opinion wholly to preclude the idea that  
St. Mark had ever seen either. The   
minute analysis of any passage in the  
three will, I think, convince an   
unprejudiced examiner of this.

On the   
chronological difficulties which beset this  
part of the Gospel history, see note  
on Matt. xxvi. 17.

**1. the passover, and [feast of] unleavened bread]**  
classed together, because the time of   
eating the Passover was actually the   
commencement of the feast of unleavened  
bread. The announcement by our Lord  
of his approaching death (Matt. xxvi. 2)  
is omitted by St. Mark and St. Luke.

**3—9.]** THE ANOINTING AT BETHANY.  
Matt. xxvi.6–13. John xii.1–8. (On  
Luke vii. 36-50, see note there.) The  
whole narrative has remarkable points of  
similarity with that of St. John,—and has  
been used as one of the indications that  
St. Mark *had knowledge of and used* the  
Gospel of St. John. My own view leads  
me to a different conclusion.

I have  
already remarked (note on Matt. xxvi. 3),  
that while St. Matthew seems to have   
preserved trace of the parenthetic nature of  
this narrative, such trace altogether fails  
in our account. It proceeds as if   
continuous.   
  
**3. spikenard]** The original,