**29, 30.]** {29} It has been imagined that  
these words are a continuation of our  
Lord’s discourse, but surely they would  
thus be most unnatural. They are evidently   
a parenthetical insertion of the  
Evangelist, expressive not of what had  
taken place during John’s baptism, but of  
the present effect of our Lord’s discourse  
on the then assembled multitude. Their  
whole diction and form is *historical*, not  
belonging to discourse. See likewise a  
grammatical objection to this rendering  
in my Greek Test.

**31–35.]** See on Matthew, vv. 16—19.

**36–50.]** ANOINTING OF JESUS’ FEET  
BY A PENITENT WOMAN. Peculiar to  
Luke. It is hardly possible to imagine  
that this history can relate to the same  
incident as that detailed Matt. xxvi. 6;  
Mark xiv. 3; John xii. 3: although such  
an opinion has been entertained from the  
earliest times. Origen mentions and   
controverts it. It has been held in modern  
times by Grotius, Schleiermacher, Ewald,  
and Hug: and recently by Bleek. But  
the *only particular common to the two*(unless indeed we account the *name of the  
host* to be such, which is hardly worth  
recounting), is *the anointing itself*; and  
*even that is not strictly the same*. The  
*character of the woman*,—the *description  
of the host*,—the *sayings uttered*,—the  
*time*,—all are different. And if the   
probability of this occurring twice is to be  
questioned, we may fairly say, that an  
action of this kind, which had been once  
commended by our Lord, was *very likely  
to have been repeated*, and especially at  
such a time as ‘six days before the last  
Passover,’ and by one anointing Him for  
His burial.

I may add, that there  
is not the least reason for supposing the  
woman in this incident to have been Mary  
Magdalene. The introduction of her *as a   
new person* so soon after (ch. viii. 2), and  
what is there stated of her, make the notion