

## CHAPTER V

## THE SECOND GOSPEL

THE priority of St. Mark's Gospel is now generally accepted by modern critics. Out of 661 verses in that Gospel all but 50 are to be found in Matthew and Luke, and this incorporated matter so often reveals a marked similarity, not merely in order of arrangement, but also in vocabulary, that the conclusion is inevitable that the first and third evangelists considered the Markan narrative which they thus used to be authoritative. Their respect for the document shows itself in the inclusion in their Gospels of many words and phrases which we should have expected them to alter in the use of their editorial capacity. Thus in Mark ii. 1-12=Matthew ix. 1-8=Luke v. 17-26 we have an account of the healing of a paralytic man in which the awkward parenthesis, 'then saith He to the sick of the palsy,' is reproduced. In Mark ii. 20=Matthew ix. 15=Luke v. 35 the removal of the bridegroom is spoken of by the use of the rare word ἀπαρθῆναι. The expression 'to taste of death' is metaphorical, and its alteration by subsequent editors might have been expected, yet it occurs in all three Gospels (Mark ix. 1=Matt. xvi. 28=Luke ix. 27). The same thing occurs where one or other of the two reproduces Markan matter. In Mark xiv. 20=Matthew xxvi. 23 the words ἐμβάπτω and τρύβλιον appear, though they are not found in the rest of the New Testament writings; and in Mark xiii. 33=Luke xxi. 36 we have the word ἀγρυπνεῖτε, which does not appear elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels. It has also been pointed out

that where all three Gospels quote from the Old Testament the citations are invariably from the LXX.

Now if the common Markan matter presented invariably such correspondences the conclusion would have been easily drawn that the two later editors had used canonical Mark, and had transferred this Gospel *en bloc* to their writings. But side by side with these resemblances there occur equally distinct divergences. Matter contained in Mark is omitted by both the first and the third evangelists. Outstanding examples of these are :

1. The parable of the Seed growing secretly (iv. 26-29).
2. The healing of the blind man at Bethsaida (viii. 22-26).
3. The reference to the young man with the linen cloth (xiv. 51-52).

Again matter contained in Mark is omitted by one or other of the two later evangelists. The chief instance of this is to be found in what is called 'the great Lukan omission' (Mark vi. 45-viii. 26). The passage contains much that would make it peculiarly worthy of being transcribed by St. Luke with his appreciation of the Gentile mission of St. Paul, and with his marked sympathy with women. In addition to the story of the Syrophenician woman it contains also much teaching on ceremonial defilement, and this again would be welcomed by one who was in sympathy with St. Paul's attitude to the Mosaic Law. Explanations of its omission by St. Luke are forthcoming, and these will be examined later on, but it will be sufficient here to record the fact as an outstanding instance of St. Luke's divergence from the second Gospel as we know it.

There is yet a third class of passages in which the first and third evangelists seem to depart from a Markan source. They do this of course in all passages which belong to the second document or collection of Logia. But even in narrative portions we come upon cases in which

Matthew and Luke contain incidents which do not appear in Mark. A good example of this kind of passage is found in the healing of the son (servant) of the centurion. It is true that in the third Gospel we have a whole section, and a very considerable one, in which St. Luke has embodied the account of our Lord's journey from Galilee through Perea to Jerusalem, and an additional section appearing in the third Gospel would present no great difficulty. But such additional narratives are not found in Matthew, and Luke's 'Travel Document' is from a distinct section in his Gospel. The similarity between Matthew's description of the healing of the centurion's servant, and that which appears in the third Gospel, makes it almost certain that the two evangelists derived it from a common source, and the question arises what could this source have been? In the first Gospel it appears sandwiched between the story of the healing of the leper, and the recovery of the mother of Peter's wife, which are both Markan sections. And yet the incident does not appear in St. Mark's Gospel as we know it. Here again we must reserve the discussion of this fact for a later section of the present work. It is mentioned now by way of illustration of points of divergence from Markan narrative on the part of the other evangelists. Such differences have greatly complicated the Synoptic Problem, and it is not surprising that some scholars have held that the priority of Mark cannot be granted, while others have held that such differences can only be explained on the assumption that all three evangelists drew from another source earlier than all three. The former account for what, on their theory, are *additions* made by St. Mark, the latter for what appear to be *omissions* discovered in his Gospel.

The chief exponent of the theory that St. Mark was dependent upon the first Gospel is Zahn,<sup>1</sup> who finds that in many points Mark is secondary to Matthew. We shall

<sup>1</sup> See p. 62.

not follow Zahn in discussing this point. His position is not accepted by the great majority of scholars. Those who wish to consider the matter will find the arguments against his contention admirably set forth by Dr. Stanton.<sup>1</sup> For our purposes it is sufficient to point out that the absence from Mark of so much matter that is contained in Matthew is inexplicable on this theory, and though some scholars take a different view, we shall see that there is no good reason for supposing that St. Mark used Q<sup>2</sup> in the preparation of his Gospel. His neglect of the Sayings in the form in which they appear in Matthew can scarcely be accounted for if Matthew was before him when he wrote. At the same time most scholars point out that there are in the narratives given us by St. Mark certain secondary elements. Thus Dr. P. W. Schmiedel says that it is not possible to assign to Mark priority at all points, and that in the light of secondary passages canonical Mark is a later edition. So also Dr. Salmon holds that canonical Mark is 'at once the oldest and the youngest of the Synoptics.' Now this conflicting feature of the second Gospel may be explained without resort to the difficult theory that Matthew is prior to Mark. It is possible that St. Mark prepared his 'Memoirs of St. Peter's preaching'<sup>3</sup> more than once for the benefit of the different churches with which he was associated; and, if canonical Mark was the latest of the three editions thus prepared, it will be just as we should expect that secondary elements should appear in it. They would thus be secondary, not to the first Gospel, but to that Markan portion which appears in it.

Others, however, consider that all the resemblances as well as the differences are accounted for on the supposition that no one of the three evangelists was dependent upon any one of the others, but that all three used freely an earlier Gospel which corresponded most closely to the

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 38 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 109, 110.

<sup>3</sup> τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα.

second Gospel, and which contained both narrative and discourses. The common origin would account for the resemblances, and editorial freedom in selection would account for the differences. This theory has been called the theory of an 'Ur-Markus' or original Mark. It has never gained any great amount of acceptance in England, though German scholars have felt its attractiveness. We do not advocate its acceptance, for it is inconceivable that if such a Gospel ever existed it should have disappeared without the slightest reference to it having appeared in the early writings of the Christian Church. Dr. Sanday rejects the theory of an Ur-Markus, because the great majority of the coincidences seem to belong to a later form of text rather than to an earlier. He calls this form of text 'a recension,' because 'there is so much method and system about it that it looks like the deliberate work of an editor, or scribe exercising to some extent editorial functions' (p. 21). Dr. Schmiedel says that 'the difficulty with which the hypothesis can be made to work is increased if we suppose that this original Mark was nearly equal to the canonical Mark.' It becomes difficult to understand why a new book so little different from the old should have been written. If the original was longer than canonical Mark, it becomes possible to assign to it a considerable number of sections (now preserved only in Matthew and Luke) not so easily explained as derived from Matthew's and Luke's other sources. If it were shorter, then the additions of canonical Mark are merely the verses peculiar to him, and these are so very few, that a new book would hardly have been deemed necessary for their incorporation.

The theory which the present work upholds is one which, we claim, retains the great advantages of the Ur-Markus in accounting for the differences between the three Gospels, and yet avoids the many disadvantages which, as we have seen, belong to the hypothesis. It consists in an application of the Proto- Deutero- and Trito-Mark,

with which Dr. Arthur Wright has made us familiar, not to oral tradition as he makes it, but to documents. This theory has also been advanced by M. Barnes in two articles which appeared in the *Monthly Review* in 1904. Before we proceed to consider it in detail, there are one or two questions which must be cleared out of the way.

The first of these concerns the homogeneity of the second Gospel. The dependence of St. Mark upon an earlier document, for which the convenient formula 'Q' may be adopted, is put forward with special cogency by B. Weiss, who holds that St. Mark added excerpts from this document to what he recalled of St. Peter's preaching. The document is held to have contained both Logia and narrative, and, as it was also before the first and third evangelists, it accounts for those passages in which they are in agreement against St. Mark. It also offers an explanation of the appearance of sayings in the second Gospel. The theory is really a repetition of the theory of an Ur-Markus, the only difference being that this oldest source is considered to differ from canonical Mark by its inclusion of both Narrative and Sayings. The general objections to the theory of an Ur-Markus will therefore apply to this, and in addition it may be said that the agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark does not of necessity imply the existence of an earlier Gospel now lost from which all three drew their material. It will be shown that where Sayings, properly so called, are found in the first and third evangelists, they differ so markedly that it is now generally held that the collection of Logia before the one was different from that used by the other, and where they reproduce incidents rather than discourses it is at least possible that the edition of Mark which they used differed from that which we have in canonical Mark. The healing of the centurion's servant may have been omitted in the later edition which St. Mark prepared at Rome, though he had included it in his earlier

editions, and it is also most probable that many of these 'agreements' which are found in the non-appearance of personal and picturesque details are to be explained in the same way.

The appearance of sayings in the second Gospel does not present any serious difficulty in this connection. In relating an incident in the life of our Lord, St. Mark would not of necessity be precluded from writing down what Jesus said on the occasion in question. It would be part of the narrative, and without it the account would be pointless and imperfect. That saying might appear in any collection of sayings, as a distinct Logion, separated from its setting, and as such it would find its place in the collection made by St. Luke or by St. Matthew. Its appearance in Mark then would not imply that he had derived it from such a collection. The parable of the Seed growing secretly may here be referred to. It appears only in St. Mark's Gospel, and if it is maintained that he derived it from Q it is very difficult to believe that both St. Matthew and St. Luke by mere coincidence agreed in omitting it. The teaching it conveys would have been peculiarly appropriate at any rate to the disciple of St. Paul, and that he should have omitted it deliberately has never been seriously suggested. Mr. Streeter<sup>1</sup> maintains strongly that St. Mark used Q, but even he admits that his theory breaks down in being applied to this particular parable, and he therefore concludes that St. Mark knew and used Q, 'but only to a limited extent.'

Mr. Streeter adduces, as supporting the theory that St. Mark used Q, the sections describing the Baptism of our Lord and the controversy with reference to the casting out of demons. Both of these sections have been mentioned elsewhere in illustration of the contention that canonical Mark is a later edition of St. Mark's Gospel as first written,

<sup>1</sup> *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 178.

and to that section of this work we must refer the student.<sup>1</sup> The abbreviated form, in which the section describing both the Temptation and the Baptism of our Lord appears in Mark, is held by Mr. Streeter to show that St. Mark is epitomising Q. He says that 'An original tradition is always detailed and picturesque, and would hardly record, as does St. Mark, a temptation to do nothing in particular.' But if the Markan record was a reproduction of St. Peter's preaching, it is certain that it would be conditioned by the circumstances attending that preaching; and since we are told, and have good reason to believe, that St. Peter spoke as the occasion demanded, the Roman edition might differ just as the account of the Baptism and Temptation actually differ in canonical Mark. What was of intense interest in Palestine or to Jews of the Dispersion in Alexandria might demand considerable curtailment when prepared for Christians in Rome.

In the thirteenth chapter of St. Mark's Gospel there occurs a remarkable section which is known by the name of the little Apocalypse (Mark xiii. 3-37). It consists apparently of two discourses which have been woven together to form one whole. The former consists of warnings of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem, and bears a close correspondence in style to that class of Jewish writings which have been called Apocalyptic or Eschatological; the latter consists of teaching concerning the Parousia. It appears in all three Gospels, and in all there is a close verbal correspondence. The record, however, in the first Gospel is very much closer to that which we find in Mark. The Lukan record differs mostly in omissions or abbreviations, except in Luke xxi. 24, which stands alone and reads like an interpolation reminiscent of Romans xi. 25. The Matthaean version again reproduces (chap. xxiv. 19-22) part of the discourse given by our Lord on sending forth His disciples (chap. x. 17-22), and

<sup>1</sup> See p. 118.



the doublet is characteristic of that Gospel, which often repeats as part of the Logia that which appears in the Markan narrative.

Now it is obvious that as part of the Markan narrative this section is unique. It stands alone in St. Mark's Gospel as a 'discourse'; it is apocalyptic in construction, and it lacks that element of moral and spiritual significance which we find in the parables and other Logia. St. Mark, as we have seen, does not exhibit that tendency to 'conflation' which we find in the other evangelists, but in this section there seems to be an undoubted conflation of sayings relating to the destruction of Jerusalem, and those which refer to the Parousia. These facts have given rise to a number of views concerning the section. Dr. Stanton considers that it is to be attributed to 'some Jewish-Christian who was influenced in his general presentation of the distinctively Christian material which he had at his disposal, by his Jewish conceptions, and amplified it with expressions familiar to him through Jewish writings.' If this view be accepted, and to us it seems the most likely, there is no reason why its author should not be St. Mark himself. The Pauline as well as the Johannine writings show that 'Apocalypse' might characterise the writings of Christians, and therefore the homogeneity of the second Gospel need not be destroyed by the appearance of this original section. Another view is that of Mr. Streeter, who considers it to be a document dating from the year 70, and revealing, like the rest of St. Mark's Gospel, traces of Q. We should prefer to say that distinct sayings of our Lord which appear in the second Gospel also appeared in the collection of sayings used by St. Matthew. Dr. Burkitt considers the section to have formed a separate fly-sheet incorporated into the Gospel by the evangelist, and the allusion to 'him that readeth,' in Mark xiii. 14, is cited by him in support. Others again derive the whole section from Q. It will be observed that these

authorities are agreed in treating the section as a separate document, apocalyptic in character, and incorporated by St. Mark into his Gospel. Attempts to discover its source will necessarily be speculative, and as it is the one section in the Markan narrative which appears to break into the homogeneity of the Gospel, we prefer to regard it as coming from the hand of St. Mark.

The absence of doublets from the second Gospel is perhaps the strongest evidence of its homogeneity. In the first and third Gospels there are many cases in which a saying of our Lord appears more than once. These are fully set forth by Dr. Stanton,<sup>1</sup> and may be studied conveniently in that arrangement. They indicate conclusively that the compilers of those Gospels used more than one source; and as in nearly every case one of the two sayings occurs in the Markan narrative, the conclusion is inevitable that the doublets are due to the writers combining with Markan narrative, which they used, another source consisting largely, if not entirely, of sayings. This may be seen illustrated in Matthew x. 19-xxiv. 9-14, and also in Luke viii. 17-xii. 2. But when we study the second Gospel from this point of view the case is altogether different. Of the many instances discussed by Dr. Stanton only two are found in Mark.<sup>2</sup> One of these is in the two accounts of feeding the multitude. But it may be urged in reply that scholars are far from agreeing that in this we have two accounts of one miracle, and in our Lord's words recorded in Mark viii. 19, 20 there seems to be a reference to two miracles rather than to one. Rejecting this instance then we find the one instance recorded in Mark ix. 35, Mark x. 41-45, where our Lord rebukes the disciples for their personal ambition to occupy high places in His kingdom. This, says Dr. Wright, is the only instance of a doublet in St. Mark. Even with reference

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 54 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Oxford Studies*, p. 419.

to this, we may plead that this human weakness in the disciples may quite easily have shown itself on more than one occasion, and the phraseology in which our Lord is represented to have corrected it is by no means identical. In one case, too, He is said to have reproved them by bringing a little child into their midst, while in the other there is no mention of the child. But even if we accept this as a true doublet, the single instance should not be allowed to weigh unduly in considering the homogeneity of the Gospel.

In passing to a more constructive criticism of the second Gospel we proceed to consider the history of St. Mark as that is given us, and such reference to his connection with the second Gospel as may be discovered in the writings of the Fathers.

St. Mark was the son of a woman named Mary, and his mother's home in Jerusalem seems to have been a place of resort for the disciples. There is a tradition that the Upper Room, where the Lord celebrated the last Passover, as well as the room in which the disciples were assembled at Pentecost, was in her house. Some have supposed that the man carrying a pitcher of water, and the young man who fled away naked, which are mentioned only in the Markan narrative, were St. Mark himself. Papias says that 'he neither heard the Lord nor followed Him, but subsequently attached himself to Peter.' The latter, on being delivered from prison (Acts xii.), went at once to St. Mark's house, 'where many were gathered together praying.' He was well known there and was recognised by the servant, whose name was inserted in the record by the person from whom St. Luke derived the earlier chapters of 'The Acts of the Apostles'—probably from St. Mark himself. We are told, again by Papias, that St. Mark became the interpreter of St. Peter, and as the latter was probably unable to speak Greek with ease, this was likely enough. It has often been pointed out that the address given by

St. Peter<sup>1</sup> in the house of Cornelius (Acts x. 34 ff.) is an epitome of the second Gospel, and this becomes significant if St. Mark was one of the brethren that accompanied St. Peter from Joppa (Acts x. 23). We have only to accept that the newly baptized in Caesarea wished to retain some record of St. Peter's preaching, and that St. Mark wrote down what St. Peter had said, and left it with them. Eusebius tells us that St. Mark was sent to Egypt in the first year of the Emperor Claudius, which would be in A.D. 41, and both Eusebius and Jerome tell us that he took his Gospel with him. St. Chrysostom tells us that he wrote his Gospel in Egypt. Both statements may well be true if St. Mark, wishing the Church in Alexandria to possess some record of apostolic teaching on the facts of Christ's life, re-wrote 'as much as he remembered' (ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν) of St. Peter's addresses. This document would pass into the treasured records of the Church in Alexandria.

We next find St. Mark in the company of Paul and Barnabas at Antioch. Presumably he had returned from Egypt to Jerusalem, and accompanied the two apostles on their missionary journey, which may be assigned to the year A.D. 50 (Acts xiii. 5). He did not, however, continue long with them, as he left them at Pamphylia and returned to Jerusalem. Afterwards he went with Barnabas to Cyprus, St. Paul having resented his leaving them in Pamphylia. The strained relations between St. Mark and St. Paul did not, however, continue long. They were together when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Colossians (Col. iv. 10), and St. Mark's name occurs again in connection with St. Luke's in the Epistle to Philemon (24). The reference in the Colossian Epistle shows St. Mark to be on the point of making a journey from Rome to Asia, but a few years after this he is again required at Rome by St. Paul, who says (2 Tim. iv. 11) : 'Take Mark and bring

<sup>1</sup> Zahn, p. 448.

him with thee, for he is profitable to me for the ministry,' words which Zahn interprets to mean that St. Mark was in possession of 'treasure of narrative from the lips of Peter and of other disciples of Jesus, who were accustomed to come and go in his mother's house.'<sup>1</sup> Apparently he did return to Rome, for it is generally accepted now that the reference in 1 Peter v. 13 is to be taken as showing that St. Mark and St. Peter were together in that city when the first Epistle of Peter was written. This would be after the year A.D. 61. This falls in with other references in Patristic writings. In his *Hypotyposes* Clement of Alexandria tells us that it was part of the tradition of former time that 'When Peter had publicly preached the word in Rome, and declared the Gospel by the Spirit, those who were present, being many, urged Mark, as one who had followed him for a long time and remembered what he said, to record what he stated; and that he having made his Gospel gave it to those who made the request of him; and that Peter was careful neither to hinder him nor to encourage him in the work.'<sup>2</sup> Zahn contrasts the last clause in this quotation from the *Hypotyposes* with a statement made by Eusebius (ii. 15) to the effect that St. Peter was pleased with the zeal of St. Mark, and that his work obtained the sanction of his authority for the purpose of being used in the churches. Zahn reconciles the two statements by explaining that St. Peter took no part in the transactions that led up to St. Mark's undertaking this work, but when the work was completed, accepted it, and approved of it. The last Father to be cited in this connection is Irenaeus, who says (*Haer.* iii. 11) that 'Matthew published his Gospel . . . while Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the Church in Rome. After their departure Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, himself also has handed down to us in writing the things which were preached by Peter.'

<sup>1</sup> Zahn, vol. ii. p. 430.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 432.

The patristic testimony fits in fairly well with such an outline of St. Mark's connection with St. Peter as is given us in the Scriptures. The statements made by the different Fathers, however, reveal one detail at least in which there seems to be some contradiction. Some of them connect St. Mark's Gospel with Egypt, while others declare that it was produced in Rome. It is probably because of this uncertainty that more emphasis is not laid upon patristic testimony in discussing the origins of the Markan Gospel. But we have only to suppose, what bears every mark of probability, that St. Mark wrote down what he remembered of St. Peter's preaching both while he superintended the Church in Alexandria and later on when he was again associated with St. Peter in Rome, to see that the apparent contradiction between the Fathers may be resolved. Chrysostom and Jerome are right in ascribing the Gospel to Egypt, and Clement is equally right in declaring Rome to be its birthplace. We shall show presently that the Markan narrative in the first Gospel bears unmistakable marks of an Alexandrian origin, while canonical Mark as distinctly points to Rome. But if these marks appear in these two Gospels, the Lukan Mark has many traits which indicate a Palestinian origin, and there is no reason why St. Mark should not have written an even earlier edition of his Gospel which was left at Caesarea, where it would pass into the hands of St. Luke when he visited that town.

The theory of three Markan editions has been strongly advocated in England by Dr. Arthur Wright, who claims that it has all the advantages without any of the improbability of an Ur-Markus. He holds that the first edition is to be found in St. Luke's Gospel, embedded in other matter, the first Gospel contains the second, and the second Gospel the third. Unfortunately for its acceptance Dr. Wright's masterly analysis of these three editions which he names Proto,- Deutero,- and Trito-Mark has

scarcely had the justice done to it which it deserves, and this is largely due to the fact that he has woven this theory into that which assumes an oral basis as underlying all three, the oral basis having taken many years to form. As we have shown, there are good reasons for rejecting the theory of an oral tradition as basis for these Gospels, but, if this part of Dr. Wright's contention be removed, we hold that he has carried the analysis of the Synoptic Gospels a long way towards a conclusion. The characteristics of the Proto- and Deutero-Mark will be considered in discussing the salient features of the first and third Gospels. We shall here content ourselves with noticing features of the second Gospel, which show it to be secondary to those Gospels where the three have a common narrative.

The references to the Baptist in this Gospel are such as indicate a later production for a Gentile, or largely Gentile, Church, such as existed in Rome, with which Mark's Gospel, as we have seen, was associated from a very early date. To such a Church the interest in the Baptist would be slight. It would be quite otherwise to a Church which belonged to Palestine, or whose members were Jews of the Dispersion. We know from the fourth Gospel how great was the interest aroused by the Forerunner, and we can easily understand that his preaching and his contact with the Messiah would call for somewhat detailed treatment. It would not, however, be so in Rome a whole generation after the death of the Baptist, and thus we find that such references to him as appear in the second Gospel are, in comparison with what we have in the other two, very slight. They constitute a mere outline of his relation to Christ ; just enough to serve as an introduction to the Gospel. Even thus the record is not without those vivid touches which make the second Gospel the most dramatic of the three, and the one most full of those personal reminiscences which have done so much to make

the Person of our Lord stand out before the devout imagination of succeeding ages. These appear in the statements that the heavens were rent asunder at the Baptism, and that during the Temptation—an event always closely connected with the Baptism—our Lord was in the haunt of wild beasts.

The vivid touches of the second Gospel we consider to be distinctly secondary features. Their non-appearance in the other Synoptic Gospels is generally accounted for on the ground of editorial omissions by the respective editors. The reasons assigned for such action on the part of the editors are twofold. Many words and phrases are held to have been rejected as being pictorial and contributing nothing of real value to the history. By editors who had other matter which they deemed of importance, and who were pressed for space, these would be at once surrendered. But against this it may be urged that the writings reveal no such tendency as we should expect in a modern writer compiling a history, and careful to introduce nothing which did not bear immediately upon the point with which he was dealing. There is a personal, affectionate note in all three evangelists which would lead them, and has led them, to admit matter which was of no distinct historical value, but which they included because of the reverence which they felt for all details of the wonderful story. The principle of economy, too, does not appear in other parts of their work. They admit phrases and even whole clauses which we should imagine they might have excluded without loss. Their whole attitude towards their sources is rather that of almost scrupulous fidelity than that of arbitrary rejection of matter which to them seemed without value. Finally, while it might be possible for one or other of the first and third evangelists to omit such matter as unimportant, it is very difficult to believe that they should have, by an extraordinary coincidence, agreed upon what should be omitted and what retained. Most



of the phrases under consideration are lacking from both the first and third evangelists. They wrote for very different readers, at different times, and in different places, and yet we are asked to believe that they fastened upon identical words and phrases for excision. They include the 'awkward parenthesis' of Mark ii. 10, but agree to omit the statement that Jesus took the little children into His arms when He blessed them. If, however, these features of the second Gospel were secondary, their non-appearance in the other two is easily explained. They do not appear because they were not found in the edition of Mark which they used. It is sometimes urged that the fuller statement is always the earlier, and that the existence of such picturesque details in the second Gospel indicates priority. But this contention ignores the circumstances in which the Gospels were written. Those who hold this view are unconsciously imagining that the works were produced under modern conditions which govern the production of literature, whereas this Markan narrative reveals everywhere traits which bear out the old tradition that it was but the transcript of the preaching of St. Peter, and that he told the story not according to some distinct plan in his own mind, but just as the circumstance and need of his hearers might demand. The whole narrative is a record of apostolic preaching. As such, we contend, the story which was told last would be the fullest and most detailed of all. The preacher would discover as he went on what details were of most interest to his hearers. Incidents upon which he dwelt at first might be omitted on subsequent occasions ; or St. Mark, in writing down the story for others than those for whom he wrote at first, might omit one incident and insert another which had not found a place in the earliest writing. But always, in response to the craving of those to whom the personal life of Jesus was a matter of supreme interest and importance, the story, either as given by St. Peter, or written

down by St. Mark, would reveal in its latest edition features which would make it vivid, dramatic, and full of that 'atmosphere' which we may be sure our Lord carried with Him wherever He went.

Another reason assigned for the omission of such details is that the first and third evangelists would be careful to omit anything which seemed to be derogatory to the person of Christ or to the character of the apostles. It is not shown why this should have been less safeguarded by St. Mark than by the others. Even if canonical Mark was prior to Matthew, it could not have been so by more than a few years, and a tendency which appears in one writing might have been expected in the other, since both would reflect the feeling of the same age. But putting this consideration on one side, we would urge in reply that the insertion of these personal details can scarcely be said to lower the dignity of our Lord and His disciples. The character of Christ is far from being compromised by the statement that when He looked upon the rich young ruler He loved him, yet this detail is omitted from both the first and the third Gospel. In another passage we read that Christ was grieved for the hardness of men's hearts; this does not appear in the first or in the third evangelist, and its non-appearance in these Gospels is generally explained on the lines stated above, but it is to be questioned whether the statement shows as much of the sternness of Christ's indignation as is evidenced in the great denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees given by St. Matthew.<sup>1</sup> If any passage would seem to reveal Christ in a condition which, for want of understanding, might be held to be one of weakness, it is that which describes Him in the garden of Gethsemane praying that the cup might pass from Him, and acknowledging the weakness of the flesh. The disciples certainly appear in what may be called a compromising position on that occasion. Yet the incident

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mark viii. 33=Matt. xvi. 23.

is recorded by all three evangelists. These omissions of course belong to the same group of characteristics which find an extreme example in what has been called the great omission of St. Luke, and this will be fully considered in discussing the Markan sections of the third Gospel in chapter vi.

The use of the word *εὐαγγέλιον* is full of significance in a study of the Markan narrative in the three Gospels. In canonical Mark the word occurs with considerable frequency and is used in an absolute sense (Mark i. 14, 15, viii. 35, x. 29). It does not occur at all in St. Luke. Used absolutely it is absent from St. Matthew, and in the parallels cited above it does not appear at all. This is the more extraordinary because St. Luke uses the verb *εὐαγγελίζομαι* frequently (iv. 18, vii. 22, viii. 1, xvi. 16), and as the follower of St. Paul he would be familiar with the marked use of the noun by that apostle. The editor of the first Gospel has no objection to the word itself; he uses it in combination with other terms (lx. 35, xxvi. 13). There does not seem to be any reason why he should not retain the word in passages borrowed from the source which presumably he was using. Few facts better illustrate the value of the three editions theory than does this. The Christian Church was slow to recognise the necessity for any formulated or canonical presentation of the Gospel story. St. Peter gave his account of the wonderful life, 'in accordance with the needs of his hearers.' It was only after it had become evident that the return of the Lord in Messianic glory would not be as immediate as the Church had thought, and when meanwhile the attempts to seduce the Gentile converts from the faith made it necessary that they should have some assurance of the certainty of those things in which they had been instructed; it was only then that the necessity for a guaranteed account of Christ's words and works began to be felt. Thus we find St. Paul speaking of the presentation of certain facts

as being 'in accordance with my Gospel,' and of the necessity of prophesying 'according to the analogy of the faith' (Rom. xii. 6), and he exhorts Timothy to 'hold fast the pattern of sound words which thou hast heard from me' (2 Tim. i. 13). This resolving of experience into historical statement is well illustrated by the use of πίστις in the New Testament. This word has a whole gamut of uses in which we can detect its passing from a wholly subjective relationship to Christ into the description of a more objective 'Faith,' a formulary or creed 'once delivered to the saints' (Jude 3). If, as seems likely, the Lukan edition of the Markan narrative was the earliest, we should expect to find the word εὐαγγέλιον scarcely used at all. In the later edition, embodied in the first Gospel, the word would begin to appear, while in trito-Mark or our Canonical Gospel—written later in Rome—where St. Paul's influence would be added to St. Peter's, the word would be fully established, and this is precisely what we do find. It is to be noticed that in the first Epistle of Peter (iv. 17) the word εὐαγγέλιον appears used in an objective sense as connoting a body of authoritative doctrine to which obedience was expected, and if this Epistle was written when St. Mark had rejoined St. Peter in Rome (1 Peter v. 13) the appearance of the word in the trito-Mark becomes all the more significant. Dr. Stanton calls attention to the appearance of the word in an absolute use in canonical Mark, but draws the conclusion that it is due to the alteration of some reviser of the original. Unless positive proof for this can be adduced, it seems better to accept the explanation given above.

The secondary character of canonical Mark is further illustrated from the appearance within it of Pauline features. In the second Gospel the death of Christ is emphasised in a way which is very marked when passages are compared with their parallels in the other two Gospels, and in one passage (x. 45) we have the much discussed

sentence 'The Son of Man is come . . . to give His life a ransom for many.' The word *λύτρον* occurs only in this passage in the New Testament, but its derivative *ἀπολύτρωσις* is frequent in St. Paul's letters. Now if St. Luke had canonical Mark before him when he compiled his Gospel, on what principle did he omit this passage? His teacher, St. Paul, had made this view of a mediatorial death the prominent feature of his teaching. Why should St. Luke fix upon this expression of all others for omission? Nor do we find much relief from our perplexity when we are told that the passage is not an omission of St. Luke's, but 'belongs to a later recension of the Markan text.' For it is found word for word in the first Gospel, and if this explanation be accepted we should have to suppose that the recension took place subsequently to St. Luke's use of Mark, but before the first evangelist had incorporated the Markan narrative in his Gospel. It is no safe conclusion which is based upon such finessing.

Dr. Stanton rightly observes that in the emphasis laid upon the mediatorial aspect of Christ's death, there is nothing that is distinctively and peculiarly Pauline. St. Peter also urges the significance of our Lord's death when he says 'ye were redeemed . . . with the precious blood as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ' (1 Peter i. 19). The appearance of this saying of our Lord in the later editions may thus be a Petrine, and not a Pauline, note. At the same time St. Mark's association with St. Paul both during the short time when he accompanied him on his missionary journey, and later on when he was again associated with him in Rome, may have led him to see a significance in certain sayings of Christ as given by St. Peter, which had not impressed his thought and imagination when he first wrote down his memoirs of the preaching of that apostle. In any case the emphasis, whether made by St. Peter or by St. Mark, belongs to a later period of apostolic teaching.

In St. Peter's speeches recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, he dwells upon *the fact* of Christ's death ; *the interpretation* of that death belongs to a later stage ; and even if we had not the significant passage quoted from the Epistle to guide us, we might have felt sure that it would be reflected in the teaching of St. Peter, especially when he had to declare the value of that death to Gentiles. We conclude then that the words are absent from the third Gospel because they did not appear in the edition of Mark which St. Luke used, and they have their place in the later editions because the emphasis they carry belongs to a later period in the public ministry of the apostles.

If we turn to the eschatological passages of the three Gospels the same feature of change of expression due to different circumstances appears. Let us take a single example. The declaration of Christ concerning His Messianic reign made before the council of the chief priests is given in all three Gospels (Mark xiv. 62, Matt. xxvi. 64, Luke xxii. 69), but with significant alterations. As Dr. Stanton points out, the original form of Mark is best preserved in the first Gospel. The alterations in Luke are evidently editorial corrections made so as to emphasise the fact of Christ's *Messianic position* being given to Him immediately, whereas the record in Matthew declares that 'He would immediately *appear*. In the later edition, however, preserved for us in canonical Mark, the Church had come to see that the Parousia would not be immediate, and the words ἀπ' ἀπρὶ are in consequence omitted. Now if canonical Mark was the source from which the later evangelists drew their account of this declaration, they must have added the words indicating an immediate manifestation ; and that they should do so when every day made the Parousia, which they expected, further removed from the time when the words were first spoken, is inexplicable. Dr. Stanton speaks of the significant

alteration in canonical Mark as being made by the 'last reviser of Mark,' and we have no objection to that phrase except that we hold that St. Mark was his own reviser.

Another strongly corroborative indication of the secondary character of canonical Mark is mentioned by Dr. E. A. Abbott (Art. 'Gospels,' *Enc. Biblica*).<sup>1</sup> It is that in the second Gospel we have a great many names inserted which are lacking from the parallels in the other two Gospels. Dr. Abbott points out that the tendency to insert names of persons is most marked in Apocryphal Gospels, and their presence in the second Gospel indicates a late writer. If then the editors of the first and third Gospels had these names before them in their source, but chose to omit them, they were acting contrary to the common tendency. It is better to suppose that the names were not included in the earlier editions of Mark, but that in an edition prepared much later, and so far away from the scene of the incidents recorded as Rome, the names would be inserted naturally. Every missionary knows that to mention the names of converts in published accounts of their work among a people hostile to Christianity is fraught with peril to those who are mentioned. Such names are therefore excluded from editions published where the identification of individuals would be easy, but appear in the trito-Mark. The difficult question of the appearance in the fourth Gospel of the raising of Lazarus finds its best explanation in an application of this rule. We know that there were attempts made to put Lazarus also to death, and other members of the family at Bethany seem to have been threatened. At any rate, although the Synoptists record the saying of Christ that the name of the woman who broke the bottle of spikenard and with its contents anointed the feet of Jesus, should be mentioned wherever the Gospel was proclaimed, that name was never

Omitting the name 'Jesus,' there are seventy-three names in Mark as against twenty-seven in Matt. and twenty-two in Luke.

mentioned by them. It was left for the author of the fourth Gospel long years afterwards, when probably both Lazarus and Mary were dead, to introduce the story of the raising of Lazarus, and of Mary's expression of grateful love. We shall therefore find an easy explanation of the appearance of names in the canonical Mark. One example of this usage may be specially referred to. We read in canonical Mark that the Simon who carried the cross of our Lord was 'the father of Alexander and Rufus,' a reference which in the way it is introduced in the second Gospel seems pointless. But when we return to the list of the names of those to whom St. Paul sent greeting when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans we find that one of those mentioned is Rufus. Now 'Rufus' is by no means an uncommon name, but if the surmise is correct that the man to whom St. Paul refers was the son of Simon of Cyrene, then the insertion of the name in the Roman edition of St. Mark's writings ceases to be abrupt. The reference would at once be picked up by Roman Christians. So again the name of Pilate (Mark xv. 1, Matt. xxvii. 2, Luke xxiii. 1) in the Caesarean edition and in the Roman is introduced without explanation of the position of the man named. Persons living either in Caesarea or in Rome did not need information as to Pilate's position, but in the edition prepared for Jews living in Alexandria the words are added which informed the reader that Pilate was 'the Governor.'

Geographical names have a similarly marked use. The story, for instance, of the deliverance of 'Legion' from the demons is given in all three Gospels, but a well-known difficulty, clearly marked in the uncertainties of the text in the passages, arises from the fact that different names are given in all three. Accepting the best supported text in each case we find that in the first Gospel we have 'the district of the Gadarenes,' in the second 'the district of the Gerasenes,' and in the third 'the district of the



Gergesenes.' There has been much discussion arising out of this difference, but the best explanation we have seen is one which is based upon the theory of three editions of Mark, in which the Palestinian edition gives the name of the town accurately as 'Gergesa,' the Egyptian edition gives the name 'Gadara,' which was better known abroad, while the Roman edition gives the official name of the district, which was 'Gerasa.'

The Latinisms of the second Gospel are frequent enough to attract attention, and they have generally been cited in support of the Roman origin of the Gospel. Nothing decisive can be inferred from the use of these words (a list of which is given in the article on the Gospel of St. Mark by Dr. S. D. F. Salmond in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*), because they are just such words as an editor would be justified in altering if he saw fit to do so, and again they are for the most part words which would rapidly come into use in outlying parts of the Roman Empire, so that if they were in the first edition of the Markan narrative they might or might not be changed by an editor. They are, however, far more frequent in the second Gospel than in the others, and to this extent they support the Roman origin of the canonical Mark. One or two changes, too, seem significant. Thus in Luke xx. 22 the regular word for 'tax' is used, but in both the Egyptian and Roman editions we have *κῆνος*, the Latin 'Census.' In Mark xv. 39 the Graecised form of the Latin 'Centurion' is used, but in the other editions this appears in the form *ἐκατοντάρχης*. More significant perhaps is the passage in Mark xii. 42 where St. Mark gives us the value in Roman coinage of *δύο λεπτά*, 'two mites,' which, he says, make a *κοδράντης*, Latin Quadrans. St. Luke mentions the *δύο λεπτά*, but does not give their Roman value, the term being easily understood in an edition prepared for use in Palestine. In recording the cure of the paralytic the evangelists use a different word in each case for 'bed.' In the first Gospel

the usual word for bed is used (κλίνη), in the third St. Luke uses the word usually employed by physicians for a sick-bed (κλινίδιον), but in the second Gospel, as we have it, the word κράββατος, the Graecised form of the word used for a soldier's wallet, appears. Other similar words are ξέστης (Mark vii. 4) and σπεκουλάτωρ (Mark vi. 27) which appear in the trito-Mark alone. The easily recognised 'Praetorium' appears in both the Egyptian and the Roman edition, but the way in which it is introduced in the latter as a closer definition of the indefinite αὐλή indicates again the Roman edition in canonical Mark.

The date of the composition of the second Gospel has been given variously from the earliest time, and this uncertainty seems to be due to a failure to distinguish between canonical Mark and earlier editions of the same work. The Paschal Chronicle places it as early as A.D. 40, and Eusebius assigns it to the third year of Claudius (A.D. 43). Others again, like Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, say that it was written after St. Peter's arrival at Rome (A.D. 63). But these are not agreed, for Clement speaks of the Gospel as being in existence during Peter's lifetime, while Irenaeus says that it was written 'after his departure.' This conflict of statement is probably due to the fact that the different authorities had different editions before them when they wrote. Modern scholars are fairly agreed in assigning canonical Mark, for an approximate date, to the period between A.D. 65 and 70. In the *Oxford Studies*, however, we find the Rev. W. E. Addis asserting that the Gospel was written subsequently to the destruction of Jerusalem. The same view is held by P. W. Schmiedel.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE I

## ANALYSIS OF THE SECOND GOSPEL WITH NOTES

Chap. i. 1-8. *The Ministry of John the Baptist.*

9-13. *The Baptism and Temptation of Jesus.*

14-22. *Jesus returns to Galilee, and teaches in Capernaum.*

23-45. *Works of Healing.*

- i 1. The word ἀρχή reads suspiciously like an interpolation from a Lectionary, and it is absent from one Syriac version, but see Swete *in loco*. υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. See Wright, *Synopsis*.
2. The quotation from Malachi was added in trito-Mark as the idea of the Fore-runner became established in the Christian Church, without alteration of ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα which appeared in the earlier editions.
4. Cf. Acts i. 22. ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος Ἰωάννου. The phrase throws light upon St. Luke's source for the early chapters of Acts, and upon St. Mark's plan in the composition of his Gospel.
- 5-6. Not found in the proto-Mark used by St. Luke. Note that John's condemnation of the different Jewish sects is not found in canonical Mark, as it would be inapposite in a gospel prepared for Roman Christians.
8. καὶ πυρί. Omitted from trito-Mark; see page 81. The reference to the winnowing work of the Messiah is also omitted.
9. John's self-depreciation in the presence of the Messiah would be of importance to Jewish Christians. It is therefore included in deutero-Mark, but omitted from the other editions.
10. σχιζόμενος. A vivid detail peculiar to trito-Mark. See p. 79. Another similar detail is found in ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων. The descent of the Spirit upon our Lord is described in practically the same terms in each edition. This makes the points of difference all the more significant. The Temptation is given in outline in trito-Mark.

- i. 20. μετὰ τῶν μισθωτῶν. A detail peculiar to trito-Mark. The call of the four disciples is not given in proto-Mark. In that edition St. Mark records the later and more definite call. (Luke v. 1-11.) ἀμφιβάλλοντας. See Swete *in loco*.
- 23-28. The cure of the demoniac is not given in deutero-Mark. Note the close verbal resemblance between proto- and trito-Mark. It is difficult to see why this incident should have been omitted from the first Gospel if the editor used canonical Mark.
33. Vivid details peculiar to trito-Mark.
41. σπλαγχνισθεῖς. Another detail peculiar to trito-Mark. See p. 119.
44. Proto- and trito-Mark have προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου. But in deutero-Mark we read τὸ δῶρον, this simple expression requiring no explanation for Jewish Christians.

Chap. ii. 1-12. *Jesus cures a paralytic.*

13-22. *The feast in Matthew's house.*

23-28. *Discussion on the keeping of the Sabbath.*

ii. 2. A vivid detail peculiar to trito-Mark.

4. κράβαττον. Luke has κλινίδιον; Matthew, κλίνη. For κράβαττος—the Greek form of Grabatus—see Swete *in loco*. Its appearance in trito-Mark is an indication of Rome as the birthplace of the second Gospel.

10. For the 'awkward parenthesis,' see page 120.

17. Matthew contains the quotation ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν—a passage frequently on the lips of our Lord. See Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7.

22. In proto-Mark we have the significant addition καὶ οὐδεὶς πῶν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν. See Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 23 ff.

26. ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέως. This does not appear in proto- and deutero-Mark. 'It was omitted on account of the historical difficulty.' Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, p. 99. It may, however, have been an addition made in the third edition. 'It may have been an editorial note.' Swete *in loco*. See also Wright, *Synopsis*, p. 25, and

Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. ii. p. 145.

- ii. 27. An addition in trito-Mark. No explanation of the verse as an omission from proto- and deutero-Mark is satisfactory. See page 84. In deutero-Mark we have an addition bearing on the relation of the priesthood to the Law, concluding with the words τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζόν ἐστιν ὧδε. Such a statement would be full of meaning to Jewish Christians: the words are therefore included in an edition intended for their use, and need not be relegated to Q.

Chap. iii. 1-6. *Jesus cures a man with a withered hand.*

7-19. *Jesus continues His Ministry and appoints twelve Apostles.*

20-30. *Discussion on Mighty Works.*

31-35. *The true 'Brethren' of Jesus.*

- iii. 5. περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετ' ὀργῆς συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν. An addition in trito-Mark rather than an omission made by Matthew and Luke. See page 121.

6. μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν. See Swete *in loco*.

17. Note the translation of βουνηργές—necessary for Roman Christians. The clause οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν peculiar to the third Gospel may be an editorial addition. The cure of the Centurion's servant given in proto- and deutero-Mark does not appear in trito-Mark. See p. 106. Our Lord's testimony concerning the Baptist is also omitted. See p. 118.

20-35. The controversy between our Lord and the Pharisees as to His dependence on Beelzebub for the power to perform miracles is not from Q, or there would be greater similarity in language. See p. 84. The two verses in Matt. xii. 27-28 are omitted from the trito-Mark as having greater significance for Jewish Christians than for Roman readers.

30. ἔνοχος ἔσται αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος. See Swete and other Commentators.

31. ἔρχεται. Note the vivid historic present.

Chap. iv. 1-34. *Teaching by parables.*

35-41. *Jesus stills a storm.*

v. 1-20. *The cure of the Gadarene demoniac.*

21-43. *Jesus cures the woman with the issue of blood, and raises the daughter of Jairus.*

iv. 1-34. This section consists of Parables with connective matter in vv. 10-12. That this section consists of the teaching of Jesus rather than a narrative of His doings does not necessarily denote that its origin is to be found in Q. There was no reason why Peter should not refer to Christ's teaching in the course of his preaching. If the whole section was derived from Q, it is difficult to account for the fact that the parable of the Seed growing secretly is not given by St. Matthew, and that the parable of the Leaven is omitted by St. Mark.

26-29. Peculiar to the second gospel. For a good interpretation of this parable, see commentary by Gould in the *I.C.C. Series*.

35-37. Note the historic presents.

39. *σιῶπα, πεφίμωσο*. Vivid touches peculiar to Mark.

v. 1. *Γερασσηνῶν*. See above, p. 127. Compare Wright, *Synopsis in loco*.

3-5. A vivid addition in trito-Mark. The account of this incident is much abbreviated in deutero-Mark.

15. *ἱματισμένον*, a word which occurs nowhere else in New Testament. St. Luke retains the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, a fact difficult to explain except on the ground of fidelity to a document.

30. An interpretation of the personal consciousness of Jesus peculiar to trito-Mark. Cf. Luke viii. 46.

41. *ταλιθα, κουμι*. Note the translation of the Aramaic—a necessity to Roman Christians. The remarkable fulness of detail in this section indicates its Petrine origin.

Chap. vi. 1-6. *Jesus teaches in the Synagogue.*

7-13. *The Mission of the Twelve Disciples.*

14-29. *The death of John the Baptist.*

vi. 3. *ὁ τέκτων ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας*. The corresponding phrase in deutero-Mark is *ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός*. If canonical

Mark was before the editor of the first Gospel then this term cannot be reconciled with the tendency to enhance the supernatural view of our Lord which is brought forward to account for features of the first Gospel. If, however, canonical Mark is a later edition, the difference can be accounted for on the ground that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth had been accepted by the Church when the Roman edition was prepared by St. Mark.

vi. 13. ἡλειφον ἐλαίῳ. An addition in the third edition. Cf. Mayor on James v. 14.

14. ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης. Cf. Luke xix. 12. Herod's mission to Rome to seek the title of 'King' would be known in that city, and it therefore appears in the Roman edition. The part played by Herodias in the death of John was not included in proto-Mark, a sufficient reference having been made in Luke iii. 19.

27. σπεκουλάτωρ. An obvious Latinism which appears appropriately in the Roman edition. See Swete *in loco*.

Chap. vi. 30-44. *Jesus feeds the five thousand.*

45-52. *Jesus walks on the sea.*

53-56. *Jesus cures the sick in Gennesaret.*

vi. 34. ἐσπλαγχνίσθη. A vivid touch in the third edition.

39. συμπόσια συμπόσια. See Blass, *Gr.* p. 145. The phrases in Luke and Matthew are κατακλίνετε αὐτοὺς κλισίας and ἀνακλιθῆναι respectively. These may be editorial emendations of what is generally considered to be a Semitic construction. See, however, Moulton's *Prolegomena*, p. 97. ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ. Cf. John vi. 10.

40. πρασιαὶ πρασιαί. See p. 119, and Gould and Swete *in loco*.

45-52. Omitted in proto-Mark. Peter's attempt to walk on the water appears only in deutero-Mark. It is difficult to see whence the evangelist derived it, if he was dependent on canonical Mark. Its omission from the latter would be casual.

53. προσωρμίσθησαν. A vivid detail.

- Chap. vii. 1-23. *Discussion on ceremonial uncleanness.*  
 24-30. *Jesus cures the daughter of the Syrophenician.*  
 31-37. *Jesus cures the deaf mute.*  
 viii. 1-10. *The feeding of the four thousand.*  
 11-21. *Warning against Jewish sects and Herod.*  
 22-26. *The blind man at Bethsaida.*  
 27-38. *Peter's Confession, and first announcement of Passion.*

- vii. 1. At this point in the Markan narrative occurs 'the great omission' in St. Luke's Gospel. See p. 155.  
 2. These verses peculiar to the second gospel give exactly the explanation which would be necessary to Roman readers. They would not be necessary for Jewish Christians in Alexandria, and accordingly they are not found in the deutero-Mark.  
 11. *κορβᾶν*, note again the translation of the Aramaic word. Note also that the severity of the strictures against the Pharisees are modified in trito-Mark. See p. 71.  
 19. *καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα*. See Field, *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*, pp. 31, 32, and compare Acts x. 15.  
 24. The clauses peculiar to St. Mark in this verse illustrate again the vivid detail of trito-Mark, and indicate the eye-witness—St. Peter.  
 25. *Ἑλληνίς Συροφονίκισσα τῷ γένει*. See Swete *in loco*, and above p. 155.  
 32-37. Peculiar to trito-Mark. It is difficult to see why this incident should have been omitted from the first Gospel if canonical Mark was before the editor.  
 34. *ἐφθαθά*. Again the Aramaic word is translated.  
 viii. 10. *Δαλμανουθά*. In *Matthew* we have *Μαγαδάν*. See Swete *in loco* and Hastings, *D. B.*, *sub. verb.* 'Magada.'  
 11-21. Here again the strictures pronounced against the Pharisees are less severe than in *Matthew*. Also the sign of Jona, which does not appear in trito-Mark, is given without explanation in deutero-Mark.  
 22-26. This section is peculiar to trito-Mark. Again we may ask why it should be omitted from *Matthew*, if the editor used canonical Mark.



viii.27-29. The commendation of St. Peter is not given in trito-Mark.

33. We may ask why our Lord's severe rebuke to St. Peter should appear in Matthew, if the 'tendency' of that Gospel was to shield the reputation of the disciples. See p. 121.

35. καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. See p. 122.

Chap. ix. 1-28. *The Transfiguration and the cure of a demoniac boy.*

29-32. *Second announcement of the Passion.*

33-50. *Discussion on true greatness, toleration, and offences.*

ix. 1-13. In the Lukan parallel (chap. ix.), three verses (31-33) are peculiar to that Gospel. It is difficult to see how St. Luke could have inserted in this narrative a scrap of this sort taken from some external source. If it was in the Markan edition which he used, this difficulty is removed.

11-13. Here we have verses which do not appear in Luke, and the 'omission' is as difficult to explain as the 'insertion' mentioned in the preceding note.

15. ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεθαμβήθησαν. A vivid addition in trito-Mark.

19. ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη. So in proto- and deutero-Mark. The words καὶ διεστραμμένη are omitted in trito-Mark. See p. 121.

21-25. Another vivid detail in trito-Mark. The differences in the three accounts of this section are easily accounted for on the theory of three editions.

30. οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ. An addition in trito-Mark. Its non-appearance in Matthew and Luke cannot be explained as due to abbreviation for want of space, since there would be no great gain.

31. The details of our Lord's death and resurrection do not appear in the third Gospel. Is it conceivable that Luke would have omitted them if he had used canonical Mark?

33. In the Matthaean Mark we have here the incident of the paying of tribute money. This can scarcely be assigned

to Q. See *Oxford Studies in Syn. Problem*, p. 137. Note in the Matthaean record the use of the phrases τὰ δίδραχμα, and οὐ τελεῖ δίδραχμα.

- ix. 36. ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτό. A vivid touch (cf. x. 16).  
 38-41. This section does not appear in deutero-Mark.  
 43-48. St. Luke did not find this section in the proto-Mark ; it therefore does not appear in the third Gospel.  
 44-50. These verses have their counterpart in the collections of sayings used by St. Matthew and St. Luke. They appear in the Markan narrative as a feature of the trito-Mark.

Chap. x. 1-12. *A discourse on divorce.*

13-22. *Little children and the rich young ruler.*

23-31. *A discourse on riches and rewards.*

32-45. *Third announcement of the Passion. Zebedee's sons.*

46-52. *The healing of Bartimæus.*

x. 1-12. This section does not appear in proto-Mark. In the Roman edition divorce is forbidden in absolute terms, but in deutero-Mark, intended, we must remember, for Jewish Christians, an exception is made in cases of open adultery (πορνεία). The Jewish 'tendency' of the first Gospel is thus fully maintained.

14. ἡγανάκτησεν and ἐναγκαλισάμενος (16) are vivid touches peculiar to trito-Mark. So also is προσδραμών, v. 17.

18. τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; Here Luke and Mark are in agreement. The different form which appears in Matthew τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; may be an editorial alteration. But see Gould and Swete *in loco*. The alteration is not so great as at first sight appears, for in trito-Mark the emphasis is not on the pronoun με, but on ἀγαθόν, and the fuller statement of Matthew is implied in Mark.

21-22. ἐμβλέψας ἡγάπησεν and στυγνάσας are further illustrations of the vividness of trito-Mark. No reason appears why the editors of the first and third Gospels should have omitted these words. See p. 119.

25. τρυμάλια. This appears in proto-Mark as τρῆμα, and in deutero-Mark as τρυπήμα. The difference may be explained on editorial grounds. The Lukan word τρῆμα,

as well as *βελόνη*, which follows, is a medical term (see Hobart, *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, p. 60), and *τρυμάλια* is a late and rare word.

- x. 29. In the corresponding verse in deutero-Mark we have a considerable enlargement of this, and the added words are in agreement with the Jewish 'tendency' of which we have had so many examples in the first Gospel. *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*. See p. 122.
32. Note the extraordinary vividness of this verse, and compare Matthew xx. 17 and Luke xix. 28.
34. *ἀποκτενοῦσιν*. This is the word used in proto- and in trito-Mark. In deutero-Mark we have *σταυρῶσαι*. There is no need to suppose that this was an alteration made by the editor reflecting the actual event. As Gould points out, the scourging implied crucifixion, and St. Mark may have used one word in the first edition and the other word in the second.
- 35-40. This section is omitted in proto-Mark. If it be held that St. Luke purposely omitted it to save the credit of the disciples concerned, we may ask why it was not also omitted from the first Gospel. Further, although St. Luke does not record this special incident, he records their *φιλονεικία* in xxii. 24.
39. *ὁ πίνω πίεσθε*. The difference in the use of tenses (see Comm.) increases the vividness of the incident in trito-Mark, when we compare the words used in Matthew. Otherwise the language of the two accounts reveals a close correspondence.
45. *λύτρον*. This word, *ἀπ. λεγ.* in the New Testament, appears also in deutero-Mark. See Commentaries, and p. 123 *supra*.
- 46-52. In the first Gospel we have two men cured when Christ was leaving Jericho. In the third Gospel there is only one man cured when Christ was entering it. In the second only one man is mentioned; his name is given and he was cured when Christ was leaving the city. Dr. Wright (*Synopsis in loco*) claims that 'under the oral hypothesis with its proto-Mark the whole mystery is clear.' We agree with Dr. Wright that if St. Luke had canonical Mark before him it is difficult to account for

the discrepancy, but against Dr. Wright we would urge that a stereotyped tradition, sufficiently fixed to account for the repetition of the unusual word *λύτρον* in v. 45, would not have allowed discrepancy here. The theory of three editions in documentary form affords a better solution. There were probably two blind men, the better known of which is referred to by name in the Roman edition. See p. 126.

Chap. xi. 1-11. *Jesus enters Jerusalem in triumph.*

12-26. *The unfruitful fig tree. The cleansing of the Temple.*

27-33. *The authority of Jesus.*

xi. 1. *Βηθανίαν*. In deutero-Mark we read *Βηθφαγή* and in Luke we have *Βηθφαγή καὶ Βηθανίαν*. There is uncertainty as to the text, but the longer reading in Mark seems to have been introduced to harmonise with Luke. See Wright *in loco*.

2. *πῶλον*. In deutero-Mark we have *ὄνον καὶ πῶλον*. This is probably an editorial alteration made to harmonise with the quotation from Zecharia.

4. The additional details in trito-Mark is characteristic of this edition.

10. *ῥοσάννά*. See Wright and Swete *in loco*.

12-26. In deutero-Mark the cleansing of the Temple precedes the cursing of the fig-tree. This does not suggest either a fixed oral tradition, or the use of canonical Mark by the editor of Matthew. It does, however, suggest a story told more than once, and a casual change in the order of events. The story of the fig-tree does not appear in the third Gospel. Now whether the interpretation of this incident be on the line of 'the power of faith,' or on that of 'the doom of an unfruitful nation' (see Romans xi. 17-22), the subject would have been appropriate to St. Luke with his Pauline point of view. It would thus be hard to account for his omission of it. We conclude that it did not appear in proto-Mark.

27-33. The correspondence between all three accounts is here very close.

Chap. xii. 1-12. *National failure. Parables.*

13-40. *Discussion with Pharisees, Sadducees, and others.*

41-44. *The widow's mite.*

xii. 1-12. In proto-Mark and in trito-Mark only one parable is given, that of the Wicked Husbandmen. In deutero-Mark we have also the parables of the Two Sons and of the Royal Marriage Feast. These would appropriately find a place in an edition intended for Jewish Christians to whom the causes of national rejection needed to be made plain. It is not necessary to refer these two parables to Q, merely because they do not appear in canonical Mark. Even where all three give the same parable, the Jewish 'tendency' appears again in *Matt. xxi. 43-45.*

4. ἐκεφαλίωσαν. For this ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, see Wright and Swete *in loco*.

9. In proto-Mark we have the addition ἀκούσαντες εἶπαν μὴ γένοιτο; the latter part of this sentence is, with the exception of this passage, only found in Paul. It may therefore be an editorial addition inserted to give an adequate connection to the passage.

11. After this verse in deutero-Mark we have an addition in xxi. 43, which again is appropriate to that edition as referring to the divine rejection of Israel. *Matt. xxi. 44* is a harmonist's interpolation.

14. κῆνσον. See Comm. for the transliterated Latin word. St. Luke's φόρον is editorial.

28-34. This incident is omitted in proto-Mark. It is difficult to see why St. Luke should have omitted it if it was in the document before him. Note that the rebuke of the Pharisees and Sadducees is again more severe in deutero-Mark.

41-44. The story of the widow's mite does not appear in deutero-Mark. Dr. Wright speculates that this 'deliberate omission' may have been due to some local reason arising from the circumstances of the church in Alexandria. To us it seems better to suppose that St. Mark inadvertently omitted it in preparing his second edition than that the editor suppressed it for local

reasons. St. Mark wrote 'as he remembered,' and the incident might escape recollection on one occasion, and be recalled on others.

- xii. 42. λεπτά δύο ὃ ἐστὶ κοδράντης. In trito-Mark the value of the λεπτά is given in Roman coinage, the quadrans being one-fourth of an 'as.' See p. 128.

Chap. xiii. 1-37. *Eschatological discourses.*

xiii. 1 κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ. Another detail peculiar to trito-Mark. The difficult question of the 'Little Apocalypse' has been discussed above. See p. 111. The reader is also referred to Dr. Stanton's discussion of the question (*Gospels as Historical Documents*, pp. 115 ff.).

14. βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως. This expression is peculiar to the deutero-Mark. See Swete and Wright *in loco*. ἐν τόπῳ ἀγίῳ an addition to deutero-Mark which would be understood by Jewish Christians. The verses Luke xxi. 20 and 24, peculiar to that Gospel, are best explained as late additions made *ex post eventu*. See Wright and Commentaries.

Chap. xiv. 1-11. *The conspiracy against Jesus. His anointing at Bethany.*

12-25. *The Paschal Supper.*

26-42. *Jesus withdraws to the Mount of Olives. His agony.*

43-72. *The betrayal and the trial of Jesus.*

xiv. 3-11. The anointing of Jesus at Bethany has no place in the third Gospel; for the attempted identification of the ἁμαρτωλός in Luke vii. 37 with Mary of Bethany is now abandoned by practically all. Of this incident also we claim that it is inconceivable that St. Luke should suppress it as he must have done if canonical Mark was before him. Its non-appearance in proto-Mark is to be accounted for as above, p. 126.

12-25. On the Markan date for the Paschal Feast, see Wright and Swete.

17. St. Luke here inserts four verses which he derived from his special source (xxii. 15-18). See p. 181.

22. The giving of the cup before the bread is peculiar to St. Luke, who may have been influenced by the Pauline

order, 1 Cor. x. 15. St. Luke also makes the declaration of betrayal come after the partaking of the bread and wine. These facts, added to the considerable linguistic difference from the Markan record, indicate that St. Luke is in this section dependent largely upon his special source. See p. 181.

xiv. 27-31. The prediction of St. Peter's unfaithfulness is given in all three Gospels. No attempt is made by the editors of the first and third Gospels to shield him. Yet this supposed 'tendency' is held by many to account for many of the differences between canonical Mark and the other two Gospels. The Passion of our Lord and His shrinking from 'the cup' is also given by all three evangelists. See p. 121.

51-2. These verses, peculiar to the second Gospel, are generally considered to have been added to the Petrine Memoirs by St. Mark, and it is not improbable that the evangelist himself was the νεανίσκος.

55. The failure to find witnesses against Jesus is not recorded by St. Luke, and the identification of Peter by the servants differs from that given in Matt. and Mark. For example, in Mark xiv. 69 we read ἡ παιδίσκη πάλιν where St. Luke writes ἕτερος. Such differences indicate again St. Luke's special source. In the verse just cited Matthew has ἄλλη, and we may well ask why the editor should have altered canonical Mark if it was before him. Such discrepancies constitute a common human feature when a story is told more than once.

65. προφήτευσον. Deutero-Mark adds τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε;

72. ἐπιβαλὼν—a difficult word peculiar to trito-Mark. See Field (*Notes on Translation, etc.*, p. 41), Wright and Swete.

Chap. xv. 1-15. *Jesus before Pilate.*

16-41. *The Crucifixion.*

42-47. *The Burial of Jesus.*

Chap. xvi. 1-8. *The Resurrection.*

xv. The suicide of Judas is given in the first Gospel alone. Cf.

Acts i. 18. The reference in Acts i. shows this to have been part of the Markan tradition in spite of its non-

appearance in canonical Mark—that is, if we may hold that St. Luke derived the earlier chapters of Acts from St. Mark. If the account of this incident be not referred to deuterio-Mark it is exceedingly difficult to account for its appearance in the first Gospel.

- xv. 1. In proto- and trito-Mark Pilate's name is given without addition. In deuterio-Mark he is called ὁ ἡγεμών. This word is used to describe Pilate seven times in the first Gospel, once in the third, and not at all in the second. Pilate's title and position would be well known in both Caesarea and Rome. For Herod's part in the trial of our Lord, see *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 230, and in this work p. 163.
7. μετὰ τῶν στασιαστῶν . . . ἐν τῇ στάσει; this is peculiar to trito-Mark; the fact of the insurrection and the names of the insurgents would be known in Rome.
10. In deuterio-Mark we have here the additional incident of Pilate's wife's dream, and a little lower that of Pilate washing his hands. Dr. Willoughby Allen refers these to 'Palestinian tradition.' Their relation to what precedes and to what follows certainly suggests interpolation into Markan matter.
- 16-41. The Lukan differences here—all derived from St. Luke's special source—are to be carefully noted.
21. τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Πούφου. Cf. Romans xvi. 13, and above, p. 126.
22. The variants in this verse are instructive:  
 Proto-Mark reads κρανίον (Latin Calvarium).  
 Deuterio-Mark reads Γολγοθὰ ὃ ἐστὶ κρανίου τόπος λεγόμενος.  
 Tritio-Mark reads Γολγοθὰ ὃ ἐστὶ μεθερμηνεούμενον.
40. γυναῖκες. The first and third evangelists identify them with the women that had followed Jesus from Galilee and had ministered to Him. See p. 163.
- xvi. 1-8. The different indications of time in the three editions are:  
 Proto-Mark—ὄρθρου βαθέως.  
 Deuterio-Mark—ὅψε σὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων.  
 Tritio-Mark—λίαν πρωτὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων.



Note that the fourth evangelist seems to correct the Synoptic tradition, according to his custom, by writing *πρωτ σκοτίας ἐτι οὔσης*. For the evidence for and against the theory of the mutilation of this chapter in Greek texts see the Commentaries.

## ADDITIONAL NOTE II

### SAYINGS FOUND IN MARKAN NARRATIVE

In the *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (p. 267 ff.), Dr. Willoughby Allen, discussing the Book of Sayings and the first Gospel, describes certain sayings as being inserted by the editor of the first Gospel in Markan narrative. Such passages are as follows :

Matt. viii. 11-12.	Luke xiii. 28-29.
ix. 13.	
xii. 5-7.	
11-12.	xiii. 15 and xiv. 5.
xiii. 16-17.	x. 23-24.
xv. 13-14.	vi. 39.
xvi. 17-19.	
xviii. 7.	xvii. 1.
xix. 11-12.	
28.	

Such a statement seems to be based upon the presupposition that the sayings of Jesus have no place in the Markan record. To us it seems far more likely that such sayings are not insertions made by the editor into Markan record, but that they belonged to that record, and are not to be regarded as taken from any book or collection of sayings by the editor of the first Gospel.