

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

I. THE TRADITION

THE very form of the question "Is Mark Roman?" implies the existence of a tradition that it emanates from Rome. This tradition can, in fact, be traced back to ca. 150 A.D., and was so generally accepted throughout the second half of the second century that we cannot but give it consideration; all the more because it persists in spite of a strong tendency, illustrated in the Muratorianum and elsewhere,¹ to carry back the origin of the Gospels to a period antecedent to the dispersion of the Twelve from Palestine. Nor is the tradition of Roman provenance for Mark wholly invalidated, as I hope to show, by the fact that it cannot be traced further back than Papias (fl. 140-160). Why Papias held this belief is precisely the present subject of enquiry.

Tradition, in general, is like the British historian of science whose "foible was omniscience." It must "know all mysteries and all knowledge," and while it cannot be said to "endure all things" it certainly "believeth all things, hopeth all things," and "never faileth." Like the dragoman who escorts the devout traveller through the Holy Land, its business is to please. Hence, if at a loss for true information, it never fails to apply the spur to a practised and willing, though generally imitative imagination. The framer of tradition and the exhibitor of sacred sites (often one and the same individual) will always relate what he believes his enquirer wishes to hear, in as close approximation as his guessing powers can determine the preference. Historians are therefore quite accustomed, since the days of Herodotus, to scrutinize the answers tradition offers to their enquiries, making allowance for this courteous volubility. We also allow for its very natural (and usually quite transparent) bias in favor of the currently accepted view. But we ought

¹ The clause of the Muratorianum which represents the Apostle John as consulting with his fellow disciples preparatory to writing his Gospel, taken together with the curious reference to Paul as "following the example of his predecessor John in writing to seven churches only," shows that this contemporary of Irenaeus thinks of the fourth Gospel as written in Palestine. Irenaeus and others explicitly declare this of Matthew.

also to realize (and this is often overlooked) how much difference it makes to the reliability of the witness of tradition what kind of information is solicited.

Tradition is equally voluble, and equally positive, when stating fact or fiction. But there are some things which in the nature of the case are traditionally knowable, concerning which it may, therefore, be profitably consulted; and other things which in the nature of the case are not matters of public information, concerning which, therefore, enquiry elicits only the confusion of words without knowledge.

When questions are raised concerning the authorship, date, or provenance of any undated, anonymous composition such as a Gospel, the relative values of tradition and internal evidence differ very greatly. As regards date, tradition, for obvious reasons, is usually vague and hesitating.¹ Tradition, as a rule, has as little motive as means for determining such matters. Criticism will therefore usually find a better basis for the date of a given writing in the internal evidence than in the statements of the Fathers. As respects the author's name, on the other hand, the situation is reversed. Criticism can rarely venture even the most tentative affirmation. Tradition has the field to itself, and is bold in proportion to its consciousness of the general ignorance. It names the author of any ancient, anonymous document with perfect confidence, looking only to meet the wishes of its patrons and to enhance the value of the work on which both parties depend. Thus, when tradition roundly affirms that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and David the Psalms, the public applauds, while the critic is put to the blush. What avails it to disprove his opponent's positive affirmation, when he stands dumb before the counterdemand, "Well, if Moses and David did not write these books, who did?"

¹ The great exception to this general rule is the date "the end of the reign of Domitian" for the appearance of Revelation, a date known to Irenaeus (probably through Papias) and independently confirmed by Epiphanius. In this much disputed book of "prophecy," the predictive element made the question of date vital to the controversy and so preserved it. Criticism is turning back in our day to accept it as correct for Revelation in its present form. Its rejection by the Tübingen critics in favor of a date, earlier by a quarter of a century, put forward on purely internal grounds is curiously like the present attempt to outstrip antiquity in carrying back the date of Mark.

To the general public such ignorance is unpardonable. The more experienced recognize contrariwise in the assumed knowledge of the traditionalist what Polycarp in his Epistle calls "the empty talk of the many (*ματαιότης τῶν πολλῶν*) and his younger fellow bishop Papias, our earliest enquirer into the mystery of Gospel origins, calls the information of "those who have so very much to tell (*οἱ τὰ πολλὰ λέγοντες*). By the contrast he draws between these and "those who teach the truth," Papias implies that the information of these popular teachers, eagerly sought by "the many," was of the abundant kind that can be affirmed but not verified.¹

As regards the provenance of a writing, tradition will be apt to speak with less apologetic bias, and with far greater likelihood of knowing whereof it affirms than as regards authorship. Take as example the Book of Revelation. Doctrinal controversy brought the book into the full glare of publicity within a half-century of its origin.² Between 145 and 190 it was vehemently denounced by opponents of the "Phrygian" heresy (Montanism), and as emphatically commended by chiliasts such as Papias and those who (as Eusebius avers) were influenced by Papias in the direction of his own chiliasm, Justin Martyr, and Irenaeus, perhaps also Melito of Sardis, who wrote a defence of the book. In this case what could really be known is apparent, and should be distinguished by critics from what could not be known, but would inevitably tend to be asserted by artless inference. For the one kind of statement we have a perfect right to depend on the assertions of the Fathers; for the other we have not. When Papias and others of his age and school affirm the "authenticity," literally the "trustworthiness" (*τὸ ἀξιόπιστον*), of Revelation, as they are reported to do by Andreas of Caesarea, what they really mean (if we regard Andreas' report as exact), and what Justin means when he declares that the vision of the millennial New Jerusalem was seen

¹ With the two classes of false teaching denounced by Polycarp and Papias compare the two of similar character in 1 Tim. 6, 3-5 and 20-21.

² I.e., in the Greek form in which we know it, prefaced by the letters to the seven churches of Asia. The Greek work is based upon an older, Palestinian apocalypse (or apocalypses) translated from Aramaic, or Hebrew. The original may date back in whole or in part before the death of Nero.

“ by John an Apostle of the Lord,” is that their antichiliastic opponents, who at this time were repudiating and disparaging Revelation as a spurious and heretical book, were wrong; because to their certain knowledge it had been promulgated and employed with acceptance and honor by orthodox churches in the region of Ephesus since “ the end of the reign of Domitian.” When such early defenders of the chief inspired book of millenarianism go beyond this knowable fact, and are subpoenaed (with or without their consent) to vouch for the identity of the speaker throughout the composition in its present form, they manifestly transcend their sphere. In the epilogue of Revelation (22, 8–9) the editor of the book affirms (doubtless in good faith) that the seer who in 19, 10 had used exactly this same representation and phraseology was no other than the Apostle John (!). He reiterates this assertion in the preamble (Rev. 1, 1–3) and again in the introduction (1, 4, 9). He even takes the liberty of continuing the utterance in the first person. It is the business of the critic, after comparing 19, 10 with 22, 8–9, to decide whether this affirmation is correct or not; whether it represents knowledge or conjecture. Papias and the later defenders of the book, if they really went so far as Andreas alleges in vouching for it, and in any case Justin, who is probably echoing Papias, make an assertion which oversteps their knowledge as clearly as their intent; for few things are more certain than that the same individual who as seer in Rev. 19, 10 had just been forbidden to worship the angel and desisted, did not attempt it again as editor in 22, 8.

The example of Revelation illustrates our distinction. The place where, and (more vaguely) the time when, a given anonymous writing began to circulate is matter of public knowledge. The allegations of tradition on these points are relatively trustworthy, especially if free from (and still more if opposed to) apologetic interest. Contrariwise, the author’s name in the case of an anonymous work is necessarily known to very few (though a matter of conjecture to multitudes later, and increasingly so as controversy regarding the content seeks on the one side to clothe it with authority, on the other to disparage it). In the case of the Revelation ascribed to “ John ”

the original "prophecies" were doubtless (as usual) anonymous. The Ephesian editor who issues the work in Greek, prefacing it with introductory "letters" to the seven churches of Asia (cc. 1-3), and supplementing it with an epilogue (22, 6-21), ascribes the visions to "John." He takes the more questionable, but in his time not unusual, further liberty of adding to the message, continuing the seer's employment of the first person singular on his own account. As matter of conjecture the name of the Apostle John would be as natural to an Ephesian editor of 93 A. D. as it is unnatural when compared with the real implications of the "prophecies" themselves; for these distinctly refer to "the twelve Apostles of the Lamb" in the third person. This ancient debate on the authorship of Revelation, however, can never be settled by appeal to tradition. It belongs to internal criticism.

In the case of the Gospels, also, the author's name was not at first a matter of public concern. Until other products of similar kind came into rival circulation, creating the need for discrimination, the Gospel used in any given community was simply "the" Gospel. Matthew is in fact still quoted under just this designation by the Didache and Justin Martyr. It is exceptional (significantly so) when enough interest is taken in the question of the authorship of a "prophecy" to attach to it the name of "an Apostle of the Lord." Still more is it significant to find even Gospels condescending to be distinguished by names; most of all when, as in the cases of our Mark and Luke, the names are those of men who were not Apostles, names whose mention in this connection can hardly be accounted for unless in some way, direct or indirect, they really had a part in the production of the work.

Accordingly, when in addition to naming the author early tradition positively affirms that the so-called Gospel of "Mark" appeared at Rome some time after the death of the chief Apostle to whom it attributes the story related, the report is by no means to be despised. As respects both place and date this statement is not in the interest of apologetic; it was rather found inconvenient. As respects the provenance it tells something which belongs to public knowledge, something which if

untrue could and would meet contradiction, unless the allegation were too long delayed; something which later tradition actually does its best to counteract by affirming for subsequent Gospels an origin in Palestine by direct undertaking of one or more of the original Apostles.

Respect for tradition will be greatest where there is least evidence of an attempt to adapt it to later opinion. Unfortunately the tradition regarding the provenance of Mark gives strong indications of being later in origin than the tradition regarding its authorship and (approximate) date, and seems to be, in part, if not wholly, the fruit of early conjecture, embroidering the meagre statement of older authorities with ingenious inference of a nature tending to enhance the authority of the Gospel.

Scholars are well aware that there is but one really ancient tradition regarding the origin of any of the Gospels, and that single Gospel is not unnaturally the oldest, Mark. It is the tradition cited by Papias himself from an unnamed "Elder" obtained (apparently) during the period of his enquiries antecedent to the writing of his Interpretations of the Lord's Oracles. This period of enquiry probably did not extend later than 117 A.D.

We repeat: Only one primitive tradition of Gospel origins exists. For in spite of an enormous amount of darkening of counsel, what Papias states regarding Matthew is not a tradition. It does not even pretend to be. Papias simply declares that the precepts (λόγια) he proposes to expound were recorded in "Hebrew" by Matthew. In this statement he merely adopts the general assumption of his age (140-150 A.D.), an assumption based on two things: (1) the title *κατὰ Μαθθαίου*;¹ (2) the language of the book. The assumption, as we all know, is in both elements demonstrably contrary to fact. Contrari-

¹ This title is probably based on conjecture attaching to Matt. 9, 9, in comparison with Mark 2, 14. Matt. 9, 9, in turn rests on the gloss *ὁ τελωτής* in the table of the apostolate taken up in 10, 3. The gloss is an attempt to find room in the list for the *τελωτής*, and was probably intended to attach to "Bartholomew." It is a practical parallel to many other attempts (e.g., of the *β* text) to meet the same difficulty.

wise, what Papias states regarding Mark is a tradition. It is avowedly derived from "the Elder," probably the same individual from whom Eusebius informs us Papias cited numerous "traditions" (*παραδόσεις*), and who had the name so common in Palestine of "John." Elsewhere¹ we have ventured to identify this primitive authority with John of Jerusalem, middle link in the succession of "Elders" in that church between James, the Lord's brother (ob. 62), and Judas (ob. 135). The death of this "Elder John," whom Irenaeus (as Eusebius so clearly demonstrates) had confounded with the Apostle, is placed by Epiphanius in a year of probable martyrdoms for Palestine when Trajan repressed the second Jewish uprising (117 A.D.). But the tradition which Papias reports must be distinguished from the interpretative comment of Papias' own which follows it. The tradition occupies the first part of the sentence, including no more than the words: "Mark, who had been (or, became) the *ἐρμηνευτής* of Peter, wrote down as much as he remembered both of the doings and sayings of Christ, but not in order." Papias seems to be employing this statement of "the Elder" to justify his own partial reliance on a nonapostolic source (Mark).

The precepts of the Lord (*κυριακά λόγια*) which Papias interpreted in his Exegesis² were drawn from Matthew. No other course is conceivable; for to Papias, as to his contemporaries, Matthew was "the Gospel," the complete and apostolic record of the things said and done by the Lord in their (chronological) order. However, Papias did feel justified in also drawing to some extent from Mark, although he acknowledges that "Mark was not a follower of the Lord, but afterwards, as I said [in a passage no longer extant], of Peter." Papias defends his use of Mark by explaining that if (as the Elder had declared) this evangelist's "order" was inaccurate, he may nevertheless be trusted, because while the nature of Peter's preaching, which Mark recorded, made chronological order impracticable, the

¹ See Fourth Gospel in *Research and Debate*, 1912.

² Readings in the mss. vary between singular and plural in the title of Papias' work. He may have given collected "exegeses" received from "the Elders," or he may have given his own "interpretations" (*ἐρμηνεῖαι*), supporting them by Palestinian tradition ("the living and abiding voice").

Elder's words implied that Mark's record of Peter's discourses was both accurate and complete. This attitude of Papias toward Matthew and Mark respectively corresponds with the uniform practice of his age in the use of Gospel material. It is thus closely reflected by his contemporary Justin, and is indeed that of the Apostolic Fathers generally. As between Synoptic parallels, quotations are made almost invariably on the basis of Matthew.¹

In commenting on "the Elder's" account of Mark, Papias, we note, refers not to anything related by "the Elder," or indeed by any informant. He refers merely to a previous statement of his own ("as I said"), a statement not preserved among the extant fragments. In this non-extant reference Papias had discussed the association of Mark with Peter. Zahn has shown² that his contention was probably based on 1 Peter 5, 13. For in spite of Harnack's exposure³ of some fallacies, the substance of Zahn's contention remains highly probable. It may be stated as follows: We may co-ordinate Eusebius' statement in H. E. iii. 39, 16, that Papias "used testimonies from the First Epistle of Peter," with his earlier statement in H. E. ii, 15, 2, coupling "Papias" with Clement of Alexandria as testifying that Mark was written in Rome and that this is indicated by (Peter), when he calls the city symbolically Babylon, an obvious reference to 1 Peter 5, 13.

Zahn's reasoning is to the effect that Papias, as well as Clement (Hypotyposes, cited by Eusebius, H. E. vi. 14, 6), assigned the writing of the Gospel of Mark to "Rome itself"; and that, of the two writers appealed to, it was not Clement but Papias who based this assertion on 1 Peter 5, 13. For, while Clement's testimony to the Roman origin of Mark

¹ Note the comment of Swete (Commentary on Mark, p. xxxiv) on the complaint of Victor of Antioch (ob. ca. 550 A.D.) of the entire lack of commentaries on Mark. "The cause is doubtless partly to be sought in the prestige attaching to the first Gospel, which was regarded as the immediate work of an Apostle, and the greater fulness of both St. Matthew and St. Luke. Moreover, St. Mark was believed even by Irenaeus to have been written after St. Matthew."

² Einleitung (2d ed.), II, pp. 19 f., 214 f.; cf. pp. 22, 35.

³ "Pseudo-Papianisches," in Zeitschrift für N. T. Wissenschaft, III (1902), p. 159.

does form part of his comments on 1 Peter 5, 13 (showing his dependence on Papias), Clement himself nowhere adopts the "ground-idea" that the Epistle was written from Rome.

The argument that Clement derived the Gospel from Rome, but not the Epistle, is unconvincing. But Papias "confirmed" (*συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ*) the story of Clement's Hypotyposes, and to exclude from this confirmation his location of it at "Rome" is violent. We may therefore confidently attribute to Papias the statement that Mark was written in Rome. We can also say with confidence that Papias did not base this statement upon tradition (whatever independent knowledge he may have had as to the provenance of the Gospel), but upon an allegorical interpretation of the words *ἐν Βαβυλῶνι* in 1 Peter 5, 13. Later writers such as Irenaeus and Clement merely repeat and elaborate the statement. These two writers are in fact independently known to use Papias' work for such information, and could not be expected either to ignore or contradict his statement regarding the provenance of Mark. On this point they have nothing of their own to tell. They do show, however, a natural disposition to enhance the importance of the Gospel by enlarging upon the testimony, and to make the Apostle's responsibility for it as great as possible without actual contradiction of Papias' words. Thus Irenaeus repeats his predecessor's statement for substance, taking the aorist *γενόμενος* in its natural sense as explanatory both of the qualifications and limitations of Mark. He had been (said Papias) Peter's *ἐρμηνευτής*. Irenaeus takes this to mean the "translator" of Peter's oral discourses. So do all subsequent writers. We are justified in assuming that they correctly understood the Greek term; for Papias himself indicates that he also had the same idea by offsetting the authenticated and (as it were) official "translation" of Peter's discourses with the statement that Matthew's written record of the *λόγια* had no official "interpreter." Matthew left them "in the Hebrew," and "everyone translated them as best he could." It was, indeed, in part this lack of authoritative rendering for the Apostle's record which justified Papias' own "translations" (*ἐρμηνεῖαι*), and to these he "did not hesitate to subjoin" authenticated, autochthonous

traditions as a defense against arbitrary and "alien" perversions. For he had no higher respect than his successor Irenaeus for Gnostic "twisters of the Lord's oracles" (*ῥαδιουργοῦντες τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου*). These were "bad interpreters of things well said" (*κακοὶ ἐξηγηταὶ τῶν καλῶς εἰρημένων*).¹ In the Greek no other sense can be obtained from the statement than that Mark accompanied Peter for the purpose of translating his discourses (whether orally and immediately, or subsequently and in writing) into another language. This, then, may be set down as the conception entertained by Papias.

Whether "the Elder" (who in our view spoke Aramaic and was not directly accessible to Papias) had really in mind this kind of relation between Mark and Peter is at least doubtful; for it involves great difficulties, as Zahn and others have shown. Indeed the title of "translator" is unknown to the New Testament. As a number of critics have pointed out,² the Elder may have used the word *מַתְּרָגְמָן*, still current in the modern form of "dragoman," whose office is akin to that of courier. Papias, as may be seen by his repeated references to "translation," was concerned about this factor of true exegesis. So perhaps was his Gnostic predecessor Basilides, who claimed the authority of Glaukias, another interpreter (*ἐρμηνεύς*) of Peter. Papias, as we shall see, takes the reference in 1 Peter 5, 13 to prove a renewed association of Mark with Peter at Rome, after his association with Paul. Of the credibility of this we must enquire later; but to reason thus from the mere report of a report to the exact term used by the Elder is precarious in the extreme. We have no reason to impute to him the idea drawn by Papias from First Peter, and even if he used the exact equivalent of the Greek term *ἐρμηνευτής*, it need imply no more than an association with Peter corresponding to the expression of Acts 13, 5, *εἶχον δὲ Ἰωάννην ὑπηρέτην*, and to Luke 1, 2, where under *ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου* the same Mark is certainly included, as well as to 2 Tim. 4, 11, where Paul describes the function of Mark as *διακονία*. This is in fact the rank and office which

¹ Irenaeus, Haer. i. 1, 1.

² So, e.g., Moffatt, Introduction to the New Testament (2d ed.), p. 186, note 1, citing Schlatter, Kirche in Jerusalem.

every New Testament reference would lead us to ascribe to Mark. We might for example expect that "when Peter came to Antioch" (Gal. 2, 11), after the departure of Paul and Silas on the second missionary journey, the Apostle would take with him Mark in the same capacity of ὑπηρέτης in which he had previously served Paul and Barnabas on the first part of the first missionary journey, and subsequently had served Barnabas alone. In general this relation of Mark to Peter would be probable from the references in Acts 10-12. In particular it is made almost unavoidable by the fact that, just before this journey of Peter, Mark had returned to Jerusalem from Pamphylia more or less under a cloud (Acts 13, 13); whereas immediately after it (Acts 15, 38) he is back again in Antioch, whence he accompanies Barnabas his "cousin" (Col. 4, 10) to Cyprus. He can hardly have revisited Antioch on his own account. If he accompanied Peter it was doubtless in his usual capacity of ὑπηρέτης, or διάκονος.

We therefore quite agree with Zahn that the words of John the Elder are stretched wholly beyond their legitimate meaning when taken as applying to a preaching of Peter at Rome in Aramaic, "interpreted" by Mark into Greek (or Latin!). Zahn appears to be wholly justified in maintaining that the association of Apostle and ἐρμηνευτής—מורמתן referred to by "the Elder" does not pass the limits in time of that period in Peter's career known to us from Acts 1-15, during most of which Mark was a youth in his mother Mary's house in Jerusalem.

It may or may not be possible to give the Elder's words the "figurative" sense proposed by Zahn: "Mark, who (in so doing) became the interpreter of Peter, wrote down," etc.; but it is certain that they cannot be used in support of any other association of Mark with Peter than that of which we read in Acts. The later interpretations of it which begin with Papias' attempt to build on 1 Peter 5, 13, are responsible for the contradiction and difficulty. At this point, however, we take leave of Zahn, who refuses to admit that the misconception can go back to Papias and ascribes it all to the misunderstanding of later Fathers.

Returning, then, to the later development of the tradition, we see Papias' personal contribution to have been the locating of Mark's service as *ἐρμηνευτής* to Peter at Rome. The association affirmed by "the Elder" guaranteed Mark's qualifications as evangelist. The more definite specification of its date and circumstances greatly enhanced these qualifications by suggesting the completeness and accuracy of his record of Peter's teaching. In fact, Papias takes up every minutest detail of the Elder's testimony seriatim and dwells upon it. *ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν* had said the Elder. This (so Papias argues) implied that Mark's record of the precepts (*λόγια*), while less complete than Matthew, "omitted nothing that he had heard." Obviously the second Gospel cannot compare in completeness of recorded *λόγια* with the first. But Papias will not admit that Mark has any real defect. As a record of Peter's discourses it is complete. *ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν*, the Elder had testified. Papias reiterates that Mark "made no error (*οὐδὲν ἤμαρτεν*)," and "was careful to set down nothing falsely." Per contra, the Elder had undeniably declared that Mark's "order" was at fault (*οὐ μέντοι τάξει*). Papias therefore explains, limits, minimizes, this admitted shortcoming by every means in his power. He depicts the circumstances of the preaching which Mark heard. Unlike Matthew, whose design of making a systematic compend of the Lord's precepts (*σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λόγων* — var. *λογίων*) is self-evident from the Gospel that bears his name, and who may therefore be regarded as furnishing the basis of comparison, Peter merely related such anecdotes as were practically "suited to the occasion" (*πρὸς τὰς χρείας*). Mark's record, therefore, is even on this score "without fault," since its order is at least a correct transcript of the preaching of the great Apostle. The Romans might be supposed to have previously obtained from Matthew their knowledge of the precepts (*λόγια*), the "commandments (*ἐντολαί*) delivered by the Lord to the faith," as Papias terms them in the preceding context. This supposition is in fact actually made by his transcriber, Irenaeus.

In point of "order" there is in reality a very striking difference between Matthew and Mark. Matt. 4-14 completely reconstructs the Markan order of the ministry in Galilee

(though only to make it more artificial). Papias seems to regard the one Gospel (Matthew) as representing a systematic "compend of the Lord's oracles" (*σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων*), whereas the other (Mark) represents a mere collocation of anecdotes selected for practical edification on various occasions (*λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα; πρὸς τὰς χρείας*). This shows quite remarkable appreciation for so primitive a critic of the difference in form and structure between the two Gospels; but at the same time it confirms the impression we get from his use of First John, Revelation, and First Peter, that like the rest of his generation (and indeed inevitably) he was after all in the main dependent upon written sources, the "books" which he affects to disparage.

In thus falling back upon the Elder's testimony as to Mark's lack of "order" (*οὐ μέντοι τάξει*) Papias is not, as Moffatt strangely alleges, referring to "style rather than chronological sequence";¹ for it is chronological sequence only, and not style, which would be affected by the difference between being "a follower of the Lord" and being "afterwards a follower of Peter." Papias is merely excusing Mark's inability to relate *καθεξῆς* (as Luke purports to do²) by the fact (implied in the aorist *γενόμενος*) that at the time of writing his association with Peter had ceased. He elaborates this implication of the Elder's statement by reference to some no longer extant affirmation of his own, based (as we have seen) on 1 Peter 5, 13. For (as we have also seen) the question of the "order" (*τάξις*) had very early, and quite unavoidably, become a matter of serious concern. The disappearance of first-hand testimony would inevitably bring this about in the absence of written records.

What then was the real meaning of the participle *γενόμενος*? Irenaeus quite naturally infers that death had removed Peter at the time of Mark's writing; otherwise the evangelist could have learned the true order by enquiry from him. Later writers,

¹ Op. cit., pp. 188-189.

² Neither *καθεξῆς* nor *τάξει* apart from the context need mean more than "consecutively." Spoken of the letters of the alphabet, the "order" implied would be the conventional. Spoken of the events of sacred story, no other order can be thought of than that of real occurrence, especially when such corrections of Mark's order are made as that in Luke 3, 18-20.

such as Clement of Alexandria, dislike to admit a post-apostolic origin for the Gospel. They therefore maintain that the Apostle was still alive, as the ambiguity of the expression *γενόμενος* allows. Their assumption, however, is shown to be incorrect by the difficulty in which they at once find themselves involved. They can no longer explain Mark's failure to avail himself of Peter's knowledge. Clement's statement, for example, that Peter "learned of" Mark's undertaking, but "neither directly forbade nor encouraged it," is transparently inadequate. It does not remove the difficulty, but merely restates it. The enquirer returns with the further question, Why did the Apostle manifest such indifference? Eusebius seeks to improve upon Clement by making Peter's information come from "the Spirit," and by adding (as against seeming indifference) that he "commended the Gospel to the churches." But Mark's failure to consult Peter still remains a mystery. The Latin Adumbrations of Clement of Alexandria make the auditors, at whose solicitation Mark recorded the words of Peter, members of the imperial court at Rome of equestrian rank. Finally the late Synopsis Scripturae of Pseudo-Athanasius tries to meet the objection, and at the same time make the apostolic sanction of the Gospel letter-perfect, by changing the preaching of Peter to dictation. But now what is gained as respects accuracy of transcription is more than counterbalanced by the unrelieved contradiction of Matthew as respects order of events.

The apologetic motive for these later changes in the tradition is so transparent¹ that it would not be worth while to record them were it not for its close correspondence with the earlier. For we obtain thus a clear view of the trend, while we pursue an unbroken line backward from the later writers to Clement, from Clement to Papias, and from Papias to the "Elder." In all cases save one, Papias' theory of the provenance based on 1 Peter 5, 13 is adopted. "The Elder's" indefinite statement that Mark "had been" an *ἐρμηνευτής* of Peter, becomes

¹ Cf. Swete (op. cit., p. xxvi): "Later forms of the story exaggerate St. Peter's part in the production. Even Origen seems to represent the Apostle as having personally controlled the work (*ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ*), whilst Jerome (ad Hedib.) says that the Gospel of St. Mark was written 'Petro narrante et illo scribente.'"

progressively in later development a more and more detailed description of Peter's preaching at Rome, with Mark in attendance as reporter of the discourse. In reality there is nothing back of Papias save *ἐν Βαβυλῶνι* in 1 Peter 5, 13 to suggest that Peter ever set foot in Rome. To this *ἐν Βαβυλῶνι* we must return presently, but meantime a word must be devoted to the solitary variant in the tradition of Roman provenance for the Gospel.

The single exception is the statement of Chrysostom (Hom. 1 in Matt.) that Mark wrote his Gospel in Egypt at the request of his hearers there. As Zahn quite justly observes, this solitary variation is too late in date, and too obviously dependent on the ordinary earlier form (hearers requesting the work) to deserve our credence. It merely adapts the usual story to the Alexandrian episcopal succession, which begins (not perhaps without historical reason) with "Mark." Moreover its origin is easily accounted for. Swete¹ very reasonably explains it by the ambiguity of the statement of Eusebius (H. E. ii. 16) regarding the work of Mark in Egypt in "preaching the gospel of which he is a compiler" (*Μάρκον πρῶτον φασιν ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰγύπτου στείλαμενον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ δὴ συνεγράψατο κηρύξαι*). The fact that the same statement has led Jerome (Vir. ill. c. 8) to declare that Mark "took up the Gospel which he had compiled and went to Egypt" (*adsumpto itaque evangelio quod ipse confecerat perrexit Aegyptum*) strongly corroborates Swete's suggestion. The same ambiguous statement very obviously underlies this more cautious declaration, as well as that of Epiphanius (Haer. 51, 6) that after writing the Gospel at Rome, Mark was sent by Peter to Egypt.²

The possibility of a sojourn of Mark in Alexandria is of course entirely open; and the belief, as we have seen, gave rise to a late modification in the usual form of the tradition of the provenance of the Gospel. The two questions are mutually independent; but it will be worth while to refer to the cautious language of Swete, who in his well known Commentary³ leaves open the possibility of such a sojourn between the time when

¹ Commentary on Mark, p. xxxix.

² *ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπιτρέπεται τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐκθέσθαι, καὶ γράφας ἀποστέλλεται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγίου Πέτρου εἰς τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων χώραν.*

³ Pp. xviii ff.

Mark is last seen in Acts leaving Antioch for Cyprus as attendant on Barnabas (Acts 15, 39), and his reappearance some ten years later in Paul's entourage. Swete would account for the "widespread series of traditions connecting St. Mark with the foundation of the Alexandrian church" by the supposition that Paul's original commendation of Mark to the churches of the Lycus Valley, referred to in the words *περὶ οὗ ἐλάβετε ἐντολὰς* (Col. 4, 10), was occasioned by the proposal of Mark, then still in Cyprus, to visit these churches. This visit, Swete suggests, may have been abandoned for the mission to Egypt, whence Mark had proceeded to Rome. Swete, however, is properly explicit in pointing out that this whole possible episode of a stay in Alexandria belongs solely to the "personal history of Mark," and has no relation (at least in the period of authentic tradition) to the question of the provenance of the Gospel. In the second, third, and fourth centuries all parties are agreed in making the view of Papias fundamental. And with much reason, for Papias was the fountainhead of tradition regarding Gospel origins, having set himself, at just the critical juncture when authentic Palestinian tradition was being destroyed by the dispersal of the mother church in 135 A.D., to vindicate and preserve the apostolic *παράδοσις* as a bulwark against Gnostic vagary. As regards ancient testimony to the provenance of our oldest Gospel it is certainly true that "all roads lead to Rome." But not beyond the great junction point of Papias. That Papias affirmed this we have already seen reason to believe. It would also appear that he based his statement on the reference to "Babylon" in 1 Peter 5, 13. But was this his only ground? Did the belief rest wholly on the Scripture? Or was not the Scripture, as in so many other cases, at least in part an afterthought, confirming rather than originating belief?

Unfortunately for our present enquiry no reference to Rome appears in that ancient and apparently trustworthy tradition which Papias reports as from "the Elder." If such there was, it formed part of a highly apologetic and controversial comment, whose aim was to secure respect for a certain nonapostolic Gospel (Mark) which the author of the Exegeses thinks worthy of use alongside of the recognized apostolic standard (Mat-

thew). Besides Matthew's recognized *σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογιῶν*, Papias has determined to make use of Mark's *ἀπομνημονεύματα* of the preaching of Peter. He has a tradition of "the Elder" to cite in its favor, but in itself the Elder's endorsement of Mark is not unqualified. It has almost a patronizing tone. Papias repeats and elaborates upon it to make it apparent that nevertheless Mark may be accepted as an "errorless" transcript of the preaching of Peter. The description of the preaching agrees with what Eusebius describes (H. E. ii, 15, 2) as witness of Papias in confirmation (*συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ*) of Clement, that Mark attended Peter, and that in the Epistle "which they say was composed at Rome" Peter indicates this city figuratively in the words of 1 Peter 5, 13. In the clause, "in his Former Epistle which they say was composed at Rome," Eusebius is not quoting Papias, of course, but unspecified tradition (*φασίν*); but we cannot escape the clear statement that Papias declared the word "Babylon" in 1 Peter 5, 13 to be used symbolically (*τροπικώτερον*) for Rome. Whether, therefore, this exegesis represents Papias' only reason for locating the association of Mark with Peter at Rome, or whether it be in addition to some other, perhaps a reason of greater moment, we must at all events follow up this road and see whether or not the Epistle in question really does imply it.

The passage, 1 Peter 5, 13, makes reference to Mark in manifestly symbolic language as the writer's (spiritual) "son." It refers to the Christian brotherhood whence greetings are sent to the persecuted Pauline churches of Asia Minor as their "sister-election (*συνεκλεκτή*) in Babylon." What the author really means by this symbolism (for some part at least is symbolic) we must enquire for ourselves hereafter. Papias, in his interpretation, is clearly influenced by the Revelation of John (cc. 16-19), a book by which (as Eusebius plainly indicates) he and his successors down to Irenæus were greatly affected. Indeed, we are credibly informed by a writer¹ who seems to have used the work of Papias that he vouched for its *ἀξιόπιστον*. In

¹ Andreas of Caesarea in Apoc., preface and c. 34, sermon 12. By error, Andreas' transcript of Rev. 12, 9 is included in the Lightfoot-Harmer edition of the Apostolic Fathers as part of the quotation from Papias numbered Fragt. xi.

all probability Papias regarded the book in the same light as his contemporary Justin, who cites it (probably in dependence on Papias) as " a vision granted to one of ourselves, an Apostle of the Lord named John." Rev. 16, 19-19, 10 is the classic passage for the application to Rome of the prophecies of the Old Testament against " Babylon "; and Papias is of all men the one we should expect to apply this key (correctly or otherwise) to the symbolism of 1 Peter 5, 13. Against the supposition of its correctness, and in fact against the whole idea of an association of Mark with Peter at Rome, are the notorious difficulties in the way of this ardently defended belief.

For the only ancient support of a sojourn of Peter at Rome is the passage now under consideration, interpreted as Papias interprets it.¹ Peter certainly had not been at Rome throughout the period covered by the Pauline Epistles, still less had Mark been his minister there. Did he go to Rome after Paul's death, and there draw to himself Paul's former associates and helpers, Silvanus and Mark? This is what all defenders of the authenticity of First Peter from Papias to Sir William Ramsay would have us believe. I need hardly add that " there are many adversaries."

Present limitations forbid our entering fully upon the question of the authenticity of First Peter. Briefly let me acknowledge that continued study and reflection leads me more and more definitely toward the more radical of the alternatives left open eighteen years ago in my Introduction. O. D. Foster's study on the Literary Relations of First Peter² shows the line of proof which convinces me that the epistle cannot be earlier than the persecution of Domitian, a date which even Ramsay admits as intrinsically the most probable. The situation the writer of it confronts is that of 85 to 95 A.D., and to its " fiery

¹ Clement of Rome (5, 4, 5) and Dionysius of Corinth (ap. Euseb. H. E. ii, 15, 8) conjoin the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul, but Clement, at least, does not imply that both took place at Rome. Witnesses from the end of the second century, such as Dionysius and Caius, are too late to be regarded as independent. For a parallel instance of inference from First Peter as sole apparent basis for journeys attributed to the Apostle, see Eusebius, H. E. iii, 1. Dionysius (ibid. ii, 25) even makes Peter joint founder with Paul of the church in Corinth (!), apparently on the basis of 1 Cor. 1, 12.

² Yale University Press, 1913.

trial " we may well refer the apostasies acknowledged by some of the victims of Pliny in this same region, who in 112 A.D. testified that they had renounced this faith " twenty-five years ago " (Epist. 96, 6, ad Trajan.). A date ca. 87 A.D. is fatal to Petrine authorship.

On the other hand, critical surgery cannot rescue moral at the cost of literary integrity. Harnack's attempt against the beginning and end of the Epistle is inadmissible, because the severed parts attest organic unity with the trunk, and vice versa. From the ground their blood cries out against him. There remains no alternative but pseudonymity; and this has confirmation from the very elements we are now discussing. For in 1 Peter 5, 13 symbolism is undeniably employed. The writer shrouds his entourage and his place of writing in mystery. Like the self-styled " John " who addresses the endangered churches of Asia from " the Isle of Patmos " where he sojourns " for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus," so " Peter " writes from the midst of the church " in Babylon, elect together with you." Application of the mask of symbolism to the specific point of entourage and provenance is the classic symptom of pseudonymity. The reason is self-evident. To say plainly " Rome," or " Ephesus," would raise embarrassing questions of fact.

Taking First Peter, then, to be certainly earlier than Revelation, but with great probability later than the death of both Paul and Peter, what will be the natural interpretation of the symbolism at its beginning and end?

" Babylon " in 1 Peter 5, 13 is certainly no less symbolic in use than *συνεκλεκτή* and *ὁ υἱὸς μου* in the same verse, and the term *συνεκλεκτή* corresponds with the *ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπίδημοι διασπορᾶς* of 1, 1, " the elect of the dispersion." The latter are the recipients of the epistle, the Pauline churches of Asia Minor now exposed to the full force of a fiery persecution. Indeed this persecution may well be the same which the author of Hebrews anticipates in a letter probably sent shortly before in the reverse direction. The former group, who join with the writer of the epistle and speak through him words of encouragement and support, correspond to one great branch of Judaism in the

period whose beginning is marked by the Deutero-Isaian songs, the "captivity" in Babylon. As in Israel according to the flesh, so also in the Christian commonwealth, the two groups of exiles, the "captivity" in Babylon (cf. Rev. 18, 4) and the "dispersion" (or "sowing"; see verses 23-25) among the Gentiles are "elect sisters." Both look forward to a common deliverance and a joint inheritance in the day of redemption. The author of the epistle avails himself of this classic symbolism of Jewish literature not only in 5, 13, but also in 1, 1. It is well suited to his purpose of bringing two great branches of the Christian church, the "brotherhood throughout the world" (*ἀδελφότης ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*), into relations of mutual support, sympathy, and encouragement.

For this purpose the personal names also are appropriately chosen. "Silvanus" was joint founder with Paul of some of these Asian communities. "Mark" had been Paul's intermediary with at least one of them (Col. 4, 10). But most of all the name of "Peter" was well-nigh indispensable, and in an age wherein pseudonymity is habitual in writings for edification of this type it would raise no scruple or protest.

No suggested name of inferior authority¹ meets the requirements implied in the epistle itself. Only some elder of elders and shepherd of shepherds to the whole flock of Christ could appropriately exhort the church leaders of so many provinces to the steadfastness of martyrdom. As such speaks the "fellow-elder and witness of the sufferings of Christ" in 1 Peter 5, 1-5. Again, it belongs not to every new convert to commend Silvanus, Paul's yoke-fellow, as "faithful in my estimation" (5, 12); least of all to endorse the gospel preached by Paul as "the true grace of God." Such a message to such recipients would seem presumptuous, the commendation of Paul's fellow-worker patronizing, the reference to Mark an intrusion, from any lesser dignitary than the chief Apostle of all. It is therefore neither by accident nor mistake that Peter's name heads this epistle. The beginning corresponds with the end, however little this literary and Pauline "Peter" may correspond

¹ On "Barnabas" as suggested author, see below.

with the Galilean fisherman we know of through Synoptic story.¹

An artistic literary work of the period of Domitian, Pauline in structure, doctrine, and even phraseology, and addressed to the Pauline churches of Asia, under the name of Peter, can only be pseudonymous. But even were the letter an authentic missive of the Apostle Peter, the reference to the *ἐκλεκτοὶ διασπορᾶς* in 1, 1, taken together with its corresponding term the *ἀδελφότης ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ* (5, 9), would forbid our taking the expression *ἐν Βαβυλῶνι* in any narrow or concrete sense. As it is, Rome is probably meant, but the expression is purposely veiled, and the symbolism (like most of the imagery of this epistle) requires to be interpreted by Isaiah rather than by Revelation. The key will be found in this classic Jewish usage. It shows that the "elect sisterhood" in the author's mind is on the one side that of the "Dispersion" (*διασπορά*), on the other that of the "Captivity" (*ἡ συνεκλεκτὴ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι*). The latter of course represents the main stock. "Peter" speaks for it, because he is the leader of the original Twelve. If we conceive it to be the actual Peter who speaks, we meet difficulties, among them the question what he means by *ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ*, and why allegory should be used, if this be allegory. If "Peter" be a pseudonym, the passage will still afford our strongest evidence that Peter's martyrdom took place as alleged, in Rome. But neither ancients nor moderns would be justified in inferring from it a Roman ministry of Peter, with Mark as his "interpreter."

The mere fact that the author of the epistle probably substitutes Peter's name for his own has, therefore, no direct bearing on the question whether he believed in a sojourn of Peter at Rome; for, whoever he be, he purposely avoids naming a real locality, and makes "Peter" speak not so much in behalf of a particular local body of Christians, as on behalf of the *ἀδελφότης ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*, the whole body of the exiled people of God, among

¹ Against attempts such as Harnack's to cut off 1, 1 from the remainder, observe also the interconnection between this verse and 1, 23 (*διασπορά—ἐκ σπορᾶς ἀφθάρτου*); 2, 11 (*παρεπιδήμοις—ὡς παρεπιδήμοις*), and the dependence of James 1, 1, 10, 12, 18 on the same figure of the *διασπορά*.

whom the "elect in Babylon" are complementary to "the elect of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia" etc., as Israel in captivity beyond the Euphrates is complementary to the Jewish Dispersion. The two "elect sisters" await in both cases a common redemption.

On the other hand, the personal names are necessarily real. The writer speaks "through Silvanus" because Silvanus together with Paul had been the founder of most of the churches now exposed to persecution among "the Elect of the Dispersion." He sends the greeting of "Mark" because Mark, follower first of Barnabas and Paul, then of Barnabas alone, and lastly of Paul alone, had first of all been an intimate associate, and very probably a convert, of Peter. Mark could thus be a link between Petrine and Pauline Christianity. Whether the writer thinks of the present abode of either Silvanus or Mark is problematical; but it is clear at all events that Mark has become a "personage," and if (as the tradition, the literary relations, and the dissemination give reason to believe) First Peter is really of Roman provenance, this mention is an indication to be added to those of the later Pauline Epistles that this trusted coworker of Paul continued after the Apostle's death at Rome, forming one of the bonds connecting the church of the metropolis with Paul's earlier mission field.

This interpretation of First Peter in its general purpose, and particularly with reference to the symbolic expressions at its beginning and end, which mask the actual personality of the writer and the real situation, must be presented here more or less dogmatically for lack of opportunity to develop evidence. It will serve, however, to indicate why the definite affirmations of Papias regarding the provenance of Mark, eagerly as they have been adopted by the later church writers, who look to Papias for all their knowledge of Gospel origins, are by no means to be taken without their proper "grain of salt." Zahn, of course, is very easily convinced of the authenticity not only of First Peter, but of Second Peter also. For defensive criticism the rule is simple: All canonical writings bearing the name of Peter, authentic; all uncanonical, pseudonymous. Even Zahn, however, feels constrained by the fundamentally Pauline char-

acter of the epistle to make its real author Silas rather than Peter. Professor McGiffert has a theory of his own to account for its peculiarities: First Peter is the only original and genuine Epistle of Barnabas; the insertion of the name "Peter" is an intrusion either accidental or designed. Let us leave *sub judice* these attempts to explain how an epistle which by contents, phraseology, purpose, and address is Pauline can appear under the name of Peter, and limit our claim to the undeniable fact that in resting on 1 Peter 5, 13 for his evidence that the scene of Mark's attendance as "translator" on the discourses of Peter was Rome, Papias took very dubious ground. "Peter" possibly took passage for Rome by this conveyance; but his passport is not yet viséd, for Papias' endorsement will not suffice. We must have better evidence before we admit him to residence.

Nevertheless, the value of Papias' testimony does not wholly disappear. We have some reason to believe that First Peter really was written from Rome. Authentic or pseudonymous, its literary relations, the use of the Pauline literature which had preceded, the use subsequently made of the epistle itself in these regions, its earliest circulation — these, taken together with its purpose and animus, are more favorable to derivation from Rome than from any other church. However fallacious the exegesis of the passage on which Papias rested his belief, the construction he followed can hardly have been suggested by it; for "Babylon" would naturally be taken in the literal sense. Clement of Alexandria, as we have seen, reverts to this. It is hardly probable that Papias' view of the epistle as a missive from Rome could have maintained itself had it been demonstrably at variance with the truth. Grant that the real author of the epistle does not mean to suggest Rome by the symbolic "Babylon," and that the mention of members of Paul's entourage (one of whom was at last accounts at Rome) is due only to his desire to commend his message to the Pauline churches addressed, still, the mention of Mark as Peter's "son" along with Silvanus in a Roman document of ca. 87 A.D. would by no means be without significance to our problem. It may not be a direct consequence of this linking of

Mark's name with Peter's that the Gospel which was understood to embody Peter's memorabilia of the Lord came to be designated *κατὰ Μάρκον*; but the characterization certainly points to Mark as a "personage" of growing authority among the Pauline churches at this period, an authority which would more and more tend to rest, as it has already in this passage begun to do, on his earlier relations with Peter, rather than on his later relations with Paul.

If then, First Peter be, as seems so probable, a Roman writing of ca. 87 A.D., it shows the special respect in which Mark was then held at Rome, and shows, moreover, as the principal basis for that respect, his long-past associations with Peter. The epistle extends the right hand of fellowship to the Asiatic churches of Paul, suffering under the great wave of Domitianic persecution which had shortly before evoked our Epistle to the Hebrews, and was destined not long after to bring forth the great Ephesian book of "Prophecy" issued as the "Revelation of John." The fact that not only "Peter" but "Mark," as Peter's spiritual "son," is for this purpose a name to conjure with is in significant parallelism with the phenomenon of a Gospel emanating (as tradition affirms) from the same region, at approximately the same period, which is understood to embody the *ἀπομνημονεύματα* of Peter, but is superscribed with the name of "Mark." From this point of view one can appreciate why the "Gospel according to Mark" really corresponds in some degree to the tradition that it represents the *ἀνέκδοτα* of Peter, notwithstanding its attitude of uncompromising Paulinism on debated questions of faith and practice.

From the question of Papias' opinion of the provenance of the epistle and its probable relation to fact, we may return to that of the Gospel. Papias believed both works to emanate from Rome. He grounds his belief on a dubious interpretation of a passage whose authenticity is subject to very serious dispute. At first sight this might appear almost fatal to our attempt to link tradition, as it appears after Papias, with historical report as it may have been before. But the real origin of Papias' belief is one thing, the proof-text he adduces in its support is another. The same reasoning which applies to First Peter ap-

plies with much greater force to the Gospel of Mark. I am not speaking now of the internal evidences of Roman origin displayed by the Gospel. These must be considered later. I do not refer to the evidences of early employment, which in the case of both writings are at least not unfavorable to Rome. The question is simply whether Papias would be apt to take up the idea that Mark was a Roman gospel, or having taken it up be able persistently to maintain and transmit it, if such were not the fact. Considering how vital to his enquiry this question was, not a merely incidental question like that of the provenance of First Peter, but of direct concern to his principal enquiry; considering also that it was probably not a difficult matter, either for Papias himself or for his opponents, to know where this primitive Gospel first came into general currency, it is not unreasonable to hold that some more or less definite knowledge must have been the real basis of his belief.

Quite apart from this hopeful probability, the results of our critical analysis are by no means entirely destructive. On the contrary, they throw new and important light upon the personal history of Mark, the significance of which increases with the probability of the Roman provenance of the so-called First Epistle of Peter a few years only after the Gospel. The effect of these results is sharply to differentiate an apologetic, legendary, or at least unverifiable, later development, from a nucleus of authentic tradition, perfectly consonant with all we can learn both from Lukan and Pauline sources. On this side of the age of the great Apologists our enquiry lays bare, it is true, a persistent apologetic, dating back at least to Papias, if not to the author of First Peter himself, an apologetic which is bent on binding the aged Peter and carrying him away whither he would not, to become the forefather of the Roman papacy. With the methods of this apologetic we are all too familiar. By all means, whether with much persuasion or little, the chief Apostle must be induced to give his indorsement to Rome's succession and Rome's Gospel, to found the one and to preach, if not actually to dictate, the other. This is the animus of the whole body of tradition from Papias onward. But back of this lies a very different type, an older tradition traceable to Pales-

tine, refractory to the later attempts of Papias and others to mould it to apologetic and Roman interest. By this older tradition we do not mean the representation of First Peter, which rather forms (intentionally or otherwise) the starting-point for Roman glorification of the Gospel and see of Peter. We mean the quite dispassionate, almost disparaging, testimony of the Elder John of Jerusalem, corroborated as it is on the negative side by Matthew (and Luke) in their limitation of Peter's sphere to Jewish Christendom.

It is this Jerusalem Elder of about 100-117 who explains the title "According to Mark" by telling us (what we might reasonably have ourselves inferred from Acts 12, 12, 25; 13, 5, 13, and 15, 37-39), that Mark had been an interpreter for Peter, and had written down accurately, though not in order, such things as he remembered both of the sayings and doings of the Christ. Understood in its most natural sense (that sense which Zahn maintains to be not only admissible but alone admissible), the tradition refers to recollections set down at least a score of years after Mark's personal relations with Peter had permanently ceased. In this representation there is nothing improbable or unreasonable. On the contrary, it agrees not only with the internal characteristics of the Gospel, but also with what we learn from the mentions of Mark in the Pauline epistles written from Rome. These show, contrary to all possible anticipation, that the former associate of Peter and Barnabas, a worker originally in that Eastern field which according to Gal. 2, 1-10 had been allotted to Peter's evangelizing efforts, became subsequently, during that later period on which the Book of Acts sheds no light, an associate of Paul, and a worker in Greece and Italy. They show Rome itself at last accounts as his headquarters. The Elder's statement is thus curiously in harmony with what we know from Acts, and Acts alone, in regard to Mark's relations with Peter.

The Gospel of Mark itself, on the other hand, bears out what we know from the later Pauline Epistles alone as to his ultimate relations with Paul. Between the two stands the First Epistle of Peter (an admittedly Paulinistic writing) in which Mark has the same double relation as in the Gospel. For the Gospel, like

the Epistle, is Pauline as respects aim, standpoint, and (traditional) provenance; but as regards its evangelic data it is both traditionally, and to some extent as a matter of observed fact, a record of anecdotes derived from Peter.

We have no reason to suppose that John of Jerusalem took the slightest interest in the Epistles of Paul. We have no reason to imagine any acquaintance on his part with First Peter. Nevertheless what he has to say of Mark as author of the Gospel whose provenance later tradition attributes to Rome presents him in the same light as 1 Peter 5, 13, i.e. as Peter's spiritual "son." This lends no small corroboration to his testimony. First Peter, Acts, the Elder John—these three represent successive stages in the tradition which leads to the attachment of the name of Mark to the ἀπομνημονεύματα of Peter. Not the least important of these links is that wherein the Pauline encourager (from Rome?) of the Pauline churches of Asia under the fire of Domitian's persecution borrows the name of Peter, using also the names of Paul's lieutenants, Silvanus and Mark, as his intermediaries. In Epistle and Gospel alike the hands are the hands of Peter, but the voice is the voice of Paul. Papias' exegesis and criticism will hardly stand; but in attributing both Epistle and Gospel to Rome Papias falls in at least with certain striking features shared by these two writings. Both are Pauline to the core as regards questions of faith and practice. Nevertheless both would be understood as speaking not for Paul, but for Peter.