

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>

according to the tradition of the elders, but eat their bread with common (*κοιναῖς*) hands?"; thereafter he interjects a description of Jewish observances (vers. 3-4), whose tone can hardly be called respectful, even if "ablutions of cups and pots" do form part of Jewish ritual. Even when the sense is expressed by the Greek itself, as in *παρασκευή* (15, 42), Mark appends a paraphrase (*ὁ ἐστὶν προσάββατον*), and explains the sense of the transliterated *γέεννα* (9, 43, *τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον*).

C. LOCAL GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

1. Explanations of Palestinian climate and geography are particularly significant of the location of the readers in East or West. Thus Mark 11, 13, *ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων* invites our notice by the fact that the evangelist finds it needful to explain to his readers that Passover was "not the season of figs." Such information regarding the climate of Jerusalem might be required at Rome. It certainly could not be on any of the eastern coasts of the Mediterranean.

Other editorial explanations indicate not only such ignorance on the readers' part as is hardly to be imagined in Oriental circles, and not paralleled in Matthew or Luke, but also a condition of the evangelist's own mind, neither wholly well-informed nor sympathetic. It is inevitable from the beginning already made to push the enquiry beyond explanatory glosses, and seek in the body of the work for further indications of the geographical standpoint.

2. The great discourse on the Doom of Jerusalem (Mark 13), reproduced with some Q expansions in Matthew 24 and Luke 21, is a striking feature of the Gospel,¹ constructed, as the present writer has endeavored to prove,² on the basis of Q logia with special reference to the events of 67-70 A.D. (and hence later than 70), using the visions of Daniel to weld the whole into a typical apocalyptic eschatology. The author's prin-

¹ The only other long discourse of Mark is the chapter of parables. This also in the interpretation of Red.-Marc. is a preaching of judgment against the people of deaf ears. As Swete points out (Commentary, p. 74), the other long discourses of Mark are "delivered privately to the Twelve."

² Journal of Biblical Literature, XXVIII (1909), pp. 1-25.

cial effort, however, is to restrain rather than foment eschatological fervor, and for this purpose he not only shapes his compilation along the lines of the Pauline (or Deutero-Pauline?) eschatology of 2 Thess. 2, but even borrows its peculiar watchword *μὴ θροεῖσθε* as the chief burden of his exhortation. This reassuring appeal, "be not wrought up," sounds the keynote of Red.-Marc., warning against the plausible deceivers who proclaim the second coming of Christ, even in many cases declaring, "I am He," and showing deceptive signs and wonders. In the spirit (and to some extent the language) of 2 Thess. 2, 1-12 the readers are warned against the Antichrist and his false prophets, and bidden to refuse assent to their efforts at agitation, whether (1) on the ground of general catastrophes in various places (13, 3-8), or (2) more specifically on the ground of the visitation of Judea and Jerusalem with the desolation predicted by Daniel (verses 14-23).

The fact that such detailed prediction of the fate of Jerusalem with specific application of the Danielic visions does not elsewhere appear in the authentic teaching of Jesus need not here detain us. It may or may not support the much favored theory of an eschatological Flugblatt incorporated by the evangelist. We will not even dwell upon the fact (significantly paralleled as it is by other quasi-Pauline phenomena of Mark) that the Antichrist legend finds its roots (so far as non-Markan material is concerned) not in any authentic teaching of Jesus, but only in Revelation and the Pauline (or possibly Deutero-Pauline) tract known as Second Thessalonians. Let the historical authenticity of all the predictions of Mark 13, 14-20, describing the horrors of the Jewish war, be fully granted, despite the contrast they present to the more general moral warnings of Luke 12, 42-13, 9, and to Jesus' deprecation of attempts to prognosticate in the Q logion (Matthew 24, 25 ff. = Luke 17, 21 ff.), still it will not be easy to explain how a writer not himself an outsider should speak of these calamities as falling on "those that are in Judea" (Mark 13, 14). In comparison with this peculiarity it is of very small significance that Matthew, who is generally acknowledged to write from the Palestinian standpoint, should insert the word *εἰθώς* at the

beginning of the third and closing paragraph. For Matthew's aim is to increase faith in the particular eschatology which he takes over from Mark (in an interpretation of his own), rather than to hold in check, as does Q (and to a less extent Mark), the tendency to apocalyptic superstition. Mark, however, writes of the desolation as something which happens to "those in Judea." Not even this special visitation must mislead the church. Only when "the powers that are in the heavens are shaken" (verse 25) can the Coming be expected; for was it not an essential part of the eschatology of Paul, not only that the times of the Gentiles must be fulfilled (Rom. 9-11; cf. Mark 13, 10), but also (Eph. 6, 12) that the real struggle is "not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities and powers in the heavenly regions"?

That Matthew and Luke have taken over this doom chapter of Mark (13) is almost a matter of course. At their time of writing no other course would be conceivable. But this should not blind us to the fact that whatever the source of the materials, the construction is a composition of the second evangelist's own. The question for us to ask, then, is whether the use here made of Q logia and apocalyptic legend is such as we should expect from a converted Jew of Rome. We shall return later to the question of the "Paulinism" of Mark, which cannot be wholly disregarded in an enquiry as to provenance. Meantime we take note as a geographic indication of some value that the evangelist speaks of the events of A.D. 67-70 as calling for the flight of "those in Judea" to "the mountains."

3. The impression made by the reference to the flight of "those in Judea" is confirmed by the "meagreness" of geographical data, and the "reticence" of the evangelist in regard to "the complex political life which prevailed in Palestine at the time," which are noted by Swete, but which the commentator feels sure are "not due to ignorance."¹

Our own knowledge is unfortunately so small as to restrict to narrowest limits the possibility of argument on this score. We find, for example, reference in Mark 8, 10 to a landing on the west (?) shore of the Lake of Galilee at a place denominated

¹ Op. cit., pp. lxxxii, lxxxv.

Dalmanutha. The name is otherwise unknown, and was as much a puzzle to ancient as to modern geographers. Matthew changes to Magadan (= Magdala? Mageda?), the β text has *Μελεγαδά*, or *Μαγαιδά*. Arthur Wright in his Greek Synopsis notes the simple fact that "no satisfactory explanation of the word Dalmanutha has been found." He commends the suggestion of Rendel Harris that $\alpha\eta\eta\eta\eta$ is a clerical error of an early scribe, τ being the preposition "of," δ the preposition "to" and $\alpha\eta\eta\eta$ meaning "the parts"; so that the whole sentence runs: "He came into the parts of—into the parts." Here, whatever the fact, the ignorance will be charged not to author or transcriber but to the critic, unable, as he is, from the nature of the case, to prove the non-existence of a place so named. Even were it possible to establish this "universal negative," the evangelist personally would still escape. It would be said (as actually by Rendel Harris) that the misunderstanding by which an Aramaic phrase has been taken for a proper name is a "clerical error of an early scribe."

Similar difficulties would beset any attempt by the critic to show geographical error in Mark 11, 1, where the earliest text of Mark gives "Bethphage and Bethany," but Matthew has *εις Βηθφαγή*. Bethphage ("home of figs") is in fact a village on the Mount of Olives known to the Talmud and to Eusebius,¹ and is suitable to the context, which goes on to refer to "the village (sing.) over against you." No "Bethany" is traceable in this locality except as derived from Mark. The true solution seems to be furnished by Origen, who informs us explicitly that in his time the reading of Matthew was "Bethphage," that of Mark "Bethany," and that of Luke "Bethphage and Bethany," as in our present texts of Luke, and of Mark as well. The third reading is almost certainly a conflation of the other two. Perhaps "Bethphage" is a Palestinian correction of the inaccurate "Bethany" of (pre-Origenian) Mark, and is therefore substituted by Matthew, who makes a similar correction of Mark's geography in Matt. 8, 28. Luke and the post-Origenian texts of Mark conflate. But again demonstration breaks down through inadequate knowledge. Our ignorance both of the

¹ References in Swete ad loc.

ancient geography of Palestine and of the history of the text precludes all positive assertion.

In spite of these manifest limitations it is, nevertheless, possible to adduce strong evidence that Mark is not only "meagre" in geographical data,¹ but inferior in knowledge of Palestinian geography to later evangelists.

(a) The "city" whose residents flock forth to see Jesus after he has exorcised the legion of devils on the "Decapolis" shore of the Lake (Mark 5, 1-20), is to Mark "Gerasa," the chief city of Decapolis according to Josephus, but here a geographic impossibility which Matthew seeks to adjust to the story by substituting "Gadara." But Origen, visiting the region in the third century, easily perceived that even Gadara is still too distant, and proposed to conjecture a "Gergesa" from the "Girgashites" mentioned in Joshua. Continued enquiry by travellers since Origen has succeeded in attaching the name "Kersa" to a portion of the eastern littoral, but is still unable to produce either "steep places," or remains of any "city," such as the story requires. The plain fact seems to be that the author of this characteristically Markan story of exorcism failed to realize the remoteness of "the city of the Gerasenes" in "Decapolis" from the Lake of Galilee.

(b) Careful as he is to distinguish between 'hamlets,' (*ἀγροί*), 'villages' (*κῶμαι*), 'towns' (*κωμοπόλεις*), and 'cities' (*πόλεις*), Red.-Marc., nevertheless, refers in 8, 23 and 26 to Bethsaida Julias, the southern metropolis of Philip's kingdom, as a "village." In 6, 45 he even seems to think of it as situated west of Jordan (verse 53), which leads the modern geographers who are intent chiefly on Gospel harmony to insert two Bethsaidas on the map.

(c) In Mark 7, 31 the expression of the source (7, 24) "borders of Tyre and Sidon," which Matthew 15, 21-22 correctly understands as the frontier region of northern Galilee bordering on Phoenicia, is taken in a distributive sense as implying two separate journeys, first to Tyre, afterwards to Sidon (!);

¹ Compare, for example, the relative richness of the fourth Gospel in identifiable situations in western Palestine. For the portion of the country actually visited in all times by the pilgrim tourist (the road from Jerusalem to Capernaum through Samaria) the fourth evangelist shows closer acquaintance than any.

whence Jesus returns to the Sea of Galilee, "through the borders of Decapolis" (ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὀρίων Δεκαπόλεως). In order to reach Caesarea Philippi, the scene of the great self-declaration of Jesus, without omitting the incidents of Dalmanutha (?) and Bethsaida (?) in 8, 10 and 22, a journey from Sidon "through the borders of Decapolis" may have seemed unavoidable to Red.-Marc., but he has never succeeded in making this journey of Jesus *in partibus infidelium* seem plausible either to ancient or to modern minds. Paul gives every indication that he believed Jesus to have remained "a minister of the circumcision because of the promises made to the fathers." Luke cuts out the entire section, eliminating even the name "Caesarea Philippi." Matthew, as usual, takes the more cautious method of removing the difficulty by slight and skilful changes of the wording, so that Jesus never actually leaves Jewish territory or enters a "city of the Gentiles." The healing of the blind man "of Bethsaida" is transferred to less objectionable scenes (cf. Matthew 9, 27-31 and 20, 29-34 with Mark 8, 22-26); while for Mark's "villages of Caesarea Philippi" Matthew substitutes "regions (μέρη) of Caesarea Philippi," implying only a journey to the upper waters of the Jordan. In reality, whereas the source may very well have had "borders of Tyre and Sidon" and "villages (i.e., 'daughter' towns, as in Num. 21, 25, 32; Neh. 11, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, etc.) of Caesarea Philippi," the extraordinary journey of Jesus in Gentile regions sketched in Mark 7, 24-8, 27, with scarcely any material not duplicating his earlier narrative, is opposed to all we should infer from Paul as well as the later evangelists, and, even if admitted, is described by terms geographically unintelligible.

4. If we turn from Palestinian geography to local history, politics, and conditions, we find even Zahn himself constrained to admit that "in Mark 6, 17 there is real ignorance of the complicated family relationships of the Herods." This understates the case. Zahn's own elaborate explanations of Mark's use of the title "king" for the tetrarch Antipas, and "kingdom" for the tetrarchy, which he offers to hand about as royally as Ahasuerus (cf. Mark 6, 23 with Esth. 5, 3, 6; 7, 2),

fails to disguise the simple fact of error, which for the most part Matthew corrects, though by oversight in one instance (Matt. 14, 9) the word "king" is retained. Luke, on the other hand, not only restores to Antipas his true title, but suppresses the whole Markan story. This is in truth the only reasonable course for an evangelist having before him the far truer depiction of the Baptist and his mission supplied by the Second Source; for the inaccuracies of Mark 6, 17-29 are so flagrant as to lead Holtzmann to apply to it the term "the very pattern of a legend." Its author is clearly not aware that the Baptist met his fate as secretly as possible in the lonely frontier fortress of Machaerus, but depicts it as an accompaniment and foil to scenes of revelry in the palace at Tiberias, "when Herod on his birthday made a feast to his great ones and the chief men of Galilee." Instead of a lonely anchorite of the Judean desert to whom the "dwellers in Jerusalem" go forth in idle or superstitious curiosity (Matt. 11, 7 = Luke 7, 24), Mark conceives the prophet as an Elijah at the court of Ahab and Jezebel, or a Paul before Felix and Bernice, denouncing the unworthy king, plotted against by the wicked queen. The Q material (Matt. 11, 7-10 = Luke 7, 24-28) shows a far more correct idea of John's activity and environment.

Again the critic cannot fail to suspect the Markan combination of "Pharisees and Herodians" as joint conspirators against Jesus' life, in view of the difficulty of accounting for any party of "Herodians" before the accession of Agrippa I (41 A.D.). Here again we are limited by our own inability to prove a "universal negative"; but it is worth noting in view of the admitted ignorance of Mark as to the complicated family relationships of the Herods, and his demonstrable dependence on the Second Source, that in the latter (Luke 13, 31 ff.; cf. Matt. 23, 37 ff.) the Pharisees appear in the rôle of false friends of Jesus seeking to drive him out by the threat, "Herod will kill thee." From such a datum the editorial representations of Mark 3, 6; 8, 15, and 12, 13, would be readily explicable.

We are also limited by our ignorance on the constructive side. In spite of Zahn's confidence, the "Alexander and Rufus" of Mark 15, 21 are not identifiable. Mark stands

alone, it is true, in attaching to the story of the impressment of "Simon of Cyrene" to bear Jesus' cross the statement that this was "the father of Alexander and Rufus," and as Zahn remarks, the only possible purpose of the addition is to give greater interest to the story by connecting it with what was familiar to the readers. In this case "Simon of Cyrene" is clearly unknown, whereas the readers have knowledge of "Alexander and Rufus." But who is this Alexander? And who is Rufus? It is possible that this Rufus is the same mentioned by Paul in Rom. 16, 13, although we hear nothing there of "Alexander." It is also possible that the "letter of commendation" for Phoebe from which the greeting in Rom. 16, 13 is taken was originally addressed to Rome, though there is on the whole better reason to think its original destination Ephesus. The uncertainties of the case are so considerable that the present writer must renounce the attempt to find positive evidence here for Roman provenance, and run the risk of being classed among those with whom "further discussion is useless" because of their lack of "judgment."¹

D. THE "PAULINISM" OF MARK

From the indications of acquaintance (or the lack of it) with Palestinian geography, history, and local conditions, we must turn to a different type of evidence suggesting Roman, or at least Western, provenance for Mark, by comparison with conditions as reflected in the Pauline Epistles, more especially those addressed to, or written from, Rome.

So far from overvaluing this, Zahn falls far short of appreciating the full significance of what he calls "the tendency among Roman Christians (reflected in Rom. 14) that influenced Mark to reproduce in such great detail the discourse concerning things clean and unclean (7, 1-23), and generally to emphasize strongly Jesus' opposition to ceremonialism."

Both the Roman "tendency" (which Mark does not really oppose, but of which this Gospel is rather representative), and its special emphasis on "Jesus' opposition to ceremonialism"

¹ Zahn, Introduction, II, 490.