

# 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>

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."<sup>1</sup>

#### 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"

<sup>1</sup> Zahn, Introduction, II, 490.

in general, and to distinctions of meats in particular, are matters which demand our most careful scrutiny; for here we at last touch upon the most distinctive features in the motive and character of Mark. If a relation can really be shown between it and early "tendency" at Rome the value of our enquiry into the provenance of the Gospel will be self-evident.

Paul's Epistle to the Romans gives unmistakable evidence of the predominance in the Roman church of the element we should expect to be in control in the city which the Apostle to the Gentiles looked to as the natural centre of his missionary field. The decisive proof is that the practical exhortations for church order and unity at the close of the Epistle (Rom. 14, 1-15, 13) addressed, as so frequently in Paul (Gal. 6, 1; 1 Thess. 5, 14; 2 Thess. 3, 6-15, etc.), to those "having the leadership" in the church, have as their prevailing note the warning against too inconsiderate, too exclusively self-regarding, application of the Pauline principle of freedom from the ceremonial distinctions of the Law.

As at Corinth, whence Paul had received not long before a request for advice on the various points in dispute between "strong" (those "of Paul") and "weak" (those "of Cephas"), so now at Rome Paul finds it necessary to curb the vaunted liberalism<sup>1</sup> of those who claimed to be his own "imitators" (1 Cor. 1, 12; 11, 1, 2) by reminding them that he himself had always sought to be an "imitator of Christ," who "for the sake of the promises made to the fathers" had voluntarily subjected himself to all the limitations of Mosaism, not pleasing himself, but content to share the reproach (*ὀνειδισμὸς*) of his people (Rom. 15, 1-13; cf. 1 Cor. 8, 1-11, 1). In particular, as to the two distinctive features of Judaism in the Gentile world, the distinctions of days and distinctions of meats, Paul urges (Rom. 14) that scruples which by himself in common with all the "strong" are clearly perceived to be needless, but which the "weak" do not venture to cast aside, should not of

<sup>1</sup> The word is here used (with apologies) in the too common sense of mere relaxation of pre-existing restraints. Paul, in common with other "liberal" leaders, suffered from the misrepresentation of followers concerned only with this negative side of his teaching.

themselves be made a bar to the admission of these latter to the brotherhood. On the contrary, if the "weak" consents to keep his scruples to himself, not making them a matter of "doubtful disputations" by the attempt to impose them on others, the "strong" should make a corresponding sacrifice of conciliation. He should be willing voluntarily to surrender his proper liberty rather than use it at the risk of putting a stumbling-block in the way of one for whom Christ died.

An exhortation of this character and purpose, carried to such large extent, could not possibly occupy the place of main practical emphasis in this church-letter had not the community been really in need of just this warning. At Rome, then, in 55-60 A.D. the church was already tending, as it had previously tended at Corinth, to outrun the liberalism of Paul on its practical side, under the cry: "All things are lawful, all days are holy, all meats are clean." It was in danger of forgetting the Apostle's self-imposed limitation, to become "all things to all men," weak to the weak, bound to those not free, under the law (though really free from it), to those who still feared it, in order "by all means to save some" (Rom. 14, 13-23; cf. 1 Cor. 9, 19-22).

The real and concrete "occasions of stumbling" at Rome were the Jewish distinctions of meats and distinctions of days (Rom. 14, 1-6). It does not appear that Paul apprehended there the more subtle errors of the Apollos tendency prevailing in Corinth. We have, in fact, as little ground to expect in the western metropolis appreciation of the more mystical and deeper elements of Pauline doctrine as we have evidence that they had in reality taken any perceptible hold. Paul's liberty in actual practice, his disregard for the well-known Jewish distinctions of days and distinctions of meats, determined the "Paulinism" of an age which as yet knew little of the great Epistles. They had "been informed concerning him that he taught all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs." They were not informed of much else. If the author of Acts 21, 21 insists that this is slander, certainly those who claimed freedom as disciples "of Paul" had exceed-

ingly strong grounds for affirming its truth. At least according to Acts 21, 21 they certainly did so affirm. It is the over-emphasis of this negative side of Paul's teaching which the Apostle strives hard to counteract both in First Corinthians and Romans. His effort is proof positive of the existence, and even the predominance, at Rome of a type of "Paulinism," which while sincerely intending to "imitate" the Apostle in all things, in reality overlooked the finer side of his teaching, in particular, his considerate regard and sympathetic appreciation for Jewish scruples and fears regarding distinctions of meats and days. Our contention is that the "Paulinism" of Mark is precisely of the type Paul seeks to hold in check. It has little to do with the literary Paul, but is characterized by exactly this overbearing, inconsiderate, intolerant attitude of the "strong" toward the Jewish "distinctions."

It is no small point of coincidence between Mark and Romans that the Gospel has so much to say about the "man-made" nature of the Mosaic observances (7, 7, 8; 10, 9; cf. Col. 2, 22). It is at least equally noteworthy that the special polemic of the evangelist is waged against the two particular points: (1) distinctions of days (2, 23-3, 6); (2) distinctions of meats (7, 1-23).

As regards theological grounds for this liberalism, the evangelist is almost totally detached from the distinctive tenet of Paul (abolition of the legal relation by the cross); but practically he only differs from Paul as did the unreflecting Paulinists of Corinth and Rome of whom we have just spoken. Theologically he knows that sin is forgiven on simple repentance and faith, no matter how much "the scribes" are horrified at the claim of the Son of Man to forgive sins (2, 1-12). He knows (very much more vaguely) that this forgiveness is somehow promoted, if not conditioned, by Jesus' death on the cross (10, 45; 14, 24).<sup>1</sup> The extreme meagreness of what he has to say on this vital doctrine of the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Epistles, the gospel of the "atonement" or "reconciliation" (*καταλλαγή*) as Paul calls it (2 Cor. 5, 18-19), is perhaps the

<sup>1</sup> On the relation of Mark to the doctrine of the suffering servant (the *καταλλαγή* doctrine of Paul), see below.

most remarkable thing about Mark's soteriology. It is as un-Pauline a feature as anything in the Gospel. However, even this little is greatly diminished in Matthew, and has entirely disappeared in Luke-Acts. Positively, then, Mark offers a gospel of forgiveness by repentance and faith (1, 15) as in the Second Source (Matt. 21, 32 = Luke 7, 29, 50<sup>1</sup>), though without the Lukan explanation and defense (cf. Mark 2, 1-12 with Luke 7, 36-50). This soteriology is connected very vaguely with a doctrine of atonement through the cross. Negatively Red.-Marc. shows his hostility to the Law in a different way from Paul. The Apostle objects to it only as a temporary divine ordinance retained in authority after it had been divinely superseded. Mark objects to it *per se*. To Mark the Jewish ritual observances, irrespective of the distinction introduced by Matthew between Law and tradition, "plantation" and "hedge" (Matt. 15, 12-14), are in general "ordinances of men" (7, 7-8, 14-19; 10, 10-12).<sup>2</sup> Jewish set fasts no more agree with the new faith than a patch of old cloth on a new garment (2, 18-22). Jewish sabbaths have no authority for the Son of Man, and become an instrument of cruelty and wickedness in the hands of the Pharisees (2, 23-3, 6).<sup>3</sup> As in the Second Source, it is Jesus' message of forgiveness to publicans and sinners and his consorting with them which first evokes opposition to him on the part of "the scribes;" but in Mark that which directly leads to the plots against his life on the part of "the Pharisees and Herodians" is his defiance of the Mosaic law of the sabbath (3, 6). There is no attempt (in the true text) to interpret constructively the sanctification of special days. Fasting and sabbath-keeping are treated simply as Jewish practises which the new and higher authority overrides. If wedding guests may disregard the semiweekly Jewish fast-days,

<sup>1</sup> On the Q representation of "John as Preacher of Justification by Faith" see my article under this title in *Expositor*, 8, XVI, 93 (September, 1918).

<sup>2</sup> This would seem to have been the general Gentile point of view. It is equally characteristic of the source employed in Acts 9, 32-11, 18, though repudiated by Red.-Luc. (Acts. 15).

<sup>3</sup> The proverb (quoted also in the Talmud) of 2, 27, which gives a constructive ground for proper disregard of the sabbath is unauthentic. It fails to appear in either Synoptic parallel and is wanting in the  $\beta$  text.

much more the disciples of the Bridegroom — at least while he is with them. If David with his men may disregard the sanctity of the shewbread, much more Jesus and his disciples the sanctity of the sabbath. The issue is baldly that of the stronger authority. Jesus resorts to miracle; the Pharisees to judicial murder.

Jesus' final withdrawal from Galilee is brought about, according to Mark 7, 1-24, by the attempt of the scribes from Jerusalem to impose upon him and his disciples the Mosaic distinctions of clean and unclean meats. Jesus appeals to Isaiah for proof that they are a people of "hypocrites," whose observances are "lip-worship." A logion which in the Q form (Matt. 23, 25-26 = Luke 11, 39-41) merely subordinates ceremonial and external to inward purity, as in the prophets, is greatly extended and elaborated in the same Markan connection (cf. Mark 7, 1-2, 5 with Luke 11, 37-38). Red.-Marc. seeks to prove that Jesus explicitly abolished all the Mosaic distinctions of meats, and that he called the multitude up to him for the purpose of making his meaning and intention unmistakable (7, 14-23). Shortly after (10, 1-12), on a challenge by the Pharisees, he directly sets aside the Mosaic ordinance of divorce as "adultery," contrasting even this as man-made (verse 9) with God's intention as shown in the creation itself. It is not surprising that Luke omits both these radical passages of Mark, while Matthew so changes them as to make Jesus merely favor one school of interpreters against the other.

In the face of the history of Paul's conflict with the older Apostles over this question of holy food and holy days, and especially in the face of his admission that for the sake of the divinely promised prerogative of Israel Jesus had been subject to the Law (Gal. 4, 4-5; Rom. 15, 3, 8-9), it is impossible not to regard as exaggerated this Markan representation. It is not true Paulinism, but the "strong" doctrine of the Corinthian and Roman "imitator of Paul" which makes Jesus explicitly override and abolish the very institutions and ordinances of Moses.<sup>1</sup> In the Q parallels Jesus speaks in no such harsh and

<sup>1</sup> Matthew naturally amends Mark by minute changes intended to prove (what is doubtless the historical fact) that Jesus merely adopted the broader interpreta-

peremptory accents in proclaiming the glad tidings of forgiveness; and even the ceremonial distinctions of holy days and holy foods are treated with relative respect. In Matthew and Luke the Markan radicalism is toned down or omitted.<sup>1</sup> It may, of course, be a Jew who represents the Master in this attitude toward the institutions and religious observances of Judaism, so much harsher, so much less appreciative, than that of the Gentile Luke; but the real point of interest is not so much the possible idiosyncrasy of the evangelist as the disposition of those for whom he wrote; and it is not easy to imagine his representation attaining to quasi-canonical acceptance in any church whose tendencies were not of the "strong" type which Rom. 14, 1-15, 13, shows to have been predominant at Rome.

Let us not misconceive or exaggerate the anti-Judaism of Mark. This Gospel has not the bitter hostility of Matthew against the particular class and sect who in Matthew's view are responsible for his people's apostasy and downfall, the "blind leaders of the blind," the "Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites," whose fate will be "the damnation of Gehenna" (Matt. 15, 14; 23, 33). But neither does Matthew generalize the charge of "hypocrisy" against "this people" (Mark 7, 5-6)<sup>2</sup> nor characterize the whole system of distinctions of meats and "washings of cups and pots and brasen vessels" (Mark 7, 3-4) as a "vain worship" practised by "the Pharisees and all the Jews."

In the later period of bitter hostility between Church and Synagogue an Ephesian evangelist speaks without discrimination of Jesus' opponents as simply "the Jews." So even at a much earlier date discrimination between Law and Tradition, synagogue leaders and "people of the land," could seem over-refined to writers and readers of the remoter, western regions of the Empire. In short all the Gospels are anti-Judaistic. So is Paul. But some Gospels are more discriminating than others. Mark in its antipathy to Judaism leans rather to the side of the

tion applied by earlier prophets and contemporary teachers. The contrast, however, between the original Mark, and Mark as corrected by Matthew and Luke, is eloquent of relative nearness to, and sympathy for, Judaism.

<sup>1</sup> So also in the *a* text of Mark 2, 27.

<sup>2</sup> Didache, however, (c. 8) applies the epithet to the Jews in general as in Mark.

fourth Gospel, where Jesus' opponents are "the Jews," and where he speaks to them of "your law," than to that of Matthew and Luke. He has only a vanishing trace (Mark 12, 38-40) of the Q woes upon scribes and Pharisees, whereas in Luke 11, 37-54 these are still prominent and discriminating; while in Matt. 23, even if Scribe and Pharisee are no longer kept properly distinct but blended in one anti-Christian class, the invective is elaborated and extended both quantitatively and qualitatively. Each Gospel reflects its own period and environment. The Ephesian evangelist presents as the opposition to Jesus "the Jews" as they are known in his time. Matthew opposes the reconstructed synagogue régime of 90-100 A.D. Luke and Mark both commingle data characterized by true historical insight, which they derive from their sources, with a larger or smaller amount of misunderstanding and confusion supplied by the later hand, Red.-Luc., for example, in 16, 14 attempts to create a logical connection with the preceding context by alleging avarice (!) as a distinctive sin of the Pharisees.<sup>1</sup> The point for us to observe, however, is that in this commixture the proportion of the authentic and correct to the late and incorrect is decidedly greater in Luke than in Mark.

Thus in Mark 2, 23, if ὁδὸν ποιεῖν be authentic—Matt. and D omit—and not a mere misrendering of the Hebrew or Aramaic idiom for "went along plucking" (ὁδὸν ποιεῖσθαι), Red.-Marc. holds that the Pharisees objected to what the disciples were doing as being equivalent to "road-building" (ὁδὸν ποιεῖν) on the sabbath. Of course some sort of manual labor is the ground of pettifogging complaint, not the mere eating of the grain, for this was expressly allowed. Luke 6, 1 restores sense by supplying the act to which objection was really taken. They were "rubbing out the kernels with their hands" (ψάχοντες ταῖς χερσίν) and so (technically) threshing.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The true connection appears by omitting 16, 1-13, and attaching after verse 15 the parable of the Pharisee and Publican (18, 9-14). The really distinctive sin of the Pharisee (self-righteousness) is described correctly in verse 15. But Red.-Luc. changes the order for reasons of his own. See Bacon, "Order of Lukan Interpolations," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXXVII (1918), pp. 42, 43.

<sup>2</sup> The comment of Gould (*International Critical Commentary*), though approved by Swete, is an example of that sacrifice of the text to the supposed exi-

The superiority of Luke to Mark on this score of appreciation of things Jewish is more strikingly evinced in the story of Jesus' arrest and trial, which in the nature of the case did not admit the formal convening (at midnight!) of the Sanhedrin at the house of Annas; still less their dismissal after trial and condemnation of Jesus (through agency of suborned witnesses), and their reconvening at dawn to accuse Jesus before Pilate. Even did the few hours of time permit all this official action, the very last thing desired by Jesus' priestly enemies was to assume official responsibility for his fate. The more secretly, expeditiously, and irresponsibly he could be handed over to Pilate as an insurrectionist the better for their purpose; publicity would be ruinous. In general, therefore, as Brandt<sup>1</sup> has so clearly shown, the Markan representation of a formal trial before the Sanhedrin, in which Jesus takes the part in maintaining his own claim to be the exalted "Son of Man" which was taken later by Christian martyrs, whereas the supreme representative council of the Jewish people plays the part of false accuser, must be regarded as largely imaginative. Its most incredible feature of all, however, is produced by Red.-Marc.'s insertion of this scene of trial in 14, 53 b-64, between the statement (of his source) that the posse of arrest "led Jesus away to the high-priest" and its continuation in verse 65 that some of them (i.e., the menials who held the victim) began to spit on him, and to cover his face and buffet him, and to say unto him "prophesy!" The effect of this insertion is that the "some" who engage in this brutal abuse are members of the Jewish senate (!) at the close of a formal session of exceptional solemnity, a session attended (we are to suppose) by a Joseph of Arimathea and a Nicodemus.

Luke has not entirely eliminated the impossible Markan trial scene, but he has at least postponed it till daylight (Luke 22,

gencies of the sense which is the mortal sin of the exegete. "To make a road by plucking the ears" may be "an absurd way of making a road," but absurdity is just that of which Red.-Marc. would convict the Pharisees who make the charge. The rabbinic parallels cited by J. Lightfoot (*Horae Hebraicae*, on Matt. 12, 2) show that the complaint may also have been directed against the plucking as being a kind of "reaping."

<sup>1</sup> *Evangelische Geschichte*, 1893.

66-71), and he attributes the brutal abuse of the prisoner to "the men that held him" in detention until daylight in the courtyard of the high priest's palace.

The noticeable point about the inferiority of Mark to Luke in this instance is not merely the earlier evangelist's lower degree of appreciation of things Jewish, but also the attitude of general antipathy which makes the misrepresentation possible. Such a conception would hardly be developed and find currency in circles where men had actually seen sessions of the Jewish Sanhedrin. In short the indiscriminate anti-Judaism of Mark makes it extremely improbable that it owes its present form to an Oriental environment. Compared with the tendencies of which Paul seems chiefly apprehensive at Rome, it confirms to no small extent the tradition of Roman provenance.

#### E. ATTITUDE TOWARD JEWISH-CHRISTIAN LEADERS

Connected with this anti-Jewish radicalism of Mark is a phenomenon of the Gospel in which it contrasts even more conspicuously with Matthew and Luke, and whose character would be almost unaccountable in the East — or indeed in the West at any period much later than First Peter (87 A.D.). I refer to the depreciatory attitude of this Gospel toward the Galilean Apostles, especially Peter, and toward the kindred of the Lord, the so-called *δεσπόσυννοι*, who formed a sort of caliphate at the centre of the Palestinian mother church until its dispersal in 135 A.D.

When we reflect that the wide and dominating influence secured by Mark toward the close of the first century was due to the claim put forth on its behalf (a claim which is in some degree and in a limited sense justified by the internal evidence) that it represents *ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρον*, there can be few things more startling than to take unbiased account of its actual report wherever the individual figure of Peter appears.

At bottom it is apparent that many elements of the Markan story, especially at beginning and end, must be derived from Peter. The scenes of the Beginnings at Capernaum (1, 16-39; 2, 1-4, 11-12) and of the Night of Betrayal (14, 17-54, 65-72) are not explicable unless based, more or less directly, on Peter's