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:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

HISTORY AND INTERPRETATION IN THE GOSPELS

BY

ROBERT HENRY LIGHTFOOT

FELLOW OF NEW COLLEGE

DEAN IRELAND'S PROFESSOR OF EXEGESIS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

THE BAMPTON LECTURES

1934

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

LIMITED LONDON

FIRST PUBLISHED . . . 1935

Made and Printed in Great Britain.
Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ltd., London and Aylesbury.

THE Bampton lecturership was founded under the will of the Rev. John Bampton, M.A., of Trinity College, Oxford, canon residentiary of Salisbury Cathedral. The will is dated 24 December, 1750, and the testator died in the following year, but the bequest did not take effect until 1779. It was the purpose of the testator "to establish for ever eight Divinity Lecture Sermons" in the University of Oxford. These were to be preached annually in St. Mary's church in the course of the terms now known as the Hilary and Trinity terms, and were to deal with one or other of certain subjects laid down by the testator. From 1780 until 1895, apart from occasional accidents, the lectures were delivered annually; since that time, owing to a decrease in the revenue received from the estates which form the endowment of the lecturership, they have been delivered every other year. The lecturer, who must be at least a Master of Arts of Oxford or Cambridge, is appointed by the heads of the Oxford colleges, and no one may hold the lecturership more than once.

O Almighty God, who hast instructed Thy holy Church with the heavenly doctrine of Thy Evangelist Saint Mark ; give us grace, that, being not like children carried away with every blast of vain doctrine, we may be established in the truth of Thy holy Gospel ; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Book of Common Prayer.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
PREFACE	. . . . .	xi
I.	THE STUDY OF THE GOSPELS UNTIL THE PRESENT TIME	1
II.	FORMGESCHICHTE	27
III.	THE DOCTRINE OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK . . .	57
IV.	THE CONTENT OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK . . .	97
V.	THE PASSION NARRATIVE IN ST. MARK	126
VI.	THE PASSION NARRATIVE IN ST. MATTHEW AND ST. LUKE . . .	152
VII.	THE REJECTION IN THE PATRIS .	182
VIII.	CONCLUSION	206
INDEX TO PROPER NAMES		227
INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES . .		229

PREFACE

It was my hope, when I first sketched an outline for these lectures, that it might be possible to give equal consideration to each of the four gospels. I soon found, however, not only that this task could not be completed satisfactorily within the compass of the Bampton lectures, but also that the matter of primary importance was to reach a correct understanding of the nature and purpose of the gospel according to St. Mark. This book, we now have reason to believe, is our earliest surviving canonical authority, and has had an immeasurable influence upon its three canonical successors and thereby also upon the church's understanding of its subject through the centuries. We have, however, only become aware of the priority of St. Mark's gospel during the last one hundred years, and probably we still fail to appreciate correctly the nature and the importance of the book. If we can place ourselves in the right attitude to understand it, the other three gospels are likely to present less difficulty. Hence I do not regret the large amount of space devoted in these lectures to a consideration of our earliest gospel, nor do I consider that it needs apology, although it has led to repetition in some places.

St. Mark's gospel has suffered severely through its traditional ascription to one of whom we are told that he filled the office of ὑπηρέτης (Acts 13^5, cf. 2 Tim. 4^{11}). This, together with the rest of the Papias tradition, has led to the belief that this gospel puts before us, in more

or less haphazard order, the content of St. Peter's reminiscences or teaching. The real nature and the essential greatness of our earliest gospel have thus been effectually obscured for us.[1] The ascription of the gospel to St. Mark may be true or false, but most certainly the author was no mere compiler. If the argument in the following pages is even partially correct, such a conception of his work would be most inadequate. The author was gifted with religious insight and genius of no common order. Doubtless the doctrine which he puts before his readers was that of the church or churches in or for which he wrote, and its nature was already long familiar ; but justice has by no means been done to him at present for the way in which the doctrine is presented, and I must needs believe that for this we are chiefly indebted to the profound and individual genius of the writer of this gospel. In the conception, treatment and arrangement of his theme, especially when we consider the fragmentary and in many respects unsatisfactory form of the material which he found available, he stands, in my opinion, on a much higher level than is usually assigned to him, and his work is most suitably compared with that of the fourth evangelist, with whom he has some very close affinities. Confining ourselves for the

[1] It is possible that the Papias tradition is best understood as arising from apologetic motives rather than from a desire or an ability to impart historical information, and that its purpose is at once to bring this gospel into connexion with the leader of the twelve and at the same time to explain and justify its fragmentariness and lack of a chronological order. The book itself may have circulated for some considerable time as " the gospel," without any note of authorship at all. Only by degrees, as other gospels came to be known and valued, would the different books become distinguished by their present titles.

moment to St. Mark and St. John, we may say that both their gospels are *constructions*, works put together and arranged in accordance with a definite plan and purpose, which is never long forgotten ; and in neither case was the plain record of historic fact the chief purpose of the author. Both books were written, not by or for historians, but by and for disciples, in order to awaken and develop faith and love. They are presentations of a revelation rather than biographies, and the history which they contain is therefore viewed in a peculiar light.

Our method of approach to the study of the gospels has been changing rapidly. How far it has been possible to travel even within the span covered by a single generation, may be realized by a comparison of two allied and worthy productions of the University of Cambridge: Dr. H. B. Swete's commentary on the gospel according to St. Mark, first published in 1898, and Dr. J. M. Creed's commentary on the gospel according to St. Luke, first published in 1930. In the former volume, the gospel narrative is treated almost exclusively as a record of historic fact ; other aspects of religious truth, of great importance to the Gospel, receive but slight consideration. In the latter volume, it is constantly hinted rather than proclaimed aloud, that manifold religious influences have been at work upon the narrative, and that what we may call the purely historical interest is only one of these. I cannot doubt that we have still some way to go along these lines. To a considerable extent the path of happiness and insight for students of the younger generation lies, in my judgement, in their increasing recognition of the significance and value of certain words of Origen,

provided that they remain also constantly alive to the great danger of the words, and to the questions which these raise but do not answer. It was the purpose of the four evangelists, Origen says, "to give the truth, where possible, at once spiritually and corporeally [or, outwardly], but where this was not possible, to prefer the spiritual to the corporeal, the true spiritual meaning being often preserved, as one might say, in the corporeal falsehood."[1] The words may be combined advantageously with an aphorism of Isaac Pennington the younger (1616–1679), which could well serve as a motto for these lectures: "All truth is a shadow except the last. But every truth is substance in its own place, though it be but a shadow in another place. And the shadow is a true shadow, as the substance is a true substance."

In the interest of the welfare and efficiency of the church, which depend in the last resort upon a right judgement and a correct appreciation of its Master, I hope that critics will pause, not once nor twice but many times, before they decide to level the charge against me that I destroy and do not build. I would remind them that the only clauses in the central section of the Apostles' Creed which may be said to fall wholly within the sphere of history are those connected with the death of Jesus Christ, and that even these clauses find their place in the Creed because they are believed to have a significance which passes beyond history. The other clauses of the section, although they too are vitally concerned with history, are directly connected

[1] Origen's *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, x. 4. The important last words in the original are these, *σωζομένου πολλάκις τοῦ ἀληθοῦς πνευματικοῦ ἐν τῷ σωματικῷ, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, ψεύδει.*

with what is believed to be another order than the temporal. I am indeed far from thinking or wishing to suggest that the only historical fact contained in St. Mark's gospel is the death of Jesus ; it is possible that this gospel, rightly used, can tell us a very large part of all that we need to know about our Lord ; this was presumably the belief of the author when he put it forth ; but even its historical facts do not always lie upon the surface, and its value as an historical record will not become apparent, any more than its doctrinal value, unless we are first willing to take pains. I should add that in my opinion the historical value of St. Mark's gospel is considerable, but perhaps not always for the reasons usually alleged, such as Petrine reminiscence. And if in the following pages no mention is made of problems for which a clear and definite solution is especially expected or desired, this is neither because I am unaware of their existence, nor because I have failed to consider and weigh them to the best of my ability, but because it seems to me that a faithful adherence to fact, so far as it is perceived, is the best and indeed the only fitting service that can be offered to the cause of truth.

I have received much help from various quarters. Dr. J. M. Creed was good enough to read through the lectures in manuscript, and I am also indebted to the Rev. T. E. Bleiben, Chaplain of New College, the Rev. A. Fox, Fellow and Dean of Divinity of Magdalen College, and the Rev. R. L. P. Milburn, Fellow of Worcester College, for valuable suggestions. I must, however, remain alone responsible for whatever is found within the covers of this book. I have purposely refrained from constant reference to many British or

American works dealing with the subject-matter of these lectures ; such books as those of Dr. H. J. Cadbury, Dr. B. S. Easton and Dr. Vincent Taylor are already widely known and are easily accessible. On the other hand, I have alluded freely to articles in periodicals, especially to those on Marcan usage by my revered teacher and friend Cuthbert Hamilton Turner in *the Journal of theological studies*, since these are less readily available to many.

For the same reason I have tried to give a brief account of recent German study of the gospels. I regret the suspicion and indeed hostility with which this study is regarded at present in this country, and I think it is mistaken. However wild and untenable many German theories about the Old Testament have proved to be, the broad fact remains that we are indebted above all to the insight and untiring industry of German scholars for those beliefs about the character and nature of the Old Testament writings which were most bitterly opposed by many in this country some fifty years ago, but which have now prevailed. This same insight and industry is now inviting us to a new conception of some of the books of the New Testament, and we shall do well to proceed most carefully and cautiously in our consideration of it. But it is to be hoped that we shall have learned some lessons from the excessive opposition, on the part of many of those who went before us, to Old Testament criticism, and that we shall not repeat the same mistakes in a different context in the present generation. Those who have personal acquaintance with the way in which theological and other studies are pursued in German universities will understand why any far-

reaching new development is likely to be accompanied at first by a number of conjectures which prove to be untenable, and they will not be deterred thereby from a careful and open-minded consideration of the development itself. In this connexion I may add that a closer familiarity with religious and other writings, outside of but more or less contemporary with the New Testament literature, is much to be desired.

In the use or disuse of capital letters before certain nouns and pronouns I have tried to follow the usage of the English Bible. The footnotes have assumed larger proportions than I could wish ; they are intended chiefly for the student, and may usually be omitted by the general reader.

I should like to end my task with the words quoted by Dr. Swete at the end of the preface to his commentary upon St. Mark's gospel : *Domine Deus . . . quaecumque dixi in hoc libro de tuo, agnoscant et tui ; si qua de meo, et Tu ignosce et tui.*[1]

R. H. L.

New College,
Oxford,
December 1934.

[1] St. Augustine, *De Trinitate*, xv, 28.

I

THE STUDY OF THE GOSPELS UNTIL THE PRESENT TIME

THE four canonical gospels are the most valuable part of the literary treasure of the Christian church. They seem to have reached their unique position by the best of all possible methods, the test of use and time, in the course of the second century. The formation of the canon, that is, of the authorized contents of the New Testament, was the result of a long process of development, which did not reach its conclusion until the fifth century and even later. But as early as the last quarter of the second century Irenæus, bishop of Lugdunum or Lyons, justifies the church's fourfold gospel in these words: "It is impossible," he says, "that the gospels should be either more or fewer in number than they are. For since there are four regions of the world in which we live, and four principal winds, and the church is as seed sown in the whole earth, and the gospel is the pillar and ground of the church, and the breath of life, it is natural that it should have four pillars, from all quarters breathing incorruption, and kindling men into life. Wherefore it is evident that the artificer of all things,the Word, who sitteth upon the Cherubim, and keepeth all together, when he was made manifest unto men, gave us his gospel in four forms, held together by one spirit."[1] Language of this sort is

[1] *Iren. Adv. Haer.*, III, xi, 8.

sufficient proof that our four gospels were already sure of their position, for simpler and yet deeper reasons than those given here by Irenæus; and the language is typical also of the attitude generally adopted in the church towards these books throughout the centuries. They seem to have been regarded as complete, from the side both of history and of doctrine. Preferences might exist for one rather than another; thus St. Matthew's gospel has generally been the most and St. Mark's the least esteemed[1]; but strictly they have been the fourfold book, of which each part is essential to the whole. They were also believed to be "free from any substantial inconsistency. The divergences were thought to be only apparent, and to involve only questions of order. An order of events was sought—and often worked out with extreme ingenuity—which would allow the substance of all four gospels to be incorporated in a single account without sacrificing the peculiar features of any portion and without changing the sequence of any gospel. The question was not whether such an arrangement was possible, but only what it actually was."[2] The task of the student could only be to harmonize.

And this attitude continued unchanged until quite recent times; during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it was common to Catholic and Protestant alike. Only towards the end of the seventeenth cen-

[1] This may be very simply illustrated by the passages selected in the Book of Common Prayer as the Gospels for use on Sundays and holy days throughout the Christian year. Of these, 33 are taken from St. Matthew, 5 from St. Mark, 27 from St. Luke, and 25 from St. John. The figures for the Sundays only are Mt. 20, Mk. 2, Lk. 17, Jn. 15.

[2] Maurice Goguel, "The Problem of Jesus," in the *Harvard Theological Review*, April 1930, p. 105.

tury do we trace the first signs of a more inquiring frame of mind towards the gospels. It first arose in the course of the deistical controversy. The earlier deists genuinely thought that they were defending Christianity, but when they were answered, rather to their surprise, by churchmen more orthodox than themselves, the controversy often turned upon the veracity of the gospels. Toland, one of the earlier exponents of the deistic position and a sincere defender of the gospels, wrote the following passage in 1696: "All men will own the verity I defend if they read the sacred writings with that equity and attention that is due to mere humane works, nor is there any different rule to be followed in the interpretation of scripture from what is common to all other books. Whatever unprejudiced person shall use those means, will find them notorious deceivers, or much deceived themselves, who maintain the New Testament is written without any order or certain scope, but just as matters came into the apostles' heads, whether transported with enthusiastick fits (as some will have it), or, according to others, for lack of good sense and a liberal education. I think I may justly say, that they are strangers to true method, who complain of this confusion and disorder."[1]

Such a passage in a book which aroused a quite unexpected interest might very well lead men's minds along the path of modern study of the gospels. And attention was directed along the same lines by the great impetus given to textual criticism upon the publication in 1707 of Mill's Greek New Testament, with its thirty thousand variants of the text. A nice con-

[1] *Christianity not Mysterious*, II, iii, 22.

troversy arose as to the authenticity of the latter, in which Anthony Collins's *Discourse of Freethinking*, published in 1713, had a place. And Collins's *Discourse* received the excellent advertisement of being answered by Dr. Richard Bentley.

In the third decade of the eighteenth century the historicity of the miracles of the gospel, and especially of the resurrection, was wildly attacked by Thomas Woolston in his *Six Discourses on the Miracles*; and Thomas Sherlock, afterwards bishop of London, in *The Tryal of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus*, replied to Woolston's objections in the form of a trial at law, purporting to give the speeches of Mr. A, counsel for Woolston, and Mr. B, counsel for the other side. Mr. A naturally handles scripture with the greatest freedom, and the notion of doing so must have become very familiar, for both Woolston's *Discourses* and Sherlock's reply had a very large circulation.

That the variations in the gospels attracted attention in the middle of the eighteenth century is shown by the posthumous publication, in 1752, of Conyers Middleton's *Reflections on the Variations which are found among the Four Evangelists in their different Accounts of the same Facts*. The writer[1] starts by considering the shifts (as he calls them) to which those writers are reduced, who in their desire to do honour to the scriptures and to the doctrine of "perpetual inspiration" cannot admit the possibility of any contradiction between the evangelists in their narration of the same events. He selects certain passages of the gospels, conspicuous for their difficulty in this

[1] He was Principal Librarian of the University of Cambridge.

respect,—the genealogies of our Lord in St. Matthew and St. Luke, the account of his anointing, the designation of the traitor at the last supper, and other incidents in the story of the passion—and considers the explanations offered by St. Jerome, St. Augustine and others. He has no difficulty in showing how artificial and unconvincing most of these are, quoting with effect the rules laid down by St. Augustine for the solution of all such problems, namely, "that whenever we find the evangelists inconsistent, in their accounts of anything said or done by our Lord, we are not to suppose them speaking of the same thing, but of some other, very like to it, said or done at a different time. For it is a sacrilegious vanity, he [Augustine] says, to calumniate the gospels, rather than believe the same thing to have been twice performed, when no man can prove that it could not really be so: and when this rule fails, his next direction is, to take up with any solution, rather than allow it as a consequence, that any of the evangelists had been guilty of an untruth or a mistake." [1] This,

[1] The passages in St. Augustine's *De consensu evangelistarum* referred to by Dr. Middleton at this point are :

Quod commendare memoriæ diligenter debemus—ut si quando talia singula apud singulos invenerimus, atque in eis contrarium, quod solvi non possit, occurrat nobis, non hoc esse factum, sed aliud simile, II, lxix.

Etiam atque etiam retinendum est, sæpius Dominum eadem dixisse, ut quod existente contrario solvi non potuerit, bis dictum intelligatur, II, cvi.

Calumniari autem evangelio, dum non credit iterum factum, quod iterum fieri non potuisse nemo convincit, sacrilegæ vanitatis est, II, lxxvii.

Tantum non putes consequens esse, ut quilibet evangelistarum mentitus sit, aut in tanto et tam sancto culmine auctoritatis erraverit, III, xliii.

says Dr. Middleton, is nothing else in effect, but to require us to adhere to systems in opposition to facts, and to renounce our senses rather than our prejudices; and his conclusion is, that "the notion of the perpetual inspiration and infallibility of the apostles and evangelists has imported such difficulties and perplexities into the system of the Christian religion, as all the wit of man has not been able to explain."

His own solution, however, is not completely satisfactory. It is, that the differences between the gospels are of no importance, and may be accounted for sufficiently by admitting want of accuracy or of memory, in recollecting and recording minute circumstances, on the part of the evangelists, "without any real offence or hurt to the authority of the gospel." He seems, indeed, to be willing to deny to the scriptures divine inspiration, not only as then usually understood, but in any sense.

An example of his method may be given from his remarks upon the inscription on the cross. After drawing attention to the remarkable fact that it is given in a different form in all the four evangelists, he proceeds: "Now all these accounts agree very well with regard to the sense of them, yet it is certain, that there is but one of the four, which exhibits the true inscription: and though a difference so trifling cannot reflect any disgrace on the veracity of the evangelists, it shews, however, a want of that accuracy and exactness of truth, which we expect from all those, who undertake to transmit to posterity the authentic copies of public inscriptions."

This little work of some sixty pages still repays

study; its limitations are those of the age in which it was produced.

In the latter part of the eighteenth and throughout the nineteenth century a growing interest is discernible both in the problem of the historicity of the gospels and in the problem of their literary relationship. The former aroused the greater popular attention, as was shown by the instant reception accorded to the many lives of Jesus, especially that by David Friedrich Strauss, published in 1835, and that by Ernest Renan, published in 1863. But more important and lasting work was being slowly accomplished in the less public and less exciting sphere of literary research. In this domain the problem centred in the literary relationship of the first three gospels, and, curiously enough, it was in 1835, the year of the publication of Strauss's *Life of Jesus*, that the scholar Carl Lachmann (1793–1851) discovered for us, in the words of Julius Wellhausen, the Ariadne thread for its unravelling. It was Lachmann who first gave definite expression to what has come to be known as the synoptic problem, and pointed the way to the chief factor in its solution, namely, the priority of the gospel according to St. Mark. Until the second quarter of the nineteenth century there seems to be no trace of any special interest in this gospel. From the second century until that time the favourite gospel of the church, as we have seen, was that according to St. Matthew, which was regarded as, if not the earliest, at any rate the most primitive in its arrangement[1];

[1] Cf. F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 38 (T. and T. Clark, 1906).

and St. Mark was generally believed to be, in St. Augustine's words, the follower and abbreviator of St. Matthew.[1]

The work of Lachmann passed comparatively unnoticed at the time, chiefly because of the interest aroused by Strauss's publication. "The burning question of the historical reliability of the gospels diverted attention from the literary problem, which Lachmann had handled solely from the philological side."[2] But no historical reconstruction can be of lasting value which is not based on minute and searching study of the sources; and time was on the side of Lachmann.

It is worth while, before we pass on, to emphasize a point which was made many years ago by Professor Burkitt,[3] that the great discovery of the priority of St. Mark was due to a change of method in the study of the gospels. Broadly speaking, until Lachmann, considerations of doctrine and of what was believed to be primitive church history had been the means whereby it was sought to discover the relationship of the first three gospels to each other; Lachmann used the simplest and most cogent of all methods in connexion with this subject-matter, namely, literary comparison. "It is my desire now," he says, "to consider nothing except the order of the gospel stories; and since this is at once the simplest of all methods and, so far as I know, has not been put to the test by anyone, we

[1] "Marcus eum (sc. Matthæum) subsecutus tanquam pedisequus et breviator eius videtur," Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum*, I, iv.

[2] J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 37, second edition; Berlin, 1911.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 38.

must see how far we can get by starting from this beginning. The diversity in the order of the gospel stories is not so great as most people think; it is, indeed, very great if you compare these writers all together, or if you compare Luke with Matthew; but if you compare Mark with each of the others separately, the diversity is small." [1] And he goes on to draw the conclusion, in Professor Burkitt's words, that the order of the narrative, as we read it in St. Mark, is presupposed by and underlies the narratives in St. Luke and St. Matthew.

It is possible also that Lachmann's insight may receive further vindication in the future from the fact that, in spite of his discovery of the priority of St. Mark's gospel, he did not make extravagant claims on its behalf. He did not concern himself with it as an historical or chronological authority. His purpose was the simpler one of taking our first three gospels as we have them, comparing them together, and thereby discovering their relationship to one another; he did not deal directly with the origin of St. Mark. He seems to have regarded our gospels as forming the central section of a long period of literary development, an idea to which we shall have occasion to return. But his lasting achievement was to give the impetus to that great study of the synoptic problem, which has now continued for a century, and in which this university during recent years has taken a full share. Its chief and best-grounded result, the so-called two-source theory, is almost too well known to be repeated here. Expressed very briefly, it is that

[1] Lachmann, *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1835, quoted by J. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

of the three synoptic gospels St. Mark is earliest; that it was used, almost if not quite in the form in which we have it, by both St. Matthew and St. Luke; and that the latter had before them, in addition to St. Mark, another common source, consisting almost entirely of sayings of the Lord, which each evangelist has used and incorporated according to a method of his own. It is generally although not universally agreed that this source, or some of it, is older than our gospel of St. Mark; but there is much divergence of opinion whether it was known to the writer of our second gospel; and it is thought by some that it may have lain before St. Matthew and St. Luke in slightly different forms.

It is therefore not surprising that the lead which Lachmann gave has resulted in an increasing and almost embarrassing concentration on the gospel of St. Mark. The suggestion may be hazarded that this concentration was strongly aided by two circumstances.

First, the priority of St. Mark was discovered just at the time when the Bible was losing its age-long position and prestige as the infallible book, the complete and final word of God, the absolute organ of religious truth. So long as this view of inspiration prevailed, the four gospels could only be regarded as of equal value, historically and otherwise. It chanced, however, that, just as this belief began to crumble, the discovery was made that among the four gospels one was quite definitely on a superior historical level. It is small wonder if a hope arose, no doubt to a large extent unconsciously, that the historical priority of St. Mark might prove an adequate makeweight or counterpoise to the loss of belief in an infallible book.

For, in the second place, as the nineteenth century advanced, the dominant intellectual interest passed to natural science, and it was seen that the wonderful triumphs and discoveries made in that field were due in the last resort to a reverence for and emphasis on fact; and this led, in the case of biblical studies, to an altogether new interest in historical fact, an interest which our forefathers would have found it difficult to understand. Until little more than one hundred years ago, history was held by most students of the subject to be an art rather than a science. It was believed that its primary function was to edify and instruct. Facts, therefore, were valued above all for their utility, with the result that the distinction between what had happened and what ought to have happened tended to become obscured. But the scientific achievements of the nineteenth century were the product of patient investigations instantly vitiated by the least departure from truth and accuracy, and methods that had gained so great success in one branch of learning came naturally to be applied also to historical research. Wolf, in his *Prolegomena to Homer*, published in 1795, had demonstrated the importance of detailed and methodical source-analysis for the criticism of ancient literature; Ranke, in the first half of the nineteenth century, showed that history could be written in accordance with the strictest scientific canons. Dismayed, Lord Acton tells us, by the discovery that Scott's Lewis the Eleventh in *Quentin Durward* was inconsistent with the original in Commines, Ranke resolved to make the first principle of his lifework rigid adherence to his authorities and avoidance of the least trace of partisanship. The aim of the historian, as conceived by

Ranke and his followers, was to state facts, and these only. "My object," he said, "is simply to find out how the things actually occurred." Those who continued to regard history as, in the words of Quintilian, "proxima poetis et quodam modo carmen solutum,"[1] protested vehemently that the results of such extreme objectivity would be jejune and colourless; and Walter Savage Landor, writing in 1836, pleaded that "History, when she has lost her Muse, will lose her dignity, her occupation, her character, her name"[2]; but none the less Ranke's theory of the function of history steadily gained ground throughout the nineteenth century. That there has always remained an undercurrent of opposition to it is shown by a sentence in an address, delivered at Cambridge in 1903, by Professor J. B. Bury. "It has not yet become superfluous to insist," he said, "that history is a science, no less and no more." But the welcome accorded to Professor Bury's dictum gives the measure of the triumph of Ranke's view, which has indeed tended to become in many quarters the normal criterion by which a historian's worth is estimated.

The study of the gospels obviously could not but be affected by the prevalence of these ideas; and the discovery that there were good grounds for finding in St. Mark a chief authority for the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke gave birth to the hope that in St. Mark's gospel above all we might hope to discover the Jesus of history, to use a phrase which has lately become common in this country, this being assumed to be the object of our search.

Not unnaturally also great weight came now to be

[1] *Institutio oratoria*, X, i, 31. [2] *Pericles and Aspasia*, cxli.

assigned to certain traditions concerning the origin of the gospel of St. Mark. The oldest and most important of these, which perhaps forms the basis of all subsequent tradition, is an extract from the writings of Papias, a native and possibly bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, some time before the middle of the second century. It has been preserved to us, verbatim, by the fourth-century writer Eusebius in his history of the Christian church. According to this extract from Papias' *Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord*, a certain elder used to say that Mark became the interpreter of Peter and wrote down accurately all that he remembered of what was said or done by Christ: not indeed in chronological order, but as the incidents chanced to be narrated in the teaching of Peter. This tradition suggests that in St. Mark's gospel we have, at only one remove, the content of St. Peter's memories of the words and deeds of Jesus; and it has gone far to strengthen the belief that the gap between the actual words and deeds of Jesus, and his words and deeds as we find them in St. Mark, to say nothing for the moment of any other source—the gap, that is, between about A.D. 30 and 65, the date usually assigned for the composition of our earliest gospel—can to a great extent be bridged over satisfactorily, and, moreover, in the person of him who was obviously best qualified to do this, he himself having been the leader of the twelve.

It thus becomes clear that the great value attached in recent years to St. Mark's gospel was due above all to what was believed to be its historicity, its closeness to the facts. Hence it is not surprising that during the same period interest in St. John's gospel tended, if

not to diminish, at any rate to assume a different form. Not only was it generally agreed that, whatever may be the truth about the authorship of this gospel, it is certainly the latest of the four, but also there can be little doubt that here the evangelist is as intent upon the presentation of the meaning of the fact, as he is upon the fact itself. St. John has his own view of the significance of the history which lies behind the gospel story, and he wrote to impress this view upon his readers. He is, indeed, determined that they shall not miss it. He does not lose his hold upon historic fact, but with him interpretation is predominant, and we may not unfairly say that interpretation has been the chief object of suspicion in modern study of the gospels. Indeed, one chief hope and impetus of critical investigation has been that minute research may reveal the presence of earlier sources incorporated in our present gospels, and that thereby we may win back to an ever earlier stage of the tradition; and on this side the results in the case of St. John's gospel, as compared with the synoptists, have been thus far disappointing. No theory of the sources of his gospel has at present won any wide acceptance, nor has it been found possible to separate with any confidence the history which he gives and his interpretation of the history.

It is true, no doubt, that the presence of interpretation in the record would be generally admitted also in the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, but here, it has usually been thought, only to a very much more limited extent.[1] Further, in these gospels, unlike

[1] One reason may be suggested, why we are less ready to admit the presence of interpretation in these books than in St. John. It is,

St. John's, we can now speak with confidence of the presence of earlier sources; and the gradual unravelling of these has been expected to be of great value in the separation of historical fact from any measure of interpretation which may be present even in these gospels.

But when we arrive at St. Mark's gospel the temptation to believe that we are at the other end of the scale has proved strong. The formlessness and roughness, the apparent simplicity and incoherence of his little book are such that in spite of what are now its opening words, "The beginning of the *gospel* of Jesus Christ, Son of God,"[1] the attempt is often made to single it out altogether from its peers, and to assign to it a paramount and unique position. It is claimed that here at any rate we have historic fact without interpretation. And from this presumption it is no great step to the belief that since St. Mark's gospel is primarily a record of fact, we can and must attach to its facts the interpretation which seems to us the best or worthiest. The question has not been sufficiently examined, whether St. Mark's gospel is indeed so purely historical as it is often thought to be, and whether a careful and candid investigation will not reveal interpretation already present, and in large measure, within our earliest gospel.

Such then was the view, very widely accepted, of the second gospel in the last half of the nineteenth

that they show a remarkable combination of similarity in subject-matter with difference in interpretation. The similarity of their material is apt to blind us to the very different use to which they put it.

[1] The last three words may be a subsequent addition; but even if this is so, the argument would not be affected.

century, and usually known by the name of the Marcan hypothesis. Within certain limits, it was regarded as giving a satisfactory historical outline of the ministry. And it was hoped that a life of Jesus could be constructed, of which the facts and order could be supplied, in the main, from this gospel, and that the interpretation could be added to it. Interpretation was not looked for in St. Mark's gospel as it stands; it was regarded as a history rather than as a gospel. "In substance and style and treatment," Dr. Westcott had written in 1860, "St. Mark is essentially a transcript from life." [1]

Nothing, happily, has occurred during the last thirty years to upset the great nineteenth-century discovery of the priority of St. Mark's gospel; but the problem of its origin, purpose and character is now seen to be more complex than was formerly supposed, and closer study of its contents has raised questions which are not adequately answered by the Marcan hypothesis.

The names of two writers may be mentioned, who will always be remembered as having contributed to a different view of St. Mark's gospel, which has gained wide recognition in Germany and to some extent in England. The first is that of William Wrede, professor of theology at Breslau, who in 1901, six years before his death, published a book called *The Messianic Secret in the Gospels*, which is still regarded in Germany as an indispensable introduction to the study of the gospels, and especially of St. Mark. In this country Professor Burkitt, although he finds much to criticize

[1] *The Study of the Gospels*, p. 371, eighth edition; Macmillan, 1895.

in the book,[1] has stated his opinion that no one who treats St. Mark as an historical document can afford to neglect it; but it has never been translated into English, and it suffered severely in Great Britain from the criticism passed upon it by Dr. Sanday, who welcomed it indeed for its independence, its originality and the newness of the questions which it raised, but also considered it to be, as he said, "not only very wrong, but distinctly wrong-headed."[2] This condemnation, as we shall see, may not have been unnatural at the moment, but it does not become for this reason less regrettable, and it is therefore desirable to give some account of Wrede's chief contentions.

He begins by pointing out that an immense amount of research has been devoted to the literary study of the gospels, that is, to what is usually called source-criticism, and that it has borne valuable fruit. We can speak with much greater confidence about "assured results" in this department of the study than was possible one hundred years ago. On the other hand, much less attention has been paid to that which forms the goal of the literary study of the gospels and lends its savour to the study, namely, their historical evaluation. Wrede alludes to the great diversity of

[1] Wrede himself was well aware of the unenviable task which had fallen to his lot. On page vi of his introduction he says, "It has frequently been a cause of sorrow to me, that my inquiry challenges so much to which good and pious persons are deeply attached. I have thought of old friends, cherished pupils, religious inquirers, both known and unknown, who might light upon this work. But I could not make any alteration in what I have written. We cannot make the gospels other than we find them: we must take them as they are."

[2] *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 70; Oxford, 1907.

opinion then prevailing about our knowledge of the life of Jesus; and, indeed, had he lived four years longer than he did, he would have witnessed and no doubt taken part in a prolonged controversy which took place in 1911 in Germany upon the theme, "Did Jesus ever live?"

Wrede proceeds to lay his finger upon what seemed to him certain great weaknesses in contemporary study of the gospels. In the first place, he says, people pick and choose within the narrative; they accept what they can understand and account for, and explain away or disregard the rest. But the gospels themselves know no such line of demarcation; they lay at least as much emphasis, for instance, upon the mighty acts of Jesus as upon his words of power. No more conspicuous example of this could be given than our earliest gospel itself.[1] Hence, he says, we should beware of identifying St. Mark's gospel, as is often done, with the facts as they themselves occurred. History[2] shows that, after the earliest gospels were committed to writing, very remarkable alterations took place in the presentation of the portrait of Jesus. But the same process may have been at work before St. Mark. No judgement can be passed *a priori* upon the value of the tradition in St. Mark, because we are entirely unable to control it by means of other earlier sources. Accordingly, it must be regarded as a possibility that the oldest writing which narrates of Jesus

[1] It has often been noticed that, although St. Mark constantly refers to the teaching of Jesus, he very seldom gives that teaching at any length.

[2] Wrede might equally well have said that this is also shown by the literary comparison of the earliest gospels themselves.

and obtained a predominant influence upon the later records, has assimilated very much more of the secondary tradition which had already developed, and also very much less of "the good tradition,"[1] than we could wish. We must constantly bear in mind that we are only able to see the life of Jesus Christ through the eyes of those who were his followers; we must make at least some allowance—how much, is a further question—for Christian beliefs, Christian ideas, Christian hopes and Christian needs. Above all, the greatest caution is necessary in offering psychological explanations of some scene or narrative, which may never have been in the mind of the writer himself. Our attempt must be to understand, first of all, what the story will have meant to the evangelist, and with what purpose he related it, before we undertake to give its meaning.

Wrede then proceeds to his main task, which is chiefly concerned with the problem of the secret Messiahship of our Lord, as this is set forth in our second gospel.

But, before going farther, we must once again remind ourselves that at the beginning of the present century, when Wrede wrote, the tendency was to regard St. Mark's gospel as a reliable history, however fragmentary, of the ministry of Jesus.

If the gospel be regarded in this light, its turning-point is obviously the acknowledgement or discovery of the Messiahship of Jesus by St. Peter at Cæsarea Philippi (Mk. 8^{27} ff.). Hitherto the Messiahship has been a secret, known only to Jesus himself; from this point onwards it is shared by the disciples, who, how-

[1] This is Wrede's own phrase.

ever, are themselves now pledged to secrecy[1]; and only at the trial before the Sanhedrin, a few hours before the end, does Jesus publicly acknowledge his supernatural office.

An explanation of these phenomena, which was common at the time when Wrede wrote, was that in the first part of the ministry, owing to the unresponsiveness or obtuseness of the multitude, the disciples were gradually educated by our Lord into the meaning of his person, and that, by the time of the great withdrawal to the north, they had learned the essentials of their lesson. It still remained, however, that they should grasp the meaning of the messianic office as understood by their Master, and this task he undertook, in the course of the journey southwards, in many different ways, but chiefly by dwelling on the necessity of the sufferings and death which lay before "the Son of man." In this way, it was believed, our Lord had sought to prepare the disciples for what did, shortly afterwards, actually happen.

It was this at first sight attractive explanation of the gospel of St. Mark which Wrede had been led to find untenable. He was persuaded that the central theme of St. Mark's gospel, historically considered, could not be found in the gradual education of the disciples by their Master in the understanding of his person. The greater part of Wrede's book is concerned with the difficulties and contradictions which such a view

[1] The reference is to Mk. 8^{30}. It should, however, be noticed that in the very important passage Mk. 9^{9-13} the three disciples who have just witnessed the transfiguration are only to remain silent about their experiences until "the Son of man should have risen again from the dead."

of St. Mark's gospel involves, and it is this which gives the book its predominantly negative character. Some of these difficulties and contradictions will come before us in later lectures of this course, and it is not necessary to discuss them here. At present we need only emphasize that it was Wrede's task to direct his readers' attention to features of our earliest gospel which could not be accounted for according to the current explanation of it, and which therefore they had tended to neglect. Hence it is not difficult to understand the concern and dismay which the publication of his book provoked. If, however, we take a longer view, as a generation later it ought to be possible for us to do, we may believe not only that Wrede's very honest work was necessary, but that its results have been for the most part to the good. He was almost the first to point the way, although he himself could not fully discern it, out of an impasse into which we had been led by the unduly one-sided study of the gospels already referred to, and in particular by an unduly simple view of the origin of the gospel of St. Mark. It is unlikely that anyone, after a study of Wrede's volume, will be inclined to regard St. Mark's gospel as a simple book; rather it is a book of simplicity and mystery combined. It is indeed simple, in that it has its origin from very humble circles, circles for instance in which popular belief in possession by demons and in the insight of the demons is extremely strong; and yet it is also mysterious, in that it is an attempt—the first, so far as we know, on the part of the church—to set down in the form of an historical narrative truths which cannot receive their full expression in that form. And,

finally, now that we are better informed with regard to the structure and compilation of our earliest gospel than was possible in the previous generation, it should be easier for us than it was for Wrede to see reasons for those contradictions and inconsistencies in St. Mark's narrative, to which he drew attention.

Even more important for its influence on subsequent research has been the work of Julius Wellhausen. This great Semitic scholar, who died early in 1918, devoted the first fifty years of his life to establishing those results of Old Testament studies which are now generally accepted, and in the last twenty turned his attention to the New Testament, and especially to the synoptic gospels, publishing between 1903 and 1911 a short commentary on each of them, and an introduction to the three. The work which he thus produced is of very high value. It would perhaps have received an even wider recognition than it has, had he not been very much in advance of the thought of his time. He is also inclined to throw out far-reaching hints, rather than to establish definite conclusions. "In his brief and pregnant commentaries," writes Professor J. M. Creed, "and in the accompanying volume of introduction, are to be found the seeds of most of the more important developments of recent years."[1] It is possible that he also has suffered in this country from the criticism of Dr. Sanday, who though appreciative of Wellhausen's insight and acumen was clearly more in sympathy with his great contemporary von Harnack[2];

[1] *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, p. vii (Macmillan, 1930).

[2] See especially the footnote on p. 76 of Dr. Sanday's *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*.

and in their gospel-studies Wellhausen and von Harnack were seldom in agreement.

For our present purpose, however, it is only necessary to refer to three important propositions laid down by Wellhausen for the study of St. Mark. It may be said that these propositions, along with Wrede's work, form the basis of the study of this gospel in Germany to-day.

First, the book is largely made up of little narratives or sections, which at first had a separate existence, and were later joined together, not necessarily in their historical order, but often rather by similarity of theme.

Secondly, the book has been subjected to revision, or revisions, before it reached its present form. Its contents belong to different stages of development.

And thirdly, it has information to give, not only of the life of Jesus Christ, but also, to some extent, of the beliefs and circumstances of the early church, at the time when it was written. This last point had been already made, in certain quarters, with reference to our later gospels, but hardly with reference to St. Mark.

The work of Wrede and Wellhausen has been developed by their successors and has resulted in what may almost be called a complete change of view in regard to the character of the gospel of St. Mark. This change of view shows itself in two ways. In the first place, at the beginning of this century, simplicity and historicity were generally regarded as the outstanding features of this gospel. Here could be found, almost at first hand, and free from the obscuring influence of dogma, a life-like portrait of the Master. The evangelist had set down the facts as they came

to him or as he had heard them stated, without doctrinal leanings. The contrast was sharp at every point between St. Mark at one end of the scale and St. John at the other. The fourth gospel was agreed not only to be the work of a profoundly spiritual thinker, but also to reflect the developed doctrine of the church. The theology embodied in it had been formed and crystallized in a society. Whatever historical value might be assigned to it, interpretation and selection were pre-eminent, and were dictated by the doctrine. To all this the slight and simple gospel of St. Mark stood out, so it was believed, in striking contrast. But if the conceptions introduced by Wrede and Wellhausen are well based, the difference has been much too sharply stated. St. Mark's gospel is probably in certain respects as much the production of the church as of a single writer, and it reveals most definite doctrinal influence. Here also interpretation and selection will have been at work. This is indeed less obvious than in the case of St. John's gospel, partly because St. Mark's doctrine *is* simpler, but also because the doctrine is not interwoven with the narrative to the same extent as it is in the gospel of St. John. It is present and it is growing; but in its Marcan stage it is still to some extent many-sided, fluid, even tentative. St. John's gospel is more of a unity than St. Mark's.

If it be asked how this new view of St. Mark's gospel has come into being, and on what grounds it is based, the answer must be that it is due to a more thorough study of this gospel, in the light of the problems raised by Wrede, Wellhausen and others. The earlier view with regard to St. Mark, as we have seen, was due to contemporary presuppositions, and to an

imperfect appreciation of the contents of the book. It is not so much that new light has come from history, or, subject to certain reservations, that fresh conclusions have been drawn from what is now known of contemporary belief and expectation. The increased emphasis on eschatology, due chiefly to the work of Albert Schweitzer, has been indeed of influence, but on the whole the change is due to further study and a fresh reconstruction from internal evidence.

At the present time, therefore, the tendency is to ascribe to this gospel a definite doctrinal background; this is the first great change which the present century has seen. And the second change relates to the sources of the gospel itself. The earlier view was that the book is in all or nearly all its parts a unity,[1] first put together by St. Mark as St. Peter's interpreter, probably soon after the death of the latter, and therefore giving a reliable if incomplete account of the chief features of the ministry of Jesus. Instead of this, we are now bidden to see in it a compilation of materials of different date, origin, character and purpose, many of which may have had a considerable history—whether oral or literary or both—before they were finally inserted in this gospel, at least a large part of the book being formed from anonymous traditions which had long been current in the church. This does not, of course, necessarily imply that the contents

[1] On p. lxv of Dr. H. B. Swete's *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, first published in 1898, second edition 1902, the writer says, with characteristic wisdom and caution, "The present writer has risen from his study of the Gospel with a strong sense of the unity of the work. . . . But he is not prepared to express an opinion as to the nature and extent of the editorial revision which St. Mark's original has undergone."

are less reliable; but they will now have a different kind of guarantee.

It is this view of our earliest gospel which the modern study of Formgeschichte, now just fifteen years old in the country of its origin, seeks to establish, and it will be convenient to give some account of its methods in the next lecture. The question of the doctrinal background of St. Mark will come before us later.

II

FORMGESCHICHTE

We saw at the close of the last lecture that a new interest is arising in connexion with the study of the gospels. Attention is beginning to be focused, not so much upon the problem of their literary relationship, as upon the more fundamental problem of the process by which even the earliest of them came to take its present form.

This is a question which the earlier study of the synoptic problem did not find it necessary to raise. Until quite lately, we have been content in this country to accept the two-document theory for the origin of the synoptic gospels, according to which our earliest authorities for the life and teaching of our Lord are St. Mark's gospel and the presumed sayings-source, usually designated by the symbol Q[1]; and

[1] It seems now to be always assumed that the symbol Q originated in Germany, as being the first letter of the German Quelle, source. Dr. Armitage Robinson, however, in conversation with the present writer maintained in all seriousness that he himself was the first to use the symbol, and for an entirely different reason. In lecturing at Cambridge on the sources of the gospels, in the 'nineties of the last century, he was in the habit, he said, of alluding to St. Mark's gospel as P (reminiscences of St. Peter), and to the presumed sayings-document as Q, simply because Q was the next letter after P in the alphabet. His contention, therefore, was that some of his hearers carried his method across the North Sea, and that German scholars, having adopted the symbol Q from him, soon found an explanation for it, which to them no doubt seemed both more satisfactory and more rational. Dr. Robinson emphasized that no designation of the sayings-

for the authority of the former we have been glad to avail ourselves of the Papias tradition, according to which St. Mark's record rests, in part at least, upon the teaching of St. Peter. Emphasis has also often been laid upon the possibility that in some of the last scenes in this gospel the evangelist himself was an eye-witness of what he describes; certainly no more likely explanation has been given for the inclusion of the incident of the young man who fled in Gethsemane (Mk. $14^{51, 52}$) than that which sees in it a reference to the evangelist himself. There is also the reference in this gospel to Simon of Cyrene as the father of Alexander and Rufus (Mk. 15^{21}) obviously people whose names are expected to be familiar to the readers of the gospel. But it will be noticed that both these references are in the passion narrative—a point, the significance of which will appear later—and in any case they form a slender basis on which to build a theory of the origin of St. Mark's gospel, which for the most part is utterly objective and impersonal.[1] Nor does it seem on the whole probable that the Papias tradition will bear the weight which it is sometimes sought to lay upon it. The character of this gospel points, at any

document by the symbol Q appeared in German writings until after the period of his lectures at Cambridge, and that the now common explanation of the symbol would be found to be still later. If, as Dr. Burkitt informs me, Wellhausen was the first in Germany to use the symbol Q, it is possible to date accurately its appearance in print in that country, since the first edition of his *Einleitung*, in which it appears, was published in 1903. His commentaries on the synoptists began to appear in the same year.

[1] From Mk. $7^{3, 4}$ we cannot infer with certainty more than that the writer is addressing himself to readers who are unfamiliar with Jewish customs, and therefore presumably live at some distance from Palestine.

rate for the greater part of its contents, to a different kind of origin. Internal evidence suggests that many sections of the narrative have passed through a "moulding" process, as it were, before they reached their present form. Whatever the original account may have been, the stories often bear the marks of what was probably a considerable period of oral circulation. We may also remind ourselves of the peculiar difficulties associated with the record in Mk. 6^{30} to 8^{26}, where we seem to find, succeeding each other, two narratives which in the sequence of their contents are precisely similar. It is probable that in these chapters we have a double narrative of the same tradition, or cycle of traditions.[1]

Accordingly in the last fifteen years a new method of studying the gospels has arisen. This study, which had its origin in Germany, is not content to take the traditional origin of St. Mark's gospel for granted, and has devoted itself to a problem which it believes it may be to some extent capable of solving; namely, of accounting for the existence of the gospels, without any necessary reference to second-century traditions, and also of working back from them, through what are believed to be various stages of transmission, as nearly as possible to the actual words and deeds as they were spoken and performed in Palestine.

The word Formgeschichte, by which the new study is known, has not at present produced any satisfactory equivalent in English. Writers in this country waver between Form Criticism and Form History, in their attempts to reproduce it. Possibly the nature of the new study can best be understood if, in the first

[1] See p. 114.

place, we contrast it with previous work upon the gospels.

Until recently, we have assumed that our task as students is to lay bare, as far as may be, the *written* sources of our gospels; and this study has had the two-source theory, to which I have already referred, as its chief and well-assured result. This conclusion is of course accepted and welcomed by writers of the Formgeschichte school; but they are not content to stop short at it, or at any merely literary results.

They remind us that the early church is by no means likely to have expressed itself at once in a literary way,[1] and they believe, first, that in the earliest years memories and traditions of the words and deeds of Jesus were only handed on from mouth to mouth, and, secondly, that they were valued, not so much (as we might have expected) in and for themselves, as for their importance in solving problems connected with the life and needs of the young churches. These needs, they think, would be chiefly concerned with mission preaching, catechetical teaching, demonstra-

[1] In the *Expositor* for 1907, p. 424, Sir William Ramsay argued at length that "the lost common source of Luke and Matthew was written while Christ was still living." The aberration may be explained when we recall, first, that the problems connected with the hypothetical Q were being keenly canvassed at the time and great claims made on its behalf, and secondly, that Sir William, like Eduard Meyer, approached the study of the gospels by way of the writings of the would-be historian St. Luke. Sir William observes that St. Luke "attached even higher value" to the lost common source than he did to St. Mark.

More recently, Prof. C. C. Torrey (*The Four Gospels*, p. 256, Harper, 1933) has expressed the view that "there is not a word in any one of the four books [i.e. the gospels] that might not have been written within twenty years after the death of Jesus."

tion of the content and meaning of the Christian life, refutation of Jewish and other objections, and, perhaps above all, worship. They believe, further, that these memories and traditions would circulate at first chiefly in two forms: on the one hand, that of little, separate stories, and, on the other, that of sayings of the Lord, whether in isolation or in small collections. Both would gradually assume a more or less fixed shape, through constant repetition in the churches; and, whatever may be true about the sayings, the stories would tend to form themselves upon the model of similar stories about teachers and leaders in the Jewish or the Hellenistic world. And, finally, they suggest that many of these pre-literary traditions are still discernible in our written gospels, especially St. Mark, and that to some extent they can be classified according to their type or form; whence the name of the new study.

The writers, therefore, whom we are considering are not greatly concerned with the question of the particular gospel in which any saying or deed of the Lord, or any story about him, is recorded. Whatever the particular saying or action or story may be, Form Criticism takes it out of its present context, isolates it, and considers it in reference to its class or type. It thus goes back behind our gospels in their present state, and seeks to throw light upon the origin and development of what only in its final stages became the literary contents of the gospels.

In considering these little units of sayings or traditions, Form Criticism has of course to work backwards, *analytically*, from our gospels as we have them; but it tries also, as we have seen, to develop a *constructive*

method, which will account, from our knowledge of the early church, for the origin of the little units, the needs they were designed to serve, and—a point of great importance—the developments they underwent, until they found their final form as part of the structure of the gospels.

Form Criticism, therefore, invites us to approach the contents of our gospels in a new and unfamiliar way, and it is probable that in this country we shall be unwilling to commit ourselves to it without much further study; and, seeing that the issues are of considerable importance, this will not be a matter for regret. There can, however, be no doubt that in several fields of literature the application of this method has been attended with success. It is well known, for instance, that in primitive communities a composition such as a saga or a poem is likely to have circulated for some considerable time before it is set down in writing. Previously it will have been retained in memory only, and will have passed from mouth to mouth within the fellowship, being susceptible at first both of enlargement and also of diminution. As a result of this process, it will usually be found to receive gradually a comparatively fixed form, and to be subject to certain laws of style. These will have been determined for it, not so much by the genius of any individual, as by the largely unconscious instinct and feeling of the whole community. The written composition will be only the final commitment to parchment or papyrus of what has become, as it were, a communal possession; and with whatever subject or subjects of the past it may be dealing, it will also throw light upon the life of the society before and at the period when it receives

its written form. It will therefore be not so much an individual literary production, as the transmission, in literary form, of a community tradition; and this interest of the community in its preservation as a communal form is likely to guard it from any considerable changes or perversion alien to the fundamental type.

It is this method which Form Criticism is now applying to the gospels; but obviously the task is bound to be more speculative than the literary comparison of the three synoptic gospels, and the results reached will be less susceptible of proof. This may well be the reason why the subject has not at present aroused great interest in this country. With the help of the two-source theory, we have made considerable progress in unravelling the construction and the sources of St. Matthew and St. Luke, but St. Mark we have tended to regard as a primary authority. Conclusions reached about his gospel cannot be established with the same confidence as conclusions about St. Matthew and St. Luke, whose use of St. Mark we can check by comparing it with the original; and with this original therefore we have been inclined to call a halt. It is a feature of Form Criticism that it bids us to look upon St. Mark's gospel as itself the product of a long development—so far as these words can be rightly applied to the work of one or at the most two generations—and to realize the necessity for distinguishing different strata of tradition in his narrative, as we have already learned to do in the later gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke.

We now come, therefore, to our problem. How, from the literature in our possession, are we to work back to the form of the tradition at an earlier stage?

For it is in this direction that the inquiry is being pressed most keenly at the present time; and for the sake of convenience we will confine ourselves chiefly to the gospel of St. Mark.

It has long been recognized that this gospel consists chiefly of narrative; it contains very little teaching in the form of discourse, and with a few exceptions, of which the most notable is the prophecy of the last things in chapter 13, the teaching is given for the most part in little sayings, often connected with each other by very slender threads. At the end of chapter 9, for instance, are three sayings with regard to salt which, except for the use of this word, have no immediate relevance to one another.

"For every one shall be salted with fire."

"Salt is good; but if the salt have lost its saltness, wherewith will ye season it?"

"Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another."

Indeed, if the last thirteen verses of this chapter are read carefully, it will be found probable that we have here, throughout, a series of detached sayings, collected together and perhaps retained in memory chiefly by the aid of verbal links: the name, to cause to stumble, fire, and salt.

The same phenomenon can be seen, in a slightly less obvious form, in Mk. 4^{21-25}, an appendix to the explanation of the parable of the sower (Mk. 4^{10-20}), with which it is closely connected.[1] These verses probably contain five, if not six, separate traditional utterances of Jesus, brought together in this place,

[1] Especially with 4^{11a}, "And he said unto them, Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God."

possibly by the evangelist himself, and designed to illustrate and emphasize at this point the special privileges and responsibilities of the *disciples*.

Usually, however, St. Mark's gospel is occupied with narrative. If we consider this carefully, we shall find reason to think that much of it is made up of small independent sections, each originally complete in itself, and often having no necessary connexion with its present context. Some of these sections seem still to be almost if not quite intact, as they all once were, on the hypothesis of Form Criticism, when they had a separate existence. It seems that St. Mark, still standing comparatively close to a very early form of the tradition, has preserved in certain cases, unlike St. Matthew and St. Luke, the original introduction unchanged, without adding a connecting link.

Examples of these independent introductions may be found throughout St. Mark. Thus at 10^{13} we read, "And they[1] brought unto him little children, that he should touch them: and the disciples rebuked them." There is no note of time or place. Again, at 2^{23}, "And it came to pass, that he[2] was going on

[1] This is a good example of St. Mark's characteristic use of the impersonal plural, examined in detail by Prof. C. H. Turner in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1924, pp. 378 ff. "This form of phrase," he writes, "common in Aramaic as a substitute for the passive, is very characteristic of St. Mark's narrative, and is generally altered by the other Synoptists either by the insertion of a definite subject or (and this especially in St. Luke) by the substitution of the passive voice for the impersonal active." He finds over twenty examples of this usage in the second gospel. Among them are 1^{32}, 3^{2}, 6^{14} (reading ἔλεγον), 7^{32}, 8^{22b}.

[2] Reference may be made here to a note by Prof. C. H. Turner in *J.T.S.*, April 1925, p. 226. "Mark very rarely writes ὁ Ἰησοῦς in narrative, not infrequently in the give and take of question and

the sabbath day through the cornfields." In this case the notes of time and place, such as they are, were needed to explain what follows in the story. But in neither case is there any necessary connexion with what has just preceded; and each story is complete in itself. It is significant that St. Matthew and St. Luke, especially the latter, very seldom leave the sections in utter isolation.[1] Their tendency is to weave them together, and thereby to work towards an increasingly literary form. But it is clear that even St. Mark has taken a long step forward in this direction. It is possible to show, with a high degree of probability, that it

answer: though scribes have tried to insert it, e.g. 12^{41}. Matthew adds ὁ Ἰησοῦς not less than some forty times, especially at the beginning of a paragraph. Luke is even more sparing than Mark with ὁ Ἰησοῦς, and like Mark, but oftener, makes use of αὐτός, 'He himself,' 'The Master,' or better still a stressed 'He': it is almost equivalent to our use of the capital H." Elsewhere on the same page Prof. Turner, dealing with what he believes to be traces of St. Peter's influence in the second gospel, writes, "Peter would be content with 'He': there could be no question who was meant."

[1] For instance, St. Matthew links the story of the blessing of the children with what has immediately preceded it by his favourite temporal conjunction "then" (19^{13}), and at the close of the section prepares for what is to follow by an equally characteristic reference to a change of place, "And he laid his hands on them, *and departed thence*" (19^{15}). Both these features of the story are wanting in St. Mark.

As an example of St. Luke's procedure, whereas Mk. 2^{15-17}, the eating with publicans and sinners, and Mk. 2^{18-20}, the question about fasting, seem to be distinct and separate stories, in our third gospel they are expressly brought into relation, and form a single scene (Lk. 5^{29-35}). In St. Luke the same Pharisees and scribes who raise a difficulty at 5^{30}, propound a further problem at 5^{33}, "And they said to him." This is not so in St. Mark. Similarly, compare Lk. 20^{41} with Mk. 12^{35}, considering the context in each case.

is he, to a large extent,[1] who has arranged the order of his gospel and imposed the framework on the originally isolated sections, thereby welding them together and giving some kind of unity, cohesion and forward movement to the narrative. Sometimes the editorial connexions will be limited to a single word or phrase: "And he went forth *again* [2] by the sea side" (2^{13}): "And he went forth *from thence* [3]" (6^{1}): "And *on that day*," [4] when even was come" (4^{35}). It should be noticed in the third instance in particular, that we are at the beginning of an altogether different type of story from what has gone before, and if it be true that the sections originally existed singly, the words in

[1] This qualification is important. It is possible that certain groups of stories were already in existence, perhaps in a written form, before St. Mark embodied them in his fuller work. A notable example of such a group may be the five stories in Mk. 2^{1}–3^{6}; cf. p. 110. Along these lines a solution might be found of the apparent contradiction between 1^{45} and 2^{1}.

[2] πάλιν is "a very light and unemphatic particle" in St. Mark, who, like St. John, shows a marked fondness for the word. See *J.T.S.*, April 1928, pp. 283–7. In St. Mark's use of it, we may see one of his simplest connecting links. The meaning "again" must not always be pressed. Cf. 2^{1}, 3^{1}, 7^{31}, $10^{1, 10}$.

[3] Cf. 7^{24}, 9^{30}, 10^{1}. On the view adopted here, it is an error to understand that St. Mark sees in this expression more than a useful means of suture with what has preceded.

[4] In St. Luke's account of the plucking of the ears of corn, as found in Codex Bezæ (D), the last verse (Lk. 6^{5}) is omitted, and its place is taken by the following story: "*On the same day*, seeing a man working on the sabbath, he said to him, 'Man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed and a transgressor of the law.'" Wellhausen regards the words italicized as sufficient to show that the story is a later addition; the more precise the note of time, in a context of this sort, the less original it is likely to be.

Codex Bezæ places Lk. 6^{5} after Lk. 6^{10}.

italics must be editorial, for the isolated story will have had no occasion to refer to any sequence of events.

As an example of a longer editorial connexion, we may refer to the beginning of Mk. 4. "And again he began to teach by the sea side. And there is gathered unto him a very great multitude, so that he entered into a boat and sat in the sea; and all the multitude were by the sea on the land." Probably only with the next verse do we reach a still earlier introduction to the parable of the sower. "And he taught them many things in parables, and said unto them in his teaching." These considerations are of help in explaining the composition of this chapter. It has often been noticed that although at 4^{10} Jesus is said to be alone with those especially connected with him—a section which certainly continues as far as 4^{25}—$4^{33, 34}$ on the other hand suggest that from 4^{26} he is once more regarded as speaking in parables to the multitude; and this is borne out by $4^{35, 36}$, in which verses he is expressly stated to have been, until this moment, still in the presence of the multitude, and to be now taken away by his disciples, "just as he was," in the boat.

It seems probable, therefore, that what we may call the fundamental section in the chapter will have been the parable of the sower. To this have been added two other parables; these, however, are now separated from the first by an explanation of the latter, together with a supplement consisting of traditional sayings of Jesus, this whole section (4^{10-25}) being regarded as special instruction for "his own disciples" (4^{34}), since the multitude cannot and indeed must not understand it ($4^{11, 12}$). Only those brought into special connexion with Jesus are in a position to receive "the mystery of

the kingdom of God," which lies in and behind the teaching by parable. Finally, the evangelist has procured a setting for the whole and thus produced a more or less continuous narrative, by means of certain traditional material relating to the movements and activities of Jesus. In this material such expressions as the multitude, the crowding, the boat, the house, the sea shore, the road or way, and the mountain or hill country, seem to have been pre-eminent. Whence the evangelist may have derived the very particular and unusual notes of time and place, which he sometimes introduces, as, for instance, the "after six days" at the beginning of the story of the transfiguration (9^2), and "the villages of Cæsarea Philippi" (8^{27}), is another question.

It is noticeable that St. Matthew and St. Luke, whom we may call our earliest commentators on St. Mark, have no scruple in replacing his connecting links by others which they think more suitable. They deal much more freely with the editorial connexions in St. Mark than with the contents of the sections. St. Luke, for instance, omits entirely the present Marcan introduction to the parable of the sower, with its references to the sea shore and the boat. He has only "And when a great multitude came together, and they of every city resorted unto him, he spake by a parable" (8^4). St. Matthew ($13^{1,2}$) follows St. Mark comparatively closely, subject to certain characteristic changes. Thus, he replaces St. Mark's weak πάλιν, "again," by the more precise suture "on that day." Again, St. Mark's "a very great multitude" becomes in St. Matthew the stronger "great multitudes." [1]

[1] It may be said with confidence that St. Mark never uses ὄχλος in the plural. In 10^1, the only apparent exception, the singular should

And thirdly, St. Matthew emphasizes that the multitude *stood* on the beach. It seems to be the case that, in St. Matthew's account of the ministry,[1] no one, friend or foe, remains seated in the presence of Jesus, especially when he is teaching.[2]

probably be read; see p. 50. The word occurs nearly forty times in his gospel, on six occasions with the addition of πολύς, once with πλεῖστος (4[1]), once with ἱκανός (10[46]). But in all these cases the crowd is for St. Mark a limited quantity.

The two later synoptists, however, use also the vaguer and more general plural, St. Matthew indeed employing it almost twice as often as the singular. This difference in usage between St. Mark and St. Matthew is important, and may be illustrated by comparing Mk. 1[22] with Mt. 7[28]–8[1]. In the Marcan passage the reference is to the impression made by Jesus' teaching upon the local congregation in the synagogue at Capernaum. St. Matthew, although he has no direct parallel to the section Mk. 1[21-27] as a whole, none the less uses Mk. 1[22] to form a conclusion to the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5[1]–7[27]), and thereby, with the addition of the words οἱ ὄχλοι and of Mt. 8[1], conveys the impression made by that discourse, directly or indirectly (for according to Mt. 5[15] the sermon was addressed to disciples), upon a vast assemblage of hearers (7[28], 8[1]).

Sir John Hawkins was fond of pointing out that the division of chapters is apt to blind us to the correct distribution of paragraphs at this point; 8[1] belongs to 7[28, 29] and is inappropriate as an introduction to 8[3-4], as verse 4 shows.

Finally, it should be noticed that St. Mark and St. Matthew always distinguish between "the multitude" and "the disciples." St. Luke, however, uses both ὄχλος and πλῆθος of disciples: "a great multitude of his disciples" (6[17]), "the whole multitude of the disciples" (19[37]). To St. Mark disciples are always, like the multitude from which they are distinguished, a limited company. See *J.T.S.*, April 1925, pp. 237 f.

[1] Contrast the significant "And sitting down they watched him there" (Mt. 27[36]).

[2] Contrast Mk. 2[6], 3[32, 34]. Jesus himself indeed sits to teach, in all four gospels; but this is emphasized by St. Matthew. Compare Mt. 5[1] with Lk. 6[17], and especially Mt. 26[55] with its parallels; and note Mt. 13[1], 15[29], Jn. 6[3].

As a second example, we may take St. Mark's elaborate introduction to the story of the palsied man. "And when he entered again into Capernaum after some days, it was noised that he was in the house. And many were gathered together, so that there was no longer room for them, no, not even about the door; and he spake the word unto them" ($2^{1,2}$). Probably only after this does the section proper begin. "And they come,[1] bringing unto him a man sick of the palsy, borne of four." St. Matthew, who puts the story in a different context, writes simply: "And he entered into a boat, and crossed over, and came into his own city" (9^{1}). St. Luke, who at this point is following St. Mark closely, rewrites the passage freely: "And it came to pass, on one of the days, that he was teaching; and there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every village of Galilee and Judæa and Jerusalem; and the power of the Lord was with him to heal" (5^{17}). On the other hand, from this point onwards both evangelists adhere closely to St. Mark's account.

Confirmation of the view that St. Mark's gospel is largely made up of disconnected stories may possibly be found in his use, in the introduction to many of them, of the tense known as the historic present. "And there come his mother and his brethren" (3^{31}). "And there are gathered unto him the Pharisees" (7^{1}). "And they bring to him one that was deaf" (7^{32}). "And they come unto Bethsaida. And they bring to him a blind man" (8^{22}). Mr. H. St. John Thackeray has had occasion to refer to this use in his Schweich

[1] St. Mark's impersonal plural.

Lectures for 1920,[1] in connexion with what he believes to be the earlier as opposed to the later parts of the Septuagint translation of the books of Samuel and Kings. According to the usual view, he says, the narrator, by substituting the present for a past tense, vividly depicts a bygone incident as taking place at the moment of speech. The tense is commonly described by the vague epithet "dramatic." Mr. Thackeray believes that its use may be defined more closely. He points out that it is chiefly used in Greek literature with verbs of motion (coming, going, sending), and he regards it as "dramatic" in the sense that it serves to introduce new scenes in the drama. "It heralds the arrival of a new character or a change of locality or marks a turning-point in the march of events." Its main function, he thinks, is to introduce a fresh paragraph in the narrative, and he concludes with these words: "I can only remark in passing that the present tenses in St. Mark . . . are used in a precisely similar way to introduce new scenes and characters, . . . and that St. Luke, in suppressing them, has removed a feature which to the observant reader serves to divide the older gospel into rough paragraphs."

It seems to be agreed, by the writers of the Formgeschichte school, that there is one notable exception to the general rule which we have been considering, the rule, namely, that the traditions contained in St. Mark's gospel for the most part circulated at first in

[1] H. St. John Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, pp. 20–22 (London, 1921). I am indebted for this reference to the Rev. H. F. D. Sparks.

single, isolated stories. This exception, they believe, is the passion narrative. They think that this took shape earlier than the preceding part of the gospel, and that it always formed a more or less connected whole. Without committing ourselves to a decision on this point, we will exclude the passion narrative from consideration for the present, and confine ourselves to the first thirteen chapters of St. Mark, and even here, for the sake of brevity and still more of clarity, it will be desirable to limit our inquiry. Naturally enough, in the excitement of a comparatively recent discovery, our new guides tend to see in it a key which may be used to unlock every door, and they are prepared to classify all the different sections in these chapters under an appropriate type or heading, according to the nature of their content. It is likely that the material will prove too complex and difficult for such rigorous treatment; and for the present at any rate it will suffice to draw attention to the two main kinds of stories about Jesus which are found in our earliest gospel. In the first of these, a saying of his is the climax or at least the leading feature of the story; in the second, the emphasis is on an act of power done by him. It seems at least possible that the new study has here achieved a valuable and lasting result, and that it has succeeded in distinguishing and classifying two types of story, both of which are prominent in St. Mark.[1] In the rest of this lecture we will confine ourselves to these.

[1] The two most valuable books for the study of Formgeschichte are *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, Martin Dibelius, second edition, 1933, and *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Rudolf Bultmann, second edition, 1931. A warning, however, should be

The first then is concerned with a saying of Jesus, which forms, if not the conclusion, at any rate the chief point of the incident; the other with a " mighty work," or act of power. It is unfortunate that there is at present no agreed name for either of these types of story. For the former class, some German writers use the word paradigm, or model, in the belief that these stories were used in the preaching and teaching of the early church, according to more or less fixed forms, as illustrations of principles laid down by Jesus. Others prefer the word apophthegm, on the ground that the stories show a close resemblance to certain stories in Greek literature, which are usually so called.[1] For the latter class, the word most com-

given that the latter writer is apt to set forth conclusions which will seem to many needlessly negative in character.

The very thorough and laborious work of Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, 1919, should also be available.

In the remaining pages of this lecture I have closely followed Dr. Dibelius.

[The first of the books mentioned above has just appeared in an English translation made by Dr. Bertram Lee Woolf and revised by Dr. Dibelius himself. Its English title is *From Tradition to Gospel* (Ivor Nicholson and Watson, London). December 1934.]

[1] This nomenclature also emphasizes the importance of the saying embedded in the story. Mention should be made here of Prof. Bultmann's opinion, that in many cases the scene described has, as it were, grown up around the saying, in order to explain it.

An example may be given of an apophthegm in Greek literature: " Aristippus, being asked how Socrates died, answered, ' As I would wish to die myself ' " (*Diog. Laert.*, II, 76). This kind of apophthegm finds a close parallel in Lk. $17^{20, 21}$. Apophthegms are also a feature of Jewish literature, in connexion with sayings of the Rabbis. I select an example from Strack-Billerbeck's *Kommentar*, I, p. 808: " When Rabbi Aquiba after many years' absence from home returned thither with a great throng of pupils, his wife went to meet him, fell

monly used is miracle-story, although the German word Novelle[1] has also been suggested, because of the style and features distinctive of this type.

We will consider these in turn.

Of the former type, Dr. Martin Dibelius of Heidelberg, a pioneer in the new study, finds altogether sixteen examples[2] in St. Mark, although some in their

on her face and kissed his feet; whereupon his disciples wished to push her aside. But he said to them, Let her be; what is mine and yours is hers (i.e. we owe to her, what I am and what you are)." Cf. Mk. 10^{13-16}.

[1] In modern German literature this word implies a prose narrative comparatively short in length, which presents something new in the sense of something striking, concentrates its attention on one point only, and is distinguished by a strict attention to form. It must possess a turning-point, after which it generally passes rapidly to its *dénouement*.

It should be understood that in being thus applied to the gospel-sections under discussion the word is used in a rather unusual way.

[2] As against fifteen in the first edition of his book (1919). His sixteen examples are: first, eight of a comparatively pure type: the sick of the palsy ($2^{1\,ff.}$); the question about fasting ($2^{18\,ff.}$); the plucking of the ears of corn ($2^{23\,ff.}$); the withered hand ($3^{1\,ff.}$); "my mother and my brethren" ($3^{31\,ff.}$); the blessing of the children ($10^{13\,ff.}$); the tribute money ($12^{13\,ff.}$); the anointing at Bethany ($14^{3\,ff.}$); and secondly, eight less easily distinguished: the man with the unclean spirit in the synagogue ($1^{23\,ff.}$); the call of Levi ($2^{13\,ff.}$); the visit to "his own country" ($6^{1\,ff.}$); the rich man ($10^{17\,ff.}$); the sons of Zebedee ($10^{35\,ff.}$); Bartimæus ($10^{46\,ff.}$); the cleansing of the temple ($11^{15\,ff.}$); the question of the Sadducees ($12^{18\,ff.}$).

It is not always clear how far any particular section is believed to extend.

My own studies would lead me to form a slightly different list, but it is desirable to give Dr. Dibelius's findings in full. He himself expresses considerable doubt in regarding Mk. $10^{46\,ff.}$ as a paradigm. The student will perhaps be well advised to test the theory by considering the first eight examples given above, with the exception of Mk. $2^{1\,ff.}$, a story which presents some peculiar features.

present form are imperfect examples of what he regards as the normal type of paradigm. Its chief characteristic is that the scene described serves chiefly as a framework for an important utterance of Jesus. This utterance will usually imply a principle of universal application, and in it is to be found the purpose of the story, the framework being needed to give the occasion when the utterance was spoken, and the motive which called it forth.

Even if the paradigm includes the account of an act of power, such as the healing of the man with the withered hand (3^{1-5}), the action is subordinate, and serves only to illustrate or to heighten the impression of the saying; and no interest is shown in the manner of the miracle. Thus, in the story referred to, the essential point is to be found in the saying of Jesus, "Is it lawful on the sabbath day to do good, rather than to do harm? to make whole a life, rather than to destroy it?"[1] And the subsequent healing only puts the precept just stated into practice.

A second characteristic of this type of story, when still preserved in its original form, will be its simplicity and brevity. The introduction will tell just what is needed for the understanding of the coming saying, and no more. "And they brought unto him little children, that he should touch them; and the disciples rebuked them" (10^{13}). "And there come

[1] I have followed Wellhausen's rendering in his commentary on St. Mark, second edition, p. 21. He regards ἤ here as equivalent to μᾶλλον ἤ, and refers to the passage in his *Einleitung*, second edition, p. 21, comparing Lk. 15^{7}. A. Pallis, in his *Notes on St. Mark and St. Matthew*, p. 8, 1932, punctuates, like Souter, with four question marks, and regards the Lord's words as ironical in tone.

unto him Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection" (12^{18}). That is all. In the course of the story there will only be two, or at the most three, parties to the conversation; and when one of these represents a group, such as the disciples, or the scribes, or the congregation in the synagogue, it is treated as a unity.

Thirdly, the story itself will issue in a suitable conclusion, which will round off the whole. This will sometimes be the saying of Jesus, which it is the chief purpose of the story to impart. Thus the story just referred to, of the Sadducees who come to Jesus with a question bearing upon the resurrection, ends with the words, "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living: ye do greatly err." In the preceding story, dealing with the problem of the tribute-money, after the words, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's," we read in St. Mark, "And they marvelled greatly at him." When we recall how prone St. Mark is to call attention to the astonishment evoked by Jesus' words or deeds, we may be disposed to think that these words are his addition to a story, which has already reached its climax. Sometimes the conclusion will be an act of Jesus, which will illustrate his word already spoken. The story of the blessing of the children, for instance, ends with the act, illustrative of the saying which has just preceded it: "and he took them up in his arms, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them." Conclusions which point to a larger setting than is afforded by the story itself are unlikely to have formed part of it from the beginning. Thus at Mark 3^{6}, the end of the story of the healing of the man with

the withered hand, we read, "And the Pharisees went out, and straightway with the Herodians took counsel against him, how they might destroy him." These words coming so early in the gospel are often felt, and not unnaturally, to be difficult. But if they are really the general editorial conclusion of the five preceding stories, in each of which there is criticism of Jesus or of his disciples by opponents, then a forward reference to what was in fact the final issue of the conflict is intelligible; and these words may have taken the place of the original conclusion of the single story.[1]

Finally, it seems to be true that the paradigm in its original form shows no interest in biographical detail. It is remarkable how lacking in portraiture this type of story usually is. The delight in dwelling on details for their own sake, the characterization and description of persons from an interest in narration, all this is wanting to these little stories. Even if at first sight something of the sort seems to be present, a closer

[1] It must not, of course, be overlooked that at $3^{20\,ff.}$ we find ourselves again in the presence of controversy, and in a still more acute form. It is only necessary to say here that (*a*) 3^{1-6} seems certainly to belong to the collection of stories which begins at $2^{1\,ff.}$; (*b*) 3^{7-12} and $^{13-19a}$, unlike what now precedes and follows them, are "summarizing sections," of different character from and probably later in date than the stories contained in 2^{1}-3^{6}; (*c*) the argument with the scribes about Beelzebul (3^{22-30}) is inserted between two small sections each bearing on the connexion between Jesus and his intimates (3^{19b-21} and $^{31-35}$). It is possibly not a mistake to think that a parallel is in the mind of the evangelist between the attitude of the scribes from Jerusalem and that of Jesus' kinsfolk after the flesh. Also, St. Mark is fond of insertions between two halves of a single story, time as it were being thus given for the initial action to develop. Thus 5^{25-34} separates 5^{21-24} from $^{35-43}$; 6^{14-29} separates 6^{7-13} from $^{30-32}$; 14^{3-9} separates $14^{1,2}$ from ^{10,11}. In this last case a contrast, not a parallel, is drawn.

study of the section may suggest that it is only mentioned in order to explain something which follows in the narrative. Thus, in the paradigm of the rich man who came to Jesus, "There ran one to him, and kneeled to him, and asked him" (10[17]), our guides believe that these words are necessary to explain the rejection of such temperamental homage by Jesus, and yet at the same time his affection for a would-be disciple of such zeal.[1] It is St. Matthew who adds the detail that the man was young, and St. Luke that he was a member of the ruling class[2]; while in the gospel according to the Hebrews we are told that there were two rich men, and that one of them, on hearing the requirements of Jesus, began to scratch his head.[3] But originally, we are told, the emphasis will have been on the saying of the Lord in Mk. 10[21]; it is here that the interest is centred, not in the individual who inquires.[4] If an interest is shown in

(1) Mk. 10[17-22] seems to be the extent of the original paradigm. 10[23-27] and [28-31] are two supplements, containing instruction for *disciples*, who alone remain ([22]); contrast Lk. 18[22, 23]. We may compare Mk. 4[10-25], following on the *general* instruction given in 4[1-9].

[2] It is likely that St. Matthew infers the youthfulness of the inquirer (Mt. 19[20 and 22]) from the words of Mk. 10[20], "from my youth"; but these might be held to suggest that in fact he was no longer young. St. Luke's description of him as a ruler (Lk. 18[18]) is probably an inference from the last words of Mk. 10[22], "he had great possessions." St. Luke shows a tendency to bring our Lord into contact with persons of rank and position, as well as with the poor.

[3] See M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 6 (Oxford, 1924).

[4] Attention has already been drawn to the use of the impersonal plural in St. Mark, and it is especially prominent in the introductions to the paradigms. The later tradition tended to supply a definite subject, sometimes a proper name, and not only in the paradigms; cf. Mk. 3[2] with Lk. 6[7], and Mk. 14[13] with Lk. 22[8]. The mention of

personal details, and especially if names are given, as in the case of the wealthy tax-collector Zacchæus in the 19th chapter of St. Luke, we are in the presence of a story which is not prominent in St. Mark.

When we pass to the miracle-stories or Novellen in the second gospel, we find that they stand in sharp contrast to those which we have just considered, even when these latter contain, as a subordinate theme, the story of an act of healing. The brevity and simplicity of the paradigms are replaced in the Novellen by a considerable wealth of detail and a tendency to discursiveness in the narration of the story. What is of greater importance, in the paradigms Jesus is primarily a teacher; in the Novellen the emphasis is on his acts of power.

On the whole, the Novellen can be distinguished more easily than the paradigms from the other elements

Jairus as the name of the ruler of the synagogue is wanting in certain texts of Mk. 5^{22}; if it is not original here, it is likely to have worked back into the Marcan text from Lk. 8^{41}; it does not occur in the Matthæan parallel.

The right reading in Mk. $10^{1b, 2a}$ is probably "And the multitude cometh together [again]; and as he was wont, he taught them again. And people asked him . . ." There is evidence that there may have been no mention of Pharisees in the earliest texts. If so, they will have come in from the parallel Mt. 19^{3}. (It is noticeable, on this view, that only disciples and "the multitude" are mentioned in St. Mark's account of the journey to Jerusalem. Pharisees, *as taking part in the action of the narrative*, disappear from 8^{11} to 12^{13}, and scribes from 7^{5} to 11^{18}, except for 9^{14}, where the reading may be due to an error.)

Finally, in the apocryphal gospels names are found for the Magi, the woman with the issue, the crucified robbers, the centurion at the cross.

in St. Mark's gospel; Dr. Dibelius finds nine[1] in the first nine chapters, and a collection of them occurs in Mk. 4^{35}-5^{43}. There is reason, however, for thinking that all these nine stories, like the paradigms which we have just considered, at one time existed separately.

The most striking characteristic of the Novellen in St. Mark's gospel is their wealth of detail, and in some cases the length at which they are narrated. There is obvious interest in the description as such. "And he commanded that all should sit down by companies upon the green grass. And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties" ($6^{39,40}$). "And they brought him unto him: and when he saw him, straightway the spirit tore him grievously; and he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming. . . . And having cried out, and torn him much, he came out: and he became as one dead; insomuch that the more part said, He is dead" ($9^{20,26}$). Or we may recall the vivid description of the Legion in 5^{2-5}, where, as often elsewhere in the Novellen, much more is narrated than is necessary to the understanding of the story.

Secondly, the Novellen do not reach their climax in a saying of Jesus of universal application. The words of Jesus which they contain, apart from the word of power in connexion with the action, are comparatively

[1] The leper (1^{40-45}), the storm on the lake (4^{35-41}), the Gerasene demoniac (5^{1-20}), the daughter of Jairus and the woman with the issue (5^{21-43}), the feeding of the five thousand (6^{35-44}), the walking on the lake (6^{45-52}), the deaf-mute (7^{32-37}), the blind man at Bethsaida (8^{22-26}), the boy with a dumb spirit (9^{14-29}).

I myself doubt whether the first of these is rightly included with the rest.

few. "Why are ye fearful? have ye not yet faith?"[1] (4^{40}). "Fear not, only believe" (5^{36}). "Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid" (6^{50}). "All things are possible to him that believeth" (9^{23}). Such sayings as these are typical of the Novellen. But the emphasis in the stories is wholly on the act of power.

Thirdly, it is alleged that there is in these stories a greater *naïveté* of tone than in the former type; that they are not so strongly marked by the religious notes, prominent in the paradigms, of reverence and edification. In the storm on the lake, the disciples say almost reprovingly to Jesus, "Master, carest thou not that we perish?" (4^{38}); in the story of Jairus' daughter, "Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me?" (5^{31}); and in the feeding of the five thousand, "Are we to go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat?" (6^{37}). It is significant that in the passages parallel to these sayings the later writers, St. Matthew and St. Luke, either omit or at any rate modify the Marcan rendering, in the interests of a tone of greater reverence.

It is claimed by several writers that in certain respects the stories of Jesus' acts of healing in the gospels run parallel to similar stories in writings of non-Christian origin.[2] The following are said to be the chief points of resemblance. First, the nature of the illness is described, and reference may be made to its grievous nature, and to previous efforts at a cure, which have proved vain. Secondly, in the account of

[1] Or, "Ye have not yet faith"; cf. 8^{21}. Mr. T. Nicklin of Hulme Hall, Manchester, suggests "In no wise have ye faith."

[2] References may be found in Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 236. Cf. also on this subject Prof. A. D. Nock, *Conversion*, pp. 82 ff. (Oxford, 1933).

the healing itself, which forms the climax of the story, great interest may be shown in its method, whether it be by laying on of hands, or the use of some special substance, or a form of words. And thirdly, emphasis is apt to be laid in the conclusion on the completeness of the cure. This is often shown by appropriate action, which had previously been impossible, on the part of the sufferer. Examples of these three features in the gospel narratives will readily occur to us.

In the Novellen our Lord, it is said, is not the proclaimer of the imminent kingdom of God, with the consequent demands on, and possibilities for men; rather, he is the worker of supernatural deeds; and in Dr. Dibelius' opinion, this is the key to the understanding of these stories. The actions described suggest indeed a present Christ in power, rather than a future Judge or Saviour. It is noteworthy that the Novellen lay great emphasis on the necessity for faith, but this faith is, primarily at any rate, confidence in the power of Jesus to effect the particular remedy desired; it is hardly faith as St. Paul in Gal. 2^{20} or the writer to the Hebrews in Heb. 11 use the word.

Hence these stories may indeed have been a source of edification to the Christians, in so far as they lay stress upon the power and person of their Master, and this seems to be their chief purpose; but it is possible that they are in some respects less definitely religious in tone than the paradigms, and also show certain affinities, as has been said, with miracle-stories in circulation outside the Christian church. It is this consideration, above all, which leads certain writers to think that they may have assumed their present

form at a later date than the paradigms, and in some cases perhaps have been as it were drawn into the Christian orbit from outside. It has been suggested, for instance, that in the story of the Gerasene demoniac we have a "popular"[1] story of a Jewish exorcism in a heathen land, in which Jesus has become the central figure.[2]

Lastly, particular reference should be made to the conclusions of some of the Novellen. It is characteristic that in the course of the story the action itself is not explained, even when its method is described (e.g. Mk. 6^{41}), and sometimes, indeed, it has to take place away from public gaze (e.g. Mk. 5^{37}, ^{40}, 7^{33}, 8^{23}: contrast 2^{10}, ^{11}, 3^{5}, which are not reckoned as Novellen); but at the end the effect on those who have witnessed or hear of the action is often strongly emphasized. Thus, after the storm on the lake the disciples "feared exceedingly, and said one to another, Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?" (4^{41}). At the (present) conclusion of the story of the Gerasene demoniac, the man publishes in Decapolis how great things Jesus has done for him: "and all men did marvel" (5^{20}). The five persons permitted to be present at the raising of Jairus' daughter, that is, her parents and the three most intimate disciples, "were amazed straightway with a great amazement" (5^{42}). And at the close of the section describing the healing of the deaf-mute, we read, "They were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well: he

[1] In the sense of a story circulating widely in common talk at the time.

[2] So far as I know, Wellhausen was the first to make this suggestion, in his commentary on St. Mark.

maketh even the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak" (7^{37}).[1]

If these and similar sections were originally recited or read in isolation at the meetings of the little communities for worship or instruction,[2] it is not difficult to imagine how closely those present would identify themselves with the words just quoted: how powerful would be the effect of the silent answer, if indeed it was silent, given by the worshippers to the question put by the disciples at the close of Mk. 4^{35-41}: and how moving would be the narration of Mk. 6^{34-44} at a meeting of the community for a celebration of the Lord's supper, especially if it were followed by Mk. 6^{45-52}; neither the recipients of Jesus' bounty at the time of the feeding,[3] nor the disciples themselves, according to Mk. 6^{52},[4] had understood the

[1] Cf. also, although the stories to which the verses belong are not reckoned as Novellen, 1^{27} "And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What is this? a new teaching with authority! he commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey him": and 2^{12b} "Insomuch that they were all amazed, and glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this fashion."

[2] On this point see an important passage in A. D. Nock, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

[3] This may perhaps be implied in St. John's conclusion of the story of the feeding, 6^{14} "When therefore the people saw the sign which he did, they said, This is of a truth the prophet that cometh into the world." This confession is of a much less exalted type than that which is expected in the fourth gospel from *disciples*; cf. $6^{68, 69}$, "Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God."

[4] Mk. $6^{51c, 52}$, "They were sore amazed in themselves; for they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened."

The Matthæan parallel stands in striking contrast to this passage. In Mt. 14^{33} we read, "And they that were in the boat [i.e. the

nature of the gift, but the church itself now knew; it was increasingly certain of its secret.[1]

It is now perhaps possible to infer, from this short outline, the general character ascribed to St. Mark's gospel, or at least to a considerable part of it, in the theories which we have been considering. How far they can be of help to us in our understanding of the gospels will perhaps to some extent become apparent in the later lectures.[2]

disciples, as opposed to 'the multitudes' still on the land ($14^{22, 29}$)] worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God." In this passage of the later gospel we see the church's affirmation of faith already breaking out upon the lips of the disciples, although we are still some distance, according to St. Matthew's record, from St. Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi (Mt. $16^{13\,ff.}$). The development which is beginning to overleap the Marcan bounds in St. Matthew, reaches its full growth in St. John.

[1] In sharpest contrast with the "astonishment" constantly ascribed to disciples and others in St. Mark, and to a less degree in the other synoptists, in St. John's gospel no one is ever astonished. The closest approach in St. John to St. Mark's presentation is that in the fourth gospel people sometimes "marvel," e.g. 4^{27}, $7^{15, 21}$.

That the "secret" was being proclaimed in ever wider circles at the time when St. Mark's gospel was put forth, does not involve a contradiction; in the last resort spiritual things are spiritually discerned; cf. Jn. 3^{3}.

[2] In any consideration of the miracle-stories in the gospels, the student should refer to Sir J. R. Seeley's *Ecce Homo*, ch. 5, on "Christ's credentials," and should also read the preface to the fifth edition of the book.

III

THE DOCTRINE OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK

We have briefly considered the findings of recent study with respect to the origin and compilation of the gospel of St. Mark, and we turn now to examine the doctrine set forth in this gospel. This examination will itself have a bearing upon the problem of the gospel's origin and structure. Our conclusions, indeed, are likely to be less novel than those set forth in the last lecture, but in certain respects they run counter to views still widely held in this country about the nature of our earliest gospel. To put the matter in a single sentence, there is an increasing tendency to find interpretation continually present in a book which most of us were taught to regard as almost exclusively historical.

If we were dealing with St. John's gospel, this would not cause us great surprise. There we have long recognized a considerable element of interpretation interwoven with the history. The highest possible view of the person and office of the central figure is laid down in the prologue, and it is dominant throughout the book. At the outset of the history, after the prologue, the Baptist bears witness[1] in the

[1] This is the sole function of the Baptist in St. John, in sharp contrast to the presentation in St. Matthew and St. Luke, and, to a less extent, in St. Mark. The emphasis on the Baptist's witness to "the light" 1^{8}, he himself being only a "lamp" 5^{35}, should be carefully

most specific terms to Jesus, who is recognized as Messiah forthwith [1]; and the problem of his person and office is the chief theme of the central section of the gospel. It is the inability or failure of the Jews [2] to recognize and admit his claims, which involves their ruin.[3] To believe in the unique mission of Jesus is to have eternal life; to fail to acknowledge him and to hear his word is to be blind, and to remain in sin.[4]

In St. Mark's gospel the case seems very different. Here our first impression may well be that we are dealing with a plain historical record, to which we must assign our own interpretation; and the attempt to do so has been constantly made in the last two generations. But it is becoming probable that in this gospel also the significance which the evangelist believes to belong to and inhere in the history is constantly suggested in the form of fact, and that St. Mark's gospel is built upon the basis of a definite doctrine, although the latter is much less obtrusively and pervadingly present than in

noticed, both in the prologue and throughout the gospel; cf. especially $1^{15,19-34}$, 3^{22-30}, 10^{40-42}. Curiously enough, although reference to his baptizing is frequent, he is never called by his title of "the Baptist" in St. John.

[1] Jn. 1^{41}; cf. $1^{34,49}$.

[2] "The Jews" in St. John's gospel may be called the permanent opponents of Jesus. They represent the part taken in the earlier gospels by the scribes and Pharisees. The expression "the Jews" occurs some seventy times in St. John, whereas in the synoptists (apart from the last scenes in the passion narrative, e.g. Mk. 15^{2-26}) it is almost confined to editorial contexts, e.g. Mk. 7^{3} "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands . . ."; Mt. 28^{15} "This saying was spread abroad among the Jews, and continueth until this day."

[3] Cf. $6^{41,52}$, 8^{24}.

[4] Cf. 9^{35-41}.

the gospel of St. John. Its foundation is that Jesus is the Messiah or Christ; but the remarkable feature of the doctrine in St. Mark's gospel is that this is a secret, to be kept close throughout the ministry,[1] except from a few chosen followers towards its close. For our present purpose also it is important to notice that the actual title Messiah is applied to Jesus in this gospel, and indeed in the others also, infrequently and with reserve, and that it is represented in certain important contexts by equivalents, especially the Son of God.[2]

Much labour has been spent of late years in the investigation of the messianic beliefs current among the Jews at the beginning of our era.[3] It seems, however, to be impossible to state precisely what these were. The probability is that there was no consistent doctrine. The word Messiah in itself only means anointed or consecrated to an office, and can therefore be applied in Jewish writings to the nation, to the high priest, to the monarch and in other ways. Indeed, there are forms of the Jewish hope of the future

[1] After the transfiguration the three are charged to "tell no man what things they had seen, save when the Son of man should have risen again from the dead," 9^{9}.

[2] Notably 1^{11} at the baptism, 9^{7} at the transfiguration, 12^{6} in the parable of the wicked husbandmen, 15^{39} the centurion's confession; also 3^{11} and 5^{7}, the cry of the demoniacs. The two terms are brought together in 1^{1}, according to the present text, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," and in the high priest's question, 14^{61} "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" Notice also 1^{24} "The Holy One of God."

[3] See Foakes-Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, I, 346 ff., and A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, pp. 12 ff.

in which the figure of the Messiah does not appear at all; and the thought of the expected deliverance, which was very near the heart of Jewish faith,[1] was probably more important than the thought of the deliverer.

It would be in accordance with this train of thought, to find the chief emphasis in our earliest gospel, not on the person of Jesus as Messiah, but on his proclamation of the imminent coming of the kingdom of God; and St. Mark's gospel has often been approached along these lines. It is indeed true that this proclamation is the most prominent note in the summary of Jesus' preaching in Galilee, as given by St. Mark at the beginning of his story of the ministry. "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand" (1^{15a}). Here is a conception which (although curiously enough the precise phrase, the kingdom of God, is barely if ever found in earlier or contemporary Jewish writings[2]) would be intelligible to every Jew, and would arouse the greatest expectations. But the contention that the chief interest of the evangelist is in the proclamation by Jesus of the kingdom of God cannot be maintained. The expression "the kingdom of God" occurs much less often in St. Mark than is usually supposed. Apart from the passage just quoted, it only occurs three times in the Galilean section of the ministry, and these instances are all connected with the teaching by parables, in chapter 4. It occurs also three times in St. Mark's account of the last week, but elsewhere only seven times, all of which are in the

[1] Dr. Edward Caird's dictum is valuable, "To the Jew insight always took the form of foresight."

[2] See Foakes-Jackson and Lake, *op cit.*, p. 269.

central section of the gospel, 8^{27} to 10^{45} [1]; and there, as we shall see, the emphasis falls even more on the disclosures made by Jesus to his disciples of the true meaning of Messiahship, in connexion with the destiny and functions of the Son of man. No doubt the two conceptions, Jesus as Messiah, and the kingdom of God, of which he is the herald, are inseparably connected; but the primary interest of our earliest evangelist is in the significance of the person of Christ. It was this devotion of the early church to the person of its Master which gave to the office and work of the Messiah the much greater importance that they have in Christianity than they ever had in Judaism. The conception of the Messiah proved even more powerful than the conception of the kingdom of God, because of the *personal* aspect which the former had in Jesus.[2]

This view is borne out by the introduction to St. Mark, which, like the prologue in St. John, puts into the *readers'* hands at the outset the key which is designed to unlock the meaning of the contents of the book, and to show how, in the evangelist's view, they may best be approached and understood. In the case of St. Mark this has been obscured for us by the arrangement of the paragraphs in Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament, which is probably the text most

[1] And of these, two occur in the single section of the blessing of the children, $10^{13\text{-}16}$, and three others between 10^{23} and 10^{25} (wealth and the kingdom of God).

[2] The word Christos occurs nineteen times in St. John's gospel; "the kingdom of God" only twice, at $3^{3,5}$: "He cannot {see / enter into} the kingdom of God."

familiar to English students of the gospels in the original. In their arrangement the opening section of the gospel, dealing with the mission of the Baptist, ceases at verse 8, where John speaks of the coming one, who is stronger than himself. "I baptized you with water; but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." After these words Westcott and Hort insert a big space, only paralleled elsewhere, in their arrangement of the text of St. Mark, at the end of chapter 13 before the opening of the passion proper, and their main narrative begins in large characters at verse 9, with the first appearance of Jesus on the scene.

"And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee, and was baptized by John in Jordan. And straightway, coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens parting asunder, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon him; and there came a voice from the heavens, Thou art my only[1] Son, in thee I find full pleasure."

According to Westcott and Hort, these words take their place along with the narrative which follows, that is, the story of the ministry. This arrangement is probably an error, due perhaps to the view taken of St. Mark's gospel at the time when that great text was published. History, not interpretation, was what was then chiefly looked for in the earliest gospel. Rather, there is no real break until the end of verse 13, and the narrative proper begins with the public life and activity of Jesus: "Now[2] after that John

[1] For this, certainly the correct, translation of ἀγαπητός here, see *J.T.S.*, January 1926, pp. 113 ff.

[2] The probability of the arrangement of paragraphs suggested here is increased, if with Prof. C. H. Turner (*J.T.S.*, January 1927, p. 152),

was delivered up,[1] Jesus came into Galilee," and so forth.

The earlier verses are a single whole, and, as has been said, form the introduction, admitting the readers of the gospel, and them only,[2] to the meaning and significance of the story about to be unfolded. In other words, we are allowed to know, before the ministry opens, who Jesus is; he is divinely acknowledged as the beloved, that is, the unique or only Son of God.

If it be asked why St. Mark connects the proclamation of the divine sonship of Jesus with the moment of his baptism by John, the answer will be, that, according to the evidence we have, the baptism and preaching of John were regarded in the primitive

Souter and others we read μετὰ δέ instead of καὶ μετά at the beginning of verse 14. Prof. Turner writes, "St. Mark's normal way of commencing a new paragraph is with καί, while the other synoptists, Luke especially, prefer δέ: what are we to say when the authorities in Mark are divided? Let us look at the other instances where a paragraph begins with δέ. They are (if we except 15^{16}, where I am sure a smaller division than a paragraph should be made) only three in number in W–H, 7^{24}, 10^{32}, 14^{1}, and they are each significant of a great break in the story. At 7^{24} our Lord passes for the first time outside the confines of Palestine; at 10^{32} Jerusalem is for the first time mentioned as the objective of our Lord's movements; at 14^{1} the ministry is over, and the passion story commences." And he proceeds to argue that there is a similar break at 1^{14}.

[1] The use and significance of παραδίδωμι in St. Mark deserves very careful study.

[2] In verses 10 and 11 Jesus alone sees the vision, and to him alone the voice is addressed. At the transfiguration, on the other hand, the three disciples are aware both of the cloud and of the voice (9^{7}), and it is now generally recognized that the contrast with $1^{10,11}$ is deliberate and of importance to the evangelist's presentation of the gospel.

church as the immediate prelude[1] of what we may call the divine message or action of salvation. It is so, for example, in the speeches of St. Peter[2] and St. Paul[3] in the Acts ; and accordingly from this point St. Mark also takes his start, using it as a means to make known to his readers, in connexion with the baptism of Jesus by John, the nature and office of the central figure of the book.

If this arrangement of the text is accepted, the first thirteen verses of St. Mark will form a theological at least as much as an historical introduction to the gospel. Just as the prologue to our latest gospel contains much theology, and history only as referred to that theology, so the prologue to our earliest gospel contains history indeed, but history recorded for a theological end. St. Mark uses for his purpose the historical facts connected with the preaching and baptism of John, and the latter's baptism of Jesus; but

[1] If, once more following Prof. C. H. Turner (*J.T.S.*, January 1925 and January 1927), we regard Mk. $1^{2,3}$ as parenthetical, to be placed as it were within brackets, and translate " The beginning of the gospel about Jesus Christ, Son of God, was John the baptizer," even these words are perhaps hardly strong enough, and John is regarded as himself forming part of " the gospel." (This piece of exegesis, however, must be regarded as extremely doubtful.) On the other hand, a different form of the tradition, while assigning pre-eminent greatness to John, regarded him as definitely outside the era of salvation. Thus Mt. 11^{11} " There hath not arisen among mankind a greater than John the Baptist: yet the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he "; cf. the parallel Lk. 7^{28}.

[2] Acts 1^{22} " Beginning from the baptism of John "; 10^{37} " After the baptism which John proclaimed."

[3] Acts 13^{24} " . . . Jesus, when John had first proclaimed before his coming (*πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ*) a baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel."

he is not really interested in John's preaching of repentance. It is not dwelt on in his book, any more than it is referred to in the fourth gospel; the only content of the preaching of the Baptist in St. Mark is the coming of the greater than himself; and it is implied by the evangelist's arrangement of the narrative, rather than stated in John's preaching, that the coming one is Jesus. Only in the record of the baptism, and of the revelation which immediately follows it, do we learn who Jesus is, and of his uniqueness in relation to his Father.

But before the record of the ministry begins, we come upon the very remarkable passage, Mk. $1^{12, 13}$, usually known as the temptation in the wilderness. There can be no doubt that the story is vitally connected with the verses which immediately precede it, but the question may reasonably be asked, in what way it can be regarded as an essential part of the introduction, as it must presumably be if the suggested arrangement of the paragraphs is to be upheld.

An answer seems to be possible along these lines. We may remind ourselves, in the first place, of the summary of Jesus' preaching in Galilee, as recorded by St. Mark at 1^{15}. It opens with the words, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom (or reign) of God is upon [you]," for so we are now often bidden by good guides to understand and emphasize the words. And we may recall the general apocalyptic expectation that the triumph of the Messiah would be achieved only as the result of a peculiarly intense conflict with the forces of evil.

Secondly, as we have already said, the story is very closely connected with the verses which immediately

precede it. From them we have learned that our Lord is the Messiah, the representative of the new Israel, and that he finds full favour in God's sight. The old Israel was tempted forty years in the wilderness, and fell short of God's good pleasure. The implication of the narrative is that our Lord, like the Israel of old, also undergoes temptation, in this case for forty days, in the wilderness[1]; but that, whereas the latter failed, he is now victorious.[2] Accordingly, he is able to enter on his ministry with the declaration that the hour has struck; the kingdom of God is now at least on the horizon.[3]

St. Mark, however, was now faced with a peculiar problem. He is making an attempt—the first, so far as we know—to set forth, in more or less connected form, a narrative of Jesus' public life; and the latter is put before us from the beginning as the Christ, the Son of God : the fulfilment, that is, not only of Jewish but of all men's hopes. This was the conviction and the doctrine of the church for which the evangelist wrote,

[1] Both in the O.T. and the N.T. the wilderness is the haunt of evil spirits. The reference to the wild beasts is to be understood as emphasizing the solitude and inhumanity, not the danger of the desert.

[2] This is implied, rather than definitely stated, in St. Mark, because further conflict clearly lay ahead; but in the evangelist's view a personal interior triumph over evil is now achieved, and therefore the ministry can open with the words considered in the text.

[3] For what seems to be a remarkable example of the influence of Mk. $1^{12, 13}$, see E. G. Browne's *A Year among the Persians*, pp. 148 f. (London, A. and C. Black, 1893). Mr. A. D. Nock explains the phenomenon by the contact of early Islam with Christian monasticism.

and it gives the keynote to his gospel. And yet it was also the case that Jesus had not been generally recognized as such on earth, and that his own nation, instead of finding its expectations realized in him, had brought him to the cross.

This contradiction between what we may call outward fact and inward faith is accounted for in St. Mark's gospel by the secrecy ascribed to the truth of the Messiahship of Jesus. In this is found the explanation both of the lack of recognition, and of the rejection. According to this gospel the nature of Jesus is known during the greater part of the ministry to no one but himself. Only towards the close is it set forth by St. Peter,[1] but at once[2] the same injunction of secrecy or silence is laid upon the disciples as previously upon the demons; and the only result[3] of the insight, which the disciples now have, is that they are able to receive instruction in the meaning and duties of Messiahship, and in the implications for themselves. Not until the trial, a few hours before the end, does Jesus in St. Mark admit his Messiahship in the presence of the rulers of his nation.[4]

[1] Mk. 8^{29}. [2] Mk. 8^{30}.

[3] Thus they still call Jesus Rabbi, Mk. 9^{5}, 11^{21}, 14^{45}.

[4] Mk. 14^{62}. The question should probably not be raised, whether St. Peter at Cæsarea Philippi first grasped the fact of the Messiahship of Jesus. The important consideration is that St. Mark, at $8^{27\,ff.}$, regards the moment as suitable for the deeper instruction of the disciples in the meaning of the Christian life and faith, and for this purpose St. Peter's confession and the previous allusions to the blindness of the disciples were essential.

Wrede suggests that "Jesus forbids his disciples to reveal his Messiahship" would be a better description of Mk. $8^{27\,ff.}$ than "Revelation to the disciples of the messianic secret." This recognition by the disciples, he says, is not the foil of their own earlier lack

These commands to secrecy are a very important feature of St. Mark's gospel; they are not all of the same character, and they must be examined in detail. There is, first of all, the command to the demons in the early chapters to be silent in respect of the Messiahship of Jesus. In the popular belief of the time, various forms of illness were attributed to possession by evil spirits, and these were regarded as endued with supernatural insight. It was therefore fitting that the spirits should recognize him who would despoil them of their heritage,[1] and should give expression to their fear.

This charge to the demons to keep silence as regards the person of their conqueror[2] occurs three times in the first three chapters, but there is reason to think that in none of these contexts are we dealing with the oldest form of the tradition traceable in St. Mark. In the first story, 1^{21-27}, we are told of Jesus' visit to the synagogue, and of the astonishment aroused, first by his teaching, and secondly by his expulsion of what is called an unclean spirit. It is possible that this story is inserted here by the evangelist rather as a typical picture of Jesus in the synagogue and of the impression

of recognition, but of the failure of others to recognize; and we are meant to see here, not so much a crisis in the disciples' life, as a more direct manifestation of what Jesus is, and yet cannot be openly, at present.

See also, on 8^{27} ff., the additional note B at the end of the lecture.

[1] This is probably the implication of Mk. 3^{27}, "But no one can enter into the house of the strong man, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man; and then he will spoil his house."

[2] Mk. 1^{24} should probably be translated, "What have we in common with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? thou art come to destroy us. I know thee who thou art, the holy one of God."

made there by his words and deeds, than as the narrative of a particular event.[1] It is not formed on the model of the traditional pieces, which we considered in the last lecture.[2] There is here no great saying of Jesus of universal application, which forms the kernel of the narrative; nor is the story told with that fullness of detail which we saw to be a mark of the typical Novelle. It would also be permissible to stress the imperfect tenses in the first two sentences. "On sabbath days he used to go to synagogue and teach. And the people would be astonished at his teaching; for he used to teach them as having authority, and not as the scribes." And at the close we have a *general* statement of his power: "he commandeth even the unclean *spirits*, and they obey him."[3]

The picture is of one who to the writer and his

[1] Wellhausen remarks that signs of what we may call an editor's hand are especially noticeable in Mk. 1. His observation on Mk. 1^{16-39} is worth translating. "We have here certain constant and leading traits of the activity of Jesus put before us in the form, not of a mere enumeration, but of history, and crowded together at the outset: the companionship of disciples, without whom he cannot be conceived even at the beginning, the combination of teaching and healing, the mighty crowding which he occasions, the life of itinerant preaching after he has scarcely set foot in Capernaum, the extremely significant habit of solitary prayer at night or in the early morning."

[2] It seems possible, indeed, that the section is composite, i.e. that verses 21 and 22 and the words "a new teaching with authority" in verse 27 (cf. verse 22, to justify this punctuation) have been combined with an independent story of an expulsion of a demon, verses 23 to 27.

Contrast the following section 1^{29-31}, in which the identity of the sufferer is made quite clear, although even here no name is given.

[3] The following verse, 28, is an "additional conclusion," similar to Mk. $7^{36, 37}$; it breaks the immediate connexion between 1^{21-27} and $1^{29\,ff.}$, the sections being linked by their common reference to the synagogue.

readers is Messiah. The Messiahship, as understood by the evangelist, continually and inevitably expresses itself in both word and deed. But it is not, cannot and must not be recognized as yet by any man, and therefore the witness to it can only be given by those who have more than human insight, in other words, the demons. For others, the only result of what they hear and see is astonishment, amazement.

The other two passages also appear to be what may be called "generalizing sections," brief summaries of what had been told in the earlier tradition in reference to individual cases, although now with the added injunction to silence. Thus at 1^{34} we read, "And he healed many that were sick with various diseases, and cast out many demons; and he suffered not the demons to speak, because they knew him [to be Christ[1]]. And at $3^{11, 12}$: "And the unclean spirits, when[2] they beheld him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God. And he charged them much that they should not make him known." If these stories are read as reminders, to the *reader*,

[1] See R.V. margin.

[2] It would strengthen the argument here, if we were justified in translating ὅταν, with the R.V., "whensoever." In Marcan Greek, however, ὅταν almost always seems simply to mean "when"; and, if so, at 11^{19} the R.V., both text and margin, is probably in error, the correct translation being "when (that particular) evening came." Perhaps only at 14^{7} is it definitely "whensoever." On the other hand, the use here of ὅταν with the imperfect tense of the indicative mood is unparalleled in St. Mark; and since in the only other two examples in this gospel where the indicative mood is used after ὅταν ($11^{19 \text{ and } 25}$) the meaning in the first case may be, and in the second must strictly be, "whenever," it is at least possible that the meaning is "whenever" here.

In 11^{22} I have read στήκετε, not (with B) στήκητε.

of the veiled Messiahship, we shall best be able to penetrate their meaning.

But the command to silence occurs also, in the first half of the gospel, in four stories, where there is no allusion to Messiahship. The leper who is cleansed [1] is sent away with an almost fierce injunction to silence (1^{40-45}); the parents of the little girl, and the three disciples present, are to tell no one of what has happened to their daughter (5^{43}); and silence is enjoined after the healing of the deaf-mute in Decapolis (7^{36}), and of the blind man at Bethsaida (8^{26}). In none of these four stories is there any direct reference to the Messiahship; indeed, the very possibility of any such is excluded, since, unlike the evil spirits, no human being has at present any inkling of the truth.

In the first case, that of the leper, the command to silence may originally have had a simpler motive than that of explaining why, in spite of Jesus' mighty works of mercy, his Messiahship was not recognized, and that this was of set purpose on his part. St. Mark himself may have understood the command along the same lines as the injunction to the demons, but in an earlier form of the tradition the command to the leper may have been due to the desire of Jesus to avoid an excessive publicity, which would make his work impossible. It is not likely, however, that anyone will speak with confidence about the meaning of this command in a section of peculiar difficulty.[2]

[1] The idea of uncleanness was especially associated with leprosy. In the New Testament the removal of other diseases is described as healing, but in all the synoptists the removal of leprosy is called cleansing; the only place in which the verb "to heal" is used in this connexion is Lk. 17^{15}.

[2] The six verses, Mk. 1^{40-45}, present some remarkable variants in the

In the remaining three stories the interpretation is less difficult. In these, the almost stereotyped form of the commands to silence strengthens the belief that these also, like the injunctions to the demons, are due to the evangelist, who wishes his readers to see in these mighty works of Jesus a revelation of Messiahship, and yet to understand also why at the moment they evoked no adequate response.

" He charged them much that no man should know this " (5^{43}).

" He charged them that they should tell no man " (7^{36}).

" Tell it to no one in the village " (8^{26}).[1]

In each case the words quoted can be separated without loss from the preceding story, which has already reached its suitable conclusion[2] in the establishment of the perfection of the cure (5^{42}, 7^{35}, 8^{25}).[3] We may observe also that, strictly understood, the command to silence was in some cases impossible of execution.

text, and the correct readings (see *J.T.S.*, January 1927, pp. 156 ff.) emphasize the emotional element in the story. This is almost entirely wanting in St. Matthew and St. Luke, and indeed the true readings have had a struggle to survive in St. Mark.

[1] That this is the true reading is convincingly argued by Prof. C. H. Turner in *J.T.S.*, October 1924, p. 18. See also p. 91 below.

[2] See p. 47, and also additional note A at the end of the lecture.

[3] Mk. 5^{43b} " And he commanded that something should be given her to eat " may owe its inclusion in the text to the same motive. A striking modern parallel is mentioned by Dr. Dibelius (*op. cit.*, p. 76). The account of a healing at Lourdes in *L'Echo de Paris*, 23 August 1932, ends with the words, " (The sufferer) was taken in front of the grotto, where a mysterious sense of well-being immediately took possession of her. She was healed, and on her return to the hospital *asked for something to eat.*" The narrator clearly saw in the last incident a signal proof of her recovery.

Neither the little girl nor the blind man could remain permanently in isolation; but with this aspect of the matter St. Mark was not concerned. It is rather as though he said, Here was a manifestation of Messiahship; but it was a mystery, and passed unrecognized; and it was the will of the Messiah that it should so pass. The mighty works of Jesus showed continually, had men had eyes to see, that he was Son of God; but of set purpose at the time their meaning was veiled from the eyes of all who witnessed them.[1] This is also the explanation of another curious contradiction in the first half of St. Mark. The disciples themselves remain in darkness for the present; they do not understand the truth and are not meant to understand it; and yet from time to time they are blamed,[2] because they fail to understand. For the present, the only results produced by Jesus' acts are astonishment, bewilderment, amazement. In St. John's gospel, as we have already seen,[3] where the Messiahship

[1] Some of the acts of power in St. Mark are themselves performed secretly, e.g. $5^{37 \text{ and } 40}$, 7^{33}, 8^{23}; cf. $9^{25\text{f}}$. This secrecy of the incident itself must be distinguished from the command to secrecy at the close. It is possible that, at any rate in 7^{33} and 8^{23}, we see the influence of the idea that divine action must be veiled from profane sight. Cf. M. Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

In the cycle of stories contained in Mk. 2^{1} to 3^{6}, on the other hand, there is no secrecy. Not only does Jesus perform acts of power in public, even before enemies, but he twice refers to himself as "the Son of man." This form of the tradition is nearer to that in the fourth gospel, and is in sharp contrast to that which now precedes and follows this section in St. Mark's gospel, as we have already seen.

[2] "Why are ye fearful? have ye not yet faith?" 4^{40}. "Do ye not yet perceive, nor understand? have ye your heart hardened?" 8^{17}.

[3] See p. 56. It is perhaps significant that the words "In the midst

of Jesus is recognized throughout, there is no astonishment.

It should be noticed, finally, that the idea of the Messianic secret is much more in place in a connected "gospel," as conceived and told by our earliest evangelist, than in a story about Jesus related independently of any context. In the latter there would be no need to explain why Jesus was not forthwith greeted as Messiah, in spite of his great fame[1]; for the story was not concerned with the subsequent course of events, or with the issue of his life. Indeed, the readers or worshippers who heard the isolated story would throughout be thinking of it as an example or revelation of Messiahship, and would welcome it as such. Only in connexion with the lowliness and obscurity of his whole life, and above all with its end upon the cross, would an answer be needed to the question why, in spite of all he was recorded to have done, men failed to understand and reverence and accept him.

Before we pass to consider the central section of St. Mark's gospel, where the revelation of the Messiahship and its meaning is granted to a chosen few, it should be pointed out that the principle of secrecy just considered has had its influence upon the evangelist's presentation of the words as well as of the deeds of Jesus. We see this most clearly in the reason given for the teaching by parables, as set forth in chapter 4. It has often been remarked that the reason given in

of you standeth one whom ye know not" occur in St. John (1^{26}) before the ministry itself begins.

[1] Cf. Mk. $1^{28, 37, 45}$, $2^{2, 15}$, $3^{7, 8, 20}$, 4^{1}, 5^{21}, $6^{14, 15, 54-56}$.

Mk. 4^{12} for the use by Jesus of this method of teaching is not what we should naturally expect. For us, just as we may believe that the healing acts of Jesus were due to his great sympathy with human need and to his desire to help, so we may assume that his method of teaching by parable will have been designed to help his hearers, by vivid word-pictures symbolical of spiritual truth, to understand his meaning. St. Mark, however, sees the matter otherwise. What was originally a picturesque and arresting method of instruction is regarded by the evangelist, owing to his theory, very differently, and a special purpose is ascribed to it. Thus we read that, after the parable of the sower, they that were about Jesus with the twelve asked of him the parables (4^{10}). The answer which they receive shows the same motive which we have traced in dealing with the acts of power. In this case the mystery of the kingdom of God is granted indeed, but only to the few, the intimates; not "to them that are without"; only eyes that have been opened can understand the parables, and to disciples only is the explanation of them given (4^{34}).[1]

[1] As in the case of Jesus' deeds, so now in connexion with his teaching, even disciples sometimes show as little understanding as the rest. Thus at Mk. 4^{13}, a verse which seems to be of a different stamp from 4^{10-12}, although it does not necessarily contradict them, we read "And he saith unto them, Understand ye not this parable? and how shall ye understand the other parables?"; and at 7^{18} "And he saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also?" If Mk. 4^{13} originally followed immediately on Mk. 4^{10}, the parallel with Mk. $7^{17, 18}$ is extremely close. Cf. also the difficult verses $8^{15, 16}$, which St. Mark uses as the immediate occasion for the rebukes in $8^{17 ff.}$. This obtuseness of the disciples continues even after $8^{27 ff.}$.

Mt. 13^{10-18} should be carefully compared with its parallel, Mk. 4^{10-13}. It will be found that in St. Matthew all trace of lack of understanding

No doubt the mystery is regarded as temporary only; the whole purpose of 4^{21-25} (which, as we saw on p. 34, consists of sayings of Jesus attached by the writer to the *explanation* of the Sower parable) is to remind the disciples that one day the time will come for full disclosure,[1] and of the responsibility which lies upon them in this matter; but at present for the rest the veil remains and must remain unlifted.[2]

It is possible, therefore, that in Mk. 4^{10-25} we have a gospel section of different origin from that to which the parables themselves belong, and that we should see in it an attempt to grapple with the same problem which St. Paul faces in chapters 9 to 11 of the epistle to the Romans; how it could be that the great majority of Israel—typified in St. Mark's gospel by the immediate hearers of Jesus—was not won over to discipleship. St. Mark accounts for the problem as being due to divine purpose, in the light of an utterance ascribed to Jesus which includes a quotation from Isaiah.[3]

Up to this point, therefore, the Messiahship has continually expressed itself in both deed and word, but it has passed unrecognized by all. We now, however, reach the central section of the gospel, in which a chosen few attain to the knowledge of it,

on the part of disciples has disappeared (cf. Mt. 13^{51}), as also of any rebuke administered to them by Jesus—indeed, they now receive a special blessing, verses 16 and 17,—and that, although apparently they still need the explanation of the parable, yet the gulf between them and others has now widened.

[1] Mk. $4^{21 f.}$ can best be understood in the light of Mk. 9^{9}. The meaning in both passages is very similar.

[2] 2 Cor. 3^{14}. [3] Is. $6^{9, 10}$.

under the command of secrecy. This section extends from Mk. 8^{27} to 10^{45} or perhaps 10^{52}, that is, from Cæsarea Philippi until the last stage before the arrival at Jerusalem. At its outset the disciples, through their spokesman St. Peter, discover in their Master the highest attributes which it is in their power to imagine, and receive in return instruction in the meaning of the office which they have thus assigned to him. For this teaching, however, they are by no means prepared. They have penetrated the secret of his greatness, but they are at present unable to understand how the greatness, thus rightly ascribed to him, will and must inevitably express itself; and the section is chiefly occupied with the account of the attempts made by Jesus to impress this lesson indelibly upon his hearers, by prophecy,[1] by paradox,[2] by particular illustrations,[3] by refusal to acquiesce even in the teaching of the law of Moses.[4]

We must remind ourselves once more that up to this point the evangelist has been concerned chiefly to emphasize the *fact* of the Messiahship of Jesus. This has shown itself chiefly in two ways, in the teaching with authority and in the acts of power; but as thus shown it has not been seen for what it is; it has passed unrecognized. The teaching and the mighty works have caused astonishment indeed, but their significance has not been grasped.

Now, however, an attempt is made to explain the meaning of Messiahship. It is true that the disciples are represented as still unable to assimilate the teaching,[5] and even more than before they are subject to

[1] 8^{31}, 9^{31}, $10^{33\,f.}$ [2] $8^{35, 36}$, $9^{35, 42}$, $10^{29\,f.}$ [3] $10^{13\,ff.}$, $17\,ff.$, $35\,ff.$
[4] 10^{1-12}. [5] 8^{32}, 9^{38}, $10^{13\,f.,\ 35\,ff.}$

bewilderment[1] and fear[2]; but none the less this section differs greatly in character from anything that we have had before.

In the first place, we hear no more of the confession of the demons.[3] This is no longer necessary, for St. Peter and the disciples, men of flesh and blood, have now the same supernatural knowledge as the spirits,[4] and the insight thus granted is divinely confirmed, at the transfiguration a week later, to the three most intimate disciples. For a moment their Master is shown to them for what he truly is, the *only* Son, whom alone they are to hear and obey, even in the presence of the two chief representatives of the law and the prophecy of old.[5]

Secondly, the acts of power practically cease; external attestation is no longer necessary; indeed, the only mighty work within this section, the cure of the lad with a dumb spirit (9^{14-29}), is probably placed in its present position as a kind of foil to the story which immediately precedes it. It shows the same Jesus, who has just been glorified upon the mountain, once more at work among men in the plain below. In character it is closely allied to the Novellen in the first half of the gospel, and it will be noticed that the

[1] 9^{10}, $10^{24, 26, 32}$. [2] $9^{6, 32}$.

[3] Similarly, in St. John's gospel there is no confession by demons or unclean spirits. There is only one power of evil, whose children "the Jews" are, 8^{44}; and confession is made only by believers, especially disciples, $6^{68, 69}$, 20^{28}.

[4] Cf. 1 Cor. 12^{3}, "No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit."

[5] Cf. 2 Cor. 3^{7-18}. St. Peter's words in Mk. 9^{5} might be understood as equating Jesus with Moses and Elijah; the designation in verse 7 of Jesus as the *only* Son makes this impossible.

disciples receive special instruction at the close.[1] As we shall see in a moment, this is not in accordance with the section as a whole.[2]

For, thirdly, there is now a change in the principal recipients of the teaching. Hitherto it is the "crowd" or "multitude" which has been in constant attendance upon Jesus; the word occurs twenty-two times before the present section; and to them the teaching has been chiefly given. After Cæsarea Philippi, however, it is designed, above all, for disciples; they come into increasing prominence; and the multitude is only present on three occasions in this section.[3]

But, fourthly, the greatest change of all is in the nature of the teaching. It is now concerned, not with a general call to repentance,[4] nor for the most part with matters of controversy between Jesus and opponents, as in much of the Galilean ministry [5] and again in the last week at Jerusalem [6]; it deals with the meaning of Messiahship and the kingdom of God as understood by Jesus, and with the requirements laid in consequence upon his *individual* followers.[7] He is

[1] $9^{26\,L}$; cf. 4^{10}, 7^{17}. [2] Although it is found also at $10^{10\,ff.}$.
[3] 8^{34}, $9^{14\,ff.}$, 10^{1}. [4] Cf. 1^{15}. [5] E.g. 2^{1}–3^{6}, $3^{19b\text{-}30}$.
[6] E.g. $11^{15\text{-}18,\ 27\text{-}33}$, $12^{13\text{-}40}$. The controversy with Pharisees (but see p. 49, note 4) at $10^{1\,ff.}$ seems to resemble those at $7^{1\,ff.}$ and $8^{11\,L}$. They are, as it were, scattered at different points throughout the gospel. At 7^{15} and again at $10^{5\,ff.}$ the law of Moses is subjected to criticism.

[7] In the teaching of this section Jesus, as Messiah, is primarily an example to his followers, e.g. $8^{34\,ff.}$; they are to *share* his work and sufferings, 10^{39}. It is true that at $8^{34\,ff.}$ the teaching is given to "the multitude" as well as to disciples, and therefore cannot be solely messianic in character, since the Messiahship must still remain a secret for the few, 8^{30}. The detached sentences in 8^{34}–9^{1} are really a summary of the demands upon men of the Christian gospel, and of its promises. But they depend ultimately upon the evangelist's con-

not the Messiah of Jewish expectation, as St. Peter apparently imagines; indeed, the title is henceforth avoided in this section, and is replaced by the mysterious title Son of man. Jesus goes to Jerusalem as Messiah indeed, and presumably therefore will establish the kingdom of God, but it will be by no means in the way expected and hoped of the Messiah by the Jewish nation. Through suffering and death he must enter into his "glory" (10^{37}), and only by the same path can disciples follow him. Only so can they too win through to the kingdom of God, which in one context (9^{43-47}) is treated as synonymous with life, almost according to the use of the expression "eternal life" in the gospel of St. John. This expression is indeed only one of a number of words and phrases which are either peculiar to or are specially emphasized in this part of the gospel.[1] The section is, in fact, the key to the understanding of the passion, and Wellhausen goes so far as to say that in its loftiness of tone it surpasses the passion narrative itself.[2]

ception of "a Messiah crucified," cf. 1 Cor. 1^{23}, and are therefore not inappropriate here.

For the significance of the expression "the Son of man" in this connexion, see T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 231 ff. (Cambridge, 1931).

[1] E.g. "for my sake and the gospel's" 8^{35}, 10^{29}, the "name" of Jesus 9^{37-41}, and his "glory" 10^{37}, service and ransom 10^{45}, "to follow" in the figurative, spiritual rather than in the literal sense 8^{34}, $10^{21, 28}$ (see *J.T.S.*, April 1925, pp. 238 ff.), and, above all, "the Son of man" in connexion with suffering, death, and resurrection. Some of these recur in the later narrative, especially in chapter 13.

[2] The carefulness of the arrangement of certain sections should be noticed. Thus in 10^{13-16} the kingdom of God (or eternal life) is a gift; it cannot be earned, but a certain quality of heart is needed. None the less, the most strenuous effort is required, and this is brought

It is often said that with the arrival at Jericho and the approach to Jerusalem the Marcan narrative resumes what we may call a normal tone. And it is true that with one most important exception, the discourse on the last things in chapter 13, there is no more private instruction to disciples.[1] It is true also that some of the teaching recorded in the last week is almost as general in character as the early Galilean teaching, and has no necessary reference to the crisis immediately impending; some of it might have been given in early days in Capernaum as suitably as at this moment in Jerusalem. And finally, there is reason to think that in some of the last scenes we are in closer touch than elsewhere with first-hand evidence.

All this is true; and yet, if the view of St. Mark's gospel which we are considering is right, we shall expect to see signs of increasing tension, as it were, between the narrative of fact and the significance seen in it by the early church, a significance which the evangelist seeks to embody in his gospel. For the passion, with its sequel in the resurrection and the

out in the section following, 10^{17-26}, the apparent contradiction being reconciled in verse 27.

Wellhausen draws attention to the recognition of this deliberate arrangement in Shakespeare, *King Richard II*, act V, scene 5:

> "The better sort,
> As thoughts of things divine, are intermix'd
> With scruples and do set the word itself
> Against the word:
> As thus, 'Come, little ones,' and then again,
> 'It is as hard to come as for a camel
> To thread the postern of a small needle's eye."

[1] See additional note D at end of lecture.

coming into being of the church at Pentecost,[1] was for the church the most important event in the accomplishment of man's salvation. In it was to be seen the supreme act of the Messiah, and the truest witness to his character and purpose. If it be true that no attempt was ever made to give a merely historical account of Jesus, then this narrative will have taken shape in the first instance because of its significance for the Christian doctrine of redemption, and we must be prepared to find that this has left its mark upon the story.

At the moment I will only ask your attention to two possible instances of this : the story of the approach to and the arrival at Jerusalem, and, secondly, the account given in St. Mark's gospel of the death of Jesus.

As regards the first, the coming of Jesus to Jerusalem, it is probably not fanciful to think that acceptance of the tradition involved special difficulties, owing to the contrast between the actual facts and the significance increasingly assigned to them. It must have become ever harder for the little churches to believe that this coming, so much fraught with destiny, could have passed almost unnoticed at the time; that, in Professor Burkitt's words, to contemporary observers it may not have seemed more than a ripple on the surface. Was this the day of that coming of which the prophet had asked who could endure it, and who should stand

[1] In St. John's gospel the church is founded at the first meeting of Jesus with his disciples after the crucifixion, Jn. 20^{19-23}. This section of the fourth gospel is of great importance, and may be described as the evangelist's equivalent for the scene at Pentecost, as described in Acts 2^{1-4}.

at its appearing?[1] In St. Mark, indeed, unlike St. Matthew and St. Luke, the Messiahship is strictly veiled, but the thought of it is never far away. When Bartimæus, for instance, on the way out from Jericho, addresses Jesus as son of David, the crowd takes no notice of the utterance, and only bids him to be silent; but the words were of great importance to the readers of the gospel. Again, in the sending by Jesus for the colt, the story is set forth without explanation in St. Mark, apparently as a plain narrative of history; and at the approach to Jerusalem an ovation is given to the prophet of the coming kingdom, not, as in the later gospels, to the person of the king; and yet St. Mark wishes his readers to see, what is made explicit in St. Matthew, that in the coming of Jesus to Jerusalem may be discerned by faith the coming of the messianic king as prophesied in scripture.

We pass, secondly, to the death of Jesus, as recorded by St. Mark. In his gospel it is followed immediately by two remarkable passages, which properly close his story of the passion. The first narrates the rending of the veil of the temple, and the second the acknowledgement of the divine sonship of Jesus by the Roman officer who has been in charge of the proceedings.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to say definitely what interpretation St. Mark wishes us to assign to the tradition of the rending of the temple veil. According to the Clementine Recognitions,[2] the temple now mourns over its own now certain destruction, or over the coming destruction of the Jewish state. Possibly

[1] Mal. 3^2.

[2] 1^{41} "lamentans excidium loco imminens." See also Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium, ad loc.*

we may prefer to think that to the evangelist the rending of the temple veil,[1] placed in closest connexion with the death of Jesus, and following immediately upon it, signifies the removal, as a result of that death, of a barrier hitherto impassable, whatever that barrier may be.[2]

There need be less doubt as to the significance of the centurion's confession. For the testimony to the divine sonship of Jesus is, as we have seen, a leading motif of this gospel. It is divinely given, as the key to the understanding of the gospel,[3] in the prologue at the

[1] It is not necessary to try to define whether the reference is to the outer or inner curtain in the temple; cf. Heb. 6^{19}, 9^{3}.

[2] Cf. especially Heb. $10^{19, 20}$, "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh."

The references to the epistle to the Hebrews in this and the preceding note are the only three places where the Greek word for "veil" is used in the New Testament, apart from Mk. 15^{38} and its synoptic parallels.

[3] The word "gospel," as used here, is deliberately ambiguous; it may be understood to refer either to the proclamation of the good news, or to the book (St. Mark's) in which the story of its origins is now to be enshrined. The absolute use of the expression τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, the gospel, is peculiar to St. Mark of the evangelists. St. Matthew thrice has "the (this) gospel of the Kingdom" 4^{23}, 9^{35}, 24^{14}, and once "this gospel" 26^{13}; St. Luke never has the substantive, but uses the corresponding verb εὐαγγελίζομαι ten times; St. John has neither the noun nor the verb.

If, as is possible, the expression in St. Mark and for some time later still implied the Christian proclamation of good news, rather than the record of its historical expression, St. Luke may have avoided the substantive precisely for this reason. It was his aim to write an historical record, so far as his materials allowed. On the other hand, his partiality for the verb may be accounted for if its meaning was less definite than the meaning of the noun, and not so strictly confined

outset; it is reasserted, for the confirmation of the three leading disciples, in close connexion with St. Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi; and it is now finally[1] proclaimed, in public, in consequence of the death of Jesus, by a Gentile, the last person who might have been expected to proclaim it.

In the conversion of the first Gentile, for this is the implication of the narrative,[2] we are invited to see the response of those who until that moment were far off, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and

to the expression of the full Christian message of salvation. If the last three Greek words of Mt. 11^5 are part of the true text, which is doubtful, the verb occurs there in what is almost a quotation from the LXX of Is. 61^1; this is the only example of its use in the gospels other than St. Luke's; and the latter can use it even of the preaching of the Baptist, 3^{18}, or of the teaching of Jesus in the last week at Jerusalem, 20^1.

[1] The late Prof. C. H. Turner, when lecturing upon St. Mark's gospel, was accustomed to urge that its last verses, now usually supposed to be lost, must have contained a confession by St. Peter of Jesus as the Son of God. Accepting the full reading in Mk. 1^1, "The beginning of the good news about Jesus, Messiah, Son of God," he would argue that the first title there applied to our Lord is satisfied by the messianic confession of St. Peter at 8^{29}, and that the plan of the gospel is only completed, if we assume a further confession, by the same leader of the twelve, of Jesus as Son of God, after the resurrection, presumably at the meeting with St. Peter, perhaps hinted at in 16^7, and definitely referred to in Lk. 24^{34} and 1 Cor. 15^5.

But would not the plan of the gospel, as suggested by the words in Mk. 1^1, be satisfied if the Jewish confession of Jesus as Messiah is made at 8^{29}, and its Gentile counterpart, of Jesus as Son of God, by the centurion here?

On the conclusion of St. Mark's gospel an article by Prof. J. M. Creed in *J.T.S.*, January 1930, pp. 175 ff., should be consulted.

[2] The absence of the Greek article from the two substantives is no difficulty. The words have the same full Christian meaning as at Mk. 1^1. The article may be omitted here, as at Mt. 14^{33}, because the expression is a predicate.

strangers from the covenants of the promise, but were now brought near, in St. Paul's words,[1] by the blood of Christ.

In these two passages, brought by St. Mark into closest connexion with each other, we see and hear the testimony given to that death by the Jewish temple[2] and the Gentile world respectively.

If it be said that it is unnecessary to seek interpretation in these verses, and that St. Mark's record is simply an uninterpreted narrative of fact, the reply must be made that St. Luke at any rate thought otherwise. He shows very clearly, by the way in which he deals with these two verses, that he regards them as having very important implications, and that he too,

[1] See Eph. 2^{11-18}.

[2] It is of importance that the Jewish testimony here is given by the temple, not by persons. The office and functions of the Messiah, as understood by Jesus, involved him in sufferings and death. The latter, however, were brought about or actualized by the hostility of his own people, and their rejection of him. They cannot therefore themselves give testimony to him. It is, however, also true, according to the belief of the Christians, that in rejecting Jesus as Messiah, the Jews compassed their own ruin; cf. Mt. 27^{25} "And all the people answered and said, His blood be on us; and on our children." The "glorification" of Jesus by suffering and death (cf. Jn. $12^{23,24}$) brought about also the destruction of the Jewish nation. The nation and its head are thus inseparably connected.

The two little sections dealing with the withering of the fig-tree, which there is reason to think may not belong to the earliest form of St. Mark's gospel, are perhaps designed to emphasize this truth, the fig-tree symbolizing both the Jewish nation and the temple worship. It will be noticed that between the two parts of the story occurs the cleansing of the temple by Jesus, which in St. Mark is the immediate prelude of the crisis.

It may also be noticed that, according to this context, Mk. 15^{37-39}, it is only after and because the Jews have wrought their will on Jesus that Gentiles can offer testimony to him.

while remaining broadly faithful to the general tradition (which indeed, writing when he did,[1] he was probably more or less bound to follow at this point), has his own interpretation of the death of Jesus. He is concerned to modify the very great significance attached to it in St. Mark, and especially to see it in a less dogmatic light. We shall see later that this holds good of his practice elsewhere in his gospel.

In the first place, therefore, St. Luke separates the rending of the veil from the *immediate* connexion, which it has in St. Mark, with the death of our Lord, and places it *before* the latter, connecting it rather with the three hours' darkness, which for him, as it seems, is caused by an eclipse,[2] and interposing, between the rending of the veil and the death itself, a peaceful utterance of Jesus.[3]

And in the second place, the utterance of the Roman officer, according to St. Luke, is no longer an acknowledgement of faith in Jesus in the fullest Christian sense, " Truly this man was Son of God " (Mk. 15^{39}). Like so many others in this gospel,[4] who have

[1] It is only the fourth evangelist who ventures to recast the received tradition with great boldness; and even he is much more strongly influenced by its earlier forms than is sometimes thought.

[2] As opposed to the apparently supernatural darkness in St. Mark. St. Matthew, who follows St. Mark in placing the rending of the veil immediately after Jesus' death, connects it with further supernatural signs, the earthquake, the opening of the tombs and the resurrection of many bodies of the saints. It is partly by considering with what St. Matthew and St. Luke respectively connect the rending of the veil, that we may come to understand the meaning which each of them assigned to it.

[3] A quotation of the first half of Ps. 31^{5}, prefixed by the word " Father."

[4] The word δοξάζω occurs in St. Luke nine times: 2^{20}, 4^{15}, $5^{25, 26}$,

come into contact with Jesus and heard his words and benefited by or saw his deeds, the centurion now glorifies not him but God. To the centurion, as indeed to the third evangelist himself, the death of Jesus is a martyrdom, and the words "Assuredly this was a righteous man"[1] are used to give expression to this faith.

ADDITIONAL NOTES

A

St. Mark 5^{16-20}

A note should perhaps be added on the difficult last verses of the story of the Gerasene demoniac in Mk. 5. These are often understood as an exception to the usual command of silence, although the possessed shows at 5^{6} that he is aware of the nature and identity of Jesus.

In the first place, it should be noticed that the story could end satisfactorily, and may once have ended, at 5^{15}. Evidence is given in this verse, first, of the reality and completeness of the cure ("clothed and in his right mind"), and, secondly, of the effect upon the witnesses ("they were afraid").

It now becomes necessary, however, to bring Jesus back to the other side of the lake, where the third and greatest act of power, the raising of Jairus' daughter, is to be performed, and verses 16 and 17 supply the motive for this. They may therefore be inserted rather for the sake of what is to follow in the gospel (5^{21-43}), than because of the preceding incident (5^{1-15}), and if so, they may be "secondary" or "editorial."

7^{16}, 13^{13}, 17^{15}, 18^{43}, and here 23^{47}. In eight cases the object of the verb is God; the exception is 4^{15}, where the reference is to Jesus and the verb is in the passive voice, "And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified by all."

A comparison between St. Luke and St. John in their use of the word is very striking.

[1] Lk. 23^{47}.

We are left, finally, with 5^{18-20}, itself perhaps a further addition to the section. Wrede has pointed out that a contrast is made between the command in verse 19 and the action of the healed in verse 20. In verse 19 he is told to go home to his own people, and to tell (*ἀπαγγέλλειν*) them [only] of *God's* (*ὁ κύριος*) great mercy to him. According to verse 20, however, the man proclaims (*κηρύσσειν*, often used as a technical word for the proclamation of the Christian message of salvation) *Jesus'* goodness to him far and wide.

Accordingly, Wrede's explanation of the passage is that Jesus will not keep in his company one who is aware of his divine nature; and also gives a command to secrecy, in bidding the healed to go to his *home* (cf. Mk. 8^{26a}), and even there to say nothing of the person of his healer. The command, however, is disobeyed, as at 1^{45} and 7^{36}, and Jesus is proclaimed, against his will. The evangelist is thus able to explain the fame and celebrity of Jesus, although the Messiahship is still kept veiled.

This explanation, however, does not meet the difficulty that in verse 20 we should expect *ὁ δέ*, as in 1^{45} and 7^{36b}, rather than *καί*.

With great reserve and a keen sense of the dangers inherent in this form of exposition, the following explanation of the difficulty of the passage may be offered. It does not involve a discussion of the original purpose of the stories in 4^{35}–5^{20}, especially if 5^{18-20} is a later addition to the second of these. If the question be asked, how far it is likely to have been present to the mind of the evangelist, we can only say that in 4^{10-25} he emphasizes a particular interpretation of the parable of the sower. It seems, therefore, that he was alive to the possibility of the form of interpretation suggested in this note; on the other hand, there is no hint in 4^{35}–5^{20}, as there is in 4^{1-34}, that he has this aim in view.

Late in the day (cf. 1 Cor. 10^{11b}), Jesus, in other words the gospel, borne by the disciples (4^{36}) in the boat of the church, crosses from Jewish soil to Gentile, with all that this implies.

The difficulty and danger of the voyage are vividly described (4^{37-40}), and it is in the course of the transit that the problem of

the nature and person of Jesus begins to make itself acutely felt (4^{41}).

A landing having been effected on the other side, the power of Jesus is manifested in very signal form. The question then arises whether those who have been thus drawn within its orbit are to attach themselves to the original community, the Jewish (Christian) church (cf. carefully 5^{18b} with 3^{14a}).

The answer is given in the negative; Gentiles are to remain among their own people and in their own condition, there making known, however, what great things have been done for them by *Israel's* God, and the story of his boundless mercy.

These benefits, however, and the mercy are conferred through *Jesus*; he is their embodiment; and therefore the God of Israel is glorified, when Jesus is proclaimed; cf. Rom. 15^{9-13}. The man does not disobey.

B

St. Mark 8^{14-30}

It is usually thought that with the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida (the variant reading Bethany is noteworthy), Mk. 8^{22-26}, the first half of St. Mark's gospel closes, and at $8^{27ff.}$ an altogether new section begins. The question, however, may be raised, whether 8^{22-26} is not connected with 8^{27-30} at least as much as with 8^{14-21}. There is a remarkable parallelism between 8^{23-26} and 8^{27-30}; it can be best seen if the successive clauses of the two stories are set down side by side.

Mk. 8^{22-26}	Mk. 8^{27-30}
And he took hold of the blind man by the hand, and brought him out of the village;	And Jesus went forth, and his disciples, into the villages of Cæsarea Philippi;
and when he had spit on his eyes, and laid his hands upon him,	and in the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them,
he asked him, Seest thou anything?	Who do men say that I am?

And he looked up, and said, I see men as trees, walking.

Then again he laid his hands upon his eyes;
and he looked stedfastly, and was restored, and saw all things clearly.

And he sent him away to his home, saying, Tell it to no one in the village.

And they told him, saying, John the Baptist; and others, Elijah; but others, one of the prophets.

And he asked them, But who say ye that I am?

Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ.

And he charged them that they should tell no man of him.

If it is thought that this parallelism can hardly be fortuitous, then the opening of the blind man's eyes will symbolize also the enlightenment of the disciples by their understanding of the Messiahship of Jesus, and its nature.

This of course does not exclude the likelihood of a connexion backwards with 8^{14-21} as well as forwards with 8^{27-30}.

In Mk. 8^{14-21} the disciples are more severely rebuked than elsewhere in the first half of this gospel; their lack of understanding here reaches its climax, and is concerned with bread, in connexion with the feeding of the multitude. The best commentary on the passage is probably the discourse in Jn. 6 on Jesus as the bread of life. That discourse, it will be remembered, is preceded by the story of the feeding of the multitude (and its appendage, the walking on the lake), and followed by St. Peter's confession in Jn. $6^{68, 69}$, which is St. John's parallel to Mk. 8^{29}.

In Mk. 8^{14-30} we see the evangelist and his readers still tentatively feeling their way towards the connexion between the person of Jesus, the bread of life, and light, in the sense of understanding and illumination.

In St. John the connexion between the three factors has been fully grasped, and is set forth accordingly.

C

St. Mark 9^{11-13}

The setting of the story of the transfiguration in St. Mark, together with the exceptionally precise note of time which introduces it, may be taken to imply that the story itself is regarded as of great significance, and intimately connected with what has gone before. It places the seal of the divine confirmation and approval upon St. Peter's ascription of Messiahship to Jesus, and upon the interpretation of Messiahship which the latter immediately gave. We might have expected the story to end, at 9^{9a}, with the usual command to silence, as indeed it does in St. Luke, except that in his gospel the fact that the three disciples kept silence is dwelt on, instead of the command. But here, and here alone in St. Mark's gospel, the prohibition is represented as being only temporary, until the resurrection. When the period of the Son of man's suffering and death is over, then what must at present be a secret may and no doubt should be told.

This mention of the resurrection leads the three disciples to question what is the connexion between "the Son of man" and death and resurrection; and this in turn leads to a remarkable appendix, in which it is possible that we have an attempt to solve certain pressing problems of early Christianity. These problems were forced of necessity upon the church, as it sought to understand the significance of its own existence and of what had taken place so recently. They concern the relation of John the Baptist to Jesus, and even more the place of the ministry both of John and of Jesus in history, especially in relation to the coming of the kingdom of God. In Mk. 9^{11-13} we may perhaps see the church striving to construct some kind of a philosophy of history, in the light of its convictions about the person and office of its Master, and of his work and its results.

The problem is presented in the form of a question put to Jesus by disciples, to which Jesus replies; cf. 4^{10}, 7^{17}, 9^{28}, 10^{10}, $13^{3ff.}$.

The verses in question deal with the prophecy of Mal. $4^{4.5}$

about Elijah. It is not possible to say with confidence why they are inserted at this point. It may be because Elijah has been mentioned at 9^{4}, or because it was said, at 8^{28}, that Jesus himself was in some quarters regarded as Elijah, but most probably because of the saying in 9^{1}, that some then present would see the arrival of the kingdom of God in power.

In view of the prophecy of Malachi referred to, it was a dogma of the scribes that Elijah must first come. If then the Messiah was in some sense present, and the kingdom of God already at the doors, where was Elijah? Who was the forerunner, of whom the scripture spoke?

If verses 12 and 13 are a unity,[1] the teaching given is as follows. The scripture and the scribes are right; Elijah does indeed come and set all in order, but it is also, and equally, a prophecy of scripture that the Messiah must suffer, and be completely disesteemed. And further, Elijah has already come, but men have had their will with him. This also stands foretold in prophecy, and therefore has happened according to the will of God. And what has thus proved true already of the forerunner, will prove true also of Messiah himself.[2]

If this explanation be accepted, we see the church, in these verses, gradually transforming the traditional interpretation of scripture as regards the day of the Lord, the kingdom of God, and the person and work of the Messiah, in the light of its convictions about Jesus Christ. John the Baptist was indeed Elijah; in the ministry of Jesus and in its results faith discerns the arrival of God's kingdom; and the characteristics of the latter prove to be very different from those of Jewish expectation.

[1] See Wellhausen *ad loc.*

[2] It may be for this reason that the story of John the Baptist's death is told so fully in Mk. 6^{16-29}. The fate of the forerunner is a presage of the fate of the successor.

D

St. Mark 13[3-37]

The importance of Mk. 13[3-37] and of its position in the record can hardly be overestimated, especially if the passion narrative, Mk. 14[1 ff.], already existed, although doubtless not precisely as we have it now, before the earlier part of this gospel was put together. In this case Mk. 13 [3-37], whatever may have been its origin, is used as the climax of all that part of the gospel which precedes the passion.

Four disciples [1] receive here by far the longest private instruction which is recorded in St. Mark. There is no reference to the impending passion; the revelation deals chiefly with the attitude of mind and the behaviour expected of the church in the period immediately before the end.

In the discourse we may see, reflected as it were in a mirror, the travail, the perplexity and the unconquerable hope of early Christianity.

The passage may be briefly analysed thus : verses 5 to 13, a warning of the miseries which will precede the last days ; verses 14 to 23, the sign by which the arrival of the last days may be known, and a description of them ; verses 24 to 27, the closing scene ; verses 28 to 37, a supplement in which, contrary to expectation, the parousia just described is itself treated as a preliminary sign, and the end, the date of which has now become less definite, is brought into *moral* connexion with the immediate present by the command to watch.

The position of the discourse in St. Mark, immediately before the passion narrative, but altogether independent of it, suggests that at the time of the composition of this gospel the church had not yet found it possible to define satisfactorily the relationship between the crucifixion and the expected final consummation.

[1] Andrew is only mentioned here in this gospel, apart from 1[16], 3[18]; it is noticeable that, according to 9[9], even he, although Simon Peter's brother, must be regarded as one of those who were to be kept in ignorance, along with the rest of the disciples, of what was shown at the transfiguration to the leading three.

This is even more obvious in St. Matthew's gospel. This evangelist's arrangement of his material in chapters 23 to 25 is very striking. In 23 and $24^{1,2}$ we find the condemnation of the Jewish church, and the prophecy of the destruction of its temple; in 24^{3-51} private instruction with regard to the parousia and the fortunes of the church and the conduct expected of it before the arrival of the end; and in 25 three pictures of the kingdom of heaven, in connexion with the parousia teaching. St. Matthew thus fashions a terrific climax to the pre-passion section of his gospel. In these three chapters there is no direct reference to the events which will occupy the reader in the remaining chapters of the book, and in these latter we find ourselves in a very different although not wholly different atmosphere.

In St. Luke's gospel, indeed, the discourse is no longer private, and it is brought into connexion, *more suo*, with the prophecy of the destruction of the temple, which in all the synoptists immediately precedes it, but in St. Mark and St. Matthew is an independent section. St. Luke also has a considerable eschatological instruction to disciples in the *body* of his gospel (17^{22-37}), including a direct reference to the passion (17^{25}); and at 21^{37}–22^{2} he characteristically avoids the abrupt break in St. Mark between the last eschatological discourse and the passion narrative—i.e. between Mk. 13^{37} and Mk. 14^{1}—which is so strongly and rightly emphasized by Westcott and Hort in their arrangement of the Marcan text here.[1] St. Luke's changes, however, at this point are probably due not so much to doctrinal reasons, as to his desire, constantly noticeable throughout his gospel, to produce a smooth, consecutive, in a word (apparently) historical record.

It is only when we reach St. John that we find a satisfactory solution of the problem referred to. In his gospel there is no

[1] Although Westcott and Hort are right to place a very big break both between Mk. 13^{37} and 14^{1}, and between Mt. 25^{46} and 26^{1}, there is no real justification for the similar break which they place between Lk. 21^{38} and 22^{1}.

sharp separation between the passion narrative and what has gone immediately before it; teaching about the meaning of the crucifixion and teaching about judgement proceed hand in hand, as it were, throughout the book; and finally in the discourses at the last supper, *within* the passion narrative and immediately before the end, the disciples are bidden to find the parousia or expected presence of their Master in the coming of the Holy Spirit, or Spirit of truth, which is only made possible by his bodily departure.

IV

THE CONTENT OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK

We have now considered two important changes of opinion, as a consequence of recent study, with regard to the character of our earliest gospel, the gospel of St. Mark. According to the first of these, the greater part of the book is now believed to be based upon a number of earlier, disconnected, little sections, each embodying a tradition about Jesus. Among these sections can be traced two classes in particular, which differ markedly from one another. In the one, the section is designed to emphasize and give the setting for an important utterance of Jesus; in the other, a mighty work on his part is described, usually at considerable length. These two classes of stories appear to make up rather more than one-half of the contents of the first twelve chapters of St. Mark. The connecting links between the various stories, of whatever type the latter may be, have been much more lightly esteemed by the later evangelists St. Matthew and St. Luke, than the contents of the stories; and it is possible that not infrequently these connecting links may be due to the evangelist, who by these means contrives to set forth a more or less consecutive record of events.[1]

[1] In the *Expository Times*, XLIII, No. 9 (June 1932), Prof. C. H. Dodd contributes a valuable paper entitled "The Framework of the Gospel Narrative." He believes that he can discern in St. Mark, in

And according to the second change of opinion which has taken place in our estimation of this gospel, the writer's purpose is not simply or chiefly biographical; the key to the understanding of the book is given by its doctrine. It is true that the author constantly turns back to history; indeed, his book contains our earliest surviving record for traditions of the life of Jesus, and from this point of view alone it is rightly regarded as of great importance; but none the less the writer's chief purpose, which is never long absent from his mind, is to show the history in the light in which he himself sees it, and wishes his readers also to regard it; in other words, to interpret the history and to set forth not only its lessons but its meaning and significance. It should hardly be necessary to add that for him this was the true significance; he believed that he was giving the true interpretation of historical events.

Our task in the present lecture is to examine the content and structure of the gospel of St. Mark in the light of its main purpose. We have found reason to believe that, rightly regarded, it may be called the book of the revelation of the (secret) Messiahship of Jesus.

This at once goes far to explain certain features of the book, which would otherwise cause difficulty.

addition to the little independent sections and the larger complexes, "an outline of the whole ministry, designed, perhaps, as an introduction to the Passion-story, but serving also as a background of reference for separate stories; fragments of this survive in the framework of the gospel." With the main theses of his paper I find myself in close agreement, but I am doubtful whether we can feel any confidence that an outline, such as he suggests, existed.

In the first place, Jesus is as it were assumed; his life stands given. We learn nothing, except incidentally, of his home, upbringing, or appearance; we are not told his age, when he began to teach; we hardly ever see him, except as a teacher or mighty worker or engaged in controversy; above all, we are not admitted to a knowledge of his inner life. The writer does not even seem concerned to set forth any precise or elaborate exposition of the teaching given. It may be presumed, and it is indeed suggested in the book itself,[1] that, had the writer wished, he could have told us much more about the teaching than he has; but this was not his object. There are only two considerable sections of teaching in this gospel, in chapters 4 and 13[2]; and, as we shall see, these probably owe their presence in the book, and the position which they hold in it, to the writer's special purpose.

Equally incidental, in the second place, is all that we are told of the duration and the scene of the ministry. The notes of time and place are vague in the extreme,[3] especially in the first nine chapters of the gospel. In these, Jesus is for the most part in Galilee, with occasional journeys to districts in the east and

[1] E.g. 1^{21}, $4^{2, 33}$, 6^{34b}, 10^{1b}, 11^{18b}, 12^{1a}, 14^{49}.

[2] It is not always recognized how large a part of the section Mk. 8^{27} to 10^{45} is made up of teaching; but the teaching given here is not often strictly continuous, except at 8^{34} to 9^{1}, and 9^{33-50}, and even in these two passages (as indeed also in chapters 4 and 13) it is clearly a compilation of various materials. Mk. 10^{17-31} is probably an isolated section (verses 17 to 22), with two consecutive appendices (verses 23 to 27 and 28 to 31).

[3] Contrast, for example, the way in which St. Mark dates the appearance of Jesus on the scene simply by reference to the Baptist's ministry (1^{9} "in those days"), with St. Luke's elaborate attempt to date this latter in Lk. $3^{1, 2}$.

north, and Capernaum [1] seems to be treated as a kind of centre. But even where place-names appear, it is possible that in some cases they are inferred from the nature of the story which they introduce. Thus the episode of the swine [2] could not have taken place on Jewish soil; and the Syrophœnician woman [3] could be presumed to be living in the north. Nor must any great reliance be placed upon St. Mark's narrative as giving us the actual order of events, except in its broad outlines.[4] It is clear that he regards the Galilean period, which more or less occupies the first nine chapters of the book, as finally closed at 10^{5} by a journey southwards. Chapters 11 to 16 deal with the period in and near Jerusalem, and details of time and place become more frequent, and the narrative itself much fuller. We learn almost as much about this last week—if we are justified in thinking that St. Mark regarded it as such[5]—as about the whole of

[1] The name itself, indeed, only occurs three times, in Mk. 1^{21}, 2^{1}, 9^{33}, but so far as the evangelist is likely to have considered the matter, he probably regarded Capernaum as forming the scene of other stories also. The reading Capernaum for Nain in two manuscripts of the Old Latin at Lk. 7^{11} is highly instructive, as showing how Capernaum might come to be regarded as a suitable centre for stories about Jesus. In Mt. 9^{1} it seems indeed to be called "his own city."

[2] Mk. 5^{1} ff. [3] Mk. 7^{24} ff.

[4] I rejoice to quote again from Prof. C. H. Dodd's paper, already referred to, "Thus we need not be so scornful of the Marcan order as has recently become the fashion, though we shall not place in it the implicit confidence it once enjoyed."

[5] This seems to me extremely doubtful. There is no note of time between 11^{20} and 14^{1}, and probably no original connexion between the notes of time given in $11^{11\text{-}20}$ and that in 14^{1}. Mk. 14^{49} also suggests a longer period of teaching in the temple than is provided for in chapters 11 and 12.

the preceding period. It is reckoned to some extent by days,[1] and at the last by hours, or rather by three-hour intervals.[2] But once more we make a mistake if we treat the book, whether in the first or the second of its chief divisions, as primarily an effort at biography. We shall understand it better, if we approach it from a different point of view.

When St. Mark's gospel was written, it was becoming more than doubtful whether the Jewish church and nation would accept the doctrine of the Messiahship of Jesus. This doctrine was now becoming widely known, and in many quarters widely welcomed, but for the most part it was incurring rejection at the hands of those to whom it was especially addressed and to whom above all it might have been expected to appeal. The words of the aged Simeon in the temple, that the salvation, which he had lived to see, had been prepared as a light for revelation to the Gentiles, were receiving, every year, remarkable fulfilment; but *per contra* it was becoming probable that this salvation would by no means be to the glory of God's people Israel. An offer and a call had been made to Jewry, which the latter had shown itself unwilling or unable to accept. Even if we accept the traditional ascription of St. Mark's gospel to a Jewish writer, there are several signs in it that the Jews are already regarded by the author almost as the enemy.[3] There can be

[1] Mk. $11^{11, 12, 19, 20}$, $14^{1, 12, 17, 30}$, 15^{1}.

[2] Mk. $14^{[68 \text{ and}] 72}$ (cf. 13^{35}), $15^{1, 25, 33, 34, 42}$. The reckoning by the three-hour intervals begins from the moment when Jesus is disowned by all men, even by St. Peter.

[3] The expression "the Jews" only occurs in this gospel once, at 7^{3}; and there the tone of the *context* is extremely hostile.

no doubt at all that the book is written for Christians; sympathy with Jesus is never openly expressed,[1] but it is assumed throughout, and forms the background of each section.

It is a fundamental conviction of the writer that Jesus is Messiah; this forms the writer's gospel, and he desires to make clear, to himself and to others, what is involved in this discovery or revelation. He is persuaded that the facts, now in the past, of the life and suffering and death of Jesus can be reconciled with the agreed or expected characteristics of Messiah, supremacy, triumph, victory, deliverance, salvation; and conversely that the glory about to be revealed will make clear the meaning of the life and suffering and death.

On these latter, indeed, he has the firmest hold; he regards them as essential to his doctrine; and above all, he sees that the most important fact about Jesus is his death; this forms, to a very large extent, his gospel. It is, however, less clear to him how the life and suffering and death of Jesus are connected with the expected coming in glory of the Son of man. This, therefore, is one question which he seeks to answer. And another is the converse of it, namely, how it had come to pass that in his life on earth Messiah had passed unrecognized and unacclaimed, and, strangest of all, had been opposed by his own people and their rulers, and finally delivered by them to the Gentiles,[2] to a shameful death.

[1] Contrast such a passage as Lk. 23^{25}.

[2] This especially terrible point is first made in the third and most precise prediction of the passion (10^{33}); contrast the vaguer term "the hands of men" in the second prediction (9^{31}). In 14^{41} the expression

This twofold purpose is carried out in various ways, all of which have their rightful place within our earliest gospel; but they are not fully harmonized; the answers given are not and could not be, at the time when this gospel was written, completely satisfactory.

The gospel deals, in the first place, with the lack of recognition, during his life, of the Messiahship of Jesus. The writer shows that this *was* a secret, until the very end. Even if a chosen few, in course of time, were in some sense admitted to the secret, they showed themselves quite unable to understand its most important feature, namely, the death of the Messiah. This was not understood by any, friend or foe, until it had occurred.[1] However clearly the Messiah himself might speak to his disciples and to others of the necessity of suffering and death, and of the meaning of these words for himself and his disciples in connexion with Messiahship, they could not understand his meaning. The evangelist and his readers can now indeed see well enough that there was a continual manifestation of Messiahship, both in word and deed; but this was not apparent at the time; and the last and most important truth was only understood after it took place, and because it thus took place.

Secondly, a large part of a very important section of this gospel, 8^{27} to 10^{45}, is devoted to emphasizing the necessity[2] of suffering, on the part of the Messiah and of his followers, *before* his glory can be manifested.

τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν probably implies "the Gentiles." It will be observed that in all the three contexts just referred to the verb used, παραδίδωμι, is the same. [1] Cf. Ignatius, ad Ephes. 19^{1}. [2] δεῖ Mk. 8^{31}; cf. 13^{7},

The reason, however, for this necessity is not made clear. If it is touched upon, it is found by reference to scripture,[1] a reference which becomes prominent in the actual passion narrative itself.[2] The writer, we feel, is certain of his doctrine, but has still some way to go before he can give an adequate account of it. The two sides of his doctrine at present have not fully come together. Examples may be given of the evangelist's as yet imperfect synthesis of the doctrine of the necessity of suffering and death with his doctrine of Messiahship and glory. Thus we may notice that the *teaching* of Mk. 13^{3-37} has no necessary connexion with the *facts* narrated in the next two chapters. By means, perhaps, of traditional Jewish material as well as by reflection on the church's experiences, the teaching set forth in this chapter with regard to what must come to pass *before* the glory is revealed is already permeated with the thought of suffering. But the climax is still the coming of the Son of man; and in connexion with this, there is no note of suffering. Conversely, in chapters 14 and 15, apart from the difficult section Mk. 14^{55-65}, describing the night session of the Sanhedrin (which will be discussed in the next lecture), there is no reference to the consummation in connexion with the Son of man. There is a passing reference to the resurrection (Mk. 14^{28}), but St. Mark's story of the passion is not shot through with the beams of glory, victory and triumph, which are so distinctive a feature of this part of the gospel according to St. John[3]. And another example may be given of the

[1] 9^{12}. [2] $14^{21, 27, 49}$; cf. 12^{10}.

[3] Precisely the same imperfect or incomplete connexion may be seen (in the reverse order from that found in chapters 13 and 14, 15)

at present imperfect adaptation, in St. Mark's gospel, of the two sides of his doctrine. It seems that the tradition which was available for his purpose, while comparatively rich for the short period of the passion in Jerusalem, was poor for that of the longer ministry in Galilee. We learn almost as much about the former as about the latter. It may not be accidental that stories about Jesus, upon which piety might feed for evidence, as it believed, of his Messiahship,[1] are most prominent in the first half of this gospel, while in the starker, more historic passion narrative, together with its prelude (8^{27} to 10^{45}), we are chiefly bidden to find evidence in scripture for the " necessity " of the events.

Thirdly, it will be remembered that part of the second question which confronted the evangelist was the problem of the opposition which the Messiah had encountered, at the hands of his own people and their rulers, in his life. The theme of this opposition, and its unworthiness and baselessness, is constantly recurring in St. Mark. By means of the church's traditions of acts and words of Jesus, it is sought to make clear that his life was ever one of beneficence and help, that he went about doing good,[2] and that so far from attacking the law of Moses, he showed regard for it and complied with its provisions.[3] It was the Pharisees and scribes who did violence to the law, not

in the teaching of 8^{34}–9^{1}. Suffering and renunciation is the note of 8^{34-37}, but in 9^{1} there is no reference to suffering. So far as there is a link between the two passages, it must be found in 8^{38}.

[1] Although the Messiah was not expected to achieve exorcisms or cures. The fact that, in spite of this, the church was led to see in these activities what we may call external evidence of the Messiahship, probably throws light upon the character of the " historic life."

[2] Acts 10^{38}. [3] Mk. 1^{44}, 7^{10-13}, 12^{28-34}.

he. If and when his teaching inculcated higher than Mosaic standards, it based itself on a more fundamental appreciation, on the one hand, of the law and will of God, and on the other, of man's nature.[1]

If, then, the fundamental assumption of St. Mark's gospel is the Messiahship of Jesus, the content of the introduction to the gospel, which we considered in the last lecture, assumes the form that we should naturally expect. To the writer of the book and his readers, John the Baptist was Elijah; the appearance of John and his summons to repentance were the signal that the hour of destiny was just about to strike. Thus far we are within a circle of ideas entirely Jewish; but, as we saw last week, the writer's interest is not really in John's preaching of repentance, except in connexion with John's proclamation of the coming of a greater than himself. From that point of view, however, it is of all importance.[2] For with the arrival of Jesus on

[1] 7^{15}, $10^{5\,ff}$; cf. 12^{26}.

[2] The use of *κηρύσσειν* in St. Mark's gospel, like that of the kindred term *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, needs special notice. The words occur together at 13^{10}, 14^{9}, with obvious reference in each case to the apostolic proclamation of the Messiahship of Jesus, with all that this implied. Similarly, when the word is used in the first half of the gospel, it seems always to imply a proclamation, not indeed directly of the Messiahship of Jesus, since this is as yet a secret, but of some event or activity which the evangelist regards as vitally connected with the Messiahship of Jesus.

Hence it is used in 1^{4} of the Baptist, proclaiming a baptism of repentance unto remission of sins, because to the writer—as indeed he proceeds to show in a moment, 1^{7}—John in his rôle of Elijah was thus preparing for the coming of the greater than himself; and this greater one the church has found in Jesus.

Again, it is used of Jesus' own preaching in $1^{14, 38, 39}$, because, although

the scene the hour may be said in some sense already to be striking, as is indeed suggested in the summary of the latter's preaching in Mk 1^{15} [1], and this is an idea which was foreign, if not impossible to Jewish thought. For to the Jew the arrival of the hour would necessarily

in the summary of the content of the preaching in 1^{15} there is not and cannot be as yet any reference to the speaker, yet to the evangelist Jesus in preaching the gospel of God, or the gospel of the kingdom of God, must ultimately be referring to himself.

More difficult is the use of the word in connexion with the leper's action in 1^{45}. Here, and in 7^{36} where it is similarly used after the healing of the deaf-mute, we must suppose that the evangelist wishes to draw attention to the messianic nature of the act of Jesus. For the importance assigned by St. Mark to the cleansing of the leper, see p. 108 ; in the significance seen in the healing of the deaf-mute we may perhaps see a silent reference to Is. $35^{5, 6}$. In Mk. 5^{20} the contrast of *κηρύσσειν* with the *ἀπαγγέλλειν* of the previous verse is perhaps part of the key to the understanding of the story; see p. 89.

Most remarkable of all, however, is the use of the word in connexion with the twelve. In $3^{14, 15}$ the twelve are chosen, *ἵνα ὦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν*. We might perhaps think that the second part of this twofold reason for their appointment begins to be fulfilled at 6^{7} ff., when they are sent out on an exorcising mission, especially since we read at 6^{12} that *ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοῶσιν*. It seems, however, that this would not be quite true, for when at 6^{30} "the apostles"—so called only here in St. Mark's gospel—return, we learn that they report, not, as we might have expected, *ὅσα ἐκήρυξαν*, but only *ὅσα ἐποίησαν καὶ ὅσα ἐδίδαξαν*. The change of expression is probably deliberate. If so, the meaning is that at 6^{7} ff. the twelve, like John the Baptist, are only able to preach a mission of repentance in connexion with the coming person or event ; not until the period after the passion, when the death of Jesus has taken place and their eyes have been opened and their understandings finally enlightened, will that same preaching become a message of salvation.

[1] The words are probably stronger than is often thought, implying "The time of fulfilment has come, the kingdom of God has appeared"; cf. Mt. 12^{28}, Lk. 11^{20}. From the evangelist's point of view, this conception would not necessarily seem inconsistent with the counter conception expressed in such passages as 9^{1}, 13^{26}, 14^{25}.

mean an external transformation, and to all appearance this had not yet occurred.

Of the general summons to repentance in the verse alluded to, or of its result, we hear but little; the writer passes at once to traditions of the life of Jesus. In 1^{16-39} he seems to wish to set before us, under the form of events occurring in some twenty-four hours, certain marked features of that life; the summons by Jesus of followers to share his work; the teaching in the synagogue, and healing; the mighty thronging; the withdrawal in solitary prayer; and the constant journeying from place to place.

The position of the section which records the cleansing of a leper, at the end of the first chapter, has often proved a difficulty. The suggestion may be made that it is linked, in different ways, both with the preceding and the following sections. It is linked with the former ($1^{35ff.}$), because, like 1^{35}, it emphasizes Jesus' dislike for publicity and notoriety [1]; it was not of his will that he was regarded as a wonder-worker. And, in the second place, it is linked with the sections which will follow in chapters 2 and 3, because in it Jesus shows his willingness and indeed his desire that men should conform to the requirements of the Jewish law.[2] In the coming sections he will be shown forthwith in conflict, frequently of a very bitter kind, with

[1] This is not, I think, contradicted by Mk. 1^{38}.

[2] This again is not, I think, contradicted by Jesus' action in touching the leper, 1^{41}. Such an act was not in itself illegal, but involved ceremonial defilement, like touching a corpse. The view taken here receives confirmation from the strong interest shown by St. Matthew in the story. He seems to go out of his way, as it were, in order to place it first among the acts of power, which he records in Mt. 8, 9;

religious authority; but, by placing this little section here, St. Mark emphasizes that the quarrel, however inevitable, was not of Jesus' making or desire; for he himself has just enjoined a careful observance of the Law.[1] When trouble does arise, it will come, not from him, but from representatives of the constituted authority itself, owing, St. Mark clearly implies, to the evil in their hearts.[2] At the same time the section shows, incidentally, how the fame of Jesus grew, and that he was by no means without support. The greater part of this support no doubt was fickle, but some of it was destined to endure, and, indeed, to form the beginnings of the Christian church.[3]

and probably he does so for the same reason which has influenced St. Mark.

It is noticeable that the law suggested no means for the curing of leprosy, and that the disease was especially associated with the notion of uncleanness. Dr. Swete observes *ad. loc.* "καθαρίζειν = καθαίρειν, the term used for the ceremonial cleansing of a leper in Lev. 13 and 14, is transferred in the gospels to the actual purging of the disease." Possibly Rom. 8^3 is the best commentary upon the passage.

Finally, leprosy involved, as no other disease, exclusion from the community; and the leper was looked upon, not only as defiled himself, but as a source of defilement to his neighbours.

[1] Dr. J. H. Ropes (*The Synoptic Gospels*, 1934, pp. 27 f.) suggests that the same motive has influenced St. Mark in his setting of the question of the friendly scribe about the primary commandment. It occurs at 12^{28}, immediately before the last incident in the second group of conflict stories, at a moment when the rift between Jesus and the religious leaders is about to reach, perhaps indeed has reached its climax. Jesus' answer, says Dr. Ropes, while expressing his deepest convictions, is yet orthodoxy itself, and shows that it was no part of his purpose, then or at any time, to overthrow the law.

The previous section, 12^{18-27}, with its problem in connexion with the law of Moses, may also be regarded as of value in the same direction.

[2] Cf. Mk. 2^{6-8}, 3^5.

[3] Thus μαθηταί are first mentioned at 2^{15}; and see 3^{7-19a}.

The subject of chapters 2 and 3 is conflict, opposition to Jesus and his disciples from the side of religious authority; the old wine-skins are not able to tolerate the strength of the new wine. Between 2^{1} and 3^{6} we seem to have, for the most part, a series of five stories of conflict, the first and the last being concerned with a healing.[1] Each story deals with some problem or practice of Jewish religious life, and contains a significant saying of Jesus, which is sometimes polemical.[2] The opposition, which has hitherto only been hinted at in 1^{22}, now becomes at once acute. It is possible, perhaps probable, that these five stories formed a collection before they reached their present position in this gospel; in certain respects they contrast sharply with 1^{14-45} and 3^{7-19a}, the passages on each side of them. Thus there is now no command to or desire for secrecy, on the part of Jesus; rather the reverse. There is no reference to the casting out of demons, or to the prohibition of their confession of the Messiahship of Jesus. On the contrary, we find a constant if indirect emphasis by Jesus himself on his office and its purpose ($2^{10,\ 17,\ 28}$), and the shadow of the final passion is already present ($2^{19,\ 20}$, 3^{6}). With this last verse the series of these stories ends, in a concert of the religious and civil powers against Jesus; and

[1] It will be remembered that in 1^{4} the Baptist proclaims a baptism of repentance *with a view to remission of sins*. It is perhaps not accidental, that in 2^{1-12}, the first of the conflict-stories, an example is given forthwith of a declaration of forgiveness of sins by him for whose coming John, in the evangelist's view, prepared the way. This is the only story in St. Mark which deals with forgiveness of sins by Jesus.

[2] It is noticeable that, strictly interpreted, the cure of the paralytic takes place *in order that* those present may realise the authority or power of the Son of man upon the earth, 2^{10}.

—it would seem as a kind of foil to it—we are given in 3^{7-19a} two little "generalising sections," the first dealing with the great fame and popularity of Jesus in a wide area outside the synagogue, and the second describing the appointment and giving the names of the twelve.[1]

It is not accidental that from 3^{19b-35} we find ourselves in the presence of controversy, even more bitter than before, since it now becomes personal, being concerned with the problem of the nature and source of Jesus' authority and power. Hitherto the controversy has been chiefly concerned with questions of religious practice, although even this has resulted in a coalition of the authorities, religious and civil, to do away with Jesus (3^{6}, cf. 15^{1}); but now not only do we hear (3^{7-12}) of his great success and far-reaching popularity outside the limits of the synagogue, but at $3^{13,14}$ we read of what may be regarded as the beginnings of the Christian church, whose later message (3^{14b}) dealt essentially with the Messiahship of Jesus; and it was this doctrine, as the evangelist had good reason to know, which had proved the insuperable stumbling-block to his own countrymen.[2] Accordingly a parallel is drawn in this section between the friends and relatives of Jesus, in their failure to understand him (3^{21}) and consequent effort to restrain him (3^{31}), and the scribes who have arrived from Jerusalem, in their attribution of the

[1] We shall see reason for regarding 3^{13-19a} no less than 3^{7-12}, as a "generalizing section," if we reflect that, in order to explain the summary allusions here, we have to refer to particular incidents, recorded elsewhere in the gospels. Thus Simon receives the name Peter at Mt. 16^{18}, Jn. 1^{42}; the nickname given to James and John recalls Lk. 9^{54-56}; and for the betrayal we turn to Mk. 14, 15.

[2] Cf. 1 Cor. 1^{23} "Christ crucified, to Jews a stumblingblock."

powers of Jesus to Beelzebul. The nation's rejection of its own Messiah is here seen as it were upon the smallest scale, as an almost domestic matter within the earthly life, and it is depicted in the blackest colours. The true family of Jesus, however, is thereby made apparent (3^{34}).

With chapter 4 we reach the first of the two considerable sections of teaching in this gospel. To a very great[1] multitude Jesus speaks in parables, of which three are given here. The reason for their insertion at this point is probably not far to seek. The preceding two chapters have been full of controversy, and there has been little to relieve the darkness of the gathering storm. And yet the gospel opened with the proclamation of the arrival (in some sense) of the kingdom of God. In these parables a supreme confidence is expressed in the certain triumph of good, and of that kingdom, which we may say is tacitly identified with the cause and work of Jesus, and of his followers. Just as in chapter 13, the only other extensive section of teaching in this gospel, the purpose of the *private* instruction to the four disciples is to implant the conviction that the suffering which lies ahead is to find its explanation and *dénouement* in the coming of the Son of man, identified silently with the person of the speaker, so in chapter 4 those who listen to Jesus, himself now outside the synagogue,[2] are assured of the

[1] Only here does St. Mark use πλεῖστος in reference to the crowd. It is frequently large, e.g. $5^{21, 24}$, 6^{34}, 9^{14}; at 10^{46}, on the way out from Jericho, it is ἱκανός, considerable. See p. 40.

[2] For special reasons, at 6^{1-6a} one more scene is placed within the synagogue; see lecture VII.

silent but irresistible forces at work upon their side, as certain and unfailing as the works of nature, yet at the same time not to be perceived by all (4^{10-12}).

At 4^{35} we pass to a new section, the detailed stories of different kinds of acts of power.[1] The impression made upon the witnesses of what is here described is fear, wonder and amazement.[2] The stories show Jesus as the wielder of more than human power, occupied in bringing help to men, and this seems to be the purpose with which they are narrated here.

But in this gospel we are never allowed to forget for very long the shadow of the cross. It is probably not an accident (as will be argued in a later lecture) that 6^{1-6a}, the story of the rejection of Jesus in his πατρίς by his countrymen, follows forthwith upon these acts of power, especially the last and greatest of them. This apparently trivial story of rejection, followed by the evangelizing mission of the twelve, reminds us once more of what will be the final issue, and how from it will develop the world-wide mission of the church.

It seems likely that with the mention of "king" Herod we reach the beginning of the end of the Galilean ministry, although for three more chapters we shall not finally lose sight of Galilee.[3] The arrangement of the material in chapters 6 to 8 [4] is especially

[1] The writer, with his strong liking for the number three, probably regards 5^{25-34} as forming an essential part of 5^{21-43}, so that the section as a whole (4^{35}–5^{43}) is to be considered as a record of three acts of power.

[2] Fear 4^{41}, $5^{15, 33}$; wonder 5^{20}; amazement 5^{42}.

[3] 9^{30} "They passed through Galilee."

[4] More precisely, 6^{30} to 8^{26}.

obscure. The difficulty is increased by the fact that we seem to have before us alternative accounts of the same cycle of traditions. Between 6^{34} and 8^{26} we have two accounts of a feeding of a multitude, and they are followed in each case by a voyage, a conflict with Pharisees, and an act of power. The nature and extent of the resemblances will best be understood if they are set forth in tabular form. The fact that additional sections occur at different points in one or other of the cycles does not affect the general verdict. Thus in the first cycle we find both 6^{54-56}, which it is easy to recognize as a "generalizing summary," not unlike others which we have already encountered in St. Mark, and also 7^{24-30}, the expulsion of a demon from a Gentile, the cure being effected from a distance. In both these respects the story is unique in St. Mark. The chief emphasis, however, seems to be laid on neither of these points, but on the conversation of Jesus with a Gentile. [1]

6^{34-44}, feeding of the 5,000, is parallel to 8^{1-9}, feeding of the 4,000.

6^{45-52}, a voyage, is parallel to 8^{10}, a voyage.

7^{1-23}, conflict with Pharisees (a composite section), is parallel to $8^{11,12}$ conflict with Pharisees (about a sign from heaven).

7^{32-37}, cure of a deaf-mute, is parallel to 8^{22-26}, restoration of sight to a blind man.

[1] The story may owe its present position to the teaching in the preceding section 7^{1-23} on ceremonial purity, and may be regarded as a kind of practical commentary upon it. It should be compared with the similar story from Q, Mt. 8^{5-12}, Lk. 7^{1-10}, in which again the emphasis is rather upon the conversation than the actual deed of power.

The view is sometimes expressed that the evangelist did not realize that he was dealing with duplicate material. It may be doubted whether the question would have put itself to him in this form. We may, however, reasonably infer that the story of a feeding of a multitude by Jesus late in the day [1] in a desert place, apparently on the east side of the lake, was a marked feature of the tradition and very highly valued, and that the evangelist, having two accounts of it, with certain appendages to each, has reproduced them, with additions, side by side, drawing them together, in the course of the second cycle, at 8^{14-21}, an especially difficult passage of this gospel.[2]

In the case of the feeding, there is strong emphasis in each narrative on the compassion of Jesus and his boundless power, which is shown in high relief owing to the inability of the disciples to cope with the situation, and their lack of insight.[3]

[1] The allusion to the lateness of the hour, though found in the Matthew-Luke parallels to Mk. $6^{34\,ff}$, does not occur in the second account of the feeding Mk. 8^{1-10}, Mt. 15^{32-39}, nor in Jn. 6^{1-14}. Indeed, in St. John the possibility of it is, no doubt intentionally, excluded; for after the feeding Jesus withdraws into the hill-country alone, 6^{15}; and only at 6^{16} do we read, "And when evening came. . . ." See p. 89.

[2] Mk. 8^{15} seems to be an isolated saying of Jesus, which has somehow found its way into this context, because of the reference to bread in verse 14. It breaks the connexion of the story, and whereas the reference in the verses on each side of it is unquestionably to actual bread, the word leaven in verse 15 is used as certainly in a figurative sense. In Mt. 16^{5-12}, where the Sadducees take the place of Herod, the leaven referred to is explained as the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees; in Lk. 12^{1} the leaven of the Pharisees is said to be hypocrisy.

[3] St. Matthew's additions make this even clearer. At Mt. 14^{16} he adds, "They have no need to go away," and at 14^{18}, "Bring them [the loaves and fishes] hither to me."

It is these same points, the inexhaustible adequacy of their Master, and his disciples' failure to appreciate and respond to it, which are selected for emphasis in 8^{14-21}, the verses just referred to. In the light of the fully developed teaching of Jn. 6, we may believe that these verses tentatively point to Jesus as the author and giver of the fullness of life, under the form of bread; and if so, it is altogether fitting that they should be followed, first by the story of his bestowal of a physical gift, the restoration of sight to a blind man, and secondly by the parallel story of the spiritual illumination of the disciples about his dignity and office.[1]

Of the other contents of this section little need be said. The story of the walking on the lake seems to teach much the same lesson as the feeding, except that Jesus is now separated from his disciples, who are sent across the lake alone.[2] In their distress they show the same inability as before, to deal with the situation, and the same inability to appreciate the nature and power of their Master, even after he has joined them.

As an unfailing background to these stories, appears the opposition of the Pharisees. The neutral or enthusiastic crowd, the faithful but unintelligent disciples, the constant hostility of the religious classes: this seems to be St. Mark's conception of the setting of the ministry. To the inclusion of episodes of opposition we owe our knowledge of some of the most

[1] See p. 90.

[2] Mk. $6^{48\,end}$ appears to contradict the motive suggested in 6^{48a}. It may be that an early form of the story only emphasized the power of Jesus to cross the lake in this way, and that the ascription to him of a desire to help the disciples is a later development.

important teaching of our Lord : his doctrine of inwardness (7^{15}), his refusal of a sign (8^{12}), his ideal for husband and wife (10^{5-12}). The evangelist's purpose, however, does not seem to have been so much to record the teaching because of its importance, as to illustrate the grounds of conflict.

So much was said in the last lecture with regard to the importance of Mk. 8^{27} to 10^{45}, that it can be treated here more briefly. Side by side with the disciples' acknowledgement of the Messiahship of Jesus, there goes at once his own teaching about its meaning and implications, both for himself and for his followers. "The multitude," indeed, is still in evidence from time to time,[1] but much less so than before; it now withdraws into the background, and the disciples are the object of Jesus' special instruction, and teaching is much more prominent than action. But at least as much emphasis as before is still laid upon their inability to understand,[2] and in particular the failure of the twelve, or of their leader or leaders, is shown most conspicuously of all after the three predictions of the passion, at Mk. 8^{32b-33}, 9^{32-34}, 10^{35-45}; and it is remarkable that, as a result, in each of these three cases, reference—and, in a sense, favourable reference—is at once made to persons outside the circle of discipleship.[3]

Thus, in the first case, when St. Peter, by his ill-judged words, has drawn severe rebuke upon himself, a kind of appeal is made in 8^{34} to "the multitude" along with the disciples. The multitude cannot,

[1] 8^{34}, 9^{14}, 10^{1}. [2] $8^{32, 33}$, $9^{10, 32, 34, 38}$, $10^{13, 24, 26, 32, 35\ ff.}$

[3] Cf. the mention of the "other boats" at 4^{36b}, and see p. 89 f.

indeed, receive the secret of Messiahship, which is for disciples only; but it can and does receive instruction in the way of life, that is, of the cross.

In the second case, after the twelve by their dispute about greatness have shown their incapacity to understand, the work of one who is not of their number, and in fact does not follow [with[1]] them, but exorcises successfully in the name[2] of Jesus, is expressly allowed.

And finally, in the third case, when after the most fully detailed prediction of the passion St. James and St. John by their request for the highest places in the "glory" have shown complete misunderstanding, a blind beggar, not of the disciples nor even of the multitude, is called to Jesus, and receives his sight.

Further, after each prediction of the passion, and the inability shown in different ways on the three occasions to receive it, there is a section of appropriate teaching, each emphasizing the greatness of the renunciation called for, but equally also the greatness of the prize or privilege to be attained thereby.[3]

Thus between 8^{34} and 9^{1} St. Mark brings together various sayings of the Lord, all designed to call attention to the necessity for absolute self-sacrifice, and yet at

[1] The variations of reading in Mk. 9^{39} are interesting; Professor C. H. Turner regarded it as certain that the correct reading in this verse is ἡμῖν, not μεθ' ἡμῶν (*J.T.S*, April 1925, p. 240).

[2] That is, with its help, by its use.

[3] It may perhaps be objected that no goal or "reward" is set forth in the final section 10^{42-45}, comparable at any rate to "saving" one's life or seeing the arrival of the kingdom of God in power in the first section, 8^{34}–9^{1}, or to entering into life, or the kingdom of God, in the second section, 9^{38-50}.

Possibly, however, the "glory" alluded to in 10^{37} is presupposed as the background of 10^{42-45}, or true greatness ($10^{43, 44}$) may be regarded as the only valid goal.

the same time holding out the promise of an infinite reward.

After the second prediction of the passion, warnings are given, in 9^{33-50}, of the dangers to which the twelve are or will be especially exposed as leaders of a brotherhood. Humility, tolerance, the "giving no offence," self-discipline, the spirit of concord, once more with constant reference to the goal: these are to be characteristics of those who are "of Christ."[1]

After the third prediction, a final attempt seems to be made in 10^{35-45}, by means of a very sharp antithesis,

[1] It is maintained in the text that each of the three predictions of the passion in Mk. 8^{27}–10^{52} is followed by (*a*) an example of the failure of the disciples to understand the prediction, (*b*) reference, in consequence, to a person or persons outside the body of disciples, and (*c*) appropriate teaching. This, however, does not exhaust the contents of this section. The evangelist seems to have wished to include suitable incidents as well as appropriate teaching. Thus in connexion with the first prediction we find the incidents of the transfiguration and of the demoniac lad. The former is obviously in place here, as a divine attestation of St. Peter's confession of Jesus' Messiahship; and the latter, besides being a "foil" to the transfiguration scene, itself also emphasizes very strongly the unique person, power and success of Jesus, in this case by contrast with his disciples; see $9^{18b, 19, 27, 28}$.

Equally suggestive is the arrangement after the second prediction, especially if we may regard 10^{1-12} as possibly a subsequent addition to the verses which now precede and follow it. According to Wellhausen, episodes like that in 10^{1-12} are inserted "for the sake of variety" at various points in St. Mark; cf. 7^{1-23} $8^{11, 12}$. In that case the incident of the children in 10^{13-16} and that of the rich man in 10^{17-22} with its two appendices 10^{23-27} and $^{28-32}$ are connected very appropriately with the teaching given in 9^{33-50}. For there is a reference in 9^{43-45} to life, in the sense of eternal life, and in 9^{47} to the kingdom of God; and we find, on passing to the incidents, that 10^{13-16} deals with entrance into the kingdom of God, and 10^{17-22} with the inheritance of eternal life.

The arrangement of all the material after the third prediction of the passion is dealt with in the text.

to drive home the essence of the teaching. The failure of the sons of Zebedee is seen in an even more conspicuous light if we pass direct from 10^{37} to 10^{41}, regarding the intervening verses as a subsequent addition for another reason.[1] If this suggestion be accepted, St. James and St. John show the same crass inability to appreciate the teaching of their Master, as was shown after the first prediction by St. Peter; and the indignation of the remainder of the twelve does not improve the situation. The opportunity, therefore, is taken, in the verses which form the conclusion not only of this incident but of the teaching of the section as a whole,[2] to repudiate utterly any ambition or ideal but that of service, in the light of the example of the Son of man, the very purpose of whose coming, it is here emphatically stated, was to serve and to redeem, even at the cost of life itself.[3]

In St. Mark's gospel there are two stories, and two only, of the opening of blind eyes, and the position of each is probably significant. The first occurs immediately before the very important section 8^{27} to 10^{45},

[1] It will be noticed that verse 41 follows admirably on verse 37, but less so on verse 40. Verses 38 to 40 may have reached their present position after and as a result of the deaths of the two sons of Zebedee, if indeed both died a violent death. It is probable that reverence was shown by the church to its martyrs from a very early date.

[2] Like 8^{22-26} (see p. 90). Mk. 10^{46-52} thus does double service, standing in relation both to the section or sections which it follows and to those which it precedes.

[3] At this point in his gospel St. Luke represents Mk. 10^{35-45} by a single verse, Lk. 18^{34}: a signal example of his tendency to spare the twelve, although this is probably not the only reason for his omission of the section.

The reference to redemption occurs here only, in the Marcan record of the ministry.

in which the disciples, now knowing that their Master is Messiah, receive instruction in the meaning of Messiahship. The second occurs at the beginning of the last stage of the journey to Jerusalem; indeed, it immediately precedes the story of the so-called triumphal entry. Its significance at this point, as regards its forward reference, may be that a blind beggar recognizes Jesus of Nazareth for what he truly is (10[47]), and gives him the title, son of David, that belongs to him;[1] perhaps also that all the rest, who see, are blind.[2] In any case, we seem to be conscious, in chapters 11 and 12, of different and contradictory *motifs* contending for mastery within the narrative. St. Mark's doctrine of the secret Messiahship of Jesus is here seen strained to breaking-point. For the action ascribed to Jesus in sending for the colt and entering the city on it, is clearly meant to suggest the fulfilment of the prophecy in Zechariah,[3] in connexion with the arrival of the messianic king—an identification which is indeed expressly made in the later gospels of St. Matthew and St. John.[4] And the acclamations with which the central figure is received are all but messianic,[5] as they also explicitly become in

[1] The order of the words in the Greek is important: "son of David, Jesus."

[2] Cf. Jn. 9[35-41].

[3] Zech. 9[9]. Prof. B. W. Bacon was, I believe, the first to suggest that the last word of the LXX translation of the verse, . . . ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον, may have led to the expression used in Mk. 11[2b]; cf. also Lk. 23[53b].

[4] Mt. 21[4, 5], Jn. 12[14, 15].

[5] Mk. 11[9, 10]. The opening acclamation is Hosanna, and this is repeated at the end with the addition ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις. The word Hosanna, which in the LXX is translated sometimes σῶσον δή, sometimes βοήθησον, may be rendered "May God save!" The word ὕψιστος occurs 13 times in the N.T., and in nine of these contexts is a synonym for or epithet of the transcendent God, e.g. Acts 7[48]. In

all three later gospels. And finally in the parable of the wicked husbandmen, in 12^{1-8}, with the verses which now follow it, the veil is practically withdrawn; although the parable is spoken to enemies, who, we are told, unlike earlier hearers of the parables,[1] did not fail to understand its import, yet in the mention of the "only son" we are reminded of the two earlier passages of the gospel where this term is used, the one recounting a secret revelation to Jesus himself, the other a secret revelation to the three disciples.[2]

And yet the plan of St. Mark's gospel, strictly interpreted, demands that the Messiahship, although it cries aloud, must still remain a secret from all but Jesus and intimate disciples; and it is in accordance with this plan that in several sections of these two chapters we are conscious of an atmosphere not essentially different from that of the conflict-stories in chapters 2 and 3. Indeed, it is possible to discern

Ps. 148^{1b}, the expression "in the heights," according to the laws of Hebrew poetry, is equivalent to 148^{1a}, "from the heavens," both expressions being opposed to "from the earth," 148^{7}. We may therefore reasonably suppose that the last words of the cry of greeting are almost "May God save from heaven!" i.e. by his own "unique" act, by some "transcendent" action. It was indeed a generally accepted belief that God himself would bring the kingdom.

The words of Mk. 11^{9b}, from Ps. 118^{26}, need not mean more than "greeting in God's name," a customary Jewish welcome to anyone coming on a religious errand, not necessarily an acclamation of Messiah. What is acclaimed in St. Mark's version of the story is the coming kingdom, this kingdom being further described as the kingdom "of our father David."

It should be noticed, lastly, that the acclamation of the coming kingdom by the applauders is not the same as the proclamation of its arrival by Jesus in $1^{14, 15}$. There is now no summons to repentance, nor any reference to belief.

[1] Mk. 4^{10-13}. [2] Mk. 1^{11}, 9^{7}.

here a group of stories[1] similar to and perhaps at an earlier stage of the tradition connected with the previous group.[2] The only difference now is that the atmosphere is tenser, and the action and the themes handled are more immediately vital to the coming issue, than in the other group. Now, as then, in the final story[3] Jesus himself propounds the question, and its teaching seems to be that the greatness and dignity of the Messiah by no means depend, as the scribes assert, on physical descent from David; the Messiah is a greater than David, and his office of a higher dignity; he is not son but Lord of David, as the scripture says.[4]

Three features of these chapters in particular are likely to impress the reader. In the first place, we are struck by the supremacy and, if we may use the word, the buoyancy of Jesus in dealing with the situations which successively confront him, and his complete success. This impression is confirmed by the references to the astonishment and interest of the multitude, which is represented as giving him support and even sympathy. Secondly, a connexion seems to be implied between the doom which hangs over the Jewish nation,[5] and the impending death of the Messiah himself.[6] Each is involved in the ruin of the other. By rejecting the Messiah and encompassing his end, his own nation brings condemnation on

[1] Mk. $11^{15-18, 27-33}$, $12^{13-17, 18-27, 28-34, 35-37}$.

[2] It is noticeable that the Herodians are mentioned in St. Mark only at 3^{6} and 12^{13}.

[3] Mk. 12^{35-37}; cf. Mk. 3^{1-6}.

[4] None the less, the early church valued very highly the doctrine of the Lord's descent from David. Without going outside this gospel, we need only refer to 10^{47}.

[5] Mk. $11^{12-14, 20, 21}$, 12^{9}; cf. $13^{1, 2}$.

[6] Mk. 12^{8}.

itself and he goes down with it. And yet, thirdly, the action of those who rejected him was utterly unjustified.[1] Jesus was faithful to the spirit and intention of the Mosaic law, and to the deepest truths of scripture; it is the leaders and teachers of his nation who have proved unfaithful husbandmen, and their condemnation is at hand.[2]

We come at length to chapter 13^{3-37}, the second of the only two considerable pieces of teaching in this gospel; and its position here makes it the climax of all that part of the gospel, which precedes the passion narrative itself.

Two peculiar features of this great discourse are often overlooked, but they give the key to its significance. In the first place, the discourse is secret. It is given in private to the four disciples, who according to St. Mark have been with Jesus for the longest time.[3] Recalling other examples of private instruction to disciples in previous chapters of St. Mark, we may regard it as an effort on the part of the church to apply the teaching of Jesus to its present urgent needs. And the other feature of this discourse, which is often overlooked, is that there is no reference by Jesus in it to his own approaching, almost immediate death. So far as the discourse is "Christian," and not a reproduction of traditional Jewish "birth-pangs" of the Messiah, its purpose is to recognize the sufferings and persecutions which await disciples, but at the same time to strengthen and support them by the picture

[1] Mk. 11^{17}, $12^{24-27, 28-34}$. [2] Mk. $12^{1-9, 38-40}$. [3] See Mk. 1^{16-20}.

of the final, most certain and most glorious triumph. In this triumph, the moment of which, although utterly unknowable, is imminent, the disciples' Master, here tacitly identified with the apocalyptic Son of man, will be seen and known as such; their task meantime is to be alert and to watch.[1] With this twofold note of warning and expectancy, St. Mark ends that part of his gospel, in which he probably enjoyed a freedom of arrangement not possible for him, at any rate to the same extent, in the remaining chapters. In the next lecture we shall be occupied with these.

[1] On Mk. 13 [3-37], see additional note D, p. 94.

V

THE PASSION NARRATIVE IN ST. MARK

ACCORDING to the views of which an outline has been given in the previous lectures of this course, the church for some time possessed no connected account of the ministry of Jesus Christ. What first took shape were isolated stories and sayings, circulating independently and designed to meet the immediate needs of the communities. The motive which led to their circulation was not so much desire for historical reminiscence as the need for representative and significant sayings and deeds of the Lord which could be used in preaching, teaching and worship, the gospel being presented, in each of these three ways, primarily as a message of salvation. In course of time, small groups or cycles of kindred sayings and stories tended to be thrown together, the latter often obeying the same laws of style as similar collections in the ancient world and gradually assuming to some extent a literary form, with, here and there, some scanty notes of time and place; but, so far as we know, the compiler of our earliest gospel was the first to attempt to give a connected chronological and topographical account of the public life of Jesus.

To this general rule it is possible that there was one partial but notable exception. There are indications that a story of the passion existed, forming a connected whole, and particularly distinguished by notes of time and place, before it was embodied in the

larger work of St. Mark. From the resolve of the Jewish authorities to do away with Jesus, at the beginning of the fourteenth chapter, until the departure of the frightened women from the tomb at 16^8, where the gospel, as we have it, ends, notes of time and place become more frequent, and the story for the most part moves steadily forward in a way which has no parallel in the earlier chapters. By this, of course, it is not meant that there are not in the present passion narrative of St. Mark sections which will have had at first a separate existence. A notable example of these is the story of the anointing at Bethany, in which, as it stands now, at the outset of the passion narrative, the devotion of a single unnamed woman is set off against a surrounding framework of hostility to Jesus, on the part of enemies and a disciple alike; reasons can be given for believing that this story was at first without its present setting. We have also definite evidence that an account existed of the institution of the Eucharist, which circulated with an introduction of its own, and free of any larger context. In 1 Corinthians 11 St. Paul reminds his readers of what he had already "delivered," as he says, to them; "how that the Lord Jesus, in the night in which he was betrayed, took bread," and so forth. Again, the stories of St. Peter's denial and of Gethsemane are likely to have formed isolated themes in the teaching of the churches, and may have been gradually built into the passion narrative in ways not unlike those which have prevailed elsewhere in St. Mark. What can be claimed with a large measure of probability for this part of the gospel may be thus expressed: first, it took shape as a connected whole, at any rate in its chief outlines,

earlier than the rest of the narrative; and, secondly, it contains notes of time and place which are not editorial additions, as they often are elsewhere in St. Mark, inserted to provide links between what were previously isolated sections; here they have belonged from the beginning to the warp and woof of the whole.

If it be asked why an ordered, chronological narrative came into being for this part of the tradition at an earlier date than for the rest, a satisfactory answer can perhaps be given, when we consider the needs of the preachers, teachers and worshippers in the early church. There is no evidence that they were interested in biography as such; when an interest does show itself in words and deeds of Jesus, it seems to have been at first for the sake of the model and example which these give; but they were concerned, above all, with what they believed to be a message of salvation; and we have ample evidence that in this respect the cross received the utmost emphasis. This is not the case with any event of the ministry which precedes the passion. Outside the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles we hear nothing of John the Baptist or the Galilean period. In the epistles of St. Paul there is no reference to any event between the birth of Jesus and the passion. But the latter part of the New Testament is filled with references to the cross, and to the conquest which the church believed was made thereby of death. St. Paul gloried, or boasted, in the cross. It was to him the supreme pledge of the divine love. The writer to the Hebrews sees in the self-sacrifice of the cross the culminating manifestation of the obedience of Jesus, and of the dedication of his will to God. In the first epistle of

St. Peter we are told that our sins were borne by Christ upon the cross; in the Revelation of St. John, the figure of Jesus is put before us as, above all, the conqueror of sin and death, and, once more, through the cross.

There is also evidence that belief in the significance of the death and resurrection was closely connected with the belief in the expected coming of Jesus, regarded as the "Son of man," in glory, the belief which so much dominated the earliest Christian hope; so that the passion as a whole was regarded as the earnest and pledge of the awaited imminent *dénouement*. "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep through Jesus will God bring with him."[1] It is therefore quite possible that the first connected account which would come into existence would be that of the events connected with the death of Jesus, before the need was felt to give a coherent presentation of his ministry.

Mention should also be made of the general agreement in outline of all the four evangelists in this part of their narrative; they coincide more nearly in their accounts of the last scenes than they do elsewhere. Up to this point St. John has shown the utmost boldness in his treatment of the tradition; but he now treads closely in the footsteps of his predecessors. It is true that his narrative of the passion is set forth in a peculiar light—it is for him from first to last the story of a triumph—and in the content of the sections he deviates considerably from the earlier records; but he remains faithful to the chief events of the tradition:

[1] 1 Thess. 4^{14}. Cf. 1 Cor. 11^{26}, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

earlier than the rest of the narrative; and, secondly, it contains notes of time and place which are not editorial additions, as they often are elsewhere in St. Mark, inserted to provide links between what were previously isolated sections; here they have belonged from the beginning to the warp and woof of the whole.

If it be asked why an ordered, chronological narrative came into being for this part of the tradition at an earlier date than for the rest, a satisfactory answer can perhaps be given, when we consider the needs of the preachers, teachers and worshippers in the early church. There is no evidence that they were interested in biography as such; when an interest does show itself in words and deeds of Jesus, it seems to have been at first for the sake of the model and example which these give; but they were concerned, above all, with what they believed to be a message of salvation; and we have ample evidence that in this respect the cross received the utmost emphasis. This is not the case with any event of the ministry which precedes the passion. Outside the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles we hear nothing of John the Baptist or the Galilean period. In the epistles of St. Paul there is no reference to any event between the birth of Jesus and the passion. But the latter part of the New Testament is filled with references to the cross, and to the conquest which the church believed was made thereby of death. St. Paul gloried, or boasted, in the cross. It was to him the supreme pledge of the divine love. The writer to the Hebrews sees in the self-sacrifice of the cross the culminating manifestation of the obedience of Jesus, and of the dedication of his will to God. In the first epistle of

St. Peter we are told that our sins were borne by Christ upon the cross; in the Revelation of St. John, the figure of Jesus is put before us as, above all, the conqueror of sin and death, and, once more, through the cross.

There is also evidence that belief in the significance of the death and resurrection was closely connected with the belief in the expected coming of Jesus, regarded as the "Son of man," in glory, the belief which so much dominated the earliest Christian hope; so that the passion as a whole was regarded as the earnest and pledge of the awaited imminent *dénouement*. "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep through Jesus will God bring with him."[1] It is therefore quite possible that the first connected account which would come into existence would be that of the events connected with the death of Jesus, before the need was felt to give a coherent presentation of his ministry.

Mention should also be made of the general agreement in outline of all the four evangelists in this part of their narrative; they coincide more nearly in their accounts of the last scenes than they do elsewhere. Up to this point St. John has shown the utmost boldness in his treatment of the tradition; but he now treads closely in the footsteps of his predecessors. It is true that his narrative of the passion is set forth in a peculiar light—it is for him from first to last the story of a triumph—and in the content of the sections he deviates considerably from the earlier records; but he remains faithful to the chief events of the tradition:

[1] 1 Thess. 4^{14}. Cf. 1 Cor. 11^{26}, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

the last supper, the arrest in the garden, the examinations before the Jewish and the Roman authorities, the denial of St. Peter, the mockery by the soldiers, the crucifixion, the burial, and the visit two days later to the grave. This strongly marked measure of agreement forms a great contrast to his previous practice; and the inference is perhaps permissible that in this part of the narrative his hands were tied more closely, through the sheer necessity of following an established tradition, than they were before. The main themes of the passion story were fixed so early and so firmly that he could not but respect them.

And there is another reason why it is possible that an account of the closing scenes was needed comparatively early—for apologetic purposes. With every circumstance of desertion, shame and scandal, the Lord had suffered the extreme penalty at the hands of the Roman authority. An answer was needed to the obvious question, how could this be? What had he done? The church found it necessary to show, first, that his death was in reality the work of his own countrymen, and, secondly, that the latter were only carrying out what had long ago been prophesied in scripture. St. Mark is at pains to establish both these points; and in the later gospels they are emphasized still more.

We pass therefore to consider the opening words of the passion narrative in St. Mark. They obviously form an introduction to the whole, and cannot well ever have existed apart from the rest of the story. They also bring before us, at the outset, one of the chief difficulties of the passion narrative, the chronology

of events in relation to the passover. For our present purpose we will omit the story of the anointing, which is placed in the middle of this section.

" Now it was the passover and the unleavened bread after two days; and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him with subtilty, and kill him: for they said, Not at feast-time, lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people. . . . And Judas Iscariot, he that was one of the twelve, went away to the chief priests, that he might betray[1] him to them. And they, when they heard it, were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently deliver him up to them."

The argument of the first two verses is not easy to follow. Because of the position of the words ἐν δόλῳ, by subtilty, or stratagem, Professor C. H. Turner[2] is doubtless right in laying the chief emphasis upon them. The intention of the authorities was to carry out their purpose *secretly*, for it had been urged—so he paraphrases the second verse—that an open arrest at the feast might lead to a riot. The important point, however, for our present purpose is the decision not to act during the feast. This lasted for a week, and since nothing is stated to the contrary, we may assume that the decision was adhered to. Jesus was arrested and made away with, before the feast began; and the purpose of the introduction is to show why, owing to the unexpected help of Judas, events moved at once so quickly and so secretly.

[1] Reading προδοῖ, in contrast with the certainly correct and more usual παραδοῖ in the next verse. Cf. an important note by Prof. C. H. Turner in *J.T.S.*, April 1928, pp. 277 f.

[2] *J.T.S.*, July 1924, pp. 384 f.

Wellhausen[1] shrewdly remarks that the disciples are not likely to have had knowledge, at the time, of the intentions and decisions of the Sanhedrin. They are more likely to have inferred them from what actually happened; hence these two verses are strong evidence that Jesus was arrested before the feast, and therefore did not eat the paschal meal with his disciples, so that this meal took place, in that particular week, not on the Thursday evening, as we should describe it, but on the Friday evening.

If this is so, these verses support the course of events which is set forth in St. John's gospel. According to it, the last supper was not the paschal meal, but the crucifixion and death of the Lord took place during the afternoon hours in which the paschal victims were being killed in the temple in preparation for the passover that night, which we should call the Friday evening.

It is, however, well known that part of St. Mark's record and the passages parallel to it in St. Matthew and St. Luke appear to assume that the last supper was the paschal meal; so that we are confronted not only with a conflict between the synoptists and St. John but with an internal contradiction in our earliest authorities. Is it possible that the influence of interpretation on the history can throw light upon the problem ?

It is desirable, first of all, to give some explanation of Jewish custom in connexion with the paschal meal.[2] The word passover originally referred to the rites

[1] *Einleitung*, second edition, pp. 43 and 133.

[2] In the next nine pages I am greatly indebted to Dr. G. Buchanan Gray's *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, sections 21 and 25.

performed upon a single evening, and at the time which we are considering the word would be applied either to the festival itself or to the victim, the eating of which at the paschal meal now formed the chief element in the celebration. By this time also the passover rites had come to be performed on the first day of the festival of unleavened bread, which lasted for a week. This, therefore, now became the combined festival of passover and unleavened bread, and could be called by either name, as it is in the Marcan introduction to the passion, although the passover rites were complete by the first midnight of the festival. The paschal meal, originally consumed at home, was transferred by Deuteronomy to the temple area; but by the beginning of our era, although it was no longer eaten in the temple, it was obligatory to eat it in Jerusalem. In the legislation of the Pentateuch the meal has a markedly commemorative character, in connexion with the deliverance from Egypt; and to this by the beginning of our era had been added a strong eschatological element; it was regarded as also the pledge of a future great deliverance.

On the next morning but one after the paschal meal, that is, two days later, a sheaf of firstfruits was offered in the temple. For the purpose of our inquiry we may confine ourselves entirely to the first three days of the festival, and it will be convenient to trace the sequence of events upon these first three days. By the reckoning of the month, they were the 14th, 15th, and 16th days of Nisan, the first month of the Jewish year, each day beginning, according to Jewish reckoning, not with midnight, but with sunset.

It should therefore be pointed out that by Jewish reckoning the paschal meal was eaten on Nisan 15, which was also the first complete day of unleavened bread; but it appears that Nisan 14 was at this time regarded as the first day of the festival.

From noon on this day, Nisan 14, no leavened bread was eaten; and soon after this hour the slaughter of the passover animals began in the temple and continued almost until sunset. Accordingly, the statement in Mark 14^{12}, "On the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover," is quite correct, so far as the afternoon of the 14th of Nisan is concerned. During this afternoon, moreover, it was usual to abstain from ordinary work, and to prepare for what was to be done, as we should say, that night. After sunset on Nisan 14, that is, in the first hours of what was reckoned by the Jews as Nisan 15, the paschal meal took place. During the whole of Nisan 15, all "servile work" was forbidden by scripture,[1] and this covered, by custom, most ordinary occupations. On the day following, that is, on Nisan 16, according to the practice of the time we are considering, the sheaf of firstfruits was offered at the temple some time before noon.

We have thus the following course of events:

After noon on Nisan 14, only unleavened bread was eaten, and the paschal animals were slaughtered in the temple. On the same evening, that is, on Nisan 15, the passover was eaten, and throughout Nisan 15 normal activities were suspended.

On the morning of Nisan 16 a sheaf of firstfruits

[1] "In the first day shall be an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work," Num. 28^{18}.

was offered at the temple. Beyond this point we need not go.

If, before returning to the synoptists, we consider for a moment the fourth gospel, we find that its evidence, which is throughout consistent and precise, agrees in every detail with the Jewish customs which we have just reviewed. Thus it is expressly stated, at the beginning of chapter 13, that the last supper took place before the feast of the passover; and this is also implied in the course of the narrative. When Judas left the room, we read that it was supposed by some that he went out to buy what was needed for the (coming) festival; and the impression thus made is confirmed by two further passages in St. John's story of the passion. When our Lord is brought before Pilate, we read that the Jews did not enter the Prætorium, in order to avoid ceremonial defilement, which would make them unable to take part in the paschal meal (that night). And, finally, in the last stage of the examination before Pilate, it is mentioned that "it was the Preparation of the passover: it was about the sixth hour,"[1] the first words being a technical term for the 14th of Nisan, the day on the afternoon of which the paschal animals were slain.

In St. John's view, therefore, the crucifixion began soon after noon on Nisan 14, the day of the Preparation, and our Lord died on the same afternoon before sunset. That night, which belonged to Nisan 15, the passover was eaten, and Nisan 15 chanced also, in this year, to be a sabbath.[2] On the day after the sabbath, Sunday, Nisan 16, early in the morning, before it was light, Mary Magdalene comes to the tomb.

[1] Jn. 19^{14}. [2] Jn. 19^{31}.

Everything, therefore, in the fourth gospel accords satisfactorily with Jewish paschal custom; and the last supper is not the passover, but a meal eaten on the previous evening. We may notice also that the crucifixion and death of the Lord take place during the hours when the paschal animals were being slain and presented in the temple; and that his resurrection is discovered early in the day on which the sheaf of firstfruits was presented in the temple before noon.

It is probable that the evangelist was at least aware of and perhaps concerned to draw attention to the first of these coincidences,[1] but he makes no allusion to the second. St. Paul, however, seems to have both coincidences in mind in his first epistle to the church at Corinth; he there alludes to our Lord both as passover, that is, paschal victim—" our passover is slain for us, even Christ " [2]—and as firstfruits—" now is Christ risen from the dead, the firstfruits of them that are asleep . . . Christ the firstfruits." [3]

We turn now to our problem, which is ultimately concerned with the internal contradiction which we have found in Mk. 14; for there is no reason to

[1] At 19^{14}, immediately before sentence is finally passed, there is a pointed reference to " the Preparation for the passover." " The term chosen," says Dr. Buchanan Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 388, " is that which would inevitably spring to the mind of a Jew who was thinking of the slaughter of the Paschal victims, and would immediately suggest this to Jewish readers. . . . As the narrative of the crucifixion opens with this significantly worded note, so it closes with the application to our Lord of the words taken from the Paschal law of Exodus that " not a bone of it shall be broken " (19^{36}; Ex. 12^{46})."

[2] 1 Cor. 5^{7}.

[3] 1 Cor. $15^{20, 23}$.

suppose that in this matter St. Matthew and St. Luke are other than dependent on St. Mark. We need to consider, therefore, our earliest gospel only.

We have seen that according to the opening verses of its passion narrative, the Jewish authorities decide that it would be unwise to try to arrest Jesus during the feast; and yet later in the same chapter we read of the preparations made by the disciples for the last supper, which in verses 12 to 16 is expressly identified with the paschal meal; and it is shortly after the eating of this meal, and therefore at the height of the feast, that the arrest is made.

So far as I know, it has not been sufficiently emphasized that the unquestionable identification of the last supper with the passover is confined in St. Mark's gospel to the five verses in chapter 14, which deal with the preparation for the meal. According to these the purpose of the preparations was, indeed, to eat the passover; the expression "the passover," in the sense of the paschal victim, occurs no less than four times in these five verses.

"And on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover, his disciples say unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and make ready that thou mayest eat the passover? And he sendeth two of his disciples, and saith unto them, Go into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water; follow him; and wheresoever he shall enter in, say to the good man of the house, The Master saith, Where is my guest-chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? And he will show you a large upper room furnished, ready; and there prepare for us. And the disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found

even as he said to them ; and they prepared the passover."

We may remark in passing that this passage has an unquestionable affinity with the very difficult verses in Mk. 11, when on the approach to Jerusalem two disciples are sent for the colt, " whereon no man ever yet sat," on which their Master will enter the city.

On this view, therefore, the last supper is the passover, and the betrayal, arrest, trial and crucifixion all fall on what by Jewish reckoning was the 15th Nisan, a day on which by scripture and by custom all normal work and activity were laid aside.

But nowhere else in the narrative of St. Mark is there any certain implication that the last supper was the passover. Indeed, the rest of his narrative may be regarded as presumptive evidence against this view, for in addition to the evidence of the opening verses of his passion story, we notice, first, that his account of the meal itself does not read as though it were the passover; there is no reference to the central feature of that meal, the eating of the paschal animal itself; and, secondly, that the members of the Sanhedrin and their assistants, as well as Simon of Cyrene in all probability, are all engaged in activities which the law or custom forbade upon this day. Outside the five verses in question there appears to be only one feature in St. Mark's account of the last supper which is strongly suggestive of the passover. This is the mention of the hymn sung at the conclusion of the meal;[1] the obvious presumption being that it would be the Hallel, the psalm or psalms sung after passover. But none of those who draw attention to this feature

[1] Mk. 14^{26}.

seem to be prepared to regard it as a decisive argument.[1]

Attention is sometimes also called to the significance of the fact that, according to St. Mark, the supper was eaten in Jerusalem. It will be remembered that the synoptists represent our Lord as spending the previous nights of this last week outside Jerusalem, and it is from outside the city on the last day of his freedom that he sends the two disciples to prepare the meal within the city. This was necessary, if the meal was to be a passover; the passover could not be eaten where our Lord had been lodging on the previous evenings; whereas, if the meal was not a passover, there seems no obvious reason why this supper only should have been taken in Jerusalem.

It must be pointed out, however, that, so far as the synoptists are concerned, it is only the five Marcan verses under consideration, with their parallels elsewhere, which compel us to the view that the last supper was eaten in Jerusalem.[2]

It is not necessary at the moment to try to decide the historical question whether the last supper was or was not a passover, or whether our Lord died on the afternoon of the 14th or the 15th Nisan, although those who agree with the arguments just stated will probably

[1] Attention may be called at this point to an article on the Last Supper and the Paschal Meal, by Prof. F. C. Burkitt, in *J.T.S.*, April 1916, pp. 291 ff.

[2] In the fourth gospel Jesus six days before the passover comes to Bethany, and a supper is made for him in the house of Lazarus ($12^{1, 2}$). On the next day he goes to Jerusalem (12^{12}), and there is no mention of any subsequent return to Bethany. It is thus implied rather than stated definitely in this gospel, that the last supper took place in Jerusalem; cf. also 18^{1}.

feel that the scales are heavily weighted on one side. Historically, if the last supper was a passover, our Lord cannot have been crucified at the time when the paschal victims were being killed; and conversely, if he died when the paschal victims were being killed, the last supper cannot have been a passover. And yet it seems to be certain that very early in the history of the church both ideas were current: first, that our Lord died at the hour of the paschal sacrifice, himself the Christian passover; and, secondly, that the last supper was a paschal meal, out of which sprang the Christian Eucharist. St. John and, as it seems, St. Paul take the former view, and they are probably supported by the synoptic tradition, with the exception of five verses in St. Mark, and the parallels to these verses in St. Matthew and St. Luke. In these five verses, which must therefore be regarded as having a different origin from other parts of the passion narrative in St. Mark, the latter view has found a place.

If it be asked why St. Mark, in defiance of historical probability and indeed of the rest of his own narrative, identifies in this section the last supper with the passover, the following suggestion may be made.

It was remarked above that, at the beginning of our era, the Jewish passover was regarded not only as commemorative of a past event, the deliverance from Egypt, but also as containing in itself the pledge of a future great deliverance. St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. 11^{26}[1] show that the church's Eucharist, which was the Christian equivalent of the Jewish passover, had a similar double reference from very early times. On

[1] "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

the one hand, it commemorated the passion of the Lord, a past event; on the other, it looked forward to and was probably considered to be a pledge and earnest of his future coming.

Doubtless this second aspect, which has always been represented in the Eucharist, was very strongly emphasized in the first two generations of the church's life, and it is possible that St. Mark, when setting forth the historical events connected with the last supper and the passion, desired to emphasize the future deliverance to be effected by the latter, of which the Christian Eucharist was the permanent reminder, and that he does this by identifying, in Mk. 14^{12-16}, the last supper with the paschal meal.

It may be for the same reason that the story of the anointing by the unnamed woman, which to St. Mark is a token of the Messiahship of Jesus,[1] is placed by him at the outset of his passion narrative.[2] He thus puts into his readers' hands, as it were, the means whereby they may best approach and understand the narrative which follows. The passion is the supreme act of the Messiah, and conversely the Messiahship of Jesus is the explanation of the passion.

[1] In St. Mark, as in St. Matthew, the *head* of Jesus is anointed. (The versions of the story given by St. Luke and St. John differ in this respect, as in others, from St. Mark's version, and would require separate consideration.) Further, the use of the expression τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in Mk. 14^{9} is noticeable.

[2] Mk. 14^{3-9}.

We turn to another great difficulty in the Marcan passion narrative, which has recently formed the subject of a valuable monograph by Professor Hans Lietzmann, of Berlin.[1] The reference is to the Sanhedrin's night session,[2] which reaches its climax in the public acknowledgement by Jesus of his Messiahship, and his condemnation on the ground of blasphemy. There are difficulties in the way of regarding the record at this point as a plain narrative of history. It may perhaps be better understood as an attempt on the part of a section of the church, in the absence of precise information, to set forth the grounds on which the Lord was believed to have been condemned by the leaders of his nation, and handed over to the procurator. In the light of the developing convictions of the church, and of the treatment it had received from the Jews by the time at which this story may have taken shape, it was probably inevitable that the Jewish aristocracy should be represented as deliberately and with full knowledge casting out the " name " of Jesus, and rejecting their Messiah.[3]

[1] *Der Prozess Jesu* (Berlin 1931). In the remainder of this lecture I have constantly followed Prof. Lietzmann closely. Stephen Liberty, *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry* (Oxford, 1916), may also be consulted with advantage, especially pp. 141–157.

[2] Mk. 14^{55-65}. It is sometimes contended that this night session was not a trial, but a preliminary inquiry; the wording of Mk. 14^{64b}, however, is strong evidence against this view: " And they all condemned (*κατέκριναν*) him to be worthy (*ἔνοχον*) of death."

[3] It should be noticed that the so-called public claims of Jesus, which are here, at an early stage of the tradition, briefly set forth in the last hours only of his life, are, at a later stage of the tradition, worked out at length by St. John in the *body* of his gospel. This may be thought to give further support to the views put forward in the text.

For the historian an initial although perhaps not an insuperable difficulty is that no disciple is likely to have had accurate information about the procedure at this gathering, if indeed any such took place in the middle of the night. It is noticeable that, later on,[1] allusion is made to another session early in the morning, but that in this case no attempt is made to enter into details. It is, however, the content of the earlier section, even more than the unlikelihood of a night session at all, which chiefly constitutes the difficulty.

The first charge brought against the prisoner is his alleged utterance, "I will destroy this temple, made with hands, and in three days will build another made without hands." It is legitimate to remind ourselves that, a few days before, the prisoner himself had attacked the practice of buying and selling in the temple, presumably in order to safeguard its holiness. He seems also to have found support for his action among the common people, and it was this which is represented as arousing the anxiety of the authorities. We read elsewhere, it is true, that he was not impressed by the grandeur of the temple, and foretold its overthrow; but that is a different matter from the mysterious utterance here ascribed to him.[2] It seems to set forth the risen Jesus as the life of a new and spiritual

[1] Mk. 15^{1}. This verse, however, is not free from difficulty, and both the reading and the meaning are uncertain. Owing to the earlier session of the Sanhedrin recorded in Mk. 14^{55-65}, it is sometimes sought to translate "the chief priests . . . confirmed their resolution" rather than "held a consultation," but the latter is likely to represent the Greek more nearly. In St. Mark *συμβούλιον* occurs elsewhere only at 3^{6}.

[2] At the end of Mk. 13^{2} certain Western texts add "and in the course of three days another (temple) shall arise (made) without hands."

temple, in contrast to the ordinances of the earlier material sanctuary, as indeed St. John does interpret it;[1] and it may be thought to breathe the spirit of the converted Hellenists of the tendency of St. Stephen, who questioned the permanence and significance of the temple rites. It is possibly no accident that the word χειροποίητος, made with hands, which does not occur elsewhere in the gospels, is found also in the speech of St. Stephen, in the speech of St. Paul at Athens, and twice in the epistle to the Hebrews, in each case in reference to a material as contrasted with a spiritual building.[2] According to St. Mark, this first charge was not proceeded with, owing to lack of agreement among the witnesses; and the high priest now passes to the definite question, "Art thou the Christ, the son of the Blessed One?" the last words being a periphrasis for the divine Name, the use of which was avoided by the Jews.

Since a detailed argument cannot be set forth at this point, it must be stated dogmatically that the expression "Son of the Blessed One," or "Son of God," as a synonym for the Messiah, although of very early use in Christian circles, was almost certainly not generally employed among the Jews;[3] and its use here by the high priest constitutes a problem.

To this definite question our Lord, in St. Mark,

[1] Jn. 2^{19-21}.

[2] Acts 7^{48}, 17^{24}, Heb. $9^{11, 24}$. It occurs also Eph. 2^{11}, with reference to circumcision.

[3] For a full discussion of the questions involved, see G. Dalman's *The Words of Jesus*, Eng. trans., pp. 268 ff. (Edinburgh, 1902). Reference should also be made to *J.T.S.*, April 1904, pp. 453 f., and October 1931, pp. 64 ff., in both of which places Prof. F. C. Burkitt refers to this passage of St. Mark.

gives an equally definite reply, in affirmation. This is regarded by the high priest as blasphemy, which of itself requires the penalty of death; and the Sanhedrin decides accordingly. It is remarkable that, from the time of the arrest, only three utterances are ascribed to Jesus by St. Mark[1]: the words here, the "thou sayest" to Pilate, and the first words of the twenty-second psalm upon the cross; otherwise he keeps unbroken silence. The reply, as recorded here by St. Mark, runs thus: "I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven"; but however mistaken or dangerous such a claim might be, it did not in itself constitute a blasphemy; the Rabbis of the Mishna expressly require the use of the divine Name in a case of blasphemy as a cause of condemnation[2]; and it will have been noticed that, by the use of "the Power" as a synonym for God—"at the right hand of the Power"—Jesus has shown the same reserve and respect which were apparent in the high priest's question.

If we now turn to the story of the death of St. Stephen in the Acts, it cannot fail to impress us that the two elements which are prominent in the Marcan story at this point are prominent also in the story of St. Stephen. The charge against the latter dealt above all with his disrespectful attitude towards the temple; and in his final words he says that he sees the heavens

[1] Mk. 14^{62}, $15^{2,34}$. This is strong evidence for the general excellence, historically, of St. Mark's passion narrative. If we contrast it in this respect with the later gospels, canonical and apocryphal alike, we shall be the more impressed by his reticence.

[2] See *The Mishnah*, H. Danby, p. 392 (Oxford, 1933).

opened, and the Son of man (identified with Jesus) standing on the right hand of God. It is not surprising if these words of Stephen were regarded as blasphemy, for he to whom they referred had come in the meantime, according to Jewish belief, under the divine condemnation;[1] and his death therefore was to the Jews, as St. Paul found, a stumbling-block.[2] But at the time of which we are thinking, this had not occurred. Our Lord had committed no crime, and that he should regard himself as the expected Messiah might have seemed to the council foolishness, but not blasphemy. By the time of St. Stephen, after the crucifixion, the situation had entirely changed.[3]

But we have not yet reached, in Professor Lietzmann's view, the greatest difficulty. According to this section of St. Mark, Jesus was condemned to death by Jewish authorities for blasphemy. From this it would necessarily result, according to the law,[4] that he, like St. Stephen later, would be put to death by stoning. Nothing, however, is more certain than that our Lord was crucified; and this was a typically Roman punishment; from which we naturally and rightly infer that it was Pilate who passed sentence on him.

This difficulty is usually met by the explanation that Pilate only endorsed a Jewish verdict; that the

[1] Deut. $21^{22, 23}$; cf. Gal. 3^{13}. [2] 1 Cor. 1^{23}, Gal. 5^{11}.

[3] Minor difficulties are pointed out by Prof. Lietzmann in connexion with the mockery in Mk. 14^{65}. In the first place, the rough treatment is apparently the work of the hierarchy itself (the "officers" or police are not mentioned until the last clause of the verse), and this must be regarded as unlikely; and secondly, the mocking command to prophesy is strange; the prisoner had just been condemned, not as a false prophet, but for blasphemy, in connexion with his claim to Messiahship.

[4] Lev. 24^{14-16}.

Sanhedrin possessed the formal right to convict, but not to carry out the sentence; for this, confirmation by the procurator was required. If it be urged that in this case death might still have been expected to take place by stoning, appeal is made to the Jews' statement to Pilate in St. John, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death."[1]

Once more, it must for the moment be stated dogmatically that evidence is accumulating that Jn. 18^{31} is incorrect—it is indeed unlikely that the Jews should instruct Pilate upon the limitations of their powers—and that the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem at this time had power to condemn to death on religious grounds. If, therefore, they tried our Lord and found him guilty of blasphemy, they could have had him put to death by stoning. Seeing, however, that it was Pilate who passed sentence, it is unlikely that blasphemy was the ground of condemnation.[2]

[1] On this view the stoning of St. Stephen in Acts 7 is regarded as an illegal act of mob violence, although it is not so described by St. Luke; and the only recognized exception to the limitation of the Sanhedrin's powers in this respect is its right to punish with death any Gentile found within a certain limit of the temple area. Of this right there is no doubt, and it is established by the well-known inscription found in 1871, on the site of the temple. Cf. J. A. Robinson's commentary on the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, pp. 59 f., 160.

[2] Prof. Lietzmann's argument at this point is based upon M. Jean Juster's *Les Juifs dans l'empire Romain* (Paris, 1914). The latter (*op. cit.*, II, 132–42, with notes) deals exhaustively with the competence of the Sanhedrin at this period. He first seeks to show, successfully in Lietzmann's opinion, that the only evidence outside the N.T., which might lead us to suppose that the supreme Jewish court had not at this time power to inflict and carry out a capital sentence, is unreliable. He then brings forward various pieces of evidence to the contrary. Among these, in addition to the account in Acts of the execution of St. Stephen, and the temple inscription,

It is remarkable that the question put by Pilate to the prisoner takes the form "Art thou the King of the Jews?"[1] Of this title we have heard nothing hitherto; but it dominates the rest of the proceedings: the mockery by the soldiers, the purple robe, the crown of thorns, the inscription on the cross. To Roman ears such a title could only have one meaning; namely, that the accused was one of the nationalist leaders, who from time to time inflamed the patriotic passions of the Jews; and it becomes less surprising that our Lord was correlated with Barabbas,[2] who, we read, was in custody "with his party of rioters, men who in the riot had committed murder."

The peculiarities of the trial before Pilate in St. Mark are obvious. Pilate begins, before any charge is preferred, with the question of the kingship; only then follow unspecified accusations by the Jews; and to these the prisoner does not answer. But in the very fact of its poverty and unsatisfactoriness it is legitimate

both of which were referred to in the previous note, is the putting to death, by stoning, of James the brother of the Lord, and certain others, by order of the Sanhedrin, as narrated by Josephus (*Ant.* XX, ix, 1).

M. Juster's conclusion is that under Pontius Pilate the Sanhedrin unquestionably possessed competence to punish certain religious offences with death. Prof. Lietzmann therefore believes that the Jewish hierarchy did not pass formal sentence on our Lord, as related in Mk. 14^{55-65}, but only held a short consultation early in the morning, as stated in Mk. 15^{1}, and handed him over forthwith for sentence to the procurator.

[1] There is no satisfactory transition in St. Mark from "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" to "Art thou the King of the Jews?" Contrast the altogether satisfactory juncture achieved in St. Luke by means of Lk. 23^{2}.

[2] On the possibility that Barabbas also bore the name Jesus, see A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, pp. 227 f.

to see the excellence and faithfulness, from the historian's point of view, of the Marcan record at this point. If, in the absence of any eyewitness' account of what happened at the trial, the earliest tradition could only infer what had passed, from the obvious result, together with the public inscription on the cross, then we can understand why the writer naïvely places the question of Pilate in the forefront of the trial.[1] He has fashioned a trial scene in the only way which was open to him; but it is faithful to the fact of chief importance.

If, then, we try to summarize what may have happened in those fateful hours, we reach the following result. Our Lord was arrested secretly, at night, by the servants of the Sanhedrin. He was taken to the high priest's palace, and after a meeting of the council next morning was handed over to the Roman procurator. If we ask why the Jewish authorities did not themselves deal with the matter, the truest answer is that we do not know. It is possible that they desired to avoid the odium of the execution. Professor Lietzmann suggests that the result of a religious legal trial in the case of Jesus would have been by no means certain. But the authorities, or at least a

[1] The best comment known to me on the difficult reply "thou sayest," is that of Dr. M. Dibelius in the *Zeitschrift für N.T. Wissenschaft*, 1915, p. 117: "It can scarcely be regarded as accidental, that the reply is, not *ναί* [that is, yes], but σὺ λέγεις [that is, thou sayest]; on the other hand, we should beware of an excessive emphasis upon the pronoun, for the meaning is certainly not 'I do not say so, but you do.'

"With the reply 'yes' the scene would come to a close, for then it would only remain for Pilate to pass judgement; 'thou sayest,' which implies 'you do well to ask it' ('Du hast recht mit deiner Frage'), gives the possibility of a continuation of the scene."

majority of them, desired the removal of Jesus; hence the safer way was chosen, and he was handed over to the Romans on the charge of claiming royal power. The precise grounds on which this charge was based, once more we do not know. Pilate allowed himself to be convinced of the justice of the charge, and Jesus was condemned as a would-be king.

But very early in the history of the church two discoveries were made: first, that Jewish hostility was implacable, and secondly, that the civil power on the other hand was not necessarily adverse. It may be for this reason that in the gradual formation of the story of the passion we find an increasing tendency to ascribe hesitation and unwillingness to Pilate. This can be traced in an unbroken line from its beginnings in the Marcan narrative, through the elaborations in St. Matthew (including the warning by his wife), the threefold protestation by Pilate in St. Luke of the innocence of Jesus, and the prolonged discussions between Pilate and the prisoner in St. John, until its final issue in the acts of Pilate.[1]

Parallel therewith is the growing tendency to lay the responsibility for guilt upon the Jews; and it is possible that to this tendency we owe the elaboration of a night meeting of the Sanhedrin, in which the Jewish authorities, with full knowledge of his claims, assume responsibility for the death of Jesus. As regards the place of the night session in the narrative, we notice that it is inserted into the middle of the story of the movements and denial of St. Peter, the foremost disciple, who alone was still in some sense follow-

[1] Cf. *The Apocryphal New Testament*, M. R. James, pp. 94 ff. (Oxford, 1924).

ing. Perhaps we may find here a key to the solution of the problem. It is at the moment of the final desertion of Jesus by his friends, when he is in the hands of his enemies and on the verge of cruel and complete destruction, that he none the less proclaims to the world his office, his nature and his destiny.[1]

We may see here the same motive, the motive of devotion or love for Jesus regarded as the Christ, which has perhaps led to the insertion of the story of the anointing, in the midst of the hostile schemes of the Jewish authorities and Judas, at the outset of the passion narrative, and to the centurion's confession, which we have already considered, at its close.

[1] None the less, the section contradicts what seems to be the fundamental plan of St. Mark's gospel (as set forth in lectures III and IV), according to which the Messiahship of Jesus is a secret, except from a chosen few, until after Jesus' death has taken place. This may be thought by some the most weighty argument against the probability that the section stood in the gospel at the time when it left the author's hands.

VI

THE PASSION NARRATIVE IN ST. MATTHEW AND ST. LUKE

We have now dealt with three important passages in St. Mark's passion narrative, in which, if we are to understand them aright, it is probable that allowance must be made for the influence of interpretation on the history. At the end of the third lecture we considered the events which, according to St. Mark, followed immediately upon the death of Jesus—the rending of the temple veil and the centurion's confession; and in the last lecture we reviewed the difficulties connected with the character of the last supper and with the night session of the Sanhedrin.

Before we pass to the records of the passion in St. Matthew and St. Luke, something must be said with regard to the influence of the Old Testament upon St. Mark's passion narrative, and to the stress there laid, explicitly or implicitly, upon the fulfilment of the Old Testament scriptures. It is not at all easy for us to do justice to this argument from prophecy, as our fathers called it. The difference between our outlook and that of the evangelists has been admirably expressed by Professor Burkitt; it is, in a word, that between them and us stands the whole towering edifice of the doctrinal expression of the Christian faith. "We know," he says, "what Jesus of Nazareth has been to the world; the Evangelist[s] lived in an age which was

only beginning to find out. The argument from Prophecy is ultimately an attempt to show that the Life and Mission of Jesus was no Divine freak or caprice, but a part of a well-ordered whole. To the pious Jew the utterances of the Prophets had very much the same place in their idea of the world as what we call the Laws of Nature have for us: they were things which had been formulated by men, yet they were not constituted by man, but by God. How what we call the Old Testament had acquired this sacred character is another matter, but that it had acquired the character is undisputed. The power of the argument from Prophecy, both the motive force which prompted its use, and its effect upon those who were influenced by it, was that it attempted to legitimatize the gospel History, to show that it was the legitimate outcome of the religion of holy men of old." [1]

This interest in finding the fulfilment of the hope of Israel in Jesus has had a strong influence upon the presentation of the record. We are apt to forget that what happened in the last days at Jerusalem must have seemed to the first disciples so staggering and shocking, that an account of the circumstances themselves would only be tolerable if there was reason to regard them as more than unexplained historical events. Only to those who were convinced, not only that Jesus now lived with the Father, but that the ignominy of the arrest, the delivery to the Gentiles and the horror of the end had taken place in accordance with the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God—only to such could the task of narrating or hearing the events be possible. All those, indeed, who had seen

[1] *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 201 f.

the risen Jesus had reason to believe that what had happened had come to pass according to the will of God; but for the proof of their interpretation they had to look elsewhere; and they found it in their divine library of the Old Testament. In these writings God's will and counsel were made known; and the proclamation of salvation through Jesus consisted, not only or primarily in setting forth a record of his life and death, but even more in showing that the Old Testament scriptures threw light upon and guaranteed the significance of these.

It is not the gospels only which show the importance of the Old Testament in early Christian teaching. We recall the twofold reference to the scriptures in the very early formula quoted by St. Paul in 1 Cor. $15^{3,4}$, "how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures"; where it is possible that the meaning is extremely simple, and that we should express it by the words "as it was destined that he should," without reference to any special verse of scripture; in short, according to the will of God.

This interpretation may be supported by St. Luke's reproduction of certain words ascribed to Jesus at the last supper in St. Mark. In Mk. 14^{21} we read, "The Son of man indeed goeth, *καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ*, as it stands written of him": in St. Luke's parallel, 22^{22}, "The Son of man indeed goeth, *κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον*, as it has been determined."

The same regard for the Old Testament is prominent in many of the speeches in the Acts of the Apostles. It has often been pointed out that these speeches are

not infrequently arranged according to the following scheme: first, proclamation of the salvation which has come in Jesus; secondly, proof from scripture; and thirdly, exhortation to repentance. It is possible that the writer thus shows us the normal structure of the early Christian sermon. The speeches of St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, in the temple after the healing of the lame man, and to Cornelius at Cæsarea, and the speech of St. Paul in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch all show this uniformity of structure; and the appeal to scripture is an essential and central feature of it.

In St. Mark's gospel there are three ways by which attention is drawn to the importance of the Old Testament in the interpretation of the meaning of the passion, or, conversely, to the importance of the events narrated, because of their connexion with the scriptures. In the first place, a general reference may be made to scripture, without a definite citation; this occurs twice in utterances ascribed to Jesus. At the last supper we have the words already quoted, "the Son of man indeed goeth, as it stands written of him" (14^{21}); and in Gethsemane at the time of the arrest, "[this has happened] that the scriptures might be fulfilled" (14^{49}). Secondly, we may find an express quotation; "it stands written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered" (14^{27}); or a quotation without reference to its source. For an example of this we may refer to the only words ascribed by St. Mark to our Lord upon the cross: the opening words of the twenty-second Psalm (15^{34}). And thirdly, there are passages where scripture is not indeed directly mentioned or quoted, but in which it is

more than probable that the writer has the Old Testament in mind. We must all have been impressed with the parallels between St. Mark's passion narrative and certain verses of the 22nd, 31st, and 69th psalms, and perhaps also the 53rd chapter of Isaiah; especially the distribution of the garments, the mocking of the crucified, the offering of vinegar. And we shall not do justice to the purpose of the writer, if we merely consider whether these and like passages in his record are all historical or not. We must ask with what purpose he included them, and how they are designed to confirm the reader, or perhaps rather the worshipper, in his confidence in the divine significance of a terrible event. It is possible that the emphasis on these and similar incidents can be best explained on the assumption, a very reasonable assumption, that long before the Christians had a written passion-gospel of their own, they found support for their beliefs in these written passion-gospels, as we may call them, of the Old Testament scriptures just referred to. And these latter would be, on one side, of much greater value to them than the fragmentary stories of escaping young men or fearful women; for these Old Testament passion narratives were divinely granted and attested: it stood so written. Through them the little worshipping communities might be led to an increasing confidence in the divine significance of what was also a recent historical event. It is conceivable, therefore, that when a Christian passion-gospel finally took shape in writing, it was impossible to pass by certain details which may have been drawn originally from the Old Testament passion narratives, but had by this time, through constant repetition, be-

come inseparably connected with the Christian passion-gospel.[1] They were indeed of special value to it, because they gave the seal of divine approval to the whole. St. Mark's record must always be treated as a gospel, in which the will of God can be discerned, as it was revealed, or believed to be revealed, in scripture.

It may perhaps be felt that, before we leave St. Mark, some more explicit reference should be made to one particular Old Testament quotation in this gospel, the words ascribed at Mk. 15^{34} to our Lord upon the cross. These words, as has been said, form the first sentence of the 22nd psalm, and the question may reasonably be asked, what explanation of them is offered by those who approach St. Mark's gospel along the lines suggested in these lectures? Any attempt to reply to such a question, however, must be prefaced by two considerations. In the first place, we may recall the warning of Dr. R. C. Moberly,[2] when dealing with this saying, namely, that "there are not any words, in the history of the world, whose meaning it would be so little reasonable to attempt, or expect, to exhaust, by any single strain of interpretation whatever"; and secondly, it may be pointed out that our present purpose is not so much to try to explain the meaning of these words, as used by our Lord, if they are rightly ascribed to him, as to understand for what reason and

[1] The importance of this consideration was, I think, first brought before me by reading Dr. M. Dibelius' *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, I, 32 f. (Sammlung Goeschen, 1926).

[2] In his *Atonement and Personality*, pp. 134 f. (London, 1909).

with what purpose they are placed here, in the earliest tradition known to us.

For,[1] from the point of view with which we have approached this gospel, we must exclude at once a common supposition: namely, that in these words the evangelist, in his faithfulness to historical fact, and in spite of every temptation to the contrary, allows us to listen to a final and despairing utterance of Jesus, forsaken by both God and man in his extremity. Such a view assumes a narrator who, interested primarily in historical fact, reports faithfully for posterity a terrible and inexplicable utterance. But all our inquiry has tended to show that there was no narrator of this sort, and the objectivity of this gospel as a whole, in spite of certain possible exceptions, is evidence against it; the passion narrative was written for the strengthening and edification of the Christian communities, not for their bewilderment. We may, indeed, infer that the evangelist attaches great importance to the utterance, since the bystanders at once misunderstand it, seeing very strangely in the word Eloi a reference to Elijah. We are reminded of the frequent misunderstandings of the words of Jesus in St. John, which are always used by the evangelist to emphasize the importance of the word of Jesus thus misunderstood. In the fourth gospel the true meaning of the original saying is often drawn out by a correction of the misunderstanding, and thus explained to those who can receive it.[2] In the

[1] In this passage I have followed closely Dr. M. Dibelius' *Formgeschichte*, p. 194.

[2] Notable examples are Jn. $3^{3\,ff.}$, $4^{10\,ff.,\,32.\,ff.}$, $11^{23\,ff.}$, $14^{4\,ff.}$. Contrast $2^{19\,ff.}$, where no explanation of the hard saying is given to the Jews.

present case, there is no explanation; but the first words of the 22nd psalm are not altogether harrowing, if they are taken in conjunction with the words which immediately follow and explain them, or with the psalm as a whole. It is only when altogether stripped of their context and placed at the centre and climax of the Christian passion narrative that they lend themselves to an unduly painful and literal interpretation. And an evangelist who emphasizes the importance of the utterance, by dwelling at once on the misunderstanding of it by the *hearers*, knows that the *readers* of it—the initiated—will not fail to grasp its purport and significance. For them the words could by no means express the meaning which is sometimes given to them. Such an interpretation would imply an interest in what we may call the mental state of Jesus, which is foreign to this gospel. He who in his extremity is represented as taking on his lips this inspired utterance of Jewish piety, when itself in dire distress, is not to be regarded as having abandoned himself to despair, or even as questioning a Father's will; but rather to be claiming as his own a psalm, in which, taken as a whole, more perhaps than in any other passage of the scriptures, to judge by the use which they have made of it, the Christians found revealed to them the meaning and purpose of the passion.

But it is indeed not surprising that, as the new religion developed, the purpose of the word, if this has been correctly understood, was lost, and therefore it was found too difficult. Its omission from the gospels of St. Luke and St. John can indeed be readily explained, in accordance with the outlook of these

writers; but certain textual phenomena[1] suggest that even in St. Mark it gave offence.

We turn now to consider those features in St. Matthew's story of the passion which reveal his special interests; and here we have the inestimable advantage of being able to compare him with his chief authority, St. Mark.

In the first place, the influence of the thought and language of the Old Testament shows itself even more strongly in St. Matthew's gospel than it does in St. Mark, but the matter need not be further dwelt on. Nor need we consider in detail St. Matthew's larger additions to the passion narrative; the stories of the death of Judas, and of the guard at the tomb. These are generally agreed to be among the latest in the gospel tradition, and it would serve no good purpose to pursue them here. There are in this gospel some smaller additions of the same sort, such as the dream of Pilate's wife, and his handwashing before the multitude. The interesting suggestion[2] has been made that such a story as that of the dream is likely to have been told more fully in the churches. The content of the dream will have been described, but for some reason the evangelist was unwilling to include it here. By the brief mention of the dream itself, he reminds his readers of the story and of the place which it would occupy in the tradition. The same explanation may

[1] There is strong Western authority for the reading "hast thou reproached" instead of "hast thou forsaken." Prof. C. H. Turner, indeed, accepts the former as the original, and the latter as due to assimilation to St. Matthew and the LXX.

[2] See Dr. M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (2nd Edn.), pp. 113, 197.

solve a difficulty in the account of the portents which according to St. Matthew followed on the death of Jesus. Although the tombs are opened forthwith and many bodies of the saints are raised, yet the latter are not seen in Jerusalem until after the resurrection of the Lord. The writer may be recalling very briefly a story of which his readers would possess the details; and he may have involved himself in chronological difficulties through his abbreviation of the narrative.

Much more important for our purpose is the presentation in this gospel of the person of Christ. St. Matthew desires to make it very clear that nothing in the course of the passion comes upon Jesus unexpectedly; he is entirely master of his fate. No better example of this could be given than a comparison of St. Matthew and St. Mark at the opening of their passion narratives. The latter, it will be remembered, runs thus: "Now it was the passover and the unleavened bread after two days: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him with subtilty, and kill him: for they said, Not at feast-time, lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people." Here Jesus takes no part; he is throughout the object, not the subject, of the story; but St. Matthew's reproduction of this passage of St. Mark—for, so far as we know, he has at this point no other source—presents us with a very different version of the matter. "And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these words, he said unto his disciples, Ye know that after two days the passover cometh, and the Son of man is delivered up to be crucified. Then were gathered together the chief priests, and the elders of the people, unto the court

of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas; and they took counsel together that they might take Jesus by subtilty, and kill him. But they said, Not during the feast, lest a tumult arise among the people." It will be noticed that only after Jesus has warned his disciples of "all things that should come upon him," to use the language of St. John in another context,[1] do his enemies consider taking action; and it may be added that their purpose is described in language borrowed textually from the LXX version of psalm 31^{14}, "When they were gathered together against me, they took counsel to take away my life."

And the same tendency is at work in small additions to the narrative throughout. Much as St. Matthew abbreviates St. Mark's five verses of the story of the preparation for the passover, he takes care none the less to insert the words "My time is at hand" (26^{18}), in the message to the owner of the upper room. At the last supper, in the prediction of the betrayal, an addition by St. Matthew at the close removes any possible doubt with regard to the speaker's knowledge of the identity of him of whom he speaks. "And Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said, Is it I, Rabbi? He saith unto him, Thou hast said" (26^{25}). And at the betrayal itself Judas is met with the words, of which the most probable rendering is "Friend, do that for which thou art come" (26^{50}). A moment later, the proffered assistance on the part of the disciples for the sake of their Master is refused, with the reminder that he could at any moment have at his disposal hosts of angels. Most striking of all, perhaps, are St. Matthew's adaptations of his Marcan

[1] Jn. 18^{4}.

authority in connexion with the night meeting of the Sanhedrin. In St. Mark the charge levelled against Jesus, although, as we are told, it could not be substantiated, referred to his utterance that he would destroy "this temple made with hands," and in three days build another made without hands: words which for all their difficulty have not proved unintelligible to Christian piety.[1] In St. Matthew's version, however, the words appear to be meant primarily as an expression of the power of the speaker. "I can destroy the temple of God, and build it in three days." Again, it is probable that in St. Mark the high priest's question about the Messiahship has no direct reference to the temple saying; he is passing to another point. But in St. Matthew the two can be and are probably meant to be connected; the power claimed by Jesus in the temple saying leads the high priest to the thought of the Messiahship. And in the reply of Jesus to the high priest's adjuration, instead of St. Mark's "Ye shall see the Son of man seated at the right hand of the Power," that is, of God, we have now "*from henceforth* ye shall see the Son of man seated at the right hand of the Power."[2] The words have become a declaration, rather than a prophecy. And finally, in the closing verses of this gospel, the risen Jesus reveals himself to the eleven on a mountain in Galilee as one to whom all authority is given, who makes disciples from all nations and is always with his church, until the end. At this last stage, it is true, our original authority is wanting; we do not know how St. Mark described, if he ever did describe, the final

[1] Cf. 2 Cor. 5^1, Jn. 2^{21}.

[2] See the additional note at the end of the lecture.

scenes; possibly St. Matthew did not know. But we are likely to be right in thinking that the final verses of the latter have a typically Matthæan cast, and that in them, as in the others which we have considered, we see the increasing transformation of the early passion story into what was believed to be a revelation of the true Messiah. In this gospel the church is rapidly travelling, in certain respects, doctrinally along the road which issued in the gospel of St. John.

When we turn to St. Luke's passion narrative, we must be prepared for some surprise. St. Luke is not only the most literary of the synoptists; he is also an extremely independent writer. And nowhere is this characteristic more conspicuous than in his story of the passion: so much so, that in this country it is usually believed that he had before him, for this part of his gospel, a special source, which for the most part he prefers to St. Mark. This theory is, I believe, misleading and unnecessary, if once we have understood his method and his purpose.

Like St. Matthew, St. Luke is a witness to the development of the church's interest in the passion narrative; but in his gospel this interest has struck a different path, particularly in regard to his portrait of the person of Christ. And yet, strangely enough, if St. Matthew prepares the way in certain respects doctrinally, for the fourth gospel, St. Luke is even more, although usually in other directions, the herald of St. John.

In the first place, we are conscious in this gospel of a heightened emphasis upon the connexion of Jesus with the capital. Of St. Mark's sixteen chapters

the first nine are occupied with events in or in the neighbourhood of Galilee, and the capital is only mentioned by name in the chapter before that in which it is reached. But as early as the ninth of the twenty-four chapters of St. Luke the Galilean ministry, which began only in the fourth chapter, is ended, and Jesus stedfastly sets his face to go to Jerusalem, the narrative from this point onwards being presented as the story of a journey, a long and almost a triumphal journey, to the goal.

Perhaps it was felt increasingly that the space assigned in St. Mark to the supremely important period at the capital, and above all to the relations of Jesus with the rulers of his church and nation,[1] as opposed to the provincials, was unduly cramped. Unlike St. John, St. Luke does not yet venture to

[1] In Mk. 14^{43}, at the arrest of Jesus in Gethsemane, we read that Judas was accompanied by a crowd with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders. And it is to this crowd that Jesus speaks in Mk. $14^{48, 49}$, "... I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and ye took me not. ..."

At the outset of St. Luke's story of the arrest, Lk. 22^{47}, we are only told that a crowd arrived with Judas; at this point it is not further described. But at Lk. 22^{52} it is stated that the words just quoted were uttered "to the chief priests and captains of the temple and elders, who had come against him." The arrest thus receives a more important setting, and the saying becomes more appropriate, and suitable for St. Luke's purpose; on the other hand, it must be regarded as unlikely that it was the authorities themselves, rather than their emissaries, who came "with swords and staves" and effected the arrest.

In St. John, a "band" of Roman soldiers with their "captain" accompanies the Jewish police, Jn. $18^{3, 12}$.

Insufficient attention seems to have been paid at present to these small differences between the evangelists, for when considered in the mass, they are of importance, and throw much light upon the special interests and purposes of the writers.

burst the bonds of the tradition altogether; he knows of no visit of Jesus to Jerusalem during the ministry other than the last; but he is careful to make the duration of this visit very vague; there is no precise dating by days, such as he found in his authority, St. Mark. If we had St. Luke's account only, we should have no reason to think that the end came within a week of Jesus' arrival in the city. "And he was teaching daily in the temple." "And it came to pass on one of the days, as he was teaching the people in the temple." "And every day he was teaching in the temple." "And the feast of unleavened bread *drew near*, which is called the passover." [1]

It may be the same motive—the growing importance of Jerusalem for the history of the Christian church—which leads St. Luke to confine the manifestations of the risen Jesus to Jerusalem and its immediate neighbourhood. He knows nothing of appearances in Galilee. By a very daring change, the words heard by the women at the tomb, instead of the Marcan "he goeth before you into Galilee," become in St. Luke "remember how he told you, when he was yet in Galilee." [2] The tradition still knows of and must be faithful to a reference at this point to Galilee, but

[1] Lk. 19^{47}, 20^{1}, 21^{37}, 22^{1}. It should also be noticed that the chief priests' question to Jesus, by what authority he did "these things," does not necessarily or even probably refer in St. Luke to the cleansing of the temple, as it certainly does in St. Mark. In St. Luke Jesus is attacked rather for "teaching the people in the temple and preaching the gospel," Lk. 20^{1}.

[2] The reference is now to the three prophecies of the passion, Lk. $9^{22, 44}$, 18^{31-33}. In St. Luke, as in St. Mark, the first two are made to "the disciples," the third to "the twelve."

its significance is changed. The way is thus prepared, not only for the command to the eleven, at the end of this gospel, to "tarry in the city" in preparation for the gift of Pentecost, but also for the first appearance, in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, of the risen Christ himself. This is granted to two disciples, strangely enough outside the circle of the eleven, on the walk to Emmaus, which affords an opportunity for a very full explanation of the riddle of the cross, the solution being found, as always, in a correct understanding of the scriptures.[1]

In the second place, St. Luke's passion narrative, like the rest of his gospel, bears constant traces of his effort to write a connected and consistent narrative. We saw in the last lecture that parts of St. Mark's passion narrative are not by any means coherent. In his opening verses, the authorities decide not to arrest Jesus at feast-time, but owing to the insertion, a little later, of the section dealing with the preparation for the passover, it seems as though in the end this is precisely what they do. St. Luke therefore omits in his preface any reference to the decision not to take action at the feast. "And the feast of unleavened bread, which is called the passover, drew near. And the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might kill him, for they feared the people."[2] Next, when he comes to link the story of the preparations for the passover with the last supper itself, he does so by a most ingenious suture. "And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him. And

[1] Lk. 24^{25-27}. An outline of these verses is, in a sense, already given at Lk. 24^{7}: δεῖ is used here, just as ἔδει there.

[2] Lk. $22^{1,2}$.

he said unto them, With desire I have desired[1] to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." We may almost describe these words as the despair of commentators. They appear to support the view of the preceding verses that the last supper was a passover, and thus serve to bind the narrative together; but at the same time they certainly suggest that our Lord did not partake of it, and in this way they help to explain the absence of any passover reference in the story of the meal itself.

Nowhere, however, do we see St. Luke's appreciation of an ordered narrative more clearly than in his arrangement of the events which followed the arrest of Jesus. In St. Mark, Jesus is led away to the high priest; "and there come together with him all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes. And Peter had followed him afar off, even within, into the court of the high priest: and he was sitting with the officers, and warming himself in the light of the fire." Then we return to the night session of the Sanhedrin, and the two charges brought against the prisoner, concerning the temple and the Messiahship; with these we have already dealt. At the end of the trial, if such it was, and after sentence is passed on the ground of blasphemy, we read of the rough handling of the prisoner. We are then brought back to St. Peter, beneath, in the court,

[1] On the fondness of St. Luke for Hebraistic idioms see J. M. Creed, *op. cit.*, pp. lxxviii. ff. He points out that, although there is no reason to suspect that St. Luke knew Hebrew, yet in his gospel "the Hebraic colouring is more pronounced than in any other book of the New Testament," the Hebraic influence being mediated by the LXX.

and to his threefold denial. Finally, we read that "straightway in the morning the chief priests with the elders and scribes, and the whole council, held a consultation (or, a meeting) and bound Jesus, and carried him away, and delivered him up to Pilate." We are not told the charge which they bring against their prisoner, but we now hear for the first time, and from the lips of Pilate, the expression "the King of the Jews." "And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews?"

St. Luke, however, removes all the roughnesses and difficulties of which we are conscious in St. Mark. Jesus, we read, is brought into the high priest's house, and St. Peter follows afar off. Then immediately we have the story of the denial, so that St. Peter is dealt with in a single section. Next we read of the horse-play to which the prisoner was subjected. This is now the action, not of the magistrates themselves, for they have not yet come together, but of the men in charge of Jesus. Only in the early morning is the meeting held, and its purpose in St. Luke seems to be to formulate a charge to take to Pilate; in any case it is concerned now solely with a single question, the Messiahship and divine origin of Jesus. There is no condemnation to death, as in St. Mark, upon the ground of blasphemy, or indeed on any ground; but our Lord's reply leads at once to the adjournment to Pilate, before whom specific charges are laid against the prisoner. "And they all said, Art thou then the Son of God? And he said unto them, Ye say that I am.[1] And they said, What further need have we of witness? for we ourselves have heard from his

[1] On the meaning of these difficult words see note on p. 149.

own mouth. And the whole company of them rose up, and brought him before Pilate. And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar,[1] and saying that he himself is Messiah,[2] that is, King. And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews?"

This question no longer sounds abrupt, and by his rearrangement of the whole St. Luke has brought it into closest connexion with the earlier trial. But the more closely we study the matter, always with reference to our earliest gospel, the less reason have we to postulate for St. Luke a special source, superior historically to St. Mark. That this is so often done is a fine testimony to St. Luke's literary skill.[3]

[1] It is noticeable that St. Luke must have had this part of the charge in mind and prepared for it, when he wrote Lk. 20^{20}, his introduction to the question about paying tribute to Cæsar. The introduction in Mk. 12^{13} is typically simple—"And they send to him certain of the Pharisees and the Herodians, that they might catch him in talk"—and a study of the section as a whole, in the two gospels, does not suggest that St. Luke had any other authority for it than St. Mark; but the way in which he re-writes St. Mark's opening words is elaborate and represents the question as definitely designed for the formulation of the present charge. "And they watched him, and sent forth spies, who feigned themselves to be righteous, that they might take hold of his speech, so as to deliver him up to the rule and to the authority of the governor."

[2] In the "genuinely Jewish phrase" *χριστὸν βασιλέα*, Prof. Burkitt is inclined to see the use by St. Luke in this context of "a valuable source" (*The Gospel History*, p. 139), just as he is impressed by the use of *τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ* in the high priest's question at the trial, Mk. 14^{61}, and of *ὑμνήσαντες* at the end of the last supper, Mk. 14^{26} (*J.T.S.*, April 1916, p. 294). To the present writer these considerations do not seem decisive.

[3] It should also be noticed how carefully St. Luke has prepared, in

But, in the third place, a much more important feature of St. Luke's passion narrative is the sentiment with which he writes, and his determination to strip his story of all tragedy. His foundation narrative, St. Mark, reads like a tragedy, from first to last; St. Luke's does not; and this, although he is on the whole, as no doubt he had to be, conservative of the tradition.

Let us consider this in reference, first, to the part played by Judas; secondly, to the part played by the remainder of the twelve; and thirdly, to the presentation of the central figure. The tradition which St. Luke had before him was, according to St. Mark, as follows. Judas goes to the chief priests for the purpose of betraying Jesus. The first incident at the last supper is the prediction of the traitor's action. This section in St. Mark is of considerable length, and it ends with the words, "Good were it for that man if he had not been born." We notice also that it precedes [1] the institution of the Eucharist, the presump-

an earlier section of his gospel, for his peculiar version of this part of the passion narrative. In Mk. 10^{33} f., the third and most detailed prediction of the passion, we read, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered to the chief priests and the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles. . . ." St. Matthew (20^{18} f.) follows St. Mark, in the words quoted, exceptionally closely. St. Luke, however, in his parallel (18^{31-33}) omits all reference to a condemnation to death by the Sanhedrin: "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that stand written by the prophets shall be accomplished to the Son of man. For he shall be delivered to the Gentiles . . .", and this is in exact accordance with the passage just quoted in the text, Lk. 22^{70}–23^{36}.

[1] On the twelve "transpositions of St. Mark's order" in St.Luke's passion narrative, see J. C. Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, pp. 80 ff. St.

tion being that Judas is not present at the latter, although this is not stated by St. Mark. Finally, the betrayal itself is also narrated very fully, and the climax is as follows: "Now he that betrayed him had given them a token, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that is he; take him, and lead him away safely. And when he was come, straightway he came to him, and saith, Rabbi: and kissed him much." We may say that the action of Judas is viewed almost as darkly in our earliest as it certainly is in our latest gospel.

St. Luke, on the contrary, while remaining faithful to the tradition, is at pains to show it in a less disastrous light. In the first place, the action of Judas is attributed to another power than his own. Of the synoptists, St. Luke alone writes that Satan entered into Judas and prompted him to the betrayal; and it is perhaps permissible, in the light of St. Luke's general tendency, to interpret the statement as designed to account for, rather than to heighten the offence of Judas.[1]

Luke's transpositions of order are, however, by no means confined to those in his passion narrative. Thus:

With Lk. 4^{5-12} contrast Mt. 4^{8-10}.
With Lk. 6^{12-19} contrast Mk. 3^{7-19a}.
With Lk. $8^{22a, b}$ contrast Mk. $4^{37, 38a}$. (*N.B.* also Mt. 8^{24-26}.)
With Lk. $8^{28, 29a, b}$ contrast Mk. 5^{3b-8}.
With Lk. 8^{51} contrast Mk. $5^{37, 38a}$.
With Lk. $8^{55b, 56}$ contrast Mk. $5^{42, 43}$.
With Lk. $11^{31, 32}$ contrast Mt. $12^{41, 42}$.
With Lk. $17^{1, 2}$ contrast Mt. $18^{6, 7}$.

[1] This is, of course, conjecture only, and the similar terms used in Jn. $13^{2, 27}$ with reference to Judas can easily be quoted against it, since there is no doubt that in the fourth gospel the character of Judas is painted in the blackest colours. It is possible, however, that this is a case, of which several examples could be given, in which St. John uses phraseology resembling that of the third gospel, but we might almost say with an opposite purpose. Cf. p. 87, note 4, and p. 177, note 1.

Secondly, the prediction of the betrayal at the last supper is very much abbreviated; only the central verse is taken from St. Mark; and by his arrangement of the material, St. Luke avoids, as it were, the concentration of the crime on Judas. Above all, the section is placed to *follow* the institution of the Eucharist. "But[1] behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table. For the Son of man indeed goeth, as it hath been determined; but alas for that man through whom he is betrayed! And they began to question among themselves, which of them it was that should do this thing." This subject, however, is not further pursued, and we pass at once to the general contention among the disciples for priority.[2] Finally, the story of the betrayal is once

[1] St. Luke's fondness for πλήν used as a conjunction is remarkable; the numbers are Mt. 5, Lk. 15, Acts 1, subsequent books of the N.T. 6. It is used as a preposition once in St. Mk. (12^{32}), and thrice in Acts (8^{1}, 15^{28}, 27^{22}); not elsewhere in the N.T.

[2] This little section, Lk. 22^{24-27}, recalls strongly Mk. 10^{41-45}, the latter part of the section dealing with the ambitious request of the sons of Zebedee, the whole of which is omitted by St. Luke at that point. In St. Mark the request shows the disciples who make it, in an extremely unfavourable light. It is there the final episode of the great section, Mk. 8^{27}–10^{45}, and the culminating example, in that part of the gospel, of the disciples' obtuseness and inability to understand their Master. For it St. Luke at that point substitutes the single verse, Lk. 18^{34}, "And they understood none of these things; and this saying was hid from them, and they perceived not the things that were said" —with reference to the third prediction of the passion.

Two points should be noticed in connexion with St. Luke's reproduction of the last part of Mk. 10^{35-45} at the last supper, Lk. 22^{24-27}.

First, it is in accordance with the tendency to remove any doctrine of atonement from this gospel, that St. Luke prefers Lk. 22^{27}, "I am in the midst of you as he that serveth," to the words found in Mk. 10^{45}. It must, however, be recognized that St. Luke's

more extremely short. And Judas does not kiss Jesus. As he advances towards him to do so, he is checked by what is perhaps meant as a gentle, dignified remonstrance. "While he yet spake, behold, a multitude, and he that was called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them: and he drew near unto Jesus to kiss him. But Jesus said unto him, Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?"

Still more striking is St. Luke's determination to minimize the failure of the rest. According to St. Mark, Jesus predicts this failure as he goes with them after the supper towards the mount of Olives; and in answer to St. Peter's indignant protestation, the threefold denial is prophesied. St. Peter protests the more: "If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee. And in like manner also said they all." But immediately after the arrest, according to the same authority, "they all forsook him and fled."

All this is omitted by St. Luke, and in its place, at the last supper, in closest connexion with the rest of the conversation at that meal, we are given a narrative which, while true to the essential facts, goes far to take away their sting.[1] Responsibility is once more removed,

version is not altogether appropriate here, since the Lord is at the moment himself reclining with the rest, Lk. 22^{14}. Secondly, in Mk. $10^{43, 44}$ service is enjoined as the way to greatness; in Lk. 22^{26} those who are already in the position of leaders are bidden to become like their subordinates, in virtue of the example of Jesus.

[1] St. Luke's arrangement of the conversation of our Lord with the twelve at the last supper has been very carefully made, and will repay close study. It will be remembered that in St. Mark, as in St. Matthew, no conversation at the meal is recorded, except in connexion with the two sections—perhaps originally independent—which deal with the prediction of the betrayal and the institution of the Eucharist respectively. The assumption in the text above is that St. Luke was

so far as may be, from the human agents, and the story, if carefully studied, reveals itself rather as a promise of ultimate victory after passing failure, especially for St. Peter, than as one, like its Marcan original, of complete collapse. " Simon, Simon, Satan asked to have you (plural), that he might sift you (plural) as wheat: but I made supplication for thee, that thy

bound by the strength of the tradition to record at this point, in some form or other, the contents of these two sections. He seems, however, to think it desirable to include also important aspects of the teaching of Jesus, in connexion with this meal, and he may thus be regarded as preparing the way for the long discourses, containing some of the deepest and most intimate teaching of Jesus, on the same occasion, in St. John.

It has already been pointed out that the prediction of the betrayal is placed by St. Luke *after* the distribution of the wine and bread, that it is not dwelt on, and that we pass at once to the *general* struggle among the twelve for precedence. This is checked by reference to the example of their Master, but almost immediately the highest possible prospects are held out to them unasked (contrast Mk. $10^{35 \text{ ff.}}$), and apparently to all the twelve, for their consistent adherence to him. Lk. $22^{29, 30}$ should be compared with Mt. 19^{28}, and cf. Creed *ad loc.*

The prophecy of the denial is dealt with in the text. By placing it at the meal, rather than on the way to Gethsemane as do St. Mark and St. Matthew, St. Luke shows the same desire to soften the severity of the Lord's sayings as in the earlier chapters of the gospel, where some of his sternest criticisms are passed upon the Pharisees, and sometimes indeed the host himself, on the occasion of a meal, e.g. 5^{29-39}, 7^{36-46}, 11^{37-52}, 14^{1-24}. This procedure often stands in sharp contrast to the settings adopted for such sayings in St. Matthew. St. Luke perhaps considered that in this way the indictments were robbed in some measure of their sting.

As regards the very difficult verses, Lk. 22^{35-38}, famous above all for the saying about the two swords, possibly the least unsatisfactory explanation hitherto put forward is that they are partly designed, as used in their present context, to account for the use of a sword by a disciple shortly afterwards at the arrest. Lk. 22^{49} is peculiar to this gospel.

faith fail not: and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren. And he said unto him, Lord, with thee I am ready to go both to prison and to death.[1] And he said, I tell thee, Peter,[2] the cock shall not crow this day, until thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me." [3]

But nowhere is St. Luke's aversion from tragedy more clearly shown than in his delineation of the central figure. The gentleness which above all else appeals to the *scriba mansuetudinis Christi* [4] has led him to deprive our Lord of almost all the fire and passion which it is often thought are still discernible in St. Mark. St. Luke's portrait in the passion story is that of the suffering but faithful servant of God, we may even say, the martyr. It is altogether fitting that the only quotation ascribed to our Lord from Isaiah 53, the last and greatest of the suffering servant passages, should occur in the passion narrative of St. Luke: " and he was reckoned with transgressors." [5]

[1] These words are most signal evidence of St. Luke's desire to remove the sting, as far as possible, from St. Peter's failure. In place of the Marcan " Although all shall be offended, yet will not I," followed by the vehement " If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee," we have in Lk. 22^{33} this single and much quieter statement, *describing precisely what St. Peter* (according to Acts $4^{1\,ff.}$, $5^{17\,ff.}$; $12^{1\,ff.}$ and tradition) *did later actually undergo*, after his temporary lapse.

[2] This is the only passage in the gospels where our Lord addresses St. Peter in the vocative by any other name than Simon.

[3] It has often been remarked that St. Luke palliates the disciples' conduct in Gethsemane (although he does not thus name the place himself) by representing them as " sleeping *for sorrow*." There is also no special choice of the three at this point in St. Luke, nor any command to them to watch, followed by a rebuke for their failure to do so.

[4] As St. Luke is called by Dante (*De Monarchia*, Bk. I).

[5] Lk. 22^{37}; cf. Is. 53^{12}.

Our Lord in St. Luke is one who, when beset by the forces of evil, shows by his patient endurance and forgiveness a perfect pattern of the blameless life, which finds its hope and confidence in God. The narrative of the withdrawal before the passion, in this gospel, still includes the dedication of a Son to his Father's will; but, with St. Luke alone before us, we should have no reason to think that this self-dedication was achieved slowly and hardly, at infinite cost. It would be to us only a notable example of our Lord's constant habit of prayer, so strongly emphasized by this evangelist. If the shorter reading in this passage is right, there is no trace of what is called the agony. There is no threefold withdrawal, no wrestling in prayer, no appeal for human sympathy. It is made clear that any reference to temptation must apply only to disciples; and all trace of mental and physical distress on the part of our Lord is removed.

For the same reason the arrest in St. Luke does not take place, as it does in Mk. 14^{41}, because the "hour" of Jesus has come, for the fulfilment of his destiny, the salvation of men, in obedience to the will of God; rather, it is the hour of his enemies[1] and the power of darkness, when for a time they work their will upon him.

[1] It may safely be said that this conception is peculiar to the third gospel. In Mk. 14^{35}, although our Lord there prays that if possible the hour may pass away from him, the hour itself belongs to God and can be disposed of, as God wills. And in St. John's gospel, so far from the hour belonging to the enemies of Jesus (in spite of Jn. 14^{30}), it is repeatedly dwelt on as his hour, in and by which he is glorified, Jn. 12^{28}, 13^{1}, 17^{1}.

It has been suggested to me by a friend that we should see in Lk. 4^{13} "the devil . . . departed from him (Jesus) until a season" a forward reference to Lk. 22^{53b}. See p. 65 f.

Nor are we conscious, in the closing scenes in St. Luke, of a sorrow and a dereliction, of which the best explanation is given in silence by the facts themselves. In this gospel the veil of reserve is sometimes almost drawn away. Attention is constantly drawn to the impression made by the bearing of the prisoner upon friend and foe alike. The Lord turns and looks upon St. Peter in the moment of denial. Pilate three times avows that he can find no fault in Jesus. According to the usual reading our Lord, like the martyr St. Stephen, prays for his murderers. To the fellow-sufferer who acknowledges him he promises a share with himself in the blessed lot of the martyrs; he dies with an expression of confidence in God upon his lips, and thereby by his patience convinces the Roman officer of his blameless life; he does not *convert* him.[1]

In St. Mark there is no sympathy, no trace of succour, human or divine, and no one dares to pity Jesus. Indeed, in St. Matthew "all the people" accept responsibility for what is done, and invoke destiny upon themselves and their descendants. But in St. Luke a great multitude of the people follows Jesus to the crucifixion, and the women bewail and lament him. And at the close these same people return, smiting their breasts, owing to the impression which the things they had witnessed made upon them.

The conception is throughout consistent, and is best accounted for, not by the use of a second, special source, which the evangelist preferred in this part of his narrative (presumably on account of its historical value) to his Marcan authority, but by the peculiar

[1] Lk. 23^{47}, "Certainly this was a righteous man." Contrast Mk. 15^{39}, "Truly this man was Son of God."

sympathies and purpose of the author. The future, however, did not lie with him; he stands alone among the gospel writers in his interpretation of the passion. It is very noteworthy and remarkable that the last and greatest of the four evangelists, for all his debt, as it seems, to the gospel of St. Luke, constantly takes care to correct his doctrinal assumptions, and thereby returns much nearer to the prototype, St. Mark.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

St. Mark. 14^{60-62} and its parallels

The question or questions put to our Lord at the meeting of the Sanhedrin, and his replies, need careful study in the different versions of the synoptists.

1. It will be noticed that in Mk. 14^{61}, as in Mt. 26^{63}, the high priest in his question couples together the two expressions "the Christ, the Son of God" (although St. Mark's version by a periphrasis avoids the use of the divine Name). This remarkable combination, the former as characteristic of Jewish as the latter is of Gentile Christianity, occurs elsewhere in the gospels only at Mt. 16^{16}, Mk. 1^{1}, Jn. 11^{27}, 20^{31}, all of which are very important passages. Cf. also Mt. 27^{40-43}, Jn. $1^{41.\ 49}$.

2. In St. Mark the question receives, contrary to our Lord's usual custom, a direct and explicit reply in the affirmative, followed by a prophecy of the event which is to justify the claim thus made.

In St. Matthew, on the other hand, our Lord's reply runs, "Thou hast said [see note on p. 149]: howbeit I say unto you, From henceforth ye shall see. . . ." The first part of the reply is here less direct and explicit; and it is followed, not so much by a prophecy, as by a declaration which seems to mean that the speaker, in his character of Son of man, will be seen in glory by his hearers almost if not quite immediately.

It is remarkable that the difficult phrase ἀπ' ἄρτι, "from henceforth," is found also in Mt. 26^{29}, "I will not drink from

henceforth of this fruit of the vine." Elsewhere in the N.T. only Mt. 23^{39}, Jn. 13^{19}, 14^{7}, Rev. 14^{13}.

3. In St. Luke (who omits all reference to the false witnesses and the temple charge, Mk. 14^{56-59}) there is considerable amplification, and his version must be set forth in full.

" And as soon as it was day, the assembly of the elders of the people was gathered together, both chief priests and scribes; and they led him away into their council, saying, If thou art the Christ, tell us.

" But he said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I ask, ye will not answer. But from the present time the Son of man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God.

" And they all said, Art thou then the Son of God ?

" And he said unto them, Ye say that I am [or, Do ye say that I am ?]."

The questions about Messiahship and divine Sonship are now separated, and receive different treatment. The first question, about Messiahship, and the first part of our Lord's reply to it, strongly recall Jn. $10^{24, 25}$, and indeed the atmosphere of the fourth gospel generally, e.g. 8^{39-59}, 9^{13-34}, 10^{32-34}.

The second part of the reply states that, in spite of his hearers' disbelief, " from the present time the Son of man thall be seated at the right hand of the power of God." (By the addition of the words " of God " St. Luke as it were hellenizes his Marcan original, in which " the right hand of the Power " is a Jewish periphrasis for " the right hand of God.")

The remarkable expression *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*, " from the present time," occurs five times in St. Luke, 1^{48}, 5^{10}, 12^{52}, 22^{18} and here; elsewhere in the N.T. only at [Jn. 8^{11}], Acts 18^{6}, 2 Cor. 5^{16}; and just as St. Matthew uses his *ἀπ' ἄρτι* both here and in the saying of Jesus, referred to above, at the last supper, so St. Luke uses his *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* both here and in his version of that saying, " I say unto you, I will not drink from the present time of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come," Lk. 22^{18}.

It seems clear that both evangelists saw a vital connexion between the divine office and authority of Jesus referred to in

the present context, and his death, which is the subject of the other saying, the Lucan version of which has just been quoted.

4. We may thus be enabled, by a comparison of these three accounts, to trace a steady and consistent development in the beliefs of the early church about the person and office of its Master.

In the Marcan record we already find an explicit claim to Messiahship. This, however, will only be *demonstrated* hereafter, and the event which is to manifest it is entirely future. Jesus is indeed Messiah, but he is not now Messiah in glory.

In St. Matthew the office of Messiah is accepted, but its exercise is no longer wholly future; it is in some sense already being manifested, and can or should be recognized as such. In other words, the idea and meaning of Messiahship are undergoing radical transformation in the minds and at the hands of the Christians.

In St. Luke matters have advanced still farther. Emphasis is now laid upon the unbelief of the enemies of Jesus, who none the less from that moment is invested with divine authority. We seem here to be on the threshold of the doctrine of the fourth gospel, according to which Jesus is unchangeably Messiah and at all times manifests his glory as the Son of God, 1^{14}, and may be always known as such (except by his enemies, 5^{44}, $12^{39\text{-}41}$), although the nature and character of his office and person is shown, above all, in and by his death; cf. Jn. 8^{28}, $12^{31\text{-}36}$, $13^{31, 32}$.

VII

THE REJECTION IN THE PATRIS

In the last two lectures we have reviewed the story of the passion in our first three gospels, considering the principal difficulties connected with it, and trying to distinguish the motives by which the evangelists respectively were influenced. We chose this section of the narrative, partly because the passion story may possibly have taken shape as a connected whole earlier than any other section of the gospels, and partly because, whether from this cause or not, there is a closer measure of agreement in the structure and order of this part of all the four gospels than we find elsewhere. Our greatest difficulty was in connexion with St. Mark, because he is our primary authority, and therefore we cannot go with any confidence behind him, although we found reason to believe, owing to certain internal contradictions in his story, as well as for other reasons, that his narrative also is made up from older sources.

St. Matthew follows his predecessor St. Mark extremely closely, and as far as we could see, has no other source of value. His special material seems to consist either of traditions of late origin, or of slight but important additions to the Marcan narrative, which can be accounted for on doctrinal or apologetic grounds.

St. Luke's procedure was found to be very different from St. Matthew's. Not only is he the most literary

of the four evangelists, but he definitely aspires to write a history, and thereby to commend his theme to educated men and women generally. In his gospel we see the new faith coming out, as it were, into the world, and making a strong bid and plea for its allegiance. To St. Luke, therefore, the meagreness, roughness and contradictions of the Marcan narrative —the very features which lead us at the present time to assign to it, historically, a peculiarly high value— were especially distasteful, and in the final section of his gospel, even more than elsewhere, he has set himself to efface them and to produce a satisfying record. And so well has he performed his task, that it is widely believed, especially in this country, that he had for the story of the passion, in addition to his Marcan source, not merely isolated traditions here and there, the historical value of which may be variously judged, but an altogether different source, to which he assigned a specially high value, for the most part preferring it to St. Mark. It was maintained in the last lecture that this assumption is both misleading and unnecessary, and that St. Luke's method and procedure can best be accounted for as the work of a peculiarly skilled artist, who, although indeed feeling himself bound to reproduce the main features and outlines of the received tradition, yet was concerned to stamp it with the coherence, the doctrine and the sentiments which especially appealed to him. It was maintained further that so far from St. Luke's orderly and polished *literary* narrative being a presumption in favour of the superior *historical* character of his information, it only throws into a clearer light the very great value, for the historian, of the Marcan source, and the extreme difficulty

encountered by our earliest evangelist, St. Mark, in producing any connected historical narrative at all.

We have now to inquire whether St. Luke has pursued the same method elsewhere in his gospel, and if so, to what extent. Our best course at the moment, in considering this problem, will be to select some particular passage in St. Luke's account of the ministry, where his narrative is probably connected in some way with a similar passage in St. Mark, but also differs greatly from it, and, in addition, is placed in an entirely different setting. There are at least four such passages[1] in this gospel, and for our present purpose it will be convenient if we choose the story usually known as the rejection of our Lord at Nazareth. And, indeed, it is as remarkable as any of the passages which could be chosen, with the possible exception of the story of the anointing of our Lord.

St. Mark's story of the unfavourable reception of Jesus, or, as we might conversely describe it, of his lack of success, on his visit to his native place or πατρίς —for the word Nazareth does not occur in this context in St. Mark[2]—is found in the sixth chapter of his gospel, immediately after the story of the raising of the daughter of Jairus, which is the only story of its kind in St. Mark, and the third of the great acts of power

[1] Lk. 4^{16-30}, the rejection at Nazareth; cf. Mk. 6^{1-6a}. Lk. 5^{1-11}, the call of St. Peter; cf. Mk. 1^{16-20}. Lk. 7^{36-50}, the anointing of Jesus; cf. Mk. 14^{3-9}. Lk. 10^{25-37}, the two commandments; cf. Mk. 12^{28-34}.

[2] In St. Mark's gospel it only occurs at 1^{9}; Jesus goes from Nazareth to John's baptism.

The form Ναζαρά only occurs Mt. 4^{13} and Lk. 4^{16}, and this may be evidence that Q had a reference in this form to Nazareth at this point.

recorded of Jesus at this point in this gospel. It is followed, after the account of the mission of the twelve, and of the charge which they receive, by a reference to the interest aroused in the local tetrarch,[1] Herod Antipas, owing to the increasing fame of Jesus, a reference which seems to mark the beginning of the end of the ministry in Galilee.

The six verses[2] devoted to the story of the rejection are characterized at first sight by extreme simplicity. The people of the place "were caused to stumble," so we read, in Jesus, apparently because they regard him as one of themselves; they know his occupation and the members of his family; and they cannot account for the wisdom given to him, which has just been shown by his teaching on the sabbath in the synagogue, and, according to the present text,[3] for his acts of power, the news of which, we must suppose, has reached them. The situation is met by our Lord, in the saying which forms the climax of the incident, with the enunciation of a truth of general application, just as one of his sayings, preserved in the Oxyrhynchus papyri,[4] runs thus: "A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither does a physician perform cures on those who know him"; and the story in St. Mark ends sadly, with a reference to the inability of Jesus to do

[1] Called "king," as no doubt he may have been known locally, at Mk. 6^{14}; but the more correct title is given in the parallels, Mt. 14^{1} Lk. 9^{7}. St. Matthew, however, returns to "king" at 14^{9}.

[2] Mk. 6^{1-6a}.

[3] On the possibility that the original Marcan text had a reference at this point only to the wisdom of Jesus, and not also to his acts of power, see M. Goguel, "Le rejet de Jésus à Nazareth," *Zeitschrift für N.T. Wissenschaft*, 1911, pp. 321 ff.

[4] Oxyrh. log. 6, ed. Grenfell and Hunt, 1897.

any great acts of beneficence among his own people, and to his surprise at what is termed their unbelief.

"And he went out from thence; and he cometh into his own country; and his disciples follow him. And when the sabbath was come, he began to teach in the synagogue: and many[1] hearing him were astonished, saying, Whence hath this man these things? and, What is the wisdom given to this man, and such acts of power wrought by his hands? Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James and Joseph and Jude and Simon? And are not his sisters here with us? And they were caused to stumble in him. And Jesus said to them, A prophet is not without honour, except in his own country, and among his own kinsmen, and in his own house. And he could there do no act of power, except that he laid his hands upon a few that were sick and healed them; and he marvelled because of their unbelief."

This is the last appearance of Jesus in the synagogue in St. Mark; but curiously enough, the opening words of the story bear a remarkable resemblance to that of his first appearance in it. We read in the first chapter, of Jesus and his first four disciples, whom he has just called, "And they go into Capernaum; and straightway on the sabbath day he went to synagogue and taught. And the people were astonished at his teaching. . . ." and so forth.[2] It will be remembered, further, that on that occasion witness was at once given to the superhuman character of Jesus by the only person present who was in a position to perceive it, the man in the possession of an unclean spirit, who

[1] Or, reading οἱ πολλοί, "the more part."

[2] On this passage, Mk. 1^{21-27}, see pp. 68 f.

testified also to the *purpose* of the coming of Jesus: the truth of his insight being demonstrated forthwith, in the expulsion of the demon. "And straightway there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying, What have we in common with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? thou art come to destroy us: I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God."

On the present occasion, however, the tendency is all the other way. The wisdom of the teaching, and the acts of power are admitted; but now they only cause resentment, and every effort is made to belittle the significance of Jesus. Attention may be called to one of the titles here applied to him, the significance of which is often missed. Owing to the wealth of devotion which has been poured into the words "the son of Mary," it is not often realized that the expression only occurs here in the New Testament, and that, as used by the people of Jesus' acquaintance, it is most unnatural, and was presumably meant to be derogatory in the highest possible degree. No man in the East, whether his father were living or not, would be known familiarly by reference to his mother.[1] He might be known by reference to his father, just as our Lord is referred to, both in St. Luke's and in St. John's gospel,[2] by the title "son of Joseph"; and she might be known by reference to her son, just as we read "the mother of Jesus," in St. John[3]; but he could not be known, except presumably with purpose to insult, by reference to his mother. It is not sur-

[1] I am indebted for help at this point to the Rev. E. F. F. Bishop, of the C.M.S., Jerusalem.

[2] Lk. 4^{22}; cf. 3^{23}. Jn. 1^{45}, 6^{42}. [3] Jn. $2^{1,3}$; cf. Acts. 1^{14}.

prising that instead of St. Mark's "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" we find in St. Matthew, "Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary?"[1]

We see, therefore, that although the first and the last stories in St. Mark of the appearance of Jesus in the synagogues of Galilee are closely similar in their beginnings, they continue on wholly different lines. We must therefore ask whether the position of the latter story in St. Mark is altogether accidental, or whether, utterly topical and incidental as it may seem to be, yet, placed where it is, just before the drawing to a close of the Galilean ministry in St. Mark, it is not designed to symbolize something much more important than the rejection of a teacher, who has become famous, by those of his own village, because they have known him from a child.[2]

[1] Mt. 13^{55}. Origen (*c. Celsum*, VI, 36) states, however, that "nowhere in the gospels circulated in the churches is Jesus himself described as a carpenter." This, together with the strange omission, discussed in the text, of any reference to St. Joseph, has led some commentators to suppose that the original reading in Mk. 6^{3} was ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱὸς καὶ Μαρίας (so the Ferrar group and others), which has been altered for dogmatic reasons to the present text. But if so, why has the text of Mt. 13^{55} and similar passages remained unaltered?

[2] It should be added that, when the story of Mk. 6^{1-6a} is carefully examined, it is found to be by no means free from difficulty. In the first place, no real explanation is given for the change from the astonishment of verse 2 to the "offence" of verse 3. For all that appears to the contrary, the astonishment might equally well have been followed by admiration and regard. Secondly, verse 5 seems to contain a contradiction. It starts by saying that Jesus could there do no single mighty work, but none the less refers at once to certain acts of healing. It is possible that the verse originally ran, "And he could there do no single mighty work because of their unbelief." And finally we may ask what it could have been, at this stage of the ministry

If the views which we have been considering of the origin and composition of St. Mark's gospel are on the whole correct, it may be doubted whether, at the time when St. Mark wrote, an evangelist was in a position to attempt an entirely coherent and systematic presentation of the gospel-story ; the material before him was altogether too fluid and too inchoate. Only when we reach St. John's gospel do we find a completely developed construction, as we may call it, of the ministry, in which all the component parts are carefully and elaborately set forth in reference to one central theme. But it is possible that the explicit teaching and careful arrangement of our latest gospel may help us to understand the first attempts at these in St. Mark, and to see a meaning and purpose, which would otherwise be quite beyond us, at a very much earlier stage of the tradition; so that what is unquestionably present in a developed form in St. John, may already show signs of its presence, in a far more primitive and tentative fashion, in St. Mark.

In St. John's gospel, it will be remembered, the ministry is arranged upon a background of seven signs,[1]

according to St. Mark, in which his kinsfolk "disbelieved." This question may be answered by understanding belief here to denote the regard and honour (verse 4) due to the presence of a prophet. If, however, we consider the associations of *σκάνδαλον* and *σκανδαλίζω* (cf. Rom. 9^{33}, 1 Cor. 1^{23}) and of *ἀπιστία* (cf. Rom. 3^{3}, 11^{20}) in the apostolic church, it must remain a possibility that this story of rejection is as it were a dramatization, applied to Jesus himself, of the truth implied in the saying of verse 4. "His mother and his brethren" have been dealt with at $3^{31\,ff.}$, and are regarded as no longer present; "his sisters" are assumed to be still in the *πατρίς*.

[1] Jn. 2^{1-11}, the water made wine at Cana of Galilee; 4^{46-54}, cure of the nobleman's son at Capernaum; 5^{2-9}, cure of the sick man at the pool of Bethesda; 6^{1-14}, the feeding of the multitude; 6^{16-21}, the walking

which are so set forth as to throw an ever-increasing light upon the person and significance of the central figure. In the last and greatest of these signs, the raising of Lazarus at Bethany, Jesus is shown in his highest manifestation, as being himself the resurrection and the life; and it is this sign which is represented in this gospel as making the Jews resolve finally upon his death. We read in St. John that on hearing of what has happened at Bethany, the chief priests and the Pharisees gather a council and consider what line of action they must take. And the story goes on to say that, after hearing the advice of Caiaphas, who was high priest that year, "from that day forth they took counsel that they might put him to death." In this gospel, therefore, the restored *life* of Lazarus leads directly to the *death* of Jesus. The latter is finally rejected by the Jews, when and because he is seen to be the life itself.[1]

on the sea; 9^{1-7}, bestowal of sight on the man born blind; 11^{1-44}, the raising of Lazarus.

A good case may be made out for the view that chapter 6 should precede chapter 5. In that case the last three signs reveal a gradually increasing significance. In the fifth, one who has suffered for thirty-eight years is cured; in the sixth, a man born blind receives sight; in the seventh, death is changed into life.

The question has sometimes been raised, whether the enumeration of seven signs is intentional, and it has even been asserted that 6^{16-21} does not narrate a "sign" at all. It is true that the word "sign" is not actually applied to each of the seven cases cited above; but I do not think that the matter is really doubtful. We may compare the way in which seven different predicates are asserted of our Lord in St. John, in sentences beginning "I am . . .," 6^{35}, 8^{12}, $10^{7, 11}$, 11^{25}, 14^{6}, 15^{1}.

[1] This sentence is possibly too definite, in so far as the revelation to Martha, 11^{20-27}, is and no doubt is meant to be secret; cf. 11^{28}. It is a conspicuous truth of the fourth gospel that a certain quality

And it is perhaps just possible to trace very faint signs of the same tendency of interpretation at the much earlier stage of the tradition which we find in St. Mark, with regard to the end of the Galilean ministry of Jesus. It may conceivably be deliberate, that the story of the rejection of Jesus, or of his lack of success among his own countrymen, is placed in this gospel immediately after the narration of three acts of power, in the last and greatest of which our Lord is portrayed as being, if not himself the life, at least the giver of it. It may be that in the story, which lay ready to his hand, of the lack of success of Jesus in " his own country," the evangelist sees the symbol and explanation of his lack of success also in the larger world of Galilee, and perhaps even of Israel itself.

In any case, support for the belief that the setting of such a story as this within the framework of the gospel narrative is itself not without importance, may be found in the very slightly different [1] but almost certainly significant place assigned to this same story in St. Matthew.

It is well known that this evangelist, in the first half of his gospel, shows a special interest in the arrangement of his material, which he tends to dis-

of heart and mind is necessary, in order to perceive and understand religious truth. " God is spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth," 4^{24}. This quality " the Jews " do not (12^{37}) and cannot (12^{39}) possess. The sentence, however, may stand, since the words are probably true as regards the impression which the evangelist wishes his *readers* to receive.

[1] The chief difference between St. Mark and St. Matthew as regards the setting of this story (Mk. 6^{1-6a}, Mt. 13^{53-58}) is that in St. Mark it is followed by the mission of the twelve, whereas this latter is placed by St. Matthew at an earlier stage, in chapter 10.

pose in groups, each of these being devoted to a single theme. It is chiefly for this reason that the order of events in the first half of his gospel is so different from that which we find in his chief authority, St. Mark. But, strangely enough, after the thirteenth chapter what we may almost call his passion for rearrangement ceases, with the mention, at the beginning of chapter 14, of the interest aroused in Herod Antipas by Jesus; and thereafter he remains strictly faithful to the order of his Marcan source. From this point, for whatever reason, his interest in rearrangement seems to have exhausted itself.

We noticed, a moment ago, that St. Mark was probably not yet sufficiently master of the sayings and incidents at his disposal to attempt a fully systematic presentation of them[1]; but such a presentation is the aim which, as regards the Galilean ministry, St. Matthew set before himself; and he has been remarkably successful.[2] The result of his rearrangement in the chapters devoted to it is as follows. At the outset of the ministry, we are given, in chapters 5 to 7, a great collection of the sayings of Jesus, these being regarded for the most part as a new law, and delivered, like the law of Moses, from a mountain. These *words*

[1] The nearest approach to it is in Mk. 8^{27}–10^{45}, where an attempt is made to explain the meaning of the coming passion in connexion with the doctrine of the Son of man.

[2] We may compare his masterly arrangement of his material in chapters 23–25, immediately before his passion narrative. In chapter 23 we are given the overwhelming denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees (these representing to St. Matthew the Jewish church of his own time); in chapter 24 the prophecy of the parousia, regarded as most imminent; and in chapter 25 three parables of the kingdom of heaven, in connexion with the previous prophecy of the parousia.

of Jesus are followed, in chapters 8 and 9, by a selection from his *deeds*, this section being almost entirely[1] devoted to the stories of ten acts of power. The way having been thus prepared by the words and deeds of Jesus himself, the twelve apostles are sent forth on their mission, and in chapter 10 the charge which they receive is given. Chapters 11 and 12 describe the reception given to the words and deeds of Jesus; and it is important to observe that this reception is represented as having been almost uniformly unfavourable. Satan by no means falls as lightning from heaven,[2] in St. Matthew. It is in these chapters that we find the contemporaries of Jesus compared to sulky children sitting in the market-place; the woes upon the cities which had seen his mighty works, but had remained unmoved; the controversies with the Pharisees about the sabbath; the repudiation of the charge of alliance with Beelzebul.

Thus far, therefore, Jesus has taught by word and deed, and his followers have been commissioned; but the response which he has met has been extremely disappointing. The truths which he has brought have been hidden from the wise and understanding, and have been revealed to babes.[3] Accordingly, it is not surprising that the first part of chapter 13 is given up to seven parables, the necessity for this method of teaching being found, in accordance with the peculiar theory of the evangelist, in the wilful and deliberate

[1] In Mt. 8^{1}–9^{34}, the section in question, comprising sixty-eight verses in all, only thirteen of these, $8^{19\text{-}22}$, $9^{9\text{-}17}$, are not concerned with acts of power. Sir John Hawkins, in the *Exp. Times*, July 1901, indicates reasons why these thirteen verses may have been included in the section. [2] Lk. 10^{18}. [3] Mt. 11^{25}.

blindness of the hearers; and a sharp distinction is drawn between them and the disciples. Only the eyes of the latter are blessed, for they see; and their ears, for they hear; and they only receive the explanations of the parables.[1]

[1] Two points of interest emerge from a comparison of the Marcan and Matthæan narratives at this point.

(*a*) St. Matthew omits the rebuke of the disciples, which is implied in Mk. 4^{13}, "And he saith unto them, Know ye not this parable? and how shall ye know the remaining parables?" So far as disciples are concerned, Mt. 13^{10-17} contains nothing but words of commendation and encouragement; and they are very sharply distinguished from the other hearers.

(*b*) The ἵνα in Mk. 4^{12} becomes ὅτι in Mt. 13^{13}. It is often suggested that St. Matthew is likely to be the more original here, on the ground that teaching by parable *because of* men's spiritual blindness and dullness, and therefore presumably with the object of removing it, is more in accordance with "the mind of Christ" than teaching by parable, *in order to produce* such blindness.

Such an interpretation, however, runs counter not only to the context, Mt. 13^{10-17}, if this is carefully studied—notice especially St. Matthew's introduction of Mt. 13^{12} at this point—but also to the whole tendency of this gospel, in which the Jews are regarded as deliberately and of their own will rejecting Jesus; cf., above all, Mt. 27^{25}, "And all the people answered and said, His blood be on us, and on our children." In Mk. 4 teaching is given by parable because of the divine purpose, just as the Messiahship passes unrecognized for the same reason; in Mt. 13 teaching is given by parable as a punishment for unbelief and refusal to repent.

It should be added that the same motive, referred to above, has led to attempts to translate ἵνα in Mk. 4^{12} "because," and μήποτε "perhaps," "it may be that"; and support may be found for both these renderings, strange as they are. Without going outside the N.T., Jn. 8^{56} may serve as an example for this use of ἵνα, and Mt. 25^{9} for this use of μήποτε, although this latter is here followed by οὐ μή.

But these attempts are in the last resort governed by the desire to explain or explain away a difficult passage, and if the more usual renderings are in accordance with the evangelist's general outlook, those renderings should be allowed to stand.

Thus there now remains only one more incident to be recorded, according to St. Matthew's great scheme of rearrangement in these chapters; after it, at the beginning of his fourteenth chapter, he takes up anew the order of his Marcan source, and thereafter follows it unswervingly; but it can hardly be an accident that the incident which has thus been selected to be kept back till the end, in order to be presented as the climax of the rearrangement and therefore of the Galilean ministry itself, is the incident which we have been considering, the rejection of Jesus in his native place, which is here presented in its sternest form. Our Lord is depicted in St. Matthew as deliberately restricting his acts of power among his own people in consequence of and almost as a punishment for unbelief; the story ends in this gospel "And he did not many acts of power there because of their unbelief."

The impression given is that a great summons and offer has been made to the contemporaries of Jesus in Galilee, and they have almost all rejected it, so that their last state is worse than the first.[1] And this would be in accordance with the general teaching of the writer. He is more deeply concerned with what he regards as the tragedy of the rejection of the gospel by the Jew, than with the joy of its reception by the Gentile, and this gives his book an extremely sombre tone. Apart from the coming vindication of the Jewish-Christian church at the expected consummation, the thought of the evangelist is fixed chiefly on the past; and therefore he ends his Galilean narrative with this story of rejection. With it he accomplishes

[1] Mt. 12^{45}.

his scheme of rearrangement in the first half of his gospel.

St. Luke, like St. Matthew, is interested in the problem of arrangement, but he is concerned with it in a very different way. He differs from his colleague in two notable respects. In the first place, it is not St. Luke's purpose to collect his material in blocks, each of them dealing with a single subject. His interest is chiefly in a broad geographical arrangement, affecting his whole gospel, and not the Galilean section of it only. His purpose seems to be to present the activity and work of Jesus as developing steadily, without serious break, from small beginnings in his original surroundings [1] until the goal is reached in the capital, Jerusalem; just as in his second volume,

[1] It might be urged that Lk. $4^{14, 15}$, with its allusion to a general Galilean ministry before the visit to Nazareth takes place (Lk. 4^{16-30}), is evidence against the purpose ascribed above to the evangelist. There is force in the objection, but it can perhaps be met by supposing that the common tradition about the ministry knew that it began in Galilee, but did not define its place of origin more closely. Within this limit, therefore, each evangelist was free to choose his starting-point. In St. Mark the ministry begins at 1^{14}, with the reference to Galilee, but no particular place is mentioned until Capernaum, at 1^{21}. St. Matthew is much more precise. On "withdrawing" into Galilee, Jesus leaves Nazareth and takes up his residence in Capernaum, Mt. $4^{12, 13}$, which seems indeed, in this gospel, to be "his own city," Mt. 9^{1}. In St. Luke Capernaum is simply "a city of Galilee," 4^{31}, and no stress is laid upon it. Nazareth, on the other hand, is the place "where he had been brought up," 4^{16}; there the first story of the ministry, which is told at length, is located; and from it the circle widens steadily. Thus most of the events narrated between 4^{31} and 7^{50} are probably regarded as taking place in or near Capernaum; but an extension of the ministry takes place at 8^{1-3}, which Wellhausen regards as opening a new section even more markedly than 9^{51}, where we read of the beginning of the journey, through Samaria, to Jerusalem.

the Acts of the Apostles, he traces the steady expansion of the gospel *from* Jerusalem in ever-widening circles, till it reaches Rome.

There is, therefore, in St. Luke's gospel no suggestion,[1] in the middle of the ministry, of a withdrawal of Jesus far away from Galilee and the country bordering on the lake into the districts lying to the east and north. When Jesus does leave the neighbourhood of the lake, in chapter 9, shortly after the interest of Herod Antipas has been aroused in him, it is with the express intention of starting forthwith for Jerusalem[2]; and the rest of the gospel, until the arrival at the capital in chapter 19, is occupied with what is represented as taking place upon this journey, chiefly in Samaria.[3]

[1] It is probably impossible to say at what precise point in St. Mark's gospel the ministry in Galilee comes to an end. The narrative between 6^{1} and 8^{26} is obscure as regards topographical details, and often seems to hesitate. It is, however, clearly implied that soon after the mention of Herod Antipas at 6^{14} Jesus withdraws or prepares to withdraw from Galilee, as mentioned in the text; and when he returns to it, at 9^{30}, he desires his journey through the district to be secret, and it is extremely short.

In St. Luke the only trace of visits of Jesus to districts outside Galilee, before he starts for Jerusalem, is the mention of the "city called Bethsaida," if this is the correct reading, in Lk. 9^{10}. The place mentioned is no doubt the Bethsaida on the north-east shore of the lake, just outside the territory of Herod Antipas.

[2] In the story of the transfiguration, earlier in the same chapter, St. Luke alone states (9^{31}) that the subject of the conversation between Jesus and Moses and Elijah, both of whom "appeared in glory," was "his decease, which he must accomplish in Jerusalem."

In the light of St. John's doctrine that the "glory" of Jesus is revealed most fully in the passion, e.g. Jn. 12^{23}, 17^{1}, the connexion thus established in St. Luke between the transfiguration and the passion is noteworthy.

[3] From time to time we are reminded that in this section Jesus is regarded as being on a journey, through Samaria, to Jerusalem,

In this way, the ground may be regarded as having been completely covered, and here, too, in ever-widening circles.

And, in the second place, St. Luke differs from St. Matthew in that his gaze is fixed upon the future, rather than the past. He and his friends had the flowing tide with them, and St. Luke knew it, perhaps to a dangerous extent. He is more keenly interested in the extension of the gospel to the Gentile than in its rejection by the Jew, and he does not emphasize the tragedy involved thereby. Himself in all probability the only Gentile writer among the authors of the books of our New Testament, he was persuaded that what he had witnessed occurring far and wide throughout the Roman empire was no chance affair, nor was it due, solely, to the folly and the blindness of the Jew; the hand of God was in it. The wrath of the Jew had redounded to the glory of God. There is comparatively little trace in St. Luke of the "great sorrow and unceasing pain in the heart" because of the blindness of Israel, to which St. Paul gives expression in the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Romans.[1]

13^{22}, "And he went on his way through cities and villages, teaching, and journeying on towards Jerusalem"; 17^{11}, "And it came to pass, on the journey to Jerusalem, that he was passing through the midst of Samaria and Galilee." These last words are difficult; see J. M. Creed, *ad loc.* He translates "between Samaria and Galilee," i.e. along the borders of Samaria and Galilee.

A mission of Jesus to Samaritans would be altogether congenial to St. Luke, although much of the teaching in this section is clearly not well placed in it.

[1] The most notable examples of it in St. Luke are the lament over Jerusalem, $13^{34, 35}$, and the weeping over the city, 19^{41-44}.

This is perhaps a convenient place to quote an observation of Wellhausen (*Einleitung*, 2nd ed., p. 64). After dwelling on the differ-

We have seen reason to think that the little section dealing with the rejection of Jesus in his own country by his own people is regarded by both St. Matthew and St. Mark as of great significance, and has in their gospels all the elements of tragedy. It is possible that in it they see as it were in miniature the rejection by Israel of its own Messiah. Jesus Messiah is to his countrymen, and therefore to Israel, a σκάνδαλον or stumbling-block.

It is clear from the position which St. Luke also has assigned to the story, that for him too it is of great importance; but he is interested in it for an altogether different reason. For him too it has symbolic meaning; even more obviously than in the other two synoptists the theme is the rejection of the gospel by the Jew; but by placing the story at the outset of the ministry, and making it the first incident to be described at length, St. Luke has made it possible to represent this rejection or lack of success as foreseen and inevitable from the beginning; and this robs the story of all tragedy, since the work of Jesus is still all before him. Whatever opposition may be offered at this point can only result in an extension of his mission. In St. Mark the surprising and unnecessary offence and rejection in the "patris" leads ultimately to a *via dolorosa*, the journey to Jerusalem; in St. Luke the almost deliberately evoked and not unnatural anger

ent tendencies shown by St. Matthew and St. Luke, he concludes, "After what has been said, a warning must be given against emphasizing too sharply the difference between Matthew and Luke. They are not yet theologians, and allow different growths to exist side by side; both of them contain to some extent what is hybrid in character, and this is quite intelligible in view of the complex nature of their writings, along with their own peculiarities."

and rejection at Nazareth is at once followed by larger work in Galilee. In St. Mark Jesus is rejected by his countrymen and he accepts the situation, although apparently with sorrow and surprise. In St. Luke, if the story be carefully studied, he not only foretells that they will reject him, before they have done so, but gives them reason for doing so forthwith.

A subordinate motive in St. Luke's account will have been to furnish his story with details suitable to his attempt to write the history of the life of Jesus; to this desire we may attribute the reference to the boyhood of Jesus, and to his habit of attendance at the synagogue.

"And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and he entered, as his custom was, into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up to read. And there was handed to him a roll of the prophet Isaiah, and having opened the roll he found the place where it was written :

"The spirit of the Lord is upon me,
Because he hath anointed me;
He hath sent me to bring good tidings to the poor,
To proclaim release to captives, and recovery of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty those that are bruised,
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.

"And he folded the roll, and gave it back to the attendant, and sat down; and the eyes of all in the synagogue were fastening upon him. And he proceeded to say to them, To-day has been fulfilled this scripture you have heard.

" And all bare witness to him and marvelled at the words of grace proceeding from his mouth, and they said, Is not this Joseph's son ? And he said to them, I tell you, you will surely say to me this parable, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done at Capernaum, do also here in thine own country.[1] And he said, Amen, I say to you, no prophet is acceptable in his own country. And of a truth I say to you, there were many widows in the days of Elijah in Israel, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when there came a great famine over all the land, and to none of them was Elijah sent, but to Sarepta in the land of Sidon, to a widow woman.[2] And there were many lepers in Israel in the days of

[1] This verse is of peculiar difficulty, because no activity of Jesus at Capernaum has yet been related. For the purpose of the story, however, such activity may be regarded as covered by verses 14, 15 above, and the challenge referred to is probably one expected on the *present* occasion, not a future challenge consequent on future successful work in Capernaum. Wellhausen, taking the latter view, comments thus, " Very remarkable is the future tense ἐρεῖτε. Jesus cannot rejoice over the present approbation of his fellow-citizens, because he knows that in the future it will be quite different. He anticipates his work in Capernaum which has not indeed yet begun, and looking further into the future he sees that he will not continue it with the same success in Nazareth, and will therefore become an object of mockery there."

[2] Wellhausen thinks that χήραν is due to misreading an Aramaic original ארמיא as ארמלא, and therefore (*a*) postulates an Aramaic original for verses 25–27, and (*b*) renders " to a Syrian woman," holding that this provides the necessary antithesis to the " many widows in Israel " of the same verse, and is also parallel to " Naaman the Syrian " in verse 27. This is attractive, but at 1 Kings 17^9, on which Lk. 4^{27} is built, the LXX has γυναικὶ χήρᾳ, and the necessary antithesis may be regarded as sufficiently given by the mention of " Sarepta in the land of Sidon."

Elisha the prophet, and none of them was cleansed, but Naaman the Syrian.

"And they were all filled with anger in the synagogue as they heard these things; and they rose up and cast him forth outside the city; and they brought him to the brow of the hill, on which their city was built, to throw him headlong down. But he passing through the midst of them was going on his way."[1]

So far as we can reconstruct the earliest teaching of Jesus from our primary authority St. Mark, it seems to have been a general call to repentance, in view of the great nearness of the kingdom of God. We may say with some confidence that in its first stages it contained no reference to himself. It is therefore the more remarkable that according to St. Luke our Lord in his first recorded sermon in the synagogue[2] declares that the fulfilment of what we may call the Isaianic gospel to the poor *has* now come to pass with the beginning of his own activity. "To-day

[1] Lk. 4^{16-30}. With the last sentence, cf. Jn. 7^{30}, "They sought therefore to take him: and no man laid his hand on him, because his hour was not yet come," and Jn. 10^{39}, "They sought again to take him: and he went forth out of their hand."

[2] These words are possibly misleading. For, although reference is made in all four gospels to teaching by Jesus in the synagogue, its content is never given, except here and in Jn. 6 (for the little that is recorded in such passages as Mk. 3^{1} ff., Lk. 13^{10} ff. forms no real exception). When Jesus teaches elsewhere than in Jerusalem, he always does so, except in Lk. 4^{16} ff. and Jn. 6, in the open air or in a house. Perhaps this may be accounted for by the widening breach between the synagogue and the church at the time when the gospels were being formed. In any case, it is likely that there are special reasons why the teaching in Lk. 4^{16} ff. and Jn. 6 has been placed by the evangelists within the synagogue.

has been fulfilled this scripture which is sounding in your ears." There is now no call to repentance because of a coming supreme supernatural event, but a proclamation of a present salvation and deliverance for the poor, which it is all but stated[1] is to be found in the person and presence of the speaker.

For the moment, this does not give offence; if we rid our minds of presuppositions drawn from the Marcan form of the story, we shall see no reason to think that the testimony given to the words of grace of Jesus, or the surprise which they evoke are otherwise than friendly; nor is the reference to the origin of Jesus meant maliciously in St. Luke, although it, like the surprise, is a clear echo of the Marcan narrative. And still there is no opposition, even when Jesus in the next sentence informs his hearers that they will assuredly demand external guarantees of his credentials, such as have been or will be forthcoming, as it is believed, elsewhere.

It is the *following* sentences which arouse the anger of the Nazarenes, when Jesus *foretells* their inevitable rejection of him, in accordance not only with the saying "No prophet is acceptable in his own country"—a further echo of St. Mark—but with precedent in the history of the chosen people. Just as instances are recorded of Elijah and Elisha being of help to aliens, so his own acts of power are not being or will not be repeated at his home, but have been done or can be done elsewhere in Galilee.

But the cases of Elijah and Elisha do not really harmonize with the saying, "No prophet is acceptable

[1] This development in the gospels reaches its final expression in the seven sentences in St. John's gospel, referred to on p. 190.

in his own country"; Elijah and Elisha did not confer benefits upon Gentiles because they were expelled by their own countrymen; their acts of benevolence to Gentiles were examples of the boundless grace of God; nor do the benefits received by Gentiles rather than by Jews at the hands of Elijah and Elisha truly illustrate a contrast between works of Jesus done at Capernaum but not done at Nazareth, since both these places were on Jewish soil.[1]

It is probable that St. Luke is here refashioning the Marcan story, perhaps with the help of other traditional material, in accordance with a purpose of his own. He desires to seek precedent in Jewish history for what, at the time when he wrote, was happening, as he believed, on an unprecedented scale, the grace of God flowing forth to Gentiles, not to Jews; and he finds it, very justifiably, in words ascribed to Jesus in connexion with traditions of Elijah and Elisha.

In St. Mark the stumbling-block was *local* jealousy of Jesus; in St. Luke the anger is due to *national* jealousy for divine privileges, and it leads to an immediate rejection, the difficulty being now not so much the person of Jesus as the gospel which he brings.

And, finally, thus far St. Luke has followed St. Mark in placing the scene within the local synagogue; but in his last two verses Jesus is expelled not only

[1] A careful study of the stories in St. Luke's Gospel will often reveal a similar "inconsistency of thought" in the narrative. A conspicuous example is the story of the anointing of Jesus in Lk. 7^{36-50}; see J. M. Creed, *ad loc.* In the same context this writer observes, "The scene in Luke, like many of the scenes peculiar to this evangelist, is at once impressive in its total effect, and in detail lacking in verisimilitude."

from the synagogue but from " their city." At present,[1] of course, the effort to destroy him fails, because, in St. John's language, his hour has not come; but it is likely that we are here silently invited to see at the outset, in Jesus' own city of Nazareth (as it is definitely called in St. Luke), an effort to carry out what did in fact finally take place, not in that small city, but in the city of the Jews, Jerusalem, when men did indeed cast him out of the city[1] and kill him, and thus set free the gospel to the world, as it was now set free forthwith for larger scope elsewhere.

[1] It is noticeable that in Lk. 20^{9-16}, the parable of the wicked husbandmen, we read that the latter " cast him [the son] out of the vineyard and killed him." The order of the words has possibly been influenced by the facts of the crucifixion (cf. Heb. 13^{12}, " Wherefore Jesus also . . . suffered outside the gate "), for in St. Mark, as in the correct text of St. Matthew, the verse runs, " And they took him and killed him and cast him forth outside the vineyard," which would be the more natural procedure.

VIII

CONCLUSION

THE greater part of the last lecture was devoted to a consideration of the rejection or lack of success of Jesus in his native place, and to the position assigned to this narrative in the gospel record by each of the synoptic writers. It was found likely that all three evangelists see symbolical importance in the story, in connexion with the rejection, by the great majority of his own countrymen, of Jesus regarded as the Christ,[1] but that St. Luke differs sharply from St. Mark and St. Matthew in the use to which he puts the story.

The narrative in the first two gospels seems to be in the form of what is now often called upon the continent a paradigm, or model-story, that is, a story about Jesus, which set forth, according to certain laws of form, in very brief and simple fashion, and with no extraneous detail, the occasion of some important or well-known traditional saying of the Lord, this forming the chief point and sometimes the climax of the whole.[2] It is believed that these stories at first circulated in the early church independently of any context, being found necessary for the purpose of their work by missionaries, preachers, and teachers.

[1] According to the plan of all three synoptic gospels, the rejection takes place before St. Peter's recognition of Jesus' Messiahship. But this does not affect the likelihood that the evangelists found symbolical importance in the story.

[2] See page 46.

St. Mark's story of the rejection conforms on the whole satisfactorily to this type; its principal feature is the saying of Jesus, "A prophet is not without honour, except in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house," and the same may be said of the version in St. Matthew.

The parallel version in St. Luke was found to be of a very different character. Also the position of the story in his gospel is much more obviously significant than the position of the story in St. Mark. In making the incident the first story of the public ministry to be described at length, St. Luke probably invites us to see the future course of events, as it were, writ small, and indeed now forthwith foretold by Jesus. We found, too, that in St. Luke's version we have passed beyond the concise and closely-knit structure of the paradigm. The story now contains a reference to the boyhood of Jesus, and to his habit of attendance at the worship of the synagogue, and is thus connected with the desire to give details of the life of Jesus,[1] a motive altogether strange to the original purpose of the paradigm. And finally, the story itself is loosely put together in St. Luke. To some extent, indeed, it does lead up to a great utterance ascribed to Jesus, Lk. 4^{25-27}, dealing with incidents drawn from the lives of Elijah and Elisha, but an allusion to these incidents is not quite appropriate here. They are suited rather to the future extension of the gospel to the *Gentiles*, than to its success or immediate expansion among other *Jewish* communities in Galilee as opposed to Nazareth; and from this point of view the verses are not really

[1] Cf. Lk. 3^{23}, a reference to the age of Jesus at the beginning of his public life.

adapted to their present setting. We find the same looseness of construction in other stories in this Gospel, where St. Luke gives us a version clearly connected with but at the same time differing sharply from its Marcan counterpart; and it should not be too readily assumed that St. Luke is in all these cases drawing upon a single and quite different authority, which he prefers for these stories to the parallel narratives in St. Mark. It is possible that St. Mark is still his primary authority, but that at these points, with the additional help of scattered material drawn from other sources, he has adapted St. Mark's narrative to suit his special purposes.

The four gospels must not be regarded as simply an attempt, by the second and third generation of Christians, to record and preserve what had survived or could be traced of traditional words and acts of Jesus. This motive will no doubt have had some influence, and we may rightly hope and believe that in reading or hearing the gospels we are constantly in immediate or almost immediate contact with the fountain-head of our religion; but even so the preservation of an incident or saying will usually have been due, in the last resort, to what was believed to be its significance or value to the society which preserved it; nor did those who recorded the stories or the words regard themselves as precluded from emphasizing those aspects of the tradition which appealed to them and disregarding others which did not. Above all, the portrait which we have in our gospels is always of

Jesus regarded as the Christ. There does not seem ever to have been a desire to bequeath to the church what we should call a purely historical picture of Jesus. An interesting suggestion has been put forward, to explain why, during the last fifty years, this character has been so often assigned, but, as we are now beginning to see, wrongly assigned, to the gospel of St. Mark. According to Dr. Dibelius' reckoning, this gospel contains no less than sixteen paradigms or model-stories, a very large number for so small a gospel.[1] In previous lectures of this course we have found reason for thinking that some of these stories are among the earliest historical material that we possess. And in most of them our Lord is represented chiefly as a teacher.

As we have already reminded ourselves in this lecture, the paradigm usually culminates in some saying of his, which implies or lays down a universal principle. If an act of power is included in the story, it is of secondary importance, and no great emphasis is laid upon it, except as bringing corroborative testimony to the teaching.

It is therefore possible that owing to our new and unprecedented interest, during the last two generations, in historic fact, and especially because we had just discovered that St. Mark's gospel is our earliest surviving record for what we call the life of Jesus, we were led to assign to it, as a whole, the nature and character which belongs rightly only to a part of it. We are slowly beginning to see that other parts of this gospel, including the framework of the whole, and its

[1] Even if, as I should myself wish to maintain, this number is too large, the point would still hold good.

general plan, are based upon a different conception of our Lord.

It is not always easy for the student of the gospels to remember that the motive power which more than any other factor caused the light of the gospel to shine throughout the world was the conversion and the preaching of the blessed apostle St. Paul, and further that in the gospel proclaimed by St. Paul it was not necessary, any more than it is in the creeds, to know of any single event between the birth and the passion of our Lord. St. Paul does, indeed, know of a tradition of the Lord's sayings, and he is able to employ it, on the very few occasions when he needs to do so; and he can use such expressions as " the meekness and gentleness of Christ."[1] No doubt also he could have learned very much more, had he wished, of the sayings of Jesus and of the events of his life. But they were not necessary for him; they did not touch the essence of his gospel, which had a different basis, and a different kind of history. This history concerned a divine being, the pre-existent Son of God; and in St. Paul's view it was more important to know that this divine being had lived a human life, than to know the manner and details of its course, especially as these had now been left behind for ever.

None the less, it will be found to have a bearing on our understanding of the gospels, if we pause for a moment and inquire a little more closely into the precise nature of what is often called St. Paul's Christ-

[1] 2 Cor. 10^{1}.

ology. This finds its fullest expression for our present purpose in an incidental but very important passage in the second chapter of the epistle to the Philippians. We there read, according to the usual interpretation of the passage,[1] that Messiah Jesus, although he was originally in the form of God, did not think his equality with God a treasure to be grasped or retained at all costs. He therefore emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, and "became" in the likeness of men. Owing to this condescension and self-humbling, and the obedience which accompanied it and had proved absolute, free from any reservations whatsoever, God exalted him once more to the position which was his by right, and had been his before.

According to this understanding of the passage, the earthly life of Jesus was only a temporary episode in an otherwise infinite celestial existence; it was a passing incident, however important, between preexistence in the form of God and the high exaltation which succeeded it. His work on earth accomplished, our Lord resumed his rightful place. This may seem, and indeed is in some ways, very like the doctrine of St. John. In his gospel our Lord alludes very simply to the beginning and the ending of his earthly life. "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go unto the Father."[2] But it would be equally true to say that in St. John's gospel Jesus never really leaves the Father's side. Even when his hour is come, he is not alone, because the Father is with him.[3] In this gospel there is no self-emptying or veiling; no laying

[1] Phil. 2^{5-11}. See Bishop Lightfoot's *Philippians*, pp. 110 f.

[2] Jn. 16^{28}. [3] Jn. 16^{32}; cf. $8^{16, 29}$.

aside by Jesus of his glory, because he has assumed humanity. The divine radiance shines forth continually through the veil of flesh and is revealed, or unveiled, in what he is and does on earth.

But St. Paul in Philippians, according to the interpretation which will be given in a moment, had not reached thus far. His Christ has not yet quite attained unchanging, absolute divinity. For St. Paul there is a difference between the pre-existence in the form of God, and absolute equality with God. In St. Paul's view, in the passage in Philippians, our Lord only gained this latter in consequence of his becoming man, and of the obedience which he showed. St. Paul did not think of Jesus as possessing equality with God before the earthly life. Equality with God was, as it were, a final stage, which could not have been given to Jesus in its fullness, had it not been for what he was and did on earth.

It is possible that we have been misled, in our understanding of Philippians 2, by a very rare and difficult Greek word, ἁρπαγμόν. According to the view here taken, it does not mean in this passage a treasure which its owner would wish to retain in his keeping at all costs, but something which comes or may come to us without effort on our part; as we might say, a windfall, an unexpected piece of luck, a godsend.[1]

[1] This interpretation appears to be supported by Prof. A. D. Nock (*Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, ed. A. E. J. Rawlinson, p. 99). The idea may be compared with that in Heb. 12², "Looking unto Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God." This explanation of the passage involves a definite distinction between "being originally in the form of God" and "being on an equality with God." With

According to this interpretation, our Lord, although he existed always in the form of God, had one more step to take before he could be on an equality with God. Equality with God could only be his as a result of *effort* on his part; he could not regard it as a godsend; it lay, indeed, before him, but it must be earned; and the price was absolute self-sacrifice.

This price, in St. Paul's view, Jesus paid; and *therefore*, St. Paul goes on, God *ὑπερύψωσεν αὐτόν*, God super-exalted him; through the earthly life and the way he lived it, and especially its end, he reached a higher place than had been his before; and he is now glorified with God.

I do not think we need be greatly distressed by the apparent divergence between St. Paul's doctrine in

reference to this point, Dr. M. Dibelius writes, on Phil. 2^7, "The words *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων* signify the heavenly essence, which is divine, but not equal to God; the pre-existent Son of God (cf. Rom. $1^{3,4}$ 8^3), who, however, is not yet *ἐν δυνάμει*, not yet *κύριος*."

This interpretation, however, is open to the same objection as that espoused by Bishop Lightfoot, viz. that it involves treating *ἁρπαγμόν* as the equivalent of *ἅρπαγμα*, and it must remain at least possible that the interpretation most likely to be correct is that which gives *ἁρπαγμόν* its natural sense. Attention, therefore, should be drawn to three important articles in *J.T.S.* (July 1909, April 1911, Oct. 1914), all of which maintain that *ἁρπαγμόν* is not used here in the sense of *ἅρπαγμα*, but has its correct meaning of "the action of plundering." On this view, the distinction is between Jewish and Christian ideas of Messiahship. Whereas the Jewish Messiah might be expected to use his position and power for the benefit and glory of his nation, God's elect, at the cost of other nations, the Christian Messiah did not regard his equality with God as an opportunity for self-aggrandisement, but poured it forth freely on behalf of others, at whatever cost to himself.

Cf. also A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, p. 134.

Philippians just referred to, and its final expression in the gospel of St. John. St. Paul himself does not seem to have been permanently contented with it; it is probable that in a still later epistle, that to the Colossians, he has himself advanced considerably in the direction of the gospel according to St. John. But if the interpretation just given of the verses in Philippians be admitted as a possibility, the passage becomes a valuable aid to our understanding of the synoptists, especially St. Mark and St. Matthew, and even of some features in the gospel of St. John.

For an essential feature in the presentation of the central figure of the gospels is that of one who ministers or serves.[1] This thought is never long absent from the minds of the evangelists. Even in the mighty deeds of power, when the greatness and majesty of Jesus are most manifest, he is seen working and acting for the benefit of men. And the end or climax of this ministry or service is to be suffering and death. This also is a note which is constantly heard, long before the passion narrative itself. The life of humility in service and the death in extreme humiliation are, however, believed to be in accordance with the will and purpose of God,[2] and are therefore accounted for, partly by reference to the Old Testament scriptures,[3] but even more by the deep and at first almost passionate belief in the imminent reversal of that humiliation. He who had come in the form of a

[1] Most explicitly at Mt. $20^{26\,ff.}$, Mk. $10^{43\,ff.}$, Lk. 22^{27}, Jn. $13^{4,\,12\text{-}15}$.

[2] For the life, consider the use of ἀποστέλλω in this connexion in all four gospels; for the death, notice the δεῖ of Mk. 8^{31}, Mt. 16^{21}, Lk. 9^{22}, in the first prediction of the passion, and also Jn. 18^{11}.

[3] E.g. Mk. $14^{21,\,49}$.

servant would very shortly come, no longer as a servant, but as lord. And the one state was the necessary pathway to the other. The earthly life and death were the preliminary to the exalted, heavenly glory; and the greater the humiliation, the more exceeding the glory. And this thought, that an essential condition of the exalted state was the previous state of service and obedience, with all that these words imply of effort and longsuffering, is still discernible within the gospel narratives.[1]

A strong tendency, indeed, already exists—and it is growing—to regard Jesus, the Son of God, as raised already, even in the days of his flesh, quite above the limitations of humanity; to take a single example, he is described in St. Matthew[2] as healing *all* that were sick, and casting out the spirits with a word; but just because the future hope is still so dominant, it is possible to admit and even sometimes to emphasize the intensely humble and difficult conditions of that earthly state which have now made possible the coming, future state; indeed, since they were faithfully fulfilled, they have become its pledge and guarantee.[3]

[1] It is *the Son of man* who must suffer, Mk. 8^{31}. Compare also this verse with 8^{38}, and 10^{38b} with 10^{37b}; and see, too, Lk. 12^{50}, 13^{32} (comparing the τελειοῦμαι with Heb. 2^{10}, διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι), $24^{20, 26}$.

[2] Mt. 8^{16}; contrast the parallel Mk. 1^{34}. Probably, the more we realize that the gospels are gospels, and not simply portraits of "the days of his flesh" Heb. 5^{7}, the less shall we be surprised at the phenomena which the gospels present to us.

[3] Cf. Lk. 24^{39}, Jn. 20^{20}, and the familiar lines of Charles Wesley's Advent hymn:

> "Those dear tokens of his passion
> Still his dazzling body bears,
> Cause of endless exultation
> To his ransomed worshippers."

The only note in the Philippians passage which seems to be wanting in the synoptic gospels is that of pre-existence. Thanks to it, St. Paul is able to emphasize, even more than the synoptists, the voluntary nature of the earthly life and death. St. John also lays great stress upon the willingness; but in his gospel, as we have seen, the thought of the cost, and especially of the cost of the passion, has almost disappeared.

There is no one unchanging explanation of the person of Jesus in the books of the New Testament. Even in the same writer or in the same book conflicting explanations may stand side by side, without any sense, as it seems, on the part of the writer, of difficulty or inconsistency; nor were any of the synoptic writers, strictly speaking, theologians.[1]

All through the first century, and indeed much later, the church was feeling its way towards a permanent and satisfactory doctrine of the person of Christ. We have to learn to look upon the New Testament in a rather different way from that in which it was regarded, and had to be regarded, and was rightly regarded by our fathers. We have been granted, during the lifetime of many who are still with us, a new and very remarkable revelation with regard to the laws of development and growth; we are allowed, if we will, to understand much that was necessarily hidden from those who went before us. Our recognition of the surpassing debt we owe to them ought not to prevent us from making the necessary adjustments demanded by new knowledge. We

[1] See p. 199.

are not their true followers if we refuse all change. The greatest and noblest among them would be the first to encourage us to go forward, provided we are sure that the ground is firm beneath our feet; they would rejoice, if to us it is given to see things which they desired to see, and saw them not, because the time had not yet come. Perhaps our greatest debt to them is for their patience, in what could not but be for them the cloudy and dark day of the new discoveries, and for their unshakeable confidence and hope.

I spoke just now of change; but indeed all that is needed or feasible at present is a change of attitude upon our part. We may quite possibly find that this, combined with a steady realization of the immense weight and authority which is rightly owing to tradition, will give us all the life and freedom which we need.

How, then, at the present time, in the light of the new knowledge, can we best seek to explain to ourselves the books of the New Testament, and especially the gospels ?

It is gradually becoming apparent that during the first two or perhaps the first three generations of its life the church, in addition to and partly because of its practical work, which rightly had the first claim upon its energies and time, found itself faced on the intellectual side with a great and necessary task of singular complexity. This task consisted in trying to understand and explain, in the best and truest and most satisfying way, an event which, although it was

believed to be indissolubly connected with the course of history, was also believed to be itself unparalleled. The same God, who in varying degrees and ways had spoken of old time to the fathers in the prophets, had finally and quite lately spoken in a new way, in a Son; and the gospels are the most valuable and important attempts which have survived, on the part of the society which found itself entrusted with this truth, to set forth its meaning and significance.

With the exception of St. John's gospel, all four attempts must be regarded as provisional and tentative. The writers are feeling their way, very cautiously and haltingly at first, but with increasing confidence and boldness, in the progressive interpretation of an historic figure. Broadly speaking, and subject probably to one partial but notable exception, to be considered in a moment, the process of interpretation was steadily from less to more. One after another, during the first century, the categories first of the Jewish and then of the Greek religious world were applied to Jesus, and were all found to be of value; they achieved a permanent place in the interpretation of his person in the records; nor did the church leave any of them precisely where they were before; they were all baptized, as it were, in him, and impregnated with new meaning; but equally they were all found to be partial and inadequate; the church was unable to rest finally and completely in any one of them.

Above all, it seems, no attempt at interpretation could win more than a very partial success, if it were not in accord with the fundamental principles and outlook of the Jewish faith. The transcendence and holiness of God, and the permanent separateness from

the world, necessary to religion, are postulates of almost all our gospels. In one of them, indeed, the gospel according to St. Luke, we seem to discern an attempt which, while seeking to remain true to the general tradition, at the same time sets itself, by a kind of deliberate vagueness, to accommodate the gospel to the world, and to remove all barriers.

In this gospel what chiefly finds expression is not so much a message of divine salvation in response to human need, as a message of universal goodwill, both human and divine. The portrait of our Lord as given in the gospel according to St. Luke has some points of close resemblance to those of certain religious heroes of the ancient world. And the fact that this book has found a place within the fourfold gospel of the church may be taken as evidence that the attempt was rightly made, and that its counterparts in all ages have a necessary and justifiable place in the presentation of the truth as it is in Jesus. But it is interesting to notice the attitude of the fourth evangelist in this connexion. To this great writer it was given to sum up the work of those who went before him, and to lay down certain doctrines which he believed to be essential both for the complete expression and for the preservation of the church's gospel. And for all his debt, as it seems, in certain respects to the gospel of St. Luke, he turns his back, rigorously and unequivocally, upon the latter's doctrinal vagueness and his generous universalism. There is no book in the New Testament in which the unrelieved Jewish contrast of good and evil, light and darkness, is shown more vividly and sharply than in the gospel of St. John. And this contrast is thrown back, in his inter-

pretation, within the earthly ministry itself. It would not be very far from the truth, to say that in St. John's gospel the life of Jesus Christ is on one side itself the day of judgement.

I said just now that the process of interpretation, broadly speaking, was steadily from less to more. This might be taken to imply that the tendency was necessarily also from the more to the less historical, and conversely from the less doctrinal to the more so; but this view, though partly true, should only be accepted with great caution, and subject to certain reservations.

It owes its attractiveness partly to the excessive historical value assigned in the last two generations to St. Mark's gospel, and this, we are now beginning to see, was a mistake. It is probable that both history and doctrine are present, although in varying degrees, in all our four gospels, in the earliest and in the latest alike. There are certain respects in which St. Mark is nearer than either St. Matthew or St. Luke to the doctrinal position of St. John. None of the gospel writers was able to reconcile completely his belief in the person and significance of Jesus with a purely historical presentation of his life. St. Mark seeks to overcome the difficulty by his theory of the messianic secret; the true nature of Jesus is explained to the *reader* at the outset, at the very first appearance of Jesus in the gospel, and it is known throughout to the demonic powers; but it remains hidden, and must remain hidden, for the first part of the ministry from all men, and is only revealed to chosen disciples, and then under strict commands to secrecy, towards the

close. Only very rarely, and for a very brief space, and usually although not always in the presence of a chosen few, as at the transfiguration, or in the greater acts of power, is the Prince divested, as it were, of his beggar's garment of humanity, and seen for a moment, if indeed he is seen,[1] for what he truly is. St. Mark thus frames and interprets the other side of the tradition, according to which Jesus had been known to his contemporaries, who had not received enlightenment, as a teacher or a Rabbi or a prophet.

This method of interpretation was no longer open to St. John; it leads indeed to considerable difficulties already in St. Mark, and it is seen rapidly breaking down in the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke.[2]

[1] For it must be remembered that at the feeding of the multitude in Mk. 6^{34-44}, for instance, none of those present shows any appreciation of the situation, or insight into it. The sign, if sign it was, is only for the reader; it was not "seen" (Jn. 6^{30}) or understood by those who partook, on the occasion, of the proffered bounty. This is expressly stated of the disciples, Mk. 6^{52}, and is true *a fortiori* of the multitude.

[2] St. Mark adheres (almost) faithfully to his general plan, according to which no human being is admitted to the secret or the meaning of Messiahship before $8^{27\,ff.}$; and those who then confess it are, like the demons earlier, at once commanded to secrecy and silence. These limits are overstepped in St. Matthew and St. Luke; see e.g. Mt. 14^{33}, Lk. 4^{21}. In their gospels St. Peter's words in Mk. 8^{29} cannot have the same signal importance that they have in St. Mark.

Again, the teaching which is given immediately after Mk. 8^{29}, and very strongly emphasized, has not in St. Matthew and St. Luke the same novelty and strangeness which is such a conspicuous feature of it in St. Mark. In the light of such passages as Mt. 5^{3-12}, $10^{16\,ff.}$, $11^{25\,ff.}$, Lk. $6^{20\,ff.}$, much is already known in these gospels, before St. Peter's confession, of the characteristics of discipleship, and of the necessity of suffering for disciples, as well as for their Master.

Finally, the commands to and the desire for secrecy, which are a constant theme in St. Mark, are much less consistently maintained in

In these two gospels Jesus more often than not is shown by word and deed, and sometimes to persons quite other than disciples, in the light of his true being. Great multitudes follow him; he speaks with superhuman authority; he has received all things from the Father, and himself chooses the recipients of his own knowledge of the Father; above all, perhaps, he is the Son of man, not only to be revealed hereafter, but already [1] in his office and activities on earth. The

St. Matthew and St. Luke; compare e.g. Mk. 9^{9} with Lk. 9^{36}, or Mk. 9^{30} with the parallels. Even if they are still kept, they have become in the later gospels like dead branches on a living tree, which have no further function but have not yet dropped off.

[1] This is of course true of St. Mark's gospel, but to a much more limited extent. The distinctive feature of the use of the expression "the Son of man" in St. Mark is that, apart from $2^{10, 28}$, it is not used before $8^{27\,ff.}$, but is then immediately—and repeatedly in the remainder of the gospel—connected with the doctrine of necessary suffering and usually also of death. (I do not add, and of resurrection, because although that too forms part of the doctrine in the three predictions of the passion and is also referred to at 9^{9}, resurrection was clearly a necessity, if death had intervened, before the Son of man could come in glory. Even if the doctrine of the coming of the Son of man is not essential to the doctrine of the resurrection (a question which it is not at the moment necessary to raise), the doctrine of the resurrection is essential to the doctrine of the coming of the Son of man, if death has taken place).

After 8^{27} the expression "the Son of man" is used twelve times in St. Mark's gospel, and on no less than seven of these occasions the necessary connexion of the Son of man with suffering is emphasized. Of the remaining five, three are concerned with the expected coming in glory, one with the resurrection (9^{9})—thereby, as we have seen, implying previous death—and one only with the purpose of the earthly life itself (10^{45}, "The Son of man *came* . . .", the last words of this verse also containing a reference to the giving up of life).

St. Matthew and St. Luke use the expression more freely than St. Mark in reference to the whole course of the earthly life, e.g. Mt. 11^{19}, Lk. 9^{58}; and much more frequently and obviously than St. Mark they

tension between the obscurity and lowliness of the original tradition and the surpassing significance which was coming more and more to be assigned to the person and to the events with which it dealt, was likely to produce a dangerous situation. Above all did it become a problem how one who had come more or less openly—not secretly, as in St. Mark—before his contemporaries and nation as a unique messenger of God, the fulfilment of their hopes and aspirations, and had shown himself by word and deed to be so, how could he have failed so utterly of recognition? How came it that his revelation, attested as it was by signs and wonders and absolute authority, had been so terribly rejected? This latter difficulty is met by St. John by an even more drastic solution than St. Mark's; one which could only have become possible after it became clear that the Jewish nation had finally rejected the Messiahship of Jesus. In St. John's gospel the true nature of Jesus is no secret; it is or can be known by friend and foe alike from the beginning; but "the Jews," who in this gospel are the enemy, are completely darkened. In their blindness and infatuation they cannot see or understand him whom God has sent in the fullness of divine authority. Hence they cannot but reject him, and thereby seal their doom.

In the matter of the tension common to all the evangelists between the history and the understanding of it, St. John is in an easier position than his predecessors. Since there is now no secret as to the person of Jesus, St. John is able to give free rein in the words and deeds of Jesus himself to the expres-

use it also almost as a synonym for Jesus, who is speaking, e.g. Mt. 16^{13} compared with Mt. 16^{15}, Lk. 22^{48}.

sion of its significance and meaning, although here too it is still only given to a chosen few to receive and understand the meaning and the fullness of the revelation. We have now, not so much, as in the synoptists, an interpretation of the words and deeds of Jesus, regarded as the Christ; but we have what we may call a history of the Son of God; in this gospel he who speaks and acts on earth is still always also at his Father's side. It is no longer necessary or indeed possible to distinguish between the framework, or the interpretation generally, and the content of the earlier historical tradition; here they are indissolubly fused. In St. John's gospel there speaks not only an exalted, heavenly being, as is often the case already in the earlier gospels, but an incarnate Lord; and it is the belief and witness of the church that this is the truest interpretation which has been given or can be given of the historic figure.

And yet even the final interpretation which St. John has given us was not achieved without great loss. We may feel that in this gospel we are seldom if ever walking on firm ground; a kind of luminous haze, which is most difficult to penetrate, surrounds not only the figure of Jesus, but all the speakers and actors in the story; and the gospel narrative itself becomes almost, although happily not quite a kind of mystery play, setting forth the eternal counsels of God, and his laws and love for the world. Probably there will always be those to whom the simpler and homelier features of the earlier tradition will appeal more strongly.

It seems, then, that the form of the earthly no less than of the heavenly Christ is for the most part hidden from us. For all the inestimable value of the gospels, they yield us little more than a whisper of his voice; we trace in them but the outskirts of his ways. Only when we see him hereafter in his fullness shall we know him also as he was on earth. And perhaps the more we ponder the matter, the more clearly we shall understand the reason for it, and therefore shall not wish it otherwise. For probably we are at present as little prepared for the one as for the other.

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

Acton, Lord, 11
Alexander, 28
Andrew, St., 94
Aquiba, R., 44
Aristippus, 44
Augustine, St., xvii, 5, 8

Bacon, B. W., 121
Barabbas, 148
Bartimæus, 83
Beelzebul, 112, 193
Bentley, R., 4
Bishop, E. F. F., 187
Bleiben, T. E., xv
Browne, E. G., 66
Bultmann, R., 43 f., 52
Burkitt, F. C., 7 ff., 16, 28, 82, 139, 144, 152, 170
Bury, J. B., 12

Cadbury, H. J., xvi
Caiaphas, 190
Caird, E., 60
Collins, A., 4
Cornelius, 155
Creed, J. M., xiii, xv, 22, 85, 168, 175, 198, 204

Dalman, G., 144
Danby, H., 145
Dante, 176
David, 83, 121 ff.
Dibelius, M., 43 ff., 51, 53, 72 f., 149, 157 f., 160, 209, 213
Dodd, C. H., 97, 100

Easton, B. S., xvi
Elijah, 78, 91, 93, 158, 197, 201 ff.
Elisha, 202 ff.
Eusebius, 213

Foakes-Jackson, F. J., 59 f.
Fox, A., xv

Goguel, M., 2, 185
Gray, G. B., 132, 136
Grenfell, B. P., 185

Harnack, A. von, 22 f.
Hawkins, Sir J. C., 40, 171, 193
Herod, 113, 185, 192, 197
Herodians, 123, 170
Hort, F. A., 61 f., 95
Hunt, A. S., 185

Ignatius, St., 103
Irenæus, St., 1 f.

Jairus, 50 ff., 88, 184
James, son of Zebedee, 118, 120
James, brother of the Lord, 186
James, M. R., 49, 150
Jerome, St., 5
Joseph, St., 187 f.
Joseph, brother of the Lord, 186
Judas Iscariot, 131, 162, 171 ff.
Jude, brother of the Lord, 186

Klostermann, E., 83

Lachmann, C., 7 ff.
Lake, K., 59 f.
Landor, W. S., 12
Lazarus, 190
Liberty, S., 142
Lietzmann, H., 142, 146 ff.
Lightfoot, J. B., 211, 213

Malachi, 93
Manson, T. W., 80
Martha, 190

Mary, St., 186 ff.
Meyer, E., 30
Middleton, C., 4 ff.
Milburn, R. L. P., xv
Mill, J., 3
Moberley, R. C., 157
Moses, 78 f., 192, 197

Naaman, 201 f.
Nicklin, T., 52
Nock, A. D., 52, 55, 66, 212

Origen, xiii f., 188

Pallis, A., 46
Papias, xi f., 13, 28
Paul, St., 53, 64, 70, 86, 127 f., 136, 140, 144, 146, 154 f., 198, 210 ff.
Pennington, I., xiv
Pilate, 145 ff., 160, 169 f., 178

Quintilian, 12

Ramsay, Sir W. R., 30
Ranke, L. von, 11 f.
Rawlinson, A. E. J., 59, 148, 212 f.
Renan, E., 7
Robinson, J. A., 27, 147
Ropes, J. H., 109
Rufus, 28

Sanday, W., 17, 22
Satan, 172, 175
Schmidt, K. L., 44
Scott, Sir W., 11
Schweitzer, A., 25
Seeley, Sir J. R., 56
Shakespeare, W., 81
Sherlock, S., 4
Simeon, 101
Simon, brother of the Lord, 186
Simon of Cyrene, 28, 138
Socrates, 44
Souter, A., 46
Sparks, H. F. D., 42
Stephen, St., 144 ff., 178
Strauss, D. F., 7 f.
Swete, H. B., xiii, xvii, 25, 109

Taylor, V., xvi
Thackeray, H. St. J., 41 f.
Toland, J., 3
Torrey, C. C., 30
Turner, C. H., xvi, 35 f., 62 ff., 72, 85, 118, 131, 160

Wellhausen, J., 7 ff., 22 ff., 28, 37, 46, 54, 69, 81, 93, 119, 132, 196, 198, 201
Wesley, C., 215
Westcott, B. F., 16, 61 f., 95
Wolf, F. A., 11
Woolf, B. L., 44
Woolston, T., 4
Wrede, W., 16 ff., 67, 89

Zacchæus, 50
Zebedee, 120, 173
Zechariah, 121

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

Exodus	PAGE
12[46]	136
Leviticus	
13 f.	109
24[14 ff.]	146
Numbers	
28[18]	134
Deuteronomy	
21[22 f.]	146
1 Kings	
17[9]	201
Psalms	
22	156 ff.
31	156
31[5]	87
31[14]	162
69	156
118[26]	122
148[1, 7]	122
Isaiah	
6[9, 10]	76
35[5 f.]	107
53[12]	176
61[1]	85
Zechariah	
9[9]	121
Malachi	
3[2]	83
4[4 f.]	93
St. Matthew	
4[18]	184
4[28]	84

St. Matthew	PAGE
5[1 ff.]	40
5[2 ff.]	221
7[28 ff.]	40
8[1 ff.]	193
8[15 ff.]	114
9[1]	41, 100, 196
9[35]	84
10[16 ff.]	221
11[5]	85
11[11]	64
11[19]	222
11[25]	193
11[25 ff.]	221
12[28]	107
12[45]	195
13[1 f.]	39 f.
13[10 ff.]	75, 195
13[51]	76
13[53 ff.]	191
13[55]	188
13[58]	195
14[1]	185
14[9]	185
14[12 f.]	196
14[16, 18]	115
14[22 f.]	56
14[33]	55, 221
15[29]	40
15[32-39]	115
16[5 ff.]	115
16[13, 15]	223
16[18 ff.]	56
16[19]	179
16[18]	111
16[21]	214
19[3]	50
19[13, 15]	36
19[20, 22]	49
19[28]	175

St. Matthew — PAGE

20[18 f.] 171
20[26 ff.] 214
21[4 f.] 121
23 ff. . . . 95, 192
23[39] 180
24[14] 84
25[9] 194
26[1 ff.] 161
26[18] 84
26[18. 25] 162
26[29] 179
26[50. 58] 162
26[55] 40
26[61] 163
26[63 f.] 179
26[64] 163
27[3 ff., 19, 24] . . . 160
27[25] 194
27[35] 86
27[36] 40
27[40 ff.] 179
27[51 ff.] 161
27[62 ff.] 160
28[11 ff.] 160
28[15] 58
28[16 ff.] 163

St. Mark

1[1] . . . 59, 85
1[2 f.] 64
1[4] . . . 106, 110
1[7] 106
1[8] 62
1[9] . . . 62, 99, 184
1[10 f.] 63
1[11] . . 59, 122, 179
1[12 f.] . . . . 65 f.
1[14] . . 62, 64, 106, 196
1[14 f.] 122
1[15] . . . 60, 65, 107
1[16] 94
1[16 ff.] . . 69, 108, 124, 184
1[21] . . . 100, 196
1[21 ff.] . . 40, 68 f., 186 f.
1[22] . . . 40, 110

St. Mark — PAGE

1[23 ff.] 45
1[24] . . . 59, 68
1[27] 55
1[28 ff.] 69
1[32] 35
1[34] . . . 70, 215
1[38 f.] 106
1[40 ff.] . . . 51, 71, 108
1[44] 105
1[45] . . . 37, 107
2[1] . . . 37, 100
2[1 f.] 41
2[1 ff.] . . . 45, 110
2[1–3[6]] . . 37, 73, 110
2[6] 40
2[6 ff.] 109
2[10] . . . 110, 122
2[10 f.] 54
2[12] 55
2[13] 37
2[13 ff.] 45
2[15] 109
2[15 ff.] 36
2[17] 110
2[18 ff.] . . . 36, 45
2[19 f.] 110
2[23] 35
2[23 ff.] 45
2[28] . . . 110, 222
3[1] 37
3[1 ff.] . 45 f., 48, 123, 202
3[2] . . . 35, 49
3[5] . . . 54, 109
3[6] . 48, 110 f., 123, 143
3[7 ff.] . . . 48, 109 ff.
3[11] . . . 59, 70
3[12] 70
3[13 ff.] 48
3[14] 90
3[14 f.] 107
3[16] 94
3[20 ff.] . . . 48, 111 f.
3[27] 68
3[31] 41
3[31 ff.] . . . 45, 189

St. Mark	PAGE
3[32. 34]	40
4[1]	40
4[1 ff.]	38
4[1-34]	74 ff., 99, 112
4[10 ff.]	34, 122, 195
4[11]	34
4[21 ff.]	34
4[35]	37
4[35 ff.]	51, 55, 113
4[38]	52
4[40]	52, 73
4[41]	54
5[1 ff.]	51, 54, 100
5[2 ff.]	51
5[7]	59
5[16-20]	88 ff.
5[20]	54, 107
5[21 ff.]	48, 51
5[22]	50
5[25-34]	113
5[31]	52
5[36]	52
5[37, 40]	54, 73
5[42]	54
5[42 f.]	72
5[43]	71 f.
6[1]	37
6[1 ff.]	45, 112 f., 184 ff.
6[7 ff.]	48, 107
6[14]	35, 185, 197
6[16-29]	93
6[30]	107
6[30]–8[26]	29, 113 ff.
6[34 ff.]	55, 221
6[35 ff.]	51
6[37]	52
6[39 f.]	51
6[41]	54
6[45 ff.]	51, 55
6[48]	116
6[50]	52
6[52]	221
6[54-56]	114
7[1]	41
7[1-23]	114, 119
7[3, 4]	28, 58, 101
7[5]	50
7[10 ff.]	105 f.
7[15]	117
7[17 f.]	75
7[24]	37, 63
7[24 ff.]	100, 114
7[31]	37
7[32]	35, 41
7[32 ff.]	51
7[33]	54, 73
7[35]	72
7[36]	71 f., 107
7[36 f.]	69
7[37]	55
8[1-10]	115
8[11]	50, 119
8[12]	117
8[14-30]	90 ff.
8[14 ff.]	115 f.
8[17]	73
8[21]	52
8[22]	35, 41
8[22 ff.]	51, 120
8[23]	54, 73
8[25]	72
8[26]	29, 71 f.
8[27]	39, 222
8[27 ff.]	19, 67, 221 f.
8[27]–10[45]	77 ff., 99, 103, 117 ff., 173, 192
8[29]	67, 85, 221
8[30]	20, 67
8[31]	103, 214 f.
8[32 f.]	117
8[34]	117
8[34 f.]	80
8[34 ff.]	79
8[34]–9[1]	99, 105, 118
8[38]	215
9[1]	107
9[2]	39
9[3]	222
9[5]	67, 78
9[7]	59, 63, 122

St. Mark	PAGE
9[9]	59, 94, 222
9[9-13]	20
9[11-13]	92
9[13]	104
9[14]	50, 117
9[14 ff.]	51, 119
9[14-29]	78
9[20]	51
9[23]	52
9[35]	73
9[36]	51
9[30]	37, 113, 197, 222
9[31]	102
9[32 ff.]	117
9[33]	100
9[33-50]	99, 119
9[37-41]	80
9[39]	118
9[50]	34
10[1]	37, 39, 117
10[1. 2]	50
10[1-12]	79, 119
10[5 ff.]	106, 117
10[10]	37
10[13]	35, 46
10[13-16]	45, 61, 80, 119
10[17 ff.]	45, 49
10[17-28]	81
10[17-31]	99
10[27]	81
10[21]	80
10[23 ff.]	61, 119
10[28 f.]	80
10[32]	63
10[33]	102
10[33 f.]	171
10[35 ff.]	45
10[35-45]	117 ff.
10[37]	80
10[37 f.]	215
10[38 ff.]	120
10[39]	79
10[41 ff.]	173
10[43 ff.]	214
10[45]	80, 222
10[46]	40
10[46 ff.]	45, 120
10[47]	121, 123
11[1 ff.]	82
11[3]	121, 138
11[9 f.]	121 f.
11[12-14]	86, 123
11[15 ff.]	45, 123
11[17]	124
11[18]	50
11[19]	70
11[20]	100
11[20-25]	86, 123
11[21]	67
11[22. 25. 29]	70
12[1 ff.]	122, 124
12[6]	59
12[8]	123, 205
12[10]	104
12[13]	50, 123, 170
12[13 ff.]	45
12[17. 18]	47
12[18 ff]	45
12[18-27]	109
12[24-27]	124
12[26]	106
12[27]	47
12[28-34]	105, 109, 124, 184
12[32]	173
12[35]	36
12[35 ff.]	123
12[38 ff.]	124
12[41]	36
13[1. 2]	123
13[2]	143
13[3-37]	34, 80 f., 94 ff., 99, 104, 124
13[7]	103
13[10]	106
13[26]	107
13[35]	101
14[1]	63, 100
14[1. 2]	161
14[1 ff.]	48, 126 ff., 130 ff.
14[3-9]	45, 131, 141, 151, 184

St Mark	PAGE
14[7]	70
14[9]	106
14[13]	134
14[12 ff.]	137 ff.
14[13]	49
14[21]	104, 154 f., 214
14[25]	107
14[26]	138, 170
14[27]	104, 155
14[28]	104
14[31]	174
14[32 ff.]	127
14[33]	85
14[41]	102, 177
14[43]	165
14[44 ff.]	172
14[45]	67
14[48 f.]	165
14[49]	100, 104, 155, 214
14[50]	174
15[51 f.]	28, 156
14[55-65]	104, 142 ff.
14[56 ff.]	180
14[58 f.]	163
14[60 ff.]	179 ff.
14[61]	59, 170
14[62]	67, 145, 163
14[64]	142
14[65]	146
14[66 ff.]	127
14[72]	101
15[1]	101, 143, 148
15[2]	145, 148 f.
15[2 ff.]	58
15[7]	148
15[16]	64
15[21]	28
15[34]	145, 155, 157 ff.
15[37 ff.]	83 ff.
15[39]	59, 87, 151, 178
15[40 f.]	156
15[42]	101
16[1 ff.]	156
16[7]	85, 166
16[8]	85, 127

St. Luke	PAGE
1[48]	180
2[32]	101
3[1 f.]	99
3[18]	85
3[22]	187, 207
4[13]	177
4[14 f.]	196, 201
4[16 ff.]	184 ff.
4[21]	221
4[22]	187
4[25 ff.]	201
4[31]	196
5[1 ff.]	184
5[10]	180
5[17]	41
5[29 ff.]	36, 175
6[5]	37
6[7]	49
6[10]	37
6[17]	40
6[20 ff.]	221
7[1 ff.]	114
7[11]	100
7[15]	71
7[28]	64
7[36 ff.]	175, 184, 204
8[1 ff.]	196
8[4]	39
8[41]	50
9[7]	185
9[10]	197
9[22]	165, 214
9[31]	197
9[36]	222
9[44. 51]	165
9[54 ff.]	111
9[58]	222
10[18]	193
10[25 ff.]	184
11[20]	107
11[37 ff.]	175
12[1]	115
12[50]	215
12[52]	180
13[10 ff.]	202

St. Luke	PAGE
13[22]	198
13[32]	215
13[34 f.]	198
14[1 ff.]	175
17[11]	198
17[20 f.]	44
17[22 ff.]	95
18[18, 22 f.]	49
18[31 ff.]	165, 171
18[34]	120, 173
19[1 ff.]	50
19[37]	40
19[41 ff.]	198
19[47]	165
20[1]	85, 165
20[9 ff.]	205
20[30]	170
20[41]	36
21[5 ff.]	95
21[37]	165
22[1]	165
22[1 f.]	167
22[8]	172
22[8]	49
22[14]	174
22[15 f.]	167 f.
22[18]	180
22[21 ff.]	173
22[22]	154
22[24 ff.]	173
22[27]	214
22[29 f.]	175
22[31 ff.]	175
22[37]	176
22[39 ff.]	177
22[45]	176
22[47]	165
22[48]	223
22[49]	175
22[62]	165
22[63]	177
22[64 ff.]	169
22[61]	178
22[62 ff.]	180
22[70 ff.]	169 ff.

St. Luke	PAGE
23[2]	148
23[25]	102
23[27 ff.]	178
23[34]	178
23[35 ff.]	175
23[39 ff.]	178
23[44 ff.]	87
23[47]	88
23[47 f.]	178
23[53]	121
24[6]	166
24[7]	167
24[18 ff.]	167
24[20]	215
24[25-27]	167
24[26]	215
24[34]	85
24[39]	215
24[47 f.]	174
24[49]	167

St. John	
1[8]	57
1[14]	181
1[15. 19 ff.]	58
1[26]	74
1[34]	58
1[41]	58, 179
1[42]	111
1[45]	187
1[49]	58, 179
2[1 f.]	187
2[1 ff.]	189
2[10 ff.]	144, 158
3[3]	56, 61
3[3 ff.]	158
3[5]	61
3[22 ff.]	58
4[10 ff.]	158
4[24]	191
4[27]	56
4[32 ff.]	158
4[46 ff.]	189
5[2 ff.]	189
5[35]	57

St. John — PAGE

5[44] 181
6[1 ff.] . . . 115 f., 189
6[8] 40
6[14] 55
6[16] 115
6[16 ff.] . . . . 189 f.
6[30] 221
6[41] 58
6[42] 187
6[52] 58
6[59] 202
7[15, 21] 56
7[30] 202
8[11] 180
8[16] 211
8[24] 58
8[28] 181
8[29] 211
8[39 ff.] 180
8[44] 78
8[56] 194
9[1 ff.] 190
9[18 ff.] 180
9[35 ff.] . . . 58, 121
10[24 f., 32 ff.] . . . 180
10[30] 202
10[40 ff.] . . . 58
11[1 ff., 20 ff.] . . . 190
11[28 ff.] . . . 158
11[27] 179
12[1 f., 12] . . . 139
12[14 f.] . . . 121
12[23] . . . 177, 197
12[23 f.] . . . 86
12[31 ff.] . . . 181
12[37, 39] . . . 191
12[39 ff.] . . . 181
13[1] 177
13[1 ff.] . . . 135
13[2] 172
13[4, 13 ff.] . . . 214
13[19] 180
13[27] 172
13[31 f.] . . . 181
14[4 ff.] . . . 158
14[7] 180
14[30] 177
16[28, 32] . . . 211
17[1] . . . 177, 197
18[1] 139
18[2] 165
18[4] 162
18[11] 214
18[12] 165
18[31] 147
19[14, 31] . . . 135 f.
19[36] 136
20[19-23] . . . 82
20[20] 215
20[28] 78
20[31] 179

Acts
1[14] 187
1[22] 64
2[1-4] 82
4[1 ff.] 176
5[17 ff.] 176
7[48] . . . 121, 144
7[54 ff.] 147
8[1] 173
10[37] 64
10[38] 105
12[1 ff.] 176
13[5] xi
13[24] 64
15[28] 173
17[24] 144
18[6] 180
27[22] 173

Romans
3[3] . . . 189
8[3] . . . 109
9–11 . . . 76
9[33] . . . 189
11[20] . . . 189

1 Corinthians
1[23] . . . 80, 111, 146, 189
5[7] 136

1 Corinthians — PAGE

10[11] . . . 89
11[23] . . . 127
11[26] . . 129, 140
12[3] . . . 78
15[3 f.] . . . 154
15[5] . . . 85
15[30. 32] . . . 136

2 Corinthians

3[7-18] 78
3[14] 76
5[16] 180
10[1] 210

Galatians

2[20] 53
3[13] 146
5[11] 146

Ephesians

2[11] 144
2[11-18] 86

Philippians

2[5 ff.] . . 211 ff.

1 Thessalonians — PAGE

4[14] 129

2 Timothy

4[11] . . . xi

Hebrews

1[1 f.] 218
2[10] 215
5[7] 215
6[18] 84
9[3] 84
9[11. 24] 144
10[19 f.] 84
11[1] 53
12[2] 212
13[12] 205

Revelation

14[13] 180

Clementine Recognitions

1[41] 83

Ignatius, ad Ephes.

19[1] 103