

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## MARK AS A SOURCE FOR THE FOURTH GOSPEL

H. J. FLOWERS

FANTILES, CHORLEYWOOD, HERTS, ENGLAND

**W**HEN we compare the Fourth Gospel with the Synoptics, we are struck at once by the differences. But on closer examination, we see that, shimmering through the differences, there are points in which John and the Synoptics agree. That makes us wonder whether John had any or all of the Synoptics to work upon. We shall take it for granted that Mk. has been used, together with other sources, by Lk. and Mt. It may be that Mk. itself is of composite authorship, and it may also be that interpolations into the original writing can be found, but, taking it as a whole, internal evidence seems to vindicate the tradition that the Gospel goes back to Petrine teaching. We will examine, in more or less detail, the Gospels of Mk. and Jn., to see whether there are signs of dependence, leaving out of account the fact that we possess Mt. and Lk. It may be that some of the changes that John makes to the Markan account have justification in either Mt. or Lk. But, for the time being, we shall assume that such changes as Jn. does make, he makes on his own authority, irrespective of the fact that he may have been preceded by others. This seems, on the whole, to be the simplest plan. We possess then two Gospels, one going by the name of Mk. and the other by the name of Jn., and we shall apply to them much the same kind of analysis as is generally applied in the discussion of the Synoptic problem. That is to say, we are searching for the following points, (a) do Jn. and Mk. record, in any degree, the same events? (b) If so, is there any evidence that Jn. used

Mk.? (c) If so, how does Jn. deal with Mk. in embodying, supplementing or correcting him? We shall first submit the Gospels to a detailed analysis, and then, at the end of the analysis, sum up the results.

At the very beginning of our investigations, we are made to pause. Mk. commences with ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and Jn. begins with ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος. Mk.'s superscription may be taken in more than one way, either (1) as an early heading which arose from the conflation of an early title ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΙΨ ΧΥ with the note APXH which marked the beginning of a new book, thus differentiating it from Mt. perhaps (so Nestle, *Expos.*, Dec. 1894. Zahn in his *I. N. T.* is against this), or (2), as a title prefixed to the book by the author himself, or (3), it may be intended to refer the words to the sequel. Thus, Irenaeus and Origen (*Contra Celsum*, 24) connect the title with verse 2. Origen, in his comment on Jn. 1 14, says that John the Baptist may be the beginning of the Gospel. He also shows by the context that people in general took that view. On the other hand, Basil and Victor make the preaching of John to be the beginning of the Gospel. The word εὐαγγέλιον is a favourite one of Mk., but neither the verb nor the noun is in Jn. If Mk. does treat the preaching of the Baptist as the beginning of the Gospel, it is fairly plausible, at first sight, to suggest that the Fourth Gospel is correcting, for, in the Prologue, the Gospel is carried back to the very beginning of time. Even before the Incarnation, the Logos had been dealing with men as Light and Life. Now there is evidence, that, in the early church, apologists (cf. Origen, *Contra Celsum*) had to face the question of what God had been doing before Jesus came, and Mk.'s Gospel provokes that question, but Jn.'s answers it. On the other hand, ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος seems to refer to Gen. 1 1, אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ = ἐν ἀρχῇ, ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, and even goes beyond it. Moreover, there is much to say for the view that Gen. 1-3 underlies many of the ideas in the Fourth Gospel, and has coloured more than one of its narratives. Jn. is dealing with the meaning of Christianity, and says that it is nothing less than a new creation. There is a sacred week at the beginning

of the world, and there is a sacred week at the beginning of the renewed world. God walks in His garden in the cool of the evening, and Jesus walks in his garden and is mistaken for the gardener. It may be that Jn. is correcting Mk.'s conception, but if so, he has Gen. in mind in his vocabulary (cf. *ἐν ἀρχῇ, ὁ θεός, ἐγένετο, σκοτία, κόσμος, φῶς, ζωή*).

## JOHN THE BAPTIST AND THE BAPTISM OF JESUS

The prophetic quotation in Mk. may not be original, but the point to be made here is that, in Mk., the quotation belongs to the author, and is an exact quotation from the LXX, except that for *αὐτοῦ* the LXX has *τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν*. John puts it all into the mouth of the Baptist, and has a considerable change in language. Mk. states that John the Baptist came preaching repentance, but the main emphasis is on the "coming one," greater than the Baptist (1 7-8). The Fourth Gospel omits all reference to the personal ministry of the Baptist as being worthy in itself, and treats him as nothing more or less than a witness to Christ. Mk. does not show that John recognizes Jesus. The Fourth Gospel adds 1 19-22, for which it has no parallel in Mk., and is emphatic, both in the Prologue as it stands (it seems to need reconstruction), and in the self-witness of the Baptist, that he is nothing but a voice, but there is justification for this in the self-subordination of the Baptist himself as given in Mk. 1 7-8. However, the strong and reiterated language of the Fourth Gospel is hard to explain, unless it had other sources at its disposal, or unless it was dealing with the problems of its own day.

Jn. 1 24-34 is parallel to Mk. 1 7-11. The Baptist is never called *ὁ βαπτιστής* by Jn., although his baptism is spoken of in 1 25, 26, 28, 31, 33; 3 23; 4 1; 10 40, but always incidentally and never directly. Both Mk. and Jn. say that the Baptist asserts that he baptizes with water, but the one who comes after him will baptize *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*.<sup>1</sup> But in Mk., this is

<sup>1</sup> In *Baptist Quarterly*, October 1926, I suggest that what John really predicted was a baptism *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ὕδατι*.

said before the baptism of Jesus; in Jn., in the passage which apparently corresponds to the baptism. Mk. has *ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου*, Jn. has *ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος*. Jn. has *ἄξιος* for *ικανός*, and *ἵνα λύσω* for *λύσαι* and has *αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος* for *τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ*, thus making into an honourable act what, in Mk., is an act of menial service. In relating the baptism of Jesus, Mk. states that Jesus saw the heavens opening and the descent of the Spirit, and then goes on to say, without relating the persons who heard the voice, that the voice came saying, *σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα*, but the very form of this sentence with *σύ* and *σοί* shows that the voice came to Jesus. In the account of the Fourth Gospel, we notice the following points: (1) It does not mention at all the baptism of Jesus, but shows, by the language it uses, that it is acquainted with the tradition. (2) The purpose and effect of the vision are changed. The Baptist says that he was forewarned by God about the vision. The voice is not mentioned. The Spirit as a dove comes down and abides on Jesus, but the effect is not mentioned. It is the effect upon John which is important. It enables him to recognize the Messiah, to declare Him publicly, and to state that he is the one who is to take away the sin of the world. It is quite plain that the author of the Fourth Gospel was acquainted with the primitive tradition, but it is also equally plain that he is departing from it. Another addition of the Fourth Gospel is the statement that John baptized in Bethany beyond Jordan. Mk. states that John preached in the wilderness, and baptized in the Jordan. Another point is one of chronology. John says that the vision of the dove came on the day following the prediction of a follower by the Baptist. Mk. dates it vaguely as "in those days."

The next point where Jn. and Mk. meet is in Mk. 1 14-15, and Jn. 4 1-3. Jn. has already related the call of four disciples, a call which will be discussed later, he has related the ministry in Cana, Capernaum, Jerusalem and Judaea, but where he meets Mk. is in saying that Jesus left Judaea and went back again into Galilee. It is the evident intention of Mk. to

connect the beginning of the ministry of Jesus and the end of that of John, and the message is much the same, the nearness of the Kingdom of God, and the need for repentance as a preparation for that Kingdom. But the connection of the Fourth Gospel is quite different. Apparently Jesus leaves Judaea in order to avoid premature conflict with the Pharisaic party there, who were comparing his baptism with that of John, for John was still baptizing. Here we have a direct contradiction of the tradition embodied in Mk., and it seems as if the Fourth Gospel were relying upon a second tradition, and endeavouring to correct the first. One would have thought that the theological outlook of the author would have prevented him from allowing the ministry of the Baptist to continue alongside that of Jesus, and we are almost forced to say that historical tradition is appearing here through the theological framework.

In the removal from Judaea to Galilee, Jesus passed through Samaria and evangelised it, according to the Fourth Gospel. This again has no parallel in Mk. We must now examine the additions and changes which we find in Jn. as against Mk., prior to the removal to Galilee. They are as follows:

(1) Immediately after the baptism of Jesus, Mk. gives an abbreviated account of the Temptation. This is not definitely referred to in Jn. It is not, however, opposed to the spirit of that Gospel, as some scholars suggest. Many seem to forget that the Johannine Christ is, after all, depicted in an historical narrative, and that the author was historian enough to make Jesus real as well as ideal. Jn. 12 27 shows that Jesus could be uncertain. Jn. never speaks of Jesus being tempted, but he describes a real temptation, when he says that the Jews tried to make Jesus king.

(2) According to the Fourth Gospel, the day after the public witness of John the Baptist to Jesus, two of his disciples, acting upon his testimony, followed Jesus and became his disciples. One of the two was Andrew. He found Simon and brought him to Jesus, saying that they had found the Messiah. Jesus gave Simon the surname of Peter. The connection in

Mk. is absolutely different. Here Andrew and Peter are found fishing in the Sea of Galilee, after Jn. had been imprisoned, and there is no trace of their having been formerly John's disciples. Mk. mentions the surnaming of Peter in 3 16, at the charge to the Twelve, although this does not of necessity mean that the name was conferred then, although the use of *ἐρέθισεν* suggests it. And, according to Mk., the disciples did not confess belief in the Messiahship of Jesus until Caesarea. There is no parallel either of thought or language between the two accounts.

(3) According to Jn., the day after the calling of Andrew and Peter, Jesus determined to go into Galilee and called Philip. Philip found Nathanael, and the conversation between Nathanael and Jesus is related. This is not in Mk. On the other hand, Mk. relates the call of James and John, the sons of Zebedee, in close connection with that of Peter and Andrew, which is not in Jn., unless it is suggested in the other disciple who was called with Andrew. Even then the circumstances are entirely different.

We need now to examine (1) the relation between the Markan and Johannine accounts of the journey into Galilee, and (2) the Synoptic and Johannine accounts of the appointment of the Twelve.

(1) Mk. leaves an interval between the Temptation of Jesus and his preaching in Galilee. This may mean that Jesus did not preach at all in the interval or that the preaching was elsewhere than in Galilee and Mk. knew nothing of it. (The second view is put forward by Askwith, "*The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel*," p. 264.) The first view is the more natural. In any case, the preaching in Galilee and the imprisonment of John are closely correlated in the mind of Mk., chronologically if not causally. Mk. includes in this visit to Galilee the preaching of the Gospel and a visit to Capernaum, where many people are healed. According to Jn., there were two early visits to Galilee, one made before the arrest of the Baptist, and the other some time after. But in neither case is the visit in any way dependent upon the imprisonment. In the first visit, some of the disciples were called. There is no suggestion of fame,

no preaching, but there is a visit to Cana, during which Jesus manifested his glory. There is a visit to Capernaum. Then comes the visit to Jerusalem, and then, as a result of the actions of the Pharisees, the journey back into Galilee, where Jesus is received and heals the officer's son. We thus see historical tradition showing itself in Jn., in that the ministry of Jesus begins in Galilee, and that there he performs miracles and calls his disciples.

(2) Mk. describes Jesus as calling whom he would to be his disciples, and emphasises the absolute, uncontrolled action of Jesus. Lk. and Jn. have "chosen out." Mt. does not say that the Twelve were chosen by Jesus. He omits Mk. 3 13-19 a, and therefore Mt. 10 1 is unexpected. A difficulty is left over unsolved by the Synoptics, in that Jesus chose as one of his disciples a man who afterwards betrayed him. Mk. calls Judas "traitor" in the very first catalogue of the apostles (3 19), because that name stuck to him in the Church. Jn. solves the difficulty to his own satisfaction by saying that Jesus knew from the beginning who would betray him (cf. 6 64, 70-71). The sole purpose of this note is apologetic. In 6 64, the Sinaitic Syriac omits *ἦδει γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παραδώσων αὐτόν*. Blass and Merx follow, and strike it out of the text, Blass because *ὁ παραδώσων* is a unique use of the future participle in Jn., Merx for the additional reason that *οἱ δώδεκα* are mentioned only in Jn. in 6 67, 70, 71 and 20 24, and the notice is quite inexplicable, since this Gospel has given no account of the calling of the Twelve. (*Die vier kanonischen Evangelien*, Pt II, Section II, pp. 140-146.) These reasons are quite unsatisfactory. Jn. takes it for granted that his readers know about the calling of the Twelve (cf. 15 16). Merx seems to have forgotten that Mt. also refers to the Twelve (10 1), and yet does not describe Jesus calling them. Lk. says that Jesus called the Twelve, "Apostles," (6 13), although he does so indirectly, and the word is not put into the mouth of Jesus. It may be the point of view of the historian of the Early Church showing itself. In Jn. 13 16, "the apostle" is called "the servant," showing that Apostleship is founded not only in companionship with Jesus during a certain period, which is the point of view



in the early part of Acts, but in loving service. Mk.'s view is that the Twelve were appointed in order that they might be with Jesus and preach. Mt. and Lk. omit the first purpose, whilst Jn. omits the second. The Synoptics show how the disciples came to know that Jesus was Messiah, and preached before they acknowledged who he was. Jn. nowhere describes the Twelve as being away from Jesus, except on two occasions, when they went to buy bread during the visit to Samaria, and also for a short interval after the Feeding of the Five Thousand. The disciples are never described as going on a preaching tour, and in the whole of the Johannine narrative, there seems to be no place for the tour. The disciples know Jesus from the beginning, although there are signs of ignorance, as in the question of Philip during the last discourses.

After the call of Philip, the Fourth Gospel describes the visit of Jesus to Cana, and the wedding there, which has no warrant in Mk. And there are many things which suggest that it has no warrant in history. It is not at all unlikely, however, that the story is built up from Synoptic sayings, such as the wine of the Kingdom, the parable of the wine and the wineskins, and the Lukan remark that people prefer old wine to new, because they think that the old is better.

After the wedding, according to Jn., Jesus went to Capernaum with his family and disciples, and stayed a short time (2 12). There seems to be no purpose in the remark, unless it is a reference to what we know from Mk. 1 21. Mk. says that Jesus went with some others (apparently the disciples whom he had called just before), but makes no mention of his family. Both, however, in scattered references, suggest that the home of Jesus was there, and that Joseph was dead.

John relates that, after the stay in Capernaum (the ministry is not mentioned, although Mk. deals with a healing and preaching ministry), Jesus went to Jerusalem, cleansed the Temple, and had a conversation with Nicodemus. Preaching and miracles are mentioned, and the impression is that the influence on the people was very great. One point of difference between the Markan and Johannine accounts falls to be examined here, namely, the cleansing of the Temple. The literary relationship

between the two is quite negligible. There is hardly a single point of contact. The following differences call for notice. (a) Mk. puts the cleansing on the day after the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, before the last Passover. Jn. puts it in the first visit to Jerusalem, at the beginning of the period of the Judæan ministry. (b) The connections are quite different. In Mk., the cleansing is the sequel to the homage which the people had given to Jesus, and if he has not the support of the people in his act, at least they are not opposed to him (cf. Mk. 11 18). But in Jn., it is an outburst of prophetic zeal at the first contact of Jesus with the established religion. (c) In Jn., the act is sudden and final; in Mk., it seems to be part of a lengthy and continued policy (cf. 11 16-17). (d) The words of justification for the act are different, but they express the same idea. (e) Jn. apparently means that only the oxen and sheep were driven out. Mk. says the people were driven out. Jn. adds the use of the scourge, and the reflections of the disciples, but omits the notice regarding the support of the people. He also adds the discussion with the Pharisees over the destruction of the temple, and uses the words, "Destroy this temple, and in three days, I will raise it up." Mk. does not state this in connection with the cleansing, but he mentions it as being one of the accusations brought against Jesus at his trial.

The conversation with Nicodemus has no parallel in Mk. Then we are given another notice in the Fourth Gospel that John's ministry was carried on alongside that of Jesus (3 22-30), with a direct contradiction of Mk. or the tradition given to us in Mk. in the statement that John was not yet cast into prison (3 24). If this is not a contradiction of some tradition which the author knew was in circulation, it is hard to understand the notice. For the Fourth Gospel nowhere describes the imprisonment of John.

The next place where the narratives of Jn. and Mk. meet is in the account of the feeding of the Five Thousand (Jn. 6 1-13 = Mk. 6 30-44). But before then, there have been many cases, where Jn. reminds us of Markan phraseology. These will be tabulated later.

In the accounts of the feeding, we notice first that the connections are quite different. Mk. connects the feeding with the retirement of Jesus with his disciples into an uninhabited region, to give them a rest after their mission. Jn.'s chronology is very vague, and he says, "after these things, Jesus departed over the Sea of Galilee, that is, Tiberias." This is a good illustration of the fact that Jn. is not endeavouring to preserve strict order, or to give a full account of the ministry of Jesus. Jesus departs from the scene of his ministry at the time, which is left quite indefinite. The preceding chapter speaks of the healing and teaching of Jesus in Jerusalem, and it is most unnatural to speak of the departure of Jesus "across the Sea of Galilee." Mk. also says that Jesus crossed the sea with his Disciples, ἀπῆλθον τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον, for which Jn. puts "across the Sea of Galilee." Mk. seems to have a small point which brings his main chronological position into line with that of Jn. In verse 39, he speaks of the people sitting down on the green grass. This shows the time to be the Passover. Bacon, on the other hand, says that such a notice is quite within the capacity of any early evangelist who had witnessed Christian love feasts in the open air. If the reference were isolated, this might be true criticism. But Jn. also refers to the grass in 6 10, and he also mentions the nearness of the Passover in 6 4. This seems to show that Mk. knew that there was a Passover feast during the ministry of Jesus other than that referred to at the end of the Gospel. Mk. and Jn. both say that the crowd followed Jesus, but in entirely different language. Mk. says that the people followed Jesus by land, but also that they reached their destination before Jesus. Jn. gives us the reason why the people followed Jesus. It was because they saw the signs which he was performing upon the sick (6 2). Mk. says that Jesus had pity on the people, and taught them to such a late hour that it was necessary for the disciples to intervene. Of this there is nothing in Jn. Here, Jesus went up into the highlands and sat down with his disciples, and as soon as he saw the people coming to him, suggested to Philip that food should be given them.

In Mk., the disciples make the suggestion that Jesus should

send the people away to buy food. Jesus tells the disciples to give food to the people. The disciples ask whether they are to go and buy bread, and say that 200 denaria would be required. Jesus asks how many loaves they have. The disciples go to find out (*γινόντες*) and answer "five and two fishes." In Jn., there is no mention of the need of the people. Jesus asks Philip where food is to be obtained for them (the first mention of food is from Jesus, not from the disciples), but he asked this, testing Philip, for he himself knew what he intended to do. "*Die wirkliche Frage Jesu bei Mr. wird bei Joh. zur versuchlichen Scheinfrage herabgedrückt entsprechend seiner hohen Christologie.*" (Werule, *Die Synoptische Frage*, p. 238.) Philip says that 200 denaria would not be enough to buy food for all (notice the agreement on the price). Andrew interrupts with the remark that a boy is there with five barley loaves and two small fishes (agreeing with Mk. in the numbers, but adding *κριθίνους*, and using the diminutive *ὀψάρια*).

In Mk., Jesus commands, but indirectly, that the disciples should make the people sit down in companies on the green grass, and the people sat down in companies of fifty and sixty. In Jn., the direct command is given, mention is made of the grass, but nothing is said about sitting down in companies. Both Mk. and Jn. say that the people sat down, using *ἄετεςαν*, but it is hard to understand how such a thing could be expressed without the use of some such word. Jn. says there were five thousand men (*ἄνδρες*, 6 10), a note which Mk. puts at the end of the account of the miracle (6 44). Mk. says Jesus took the loaves (*λαβών*), looked up into heaven, blessed (*εὐλόγησεν*) and broke the bread, and gave it to his disciples to distribute it to the people. Jn. says Jesus took the loaves (*ἔλαβεν*), blessed them (*εὐχαριστήσας*), and himself distributed it to the people. Mk. says the people ate and were filled (*ἐχορτάσθησαν*), and that the disciples took up *κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων*. Jn. says the people were filled (*ἐνεπλήσθησαν*, which seems to be a stylistic correction<sup>2</sup>),

<sup>2</sup> Jn. uses *ἐχορτάσθητε* in 6 26, however, showing that he knew the Markan word.

and Jesus gave orders for the fragments to be collected.<sup>3</sup> The disciples did so *καὶ ἐγάμισαν δώδεκα κοφίνους κλασμάτων ἐκ τῶν πέντα ἄρτων τῶν κριθίων ἃ ἐπερίσσευσαν τοῖς βεβρωκόσιν.*

Mk. appends immediately to the miracle the remark about Jesus sending his disciples across the sea towards Bethsaida, while he dismissed the people. When this was done, he went up into the mountainous parts to pray. After that, we are given the account of the walking on the sea. According to Jn., the miracle aroused the expectations of the people, they saw that Jesus was a prophet and desired to make him king. To escape them he went up into the hill country alone. (It is to be noticed that we have not been told since 6:3 that Jesus had come down again.) In the evening, the disciples went down to the shore and sailed across towards Capernaum. It is not said where they had been in the meantime, no mention is made of compulsion, and nothing is said of Jesus bidding good-bye to the people. Then follows the account of Jesus walking on the sea. We must now examine the accounts of this miracle in Mk. and Jn.

In Mk., when it was late in the evening (*ὀψίας γενομένης*), the boat was in the middle of the sea, and Jesus was alone on the shore. Jesus saw the disciples hard-pressed in their rowing, for *ὁ ἄνεμος* was against them. About the third watch, he came to them walking on the sea, and wished to pass them by. They saw him, were afraid, and thinking it was a vision, they cried out. He spoke to them, *θαρσεῖτε, ἐγὼ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε.* He climbed into the boat, the wind ceased, they became more afraid, for they had not learned the lesson of the loaves, because their heart was hardened. In Jn., when it became late (*ὀψία ἐγένετο*), the disciples went down to the shore, and crossed over the sea towards Capernaum. Darkness came on, and a great wind (*ἀνέμου μεγάλου πνέοντος*). When they had rowed about twenty five or thirty stadia, they saw Jesus walking on the sea and near the boat, and they became afraid. Jesus said, *ἐγὼ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε.* They were

<sup>3</sup> In Jn. alone, do we have the command of Jesus for the fragments to be gathered up.

willing to take him into the boat, and immediately the boat came to land.

After this miracle, Jn. and Mk. again separate until Jn. 7 1 — Mk. 9 30. Mk. has, before this, spoken of other miracles, a tour to the north for which no motive is given, then another miracle of feeding, perhaps a duplicate of the story of the Five thousand, with language which is less picturesque and more eucharistic. This miracle is followed by an encounter with the Pharisees and a cure. Then follows the teaching on the way to Caesarea, which is "historically and doctrinally the milestone in Mk.'s Gospel" (Bacon). In Mk., the meaning of the incident is not to be found in the confession of Peter, but in the fact that here we have the beginning of the doctrine of the Cross. It has been adumbrated before, and the Gospel has all along been preparing for it, but henceforth it is central in the mind of Jesus. Then follows the account of the transfiguration, the discussion of the Elijah tradition, and the curing of the boy with an evil spirit. Then Jesus leaves his retreat with his disciples and travels southward through Galilee. We have none of this directly in the Johannine narrative. Yet there are signs that Jn. has used the same kind of tradition that we find in Mk. That he should leave out of his narrative the account of the transfiguration is perfectly intelligible, as it has no place in his Christology. But the eucharistic colouring found in Mk.'s story of the feeding of the four thousand has been expanded into the doctrine of the mystical communion of the believer with Christ, with the new thought that the bread of life is to be equated with the Body of Christ (chap. 6). And we can, I believe, find a parallel to the confession of Peter at Caesarea in 6 68-69. If it is the same confession, it has been altered beyond recognition, and Westcott says therefore that the two confessions are different. But there are points of contact. (1) In Jn., the confession follows the feeding of the Five Thousand. In Mk., it follows the feeding of the Four Thousand. This raises the assumption that Jn. follows Mk., especially if the story of the Four Thousand is a duplicate of the other. (2) In both Mk. and Jn., the confession of Peter is a set-off against the disappointment of the

crowd and their troubled minds. (3) "Whom say ye that am?" is not so very far removed from "will ye also go away? There must be some recasting of phraseology, since, according to Jn., the disciples knew who Jesus was long before this. (4) *ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ* appears only here and in Mk. 1 21-28 in the Gospels. In Mk., it is the confession of the demoniacs, wrung out of them by the personality of Jesus. In Jn. we have no demoniacs and no confession by demoniacs, but we have a knowledge and a belief in Jesus gained by experience (note the tenses, *πεπιστεύκαμεν* and *ἐγνώκαμεν*). Here Jn. shows signs of the Synoptic idea of the disciples growing into belief in Jesus. In Jn., knowledge and belief are equated. It is *γνώσις* which is required, as the Gnostics were beginning to demand. But real *γνώσις* is *πίστις*. And both these are the result of moral endeavour. They are allied to *ἀγάπη*. (5) In Mk., it is plainly shown that the confession gave Jesus the opportunity to teach "The Cross." In Jn., the confession follows the claims of Jesus and the consequent sifting of the people into followers and opponents. Mk. shows that Jesus began to concentrate attention upon the disciples, consequent on such a sifting.

According to Jn., after the feeding and teaching, Jesus came from the north to Galilee, and taught there. He was unwilling to go into Judaea, because the Jews desired to kill him. We find an interesting parallel between Mk. 9 30 and Jn. 7 1-4. In Mk., we have just been told of the Transfiguration and the healing of the boy with an evil spirit. Then, we are told, Jesus journeyed through Galilee with his disciples and wished no one to know of it. In this period of obscurity, he taught his disciples again concerning his sufferings. They all came to Capernaum, teaching followed, and then begins the account of the last journey to Jerusalem (10 1). The reason why Jesus wished to remain in obscurity is not made perfectly plain in the Markan story, but we are given help in Lk. 9 51, where we are told that the days of Jesus were fulfilled, and he deliberately set himself to risk all on a final visit to Jerusalem. But Jn. has a similar notice in 7 1-4. Jesus is now in Galilee, and does not wish to walk in Judaea,

because the Jews seek to kill him. He does not travel up with his brethren, but goes up *ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ*. This is one of many minute signs that the Markan outline allows itself to show through the Johannine covering, no matter how much the general scheme is changed.

Mk. 10 1 and Jn. 10 22 again show contact. The final departure of Jesus from Galilee in Mk. 10 1-2 marks the beginning of the Judæan ministry. The details of this are vague until Jesus reaches Jerusalem, when the account becomes much more complete. The cure of the blind beggar outside Jericho marks the opening stage of the Messianic entry into the capital. Dialogues are held in the Temple, where Jesus teaches in the daytime, but every night he goes out to Bethany, and makes that village his headquarters. On the first day, there is the entry, Jesus looks round the Temple, does nothing and returns to Bethany. On the second day, he goes to Jerusalem, curses the fig tree on his way, enters the Temple, and returns to Bethany. On the third day, he again goes to Jerusalem, the disciples notice the withered fig tree, and there follows the teaching in the Temple and to the disciples. Then begins the story of the Passion in 14 1. In Jn., the sequence is absolutely different. We have the account of the feast of Dedication, and the story of the man healed on the Sabbath day, and the opposition of the Jews. Then Jesus crosses the Jordan, stays there a short time, hears of the sickness of Lazarus, stays yet longer, and then goes to Bethany, raises Lazarus, and as a result, many Jews believe on him, but the Pharisees plot against him. Bethany is called the village of Mary and Martha, who have not been mentioned before, which again presupposes that the reader knew of them. Jesus will not go to Judæa, but goes to a place called Ephraim with his disciples. The Passover is near. Then six days before the Passover he goes to Bethany again, and the story of the Anointing follows. Then comes the entry, the arrival of the Greeks, teaching, withdrawal, further teaching, and then the last supper, the day before the Passover.

There are several things which need to be said as the result of this analysis. (1) It seems to be one of the few cases in which



*entweder . . . oder* can be applied. The days in which Mk. and Jn. could be set over against each other as absolute contradictions have gone by. As we have seen already, there are numerous cases of parallelism between them, and it is quite certain that there is in Jn. a nucleus of tradition analogous to what we have in Mk., even if there is no more. No longer can we treat it as idealisation with no attention to historic fact. Many scholars also have carried their belief in Mk. as against Jn. much too far. Mk. shows gaps in the narrative which cause great difficulty. He seems to have doublets which compel us to exercise judgment. And the Gospel is not the simple picture of Jesus that many still seem to think. We have dogmatic even here, and the difference between him and Jn. is not so much one of kind as one of degree. Yet in the case of the last week, it seems necessary to put Jn. and Mk. against each other. Neither may be right. Both cannot be. There is no place for the raising of Lazarus in the story of Mk. He presents an intelligible sequence of events. Probability is all on his side, and in questions of ancient history, we have to be guided, in nine cases out of ten, by probabilities. (2) From this point onwards, Mk. and Jn. separate almost entirely and touch at only isolated points. (3) The anointing six days before the Passover of which we are told in Jn. 12 1-11 is equivalent to the anointing recorded by Mk. later, two days before the Passover. We can find several points of contact between the two accounts. Both dinners are said to have been held in Bethany. Mk. says that it was in the house of Simon the Leper. Jn. says that Lazarus was there and the impression is that it was not in his house. Jn. says the woman's name was Mary. Mk. speaks only of a woman. According to Mk., the woman had *ἀλάβαστρον μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς*. Jn. says Mary took a pound *μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου*, but omits *ἀλάβαστρον*. Mk. says she poured it over the head of Jesus. Jn. says she anointed the feet of Jesus and wiped his feet with her hair, and mentions the fact of the whole house being filled with the odour of the ointment. Mk. says that some people there were angry; Jn. says that it was Judas particularly, and adds the significant remark about Judas being a thief. The complaint,

according to Mk., was "the ointment could have been sold for over 300 denaria, (*ἐπάνω δηναρίων τριακοσίων*) and given to the poor (*δοθῆναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς*)." Jn. says that Judas asked why the ointment was not sold for 300 denaria (*τριακοσίων δηναρίων*) and given to poor people (*ἐδόθη πτωχοῖς*). Mk. says that Jesus answered, "Leave her alone (*ἄφετε αὐτήν*), why trouble her? She hath wrought a good work in me. *πάντοτε γὰρ τοῖς πτωχοῖς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε αὐτοῖς εὖ ποιῆσαι, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε*. She hath done what she could. *προέλαβεν μυρίσαι μου τὸ σῶμα εἰς ἐνταφιασμόν*," and adds that she would always be held in remembrance for her deed. Jn. gives the reply of Jesus as, "leave her alone (*ἄφες αὐτήν*), let her keep it for the day of my entombing (*ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τηρήσῃ αὐτό*)," an exceedingly hard phrase to explain, and in any case, a decided lowering of Mk. Then we have *τοῖς πτωχοῖς γὰρ πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε*, omitting Mk.'s redundant "you can help them whenever you wish." The verbal similarities are too close to deny literary relationship, but Mk.'s account has a Messianic significance which Jn.'s lacks.

According to Jn., the day after the raising of Lazarus, the great mass of the people (*ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς*), who had come up to the feast, went out to meet Jesus because they heard he was coming to Jerusalem. Their enthusiasm was aroused by the raising of Lazarus (cf. 12 9-11, by which we are to judge that the story was common property). It was this miracle which called forth the greatest faith and aroused the most bitter opposition. It was the people who had actually seen the miracle who were ultimately responsible for the welcome given to Jesus (cf. 12 18). According to Mk., the order of events was as follows. On the last journey to Jerusalem, when Jesus and his disciples came near to Bethphage and Bethany at the ascent of the Mount of Olives, Jesus sent two of his disciples into the village that lay opposite them (Bethany?), giving them instructions about finding an ass, upon which no man had ever sat! He also instructed them what to say in case their actions were questioned. These instructions the disciples carried out, and everything happened just as Jesus had said. It appears that Jesus was

known in the village, and that the owners of the ass were adherents of his cause (verse 3). The disciples brought the ass to Jesus, and put their garments upon it, and he sat on it (*ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτόν*). Many strewed their garments in the road, while others took leaves and stubble from the fields and did the same (*ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδας κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν*). And those who went before and those who followed cried 'Ωσαννά' *Ἐυλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Ἐυλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυεὶδ. Ὡσαννά ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις*. There was apparently a great crowd with him, some in front and some behind, but we are not told when they came or where they came from. According to Jn., the crowd came from Jerusalem to meet Jesus, and took the branches of palm trees (*τὰ βαΐα τῶν φοινίκων*, which may be a more polite and at the same time more symbolic representation of Mk.'s *στιβάδας*, which is very ordinary and suggests no thoughts beyond itself), and greeted him with the cry 'Ωσαννά, *εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου* (as in Mk.) *καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ*, (the personalising of Mk.'s phrase regarding the Kingdom). Then Jesus found an ass (*εἶρων ὄναριον*, Mk. has *πῶλον*), and sat upon it (*ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτό*) in fulfilment of the prophecy of Zechariah. The Pharisees heard of the tumult and realised that their hands were tied. The world had gone after Jesus.

Several points call for notice:

(1) In Mk., it is a crowd already collected who go to Jerusalem with Jesus. In Jn., it is a crowd who come from Jerusalem to meet him. (2) In both, the entry is evidently Messianic in the minds of everybody, the people, the author, and Jesus, and it is meant to have that significance for the readers also. (3) The action of Jesus in riding into Jerusalem upon an ass is deliberate in both, although, in Mk., the agency of the disciples is employed. In Jn., also, Jesus finds the ass after the crowd has come out and welcomed him; it is as if he rides into Jerusalem on the wave of enthusiasm. In Mk., the finding of the ass is a preconceived plan and has a part in arousing the expectations of the people. It looks as if Jesus were deliberately walking in the footsteps of prophecy. (4) Mk.'s is the more primitive account, not only because of the changes Jn. makes

in the nature of the crowd, but also owing to the fact that Jn. has brought the entry into line with festal celebrations, and has changed one or two points to coincide with his story of the raising of Lazarus. (5) The Hosanna is practically the same in both, and for the main part, exactly the same.

In the Passion narratives, the two accounts meet but seldom. For the sake of simplicity, we will examine them in four stages, (1) the events up to the betrayal; (2) the betrayal itself; (3) the trial scenes; (4) the crucifixion.

(1) *The events up to the betrayal.*

In Jn., the order is the supper, the foot-washing, the separation of Judas and his departure from the Apostolic company, the last discourses, the parable of the vine, the high-priestly prayer, the departure over Kedron to a garden. In the discourses, it is perfectly plain that the subjective element goes fairly deep, and the great question is not whether the element is there, but how deep it goes. It shows itself in the high-priestly prayer in one or two places: the title *χριστόν*, which could not possibly have come from the lips of Jesus and which is an offence against historical decorum; the dualism of verse 9, which is quite in accord with the point of view of the author, but seems alien to the optimistic spirit of Jesus, and his view of the world; the pre-existence implied in verses 5 and 24; and finally the tone of the prayer seems to be against the spirit of Gethsemane. In Mk., after the supper at Bethany, Judas makes his agreement with the high priests, then comes the order of Jesus that the disciples should prepare the Passover, then while they are eating it, Jesus informs his disciples of the traitor in their midst. Then there is the institution of the supper, the departure, after singing a hymn, to the Mount of Olives, Jesus predicts the denial by Peter, and then they all come to Gethsemane. The following points are omitted by Jn.: (1) the preparations for the Passover, (2) the institution of the Eucharist, (3) the conference between Judas and the priests. The additions he makes are (1) the footwashing, (2) the discourses, (3) the high-priestly prayer.

We must examine in detail the places where the accounts are somewhat parallel. (1) The prediction of the denial by

Peter. In Jn., this comes after the foot-washing. It is brought into line with Scripture, though the quotation from the LXX is not exact, *ὁ τρώγων μου τὸν ἄρτον ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμέ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ*, and then later, *εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με*. The disciples are at a loss to understand who is meant. At Peter's request, the disciple whom Jesus loved leans back on the breast of Jesus and asks who was the traitor. Jesus says *ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὃς ἐγὼ βάψω τὸ ψωμίον καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ· βάψας οὖν τὸ ψωμίον λαμβάνει καὶ δίδωσιν Ἰούδα Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου*. Satan enters into Simon. Jesus tells him to perform his task quickly. The disciples do not understand what this means. Judas takes the *ψωμίον* and goes out immediately. It is night. In Mk., it all happens while they are eating. Jesus says *εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με* (the exact words of Jn.), and adds *ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ*. The disciples are at a loss, and each wonders whether it is himself (not in Jn.). Jesus says it is *ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρίβλιον*, (this is different from Jn.). Here it probably refers to the Charoseth; in Jn. the *ψωμίον* is probably the tid-bit which an oriental host is accustomed to offer to a favourite guest. Then follows the judgment of the betrayer. There is no mention in Mk. of Judas leaving the company, and it is not until we come to 14 43, where we are told that Judas comes to Gethsemane with the crowd, that we learn he has left.

(2) In Jn. the prediction of Peter's denial appears after the departure of Judas and in the midst of the discourses of Jesus. Jesus says he is going away and the disciples cannot follow. Peter questions this, and says that he will lay down his life for Jesus. The answer is *οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσῃ ἕως οὗ ἀρνήσῃ με τρίς*. According to Mk., the denial is predicted at the Mt. of Olives. Jesus tells the disciples they will all be scattered. Peter denies it for himself. Jesus says *σὺ σήμερον ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δις ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ*. Peter again denies it, as do all the disciples. The *δύς* of Mk. is difficult. Abbott suggests a Semitic original which reads, "twice, yea thrice, thou shalt deny me before cock-crow," and this seems possible. Anyhow, Mk. is hard and Jn. uses different language.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> It may be, however, that *κς* should be omitted and that the "cock crow" refers to the *Gallinismus* (cf. *J. T. S.*, June 1921).

According to Mk., after the institution of the Supper, Jesus goes with his disciples to the Mt. of Olives, then comes the prediction of Peter's denial, and they all came to a place the name of which is Gethsemane. According to Jn., they all pass over the Kedron to a garden. Perhaps Jn. has the flight of David from Absalom in mind. The fact that Jn. omits the institution of the Supper is intelligible, since its meaning has already been given in the discourse following the feeding of the Five Thousand.

(2) *The Betrayal.*

According to Mk., they all came to Gethsemane. Jesus told his disciples to pray, took Peter, James and John further on; then the story of the Agony begins. Jesus left the three, went on a little further, prayed, asked for the cup to be taken from him, found the disciples sleeping, told them to watch and pray, went away again and prayed (and yet a third time), and then said the hour had come and the betrayer was at hand. Then follows the account of the Betrayal. In Jn. direct reference to this is omitted, but there are two traces at least that it was known. (a) Earlier in the Gospel, after the account of the coming of the Greeks, mention is made of Jesus. Jesus says, "And what am I to say? Father, save me from this hour. No, not that, because it was for this that I came to this hour. Father, glorify Thy name," which sounds very much as though it is the Johannine counterpart of the Agony and "not what I will, but what Thou wilt." (b) At the Betrayal, Peter strikes Malchus. Jesus tells him to put back his sword, saying τὸ ποτήριον ὃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατήρ, οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό; This reminds us of the Markan παρένευγε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

In the actual account of the Betrayal, there are the following omissions by Jn. (a) The sign of the traitor's kiss. (b) The expostulation of Jesus at being treated like a robber. (c) The flight of all the disciples. (d) The account of the young man. Jn. adds the falling to the ground of the people, the act of Jesus going forward to be arrested, his question as to whom they were seeking, the fact that it was the right ear of the

servant that was cut off, that his name was Malchus, that it was Peter who struck him, that Jesus told Peter to put back his sword, and asked whether he was not to drink the cup which his Father gave him. Mk. says that Judas came with a crowd with swords and clubs from the chief priests, Scribes and Elders. According to Jn., Judas took a cohort and servants from the chief priests and Pharisees, who had torches, lanterns and weapons.

### (3) *The Trial.*

The places where Jn. meets Mk. are very few. It must be mentioned, in the first place, that there is probably a displacement in Jn. 18, for there is a breaking up of the denial by Peter into two parts, and there is a marked redundancy of events and phraseology. Spitta conjectured displacement. Moffatt follows, and his reconstruction is, to some extent, confirmed by the Sinaitic Syriac. Moffatt puts 18-24 between 14 and 15 and omits 25<sup>a</sup> as tautologous. That means that Jesus is led first of all to Annas, who questions him and sends him to Caiaphas. Before, the course of events had been very obscure.

Thus we have a double trial. (1) An ecclesiastical one, a prior examination before Annas, and then before Caiaphas, (2) The civil trial by Pilate. The denial by Peter took place between the examination before Caiaphas and the trial before Pilate. According to Mk., Jesus was led immediately after arrest before the high priest, was tried, found guilty of blasphemy (Peter's denial follows), and then sent to Pilate. The trial before Annas in Jn. is apparently equivalent to Mk.'s account of the trial before the high priest, although the two accounts have not a trace of similarity. Jn. omits the false witness, the adjuration, the great confession, the charge of blasphemy, and the judgment. But he shows what Mk. does not show, that Jesus is the real judge. He also adds the trial before Caiaphas. He omits the mockery as prophet after the ecclesiastical trial. Now we must examine the accounts of the denial.

Jn.'s account is as follows: Simon followed Jesus with

another disciple, who was known to the high priest and so gained admission into the courtyard of the house of the high priest (the house of Caiaphas apparently). Peter stood at the door, the other disciple went inside, spoke to a woman at the door, then went back and fetched Peter. The woman said *Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου;* Peter answered *οὐκ εἰμί.* Peter went and stood by the fire, and the bystanders asked *Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶ;* ἤρῆσατο ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν *οὐκ εἰμί.* Then a kinsman of Malchus said *οὐκ ἐγὼ σε εἶδον ἐν τῷ κήπῳ μετ' αὐτοῦ; τάλιν οὖν ἤρῆσατο ὁ Πέτρος,* and immediately the cock crowed. According to Mk., Peter (apparently alone) followed Jesus, entered the court of the high priest (as in Jn.), and sat down by the fire. A woman saw him there (agreeing with Jn. as to questioner, but differing as to time and place), and said *καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ ἦσθα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.* Peter denied, saying *οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι σὺ τί λέγεις.* He went out of the courtyard, and the cock crowed. The girl saw him again and said to the bystanders *οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστίν.* He denied again. After a short time, the bystanders (agreeing with John as to questioners, but differing as to time) said *ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ· καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ.* Peter began to swear, saying *οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον τούτον ὃν λέγετε.* The cock crowed a second time. Peter remembered the word of the Lord and wept.

Jn.'s treatment of the trial before Pilate is very dramatic, with the alternating of action inside and outside of the Praetorium. It falls into seven stages: (1) Outside the Praetorium. The Jews claim the execution of their sentence. (2) Inside. Christ is King. (3) Outside. First declaration of innocence. Barabbas. (4) Inside. Scourging and mockery. (5) Outside. Second and third confessions of innocence. Ecce Homo. Son of God. (6) Inside. Source of authority. (7) Outside. Caesar's friend, and last sentence.

According to Mk., the order is as follows. After the ecclesiastical trial, in the early morning, there is a full meeting of the Sanhedrim. They bind Jesus and hand him over to Pilate. Pilate asks "are you the King of the Jews?" Jesus answers "Yes." The high priests make accusations. Jesus



does not answer. Pilate marvels. Pilate asks the Jews if they wish to kill their king. They ask for the release of Barabbas. Pilate asks what evil Jesus has done. The answer is, "Crucify him." Pilate releases Barabbas, scourges Jesus, and hands him over for crucifixion. Then follows the mockery.

The following points call for notice.

(1) The whole trial by Pilate is peculiar according to Jn. as compared with Mk., except for the single phrase, "Art thou the King of the Jews?"

(2) The time of the mockery is changed in Jn. With Mk., there are two mockeries, once before the trial by Pilate, this time at the hands of the Jewish senate, and once after the condemnation by Pilate, this time at the hands of the soldiers. With Jn., the mockery takes place during the trial.

(3) In phraseology, however, the two are often very close. Jn. has *καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ*. Mk. has *καὶ (οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται) ἐνδιδύσκουσιν αὐτὸν πορφύραν καὶ περιτιθέασιν αὐτῷ πλέξαντες ἀκάνθινον στέφανον* in the second mockery. Jn. has *ἰμάτιον πορφυροῦν περιέβαλον αὐτόν*. Both have *χαίρει ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, except that Mk. has not *ὁ*. Jn. has *ἐδίδουσαν αὐτῷ ῥαπίσματα*, and in the account of the first mockery, Mk. has the more graphic and certainly the more primitive *ραπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον*. Thus, apparently, Jn. has, to some extent, conflated the accounts of the two mockeries.

#### (4) *The crucifixion.*

Jn. omits the following points recorded by Mk. (1) The impressment of Simon. (2) The reproaches of the spectators and the robbers. (3) The darkness. (4) Eloi. (5) The rending of the veil. (6) The confession of the centurion.

He adds (1) The charge of Mary to the care of the disciple. (2) "I thirst." "It is finished." (3) The piercing of the side. (4) The ministry of Nicodemus, and many other points which it is not our immediate purpose to examine, but which, in the main, bring out the dignity of Jesus.

There are many points which go to show that Jn. had access to Mk. They both say that the place where Jesus was

crucified was called Golgotha, and both translate as *Κρανίου τόπος*. They both say that two others were crucified with him, Jn. adding *μέσον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν*, but omitting the remark that the other two were thieves. Both say that the soldiers cast lots for the clothes, but Jn. adds that there were four soldiers, uses different language, brings the incident into line with prophecy, and becomes confused over the Hebrew parallelism, so confused indeed, that the prophecy he quotes to support his fact really contradicts it. Both Mk. and Jn. mention the sponge of sour wine, Mk. saying *δραμὸν δὲ τις καὶ γεμίσας σπόγγον ὄξους περιθεὶς καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν*, and Jn. *σκεῦος ἔκειτο ὄξους μεστόν· σπόγγον οὖν μεστόν τοῦ ὄξους ὑσσώπῳ<sup>5</sup> περιθέντες προήνεγκαν αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι*. The reasons given however are different. In Jn. the wine is given because Jesus says, "I thirst;" in Mk., because Jesus says, "Eloi Eloi," which the bystanders mistake for a cry for Elias, and the wine was given apparently to keep Jesus alive, to see whether Elias would come in answer to his cry. Both state that, immediately afterwards, Jesus died, according to Mk. with a loud cry, and according to Jn. after he had said *τετέλεσται* and inclined his head. Both show that there were women at the cross, and they agree in that Mary Magdalene was one, and that there was another Mary, whom Mk. calls the mother of James and Joses, and Jn. calls the wife of Cleopas. Both include the request of Joseph of Arimathaea, but in different language. Mk. says that he was on the look out for the Kingdom of God; Jn. that he was a disciple of Jesus, but secretly, because of the Jews. Both state also that it was *ἡ παρασκευή* that day.

## THE RESURRECTION

Mk. 15 42-47 deals with the burial by Joseph, but has several obscure points, which the other Synoptists try to clear up. Jn. mentions two attempts to bury Jesus, (1) in 19 31, by Jews, an attempt which was based on the law, Deut 21 22 probably. Jn.

<sup>5</sup> Those scholars are undoubtedly right who read this as *ἄσπῳ*, taking *ὑσσώπῳ* as due to dittography.

perhaps confused the law of the Sabbath with a law which had reference to any day of the week. Or, perhaps, if the victims had lived until the Sabbath, the authorities would have been unable to bury them, and so fulfil the law without breaking the Sabbath law. (2) An attempt which was successful, by Joseph of Arimathaea and Nicodemus, who intervened in time to prevent the Jews carrying out their purpose.

There are agreements between the authentic portion of Mk. and Jn. in the following points. They state that Mary Magdalene came early on the morning of the first day of the week to the sepulchre, and found the stone rolled away. Mk. adds that Mary had with her Mary the mother of James and also Salome, and that while they were going to the sepulchre, they were discussing the difficulty of removing the stone. Both use τῇ μᾶ τῶν σαββάτων, πρῶτῃ, which Jn. explains by σκοτίας ἐστὶ οὕσης and Mk. by ἀνατειλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου. In the spurious ending of Mk., which is obviously a compilation, there is an account of the appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene, which is taken from Jn.

Now we must examine those cases in which Jn. has detached sayings and incidents which seem to reveal a knowledge of Mk.

(1) Mk. 6 2-3 is parallel to Jn. 6 42 and 7 15. Mk. has πόθεν τούτῳ ταῦτα καὶ τίς ἡ σοφία ἢ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ; Jn. has πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οἶδεν μὴ μεμαθηκώς; Mk. has οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας, καὶ ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφου καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος; καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ ὧδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς; Jn. has οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς, ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, οὗ ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα; In Mk., this is said at Nazareth; in Jn., during the discussion on the Bread of Life.

(2) Mk. 6 4 is parallel to Jn. 4 44. Jn. has Αὐτὸς γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἐμαρτύρησεν ὅτι προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει. Mk. has οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ to explain the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth. The very way the Johannine sentence is formed seems to suggest that the author is referring the readers to a phrase he presumed they already knew. "For, you know, Jesus said etc.," seems to be the force of γάρ.

(3) Jn. agrees with Mk. in saying that the miracles of Jesus on the Sabbath provoked the opposition of the authorities. Cf. Jn. 5 8, 9, 16; 7 22, 23; 9 14; Mk. 2 11, 12; 3 1, 2. But there is a marked disagreement in the two kinds of defence on the part of Jesus. In Mk., the action of Jesus is justified by the case of David. This is quite unnecessary according to Jn. Here the action springs from the Son-Father relationship.

(4) The title of the Holy Spirit in Jn 14 26, *ὁ παράκλητος*, reflects the work of the Holy Spirit as given in Mk. 13 11.

(5) Jn. 12 25 goes back in idea and phraseology to Mk. 8 35.

(6) Jn. 12 44, 45 and 13 20 go back to Mk. 9 37.

(7) Jn. 7 20; 8 48, 52; 10 20 are signs that the demonological attitude of Mk. is not entirely forgotten by Jn. But a nearer parallel is found in the charge of the Jews that Jesus has a devil and is a Samaritan. And in all these cases the priority of Mk. is obvious. "In the Synoptics, the polemic is called forth by the Beelzebub charge, and is made within the range of ethical experiences and closes with a warning against blasphemy against the Holy Spirit; its Johannine counterpart soars into the heights of transcendental Christological speculation." (Pfeiderer, *Prim. Christianity*, Vol. IV, p. 47).

(8) Jn. 15 14 is parallel to Mk. 3 35.

(9) Jn. 6 30 is parallel to Mk. 8 11.

(10) Jn. 3 5 is parallel to Mk. 10 15.

(11) Jn. 16 23; 14 13, 14 as to the power of prayer reflect Mk. 11 24.

(12) The language of Nicodemus in Jn. 3 2 is parallel in thought and perhaps in spirit to the words of the Pharisees in their discussions with Jesus during the last week of his life and, if the incident is authentic, it should probably be placed here.

(13) Jn. 9 6, 7, curing by means of spittle and clay, is parallel to a similar phenomenon in Mk. 8 22-26.

(14) Jn. 15 21 and 16 2 may reflect the predictions of Jesus to the disciples during the apocalyptic discourses of Mk. 13 12-13.

(15) Jn. 13 4-5, 12-14 is an illustration of Mk. 10 45.

(16) Jn. 14 31, *ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν* [*ἐνταῦθα*] is an exact quotation of Mk. 14 42, though in a different context.

(17) The essence of Mk. 4 27, which Mt. and Lk. reject, is given in Jn. 3 8.

(18) Jn. 6 30-32 shows the same idea as Mk. 8 11-12.

One last point must be examined before we can sum up our results. Mk. and Jn. have a number of peculiar words in common, that is, words which are not found in the other Gospels. They are as follows. *ἀκάνθινος* (with the same meaning and in parallel passages), *ἀποκόπτω*, *βροτῆ*, *γίνομαι* (with the same meaning and in parallel passages), *διακόσιοι* and *ἐνταφιασμός* (both in parallel passages and with the same meaning), *ἕως* with the present indicative, *ἤθελον* without relative or negative, *θερμαίνομαι* (in parallel passages and with the same meaning), *θυρωρός*, *Ἱεροσολυμείται*, *καταλαμβάνω*, *κράββατος*, *μισθωτός*, *νάρδος*, *πιστικός*, (both the last with the same meaning and in parallel passages), *πηγή* (but in different senses), *προσαίτης*, *πλοιάριον*, *πωρόω*, *πτύω*, *Ῥαββουλί*, *στήκω*, *φανερώνω*, *χιλιάρχος*, *φανερῶς*. Then we have *ῥάπισμα*,<sup>6</sup> *τριακόσιοι*, *ὠτάριον* in the same contexts and with the same meanings.

After this more or less minute examination of the Markan and Johannine narratives, several important points arise. What strikes us most upon a preliminary reading is, as has already been said, the differences between the two accounts. This feeling of surprise is not lessened when we study the Gospels more minutely. It is not, however, the difference of detail which is so dismaying as the difference of emphasis. To speak often of the Kingdom and rarely of oneself is not the same as to speak often of oneself and rarely of the Kingdom.

There are many things which point to John's knowledge of a tradition similar to what we have in Mk:

(1) There is no account in either of the birth or early life of Jesus, and apparently no suggestion of a virgin birth. Yet we must recognize that the omissions are for two entirely different

<sup>6</sup> *ῥάπισμα* αὐτὸν *πλαβῶν* in Mk. 14 65 is grammatically a vulgarism. Moulton and Milligan quote no parallel. Blass quotes a 1<sup>st</sup> century papyrus, *αὐτὸν κοδόλοιι πλαβῶν* (*Grammar*, p. 118).

reasons. Mk. says nothing about them because, in all probability, he knows nothing of them. At the time Mk. wrote, the tradition of the birth was not a common possession. For Mark, the Messiahship of Jesus was not rooted in his birth. John omitted the stories, but not because he did not know them. He probably did know, but preferred to say nothing about them, either because he did not believe them or because they were not suitable for his purpose.

(2) Both start the narrative at the same point, at the ministry of John the Baptist. They both show also that the beginning of the ministry of Jesus was in Galilee. Then the narratives separate to a great extent, the sole ministry of Jesus being non-Judaean, according to Mk. Jn. brings Jesus into Galilee at times, but the teaching is made to centre round the feasts at Jerusalem. There is a certain amount of secrecy about one of the journeys to Judaea. Both Mk. and Jn. bring Jesus to Jerusalem at the end.

(3) They end at the same point, the resurrection. That is to say, they do not go on to describe (in the authentic part of Mk. this is true; Jn. did not know the spurious ending) a physical ascension. Jn. implies that the ascension took place on the day of the resurrection, and it is treated as spiritual in some sense, as a departure rather than an ascent, and apparently there were several returns and departures.

(4) Jn. knows of certain facts in the Markan tradition, namely the cleansing of the Temple, the home at Bethany, the anointing, the feeding of the multitude, the walking on the sea, and the twofold nature of the trial.

But all this is not enough to show the dependence of the one upon the other. It may be that both are drawing upon the common Christian tradition. Can we prove that Jn. used Mk. as the basis of his narrative?

We can point to some very close literary parallels. (1) The section on John the Baptist. (2) The account of the feeding of the multitude. (3) The anointing at Bethany. (4) Certain points in the narrative of the Passion, such as the betrayal, the cup and the denial by Peter. (5) The close correlation of the feeding of the five thousand and the walking on the sea. (6) The use of parallel sayings. (7) The direct contradiction

on the question of the imprisonment of John the Baptist, the reference to Mary and Martha, and the feeling right through the Gospel that the author is taking a certain amount for granted. (8) The use of such words as *ἀκάνθινος*, *κράββατος*, *ἐνταφιασμός* and *πιστικός*, which are rare, have the same meaning and are in parallel passages.<sup>7</sup>

On the other side must be mentioned (1) The omission of a great deal of Mk., especially parts of the teaching. (2) The entirely different attitude to the miraculous. (3) The different interpretation given to the person of Jesus and the revelation of himself. These arguments do not seem conclusive, as they all go back to one point, the motive of the Gospel, and by that they are all explained.

We draw then the conclusion that Jn. had use of the Gospel of Mark, and had Mark's programme in mind during the writing of his own narrative. Jn. never refers to Mk. He does not do what Lk. does, confess having used literary sources. He merely takes Mk. for granted and embodies him where he sees fit. At times, perhaps with another tradition in mind, perhaps for reasons of his own, he deliberately contradicts Mk. At times, Jn. leaves Mk. quite alone as the narrative does not suit his purpose. All that he receives goes through the crucible of his own faith and is re-interpreted.

<sup>7</sup> Of these words, however, only *πιστικός* is really important. *κράββατος* is a perfectly good word, and is used in Acts 5 15 and 9 22. If *ἀκάνθινος* is quoted as showing a relationship between Jn. and Mk., then the use of *ἐκ δασέων* can be quoted to prove the dependence of Jn. upon Mt., cf. Mt. 27 29. *ἐνταφιασμός* is not used in Mt. or Lk., but the verb is used in Mt. 26 12, a similar context. The importance of *πιστικός* might be avoided by the hypothesis that the texts of Mk. and Jn. have become assimilated, though this does not seem justifiable.