

# 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>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

trouve dans Sophocle (Ajax 92, ὡς εὖ παρέστης). Εὖ se prononce ἐφ en grec moderne ; cette prononciation de l'ν est attestée dans des inscriptions du début du second siècle : ἀπελέφτερος, ἐπίστεφεσε (Jannaris § 51). Un copiste a écrit par mégarde ΕΦΠΑΡΕΙ et un *diorthotès* a corrigé  
 Ο  
 mécaniquement ΕΦΠΑΡΕΙ, sous l'influence peut-être de ἐφ' ὄσον (xxv 40 et 45). Il faut rétablir : εὖ πάρει. C'est la réponse naturelle au salut : χαῖρε ῥαββεῖ. Et en un sens profond et sublime Jésus qui vient d'accepter la volonté de son Père (verset 42) dit au traître : *Tu es le bien venu !*<sup>1</sup>

PAUL-LOUIS COUCHOUD.

## THE SOURCES OF THE PASSION NARRATIVE IN ST MARK'S GOSPEL

CRITICS have been influenced too much and too long by Papias's account of the origin of Mark's Gospel and have therefore overlooked the evidence which the Gospel itself contains, indicating that it is to some extent a compilation from written sources. The object of this essay is to show that in chapters xiv 1-xvi 8 there are a number of indications which suggest that Mark's narrative of the Passion was based upon two written sources. The case for this theory is of course greatly strengthened by the fact that in chapters i-xiii also there are traces of the use of written sources.

1. There are two doublets in the Gospel :—

- (a) The feeding of the 4,000 and the feeding of the 5,000.
- (b) ix 35. 'If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, and servant of all.'

x 43, 44. 'Whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister : And whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all.'

But the presence of even two doublets is enough to suggest the use of written sources.

2. The two longest discourses in this Gospel, the Sermon by the Sea in chapter iv and the apocalyptic discourse in chapter xiii, both bear traces of compilation.

(a) The Sermon by the Sea begins 'He taught them many things in parables and said to them in his teaching', and ends 'and with many such parables he spoke the word to them as they were able to hear it.'

<sup>1</sup> Si la conjecture de Mr Pallis est juste, elle s'applique aussi, probablement, à la coupe de verre sur laquelle J. Rendel Harris et A. Deissmann (*Licht vom Osten* 4 1923, p. 103) lisent ἐφ' ὃ πάρει ; εὐφραίνου. La bonne lecture serait ἐφ πάρει c'est-à-dire εὖ πάρει : *Tu es le bien venu ! Réjouis-toi !*

But without a parable spake he not unto them; and privately to his disciples he explained all things' (iv 33-34), while in verse 36 we learn that (the disciples) sent the multitude away, so that clearly verses 3 to 32 are intended to be regarded as a continuous discourse addressed to the multitude; but this equally clearly they are not, for verses 10 to 20 (or perhaps we should say 10 to 25) are addressed to the disciples when they are alone. Luke maybe noticed the discrepancy, for he omits all that follows verse 25, though he gives the parable of the mustard seed in a somewhat different form in another connexion.

(b) It has long been recognized that certain portions of chapter xiii can be detached from the rest and form a continuous discourse known as 'the little Apocalypse', while what is left also makes a continuous discourse: a fact which renders it more probable that the evangelist is here combining two written sources, than that he is freely expanding one written source, with matter stored in his own memory.

Having shown that it is probable that in compiling his Gospel Mark made some use of written sources, we now pass on to consider chapters xiv 1 to xvi 8, in which two accounts of the same series of events seem to be combined. It will be best to divide this portion of the Gospel into sections and examine each one separately.

1. xiv 1-32. Here we notice three points which suggest the possibility that two sources are being dovetailed together: (i) the account of the anointing comes in rather awkwardly between the decision of the chief priests to put Jesus to death and Judas's offer to betray him; (ii) the recurrence of the statement 'as they were eating' in 22 soon after a similar phrase has been used in 18; (iii) 'they went out to the Mount of Olives' 26—'they came to a place which was named Gethsemane' 32.

Using these as sign-posts, it is easy to divide the section into two parallel narratives:—

A. 1, 2, 10, 11, 17-21, 27-32 *a*.

B. 3-9, 12-16, 22-26.

If this division be correct the words 'evening being come' xiv 17, will refer back to the date given in 1 'it was the Passover . . . after two days', and so give the same date for the Last Supper as John does: A. will also apparently place the prophecy of Peter's denial, as Luke and John do, in the room where supper was eaten and not on the road to Gethsemane, and will agree with John in giving an account of the Last Supper which does not include the institution of the Eucharist. Further it should be noted that while the text of the Gospel as it stands makes the chief priests do what they had decided not to do, arrest Jesus

during the feast, the source A represents them as adhering to their original decision. Thus a glaring discrepancy is removed.

It is also worth noting that the expression 'the twelve' is used three times in A, and 'disciples' not at all; while in B 'disciples' occurs four times and 'the twelve' not at all. This may be accident, but it also may be an indication of the use of two sources.

2. xiv. 32*b*-52. The points which suggest that two sources lie behind the narrative are:—

- (i) 'Sit here while I pray.' 32*b*.  
'Tarry ye here, and watch.' 34.
- (ii) 'He prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him.' 35.  
'Take away this cup from me.' 36.
- (iii) The triple withdrawal of Christ; for Mark is fond of putting things in threes.
- (iv) 44 may possibly be a parallel of 43 and 45.

This section also may be divided into two accounts of the agony and arrest, each with certain characteristics of its own:—

A. 33*a*, 34, 36, 40, 43, 45, 46, 48-50,

B. 32*b*, 33*b*, 35, 37-39, 41, 42, 44, 47,

verses 51 and 52 being regarded as the evangelist's own. If this division be correct, 'the third time' in 41 will be an editorial addition rendered necessary by the fusion of two sources, one of which represented Christ as withdrawing to pray twice, and the other only once.

The following details seem to be characteristic of A: the use of the word 'cup', of the phrase 'the twelve', and the Aramaic words 'Abba' and 'Rabbi'. Characteristic of B are 'he that betrayeth', 'the hour', 'disciples'.

The use of 'the twelve' in one narrative and 'disciples' in the other suggests that A in this section is a continuation of A in the former section and B of B.

3. xiv. 53-72. The points suggesting a fusion of sources here are the repeated mention of false witnesses in 56 and 58, the fact that, immediately after he has been represented as keeping silent, Jesus answers the High Priest's next question, 'the chief priests and the elders and the scribes' 53, and 'the chief priests and all the council' 55. Using these as clues, we allot to:—

A. 53, 54, 57, 58, 60, 61*a*, 65, 68*b*-72.

B. 55-56, 61*b*-64, 66-68*a*.

Verse 59 I regard as an editorial addition derived from 56—or maybe in both cases the words are editorial.

If this division be correct, A makes the chief charge against Jesus that he said he could destroy the Temple, B that he claimed to be the Christ.

A makes Peter deny Our Lord twice, and B once. A makes Jesus silent when accused, B makes him reply. The value of this reconstruction can only be fairly judged when the verses allotted to each source are read continuously.

The real crux is the denials of Peter; verse 67 as it stands reads awkwardly, but if Mark had two accounts before him the words 'seeing Peter warming himself', xiv 67, may well be an insertion by the evangelist based on the statement of his other source—verse 54. It is a small detail, but worth noting, that while in 54 Peter is said to be 'within', in 66 he is said to be 'beneath in'.

The really important point, however, is the form in which Mark gives Christ's prophecy of Peter's denial 'before the cock crow *twice* thou shalt deny me thrice.' Here we would suggest that possibly Mark's source read 'before the cock crow twice thou shalt deny me twice', and that when adding a third denial from another source Mark altered the second 'twice' to 'thrice' to make the prophecy agree with what he supposed to be the facts. If this be so, then the word 'again' in 69 and 70*a* will also be an insertion made by the evangelist when he was combining his two sources.

If my reconstruction be right, I incline to think that 68*b* ff. stood in his source immediately after 54, and were placed by Mark where they now stand so as to bring the three denials of Peter together.

(4) xv 1-xvi 8. In this section the sources are somewhat harder to distinguish, but in the trial before Pilate, in Pilate's offer to release Barabbas, in the account of the crucifixion, and especially in the account of the visit of the women to the sepulchre, there are things which are most easily explained as due to the fusing of two sources.

As in the trial before the Sanhedrin so in the trial before Pilate Jesus is represented both as answering and as not answering the charges brought against him.

The passage about Barabbas falls so easily into two complete and consistent narratives that it seems only natural to suppose that it is based on two independent sources:—

A. xv 7, 8, 15. B. xv 6, 9-14. (I attribute these verses to B because they speak of 'The King of the Jews').

In the former Pilate makes no effort to save Jesus, in the latter he offers to release him. In the other three Gospels we find an obvious attempt to relieve Pilate of the responsibility for Christ's death as far

as possible, and this is the tendency also of B in Mark. So that A is probably the more primitive narrative. The mockery xv 16-20 will necessarily belong to the same source as xv 2, in which the charge against Jesus is that he made himself the King of the Jews. The actual crucifixion is recorded twice, xv 24 and 25, and the repetition is the kind of one it would be natural for an author who was combining two sources to make.

Since the account of the crucifixion which states that it took place at the third hour belongs to B, it is probable that the verses which mention the sixth and ninth hours belong to that source also (xv 33-36). Here it should be noted that the Aramaic words 'eloi eloi lama sabaktanei' are followed by the words 'which is being interpreted', a clause which occurs twice only in this section, and not after the Aramaic words 'Abba' and 'Rabbi' which are found in passages we have attributed to A. It would seem then that it is characteristic of B, and if so xv 22, where it follows the word Golgotha, will belong to B also.

If we are right in thinking that the account of Christ's trial before the Sanhedrin is based on two sources, in one of which the charge against him was that he said he would destroy the Temple, in the other that he claimed to be the Christ, then the passage recounting the jeers of the passers by and the chief priests will be based on the same two sources.

The account of the women visiting the tomb admittedly presents great difficulty, for it is hard to understand why the women should have failed to deliver the reassuring message given them by the young man. Matthew and Luke solve the difficulty by flatly contradicting it: but this is not an answer to the question 'why should Mark have made this statement?'. The solution I suggest is that the passage is built on two sources, A represented by xvi 2-4 and 8, B represented by xvi 1 and 5-7.

At first sight it might seem that 5-7 should be attributed to A, because the young man's words 'he goeth before you into Galilee' recall the words of Christ (xiv 28) 'after I am risen I will go before you into Galilee', and that Mark intended them to recall Christ's own words is made clear by the conclusion of xvi 7 'as he said to you'. On the other hand the use of the word 'disciples' suggests that these verses belong to B. On the whole the most probable explanation seems to me to be that xiv 28 and xvi 7 are in reality a doublet, and that the words 'as he said to you' did not occur in the source but were added by the evangelist to harmonize his two sources.

The source A simply states that the women when they found the stone rolled away fled in terror and told no man: a perfectly natural and intelligible statement, but not in accord with B, which represents them

as receiving from a young man a message of hope to deliver to the disciples. The account of the entombment xv 42-47 appears to be taken from or at any rate to be based upon A, since it contains the statement that a stone was rolled before the tomb, and the mention of the centurion (44) suggests that 39 belongs to the same source also.

We can now give a list of the portions of this section which can tentatively be attributed to the two sources respectively.

A. xv 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 15, 24, 27, 29, 30, 32<sup>b</sup>, 39, 42-47. xvi 2-4, 8.

B. xv 2, 6, 9-14, 16-20a, 22, 25, 31-32a, 33-36. xvi 1, 5-7.

The other verses it does not seem possible to attribute with any confidence to the one source rather than to the other, especially as it is probable that the evangelist did not embody the whole of either source, and made additions and alterations in combining them.

I claim then that a case has been made out for supposing that Mark xiv 1 to xvi 8 is based on two written sources with slight editorial additions and accommodations.

But I do not suggest that it is based upon an earlier Gospel or Gospels. Mark is composite, but not in the same sense that Matthew and Luke are. For when we speak of his sources, though we mean something written, we do not mean anything that can properly be called a book. I venture to suggest the following hypothesis.

Papias's account is not an accurate account of how the second Gospel, as we now have it, came into existence, but it does contain a germ of truth. Much of this Gospel is based on notes which Mark made of Peter's teaching, and this would not be an orderly narrative such as Mark's Gospel is. Besides this Mark had some small collection or collections of sayings of Christ which he used principally in chapters iv and xiii.

He also had a second written account of the Passion and the events immediately preceding and following it. These he set in order and combined to the best of his ability, not always avoiding repetition and overlapping.

Mark was in touch with other people besides Peter who could give him first hand or good second hand information, and there is nothing improbable in a man who could, and in fact did, write a book collecting written materials for it.

In conclusion I would urge that the argument for regarding xiv 1 to xvi 8 as based upon written sources must be considered in connexion with the argument for regarding chapters iv 1-36 and xiii as similarly based, and that for regarding the feeding of the 5,000 and of the 4,000 as a doublet.

If there were no reason to suppose that the author had used written sources in any other part of his Gospel, the traces of their use in the

concluding section of the Gospel might be regarded as not sufficiently convincing.

But if we feel convinced that he used written sources for chapters iv and xiii, and that the presence of a doublet in chapters vi and viii shows that he used written sources there also (for surely the presence of a doublet proves the use of two *written* sources), then the probability that the phenomena in the last section of the Gospel which suggest the use of written sources are due to that cause and not merely to the writer's repetitive style is greatly strengthened.

E. R. BUCKLEY.

### A NOTE ON THE MOZARABIC KALENDAR

THE recent publication of the León Antiphoner by the Benedictines of Silos has made it possible to supplement and correct the text which Dom Férotin included in his study of the Mozarabic Kalendars in his edition of the *Liber Ordinum* (pp. 451 f; Codex D). Férotin has himself told us of his difficulties in regard to the León manuscripts, and his version of the Kalendar was admittedly based upon (a) a partial and hasty transcription which he was able to make in 1897, and (b) notes subsequently furnished to him by the Canon-Archivist. It is neither surprising nor in any way derogatory to the reputation of so great a scholar that a closer examination of the manuscript should have shewn his text to be at fault.

Abbot Serrano of Silos, who introduces the new edition and is himself a palaeographer of distinction, goes further. He thinks that, on palaeographical grounds, the entries in the León Kalendar may be divided into two groups—one contemporary with the Antiphoner itself (which he plausibly assigns to a date between 860 and 930), and the other interpolated at a later date (probably before 1063). In some cases, he says, the later entries are plainly in a different hand; in others they may be distinguished by the minuscule initial (*scī*, *scē*, &c.)—those of the original series having the majuscule (*Scī*, *Scē*, &c.). On the one page of the manuscript which the editors reproduce in facsimile, and which shews the Kalendar for May and June, all three types may be observed; *sci. Gervasi et Protasi* (June 19) is plainly not in the same hand as the rest, and seven other entries begin with the minuscule. It is much less certain that all the 'minuscule' entries are, in fact, interpolations.<sup>1</sup> In

<sup>1</sup> Millares, Carlos, *Paleografía española* (1929), reproduces and transcribes the page of the Kalendar containing March and April. This has two minuscule entries (Apr. 16 and 18), but Millares makes no comment upon them. I have not been able to examine the facsimiles in García Villada's *Catálogo de los códices*, &c., de León (1919).



the Kalendar as set forth below, the items which Dom Serrano regards as additions are printed in italics, and the appended notes will indicate one or two difficulties in the way of accepting his theory that the 'majuscule' entries represent a very early form of the Mozarabic Kalendar.

The León Kalendar occupies six pages of the manuscript (fol. 6v.—fol. 9v.). The illuminated design on each page is a 'Moorish' arch resting upon pillars with foliated capitals and enclosing two smaller arches of the same kind, of which the juncture rests upon a slender central shaft. Under each of the smaller arches is written the kalendar for one month, in a vertical column, the free days being left blank. The tympanum of the main arch is occupied by an allegorical design representing one of the evangelists. A comparison of the text with that given in the *Liber ordinum* reveals considerable discrepancies. Férotin gives three commemorations—S. Eusebius (Sept. 26), S. Mames (Aug. 7), and S. Dionysius (Jan. 23)—which are not found in the manuscript, and omits eleven which are; and several entries are placed on the wrong day.

Here is the Kalendar as it appears in the Silos edition—reproduced by the kind permission of the editors.† The commemorations marked with an asterisk have a 'proper' in the Antiphoner itself. The letters after each entry denote the other kalendars and some of the service-books in which the same commemoration appears—the letters A–I being used as by Férotin, K denoting the Kalendar of Carmona (*Lib. Moz. Sacr.*, xlv), M the *Liber comicus* published by Morin, S the *Liber mozarabicus sacramentorum* published by Férotin, and V the *Orationale* of Verona.

## JANUARY

1. Circumcisio Domini in Iherusalem\* ABCEFGHI, MSV
2. Jejunium observabitur<sup>1</sup> ABCEFI, MSV
6. Apparitio Domini in Bethelēm\* ABCEFGHI, MSV
7. S. Iuliani et com. eius Antioc.\* ABCEFGH, MSV
8. Alisio Infantum in Bethelēm\* ABCEFGI, MSV
9. SS. Quadraginta martyrum ABCEFGHI
11. S. Tipassi EF
17. Depositio S. Antonii, monaci BEFI
18. S. Sulpicii, episcopi EFI
19. S. Sabastiani et com. Roma\* ABCEFGHI, S
20. SS. Agnetis et Emerenciane, Roma ABCEFGHI, S

† I give the names exactly as they stand there—spelling and all; the references to other sources are my own.