

THE SOURCES  
OF THE  
SYNOPTIC  
GOSPELS

BY THE LATE  
WILFRED L. KNOX  
EDITED BY H. CHADWICK

*VOLUME ONE*  
ST MARK



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE  
SOURCES OF THE  
SYNOPTIC GOSPELS



THE  
SOURCES OF THE  
SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

BY THE LATE  
WILFRED L. KNOX, D.D.  
FELLOW OF PEMBROKE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE  
FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

EDITED BY  
H. CHADWICK  
FELLOW AND DEAN OF  
QUEENS' COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

VOLUME ONE  
ST MARK



CAMBRIDGE  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1953



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,  
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)  
Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9780521180603](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521180603)

© Cambridge University Press 1953

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written  
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1953  
First paperback edition 2010

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

ISBN 978-0-521-18060-3 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or  
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in  
this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is,  
or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

TO  
PROFESSOR C. H. DODD  
AND THE  
MEMBERS OF HIS  
SEMINAR



# CONTENTS

|                  |   |      |
|------------------|---|------|
| EDITOR'S PREFACE | <i>page</i>                                   | ix   |
| PREFACE          |   | xi   |
| ABBREVIATIONS    |   | xiii |
| INTRODUCTION     |   | I    |
| I                | The first group of conflict-stories           | 8    |
| II               | The Twelve-source                             | 17   |
| III              | Jesus and the devils                          | 32   |
| IV               | The book of parables                          | 35   |
| V                | Books of miracles                             | 39   |
| VI               | Nazareth and John the Baptist                 | 47   |
| VII              | Corban and miscellaneous incidents            | 52   |
| VIII             | A book of localized miracles                  | 59   |
| IX               | The 'Central Section'                         | 63   |
| X                | The entry to Jerusalem                        | 77   |
| XI               | A second group of conflict-stories?           | 85   |
| XII              | The warning against the scribes               | 93   |
| XIII             | The 'Little Apocalypse'                       | 103  |
| XIV              | The Passion story                             | 115  |
| A.               | The Last Supper                               | 116  |
| B.               | Gethsemane                                    | 125  |
| C.               | The trial by the Sanhedrin and Peter's denial | 131  |
| D.               | The trials before Pilate and Herod            | 135  |
| E.               | The mocking by the soldiers                   | 142  |
| F.               | The crucifixion                               | 142  |
| XV               | The Resurrection story                        | 148  |
| SUMMARY          |   | 150  |
| INDEXES          |   | 153  |



## EDITOR'S PREFACE

When Wilfred Knox died on 9 February 1950, he left uncompleted and unrevised the present work on the Synoptic Gospels, on which he had been engaged for some years. The first volume on St Mark had already been accepted by the University Press before his death. No doubt much more remained to be done on the second volume on St Luke and St Matthew, but what he had completed is in a fairly advanced state, and it is hoped to publish this also.

To edit the *Nachlass* of a great scholar is not an easy task. I have not ventured to add much on my own account, though I have freely revised Dr Knox's own material.

A memoir of the author is being prepared by the Reverend G. K. Tibbatts of Sidney Sussex College. To this will be added a bibliography of Dr Knox's writings.

I am indebted to Professor C. H. Dodd for help with the proofs, and to my wife who has compiled the index of biblical references.

H. CHADWICK

31 January 1952

QUEENS' COLLEGE  
CAMBRIDGE



## PREFACE

It is to be feared that this book will be regarded as heretical by the more advanced form-critics, since it is an attempt to deal with the Synoptic Gospels not as collections of anecdotes but as compilations of sources underlying Mark and the hypothetical Q, and also the matter peculiar to Luke and Matthew. The importance of the attempt is that it cuts down by some thirty years the supposed interval between the events recorded in the Gospels and their first appearance in a written form. If this can be established, it follows that we must allow a far greater historical reliability to the narratives than is usually admitted; the period of compilation can scarcely be later than A.D. 40 in at least two cases.

This does not mean that we can accept the stories as accurate history without further question. It would have been a miracle if a religious movement of the character described in the Gospels had not been accompanied by miracles; it would have been an even greater miracle, if those miracles had not been exaggerated. But modern experience shows that both processes begin during the actual life of the person to whom they are attributed; the fact that we may not believe them gives us no right to be sceptical as to the general reliability of Jesus' life and teaching as recorded by his disciples. Whether we believe that in the case of the New Testament there may be reasons for accepting stories of miracles which we should otherwise reject is a matter which depends on our personal convictions, not on the analysis of the sources. The stories may often be drawn from a very ancient tradition; but even if they are untrue, they do not discredit the rest of it.

I owe so much to Professor Dodd and the members of his Seminar that I can only dedicate this book to them in the hope that they will pardon me for borrowings which I have failed to acknowledge.

WILFRED L. KNOX





## ABBREVIATIONS

- Albertz            *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche*, by M. Albertz. Berlin, 1921.
- Apocr. N.T.*      *The Apocryphal New Testament*, by M. R. James. Oxford, 1924.
- Bultmann        *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, by R. Bultmann. Second edition, Göttingen, 1931.
- C.A.H.*            *Cambridge Ancient History*.
- C.H.*              *Corpus Hermeticum* (ed. A. D. Nock and A. J. Festugière, Paris, 1945).
- Creed             *The Gospel according to St Luke*, by J. M. Creed. London, 1930.
- Dibelius         *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, by M. Dibelius. Second edition, Tübingen, 1933.
- F.G.H.*            *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, ed. F. Jacoby. Berlin and Leiden, 1923-50.
- Gentiles*         *St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, by W. L. Knox. Cambridge, 1939.
- G.J.V.*            *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. Fourth edition, Leipzig, 1901.
- Hellenistic Elements*    *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity*, by W. L. Knox (Schweich Lectures, 1942). London, 1944.
- H.z.N.T.*         *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. H. Lietzmann.
- H.T.R.*            *Harvard Theological Review*.
- Jerusalem*       *St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, by W. L. Knox. Cambridge, 1925.
- J.R.S.*            *Journal of Roman Studies*.
- J.T.S.*            *Journal of Theological Studies*.
- L.S.J.*            *Greek-English Lexicon*, by Liddell and Scott, rev. H. Stuart-Jones and R. Mackenzie.
- P.M.G.*            *Papyri Magicae Graecae*, ed. K. Preisendanz.
- P.W.K.*            *Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*.
- Rawlinson        *St Mark*, by A. E. J. Rawlinson. London, 1925.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

- Smith *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, by B. T. D. Smith.  
Cambridge, 1937.
- Str.-B. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*,  
by H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck. Munich, 1922-28.
- Streeter *The Four Gospels*, by B. H. Streeter. London, 1924.
- T.W.z.N.T.* *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. G.  
Kittel and G. Friedrich.
- Vincent Taylor *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, by Vincent Taylor.  
London, second edition, 1935.

## INTRODUCTION

In 1921 Eduard Meyer pointed out that in Mark we have clear indications of the use of sources; the Gospel is not merely a compilation of anecdotes, but an attempt to bring into order a set of earlier records of the life and teaching of Jesus, which would be inevitably needed for the preaching of the Gospel.<sup>1</sup> But by 1921 the star of form-criticism had already risen above the horizon, and in the fascinating exercise of fitting the stories of the Gospels into the various 'forms' of popular story-telling, and discovering situations in the supposed life of the early Church which might have led to the invention of a particular anecdote or saying, Meyer's warning was allowed to pass unheeded. Rawlinson dismisses his view on the ground of 'the persistence throughout the Gospel of the very peculiar and characteristic Marcan mannerisms of style. The evangelist may have been using sources, but, if so, it is extremely unlikely that modern conjecture can succeed in determining what they were.'<sup>2</sup>

The first objection raised by Rawlinson is quite beside the point. In most ancient historians we get a general uniformity of style, owing to the fact that the author has rewritten his sources more or less completely. Since any sources which Mark may have used were probably written in Aramaic, it would be a simple matter for him to impose his own style upon them; in any case his style is merely that of a poor writer of Greek reproducing popular stories in a very bald and simple form, with a few tricks of writing which enable him to produce an effect of vivid narration; some at least of these may have been present in his sources. His second objection appears to be little more than a refusal to face the issue. On the other hand if Mark represents not a collection of unattached anecdotes but a conflation of older documentary sources, or oral sources with a definitely fixed text committed to memory by those who used them, the fact is one of the first importance for any attempt to discover the historical value of his Gospel.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Urspr. u. Anf. des Christenthums*, I, 121 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *St Mark*, xliii.

<sup>3</sup> Except in very rare cases, as, for example, where a difficult phrase can only be explained by the hypothesis of a mistake in copying a written word which would not

If Meyer was right in seeing that Mark had sources at his disposal, it should be possible to identify at least some of them; the attempt must involve a measure of conjecture, yet it should be possible in certain cases to attain to reasonable certainty. He was undoubtedly right in seeing that the primitive evangelist would need to be controlled by those who had been eyewitnesses of the ministry of Jesus, if he was not to distort his message; even as it is, the Gospels represent a substitution of 'futurist' eschatology, of the kind current in Jewish apocalyptic, for the 'realized' eschatology of Jesus himself.<sup>1</sup> He could hardly be controlled unless he was furnished with a more or less fixed tradition.

On the other hand it would seem that Meyer's familiarity with the methods of ancient historians led him to a mistaken conception of the kind of source that Mark was likely to have at his disposal. His 'Twelve-source' does indeed represent a definite step forward in the study of the Gospels, though interest in form-criticism has resulted in a general failure to recognize its existence and importance. It violates all the 'laws' of form-criticism, for it contains a consecutive account of the career of Jesus, with only one or two selected incidents attached to it, perhaps inserted later; it leads up to a Passion story which is rightly informed at two crucial points, and may well give a better account of the events after the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem than the other tradition or traditions which Mark has conflated with it (cf. below, p. 118). The existence of similar short summaries of the career of Jesus in a more or less fixed form has been shown by Dodd in his examination of the 'speeches' ascribed to Peter in Acts x. 36ff. and to Paul in Acts xiii. 16ff.<sup>2</sup> But we have two other sources of a quite different kind, which appear to be well established. Mark xiii is generally recognized as an independent Apocalypse, which has been incorporated by Mark as a whole. (We

have been possible if the same word had been copied from dictation, it would seem to be impossible to distinguish between written sources and those committed to memory. The word 'source' will be used for the materials which were available for the evangelist, without prejudice to the question whether they had actually been committed to writing; in any case the words were fixed.

<sup>1</sup> Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> I find his arguments as set out in *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* for the view that these speeches are a more or less fixed form of *kerygma* current in the Church (perhaps the forms of Jerusalem and Antioch) entirely convincing.

## INTRODUCTION

shall see later that this view may need modification in detail, but is substantially correct.) Similarly the view of Albertz that we have in Mark ii. 1–iii. 6 a collection of stories illustrating the growth of the tension between Jesus and the leaders of the Jewish nation seems well established. His later group of ‘conflict-stories’ (xi. 15–xii. 40) is highly doubtful.<sup>1</sup>

Here we have sources of a kind different from anything Meyer envisages. We have at least one short summary of the life of Jesus, and two collections, the one a compilation of sayings, the other of ‘incidents’, though the incidents are entirely subsidiary to the sayings they contain. It is natural that Meyer should not have thought of ‘sources’ in this sense, for ancient historians were not accustomed to incorporate in their works popular literature written for purposes of religious propaganda.<sup>2</sup> But the situation of the primitive Church would demand collections of the sayings and doings of Jesus of this kind. We have noticed that mission-speeches of a more or less definite pattern can be found in the New Testament. But a mere summary of the vital facts of the Gospel—that Jesus went about doing good, that he died for our sins and was raised on the third day according to the Scripture—, however bulky the quotation of *testimonia* might be and however full the story of the Passion, would not permanently satisfy the homiletic needs of the Church. Those who had accepted Jesus as Lord for whatever reason, as for instance the hearing of a sermon, the witnessing of a miracle of

<sup>1</sup> For Albertz’s view, cf. his *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche*, and see below, pp. 85 ff.

<sup>2</sup> It should, however, be observed that Diodorus Siculus (1, 27) has incorporated a panegyric of Isis, which had a wide currency in inscriptions, in his history; cf. Nock, *Conversion*, p. 40. We may also compare the panegyric of Heracles by Matris of Thebes in Diodorus’ account of Heracles, iv, 8, 1 ff. (cf. Schwartz in *P.W.K.* v, 676); here we are dealing with an ambitious rhetorical effort, but probably one compiled for a special occasion. For another specimen of a scrap of religious literature which would seem to have circulated independently, cf. the closing prayer of the *Poimandres* (*C.H.* 1, 31) which reappears in the Christian prayer *P. Berol.* 9794, *Berl. Kl. Texte* vi. 112, l. 42, and appears to be quoted in an amulet. (Cf. Nock and Festugière, *Hermès Trismégiste*, p. xxxvii.) It is of course possible that both these two are quoting from the *Poimandres*, but it hardly seems likely that the Christian compiler of the third century would knowingly incorporate a prayer from a heathen work; I should be inclined to suspect a Hellenistic-Jewish origin. For Christian compilations which appear to have grown up outside the main stream of the Gospel tradition we may compare the Oxyrhynchus Logia (*Pap. Ox.* 1 and 654).

healing or an outpouring of the Spirit, or again conviction that Jesus was indeed the fulfilment of prophecy, would inevitably seek to know what manner of man the Lord had been. Moreover the travelling evangelist of the primitive Church would need some material for his work beyond the two elements of the mission-speech with its *testimonia* and the Passion story. For this purpose the individual pericope would be too short; the whole Gospel would be too long. What he would need would be a compilation of sayings or miracles or a mixture of the two, having some general unity either of thought or verbal association to aid his memory. Thus there would arise a number of 'Tracts' containing accounts of the ministry of the Lord on earth, either written or committed to memory; it is at least reasonable to suppose that the great Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch would exercise some supervision of these collections and not leave the individual missionary to compile his own and to introduce matter of his own invention. We know little of the process by which the Church detached itself from Judaism; it would appear from the only evidence available that for some time Christians attended the synagogue but had their own worship as well (Acts ii. 46). But we must allow for the possibility that in some places Christians would be expelled from the synagogue quite soon, while elsewhere a particular synagogue might be dominated by a Christian majority, supported by the Elders, even if it were not entirely Christian in its membership; elsewhere again Christians might be allowed to express their opinions quite freely.<sup>1</sup> These conditions would demand

<sup>1</sup> In theory each synagogue was an independent unit, though it would appear from Mark iii. 22 that it was not an unknown thing for scribes from Jerusalem to visit outlying regions to investigate the affairs of local synagogues, as leading rabbis did later. Even if the incident is rejected as unhistorical, it would be evidence for the conditions of the primitive Palestinian Church, though there seems no reason to doubt Mark's story. For rabbinical 'visitations', cf. Mishnah, Erub. x. 10 (tr. Danby). But it is not clear how their decisions could be enforced, if the elders who ruled a synagogue refused to obey. Presumably the whole synagogue could be placed under a ban and non-Christian Jews ordered to withdraw, but this procedure would not be very effective in a place where there was a Christian majority. For the government of synagogues and exclusion from the synagogue, cf. Schürer, *G.J.V.* II, 506ff.; it appears that apart from the N.T. references we know nothing of exclusion from the synagogue at this period; the statement of Suet. *Claudius* 25 about Jewish-Christian riots at Rome suggests that expulsion from the synagogue was not easy to enforce (*adsidue tumultuantes*). For the homiletic usage of the synagogue in the first century A.D. cf. G. D. Kilpatrick, *Origins of the Gospel according to St Matthew*, pp. 59 ff.

## INTRODUCTION

something more than a mere repetition of an outline *kerygma* of the Gospel, backed by a selection of proof-texts from the Old Testament and 'prophecies' of an apocalyptic type; it seems quite incredible that in these cases, particularly where Christians had been expelled from the synagogue, there would be no attempt to provide a record of what Jesus had done and taught.

It is indeed sometimes urged that the first generation of Christians was so filled with enthusiastic expectations of the immediate return of the Lord that its members had no interest in the details of his life.<sup>1</sup> This seems to me frankly incredible. The missionary could hardly call on men to repent and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, the Messiah whom the rulers of the Jews had crucified and whom God had raised from the dead, unless they were prepared to vindicate this somewhat startling message by giving an account of the things which Jesus had said and done. And no expectation of the Lord's return, however enthusiastic, is likely to have retained for long an intensity sufficient to stifle the ancient and deep-rooted curiosity of the human mind and its desire to be told a story. Converts would certainly ask questions which must needs be satisfied. Fascher's saying that 'in the beginning was the sermon' may be true; but very soon after the sermon, or as part of it, must have come the lesson, a *haftarah* containing some account of the life of Jesus, not yet indeed regarded as scripture, but tending to assume a fixed form. For such a view we have the evidence of such passages as Acts x. 37f., where the brief summary of the ministry in the typical primitive *kerygma* is a fairly transparent literary device for avoiding the necessity of a fuller account; the hearers are supposed to know the story and therefore Peter need not repeat it here; but normally the hearers would not know. The similar Pauline *kerygma* of Acts xiii. 24ff. leaps from the Baptist to the crucifixion; but no body of converts could be permanently content to know nothing of the intervening period.

Thus, 'In the beginning was the sermon' needs to be supplemented by the words, 'The lesson was a close second', perhaps incorporated in the sermon and recognized as authoritative, since it contained a record of the words and deeds of the Lord.

Writings of this kind, as Albertz points out,<sup>2</sup> would be a natural

<sup>1</sup> Dibelius, *Formgeschichte d. Evang.*<sup>2</sup> pp. 9, 22.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 105.



growth, not a literary product. They would be of the sort of length which could easily be committed to memory, and furnish the basis for a sermon to instruct a congregation, to confirm their faith under persecution, or to edify them and emphasize their responsibilities as Christians. They could be used as an addition to the synagogue lessons or as a substitute for them. The practice attested by Justin Martyr<sup>1</sup> of reading the memorials of the Apostles at Christian worship may well go back to the very early beginnings of the Church; it would be extremely perilous to argue from the absence of any mention of the practice in earlier Christian writers that it cannot have existed, in view of the scanty nature of our records.

But such collections, which may perhaps be described as 'tracts', could not simply be left to travelling evangelists to compose; the Churches which sent them out would feel obliged to supervise their composition, though I hope in a subsequent volume to show that one collection has found its way into Matthew's Gospel, which was inspired by a hatred for the Gentiles which goes beyond anything that any responsible Jewish community can be supposed to have sanctioned. Quite apart from the collections already noted, we can trace other collections of material, united by a common subject of some sort; they are comparatively easily traced in Mark and Luke, though less easily in Matthew, whose habit of conflating his sources rarely allows us to isolate them with any degree of certainty.

Vincent Taylor has indeed suggested a method of compilation somewhat similar to that suggested here.<sup>2</sup> But his view that there were in the first place connected cycles of oral tradition which were worn down into isolated fragments, such as the 'conflict-stories' of Mark ii. 1–iii. 6, and then recombined into cycles, such as the present group of conflict-stories, seems to represent a duplication

<sup>1</sup> *Apol.* I, 67 (98D). It may be noted that the problem presented by the N.T. quotations of I Clem. xiii. 2 and xlvi. 8 (the former introduced by the formula 'it is written') disappears if we suppose that the quotations are drawn not from an 'apocryphal' collection (so Knopf in *H.z.N.T.* on I Clem. xiii. 2), but from collections of the sayings of Jesus of this kind. Clement may well have known such 'tracts' rather than the Gospels which soon superseded them. It is possible that such sayings as that of Acts xx. 35, the 'Bezan Logion' of Luke vi. 4, the allusion to the signs of the weather in Matt. xvi. 2f. (not found in  $\aleph$ , B and the old Syriac versions) and the *Pericope de adultera* are survivals of collections of this type; the remainder of such collections may have been included in the other sources used by the evangelists.

<sup>2</sup> *Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, ch. VIII.

## INTRODUCTION

for which there is no evidence. There seems no reason to doubt that the cycles which we can trace represent the original form; the stories may have circulated for a time independently and so reached their present shape, or on the other hand their present brevity and lack of detail may represent an attempt to compress the stories into a form in which they could easily be learnt by heart by a more or less illiterate evangelist. Nor is it safe to assume with the majority of form-critics that the rather fuller versions of the stories, which we sometimes meet, represent an expansion by the imagination of a later generation; this may, or may not, have happened in some cases, but it is equally possible that some at least represent an earlier stage of the tradition in which stories were combined into cycles of a fixed form before the original details had been forgotten. Here each story or parable must be examined on its own merits. Vincent Taylor does not attempt to go beyond this group and the Passion story; it will be seen that this by no means exhausts the whole of the cycles which can be identified with varying degrees of probability.

This does not only apply to Mark. It may be regarded as reasonably certain that Matthew and Luke were acquainted with a source which included an account of the temptation of Jesus, a sermon on a mountain, the healing of the centurion's servant and the message of the Baptist; but whether this cycle was not originally compiled from earlier tracts remains to be investigated. The rest of their common material—and it must be remembered that 'Q' is simply a symbol of the material common to Matthew and Luke which is not found in Mark—may have been derived from the same document; but some at least of the difficulties of the Q hypothesis are more easily explained if it be supposed that both evangelists were drawing on collections of material which in some cases reached them in the same written form, but in others had an independent history behind them. It is obvious that this view has not the attractive simplicity of the older 'Two-document' or 'Four-document' hypothesis. Here I can only record my conviction that in dealing with the primitive Church we must recognize that everything we know of its history and outlook suggests that the single and simple explanation is likely to be the furthest from the truth.

CHAPTER I  
THE FIRST GROUP OF  
CONFLICT-STORIES

This group of stories (Mark ii. 1–iii. 6) has been investigated by Albertz, whose conclusions seem quite convincing. It is, however, worth noting that the group of stories may well have begun not with ii. 1, but with i. 40. For the stories as a group would seem intended to meet the question, familiar to anyone who has ever tried to teach the Gospel story to children or simple people: ‘Why if Jesus was the Messiah, did his own people want to kill him?’ And from this point of view the story of the leper would make an admirable beginning, since it proves that Jesus did not begin by breaking the law; on the contrary he observed it.<sup>1</sup> The method is that normal with ancient

<sup>1</sup> The story of Mark i. 40–6 is extremely puzzling. The attempts of Rawlinson *ad loc.* and the writers quoted by him on p. 256 involve a subtlety which seems quite unthinkable in a ‘pronouncement-story’ of this kind. They rightly see that the ὄργισθεις of D must be preferred to the conventional σπλαγχμισθεις of the T.R. Either Luke or Matthew would almost certainly have retained σπλαγχμισθεις if they had had it before them. Lake’s attempt in *H.T.R.* xvi (1923), 197f. to refer the ‘anger’ to the leper is equally over-subtle. The word ἐμβριμᾶσθαι should mean to snort or bellow with anger (cf. Lucian, *Nekyiom.* 20 (484) where the snorting of Brimo and the barking of Cerberus ratify a decree in Hades). Matt. ix. 30 looks like ‘Christian Greek’ derived from this passage in Mark. John xi. 33 and 38 look like the inarticulate groans suitable to miracle or magic (cf. *P.M.G.* iv, 657) modelled perhaps on Matt. ix. 34 or a parallel tradition. The etymologies state that it is used by Euripides (fr. 1099) in the sense of ἐπιτιμᾶν, but since they merely give the word it is hard to feel confidence in their interpretation. Suidas gives two meanings: (a) μετ’ ὄργης ἐλάλησεν and (b) μετ’ αὐστηρότητος ἐπετίμησεν, but again it seems doubtful whether he has any authority except the N.T. usage already noted. In the Greek O.T. it is used more or less as the equivalent of ὄργη (Ps. vii. 12 Aquila; Ps. xxxvii (xxxviii). 4 Aquila and Symmachus; Isa. xxx. 27 Theodotion). In Isa. xvii. 13 Symmachus has ἐμβριμᾶσεται where the LXX has ἀποσκοροκίει and Aquila ἐπιτιμήσει. It would seem that in conjunction with ὄργισθεις in Mark i. 41 the word can hardly be taken as simply = ἐπετίμησεν in its weakened meaning of ‘charged him strictly’ even if it could be used as an equivalent for the meaning ‘rebuked him’.

At the risk of adding another solution I am inclined to suggest that at some point in the oral tradition a story of the cleansing of a leper has been confused with a story of the casting out of a devil, for which the anger and the loud cry which casts ‘him’ (i.e. the devil) out would be appropriate. All that can be said is that this solution is not more fantastic than the others.

writers, who prefer to make their point by incidents, rather than by the discussion of tendencies.

But the group of stories throws a peculiar light on the transmission of the tradition. The question in the ancient world would only be raised on the soil of Palestine, or in a predominantly Jewish community. Gentile anti-semitism would ask for no explanation of Jewish hostility to Jesus; it was the sort of thing that might be expected of Jews.<sup>1</sup> Thus Luke finds no difficulty in opening his Gospel with the scene of the rejection at Nazareth, though in his version Jesus appears to reject the Jews before they reject him (Luke iv. 16ff.). In the same way Mark assumes that the reader knows who the Pharisees are, and even understands 'the Herodians' in iii. 6. On the other hand αὐτοῖς in i. 44 implies the existence of a definite opposition, who are at least watching Jesus with grave suspicion. It is of course possible that the story comes from a period in Jesus' ministry when he was already suspect to the authorities, but it more naturally refers to the Jewish nation as a whole. Probably αὐτοῖς represents the general view of the later Gentile Church, for which the Jews, or at least the Pharisees, are recognized enemies. εἰς μαρτύριον may be original; the leper is to offer the sacrifice as a testimony that he has been healed. Thus we have at least some grounds for suspicion that the whole of this tract came to Mark after it had passed through the hands of a Gentile Church.<sup>2</sup> Yet it had originally been compiled to meet Jewish difficulties.

As against this the allusion to Herodians proves its antiquity. Luke and Matthew reproduce the story of Mark iii. 1-6, but omit the Herodians for the simple reason that the word meant nothing to them, or at any rate to their prospective readers; Matthew preserves them in his version of the tribute-money incident (xxii. 16), merely

<sup>1</sup> For ancient anti-semitism, cf. Josephus *c. Ap.* 1, 219 ff., *Antt.* III, 179, XIV, 187, 213, 241 ff.; whether the decrees in favour of the Jews are authentic or not is immaterial; they show the kind of pressure needed to prevent outbreaks of anti-semitism in Asia. For the borders of Palestine, cf. *B.J.* II, 466 ff., and for Rome Tac. *Hist.* v, 3 ff.; see also Bevan in *C.A.H.* IX, 433.

<sup>2</sup> This is confirmed by the two remarkable Latinisms of iii. 5 and 7. συλλυπεῖσθαι means 'to sympathize with', not 'to be grieved'. But *contristari* (rare in literature before Augustus) does mean 'to be grieved'. Similarly συμβούλιον means 'a council' (*concilium*), not 'counsel' (*consilium*). It looks as though Mark or his source was drawing from a Latin version and retranslating it pretty badly. Cf. my *Hellenistic Elements*, p. 6 n. 4.

out of mechanical copying of Mark. It may indeed be doubted whether Mark really knew who they were. There was never any serious question of using the Herodian dynasty to solve the problem of Palestine after the death of Herod Agrippa in A.D. 44. In practice 'Herodians', i.e. a body of Jewish opinion which seriously regarded the rule of the Herodian dynasty as the best solution of the Jewish problem,<sup>1</sup> can hardly have been a factor in Jewish life after the time of Herod Agrippa, when it still seemed possible that the Roman government might reconstitute the kingdom of Herod the Great.

We are thus dealing with a tradition, which dates from the period between the deposition of Archelaus by Augustus in A.D. 6 and the death of Agrippa in A.D. 44, and reflects a period of history which had ceased to mean anything to the Church by the time when Matthew and Luke were compiled.

This raises a further question. The second group of conflict-sayings recognized by Albertz (pp. 16ff.) may once have been an independent unit. But it will be seen later (pp. 85 ff.) that there are grave reasons for doubting whether this set of incidents represents an older compilation, and is not put together by Mark from other sources. If so, the question arises whether the tribute-money incident (xii. 13 ff.) may not have belonged to this collection; it would be entirely in place as a continuation of iii. 6, giving the results of the Pharisee-Herodian plot; in itself the question as to tribute-money was an extremely clever trap. The incident and its relation to its context may, however, be postponed until we come to this section of Mark.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the Herodians, cf. Otto in *P.W.K. Suppl.* II, 200, Rowley in *J.T.S.* xLI (1940), pp. 14ff., and my article 'Church and State in the New Testament' in *J.R.S.* xxxix (1949), p. 23. For the abandonment of the 'Herodian solution' after A.D. 44, cf. *C.A.H.* ix, 433.

<sup>2</sup> Bultmann (p. 54) holds that the original pericope consisted of iii. 1-5; 6 is a secondary addition, since the opening verses do not specify the opponents, and the Pharisees are introduced as the conventional enemies; he appears to ignore the Herodians. But we are dealing with an element of the tradition that is old enough to have had the allusion to the Herodians attached to it at a time when people were still interested in the Herodians (at latest before A.D. 44), and Bultmann's objection is quite unjustified; we are merely dealing with the ordinary carelessness of hellenistic writers. Thus in Nicolas of Damascus' *Life of Augustus* (*F.G.H.* 90, F 130, 70) the two tribunes remove the crown from Julius Caesar's statue. Caesar complains in the Senate, alleging that they had put the crown there themselves in order to discredit him; the tribunes are banished and others appointed. 'But the people shouted that

## THE FIRST GROUP OF CONFLICT-STORIES

In any case we have here a collection of stories, which belong to no particular period in Jesus' ministry. As a matter of fact it is already implied in iii. 4 that Jesus is aware that his enemies are plotting against him; there is no point in the dilemma as to doing good or evil on the sabbath day unless his enemies have a guilty conscience, since otherwise they could make the obvious reply that it is never lawful to do evil on any day, and only to do necessary good deeds on the sabbath. If, however, they are already plotting, the dilemma is a good one. The fact that this collection of stories is a single unit incorporated as a whole into the Marcan narrative may explain the supposed anachronism of Jesus' use in ii. 10 and 28 of the term 'Son of man' which Mark otherwise does not bring in until after the confession at Caesarea Philippi (viii. 29). Rawlinson (p. 24) holds that the view that Jesus only used the title of himself at a late stage of his ministry is 'a modern theory, which the evangelist did not share, as this story shows', and he is probably right in doing so. But even if Mark did regard the title as suited to the later period, we may perhaps doubt whether he himself did not realize that these stories belonged to an entirely timeless collection; in any case there is nothing surprising in the inconsistent appearance of it at this point, when once it is realized that we are dealing with a source, since all the evangelists are liable to be hopelessly slovenly in their revision (cf. *Hellenistic Elements*, p. 8, for examples from St Luke).<sup>1</sup>

he was a king already and ought to put the crown on without further delay.' Jacoby notes that actually 'the people' are drawn from the story of Antony's offer of the crown to Caesar at the Lupercalia; he adds that no Greek reader will have felt any difficulty about their sudden appearance (in a place where they could not possibly be). Yet Nicolas was writing for a far more sophisticated public than Mark.

<sup>1</sup> Rawlinson *ad loc.* following Loisy inclines to the view that the original story of ii. 1-12 simply told of the healing of a paralytic: the argument with the scribes 5 b-10 is an insertion betrayed as such by the awkwardly repeated 'He saith unto the paralytic' resumed at 11 from 5 a. With the theological difficulties which he raises we are not concerned; but the repetition of 'he saith unto the paralytic' is almost inevitable, since in 10 Jesus is addressing the scribes and in 11 the paralytic. The narrative has to convey what in a play would be conveyed by a stage-direction and in an oral narrative by a change of tone or a gesture. It may be noted that Matthew and Luke, although they take considerable liberties with the Marcan wording at this point, can find no way of avoiding the awkwardness. Luke, who is a far more skilful writer, has a similar awkward situation at xxiii. 42, where the penitent thief turns from his fellow malefactor to address Jesus. But he merely writes 'and he said', which does not tell us who is speaking to whom. By itself ii. 1-5 a and 11 f. gives a very feeble miracle story, while the story of 5 b-10 has neither beginning nor end.

Better (or more pretentious) historians than Mark can be guilty of far worse inconsequences arising from the ancient practice of incorporating sources in blocks and failing to revise them adequately.<sup>1</sup>

Once it is seen that we are dealing with such a collection the difficulty of iii. 6 disappears. If Mark be treated as strictly accurate history it is absurd to suppose that the Pharisees start plotting against Jesus after the not very serious incidents recorded in the preceding chapters, and still more that they should after the incident of the paralytic form an unholy alliance with the Herodians, their natural enemies, to destroy Jesus; it is still worse that they should do nothing about it until the end of the Gospel. Mark may not have felt the difficulty very strongly; the Pharisees are already for him the natural villains of the piece; Luke saw the difficulty and watered the plot down to a mere conversation among the Pharisees as to what they should do to Jesus. But the original collection of stories ended with the plot for the simple reason that at one time it stood by itself as an introduction to the story of the Passion. Whether it was intended to lead on to a full story of the Passion, such as one of the sources which Mark and Luke have conflated to form their present narratives of the last scenes in the life of Jesus, or whether it was intended simply to lead up to a comparatively brief *kerygma*, such as those which survive elsewhere in the New Testament, we have no means of saying. But it would seem likely that it was intended from the first to serve as an introduction to a full Passion story. It could be followed immediately by Mark ix. 30-2 (which, it will be seen later, came to Mark from a source, though naturally we cannot be sure that it was this particular one; cf. below,

<sup>1</sup> Thus Josephus, *Antt.* xiv, 131 ff. describes the assistance brought by Antipater to Mithridates of Pergamum during Caesar's Egyptian campaign of 48 B.C. From his main source it was clear that Hyrcanus was not present with Antipater, who persuaded the Jews of Leontopolis not to oppose Mithridates by showing them letters from Hyrcanus. But while his main source rightly said nothing of the presence of Hyrcanus, Strabo quoted Asinius as saying that after Mithridates Hyrcanus also invaded Egypt, and Hypsicrates as saying that Hyrcanus took part in Antipater's expedition. Josephus could not resist the chance of quoting a Gentile testimony to Jewish activities and inserts Strabo's notice at 137 ff., though it is clear from his main source that Hyrcanus did nothing of the kind.

Those who wish to see the sort of inconsequences of which ancient compilers of a far higher literary standard than Mark are capable, would do well to study Part I, Section F of Tarn's *Alexander the Great*, II, 63 ff.

p. 67), a sentence describing the arrival at Jerusalem, and Mark xiv. 1 ff. Naturally we should want to know how the Chief Priests and Sadducees came to replace the Herodians in the plot, but Mark probably would not have felt the need; in any case it is highly probable that he could not say for the simple reason that he did not know.<sup>1</sup>

A curious problem arises with regard to the inclusion among the conflict-stories of the call of Levi in ii. 13 ff. This has been taken as a simple pronouncement-story ending with 17; the meal of 15 f. has been inserted by Mark; the original story contained an objection to the fact that Jesus associated with publicans and sinners (Dibelius, *op. cit.* p. 64, n. 1). On the other hand this view leaves unexplained the obscurity of 15; is Jesus sitting in Levi's house or in his own? Luke (v. 29) interprets the verse in the former sense, Matthew (ix. 10) apparently in the latter. Vincent Taylor (p. 148) treats 14 as a simple biographical story about the call of Levi; in this case it would seem to have been interpolated by Mark for no apparent reason into the group of conflict-stories. (Cf. also Rawlinson, *ad loc.*) But it remains quite possible that Mark's clumsy use of pronouns is intended to mean that Jesus sat at meat in Levi's house; and that Luke interprets Mark correctly when he writes that 'Levi made a feast for him (Jesus) in his (Levi's) house'. The 'many' who follow Jesus Mark will have found in his source. Dibelius holds that they are a Marcan addition, but Mark can usually make his meaning clear, while here we have a hopeless obscurity: are the followers disciples or publicans? (cf. the commentaries *ad loc.*). It is quite possible that the call of Levi always stood here in the tradition as an introduction to the story of the conflict over eating with publicans and sinners; this view has the advantage that there seems no reason why Mark should have inserted the story, intended to show that the disciple must leave all and follow Jesus, into a group of stories all connected by the entirely different theme of the conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees; if Mark had found the story unattached in the tradition the natural place for it would be after i. 20. The difficulty sometimes felt about Mark ii. 17b 'I am not come to call the

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that John xi. 47-53 may quite well be a fragment from an older source describing the development of the plot with a slight admixture of Johannine theology. Whether the story was based on good information, or the inevitable inference drawn by the Church from the facts, cannot of course be decided.



righteous but sinners' (I cannot say that I personally find it a serious one) would vanish if the saying dates from a time when 'the righteous', i.e. the Pharisees, are known to have rejected Jesus' view of the Kingdom of God.<sup>1</sup>

The realization of the fact that we have in this source a collection of stories which do not belong to any period in the ministry of Jesus that can be definitely fixed removes some further objections that have been raised as to their historical value. Thus Bultmann objects to the stories of Mark ii. 13 ff. and 23 ff. with the rhetorical question, 'Did Jesus behave himself so correctly in all these matters, that he is not attacked?' (p. 50) and again (p. 16) regards it as ridiculous that 'the scribes from Jerusalem come simply to see the disciples eat'. (He admits, however, that the right of the scribes from Jerusalem to exercise a kind of inspection in Galilee is historical.)

In point of fact it would be perfectly natural for Jesus to comply with the general Pharisaic interpretation of the Torah at the outset of his mission. The Gospels are written under the influence of the later view which, after the crucifixion, regards the Pharisees as the villains of the piece, as Bultmann rightly sees (p. 54). But they were the accredited religious leaders of the nation and there is no reason why Jesus should not have hoped in the first instance to win their support for his message. There is moreover a considerable amount of evidence that he did in fact try to enlist them, and only abandoned the attempt when it was clearly impossible to hope for their support except on terms which he could not accept. This evidence is all the more valuable, since it is contained in sayings which have been

<sup>1</sup> Although I feel on dangerous ground when disagreeing with Professor Dodd, I cannot accept his view that the last clause of 17 is an addition by the Church to the original saying 'They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick' (*Parables of the Kingdom*, pp. 117f.). It is of course possible that the saying did not originally belong to the story; but the irony seems to be quite characteristic of Jesus. In any case the treatment of the verse by Luke and the copyists of Mark and Matthew seems decisive in its favour, since they show how difficult the saying was felt to be. Luke boldly avoided the difficulty by adding εἰς μετάνοιαν. Matthew (ix. 13) seems to have retained the Marcan text; but the Caesarean text, as represented by Θ, the Ferrar group, and C add εἰς μετάνοιαν in order to remove the difficulty, and are followed by the T.R., which has also introduced the improvement into the text of Mark. This treatment clearly shows how hard the text was felt to be and strikes me as the best possible evidence of its authenticity. If the saying were secondary, it would from the first have contained εἰς μετάνοιαν.

preserved in the tradition, although they do not fit in with the general picture of the narrative, which is dominated from the outset by the breach with the Pharisees. Thus in the mass of later accusations piled up against the scribes and Pharisees in Matt. xxiii, one charge, that of verse 23, stands out. It displays an attitude to the Pharisaic interpretation of the Law which does not appear elsewhere. Bultmann rightly regards this as part of the oldest tradition (p. 158; cf. below, p. 96). To these may be added the friendly relations between Jesus and the Pharisees which emerge in Luke xiii. 32 and also in vii. 36 where we have a genuinely friendly invitation; we may contrast xiv. 1 and possibly xi. 37. In Luke xiv. 1 we certainly have an artificial situation where the invitation is just a trap; in the latter it is not clear that xi. 37-41 may not contain a genuine saying apart from the exaggerated denunciation of ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας and ἄφρονες. The situation here may be a Lucan setting, but it need not be, and it is surprising that the Pharisee is not represented as intending to entrap Jesus. If genuine, the setting suggests that Jesus had by this time ceased to follow the strict practice.

A further saying of this kind is Luke v. 39. Bultmann (p. 107) regards it as a popular proverb, whose authenticity can hardly be defended, since it does not appear in the Marcan tradition (ii. 22) which Luke is following here. There are of course parallels to the proverbial saying (cf. Wetstein *ad loc.*); but there is no reason why Jesus should not have used a popular proverb; on the other hand there is every reason why Luke should not have ascribed to Jesus a saying which implied a wistful recognition of the difficulty which the scribes and Pharisees must find in abandoning their established outlook in favour of the 'new wine' of his teaching.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Creed *ad loc.* Harnack (*Marcion*,<sup>2</sup> 247\*) may be right in ascribing the omission of the verse in D and the old Latin to Marcion. The saying is so startlingly contrary to those which precede it that its authenticity both as part of Luke's text and as a saying of Jesus appears to be beyond question, unless we are to assume that the primitive community was in the habit of ascribing to Jesus sayings entirely contradicting its own settled convictions. The view that any proverbial saying ascribed to Jesus must be a later addition to the tradition rests on no evidence at all, but is a purely *a priori* assumption; the frequency with which such sayings appear, often with a startling effectiveness, suggests that they are one of the most reliable elements in the tradition, though naturally it is likely enough that some proverbs have been wrongly ascribed to him. The view that v. 39 is wrongly ascribed seems entirely fantastic.

We may probably add Luke xvii. 20, which will be dealt with separately. Mark xii. 28ff. belongs to a similar early tradition, as is shown by the way in which it has been revised by Luke and Matthew. Of the historical value of this element in the Gospels there can be no doubt, for it has been preserved in isolated sayings which are entirely contrary to the general attitude of the early Palestinian Church, as represented by the dominant tradition. Of the stages in the process by which Jesus passed from the hope of winning the Pharisees, the natural leaders in a movement for setting up the 'kingdom of God', into an opposition which led the Pharisees to form a coalition with the Herodians, we know nothing, except that it would seem to go back to the days of his ministry in Galilee. The incident of Mark viii. 13ff., apart from its Marcan expansions, shows every sign of being historical; it is a warning against attempts of the Pharisees and Herodians to find means for discrediting Jesus by corrupting his disciples (cf. below, p. 57). But it had become entirely unintelligible to Mark himself, while Luke and Matthew can make nothing of it. Since it is connected with a voyage in a boat it would appear to belong to the Galilean period; the boat and the one loaf are integral to the story.

It would appear then that Jesus did attempt to maintain friendly relations with the Pharisees for a period which we cannot determine. It would be natural for him to avoid giving offence himself; on the other hand he would appear to have refused to impose on his disciples anything beyond that standard of popular observance of the Law in which they had been brought up. It was this failure that was at least one of the causes of the quarrel. This is the picture given in the first group of conflict-stories, and there is no reason to doubt its accuracy, or the historicity of the incidents given as samples of the way in which the quarrel developed. On the other hand we have no guarantee that any of them occurred almost at the outset of the ministry and considerable grounds for supposing that the coalition of Pharisees and Herodians in active opposition is relatively late. Nor is it to be supposed that the relatively trifling disputes were the real cause of the breach between Jesus and the Pharisees: the real cause was the growing sense of the incompatibility of his conception of his mission with the ideals of the Pharisees.

## CHAPTER II

### THE TWELVE-SOURCE

With the next section of Mark (iii. 7 ff.) we come to a crucial passage for the understanding of Mark's methods of compilation and the nature of the material at his disposal. As Meyer rightly saw the clumsiness of the repeated 'And he appointed (the) Twelve' in 14 and 16 is unthinkable even in the most artless of writers (*Urspr. u. Anf.* I, 136). Such clumsiness, however, is common in far more pretentious writers when they are inserting from sources.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand Meyer's suggestion that the new source (the 'Twelve-source') begins at 15 seems mistaken; his objection that the story is inconsistent since the Twelve are appointed in 14 to be with Jesus and in 15 to be sent on missions is hardly serious. There seems no reason why Mark's source should not quite simply have stated the fact that Jesus' appointment of the Twelve was intended for the double purpose, while it must be remembered that the preaching mission is only represented as a single event. Moreover the section Mark iii. 7-15, as will be seen, harmonizes in character with the rest of the Twelve-source, while it is most unlikely that the appointment of the Twelve would be mentioned in 14 if it is not part of the Twelve-source, since it is only in this source that they appear.<sup>2</sup> It is far more natural to take iii. 7-15 as the opening of the Twelve-source, or of a section of it, and to regard 16-19 as an

<sup>1</sup> For a specimen, cf. Josephus, *Antt.* xiv, 227 ff. Josephus is giving a list of favours conferred on the Jews in the time of Hyrcanus by Caesar and other Roman authorities. 227 closes a letter from Dolabella to Ephesus. 228 continues: 'And these were the grants made to our people by Dolabella when Hyrcanus sent an embassy to him. And Lucius Lentulus, consul, said: "I have released from military service the Jews who are Roman citizens, practising the Jewish religion in Ephesus" . . . ' Here, as a comparison with 234 and 236 shows, Josephus has simply changed the λέγει of the official statement to εἶπεν, and so made the pronouncement of Lentulus carry on his summary of Dolabella's action as if it were part of his narrative. The effect is incredibly clumsy since we have no introduction to the string of pronouncements following the letter of Dolabella, except the summary and the opening words of Lentulus' pronouncement, which reads as if it were part of Josephus' narrative, but in fact is merely the opening of a whole set of further decrees in favour of the Jews.

<sup>2</sup> Except for iv. 10, where there are special reasons, for which see below, pp. 37 f.

insertion which comes from another 'source' in the sense that it is a fixed part of the tradition that Jesus had Twelve disciples, whose names were given in an 'official' list, which circulated in the early Church with minor variations as to the right of Thaddaeus or Judas the brother of James to be regarded as an 'Apostle'. (The list in its simplest form appears in Acts i. 13, where it shows every sign of being an insertion into the narrative. The names should have come, if anywhere, after verse 5; but the source from which Luke draws this part of his story would seem to have assumed that the reader knew who 'they' were.)

The section opens at iii. 7 with a typical scene (cf. Rawlinson, *ad loc.*). It is commonly regarded as axiomatic that these typical scenes are due to Mark's editorial work. On the other hand we have to assume that either this section or iv. 1 came to Mark from his sources, since it is inconceivable that he would have repeated himself so clumsily. Bultmann (p. 366) supposes that the section has simply been constructed out of iv. 1. On the other hand this leaves unexplained the remarkable excursion into the geography of Palestine on the part of Mark; he was writing for a Gentile public which would not be in the least degree interested in these regions.<sup>1</sup> Nor is it easy to suppose that he would not have seen that the wide publicity described in iii. 8 is quite out of place at this early stage in the ministry of Jesus.<sup>2</sup>

There is further the grave difficulty of supposing that Mark, if he

<sup>1</sup> It is of course possible enough that the account is exaggerated. But Jews had nothing to learn from Greeks in the matter of exaggeration. Moreover, when it is seen that the Twelve-source as a whole simply gives a general summary of the ministry of Jesus and ends in a Passion story, with only a few incidents of a special character included, it is not necessary to suppose that it was exaggerating; we have no means of discovering what measure of interest the career of Jesus excited before his last visit to Jerusalem. It is only if Mark's narrative be taken as a chronological record that it becomes impossible to suppose that his teaching had obtained such wide publicity at so early a stage.

<sup>2</sup> Bultmann's further assumption that the call of the Twelve (13-19) is of Mark's construction, the conception of a permanent body of Twelve, who are the authoritative witnesses of the Gospel, being due to later dogmatic motives, is an entire *petitio principii*, and ignores the contrast between the naive references to 'the disciples' usual in Mark and the specific usage of the Twelve-source. It should be observed that the fixed group of Twelve appears in I Cor. xv. 5, a fixed formula of a credal type, probably some years older than the Epistle (cf. Dibelius, pp. 17 ff.); for the possibility that it drew on this source, cf. below, pp. 148 f.

were composing a typical scene, would have been guilty of the very clumsy repetition of the teaching from the boat (iii. 9 and iv. 1). Moreover his use of πάλιν in iv. 1 here, as in viii. 1 and x. 32, suggests that he is simply following the practice of recording the same incident from two sources and making it appear that they are not the same incident by the insertion of πάλιν which we find in ancient historians.<sup>1</sup> In the same way the first account of the preaching from the boat is natural if it stood in a source, entirely pointless if it is an 'ideal scene' preparing for iv. 1 (Dibelius, p. 44). What we have is a regular practice described here and a particular instance recorded in iv. 1; whether the regular practice grew out of the single incident, or whether at iv. 1 we have a specimen incident manufactured out of a recorded habit, or whether again Jesus often preached from a boat, and the parable of the Sower was delivered on such an occasion, is a point that can only be determined on the basis of our preconceived views of the reliability of the sources at Mark's disposal; we shall find reason to suppose that both in the Twelve-source and the parable of the Sower we are dealing with sources of a very high degree of reliability. In any case Mark's narrative betrays a clumsiness in the repetition which is simply due to a combination of sources.<sup>2</sup>

Further, the whole section 7-19 supports this view. In the preceding group of conflict-stories 'the disciples' appear as a recognized body of followers of Jesus, as they normally do throughout the Gospel. In some cases it may be open to doubt whether Mark has not used the term 'disciples' to denote a fixed group, when in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Plutarch, *Alexander*, xxxii (684A) and xxxiii (685A), where Parmenio's second appeal for help at Gaugamela (πάλιν) is due to the fact that here Plutarch or his source has conflated Callisthenes' account with another and made nonsense of the whole affair (cf. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, II, 182f.). So in Josephus, *Ant.* xiv, 34 and 37 we read of Pompey's advance from Damascus into Palestine in 63 B.C. and Aristobulus' gift of a golden vine (from Strabo). At 37 ambassadors come 'again', Antipater on behalf of Hyrcanus, Nicodemus on behalf of Aristobulus. But this is simply Nicolas of Damascus' account of the same incident disguised by πάλιν.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Athenaeus, *Deipn.* iv, 38 (152F-153B) where Posidonius' account of how Seleucus, when taken prisoner by Arsaces, was well treated and allowed to sit at a special table, has been turned by Athenaeus into an account of the Parthian king's table manners (*F.G.H.* 87, F5 and note *ad loc.*). Again, in xii, 54 (538C) Athenaeus describes the special tent set up by Alexander for the Persian weddings from Chares; but it is really a description of Alexander's tent of audience, which has become a special pavilion erected for the ceremony.

fact the tradition referred to a more loosely defined body of followers; as Bultmann points out the tendency has been at work in such a passage as Matt. xii. 49 where 'those about him' (Mark iii. 34) becomes conventionally 'the disciples' (p. 370). No doubt Mark in the conflict-stories is anticipating his own narrative in representing Jesus as surrounded by a fixed body of disciples before the appointment of the Twelve. But if he is simply assembling various pre-existing sources with little or no regard to their chronological order the mistake could not have been avoided without a far higher degree of editorial accuracy than is normally to be found in the historians of the hellenistic age. On the other hand he has here inserted a source which described the formal appointment of a particular body of Twelve who were from henceforth an inner ring of companions, and in this source are not described as 'the disciples', the usual Marcan term, but as 'the Twelve'.<sup>1</sup> Naturally we have 'disciples' in iii. 7 and 9 since 'the Twelve' have not yet been selected from the whole body of followers.

From the lake Jesus goes up to 'the mountain'; the transition is abrupt, but the abruptness may be due to the artlessness of the source no less than to the artlessness of the evangelist; the scenery of the lake of Gennesaret is assumed as the background of the story until the journey to Jerusalem (cf. vi. 46). Here the Twelve are appointed to accompany Jesus and to preach and to have authority to cast out devils, and the source is abandoned for the time being; we go back to a stratum in which Jesus is working in a city, presumably Capernaum, with a house at his disposal.<sup>2</sup>

At this point may be noticed a fragment found in Luke (viii. 1) which has no Marcan parallel. It describes Jesus and his *entourage* during his Galilean ministry; they consist of 'the Twelve' and others. The last extract from the source in Mark's narrative was the

<sup>1</sup> Bultmann relegates all these passages to 'editorial work' as he is bound to do if he is to uphold his general thesis, except for vi. 7-13; but this fails to explain why Mark should sometimes refer to 'the disciples' and sometimes to 'the Twelve' in his editorial work. This of course might be explained as mere chance, if it were not for the peculiarly uniform character of the passages in which 'the Twelve' appear.

<sup>2</sup> It might be argued that 'the house' of iii. 19 is no more awkward than the mountain of verse 13. But in the latter case Jesus goes up from the lake to the adjoining mountain; in the former he goes into a house which would appear to be on the top of the mountain.

actual appointing of the Twelve, ending at iii. 19, reproduced at Luke vi. 16. It is entirely in the manner of this source to be interested in the subsidiary figures and to describe the movements of Jesus in terms of the general framework of his mission, not in specimen incidents of the type generally recognized by form-criticism. It is of course possible that Luke owes this information to some other source; thus it is often held that he betrays a special interest in the Herodian dynasty. This is difficult to maintain in view of his elimination of Mark's 'Herodians' (cf. below, p. 57), whom he appears not to have understood. It is at least probable that Joanna should also be regarded as due not to Luke's special 'Herodian' information, but to the Twelve-source, Luke having preserved a fragment which Mark omitted as trivial. In this case it is quite possible that 'the day after' comes from the source, and was intended to describe how Jesus, after appointing the Twelve, went about with this selected group of disciples. The insertion of the fragment at this point is simply due to the fact that Luke is here returning to his use of Mark, after a long extract from Q and some material peculiar to himself, and so brings the verse in from the Twelve-source, where it would have appeared in Mark, if he had not omitted it, just before the parable of the Sower. It is of course arguable that it is by mere chance that Luke writes 'The Twelve' in a passage which shows in a marked degree the peculiar features of this source and inserts it in the place where it would naturally have stood between the extracts from the source which are preserved in Mark iii. 19 and vi. 7; but the argument postulates a coincidence which puts a heavy strain on our credulity. Naturally 'the day after' must not be pressed to mean more than that the appointment of the Twelve in the source marked a change in Jesus' methods of preaching from a more or less settled ministry in Capernaum to one of moving about in Galilee. The omission of this section of the source by Mark will be due either to pure inadvertence or to the fact that it was a doublet of xv. 40.

The remaining passages which can be identified as coming from this source appear to be vi. 7-13, which is resumed at 30-2, ix. 33-5 and 38f., x. 32b-45, xi. 11, xiv. 1f., 10f., and 17-21. This leaves it open whether other elements of the narrative may not have been drawn from the same source; where we have no mention either of 'the Twelve' or 'the disciples' we have no means of being certain



as to the source from which the narrative is drawn. We shall see (pp. 115 ff.) that it appears that in the Marcan account of the Passion taken in conjunction with some parts of the Lucan, we have two parallel accounts which have been conflated; since in the earlier part of the story the Twelve-source has been drawn on, it would seem probable that it is also one of Mark's two sources for the whole Passion story.<sup>1</sup> It may be noted here that the passages fall into two classes, those which give general summaries of the ministry of Jesus and those which concern the activities of the Twelve or particular disciples, especially the sons of Zebedee (cf. Meyer I, 137). It is customary to assume that the summaries are editorial insertions by Mark; but it will be seen that the difficulties already noted in regard to iii. 7-15 apply to other of the passages drawn from this source. Such a document would simply be an expanded form of the Petrine *kerygma* as given in Acts x. 38f., a fact which suggests that it need by no means be secondary.

Meyer would include in passages from this source iv. 10ff., where we find the curious phrase 'Those about him with the Twelve'. He infers that the testimony from Isa. vi. 9 is inserted into the request for an explanation of the parable of the Sower from this source. In regarding it as an insertion he is undoubtedly right (cf. below, p. 36). But there is no reason for referring it to this source. For in this passage iv. 1-34 we have at verses 10 and 34 two unique descriptions of the immediate *entourage* of Jesus. If the reading of iv. 10 is correct, as it clearly is, Mark has added 'with the Twelve' to his source to explain the unparalleled 'those about him';<sup>2</sup> the use of the term is due to the fact that the Twelve have been mentioned in the preceding chapter. Apart from this the Twelve do not appear until vi. 7. Here we have a rather abrupt opening to the pericope describing the mission of the Twelve, which may be due to Mark's editing. But it may equally well be a characteristic of this source to give such abrupt summaries, cf. vi. 32, ix. 33, xi. 11, xiv. 17.

<sup>1</sup> This list differs somewhat from that of Meyer (*op. cit.* pp. 137ff.). The reasons will appear below.

<sup>2</sup> οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα has the support of the majority of the Uncials, *fam.* 1 and most of the versions. W, Θ and the Western texts have οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, a conventional correction of the unusual phrase. For the whole of the Parables' source, cf. below, pp. 35-8.

The abruptness is much less when it is realized that this pericope presumably followed immediately after iii. 15; the single sentence provided a transition from the appointment of the Twelve to their mission. On this hypothesis a difficulty of the section vi. 7-13 disappears; in vi. 7 the Twelve are given power over unclean spirits, but no more, while at verse 12 they preach repentance; if however the section followed immediately after iii. 15, the duty of preaching had already been mentioned; the repetition of the commission to cast out devils might imply the giving of some sort of commission on the occasion of the sending out of the Twelve.<sup>1</sup> The charge given to the Twelve in vi. 7ff. will be discussed in connection with the parallels in Matt. and Luke.

The Twelve return from the mission at vi. 30 where they are rightly described as apostles, i.e. *שליח*, the common term for an authorized emissary.<sup>2</sup> This is a mere fragment, ending at verse 32; originally it followed immediately on vi. 13, the source having been broken up by Mark in order to allow of the insertion of the story of the death of the Baptist which came to him from a different source of the normal type, whether written or oral. At 33 there is an extremely awkward transition; Jesus goes to the desert with his disciples for rest, but many see them going and follow them. It would seem that Mark is going over to a new source, which began with the wording of 34, and formed a collection of miracles (cf. below, p. 43). Mark had no way of producing the crowd in a desert unless he inserted some explanation and introduced 33 for the purpose.<sup>3</sup> In the original story the 'desert place' was not too remote

<sup>1</sup> Is some memory of this preserved in Luke x. 18 ff.? The words are out of place in Luke, and would suit such an occasion as this; but this can only be conjectured.

<sup>2</sup> Note *ἀποστέλλειν* in iii. 15 and vi. 7. Luke at vi. 13 wrongly reads back into the original appointment the term *ἀποστόλους* in its later technical sense. But there is no reason for supposing that the sending of the Twelve does not record a historical incident, or that it is the ascended Christ who speaks in it to the missionaries of the primitive Palestinian Church, and that Mark has thrown it back into the lifetime of Jesus because he saw it did not suit the conditions of the mission to the Greek world with which he was familiar (Bultmann, p. 156). This is an amazing amount of ingenuity to employ in getting rid of a quite straightforward story.

The well supported *οὐς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν* in Mark iii. 14 is presumably due to assimilation to Luke, though in its Marcan position it would be unobjectionable. For the term, cf. Str.-B. on Rom. i. 1.

<sup>3</sup> The verse was necessary to explain how the multitude came to be present when Jesus was in a desert place (verse 35); on the other hand it may well be that Mark

for the disciples to suggest that the crowd should be sent away to the neighbouring villages.

The Twelve then disappear until ix. 35. The section ix. 33–50 is composite; Bultmann (pp. 160f.) rightly sees that we have a sort of ‘catechism’ in 36 and 37 and 41–50 based on the keywords ‘little children’, ‘in my name’ and ‘scandals’, which has been introduced by the story of Jesus taking a little child; this Bultmann regards as a doublet of x. 13ff., which may, but need not, be correct; the incident is one of a kind which might easily be duplicated in the tradition, but might easily have occurred twice in real life. In this catechism 38f. stand out as an alien element; Bultmann ascribes them to a later enlarger of the original Mark (pp. 160f.) and an invention of the Church (p. 23), but this is a somewhat desperate expedient.<sup>1</sup>

It would appear that Mark had before him the Twelve-source containing ix. 33–5 and the story of the strange exorcist (38–40); it is in accordance with the whole character of the source to take this interest in the Twelve as a whole and in the individual disciples. After 36 he inserted the incident of the little child<sup>2</sup> (for this, cf. below, p. 68). The reason for the insertion of this fragment of the

thought that the retirement for rest at this point of the Twelve-source provided a suitable place for the story of the feeding which would eliminate any suggestion of a Messianic movement initiated by Jesus; cf. below, p. 43.

<sup>1</sup> Bultmann (pp. 23f.) has to minimize the importance of verse 40 which ‘might be a secondary addition and a variant of Matt. xii. 30’. It is difficult to see how a direct contradiction can be described as a ‘variant’; it is still harder to see how the Church could ever have added verse 40 to make quite unmistakable the meaning of a saying so shocking to all sound ecclesiastical feeling that Matthew had to omit it. In any case Luke read the verse; if anything here is a later addition it is the preceding sentence, which is not in Luke (ix. 49f.), though the omission is no doubt due not to the fact that the saying did not stand in his text of Mark, but to his desire to minimize so dangerous a saying. The view of the primitive Church can be found in Acts xix. 13ff. Here we are on hellenistic ground; but Jewish Christians would hardly be more tolerant. It is true that if we accept the saying we are faced with the necessity of admitting that the disciples did cast out devils in the name of Jesus during his lifetime. I can only say that I find this a great deal more credible than the supposition that the Church invented this saying. Vincent Taylor (p. 68) remarks that its value for the first Christians needs no argument: but this credits them with a purely modern point of view. Cf. Eitrem, *Symb. Osl. Suppl.* xii (1950), p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> It is possible that the pronouncement story of ix. 36f. had already found its way into the Twelve-source as one of a group of three pronouncement stories illustrating Jesus’ teaching to the Twelve and that Mark simply added 41ff. On the other hand we should not underrate the influence of careless transcription of sources in scissors-and-paste work.

## THE TWELVE-SOURCE

source at this point would seem to be simply the mention of Capernaum; it was a suitable point to introduce Capernaum, the scene of the early ministry of Jesus (i. 21 and ii. 1), since the source which Mark uses at x. 1 located Jesus 'in the borders of Judaea and beyond Jordan' and was followed by the journey to Jerusalem; it was clearly only right to represent the ministry of Jesus in Galilee as ending in Capernaum where it had begun.

The Twelve reappear at x. 32ff. in a summary account of the journey to Jerusalem and the prophecy of the Passion. A similar summary has already appeared at viii. 31, embedded in the story of Peter's confession, and another at ix. 30ff. It is customary to regard all three as editorial (Dibelius, p. 227) owing to the dogmatic assumption that anything of the nature of a biographical summary, as opposed to a complete pericope, must be the editorial work of the evangelist. But this entirely fails to notice the reappearance of the Twelve as against the customary 'disciples'. Moreover, it fails to explain the repetition of a narrative which has already appeared at ix. 30. Even if we accept the highly dubious view that the multiplication of predictions of the Passion in the section viii. 27-ix. 32 is due to deliberate artistry on the part of Mark and not to his methods of compilation (cf. below, pp. 63 ff.), this section is too far removed from the story of Peter's confession and the Transfiguration by the alien matter of x. 1-31 to enhance the sense of doom which Mark is supposed to have imparted into this section of his Gospel. The fact would seem to be that Mark had the section before him in his Twelve-source and simply copied it down, inserting πάλιν, as at iv. 1, to cover up the fact that he was duplicating his sources (cf. above, p. 19).<sup>1</sup> The very clumsy wording of verse 32 confirms this view; it suggests that Mark thought that ἦν προέγων demanded some such antithesis as οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες and simply inserted the last clause, forgetting to delete καὶ ἔθαμβοῦντο.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This explains the difficulty noted by Rawlinson, *ad loc.* that 'each of the three predictions of the Passion in this Gospel, taken by itself, would give the impression that the subject had not been mentioned before; and the disciples are represented as showing the same lack of understanding on each occasion'. This is natural if we are dealing with a compilation of sources, more or less mechanically transcribed; it is fatal to any idea of Marcan 'artistry'.

<sup>2</sup> The only possible alternative would seem to be to accept the ingenious suggestion of Turner (quoted by Rawlinson, *ad loc.*) that the original text ran καὶ ἔθαμβεῖτο referring to Jesus; this was then altered out of a false sense of reverence.

Here Mark continues his use of the Twelve-source in 35-41, as is shown by the appearance of 'the Ten' in 41. How the incident ended in the Twelve-source we do not know; Luke inserts a doublet of 42 ff. in his story of the Last Supper, where it probably leads up to an extract from the Twelve-source (xxii. 24 ff.; cf. below, p. 122); but this may be a mere coincidence. It is likely that the Twelve-source went on as far as 44 at least, though it is always possible that it closed the incident with a mere notice that Jesus rebuked the Ten or words to that effect, and that Mark has added the rest from floating tradition. (For the rest of the incident, cf. below, p. 72.) In any case it included the whole passage 35-41; the reference to the Ten and the interest in the sons of Zebedee is decisive.<sup>1</sup>

The last appearance of this source before the Passion story proper is at xi. 11. This verse describes the end of the journey to Jerusalem; whether the source recorded the triumphal entry we cannot say; but there was a version of the story of the entry in which the apparently miraculous knowledge of Jesus about the colt did not appear (cf. below, p. 78). It is at least probable that this version was drawn from the Twelve-source. Whether the Marcan narrative of the cleansing of the Temple was drawn from this source can only be a matter of conjecture (cf. below, p. 80); it will be seen that Mark has interwoven several sources in his description of the last week in Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup> But we cannot be certain of this; the Twelve-source, as

In either case the notice confirms the value of the source, either as showing the disciples' sense of the danger of going up to Jerusalem or as a survival of an earlier christological outlook. It may be noted that the main objection to Turner's view, the absence of any MS. support, disappears if Mark was following a written source, since he may have made the alteration himself.

<sup>1</sup> D and Θ read of λοιποῖ δέκα with support from the Old Latin, Palestinian Syriac and Bohairic. But this is a fairly obvious assimilation to the normal N.T. practice of referring to 'the rest' of the followers of Jesus after one or more have been specifically mentioned; cf. Mark xvi. 13, Luke xxiv. 9, Acts ii. 37, I Cor. ix. 5, Gal. ii. 13; see also Phil. iv. 3.

<sup>2</sup> For a similar interweaving of sources, cf. Plutarch's account of the taking of Pellene by Aratus in the winter of 241 B.C. while it was being sacked by the Aetolians, who had seized it earlier in the day (for the incident, cf. *C.A.H.* vii, 735). According to Plutarch, *Aratus*, xxxi (1041 C), Aratus refused to help Agis to defend the Isthmus of Corinth and withdrew, although mocked at as a coward. The subsequent story describes how: (1) On hearing that the Aetolians had passed the Isthmus and taken Pellene he decided to attack them while they were in a state of disorder sacking the town. (2) Such was in fact the disorder that the officers had seized the wives and

has been already seen, is full of these rather abrupt notices and it may simply have had the bare statement of xi. 11, a verse so apparently pointless that it is omitted by Matthew and Luke with the result that the cleansing of the Temple happens on the same day as the triumphal entry. It is clear that this makes a more dramatic story; but it is not to be supposed that Matthew or Luke had any superior information. Matthew omits the verse as pointless while Luke did not need it, since he omits the story of the barren fig tree and the staying at Bethany (cf. below, p. 80).

There is perhaps some confirmation of the view that the cleansing of the Temple is drawn in whole or in part from the Twelve-source in the fact that Mark xi. 18 ends with the Chief Priests and the scribes plotting to kill Jesus, but afraid of the people. It has been noticed above that the collection of 'conflict-stories' ends at iii. 6 with a verse which seems intended to introduce a story of the Passion. Here, too, xi. 18 could lead directly on to xiv. 1 and we find that the Twelve-source reappears in the story of the Passion at xiv. 10 and 17ff. The story of the anointing appears to be a 'timeless' incident inserted between 2 and 10, from which it would appear that the opening verses of the chapter come from this source as well, though the Twelve are not actually mentioned. These and other points in the Passion story, where the use of this source can be traced or at least suspected, will be dealt with below (pp. 115 ff.).

The identification of this source has an important bearing on the

daughters of the citizens and put their helmets on the women's heads to mark out their property. (3) While they were in this state of disorder Aratus attacked and routed them. (4) One of the captive women had been put by her captor in the Temple of Artemis; she came out on hearing the noise, and being remarkable for her stature and beauty increased the panic of the Aetolians who took her for a divine apparition. (5) But the people of Pellene say that it was really Artemis who appeared and threw the Aetolians into a panic. (6) But Aratus says nothing of this, only that he forced his way into the city with the Aetolians and killed 600 of them. Here (1), (3) and (6) come from the memoirs of Aratus (cf. Jacoby, *F.G.H.* 231, F 2 (and note)), who was probably concerned to minimize the extent to which he had allowed the Aetolians to enter and sack Pellene (a recognized stratagem, cf. *C.A.H. loc. cit.*). (2) and (4) come from a different source, which gives the impression of being well informed; the woman was daughter of a prominent citizen, named Epigethes. This source may also be responsible for (5), but if so its author had already combined the story of the daughter of Epigethes with the story of the epiphany of Artemis. The whole of this conflation is told in about 300 words, i.e. about the same number of words as are contained in the section Mark xi. 11-28.

whole question of 'form-criticism'. It would appear that among the sources at Mark's disposal was a document which was not a mere compilation of isolated incidents or collection of sayings, nor yet a Passion story pure and simple. It was concerned to set out a brief summary of the ministry of Jesus, containing a picture of his teaching and healings by the sea, his appointment of the Twelve and his method of using them, two specimen instances of his dealing with the sons of Zebedee, his journey to Jerusalem for the last Passover, with a prophecy of the Passion, and a Passion story. It is normally held that biographical summaries are due to Marcan editing, and that the giving of names to subordinate persons is a late and secondary feature (Bultmann, p. 72). Similarly, the idea of a fixed group of Twelve specially selected disciples is regarded as due to the fact that they were the leaders of the Palestinian Church, whose position had to be explained by the claim that they had been appointed by Jesus. At least it is clear that Mark had all these supposedly late features in his source.<sup>1</sup>

Thus it would appear that we have evidence that the biographical tradition implied in Acts x. 37 was in fact formulated in a summary account of the career of Jesus with a few incidents mainly concerned with the position of the Twelve as the leaders of the primitive Jewish Church. In fact such a narrative would be needed to explain to the new convert the nature of the Christian society and the position of the leading members of it (Acts iii. 15, x. 39). It is of course arguable that Jesus did not in his lifetime appoint such a group of Twelve; but the evidence is that he did, and the denial of it can only rest on a preconceived opinion of what he could or could not have done. Mark had before him a document which was concerned with the Twelve as leaders of the Church and regarded the document as an authoritative part of the Christian tradition. The document has a claim to a very high degree of consideration as a historical source; for it gives an account of the events leading up

<sup>1</sup> It might be argued that Mark inserted the names of the sons of Zebedee and John into a source which only mentioned unnamed disciples. But on Bultmann's principle (*loc. cit.*), that we can infer from later developments the processes already at work before the formation of the tradition in its Marcan form, we should expect that other disciples besides Peter and the sons of Zebedee would be credited with questions as they are in the Fourth Gospel.

to the Passion which has preserved a tradition which was obscured by the later doctrinal and devotional development of the Church (see below, p. 146).

The incidents in the Twelve-source, in which particular disciples appear, must be distinguished from the group of stories in which Peter, James and John (with Andrew in i. 29 and xiii. 3) form an inner circle.

It is indeed possible that we have the beginning of the Twelve-source in i. 14–22 describing the call of these four, and that it is continued in 29–31 and 35–9, for which iii. 7 would provide an excellent continuation. But this is purely conjectural, and it tells against it that in these passages James and John are subordinate to Peter and Andrew: further i. 39 may equally well have led on to iii. 20 (cf. below, p. 32). The three disciples Peter, James and John, without Andrew, appear at v. 37, where the whole passage dealing with Jairus' daughter and the woman with the issue of blood (v. 21 ff.) appears to have stood together in the pre-Marcian tradition (Mark may of course be responsible for the 'sandwiching' of the two stories). If so the Twelve-source is ruled out by the appearance of 'disciples' at v. 31. Similarly it would seem that the Transfiguration and the demoniac boy stood together; in this section the 'disciples' appear at viii. 27 and ix. 14. The agony in Gethsemane in its Marcian form has 'disciples' at xiv. 32; Luke may have preserved the version of the Twelve-source (cf. below, p. 126), but the three stood in the other source. In all these incidents the three are silent witnesses, except for Peter's question at the Transfiguration, whereas in the Twelve-source the sons of Zebedee take the initiative at x. 35 as does John at ix. 38. The 'Little Apocalypse' appears to be an early piece of apocalyptic writing, though in its present form it can be little later than A.D. 50 (cf. below, pp. 103 ff.), but it is possible that the introduction comes from Mark himself; it presupposes the existence of an earlier tradition in which selected disciples have a more intimate knowledge of Jesus than the rest, since Mark or an earlier apocalyptic writer would hardly have invented the practice; unless he found it in the older tradition, he would not regard it as a natural way of making his construction plausible.

The only other incidents in which individual disciples appear in this way in Mark are the questions of Peter at x. 28 and xi. 21 and



the story of his denial. There is good reason for supposing that Peter's denial is a conflation of two sources, one of which may have been the Twelve-source (p. 132). But the denial also stood in another source; the story of the barren fig tree, in which Peter figures, appears to come from a 'disciples' source (cf. xi. 14); the last clause of xi. 14 might of course be a Marcan addition, since it is Mark who has sandwiched the cleansing of the Temple into the two parts of the cursing of the fig tree; but there is no reason for supposing that this story came from the Twelve-source. Similarly x. 28 might have come from it, since it is quite possible that it is Mark who has attached Peter's question to the preceding story. But it is more probable that it had been attached in Mark's source, in view of the general continuity of the theme of riches. Probably Peter as a questioner appeared in several collections.

It is of course impossible to delimit the source strictly, since any pericope which does not mention either 'the disciples' or 'the Twelve' might have come from it. On the other hand the length of the passages already considered is roughly the same as that of the conflict-stories, and it may be that this would be regarded as a convenient length for a collection of sayings or incidents intended for reading in Church as an introduction to the Passion story (it will be seen later that the Twelve-source probably contained a fairly full story of the Passion).

It might of course be objected that references to 'the Twelve' are due either to Marcan editing or to pure chance, assisted by early errors in the MS. tradition. As against this it should be observed that at iii. 16, vi. 33, ix. 35 and x. 32 there is a distinct awkwardness in the narrative which suggests a clumsy conflation of sources. Further, at xiv. 10 the description of Judas as  $\delta \epsilon \iota \varsigma \tau \omega \nu \delta \omega \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha$  is much more natural if we are dealing with a comparatively short document, so that the reference back to iii. 19 originally followed soon after the first mention of him, instead of being separated from it by eleven chapters.<sup>1</sup> Further, the source has a distinctly uniform character; it is a summary of the methods of Jesus' teaching in the form of a continuous 'biographical' narrative, with a few incidents

<sup>1</sup>  $\delta \epsilon \iota \varsigma$  is accepted by Westcott and Hort in spite of the omission of the article by the majority of the MSS.; its omission is easy to explain, but no one would insert it in view of its awkwardness in the Marcan text.

#### THE TWELVE-SOURCE

inserted dealing with his relations with the sons of Zebedee as prominent members of the Twelve; it is of course possible that in its original form the source consisted of a 'biographical' summary alone, i.e. that it was an expanded form of Acts x. 38f., and that the incidents of ix. 33ff. and x. 35ff. had been added to it before it reached Mark; but naturally we have no evidence on this point.

## CHAPTER III

# JESUS AND THE DEVILS

As a possible, but doubtful, collection of the type we are considering, we may note the sections Mark i. 21–39 and iii. 20–30. In the first passage we have a typical miracle story, rather awkwardly appended to a general summary describing Jesus' habitual preaching in the synagogue at Capernaum, which might, or might not, be drawn from the Twelve-source (cf. above, p. 29). The story ends with a conventional acclamation. The story of Peter's mother-in-law may well have been inserted by Mark from some other source of information; the three verses which follow are remarkable for the emphasis which they lay on the casting out of devils and Jesus' attitude towards them, and the theme is resumed at the end of 39. This could lead on quite well to iii. 20 (for  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$  on this view, cf. p. 19); iii. 28ff. will have been included here by Mark, verse 30 being added rather clumsily to justify the insertion. The saying stands in a different context in Luke (xii. 10); it may well have come to Mark as an isolated fragment. Apart from these two passages we should have a document with a quite consistent theme, the activity of Jesus as the conqueror of the devils; it might have been introduced by the brief Marcan story of the Temptation (i. 12ff.). It may be noted in favour of such a view that the two incidents which Mark dovetails into one another in iii. 20–35 do not really fit in well to the same stage of the ministry of Jesus. The scribes from Jerusalem are not likely to have heard of his activities at the early stage of his ministry where Mark has placed them; on the other hand the attitude of his relatives, i.e. iii. 20–1 and 31–5 (with 31a omitted as a piece of Marcan editing), might very well follow i. 39. This source, which described Jesus' conquest of devils, the view of his relatives that he was mad (i.e. that he was himself possessed by a devil), and the refutation of the view that he cast out devils by Beelzebub, was, like the 'conflict-source', a short summary of the whole of Jesus' career in this matter, containing incidents drawn from various stages. Mark saw that the incidents of it recorded up to i. 39 did not justify

## JESUS AND THE DEVILS

the arrival of the scribes from Jerusalem and so deferred the two incidents until a point at which the activity of Jesus could reasonably be supposed to have gained general notoriety. The fact that his Twelve-source emphasized Jesus' power over devils (iii. 11 and 16) enabled him to fit the first section of it in between the conflict-stories and iii. 20-35.<sup>1</sup>

There are, however, serious objections to the view put forward above. In the first place the section i. 29-39 has a peculiar character of its own. It is a continuous narrative, remarkable for its apparently pointless details. The healing of Peter's mother-in-law is rather unimpressive as a miracle; there is no opening for an acclamation, while the cure itself is not particularly remarkable. The details of time in 32 and 35 have no obvious value, while 36 and 37 have so little point that they are omitted by Matthew and Luke. As history the section is impressive; it is marked by a precision and a lack of value for purposes of edification which is very hard to account for, unless it is a piece of genuine recollection. This objection need not be fatal. It is always possible that such a piece of personal recollection was combined by the compiler of a source with other material, or again that Mark inserted it into a source describing Jesus' dealings with the devils in place of a short summary which recorded how the news of his activities penetrated from Galilee to a wider region. The latter is more probable, since it is at least possible that the section really belongs to the call of the four disciples in i. 14-20. In this case i. 14-20, 29-31 and 36-9 will preserve a genuine recollection of Peter's first meeting with Jesus; it will not have formed part of the Twelve-source; but all this is conjectural.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that Luke xi. 14 ff., which contains the Beelzebub controversy from a different source, adds to it a saying about Jesus and his mother at the end. This saying may have been substituted for the Marcan saying by Luke's source, as being less abrupt; it was not substituted by Luke, since he has preserved the Marcan saying, omitting the view of Jesus' relatives that he was mad, at viii. 19 ff. (cf. below, p. 34).

<sup>2</sup> Rawlinson, *ad loc.* rightly rejects the view that the disciples could not have followed Jesus immediately on a mere call. The objection betrays a complete failure to understand the possible effects of a 'numinous' personality in a time and place where religion is dominant. Bultmann (pp. 26 f., 58 ff., and 64 f.) dismisses the whole story as an 'ideal' scene developed out of the thought that the disciple must follow Jesus, and in so doing become a 'fisher of men'. Hence the call is given to the real or supposed first disciples and then fitted into a scene by the lake: the call of Levi is simply a doublet. But no evidence is given for this; it is merely a possible way in

There is a further difficulty in the fact that the Beelzebub controversy with a saying about the true relatives of Jesus lay before Luke in a different form (xi. 27f.). This again is not fatal, since it is reasonable to suppose that the collections of the sayings and doings of Jesus existed in various forms: some of these variations can still be distinguished in the Gospels. None the less while it can be claimed that this section may be a pre-Markan unit, it is impossible to go further than this. It is, on the other hand, possible that Mark obtained the material of iii. 21-35 from an oral tradition in which the two incidents were already combined, perhaps in answer to a Jewish accusation that Jesus had a devil and that his family recognized the fact (for the former charge, cf. John viii. 48). The section i. 21-8 will then consist of an isolated story illustrating Jesus' power over the devils, as a suitable introduction to his ministry (which is thus shown to be Messianic from the outset), to which has been added a fragment of reminiscences, which might go back in the last resort to Peter himself.

which oral tradition might build up scenes out of the faith and needs of the community. But the date of the source which lies behind Mark and the lack of any miraculous motive (contrast Luke v. 1 ff.) give no support to this quite arbitrary reconstruction. Against Bultmann's allegation that the scene of the call of the fishermen arose out of the saying comparing the disciples to fishermen, we may note that they are also compared to harvesters and shepherds. Why have we not a scene in which (like Elisha) they are summoned from farm-work, or (like Moses) from keeping sheep?

## CHAPTER IV

# THE BOOK OF PARABLES

In Mark iv. 1-35 we have a source of a well-defined character. Its subject-matter and structure can still be seen, though it has been considerably modified in the course of transmission. It opens with a particular incident of Jesus preaching from a boat to the multitude; this was practically a duplicate of the typical scene which introduced the Twelve-source; Mark treats both as single incidents and covers up the fact that he is using two parallel sources by introducing the second with *πάλιν*. Then followed originally a triad of parables, each of which was introduced with the formal opening, 'And he said (unto them)'. It ended with the present conclusion of 33f., which describes Jesus' habitual method of preaching; he used parables to suit himself to the capacity of his hearers and never gave them long sermons without a parable to make them more interesting. (It must be remembered that a short proverbial saying, such as 24f., is a *marshal* or parable; cf. Smith, *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 31 ff.) This corresponds to the actual situation. Except in a few very rare instances, such as the Unjust Steward, where the tradition seems to have been confused, the parables in their original context would be perfectly clear to any hearer.<sup>1</sup> In 35 we are told that it was also his practice to explain anything that might seem obscure to his own disciples in private, either because he did not wish to leave them uncertain of his precise meaning (though the crowd might occasionally be puzzled), or in order that they might, if necessary, explain his meaning to others.

Here, however, we have a difficulty. For in 10-20 we have a specimen of such a private explanation. It is to be observed in the first place that the explanation is clearly displaced. For 'those about him with the Twelve' when they are alone ask him about the parables, when in fact only one has been uttered. In the second place we have three answers to their question, one of which contradicts the other

<sup>1</sup> The difficulty of understanding the parables owing to our loss of the original context is often exaggerated. In any case they were intended to be luminously clear.

two. For 13 simply tells the disciples that they must use their own intelligence to understand this extremely simple parable; it is in such obvious contradiction to the rest of the passage that it has been omitted by Matthew and Luke. Clearly it is the authentic answer; it is a saying which has no value for purposes of edification and would never have been invented. On the other hand it will not fit into the context here, since the disciples in 10 ask about the parables in the plural, and are given in 11 an explanation of the reason why Jesus teaches in parables. But 10 again will not fit the context; for here the Twelve (and some other unspecified persons) are alone with Jesus, whereas in 21 ff. Jesus is again addressing the crowd, although there has been no hint of a change of scene.

The development would seem to have been as follows. Originally a request for an explanation stood either after the parable of the Sower or after the three parables of the kingdom which formed the original tract. (The sayings of 21-5 did not stand in the original source, but were floating sayings which Mark or a previous editor added here, either because of their generally parabolic character or in order to enforce the teaching of the parable of the Sower; the kingdom is already being sown, and in the near future there will be a revelation of the response of the hearers.)<sup>1</sup> It is more probable that originally the request was for an explanation of 'the parables' and that 13 ran, 'Know ye not these parables?'; since, as will be seen below (p. 53), it is normal in these tracts for a question, usually a stupid one, to stand near the end of the tract.

The next stage was that it occurred to the primitive Church that the parables of Jesus formed an excellent opportunity for bringing in the *testimonium* of Isa. vi. 9f., to explain the rejection of Israel. It was part of God's purpose to hide the mystery of the kingdom of God from the Jews, or at any rate from the rich and learned classes, and to reveal it to the outcast and the Gentiles. It was simply added in front of the original refusal of an explanation. Meanwhile the conventional<sup>2</sup> explanation of the parable of the Sower had become

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah*, pp. 57f. He rightly criticizes Bultmann's arbitrary rejection of these verses.

<sup>2</sup> I cannot help feeling that Dodd in *The Parables of the Kingdom*, pp. 180ff., exaggerates the difficulties of the explanation given, while rightly (pp. 13 ff.) pointing out its secondary character. Jesus, as the Sower, is well aware that many will reject him or fall away, but none the less the seed sown on good ground will produce an

generally current in the Church; it was no doubt genuinely believed to have been given by the Lord Himself. So it was appended to the refusal of an explanation, which however was allowed to stand with a disregard for consistency characteristic of the compilers<sup>1</sup> through whom most of our ancient history has come. But since it only explained the parable of the Sower the whole block of matter 10-20 (*testimonium*, refusal of an explanation and conventional explanation) had to be moved from its position after 32 to its present position; there was no similar conventional explanation of the other two, the parable of the seed growing in secret being unintelligible in the changed conditions of the Church of the second generation (for the difficulties cf. Smith, *op. cit.* pp. 129ff.; his view that it was originally a reference to the Zealot movement is correct, since it is clear that Matthew and Luke did not understand it and therefore left it out), while the Grain of Mustard Seed needed no explanation. On the other hand the plural of 10 had to be left since the question and answer referred to the use of parables as such; but the singular had to be written in 13 since the explanation referred simply to one parable. The lack of consistency in the situation as regards the multitude probably did not trouble the original editor; Mark failed to notice it since he incorporated the whole tract.<sup>2</sup> It is of course possible that the final stage was the work of Mark himself, but as a rule he avoids these inconsistencies by inserting a narrative sentence to bring Jesus to the place required by his story.

This account of the development of the text explains a further peculiarity. As it stands we have two descriptions of the disciples, 'those about him with the Twelve' (10) and 'his own disciples' (34),

abundant harvest. The explanation, as it stands, reflects the general experience of the Church. But it expresses the experience of all missions, and will have been a warning to the hearers to be on their guard against the danger of falling away and not to be discouraged if others do so.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Strabo's complaint of the inconsistencies of older writers, xv, 1, 68 (717). It is perhaps open to question whether he had any right to criticize others. An examination of Curtius Rufus' two contradictory portraits of Alexander by Tarn (*Alexander the Great*, II, 97ff.) casts a lurid light on the capacity of ancient writers in this direction.

<sup>2</sup> It is quite possible that the intermediate editor, while prepared to add what he believed to be genuine sayings of the Lord, did not dare to add an explanatory statement of his own to bring Jesus out of his privacy to the crowd; Mark would probably have been quite ready to do so, but just failed to notice that it was needed.



both of which are without a parallel in the Synoptic Gospels. It has already been noticed that the former seems originally to have run 'those about him', Mark having added 'with the Twelve' to make it clear who 'those about him' were (cf. above, pp. 22f.). The phrase 'those about him' by itself occurs once (Luke xxii. 49),<sup>1</sup> but is strange in itself. 'His own disciples' in verse 34 is quite unparalleled.<sup>2</sup> The immediate *entourage* of Jesus are everywhere else 'the disciples', 'the Twelve' or in Luke by a natural anachronism 'the Apostles' (Luke xvii. 5, xxii. 14, xxiv. 10; for Mark iii. 14 and vi. 30 with the parallels, cf. above, pp. 22ff.). The two phrases seem only explicable if they go back to a time when it was known that Jesus had an inner circle of followers, but when those followers were not so formally marked off from the rest of his disciples that they could simply be described as 'the disciples' or 'the Twelve'. They had to be differentiated from the whole body of the more or less loosely attached followers, who were in some sense disciples, by the adjective ἱδιος, or described as his companions. If so, it would seem that the original of the source is older than Gal. i. 17, 19 and I Thess. ii. 7, and presumably than the famine-visit described in Gal. ii. 1 ff. It is not merely a question of the accuracy of Luke's picture in Acts; the Pauline Epistles show that 'the Twelve' or 'the Apostles' (the latter term being gradually extended to other leading figures in the Church besides the Twelve) were the recognized leaders of the Church in Jerusalem. The oldest mention of them would appear to be I Cor. xv. 3 ff., which may have been originally the Resurrection narrative of the Twelve-source, but would seem to have been used as a primitive 'creed' of the Jewish-Christian community. (Cf. Dibelius, 17f., and below, p. 149.) We are thus left with evidence that this collection of parables, in its original form, went back to a period in the life of the Church when the language of the formula of I Cor. xv. 3 had not yet become a stereotyped phrase for the inner circle of the disciples of Jesus.

<sup>1</sup> Here it is merely used for artistic effect, Jesus and his *entourage* confronting Judas and his.

<sup>2</sup> In both cases the difficulty of the phrase led the Caesarean and Western texts to change the phrase to the normal τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. In 10,  $\aleph$  and B are supported by fam. 1 against D, W,  $\Theta$  and fam. 13: in 34 fam. 1 follows D, W and  $\Theta$ . But the tendency to use the conventional phrase would inevitably lead to the alteration.

## CHAPTER V

### BOOKS OF MIRACLES

In the following section of the Gospel (Mark iv. 35–viii. 27) it is not possible to be certain how far Mark is making use of material which had already been combined into larger units than the individual stories. The first section (iv. 35–v. 43) includes the Gerasene demoniac (v. 1–20), which shows every sign of being an extraneous interpolation into the Gospel tradition. No doubt Mark or a predecessor accepted it in good faith, but it emanates from an atmosphere which is entirely alien to the general synoptic tradition (cf. Dibelius, *Formgeschichte d. Evang.*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 84ff.). The story has often puzzled commentators; Gerasa has no territory near the sea of Galilee (cf. Rawlinson, *ad loc.*); verse 8 is very clumsily interpolated after 7; the question about the demons' name is of course normal in magic but unparalleled in the New Testament; τοῦ Ὑψίστου is rarely used of God in the Synoptics (cf. below, p. 41); Mark does not use κύριος (19) of God except in O.T. quotations and in the Little Apocalypse (xiii. 20), which is written throughout in a style reminiscent of the O.T.; the command given to the demoniac to proclaim what God has done for him is entirely different from the general command to preserve Jesus' secret. The explanation would seem to be that the story is one of the numerous aetiological myths which were current in the hellenistic world to explain the rite of precipitating a victim or victims from a cliff into a river, lake or sea as a means of removing the contagion of sin or ritual impurity acquired since last the rite was performed.<sup>1</sup> A legend, explaining

<sup>1</sup> The best known specimen of this kind of rite is of course the scapegoat, which was not in practice driven into the wilderness but precipitated over a cliff into a ravine (Mishnah, Yoma 6. 6). For parallels, cf. Strabo x, 2, 9 (452), where the rite has been attached to the suicide of Sappho, though according to Strabo the more archaeologically minded knew of an older legend. In the rite of the Argei at Rome, instituted in the third century B.C., puppets were later substituted for the original human victims (Diels, *Sibyllinische Blätter*, pp. 43f.). A rite of this kind was practised at the sources of the Jordan at Paneas (Caesarea Philippi) up to the time of Gallienus (Eusebius, *H.E.* vii, 17). For other cases, cf. Frazer, *The Scapegoat*, *passim*. For the

the custom of precipitating one or more pigs into the lake as a means of carrying away the contagion of last year's sins, and ascribing the practice to some pagan wonder-worker, may in the first place have been attached to a Jewish rabbi; his annihilation of 2000 swine may well have been a just punishment on the heathen for keeping pigs at all in the Holy Land. In this case we should have a second aetiological myth to explain why the rite had been abandoned, presumably since the conquest of Galilee by Alexander Jannaeus (83-80 B.C.). The cities of Decapolis had regained their independence since, but it is likely enough that the rite would not be revived.<sup>1</sup> On the assumption that a story of this kind has been attached to Jesus by the floating popular tradition of Transjordan the details noted above are easily explicable. The victim or victims might be led to the lake from Gerasa, as the scapegoat was led from Jerusalem to the desert by a man appointed for the purpose. The awkward verse 8 has been interpolated after 7 because in the original story the miracle stood in a catalogue of victories over demons, in which it would be natural for the unclean spirit to recognize his master and to address him in the peculiar language of 7; Mark has to insert his explanation of why the demon was being tormented and has done so very clumsily. 'Most High' is a common name for the God of Israel on the

transfer of such a legend from an earlier to a later hero, cf. Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* IV, 10, where Apollonius is said to have delivered Ephesus from a plague, but the incident is commemorated by a statue of Heracles; cf. Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* V, 3, 14.

<sup>1</sup> For the history of the Decapolis, cf. *G.J.V.* I, 283 and II, 148ff. For the ease with which great deeds could be transferred to striking personalities, cf. Pausanias VIII, 11, 6 and IX, 15, 5, where we are told that Epaminondas was killed at Mantinea by Gryllus the son of Xenophon, and that this is depicted in paintings of the battle at Athens and Mantinea. Euphranor the painter of the battle-scene at Athens was a contemporary of the battle. (Cf. *P.W.K.* s.v.) The account of the battle in Diodorus Siculus, however, makes it clear that Epaminondas was killed by a desperate rally on the part of the retreating Spartans (xv, 86, 5); his source for this part of his history is Ephorus. His whole account leaves no room for the Athenian cavalry to have been engaged in this part of the battle. (Cf. Frazer on Pausanias, I, 3, 4 and VIII, 11, 6 for the mistake.) If Tarn is right in seeing in Teles (*Teletis Reliquiae*, ed. Hense, p. 43) εἶτα ἄρξαι, εἶτα βασιλεῦσαι, εἶτα ὡς Ἀλέξανδρος ἀθάνατος γενέσθαι; εἰ δὲ καὶ τοῦτου τύχοι, οἶμαι, ἵνα Ζεὺς γένηται ἐπιθυμῆσαι an allusion to Alexander's journey to the well of life (*Alexander the Great*, II, 364), we have the story of the Babylonian Gilgamesh epic attached to Alexander in Greek literature before 240 B.C. (cf. Meissner, *Alexander u. Gilgamesh*, Leipzig, 1894).

'religious frontier' between Judaism and paganism.<sup>1</sup> The question as to the name would be natural in a pagan or Jewish wonder-worker, since it is normally necessary to know the demon's name if you wish to control him (*P.M.G.* I, 160ff.; III, 159, 500ff. and *passim*); but Jesus is nowhere else represented as having need of such knowledge. The use of κύριος for God is normal in Jewish Greek where it often represents the actual name. The number of the devils is explained if the original story told how the heathen hero instituted a rite of cleansing of this kind in which the victim was a single pig which removed a number of devils; this has been increased in the Jewish version to its present fantastic figure for the reason noted above. (For the whole passage, cf. Dibelius, *loc. cit.*, who, however, does not notice the probability of a pagan origin.)<sup>2</sup>

If this miracle be omitted we should have a group of three miracles, the stilling of the storm (iv. 35 ff.), Jairus' daughter and the woman with the issue of blood (v. 21 ff.), which might have formed a unit of the kind already suggested; there would have to be a short account of how Jesus preached on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, but this need have been no more than a single verse; we should certainly expect such a tract to provide a group of three miracles, just as the original version of iv. 1-34 gave three parables; it is of course possible that there was one tract giving three of each. The general style of all three miracles is very similar in respect of the typical details (especially to heighten the miracle (iv. 37, v. 23, 25 f., 35)), the appearance of interlocutors, and the final acclamations, except in the case of the woman with the issue of blood, where the dovetailing of the story into that of the daughter of Jairus has eliminated the possibility of an acclamation. These features mark

<sup>1</sup> For a full discussion, cf. 'The Gild of Zeus Hypsistos' by Roberts, Skeat, and Nock in *H.T.R.* xxix, 1, 63 ff. For whatever reason Luke uses the term in his infancy narrative, but otherwise only here (viii. 26) and vi. 35 (Matt. has 'your father in heaven' in his parallel passage v. 45). In Acts, Luke only uses the term in St Stephen's speech (vii. 48) where his source may have been influenced by the LXX and in the highly appropriate scene at Philippi, xvi. 17. Luke might have regarded it as appropriate here since the Decapolis was a heathen area on the edge of Galilee, but it is quite doubtful whether he knew this. On the other hand the phrase was quite likely to occur in Mark's source. Harnack's suggestion, quoted by Rawlinson, *ad loc.*, that ὑψιστος in Mark is due to assimilation to Luke is unnecessary.

<sup>2</sup> For the abyss cf. the μέλαν χάος of the Jewish-Christian exorcism, *P.M.G.* iv, 1248.

them out as typical miracle-stories of the hellenistic age (cf. Bultmann, pp. 229, 230). But while Bultmann is inclined to allow the walking on the water a Palestinian origin in view of similar Jewish stories, he tends on grounds of style to attribute most of these miracle-stories, in which the emphasis is on the wonder as such (not as in the 'apophthegms' on a saying for which the miracle or other incident is only a setting), to the hellenistic community. But it is misleading to use the word 'hellenistic' of these wonder-stories. They were popular in the hellenistic age and common in Greek writers, but it would seem that they are international in the sense that popular love of a miracle leads to a general similarity in the form of its stories (cf. Dibelius, p. 79); the public want to be assured that the disease healed or the danger averted was such that the wit of man was powerless to deal with it, that the miraculous power of the wonder-worker was confirmed by his success, that there was no doubt that the success was genuine, and finally to hear of the admiration which the success of the wonder-worker elicited from the bystanders. It would seem that these features are not particularly 'hellenistic' in the sense that they are likely to come from the early Gentile Church rather than the Palestinian. They may, or may not, be legendary accretions on the Gospel, but there is no reason to suppose that they are late or 'hellenistic'.<sup>1</sup>

Thus it is quite reasonable to suppose that these three stories once circulated as an independent 'tract' describing the miracles of Jesus. It is impossible to say anything as to their age or place of origin.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Thus Bultmann (p. 230) describes the miracle at Nain (Luke vii. 11 ff.) as 'typically hellenistic' and decides on 'hellenistic Jewish-Christianity' as its place of origin, entirely ignoring the parataxis which makes it typically semitic and Palestinian (cf. *Hellenistic Elements*, pp. 1, 20).

<sup>2</sup> Even if Bultmann is right in rejecting the name of Jairus in Mark v. 22 on the ground of its absence in D and Matthew, and further in the assumption that the presence of names is an indication of late origin (p. 337), we have no reason for supposing that these stories are 'hellenistic'. But it is doubtful whether the presence of names is necessarily evidence of late origin; the natural process would be for the names to appear at first, then to drop out of sight; later fictitious names would be invented, as they were later for the two malefactors on Calvary (cf. Acts of Pilate x, *Apocr. N.T.* p. 104). Malchus in John xviii. 10 is probably late. The omission of the name in D and Matthew seems rather to indicate that the story comes from an early stage of the tradition in which names are still preserved, but tending to disappear. Each case must be judged on its merits.

The section that follows, vi. 30-56, opens with an extract from the Twelve-source, to which a fresh pair of miracles are appended by a somewhat clumsy introduction, possibly connected with a desire to gloss over the fact that there was some attempt to make Jesus a king (cf. above, p. 24 n.). This desire may also explain the difficulty, noted by Bultmann (p. 231), of the double motive of 45; Jesus 'compels' the disciples to go before him by sea, while he retires into the mountain to pray. It was necessary to explain how Jesus and the disciples came to be separated; but there seems no reason why he should send them away while he dismisses the crowd. On the other hand the separation might well have been explained by a verse in which he ordered the disciples to cross the lake while he went into the mountain to pray (cf. xiv. 32). Into this Mark, or a predecessor, may have inserted the statement that he 'compelled' the disciples to go on board the boat, before he dismissed the crowd; clearly he would not have dismissed his lieutenants if he was contemplating a rising. It must be noticed, as a possible support of this view, that in the Fourth Gospel there is some evidence that the evangelist is using an older version of the story than Mark. The 'contrary wind', which may well be an intrusive element from the story of the stilling of the storm in v. 35, is present in John vi. 18, but is less emphasized than in Mark, whereas we should naturally expect it to be enhanced. The conjunction of the storm with the feeding of the 5000 involves the evangelist in the elaborate and rather unconvincing explanation of the reunion of Jesus with the crowd in John vi. 22-4; this again suggests that the walking on the water and the feeding were a fixed combination. Otherwise it would have been easy for the evangelist to attach the eucharistic discourse to the miracle of feeding, to which it properly belongs, instead of dividing the two sections and then reuniting them by editorial artifice. Further, Mark habitually minimizes the political element in the charges brought against Jesus, while Luke and John recognize it; there seems no motive for enhancing its importance in the later tradition, which is generally concerned to exonerate the Roman government and throw the blame on the Jews. But Mark's tendency to avoid the issue entirely is intelligible if he is writing at a time when the Church has not yet been condemned by the Imperial government; after the condemnation by Nero (cf. Momigliano in

*C.A.H.* x, 725 and note 8, p. 887) there was no longer any need for this discretion.<sup>1</sup>

Thus we have some evidence that here again Mark is incorporating an older source. It is probable that Dibelius is right (pp. 91f.) in seeing in these stories 'epiphanies' in which the divinity of Jesus is manifested to those who have eyes to see. But it must be noted that these selections of miracles are not merely intended, as he supposes, to excite faith in Jesus as the great wonder-worker, and without religious value except in so far as they produce converts by manifesting his thaumaturgic powers to the reader, though not to the original witnesses. They are intended to form part of the *kerygma* of how Jesus went about doing good, because God was with him; his pity is mentioned in vi. 34, but it is to be understood throughout. Further it should be noted that, if the intention is simply to excite belief, Mark is not responsible for it. For although the 5000 may not have been aware of the miracle by which they were being fed, the disciples obviously must have been aware of it; and Mark is puzzled by the statement of his source that the disciples were amazed by the walking on the water just after they had witnessed the miracle of feeding, and so adds that they failed to understand it because their heart was hardened.<sup>2</sup>

It may be noted that the feeding of the 5000 shows distinct traces of being the older version of the miracle of feeding as against Mark viii. 1 ff., in view of the fact that the eucharistic reference of the story is less clearly marked (cf. *Hellenistic Elements*, pp. 3ff.). Bultmann (p. 232) regards the second version as more original in view of the lack of editorial expansion at the beginning, the absence of reference to the neighbouring villages and to the fish in verse 5; at the end of 6 they are introduced from vi. 34f.; on the other hand it is secondary in so far as the action begins with the initiative of

<sup>1</sup> For all this section I am heavily indebted to suggestions by Professor C. H. Dodd.

<sup>2</sup> For an amusing parallel to this kind of explanation, cf. the Infancy Gospels. According to Ps.-Matthew, Joseph on one occasion was making a wooden bed and told his servant to cut two pieces for the side; the boy cut one shorter than the other, whereupon Jesus pulled the shorter piece and made it equal to the other (Ps.-Matt. xxxvii, Tischendorf, p. 106). In the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy in Tischendorf's Latin translation we find that 'as often as' Joseph cut a piece too long or too short, Jesus stretched out his hand and made it of the right length. Having thus heightened the miracle the author adds the explanation 'non erat enim Josephus artis fabrilis admodum peritus' (xxxviii, *ibid.* p. 201).

Jesus, while viii. 2 and 3 are a later version of vi. 35 (ἐσπλαγγνίσθη) and vi. 36. It is not clear at what point in the pre-Markan tradition these changes are supposed to have been introduced, or whether Bultmann supposes them to be due to Mark himself. Though the stories are no doubt a doublet, they reached Mark from two sources which he regarded as reliable, and so felt bound to insert both, putting in πάλιν at viii. 1 to make it clear that there really were two incidents and that he was not repeating himself when in fact he was.<sup>1</sup> It would seem that the miracle of feeding bound up with the crossing of the lake was handed down in two lines of tradition, one of which attracted to itself the originally independent story of the walking on the water; the two were then attached to a tract of three miracles, the calming of the storm, the woman with the issue of blood and Jairus' daughter. It is, indeed, possible that the story of the feeding in both versions remained an isolated unit. As against this, however, in both cases it is associated with a return across the lake; in one version the return is coupled with the suggestion of an attempted Messianic rising and the walking on the water; in the other we have a bare mention of the return. It looks as though the association was fixed in the tradition before these stories reached Mark.

In any case we have to assume a change of source between 45 and 53 in order to explain the hopeless confusion of the geography (for which cf. Rawlinson *ad loc.*). Jesus and the Twelve retire at vi. 32 to some unspecified place for refreshment and rest, travelling by boat. The feeding of the 5000 was located on the eastern side of the lake and so Mark introduced it at this point, since he was describing a voyage of some kind; this enabled him to make it clear that there was no deliberate intention of provoking a Messianic rising, though it involved him in the improbability of saying that the multitude could go round the lake on foot and yet get to the eastern shore first. After the feeding Jesus sends his disciples across to Bethsaida and joins them on the way; the disciples, however, reappear at

<sup>1</sup> Dibelius holds that in viii. 1 ff. the lack of dramatic details and artistic storytelling shows deliberate shortening (p. 75 n. 1). It seems quite incredible that the later version would increase the supply of provisions and cut down the numbers fed. Clearly the whole tendency would be to exaggerate the numbers as in fact Matthew does by adding 'apart from women and children'.



Gennesaret, the explanation being not the peculiarity of the winds of the sea of Galilee but a clumsy conflation of sources.<sup>1</sup>

It is customary to relegate the summary of miracles (vi. 53 ff.) to Mark's editorial work, though no reason is given for his insertion of this rather pointless summary here. It is far more likely that it came to him in a source, quite possibly the Twelve-source, which was concerned to describe the extension of Jesus' mission from Capernaum to the Gennesaret area. Rawlinson's suggestion that it is intended to contrast the enthusiasm of the common people with the aloofness of the recognized leaders is hardly convincing; we have a clear case of the introduction of such fragments of sources in the doublet of Mark ix. 30f. and x. 32ff., and it would seem that this has happened here. That it was the Twelve-source that gave this summary of miracles can only be suggested as a conjecture; such summaries accord with its general style (cf. above, p. 28). But we have no mention either of 'the Twelve' or 'the disciples'; it is therefore impossible to be certain.

<sup>1</sup> The Western texts add ἐκεῖθεν in Mark vi. 53 to avoid the difficulty, making the boat cross to Bethsaida and go 'thence' to Gennesaret; this is simply an attempt to avoid the difficulty. For a good example of this kind of mistake, cf. Josephus, *B.J.* III, 29 ff., where Agrippa joins Vespasian on his march against the Jews at Antioch, although his forces are already engaged in coping with raids from Galilee (*Vita* 398); it appears, however, from *Vita* 407 that he really joined him on his march from Antioch to Tyre. But in *B.J.* Josephus omits the section of his source which deals with the march from Antioch to Tyre and so takes Agrippa north to Antioch. Cf. Weber, *Josephus u. Vespasian*, pp. 94 ff.

Rawlinson may be right in suggesting that Mark's ideas of the geography of Galilee were pretty vague; but Josephus must have had a fair knowledge of these regions and can be guilty of an absurdity of a far worse kind. Unfortunately the parallel account of the crossing after the feeding of the 4000 does not help us, since it brings the boat to the impossible 'Dalmanutha' (Mark viii. 10; cf. Lagrange *ad loc.* for various attempts at a solution).

## CHAPTER VI

### NAZARETH AND JOHN THE BAPTIST

Besides this possible collection of miracles and the story of the demoniac of Gerasa, Mark has fitted into this part of his Gospel two sections, vi. 1-6 and 14-29. The first story, the rejection at Nazareth, presents the difficulty that verse 2 suggests admiration (enhanced in Luke iv. 22) and does not fit in with the rejection. (Cf. Bultmann, p. 31, who suggests that this may have been the original intention of 3 (καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο κ.τ.λ. being a later addition); but of this there is no evidence.) Dibelius (p. 107) and Bultmann hold that the story of the rejection is simply developed out of the saying of 4, though for this purpose it has to be assumed that originally the saying was in the longer form in which it appears in *Pap. Ox.* 1: οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ ἱατρὸς ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν; clearly the saying as it stands in Mark is not nearly prominent enough to furnish the basis of the whole story. It is obviously hardly reasonable to suppose that the papyrus has an older tradition in this one point; the rest of its sayings, except where they are quotations from the Gospels, have no claim to originality. Further it is most unlikely that Mark or an earlier inventor would have said of Jesus that he could not do mighty works because of their unbelief. Bultmann rightly sees that 5b is intended to modify the impression of Jesus' inability to work miracles, but holds that the purpose of the original was not to emphasize Jesus' inability, but the dependence of miracles on faith. Thus the story is developed out of a proverbial saying by the primitive community in order to explain why miracles sometimes fail to happen in the course of its mission; the reason is the hearers' lack of faith. On the other hand it is clear that Matthew understood οὐκ ἔδυνατο as meaning real inability, and as the point of the story, and modified it accordingly; while 6 is not likely to be a late addition and could only stand as part of a story of rejection. On the principles of form-criticism (Bultmann, p. 7) we must judge the processes at work in the precanonical tradition by the way in which Mark is revised

by his successors; if so, it would seem that we ought to suppose that the inability of Jesus and his 'wonder' stood out even more clearly in Mark's source and was the real point of it. (Cf. *noluit* and *non faciebat* in the Old Latin MSS. and Origen, in *Ev. Matt.* x, 19.)

As a matter of fact the difficulty would seem to have a simpler explanation. Luke (iv. 16-30) has a different version, which stands at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, and begins with a yet more enthusiastic admiration for Jesus on the part of his hearers. At 22, however, we have a variant of the Marcan comments on the family of Jesus ('son of Joseph' for 'son of Mary'), leading up to the proverb, 'Physician, heal thyself' and the saying of Mark vi. 4, introduced by εἶπεν δέ (24) which may safely be regarded as marking an insertion from another source into the account from which the main part of his story is drawn. But the source from which it is interpolated is not Mark, for it opens with ἀμήν; Luke is very slovenly in getting rid of this barbarism, but he cannot be credited with having introduced it into a saying inserted from Mark in which it does not appear. [It is probable that the ἐπ' ἀληθείας with which 25 opens is an emendation of ἀμήν, though elsewhere Luke uses ἀληθῶς as a substitute (ix. 27, xii. 44, xxi. 3).] It follows that Luke has before him a slightly varied form of the Marcan story,<sup>1</sup> and that he has introduced the *testimonium* of 18 and the sending of Elijah and Elisha to the Gentiles in order to add a symbolical value to the scene (cf. Creed *ad loc.*), the sayings as to Elijah and Elisha being taken from earlier tradition (Bultmann, p. 31, following Wellhausen).

On the other hand the contrast between the original enthusiasm clearly expressed in Luke and apparently implied in Mark vi. 2 cannot be part of the original story, if that story was developed out of the proverbial saying. The most natural explanation is that Mark is here dealing with an isolated unit of tradition, which told of the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth, and of his inability to do any mighty works. But it seemed incredible to him or to his authority that the Lord should have spoken in a synagogue without exciting admiration from his hearers, since this was a conventional part of the tradition; consequently he, or a predecessor, introduced the customary

<sup>1</sup> On the principles of form-criticism it should be an older tradition in view of the fuller list of the names of the family of Jesus in Mark vi. 3.

'amazement',<sup>1</sup> and proceeded to add the rest of the story without regard for consistency; this was simply done by the change of ἔλεγον into ἐξεπλήθισσοντο λέγοντες in 2b.<sup>2</sup> The result is an inconsistency easily paralleled in Mark's better.<sup>3</sup> Thus Mark has merely inserted a purely conventional account of the admiration which Jesus was bound to excite; the rest comes from his tradition except that he may be suspected of having modified Jesus' inability to work miracles by inserting the healing of a few sick. Naturally we cannot demonstrate that Mark's story did not grow out of the Oxyrhynchus logion, nor yet that the logion was not a secular proverb attached to Jesus by popular tradition. But Bultmann's saying that the logion 'can hardly have grown out of Mark vi. 4, rather the opposite is probable' is entirely arbitrary, especially in view of the fact that Luke's 'Physician, heal thyself' looks suspiciously like the original saying in process of being transformed into the Oxyrhynchus saying. Obviously Bultmann here contradicts the general (and legitimate) assumption of form-criticism, which he recognizes on pp. 93f., that an expanded saying in a later source is normally to be regarded as secondary.

There seems to be no evidence that the Nazareth incident was ever combined with any others into a short collection. This does not mean that it was not so combined; we can only hope to trace such

<sup>1</sup> Possibly the heightening of the admiration in Luke iv. 21f. is due to pre-Lucan tradition, like the ἀμήν, but there can be no certainty as to this.

<sup>2</sup> Alternatively there may originally have been a contrast between the admiration of a majority and the opposition of a minority, 'the Pharisees'(?), who carried the majority with them.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* XIII, 314-19, where we have a lurid account of the death of Aristobulus I; his last moments are tormented by his consciousness of having murdered his mother and brother; at 318 we are told that 'with these words he died after reigning for one year, having been called [or "having regarded himself as a"; cf. *G.J.V.* I, 275] Philhellene, and having conferred many benefits on his country, having conquered the Ituraeans in war and annexed much of their land to Judaea, compelling the inhabitants, if they wished to remain in the country, to be circumcised and to live according to the laws of the Jews. And he was of a good (ἐπιεικῆς) character, and of great modesty (σφόδρα αἰδοῦς ἦπρω), as Strabo testifies, quoting Timagenes. . .'. (Here follows a short quotation of which the foregoing is a paraphrase.) Here Josephus gives the conventional Jewish view of Aristobulus as a monster of crime, but cannot resist the temptation to insert a favourable notice of a Jew from a Gentile writer, although it entirely contradicts what has preceded it. Josephus passes as a historian: but he cannot resist the temptation to quote Gentile writers who praise Jews, whatever the truth may be.

collections where they have been allowed to stand more or less intact, as in Mark iv. 1-34, or when there is a similarity of form or content which makes the existence of such a source more or less probable. It does not mean that the story is late or secondary, since we have no means of determining how much oral tradition may have survived independently, nor what the value of that oral tradition may have been.

The death of the Baptist is presumably a piece of popular rumour, which may or may not be reliable but is not part of the Gospel tradition proper, in the sense that it does not come from the disciples; nor does it even profess to come from the disciples of John. It may or may not have reached Mark in a written or fixed oral form. The doubts cast on its reliability seem to rest on rather uncertain reasoning. It is objected that the story is inconsistent with the version of Josephus. This is true enough, but Josephus at this point is at his most unreliable, and his account of the Baptist's teaching is ludicrous: 'He commanded them to practise virtue and to behave with justice to one another and with piety towards God and so to come together in baptism. For so their baptism would be acceptable to God, if they made use of it not to secure pardon for their sins, but for the purification of the body if the soul had first been cleansed by righteousness' (*Antt.* XVIII, 117). Why Herod should have put John to death for fear lest such harmless platitudes as these might lead to a rebellion, does not appear. The fact is that Josephus here has come to the end of Nicolas of Damascus and has not yet come to his own career, where he must have known the truth, though he may not tell it, or the good Roman source which he uses in the *Wars*; his record of events in Judaea is very slight in extent and quite unreliable. His source here appears to be a 'History of the Herods' which was strongly on the side of Herod Agrippa I and opposed to Antipas and all the members of the house who failed to live up to his standards of Jewish piety.<sup>1</sup>

It is also objected that the whole scene of the daughter of Herodias dancing before the drunken court of Antipas is entirely improbable. But it may be doubted whether it is less credible than the scene at the court of Orodes after the defeat of Crassus

<sup>1</sup> For Josephus' sources here, cf. Hölscher, *Die Quellen des Josephus*, pp. 59 ff., and his article in *P.W.K.* IX, 2. 1987 ff.

## NAZARETH AND JOHN THE BAPTIST

described by Plutarch (*Crassus*, 33), and there is no reason to suppose that the Herods in general were more civilized than the Arsacids, or more orthodox in their Judaism than the Arsacids in their Mazdaism. (For the latter, cf. Tarn in *C.A.H.* ix, 594.) Thus while it is possible that Mark is repeating bazaar-rumours as Rawlinson (p. 82) suggests, there is no reason to suppose that the rumour may not have been a great deal nearer to the truth than the story of Josephus.

## CHAPTER VII

# CORBAN AND MISCELLANEOUS INCIDENTS

The next section is a well-marked unit (vii. 1-23). It may have some foundations in history, in so far as Jesus may have used the *testimonium* of Isa. xxix. 13 against the Jews, though not in the LXX form (as in Mark vii. 6), nor on this occasion; more probably it is simply a proof-text used by the Gentile Church against the Jews in which the Pharisaic teaching as to vows is used, and perhaps distorted, as an argument against Judaism. It is possible indeed that Jesus did at some time use the argument from this practice against the Pharisees, but the last clause of 13 is quite clearly addressed by the Church to the synagogue.<sup>1</sup> The introductory explanation of the standpoint of the Pharisees (which the reader has been assumed to understand at ii. 16, 23 and iii. 6) shows that we are dealing with a tract of Gentile origin, as does the typically hellenistic catalogue of vices at 18ff.;<sup>2</sup> the saying of 15 may, however, quite well be authentic.<sup>3</sup> The whole section stands out as a well-marked unit. It

<sup>1</sup> For the difficulties as to the use of the LXX text and the Corban saying, cf. Rawlinson *ad loc.*

<sup>2</sup> The introductory explanation of the Pharisees shows the hellenistic origin of this particular passage, at least in its present form, but this does not prove the hellenistic character of the Gospel as a whole. The final form of the Gospel is no doubt due to a writer in a hellenistic Church; but the assumption that the Pharisees (still more the Herodians) are intelligible to the reader in the passages noted above shows that the material is of Palestinian origin and has not been edited by Mark but allowed to stand as it reached him. For similar phenomena in Josephus, cf. *B.J.* III, 29, where Antioch is introduced as the third city of the Empire and the metropolis of Syria, though he has already mentioned it thirteen times; but it was introduced in this way because it was the first mention of it in his 'Flavian' source (cf. Weber, *Josephus u. Vespasian*, pp. 97f.). So in *Antt.* xviii, 91f. he describes the building of the tower of Antonia by Hyrcanus from his 'Herodian' source; but we have already had it in his account of the Life of Herod at xv, 403 from Nicolas of Damascus (cf. Hölscher, *Die Quellen des Josephus*, pp. 16, 63).

For the catalogue of vices, cf. *Hellenistic Elements*, p. 5; to those noted may be added *C.H.* IX, 3.

<sup>3</sup> There is a close resemblance between this saying and that of Epictetus quoted by Stobaeus (Hense III, 1, 144), but the wording is quite different and there is no need to suppose any connection.

is worth noting the structure, since we shall find similarly constructed tracts in dealing with St Luke. We have:

(1) A narrative introduction (expanded by an explanation of the practice of the Pharisees).

(2) A question addressed to Jesus.

(3) His answer.

(4) Further sayings introduced by 'and he said unto them'. In these collections, as will be seen, the connection between the various sayings may be one of subject-matter (real or supposed), or it may be merely one of verbal association. We may have separate introductions for each saying or for groups of sayings, and the words 'and he said unto them' may be expanded as in 14 here by slight narrative details.

(5) At or near the end a request for an explanation or an interruption leading to a further saying; there is normally an effective conclusion; here the saying on what defiles a man ends with a cretic followed by a trochee.

In this particular tract the general connection of sense and the construction as a whole are far more effective than we normally find; the compiler would seem to have been a Greek who knew his business better than the majority of the compilers. There is only one serious defect, the sudden introduction of a crowd from nowhere at 14;<sup>1</sup> it is possible that this is due to Mark, who had before him a request for an explanation by the disciples, and introduced both the crowd at 14 and the return 'into the house' at 17, in order to make this chapter match the tract on the parables in ch. iv. It will be noted that, if the view expressed above be correct, the structure of that chapter originally corresponded to this, with a narrative introduction, a series of parables and parabolic sayings with an introduction of 'and he said (unto them)' and a request for an explanation, which in 18 as in Mark iv. 13 is answered by an ironical rebuke of the questioner's stupidity. The only structural differences are that in Mark iv the opening parable is not elicited by a question, while the tract concludes not with the refusal of an explanation, but with a narrative summary of Jesus' method of teaching by parables.

The story of the Syrophenician woman (Mark vii. 24-30) stands as an isolated unit and presents several problems. The core

<sup>1</sup> But cf. above, p. 10 n. 2, for similar awkwardnesses.



appears to be the dialogue between Jesus and the woman, which is practically the same in Mark vii. 27–8 and Matt. xv. 26–7 except for Matthew's omission of ἀφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα. This omission is no doubt due to the dislike of the Jewish-Christian circles, through which much of Matthew's tradition has passed, even to this qualified admission of the Gentiles to the children's meal. The rest of the story may be drawn from Mark; in this case Matt. xv. 23 f. is an additional dialogue between Jesus and his disciples, based on the originally unattached saying of Matt. xv. 24. But this addition cannot be ascribed to Matthew, who does not himself oppose the admission of the Gentiles, though it is probable that he would only have admitted them as proselytes of Judaism. It would be conceivable that Mark had the same dialogue before him and omitted it to suit his own more 'liberal' view; but it is very doubtful whether he would have done so, since in general he is a pretty pedantic compiler, and we should expect him to have omitted the whole story, which is at best a somewhat grudging concession to the faith of one particular Gentile. Even the πρῶτον of 27 only softens the reluctant consent to a slight extent, whereas normally in Mark the Jews have already been rejected (iv. 12, vi. 4, etc.).<sup>1</sup> Luke has omitted the whole story and Mark could perfectly well have done the same.

A further difficulty is presented by the wording. Apart from the identical piece of dialogue already noted the actual wording of the two stories is as different as it could be. (The only identical words appear to be ἐκείθεν in Mark vii. 24, γυνή and ἐλθοῦσα in 25, εἶπεν in 29.) Some of the changes are characteristic, such as προσεκύει in Matt. xv. 25 and the heightening of the miracle by the simul-

<sup>1</sup> Bultmann (p. 38) suggests either that πρῶτον is an insertion by Mark (or a predecessor) into the tradition, since it weakens the force of the argument, or that the whole clause is an insertion into the text of Mark. The former view is of course possible, though quite unnecessary unless it is assumed *a priori* that Jesus cannot have contemplated any possible extension of his message to the Gentiles. The latter view seems pure special pleading. Matthew frequently gives a version modified by Jewish-Christian prejudices (Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 261), and it is natural to suppose that he has done so here. 'Secondary insertions' into the text of Mark are scarcely a legitimate explanation unless there is some MS. evidence, or the text presents a difficulty which cannot be explained by any other means.

As a curiosity it may be noticed that Bultmann (p. 68) supposes that Mark invented the borders of Tyre by inference from the story—as if Gentiles were not plentiful enough in Galilee and Decapolis (cf. Josephus, *Antt.* xviii, 36 ff., *B.J.* ii, 457 ff.).

taneity of the cure (for this, cf. Matt. viii. 13 as against Luke vii. 10). The remaining changes might be due to Matthean editing, but if so it is curious that Matthew, who normally abbreviates, should have added καὶ Σιδῶνος in xv. 21 and amplified Mark vii. 25 as he has done (even if the statement that she came 'out of those borders' was inserted to show that Jesus was not on Gentile soil at the moment). Thus it is conceivable that the story circulated in several forms in oral tradition; the identical dialogue will in this case be due to the fact that its value as a proof-text, showing that in certain cases Gentiles could be admitted, caused the actual words to be preserved, or to the fact that Matthew has for some reason followed the Marcan version of the dialogue. If so it would seem to follow that the dialogue was from the first handed down in its present setting; it could only stand as part of the story of the healing of a Gentile's child, and it seems fantastic to suppose that the original story was lost and a new one invented as a setting for the sayings which alone had survived.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This appears to be the meaning of Dibelius' very obscure treatment of the incident (p. 261). Bultmann (p. 39) regards this story and the Centurion's servant as variations of the same theme; both are 'ideal scenes' and both contain the only 'healings at a distance' in the Synoptic tradition, which 'hardly any one will uphold'. This seems a survival of a rather naive liberalism; naturally we can assume that the story has been exaggerated; the primitive Jewish-Christian community may have been reluctant to admit that Jesus went into the house of a Gentile. If there has been exaggeration it is quite as likely to come from Jews as from Gentiles.

But the parallelism of form between the two stories is remarkable, when the Johannine version is taken into account. Unfortunately, Luke (vii. 1-10) has rewritten the opening for his own reasons (cf. *Hellenistic Elements*, p. 10), so that we cannot be sure whether there was a version in which the centurion began by sending friends. In any case the request is at first met with something like a refusal (John iv. 48; normally miracles in this Gospel are frankly thaumaturgic, and the saying can only be explained as a careless insertion from a source which knew the earlier tradition). This is followed by a saying which proves the Gentile's faith; if the centurion can send soldiers on errands Jesus can send angels or other spiritual agents. This faith elicits a favourable response, and a word of healing (omitted by Luke, probably through sheer carelessness), and the servant is healed; both the Matthean and Johannine versions make the cure coincide with Jesus' favourable answer; this was no doubt a later addition to the story. In John the fact that the centurion and his house believed may be regarded as an acclamation; there is none in the other versions.

It may perhaps be worth asking whether we have not in these two stories fragments of a tract relating to Jesus' dealings with Gentiles, which goes back to the time when their admission to the Church was a live issue. But the evidence is quite insufficient to justify more than a conjecture; the fact that Mark does not mention the centurion's servant tells against it.

The story of the deaf mute at Decapolis will be considered in the next chapter; this is followed by the feeding of the 4000 and the return across the lake, which have been considered already. This leaves in this section of Mark the two incidents of the demand of the Pharisees for a sign (viii. 11-13) and the warning against the leaven of the Pharisees and Herod (viii. 14-21). The situation is purely Marcan (cf. Bultmann, p. 54), as is the association of the two incidents; both of them show the Pharisees as the conventional opponents. Whether the Pharisees in 11 are due to Mark or his source is uncertain; in Luke xi. 16 and 29 the story has been conflated with the Q version of the Beelzebul controversy; whether this conflation is due to Luke or a previous compiler does not concern us at this point. But in the Lucan version we have no mention of the Pharisees, which suggests that he is following an older tradition for which the Pharisees were not yet the conventional opponents. All we can say of the first incident is that it preserves a record of Jesus' sense of the tension between himself and 'this generation' similar to that of Mark ix. 14, which may well go back to the earliest tradition.

The second story, the warning against the leaven of the Pharisees and Herod, is on the other hand remarkable. The setting is pre-Markan in the sense that it records an occasion in which the disciples had forgotten to take bread with them for a journey on the lake; we have no means of saying what the occasion was; it is only inserted here because the disciples were at 'Dalmanutha' which is by implication on the western side of the lake (the feeding of the 4000 having taken place on the eastern side); they have, however, to be in the region of Bethsaida at viii. 22. But it is clear that it comes from a relatively late period of the ministry, since the Pharisees have already formed their coalition with the Herodians; it is of value as preserving a memory of the gradual growth of tension between Jesus and the Pharisees, which has left its mark on the story, though it had largely been forgotten by the time that the Gospel was written (cf. p. 16 above).

The journey in the boat and the lack of more than one loaf appear to be integral to the story. As against this 17 is introduced by Mark for the sake of the *testimonium* of Jer. v. 21 as applied to the disciples before the resurrection. Verses 19 and 20 are simply a

clumsy attempt to adapt the story to its present position. It would obviously be absurd to suppose that in the given situation the disciples could really be worried because they had forgotten the bread. But Mark needed a journey across the lake and found this incident attached to such a journey, so he put it in here, using the text of Jeremiah to explain the stupidity of the disciples and at the same time rubbing in the two miracles of feeding. The whole procedure throws a somewhat lurid light on the supposed 'artistry' of Mark.

But in itself the story is of a very high historical value. It goes back to a period in which the tradition preserved a memory of the facts independent of their value for purposes of edification. There is no evidence that Mark understood its meaning. Matthew preserves it (xvi. 5-12), but since he does not understand it, he substitutes the Sadducees for the Herodians, and explains at the end that the disciples understood that he meant the teaching of the Pharisees and the Sadducees, though properly speaking the Sadducees had no teaching but merely denied certain Pharisaic innovations. Luke despairs of it (xii. 1) and merely says 'the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy', which is simply the conventional attitude.<sup>1</sup> The original saying was a warning against *agents provocateurs* who would bribe the disciples either to give information which could be used against Jesus, or perhaps to produce 'incidents'. Such a procedure was obvious and in the end successful, though the Herodians had no part in it; it may be presumed that they would not have any influence on the Sanhedrin, and it is possible that they were only useful allies in Galilee. The preservation of the incident suggests that the tradition behind the Gospels is of a greater historical value than is sometimes allowed.

<sup>1</sup> Luke's supposed interest in Herod and his circle rests on Joanna wife of Chuza at viii. 3 from the Twelve-source (cf. above, p. 21), the incident of xiii. 31 and the trial before Herod, xxiii. 7 ff. (for which see below, pp. 135 ff.). On the other hand he ignores Mark's Herodians because he does not understand them. Matthew preserves them at xxii. 16 (=Mark xii. 13) but omits them at xii. 14 (=Mark iii. 6). In the former passage their preservation is simply due to mechanical copying. It may be noted that Pap. 45 here reads Ἡρωδιανῶν with W, Θ and fam. 1; but it would be unsafe to follow this reading in view of the probability of assimilation to iii. 6 and xii. 13.

It looks as though Luke's supposed interest in Herod is simply due to his sources, in view of his omission of the Herodians and of Herod here.

## SYNOPTIC GOSPELS I

It is of course possible that the incident comes from the same source as iii. 6 and the tribute-money question (cf. above, p. 10 and below, p. 89). In this case Mark has detached it and inserted it here because he wanted a voyage in a boat; but there is no evidence that this was so. In its original form it was a warning of a practical danger, ending simply with the question of 21 following immediately on 16.

## CHAPTER VIII

### A BOOK OF LOCALIZED MIRACLES

The next section (Mark vii. 31-7) at first sight looks like another isolated incident. It stands between the Syrophoenician woman and the doublet version of the miracle of feeding with a very clumsy Marcan introduction. The difficulty of returning from the borders of Tyre and Sidon to the Sea of Galilee *via* Decapolis (on the eastern shore of the lake) can hardly be explained with Rawlinson *ad loc.* as due to Mark's desire to locate the second miracle of feeding on Gentile territory; apart from the seven loaves and the seven baskets of remnants, which might or might not suggest the seventy nations of the world, there is nothing to indicate that this miracle is regarded as happening on Gentile ground. The obvious explanation is that the miracle of healing the deaf man was located at Decapolis; the abrupt introduction of viii. 1 and its assumption of a multitude mark it as a miracle story which has no organic connection with its present context. It would seem that Mark's journey is a mere editorial link to bring Jesus from the scene of the healing of the preceding section to the healing of the deaf man for the simple reason that this miracle was in the tradition located in Decapolis.

The story has obvious affinities with two others, the blind man of Bethsaida (viii. 22-6) and Bartimaeus (x. 46-52). In each the story is localized; in each case the cure is worked with some difficulty, the difficulty in the first two cases arising from the nature of the complaint, in the last from the attempt of the bystanders to silence the patient. A further peculiarity is that the first and the third have no acclamation; on the other hand the second ends with a very exaggerated one, if it is intended simply to refer to the healing of one deaf man. It would be far more effective as a summary of several miracles, though as it stands in Mark it refers only to healing the deaf and dumb; but this might be due simply to an editorial change by Mark himself. It would be simple to alter 'the deaf to hear and the blind to see' into 'the deaf to hear and the dumb to

speak'. Further, the αὐτοῖς of vii. 36, though not impossible if it is taken to apply to the patient and the friends who bring him to Jesus, would be far more natural as a summary of several miracles in which the command was addressed to the patients only, as in i. 44.

Thus the suspicion is aroused that we have here an independent tract of three miracles, each located at the place where Mark puts them. But his general framework of the journeys of Jesus forced him to break up the original collection and put each miracle at a moment when Jesus was passing through the given place. In the original the deaf man at Decapolis stood last; in Mark it had to come first since Jesus had to be taken from the 'borders of Tyre' in vii. 24 to Caesarea Philippi in viii. 27 with a visit to the eastern side of the lake at viii. 1: Decapolis and Bethsaida could be fitted into such a journey. Whether Bartimaeus came first or second we cannot say; either the tract ignored the chronological order of the incidents, or Jesus had passed through Jericho at some earlier point in his ministry, as is perfectly possible. Mark, however, did not trouble to detach the acclamation and the general command of secrecy from their position after the Decapolis incident; he allowed them to stand simply as a conclusion to that incident and not in their proper place as the conclusion of the whole tract. The command to the blind man of Bethsaida not even to go into the village was left in viii. 26; it has sometimes been criticized as absurd, since the man must sooner or later return to his home; it appears a natural precaution if Jesus wished to avoid dangerous publicity or a delay on his journey; there is an obvious inconsistency between the 'village' and Bethsaida, the most natural explanation of which is that the incident occurred at a village near the city, on some occasion when Jesus was approaching it by land. As, however, Mark has fitted it into a journey by boat, Jesus has to arrive at Bethsaida for the miracle, while the inconsistent 'village' remains.<sup>1</sup> The bald ending of the Bethsaida story at

<sup>1</sup> For a parallel, cf. Diod. Sic. v, 26, where we are told that owing to the cold Gaul does not produce olives or vines. 'Therefore those of the Gauls who are deprived of those fruits' make beer or mead instead. The statement is untrue and inconsistent with the reference to 'those of the Gauls' who cannot produce wine. Strabo, iv, 1, 2 (178), who like Diodorus is transcribing Posidonius, shows that Diodorus has an account of Narbonensis, which went on to describe the rest of Gaul. Posidonius rightly said that Narbonensis produced the same fruit as Italy: 'but as you go

viii. 26 supports the view that we have here a fragment of a source which did not end so abruptly.

Bartimaeus again has neither acclamation nor a command of secrecy. It is true that there is no difficulty about the working of the cure except in so far as the bystanders interfere, but it is not to be supposed that the original tract was interested in the gradual nature of the cures as such. The fact that this feature has been preserved ought, on the principle that we must judge of the pre-canonical tradition of miracle stories in the light of the treatment of such stories in the later Gospels and the post-canonical writings, to give us a very high opinion of the value of these stories;<sup>1</sup> for both Luke and Matthew omit the first two owing to their inconsistency with the more highly developed Christology of their time. They were of course equally inconsistent with the Christology of Mark, but he appears not to have noticed it. Bartimaeus could be preserved since the delay was not due to any inherent difficulty but to the interference of the bystanders; yet even here a later generation might have asked why Jesus could not have healed the blind man at once, since he must have known that he was there asking to be healed. The stories are 'hellenistic' only in the sense noted above (p. 42); they conform to a general pattern, but there is no reason to doubt that they go back to an older tradition than Mark, and no reason whatsoever to suppose that Mark is responsible for their localization. We have of course no evidence for their chronological order, or the period in the ministry of Jesus to which they belonged, except in so far as it is quite probable that Jesus did not go so far from Galilee as Jericho until his last journey to Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup>

north, figs and olives fail, but the rest grow. And as you go farther north, the vine does not ripen easily.' Cf. *F.G.H.* 87, F 116 and Jacoby's notes on the whole passage. The inconsistency is due to abbreviation.

<sup>1</sup> Dibelius (p. 81) holds that Mark preserves them as a guide to Christian healers; it is not clear why the technique should be preserved in these two particular cases and not elsewhere, except possibly in v. 41 where *Talitha Coum* may be preserved as the necessary 'word of power' for raising the dead. But it is entirely improbable that the Church would have preserved a record of gradual miracles merely for this purpose: the method could be learnt without the damaging admission that Jesus himself had to use it in difficult cases.

<sup>2</sup> As against the view that Mark is responsible for locating Bartimaeus at Jericho it should be noted that considerations of dramatic propriety would naturally suggest making the triumphal entry follow immediately on x. 45, or alternatively putting the



The probability that these three stories come from the same source throws a rather important light on Mark's supposed 'Messianic secret'<sup>1</sup>. (For a discussion of Wrede's theory, cf. Rawlinson, pp. 258ff.) It is probable enough that in some cases Mark, having before him sources which described commands to keep a cure secret, extended them to other occasions. But it would seem that the commands really go back to the historical situation of the ministry, in which Jesus wished to avoid the gathering of a crowd and possibly in some cases the risk of a 'Messianic' rising. Naturally the secret could not be kept permanently by a patient who had been healed, but it could be kept secret until he was out of reach of any crowd that might assemble. It is of course probable enough that Mark regarded the recognition of Jesus by demoniacs as proof of his power over the supernatural world; that demoniacs who may well have heard of him as a wonder-worker should recognize him in terms which the Church could regard as Messianic seems psychologically probable enough. Wrede's objection that disciples who had recognized Jesus as the Messiah would not have forsaken him and fled, shows a remarkable inability to realize how most of us would have acted in similar circumstances.

healing of the deaf man with its enthusiastic acclamation after Bartimaeus, and thus giving a good explanation of the greeting of the crowd at the entry. Bartimaeus merely interrupts the Passion-motif which dominated the section x. 32-45; the lack of an acclamation leaves it with no organic connection with what precedes or follows. Mark put it here because it was located by his source.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (1901). [Eitrem, 'Some Notes on the Demonology of the New Testament', *Symb. Osl. Suppl.* xii (1950), pp. 47f., has pointed out that in folklore medicine prohibitions against making a cure public are common; cf. *P.M.G.* VII, 1025, 1011.]

CHAPTER IX  
THE 'CENTRAL SECTION'

(MARK viii. 27-x. 45)

It is generally held that this part of Mark has a peculiar character of its own, as a solemn preparation for the Passion (cf. Rawlinson, p. 108). That the section gives this impression need not be disputed; but it remains a question whether this is due to deliberate editing by Mark or to the nature of the sources at his disposal. It has already been noted that several pericopae appear to have been taken over bodily or with slight adjustment from the Twelve-source (ix. 33-5, x. 32-45; cf. above, pp. 24 and 25). Apart from these sections Mark has done so much arrangement of his material that it is difficult to isolate particular sections as coming from different sources; but there are certain indications which suggest that such sources existed. Thus the 'after six days' of Mark ix. 2 is quite pointless as a pendant to ix. 1. On the other hand it would be entirely in place as a pendant to Peter's confession. Mark would seem to have found the confession and the Transfiguration linked together in his source by the note of time; he has separated them in order to introduce the rebuke of Peter.<sup>1</sup> Naturally our view of the historical value of the story of the confession depends on our view of Jesus' 'Messianic self-consciousness'.

It would seem that the section viii. 31-ix. 1 comes from another source, and has been inserted here by Mark, perhaps because he wished to make clear what the Messiahship of Jesus really meant, perhaps simply because Peter figured prominently in both sources

<sup>1</sup> Bultmann (p. 276) objects that the story of the confession ought to be followed by a scene such as Luke v. 1 ff., or a charge as in John xxi. 15 ff. But if the story led straight on to the Transfiguration this does not apply. The objection that the question ought to come from the disciple, not from the master, is part of the general weakness of treating the normal conventions of popular literature as 'laws of nature'. Bultmann supposes that the conclusion of the story in the early tradition (which of course was not historical) is found in Matt. xvi. 18 ff. But it is his general principle that an interest in particular disciples (especially if it glorifies them) is secondary. The view (*ibid.* p. 277) that the early hellenistic Church would not have hesitated to describe Peter as 'Satan' is scarcely plausible.

and he thought it convenient to group them together. (It is of course always possible that they had been united by an earlier compiler before they reached him.) There is some support for this view in the clumsy connection at 34; 'calling the multitude with his disciples' seems to be a Marcan addition, intended to make it clear that the call to bear the Cross is addressed to all the followers of Jesus, not merely to the Twelve and their successors as apostolic leaders of the Church. The original source of this section consisted of a collection of sayings, introduced by the prophecy of the Passion; the rebuke of Peter will have been followed simply by 'and he said to his disciples'. We then have the group of sayings 34-8 and the single saying of ix. 1.<sup>1</sup> It is probable that ix. 11-13 also came from this source, a collection of sayings dealing with the Passion and the Parousia; as it stands it breaks the connection between the Transfiguration and the healing of the demoniac implied in the tension between Jesus and his generation in ix. 19.

Mark has inserted the dialogue ix. 11-13 (with 9f. as an editorial transition) from the same source as viii. 31-ix. 1 (cf. Bultmann, p. 279) because he wished to connect the Elijah saying with the appearance of Elijah on the mountain. There was probably more of this source, the fragments noted being rather short for an independent tract; but there is no means of identifying any other section of the Gospel as having once formed part of it. The difficulty is increased by the fact that we cannot say with certainty whether what we possess represents the beginning or the end. It may, however, be noted that the question of 11 and the dramatic ending of 13 rather suggest that this was originally the conclusion of a collection of sayings.<sup>2</sup> But it is possible that it existed as an introduction

<sup>1</sup> Creed on Luke xiv. 27 holds that the metaphor of the Cross in 34 would not have been appropriate apart from the actual crucifixion, and therefore that 'the saying must have taken shape in the community'. But apart from the possibility that Jesus might already have foreseen that the conflict between himself and the authorities could only have one ending, the saying may well have been proverbial by this date; cf. *Genesis Rabba* 56 where Isaac carrying the wood for his sacrifice is like one that carries his cross on his shoulders, and Plut. *De Ser. Num. Vind.* ix, 554 where wickedness brings its own punishment just as a malefactor carries his own cross. The call then is to become criminals and outcasts as in Mark xiii. 13.

<sup>2</sup> For the difficulties of the passage, cf. Rawlinson *ad loc.* But his proposal (following Turner) to transfer 12b so as to make it follow 10, 'questioning what the rising from the dead should mean and how is it written of the Son of Man that he

to a version of the Passion narrative, in which case the difficulty of its comparative brevity would not arise.

There is thus a considerable amount of evidence that the section viii. 27–ix. 29 conflates two pre-Marcian sources. This of course does not prove the historical reliability of either or both of them. Our judgement on this point must depend on our judgement of the sayings in the one source and of the stories in the other. But it must be observed that the attempt made by Bultmann (p. 278, following Wellhausen, Bousset and others) to explain the Transfiguration as a story of a Resurrection appearance is a classical example of *ignotum per ignotius*. If we relegate all the resurrection appearances to the category of ghost-stories we can of course find numerous parallels; but there are many instances of 'phantasms of the living' which are as well (or ill) attested as the run of ghost-stories. If on the other hand it be admitted that there were genuine resurrection appearances of some kind, there seems no reason for denying the possibility of the Transfiguration before the crucifixion. No doubt there are mythical elements in the story, but Creed (p. 133; cf. Rawlinson *ad loc.*) rightly points out that 'the mythical element in the narrative is to be explained by the element of myth in the mind of Peter and his companions'. The story of the demoniac boy may have been added to the Transfiguration in order to point the contrast; but it may well be doubted whether Mark (and *a fortiori* an earlier compiler) would have hit on the device of combining the story of the demoniac boy with the Transfiguration in order to emphasize the contrast between Jesus in his glory and the return to the squalid surroundings of 14–18. It looks as though the saying of ix. 19, which implies the contrast, is best taken as a genuine reminiscence; Mark has gone far to spoil the effect by inserting the

should suffer many things and be set at nought', seems both difficult, since there has been no immediate allusion to his suffering, and unnecessary. If 11–13 originally followed immediately after ix. 1 the question simply means 'How is it possible to suppose that the Son of Man will come in the lifetime of some of us, since Elijah, according to the scribes, must come before him and restore all things?'. The answer is, as Rawlinson suggests, that a suffering Elijah corresponds to a suffering Christ. But there is no reason to see an implied reference to an apocryphal scripture; the identification of Jesus with a suffering Messiah would naturally lead to the identification of the Baptist with a suffering Elijah. The obscurity arises from the separation of the saying from its original context by Mark.

On ix. 1, cf. Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 53.

editorial explanation of the silence of the disciples at 9f. and the saying about Elijah into his source, while we have no reason to suppose that the compiler of the original source would have been content to limit himself to the implied tension between Jesus and 'this generation' in 19 if he was simply inventing it.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand if Mark is rightly interpreted by Wellhausen and others as making the Transfiguration scene a dividing line in the ministry of Jesus, and if Mark was right in doing so, it is not unnatural that we should have here the striking note of time in ix. 2 and a genuine reminiscence of the order of events in the connection of the demoniac boy with the descent from the mountain. It must be supposed that it was Peter's confession that made it clear to Jesus that the time had come for him to enter on the last stage of his mission, the journey to Jerusalem, which, humanly speaking, was bound to end in the Passion. The decision involved a spiritual crisis which underlies the story of the Transfiguration, whatever form we suppose the Transfiguration to have taken.<sup>2</sup> The impression

<sup>1</sup> It is of course possible that the demoniac boy was only added by the compiler of Mark's source; but this implies that he was a literary artist of no mean order. It involves far less strain on the imagination to suppose that the coincidence of the coming of the father of the demoniac boy and the descent from the mountain took place as recorded.

<sup>2</sup> The Lucan account of the Transfiguration differs widely from the Marcan. Apart from normal editorial revisions in Luke ix. 28-30 we have in 31 the subject of the conversation between Jesus and Moses and Elijah, which might be editorial. The three disciples are overcome by sleep; they wake and see the three figures; but Moses and Elijah are apparently withdrawing from them. Peter proposes to make the three booths; verse 34 apparently means that 'they' (Peter, James and John) were afraid when they saw 'them' (presumably Jesus, Moses and Elijah or possibly only the two latter) entering into the cloud. (The confusion of the pronouns suggests a semitic source; the substitution of *ἐκείνους* for *αὐτούς* in A, D and the Caesarean texts, including Pap. 45, is presumably an attempt to make the meaning clear, though it is possible that it is the original text, since *ἐκείνους* might easily be changed to the far commoner *αὐτούς*. If *ἐκείνους* is the correct reading there would be less reason to suppose that Luke is following a semitic source, the meaning being clear.)

We meet with a similar overpowering fear and partial consciousness, followed later by a return to normal consciousness, in Pausanias' account of the method of consulting the oracle of Trophonius at Lebadea (ix, 39, 13). Cf. Iamblichus, *De Myst.* III, 2 (Parthey, 104, 10ff.) for similar phenomena in the mystery initiations; cf. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* 52 and 61, Orig. *c. Cels.* iv, 10, Greg. Naz. *Or.* iv, 55 f.; for the language transferred to philosophy, Plotinus, I, 6, 7, 15 ff. (Schwyzer-Henry). It would seem that Luke or his source has been coloured by a knowledge of mystery cults and similar rituals, or by the popular accounts of them.

produced by it might well have caused the cure which followed to be permanently connected with it in the mind of the witnesses. In this case we have here a connected piece of narrative of a kind which is rare in the tradition, but not therefore to be ruled out. On the other hand it remains possible that the story of the demoniac boy was simply an isolated miracle story, which was inserted here by Mark because it had to go in somewhere.

So far it would seem that the dramatic effect of the Marcan narrative is due to the nature of his materials rather than to conscious art. The same applies to what follows. The short prophecy of the Passion ix. 30-2 stands where it does because it followed one or other of the sources used in this section; it cannot have followed on the story of the Transfiguration, unless we suppose that Mark found it there and replaced it by 9f. because he needed at that point an explanation for the failure of the disciples to tell any one about the Transfiguration. This is by no means impossible; if on the other hand the demoniac boy was attached to the Transfiguration in Mark's source, the whole collection may well have ended with the prophecy of the Passion. Again it might have formed the conclusion to the sayings-collection which begins at viii. 31 and ends at ix. 13. There is no reason for supposing that Mark would simply have invented it as a doublet of the fragment of the Twelve-source which he introduces below at x. 32; he could perfectly well have inserted that fragment here if he wished to emphasize the imminence of the Passion; as it is he has left it hopelessly detached from the Passion theme.

At ix. 33 the Twelve-source reappears for a moment, very clumsily combined with a quite different block of matter, the teaching of ix. 36f. and 41-50. This teaching was compiled on the worst system of verbal association. Even to receive a little child in Christ's name is to receive him; to receive him is to receive God who sent him. Hence even to give a disciple a cup of cold water because he is a disciple entitles the giver to reward. On the other hand to cause one of the least disciples to stumble will receive the gravest condemnation. This leads on to the group of sayings as to scandals, ending with the reference to unquenchable fire, which leads on to the quite unintelligible sayings on fire and salt, ending with the saying of 50b which may be a genuine saying of Jesus but has no

apparent connection with what goes before.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand this closing verse throws an interesting light on Mark's real capacities as a compiler; he had the story of the quarrel of the Twelve on the road to Capernaum and a collection of sayings ending with an injunction to keep peace with one another. So he began with the story from the Twelve-source (33-5), and then went over to the story of the little child, perhaps with a vague feeling that it was a lesson in humility, though in fact this was not the lesson drawn from it. But at 37 he had the words 'in my name' and they provided a good enough excuse for him to introduce the story of the strange exorcist from the Twelve-source, since it referred to casting out devils 'in thy name'.<sup>2</sup> Then he returned to his second source and carried it on to 50. Once again we have no evidence as to the extent of this second source. There may be other fragments preserved elsewhere in Mark, but they cannot be located; there is no other point at which logical connection is so frankly abandoned in favour of verbal association. It is of course possible that Mark is responsible for compiling a number of isolated sayings into this discourse, but the complete indifference to logical connection and the fact that the sayings on salt and fire are almost unintelligible suggest that he is simply incorporating a source that came to him in this form and has not tried to make anything of it. Again the source may have been standardized oral tradition rather than a document.

In what follows we begin with an independent pericope on the Christian law of marriage (x. 1 ff.) fitted into the framework of the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem (as given by the Twelve-source, which had mentioned Capernaum at ix. 33) and the arrival at Jericho on the way to Jerusalem as fixed by the story of Bartimaeus (x. 46 ff.). The introduction may safely be assigned to Mark; the dialogue with the Pharisees was no doubt recorded without any note of time or place; the particular situation was dictated by the need of

<sup>1</sup> It is of course possible that Mark added 50b to the source in order to provide himself with an excuse for his conflation of it with the incident from the Twelve-source. But there seems no reason why he should have had the idea of conflating the two unless the second source had ended with 50b and so provided some reason for the conflation.

<sup>2</sup> Bultmann (p. 23) holds that it was only in the later Church that devils were cast out in the name of Jesus, but the assumption is entirely arbitrary. For the incident, cf. above, p. 24 n. 1.

filling in the journey to Jerusalem with some unattached material.<sup>1</sup> To the dialogue Mark has added the later ecclesiastical formulation of Jesus' answer into a Christian law of divorce (11 f.); this circulated as an independent saying, which Matthew has inserted into the Sermon on the Mount (v. 32), though he has also preserved it here. Luke has allowed the dialogue with the Pharisees to be excluded by his 'great insertion'; but the Christian law of marriage was too important to be omitted, and he seems to have realized this after his Gospel was concluded and to have put it down as a marginal note with one or two other sayings at xvi. 16 ff.; the note found its way into the text and has ruined the connection between the parable of Dives and Lazarus and the dialogue with the Pharisees on riches, which is its proper introduction. (This passage will be dealt with in Vol. II.)

To the dialogue on marriage Mark appends the story of the blessing of the little children (x. 13 ff.). The story would be far more appropriate at ix. 36, since it really does illustrate the theme of humility as a necessary condition of discipleship.<sup>2</sup> But by pure inadvertence he puts in at that point a variant of the incident (or a different but similar incident) from another source, and inserts the more appropriate version here.

The section ends with a group of sayings (x. 17 ff.) on the conditions and rewards of discipleship in respect of worldly riches. It would seem that we have here a short tract of three sayings with a narrative introduction, question and answer, a further saying or group of sayings and a final question leading up to the closing answer. It is of course possible that it is simply Mark who is collecting a group of independent sayings.

But the triple structure makes this less likely; it is still more unlikely that Mark would have preserved Jesus' question at 18,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The discussion on divorce and the repetition of the incident of the little child ruin the effect of x. 32 ff. as a solemn introduction to the story of the Passion. Bultmann (p. 25) may be right in holding that the discussion is an incident invented as a framework for the saying 6-9. But it is far more likely that the law of divorce is an inference from the incident, which may of course be earlier than Jesus' breach with the Pharisees, 'tempting him' being a Marcan addition of the conventional type.

<sup>2</sup> Matthew saw that this story was more appropriate to ix. 23 and inserted it at xviii. 13 in front of the Marcan sayings ix. 37 ff., repeating it again in its Marcan position at xix. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Bultmann (p. 57) appears to regard the story as an 'ideal scene': such questions were no doubt put to Jesus, but that does not prove that the stories we possess are



which is clearly pre-Markan, unless it had come to him in a collection which he inserted bodily. He is probably responsible for the introduction in 17a, where γουπητήσας seems to reflect a later tradition, and for the narrative framework of 23; the original will have been a collection of sayings introduced by 'and he said'; Mark has introduced 23a in order to make them into a single story. The notice that the disciples were amazed will have been the conclusion of 23, while πάλιν will derive from Mark's source, inserted to join the originally independent saying to the preceding sayings.<sup>1</sup> 26f. will also have stood in Mark's source, since the saying about the camel and the needle's eye will have demanded an explanation from the outset. The last section (28ff.) will again have stood in Mark's source, since a question from a bystander (often Peter) is a normal way of ending these collections. Bultmann (pp. 115f.) may well be right in holding that the original saying ended at ἐκατονταπλάσιονα, and that the Lucan version (xviii. 29f.) is original as against Mark. But his view that in this case the saying had no reference to the person of Jesus is based on his failure to realize that it is the coming of Jesus that inaugurates the kingdom. In any case the triple structure and the good connection of subject suggest a tract or part of one. We have already seen reason to suppose a tract of three parables and perhaps a tract of three miracles; we shall see later in Matthew a tract on the right interpretation of three commandments of the decalogue, and we have in Luke ix. 57ff. a very similar group of three sayings on discipleship. Both in this passage in Mark and in the Lucan sayings on discipleship we may have

historical; 'they will only be so in the sense that the community has formed such scenes in the spirit of Jesus'. Naturally the dramatic setting may be due to Mark or his source. But if it is meant that the whole story represents 'views of the community which were traced back to Jesus' given out as a saying of the Lord, we seem to have a complete admission of the bankruptcy of form-criticism as a means of testing the authenticity of the sayings of Jesus. There was never a moment when the Church would have invented verse 18 as part of an ideal scene; Luke has indeed preserved it, but Matthew has amended it. (Even if we suppose that in Matt. xix. 17 C, W, etc. are right in preserving Mark's text, the alteration of the saying in the great majority of the best MSS. shows that the Marcan text was felt impossible from a very early period; but the text in C, W, etc. is clearly due to assimilation to Mark.)

<sup>1</sup> πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς only here and xv. 12 in Mark. In the latter case it is used in its proper sense of answering 'a second time', resuming xv. 9. In Mark's source here there will have been simply two sayings introduced by 'and Jesus said'.

fragments of larger wholes, parts of which may still be preserved, though they cannot be identified.

This section of Mark concludes with a piece of the continuous narrative characteristic of the Twelve-source (x. 32-4; cf. above, p. 25) and the request of the two sons of Zebedee (x. 35-45; cf. above, p. 26). To the request Mark has added the saying of 42ff. Bultmann (p. 23) holds that 38b and 39 do not form part of the original saying, which consisted simply in the refusal of the request (i.e. 38a and 40, δὲ being inserted). The statement that the way to such eminence lies through martyrdom is 'a clear *vaticinium ex eventu*' apparently invented for this particular situation. This view, however, rests on the assumption that any pronouncement story must have a single point and no more, and that any saying which contains a double point must represent an expansion of the original. But in view of the fact that the source which records the event shows a lamentable reluctance to follow the 'laws' of popular oral tradition, this can only be regarded as a piece of precarious dogmatism. It is extremely difficult to see why the bare refusal of pre-eminence to two unnamed disciples (the sons of Zebedee being, *ex hypothesi*, a later addition (p. 72)) should ever have been recorded; the story is pointless unless the request came from some person or persons who had a *prima facie* claim. That the saying about martyrdom has been expanded is probable enough. The saying about the cup is natural, being drawn from Ps. cxvi. 10 (cf. *Gentiles*, p. 135); but the allusion to baptism has an air of being added later when the 'cup' had already been associated with the Eucharist.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand the view that we have here a *vaticinium ex eventu* implies that both sons of Zebedee had already been martyred when the Twelve-source was compiled; the view that this was in fact the case has been held by some modern authorities, including Burkitt, but it involves a quite monumental

<sup>1</sup> βαπτίζεσθαι can be used of being overwhelmed with calamities (cf. *L.S.J.* s.v.), but hardly βάπτισμα. Consequently the saying would hardly be intelligible except as an allusion to baptism. It is of course possible that the original saying simply referred to being 'overwhelmed in the disasters which await me' (cf. Lagrange *ad loc.*) and that βάπτισμα is secondary. It is remarkable that Matthew omits the clause at xx. 22, though some MSS. make a well-meaning attempt to correct the omission. It would be tempting to suppose that the clause was a late addition to Mark, but this is dangerous in the lack of MS. evidence. Nor have we any clear evidence that Matthew, like Luke, had access to Mark's sources.

preference for the inferior evidence. It is of course tenable that Mark has inserted into his source an originally independent saying in which Jesus asked his disciples whether they were prepared to follow him as far as martyrdom and received an affirmative answer; in this case 38b-40 have been inserted by Mark into the Twelve-source; or again the question and answer may have been inserted into the request for precedence by the source itself. On the other hand unless we are to make a rigid 'law of nature' to the effect that a pronouncement story cannot contain a double point, there is no need for such a view. The story in the Twelve-source may simply have ended abruptly with the saying that the Ten were angry with James and John; there may have been a conclusion which Mark has omitted in favour of the saying of 42 ff. (cf. above, p. 26).

The verses which follow, 42-5, may have stood in the Twelve-source in their present Lucan position (xxii. 24-6). But while that source seems to have contained the saying of Mark x. 45 in a different form in its present Lucan context, it seems likely that 43 and 44 only appear at Luke xxii. 24-6 because Luke had decided for some reason to omit the story of the sons of Zebedee and thought that this saying, which he wished to preserve, would come in suitably as the introduction to the saying of 27 which he found in the Twelve-source (cf. below, p. 122). It would seem that Mark x. 45 reached Mark as an unattached saying and that he inserted it here and omitted the parallel saying of the Twelve-source in his narrative of the Last Supper as a doublet. This is perhaps confirmed by the fact that it ends with the reference to Isa. liii. 10ff. in Mark, but not in Luke where, however, we have the same conception of the Son of Man as ministering. The omission in Luke is striking, since although he does not use the term *ἄνθρωπος* in Acts, he introduces allusions to Jesus as the Suffering Servant frequently, only avoiding any ascription of such allusions to Paul, in which he appears to be correct (cf. *Jerusalem*, p. 16 n. 23). Whether we regard the Marcan or Lucan form of the saying as more original appears to depend on whether we believe that Jesus believed in his Messianic vocation and conceived it in the terms of Isa. liii. If we accept this view, it would seem that the Lucan source has been influenced by transmission through Pauline circles, as appears to be the case with other parts of

## THE 'CENTRAL SECTION'

his material; if not, we shall presumably regard the Marcan form as later and due to the development of the Christology of the Suffering Servant, in spite of the awkwardness involved in the fact that Luke would then seem to have modified the Marcan Christology in spite of the prominence of the Suffering Servant in Acts, and its appearance by implication in Luke xxiv. 26.<sup>1</sup> For the more developed Christology ought to be a sign of later interpretation.

### NOTE

The view that any reliance can be based on Papias' statement that John the Divine and his brother were slain by the Jews would, it may be suspected, never have been put forward, if it had not provided an easy proof that St John the son of Zebedee did not write the Fourth Gospel. I should myself regard it as entirely certain that he is not the author, but the case should not be bolstered up with bad arguments. The evidence of Papias is contained in various fragments, conveniently collected in Preuschen's *Antilegomena*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 91 ff. The first and most noticeable thing about Papias is his worthlessness as a source of Church history. Eusebius, who had his five books before him, can find nothing better to quote from them than his account of how he collected his information, two miracle-stories dealing with the daughters of Philip the Apostle (he really meant the deacon) and Justus Barsabbas, the famous chiliastic prophecy of the messianic kingdom preserved by Irenaeus v, 33, 3, which really comes from II Baruch xxix. 5, and a highly edifying account of the last days of Judas Iscariot. We have also his account of how Mark and Matthew composed their Gospels; critics would have saved themselves much labour if they had noted Eusebius' remark (III, 39, 13) as to his being of very small intelligence; the fact is that Eusebius, who would have welcomed any information as to the early history of the Church, could find nothing in Papias worth preserving. Nor could anyone else; Irenaeus seems to have had his works before him; he only quotes the passage noted above, which happens to support his millenarianism. It does not increase our con-

<sup>1</sup> For the 'servant-Christology' of the N.T. cf. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*, pp. 23 ff.: he fails to note that the reason why references are not more frequent is that Paul does not use the prophecy except in the credal fragment Rom. iv. 24f. For the prophecy in the N.T. cf. my *Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 72f. [Cf. also Phil. ii. 6ff.]

fidence that he recorded the raising from the dead of the mother of 'Manaim' and states that those whom Jesus raised from the dead ἕως Ἀδριανοῦ ἔζων. The fall of the angels ascribed to him by Andrew of Caesarea (Preuschen, fr. 9) is mere common-place: if we could suppose that the Catena in John (*ibid.* 18) rested on a first-hand knowledge of Papias, it would prove that he followed the general tradition as to St John.

In any case Papias' statement in the De Boor fragment of Philip of Side and George Monachus that John the Evangelist, like his brother James, was slain by the Jews (Preuschen, frs. 5, 6; George Monachus is presumably only repeating Philip of Side) must be taken in conjunction with the statement of the same fragment that Papias had himself heard the Apostle preach. It appears from Eusebius that Papias made no such claim (III, 39, 2), which suggests that we are not dealing with a very reliable source. In any case Philip of Side only says that he was slain by the Jews. Whether this is true or not, it proves nothing as to the date of his supposed martyrdom; it is probable that most of the early martyrdoms were due to riots between Jews and Christians which attracted the attention of the authorities to the new sect or to Jewish agitation against Christians as in *Mart. Polyc.* XII, 2, XVIII, 1. In all such cases the Church would inevitably say that the martyr had been slain 'by the Jews'; the justice of the charge would vary in each instance.

Thus it is quite possible to suppose that the Apostle was at some time or another martyred in circumstances which would allow the blame to be thrown on the Jews. The evidence of the Calendars quoted by Burkitt (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 252 ff.) does not really help his case. His Syrian calendar tells us that John and James the Apostles were martyred at Jerusalem; this calendar is older than A.D. 411; a Carthaginian calendar of A.D. 505 gives 27 December for the martyrdom of John the Baptist and James the Apostle, whom (*quem*) Herod slew. As against these a Spanish calendar (from Carmona near Seville) of A.D. 480-500 gives St John the Apostle on 27 December (*Dict. d'Arch. Chrét.* VIII, 640); as a curiosity may be noted a Merovingian calendar (*ibid.* p. 662) which on 27 December gives 'John the Apostle and *Jacobi Alfei fratris Domini*'. This entry hardly says much for the value of the evidence of early calendars; assuming that in the first instance the Evangelist was placed on 27 December as the last survivor of the Apostles, it would be easy for him to attract his brother, the first Apostle to be martyred. It would be a different matter if it could be supposed that the two were martyred on the same day, and that the Calendars had preserved some memory of the fact; but John was alive when St Paul visited

## THE 'CENTRAL SECTION'

Jerusalem fourteen or seventeen years after his conversion. (I take the occasion described in Gal. ii. 1 to be the famine-visit of Acts xi. 30 and xii. 25; in any case it must be after the death of Herod and therefore of James.)

It should further be noted that we are not entirely confined to Papias as preserved by Eusebius and Irenaeus. The tradition that the evangelist died a natural death after at least a long ministry in Asia is preserved in his Apocryphal Acts. These are in their present form affected by Gnosticism; their extreme encratite views and even their docetism might be possible in orthodox circles in the first half of the second century, but I cannot believe that the dance of Jesus with his disciples at the Last Supper (pp. 94 f.) comes from circles which ever pretended to be orthodox members of the Church. They are dated by M. R. James as not later than the middle of the second century (*Apocryphal N.T.* p. 228). It is obvious that they have no historical value; but it is equally obvious that an apocryphal supplement to the New Testament must attach itself to some point in the tradition which is either accepted by the Church or at any rate does not contradict that tradition. Thus the typical Gnostic Gospel (e.g. *Pistis Sophia*) purports to give revelations given by Jesus to the disciples after the resurrection, the orthodox Acts of Paul are attached to his journeys and arrival in Rome in the canonical Acts, the Acts of Peter to the tradition of his work and death in Rome; it is only where there was no tradition that the composer of apocryphal acts had a free hand (e.g. Andrew in Achaia and perhaps Thomas in India). Thus the Acts of John are a witness, apparently independent of Papias, to the tradition that John died in old age at Ephesus. It may be noted that the same tradition is implied in the story of the converted robber in Clement of Alexandria, *Quis Dives Salvetur* XLII. [Cf. M. R. James, in *J.T.S.* XXII (1921), p. 389.]

We have the further evidence of the *Epistola Apostolorum*, in which John comes first in the list of Apostles (2): the theology is crudely Johannine ('I am the Logos', 17), while the practice is Quarto-deciman (15). The date is early since the idea of a revelation made by Jesus to his disciples has not yet been discredited, while the story of the canonical Gospels and Acts is treated with the utmost freedom. For the date, cf. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern*, pp. 361 ff.: it may be added that the signs of the end in 34 are confined to astral and meteorological portents and pestilence, but there is no allusion to 'wars and rumours of wars', an omission scarcely possible after A.D. 192. The Quarto-deciman usage is Asiatic, as is perhaps the prominence of earthquakes (Schmidt, *op. cit.* p. 386). Thus we have a further witness for the association of John with Asia.

## SYNOPTIC GOSPELS I

What the facts may have been I would not venture to conjecture. But it is clearly precarious to assume that the prophecy of Mark x. 39 is a *vaticinium ex eventu* on such very dubious testimony. There seems no reason why Jesus should not have warned his disciples of the fate that was likely to befall them. At the time when Mark wrote, the prophecy had been fulfilled in the case of one of the brethren, and presumably might at any moment be fulfilled in the case of the other; it need not at that date have been one of those unfulfilled prophecies which are best forgotten.

## CHAPTER X

### THE ENTRY TO JERUSALEM

At xi. 1 we come to the opening of the Passion story. Mark has given a plausible connection between the journey from Galilee and the triumphal entry by inserting the story of Bartimaeus, which was located at Jericho by his source; it is of course quite probable that it actually occurred during the last journey to Jerusalem. But it has no organic connection with what follows. The introduction to the story of the entry with its precise details of place would appear to come from a source which was concerned to emphasize the journey from Galilee as the introduction to the Passion. It was not the Twelve-source, since we have a reference to 'disciples' in the first verse; it is natural to suppose that it comes from the same source as the other account of the journey which Mark has inserted at ix. 30. The story itself is taken by Dibelius (p. 118) in a very obscure passage to centre in the prophecy of Zechariah. '(The donkey) can only be found by means of divine guidance, and it bears otherwise signs of something special, e.g. it has never been ridden, and it is standing tied up in the street as if made ready for the disciples. This animal bears significance because its use enables the prophecy of Zechariah ix. 9 to be fulfilled. This raises the question as to how far the prophecy had formed or transformed the narrative of the triumphal entry.' The only objections to this suggestion are that Mark has nothing about a donkey and has carelessly forgotten to mention the prophecy which appears only in Matthew (xxi. 5) and the Fourth Gospel (John xii. 14f.). The Matthean introduction is similar to that which we find in his infancy narrative, and looks suspiciously like a formula from a collection of *testimonia*. The Johannine formula καθώς ἐστὶ γεγραμμένον recurs only at John vi. 31, and in that case it certainly represents the evangelist himself and not an older source; the inference is that in this Gospel too the reference to Zechariah is due to the evangelist himself, though it is of course possible that he is drawing on a collection of proof-texts no less than Matthew.



Thus while the prophecy from Zechariah has influenced Matthew and John, it has not affected Mark's narrative. The second sight and the fact that the animal has never been ridden are of course the sort of features which would naturally grow up in the religious literature of the hellenistic age, though Mark must have expected a great deal of his readers if he meant them to see any special significance in the fact that the animal was tied up in the street. The remarkable fact is that the Fourth Evangelist seems to have been following a different source for his story.<sup>1</sup> Normally he varies his sources as he pleases; but he can hardly be suspected of changing the 'legendary' features, in view of his general tendency to emphasize the miraculous. It would seem that he had before him a source in which Jesus simply found a donkey, and in which the process of legendary accretion had scarcely begun. It is possible that Jesus by riding into Jerusalem in this way intended to force on the rulers the question of whether he was the Messiah or not in view of the prophecy of Zechariah; but the prophecy does not seem to have occurred to the Church until a relatively late stage of the formation of the Gospel tradition.

It is possible that we have traces of yet a third version in the Lucan account. In xix. 32-6 Luke follows Mark closely, with a noticeable compression and improvement of the style in xix. 30 as against Mark xi. 2. On the other hand at 33 we have a slightly longer version of the story in Greek which is definitely worse than Mark's (αὐτῶν . . . αὐτοῦ . . . αὐτοῦς, the last two being entirely unnecessary). In what follows we have several entirely superfluous pronouns; the disciples 'set' Jesus on the donkey; the branches are ignored and we have an entirely new verse 37. The acclamation shows several changes; of these the reference to Jesus as a king may have been deliberately omitted by Mark and the

<sup>1</sup> For the whole question of the Fourth Gospel's source where it follows the synoptic tradition, cf. Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (1938).

For the idea of securing ritual purity or magical potency by using what has never been used before, cf. I Sam. vii. 2, II Sam. vi. 3, *P.M.G.* II, 144, IV, 1289, VII, 540f. and 826, XIII, 5f. and 96f. There is an amusing variation in IV, 27f. where the charm must be worked in a place which has not been trodden since the last Nile floods subsided. So in Mark xv. 46 Joseph buys the linen cloth; in Matt. xxvii. 59 it is καθάρα. In Mark xv. 46 we hear nothing about the tomb from this point of view; but in Matt. xxvii. 60 it is new. Luke xxiii. 53 enlarges on the theme as does John xix. 41. [Cf. Origen, *c. Cels.* II, 69.]

barbarism of Hosanna by Luke, but there seems no reason for the difference between Mark xi. 10 and Luke xix. 38b, while Mark's reference to 'kingdom' here lessens the probability of his having deliberately omitted 'king'. Thus there are some grounds for suspecting that Luke is drawing here not on Mark but on a different source, which may be Mark's Twelve-source; for a previous instance of his use of it see above, p. 21; cf. also below, p. 84.<sup>1</sup>

This raises the question whether the section which follows (xix. 39-44) may not have come to Luke from the same source as the version of the entry which he has combined with Mark's. Mark may have omitted it for the simple reason that the Pharisees do not appear as the conventional villains. (Bultmann (p. 55) regards them as the conventional opponents, but he has simply read this into the Lucan story, in which the Pharisees make a not unreasonable request to Jesus to keep his disciples in order; the disciples are here as in 37 the whole body of disciples.) The whole tone in which the scene is described is entirely different from that of the doublet in Matt. xxi. 15. The lament over Jerusalem clearly came to Luke from an authoritative source; he would hardly have included it unless he felt bound to do so. The note of tenderness is in striking contrast with xxi. 20ff., and would not have been invented by the Church.<sup>2</sup>

It must of course be recognized that we have no evidence that Luke was following the Twelve-source in his variations of the Marcan story of the entry into Jerusalem and the verses which follow. It is possible that the protest of the Pharisees and the

<sup>1</sup> The 'disciples' of Luke xix. 37 may quite well have stood in this source since we are dealing not with the inner circle of Twelve but with the whole crowd, which is regarded as consisting of 'disciples' as in vi. 17.

<sup>2</sup> The inconsistency between the tenderness of xix. 42ff. and the satisfaction of xxi. 20ff. is common in ancient writers when they pass from one source to another; cf. the description of Tiberius Alexander in Josephus, *Antt.* xx, 100 (the 'Herodian' source, cf. Hölscher, *Die Quellen des Josephus*, p. 69), and the glowing eulogy of him in *B.J.* v, 45 (from a 'Flavian' source going back to the records of Titus; cf. Weber, *Josephus u. Vespasian*, p. 193). We have an even more remarkable inconsistency in the character of Ananus in *B.J.* iv, 319ff., and *Antt.* xx, 199ff. Bultmann (p. 130) admits that the prophecy may be ancient and quotes Wellhausen for the possibility of an Aramaic original. The prophecy of course need not be a *vaucinium ex eventu*; the danger of a rebellion and its inevitable result must have been clear to a shrewd observer. For the language as drawn from the O.T. cf. Dodd in *J.R.S.* xxxvii (1947), 49ff.

prophecy came to him as scraps of oral tradition, which he inserted here because it was an appropriate place.<sup>1</sup> It is quite in accordance with his method to lump together various sayings in the gaps between his consecutive sources. All that can be said is that we have considerable reason to suppose that he had access to an independent source for his account of the entry, which may have been the Twelve-source. The Twelve-source in any case contained an account of the incident; Mark did not follow it, possibly because it lacked the miraculous features of the account he uses. But at xi. 11 he drew from it the notice that Jesus looked round the Temple and then retired to Bethany. The verse was so pointless that Matthew and Luke both omitted it; the omission improved the dramatic effect of their narratives, since it made the cleansing follow immediately on the entry instead of a day later, but Mark has preserved the actual sequence of events owing to his reluctance to scrap his sources. At the same time it enabled him to follow his favourite practice of dovetailing; since Jesus had to return to Jerusalem on the following day he could break the story of the fig tree up into two parts with the cleansing in between. No doubt the original story described the immediate effect of the curse.<sup>2</sup>

In Matthew's account of the cleansing it is fairly clear that we have only his own improvement of Mark; with Luke the case is not so clear. Luke xix. 45 may simply be an abbreviation of Mark (or a reproduction of Mark's original source). But Luke xix. 46 when compared with Mark xi. 16 suggests that it is Mark's source that he is following; it is very hard to see why he should have omitted 'for all nations'.<sup>3</sup> Either Mark inserted 'for all nations' to complete

<sup>1</sup> The fact that Matthew has a similar protest just after the cleansing of the Temple is puzzling. In the first place although it looks like a doublet, it is by no means clear that it came from the same source as Luke's story; if it did, it has been entirely rewritten. On the other hand Matthew shows no sign, as Luke does, of independent access to Mark's sources. It is possible that the story was current in several forms, that of Matthew having already become a *testimonium*.

<sup>2</sup> The story in Matthew is no doubt only a revision of Mark (Matt. xxi. 18f.). But by omitting the retirement to Bethany after the entry and before the cleansing he has only left room for one of Mark's journeys between the two places; hence the fig tree must be withered at once. Thus by a pure chain of accidents he has got back to the original form of the story.

<sup>3</sup> Creed *ad loc.* regards the omission as deliberate, the Church having superseded the Temple. This seems far too subtle; it was the failure of the Jews to understand

the quotation, while Luke followed Mark's source, or there were two sources. We have not enough evidence in Luke's highly abbreviated account to say which of these is correct, but it is fairly clear that Luke has here preserved an earlier form of the saying; there is no reason to doubt its authenticity.

Meanwhile Mark's failure to edit his sources carefully has produced a certain inconsequence. xi. 18 describes the decision of 'the chief priests and the scribes' to destroy Jesus; at xii. 12 the same people (with 'the elders' added) seek to arrest him. If the two verses are simply Marcan additions, he has been guilty of the grossest slovenliness in making them seek to destroy him in the first passage, whereas, after further provocation, they simply plan to arrest him.<sup>1</sup> The explanation is that both verses ended tracts which were intended as introductions to the story of the Passion. Either xi. 18 or xii. 12a with the slightest of verbal changes could lead up to xiv. 1 or a parallel version of the Passion. The whole story of the cleansing of the Temple from xi. 11 may come from the Twelve-source, apart from the insertion of the first half of the story of the fig tree; but it is more likely that the story of the entry and the cleansing of the Temple come from the same source, only xi. 11 from the Twelve-source having been preserved in order to enable Mark to dovetail the cleansing of the Temple into the cursing of the fig tree.

What is clear is that the cleansing of the Temple came from a source which rightly or wrongly regarded that action as the turning-point which led the authorities to decide to get rid of Jesus. It is at least probable that the source was right and has preserved a genuine historical tradition in making the cleansing of the Temple the cause

the true meaning of Judaism that led to their rejection, and the using of the Temple as a den of thieves was a symbol of their failure.

It might be argued that the Johannine position of the cleansing of the Temple (John ii. 13 ff.) suggests that we are dealing with an undated story, which owes its position after the triumphal entry to Mark. But in the Fourth Gospel the position is dictated by theological considerations; Jesus rejects the cultus of the Temple on his first visit to Jerusalem. His account at ii. 14f. shows an affinity with Matt. xxi. 12, probably due to the growing tendency of the Church to dilate on the scandals of the temple-traffic.

<sup>1</sup> Albertz (*Streitgespräche*, p. 10) ascribes both xi. 18 and xii. 12 to Marcan editing; but this fails to explain the hopeless inconsistency, which is simply due to the normal failure to harmonize sources.

of the final decision. No doubt the source was primarily concerned not with the history but with providing a suitable introduction to the story of the Passion for liturgical purposes; it may be noted in its favour that the Pharisees are not mentioned as responsible; they are by implication included among the scribes, but a late source would have singled them out as guilty of the plot. On the other hand the fact that some Pharisees are on relatively friendly terms with Jesus at Luke xix. 39f. is not necessarily inconsistent with the action of the scribes in Luke xi. 18; the Pharisees were not a closely organized body whose members would act with rigid uniformity. It is perfectly reasonable to suppose that some of those who followed the stricter tradition of Jewish piety would remain on friendly terms with Jesus after some of their leaders had decided to get rid of him.<sup>1</sup> The Herodians do not appear either at xi. 18 or at xii. 12; it is impossible to say whether this is simply due to the lack of interest in them in the later tradition or to the fact that they had no importance outside Galilee.

In itself the story of the fig tree throws an interesting light on the development of the tradition. The story began as the parable of Luke xiii. 6ff.<sup>2</sup> Since the parable foretold the destruction of the Jewish state it would easily be regarded as a prophecy which had produced its own fulfilment (cf. Jer. xxviii and li. 59ff.). It would be a short step from this to a symbolic action which was also a miracle.

To the miracle Mark appends a collection of unattached sayings. These have no real connection with the story, which was intended to be a symbol of the rejection of the Jews, not a lesson on the subject of faith. Of these sayings 23f. are a variant of the saying about faith

<sup>1</sup> For Luke's inconsistency with regard to the Pharisees, cf. above, p. 15. Curiously enough Josephus is no less inconsistent; cf. his anti-pharisaical expressions in *B. J.* 1, 110ff. (= *Antt.* XIII, 409ff.) where he appears to be following a Jewish writer based on Nicolas of Damascus, as contrasted with *Antt.* xviii, 12ff. (= *B. J.* II, 162ff.) from a Jewish adapter of (?) Cluvius Rufus. (For his sources, cf. Hölischer in *P. W. K.* IX, 1944 and Otto, *ibid.* 2513.) See also *Antt.* xvii, 41 for a very unfavourable view of the Pharisees from a Herodian source. Yet all the time he claims to have been a Pharisee himself (*Vita* 12; but his evidence here is totally unreliable). The inconsistency is no doubt due to failure to harmonize sources; but 'clerical' parties normally contain a number of men of the utmost piety with an admixture of politicians whose natural unscrupulousness is stimulated by the thought that they are working for the glory of God.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Hellenistic Elements*, p. 19.

'as a grain of mustard seed' which also appeared in the Q stratum; Matthew appends it to the story of the demoniac boy (xvii. 20), Luke in a collection of miscellaneous sayings where it is introduced with a request for an increase of faith which may be original (xvii. 6). Probably the Lucan form of the saying in any case is to be regarded as the earlier; 'moving a mountain' was a conventional phrase for achieving an impossibly difficult task.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand 'this sycamine tree' is entirely pointless unless it preserves a vivid memory of the original utterance; it does nothing to lessen the grotesque impossibility, but runs counter to the general tendency to exaggeration. Mark xi. 24 appears to be a purely homiletic expansion of the original saying, reflecting a primitive conception of the quasi-magical efficacy of prayer, similar to that which appears in the stories of Jewish wonder-workers.<sup>2</sup> Matthew omits 23b and revises 24. Mark xi. 25 deals with forgiveness as a condition of prayer; this Matthew has already inserted at vi. 14 in a form whose good semitic parallelism suggests that it is nearer to the original; probably the saying was widely preserved in oral tradition as a commentary on the Lord's Prayer. Verse 26 has no claim to be part of the original text. There is no reason to suppose that Mark is following a written source here; probably the whole represents his own editing, except that the story of the fig tree had already been changed from a parable into a miracle before it reached him.

Mark's dovetailing of the fig tree into the cleansing of the Temple made it necessary for him to bring Jesus back from Jerusalem to Bethany for the second time. But it is very doubtful whether he had any authority for doing so. The natural interpretation of his narrative is that Jesus spent every day in Jerusalem and returned to Bethany every evening, since he is there for the anointing at xiv. 3. But it is far from clear that the story has any claim to stand where it does; the Lucan story of the woman who was a sinner may, or may not, be a doublet of the anointing; if so, the story was unattached in the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Str.-B. on Matt. xvii. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Loewe and Montefiore, *A Rabbinical Anthology*, pp. 371 ff. We have a like conception in Jas. i. 6 and v. 15. Similarly Abraham's trials were a punishment for his lack of faith (*Rabbinical Anthology*, p. 519); cf. the view that Zarvan after sacrificing for 1000 years for the birth of a son doubted whether his trouble would not be in vain; the result was that Ahriman was born as well as Ohura Mazda (Eznik quoted by Blue in *Anglo-Iranian Studies* (Dastur Darab Memorial Volume), p. 70).

tradition. The Fourth Evangelist on the other hand puts it on the eve of Palm Sunday for no apparent reason, and it has been seen (above, p. 78) that there is reason for supposing that he has an independent tradition at this point. In any case Mark has simply dovetailed the story into his extract from the Twelve-source, and it is therefore highly probable that it did not come to him in its present position. There is thus no reason for supposing that Jesus went to Bethany except on the evening between the triumphal entry and the cleansing of the Temple.

This raises an interesting question. While Mark seems to imply that Jesus went to Bethany every evening, Luke states that he spent the nights in a lodging of some kind on the Mount of Olives (xxi. 37). If the verse is merely an editorial insertion (so Creed *ad loc.*) it is peculiarly pointless. There seems no reason why Luke should trouble to correct Mark's apparent implication, and he makes nothing of it. If, however, the verse stood in his sources he was quite likely to include it, although it had no apparent point. On the other hand, though Luke does not notice it, the verse explains what in fact it was that Judas was able to betray. Mark offers no explanation of this, and there is no evidence that Luke saw the awkwardness of Mark's failure to do so. Nevertheless it would be extremely important for the authorities to find a guide who would lead them to the right place, if they merely knew that Jesus was somewhere on the Mount of Olives. In view of its position in Luke the detail may well come from the Twelve-source, in which it stood between some account of the cleansing and the narrative of Mark xiv. 1.

CHAPTER XI

A SECOND GROUP OF  
CONFLICT-STORIES?

The section that follows (Mark xi. 27–xii. 37) looks at first sight like a compilation of conflict-stories incorporated by Mark, and we cannot rule out the possibility that it came to Mark as a whole.<sup>1</sup> But there are grave objections to the view that they form an original unit. We have in the first place three stories of hostile questions addressed to Jesus.

(a) 'The chief priests and the scribes and the elders' ask him by what authority he does these things (xi. 27ff.). (Presumably the rather vague title implies a deputation from the Sanhedrin; the vagueness tells somewhat in favour of the primitive character of the story, since the average Galilean is not likely to have had any very clear idea as to how Jerusalem was governed.)

(b) We then have the deputation of the Pharisees and Herodians with the question as to tribute-money (xii. 13ff.).

(c) This is followed by the question of the Sadducees as to matrimonial relations in the future world (xii. 18ff.).

The second question is a very subtle trap, since it forces Jesus either to declare himself a rebel or to discredit himself with the nationalist element among the Galileans who are in Jerusalem for the Passover; the third question is presumably intended to discredit Jesus by making him look foolish in front of the crowd.

The other elements in this section, however, do not fit into the scheme at all. The parable of the wicked husbandmen (xii. 1ff.) breaks the sequence, and the opening words suggest that we have here the beginning of a sequence of parables as in iv. 1ff. or of a narrative to which the parable is an introduction. Its insertion here seems due to the fact that it alludes to the predecessors of Jesus, and

<sup>1</sup> [It is relevant here that Daube, 'Four Types of Question', in *J.T.S.* n.s. II (April 1951), 45–8, shows the four questions discussed in Mark xii. 13–37 to correspond to a fourfold rabbinical scheme, so that 'whoever collected the questions acted on a definite artistic plan'. He leaves open the question whether the collector was Mark or a predecessor. H.C.]



so fits in with his allusion to the Baptist in the preceding section.<sup>1</sup> Further, the ending, as has been noticed above (p. 81), is very ill suited to the context, since the people who are already plotting to kill Jesus here only try to arrest him. This sort of inconsistency is hardly likely to be due to Mark, but is natural if we are dealing with extracts from older sources.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand the question about the great commandment does not in its Marcan form involve any 'conflict' at all (xii. 28ff.); it is only in Matthew's imagination that the questioner is 'tempting' Jesus, and the story ends with a commendation of the questioner, and the entirely pointless statement that 'no one dared to ask him any further questions'. The story may have been current without any attachment to the visit of Jesus to Jerusalem; Luke x. 25 may, or may not, be a doublet of it. Here the lawyer is attempting to entrap Jesus as in Matthew, but this is a more or less formal addition to such stories in the later tradition. Otherwise the wording of the two stories in Luke and Mark is entirely different except for the actual quotation of the *shema*. On the other hand the position is complicated by the story of the rich man in Mark x. 17 (a 'young man' in Matt. xix. 22 and a 'ruler' according to Luke xviii. 18). For the question asked is the same in Luke x. 25 and Mark x. 17; but the questioner both in Matt. xxii. 35 and Luke x. 25 is a lawyer, as against 'one of the scribes' in Mark xii. 28. It would seem that there were two stories in circulation or possibly more. In one the questioner was a rich man, who asked what he must do to inherit eternal life; in the other a scribe or lawyer asked, 'Which is the great commandment in the law?' It tells against the view that they are doublets

<sup>1</sup> So Rawlinson rightly *ad loc.* It is commonly held that the parable cannot be authentic, since it implies the use of allegory. But the view that Jesus could not use allegory seems to rest merely on the authority of Jülicher. In *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 221 ff., Smith suggests a drastic reconstruction, but it is doubtful whether his canons for the construction of parables can be applied so strictly. For a defence of its authenticity, cf. Rawlinson *ad loc.* with a reference to Burkitt.

<sup>2</sup> For a specimen of this kind of thing, cf. Diod. Sic. xi, 54, 2. Here the Spartans persuade Themistocles' enemies at Athens to accuse him of medizing on account of his friendship with Pausanias. He is acquitted, but soon after is ostracized and retires to Argos. Hereupon the Spartans renew their attacks and demand his trial before a pan-hellenic court; Themistocles then flees to Admetus. The first trial and acquittal is a mere doublet, arising from Diodorus' attempt to conflate Thucydides and Ephorus (cf. *F.G.H.* 70, F 189-90, and *C.A.H.* v, 64).

that in both we have features that would never have been invented, the question, 'Why callest thou me good?' and in xii. 32ff. the extremely friendly relations between Jesus and the questioner, while the point in each case is different. But there is a further difficulty in the fact that the Lucan story as it stands is a complete story in itself; it begins with the question, 'What shall I do to inherit eternal life?' and ends with the answer, 'This do and thou shalt live.' (The Good Samaritan is a rather clumsy Lucan appendage.) It would seem that the Lucan story at x. 25 is a quite independent version of Mark xii. 28ff.; both were in circulation and probably neither had any fixed place in the tradition. Luke put his version in at a fairly early point, perhaps because he saw the difficulty of Jesus' being on such friendly terms with a scribe or lawyer just before the final crisis. Even so he made the question an attempt to entrap Jesus, as also did Matthew, who seems to have heard the story in its Lucan form and followed its description of the questioner as a lawyer. (But the substitution of a lawyer for one of the scribes in Matthew and Luke might be mere coincidence.) Luke omitted the Marcan version of the question as to eternal life in his story of the last week, regarding it as a doublet; he was probably right, though there may have been several incidents of this sort. Mark put it into its present position apparently because it involved a scribe, and he had already had three stories illustrating conflicts between Jesus and the chief priests, the Pharisees and Herodians and the Sadducees, and thought that the scribes ought to be represented as well. He then proceeded to detach the conclusion of the discussion with the Sadducees, describing Jesus' triumph (xii. 34b), from its proper place after xii. 27 without regard for the fact that the conversation gave no reason for the failure to go on questioning him.

It is often held that the question of Jesus about David's son represents the conclusion of the conflict-stories, in which he passes over to the attack;<sup>1</sup> it is possible that Mark intended the story to be

<sup>1</sup> So Albertz, pp. 16ff. The story is certainly of high antiquity, since the Davidic descent is assumed as accepted by the Christians of Rome (Rom. i. 3). Dibelius (p. 261) thinks it is intended to show Jesus' criticism of scribal learning, since there is no hint of any christological implications. But the whole of Mark is christological; the saying might indeed have been invented to meet objections that Jesus could not be the Messiah, since he was not descended from David, but we have no hint of such objections; nor indeed was there any hard and fast dogma that the Messiah must be the son of David. The story represents Jesus' refusal to rest his authority on a real or

understood in this sense. But its formal opening, 'And Jesus said as he was teaching in the Temple', is entirely unnecessary, since *ex hypothesi* he has been doing so since xi. 27. Moreover, if we are dealing with a collection of conflict-stories older than Mark, the conclusion of the series ought to come after this story, not before it as it does in Mark xii. 34b. Matthew saw this and transferred it to the end of the question as to David's son at xxii. 46. Luke does not need to transfer it; since he has omitted the question as to the great commandment, it follows the answer to the Sadducees, which was its original position.

Thus even if we postulate an original group of conflict-stories, it can at best only have consisted of the three hostile questions of Mark xi. 27ff. and xii. 13-27. But here there are fresh difficulties. The question of xi. 28 is extremely awkward as it stands, since it does not appear what 'these things' are. The objection need not be fatal, since it is assumed throughout the Gospel that Jesus is always doing mighty works; the awkwardness is not necessarily greater than that of the sudden appearance of the scribes from Jerusalem at iii. 22. Clearly, however, the saying would have more point if it came immediately after the cleansing of the Temple. And, as has been seen above, it probably did come immediately after it in Mark's source. The journey to and from Jerusalem in Mark xi. 12 and 27 is simply an editorial framework; if they are eliminated, we have the journey to Bethany from the Twelve-source, followed immediately by the return to Jerusalem in xi. 15. (As it stands the opening of 15 is rather abrupt, but there may have been editorial modification; originally the source may have run, 'And on the next day they came out of Bethany and came to Jerusalem'.) We thus have a perfectly straightforward sequence of the entry, cleansing of the Temple and the question as to authority. All this sequence may have stood in the Twelve-source, though if so Mark has preferred another source for the story of the entry (cf. above, p. 80), but of this we cannot be certain, since there is no mention either of the Twelve or the disciples.

supposed descent from David; it certainly would not have been invented after the belief in his Davidic descent was generally accepted, and Romans shows that this goes back well before the time when Mark was compiled. For various views which have been expressed on the passage, cf. Rawlinson and Lagrange *ad loc.*

This is not the only difficulty. The coalition of Pharisees and Herodians reappears from iii. 6. The question of the tribute-money was a very adroit attempt to find grounds for a political charge; Luke recognizes its importance, though he does not understand the Herodians; his elaborate introduction with the classical ἐγκαθέτους is significant. The Marcan story has an intolerably weak conclusion; but Mark is interested in minimizing the political aspect of the condemnation of Jesus. The question arises whether the incident may not have belonged originally to the first group of conflict-stories and been transferred by Mark to its present position, the weak ending having been added by Mark; in the original form no ending was needed since the plot had already been described, and the Passion story was to follow.<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that if Mark i. 40ff. was, as has been suggested above (p. 8), part of this source, we get with the inclusion of the tribute-money a total of seven incidents, a highly probable number for such a collection. On the other hand it is possible that the warning against the leaven of the Pharisees and Herod (Mark viii. 15) also came from this collection (cf. above, p. 58). Consequently this point cannot be pressed.

This however leaves only the question of the Sadducees. Here we are faced with a fresh difficulty. The Lucan version of the story (xx. 27ff.) ends with a friendly comment of 'some of the scribes' (assumed to be Pharisees) and the statement that no one dared to ask Jesus any more questions (xx. 39f.); it may be assumed that these verses are taken from Mark xii. 32 and 34 in consequence of the omission of the question as to the great commandment. But while we have no reason to suppose that Matthew or Luke had any authority but Mark for the rest of these incidents of Mark xi. 27ff., xii. 1ff., and xii. 18ff.,<sup>2</sup> this story in its Lucan form gives an entirely

<sup>1</sup> For this view, cf. T. W. Manson, *The Life of Jesus* (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, March 1944, p. 281, following Easton). Easton's difficulty that in Galilee 'Herodian' might mean an official of Herod's court, while in Jerusalem it would mean a supporter of the Herodian solution of the Palestine problem, need not be taken seriously, since (a) we cannot be sure that both incidents did not occur in Galilee (or in Jerusalem), and (b) in popular language the word would mean any dependent or supporter of the dynasty, and neither Mark nor his source would be concerned to distinguish them. In any case both groups would have a similar policy towards a Messianic pretender.

<sup>2</sup> The main differences here are the avoidance by both of the clumsy anacoluthon of Mark xi. 32, Luke's abbreviation of the prophecy of Mark xii. 2, the absence of any

different version of Jesus' answer. The opening of the story seems to be taken from Mark. But the answer is longer than Mark's version, whereas Luke's general tendency is to contract (ten lines in Nestle's text as against eight lines in Mark; the question on authority and the parable of the husbandmen take thirty-nine lines as against Mark's forty-two), and the extended form is remarkable for its semitic character. Thus in xx. 34f. we have a very semitic parallelism between the 'sons of this world' and those who are accounted worthy to attain to the resurrection of the dead (the parallelism remains even if we follow the Western reading *γεννώσιν και γεννῶνται* preferred by Creed *ad loc.*). The 'sons of this world' and the 'sons of the resurrection' have a distinctly semitic air; to suppose that Luke plunged of his own accord into this orgy of semitisms demands a very high degree of credulity.<sup>1</sup> It would seem that Jesus' answer to the Sadducees was current in more than one form, and the question arises whether it was originally connected with the events leading up to the Passion any more than the question as to the great command-

mention of killing the servants in Luke xx. 9ff. (this is presumably due to the desire to provide a better climax in the killing of the son; the sending of three servants in Luke is more graphic and might well be nearer to the original but seems due to Luke) and the addition of the cryptic saying of Luke xx. 18 to the quotation from Ps. cxvii. 22f. The verse is not found in the Western text of Matthew and is presumably due to assimilation. For Luke's introduction to the question of the tribute-money, cf. above, p. 89; φόρος is substituted for κῆνος to avoid a barbarism; δηνάριον was presumably too familiar to be felt as such. Otherwise the verbal agreement in all these incidents is high, and there are hardly any non-Marcian words.

<sup>1</sup> Streeter (p. 215) regards the changes as being 'well within the limits of editorial conjecture or inference from the context'. But he is arguing here for his theory of a proto-Luke, and against the view that, in the sections Luke derived from Mark, he also had a parallel version in proto-Luke. It is doubtful whether he would have admitted the argument if it had not been necessary to his thesis. He ignores the semitisms, which Creed notes but does not explain.

Moulton and Milligan, *Voc. Gr. N.T. s.v. υἱός*, hold that 'sons of this age' need not be a semitism, but only quote as parallels its honorific use in such titles as υἱός τῆς πατρίδος, πόλεως κ.τ.λ., which are scarcely analogous since they are a natural metaphor. For the semitic character of the use, cf. Blass-Debrunner, *N.T. Gramm.*<sup>7</sup> § 162. Luke preserves the semitisms in some cases where he finds them in his sources: v. 34 (= Mark ii. 19), vi. 35 (= Mark v. 45), but he omits the 'sons of thunder' at vi. 14 (= Mark iii. 17) and changes the 'sons of the kingdom' of Matt. viii. 12, which looks original, into 'yourselves' at xiii. 28. x. 6 is clearly from a semitic original. It seems most unlikely that he has introduced the usage here of his own accord by way of 'editorial conjecture'.

ment. It is perhaps doubtful whether Jesus was likely to meet with Sadducees in Galilee, or anywhere outside Jerusalem, and we have no sufficient evidence that Jesus visited Jerusalem on any other occasion during his public career; on the other hand his answer to the Sadducees was likely to lessen the hostility of the Pharisees. Thus the probability is that the story originally circulated independently as a timeless anecdote.

In this case it would seem that we have in Mark xi. 27-xii. 37 not a collection of conflict-stories, but a Marcan compilation drawn from various sources. Of this we cannot be certain, since the three questions addressed to Jesus might have been collected into a tract before Mark; but the evidence seems to suggest that the question as to authority formed part of the source which described the cleansing of the Temple, and the question as to tribute-money part of the earlier collection of conflict-stories, while the parable of the wicked husbandmen seems to have been drawn from a source in which it stood as an introduction to the story of the Passion; the beginning and conclusion show that it was not simply an unattached parable inserted here by Mark; whether in fact the parable, if authentic, was uttered in the week before the Passion is an entirely different question, which we have no means of deciding. The question of the Sadducees and that of the scribe as to the great commandment seem to have circulated independently; the latter at least had no fixed place in the tradition. On the other hand the clumsy διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ of Mark's introduction of the question as to the son of David indicates that it came to Mark in its present form as an isolated unit or from a different collection of sayings; Mark did not trouble to alter the words, although Jesus was already teaching in the Temple.

The woes on the Pharisees will be dealt with in the following chapter.

It may be noted at this point that the story of the widow's mite (Mark xii. 41 ff.) is an isolated fragment as to the source of which there is no clue. It has been suggested that the incident is derived from a similar Buddhist story.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand there are parallels in Greek literature.<sup>2</sup> It may be doubted whether these similarities

<sup>1</sup> For a full discussion of this, cf. Clemen, *Rel.-Gesch. Erkl. d. n. T.* pp. 251 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Hellenistic Elements*, p. 20. The thought goes back to Socrates (Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, I, 3, 3).

## SYNOPTIC GOSPELS I

prove more than that any reasonably advanced religion is sure to value the simple offerings of the poor more than large gifts of the rich, which cost them little. Thus an incident of this kind might occur, or a legend to the same effect develop independently, in various quarters. Whether we regard the Marcan narrative as history or legend appears to depend entirely on our own presuppositions; on the assumption that it is historical it is located in Jerusalem.

## CHAPTER XII

### THE WARNING AGAINST THE SCRIBES

The remaining section of Mark, the warning against the scribes (xii. 38ff.), is best considered in conjunction with the treatment of the same theme in the Q stratum. Luke preserves both as separate incidents (xi. 37ff. and xx. 45ff.) while Matthew (xxiii. 1ff.) conflates the two, adding other matter from other parts of the same stratum with a good deal that is peculiar to himself. It has been suggested that Mark has preserved only a fragment of a larger denunciation (so Rawlinson *ad loc.*), but it is not easy to see why a Christian writer should give only a selection on such a theme. On the other hand the growing hostility between the Church and the synagogue after the crucifixion would naturally lead to the multiplication of accusations of this kind; the tendency would be increased by the opposition of Jewish Christians of the popular type to the attempts of Christian Pharisees to persuade them to observe the Law in the Pharisaic sense.<sup>1</sup> The only evidence for supposing that Mark is drawing on a larger collection of denunciations would appear to be the close verbal resemblance between Mark xii. 38f. and Luke xi. 43. But there is no reason why the saying (which seems to be part of the earliest form of the denunciation) should not have been preserved in a very similar form in two different traditions; it is of course possible that Luke xi. 43 has been influenced by the Marcan form of the saying.

On the other hand the Marcan denunciation is in itself difficult to understand; the hearers are warned to 'beware of' the scribes, who are accused of vanity and ostentation, avarice and hypocrisy, and are therefore threatened with 'greater condemnation'. It is difficult to suppose that the disciples of Jesus himself, or even the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Acts x. 14 and xv. 10; for Paul's view of popular Judaism, cf. Gal. ii. 14, v. 3 and vi. 13. Views of this kind when expressed by a Pharisee convert in a Jewish Christian community would naturally excite opposition; it is not for nothing that Matthew is at once the most Jewish and the most anti-Pharisaic of the Gospels. Cf. *Jerusalem*, p. 224 and notes, and my *Acts of the Apostles*, p. 49; see also Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St Matthew*, p. 121.



Christians of the first generation, were likely to be seriously tempted to follow the bad example of the scribes; the warning might be intended to suggest that the scribes are likely to persecute the disciples, but the allusion to 'greater condemnation' is scarcely suited to this point. It is possible that the warning was intended to discourage Christians from associating with Jews of the Pharisaic type: but beneath this secondary form Mark may have preserved a fragment of denunciation that came to him in a good tradition, though we have no evidence for supposing that he was consciously selecting from his materials.

The non-Marcian denunciation is preserved in two widely different forms by Matthew and Luke. The Lucan form is relatively simple. It is introduced by an apparently friendly invitation to dinner by a Pharisee, who is surprised by Jesus' failure to wash before dinner; his surprise leads to a violent attack on the Pharisees for cleansing the outside of the cup and platter, while inwardly they are full of iniquity; after the question, 'Did not he that made the outside make the inside also?' comes the obscure verse xi. 41.<sup>1</sup> We then have a series of three woes on the Pharisees: (1) for tithing mint and forgetting justice; (2) for ostentation and vanity as in Mark xii. 38; (3) for being like invisible tombs. These are followed by a question from a lawyer, which elicits three woes on them: (4) for laying burdens on men's backs but refusing to touch them (i.e. evading them themselves, cf. Creed *ad loc.*); (5) for building the tombs of the prophets and so approving of the action of their fathers in murdering them. This is followed by a denunciation of the Jewish nation, ascribed to 'the wisdom of God', after which we have a very lame ending in the form of (6) a woe on the lawyers for taking away the key of knowledge, so that they neither enter (into what?), nor allow others to do so.

As it stands this is a very clumsy compilation. The opening may be due to Luke himself; but it may perhaps be doubted whether he would have represented Jesus as attacking his host with such

<sup>1</sup> For the difficulty of the text and exact meaning of 40, cf. Creed *ad loc.* Creed is inclined to follow Wellhausen on 41, taking 'give alms' as a mistake for 'cleanse' owing to a confusion of the Aramaic words *zakki* and *dakki*. At Professor Dodd's seminar considerable doubt was expressed as to the existence of an Aramaic word *dakki* meaning 'cleanse'. Cf. Butler, *Originality of St Matthew*, p. 54 and n.

discourtesy; the scene suggests rather the conventional hatred of the Pharisees which characterizes the early Palestinian community. We should naturally expect seven woes, as we find them in Matthew; the lawyer's question in xi. 45 and the direction of the three woes which follow at the lawyers (in Matthew all are directed against the 'scribes and Pharisees') suggest that Luke or an earlier editor found a catalogue of six woes, and inserted the lawyer's question, changing the objects of the last three woes from 'Pharisees' into 'lawyers' because two groups of three seemed more suitable than a list of six. The insertion from 'the Wisdom' of God came to him in his source, as is clear from its appearance in Matt. xxiii. 34; it would appear that it had been inserted into its Lucan position by a previous compiler because it dealt with killing the prophets, with the result that the last woe had to follow very weakly at the end of the list.

As against this Matthew (xxiii. 1 ff.) has a saying by Jesus that the scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat and must be obeyed but not imitated, 'for they say and do not'. This is explained by a variant form of Luke's first woe on the lawyers. Then comes an expanded form of the Marcan denunciation, 'enlarging the phylacteries' being added to the charges. Verses 8-12 consist of miscellaneous sayings of which 8 and 10 are doublets while 11 and 12 are floating sayings of a proverbial character, which Jesus may have used on various occasions (cf. Mark ix. 35, Luke ix. 48, Matt. xviii. 4, Luke xiv. 11 and xviii. 14); there is no particular reason to suppose that they had any original connection with a denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees. There follows a set of seven woes: (1) For shutting the kingdom of heaven, and neither entering nor allowing others to enter (= Luke's (6) in a more original form, since it avoids the hellenistic 'key of knowledge' and makes it clear what it is that they neither enter nor allow others to enter).<sup>1</sup> (2) Compassing sea and land to make one proselyte. Luke has no parallel, and the saying seems clearly secondary, implying a situation in which the Church

<sup>1</sup> I owe the point to Professor Dodd who compares the title of *Corp. Herm.* x (cf. Festugière, 1, 107). This idea of an esoteric 'key of knowledge' is certainly hellenistic rather than Jewish; but it would be difficult to find any trace of familiarity with literature of this type in the Lucan writings, apart from the absolute common-places of popular philosophy in such passages as Acts xiv. 15 ff. and xvii. 23 ff. I should be inclined to suspect that the alteration is due to an earlier editor and not Luke; cf. below, p. 101.

and the synagogues are competing for proselytes. (3) 'Blind guides.' This appears to be a cento of denunciations based on such sayings as Matt. v. 33 ff. and xv. 14 (= Luke vi. 39, which was probably the original position in the Q stratum). It is possible that the condemnation of rabbinical casuistry goes back to an authentic tradition of the sayings of Jesus, but that does not mean that it belongs to this passage. (4) Tithing mint, anise and cummin (= Luke (1)). Here the triple parallelism, three herbs and three 'weightier matters of the Law', looks more original than Luke's 'mint and rue and every herb' and his 'judgment and the love of God'. On the other hand 24 looks like a proverbial saying, inserted here with the introduction of 'blind guides'. It may be an authentic saying of Jesus, but that need not mean that it originally stood here. (5) The inside of the cup and the platter (25 f.) avoids the difficulty of Luke xx. 41, but looks like an attempt to avoid the difficulty. (6) 'Whited sepulchres, outwardly fair but inwardly full of dead men's bones' (= Luke's (3) but with a completely different point and wording). (7) Building the tombs of the prophets (Luke's (5)). This is followed by a full-blooded denunciation based on the style of the Baptist (32 f.) and the denunciation of the murderers of the prophets, ascribed to Jesus himself, not as in Luke to the 'Wisdom of God'. Thus Matthew has seven woes, of which (1), (4), (6) and (7) have parallels in Luke (Luke's (1), (3), (5) and (6)), though without any common order. Matthew's (2) and (3) do not appear in Luke at all; his (5) appears as Luke xi. 39 ff., but not as a woe, while Luke's (4) appears, not as a woe, in Matt. xxiii. 4.

With regard to the form of the sayings, it may be observed that those common to both evangelists tend to a close similarity: 'You do this, and you do not do that (whereas you ought to do both or neither).' Matthew's (1) (= Luke's (6)), and again Matthew's (4) (= Luke's (1)), fit this scheme exactly. Now there is no reason, apart perhaps from the 'woe', why the former should not be an authentic saying, and there is every reason to suppose that the latter must be; there was never a moment in the history of the Church when Christian Pharisees<sup>1</sup> could have gained acceptance for this

<sup>1</sup> The Mishnah (Peah i. 4 and Ma'as. i. 1) extends the Law from corn, wine and oil to herbs. The last clause was too much for D which omits it in Luke. But it seems dangerous to regard it with Creed as due to assimilation to Matthew; it appears in Pap. 45. The motive for omission was extremely strong.

relative approval of a Pharisaic extension of the Torah as an authentic saying of Jesus; the only explanation of its survival seems to be that it was known as a genuine saying which could not be disputed. Matthew has disturbed the parallelism by adding 24. A similar structure appears in his (6) (= Luke's (3)), when it is recognized that Matt. xxiii. 28 is a homiletic expansion.<sup>1</sup> As against these Matthew's (2), which, as has been noted, can hardly be regarded as having any claim to authenticity, has a different structure, since there is no contrast between what the Pharisees do and what they fail to do, but two charges, the second of which aggravates the first.

This leaves Matthew's (5), the cleaning of the outside of the cup and the platter. The substance of this appears in Luke xi. 39ff., though not as a woe. It has already been noticed that the violence of Jesus' attack on his host in the Lucan version seems to reflect the attitude of the early Jewish community; the Pharisees are outside the pale and need not be regarded as deserving of the most elementary courtesy. On the other hand the Lucan version adds to the Matthean the saying of 41, 'Did not he that made the outside make the inside also?' Now this saying by itself, with the omission of ἀφρονες, would make a perfectly good and entirely courteous answer to the Pharisee's 'surprise' that Jesus did not wash before dinner.<sup>2</sup> This may well have formed an independent pronouncement-story; it has been conflated either by Luke or a previous editor with the saying of 39, which appears as a woe in Matthew. The conflation with the story with the first woe made it necessary for the Lucan version to recast the form of the saying as to the cleansing of the outside of the cup, so that it ceased to be a woe, with the result that the original seven was reduced to six. The saying of 41

<sup>1</sup> The precise meaning is obscure. If the Lucan version means anything, it would seem to mean that the Pharisees expect men to trust them, but those who do so incur defilement (presumably by being led into sins like theirs), as do men who walk over tombs hidden below the surface of the ground (Mishnah, Oholoth ix. 14). The Matthean version is intelligible (cf. Str.-B. and Allen *ad loc.*), and probably represents the original. Luke may have compressed it through failure to understand it. It is of course possible that both versions of the saying were current, but in any case Luke's form has been abbreviated to an extent which deprives it of its point.

<sup>2</sup> Presumably in the original story the Pharisee expressed his surprise; but his expression has been omitted in accordance with the tendency of the later tradition to ascribe to Jesus an unlimited power to read the thoughts of men (Mark ix. 33 ff. and Luke ix. 46f.; cf. *Gentiles*, p. 71 n. 5).

may also have been originally independent, and have had no connection with the cup and the platter beyond the one word καθαρά; in this case the words will simply have meant, 'Give all that is possible by way of alms and all things are clean unto you.'<sup>1</sup> It may be noted that with the omission of 26 and 28 the woes which deal with the cleansing of the outside and 'whited sepulchres' have an exactly parallel form in the Matthean version; moreover, this omission explains the quite impossible γέμουσιν ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας of 25. It would seem that originally the woe ended γέμετε ἀρπαγῆς; γέμετε was changed to γέμουσιν by assimilation to the end of 27, while subsequently ἐξ was added, perhaps by Matthew himself in order to give some sort of sense to the passage.<sup>2</sup> The assimilation would be a great deal more likely if 25 and 27 originally stood close together.

There is thus considerable reason for supposing that Matthew and Luke both represent an earlier source containing seven woes, though in view of the differences between the two lists and the order of the woes it seems likely that the document had already assumed different forms; it was natural that this should be so, for the theme was no doubt popular and widely used. Fresh disputes with the Pharisees would provide new material. The document was probably put into the form of woes by the compiler, and some of the material has little claim to be regarded as authentic. Matt. xxiii. 15 has been noticed above; the saying about the tombs of the prophets<sup>3</sup> seems also to

<sup>1</sup> If this view is accepted, it would follow that the insertion of the Pharisee's invitation to dinner and the pronouncement of 40 were added after 41 had been attached to 39, since the tradition common to Matthew and Luke had already joined these two verses together, Matt. xxiii. 26 being an attempt to make sense of the obscure Lucan form. Moulton and Milligan suggest 'the inside', i.e. 'give the contents of the cup and the platter as alms' (*Voc. Gr. N.T. s.v. ἐνειμι*). But this seems very hard without ἐν αὐτοῖς.

<sup>2</sup> As the text stands the only possible meaning seems to be that the cup and platter are full as a result of the rapacity of their owners (so Allen *ad loc.*). Creed on Luke xi. 39 rightly remarks that this 'seems too subtle for the Gospel sayings'.

<sup>3</sup> H.-J. Schoeps in *Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde* (Symb. Bib. Upsal., 1943) suggests that the theme of the murder of the prophets is derived from a Jewish original of the *Vitae Prophetarum*. I had independently made a similar suggestion at Professor Dodd's seminar, but Professor Marsh pointed out that in Neh. ix. 6 the guilt is accepted by the Jewish writer, presumably on the strength of I Kings xix. 10. In I Thess. ii. 15 Paul charges the Jews with killing their own prophets and in Rom. xi. 3 he quotes Elijah's words, applying them to Israel as a whole, not simply to

enshrine a favourite argument of the early Church in Palestine and elsewhere in its controversies with the Jews.<sup>1</sup> The argument that the Jews by building the tombs of the prophets condone the deeds of their fathers is hopelessly weak and disingenuous, and would appear to have grown up in a rather low level of anti-Jewish controversy.

The quotation from 'the Wisdom of God' is very peculiar. In Matthew it is put into the mouth of Jesus himself. To Christian writers after Paul, Jesus was the incarnation of the divine Wisdom. On the other hand there is no parallel in the Gospels for the description of Jesus as the Wisdom of God, or as the Wisdom or Logos who spoke through the prophets, and it is most unlikely that Luke would have substituted 'the Wisdom of God' for the first person singular of the Matthean version. On the whole it seems probable that Bultmann (pp. 119f.) is right and that we have here an insertion from an early Christian writing, ascribed to and perhaps described as 'the Wisdom of God'. An extract from this had been inserted into the common source of Matthew and Luke; the latter has allowed the wording of his source to stand in spite of its awkwardness, simply because he did not trouble to correct it.<sup>2</sup> It is true that we have no parallel for such an insertion from a Christian writing, with the source acknowledged, in the Synoptic Gospels. But we

Elijah and the northern kingdom. There may well have been rabbinical enlargement on the theme (cf. Str.-B. on Matt. xxiii. 30ff.). But the *Vitae Prophetarum* appear to be a Christian work to justify the charge of Acts vii. 52 (naturally for Stephen (or Luke) it was of faith that the prophets had foretold the coming of Christ). Heb. xi. 35 describes martyrdoms of the prophets in a Christian version of a *kerygma* of the Old Testament which shows no anti-semitic bias and may be adapted from a Jewish original.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 102 (329D), where the Jews are always murderers of 'the righteous'.

<sup>2</sup> There is scarcely any limit to the carelessness of ancient compilers. Cf. Arrian, *Anab.* xvii, 19, 6: Alexander's pretext for attempting to conquer Arabia Felix was that the Arabians had not sent an embassy to him, 'but the real reason, as it seems to me, was his insatiable desire for conquest'. Here 'as it seems to me' is not Arrian's own opinion, but inserted into his extract from Aristobulus of Cassandreia, whom he is following (*F.G.H.* 139, F 55), as appears from the fact that Strabo, xvi, 1, 11 (741), quotes the same passage of Aristobulus (cf. *F.G.H.* 139, F 56) to the effect that 'he says that Alexander made it his pretext for the war that the Arabs alone sent no embassy to him, but in reality he sought to be lord of the whole world'. Arrian has simply not taken the trouble to cut out Aristobulus' 'as it seems to me', or to revise it so as to show that it is Aristobulus' view and not his own.

cannot rule out the possibility that an early compiler of the sayings of Jesus would regard it as natural to amplify them by the insertion of a parallel from a Christian denunciation of the Jews, which was not attributed to Jesus himself. Luke is far more likely to have copied his source out direct than to have changed 'I send unto you' into 'the Wisdom of God saith "I send unto you"'; on the other hand Matthew is quite likely to have changed his source in the opposite direction.<sup>1</sup>

But when these passages have been omitted there are some elements, the presence of which in the tradition can only be explained if they are based on authentic recollections of the sayings of Jesus. Of these the saying as to mint, anise and cummin has been noted already. The opening of the Matthean discourse is equally unintelligible, except as a survival from a period of Jesus' career during which he still hoped that the Pharisees would accept his conception of the kingdom of God. The closing words 'but do not after their works; for they say and do not' may have been added by the Church; the original saying upheld the Pharisaic tradition of piety, including their method of interpreting the Torah. If this is so, the saying will date from an earlier period than xxiii. 23, where it is recognized that there is an impassable gulf between Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom and the attitude of the Pharisees; on the other hand it is possible that the charge of laying burdens on men's backs and refusing to bear them themselves represents a condemnation of certain forms of rabbinical casuistry going back to Jesus himself. xxiii. 13 may perfectly well be an authentic saying in its Matthean form, and the same applies to xxiii. 25 and the saying appended to it in Luke xi. 41, assuming the interpretation suggested above to be correct. xxiii. 27 may well be the original form of an authentic saying. It is also likely that xxiii. 16ff. contains authentic sayings.

On the other hand the compilation of a list of seven woes looks definitely secondary (so Bultmann, rightly, p. 119). What we have is a document based on the sayings already noted, some of which go back to the period in the ministry of Jesus when he broke with the Pharisees, or even earlier. These were compiled into a tract

<sup>1</sup> Creed *ad loc.* regards Bultmann's view as unlikely, but admits that he has no satisfactory alternative.

attacking the Pharisees, scribes or lawyers, and expanded by a woe condemning them as the murderers of the prophets, though this should rightly have been addressed to the Jewish nation as such; still the Pharisees were the dominating element in the nation and it was the rulers of the nation, such as Ahab, Manasseh and Joash, who had killed the prophets. Either at this point or at the next stage in the tradition this was amplified by the extract from the 'Wisdom of God' in front of the last woe on those who shut the kingdom of heaven before men, leaving the last woe (in the Lucan version) hopelessly isolated from the rest. It is possible that the differences between the Matthean and Lucan versions are due to the two evangelists: but reasons have been noted above which make it more likely that the document underwent a certain amount of re-editing before it reached them. In this case the comparatively close verbal similarity in some parts of the two passages (note Matt. xxiii. 23 f. and Luke xi. 42; Matt. xxiii. 25 and Luke xi. 39 and the extract from the Wisdom of God, where we have no changes that are not easily explicable as to editing by the evangelists) will be due to the fact that the intermediate editors happened to leave their original unchanged.

How far the charges which may reasonably be supposed to go back to Jesus himself were really justified is not a matter which can be decided by comparing them with the highest expressions of rabbinical piety. The original denunciations were presumably addressed to the followers of the Pharisaic tradition in Galilee, and do not go beyond the condemnations of false Pharisaism to be found in rabbinical literature (cf. Str.-B. iv, 336f.). But in the last resort the teaching of Jesus stood for a conception of the Torah which was irreconcilable with that of the Pharisees and could only lead to a breach between him and them.

A curious point arises in the Lucan ending of this passage (xi. 53f.). It is normally regarded as a Lucan addition (Bultmann, p. 361). It is possible that this view is correct. But the insertion leaves an incredibly clumsy connection with the opening verses of xii. Luke would seem to have had xii. 1 ff. as a collection of sayings of which some were addressed to the disciples, and some to the crowd; Luke has no doubt framed his awkward xii. 1 to bring both disciples and crowd on to the stage, although the picture of a private



discourse to the disciples, while the crowd are 'treading down one another', is almost grotesque. It is only made worse if it is made to synchronize with the attempts of the Pharisees to trap Jesus into words which can be used as evidence against him. Moreover ἀποστοματίζειν here can only mean to 'catechize' or to 'cross-examine' him,<sup>1</sup> and there seems no reason why Luke should insert an editorial ending to this effect when in fact he had no specimens of such catechizing to offer. Even if we regard the conflict-stories of xx. 1 ff. as specimens, they are far too widely removed from xi. 53 to justify the editorial insertion. It is at least possible that we have here the original ending of the source, which described how after their breach with Jesus the Pharisees attempted by questioning Jesus to entrap him into utterances which could be used as evidence against him. In this case the source will have been an introduction to the story of the Passion; it may well contain a genuine piece of historical reminiscence.

<sup>1</sup> The second-century grammarian Pollux (II, 102) gives Plato as an authority for this meaning. The Western text rightly saw that this meaning was needed, and rewrote the verse accordingly, substituting συμβάλλειν αὐτῷ for ἀποστοματίζειν (for συμβάλλειν, cf. Acts iv. 15; for the text cf. Creed *ad loc.*). Creed rightly sees that the sense 'cross-examine' is required, but does not notice Pollux, who may be presumed to reflect the tradition of the schools. Whether Plato (*Euthyd.* 276c, 277A) used the word in this sense does not of course matter. Luke is more likely to have read a grammarian than Plato, and to have used the word on his authority.

## CHAPTER XIII

### THE 'LITTLE APOCALYPSE'

It is generally recognized that Mark xiii. 1-37 in its present form is an independent apocalypse; the four disciples of 3 indicate that it is the earliest specimen of the Christian apocryphal convention, which expands the received tradition by means of supposed revelations given to specially selected groups of disciples.<sup>1</sup> The Apocalypse, however, is not originally a single document. Its basis is an apocalypse dating back to Caligula's attempt to put up his statue in the Temple, an attempt which excited as much consternation among Jewish Christians as among the Jews in general.<sup>2</sup> The fact that many of its features are drawn from conventional Jewish apocalyptic is no evidence that it was originally a purely Jewish document; with the wealth of apocalyptic provided by Jewish tradition, Christians had no need to invent new elements for themselves. On the other hand it may be noted that we have in Mark a very early form of the apocalypse. For the version of it which appears in II Thess. ii. 3 ff. has already faced the fact that Caligula's attempt had been indefinitely postponed, and has provided the mysterious  $\delta\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\upsilon\varsigma$  to explain the postponement. There seems no reason for disputing the authenticity of II Thess., apart from a certain reluctance to ascribe the rather artless acceptance of the Caligula-apocalypse to the Apostle of the Gentiles; but in any case the Epistle is concerned to explain that, although the original prophecy has not been fulfilled, and has indeed been postponed indefinitely, yet it remains a true forecast of the signs which must precede the end of all things. The Marcan version preserves the original form, when the danger was still

<sup>1</sup> The group of three, Peter, James and John, falls into a different category; cf. above, p. 29. The addition of Andrew represents a new stage in the development; Andrew has been added to the three to make the Apocalypse more impressive.

<sup>2</sup> Bultmann (p. 129) assumes that the original apocalypse was a Jewish one, and that the identification of the Messiah in 21 f. and the Son of Man in 26 f. with Jesus is the work of Mark or an intermediate editor. But for this he gives no evidence. II Thess. ii. 1 ff. shows that the prophecy was current in one or more Christian versions, as well as in Jewish forms. For the whole affair cf. *Jerusalem*, pp. 172 n. 6, 187 n. 9, and Dodd in *J.R.S.* xxxvii (1947), 47 ff.

imminent, although it has been conflated with other sayings which teach the exact opposite, namely that 'the end is not yet'.

Thus xiii. 14-20 preserve a form of early Christian apocalyptic which goes back to a period prior to the assassination of Caligula in A.D. 41. It is further probable that this apocalypse always included the prophecies of 8f., a conventional series of disasters foreshadowing the end.<sup>1</sup> 12 is also a piece of conventional apocalyptic, based on Micah vii. 6, though as it stands it has been conflated with a quite different prophecy of the persecution of the Church in 13; properly it was a sign of cosmic disorder (cf. IV Esdras v. 9 and vi. 24). Then follows the forecast of Caligula's attack on the Temple, which had from the beginning been associated with the prophecies of famines and presumably other disasters. It would be a tempting but quite unwarrantable speculation to suppose that we have here the prophecy of Agabus (Acts xi. 28); the probability is that there were innumerable apocalypses of this type current both in Jewish and Christian circles in Palestine at the period. All that can be said of it is that it survived, in spite of the fact that it had never been realized; those in Judaea had never been forced to flee to the mountains by the approach of a Roman army. It would seem that it remained as a piece of fossilized tradition, perhaps receiving occasional additions, in spite of the fact that the Marcan version had never come across the convenient explanation of II Thess.<sup>2</sup> From this point the

<sup>1</sup> Wars are naturally signs of the end, which is to be ushered in by the final attack of the Gentiles on Jerusalem. For these and the other signs cf. Jub. xxiii. 13 ff., and the references in Charles's note on xxiii. 18. Such disasters are part of the stock-in-trade of astrology; cf. *Catal. Codd. Astrol.* VIII, 3, 186; it is even recognized that they can be foretold from the stars in the qualified recognition of astrology in Philo, *De Op. Mundi* 58f. (where Philo appears to be using Posidonius' commentary on the *Timaeus*; cf. *Gentiles*, p. 63). Cf. also the catalogue of disasters, based on Lev. xxvi and Deut. xxviii, in Philo, *De Execr.* 127ff. Here the disasters are threatened on Israel as a punishment for their sins, but it appears that they will repent (162 ff.) and be restored to their land, presumably under the Messianic leader of *De Praem. et Poen.* 95. The whole passage is entirely different from anything else in Philo, and while it is little more than a paraphrase of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, there seems no reason why he should have written it. It would seem that it was a conventional Jewish-hellenistic apocalypse with a human Zionist leader, and that Philo incorporated it, as he might incorporate anything else.

<sup>2</sup> The shortening of the days cannot be taken as an alternative explanation, since the shortening of the days could only come after the beginning of the tribulations; and in fact the tribulations had never begun.

## THE 'LITTLE APOCALYPSE'

apocalypse loses all touch with normal reality; we have a series of celestial portents based on Isa. xiii. 10 and xxxiv. 4, followed by the appearance of the Son of Man in the clouds (Dan. vii. 13), and the gathering in of the elect by the angels (Zech. ii. 6). All this is more or less common form in Jewish apocalyptic (cf. Ass. Moys. x. 5 ff., I Enoch lxxx. 4 ff., IV Esdras v. 4; for the Messiah, cf. IV Esdras xiii. 3 ff.).

The apocalypse in its Marcan form presents several puzzles. In 21 ff. we have a repetition of the warning against false Christs with which the whole has already opened (5 b and 6). Here it would seem that Luke has preserved the explanation. For in xxi. 10 (= Mark xiii. 8) he inserts for no apparent reason τότε ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς; the new introduction here can only mean either that the original compiler was drawing on an existing series of sayings, each with an introduction of this kind as in the Oxyrhynchus Logia,<sup>1</sup> or that he was going over to another source in which this introduction stood. It would seem that here as elsewhere Luke has access not merely to Mark but to Mark's sources, and that he has by pure chance inserted the opening formula which Mark has cut out. This again implies that Mark had 5 b-7 as an independent saying; he regarded this as a suitable place to insert them, in spite of the fact that 8 is a doublet of 7, while 5 b-6 is repeated at 21 ff.

On the other hand 21 ff. do not belong to the original apocalypse; the opening of 24 with its allusion to 'those days after that affliction' should clearly come immediately after the 'shortening of those days'. It is, however, unlikely that Mark would have inserted both forms of the warning against false Christs in this extremely clumsy fashion; on the other hand he is quite capable of inserting the first saying before the apocalypse, and leaving the other in the middle of it if they both came to him in collections of sayings from a good source. Thus although 21 ff. do not really belong to the apocalypse, it would seem that they had found their way into it before it came into Mark's hands. In itself the warning against false Christs who say ἐγὼ εἶμι may be based on a genuine reminiscence; it might be simply a *vaticinium ex eventu*, but, unless we assume that Jesus had no idea that his disciples were to carry on his work after his death, we cannot rule out the possibility that he may have foreseen that the

<sup>1</sup> The point was noted at Professor Dodd's seminar by the Rev. R. G. Heard.

circumstances of the time would inevitably produce false claimants to the Messianic title.

Mark xiii. 9–11 are another piece of alien matter. The ‘beginnings of tribulation’ in 8 should lead on to the break-up of society in 12, not to the persecution of the Church. Luke felt the awkwardness and avoided it by inserting ‘before these things’; the persecution had begun, but the cosmic portents had not at the time when he was writing; this is an awkward way out of an awkward situation. On the other hand the Marcan account has some secondary features. The prophecy of trials before governors and kings seems to have been developed out of an original warning of persecutions in the local synagogues of Galilee at the time of the mission of the Twelve, which has been preserved in Matt. x. 17, where it has been expanded by the addition of the Marcan warning of persecution before governors and kings and the allusion to the Gentiles. Luke, however, has preserved at xxi. 15 the original wording of the apocalypse as against Mark: ‘a mouth and wisdom’ is clearly more primitive than the Marcan allusion to the Holy Spirit which reflects a developed theology.<sup>1</sup>

The break-up of society is on the other hand part of the original apocalypse; in 13 Mark has added to it sayings about the fate of the disciples; Luke has rewritten this verse so that the break-up of society has become a warning of the family divisions which will result from the persecution of the Church. It appears that Luke is following all through his section xxi. 12–19 a different form of the Marcan apocalypse; since in 15 he has a more primitive form than Mark, while 16 is later; 17 is the only verse which is identical with Mark in wording and here we have a striking saying which would naturally retain its original form. His omission of the prophecy of the Gentile mission in Mark xiii. 10 seems inexplicable if he is simply revising Mark.<sup>2</sup> 18 is thoroughly semitic (cf. I Sam. xiv. 45;

<sup>1</sup> I owe the point to Professor C. H. Dodd. Matt. x. 19 which is conflating Mark with another source has probably preserved a primitive feature in ‘there shall be given you’ as against Luke’s ‘I will give you’. ‘The spirit of your father’ in the next verse seems to be midway between the original Lucan version and the developed theology of Mark.

<sup>2</sup> Matthew omits all the Marcan section except the last clause ‘he that endures to the end, the same shall be saved’, because he has already used it in his charge to the Twelve. He substitutes a series of warnings which reflect the effect of the Jewish rebellion on wavering elements of the Church in Palestine.

## THE 'LITTLE APOCALYPSE'

II Sam. xiv. 11); it may quite well be an authentic saying, but there is no evidence about the source from which it came.

The rest of Mark xiii is a collection of miscellaneous matter. The parable of the fig tree belongs to the same stratum of 'realized eschatology' as such sayings as Luke xii. 54ff. and xvii. 20.<sup>1</sup> 29 may always have been attached to the parable as a warning that the events attending the ministry of Jesus are a sign that the kingdom of God is already imminent, if not present. As it stands it is grotesque; it is somewhat late to realize that the end of all things is at hand, when you see 'all these things' coming to pass, since 'all these things' are presumably the final coming of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven. 30 is a saying of the same character as ix. 1,<sup>2</sup> and had originally the same sense of realized eschatology; like the preceding verse it owes its apparent forecast of the end of all things to the fact that it has been inserted into the apocalypse. It was probably in the first instance an isolated saying, as are the two verses which follow. 31 looks suspiciously like a later Christian version of Matt. v. 18 (=Luke xvi. 17). 32 on the other hand is certainly authentic, supported, as it is, by Luke's omission of the whole verse and the omission of the words 'neither the son' in the received text of Matt. xxiv. 36.<sup>3</sup> Verses 33-7 form a homiletic conclusion which has received its futurist eschatology from the evangelist; it appears to be a fragmentary survival of a fuller parable.<sup>4</sup>

We have thus what might appear to be a mosaic of fragments; it is, however, possible to find a clue in the word βλεπετε which

<sup>1</sup> To these may be added the puzzling saying Matt. xvi. 2f. Its omission by  $\aleph$  and B, supported by fam. 13, syr. sin. and Origen, is decisive against its authenticity as part of the text of Matthew. On the other hand the language shows no resemblance to the parallel saying Luke xii. 54-6 until we come to the last clause, which might be drawn from Luke, though there is no verbal identity. The only explanation seems to be that the saying was current in two different forms in the tradition and was inserted at a very early stage into the text of Matthew in its non-Lucan form.

<sup>2</sup> For Mark ix. 1 cf. Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom*, pp. 53f.

<sup>3</sup> The difficulty of the text has caused its omission by W, 13, etc., and syr. sin. as well as the T.R., which shows that the difficulty was felt from a very early period. Bultmann (p. 130), following Dalman, regards it as a Jewish saying with a Christian conclusion added. But it is grotesque to suppose that a Christian editor of the Jewish saying would insert 'neither the son'. Bultmann's principle that we must judge of the earlier stages of the tradition by the analogy of what we find in the later developments is decisive in such a case as this.

<sup>4</sup> For this section cf. Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom*, pp. 161 ff.

recurs at 5, 9 and 33. In each case it introduces a set of warnings, which may have been expanded but have a definite reference to circumstances which may quite well have been foreseen by Jesus. 'See that you are not led away by Messianic pretenders who come in my name' (5f.; 7 was a later, but pre-Markan addition); 'be careful of your conduct' (originally during the Galilean mission); 'you will be arrested and beaten in the synagogues' (the reference to kings and the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles is a later addition). Luke xxi. 13 may mean, 'it will give you a chance of testifying about my message' and might be the original; 'do not trouble beforehand about your answer; you will be given "a mouth and wisdom" which will prove irresistible'; 'all men will hate you, but you will be preserved and will win through by your endurance'. This collection of sayings (Mark xiii. 9-13, omitting 12; 13 may be an unattached saying) ended in its original form with 33-7; it is a call by Jesus to alertness in 'the crisis created by his own coming' (Dodd, *loc. cit.*). It may perhaps be conjectured that the series of sayings ended originally with βλέπετε, γρηγορεῖτε in 37 being substituted by someone who had a certain feeling for a better rhetorical ending.

Thus we have here a catena of sayings which once circulated independently; they were linked together by a common theme and a common introductory word. But Mark has dovetailed them into his Caligula-apocalypse, which began at 8 (=Luke xxi. 10; cf. above, p. 105) with the conventional apocalyptic warning of wars, earthquakes and famines.<sup>1</sup> It went on at 14 to the Caligula-apocalypse proper with its cryptic warning that the 'abomination of desolation', a neuter noun, followed by the masculine participle, contained a

<sup>1</sup> Luke is responsible for the hellenistic assonance λοιμοί . . . λιμοί for which cf. Creed *ad loc.*; cf. also Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 47 (370B), *Catal. Codd. Astr.* viii, 3, 186. 1. He has also introduced the φόβητρα of 11 (cf. *Catal. Codd. Astr. ibid.* 187) and συνοχή ἔθνων in 25 (*ibid.* 169. 5). The φόβητρα (meteorological portents) might of course come from Josephus (*B.J.* vi, 289 and 297ff.). But they are common form in the books of portents; cf. Lydus, *De Ostentis*, 9c (ed. Wachsmuth), going back to 'Petosiris', who with 'Nechepso' goes back to the first century A.D. (so Wachsmuth's introduction to Lydus, xxi) or earlier (Festugière, *La Rév. d'Hermès Trismégiste*, 1, p. 77, puts these compilations in the 2nd century B.C.). Astrology and meteorology are not distinct sciences for purposes of prognostication; but Luke would hardly have inserted portents here if he had not felt that the purely astrological portents which he gives from Mark needed reinforcement. Cf. also Vettius Valens 196. 10f. Kroll (ἀκαταστασία and συνοχή).

hint for the solution of the mystery; it referred to the emperor and his statue.<sup>1</sup>

This apocalypse runs on as a connected whole from 14 to 27, except that the original probably had no reference to false Christs (21-3); the passage breaks the connection and may have been inserted by a Christian editor before Mark, who knew of the prophecy of false Christs which appears in the other collection (5b and 6) from oral tradition; Mark includes both versions; the original apocalypse ended at 27, which indeed left little to be added. Mark, however, added the material 28-32 and wound up with the last paragraph of the βλέπετε source.<sup>2</sup>

It is traditional to hold that Luke simply revised his Marcan source, modifying it so as to make it refer to the fall of Jerusalem when the city had fallen, though the Temple had never been desecrated. But reasons have already been indicated for doubting this, and the full discussion of the whole question by Dodd referred to on p. 103 n. 2 above makes it clear that there is every reason for supposing that Luke is using an earlier form of an apocalyptic utterance, ascribed to Jesus by the tradition of the Church, which foretold the fall of Jerusalem. There is evidence that Jesus did in fact utter warnings to this effect, though there is little doubt that the bulk of the apocalypse was the work of Christian prophets. The relation of Luke's version to the Marcan apocalypse seems to be that he had before him either Mark and the earlier apocalypse which centred on the fall of Jerusalem, and that he combined these two, or alternatively that the βλέπετε source of Mark had been combined with the fall of Jerusalem before it came to Mark; either Mark or a previous reviser substituted Caligula's attempt to set up his statue in the Temple. Luke, however, abandoned the Caligula-apocalypse in favour of the original, which dealt with the fall of Jerusalem. It favours the latter view that Luke at the points noted above (pp. 106f.) has preserved primitive elements which Mark has omitted or changed. The verbal similarity of such verses as Mark xiii. 6 (= Luke xxi. 8),

<sup>1</sup> For the rabbinical and Philonic use of the irregularities of O.T. grammar as revealing important truths, cf. Daube, *The N.T. and Rabbinic Judaism* (forthcoming).

<sup>2</sup> It might be urged that 23 ought to come from the βλέπετε source. But it seems that a warning against being deceived by false Christs was always associated with the prophecy of their appearance. It is quite possible that it was the βλέπετε of 23 that suggested to Mark his conflation of the source with the Caligula-apocalypse.



8 (= 10), 17 (= 25), 26 (= 27), will then be due either to the fact that neither Mark nor Luke have changed the wording of the source, or that Luke has consciously or unconsciously assimilated his version of the source to that which he had before him in Mark. It would seem that the sayings of Mark xiii. 28–31 stood in the common source which preserved the introduction ‘and he spake a parable unto them’ (Luke xxi. 29) from a period when it was still a collection of sayings; it is hard to suppose that Luke would have inserted it into Mark’s coherent discourse. The ending of the discourse in Luke xxi. 34–6 appears to be a composition of Luke, based on the conventional homiletic of the primitive Church.<sup>1</sup>

To the reasons for supposing that Luke has preserved a different, and probably older version of the prophecy, as set out in Dodd’s article, may be added the statement of Eusebius, *H.E.* III, 5, 3, that the Christians of Jerusalem fled to Pella κατά τινα χρησμόν τοῖς αὐτόθι δοκίμοις δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐκδοθέντα. The words should indeed mean that the prophecy was uttered shortly before the war began, though it is doubtful whether the words of Eusebius can be pressed so strictly. In any case such a warning was more likely to be given if the Church was already familiar with warnings of the coming destruction of Jerusalem supposed to come on the authority of Jesus himself. No doubt such prophecies were common at the time; we have the case of Joshua, the son of Ananus, who started prophesying against Jerusalem some four years before the war in a time of peace, and continued to do so till he was killed during the siege (*B.J.* VI, 300). His message is obviously based on O.T. models, such as Jer. xii. 34 and x. 22. In Luke xxi. 24 we have a thoroughly Jewish point of view; Jerusalem will be trodden underfoot by the Gentiles till the time of the Gentiles is fulfilled. Here we have the purely Jewish hope of the restoration of the city in the Messianic age, a hope which would be shared by Jewish Christians, but seems unthinkable in a Gospel written for Gentile Christians after A.D. 70.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There is a striking resemblance to I Thess. v. 2–8 and to the language of *Corp. Herm.* I, 28 and VII, 1 ff. Cf. also Epict. III, 22, 26 (based on Ps.-Plat. *Clitophon* 407A) for this convention in hellenistic literature. The last clause, however, reverts to a purely Jewish apocalyptic vein. Cf. also Rom. xiii. 11 ff. on which see Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, p. 503.

<sup>2</sup> Creed *ad loc.* rightly takes the clause to mean that there is a fixed time for the Gentile domination, and compares Ezek. xxx. 3; he suggests tentatively that it may

There is no reason to doubt that Jesus foretold the destruction of Jerusalem in language similar to that of the apocalyptic writers of the period, which itself was modelled on the language of the Old Testament. His words might have been only a symbolic forecast of the rejection of the people; but it is quite reasonable to suppose that he foresaw that the growing tendency to resort to violence could only end in disaster.<sup>1</sup> The charge brought against Jesus in Mark xiv. 58 suggests that he had used words which could be interpreted as a threat to destroy the Temple.

The Lucan ending of the apocalypse proper (xxi. 28) has nothing to correspond to it in Mark. It looks as though it were an editorial insertion by Luke, who saw the awkwardness of the parable of the fig tree as a sequel to the coming of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven and so went back to the 'beginning' of the signs he had been describing; the language is distinctly Lucan,<sup>2</sup> though this might only

include the thought of Rom. xi. 25; 'The times of the Gentiles are the times of their opportunity to enter the kingdom.' This seems over-subtle; it is true that Paul describes the Redeemer as 'coming from Sion' on the strength of Isa. lix. 20, but there seems no reason to suppose that he contemplated a Messianic kingdom on earth centred at Jerusalem. There is no hint of it in I Thess. iv. 13 ff. or I Cor. xv. 51 ff. His point is that Israel must be converted after the fulness of the Gentiles has been brought in and before the Parousia. The restoration of Jerusalem as the centre of the Messianic kingdom goes back to Dan. ix. 25 (a restoration followed by the cutting-off of the Anointed One; this feature disappears, but the restoration remains in Ps.-Sol. xi. 3 ff., xvii. 25 ff., II Bar. i. 4; cf. Volz, *Die jüdische Eschatologie*, p. 167), while 'the times of the Gentiles' reflect the same kind of Jewish speculation as that of Rev. xi. 2 and xiii. 5.

Another typically Jewish element is the roaring of the sea in 25: for this, cf. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 89 ff.: Jahweh's conquest of the kingdoms of the world is a repetition of his conquest over the primeval chaos of which the sea is a symbol; in Rev. xxi. 1 there is no more sea after the final judgement.

<sup>1</sup> Josephus in general tries to minimize the rebellion as the work of a small number of agitators who misled the people. But in *Antt.* xviii, 4 ff., he or his source dates it back to Judas of Galilee in A.D. 6-7. Even before this there had been risings, in one of which the Temple was nearly burnt down and the treasure plundered (*Antt.* xvii, 254 (= *B.J.* II, 42)). In *Antt.* xviii, 25 Josephus tries to date the beginning of the troubles to the procuratorship of Florus, but this is simply a note added to his source (cf. for his source Hölscher in *P.W.K.* IX, 1991).

<sup>2</sup> ἐπαρῆν appears in Luke-Acts eleven times; in Matthew and Mark only at Matt. xvii. 8. ἐγγίσει three times in Mark, all repeated in Matthew, who has it in other places, two of which are the stereotyped formula ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν; Luke-Acts uses it twenty-four times. ἀπολύτρωσις appears only here in the Gospels; it is used four times by Paul; also three times in Ephesians and twice in Hebrews.

mean that Luke has revised his sources rather thoroughly as he sometimes does. But it is likely that the ending 'on a note of consolation as against terror' (so Creed rightly *ad loc.*) is due to Luke.

For the whole recasting of realized eschatology in an apocalyptic form in this chapter we may compare Luke's other apocalypse from the Q stratum (Luke xvii. 20 ff.). Here we begin with a well-known hellenistic form, an apophthegm of a teacher in reply to a question.<sup>1</sup> Bultmann (p. 24) admits that the saying may be genuine, but that the saying has been given a hellenistic dress which is secondary. But Luke is perfectly capable of rewriting his material in Greek form without altering the contents, as he has done in vii. 2 (contrast the parallel in Matt. viii. 5); Bultmann's objection that the Pharisees are here introduced as the typical opponents, although the Pharisees as such had no interest in the kingdom of God, is remarkable, since (a) the Pharisees here are not introduced as in any way opposing Jesus, while (b) some at least of the Pharisees were followers of Judas of Galilee,<sup>2</sup> just as later Bar-Cochba was recognized as the Messiah by Aqiba.<sup>3</sup>

To this originally isolated saying<sup>4</sup> Luke (or a previous compiler) appends the quite inconsistent apocalypse which he had from the stratum common to him and Matthew. xvii. 22 may indeed be an authentic saying, probably attached to the apocalypse before it reached Luke; it appears to have meant that the time would come when the disciples would look back with regret to the days of Jesus' life on earth, since there seems no other meaning that it could bear; you could not desire to see 'one of the days' after the Parousia. 23 is a doublet of the Marcan saying (xiii. 6, for which cf. above, p. 109). 24 is a conventional saying of futurist eschatology (cf. II Bar. liii. 8), while 25 is added from floating tradition; it may originally have been part of the same saying as 22 (πρῶτον δέ being an editorial addition). The 'days of Noah'<sup>5</sup> may be a futurized version of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Athenaeus, *Deipn.* iv, 55, 162 E; vi, 45, 245 A; Lucian, *Demonax*, 62 (394); Plutarch, *De Lib. Educ.* iv (2 F).

<sup>2</sup> Josephus, *Antt.* xviii, 4.

<sup>3</sup> *G.J.V.* i, 682 ff.; Moore, *Judaism*, i, 89.

<sup>4</sup> For the saying (xvii. 20-1) as meaning 'within you', 'belonging to the spiritual order', and therefore not 'localized' in time, cf. Dodd, *Parables*, p. 84, with which I entirely agree. Bultmann (p. 128) regards this interpretation as 'modernizing'; but it is at least as old as Origen, in *Joh.* xix, 12.

<sup>5</sup> For the hellenized style of the days of Noah and the reason for the addition of the days of Lot, cf. *Hellenistic Elements*, p. 10.

## THE 'LITTLE APOCALYPSE'

a saying contrasting the carelessness of mankind in general and the crisis produced by Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom; but it may be an eschatological warning added by the Church when it amplified his teaching in the apocalyptic sense. 32 is a queerly isolated saying; it may have been introduced by Luke as an appendix to his introduction of the days of Lot, but it may equally well have been a saying of Jesus attached whether rightly or wrongly to the saying of 31, which itself, without the words 'in that day', may well have been used by him in his proclamation of the kingdom. The source has attached to this the floating saying of 33, which Luke has already used in its Marcan position (Luke ix. 24 = Mark viii. 35 = Matt. xvi. 25). It came to him and Matthew in their non-Markan material, but it is more likely to have been transferred by Matthew than by Luke, since Matthew (x. 39) is here collecting materials from various parts of the tradition to compose one of his well worked out discourses, though we cannot assume that all matter common to Luke and Matthew came from a single source. 34 and 35 may be versions of authentic sayings of Jesus interpreted in the conventional apocalyptic sense; but they need not originally have had any such meaning, since they may have been intended as a warning to would-be disciples that they must be prepared to obey the call of Jesus, even if it means leaving all earthly ties behind. As they stand, they are impossible: the compiler has failed to notice that the coming of the Son of Man like a flash of lightning would leave no time to go down from the house-top or to return from the fields.<sup>1</sup> The presumption is that they stood in Luke's source, possibly with no eschatological significance; the would-be disciple must follow without excuses or delay. 37 is frankly unintelligible as futurist eschatology. Matthew has transposed it to come immediately after the appearance of the Son of Man like a flash of lightning and omitted the introductory question; it was a good striking saying and the dramatic atmosphere would conceal the fact that it meant nothing in that position.<sup>2</sup> But as an

<sup>1</sup> Luke's version of 31 seems to come from his source, not from Mark; it preserves in the first half of the verse a semitic parallelism which Luke has hardly invented; there was presumably a similar parallelism in regard to the garment, but this has been omitted in order to bring in the quotation from Gen. xix. 26 and so lead up to Lot's wife.

<sup>2</sup> Allen *ad loc.* explains it as meaning that when the world has become rotten with evil, the Son of Man and his angels will swoop down on it like eagles (or more properly vultures). This involves reading a vast amount into the saying, and frankly

isolated saying from the sphere of realized eschatology, it is a summons to those who wish to enter the kingdom to swoop on it as swiftly as vultures on a carcass.

Thus, as an apocalypse, the whole section is inconsistent; the day is to come like a flash of lightning, yet the hearers must be warned not to delay their flight.<sup>1</sup> The warning suits the situation of a war with Rome. But we are dealing with the Parousia, not ostensibly with the destruction of Jerusalem as one of the signs of its imminence. On the other hand, if we regard the whole passage as a compilation of independent sayings, originally compiled for purposes of preaching and connected by the general theme of the crisis created by the coming of Jesus, which has subsequently been transformed into an apocalypse by a not very intelligent editor, it becomes reasonably intelligible. The editor would have to do no more than to leave out 'And he said also', or words to that effect, and so produce what seemed to be an apocalypse; the difficulty just noticed would not trouble him. The comparison of the coming of the Son of Man to the flash of lightning would set the tone of futurist eschatology, a theme suited to the tense atmosphere of the years before the Jewish rebellion, and the rest would follow almost automatically.<sup>2</sup> But in the original collection there was nothing that was inconsistent with a realized eschatology.

I cannot believe in a comparison of the Son of Man and his angels to carrion-eating birds. Smith suggests that as the vultures will appear if the occasion be given, so will the Son of Man appear at the appointed time. The saying is certainly enigmatic, but this does not seem a very hopeful solution, though it may be the best that the Matthean position allows. <sup>1</sup> Cf. Dodd in *J.R.S.* xxxvii (1947), 53.

<sup>2</sup> It might indeed be argued that Luke himself was the reviser who omitted the introduction of the separate sayings and so made an apocalypse out of a collection of Logia. But the evidence is against this. He has written up the opening question of the Pharisees and Jesus' answer into a hellenistic form and has improved the style of the days of Noah; in the days of Lot his own stylistic methods are obvious. But the rest of the sayings show little, if any, improvement of the style; 34 and 35 are entirely semitic in their parallelism. 36 is presumably due to assimilation to Matthew in view of its omission by D and the Western texts. The variation here (Matthew has two in the field and two at the mill; Luke two in one bed and two at the mill) suggests that the common source circulated in two forms into which a certain amount of variation had crept in during the process of transmission. I should be inclined to suppose that there was an original triad of sayings (field, bed, mill), and that the field dropped out of one, the bed out of the other. (Cf. Matt. vii. 9-10 as against Luke xi. 11-12.) But it is possible that in Matthew's source the bed had been changed to the field by assimilation to the saying of Luke xvii. 31.

CHAPTER XIV  
THE PASSION STORY

NOTE

It is generally agreed that the story of the Passion formed a single unit long before there was any attempt to write a consecutive story of the life and teaching of Jesus in the form of a 'Gospel'. On the other hand the Marcan story presents numerous difficulties and apparent inconsistencies which have often been noted and will concern us in this chapter. Moreover, in the Marcan account we find an alternation between 'the disciples' and 'the Twelve' up to the point at which they all forsook Jesus and fled, which suggests that there may be in Mark a conflation of at least two sources, the Twelve-source which we have already investigated in the earlier part of Mark, and another which follows the ordinary Marcan usage of referring to 'the disciples'. From this point onwards we have not this clue to guide us; none the less it seems possible even without this to isolate the two strands of the narrative with a high degree of probability. In this chapter, except in the latter part of (D), the latter part of the trial before Pilate, I print the suggested reconstruction before the discussion of the evidence. Owing to the difficulty of disentangling the originals at this point, the discussion is put first.

## A. THE LAST SUPPER

It will of course be recognized that in some cases it can only be conjectured whether a particular sentence comes from one source or the other, while in other cases it is possible or probable that elements have been included which did not belong to either.

## DISCIPLES' SOURCE

καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἄζυμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθνον, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ Ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες ἐτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα φάγης τὸ πάσχα; καὶ ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ ἀπαντήσῃ ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ, καὶ ὅπου ἔαν εἰσέλθῃ, εἶπατε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότη ὅτι ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει Ποῦ ἔστιν τὸ κατάλυμά μου ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνάγκαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἔτοιμον· καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν. καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἠτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα. (Mark xiv. 12-16)

καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον Ἰησοῦς ἐκλάσεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν Λάβετε· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου· καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πῖω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. (Mark xiv. 22-5)

πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετὰ μου ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης. ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ τὸ ὀρισμένον πορεύεται, πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ παραδίδεται. καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν πρὸς

## TWELVE-SOURCE

ἦν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας. καὶ ἐζήτησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς πῶς αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ κρατήσαντες ἀποκτείνωσιν. ἔλεγον γὰρ Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ μήποτε ἔσται θόρυβος τοῦ λαοῦ. καὶ Ἰουδᾶς Ἰσκαριώθ, ὁ εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ἀπήλθεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδοῖ αὐτοῖς. οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐχάρησαν καὶ ἐπηγγείλαντο αὐτῷ ἀργύριον δοῦναι. καὶ ἐζήτηε πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαιρῶς παραδοῖ.

(Mark xiv. 1 f., and 10 f.)

[Here followed a sentence of preparation for the Last Supper (p. 119).]

καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα. καὶ ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσθιόντων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με, ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ. ἤρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς κατὰ εἰς Μήτην ἐγώ; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρίβλιον· ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πορεύεται ὡς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ· οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδεται· καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκείνος.

(Mark xiv. 17-21)

καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μετ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαρι-

## THE PASSION STORY

### DISCIPLES' SOURCE

ἑαυτοὺς τὸ τὶς ἂν εἶη ὁ τοῦτο μέλλον  
πράσσειν. (Luke xxii. 21-3)

[The original form of the prophecy of the denial displaced by Luke xxii. 31f.: see below, p. 124.]

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Κύριε, μετὰ σοῦ ἔτοιμός εἰμι καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν καὶ εἰς θάνατον πορεύεσθαι· ὁ δὲ εἶπεν λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ φωνήσει σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ, ἕως [τρὶς?] ἀπαρνήσῃ με<sup>1</sup> μὴ εἰδέναι.  
(Luke xxii. 33f.)

### TWELVE-SOURCE

στήσας εἶπεν λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτοὺς· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. (Luke xxii. 15-18)

[For the probability that Luke xxii. 19a, and perhaps 19b-20, are added by Luke, cf. below, p. 120.]

(ἔγένετο δὲ — ὡς ὁ διακονῶν Luke xxii. 24-6. See below, pp. 121f.)

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τίς μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονῶν; ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔστε οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου· κἀγὼ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ βασιλείαν, ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου καὶ καθήσεσθε ἐπὶ θρόνων τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς κρίνοντες τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. (Luke xxii. 27-30)

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε, ὅτι γέγραπται· Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται. ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ Εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σὺ σήμερον ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δις ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι [τρὶς?] με ἀπαρνήσῃ. ὁ δὲ ἐκπερισσῶς ἔλεγεν Ἐὰν δέη με συναποθανεῖν σοι, οὐ μὴ σε ἀπαρνήσομαι. οὕτως δὲ καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον. (Mark xiv. 27-31)

[Luke xxii. 35-8 probably from unattached tradition.]

It has already been noted (p. 84) that Luke xxi. 37f. may quite well come from the Twelve-source. In any case Mark draws from that source xiv. 1, 2, 10 and 11 (= Luke xxii. 1-6). Mark inserts into it the story of the anointing (xiv. 3-9), which Luke, rightly or wrongly, omits as a doublet of vii. 36ff. (p. 83). There is no evidence that Luke preserves any details of the source which Mark has

<sup>1</sup> If originally there was only one denial (cf. below, p. 132) τρὶς did not stand in the source of Mark xiv. 30 c. In that case με followed ἀπαρνήσῃ as it does in A, fam. 700 and some other MSS.



omitted, or that he is doing anything here but revising Mark. The important feature of the source is that it preserves the intention of the authorities to avoid an arrest on the Passover. There can be little doubt that the fact is correctly stated; Jesus had many supporters from Galilee, and the great festivals were always liable to lead to outbursts of trouble in Jerusalem. The danger had been recognized as early as the days of Herod the Great and certainly had not lessened since then.<sup>1</sup> Whether the compiler of this source had any direct information at his disposal must be left undecided. It is possible that he simply inferred the fact of the decision and the date (two days before the Passover) from the actual course of the events, which fill up precisely two days. On the other hand the knowledge that the arrest and crucifixion took place before the Passover is a striking testimony to the value of the Twelve-source, as against the other tradition which Mark combines with it, and the statement may rest on good authority. The later identification of the Last Supper and Eucharist with the new Passover meal has led to the assumption in the other source that the Last Supper must have been the Paschal Supper, in spite of the impossibility of a crucifixion on the day of the feast itself.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *B. J.* 1, 88, from Nicolas of Damascus (cf. Hölischer in *P. W. K.* 1x, 1974).

<sup>2</sup> Bultmann (p. 282) states dogmatically that the decision of the authorities can only rest on a conjecture from the events, not on authentic information. For this he gives no evidence. Quite apart from the possibility that Joseph of Arimathea and Paul were present, there may have been other members of the Sanhedrin who were converted later. In any case the relations between the Church and leading Pharisees were often reasonably friendly until the fall of Jerusalem. Cf. *Jerusalem*, p. 13 n. 8 and p. 92 n. 36. (Bultmann prefers the reading of D, supported by some old Latin MSS., μήποτε ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ θόρυβος γένηται. But even if the reading be genuine, it implies that the authorities were anxious to avoid an arrest on the feast-day itself, while the reading is fairly obviously an attempt to avoid the difficulty that the crucifixion according to Mark happens on the very day the authorities want to avoid.) His other objections are trivial. (a) The time for making the arrest and carrying out the execution is far too short (two days). But quite apart from the fact that xiv. 1a now comes from Mark's other source the Last Supper, arrest and crucifixion actually occupy only two days, and it is probable that the dating of xiv. 1a is simply an inference from the actual time taken. (b) That the crowds who might cause trouble were already in Jerusalem. But they would not be assembled in the Temple and ready to riot on any excuse, as they would on the day itself. (c) It is not clear why the time should be too short if the authorities and Pilate had been warned to be ready to deal with a dangerous agitator whose arrest was imminent—an obvious and elementary precaution.

For a full discussion of attempts to reconcile Mark with the Fourth Gospel

At xiv. 12 Mark goes over to his other source, and 'the disciples' ask where the preparations are to be made for the Paschal meal. The Twelve-source must have had some statement to the effect that Jesus made arrangements for a last meal with his disciples; but the statement need have been no longer than John xiii. 1 which may actually be based on this source, translated into terms of Johannine theology. It might seem that such a discrepancy in the dating was fatal to the credibility of the Marcan record; in fact it is characteristic of all but a few of the ancient historians to fail to reconcile their chronology; they are concerned with personalities, and often with propagandist distortions, and indifferent to such details as actual dating.<sup>1</sup> All that can be said of Mark's Disciples' source is that it has, by the time it reached Mark, been harmonized with an ecclesiastical tradition, while his Twelve-source has not.

At 17 Mark again goes over to the Twelve-source, which is continued as far as 21, where it gives way to the other, the break being clearly marked by the clumsy καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν of 22

cf. Rawlinson, Additional Note 7, p. 262. But it is not really a question of harmonizing Mark with John, but Mark with Mark. The view of Str.-B. (ii, 846ff.) that there were two Passovers that year seems extremely far-fetched.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Macan, *Herodotus, Books VII-IX*, 2. 267 for Herodotus. As showing the chronological confusions possible even in regard to events of the highest historical importance, Herodotus' story of Artemisium may be taken as a specimen. Here the storm that damaged the Persian fleet according to VII, 191 lasted for three days. 192 begins: 'So the storm stopped on the fourth day. But the lookouts on the Euboean hills ran down on the second day and told the Greeks of the wrecking of the fleet. And when they heard of it, they hastened back to Artemisium with all speed', apparently exposing themselves to the storm for two days. After the storm the Persians, in spite of their losses, send 200 ships round Euboea to cut off the Greek fleet in the Euripus; but fortunately a 'second' storm springs up and wrecks this squadron off the hollows of Euboea. Obviously the Persian admiral would be more likely to send his encircling force off as soon as he could, and not wait until he had reached Aphetae. Herodotus has simply combined his various stories of Artemisium by copying them out one after another without any serious attempt to synchronize them. He has thus produced a narrative which is nonsense as it stands, though the actual order of events can be reconstructed with fair accuracy. It would seem that the 'three days' of the storm are due to the fact that Scyllias the diver, who deserted to the Greeks, did not arrive until two days after the storm. For the whole, cf. Munro in *C.A.H.* IV, 287ff. Yet Artemisium was one of the battles which saved Greece from the barbarian, and one might expect an accurate account of the order of events to have been preserved. On the other hand it may be doubted whether even one of those who had been present at the Last Supper might not, under the influence of later theological developments, have allowed the later development to overrule the demands of chronological accuracy, a conception which would have meant nothing to him.

repeating the *καὶ ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν* of 18; in the source 22 will have followed immediately on 16. Meanwhile, it is of interest to note that Luke in his account of the prophecy of Judas' betrayal has followed neither Mark nor the Twelve-source; his version is much shorter, and in the critical sentence (Luke xxii. 22) substitutes *πλὴν οὐαὶ* for Mark's *οὐαὶ δέ*; Luke does not use *πλὴν* when left to his own devices, and the Greek is definitely inferior to Mark's. On the other hand it is probably from the Twelve-source that he drew his narrative of the institution of the Eucharist in 14-16. For that source is aware that the Last Supper is not the Paschal meal; Jesus explains that he was most anxious to eat the Passover with his disciples, but that events have made this impossible. It seems that Luke after inserting the account of the preparation for the Last Supper from Mark (it would be interesting to speculate on the possibility that his 'Peter and John' were drawn from whatever account the Twelve-source gave of that preparation) went straight on to his account of the Last Supper in xxii. 15-18. Quite possibly it was the mere verbal association of the word *πάσχα* that led him to do so; xxii. 14 represents his own revision of Mark, 'the Apostles' being substituted for 'the Twelve', just as at vi. 13, where Mark's statement that Jesus appointed Twelve to be with him, and to be used as emissaries when needed, has been changed to 'he called them Apostles' and so institutes the apostolate of the later Church. Meanwhile Luke had to harmonize the account of the Twelve-source with the general tradition and usage of the Church with regard to the Eucharist and proceeded to insert at least xxii. 19a (cf. Creed *ad loc.*). By the time he has done this he has passed over the point at which the Twelve-source, as followed by Mark, reproduced the prophecy of Judas' betrayal. But the Disciples' source also recorded it immediately after the story of the institution, and Luke inserts its account in spite of its brevity and its inferior Greek. It may perhaps be suggested that the fact that Luke has gone over for these verses to the Disciples' source suggests that he may have done so at 19 and that the preference for the shorter text of the Lucan narrative of the institution may not be so well assured as is generally held.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the view that 15 means that Jesus had hoped to eat the Passover with the disciples, but found that it would be impossible, cf. Burkitt and Brooke quoted by Creed *ad loc.* In regard to the institution of the Eucharist the shorter version of the

Luke goes on to the story of the quarrel for precedence, xxii. 24-6. The passage presents some peculiar problems. In the Marcan version (x. 42) those who 'seem' to rule the Gentiles represent an almost classical *nuance* of irony, which appears in Paul and in Luke viii. 18; but in this passage while δοκεῖ reappears in Luke xxii. 24 it is in the normal sense of 'to be reputed to be' without reference to whether the reputation is true or not.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand Luke has also hellenized the saying by his introduction of εὐεργέται, a common title of hellenistic kings. The similarity of language between

Western text (D and the Old Latin) has been almost universally accepted since the days of Hort, and it may be right. But it is only a Western text (for the old Syriac, cf. Creed *ad loc.*). Since it cannot be assumed that the Western text must be right, we have to consider the possible motives for omission or insertion. It would be natural to harmonize Luke's narrative with the tradition of the Church, though it does not quite appear why the interpolator should have recourse to I Cor. xi. 23 ff. rather than to Mark. On the other hand it would be quite easy for the Western text to omit 19 b and 20 as a doublet of the preceding verses in spite of the reversal of the order of bread and cup. Further, the later tendency would be to omit the crucial formula of the rite, just as the formulae of a mystery-rite were not revealed except to initiates, and just as Judaism withdrew from public worship, and even from reproduction in books, the actual words of the decalogue (cf. *Gentiles*, p. 29). Thus it is quite possible that if Luke reproduced from I Corinthians the formulae of the Pauline Churches, simply substituting them for the Marcan formula, a later copyist would suppress them, and so, like Mark, leave no clue to the outsider that he is recording the establishment of the Christian rite, and not merely a touching story of the last night of Jesus before his Passion. It is to be observed that while the Marcan story has not the command, 'Do this', it presupposes that the Church has always observed the Eucharist as a carrying on of the rite which Jesus instituted. And it is quite possible that Mark omitted it for the reasons suggested above.

<sup>1</sup> I cannot agree with Kittel in *T.W.Z.N.T. s.v.* that the classical contrast between δοκεῖν and εἶναι plays no role in the New Testament, and that there is no need to suspect an ironical implication in Paul's use of the word in Gal. ii. 2 ff. Even if the word could simply mean here 'to be reputed' the repetition of the phrase four times between Gal. ii. 2 and 9 and its reappearance in vi. 3 (where we have a definite contrast between 'seeming to be something' and 'being nothing') are fatal to his view. In one of the parallels quoted by him, Josephus, *Antt.* xix, 307, there would seem to be the same implication; Petronius is rebuking the people of Dora for an anti-semitic outbreak, and says that those 'who seem' to be in authority at Dora claimed that the outbreak was not due to their policy but to the violence of the mob; here it adds point that while they 'seem' to be in authority, they cannot control it. Similarly Luke viii. 18 must mean not 'what he is reputed to have', but what he 'seems to have' when really he has nothing. In Mark x. 42 it is singularly pointless to talk of those who are 'reputed' to rule over the Gentiles, presumably referring to the Roman empire, unless it is intended to suggest that the rulers of the Gentiles are not really all that they suppose themselves to be. The phrase seems to be due to Christian irony, and to come from a better stratum of Greek than is common in Mark.

Mark x. 42-4 and Luke xxii. 24-6 is strong, when allowance is made for a small amount of stylistic revision by Luke. On the other hand Luke xxii. 27 has no close Marcan parallel; but it contains a contrast between 'serving' and 'sitting at meat' which might explain Luke's reason for inserting the whole passage at this point. As against this, however, it must be noted that John xiii. 13-15 deals with the same theme at the Last Supper; and the Fourth Gospel shows signs of acquaintance with a source which may have been the Twelve-source (cf. above, pp. 78 and 119). Moreover, the Johannine incident of the foot-washing is far more intelligible if it is a dramatization of a saying of the nature of Luke xxii. 27 and John xiii. 14, already associated with the Last Supper, than if it is entirely due to the evangelist, since the whole of John xiii. 1-39 seems intended to do justice to the tradition (except in so far as it has been anticipated in vi) before going on to the final 'revelation' of the farewell discourse. There is thus reason to suppose that a quarrel for precedence leading up to the saying of xxii. 27, but without 25 and 26, reached Luke and the Fourth Evangelist as part of the tradition of the Last Supper; they had presumably been attracted to that position by the allusion to sitting at meat. Luke had omitted the quarrel for precedence of Mark x. 35 ff., possibly out of respect for the Twelve, more probably out of a mere failure to insert it into the mass of non-Markan material which he uses to fill up the Marcan journey to Jerusalem. He inserts 24-6 here as an introduction to 27 which already stood here in the Twelve-source. (It is of course possible that Luke inserted the whole section 22-7 himself; but it is not clear why he should have done so, or why there should be this coincidence with the Fourth Gospel.) Naturally there will have been some slight editing to allow for the insertion of 25 and 26: ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἄλλ' will in this case be a Lucan insertion.

The verses that follow in Luke (xxii. 28-30) may well have stood in the Twelve-source. In their present Lucan position they furnish a dramatic climax to the story of Jesus' dealings with the Twelve, only to be followed by their failure at the critical moment. The δέ of 28 would be far more appropriate if the saying of the preceding verse stood alone than it is in its present Lucan position immediately after Jesus has been rebuking the Twelve for their ambition. The saying must have existed as a piece of

unattached tradition, since Matthew, who only knows the Twelve-source through the medium of Mark, has a version of it which he inserts at xix. 28 before his reproduction of Mark x. 29. The closing words, 'Ye shall sit on' ['twelve' in Matthew alone] 'thrones, judging the Twelve tribes of Israel', are identical in Matthew and Luke apart from Matthew's repetition of 'twelve' and a trifling change of order; on the other hand the opening clauses have not a single word in common. It would seem that the actual promise became crystallized at a very early stage of the tradition; it is possible that the Lucan version with its allusion to eating and drinking contains an original element, and that it was this which led to its attachment to the Last Supper. The fact that at this moment there ought to be only eleven disciples and eleven thrones shows that the Last Supper cannot have been the original setting, but Luke or the compiler of the Twelve-source evidently failed to notice the point.

A change of sources is apparent at Mark xiv. 26. The source from which he drew the narrative of the institution closed the Last Supper with the Hallel and the departure to the Mount of Olives; from it he goes over to the Twelve-source and is thus guilty of the clumsiness of making the prophecy of Peter's denial take place while Jesus and his disciples are making their way through the streets to the Mount of Olives. Such clumsiness need cause no surprise. It is to be noted that it is the source which Mark follows in xiv. 27-31 which alone preserves the striking feature of the second cock-crow; a single cock-crow with one or three denials, or three cock-crows and three denials, or three cock-crows and one denial would conform to the normal standards of popular story-telling, but the two cock-crows for three denials are scarcely explicable except as a genuine historical reminiscence; the improbability of the detail has led to its disappearance from many of the best MSS.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>  $\delta\varsigma$  here is omitted by  $\aleph$ , C, D and most of the old Latin MSS.; but it is found in A, B and (after ἀλέκτορα) in  $\Theta$  and fam. 13; it is found in all but two minuscules. Quite apart from the ease with which such a word could drop out, the omission is to be explained by the pointlessness of 'twice' in this kind of literature.  $\aleph$  almost alone is consistent in removing ἐκ δευτέρου in 72. Matthew omits the detail for the same reason (Luke seems to have a different source). It is clear from Str.-B. on Matt. xxvi. 34 that the prohibition of keeping poultry in Jerusalem was one of the ideal rules that were not kept, even if they were not invented for the first time after the fall of the city. To suppose an allusion to the Roman watches or to one cock answering another (cf. Rawlinson *ad loc.*) is quite unnecessary.

Meanwhile Luke (xxii. 31 ff.) avoids the clumsiness of Mark's transition from one source to the other. It is possible that his version of the prophecy of Peter's denial is that of the Disciples' source, Mark's being, as has been seen, that of the Twelve-source. On the other hand we should expect a transition from one source to another with so marked a change of subject to be introduced by, 'And he said'; this of course cannot be pressed, since while it is clear that Luke has often preserved such introductions, we cannot say how often he may not have eliminated them. Further, the wording of 31 f. is suspicious in itself. The doubled address Σίμων, Σίμων is rare and only Lucan in the N.T. (Luke x. 41 (Martha) and the 'Saul, Saul' of Acts ix. 4, xxii. 7 and xxvi. 14). Further, the contrast between the position of Peter and the rest of the disciples implied by the contrast between ὑμᾶς and σοῦ seems to go beyond anything in the authentic tradition in the pre-eminence it ascribes to Peter over the rest of the Twelve. Bultmann (p. 288) points out that his πίστις and ἐπιστρέψας reflect the language of the hellenistic mission; his general interpretation is coloured by his determination to show that we have in Luke a tradition which knew nothing of Peter's denial until it was inserted in the period of the controversy about Gentile converts and Peter's part in it. This I can only regard as fantastic. What we have in Luke xxii. 33 f. is the prophecy of the denial as it stood either in Mark or in one of his sources. But the opening of it has been replaced by the saying of 31 f. which reflects the later controversy between Peter and Paul, leaving a hopelessly abrupt transition from the theme of the twelve thrones; incidentally it enabled Luke to suppress the prophecy of resurrection appearances in Galilee which were not found in his tradition.<sup>1</sup>

The sayings of Luke xxii. 35-8 seem to have come to Luke from some source which he regarded as reliable; the peculiar character of their teaching would have secured their omission, if he had not felt

<sup>1</sup> The difference in the actual wording of Luke xxii. 33 and Mark xiv. 29 might be due simply to Luke's dislike of σκάνδαλον and its derivatives. Thus at xvii. 1 he uses the word only once (it could not be entirely avoided), while Matt. xviii. 7 has it three times. This might be merely stylistic; but he uses σκανδαλίζεσθαι twice only (vii. 23 and xvii. 2) whereas Mark uses it eight times. On the other hand there is no verbal identity between Luke xxii. 33 f. and Mark xiv. 29 f. except for the key-words which could not be avoided, and only a single cock-crow. My own impression is that Luke has followed one of the sources and not Mark, but this is quite uncertain.

bound to include them; they may have stood in one of Mark's sources and been omitted by him because he felt their difficulty. On the whole the least unsatisfactory explanation seems to be that of Bertram (*Leidensgeschichte Jesu*, p. 48) that 36 and 38 are floating sayings of the Zealot movement which have somehow made their way into the Christian tradition. The βαλλάντιον of 35 shows that we are dealing with a Lucan reference back to x. 4;<sup>1</sup> the *testimonium* of 37 may also be due to Luke; the supposed saying will have reached Luke in the form ὁ ἔχων πῆραν ἀράτω καὶ ἀγορασάτω μάχαιραν· καὶ ὁ μὴ ἔχων πῆραν κ.τ.λ.

## B. GETHSEMANE

## DISCIPLES' SOURCE

καὶ ὑμῆσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἑλαιῶν. (Mark xiv. 26)

καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς χωρίον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανεὶ, καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Καθίσατε ὧδε ἕως προσεύξωμαι, καὶ παραλαμβάνει τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἕως θανάτου· μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε. καὶ προελθὼν μικρὸν ἐπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ προσηύχετο ἵνα εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν, παρέλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα, καὶ ἔλεγεν Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, πάντα δυνατὰ σοι· παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· ἀλλ' οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλὰ τί σύ.

(Mark xiv. 32-42)

καὶ ἔρχεται καὶ εὕρισκει αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ·

(Mark xiv. 37a)

[The wording here has been lost owing to a Marcan insertion, p. 126.]

## TWELVE-SOURCE

καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη κατὰ τὸ ἔθος εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἑλαιῶν. (Luke xxii. 39) [ἠκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ Lucan editorial.]

γενόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν. καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λίθου βολῆν, καὶ θεὸς τὰ γόνατα προσηύχετο. ὦφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν, καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχῆς ἔλθων πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς (Luke xxii. 40-5a) εὗρεν αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας καὶ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν τί ἀποκριθῶσιν αὐτῷ. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε; ἀπέχει. [For the punctuation and meaning cf. Rawlinson *ad loc.*] ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα, ἴδου παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν.

(Mark xiv. 40-1)

<sup>1</sup> For other interpretations cf. Creed *ad loc.* It may be noted that both Theudas and the Egyptian promise to repeat the miracles of Joshua; in Josephus, *Antt.* xx, 97 Theudas is going to divide the waters of Jordan; *ibid.* 167 the Egyptian will make the walls of Jerusalem fall down flat. Did they merely claim to do this, or did they also claim to be Jesus returning for his final triumph and Joshua *redivivus* at the same time? We cannot rule out the possibility that they tried to enlist Christian support by circulating sayings purporting to come from Jesus himself. Cf. *Hellen. Elem.* p. 26.



## SYNOPTIC GOSPELS I

### DISCIPLES' SOURCE

ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν· ἰδοὺ ὁ παραδιδούς με ἤγγικεν. (Mark xiv. 42) δεδώκει δὲ ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτὸν σύσσημον αὐτοῖς λέγων Ὅν ἂν φιλήσω αὐτός ἐστιν· κρατήσατε αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπάγετε ἀσφαλῶς. καὶ ἔλθων εὐθύς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ λέγει Ῥαββεί, καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν· οἱ δὲ ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν. (Mark xiv. 44-6)

εἰς δὲ τις τῶν παρεστηκότων σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν ἔπαισεν τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτάριον. (Mark xiv. 47)

### TWELVE-SOURCE

καὶ εὐθύς ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰούδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. (Mark xiv. 43) καὶ ἤγγισεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλήσαι αὐτόν. Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἰούδα, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδως; (Luke xxii. 47f.)

καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ὅς ἐπὶ ληστήν ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων συλλαβεῖν με; καθ' ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με· ἀλλὰ ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί. καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον πάντες.

(Mark xiv. 48-50)

καὶ νεάνισκός τις συνηκολούθει αὐτῷ περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ καταλιπὼν τὴν σινδόνα γυμνὸς ἔφυγεν. (Mark xiv. 51f.)

[Sentences written across both columns might come from either source or from independent tradition.]

Mark's account of the scene in Gethsemane (xiv. 32 ff.) resumes the Disciples' source, which Mark left at 26; he follows it up to 38, where he substitutes for Jesus' words to Peter a piece of fine rhetorical prose, drawn perhaps from a Christian sermon.<sup>1</sup> Luke follows the Twelve-source, which, as has been seen above (p. 84), regards Jesus as spending his nights on the Mount of Olives; so here it simply assumes that there was a regular place, known to Judas, and does not mention the name; incidentally Luke, by following this source, avoids the barbarous name of the garden. It might seem to tell against the view that Luke's version is drawn from the Twelve-source that in xxii. 39 we read 'and the disciples followed him'. Luke might easily have changed the word by mere inadvertence. On the other hand it is more likely that the source did not mention the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Hellenistic Elements*, p. 3. Of course it is possible that the piece of fine writing was due to the original translator of the source from Aramaic into Greek, but I am inclined to suspect Mark himself.

Twelve at this point, and that the words were inserted by Luke himself; the source might well have omitted to mention the presence of the subordinate figures.<sup>1</sup> The remarkable fact is not that Luke should have inserted 'disciples' into a section from the Twelve-source, but that elsewhere in general he follows Mark or Mark's source with such accuracy. It might seem from the closeness with which both preserve the wording of this source that they regarded it as peculiarly authoritative.<sup>2</sup>

If, however, the source did not mention the fact that the disciples followed, Luke might easily add his explanation for the sake of clarity.

His account of the agony in the garden is drawn from a different source from Mark's and is noticeable for its insistence on the purely human aspect of Jesus' facing of the cross. The details were too strong for many of the copyists<sup>3</sup> who suppressed them. On the other hand it seems probable that the source did not give the words

<sup>1</sup> Cf. above, p. 10, n. 2. Thus in Mark vii. 1 Jesus appears to be engaged in a private controversy with the Pharisees; but at 14 we hear of a crowd in the background, while at 17 it is assumed that the disciples were present, presumably from the beginning. Similarly in iv. 1 ff. we do not learn of the disciples' presence till 'those about him with the Twelve' emerge at 10; in v. 21 ff. they appear in the same way. For the introduction of disciples where they did not appear in the source cf. Matt. xxiii. 1 and Luke xx. 45 as against Mark xii. 37f., perhaps to point out that the 'disciples' had taken the warning to heart, while 'the crowd' had not. Here the motive will have been merely editorial.

<sup>2</sup> At xxii. 14 he has changed Mark's 'twelve' to 'Apostles', but he identifies Mark's twelve with the later apostolate (cf. p. 120). Otherwise he preserves Mark's 'twelve' but does not use it elsewhere. The only exception is ix. 12: he preserves Mark's ἀπόστολοι at ix. 10, but in his much abbreviated introduction writes δώδεκα for Mark's μαθηταί at 12. (xvii. 5, where the Apostles appear, may quite well come from the Twelve-source; Mark's version of the saying (xi. 22f.) is from a different source. But this can only be conjectured.) With Matthew he substitutes 'disciples' for the clumsy 'those about him with the twelve' of Mark iv. 10 (viii. 9 = Matt. xiii. 10); here however we have a Marcan insertion, not the Twelve-source (p. 42). Matthew in general blurs the distinction by writing 'the twelve disciples'. But like Luke he reserves this term for passages drawn from the Twelve-source.

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of the textual evidence cf. Creed *ad loc.* The motive for omission is shown by the reference to Epiphanius given by him *loc. cit.* It may be added that Marcion would find them equally difficult to accept. An insertion on anti-docetic grounds seems quite incredible. For though the Church in the end succeeded in avoiding docetism, it would never have gone to such lengths as this in insisting on the Lord's humanity. The preservation of the details can only be explained if they stood in a source regarded as of the highest authority; even so Mark omitted them.

of Jesus' prayer. Luke xxii. 42a would seem to be simply a Lucan revision of Mark xiv. 36, though we have to allow for the possibility that the words would be preserved in a more or less fixed form from a very early date and so might stand in more than one source. It is, however, more probable that the Twelve-source had no record of the words and that Luke has supplied the lack from Mark, or in view of the non-Markan *πλήν* from Mark's source, Mark having slightly revised the wording.

The next section of the story (Mark xiv. 37-46 and Luke xxii. 45 f.) presents several difficulties. At xiv. 41 Jesus is reconciled to the fact that the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners; yet at 42 he appears to contemplate flight. Further, the entirely colourless departure of Jesus in 39 and his return (which only serves to emphasize the fact that the disciples are asleep, and to explain the reason) are rather suspicious; they add nothing to the story but they provide a means of triplicating the incident of the return to the disciples. Such a triplication would be natural if there were two stories, each of which had one story of the return; to raise the number to three would be automatic. In both narratives the disciples are asleep; how much of the detail given in Mark xiv. 40 comes from one of his sources but was attached to the one visit to the sleeping disciples, and how much, if any of it, is due to Mark's editing must be largely a matter of subjective judgement; in the suggested reconstruction I have put down what appears to be the bare minimum. At Mark xiv. 38 the original saying of Jesus to the disciples has been replaced by the piece of homiletic prose noted above; it is possible that the original has been preserved in Luke xxii. 46, where Luke's much less impressive wording may represent his preference for the source which he copied *verbatim*, overlooking, somewhat carelessly, Mark's piece of fine writing. The source went on with the command to rise and be going; apparently it supposed that Jesus contemplated an attempt to escape, since this is the natural meaning of the words.

The Twelve-source on the other hand can be reconstructed by the omission of the quite colourless departure of Jesus and his return to the disciples in Mark xiv. 39 and 40; it is of course possible that 40b has been taken from this source (cf. above, p. 125), but it is equally possible that Luke has drawn his somewhat different wording of xxii. 45b from it. Mark has then inserted the opening

'he comes for the third time' since his source had only one visit, and then gives the rhetorical question of Jesus (if that be the correct punctuation), and the rest of 41; the hour is come and the Son of Man is delivered into the hands of sinners. There is no suggestion of an attempt to escape.

There is similar evidence of conflation in the story of Judas. In 44 he is ὁ παραδιδούς, as in 42; the Twelve-source alone preserves the name of Judas 'the one of the Twelve'. Mark has broken up the story of the Twelve-source, inserting into it the narrative of the traitor's kiss and possibly the story of the High Priest's servant; there seems no reason for ascribing this detail to one source rather than the other, except perhaps that the Twelve-source at this point is somewhat longer than the Disciples' source; there is some probability that they would be more or less equal in length, which gives a very slight reason for ascribing the incident to the shorter. It would seem that Luke took the story from Mark; his use of ἀφείλεν (xxii. 50) here is decisive, since the word is by no means a natural one.<sup>1</sup> Thus we have in Mark xiv. 43 an extract derived from the Twelve-source in which 'Judas one of the twelve' appears with a crowd. There was presumably in the other source some description of the followers to whom he gave the sign of the kiss, but this has been reduced to αὐτοῖς in Mark xiv. 44 in consequence of the insertion of the crowd of xiv. 43 drawn from the Twelve-source. It is more difficult to decide whether Luke xxii. 47f. represents the account given by this source of the kiss of Judas. Since the source regards Jesus as spending every night on the Mount of Olives, and seems to be responsible for the mention of 'the place' as one which was well known (p. 84), it is probable that it regarded Judas' betrayal as consisting in leading the multitude to the place where Jesus could be found, not simply in identifying him by the kiss. Thus it is possible that it had no account of the kiss; in this case the Lucan version will represent a revision of Mark. (Cf. Creed, p. 272.) Luke is capable of fairly considerable alterations as is shown by the healing of the wounded servant of the High Priest; on the other hand it seems doubtful whether the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch z.N.T.*<sup>4</sup> s.v. The use seems about as unnatural as it would be to say in English 'removed his ear'. It appears to be derived from the LXX, in which it is fairly common for 'removing' the head of a criminal by decapitation (Gen. xl. 19, etc.). Cf. Ezek. xxiii. 25.

motives for the change ('it heightens the dramatic effect, and also shows Jesus to be cognisant of Judas's intention') are adequate; *ex hypothesi* Jesus has been cognisant of Judas' intention since xxii. 21. Here a decision can only be reached on the ground of a subjective view of the probabilities. It should be remembered that the kiss of identification might well be necessary, as well as the leading of the crowd to the place where Jesus was to be found; granted the darkness and confusion of the occasion, the possibility that Jesus would escape by allowing a follower to be arrested in his place, and the general incompetence of the police methods of the ancient world, some act of identification might be necessary.

It is possible that in Mark xiv. 49 we have some amplification of the story of the Twelve-source; 'that the Scriptures may be fulfilled' may represent the belief of the later Church that the Passion was a fulfilment of prophecy. Mark xiv. 50 seems to represent the end of this section of the narrative in the Twelve-source, which thus describes the failure of the Twelve at the critical moment; the detail of the young man (xiv. 51f.) may have stood in it, but it seems quite impossible to identify the source from which it came. It has of course been suggested that it is Mark himself, the view being based on the absence of any other explanation; but in view of the Jewish horror of nakedness<sup>1</sup> the point of the story may be to show the general state of panic that prevailed. In any case there is no reason for ascribing it to Mark himself, if Mark is regarded as the final compiler of the Gospel, rather than to the compiler of one or other of the two sources. If it is to be ascribed to either of them, the Twelve-source may perhaps claim a certain preference in view of the fact that the preceding verse comes from it. For the incident is so apparently pointless that it is omitted by Matthew and Luke and it is more likely to have been included as a continuation of 50 than inserted from a source which Mark had abandoned at 46 or 47.

<sup>1</sup> *Gentiles*, p. 137.

C. THE TRIAL BY THE SANHEDRIN  
AND PETER'S DENIAL

## DISCIPLES' SOURCE

καὶ ἀπήγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ συνέρχονται πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς. (Mark xiv. 53)

οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον ἐζήτησαν κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαρτύριον εἰς τὸ θανατώσαι αὐτὸν καὶ οὐχ ἠύρισκον. πολλοὶ γὰρ ἔψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἴσαι αἱ μαρτυρίαι οὐκ ἦσαν. καὶ τινες ἀναστάντες ἔψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες ὅτι Ἠμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλίψω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποιήσων οἰκοδομήσω. καὶ οὐδὲ οὕτως ἴση ἦν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτῶν. καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσον ἐπηρώτησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λέγων Οὐκ ἀποκρίνη οὐδέν; τί οὗτοι σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν; ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπα καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν. πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Ἐγὼ εἰμι καὶ ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς διαρρήξας τοὺς χιτῶνας αὐτοῦ λέγει τί χρεῖαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων; ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας· τί ὑμῖν φαίνεται; οἱ δὲ πάντες κατέκριναν αὐτὸν ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτου. (Mark xiv. 55-64)

καὶ ὄντος τοῦ Πέτρου κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ ἔρχεται μία τῶν παιδισκῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον θερμαινόμενον ἐμβλέψασα αὐτῷ λέγει Καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ ἦσθα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ· ὁ δὲ ἠρνήσατο λέγων Οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι τί σὺ λέγεις. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον (καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν?).

(Mark xiv. 66-8)

## TWELVE-SOURCE

Συλλαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἤγαγον καὶ εἰσήγαγον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως. (Luke xxii. 54a) (?)

καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ Προφήτευσον· καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται βασιλεύμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον. (Mark xiv. 65)

καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ἕως ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλήν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, καὶ ἦν συνκαθήμενος μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν καὶ θερμαινόμενος πρὸς τὸ φῶς. (Mark xiv. 54)

καὶ (διαστάσης ὡσεὶ ὥρας μιᾶς Luke xxii. 59?) οἱ παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον τῷ Πέτρῳ Ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ· καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ· ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύειν ὅτι Οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἀνθρώπον τοῦτον ὃν λέγετε· καὶ εὐθύς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.

(Mark xiv. 70b-72a)  
(καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, Luke xxii. 61a?)

καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πρὶν ἀλέκτορα δις φωνῆσαι, ἀπαρνήσῃ με· καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν. (Mark xiv. 72b)

καὶ εὐθύς πρῶτι συμβούλιον ἐτοιμάσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον δῆσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήνεγκαν καὶ παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ (Mark xv. 1.)

The reconstruction suggested above is complicated by the fact that Mark has not only combined the two sources, but has also broken up the account of the denial. The result is that the sources are very much entangled. On the other hand the reconstruction explains several of the notorious difficulties of this part of the story.

Thus Mark xiv. 65, as it stands after the trial, appears to imply that the buffeting was the work of members of the Sanhedrin, while the last clause should mean, 'And the attendants took him into custody with blows' (so Rawlinson *ad loc.*). This is precisely what it did mean originally. But Mark in breaking up his sources has transferred the opening of the Twelve-source's account of the denial from its proper position after 65 to 54. He has, however, failed to transfer 65 leaving it with the rest of the Twelve-source's version of the denial which he inserts after the trial, so that it appears to describe what happened after the condemnation, whereas it really belongs to the reception of Jesus at the High Priest's house after his arrest.<sup>1</sup> The Twelve-source had no trial-story at this point. With regard to the actual story of Peter's denial it may be noted that the second denial is entirely colourless (Mark xiv. 69f.), and at once raises the suspicion of triplication.<sup>2</sup> The suspicion is strengthened by the fact that after his first denial he goes out into the forecourt, and remains there; it is not exactly clear why the maid should join him outside the hall and Matthew (xxvi. 71) changes her into 'another' to avoid the difficulty. In this source his departure was followed by a notice of the cock-crow (it will be remembered that this source knows only of one);<sup>3</sup> it may be asked whether the very well supported insertion of *καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν* at this point (A, C, D, Θ, fam. 1, fam. 13, the Old Latin (except c)) is simply a well-meant attempt to provide

<sup>1</sup> The challenge to Jesus to prophesy need not be related to the covering of his face; it may simply have been a challenge to the 'prophet of Nazareth in Galilee' to show his powers.

<sup>2</sup> For a specimen of triplication, cf. Nicolas of Damascus' account of the offering of the crown to Julius Caesar at the Lupercalia (*Exc. de Ins. in F.G.H.* 90, F 130 (71 ff.)). Here Licinius puts the crown at Caesar's feet, Crassus on his knees, Antony on his head. Plutarch and Suetonius know nothing of this. The latter mentions the placing of a wreath on his statue and several offers of a crown at the Lupercalia by Antony (*Divus Julius*, 79); the former the wreathing of the statue and two offers of the crown by Antony (*Julius Caesar*, 61, *M. Ant.* 12). Cf. Jacoby's note *ad loc.* in *F.G.H.* It would seem that Shakespeare in *Julius Caesar* shows the unconscious tendency to triplication.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, p. 123.

two cock-crows or, if not the correct text, a corruption old enough to go back to a copyist who knew the original text of the source. We cannot argue from its absence in Matthew and Luke since neither of them recognizes two cock-crows. In any case the source recorded a cock-crow here. It may perhaps be from the Twelve-source that Luke derived the note of time 'after about one hour' in xxii. 59, the original meaning being 'about an hour' after Jesus had been brought in; but it is of course possible that the phrase is due to Luke's editing. It would appear that Luke found the triple denial of Mark more attractive than the single denial of the Twelve-source, and so follows Mark here, while in the account of the Agony he gives simply the account of the Twelve-source; on the other hand he follows the source in putting the whole denial-story before the trial.<sup>1</sup> The detail of Luke xxii. 61a may have been drawn from the Twelve-source, in which Jesus is still awaiting his trial at the time of Peter's denial and not yet condemned by the Sanhedrin; but it is of course possible that it is due to Luke's editing of his material.

It is more important to observe that the distinction of sources disposes of the well-known problem of the two trials before the Sanhedrin. The 'trial' may well have been no more than an informal discussion intended to decide on the charges to be brought before Pilate; it was held at a time which could be regarded either as very late in the night or very early in the morning. There is the possibility that the account of the Twelve-source was longer than that shown above, since the πάλιν of Mark xiv. 61 may here as elsewhere (see above, p. 19) imply a duplication of the same incident from two sources. In this case the Twelve-source will have been worked into the other version by Mark; the Lucan introduction to the trial in xxii. 66 might be the opening of it, though the actual trial consists mainly of a piece of Lucan fine writing (cf. *Hellenistic Elements*, p. 11) and a slight revision of Mark in 69; probably 70f. are also taken from Mark. It is, however, possible that we have in Mark xiv. 60-1a the story of the trial (or inquiry) before the

<sup>1</sup> In Mark xiv. 72 as in 30 there is good MS. evidence for the order ἀπαρνῆση με πρὶς (A, Θ, fam. 1, fam. 13, Coptic): με would have to follow ἀπαρνῆση if πρὶς did not appear. At 30 A, fam. 1, syr. sin. Coptic, have με after ἀπαρνῆση. Once again one may ask whether we have a reminiscence of the sources in which there was only one denial.



Sanhedrin, describing merely a questioning of Jesus and his refusal to answer. The apparent discrepancy between Jesus' refusal to answer and his subsequent answer will in this case be due to a conflation of the different traditions of the two sources. There would of course have to be an account of the giving of evidence against Jesus. But this might mean simply that 56 came from the Twelve-source too, while 57ff. (the destruction of the temple) came from the other source; there would in this case be a rather fuller account of the inquiry of the Sanhedrin than the suggested reconstruction allows.

Obviously, however, this is no more than a possibility, and it is perhaps more likely that the Twelve-source contained the bare notice, while the whole story of the trial before the Sanhedrin comes from Mark's other source. The variations in the Lucan story will be due to Luke's editing, or possibly to his independent use of Mark's source. The first refusal of Jesus to answer the witnesses, followed by his direct reply to the High Priest's challenge, involve no necessary inconsistency; whether they are a correct narrative of the events is a question which can only be answered on the ground of our subjective view of the probabilities, and general considerations as to the 'Messianic consciousness' of Jesus and the eschatological element in his original teaching.

In any case there was only one trial before the Sanhedrin (or one inquiry held by it). The 'second' trial of Mark xv. 1 is merely due to a conflation of sources, while Luke's *ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα* in xxii. 64 will represent his editing of the one trial of Mark xv. 1, as he found it in the Twelve-source, followed by the insertion of the trial story of Mark. Thus the puzzle of the two trials is merely due to Mark's failure to harmonize his two sources.

## D. THE TRIALS BEFORE PILATE AND HEROD

## DISCIPLES' SOURCE

καὶ ἀναστὰν ἄπαν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτον. (Luke xxiii. 1, which however is quite likely to be Luke's revision of Mark. In any case the source had a sentence to this effect.)

καὶ κατηγοροῦν αὐτοῦ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς πολλά· ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν Οὐκ ἀποκρίνη οὐδέν; ἶδε πόσα σου κατηγοροῦσιν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη, ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν Πιλάτον. (Mark xv. 3-5)

## TWELVE-SOURCE

καὶ εὐθὺς πρῶτῳ συμβούλιον ἐτοιμάσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ὄλων τῶ συνέδριον δῆσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήνεγκαν καὶ παρέδωκαν Πιλάτῳ.

(Mark xv. 1)

ἤρξαντο δὲ κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ λέγοντες Τοῦτον εὕρομεν διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν καὶ κωλύοντα φόρους Καίσαρι διδόναι καὶ λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν Χριστὸν βασιλέα εἶναι.

(Luke xxiii. 2)

καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πιλάτος Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ λέγει Σὺ λέγεις.

(Mark xv. 2)

The reason for ascribing Mark xv. 1 and 2 to the Twelve-source and 3 and 4 to the Disciples' source in the suggested reconstruction is that it would appear to be the former source which regards Jesus as having been condemned on political grounds, while for the Disciples' source he is condemned as a Messianic pretender. The silence of Jesus before Pilate is more natural in the latter source, since Jesus has already confessed his Messiahship before the Sanhedrin and there is no need for him to repeat it. Moreover this source is concerned to find fulfilments of prophecy in the Passion to a greater extent than the other, and it is likely that the silence of Jesus is intended as a fulfilment of Isa. liii. 7.<sup>1</sup> (πάλιν is again an editorial addition marking the insertion of a doublet of the same incident from a different source.) Up to this point there is a fairly clear distinction between the two sources. In the Disciples' source we have no account of the specific charges brought against Jesus by the High

<sup>1</sup> The Twelve-source has quotations from or allusions to the O.T. only at Mark xiv. 18, 21, 27 and 49 (this may be due to Mark, cf. above, p. 130). The other source, besides identifying the Last Supper with the Paschal meal, has allusions at xiv. 24, 34, 62: for allusions in xv cf. below, p. 144; for Luke xxiii. 30 and 35, see p. 144 n. 3 below. This point can at best have a slight value as confirmatory evidence, but no more: naturally both sources believed that the death of Jesus was 'according to the Scriptures'.

Priests and the rest of the Sanhedrin. 'The whole multitude of them' in Luke xxiii. 1 may come from the Disciples' source; if so, it was intended to suggest that it is the whole Jewish people who are responsible for the accusation. In any case the crowd is present in Mark xv. 8 for no apparent reason, but this need not surprise us.<sup>1</sup> Jesus refuses to answer. In the Twelve-source Jesus is accused of claiming to be 'an anointed king' (Luke xxiii. 2). The Marcan story as it stands is quite unintelligible without this accusation, since Pilate in Mark xv. 2 asks Jesus if he is the king of the Jews, though no one has made any suggestion that he claims to be so; the High Priests have condemned him on the charge of blasphemy and claiming to be the Messiah. It might be held that Luke has invented the charge in order to make sense of Mark's story: but as Burkitt points out (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 139), Luke's phrase Χριστὸς βασιλεὺς, though it gives no proper sense in Greek, is the exact equivalent for the Aramaic *Malka Meshiha* and it is highly unlikely that Luke would have hit on it by chance; the term does not appear elsewhere in the New Testament. On the other hand Mark appears to be concerned to minimize the political aspect of the charges brought against Jesus, while Luke is not; it would seem that he has deliberately omitted the specific charge, although he has preserved the question of Pilate in xv. 2 from the Twelve-source.

But the Disciples' source could not entirely ignore the suggestion that Jesus was the king of the Jews. It might be more concerned to prove that he was the Messiah; but the Messiah was to be a king, and Jesus certainly was the king of Israel. This appears to be the explanation of the reappearance of Jesus' kingship at Mark xv. 9 with the explanation that Pilate knew that the motive of the High Priests was malevolence and therefore did not take the charge seriously.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Jacoby on Nicolas of Damascus' *Life of Augustus* (F.G.H. 90, F130, 70) quoted above, p. 10 n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> For the interpretation of διὰ φθόνον, cf. Fridrichsen in *Eranos* xlv (1946), 166ff. He does not distinguish between different sources of the narrative, but his arguments are even more cogent if the mention of φθόνος is the source's explanation of its first introduction of the question of 'kingship'. For this reason I cannot agree that the verse is an editorial insertion by Mark because φθόνος was the usual term for expressing the attitude of the synagogue to the Church in Rome. Naturally his choice of the actual word may have been dictated by such reasons; but that Pilate recognized that the rulers were acting from malevolence and that there was no serious justification of the charge that Jesus claimed to be a king will have stood in his source.

The attempt to separate the sources at this point is complicated by the Herod incident in Luke. It can, like almost any other incident in the Gospels, be omitted without interrupting the narrative; Luke xxiii. 18 could perfectly well follow 4. Creed (p. 280) inclines to hold that the scene is developed out of the *testimonium* of Ps. ii. 2, as found in Acts iv. 25 f. and there referred to Herod, on the grounds that (1) the story is not in Mark; (2) that Pilate would not send a prisoner to be tried by Antipas within his own jurisdiction; (3) that in Luke xxiii. 10. the rulers are accusing Jesus before Herod while in 15 'they appear to have remained with Pilate to await the prisoner's return'; (4) that the mockery of Jesus by Herod and his soldiers has a strong resemblance to the mockery by the Roman soldiers in Mark xv. 15 which Luke omits. As against these objections it may be noted (1) that Mark is concerned to minimize the political significance of the trial, while Luke admits it; and that (2) is very unconvincing. In Acts xxiii. 34 Felix inquires of what province Paul is, apparently to make sure that he does not come from the jurisdiction of one of the subject kingdoms on the borders of his province; when he hears that he comes from another province of the Empire he proceeds to try him. It is quite probable that some of the extended powers granted to Herod the Great (Josephus, *B.J.* I, 474) were continued to his successors in view of the peculiar difficulties of governing Judaea, while in any case Pilate was not the kind of ruler to care very much about the strict legality of his procedure, and it might well be convenient for him to make friends with Herod at no cost to himself.<sup>1</sup> It is always possible that Pilate sent Jesus to Herod merely to discover how far he was to be treated as a serious agitator (Burkitt, *op. cit.* p. 138, following Verrall's suggestion), in which case the procedure would merely be a variation of that of Festus in Acts xxv. 14 ff.

(3) It is possible that Luke has simply inserted xxiii. 10 to make it clear that the rulers of the Jews were responsible for the crucifixion, and 15a to harmonize Pilate's words with the insertion. The awkwardness of 15a, as the text stands, is such that some of the best MSS. have amended the text with the result that the rulers of the

<sup>1</sup> In any case illegalities were easily perpetrated in an obscure province such as Judaea, cf. Josephus, *Antt.* xviii, 87; *B.J.* II, 272 ff.; Tacitus, *Ann.* xii, 54. For Pilate's character cf. Philo, *Leg. ad G.* 302.

Jews appear as Pilate's *consilium*.<sup>1</sup> But if 10 and 15a (except ἄλλ' οὐδὲ Ἡρώδης) be omitted, we get a quite consistent picture. Pilate hears that Jesus is a Galilean and sends him to Herod; the accusers presumably disperse, expecting that Herod will hold a serious trial, but owing to the shortness of the hearing before Herod they have not returned by the time that Jesus is sent back, and have to be summoned by Pilate. Luke, however, makes the rulers go to Herod to accuse Jesus and has to recognize that Herod's refusal to condemn Jesus must have been already known to them. This sort of confusion is far more likely to result from careless conflation of sources than from inventive incompetence on the part of the evangelist.<sup>2</sup> Thus it is quite possible that Luke's source contained the Herod incident when it reached Luke; but it is of course possible that Luke found it in some other account or derived it from tradition. This seems far more likely than that Luke invented the incident to fulfil the prophecy of Ps. ii. 2, but was guilty of the blunder of making Pilate convene the rulers and the people at 13. But he is quite capable of including the Herod incident and then inserting 15a to harmonize his two stories. In any case the similarity of wording as

<sup>1</sup> Creed prefers here ἀπέπεμψεν γὰρ αὐτὸν πρὸς ἡμᾶς,  $\aleph$ , B, L,  $\Theta$  to ἀπέπεμψα γὰρ ὑμᾶς πρὸς αὐτόν of A, D, W and the Latin and Syriac versions on the ground that the latter is intolerably weak and has been altered to avoid the inconsistency with 10. But Blass-Debrunner (*N.T. Gramm.*<sup>7</sup> (1943) § 280) do not recognize any clear case of the 'widespread tendency' to use ἡμεῖς for ἐγὼ except in Hebrews and John i. 4. There is no case in the Lucan writings, and the situation precludes the idea of Pilate identifying himself with the Jews. On the other hand 'I sent you to him', though weak as a report of Pilate's speech, is perfectly intelligible as an insertion to harmonize this section with the previous narrative.

<sup>2</sup> Evangelists must not be expected to be too skilful in handling their subsidiary figures. In Nicolas of Damascus' *Life of Augustus*, in addition to the case noted above (p. 10 n. 2) we find that in 81 the conspirators choose the occasion of a gladiatorial show for the assassination, as it would be easy to secure arms without exciting suspicion; in 92 the people rush from the theatre, 'for they happened to be watching gladiators'; in 94 the conspirators are accompanied by servants and gladiators prepared for the purpose, while in 98 the employment of the gladiators leads to the remark 'for there were contests at the time'. For the composite character of the narrative at this point, cf. Laqueur in *P.W.K.* xvii, 410ff., and C. M. Hall, *Nicolas of Damascus' Life of Augustus* (Smith College Classical Studies, 1923). For an equally slovenly bit of composition, cf. Josephus, *B.J.* iv, 530 and 553. In the former passage we read that Hebron is older than Memphis; in the latter it is 'a very ancient city, and lies, as I have said, in the hill-country not far from Jerusalem'. In fact Josephus has not described its situation, except by implication in 530ff. The only detail repeated is the antiquity of Hebron which is not really covered by the 'as I have said'.

between xxiii. 2 and 14 indicatés that they came from the same source.<sup>1</sup>

(4) The mocking of Jesus by Herod has no very close similarity to the story of Mark xv. 16ff.; the only common detail is the putting of a robe of some kind on him. In any case Luke has preserved a mockery of Jesus by the soldiers during the actual crucifixion, apparently from the source which did not contain the incident of the mocking by the soldiers in the praetorium (cf. below, p. 145), and may well have found the Herod incident in the same source. Thus there is no real justification for rejecting the Herod incident as a pious fiction invented by Luke out of Ps. ii. 2. Mark's omission of the story (if it stood in the Twelve-source) may well have been due to the inconclusiveness of the proceedings and his failure to see the value of the incident as a *testimonium*, while Luke's failure to exploit that value here is more naturally explained, if in fact his source failed to see it in that light. On the other hand the reconciliation of Pilate and Herod looks suspiciously like a pious appendage, though whether it is due to Luke or his source cannot be stated.

Apart from the trial before Herod we have, as has been noted above (p. 136), indications of two different sources for the trial before Pilate in the absence of any reference to kingship in Mark until xv. 9, as contrasted with its prominence in Luke xxiii. 2f. Although the rest of the story of the trial cannot be separated so clearly between the two sources, there are indications that it is in fact a conflation. In Mark xv. 6 Mark introduces Barabbas with the notice of Pilate's custom of releasing a prisoner at the Passover. Luke knows nothing of any such custom.<sup>2</sup> Consequently in Luke there is no question of a choice between Jesus and Barabbas, as in Mark xv. 9 and 12. Pilate has already acquitted Jesus (Luke xxiii. 13 ff.), and the subsequent condemnation is due to the pressure of the crowd; Pilate makes no attempt to bargain with them. Some support is lent to the view that Mark and Luke are following separate sources by the differences of wording at this point and the fact that the last clause of Luke xxiii. 22 simply repeats 16, which comes from the source

<sup>1</sup> Note διαστρέφοντα in xxiii. 2 and ἀναστρέφοντα in 14.

<sup>2</sup> xxiii. 17, omitted by A, B, L and the Egyptian versions and placed after 19 by D and the old Syriac versions (with slight verbal differences in D and Θ), is a fairly obvious attempt to harmonize Mark and Luke.

for the trial which Mark has not used. (It must, however, be observed that Luke has introduced a good many of his peculiar words at this point.)<sup>1</sup> It is of course possible that Luke deliberately omitted the mention of Pilate's custom of releasing a prisoner at the Passover on the ground that the existence of such a custom seemed to him to be highly improbable; but it is by no means certain that he knew enough of Roman procedure in Palestine, particularly under Pilate, to say whether such a custom were possible or not. More probably he simply followed the Twelve-source as far as xxiii. 20, while Mark followed the Disciples' source up to xv. 11. But the entirely colourless repetition of xv. 12 is suspicious as is πάλιν. It is at least possible that Mark has drawn xv. 14 from the Twelve-source, while the Disciples' source simply went on from 11 to 15. In this case Luke has drawn xxiii. 20f. from Mark, going back to the Twelve-source at 22 with an editorial τρίτον. Originally each source had one attempt by Pilate to deliver Jesus: Mark xv. 12f. are inserted by Mark for the sake of triplication; Luke's closing verses (24 and 25) appear to be drawn from the Twelve-source in view of the repetition of the words of 19 at 25. But this is no more than a probability; if the sources have been conflated by Mark, or if Luke has modified his source to introduce the Marcan triplication, the work has been done too thoroughly to allow of a complete separation of them. In any case the bulk of Luke appears to come from one of the sources,

<sup>1</sup> In the sections Mark xv. 6-15 and Luke xxiii. 18-25 the only significant common words are στάσις, φόνος, πάλιν, σταυροῦν, παρέδωκεν. Of these all but φόνος and perhaps παρέδωκεν are inevitable. φόνος might represent an insertion from Mark; but both sources would almost certainly have contained the detail that Barabbas was a murderer or an associate of murderers in view of the value of the contrast between the murderer and the lord of life (Acts iii. 14). But we find in the section the following Lucan words: ἐπισχῆν (hap. leg. N.T.), εὐτόνος (here and Acts xviii. 28 only), ἐξουθενήσας (Luke and Paul: once (Mark ix. 12) elsewhere), ἀναπέμπειν (Luke and Paul), προυπάρχειν (here and Acts viii. 9 only), συγκαλεῖσθαι (Luke and Acts only in Middle, συγκαλεῖν Mark xv. 16), ἀνακρίνειν (Luke and Paul), παμπληθῆς (hap. leg. N.T.), προσφωνεῖν (Luke and Paul, except for Matt. xi. 16), ἐπιφωνεῖν (Luke and Acts). This of course tells us nothing of Luke's source; similarly in xvii. 1f. the saying on scandals, though known to Mark, is probably taken by Luke from the Q-stratum (cf. Streeter, p. 281 n.). In these two verses ἀνένδεκτον, λυσitteλεῖ and μυλικός are all *hapax legomena* in the N.T. Similarly in viii. 6 he introduces καταπίπτειν (Luke and Acts), φνέν (Luke, Acts and Heb.) and ἰκμάς (hap. leg. N.T.) into one verse of the Marcan parable of the Sower, while viii. 5 is nearly all from Mark.

a source which Mark has almost entirely discarded, though Luke has introduced elements from Mark, including possibly the triplication.

This source knew nothing of any custom. It would seem that the demand for the release of Barabbas was simply raised by the crowd when Pilate proposed to release Jesus as described in Luke xxiii. 16.<sup>1</sup>

The two sources may thus be reconstructed as follows:

DISCIPLES' SOURCE

καὶ κατηγοροῦν. . . διὰ φθόνον παρα-  
δεδώκεισαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς.  
(Mark xv. 3-10)

οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον  
ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ  
αὐτοῖς. (Mark xv. 11)

ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος βουλόμενος. . . φραγελ-  
λώσας ἵνα σταυρωθῆ. (Mark xv. 15)

TWELVE-SOURCE

The trial before Herod, Luke xxiii.  
6-12 (?).

Πιλάτος δὲ (συνκαλεσάμενος. . . καὶ  
τὸν λαόν;) εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Προσ-  
ητέγκατέ μοι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον  
ὡς ἀποστρέφοντα τὸν λαόν, καὶ ἰδοὺ  
ἐγὼ ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἀνακρίνας οὐθὲν  
εὔρον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αἴτιον  
ὧν κατηγορεῖτε κατ' αὐτοῦ. (ἀλλ'  
οὐδὲ Ἡρώδης. . . πεπράγμενον αὐτῷ?)  
παιδεύσας οὖν αὐτὸν ἀπολύσω.

(Luke xxiii. 13-16)

Ἄνεκραγον δὲ παμπληθεὶ λέγοντες  
Αἶρε τοῦτον, ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν Βαραβ-  
βᾶν. ὅστις ἦν διὰ στάσις τινα γενο-  
μένην ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ φόνον βληθείς ἐν  
τῇ φυλακῇ. (Luke xxiii. 18f.)

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Τί γὰρ κακὸν  
ἐποίησεν οὗτος; οὐδὲν αἴτιον θανάτου  
εὔρον ἐν αὐτῷ· παιδεύσας οὖν αὐτὸν  
ἀπολύσω. (Luke xxiii. 21-3)

καὶ Πιλάτος. . . τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν.  
(Luke xxiii. 24f.)

<sup>1</sup> For the whole Barabbas incident, cf. Rawlinson *ad loc.* It should, however, be noticed that the sudden change of attitude on the part of the crowd, on the assumption that the crowd on this occasion is the same as that which had welcomed Jesus on Palm Sunday, can only cause difficulties to those who have never observed the ordinary behaviour of a crowd and the rapidity with which it will change its attitude. In the case of Jesus his most ardent supporters might well have turned against him after the way in which he had wasted his opportunities since he arrived in Jerusalem. There is, however, much to be said for the view of Meyer, quoted by Rawlinson, that the crowd had come to ask for the release of Barabbas, not because Pilate was in the habit of releasing a prisoner at the Passover, but because governors might be swayed by acclamations; Rawlinson *loc. cit.* quotes an instance of such acclamations securing the acquittal of a prisoner from Deissmann; cf. also *Mart. Polyc.* 5 and 12 for the part played by them in causing search to be made for Polycarp and for his condemnation. For a late instance cf. the martyrdom of St Savinus quoted in *Dict. d'Arch. Chrét. s.v.* 'Acclamations'. It is of course possible that Mark's source



It is of course clear that various other reconstructions of the sources are possible and the foregoing analysis is merely offered as that which appears perhaps the most probable. The Twelve-source must have had a notice of the condemnation of Jesus, which may be the source of Luke xxiii. 24f. as suggested above. But these verses may be simply a Lucan revision of Mark, in which case the notice of the Twelve-source has been lost. The repetition of *διὰ στάσιν καὶ φόνον* in 19 and 25 suggests that Luke is following the Twelve-source; the differences in wording prove little, since *ἐπικρίνω* is *hap. leg.* N.T., *ἀήτημα* only here, Phil. iv. 6 and 1 John v. 15, while *φραγελλώσας* (Mark xv. 15) would have to go out as a barbarism.

### E. THE MOCKING BY THE SOLDIERS

At this point Mark has the mocking of Jesus by the soldiers (xv. 16–20). It may be conjectured that this came to him from the Disciples' source, which in general avoids the theme of Jesus as the king of the Jews, but need not have objected to introducing it at a point where it could not be taken seriously. The Twelve-source may already have had the mocking by Herod.

### F. THE CRUCIFIXION

This brings us to the story of the crucifixion itself (Mark xv. 21 ff.). It may be noted in advance that it contains several difficulties. (1) The offering of the vinegar in Luke xxiii. 36 has singularly little point where it stands. It looks like a doublet either of Mark xv. 23 misunderstood as in Matt. xxvii. 34, or of Mark xv. 36. (2) The triple repetition of the fact of the crucifixion in Mark xv. 24, 25 and 27 is extremely clumsy and at once suggests a compilation of sources. (3) This suspicion is confirmed by the curious difference in the mention of the two thieves. In Luke xxiii. 33 they appear immediately after the arrival at the place of the Skull, in Mark not till after

for this part of the story used the imperfect *ἠπέλευεν* in the sense 'was intending to', but was misunderstood either by Mark or some previous compiler, who inserted xv. 8 b; it can hardly be supposed that both imperfects are intended in this sense. But it is probable either that Pilate was in fact in the habit of releasing a prisoner as a means of getting through the Passover quietly, or that the demand for the release of Barabbas coincided with the trial of Jesus by mere chance.

the mention of the inscription (xv. 27). (4) There is a similar difference over the mention of the inscription: in Mark it comes immediately after the second notice of the fact of the crucifixion, in Luke not until xxiii. 38, where it appears as a note explaining why the soldiers addressed Jesus as 'king of the Jews' at all. (5) In Mark the bystanders join in mocking Jesus on the cross (xv. 29): in Luke they are more or less sympathetic observers (xxiii. 35 and 48).

The difficulties are explained if we are still dealing with a combination of narratives from the two sources which may be reconstructed as follows:

DISCIPLES' SOURCE

(continued from Mark xv. 20)

καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Γολγοθᾶν τόπον, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενος Κρανίου τόπος. καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ ἔσμυρνισμένον οἶνον· ὃς δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβεν.

(Mark xv. 22f.)

καὶ διαμερίζονται τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλήρους ἐπ' αὐτὰ τίς τί ἄρη. ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν. καὶ ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη· Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσιν δύο ληστᾶς, ἓνα ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἓνα ἐξ εὐωνύμων αὐτοῦ. καὶ οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτόν, κινεοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες Οὐά, ὃ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, σῶσον σεαυτὸν καταβάς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ.

(Mark xv. 24b-30)

καὶ γενομένης ὥρας ἕκτης σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης. καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὥρᾳ ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Ἐλωὶ ἔλωι λαμὰ σαβραχθάνι, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον Ὁ θεὸς μου, ὁ θεὸς μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με; καὶ τινες τῶν παρεστηκότων ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον Ἴδε Ἥλιον φωνεῖ. δραμῶν δὲ τις γεμίσας σπόγγον ὄξους περιθεὶς καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν, λέγων Ἄφετε Ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἥλιος καθελεῖν αὐτόν. καὶ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο ἀπ' ἄνωθεν

TWELVE-SOURCE

(continued from Luke xxiii. 25)

καὶ ἀγγαρεύουσιν παράγοντά τινα Σίμωνα Κυρηναῖον ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ, τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ρούφου, ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ. (Mark xv. 21) ἦγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι δύο κακοῦργοι σὺν αὐτῷ ἀναιρεθῆναι, καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς κακοῦργους, ὃν μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν, ὃν δὲ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.

(Luke xxiii. 32f.)

καὶ εἰστήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν.

(Luke xxiii. 35a.)

καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπάιζοντες μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων ἔλεγον Ἄλλους ἔσωσον, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι. ὁ χριστὸς, ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμεν. (Mark xv. 31f.) ἐνέπαιζαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται προσερχόμενοι, ὄξους προσφέροντες αὐτῷ καὶ λέγοντες Εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, σῶσον σεαυτόν· ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφή ἐπ' αὐτῷ· Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος· εἰς δὲ τῶν κρεμασθέντων κακοῦργων ἐβλασφήμει αὐτόν Οὐχὶ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς; σῶσον σεαυτόν καὶ ἡμᾶς· ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἕτερος ἐπιτιμῶν αὐτῷ ἔφη Οὐδὲ φοβῆ σὺ τὸν θεόν ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ; (cf. below, p. 147) καὶ ἔλεγεν Ἰησοῦ, μνησθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθῃς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου.

SYNOPTIC GOSPELS I

DISCIPLES' SOURCE

ἔως κάτω. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν, εἶπεν Ἐληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἀνθρώπος θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν.

(Mark xv. 33-9)

TWELVE-SOURCE

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἀμήν σοι λέγω, σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ. (Luke xxiii. 36-43) ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀφείδως φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν. (Mark xv. 37)

καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαραγενόμενοι ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην, θεωρήσαντες τὰ γενόμενα, τύπτοντες τὰ στήθη ὑπέστρεφον. (Luke xxiii. 48)

As regards this reconstruction it may be noted: (1) that the mention of Alexander and Rufus is in keeping with the general character of the Twelve-source, which shows an interest in subordinate figures.<sup>1</sup> (2) It will be observed that the narrative attributed to the Disciples' source shows its affinity to that source as reconstructed hitherto by its interest in the destruction of the Temple (above, p. 134); the same theme is implied in the rending of the veil in the Temple,<sup>2</sup> which marks the end of the old order. (3) This narrative is also interested in the fulfilment of prophecy; from it come Mark xv. 24 (Ps. xxii. 19), 29 (Ps. xxii. 8), 34 (Ps. xxii. 1), 36 (Ps. lxxix. 22). The other source has relatively little interest of this kind.<sup>3</sup> (4) On the other hand the Twelve-source recognizes that Jesus is crucified as the king of the Jews, as it does in the trial before

<sup>1</sup> The names are a striking warning of the danger of too slavish an acceptance of the theory of the extremer form-critics that the mention of subsidiary names is late and secondary. The survival of the names in Mark as against Matthew and Luke can only mean that Alexander and Rufus would be known to Mark's readers. In other words we have here a primary feature; the second stage is the disappearance of names, while the introduction of new and normally imaginary names represents a third stage.

<sup>2</sup> In Mark xv. 38 the rending of the veil comes immediately after the death of Jesus, in Luke xxiii. 45 just before his last words. This might seem to imply that it stood in both sources. But Luke takes over Mark xv. 33 (the darkness), omits 34-7 (the cry 'Eloi, Eloi' and the offering of vinegar) and adds from Mark the rending of the veil before going on to Jesus' last words, which he has rewritten completely.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, p. 135. In Luke we have from the Twelve-source θεωρῶν ἐξεμυκτήριζον (xxiii. 35, an allusion to Ps. xxii. 8). But θεωρῶν could hardly be avoided, while ἐξεμυκτήριζον is Luke's substitution for the ἐμπαίζοντες of the source, as it appears in Mark xv. 31. The point is of some importance, since it shows that the reading of Ps. xxii into the story of the Passion is still going on later than Mark; in other words the story of the Passion is not, as has been suggested, constructed out of O.T. prophecies, but the prophecies are still being found in it as late

Pilate; in the Disciples' source Jesus is crucified as the Messiah, and Pilate does not treat the charge of kingship seriously; the soldiers do indeed mock him as the king of the Jews (if Mark xv. 16ff. be from this source), but this is more as a means of expressing their contempt for the Jews than for any other reason. Similarly in the account of the crucifixion the theme only emerges in the superscription, which again may be regarded as expressing Pilate's cynical dislike of the Jews as in John xix. 20ff. But in the Twelve-source the rulers mock Jesus as the king of the Jews, as do the soldiers; the superscription is brought in to explain why the soldiers thought of him in this light. (5) In the Disciples' source the guilt rests on the whole nation as represented by the crowd; in the Twelve-source it rests on the rulers and the soldiers; the inconsistency in the Marcan and Lucan narratives on this point is simply due to the different bias of the two sources. No doubt in fact the sympathies of the crowd were divided. (6) The triple mention of the crucifixion is simply due to the fact that one narrative described the crucifixion 'at the third hour' and added the crucifixion of the two thieves, while the other recorded the crucifixion of Jesus and the two malefactors immediately after the arrival at Golgotha; Mark rather clumsily inserts the mention of the crucifixion from the Twelve-source (σταυροῦσιν Mark xv. 24 = ἔσταυρώσαν Luke xxiii. 33) and repeats it from the Disciples' source at 25 and 27. The Twelve-source did not mention the ἐσμυρνησμένος οἶνος; it had a notice of the offering of wine as part of the mockery of the soldiers, but no mention of the Elias incident.<sup>1</sup> (7) It is interesting that narrative B has κακοῦργοι consistently in place of Mark's λησταί. They appear only in Luke, since at these particular points only Luke preserves this narrative. Thus it is possible that it is a Lucan emendation; but there seems no reason for the change, since Luke uses λησταί four times (x. 30 and

as Luke, because the real or supposed resemblances could be found in the original tradition.

If the daughters of Jerusalem came from the Twelve-source, there would be more reason to suppose that it too was interested in the fulfilment of prophecy, but that incident is a *testimonium* developed into a pronouncement-story (cf. Bultmann, p. 37) and may originally have existed independently.

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that we are not here dealing with 'triplification'; the three mentions of the crucifixion in Mark are three accounts of the same fact, not one fact multiplied into three, while no narrative has three offers of wine.

46, xix. 46 and xxii. 52), and the word is good classical Greek. (8) It is also interesting to note that at xxiii. 33 Luke has ἀριστερῶν, while at xv. 27 Mark has εὐωνύμων, presumably because it stood in the Twelve-source. There seems no reason why Luke should change the word if he is simply following Mark; when writing himself in Acts xxi. 3 he uses εὐώνυμος. (9) The Disciples' source must have had a notice of the death of Jesus; but ἐξέπνευσεν in Mark xv. 37 and Luke xxiii. 47 suggests that both evangelists here happen to use the other source.

We have thus two distinct stories, each of which might stand alone. It is true that the Marcan narrative gives on the whole a coherent account; but when closely examined it shows several of the inconsistencies which are normal in ancient writers when they are conflating two sources. Further, the two narratives as separated above show two quite distinct characters; the Disciples' source may perhaps be described as more theological in its interest, while the Twelve-source is more concerned with history as such.<sup>1</sup>

With regard to the Passion story as a whole, the following points may be noted: (1) The omission of Luke xxiii. 34a in B, W, D, Θ, syr. sin., etc. is far more intelligible as an anti-semitic suppression than its presence as a Marcionite insertion in  $\aleph$ , A, C, and the Lake and Ferrar groups of cursives; after all the Jews had not been forgiven, and it would be blasphemous to suppose that Jesus' prayer at such a moment had not been answered. Its presence in Luke and not in Mark may be due to the fact that he is the least anti-semitic of the evangelists.<sup>2</sup> (2) The view that the cry of Jesus in xv. 34 is due to the imagination of the source which intended the reader to see in it proof of the fulfilment in Jesus of the Messianic Ps. xxii deserves to be regarded as one of the most remarkable curiosities of criticism. There could never have been a moment when Jesus was regarded as the risen Lord, and yet credited with the utterance of such a cry; the later tradition, represented by Luke, substitutes Ps. xxxi. 5. On the other hand, as has been already noticed, this later tradition is

<sup>1</sup> This must not be taken to mean either that the Disciples' source is unreliable as a record of events or that the Twelve-source is invariably reliable. But the Disciples' source is more liable to let its story be coloured by theological considerations than the Twelve-source.

<sup>2</sup> Alternatively, Luke conceived it as a prayer for the Romans who acted in 'invincible ignorance'.

still modifying the language of Mark or his sources in order to find allusions to Ps. xxii in the traditional story of the Passion.<sup>1</sup> The process is perfectly intelligible if the words were actually used by Jesus and so led the first disciples to interpret the Psalm as a prophecy of the Passion; it seems entirely grotesque to suppose that there was ever a moment when the Church was prepared to use Ps. xxii. 1 as evidence that Jesus was the Messiah and yet to admit that he could have been forsaken by God at this particular moment, especially in view of the damaging use which Jewish opponents could have made of the admission. Its omission in the Twelve-source is presumably to be explained on theological grounds. (3) The dialogue between Jesus and the penitent thief shows clear signs of having been taken by Luke from an earlier source into which Luke has inserted xxiii. 41 (or completely rewritten it; for this, cf. my *Hellenistic Elements*, p. 11). It is probable that the introduction of Ps. xxxi. 5 at Luke xxiii. 46 is due to Luke or an intermediate editor of the source later than Mark. It is of course possible that it stood in the source, but, if so, it is hard to explain its omission by Mark. The probability is that it is due to Luke himself, the motive being the desire to avoid Ps. xxii. 1.

<sup>1</sup> To the Lucan cases already noted may be added the 'wine mingled with gall' which Matthew substitutes for the Marcan *οἶνον ἐσμυρνισμένον* (Matt. xxvii. 34 = Ps. lxix. 22) and the quotation of Ps. xxii. 9 at Matt. xxvii. 43, as well as the fulfilment of Zech. xi. 12 f. in the fate of Judas (Matt. xxvii. 9: for this cf. Kilpatrick, *Origins*, p. 81, from which it would appear that Matthew is relying on older material).

## CHAPTER XV

# THE RESURRECTION STORY

The loss of Mark's ending<sup>1</sup> leaves us with little guidance as to the sources from which the existing narratives of the Resurrection appearances are drawn. None the less it is worth noting that in I Cor. xv. 5 the story begins with an appearance to Cephas followed by an appearance to 'the Twelve' (only here in Paul). In Luke xxiv. 34 the two disciples returning from Emmaus find 'the eleven' assembled and are greeted with the news that the Lord has risen and appeared to Simon.

The Emmaus story has every appearance of having been largely edited by Luke. xxiv. 19-21 is a specimen of the apostolic *kerygma* of the crucifixion and resurrection, the latter being naturally left in suspense to suit the real or supposed situation of the moment; the claim that this is the fulfilment of prophecy in 26f. is again part of the *kerygma*, though on grounds of dramatic propriety it is put into the mouth of the risen Lord and thus comes after the story of the ministry and death. But 'there seems to be no good reason why the story should not be founded on fact' (Creed, p. 290). If so, it is possible that this story of an appearance in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem has been put by Luke before the story of an appearance to Simon and to the eleven, drawn from the same source as the Pauline summary, which may well have been the conclusion of the Twelve-source.<sup>2</sup> Naturally this cannot be pressed to mean that the source included more than the bare statement of I Cor. xv. 5; if it

<sup>1</sup> For the grounds on which it is entirely impossible to hold that Mark's Gospel ended at xvi. 8, cf. my article 'The Ending of Mark's Gospel' in *H.T.R.* xxxv. (Jan. 1942) 13 ff.

<sup>2</sup> It has been noted above (p. 123) that either the source or Luke is extremely careless in introducing the promise of the Twelve thrones at the Last Supper, when Jesus is already aware of the intention of Judas to betray him. There is a similar carelessness in the Pauline mention of the Twelve, while Luke remembers to substitute 'eleven'. It would be fairly easy to understand the inaccuracy if it was due to the source itself, which was dominated by the conception of the Twelve as a closed body, and a good deal more artless than Paul or Luke, who have each forgotten to make the necessary emendation of its inaccuracy when reproducing it.

## THE RESURRECTION STORY

included any more of the Lucan material it would be natural to suppose that it recorded the second *kerygma* of Luke xxiv. 44-7; it might have included 47c-49, if the source was concerned to associate the position of the Twelve with the Church of Jerusalem. The clumsy repetition of the *kerygma* suggests that Luke found both of them in his sources. It may further be noted that it is only in Luke xxiv. 33f. and I Cor. xv. 5 that we find an appearance to Peter associated with and immediately preceding an appearance to the eleven.

There is, however, the serious objection that 'the eleven' and 'the apostles' appear at Luke xxiv. 9f. Here Luke may simply be rewriting Mark xvi. 7f. His information only described appearances in or near Jerusalem, while Mark implied a tradition of Galilean appearances which apparently had been lost before it came to Luke. Hence it is possible that Luke in his account of the resurrection appearances has slipped into the use of the conventional language of the later Church, or alternatively, used another source or tradition which spoke of the Twelve. If so, he may equally well have done so at xxiv. 33. Hence the latter verse can at best be no more than a slight confirmation of the possibility that here and in I Cor. xv. 5 we have a fragment of the resurrection narrative of the Twelve-source, unless indeed we suppose that the Pauline phrase 'that he rose from the dead on the third day' is a summary of a story that the women found the tomb empty and told the eleven (Luke xxiv. 1, 2, 9 and 10) which also stood in the Twelve-source. The supposition would explain the curious difference in the position of the names of the women as against Mark; Joanna who appears in Luke but not in Mark appeared in the Twelve-source at viii. 1. But probably this is mere coincidence. The most that can be said is that the Pauline summary represents a kerygmatic summary which may reflect the ending of the Twelve-source.



## SUMMARY

So far it has been possible to identify the following sources which seem to have existed as independent units before their compilation by Mark into the form of a 'Gospel'.

(1) Conflict-stories (i. 40–iii. 6) serving as an independent introduction to the Passion story; this source may also have included viii. 14f. and 21 and xii. 13–17.

(2) The Twelve-source, mainly a summary with one or two incidents showing Jesus' dealings with the Twelve and a Passion story.

(3) A 'book' of parables (Mark iv. 1–34).

(4) The death of the Baptist (Mark vi. 16–29).

(5) The Corban story (vii. 1–23).

(6) A 'book' of localized miracles (Mark vii. 32–7, viii. 22–6, and x. 46–52).

(7) A denunciation of the Pharisees preserved in Luke xi. 37–52 and Matt. xxiii. 1–6, elaborated out of the fragment Mark xii. 37b–40 with some genuine material.

(8) The Marcan apocalypse (Mark xiii), unless it is Mark's own compilation out of smaller units preserved in different sources; the Caligula apocalypse at least was a single unit of tradition, in a fixed form which was revised from an earlier apocalypse predicting the fall of Jerusalem.

(9) A Passion story which was independent of the Twelve-source.

Besides these we may conjecture a book describing Jesus' conquest of the devils (iii. 20–35, perhaps including also the Baptism and Temptation, i. 23–7 and 32–9; these elements are very conjectural), and one containing a collection of three miracles (iv. 35–41 and v. 21–43; in this the dovetailing of the woman with the issue of blood and Jairus' daughter will be due to Mark).

Peter's confession, the Transfiguration and the demoniac boy look as though they had a pre-Markan connection, but the nature

#### SUMMARY

and extent of the source are quite uncertain; it may have included the journey to Jerusalem of ix. 30-2 and the entry to Jerusalem. It may have been combined with one of the units noted above; in any case it must have been the introduction to a Passion story, presumably that combined by Mark with the Twelve-source. It may have been a continuation of one of the other sources; if so (1) above is the most likely. But in this case the source will already have been composed out of smaller units.



# INDEXES

## I. GREEK AND LATIN WRITERS

|   | PAGE     |                                   | PAGE              |
|---|----------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Aratus                                  |          | Lucian                            |                   |
| fr. 2 Jacoby                            | 27       | <i>Nekyiomanteia</i> , 20 (484)   | 8                 |
| Aristobulus of Cassandreia              |          | <i>Demonax</i> , 62 (394)         | 112               |
| frs. 55-6 Jacoby                        | 99       | Lydus                             |                   |
| Arrian                                  |          | <i>de Ostentis</i> , 9c           | 108               |
| <i>Anabasis</i> xvii, 19, 6             | 99       | Nicolas of Damascus               |                   |
| Athenaeus, <i>Deipnosophistae</i>       |          | fr. 130 Jacoby                    | 10, 132, 136, 138 |
| iv, 38 (152F-153B)                      | 19       | <i>Papyri Magicae Graecae</i>     |                   |
| iv, 55 (162E)                           | 112      | I, 160ff.                         | 41                |
| vi, 45 (245A)                           | 112      | II, 144                           | 78                |
| xii, 54 (538C)                          | 19       | III, 159                          | 41                |
| <i>Catal. Codd. Astrol.</i>             |          | III, 500ff.                       | 41                |
| viii, 3, p. 169                         | 108      | iv, 27 f.                         | 78                |
| viii, 3, p. 186                         | 104, 108 | iv, 657                           | 8                 |
| viii, 3, p. 187                         | 108      | iv, 1248                          | 41                |
| Chares                                  |          | iv, 1289                          | 78                |
| ap. Athen. <i>Deipn.</i> xii, 54 (538C) | 19       | vii, 540 f.                       | 78                |
| <i>Corpus Hermeticum</i>                |          | vii, 826                          | 78                |
| I, 28                                   | 110      | xiii, 5 f.                        | 78                |
| I, 31                                   | 3        | xiii, 96 f.                       | 78                |
| vii, 1 ff.                              | 110      | Pausanias                         |                   |
| x (title)                               | 95       | viii, 11, 6                       | 40                |
| Diodorus Siculus                        |          | ix, 15, 5                         | 40                |
| I, 27                                   | 3        | ix, 39, 13                        | 66                |
| iv, 8, 1 ff.                            | 3        | Philostratus                      |                   |
| v, 26                                   | 60       | <i>Vita Apoll. Tyan.</i> , iv, 10 | 40                |
| xi, 54, 2                               | 86       | Plato                             |                   |
| xv, 86, 5                               | 40       | <i>Euthydemus</i> , 276C, 277A    | 102               |
| Ephorus                                 |          | Plotinus                          |                   |
| frs. 189-90 Jacoby                      | 86       | <i>Enn.</i> I, 6, 7               | 66                |
| Epictetus                               |          | Plutarch                          |                   |
| III, 22, 26                             | 110      | <i>Alexander</i> , 32, 33         | 19                |
| ap. Stob. III, 1, 144                   | 52       | <i>Aratus</i> , 31                | 26                |
| Euripides                               |          | <i>Crassus</i> , 33               | 51                |
| fr. 1099                                | 8        | <i>Julius Caesar</i> , 61         | 132               |
| Iamblichus                              |          | <i>M. Antonius</i> , 12           | 132               |
| <i>De Mysteriis</i> , III, 2            | 66       | <i>de Ser. Num. Vind.</i> , 9     | 64                |

INDEXES

|                                  | PAGE  | Strabo (cont.)                        | PAGE |
|----------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|------|
| Plutarch ( <i>cont.</i> )        |       |                                       |      |
| <i>de Iside et Osiride</i> , 47  | 108   | XVI, 1, 11 (741)                      | 99   |
| <i>de Liber. Educ.</i> , 4       | 112   | ap. Joseph. <i>Antt.</i> XIII, 314-19 | 49   |
| Pollux                           |       | Suetonius                             |      |
| <i>Onomasticon</i> , II, 102     | 102   | <i>Claudius</i> , 25                  | 4    |
| Posidonius                       |       | <i>Julius</i> , 79                    | 132  |
| fr. 5 Jacoby                     | 19    | Tacitus                               |      |
| fr. 116 Jacoby                   | 60 f. | <i>Hist.</i> v, 3 ff.                 | 9    |
| Pseudo-Plato                     |       | <i>Ann.</i> XII, 54                   | 137  |
| <i>Clitophon</i> , 407A          | 110   | Teles                                 |      |
| Stobaeus                         |       | <i>Reliquiae</i> , p. 43 Hense        | 40   |
| <i>Anthologium</i> , III, 1, 144 | 52    | Vettius Valens                        |      |
| Strabo                           |       | 196. 10 f. Kroll                      | 108  |
| IV, 1, 2 (178)                   | 60    | Xenophon                              |      |
| X, 2, 9 (452)                    | 39    | <i>Memorabilia</i> , I, 3, 3          | 91   |
| XV, 1, 68 (717)                  | 37    |                                       |      |

II. JEWISH WRITERS

|                         |     |                           |     |
|-------------------------|-----|---------------------------|-----|
| Assumption of Moses     |     | Josephus ( <i>cont.</i> ) |     |
| x. 5 ff.                | 105 | XIV, 137 ff.              | 12  |
| II Baruch               |     | XIV, 187                  | 9   |
| i. 4                    | 111 | XIV, 213                  | 9   |
| xxix. 5                 | 73  | XIV, 227 ff.              | 17  |
| liii. 8                 | 112 | XIV, 241 ff.              | 9   |
| I Enoch                 |     | XV, 403                   | 52  |
| lxxx. 4 ff.             | 105 | XVII, 41                  | 82  |
| IV Esdras               |     | XVII, 254                 | 111 |
| v. 4                    | 105 | XVIII, 4                  | 112 |
| v. 9                    | 104 | XVIII, 4 ff.              | 111 |
| vi. 24                  | 104 | XVIII, 12 ff.             | 82  |
| xiii. 3 ff.             | 105 | XVIII, 25                 | 111 |
| <i>Genesis Rabba</i> 56 | 64  | XVIII, 36 ff.             | 54  |
| Josephus                |     | XVIII, 87                 | 137 |
| <i>Antiquitates</i>     |     | XVIII, 91 f.              | 52  |
| III, 179                | 9   | XVIII, 117                | 50  |
| XIII, 314-19            | 49  | XIX, 307                  | 121 |
| XIII, 409 ff.           | 82  | XX, 100                   | 79  |
| XIV, 34                 | 19  | XX, 199 ff.               | 79  |
| XIV, 37                 | 19  | <i>de Bello Judaico</i>   |     |
| XIV, 131 ff.            | 12  | I, 88                     | 118 |
|                         |     | I, 110 ff.                | 82  |
|                         |     | I, 474                    | 137 |
|                         |     | II, 42                    | 111 |
|                         |     | II, 162 ff.               | 82  |

INDEXES

|                           | PAGE | Mishnah                      | PAGE |
|---------------------------|------|------------------------------|------|
| Josephus ( <i>cont.</i> ) |      |                              |      |
| II, 272 ff.               | 137  | Peah i. 4                    | 96   |
| II, 457 ff.               | 54   | Maaseroth i. 1               | 96   |
| II, 466 ff.               | 9    | Erubin x. 10                 | 4    |
| III, 29                   | 52   | Yoma vi. 6                   | 39   |
| III, 29 ff.               | 46   | Oholoth ix. 14               | 97   |
| IV, 319 ff.               | 79   |                              |      |
| IV, 530 ff.               | 138  | Philo                        |      |
| IV, 553                   | 138  | <i>de Opif. Mundi</i>        |      |
| V, 45                     | 79   | 58 f.                        | 104  |
| VI, 289                   | 108  | <i>de Execrationibus</i>     |      |
| VI, 297 ff.               | 108  | 127 ff.                      | 104  |
| <i>contra Apionem</i>     |      | 162 ff.                      | 104  |
| 1, 219 ff.                | 9    | <i>de Praemiis et Poenis</i> |      |
| <i>Vita</i>               |      | 95                           | 104  |
| 12                        | 82   | <i>Legatio ad Gaium</i>      |      |
| 398                       | 46   | 302                          | 137  |
| 407                       | 46   |                              |      |
| Jubilees                  |      | Psalms of Solomon            |      |
| xxiii. 13 ff.             | 104  | xi. 3 ff.                    | 111  |
|                           |      | xviii. 25 ff.                | 111  |

III. OLD TESTAMENT

|             |     |                         |             |
|-------------|-----|-------------------------|-------------|
| Genesis     |     | Psalms ( <i>cont.</i> ) |             |
| xl. 19      | 129 | xxii. 1                 | 144, 146 f. |
| Leviticus   |     | xxii. 8                 | 144         |
| xxvi        | 104 | xxii. 9                 | 147         |
| Deuteronomy |     | xxii. 19                | 144         |
| xxviii      | 104 | xxxi. 5                 | 146 f.      |
| I Samuel    |     | xxxvii. 4               | 8           |
| vii. 2      | 78  | lxix. 22                | 144, 147    |
| xiv. 45     | 106 | cxvi. 10                | 71          |
| II Samuel   |     | cxvii. 22 f.            | 90          |
| vi. 3       | 78  | Isaiah                  |             |
| xiv. 11     | 107 | vi. 9                   | 22, 36      |
| I Kings     |     | xiii. 10                | 105         |
| xix. 10     | 98  | xvii. 13                | 8           |
| Nehemiah    |     | xxx. 27                 | 8           |
| ix. 6       | 98  | xxxiv. 4                | 105         |
| Psalms      |     | liii. 7                 | 135         |
| ii. 2       | 138 | lix. 20                 | 111         |
| vii. 12     | 8   | Jeremiah                |             |
|             |     | v. 16                   | 56          |
|             |     | x. 22                   | 110         |
|             |     | xii. 34                 | 110         |

INDEXES

|                           | PAGE | Daniel    | PAGE |
|---------------------------|------|-----------|------|
| Jeremiah ( <i>cont.</i> ) |      |           |      |
| xxviii                    | 82   | vii. 13   | 105  |
| li. 59 ff.                | 82   | ix. 25    | 111  |
| Ezekiel                   |      | Zechariah |      |
| xxiii. 25                 | 129  | ii. 6     | 105  |
| xxx. 3                    | 110  | xi. 12 f. | 147  |

IV. NEW TESTAMENT

| St Matthew   |            | St Mark         |                     |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| v. 32        | 69         | i. 12 ff.       | 32                  |
| v. 33 ff.    | 96         | i. 14-20        | 33                  |
| v. 45        | 41         | i. 14-22        | 29                  |
| vii. 9-10    | 114        | i. 21           | 25                  |
| vii. 23      | 124        | i. 21-8         | 34                  |
| viii. 5-13   | 55         | i. 21-39        | 32                  |
| viii. 12     | 90         | i. 29-39        | 33                  |
| ix. 10       | 13         | i. 29-31        | 29                  |
| ix. 13       | 14         | i. 35-9         | 29                  |
| ix. 30       | 8          | i. 39           | 32                  |
| ix. 34       | 8          | i. 40-6         | 8, 89               |
| x. 17        | 106        | i. 41           | 8                   |
| x. 19        | 106        | i. 44           | 60                  |
| xii. 1       | 57         | ii. 1           | 25                  |
| xii. 14      | 57         | ii. 1-iii. 6    | 3, 8 ff.            |
| xii. 30      | 24         | ii. 19          | 90                  |
| xv. 14       | 96         | iii. 6          | 27, 57, 89          |
| xv. 26-7     | 54         | iii. 7          | 29                  |
| xvi. 2 f.    | 6          | iii. 7 ff.      | 17 ff., 22 f.       |
| xvi. 5-12    | 57         | iii. 11         | 33                  |
| xvii. 2      | 124        | iii. 13-19      | 18                  |
| xvii. 8      | 111        | iii. 14         | 38                  |
| xvii. 20     | 83         | iii. 16         | 33                  |
| xviii. 4     | 95         | iii. 17         | 90                  |
| xviii. 7     | 124        | iii. 19         | 20 f., 30           |
| xviii. 13    | 69         | iii. 20-35      | 32 f.               |
| xix. 13      | 69         | iii. 20         | 29 f.               |
| xxi. 5       | 77         | iii. 22         | 4                   |
| xxi. 12      | 81         | iii. 34         | 20                  |
| xxi. 15      | 79         | iv. 1           | 18 f.               |
| xxi. 18 f.   | 80         | iv. 1-35        | 22, 35 ff., 50, 127 |
| xxii. 16     | 9, 57      | iv. 10          | 127                 |
| xxii. 49     | 20         | iv. 10 ff.      | 22                  |
| xxiii. 1 ff. | 93, 95 ff. | iv. 35-viii. 27 | 39 ff.              |
| xxiii. 1     | 127        | iv. 35 ff.      | 41                  |
| xxiii. 23    | 15         | iv. 37          | 41                  |
| xxiii. 34    | 95         | v. 1-20         | 39 ff.              |
| xxvii. 59-60 | 78         | v. 21 ff.       | 29, 41 f., 127      |

INDEXES

| St Mark ( <i>cont.</i> ) | PAGE              | St Mark ( <i>cont.</i> ) | PAGE                |
|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| v. 22                    | 42                | x. 1                     | 25                  |
| v. 23                    | 41                | x. 1 ff.                 | 68 f.               |
| v. 25 f.                 | 41                | x. 13 ff.                | 24, 69              |
| v. 31                    | 29                | x. 17 ff.                | 69 f.               |
| v. 35                    | 41                | x. 28                    | 29 f.               |
| v. 37                    | 29                | x. 28 ff.                | 70                  |
| v. 41                    | 61                | x. 32                    | 19, 25, 30          |
| v. 45                    | 90                | x. 32-45                 | 21, 63, 71          |
| vi. 1-6                  | 47 ff.            | x. 35 ff.                | 122                 |
| vi. 7                    | 22 f.             | x. 35                    | 29                  |
| vi. 7-13                 | 20 f., 23         | x. 39                    | 71 ff.              |
| vi. 14-29                | 47 f., 50 f.      | x. 42                    | 121                 |
| vi. 30                   | 38                | x. 45                    | 61                  |
| vi. 30-2                 | 21 ff.            | x. 46-52                 | 59 f., 68           |
| vi. 30-56                | 43 ff.            | xi. 1 ff.                | 77 ff.              |
| vi. 33                   | 30                | xi. 11                   | 21 f., 26 f., 80    |
| vi. 46                   | 20                | xi. 11-28                | 27                  |
| vi. 53 ff.               | 46                | xi. 14                   | 29                  |
| vii. 1-23                | 52 ff., 127       | xi. 15-xii. 40           | 3                   |
| vii. 24                  | 60                | xi. 18                   | 27, 81 f.           |
| vii. 24-30               | 53 f.             | xi. 21                   | 29                  |
| vii. 31-7                | 59 f.             | xi. 22 f.                | 127                 |
| viii. 1                  | 19, 60            | xi. 27-xii. 37           | 85 ff.              |
| viii. 1 ff.              | 44 f.             | xi. 32                   | 89                  |
| viii. 10                 | 46                | xii. 2                   | 89                  |
| viii. 11-13              | 56                | xii. 12                  | 81 f.               |
| viii. 13 ff.             | 16, 56 f., 89     | xii. 13                  | 57                  |
| viii. 22                 | 56                | xii. 13 ff.              | 10                  |
| viii. 22-6               | 59 f.             | xii. 28 ff.              | 16                  |
| viii. 27                 | 29, 60            | xii. 37 f.               | 127                 |
| viii. 27-ix. 29          | 65                | xii. 38 ff.              | 93                  |
| viii. 29                 | 11                | xii. 41 ff.              | 91                  |
| ix. 1                    | 64                | xiii. 1-37               | 103 ff.             |
| ix. 11-13                | 64                | xiii. 3                  | 29                  |
| ix. 14                   | 29, 56            | xiv. 1 ff.               | 13, 21, 116 ff.     |
| ix. 19                   | 64                | xiv. 1                   | 27, 81              |
| ix. 30-2                 | 12, 67            | xiv. 2-10                | 27                  |
| ix. 32                   | 29                | xiv. 3-9                 | 117                 |
| ix. 33                   | 67 f.             | xiv. 10 f.               | 21, 27, 30, 116 ff. |
| ix. 33-5                 | 21 f., 31, 63, 97 | xiv. 12 ff.              | 119 ff.             |
| ix. 33-50                | 24 ff.            | xiv. 17-21               | 21 f., 27           |
| ix. 35                   | 24, 30, 95        | xiv. 32                  | 29, 43              |
| ix. 35 ff.               | 31                | xiv. 32 ff.              | 126 f.              |
| ix. 36                   | 69                | xiv. 37-46               | 128 ff.             |
| ix. 36 f.                | 67                | xiv. 51 f.               | 130                 |
| ix. 37 ff.               | 69                | xiv. 53 ff.              | 131 ff.             |
| ix. 38 f.                | 21                | xiv. 58                  | 111                 |
| ix. 41-50                | 67                | xv. 1 ff.                | 135 ff.             |



INDEXES

| St Mark ( <i>cont.</i> ) | PAGE    | St Luke ( <i>cont.</i> ) | PAGE                |
|--------------------------|---------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| xv. 6-15                 | 140     | xi. 29                   | 56                  |
| xv. 9                    | 70      | xi. 37 ff.               | 90, 94 ff.          |
| xv. 12                   | 70      | xi. 49                   | 99                  |
| xv. 16 ff.               | 139 f.  | xi. 53 f.                | 101                 |
| xv. 21 ff.               | 142 ff. | xii. 1 ff.               | 101                 |
| xv. 40                   | 21      | xii. 10                  | 32                  |
| xv. 46                   | 78      | xii. 54 ff.              | 107                 |
| xvi. 7 f.                | 149     | xiii. 6 ff.              | 82                  |
| xvi. 8                   | 148     | xiii. 28                 | 90                  |
| xvi. 13                  | 26      | xiii. 31                 | 57                  |
|                          |         | xiii. 32                 | 15                  |
|                          |         | xiv. 1                   | 15                  |
| <b>St Luke</b>           |         | xvii. 1                  | 124, 140            |
| iv. 16-30                | 9, 48   | xvii. 5                  | 38, 127             |
| v. 1 ff.                 | 34, 63  | xvii. 6                  | 83                  |
| v. 29                    | 13      | xvii. 20                 | 16, 107             |
| v. 34                    | 90      | xvii. 20-37              | 112 ff.             |
| v. 39                    | 15      | xviii. 14                | 95                  |
| vi. 4                    | 6       | xviii. 29 f.             | 70                  |
| vi. 14                   | 90      | xix. 32 ff.              | 78 f.               |
| vi. 16                   | 21      | xix. 39-44               | 79 f.               |
| vi. 35                   | 41, 90  | xix. 39 f.               | 82                  |
| vi. 39                   | 96      | xx. 9 ff.                | 90                  |
| vii. 1-10                | 55      | xx. 19                   | 90                  |
| vii. 11 ff.              | 42      | xx. 27 ff.               | 89 f.               |
| vii. 36                  | 15      | xx. 41                   | 96                  |
| vii. 36 ff.              | 117     | xx. 43 ff.               | 93                  |
| viii. 1                  | 20, 149 | xx. 45                   | 127                 |
| viii. 3                  | 57      | xxi. 10                  | 105                 |
| viii. 6                  | 140     | xxi. 12-19               | 106                 |
| viii. 9                  | 127     | xxi. 24                  | 110                 |
| viii. 18                 | 121     | xxi. 28                  | 111                 |
| viii. 19 ff.             | 33      | xxi. 29                  | 110                 |
| viii. 26                 | 41      | xxi. 37 f.               | 84, 117             |
| ix. 10                   | 127     | xxii. 14 f.              | 26, 38, 120 f., 127 |
| ix. 12                   | 127     | xxii. 31 ff.             | 124                 |
| ix. 28 ff.               | 66      | xxii. 35-8               | 124 f.              |
| ix. 46 f.                | 97      | xxii. 45 ff.             | 128 f.              |
| ix. 48                   | 95      | xxii. 49                 | 38                  |
| ix. 49 f.                | 24      | xxiii. 1 ff.             | 135 ff.             |
| ix. 57 ff.               | 70      | xxiii. 7 ff.             | 57, 139 f.          |
| x. 6                     | 90      | xxiii. 13 ff.            | 139                 |
| x. 18 ff.                | 23      | xxiii. 18-25             | 140 f.              |
| x. 25                    | 86      | xxiii. 33                | 142 f.              |
| xi. 11-12                | 114     | xxiii. 36                | 142                 |
| xi. 14 ff.               | 33      | xxiii. 38                | 143                 |
| xi. 16                   | 56      | xxiii. 53                | 78                  |
| xi. 18                   | 82      | xxiv. 9 f.               | 149                 |
| xi. 27 f.                | 34      |                          |                     |

INDEXES

|                          | PAGE   |                       | PAGE       |
|--------------------------|--------|-----------------------|------------|
| St Luke ( <i>cont.</i> ) |        | Acts ( <i>cont.</i> ) |            |
| xxiv. 13-35              | 148    | xxiii. 34             | 137        |
| xxiv. 24-6               | 72 f.  | xxv. 14 ff.           | 137        |
| xxiv. 44-7               | 149    |                       |            |
| St John                  |        | Romans                |            |
| i. 4                     | 138    | i. 1                  | 23         |
| ii. 13 ff.               | 81     | iv. 24 f.             | 73         |
| iv. 46-54                | 55     | xi. 3                 | 98         |
| vi. 18                   | 43     | xi. 25                | 111        |
| vi. 22-4                 | 43     | xiii. 11 ff.          | 110        |
| vi. 31                   | 77     |                       |            |
| viii. 48                 | 34     | I Corinthians         |            |
| ix. 38                   | 29     | ix. 5                 | 26         |
| xi. 33                   | 8      | xi. 23 ff.            | 121        |
| xi. 38                   | 8      | xv. 3 ff.             | 38, 148 f. |
| xi. 47-53                | 13     | xv. 5                 | 18         |
| xii. 14 f.               | 77     | xv. 51 ff.            | 111        |
| xiii. 1                  | 119    |                       |            |
| xviii. 10                | 42     | Galatians             |            |
| xix. 20 ff.              | 145    | i. 17                 | 38         |
| xix. 41                  | 78     | i. 19                 | 38         |
| xxi. 15 ff.              | 63     | ii. 1                 | 38, 75     |
|                          |        | ii. 2                 | 121        |
| Acts                     |        | ii. 9                 | 121        |
| i. 13                    | 18     | ii. 13                | 26         |
| ii. 37                   | 26     | ii. 14                | 83         |
| ii. 46                   | 4      | v. 3                  | 93         |
| iii. 14                  | 140    | vi. 3                 | 121        |
| iii. 15                  | 28     | vi. 13                | 93         |
| iv. 15                   | 102    |                       |            |
| vii. 48                  | 41     | Philippians           |            |
| vii. 52                  | 99     | ii. 6 ff.             | 73         |
| viii. 9                  | 140    | iv. 3                 | 26         |
| x. 14                    | 93     |                       |            |
| x. 36 ff.                | 2, 5   | I Thessalonians       |            |
| x. 37                    | 5, 28  | ii. 7                 | 38         |
| x. 38 f.                 | 22, 31 | ii. 15                | 98         |
| x. 39                    | 28     | iv. 13 ff.            | 111        |
| xi. 28                   | 104    | v. 2-8                | 110        |
| xi. 30                   | 75     |                       |            |
| xii. 25                  | 75     | II Thessalonians      |            |
| xiii. 16 ff.             | 2      | ii. 3 ff.             | 103        |
| xiii. 24 ff.             | 5      |                       |            |
| xv. 10                   | 93     | Hebrews               |            |
| xvi. 17                  | 41     | xi. 35                | 99         |
| xviii. 28                | 140    |                       |            |
| xix. 13 ff.              | 24     | James                 |            |
| xx. 35                   | 6      | i. 6                  | 83         |
| xxi. 3                   | 146    | v. 15                 | 83         |
|                          |        |                       |            |
|                          |        | Revelation            |            |
|                          |        | xi. 2                 | 111        |
|                          |        | xiii. 5               | 111        |
|                          |        | xxi. 1                | 111        |

INDEXES

V. CHRISTIAN WRITERS

|                               | PAGE |                               | PAGE  |
|-------------------------------|------|-------------------------------|-------|
| Acts of John                  |      | Justin                        |       |
| pp. 94 f., tr. James          | 75   | <i>Apolog.</i> I, 67 (98D)    | 6     |
| Acts of Pilate                |      | <i>Dialogus</i> 102 (329D)    | 99    |
| x                             | 42   | Lactantius                    |       |
| Arabic Infancy Gospel         |      | <i>Div. Inst.</i> v, 3, 14    | 40    |
| xxxviii                       | 44   | <i>Martyrium Polycarpi</i>    |       |
| Clement of Alexandria         |      | v                             | 141   |
| <i>Quis Dives</i> XLII        | 75   | XII                           | 141   |
| Clement of Rome               |      | XII, 2                        | 74    |
| xiii, 2                       | 6    | xviii, 1                      | 74    |
| xlvi, 8                       | 6    | Origen                        |       |
| <i>Epistola Apostolorum</i>   |      | <i>in Evangelium Ioannis</i>  |       |
| 2                             | 75   | XIX, 12                       | 112   |
| 15                            | 75   | <i>contra Celsum</i>          |       |
| 17                            | 75   | II, 69                        | 78    |
| Eusebius                      |      | IV, 10                        | 66    |
| <i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i> |      | <i>in Evangelium Matthaei</i> |       |
| III, 5, 3                     | 110  | X, 19                         | 48    |
| III, 39, 13                   | 73   | Papyri                        |       |
| VII, 17                       | 39   | <i>P. Berol.</i> 9794         | 3     |
| Gregory Nazianzen             |      | <i>P. Oxyrh.</i> 1            | 3, 47 |
| <i>Oratio</i> IV, 55 f.       | 66   | <i>P. Oxyrh.</i> 654          | 3     |
| Irenaeus                      |      | Pseudo-Matthew                |       |
| <i>adv. Haereses</i> v, 33, 3 | 73   | xxxvii, Tischendorf, p. 106   | 44    |
|                               |      | 'Suidas', <i>Lexicon</i>      |       |
|                               |      | s.v. ἐνεβριμῆσατο             | 8     |

VI. MODERN WRITERS

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Albertz, M., 3, 5, 8 ff., 87               | Burkitt, F. C., 71, 74, 86, 120, 136 f.      |
| Allen, W. C., 97, 98, 113                  | Butler, B. C., 94                            |
| Bauer, W., 129                             | Charles, R. H., 104                          |
| Bertram, G., 125                           | Clemen, C., 91                               |
| Bevan, E. R., 9                            | Creed, J. M., 15, 48, 64 f., 80, 84, 90, 94, |
| Billerbeck, P., 23, 97, 99, 101, 119, 123  | 96, 98, 100, 112, 121, 125, 127, 137         |
| Blass, F., 90, 138                         | Dalman, G., 107                              |
| Bousset, W., 65                            | Daube, D., 85, 109                           |
| Brooke, A. E., 120                         | Debrunner, A., 90, 138                       |
| Bultmann, R., 2, 10, 14-15, 18, 20, 23 f., | Deissmann, A., 14                            |
| 28, 33, 36, 42 f., 44, 47, 49, 54 ff.,     | Dibelius, M., 5, 13, 18 f., 25, 38 f.,       |
| 63, 65, 68 f., 70 f., 79, 100, 103, 107,   | 44 f., 47, 55, 61, 77, 87                    |
| 112, 124, 145                              |  |

## INDEXES

- Diels, H., 39  
Dodd, C. H., 2, 14, 36, 44, 65, 95, 103,  
106 f., 112, 114, 130
- Easton, B. S., 89  
Eitrem, S., 24, 62
- Fascher, E., 5  
Festugière, A. J., 95, 108  
Frazer, J. G., 39, 40  
Fridrichsen, A., 136
- Gardner-Smith, P., 78  
Gunkel, H., 111
- Hall, C. M., 138  
Harnack, A. von, 15, 41  
Heard, R. G., 105  
Hölscher, G., 50, 52, 79, 82, 111, 118  
Hort, F. J. A., 121
- James, M. R., 75  
Jülicher, A., 86
- Kilpatrick, G. D., 4, 93, 147  
Kittel, G., 121  
Knopf, R., 6
- Lagrange, M. J., 46, 88  
Lake, K., 8  
Laqueur, R., 138  
Lobeck, C. A., 66  
Loewe, H. M., 83
- Macan, R. W., 119  
Manson, T. W., 89  
Manson, W., 36  
Marsh, F. S., 98  
Meissner, B., 40  
Meyer, E., 1-3, 17 ff., 141  
Milligan, G., 90, 98
- Momigliano, A., 43  
Montefiore, C. G., 83  
Moore, G. F., 112  
Moulton, J. H., 90, 98  
Munro, J. A. R., 119
- Nock, A. D., 3, 41  
Norden, E., 110  
North, C. R., 73
- Otto, W., 10, 82
- Preuschen, E., 73 f.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J., 1, 8, 11, 13, 18, 25,  
33, 39, 41, 45 f., 51 f., 62 f., 64, 86,  
88, 93, 119, 123, 132, 141  
Roberts, C. H., 41  
Rowley, H. H., 10
- Schoeps, H. J., 98  
Schürer, E., 4, 40, 49, 112  
Schmidt, C., 75  
Schwartz, E., 3  
Skeat, T. C., 41  
Smith, B. T. D., 35, 37, 86  
Streeter, B. H., 54, 90, 140
- Tarn, W. W., 12, 19, 37, 40, 51  
Taylor, V., 6-7, 13, 24  
Turner, C. H., 25 f., 64
- Verrall, A. W., 137  
Volz, P., 111
- Wachsmuth, C., 108  
Weber, W., 46, 52, 79  
Wellhausen, J., 48, 65 f., 79, 94  
Weststein, J. J., 15  
Wrede, W., 62

## VII. NAMES AND SUBJECTS

- Ahriman, 83  
Alexander the Great, 40  
Antipater, 12  
Apollonius of Tyana, 40  
Aquila, 8
- Archelaus, 10  
Aristobulus I, 49  
Artemisium, battle, 119  
Asinius, 12  
Augustus, 10

## INDEXES

- Caligula, 103 ff.  
 Callisthenes, 19  
 Curtius Rufus, 37  
  
 Eznik, 83  
  
 Gilgamesh, 40  
  
 Heracles, 3  
 Herod Agrippa, 10, 46, 50  
 Herod Antipas, 50, 137 ff.  
 Herod the Great, 10, 137  
 Herodians, 10, 13, 16, 21, 52, 57, 89  
 Herodias, 50  
  
 Isis, 3  
  
 John Baptist, 50 f.  
 John son of Zebedee, early martyrdom,  
     73  
  
 Marcion, 15  
 Matris of Thebes, 3  
 Messianic Secret, 62  
  
 Nechepso, 108  
  
 Ohura Mazda, 83  
 Orodes, 50  
  
 Paneas, 39  
 Papias, 73 ff.  
 Petosiris, 108  
 Pharisees, 8 ff., 52 f., 56 f., 82, 89, 91,  
     93 ff., 100-2, 112, 118  
 Philip of Side, 74  
 Posidonius, 104  
  
 Sadducees, 57, 89 ff.  
 Sappho, 39  
 Shakespeare, W., 132  
 Strabo, 12  
 Suffering Servant, 72  
 Symmachus, 8  
  
 Theodotion, 8  
 Timagenes, 49  
  
 Vespasian, 46  
  
 Zarvan, 83