



Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division

B. 5. 1. 2. 3.

Section

A. B. 13

Number





*S. MARK'S INDEBTEDNESS
TO S. MATTHEW*



S. Mark's Indebtedness
to S. Matthew

BY

F. P. BADHAM, M.A.

EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD

LONDON

T. FISHER UNWIN

PATERNOSTER SQUARE

1897

[*All rights reserved.*]

To
PROFESSOR HILGENFELD
BY ONE OF HIS DISCIPLES.

“ Marcus Pedisequus et Breviator Matthæi.”

AUGUSTINE.

Contents.

	PAGE
PREFACE	ix
INTRODUCTION, S. LUKE'S S. MARK	xv
 CHAP.	
I. UN-JUDAIC CHARACTER OF S. MARK	1
II. LATER ESCHATOLOGY OF S. MARK	8
III. GLOSSES AND INFLATION	12
IV. PICTURESQUE DETAILS	38
V. S. MATTHEW TWICE CORRECTED IN S. MARK	51
VI. INJUNCTION OF SECRECY (Mark v. 43)	59
VII. ABRUPTNESS OF S. MARK	64
VIII. OMISSION OF PETER INCIDENTS (Matt. xvii. 24-27 ; xiv. 28-31)	70

CHAP.	PAGE
IX. PATCHWORK IN MARK iii. 7-20 . . .	75
X. APOSTOLIC MISSION AND CHARGE (Mark vi., xiii.)	81
XI. DOUBLETS AND INCONGRUITIES IN S. MARK	87
XII. OMISSION OF PARABLES	93
XIII. TRACES OF MATT. i., ii.	98
XIV. GUARDS AT THE SEPULCHRE	107
XV. DESIGN AND STYLE OF S. MARK	113
XVI. EVIDENCE OF PAPIAS	120
CONCLUSION	128

Preface.

THE object of this work is to prove that S. Mark is generally posterior to S. Matthew.

There is of course nothing really novel in such a view—S. Mark's posteriority was long ago proclaimed at Tübingen. But Baur's *Tendenzkritik* led the Tübingen pioneers to the untenable position that S. Mark was posterior to S. Matthew universally, posterior also to S. Luke; and a violent reaction ensued, of which the effects still continue. In Germany indeed the old tradition, modified at these extreme points, has been consistently and uncompromisingly maintained by Professor Hilgenfeld—to quote his own

words recently written, "The preference at present shown for S. Mark is opposed to the most certain conclusions of science"—but Professor Hilgenfeld is the spokesman of a minority, a minority which Dr. Davidson represents in England almost solitarily.

As an exposition of the view now dominant we may conveniently turn to the article "Gospels," by Dr. Sanday, in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, 2nd edition. Dr. Sanday declares that the greater originality of S. Mark is, "if not an assured result of criticism yet rapidly becoming so;" but he is obliged to recognise that the claim "cannot be made without reserve;" and he follows with a tentative conclusion that "there are distinct layers in our present S. Mark, one layer (commonly called 'ur-Marcus') that is earlier than our S. Matthew, and another ('deutero-Marcus') that is later."

Thus Dr. Sanday. But even the most

convinced of S. Mark's partisans can scarcely regard the present situation as satisfactory, for "ur-Marcus" and "deutero-Marcus" have been in stock for a considerable period, and the difficulty of separating them is just as much a difficulty now as it was forty years ago. Matters appear to be at a deadlock. No one has ever succeeded in distinguishing the two layers solidly, or in discovering any internal signs of duality in S. Mark which correspond with the variation of aspect towards S. Matthew, or in subtracting from S. Matthew any considerable amount of the matter common to S. Mark without leaving the remainder of S. Matthew unmanageable. Besides, it has never been more than an assumption, one of several explanations possible, that the dual aspect of S. Mark towards S. Matthew is an index of duality of source. The only essential difference in the situation to-day from what it was forty years ago

is the formidable increase of S. Mark's supporters,—it is apparently their number that convinces Dr. Sanday of S. Mark's approaching triumph,—but the significance of this increase may easily be over-rated. The doctrine of S. Mark's originality, it so happens, has appealed to a diversity of interests; and that Westcott, Abbott, and Renan should have coincided in advocating S. Mark's claims is a phenomenon which loses in effect when we discover that the reasons for their preference are to a great extent internecine.

In the ensuing pages I have endeavoured to collect instances of S. Mark's posteriority sufficient to prove that posteriority to S. Matthew is not the exception, but the rule; and I have also endeavoured to prove that there are certain signs of duality in S. Mark which do not at all correspond with the variation of aspect towards S. Matthew. If

the proofs are adequate, there is no room left for "ur-Marcus."

My thanks are due to the editors of the *Scottish Review* and the *Expository Times* for allowing me to reprint such portions of the book as have already appeared in those periodicals.

REFORM CLUB, PALL MALL.

January 29, 1897.

Introduction.

S. LUKE'S S. MARK.

THE sponsors of "ur-Marcus," drawing a distinction between those sections of our Second Gospel which re-appear in S. Luke and those which do not, often maintain that S. Luke was indebted not to our canonical S. Mark, but to "ur-Marcus."¹ An examination, therefore, of S. Luke's

¹ That S. Luke is posterior to S. Mark with regard to those sections which they have in common is now generally admitted. One may notice that the unusual vocabulary employed in the Second Gospel is modified, and that glosses attach such as "could not come at Him for the crowd," "for all live unto Him." Notice, too, that the Second Advent is referred to more vaguely, the siege of Jerusalem more definitely (Luke

S. Mark forms an appropriate preliminary to any attempt at determining the relationship of S. Mark to S. Matthew.

S. Luke's Gospel, it must be remembered, is composite. This is implied in the preface, and, indeed, is evident from the breaches of continuity in his work, and the numerous repetitions and incongruities. But composite though the Third Gospel is, it is evidently far from being a mere compilation, and one may fairly assume that when S. Luke found his documents overlapping he would sometimes make a sacrifice. Here, then, we have adequate justification for many of the gaps in S. Luke's S. Mark, viz., that S. Luke's other document or documents provided him with parallel accounts. For example, we find in his Gospel different accounts of the call of Peter, the Baptist's relationship to Elias, the distinction of the

ix. 27 ; xxi. 7, 14, 20, 31), and that the owner of the vineyard departs "for a long season." But the argument from such differences becomes superfluous if, as I am endeavouring to show, the sections of S. Mark repeated in S. Luke involve those omitted.

greatest commandment, the warning to Peter, the trial before the Sanhedrin, the military outrages, and the attitude of the people during the crucifixion (Luke v. 1-11; i. 17; x. 25-28; xxii. 31-38, 66^b-70; xxiii. 11, 35^a).

Now for direct proof of excision. In the seven cases above mentioned the contexts from the Second Gospel which S. Luke reproduces involve the matter omitted.

1. Simon's appearance as Christ's disciple and host in Luke iv. 38 is abrupt and unexplained. He ought to have been called previously, as in Mark i. 16-20.

2. The statement in Luke ix. 36, with regard to the Transfiguration, "the disciples told no one in those days," leaves us wondering why not, and why the duration of their silence should be mentioned. All is explained by reference to Mark ix. 9-13, where Christ enjoins silence until after His passion, this intimation that the Elias who has just vanished will not reappear forming direct preface to the important declaration about the Baptist.

3. "The scribes answered, Master, Thou hast well said. For they durst not *any more* ask Him any question" (Luke xx. 39, 40), requires that a scribe should have questioned Christ previously, as in Mark xii. 28-34.

4. In Luke xxii. 61 Peter calls to mind Christ's warning rather after the form given in Mark xiv. 30. And in Luke xxiv. 6, 7, the quite unnecessary mention of Galilee, carrying us as far back as the announcements in Luke ix., receives its explanation from Mark xiv. 28; xvi. 7.

5. In Luke xxii. 63-65 Christ is mocked before His condemnation has supplied the opportunity; and in verse 71 the question is asked, after a trial at which no witnesses have been produced (contrast Mark xiv. 55-59), "What *further* need have we of witness?"

6. The prophecy in Luke xviii. 31-34 requires that Christ should be mocked *by Romans*, and spit upon, and scourged, as in Mark xv. 15-20.

7. The "also" of Luke xxiii. 35—"and the rulers also scoffed"—is unjustified. We

ought to have some previous scoffers as in Mark xv. 29.

Things being thus, deliberate omission may be reasonably suspected whenever we find a gap in S. Luke's S. Mark supplied by his other document or documents. The visit to Nazareth, the parable of the mustard seed, "With what measure ye mete," the request of James and John for the seats of honour, the blasting of the fig tree, the unction at Bethany, the prophecy of the Apostles' dispersal (Mark vi. 1-6^a; iv. 30-32, 24; x. 35-45; xi. 12-14, 20-25; xiv. 3-9, 26-31)—all this is missing in the Third Gospel, and we find the deficiency supplied by Luke iv. 16-20; xiii. 18, 19; vi. 38; xxii. 24-30; xiii. 6-9; vii. 36-50; xxii. 31-38. But it is not only in the case of documents overlapping that S. Mark might be expected to make sacrifices. Sacrifices would also be called for by the exigencies of dovetailing; and, as before observed, the Third Gospel is evidently no mere slavish compilation. This much premised, to resume our list of demonstrable omissions.

8. The close sequence observable in Mark iii. 7-19; iv. 1-36¹ is disturbed in Luke vi. 12-19; viii. 4, 22; and it may be added that in Luke vi. 12-19 the sequence resulting is unnatural. Besides, in omitting the boat pulpit S. Luke is omitting a detail which occurs in the Second Gospel *twice* (Mark iii. 9; iv. 1).

All this is explicable enough. A proper context had to be constructed for the foreign wedge (Luke vi. 20-viii. 3^a). S. Luke was already provided with a boat pulpit, and could not have Christ in a boat for the arrival of His relatives. Further, there was a convenient locality for some of the dispersed matter to gravitate to.²

9. A similar reason, the intrusion of a foreign wedge (Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14), will account for the sacrifice of Mark ix. 42-

¹ Multitudes assemble. Therefore Christ appoints twelve assistants. Christ embarks for the parables, and in the evening, wearied, issues the command to sail.

² For a similar example of gravitation cf. Mark xv. 41 with Luke viii. 3.

x. 12. It ought to be added that S. Luke's other document or documents provided him with the divorce decision, also with the millstone and salt metaphors (Luke xiv. 34, 35 ; xvi. 18 ; xvii. 2). And it was "a hard saying" that about cutting off hand and foot.

Now for direct proof. This section sacrificed contains a notice of Christ's journey beyond Jordan (Mark x. 1). From thence to Jerusalem He subsequently passes through Jericho. But the omission of this journey beyond Jordan in the Third Gospel leaves Christ passing through Jericho on His way from Galilee to Jerusalem, although it lies quite out of the route.

10. Respect for S. Peter will account for the sacrifice of his remonstrance and the consequent rebuke (Mark viii. 32, 33). But the absence of the remonstrance and rebuke in Luke ix. leaves the severe tone of the subsequent utterances quite unexplained.

11. The account of the Baptist's imprisonment in Mark vi. being related quite out of chronological order, it was very natural that

S. Luke should attempt a rectification (Luke iii. 18-20). But the result of rectifying is that Herod's opinion about Christ (Luke ix. 7-9) is left extraordinarily isolated; and, seemingly, a bit of the *débris* remains with a wrong application ("διηπόρει," "ἰδέως," cf. Mark vi. 20). Notice, too, the phenomenal discrepancy of "John I beheaded, but who is this?" with "This is John whom I beheaded;" S. Luke's departure obviously arising from the fact that under the altered circumstances a direct assertion of John's death was preferable to a reference.

12. S. Luke's procedure seems to have been regulated, too, by a tendency to abbreviate. He had to be careful in joining two or more documents together that his work did not exceed certain limits. A comparison of the general style and phraseology of the Second Gospel and the Third tends to prove that S. Luke considered dispensable much of the minute picturesque detail in the Second.¹ But the points on

¹ For example, notice περιβλέπεσθαι. This word occurs six times in S. Mark (iii. 5, 34; v. 32; ix. 8; x. 23;

which I prefer to lay stress are more definite. (*a*) The demand for Barabbas is not preceded by a notice that the release of a prisoner was customary. (*b*) Judas comes to kiss without any notice that the kiss had been pre-arranged as a token of identification. (*c*) The stone which the women find rolled away has not previously been set in position. (*d*) Christ's exclamation, "With swords and staves," is unprepared for by a notice that the guard were sent so armed. True that in some MSS. these over-hasty erasures (except the last) are supplied, but, considering the authority of the MSS. which do not supply, the variety of reading serves rather to emphasize the original deficiency.

Let us now review our present position. These twelve proofs of omission considered together bring S. Luke's S. Mark very near to our canonical S. Mark. But one considerable omission remains, Mark vi. 45-viii. 26 —the walk on and stilling of the waves,

xi. 11), once in S. Luke (vi. 10 correspondent to Mark iii. 5), and nowhere else in the New Testament.

the unwashed hands, the Syro-phœnician child, the deaf stammerer of Decapolis, the 4000, the demand for a sign, the caution against leaven, and the blind man of Bethsaïda. This is the longest of all S. Mark's omissions, and the sponsors of ur-Marcus have been specially tempted to obelise the whole section. Now the integrity of S. Mark is one question, the integrity of S. Mark in relation to S. Luke quite another, and we must keep the two questions distinct. It may be admitted that the narratives of the 4000 and the 5000 probably proceed from different sources. It may be admitted, too, that there are breaches of continuity in Mark vi. 35, 45, 53, 56; viii. 22—the disciples starting for Bethsaïda and landing at Gennesaret; seeking for rest and quiet (consider their arrival at Bethsaïda subsequently, and its abruptness), and then touring through "cities and villages!" But it by no means follows because things are thus that therefore S. Luke's S. Mark was deficient. It by no means follows—quite the reverse! For the breach of continuity

is not where S. Luke's omission begins, between the 5000 and the walking on the sea—there the connection is very close—but between the walking on the sea and the arrival at Gennesaret. Moreover, what seems at first sight a singularly unpropitious coincidence to allude to, the mention of Bethsaïda (for in Mark vi. 45 the disciples sail *to* Bethsaïda, while according to Luke ix. 10 they are at Bethsaïda already), proves on second examination a most signal proof of S. Luke's reliance on Mark vi. 45. The discrepancy, most phenomenal in its way, for independent information just at this point is quite the last hypothesis to resort to, is all explained by reference to the Greek—“εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαΐδα(ν)” —which *might* mean “to the side opposite *from* Bethsaïda.”¹

¹ Βηθσαΐδαν may just as well be a genitive as an accusative. Cf. οὐαί σοι Βηθσαΐδαν, Matt. xi. 21; similarly **S, E** Luke x. 13. Although it is more natural to take Βηθσαΐδαν in Mark vi. 45 as an accusative, it must be remembered that S. Luke may have been influenced by the fact above noted that this interpretation is difficult to reconcile with verse 53.

A similar lesson is taught by the discrepancy between

Thus S. Luke's omission of Mark vi. 45–viii. 26 does not coincide with the line of cleavage, which the phenomena in that section perhaps require. But we may go further. This section is stamped throughout with all the peculiar characteristics of the Second Gospel, characteristics which S. Luke often reproduces. Notice especially the peculiar phraseology and minute detail of the miracles of Bethsaïda and Decapolis, the medium employed in both cases, the wonder word, the graduation of the blind man's recovery. Characteristic too, the report of Christ's gestures and emotions, “ἰστέναξι,” “ἀναστενάξας,” and the Aramaic “Corban,” “Ephphatha.”

Thus S. Luke's acquaintance with Mark vi. 45–viii. 26 appears inevitable; and, when we come to examine the section in detail, and inquire into the reasons for S. Luke's procedure, this impression is confirmed. S. Luke was otherwise provided with accounts of

Luke xxii. 58 and Mark xiv. 69: As the maid had addressed not Peter, but “them that stood by,” S. Luke assumes that Peter's response was to one of these bystanders, not to the maid.

the unwashed hands, the caution against leaven, and the demand for a sign (see Luke xi. 29, 37-41; xii. 1). He had already recited proof of Christ's power to still a storm and multiply loaves. The violent conflict of early traditions with regard to the blind-deaf-dumb cures (cf. Matt. ix. 27-34; xii. 22-24) rendered *accuracy* (see Luke i. 1-4) impossible. And the Syro-phœnician narrative, besides being particularly harsh sounding for Gentile readers, was, as to every edifying feature,—the mercy shown to a Gentile, the Gentile's faith, the efficacy of Christ's power from a distance—anticipated by the miracle wrought for the Roman Centurion.

In fine then, considering that so much of the Second Gospel is involved by what S. Luke repeats, and considering that adequate reason for omission is never far to seek, and, in addition, considering that no distinction of diction or tendency has ever been detected between the sections repeated and those omitted, all things considered, it may be fairly concluded that no

proof of the existence of an ur-Marcus is afforded by the Third Gospel. Setting apart the last twelve verses (Mark xvi. 9-20), there appears reason to believe that the S. Mark which S. Luke employed was our canonical S. Mark, whole and entire. We are left to examine S. Mark's relationship to S. Matthew untrammelled, unaided.

CHAPTER I.

UN-JUDAIC CHARACTER OF S. MARK.

ONE of the chief differences between S. Matthew and S. Mark is the distinctly un-Judaic character of the latter. It is a difference of which advocates of S. Mark's priority have scarcely realised the full import; for though it is conceivable that a Gospel prepared for Gentiles should afterwards have received some Judaic colouring, it is almost impossible to imagine a colourist so attentive to minutiae as the present case would require. True that some of the most Judaic features of S. Matthew occur in passages altogether peculiar to that Gospel, and may perhaps be derived from quite another source than the sections paralleled in S. Mark; but the sections paralleled in S. Mark contain too

many for this avenue of escape to remain open very long. On one side or the other there must have been deliberate alteration of the text.

In reporting the incident of the corn-plucking and the cure of the withered hand, our Second Evangelist omits all mention of "the Law," and of the priestly exemption for purposes of ritual; and in place of the Rabbinical rule about sheep falling into pits, he gives us the general principle as to saving life or killing. He again omits all mention of "the Law" in reporting the lawyer's question. "Some say thou art Elijah"—he omits "and others, Jeremiah"; "that your flight be not in the winter"—he omits "nor on a Sabbath"; "the abomination of desolation"—he omits "spoken of by Daniel"; "no sign given you"—he omits "save the sign of Jonah."

The omission last mentioned is especially interesting, for the reference to Jonah is one of those things that occur in the First Gospel twice (Matt. xii. 39; xvi. 4), and in the eyes of many critics these doublets are evidence of the combination of two distinct

documents. In any case, the fact of the double occurrence renders it very unlikely that "save the sign of Jonah" is a post-addition. Similar remarks apply to S. Mark's omission of the twice quoted passage, "mercy not sacrifice" (Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7).

He omits the name of the High Priest who condemned Christ, presumably because of little interest to his readers (Mark xiv. 1, 53); and for those ignorant of the topography of Jerusalem, he explains that the Mount of Olives overlooked the Temple (Mark xiii. 3). Aramaic words are used, not casually, as in Matt. v. 22; xxvii. 6, but at calculated points, and with the manifest object of impressing an audience unfamiliar with Aramaic (see Mark v. 41; vii. 11; viii. 34);¹ and though "Eli, Eli," in Matt. xxvii. 46, may seem analogous, it is not really so, being requisite to explain the jibe about Elias.

Notice again S. Mark's omission of the prophecy quoted in Matt. xiii. 14, 15.

¹ That Aramaic phrases are no token of primitiveness is proved by the *Acta Pilati*.

Surely we find a relic of this prophecy in Mark iv. 12 : "That they may not perceive, lest haply they should turn again and it should be forgiven them." The quotation being from the lips of our Lord Himself it seems, *prima facie*, far likelier that the shorter form in S. Mark is an abbreviation than that the lengthier form in S. Matthew is an expansion.

In his report of the rich ruler's inquiry S. Mark omits the Chiliastic promise, "In the regeneration ye shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes"—an omission which makes the subsequent request of James and John for the two chief thrones sudden and abrupt. In the brief denunciation of Scribes and Pharisees (Mark xii. 38-40, contrast Matt. xxiii.) his introductory phrase ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγε, "said in the course of teaching," is suggestive of his knowing more than it was to his purpose to report. By omitting Christ's declaration about the need of fulfilling all legal righteousness he leaves Him undistinguished from the penitents who come "confessing their sins." By omitting "then shall appear the

sign of the Son of man in heaven : and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn," he leaves the subsequent ὀψοῦται ("then shall they see") without a subject.

Still more significant is his treatment of the Syro-phœnician narrative. He omits the first repulse and Christ's declaration of being sent only to "the lost sheep of Israel" (Matt. xv. 24); and thus plunging *in medias res* he leaves the woman's abject attitude unaccounted for, and also, to some extent, Christ's commendation. But especially notice the statement with which he replaces the matter omitted: "Jesus entered into a house, and would have no man know it, and He could not be hid"; for here the narratives in S. Matthew and S. Mark are running too parallel for independent information to be reasonably expected, and while it is obviously impossible to derive S. Matthew's description from S. Mark's, the reverse process is easy. S. Mark's new detail looks like an excuse for and explanation of what he does not relate: the request of the disciples, "Send her away for she crieth after us," being interpreted as a desire to avoid publicity, not a reflection

on the woman's Gentile birth, it would seem natural that her second approach should be timed when the privacy of a house afforded the opportunity needed.

If it be admitted that our Second Evangelist had Matt. xv. 21-28 in his hands, then it seems probable that he also had the analogous passage in Matt. x. 5, 6: "Go not into any way of the Gentiles: go rather to the lost sheep of Israel."

Before quitting the subject of the un-Judaism of our Second Evangelist, attention is due to his constant explanation of Jewish customs and softening down of Jewish terminology. The Preparation is explained as "the day before the Sabbath," and the first day of unleavened bread as that "on which the Passover must be slain." We are informed that "common" is synonymous with "unclean"; that John's disciples and the Pharisees were in the habit of fasting; that amongst Jews it was of traditional obligation to wash the hands before eating and after marketing. (In passing, notice what an awkward repetition this long digression about ablutions necessitates: "had seen that some

of His disciples ate with defiled hands” ; “Why do they eat with defiled hands?”). “Greek” takes the place of “Canaanite” ; “healed” is twice explained by “taught” ; “long robes” replace the large fringes and broad phylacteries of Matt. xxiii. 5 ; and for the Oriental metaphor of bearing the shoes is substituted “unloose the latchet.” Such differences between S. Matthew and S. Mark are of course merely superficial, but cumulatively they have force.

In fine, the un-Judaism of S. Mark is consistent, systematic, and eminently artificial. We have no artless scribe, writing down all he knows without regard to the impression he will produce, but one who is distinctly eclectic.

CHAPTER II.

LATER ESCHATOLOGY OF S. MARK.

A COMPARISON of the Eschatology of S. Mark and S. Matthew reveals some significant differences which tell strongly for the priority of S. Matthew.

In Matt. x. 23 Christ promises that the Messianic reign shall commence before His disciples have visited all the cities of Israel, but just at this point the replica in Mark xiii. 9-13 stops short. It is conceivable, of course, that this verse is a post-addition; but its peculiarly Judaic character, its close connection with what precedes (cf. "To the lost sheep of Israel"), and the fact that it completes the parallel to Matt. xxiv. 14-19, render the idea of post-addition exceedingly improbable.

In Matt. xvi. 28 Christ declares that "some stand here which shall in no wise taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in His kingdom;" but in Mark ix. 1, "in no wise taste of death till they shall see the kingdom of God come with power." The original idea was surely of the *personal* advent, for it is of His coming with the angels that Christ has just spoken, and of rendering to every man according to his works. Does not the interpretation in an *impersonal* sense—"some standing here shall see My gospel triumph"—indicate a time when the expectation that Christ would return during the lifetime of His immediate followers was already disappointed?

So, again, with regard to the great final charge in Matt. xxiv. We are told that "this gospel shall be preached to all nations; and then shall the end come." The οὖν in the next verse ("When therefore ye see") makes the setting up of the great abomination a sign of the beginning of the end. And, further on, the darkening of the sun and the appearance of the Son of man on the clouds of heaven follow

the desolation of Jerusalem εὐθέως—"immediately after the tribulation of those days." But in Mark xiii. these prophecies appear with such difference as to suggest that a difficult interval after the destruction of Jerusalem has already elapsed. "The gospel must first be preached to all nations," repeats the Second Evangelist, but in a covert sort of way, and without telling us that when missionaries to all nations have gone forth, "then shall the end come." The setting up of the great abomination is introduced by δέ instead of οὖν. And the advent of Christ follows the destruction of Jerusalem indefinitely—"In those days after that tribulation."

It is perhaps worth noticing, too, that instead of S. Matthew's "standing in the holy place," we have in Mark xiii., "standing where it ought not." The variation may be merely due to S. Mark's un-Judaic design, but it may also be due to the fact that the flight to Pella was not occasioned by the setting up of any idol in the Temple itself. The general expectation of an idol in the Temple was never realised, and expounders of prophecy appear to have been

thrown back on the Roman eagles that encircled Jerusalem (cf. Luke xxi. 20).

With regard to the final paragraph (Mark xiii. 33-37) it is difficult to conclude anything definitely, for its place in S. Matthew is taken by matter apparently derived from another source altogether (see pp. 130, 131). Still there are points that may be noticed. The extended exhortation, "What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch," seems to carry us beyond Apostolic times. And the words, "whether at cock-crow or in the morning," would have been most fittingly addressed to men already wearied with the midnight vigil.

CHAPTER III.

GLOSSES AND INFLATION.

THE following table of parallel passages speaks for itself. It will be perceived that S. Mark develops his material, softens asperities, explains ambiguities, heightens effects, and generally strains after emphasis and intensity. Of course, in many of these cases, considered separately, the obligation might be in either direction—S. Matthew might have pruned, toned down, &c.—but considering them altogether one can see that there is a unity on the positive side and not on the negative. To suppose that S. Matthew had predilections exactly antithetical to those of S. Mark is to suppose a literary miracle.

S. MATTHEW.

“How hardly they that have riches.”

“Shall receive a hundred-fold, and inherit eternal life.”

“They which rule.”

“He prayed, Father, let this cup pass from Me.”

“Father, if it be possible.”

“A renowned prisoner” (ambiguously).

“He shall not honour.”

S. MARK.

Qualified, “That trust in riches.”

Precluding Chiliastic interpretation, “A hundred-fold more in this time with persecutions, and in the world to come eternal life.”

Reserving the real sovereignty to God, “They which seem to rule.”

With explanation, “He prayed that the hour might pass from Him, saying.”

Lest the Divine power should seem to be limited, “Father, all things are possible unto Thee, if it be possible.”

Renowned, but for his crimes, “Lying bound with them that had made insurrection, men who in the insurrection had committed murder.”

Subdued, “Ye no longer suffer him to do anything for.”

S. MATTHEW.

"He granted the body."

"Μηδὲ ῥάβδον, μηδὲ ὑποδήματα."

"Then come the disciples of John, saying, Why do we fast and Thy disciples not?"

"The disciples had indignation, saying, To what purpose is this waste?"

S. MARK.

Precluding any cavil that Christ merely revived from a swoon, "He marvelled if he were already dead, and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead. And when he had learned it of the centurion, he granted the corpse."

Mitigated, "Εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον, ἀλλὰ ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια." Notice in this case the two awkward ruptures of construction that the alteration involves, "He charged them that they should not take . . . but shod with sandals . . . and do not put on two coats."

Acquitting John's disciples, "They come and say, Why do John's disciples?"

Softened, "There were some that had indignation."

S. MATTHEW.

“Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God that ye may keep your tradition. . . . Well did Isaiah prophesy of you, ‘Teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men.’”

Herod the tetrarch.

“There went out Jerusalem.”

“Answered nothing.”

“Dugged a winepress.”

S. MARK.

Avoiding the self-incriminating “also ;” applying the prophecy directly ; and altering the order so as to graduate Christ’s condemnation, “Well did Isaiah prophesy, ‘Teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men.’ Ye leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men. And he said, Full well do ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your tradition.”

Inaccurately, Herod the king.

Improved, “They of Jerusalem.”

Noticing that Christ had already answered, “No more answered anything.”

More exactly, “a pit for the winepress.”

S. MATTHEW.

“Whosoever shall put away his wife.”

“The other Mary,” “James,” “the sons of Zebedee,” “Simon of Cyrene.”

“Preached saying, Repent.”

“Began to preach.”

“Repent.”

“For My sake.”

“The Spirit.”

S. MARK.

Further providing for a contingency impossible under the Jewish law, but common enough in Greece and Rome, “And if she herself shall put away her husband.”

With specification, “Mary of Joses,” “James the Less,” “James and John the sons of Zebedee,” “the father of Alexander and Rufus.”

“Preached a baptism of repentance unto remission of sins.”

“Preaching the gospel of God.”

“Repent, and believe in the gospel.”

“For My sake and the gospel’s” (twice).

“The Holy Spirit” (twice).

S. MATTHEW.

“Seeing a fig-tree, He came.”

“If a man die . . . and the second . . . unto the seventh.”

“He saw Peter’s mother-in-law sick of a fever.”

“He called them.”

“White as the light.”

“And Jesus was going up to Jerusalem.”

S. MARK.

“Seeing a fig-tree with leaves, He came if haply He might find anything thereon.”

“Die and leave a wife behind him . . . and the second; neither left he any seed; and the seven, and left no seed.”

“And Simon’s mother-in-law was sick of a fever, and straightway they tell Him of her. And He came.”

“He said, Call ye him. And they call the blind man, saying unto him, Be of good cheer, rise, He calleth thee. And he sprang up and came.”

“Glistering, exceeding white, so as no fuller on earth can whiten them.”

“They were in the way going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going before them.”

S. MATTHEW.

“Asking a certain thing.
And He said, What wouldst
thou ?”

“Say to such a one, I
keep the passover in thy
house.”

“Did as Jesus appointed
them.”

“Said to them.”

“Take up thy bed. And
he arose and departed.”

“When Herod's birth-
day came.”

S. MARK.

“Saying, Master, we
would that Thou shouldst
do for us whatsoever we
shall ask of Thee. And
He said, What would ye
that I should do for you ?”

“Say to the good man
of the house, Where is my
guest-chamber ? And he
will himself show you a
large upper room, fur-
nished and ready : and
there make ready for us.”

“Went forth, and came
to the city, and found as
He had said unto them.”

“Began to tell them the
things that were about to
happen to Him, saying.”

“Take up thy bed. And
he arose and straightway
took up the bed, and went
forth before them all.”

“When a convenient
day was come that Herod
on his birthday.”

S. MATTHEW.

“Pleased Herod.”

“She being put forward by her mother, saith, Give me here the head of John the Baptist.”

“He sent and be-headed.”

“Knowing their thoughts.”

“For the sake of his brother’s wife. For John said, It is not lawful to have her.”

S. MARK.

“Pleased Herod, and them that sat at meat with him.”

“She went and said to her mother, What shall I ask? And she said, The head of John the Baptist. And she came in straightway with haste unto the king and asked, saying, I will that thou forthwith give me the head of John the Baptist.”

“Straightway he sent a soldier of his guard, and commanded to bring his head.”

“Straightway perceiv- ing in His spirit that they so reasoned within them- selves.”

Emphatic repetition,
“For the sake of his brother’s wife. For John said, ‘It is not lawful to have thy brother’s wife.’”

S. MATTHEW.

“Many publicans and sinners sat down with Him. And when they saw it.”

“Every one that hath left houses, brethren, sisters, father, mother, children, or lands shall receive a hundred-fold.”

“This generation. No sign given unto it.”

“Simon, and Andrew his brother.”

“James, and John his brother.”

“To what purpose is this waste?”

“Who gave thee this authority?”

S. MARK.

Emphatic repetition again, “Saw that He was eating with publicans and sinners.”

“No man hath left houses, brethren, sisters, mother, father, children, or land, but he shall receive a hundred-fold, houses, brethren, sisters, mothers, children, and lands.”

“This generation. No sign given unto this generation.”

“Simon, and Andrew brother of Simon.”

“James, and John brother of James.”

“To what purpose hath this waste of ointment been made? And they murmured at her.”

“Who gave thee this authority to do these things?”

S. MATTHEW.

“Offer.”

“This man.”

“Save in his own country.”

“Cried.”

“This wisdom.”

“In the beginning.”

“Thefts, false witness, railings.”

“When therefore they were gathered together.”

S. MARK.

“Offer for thy cleansing.”

“This man of whom ye speak.”

“Save in his own country and among his own kin.”

“Cried with a loud voice.”

“This wisdom that is given to him.”

“In the beginning of the creation.”

Completing the catalogue, “Thefts, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness.”

Unnecessarily explaining the purpose, “They went up and began to ask him to do as he was wont unto them.”

S. MATTHEW.

"How many baskets?"

"Have ye not read?"

"What David did?"

"At even."

"As it dawned."

"Not many mighty works."

S. MARK.

"Baskets full of broken pieces? (twice). And they say, 'Twelve . . . seven.'"

To readers but slightly acquainted with the O. T., "In the book of Moses, in the place concerning the Bush?"

More definitely, but inaccurately, "In the days of Abiathar the high priest?"

"At even when the sun had set."

"Exceedingly early, when the sun was risen."

"No mighty work, save that He laid His hand upon a few sick folk and healed them."¹

¹ The greater harshness of S. Mark at this point "οὐκ ἔδύνατο . . . καὶ θαύμαζεν" has led to a prejudice in his favour. But "καὶ θαύμαζεν" is not unique (see Matt. viii. 10; Luke vii. 9); nor is "οὐκ ἔδύνατο" (see Luke v. 17); and an idea of the limitation of Christ's power appears specially characteristic of our Second

S. MATTHEW.

“They came to the other side.”

“Saying.”

“His disciples came.”

“And as they went from Jericho.”

“If ye have faith and doubt not.”

“Cares of this world.”

S. MARK.

“They came to the other side, and when they were come out of the boat” (twice).

“When they were come they say.”

“When His disciples heard thereof, they came.”

“They came to Jericho. And as they went from Jericho.”

“Have faith. Whosoever shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he saith cometh to pass.”

“Cares of this world, and the lusts of other things entering in.”

Evangelist (see Mark vii. 33, 34 ; viii. 23-25). “*ὄκ ἐδύνατο*” may be merely an inference from “*ὄκ ἐποίησεν*”; and “*καὶ ἐθαύμαζεν*” and the other extra matter dividing off “*διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν*” is marked by no hiatus whatever in S. Matthew.

S. MATTHEW.

"Less than all seeds."

"Yielded fruit."

"Must suffer many things and be killed."

"Afterwards He sent unto them His son."

"Thou son of God."

"Brought all who were sick."

"Told it in the city."

"I will make you fishers of men."

"And followed Him."

S. MARK.

"Less than all seeds that are upon the earth."

"Yielded fruit, springing up and increasing and brought forth."

"Must suffer many things, and be rejected and killed."

"He had yet one, a beloved son : He sent him last unto them."

"Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God."

"Began to carry about on beds those that were sick."

"In the city and in the country."

"I will make you to become."

"And followed Him in the way."

EMPHATIC POINTING.

S. MATTHEW.

“Out of the heart.”

“Whatsoever.”

“Passeth into the belly.”

“Taketh from it.”

“Destroy this temple
and build in three days.”

“Sleep on now.”

“Be not anxious.”

“Why trouble her?”

S. MARK.

“From within, out of
the heart.”“Whatsoever from with-
out.” Cf. Mark iv. 11,
“ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἔξω.”“Cannot defile him,
because it goeth not into
his heart, but into his
belly.”“Taketh from it, the
new from the old.”“This temple made
with hands, and in three
days build another made
without hands.”“Sleep on now : it is
enough.”“Be not anxious before-
hand.”“Let her alone : why
trouble her? She hath
done what she could.”

S. MATTHEW.

“For my burial.”

“The kingdom of
heaven is at hand.”“Behold, I have told
you.”

“Then shall they fast.”

“This night.”

“From heaven or from
men ?”“Saw no one save Jesus
only.”“But with God all
things are possible.”

“I have observed.”

S. MARK.

“Beforehand for my
burial.”“The time is fulfilled,
and the kingdom of God
is at hand.”“Take ye heed ; behold
I have told you.”

“Then in that day.”

“To-day, even this
night.”“From heaven or from
men ? Answer me.”“Saw no one any more
save Jesus only with them-
selves.”“But not impossible
with God ; for with God
all things are possible.”“I have observed from
my youth.”

EXCESSIVENESS.

S. MATTHEW.

“Peter saith.”

“Wondered.”

“Cried out the more.”

“Was grieved.”

“Saying.”

“They marvelled.”

“Many followed.”

“He saw the heavens
opened.”

“Lifting up their eyes.”

S. MARK.

“Saith exceeding vehe-
mently.”“Wondered exceedingly.” (Cf. “λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ”
Mark vi. 51.)“Cried out the more a
great deal.”“Was exceedingly
grieved.”“Besought Him much,
saying” (twice).“Marvelled greatly,”
R.V.“The multitude cometh
so that they could not so
much as eat bread”
(twice).

“Rent asunder.”

“Suddenly looking
round.”

S. MATTHEW.

“There came one to Him.”

“They followed from the cities.”

“They sent into all that region.”

S. MARK.

“There ran one to Him and kneeled to Him.” Is there not something unnatural in the ruler's rushing forward so suddenly?

“They ran there together from all the cities and outstripped them.” This simultaneous racing “*from all the cities*” is still more artificial.

“They ran about through all that region.”

REDUPLICATION AND REDUNDANCY.

“When they deliver you up.”

“Take Him.”

“That she may live.”

“When they lead you and deliver you up.”

“Take Him and lead Him away safely.”

“May be made whole and live.”

S. MATTHEW.

“I know not.”

“Was silent.”

“Do ye not yet perceive?”

“Said.”

“Saying.”

“Was an hungred.”

“Where wilt Thou that we make ready?”

“Not go down into his house.”

“Send us into the swine.”

“In the resurrection.”

“For the elect’s sake.”

S. MARK.

“I neither know nor understand.”

“Was silent and answered nothing.”

“Not yet perceive neither understand?”

“Taught and said.”

“Beseeching Him and saying.”

“Had need and was an hungred.”

“That we go and make ready?”

“Not go down or enter into.”

“Into the swine that that we may enter into them.”

“In the resurrection when they rise.”

“For the elect’s sake whom He chose.”

S. MATTHEW.

"Your tradition."

"From the beginning
of the world.""Show Me the tribute
money."

"Casting lots."

"They beat."

"She arose."

"Who followed."

"They were astonished
exceedingly.""The boat was covered
with waves."

S. MARK.

"Your tradition which
ye have delivered.""From the beginning
of the creation which
God created.""Bring Me a penny
that I may see it.""Casting lots, what
each should take.""They beat, and sent
away empty."

"Arose and walked."

"Who followed, and
came up with Him to
Jerusalem.""They were amazed
at His words . . . they
were astonished exceed-
ingly.""And the waves beat
into the boat, insomuch
that the boat was now
filling."

S. MATTHEW.

“His leprosy was cleansed.”

“And the woman was made whole from that hour.”

“Is it lawful to give ?”

“Can they mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them ?”

“Promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she should ask.”

S. MARK.

“His leprosy departed from him, and he was made clean.”

“Straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up, and she felt in her body that she was healed of her plague.”¹

“Is it lawful to give ? Shall we give, or shall we not give ?”

“Can they fast while the bridegroom is with them ? As long as the bridegroom is with them they cannot fast.”

“Saith, Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt and I will give it thee. And he sware, Whatsoever thou shalt ask of me, I will give it thee, even unto the half of my kingdom.”

¹ Compare also S. Matthew's “He spake and saw” with Mark vii. 35 ; viii. 25.

S. MATTHEW.

“Besought Him saying,
If Thou cast us out.”

S. MARK.

“Besought Him much
that He would not send
them away out of the
country. And they be-
sought Him, saying.”

AFTER-THOUGHTS.

“The poor ye have
always with you.”

“Always with you, and
whensoever ye will ye
can do them good.”

“Will faint by the
way.”

“Will faint by the way,
for some of them come
from afar.”

“Herod heard.”

“Heard, for his name
had become known.”

“For the sake of
Herodias.”

“For the sake of
Herodias, for he had
married her.”

“He blasphemeth.”

“He blasphemeth. Who
can forgive sins but
God?”

S. MATTHEW.

"False witnesses came."

"Drink ye all of it."

"Many publicans and sinners sat down with Jesus."

"Brought to Him."

"When they saw Him."

"When the multitude heard."

S. MARK.

"False witnesses came, and their witness agreed not together" (twice).¹

"And they all drank of it."

"Sat down with Jesus, for there were many, and they followed Him."

"Began to carry where they heard He was."

"When they saw Him, for they all saw Him."

"And the people saw them go, and many knew them."

 POSTSCRIPTS.

"Not of the dead, but of the living."

"Not of the dead, but of the living. Ye do

¹ The non-agreement might easily be inferred from St. Matthew's "They sought witness, and found it not, although many false witnesses came."

S. MATTHEW.

“And choked it.”

“How shall his kingdom stand?”

“But the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven.”

“Making void the word of God.”

S. MARK.

greatly err.” In this and the four following cases notice the impotency of the conclusion.

“Choked it, and it yielded no fruit.”

“Cannot stand, but hath an end.”

“Whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin : because they said, He hath an unclean spirit.”

“Making void the word of God : and many such like things ye do.”

In S. Matthew, “Herod said, This is John the Baptist. He is risen”; in S. Mark, “Herod said, John the Baptist is risen. But others said, It is Elijah. And others, It is a prophet even as one of the prophets. But

Herod said, John whom I beheaded, he is risen." The extra matter in S. Mark looks very like a slavishly-conceived justification for the opinions held about Christ which the disciples are presently to report. And notice the awkward repetition of Herod's opinion which this intercalation necessitates.

In S. Matthew, Herod desires to kill John, but fears the people, for all account him a prophet. In S. Mark, it is Herodias who desires to kill, and Herod's respect for John that prevents. The discrepancy is pronounced, but the two Gospels at this point are running too parallel to allow our taking refuge in the hypothesis of independent traditions. We are obliged then to infer the existence behind both Gospels of a text susceptible of either interpretation; but while, to arrive at it, we have only to alter the text of S. Matthew slightly (*e.g.*, καὶ ἠθέλεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι· καὶ ἐφοβήθη, ὅτι πάντες ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον¹), we are obliged in the case of S. Mark to dispense with several extra details, which are thus shown to be secondary,—“She set herself

¹ Cf. Matt. xxi. 26.

against him;" "He kept him safe;" "He was perplexed and heard him gladly."

Again, it is surely a sign of posteriority that the Second Evangelist should twice excuse the Apostles' attitude, "For they wist not what to say"; should supply the moral to be drawn from the Draught of Meats, "This He spake making all meats clean;" should explain the Gadarene demoniac's ejaculation, "What have I to do with Thee," by adding, "For Jesus had said, Come forth, thou unclean spirit;" should give motive for Christ's *touching* the leper, "Being moved with compassion;" should extenuate the apparent unkindness of, "They left their father in the ship," by adding "with the hired servants;" should account for Christ taking the Twelve apart (Matt. xx. 17), by explaining that the rest of the company were in a state of panic; should qualify the harshness of "It is not meet to take the children's bread," by prefixing "Let the children be fed first;" should illustrate "Straightway ye shall find," by making the disciples in very fact find the ass in a gateway, and should represent the contingency provided for, "If any man say aught,"

as actually arising ; should illustrate “ Go into the city to such a man,” by adding a note for identification ; should account for the sternness of “ Behind me, Satan,” by representing the prediction of the Passion as uttered *παρρησία*, and Peter as remonstrating in the presence of the disciples (In this last case there are awkward consequences, for our Second Evangelist, requiring some enlargement of audience for the utterances that follow, avails himself of “ the multitude,”—forgetful that Christ is in retirement at Cæsarea Philippi). Again, those statements in Mark iv. 10, 33, 34, that Christ was “ alone ” when questioned about the sower, and explained all things to the disciples “ privately,” are they not due to a mistaken interpretation of Matt. xiii. ?—for at the close of day Christ is still sitting in the boat in the presence of the multitudes ; and the notion of His selecting an audience frustrates the invitation “ He that hath ears to hear, let him hear,” and also the reproach, “ They close their ears.”

CHAPTER IV.

THE PICTURESQUE DETAILS.

OUR consideration of the lengthier text in S. Mark now brings us up facing that elaboration of detail which S. Mark's champions never weary of appealing to as infallible proof of originality and eye-witness. There are, however, as Strauss and Davidson have recognised, good grounds for a view quite contrary.

What an extraordinary conception of S. Matthew we are driven to by the hypothesis that the precise vivid details of S. Mark are original! For these details are absent from S. Matthew one and all, and if the Matthæan narratives are to be derived from those in S. Mark, the conclusion is inevitable that the

author of the former was unprecise, unpicturesque deliberately !

Again, on the hypothesis that the precise vivid details are not the outcome of determined artistic design, but a natural result of eye-witness, how strangely they sometimes occur ! The first, "κύψας," in an utterance of the Baptist's. The second, "with the wild beasts," belonging to a time when Christ was alone. From the exactitude of "even to the half of my kingdom," are we to infer that the artless eye-witness was actually present at Herod's banquet? Did he rush after Salome from the banqueting-hall in order to overhear her dialogue with Herodias? Mark vii. 30, "She found the child laid upon the bed," would make the narrator the Syro-phœnician herself; for who but she could describe the scene that presented itself when she got home? Similarly, the scene in Mark v. 15 ("They come to Jesus, and behold him that was possessed with devils sitting, clothed and in his right mind, even him that had the legion: and they were afraid") is depicted from the point of view of the Gadarenes. And all the eye-witness in the world cannot account for S.

Mark's knowledge of the internal sensations of the woman with the issue.

As a rule the sequence of events is definitely noted ("on that day," "straightway after"), and gestures and emotions are continually reported ("looking round," "frowning," "embracing," "sighing," "moved with indignation," "with anger," "being grieved," "looking on him loved him"); but let any one consult his own memory as to events a few years back. How often can he really assign events to a day, to an hour? How often can he recall the exact expression on a person's lips, the direction of his eyes, the tone of his voice? No! in any case we are forced to infer a certain self-consciousness and a deliberate artistic design on the part of the Second Evangelist.

The Second Evangelist's details are often purely ornamental, rather awkwardly distracting attention from the main idea, and quite dispensable. Such are his statements that, when Christ started for Gadara "there were other boats with them"; that there were four men carrying the paralytic's mattress, one at each corner; that the cock crowed twice

before Peter remembered ; that the angel of the sepulchre sat on the right side ; that it was in the stern of the boat, on the cushion, that Christ lay asleep ; that a child whom Christ raised was precisely twelve years old ; that the pedigree of the Tyrian woman, whose daughter Christ healed, was Syro-phœnician ; that the exact quality of the precious ointment was “pistic nard” ; that the number of rabid swine was two thousand ; that the sum requisite for the purchase of loaves was two hundred pence, and the market value of the precious ointment, three hundred. In the case of the pricing of the loaves and of the precious ointment, is there not something untrue to nature in making the disciples so ready with their figures ? Did onlookers in Gadara really occupy themselves in ascertaining the exact number of swine that perished ?

How few of the details really require any special knowledge ! How many are suggested by, or might be inferred from the briefer narrative in S. Matthew ! It need not be an eye-witness who tells us that the feeding multitudes arranged themselves in groups,

and that the grass on which they sat was green. The epileptic's symptoms described in Mark ix.—“It dashes him down; he foameth and grindeth his teeth and pineth away”—are quite ordinary, and the narrator need not have been present on this particular occasion in order to describe them. Any one might naturally conclude for himself that the ruler's daughter required nutriment when she revived; that the epileptic's paroxysm left him in a state of collapse; that a blind man who had taken his station by the roadside had done so for the purpose of begging, and that when he hurriedly arose, he threw aside the wrap across his knees; that when Peter was recognised he was exposed to some artificial light; that to get out the ointment, the alabaster cruse was broken or unsealed; that when the disciples arrived in port “they moored to the shore”; that Herod's birthday guests, whose good opinion he valued, were “his lords the chiliarchs and the chief men of Galilee.” S. Matthew's brief statement, “There met him from the tombs,” is a sufficient germ for all S. Mark's extravagance, “There met him from the tombs, . . . who had

his dwelling in the tombs: and always night and day in the tombs and in the mountains he was crying out and cutting himself with stones." Similarly, from S. Matthew's brief description, "Exceeding fierce, so that no man could pass that way," might not any one naturally guess that constant efforts had been made to abate such a serious nuisance?—"and no man could any more bind him, no not with a chain; because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been rent asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces. And no man had strength to tame him." The legion of possessed swine would naturally suggest the idea that the demoniac's possession was multiple. The fact that the swineherds were "afar off" might easily lead a writer, straining after verisimilitude, to represent their report as being supplemented by that of nearer witnesses. The fact that in Matt. xxi. 19, the withering of the fig tree takes place "immediately" might well lead to a commentatorial notice that the foliage appeared drooping on the day subsequent; and that such is the relationship of Mark xi. 11-23 to Matt. xxi.

19 is proved by the fact that this desideration of a second day for the curse to take outward effect leaves our Lord on the first day of His arrival in Jerusalem with nothing whatever to do except περιβλέπεσθαι (one of our Second Evangelist's mannerisms), and also involves an awkward repetition of the evening retirement to Bethany (Mark xi. 11, 19).

Consider the frequently trivial character of these details. It is a rule in biography that later biographers employ what the earlier disdain : crumbs are swept up only when the feast is finished. Consider, too, the tendency to emphasise the marvellous. With the phenomena of the Apocryphal Gospels before our eyes it ought surely to be reckoned a sign of decadence that our Second Evangelist dilates so exuberantly on the Gadarene's ferocity and the epileptic's paroxysm.

And sometimes the new details do not seem conceived quite in the character of the narratives to which they are added. "The time of figs was not yet" explains the tree's barrenness, but is inharmonious with Christ's expectation of finding fruit. The ornate description of the epileptic's fit obscures the

fact that it was not his recovery from this particular attack that really constituted the miracle, but his immunity in the future. "He bought a linen cloth," but it was a day of Sabbatical obligation! After the very vigorous expulsion of the money-changers, there is bathos in "He would not suffer that any man should carry a vessel through the temple"; and, moreover, this remark awkwardly separates the money-changers from Christ's address to them. It is strange to hear that "He wanted to pass them by" after "seeing them distressed He came to them walking on the sea"; strange that the demoniac about to cry out against interference "ran to meet Him"; strange, and, from its needless exactitude, grating, "and they had only one loaf" after "they had forgotten to take bread."

Of course it is easy to carry the objections to S. Mark's picturesque details too far. For example, with regard to the young man in the linen cloth (Mark xiv. 51, 52), the startling *bizarrerie* of the incident gives one confidence that it is no invention. But the authenticity of the incident is one matter,

and the relationship of the narrative which contains it to the one which does not, quite another. It is a mere assumption, common enough, but unreasonable, that only the earliest Evangelists would be original, that the editors would be unoriginal completely; and all that this authentic-looking incident ought to lead us to is the reflection whether it is likelier that in S. Matthew something has been expunged, or in S. Mark something added. Similarly with regard to the letting down of the paralytic's mattress, one instinctively feels that such a detail is something more than a mere artistic flourish. But here, when instead of utilising the ordinary Syrian inner court, S. Mark actually makes the bearers "dig through" and break up solid tiling, forgetful of the people's heads underneath, one feels again that the description is other than first-hand. Surely the likeliest of S. Mark's new details may be explained by supposing that he had heard comments on the Matthæan narrative by some occasional eye-witness.

All the characteristics above noted in S. Mark's elaboration of detail are especially

conspicuous in the Jäirus history. Let us consider the extra items separately. Firstly, as to the woman with the issue. In S. Matthew we are simply told that "she came behind, and touched : but Jesus turned and saw her." In S. Mark the opportunity for her furtive act is improved by surrounding Christ with a great crowd, and Christ's sentience is rendered more striking. But the crowd has had no opportunity to gather, for Christ has only just disembarked from Gadara (a difficulty underlined by our Third Evangelist's transparent device of keeping a previous crowd waiting on the shore, Luke viii. 40). Further, Christ's address to the woman is rendered remarkably ineffectual by the awkward interval of investigation which separates it from her cure—"Thy faith hath made thee whole : be whole of thy plague." Secondly, notice the redundancy, "begging and praying," "fearing and trembling;" also the nervous explanations of motive, "having heard the things concerning Jesus," "perceiving that the power from Him had gone forth," "overhearing the word which was spoken," "knowing what had been done

to her ;” and the replacement of the Oriental “flute-players” by the elucidatory paraphrase, “many weeping and wailing.” Thirdly, from the First Evangelist’s statement that the hemorrhage was of twelve years’ standing, might not any one infer that the sufferer had had recourse to medicine, of course without beneficial results, and had been put to ruinous expense? It is little more than mere embellishment then, when the Second Evangelist adds, “And she had suffered many things of many physicians, and spent all she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather made worse.” Fourthly, the ruler’s amazingly trustful request—as reported in Matt. ix.—that Christ will come and work such an unprecedented wonder as raising the dead is one that to a later writer, straining after verisimilitude, would naturally seem to require some shading off. That this is our Second Evangelist’s motive in at first representing the child as merely sick is shown by Christ’s speech to Jäirus, when death has actually supervened, “Fear not, only believe.” Fifthly, “Talitha Cumi.” It is a thing to be felt, not argued about, that it was a later

generation that required here and elsewhere the actual wonder-words. But it may be observed that in another case where the Second Evangelist, as against the First, supplies an Aramaic expression, viz., "Boanerges" (Mark iii. 17), the remarkable disturbance occasioned in the construction extrudes it as unoriginal. And "Ἰαββᾶ ὁ πατήρ," explicable enough when we trace it back to its origin in the mixed language of a *tongue* (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6), is as inappropriate in Mark xiv. 36, as if one were to commence the Lord's Prayer with "Père Padre."¹ Sixthly, "He charged them (Jairus and his wife) that they should say nothing to any one." But Christ was accompanied by a great crowd, let us remember, when He started for Jairus's house. The message of the child's death was publicly delivered. And He found the

¹ If Mr. N. Herz's conjecture be correct, that the very curious and hitherto unexplained word in Codex Bezae "ραββι" (cf. "TABEACULTHA," Codex Palatinus) represents the Aramaic "Riyba" (=maiden), then we have evidence of an early alternative to Talitha: yet these are "*ipsissima verba.*"

house full of mourners. What possibility was there of secrecy? Where the prohibition comes from will appear presently (see pp. 59-61). Sufficient here to notice that it is entirely out of keeping with its context.

Thus the Jäirus history of Mark v. seems to stand in the same relation to the correspondent section of Matt. ix. as a developed picture to an original sketch. Though twice as long, it contains few features really new. The name Jäirus looks original, but here once more originality must be distinguished from priority. Would the First Evangelist have omitted the name if he had known it? With this exception, we have little more reason to assume that our author was independent, than to infer from the ordinary uncanonical details of a sacred picture that the artist had any exceptional source of information.

CHAPTER V.

S. MATTHEW TWICE CORRECTED IN
S. MARK.

IN the preceding chapter it was pointed out that after making all due deductions, there remained a certain residuum of detail in S. Mark which looked genuinely original, but at the same time was of the nature of comment on and sub-addition to S. Matthew. To the two examples there given one may perhaps add S. Mark's peculiar information about the lawyer's answer, and the Gadarene demoniac's request to accompany Christ. It is certainly easier to understand the favourable view taken of the lawyer ("not far from the kingdom of God," Mark xii. 34; contrast "tempting him," Matt. xxii. 35), as subse-

quent to the unfavourable. And how natural that a commentator should preclude the idea, left possible in S. Matthew, that the demoniac was guilty of the superlative ingratitude of not protesting in some way against his fellow-countrymen's prayer that Christ would depart.

But we now come to cases that are more important. On two occasions S. Mark corrects S. Matthew clearly and deliberately.

Firstly, we find S. Mark singularising the pairs of Matt. viii., ix., xx.,—two blind men near the house of Jäirus,¹ two Gadarene demoniacs, two blind men at Jericho.

It is generally supposed, in fact no other reasonable explanation has ever been suggested, that the duplication in Matt. viii., ix., xx. is a harmonist's device for reconciling conflicting traditions ;² and, at any rate in the case of the

¹ It seems reasonable to identify the miracle at Bethsaïda, Mark viii. 22-26, with that in Matt. ix., considering how rarely the Second Gospel omits any *incident* of the First. Besides, there is resemblance as to the privacy of the occasion, the manual action, the injunction of secrecy, and the modulation of the cure.

² One may compare the appearance of two rich men in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, due pre-

cures at Gadara and Jericho, it is certain that neither of these conflicting traditions can possibly have been derived from S. Mark, since all and everything predicated in S. Matthew of the two Gadarene demoniacs, the two blind men at Jericho, is predicated in S. Mark of the single Gadarene demoniac, the single blind man at Jericho. It may be also noticed that the Second Evangelist's definite personal descriptions of the Gadarene and of the blind man at Jericho would preclude subsequent duplication. Thus, although in singularising the pairs of Matt. viii., ix., xx., the Second Evangelist seems to stand on superior ground to the First, the form of his narrative shows that he singularised with the narrative of the pairs before his eyes.

Secondly, we find S. Mark deliberately improving on the introduction to the charge "by Beelzebub" (Matt. ix. 27-34; xii. 22-24).

With regard to this introduction, every-

sumably to the discrepancy between Matt. xix. 16, 17; Mark x. 17, 18; Luke xvi. 14, 15; also the two angels of Luke xxiv.

thing in S. Matthew is in the greatest confusion. In ix. 27-34 we have the pair of blind men, already mentioned, and a dumb man (*v.r.* "and deaf"); and in xii. 22-24, evidently a doublet to the above, a man blind and dumb (*v.r.* "and deaf").¹ In S. Mark, on the other hand, we have clear, definite descriptions of a deaf mute in Decapolis (Mark vii. 32-37), and, as said before, of a blind man at Bethsaïda; but neither of these narratives corresponds in position to the blind-deaf-dumb cures of S. Matthew, and their place as introduction to the charge "by Beelzebub" is taken by "His friends went out to lay hold on Him ;

¹ "And two blind men followed. . . . And there was brought to Him a dumb man. And the dumb spake : and the multitudes marvelled saying, It was never so seen in Israel. But the Pharisees said, By the prince of the devils casteth he out devils" (Matt. ix. 27-34).

"There was brought to Him one blind and dumb : and the dumb spake and saw. And the multitudes were amazed, and said, Is this the son of David? But the Pharisees said, This man doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils" (Matt. xii. 22-24).

for they said, He is mad." Let us examine these three new passages separately.

The cure of the deaf mute in Decapolis, standing where it does, is demonstrably a foreign intrusion; for (a) It eats away a necessary preface to the congregation of the 4000 (cf. Matt. xv. 29-31). How abruptly the 4000 appear in Mark viii. 1! They have already been with Christ three days. (b) A surviving fragment of the Matthæan preface, "He doeth all things well" (Mark vii. 37), requires for its justification some wider proof of power than a single cure (cf. Matt. xv. 30, 31). (c) The appearance of *two* multitudes (Mark vii. 33, viii. 1), which the private withdrawal for the mute's cure involves, is awkward in the extreme: (d) and so is the "they" in verse 37, for Christ and the mute are alone.

But though the Decapolis miracle is not at all of a piece with its context, it is easy to perceive the attraction which that context presented, viz., the reference (Matt. xv. 31) to "the dumb speaking." Similarly with regard to the miracle at Bethsaïda, the disciples' imperceptiveness suggested a con-

text, one that could be improved by the addition, "Having eyes see ye not";¹ and though in this case there is nothing actually resentful in the context, for the miracle stands isolated, yet it is so obviously from the same pen as the miracle in Decapolis, that the two narratives must be extruded together. It may be added that both are shown to be editorial by the fact of their being entirely couched in the *general* style of the Second Gospel, the style common to all parts indifferently.²

And now let us look back on the decapitated Beelzebub section in Mark iii. That new and independent-looking introduction, ὅτι ἐξέστη, "They said, He is mad," so impressive at first sight on account of its startling crudeness, is it new and independent in reality? Turning to the parallel passage

¹ In Mark xii. 38-40 (if what has been said as to the relation of that section to Matt. xxiii. be admitted), the addition, "Which devour widows' houses," seems to be similarly motived. It is the only clause not found in Matt. xxiii.; and in Mark xii. it serves to introduce the new narrative of the widow's mite.

² See Introduction, p. xxvi.

in the First Gospel, we find that there the multitudes ἐξίσταντο (the only instance of ἐξίσταναι in S. Matthew), and the coincidence between the two Gospels, cannot reasonably be set aside as fortuitous. Possibly it is the multitude, not Christ, that ought to be supplied as the subject of ἐξέστη, a supposition rendered likelier by the fact that mention has just been made of frenzied course. But the text at this particular point is in great confusion, and there is much in favour of the Codex Bezae and the old Latin, "ἐλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξίσταται αὐτούς," "exentiat eos." Whichever explanation be correct, one thing is clear, that the ὅτι ἐξέστη of Mark iii. 21 is not independent of Matt. xii. 22-24.

Thus, by many considerations, we are brought to a conclusion which the doublet Matt. ix. 27-34; xii. 22-24 by itself renders inevitable. For it is obvious that the introduction to the Beelzebub section given in Matt. ix., xii., and that given in S. Mark, are, as literary devices, antagonistic; and the coincidence between the two Matthæan introductions (both narratives stating that Christ cured blindness and dumbness, that the

multitudes were amazed, and that their amazement provoked the Pharisaic charge "by Beelzebub"), precludes any reasonable suspicion of unoriginality in S. Matthew.

CHAPTER VI.

THE INJUNCTION OF SECRECY (Mark v. 43).

IN Matt. ix. Christ raises the daughter of Jäirus, and then heals two blind men—"and He strictly charged them (*ἐνεβριμίθη*) saying, See that no man know it. But they went forth, and spread abroad His fame (*διεφήμισαν*) in all that land." As the two blind men are omitted in the Second Gospel (see preceding chapter) it results that the injunction of secrecy is left applying to the persons mentioned just previously, viz., to Jäirus and his wife—"He charged them much that no man should know this" (Mark v. 43).

Now it may be answered that the addition of an injunction of secrecy to the longer

account of the raising of Jäirus's daughter in S. Mark is independent of the injunction to the blind men, and that here we have only a curious coincidence. But the absolute impropriety of the injunction as delivered *apropos* of the raising of Jäirus's daughter, a case in which secrecy was absolutely impossible (see pp. 49, 50), stands in the way of such an escape.

Again, this view of the matter is confirmed by the evidence of language. The combination of the words ἐμβριμᾶσθαι and διαφημίζειν is peculiar to the passage in point, and to Mark i. 43, 45—"He *strictly charged* him [the leper], See thou say nothing to any man. But he went out and began to *spread abroad* the matter." Things being so, it seems that in Matt. ix. 30, 31 we have no mere editorial addition, but that behind both the First Gospel and the Second there was a document which contained matter peculiar to each.

If the injunction of secrecy in Mark v. 43 be admitted as a veritable relic of the cure of the two blind men, then once more we have occasion to recognise the priority of S.

Matthew's pairs to the narratives of single cures in S. Mark ; for, the doubleness being evidently systematic, the cure of these two blind men cannot but come from the same hand as the double cures at Gadara and Jericho. Once more we have occasion to recognise the priority of the three simple narratives of Matt. viii., ix., xx., to the ornate narratives in S. Mark with all their picturesque details. And if in these three cases the priority of S. Matthew be admitted, then it must be admitted also in the case of the other miracles simply recounted in S. Matthew, embellished in S. Mark, *e.g.*, in the case of the cure of the epileptic (Matt. xvi. 14-20, Mark ix. 14-29).

Thus the arguments for the posteriority of S. Mark overlap, confirming and re-confirming one another.

Before closing this chapter it may be noticed that a very similar lesson to that of Mark v. 43 is taught by Mark ix. 13,—“And they did to him [John the Baptist] whatsoever they listed, *even as it is written of him.*” One searches the Old Testament in vain for a hint, even of the remotest cha-

racter, that Elias redivivus was to suffer martyrdom; and though the idea that we find in Rev. xi. 3-13, where he is slain by Antichrist, may well have been pre-Christian, yet it is clearly impossible to bring this into connection with the death of a merely figurative Elias at the hands of Herod. What then is the meaning of "Even as it is written of him"? The explanation is surely to be found in the parallel passage Matt. xvii. 9-12, which concludes with a reference to the prophesied sufferings of the Son of man—"Thus also shall the Son of man suffer of them" (*v.r. necesse habet pati*). S. Mark desired to bring out more clearly the point that although prophecy necessitated an effective Elias mission, prophecy also necessitated a certain limit to its effectiveness;¹ and he therefore

¹ The connection of ideas in Matt. xvii. and Mark ix. is as follows. Christ enjoins secrecy until after His Passion, thus indirectly intimating that the Elias who has just vanished will not reappear. But the apparition had been so transient, whereas it was an effective mission that was expected of Elias! How could the Messiah suffer if the work of restoration was to be accomplished? Would not Elias save Him? And so

transposed the reference to the Son of man's sufferings; with the result that a clause properly applying to Christ's sufferings was left applying to the Baptist's. It was a mistake of course to leave the clause so applying, but that S. Mark's acquaintance with the Old Testament was defective is clear from the mistake about Abiathar (Mark ii. 26); and it is evident that he was misled by S. Matthew's "Thus also."

the disciples answer, "*How then say the scribes?*" Christ replies that the effective work expected—and justifiably expected—of Elias has been otherwise accomplished by the Baptist, and that it has terminated. "Thus also," no less than in the case of an effective Elias mission, prophecy requires that the Son of man should suffer.

CHAPTER VII.

ABRUPTNESS OF S. MARK.

IT is always difficult for one writer to abbreviate another's work quite successfully. Subjoined are certain reasons for inferring that the frequent abruptness, forcedness, and inconsequentiality of the Second Gospel are due to abbreviation and excision.

Champions of S. Mark's originality generally explain this abruptness by adducing a very late tradition ¹ that S. Mark made hasty notes of S. Peter's discourses, an explanation which breaks down entirely when worked out in detail. For (*a*) the instances of abrupt-

¹ Reported by S. Jerome.

ness, as will appear presently, are not at all of a superficial or irregular character such as one might expect in a reporter's notebook, but are uniform and often intricate. (b) The Second Gospel, far from being a haphazard collection of notes, exhibits both in substance and style unmistakable tokens of art and design (see pp. 113-119).

No! it is in the fuller Matthæan text that the explanation of S. Mark's abruptness is to be found.

The Apostolic mission (Mark vi. 7-13) lacks occasion; we require the shepherdless multitudes of Matt. ix. 36. The prohibition against any *viaticum* appears unmotivated in the absence of "For the labourer is worthy of his food." That reference to the inhospitality of Sodom, unsuited to our un-Judaic Evangelist's Gentile audience, what an impotent climax its omission leaves us with!—"Shake off the dust for a testimony against them." That challenge of the high priest's servants, "Prophecy unto us," is scarcely intelligible in the absence of "Who is he that smote thee?" The centurion's sudden exclamation, "Surely this man was a son of God,"

requires phenomena like the earthquake and opening of the tombs to justify it, for of the rending of the veil the centurion would of course know nothing. The four thousand appear quite unexpectedly in the absence of any prefatory statement like Matt. xv. 29-31 (see p. 55). "But one of them that stood by smote the servant of the high priest" stands isolated, and without literary motive, whereas in S. Matthew it forms a natural introduction to Christ's utterance about the legions of angels and drawing the sword. "He will send His angels to gather His elect" is surely no fitting climax to the eschatology of Mark xiii., but leads us to expect a higher note, such as is struck in Matt. xxv., "Then shall He sit on the throne of His glory." The "also" of Mark vii. 18, "Are ye also without understanding," if it does not absolutely require a previous notice of misunderstanding on the part of the Pharisees (see Matt. xv. 12-14), at any rate seems much more natural in such connection. There is a singularly maimed appearance about Mark xii. 37; for Christ's question, "How is he then his son?" is one which requires the

effect produced in Matt. xxii. 46, "No man could answer Him one word."¹ Taken by itself, the skeleton account of the Temptation (Mark i. 12, 13) is scarcely intelligible; and the ministration of angels, in the absence of any allusion to fasting and hunger, is left unexplained. Christ's suddenly reproachful address to the disciples, "O faithless generation," explicable enough in S. Matthew, where the disciples' failure to cure the epileptic is due to their want of faith,² stands without point in S. Mark, where the failure is attributed to other causes than faithlessness. The extreme awkwardness of "After two days was the passover; and the chief priests sought," appears due to the Evangelist's incorporating Matt. xxvi. 2 ("Ye know that after two days the passover cometh")

¹ The omission is obviously due to S. Mark's transferring the other clause of Matt. xxii. 46, "Neither durst any man ask Him any more questions" to what he considered a more correct position in Mark xii. 34.

² "If ye had faith as a grain of mustard-seed," perhaps omitted by our Second Evangelist because another authority provided him with the text elsewhere (see Mark xi. 23).

into the narrative.¹ Such a climax as Peter's confession seems to require some commendatory reply to emphasise it, and without such reply the severe rebuke ensuing is left unbalanced. (By the way, notice the close correspondence between commendation and rebuke in Matt. xvi., "art a rock," "art an offence;" "revealed to thee by God," "savourest of men." Notice, too, the extreme awkwardness of Mark iii. 16, "and Simon he surnamed Peter," due, apparently, to a combination of Matt. x. 2 and xvi. 18. Besides, the promise about binding and loosing is given in S. Matthew twice.) How disappointing, "He entered into Jerusalem into the temple" (Mark xi. 11), not followed by any incident whatever!² How superfluous, "And

¹ It is difficult to imagine the reverse process, an Evangelist's putting part of the narrative into a speech of Christ's.

² In S. Matthew this entry is followed by the expulsion of the money-changers, and the introduction into the Temple of "the blind and the lame"; but the extra day desiderated in the Second Gospel (see pp. 43, 44) attracts the money-changers; and the introduction of "the blind and the lame," significant merely

they came to Capernaum. And when He was in the house" (Mark ix. 33), for the incident subsequent, the contention who should be greatest, is not one that requires any localisation ; whereas, when we turn to S. Matthew, we find that there the mention of Capernaum and the house are thoroughly appropriate, prefacing as they do the demand on S. Peter for the didrachma—a demand which would naturally have been made in Capernaum, where Peter's house was situated.

as pointing a contrast between David and the Son of David (cf. 2 Samuel v. 6–8), would have been inharmonious with the Second Evangelist's un-Judaic design. *Apropos* of the excision of "the blind and the lame," compare Matt. xxi. 15, 16 with Mark xi. 18. The latter might be derived from the former, but the former could scarcely be derived from the latter.

CHAPTER VIII.

OMISSION OF PETER INCIDENTS.

(Matt. xvii. 24-27 ; xiv. 28-31.)

AT the end of the last chapter it was pointed out that "Capernaum" and "the house," natural features of the didrachma incident, appear quite unnecessarily in S. Mark, *apropos* of the Apostles' contention. Similarly it may be noticed that Christ's intuitive power, illustrated in S. Matthew, and quite casually, by His anticipating Peter's question (*προέφθασεν αὐτὸν*), is underlined in S. Mark by His acquaintance with the subject of the Apostles' debate after they have refused to enlighten Him (cf. Luke ix. 47, "saw

the reasoning of their hearts.”)¹ Thus it seems that in dropping the didrachma incident (from its Judaic character, quite unsuited to his design), our Second Evangelist has allowed some of its colouring to run into the narrative subsequent.

Regarding the narratives from another point of view, here again we have phenomenal discrepancy between S. Matthew and S. Mark, such as has been noticed in the Herodias and Syro-phœnician sections (see pp. 5, 6, 35, 36), and, as there, so also here the two Gospels are running too parallel to allow the notion of independent traditions.

The highly miraculous character of the didrachma narrative has often induced critics to brand it as belonging to an extreme cycle of tradition. But, as Strauss points out, it was just while the Temple was standing,

¹ The survival of colour from the didrachma incident accounts for everything except the point that in S. Matthew the disciples question Christ, and in S. Mark secretly question among themselves; but this discrepancy may be easily explained by an anterior text capable of either interpretation, “They questioned who should be greatest. And Jesus said.”

and the question of the obligation of Jewish Christians to contribute to its support continually arising, that the precedent of Christ's payment would have been of real importance; and it must be remembered that the fact of being based on rumour, or of having passed through several mouths, might determine the narrative's position in this extreme cycle just as effectually as mere lateness. This much at least is certain, that when at last a sudden necessity¹ arose for written Gospels they appeared in tolerably rapid succession, mere local accidents determining the order; hence there seem to be only slender grounds for any identification of nearer or further cycles of traditions with earlier or later documents. To repeat what has been said before, the earliest writing Evangelist was not at all necessarily the best informed.

What has been said of the highly miraculous

¹ Taking our Lord's age as an index, one may infer that circ. A.D. 65 only three or four of the Apostles were left. And it is easy to see what an impetus must have been given to the demand for some permanent record when the great crisis of A.D. 70 was passed, and still Christ did not return.

character of the didrachma narrative applies also to the next passage to be discussed—Peter's walking on the sea (Matt. xiv. 28-31). Miracle-minimisers have been tempted to regard as a post-addition verses which preclude any non-miraculous explanation. Post-addition to the tradition they may be—I am only concerned in showing that they are no post-addition to the narrative in its literary form. Notice (*a*) that the absence of Peter's attempt (illustrative of the danger of doubt) leaves the miracle of Christ's walking on the sea in Mark vi. 45-52 without moral import; (*b*) that the paragraph contains distinctly Matthæan words, *καταποντίζεσθαι, διστάζειν*; (*c*) that it completes a doublet to the previous example of Christ's control of the sea; ¹ (*d*) that the extraordinary addition in S. Mark, "He would have passed them by" (see p. 45), receives explanation as an

¹ "Save, Lord, we perish." "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" "There was a great calm. And the men marvelled" (Matt. viii. 23-27).

"Lord, save me." "O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?" "The wind ceased. And they that were in the boat, worshipped Him" (Matt. xiv. 30-33).

inference—a mistaken inference indeed, but not an unnatural—from the fact of Peter's leaving the ship to go to Christ when Christ is just coming on board.

There is no difficulty in finding a motive for the omission of such verses as Matt. xiv. 28-31 in S. Mark. As in the case of Peter's blessing (see p. 68), an un-Judaic Evangelist might well omit a passage with S. Peter for its central figure.

CHAPTER IX.

PATCHWORK IN MARK III. 7-20.

MARK iii. 7-20 is in some respects one of the most important passages in S. Mark. That remarkable abruptness and forcedness which has before been noticed here reaches a climax.

How strangely and suddenly the scene shifts—"He spake that a boat should wait on Him," "He goeth up into the mountain," "He cometh home." The ascent of the mountain is surely but inadequately accounted for by the mere intention to appoint apostles; and the huge assemblage from every quarter leads us to expect some greater result than a general notice that the sick among them were healed. How strange that Christ should be

said to appoint twelve with the object of conferring on a future occasion the functions for which He appointed them!¹ Is there not some strain observable in "He calleth unto Him whom He would *Himself*, and they went unto Him"? Why the awkward repetition of $\pi\lambda\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$ in verses 7, 8—"A multitude from Galilee followed Him. And from Judæa, and from Jerusalem, and beyond Jordan a multitude, hearing what great things He did, came to Him"? "Hearing what great things"—but none have been recorded at this particular juncture.

But all these peculiar phenomena receive explanation when we consider Mark iii. 7-19 in connection with the correspondent verses in the preface to the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. iv. 23-v. 1). There the congregation of the multitude from Galilee and the remoter districts follows naturally on a great

¹ "He appointed twelve *that He might* send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out devils" (Mark iii. 14, 15).

"He called the twelve, and began to send them forth, and He gave them authority over the unclean spirits" (Mark vi. 7).

circuit during which Christ "healed all manner of disease; and the report of Him went forth into all Syria;" but separated as it is from that circuit in our Second Gospel (cf. Mark i. 39), the *πληθος*, *πληθος*, becomes necessary; the distinction, that is to say, between a multitude of Galilæans who *followed* from a particular town and a multitude from the remoter districts who, "hearing what great things He did," *came*. Again, considering the preface to the Sermon *en bloc*, we can see that the coming of the disciples to Christ in Matt. v. 1 forms a clear doublet to their coming in Matt. ix. 35, 36; x. 1;¹ and thus we obtain adequate

¹ "Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness. And seeing the multitudes, He went up into a mountain: and His disciples came unto Him" (Matt. iv. 23-v. 1).

"Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness. And seeing the multitudes, He was moved with compassion for them. And He called unto Him His twelve disciples" (Matt. ix. 35-x. 1).

motive for the nervously awkward gloss above noted in Mark iii. 14, 15, "that He might [presently] send them forth," &c. Further, considering the combination in Mark iii. 12, of "His disciples came unto Him" (Matt. v. 1) with "He called unto Him His twelve disciples" (Matt. x. 1), we find adequate motive for that other nervously awkward gloss, that the disciples who came to Christ were "whom He would Himself." Again, the close connection observable in Matt. iv. 23-v. 1 between circuit and multitude and disciples forbidding any doubt that the arrangement there is original, it follows that Mark iii. 13-19, interrupting the narrative so sadly, is a section out of place. Once having broken the continuity of his narrative by inserting this mountain section our Second Evangelist was obliged to pick up the thread from the point where it was broken, and hence we are told, "He cometh home" and "the multitude cometh together again."

Thus it appears that the peculiarities of Mark iii. 7-20, far from evidencing originality, constitute, on the contrary, a striking

exhibition of elaborate mechanism. Other peculiarities pointing in the same direction are noticed elsewhere (pp. 49, 56, 57, 68, 91). And the importance of the passage is greatly increased when we consider that Matt. iv. 23-v. 1, thus fragmentarily repeated in S. Mark, is the preface to the Sermon on the Mount, and presumably involves some portion of the Sermon itself.

Apropos of this last point, that Mark iii. 7, 8, 12 represents the preface to the Sermon, one may notice further that there is some probability that Mark i. 22 represents its termination—"And they were astonished at His teaching, for He taught as having authority, and not as the scribes." It seems unlikely that so particular a comment on Christ's teaching should have been originally designed for a context in which no specimen of that teaching is given.¹

¹ St. Mark omitted the Sermon perhaps because it presupposes the Law—"Ye have heard how it was said by them of old time." It may be noticed, too, that he was otherwise supplied with several of the important utterances (Mark iv. 21; ix. 43-50; x. 11, 12; xi. 25, 26; xii. 40); and, as further lessening the extent of

his omission, that there is doubt whether he possessed the Sermon entire (see pp. 130, 131). But in this and similar cases we must beware of exaggerating the difficulty of omission. S. Mark's elaboration of miracle shows that his view of the relative importance of things was not the same as ours. Above all, it must be borne in mind that we do not know to what extent he intended to supersede previous documents.

CHAPTER X.

THE APOSTOLIC MISSION AND CHARGE.

(Mark xiii. 9-13 ; vi. 7-13.)

IN the primary apostolic charge of Matt. x. Christ forewarns disciples they will be persecuted, will be hated of all, will be delivered up by their own kindred, "But he that endureth unto the end shall be saved. Verily, I say unto you, ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel until the Son of man be come." There is a doublet to this passage in the great final charge of Matt. xxiv., the only important difference being that there a further horizon is contemplated than the cities of Israel, "This

gospel shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony to all the nations. And then shall the end come." In S. Mark the warning is only found once, viz., in the final charge (Mark xiii.), and, strangely enough, the words in which it is couched are the words *not of Matt. xxiv., but of Matt. x.;* but in one important particular the language of Matt. xxiv. peeps through, "The gospel must first be preached to all nations."

Now, a little consideration will show that both passages in S. Matthew must be prior to that in S. Mark. For it is inconceivable, of course, that Mark xiii. 7-13 should have been copied into S. Matthew *twice*, and it is inconceivable, too, either that the narrow Judaic horizon of Matt. x. should have been derived from the world-wide horizon of Mark xiii., or that the single sentence, "The gospel must first be preached to all the nations,"¹ should have been expanded into

¹ This verse is dislocated in Mark xiii. for reasons before mentioned (see p. 10). It will be noticed that Matt. x. 18 offered a convenient opportunity for the remove.

Matt. xxiv. 9-14. *Apropos* of the different position which this sentence "To all nations" occupies in Mark xiii., it may be further noticed that the close correspondency between Matt. x. and xxiv. (doublets, presumably derived from distinct documents), precludes any reasonable suspicion of unoriginality in either. And thus we are forced to the conclusion that Mark xiii. 9-13 is a combination and compression of the passages in Matt. x., xxiv.

One difficulty only remains, Why should the author of our Second Gospel have transferred a portion of the primary charge to the occasion of a later charge? There is the fact, of course, that Matt. xxiv. 9-14 (considered as belonging to a document distinct from that to which Matt. x. belonged) would partially justify such transference; but close scrutiny of the differences between the primary apostolic charge in Matt. x. and Mark vi. will show that our Second Evangelist had, in fact, no choice left but to proceed as he did. This, however, brings us to the second part of our subject, the peculiarities of Mark vi. 7-13, and it is necessary to start quite afresh.

We notice, then, in contrasting the primary charge of Matt. x. with that in Mark vi., that the First Evangelist and the Second took quite different views of its nature. In S. Matthew the Apostles receive their commission, the marching orders which are to govern Christian conduct to the end of time; but it is never stated that they leave Christ's side, and subsequent narratives imply their continued presence. In S. Mark, on the other hand, the Apostles are actually there and then despatched. In place of S. Matthew's statement that, when Christ had made an end of charging the disciples "He departed thence to preach," we are told that "They [the Apostles] went out and preached that men should repent, and they cast out many devils, and anointed many that were sick;" and in place of St. Matthew's further statement, that after the Baptist's execution "his [the Baptist's] disciples took up his body and buried it. And they [the Baptist's disciples] came and told Jesus what had been done. And, when Jesus heard, He withdrew to a desert place apart," we are told that "The apostles gather themselves together unto Jesus

and they told Him all things whatsoever they had done, and whatsoever they had taught. And He saith, Come ye apart into a desert place and rest awhile" (Matt. xi. 1 ; xiv. 12, 13 ; Mark vi. 12, 13, 29-31). Thus the discrepancy between S. Matthew and S. Mark is pronounced ; but when we come to scrutinise the discrepancies closely, we find that, while the text of the Second Gospel may easily be explained by the brief ambiguous text of the First, the reverse process is rendered quite impossible by S. Mark's elucidatory details.

The different position occupied in the two Gospels by the visit to Nazareth (in S. Matthew, following the apostolic charge, and, in S. Mark, preceding), points in the same direction. For the visit of Christ to Nazareth apparently involves the accompaniment of the disciples (see Mark vi. 1) ; and, at any rate, the literary articulation forbids such an incident intervening between any despatch of the Apostles and their return. In short, there is obvious reason why S. Matthew's order should have been altered in S. Mark, but no reason is perceivable for the reverse process.

Reverting to the previous question, the transposition of Matt. x. 16-23 in S. Mark, we can now see that the transposition was necessary. Our Second Evangelist, regarding the primary charge as an actual dismissal, was obliged to omit or postpone such portions as did not tally with this conception.

CHAPTER XI.

DOUBLETS AND INCONGRUITIES IN S. MARK.

THAT there are some doublets and incongruities in S. Mark is almost incontestable. Thus, for example, the incident of the exorcist intrudes between two verses very closely connected; and the idea that the affixion to the Cross took place at the third hour is scarcely harmonious with the commencement of the miraculous darkness at the sixth. Again, there are curious repetitions about the crowd (iii. 20, 32; iv. 1), the healing property of Christ's garments (iii. 10; vi. 56), the recognition by the devils (i. 34; iii. 11, 12), the boat pulpit (iii. 9; iv. 1), the popularity of Christ and the design of

apprehension (xi. 18 ; xii. 12, 37), the need of being last and minister of all in order to be first (ix. 35 ; x. 43, 44). But passing over these merely superficial phenomena, which may be explained by editorship, there remains a second class of doublets and incongruities which point to something deeper.

There are the two miraculous feedings, the disciples' attitude in the second case being scarcely reconcilable with their having witnessed a multiplication of loaves already. Christ twice manifests His power over the sea, and the disciples are twice astounded (iv. 39-41 ; vi. 51, 52). Christ's Divine Sonship is twice attested from heaven. In ix. 30, 32, despite viii. 31 ; ix. 9-13, the Passion is announced as though for the first time, and so received by the disciples. In vi. 45, 53, we hear of the disciples setting sail for Bethsaïda, and arriving at the land of Gennesaret. In vi. 31, 32, Christ is represented as anxious for privacy, yet verse 56 represents Him as courting publicity. It is strange to find the disciples repelling children just after Christ's disposition towards children has been so clearly manifested (x. 13-16 ; ix. 36, 37).

Christ is mocked and spit upon twice—first by the high priest's officers, then by Pilate's—and though there is nothing actually unnatural in the fact of this repetition, yet the double fulfilment of Isa. l. 6 suggests different authors.¹ Why the second congregation of the Sanhedrin in Mark xv. 1? The offer of "wine and myrrh"—if, as Strauss suggests, it is a naturalistic gloss on S. Matthew's "wine (*v.r.* 'vinegar') and gall"—must surely come from another source than the subsequent offer of vinegar on the reed. The mention of the two women, xv. 47, is strange between the mention of the three, xv. 40; xvi. 1 (even Alford notices a documental suture here), and it is strange that the same woman should in xv. 47 be distinguished by her relationship to Joses, and in xvi. 1 to James. In the extraordinary conclusion (xvi. 8), "They said nothing to any one, for they were afraid," we apparently

¹ It is worth observing that in the Gospel of Peter the trial before the Sanhedrin appears blended with the trial before Pilate, and the mockery by Pilate's officers with that of the high priest's. Does not this suggest that the author found his facts in different documents?

have preparation made for a repetition of the injunction about Galilee, like that in Matt. xxviii. 9, 10, with its renewal of "Fear not," "Go, tell" (see pp. 108-111). No; if our Second Gospel were the only Gospel in existence there would still be a strong presumption of a dual base; but when we come to consider the doublets and incongruities in their relation to S. Matthew, this presumption becomes a practical certainty. For this is what we find:—

Firstly, that some of the doublets of S. Matthew are absent from S. Mark *conjointly*. Instances of this double absence have already been given (see pp. 2, 3, 54, 57), "Save the sign of Jonah" (Matt. xii. 39; xvi. 4); "Mercy not sacrifice" (Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7); "The dumb spake and the multitudes marvelled; but the Pharisees said, By the prince of the devils casteth He out devils" (Matt. ix. 27-34; xii. 22-24); and another instance will be noted presently (pp. 110, 111, cf. pp. 65, 66). In the case of Matt. ix. 27-34; xii. 22-24 at any rate the doublet is unmistakable.

Secondly, that some of the doublets repeated

in S. Mark are *conjointly* posterior to S. Matthew. Such posteriority has been shown with regard to the two narratives of miraculous feeding (see pp. 55, 66, 84, 85); also with regard to the two forewarnings of tribulation (Matt. x. 16-23; xxiv. 9-14), compressed and combined in Mark xiii. 9-13 (see pp. 81-86). It has been shown, too, with regard to the two circuits of Galilee, followed by the appointment of the Twelve (Matt. iv. 23-v. 1; ix. 35-x. 1. See pp. 65, 75-80), these sections reappearing in Mark i. 39; iii. 7^b, 8, 13-15; vi. 6^b, 7, in such a broken and attenuated form that the doublet is scarcely recognisable.

Thus it is evident that the doublets and incongruities in S. Mark are to be considerably reinforced by the analogous phenomena in S. Matthew, and that the fact of the doublets and incongruities in S. Mark being fewer and fainter is to some extent at least a record of spent force.

But there is a corollary of immense importance to be added. The doublets and incongruities in S. Mark proving to be substantial, and providing us with a valid

principle for bisecting, it inevitably follows that the idea of an ur-Marcus and a deutero-Marcus (or, to use Dr. Sanday's expression, "A layer prior to S. Matthew and a layer posterior") is thoroughly unsound. For clearly the conjoint absence of certain of the Matthæan doublets, and the conjoint posteriority of some repeated, involve a bisection of the Second Gospel altogether cross to any based on its relationship to the First.

CHAPTER XII.

OMISSION OF PARABLES.

THE lengthiest of S. Mark's omissions are speeches and parables, which, from the nature of the case, might be excised from S. Matthew without leaving any conspicuous gap. It is no objection therefore to our Second Evangelist's acquaintance with these speeches and parables if the evidence of his acquaintance is only slight; and as we have seen (see pp. 75-80) that he deliberately excised such an utterance as the Sermon on the Mount, there is *primâ facie* no improbability in his having acted similarly elsewhere.

Let us consider how the case stands in Mark iv. Our Second Evangelist stops

short in the middle of a series of parables given by S. Matthew, omitting the explanation of the Tares,¹ and the parables of the Treasure, the Pearl, the Drag-net, and the Store-keeper. But was he therefore ignorant of this section? The phrases with which he concludes indicate *not*. "With many such parables spake He unto them," is surely a sign of acquaintance with more parables in this connection than it was to his purpose to report. And it can scarcely be a fortuitous coincidence that he supplies "But privately to His disciples He expounded all things" (see p. 37) just at the point where the explanation of the Tares occurs in S. Matthew.

This impression that our Second Evangelist was acquainted with Matt. xiii. 36-52 is confirmed when we come to examine the

¹ The place of the Tares is taken in Mark iv. by the Wheat growing secretly, and it has often been observed that there is considerable correspondence between the two parables. It is perhaps easier to suppose that S. Mark obtained his parable independently, and placed it in its position on account of this correspondence, than that he simply derived it from S. Matthew.

language of that section. We find several of S. Matthew's favourite expressions — amongst others *συντέλεια αἰῶνος*. This expression occurs five times in the First Gospel, and nowhere else in the New Testament; and we find it represented by *συντελεῖσθαι* in Mark xiii. 4 (cf. Matt. xxiv. 3).

It may be presumed, then, that Matt. xiii. 36–52 was in the hands of our Second Evangelist. And when we proceed to examine the other peculiar Matthæan parables—viz., the Unmerciful Servant, the Labourers, the Two Sons, the Marriage-feast, the Ten Virgins, the Talents, the Sheep and Goats—it is with a presentiment that what our Second Evangelist has done once we may find him doing again.

Consider the connection of these parables with their contexts. Though the parables may not be involved by the contexts (see, however, an exception in the case of the Sheep and the Goats, p. 66), the contexts are more or less involved by the parables. In the case of the Two Sons, the direct address to the Pharisees and the tone of that address

demand, if not the circumstances of Matt. xxi., Mark xi., then circumstances closely analogous. So again in the case of the Labourers, the very special lesson inculcated that reward is of grace not desert, and that future disciples will not be mulcted for time lost, demands just such an exceptional occasion as that provided by Peter's question, "What shall *we* have therefore?" (Matt. xix.; Mark x.).

Thus, then, it is exceedingly difficult to think of the Two Sons and the Labourers as existent in a literary form apart from the occasions provided in S. Matthew and S. Mark. It is equally difficult to think of the Unmerciful Servant except as occasioned by Peter's question, "How oft shall my brother sin against me?" And the fact that in the case of the Unmerciful Servant the occasion as well as the parable is omitted in S. Mark goes far towards disproving the assertion, so frequently made by those who would except these parables from S. Mark's ken, that our Second Gospel has supplied the framework in which the Matthæan parables have been set.

With regard to the last point, if we could imagine the existence of a collection of "Logia" without any thread of narrative to explain the various occasions and applications, the difficulty in the way of admitting such foreign setting would be considerably lessened. But, by general admission, the idea of Logia without any narrative is impracticable; and it seems likelier that the setting that we have is original than that a later writer absolutely ignored the original setting in favour of quite another document.

Finally, we are thrown back on the test of style and language. The seven parables above mentioned present several points of contact with Matt. xiii. 36-52 (*e.g.*, compare the separation of the Sheep and the Goats to the separation of the Wheat from the Tares, the Good Fish from the Worthless), and with other portions of S. Matthew (*e.g.*, compare Matt. xxv. 31, *καθίσει ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ*, with Matt. xix. 28, a verse which is involved in S. Mark, see p. 4). Besides, some of them appear to be cast in the same mould as a parable which S. Mark repeats—the Husbandmen.

CHAPTER XIII.

TRACES OF MATT. I., II.

WE now approach the most precarious part of the argument. At no point has the priority of S. Mark been insisted on more strongly than with regard to Matt. i., ii. The Baptismal Consecration, so it is usually urged, forms an older starting-point than the Nativity; and the peculiar phraseology and style of Matt. i., ii. give these two chapters the appearance of a post-addition. Post-addition let them be, but it does not necessarily follow that their absence in S. Mark is a note of priority to S. Matthew. The very fact of their being a post-addition might lead

a later Evangelist to revert to the earlier pattern.

The main objection of course to our Second Evangelist's acquaintance with Matt. i., ii. is the transcendental consequence of that section. How could he have passed by the Parthenic Conception? But to this the answer is ready, that there is no evidence that the Parthenic Conception was regarded as of such transcendental consequence at the time that our Gospels were written. On the contrary, all the evidence forthcoming goes to prove that, except as an example of prophecy fulfilled, it was of very little consequence indeed. Notice that there is no allusion to it in the Epistles, or in the sermons of Acts, or in any Patristic document earlier than the Apology of Aristides. Notice that it forms no centre-point in Matt. i., ii., or Luke i. 5-ii., merely occupies the same amount of space and attention as the Magi and the Shepherds.

At first sight this indifference appears exceedingly strange, but at first sight only. It was a fairly common belief among the Jews of the first century that several heroes of the Old Testament, purely human of course, had

been "begotten by God," without any commerce between their parents.¹ Further, we find various early Christian sects, notably the Nazarenes, acknowledging Christ's virgin-birth, but not acknowledging His Divinity.² And certainly there is no clear indication of Christ's Divinity either in Matt. i., ii. or Luke i. 5-ii. ; for, with regard to the only two expressions which bear on the point, "By the Holy Spirit," and "Therefore shall be called the Son of God," the former, taken according to the common parlance of the time,³ merely denotes "by divine opera-

¹ Numerous illustrative passages in Philo have recently been brought forward by Mr. F. C. Conybeare. Philo's evidence is corroborated by the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," the "Book of Jubilees," and perhaps by Galatians iv. 24 (see *Academy*, June 8 and July 10, 1895).

² Eusebius, H. E., iii. 27 ; Hippolytus, *Philosoph.* vii. 23, x. 19 ; Tertullian, *Adv. Omnes Hæreses*, viii. One may compare Pseudo-Matthæi Ev. ii., iii., where S. Anne conceives (*v.r.* by "the Holy Ghost") while her husband is a month's journey distant.

³ See Dr. Edersheim's "Life and Times of the Messiah." It was a fashion of the time to say that the Breath of God did what previous generations would

tion"; and the latter is restricted in sense by Luke iii. 38, where Adam is called God's son because immediately owing his existence to Divine agency.

No, it is not as the corollary of Christ's Divinity that the miraculous conception is related in Matt. i., ii., but merely as an example of prophecy fulfilled, among other examples of prophecy fulfilled, "out of Egypt," "called Nazarene." Things being so, our Second Evangelist, addressing Gentiles, might well brush the whole section aside. Davidic descent, virgin-birth, fulfilment of Old Testament type and prophecy—this would be nothing to his purpose.

Thus much premised, we may proceed, without any foreboding that our quest will be fruitless, to search for traces of Matt. i., ii. in S. Mark. As a matter of fact such traces are to be found.

Firstly, there is the introductory sentence (Mark i. 1), "Beginning of the gospel of

have spoken of as done simply by God. Compare Luke xi. 20 "by the finger of God," with Matt. xii. 28 "by the Spirit of God."

Jesus Christ (the son of God),” correspondent to the introductory sentence of S. Matthew, “Book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David.” An Evangelist writing for Gentiles might well change “Book of generation” into “Gospel”; but the reverse process is inconceivable. And Matthew i. 1 at any rate carries with it the genealogy. On the inseparability of the genealogy from Matt. i. 18–ii., see *Academy*, December 15, 1894.

Secondly, the main-stock of S. Matthew is connected with the first two chapters by certain Old Testament quotations (prefaced in the same manner as those in Matt. i., ii., “*ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ρηθὲν,*” and stamped with the same peculiar character; namely, Matt. iv. 15, 16; viii. 17; xii. 18–21; xxvii. 9, 10; xiii. 35; xxi. 5); and although none of these quotations are repeated in S. Mark, yet probable traces of three may still be detected. For the definite settlement in Capernaum (Matt. iv. 13; ix. 1), mentioned presumably in consequence of the Zebulon-Naphthali prophecy, is referred to in Mark ii. 1 by the expression εἰς

οἶκον.¹ The statement in Mark iv. 33, "Without a parable spake He not unto them," seems to lead up to and require the reason, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken, I will open My mouth in parables." And if, as generally thought, the appearance of a colt in Matt. xxi. 2, 3, 7, is due to the prophecy inserted, "Riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass," an ass alone having been mentioned originally, then in Mark xi. 2, where the colt is mentioned by itself, we have, as Strauss points out, a still further development—a development accounted for by the consideration "whereon no man ever yet sat."²

Another of S. Matthew's Old Testament

¹ If Mark ii. 1 stood alone, εἰς οἶκον might be taken merely as "into a house"; but in iii. 19, where it recurs, the sense of home is requisite, for there is no mention of Capernaum at all, though Capernaum is evidently understood.

² A very general preference is shown for S. Mark's narrative. The two animals of S. Matthew are so obviously due to prophecy. But, in fact, it is far likelier that two animals were actually employed than that an unbroken colt was chosen on such a solemn occasion.

quotations may be noticed in this connection, "The voice of one crying," repeated in Mark i. 2, 3. In this case, indeed, the quotation is not marked by that peculiarity of character which stamps the quotations above mentioned; but being as it is of a commentatorial nature, completing the list above given, it does not seem quite reasonable to distinguish it from all the others: besides, the manner of introduction is very similar, "οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ῥηθὲς ὑπὸ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος."

Thirdly, the word ἀναχωρεῖν (= to retire) is found nine times in the First Gospel—four times in Matt. i., ii., and three times out of the remaining five in proximity to the quotations connected with Matt. i., ii. (see above). It may be surmised, then, that the word is distinctive of the author of Matt. i., ii.; and its presence in Mark iii. 7, corresponding to Matt. xii. 15, points to our Second Evangelist's use of a document of which Matt. i., ii. formed part.

Fourthly and chiefly, if it be admitted that the First Gospel and the Second are composite (see pp. 87-92), it necessarily

follows from the coincidence of arrangement after the feeding of the five thousand, also from coincidence in such cementitious passages as Matt. xvi. 5-12 ; Mark viii. 14-21, that the compositorial work was not achieved independently. Which way is the debt? The following considerations show that the compositor of S. Matthew cannot have been acquainted with our S. Mark.

(a) Our Second Gospel is characterised, not in parts only but all through, by most distinctive style and phraseology (see pp. 113-119). There is, in this respect, a oneness about it which is quite lacking in S. Matthew ; and it seems impossible that S. Mark should have been employed in the construction of S. Matthew without any infiltration of its peculiarities. What we find is that though none of the *general*, presumably redactorial, expressions of S. Mark are found in S. Matthew, some of the general expressions of S. Matthew are found in S. Mark.

(b) Reasons have already been pointed out for believing that the cure of blindness and dumbness in Matt. ix. 27-34 ; xii. 22-24, also the *doubleness* of cure which occurs in the

former passage, and in Matt. viii. 28-34 ; xx. 29-34, are deliberately corrected in S. Mark (see pp. 51-63). And it has been pointed out further that the narratives in S. Mark which supplant these passages present the general peculiarities of the Second Gospel to an intense degree (see Introduction, p. xxvi.). This is really the strongest argument against the structural posteriority of S. Matthew to S. Mark. It is difficult to see how, with our S. Mark before his eyes, the compositor of S. Matthew could have produced the result he has.

Such then is the case for inferring our Second Evangelist's acquaintance with Matt. i., ii. The proofs are not strong, but as strong as could reasonably be expected, considering how lightly these two chapters are attached to the remainder of S. Matthew.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE GUARDS AT THE SEPULCHRE.

HERE, again, we have a case in which preference for a less miraculous narrative has led miracle-minimisers to postpone S. Matthew to S. Mark. The narrative of the guards may be an accretion, but, as Strauss points out, at any rate it must have made its appearance long before the earliest of our Gospels can have been written ; for the current Jewish slander mentioned in Matt. xxviii. 13 is not merely that the disciples stole the sacred Body, but that they did so *while the guards slept*.

S. Mark might well have omitted such a narrative owing to distance from the circles in which the slander was prevalent. Or he

may have had reason to doubt whether the narrative was historical. *Apropos* of this latter point, one may observe that the introductory sentences of Matt. xxviii. and of Mark xvi. seem to be derived from different documents, the two women mentioned in the one case belonging to quite another sequence than the three mentioned in the other (see p. 89);¹ and S. Mark may have felt that the intentions of the three were difficult to reconcile with the idea of the sepulchre being guarded and sealed.

But whether or not Matt. xxviii. 1 ; Mark xvi. 1, 2 are derived from different documents, the verses subsequent clearly belong to one and the same ; and there are certain minute differences between the two Gospels which tell strongly for the priority of S. Matthew.

Firstly : Notice how naturally and easily the women's panic is mentioned in S. Matthew

¹ Notice, too, the remarkable discrepancy between S. Matthew and S. Mark as to the time of the women's visit. In S. Matthew they come at the commencement of the Lord's Day of the Jewish Christians, at six on Saturday evening.

—“The guards did quake. And the angel said to the women, Fear not *ye*”; and that in S. Mark, on the other hand, there is nervous precision—“they saw a young man sitting, arrayed in a white robe; and they were amazed (*ἐξεθαμβήθησαν*). And he saith unto them, Be not amazed (*μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε*).” It may be added that in other passages where *ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι* occurs, it appears to be a mannerism of S. Mark’s, and unprimitive (Mark ix. 15; xiv. 23: cf. i. 27; x. 24, 32).

Secondly: Notice that S. Mark’s shifting the angel’s position to the inside of the tomb, breaks what in S. Matthew is a very natural connection—“Rolled away the stone and sat upon it.” S. Mark’s angel is seated, but how?

Thirdly: Consider the terms of the angel’s address. “Ye seek”—even without S. Matthew’s *οἶδα ὅτι*—is a divination of the women’s purpose, appropriate enough as spoken by an angel outside the tomb to women outside, but insipid as spoken to women who have already entered and sought. “He is not here” is similarly rendered insipid if the women are already able to perceive that the tomb is empty. And

“Behold the place where they laid Him” —even without S. Matthew’s δεῦτε—sounds like inviting the women to do something they are not yet in a position to do. It may be added that these three discrepancies in the angel’s utterance (Mark xvi.), are underlined by the fact that S. Luke avoids them.

Fourthly : Notice that the Second Evangelist describes the scene as it appeared a minute later. In S. Matthew the angel descends like lightning and rolls away the stone and seats himself on it ; while in S. Mark the women find the stone rolled away and the angel seated. The lightning-like appearance, which would of course be inharmonious with a scene in which there were no guards, has softened in the interval. In fine, the aspect in which things present themselves to the women in Mark xvi. might be inferred from S. Matthew, but the earlier phase in St. Matthew could scarcely be inferred from S. Mark.

Fifthly : There is obvious reason why the position of the angel should have been shifted. S. Mark—desirous of avoiding the incongruity of Matt. xxviii. 9-10, where the

women are again bidden, "Fear not," "Go, tell," when actually on their way to tell and already reassured—thought fit to represent their emotion on quitting the sepulchre as one of unmixed terror ¹ (see pp. 89, 90). Consequently he was obliged to bring them into the sepulchre before letting them see the angel; for they were no longer in a condition to obey the angel's δεῦτε ("Hither"). By the way, it may be noticed that S. Mark's omission of ταχύ is connected with his view of the women's attitude—the angel cannot well say "Go *quickly*" to women about to fly.

Sixthly: If the frequently-made suggestion be admitted that the angel's reference to Peter—"Tell His disciples and Peter"—was preparatory to Peter's visiting the tomb ("But Peter arose, and ran to the tomb; and stooping and looking in, he seeth the linen clothes lying," Luke xxiv. 12), then the women cannot have entered, for Peter inspects the tomb as it has not been inspected before.

Putting these facts together, it appears to

¹ "ἔφυγον· εἶχεν αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις· ἐφοβοῦντο." Cf. Mark v. 42, "ἔκστασις."

be a tolerably certain inference that the guard and the earthquake of S. Matthew underlie S. Mark. And thus we are brought round to a conclusion which from the outset was almost inevitable,—the doublet of Matt. xxvii. 51-54; xxviii. 2-4,¹ leaving scarcely any room for unoriginality in S. Matthew.

¹ “The earth did quake . . . *after His resurrection.* Now the centurion, and **they** that were with him watching, when they saw the earthquake and the things that were done, feared exceedingly, saying, Truly this man was the Son of God” (Matt. xxvii. 51-54). “And there was a great earthquake; and the watchers did quake” (Matt. xxviii. 2-4). It is perhaps worth notice that in the Gospel of Peter these two passages are blended together.

CHAPTER XV.

DESIGN AND STYLE OF S. MARK.

LOOKING back at the ground that has been travelled over, considering together all the cases in which the Matthæan text is mutilated, altered, or added to, we can now discern the outlines of an intelligible plan. Our Second Evangelist's object was: (*a*) To produce a more concise Gospel than his predecessor. (*b*) To avoid matter unsuited to a Gentile audience. (*c*) To exhibit Christ as Son of God—accredited by the miracles He worked—rather than as prophet. (*d*) To re-paint the sacred picture with such peculiar light as he had, in the particular style and colour that he preferred.

Occasionally, indeed, it is necessary to make allowance for literary caprice—as, for example, when he chooses the Husbandmen and leaves the Labourers. And occasionally, as said before, his omissions are sufficiently serious to make one doubt whether he intended to supersede his predecessors entirely. But whatever doubt may sometimes arise as to his motives, there can be no question at all as to the general harmoniousness of the effect produced. We have none of S. Matthew's violent discords. The doublets, compared with S. Matthew's, are only few and faint. And knitting all parts together, and exhibited by the peculiar vigour of style and phraseology no less than by elaboration of detail, there is evidence of a clearly defined, exceptional artistic sentiment.

The significance of S. Mark's vocabulary may easily be underrated. Notice how often any list of the words for which our Second Evangelist shows a predilection (*e.g.*, εὐθέως, σπαράσσειν, φιμοῦν (imperative), συζητεῖν, πωροῦν, διαστέλλεσθαι, ἄλαλος, συντρίβειν, ἤφιε, κατακεῖσθαι, εἰσπορεύεσθαι, ἐναγκαλίζεσθαι, προστρέχειν, θαμβεῖν, ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, περιβλέπεσθαι), comprises

those required by his picturesque details. Notice that the narrative aorist is superseded by the present, and oblique narration by direct ; that intense expressions are preferred to ordinary ; that uncouth solecisms occur frequently.¹ Considering all these peculiarities of diction together, it appears impossible to regard them as merely superficial—they agree too closely with other general peculiarities of S. Mark that have already been noted.

Another illustration of unity of design is furnished by the orderly gradual growth of the Messianic idea. There is no premature recognition of the Messiahship as in S. Matthew, no sudden plunge into publicity. It is the demoniacs who first recognise Christ, and their utterances are strictly checked

¹ S. Mark's advocates frequently, but unreasonably, appeal to these solecisms as proofs of priority. For example, it is argued that because S. Mark uses *κράβατος* (a word which Phrynichus rejects as unclassical), and S. Matthew *κλίση*, the former must be prior to the latter. In this particular case the use of *κράβατος* in S. John and the Acts shows how little Phrynichus represents the views prevalent in Christian circles a century before.

(Mark i. 25, 34 ; iii. 11, 12). The disciples' hearts are preternaturally hardened (Mark vi. 52 ; viii. 17), so that Peter's confession marks a real climax ; and when the Passion is announced, they only realise the meaning of the announcement gradually (Mark ix. 10, 32).¹ The report of the miracles spreads first throughout Galilee—only at a latter epoch to Phœnicia and Jerusalem and Idumæa and beyond Jordan. When Christ first visits Capernaum a crowd assembles at the door ; on the second occasion they block the doorway ; on the third occasion they leave Christ no leisure so much as to eat, and His relatives are unable to gain access at all. Similarly with regard to those resorts to the beach, which in our S. Mark alternate with the visits to Capernaum : on the first occasion a great multitude assembles ;

¹ It is difficult for one writer to interpolate another's work quite successfully. Notice the incongruity of Mark ix. 10 with its context. For as there was no misunderstanding on the first occasion when Christ announced the Passion, why should there be on the second ? And the question about Elias shows that the disciples realised Christ's meaning fully.

on the second, a greater, so that Christ engages a little boat in case of emergency ; on the third occasion He actually embarks, and sails away into privacy.

This question of arrangement is a vital one, and we must pause to examine it. By Renan and others it has been reckoned to S. Mark for original righteousness that starting from such a suitable beginning as the miracle in the synagogue he gradually unfolds the developments on an intelligible plan. And it has been maintained, *e.g.*, by Dr. Sanday, that from a literary point of view, while it is easy to explain the arrangement in Matt. viii., ix., by assuming that of S. Mark, the reverse process is "wholly impossible." As to these points one may ask (*a*) Whether there is not an artificial appearance about the gradual increase of the crowd, the growing volume of report? Doubtless things must have happened somewhat in this fashion, but would the early disciples, not knowing what the future was to be, have noted such progression so definitely and methodically? (*b*) Whether what has been said as to Mark i. 39 ; iii. 7-21 (see pp. 51-58, 75-80, 91), is not

in some measure fatal to the idea that S. Mark's arrangement is prior. (c) Whether it is not much likelier in the nature of things that a disorderly document should have been subsequently improved than that such consecutiveness as we find in S. Mark should have been subsequently ignored? *e.g.*, whether the close sequence observable in Mark i. 21, 29; i. 45; ii. 1; iv. 1, 36 would have been broken? Or, to take a still more conspicuous case, whether the narration of Simon's¹ pursuit of Christ, which in Mark i. so intimately connects the cure of Simon's mother-in-law with the circuit of Galilee, would not, if within the ken of our First Evangelist, have prevented the disjuncture that we find between Matt. iv. 23 and viii. 15?

To touch further on this question of arrangement would necessitate a digression

¹ How carefully S. Mark abstains from using Simon's surname before Christ confers it! Is not this a deliberate improvement on S. Matthew? And if, as suggested (p. 68), the conferring of this name in Mark iii. 16, is transferred from a later occasion, then the distinction which S. Mark observes between the two names appears still more artificial.

about the dual base of our First Gospel (see pp. 87-92).¹ But this much at least is clear, that as to sequence no less than as to matter and style and phraseology, the Second Gospel is one and whole in a far, far higher sense than the First Gospel. All parts appear firmly jointed together. But when once the process of disintegration commences, once any sutures whatever are admitted, then this special unity is transformed into a sign of weakness instead of strength. The removal of a single section of any length causes the whole Gospel to fall in pieces, and the unity of its design becomes a fatal measure of its unoriginality.

¹ In this connection, notice the different position occupied in the two Gospels by the Corn-Withered-hand-Beelzebub-Relatives-Sower section. If, as is suggested, there were two original documents to be combined, might not our Evangelists have chosen different points at which to inter-splice them?

CHAPTER XVI.

THE EVIDENCE OF PAPIAS.

ADVOCATES of S. Mark's priority are wont to make Papias their starting-point, but his statements are of such an exceedingly ambiguous character that they ought rather to be worked up to from the internal evidence.

Papias informs us, on the authority of "John the Elder," that Mark "wrote down accurately what he remembered of Peter's discourses," but that his work was disorderly owing to the fact that he had not been an eye-witness; and also owing to the fact that Peter's discourses had been occasional, not at all designed as a *σύνταξις* of our Lord's acts and sayings. A document which

originated in such a manner would necessarily be of a primary character, but there are the gravest difficulties in supposing that John the Elder spoke with our Second Gospel in view. (*a*) Critics are agreed that our Second Gospel, to some slight extent at least, is not primary. (*b*) It consists of matter most unsuited for occasional discourses—parable and doctrine we should expect rather than elaborate narrative. (*c*) It is a *σύνταξις* of our Lord's sayings and acts in a higher sense than either our First Gospel or our Third—the sequence of events being noted far more definitely—“on that day,” “immediately after.” (*d*) As the arrangement of the sections common to our Second Gospel and our Third is, with one or two trifling exceptions, exactly the same, and as the divergence from our First is not serious, there does not seem to be adequate room for that general disorder which John the Elder thought it necessary to account for.

S. Mark's advocates generally minimise these difficulties by applying John the Elder's description to “ur-Marcus.” It is urged that ur-Marcus may have been more

desultory. But, as before shown, the connectedness of our Second Gospel and its unity of design are such that in order to get at this desultory, disorderly document it is not a matter of striking out a passage here, and altering another there, but of breaking the whole composition up. In fine, we have to exmachinate another S. Mark radically different from the one we possess, and of the existence of which no proof is forthcoming elsewhere.

Surely it is more natural to read John the Elder's words in connection with Luke i. 1-4. There S. Luke refers to some previous work or works in contrast with which his own Gospel is to be written *καθεξῆς*: and Credner, Lightfoot, and others have pointed out that John the Elder's language distinctly recalls S. Luke's *ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, παρηκολούθησεν, &c.* But what can this document be which S. Luke regarded as disorderly? Certainly not our Second Gospel, for, as previously said, he reproduces its order. We are left then to conclude that he had his second authority in view, that great anonymous Gospel of

which the nucleus lies between Luke ix. and xix. There not the slightest attempt is made to preserve any unities of time or locality, and the only order observable is purely subjective. Consider the disjointed, spasmodic utterances in Luke xii. 1-12; xvi. 14-18—precisely such phenomena as might arise from a fragmentary recollection of occasional discourses!

The difficulty which the title of our Second Gospel offers is perhaps not so great as it appears at first sight. The varying title of the Epistle to the Hebrews is suggestive. And supposing the actual work of S. Peter's disciple to have disappeared—merged in S. Luke—the fact of his having once been well known as an evangelist might account for the survival of his name in connection with another document, especially if that document were anonymous. It might even be—for Mark is not such an uncommon name—that the title of our Second Gospel had a separate origin.

Let us next see whether any further light is thrown on this subject by the second statement of Papias—"Matthew composed the

Logia in Hebrew, and every one translated them as he could." This statement, it is to be observed, is of considerably less weight than the former, for it is not given to us on the authority of John the Elder. It is rather difficult to imagine such an early authority as the Elder having been mistaken about S. Mark ; but with regard to a statement made on his own authority by Papias (circ. A.D. 130) it will be sufficient explanation if we find circumstances such as to render his statement plausible.

Now it is clear from the different origins that Papias gives us of Mark and Matthew that in his eyes those two documents did not at all stand in the same relationship to one another as our present S. Matthew and S. Mark ; and, as it is a generally accepted fact that our present S. Matthew, as it stands, is no translation from a Hebrew original, those who more or less identify Papias's Mark with ours, are disposed to desiderate an original Hebrew collection of Christ's sayings embedded here and there in our S. Matthew. Why needlessly multiply documents? No proof of the existence of this original collec-

tion of Hebrew Logia is forthcoming elsewhere. All attempts to discover such from verbal variation between the Synoptic Gospels have failed. And the reference may be quite sufficiently explained by "The Gospel according to the Hebrews," which so many of the Fathers, though mistakenly, accounted the original of our Greek S. Matthew. The Jewish tendencies of Papias render his usage of this Gospel probable *a priori*; and the statement of Eusebius, "He recounts a narrative . . . which the Gospel according to the Hebrews contains," though not quite conclusive, is very nearly so. Presuming, then, that it was in view of "The Gospel according to the Hebrews" that Papias spoke, the resemblance of that Gospel to our Greek S. Matthew being what it was, it is exceedingly difficult to suppose that his other document was our S. Mark.

But where are those other translations that Papias mentions—"Every one translated as he could"? There is no getting over this clear, precise statement by basing it on rumour. Either it is after all an actual fact that Matthew produced a Hebrew collection

of Christ's sayings, of which varying Greek versions got into circulation, or else we must bring within Papias's cognisance documents so related to one another and to the Gospel according to the Hebrews as to make the theory of free translation a plausible explanation of their divergencies. The latter alternative offers little difficulty. It is now generally admitted that our three Synoptic Gospels were current at the time that Papias wrote. And if Papias regarded our First Gospel as a translation from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, he might well take a similar view with respect to our Second Gospel and portions of the Third.

Again, the fact that in both cases Papias asserts and accounts for a defect in the documents before him—"S. Mark's opportunities were limited," "Translators were inefficient"—is strongly suggestive of some attempt at harmonisation. And is it not likelier that he wrote with regard to the then, as now, situation—the verbal discrepancies in the "triple tradition," the difference of order in S. Luke's anonymous Gospel—than that his words of disparage-

ment were of mere antiquarian interest, *applying to circumstances which had already passed away?*

Whether or not these suggestions about Papias are valid is a matter which has little bearing on the general argument of this book. But this much at least must, I think, be conceded, that what John the Elder and Papias say is of such extreme ambiguity, and capable of so many different solutions, that it ought not for one moment to be allowed to weigh against the internal evidence of posteriority in our Second Gospel.

CONCLUSION.

IN the foregoing pages an attempt has been made to show that S. Mark is posterior to S. Matthew generally, and that the notes of posteriority are common to all parts alike. Whatever instances there may be of priority can only be few and scattered. There is not sufficient material left or room enough for an *ur*-Marcus.

Certainly some instances of priority must be admitted. The chief of such instances is, undoubtedly, the absence of the Nativity section (Matt. i., ii.), and its cognates; but in this case, as I have endeavoured to show, S. Mark reverts to an earlier pattern with Matt. i., ii. before his eyes. Passing over other points already mentioned in this connec-

tion, one may notice that Matt. xiii. 12 looks like a fragment of Mark iv. 21-25 that has suffered shipwreck; that there is a decidedly late appearance about the explanations in Matt. xvi. 12; xvii. 13, -and about λέγουσι, λέγει in xxi. 41, 42; that the harshness of "Is not this the carpenter?" "Why callest thou Me good?"¹ sounds primitive; that the extra utterances Mark ix. 49, 50; x. 15; xi. 25 seem integrant, and may well have been omitted in S. Matthew as making doublets; that Mark viii. 38 may have been modified in Matt. xvi. 27 for a similar reason; and that there is, *prima facie*, no reason against the priority of such readings as "to Bethsaïda," "wheresoever He came into villages and into cities," "and how shall ye know all parables?" "Levi," "tell His disciples and Peter." But thus much said, the list of instances of priority in S. Mark is almost exhausted; and were such instances three times as numerous, still they afford no answer to the general argument here put forward. They need

¹ In this case, however, there is fairly strong authority for a similar reading in S. Matthew.

only prove that the author of the Second Gospel was not obliged to rely wholly on the First, but had access to material behind. Sometimes the original text would appear in the First Gospel, sometimes in the Second, here or there according to the exigencies of editorship; and my suggestion is that owing to the clearly defined design of the author of the Second Gospel, his fixed artistic sentiment and strongly marked individuality, the original text necessarily appears far less frequently in his work than in that of his predecessor. "His predecessor," for even in those cases in which the original text is better represented in S. Mark, still, standing where it does, this more original text is posterior to the less original.

With regard to the last statement, there is one reservation to be made, and only one. We find a group of sections, common for the most part to S. Matthew and S. Luke (Matt. iii. 7-10; v. 25, 26; vi. 21-vii. 12; viii. 8-12, 19-22; x. 26-33; xi. 2-30; xii. 32-37, 41-45; xiii. 16, 17; xxiii. 37-39; xxiv. 26-28, 37-41, 43-51), of which no trace whatever can be detected in S. Mark.

The narrative does not require them, and sometimes runs smoother in their absence. But excepting these, post-additions perhaps, almost every part of S. Matthew has been covered, and it may be fairly concluded that the author of the Second Gospel possessed our S. Matthew entire.

Beside the fact that there is not sufficient room and material left for such a document as ur-Marcus, I have also endeavoured to show that the doublets and incongruities in S. Mark, involving as they do a cleavage altogether cross to the variation of aspect towards S. Matthew, destroy the whole ur-Marcus theory at its base. If the proofs be admitted, it inevitably follows that the secret of the formation of S. Mark is to be looked for in S. Matthew. "In our S. Matthew," says Hilgenfeld, "two distinct documents have been combined." And I submit that it is by the definition of these two documents, alternately requiring sections peculiar to S. Matthew, that the exact relationship of S. Mark to S. Matthew must be determined. Requiescat ur-Marcus.

The Gresham Press,
UNWIN BROTHERS,
WOKING AND LONDON.

DATE DUE

_____	_____		
_____	_____		
_____	_____		

BS2585.4 .B13

S. Mark's indebtedness to S. Matthew

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00056 0799