

Dyke (H. J. van), Reality of Religion, 3.
 Fremantle (W. H.), Gospel of the Secular Life, 197.
 Gibson (J. G.), Stepping Stones to Life, 128.
 Jones (T.), Divine Order, 68.
 Leckie (J.), Life and Religion, 1.
 Lonsdale (J.), Sermons, 126.
 Macleod (A.), A Man's Gift, 81.
 Macleod (D.), Sunday Home Services, 181.
 M'Combie (W.), Sermons and Lectures, 146.
 Maurice (F. D.), Prayer Book, 47.
 Moore (D.), Seventy Sermons from the Penny Pulpit.

Murray (A.), With Christ in the School of Prayer, 9.
 Parkhurst (C. H.), Three Gates on a Side, 19.
 Price (A. C.), Fifty Sermons, iii. 41.
 Robertson (F. W.), Human Race, 101, 115.
 Row (C. A.), Bampton Lectures, 1877, 148.
 Sandford (C. W.), Counsels to English Churchmen
 Abroad, 101.
 Short (C.), Duration of Future Punishment, 51.
 Spurgeon (C. H.), Sermons, vol. xii. No. 695.
 Stewart (J.), Outlines of Discourses.
 Westcott (B. F.), Historic Faith, 29.

St. Luke's St. Mark.

BY F. P. BADHAM, M.A., EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

THE following article deals with the relationship of the Second Gospel to the Third. My object is to show that those sections of the Second which reappear in the Third generally involve those absent; hence that it was not, as sometimes maintained, a shorter, earlier edition of the Second Gospel, an 'ur-Marcus' that St. Luke employed, but—the last twelve verses apart—our Second Canonical Gospel whole and complete.

As to those sections which reappear, we can see that at many points St. Luke softens down asperities and explains obscurities. The unusual vocabulary employed in the Second Gospel is modified, and glosses attach, such as 'could not come at Him for the crowd,' 'For all live unto Him.' One may notice, too, that the second advent is referred to more vaguely, the siege of Jerusalem more definitely (Luke ix. 27, xxi. 7, 19, 20, 31), and that the Husbandman departs 'for a long season.' But the posteriority of the sections repeated in St. Luke is now generally conceded, and the argument from these minor differences becomes superfluous if it can be shown that the sections repeated involve those absent.

St. Luke's Gospel, it must be remembered, is composite. This is stated in his 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 St. Luke found his documents overlapping he would sometimes make a sacrifice. Here, then, we have adequate justification for many of the gaps in St. Luke's St. Mark, namely, that St.

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 greatest commandment, the forecast of Peter's denial, the trial before the Sanhedrin, the military outrages, and the attitude of the populace during the Crucifixion (Luke v. 1-11, i. 17, x. 25-28, xxii. 31-38, 66b-70, xxiii. 11, 35a).

Now for direct proof of excision. In the seven cases above mentioned, the context from the Second Gospel which St. Luke reproduces involves 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 till 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, according to the form given in Mark xiv. 30.

5. In Luke xxii. 63-65 Christ is mocked before His condemnation has supplied the opportunity, and in ver. 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 xviii. 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 St. Luke's St. 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. 16-30, xiii. 18, 19, vi. 38, xxii. 24-30, xiii. 6-9, vii. 36-50, xxii. 31-34. But it is not only in the case of documents overlapping that St. Luke 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 obviously 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. 1-36,¹ 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, St. 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*). St. Luke was already provided with a boat pulpit (Luke v. 1-10), 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, namely, Luke xi. 14, etc.²

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, compare Mark xv. 41 with Luke viii. 3.

9. A similar reason, the intrusion of a foreign wedge (Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14), will account for the sacrifice of Mark ix. 42-x. 12. It ought to be added that St. Luke was already provided with the divorce decision, also with the millstone and the 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 the direct proof. This section sacrificed contains a little 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 St. 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 St. 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 apparently a bit of the débris remains with a wrong application (*διηπόρει, ἠδέως*. Cf. Mark vi. 20). Notice, too, the phenomenal discrepancy of 'John I beheaded; but who is this?' with 'This is John whom I beheaded'; St. 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. St. Luke's procedure seems to have been regulated too by a tendency to abbreviate. He had to be careful, in joining two or more Gospels together, that his work did not exceed certain limits. A comparison of the accounts of miracles in the Second Gospel and the Third tends to prove that St. Luke considered dispensable much of the minute picturesque detail in the Second. But the points on 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 prearranged 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 guards 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 St. Luke's St. Mark very near our canonical St. Mark. Only one considerable omission remains (Mark vi. 45-viii. 26),—the walk on and stilling of the waves, the unwashed hands, the Syro-Phœnician child, the deaf stammerer of Decapolis, the four thousand, the demand for a sign, the caution against leaven, and the blind man of Bethsaida. This is the longest of all St. Luke's omissions, and the sponsors of ur-Marcus have been specially tempted to obelise the whole section. Now, here an obvious confusion of ideas is perceptible. The integrity of St. Mark is one question, and the integrity of St. Mark in relation to St. Luke quite another. It must be admitted that the narratives of the four thousand and the five thousand probably proceed from different sources. It must be admitted, too, that there are breaches of continuity in Mark vi. 35, 45, 53, 56, viii. 22: the disciples starting for Bethsaida and landing at Gennesaret, seeking rest and quiet (consider their arrival at Bethsaida subsequently, and its abruptness), and then touring through 'cities and villages.' But it by no means follows because things are thus, that therefore St. Luke's St. Mark was deficient. It by no means follows—quite the reverse! For the breach of continuity is not where St. Luke's omission begins, between the five thousand and the walking on the sea,—there the connexion 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 Bethsaida (for in Mark vi. 45 the disciples sail *to* Bethsaida, while according to Luke ix. 10 they are at Bethsaida already) proves on second examination a most signal proof of St. 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 ex-

plained by reference to the Greek,—*εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαιᾶ(ν)*, which *might* mean 'to the side opposite *from* Bethsaida.'¹

Thus St. 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 St. Luke often reproduces. Notice especially the phraseology and detail of the miracles of Bethsaida 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, *ἐστρέναξε, ἀναστρένας*, and the Syriac 'Corban,' 'Ephphatha.'

Thus St. Luke's acquaintance with Mark vi-45, viii. 26 appears inevitable; and when we come to consider the incidents separately, reason for his procedure presents itself readily. St. Luke was otherwise provided with accounts of 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 to 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' impossible. And the Syro-Phœnician narrative was particularly harsh sounding for Gentile readers.

In fine, then, considering that so much of the Second Gospel is involved by what St. 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. The St. Mark which St. Luke employed was the canonical St. Mark whole and entire.

¹ *Βηθσαιῶν* may just as well be a genitive as an accusative. Cf. *ὄψαι σοι Βηθσαιῶν* (Matt. xi. 21); similarly, *κ, E* (Luke x. 13); and *πρόσωπ Βηθσαιῶν, A* (Luke ix. 10).

A similar lesson is taught by the discrepancy between Luke xxii. 58 and Mark xiv. 69: As the maid had addressed not Peter but 'them that stood by,' St. Luke assumed that Peter's response was to one of these bystanders, not to the maid.