

## The Prologue of Mark : A Study of Sources and Structure

BENJ. W. BACON, D.D., LL.D.<sup>1</sup>

NEITHER accepted date, nor ancient tradition, nor internal evidence justify the present tendency to treat our Mk. as a primary source.<sup>2</sup> Relatively to our Mt. and our Lk.<sup>3</sup> it is primary. Wellhausen and Burkitt call this the one enduring result of Synoptic criticism in the nineteenth century; but Wernle's proof that Mt. and Lk. are mutually independent deserves to stand beside it.

The other assumed factor in the dominant Two-document Theory, the "Syntagma of the Words (Oracles) of the Lord,"<sup>4</sup> attributed by Papias to the Apostle Matthew, has

<sup>1</sup> This article is an extract from the author's work now in course of preparation on "Structure and Sources of the Synoptic Gospels."

Harnack's reconstruction of Q (*Sprüche u. Reden Jesu*, 1907) came to hand too late for consideration in this article. It is of great service for the text, but labors under the same defect as Wernle's (*Syn. Frage*, 80-91, 178-188, 224-233), in the neglect of the evidence of Mk. Hence the inconsistency felt by Wernle regarding the *historical* introduction (226, 231), which Harnack (*Sprüche*, p. 159, and *Th. Lit.* xxxii. 5, p. 136) is unable to remove. Among the reconstructions of Q should also have been mentioned that of Hawkins, *i. c.* pp. 88-92.

<sup>2</sup> Note the titles: *The Earliest Gospel*, Menzies, 1901, *Das Älteste Evangelium*, J. Weiss, 1903; also Wellhausen's argument for the *dependence* of the source from which Mt. and Lk. draw their discourse material (Q) on Mk. (*Einleitung*, 1905, § 8) and Wernle's denial to Mk. of any written source save in c. 13 (*Syn. Frage*, 1899, p. 223; followed by Burkitt, *Gospel History*, 1906).

<sup>3</sup> The abbreviated forms Mt., Mk., Lk. require no explanation. For convenience we employ the form Mt.-Lk. as = Matthæo-Lukan.

<sup>4</sup> In the principal passage Papias employs the word "Oracles" (λόγια) as in his own title. But when describing the limitations of Mk. he explains that Peter had "made no attempt at a Syntagma of the Lord's words" (λόγα; so the better reading. Cf. *Dict. of Gospels*, Hastings, *s. v.* "Logia").

proved elusive. Wendt<sup>5</sup> has not obtained it by the mechanical process of adding Mt. to Lk., and subtracting Mk. Resch<sup>6</sup> has only made confusion worse confounded of the "heap of interesting ruins" which had been left, as he said, by his predecessor. The problem has been conceived too simply, not to say too mechanically. But with better methods it is not incapable of solution. For one thing we must not approach even the residue of Mt. plus Lk. with minds made up as to what we are going to find. The testimony of Papias' Elder does indeed make it probable that a collection of Jesus' sayings (λόγοι), ascribed to Matthew had early currency in Palestine, and the probably Palestinian gospel which has borne this name since early in the second century is undeniably framed (apart from its Markan outline) on five great blocks of discourse material<sup>7</sup> with the manifest intention of "teaching them to observe all things commanded" by Jesus. Whether a source of this type can be differentiated in the non-Markan element of Mt. by the aid of Lk. is a problem for the literary analysis of Mt. It must be kept distinct from the parallel analysis of the non-Markan Lk.; and both processes must be tested by the results obtained from an independent study of the sources and structure of Mk. For if we have testimony from Papias of the currency of Syntagmata of the Lord's Sayings we have testimony both older and more authentic, written without acquaintance, it would seem, with any of our gospels save Mk., that "many had undertaken to draw up narratives (Diegeses)" of Jesus' career as a whole, "both works and teachings."<sup>8</sup>

It is to the third of these independent problems that the present discussion is directed, examining systematically our Gospel of Mk. for evidence of dependence on written sources, however otherwise known, reserving comparison of these results with results of Matthæan and Lucan analysis as the final stage of the process.

<sup>5</sup> *Lehre Jesu*, 1886.    <sup>6</sup> *Die Logia Jesu*, 1896. Revised in *T. u. U.*, 1906.

<sup>7</sup> Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 132.

<sup>8</sup> Lk. 11, Ac. 11. Cf. Papias on Mk. as reporting ἡ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα.

The general evidences of the use of sources by Mk. may be classified under three heads: (1) Duplications of material. Occasional duplications of a saying (Mk. 9 33 = 10 43, 44)<sup>9</sup> or an incident (Mk. 6 35-44 = 8 1-9) can prove no more than the use of divergent oral tradition. Systematic duplication in a *series* of incidents or sayings, or both, following in similar order proves literary dependence. The former is admitted to exist, the latter remains to be proved by systematic examination. Some general indications, however, have already been noted.<sup>10</sup>

(2) Making all reasonable allowance for textual corruption and accidental coincidence, if Mt. and Lk. were really independent of one another, their coincident variation from Mk. can only be accounted for by use of a common non-Markan source, whose relation to Mk. will remain to be determined by comparison. In many such cases the narrative of Mk. is notoriously the more complex and embellished.<sup>11</sup>

(3) The selection, order, and adjustment of material in Mk. affords evidence of adaptation to purposes foreign to the content. In certain cases the material is traceable outside Mk. in more original form. Under this head may be specified the systematic omission in this gospel of discourse material; not only material known to us through Mt. and Lk., and from its nature *presumably* known to Mk. (*e.g.* ethical teachings and the Lord's Prayer), but also material *certainly* known, because alluded to (4 33 6 2), and for his own purposes *utilized* by the Evangelist.<sup>12</sup>

In dealing systematically with the question of the Sources and Structure of Mk. it becomes needful at the outset to frame an exegetically correct idea of the evangelist's distribu-

<sup>9</sup> Hawkins, *l.c.*, pp. 73, 81.

<sup>10</sup> Bacon, *Introd. to N.T. Lit.*, p. 207.

<sup>11</sup> Bacon, *l.c.*, p. 208. The cautious judgment of Hawkins (*l.c.*, p. 172 ff.) is disregarded by Burkitt, who in minimizing the importance of these phenomena overlooks apparently (1) that Hawkins had already made full allowance for accident and for textual corruption, (2) that Hawkins excluded from consideration all but the "*small* additions in which Matthew and Luke agree against Mark." We propose to draw no such arbitrary line.

<sup>12</sup> Bacon, *l.c.*, p. 209.

tion of his material. Fortunately in the logical analysis we make of the Gospel as a whole, we find ourselves in substantial accord with masters in this field of an earlier generation<sup>13</sup> as well as those of our own time.<sup>14</sup>

We may take the superscription Mk. 1 1 ("Origin of the Gospel of Jesus Christ [the Son of God]"), whether in longer or shorter form,<sup>15</sup> as properly describing the general intention of the evangelist. Expositors are practically agreed that the first division of his subject set forth how "the good tidings of peace . . . were published throughout all Judæa, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached, even Jesus of Nazareth, how God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went about doing good and healing all those that were oppressed of the devil,—for God was with him; we (the disciples) being witnesses of all the things which he did."<sup>16</sup> The anointing and vocation of the Messiah with their immediate results occupy Mk.'s entire attention down to the great division after 6 13.

Up to 3 6 the evangelist is occupied with the immediate results of the anointing with the Holy Ghost and power, 1 1-13. These results are twofold: among the people astonishment and popularity to a point where it defeats itself, 1 43; among the scribes and Pharisees jealous opposition to the point of plotting against his life, 3 6. In 3 7-12 we have an editorial breathing space. The scenes are changed. A new

<sup>13</sup> Klostermann's *Markus*, 1867, shows the insight of a genius in this respect, dividing the Gospel into halves after 6 13, subdividing the first half after 1 13, 1 45, and 3 6, and the second after 6 29, 6 52, 7 23, 8 22, 9 29, 10 21, and 13 27. B. Weiss' *Markusevangelium*, 1872, subordinates the divisions after 7 23, 9 29, and 10 21, and substitutes 10 45 and 15 47 as of major import.

<sup>14</sup> See the works of Menzies and J. Weiss already referred to, and add the commentaries of E. P. Gould, 1896, H. B. Swete, 1898, and J. Wellhausen, 1903, and R. A. Hoffmann, 1904. Wellhausen divides after 1 13, 6 13, 8 22, and 10 22; J. Weiss after 1 13 (1 22), 1 45, 3 6, 6 13 (6 23), 8 22, 10 45, and 13 27. Cf. also M. Schulze, "Plan des Markusevang." in *Zts. für wiss. Theol.*, 1895.

<sup>15</sup> The words *καὶ θεοῦ* are omitted by  $\aleph$  Syr.<sup>17</sup> and Origen. On the redactional character of Mk. 1 1 as proved from its language see Hawkins, *Hor. Syn.*, p. 122.

<sup>16</sup> Ac. 10 22-23.

and much wider audience appears. Proleptic references to the resort to the boat as a pulpit (3 9; cf. 4 1), to the attempt of the woman with the "scourge" (*μαδριξ*) to "touch him" for healing (3 10; cf. 5 27), and to the outcry of the demoniac "Thou art the Son of God" (3 11; cf. 5 61), show that the evangelist looks forward over the whole series of incidents in cc. 4 and 5. The fact that the series begins with the choosing of the Twelve "to be with him that he might send them forth to preach and to exorcise with authority," 3 13-19, and ends with the sending of them on this mission, 6 7-13, is conclusive as to the intended structure. Down to 3 35 Mk. is occupied with those whom Jesus "took to be with him." In 4 1-34 he is telling how he gave to them "the mystery of the kingdom of heaven" which was hidden in enigmas from "those that were without." In 4 35 to 6 6 he is telling how they were taught to use the "authority" of the faith that can "move mountains." If 6 1-6 seems to us in this connection an anticlimax, we must remember that for the evangelist it was of supreme importance to meet the objection "What, then, of cases where the 'word of power' fails to heal?" This could only come after the examples of success, and the answer was equally triumphant: Jesus had met the objection among his unbelieving countrymen, and assigned the failures to their true cause — the people's unbelief. With this logical analysis of Mk. 1 1-6 13 we may proceed to the closer scrutiny of the subdivisions in order.

#### SUBDIVISION A. MK. 1 1-13

What may be called the Prologue of Mk., the thirteen verses of Vorgeschichte, antecedent to the call of the first disciples, forms the fundamental thesis. —As Justin meets the objection of Trypho that "Christ, if he has indeed been born and exists anywhere, is unknown, and does not even know himself, and has no power, until Elias come to anoint him, and make him manifest to all,"<sup>17</sup> by adducing the baptism of Jesus by John,<sup>18</sup> so the Prologue describes first the Elijan Forerunner and his Prophecy of the Christ

<sup>17</sup> *Dial.* c. 8.

<sup>18</sup> *Dial.* c. 49.

(§ 1, 1 1-6, 7-8), then Messiah's Anointing and Endowment with the Spirit (§ 2, 1 9-11), lastly (§ 3, 1 12-13) the Testing of his Power.

Bousset rightly comments on the extreme scantiness of the narrative as a whole as proof of abridgment.<sup>19</sup> That which to the eye would serve to connect John with the Elias of Malachi 4 5-6 and II Kings 1 8 is given with utmost fulness, but not even the attempt is made to give the content, or effect, of his message of repentance to Israel; it is mentioned as "the (well-known) baptism of repentance unto remission of sins" and dropped. The penitents "confessed their sins." For the character of the movement we have to refer to Mt., but especially to Lk.

So with the Temptation "in the wilderness." All that to the eye would prove that Jesus really was that which he had been called in the Anointing and Vocation is given. Swept by the Spirit into the wilderness, he was tried forty days (in vain) by Satan, shielded like Daniel from the fangs of wild beasts, served like Elijah by the ministration of angels. But for the ethical content of the temptation narrative our evangelist has no interest. We cannot say, He was ignorant of it; for the representation of an ethical reaction produced in the mind of Jesus by the overwhelming new thought "Thou art my Son," even if it be a mere intuition of the early church, and not an actual autobiographic datum from Jesus' own lips, is truer to the fact and logically antecedent to Mk.'s more mythological picture of a general trial of strength with Satan.<sup>20</sup> No more can be got from Mk. alone than the latter. The plea of the two Weiss' that it is insupposable that the statement could be given out to readers in the bald form "Jesus was tried forty days by Satan" unless they could be supposed to possess some independent knowledge of the nature of the moral victory is a strong one. It is far from decisive in itself, but taken together with the other

<sup>19</sup> *L.c.* Mit seinen kurzen Andeutungen setzt Markus eine reichere Ueberlieferung voraus.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Bacon, "Autobiography of Jesus" in *Am. Journ. of Theol.* July, 1898, and *Enc. Bibl. s.v.* "Temptation."

phenomena of the Prologue it tends to justify the contention "Mark is not the first to relate these things. He is drawing from older tradition, which in parts is presented in weakened form."<sup>21</sup>

As in speaking of the greater omissions of Mk., we have found it convenient to extend a preliminary survey beyond the limits of the Prologue, so with the phenomena designated by Hawkins as "small additions in which Mt. and Lk. agree against Mk."<sup>22</sup> These "coincident variations" of Mt. and Lk. are usually treated by themselves when "small" in extent. When they also consist of "additions," their non-appearance in Mk. is indicated in the text of some Synopticons, such as the excellent one of A. Wright, by asterisks, indicating the number of words in question. It should be remembered, however, that the distinction of smaller and larger is purely artificial, and that the "smaller" constitute only a subdivision of one type of the coincident variations (the plus of Mt. and Lk.).<sup>23</sup> The phenomenon appears in its real significance, as regards even "smaller additions," only when we note the *distribution* of these coincidences. If they appear uniformly, the phenomenon will probably have its explanation in some obscure relation of the Gospel as a whole to Mt. and Lk. If, however, they appear in marked excess in certain parts of Mk., we must resort to some type of source theory in explanation. If finally it transpire that just those parts of Mk. which on independent grounds have long been recognized as Mk.'s peculium, are relatively free from them, whereas those parts abound in them which, by common consent, are of the nature of subject matter accessible to others also, this fact will also be of great significance. Fortunately the classification has been made for us quite without thought

<sup>21</sup> J. Weiss, *l.c.*, p. 135.

<sup>22</sup> *l.c.*, p. 172.

<sup>23</sup> Of the "alterations and small additions," the cautious and judicial minded Hawkins says that *besides* some 218 coincident variations which might be accounted for in various ways, he finds others "as to which it seems almost impossible that Mt. and Lk. could have accidentally concurred in making them." Of the latter he appends 21 examples.

of any such application. According to J. Weiss, *e.g.*, the series of incidents connected with Jesus' appearance in Galilee after the arrest of John, the call of the fishermen, and beginning of his campaign for rescue of the "lost sheep of Israel" with the great Sabbath in Capernaum, shows through all minor traces of later embellishment and adaptation to ecclesiastical theory the unmistakable color of the eyewitness. In this judgment nearly all competent authorities concur. This series of events from Mk. 1 14 to 1 39, where Jesus, after the momentous events of this first Sabbath, forsakes Capernaum temporarily and begins a tour of preaching in the synagogues of Galilee, is generally regarded as conveying substantially the personal narrative of Peter, whose home is its center. The adjoining sections, *per contra*, the Prologue, dealing with events in a past indefinitely earlier than the first association related between Jesus and our informants, and the series of incidents in Mk. 1 40-45, 2 1-3 6, introduced regardless of chronological sequence, merely to illustrate (*a*) how Jesus was compelled to withdraw from popular importunity, and (*b*) the growth of opposition, are not of a character to suggest Petrine narration.<sup>24</sup> By common consent the stylistic marks of first-hand originality are to be found in 1 14-39, and not in 1 1-13, nor in 1 40-3 6. The latter group Wendt<sup>25</sup> regards as part of a series continued in 12 13-37, an early collection of incidents of controversy between Jesus and the synagogue authorities, taken up by Mk. in these two sections. Many later critics have concurred with this view. But we are not now concerned with more than the general agreement that there is a contrast in content and structural character between the twenty-six verses of Mk. 1 14-39 (Petrine element) and the adjoining fifty-three verses of Mk. 1 1-13 and 1 40-3 6. Do the phenomena of coincident variations in Mt.-Lk. corroborate it? What is the result of inspection on the single point of the "*smaller* additions in which Mt. and Lk. agree against Mk."? In

<sup>24</sup> J. Weiss finds this suggested by the *descriptive additions* in 2 1-12, but not in the substance.

<sup>25</sup> *Lehre Jesu*, p. 27.



the twenty-six verses of the "Petrine" element we have not a solitary instance.<sup>26</sup> In the fifty-three verses of the other we have seventeen instances, varying from the dimensions of a single particle, to clauses of two, three, four, and (in two cases) six words in length.<sup>27</sup>

We must remember that the foregoing represents only a portion of one element of the coincident variations of Mt. and Lk. The *large* coincident additions, the coincident omissions, and the coincident differences of wording are all left as yet out of consideration. Let us briefly state the facts concerning these. The large coincident additions of Mt.-Lk. amount all together to fourteen verses. *All* are found in the non-Petrine element. The coincident omissions are seventeen in number, of from one to thirteen words in extent. Of these all but one occur in the non-Petrine element. Mt. and Lk. concur in omitting the names after Simon in 1<sup>29</sup>.<sup>28</sup> All the other coincident differences of wording, many of which are significant, occur in the non-Petrine element. An example in this case will be of more value than mere counting. In the story of the Cleansing of the Leper, Mk. 1<sup>40-45</sup>, which J. Weiss properly designates an erratic block, the wording in Mk. 1<sup>40</sup> v. 41 is as follows: "If thou wilt thou canst make me clean. And being moved with compassion he stretched forth his

<sup>26</sup> In Wright's Synopticon two asterisks appear in Mk. 1<sup>31</sup>, opposite the words *καὶ ἡγέρθη* of Mt. 8<sup>15</sup>, and *δὲ ἀναστᾶσα* of Lk. 4<sup>20</sup>. Their insertion would seem to be due to simple oversight, for Mk. has the equivalent expression at the beginning of the verse, *προσελθὼν ἡγείρεν αὐτήν*. Why an asterisk is inserted before *Χριστός* in ver. 34, though the verse does not appear at all in Mt., I do not understand.

<sup>27</sup> In 1 s. 40 2 s. 12. 22. 28 3 1. 5. By oversight Wright omits to mark with the required \* the absence of the particle *γί* after *εἰδὲ μὴ* in Mk. 2<sup>22</sup>. This, however, is important, for the use of *γί* in the NT. is almost confined to the Lucan writings and Paul. He also overlooks *μόνοι* in 2<sup>28</sup> and the textually doubtful cases of 2<sup>22</sup> and 3<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Wernle, p. 56. The clumsiness of the sentence would account for the omission even if Lk. were not precluded from mention of these names in 4<sup>28</sup> by placing the call of the men later in 5<sup>10</sup>. The apparent coincident omission of *μετὰ τῶν μισθωτῶν*, and change of *ἀπῆλθεν ὁπίσω* to *ἠκολούθησεν*, in Mk. 1<sup>20</sup> is an illusion of Wright's typographical arrangement. Lk. 5<sup>11</sup> is parallel to Mk. 1<sup>17</sup>, not 1<sup>20</sup>.

hand and touched him, and saith, I will, be thou made clean." This is expressed differently and more briefly by Mt. and Lk., but in language that is word for word and letter for letter the same in the two supposedly independent borrowers. No very extended series of such identical additions, omissions, and variations is required to eliminate entirely theories of accidental coincidence. This done, there are left, as Hawkins concludes, but three alternatives, (1) an Ur-Marcus, (2) "an early non-Marcan document to which the compilers of the first and third Gospels were able to refer . . . in some or all of the sections which consist mainly of narrative," or (3) "consultation by one of these compilers of the work of the other in a more or less incomplete state." The phenomena of distribution, by mere count in the two chapters now under consideration, without examination for the present into the nature of the differences,<sup>29</sup> already goes far to eliminate the third hypothesis. Whether we are compelled by the phenomena to fall back upon an Ur-Marcus, or an Ur-Evangelium hypothesis to supplement the admitted inadequacy of the two-document theory remains to be determined.

Thus far only the surface has been touched. We have now to take up seriatim the three sections of the Prologue, beginning with the section Mk. 1 1-8.7 f., = Mt. 3 1-12 = Lk. 3 1-20. This section I will designate (on the basis of its significance to Mk. alone, and of its subdivision after verse 6): § 1 (a) The Appearance of the Forerunner, and (b) his Proclamation of the Christ.

In accordance with the general disposition of our evangelist already noted, to pass by the ethical content of his sources and confine himself to the external, so as not even to give the content of Jesus' religious teaching, both parts of this section deal with externals. In verses 2-6 the effort is to

<sup>29</sup> Such examination is often important, as, e.g., in the coincident variation *βαπτισθε* Mt. 3 11 = Lk. 3 12 against Mk. 1: *ἰβαπτισσα*, the former alone being consonant with historic truth, as J. Weiss rightly maintains. So far as reasonable limitations of space allow, significant coincident variations will be discussed in the treatment of the sections seriatim.

show how the outward appearance and life of the Baptist, and the reformatory movement inaugurated by him, corresponded to the prophecy of Malachi regarding the coming of the "Messenger of the Covenant" to accomplish the great repentance. To this end there has been intercalated between the introduction to the quotation from Is. 40 3, and the words of the quotation itself, the passage from Mal. 3 1 which to the perplexity of later transcribers is thus made to sail under the flag of Isaiah. Obviously Mt. and Lk., coincidentally guiltless of this interpolation, represent the original form. The fact is proved by the derivation of the intruder. It is not taken direct from the OT., in which case of course the interpolator would have known it was not from Isaiah; but, as the language evinces to a certainty, *from the discourse of Jesus on the Baptist*, reported in identical terms in Lk. 7 27 = Mt. 11 10. The variation from the LXX of Mal. 3 1 is so wide that the word for word agreement of Mk. 1 2b with Mt.-Lk. can only be explained by derivation from this source. This derivation is universally admitted. The question How then can Mt. and Lk. be later? is answered by the plea, "It is a textual corruption." But where is the documentary evidence for textual corruption? And if it be a textual corruption, why is the whole description of the Baptist, in terms manifestly intended to identify him with *Malachi's* "Elias which was for to come," dependent upon it for its significance? Of the Isaian prophecy there is no development beyond the mere statement of John's preaching "in the wilderness," though from the change of the original "a highway for our God" into "the way of him" (i.e. the Lord), it is clear that the evangelists, who agree in this alteration, wish the preparing of Jesus' way to be understood as part of the predicted function of the Baptist. Of the "messenger of the Covenant" passage itself we could not see the applicability at all unless we had before us also the context from which it is taken, in which Jesus, in the Matthæan form explicitly, in the Lucan implicitly, declares that John the Baptist was "Elias which was to come." For this reason garb and food of the hermit

are described, the former in language derived verbally from the description of Elijah in II Kings 1 s.<sup>80</sup> We have not to do, therefore, with a mere erratic block from the Lk.-Mt. discourse loosely attached in 12 b, but the whole structure of the Markan paragraph is dependent upon the identification made in the Mt.-Lk. discourse: John is the Elijah foretold by Malachi. An original narrative of simpler form, attested not only by Mt. and Lk., but by John, as well, which knew only the Isaian comparison, "A voice crying in the wilderness," has been filled up and expanded on the basis of this Mt.-Lk. identification with Elijah.

The irrefragable proof of the relation of dependence thus indicated is to be found in the language. In the long and vividly dramatic discourse of Jesus from which the Malachi citation is borrowed, various characterizations of the Baptist appear. The multitudes (of Jerusalem according to Mt. 21 s3 Lk. 20 s) had gone forth to him "into the wilderness" (*εις την ερημον*). They had not found him "clothed in soft garments," but in the rough hair-mantle of the prophet (Zech. 13 s). They had noted also his ascetic food, he had come "neither eating bread nor drinking wine, and they said, He hath a devil." These Mt.-Lk. traits, *and only these*, serve as Mk.'s description. John came baptizing "in the wilderness" (*εν τη ερημω*); he was "clothed in a garment of hair"; his food was that of the wilderness (conceived as one who only knows life in the wilderness from the OT. may conceive it), "locusts," permitted as clean

<sup>80</sup> D and Itala omit the clause *και ενωπιον δεματινην περι της σφδρας αυτου* = II Kings 1 s b, which may therefore be a later insertion from Mt. 3 s. The clothing of camel's hair remains, however, to attest the Elijan model for the portrait. It seems to be a rendering (correct?) of *איש שער* rendered in R. V. "a hairy man," margin "a man with a garment of hair." Wellhausen (*Marcusev.*, p. 4) disputes this, and prefers Zech. 13 s. If so, the relation to Lk. 7 s is not less clear, only J. Weiss' rejection of ver. 27 as a loan from Mt. 11 10 will be more probable, and the closer connection with Elias more distinctively Matthæan. Even with this cancellation, however, the identification of John with Elias does not disappear from Lk. Cf. 1 17, 7 s. 11 s3 and 16 1s, and on the latter *Edujoth* viii. 7, and my art. in *Expositor* (July, 1902), "Elias and the Men of Violence."

food in Lev. 11 22, and "wild honey," the special wilderness product of many OT. passages.<sup>31</sup> Can any one suggest any other reason than dependence on the Mt.-Lk. discourse why Mk.'s description should confine itself to the Baptist's garb and diet? Or will some one add another to the proposed emendations, which from the "oil-cakes" of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*<sup>32</sup> down to the "carob-beans" of Henslow<sup>33</sup> proceed on the assumption that John Mark knew John the Baptist's real bill of fare, and was concerned to give it correctly?

But we may use our microscope with still higher magnifying power, and the result will only be the more conclusive. Little need be said of the coincident variation of Mt. and Lk. in the phrase "all the surrounding district of Jordan." Surely the Lucan "district of Jordan" more correctly and historically describes John's hearers than Mk.'s exaggeration "all the region of Judea and all the Jerusalemites," which seems to reflect the reproachful discourse of Jesus in Mt. 21 32. Or are we to regard Mt.'s conflation of the two phrases as the most primitive: "Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region of Jordan"? But to return to the Baptist's diet. The form *ἔσθων* (instead of *ἐσθίω*) employed twice in the famous discourse in Jesus' contrast between the Baptist and himself (Lk. 7 33. "eating and drinking," "neither eating nor drinking") is a very rare one found once or twice in LXX, and occasionally in Greek poetry. Besides these two there are but three other occurrences in the NT., against sixty-six of the regular form *ἐσθίω*. Two of these three are in the kindred Lucan logia Lk. 10 7 and 22 30. The only other instance in the NT. is in the phrase of Mk. before us, the Baptist was "eating (*ἔσθων*)<sup>34</sup> locusts and wild honey"! Mk. himself in the ten other instances

<sup>31</sup> *E. g.* Dt. 32 12 1 Sam. 14 25.

<sup>32</sup> *Ἐρυπίδας* for *ἀκρίδας*.

<sup>33</sup> *Exp. Times*, March, 1904.

<sup>34</sup> The reading is indisputably established by the testimony of B D L. Inferior Mss. have substituted the common form. In Mk. 13 20 some editors adopt the form *κατέσθωρες*; but  $\mu$  D ll have *καταέσθωρες*, *καταέσθωσις*. If the former be read, it merely connects this saying by another link with the same source with which it has independent connection.

where he employs the verb always uses the ordinary form *εσθλω*, a proof not only that he had the discourse of Lk. 7 38 1. before him, but that he had it *written in the Greek language*.

(b) The second part of § 1 in which the two verses Mk. 1 6 1. on John's Proclamation of the Christ and the Baptism of the Spirit, stand over against the long discourse of Mt. 3 7-12, and the still longer and fuller one of Lk. 3 7-17, is one in which the general Markan characteristic of externality is vividly illustrated. In the parallels the Baptist's preaching is described in terms flaming with the imagery of Mal. 3 and 4. The great "day that burneth as a furnace" is at hand. The "wicked are as stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up." "The messenger of the covenant" (מלאכי; cf. Ex. 23 20 1.) is coming, but first for judgment, "and who may abide the day of his coming, for he is like unto a refiner's fire." This is the imagery of John's preaching in Mt.-Lk., and leaves no shadow of doubt regarding whom he meant by the Coming One, the Stronger than he, whose winnowing fork is in his hand to gather the wheat into his garner, and to burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. It is not Jehovah; for the Baptist would not speak of bearing (or loosing) the sandal of Jehovah. It is the Messenger of the Covenant on his mission of judgment as Malachi depicts it. Beyond all question Wellhausen is right in indorsing the verdict of J. Weiss that the original contrast of the Baptist's defense of his baptism was between the present time of repentance, a "baptism of water unto forgiveness," and a swiftly approaching day of wrath and indignation, "baptism of fire unto judgment."

Such is the fiery eloquence of the last and greatest of the prophets as Mt. and Lk. describe it in terms which amply justify the great discourse of Jesus whose climax is that John himself is that Messenger of the Covenant as to whom he had sent to ask "Art thou he that should come?"<sup>35</sup> The

<sup>35</sup> "He that should come" in accordance with what we know of the Baptist's expectations should properly signify the Messenger of the Covenant. The character of Jesus' activity if any at all adequate report had reached John would be more apt to suggest Elias, the great "restorer." It could hardly suggest the Messiah.

continued contrasts of the discourse, "wailing" *vs.* "piping," asceticism in the desert *vs.* friendly intercourse with publicans and sinners, the denunciatory "preaching of Jonah,"<sup>86</sup> the winning "wisdom of Solomon," all are chosen with the object of bringing out this relation: John the Messenger of the Covenant (the Elijah of the "great repentance"?); Jesus the Wisdom of God, pleading with the erring, going forth to seek and to save that which was lost. In the fuller and more self-consistent account of Lk. 3 7-17, in which the only trace of Markan influence is in the three words "the Holy Ghost and"<sup>87</sup> of ver. 16, the saying as to the two baptisms and the Coming One is not even volunteered by John. As in the Fourth Gospel it is elicited by an interruption, a murmur concerning the Baptist's own authority, from which he sharply calls back their attention to the real issue: "My baptism of water is indeed of small authority, but all too soon cometh a Stronger than I, whose baptism is of fire."

What then is the relation of Mk.'s briefer story to this larger whole? Wellhausen himself admits that in this instance his theory of the dependence of Q on Mk. breaks down.<sup>88</sup> Bousset points to it as a fatal obstacle. Every trace of the original bearing of the Baptist's words has disappeared. In spite of the reference to the Messenger of the Covenant in ver. 2 *there is no warning of judgment at all.* The Coming One is not the Judge whose winnowing fork is in his hand, but simply Jesus; and the two baptisms are not the present baptism of repentance *vs.* the future baptism of fire, but the outward baptism of water, which symbolically foretells the inward baptism of the Holy Ghost!

To add words in proof of the priority of the Mt.-Lk. conception to the cogent demonstrations of such predecessors in the field as Bousset, Weiss, and Wellhausen would be folly. He who cannot read here the true relation of dependence is

<sup>86</sup> On John's preaching as meant by the enigmatic reference to "the Sign of Jonah" see Bacon, *Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 225, 232.

<sup>87</sup> πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ.

<sup>88</sup> P. 74; cf. Bousset's review in *Theol. Rundschau*, I and II, Jan. and Feb., 1906.

not fitted for the study of literary criticism. But as before something remains to be said on the score of linguistic evidence.

In ver. 8 Mk. is not baldly perverting a warning of the Baptist into a prediction of Pentecost. He has a basis for the reference, though not the same as in his additions to the prediction to the sons of Zebedee, "Ye shall indeed drink my cup *and be baptized with my baptism.*"<sup>39</sup> Jesus, as we are twice informed in the subsequent narrative of Lk.<sup>40</sup> himself, drew this contrast of outward and inward baptism, in his promise of the Messianic gift of the Spirit. Peter in the house of Cornelius "remembered the word of the Lord how he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." In Mk. 18 we have a simple conflation of this saying of Jesus with the very different saying of the Baptist. *And in both Mt. and Lk. we have conflation of conflation by adding the further ingredient "and fire" which could be obtained from no other source but the original.* The dependence of both Mt. and Lk. on Mk. is here proved with all the cogency its advocates can desire, the cogency of the conflate reading indisputably secondary to its factors; and above and beyond that we have the coincident testimony of Mt. and Lk., equally cogent, to a source on which all three have built, but to which they have access independently of Mk.

After such evidence as this it may seem unimportant that in the single verse Mk. 18 we have three instances of coincident additions of Mt. and Lk.,<sup>41</sup> and that the construction *οὐ οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς λῦσαι . . . αὐτοῦ* with its pronounced Semitism *οὐ . . . αὐτοῦ*, its *ἰκανός*, and its unusual order, is one which Hawkins rightly pronounces distinctively Lucan,<sup>42</sup> including in the term "Lucan" the sources as well as the redactional element of our Third Gospel. The descriptive *κύψας* is a characteristic addition of Mk. to the original phrase, wanting in both parallels.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Mt. 20 21, 22, where the words italicized of Mk. 10 22, 23 are wanting, and Lk. 12 50.

<sup>40</sup> Ac. 1 6 11 16.

<sup>41</sup> *μέν, ἐν, καὶ πρὸς.*

<sup>42</sup> *Hor. Syn. p. 44.*



The change of order in the clauses of ver. 7 f. for the sake of the antithesis of ver. 8 is also due to Mk., as the coincidence of Mt. and Lk. attests.

In § 2 (Mk. 1 9-11 = Mt. 3 13-17 = Lk. 3 21-22) on the Baptism and call of Jesus, Usener<sup>43</sup> has argued cogently for the priority of that form of the Voice from heaven (בת קול) which is found in the Western text of Lk., "Thou art my son, to-day have I begotten thee,"<sup>44</sup> the form of Mk. on which Mt. and the *a* text of Lk. are based, being derived from the Voice of the Transfiguration story, which itself rests on Is. 42 1-4 (cf. Mt. 12 18-21). Were these results accepted, this would strongly confirm those we have drawn from the preceding sections, indicating a Lucan source as the basis. In general the probability of a strong coloration of the narrative by the stereotyped phenomena of "baptism and the outpouring of the Spirit" in the church must be admitted. The author describes the experience of Jesus, of which he knew little, in terms of the experience of converts, of which he knew a great deal. But the closer correspondence of the Baptism than of the Transfiguration story to the Isaian passage ("I will put my Spirit upon him") is opposed to Usener's view, and the explanation given by me heretofore<sup>45</sup> still seems preferable. Only *σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου* represents the original. The technical designations of the Messiah as ὁ Ἀγαπητός, Ἐκλεκτός, or Ἐκκληλεγμένος,<sup>46</sup> and references to the divine foreordination *ἐν σοὶ (ᾧ) εὐδόκησα*, or adoption, *ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε* are dogmatic additions of which Mark seems to be here the originator, with the ex-

<sup>43</sup> *Religionsgesch. Untersuchungen*, Th. I. p. 38 ff.

<sup>44</sup> Pa. 27; cf. Heb. 5 a.

<sup>45</sup> Art. "Autobiography of Jesus" in *Am. Journ. of Theol.*, July, 1898, and "The Aorist *εὐδόκησα* in Mk. i. 11," *Journ. Bibl. Lit.* xvi. (1897) and xx. 1. The evidence of Fragment 5, *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (Preuschen, *Antileg.*, p. 4), "My mother the Holy Spirit took me," etc., corroborates the view that the Baptism and Temptation story in their earlier form were related in the first person, i. e. by Jesus.

<sup>46</sup> Ὁ Ἀγαπητός or Ἐγαρημένος is the uniform title of Messiah in the *Visio Isaías* and some kindred apocrypha; cf. *Barn.* iii. 6 iv. 3, 8, and *B.D.* (Hastings'), s.v. "Isaiah, Ascension of."

ception of the last, though the terms may well have been taken from the Transfiguration story.<sup>47</sup>

Usener<sup>48</sup> and J. Weiss<sup>49</sup> are insistent on the priority of the conception represented by *ἐπ' αὐτόν* of Mt.-Lk. as against *εἰς αὐτόν* of Mk. 1 10. The *σχιζομένους* of the same verse against Mt.-Lk.'s use of *ἀνεψυχθῆναι*, which might represent assimilation to Is. 64 1 (63 19), Weiss lays no stress upon. His argument as to the former needs no repetition. To his mind the Lucan conception that the Holy Spirit took bodily form and rested visibly (*εἶδει*) upon Jesus may claim priority (historicity is not the point in question) to that wherein this is reduced to a mere vision in Jesus' own mind of the Spirit's entrance *into* him. Neither can we pause to consider post-Markan embellishments of Mt. and Lk., like Mt. 8 13-14.<sup>50</sup> An unsolved problem of synoptic criticism is the use of Semitisms, of which one of the marked instances is the opening clause of Mk. 1 9 *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκεῖναις ταῖς ἡμέραις* = *וַיְהִי בַיּוֹמֵי אֵלֶּה*. We venture to lay it down as a general principle that it was not the tendency of our Greek evangelists purposely to create or to multiply expressions of this character, but on the contrary to reduce their number and crudity by slight alterations of form, paraphrase, or omission, so as to avoid the wearisome and illiterate repetition of constant *καὶ εἶπεν*'s and *καὶ ἐγένετο*'s and the like. But it is equally important to observe a complementary principle operating in the contrary sense in at least one of our evangelists. Lk., the most cultured stylist of all, is unquestionably alive to the charm of Semitic naiveté of style. A moment's attention to the contrast between his classical preface (1 1-4) and the succeeding two chapters will suffice to show that he intentionally *retains*

<sup>47</sup> Mk.'s comparatively frequent use of the Pauline theological terminology is notorious. Cf. 1 1, 8 28, 10 29 "Gospel of God (of Jesus Christ)"; 1 4 "Repentance unto forgiveness of sins"; 1 15 "The time is fulfilled," "Repent and believe," etc.

<sup>48</sup> *L.c.* p. 40 ff.

<sup>49</sup> *L.c.* p. 130.

<sup>50</sup> An apologetic addition to remove the difficulty of Jesus' submitting to a baptism "for forgiveness of sins." Cf. *Gospel according to Hebrews*, frag. 3, Preuschen, *l.c.*, p. 4.

(we do not say "manufactures") Semitisms of a biblical type in more marked degree than any other NT. writer, though here too there is not infrequent resolution of the Semitic parataxis, variation of the agglutinated sentences by the use of participles and particles, and paraphrase of the *καὶ ἐγένετο's*, *καὶ εἶπεν's*, *καὶ ἰδοὺ's*, and the like.

The practice of each evangelist in this particular must therefore be studied by itself. When this is done certain general rules of extreme importance for the study of sources at once become apparent. As an example, we may take the Semitism *καὶ ἐγένετο* of Mk. 19.<sup>51</sup> Lk. is the only writer who systematically retains it. Not counting the paraphrases like *ἐγένετο δέ*,<sup>52</sup> by which he avoids monotony, Lk. allows this Semitism to remain in no less than forty-two instances.<sup>53</sup> Mt. has but five all together, in the strict Semitic form, *all* of them in the stereotyped formula *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους (παραβολὰς κτλ.) τούτους*, which concludes his five great blocks or *pereqs* of discourse material. One sporadic case of different form (*καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ*)<sup>54</sup> appears in Mt. 9 10, a passage soon to be considered. Mk. has but one other instance (44) of *καὶ ἐγένετο* with the finite verb, and one (223) followed by the infinitive.<sup>55</sup> The inference is patent. All three evangelists

<sup>51</sup> The whole phrase is Semitic—*καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις* = יָרַד בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם. Mt. paraphrases it by *τότε* (a favorite with Mt.) *παραγίνεται*. But at the proper place for its relation to the section, Mt. 31, he has the equivalent in its complete form: *Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις παραγίνεται Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής*. We venture to think this was its original place in the source of Mk. First a statement of Jesus' home and descent from the lineage of David (omitted by Mk.); then the phrase applied, as in Mt., to *the Baptist*; then the prophecy *καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἑσαῖα τῷ προφήτῃ, φωνή κτλ.*

<sup>52</sup> This is found in Lk.-Ac. *only*, and occurs no less than thirty-eight times!

<sup>53</sup> For statistics cf. Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 30. The *καὶ ἐγένετο* of our paragraph peeps through even the Latin of Gospel according to Hebrews, frag. 4 (Preuschen, *l.c.*), *Et factum est cum ascendisset* etc. On *καὶ ἐγένετο* in particular, cf. Simcox, *Writers of the New Testament*, p. 6, Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 25, and Plummer, *Crit. Comm. on Lk.*, p. 46.

<sup>54</sup> This variant rendering occurs nowhere else but in Lk. (Ac. 57?), and is used there eleven times.

<sup>55</sup> This form is employed by Lk. twenty-one times. Hawkins gives the

found the Semitism objectionable. Mt. and Mk. followed the sweeping rule of suppressing or veiling it wherever possible. Lk., with more artistic or historic sense, allowed it as a rule to remain, skillfully avoiding monotony by various paraphrases. What applies to *καὶ ἐγένετο* applies to *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις* and to *καὶ ἰδοὺ, καὶ ἐγένετο φωνή* (לְהַדְרֵי בֵּית קוֹל) and similar Semitic phrases in like manner. The habit of the evangelist must be studied in regard to it, and the result will often prove singularly illuminating.<sup>56</sup> We adduce at this point only two further illustrations: (1) *καὶ ἰδοὺ*, which Mk. has suppressed entirely,<sup>57</sup> though Mt. uses it twenty-seven times, in several instances as a substitute for the (to him) obnoxious *καὶ ἐγένετο*, and even Lk.-Ac. thirty-seven times; and (2) *τότε*, which Mt. uses 140 times, often as a substitute for less favored Semitisms, and Lk.-Ac. forty times; but Mk. only tolerates in the Eschatological Discourse (admitted even by Burkitt to be from a written source) where it occurs four times, once in the Beelzebub logion (certainly from a written source), and once in the otherwise exceptional logion Mk. 220.

§ 2 has thus in verses 9 and 11 its quota of linguistic phenomena attesting derivation from a source more strongly tinged with Semitisms than the taste of any of our evangelists approves. The *καὶ ἐγένετο* is varied by Lk. to *ἐγένετο δέ*, altered by Mt. to *τότε*. *Ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις* remains in none but Mk. *Καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο* is varied by Lk.; altered by Mt. to a Semitism which he prefers, *καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνή*.

§ 3, The Temptation, has but the two verses Mk. 1 12-13 to offset the full description Mt. 4 1-11 = Lk. 4 1-13. If it be maintained to be improbable that a later evangelist should voluntarily exclude material so rich in ethical content as the

following as the total number of occurrences of *ἐγένετο* in any construction in the historical books: Mt. 13 times, Mk. 16, Lk. 71, Ac. 52 (besides twice *ἐγένετο*), Jn. 17.

<sup>56</sup> As statistics would too greatly encumber our text, we omit the tables prepared for the larger work, referring especially to the invaluable statistics of Hawkins and Wernle, and the discussions of Dalman and Wellhausen.

<sup>57</sup> Even in 52, B D L omit *ἰδοὺ*.

Baptist's preaching of judgment and Jesus' three answers to temptation, let the objector go through the Gospel of Mk. as a whole, applying to it the standard of Mt. 28 20, that disciples are to be taught "to observe all things which Jesus commanded," and ask himself what has become of this teaching of Jesus. The Matthæan conception of the faith as obeying the commandments of Jesus is not Mk.'s conception. His readers are to have faith in Jesus as the Son of God, and to follow him at the cost of possessions and life in the heroic devotion of this belief. There *is no teaching of Jesus* for Mk. but the example of his heroic career, and the commendation of its spirit of self-abnegating service to all who would follow (8 34-38 9 35-50 10 17-31). "Commandments of the Lord" to be observed do not exist. What in the other gospels is teaching, in this gospel is nothing but a part of the drama. There are no exceptions.<sup>58</sup> Even the parables, what few are given, come merely as an element of Jesus' conflict against "a disobedient and gainsaying people." He hides "the mystery of the kingdom of God" in the hearts of a remnant, and defies "them that are without." The Eschatological Discourse is not given to teach eschatology, but as the vindication of Jesus against those who "denied the Holy and Righteous One" and had since suffered the predicted penalty of their crime. The "teachings" about forgiveness (2 1-12), Sabbath-keeping (2 23-3 6), exorcisms (3 22-30), ceremonial (7 1-23), divorce (10 1-12), census-money (12 13-17), resurrection (12 18-27), the higher law (12 28-34), and David's Son (12 35-37) are not here as "teachings," but as part of the conflict in which the Jewish law is shown to be superseded by the new principle. There must be some appreciation of this fundamental constitution of Mk.'s gospel before we say whether it is likely that such and such material would be omitted.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>58</sup> The nearest to an exception is Mk. 12 41-44, a story inexplicably wanting in Mt. and strongly characterized by the humanitarian pathos of the Lucan Source. If any exception is made here, the verses must be regarded as an addition after "widows' houses" of 12 40, taken from Lk., or the Lucan Source. Mk. 4 21-25, 11 20-25 are appended logia.

<sup>59</sup> Mention has been made above (note 47) of the use of Pauline terms in Mk. Stronger evidence of Pauline influence appears in 7 1-25, where the

In the light of these general characteristics it is no longer surprising to find nothing left of the Temptation story but that which attests the greatness of the calling and power with which Jesus has been endowed at his baptism. "Driven forth to the wilderness" by the Spirit which had come upon him, and which impels him like Elijah, he is vainly tried by Satan forty days. In his own house the strong man is bound; soon his goods are to be spoiled. Thus far Mk. makes of the Temptation what we should expect if he had before him the fuller narrative conveyed to us by Mt. and Lk. But whence the two traits of the ministry of angels, and sojourn unharmed among the wild beasts, the former of which reappears in Mt. only, the latter not at all elsewhere? Are these Mk.'s own invention? By no means. His source is no other than what we have, plus his knowledge of the OT. He is not interested in the ethical question in what sense one should understand the promise quoted by Satan, "He shall give his angels charge over thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone." But to him as to Paul, as to the author of Heb. 1 2-14, the quotation is welcome from any source, as proving that "he is become by so much better than the angels as he hath inherited a more excellent name than they." They are already shown to be "ministering spirits sent forth to do service for the Heir of salvation." And as for the submission of wild beasts?—Mark too can cap the Devil's quotations—the same psalm<sup>60</sup> proceeds "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and the adder, the young lion and the dragon shalt thou

question of clean and unclean meats, so vital in Acts and the Pauline Epistles, is settled on the broad principle: "Nothing that goeth in, but that which cometh out of a man defileth him." The location of this section at the beginning of Jesus' tour of evangelization in Gentile parts, is also significant. More important than all else as a Pauline characteristic, however, is the complete eclipse in this gospel of the teaching of Jesus in "commandments to be observed," in favor of the simple drama of redemption. The Gospel is the story of Jesus the Son of God victorious over all enemies by "humbling himself, and becoming obedient unto the death of the cross."

<sup>60</sup> Ps. 91 12, 13. The promise is not unreflected in the apocalyptic and pseud-epigraphic literature, and appears more than once again in the NT. Cf. *Test. Levi*, xviii. 26, Lk. 10 19, Rm. 16 20.

trample under feet." The relation of dependence and the question of priority here seem to me to admit of but one answer: Mk. is using the Mt.-Lk. story of the Temptation for his own dramatic purposes.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>61</sup> F. Spitta, "Beiträge," etc. in *Zts. f. nt. W.* V. 4 (1904), pp. 323-326, and VIII. 1 (1907), pp. 66 f., taking the same view as above of the dependence of Mk.'s prologue on the source represented in Lk. 3:1-4:13, finds the basis for the Markan addition of superiority to the beasts in a series of passages from OT. and Apocrypha, besides Ps. 91:13, as follows: Ex. 34:2-23, Job 5:23 f. ("stones of the field" and "wild beasts" in league with man), *Test. XII. Patr.* Napht. viii. Issach. vii., and *Apoc. Mos.* x. 1.