

The Treatment of Mk. 6¹⁴⁻²³ in Luke

BENJ. W. BACON, D.D., LL.D.

THE first answer of gospel criticism to this famous problem is the so-called Proto-Mark theory: The form of Mk. utilized by Lk. did not yet contain the missing sections. The suggestion, however, encounters at once the formidable objection: But Mt., a gospel certainly not materially later than Lk., embodies already practically all of the missing Markan material.¹ It must indeed be admitted that Mk. 6^{45-8²³} could be omitted without seriously interfering with the continuity of the gospel, and even that there is a decided gain in bringing the Martyrdom of the Baptist-Elias and Feeding of the Multitude (Mk. 6¹⁴⁻²³, 30-44, the latter the type of the Agape) closer to the prediction of the Fate of Jesus, and the Relation of his Martyrdom to that of John (8²⁷⁻⁹ 1.2-13); for thus we obtain a group, as in Jn. 6, whose single theme is appropriate throughout to the sacrament. The force of the argument that both the third and fourth gospels are not likely to have effected this felicitous abridgment without some authority in tradition must be recognized; and it must be conceded in addition that a large part of Mk. 6^{45-8²³} consists of clearly duplicate material. And yet with all these concessions it remains certain that there is no break in the structure of Mk. at the points indicated, and that if there is duplication, it continues in subsequent chapters as well.²

Without denying the large possibilities, nay probabilities, of the combination of written sources of Mk., without excluding the process of textual alteration so notably illustrated in

¹ On the two missing healings Mk. 7²³⁻²⁷ and 8²³⁻²⁵, see below.

² On the phenomena of duplication in Mk., see Bacon, *Introd.* p. 207.

the rival forms of the appendices, we may safely indorse the verdict of an increasing number of modern critics that at least the burden of proof lies upon those who assume a form of Mk. from which 6 45-8 28 was missing, to account for its non-appearance in Lk. On the other hand, advocates of the Proto-Mark theory have the right to expect from their opponents a reasonable explanation of the omission, on the supposition that this material formed part of the gospel Luke has elsewhere incorporated almost entire. This explanation we shall attempt to give, not on general and *a priori* grounds of what any conceivable evangelist might be expected to admit or reject, but on the basis of a study of (1) the actual practice of this particular evangelist in his omissions elsewhere (2) of the significance of the *group* of incidents in Mk. 6-8; for we must remember that it is one thing to explain how Lk. might have had objections to this, that, and the other element of the group in question, and quite another to meet the cumulative force of consecutive omissions. The real question to be answered is, Why does Lk. treat Mk. 6-8 so differently from the other great divisions of this gospel in the matter of omissions? This involves a study of the general structure of Mk. and thereafter what Lk. has made of it.

1. It will be generally conceded that Lk. in many instances has preferred the version of an anecdote or logion which he found in some other source, and in these cases has avoided duplication by dropping the Markan version; though he seems usually to avail himself of a phrase or two from the discarded form for the embellishment of its rival. A generally recognized instance is the Calling of Simon (5 1-11) where a symbolic narrative found in its proper connection in the appendix to Jn. (Jn. 21 1-14) and probably also in the Gospel of Peter,³ is adapted to serve in place of Mk. 1 16-20. Scraps from Mk. 4 1 and 1 16-18 are easily recognizable at beginning and end (5 1-3. 10 f.), but that the story is mis-

³ The fragment breaks off at the point where a group of the disciples after their flight to their several homes from the tragedy in Jerusalem, "taking our nets went away unto the sea"

placed, and really has to do with the question of the Gentile mission, is apparent from the lame way in which James and John are appended, while throughout the narrative Peter stands alone. Andrew disappears altogether. The real antecedent is the passage Lk. 22 31-34 which sets in prospect such a Commission of Peter as Jn. 21 actually relates. For the Petrine element of Acts Peter is in fact the apostle to the Gentiles (Ac. 15 7).

The omission of the Anointing in Bethany (Mk. 14 3-9) is similar in all respects to the omission of the Call of the Four. The story of the Penitent Harlot in Lk. 7 36-50 is not a real doublet, because the two incidents are fundamentally different in character. Their resemblance in outward circumstance, however, was so great as to induce Lk. to treat it as a doublet. He omits the Anointing in Bethany after having utilized its notable traits to embellish its rival. In Lk. 7 36-50 the incongruous introduction of the alabaster cruse of ointment in the last clause of verses 37 and 38 and verse 46, and probably the name Simon (43 f.) represent borrowings from Mk. 14 3-9.

The Cursing of the Fig-tree is another instance proving how far Lk. would go in excluding Markan material which seemed to him to be duplicated by what he had included elsewhere. Lk. 13 6-9 might really have stood beside it. Yet no other adequate reason appears for the omission of Mk. 11 12-14. 20 f. save the previous inclusion of the parable.

But there is also evidence of Lukan omissions where the motive would seem to lie solely in the nature of the material. The awkwardness of the attempted connection of the affirmative statement of the righteousness of the kingdom, Lk. 6 27-38, with the preceding, by means of the formula "But I say unto you which hear" is an indication that the antitheses of Mt. 5 17 ff. describing the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees as what "they of old time" had said, have been omitted. We have indeed no guarantee in this case that all the Matthean material was ever contained in Lk.'s source. Much of it certainly did not appear originally in this connection. But in phraseology and structure the antitheses of

Mt. 5 21 f. 27 f. 31-45 are akin to the Lukan form, and when we go on through Lk. and observe how references to Jesus' corrections of the scribes' interpretation of the law are systematically omitted or restated, it becomes very easy to believe such is the case here also; especially when we note that two scraps of the missing material are incorporated in loose connections in Lk. 16 17. 18, and a few more in 6 27a. 28b. 29-30. The other notable omissions of this class of material are the Abolition of Distinctions of Meats, Mk. 7 1-23, of which Lk. has only a remote parallel in 11 38-41, without trace of embellishments from the omitted section, the Question on the Law of Divorce, Mk. 10 1-12, of which a possible trace remains in Lk. 16 18, and the Scribes' Question, Mk. 12 28-34, from which a scrap has been borrowed in Lk. 10 27 to form, in combination with others from Mk. 10 17 = Lk. 18 18 and 10 19 = Lk. 18 20, an introduction (Lk. 10 25-29) to the Parable of the Good Samaritan.

This indication of Lk.'s method in omission applies very obviously to the portion of the omitted division of Mk. already referred to as the Abolition of Distinctions of Meats (Mk. 7 1-23), which is open to the further objection of duplication in Lk. 11 38-41.

Another motive for omission is that based upon the quality of the material. An example of this appears in the series of Mk. passages dealing with popular apocalyptic expectations connected with the identification of the Baptist with the coming Elias. For all these Lk. cuts away the ground in advance by his infancy chapters, wherein the great Forerunner appears simply as a prophet to go before the face of Messiah "in the spirit and power of Elias," not literally his reincarnation. Consistently with this an appendix is added to the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk. 16 19-25. 26-31) deprecating the popular belief attested in Mk. 6 14 9 13 Rev. 11 3-13 that Elias, after martyrdom at the hands of the tyrant, should rise from the dead and by "mighty works" effect the "great repentance." Lk. (and still more emphatically Jn. 5 32-47) repudiates this superstitious interpretation of the apocalyptic doctrine of "the wit-

nesses of Messiah" (Rev. 11 31. based on Zech. 4 3. 11-14 Mal. 4 51.; cf. 2 Esdr. 6 26), and maintains that the witness is the written witness of the law and the prophets (cf. 24 25-27 Jn. 5 461.) which if Israel receive not they will not repent though one should go to them from the dead. In this interest we have a series of changes and omissions. The story of the martyrdom of John the Baptist Mk. 6 14-29, so strongly marked by traits recalling the story of Elijah's denunciation of Ahab and Jezebel's plotting against his life, is omitted altogether; though the scrap 3 191. attached by Lk. to the story of The Baptist's Preaching, 3 7-17, is conclusive evidence that he knew it. In Jesus' Discourse about the Baptist, Lk. 7 24-28, the identification with "Elias that was for to come" of Matthew's version (Mt. 11 14) fails to appear. In the Transfiguration (Lk. 9 28-43) two verses are interjected (vs. 31-32) to explain that the appearance of Moses and Elias in glory was to foretell (*of ἔλεγον*) the death Jesus should accomplish in Jerusalem. Conversely, a significant amputation is made of Mark's account of the conversation as Jesus and his companions descend from the mount, wherein Jesus identifies Elias with the Baptist, and compares his own fate with the fate predicted in (uncanonical) "Scripture" of the Forerunner, Mk. 9 9-13. Finally, the cry from the cross, mistaken for an appeal for the coming of Elias, is removed, or (according to some texts) replaced by the prayer "Father, forgive them." The evidence of this system of changes, additions, and omissions suggests ample motive for omitting the story of the Baptist's Fate, Mk. 6 14-29.

Much more doubt must attach to the omission of the Walking on the Sea, Mk. 6 45-52, of which the only trace remaining seems to be the phrase "to a city called Bethsaida" in the preceding story, Lk. 9 10. Considering that Mt., Mk., and Jn. all maintain the connection of this story with the Feeding of the Multitude, the idea that the two were dissociated in the source followed by Lk. does not seem probable. We grant that he had general reasons for making his excisions from this particular division of Mk. by wholesale. But why put in the knife at just this point? The *a priori* reasoner

will be tempted to imagine a skepticism on the part of the "historian"-evangelist which is not borne out by study of his actual practice. Lk. is not incredulous of miracle. Safer inferences can be drawn from his method of composition. One of the characteristics of this gospel is the effort made to counteract a docetic view of the person of Christ. This appears in the resurrection-narrative Lk. 24 36-43 and the repeated insistence on his having eaten with the disciples after the resurrection. Again, not the end only, but the beginning, of Jesus' career is profoundly modified in Lk. from the Markan form. Here too the result at least, if not the intention, is to forestall docetic misrepresentation such as might easily lay hold with eagerness on such a story as the Walking on the Sea. In view of the character of this story, and of other demonstrably intentional omissions on the part of Lk. its non-appearance here cannot be held to prove its absence from his source.

2. There remains in Mk. 6 53-8 27 the story of a great journey — or rather a succession of extraordinarily extensive, and for the most part seemingly motiveless, courses to and fro — beginning at "Gennesaret" and ending at "Caesarea Philippi." Some of the material, as we have seen in the case of the Abolition of Distinctions of Meats, 7 1-23, might well have been omitted by Lk. on account of its character and resemblance to material drawn by him from another source. Some, *e.g.* the Second Feeding of the Multitude, Mk. 8 1-10, might well be rejected because recognized as duplicate, in spite of Mk.'s dexterous combination in 8 13-21. Some elements are really given by Lk. from a better source in fuller form (Lk. 11 29 = Mk. 8 12). Two verses (Mk. 8 11. 15) appear in the form of scraps loosely attached in Lk. 11 18 and 12 1. The rest, including the Syro-phœnician Woman 7 24-30, Healing the Deaf-mute 7 31-37, and Healing of the Blind 8 23-28, remains to be accounted for, together with the general representation of this period of journeyings. Certain features of Lk. 11 14 and Mt. 9 32 *f.* compared with 15 29-31 and Jn. 9 1-41 suggest that even the healings of the Deaf-mute and the Blind may have been known in simpler

form to Mt. and Lk. independently of Mk.⁴ But still it would be hard to account for the complete omission of the Syro-phœnician, and the specially drastic treatment of this division of Mk.'s gospel. The real significance of this latter really remarkable phenomenon cannot be appreciated without a study of the editorial adaptation of Mk. 6 14-9 29, the division of Mk. which falls between the Mission of the Twelve and the Exodus from Galilee.

The division opens with a relation of the martyrdom of the Baptist, apropos of the rumors concerning the person of Jesus. This is so greatly elaborated that the evangelist forgets to tell us what ensued upon the rumors coming to Herod's ears. A very long series of interjected anecdotes follows, but we are manifestly back upon the original subject in 8 27-9 13, where the rumors as to the person of Jesus are again taken up, and meet their answer. This answer is that he is the Christ, but is to suffer the same fate of martyrdom which the Baptist had suffered as his Forerunner. For reasons which need not be here defined the Healing of the Epileptic (9 14-29) intervenes before the Via Crucis of the final division of the gospel; but this does not affect the general outline of the present division, which is determined by the two main foci already defined: the Martyrdom of John, and the (predicted) Martyrdom of Jesus.

It is perfectly in harmony with this general outline that in all our gospels the Feeding of the Multitude and (Lk. excepted) the Walking on the Sea should take first place in

⁴ In other connection I hope to show more fully that this pair of healings (for even in Mk. the literary connections of 7 31-37 with 8 23-25 are unmistakable) are elaborations by the second evangelist himself of the two healings which in Lk. introduced in very brief and succinct form the great Discourse against the Scribes from Jerusalem, who said, He casteth out by Beelzebub. In brief they stood in the place of 6 26 and were followed by 8 23-25 (removed by Mk. to its present place) and 7 1-23 as in Mt. 12 22-45 = Lk. 11 14-22. Mk. has elaborated their spectacular features and employed them as a frame for the mission in the kingdom of Philip, 7 31-8 27. Mt. does not so much omit them as incorporate them in abridged form, and in phraseology compounded from Mk. and Lk. in 9 27-31. Lk. omits the healing of the blind man altogether; probably on account of the resemblance to Mk. 10 46-52, a possible doublet (cf. Mt. 9 27-31). See below.

the included material. From Jn. 6 it is easy to see how unavoidably the narrative which furnished the ætiology of the Agape would bring in its train material concerned with the sacrament in memory of the Lord's death. To "understand concerning the loaves" is to Mk. (6 52) to have the key to the significance of the Walking on the Sea. In point of fact it seems to have symbolized to Mk., whatever its historical basis or lack thereof, Jesus' separation from the Twelve in Gethsemane, and his return to them triumphant over the power of death. Matthew in fact adds a trait symbolic of Peter's over-confident attempt to follow Jesus "unto prison and death" redeemed ultimately by a heroic end. From this allegory of the Manifestation to (Peter and) the Twelve onward, a new theme is taken up. If 6 30-52 symbolically anticipates Jesus' death and resurrection, the rest of the included material performs the same office *for the Mission to the Gentiles which ensued*. In 6 53-56 we have indeed only an editorial summary depicting the situation for the ensuing account of the Conflict with the Scribes from Jerusalem 7 1-23. But this for Mk. derives all its significance from the fact that its result is a *Ministry among the Gentiles*. The point of collision with the scribes is that around which so large a part of the Book of Acts revolves, the Distinctions of Meats, the point of collision in the early church also. But the utterance of Jesus extends to Mosaic ceremonial in general. The issue of the conflict according to Mk. is that Jesus took the most radical Pauline ground, entirely abolishing all distinctions of meats and immediately began a great journey into Gentile territory including the whole extent of Phœnicia from Tyre to Sidon, then Decapolis (from Damascus?⁶) south to the Sea of Galilee, where the Feeding of the Multitude is repeated for the benefit of the Gentiles of Decapolis; then, after an attempt to land at Dalmanutha (?) frustrated by the hostility of the Pharisees, a return to the heathen side of the Lake at Bethsaida, where the eyes of the blind are opened, and a new journey through the whole extent of Philip's kingdom to Cæsarea Philippi.

⁶ So Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 158.

As to the nature of the territory designated "the coasts of Tyre and Sidon" and the significance of Jesus' entrance upon it, Mk. removes all uncertainty by introducing after the plea of the woman (who does not, as in Mt. 15 22, come "forth from" those coasts, but finds Jesus concealed "in a house" in those coasts) the clause "now the woman was a Gentile (Ἑλληνίς), a Syro-phoenician by birth." As to his attitude regarding Decapolis we must judge by the direction to the healed Demoniac of Gerasa⁶ to preach the Lord Jesus "in Decapolis," in sharpest contrast to the uniform and "threatening" (ἐμβρισησάμενος 1 43) prohibitions to "make him known" in Jewish territory. Of the territory of Philip we can only say that in Mk. 8 22-27 it appears (historically enough, no doubt) as a refuge from the plots of "the Pharisees and Herod" (8 15).

We can scarcely claim warrant for calling this a "missionary journey," and yet, as Menzies rightly points out, Mk.'s adaptation of the older point of view of Mt. 15 21 (ἀνεχώρησεν) is no doubt "meant to be suggestive."⁷ The transformation in 7 27 of the repellent saying of Mt. 15 26 into a *prophecy* of the feeding of the dogs after the children, whose fulfillment on account of the woman's "word" begins at once, makes plain the evangelist's point of view in the formation of this group. It is Lk. 4 16-30 in action, and forms an enlarged and greatly developed substitute for the incident of the Centurion's Servant (Mt. 8 5-13 = Lk. 7 1-10). The curiously elaborated pair of healings, one (the Deaf-mute, 7 32-37) in Decapolis, the other (Blind Man of Bethsaida, 8 22-26) in the kingdom of Philip, have in this connection their symbolic significance,⁸ as well as the second Feeding of the Multitude (8 1-10). But we have more in Mk. 7 1-23 π. than a mere repudiation of distinctions of meats and beginning of the extension of the gospel to the Gentile world.

⁶ Mk.'s geography is at fault, but τόλαι 5 14 leaves no doubt that he means the metropolis of Decapolis.

⁷ Commentary, *ad loc.*, p. 155.

⁸ The basis is Is. 29 9-18, a passage already utilized in 7 6-7 and a favorite in similar application with Paul (1 Cor. 1 18-26; Rom. 9 21. 11 5; Col. 2 21). See below.

In the portions omitted or transformed by Mt. and Lk. Judaism itself is denounced in language borrowed from Is. 29 13 as a "vain worship" and "teachings which are commandments of men" (cf. Col. 2 22). In the same context (Is. 29 18) the evangelist read the prophecy "In that day shall the deaf hear the words of the book (referring to the "sealed book" of verses 10-12), and the eyes of the blind shall see out of obscurity and out of darkness."⁹ Now at the beginning and end of this "Missionary Journey" the evangelist introduces two healings, the unsealing of the ears of the deaf (7 32-37) and the opening of blind eyes (8 22-26), and has taken pains to elaborate the process of disenthralment; for as has frequently been observed the eccentricities of language and style in these two paragraphs are distinctive of the evangelist himself. It is reasonable to suppose that the motive for this elaboration, particularly in such traits as the introduction of the command *Effatha* in the original Aramaic, lies in a symbolic application suggested by Is. 29 18. In this connection of "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God to both Jews and Greeks" we are not surprised, accordingly, at the introduction, after the Feeding of the (Gentile) Multitude (8 1-10), of the Jews' Demand for a Sign and its Refusal (8 11-13), and the Rebuke of the Twelve for failure to understand the Sign of the Loaves (8 14-21) in language borrowed from the same Isaian connection (Is. 29 10. 43 s; cf. Rom. 11 8), "having eyes see ye not, and having ears hear ye not, have ye your heart hardened?" (8 17 f.; cf. 6 52. 7 17).

So far as we are able to trace it in the parallels the historical basis for this elaborate construction of Mk. between the Galilean Ministry, ending with the Mission of the Twelve, and the Exodus from Galilee, is a very small factor. The story of the Martyrdom of the Baptist-Elias is properly termed by Holtzmann "das Muster einer Legende." Well-

⁹ The whole context, including also verses 14 and 19 (destruction of the wisdom of the wise, rejoicing of the "poor among men" and "the meek") together with the reference in 35 s. f. is employed in the great discourse of Mt. 11 1-12 45 (11 s. ss. cf. 13 14-17) and by Paul in 1 Cor. 1 19-21. ss. 3 1.

hausen correctly infers from the fact that the notice of Herod remains without result, that the original sequel, the withdrawal of Jesus, has been superseded. Such a historical withdrawal is made probable, however, by Lk. 13 31-33. It may well have included "the borders of Tyre and Sidon." The Feeding of the Multitude which follows (6 30-44) is abundantly guaranteed as a primeval tradition by the duplicate forms already embodied by Mk. himself. But the connection formed by Mt. between this and the preceding narrative is notoriously fallacious. No chronological relation whatever exists between the Threat (or saying) of Herod and the Feeding of the Multitude. Moreover, when we note that in 8 13 the boat journey (to Gennesaret?), which in this version also ensues upon the Feeding, is totally devoid of any noteworthy incident, the claim of the Walking on the Sea to a historic foundation becomes weaker than ever. The addition of Mt. suggests, indeed, that the development of the legend is to be attributed rather to oral tradition, elaborating the theme of the Stilling of the Storm in connection with the symbolism of the eucharist, than to the imaginative genius of Mk. himself; but this does not lend it greater credibility.

A nucleus of tradition is traceable in 6 53-56, since, as Klostermann observes,¹⁰ verse 56 generalizes verses 53-55, which seem to have been adapted originally to introduce a specific healing. In the connection of the journey by boat on the one side, and the collision with the scribes on the other (cf. 8 10-12 Mt. 9 32 f. 12 22 Lk. 11 15 ff. Jn. 9 1-41), we can only infer that the incident to which 6 53 f. originally led up was the Healing of the Blind and Dumb; for at least the former (8 22b-26) is wrongly located by Mk. at Bethsaida, which was not a *κώμη* (v. 26), but a city (Lk. 9 10). The omission of these two healings by Mt. is therefore only apparent. The Slander of the Scribes from Jerusalem which should follow (by testimony of Mt. 12 and Lk. 11) after 7 1, has been introduced by Mk. proleptically in 3 22-30 as an offset to the incident of the Mother and Brethren, 3 20 f. 31-35.

¹⁰ *Markus*, p. 146.

But as a nucleus for the construction 7 1-23 there remains the complaint of 7 5 and the saying 7 15, a true parallel to Lk. 11 37-41. The flight (Mt. 15 21 ἀνεχώρησεν) to the "borders (Mt. "parts") of Tyre and Sidon," and the incident of the "Canaanite" (Mt. 15 22) woman in the earlier Matthæan form ¹¹ have long been recognized as a genuine element of early and probably authentic tradition. The journey of Mk. 7 31 "out of the borders of Tyre through Sidon" is obviously a creation from the two factors of the phrase in the Matthæan form. The only other traditional elements are the Demand and Refusal of a Sign (8 11 f. cf. Jn. 6 22-59 Mt. 16 1-4 = 12 38 f. = Lk. 11 29) and the logion "Beware of the Leaven of the Pharisees" (8 15 = Lk. 12 1; cf. Mt. 16 6). The rest of this whole great division of Mk. is purely redactional, though part of it (*e.g.* 7 17-19) may be older than our evangelist.

What then is the explanation of the very exceptional treatment accorded to it by Lk., and in some degree even by Mt.? We obtain in the present writer's judgment the true key to Lk.'s great omission when we observe in what interest the nucleus of tradition has been built up by the compiler in Mk. 6 53-8 28, and then compare this with the solution of the same questions in which Mt. and Lk. have rested.

Geographically the outline of Mk. 6 53-8 28 is that of a journey of extraordinary proportions, when compared with the career of Jesus as otherwise known. It seems to take the place of an original, simple retirement from Herod's threatening interest, perhaps only into the "borders of Tyre and Sidon," *i.e.* upper Galilee, from whence Jesus returns "between Galilee and Samaria," *i.e.* along the great route from Ptolemais to Scythopolis and Gennesaret, skirting the foothills which border the Plain of Esdraelon on the south (Lk. 17 11; cf. 9 52). Instead of this Mk. introduces a journey through all Phœnicia from south to north, all Decapolis from Damascus (?) south to the Sea of Galilee, and all the kingdom of Philip from Bethsaida to Cæsarea. This

¹¹ The last clause of Mt. 15 22 is of course the evangelist's; cf. 9 22 17 18.

journey among the Gentiles begins, as we have seen, with Jesus' violent rupture with the "Scribes from Jerusalem," and his prophecy to the believing "Gentile woman" of Phœnicia concerning the ultimate feeding of the "dogs." His stay on Gentile soil is interrupted only by the attempt to land at Dalmanutha (?); and this is frustrated by the Pharisees' Demand for a Sign.

How now do Mt. and Lk. treat this geographical representation of Mk.? Mt. 15 21. 29. 39 16 5-13 after the minute method of subtle alteration characteristic of this gospel reduces the whole to a journey confined within the boundaries of the sacred land.¹⁹ Lk. deals more radically with it, cutting out not only the references to Phœnicia and Decapolis, but even Cæsarea Philippi (with Mk. 8 27 cf. Lk. 9 18).

But the geographical outline is to Mk. a mere framework for the grouping of the material whose practical bearing on the moot points of doctrine we have endeavored to set forth. Into it he has cast an elaborate development of seven incidents and sayings having Is. 29 8? 10-12. 13 f. 18 f. as its keynote. The hungry "multitude of the nations" is fed. The "closed eye" of the prophets and seers is opened and their understanding quickened. "The deaf hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind see out of the obscurity and the darkness." Jacob's "children, the work of God's hands in the midst of him" see the "marvelous work and wonder done among the people," and "sanctify the God of Israel."²⁰ The whole section reads as though the Thanksgiving at the Return of the Twelve, Lk. 10 21-24 = Mt. 11 25-27 18 16 f., had been elaborated, even before Mk. (note Mt. 15 29 ff.), on the basis of the prophecy to which it alludes (Lk. 10 21 from Is. 29 9-12), and thereafter the group had been developed by attachment of the incidents of the healing of the Deaf-mute and Blind, and the Demand of a Sign (Mt. 9 32-34 11 25-27

¹⁹ One may fairly question whether the real intention of Mk. is not similar. The regions of Phœnicia, Decapolis, Iturea and Trachonitis were then Gentile, but the ideal boundaries of the Holy Land in the O.T. certainly include them.

²⁰ The allusion to Is. 29 22 here quoted is found not in Mk., but in Mt. 15 22 ff. introducing the parallel to Mk. 7 21-23.

12 22 ff. Lk. 11 14-16). In this process the influence of 1 Cor. 1 18-24 3 1 (cf. Rom. 11 8) would be a factor of vital importance. In the judgment of so good a critic as Harnack the relation of these two passages (1 Cor. 1 19. 21 and Mt. 11 25-29 = Lk. 10 21-22) is in fact so close as to suggest even a literary connection.¹⁴

But the evangelist Mk. makes a more concrete application of the doctrine of Is. 29 to the burning question of his day than any of the parallels. On the basis of the incident Lk. 11 37-41 (with Lk. 11 41 cf. Mk. 7 19b), whose contrast between purity of inside and outside¹⁵ is rendered in the form, "Not that which goeth into, but that which cometh out of a man defileth him," Mk. enunciates and defends at length a Paulinism as radical as that which Paul himself is obliged to restrain and qualify in his reply to his correspondents at Corinth (1 Cor. 8 1-13 10 23-33) and again in Rom. 14 1-23 by the converse principle of consideration for the scruples of "the weak." The standpoint of Mk. 7 1-23 is that of Rom. 14 14a "I know, and am persuaded of the Lord Jesus (we note, however, that Paul refers to no explicit utterance of Jesus to this effect, but rather implies the contrary, Rom. 15 8) that there is nothing unclean of itself." It does not even find room for the qualification "howbeit to him that accounteth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean." The whole ceremonial of Judaism, its alleged¹⁶ "washings of cups and pots and brassen vessels" is rejected rudely, and even contemptuously. As a "people" they are classified as "hypocrites"; and their worship is "vain," their teachings are "commandments of men" (cf. Col. 2 22).

¹⁴ Harnack, *Sprüche u. Reden Jesu*, p. 210, n. 1.

¹⁵ In the Lukan form "your inside" this applies to the man. In the Matthean Mt. 23 28 to the dish. Lk. 11 41 "give the contents for alms" taken with Am. 8 10, Is. 61 8 and the Rabbinic doctrine "Almsgiving maketh atonement for sin" shows that the latter is correct, but not in the sense "purify the *inside*," but purify the *contents* of the dish. Mk. follows the Lukan form.

¹⁶ Mk. 7 3-4 exaggerates the facts. The practices described cannot justly be attributed to "all the Jews," nor do they convey a fair description even of "the Pharisees."

Mt. dexterously reduces this radical anti-Judaism by inserting a logion referring to "the hedge of the law" (Mt. 15 13), so that the distinction appears to be between the Mosaic law itself, a "planting of the Heavenly Father," and the "traditions of men." But this is *not* the distinction implied in Mk. The distinction in Mk. 7 1-23 is precisely the same as in Mk. 10 1-12 (both of these are omitted by Lk., and so modified by Mt. as completely to lose their radicalism), and Mk. 2 25 and 3 4. For Mk. "the commandment of God" is the eternal moral law of mercy and righteousness as it was "in the beginning of the creation." Mosaism and the "traditions of the elders" stand together in contrast over against it, except in so far as Mosaism embodies this eternal natural ethics. The general attitude of Mk. toward Judaism is radical to the point of iconoclasm.¹⁷ On the specific question which became the burning issue between the mother church and the churches of the Gentiles, filling the greater Pauline Epistles with its echoes, and occupying the position of supreme importance in Acts, Mk. is a Paulinist of the Corinthian ultra-Pauline type. His motto is "All things are lawful." "Meat will not commend us to God: neither if we eat not are we the worse, nor if we eat are we the better." "God looketh not on the outward man, but on the heart"; the saying "Not what goes in but what comes out" makes all meats clean. Mt. and Lk. systematically soften or remove this radicalism.

In its position as the starting point of the journey among the Gentiles the significance of this repudiation of Mosaism as a whole has double emphasis. Judaism itself is for Mk. the "hypocrisy" of "a people that honor God with their lips while their heart is far from him," "vain worship" and "precepts of men." When he couples to this an elaborate exposition of the saying on inward and outward defilement, expressly to prove that it abolishes all distinctions of meats (7 19), and thereafter describes a journey of Jesus among the Gentiles, his theological position on the great

¹⁷ Even the preaching in parables is a preaching of judgment to "them that are without," for their hardening and rejection 4 11 f.

issues of the Petro-Pauline controversy is not happily defined in the Tübingen conception of him as a reconciler (!) of the contending factions. It is not unparalleled in the New Testament, but its parallel is in the party of the "strong" in the Epistles to the Corinthians and Romans. But this type of Paulinism has met such treatment at the hands of Lk. as to show clearly that the entire Markan construction of this section of his gospel would be to Lk., in its present form, absolutely inadmissible. What he makes of the principle involved is clearly exhibited in another part of his work.

The doctrinal parallel to Mk. 7 1-23 is Ac. 9 32-11 18, or more exactly Ac. 11 1-18, where the great battle which Paul informs us was fought out by himself alone, first at Jerusalem, later against Peter himself, and "even Barnabas," at Antioch, is represented in this narrative to be fought out by Peter as the apostle and champion of the Gentiles (cf. 15 7). Both elements of the great issue are involved, the admission of the Gentiles on terms of complete equality, 11 18, and the unconditional "eating with" them. The Jew Peter abandons his caste as a Jew for the purpose of his mission work, 11 3, and having abandoned it and eaten with the Gentiles, defends his action before the assembled church in Jerusalem until unanimous sanction is obtained. Here the basis of settlement is strictly that of Gal. 2 11-21; those who were Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, because the ground of their salvation is not obedience to the law but faith in the cross, must abandon their caste. If they do not, they build up again the barrier they had destroyed, and in compelling the Gentiles to Judaize make the grace of God void. But while the voice is the voice of Paul the agency is the agency of Peter. In thrice repeated, twice related, vision, the Voice from heaven bids him slay and eat without distinction, and rebukes his demurrer with the command "What God hath made clean, make thou not unclean." In literary construction this Vision and Revelation to Peter by Voice from heaven of the Pauline principle of the co-heirship of the Gentiles is the counterpart of the Transfiguration

story, which similarly translates into the language of symbolism the Pauline Revelation of a spiritual Christ not after "the things that be of men," which our evangelists place side by side with its prose parallel (Mk. 8 27-9 1. 11-13 = 9 2-10). Doctrinally it is a parallel to the Markan scene where Jesus abolishes all distinctions of meats as "precepts of men." It puts into the language of apocalypse the words of Paul, "I know and am persuaded of the Lord Jesus that there is nothing unclean of itself, save that to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean." But this Pauline solution of the great question was *not* Peter's (though we may well believe that after the death of both apostles the church in Rome, if not in Antioch, came to regard Peter's attitude as essentially identical with Paul's); it was *not* that of the church at large (Rev. 2 20. 24. Διδ. 6 3), and emphatically it is *not* that of Lk. In spite of the settlement of the question on the purely Pauline basis in the material incorporated in Ac. 9 32-11 18, where Peter and the Voice from heaven are the decisive authority, it is settled a second time by the apostolic council convened by appeal of the Church in Antioch to the Church in Jerusalem, and settled on a much less radical basis. This time the Pauline doctrine that all distinctions of meats are in principle "ordinances of men," which have no validity for the Christian, so that Peter is right in eating with the Gentiles, is superseded by a "compromise,"¹⁸ which would fully justify the action of Peter in refusing to eat with the Gentiles in Antioch. Jews when among the Gentiles are *not* to "forsake Moses," but to "walk after the customs" (Ac. 21 21-26). The Gentiles, then, if there is to be fellowship, must "Judaize" at least to the extent of the four "decrees," whose object seems to be to make it possible for Jews to eat with them without incurring the "pollutions of idols."¹⁹ This Antiochian "Petrine" solution of the question remains the orthodox and ecumenical solution to the end of Acts, even Paul himself being made

¹⁸ Lightfoot, *Comm. on Gal.*, ed. 1896, p. 126.

¹⁹ On the significance of the decree against fornication, cf. *Clem. Hom.* III. lxxviii.

to indorse, and publicly and authoritatively to proclaim it (Ac. 16 s. 4 21 20-26)!²⁰

One has only to observe the central importance to the author of Acts of this ecclesiastical solution of the great question of the basis of fellowship with the Gentiles, to understand why in his gospel not merely certain elements of the great division of Mk. on Christ's journey among the Gentiles are omitted, but why the journey itself, and indeed the whole division of Mk. which deals with the question of Mosaism *vs.* Gentile freedom, is completely obliterated. To all appearance there was abundant justification in the sources at Lk.'s command for skepticism as to the historical character of the Markan construction. Over and above this there were doubtless features objectionable to him in much of the material, including their duplication of some things he incorporates elsewhere. But neither of these is the compelling motive for Lk.'s great omission. His treatment of this division of Mk. *as a whole*, suppressing completely the Gentile journey and all its concomitants, is a phenomenon that cannot be fully explained save in the light of the second treatise devoted from beginning to end to this vital question and centering upon its solution by apostolic decree in the Antiochian and not the Roman sense. It cannot be rationally explained without consideration for the systematic omission and transformation by which both Lk. and Mt. have removed the radicalism of Mk.'s Pauline principles.

As Lk. views this division of Mk.'s gospel he justly notes that the problems met in it are the actual problems of the apostolic church, the questions of the abolition of distinctions of meats and of how the Gentiles also are to be fed with the bread of life. But to these Lk. had devoted his entire second treatise. He can therefore most fittingly drop Mk. 6-8 with its wanderings among the Gentiles and its theme "Give ye them to eat," returning to the more primitive connection of the Agape cycle. In his gospel accordingly, as in Jn. 6, the Sign of the Loaves is followed immediately by

²⁰ On the position of Lk.-Ac. on this moot point of the apostolic age, see Bacon, "Acts *vs.* Galatians" in *Am. Journ. of Theol.*, July, 1907.

the Announcement of the Messiah's fate, 9 18-20. From this point the Via Crucis begins, 9 51 ff., a gradual approach to Jerusalem from Galilee as the northern limit. Only the Sending of the Seventy "before his face into every city and village whither he himself was about to come," 10 1 ff., remains a faint echo of the Markan "Journey among the Gentiles." The Book of Acts is his substitute for Mk. 7-8 in their practical bearing.