

tion of decency, thrift, industry, and comfort. The ideal is to establish freedom—freedom to think, freedom to worship, freedom to teach, freedom to trade, freedom to make one's way in the world—always providing that such freedom does not include licence to corrupt and injure others. This is the ideal; it has to be worked out in practical fashion, and presents many difficulties, many points on which the best and most thoughtful minds will differ; but, I repeat, St. Paul held it demonstrably as an ideal, and believed that political power and executive was a high and sacred trust for the promotion of great moral ends.¹

Christ's words were not a book for Sabbath days,
But law of life, and judgment of the land;
Not to be chosen, and pieced and dogmatised,
But lived up to—the whole and not a part,
Alive not dead, one spirit in new forms;
And lived, as Christ lived, poor, despised, alone,
Apart with God and working miracles,
Not on the waves and winds, but on the wills
Of men, upon the hearts of multitudes,

¹ C. S. Horne, *All Things are Yours*, 161.

The hidden germs of fresh humanities,
Of live confederations yet unborn,
The hidden founts of gathering river-floods,
To hear one day the music of His name
Through lands of harvest to the boundless sea.

LITERATURE.

- Bernard (J. H.), in *Sermons for the People*, ii. 95, 99.
Goodwin (H.), *Parish Sermons*, 229.
Holland (H. S.), *Logic and Life*, 250.
Horne (C. S.), *All Things are Yours*, 161, 178.
Neander (A.), *Church History*, i. 120.
Ridgway (C. J.), *The King and His Kingdom*, 93.
Seeley (J. R.), *Ecce Homo*, 175.
Swing (D.), *Truths for To-day*, 144.
Uhlhorn (G.), *The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, 171.
Waffle (A. E.), *If Christ were King*, 218.
Watson (J.), *The Inspiration of our Faith*, 246.
Christian World Pulpit, lii. 25 (H. C. Potter); lxxix. 85 (H. S. Holland).

The Composition of Mark iv. 21:25: A Study in the Synoptic Problem.

BY THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.Sc., D.D., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND THEOLOGY IN NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

THE chief peril which besets all discussions of the Synoptic Problem is the desire to arrive at large generalizations under which all the phenomena can be arranged. Up till now, all such generalizations have left unexplained a very considerable residuum of details. These details demand patient investigation. Yet many of the attempts to deal with them have been marred by a treatment which is the direct antithesis of that mentioned above. The tendency has arisen to read into the details, far more than they can possibly contain, and so the door is thrown open to a precarious subjectivity. Wendling's theory of the strata in the Gospel of Mark is a good illustration of failure to see the wood for the trees. There are many points at which we must be ready to confess ignorance, and others where we have to be satisfied with partial explanations.

The passage with which this study is concerned occurs immediately after the explanation of the Parable of the Sower, which is reported in all three Gospels. Many scholars regard that ex-

planation as revealing rather the influence of the early Church than the method of Jesus. Be that as it may, it certainly interrupts the connexion between Mk 4²¹⁻²⁵ (|| Lk 8¹⁶⁻¹⁸) and the somewhat obscure section on the purpose of parabolic teaching (Mk 4¹⁰⁻¹² with ||⁹) to which it is obviously related. It is not necessary for our purpose to dwell on that section. Its main significance seems to be that the new and unfamiliar message of the Kingdom which has to be presented through the educative medium of parables has found a response in the spiritual sensibilities of the disciples, while upon the majority of the hearers it has made no impression. Jesus' language, however, might foster in the minds of His followers the notion that His teaching concerning the Kingdom was meant to be esoteric, the special privilege of a select few. Hence our paragraph follows, explaining in its first part the fact that light is intended to illuminate, and that spiritual discoveries must be imparted, while in the second it urges upon the disciples the necessity of giving

earnest heed to the new teaching, in case, through inadvertence or listlessness, they should grow unfit for receiving the fresh vision of Divine realities. The general drift of this material is relevant enough to its context.

The first point to be noted is that the content of the passage is not found here in Matthew. Omitting it, and also the remarkable Parable of the Spontaneous Growth of the Seed, which Mark

alone records, he inserts the Parable of the Tares among the Wheat, which is reported by neither of the others. But he incorporated practically all the material belonging to our paragraph at other places in his Gospel. One section is worthy of special attention. In Mt 13¹², embedded in a passage directly parallel to Mk 4¹⁰⁻¹² (Lk 8⁹⁻¹⁰), which forms the background of our passage, the actual material of Mk 4²⁵ has been used:

Mt 13¹².

ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται
αὐτῷ, καὶ περισσευθήσεται·
ὅστις δὲ οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ
ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ'
αὐτοῦ.

Mk 4²⁵.

ὅς γὰρ χει, δοθήσεται
αὐτῷ·
καὶ ὅς οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ
ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ'
αὐτοῦ.

Lk 8^{10b}.

ὅς ἂν γὰρ ἔχη, δοθήσεται
αὐτῷ,
καὶ ὅς ἂν μὴ ἔχει, καὶ
ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται ἀπ'
αὐτοῦ.

That Matthew has, in his divergent context, followed Mark, is self-evident. His substitution of *ὅστις* for *ὅς* is, like Luke's *ὅς ἂν*, intended to generalize the clause, and so bring out more fully Mark's meaning. His addition of *καὶ περισσευθήσεται* is probably to be explained as an assimilation to the doublet which occurs in Mt 25²⁰ (|| Lk 19²⁰), where *καὶ περισσευθήσεται* is also found. One is inclined to think that that was the original context of this saying. This explanation seems more likely than that of B. Weiss (*Das Marcusevangelium*, p. 156), who regards the addition as an echo of

προσθεθήσεται in Mk 4²⁴. Luke also introduces a modification, changing Mark's *ἔχει* into *δοκεῖ ἔχειν*, so as to be more literally true to the situation. Now the doublet in Mt 25²⁰ (|| Lk 19²⁰) is incontestably derived from Q. But so are his other parallels to Mark in this paragraph. That is made peculiarly clear by the fact that Luke has duplicates of his Marcan parallels in the passage before us in no less than three instances in this short section, and two of these completely agree with Matthew against Mark. I subjoin these here:—

(1)

Mt 10²⁶.

οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον
ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, καὶ
κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.

Mk 4²².

οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν τι κρυπτόν,
ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ·
οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον,
ἀλλ' ἵνα ἐλθῇ εἰς φανερόν.

Lk 12².

οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἔστιν
ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, καὶ
κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται

(2)

Mt 25²⁰.

τῷ γὰρ ἔχοντι παντὶ δοθήσεται,
. . . τοῦ δὲ μὴ ἔχοντος, καὶ ὃ
ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

Mk 4²⁵.

See first table of parallels.

Lk 19²⁰.

παντὶ τῷ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται,
ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος, καὶ ὃ
ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

As regards the instance examined previously (Mt 13¹²), it therefore appears that Matthew, although acquainted with a similar saying in Q, which Luke also incorporated in his Gospel, introduced it in 13¹² in its Marcan form, thus showing that he knew the Marcan material of our passage, while using it only in this one instance.

We have seen that in the case of three of Mark's verses (21, 22, 25) Luke has parallel material in the same context as Mark, and another form of the same saying common to him, in two cases, with Matthew, and in these obviously derived from Q. Let us first examine those members of Luke's three doublets which are directly parallel to Mark.

No more requires to be said about Lk^{18b} = Mk 4²⁵ (= Mt 13¹²). Luke follows Mark with accuracy, although he has a varying form of

Mk 4²⁵.

οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν τι κρυπτόν, ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ·
οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν.

The only thing to observe is that Luke amplifies Mark's material by adding δ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῆ, which is surely a reminiscence of δ οὐ γνωσθήσεται in his alternative form of the saying (12²), derived from Q. Here we have a case exactly corresponding

Mk 4²¹.

μὴ τι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος, ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον
τεθῆ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν
λυχνίαν τεθῆ;

It will clarify the question, if, at this point, we glance at the duplicate which occurs in Lk 11³³. It is more closely related to Mt (5¹⁵) than to

Mt 5¹⁵.

οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ
τὸν μόδιον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν καὶ λάμπει
πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

These varying forms of the saying seem almost to presuppose different Greek sources. It is of interest to observe that the Lucan passage belongs to that section of the Third Gospel (9⁵¹–18¹⁴) in which so much material peculiar to Luke finds a place. Sir John Hawkins has conclusively shown (*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 37) that the members of Luke's doublets belonging to this section 'came to Luke quite independently of the Marcan source.' It is highly probable that at least in various parts of this section in which there is a certain but far from close resemblance between sayings in Luke and Matthew, Luke has followed a different Greek source, which may, of course, have been simply a different redaction of Q from that followed by Matthew. There is also the possibility that Luke was influenced in his report of various sayings by well-authenticated forms of oral tradition with which he became acquainted. Hence the saying before us (Lk 11³³) very probably belongs to one of Luke's special sources, oral or written, and not to Q. For not only has it assumed a different shape from that in Matthew, but it belongs to a totally different context.

the same saying in another context (identical with that in Mt.). I give in detail Lk 8¹⁷ = Mk 4²²:—

Lk 8¹⁷.

οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν κρυπτόν δ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται,
οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον δ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῆ καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ.

to Matthew's addition of καὶ περισσευθήσεται in 13¹². Both Luke and Matthew deliberately expand the Marcan material on the authority of Q.

The situation is more obscure when we compare Lk 8¹⁶ with Mk 4²¹:—

Lk 8¹⁶.

οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεῖει
ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθησιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν
ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς.

Mark. But one could scarcely venture to assign it, as in the case of Luke's two other doublets, to the same source as Matthew:—

Lk 11³³.

οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἄψας εἰς κρυπτὴν τίθησιν
οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν,
ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φέγγος βλέπωσιν.

Now when we compare Lk 11³³ with its doublet in Lk 8¹⁶, it is evident that they are not independent of one another. The first clause and the last, which have no real parallels either in Mk. or Mt., are common to both. But 8¹⁶ deliberately follows the context of Mark, while 11³³ has nothing Marcan corresponding to it in its position in Luke's Gospel. So we must conclude that Luke, although following Mark's order, and therefore necessarily having Mark's material before him, was distinctly influenced in his version of the saying by the form of it which he has incorporated at 11³³. This procedure would suggest that he assigned a higher value to his special source than to Mark, when both lay before him, an hypothesis which may be verified in his narrative of the Passion. In one detail he follows Mark, as contrasted with his special source, with a slight modification, ὑποκάτω κλίνης = ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην. But curiously enough he substitutes for ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον, which belongs both to Mark and his own special source, the vague phrase, καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεῖει. The paraphrase, indeed, accords with Luke's tendency to ignore local colouring as found in Mk., but why should

he have retained ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον in 11³³? It is useless to attempt an answer. The phenomenon reminds us how slight is the knowledge we possess of the exact processes followed in each instance by the evangelists.

There remain to be examined vv.^{23, 24} in Mk. There is no parallel to εἶ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω (v.²³) either here or in the corresponding

ΜΚ.

βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε
ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται
ὑμῖν, καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

We need not dwell on the unimportant difference between Lk. and the first clause of Mk. Both really emphasize the necessity of attentive hearing. But the additional matter in Mk. presents a complex problem. The first clause of it agrees verbally with Mt 7^{2b}, which finds a parallel in Lk 6³⁸, belonging also to the Sermon on the Mount. Only, the Lucan material in the whole section in question is not merely so full but so original that it seems to imply an ampler redaction of Q than that used by Matthew, if not a varying version, probably written, of the same tradition. Why did not Luke continue to follow Mark at this point? Not because he objected to using similar material twice. That he has done systematically throughout our passage. And Sir John Hawkins has shown that in 6²⁰⁻⁸, which includes the single Lucan parallel to Mk 4^{24b}, 'it is morally certain that he laid aside entirely his usual Marcan source' (*op. cit.* p. 33). Further, we know that Matthew uses Q-material for the Sermon on the Mount. So that the first and third evangelists are independent of Mark in this saying. But Luke's omission of it in 8¹⁸ certainly suggests that it did not form part of the Marcan text which he was following in that section. May not its insertion in Mk. belong to a later revision of which traces appear here and there? That revision may have drawn upon Q or have used oral tradition. The hypothesis is perhaps strengthened by the data of the final clause, καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν. These words occur in Mt 6³³ || Lk 12³¹, in close proximity to the saying about the Measure in Mt., but far removed from the similar saying in Lk. Had the reviser of Mk. no more than a vague reminiscence of Q-material? or was he acquainted with the Gospel of Mt.? We are moving in a region of guesses,

passages in Mt. and Lk., found in different contexts. This may be accidental, as the phrase might easily be omitted as not affecting the meaning of the section to which it is appended. Or it may be a trace of a revision of Mark subsequent to the time at which it was used by Luke. The significance of this last suggestion is enhanced by the character of v.²⁴ :—

ΛΚ.

βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκούετε.

so it would be futile to attempt to decide between possible alternatives. But even the asking of the questions opens up an interesting vista.

I have not yet dealt with a feature of the paragraph which may possess significance, the clause, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, prefixed to w.^{21, 24}. Luke has nothing to correspond. The conditions of the material in Mt. preclude its occurrence there. To begin with, it may be said that the imperfects ἔλεγεν and ἔλεγον are a mannerism of Mark's. *E.g.*, in Mk 9¹, the writer interrupts an eschatological utterance of Jesus with the phrase καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, while Matthew continues with the direct ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, and Luke with λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς. It is possible that here and in several other Marcan passages which might be cited, the explanation holds good which Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt offer of the phrase λέγει Ἰησοῦς, in the Oxyrhynchus Logia, that it is intended to give greater impressiveness to the sayings (*New Sayings of Jesus*, p. 26). Several instances, however, apart from those in our paragraph, perhaps point in another direction. *E.g.* Jesus' conversation with His disciples on the true significance of 'pure' and 'impure,' opened by the phrase καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς (Mk 7¹⁸), is interrupted by the insertion of ἔλεγεν δὲ ὅτι, which adds no new features, but simply introduces the saying, 'that which proceeds out of the man, that defiles the man,' an obvious continuation of what He had been saying. In Mt. there is no break. Similarly, Mk 4⁹ takes up the idea expressed in v.⁸, but prefaces it with καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς. The clause καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς seems to be used in the same way, *e.g.* in the explanation of the Parable of the Sower, which Matthew links directly with what precedes by the use of οὖν, while Luke has the bare introduction, 'now this is

the parable' (Mt 13¹⁸ = Lk 8¹¹). May it not be said that in this usage there is disclosed the nearness of Mark to the oral tradition? Does not the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* (or *λέγει*) reveal his consciousness of using, so to speak, the raw material which has not yet, on the large scale, assumed a stereotyped form?

If this suggestion has any cogency it will so far illuminate the paragraph under consideration. The insertion of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* in vv.²¹⁻²⁴, and subsequently in vv.²⁶⁻³⁰, would then indicate that Mark was here consciously drawing upon oral tradition. The hypothesis is supported by the impression of originality which is produced, as Wellhausen aptly points out (*Das Evangelium Marci*, p. 35), by the isolation and external arrangement of the sayings. Now, when we speak of oral tradition, we do not necessarily mean the Petrine basis of Mk., for which there is such valuable attestation. This section rather suggests a departure from the evangelist's usual frame-work of material, and the employment of that method of grouping which we especially associate with Mt. (so also Holtzmann, *Die Synoptiker*, p. 133). In my judgment, far too small a place has been assigned in recent discussions of the Synoptic Problem to the factor of floating traditions, forms of sayings found in certain circles of disciples which might vary considerably from their stereotyped shape in written documents.

Mr. Streeter, as the result of an examination of Mk 4²¹⁻²⁵, comes to the conclusion that 'in every case the saying as given by Mt. and Lk. is in substance the same as in Mk., but small verbal agreements show they derived it from Q and not from Mk.' I agree, generally speaking, with this statement, only our investigation has shown that there is an emphatic disagreement between the Q-material as found in Mt. as well as in those members of Luke's doublets which agree with Mt., and the Marcan sayings to which the other members of Luke's doublets are parallel. I am unable therefore to accept his final assertion that 'the whole section is thus clearly a collection of fragments torn from their original context in Q, as if it were a collection of texts quoted loosely from memory' (*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 172). Q is here virtually regarded (as so frequently) as the only important source of sayings for Jesus. The vaguer channels of tradition are ignored. As a matter of fact, our

paragraph corroborates Wernle's penetrating observation: 'What we may learn from a comparison of Mk. with Q is how differently the community understood and applied a word of Jesus' (*Die Synoptische Frage*, p. 210).

Let me attempt to sum up the results of our examination of Mk 4²¹⁻²⁵, taking care not to overpress the evidence.

(1) The method by which Mark groups together the sayings of this paragraph suggests that he is drawing upon oral tradition, which may have been Petrine (a possibility which even J. Weiss admits, *Das älteste Evangelium*, p. 372), but which, from its apparent lack of cohesion with the frame-work in which it is set, may with greater probability be referred to floating reminiscences of the words of Jesus. The evidence which has been exhibited seems to show that here at least Mark is not dependent on Q. The clause about Measuring (v.^{24b}) hints at a later revision of that form of Mk. which lay before Matthew and Luke, a revision which makes use of Matthew's Gospel. Perhaps v.²³ ('If any man hath ears to hear,' etc.) is due to the same source, although it may belong to the tradition which was the source of vv.²¹⁻²², and its position may round off that tradition as distinguished from what follows.

(2) The phenomena in Mt. apparently imply that, while the evangelist was acquainted with the Marcan material (Mt 13¹² = Mk 4²⁵), he was more directly influenced by Q, whose version he prefers to follow, and to whose context he is disposed to adhere.

(3) The relation of Luke to Mark is of special interest in the light of this paragraph. He follows Mark's arrangement and agrees closely with some of his material, but even in such cases he is affected by the influence either of Q or of some special source to which he had access, and which he estimates at a high value. Luke's relation to Matthew is equally significant. Twice in this short section he uses in one member of a doublet the Q-material which appears in Mt., but once at any rate he seems to use a source other than Q (possibly a special redaction of Q), for not only has his version of the saying in question (11³³) a different form from that in Mt. (Q), but it belongs to an entirely different context. Finally, the phenomena of Lk 8¹⁶ remind us that in many details we have no clue to the exact procedure of the gospel-writers.