

Theology on *the Web.org.uk*

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes.
Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit
or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the
copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the
ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the
links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

THE EARLIEST GOSPEL



THE EARLIEST GOSPEL

A HISTORICAL STUDY OF
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK

WITH A TEXT AND ENGLISH VERSION

BY

ALLAN MENZIES, M.A., D.D.

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1901

All rights reserved

GLASGOW : PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS BY
ROBERT MACLEHOSE AND CO.

PREFACE.

THE Gospel according to Mark is now regarded by nearly all scholars as the earliest and also the most original of those which we possess; and if this is the case the study of the Life of Christ must begin with it. As Professor Pfleiderer points out in his *Urchristenthum*, this Gospel alone admits of examination apart from any other; and the first step in the attempt to see Christ as history reveals him, must be to apprehend as clearly as we can the individual testimony of Mark's Gospel.

Several recent works on the second Gospel appreciate its importance on this ground. What is now presented to the reader does not enter into competition with the commentaries of Professor Swete or of Professor Gould, but may perhaps to some extent supplement them. On textual and philological questions Dr. Swete's book must always be consulted, and that of Dr. Gould is full of suggestion on the side of thought. Another English book which should be named is the commentary on the Synoptic Gospels in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, by the late lamented Dr. A. B. Bruce.

The present work seeks to determine the historical outcome of the earliest Gospel taken by itself. On the one hand it strives to approach to the original facts handed down by the tradition; on the other to understand those special interests of the age in which the Gospel was written which necessarily determined in some degree both its contents and its form. The writer has learned most from two German works which are perhaps too solid ever to be translated, *Das Marcus-evangelium* by Dr. B. Weiss, 1872, and the treatment of the Synoptic Gospels by Dr. H. J. Holtzmann in the

Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, first edition, 1889.
But he has exercised throughout an independent judgment.

For the sake of the student who may use this work the Greek text which is adopted is given, and the principal variants are pointed out. The English version will show him how the text is understood. The commentary can be read continuously, and the reader who does not know Greek will yet, it is hoped, find the book serviceable. It is written with a profound conviction that as criticism declares the second Gospel to be the porch by which we must go in to find the Saviour as he was and is, the earnest reader of that Gospel may indeed find him there. For his teaching, it is true, we have to look elsewhere; and his figure as here disclosed is homelier and more subject to human limitations than that to which we are accustomed. But though more human it need not be less divine.

I am greatly indebted to Mr. William Edie for the help he has given me in the preparation of this volume. He has corrected the press throughout and has furnished the indices.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TABLE OF SECTIONS AND OF THE PARALLEL PASSAGES IN THE GOSPELS ACCORDING TO MATTHEW AND LUKE,	ix
INTRODUCTION :	
The Synoptic Problem. The Gospel not originally written,	1
Motives of the formation of the Gospel tradition. The Gospels to be understood from the Apostolic Age,	4
Why the Gospels appear so late,	5
Absence from the earliest Christian writings of details of the Gospel ministry,	6
Early Christian theology did not require the Gospels,	10
The tradition was important practically,	11
Aetiological motive of the Gospel tradition,	15
Apologetic motive,	15
Devotional motive,	17
Yet the Gospels are also historical,	18
State of the tradition before Mark wrote. Its fragmentary nature,	20
Early collections of Gospel materials,	21
Nature of Mark's Gospel as gathered from itself,	25
Absence of discourses,	25
Sources of this Gospel,	27
Mark's order,	29
Progress of Mark's narrative,	30
He treats his materials with freedom,	31
Descriptive touches. Was the Gospel written to be read at meetings?	35
The Gospel is addressed to Western readers,	36
Aramaisms and Latin words,	36
Traces of Paulinism,	38

Date of this Gospel,	39
Personal history of Mark,	40
Mark and Paul,	41
Mark and Peter,	43
Church tradition as to Mark,	44
Account of Papias,	45
Conclusion,	51
TEXT, VERSION, AND COMMENTARY,	55-297
INDEX OF SUBJECTS,	298
INDEX OF PASSAGES REFERRED TO,	302

ERRATA.

- Page 30, line 25. For "Nazareth" read "Nazaret."
 ,, 46, note, second last line. For *der* read *des*.
 ,, 64, line 7. For *aītōv̄* read *aītōv̄s*.
 ,, 64, line 8. For *aītōv̄s* read *aītōv̄s*.
 ,, 67, line 8. For "Nazareth" read "Nazaret."
 ,, 127, notes, line 7. For "68" read "63."
 ,, 132, top line. For "Nazareth" read "Nazaret."
 ,, 136, verse 15. For 'Hλείας read 'Ηλείας.
 ,, 139, notes, col. 2, line 4 from below. For "Aretas" read
 "Herod (Philip?)."
 ,, 152, line 2. For *kaī* read *kaī*.
 ,, 157, notes, col. 2, line 2 from below. For "Gadarene" read
 "Gerasene."
 ,, 188. Verse 6 begins at *ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς*.
 ,, 205, line 5. For "Luke xi." read "Luke xix."

TABLE OF SECTIONS AND OF THE PARALLEL PASSAGES
IN THE
GOSPELS ACCORDING TO MATTHEW AND LUKE.

	MARK.	MATTHEW.	LUKE.	PAGE.
Title,	i. 1	—	—	56
The Baptist,	i. 2-8	iii. 1-12	iii. 1-18	58
The baptism of Jesus,	i. 9-11	iii. 13-17	iii. 21, 22	60
The temptation,	i. 12, 13	iv. 1-11	iv. 1-13	62
Return of Jesus to Galilee,	i. 14, 15	iv. 12-17	iv. 14, 15	62
Call of the first Disciples,	i. 16-20	iv. 18-22	v. 1-11	64
In the Synagogue at Capernaum,	i. 21-28	—	iv. 31-37	66
Cure of Peter's mother-in-law,	i. 29-31	viii. 14, 15	iv. 38, 39	70
Cures in the evening,	i. 32-34	viii. 16, 17	iv. 40, 41	72
Jesus leaves the house before day-break,	i. 35-39	—	iv. 42-44	72
Cure of a leper,	i. 40-45	viii. 1-4	v. 12-16	74
Cure of a paralytic,	ii. 1-12	ix. 1-8	v. 17-26	76
The call of Levi,	ii. 13-17	ix. 9-13	v. 27-32	82
The question of fasting,	ii. 18-22	ix. 14-17	v. 33-39	86
The Sabbath : first story,	ii. 23-28	xii. 1-8	vi. 1-5	88
The Sabbath : second story,	iii. 1-6	xii. 9-14	vi. 6-11	90
Jesus retires : concourse : demands on him,	iii. 7-12	{ iv. 23-25 } { xii. 15-21 }	{ vi. 12, 13, } { 17-19 }	94
Appointment of the Twelve,	iii. 13-19	x. 2-4	vi. 12-16	96
Jesus' relatives,	iii. 19b-21	—	—	98
The views of the authorities on the exorcisms of Jesus,	iii. 22-30	{ xii. 22-32, } { 43-45 }	{ xi. 14-26 } { xii. 10 }	98
Arrival of Jesus' relatives ; his true family,	iii. 31-35	xii. 46-50	viii. 19-21	102
Jesus teaches in parables,	iv. 1-34	xiii. 1-52	viii. 4-18	104
Parable of the Sower,	iv. 3-9	xiii. 3-9	viii. 5-8	104
The use of parables,	iv. 10-12	xiii. 10-15	viii. 9, 10	108
Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower,	iv. 13-20	xiii. 18-23	viii. 11-15	110
The lamp not to be hidden,	iv. 21-25	{ v. 15 } { x. 26 }	{ viii. 16-18 } { xi. 33 } { xii. 2 }	112
Parable of the Man who sleeps while his seed is growing,	iv. 26-29	[xiii. 24-30]	—	114

	MARK.	MATTHEW.	LUKE.	PAGE.
Parable of the Mustard Seed,	iv. 30-32	xiii. 31, 32	xiii. 18, 19	116
The method of parables: another statement,	iv. 33, 34	xiii. 34, 35	—	116
The storm on the lake,	iv. 35-41	viii. 18, 23-27	viii. 22-25	118
The Gerasene demoniac,	v. 1-20	viii. 28-34	viii. 26-39	120
The raising of Jairus' daughter: [Part I.],	v. 21-24	ix. 18, 19	viii. 40-42	124
The woman with an issue,	v. 25-34	ix. 20-22	viii. 43-48	126
The raising of Jairus' daughter: [Part II.],	v. 35-43	ix. 23-26	viii. 49-56	128
Jesus at Nazaret,	vi. 1-6a	xiii. 53-58	iv. 16-30	132
Mission of the Twelve,	vi. 6b-11	ix. 35-x.	{ ix. 1-5 x. 1-12 }	134
Success of the Disciples,	vi. 12, 13	—	ix. 6	136
Herod hears of Jesus,	vi. 14-16	xiv. 1, 2	ix. 7-9	136
Story of the death of the Baptist,	vi. 17-29	xiv. 3-12	iii. 19, 20	138
Return of the Disciples: withdrawal with them,	vi. 30-32	—	{ ix. 10 x. 17-20 }	140
The feeding of the five thousand,	vi. 33-44	xiv. 13-21	ix. 11-17	142
The walking on the sea,	vi. 45-52	xiv. 22-33	—	144
Return to Gennesaret,	vi. 53-56	xiv. 34-36	—	148
The Disciples neglect ritual washings: does Jesus hold the tradition?	vii. 1-13	xv. 1-9	—	148
The true principle of purity,	vii. 14-23	xv. 10-20	—	152
The Syro-Phoenician woman,	vii. 24-30	xv. 21-28	—	154
The northern journey,	vii. 31-37	xv. 29-31	—	156
The feeding of the four thousand,	viii. 1-10	xv. 32-39	—	158
The Pharisees ask for a sign,	viii. 11-13	{ xvi. 1-4 xii. 38-42 }	{ xii. 54-56 xi. 29-32 xvii. 20, 21 xi. 53-x. 1 }	162
The Disciples forget to take bread,	viii. 14-21	xvi. 5-12	xi. 53-x. 1	162
The blind man of Bethsaida,	viii. 22-26	—	—	166
The journey to Caesarea Philippi: the Disciples recognize Jesus as Messiah,	viii. 27-33	xvi. 13-23	ix. 18-22	166
Jesus' followers also are to bear their cross: the reward will follow soon,	viii. 34-ix. 1	xvi. 24-28	ix. 23-27	170
The transfiguration,	ix. 2-8	xvii. 1-8	ix. 28-36	174
Discussion of Messianic doctrine,	ix. 9-13	xvii. 9-13	—	174
The demoniac boy,	ix. 14-29	xvii. 14-20	ix. 37-43a	176
Second prediction of the sufferings of Messiah,	ix. 30-32	xvii. 22, 23	ix. 43b-45	180
The dispute of the Disciples, who was greatest,	ix. 33-37	xviii. 1-5	ix. 46-48	182
The exorcist using Jesus' name,	ix. 38-40	—	ix. 49, 50	182
Another saying about "the name,"	ix. 41	x. 42, xxv. 40	—	184
On offences—to others,	ix. 42	xviii. 6, 7	xvii. 1, 2	184
On offences—to oneself,	ix. 43-50	{ xviii. 8, 9 v. 29, 30 }	—	186
Journey to Judaea,	x. 1	xix. 1, 2	—	186
Question as to divorce,	x. 2-12	xix. 3-12	xvi. 18	188
Jesus welcomes children who are brought to him,	x. 13-16	xix. 13-15a	xvii. 15-17	190
The rich man's question,	x. 17-31	xix. 15b-30	xvii. 18-30	190
Renewed prediction of the passion,	x. 32-34	xx. 17-19	xviii. 31-34	196

	MARK.	MATTHEW.	LUKE.	PAGE.
The petition of the sons of Zebedee, Address to the Twelve about serving and being served,	x. 35-40 x. 41-45	xx. 20-23 xx. 24-28	[xii. 49, 50] xxii. 24-27	198 200
Cure of Bartimaeus, . . .	x. 46-52	{ xx. 29-34 ix. 27-31 }	xviii. 35-43	202
The triumphal entry, . . .	xi. 1-11	xxi. 1-11	xix. 28-38	204
The barren fig-tree, . . .	xi. 12-14	xxi. 18, 19	—	208
The cleansing of the Temple, .	xi. 15-17	xxi. 12, 13	xix. 45, 46	208
Effect of this act on the authorities,	xi. 18, 19	xxi. 14-17	xix. 47, 48	210
Discourse on the fig-tree, . . .	xi. 20-25	{ xxi. 20-22 xvii. 20 }	xvii. 6	210
Jesus challenged to state his authority to cleanse the Temple: his answer,	xi. 27-33	xxi. 23-27	xx. 1-8	212
The Parable of the Vineyard, . . .	xii. 1-12	xxi. 33-46	xx. 9-19	214
Should the Jews pay tribute? . . .	xii. 13-17	xxii. 15-22	xx. 20-26	218
Second encounter: the resurrec- tion, . . .	xii. 18-27	xxii. 23-33	xx. 27-38	220
Third encounter: the chief com- mandment, . . .	xii. 28-34	xxii. 34-40	xx. 39, 40	224
The Son of David, . . .	xii. 35-37	xxii. 41-46	xx. 41-44	226
Jesus denounces the Scribes, . . .	xii. 38-40	xxiii. { xx. 45-47 (xi. 37-54) }	228	
The Widow's mite, . . .	xii. 41-44	—	xxi. 1-4	228
Jesus predicts the destruction of the Temple, . . .	xiii. 1, 2	xxiv. 1, 2	xxi. 5, 6	230
The Disciples ask for a revelation,	xiii. 3, 4	xxiv. 3	xxi. 7	232
The earlier signs of the end, . . .	xiii. 5-8	xxiv. 4-8	xxi. 8-11	232
Warnings and exhortations to Disciples for the period of per- secution, . . .	xiii. 9-13	xxiv. 9-14	xxi. 12-19	234
The immediate signs of the end: great tribulation, . . .	xiii. 14-20	xxiv. 15-22	xxi. 20-24	236
Warnings to Disciples for the critical period, . . .	xiii. 21-23	xxiv. 23-25	—	238
Signs in heaven: the coming of Messiah, . . .	xiii. 24-27	xxiv. 29-31	xxi. 25-28	238
Parable of the Fig-tree, . . .	xiii. 28, 29	xxiv. 32, 33	xxi. 29-31	240
The time of the Second Coming: it is certain, but the precise date is a mystery, . . .	xiii. 30-32	xxiv. 34-36	xxi. 32, 33	240
The Disciples are to watch, . . .	xiii. 33-37	{ xxiv. 42- (xxv. 30) }	{ xii. 35-48 (xiii. 25 (xix. 11-27 (xxii. 34-36))) }	242
The resolution to put Jesus to death, . . .	xiv. 1, 2	xxvi. 1-5	xxii. 1, 2	242
The anointing at Bethany, . . .	xiv. 3-9	xxvi. 6-13	—	244
The betrayal, . . .	xiv. 10, 11	xxvi. 14-16	xxii. 3-6	246
Preparation for the passover, . . .	xiv. 12-17	xxvi. 17-20	xxii. 7-14	248
The passover meal, . . .	xiv. 18-21	xxvi. 21-25	{ xxii. 15, (16, 21-23) }	248
The Lord's Supper, . . .	xiv. 22-25	xxvi. 26-29	xxii. 17-20	250
To the Mount of Olives; pre- diction of Peter's denial, . . .	xiv. 26-31	xxvi. 30-35	{ xxii. 31- (34, 39) }	254
Gethsemane, . . .	xiv. 32-42	xxvi. 36-46	xxii. 40-46	256
The arrest, . . .	xiv. 43-52	xxvi. 47-56	xxii. 47-53	260

	MARK.	MATTHEW.	LUKE.	PAGE.
The trial before the High Priest,	xiv. 53-65	xxvi. 57-68	{ xxii. 54, 55, 63-71 }	262
Peter's denial,	xiv. 66-72	xxvi. 69-75	xxii. 56-62	268
The trial before Pilate,	xv. 1-5	xxvii. 11-14	xxiii. 1-5	270
Jesus and Barabbas,	xv. 6-15	xxvii. 15-26	xxiii. 18-25	272
The mocking,	xv. 16-20	xxvii. 27-31	—	274
The last journey,	xv. 21	xxvii. 32	xxiii. 26-32	276
The crucifixion,	xv. 22-32	xxvii. 33-44	xxiii. 33-43	276
The Death of Jesus,	xv. 33-41	xxvii. 45-56	xxiii. 44-49	280
Burial of Jesus,	xv. 42-47	xxvii. 57-61	xxiii. 50-56	282
The empty grave,	xvi. 1-8	xxviii. 1-10	xxiv. 1-12	284
Conclusion added later,	xvi. 9-20	{ xxviii. 9, 10, 16-20 }	xxiv. 13-53	290
The Shorter Conclusion,	—	—	—	296

INTRODUCTION.

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

IN the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles of the New Testament there is little trace of any written account of the life of Christ. The term Gospel does not denote in these works either a book or a historical account of the life and death of the Saviour. It is a spoken not a written thing; it is the spoken proclamation of God's will for man's salvation as made known in Jesus Christ. Paul has his Gospel which he habitually preaches,¹ and there is "another Gospel" to which the Galatians too lightly turn aside;² both are spoken messages. No doubt each of them must have been based on some amount of historical information, but this, as we shall see, may have been very brief, and indeed compressed into a few short phrases. The Christian movement existed at first and made the great conquests of which we read in the New Testament, without the aid of written histories. It was a statement with a doctrine founded on it, but the statement had not yet attained to any elaboration or even to independent form as a written work.

When did
the Gospels
arise and
what are
they?

On the other hand Justin Martyr, writing in the middle of the second century, speaks of "Memoirs of the Apostles which are called Gospels," and says that the reading of these forms a regular feature of the Christian meeting.³ Justin's pupil Tatian some time afterwards composed his *Diatessaron*, which, while it contains some features not adopted afterwards

¹ Gal. ii. 2.

² Gal. i. 6.

³ *Apol.* i. 66, 67.

by Christendom, is in substance a harmony of the four Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Thus between the period in which the Epistles of the New Testament were written and that of Justin, lies the period of the formation of the Gospels we now possess and of their rise to acceptance and adoption by the Church.

What can we tell as to the process by which these wonderful books were formed which stand at the head of the New Testament and are undoubtedly the most important literary treasure of the Church? How were the Synoptic Gospels "made," for of them alone do we here speak? From what motives were they written? In what class of literature are we to place them? Are we to regard them as works of purely historical nature and origin, which arose out of an unmixed desire to communicate information and to arrange it in such a way that it should speak for itself, and cause the past to appear again in its own force and reality? Have we to recognize in them a purely intellectual effort to apprehend the true nature and connection of events which had recently occurred? Or did they come into existence from practical motives, as most of the Suras of the Koran did, to provide guidance which was urgently required in the affairs of the Church? Did they arise in any degree out of a poetic impulse, as we are apt to think that many of the stories about Buddha did, so that they are to be regarded not as pure history but as a picture-book consciously or unconsciously framed for the instruction of believers? Were some of the stories they contain formed on the model of well-known narratives of the Old Testament? Are some of them allegories freely formed, or formed on some slight historical basis, reflecting situations of great interest in the experience of the Church? Is the apologetic motive to be recognized in them; do the writers endeavour so to describe Jesus Christ as to meet the objections brought against Christianity by Jewish and by Gentile neighbours?

These questions, which every serious student of the Gospels must feel to be at least deserving of treatment, are moreover intimately bound up with the further set of questions as to the form and order in which the stories of the Gospels

were at first transmitted and arranged. Was there a period of oral transmission, when constant repetition tended to bring the narratives into a more suitable and more perfect form, and to imprint them on the memory of the members of the Church? And did the writers of our Gospels draw from this oral tradition, so that they are to be regarded as all making use of the same broad source which was open to all, and the local variations of which would lead to differences in their finished narratives?¹ Or is there a literary connection between our various Gospels, several of them having drawn from an earlier written document or documents,² or did the later Evangelists see and use the works of the earlier?³ If there were sources from which our Evangelists drew, what were these sources, and where is the use of each to be discerned in their works? If there was 'borrowing' on the part of one Evangelist from another, which was the original; which was the first borrower, which the second? And did the second use the first in the form in which we have it, or in an earlier form? Was there a Proto-Mark, for example, or did Matthew and Luke draw from Mark practically in the form in which we now have his work?

¹ The *Oral Tradition Theory*, of which Gieseler may be regarded as the founder, has been most in favour in this country. It has the advantage of making the Evangelists independent of each other, all having drawn from the same source, and their differences being explained by the character and circumstances of each writer. The weakness of this theory lies in its not accounting sufficiently for the verbal agreement, in many parts, of the three writers. Mr. Wright's *The Composition of the Four Gospels*, 1890, contains a very able and ingenious statement of the tradition theory.

² The *Primitive Source (Diegesen) Theory*, propounded by Schleiermacher, is the view that shorter writings preceded the complete Gospels, and were used in various degrees by all the Evangelists.

³ The *Borrowing Theory* dates from Augustine who held Mark to have copied and abbreviated Matthew, and has had a rich and varied history.

In addition to the above the *Primitive Gospel* theory should be named; Eichhorn considered this work to have been in Aramaic. Abbott's theory of the Triple Tradition (Article "Gospels" in *Encyclop. Brit.*, 9th edition; also set forth to the eye in Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*) which the three Synoptists have in common, comes under this head. This theory appears, in a modified form, in the article "Gospels," *Encyclop. Bibl.*, Vol. ii., written by Dr. Abbott and Prof. Schmiedel, to which, as well as to the article on the same subject by Prof. Stanton in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. ii., the reader is referred for the most recent statements on the relation of the Gospels to each other.

These questions are far too vast to be formally discussed in this place; and the Introduction to this work is limited to a few points which, with a view to the state of the study of the Gospels in this country, it may be specially useful to consider. We shall speak (1) of the motives which led to the formation of the tradition in the Apostolic Age; (2) of the state of the tradition before Mark wrote; (3) of the light to be gathered from his Gospel itself, carefully examined, as to the aim and the *modus operandi* of its writer; (4) of the information about Mark and his Gospel to be drawn from the N.T. itself and from ecclesiastical tradition. These enquiries taken together yield conclusions as to the second Gospel, on which, if they are accepted, further study of the Synoptic problem may proceed.

1. *Motives of the Formation of the Gospel Tradition.*

To understand any literary work it is necessary first of all to have some acquaintance with the age which produced it. There is no sound reason why this fundamental rule of criticism should not be applied to the study of the Gospels. It has been customary to dispense with this enquiry in their case, and to offer instead a personal account, as full as the circumstances permitted, of Mark, Luke, or Matthew, as the case might be, and of the special qualifications and opportunities which fitted him to write a life of Jesus. This mode of accounting for the Gospels is no doubt the simplest, and it has the sanction of antiquity; the early Church writers when seeking to explain why a Gospel stood in the canon, were content to show how its writer, if not himself an Apostle or an eye-witness of the facts recorded, was connected with one of the Apostles, and was thus in a position to gather his information about Jesus from one of the earliest sources. But it may reasonably be held that considerations of this kind, while they have their place in the introduction to a Gospel, and are rightly now more valued and relied on than was formerly the case, ought not to occupy the first place in our enquiry. We cannot understand the writer of a book till we know something of his age. However sure we are of the personal facts regarding Mark or Luke, it is certain that

The Gospels
to be under-
stood from
the Apos-
tolic Age.

there must be much in his writing which is not due to his individual action but to the beliefs and tendencies in the midst of which he lived. Either the Evangelist was the mere copyist of a fixed tradition, or, if he exercised some will and choice of his own in the act of writing, we must ask what the circumstances were in which his views were formed, and what needs and impulses he was seeking to satisfy in his readers.

Thus the study of the Epistles and of the Apostolic Age is to be regarded as the indispensable preliminary to the study of the Gospels.

Now when we read the Epistles and the Acts with a view to gathering from them any light they may be found to shed on the formation of the Gospels, our first impression is one of disappointment. The writers of the Epistles not only do not quote any such books as the Gospels; they speak very little about the matters with which the Gospels deal. The Christian movement, as we said, is carried on by the first Christians without the books which to us are the primary and indispensable documents of the faith. The Apostles have no Christian writings to refer to. They quote the Hebrew Scripture as a religious authority for believers, but apparently they have no account of the acts of Christ, no collection of his sayings, to put into the hands of their converts.

This is no more than to say that the Epistles were written before the Gospels. We should have supposed that the Christians would at once provide themselves with an account of Christ's life and sayings, and one finds a writer here and there who is sure that the Gospels must have existed in the Apostolic Age, although the Epistles say nothing about them. But the fact is generally recognized that the Gospels were later of appearing than we should have supposed likely, and that the writers of the Epistles were still without them. Bishop Westcott, to quote a great authority, deals in his *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (pp. 161-170) with the fact of the late appearance of these the most important books of the Church, and gives a number of reasons for it.

To explain why the Gospels were not written sooner, he points out with undeniable truth that the spirit of the first

Why did
the Gospels
appear so
late?

Christian period was not disposed to literary production, since it was believed that the present age was on the point of disappearing and making way for the coming age of triumph. Another reason assigned is the prevalence of oral teaching among the Jews, and also among the Christians of that age, and the want of practice in writing among such people as the early Christians were. Another is that the Christians felt moved by the Spirit to preaching rather than to writing, and that the Scriptures of the Old Testament were the Scriptures of the Church, to which no addition appeared possible.

Apt and weighty as these reasons no doubt are, they yet appear inadequate to explain entirely the late appearance of the Gospels. There was literary production in the early Church when it was needed. The Epistles were written, the journal in Acts and perhaps other parts of that work were written, very early in the history of the Church, and if a full account of the life of Christ had been a felt need of the first Christian Age, we cannot doubt that the need would in some way have been met. May it not have been the case that in the first Christian Age a full account of the earthly life of the Saviour was not required? May this not count at all events as one of the reasons why the Gospels, to us the most fundamental of all the Christian books, were not produced earlier? Surely it may. In fact, the evidence that this was the case meets us in all the books of the New Testament after the first four. Every one has noticed how little attention is paid in the Epistles of Paul and in the other Epistles to the earthly career of Jesus Christ; and the same is true of the Apocalypse and of the Acts. Take away the first four books of the Christian collection, and it is well known that the materials afforded by the rest for a knowledge of the life of the Saviour on earth are extremely scanty. We should not know from them that the burden of the preaching of Jesus was the coming of the kingdom of God, or that he bade his disciples also announce that kingdom; we should not know that he ever spoke a parable, or that he left behind him a considerable body of doctrine; we should not know that he called himself the Son of Man; we should not know what the charge was on which he was tried and put to death; we should not know in what way he collected his

disciples, or that he was baptized by John the Baptist, or that he had friends at Bethany, or that his adherents were chiefly found among the poor and the less educated. These and a hundred other characteristic facts of the life of Jesus on earth are not mentioned in the Epistles, though when we know them, the Epistles are found to corroborate them.¹ It is extremely striking to find how little there is in the earliest Christian writings about that life of lives.

What is the reason of this strange silence among the early Christians as to the incidents of their Master's life on earth? Were the early Christians not so deeply interested as we are in what Jesus did and what he spoke in Galilee and in Jerusalem? That we have no right to say. On the other hand we notice that there is one particular part of the appearance of the Saviour which not only interested them extremely, but was always put in the forefront of Christian teaching. When an Apostle preached the Gospel in a new place or when he wrote a letter to his converts, there was one part of the history of Christ which, broadly speaking, was always insisted on. He did not omit to speak of the death of Christ, nor of his resurrection and ascension, nor of his life in heaven, nor of his second coming. When Paul first preached to the Galatians, what did he tell them about Christ? Not about his miracles, nor about his teaching, but about his death. Christ crucified was vividly set forth to them, written large before their eyes; and then an influence proceeding in some way from the heart of that great tragedy came at once and took possession of them, and they felt themselves to be in active correspondence with the world above where Christ, once crucified for them, now lived with God.² Again, Paul sums up to the Corinthians the Gospel he preached to them at first, and he indicates that what he then set before them was not his private doctrine merely, but that on which all the Apostles and in fact Christians generally were agreed. And all the history of Christ that Gospel contains is that he died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried and rose the third day according to the Scriptures; that is the tradition, and then follows a

¹ See papers by Dr. George Matheson, *Expositor*, Second Series, Vols. i., ii.

² Gal. i. 4; iii. 1.

list of the appearances of the Lord to his friends after his death.¹

An examination of the other Epistles shows the same state of things. We find in them a complete blank as to the Galilean ministry, and the teaching is present in echo only, not in direct quotation. What is dealt with is not the incidents and words of the Gospel story, but the death of Christ viewed as a fact of immense religious and moral significance, his being raised from the dead by the power of God, his grace and energy now shed abroad on his people by his spirit, and the prospect of his near return to justify his followers and confound his foes.

Similarly in the speeches placed in the mouths of the Apostles in the Acts, the beneficent ministry of Jesus is once or twice summed up in a few phrases; but what is most dwelt on is his death at the hands of the Jews and his resurrection² and his second coming by which the reverse suffered in his death is to be retrieved.

In fact the Christ of the Epistles and of the Apostolic Age is not an earthly but a heavenly figure.³ And what is true of Paul here is true also of the other New Testament writers outside the Gospel. It was their faith in the Risen Lord, now with God, that opened up to the early Christians generally the heavenly world and filled them with hope and enthusiasm. Christ was thought of not primarily as a human person who had spoken and acted in an adorable way when present among men, but as a Being who by his nature and origin belonged to the skies, and who had come to the earth to execute a mission God had given him. This mission accomplished, and his death, which was the principal part of it, endured, he had gone back to the region he had come from, to guide his human followers from there and to come again ere long and take them to himself.

And this brings us to understand, in part at least, the strange fact that it was not a matter of pressing importance to the first Christians to be acquainted with the details of the

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 1 ff. ² ii. 23-36; iv. 10; v. 30, 31; x. 37 ff., etc.

³ Dr. Somerville, in his Cunningham lectures on *St. Paul's Conception of Christ* (p. 9), says: "It is always of the exalted Christ that Paul speaks." "The historic Jesus alone was no Messiah to Paul." "The knowledge of the Risen Lord was the essential thing to him in the understanding of Christ."

life of Jesus on the earth. While the spirit of Christ acting from above was felt to be directing all their affairs and carrying them along in a victorious career, it was not necessary to go back to the Galilean ministry and follow step by step all that had been done and said there. The spiritual heavenly Lord replaced the earthly Jesus so fully that his place was not felt to be vacant, and memory was not directed to the task of drawing up records to replace him. A biography of Jesus was not called for in this early period; a knowledge of the earthly life, while no doubt of interest in itself, was not essential to faith nor vital to salvation. There was a general knowledge on the part of Christians of what Jesus had been and done, and his earthly life might be referred to now and then as a proof of his condescension and submission. Yet in passages of this kind there is little reference to the details of the ministry. When Paul speaks of Christ's having become poor for our sake,¹ or of his having put on the form of a servant and humbled himself,² he may be referring to the general fact of the Saviour's having come to live a human life on the earth, and not to the special characteristics of his ministry. When the writer to the Hebrews speaks of Christ as having learned obedience through the things which he suffered and refers to the cries and tears with which he appealed to God to save him,³ we see some reflection of the detail of the story of the Passion. The expressions in First Peter about Christ having left us an example that we should follow his steps and his not having reviled again when he was reviled, point to the same part of the Evangelical tradition.⁴ But in these and other cases the allusions to Christ's earthly experiences are not put in the forefront as if they were the most important part of Christian teaching. They have little to do with doctrine; they are brought in for practical purposes. In spite of everything of this kind that can be brought forward, it remains true that the thoughts of the early Christians were fixed on the heavenly Christ, in whose career the earthly appearance of Jesus was a mere transitory, though an important, episode. In addition then to the reasons adduced by Bishop Westcott and others to

¹ 2 Cor. viii. 9.

² Heb. v. 7 f.

³ Phil. ii. 7.

⁴ 1 Peter ii. 21; iii. 18.

explain why the Gospels were not written sooner, we must add this, that the attitude of mind of the early Christians was such that there was no felt need for such narratives. It was true of Christians generally, as St. Paul expressly says of himself,¹ that the circumstances of Christ's career as the Messiah of the Jews were in his eyes irrelevant to the truth of the Gospel. He had made up his mind not to know Christ after the flesh, *i.e.* as a human personage with interests belonging to this world. The only Christ he cared to know was he who was to be apprehended after the spirit, not Christ in Galilee, but Christ crucified. He has no views to enforce about the life of Jesus on earth. In a practical matter, such as the observance of the Eucharist, he may quote the example of the Lord Jesus. But he has no theoretic interest in the detail of Jesus' life on earth for its own sake; that is a thing that lies quite apart from his path. In this the Apostle Paul is representative of early Christendom. (The life and teaching of Jesus were not then, as in fact they are not to this day, part of the saving doctrine of the Church.) As now they lie outside the creed, so then a man could be a Christian without knowing them, and an Apostle could preach and make little mention of them.²

Early
Christian
theology did
not require
the Gospels. Now if these observations are sound, certain consequences follow from them as to the conditions under which the Gospel narratives at first took form. If the details of the earthly life of Christ were a thing apart from doctrine, then, and in so far as this was so, the growth of the tradition was not inspired by a doctrinal impulse, but was left to be carried on under motives of another character. The theologian whose eyes were fixed on the heavenly Messiah seated at God's right hand, the Lord of Glory to whom all things would shortly be made subject, could scarcely occupy himself at the same time with the narratives of the Galilean ministry so as to make sure that the nature of Christ was adequately set forth in them. In proportion as the heavenly Christ engrossed the attention of believers the work of

¹ 2 Cor. v. 16.

² See an elaborate paper by Von Soden, in *Theologische Abhandlungen, Carl von Weizsäcker gewidmet*, on the "Interest of the Apostolic Age in the Evangelical History." The paper is quoted by Dr. Sanday with approval: "St. Paul's Equivalent for the Kingdom of Heaven," *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1900.

dealing with and drawing up the memorials of Jesus' life on earth would be left to take care of itself. Only where the theological interest was fainter would the earthly memories bulk more largely. This we find indeed to be the case; for the Gospel tradition took shape in that region of the Church where Paul, the great leader of Christian thought, was least known, where belief was simplest, and the views held of Christ's person least developed. The tradition grew up not in a Western but in an Oriental atmosphere; that is evident on the face of it; and it grew up largely, though of course not entirely, uncontrolled by doctrine. The earliest Gospels are among the least doctrinal of the books of the New Testament. How a life of Christ would turn out which was written under the influence of a distinct type of doctrine, Christians were afterwards to learn when the fourth Gospel came into existence. In it, Jesus acts and speaks as a Being who is not of this world but who has come to this world from elsewhere to redeem it and is soon to return to that higher region. But with the earlier Evangelical tradition it is otherwise. In the greater part of the narrative here it is difficult to see any attempt to express any particular doctrine, further than that common to all Christians alike, that Jesus is the Messiah. As the detail of the life of Jesus is absent from the Epistles, so with some exceptions the doctrine of the Epistles is absent from the Gospels. There is no attempt in the Epistles to make use of the Evangelical narratives; and there is no attempt in the Evangelical narratives to show agreement with the doctrinal system. The two sets of writings, as Von Soden has well shown, belong as it were to different worlds, different atmospheres of thought, and it is evident to the unprejudiced eye that the two are independent of each other.

It was in connection with practical matters that the Church first felt the importance of the Evangelical tradition. However enthusiastic a religious movement may be, and however full of self-governing energy, some amount of regulation is necessary to it from the outset, and as time goes on the need arises for some authority external to the believers themselves. The early Church needed a constitution and some amount of direction for its rites; rules of conduct were also wanted by its members in various situations of life. We find the Apostle Paul, who has

Yet the
tradition
was
important
practically.

such a genius for tracing everything back to first principles and with whom the Christian life works itself out logically to its necessary consequences in every detail, we find even him setting up rules for various matters, and we find that in prescribing such rules he often appeals to the authority of Christ. He knows a number of words of Christ, and he uses them not as a source of doctrine, though sometimes they are this to him also (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 15), but as a standard of practical Christian life. Does he wish to regulate the observance of the Lord's Supper at Corinth? He rehearses the tradition which he himself received and which he had delivered to the Corinthians at first of what the Lord did on the night on which he was betrayed. "I received from the Lord," he says, "that which I also delivered to you."¹ Does he wish to point out the obligations resting on members of the Church to those who preach to them? He quotes a word of the Lord: "Even so did the Lord ordain that they which proclaim the Gospel should live of the Gospel."² Is he discussing the difficult question of the obligation of Christians to their heathen spouses? He quotes the Lord's words as to the permanent nature of the marriage tie.³ Other instances also might be quoted. And what we see of this in Paul is of course a specimen of what must have gone on in every part of the Church. Words of Christ which gave guidance in practical matters were treasured up and repeated and applied to practical cases. That they were made the subject of regular catechetical instruction in the Church, such as Mr. Wright describes in his *Composition of the Four Gospels*, the evidence does not perhaps warrant us to assume. These lessons are not spoken of by the N.T. writers when they appeal to the Master's words. The early Christians conceived the Master to be with them when they met in his name, and to bring to their memory what he had said. To codify such a law and make it the subject of learning and repetition is inevitably to de-spiritualize it, and this the early Christians would not be in great haste to do. They would take their Master's commandments from his living self present to them at their meetings as long as they could. But of course the words were

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 23.

² 1 Cor. ix. 14.

³ 1 Cor. vii. 10-11.

always in demand. The religion consisted in keeping the commandments of the Lord; he himself had said so,¹ and it was necessary therefore to know what his commandments were in order to be his true follower. Thus there was a constant demand in every part of the Church for the words of Christ, and these words were the earliest Christian law. This, as every one knows, did not save them from being modified and changed in the process of transmission, and many of these changes are by no means unimportant. It is no doubt a small matter to us now that there was early a difference in the tradition as to the equipment of the Christian missionary, one version bidding him take a stick and another specially forbidding him to have a stick; one version directing him to wear sandals, and another to have no footgear at all. But the words used at the institution of the Lord's Supper vary in the different traditions, which is a graver matter; and the Lord's Prayer was early handed down in two very different forms. Tradition altered while it preserved.

Thus we see that at a time when the stories about the earthly life of Jesus were still a private matter which did not bear on salvation, the remembered words of Christ were claimed for Church use and surrounded with authority. There can be no doubt that any utterance known to have come from the Master must have been accepted with reverence; but at the same time Christians must have exercised some measure of unconscious choice which words should be brought forward and insisted on; and this choice must have been determined by the needs of the Church from time to time in one place or another. The arrangement of the authoritative words must also have been a matter of consideration, as soon as any considerable number of them came to be known. Words of Christ bearing on any question which was being actively debated in the Church must have been brought forward and dwelt on. When the discussion arose whether the Gentiles were to be invited to attach themselves to Christ, words of the Master bearing on that point were sure of a hearing. When the question arose whether the Jewish law was binding on Christians, e.g. whether they were under any obligation to keep the Jewish Sabbath,

¹ Luke vi. 46, etc.

everything the Lord had said on such questions was of the utmost value. When the Christians were persecuted and reviled by the heathens how were they to bear themselves? When unworthy members were found to be present in the Church how were they to be dealt with? If a tradition could be found answering such a question it would be solved in the very best way.

It must accordingly be recognized that the circumstances and needs of the Church co-operated in the elaboration and arrangement of the Gospel tradition. The following commentary will point out instances in which this may be recognized; I would here remark that it could not be otherwise, and that there is nothing in the fact to lessen the value we attach to the Gospels. It stands to reason that Christians valued most those features of the tradition which they found practically helpful to them, that when Christ was to them all things they should care most for those things to be found in him which they were most in need of at the time. Their choice of the parts of the tradition which were to be repeated and preserved was partly at least determined in this way, and so also was the arrangement of the materials thus chosen.

But in speaking of the needs of the Church as determining to some extent the form of the tradition, we are not to think only of special questions like those mentioned above, which came into prominence from time to time. Every religious movement is conscious of needs which are always present. Whatever special questions may from time to time agitate the life of a religious community, there are certain deeper needs which are present always and for which satisfaction is sought at all times. To mention three of these permanent needs, we may say that every religious body is seeking constantly for explanations of its own character and its own arrangements and institutions; that it is also seeking constantly to defend itself against attacks made on it from without; and that it is constantly compelled to return to its source and to refresh itself at the original truth which lies at its beginning. It is inevitable that these needs should tell on the formation of the tradition.

1. The members of an organization want to know about the

origin of the body they have entered and to have its various features explained to them. How many disciples were there and how did they become disciples and what were their names? The early Christians must have wished to know this. They must have wished to know how the Lord's Supper which they celebrated frequently was instituted. They must have felt that the death of Christ at the hands of the Jews called for some explanation. What was the relation of John the Baptist, whose disciples still kept up his name and faith in some parts of the world, to Jesus and to his cause? What did Jesus himself say about his death? Did he foresee it, and if so what view did he take of it? In view of such demands for knowledge the tradition was called to be the lesson book of the Church with regard to its own earliest history. The simplest and most effective way to explain to the Church her own origin and the nature of her institutions was to tell the story of her Founder, and to show him calling his disciples, fixing their number, sending them out and giving them their charge. The rites of the Church were best explained by the story of their institution; the duty of Christians towards the Jewish law and rites by exhibiting the Saviour as he encouraged the observance of the laws of his nation or set them aside; the attitude of believers to the followers of John the Baptist by telling how Jesus and John met and what passed between them.

The
apologetic
motive.

2. The Christians must from the very first have felt it necessary to defend themselves against the attacks of their opponents, and the tradition of the life and teaching of Christ was the best defence of their faith. If Jesus was such as the stories about him represented him to have been, then it was plain that the charges made against him were not true. These stories therefore, properly set forth, were the best apology they could advance for their cause.¹ Christianity had to defend itself against attacks from two sides and to meet two sets of charges, one from the Gentiles and the other from the Jews.

¹ Dic. P. Wernle, "Altchristliche Apologetik im Neuen Testamente," in Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, No. 1, seeks to exhibit the action of the apologetic motive in each of the four Gospels, and considers this to have been the leading motive in the composition of the works; in which he perhaps goes too far.

The attack from the Gentile side is not very definite in the earlier books of the New Testament; it has not yet formulated itself as it afterwards came to do. And if the tradition was formed in Palestine, the need of answering Gentile attacks cannot have told for much in the earlier stages of its growth. The simplest narrative of the facts would dispose of the charges that the Christians were a disorderly set of people, without any rule or discipline, and that they were unsocial and did not care for their neighbours or for the interests and institutions of the country they lived in. That the Gospel was a mere Jewish freak, of no interest to the nations beyond Palestine, could be disproved by narratives bringing the Saviour in contact with Gentiles. Of the specific Gentile apologetic, consisting of the declaration of one God as against the many gods of Greece and Rome, and of His moral rule over the world, traces are not wanting in the Gospels:¹ but these may not belong to the earlier growth of the tradition. To the Gentiles the Cross was foolishness; there was no wisdom to be seen in it, only an inroad of brute force crossing the plans of Jesus, from which it was idle to expect any help or instruction. To this the tradition could reply by showing the death of Christ to have been not unforeseen by him, and to have been accepted by him as a part of the divine will and as a means of great blessing to men. In this and in other ways it could be shown that his death was really not a defeat for him, but that he died as a victor, master of himself and of his fate.² The argument for the Gentiles however here coincided with that for the Jews, against whom the Christian community was obliged from the very first to defend itself. The line taken up in this defence may be seen in the speeches in the earlier part of Acts, and also in the three chapters of Romans in which Paul shows that the Christians are in the line of the promises from which the Jews have cut themselves off. It had to be proved from Scripture that a crucified Messiah was not a contradiction in terms, but was foreseen in prophecy and therefore ordained by God. It had to be shown that the death of the Messiah was not a mere useless outrage to Jewish feeling, but was the means chosen by God of inaugurating a new period of grace. That the Jews,

¹ See Mark xii. 28-34.

² Mark xv. 37-39.

not the Christians, had fallen away ; that their fall was foretold and divinely appointed ; that the Law was no longer to be taken in the old sense, but to be kept more spiritually than before ; that the Christians were not worse men than those around them but better neighbours, quieter, kinder, more to be relied on ; all this had to be proved to the Jews.

And all this the tradition about Jesus found itself able to prove in the most striking way. The argument from Scripture, put in the mouth of Jesus himself, who foretells his death and indicates the result it is to secure for men, was perfectly effective ; for his death thus lost the aspect of a fate which had violently overtaken him, and appeared as a sacrifice which in his love, and entering into the will of God, he had voluntarily undertaken. Jesus, rejecting the tradition but exalting the law to an ideal spiritual authority, was the best champion of the mingled liberty and subordination of his followers ; and his beneficent life, as he went about doing good, and commanded his disciples to give freely to all men all possible blessings, this was the best answer they could point to when their movement was charged with being unbrotherly and unsocial. No one would say that these elements of the Gospel tradition were invented to serve the purpose of arguments for the Christian cause ; but that they did serve in this way is undeniable, and that those who arranged and handed on the tradition must have felt it to have this virtue, is equally plain.

3. Devotion. Every religious movement turns to its origin to realize its own true spirit and to gain fresh vigour for its advance. And the spring of the Christian movement has always been Christ himself. Here we come to the perennial need of the individual for comfort, forgiveness, renewal, encouragement. If Christ sent out his missionaries to heal the sick, to cast out devils, to give freely to all men what they had freely received from him, what better means was there to do this than to place him before the eyes and ears of the believer, to describe the scene, the company, the gesture, to repeat the words in which he relieved the sinner of his load of sin, gave the paralytic strength to walk, brought the demoniac to his right mind, rebuked his disciples' fears, prayed for the guidance which he also wanted, satisfied, with little outward

The
devotional
motive.

store, the hunger and thirst of thousands? The Gospel stories about Christ serve in an unparalleled way the purposes of devotion. Is it unreasonable to assume that those who in the earliest times transmitted and arranged them, expected and intended them to exercise this power? And if they did so, then they must of course have wished to make the story effective for the end they saw it would serve. We said that the Gospels were not dogmatic; yet the stories must have expressed the view held by those who told them as to the person and nature of Jesus. If the narrators regarded him as the Saviour, as an object of faith, as a divine Being, this could not fail to appear in their accounts of him. The narratives would be so arranged, and told in such a way, as to produce in others the faith they themselves felt in their Lord.

Yet the
Gospels
are also
historical

It will not be denied by the unbiassed student that the various motives now enumerated must have entered into the formation of the narratives about Christ, nor that they must have began to operate early. It does not follow from this however that the tradition was not built up on actual reminiscences at all, but owes its whole existence to the needs and the artistic faculties of the early Church. When Strauss advanced his theory that many of the Gospel narratives are mythical products, formed on the model of narratives in the Old Testament, and when Baur accounted for the character of each of the Gospels by setting it down to the doctrinal tendency of the writer, it was very naturally felt by many, that if the mythopoetic faculty of the early Christians and the doctrinal tendency of the Gospel-writers could do so much, they might have done everything, and that no other explanation of the Gospels need be looked for; they were not historical but mythical and doctrinal products. Few would now deny that there was some truth in the position of each of these writers. Old Testament models are traceable in some of the Gospel stories, and the doctrinal position of the writers does here and there appear. The mistake of Strauss and Baur on this matter was that the solutions they gave of a difficult problem were too simple. Not only the influences they alleged as acting in the early Christian community, but many others also, must be

recognized as having contributed to the result attained. But if we allow that the Gospel tradition was not made up of pure reminiscence, but was modified by the impulse to find in the life of Christ explanations of Church arrangements, by the interest of defending the Christian position, and by the desire for edification, are we driven to the conclusion that the tradition was an entirely unhistorical formation, and that it is not based on actual reminiscence at all? Such a conclusion would be most illogical. The motives which act on the formation of tradition are one thing; the producing cause of the tradition and of the movement which carries it on is another thing. That there was in this case a producing cause, viz. the actual appearance of Jesus in Galilee, and that the tradition was formed on actual reminiscences of his life and acts and words is very certain. But for the Dutch writers in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, and their few followers in Germany and in this country, to whom Jesus is not a historical figure at all, it would be unnecessary to spend words on this point. That the Gospel tradition operated on real facts and on things actually remembered is capable of proof. We are able to trace in the Gospels the mode of operation of early Christian tradition and to see the direction in which it travels. We do not see the starting-point, but we gather from the later development of what nature the beginning must have been. The tradition always proceeds from what is more concrete to what is more ideal, from the simple and homely to the dignified and majestic, from the less to the more wonderful. The simple fact of the earlier account is surrounded in the later with a veil of wonder; details which might appear too rustic and plain are omitted; the figure of the Saviour is raised more and more above the earth; the story is made always more edifying, more impressive. These phenomena, of which the study of the Synoptic Gospels shows manifold instances, do not point to the conclusion that the facts on which tradition operated were themselves invented. On the contrary the facts were often somewhat too real for the tradition to use. They did not at first quite suit the purposes of the Christian community, but had to be changed in the unconscious process of transmission before they could be used.¹

¹ For instances see the commentary on i. 10, 35-38; iii. 10-12; xi. 3, etc.

2. State of the Tradition before Mark wrote.

Let us now endeavour to realize the condition in which the tradition existed, and the way in which it was being carried on and fixed, in the period before any complete Gospel was written. The state of the records preserved in the written Gospels enables us to some extent to do this.

In form the tradition consisted at this time of short pieces, some of course longer than others. Many contained sayings of the Master, an interview with a friendly or an unfriendly interlocutor leading up to a sentence which breaks upon the ear with unforgettable force and authority and brings the story to a close. In some cases several such incidents were held together by an old connection.

What was preserved in this way, however, were only so many isolated glimpses of the life of Jesus; the connections were for the most part lost. There was hardly any geography preserved, hardly any chronology. One had the incidents without dates of place or time. As is common with anecdotes, conventional statements of place or time were given, which appeared to fix the occurrence, but only appeared to do so. A story is placed "at the seashore," "in a house," "on the mountain": mere typical headings which show that the precise locality was not known. With respect to time, there was seldom any attempt to fix a date; what time-dates there are in our Gospels are so vague and so diverse as to show that they do not belong to the sources at all, but that the Evangelists tried to supply them.¹

The scheme and connection of the life therefore early became obscure, and the tradition was, as it were, a set of fragments which could be placed side by side, but the original concatenation of which had disappeared. No doubt Christians knew

¹ The story of the cure of the paralytic is introduced in Mark (ii. 1) with the words "after some days he was reported to be in the house." In Matthew (ix. 1) he is merely said to have come to his own town. In Luke (v. 17) we have "it happened on one of those days, when he was teaching." The story of the plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath is thus introduced :

Mark ii. 23, "He happened to be passing through the cornfields on the Sabbath." Matth. xii. 1, "At that time Jesus went through the cornfields on the Sabbath." Luke vi. 1, "It happened on a Sabbath (the "second-first" Sabbath) that he was going through the cornfields," etc., etc.

Narratives
were pre-
served, but
not connec-
tions.

that the events of the life of Christ had taken place in a certain order. The ministry began with John the Baptist, we read in Acts x. 36-38; and after a beneficent course in Galilee it terminated with the crucifixion at Jerusalem. An Apostle might be able to tell more about the order; but such information, being neither a story nor a word of Christ, the tradition did not adopt it. The sequence of the events in Galilee was not preserved in any diary or journal, and the conventional openings of the different stories are a poor compensation for what was thus left behind. It remained for the collector of the tradition to frame as good a scheme as he could by means of such hints as he might gather from the tradition itself or might derive from other quarters.

As for the tradition of the words of Christ the case is substantially the same. Sayings and parables were remembered, but not, in many cases, the circumstances of their delivery or their relation to each other. The point which a saying had been spoken to illustrate might no longer be known, and the word might in consequence be made to serve a purpose for which Jesus had not intended it. Or a sentence would be preserved in two different ways; in one version it was led up to by a story, in connection with which it appeared in its full force, while another form of tradition gave the sentence without the story, perhaps in a chain of similar sentences, each perhaps given without any suggestion of its original story. If the teaching of Jesus passed through a certain development, the tradition, subject to such mischances, could not record it, and sentences belonging to different periods of the ministry came to be mixed up together. It was left for the collector who came after to arrange the sayings with such skill as he possessed, in longer or shorter discourses, and in such situations in the life as he found suitable. The fourth and the ninth chapters of Mark offer examples of this, and examples on a much larger scale are found in Matthew and Luke.

Various collections had been made at one point or another of the field of the tradition before any of our Gospels came to be written; and some of these had been put in writing.

The Teaching also was preserved in detached pieces.

Early collections of Gospel materials.

It is possible by carefully observing the existing narratives to make out some of these early collections. It seems natural to suppose that where Mark, Matthew, and Luke are found in close verbal agreement with each other, there is a reason for it. This is not the case at every part of the narrative. Any one can satisfy himself by looking through the pages of a synopsis that agreement is much closer in some parts than in others; there are places where the three accounts go together word for word for some time, and there are places where, while the matter is the same, the phraseology is very different. For instances of close verbal agreement we may refer to the second chapter of Mark with the parallels, and to the story, as found in the three, of the entry into Jerusalem and of the Jerusalem encounters. For instances of a less strict agreement, where the events are the same but are narrated in different ways, the story in the latter part of the first chapter of Mark may be taken. Now the close verbal agreement of the second and eleventh chapters may be explained either on the supposition that two of the Evangelists copied the words of the third, or on the supposition that all three followed in these parts of the narrative an earlier authority. But if one of the Evangelists is copied by the other two, why do they not then copy him in other passages? Why the close following in some parts, and the loose following in others? The only reason that can be thought of is that they had more confidence to follow him in some places than in others; and this could only be because in these passages his words were familiar to them. They knew these parts of the narrative not only from him but from other sources also, *i.e.* from an older written text which he had followed and which was in good repute in the Church. Thus we are led to believe that documents already existed in the Church before the earliest Evangelist entered on his task, and that these had established themselves in some degree of authority and were not to be put aside, even if he had wished to do so. What sources of this kind can we identify? To speak first of the Teaching, a collection of parables would seem to have been early begun;¹ a discourse to the disciples when being sent out to preach must have

¹ Mark iv. and parallels.

been formed very soon.¹ The situation of the Sermon on the Mount is provided from the first, though Mark does not take advantage of it;² all the accounts here give the catalogue of the Apostles. The eschatological discourse also certainly existed in some form before any of our Gospels.³ As Mark abstains generally from giving the Teaching, the evidence with regard to this part of the tradition need not here be considered in its entirety; the pieces mentioned are those known to Mark as well as to Matthew and Luke.

With regard to the various bodies of Narrative, some parts of the history of the Passion must have taken form before Gospels began to be written; but the agreement of the Gospels here is more that of order than of verbal identity. The latter obtains most in Mark xi., xii., spoken of above, and this part of the narrative will not have been composed by any of our Evangelists. Here and in Mark ii. 1–iii. 6, the agreement of the three is at its greatest. Another piece of narrative of early formation is the group of stories, Mark iv. 35–v. 43; the storm on the sea, the restoration of the Gerasene demoniac, the raising up of Jairus' daughter and the cure of the woman in the crowd, are told by the three Evangelists with verbal agreement, though Mark seems to have amplified the source, Matthew to have curtailed it. Another phenomenon which may be mentioned here is that the cycle of stories comprising the feeding of the multitudes, a journey on the lake, an incident connected with Bethsaida, and an encounter with the Pharisees, occurs twice in Mark; compare vi. 34–vii. 23 with viii. 1–26. As the two versions differ in many respects it is not surprising that Mark adopted them both. It was however only the first story of the feeding which was so well known as to be reported in verbal agreement by the three Evangelists. While Matthew follows Mark in the second cycle, Luke does not.

This then was the state of the tradition when the first continuous account of the life came to be written. Much no doubt had been lost, not to be recovered; much had been changed. Jesus once believed in as Messiah, the record of his

¹ Mark vi. 7 *sqq.* and parallels.

² Mark iii. 13; cf. Matth. iv. 23 *sq.*; Luke vi. 12.

³ Mark xiii.

life necessarily assumed more and more of Messianic colouring. The glorified figure once believed in, of the Saviour at God's right hand, invested with all power in heaven and earth, and in a divine manner guarding, enriching, and directing his people, the earthly narrative was insensibly idealized to accord with such conceptions; the human Jesus tended to be transformed into a Being all powerful and all knowing. Add to such tendencies the infirmities of the original reporters and the consequent uncertainty attaching from the very first to much that they reported. In what has reached us how often do we find that Jesus' chosen disciples failed to understand him! No report they could have given, even had it been taken down verbatim as soon as they realized in their minds each narrative they had to give, could have got rid of this inability and dulness on their part. At the best their account of their Master must have been very external; the history of his mind, with his growing insight and purpose and his maturing policy, they never could have given. Much then that should have gone to the composition of a full and adequate life of Christ, has gone beyond recall, or never came into existence. The tradition is formulated for us in the Gospels with all its defects and errors, as it existed at a particular time and then at another time, in its rapid career of growth and change. Much is made marvellous that at first perhaps was natural and human, while much that was most truly wonderful was never apprehended, or was apprehended too late to be put down as it really was.

On the other hand, however, is to be noted the great fact that the formation of the tradition regarding Jesus was a work of enthusiasm and devotion, carried out by men on whom he had made an overmastering impression, and in whom his spirit was living and active. They did not merely repeat what they had heard with verbal accuracy. The narrative was a great deal too living to them to allow them to do that. Their heart was in the work of making their Master live and act again in the world, as they now knew that he had lived and acted when in the flesh. They knew him not only from the accounts of eye-witnesses; indeed the eye-witnesses themselves knew that they had not understood at the time what had

passed before their eyes, but that now the light had dawned which made them understand it. They felt the narrative to be due in part to the Saviour himself who now lived in them and in the Church. Now they knew what he desired, how he felt, how he prevailed. When Paul says that Christ speaks in him (2 Cor. xiii. 3) and that the Lord gives him power to edify (2 Cor. x. 8), he expresses the experience of other Christians besides himself; and though he speaks of no charism for writing history, others were conscious of such a gift. The Spirit which came to them from Christ brought to their remembrance what he had said to them.

Thus we know on the one hand that the tradition contains historical matter; and on the other that that matter was put in shape under an ideal impulse. In Mark we find the deposit at the earliest stage now accessible to us, at a point at which the idealizing tendency is no doubt already at work, but has not yet gone so far as in the other Synoptics, not to speak of John.

3. Nature of Mark's Gospel, as gathered from itself.

The Gospel of Mark is the earliest of the attempts of which Luke speaks (i. 1), "to draw up a continuous narrative" out of the materials delivered by "eye-witnesses and servants of the Word." In what state those materials were when Mark took in hand to write his book, we have now seen. We shall now try to ascertain first of all by observation of the book itself what the writer added to his sources in the way of arrangement and treatment.

One of the most striking things about the second Gospel is that it gives so much less of the teaching of Jesus than either of the others. It tells us much of the effects of Jesus preaching, but of the preaching itself it gives but scanty specimens; the only discourses which do not arise out of some immediate occasion but show some arrangement of pieces of the teaching for their own sake are the set of parables, with sayings appended, in chap. iv., the set of sayings in chap. ix., and the eschatological discourse, chap. xiii. This is a decided shortcoming in the book as compared with the other two Gospels, and the want of discourses certainly calls for some

Why Mark
does not
give more
of the
Teaching.

explanation, if any can be given. Did the writer know the discourses as collected in Matthew and Luke, and did he deliberately choose not to include them in his work? Or is their absence due to his not knowing them?

Not to his not knowing them, surely; but rather perhaps to his not knowing them as collected. All Christians must have known the Lord's Prayer, and the injunction not to lay up treasures, and the sayings insisting on repeated and strenuous prayer; yet Mark does not give any of these. We must conclude that he did not put into his Gospel nearly all he knew about Jesus on this side. Perhaps an examination of what he does give of the teaching may help to explain why he does not give more. In the latter part of the fourth and also of the ninth chapter we get from him little collections of sayings of Jesus; but we find that these are to be counted among the obscure passages of the second Gospel; the sayings are not placed in the context in which Matthew and Luke have them and in which their meaning is plain, but require study to make out what they are here meant to convey. What Mark gives of the teaching is nearly all in the form of stories; he does not aim at any arranged and connected teaching such as the Sermon on the Mount. It is accordingly a possible explanation of this feature of his book that the arrangement of the teaching into such connected discourses as we have in Matthew and Luke, had not been carried out when he wrote, or was not known to him. What he knew was the teaching in its earlier form, before the Logia or Utterances¹ of Jesus had been made into collections or a collection by themselves.

It is also very possible that if the writer of this Gospel was placed, when he wrote, in the Western part of Christendom, the arrangement of the sayings, which must have been done in the East, where the tradition most abounded, might not yet have reached him. What, however, is more within our ken is that the second Gospel is, and must have been meant to be, a book of action rather than discourse. One mighty act succeeds another in it with breathless haste, so that there is scarcely room for pause. It may also be considered that a book in old

¹ So Mr. Wright.

times could not outrun a certain size which was determined by the capacity of the roll on which it was to be written. A larger work had to run into a second book or into a number of books.¹ But it was no doubt desirable that the account of Jesus which was here contemplated should not exceed one book; none of the four Gospels does so. The others are all larger than the second; but the second Evangelist also may well have had the need of compression present to his mind, and have come to the resolution to do justice to his narratives (many of which are longer than the parallel ones of Matthew and Luke), and to give hardly any connected discourses. It was necessary to give some parables, as that was the most characteristic form of Jesus' teaching, and the eschatological discourse possessed a pressing and immediate interest which required its insertion. But beyond this, no set discourses.

The plan of the writer, then, was to gather the narratives about Jesus together into a connected history. So far as we know, he was the first to attempt to do this. In addition to the materials spoken of above, which were also known to Matthew and to Luke from other quarters, he had others at his command. In many parts of his narrative we see that Matthew and Luke follow his order, but much less closely than in the former case. Of the pieces they treat with freedom, some belong to the early ministry at Capernaum at a time when Jesus' circle of followers was not large; and these contain many homely touches omitted by the later writers, and not likely to have been invented. For an example we may take the statement that Jesus left Capernaum long before day and went off to a lonely place to pray, and that the disciples made after him to bring him back, but were not able to do so. These traits Matthew omits, while Luke deprives them of their domestic character and makes them into a smooth and edifying story (Mark i. 35-38, Luke iv. 42, 43). We may also mention the narrative of the epileptic boy (ix. 14 sq.), where the later Gospels omit the homely touches of the surprise and the running-up of the crowd, the second

Mark's sources.

¹ See a paper in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1896, by Professor Rüegg, of Zürich, "The Space-Limit of Ancient Books," etc., on the reasons why Luke's two works both look forward at the close to a continuation.

conversation with the father, the formula of exorcism used by Jesus, and the curious phrase, "this kind" (of demons). For these parts of his Gospel Mark is held by many scholars to have been indebted to the Apostle Peter. They certainly contain particulars which only members of a small circle could have supplied, and of that circle Peter was one. This is also true of some parts of the narrative of the last days at Jerusalem, in which we hear of the private arrangements of Jesus with his party, which only few were allowed to know; and the account of the trial before the Sanhedrin must, at least in great part, be due to Peter. The Apostle, while by no means flattered in Mark's Gospel (Matth. xiv. 28-31, xvi. 17-19, xvii. 24-27, Luke xxii. 31, 32 are omitted in Mark, who alone gives ix. 6, xi. 21; compare also Mark xiv. 37, 30 and the betrayal scene, with the parallels), is certainly prominent in it. The narrative of the ministry opens with his call; then we are taken from the synagogue to his house and introduced to his family; it is Peter who argues that he and his friends have given up everything to follow Jesus (x. 28). It is he who observes the withering of the fig tree (xi. 21); and a special message is sent to him by the angel at the tomb as to seeing Jesus again in Galilee (xvi. 7); the narrative apparently was to include the vision which he had, of which all but the mere mention has disappeared from the records.

In addition to this source, not yet open to others, Mark may have had some special knowledge of his own, connected with the last days at Jerusalem. In the curious incident of the young man who was present at the arrest with scanty clothing, and fled, leaving his garment behind him (xiv. 51, 52), it is possible, though not necessary, to see a personal reminiscence of the Evangelist. Mark alone preserves the little fact that Simon, who carried the cross for Jesus, was the father of Alexander and Rufus, who may have been members of the Church personally known to him, and vouchers for this piece of information (xv. 21).

Such, then, were the sources Mark had at his command. Besides certain written pieces which were well known and highly considered in the Church, he had traditions which were less known and of a more private nature, the latter

being simpler and less matured in form than the former. Doubtless, therefore, he considered himself to be in a very favourable position for providing the Church with a complete account, which was still wanting, of the Saviour's earthly ministry. In order to carry out this great design he had to decide on a course of action in two important respects. In the first place, the arrangement of his materials had to be determined and the scheme of the narrative to be fixed which he was to unfold; in the second place, there was the question of literary treatment; were the sources to be given verbatim or with a certain amount, perhaps a considerable amount, of moulding, colouring, and editing?

As for the question of arrangement our author was well directed. We saw that the sources to a large extent failed to give any guidance in this matter. While some connected groups of stories had been formed, many pieces of the tradition had nothing about them to show their connection; they were as it were loose leaves at the writer's service, but not numbered nor provided with any reference to their proper position. How find the cord on which all these pearls were to be placed; how fix their proper position on that cord? What indeed was the story of which these were the incidents: of what nature was the central development around which they were all to fall into place? This Mark, alone of the Evangelists, was enabled clearly to make out and to record. It is here indeed that the observer most of all discerns that Mark must have been guided by one who knew the life of Jesus not only as a set of isolated stories but as a connected whole inspired by a growing purpose. One might suppose indeed that though the tradition consisted mostly of detached incidents and sayings, there might yet be in the Church an impression, not perhaps clearly defined, yet in general correct, of the order in which the events of the ministry succeeded each other, and of the development of Jesus' aims and efforts. If any such knowledge existed it was early obscured; in the second Gospel only is a clear and intelligible order of events and of ideas exhibited. While our writer nowhere states the arrangement of his work and gives no titles nor divisions, we can see him advancing in an orderly sequence and can with a little attention make out his scheme.

Mark's
order.

In several aspects of the ministry Mark's narrative allows us to observe growth and progress:

(1) *The calling and training of the disciples.* Some are called earlier than others. The ministry opens with the call of the disciples who were fishermen. In ii. 15 we are told that Jesus had by this time a number of followers. In iii. 14 he institutes the circle of the Twelve, to train them and send them out to preach, and the teaching of chap. iv. is partly addressed to an inner circle, and is to be regarded as part of this training. In chap. vi. the disciples receive their charge and are sent out. In chap. viii. his disciples accept him as Messiah, and after this the public teaching is at an end and what we hear of the teaching is mainly directed to them, until the time comes when he opens his mouth in the new career of teaching at Jerusalem. This of itself gives the Gospel a unity and a growing interest wanting in Matthew and Luke. Weiss finds in this the main scheme of the second Gospel and divides it into sections according to this view of it.

(2) In the matter of Jesus' *exorcisms and cures* there is in Mark, if not an advance, yet an interesting sequence, which disappears in the later Gospels. Here Jesus recognizes the cure of demoniacs as part of his own appointed work, but not the treatment of disease generally. While he does not doubt his power to cure disease where there is faith on the part of the patient (at Nazareth this condition was wanting and he could do but little), he is unwilling to exercise this power on a large scale, and withdraws when too much is asked of him in this way. His later cures take place at special appeals which he cannot resist, and by way of exception (cf. notes on i. 40, ii. 10, viii. 22, etc.). His disciples are commissioned to cast out demons but not to cure diseases (iii. 15, vi. 7). In Matthew cures of every kind of disease are performed on a large scale from the very first (Matth. iv. 23).

(3) Again the *subject of the teaching* shows advance. At first the Kingdom is announced, and men are called to repent and to be prepared for it. In the parables the seeming delay of the Kingdom is explained and its nature exhibited. Then the teaching grows more controversial; the tradition system is criticized and repudiated; the demand for a sign of the promised

change is spoken of as a proof of unbelief, and the ruling authorities are more and more clearly recognized as enemies of the good cause.

(4) There is advance in the *Messianic claim of Jesus*. At first no such claim is made. When the demons hail Jesus as God's representative they are commanded to be silent and not to speak in that way. The teaching is about the Kingdom not about the Messiah. Only where the title Son of Man is used of himself by Jesus in chap. ii. is there any appearance of a Messianic claim. But it has been suggested that the two stories in which this title occurs are placed too early, ii. 1-iii. 6 being a collection previously formed which Mark adopted entire.¹ Even if the title was used early it may not imply an open avowal of Messiahship. That avowal only comes in the middle of the Gospel when Jesus, with much work now behind him, many appeals having been made and his cause kept steadily for some time before the eyes of his countrymen, asks his disciples what men take him to be and hears that they at least take him to be the Messiah. From that time forth the tone of the teaching changes and becomes darker and more tragical. There is however no open proclamation of Messiahship till, after the acclamation, now suffered to pass without rebuke, of Bartimaeus and of the crowd at the entry to Jerusalem, Jesus answers the question of the High Priest at the trial, "Art thou the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed?" with a solemn affirmative.

In Mark these various developments are clearly observed. In Matthew and Luke they are obscured, and it is only from the second Gospel that we distinctly know them. They only require to be stated to be recognized as substantial and historical; and as they are not indicated in the individual narratives, but only brought out by good arrangement, we judge that Mark was well informed as to the course of the ministry as a whole, and that he probably had some help in the arrangement of his book beyond what the narratives themselves supplied.

In working out his plan with a view to this connected history, Mark did not regard his materials as sacred or inviolable,

¹ See Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i. (not translated), p. 23 *sqq.*

Mark
treats his
materials
with
freedom.

but used considerable liberties with them. In the first place, he had to connect a number of unconnected pieces into a progressive narrative, to weave them into a story. Where arrangement had already been given to a group of narratives, he appears to accept that arrangement, as in chap. ii. 1-iii. 6, chap. v., chap. vi. Elsewhere he arranges his materials very skilfully, and binds them together into a well-jointed narrative, with a scheme which looks at first sight as if it came from a journal taken down at the time, but which is found on closer inspection to be artificial. Thus the first chapter has been taken by many writers to give the events which took place in one day at Capernaum; one occurrence is joined to another with the word 'immediately,' as if Jesus had hurried from one great work to another till the day was over. But we find as we read further in the Gospel that Mark binds all his materials together in this way, and makes one great event or act succeed another in a breathless sequence, as if the ministry had all been made up of impressive and dramatic incidents without any pauses between them. On reflection, we see that this is Mark's manner, and learn to allow for it. The fact is that the chronological and geographical data at his command were so scanty that the only way to make a coherent story of them was to place them in this immediate and rapid sequence. He does not invent places or times for the several incidents, but places them in such a way that the main current of the narrative moves evenly forward. This is the great merit of Mark's work as a historian. The different periods of the ministry do succeed each other in good order in his work. On looking into his detailed connections, however, we see that he does not mean them to be taken too strictly. He is often quite aware that what he is going on to report did not come close after what he has just reported. "And he comes home," in iii. 20, does not mean that Jesus made straight for his house after the appointment of the Twelve. It only means that this is another piece of narrative belonging to this part of the history, and that according to the author's scheme it is put here and made to connect with what goes before. "And he said," in iv. 21, does not mean that the saying about the lamp was part of the same discourse as the explanation of the parable of the Sower; but only that

it also was a saying of Jesus which may fitly be placed and considered in this connection.

There results from this a certain vagueness and ambiguity. It is not always easy to tell how close the connection is meant to be between one piece of narrative and another. The first readers probably did not feel this. As it is, the history is effective, and even powerful. We are carried swiftly from one situation to another, in which Jesus is master of all the circumstances and all the persons, chooses the best means, shows himself worthy of all confidence even in the most trying position, and utters the word never to be forgotten, which was true then and is true still. The writer is entirely out of sight; one never thinks of him; the story is everything.

Along with this lively manner of connecting together the pieces of his narrative, we must also speak of Mark's lively treatment of the individual pieces. This has been much more generally remarked, and we need not linger over it. The chief characteristic of the style of the Gospel is its vividness. Every situation is made real, the narrative is very often in the present tense, which places the reader as it were in the position of one who is there and actually sees and hears what is being told. Or it is in the imperfect or descriptive tense, which suggests that this and that circumstance entered into the situation when the action took place which is then narrated. Or it is said that Jesus "began to" do so and so, which may be an Aramaism, as Wellhausen says,¹ but certainly has the effect of description in preparing the mind for a definite action just about to be stated. In this and other ways considerable art is expended on the description of situations. Sometimes part of the description is kept till the narrative has been begun (see ver. 6 in the first, ver. 4 in the last chapter, and xi. 13). And sometimes we have a piling up of particulars to bring out strongly the condition of a patient, or some important circumstance. Compare the detail of the condition of the Gerasene demoniac in chap. v., and that of the woman with an issue later in the chapter; also the description of the crowds in chaps. ii. and iii. The grammatical connections are of

¹ *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi. 192; cf. Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 21.

the simplest; one fact is added to another with ‘and—and’ (34 times with a principal verb in chap. iii.), so that attention is not distracted. The large use of pronouns is also to be remarked; “he,” “him,” “his,” applying to different persons in the same sentence; cf. ix. 20, “They brought him to him. And the spirit saw him and tore him,” or ver. 28, “When he came into the house his disciples asked him.” Matthew and Luke often arrange to avoid such accumulations of pronouns, which no doubt are traceable to the Aramaic form of the tradition, the pronouns in Aramaic being not separate words, but suffixes, and therefore bulking much less largely in a sentence. Mark keeps the primitive simplicity, awkward as it is.

He does not spend much care on his grammar and style; but he will have his story popular and effective. Here we notice the expressions he uses to indicate the feelings of the actors, and particularly of the Lord himself. The woman (v. 33) is “afraid and trembling”; viii. 2, Jesus says, “I have pity on the multitude”; viii. 12, he “sighed in his spirit”; iii. 5, he “looked round with anger”; vi. 6, he “marvelled at their unbelief.”

In some cases, as notably in chap. v., Mark is much longer than Matthew or Luke. Sometimes we are led to think that the latter have omitted for the sake of brevity little touches which may have belonged to the original, and which Mark retained;¹ but in some cases it is Mark who has amplified by adding descriptive touches, or even whole sentences, of his own. The other Evangelists who had to find room for their discourses had a motive for brevity which Mark had not, and on the other hand, Mark has undoubtedly a tendency to amplification.² In each case where Mark is longest, we have to consider which of these agencies has been at work.

¹ As where Mark says that Jesus was asleep on the pillow, and Luke omits the clause, Matthew the pillow.

² If, as used to be taken for granted, no Evangelist would abbreviate a narrative he was following, and the shorter account is always the earlier, then in the passages where Mark is longest, it follows that Matthew and Luke cannot have followed him as we have him, and that if they did follow him they must have had him in a shorter form. This is the ground of the theory, still held by many scholars, of an original Mark ‘Urmarcus,’ now lost.

The descriptive touches introduced by Mark have sometimes the effect of making his narrative slightly heavy, as in his description of the Gerasene demoniac and of the woman in the crowd. This is rare, but there is perhaps enough of it to warrant the conclusion that it was before he came to deal with the narratives that they were made so firm and positive, so free from everything redundant or uncertain, so rounded and complete, that they at once imprint themselves with all their details on the memory. The older pieces in Mark have by no means lost this character; it is not so noticeable in the matter which he himself brought into the record. In these sections repetition has not been so much at work, and the stories are less perfectly formed; we think less of the purpose the narrative might serve, more of the lively reminiscence by which it was preserved for us. And this leads us to the question of the immediate use to which Mark intended his work to be put. Narratives which are often repeated, and so assume a fixed and telling form, are suited thereby for liturgical or catechetical use. Pure reminiscences, on the other hand, are less suited for that purpose. Now the Gospels were being read at Christian meetings at the time when Justin wrote about the middle of the second century. Were they originally drawn up for that purpose? This question does not, so far as I am aware, admit of an answer. Even in the careful and exhaustive discussion in Zahn's Introduction the reader finds no satisfaction regarding it. Yet it is not impossible to point out the direction in which the truth on this question is to be looked for. The reading of the Gospels at Christian meetings may be regarded as a continuation of the process of repetition which first gave form to the tradition. These parts of the tradition, therefore, which had gone through this forming process were ready for liturgical use as soon as the practice arose of using such matter in worship. Sections on the contrary in which private reminiscence is largely in evidence, such as the story of Jesus leaving Capernaum before daybreak and being pursued by the disciples, or the cures in which the means applied and the *modus operandi* are so frankly described (vii. 32 *sq.*, viii. 22 *sq.*), or the story of the young man who fled naked, these were not so fitted for Church use, and the writer who added such pieces to the set of well-rounded stories so well known to all was not

taking the best way to provide a book for Church reading, and is not likely to have had that destination in view for his work. To this has to be added the doubt whether at the time when Mark wrote the Church felt a book to be needed for the purpose. What we know of the early history of the canon rather suggests that the demand for a collection for such a use cannot have arisen very early. The Gospels came into Church use because they were found adapted for it; but it could not be known before they were written that they would be so used. Before they were read in Church they served manifold other purposes; and it is in these perhaps that the immediate motives are to be sought which caused them to be written. Mark wrote his Gospel, it seems pretty certain, not with a view to Church use, but for the information of the brethren on a subject which was very important for them, and had not yet been put in a connected form. He had reminiscences which he desired to put in writing before they were lost to the world, and he worked these up into a complete statement along with the better known traditions, so that the Christians might no longer be at a loss when asked to give an account of the Founder of their faith. The book was to be the Christian's best apology against attacks from outside, and to give him information about the various points of his religion; it was to prove to him and to others that he did well to put his faith in Jesus and keep his commandments and wait for him to come again.

The book was addressed to Western readers. That this is the case is proved by a number of features in the Gospel itself.

1. Aramaic words, which had impressed themselves on the narrative so strongly that it could scarcely be told without them, are translated for the Greek reader. Boanerges, that reader is told, means 'Sons of thunder' (iii. 17); Talitha cumi means 'Maid, arise' (v. 41); *κορβᾶν* (vii. 11) means 'a gift'; Effatha (vii. 34) means 'Be opened'; Golgotha (xv. 22) means 'place of a skull.' The last words on the cross are accompanied with a translation (xv. 34). In addition to these instances, in which the writer says he is giving a translation, there are others, in which he gives one without thus announcing it.

For what
reader
Mark wrote.

Beelzebub (iii. 22) is explained to be the ruler of the demons; Gehenna (ix. 43) is the unquenchable fire; Bartimaeus (x. 46) is a blind beggar; Abba (xiv. 36) is father.

2. There are also passages in which Jewish customs are explained for readers not familiar with them. The long explanation of Jewish practices connected with purification (vii. 3, 4) could be of no use for readers in Palestine; nor would they need to be told (xiv. 12) that the first day of unleavened bread was the day when the sacrifice was killed for the passover, or (xv. 42) that Preparation was the day before the Sabbath. These explanations, however, are given very sparingly, and in many passages where they might have been given they are wanting, for we are not told the meaning of the title ‘Son of Man,’ nor why it was blasphemy for Jesus to forgive sins or to declare himself Messiah. The apocalypse of chap. xiii., moreover, is Jewish in many of its features, and must have appeared strange to a reader in the West. Mark, moreover, we notice here, does not use the argument from prophecy to show that Jesus was Messiah, and that ancient oracles were fulfilled in him; the passage i. 1-4 is the only one where this is directly done, and the text there is not secure. This proof of the Messiahship required a theologian, and that character our author rarely assumes. His proof is different; it is that from the impression Jesus made in his life, both by his preaching and in his acts and his encounters with opponents. This proof, culminating in the word of the centurion at the cross (xv. 39), “Certainly this man was the Son of God” (or of a divine Being), was a simple and effective one, which would appeal to Gentiles more readily than that from prophecy.

3. As for the Latin words used in the Gospel which have been held to prove its Western destination, too much may easily be made of them. Matthew and Luke accept Mark’s Latin words with hesitation; often one of them adopts the word, never both of them. It would seem that while many Latin words were current everywhere in that age of mixed populations and of commerce, as many French words are in our day, Mark is somewhat more inclined to use them than the other Evangelists. Not so much, therefore, is to be inferred from his Latinisms

as to his writing for Gentiles as from his renderings of Aramaisms.¹

Here we may also mention that in speaking of divorce (x. 12), the writer has in view the Roman practice, which allowed the wife as well as the husband to dissolve the marriage tie; Matthew, writing for Jews (v. 32, xix. 9), contemplates such action on the part of the husband only.

Although the writer does not exhibit any strong doctrinal tendency, that is not to say that he does not reflect the views of doctrine which prevailed in his day, and that the ideas in especial of the Apostle Paul are not frequently met with in his book. His title (i. 1) is thoroughly Pauline, "Gospel of Jesus Christ (the Son of God)." It is in Paul that the Gospel, instead of being that of the Kingdom, is the Gospel of Christ (Rom. xv. 19, 1 Cor. ix. 18), or of God's Son (Rom. i. 9); and if the words 'Son of God' be accepted, and do not mean demigod as they may with the centurion (xv. 39), then, again, it is Paul who makes 'Son of God' a current title for Christ (Rom. i. 3, 4; 2 Cor. i. 19, etc.). The statement of the opening proclamation of the Gospel (i. 15) is thoroughly Pauline; in Galatians (iv. 4) that we hear of the time being fulfilled when God sends out the new message to mankind, and that faith is the true attitude towards the Gospel is Paul's characteristic doctrine. The form "Abba, Father," is peculiar to Paul, along with Mark, in the New Testament writings (cf. xiv. 36, Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 6); the explanation why Jesus spoke in parables (iv. 11 sq.) is precisely according to Paul's reason for the unbelief of the Jews (Rom. xi. 8); and the statement that the Christian mission must reach all nations before the end can come (xiii. 10), corresponds with that of Paul (Rom. xi. 25),

¹ The Latinisms are

	Mark	Matthew	Luke
ii. 4, also vi. 55.	<i>κράβαττος.</i>	<i>κλίνη.</i>	<i>κλινίθιστον.</i>
v. 9.	<i>λεγύμων.</i>	Omits.	<i>λεγύμων.</i>
vi. 27.	<i>σπεκουλάτωρ.</i>	Omits.	Wants the story.
vi. 37.	<i>δηνάριον.</i>	Omits.	Omits.
xiv. 5.	<i>δηνάρια.</i>	<i>πολλοῦ.</i>	Wants the story.
xii. 14.	<i>κῆμσος.</i>	<i>κῆμσος.</i>	<i>φόρος.</i>
xii. 42.	<i>κοδράντης.</i>	Wants the passage (<i>κοδρ.</i> v. 26).	Omits.
xv. 15.	<i>φραγέλλώσας.</i>	"	<i>παιδεύσας.</i>
xv. 39.	<i>κεντυρίων.</i>	<i>ἐκαποντάρχης.</i>	<i>ἐκαποντάρχης.</i>

that the fulness of the Gentiles is, according to God's plan, to come before the gathering in of Israel. Of other similarities between Mark and Paul we may cite the curious parallel between Herod and John the Baptist in chap. vi. on the one hand, and Felix and Paul, Acts xxiv. 24-27. In what is said about giving offence (ix. 37-42 compared with Rom. xiv. 13-19) and in the teaching of Jesus about his death (cf. *λύτρον*, ransom, x. 45, with *ἀπολύτρωσις*, ransoming, Rom. iii. 24, "my blood of the covenant, shed for many," xiv. 24, and "whom God set forth propitiatory in his blood," Rom. iii. 25), a problem is presented to us, which we do not here attempt to solve. Was Paul's doctrine of the death of Christ based on words of the Saviour known to him from the tradition; or are the words of Christ coloured in Mark, and through him in the other Gospels, from Pauline doctrine? (See the commentary on the passages.)

On the whole it appears that the Paulinism of Mark does not amount to very much. What was said, p. 11, of the undogmatic atmosphere in which the tradition was developed can be applied with little subtraction to Mark's dealing with it. He handed it on, altered to some extent in style and arrangement but not altered in point of teaching, as he had collected it from the primitive Church and from his private sources. By nature, if we may judge from his book, he was little inclined to doctrine, but was rather literary and historical in his tastes and aptitudes.

If we question the Gospel itself as to its date, the apocalypse in chap. xiii. seems to afford a clue, as ver. 14-19 set forth a situation which may be placed just before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; the approach of the Abomination (see the commentary) and the flight of the Christians from Judæa belong to the year 70. The destruction of the Temple (ver. 2 of the same chapter) is predicted in terms which would scarcely have been used after it had happened; and this apocalypse, though some verses of it may be older and genuine, thus comes to have its date of composition definitely fixed. But it is not impossible that the Gospel as a whole may be later than the apocalypse incorporated in it. Much of the latter is Jewish in tone, and it may have been adopted rather

because the situation required an oracle of Jesus than because this oracle was specially fitted for the readers of the Gospel.

Another indication of time is to be found in ix. 1, where the words are placed in Jesus' mouth that some of those listening to him will not die without seeing the advent of the Kingdom. It is not said that many will survive to see this, so that the words carry us to a period when most of the immediate followers of Jesus on earth had died, and it seemed possible that they might all die before the event took place to which they had looked forward with such yearning. The prediction declares that the faith of the Church will not be so entirely disappointed. This would point to a time 40-50 years after the Crucifixion, when young men who had heard Jesus' teaching were from 60-70 years old. The words would scarcely be used much after this; and thus we have another indication, more positive than the last, that the Gospel was composed, if not before the year 70, at least not long after it.

4. Information about Mark, in the New Testament, and in Church Tradition.

So much the second Gospel, examined in the light of our knowledge of the Apostolic Age, tells us about itself, its composition, its aim, its tendency or want of tendency, its destination, and its date. It does not tell its writer's name, for the title is not to be regarded as part of the original work but was added when the Gospels were collected (see the commentary). But there was never any doubt as to the name to be prefixed to it. All tradition connects it with a person who is mentioned pretty frequently and in a great variety of connections in the New Testament itself, and with regard to whom we have also some patristic evidence. We have now to look at the reports about Mark and to compare them with what has been gathered from the Gospel itself about its writer.

Assuming what there is no reason to doubt, that there is only one person called Mark in the New Testament, we find that a good deal is known about him at various periods of his life. We first hear of him in Acts xii. 12 in connection with his mother Mary, who has a house in Jerusalem, resorted to by the Christians in the days of the Apostles. To this house

Peter repairs after escaping from prison. We are told here that the young man's name was John. Mark, therefore, was a Roman name assumed according to a practice of which the New Testament affords many examples. At ver. 25 of this chapter we read that Mark was taken by Paul and Barnabas to engage in the work of the Church at Antioch; till then he had lived at Jerusalem, and we have to think of his early life as spent among the Christians at Jerusalem where the Apostles were well known, and the traditions of the life and words of Jesus were native and current. How long he had lived there we cannot tell; we shall see that he was connected with regions outside Judæa, and the fact of his having a Roman name agrees with this; but his mother would scarcely have held the position she did in Jerusalem if the family had not been established there some time. The young man was further taken by Barnabas and Saul to act as their attendant (*ὑπηρέτης*) on their first recorded missionary journey (Acts xiii. 5); he was not to preach but to be useful in subordinate capacities. There was a reason for his adoption; we learn in Colossians iv. 10 that Barnabas and Mark were cousins. Barnabas, the elder cousin, who naturally summoned the younger to come with him, was a Levite (Acts iv. 36), but belonged by birth to the island of Cyprus. He had made a considerable sacrifice of property to the Church, and stood in high esteem at Jerusalem, and altogether was so situated that it must have been of great advantage to the young man to be associated with him. If Mark also was connected with Cyprus he would know Greek as well as the Aramaic of Palestine and would be a useful person on a missionary tour in Greek-speaking countries. On this tour accordingly, he traverses with Barnabas and Paul the island of Cyprus. But when the party turned inland into Asia Minor he broke off from his companions and went back to Jerusalem, an act not forced on him by any outward necessity, but the result of his own choice. It is vain to speculate as to his motives for this step, whether he was averse to travel and danger in unknown lands, or whether he had interests at Jerusalem which called him back.

There was no personal breach on his part, for we find him

willing, a year or two after, to join the same party again for a tour in the same regions (Acts xv. 36-39). He was now apparently living at Antioch; though he had left Paul on that former occasion he had not separated himself from the Gentile mission, and Barnabas proposes him to Paul for a companion. But Paul resented the young man's former defection too keenly to accept him again so soon, and so Mark disappears out of the history of that period. In Acts he is named no more.

We do not hear of him again for ten years. From his Roman captivity in 62 A.D. the Apostle Paul writes (Coloss. iv. 10), "There greets you Aristarchus my fellowprisoner, and Mark Barnabas' cousin; with regard to whom you have received instructions. If he comes to you give him a good reception." Mark accordingly is with Paul in his captivity, and is active in Church matters. In the sweet little letter to Philemon, also written at the same time, Mark along with others sends greeting to the Christian master whose slave is being sent back to him. Mark is living in Paul's intimate circle, and is going to visit Colossae, in what capacity we are not told; but instructions have been sent to that place, such as we often find in Paul's Epistles, defining no doubt Mark's position and errand, and indicating the footing on which he is to be received. In Philemon, ver. 24, he is named along with Epaphras, Aristarchus, Demas, and Luke, who are all said by Paul to be his fellow-workers. The situation brought before us in 2 Tim. iv. 11 is very similar to that in these two Epistles. There Luke is with the Apostle and no one else of his friends, and Timothy is bidden to get hold of Mark and bring him to the Apostle. The reason given for this is that Mark is useful to Paul for service. What service is meant, is not said; the phrase points rather to personal service of the Apostle than to employment in the Church at Rome, for which Paul was not responsible, or for travelling. While many scholars do not regard 2 Tim. as being in its entirety a work of the Apostle Paul, the passage referring to Mark, with the message about the cloak and the parchments, and that about Alexander the smith may be defended as being a piece of Paul's own writing, which has been made part of a later work. The impression given here about Mark is the same as that suggested in Colossians and Philemon;

he was a serviceable practical man, whose defection in the past the Apostle had long forgiven, and who on his part had not kept up any grudge against the Apostle for judging him so hardly at that earlier time.

The last mention of Mark in the New Testament connects him, not with Paul, but with Peter. And we are then reminded of that earlier part of his history when he was a member of the Jerusalem Church, and when the house he belonged to was a place of meeting for the brethren and the place to which Peter turned when he escaped from prison. In 1 Peter v. 13 we read, "The (Church or) diaspora at Babylon, elect along with you, greets you, and Mark my son." If First Peter is a genuine work of the Apostle of that name, these words would show that Mark was closely connected with him at the time when it was written. If the Babylon spoken of is Rome, as most scholars hold,¹ then Mark's connection with the capital of the Empire, indicated in 2 Timothy, is also indicated here, and we have to think that he lived on at Rome, with Peter for his chief instead of Paul; Paul having been removed by death or gone away on later journeyings, Peter having come to Rome, and Mark thus reverting to an attachment of old standing. That Peter calls him his son cannot in this case mean that he was a youth, for the Epistle cannot be placed earlier than 64, when Mark would be at least forty-five years old. If, as is often assumed, Peter calls Mark his son in allusion to the fact that he had first brought him to the Gospel when he was a young man at Jerusalem, the mode of speech cannot be considered very natural.

This, it is well known, is not the only difficulty bearing on the situation of 1 Peter. That Epistle speaks of persecution of Christians on account of their Christian name (iv. 16), and this can scarcely be placed before the reign of Domitian.² There is also the difficulty of connecting a work written in elegant and flowing Greek with an Apostle who, in addressing Gentile audiences, made use of an interpreter; that of the literary

Connection
with Peter.

¹ See F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, i. 1-ii. 17, pp. 5-7.

² Ramsay accordingly (*Expositor*, Oct. 1893) dates the Epistle about 80 A.D. Peter would at that time be about 80; Mark could not be less than 60. See Schmiedel in *Encyclop. Bibl.*, i., p. 761.

dependence of the Epistle on Romans, on Ephesians, and even on James; and that of the developed and popularized Pauline doctrine which it contains. However reluctant we may be to take away from the first of the Apostles the authorship of a beautiful and cherished work, the facts seem to indicate that the situation given in the Epistle is a feigned one, which at the time of the writing readers would easily understand. The Epistle contains nothing which specially points to Peter as its author; it gives no reminiscences of the life of Christ on earth, no allusions to Paul and his work among the Gentiles, on which, if it is genuine, Peter had now entered, no explanation of the writer's relations to the Gentile Churches, so different from those he had held formerly (Gal. ii.). A veritable work of Peter might have been expected to touch on these points. On the other hand the situation is composed of elements which are found in tradition at a later time and may have been in the memory of the Church of the end of the first century.

Church
tradition as
to Mark. Early Church writers introduce the second Gospel with statements about Mark and his connection with Peter; and these statements must be carefully considered.

Muratorian
Canon. By the close of the second century A.D. the belief prevailed in the Church that Mark's Gospel was written second of the four then recognized; and on the question of Mark's circumstances and his qualifications for writing such a work, it was generally accepted that he had been closely connected with Peter and that much of the contents of the Gospel was derived from that Apostle. The Muratorian Canon, a Latin document named after the Italian theologian who brought it to light early in the eighteenth century, but based on a Greek writing composed in the last quarter of the second century A.D., is mutilated at its beginning, and opens in the middle of a statement about the writer of the second Gospel. What was said about the writer of the first is lost; of the second we hear,¹ "among whom he was, and so set it down," or "he was present at some of the occurrences and so set them down." The first rendering yields the sense that Mark was, if not an eyewitness himself, associated with those who had been in that position, and that in this way he was qualified to write the work known to the Church as his Gospel. The second is the

¹ Quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit.

rendering of Zahn,¹ and appears to state that Mark was personally cognizant of some of the occurrences of the Evangelical history and that he therefore gave these passages of it a place in his work.

The document may have spoken of Mark's connection with Peter in some of the lines now lost. A number of passages from Fathers of the late second and early third centuries agree in stating this connection,² though they differ as to the details they give about it. Clement of Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14) tells us that when Peter preached in public at Rome, many of those who were present appealed to Mark who had long been his follower and remembered what he had said, to write it down and to hand the Gospel thus made to those who wanted it. Peter knew of this but did not assume any responsibility for what was done. Clement tells the story also in another way (Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 15) to the effect that the Spirit revealed these proceedings to Peter and that he was pleased and directed the work to be given to the Churches for reading. Of this, Origen, who followed Clement at Alexandria, has only the bare statement that Mark's Gospel was written second, and that he wrote it as Peter explained it to him (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25).

Irenaeus of Lyons states the matter somewhat differently, Irenaeus. saying that it was after the decease of Peter and Paul, that Mark, Peter's disciple and interpreter, handed down to us in writing what Peter used to preach. That Mark was Peter's interpreter we hear also from Tertullian. The earliest form of the tradition, however, and that from which the others are in all probability derived, is that quoted by Eusebius³ from a work written by Papias of Hierapolis called *Commentaries on the Oracles of the Lord*. This work is now placed by Lightfoot,⁴ who formerly dated it later, in the decennium 130-140 A.D. Harnack⁵ places it ten years later, Zahn⁶ considerably earlier. Papias.

Of this writer, it is true, Eusebius does not speak with any respect, declaring him to have been a man of small capacity,

¹ *Gesch. d. Kanons*, vol. ii., p. 19. Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernat. Rel.*, p. 189, gives, "at which, however, he was present, and so he set them down."

² Swete prints them in his Introduction, p. xviii. *sq.*

³ *H. E.* iii. 39.

⁴ *Essays on Supernat. Relig.*, p. 150; cf. *Contemp. Rev.*, vol v., p. 407.

⁵ *Chronologie*, p. 357.

⁶ *Einleitung*, vol. ii., p. 204.

and quoting from him various utterances as to the grapes at the Millennium, the survival to the reign of Hadrian of the persons raised by Christ, and other curious matters. This early writer on the Gospels, however, communicates certain pieces of information about Mark which are of extreme interest. He says that he heard what he put down from a person called John, John the Elder, or the Presbyter John. This person, whose statements live through Papias, is variously defined by scholars. Zahn, who places the work of Papias early, considers this John to be the beloved disciple himself. Lightfoot and Harnack, who place Papias later, consider this John to have belonged to the generation after the Apostles. He is coupled by Papias with a person of the name of Aristion, of whom we shall hear more, and who clearly belongs to the class of the followers of the Apostles; and he appears to have been a man of great weight in Asia Minor at the time of the first century. The passage of Papias is as follows:

“Mark, who had been Peter’s interpreter, wrote down accurately all he remembered of the words and acts of Christ, but not in order. For neither did he hear the Lord, nor was he one of his followers; he was a follower, as I said, at a later time of Peter, who arranged his addresses as occasions dictated, without any intention of putting together a complete statement of the Lord’s sayings. Mark accordingly made no mistake in thus writing down some things as they occurred to him; for of one thing he was most careful, not to omit anything he had heard, nor to misrepresent anything in it.”¹

From this recital, which is of such early date and so evidently genuine, we gather (1) that Mark had acted as Peter’s interpreter. The word used signifies one who translates, a dragoman, not a secretary or a mouthpiece. Mark must have assisted Peter to address people of whose language the Apostle was not sufficiently master. This points to Greek-speaking lands, in

¹ Of studies of this important passage there have been very many. Of the recent ones may be named: Lightfoot, “Papias of Hierapolis,” in the *Contemporary Review*, 1867, p. 397; Lightfoot, “Essays on the work entitled *Supernatural Religion*,” Nos. 5 and 6; Zahn, *Einleitung in das N.T.*, ii. 204 *sqq.*, 241 *sqq.*; Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 690 *sq.*; Link, “Die Dolmetscher des Petrus,” *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1896, p. 404; Rohrbach, *Der Schluss der Markusevangeliums*, etc., 1894.

which Peter was acting as a missionary, and Mark turned his Aramaic into Greek. (2) Mark wrote after this connection with Peter had come to a close, and Peter was no longer at hand to be consulted on the subject. What he wrote was, if not exclusively, for the words scarcely go so far as to preclude Mark's use of other sources, yet in great part based on his reminiscences of Peter's addresses.

There is much that is very singular in the form in which Papias brought these details to the knowledge of his readers. Praise and blame are mingled in his words. While Mark is defended against the charge of omission, inaccuracy, or misrepresentation, which seems to have been brought against him, for such charges are implied in the last sentence of the extract, he is expressly allowed to fall short in some respects of a perfectly satisfactory performance. It is implied that if he had been an eyewitness of the Lord's life, he would have been in a better position for doing what he attempted. That defect was no doubt made good to a certain extent. The post which he filled of interpreter to Peter could not fail to make him very intimately acquainted with what Peter had to communicate; yet on the other hand the mode in which he acquired his information was not adequate for the writing of a Gospel. Peter's addresses, by translating which Mark laid the foundation of his Gospel, were not arranged so as to form a connected narrative of Christ's life and teaching. They were directed to a different aim, and arranged according to what was called for on each occasion when he had to speak. And if the Apostle's teaching was thus fragmentary and occasional, this was reflected in the Gospel Mark wrote; it also was defective in point of order. It is suggested too that it was deficient in point of quantity. He wrote all he remembered. He made no mistake in writing down some things as he remembered them. These certainly are grudging phrases; the person who used them must have judged Mark's Gospel to come short of a standard, of which he was aware, of Gospel-writing. That work is not full, though it is correct so far as it goes; and it is not properly arranged; and this is due to its not being the work of a personal follower of the Lord, but only of the interpreter of one of his followers.

What is the standard thus applied to the Gospel of Mark, in comparison with which it is found wanting? The passage has little point if we think here of the Synoptic Gospels. The Presbyter could not think Luke superior to Mark in point of the position of its author; since neither was Luke an eye-witness, nor even Paul, whose follower he was. Nor could the first and third Gospels be thought superior to the second in point of order, for the order is substantially the same in all three. What Papias says about the work of Matthew, which he knew to have been written in Hebrew and translated into Greek, precludes rather than favours the notion that he would compare the second Gospel unfavourably with the first. "Matthew," he says, "compiled the logia (*i.e.* the oracles, or the stories containing oracles, or the narratives: the phrase admits of any of these renderings) in the Hebrew dialect, and every one translated them as he was able." This certainly shows no such high opinion of Matthew's work as to account for the depreciation of Mark. If, therefore, the Matthew and the Mark mentioned by Papias are our first and second Gospels, Mark is not here being compared with Matthew or with Luke, which for such a comparison is in the same position as Matthew.

Leading scholars agree that Mark is here being compared with a Johannine standard.¹ Papias belonged to a region where John the Apostle had lived and written, and where Johannine ideas prevailed.² Aristion, whom he couples with John the Elder and describes as belonging to the generation which knew the Apostles, is generally considered to be that 'Ariston' who is said, in an Armenian ms. discovered by Mr. Conybeare,³ to have written the canonical conclusion of Mark's Gospel. When we consider these facts, many things grow clear about the fragment of Papias. If the fragment came from the quarter where the fourth Gospel, or the type of treatment it embodies, was regarded with lively interest, such judgments as Papias expresses about Mark would naturally

¹ So Lightfoot, Harnack, Zahn.

² For the most thorough-going application of this principle, see the work of Rohrbach, cited above.

³ *Expositor*, Oct., 1893, p. 241; Swete, *St. Mark*, p. ciii. *sq.*

arise. In the opening words of the first Johannine Epistle ("That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we beheld and our hands handled, of the word of life. And the life was made manifest, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and report to you the eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested to us. What we have seen and heard we also report to you," etc.), we hear how much an eyewitness can do for believers, as if no one not holding that position could furnish a satisfactory account of the Saviour. On the question of order, the Johannine tradition is of course very different from the Marcan, and if the order embodied in the fourth Gospel was the right one, then the second, which omitted all the journeys to Jerusalem except the last, which did not mention the intercourse of Jesus with John the Baptist subsequent to the baptism, which named neither Nicodemus nor Lazarus nor the woman of Samaria, which had hardly any discourses, which made Jesus eat the Passover with his disciples instead of himself dying on the day when it was offered, was certainly not written "in order," and only comprised "some things." The fourth Gospel claims some authority on the matter of order, and often explains how right and necessary the sequence of events is which it observes. The miracle of Cana is the beginning of miracles (ii. 11), one of which Mark knows nothing. The appearance of the risen Saviour in Galilee, which Mark (xvi. 7) regarded as the first, the fourth Evangelist is careful to state was really the third; the Jerusalem Christophanies having preceded it, which Mark entirely ignores, or even implicitly denies. The views, therefore, which Papias reports from the Presbyter as to the composition of Mark, exactly correspond with what was to be looked for from such a quarter. And the close of Mark, added by a person belonging to the same circle, bears similar testimony as to what was regarded in Asia Minor as a shortcoming in the second Gospel. The addition of xvi. 9-20 by the Presbyter Aristion both remedies the abruptness of the end of the Gospel at xvi. 8 ("for they were afraid") and provides a statement about the Christophanies in keeping with the Johannine tradition. Instead of placing the first appearance in Galilee, it speaks of the meeting with Mary

Magdalene, which comes first in John xx. 11-18, and is in the neighbourhood of the tomb; then of appearances to the disciples at or near Jerusalem, as in Luke and John.¹

All this confirms the tradition of Papias and enables us to recognize it as a true reflection of what was felt and said about Mark's Gospel in a very influential quarter of the Church a little before or after the close of the first century. The tradition throws light primarily on the history of Mark's Gospel in the Church at a time when other Gospels, preferred to it then as now by many Christians, were making their appearance, but it also gives facts which may be accepted as to the composition of that work. It was remembered in the Church at this period, as it had been by the writer of First Peter, that Mark, connected in his early manhood and also somewhat later with the Apostle Paul, was afterwards connected with Peter, in the field of the Gentile mission. That he acted as Peter's interpreter is a trait which would scarcely have been invented, and the fact implied in the fragment of Papias that Mark wrote his Gospel after his interpretership was at an end and at a time when he could no longer consult the living Apostle but had to depend on his recollection of what the Apostle had said, must also be taken as true. A doubt remains, however, whether the picture suggested by Papias of the origin of this Gospel can be accepted in all its parts. Can we suppose that Peter's addresses, or the addresses of any Apostle at that time, furnished materials for a life of Christ? To judge from the addresses in Acts they certainly did not, and if the Petrine Epistle is added to these, it will make little difference. Teaching and Gospel-writing were two quite different things and belonged to different spheres of Church life. In a matter so obscure it is difficult to make out anything with certainty, but it appears as if Papias were here speaking according to a convention which required everything to come from an eyewitness, and regarded the words of an Apostle as a specially authentic source of Evangelical tradition. We cannot but reflect that the interpreter has

¹ It may be noticed that the Christophany in Galilee, if not embodied originally in the fourth Gospel, was afterwards added to it in the 21st chapter; it could not be left unnoticed, but was relegated to its proper place as third in the series.

opportunities of private intercourse with his principal, and that Mark may have gathered as much from Peter's conversation as from his public addresses. We have also to remember that Mark used written sources for his work; tradition did not preserve this fact, but it has now been brought to light by literary criticism. On this point Papias' account is certainly defective; he does not expressly deny that Mark used documents, but neither does he suggest that he did so. His story therefore is not to be taken as a complete account of the writing of the second Gospel, but only as a contribution, in the style of early Church tradition, to our knowledge of that undertaking. We may be sure that Mark regarded his reminiscences of Peter's information as a most valuable part of the materials he was able to command, and that he either made notes of what Peter said at the time of hearing it or set to work at once when the Apostle was removed, to write it down. With this he worked up the other sources he had collected, and so produced the work we know.

In this way arose the earliest and the simplest picture preserved to us of the ministry of Jesus. There was a time when the Church possessed no other, and it is by the careful and conscientious study of this one, taken by itself alone, as if we had no other, that we shall best understand this Gospel and then those which came, not long after it was written, to stand beside it. If Mark was the earliest Evangelist, then let Mark be studied as he is. It will be found, I believe, that the picture he draws is historical in the main. He shows a more purely historical interest than any of the other Evangelists and is much less distracted than any of them by doctrinal or social considerations. The freedom with which he uses his materials is not due to doctrinal so much as to literary impulse. He is not seeking to make his picture of Christ agree with Church doctrine so much as to produce a narrative which would confirm Christians in their loyalty to Christ and would also prove attractive to those outside. His materials were not so sacred and inviolable in his eyes that he could not touch them up and arrange them so that the light should fall on them in the way he desired. His successors also used this freedom, and in these cases changes are often introduced in the interests of doctrine.

They sought to express higher views as to the person of Christ than Mark had indicated. Not that the desire to elevate the person of the Saviour is not present in Mark also. His phrase 'Son of God' is enough to show this, for, as he uses it, it is a great advance on anything the narratives themselves contain; his assertion (chap. xiii. 31) that the words of Christ can never pass away, the trait that no man had ever sat on the ass used at the triumphal entry, the heavenly voices, and no doubt the story of the Lord's resurrection, which should have stood, but does not now stand, at the end of the work, all make in the same direction, and go to surround the figure of Christ with a light brighter than any of this world.

Yet on the other hand, there was much left for the Evangelists to do who should come after. The Christ of the second Gospel has no miraculous birth, nor any genealogy connecting him with David; he is not Messiah from the outset, but carefully avoids all Messianic assumptions till close to the end of his life on earth; he does not wield divine power, nor is he equipped with superhuman insight. His cures are achieved with labour and effort, so that it is a question if it is not breaking the Sabbath to do them on that day, and they are connected with a simple method of practice, not unknown in the country. The idea of a Being who can order anything he likes to happen in an instant, is not found in Mark; Jesus here secures his results by urgent effort and prayer, and sometimes cannot accomplish them at all. I have not used the word 'miracle' in this commentary, as it appears to me quite inappropriate to describe the 'powers' Jesus is here described as accomplishing.

The study of the Gospels is in some respects now entering on a new phase; the resources of scholarship with respect to them are receiving additions, new, not only in degree, but in kind. On the one hand the contributions of Aramaic scholars promise much. We are told that no one not versed in Aramaic can in future help in the understanding of the Gospels, and as Christ and his Apostles did speak that language, it is natural to think that we may come by delicate linguistic processes to know the very words they used, which in our Gospels are translated into Greek, and so be enabled to understand these works far more really than we now do, and to get rid of manifold mis-

conceptions now attaching to them. On the other hand textual criticism is at present in a position of unstable equilibrium which may soon be changed into movement in a new direction. From such continental scholars as Blass¹ and Nestle,² especially, we hear that the Western text must in future count for more than it has hitherto done, and that many readings hitherto treated as mere curiosities must now be seriously considered. Towards these movements, one who is no Aramaic scholar, and who does not feel called on to deal actively in textual criticism, must maintain an attitude of reserve, hopeful that solid results may be attained by them, but feeling that the Gospels, even as we have them now, present a fruitful field of labour. The reader of this book will find the principal proposals of Aramaic scholars noticed under the respective passages; and the important variants are also pointed out. The writer has followed Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort where they agree, in all but a few passages. Where they disagree he has exercised his own judgment as to the text to be adopted. For the sake of students, the text thus formed is printed, and textual notes are given to point out the more important and interesting variants.

A translation is also given in which evidence may be found by those who care to seek for it, that the various duties of a scholar to his text have not been neglected in the preparation of this work. Only those who have tried can know how difficult it is to forget, in translating the New Testament, the noble words of the Authorized Version; but if Mark did not write with a view to being read at meetings, a version approximating to the language of our own day may represent more correctly to the reader than the stately language of the seventeenth century, what the book was originally intended to be, and actually was, to its first readers.

Taking the text as he now finds it, and contenting himself meanwhile with the Greek words in which the Gospels have come down to us, the student who seeks to appreciate these books as works of thought, apart from dogmatic prepossession,

¹ *Philology of the Gospels*, especially Chap. xi. on the Textual Condition and Original Separate Forms of Mark's Gospel.

² *Introduction to the Greek N.T.*, translated by W. Edie, 1901.

either positive or negative, will find enough to do. I would not conceal my belief that the face of Jesus, as he actually was and spoke, strove and suffered, lived and trusted and hoped, has been to a large extent hidden from us by the theology we have inherited; nor my conviction that as earnest and truthful study reveals again his features, his spirit will enter with fresh energy into the life of his followers.

THE EARLIEST GOSPEL.

KATA MAPKON.

I.

I. Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [υἱοῦ θεοῦ],

According to Mark. This is the earliest form of the title standing in this place. "The Gospel according to Mark" appears in copies from the fifth century onwards. "Saint Mark" is found much later. The short title is not, any more than the titles of the other three Gospels, due to the writer, but belongs to the period when the four narratives of the life of Christ were brought together in one *corpus*. The general title "The Gospel" belonged to all the four; they were four versions of the one Gospel; and to each of the several narratives was prefixed as its sub-title the name of its reputed author. (See Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, § 423, Zahn, *Gesch. d. N.T. Kanons*, I. p. 150 *sqq.*, and *Einleitung*, II. 172, 220 *sqq.* Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 681 *sqq.*, considers this arrangement to have been arrived at early in the second century). The work came before the public at first without its author being named. The words "according to" indicate not the authority—else Peter would have been named here by early opinion rather than Mark—but the writer. It is the Gospel as Mark wrote it. The work itself is anonymous; the person of the author never appears in it.

The punctuation of the first four verses may be arranged in the following ways: (a) Full stop after ver. 1, which then becomes a title, while ver. 2-4 form one sentence; so WH. (b) Full stop after ver. 3, the first three verses being the title, and the narrative beginning at ver. 4 (so Tisch.). (c) Full stop after ver. 4, the four verses being one sentence of which "the beginning" is the subject, and "was" (*ἐγένετο*) in ver. 4 the verb. John the Baptist was the beginning of the Gospel.

If verse 1 is a title, was it added later, or is it due to the original writer? Dr. Nestle, now of Maulbronn (*Expositor*, Dec. 1894, see also his *Introduction to the Greek N.T.* p. 130, Eng. Tr. pp. 163, 261), supposes the title to be the work of a copyist, who took the "Here Beginneth" which stood at the head of this new book on the roll he was working at, to be a part of the writing itself, and proceeded to form a complete title. In that case the original work must have begun with the word *καθὼς*, "as." Though Harnack in his *Gesch. d. altchr. Litteratur* gives a number of instances of books which began with *καθὼς*, such a beginning is in this case highly unnatural. It is easier to take ver. 1 as part of the original work, and as the opening words of the writer's own title, in which he states the nature of his subject. He is to write about the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. To understand this phrase we must ask what was meant, when Mark wrote, by "the Gospel of Jesus Christ."

1. Gospel. In the Apostolic Age the word Gospel does not denote a book but a spoken proclamation. Only in the second century did the Lives of Christ begin to be called Gospels. The original Gospel was a spoken proclamation of the great Christian facts, the Messiahship of Jesus and the fulfilment of the promises in him. (So 1 Cor. xv. 1, 2). Paul speaks of more Gospels than one: "my Gospel," he says, Rom. ii. 16; "another, any other Gospel," Gal. i. 6, 9. The announcement of an Apostle was his Gospel; and it might contain some statement about the life and the commandments of the Saviour. (See 1 Cor. xv. 1-8, Acts x. 36-43, xiii. 23-32).

ACCORDING TO MARK.

I.

The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ (the Son of God),

But to the Apostles the earthly life of Jesus was not the main part of the Gospel. His life in heaven at God's right hand, his presence with his people through his spirit, and his second coming to judgment, these bulked much more largely in the preaching not only of Paul but of all the Apostles than his ministry on earth. (Cf. Introduction, p. 7 sq.).

For an exhaustive proof of this see Von Soden's essay on the Interest of the Apostolic Age in the evangelical History, in *Theologische Abhandlungen*, Carl Weizsäcker gewidmet, 1892. Zahn, *Einleitung*, II. 165, argues that Gospel of Jesus Christ means Gospel announced by Jesus Christ, and that the title here refers to the preaching of the Gospel by Jesus which begins i. 14. But this is straining the term.

His earthly manifestation was only the humble beginning of an act of God, the true meaning of which had become apparent after his death. It was only the beginning of the Gospel. (Cf. Heb. ii. 3). If our verse was written in the Apostolic Age, this must be its meaning. What Mark proposes to tell is how the

Gospel began in the earthly ministry of Jesus. Zahn, *Einleitung*, II. 221 sq.

1. **Jesus Christ.** The Gospel of which the earthly life is the beginning is that of Jesus as Messiah. That Jesus is Messiah, to whom the generations looked forward and in whom the day of salvation had arrived, this was the burden of the Gospel. Rom. x. 9, Phil. ii. 11. Not during his lifetime on earth did Jesus appear as Messiah, but now that he is made Lord and Christ by God, Christians think of him as living in glory with God, and apply to him the name of Messiah or Christ which he never bore on earth with ever greater confidence, so that it becomes no longer a title but his proper name. On the formation of this mode of speech in the Pauline Epistles see Sanday and Headlam's *Romans*, pp. 3, 4.

Son of God. The words *υιοῦ θεοῦ* were read here very early. If they stood in the original they must have fallen out through carelessness, which could scarcely be the case. They are more likely to have been added. WH place them on the margin; Ti. rejects them.¹

¹If accepted as part of the text, these words must be understood, like all the terms in this verse, in the Pauline sense. In the body of the Gospel Jesus is spoken of as Son of God by the demons, iii. 11, v. 7, and by the heavenly voice at the baptism, i. 11, and at the transfiguration, ix. 7. In these cases the phrase is an official Messianic title, denoting the representative of God who is empowered, like David of old, to execute divine purposes. It implies no doctrine as to his extraction or essential nature. In Paul, on the other hand, the Son of God is a heavenly figure, Rom. i. 4, Gal. iv. 4, who was with God before he appeared in the world, and has now been exalted to still higher honours than he enjoyed before. In this verse the words must express the writer's

own view of Christ's nature, and as he writes for Gentiles, only the latter, metaphysical sense of the phrase can be thought of. The doctrine of the Son of God could not arise on Jewish soil, but to Greek speaking people it presented little difficulty. Dalman (*Die Worte Jesu*, p. 223) shows that Son of God was not a Jewish title for Messiah, and that the Jews did not, like other nations, believe in the divine descent of their kings. This is directed against Deissmann, who suggests the "divi filius" of Augustus as an illustration of the Christian "Son of God." (*Bibelsstudien*, p. 166). The root of the Christian doctrine is undoubtedly to be sought in Jesus' own teaching as to his relation to God, and in Paul's development of that teaching.

The Baptist, i. 2-8.

2 καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ¹

‘Ιδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου,
3 οὐ κατασκεύάστε τὴν ὁδὸν σου’²

φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἑρήμῳ,

‘Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου,
εὐθεῖας ποιεῖτε τὰς τριβούς αὐτοῦ.

4 ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ὁ³ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἑρήμῳ⁴ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα
5 μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν. καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ
‘Ιουδαϊα χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμεῖται πάντες καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ’
αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἱορδάνῃ ποτάμῳ ἔξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν.
6 καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμῆλου καὶ ζώνη δερ-
ματίνη περὶ τὴν ὁσφὺν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐσθῶν ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.
7 καὶ ἐκήρυξεν λέγων, “Ἐρχεται ὁ ἵσχυρότερος μου ὀπίσω μου,
οὐκ οὐδὲ ίκανὸς κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ιμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων

2. As Scripture says: ‘as’ must refer to “beginning”; that word suggested to the writer not only the first act of the Saviour’s career, which was his earthly ministry, but also the opening act of that ministry itself. The first act of the ministry took place in connection with John the Baptist, and it was in accordance with prophecy. This was the case in two particulars; 1st, the principal figure was preceded by that of a herald, and, 2nd, it was in the desert that the herald delivered his message. Mark, who deals very little in prophecy on his own account, follows, in what he says about John the Baptist, the source which Matthew and Luke also use, and gives the same O.T. quotation, not from the Hebrew where the words “in the desert” point out where the road is to be made, but from the Septuagint where they indicate the place in which the voice was heard. In the O.T. the “Lord” whose way is to be prepared is Jehovah himself; in the N.T. application of the text, the “Lord” is Jesus the Messiah (Acts ii. 36). John, lifting up his voice in the wilderness, prepares the way for Jesus the Lord: thus is the prophetic saying found to tell of Christ.

To this quotation from Isaiah, common to the Synoptists, Mark prefixes another from Malachi; and as he does so without altering the formula of citation he comes to attribute to Isaiah the words

of Malachi. This error was removed by some copyists, who substituted for “in the prophet Isaiah” the words “in the prophets.” The Malachi passage was applied to John the Baptist by Jesus himself, in a discourse reported by Matthew (xi. 10) and Luke (vii. 27); see also Mark ix. 13; and thus it was Jesus himself who first suggested that John was his appointed fore-runner. Matthew and Luke do not give this quotation here.

The history of Jesus Christ, then, began in connection with John the Baptist. That it did so is a view found very early in the Christian tradition; cf. Acts i. 22, x. 37, xiii. 23 sq. In the fourth Gospel the history of Jesus on earth starts from the same point (i. 6, 15, etc.). It was to be expected that as the figure of the Saviour rose in importance, the beginning of his career should be carried further back; in Matthew and Luke we have narratives of the infancy, and John begins at the beginning of all things.

4. In the prophecy the wilderness was the desert which the exiles had to cross on their return from Babylon to Palestine. In the Christian application it is the rocky valley of the Jordan. Matthew describes the figure of the Baptist at once; Mark, following a literary habit we shall notice frequently, postpones the description. The work of John is set forth in

¹ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις.

² Add ἔμπροσθέν σου.

³ Omit ὁ.

⁴ Add καὶ.

[Matthew iii. 1-12; Luke iii. 1-18.]

As Scripture says in Isaiah the prophet,¹

2

“ See, I send my messenger before thee,
who shall prepare thy way.²

3

The voice of one crying in the wilderness,
Prepare the way of the Lord,
level the paths for him !”

John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness, preaching the baptism of repentance for forgiveness of sins.³ And there went out to him the whole Jewish land and all the people of Jerusalem, and were baptized by him in the Jordan river, confessing their sins. And John was dressed in camel's-hair, with a leather girdle about his loins; and he ate locusts and wild honey. And he preached saying, There comes after me he who is stronger than I, for whom I am not fit to stoop down and untie his

Christian terms. Christian baptism has repentance for its condition and is followed by remission of sins (Acts ii. 38). Forgiveness belongs in the N.T. to the Messianic Kingdom (Acts x. 43, xiii. 38, Rom. iii. 25, Gal. iii. 24, etc.). Does Mark (and also Luke; Matthew does not mention forgiveness here) mean that John's baptism pointed forward to the forgiveness afterwards to be realized through Christ? That is a forced interpretation of the words, and it is more probable that the Evangelist assimilated John's baptism to the Christian rite with which he was acquainted. John's baptism was afterwards regarded by Christians as defective.

5. **the whole Jewish land**, etc. The geographical expressions are vaguer than in Matthew, and the verbs are in the describing tense, so that we need not take the statements as if they contained statistics. We know from xi. 30 and the parallels, that the ruling classes in Jerusalem at least were little affected by John's preaching. Confession of sins was a feature of early Christian baptism (Acts xix. 18 and early Fathers). But among the Jews of later times also, confession formed a part of every solemn religious act.

6. The dress is similar to that of Elijah (2 Kings i. 8) and other austerer prophets; a rough garment of hairecloth, with a

rude belt. What we know of John (Matt. xi. 7-18) shows that it was quite in keeping with his character. Loensts were allowed to the Jews for food (Levit. xi. 22); yet one practising such a diet could be spoken of as one who came neither eating nor drinking.

7. The Baptist foretells the coming, not as the old prophets do, of God, but of a human personage, wearing shoes, to whom he regards himself as entirely subordinate; he is not worthy to take off his shoes when he arrives. It is the Messiah whose coming he foresees. If the Messiah is at hand, then judgment is near, and in Matthew and Luke the Baptist speaks of the judgment as one of the old prophets might. There is to be a baptism at the Messiah's hands also but a different one, namely, a baptism with the Holy Spirit. This brings out the contrast between the baptism of John and that of the Church. The difference consisted, as we learn from Acts xviii. 24-xix. 6, in the fact that John's baptism was without the Spirit; it was a mere lustration with water, while in the Christian rite the sudden afflatus of the Spirit and outburst of activity was essential. Cf. Gal. iii. 5, and many passages in Acts. It is to be remarked that in the Synoptic Gospels Jesus does not baptize, and that the gift of the Spirit is considered

¹ In the prophets.

² Add, before thee.

³ Or if καὶ be read before κηρύσσω, with most of the mss. (Tisch.): John appeared who baptized in the wilderness and preached the baptism, etc.

8 αὐτοῦ. ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἀγίῳ.

The Baptism of Jesus, i. 9-11.

9 Καὶ¹ ἐγένετο ἐν ἑκέναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἥλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβάνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανούς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτὸν
11 καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, Σὺ εἶ ὁ νιός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός² ἐν σοὶ εὑδόκησα.

in the New Testament generally as bestowed on the Church only after the Master's departure. See Acts ii. 38, etc.; John vii. 39. To the Christian of the Apostolic Age it is Christ who sends the Spirit (Rom. viii. 9, 10).

A few words may be said on the position to be assigned to John the Baptist. Jesus himself regards John as one who belongs to the pre-Messianic rather than the Messianic Age. He speaks of him as a prophet, as more than a prophet, as in fact the final figure of the prophetic line. But John is still outside the Kingdom. He is Elijah, and belongs not to the Gospel but the Law (Matt. xi. 1-14). Jesus regarded him with great admiration and sympathy; his message that the Kingdom was close at hand was a long step to the final declaration that the Kingdom had come; but yet he had stopped short of the true light.

In the Gospels there is a tendency to draw John the Baptist into the Christian circle. That tendency culminates in the fourth Gospel, where the Baptist shows himself acquainted with later Christian doctrine on the effects of the death of Christ, formally abdicates his position as leader of a religious movement in favour of Jesus, and speaks of the mysteries of the faith in expressions identical with those used by Jesus himself.

In the passage before us the process of the Christianizing of the Baptist has undoubtedly begun, and it was apparently the controversy as to Johannine baptism that set it in motion. For a statement of the early Johannine movement, and of its reflection in the

Gospels, see Baldensperger, *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums*, 1898.

9. The Baptism of Jesus. Up to this point we have had description, in imperfects; now comes narrative, in aorists. The preceding verses are preparatory to this one.

in those days. The statement of time is vague; it might mean while John's preaching was going on, or before his arrest (ver. 14), or before that period of the life of Jesus for which there is detailed information; but probably it is simply conventional (see Introduction, p. 20).

Nazaret is said to be in Galilee, as if for readers at a distance.

Matthew says "from Galilee," but he has spoken of Nazaret and explained where it was, already (ii. 22, 23). Luke simply introduces Jesus at the Jordan without saying where he came from.

Jesus is now introduced for the first time. His history and that of the Gospel begins, in the tradition followed by Mark, with John the Baptist. Of his earlier career Mark gives no direct information. Jesus comes from Nazaret: on his relations with his neighbours there see vi. 1-6; on his family, iii. 20, 21, 31-35.

And was baptized by John. It is not said that John knew him; he was baptized, so far as Mark indicates, just as any other Israelite who came to John; there is no mention of confession. His experience in the rite, however, was peculiar. Things happened to him, not as in Matthew and Luke outwardly, so that the bystanders could observe them, but to his conscious-

¹Omit καὶ.

²Or ὁ νιός μου, ὁ ἀγαπητός.

shoe-string. I baptized you with water, but he will baptize 8 you with the Holy Spirit.

[Matthew iii. 13-17; Luke. iii. 21, 22.]

And¹ it came about in those days, that Jesus came from 9 Nazaret of Galilee and was baptized in the Jordan by John. And immediately when ascending out of the water he saw 10 the heavens rent asunder and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him; and a voice from the heavens, Thou art my 11 beloved son;² in thee I have found pleasure.

ness, which made the baptism a great crisis of his life. This baptism was not what John's rite was in other cases, without the Spirit; but became the great type of the Christian ordinance, in which water and the Spirit are both present, and a new life under the power of the Spirit is begun.

10. He saw the heavens rent asunder. In Jewish cosmology there were seven heavens, solid hemispheres arched one above the other over the earth, each with its chambers and special contents. For an account of what was thought to be contained in each of them see the *Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, translated from the Slavonic by Morfill and Charles: Oxford, 1896. God is not named; only the voice, an instance, Dalman thinks, of caution in language, *Worte Jesu*, p. 167. Of course it is God who sends the Spirit and utters the voice, and He is conceived as seated in the highest heaven, so that all the heavens have to open in order to allow of this immediate communication.

The Spirit. What is the force of the definite article here? Surely the Spirit spoken of is that with which the Christian readers are familiar in connection with baptism. They have all when professing faith in Christ and being baptized for him experienced the mysterious power which entered into them as if from above as consecration and as energy (Gal. iii. 5). When Jesus was baptized, so Mark tells us, he met with the same divine influence, exercised in his case in its highest form. The occurrences were for him; as they are here narrated, it might be held that only he himself could tell of

them afterwards. He sees the vision, hears the heavenly voice.

like a dove. For a large collection of suggestions connected in one place or another with this bird see Holtzmann, *Hand-Commentar, ad loc.* It is evidently meant that the influence Jesus experienced was very real and living, but that there was in it no harshness.

And immediately. This phrase occurs very often in Mark, and is frequently seen to belong not to his source but to his own style. Compare, e.g. i. 20 with Matt. iv. 21; i. 21 with Luke iv. 31; i. 28 with Luke iv. 37. It gives the narrative an air of breathlessness, as if one event followed on another without any interval.

11. Thou art my beloved son. Jesus feels himself to be installed into a special office, not by his own act, but that of God. God claims him as His son in words like those of Ps. ii. 7, "Thou art my son"; Isa. xlvi. 1, "in whom my soul delighteth," where the person addressed is the representative head of the chosen people, or the faithful remnant of the people personified. The title is here as in these passages, not metaphysical, but official: Jesus feels himself, if the words are to be taken as expressing what he felt on this occasion, to be claimed by God and set apart from all other occupations, to represent God as the King had done, or as the Servant of Jehovah in Isaiah had done. The words, "in thee have I found pleasure," if expressive of Jesus' consciousness, would state the grounds of his being thus set apart, and might indicate that the official sonship into which he was now to be placed was

¹ Omit And.

² My Son, O Beloved.

The Temptation, i. 12, 13.

¹² Καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον. καὶ ἦν
¹³ ἐν τῇ ἔρήμῳ τεσσεράκοντα ἡμέρας πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ,
 καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.

Return of Jesus to Galilee, i. 14, 15.

¹⁴ Καὶ μετὰ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην ἥλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς
¹⁵ τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ λέγων ὅτι
 Πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ· μετανοεῖτε
 καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.

founded on the sonship of intimacy in which he had lived till now with God. Without the private religious life by which he had learned so as to be able to teach others, how God was to be addressed and served, and what was to be expected from him, he could not have heard the special call which now met his ear.

But it is doubtful if the word 'Beloved' can be taken in this way. In Hastings, *B.D.* ii. 501, Dr. J. A. Robinson shows grounds for thinking that it was, when the Gospels were written, a standing Messianic title, and to this effect is given in the varied punctuation under the text and translation. In any case we have before us here a statement placed by the evangelist at the opening of his narrative of what Jesus was. He has no genealogy or narrative of the infancy, but he here gives his readers to understand that the person of whom he writes is the Messiah, and was hailed in that capacity by a voice from heaven, *i.e.* by God himself at the outset of his career.

We shall see afterwards that Jesus, while feeling himself the object of a special divine call, made no public claim of Messiahship, and shrank from any external recognition which pointed in that direction, till near the close of his career. This Mark enables us most clearly to understand; yet he opens his Gospel with the symbolical narrative of the baptism.¹

12. The Spirit acts at once, impetuously as it is its nature to do. Under its influence Jesus wanders away from the

abodes and faces of men. He goes into the wilderness, a remoter district than that in which John carried on his work (ver. 4), a wilder tract than that in which a man might feed his sheep and even leave them for a while (*Luke xv.* 4), since the wild beasts are the only creatures he meets with there. Of this episode he must himself have told all that was really known; and there are words in the discourses which seem to refer to a great struggle he went through at the outset of his career with the great adversary of God and of all good (*Mark iii.* 27). Jesus shared the belief of his age in the reality and power of Satan; and his sojourn in the wilderness was to him a period of temptation at the hands of that potentate. But good spirits were with him too. The three statements that "he was tempted," that "he was with the wild beasts," and that "the angels waited on him," are not to be taken as consecutive, but as all alike descriptive of what went on during this period. Forty days this went on; perhaps the number is a round one; we have it in the story of Moses on the mount (*Exod. xxiv. 18, xxxiv. 28*), and in that of Elijah (*1 Kings xix. 8*). The writer must have been familiar also with the case of Paul, who after his conversion conferred not with flesh and blood, but went away to Arabia (*Gal. i. 16, 17*).

In Matthew and Luke this short but very suggestive narrative is supplemented with what may now be regarded as a parable telling of the question Jesus had to face in order to gain a clear view of the work he had

¹ On the Christology of Mark's Gospel see a very useful paper by Wilhelm Brückner in *Prot. Monatshefte*, Nov. 1900.

[Matthew iv. 1-11; Luke iv. 1-13.]

And immediately the Spirit puts him forth into the wilderness.¹² And he was in the wilderness forty days, being tempted¹³ by Satan. And he was with the wild beasts; and the angels waited on him.

[Matthew iv. 12-17; Luke iv. 14, 15.]

And after the arrest of John Jesus came into Galilee¹⁴ preaching the Gospel of God and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe the Gospel.¹⁵

to do and of the methods he felt it right to employ. In Matthew the ministration of the angels comes after the temptations are surmounted. In Luke the devil departs for a season—a dark intimation that he is to return. See on the Demonology of the Third Gospel, in *Critical Studies in St. Luke's Gospel*, by Colin Campbell, D.D., 1891.

14. The arrest of John is to be narrated afterwards; as a well-known event it is mentioned here to fix the time when Jesus came to Galilee to begin to preach. This statement implies of course that Jesus did not return to Galilee at once after the baptism and the temptation, but that a period, the duration of which is not defined, elapsed before he made this journey. Is this period to be filled up with the incidents detailed in John i.-iv. as having taken place in Galilee?¹ Before he came to Galilee he has, in the fourth Gospel, preached, baptized, called disciples, and been recognized as Messiah, all in Judaea. Of all this Mark knows nothing; and he certainly conveys the impression that the preaching and mission of Jesus opened in Galilee. There is no reference to any former ministry; the preaching is a new and surprising thing, it is the outburst of a new message by a voice not heard before, and produces extraordinary results.

It is after John's mouth is closed that Jesus begins to preach, and for this purpose he goes back to his own country. So Mark: Matthew states more expressly, supporting the statement from Scripture, that the beginning

of Jesus' preaching was in Galilee. John iv. 43 sq. appears to give as the reason for the choice of Galilee that Jesus knew his preaching would cause less sensation there than in the South. That no doubt was the case; the leaven of the Pharisees prevailed there to a less extent, and men's minds were freer and opener. It was by preaching that his work was to be done; he was to appeal to the mind and heart of his countrymen with his message. In outward form he was a prophet coming before his people with a word given to him. Mark undertakes to tell us what the burden of the preaching was, but we find his statement of the tenor of the original Christian movement (like that in ver. 1 of this chapter) to be expressed in Pauline terms. The shorter statement of Matthew "Repent for the kingdom of God is at hand," appears in Mark also; but several additions are made to it. (1) Jesus is said to have come to Galilee preaching "the gospel of God." That is Paul's phrase (Rom. i. 1-3, 1 Thess. ii. 8, 9, and other passages), and means with Paul the declaration on God's part through His ministers that He has now brought to fulfilment that which He promised before in the sacred writings. In the following summary of the preaching this idea is plainly present. It is introduced with *στι*, "that," as if the very words were given which Jesus used (so Weiss, *Marcusevangelium*, p. 53). What we find, however, is not a verbatim report, but a condensed statement of the contents of a course of public speaking. The preaching opened with the

¹ For an able argument to this effect see *A Study of the Saviour in the Newer Light*, by

Call of the first disciples, i. 16-20.

- 16 Καὶ παράγων παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν Σίμωνα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Σίμωνος ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ·
 17 ἥσαν γὰρ ἀλλεῖς. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Δεῦτε ὡπίσω μου,
 18 καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἀλλεῖς ἀνθρώπων. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀφέντες
 19 τὰ δίκτυα ἤκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. καὶ προβὰς ὅλίγον εἶδεν Ἰάκωβον
 τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτούς·
 20 ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα. καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς·
 καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδαίον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ τῶν
 μισθωτῶν ἀπῆλθον ὡπίσω αὐτοῦ.

declaration that "*the time is fulfilled.*" So Paul tells us, Gal. iv. 4, that when "the fulness of the time came," God did what was fit then to be done; in 2 Cor. vi. 2, he says, "now is the accepted time"; in Rom. xvi. 25 *sqq.*, he says that "*the mystery kept in silence for ages*" is now revealed. This thought implies the reflection of the Apostolic Age on the relation of Christ's coming to the Old Dispensation. The Gospel preaching could scarcely begin in this way. (2) The closing exhortation is peculiar to Mark; "believe in the Gospel," or to take the words more accurately, "be believers," or "have faith, on the ground of the Gospel."¹ Faith was to Pauline thinking the essential qualification of a Christian, and any summary of Christian truth would seem defective in which faith was not spoken of. This view is carried back to the beginning, and the Gospel is spoken of as the ground of faith in a way which was impossible at first, when men did not yet know what the Gospel was.

Deducting these Pauline additions, we find that Mark as well as Matthew makes Jesus open his ministry with calling on men to *repent because the kingdom is at hand*. This is the proclamation in Matthew of John the Baptist also (iii. 2) and the same words are put in the mouths of the disciples for their mission, Matt. x. 7. The Kingdom of God is not to be conceived as an external polity about to descend out of heaven upon the earth (see Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 75 *sqq.*); the phrase

does not denote an organism in space but indicates God's kingship, God's personal rule, which is to supersede all human and less perfect government. Matthew says "kingdom of heaven," Mark and Luke "kingdom of God"; but the phrases are identical, "heaven" being a phrase the Jews frequently used in order to avoid pronouncing the divine name.

The notion that God himself should rule over a people thoroughly converted and prepared to serve Him, is of old standing in Jewish thought and is found in Psalms and prophets. In Daniel (chaps. ii. and vii.) it gives rise to very concrete expectations, and in Enoch and other books of an apocalyptic cast, which were much read in our Lord's time, it assumes many curious forms. In declaring that God's rule was at hand, Jesus was saying nothing strange. The divine rule was the goal to which all the thought and aspiration of his people tended. The Pharisees thought to realize it by getting the law perfectly obeyed; to them it was still future; signs of its appearance would be given before it actually came. John the Baptist declared it to be very close at hand; but to him too it was a thing of the future. Jesus uses the same words about it as John, but their meaning is different to him; the kingdom is far more near and real. It is a treasure actually enjoyed, a force already operating. The repentance called for because the kingdom is at hand, is the change which will fit men to live with God for their immediate personal ruler. This

¹ πιστεύειν ἐν can scarcely be the same as πιστεύειν ἐπὶ or εἰς. In John iii. 15 the reading is uncertain, and if εἰς is retained it probably is not to be taken with πιστεύων. See Westcott

and Holtzmann on the passage. The verb is used absolutely in Acts (viii. 13, etc.), Mark xvi. 14, and often in the fourth Gospel.

[Matthew iv. 18-22; Luke v. 1-11.]

And as he was passing along by the sea of Galilee he ¹⁶ saw Simon and Andrew, Simon's brother, casting in the sea; for they were fishers. And Jesus said to them, Come after ¹⁷ me, and I will make you become fishers of men. And ¹⁸ immediately they left their nets and followed him. And he ¹⁹ went a little further and saw James the son of Zebedee and John his brother, them also in their boat putting their nets in order. And immediately he called them; and they ²⁰ left their father Zebedee in the boat with the servants and went off after him.

Jesus apprehends in a deeper way than John. See the Sermon on the Mount, and especially the Beatitudes.

In these ¹⁵ verses Mark gives all he thinks necessary in the way of introduction before he comes to his detailed narratives. His introduction is short not by abbreviation of the materials he uses —on the contrary, he adds to the common matter many touches of his own,—but by using few materials. The difference between him and the parallel writers is the absence of any speeches beyond those which are necessary for the story. See Introduction, p. 25 *sqq.*

i. 16-45. OPENING OF THE MINISTRY.

16. A prophet has **disciples** to receive and perpetuate his testimony (Isa. viii. 16), but he must surely have preached for some time alone, and to some extent consolidated his testimony, before he can commit it to disciples. Considering the position afterwards enjoyed by the disciples of Jesus, the circumstances of their call must have been of the greatest interest to the faithful. The story might be told originally by Peter, or by any of the Four. It stands here an isolated luminous incident; the connection with what goes before and with what follows is not clear. Matthew tells us that Jesus settled in Capernaum, and then speaks of his "walking" by the sea of Galilee; in Mark, if we took his narrative quite strictly, this incident would belong to Jesus' original journey to Capernaum. Has he met with Simon and Andrew before as the fourth Gospel tells us? Was he alone when he encountered them, or had he companions, perhaps even disciples, with him? We

cannot tell. The story, to do it justice, must be taken not as a part of a full and connected narrative, but by itself.

"Simon" is a well-known name, and Mark keeps it as he found it in his story and does not think it necessary to add that of "Peter." He is the better known of the two brothers, whether or not the older; Andrew is introduced as his brother. They are fishing from their boat, not far from the shore, casting on this side and that, the Greek word implies. Their call is no doubt abrupt, if they had not known Jesus before, but a prophet did act abruptly, and if the call was led up to, it might not have made so deep an impression on their memory. The words of the call explain the purpose for which Jesus wants them, and show the view he is taking of his own office. Jesus speaks as one who knows he has to persuade men; and these fishermen are to help him in that work. Men are to be caught, the means on which he relies are speech and moral suasion. Jesus then has made up his mind to further the kingdom by winning individuals for it and sending out others to help him to do so. These disciples are among the first of his trophies; he himself is the great fisher; already, before we have heard any of his discourses, we see him exercising such attraction that grown up men when he asks them at once rise from their trade and leave everything they have to become his followers.

19. The second pair of brothers are men who are to be heard of in the churches scarcely less than the first. They too are first seen in their boat, though they have not yet got to work. The nets

In the Synagogue at Capernaum, i. 21-28.

21 Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ. καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν
 22 ἐδίδασκεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν.¹ καὶ ἔγεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ
 αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἔξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ
 23 γραμματεῖς. καὶ εὐθὺς ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἀνθρωπος ἐν
 24 πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ καὶ ἀνέκραξεν λέγων, Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοι, Ἰησοῦ
 Ναζαρηνέ; ἥθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἴδαμέν² σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἄγιος
 25 τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ἐπιτίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων, Φιμώθητι καὶ

would not be mended in the boat; the adjustments were being made for fishing. The scene is flashed upon us in a few words; from the midst of their toil they rise up, to enter on a new course of life, and leave their father behind. Yet the hired servants are there to help him to carry on the work from which they are called away.

21. From here to ver. 38 is in form the account of a single day, crowded with many exciting incidents. Some of these incidents are given in Matthew and Luke, but in Mark they are accurately dove-tailed together in a way which neither of the other evangelists seeks to imitate, and have a precision and an air of reality as of a reporter who was very near to the facts. In Mark, moreover, this day at Capernaum forms the first act of the ministry, and to a large extent determines its subsequent course. Both in Matthew and Luke there is a formal opening of the ministry by a sermon before these incidents are given.

The entry into Capernaum (properly Capharnaum, Nahum's village) takes place apparently on a working day when the disciples have just been called. This is Jesus' first arrival, in Mark's view, at the place which is afterwards his headquarters, and it is his first public appearance there that is now to be narrated. The synagogue service when Sabbath came round gave him the opportunity of speaking, for the synagogue had no ordained class of preachers: the order of worship was fixed, and embraced

along with prayers the reading of lessons from the law and from the prophets (see Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div. II. vol. II. p. 82; Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. I. p. 443 *sqq.*). One known to be acquainted with the law as studied in the higher schools, or one who was believed to have a message, and was collecting disciples, was naturally invited to address the congregation. In the opening part of his ministry Jesus readily found such opportunities. What he said is not reported, but only the effect his preaching produced on the hearers. They compared him with their ordinary teachers, whose method was to give out a text and then recite the various comments made on it by famous predecessors. Jesus followed a different plan. He had a message of his own, of which he was quite sure, and which he delivered with conviction and enthusiasm. He acted not by authorities but by the authority of truth so known, so spoken. It may be noticed that little of the synagogue-preaching of Jesus is preserved. The teaching we have from him is either addressed to disciples or occasional; we never hear from himself in what way he opened his campaign, what kind of an address he made when speaking in a place for the first time. What we have shows him to us not as a preacher but rather as a man of action and of prompt decision. We can, however, infer with certainty from what we know of his manner, that his synagogue addresses were very simple, and that they abounded

¹ WH read εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν. The reading I have preferred involves a vulgarism (said by Wellhausen to be due to translation of the Aramaic, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi., p. 192), which appears again ver. 39, and which was removed, certainly very early, by the insertion of εἰσελθὼν.

² Or οἴδα, as in Luke. The reading is doubtful.

[Luke iv. 31-37.]

And they enter into Capernaum. And immediately on the ²¹ Sabbath he taught in the synagogue. And they were struck ²² with amazement at his teaching, for he taught them as one who had authority and not as the scribes did. And immediately ²³ there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit, and he screamed out, What business have you with us, Jesus ²⁴ of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? We know¹ who you are, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rated him ²⁵

in figures and illustrations which riveted attention, and the inner meaning of which could soon be discerned. The theme was the kingdom, the presence of God according to His promises, the removal of grief and suffering for all who embraced the message. The dominant note was that of compassion, but that of triumph went along with it. We know that he was able to address large crowds and to hold their attention, and we must suppose that he spoke with great energy, and appeared as one inspired.

With these very suggestive words does Mark begin his account of Jesus' public ministry. Appended as they are in Matthew vii. 28, 29 to a discourse of very miscellaneous contents they certainly lose much of their force.

23. The preaching had other results than those mentioned above. The word 'immediately' stands awkwardly in this instance; it applies to the verb 'screamed out' rather than to the verb 'was,' with which it is joined. "A man with¹ an unclean spirit" is introduced, without any explanation of the meaning of the term (see *Excursus* at the end of this section). The preaching has a very perturbing effect on this person, and he breaks in on the meeting with a succession of screams. It appears to be the first case of the kind that Jesus has encountered, and it has the peculiar feature that the outbreak of the demon is due to the preaching. As this case led to a great extension of Jesus' fame, it forms an important link in the narrative. The demoniac speaks in the plural number,

acting as the mouthpiece of the whole class of the demons, not because of his dual consciousness, as if he and his particular demon were two persons, but because his personality is entirely lost sight of; it is their speech, not his. And what the demons feel is that Jesus, who speaks in such commanding tones of the one true God and of His designs for His creatures, is threatening their power. If what he says is true, and if effect is given to it, then their occupation of this and their other victims is in danger; they will not be able to carry it on any longer. They have drawn their conclusions about the person whose overwhelming presence and address they have witnessed. He is a special representative of God, in fact, the Messiah. He represents a power with which they and the system they belong to are, and must ever be, at war. The kingdom of God and the kingdom of the demons are opposite, and there can be no dealings between them.

Thus it happens that the first recognition of Jesus as one endowed with a special mission and power comes to him from a person suffering from demoniacal possession. Persons so afflicted were peculiarly the victims of the mental and spiritual evil of the time. It was its want of a strong faith that made it so liable to be tyrannized over by the small fry of the unseen world; and we may possibly understand how the demoniac should be the first to discern the coming of a power fit to put an end to such disorders.

25. Jesus treats the demon as really existing, and at once takes in hand the

¹ The *εν* is that of instrument or accompaniment rather than of surrounding medium, as

Swete takes it (*Blass, Gramm. d. N.T. Gr.*, p. 123, Eng. Tr. p. 131).

26 ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ. καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον
 27 καὶ φωνῆσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐθαυμάζηθσαν
 ἄπαντες, ὅστε συνξέτεν αὐτοὺς¹ λέγοντας, Τί ἔστιν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ
 καὶ καὶ² ἔξουσίαν καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει
 28 καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ
 εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

work of exorcism, a task naturally belonging to a teacher of religion, and engaged in by other teachers. (Matt. xii. 27, the sons or pupils of the Pharisees practise it ; and Acts xix. 13, we meet with a set of itinerant Jewish Exorcists at Ephesus). Jesus has a **method** in such cases, which we observe here for the first time, but shall meet with again. Whether his method was similar to that of others who undertook to exorcise we cannot tell. He addresses himself not to the patient but directly to the demon, and he at once takes the upper hand of the demon, forbids it to speak or to go on speaking, and orders it at once to go out of the victim. On this occasion the method is at once successful. The spirit makes some protest against the treatment it is receiving, but it has to obey. It convulses the man, and utters a loud cry as it departs. With this spasm the patient's double consciousness is at an end ; he comes to himself, and is restored to society as a quiet and sensible person.

27. At this mighty act the wonder about Jesus breaks forth afresh in eager question and answer. The congregation, however, do not take up the view thrown out by the demoniac as to the person of Jesus. They repeat what they said before about the preaching, that it is characterized by authority ; it is not only a word but a power. This view never wavered afterwards ; it is attested for us even in the last days at Jerusalem. His preaching as well as his works proved Jesus' authority. Even the demons, the people of Capernaum observe, feel the power of his word. And he not only acts on them indirectly by his preaching ; he lays direct commands upon them, and they obey him. His reputation is all at once established, therefore, as one who can deal successfully with cases of possession ; and in a country where many were so afflicted this could not fail to

make him famous. He began to be spoken of not only in Capernaum but in the surrounding country. Those who were interested in any case of the kind had their attention drawn to him. No wonder, therefore, that from this point onward crowds follow him.

Luke alone reproduces this story, but as we saw he gives it a place in his narrative in which it has less importance than in Mark. He omits the demon's parting scream, and says the man was not hurt at the expulsion. The remarks of the congregation also are made much smoother.

Excursus on the demons of the Synoptic Gospels.—The story just dealt with is one of a number. There are five detailed cases in the Gospels in which Jesus is reported to have dealt with persons labouring under possession, and there are a number of general statements as to his action in this respect. The case before us is too deeply embedded in the earliest narrative of the life of Christ to be disposed of as unhistorical. The sequence of events depends on it ; the spread of Jesus' fame, which determined to some extent his subsequent action, was due to this occurrence. And the other cases also are so artless and so life-like in their details that they must represent real occurrences. It is an inseparable part of the tradition therefore that Jesus acted in this way, and that his reputation was increased by his success in such cases. What was the nature of the disorder he thus dealt with, and how did he deal with it ?

The terms used by the evangelists in describing the cases show what was the popular belief about them. "Demons," "demonized ones," is the usual phrase. The persons afflicted were thought to be possessed by a spirit, or by a number of spirits. These were beings not confined, as the animal spirit is, to the

¹ Or πρὸς ἁυτοὺς.

² WH punctuate διδαχὴ καὶ καὶ² ἔξουσίαν καὶ

saying, Stop speaking, and come out of him. And the unclean spirit convulsed him and uttered a loud cry and went out of him. And they were all amazed, so that they asked, What is this? A new teaching with authority! And he commands the unclean spirits too,¹ and they obey him! And his fame at once went out everywhere, into the whole surrounding region of Galilee.²

organism in connection with which it has grown up and formed its character, but capable of entering the body of a man or an animal, and leaving it again to take up its abode in another. Mary Magdalene had seven devils, cf. Matt. xii. 45; we are to meet with a man possessed by a legion; Jesus is said by his adversaries to have Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. The word "unclean spirit," which is used in many passages, adds scarcely anything to this. It does not imply any moral reproach against the possessed persons; there is no trace of the view on the part either of their neighbours or of Jesus that their affliction is due to their own sins; they are objects of pity, not of censure. Nor, on the other hand, are they entirely unclean ceremonially, since they frequent the synagogue along with their neighbours, and there is no evidence that they are avoided.¹

What was the nature of these cases in Palestine? This will perhaps never be made out with certainty. The information, while very graphic, does not afford a complete diagnosis of any of the cases. In no instance do we know all the symptoms, or with any fulness the patient's history, or his condition after the cure. The language of the evangelist, moreover, is far from precise, and varies with the growth of the tradition. Thus in Mark we hear of a "deaf and dumb spirit," and in

Luke of a "spirit of weakness." The facts clearly present are scanty, and are given in popular rather than scientific language. Yet something can be made out.

(1) It is not the case that the Jews with whom Jesus had to deal put down all maladies to the action of spirits, so that they had no other way but this to speak of ailments, bodily or mental. That is true of primitive therapeutics, and in the sacred texts of Egypt and of Assyria and Babylonia we may see how this view continued even in higher civilizations. Every malady was thought to be due to a spirit, and was to be treated by exorcism; there was a form of exorcism for the spirit of each ailment. The Jews of Christ's time are not at this stage of medical science. The Gospels report many cases of sickness which were not ascribed to demoniac action. Fever, palsy, blindness, deafness, lack of speech, are all spoken of in Mark in the terms we use ourselves; by Matthew and Luke other classes of ailments are suggested, which are mentioned in addition to demoniac possession; and we hear of physicians as well as of exorcists.

(2) In some of the cases the symptoms of known ailments appear. The sudden transitions from one mood to another, and the excited screaming ejaculations, suggest hysteria. The cramps in another case, and the convulsions which are dangerous to the patient's own life and

¹ Yet the term unclean is originally, in this connection, of ceremonial significance. Unclean, in Hebrew usage, means unqualified to appear before Jahve, and take part in His service. This disqualification arose in a number of ways, but very generally it came from some connection voluntary or involuntary with some other God than Jahve. The mourner was unclean, if we may follow the very acute argument of Dr. J. C. Matthes in

the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, July, 1899, because he was under the influence of the spirits of the departed and engaged in their service. The demoniac was connected with a hierarchy of spirits which was antithetic to Jahve; what had these spirits to do with Jahve's direct representative? A demoniac who dwelt in the tombs was manifestly in this position; but the same was true of every one in whom such a spirit resided.

¹ Or, A new teaching! With authority he commands even the unclean spirits . . .

² Or less likely, In the whole country surrounding Galilee.

Cure of Peter's mother-in-law, i. 29-31.

- 29 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθὼν ἦλθεν¹ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν
 30 Σίμωνος καὶ Ἀνδρέου μετὰ Ιακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου. ἡ δὲ πενθερὸς
 Σίμωνος κατέκειτο πυρέστουσα, καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ
 31 αὐτῆς. καὶ προσελθὼν ἥγειρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς χειρός· καὶ
 ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός, καὶ διηκόνει αὐτοῖς.

limb, suggest epilepsy. Where there is obstruction of hearing or of speech, and the demon is characterized accordingly, it may be surmised that a modern physician would have regarded these as mere accidents of the disease, and would have noticed other symptoms not so striking which yet lay nearer to the root of the evil. Not all imperfections of speech or hearing are attributed to possession; only those, it appears, which were accompanied by some other less understood weakness. We are not going beyond the facts if we say that the cases in which possession was assumed were such as the medical knowledge of the day did not fully account for, and in which there was something mysterious. Both in hysteria and in epilepsy the theory of possession is, where medical knowledge is not advanced, very natural.¹ The patient appears to have come under the power of another agent than himself. What more obvious where spirits are actively believed in than to say that it is a spirit that has entered him and is speaking in that excited voice so unlike his own; or that it is a spirit which has laid hold on him, and is twisting his limbs and even throwing him into dangerous situations? And where either of these complaints is accompanied by other infirmities, the latter will also be put down to the action of the spirit, which will then be described as deaf and dumb, or weak. Mental disorders will also be readily ascribed to the same agency.

(3) The theory has to be noticed that possession is a specific ailment in itself, not to be identified with any other. There is certainly some truth in it. The phenomena detailed for us in the Gospels have been met with, and are

met with to this day, in various parts of the world. Mr. Tylor says that the theory of possession and the rite of exorcism may be perfectly studied in India at the present day (see a paper on Demonolatry, Devil-dancing and Demonical Possession (in India), by R. C. Caldwell, in the *Contemporary Review*, February, 1876). A book on Demon Possession in China by Dr. Nevius, forty years a missionary in that country, gives a number of cases with careful descriptions of the symptoms and of the method of cure. The cases are closely similar to those in the Gospels; there is the same belief both on the part of the patient and of others that he is possessed, the same double consciousness, the same use by the spirit of the man's organs of speech, the same abrupt and crying utterance. By prayer in the name of Jesus rather than by direct command as in the Gospels, missionaries have relieved these sufferers, the spirit confessing the power of Jesus and departing. Dr. Nevius argues strongly, and with considerable learning, that possession by spirits really exists in China at the present day as in Galilee in our Lord's time and in many other regions and ages.

It is not perhaps necessary to adopt this view. Where the belief in spirits of a lower order is active, it is hard to set limits to the effects it may produce in human thought and action. The belief is itself a malady which, if acting uncontrolled, is capable of producing the phenomena in question. As other beliefs assume outward form and elaborate organization, so as to become great and apparently objective powers ruling men's minds, so this one. Thus it is not strange that it should act with

¹The same explanation is given of apoplexy in Jewish writings, and it is said that every malady falling suddenly on a man is to be ascribed to a devil. See Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes*

Judenthum, ii., where there is a large collection of matter illustrating Jewish belief in spirits and their action.

¹ Or ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον, see note on the opposite page.

[Matthew viii. 14, 15; Luke iv. 38, 39.]

And immediately on coming out of the synagogue he went¹ 29 into the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John. Now Simon's mother-in-law was prostrate with fever, and they 30 at once tell him about her. And he went where she was and 31 took her by the hand and made her rise; and the fever left her and she waited on them.

special strength where it is united with morbid physical tendencies, and we can also understand how ideas belonging to it may pass quickly from mind to mind in epidemic fashion. When knowledge increases it loses its hold; at a later stage it is limited, Mr. Tylor says, to certain peculiar and severe affections, specially connected with mental disease; when scientific medicine flourishes it is driven to remote and backward districts or classes; when a vigorous faith in the great God springs up, the belief in demons and their works shrinks away before it.

On the whole subject see Dr. Tylor's *Primitive Culture*, Chapters xiv. and xv., and his article on Demonology in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*; the chapter on Exorcists in Bingham's *Antiquities*, where patristic references will be found; *Demon Possession and Allied Themes*, John A. Nevius, D.D., 2nd edition, 1896. A paper on "Die Daemonischen d. N.T." in the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, Nov. 1898, by Th. Braun, who appears to be chaplain in a lunatic asylum, is an excellent study.

29. This is obviously Jesus' first visit to Simon's house; he has not seen this patient before. He must have spent at least one night in Capernaum before this, in other quarters; now Simon's house perhaps became his house [cf. ver. 36 and other passages below]. As soon as he entered it he showed how willing and how able he was to help in severe domestic distress. What precisely the ailment was under which Peter's mother-in-law lay prostrate we

cannot tell. Ague was prevalent in Palestine, and it may be indicated here. Jesus' method of cure is very simple. He goes up to the patient, perhaps entering the other room of the house to do so, takes her hand, and causes her to put forth some exertion herself, so that she stands on the floor like a person in health; she then acts as if cured, and performs the duty of waiting at table on the party which has come in. We shall find in other instances that Jesus does not cure ailments which are brought to him without calling on the patients to put forth some exertion, and so to co-operate with him towards their recovery.

The process is accordingly quite natural; but the evangelist says, after telling how the patient got up, 'and the fever left her.' The cure was regarded as a work of power wrought by the great teacher, as a proof never to be forgotten of his greatness and his kindness. In Matthew the cure is accomplished by a touch, the method used in Mark in a case of leprosy; in Luke the fever is rebuked, as if it were a demon.

32. We were told that in consequence of the scene in the synagogue the fame of Jesus went out into the surrounding country. We now see what an impression had been produced in the town itself. All the town has heard of the expulsion of the demon, and the cure effected in the house of Simon and Andrew has no doubt also become famous. The neighbours leap to the

¹ With the variant 'they went.' If this reading be adopted, we have Jesus spoken of with a party of others among whom James and John are not counted, and probably not Simon and Andrew. The party who enter Capernaum, ver. 21, embraces these four disciples with the Master, and if the plural is read in this verse, it must be supposed to have embraced others besides these. The reading adopted, that of the Vatican ms., and practically also of Codex Bezae, yields a much clearer narrative. See Nestle, *Introduction*, Eng. Tr., pp. 262, 265.

Cures in the evening, i. 32-34.

32 Ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης, ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος, ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν
 33 πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας καὶ τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους· καὶ ἦν
 34 ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν· καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν
 πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις νόσοις, καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ
 ἐξέβαλεν καὶ οὐκ ἤφιεν λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια, ὅτι ἥδεισαν αὐτὸν.¹

Jesus leaves the house before daybreak, i. 35-39.

35 Καὶ πρωὶ ἔννυχα λίαν ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς ἕρημον
 36 τόπον κάκει προσῆχετο. καὶ κατεδίωξεν αὐτὸν Σίμων καὶ οἱ
 37 μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εὑρον αὐτὸν καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ὅτι Πάντες
 38 ἤητούσιν σε. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ἄγωμεν ἀλλαχοῦ εἰς τὰς ἔχομένας
 39 κωμοπόλεις, ὥντα καὶ ἑκεῖ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον. καὶ
 ἥλθεν κηρύστων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν
 καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων.

conclusion that the teacher who has done these works can do others too; that he must have command over disease of every kind. Their eagerness quickly rises to take advantage of the opportunity which has presented itself. Humble folk cannot ask a great prophet who has such a gift to visit patients in their houses. A centurion might do so, or a member of a synagogue, but others must take the shorter plan of carrying their patients to him. It is the Sabbath, and they are forbidden for some hours to do such an act of labour, but evening comes on, and when the sun sets the Sabbath is at an end, and they can set out. Simon's house, if it was like Eastern houses generally, presented a long wall to the street with no opening in it but the door, and that not a large one. Around this door there is now a great crowd made up of little parties, each of a sick person with those who had carried or supported him to the spot. It is specially mentioned that the victims of possession were brought. So when the people of the house looked out they recognized every neighbour they knew to have a case of sickness in his household—all the sick in the town seemed to have been brought together, crowding to the door.

The disciples remembered that Jesus

on this occasion treated many, and that the cases he dealt with were of various kinds. It is not said whether all were cured who were brought, only that Jesus went on for a long time doing what was asked of him. As we are not told what the complaints were which he was asked to deal with, nor what methods he employed, we are not able to judge what actually took place, but only know that those who reported the scene believed that Jesus responded to every claim that was made on him, and that his power proved equal to every demand. With those labouring under possession he deals as before. Among persons of this class too his fame has spread as by a spiritual epidemic. They all know that he has power over the possessing spirits, and regard him as specially commissioned to attack them. Persons suffering from that disorder are apt to come out with things they might be expected to wish to conceal (see Dr. Nevius for this), and so as soon as Jesus turns towards them they shout out what they think about him just as the demoniac in the synagogue did. But he takes the upper hand of them as before, and will not let them come to speech. He does not desire such fame or greatness as they thrust upon him.

¹ Add χριστὸν εἶναι.

[Matthew viii. 16, 17; Luke iv. 40, 41.]

But when evening was come, when the sun set, they ³²
brought to him all those who were sick, and those who were
possessed. And the whole town was gathered together at ³³
the door. And he cured many who were sick with various ³⁴
illnesses, and cast out many demons, and he did not allow the
demons to speak, because they knew him.¹

[Luke iv. 42-44.]

And early in the morning, when it was still dark, he rose ³⁵
and went out and went away to a solitary place and there
prayed. And Simon followed him up, and those with him, ³⁶
and they found him and say to him, They are all looking for ³⁷
you. And he says to them, Let us go elsewhere, to the ³⁸
neighbouring country towns, I must preach there also; for that
was what I came out for. And he went and preached in their ³⁹
synagogues throughout Galilee, and cast out the demons.

Neither in Luke nor in Matthew is this narrative by any means so graphic as in Mark. In our Gospel there is a double statement of time; first the general one, when evening came, then the particular one of the moment, sunset, when it became permissible to enter on such labours. Matthew keeps one of these phrases, Luke the other. Matthew goes on to say that many possessed persons were brought, and that he expelled the spirits with a word and cured *all* the sick; Luke that many were brought suffering from various diseases and that he cured them, laying his hands on each individually (cf. for this action the case of the leper, Mk. i. 41, the request of Jairus, v. 23, also vii. 32, and many passages in Acts), moreover that there were many demoniacs on the spot, crying out that he was the Messiah; and that he enjoined silence on them, while many of the demons were expelled.

Matthew finds in this activity a fulfilment of prophecy; the words he quotes from Isa. liii. are applied, as is usual in such cases, in a different sense from that of the prophet quoted.

35. Jesus is dissatisfied with the turn things have taken; for what reason we shall see directly. Before the crowd can collect again in the morning, and before his friends, who, no doubt, are delighted with the events of last night, can interfere with his liberty of movement, he is up and out of the town. He goes to a place where he will be undisturbed, and there spends some time in prayer. In the meantime the people in the town are bent on seeing him again. They naturally inquire at Simon's house, where they had last seen him. Simon, who must be the original teller of this story, finds that his guest has fled (or, if Jesus had not stayed in his house at night, that he is not to be found in the town), and on inquiring hears that he has been seen early in the morning on some road or at some spot not far away; or perhaps he already had a favourite haunt in the neighbourhood of Capernaum, and they knew where it was, and at once went there. At all events, the friends came up to Jesus some time after his departure. They want him to go back with them at once. Every one wants him they say; as if, when he knows how

¹ Add, to be Messiah.

Cure of a leper, i. 40-45.

40 Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονι-
 41 πετῶν λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι Ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι. καὶ
 σπλαγχνισθεὶς¹ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἥψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ,
 42 Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα καὶ
 43 ἐκαθερίσθη. καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν καὶ

much he is wanted, he could do nothing but go back with them at once to take up again the scene of last evening. But his thoughts are quite different from theirs. His prayers, if they had reference to the situation in which he had found himself at Capernaum, had only confirmed the decision which had prompted his early flight. He had come out in order to continue the work of preaching in the neighbouring towns.¹ Preaching was his real work, the work in which soon after his baptism he had come to see that his true mission lay, and in which he had called his disciples to assist him. It was natural that a powerful teacher and one with such a gift of sympathy as he had should be applied to for works of healing; but he did not feel that that activity lay so directly in his way as preaching did; it must not be allowed, at least, to interfere with his preaching. Nor must Capernaum monopolize him; he has a duty to the country and to other villages. He persists, therefore, in his resolution, and summons the disciples to come with him and help him to give effect to it. A tour in Galilee ensues, in which he devotes himself to the regular task of preaching in the synagogues discourses which are not preserved. One act of healing is spoken of in connection with this tour, but no extended or general activity of that kind. With cases of possession, however, he was always ready to deal; these he considered as belonging to his mission, and also to that of his disciples. The charge he gave to the disciples when he sent them out must reflect what he felt to be the nature of his own duty (iii. 15). They were to be sent out to preach and to have power to cast out demons (cf. also vi. 7).

Matthew omits this incident, which exhibits Jesus in a position of difficulty; Luke changes its tenor to make it more worthy of the Saviour's dignity. With him it is after daybreak when Jesus sets out; it is not the disciples who pursue him, but the multitudes who come streaming out of the town to prevail on him not to leave them. He excuses himself by appealing to his heavenly mission; not saying, as in Mark, "this was what I came out for," but "this is what I was sent for," and stating the object more definitely, "to preach the kingdom of God." The statement that Jesus preached in the synagogues of Galilee meets in the parallels a curious fate. In Luke the word "Galilee" is changed in a reading adopted by WH, but not by Tisch., into "Judæa." In Matthew the statement is expanded into a general description of Jesus' activity and of the widespread sensation it caused; after which follows the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew's inauguration of the ministry, as the scene in the synagogue at Capernaum is that of Mark. Then he comes back to the story of the leper which follows here in Mark.

40. An incident is narrated which belongs to the position Jesus has now taken up, and which leads to further important consequences in the development of his career. He has withdrawn from impertinent requests to do cures, and is restricting himself to preaching and casting out demons. Now, however, while he is engaged in the missionary journey spoken of in ver. 39, an appeal is made to him to break through that restriction. The appeal is made in the presence of other people, where, of course, the leper ought not to have been

¹ Lit. village-towns. Galilee was thickly studded with large villages and towns.

¹ ὁργισθεὶς. For this reading, see Nestle, *Introduction*, Eng. Tr., p. 262, where evidence and argument are given for it.

[Matthew viii. 1-4; Luke v. 12-16.]

And there comes to him a leper, appealing to him and going down on his knees to him, with the words, If you will, you can cleanse me. And he was moved with compassion¹ and stretched out his hand and touched him; and he says, I will, be cleansed. And immediately the leprosy departed from him and he was cleansed. And he addressed him sternly and

(ver. 43, he put him out or drove him away). It is made, moreover, in a humble and affecting way. The leper has heard of Jesus' curing, not leprosy indeed, but other complaints, and has conceived the bold thought that even his disease, generally so incurable, may not be beyond the power of the great teacher. It is a question, he conceives, not of Jesus' power but of his will. He has not been doing any cures of late; he appears unwilling to put forth his power in that way. If he would change his mind, if he would but choose, the leper is sure he could deal with his complaint and make him clean.

Jesus is moved by the appeal,¹ puts out his hand in a way to be seen by all, and touches him, then pronounces the word the man had asked for: "I will; be cleansed," and the man is cured. Immediately, we read, the leprosy departed from him and he was cleansed. But the story does not end here. Jesus apparently is not pleased with what has taken place, and turns against the man he has just befriended, attacks him with forcible words and hurries him not out of the building though the words allow such an interpretation, but away from the company. What is the reason of this sudden change? Is he angry because the man has come where he ought never to have been and has brought his loathsome disease in dangerous contact with healthy persons? His words suggest nothing of that kind. What agitates him is, to judge from his demeanour, the apprehension that now he will be spoken of throughout the country as one who is able to cure leprosy without any troublesome formalities, and that all the lepers far and near will be brought to him. He orders

the man to say nothing of what has taken place. He is not to say that Jesus cured his leprosy. Jesus will give him no certificate of health, that indeed is plainly impossible. The man must go through the regular procedure to get a clean bill of health—he must take the journey to Jerusalem, apply to the priest, offer the sacrifice prescribed in Levit. xiv., get his certificate and then, and only then, presume to act as one who is cured, and associate with his neighbours.

Evidently the story, if this is the correct interpretation of it, is surrounded with great difficulties. It is difficult to understand how a man in a state of active leprosy could come close up to Jesus. In Luke xvii. 11-19 the lepers remain at a distance. The cure far transcends any other exercise of power yet reported about Jesus. To change diseased skin and ulcerous flesh all at once into natural and healthy skin and flesh in which the blood is flowing freely, is an act we can so little represent to ourselves that we are led to wonder whether this is really what the evangelist intends to convey. If Jesus, moreover, did such an act, how are we to account for his agitation after it was done, and, if the variant is adopted, also before it was done, and why did he desire to keep it secret?

These difficulties may be met by supposing, as the words of the story, with the exception of one phrase, allow us to do, that the case was not one of active leprosy but of a cure begun but still doubtful and needing attestation. The word translated 'make clean' is used in the LXX. of Levit. xiii. xiv. of the act of the priest in certifying that a cure has taken place and that the

¹ One ancient MS. says he was enraged.

¹ Or, anger.

λέγει αὐτῷ, Ὅρα μηδὲν μηδὲν εἴπῃς, ἀλλὰ ὑπαγε σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ιερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ἂ προσέταξεν
 45 Μωϋσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. ὁ δὲ ἔξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, ὥστε μηκέτι αὐτὸν δύνασθαι φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἔξω ἐπ’ ἐρήμους τόπους ἦν, καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν.

Cure of a Paralytic, ii. 1-12.

- 1 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναούμ δι' ἡμερῶν ἤκουσθη ὅτι
 2 ἐν οἴκῳ¹ ἐστίν. καὶ συνήχθησαν πολλοὶ ὥστε μηκέτι χωρεῖν

former leper may now return to society. The word also occurs in Acts x. 15, xi. 9 of the act of declaring, rather than making, clean.¹ In Luke ii. 22, *καθαρισμός* is *ritual* cleansing. If we adopt this rendering, then the leper of the story is on the way to recovery but withheld by some cause, whether a doubtful symptom in his bodily state or some external difficulty, from getting himself restored to the community. In this painful situation he comes to Jesus with the entreaty that he would remove the doubts surrounding his case and enable him to be recognized as clean. Jesus by stretching out his hand and touching the suppliant not only shows personal sympathy with him but treats him as clean and declares he is to be received. But he requires the man to go through the regular procedure for his restoration. He is not to say that Jesus cured him but to obtain a certificate of his cure in the ordinary way.

The words, as we said, appear to admit of this interpretation. This narrative, like others in the Gospel, is at first sight very simple, but proves on examination to be ambiguous and perplexing. On the whole, however, we cannot escape the conclusion that the story is meant to tell not of a declaration of cure but of the cure itself. Jesus' act in touching the leper must

be interpreted according to such texts as v. 23, vi. 5, viii. 22, 23, where touching with the hand is a part of healing method. In 2 Kings v. 11, Naaman says that Elisha ought to have waved his hand over the place (Kautzsch however in his new translation of the O.T. disputes this rendering of the words); and in considering touch as curative² (see also 2 Kings iv. 34, and passages in Acts) early therapeutics were doubtless guided by sound instinct. Again, the sensation caused by this occurrence seems to be greater than would be caused by a mere declaration. What the man told to everyone he met must have been that Jesus had cured him. It is true that the words "the leprosy departed from him" may be based on inference more than observation; but the inference is confirmed by the man's own behaviour. It is therefore a cure that Mark here has in view.

Matthew's narrative is simpler and, we must judge, more original; he does not mention any agitation on Jesus' part, and while the touch is evidently regarded as healing, the procedure is closely analogous to that of the other cure of leprosy mentioned in the Gospels, Luke xvii. 11-19. In the latter case all that Jesus does when appealed to by the ten lepers, is to tell them, as they stand at a distance, to go and

¹ For the use of the word in the ritual sense see Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 43, where inscriptions are quoted.

² In the newly discovered Mimambi of Herondas, iv. 18, Kokkale addresses the Gods,

especially Paian, in the temple of Asclepius, when bringing her offering of a cock, with the words, "It is payment for the cure, for thou, Lord, hast wiped away our sickness with the gentle laying on of thy hand."

at once turned him off, and says to him, See that you say 44 nothing about it to any one, but away with you, show yourself to the priest, and present for your cleansing the offering Moses prescribed, that people may have the notification. But 45 he, on going off, began to publish it busily and to speak of the affair¹ far and wide, so that he could no longer openly enter a town, but stayed in the country in uninhabited places, and people came to him from every quarter.

[Matthew ix. 1-8; Luke v. 17-26.]

And after some days had elapsed he came back to Capernaum, and the report spread that he is in the house.² And a

show themselves to the priests. As they went, it is said, they were cured. The treatment of leprosy is spoken of generally as a feature of the earliest Gospel ministry, Matt. x. 8, xi. 5; but in these passages it is mentioned along with the raising of the dead which was not an ordinary feature of the ministry and is perhaps to be understood in a metaphorical sense. The absence of all details about the cases and the vague language of the evangelist make it impossible to determine what that treatment was. To all appearances it was extremely simple. In the Apostolic Age this is no longer reckoned among the gifts of the Church.

45. Mark's use of this story as a step in the narrative is all his own. In Matthew and Luke it sits loosely; here it springs out of what has been told and prepares for what is to come. Jesus has turned away from healing to preaching, and has fled from the scene where cures were demanded of him to towns where he might preach without such interruption. But the leper's appeal has taken him, against his will, back to healing again and to the public excitement to which the cures gave rise. His plans are crossed; he could not be seen to enter a town without being mobbed by people bringing to him their sick and their possessed. And even when he stayed outside the towns in unfrequented spots, he was found out, and became the centre of a throng.

We thus find that Mark applied his materials with considerable skill. The stories he recounts he found ready to

his hand, but he told them in a new style, colouring them with phrases of his own, such as "immediately," "rated him," "had compassion on him," "addressed him sternly"; and he placed them in a new order. Some he alone gives us; Matthew and Luke for reasons easily divined did not think fit to use them. In those narratives which Peter was in a position to communicate as hardly any one else was, we recognize a very primitive tradition and are on firm historical ground; and the story of the sensation caused at first by Jesus preaching and acts and of his consequent embarrassment, must be very early.

ii. 1.-iii. 6. GROWTH OF OPPOSITION.

We now come to a section of the narrative in which the three Synoptists accompany each other very closely. It consists of a set of narratives of encounters Jesus had with various critics and adversaries. These stories are similar in length and in arrangement, a short narrative leading up to a saying of Jesus which concludes the section and forms its point. In form and also in spirit these sections are very similar to those giving the encounters at Jerusalem in the last days (Mark xii. 13-44 and parallels), and each set concludes with a statement that Jesus' enemies concerted plans to rid themselves of him (cf. iii. 6 and xii. 12). In substance also there is a resemblance between the two collections; the questions discussed are such as must have been agitated in the Apostolic Age. In the present

¹ Or, to publish the word.

² Home.

3 μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν, καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον. καὶ
 ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ¹
 4 τεσσάρων. καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι προσενέγκαι¹ αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον
 ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν, καὶ ἐξορύξαντες χαλῶσι τὸν
 5 κράβαττον ὅπου ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο. καὶ ιδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς
 τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, Τέκνον, ἀφίενταί σου αἱ
 6 ἀμαρτίαι. ἥσαν δέ τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι καὶ
 7 διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, Τί οὗτος οὕτως λαλεῖ;
 βλασφημεῖ τίς δύναται ἀφίεναι ἀμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός;

instance the questions illustrated are the Christian forgiveness of sins without any formalities, the Christian treatment of sinners, fasting, and the keeping of the Sabbath. In the later collection the early Christians found direction as to their relation to the civil power, the arrangements to be expected at the Resurrection, the great commandment in the new religion, and the nature of the Messiahship of Jesus. All these questions alike receive discussion in the Pauline Epistles. The collections before us may therefore have been formed with an eye to the needs of Christians in the Church; and the fact that the three Synoptists incorporate them with so little variation shows that the collection existed early. Matthew and Luke do not always follow Mark so closely; but what they found in Mark here was matter with which they were already acquainted, and about which they had no hesitation. If this view is correct, then the exact place of each of these pieces in the biography of Jesus cannot now be fixed. In the second Gospel the collection is skilfully connected with the narrative already given—a connection which Matthew and Luke do not try to reproduce. See Introduction, p. 22 sq.

1. The story existed originally in a detached form; and may have begun with a statement that Jesus was "in the house" when the incident took place, the house being the typical situation as other situations are typified in the phrases, "to the sea," "in a synagogue," "up the mountain." In Mark's narrative the reader naturally thinks of Simon's house, though the phrase is still a vague one and means no more than "indoors." We heard why Jesus

left the house and the town before, and we know what is to be expected if he comes back. He could not enter a town by day, we were told; he must therefore have entered Capernaum by night. But his return is not a secret long; the report soon gets abroad that he is in the house, and the house where he is staying is soon crowded with an eager throng; the room, both rooms perhaps, we can scarcely think of more, are crowded and so is the doorway; and as all these people have come to him expecting something at his hands, he gives them what he has, he preaches the word to them. That is the position of affairs when the incident takes place which is now to be spoken of.

Matthew (ix. 1) does not mention the house at all, but only the return to Capernaum; with him the incident may have taken place in the open air (ver. 7 the paralytic "went away," not "went out"). With Luke we have the story of the house and its roof as in Mark, and in the house is established a great and formidable company of holy men and teachers of religion, gathered from the villages of Galilee and also from distant Judaea and from Jerusalem.

3. The preaching is not long undisturbed. A case is brought to Jesus now which had not been brought to him in time when he was at Capernaum before. The patient is spoken of as a paralytic; but no details are given to enable the medical enquirer to judge of the case. Paralysis is a name given in the Gospels to more than one ailment. The centurion's servant (Matt. viii. 6) suffers from a paralysis which is accompanied with great pain, perhaps from a contracted joint. The case here is more akin to paralysis proper; there is a lack of power, a supposed inability to move.

¹ προσεγγίσαι.

great number of people collected, so that there was no longer room for them, not even before the door; and he spoke the word to them. And they come to him with a paralytic, 3 carried by four bearers. And as they were not able to get to him with their patient¹ on account of the crowd, they took off the roof at the spot where he was, and let down through the hole they had made, the couch with the paralytic lying on it. And Jesus seeing their faith says to the 5 paralytic, Child, your sins are forgiven. But there were 6 some of the scribes sitting there and reasoning in their hearts, How can the man say such a thing? He is 7

The man cannot go himself to the great Healer, but he has energetic friends to help him. Finding that there is no getting near Jesus through the door, and determined to secure his aid this time before he escapes again, they hit upon a plan which shows great determination. The patient is carried up the outside stair to the roof, his friends take up the wooden joists and water-proof boarding which form the ceiling of the room below, and make in this way, perhaps with the use of tools (*ἐξορύξαντες* lit. dug out), a hole large enough to let the couch with its patient be lowered through it to Jesus' feet.

5. Matthew has the same words, with additions, but has omitted the acts which showed the faith of the bearers, so that we see him to have curtailed his source. The bearers like the leper of chap. i. have shown a most energetic conviction that Jesus is able to help, and have taken the most heroic measures to make him put forth his power. Every one must admire the courage and determination they have shown. And Jesus does admire it; but apparently he does not meet their hopes. Asked for a favour which they believe him able to confer, he opens his mouth to speak to the patient with an affectionate phrase indeed, but not on the subject brought before him. It is scarcely possible to get over this difficulty without supposing that the story originally contained here some statement about the man's former life, which the tradition, for whatever cause, did not preserve. A sentence of absolution implies knowledge of the sins which call for it, and Jesus must have known about the man's

sins, not only inferred them from his malady, before he began to speak of them. On this occasion also we may trace in Jesus' action that shrinking from the work of healing which we noticed in chap. i. The bearers bring their case to Jesus in such a way that he cannot put away their claim; he must do something for them. But what they want him to do he is reluctant to undertake. There is another service he can render the patient, a greater service indeed than that of physical cure. The man is unhappy: his conscience is accusing him—of what we are not told, as the story now stands. That distress Jesus knows he can remove; and he feels called to do so. And so we hear the affectionate words, pronounced with the authority without which many men can scarcely believe in any absolution, "Child, your sins are forgiven"!

6. We had the scribes compared with Jesus as preachers, to their disadvantage (i. 22). Here we find some of the class listening to his preaching, and that not in the synagogue where they were masters, but in the house. This shows some friendly feeling towards him on their part. There are indications that the Pharisees, to whose way of thinking most of the scribes inclined, regarded Jesus at first with favour. His aim would appear to them to be the same as their own; he too was seeking to get the people ready for the Kingdom of God. But Jesus differed too radically from the scribes in spirit and in method to allow this friendliness to continue long. He was not bound by their rules, and he was guided by

¹ To get near him.

8 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὗτως διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε ἐν 9 ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν τῷ παραλυτικῷ, Ἀφίενται σου αἱ ἀμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν, Ἐγειρε καὶ ἄρον τὸν 10 κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὑπαγε;¹ ἦν δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἔξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφίεναι ἀμαρτίας,² λέγει τῷ 11 παραλυτικῷ, Σοὶ λέγω, Ἐγειρε, ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ 12 ὑπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου. καὶ ἡγέρθη καὶ εὐθὺς ἤρας τὸν κράβαττον ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων, ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι πάντας καὶ δοξάσειν τὸν θεὸν λέγοντας ὅτι Οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἴδαμεν.

original convictions which they did not share. To hear what they now heard, the declaration to the paralytic by Jesus that his sins were forgiven, could not but give the scribes who were present a great shock. To their thinking, sin could only be forgiven by offering a sacrifice and having absolution formally pronounced by the priest. With the whole ancient world they regarded sin as a debt the sinner had incurred to God. God only could remit the debt, and it could only be done according to the ritual He had appointed. To declare as Jesus had done to this man that his sins were forgiven was to trench upon the divine prerogative, to treat sacred things lightly, and therefore to incur the severest censure. The later prophets, it is true, abound in passages¹ declaring that God forgives at once, without any sacrifice, the sinner who penitently turns to Him; and the scribes doubtless allowed that prayers for forgiveness were answered in Galilee, where no offering could be made. But the principle remained in their minds which we find stated even in the N. T. (Heb. ix. 22), and which is a cardinal article of belief with multitudes of Christians to this day, that without shedding of blood there is no remission. A formal sentence of absolution such as Jesus had pronounced could not pass unchallenged.

8. Jesus recognizes their objections in his spirit, or as we say in his mind, before he hears them with his ears; and challenges the scribes before they have opened their mouths to speak their thought. The point to which he

addresses himself is that the forgiveness of which he has assured the paralytic is real and effective, and not a mere boast or arrogant assumption. The point is one of such pressing importance for him, that in order to establish it he makes up his mind to do what he had just before deliberately refrained from doing, to put forth his energy for the physical quickening of the patient before him. He feels sure he can make the patient get up and walk; he feels sure too that in declaring the forgiveness of his sins he does not use vain words but announces what is true and brings about the true life with God in the soul of the sufferer. Both these things he feels it in him to do, so strong is the power which is in him and carries him forward. And the one act can be used as an argument to prove that the other is real. Which is easier? To effectively say Your sins are forgiven or to say Rise and take up your bed and walk? The scribes will say, no doubt, that the former is the easier. Whether they are right and consistent on the point or not, they will say it is a harder work to make the paralytic walk than to bring about the forgiveness of his sins, and that he who does the first can no doubt do the second also.

10. A new term is here introduced into the narrative. Jesus speaks of himself by that title, never explained in the Gospels, yet apparently understood by those who heard him, and used in such a variety of aspects—**Son of Man**. If, as is generally allowed, the title as used by Jesus indicates his Messiahship, there has been little preparation for it

¹e.g. Jer. xxxi. 31 sqq.; Isa. xliii. 25, lv. 7.

¹περιπάτει, as in Matth. and Luke.

²Or ἀφίεναι ἀμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

uttering a blasphemy. Who can forgive sins but God alone? And Jesus at once perceiving in his spirit that they are reasoning in themselves in such a way, says to them, Why do you think such thoughts? Which is easier, to say to the paralytic, Your sins are forgiven, or to say, Get up and take your bed and go?¹ But you are to know that the Son of Man has power on earth to forgive sins,²—(then he says to the paralytic), I tell you Rise, take up your bed and go away to your house. And he rose, and at once took up his bed, and went out before them all, so that they were all amazed, and glorified God, saying, We never saw anything like it before.

in Mark's narrative. All at once he speaks of himself as Messiah and declares it to be a prerogative of the Messiah to forgive sins on earth. He does not claim this right for himself as a human individual, nor does he claim it for others who may feel and act as he does; it is the Messiah, he only, who is said to have power to forgive. And to prove that he possesses this power, *i.e.* that his assurance of forgiveness is not an empty word, but is valid and effective, and that the forgiveness spoken on earth is recognized by God in heaven—to prove this, Jesus proceeds to that exercise of power on which he did not enter before, and deals with the physical malady of the paralytic. The patient, like Simon's wife's mother, is summoned to make an effort which he and his bearers considered to be beyond his power. Called to co-operate in the work of his restoration, he gets up, takes his stretcher under his arm, and walks away with it. The scribes themselves witness the cure which proves that their objection was unfounded. This is not said in so many words. The narrator contents himself with describing the surprise and joy of all the beholders and quoting their confession that what they have seen belongs to a higher order of things than they were acquainted with before. We are left to understand that the argument of Jesus prevailed, and that the new way of forgiveness, forgiveness through the Messiah without any sacrifice, was no longer to be questioned.

The parallel narratives diverge at the close. In Matthew it is the multitudes who are overawed at the occurrence and come to the conclusion that God has granted a new power to men. This is not meant to convey that men generally can now forgive sins as Jesus does, any more than men generally can cure paralytics as Jesus has done, but that the power Jesus exhibits is a divine gift to men, and shows God to be mindful of His people in thus sending and equipping His messenger.

There are two great difficulties connected with this story. The first is that Jesus here appears to make use of his power in order to prove a point—a very different use of his power from any we have seen him make before. His mighty works are generally done, and in Mark this is specially the case, not of set purpose, but under some strong feeling, from an excess, generally, of compassion or of indignation. In this case the work is done in order to furnish evidence of something Jesus wishes people to believe. Hence, while he generally dislikes to have his works spoken of, and urges those concerned not to publish them, this work is done with a view to publication. If a new way of forgiveness is opened, that is not a thing to be kept secret but to be made known, and a cure done to prove that the forgiveness is real must be made known too.

These considerations prove at least that the work done to prove this point cannot belong to the opening stage of

¹ walk.

² Or, to forgive sins on earth.

The call of Levi, ii. 13-17.

13 Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν παρὰ¹ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος
14 ἥρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. καὶ παράγων εἶδεν
Λευεῖν² τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τῷ τελώνιον, καὶ λέγει

the ministry, when Jesus did not wish his works of power to be spoken of. On the other hand the occurrence appears to be possible at a later stage of the ministry. It is quite certain that Jesus felt—as many of his fellow-countrymen must also have suspected—that a more direct way of forgiveness was necessary than that which was in force, and that he knew that he himself had power to open up such a way. That indeed might appear to him a thing the Messiah must do, and once he was clear about his Messiahship he might declare by word and act this feature of the new Age, so that it might be known that the promises of a full forgiveness in the last days were now fulfilled, and that the mourners might at once be comforted. The public denial of such forgiveness would seem to him to be a denial of the essence of the Gospel, and would act on him as a paramount call to put forth all his power.

The second difficulty is the introduction at the close of the story of the enigmatic title “Son of Man.” Assuming in the meantime that Jesus did use this title and apply it to himself, and that the title was capable to the ears of those who heard him of a Messianic meaning, recalling however faintly to their minds the being “like a son of man,” who stands before God in Daniel’s vision (vii. 13) and sets up the kingdom which is never to be destroyed, assuming this, the title stands too early in Mark ii. In Mark’s narrative Jesus strenuously refuses to assume the character of Messiah. The demons who hail him as God’s vice-gerent he orders to be silent; i. 25, 34, iii. 12, v. 7. He speaks of himself as a prophet (vi. 4), as a sower, as a fisher. He avoids all publication and advertisement of himself (v. 43, vii. 36). Only at viii. 30, 31, does he accept the Messianic title at the hands of Peter and of the other disciples; yet even here he will not have himself proclaimed publicly as the Saviour of Israel; see also ix. 9. Only at Jericho

does the Messianic proclamation begin, which accompanies him at his entry into Jerusalem, and is crowned by his declaration of his Messiahship to the High Priest. This account of Jesus’ attitude towards the Messiahship, clearly recognizable in the tenor of Mark’s narrative, is in the parallels confused: and the present story shows that Mark himself could overlook it. Jesus could not at the same time when he was declining to be greeted as Messiah, and avoiding all sensation, assume, in addressing a mixed audience, even a veiled Messianic title; a narrative in which he does this must, if trustworthy, be placed near the end of his career.

Jesus, however, did not himself use the words ὁ νήστος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, which are found in his mouth in the Gospels. He spoke Aramaic, and the words he actually spoke must be the subject of enquiry. This has of late been urged by Wellhausen (*Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 1894, p. 312; *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi. p. 187-215, where the passages in which the title occurs are dealt with in detail) and other scholars, who have thus opened a new chapter of a long discussion. The Aramaic word for Son of Man, *bar-nasha*, Wellhausen asserts, means simply a man, a member of the human race, and ought not to have been rendered by the much more definite Greek phrase, ὁ νήστος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, “The Son of Man.” On this showing the phrase does not claim for the Messiah in this passage, but for man generally, that he can forgive sins: in the end of this chapter it is man as human that has power over the Sabbath. The phrase cannot denote the Messiah, and where the Greek words are used in such a way that they must mean the Messiah, Jesus cannot have used the phrase. While Wellhausen maintains that “Son of Man” cannot mean Messiah, and that Jesus put forth no such Messianic claim as the phrase suggests, Lietzmann (“Der Menschensohn, Ein Beitrag zur

¹els.²Ιάκωβος.

[Matthew ix. 9-13; Luke v. 27-32.]

And he went out again beside¹ the sea, and all the multitude resorted to him and he taught them. And as he passed along he saw Levi² the son of Alphaeus sitting at the toll-house, and he says to him, Follow me. And he rose and

N.T. Theologie,” 1896, p. 85), asserts that Jesus could not call himself the Son of Man as he does in the Gospels, since the language he spoke did not enable him to do so, the Aramaic words having no such emphasis as the Greek words have, and the title being thus non-existent in the language spoken by Jesus. It was the Greek phrase, he holds, which, suggested by Daniel vii. 13, was put in Jesus’ mouth, first in the passages referring to the Second Coming, in which it was natural and appropriate, and then in passages where it is less suitable. These views are controverted by the Aramaic scholar Dalman (*Die Worte Jesu*, i. 1898, p. 191 *sq.*) in a full discussion of the Aramaic problem, and by Schmiedel (*Protest. Monatshefte*, Aug. 1898: see *Expository Times*, Nov. 1899, p. 62), who both suppose Jesus to have derived the title from Dan. vii. 13, and to have meant by it that human figure who is destined to carry out God’s final purposes.

The debate is by no means ended, but it has led to an increased conviction that the tradition has placed the title in Jesus’ mouth on occasions when he was not likely to use it. The Gospels do not agree with one another on this point; compare “Son of Man,” Matth. xii. 32, with “Sons of men,” Mark iii. 28; and “Whom do men say the Son of Man is?” Matth. xvi. 13, with Mark vii. 27, Luke ix. 18, ... “that I am?” while the eschatological use of the title as in Mark xiii. 26, viii. 38, xiv. 62, Matth. x. 23 is intelligible, being based on that in Daniel and in Enoch (see Charles’ *Book of Enoch*, pp. 312-317, and ‘Eschatology,’ in Hastings’ *Dictionary of the Bible*, i. 744).

¹ If the Western reading “James” were accepted, there would be two publicans among the twelve. But this story must be the same as that of Matthew ix. 9-13, where this publican is called Matthew, to be distinguished afterwards (Matthew x. 3) from James, son of Alphaeus. Levi will be his original, Matthew

Some of the other applications present great difficulty, Mark ix. 9-12, Matth. viii. 20, xi. 19. For the latest contribution to the discussion see Brückner’s paper quoted above (p. 62) on Mark’s Christology.

Thus the forgiveness of sins “by a word,” which obtained in the Church, finds its warrant in the Gospel.

13. In all the three accounts the call of Levi follows the cure of the paralytic; but in none is it necessary to take the two as closely consecutive. Mark connects them with this little description, drawn perhaps from his own special source, of how the lakeside preaching, which afterwards led to a peculiar situation (iv. 1, where the words of this verse are repeated) began. Jesus went out from the town, where many men were, to the shore of the lake, where few were, and where he had been before (i. 16); but he did not thereby escape the crowd. They kept coming after him there just as they did in the town (ver. 1), and he went on teaching them.

14. It is in connection with this preaching by the lakeside, Mark suggests to us, that another of the disciples receives his call. Along the N. end of the Sea of Galilee ran the road which led from Damascus to the Mediterranean, and at this point goods passed out of the tetrarchy of Philip, though they might have travelled much farther, into that of Herod Antipas. At this frontier there was an office for collecting customs, and Jesus on his walk arrived at this spot, and saw Levi, the collector, sitting at his post.¹ A tax-collector might not have time to practise such religious duties as the Scribes and

his acquired name. As Mark speaks of Simon up to iii. 16, afterwards of Peter, so he speaks here of Levi, and in iii. 18 of Matthew. Levi was the son of a different Alphaeus from the father of James the Less. See Zahn, *Einführung* ii. 263.

¹ to.

² James.

- 15 αὐτῷ, Ἀκολούθει μοι. καὶ ἀναστὰς ἥκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. καὶ γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἀμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ
 16 ἥσταν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἥκολούθουν αὐτῷ. καὶ¹ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων² ὥδοντες ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι Μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν³
 17 ἐσθίει.⁴ καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς, Οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἴατροῦ ἀλλ' οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες· οὐκ ἥλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτωλούς.

Pharisees required; nor could he keep himself separate, according to their rules, from contact with Gentiles. Greek merchants crossed the frontier on the Sabbath, and had to be attended to; and the collector might rarely make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem (Luke xviii. 10). It followed from the unpopularity of their occupation and the consequent moral reaction on themselves that men of this class stood outside of religion, and were regarded by those who took things strictly and who set the standard for the country, as lapsed members of Israel, and as little better than heathens. No wonder, then, that the call of Levi to be one of his regular followers was a very marked incident in Jesus' ministry. The call is told in the same words as that of the other disciples, and suggests the same speculations as to Jesus' previous knowledge of Levi and Levi's of Jesus.

15. This may be some time after the call. It is only later (iii. 14) that the Twelve are summoned to devote themselves to Jesus entirely, and thus Levi, though a called disciple, is still at liberty to entertain his friends in his own house, and Jesus does not disdain to meet these friends at his board. A number of collectors were there, men who suffered as their host did from the religious and social effects of their calling. Along with them there are in the party some people who are called sinners. The word is used in the narrow sense which the Pharisees gave it, of persons who did not attempt to 'keep the Law as they did. Such persons were outsiders; if only the Law could justify, they could not possibly be righteous, and they did not belong to the circle where God's favour could be

counted on. (See xiv. 41, Luke, vi. 32, 33, xv. 2, xix. 7, Gal. ii. 15.)

Jesus did not judge people in this position as the Pharisees did; he sympathized with them and felt he had a religion to offer them in which they could find what they wanted. Besides Levi and his associates and friends of this party, Jesus and his disciples are of the party, and as his disciples have not been mentioned before in a body, but only individuals whom he called, it is added in explanation that he had many disciples besides the four fishermen and that at this time they went about with him everywhere. When he enters Levi's house they come with him, and the hospitality shown to him extends to them also. From the ranks of these early followers the Twelve are afterwards chosen, and after the appointment of the Twelve there is still as we shall see a wider circle of followers.

16. Pharisee means one who keeps himself separate, and the whole aim and policy of the party which bore this name was to separate themselves and all who followed them from all contamination and transgression, thus doing what they could to make Israel worthy of the divine salvation. 'Separate from sinners' they were and professed to be. That a Rabbi who to a large extent shared their views and sought the same objects as they, should deliberately renounce this separation and sully himself by contact with the careless and irreligious was to them most strange. The Scribes, therefore, in the story, men of the Law who belonged to the Pharisees' way of thinking (not all men of the Law belonged to it) hold up their hands in sorrowful wonder to the disciples at their Master's

¹ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ.

² Add καὶ.

³ ἀμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν.

⁴ Add καὶ πάνει.

followed him. And it comes about that he is at table in his¹ 15 (Levi's) house, and many publicans and sinners were at table with Jesus and his disciples for there were many of them (of the disciples) and they went everywhere with him.² And 16 some Scribes who were of the Pharisees' party saw that he eats with publicans and sinners, and they said to his disciples, He eats³ with publicans and sinners! And Jesus heard 17 it, and says to them, Those who are in health have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. I am not come to call the righteous but sinners.

conduct, and this they do perhaps more than once.¹

Thus the question of mixed communities, at which Jew and Gentile sat at the same board and partook of the same food, to the scandal of the stricter section of the Church (Gal. ii. 12), has its prelude in the life of the Saviour, and is dealt with by himself.

17. It is not clear whether the reply was made to the Scribes themselves or to the disciples when they reported the complaint to him. His reply to the criticism made on him (and we must remember that the same objection was taken to Jesus' geniality in social matters in other quarters also; Matth. xi. 19, Luke xv. 1, xix. 7) was quite ready, and it goes to the root of the matter. The Scribes, who are the religious teachers of the people, think they have done their duty when they have studied the Law and set themselves and all who will follow them to keep it exactly. To those who from one reason or another cannot or do not bear the heavy burdens they impose, they recognize no duty but think of them as outsiders and look down on them with scorn. Jesus

takes a very different view of his office as a public teacher. He feels himself called specially to those whom the teaching of the Scribes leaves unaffected. He has a message for them; to those who follow the method of the Scribes, and spend their lives in the attempt to keep every one of the hundreds of precepts of the Law he cannot do much good, but the sinners—to use the scornful and uncharitable phrase—those who have abandoned the effort after strict legal righteousness or have never tried it, these he can help. The method of the prophets, the religion that consists in walking humbly with God, doing justly and loving mercy, can be preached to them with some effect and with good hope of really helping them. That is what he means by the little picture he throws out about the physician who is of no use to those in health but only to the sick. We notice that when he speaks of himself as a physician he is thinking of the ills of the mind and spirit, not those of the body.

The righteous—Jesus is not here pronouncing any opinion as to whether there are really righteous persons or not

¹ Imperfect. The ὅμιλος simply recites what is thought so strange.

¹ The Greek words might possibly allow us to understand that, as Matthew has it, Levi was at table in the house of Jesus. The house was a large one, fit for a large company.

² Or, for there were many of them (publicans and sinners), and they were following him. Or, there were many of them. And some Scribes of the Pharisees were following him, [(a) as disciples or (b) as enemies] and saw, etc. The text of the passage is very uncertain, and different punctuations are adopted, which yield diverse meanings. In one case Jesus was followed by disciples who were not publicans and sinners, in the second by publicans and sinners (as if that class of people recognized in him their champion and attached themselves to him), and in the third case by Scribes of the Pharisees, friendly or unfriendly.

³ Add, and drinks.

The question of fasting, ii. 18-22.

18 Καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες.
 καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγονται αὐτῷ, Διατί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ
 οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύονται, οἱ δὲ σὸι μαθηταὶ οὐ
 19 νηστεύονται; καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Μή δύνανται οἱ νιὸι
 τοῦ νυμφῶν ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφός μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστὶν νηστεύειν;
 20 ἔσται δέ τοι τὸν νυμφίον μετ' αὐτῶν οὐ δύνανται νηστεύειν.
 21 Ἐλεύσονται δέ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἡ πατρικὴ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφός, καὶ
 τότε νηστεύονται ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. Οὐδέποτε ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους

(see Luke xv. 7; xviii. 14), but those who follow the way of righteousness marked out by the Scribes, and so count as righteous—they do not require him, and he can do little for them. He came to call sinners, to what? To repentance, Luke adds to Mark's phrase, and to some extent no doubt correctly. But not to repentance only, also to the Kingdom—to all the blessings of a religion imposing no artificial burdens, in which they could feel that they could yet serve God and that He had not forsaken them. Compare the call at the close of the eleventh chapter of Matthew, and also the Beatitudes, for a description of the attitude which fits men to receive Christ's Gospel. It is right, then, that he should be found where those people are to whom he has a special mission.¹

18. No chronological connection is stated between this story and the last. Luke makes the conversation of the last story flow on into this one, "And they said to him," while Matthew connects with "then." There is no real connection. The incident arises out of a fast which the disciples of John (whether or not their master was dead at the time) does not appear—the Pharisees would not be fasting for that reason) were observing along with the Pharisees. A Pharisee fasted twice a week (Luke xviii. 12); how it was done, by some of them at least, we may read in Matth. vi. 16. John's disciples, we may suppose, took the religious life strictly; they as well as the Pharisees were looking for the coming of the Kingdom, and striving to

prepare the people for it by keeping up the highest standard of piety. Fasting, in early times a preparation for prayer, still gave emphasis to that exercise; and Jesus could not be indifferent to the objects which both sets of religionists had in view. He, too, was looking for the Kingdom; he, too, told his disciples to pray for it. Yet on this occasion, whether the fast was a weekly one or one that came round more rarely, his disciples pay no attention to it.² The difference between the disciples of John and those of Jesus in this respect excites remark, and Jesus is asked, we are not told by whom, for an explanation.

19. This explanation he furnishes in a little parable. A Jewish wedding was followed by a merrymaking, which continued for a good many days. Samson's wedding (Judges xiv. 17) lasted seven days; that of Tobit (Tob. viii. 20) twice as long. In this observance the bridegroom's male friends were charged with the duty, as it were officially, of maintaining the carousal and keeping up their own spirits and those of all concerned to the proper pitch. Is it possible, Jesus asks, for these children of the bride-chamber (an Aramaic phrase, evidently) to engage in fasting? They cannot possibly do such a thing; it would be totally out of character. As long as the bridegroom is with them, i.e. as long as the wedding festival lasts, they must be merry and not sad.

So far the meaning is quite clear. The early ministry of Jesus was a time of joy and cheer. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, proclaiming

¹ Cf. Brandt, *Die Evangelische Geschichte*, p. 465 *sqq.*

²The fast, whatever it was, was not enjoined by the Law, which prescribes fasting on the day of Atonement only. The growth of the

practice of fasting is a feature of later Judaism, on which Deutero-Isaiah, and Zechariah forcibly comment. See Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, "Fasting" and "Feasts and Fasts."

[Matthew ix. 14-17; Luke v. 33-38.]

And the disciples of John and the Pharisees were observing ¹⁸ a fast, and people come and say to him, Why do your disciples not fast when the disciples of John and those of the Pharisees are fasting? And Jesus said to them, Can the assistants at ¹⁹ the wedding fast while the bridegroom is with them? As long as they have the bridegroom with them they cannot fast. But the days will come when the bridegroom will be taken ²⁰ away from them; and then they will fast, in that day. No ²¹

glad tidings, which men heard with delight.

"This is the hour of banquet and of song"

was true then, as it is still true when Christ's people fully realize his spirit and his word. In such circumstances fasting is out of the question. If the afflicting of the soul is done without a definite object it is valueless; and Jesus will not impose it on his disciples when their experience does not call for it.

20. The ideas thus put forth are taken up and carried a step further in the two little parables which are immediately to follow. But ver. 20 is of a different tenor. Here fasting is not deprecated but upheld, and even enjoined. When the circumstances call for it Jesus encourages it, as in Matth. vi. 17 he speaks of the right method of the exercise. What are the circumstances here contemplated in which fasting will be right and necessary for his disciples? When the bridegroom is removed, then fasting will be appropriate. If the case supposed still belongs to the illustration, then Jesus says, As long as the wedding goes on there can be no fasting, but if the wedding is violently interrupted and the bridegroom carried off from his friends (by brigands, or a hostile incursion, or by an unfeeling creditor), then feasting will give way to fasting. In the case of John the Baptist something of the kind may have happened when these words were spoken, and then they would express sympathy with the position of John's disciples, so differently situated from those of Jesus himself.

But the verse as we now have it does not read thus. The grammar implies not a change of circumstances that

might take place any day or might already have taken place, but a change which is to take place in the future (on *εταίη* with the aorist subj. see Winer (Moulton) p. 389, Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 316). The removal of the bridegroom is a thing looked forward to as certain, and we see that what is spoken of is not what might happen to any bridegroom, in a story, but what is actually going to happen to one particular bridegroom, i.e. to Jesus himself, who now identifies himself with the bridegroom of his parable and so turns it into an allegory of his own fortunes. The form of the story is in favour of his having done so. The "as long as" of the earlier part looks forward to a change—"the days will come." But in this case the section cannot belong to the earlier part of the ministry, but must be placed after the declaration of the Messiahship, along with the forebodings which begin at that point of the history.

The early church practised fasting (Acts x. 30, xiii. 3, xiv. 23, 1 Cor. vii. 5, cf. *Didache* ch. vii., Luke ii. 37); and our story as it stands furnishes a warrant for an observance which Jesus had not encouraged in his own lifetime.

On this and the other parables see Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, 1899.

21. These parables take up the idea of ver. 19; it is in that view at least that they appear to have been placed where they are. Having, in the figure of the marriage, defended his disciples from the demand that they should fast although not mourning, Jesus now justifies that position by two illustrations showing the danger of assorting things together which do not accord. A thing which has life in it and tends to move and grow must not be enclosed in a frame that is lifeless and devoid of

ἀγνάφου ἐπιράπτει ἐπὶ ιμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μή, αἴρει τὸ πλήρωμα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ καυνὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ, καὶ χείρον σχίσμα 22 γίνεται. καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή, ρήξει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἀσκούς, καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί. (ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς).

The Sabbath; first story, ii. 23-28.

23 Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σποριμών, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὄδον ποιεῖν τίλλοντες 24 τοὺς στάχνας. καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον αὐτῷ, "Ιδε τί ποιοῦσιν 25 τοῖς σάββασιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν; καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαινεὶδ ὅτε χρείαν ἔσχεν καὶ ἐπείνασεν 26 αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ; εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν, οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἵερεis, καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ

elasticity. That is the truth put forth in these two very homely little sketches. The old cloak may need mending badly enough ; and the new wine must no doubt be put in skins to ferment and keep ; but ordinary domestic prudence warns against mending the old cloak with cloth that will shrink, or putting the new wine into hard old skins. The movement Jesus has set on foot is a fresh and growing thing ; it is impossible to set limits to its expansion, irrational to confine it to forms which were not made for it. The lofty consciousness of Jesus here finds expression, that as his Gospel is one of joy, it is also one of freedom. He reverenced the forms of the religious life of his time, but he saw them to be inadequate to the new principle of which he was the herald to the world. He set no forms for his followers to observe : they can appeal to him for principles but not for forms.

If there is any difference between the two parables, the first one suggests that the old faith will suffer if its forms are used for the new movement (not as Paul, who fears that the Gospel will itself be lost if connected with unsuitable observances, Gal. iv. 9-11) : while in the second the ill-assorted union is shown to be bad on both sides. The addition "New wine into new bottles !" appears to postulate a new set of religious forms

for the Christian principle, and so to go somewhat further than Jesus does in Matt. vi. and cognate passages. Such a sweeping declaration moreover goes beyond the situation here. Asked about fasting and having made his reply with regard to that point, why should Jesus go on to assert the independence of his followers from all the forms of Judaism ? We cannot therefore feel sure that the connection in which the parables are given by Mark is the original one.

In Luke two garments are ruined ; a piece being cut out of a new cloak to patch an old one. An additional illustration is given of the truth that old and new do not agree and ought to be kept separate. In the little sketch of the man who sticks to the good old wine, the old seems to receive the preference ; as if Jesus had some set of people in his eye, the disciples of John, or some of his own disciples, for whom the parting with old forms was hard. But the lesson may be simply that old and new ought not to be brought in competition with each other (so Jülicher). Some of the MSS. omit the clause ; and WH bracket it (see Plummer's *Luke*).

23. The present set of stories concludes with two which define the attitude Jesus took up towards the Sabbath, and his defence of his position.

one sews on an old cloak a patch of undressed cloth; or else the piece added draws away from the other, the new from the old, and there is a worse tear. And no one puts new ²² wine into old skins; or else the wine will burst the skins, and the wine is lost, and the skins too. (New skins for new wine!)

[Matthew xii. 1-8; Luke vi. 1-5.]

And he happened to be passing through the cornfields on ²³ the Sabbath; and his disciples began to pluck the ears of corn as they went along.¹ And the Pharisees said to him, Look, ²⁴ why do they do on the Sabbath a thing that is not allowed? And he says to them, Have you never read what David did ²⁵ when he was in want (of provisions) and was hungry, he and those who were with him? He went into the house of God in ²⁶ the high-priesthood of Abiathar² and ate the show-bread,³ which no one is allowed to eat but the priests, and he gave it to his

First Utterance on the Sabbath.

The connection is as usual vague.¹ The incident belongs to the season of the year when corn ripens in Palestine, viz. after Easter. As the story presupposes that Jesus was, at the time it refers to, followed by a set of disciples, and so well known as to attract the attention of men in authority, it seems to prove that the ministry, which must have gone on till the following Easter, lasted somewhat longer than a year.

The scene is in the fields. Jesus is walking with his disciples, not necessarily the Twelve, of whose appointment nothing has yet been said; and they encounter a party of men known as Pharisees, who have been observing

them. The disciples have been doing an act which the Pharisees say is not allowed to be done on the Sabbath, pulling the ripe ears of corn and eating the grain. This is not forbidden in the Mosaic law, which contents itself with a general prohibition of work on the Sabbath (Exod. xvi. 23, xx. 8-11, xxxv. 2, etc.) without entering into details. The act of plucking ears of corn was not in itself forbidden to the passerby; see Deut. xxiii. 25. The Scribes however had made the action illegal on the Sabbath. In forming the unwritten law they had specified what acts were to be regarded as labour and therefore forbidden on that day, and they had come to the conclusion that the act of

¹ Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 25, states that the opening *kai éyétero*, 'and it came to pass,' which states the circumstances of the action about to be narrated, has no Aramaic equivalent, and argues that a story with such a beginning

cannot have been taken from an Aramaic source. A Greek source is certainly common to the three synoptists; this opening, which Matthew and Luke do not adopt, is Mark's own.

¹ The Greek words mean in strictness, "to make a path by plucking the ears of corn." But this is absurd; and the Evangelist is to be regarded as using the words loosely, in a sense which occurs also in the LXX. Wellhausen considers the construction to be due to awkward translation from Aramaic (*Sk. u. Vorarb.* vi. 191).

² 1 Sam. xxi. 1-6. The High-priest was Ahimelech not Abiathar, who was his son and succeeded him. The confusion between the two began in the text of the O.T., both Hebrew and Greek. See Swete's note *ad loc.*

³ Lit. loaves of presentation.

27 οὐσιν; καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον
28 ἐγένετο καὶ οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον. ὥστε κύριος
ἐστιν ὁ νιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου.

The Sabbath; second story, iii. 1-6.

1 Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς συναγωγὴν, καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπος
2 ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα· καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτὸν εἰ τοῖς
plucking ears of corn came under the category of harvest labour, and was not to be done on the Sabbath. Jesus has not taught his disciples this. How could a Rabbi with disciples allow them to be so careless; and how could one preaching the Kingdom so neglect the Law, on the observance of which the coming of the Kingdom depended?

25. Jesus might have questioned the authority of the law by which the disciples were being condemned. We shall come afterwards to the passage where he repudiates the whole system of the tradition, and claims that the law of Moses alone has force. He does not do so here; but seems to concede that a breach of the law has taken place. Only it is an excusable one, and Scripture itself justifies it. David did just what the disciples have done: he put aside the law about the show-bread when he and his followers were in urgent want of food. The law about the show-bread is a right and sacred provision, and so no doubt is the law about the Sabbath: but a pressing need is entitled to override either, and if the disciples are censured for their act, so must David be for his. And the conclusion is that ritual laws, laws not naturally arising out of the requirements of conscience, cannot stand when the observance of them implies danger or injury to human beings. Human life is more sacred than religious forms.

Jesus' method of using the Old Testament differs broadly from that of the Scribes. As Wünsche observes, it is Haggadah, the treatment of Scripture narrative, that he employs, rather than Halachah, the application of laws. He interprets the law according to his own conscience, as the old prophets did; and finds in Scripture not a book of rules to be bound tightly on men's shoulders, but a book full of living ideas and inspiring examples. Nor would Jewish sentiment at all condemn his method of using Scripture. While the

Jews were very strict in applying laws, they exercised a free judgment on Scripture characters and situations.

27. The position as illustrated in the case of David is summed up in ver. 27. The Sabbath is not to be regarded as an eternal thing which was there before man, and which man was born to observe. It is to be regarded as an ordinance given to man for his needs, and therefore at his disposal. The Sabbath law therefore is not a very great one, but one which, while no doubt to be observed in principle, may, when there is necessity, be set aside.

The story is complete; but a verse is added. As in ver. 10, the title 'Son of Man' is introduced at the close of the piece, and suggests, after the story has reached its logical conclusion, a new set of considerations and a different lesson. The new point is brought in, that Jesus himself personally, as Son of Man or Messiah, who stands in a different position from the ordinary individual, has a right to deal with the Sabbath as he thinks fit. He, like David the King, may on occasion set the law aside, both for himself and for his followers; and so the disciples are excused not because their act is in itself defensible and right, but because they are sheltered by the dispensing power of the Messiah. Attempts to make these two views appear consistent with each other are to be found in many a commentary. If "Son of Man" means simply man generically, the logic of the story is kept up. But if the title, as its history shows, must be considered Messianic, then either the narrative belongs to the latest period of the ministry and not to the year before its close, or the title is misplaced here. It might seem to an editor that it was too much to claim for man as such, as ver. 27 does, that he should have power to set the Sabbath law aside, but that the Messiah might rightly claim this as one of his privileges.

Matthew adds another argument for

companions too. And he said to them, The Sabbath was made ²⁷ for man, and not man for the Sabbath. So that the Son of Man ²⁸ is Lord of the Sabbath also.

[Matthew xii. 9-14; Luke vi. 6-11.¹]

And he went to the synagogue again; and there was a man ¹
there whose hand was withered. And they watched him to ²

Sabbath freedom; this time from the sacred usage of the temple. If the priests work on the Sabbath as on other days (they even had more to do on that day), then the commandment admits of exceptions. Matthew has also the saying about a greater than the temple, and the quotation from Hosea, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice." There was thus a further tradition on the subject of the Sabbath than that used by Mark. Mark's ver. 27 is omitted by both Matthew and Luke, who both however give the sentence about the Son of Man. The inference seems warranted that ver. 27 and ver. 28 belong to two different traditions.

Second Utterance on the Sabbath.

iii. 1. The connection is not close. This time the scene is more formal. We are introduced to a synagogue-meeting. We are not told where it took place; such details were not vital to the tradition. The only visit to a synagogue of which any details have been given is that of i. 21 *sq.*; but there need be no reference here to that occasion. Nor will anyone who understands how these stories were transmitted consider that this going to synagogue must have been on the same Sabbath as the encounter in the corn-fields, or that there is any connection between the two narratives but that of a common subject.

In this synagogue Jesus is confronted with men who are his positive enemies, which we never found to be the case before. We have had criticism of his proceedings, but it was not venomous. No more was indicated than that other Rabbis were anxious to keep this Rabbi right, or even thought his proceedings very strange. Now we find people who have reached such a stage of

dislike and enmity towards him that they sit at a religious meeting watching him to see if they can get a handle for a direct attack upon him.

There is no word yet of any political charge; that comes much later; and the materials for such a charge have not yet emerged. But the Sanhedrin has the oversight of all religious matters among the Jews; and if Jesus can be shown to be teaching false or mischievous doctrine, "deceiving the people" as the phrase went, or assailing essential beliefs or institutions such as the Sabbath, then the Sanhedrin will have much to say in the matter. Such is the design in pursuance of which Jesus is watched when he comes to the synagogue this Sabbath.

These enemies of Jesus are to be thought of as sitting in the chief seats of the synagogue. Jesus too, a teacher who may wish to speak at such a meeting, is somewhere near the front, and well forward among the rest of the congregation is a man with a withered hand. The hostile party look at Jesus and then at him, in a meaning way. Will the Rabbi perform a medical operation on the Sabbath day? Apparently they have no doubt that he is able to cure the man of his affliction if he chooses. They will not be in the least surprised at that. The cure will be a piece of work, however; not merely the issue of a fiat which will be at once carried into effect, but such an operation as we read of in Mark vii. 32 *sq.*, viii. 22 *sq.*, involving perhaps the application of various means and, as in ii. 9-11, the expenditure of a high degree of energy. They will have a charge against Jesus if he goes into such operations on the Sabbath. So that it is not from kindly feeling that they are interested in the man's infirmity.

¹ Luke xiv. 1-6, is a closely similar narrative with some differences in details; while Luke xiii. 10-17 is also on the same theme.

3 σάββασιν θεραπεύσει¹ αὐτόν, ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ. καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ἔνηράν, "Εγειρε εἰς τὸ 4 μέσον. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ἐξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι 5 ἡ κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἡ ἀποκτεῖναι; οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων. καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτὸὺς μετ' ὀργῆς, συνλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, "Ἐκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα. καὶ 6 ἐξέτεινεγ, καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐξέλθοντες οἱ Φαρισᾶοι εὐθὺς μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν συμβουλιον ἐποίησαν² κατ' αὐτοῦ, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν.

They are not sympathizing with him and hoping that he will meet with relief, but preparing to use his cure, if it should now come about, and likely enough they think it may, as a weapon against one they are coming to regard as a rival.

3. Jesus accepts the challenge expressed in the bearing of his opponents, and bids the man with the disabled arm to step into the open space in front of the reading desk and pulpit; the lesson he is about to give is to be public; there is to be no escape from it for any one present in the building. He then states in unmistakable terms what is the point at issue between him and his opponents. They agree with him in the general principle that when one is able to benefit a fellow-creature one is bound to do so. Where they differ from him is that they think that when the Sabbath comes round the duty of beneficence is to be set aside. In general, no doubt, kind and good men, they divest themselves on the Sabbath of their humarer feelings and think of nothing but keeping the day sacred. In one point, it is true, they make an exception. When life is in danger, they agree that one must save it even on the Sabbath. A sheep that has fallen into a pit is to be taken out on that day of the week (an illustration introduced here by Matthew; and by Luke in the closely similar story of the man with the dropsy, Luke xiv. 5); and they acknowledge it as a general principle that "when life is in danger the Sabbath must give way." The Sabbath law accordingly is not absolute; they themselves confess that the law of natural human feeling is entitled, sometimes at least, to override it. And what Jesus here pleads for is an extension of this principle. Humane feeling

is to be listened to on the Sabbath, not only in cases of mortal danger, but in other cases as well. When one can do good to a fellow-creature it is right to do it on the Sabbath as well as on another day.

To this the opponents are silent. They feel the force of Jesus' argument, but they cannot give up the system of rules about Sabbath observance which has been built up in so august a structure, and in which they have spent their lives.

5. Mark describes Jesus' expression and feeling on encountering this dull resistance to reason. He says that Jesus was both angry and sorry, and that he showed his anger in the glance he cast round on his opponents (the glance round recurs ver. 34, x. 23, xi. 11; Luke adopts the expression here); angry, no doubt, that they opposed him, though they knew he was right; and sorry for the induration of the inner organ of perception and feeling (the hardening of their hearts) by which, while inwardly agreeing with him, as they could not fail to do, they held out against confessing that they did so. That such men as these should occupy places of authority in Israel!

The demonstration in act then follows of the principles which have been set forth in words. Those who take Jesus for their guide are to see in the act that kindness is greater than any rule, and are to regard the Sabbath not only as a day of restraint but as a day in which compassion is to act as on other days, or even more freely. The cure is like that of the paralytic, chap. ii. 11. The patient is called to do an act which appears impossible to him, and the restoration takes place with his own

¹ θεραπεύει, as in Luke.

² ἐδίδουν.

see whether he is to heal him on the Sabbath ; that they might charge him with it. And he says to the man with the withered hand, Rise and come forward. And he says to them, Is it lawful on the Sabbath to do good or to do evil, to save life or to kill ? But they were silent. And he looked round on them in anger, grieved at the hardening of their heart, and says to the man, Stretch out your hand. And he stretched it out, and his hand was restored. And the Pharisees went out and at once held a consultation¹ with the Herodians against him, to destroy him.

co-operation. Medical science will seek in vain, in the absence of any diagnosis of the case, to determine what was done. Compare the case of Jeroboam, 1 Kings xiii. 4-6.

Discussions about the Sabbath occurred in several of the Churches of the West : see Rom. xiv., Gal. iv., Col. ii. While the observance of the seventh day was not made a condition of Church membership for the Gentiles, even in such a document as the rescript of the Council in Acts xv. 28-29, discussions naturally arose on the subject, and the nature of the obligation of the Sabbath must have been a matter of great interest wherever there were Jews in the Church.

6. The series of encounters between Jesus and members of the dominant party culminates in this statement. What is now said, however, carries us far beyond the situation of the preceding sections. Instead of isolated attacks and experiments on the Rabbi, who proves so capable of defending himself, we have all at once an alliance between the party of legal piety and the party supporting the existing Jewish monarchy, for the purpose of bringing his career to a violent end. This is not what was aimed at in the interview just reported. There the opponents wanted to get a charge

against Jesus on which the Sanhedrin could proceed against him ; but the alliance with the Herodians looks further. The Herodians may not have much influence with the Sanhedrin, and the Pharisees do not need them there ; but they may be of use in influencing the Roman power with a view to a death sentence. The statement belongs, in fact, to the last days of the life of Jesus ; we have it in its proper place in xii. 13, where Jesus is at Jerusalem, and the ruling parties, feeling him to be dangerous, form an unnatural alliance in order to get rid of him. As the outcome of the present set of encounters the alliance is too early. The Pharisees seem to have carried out the design spoken of in ver. 2, and got the Sanhedrin to direct its attention to Jesus and his teaching. Cf. iii. 22, vii. 1.

iii. 7—vi. 13. PROSPEROUS EARLY MINISTRY.

After the preceding set of encounters, the beginning of which (ii. 1) is so carefully fitted into the Capernaum ministry while its close points forward to the delivering up of Jesus to the Roman power, the story of the growth of his cause is taken up again. From the present point to vi. 13 is a section of

¹ Mommsen (*Hermes*, xx. 287), considers the word *συμβούλιον* to be not properly Greek, but a sort of lawyer's term representing the Latin *consilium*. The variety and uncertainty of the verbs used with it in the Gospels [*έδιδουν* in the variant here : *έποικαν* here and in xv. 1: *ελαζού* Mt. xii. 14, xxii. 15, xxvii. 1, 7, xxviii. 12, *έτρωγάντες* Mk. xv. 1 (variant)], show that the word was felt to be awkward. The instances of use quoted by Mommsen, one from an inscription and one from Plutarch, and those from the inscriptions in Deissmann, *Neue Bibelst.*, p. 65, all show it to have indicated a meeting rather than the plan adopted at a meeting, which with the reading *έδιδουν* might be thought of here. Theodotion uses it for the LXX *συνέδρια*, Prov. xv. 22; see Swete's note on this passage.

Jesus retires; concourse; demands on him, iii. 7-12.

7 Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀνεχώρησεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἤκολούθησεν,
8 καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἱορδάνου καὶ περὶ Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνα,
9 πλῆθος πολύ, ἀκούοντες ὅσα ποιεῖ, ἥλθον πρὸς αὐτόν. καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτῷ ὡς πλοιάριον προσκαρτερή αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν
10 ὄχλον ἵνα μὴ θλίβωσιν αὐτόν πολλοὺς γάρ ἐθεράπευσεν, ὥστε
11 ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ ὡς αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται ὅσοι εἰχον μάστιγας. καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον
12 αὐτῷ καὶ ἔκραζον λέγοντα¹ ὅτι Σὺ εἶ ὁ νιὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ πολλὰ ἐπετίμα αὐτοῖς ὡς μὴ αὐτὸν φανερὸν ποιήσωσιν.

the Gospel of Mark, which shows Jesus during his successful early ministry, as a teacher, as a worker of great acts of power, and also as organizing the movement which was to spread so far.

We have in the first place a general description of the position in which Jesus now found himself, ver. 7-12; then we are told of a new step which he took in the institution of a closer circle of disciples, afterwards known as the Twelve, 13-19. Then we come to attacks made on him in connection with his successes in casting out demons, 20-35.

7. We have heard what the opponents of Jesus did after the encounters; we are now told what Jesus himself did. A connection seems intended: they plot against him; he withdraws to a spot to which few Scribes or Pharisees would come. His liberty of movement does not appear to have been interfered with. The situation is now sketched in which Jesus is when he afterwards proceeds to take the first step towards the organization of his followers. The concourse is described in general terms; it is similar to that which has taken place before (ii. 13), but is now on a larger scale. A great number of people who had collected from various parts of Galilee followed him to the lakeside; and in the assemblage which was witnessed there it is remembered that many persons were present who had come from the provinces bordering on Galilee to the South, East, and North. When John the Baptist was preaching

in the wilderness of Judaea we know that a great number of people went to him, not only from Judaea and Jerusalem, but also from Galilee (Matt. xi. 7 *sq.*), and the same thing happens here in the case of Jesus himself. It is a very external and vulgar kind of sensation that the evangelist describes; the people flock together, not because echoes of Jesus' teaching have reached their conscience, but because they have heard of his works. Some of the regions from which the crowd was drawn were inhabited by other than Jewish populations; but the evangelist does not mean to represent the concourse as made up of heathens; he only writes to show how far the reputation of Jesus had now spread, and how powerfully men were drawn to him even from outside his own country. Matthew and Luke both report the gathering of a multitude from all quarters before the great discourse given by Jesus, in Matthew, on a mountain, and in Luke, on a plain (Matt. iv. 24, 25; Luke vi. 17). Mark does not use the crowd in this way, but it is easy to see how both the other Evangelists here follow him. In Mark we have (1) ver. 7, 8, the crowd; (2) ver. 13, the ascent of the mountain; (3) ver. 13-19, the appointment of the Twelve.

In Matt. (1) iv. 25, the crowd; (2) v. 1, the mountain; (3) the sermon; the appointment of the Twelve being given elsewhere. When he comes (xii. 15) to this point in Mark in his new connection, he gives the statement again in a brief summary.

¹ λέγοντες.

[Matthew iv. 23-25; xii. 15-21; Luke vi. 12, 13, 17-19.]

And Jesus with his disciples withdrew to the sea, and great numbers from Galilee followed him, and from Judaea and from Jerusalem and from Idumaea and from the country beyond Jordan and from the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon, great numbers, when they heard of all he was doing, came to him. And he told his disciples to have a little boat in readiness for him, on account of the crowd, lest they should press too hard on him. For he healed many, so that all who had any bodily ailments pressed up to him to touch him. And the unclean spirits, whenever they beheld him, fell down to him and screamed out, You are the Son of God! And he charged them repeatedly not to advertise him.

In Luke (1) vi. 12, the mountain (to pray); (2) ver. 13-16, the Twelve; (3) ver. 17, the crowd; (4) the sermon.

9. Ver. 9-12 are peculiar to Mark, and exhibit the vivid detail of a trying situation which we noticed before in chap. i., Matthew and Luke omitting these peculiarities and generalizing.

The occurrences of i. 32-34 are repeated on a larger scale. The pressure becomes so great that Jesus is driven to think of a means of escaping from it. His fisher friends are to help him out of the difficulty should matters grow too serious. The incident is one which they would not readily forget, and the report of it is probably due to one of them. The little boat here, *πλοΐαρχος*, is held by some to be a different craft from the *πλοῖον* of iv. 1, 36, v. 2, 21; but Mark is fond of diminutives. After we have heard about the boat, the circumstances are explained which made the precaution necessary; this also is according to Mark's style.

What made it necessary that a boat should be at hand was that Jesus' reputation as a healer brought crowds of people about him whose one idea was to get close to him at once and secure the benefit of his wonderful power before they lost sight of him. They entertained the belief which we find held also by the woman with the issue of blood, and also in vi. 56, that to touch him was in itself a remedy, even if his attention was not turned to the case.

Luke vi. 19 states the belief with which this was done; all the multitude, he says, "were trying to touch him, for power went out from him and healed them." (For similar general statements in Luke see Acts v. 15, and xix. 11, 12). In Mark this is not said, nor even implied; but only that the way in which the people acted made Jesus think of defensive measures. The boat is used afterwards for a pulpit, since preaching was impossible if people would not stay at a respectful distance. He had made his escape before (i. 35) from a situation in which preaching was made impossible to him.

11. See notes on i. 24, 34. The statements are descriptive (imperfects) rather than narrative, and represent what happened at this period whenever Jesus appeared in public. The demons recognize in him a representative of God, who is threatening their power and kingdom, and, as in the cases mentioned by Dr. Nevius in China, they do not keep silence as to that which they are afraid of, but are inclined to chatter about it. This is not the kind of proclamation Jesus wants, nor does he wish the kind of reputation it can bring him, any more than that of a worker of wonders. This scene, accordingly, or a set of scenes like this, introduces an act by which the right kind of preaching, the announcement not of him, for he does not wish to be announced himself, but of the Kingdom, is to have a great extension.

Appointment of the twelve, iii. 13-19.

13 Καὶ ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὅρος καὶ προσκαλεῖται οὓς ἦθελεν αὐτός,
 14 καὶ ἀπῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν. καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα,¹ ἵνα ὁσιν μετ'
 15 αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν καὶ ἔχειν ἔξουσίαν
 16 ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια. καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα,² καὶ ἐπέθηκεν
 17 ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον, καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ
 Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰακώβου, καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὄνόματα
 18 Βοανεργές, δὲ ἐστιν Υἱὸι Βροντῆς, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ
 Βαρθολομαῖον καὶ Μαθθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ
 19 Ἀλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαῖον καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Καναναῖον καὶ Ἰούδαν
 Ἰσκαριώθ, ὃς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτόν.

13. **The mountain** is that which was at hand. We read of his going to the sea (ii. 13, iii. 7); now he takes to the hill. In Matthew this ascent introduces the great sermon; here it is undertaken for the sake of matters of administration, for which retirement was necessary. In Matthew his disciples go to him on the mountain to receive the sermon which is in form addressed to them; here they go to be constituted into a new position in his cause. Jesus is providing for the future. Luke marks the importance of the occasion by saying that Jesus spent a night in prayer after ascending the mountain before calling the disciples; cf. Acts i. 24, xiii. 3. What Mark's narrative taken by itself would suggest is that Jesus wished the preaching and the other features of his ministry not to depend in future on his personal efforts only. His activity is to be multiplied, and wherever the preaching goes it is to be accompanied by those signs of its power which have gone with it hitherto. All this he arranges, and it could not be arranged in the presence of the crowd. He makes a selection from those who have till now been following him. Out of the larger number who have mounted the hill with him he calls those whom he has determined to draw into close relations with himself. Whether their calling and the

appointment of the **Twelve** are two acts, or the same in two different statements, can scarcely be determined. Mark does not say why this number was fixed on.¹ That it was fixed from the very earliest time appears from 1 Cor. xv. 5; and Matth. xix. 28 suggests a reason when it connects the twelve disciples with the twelve tribes of Israel (cf. Matth. x. 6). It may be doubted whether Jesus himself called these men **apostles**, as Luke states (vi. 13) in a clause which appears also in many old MSS. of Mark here. Dr. Swete suggests that if not at this point he may have given them that name afterwards; but neither, perhaps, is this likely. An "apostle" is not only (both in Hebrew and Greek language) a messenger but a representative, and implies a fixed power or organization, in the name of which he transacts with other powers (synagogues, churches). The word appears in the church of Jerusalem from the first (Gal. i. 19, where it is applied to James, the Lord's brother, who was not one of the Twelve), but it seems an anachronism when placed in the mouth of Jesus himself.

The **purpose** for which these men were set apart is then described in simple terms. They were to be with him, not that no others were to accompany him henceforward, for we often find him after this surrounded by a

¹ Dr. W. Brandt, in his very able and important work, *Die Evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christentums* (Leipzig 1893), arrives at many conclusions which have

appeared to most of his critics too negative. But he accepts it (p. 12) as a historical fact that Jesus chose twelve of his faithful adherents for special office.

² οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνόμασεν has strong ms. support. The Sinaitic Syriac wants it. It may have crept it from Luke.

² Omit καὶ ἐποήσεν τοὺς δώδεκα.

[Matthew x. 2-4, cf. v. 1; Luke vi. 12-16.]

And he goes up to the mountain and calls to him those whom 13
he himself was minded (to call), and they went to him. And 14
he appointed twelve, that they might be with him and that 15
he might send them out to preach and to have authority to 16
cast out the demons. And he appointed the twelve¹ (and he 17
gave Simon the name) Peter, and James the son of Zebedee 17
and John the brother of James, and he gave them the name 18
Boanerges, that is, Sons of Thunder, and Andrew and Philip 18
and Bartholomew and Matthew and Thomas and James the son 19
of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus and Simon the Cananaean, and 19
Judas Iscariot, he it was who betrayed him.

much wider circle ; but they were to give up their lives to being with him—a thing which not every one could be asked to do. From this time forward they are to say that they have given up all to follow him. There was more than this, however, in their appointment. They were to take part in the mission which Jesus had taken for the great work of his life. That mission is to get the people ready for the Kingdom of God when it arrives, according to prophecy, in outward form (i. 15). This he has to do by his preaching, and the Twelve, being kept beside him, will be educated so that in time they will share this labour. It is by keeping them with himself that he will make them fishers of men (Zahn, *Einf.* ii. 225). In chap. vi. we read how he does send them out. In accordance with the view Jesus takes in this Gospel of the work of healing, that work is not made a part of the duty of the missionaries. In Matthew x. 8 and Luke ix. 2 they are to act as physicians, as Jesus himself does, but in Mark it is not so. The casting out of demons, however, stands on a different footing. The alarm testified by the demons at the preaching of the Kingdom showed that Kingdom to be real and near ; and it was right that wherever the kingdom was preached its ascendancy should be demonstrated over the hostile kingdom of the demons. This was a part of the preaching, and so the missionaries are to have authority to cast out demons, an authority which they were not always,

though sometimes, successful in exercising. Jesus, no doubt, instructed them in the subject, and they saw his method in operation, and could imitate it.

16. The words, "he appointed twelve," are taken up again ; we are now to hear who the twelve were or are. The catalogue given by Mark does not correspond with the foregoing narrative, as Simon and Andrew are separated in it, and Levi is here called Matthew, and comes after two others of whom nothing has yet been said. The general arrangement of the list is the same in all the three Synoptists, while there are differences in detail. In Mark those three disciples have the precedence who came to form the inner circle of Jesus' intimates (v. 37, ix. 2, xiv. 33), or perhaps he mentions first those to whom Jesus gave new names ; and thus Andrew is separated from his brother. Simon's new name is given him, apparently, at the appointment of the Twelve; hitherto he has been Simon, henceforward in this Gospel he is Peter (except xiv. 37). In Matthew, on the other hand, the name is conferred in connection with his confession, which gives it its appropriateness (xvi. 17; absent in Mark's narrative). The name actually given him was Kephas, which is Aramaic for 'rock'; Peter is the Greek form. The sons of Zebedee also have a name given them by Jesus, or rather a title : "Boanerges" he calls them, which Mark renders "Sons of thunder," but which may mean 'Sons of tumult'

¹ Omit this clause.

Jesus' relatives, iii. 19 b-21.

20 Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν ὁ¹ ὄχλος, ὡστε
21 μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μηδὲ ἄρτον φαγεῖν. καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ'
αὐτοῦ² ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν· ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι Ἐξέστη.

The views of the authorities on the exorcisms of Jesus, iii.
22-30.

22 Καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες ἔλεγον
ὅτι Βεελζέβουλ ἔχει, καὶ ὅτι Ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων

("Angry men," Meyer, *Jesu Mutter-sprache*, p. 51; and Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 33, 39); and this name also is descriptive of character (Luke ix. 54). The second Simon has the surname 'Cananaean' or 'Cananite' which is now taken to be not a geographical term, referring to Canaan or to Cana, but the designation of a sect, and identical with Ἰηλωτής, Zealot, which is Simon's title in both of Luke's lists (vi. 15, Acts i. 13). The Zealots were fanatics for the strictest observance of the law.

Judas (the only Judas in Mark's list; Luke has two) belongs to Kerioth, a place in Judah. This, though Mark does not explain it, is what Iscarioth, man of Karioth, implies. He was accordingly not a Galilean. It has been suggested that he must have joined Jesus on the last journey towards Jerusalem, but he may have been drawn to Galilee by the fame of Jesus (iii. 22). Swete suggests, at the end of a very full and careful discussion of these names and persons,¹ that Judas was one of the newly-arrived disciples (?) of iii. 8.

20. A new piece begins here; the statement that Jesus came home is not to be taken as the conclusion of the excursion to the sea, ver. 7, and to the

¹ On the names of the disciples see Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte*, iii. 819 sq., who considers the list to prove that three languages were spoken in the circle of Jesus and his disciples. Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, 33, questions that statement, and discusses the various names.

²i.e. with the reading of the text. The reading of D, with the Gothic and some Latins, substitutes for this incident about Jesus'

mountain, ver. 13, but as indicating the situation in which Jesus was when his relatives came to see him. He is indoors, and a crowd outside; cf. i. 33 and ii. 2. On this occasion there is a new touch; the crowd blocks up the house, so that domestic operations are brought to a standstill. There is nothing here about the Twelve, and if the Evangelist does not place them in the scene, his readers need not do so.

21. With this little domestic incident Mark connects the statement, given by him alone, of what Jesus' relatives thought of his proceedings at this time, and of the measures they proposed to take in consequence. This story is not at once finished; along with the view taken by the relatives Mark gives the similar view taken by men high in the religious world, and a selection from Jesus' utterances upon it. Then follows the conclusion of the story about the relatives.

"His people," i.e. his family—the expression is vague, but no other sense is possible²—hear of the sensation Jesus is making, and form their conclusions about him. There is no reason to think that his family are here supposed to be anywhere but at Nazaret, where Jesus himself had lived till he set out to hear the preaching of John the Baptist (i. 9), and

family a statement about the Scribes and others which does not harmonize with the accounts of their policy found elsewhere in Mark. See Meyer, *Jesu Mutter-sprache*, p. 166, who rejects the reading of D. Nestle, in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1896, p. 107 sq., supports this reading of D, and proposes to take of λαοῖς as equivalent to the Hebrew *chaberim*, members (of the people), and suggests that οἱ παρ' αὐτῷ of the text may be traced to the same Hebrew word.

¹Omit δ.

² καὶ οἵτε ἤκουσαν περὶ αὐτοῦ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ λαοῖς.

[Mark alone has this.]

And he comes home. And the¹ crowd collects again, so that 20 they cannot even take their food. And his people heard of it 21 and² set off to lay hold of him; for they said, He is out of his senses!

[Matthew (cf. ix. 32-34), xii. 22-32, 43-45; Luke xi. 14-26; xii. 10.]

And the Scribes who had come down from Jerusalem said, 22 He has Beelzebul, and, It is by the prince of the demons that

where they still are when he pays his visit to his home (vi. 1-5). We are told here of their setting out, but the report of their arrival is postponed; another incident is told as if to fill up the interval while they are on the road. We should not have expected to hear of the members of Jesus' family acting as they are here said to have done, and it enhances our confidence in Mark's Gospel that it should report such facts so simply. It is the relatives, not the persons who bring them the report, who say of Jesus that he is out of his mind. The common judgment about Jesus was not to this effect, but rather to the effect that he was a teacher who, if he acted in very unconventional ways, yet was possessed of great powers, and was well entitled to preach and act as he did. It is the relatives who have known him always as a very quiet and retired person, and who never anticipated any great things from him, who, on hearing that he is surrounded by an eager throng, that he holds them with his words and does great works for them, come quickly to the conclusion that he must be out of his mind. Their knowledge of him does not account for what they now hear; and they share the error of the vulgar that one who is inspired in a way they cannot understand is not normal, but that there is something wrong with him. His relatives do not declare him to be possessed; that is said afterwards by others, and Mark here makes a distinction which ought not to be lost sight of; he recognizes mental disturbance and demoniac possession as two different things. What

the relatives say is that Jesus has taken leave of his senses, and their decision is at once formed as to what must be done in the circumstances. He requires to be taken care of; and they must do it. He must be withdrawn by force from the life he is leading, and a check must be put on his movements.

22. What follows is a short version of the discourses, given in the other Synoptists in considerable extent and variety, on the subject of the demons and their expulsion. In the parallels these discourses arise out of an expulsion Jesus has just effected of a dumb demon (Luke) or of a demon from a blind and deaf man (Matthew). Matthew has given the story before of a "dumb man with a demon" (ix. 32-34), but he repeats it here when Mark, whom he is following, brings him to the subject. Mark's connection is his own; the view taken by the Scribes is placed alongside of that of Jesus' family.

Matthew speaks of Pharisees here; but Mark makes the new speakers more important still. They are Scribes come down from Jerusalem, great leaders in the theological world, whose words carry authority (cf. vii. 1, also notes on iii. 6). These Scribes, at any rate, give utterance to the theory put forward on one occasion by some opponent of Jesus, to account for his success in casting out the demons. That he was successful there was no doubt; no one denied it. If we knew the methods followed by the Jewish exorcists in their operations it would be easier for us to judge of what we

¹ Or, a.

² And when the scribes and the others heard of it, they . . .

23 ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς
 24 ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Πῶς δύναται Σατανᾶς Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν; καὶ ἐὰν
 βασιλείᾳ ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῇ, οὐδὲ δύναται σταθῆναι ἡ βασιλείᾳ
 25 ἐκείνῃ καὶ ἐὰν οἰκίᾳ ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῇ, οὐδὲ δύναται εἶναι
 26 στῆναι καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐμερίσθη, οὐ
 27 δύναται στῆναι ἀλλὰ τέλος ἔχει. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ δύναται οὐδὲς εἰς τὴν
 οἰκίαν τοῦ ἵσχυροῦ εἰσελθὼν τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ διαρπάσαι, ἐὰν μὴ
 πρῶτον τὸν ἵσχυρὸν δήσῃ, καὶ τότε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει.

find here. The plan generally followed seems to have been to invoke some unseen power that was stronger than the demons, so that they had to obey it, Acts xix. 13. The Scribes, therefore, ask what unseen power does this Rabbi invoke, what is the stronger spirit by whose help he drives out the demons? And their mistake is that they do not think of a good spirit as helping Jesus, but of a bad one. He did not audibly invoke the bad spirit, but it was with him; in fact, he was possessed himself with a great, powerful spirit; that was the secret of his greatness in this field. He has *Beelzebul*,¹ they say: it is by the great demon in him that he drives out the demons. He is himself the worst demoniac, and his exorcisms are nothing to his credit, considering by whose power they are done. Where the belief in demons was firmly established the theory was not unnatural; but men of weight should have been above pronouncing it.

23. They have not brought their railing accusation to him, but he hears of it, and calls its propounders publicly to hear him refute it. How he knew of it Mark does not say. His reply is said to be in parables, i.e. in parable style (cf. xii. 1), since not all of what follows is parable. A word may be said on the **parables of Jesus**, which are here introduced to us by name, though we have met with some of them already (ii. 19-22). A parable is a comparison, i.e. an incident or figure of real life suggesting a principle which Jesus wishes to introduce to the minds of his hearers. The subject of such a parable is not invented but chosen; it is a person or a

matter occurring in the actual world, and of the reality of which there is no question. A parable is an argument; it is meant generally to prove one particular point, and therefore its details are not to be pressed, or indeed interpreted at all, as those of an allegory are meant to be. To interpret a parable aright we must ask what is the point it is meant to prove, and having found out the service it is intended for we must leave its detail in its proper place, as belonging to the story and enhancing its effectiveness, but not as suggesting spiritual equivalents (see Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, Part i. 1888, and for a criticism of Jülicher's view see Sanday, "A new work on the Parables," in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. i. No. 2).

The first sentence reported here from Jesus' mouth is not a parable, but puts in a pointed question the truth which is illustrated by the two parables following. How can Satan drive out Satan? The ugly word *Beelzebul* is dropped; but *Satan* is the same, the head of the world of bad spirits. It is assumed that that world is a monarchy, and is so homogeneous and organized that what happens to its members affects its head. If this, as was generally believed, was true, then how could the chief of the demons be driving out the demons, as the Scribes said he was doing through Jesus? That would be driving out himself. And then come the parables; two of them in the same form of sentence, and the conclusion following, it also in the same form of sentence, so as to make the inference as plain as

¹The figure of Beelzebul is not very definite. The proposed etymologies are 'Lord of Elth,' which might indicate reference to idolatry, and 'Lord of the dwelling,' which makes havoc of the sense in Matth. x. 25. The word is also

proposed to be taken as a phonetic variation of Beezebub, the fly-god of Ekron. In our passage a principal demon is indicated, and Matth. x. 25 shows the name to have been used as an abusive term, like our 'great devil.'

he drives out the demons. And he called them to him, and ²³ said to them in parables, How can Satan drive out Satan? If ²⁴ a kingdom is divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand, and if a house is divided against itself, that house cannot stand, ²⁵ and if Satan has revolted against himself and is divided, he ²⁶ cannot stand but is at an end. But no one can enter into a ²⁷ strong man's house and plunder his gear, unless he have first bound the strong man, and then he will plunder his house.

possible.¹ When the members of a kingdom turn against each other, that kingdom is near its fall. (The same is not so true of a city, which in Matthew is the second instance, since party government is natural there). And when the members of a household, an Eastern patriarchal household, of course, containing several families, take to measures of undisguised hostility against each other, that household cannot hold long together. Just so of the realm of Satan. If Satan has taken to persecuting his own subordinates, then Satan has revolted against himself and is divided. This is expressed by the indicatives *ἀνέρτη* and *ἐμεπλαθη* (has revolted, is divided). The state of matters described is actually existing, if the Scribes' charge against Jesus is true. And if that is the case, then what is true of the divided monarchy and of the divided house is true of Satan's kingdom also; it also is tottering to its fall. The Scribes may not be able to accept this conclusion; Satan's kingdom is too important a part of their world of thought to be so easily given up. They will therefore have to withdraw the suggestion that Satan is acting so suicidally. This, not the assumption that Satan's power is actually at an end, is the issue to which the speech points. Jesus, no doubt, believed that that power was at an end, but his conviction was not based on this argument which he offers to the Scribes, but on inferences which are reported more fully in Matthew and Luke than in Mark. The present argument we can scarcely help feeling is meant half in satire. It is not logically convincing, since Satan might very well sacrifice some of

his subordinates for the sake of a greater victory, and it reaches a conclusion which is true from premises, those of the Scribes, which are false or shaky.

27. The true account of the matter is now given; the positive conclusion to which Jesus has himself been led. It is put in an allegory—when one sees the house being plundered of a man who has a reputation for physical strength² what conclusion must be drawn? Not surely that the strong man is lending a hand to the intruder who is making off with his property. That is what the slander of the Scribes amounted to. No, one concludes that something has happened to the strong man, he is disabled in some way, or he would never allow such a thing to happen.

The strong man no doubt is meant to represent Satan, and his goods are the demons with which such havoc is played. We must not put more in the words than they will bear. Nothing is said of a great encounter with the prince of evil. The temptation can scarcely be referred to; in the accounts of that occurrence Satan is the attacking not the attacked power, and he is only repulsed for the time, not bound. That Satan is overcome in principle is not here stated as a fact, but only inferred from the way in which his instruments are being driven off. It is from these cures of demoniacs that Jesus has been led to the conclusion that the enemy of mankind is being disabled (cf. Luke x. 18). If the Kingdom of God is really near and its powers at work, then it may well be that the opposing kingdom of evil is suffering paralysis.

¹ The *kai* beginning ver. 24 ought not to be translated; it looks forward to the *kai* of ver. 25 and that of ver. 26, all three verses forming one sentence. If the connection were

with ver. 23, *γάρ* rather than *kai* would express the logical relation.

² The definite article.

28 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς νιόις τῶν ἀνθρώπων
 29 τὰ ἀμαρτήματα καὶ αἱ βλασphemίαι ὅσα ἐν βλασphemηστοις ὁσ
 δὲ ἀν βλασphemήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἀφεσιν εἰς
 30 τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ ἔνοχος ἔσται¹ αἰωνίου ἀμαρτήματος. ὅτι ἔλεγον,
 Πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει.

Arrival of Jesus' relatives; his true family, iii. 31-35.

31 Καὶ ἔρχονται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔξω
 32 στήκοντες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν καλοῦντες² αὐτόν. καὶ ἐκάθητο
 περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος, καὶ λέγονται αὐτῷ, Ἰδού ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ
 33 ἀδελφοὶ σου³ ἔξω ἡγοῦνται σε. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς λέγει, Τίς
 34 ἔστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί; καὶ περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς
 περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους λέγει, Ἰδε ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ
 35 ἀδελφοί μου ὃς ἀν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗτος ἀδελφός
 μου καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἔστιν.

28. The Scribes considered that Jesus must be assisted by a spirit to drive out the demons. Jesus himself does not judge differently; he does not think of claiming that he can do such works of himself or by his own power. Their mistake lies not in saying he has a spirit to assist him, but in thinking of the wrong spirit, of an unclean spirit. Jesus was aware of a power that carried him along in his career; it came to him at his baptism, it carried him to the wilderness, it still acts in and through him (cf. Luke iv. 18, 21). That is the spirit which does the great works that are wrought by his hands.

The words of the 28th verse are uttered by one in a state of intense indignation. May we say that Jesus himself might not have repeated them at a calmer moment? The charge brought against him, that of being the instrument of a bad spirit and working in league with, and in the interests of, the kingdom of darkness, was a venomous as well as an illogical one. The spirit that accomplished such acts

was clearly divine, not devilish; and those who misjudged it as the Scribes did cut themselves off fatally from God and God's cause. Everything may be forgiven, he says; all the blasphemies men utter may be forgiven the sons of men¹; at the final balance all these may be cleared away and men enter the world to come with nothing standing against them. But one sin there is which does not admit of being thus wiped out; it is a sin which does not come to an end in the present world but continues for the condemnation of its perpetrator in the age beyond.²

On the Beelzebul discourses as a whole, see Jülicher, ii. 214-240. What Mark gives is excellently connected, but here as in other reports of discourses he is very brief. The other synoptists have two remarkable sayings which are hard to reconcile with each other. In Mt. xii. 27, Luke xi. 19 Jesus appeals to the exorcism practised by adherents of the Pharisees' party. Those exorcists would never allow that the work of expulsion

¹ In the parallels this "sons of men" in the plural, meaning simply men, is transformed into the Son of Man in the singular, and a comparison is made between the Son of Man

(the Messiah) and the Holy Spirit, and between the guilt incurred by blaspheming each of them respectively (cf. p. 82 on the "Son of Man").

² ἔστιν.

² φωνοῦντες or ἡγοῦντες. See Nestle, *Introduction*, Eng. Tr., p. 263, where φωνοῦντες (D) is said to be the original.

³ Add καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ σου.

Of a certainty I tell you, everything shall be forgiven to the ²⁸
sons of men, their sins and all the blasphemies they have
uttered; but whoever blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit, he ²⁹
can never obtain forgiveness, but will be¹ guilty of an eternal
sin. Because they said, He has an unclean spirit. ³⁰

[Matthew xii. 46-50; Luke viii. 19-21.]

And his mother and his brothers come; and they stood ³¹
outside, and sent to call him. And there was a crowd sitting ³²
round about him, and the message is brought to him, Your
mother and your brothers² are outside asking for you. And ³³
to that he says, Who is my mother and my brothers? And ³⁴
he looked round on those who were seated about him, and says,
Behold, my mother and my brothers! Whoever does the will ³⁵
of God, he is my brother and sister and mother!

could be done by the instrumentality of an evil spirit. They would protest as Jesus does that only a good spirit is to be thought of as the agent. In referring his slanderers to these persons, whose work he recognizes as real, just as the Pharisees recognize his own, Jesus seems to take lower ground than he does in the following verse, Matth. xii. 28, Luke xi. 20, where he speaks of his own expulsions as evidence of the imminent approach of the Kingdom of God. Were the expulsions of the Jewish exorcists also evidence of this? The emphatic "I, by the finger of God" seems to exclude them.

31. We heard, ver. 21, of the thoughts Jesus' family entertained about him, and of their setting out to act upon the view they took. In Matthew and Luke the earlier chapter of the incident is not mentioned, and the repulse of his kinsfolk by Jesus appears harsher, as they are not there shown to have done anything to deserve it. In Mark their misjudgment of him is narrated along with that of the Scribes, and we naturally understand that Jesus had heard of their plans.

When they arrive he is in a room in the house (ver. 19 b), closely surrounded by attentive listeners, who are seated, as he, the teacher, also is. This crowd

is in a different mood from that of ver. 20; the scene is not one of tumult but one of quiet earnestness, after the Master's heart. The message about his family is not, in the circumstances, one to appeal to domestic affection, but one suggesting alienation and strife. No wonder that he prefers the circle in which he is to that which summons him. If his kindred after the flesh behave towards him in a way to make him feel that he is homeless, still he has those who care for him and for whom he cares. There is a 'multitude' sitting about him, not a select body of friends such as the Twelve, but a miscellaneous gathering of people, whose one link of union is their interest in him and their desire to hear him. He is speaking to them when the interruption comes, setting forth to them, we must suppose, to account for the form his words take afterwards, what God wants them to do in order to be fit for His Kingdom when it comes, as it shortly will. They hang on his words; they are agreed with him that what he sets before them is God's will and true religion. So they are with him heart and soul at the moment of his happiest activity. He need not be without family, however much his mother and sisters and brothers according to the flesh misinterpret him, and wound

¹ Or, is.

² Add, and your sisters.

Jesus teaches in Parables, iv. 1-34.

1 Καὶ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. καὶ συνάγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος πλεῖστος, ὡστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ¹ πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν 2 θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦσαν. καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλά, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, Ἐάκουέτε·

Parable of the Sower, iv. 3-9.

3 Ἰδοὺ ἔξηλθεν ὁ σπείρων σπεῖραι. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν 4 ὁ μὲν ἐπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὄδόν, καὶ ἥλθεν τὰ πετεινὰ καὶ κατέφαγεν 5 αὐτό. καὶ ἄλλο ἐπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρώδες ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν

him. These are his mother and sisters and brothers.

It is common to nascent religious movements that they break through the ties of nature and form new bonds which ardent spirits feel to be stronger and more real. But the new union brings also division; the new truth brings for a time, perhaps for a long time, not peace but a sword. ‘Islam has broken all bonds,’ the early Moslems declared when the faith required them to fight against their own clansmen. In the Gospels there are sayings almost as freezing, as to the necessity for ‘hating’ father and mother and brother. Does not Christ forbid one of his followers to go to his father’s funeral? But while there is this uncompromising call to the sacrifice implied in the new and higher duty, there is never any pretence that the abandonment of family is not painful. Passages like Matth. x. 37-39 show no insensibility of the pain of such partings, and could not have been spoken by one who had not himself felt it. To take the story before us as an allegory of the transition of the Gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles (so Volkmar) is to do it much less than justice. To Gentile readers it would no doubt appeal strongly; but to the Jewish Christian also it had its message, claiming him as in the highest sense a kinsman of the Lord.

iv. 1-34. The Parables of Jesus. Mark has told us repeatedly how Jesus preached in various situations, and what an effect his preaching had;

but he has given us no specimens of it. And yet he has given us some of the doctrine. The teaching of Jesus was preserved in the earliest period in two forms; firstly in stories leading up to some saying of Christ, and secondly in discourses which were remembered for their own sake and could be transmitted without stories to carry them. The first form tended to pass into the second; but what Mark has given us up to this point is in the first, not in the second form. We now come to a section which is devoted to the teaching; but we see at once that it does not put before us one of the synagogue-addresses of Jesus, which indeed, unreported as they were, with the very doubtful exception of Luke iv. 21-27, are lost to the world, but confines itself to one particular kind of teaching, of which Jesus was a master. What is given us is an account of the parables of Jesus; three of these are reported; then there is a discussion of the method of parables, and an elaborate interpretation of one of the stories.

1. There was teaching by the sea before (ii. 13), and a great crowd by the sea (iii. 8, 9) where the boat was ordered as a precaution. If the article is read, “the boat,” the writer will have remembered that passage. The boat is put to the use for which it appeared there to be meant, namely, to enable the work of preaching to go on without interference by the crowd. There is no attempt to fix the date of this new day of teaching; the day introduced by the

¹ Omit τὸ.

[Matthew xiii. 1-52; Luke viii. 4-18.]

And he began again to teach by the seaside. And a very great multitude of people assembles at the spot where he is, so that he got into the¹ boat and sat in the sea, and the whole multitude was close to the sea on the land. And he taught them much in parables, and said to them in his teaching: Hear!

[Matthew xiii. 3-9; Luke viii. 5-8.]

Look! The sower went out to sow. And so it was as he sowed, that some fell on the road and the birds came and ate it up. And some of the seed again fell on the part of the field where the rock was, where it had not much earth, and it sprang

vague statement that he began¹ again to teach by the seaside goes on throughout the chapter; ver. 35 speaks of the evening, as if it were still the same day.

2. The teaching went on for some time, and on this occasion it was in the form of parables. The words describe generally what he did this day, and then introduce the first parable Mark found in the collection. "In Parables," cf. on iii. 23, xii. 1. The piece now following was known to Matthew and Luke also, and contained, after the parable of the Sower, explanations as to the method of which it was the chief example. The address begins with the summons "Hear," so common in the prophets. The teacher is ready, and asks the attention of the crowd for what he is to say.

3. The story, for which Jesus enlists the eyes of the multitude as he had just claimed their ears, is very simple. It is a story; while it sets before us a very familiar figure, a countryman engaged in an ordinary operation of husbandry, it does so in narrative form, and so brings the figure more vividly before us, and compels us to take an interest in him, and even to enter in some degree into his feelings as he carries on this occupation. It is the sower who is spoken of; the man who has this piece of work to do, when the

time calls for it. And now we are to be told of the various fates which befell the seed he cast abroad. First some fell on the road, for there was a road along one side of the field. This seed was thrown a little too far, or leaped out of the field upon the road. Here the seed could not perform its office; it lay on the surface and found no entry, and the birds, which in the country are nowhere far away, soon came and carried it off.

Here Luke says that the seed was "trodden down," and that the birds "of heaven" ate it up. Luke's version of the parable is shorter, and is considered by Weiss to be more original, a view which Jülicher does not share. In this verse Luke's phrases show reflection, and the customary tendency towards elegance; and it may be observed that the author of the interpretation (ver. 15) knows nothing of the treading down, but only of the removal by birds.

Here, then, the seed encountered obstacles which prevented it from accomplishing the design of Providence and the aim of the sower.

5. There was a part of the field where the rock looked through or was covered with only a thin layer of earth. The story of the seed that fell here is told as if its fate was sealed the next day; for the sake of a graphic story the experience of weeks is put into a few

¹ 'Began' is a conventional form. See Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 21.

¹ Or, a

6 πολλήν, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξανέτειλεν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς· καὶ
ὅτε ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος ἐκαυματίσθη καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ρίζαν
7 ἐξηράνθη· καὶ ἄλλο ἐπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας, καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ
8 ἄκανθαι καὶ συνέπιξαν αὐτό, καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν· καὶ ἄλλα
ἐπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλίν, καὶ ἐδίδουν καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ
9 αὐξανόμενα,¹ καὶ ἔφερεν εἰς² τριάκοντα καὶ εἰς² ἑξήκοντα καὶ εἰς²
ἑκατόν· καὶ ἔλεγεν, Ὡς ἔχει ὡτα ἀκούειν ἀκούετω.

words. These plants, unable to develop downwards, shot upwards, as agriculturists assure us plants actually do : the story is the work of an acute observer. The consequence was unavoidable. Even well-rooted plants might suffer from the heat (*ἐκαυματίσθη*), but they would not shrivel up at once (*ἐξηράνθη*), being well nourished from below, and recovering somewhat at night. Here also, then, the seed and the sower meet with obstacles.

In Luke's parable the failure of this part of the seed is differently accounted for. After sprouting it withered, he says, because it had no moisture. The interpretation speaks of the want not of moisture but of roots, and so points rather to Mark's version than Luke's. Luke's appears simpler at first sight, but is really not so close to the fact of the matter, and not so likely, therefore, to be original.

7. **Thorns** are the plague of the farmer in the East, as weeds of various kinds are with us ; and where they had established themselves in a field could scarcely be eradicated. Whether the thorns are visible, having already begun to grow, or whether the roots only are there, not of course unknown to the sower, makes no difference. The seed which fell on this part of the field was free from the dangers spoken of before ; there was soil to cover it, and depth of earth to receive its roots. But the thorns grew faster than the wheat, and the latter had no chance, being deprived of sun and air. It threw up green stalks, but they were failures. So here too, sower and seed met with reverse.

8. The sower's toil is not all disappointment and loss. Some of it yields a splendid return, in which he forgets all his discouragements. In the **good soil**, which is neither too shallow nor full of

the roots of thorns, the seed accomplishes its mission. The reading adopted connects "mounted up and increased" with "the seed" which is the subject of the sentence, and not with the "fruit." Jülicher who adopts the other reading maintains (*ad loc.*) that "fruit" might embrace all that comes from the seed, stalk and ear as well as grain, but this is surely strained. It, or the plants rising from it, grow tall and develop leaf and ear. "Thirty and sixty and a hundred" is an Oriental way of expressing the large increase, and makes a more telling picture than Luke's "hundredfold."

The parable is wound up with words which challenge the hearer to examine well what has been said, and to find out for himself its inner meaning (cf. Apoc. ii. 7, 11 etc., and xiii. 18, "Here is wisdom"). Are these words to be attributed to Jesus or to the evangelist? If to Jesus, it would appear to follow that he cannot have thought it necessary to furnish this parable with an interpretation, but must have thought, as in the case of parables which have no such appendix, that the discerning could see its point without further assistance. If the words are due to the evangelist, he treats this parable as a typical example of the teaching of Jesus, giving the "Hear!" at the beginning and this summons to understand at the close, both of which Jesus may often have used, though not specially in connection with parables. In this case the words may have no very great significance. If, on the contrary, the evangelist, after writing down this parable, deliberately added the sign that there was something special to be looked for in what he had just written, and that the reader ought not to go further till he had found it out, what was the inner meaning he

¹ αὐξανόμενον.

² εἰς, ἐν, or ἐπεν ; or ἐπεν three times, in later MSS. written ἐπεν ; Latins, unum.

up at once, because it had no depth of earth, and when the sun rose it suffered from the heat and because it had no root it withered. And some of it, again, fell among the thorns, and the thorns mounted up and choked it, and it bore no fruit. And some fell on the good ground, and bore fruit as it mounted up and increased,¹ and yielded as much as thirty² and sixty² and a hundred.² And he said, He who has ears to hear, let him hear.

wished his readers to look for? In this case also it would seem that the reader's attention would not have been thus challenged if an interpretation of the parable was just about to be given; and the presence of this challenge shows that the interpretation which follows was not originally linked to the parable.

Lending our ear, meantime, to the challenge, let us ask what, in the absence of any interpretation, we should conceive to be the point of this parable. The parable of the patched coat and that of the old wineskins could be read without any special interpretation; no key is furnished to them and yet we are able to find out what they mean. Is this the case here also?

What must have occurred to the first hearers of the parable of the Sower, was that Jesus was telling them of a figure which was very familiar to them all and bidding them look first at the many obstacles in the way of his work, and then at the certainty of his success in the main and in the long run. What led him to think, they must have asked, of all those partial failures the sower meets with and then of the reward his labour does gain in the end? All so true, and entering so accurately into the sower's case; how did Jesus know it all? He must know it from his own experience, because the task he is labouring at has difficulties and failures too, and because he also looks for a reward of which he is sure at last. What is he working at, the hearers would ask, and how can he have met with experiences like those of the sower? Well, he is working at getting the people ready for the Kingdom

which he says is at hand, and actually here; and he does that by his preaching, he has made it the work of his life to preach to the people with that end. This story then must have arisen out of his experience as a preacher. He too has met with obstacles, and feels that much of his preaching has been thrown away. Does he mean us to find in his work a species of failure answering to each of the failures of the sower? Has his word fallen on hard places where it never could enter at all, and the birds of the air, in this case invisible, caught it away before it was ever thought of? Has his preaching fallen on shallow soil where it was welcomed at first but could not strike root? Has he also felt that he had made converts only to find soon after that the hearts he thought he had impressed were too much engrossed with worldly cares and struggles to belong to him permanently? Perhaps he meant us to think of these details, perhaps not. At any rate he meant that the message he preaches has encountered difficulties of various kinds. To some extent he is disappointed; he thought at first that all ears would be quite open to him and that all hearts would be won by his first appeal; and now he finds it is not so; there are various kinds of men in the world, and men think of other things besides religion. And yet, on the other hand, he is not daunted by this experience. He is looking for success in the end, in spite of all these failures. Some people hear him; not all are hard or frivolous or worldly. Those who give themselves to follow his teaching, they, he considers, will be in the Kingdom when it

¹ Or, fruit which mounted up and increased.

² Or, one thirty, one sixty, and one a hundred, or, "at the rate of thirty," etc. Wellhausen considers the confusion to be due to translation of the Aramaic **א** which could be rendered with either *eis* or *ev* (*Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, vi., 193).

The use of Parables, iv. 10-12.

10 Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας, ἡρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν
11 σὺν τοῖς δάδεκα τὰς παραβολάς.¹ καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, 'Υμῖν τὸ
μυστήριον δέονται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ' ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν
12 παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται, ἵνα

βλέποντες βλέπωσι καὶ μὴ ιδωσιν,
καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούσωσι καὶ μὴ συνιδωσιν,
μήτοτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.

comes ; the work will be justified then, and its drawbacks all forgotten.

The parable gives us under a thin disguise the experience of Jesus as a preacher. Looking back on his preaching after it has gone on for some time, he tells us that it has not all been successful. But he is far from concluding that he must give it up or exchange the role of preacher for another. That no doubt has been suggested to him, though Mark says nothing of these suggestions ; but he remains true to the simple conception he formed at first of his office and duty. The sower still goes forth to sow, and in spite of apparent failure is still sure of the harvest.

10. Before giving any more parables (ver. 2), Mark, as well as the parallels, gives two explanatory sections, one as to the intention and effect of this method of teaching, the other as to the meaning of the parable already reported. No method could be more provocative of enquiry and discussion than that adopted by Jesus, and we cannot wonder that even in the inner circle such curiosity began to show itself.

It is not the crowd who ask about the parable, but Jesus' own circle. Outsiders must often have picked up the point of Jesus' parables very quickly (Mark xii. 12, however, is the only example where the effect produced by a parable is described) ; but one disposed to dwell on them would soon see in them deeper meanings than those which appeared at first. In the present instance it is his *disciples* who enquire, not the Twelve only, but a company of faithful ones, like those we found sitting round him and hanging on his words before (iii. 32). We shall again recognize such a following. "They asked him for the parables." The enquiry is described

very vaguely, and it is afterwards answered in two different ways. Mark must have meant to indicate a question about the nature and aim of parables generally, and so, in vv. 11, 12, we have an explanation of this method of teaching. Matthew agrees with this, for with him "the disciples" ask, "why do you speak to them in parables?" In Luke as in the Western reading here [D and Latins], they ask what this particular parable means.

The enquiry is answered by all three Synoptists first in the one sense, and then in the other. First we have an answer as if the enquiry was as in Matthew, *why do you speak in parables?* To this it is replied, that the hearers of the word are of *two classes*, the inner circle who are initiated, and those without, the uninitiated. To the former the secret of the Kingdom is already communicated. They know about the Kingdom and its coming. The latter, however, are not to hear that secret, it is to be kept concealed from them. The preaching which is addressed to them is not intended to lead them to a true understanding of the Gospel, and in their case it all takes place in a form to prevent them from knowing the secret which true disciples know. It is the divine intention that they should remain unenlightened ; scripture proves this, for does not Isaiah speak of those who see and hear with the outward senses, but remain all the time blind and deaf to the divine message, and is not this spoken of as the ordinance of God who has decreed that these persons should not repent nor be forgiven ?

Thus Jesus declares that *he speaks in parables in order that he may not be understood*, and that the Jews who hear him may not be converted and saved. It is impossible to believe that

¹ τις ἡ παραβολὴ αὕτη.

[Matthew xiii. 10-15; Luke viii. 9, 10.]

And when he came to be in private, those who were ¹⁰ about him with the Twelve asked him for the parables.¹ And he said to them, To you the mystery of the Kingdom of ¹¹ God is committed but to those outside it all comes in parables, in order that ¹²

“seeing they may see and not perceive,
and hearing may hear and not understand,
lest they should convert and be forgiven.”

he either thought or said this; and the question arises for us how such a sentiment came to be put in his mouth. The explanation is to be found in the history of the quotation from Isaiah in N. T. literature. The Gospel of Mark was not the earliest work in which the passage is used as it is here. It is used in the epistle to the Romans xi. 8 (cf. also Deut. xxix. 4, Isa. xxix. 10) in a passage where the Apostle Paul is seeking to account for the strange fact that Israel, the people of the promises, has not accepted the Gospel. To him it is an evident fact that Israel as a whole is ‘hardened’ (cf. Mark iii. 5, where the same fact appears to be in view), and he finds warrant in Scripture for believing that this hardening was not unforeseen in the divine plan but was deliberately ordained by God for ends afterwards to be made clear. “The rest,” that is Israel, “were hardened,” Rom. xi. 7. “Hardening in part has happened to Israel,” ver. 25. With Isaiah the words are perhaps ironical, but to Paul they state a fact which stands plain before his eyes. To those after Paul it did not become less a fact than it had been to him (see John xii. 40, Acts xxviii. 26-28); and our passage is most simply explained if we refer it to the same effort on the part of the Church to account for that strange dispensation. How did it come that the Jews to whom Jesus first addressed his preaching were not converted by it, had no ear for it? The answer to this question was sought in the parabolic method of Jesus’ teaching. To the second generation after the Gospel teaching, much of the original message was already obscure, though not on that account less sacred; and the para-

bles in particular appeared to be full of deep mysteries only to be understood by those possessing a special key to them. No wonder then that the Jews had not understood them; nay had not this mode of teaching been adopted in order that the Jews might not understand; was it not necessary if they were to be hardened, as God’s plan implied, that they should receive the Gospel in a form in which it could do them no good?

To us, the question why Jesus spoke in parables needs no elaborate answer. He did so because his thought and his speech were oriental; because he thought concretely, in images and examples, because it was more natural to him to present a truth in living figures which could not be forgotten, than in formal statements. It may also be considered with regard to those parables which have the Kingdom for their theme, that his views about the nature of the Kingdom were so widely different from those of his countrymen that he could scarcely state to them all that he thought about it without offending them. In a parable, on the other hand, truth insinuates itself into the mind gently and produces conviction without apparently trying to do so.

In Matthew we observe that the quotation from Isaiah is put to quite a different use from that in Mark. In Mark, Jesus teaches in parables in order that the Jews may be hardened, according to the divine decree; in Matthew because they are hardened already. In Mark the parabolic method is a precaution, that the decree may not be interfered with; in Matthew, it is a punishment.

¹ Or, what this parable was.

Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower, iv. 13-20.

13 Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, καὶ πῶς
 14 πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε; ὁ σπείρων τὸν λόγον σπείρει.
 15 οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὄδὸν ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος, καὶ
 ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν, εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ αἴρει τὸν λόγον τὸν
 16 ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτούς. καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν ὄμοιοι οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη
 σπειρόμενοι, οἵ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς
 17 λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ρίζαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀλλὰ πρόσ-
 καιροί εἰσιν, εἶτα γενομένης θλίψεως ἡ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον,
 18 εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται. καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσὶν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρό-
 19 μενοι· οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες, καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ

Matthew gives here (xiii. 16, 17) the verses felicitating the disciples on what they, differing from the multitude in this, actually see and hear. In Luke the words occur (x. 23, 24) after the praise Jesus lifted up to the Father for what He had revealed and delivered to him, His Son; as if to indicate that the disciples also shared the knowledge of that mystery. The true connection of the words may be different from either of these. They seem to belong to the thought represented in Luke xi. 29-36, where the things going on in Jesus' mission are said to be greater than those which drew the Queen of Sheba to the court of Solomon, or those which led the men of Nineveh to repent.

13. Now we come to a saying of Jesus which implies that the disciples had asked to have one particular parable explained to them. In the source the question must have been as Luke gives it (viii. 9; cf. the Western reading, Mark iv. 10); and the singular "parable" was changed by Mark into the plural "parables," because the answer he was to give first was about the intention of the parables generally. The disciples, then, have confessed themselves ignorant of the meaning of the parable just spoken, and Jesus comments on their ignorance. Those in their position, to whom the secret of the Kingdom has been given, and who, for this must be the idea implied here, are destined to teach others, they ought to know the meaning of the parables one and all, and if they do not of themselves attain this knowledge, it must be communicated to them specially. Jesus therefore proceeds to give them the

interpretation of the parable of the Sower. These considerations do not belong to the original situation, but to a later period when the parables had grown obscure, and it was thought that the disciples must have been specially enlightened in order to interpret them. Nor can the following interpretation be recognized as one which only Jesus himself could possibly have given of the parable. Instead of dwelling on the central point the story was told to illustrate, and showing what light it casts on Jesus' policy and action, the exposition now given fixes on the details of the story which we saw to be unimportant for its original bearing, and treats them as in themselves very important and interesting. While Jesus told the story to show how he went on preaching although he met with many a discouragement, and what he expected from it, we now have it treated as a lecture on the various kinds of human character, as affected by the Gospel. The parable is made not an argument but an allegory, in which not one great lesson but a number of co-ordinate lessons are taught. It is true as Jülicher points out, that the story is not fully allegorized, a number of its features being left without any interpretation. Attention is not fixed on the person of the sower or on the origin of his message, nor are the details of the harvest dwelt on as in Matthew's interpretation of the parable of the Wheat and the Tares, Matth. xiii. 36-43. But while it is not allegorized as much as it might have been, it is allegorized, as Jülicher admits. Meanings are suggested for its images, which the first hearers cannot have had time to think

[Matthew xiii. 18-23; Luke viii. 11-15.]

And he says to them, Do you not know¹ this parable, and how are you to know all the parables? The sower sows the word. And these are those on the road where the word is sown; as soon as they hear it Satan comes at once and takes away the word which is sown in them. And those similarly who are sown on the rocky part are those who when they hear the word receive it at once with joy; and they have no root in themselves, but are only for the moment; then when affliction or persecution arises on account of the word, they at once take offence. Another class again are those who are sown among the thorns; these are people who hear the word, and the cares

of; instead of a piece of picture-language thrown out for a present practical purpose it is turned into a series of reflections.

14. First, then, we are told that the sower sows the word: who the sower is, is not said; not he but the seed, which is the word, is to be spoken of in its various fortunes. The word is that which to Christ and the early Christians was the chiefest of all words, viz. the message about the Kingdom God was sending, and to which He was calling men. Here the interpretation is faithful to the position Jesus undoubtedly took up in his preaching, in that he preached not himself but the Kingdom. Devoted as he was to the word of the Kingdom, it is very possible that he did reflect on the various causes which prevented its reception. The parable is intelligible enough if we say it is a story about the Kingdom and the hindrances to belief in it. We shall see as we go on how this answers.

15. Instead of saying that the road represents such a class of hearers, the evangelist says, "Those on the road," as if he were speaking of the seed and not of the soil. But the expression is an abbreviated one. The full form would be, "Those referred to in the case where the seed fell on the road." We are to think of a class of hearers of the word, of those, namely, into whose mind the word never enters at all. The hardness of their hearts would be enough to account for this. If the word makes no impression on a man, it is not necessary

that it should be artificially carried away from him. But the birds were in the parable, and so the interpretation takes them in, and makes of them those winged agents of evil who were constantly seeking to thwart God's plans and to whom all mischief was attributed.

16. For those plants in thin soil which grow quickly and as quickly wither, an analogy is soon found in human character. There are persons quickly moved to feeling, and exciting high hopes in the preacher, but with no depth in which a spiritual principle can take root and enter on a growth nothing can check. What came to them lightly goes lightly; they are not made for constancy. As soon as they realize the consequences of their acts, as soon as friends look on them coldly, or the informer is seen in the distance, they feel that that is not what they bargained for, and that they must wait for quieter times before declaring for the cause. In this verse we are reminded of the early period of the Church rather than of that of Christ himself, who might foresee the persecution of his followers but did not witness it.

18. The fate of the seed among the thorns suggests persons hearing the Gospel message who have a stronger nature than those last spoken of. The better life begins in them and strikes deeper root than in the last case; but if the Gospel lays strong hold on them, other things compete with it in their life, and they have not enough determination

¹ Or, You do not know.

αἰῶνος καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι
 20 εἰσπορευόμεναι συνπνίγουσιν τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται. καὶ
 ἐκεῖνοι εἰσὶν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες, οἵτινες ἀκούουσιν
 τὸν λόγον καὶ παραδέχονται καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν¹ τριάκοντα
 καὶ ἐν¹ ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἐν¹ ἑκατόν.

The Lamp not to be hidden, iv. 21-25.

21 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι Μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν
 μόδιον τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ;
 22 οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν² κρυπτόν, ἐάν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ· οὐδὲ ἐγένετο
 23 ἀπόκρυφον, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν. εἴ τις ἔχει ὥτα ἀκούειν

to give up all for the sake of the treasure they have found. The reflective style of these verses seems to point to a mature experience of the reception the Gospel met with on the part of men engaged in worldly callings and in the life of society. Compare 1 Tim. vi. 6 *sqq.* On the theme of giving up all for the Gospel Christ himself generally strikes a stronger note. Compare the parable of the Pearl and such passages as Matth. xix. 21 *sq.*, vi. 24 *sq.*

20. No comment is called for here, but the question arises whether Christ himself could naturally dwell on the **different rates at which believers profit** by their faith, or whether this does not imply a Church, in which such observations naturally suggest themselves. In the parable of the Talents also, the rates of increase differ, and that parable may possibly be regarded as authentic, though belonging to the very close of the ministry. Of the interpretation as a whole it must be said that if not authentic it is very early, and that it is not impossible that it may be based on words Jesus used in speaking of the parable. It compares favourably with the interpretation of the parable of the Tares and the Wheat (Matth. xiii. 37-43), which is much more allegorizing and shows the ideas of the early Church more plainly. In the present piece there is nothing to show that Matthew and Luke did not follow Mark, cutting off his redundancies (which make his version the longest of the three) and

otherwise improving and correcting him. Matthew individualizes Mark's classes of hearers, giving each with a singular. Luke adds here and there a beautiful phrase out of his rich Christian language. The reader will compare what we saw the parable to mean when considered by itself in the light of the original circumstances (p. 107).

21. We now come to a **set of sayings** of Jesus which Mark collects here without insisting in any way that this is the original or the right place for them. He introduces each piece with the formula ἔλεγεν, which means no more than 'This was one of his sayings,' or 'He used to say.' Such a heading might be prefixed to individual sayings in an early collection of such reminiscences.¹ It implies that the circumstances in which the saying was spoken either are not remembered or are a matter of indifference. Now, some of the sayings collected here in Mark occur in Matthew and Luke in contexts which show quite clearly what these evangelists supposed them to mean. The student has to consider both what these sayings mean in the various contexts in which they are found elsewhere, and what meaning they are apparently meant to convey in Mark.

One of the sayings of the Master was about **a lamp**, and the object for which a lamp is prepared in the evening. Ἐρχεται, "comes," does not suggest that the lamp is brought into the room from

¹ Compare the newly discovered so-called *Logia Iesu*, which, however, are much later.

² Add τι.

of the present life and the false enticements of wealth and the thought of other objects of desire, these all come in and choke the word so that it proves unfruitful. And those who were sown on the good ground, they are those who hear the word and welcome it and bear fruit thirty or sixty or a hundredfold.¹

[Matthew v. 15, x. 26; Luke viii. 16-18, xi. 33, xii. 2.]

And he said to them, Is the lamp brought to be put under the bushel, or under the bed? Is it not brought to be set on the lampstand? For there is nothing hidden except that it should come to light, nor is anything made a secret except that it might come into publicity. If any one has

some other apartment; the houses in the parables are one-roomed dwellings, and the lamp shines at the street-door; see Luke xi. 33. It would be prepared in a corner of the room, and then came the question where it was to be placed. How irrational, when the lamp is trimmed and lighted and comes out into the room, to put it in a position where it cannot light up the dwelling; under the wooden measure, in which the flour is measured for the day's bread, or under the bed, where it can only light part of the floor! One puts it high up on the lampstand, so that its rays can spread all round and into every corner!

In this context, where Luke as well as Mark gives it, the little parable of the Lamp affords a lesson about the interpretation of the parable which has just been recorded. The disciples are those who know what the parables mean; the interpretation has been given to them alone. And they ought to communicate that knowledge, not to keep it to themselves. This connection can scarcely be genuine. That it is what Mark had in view is, however, made certain by ver. 22, where he goes on to speak of the use of a knowledge which for any reason has been hidden, or communicated only to a few. The knowledge of Christ's meaning in the parables has been given to the disciples only. But it ought not to be concealed permanently. On the contrary, it is said, there is no other object in hiding

a thing, but that it may be exhibited (when the right time comes); if a thing has been made a secret, that can only have been done with a view to its publication (when the moment arrives which the whole transaction had in view). It belongs to the nature of a mystery that it should be unveiled.

In this context this can only mean that there was at one time in Christ's following some doctrine or doctrines which were regarded as *esoteric*, and not to be communicated to the world, but that the time came, or was expected to come, for throwing off reserve about them. That Jesus himself may have contemplated this change cannot be denied. He spoke both of the Kingdom and of his own Messiahship in a veiled way, and he led his disciples to views which he did not wish them to proclaim at once. But this reticence which he enjoined so often could only be temporary. The time must come when it would be their duty to proclaim their Master as Messiah and the Kingdom as no longer coming but come. If the Kingdom was in the meantime a mystery, yet a mystery was a thing meant to be revealed at its due time.

To Mark, however, and to his age the words must have put on other meanings. The hint "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear!" would convey an admonition that the time had come to give up some piece of reserve in Christian teaching. That

¹Or, one thirty, etc.

24 ἀκούετω. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε. ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ
25 μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν. ὅς γὰρ
ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ· καὶ ὃς οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὁ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

Parable of the man who sleeps while his seed is growing, iv. 26-29.

26 Καὶ ἔλεγεν, Οὗτος ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς ἄνθρωπος
27 βάλῃ τὸν σπόρον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ καθεύδῃ καὶ ἐγείρηται νύκτα
καὶ ἡμέραν, καὶ ὁ σπόρος βλαστᾷ καὶ μηκύνηται ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν

reserve was practised we see from 1 Cor. ii. and Heb. vi.

In Luke xi. 34 and Matth. v. 15, 16 the parable of the Lamp stands in other connections. In Luke the lamp is simply the new light, greater than any which has shone before, which has opened on mankind in the Gospel. The single eye can behold it, and the whole person then becomes illuminated. (In Matth. vi. 22 the single eye appears in a different relation; it is the eye which is not distracted by the world's vain shows). In Matth. v. 14-16 the disciples are the lamp, the light of which must illuminate not only the Jewish land but the world; by their good works the world's attention is to be drawn to them and to their doctrine.

The hidden thing which is to be made public occurs again, Matth. x. 26 and Luke xii. 2; and in these passages the disciples are exhorted not to be intimidated by their adversaries, but to preach boldly all that they have learned of the Gospel. All Christian truth is to be preached, even what was formerly private and was spoken of only in the inner circle.

24. These counsels, as they stand here, are for students and teachers of Christian truth. Such persons are admonished to look carefully into what they hear from the source of truth. It has been described (ver. 11) as a mystery, and they are to be faithful to the trust thus given to them, to enquire more deeply into it and not to deal with it as if all of it lay on the surface. If they bring from it unsuspected stores of truth and deal out to their hearers far more than the text would have led

them to expect, their faculty will grow of bringing to light the hidden riches of the word. Even more than they have sought for will be given them, and this is reinforced by the common proverb: "He who has grows richer and he who has not grows poorer."

These sentences, as brought together in Mark, point to the spiritual or allegorical method of Scripture interpretation, which considers that the obvious meaning of the sacred words is their least important meaning and that they are all full of mysteries which the student must apply his ingenuity to bring to light. That such treatment should have been applied very early to words of Jesus is not wonderful (cf. 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15). The phrases connected together by Mark in this section occur in Matthew in contexts of their own. The verse "In what measure . . ." stands in Matth. vii. where it refers to the judgments men form of each other's character and actions. The phrase "shall be added to you"¹ is spoken in Matth. vi. 33 of the truth that he who seeks the Kingdom and righteousness of God will not find himself destitute of worldly things which he has given up seeking. And the verse "He that hath, to him shall be given, etc.," seems to be in its original position in the parable of the talents, Mt. xxv. 29, Luke xix. 26. Matthew and Luke each give that saying twice: the second time in that parable; the first in the present parable-discourse. In Luke it stands in the same position as in Mark; Matthew, who is not at this point accompanying Mark, has given this saying already in his statement (xiii. 12) about the use of parables.

¹Said by Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 183, to be in the passive in order to avoid the use of the divine name.

ears to hear, let him hear. And he said to them, Consider 24 carefully what you hear. With what measure you measure it will be measured out to you, and even more shall be added to you. For he who has, to him shall be given; and he who 25 has not, even what he has shall be taken away from him.

[Cf. Matthew xiii. 24-30.]

And he said, So is the Kingdom of God, as if a man had 26 cast his seed upon the ground, and should then sleep and 27 wake night and day, and the seed spring up and grow tall, he

26. Here Mark is alone; and he evidently had no tradition as to the place of this parable in the narrative; it is introduced quite loosely. In ver. 11 we were told that parables were only for the multitude; but in ver. 10 Jesus was alone with the disciples, and the situation has not been changed; vv. 24, 25 are still for the disciples. To save his consistency Mark should have brought the multitude on the scene again, but he has not done so.

Another parable, then, on the same theme as the first. But this time it is not the operation of sowing that is to be thought of, but what happens when that work is done. It is the Kingdom of God that is illustrated by this story, or picture, for it is scarcely a story. Of the Kingdom of God we have not heard in Mark since the opening announcement in i. 15; and if we had no Gospel before us but this one we should have some difficulty in knowing what view Jesus took of it. This parable evidently only throws light on it from one side. We are not told about the Kingdom in a systematic way, only one particular feature of it is cleared up. No doubt that is true of all the parables dealing with the theme.

"So is the Kingdom of Heaven as a man had east (aor.) seed on the ground, and should then go on (pres.) sleeping and waking as night and day pass by, and the seed should shoot forth," etc. The constructions are awkward and broken, and the Kingdom is not likened to any particular person or thing, as is elsewhere done, but to a condition that occurs in a certain department of life. At one particular juncture in the experience of the sower, a situation presents itself with which the King-

dom of God, of course at the time when the parable was spoken, may be compared. After the seed is sown, what does the sower do, and what happens to the seed? This is the situation. The sower has an easy mind; he does not consume himself in anxiety, he knows there is nothing more for him to do in the meantime, and he just waits, sleeps and wakes as nights and days pass quietly along. But the seed is not idle though he is not bending over it. The earth takes charge of it, and does what human care and pains avail not to effect, making it to grow up in natural course, to fulfil the sower's hopes. First the green shoot appears above the brown earth, then the ear runs up the stalk and appears at the top (it is wheat, of course, that is spoken of) and then, as the ultimate and satisfying fact ($\pi\lambda\eta\rho\eta\varsigma\sigma\tauος$ in the nominative), there is the solid grain filling the ear. The sower has apparently nothing to do with all that; it is the earth that does it all, whether he is looking on or not. But the time comes when he is called upon again to act. When the indications take place that the corn is ripe, then he sends out his reapers.

What would this parable mean to those who first heard it? It would be spoken when Jesus felt himself to have done his sowing. He preached about a Kingdom, and yet there was nothing of the kind to point to outwardly. Where was the Kingdom he announced so confidently as being at hand or actually there? He means that he can wait, as the sower does; this is what the discerning hearer would gather from his story. He has done his part, and he believes that what he has done is not lost; though the result does not yet

28 ἀύτος. αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶτεν στάχυν,
29 εἶτεν πλήρης σῖτος ἐν τῷ στάχυι. ὅταν δὲ παραδοῖ ὁ καρπός,
εὐθὺς ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, ὅτι παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμός.

Parable of the Mustard seed, iv. 30-32.

30 Καὶ ἔλεγεν, Πῶς ὄμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ ἐν
31 τίνι ἀντὶ τὴν παραβολὴν θῶμεν; ὡς κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃς ὅταν σπαρῇ
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, μικρότερον δὲ πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς
32 γῆς, καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ, ἀναβαίνει καὶ γίνεται μεῖζον πάντων τῶν
λαχάνων καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους, ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν
σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν.

The Method of Parables: another statement, iv. 33, 34.

33 Καὶ τοιάντας παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον,
34 καθὼς ἡδύναντο ἀκούειν χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς,
κατ’ ἴδιαν δὲ τοῖς ἴδιοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλανεν πάντα.

appear, still it is not doubtful, the seed is growing, the harvest must come soon. Did the hearers take the words about sending out the reapers at the end to apply to Jesus himself? It is unlikely that he meant them to do so. The waiting attitude, the certainty of the result for which he had laboured, that is the point of the comparison. Nor should we be too sure that in this as in other parables of growth Jesus meant to indicate the view that the Kingdom was to arrive gradually by development, rather than suddenly by the act of God. He always believed that the final advent of the Kingdom would take place by the act of God. The prophetic ministry was to prepare the way for that last act. But it was very near at hand; it would burst on the world before the disciples had gone over the cities of Israel. If there was a pause before the final act, it was not strange; the same thing happened in the natural world in the case of the sower.

Thus while the parable of the Sower tells us of the difficulties and disappointments connected with the teaching, and of the hope by which the teacher was consoled, this one tells of his trust in other powers than his own to finish what he has begun. The evangelist no

doubt, as Jülicher says, would think at the end of the parable of the angels and of the return of Messiah from the skies; but to Jesus himself probably this was no part of the lesson. When we consider this parable and what it meant at first, we see without difficulty why Jesus taught in parables. That method enabled him to avoid harsh contradictions of the hopes cherished by his countrymen, and at the same time to insinuate into their minds his own spiritual views.

Matthew's parable of the Tares and the Wheat is an expanded version of this shorter one of Mark. The following terms are found in both; (1) the man who has sowed his field; (2) his sleeping; (3) the shooting of the corn and its producing fruit; (4) the waiting till the harvest; (5) the reaping. It is scarcely conceivable that Mark's short piece, containing ideas which Jesus might himself entertain, is extracted from the longer piece of Matthew in which problems of church government appear which could scarcely be within Jesus' own sphere of vision.

30. This parable with its counterpart of the Leaven is found detached in Luke xiii. 18-21; and Mark also found it

does not know how. Of herself the earth bears fruit, first 28 the green shoot, then the ear, then there is the full corn in the ear. But when the fruit allows, he immediately sends 29 out the sickle, because the harvest is come.

[Matthew xiii. 31, 32; Luke xiii. 18, 19.]

And he said, How shall we compare the Kingdom of 30 God, or in what parable shall we place it? We may 31 compare it to a grain of mustard seed, which when it is sown on the earth is smaller than any of the seeds that are on the earth, yet when it is sown it mounts up and becomes 32 greater than all the herbs and puts out great branches, so that the birds of heaven can lodge under its shadow.

[Matthew xiii. 34, 35.]

And in many such parables did he speak the word to 33 them, as they were able to hear it; but without a parable 34 he did not speak to them. And in private he gave interpretations of everything to his own disciples.

detached, and gives it without its counterpart, with the little introduction (omitted by Matthew) in which Jesus is looking about for a simile to show forth the nature of the Kingdom he is preaching. Here we see Jesus in the act of making a parable, and observe his method. A parable is a comparison; instead of defining the Kingdom and placing it in the proper logical categories, so as to approach the notion from various sides, Jesus asks to what it may properly be compared. What familiar experience provides it with a fitting illustration? This evidently ought to stand at the head of all the parables. It was thus that Jesus came to employ this method. The Kingdom could not be defined; Jesus could not say in so many words all he thought about it; only by such simple comparisons could he declare his thought.

In Luke the oldest form of this little discourse is found. What we find there is a story about a man (cf. Mark iv. 26) who selected a certain seed, a seed of mustard, and sowed it all alone, not, as usually, in a handful, in a certain spot in his garden.¹ Matthew says he sowed

this one seed in his field, which seems less likely. Mark drops the story and says nothing about the man, but only about the seed itself, not improving, surely. All he states is that when this seed, which is said by an hyperbole to be smaller than all the other seeds, is sown in the earth it grows into a surprisingly large plant, which quickly overtops the other garden herbs that are growing round about it, and throws out branches so as to cast a broad shadow in which the birds may settle and rest. In Luke and Matthew the mustard plant becomes a tree and causes commentators to think not of the simple mustard, but of another plant, one which no one would think of sowing in his garden. The touch about the birds reminds us of O.T. phraseology (cf. Ezek. xvii. 23, xxxi. 6), and easily lent itself to far-reaching thoughts of the Kingdom and its universal shelter. What Jesus originally meant by the very homely figure was just that a movement like his was not to be judged by its possibly humble beginning. Jesus confesses that his cause is to the outward eye a small affair. John the Baptist

¹ See Koetsveld, *De Gelijkenissen Jesu*, p. 48. This is a charming work.

The Storm on the Lake, iv. 35-41.

35 Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὄψίας γενομένης, Διέλθω-
 36 μεν εἰς τὸ πέραν. καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν
 37 ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ. καὶ γίνεται
 λαιλαψ μεγάλη ἀνέμου, καὶ τὰ κύματα ἐπέβαλλεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον,
 38 ὥστε ἥδη γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλοῖον. καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ ἐπὶ
 τὸ προσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων· καὶ ἔγειρουσιν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγοντιν
 39 αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα; καὶ διεγερθεὶς
 ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ, καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, Σιώπα, πεφίμωσο.
 40 καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἀνέμος, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. καὶ εἶπεν

with his disciples may have bulked more largely before the country than Jesus with his (cf. John iii. 30). Much larger than the mustard was, no doubt, that plant to which the system of the Pharisees was likened, and which Jesus declared was to be rooted up because it was not planted by the heavenly Father (Matthew xv. 13). The view indicated by the parable does not stretch ambitiously into the future. As in the other parables of growth, we have the strong and quiet conviction that the work which is being done will last, and that other forces besides that of the preacher are nursing it and will bring it to maturity. What is specially claimed here is that the work Jesus is doing will soon surpass all that is at first thought likely, perhaps also that it will afford shelter and refreshment to many.

33. The 'they' to whom he speaks here must be the public, as the private instructions are mentioned separately. The 'they' to whom he spoke vers. 21, 24 are the disciples or teachers. Here, therefore, we have a loose joint in the narrative. Vers. 33, 34 may have stood originally after the parable of the Sower, which was spoken to the crowd. They repeat the statement of ver. 2, that he spoke to the multitudes in parables, and state in a sentence the contents of vers. 10-12.

Two views of the parabolic teaching are here placed side by side. First, we are told that Jesus spoke the word to the multitudes in parables as they were able to hear it; he adapted himself to the capacity of his hearers, and did not make his teaching too difficult for them. This implies that they understood him, even when he spoke in parables; and as to the nature of his parables, that

they were not intended to conceal but to reveal truth, and that they served that purpose even without interpretations. In the second place, we have the view that the outer circle was treated to parables while the inner got the interpretations. This corresponds to what we had before; the parables were not meant to be understood by those who first heard them; they were calculated to conceal truth, and were of no use without the interpretation, which was only supplied to the inner circle. The writer combines these two views by stating them close together, almost in one sentence. But this does not remove their essential disagreement.

Matthew xiii. 34, 35 gives the first of these disparate utterances, and finds the speaking in parables to be according to prophecy. He then proceeds to give, in place of the general statement about interpretations, the interpretation of the one parable of the Tares and the Wheat.

iv. 35—v. 43. We pass here into a new phase of Mark's narrative. We have had, after the opening scenes at Capernaum (chap. i.), the stories of opposition successfully dealt with, then the consolidation of the cause, and then a sample of the teaching; all these elements of the narrative skilfully articulated together, as if the story were being reproduced from a diary. We now come to a set of pieces, still arranged in close connection with what goes before, in which Jesus appears conspicuously great and powerful, dismayed by no dangers and triumphing over nature, over the demons, over human sickness and grief. In these stories we find that Mark has the longest narrative, and it appears much

[Matthew viii. 18, 23-27; Luke viii. 22-25.]

And on that day, when evening had come on, he says 35 to them, Let us cross over to the other side. So they 36 leave the crowd and take him with them in the boat as he was; and there were other boats with him too. And a 37 great storm of wind comes on, and the waves began to break into the boat, so that the boat was by this time filling. And he, he was in the stern asleep on the pillow; 38 and they wake him and say to him, Master, is it nothing to you that we are sinking? And he roused himself and 39 rebuked the wind, and said to the sea, Peace, be still!, and the wind fell, and there was a great calm. And he said to 40

more natural to suppose that Matthew and Luke, finding these sections in Mark only and not in the collection they knew before, abbreviated them, than that Mark built up his longer version from those scantier ones. We shall see whether the details confirm this view.

35. Mark alone gives a close connection at this point. Jesus is still in the boat, the crowd still on the shore as at ver. 1; even at the approach of night they have not gone away. Thus there is no embarkation, as in Matthew and Luke; rather than land, to be jostled by the crowd, Jesus suggests that the boat be used as a means of escape. The disciples are to turn her head and row off to the other side. They can come back under cover of night. To make this little journey no preparations are necessary; the disciples do not go ashore for provisions or cloaks, but simply move off, leaving¹ the crowd on the shore and carrying Jesus with them. They do not get away alone. There are other boats at the beach, or on the water beside his, and these, when the Rabbi is seen to be carried off by his followers, are quickly prepared to make the journey with him. This circumstance also the narrator distinctly remembers, that the boat was not alone but escorted by others.

¹ Or should we here translate: "sending away"? Cf. vi. 45, where ἀπολύεται is used in a situation precisely similar. Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 17, considers ἀφίέτες, "they leave," to represent an unemphatic Aramaic (not a Hebrew) word, which was a conventional phrase to describe the turning from one situation to another.

37. Comment can add nothing to these verses; they tell their own story in the shortest and most graphic way. The pronoun "he," ver. 38, is emphatic, and fixes attention on the contrast between the dangerous situation, the squalls whistling and the waves dashing their tops over the gunwale, and the demeanour of the Master. It is not he but the disciples who behave in the way to be expected in the circumstances. They get into a panic, and declare that they are sinking. He must be awaked, to share their terror. It is not kind of him, they feel, not to be alarmed as they are; their feelings are aggravated by seeing him so calm. They call upon him, therefore.² But he is not affected by the panic; his waking, like his sleep, is quiet, and he is still master of himself and of the circumstances. He awakes and takes in the situation, and speaks to the wind and the waves that are annoying them, using the words he would address to a demon.³ And after he had said these words, the wind fell at once, and the sea which had been so stormy became very quiet.

40. Jesus finds fault with his companions simply for being afraid. If they had had faith they would not have been afraid; his own demeanour shows that. It was in God, not in him (so Gould), that they ought to have faith (cf.

² Εἰδάσκαλε. Matth. has κύριε, Luke ἐπιστάτα. Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, 299 sqq., traces all three to the Aramaic "Rabbi," and points out how κύριος alone remains a designation of the Risen Christ.

³ Cf. the Greek word here and i. 25.

4ι αὐτοῖς, Τί δειλοί ἐστε οὕτως; πῶς¹ οὐκ ἔχετε πίστιν; καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν, καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἄλληλους, Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν, ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ;

The Gerasene demoniac, v. 1-20.

- 1 Καὶ ἥλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν
- 2 Γερασηνῶν.² καὶ ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου, εὐθὺς ὑπήντησεν
- 3 αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, ὃς τὴν
- κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν, καὶ οὐδὲ ἀλύσει οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς
- 4 ἐδύνατο αὐτὸν δῆσαι, διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν πολλάκις πέδαις καὶ ἀλύσεις
- δεδέσθαι, καὶ διεσπάσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τὰς ἀλύσεις καὶ τὰς πέδας
- 5 συντετρίφθαι, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἴσχυνει αὐτὸν δαμάσαι· καὶ διὰ παντὸς
- νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὅρεσιν ἦν

v. 36, ix. 23, xi. 22), as he had. He was not afraid because he believed God to be taking care of him. He knew that no harm could happen to him without God's leave, and that God did not choose that he should come to harm ; and this he felt so strongly and so constantly that he never thought of danger, even when in a small boat on a rough sea. That is the lesson Jesus desired his followers to learn from this incident, and in any account of his teaching this lesson ought to have a place.

41. What these men infer from the occurrence is, however, something very different. From one fear they pass to another, from fear of the elements to that of the person who had shown himself able to command the elements. The disciples, as the story goes, come to the conclusion that they do not really know their Master ; he is a greater Being than they had taken him to be ; he is more than human ; and the effect of this discovery on them is not to increase their confidence and joy in his society, but to throw them into a state of fear.

There is little tendency here to magnify the disciples. They are placed before us as poor sailors, thrown into a panic by a squall, and, as superstitious men, ready to imagine spiritual terrors at small suggestion. Nor are the words

at all softened in which Jesus rebuked their fears. It is in these features of the story that we see the original fact from which the whole sprang. Mark no doubt means to represent Jesus as having had power over the winds and waves, but that power is not claimed by Jesus himself ; it belongs to the interpretation afterwards put on his words and demeanour. The Church early came to think that Jesus could do all things for his followers, and that when they had him they were safe from every storm (Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, p. 371).

This landing on the east side of the Sea of Galilee looks as if it were the end of the journey begun (iv. 35) at Jesus' wish to go to the other side. But that journey was entered on in the evening and delayed by the storm, while the incidents now to be reported as taking place on the east shore must have required several hours of daylight. The continuity therefore is in form rather than substance ; it belongs to Mark, not to the source.

v. 1. There are three forms of the name of the people with whom Jesus is now brought in contact. Matthew has Gadarenes, Luke in the Sinaitic ms. has Gergesenes. But Gadara, the capi-

¹ οὕτω (for οὕτως πῶς) WH's reading, implies a reference to a preceding passage, which is not to be found ; and it could be formed from the reading here adopted.

² Γαδαρηνῶν or Γεργεσηνῶν.

them, Why are you such cowards? Why do you not have faith?¹ And they were in great fear, and said to one another, Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?

[Matth. viii. 28-34; Luke viii. 26-39.]

And they came to the other side of the sea, to the country of the Gerasenes.² And on his getting out of the boat, immediately there met him, coming from the burying place, a man with an unclean spirit who had taken up his abode in the burial vaults, and by this time no one could bind him, not even with a chain; since he had often been bound with fetters and chains, and the chains he had burst asunder and the fetters he had broken, and no one was able to tame him. And continually, both by night and by day, he was in the vaults and in the mountains, crying out and hacking

tal of Peraea, is at a distance from the Sea of Galilee; and the Gergesenes, if the name is connected with a tribe of Gergashites (Gen. x. 16), were west of the Jordan. In Mark, and also in Luke, the reading Gerasenes is best supported. It cannot refer to the town Gerasa on the frontier of Peraea, which is about 30 miles from the southern end of the Sea of Galilee. Modern research has discovered a place called Gersa or Khersa, on the east side of that sea (Bädeker's *Palestine*, p. 371; Thomson, *Land and the Book*, ii. 35), which satisfies the requirements of our passage, there being a steep slope from the high ground into the lake.

On Jesus landing, the encounter at once takes place which is now narrated. Mark begins with telling us that a demoniac came out of the place of burial, which must have been situated near the lake, and that Jesus had an interview with him. (In Matthew there are two demoniacs). But before proceeding with the story, Mark has an elaborate description, awkwardly introduced and very ungrammatical in structure, of the state in which the unfortunate person had been for some time and now was. This is given more simply in Luke, whose narrative here is closer to the source. Luke states

that the man had given up wearing clothes, a fact which Mark omits to mention here, though he afterwards speaks of his sitting 'clothed' (ver. 15). This man, then, had given up living in the town among men, and had taken up his abode instead in the place of burial, which we are to think of as a set of chambers hewn out of the rocks and surrounded with horizontal niches for the reception of the dead. Shelter from the elements was no doubt to be found in such a place; but no one could have chosen to live here without doing violence to his natural feelings. By living in the vaults a man gave himself up to the spirits that haunted such places, and became estranged from the service of the living God. (*Vide supra* Excursus on demoniacs, p. 68, 69, note). The spirit who dwelt in him was accordingly one of a specially violent and misanthropical disposition. The efforts made by his friends to control him and curtail the power of his dark and evil demon had only made him fiercer and driven him more entirely into the demon's power; so that by this time he was entirely abandoned by all men to his solitude and misery, and added by his presence to the terrors of the place where he abode. By night as well as by day he was in the power of

¹ Have you not yet faith?

² Gadarenes, as in Matth.; Gergesenes, as in Luke, R.V. margin.

6 κράξων καὶ κατακόπτων ἑαυτὸν λίθοις. καὶ ιδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν
 7 ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔδραμεν καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ καὶ κράξας φωνῇ
 μεγάλῃ λέγει, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ, νιὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου;
 8 ὄρκίζω σε τὸν θεόν, μή με βασανίσης. ἐλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ,
 9 Ἐξελθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. καὶ
 ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν, Τί ὄνομά σοι; καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Δεγιὼν ὄνομά
 10 μοι, δτι πολλοὶ ἐσμεν. καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλὰ ἵνα μὴ
 11 αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ ἔξω τῆς χώρας. ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πρὸς τῷ ὅρει
 12 ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη βοσκομένη καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν λέγον-
 τες, Πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸν χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν.
 13 καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς. καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκά-
 θαρτα εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸν χοίρους, καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τὸν

the dark and violent spirit; prowling about the tombs and the hill-sides, and terrifying the neighbours with his cries; and his hands were often turned against himself. Mark enhances the statements of the source, and piles up a complicated and rugged sentence worthy of the theme.

6. The meeting was narrated in ver. 2 and is now told again with more particulars. The man recognizes Jesus from a distance, and uses words identical with those used by the demoniac in the synagogue (i. 24). The Kingdom of God and that of the demons are conflicting powers; and the demons shrink in terror from God's representative. Jesus' fame had been diffused in every direction (i. 39, iii. 11), and the sensitive minds of the possessed had readily picked up the impression of his extraordinary powers. The kingdom of Satan, once it began to fall, fell quickly. The possessed person instead of avoiding the power which he apprehends will destroy the spirit that dominates him, goes straight to Jesus, like the moth to the candle, does the act of respect he feels to be due, and then instead of keeping silence, bursts out speaking in the person of the spirit what, if that spirit was to keep its place and power, ought most to have been kept unspoken. (For this lack of discretion on the part of persons possessed see above, p. 72). Here as in the former passage, the phrase **Son of God** has no metaphysical import. To the demons Jesus is a son of God in the sense that he is a Being representing God, and appears to be sent by God to bring their power to an end. The torture apprehended by the demon and

which Jesus is entreated to spare him is either the torture of leaving his human victim, an operation always attended in the Gospel by painful convulsions, or the torture which awaits all demons when the hour of their reckoning comes and they are committed to their final place of durance. The demon speaking through the man beseeches Jesus in the strongest way to spare him the torture, which is already beginning, for Jesus has at once begun the work of expulsion and is ordering the spirit to come out. The man who so entirely identifies himself with the spirit and has lost his own proper volition and personality, is to be set free from that tyranny.

This conversation is described in imperfects, and we are to suppose that it went on for some time. Jesus proceeds in a skilful way, drawing off the mind of the patient from the main point of attack, so as not to add to his excitement, and addressing him on an indifferent subject, so as to soothe him and make him feel that he is treated as a sane and intelligent being. Accustomed to be dealt with as a monster and laughed at and thwarted by those who ventured to speak to him at all, he becomes tractable at the touch of kindness and enters into conversation. The question '**What is your name?**' was addressed of course to the man in his own proper person. But he has lost the habit of speaking in his own person, and replies in the name of the demon. **Legion** is the demon's name; in Aramaic the word can stand either for the body of men composing the legion or for the officer commanding it (Arnold Meyer, p. 49). As the demon speaks of himself in the singular, the

himself with stones. And he saw Jesus from a distance and 6 ran and made a salaam to him and uttered a loud cry, saying, 7 What business have you with me, Jesus, you son of the most high God? I adjure you by God do not torment me. For 8 he was saying to him, Come out of the man, you unclean spirit. And he questioned him, What is your name? And he 9 says to him, Legion is my name, for we are many. And 10 he entreated him again and again not to send them out of the country. Now there was there, on the mountain side, a large 11 herd of swine feeding. And they besought him, saying, Send 12 us into the swine; let us enter into them. And he allowed 13 them. And the unclean spirits went out and entered into the swine, and the herd rushed down the steep into the sea, about

latter will be the meaning. The man feels himself possessed by one great demon who has a regiment of minor ones attending him, and speaks in their name. By this time it is clear that Jesus is to have his way with the demons, and the man, having acted so long as their instrument, does so to the last moment, and takes to negotiating about the quarters they are to take up on leaving him. First he asks that they may not be sent out of the country. The point of this request may be that the man is not quite emancipated yet from the spirits, and does not want them sent so far away that they cannot come back to him (on the return of spirits to a person from whom they have been expelled, see Matth. xii. 43 sq.). Other explanations are that the demons had a natural liking for the tombs, which (though they were not the spirits of dead persons) were a suitable haunt for them, or that they feared to be sent into the desert, or to be remitted to the abyss (so Luke).¹

11. The spirits must have an organism to inhabit if they are to remain in the upper order of things and not be relegated to limbo. But the organism need not necessarily be human. To the disordered fancy of their victim, filled with low superstition and yet with some

method in his frenzy, it appeared that the regiment of demons for whom quarters had to be found might very properly be accommodated in the herd of swine which was feeding within sight.² That will give them a *pied-à-terre* in the neighbourhood; if they go there, he will not be separated from them as if they had gone out of the country. Perhaps it also occurred to him as it certainly has occurred to many commentators, that the swine and the demons were a good match for each other, that unclean spirits might be content with unclean animals to dwell in. He at any rate is now to lose their company. Under Jesus' kindly treatment he has brought himself to that point, and by humouring his last suggestion, the suggestion rather of his lower disordered, than of his better, self, Jesus gets the change accomplished which he has been aiming at in the man's state. Let them go to the swine by all means, he says, and so the man is quit of them.

13. The story however, does not end here. The demons are not fortunate in their new quarters, and if the man's aim in suggesting what he did, was to keep them in the neighbourhood, he was disappointed in this, and was separated from his demons more completely than he had expected. The only point in the

¹ Nestle, *Philologica Sacra*, p. 22 sq., suggests that "out of the country" in the text here, stands for the Aramaic נְצָרָת, "to the border," which was easily confused with נְמַתָּה, "to the depths," as in Luke. Cf. Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 52.

² Matth. says "not far off," Mark "on the mountain side." For an explanation of this

difference in the tradition from the similarity of two (Syriac) words, see Nestle, *Philol. Sac.* p. 23, and cf. Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 52, who accounts for the difference by the different geography of the evangelists, the scene being in Mark at the lakeside, where the hill was at hand, in Matthew in the Gadarene country, further inland.

κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ὡς δισχίλιοι, καὶ ἐπνίγοντο ἐν τῇ
 14 θαλάσσῃ καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοὺς ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν
 εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τὸν ἄγρον· καὶ ἥλθον ἵδειν τί ἐστιν τὸ
 15 γεγονός. καὶ ἔρχονται πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ θεωροῦσιν τὸν
 δαιμονιζόμενον καθήμενον, ἴματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα, τὸν ἐσχη-
 16 κότα τὸν λεγιῶνα, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν. καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς οἱ
 ἰδόντες πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων.
 17 καὶ ἤρεντο παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπέλθειν ἀπὸ τῶν ὄριων αὐτῶν.
 18 καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, παρεκάλει αὐτὸν ὁ
 19 δαιμονισθεὶς ὥνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ἦ. καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ
 λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου πρὸς τὸν σούς, καὶ
 ἀπάγγειλον αὐτοῖς ὅσα ὁ κύριός σοι πεποίηκεν καὶ ἥλέησέν σε.
 20 καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καὶ ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει ὅσα
 ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ πάντες ἐθαύμασον.

The raising of Jairus' daughter, Part I., v. 21-24.

21 Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ πάλιν εἰς τὸ
 πέραν,¹ συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.

story that needs to be explained is what it was that caused the *rush of the swine* into the water. If the man believed the demons were going in that direction, he would himself move in that direction, in the last paroxysm of the expulsion ; and this may help to explain what happened. That the swine perished was a matter no Jew could pretend to regret ; and we are left to infer that the demons, so quickly deprived of their new lodging, found their career on earth at an end, and had to go out of the country, to a distance which precluded all danger that they should return to their old victim.

14. The herd is a common one, each farm or house having property in it ; and the loss is a public catastrophe. On hearing of it the people naturally *hurry to the spot*, to save perhaps what can still be saved, and at any rate to make sure of all the circumstances. They may have gone first to look after their property, but the writer does not dwell on this ; he only tells us what bears on the story of the demoniac. First, we are told

what the people saw on coming from their houses to where Jesus was. They saw the *demoniac sitting*, not running about nor shouting nor excited and defiant as they had been used to see him, but quiet and at rest. They saw him clothed (Mark only tells us now that he had given up the use of clothing), which was a great change, and in his right mind. He would answer a question naturally, like any other person. At seeing this, we are told, they were afraid ; like the disciples in the boat they suspected themselves to be in the presence of a superior Being, who might have some strong spirit at his command. That is what they saw ; and then those who had been present, natives who had been working near the landing place and had watched what occurred (Mark had not mentioned them before), have to tell their story of what they had seen and what they had inferred from it. They had seen the demoniac, at first loud and violent as usual, gradually calm down under Jesus' treatment of him, till he entered into conversation with him.

¹ εἰς τὸ πέραν πάλιν.

two thousand of them, and were drowned in the sea. And the herdsmen who had charge of them fled and carried ¹⁴ the news to the town and to the farms; and the people came to see what had happened. And they come to Jesus and ¹⁵ behold the man who was possessed sitting clothed and in his sober senses, the man who had "Legion," and they were afraid. And those who had seen it told them how things had gone ¹⁶ with the man who was possessed, and about the swine. And they began to entreat him to depart out of their territory. ¹⁷ And as he was embarking in the boat the man who had ¹⁸ been possessed entreated him that he might be with him. But Jesus did not allow him to come but said to him, Go ¹⁹ home to your own people and tell them all that the Lord has done for you and what mercy he has showed you. And ²⁰ he went away and began to proclaim in Decapolis all that Jesus had done for him, and every one wondered.

[Matth. ix. 18, 19; Luke viii. 40-42.]

And when Jesus had crossed over in the boat to the ²¹ other side again,¹ a great multitude came together to him,

Then they had seen him plying Jesus with earnest and repeated entreaty on behalf of his demons, and had seen him point to the swine and make movements of his body towards them as if he himself were going to get into them. Then they could tell of the moment when the man seemed to get rid of his demons, perhaps with some last violent movements in the direction of the swine; and how at that moment the swine took fright and rushed down the steep bank never halting till they were immersed and drowned, one and all.

17. This community asked Jesus to go away, probably because they credited him with mysterious powers and feared his further use of them. We read before that 'they were afraid.' It is not said that they bore him illwill for the material loss they had just suffered; but the narrative here is of the briefest.

18. Jesus of course has to comply with the request of the people, and moves to the boat. His journey over this new land has not been a long one and he leaves it under constraint. If the

journey is given by Mark as an example of a mission on foreign soil, in which the disciples gained experience (so Weiss), it was an unsuccessful mission, and Jesus meets with a rebuff such as has not happened to him before. But the concluding incident of the story rather suggests a different point—the Gospel is preached on the foreign soil; the cured demoniac becomes the first missionary (so Volkmar).

But there is no need to look for such artificial points of view. The closing incident of the story like its earlier incidents, is psychologically true and speaks for itself. At the last moment when Jesus, ungraciously dismissed from the district, is entering his boat, the former demoniac comes forward and asks to be allowed to come with him and to become indeed his stated follower (cf. the phrase iii. 14). No wonder he should feel such strong attachment to one by whose firmness, wisdom, and kindness he has become what he now is. But Jesus has different views for him and prescribes for him a life in his

¹ Or, to the other side, again a great

22 καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυναγώγων ὄνδρις τοῖς Ἰάειρος, καὶ ἴδων
 23 αὐτὸν πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ πιρεκάλει¹ αὐτὸν
 πολλὰ λέγων ὅτι Τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει, ἵνα ἐλθὼν
 24 ἐπιθῆσι τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ, ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ξήσῃ· καὶ ἀπῆλθεν
 μετ' αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἤκολούθει αὐτῷ ὁ χλος πολύς, καὶ συνέθλιβον
 αὐτόν.

The woman with an issue, v. 25-34.

25 Καὶ γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος δάδεκα ἔτη, καὶ πολλὰ
 παθούσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἱατρῶν καὶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς
 πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ὡφεληθεῖσα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα,
 27 ἀκούσασα τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὅχλῳ ὅπισθεν
 28 ἥψατο τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν γάρ ὅτι Ἐὰν ἀψωμαι καν
 29 τῶν ἰματίων αὐτοῦ, σωθήσομαι. καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξῆρανθη ἡ πηγὴ
 τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔγνω τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἴαται ἀπὸ τῆς

own home among the members of his family, and the task of preaching there the greatness and goodness of God most High. To remember and proclaim what God Almighty has done for him, will best preserve him from falling back under the power of demons. The man, left behind, fulfils the Master's commands, but not as they were given. He does give himself to proclaiming the change that has come over him. But he does not make his own home the scene of his message, as Jesus prescribed; he proclaims it far and wide in Decapolis, the Ten-town-land, E. of the Sea of Galilee. And he ascribes his cure to Jesus himself, not as Jesus had told him to God Almighty. He had not learned Jesus' teaching in this respect; but neither had the immediate disciples done so (cf. iv. 40, 41).

21. This reads, whichever reading is adopted, as if the scene of the "crowd by the lakeside," repeated itself the moment Jesus returned across the water, and as if Jairus came on the scene immediately after. But it may be only Mark's way of connecting two pieces of narrative together. When we try to arrange this part of the story in the succession of day and night, we find there is little cohesion in it.

The following narrative is not strictly consecutive with the foregoing; all that can be said is that it belongs to the period of the crowds at Caper-naum, which also furnished the occasion of the voyage just described.

In Luke (viii. 40) the multitude is drawn up on the shore when Jesus returns, "for they were all expecting him," whether they had stayed there all night since his departure, or had received a signal that his boat was seen returning. Matthew (ix. 1) drops this connection entirely.

The two narratives which follow were tacked together when Mark got them; there is no essential connection between them. Together they furnish a picture of the incessant and triumphant activity of Jesus, and of the variety of the claims which were made on him. He cannot go through the street to do a work that is asked of him, without being compelled to do another on the road.

Those who have resorted to Jesus for help have till now been of the humbler sort, of the class which is moved by sensations and collects in crowds. A man of rank and dignity now comes on the scene bearing a petition to be laid at the Master's feet. Jairus is of the number of the synagogue-rulers, i.e.

¹ πιρεκάλει.

and he was by the sea. And there comes one of the 22 synagogue-rulers, Jairus by name, and on seeing him falls down at his feet, and besought¹ him with many words, 23 saying, My little daughter is in extremities; will you not come and lay your hands on her that she may recover and live. And he set out with him. And a great multitude 24 went with him, and they pressed upon him on every side.

[Matthew ix. 20-22; Luke viii. 43-48.]

And a woman who had a hemorrhage for twelve years 25 past, and had suffered a great deal at the hands of many 26 physicians, and had expended her whole means and got no benefit from it all but rather had grown worse, having 27 heard about Jesus, came up behind in the crowd and touched his robe; for she said, If I could touch, were it but his 28 clothes, I shall recover. And immediately the hemorrhage 29 dried up, and she knew in her body that she was cured of her

of the dignitaries who arranged the service and kept order in the meetings; in what synagogue he officiates there is no need to tell; Capernaum would have a number of different congregations (Schürer, Chap. 27, Div. II. vol. ii. p. 68 sq.). But if Jairus is a proud man on the Sabbath in the synagogue, he puts his pride away on this occasion, even falling at the feet of the Rabbi in a public place and plying him with entreaties which the bystanders can hear. He is in one of those situations which cause even an official to forget his dignity and to express himself in the direct language of the heart. His little daughter (a diminutive of affection, cf. ver. 42; but Mark is fond of diminutives, *πλούτιον*, iii. 9, *κυριάπιον*, vii. 28, *ἰχθύῖον*, viii. 7, etc.) is in the last stage of an illness, which is not named; but the ruler thinks that if Jesus will come and deal with her case, employing the method of laying on of hands (see on i. 41, vi. 5), she may yet recover; and he urges and entreats him to do so, not desisting from his urgency till Jesus consents to go. Nothing is said in this instance of Jesus' unwillingness to attempt what is required of him; he did not consent at

once, and what explanations the father added to his entreaties we are not told. No wonder that the scene has been eagerly witnessed by a crowd, and that they accompany Jesus and press round him on the street as he goes to the ruler's house, to see what will come of it.

In Matthew the girl is said by her father to be dead; in Luke he has left her dying.

25. The story now following is preserved in a much simpler form in Matthew (ix. 20-22), where there is no mention of the crowd, nor of Jesus' enquiry who had touched him, and feeling that his virtue had gone out, nor of the discussion with the disciples, nor of the confession of the woman. Mark's elaborations are adopted with some modification by Luke.

Jesus is in the middle of a crowd, who are escorting him to see a new proof of his power, when this woman, type for all ages of the sensitiveness and the eager faith of womanhood, comes up behind him. An elaborate description, matching that of the Gerasene demoniac (ver. 3-5) in its cumbrous accumulation of circumstances in one

¹ beseeches.

30 μάστιγος, καὶ εἰθὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ
δύναμιν ἐξέλθοσσαν, ἐπιστραφεὶς ἐν τῷ ὅχλῳ ἔλεγεν, Τίς μόνος
31 ἦψατο τῶν ἴματίων; καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, Βλέπεις
32 τὸν ὅχλον συνθλίβοντά σε, καὶ λέγεις, Τίς μου ἦψατο; καὶ
33 περιεβλέπετο ἵδεν τὴν τοῦτο ποιήσασαν. ἡ δὲ γυνὴ φοβηθεῖσα
34 καὶ τρέμουσα,¹ εἰδὼν ὃ γέγονεν αὐτῇ, ἥλθεν καὶ προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ
ἡ πίστις σου σέτωκέν σε· ὑπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην καὶ ἵσθι ὑγιῆς ἀπὸ
τῆς μάστιγός σου.

Raising of Jairus' daughter, Part II., v. 35-43.

35 Ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἔρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου
λέγοντες ὅτι Ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπέθανεν· τί ἔτι σκύλλεις τὸν
36 διδάσκαλον; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς παρακούσας³ τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον
37 λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ, Μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστενε. καὶ οὐκ
ἀφῆκεν οὐδένα μετ' αὐτοῦ συνακόλουθησαι εἰ μὴ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ

sentence, places her history and her views on this occasion before us. It is not mentioned that her complaint makes her ritually unclean; yet that no doubt would add to her distress. She has come through a great deal of suffering, and has seen her fortune melt away in the attempt to find relief, so that she is now deprived of hope and comfort. But she has heard about Jesus, and has come to the conclusion, like the leper, and the synagogue-ruler, that he could help her. She shares the belief entertained as we saw by many (see iii. 10), that his touch is sovereign. It need not be the touch of his hand ("lay thy hands upon her and she shall recover"), and perhaps what she requires can be obtained without his knowing about it. Only to touch his clothes, she thinks, will serve her purpose. And so she slips up behind him in the crowd, where she will never be observed, but can slip away again at once when she has stolen the cure she thinks within her reach. In Matthew and Luke it is his fringe or tassel that she touches, believing the virtue to be present to the very extremities of his garment.

30. None of the evangelists represents

Jesus as having consciously done anything for the cure of this woman. In the simplest narrative (Matthew) he tells her that her faith has cured her, and no other agency is spoken of. In Mark also the words as to her faith are given, but another account of the cure is worked into the story. Jesus himself is made to share the belief of this woman and of others, that to touch him was a remedy. In ver. 30 we are given to understand that Jesus had, and knew he had, a power going out from his person apart from any exercise of his will, and that he recognized on this occasion that a draft had been made on that power, and that it had gone out. This belief provides the motive of the rest of the scene, in which enquiry is made for the person who has obtained the benefit of Jesus' power without applying to him for it. On his turning round to enquire who had touched him the **disciples** are ready with the answer that there are people touching him all round. They do not know that there is any sick person in question, and apparently they do not understand about the special virtue of his touch; they do not yet know that the Saviour may be touched in various

¹ δι' ὃ πεποιήκει λάθρᾳ.

² θυγάτηρ.

³ ἀκούσας.

complaint. And immediately Jesus, perceiving in himself that 30 the power proceeding from him had gone forth, turned round in the crowd and said, Who touched my clothes? And 31 his disciples said to him, You see the crowd pressing on you all round, and do you say, 'Who touched me?' And he 32 looked round to see her who had done it. But the woman, 33 afraid and trembling,¹ knowing what had happened to her, came and fell down before him and told him all the truth. And he said to her, Daughter, your faith has wrought 34 your cure; depart in peace, and be free from your complaint.

[Matthew ix. 23-26; Luke viii. 49-56.]

While he is yet speaking people come from the synagogue-³⁵ ruler's house saying, Your daughter is dead; why do you trouble the Master any further? But Jesus heard² what 36 they said, and says to the synagogue-ruler, Do not be afraid, only believe. And he allowed no one to go with him 37

ways and to various issues. (In Luke their foolish reply is somewhat improved). Nor does the woman answer to his spoken enquiry. But when he looks round to satisfy himself who it was of those about him that had drawn on his unconscious aid, she can no longer withdraw from him. Her state of mind is described with the touches Mark loves to give. She is afraid and trembling, whether at finding her attempt at privacy defeated and many eyes falling upon her, or because she has just come in contact with a supra-human power and now confronts its owner. She has no doubt that she is the person sought for, since she has touched Jesus to such good effect, and so she throws herself on the ground at his feet and tells all she had striven to conceal. The words addressed to her by Jesus do not carry her cure with them, as in Matthew they possibly are understood to do; the cure is already effected. "Daughter" he names her, as he named the paralytic "child" (ii. 5), and assures her that her faith has cured her, which in x. 52 is apparently to be taken literally, but after the words about the power issuing from Jesus (v. 30) can only mean here

that her faith has led her to the true agency of cure. And then she is bidden to depart with his blessing, and to remain in good health for the future.

35. Jairus' family have been aware of his intention to apply to Jesus; while the child was only in extremities he might be able to help. But after the ruler left the house a change had taken place in her state; they see that she is dead, are convinced that Jesus cannot possibly now do anything, and send a message to prevent him from coming. But Jesus is not to be turned back from an errand of mercy on which he has set out; he will not disappoint the hopes which have been fixed on him. If we knew what the malady in question was, and what the ruler told Jesus about the case, we should be better able to judge of this point of the story. At any rate Jesus encourages the ruler not to despair, but to have faith in God that all is not lost. Fear and belief are exclusive of each other here as at iv. 40. One should always, Jesus holds, believe that God is present and is ordering all things for good; then no danger or ill-tidings will be able to terrify. It is not therefore in reliance

¹ on account of what she had done secretly.

² Or, paid no attention to.

38 Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου. καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου, καὶ θεωρεῖ θόρυβον καὶ κλαίοντας 39 καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά· καὶ εἰσελθὼν λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε; τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει. 40 καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ 41 εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον. καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου λέγει αὐτῷ, Ταλιθά κούμ, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερψυχούμενον, Τὸ 42 κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον καὶ περιεπάτει· ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα. καὶ ἐξέστησαν εὐθὺς ἐκστάσει 43 μεγάλῃ. καὶ διεστέλλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα μηδεὶς γνοῖ τοῦτο, καὶ εἶπεν δοθῆναι αὐτῷ φαγεῖν.

on any extraordinary power of his own, but in reliance on God's goodness and power, that he proceeds with the ruler to his house. What is to take place, however, when he gets there, is not to be public; not even all of his twelve immediate followers are to go with him; at this point the others are dismissed, only Peter, James, and John, designated here, as formerly, as brother of James, are allowed to go on. This inner circle of disciples appears here for the first time. The crowd which was following is apparently dismissed on the street, and made to come no farther. In Luke, however, it is only on arriving at Jairus' house that Jesus forbids the crowd to follow him farther.

38. In Eastern countries the ceremonies following a death are entered on and carried through without loss of time. In this case the mourners must have been summoned with extreme rapidity, for when Jesus arrives at the house just after the message had come that the child was dead they are already at their task. On approaching the door it is at once seen that the mourning is going on. There is a tumult about the door, and the ululation within is heard on the street. Jesus, however, strong in the conviction that God can help and that it is wrong to despair, goes boldly in, and before having seen the child declares at once that mourning and weeping are out of place, because she is not dead but sleeping. The words are understood by those present in their natural sense, and not of death as a sleep. Jesus is declaring, they think, that death has not taken

place; death has not taken place when the mourning is already going on!

40. Jesus, however, is not to be trifled with, and in spite of their ridiculing his assertion about the child, he takes the strong hand with them and **brings the mourning to a close**, turning the mourners out of the house. Whatever the idea was with which he supported the courage of the father and came on to the house in the face of the message to the contrary, he is determined to act on his own conviction, and at once does so. The house being quiet, so that God's presence and help can be realized once more, he steps at once to the inner room where the patient is, taking with him only those who are in full sympathy with him. No one is to be present who is not deeply concerned about the issue, no one who has not faith in God's power. The *modus operandi* is that which we have had before in the case of Peter's wife's mother and of the瘫痪者 (i. 31, iii. 5). He **takes the patient by the hand**, and calls on her to make an effort. She at once responds to the summons, and, in fact, does much more than she is told: she not only sits up in bed, but stands on her feet and walks about. She was not quite a child, we are told, in explanation, partly, perhaps, of this and partly of the father's phrase, ver. 23; she was a girl of twelve, though from the father's speaking of "my little daughter," when he applied to Jesus about her, one might not have understood her to be so old.

The **surprise of those present** at seeing this great work is spoken of

but Peter, and James, and John, James' brother. And they 38 come to the synagogue-ruler's house; and he beholds a tumult, and people making a great weeping and lamentation. And 39 on entering he says to them, Why this tumult and crying? The child is not dead but sleeping. And they derided him. 40 But he put them all out, and then taking with him the father of the child and the mother and his own followers, he goes in where the child was. And taking the child by the 41 hand he says to her TALITHA CUM, which may be translated, Damsel, I tell you, rise. And immediately the damsel got 42 up and walked, for she was about twelve years old. And they were seized at once with the greatest amazement. And he gave many injunctions that no one should know of it, 43 and he told them to supply her with food.

in the very strongest phrases. They "were out of themselves with amazement," one might translate the words. They had all taken the view that it was a case for mourning; Jesus alone had held that God's help was still to be looked for. But he does not want to be spoken of as one who is able to raise the dead; the people in the house, who regarded the child as dead, may say this about him if they are not specially warned; and so, in pursuance of his policy of silence, Jesus enjoins that this work of power is not to be spoken of. What he told them to say to those waiting to learn the issue of his visit, and to friends who saw the child living after having been told that she had died, we do not hear. Before leaving the house he says something about her being fed, giving, perhaps, some directions as to her diet, as a wise physician should.

This story as Mark tells it is ambiguous; it is impossible to determine whether the case is one of real or only of apparent death. Jesus acts throughout as if the child were not dead; it is on that view that he consents to go with the ruler to his house, and he persists in that view when the message arrives that she is dead, exhorting the ruler not to give up hope but still trust in God. (In Luke, whose account here

agrees with Mark's, the words are added, 'and she will recover,' implying that death has not taken place). Had he believed death to have taken place he must have expressed himself differently (cf. John xi. 21-23). At the house he still holds to the view that the child is not dead but sleeping, which the mourners understand literally; and he treats her as a living person, calling on her to make an effort for her own recovery. If Mark's account stood alone, there could be little doubt as to the purport of the story. Here the child is not really but only apparently dead; her spirit has not departed definitely, but only for a time.¹ It is in Matthew that the case is treated from the first as one of real death. Jesus is told by the ruler that his daughter is dead, and undertakes the task of restoring to life a person who has died and is beyond all human care. In Matthew, accordingly, the words 'not dead but sleeping' have another significance, and express the Christian view of death, that it is not a final state but a transition, like sleep, from which there is an awakening at the call of the Saviour. We see, as Holtzmann says, how the story grows in the reports we have of it, and we can also infer something as to its growth at an earlier stage.

¹ See a paper in *Zeitschr. für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, i. 4, by S. A. Fries, on the views held by Jesus as to the resurrection of the dead, where it is pointed out that the signs

of the occurrence of death were not so well known in N.T. times as they are now, so that mistakes were more possible. *Expos. Times*, xii. (Mar. 1901), p. 256.

Jesus at Nazareth, vi. 1-6a.

- 1 Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ, καὶ
 2 ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου
 ἥρξατο διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ· καὶ οἵ¹ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες
 ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες, Πόθεν τούτῳ τάῦτα, καὶ τίς ἡ σοφία
 ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τοιαῦται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ
 3 γνόμεναι; οὐχ οὐτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων,² ὁ οὐλὸς τῆς Μαρίας καὶ
 ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆτος καὶ Ιούδα καὶ Σίμωνος; καὶ οὐκ
 εἰσὶν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ ὡδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς; καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο
 4 ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Οὐκ ἐστιν προφήτης
 ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν αὐτοῦ
 5 καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεὶ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν
 δύναμιν, εἰ μὴ ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις ἐπιθεῖσις τὰς χεῖρας ἐθεράπευσεν.
 6α καὶ ἐθάμασεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.

vi. 1. The connection is loose. The narrative which follows belongs to the height of the ministry. On a tour away from his usual headquarters, which he is briefly said to have left, Jesus comes to his native town, i.e. to **Nazaret**. Even if Mark knew of the birth at Bethlehem, which he does not mention, he could call the place where Jesus' parents were at home, and where he himself had been brought up, his native place. (Matthew adopts Mark's phrase about Nazaret, his story of the infamy notwithstanding). Earlier in the ministry Jesus appears to have avoided Nazaret; his family might still have designs upon him, such as we hear of in chap. iii. Now he is stronger than at that time; he is accepted by many as a prophet, and when he appears at Nazaret he comes there as a Rabbi who is well known and has a following.

We must beware of filling up Mark's brief account, as Dr. Swete does, with details drawn from Luke iv. In Luke the discourse at Nazaret forms the opening declaration of the ministry, Jesus appealing first of all to the people of his own town, as Paul in the Acts does to the Jews, and after their rejection of him going to Capernaum, as Paul goes to the Gentiles (cf. the heathen Naaman and the heathen widow of Sarepta; Luke iv. 24-27). Interpreting Mark from himself alone, we observe that Jesus' family do not, as might have

been expected, appear by his side on this occasion. Nor is his word in such demand as at the Lake of Galilee (iii. 7, iv. 1). Only when the Sabbath comes round is his mouth opened. On that day a public teacher must be found in the synagogue where the hope and the duty of Israel are considered; and Jesus is there, and speaks to the people who have known him from his youth.

2. His **townspeople** are not able to take in his greatness, with perhaps some exceptions, for the phrase used (with either reading) suggests that such there were, but no details are given about these. The minds of his fellow-townsmen are already occupied with certain views about him, based on his life at Nazaret before he became famous and on their familiarity with his relatives, and they cannot at once change these views. Not that they are not greatly struck by his preaching and doctrine, and by the wonderful power of his person. But they cannot understand how he can be so great. He has enjoyed no professional education, but is a self-taught man. It is very extraordinary that he should have learned so much. What he speaks is undoubtedly wisdom—it approves itself to the mind and is not mere talk—that cannot be denied, but where did he get it? It is not scribe-wisdom, and he is not sent by any one to teach as he

¹ Omit οἱ.

² ὁ τοῦ τέκτους οὐλός.

[Matthew xiii. 53-58; Luke iv. 16-30.]

And he went out from there and comes to his own native place, and his disciples follow him. And when the Sabbath came round, he began to teach in the synagogue; and most of the people¹ were astonished when they heard him and said, Where did the man get all this? and What is the wisdom that is given him, and such works of power too, as take place through his hands? Is not this the craftsman,² the son of Mary and the brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon? And are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended at him. And Jesus said to them, A prophet is not without honour except in his native place and among his own kindred and in his own home. And he was not able to do any work of power there, except that he laid his hands on a few sick people and cured them. And he wondered at their unbelief.

does; it is impossible to account for it. And the works of power that are accomplished through his hands are by no means trifling, according to the accounts that have come to Nazareth; what is to be said about them? It is impossible to account for them by anything his townsmen know of his early days. In what they remember of him there was nothing to point to any distinction. He is known to them, not as a scholar or a teacher or public speaker, but as an artificer (Matthew says the son of the artificer)—one who had carried on some kind of manual labour. Early fathers speak of his having been a carpenter and having made ploughs and yokes; the people of Capernaum, so far as the Greek word goes, do not specify the kind of work. Further he is known to them as the son of Mary. Mark knows nothing of his having been born in any extraordinary way; to his fellow-townsmen at any rate he is simply the son of a woman who is living among them and well known to them. Her husband is not mentioned and may be supposed to have been by this time dead. There are four brothers whose names are given,¹ and some sisters. The whole family appear

to be living together at this time at Nazareth; see on chap. iii. 21, 31.

To the people of Nazareth the contrast between what they know Jesus to be in point of family and early history and what they see him to be now, is too great to be reconciled. They cannot bring the two views to agree, and so they take offence at one who has placed before them such a difficult problem and refuse to consider his claims or his message. At this we can scarcely wonder. To ourselves the facts of the earlier life of Jesus as here suggested to us present a very baffling, if fascinating problem. The thoughts he uttered in his preaching must have been in his mind when he lived an undistinguished life at Nazareth and was known to his neighbours simply as a craftsman. He must then have been accumulating the observations of nature and of human life which were to illustrate his preaching, and must have then formed his views as to the meaning of Scripture and the relation of the system of the Scribes to true religion. Yet he never preached, and was not known as one who had anything important to say. It is a complete surprise to his mother

¹ Mark speaks of Joses, Matthew of Joseph.

¹ Or, many.

² son of the craftsman (as Matth.).

Mission of the Twelve, vi. 6b-11.

6^b Καὶ περιῆγεν τὰς κώμας κύκλῳ διδάσκων. καὶ προσκαλεῖται
 7 τοὺς δώδεκα, καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀπόστελλειν δύο δύο, καὶ ἐδίδου
 8 αὐτοῖς ἔξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων. καὶ παρήγγειλεν
 9 αὐτοῖς ὡν μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὅδὸν εἰ μὴ ράβδον μόνον, μὴ ἄρτον,
 10 μὴ πήραν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ξάνην χαλκόν, ἀλλὰ ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια,
 καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσσησθε¹ δύο χιτῶνας. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Οπου ἐὰν

and family and to his neighbours, when he begins to deliver a message as a prophet. His family declare him to be out of his mind; his townspeople refuse to face the problem he presents to them.

The tenor of the sayings is reported to us which this action of his countrymen caused Jesus to make. He said more than this, but this sentence sums up his view on the subject. It belongs to the office of the prophet, he declares in a little proverb, that he should be treated in this way. Of his general reception in the country he cannot complain, and if his own town, his own relatives, his own family, have no honour to give him, that was to be expected; it is the common lot of all prophets and he is in good company.

As his countrymen did not believe in him nor expect anything at his hands, his power to do great things was not called forth. "He was not able," the evangelist frankly says. The conditions were too much for him. Only some unimportant cases of sickness did he treat, laying his hands on the patients. A little faith sufficed for all that was needed in these cases; and so much faith these persons had (Weiss). And in conclusion we are told that he wondered at the unbelief of his fellow-townsmen. He was able to account for it, and to see it to be a thing every prophet must lay his account with, yet it grieved him. That the people among whom he had grown up and whom he had watched with such profound interest, gathering from them his rich knowledge of human character, that these men and women familiar to him and loved by him should sympathize with him so little, this could not fail to grieve. Why should these of all men be so cold and hard?

6b. No precise connection. A preaching tour is mentioned, and serves to introduce the following narrative of the independent mission of the Twelve. The visit to Nazareth no doubt took place on such a tour; but more we cannot say. It marks the unpretending, and, at the same time, the national character of the ministry of Jesus that he goes specially to the villages (cf. i. 38). Had he wished to address Gentiles he would have gone to the towns, as Paul did; but it is his own countrymen who are to be roused, and he goes to their settlements. Such an injunction as Matt. x. 23 belongs to a later period. The preaching is now multiplied. The Twelve were called at first, we heard (iii. 14), that they might be with him, and that he might send them out to preach. They have now been with him some time and are full enough of his ideas to carry on the propaganda. They can be sent out by themselves.

The first sending out of the missionaries by the founder is, in every religion where it takes place, a matter of the deepest interest to later believers, who behold in this act the first appearance, if only in germ, of the institutions and modes of action to which they are accustomed. The narrative of the first sending, moreover, is apt to reflect differences of practice which afterwards came in (see *Sacred Books of the East*, vols. xiii., xvii., and xx.).

It is so in the present instance. The synoptic Gospels contain four versions of the Master's charge to the missionaries; for that to the Seventy in Luke x. is evidently traceable to the same original as that to the Twelve in Luke ix. Mark is true here to the views we have always found him to hold as to the earliest procedure in connection with the Gospel, but we cannot be sure that his tradition represents the earliest

¹ ἐνδύσσησθαι.

[Matthew ix. 35-x.; Luke ix. 1-5; x. 1-12.]

And he went round about the villages teaching. And ^{6b}
he calls to him the Twelve, and began to send them out two
by two, and he gave them power over the unclean spirits.
And he told them to take nothing for their journey but ⁸
just a stick; they were not to take bread, nor a wallet, nor
any copper in their girdle (but they were to be shod with ⁹
sandals); and do not, he said, put on two tunics. And ¹⁰

narrative in every particular. The disciples are sent out in pairs¹ (the monks of Buddhism went singly). This was the practice of the early Church in most of the cases which are recorded. Compare Acts iii. 1, viii. 14, xiii. 2. The general description of the function of the missionaries is very imperfect. Mark does not even say that they are to preach; that has to be gathered from the earlier statement (iii. 14) and from what follows. Nor are we told that they are to deal with cases of sickness. In Matthew and Luke, where they are told what they are to preach, they are also directed to tend the sick (Matt. x. 8, Luke ix. 2), but in Mark this duty is not entrusted to them either in iii. 14 or here. The evangelist has no doubt of Jesus' power to cure disease, as Jesus unquestionably believed himself to have the power. All religious teachers were in that age expected to exercise powers of healing, and the missionaries do deal with cases of sickness (vi. 13), though in a very simple way, while gifts of healing are found in the Church afterwards (1 Cor. xii. 9, James v. 14 *sqq.*). Yet the Master is not said to have told his disciples to cure diseases, and considering his attitude when requested to do so himself (see on i. 41 *sqq.*, ii. 5), it may be doubted whether he regarded the work of cure as forming a special part of his mission. No such doubt attaches to the work of exorcism. The disciples are to regard it as part of their duty. Are they to exorcise in the name of Jesus? It is not so said here, but see ix. 38 *sqq.*, xvi. 17, Luke x. 17, Acts xix. 13. If Jesus was known throughout the country, and by none better than by the demons themselves, to be gifted with a power before which their disorder was coming to an end, his disciples

would appeal to his authority, and would feel that in this part of their work they had a weapon which the sons of the Pharisees could not wield.

8. In Matthew and Luke x. the missionaries are to go barefoot. There is therefore a contradiction at this point, Matthew and Luke saying, No foot-gear (*νυποδήματα*)! while Mark says sandals! Some early controversy is no doubt reflected. Matthew and Luke ix. forbid a stick, which Luke x. does not mention and Mark enjoins. Mark forbids brass money, used in Palestine, Luke ix. silver, *i.e.* money generally, as used in other lands (Wright); Matthew combines traditions and forbids gold, silver, and brass. The differences are not of great importance; they only prevent us from drawing a complete picture of the Christian apostle, such as can be given of the Buddhist monk of the earliest time. If the Master prescribed a rule and gave certain instructions as to the equipment of his representatives on their preaching tours, the rule was elastic and capable of change. What is said about the wallet for provisions, the purse for money, and the two tunics shows that the missionaries were to carry nothing they could do without, and that they were to depend for their subsistence on those to whom they preached. Paul distinctly says (1 Cor. ix. 14), that the Lord gave this injunction, and Matthew and Luke x. have the injunction here.

10. Another saying is added, with "And he said," as if it were a saying from another source. The missionaries are not to be too nice about their quarters. In Matthew they are to make enquiry for some worthy citizen, but here, apparently, they are to take their chance, and not to change their lodgings till they leave the place. This implies, on

¹ For the natural reason of this cf. Latham's *Pastor Pastorum*, p. 297.

II εἰσέλθητε εἰς οἰκίαν, ἐκεῖ μένετε ἔως ἂν ἐξέλθητε ἐκεῖθεν. καὶ ὅτι ἂν τόπος μὴ δέξηται¹ ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν, ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.²

Success of the disciples, vi. 12, 13.

12 Καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοῶσιν, καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλλον, καὶ ἥλειφον ἐλαίῳ πολλοὺς ἀρρώστους καὶ ἐθεράπευνον.

Herod hears of Jesus, vi. 14-16.

14 Καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης, φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον³ ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ 15 νεκρῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ. ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἡλείας ἐστίν ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι Προφήτης ὁς 16 εἰς τῶν προφητῶν ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἔλεγεν, "Οὐ ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτος ἤγέρθη.

the one hand, that they are full of the momentous importance of their mission. The warnings and the blessings which they bring are of such value that they can well claim for the sake of them a few days' hospitality. On the other hand, the Gospel would by this mode of procedure be planted in households and spread from the house where the missionaries had been entertained to the rest of the place. Compare the church in the house of Stephanas, 1 Cor. i. 16, of Aquila and Priscilla, 1 Cor. xvi. 19, and other instances in Paul.

If, on the contrary, the missionaries meet with a bad reception in some place, if they are not welcomed nor their message received with respect, they are to take a bold line in such a case. They are not to think for a moment that they are to blame or that their message is at fault, and on leaving the place they are to perform a well-known symbolic act to show that they are clear of all responsibility for what has happened. The Gospel has been preached in that place,

and the inhabitants alone must bear the blame for the disastrous consequences of its refusal. As to what these consequences are, see Matth. x. 15, xi. 20-24, cf. Luke x, 10-16, and the variant to the same effect here.

12. The preaching is here summed up in its first word. The disciples must have preached a great deal more than is here reported : but their preaching no doubt opened with the announcement of the great event which was shortly coming upon the world to try all the lives and actions of men, and with an exhortation to prepare for that event. Mark, who has given no account of the preaching of Jesus, can only indicate very generally that of the disciples, but his readers understood well enough what it had been. In the work of casting out demons they were very successful, as we are prepared to expect. As to their cures, they only attempt simple cases ; they cure 'sick persons,' like Jesus at Nazareth (ver. 5) where his power was

¹ ὅσοι ἀν μὴ δέχωνται.

² Add ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται Σοδόμοις ἡ Γομόρραια ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ἡ πόλει ἐκείνῃ ; cf. Luke x. 12.

³ ἔλεγεν.

he said to them, Wherever you go into a house, stay there till you leave the place. And if a place does not receive¹ you and the people there will not listen¹ to you, when you are leaving, shake off the dust under your feet, for a testimony to them.²

[Luke ix. 6.]

And they went out and preached that men should repent. 12
And they cast out many demons and anointed with oil many 13
sick persons and cured them.

[Matthew xiv. 1, 2; Luke ix. 7-9.]

And king Herod heard of it, for his name was now 14
before the public, and people were saying³ that "John the
Baptist is risen from the dead, and that is the reason why
these powers work in him." But others said, He is Elijah, 15
and others said, He is a prophet like one of the prophets.
But Herod, when he heard of it, said, The man whom I 16
beheaded, John, he is risen.

prevented from showing itself. They do this according to a method which was afterwards continued in the Church (James v. 14), though Jesus himself is not reported to have used it. In Luke their success on this side is more marked. Their exorcisms are not mentioned till afterwards (x. 17), but they are here said to have dealt with cases of sickness wherever they went.

vi. 14—viii. 26. JESUS AT THE HEIGHT OF HIS ACTIVITY.

14. In Luke ix. 7, where we have the same source, it is the mission of the Twelve that **Herod** hears of; Mark indicates this less clearly. That mission, in which the disciples, no doubt, spoke of their Master as the source of their teaching and appealed to his name in acts of exorcism and healing, advanced public discussion about Jesus to a farther stage. His name had already been public, i. 28, iii. 8; but curiosity was now actively awakened about him,

and various theories were being tried to account for him and for the 'powers' he wrought, which his own fellow-townsmen had found so inexplicable (vi. 2). It is here for the first time in Mark, if we except the utterance of the demoniacs and the imported references to the Son of Man in chap. ii., that we find Jesus connected with the **Messianic thought of his day**. The question being raised, "What are we to think of this new teacher who has not passed through the schools and yet teaches with such authority and possesses such power over the demons and in cases of sickness?" more answers than one are forthcoming. Some think of John the Baptist. All, we know, held John for a prophet, and the people do not readily surrender their hero to the grave. He had been done to death in a frontier castle (Josephus, *Antiq.* xviii. 5, 2), but God had raised him up again, they judged, as heroes are raised up by God; and in Jesus, who preached the same

¹ As for those who will not receive you nor listen.

² Add, Assuredly I tell you, It will be more tolerable for Sodom or Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that town.

³ he said.

Story of the death of the Baptist, vi. 17-29.

17 Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἀποστείλας ἐκρύπτησεν τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ἐν φυλακῇ διὰ Ἡρωδίᾳ τὴν γυναικα Φιλίππου
 18 τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης
 τῷ Ἡρώδῃ ὅτι Οὐκ ἔξεστιν σοι ἔχειν τὴν γυναικα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ
 19 σου. ἡ δὲ Ἡρωδίας ἐνέχειν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἥθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι
 20 καὶ οὐκ ἤδυνατο· ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς
 αὐτὸν πολλὰ ἡπόρει,¹ καὶ ἤδεις αὐτοῦ ἥκουεν. καὶ γενομένης
 21 ἡμέρας εὐκάίρουν, ὅτε Ἡρώδης τοῖς γενεσίοις αὐτοῦ δεῖπνον ἐποίησεν
 τοῖς μεγιστᾶσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις τῆς
 22 Γαλιλαίας, καὶ εἰσελθούσης τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς² τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος
 καὶ ὄρχησταμένης, ἤρεσεν τῷ Ἡρώδῃ καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις. ὁ

message, John's energy still lived. Others, again, held that Jesus was Elijah. It was a current belief of the day that Elijah must come before the Messiah could appear (Matth. xi. 14, xvii. 10-12): his coming was predicted by Malachi (iv. 5, cited in Mark i. 2) as a preliminary to the advent of the great Day of the Lord. This theory connected Jesus more closely than the former one with the great act of judgment. And others said he was a prophet like one of the prophets, not, that is to say, specially connected at all with the final winding up of affairs, but, like the prophets of old, inspired—for Jesus certainly was inspired—to preach to his own generation, as the prophets had to theirs.¹

Now we know what it was that Herod heard. He is here called King though his rank was less, a mistake which Matthew (xiv. 1) and Luke (ix. 7) avoid. What we know of him brings him before us as a lawless and half civilized ruler, more heathen than Jew, yet with an ear for Jewish religious ideas, and both luxurious and superstitious.

The heads of the discussion going on in the country reach the Court at Tiberias, and Herod's conscience helps him to decide among the conflicting theories as to the secret of Jesus' power. As Macbeth sees Banquo at the feast, so Herod sees John, the man who had appealed so strongly to his

better nature and whom he had so weakly surrendered. He has no doubt that it is John returned from the dead to confound him.

There follows the story of **Herod's dealings with John**, told by Mark at much greater length than by either Matthew or Luke, and with many added details.

17. Jewish law not only allows, but in certain circumstances obliges, a man to marry the wife of a brother who has died (Deut. xxv. 5), but it forbids him to marry the wife of a brother who is living (Levit. xviii. 16, xx. 21). This Herod had done. He divorced the daughter of Aretas King of Arabia, to marry Herodias wife of his half-brother Herod, son of Herod the Great by Mariamme of Jerusalem. This is told in detail in Josephus (*Antiq.* xviii. 5, 1, 4). Thus Josephus calls the brother whom Herod Antipas wronged in this way, by the name of Herod, while in Mark (and Matthew where, however, the text is doubtful) he is called Philip. Many scholars add the two statements together and say that Herodias' first husband was called Herod Philip. Others consider that the Gospel narrative is here in error. Antipas and Herodias had a daughter Salome who was about twenty years old at the date of the story before us, and who became

¹ Jeremiah, named in Matth. xvi. 14, seems to be an usher of the Messianic Age, like Elijah. See on this subject Schütrier, *History of the Jewish People*, section 29.

[Matthew xiv. 3-12; Luke iii. 19, 20.]

For he, Herod, had sent and seized John and put him ¹⁷ in chains in prison, on account of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, because he had married her; for John said to ¹⁸ Herod, It is not lawful for you to have your brother's wife. But Herodias was enraged at him¹ and wished to put ¹⁹ him to death and was not able; for Herod feared John, ²⁰ knowing him to be a good man and a holy, and took good care of him; and when he heard him he was much exercised,² and yet he liked to hear him. And on the arrival of a ²¹ favourable day, when Herod on the occasion of his birthday gave a banquet to his chief officials and to the colonels and to the notables of Galilee, the daughter of Herodias³ came ²² in and danced; and Herod and his guests were pleased. And

the wife of Herod's brother Philip, tetrarch of Ituræa (Luke iii. 1). Philip is the name of Herod's son-in-law, but is taken by the evangelists to be that of his wife's first husband. The story has other serious difficulties besides this one. Josephus, who narrates the arrest of John, assigns a different motive for it from that given here, viz. that Herod was jealous of John's power over the people. Mark's narrative, on the other hand, implies that Herod and the Baptist had met and conversed together before the latter was arrested. John made himself the mouthpiece of the strong indignation which Herod's marriage had excited in the public mind, and charged Herod with acting in defiance of the law, to which nominally at least the Herods adhered. It was from pique at this bold speaking and not from any public motive such as Josephus alleges, that Herod ordered him to be put in prison. It is not impossible that there may be truth in both accounts. The statement of Josephus that **Machaerus**, a fortress on the Arabian frontier of Antipas' territory not far from the shores of the Dead Sea, was the scene of John's imprisonment, has never been doubted.

19. The relations developed between **Herod** and the **Baptist** after the arrest are a special feature of Mark's narrative. They remind us of those between Paul and Felix (Acts xxiv. 22-26), where also we have a potentate defending a prisoner from designs against his life, and feeling strongly but ineffectively the moral and religious influence of that prisoner. In Matthew, Herod wants to put John to death but fears the people; in Mark, he fears John and keeps him alive.

21. An overloaded sentence (cf. chap. v. 2-5 and 25-28). John's arrival at Machaerus (for the scene of the following incident is close to his prison, and the difficulty of supposing such a gathering to have taken place at the remote fortress is not insurmountable) gives Herodias her opportunity; what Herod would not do for her when alone, he may be inveigled into doing when a large company is present; and the dancing is intended by the mother, —hence the “favourable day”—to produce the result now told us. **Salome**, daughter of Herodias by her former marriage with Aretas, was married to Philip soon after this incident (see Schürer's *History of the Jewish People*, Div. I., section 17, vol. ii. p. 228qq.)

¹ Or, laid wait for him.

² Or, he did much that he heard from him; see Nestle, *Introd.*, E. Tr., p. 264.

³ Or, his daughter Herodias. This well-supported reading makes Herod's wife and her daughter have the same name.

δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν τῷ κορασίῳ, Αἴτησόν με ὃ ἔαν θέλγε καὶ δώσω
 23 σοι· καὶ ὡμοσεν αὐτῷ, "Οτι ἔαν με αἰτήσῃς δώσω σοι ἕως ἥμερους
 24 τῆς βασιλείας μου· καὶ ἐξελθοῦσα εἶπεν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς, Τί
 αἰτήσωμαι; ἢ δὲ εἶπεν, Τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτίζοντος.
 25 καὶ εἰσελθοῦσα εὐθὺς μετὰ σπουδῆς πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα γρήσατο
 λέγουσα, Θέλω ἵνα ἐξαυτῆς δῷς μοι ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου
 26 τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ· καὶ περίλυπος γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς διὰ τοὺς
 27 ὄρκους καὶ τοὺς ἀνακειμένους οὐκ ἡθέλησεν ἀθετῆσαι αὐτήν· καὶ
 εὐθὺς ἀποστείλας ὁ βασιλεὺς σπεκούλατορα ἐπέταξεν ἐνέγκαι τὴν
 28 κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἀπεκεφάλισεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ καὶ
 ἦνεγκεν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακι καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ κορασίῳ,
 29 καὶ τὸ κοράσιον ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς· καὶ ἀκούσαντες
 οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἥλθαν καὶ ἤραν τὸ πτῶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔθηκαν
 αὐτὸν ἐν μημείῳ.

Return of the disciples—Withdrawal with them, vi. 30-32.

30 Καὶ συνάγονται οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἀπῆγ-
 31 γειλαν αὐτῷ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησαν καὶ ὅσα¹ ἐδίδαξαν· καὶ
 λέγει αὐτοῖς, Δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ιδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον καὶ
 ἀναπαύσασθε ὅλίγον. ἷσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες

but is here spoken of as a *κοράσιον*. Strange that a princess on the verge of womanhood should thus make a show of herself before so mixed a company; she, Herodias, it was, as Mark emphatically puts it, who caused this to be done. The king falls at once into the snare thus laid for him, and commits himself to his step-daughter before all his guests, swearing an oath to keep him from going back on his word. It throws some light on the composition of the story, that the words used by the king in bidding the girl claim her reward, are the same as those spoken by Ahasuerus to Esther (Esth. v. 3, 5). As Herod has no kingdom to dispose of, but is only a vassal, the words do not suit him so well as they did the Persian monarch.

24. Mother and daughter, bound together by older ties than those connecting them with Herod, understand each other thoroughly. The mother has her answer ready to the request she had

known her daughter would bring her; and the daughter enters eagerly into the mother's plan, skips into the banqueting hall, and out with her request before Herod has had time to think, adding of her own wit that the head is to be given her on a plate, and at once. The guests who saw the dancing are to see the granting of the boon.

26. No circumstance is spared us of the proceedings by which the revengeful woman got her will accomplished. "Speculator," the Latin word used here and also in Hebrew writings to describe an executioner, means a scout or spy. The word is applied to the guard at a court or an officer's quarters, who had various functions to discharge, and among them this one. See Schürer's very full statement on the subject, and Swete's note here. The evangelist records that the great prophet received proper burial at the hands of his disciples.

¹ Omit *ὅσα*.

the king said to the girl, Ask whatever you like and I will give it you. And he swore to her, I will give ²³ you whatever you ask, up to the half of my kingdom. And she went out and said to her mother, What shall ²⁴ I ask? And she said, The head of John the Baptist. And ²⁵ she went in at once with haste to the king, and asked him, I wish you to give me at once the head of John the Baptist on a dish. And the king was very much distressed, but on ²⁶ account of his oaths and of the guests at his table he was unwilling to refuse her. And immediately the king sent a scout ²⁷ and ordered him to bring his head. And the guard went and beheaded him in the prison and brought his head on a ²⁸ dish and gave it to the girl, and the girl gave it to her mother. And when his disciples heard of it, they came and took ²⁹ his corpse and laid it in a tomb.

[Luke ix. 10; x. 17-20.]

And the apostles come together to Jesus; and they re- ³⁰ ported to him all they had done and all they had taught. And he says to them, Come you yourselves apart to some ³¹ uninhabited spot, and take a little rest. For there were a

This story fills up the interval between the sending out of the disciples and their return ; for a similar arrangement see chap. iii., where the Beelzebul charge and the discourse on it fill up the space between the setting-out of Jesus' family and their arrival. The talk about Jesus, aroused by the disciples' mission, and the identification of him with the Baptist, now dead, also give the story its place here.

30. On the title "the Apostles," of which this is the only undoubted occurrence in this Gospel, see note on iii. 14. For Mark's readers and for Mark himself the Apostles are a well-known set of men ; but the office and the title seem to belong to the period when there was a plurality of churches which required to be kept in touch with each other by officials free to move about. We might translate here etymologically, "the emissaries," but the word must have meant more than this to the first readers. See Hort's *Ecclesia*, p. 22 sq.

Apparently there was a rendezvous at

the conclusion of the tour. As Francis' brethren came together to Portiuncula after their mission, so the disciples came together to a place not named, but which must have been on the western side of the lake, and a place where Jesus was well known, to give in their report. We have heard already how they succeeded (vers. 12, 13). The return is the introduction to the stories of the feeding and of the walking on the water : in the tradition Mark here follows, all three are closely bound up together.

In Matthew xiv. 13 the retreat now to be told is occasioned by the news brought to Jesus by disciples of the Baptist of their master's end. As in Matth. iv. 12 he withdraws from Judaea to Galilee on hearing of John's arrest, so here, on hearing of his death, he withdraws to a place remote. In Matth. xvii. 12, Jesus regards the fate of John as a presage of his own. In Mark the motive of the retreat is differently stated : the disciples are to get some needed rest. And this is the more

32 πολλοί, καὶ οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν. καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλούῳ
εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ιδίαν.

The Feeding of the Five Thousand, vi. 33-44.

33 Καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἔγυνωσαν¹ πολλοί, καὶ πεξῆ
ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτοὺς.²
34 καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτούς,
ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα, καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν
35 αὐτοὺς πολλά. καὶ ἥδη ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης προσελθόντες
αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἐρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος,
36 καὶ ἥδη ὥρα πολλή ἀπόλυτον αὐτούς, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς
37 κύκλῳ ἀγροὺς καὶ κώμας ἀγοράσσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν. ὁ δὲ
ἀποκρθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν. καὶ λέγουσιν

necessary as the situation with the crowd (iii. 20, iv. 35) has repeated itself. Many are arriving, no doubt because he is there, and going, no doubt with something gained, and in the bustle regular meals are out of the question. As the disciples are now Jesus' first care, they are to go away with him to a place where there are no people to disturb them. They have done that before, for his sake (iv. 35); now they are to do it for their own. Accordingly they set out without mentioning to others what they are going to do, leave the people behind them, and push off in the friendly boat that is used for such excursions.

33. The Master's kind thoughts for his disciples, however, are defeated, and according to Mark in a very extraordinary way. The departure is observed by a number of people who are so deeply interested in Jesus that they cannot submit to be deprived of him. He had escaped them before, and seeing, from the direction the boat takes, to what point it is bound, they set out on foot determined that they will be there too. On their long walk round the north end of the lake they announce in the towns they pass the purpose of their journey, and this swells their numbers. So well have they taken their measures, that when Jesus arrives at the spot he thought of they are there on the beach before him.

In Matthew the crowd follows Jesus, i.e. arrives at the spot when he is already there. He then 'goes out,' the word used in Mark for getting out of the boat on the beach here means that he came out of the quiet spot where he was with his disciples, into the presence of the crowd just arrived. In Luke they follow him, and he receives them on their arrival. In both Matthew and Luke they have brought sick people with them, to whom he devotes himself. In Mark there is nothing of this; with him the journey is more rapid, and only able-bodied persons appear at the end of it.

There is to be no quiet therefore with the disciples at the spot which they have reached with some labour. Yet the Master is not discomposed at this crossing of his plans. He regards the crowd on the beach not with anger or aversion or contempt, the feelings with which a crowd is apt to be regarded by persons aiming at retirement, but with compassion. To his eyes they were like sheep without a shepherd, which have no clear object, and will run hither and thither even to long distances under some blind impulse. It was guidance, teaching, they were in want of; if their religious teachers did their duty better, the people would not be so helpless. Jesus therefore sets himself at once to the work that is so much needed. We see

¹ ἐπέγυνωσαν αὐτούς.

² συνῆλθον αὐτοῦ.

great many people there, some arriving and some going away, and they had no time even to take a meal. And they set ³² off in the boat to go to an uninhabited place apart.

[Matthew xiv. 13-21; Luke ix. 11-17.]

And many saw them setting out and knew what they ³³ were doing,¹ and people ran together on foot from all the towns to the spot, and got before them.² And when he landed he ³⁴ saw a great multitude and he had compassion upon them, because they were like sheep without a shepherd, and he began to teach them many things. And when it was late in the day ³⁵ his disciples came to him and said, This is a remote place and it is late in the day. Send them away so that they may go to ³⁶ the farms and villages round about and buy food for themselves. But he answered and said to them, Do you give them food. ³⁷ And they say to him, Are we to go and buy ten pounds

him here in a situation which is entirely to his mind. A quiet, orderly crowd is hanging on his words, there are no sick people clamouring for attention, no interruption of any kind. He can tell them all that is in his heart, of what their life should be towards God and towards each other so as to be prepared for the Kingdom when it comes.

35. While the Master is eager about the Word, and forgets bodily needs, the disciples are practical men, and feel that the question of provisions (Luke adds lodgings) is becoming more and more urgent. It never occurs to them that they can do anything themselves towards feeding the multitude, and the only suggestion they can make is that as the people must have some food, they should be dismissed and told to get it for themselves.

Jesus, however, takes quite a different view of the case—a very surprising view. He is unwilling to send the people away with their wants unsatisfied. That would be a cold and unsocial thing to do after he has been telling them no doubt that the children of the Father in heaven ought to care for each other, and to be ready to share with each other what the Father gives them.

Jesus is fond of his listeners, and loves to make them feel that they form a circle and belong to each other (iii. 35), and he feels it in him now to play the part of host or house-father, and to combine those who have been united in hanging on his words, in the further union of social kindness. And so when the disciples propose to dismiss the gathering, he refuses to do so, and calls them to do what they can to furnish a meal for all present. Those who had come to the place in a boat were more likely to have provisions with them than those who had come on foot.

The Apostles' question is to be understood as made in all seriousness. They have been told to feed the people, and they consult their Master as to the method of doing so. Are they, they ask, to go and spend 200 denarii (a denarius is a day's wage (Matt. xx. 2), and roughly represents a franc; the round sum named would be about £8) on loaves? That sum is mentioned, it is suggested, because the disciples had so much in their bag at the time. More likely it is a rough guess at what would be required. The sum is quite out of the question for their party. If the crowd numbered five thousand,

¹ Or, recognized them. But the reading for which this stands is a tautology borrowed from ver. 54.

² Or, and came together at the place.

αὐτῷ, Ἐπελθόντες ἀγοράσωμεν δηναρίων διακοσίων ἄρτους¹ καὶ
 38 δώσωμεν² αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν; οὐδὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Πόσους ἔχετε
 ἄρτους; ὑπάγετε, ἴδετε. καὶ γνόντες λέγοντι, Πέντε, καὶ δύο
 39 ἰχθύας. καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλῖναι³ πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια
 40 ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ. καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρασιὰ πρασιὰ κατὰ ἑκατὸν
 41 καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα. καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο
 42 ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς
 ἄρτους καὶ ἐόιδον τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς
 43 δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν. καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν.
 44 καὶ ἦραν κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίων πληρώματα, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν
 ἰχθύων. καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες τοὺς ἄρτους πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες.

The Walking on the Sea, vi. 45-52.

45 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἡγάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ
 πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν, ἕως αὐτὸς

the money named would be at the rate of a denarius for twenty-five of them.

38. Jesus, however, will not enter on any such question. He does not want the disciples to buy bread, but to produce what they have, for the common benefit, and he tells them to go and look how much they have. They have five loaves; the loaf of these days was a thick scone about the size of a plate; a loaf was what a man would eat at a meal (Luke xi. 5, 6). The fishes would be salted or dried; they were ready for use as a relish to the bread which formed the ordinary diet of plain people.

39. Jesus now takes command of the whole body of people present, and proceeds to organize a common meal. They have yielded their minds to him; they willingly obey his orders in their outward movements. The disciples act as stewards, and under their directions the people are arranged not in one large mass around a common centre, but party by party, "symposium by symposium (Gr.)." The orderly arrangement, as of rectangular garden beds contrasting with the green grass, remains clear in the narrator's memory. It is possible that some or most of these symposia had some provisions of their own. It is nowhere said that the five loaves and two fishes of the disciples were all the

food that could be found on the spot; and a person here and there may have had something with him and acted as the centre of one of these parties. What is narrated, however, is not what happened at these other companies, but what Jesus himself did and said. And his procedure on this occasion is exactly the same as at the institution of the Lord's Supper, exactly the same as in the company of the two disciples at Emmaus (xiv. 22, see notes there; Luke xxiv. 30). Here, therefore, as on these other occasions, we have to recognize not a mere material act of feeding, but an act of spiritual communion in which the eating of a piece of bread (no one gets a whole loaf or a full meal here any more than at the institution of the Supper, when one loaf was broken up for twelve persons; and in Luke xxiv. the meal is never finished at all) is charged with higher meanings. In the Gospel of John (chap. vi.) the proceeding as to the loaves is very much materialized; no doubt is left that by some process of multiplication the whole multitude was fed out of the scanty supply furnished by the hands of the disciples. But in that same chapter the narrative is also spiritualized, and its higher meaning is taken to be that Christ himself is the true

¹ ἄρτους;

² δώσωμεν.

³ ἀνακλιθῆναι.

worth of bread and feed them?¹ But he says to them, How many loaves have you? Go and see. And they looked, and say, Five, and two fishes. And he ordered them to make all the people lie down² in parties on the green grass. And they took their places in regular groups by hundreds and by fifties. And he took the five loaves and the two fishes and looked up to heaven and said the blessing and broke the loaves in pieces, and gave them to the disciples to set before them, and the two fishes he divided to them all. And they all ate and were satisfied. And they took up twelve baskets of fragments, and also remains of the fishes. And those who ate the loaves were five thousand men.

[Matthew xiv. 22-33.]

And immediately he made his disciples get into the boat and make for the other side before him, in the direction of

bread of which men must eat if they would live. The fourth Gospel, it is well known, gives no account of the institution of the Lord's Supper; but it gives its own doctrine of that ordinance in connection with the narrative of the feeding of the multitude.

42. Those who partake of the Eucharist are satisfied, though physically they may still be hungry. Man shall not live by bread alone, Jesus said (Luke iv. 4), and Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be satisfied (the word used here). It was those who had listened to his word who were satisfied with all he did for them, though outwardly it was perhaps little enough. But if this was what was meant at first by the feeding and the being satisfied, the story soon began to grow to something more. It soon came to be believed that all the multitude had been fed from the small supply of the disciples, and that every one there had had a full meal. Figures were produced as to the quantity of broken bread left on the ground, and as to the exact number of persons fed. Mark says 5000; Matthew adds to this figure women and children; these, too, had made the long walk round the

head of the lake, and had come entirely unprovided.

I have given the original scene, as it seems to me to be still recognizable in the common tradition of the Synoptists. But there is no doubt that even to Mark the element of wonder is taking the upper hand of that of social sympathy, the predominance of which makes the occurrence intelligible and beautiful to us. In John the process of supernaturalizing the story has reached its term; and if we are to assume an act of material multiplication, then no doubt John's narrative is the most precise and distinct of all the accounts. The points added to the story in John vi. are as follows: 1. The scene is laid on a hill-side on the east of the Sea of Galilee. 2. Jesus sees the multitude coming, and considers, before they arrive, how they are to be fed. 3. Though he knows what he is about to do, he has a conversation with a disciple on the subject, "tempting" him. 4. Philip and Andrew are named as the spokesmen of the disciples. 5. The disciples have no food; the supplies are got from a bag on the ground. 6. Jesus directs the collection of the fragments from motives of thrift.

¹ Or, Are we to go and buy ten pounds worth of bread? Then we can feed them, or, with the other reading, Then we will feed them.

² Or, with the other reading, He ordered them all to take their places.

46 ἀπολύει τὸν ὥχλον. καὶ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὅρος
 47 προσεύξασθαι. καὶ ὄψις γενομένης ἦν τὸ πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς
 48 θαλάσσης, καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. καὶ ἴδων αὐτοὺς βασανί-
 ζομένους ἐν τῷ ἑλαύνει, ἦν γὰρ ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναυτίος αὐτοῖς, περὶ
 49 ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης· καὶ ἤθελεν πιρελθεῖν αὐτούς. οἱ δὲ ἴδοντες
 αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα ἔδοξαν ὅτι φάντασμά
 50 ἔστιν, καὶ ἀνέκραξαν. πάντες γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶδαν, καὶ ἐταράχθησαν.
 ὁ δὲ εὐθὺς ἐλάλησεν μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Θαρσεῖτε,
 51 ἐγώ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε. καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον,
 52 καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος. καὶ λίαν¹ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο· οὐ γὰρ
 συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη.

45. The company was in no haste to dissolve, so much good feeling had been called forth and the difficulties of the situation had been so wonderfully made to yield. Jesus himself has to move, and the simplest way to show that the meeting is at an end is to make the **disciples set out** on their way home.¹ When the boat leaves the shore every one will understand the signal. Jesus, as host, has to bid the people good night when they set out to walk home; but he is not to go with them. He remains behind; and the boat, instead of heading at once westward in the direction of home, is to proceed northward, in a line parallel to the shore,² as if he did not wish the disciples altogether to leave him, but had some idea of joining them again somewhat later. He then bids the guests farewell on the spot where he has entertained them, and goes alone to the high ground behind. Could the disciples still see this from their boat? Did he tell them afterwards with what intention he had sought the deeper and clearer solitude, or did they themselves judge that it was so, since they knew him to be in habitual intercourse with the Father in heaven? (cf. i. 35).

¹ To impart into the story at this point the statement of John vi. 15 as to a popular movement after the feeding to make Jesus a king, and to suppose that this hastened the break-up of the gathering, is to introduce fatal confusion. The people had to find lodgings, as Luke sees.

² This must be the original meaning of the words *πρὸς Βηθσαϊδῶν*. The disciples are not

47. Verse 47 and the first half of 48 describe the situation of the disciples and of Jesus when night came on. When it is said that the boat was in the middle of the sea (the Greek literally), it is not meant that the disciples were halfway across, for that was not the course they were to steer, but that they were away from the shore with deep water round them. Then we are taken all at once to the **fourth watch**, the dark and desolate hours that precede the dawn. An interval of many hours is not accounted for, and the boat is still at the eastern side of the lake, for we hear afterwards of the crossing to Gennesaret (ver. 53).

The narrative before us is accordingly far from full; what the evangelist certainly means us to understand is that the disciples were in a position of weariness and harassment, though not of danger, which had gone on for a long time. It was dark and the wind was contrary, and Jesus had not come to them (John vi. 17 contributes this touching reminiscence), so that they had little hope left of carrying out their arrangement with him. Circumstances had been too strong for them.

48. Jesus saw that they were in a diffi-

to cross the lake before he joins them. Bethsaida, a town built by Philip, and called Julias, after the Emperor's daughter, lay on the left or eastern bank of the Jordan, a little above its entrance into the Sea of Galilee. The existence of another Bethsaida on the West side of the lake is very problematical. See Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible, sub voce*.

¹ Add *ἐκ περισσοῦ*.

Bethsaida, while he sends the multitude away. And after 46 taking leave of them he went away to the high ground to pray. And when evening had fallen, the boat was out upon 47 the sea and he was alone on the land. And he saw them 48 hard put to it in rowing, for the wind was against them, and about the fourth watch of the night he comes towards them walking on the sea, and he was going to pass by them. But when they saw him walking on the sea they thought 49 it was an apparition and cried out. For they all saw him 50 and were terrified. But he at once spoke with them, and says to them, Be of good cheer; it is I; do not be afraid. And he came up into the boat beside them, and the wind 51 fell; and they were quite beside themselves with wonder, for the matter of the loaves had not brought them to an 52 understanding,¹ but their heart was hardened.

culty; this he himself must have told them afterwards, and it came to be woven into the story as an additional element of wonder, and as a strong proof of his watchful care of his servants even when things are at the worst with them. What the disciples themselves were able to report was that at the very darkest and loneliest period of the night they saw a figure coming towards them, walking, as they judged, on the water. It was about to pass by, as if it meant only to show itself to them. He was going to pass by them, Mark writes, meaning perhaps that Jesus only meant to show himself, as if that was enough to reassure them. But the spectacle was far from reassuring them.

49. Of their brief discussion and consultation as to the strange sight we hear some report. It is going past! It is a ghost! No, it is coming up to us! Do you see it? Yes; and you? And then the screams when they conclude that it must be a real ghost because they all see it, and that it is advancing to them! But their scream is at once answered in a familiar voice. Jesus himself is speaking to them, and bidding them put away all their fears. It is no one but himself and there is no occasion for fear. (Cf. his chiding their fear of the storm, iv. 49). Compare the 'Εγώ εἰμι of xiv. 62.

To the Church the words mean that all is well because Jesus is Lord and all things are made subject to him.

51. On his joining them in the boat, all their difficulties are at an end, though Mark does not say with John that their voyage was at once accomplished. The wind fell as in iv. 39 and they again saw him to be Lord of the elements. But the impression made on them by the occurrence was as great as if they had not seen anything of the kind before. Only on this occasion they keep their feelings to themselves and do not express them in words, as they do in iv. 41, and as they are made to do in Matthew's version of this story. There indeed the disciples are spared Mark's reproach of want of intelligence, and at once greet their Master as God's Son, thus anticipating Peter's confession two chapters later. In Mark they are not at that point yet, they are only at the stage of wondering at the things Jesus is able to do.

52. Here we have one of the disciples looking back on his former blindness. If the Twelve had understood who their Master was, he reflects, they need not have been so much surprised at anything he did. To one standing at the position of the Apostolic Christology and recognizing in Jesus the Son

¹ Literally, they had not understood at the loaves.

Return to Gennesaret, vi. 53-56.

53 Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἥλθον εἰς Γεννησαρέτ, καὶ
 54 προσωριμίσθησαν. καὶ ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς
 55 ἐπιγνόντες αὐτὸν περιέδραμον ὅλην τὴν χώραν ἑκείνην καὶ
 56 ἤρξαντο ἐπὶ τοῖς κραβάττοις τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας περιφέρειν, ὅπου
 ἦκουν ὅτι ἐστίν. καὶ ὅπου ἀν εἰσεπορεύετο εἰς κώμας ἢ εἰς
 πόλεις ἢ εἰς ἀγρούς, ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ἐτίθεσαν τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας,
 καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κἀν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἴματίου αὐτοῦ
 ἄψωνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἀν ἥψαντο αὐτοῦ ἐσώζοντο.

The disciples neglect ritual washings; does Jesus hold the tradition? vii. 1-13.

- 1 Καὶ συνάγονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ τινες τῶν γραμ-
- 2 ματέων ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων. καὶ ἰδόντες τινάς τῶν μαθητῶν
 αὐτοῦ ὅτι κοινὰς χερσίν, τοῦτ' ἐστιν ἀνίπτοις, ἐσθίουσι τοὺς
- 3 ἄρτους—οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῇ¹
 νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν, κρατοῦντες τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν

of God, a Being endowed with divine power, there was nothing surprising in the fact that he could walk on the water and could make the wind be still. Could not the disciples have recognized him earlier? Ought not the matter of the loaves of itself to have opened their eyes?¹ But that, he remembers was not the case. It was very gradually that they came to see what their Master was. They passed through the stages of unintelligent surprise and superstitious alarm and dull wonder before they came to understand.

The progressive additions of the various narratives are not difficult to specify. Originally the boat is at the east side holding towards Bethsaida but not steering steadily on account of the wind; the crossing takes place after Jesus has joined. As to place, Mark while preserving, as he alone does, the original orders to the disciples, says that they were in the midst of the sea, as if they had been miles distant from either shore. In Matthew, who has dropped the phrase about Bethsaida in the order to the disciples, the boat is plainly represented as half way across. Luke, too, did not understand the original refer-

ence to Bethsaida, and made that place the object of the original voyage across the lake (ix. 10). Thus the position of the disciples in the boat is made as dreary as possible. The matter of time is treated in the same way. Jesus was to have joined the disciples after seeing the people set out for their night quarters; but does not come for many hours later, at the darkest and loneliest part of the night.

53. The scene of the preceding narrative was close to the east side of the lake. The party now being complete, the plan set forth in ver. 45 can be carried out, and the course is altered from northwards to westwards. The landing takes place at **Gennesaret**, a very fertile plain, described by Josephus in enthusiastic terms (*B. J.* iii. 10, 8), and of course after daybreak, though the arrival may have been earlier. It appears as if the people here do not know Jesus, but have only heard of him by rumour. There are some who recognize him, and these at once make it their business to spread the news about the district that the great prophet who has taught and wrought with such power at Capernaum, is at hand.

¹ For the grammar of this expression see Rutherford, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. xiv.

[Matthew xiv. 34-36.]

And they went across to the land¹ and came to Gen- 53
nesaret and moored to the shore. And at once on their 54
landing people knew him, and ran round the whole of that 55
district; and they began to carry their sick people about on 56
their couches where they heard that he was. And wherever 56
he entered into villages or towns or farms, they laid their sick 56
in the open spaces and begged him to let them touch if only
the tassel of his cloak; and as many as touched it were restored.

[Matthew xv. 1-9.]

And the Pharisees come together to him and some of the 1
Scribes, who had come from Jerusalem. They had noticed 2
how some of his disciples ate their meals with their hands 3
“common,” that is to say not washed. For the Pharisees and
all the Jews do not eat till they have first washed their hands

A set of scenes follows, compressed by Matthew into one general description, but distributed by Mark among all the places great or small which Jesus visited in the district. Wherever he comes, even though but to a cluster of houses, he finds the market place or open ground beside the dwellings transformed into an hospital. The sick have been brought out to the place where he is expected, just as at Capernaum (i. 32). And this visit to Gennesaret stands out in the memory of the reporters as having brought out the popular belief in the specific virtue of a touch of Jesus, to an extent not elsewhere equalled. The woman who came behind Jesus to touch him at Capernaum was an isolated instance of this belief; but here a whole district is full of it and acts on it in the most systematic way. Compare the same belief with reference to the Apostle Paul (Acts xix. 11, 12).

1. Mark places encounters with the Pharisees after journeys, when Jesus is at home; cf. ii. 1 *sq.*, iii. 22 *sq.*, viii. 10 *sq.*; and also here.

The incident here reported must belong to the later ministry, when the difference of principle between the

authorities and Jesus has come to be realized.

On the Scribes of Jerusalem see note on iii. 22. The present interview is a formal and grave one; the opponents do not meet Jesus casually but seek an interview with him. From the statement in ver. 14, that Jesus called the multitude to him again, the interview appears to be in the first instance private. Jesus is to encounter the representatives of the Jewish legal system as developed in the leading school of the country and applied in its highest court. The Scribes from Jerusalem, lawyers from the capital, men of the highest authority, are acting in concert with the local Pharisees, who know all that is said about Jesus, and are quick to notice any irregularity. It has been brought under the notice of these men that some of Jesus' disciples, surely not all, neglected the practice which all who aimed at a religious life ought surely to observe, of formally and openly washing their hands before taking their places at a meal. The hands of a good Jew sitting down to meat ought to be “holy”; but Jesus' disciples sit down to meat with their hands “common.”

3. Here the evangelist finds it neces-

¹ Or, they went across and came to land at Gennesaret. This is less in Mark's style.

- 4 πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ ἀπ' ὑγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ βαντίσωνται¹ οὐκ ἔσθίουσιν,
καὶ ἄλλα πολλά ἔστιν ἂ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, βαπτισμὸν ποτηρίων
5 καὶ ἔστων καὶ χαλκίων²—καὶ ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ
οἱ γραμματεῖς, Διατί ὡς περιπατοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ σου κατὰ
τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ κοινᾶς χερσὶν ἔσθίουσιν
6 τὸν ἄρτον; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἡσαΐας περὶ
ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται ὅτι

Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοὺς χειλεσὸν με τιμᾷ,
ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἡμοῦ.
μάτῃ γ δὲ σέβονται με,
διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.

- 7 8 ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν
9 ἀνθρώπων. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ

sary to leave his sentence uncompleted in order to tell his Gentile readers about the **purificatory customs of the Jews**. Greeks and Romans have their washings too, but those of the Jews are of a peculiar nature. The Pharisees, who are the most Jewish of the Jews and carry out the system most strictly, and indeed all the Jews, for it is a universal custom, make a religious duty of washing the hands before meals ; they wash with the fist, as the word literally means, i.e. scour the palm of one hand, the part most likely to have become defiled, with the fist of the other. The rendering "to the elbow" does not lie in the word. Edersheim's rendering, "to the wrist,"¹ also does violence to the Greek word.

4. That is one custom common to the Jews, observed at least by all who care for the tradition. Another is that when they come from market, where they rub shoulders with the Gentiles, and may have touched many an object fitted to injure their ritual purity, they recover their purity, at any rate before the next meal, by a special sprinkling. And many other observances there are, Mark sums up, which, though troublesome and unnatural, they yet respect because enjoined by their tradition.

The "tradition" is an immense subject. The reader may study it in reference to this passage in Edersheim's *Life and Times*, ii. 9 *sqq.*, Schürer, I. i. 306 *sqq.*, or Weber's *Jüdische Theologie*.

Not often has the attempt been carried so far to regulate the whole of life after a particular religious idea. The heavy burdens imposed on the people in this attempt were what drove publicans and sinners to despair. They prevented the spread of the religion, as, however the foreigner might be inclined to believe in the God of Israel, he shrank from the practices which were presented along with that belief, and which entered into every detail of daily conduct. The tradition, therefore had to be relaxed for proselytes ; cf. Acts xv. 1-31. How far the ordinary Jew of Jesus' time felt bound to do all the scribes enjoined may in many points be questioned. Jesus allows his disciples great liberty from the tradition, and often sets it at naught himself ; cf. Luke xi. 38, Matthew v. 21-48, Mark ii. 23-28, etc. These deviations in detail might be allowed to pass, but to attack the tradition as a whole, as a system, which Jesus does here, was a graver matter.

5. The sentence broken off at the end of ver. 2 is begun again. The questioners infer from what they have seen that the disciples do not 'walk,' or direct their lives, according to the tradition. Do they not recognize the tradition as an authority to be respected by religious people? Can it be that their disregard of it is intentional, and that their Master approves of their action in this matter? The question is very explicit, and a great deal must depend

¹ *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, Vol. ii., p. 10-12.

¹ βαπτίσωνται.

² Add καὶ κλιψῶν.

energetically,¹ observing in this the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market-place they do not eat till they have sprinkled themselves,² and there are many other things which their tradition makes them observe, washings of cups and jugs and coppers.³ And the Pharisees and the Scribes ask him, Why do your disciples not act in accordance with the tradition of the elders, but take their food with ‘common’ hands? But he said to them, Finely did Isaiah prophesy about you, hypocrites as you are! as it is written,

This people honours Me with their lips
but their heart is far from Me.

In vain do they worship Me
the doctrines they teach are human injunctions.

7

You give up the commandment of God and uphold the tradition of men instead. And he said to them, It is a fine thing you do; you set aside the commandment of God

on the answer Jesus returns to it. Will he, when directly challenged, recognize the oral law as binding? So to recognize it is to approve of the burdens bound by Scribes and Pharisees on the people whom he wished to emancipate. To refuse to recognize it was to declare war on the religious rulers, who had built on it their wholesystem and power.

6. Jesus is quite prepared for the attack. The subject of the tradition has had his serious attention, and he has quite made up his mind about it, and has found in Scripture strong confirmation of his view; cf. Matthew v. 17-end. In Mark he does not argue the question, but answers at once with a direct repudiation of the authority of tradition, and a denunciation of those who hold and cultivate it; and he afterwards defends his answer with one concrete instance. (In Matthew the line of argument is different and less clear). A quotation from Scripture comes first, given, however, as we now find it neither according to the Massoretic Text nor the Septuagint. How aptly do the words of Isaiah (xxix. 13) apply to the present state of affairs! The prophet seems to have these very men

in his eye, for he speaks of people who make a great show of religion, but do not in their heart sympathize with the principal requirements of God, bent as they are on objects of their own. Their laborious service of God, therefore, serves no purpose (the word ‘in vain’ is added by Mark to the original). Hypocrites they must be called, for they are acting a part, pretending the greatest zeal for God while thinking only of themselves and their own system. And then Jesus states the conclusion he has formed about the whole tradition system and its teachers. It is not a divine system as they pretend, but a human system. It does not as originally intended uphold and supplement the law of God, but runs counter to it. The two laws—the law of God and the human tradition—are so different that it is necessary to choose between them, and the scribes have made the wrong choice: their attachment to the tradition has led them into virtual rejection of the divine law.

9. The instance cited by Jesus to substantiate his charge of the abrogation of the Torah by the Halachah or tradition is a simple one, and one which was

¹ πυκνὰ, frequently (Lk. v. 33), Tischendorf’s reading, gives an unsuitable sense.

² Or, washed themselves. παρισώμεναι, the reading adopted, was more likely to be misunderstood and altered.

³ Add, and beds.

io θεοῦ, ὥν τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν τηρήσητε. Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν, Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου, καὶ, Ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ 11 μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάτῳ. ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε, Ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἀνθρώπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ, Κορβάν, δὲ στιν Δῶρον, δὲ ἐὰν ἔξ ἐμοῦ 12 ὠφεληθῆς, οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ 13 μητρὶ, ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ὃ παρεδώκατε καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.

The true principle of purity, vii. 14-23.

14 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Ἀκού-
15 σατέ μου πάντες καὶ σύνετε. οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτὸν δὲ δύναται κουψᾶται αὐτόν· ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ

actually debated in the Jewish schools. The Rabbis did not dispute that a man ought to honour his parents, and that the general duty of honouring them implied the particular duty of supporting them. But if a man's duty to his parents came into competition with his duty to the temple, if he had dedicated to the temple a certain part of his means and could not both keep that vow and support his parents, what ought he to do? The Rabbis decided that the duty to the temple must take precedence of that to parents; and it is for this decision that Jesus here attacks them. Moses, the authority whom all recognize (though see later, x. 5), through whom the will of God was made known to man in its earliest and most authentic form, has to stand aside in order that the man-made tradition may operate without any restraint. And for the keeping of a moral law, in which a man's conscience and judgment are called to develop and apply the divine intentions, there is substituted the mechanical observance of a set of rules made by scribes a generation or two ago. This, Jesus says, is but one example of the working of the system which the scribes administer: plenty more examples could be given.

This is Jesus' last word on this subject to the scribes who had come to enquire as to his position. He leaves them in no doubt that he rejects the oral law on which they bestow such pains, and that he claims to have the

Jewish religion regarded as a system of moral commands, and not of mechanical regulations. Men, however, who take the mechanical view of religion are not easily convinced by appeals to moral considerations, and are apt to regard one who thinks more lightly than they do of their rules and doctrines as a foe to religion. We could scarcely expect that Jesus' arguments on this occasion would have any other effect on the scribes than that of deepening their suspicions about him.

In relation to the future history of the Christian movement, this episode is of the greatest importance. The system of tradition was, as we saw, that part of the Jewish religion which most unfitted it for wide diffusion. In declaring that the tradition is a mere human construction and quite unessential, Jesus opens the door, though he himself does not draw this inference from the principle he sets up, for the Gentiles to come in to the religion of Israel.

14. The principles which Jesus has declared to the scribes of Jerusalem and the local Pharisees, at a private interview, he does not shrink from placing before the multitude also. They are the chief sufferers from the existing order of affairs; he cannot shrink from the task of enlightening them. To the leaders he impugns the whole system of tradition; in speaking to the people he limits himself to that side of the large subject which the leaders had specially brought before him, the ques-

in order to observe your own tradition. For Moses said, ¹⁰ Honour thy father and thy mother, and, He who curses his father or mother, let him be put to death. But you say, Suppose a man to say to his father or his mother, The assistance you might have had from me is Corban, that is to say, dedicated—then you allow him to give up doing anything for ¹¹ his father or his mother. And thus you abrogate the word of ¹² God by your tradition which you enjoin. And many other things of just the same kind do you do.

[Matthew xv. 10-20.]

And he called the multitude to him again and said to ¹⁴ them, Hear me, all of you, and understand. There is nothing ¹⁵ outside a man which by going into him can make him

tion of ritual purity in connection with food and meals. He now defends his disciples against that attack. And he speaks in a parable (ver. 17), not to conceal his meaning from the multitude (iv. 12), but that they may look for his meaning in the story he tells, and find it for themselves, and so be more powerfully impressed with it. He leaves something for them to do; and summons them not only to hear (aorist, to hear at once and make sure of it), but to exercise insight and understand.

The subject of this parabolic saying is taken from the levitical law of purity, and is found in the well-known fact that the principal causes of levitical impurity, spoken of in the law, are sicknesses or misadventures accompanied by hemorrhage, eruptions, issues, etc. The law itself says comparatively little about the impurity contracted by eating forbidden foods (see Levit. xi.), but a great deal about the means to be used for cleansing lepers, etc. (Levit. xii.-xv.). The practice of later times had somewhat altered this proportion, many things being held to defile which are not said in the law to do so; but the broad fact remained that uncleanness followed more certainly and more patently, and for a longer time, from things leaving the body than from things going into it. Jesus overlooks the latter case altogether, and proposes to his hearers for their intelligent consideration the simple fact that a man is deprived of his purity, of his standing

as a member of the holy people, not by what goes into his body but by what goes out of it.

If the hearers were capable of seeing what was meant by this parable even without any interpretation, and Jesus judged that they were capable, we may be so also. The words, we observe, contain Jesus' defence of himself to his fellow-countrymen for not having made his disciples observe more strictly the laws of ritual purity. If these laws are based on any intelligible principle, it must be that eating unclean things makes a man unclean, and that therefore one must use every precaution in order not to swallow anything that can act in this way. But the law of Moses does not stand on this ground. There it is what comes out, not what goes in, that makes unclean. The elaborate laws of purity therefore are not to the point, and cannot possibly attain their purpose; they set to work at the wrong side. And here the hearers' thoughts might go a little deeper and suggest that purity is not perhaps a mechanical thing to be thus guarded, but must have to do with a man's character as well as his food. If what defiles him is the bad things that proceed out of his character, then, how vain the thought that he can be kept pure by washing his hands, or his cups, or his kitchen utensils!

Matthew alters the parable and destroys its original force, as taken from the levitical law, by making the phrases run:

τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενά ἔστιν τὰ κοινῶντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον.¹
 17 καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς² οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ
 18 μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολὴν. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς
 19 ἀσύνετοί ἔστε; οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἔξωθεν εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς
 20 τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινωσται, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται
 21 αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἀλλ’ εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα
 22 ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα; ἐλεγεν δὲ ὅτι Τὸ
 23 ἔκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενον, ἐκεῖνο κοινοὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. ἔσωθεν
 γὰρ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοὶ
 22 ἐκπορεύονται, πορνεῖαι, κλοπαί, φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι, πλεονεξίαι, πονηρίαι,
 δόλος, ἀσέλγεια, ὄφθαλμὸς πονηρός, βλασφημία, ὑπερηφανία,
 23 ἀφροσύνῃ πάντα ταῦτα τὰ πονηρὰ ἔσωθεν ἐκπορεύεται καὶ
 κοινοὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

The Syro-Phoenician woman, vii. 24-30.

24 Ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια Τύρου.³ καὶ εἰσελθὼν
 25 εἰς οἰκίαν οὐδένα ἥθελεν γυνῶναι, καὶ οὐκ ἡδυνάσθη λαθεῖν ἀλλ’
 εἰθὺς ἀκούσασα γυνὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἦς εἰχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς

MARK.

Not what goes into a man, but into his mouth, but what comes out of what comes out of a man, his mouth, makes a man unclean—Mt. xv. 11. ‘He that hath ears to hear let him hear’ (iv. 9, 23) is not retained in the new text here.

17. It is according to Mark’s former statements (iv. 10, 34) that the disciples ask for enlightenment as to the meaning of the parable, and get it. They are thus distinguished above the crowd who do not ask for light, and perhaps it is meant that they are specially qualified to interpret the parable to others afterwards. To interpret a parable is in general to spoil it, and to deprive it of its rich suggestiveness. To this rule the present instance forms no exception. The interpretation given savours more of the churches, such as Antioch and Corinth, where the question of clean and unclean food was much debated, than of the Master himself. It is introduced (as iv. 13) with a rebuke to the disciples for their want of insight, in which no doubt there is a true reminiscence. Then the things

MATTHEW.

which go into a man and those which come out are considered in turn. Of the former it is shown that in the arrangements of the human body it is provided that they never come in contact with the heart, the seat of man’s will and emotions, where alone his cleanliness or uncleanness must be thought to reside, but pass away through him, and are purged out, the clean and the unclean as they might formerly be considered, both alike, without any discrimination. This feature of man’s organism is the great purifier so far as purity depends on food.

20. ‘He said’ may indicate that what follows was not spoken on the same occasion as the preceding. Verse 20 is a word of Jesus bearing on the subject in hand, and suitably placed here. The three following verses, however, seem to be added by the evangelist himself, in illustration of the subject in hand. The list of sins and vices given is very similar to those the Apostle Paul had already written down in his Epistles to the Galatians (v. 19-21), and to the Romans (i. 29-31.) Of the thirteen terms in the present catalogue ten have

¹ Add, 16 εἰ τις ἔχει ὧτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούετω.

² Add τὸν.

³ Add καὶ Σιδῶνος.

unclean; but the things which issue out of a man, these are they which make him unclean.¹ And when he went indoors² away from the multitude, his disciples asked him for the parable. And he says to them, Are you too so unintelligent? Do you not see that whatever goes into a man from without, it cannot make him unclean, because it does not go into his heart, but into his belly, and passes out into the drain; it makes all foods clean.³ But he said that what comes out of a man is what makes him unclean. For from within, from the heart of men, come evil thoughts, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, mischiefs, deceit, dissipation, an evil eye, railing, haughtiness, foolishness; all these evil things come from within, and these are what make a man unclean.

[Matthew xv. 21-28.]

And he removed from there and went away to the country of Tyre.⁴ And he entered into a house, and wished no one to know; and he could not escape notice. But immediately a woman who had heard of him, whose little daughter had

a place in that of Romans also. It is originally a catalogue of Gentile vices, used in Galatians to warn Gentile Christians against the sins to which they were specially liable, and in Romans to show the corrupt and lost state of the Gentile world. The religious vices to which the Jews were specially prone, of superstition, and hypocrisy, and narrowness, are not here specified.

The view put forward in this passage that purity depends on the state of the heart, and can be ensured in no other way than by keeping the heart clean, is the distinctive moral doctrine of Jesus, and is to be recognized throughout the whole of his teaching. In Matthew v. 21-48 it is set forth most

systematically. See the Beatitude, Matthew v. 8, also Matthew vi. 22-23, vii. 17-18, Luke vi. 43-45, and the sayings about good soil and good fruit.

24. After setting up the principle that the tradition had no authority, a principle which implied the opening of the Kingdom to the Gentiles, Jesus goes on a journey which carries him to Gentile soil. Mark no doubt meant this to be suggestive; but we see in the sequel that the journey he places in this light was not a missionary one (cf. Matth. x. 5, 23). Matthew describes it by the word "he withdrew," and so represents it as a retirement or a flight, and Mark's

¹ Add, 16: If anyone has ears to hear, let him hear.

² Or, into the house (a particular one).

³ The Revisers render the last part of the verse "*This he said, making all meats clean;*" taking *καθαπλύω* as agreeing with the subject of the verb *λέγει* at the beginning of the sentence. The words are then a reflection by the evangelist on the effect of the words of Jesus, or, as Swete says, they are a note by an editor who sees the effect of Jesus' words. But the grammatical irregularity involved in the rendering given above can be explained; see WM, p. 778.

⁴ Add, and Sidon.

πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, ἐλθοῦσα¹ προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ
 26 ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἣν Ἐλληνίς, Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει καὶ ἥρωτα αὐτὸν
 27 ἵνα τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλῃ ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῇ,
 "Ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα· οὐ γάρ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν
 28 τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ τοὺς κυναρίους βαλεῖν. ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη
 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Ναί, κύριε· καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης
 29 ἔσθιοντιν ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Διὰ
 30 τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὑπαγε, ἐξεληλυθεν ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς σου τὸ
 δαιμόνιον. καὶ ἀπελθοῦσα εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς εὑρεν τὸ παιδίον
 βεβλημένον ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐξεληλυθός.

The Northern journey, vii. 31-37.

31 Καὶ πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὁρίων Τύρου ἦλθεν διὰ Σιδῶνος εἰς
 τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως.
 32 καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν καὶ μογιλάλον, καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν

"went away," must mean the same. If we ask what circumstances might lead Jesus at this time to travel beyond his own country, we find (1) that he had now come to an open breach, as never before, with the leaders of Jewish religion on a great question of principle. There is no more preaching, after this point, in the synagogues of Galilee. A grave crisis had been reached in his life, and whether or not he was seriously threatened in his own country, he was certainly in a position calling for grave reflection. (2) Another circumstance pointing in the same direction was the need he felt of giving his disciples, whose ideas were so confused and immature, more of his company and conversation than was possible where he was well known. The same motives which led him to take his disciples with him across the Sea of Galilee (vi. 31) might prompt this journey with them to the Tyrian country. From what point he here sets out we are not told. On such points Mark's sequence is not, as we have often seen, to be interpreted too strictly. He would enter the Tyrian territory half way between Capernaum and Tyre; it is not suggested that he visited the town (cf. viii. 27, the villages of Caesarea). On his arrival it appears that he has not come to preach to the heathen. He goes into a house,

whether the dwelling of a Jewish or a Gentile family we do not learn. If the latter, then Jesus gives here an example of Jewish limitations, such as Peter speaks of, Acts x. 28. He hopes to stay there unnoticed, but this hope is disappointed. His fame has preceded him to the foreign country. Did we not read (iii. 8) that many from Tyre and Sidon, on hearing what he was doing, came to him in Galilee? These might be Jewish residents in Tyre and Sidon; but among the Gentiles also of the northern region his name would seem to have been spoken of. He has a great reputation for casting out demons; and it is not only among Jews that demoniac possession occurred. One woman at least there is in the Tyrian land who has a child afflicted in this way. She is a Greek, not a Jew, i.e. she speaks Greek and worships Greek gods. Yet she is not a daughter of Hellas, but belongs to that branch of the Phoenician race which dwelt in Syria (another branch of the same race dwelt in Libya). This woman having heard of Jesus' visit to her neighbourhood and believing that he may be able to do something for her daughter, goes to the house where he is staying, leaving her restless and unhappy child at home, and throws herself down before him with the entreaty repeated again and again that he will do for her what he

¹ εἰσελθοῦσα.

an unclean spirit, came¹ and fell at his feet. And the woman ²⁶
was a Greek, a Syro-Phoenician by birth. And she asked him
to expel the demon from her daughter. And he said to her, ²⁷
Let the children be fed first; for it is not fitting to take the
children's bread and throw it to the dogs. But she answered, ²⁸
and says to him, O yes, sir; the dogs do eat under the table,
of the children's crumbs. And he said to her, For that speech ²⁹
go your way, the demon has gone out of your daughter.
And she went away home and found the child lying on the ³⁰
bed and the demon gone out.

[Matthew xv. 29-31.]

And he left the Tyrian country again and went by Sidon ³¹
to the Sea of Galilee through the territory of Decapolis. And ³²
people bring to him a man who was deaf and spoke imper-

has done for so many, expel the demon
from her daughter.

In Matthew Jesus does not enter on Gentile territory nor attempt any incognito, but only goes towards it, while the woman comes out of her own land to where he is. She hails him as Messiah, and the interview with her takes place on the street, where the disciples are annoyed at her crying after their company and wish Jesus to dismiss her.

27. Asked by a Gentile woman to do her a service which is within his power Jesus replies that he is debtor to the Jews for all the blessings which he brings; and that the Gentiles must come after the Jews in his regards (cf. Matth. x. 6). The metaphor in which this is conveyed is certainly an insulting one to the Gentiles. In early Christian writings the term "dog" is applied to Gentiles; see Phil. iii. 2, Lightfoot's note. Perhaps Matth. vii. 6 is also an instance of this Jewish way of speaking. We must not wonder if Jesus expressed his loyalty and devotion to his own people in the language of his day. The rest of the story shows that he did not allow that language to determine his thought and action.

This is better given in Matthew. There Jesus does not use the word "first" suggesting as he does in Mark

(according to Paul's "To the Jews first," Rom. i. 16? ii. 10, ix. 24) that the Gentiles may have their turn after the Jews, and thus putting the woman's reply into her mouth.

28. The woman is not silenced by this forbidding speech, but answers, turning the metaphor so that it may serve her need. There is no doubt, she allows, a difference which cannot be lost sight of between the children and the dogs; the dogs cannot sit at table with the children nor share their blessings on equal terms, yet there is something for them too; what the children do not use themselves but let fall out of their abundance, the dogs on the floor get for their portion. Jesus has more than the Jews want, there may be a crumb over for a Gentile in sore need.

29. In the more original account in Matthew, it is the woman's faith that is praised; in Mark it is the just apprehension shown in her speech; she has taken up the proper ground and recognized the principle that the Gentiles come after the Jews. It is on these terms that the boon is granted, though won, no doubt, by her undaunted pertinacity. On going home she finds her child, formerly so excited and restless, lying on her bed (the Gadarene demoniac was found sitting, v. 15) and, as it proves, entirely

¹ came in.

33 ἵνα ἐπιθῆ αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα. καὶ ἀπολαβόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου κατ’ ἴδιαν ἔβαλεν τοὺς δάκτυλους αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὅτα αὐτοῦ
 34 καὶ πτύσας ἤψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ¹, καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐστέναξεν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Ἐφφαθά, ὃ ἐστιν Διανοίχθητι.
 35 καὶ ἡνοίγησαν αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀκοαί, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς
 36 γλώσσης αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐλάλει ὁρθῶς. καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα
 μηδενὶ λέγωσιν ὅστον δὲ αὐτοῖς διεστέλλετο, αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον περισ-
 37 σότερον ἐκήρυξσον. καὶ ὑπερπεριστῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες,
 Καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκεν καὶ τοὺς κωφοὺς ποιεῖ ἀκούειν καὶ
 ἀλάλους λαλεῖν.

The feeding of the four thousand, viii. 1-10.

1 Ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος καὶ μὴ ἔχόντων τί φάγωσιν, προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγει αὐτοῖς,

cured. Shall we say that the reputation of Jesus, of which the patient had heard, and the knowledge that he was being invoked to deal with her case, had been enough to restore her?

On Jesus' dealings with Gentiles, compare Matth. viii. 5-13 where also there is a cure from a distance. To St. Paul the Gentile gods are demons (1 Cor. x. 20), and the Gentile world is subject to powers opposed to God (1 Cor. viii. 5); so that the story before us must have appeared to Gentile Christians prophetic of the emancipation of the heathen by the salvation which appeared first among the Jews, from the tyranny of irrational and evil powers.

31. This is an extensive journey, almost entirely on heathen soil; first northwards to Sidon, then eastwards over the Lebanon to Damascus which was itself one of the cities of the Decapolis, and then southwards to the east side of the Sea of Galilee. In Matthew, where Jesus does not leave Jewish soil, he comes straight back from the outskirts of the Tyrian land to the Sea of Galilee, which is crossed from east to west; xv. 39 (see note on Mark viii. 10). In Mark there is a journey of not less than a fortnight, in which Jesus is traversing foreign lands in the society

of his disciples alone. The resolutions to which we find soon afterwards that he had come (see chap. viii.), suggest the object and the occupations of this long tour. It brings him back to the country which he visited and where he found so poor a reception in chap. v., and if we take the sequence strictly, we shall suppose that country to be the scene of the two following incidents. The towns in it were Greek, but there was a Jewish population in the territories belonging to them (see Swete's note).

32. Jesus is here surrounded by a "multitude," when a case is brought to him. It is different from any that has been reported before, and the methods employed by Jesus in dealing with it are also new to us. The case is one of deafness and of imperfect utterance; the latter is often a result of the former, as it is by hearing others speak and comparing the sounds we make ourselves with theirs that we acquire speech. Those who bring the patient to Jesus ask him to lay his hand on him, that being the outward form accompanying a cure, and symbolizing in the practice of the time the passing of healing influence to the patient (see i. 41, v. 23, vi. 5). The procedure of Jesus is narrated here in great detail, whether it be that it was peculiar in

¹ Cod. W^d (Cambridge) επτυσεν εις τους δακτυλους αυτου και εβαλεν εις τα ωτα του κωφου και ηψατο της γλωσσης του μογιλαλου.

fectly, and entreat him to lay his hand on him. And he took 33 him away from the crowd by himself and put his fingers in his ears and spat and touched his tongue,¹ and looking up to 34 heaven he sighed and says to him, Effatha, that is, Be opened. And his ears were opened and immediately the fetter of his 35 tongue was loosed and he spoke quite rightly. And he en- 36 joined them not to tell any one. But the more urgent he was in his injunction the more bent were they on making known the occurrence far and wide. And people were most exceed- 37 ingly struck with it, and said, He has done everything well! he makes both the deaf hear and the dumb speak!

[Matthew xv. 32-39.]

In those days, when there was again a great multitude and they had nothing to eat, he calls his disciples to him and says

this instance, or what is more likely, that the operation is here reported fully which is in other cases only summarized. The details in the variants are certainly more natural than those of the text; see Nestle, *Introd. Eng. Tr.*, p. 264. On having the patient handed over to him Jesus at once isolates him, as the physician still does, from the crowd. He must secure his undivided attention (cf. v. 37, viii. 23) for the cure is not to be accomplished without the patient's co-operation. He then puts his fingers into the ears which are the first seat of all the trouble; the patient is to think that some change is to be effected there. Then he touches the man's tongue with his own fingers which he has wet with his spittle (on the remedial qualities of spittle and its use in ancient medicine see Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.*, on John ix., whose passages however refer to eye-troubles only); some change is to take place there too. The man of course is eyeing him intently all this time and following all these movements with the most eager interest. Then the Master looks up to heaven; the blessing is to come from there on what is sought to be done on earth; and then he sighs deeply, which might be taken to denote the act, to be imitated by the patient,

of forcing up a blast of air from the lungs into the ear-tubes and the mouth, as if to clear away any obstruction which may exist there. In a full narrative of the details of the cure this would be quite in place; but the sigh soon came to be taken as a sigh of emotion, though of what emotion no one of course can say. Mark is rich both in details of Jesus' methods of cure and in words descriptive of his moods and gestures; and this sigh can be understood in either way. Then the command is given, 'Effatha,' no doubt in a very peremptory tone (for the retention in the Greek Gospels of Aramaic words, which were used by Jesus at critical moments and seemed to bring about notable results, see *Talitha* v. 41, *Abba* xiv. 36). On the details of the cure cf. the case of the blind man in chap. viii. 22 *sqq.*

36. Jesus' prohibition to proclaim his good deeds is now familiar to us; see i. 44, v. 43, and the injunctions laid on the demoniacs. Here, as in former cases, the eagerness of those interested in the patient is too great to be thus restrained: their wish to tell is greater than his to prevent them from telling. A deep impression is made on those who find themselves the witnesses of such proceedings. In Jesus they see

¹The variant gives: he spat on his fingers and put them in the deaf man's ears and touched the stammerer's tongue. Syr^{sin} (Merx, not Mrs. Lewis) gives: he laid his fingers and spat in his ears and touched his tongue.

2 Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, δτὶ ἥδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσίν
 3 μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν. καὶ ἐὰν ἀπολύσω αὐτοὺς νήστεις
 εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν, ἐκλυθήσονται ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ· καὶ τινες αὐτῶν ἀπὸ⁴
 μακρόθεν εἰσίν.¹ καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ δτὶ⁵
 Πόθεν τούτους δυνήσεται τις ὁδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐπ' ἑρημάς;⁶
 5 καὶ ἥρωτα αὐτούς, Πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν, Ἐπτά.⁷
 6 καὶ παραγγέλλει τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ λαβὼν
 τοὺς ἐπτά ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς
 αὐτοῦ ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν, καὶ παρέθηκαν τῷ ὄχλῳ. καὶ εἶχαν
 ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα· καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτὰ εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι.⁸
 8 καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἔχορτάσθησαν, καὶ ἦραν περιστεύματα κλασμά-

one in whom the prophecies are coming true, and they give vent to their delight in phrases like those of Isaiah, who says, xxxv. 5: Then the eyes of the blind will be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. (Cf. Isa. xxix. 18). If these predictions are being fulfilled at the hands of Jesus, what is to be thought of him? To later Christians as to us it seemed natural that this line of thought should lead much further. Cf. Matth. xi. 2-6. In Jesus' lifetime, however, there is little to show that it did so.

viii. 1. The time-date is vague; is the period indicated that of the wanderings in Galilee or that after Jesus had come back from his journey to Tyre? The crowd also appears here without any visible cause, and the situation—Jesus for three days in an uninhabited spot, where no provisions are to be had, with a multitude of four thousand, many of them from a distance, who will starve if something is not done promptly to relieve them—is quite different from anything we have had before. The crowd at the first feeding was clearly accounted for, but not this one. It seems difficult to escape the conclusion that the evangelist having on hand a second version of the story of the feeding, which he believed to refer to a different occasion, was compelled to create a place for it, and did so perhaps somewhat awkwardly.

In Matthew the multitude is that of the people who had brought their sick to him (xv. 30), and who had been so surprised and so inspired to

glorify God when they witnessed his cures.

4. In the two narratives of feeding the thousands, Mark vi. 32 sq. and viii. 1 sq., the following traits are common:

1. There is a multitude with Jesus and his disciples in an uninhabited place on the east shore of the Sea of Galilee. 2. Jesus has compassion on them. 3. The alternatives are considered of sending the multitude away or feeding them on the spot. 4. The disciples cannot see how the feeding is to be managed. 5. Jesus asks the disciples how many loaves they have, and they answer. 6. The multitude take places for a meal. 7. Jesus performs the solemn acts, narrated also in the institution of the Lord's Supper: takes, blesses or gives thanks, breaks, and gives to the disciples, who distribute to the multitude. 8. There are fishes also, which are similarly treated. 9. All the people are satisfied. 10. There is a collection in baskets of unused fragments. 11. The number is stated. The following points also may be added: 12. A voyage is entered on immediately after. 13. There is an encounter with the Pharisees directly after the voyage. 14. Bethsaida is mentioned in connection with a journey in the sequel. 15. A journey to the north follows.

The two accounts differ in the following details: 1. In vi. we are told how the multitude came to the spot; in viii. we are told at once that they have been there three days. 2. In vi. Jesus' compassion is for the unguided state of the

¹ ἤκαστιν.

to them, I feel great compassion for all those people, because 2 they have been with me now for three days and they have nothing to eat. And if I send them home without food 3 they will faint on the way; and some of them are¹ from far. And his disciples answered him, Where can any one possibly 4 get loaves to feed these people in an uninhabited district like this? And he asked them, How many loaves have you? And 5 they said, Seven. And he orders the multitude to take their 6 places on the ground; and he took the seven loaves and gave thanks and broke them and gave them to his disciples to set before them; and they set them before the multitude. And 7 they had a few little fishes, and he blessed them and bade the disciples set these also before them. And they ate and 8 were satisfied, and they took up of pieces that were over

multitude, and prompts him to teach them; in viii. he has compassion on them because of their want of food. 3. In vi. the disciples raise the question of feeding the thousands; in viii. Jesus himself. 4. In vi. there are houses and farms in the neighbourhood, where bread may be bought; in viii. there is no food to be had near the spot. 5. The numbers are changed: viii. has seven loaves and a few little fishes, instead of five loaves and two fishes; seven baskets of fragments are collected instead of twelve, and another kind of basket is spoken of; whether one was larger than the other it is impossible to determine; in one case 5000 are fed, in the other 4000. 6. In vi. Jesus sends his disciples away, and remains on shore to bid the multitude farewell; in viii. he dismisses the multitude first, and then embarks with the disciples.

The points of agreement are so numerous and important that the two narratives must be regarded as different forms of the same tradition. That of chap. vi. is undoubtedly the more original of the two. It forms an integral part of the narrative in which it occurs, is well led up to by the incidents preceding it, and is itself real and natural. That of chap. viii., on the other hand, is very loosely connected with the context in which it occurs, is considerably more wonderful than the other, and has no additional trait of importance. If the numbers

were the same as in chap. vi. no one would hesitate to believe that the two stories related to the same event; and in stories orally transmitted, numbers may easily be changed, and are not to be too strictly insisted on. We have, therefore, before us here a very instructive instance of the manner in which oral tradition modified and developed the early Christian narratives. Even the variations show how favourite a theme the story of the feeding was in the earliest Christian society. The identity of the acts recorded in it with those repeated at every celebration of the Lord's Supper—Jesus feeding all who came to him, and though with slender apparent store making all feel satisfied—this ensured for the story constant repetition and rapid elaboration. The homelier features, which realized too plainly the original situation, were dropped, and the power grew which multiplied the loaves. It may be asked whether the story of the feeding grew out of the ordinance of the Supper, or whether, on the other hand, the latter grew out of the former. We are not obliged to adopt either alternative. True, the main object of contemplation—Jesus, as host, satisfying the desires of all who look to him—is the same in both cases: but the situation was one which was likely to recur, and both the instances of it are firmly fixed in the history.

¹ have come.

9 τῶν ἑπτὰ σπυρίδας. ἥσαν δὲ ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι. καὶ ἀπέλυσεν
10 αὐτούς. καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ
ἡλθεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά.¹

The Pharisees ask for a sign, viii. 11-13.

11 Καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἤρξαντο συνζητεῖν αὐτῷ, ζητοῦντες
12 πάρ' αὐτοῦ σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πειράζοντες αὐτόν. καὶ
ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει, Τί ἡ γενεὰ αὗτη ζητεῖ
σημεῖον; ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτη σημεῖον.
13 καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἐμβὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

The Disciples forget to take bread, viii. 14-21.

14 Καὶ ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἔνα ἄρτον οὐκ εἶχον
15 μεθ' ἔστων ἐν τῷ πλοιώ. καὶ διεστέλλετο αὐτοῖς λέγων, Ὁράτε,

9. The multitude who had been fed being dismissed by Jesus, as at vi. 46, there is a voyage with the disciples which can scarcely be traced on the map. For Dalmanutha the *Codex Bezae* reads Melegada, and early Latin copies with the Sinaitic Syriac Magadan, which is also the name given in Matthew. As to the identifications of these names, see Swete's note. The course of the narrative and the analogy of chap. vi. lead us to suppose that the voyage was from the east to the west side of the lake.

11. The first feeding was followed by an encounter with the Pharisees (vii. 1), and so it is here. It is hard to say where the Pharisees went out from on this occasion. Weiss, who places Dalmanutha on the east side of the lake, will have it that they came from Jewish territory to that place; Holtzmann, that they are dwellers in the country Jesus is now visiting and came out of their houses to interview the Rabbi who had landed. But the phrase "went out" is not to be taken literally; it simply introduces a new action, like the words "he rose up early," and "he began," so common in Oriental narrative. The action of the Pharisees

now to be related was deliberate and arranged.

The sign asked for is to be from heaven; a portent is meant such as those described in Mark xiii. 24, 25, which were to usher in the appearance of the Messiah and the setting up of his rule. The Pharisees hear Jesus preaching that the Kingdom of God is immediately at hand, and they want some outward confirmation of this. Apparently they are not content with the works Jesus has done already, and do not think them important enough to show that any development of the divine policy is taking place. The Pharisees themselves held that the Kingdom would come when the people were prepared for it, and laboured to bring about that preparation. So far Jesus was at one with them. But when he declared that the Kingdom was coming at once or that it had come already, they could not follow him, and asked for different evidence, from any he had already given, for evidence which it should be impossible to mistake, that the consummation was so near. They have no genuine desire to be convinced. They make the request, Mark says, "tempting him." This must mean that their request suggested

¹ Μαγαδάν or Μελεγαδά.

seven baskets. And there were about four thousand people. 9
And he sent them away, and immediately he got into the 10
boat with his disciples, and came to the district of Dal-
manutha.¹

[Matthew xvi. 1-4; cf. xii. 38-42; Luke xii. 54-56; cf. xi.
29-32, xvii. 20, 21.]

And the Pharisees put themselves in motion and entered into 11
a discussion with him, seeking from him a sign from heaven,
tempting him. And he sighed deeply in his spirit and says, 12
Why does this generation seek a sign? Assuredly I tell you,
no sign shall be given² to this generation. And he left them 13
and embarked again and went away to the other side.

[Matthew xvi. 5-12; Luke xi. 53-xii. 1.]

And they forgot to take bread, and had only a single loaf 14
with them in the boat. And he charged them, saying, Look 15

other ways of advancing the Kingdom than those which he thought right to use. Satan tempts him (Matthew iv.) by asking him to do a great work to show his power; and Peter becomes a Satan to him when he suggests cheerful and sensible views of the future rather than those arising out of the divine counsel in the impending death of the Messiah (Mark viii. 33). There are two points settled in Jesus' mind against which the demand for a sign deeply offends. First he has made up his mind not to employ any sensational or presumptuous method in advancing his cause (see "fishers of men," "sowers," "physician," etc.). And secondly, he is convinced that the advent of the Kingdom is not in need of any signs, but carries its own evidence with it to every one whose eyes are open. The Kingdom has announced itself and is a thing of the present; to ask a sign of its coming is to relegate it to the future, and to ask for respite from its claims. (See on this Mackintosh, *Natural History of Christianity*, chap. v.).

Matthew has already had the discus-

sion about a sign (xii. 38-42; Luke xi. 29-32. Cf. also Luke xvii. 20, Matthew v. 25), but he gives it again in the place where Mark here has it (xvi. 1-4). In the fuller reports of these Gospels Jesus does offer a sign, but only that of Jonah, at whose preaching the people of Nineveh repented. What was done by these heathens for Jonah ought, he means, to be done by those who boast themselves God's own people, when he sends them what is greater than Jonah, and makes them hear such unmistakable messages of the great impending change. An editor to whom this sign was not enough, expounded the figure of Jonah differently, making him a type of the resurrection of Christ, so that the "generation" in question did receive an outward sign, in spite of the Master's own refusal.

13. "He left them and went to the other side." According to the ordinary phraseology of the Gospel (iv. 35) this is a crossing from west to east. What follows as to the provisioning of the boat agrees with this, and if Dalmanutha or Magadan is in the neighbourhood of Gennesaret, the geography is in good

¹ Magadan or Melegada.

² *Ei* in solemn negation, after the Hebrew idiom with *אָנֹכִי*; the apodosis, which would be an asseveration, being suppressed.

βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ξύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῆς ξύμης Ἡρώδου.
 16 καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἄλληλους, "Οτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχομεν. καὶ
 17 γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί διαλογίζεσθε διτὶ ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; οὕτω
 18 νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε; πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; ὁφ-
 θαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε, καὶ ὥτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε; καὶ
 19 οὐ μνημονεύετε ὅτε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους ἔκλασα εἰς τοὺς πεντακισ-
 χιλίους,¹ πόσους κοφίνους κλασμάτων πλήρεις ἥρατε; λέγουσιν
 20 αὐτῷ, Δώδεκα. "Οτε καὶ τοὺς ἐπτὰ εἰς τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους,
 πόσων σπυρίδων πληρώματα κλασμάτων ἥρατε; καὶ λέγουσιν
 21 αὐτῷ, Ἐπτά. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Οὕπω συνίετε;

order. As on other occasions, Jesus crosses the lake to escape from embarrassment. But it is possible that one typical crossing is repeated in various pieces of tradition which Mark gives separately.

14. Another story about 'loaves,' but with a different point from those we have had. The scene is in the boat ; the circumstances, that the disciples discover too late that they have not brought provisions ; they will have to go back soon. Jesus witnesses the discovery, sees the blank faces, hears the lamenting. But his speech when it comes seems far away from the present necessity. It is the **Pharisees and Herod** he is thinking about, not the awkward position of the present company. The Pharisees and the Herodians have come to an understanding about him some time ago (iii. 6), a strange alliance of religious strictness with worldly policy. And both have been of late attending to his movements, Herod (vi. 14) reminding him of the fate of his precursor, John the Baptist, the Pharisees hearing from him (vii. 5 *sq.*) an attack on their system which they could scarcely pardon. He is thinking of these two powers which alike threaten him, considering their policy and their spirit, and what has happened in the boat is drawn into the line of thought he is pursuing. The disciples no doubt had their baking done for them in the morning, and no doubt the loaves rose well enough. Will the loaves the Pharisees and the Herodians are baking succeed as well? What a bad batch that is, what a bad leaven!

And so the caution to the disciples to have nothing to do with proceedings of that character. 'Beware of the baking of the Pharisees, of Herod!'

In the parable of the leaven it is suggested how the good principle works though unseen, and in due time accomplishes all that was expected of it, no one knows how. Here we have the idea of an evil principle that makes its way from mind to mind. How if that leaven of the Pharisees, the spirit of formalism that sets ritual before morals and is essentially unfeeling, how if the leaven of Herod, the principle of expediency that cares for no ideal, how if these should have their way! What an evil for an individual, for a nation, to be drawn under such influences! How strongly are they to be deprecated and in every way opposed!

16. Perhaps we cannot wonder very much if the disciples did not pick up at once the Master's train of thought. They think his words must refer to the question of commissariat ; he is blaming them for their want of foresight, he is giving them some directions as to where they should supply themselves. And so they blame themselves still more severely for their mistake, because they think he is grieved at it too.

In Matthew, the disciples do not discover that their supply is short till they have reached the other side. In Luke, the discourse on leaven is not connected with a voyage at all but delivered in the presence of a great crowd, "to the disciples first." Matthew speaks of "the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees," a phrase hard to interpret, as these two parties were very

¹ Add *καὶ*.

to it, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the leaven of Herod. And they talked over the matter with each other ¹⁶ and concluded, It is because we have no bread. And when ¹⁷ he knew that this was their idea he says to them, Why do you talk about your having no loaves? Do you not yet perceive nor understand? Is your heart still hardened? Having eyes ¹⁸ do you not see, and having ears do you not hear? And do you not remember, when I broke the five loaves for the five ¹⁹ thousand, how many baskets full of the broken pieces you took up? They say to him, Twelve. And again the seven to the ²⁰ four thousand, how many baskets of the fragments you took up? And they say, Seven. And he said to them, Do you ²¹ not yet understand?

different; and he afterwards explains that by their leaven Jesus meant their teaching—not as in Mark their spirit and policy. Luke speaks of “the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.”

17. The disciples are here accused of the same want of insight which was charged in former passages against the hearers outside, or against the Jews generally (iii. 5, iv. 12). This is the strongest of a number of passages in which the dulness of the disciples is dwelt on (iv. 13, vi. 52, vii. 18). They show an incapacity to penetrate through the parabolic utterances of Jesus to his real meaning, and they apply his words to material and external things of which he was not thinking at all. It ought to have been impossible for them after what they had seen, to think that Jesus could be anxious about the supply of food for the party, or could have wished to scold them for not provisioning the boat more carefully. Whatever view be taken of the stories of the feeding, the disciples ought to have learned from his dealings in that matter how small a thing bread was to him and how little anxiety it was capable of giving him. The multitudes had been satisfied with very little bread, and so it could prove again where his views on such things prevailed. The point of the rebuke is a good deal obscured by all these baskets of broken pieces which have been put into it, and it reads as if Jesus were telling the disciples that he could make as much bread as they wanted whenever he chose, so that they

were independent of food supplies, and absolved from all such anxieties. Matthew, though in some points his account is less original, preserves the saying which Mark has parted with, ‘How do you not understand that what I said to you was not about loaves?’

22. Bethsaida is to the north of the Sea of Galilee, and Jesus and his disciples might pass it on the way towards Caesarea Philippi, near which we are soon to find them. But verse 27 reports that journey from the start, a fresh narrative beginning there. This arrival at Bethsaida cannot be placed in any known journey, but is a reminiscence by itself. Bethsaida was one of the places in which works of power were wrought (Matth. xi. 21), such as would have brought Tyre and Sidon to repentance, and the cure of the blind man may be one of these. It is told with details illustrating the method of Jesus in such cases, which are not given in the cures of blindness in Matth. ix. 27 sq., or in the cure of Bartimaeus, which is common to the three Synoptists—(Mark x. 46-52=Matthew xx. 29-34=Luke xviii. 35-43). As in the case of the man deaf and speaking with difficulty (vii. 32-37), Jesus at once isolates the patient brought to him, though men on foot are still in sight, and not far off. The means familiar to early therapeutics are then, as in the case just cited, employed. Spittle was used among the Jews in dealing with cases of blindness: it was forbidden among

The blind man of Bethsaida, viii. 22-26.

22 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν.¹ καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλόν, καὶ
 23 παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἀψηται. καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος τῆς
 χειρὸς τοῦ τυφλοῦ ἐξήνεγκεν αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς κώμης, καὶ πτύσας
 εἰς τὰ ὅμματα αὐτοῦ, ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν,
 24 Εἴ τι βλέπεις;² καὶ ἀναβλέψας ἔλεγεν, Βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους,
 25 ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὄρῳ περιπατοῦντας. εἴτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς
 χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὄφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ,³ καὶ διέβλεψεν καὶ ἀπεκατέστη
 26 καὶ ἐνέβλεπεν τηλαυγῶς ἄπαντα. καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκον
 αὐτοῦ λέγων, Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς.⁴

The Journey to Caesarea Philippi: the disciples recognize Jesus as Messiah, viii. 27-33.

27 Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς κώμας
 Καισαρίας τῆς Φιλίππου καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς
 αὐτοῦ λέγων αὐτοῖς, Τίνα με λέγοντιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι; οἱ δὲ

the Rabbis (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, on John ix. 1) to apply this cure on the Sabbath. Here the restoration of sight is gradual. Encouraged to open his eyes and to try to see, the patient succeeds but partially. He has had the gift of sight before, for he knows how men look, and he is aware that he sees them far too large, and with no clear outline. The clearing and softening operation has therefore to be repeated, and this time the cure is complete. Objects have a clear outline now, distant as well as near (*τηλαυγῶς*).

Like the demoniac of chap. v. the cured man is told to go home, and not talk of what has been done to him. He lives apparently outside the village which is close at hand; and he is able to find his way home; he had not always been blind. He is not even to enter the village, so determined is Jesus, as in the early chapters of the Gospel, not to have his good deeds of this kind talked of. Whichever of the many variants we adopt, whether the man is forbidden to go into the village, or to tell any one in the village, or was allowed to go to the village, but forbidden to tell any one there about

his cure, the effect is that Jesus shrinks from acquiring the reputation which would come to him by such talk.

viii. 27—x. 45. SHADOW OF THE PASSION. JOURNEYS. LESSONS.

27. The passage at which we have now arrived forms a turning point, both in the narrative and in the teaching. What goes before points to this crisis, and the declarations here made form the basis for all that comes after. Up to this point the history has been that of a growing movement: there were shadows and opposition in it, but its course was upwards, on the whole, to the great scenes of the sixth and seventh chapters. Now it becomes tragical: a catastrophe is announced, the thought of which at once becomes dominant, and determines the colour of the discourses; these, from this point forward, are mainly eschatological.

Here, for the first time in Mark, Jesus is occupied with the question of his own person and position; and when he begins to speak of it we find that he has already made up his mind and is

¹ Βηθανίαν.

² βλέπει.

³ Add ὥστε ἀναβλέψαι.

⁴ μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ οὐ παγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου καὶ μηδενὶ εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην. On these variants see WH, N.T., vol. ii., p. 99 *sqq.*

[Mark only.]

And they come to Bethsaida.¹ And people bring to him a ²² blind man, and ask him to touch him. And he took the blind ²³ man by the hand, and took him out of the village, and spat in his eyes and laid his hands on him and asked him, Do you see anything?² And he looked up and said, I make out the men, for ²⁴ I see them like trees, walking. And again he put his hands ²⁵ on his eyes,³ and he took a steady look and was restored, and saw everything clearly. And he sent him home and told him, ²⁶ You are not even to enter the village.⁴

[Matthew xvi. 13-23; Luke ix. 18-22.]

And Jesus set out, he and his disciples, to the villages of ²⁷ Caesarea Philippi; and on the way he questioned his disciples, Who do people say that I am? And they told him, They say ²⁸

addressing himself to a course of action of which we had not heard before. We have another journey to a district at some distance from Capernaum. He set out, we are told, to the villages of Caesarea Philippi, and the following scene took place on the road. This is not a continuation of the journey from Bethsaida (ver. 22), but a fresh start; otherwise it would not have been necessary to say that his disciples went with him. In the source this was not continuous with what goes before. On this journey, then, the Master is alone with his disciples at a distance from their usual ground, so that a freer view may be taken of their position. Matthew says (xvi. 13) it was in the parts of Caesarea Philippi; Mark only on the road; while Luke does not specify the place at all, but indicates the situation by saying that Jesus was praying. On the presence of a crowd of interested hearers (ver. 34), which is a slip on our writer's part, see notes on that verse. The town built by Philip on the fair slopes of Antilibanus, and named, after the Emperor Augustus, Philip's Caesarea to distinguish it from Caesarea on the Mediterranean, was

chiefly Gentile; but Jesus and the disciples do not go to the town.

On the way, then, Jesus asks his disciples what people are saying about him, what account they give of him. A view has been ripening in his own mind; but is it a view which others will take, which they will act on? This is what he wants to know. He is acquainted of course with the theories formed about him in various quarters (see on vi. 14-16); but these views are the suggestions of superstition or of idle speculation; he has rejected them and has formed a view of the part he has to play which has found no expression as yet (in this Gospel at least; in Matthew it is different) either from the lips of others or his own. On their repeating to him therefore the theories formed about him in this quarter or in that, which, various as they were, agreed in making Jesus not the actual bringer of the new day but its herald, and therefore in postponing it and shutting out the light which had actually dawned, on their repeating this to him, he puts the further question, You, who know me best, who are nearest to me, is that your account of me also? And it is

¹ Bethany.

² if he sees anything.

³ so that he saw.

⁴ Neither go into the village nor tell any one in the village; or, Go home and tell no one in the village.

εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὅτι Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστήν, καὶ ἄλλοι
 29 Ἡλείαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι εἰς τῶν προφητῶν. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα
 αὐτούς, Ὅμεις δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος
 30 λέγει αὐτῷ, Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός. καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν
 31 λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι Δεῖ τὸν
 νιὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν

Peter, one of the three who had been with him most, and whom domestic circumstances had brought specially in contact with him, who now voices the belief at which the disciples had arrived; a belief which none of them thinks of altering afterwards (but see Luke xxiv. 21), and on which the Church was built, that Jesus is himself the Messiah through whom, if at all, God's promises to Israel are fulfilled, and the new Age brought in.

We are obliged to consider at this point by what process of thinking Jesus himself must be considered, on the evidence of this Gospel, to have arrived at the belief in his own *Messiahship*; and further how the disciples were led to that belief. In Mark, Jesus does not become the Messiah before the point we have now arrived at. The passages in chap. ii. where he appears to call himself the "Son of Man" are too doubtful to stand against the rest of the evidence of the Gospel. At the baptism he hears himself greeted from above as God's Son in whom He is well pleased, and he never afterwards loses the intimate communion with God and the firm assurance that he has God's work to do, which that address implies. But his being God's Son and having a divine purpose to effect does not imply that he must take up the political rôle of the Messiah. There are other ways of carrying out that trust; as a fisher of men, as a sower, as a physician, as a teacher of a people who have no guides, he can prepare Israel for the great day when God will come to reign. And accordingly the early ministry is very far from self-asserting; the early preaching is impersonal. Jesus is conscious of a mission to the nation, and does his best to make the whole people hear him, but he preaches the Kingdom, not himself. Of the Messiah he says nothing. When the demoniacs hail him as Son of God, as a messenger God has sent to put an end to their procedure, he sternly rebukes

them, as if he would not have anything of that sort said about himself.

The Gospel of Luke (ix. 18) connects the episode of the Messianic confession with that of the feeding of the multitudes. Mark, followed by Matthew, places between these two the collision with the Scribes on the system of tradition, and the northern journey. From Luke we should gather that it was when he reached the summit of his influence in Galilee that he conceived it his duty to take his place as Messiah at the head of the nation; from Mark we should rather suppose that the opposition he encountered at the hands of the Scribes brought his work in Galilee almost to a standstill, caused him to leave the scene of his labours and to take to flights and wanderings, and then led him to think of assuming the Messianic rôle as a means of carrying forward in another way and on another scene the work for which the old methods had done all they could. In each of these views there must be some truth. In the first place Jesus must have come to see that he himself was able to save his people, and that if he did not save them it was vain to think that some one would come after him to do for them what he had not done. What he had to give them, that was what they needed, not what some later one might bring.¹ And it was a duty to assert this, and to substitute the attitude of immediate certainty and action for that of looking out for signs and waiting for the future. In the second place, Jesus' encounter with the Scribes must have convinced him that the reform of religion, so urgently required if the bulk of the nation were to have any religion at all, would never come about if a bold stroke were not struck for it. If his work in Galilee was at a standstill, he could yet do something for his nation, in a new place, by other means than he had used till now. And so everything pointed to the conclusion that he must be God's

¹ See Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, vol. iv. p. 256 sqq.

that you are John the Baptist, and others say you are Elijah, and others that you are one of the prophets. And he put the 29 question to them, And you, who do you say that I am ? At that Peter says to him, You are the Christ. And he strictly forbade 30 them to say so about him to any one. And he began to 31 teach them that the Son of Man must go through great sufferings

well beloved Son in a new way, and that even if death lay in the path along which duty now began to call him, he must not shrink from it. But God, who had always helped him till now, would help him still in this supreme effort which he nervously himself to make.

How the disciples came to think their Master was the Messiah is a slightly different question ; but they must, no doubt, have followed, though at some distance, his processes of thought. There is no more signal proof of his greatness than that these men, who had made sacrifices for him, and whose life in his service was not one of ease, felt that no title could be too great for him, and that he was capable of bringing to their nation all they expected the Messiah to bring. Though he often reproached them for their incapacity to appreciate his ideas, they understood him sufficiently to see that there could be nothing better for Israel than that his ideas should prevail, and that his elevation to the seat of all authority and rule would be the happiest conceivable event. They are not content, therefore, to regard him as a forerunner ; they no longer regard the great event as future, but are conscious that they are already in the Kingdom. He who has brought them into it can be no other than the Messiah. Peter says this, and the other disciples agree with him.

It is also to be observed that the passage about Peter as the rock on which the Church is founded does not belong to the Gospel in which the Peter tradition is most directly present, but to Matthew. In the first Gospel the name Peter appears to be bestowed in consequence of the confession, but the earlier tradition knows nothing of this ; Mark iii. 16 and Luke vi. 14 do not state the occasion of the name, but merely tell us in connection with the catalogue of the Twelve that Jesus gave Simon the name of Peter (and Matth. x. 2 also puts it in this way, "Simon, who is called Peter").

In Matthew Jesus suggests to his

disciples the answer to his own enquiry, by using, instead of the pronoun "I" of Mark and Luke, the title "The Son of Man." "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?" The answers are the same to the question thus framed as to the simpler question of Mark. The title Son of Man is evidently imported by Matthew into this connection, where it did not originally stand, as the title contains the answer to the question. (See p. 82 sq.). Peter's reply to the second question is also amplified by Matthew, who makes it run, "You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God." In Luke we have, "The Christ of God." "Messiah" was the title which would naturally be used. 'Of God' and 'Son of the living God' are amplifications, easily added from Jewish Christology. Cf. Dalman, *W. J.*, p. 224 sq.

30. While Jesus has reached the conviction that he is destined to be the Messiah of his people, he does not wish to appear before the public as a claimant of that dignity. Messiahs were short-lived among the Jews ; nor could Jesus play the part of the Messiah of popular expectation ; it was better not to awaken hopes he had as yet no resources to fulfil. Hence the disciples, full as they are of their newly-acquired views of their Master's importance, are forbidden to tell the public what they know about him.

31. A new course of instruction is here entered on ; not perhaps that the Gospel of the Kingdom is superseded, but for the disciples at least new emergencies call for new teaching. Here, and at ix. 30 and x. 32, always in retired situations where the disciples alone are present, the Master communicates this new mystery. What afterwards appears as the burden of the apostolic teaching (Acts ii. 22 sq., xiii. 27 sq. and *passim*) is here heard from the mouth of the Lord himself. The old view of the Messiah as one who should have the divine power at his disposal and enter on his position with great triumph and splendour, is to yield to a new view.

πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκ-
 32 ταυθῆναι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ὥμέρας ἀναστῆναι. καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν
 λόγον ἐλάλει. καὶ προσλαβόμενος ὁ Πέτρος αὐτὸν ἤρξατο
 33 ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ. ὃ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ ἵδων τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ
 ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει, "Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ, ὅτι οὐ
 φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Jesus' followers also are to bear their cross: the reward will follow soon, viii. 34-ix. 1.

34 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ
 εἰπεν αὐτοῖς, Εἴ τις¹ θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν,² ἀπαρνησάσθω
 35 ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι. ὅς
 γὰρ ἔαν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ'

That view is summed up in the title which Jesus here gives himself. Speaking of himself now as the Messiah, since his disciples have hailed him in that character and he has not disowned it, he does not call himself Son of David, as his countrymen called the Messiah; that was not the character he was to wear. He calls himself the *Son of Man*; and the title, as we gather from *Daniel* and *Enoch*, indicated the human Judge and Ruler who was to represent God at the last judgment and to preside over the purified theocracy of the future. In this sense Jesus does use the term before the High Priest and in some other passages. But it has also in his mouth another meaning, suggested by his own reflections on the fortunes of Messiah as he sees himself about to experience them. The Messiah, he sees, is to suffer and be set at naught before he comes to his Kingdom. In this stage of his career none of the current Messianic titles could be at all appropriate to him. But the title Son of Man is fitted to express the paradox of Messiah's career; and so the Son of Man is in the mouth of Jesus the Messiah experiencing the dark and sorrowful side of the human lot, suffering, waiting, persecuted, dying. See notes on ii. 10.

The Son of Man then, Jesus here teaches, is to be in the first place a sufferer; this is the divine plan for him; such is the divine necessity. And this view is not only stated in ("must") which his career must follow.

general; the precise manner is set forth in which the sufferings of the Messiah are to come upon him. He is to be rejected by the High Court at Jerusalem, the Sanhedrin being named as it usually is in the New Testament by enumerating the elements of which it was composed; there is to be a trial before that Court, and Jesus' claim to be Messiah is to be repudiated in a sentence pronounced by it. By whom he is to be killed is not yet stated (see x. 33, Acts ii. 23), but apparently not directly by the Sanhedrin. Only after this is he to enter on the triumphant career which popular belief marked out for him. His death would not be the end. He would rise again, not at the general resurrection (xii. 26) but at once, after the very briefest interval. "After three days," it is said; a phrase generally taken to be based on Hosea vi. 2: "after two days he will make us whole; on the third day we shall even rise"—where there is no exact measurement of time, but only the indication of a brief interval, as when we say, "In two or three days." It early became the belief of the Church that the Lord had risen on the third day from the Crucifixion (1 Cor. xv. 4), and that this was foretold in Scripture. In accordance with this more precise view Matthew and Luke have here, not like Mark, "after three days," but "on the third day."

To judge from the Book of Acts we should believe that the arguments by which the apostles explained the strange

¹ δοτις.

² ἀκολουθεῖν (Math. x. 38).

and be rejected by the Elders and high priests and Scribes and be killed and rise again after three days. And he spoke ³² quite freely to this effect. And Peter took him and began to rebuke him for it. But he turned round and confronting his ³³ disciples rebuked Peter, saying, Away behind me, you Satan, for you do not take God's view of things but man's view.

[Matthew xvi. 24-28; Luke ix. 23-27.]

And he called to him the multitude with his disciples, and ³⁴ said to them, If any one will come¹ after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whoever ³⁵ will save his life shall lose it, but whoever shall lose his life

facts of the sufferings and death of the Messiah were arrived at by themselves through their own efforts of thought and study of Scripture. Luke xxiv. 25 *sqq.* shows them still needing to be taught this doctrine after the Crucifixion. If therefore Jesus taught his disciples, as he is here said to have done, during his own lifetime, they must have forgotten what he told them, so that they had to learn it all over again. The only other alternative is to suppose that Jesus' intimations to his disciples on these subjects were not so clear and precise as they are made to appear in this and in later passages. While he could not fail to see, when he formed his resolution to go to Jerusalem and seek to bring about the needed reform there, that danger and death lay in his path, and while his faith in God and in the Kingdom might enable him to believe that even death would not prevent him from accomplishing his destined work, but that God would bring him up from the grave to fill the place prepared for him, his predictions on these subjects cannot have been so detailed as the Gospels give them, but must have been filled up from the interpretation the early Church learned to place on the Master's sufferings and death. Had he used all the words placed in his mouth, his followers could not have forgotten them, nor have failed, as Acts shows they did, to appeal to them. We have to recognize the fact that the tradition as to the suffer-

ings and death changed more than that of the works of power and the sayings, because it entered, as these did not, into Church doctrine.

What is here taught is the divine ordinance, the higher necessity, of the sufferings, not yet the purpose they are to serve.

The tragic contrast opens at once, of which the whole remaining history is full, between the view Jesus takes and that taken by the disciples, of his journey to Jerusalem and of his Messiahship.

34. The following discourse, down to ix. 1, while adopted here by Matthew (xvi. 24-28), and Luke (ix. 23-27), is composed of pieces which occur in these Gospels in other connections. Ver. 34, 35, describing the resolute attitude necessary for disciples, are found in the charge Matth. x., ver. 38, 39. Ver. 35 also occurs in an eschatological discourse in Luke xvii. 33. The same verses stand, somewhat differently framed, in Luke xiv. 25-27 in a discourse addressed to the public. The presence of the multitude, which in Mark appears somewhat unexpectedly, is there explained. Luke xiv. 25-27 is the original tradition; Mark draws from it here and accepts the multitude with it, though it suits his narrative but ill; the parallels, following Mark, give again here what they already have in other contexts.

In their earlier position in Luke (xiv.

¹ follow.

ἄν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔνεκεν ἑμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,
 36 σώσει αὐτήν. τί γὰρ ὡφελεῖ ἄνθρωπον κερδῆσαι τὸν κόσμον
 37 ὅλον καὶ ζημιωθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ; τί γὰρ δοῖ ἄνθρωπος
 38 ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ; ὃς γάρ ἐὰν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ
 τοὺς ἑμοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῷ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἀμαρτωλῷ,
 καὶ ὁ νιὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται αὐτὸν ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν
 1 τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἀγίων. καὶ
 ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐάμην λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰσίν τινες ὥδε τῶν ἐστηκότων
 οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν
 τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυθοῦνταν ἐν δυνάμει.

25 sq.) the opening words are simply an appeal to the public for devoted disciples, and point to a time in the ministry when men were offering themselves without counting the cost (the parable of the unfinished tower there follows). In Mark, placed between the announcement of the death and the following verses which speak of the judgment, a new light falls on them. Jesus asks from his followers here just what he has made up his mind to offer himself in God's cause; and he promises to them the reward which his own brave heart assures him cannot but follow on entire devotion. Jesus knows that his plan of going to Jerusalem to appeal to the nation and to bring about reforms, is full of danger and will probably lead to his death. But he has put away from himself such personal considerations, and has resolved that the only thing to be thought of is how to get God's will carried out and the people made ready for the divine action. He is going on this journey with his life in his hands, carrying his cross as one who is done with all human gains and pleasures (the figure does not involve a knowledge of the mode of Jesus' own death; every one in Palestine was familiar with the incidents of crucifixion), and is prepared to serve God by dying if he can no longer do so by living. And now he says that his followers must arm themselves with the same mind. They also must become strangers to themselves, and be intimate with the thought of sacrifice and death. Only in that way can they really be his followers.

Ver. 35, found in the discourse to the disciples Matth. x. 39 and in Luke xvii. 33, contains the rationale of this course of action. Some disciples may

prefer their own safety and advantage to the duty of carrying out the divine plan, and may seek to conserve their own personal existence (the word *ψυχή*, rendered "life," stands here not for one of several elements of the human person, as with Paul, but for the whole sentient life of the individual). But such self-seeking is doomed to fail of its end. He who lives thus unworthily cannot assure himself that that future existence will be his in which men are as the angels. He, on the contrary, who gives up, as Jesus himself did, the effort to keep himself alive, and devotes himself to God's will whatever comes of it, he will save his life; God will raise him up. This appears to be the right interpretation of this difficult saying. What it teaches is not the self-rewarding character of faithfulness to duty, that he who does right, regardless of consequences, has what is worth most in life, although he die, but the conditions of obtaining the better life beyond. The word *ψυχή*, life or soul, is here the living principle (it is nourished by food, Matth. vi. 25), without which a man cannot remain in this world or in the future, and which when a man gives up (Luke xii. 20), he exists no longer. The passage throws light on the growth of Jesus' own belief in his return to life. His *ψυχή* is to be absent for some days, he conceives, but is then to return, so that his life will be continued. (See the paper by Fries, cited p. 131, note). The disciples also are to take no thought for their life, and are to be sure that if they die God will make them live again. The duty for which they are to forget themselves is described in words belonging to a later day. For "me and for the Gospel," could scarcely be said till it was

for my sake and the sake of the Gospel shall save it. For of what advantage is it to a man to gain the whole world and to forfeit his soul. For what could a man give in exchange for his soul? For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man shall also be ashamed of him when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. And he said to them, Assuredly I tell you that there are some of those standing here who will not die till they see the Kingdom of God come with power.

known what the Gospel was, and till the preachers of it had made some acquaintance with persecution and danger.

36. The picture here called up to us is, as ver. 38 shows, that of the final judgment of one who, by some unfaithfulness to his true self, has come to be possessed of boundless wealth, and to be in fact master of the world. We are reminded of the act in the Temptation (Matth. iv. 8-11) where the tempter offers Jesus all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them; and we cannot but suppose that Jesus is speaking here from his own experience of such speculations and suggestions. At the final judgment when the good and evil attaching to each man are weighed, how will such an one appear? He has gained the whole world, but he cannot enjoy what he has gained. He has forfeited the soul which alone can give him a footing in the Kingdom and enable him to enjoy anything. And if he proposes to use his money in order to buy back what is lacking to him, that also is beyond his power, since nothing he could ever give is enough to serve as the equivalent of a soul (Psalm xl ix. 6-9).

38. In this verse (Matth. x. 33) the situation is quite clear. Here we are placed in the position of the first Christians, attested by the greater part of the New Testament; they live in a world from which they are inwardly estranged and which, they think, has no legitimate claim on them. It is an adulterous and sinful generation rejecting the Christ, therefore rejecting God, therefore liable to the judgments uttered by the prophets on unfaithful Israel (see Swete's note). Towards it

they must be quite indifferent. They must uphold their testimony undeterred by its threats and deaf to its promises. And it should be easy for them to do this, because the world for all its apparent wealth and power is in reality a world of naught. Christ is coming to change everything, and they may well hold out till he comes, and confess him and preach his words. (This statement of the subject of the apostolic preaching is not primitive; it does not apply e.g. to the discourses in the early chapters of Acts). If they should be ashamed of him and his words, and seek to enter into compromise with the world (setting such a generation before Christ and his Gospel!), it may serve their ends for a time, but when the Messiah comes to judgment they will find what a terrible mistake they have made (cf. 2 Tim. ii. 12). The Messiah has to say when he enters his Kingdom, who are to go in with him and who are to stay outside in the dark; it will go hard with them then!

ix. 1. This also is a saying of the Master on the subject of his Coming; the connection is not to be pressed. The belief in the Coming of Christ could only operate powerfully when the event was thought to be at hand. At the end of the fourth Gospel we find the belief that the beloved disciple was to survive to see it. Here the belief is that several of the disciples are to see it. Jesus, who expected it to come if not before his death at least very shortly after, could scarcely have deferred the Coming, as he does here, to a time when most of his disciples should have died, as was evidently the case when this was written.

The Transfiguration, ix. 2-8.

2 Καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας ἔξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὅρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἴδιαν μόνους. καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν,
 3 καὶ τὰ ὡμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στίλβοντα λευκὰ λίαν, οἷα γναφεὺς
 4 ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκάναι. καὶ ὥφθη αὐτοῖς Ἡλείας
 5 σὺν Μωϋσεῖ, καὶ ἦσαν συνλαλοῦντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ
 Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ, 'Ραββεί, καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι,
 καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μίαν καὶ Ἡλείᾳ
 6 μίαν. οὐ γὰρ ἔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο. καὶ
 7 ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζοντα αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς
 8 νεφέλης, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός:¹ ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. καὶ
 ἐξάπινα περιβλεψάμενοι οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν
 μόνον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν.

Discussion of Messianic doctrine, ix. 9-13.

9 Καὶ καταβανόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ² τοῦ ὄρους διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς
 ἵνα μηδὲν ἀ εἶδον διηγήσωται, εἰ μὴ ὅταν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

2-8. The following scene is reported by men who were confessedly in great agitation when they witnessed it, and who yet were well aware that what they saw was not reality but vision. It is to be regarded as symbolic, and the symbolism is to be recognized first of all in the position this narrative occupies in the context of all the three synoptists alike. It is after Jesus has made up his mind to go to Jerusalem and possibly to encounter a fate which to the ordinary Jewish mind would entirely destroy his claim to be the Messiah or in any way a chosen instrument of deity, it is at this moment that he puts on to the eyes of his most intimate friends heavenly radiance, and appears as one whose true nature is not to be judged by his human mien or his outward fortunes. It is then that his figure becomes framed to his friends' eyes in the same picture with the principal figures of the sacred history of Israel; that of the great Lawgiver and that of the great Prophet.

The change which takes place in Jesus is that a brightness like that of a heavenly Being issues from him. Mark

does not mention, as the other synoptists do, that his face shone. The garments only are mentioned, but the transfiguration extended of course to his whole person. From the description of the risen Christ (1 Cor. xv. 5-8; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 6), it appears that the Christians thought of him as a figure of inherent radiance, hovering above the earth, and exercising the human powers of sight, etc. (Compare also the descriptions of the angels at the tomb). Along with Jesus appeared in vision (ὥφθη is used of the Christophanies, 1 Cor. xv. 5-8, Luke xxiv. 34, Acts xiii. 31, etc.) Elijah, who is mentioned first, probably because of his prominence in Messianic thought, then Moses, the founder of the Old Covenant. Both had been removed from the world in a different way from other men; but this perhaps is not thought of. The great Lawgiver and the great Prophet are interested in the position and work of Jesus, and are seen to be talking with him, a visible indication that he is not come to destroy the law or the prophets, but to carry further what they began. In spite of the word of the

¹ Or ὁ υἱός μου, ὁ ἀγαπητός.

² ἐκ.

[Matthew xvii. 1-8; Luke ix. 28-36.]

And six days after Jesus takes Peter and James and John, ² and carries them up to a high mountain apart by themselves; and he was transfigured before them, and his garments became ³ luminous, very white, whiter than any fuller on the earth could bleach them. And there appeared to them Elijah with ⁴ Moses, and they were talking with Jesus. And at this Peter ⁵ says to Jesus, Master, it is a good thing that we are here; let us make three tents, one for you and one for Moses and one for Elijah. For he did not know what to say about it, ⁶ for they were terrified. And there came a cloud overshadowing ⁷ them, and there was a voice out of the cloud, This is my beloved Son,¹ hear him. And all at once on looking round ⁸ they saw no one there but Jesus alone with themselves.

[Matthew xvii. 9-13.]

And as they were coming down from the mountain he enjoined ⁹ them not to tell any one what they had seen, except when

cross which he has spoken, they appear beside him and confer with him (cf. Rom. iii. 21).

5. Peter's idea is that it is fortunate the great meeting has taken place when some of the disciples are there and can do something to show their veneration for the august visitants, and something to prolong so sweet an hour. Three tabernacles are to be set up, of green branches, as at the feast of booths; the great men will accept this service from their humble friends, and will be induced to linger. The idea shows that the three figures are thought of as standing on the ground, not hovering above it. But the suggestion is at once put aside as a foolish one and as due to the bewilderment and fright which had seized on the disciples at this near approach to superhuman beings.

7. To this scene a still greater Presence draws near; for the cloud which now casts its shadow on the figures, human and more than human, is the cloud which invests Jehovah himself when visiting the earth (Ps. civ. 3, 1 Kings

viii. 10, Isa. vi. 4). He is not to be named, only the cloud and the voice declare Him; from the cloud the voice is heard, declaring that it is in Jesus rather than in Moses or Elijah that the Most High is henceforth to be known. Law and prophets are superseded, themselves agreeing thereto, and it is in His Son, His chosen representative, that the people of God are now to see and hear His chief revelation (cf. John i. 17, Heb. i. 1, 2). Thus the disciples learn about Jesus what he himself learned at his baptism,¹ and the other disciples learn what Peter had been told to declare (viii. 29), as no human invention, but a divine truth dressed in radiant symbol and confirmed by the heavenly voice. Compare 2 Peter i. 16-18.

The Transfiguration has a number of traits similar to those of the Christophanies after the Resurrection. 1. It takes place on a mountain; cf. Matth. xxviii. 16, where the Eleven meet with Jesus at a mountain where he had appointed them. 2. Jesus changes his

¹ See notes on i. 11; "Beloved" may here also be a Messianic title current when Mark

wrote; but in xii. 6 the word is not a title but a descriptive attribute.

10 ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆ. καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συν-
 11 ζητοῦντες τί ἔστιν τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι. καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν
 λέγοντες, "Οτι λέγουσιν οἱ¹ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἡλείαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν
 πρῶτον; ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς, Ἡλείας μὲν ἐλθῶν πρῶτον ἀποκα-
 12 θιστάνει πάντα· καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν νιὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
 ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἔξουδενηθῇ; ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι καὶ
 13 Ἡλείας ἐλήλυθεν καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἥθελον, καθὼς γέ-
 γραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν.

The Demoniac boy, ix. 14-29.

14 Καὶ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδον ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ
 15 αὐτοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς συνζητοῦντας πρὸς αὐτούς. καὶ εὐθὺς πᾶς
 ὁ ὄχλος ἴδοντες αὐτὸν ἐξεθαμβήθησαν καὶ προστρέχοντες ἡσπα-

form ; cf. Mark xvi. 12, where Jesus is said to have been manifested “in another form” to two of the disciples going to the country. 3. There is a meeting with Moses and Elijah ; cf. Luke xxiv. 44, where Jesus appeals to the testimony concerning him of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms. 4. The scene ends suddenly ; cf. Luke xxiv. 31, where Jesus at Emmaus vanishes out of the sight of the two disciples.

9, 10. In these verses we have it explained, why, if the disciples knew their Master to be the Messiah of whom the Law and the Prophets spoke, they did not declare their belief till after his death. As a matter of fact, they did not attain to this knowledge till they took to preaching and study afterwards, but the Transfiguration being the enthronement of the apostolic Christology in a scene of Jesus’ own life, it naturally calls for explanation that that Christology was not preached at once when the apostles thus came to know it. Jesus, who often forbade his patients to advertise him, is said to have forbidden this also, but is said to have told the disciples when once the Resurrection took place, and they knew Jesus to have risen as the Messiah, to preach as the Acts shows them to have done. In Matthew such open declaration of him as Son of God takes place in his lifetime (xiv. 33). To this Mark adds a

verse of his own, to the effect that the disciples carried on discussion among themselves as to the meaning of the Resurrection the Master spoke of. If he announced the fact to them so plainly as he is reported to have done, why these discussions ? They were not like the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv. 12) disinclined to believe in resurrection at all ; nor could the idea present any difficulty to them that God should call back the Messiah from the grave to rule over His Kingdom. The verse is to account for the notorious fact that the disciples did not expect the Resurrection when their Master died, and that their belief in it rose up gradually. Such discussions as to the fact and the meaning of the Resurrection of Jesus did take place, though not so early. Cf. Mark xvi. 11, 13 ; Luke xxiv. 11, 37-43 ; John xx. 24-29. The ultimate belief is here traced to a word of the Lord, Luke going beyond Mark and Matthew in describing the jealous secrecy with which the disciples kept to themselves that doctrine and the whole episode of the Transfiguration.

11. The question of the disciples is not fully stated. The point of the doctrine of the forerunner as expounded by the Scribes, and vouched for in the N.T., was that when the Messiah at length came, he was to find everything ready for him, and his way fully prepared (Mark i. 2, 3) so that he would be able to enter on his reign at once. But if

¹ Add Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ.

the Son of Man rose from the dead. And they held fast this ¹⁰ saying, discussing with one another what was meant by this 'rising from the dead.' And they questioned him saying, How ¹¹ is it that the Scribes¹ say that Elijah must come first? And he said to them, Elijah does come first to restore everything; ¹² and how is it written of the Son of Man that he should suffer much and be set at naught? But I tell you that Elijah is ¹³ come, and more, that they did to him whatever they liked, as it is written of him.

[Matthew xvii. 14-20; Luke ix. 37-43a.]

And when they came to the disciples they saw a great ¹⁴ multitude about them, and Scribes disputing with them. And ¹⁵ immediately all the multitude when they saw him were

Jesus is the Messiah, then what of Elijah? Why has he not come first, and why has he not done what was expected of him?²

Jesus' reply is a demonstration that the facts as they stand do answer to Scripture. The Scribes are right in saying that Elijah is to come first; and he is right too in maintaining that the Messiah is destined by the divine ordinance to be a great sufferer. As for the first point, the disciples are wrong in thinking that Elijah has not come yet, and is to be looked for still. He has come; he is to be recognized in John the Baptist. Mark does not name the Baptist as Matthew does; but it is evident that he is the person meant; and Jesus is himself the originator of the view, afterwards taken up by the Church, that John was his forerunner, sent before him to prepare his way. As for the second point, that the Messiah is to be a sufferer, that is plainly set down in Scripture. Thus the prophecies about Elijah have been fulfilled—even prophecies little noticed before, in

which Elijah complains of bitter persecution (1 Kings xix. 2, 10). Here Jesus appears to lay the fate of John to the charge of the Jewish authorities, and not only of Herod. The other Scriptures in which the fate of the Messiah is set forth, not a very different fate from that which has already overtaken his forerunner, must soon be accomplished also.

14-29. The last work of power done in Galilee, like the first (i. 23 sq.) is an expulsion of a demon. The case is brought before us with great detail, Mark's narrative being very much the longest, and adding a number of very life-like particulars, which throw light both on Jesus' method of treatment and on his views as to the acquirement by others of the gift of exorcism.

Rafael's great picture of the Transfiguration translates into form and colour the art which is already present in this narrative. The evangelist himself presents us with the contrast between the light and glory which

with him, in the scene of the Transfiguration? But the natural meaning of the question is that stated above. The coming of Elijah in the Transfiguration was not effective for the purpose spoken of in Scripture, which implied a public ministry of the prophet; and that is what the disciples are thinking of. Mark gives the question in connection with the Transfiguration, but not to suggest that this was Elijah's coming. Was it John who appeared at the Transfiguration?

¹ We notice that the appearance of Elijah at the Transfiguration appears to count for nothing, both in the question of the disciples and in the answer of Jesus. They imply that Elijah has not come before the Messiah, and while he maintains that Elijah has come he does not refer to the prophetic figure on the mountain. Origen (*Com. on Matth.* Book xiii. 1, 2), indeed, whom Dr. Swete follows, maintains the contrary, viz. that the disciples ask here why Elijah, instead of coming before the Messiah, according to Scripture, has come along

² The Pharisees and the Scribes.

16 ζόντο αὐτὸν. καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτούς, Τί συνῆτε πρὸς αὐτούς;
 17 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου, Διδάσκαλε, ἥνεγκα τὸν νιόν
 18 μου πρὸς σε, ἔχοντα πνεῦμα ἄλαλον· καὶ ὅπου ἐὰν αὐτὸν
 καταλάβῃ, ῥήσσει αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀφρίζει καὶ τρίξει τὸν ὄδόντας καὶ
 19 ἔηραίνεται· καὶ εἶπα τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου ὡντὸν ἐκβάλωσιν καὶ
 ἔως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι; ἔως πότε ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; φέρετε
 20 αὐτὸν πρὸς με. καὶ ἥνεγκαν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτόν. καὶ ἴδων αὐτὸν
 τὸ πνεῦμα εὐθὺς συνεσπάραξεν αὐτὸν καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
 21 ἐκυλίετο ἀφρίζων. καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, Πόσος
 χρόνος ἔστιν ὡς τοῦτο γέγονεν αὐτῷ; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ἐκ παιδιόθεν·
 22 καὶ πολλάκις καὶ εἰς πῦρ αὐτὸν ἔβαλεν καὶ εἰς ὕδατα ὡντὸν ἀπολέση
 αὐτὸν ἀλλ' εἴ τι δύνῃ, βοήθησον ἡμῖν σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐφ' ἡμᾶς.
 23 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Τὸ εἰ δύνῃ; πάντα δυνατὰ τῷ
 24 πιστεύοντι. εὐθὺς κράξας ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδίου ἐλεγεν, Πιστεύω·

prevail where the ideal world is thought of and lived in, and the confusion, helplessness, and sorrow of the lower realm of material considerations and restricted vision. While Jesus and his three intimates have been upon the mountain top, a different scene has been taking place below. As Moses (*Exodus xxxii.*) on coming down from Sinai found the people escaped from Aaron's control and practising idolatry, so Jesus, on descending from the Mount of Transfiguration, finds his representatives making an exhibition of impotence to friends and enemies. Their discomfiture is no doubt being turned to their Master's prejudice, and the Scribes are busily pressing their advantage, when Jesus makes his appearance. The people, however, are not estranged from Jesus by the dispute; on his appearance they recognize that now the matter has taken another turn; the lesser help has failed, but the greater has come at the right moment; and so, in their joyful surprise, they run to meet him and express their delight that he has come. Here is the person himself, they see, about whom the dispute is being carried on; this, no doubt, is what is conveyed in the word 'astonished.'

16. The question of Jesus is addressed probably to the disciples though the grammar is not clear. The disciples however cannot or do not reply; the answer comes to him out of the crowd.

Yet it is not quite an answer to his question; he is not told what is the subject now under discussion, but how the discussion began. It began with an application to the disciples to cure a case of epilepsy believed to be due to demoniac possession, and the father who had brought them his child seizes the opportunity to bring forward the case and state the symptoms again. It was to Jesus he wished to bring his child, and now, by dint of some energy, he gets Jesus to attend to him.

The symptoms are those of epilepsy combined with defective speech, and, we afterwards learn (ver. 25), defective hearing. The child, shut off by these infirmities from the life of the family and liable to seizures at any moment and in places where they are extremely dangerous, is thought to be possessed by a malevolent spirit, and all the bad symptoms are referred alike to that agency. Such a view of the case prevented, of course, any proper treatment. A dumb devil the spirit is called, the want of speech being the most persistent ailment. The statement of the symptoms is not completed at once by the father; some of the description is left, according to Mark's manner, to a later point. (In Matthew and Luke the case is stated completely at the outset).

The disciples received authority (iii. 15, vi. 7) to cast out unclean spirits, and it is implied in ver. 29 that they had been successful, on the whole, in

astonished, and they ran up to him and saluted him. And he ¹⁶ asked them, What are you disputing about with them? And ¹⁷ a man out of the crowd answered him, Master, I brought my son to you, because he has a spirit of dumbness. And wher- ¹⁸ ever it seizes him, it tears him, and he foams and grinds his teeth and turns stiff; and I asked your disciples to expel it; and they were not able. And at this he says, O faithless ¹⁹ generation! How long shall I be with you! how long shall I have to bear you! Bring him to me. And they brought him ²⁰ to him. And when it saw him, the spirit at once convulsed him, and he fell on the ground and rolled foaming. And he ²¹ asked his father, How long has he been suffering in this way? And he said, From childhood. And many a time it has even ²² thrown him into the fire and into water, to destroy him; but if in any way possible,¹ have compassion on us and help us. But Jesus said to him, If possible, do you say! to him who ²³ believes everything is possible. Immediately the father of the ²⁴

doing so. The present, however, is not an ordinary case; the disciples have failed, and it was their failure that gave rise to the discussion.

19. There is an earlier complaint about 'this generation' in viii. 12. There it referred to the demand for a sign and to the want of apprehension of present spiritual facts, implied in that demand. That want of belief in God's present rule and all-prevailing might prevents the cures which might otherwise be wrought (vi. 5); and to Jesus it is often a matter of distress to find himself surrounded and obstructed by those who have more belief in agents of evil than in the loving God whose help is always near. In his mind there is no doubt at all that the case can be dealt with successfully and at once, and so he immediately orders the patient to be brought to him. This is not done without an exhibition by the possessing demon of its hateful energy.

Compare the former cases of possession, i. 26 v. 7, and the notes there.

21. Here, as in the case of the Gerasene, Jesus resorts to soothing measures, talking quietly and putting questions. In this way the father may be led to

abandon his hopelessness, which has been the great obstacle in the way of a cure, and to share in the confidence Jesus himself feels, that disorder may be made to yield to order. The father is so impressed with the dreadful incidents of the case that he can scarcely hope; yet as he speaks with Jesus and sees him to be undismayed at the additional recital now made of the symptoms, the hope revives which prompted him to set out upon his errand. The failure of the disciples has discouraged him, but at last the cry bursts out which he had left his house to utter, even more pathetic for the obstructions it has met with. He does not see how help is possible; but Jesus may have some way of helping, not yet known.

23. Jesus repeats the words 'If possible,' holding them up to the suppliant in wonder and disapproval. Nothing can be done in such a case on a hypothesis; and one who has faith will not think of using such words. One who believes boldly enough in the goodness and the present power of God will feel that no symptoms, no difficulties, can stand in the way of God's intentions. All things will appear to him to be possible. The

¹ lit. "if you can," but with this rendering a different word has to be taken for the phrase in the following verse.

25 βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ. ίδων δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐπισυντρέχει ὁ
ὅχλος ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ λέγων αὐτῷ, Τὸ
ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα, ἐπιτάσσω σοι, ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ
26 μηκέτι εἰσέλθῃς εἰς αὐτόν. καὶ κράξας καὶ πολλὰ σπαράξας
ἔξῆλθεν καὶ ἐγένετο ὡσεὶ νεκρός, ὥστε τοὺς πολλοὺς λέγειν ὅτι
27 Ἀπέθανεν. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἤγειρεν
28 αὐτόν, καὶ ἀνέστη. καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον, οἱ μαθηταὶ
αὐτοῦ κατ’ ιδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν, Ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἡδυνήθημεν
29 ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἐν οὐδενὶ
δύναται ἔξελθεῖν εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ.

Second prediction of the sufferings of Messiah, ix. 30-32.

30 Κακεῖθεν ἔξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ
31 οὐκ ἦθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ. ἐδίδασκεν γὰρ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ
ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι Ὁ νιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας
ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀποκτανθεὶς μετὰ τρεῖς
32 ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται. οἱ δὲ ἡγνόουν τὸ ρῆμα καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο
αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσαι.

father at once sees this ; the faith of Jesus has inspired him also with faith. He is on the side of God now and against the demon, and believes that good is to conquer evil. I believe, he says ; I see that my unbelief has been the great obstacle, but do you help me in spite of that !

25. Jesus had meant to make use of the father's co-operation in some way, and the father's want of faith which had been the great obstacle was now removed. But the rapid increase of the crowd leads him to alter his plan ; the sensation must be put a stop to. He therefore deals with the case in the simple and effective way described in former instances, and the same phenomena follow : the cry, the convulsion, the quiet and repose in place of restless activity (cf. i. 26, v. 15, vii. 30). In this case the quiet even appears to go too far and to be alarming ; the patient is, like Jairus' daughter, thought to be dead. Jesus' treatment in this further difficulty is precisely the same as that applied to that case ; he grasps the patient's hand and makes him get up. How the case proceeded afterwards in the child's home we do not learn ; the faith of the father would at

least dictate a different treatment from that followed before.

28. The **disciples** have been successful till now in their practice ; the demons have been subject to them when they invoked the name of Jesus. What is the reason of their **failure** in this instance ? Jesus recognizes the case as a special one. We can see from the report that it was not a case of simple possession, but was complicated with various ailments. In ordinary cases it is enough to order the demon to go out, appealing to the authority of Jesus whom the demons know they are bound to obey ; but in a special case we here find that special means of a spiritual nature must be employed. There must be special appeal to the divine goodness and strength, a special degree of faith must be attained by prayer that God is able and willing to do what is asked of Him. We are not told of Jesus' praying in this instance when accomplishing the cure, which was somewhat hurried towards its close (cf. vii. 34). In works of healing in the Church afterwards prayer is always used.

In Matthew the answer to the **disciples'** question is given differently. Their failure is said to be due to their

child cried out, I believe! Help my unbelief! But Jesus seeing that the crowd is still collecting, rebuked the unclean spirit, saying to him, You dumb and deaf spirit, I command you, come out of him and never enter him again! And he cried out, and convulsed him severely, and came out of him; and he became like a dead person so that most of the people said that he was dead. But Jesus took him by the hand and raised him, and he stood up. And when he had come indoors, his disciples asked him privately, Why were we not able to cast it out? And he said to them, This kind cannot be put out by any means but prayer.

[Matthew xvii. 22, 23; Luke ix. 43b-45.]

And they set out from there and passed through Galilee; and he did not wish any one to know of it. For he was teaching his disciples, and saying to them, The Son of Man is about to be delivered up into the hands of men, and they will kill him, and when he is killed he will rise again after three days. But they did not understand the saying, and they were afraid to ask him.

want of faith, and the saying is given in this connection which Mark gives in connection with the barren fig-tree (xi. 23) as to the power of faith to remove a mountain. The verse in Matth. (xvii. 21), "this kind . . . prayer and fasting," an expanded version of Mark's verse, no doubt in the sense of early Church practice, has been removed from the text by recent editors.

30. The last place mentioned was the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi (viii. 27). If the record were a full one the Mount of Transfiguration would be near Caesarea, and the present journey southwards from there, ending at Capernaum (ver. 33). It leads through Galilee, perhaps past places where Jesus had often preached and had done acts of power. This time there is no preaching; as formerly in the foreign country of Tyre (vii. 24), so now in the country which is most familiar to him, Jesus seeks to escape notice. The motive for this appears at first sight to be that he is devoting himself entirely to his disciples, and has no time or energy to give to public labours in

addition. But the reason of his withdrawing from public activity and public notice in Galilee lies deeper than this. It is to be found in the fact that the subject of his own thoughts has changed, and that the theme of his early preaching in Galilee no longer occupies the foremost place in his mind. It is of the Son of Man that he is now thinking, of the person and the fortunes of the Messiah. And the thoughts about the Messiah with which he is now engaged are for the inner circle.

The doctrine of the Messiah which he is here said to have been teaching the disciples is nearly the same as he laid before them at their first recognition of his Messiahship (viii. 31, also ix. 12). The only new point here is that the Son of Man is to be "delivered up." The Greek word may be rendered "betrayed," and it has been usual to see in the phrase an anticipation of the treachery of Judas, which involves the difficulty that Jesus courted death by taking with him to Jerusalem a person he knew to be a traitor. All that is necessarily implied is the anticipation of an arrest and confinement.

The dispute of the disciples, who was greatest, ix. 33-37.

33 Καὶ ἥλθον εἰς Καφαρναύμ. καὶ ἐν τῷ οἴκᾳ γενόμενος
 34 ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς, Τί ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ διελογίζεσθε; οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων,
 35 πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέχθησαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τίς μεῖζων. καὶ
 καθίσας ἐφώνησεν τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Εἴ τις θέλει
 36 πρῶτος εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων ἔσχατος καὶ πάντων διάκονος.¹ καὶ
 λαβὼν παιδίον ἐστησεν αὐτὸν ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος
 37 αὐτὸν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ὁς ἂν ἐν τῷν τοιούτῳν παιδίον δέξηται ἐπὶ²
 τῷ ὄνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὅς ἂν ἐμὲ δέχηται, οὐκ ἐμὲ
 δέχεται ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

The exorcist using Jesus' name, ix. 38-40.

38 Ἐφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης, Διδάσκαλε, εἴδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὄνόματί¹
 σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια,² καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἡκολούθει

The evangelist represents in this passage also that the disciples did not understand this new teaching of their Master (viii. 33, ix. 10); they were Jews and took in but slowly the doctrine of a crucified Messiah. What is taught by Jesus on the subject is not yet the Pauline doctrine which sees in the Messiah's death such rich and infinite purpose, but only the doctrine of Acts (ii. 23, 24, etc.), that that death was part of the divine ordinance for the Messiah and would be made good by the Resurrection. Yet even in this form we have many a hint that the disciples found it almost impossible to take it in. The difficulty remains that if Jesus spent so much labour in seeking to teach his disciples these thoughts, they ought not to have been so unprepared as his death found them.

Matthew (xvii. 23) softens the expression, only saying that the disciples were very sorry. Luke (ix. 45) attributes their failure to understand to a divine decree.

33. What follows is indoors; no particular house is meant. On the way he has overheard the disciples' voices, raised rather high, as he walked in front of them (viii. 33, x. 32); and on asking what their discussion was about, he learns

how the new teaching is affecting them. A similar phenomenon is seen later (x. 35 *sqq.*). The fact that they are the chosen companions of the Messiah, and that he is soon to enter on his power and reign, has opened wider careers to their imaginations. From this and later phenomena we may probably infer that Jesus' ideas for the future included some measure of worldly power. There was to be a setting up of the true instead of the false authority. In Jesus' mind the noble, the ideal, side of this victory is thought of; in the disciples' minds the details are thought of as they will affect themselves. Yet the disciples feel that Jesus cannot approve of their discussion; and when he asks for an account of it, he has to press them for an answer.

In Matthew xviii. 1 *sqq.* the dispute among the disciples is softened; they propose the question to Jesus, "Who is greatest in the Kingdom?" In Luke ix. 46 we have the incident as in Mark, but Jesus does not need to ask what the disciples have been discussing: he knows their thoughts, and at once enters on the subject.

35. Jesus makes a serious and important business of this. He sits down; he is going to teach something

¹ Om. καὶ λέγει . . . διάκονος.

² Add ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν.

[Matthew xviii. 1-5 ; Luke ix. 46-48.]

And they came to Capernaum. And after he had entered 33 the house he asked them, What were you disputing about on the way? But they were silent, for they had been disputing 34 with each other on the way, which was the greatest. And 35 he sat down and called the Twelve, and says to them, If any one wishes to be first, he shall be last of all and servant of all.¹ And he took a child, and set it in the midst of them, 36 and he embraced it, and said to them, Whoever receives one 37 child like this on account of my name receives me; and who-ever receives me receives not me but Him that sent me.

[Luke ix. 49, 50.]

John said to him, Master, we saw a man casting out demons 38 in your name² and we forbade him to do so, because he was

that is to be well attended to, and he calls the Twelve to stand about him and listen. There are others besides them in the house, but this lesson is for them. The lesson itself can only be imperfectly understood till it is illustrated from those parts of the teaching of Jesus which Mark has not given. In the Beatitudes, and in other parts of the Sermon on the Mount, the dispositions of mind essential for the Kingdom are placed before us, which, though entering on a new phase of his career and face to face with a great struggle, Jesus will not forget nor allow his disciples to forget. As he himself is among his disciples as one who serves (Luke xxii. 27), they must think that in his community the only way to be great is to forget oneself in doing for others what one can. The Twelve, first of all, are called to practise this; how else can they represent him or his cause? The lesson thus stated is then enforced in a way never to be forgotten. Of the children in the house he takes one, places it where the disciples will all see it, and embraces it as if he had nothing else to attend to but that child, nothing to do but wait on it and help it to what is good. If they will act in that way, he says, it will be well with them. If they will forget their own important

affairs and swelling ambitions, and when they meet a fellow-creature, be he ever so insignificant, ever so incapable of furthering their interests, interest themselves in him and devote themselves to him, because Christ wills it so, with all their hearts, then they will find that they have advanced themselves most truly. The Greek words, "because of my name," imply that this is to be done not from vague beneficence but because the action is one which the disciple feels his connection with Christ to require of him. Taking to themselves the least, they will feel that they have unwittingly taken to themselves the greatest; they are in sympathy with Jesus and stand not far from him. And not only Jesus but God Himself is thus brought near, for God acts just in that way; He cares for the smallest and weakest; children are not beneath His notice but are very dear to Him; He is always doing good out of pure goodwill and undeserved compassion.

Vers. 38-41 appear to break the connection; ver. 37 is about receiving children, and ver. 42 about putting obstacles in their way. What links these verses to the preceding and following context is the idea of the name of Christ, and of

¹ Omit "and says . . . of all" as Matthew and Luke.

² Add, who is not following us.

39 ἡμῖν. ὁ δέ Ιησοῦς εἶπεν, Μὴ κωλύετε αὐτὸν' οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνόματί μου καὶ δυνήσεται ταχὺ κακο-
40 λογῆσαι με· ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἔστιν.

Another saying about 'the Name,' ix. 41.

41 Ὡς γὰρ ἀν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν ὄνόματι¹ ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἔστε, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.

On offences, to others, ix. 42.

42 Καὶ ὃς ἀν σκανδαλίσῃ ἔνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων,² καλόν ἔστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περίκειται μύλος ὄνικὸς περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.

the extent of the circle formed by reference to that name.¹

The name of Jesus, we see, could be used, and used effectively for exorcism, by persons who had no commission from Jesus nor even any visible connection with him. The demoniacs throughout the country being under the impression that Jesus had come to put a stop to their proceedings, the name had terrors for them, by whomsoever used. And so it has happened that the beneficent action of the disciples who used the Master's name to set free those oppressed of the devil, has found an imitator outside their ranks. John and the other disciples for whom he spoke consider that this is not to be allowed; only those should use the name who are outwardly connected with the cause. Jesus judges differently. Those who appeal to his name

to do a work of power must, he thinks, be inwardly in sympathy with him. They are not his enemies; they cannot possibly speak evil of him. And so the name is the symbol of a wider union than that of the circle of followers. Secret sympathizers are not to be regarded as outside but as within the pale. Those who do works like those of Jesus are to be reckoned as paying him respect and as having a real connection with him. It is to be noticed that both of the apparently conflicting utterances, "He that is not against us is with us" and "He that is not with me is against me" (Matth. xii. 30), have reference to the same work of exorcism. In the one case it is said that he who casts out demons is doing what Jesus does and is on his side, even though not formally adhering to him; in the other, that he who raises objections and criti-

¹ The various phrases in which the name of Jesus is here spoken of are:

1. Ver. 37, Receives a little one on account of my name (*ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνόματί μου*).
2. „ 38, Are casting out démons in thy name (*ἐν τῷ ὄνόματί σου*).
3. „ 39, Do a work in my name (*ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνόματί μου*).
4. „ 41, A cup of cold water in the name that you belong to Christ (*ἐν ὄνόματι ὃν Χριστοῦ ἔστε*).

In No. 2 the name of Christ is the instrument by which certain powers are exercised. In Acts, Paul pronounces the name of Christ to expel a demon (xvi. 18), and in Acts xix. 18 the name is used by Jewish exorcists, not without effect, for a similar purpose. In Matth. vii. 22 we

hear of persons who have prophesied, cast out demons, and done works of power by means of the name (here in the dative without any preposition). In Nos. 1 and 3 the words are the same but the meaning is different. In 3 it describes the action of one who does not follow Christ, but in 1 that of one who acts in his spirit and in obedience to him. In 3 *ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνόματί μου* is equivalent to the *ἐν τῷ ὄνόματί σου* of 2; both phrases speak of the name as the means of exorcism. 4. This phrase is a Hebraism, see Dalman, *Wörte Jesu*, p. 250; and on the various uses of the name of Christ see a paper on "Onoma and the baptismal formula," by A. J. H. W. Brandt in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, Nov., 1891.

¹ Add *μου*.

² Add *εἰς ἡμέας*.

not following us. But Jesus said, Do not forbid him; for one who does a work of power in my name cannot possibly speak evil of me soon afterwards. For he who is not against us is for us.

[Matthew x. 42; xxv. 40.]

For whoever gives you a cup of water to drink on account of your belonging to Christ,¹ of a truth I say to you, he shall by no means lose his reward.

[Matthew xviii. 6, 7; Luke xvii. 1, 2.]

And whoever causes to stumble one of these little ones who believe,² it would be far better for him that a great millstone were put round his neck and that he were thrown into the sea.

cisms to the work of Jesus in casting out demons is, though not a declared enemy, really opposing and thwarting him. The two sentences are by no means inconsistent with each other.

41. This verse stands in the address to the missionaries, Matth. x. 42. Matthew speaks of the kind act as done in the name of a disciple, i.e. probably out of goodwill to those who are disciples of Jesus. Mark's words "on account of your belonging to Christ" are more in keeping with the context and amount to the same thing. Jesus would not use the word 'Christ' in this way; when he speaks of himself as Messiah he says the Son of Man, or the Son.

In the foregoing verses those who do the works of Jesus belong to him. Here we are told that those who are kind to his followers out of respect for their Master, even though not outwardly joining them, are to be regarded as sympathizers. In the judgment there will be a reward for them, which will by no means be withheld. This idea is developed in the parable of the sheep and the goats (Matth. xxv.). Here we have simply

a hint to the missionaries of the faith that they are to take a wide view of the religion they preach and of the qualifications for belonging to it. They are to welcome the smallest signs of sympathy they meet on their journeys, and to claim those who show any respect for their Master or kindness to themselves as really belonging to them.

42. We come back to the little ones spoken of before, ver. 37. There, however, the little one was a child, to whom, though the least important of all, the follower of Christ was to be ready to devote himself. Here the little ones are, as in Luke, grown-up persons, members of the Church, who believe and who are liable to be led into thoughts or acts perilous to their faith. The lesson, however, is not changed; it is still enjoined that the Christian is to forget himself and put himself in the attitude of fostering and defending even those far beneath him in their attainments. To lead into danger a young or immature member of the Church and possibly to wreck his faith, ah, far better that he who can do such a thing were utterly made

¹ Rejecting *μον* which makes the words run "in my name because you belong to Christ." This would make the kind person a follower of Christ; otherwise he is a kind Jew or heathen. Cf. Matth. xxv. 35.

² Add: in me.

On offences, to oneself, ix. 43-50.

43 Καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίσῃ σε ἡ χείρ σου, ἀπόκοψον αὐτήν· καλόν
ἐστίν σε κυλλὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἥωην ἢ τὰς δύο χεῖρας ἔχοντα
45 ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον.¹ καὶ ἐὰν ὁ
πούς σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε, ἀπόκοψον αὐτὸν· καλόν ἐστίν σε
εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἥωην χωλὸν ἢ τὰς δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι
47 εἰς τὴν γέενναν.¹ καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε, ἔκβαλε
αὐτὸν· καλόν σέ ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν
48 τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν, ὅπου
49 ὁ σκάληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾶ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται. πᾶς γὰρ
50 πυρὶ ἀλισθήσεται, καὶ πάσα θυσία ἀλὶ ἀλισθήσεται.² καλὸν τὸ
ἄλας³ ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἄλας ἄναλον γένηται, ἐν τίνι αὐτὸ ἀρτύσετε;
ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀλα, καὶ εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις.

Journey to Judaea, x. 1.

1 Καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἀναστὰς ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ
πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ συνπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν,
καὶ ὡς εἴώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.

away¹ with before he takes such guilt upon his soul. For concrete instances of this see Romans xiv., 1 Cor. viii. The similarity between these passages of Paul and the passage before us is very striking (cf. Rom. xiv. 13, 14, 18).

43. From giving offence we come to the subject of taking it. Between these two there is of course the closest connection, as he who is most ready to make sacrifices to maintain his own faith and purity ought to be most anxious to avoid doing anything to imperil those of others. But the discourse has undeniably wandered from its starting-point at ver. 33, 34, and furnishes another example of Mark's loose connections (cf. iv. 21-25). The material had apparently to be put in here before Jesus' departure from Galilee. Matthew, who has had these sayings

in the Sermon on the Mount (v. 29-30), repeats them in this very inferior connection (xviii. 8, 9), evidently following Mark. We have here the severe and ascetic side of the teaching of Jesus (comp. Matth. vii. 13, 14), and a practical application to a certain class of cases of the principle of denying self and taking up the cross. This intense and strenuous tone belongs to the latter part of the ministry when the shadow of the great impending change has already been entered, and all earthly affairs are seen as nothing in comparison with the judgment and the life beyond. The tone is that which is heard in the Apocalypse where all is dominated by the expectation of the Parousia. In view of the judgment that is coming a man may well resort to the most trenchant measures, that it may go well with him. The alternatives at the judgment are that one enters into

¹The millstone spoken of is not that of the hand-mill (Matth. xxiv. 41), but that, as the Greek says, of the ass-mill.

¹Vers. 44 and 46 in the T.R. are identical with ver. 48.

²Omit this clause.

³ἄλα.

[Matthew xviii. 8, 9; cf. v. 29, 30.]

And if your hand make you stumble, cut it off; it is better 43 that you should enter into life maimed than that you should have both your hands and go away to Gehenna, to the unquenchable fire. And if your foot make you stumble, cut 45 it off; it is better that you should enter into life lame than that you should have both your feet and be cast into Gehenna. And if your eye make you stumble, pluck it out; it is better 47 that you should enter into the Kingdom of God with one eye than that you should have both your eyes and be cast into Gehenna, where their worm dies not and the fire is not 48 quenched. For every one shall be salted with fire, and every 49 sacrifice shall be salted with salt.¹ Salt is a good thing; but 50 if salt loses its saltiness what can you take to flavour it? Have salt in yourselves and be at peace with one another.

[Matthew xix. 1, 2.]

And breaking up from there he comes to the region of 1
Judaea and beyond Jordan; and again multitudes came together to him, and, as he was accustomed, again he taught them.

life, i.e. one passes without dying into the Messianic Kingdom where all sin and evil are at an end and the just live happy and secure, or that one is cast into Gehenna, the place of active torment, which had superseded in Jewish belief at this time the older Sheol, the place of shadows. The notion of Gehenna was derived from the valley of Hinnom, where abominable sacrifices (passing through the fire) had been offered by some of the later kings of Judah (see Isa. l. 11, lxvi. 24, and Charles' article on Gehenna in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*). The losses which may be incurred here for the sake of duty will be forgotten or made good in the life of the future, but to be cast into Gehenna is a fate which, whether it amounts to annihilation or to unending torment (both are found in Jewish thought), can never be retrieved.

49. Foreveryone a process of seasoning is necessary, and as temptations are so

great and the stake so high that process cannot be an easy one. There is fire to be encountered afterwards if not now; how much better to face it now and by self-sacrifice ensure against the future. That principle is recognized even in the Law, where we are told (Levit. ii. 13) that no sacrifice is to be without salt. Those then who look forward to standing before God for His acceptance must not be without the sharp preservative; and in this connection a saying about salt is tacked on which in its original setting (Luke xiv. 34, 35, Matth. v. 13) has nothing to do with the individual preparation by sacrifice for judgment, but with the seasoning the world is to receive by the presence in it of the disciples of Jesus. They are the salt of the earth; but if they so adapt themselves to the world as to part with their distinctive flavour, there is no means of restoring them to their functions, and they become the most useless of all and fit for nothing but rejection. As

¹The Revisers omit this clause, and there is strong MS. evidence against it. But without it the connection of the passage is chaotic.

Question as to divorce, x. 2-12.

2 Καὶ προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι¹ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ²
 3 γυναικαὶ ἀπολῦσαι, πειράζοντες αὐτόν. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν
 4 αὐτοῖς, Τί ίμιν ἐνετείλατο Μωϋσῆς; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν, Ἐπέτρεψεν
 5 Μωϋσῆς βιβλίον ἀποστασίου γράψαι καὶ ἀπολῦσαι. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς
 6 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἔγραψεν ίμιν τὴν
 ἐντολὴν ταύτην ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως

ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς·

7 ἔνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα,²
 8 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

9 ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ μία σάρξ. ὁ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέξενξεν,
 10 ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ

Mark uses the saying, the salt stands both for the disciples who leave the world and for the self-mortification by which they themselves are kept pure and fit for God. And the discourse ends with returning to its starting-point in the dispute among the disciples. They are admonished to have salt in themselves, *i.e.* not to shrink from the self-denial they are called for, and at the same time to be at peace towards each other. To themselves they are to be severe, to others accommodating, modest, and sweet; then they will both be in a right state as individuals and will avoid quarrels and jealousy.

x. 1. Here we are told of Jesus' final departure from Galilee. In Matthew xvi. 21 he announces to the disciples at the first prediction of his death that he is going to Jerusalem; in Luke he travels through Samaria (ix. 53, cf. also xiii. 22, xvii. 11) and other districts towards the capital. In Mark his purpose of going to Jerusalem is unfolded gradually, and he does not travel straight to the capital but in the first instance only to the country of Judaea and beyond Jordan. At this point accordingly he leaves Galilee. Matthew also makes this statement, but omits the 'and' connecting Judaea and the trans-Jordanic country, as if Judaea extended to the east of the Jordan. Jesus approached Jerusalem at last from Jericho, and he seems to have reached that town from Peraea. John xi. 54,

where he is said to have made some stay with his disciples at a place called Ephraim on the borders of the wilderness, may thus contain a true reminiscence.

At all events Jesus is now in a region where he has not been before, at least since he began to teach. There are no means of judging how long a time he spent in that region; and the incidents which Mark places here are not numerous nor do they possess any necessary connection with this part of the narrative. In Luke this journey is used as a great receptacle (the Great Insertion, as it is called, extends from Luke ix. 51 to xviii. 14) to contain all sorts of materials which had not found a fixed place in the narrative; and possibly we have here in Mark a beginning of the same treatment.

We are told vaguely of crowds who surrounded Jesus on this journey. For similar crowds see that at viii. 1 in a desert place and that of viii. 34 in the northern region, where Peter's confession took place. The details of the journey not being remembered, there is a general description of Christ's activity, such as we are accustomed to hear from Mark. Crowds come to him and he teaches them. In Matthew he heals them. For a similar treatment of a multitude where Mark says he taught them, Matthew that he healed, see vi. 34, Matth. xiv. 14.

2. These Pharisees wish to know if Jesus considers divorce to be wrong. They

¹ Om. Φαρισαῖοι.

² Add αὐτοῦ.

[Matthew xix. 3-12; Luke xvi. 18.]

And some Pharisees¹ came to him and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting him. But he answered and said to them, What did Moses command you? And they said Moses allowed a man to put away his wife on writing out a certificate of divorce for her. But Jesus said to them, It was on account of the hardness of your hearts that he gave you this commandment; but from the beginning of the creation,

Male and female he made them.

Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother,
and the two shall be one flesh.

So that they are no longer two but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together let not man put asunder. And when they were inside the disciples asked him again about

have no doubt heard some such rumour about him, and they ask the question not from an honest desire to understand his position and compare it with their own, but 'tempting him.' If what they have heard about him is true, then he is setting himself up against the Law, which explicitly recognizes divorce, and if he can be induced to make such a statement publicly, they will have a good charge against him.

3. Jesus at once asks them to state the law which in their view makes divorce legal, and they quote the terms of Deut. xxiv. 1. This law was made originally not to facilitate divorce but to regulate it, and especially to secure for the wife that she should not be turned off without a proper document to show that she was divorced and was therefore at liberty to marry.

5. Such a law as that Jesus at once declares could only have been given to meet a temporary necessity, and can only be of temporary duration. It contradicts a principle, as it were, of the constitution, of the original order of things. Moses wrote another law than that one; in the original charter of all human relations you find it. There are words at the beginning which recognize that a man may at his marriage leave his father and mother, but no words recognizing that a man may leave his wife. God has joined these two to-

gether, and no human authority, not even Moses, it is implied though not said, is entitled to reverse His ordinance. If Moses appears to alter that, it is only for a time and for a special reason, not that the law he then gave was a good one, but that the people were not fit for any better.

Thus Jesus abrogates a piece of the Mosaic law; we have seen him put the tradition as a whole aside (vii. 6-9), and we have seen him dispense with the Sabbath law as held and interpreted in his day (ii. 23—iii. 5); now we see him put aside an explicit ordinance of Moses on the ground that it does not correspond to God's original intentions for man. The courage and clearness of judgment thus shown, in clearing away what is morally unsound and going back to the foundations of right as laid at the beginning, is a notable feature of the example left us by our Master.

10. After they come in, the disciples revert to the question debated out of doors. The decision given by Jesus was a very strong one, as it set aside an explicit law contained in the Torah and the disciples might not be able at once to take it in. The Master's reply to their enquiry is only a reiteration in yet stronger terms of the position he has taken up. He does not shrink from the consequences. If God allows no divorce, then those who have turned

¹ Omit Pharisees.

ii περὶ τούτου ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ὡς ἀν ἀπολύτη
12 τὴν γυναικα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχάται ἐπ' αὐτήν· καὶ
ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύτασσε τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον, μοιχάται.

Jesus welcomes children who are brought to him, x. 13-16.

13 Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία ἵνα αὐτῶν ἀψηται· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ
14 ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς. ἴδων δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἡγανάκτησεν καὶ εἶπεν
αὐτοῖς, Ἀφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός με, μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά·
15 τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,
δος ἀν μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ
16 εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν· καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ κατευλόγει τιθεὶς
τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτά.

The rich man's question, x. 17-31.

17 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὄδον προσδραμῶν εἰς καὶ γονν-
πετήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν, Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω ἵνα

away their wives are not relieved of the obligations of marriage towards them, however carefully they have complied with all the requirements of the law on the subject. They are still married to their original wives ; they can form no second union. In the sight of God there is no such thing as divorce, and he who acts as if there were and enters on a second marriage is an adulterer ; his first marriage is not at an end, and he is violating its obligations.

Matthew has had this already in the Sermon on the Mount (v. 31 sq.), but gives it again here. Mark, writing for Gentile readers, with whom the wife can claim divorce as well as the husband, adds a sentence to meet this case. It is not only the husband who is bound to regard his marriage as indissoluble. The wife must regard it in the same way, and must not think of the relief provided for her by Roman law. In Matthew the prohibition of divorce is much less absolute. The apostle Paul in 1 Cor. vii. occupies somewhat different ground on the subject of marriage, and allows of divorce in cases of mixed marriages, though apparently in no others (ver. 15).

13. This incident of travel might happen anywhere ; the lesson drawn

from it is connected with the ambitions of the disciples of which so much is heard at this part of the narrative (ix. 36, Matth. xviii. 4). In some places the people brought out their sick when they heard of Jesus' approach ; here they bring their **children** that the great Teacher may touch them, and his touch infuse some virtue into their growing lives. He would be at the height of his reputation when this took place. The disciples fail signally to enter into their Master's mind with regard to children. They consider that he has such serious matters to attend to that he ought not to be troubled with children, and must be kept free from such an intrusion. But Jesus thinks of the matter very differently, and is angry with them for understanding him so poorly. The children are to be allowed to come to him, and no obstacle put in their way ; with whom could he feel himself at home so much as with them ? they know all about the Kingdom he preaches ; it is theirs and its citizens are just such as they are.

15. We may compare with this the saying in Matth. xi. 25, "Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and revealed them to babes" and the scene in the temple, Luke ii. 41 sqq. The truths of the Kingdom must have early

the subject. And he says to them, Whoever puts away his ¹¹ wife and marries another, commits adultery against her; and ¹² if she puts away her husband and marries another, she commits adultery.

[Matthew xix. 13-15a; Luke xviii. 15-17.]

And they brought children to him that he might touch ¹³ them; and the disciples rebuked them for doing so. But ¹⁴ when Jesus saw it, he was angry, and said to them, Let the children come to me; do not prevent them; for of such is the Kingdom of God. Assuredly I tell you, whoever does not ¹⁵ receive the Kingdom of God as a child will never enter it at all. And he embraced them and blessed them, laying his ¹⁶ hands on them.

[Matthew xix. 15b-30; Luke xviii. 18-30.]

And as he was setting out on his journey, a man ran up ¹⁷ to him and kneeled to him and asked him, Good Master,

begun to grow up in Jesus' own mind, and he knew from his own experience how receptive childhood is. To such a child as he had been the Kingdom was not suggestive of social competition, but of fair ideals offering themselves spontaneously as from above. Such simple and confiding spirits possess the Kingdom, and no one can possess it in any other way than theirs. Only by believing in it and surrendering himself to its laws, his spirit seeing in it the only real world, can any one enter it, and for the grown-up person this is harder, as it may involve changing fixed habits of thought and abjuring worldly standards of judgment and modes of action. In the Kingdom all are children, children of the heavenly Father, and without the child-like mind, the confiding, upward-looking, unassuming spirit, no one can be at home in it. Compare with this the standpoint of the Beatitudes, where the Kingdom is the portion of the poor in spirit, the meek, the mourner, of those in fact who divest themselves in their heart of all that is artificial, and live in the great realities of man's relation to God and to God's creatures (cf. Baur, *First Three Centuries*, vol. i. p. 26-33).

On the caressing of the children which follows, see on ix. 36. Matthew's scene

(xviii. 1-4), in which a child is set up for an object-lesson to the disciples, is not given by Mark; but it could be constructed out of the materials Mark gives in the two scenes where Jesus embraces children: Matthew here omits the caress, which he has there given.

17. Another incident of travel, which testifies to the esteem with which Jesus was regarded, and again without any definite place or time. One who turns out afterwards to be a rich man sees Jesus starting on his journey, and accosts him hurriedly and even impetuously, ere he be gone, in the presence of the disciples, with a question of pressing moment to himself. He assumes the attitude of a suppliant (i. 40), and he addresses Jesus with a title indicating respect and even affection and confidence. 'Good' is more than just or reverend (cf. Rom. v. 7); the word was used with full consciousness of its moral significance, and, as Jesus' reply shows, was not a word to be lightly applied to a mortal. (Dalmatian, W.J., p. 277, considers that the word 'good' was by the Jews reserved for God, and that it was a gross flattery to apply it to a mortal; but this is surely an exaggeration).

The question propounded is a very

18 ξωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Τί με
19 λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός. τὰς ἐντολὰς
οἶδας,

Μὴ μουχεύσῃς, Μὴ φονεύσῃς,¹ Μὴ κλέψῃς, Μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς,
Μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς. Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα.

20 ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα πάντα ἐφιλαξάμην ἐκ
21 νεότητός μου. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἡγάπησεν αὐτὸν
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἐν σε ὑστερεῖ· ὑπαγε, ὅσα ἔχεις πάλησον καὶ
δὸς² πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει

serious one. The questioner wishes to make sure of life, that is, of a share in the blessedness of the future, comprising all the blessings promised by God to His faithful ones; the word life in later Jewish thought means no less than this. How is he to become partaker of eternal life? His asking the question shows him to be in doubt on the matter. Not that it was one on which there was any lack of teaching in the country. The Scribes¹ taught that to be a partaker of life at last a man must keep God's commandments, not only the written but the unwritten ones, not the great ones only but also the small, and that every act of obedience was put down to a man's credit in the heavenly book, every transgression put down against him, for the day of reckoning when his account would be balanced and his fate determined. Thus a man's salvation was built up by acts of merit, and the religious life consisted in doing such acts, and avoiding acts of a contrary kind; it was by doing, repeated and constant doing, of meritorious acts that he made himself safe. But the practical working of this system admitted of great uncertainties, and we see both from the N.T. and from Rabbinical literature that there was many an enquiry for some simpler and more moral standard. Jesus, this man thinks, can perhaps give him a plain rule, and so he comes to him and makes his appeal, which is not wanting in pathos. He wants guidance in his course of doing, by which he is seeking

to establish his salvation. What am I to do? he asks.

Jesus protests in the first instance at being called **good**. That title, he says, belongs to God—God only. The protest undoubtedly affords a glimpse into the inner life of Jesus. He sees all goodness concentrated in God, and while men are to try to be good as God is (Matth. v. 48), they are not so yet; nor does he dream of regarding himself as an exception to this rule. He occupies the truly religious position of seeing everything good in God, not in himself; if he had not occupied this attitude he could not be to us the type of true religion. And the questioner is first reminded of this principle, and is admonished implicitly to rise to a higher level of thought. The service of God is not, he is thus told at once, a series of doings, of transactions; it is living in active intercourse with Him who alone is good. To fix attention on our doings and forget the good God in whose service they profess to be done, is a poor way of serving Him.

In Matthew the right reading is undoubtedly, "Why do you ask me about the good?" and Jesus' disclaimer of goodness is thus got rid of, and turned into a play on the word "good," as if the man's question had been a philosophical one as to the chief good. Luke with Mark preserves the earlier version of the speech.

19. Jesus believes along with his countrymen that the **commandments** of God were meant to give life. 'He that

¹Cf. Weber's *Jüdische Theologie*, especially i. 1, on the Principle of Nomism. The system set forth in Weber is the full-blown one of a later day; in the time the Gospels refer to, it

was less developed, while Paul is witness to a higher principle which was at work in his day in Judaism, and other evidence to the same effect is not wanting.

¹ μὴ φονεύσῃς, μὴ μουχεύσῃς.

² Add τοῖς.

what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? But Jesus 18 said to him, Why do you call me good? No one is good but God only. You know the commandments:

19

Do not commit adultery, Do not kill,¹ Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Do not defraud, Honour your father and your mother.

But he said to him, Master, I have observed all these things 20 from my youth. And Jesus looked at him and loved him, and 21 said to him, There is one thing that you want. Go and sell all that you have and give it to the poor, and you will have

doeth them shall live by them,' is the O.T. answer to this man's question, quoted by Paul (Gal. iii. 12). The discovery that the law brings not life but death belongs to a more developed stage of thought. And when Jesus wishes to specify those commandments which have life attached to them, he mentions those which all civilised communities agree to regard as sacred. He does not specify anything ritual or anything merely national, but recites the commandments of the second table of the Decalogue. Of course Jesus cannot mean to say that a mere literal observance of these laws will bring life. In Matthew v. we learn how he regards them, translating them from the negative into a positive form, and considering them as addressed not to the outward acts but to the spirit and conscience. It is the law as thus "fulfilled," made inward, regarded not as a statute regulating acts but as an ideal principle of conduct, the keeping of which can count in Jesus' view on the divine approval. But with this man he does not enter on the question how the law is to be understood; he simply takes the broad ground, common to him with his countrymen, that keeping the commandments brings salvation. Along with the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and fifth commandments the injunction, "Defraud not," finds a place, a precept found in Deuteronomy xxiv. 14, and meant to enforce the prompt payment of wages (cf. James v. 4).

The applicant, however, declares that he has no need to be told this. He speaks of himself as no longer young

(Matthew, on the contrary, calls him a young man), and declares that he has been heedful of all these commandments ever since his youth. Taking the commandments in their literal sense, as mere prohibitions of immoral acts, his assertion might be true. In every civilised country multitudes could say the same. Only this keeping the commandments has not brought him the assurance which he craves; he still stands as a questioner (though Mark does not give the words, "What lack I yet?" of Matthew), and applies for some further directions as to what he can do to be sure of acceptance at the end. Ethical enquiry was not dead among the Jews; the legal system which prevailed ought in logic to have precluded it; yet the questions were asked which is the chief commandment, and what a man is to do to have life.

21. One might have expected Jesus to explain what was involved, in his eyes, in keeping the commandments. But he takes a different plan with this man. He sees him to be not far from the Kingdom—the spiritual discontent is there, the warmth of disposition, and some measure of faith in Jesus' word and cause must be there also; that is all written on his face, and Jesus sees it and loves him. Instead, therefore, of entering into argument with him, he at once claims him for his own. He did not ask everyone to be his disciple (cf. v. 19, viii. 26, Luke xiv. 25-35, ix. 61, 62), but he asks this man, with the same words as those addressed to the fisher-disciples and to Matthew (i. 17, ii. 14). If he will come with

¹ Do not kill, Do not commit adultery.

22 μοι. ὁ δὲ στυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ
 23 ἔχων κτήματα πολλά. καὶ περιβλεψάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει τοῖς
 μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, Πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν
 24 βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελεύσονται. οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἔθαμβοντο
 ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει
 αὐτοῖς, Τέκνα, πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ
 25 εἰσελθεῖν εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τῆς τρυμαλίας τῆς
 ράφιδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.
 26 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἔξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς,¹ Καὶ τίς
 27 δύναται σωθῆναι; ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει, Παρὰ
 ἀνθρώπους ἀδύνατον, ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ² θεῷ πάντα γὰρ δύνατα παρὰ
 28 τῷ θεῷ.³ ἥρξατο λέγειν ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ, Ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν
 29 πάντα καὶ ἤκολουθήκαμέν σοι. ἔφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,

Jesus and devote himself to the Kingdom then his questions will be answered ; then he will be doing a thing which will certainly be rewarded fully at the end. Only, when one gives oneself to the Kingdom there can be no half-measures. He who finds that treasure goes at once and sells all he has to purchase it. If this man is quite in earnest, if he is prepared to do all that is required in order to attain peace within and to be quite certain of the future, he must enter the highest life at once. He must sell his property and dispose of it so that he can never take it up again nor feel it calling him back to the world. He must exchange the earthly for the heavenly treasures (Matthew vi. 19, 20), and learn, following Jesus, to bear hardship and to look in the face of danger.

22. The man was unequal to the crisis of his fate, and refused the career for which his circumstances rather than his character unfitted him. He could not break the ties, as Jesus and the disciples had done, which bound him to the world.

23. The *look round* belongs perhaps to Mark's style (see iii. 5, 34). While Matthew and Luke give Jesus' saying here first in its simple and then in its more emphatic form without anything between, Mark notices the wonder of the disciples at the saying when first uttered, and so leads up to the second form. Jesus has no

hard words for the young man, only for the riches of which he had shown himself to be as it were the victim. To the ease of rich men who aim at the Kingdom he applies the word about the narrow gate (Luke xiii. 23 sq.), intensified and dramatized. The gate we hear in Luke is narrow, and one has to struggle to get through it. Those who have burdens they cannot part with cannot get through at all. A rich man, so hampered by material cares and obligations that, like the young man, he cannot embrace the incompatible treasure even when he recognizes it and to some extent craves for it, what of his case? As readily will a camel get through the eye of a needle,—the words were to be taken literally. Indeed the camel would only get through even an ordinary doorway by leaving all its burdens behind, a thing a rich man cannot do. There is an impossibility, therefore, as far as men can see ; the rich can never enter the Kingdom which is for those only who have renounced all love and care except the highest.

The future tense is used here as if the question of the admission of rich men to the Kingdom belonged to the time of fulfilment. The Kingdom is already present in principle ; the parables of growth explain its mode of development, and the Beatitudes and other sayings set forth the character it requires. But, on the other hand, its full realization belongs to

¹ *αὐτόν.*

² Add *τῷ*.

³ Omit this clause.

treasure in heaven, and come, follow me. But his face ²² fell at that saying, and he went away in distress; for he was a man of large possessions. And Jesus looked round and says ²³ to his disciples, How difficult it is for those who have riches to enter into the Kingdom of God! But the disciples wondered ²⁴ at his words. And at this Jesus says to them again, Children, how difficult it is to enter into the Kingdom of God! It is ²⁵ easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God! And they ²⁶ were still more taken aback, and said to each other,¹ Who then can be saved? Jesus looking upon them says, With ²⁷ men it is impossible but not with God; for with God all things are possible. Peter began to say to him, See we have ²⁸ left all and have followed you. Jesus said, Indeed I tell you, ²⁹ there is no one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother

the future and is spoken of in prediction. When the Kingdom comes to be fully instituted Jesus says here it will be found that almost insuperable obstacles attend the admission of rich men to it. This of course is founded on present observation; what keeps a man from joining the community Jesus is forming in anticipation of the Kingdom will keep him from entering the Kingdom itself where God is to be served with entire devotion. Thus Jesus recognizes here that the rich as little as the wise and prudent are to be expected to join his movement. We have not hitherto met in Mark with the teaching which makes poverty a condition of belonging to the Messianic community (cf. James ii. 5, Luke xii. 33, and *passim*).¹ But the early history of the Church leads us to expect to find in the Master's own teaching some such strain of thought.

26. The ordinary presupposition of the time was that it was easier for a rich man than for a poor man to be saved. The assertion that a rich man could hardly be saved at all was almost revolutionary. What will the Kingdom be, the disciples ask, if the notables and the rich people are not there? Who will be there? And if it is so hard for a rich man to be saved

who can devote his life to the business, how can the poor man who can only snatch brief intervals for his religion from his life of toil hope to be saved at all? Is it not making salvation hopeless altogether to make it out to be so hard?

And Jesus admits that the work of salvation is hard, though not just in the sense they mean. With men, he says, with men as they are, taking human views of things and relying only on human forces, it cannot be done at all. But it is not impossible for all that. God, who is all love and all power, can do everything, and can even bring to pass in man the change that is required. By faith it is understood, the power of God may be brought to bear on human lives. All things are possible to him who believes (ix. 23) and to prayer the door is opened.

28. The **disciples** acted differently from this rich man, and Peter reminds the Master of the **sacrifices** they have made for him, suggesting, though Mark does not say so, that these sacrifices ought to be counted in their favour. Jesus does not repel the claim. In Matthew (xix. 28) and in Luke (xxii. 29) the Twelve receive the promise that when the Messianic Kingdom is established they shall sit on

¹ See on this Campbell, *Ebionitism and Demonology in St Luke's Gospel*.

¹ to him.

οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφὸς ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα¹ ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἄγρους ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἔνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,
 30 ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ, οἰκίας
 καὶ ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὰς καὶ μητέρας καὶ τέκνα καὶ ἄγρους μετὰ
 31 διωγμῶν² καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰώνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. πολλοὶ δὲ
 ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ οἱ³ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι.

Renewed prediction of the Passion, x. 32-34.

32 Ἡσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ἦν
 προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο, οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες
 ἐφοβοῦντο.⁴ καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δύδεκα ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς
 33 λέγειν τά μέλλοντα αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν, ὅτι Ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν
 εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ νιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται τοῖς

twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Such a representation was less fitted for Gentile readers, and Mark omits it. Instead, he gives, at greater length than the parallels, the general assurance that whoever has made sacrifices on account of Jesus and the Gospel will be repaid for them. Whatever they have left behind from love to him or devotion to the cause (the promise ‘on account of the Gospel’ is apostolic; Jesus says ‘on account of my name,’ or ‘on account of the Kingdom’) they will find again; and here he is not speaking of the treasure in heaven but of what is to take place “in this present time.” The expressions evidently refer to the new connection and resources opened up to the Christian in the fellowship of the faithful. As Jesus himself felt his family at Nazaret replaced to him by the wider family of all those who did the will of God, so to his followers all Christians are brothers, all houses open, all possessions common. Along with these new joys griefs are also mingled, for the follower

of Jesus has always his cross to bear, his cup to drink; and persecution must be expected to continue. So much for the present life, and in the coming Age, when the catastrophe that is coming upon the world has taken place, and the new world has begun, they will have eternal life, i.e. all the delights and blessings longed for by God’s people.¹

31. The words concluding the speech are in their right place at the end of the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Matthew xx. 16), but Matthew gives them also in the position in which Mark has them here. They are directed against the Jewish view of man’s service of God as done for reward and capable of being set down in debtor and creditor accounts; and they declare that no exact statement is possible of what men have to expect from God; the issue is likely to confound all calculations. As Peter has suggested that the disciples should be rewarded for the sacrifices they have made, the verse is appropriate here also. It applies first of all, in Mark

¹ In the Western reading given below this detailed promise of equivalents in this life for what has been given up does not appear. The general promise of abundant compensation in this life remains, but the following details

refer not to the reward but to the antecedent sacrifice. He who has left these things with persecutions will receive in the coming Age the blessing which includes all others—eternal life.

² Οὐκαὶ . . . διωγμῶν.

² Om. οἰκίας . . . διωγμῶν. Ορ, δε ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν καὶ ἀδελφὰς καὶ ἀδελφὸς καὶ μητέρα καὶ τέκνα καὶ ἄγρος μετὰ διωγμοῦ ἐν τῷ αἰώνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον λήμψεται.

³ Om. οἱ.

⁴ Omit οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο.

or father¹ or children or lands for my sake and the Gospel's, but he shall receive a hundred times as much now in this present time, houses and brothers and sisters and mothers and children and lands, with persecutions,² and in the coming Age life eternal. But many who are first shall be last, and the last first.

[Matthew xx. 17-19; Luke xviii. 31-34]

And they were on the road going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going in front of them, and they were in amazement; and those who were following him were afraid.³ And again he took the Twelve beside him and began to tell them what was about to happen to him as follows; See, we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man will be delivered

at least, to the Twelve, and to the question of precedence which had arisen among them (ix. 33 *sq.*). Not the most forward claimant (in this passage it is Peter) will be best off in the end.

In Luke a man's wife is mentioned after his house, in the list of what it is hard to leave. In Mark the old text has this feature. (Cod. Ψ at Mount Athos has this in addition to the codd. mentioned by Swete).

32. In ver. 1 we were told of Jesus' travelling from Galilee to Judaea and Peraea. Exact details of the journey are wanting, but the interval is filled up with the various meetings with the Pharisees, the children, and the rich young man, and we now see Jesus actually on the road. He must have reached Jericho, which he passed on his way to Jerusalem, from the east, *i.e.* from Peraea; and thus Mark's narrative allows of the stay mentioned in John xi. 54, at a place on the edge of the wilderness.

Mark gives a vivid sketch of the party as it advanced on this journey. Jesus goes in front (Luke xix. 28?) a lonely figure, led onwards by a purpose which no one fully understands

or shares; the Twelve follow, amazed at what he is doing, for they now realize that he is actually bound for Jerusalem, and they begin to see what that must mean for him. In addition to these there is (except in the Western variant, which omits this) an additional party further in the rear, who are said to be following him. These we may recognize again at xi. 9 and xv. 41. These, we are told, were afraid; they knew it was no ordinary band of pilgrims for the festival to which they were attaching themselves, and standing further from the Master than the Twelve did, could see even more clearly the danger of his enterprise.

32. And now again he takes the Twelve apart and addresses himself to them with that new teaching which made so little impression on them. The word 'began' is not to be taken literally, as if in the tradition here drawn from this teaching had not occurred before; all that is meant is that he deliberately took up this subject and addressed them on it. See notes on the earlier occurrences of the predictions (viii. 31, ix. 31).

33. These predictions are more detailed than those of viii. 31, ix. 31, and

¹ A.V. or father or mother or wife.

² Omit houses . . . persecutions. Another reading: present time; but he who has left house and sisters and brothers and mother and children and lands with persecution shall receive in the coming Age life eternal.

³ Omit this clause.

ἀρχιερέων καὶ τοῖς γραμματεῦσιν καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ
 34 καὶ παραδόσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ ἐμπαιξουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ
 ἐμπτύσουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν,
 καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται.

The petition of the sons of Zebedee, x. 35-40.

35 Καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ νεῖοι Ζεβεδαίου λέγοντες αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἵνα δὲ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε
 36 ποιήσῃς ἡμῖν. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τί θέλετε ποιῆσαι ὑμῖν; οἱ δὲ
 37 εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Δὸς ἡμῶν ἵνα εἰς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἰς ἕξ ἀριστερῶν
 38 καθίσωμεν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Οὐκ οἴδατε
 39 τί αἰτεῖσθε. δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον δὲ ἐγὼ πίνω, ἢ τὸ βάπτισμα
 40 δὲ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Δυνάμεθα.
 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τὸ ποτήριον δὲ ἐγὼ πίνω πίεσθε, καὶ τὸ
 βάπτισμα δὲ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆσθε· τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ
 δεξιῶν μου η̄ ἐξ εἰνωνύμων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ’ οἷς ἡτοίμασται.

contain a complete enumeration of the principal incidents of the Passion as afterwards narrated. The events foretold are more directly imminent, as the party are now clearly on the road to Jerusalem, and they are all catalogued in due order—the betrayal by Judas, the trial before the Sanhedrin, the handing over to Pilate, the scourging, the mocking (though the scourging precedes the mocking in chap. xv.), and the death. As before, we judge that the evangelical tradition made these predictions more detailed and precise than they can have been when Jesus uttered them.¹ He no doubt saw generally what fate awaited him in Jerusalem; the expectation breathes in all his language at this time, but the disciples were not prepared for his death, as they must have been if this instruction was historical, nor for his Resurrection. Again, Mark places the Resurrection not on the third day as Matthew and Luke, but ‘after three days,’ a not very determinate period (cf. Luke xiii. 32).

Luke states very plainly here that the disciples did not understand this speech of Jesus; ‘it was hid from them.’

35. The old dispute among the disciples “which is the greatest” (ix. 34), here breaks out in another form in connec-

tion with a definite question of precedence in the Kingdom. While the Synoptic tradition in its present form represents Jesus as occupied at this time mainly with the thought of his impending Passion, it still allows us to see that another kind of prospect also had a share in his mind, that which it was more natural for a Jewish Messiah to cherish (*vide supra*, pp. 170, 194). Mark scarcely gives enough of the discourses at this period to account for this petition of James and John; but in Matth. xix. 28 we have the promise to the disciples of twelve thrones from which they are to judge the twelve tribes, and the banquet with which the Kingdom would open is spoken of in Mark xiv. 25, and appears in too many of the parables and other sayings not to be regarded as a genuine part of the Lord’s utterances. What is in the mind of James and John is a banquet or great court function in which the Messiah is the principal figure, and his highest ministers sit next to him. For these seats the “sons of thunder” are already intriguing. In Matthew it is their mother who makes the request for them, and this makes the inconsistency between this section of the narrative and the last somewhat less painful, but the rebuke of Jesus is not addressed to their mother but to themselves.

¹ Perhaps also the transmission of the text.

D omits here the scourging and the killing.

up to the high-priests and the Scribes, and they will condemn him to death and will deliver him up to the Gentiles, and ³⁴ they will mock him and spit upon him and scourge him and kill him, and after three days he will rise again.

[Matthew xx. 20-23; cp. Luke xii. 49, 50.]

And there come to him James and John the sons of Zebedee, ³⁵ saying to him, Master, we have a boon to ask of you, will you grant it? And he said to them, What is the boon you ask? ³⁶ And they said to him, Grant to us that we may sit, one on ³⁷ your right hand and the other on your left, in your glory. But Jesus said to them, You do not know what you are asking. ³⁸ Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptized with the baptism with which I am to be baptized? And they said to him, We are able. And Jesus said to them, ³⁹ The cup that I drink you shall drink, and the baptism with which I am baptized, you shall be baptized with it; but to sit ⁴⁰ on my right hand or on my left is not mine to give, but is for those for whom it is prepared.

38. Those who are most closely identified with him in his glory must be those who have adhered to him most faithfully in the critical stages of his fortunes. Those who desert him in his sufferings can scarcely come forward to sit down beside him when he is enthroned. This idea, so frequently met with in the Epistles (Rom. vi. 4 sq.; 2 Tim. ii. 12, 13) has already been met with in Mark (viii. 34, 35). The request of the two disciples therefore implies an undertaking that they will share their Master's fortunes, however painful. Are they strong enough to do so? The question is put to them in two figures.¹ The Master has a cup of suffering to drink (for the metaphor see Isa. li. 17, Jer. xl ix. 12, Mark xiv. 36). And he has an immersion to go through (Ps. cxlii. 7, lxix. 2, 3, 15, cxxiv. 4 sq.). Can they stand at his side in all those afflictions which are coming upon him? That is the fellowship he has to offer them. This pathetic

question shows more accurately than the set predictions the anticipations Jesus now had in his mind. The questions are only intelligible if he did not clearly realize the details of his impending sufferings.

The two disciples declare at once that they are able to stand at his side in all that awaits him. In the case of one of them at least the promise was ultimately redeemed (Acts xii. 1 sq.), and if we knew nothing of the later life of the other Zebedai, this passage would certainly suggest that he also became a martyr at the hands of his own countrymen.² On the present occasion, however, they evidently do not realize what they are undertaking, but only express their feelings of loyalty and devotion, as the disciples do almost to the end (xiv. 31). When the blow falls at last they are quite surprised, and scatter like sheep. Jesus does not question the statement of the two, but fully assumes that they

¹ Meyer, *Jesu Muttersprache* (p. 113) suggests that in the Aramaic the second metaphor may have been a different one, viz., are you able to dip into the same dish with me, thus adding a metaphor of eating to that of drinking.

² In the chronicle of George Hamartolos, a writer of the ninth century, it is stated by one MS. that John was put to death by the Jews. The other MSS. of the same work say that his end was peaceful (*εν εἰρήνῃ ἀφεντάσθη*).

Address to the Twelve about serving and being served, x. 41-45.

- 41 Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν περὶ Ἰακώβου καὶ
 42 Ἰωάννου· καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς,
 Οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἔθνων κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν,
 43 καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. οὐχ οὕτως δέ
 ἐστιν¹ ἐν ὑμῖν ἀλλ' ὡς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν, ἔσται²
 44 ὑμῶν διάκονος, καὶ ὡς ἂν θέλῃ ὑμῶν γενέσθαι πρώτος, ἔσται
 45 πάντων δούλος. καὶ γὰρ ὁ νιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἥλθεν διακονηθῆναι
 ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι, καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

will be faithful to him, and that they will have to endure in consequence a share of his sufferings. Yet even though they satisfy the conditions on which alone they can be with him in his glory he cannot grant the boon they ask. There are no doubt such seats as they speak of, and a choice must be made of those who are to occupy them. But the choice does not belong to him. That is a detail of the future, which like much else about it he leaves in higher hands. It is all arranged already, he indicates; all about the Messiah is already fixed, and this also.

41. See notes on ix. 35. The lesson given there is here enforced and amplified. The striving to be first, and the anger with which those making such attempts are regarded by the rest show that the disciples generally have quite a wrong view of what constitutes greatness in the Kingdom they all belong to. So the lesson is repeated to these ambitious men which was taught before by setting up a child as a proper object of interest. It is now taught by contrast with the principle which obtains in the world's kingdoms, a principle which the Kingdom of God cannot recognize. As Daniel (chap. vii.) speaks of the empire of the world under the figure of beasts, indicating that their tyrannical and cruel rule is to be superseded by that of a man (ver. 13, 14), humane and reasonable, so Jesus describes the principle of such government as actually exists in heathen lands, and shows that his followers can have nothing to do with it. Those who to all outward appearance rule over the nations (their rule is not intrinsic in its quality) use

their power selfishly and arbitrarily, not subordinating their own interests to those of their subjects but on the contrary regarding their subjects as mere instruments for their own purposes. The rule which must prevail and be the object of desire among Christ's followers, operates in quite a different way. He who forgets himself and makes it his first thought to do what he can to promote the welfare of his fellows, he is great in the Kingdom. It is doing good, it is being useful, that confers distinction there. This is put in the extreme and almost paradoxical form that he who wants to be great among the guests at table will act not as a guest but as the attendant on the guests (that the δάκονος here has to do with waiting at table, appears from Luke xxii. 24-27, an earlier form of the present section), and that he who wishes to be first in a household will assume the guise of its humblest member, its bondservant.

45. Jesus not merely teaches the lesson that the true way to rule men is to help them, and that therefore one should not think of ruling but only of helping; he lives and acts it, and is himself its great example. Though he regards himself as the Messiah, the popular figure of that personage, or the Son of Man, as he here calls himself, does not suit his ideas. He who communicates to the world God's ultimate intentions must, he has come to see, be a very different figure from that victorious apparition descending from the skies to sit upon a throne for the judgment of the nations. The Messiah must be a servant before he can be a ruler.¹ Among his own disciples he resembles rather the atten-

¹The figure of the Ebed Jahwe in Deutero-Isaiah, the servant who has so much to bear

before he appears in his true character and dignity, is no doubt here before his mind.

[Matthew xx. 24-28; Luke xxii. 24-27.]

And when the ten heard of it they began to be indignant ⁴¹ at James and John. And Jesus called them to him and says ⁴² to them, You know that those who count as rulers over the nations lord it over them, and their great men tyrannize over them. But that is not so¹ among you, but whoever ⁴³ wants to be great among you shall be your attendant, and ⁴⁴ whoever wants to be first among you shall be your bond-servant. For the Son of Man too came not to be attended ⁴⁵ on but to attend on others and to give his life a ransom for many.

dant than the house-father or the guest (Luke xxii. 27); it is from this attitude that he looks out on the world. And now he has come to see that the death to which he has learned of late to look forward (viii. 31, ix. 31) is not only a divine ordinance to which he must bow, but that it belongs to the character he has assumed. He is not, in the meantime at least, a conquering, but a suffering and serving Messiah. Among the services he is to render to men stands as the greatest and the last, his death; and since he is called to pass through this trial for them, he looks on his death as the last service of a career which was all service.

The words before us contain, however, something more than this. In the last clause we see that Jesus not only accepts death as a thing in keeping with the character of a suffering Messiah, but that he has begun to see in what way his death may be a benefit to others. At first it was a divine ordinance to be submitted to, then it is a part of the rôle of the suffering Servant; now he sees it to be an act which may have in itself some beneficent quality. Here and in the words of the Last Supper we find Jesus expressing views as to the purpose which his death might be expected to fulfil.

There are three circles of ideas with any of which the words "ransom for many" may possibly be connected.

(1) A ransom is the purchase-money given to obtain the freedom of a slave; and as he has spoken of slaves, Jesus might go on to speak of the ransom from

slavery. But no ransom is needed for the slave of whom he has been speaking, for him who acts the slave though really free. If the word ransom is to be taken in this sense, it is impossible to determine from what the many are to be ransomed, or to whom the price is paid; the figure has to be left quite vague, and all these details kept away from it.

(2) Jewish thought is acquainted with the idea that merit may be transferred from one person to another; as Abraham's descendants benefit by his godliness, so by signal sufferings, and especially by the death of saints, guilt may be removed; and where such beliefs obtained the death of the Messiah might well be regarded as furnishing an occasion for forgiveness by which many might receive advantage. See Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, par. 63. In viii. 37 we read that no one could give any equivalent (*ἀνταλλαγμα*) for his soul. The death of the Messiah, however, might furnish such an equivalent. This idea is perhaps too developed to be ascribed to Jesus himself, though it probably entered into Pauline doctrine.

(3) The death of the animals in sacrifice, while not regarded in early Jewish practice as propitiatory, came in later centuries, and especially after the exile, to bear that complexion. While it is difficult to determine how the Jews of Jesus' time believed the sacrifices to operate, in the Pauline Epistles we find the death of Christ viewed as an atoning sacrifice by which men are redeemed from the curse of the law, made righteous, and

¹ to be so.

Cure of Bartimaeus, x. 46-52.

46 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱερειχό· καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἱερειχῷ
 καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄχλου ἵκανοῦ, ὁ νίδιος Τιμαίον Βαρτί·
 47 μαιος, τυφλὸς προσαίτης, ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν· καὶ ἀκούσας
 ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνός ἐστιν, ἥρξατο κράξειν καὶ λέγειν, Υἱὲ Δανείδ
 48 Ἰησοῦν, ἐλέησόν με. καὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ πολλοὶ ἵνα σωπήσῃ· ὁ δὲ
 49 πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἔκραζεν, Υἱὲ Δανείδ, ἐλέησόν με. καὶ στὰς ὁ
 50 Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Φωνήσατε αὐτόν. καὶ φωνοῦσι τὸν τυφλὸν λέγοντες
 αὐτῷ, Θάρσει, ἔγειρε, φωνεῖ σε. ὁ δὲ ἀποβαλὼν τὸ ἴματιον αὐτοῦ
 51 ἀναπτήσας ἥλθει πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς

have their sins removed (Rom. iii. 24 sq., Gal. iii. 13, 2 Cor. v. 21, etc.). If our passage is interpreted in the Pauline sense it furnishes a strong indication of Pauline influence on this Gospel; the words do not occur in Luke, and Matthew is closely following Mark in this chapter.

It may be that the study of Aramaic will yet throw light on this expression. It has not yet done so, however, and the meaning of Jesus must be inferred rather than directly apprehended. Both here and in the words used at the Supper (xiv. 24), we hear of 'many' who are to profit by his death. Now, considering the ideas on which he was dwelling at this time, the profit he speaks of as accruing to many from his death must have consisted in their being in the Kingdom which was to be open to believers afterwards, and not excluded from it and left outside. Thus we are led to the belief on his part that his death would have the result of bringing into the Kingdom many who might otherwise have been left outside it. In what way precisely he expected this to come about, we cannot determine. His followers as yet were few; he had by no means succeeded in gathering Jerusalem into the fold. But if he died, a change might take place in this particular. The death of the Messiah must have a profound influence on the chosen people. It must arrest the national conscience and bring about a general movement, such as his preaching had failed to produce, towards the Kingdom. In this way he might regard his death as a means of blessing to "many," his life as a ransom "for many," his blood as shed "for many." As much as this seems plain. If Jesus

expected, as can easily be shown that he did, that the Kingdom would be visibly erected immediately after he died, and if it was to be erected, as he must have believed it would, on a scale worthy of God and of the chosen people, with multitudes in it who showed no sign as yet of turning towards it, then his death must have seemed to him to be the means by which these multitudes were to be saved. We enter at this stage at least on more speculative ground if we say that he regarded his death as having virtue because substitutionary or sacrificial. The words of our passage here are vague, and we ought not to force from them a more precise meaning than they naturally yield. They certainly convey the assurance that Jesus became reconciled to the prospect of death when he saw he was to die for the benefit of others.

x. 46—xii. 44. JESUS AT JERUSALEM.

46. We now come to the first public and unrebuked recognition of Jesus in the character of Messiah. The disciples have recognized him in that character, but are forbidden to speak of it (viii. 30), and the mood in which the party has been advancing towards Jerusalem has been far from triumphant (x. 32). Now all at once the procession becomes jubilant, not to lose that temper till Jerusalem is reached. And this is due to the courage and pertinacity of a blind man, who hails Jesus with an acclamation afterwards repeated at the triumphal Entry into Jerusalem. The act of power in the case of this blind man is the only cure recorded outside of Galilee, and the incident which forms a prelude to the Entry has a firm

[Matthew xx. 29-34; also ix. 27-31; Luke xviii. 35-43.]

And they come to Jericho. And as he was leaving Jericho, 46 he and his disciples and a considerable multitude, Bartimaeus the son of Timaeus, a blind beggar, was sitting at the roadside. And hearing that it is Jesus of Nazareth, he began to 47 cry out and to say, Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me. And many called out to him to keep silence; but he cried all 48 the louder, Son of David, have mercy on me. And Jesus stood 49 still and said, Call him. And they call the blind man, saying to him, Take courage, get up, he is calling you. And he 50 threw off his cloak and leapt up and came to Jesus. And 51 Jesus answered him and said, What do you wish me to do

place in the narrative. Bartimaeus¹ gives voice to what is in the minds of many others, and hails Jesus with a Messianic title. The title in question is one which Jesus, as we shall see, rather declined than accepted, and which in Mark's narrative only occurs in connection with the journey to Jerusalem and the last events there. (In Matthew it occurs several times at an earlier stage, ix. 27, xii. 23, xv. 22). We hear from various passages in the Gospels and elsewhere that the Messiah was expected to be a son of David; he was to restore the monarchy to Israel and to act as a conquering potentate and bring the rule of the heathen to an end. How far Jesus himself was from thinking of any such political Messiahship we have abundantly seen. When he speaks of himself as Messiah, he does not call himself Son of David, but Son of Man. But no sooner is it bruited about the country that he is going to Jerusalem to play the part of Messiah than this title is brought forth and applied to him.

While Jesus himself thought Davidic descent a very unimportant matter for the Messiah (xii. 35-37), his fellow-countrymen might be of a different opinion, and Dalman may be right in saying (*W.J.*, p. 262) that the title Son of David would not have been

applied to Jesus had he not been believed to be genealogically entitled to it. The genealogies of Joseph in Matthew and Luke are proofs of the same conviction. The earliest witness is Paul (Rom. i. 3), and an echo of the later controversy is heard in John vii. 42.

48. The man is only saying what many think, but to have it shouted out by a blind beggar is to have the proclamation made public property before its proper time. Hence the attempts to silence him. But the opposition only excites the blind man and makes him shout out the louder, while his chance lasts (for Jesus will soon be gone), what he knows to be the common sentiment. He wants help, which he is certain Jesus can give him, and for him it is now or never. The only way to bring the man to silence, Jesus sees, is to call him up and let him have his say. If anything is to be done for him he is in the right state of mind to receive the benefit; for his cry shows how sure he is that he is near to a power which is able to do a great deal for him, and how ready therefore to believe that help has come to him; and those present do nothing on their part to check his faith.

50. Notice the energy and confidence of the petitioner, who is convinced that

¹ Dr. Nestle, *Marginalien und Materialien*, p. 83 *sqq.*, shows that there is a good deal of reduplication in Mark's statement of the name. Timaeus is the Greek form from an Aramaic root which means blind. His proper name Bartimaeus is itself equivalent to the description given of him which is then repeated in

Greek. 'Blind' may have been the name of his family, and he had then a double claim to it. Matthew and Luke avoid these perplexities by not giving the name at all. Mark therefore introduces the man as "son of Blind, son of Blind, blind beggar."

εἶπεν, Τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω; ὁ δε τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ῥαββουνί, ἵνα
52 ἀναβλέψω. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Υπάγε, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν
σε. καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέβλεψεν, καὶ ἤκολούθει αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.

The triumphal Entry, xi. 1-11.

1 Καὶ ὅτε ἐγγίξουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ¹ Βηθανίαν
πρὸς τὸ ὅρος τῶν² Ἐλαιῶν, ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ,
2 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, 'Υπάγετε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι ὑμῶν,
καὶ εὐθὺς εἰσπορεύμενοι εἰς αὐτὴν εὐρήστε πῶλον δεδεμένον, ἐφ'
δὲν οὐδὲις οὕπω ἀνθρώπων ἔκαθισεν λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ φέρετε.
3 καὶ ἔαν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ, Τί ποιεῖτε τοῦτο; εἴπατε, 'Ο κύριος αὐτοῦ
4 χρείαν ἔχει, καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει³ πάλιν ὥδε. καὶ ἀπῆλθον
καὶ εὑρον⁴ πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς⁵ θύραν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου,

this is a great opportunity, and, accustomed to ask for small things now asks a great thing. On coming into close contact with Jesus he does not repeat the title 'Son of David,' seeing no doubt that Jesus does not desire it, but uses the ordinary address to a teacher, Rabbouni, My great one, My Master.

52. The following cure is not like others reported in this Gospel, as nothing is said of the methods employed nor of the stages of the recovery. On "thy faith hath saved thee," see on v. 34. The word *ἀναβλέπειν*, recover sight (so here, though not in viii. 24), implies that the man had had his sight before; in John ix. 11 it is used loosely of the cure of one blind from his birth.

That Bartimaeus followed Jesus on the road, does not imply that he became a disciple, but only that he went after Jesus on his journey, which is resumed after the brief interruption. He had been stationary beside the road before, now he walked along it, able to do what others were doing.

Matthew has had a story (ix. 27-31), evidently based on the same tradition as this one, but with two blind men who hail Jesus as Son of David. He has the story here again, with two blind men who hail Jesus in the same words. Luke has one patient, like

Mark. Neither Matthew nor Luke mentions the blind man's name.

x. i. In this narrative we find Jesus entering Jerusalem in such a way as to draw attention to himself as the head of a band of followers. The Entry is meant to be remarked, and Jesus himself adopts certain measures for that end, which derive great additional emphasis from the behaviour of the crowd escorting him. We are prepared to hear that he arrived at Jerusalem not unattended, and that the fear and anxiety with which his journey was at first regarded has to some extent disappeared. The indications that his journey is connected with the approaching Passover are very slight. How far he has come on the day of the Entry we do not learn; ver. 11 shews it must have been in the afternoon that he left Bethany. We know that he had friends there, and there is nothing in Mark's story to prevent the supposition that he had been in communication with them before his arrival. If we were at liberty to omit the name of Bethphage from this verse, as some copies at least did in the time of Origen, the geography of the passage would be much clearer. Bethphage, which alone Matthew has, is perhaps more suited to our story, as that place appears to have lain in view of Jerusalem. Luke has

¹ Om. Βηθφαγὴ καὶ.

⁴ Ti. adds τὸν.

² Om. τῶν.

⁵ Ti. adds τὴν.

³ T.R. ἀποστελλεῖ.

for you? And the blind man said to him, Rabbouni, let me recover my sight. And Jesus said to him, Go your way, ⁵² your faith has saved you. And immediately he received his sight and followed him on the road.

[Matthew xxi. 1-11; Luke xi. 28-38.]

And when they come near Jerusalem to Bethphage and¹ Bethany, at the Mount of Olives,² he sends two of his disciples and says to them, Go into the village there opposite you, and as soon as you enter it you will find a foal tied up, on which no man ever sat; unfasten it and bring it here. And if any one says to you, Why are you doing that? say, Our Master needs him, and he is to send him back here directly. And they went and found a foal fastened at a door outside on the street, and

Bethany alone, and this is recommended by the fact of Jesus' connection with that place. Mark must be held to give both names,¹ and so his narrative leaves us in doubt as to the spot where Jesus stood when he issued this order to his disciples; we can scarcely even tell to which of the villages he sent them. The following occurrences are of a very homely nature, but are remembered in great detail by the reporter whom Mark follows. The disciples sent to the village (about two miles from Jerusalem, John xi. 18) are to find there a young ass or horse, for the word may stand for either, unused till now and therefore fit for a solemn use. They are to find the creature in a certain situation and are told they have nothing to do but to unfasten it and bring it; they will not be called on to argue about the matter or to make any bargain; if they are challenged at all they have only to say that their Master² requires it but only for a short time; he will send it back directly.

This story is much altered in the parallels. Both Matthew and Luke

get rid of Jesus' assurance that the colt will be at once sent back, Luke by simply omitting the words, Matthew by changing them into a prediction that the owner instead of preventing them from taking the animal will at once send it. Matthew moreover makes two animals out of Mark's one, to meet the words of the prophecy from Zechariah ix. 9, which speaks in poetic parallelism of two, though the prophet was thinking of one only. Has the story as Mark gives it already passed through some development? We may surmise that the words "on which never man sat," belong to the evangelist rather than the Lord. With this deduction, however, we have a very simple and likely narrative. Weiss considers that Jesus did not take the initiative in arranging his triumphal Entry, but yielded to the suggestion of his friends. Even if it was so, he might bid them fetch a horse or ass out of the village and tell them that everything would yield to their enthusiasm. Against the theory of pre-arrangement there is the circumstance that the animal had still

¹ Dr. Nestle cuts this knot (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1896, p. 324 note) by pointing out that Bethphage means according to the Syrian lexicographers 'bitium,' the meeting of two roads, and is etymologically the same as ἀμφόδος ver. 4. Though it was regarded by the MSS. and versions as a proper name, it may have been descriptive in our Lord's time.

There are many places called 'Crossgates' in Scotland. But there may have been a village at the spot. Dalman, *W.J.*, p. 55, does not accept this derivation.

² ὁ Κύρος is the natural term by which they would designate Jesus; the later exalted meaning need not be thought of here.

¹ Some authorities omit *Bethphage and*.

² *Mount Elaion*, Acts i. 12; see Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, 36-40.

5 καὶ λύουσιν αὐτόν. καὶ τινες τῶν ἐκεῖ ἑστηκότων ἔλεγον αὐτοῖς,
 6 Τί ποιεῖτε λύοντες τὸν πῶλον; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ
 7 Ἰησοῦς· καὶ ἀφῆκαν αὐτόν. καὶ φέρουσιν τὸν πῶλον πρὸς τὸν
 Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἐπιβάλλουσιν αὐτῷ τὰ ἴματα αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐκάθισεν
 8 ἐπ' αὐτόν. καὶ πολλοὶ τὰ ἴματα αὐτῶν ἑστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν,
 9 ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδας, κόψαντες ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν. καὶ οἱ προάγοντες
 καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἔκραζον,

‘Ωσαννά·

εὐλογημένος ὁ ἔρχομενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου·

10 εὐλογημένη ἡ ἔρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δανείδ·
 ὕσταννά ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.

11 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς τὸ ἱερόν· καὶ περιβλεψάμενος
 πάντα, ὡψὲ ἥδη οὖσης τῆς ᾧρας, ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν μετὰ τῶν
 δώδεκα.

to be prepared for riding after the
 disciples fetched it.

4. No trouble is taken to make what the disciples found and heard correspond exactly to what Jesus had said. If the text adopted is correct, it is not said that they found the foal of which Jesus had spoken, but only that they found a foal. It is not said that the owners challenged them, but that out of a number of people standing there some challenged them. We might think we were in a different story from that of ver. 1-3, a story in which the disciples went without any particular instructions for an animal for Jesus to ride on, and found only a foal. But the instructions as Mark gives them could scarcely be invented, and the fact seems to be (as Weiss states it) that we have here a vivid reproduction of what met the eyes and ears of the disciples on this errand. They did not require to go into a stable for what they sought, nor even into the courtyard of a farm, but found an animal that would serve standing outside on the street¹ as if left there for some one to fetch. A knot of persons was standing near as if to see something they expected to happen. The disciples are making off with the animal when some of those bystanders address them, but these at once give way on hearing the words Jesus had put in the mouths of his messengers.

¹ So Blaß on Acts xix. 28, where the word must have this meaning. Nestle, in the discussion quoted above, gives the meaning ‘bivium,’ which would do here. If his equation

Luke does not give the rustic details as to the finding of the animal. Matthew, after reciting the prophecy which required two animals, simply says the disciples did as Jesus commanded them.

7. We now hear how others took up what Jesus himself began. The disciples go beyond their instructions; they make good the want of trappings on the animal by throwing off their cloaks and converting them into a saddle and saddle-cloths; then Jesus mounts, and the example of the enthusiastic disciples at once spreads to others of the company. The procession is to be a triumph, and takes the form spontaneously of a rustic festival; others also throw off their cloaks to devote them to the hero of the hour, and as no more saddle-cloths are wanted spread them on the ground, that the rider's path may be carpeted by their devotion. Others run into the fields and cut down leafy branches or green vegetable fronds, and throw them down for the animal to walk on. And the enthusiasm thus shown in act breaks forth also in word and song. Jesus is now hailed as the Coming One, the messenger long looked for but now come, who is to carry out God's purposes with Israel. He is thus hailed, not only by a beggar whose mouth is almost closed by timid bystanders, but by a full-voiced escort, whose cries as

Bethphage=ἀμφόδος=‘bivium’ is accepted, the animal was found at the cross-roads, named already in ver. 1.

they unfasten it. And some of those who were standing there 5 said to them, What are you doing, unfastening the foal? And 6 they said to them just what Jesus told them to say, and they let them do it. And they bring the foal to Jesus, and put 7 their cloaks on it and he sat on it. And many spread their 8 cloaks on the road, and others green litter which they had cut from the fields. And those in front and those who followed 9 cried,

Hosanna!

Blessed be he that comes in the name of the Lord!

Blessed be the Kingdom, that is coming, of our Father David!

Hosanna in the highest!

10

And he entered Jerusalem and went into the Temple, and after 11 looking round at everything, as it was already late in the day, he went out to Bethany with the Twelve.

they descend the slope of the Mount of Olives are heard far and wide, perhaps even in the capital itself. The words they use are not those of one of the Pilgrim Psalms, with which the faithful bound for the festivals were accustomed to greet Jerusalem, but are from the 118th Psalm, and describe how a Jewish king or hero (Cheyne thinks of Judas Maccabaeus) after long and even doubtful conflict with his enemies at last finds the gates open before him through which he is to enter for a solemn act of thanksgiving in the Temple. After all dangers and reverses God's salvation is now enjoyed fully. (This is the meaning of Hosanna!). God is to "help now": for long he has not helped. In the Psalm those forming the procession outside are answered by those within. The King is greeted by the congregation as he comes to the capital and to the Temple, comes in the name of the Lord to praise God for the success he has had in His service and to rule henceforth by His authority. To the words of the Psalm the triumphing crowd adds another phrase of exultation, Blessed be the Kingdom, that is coming, of our Father David! These words explain their view of the occa-

sion. The Kingdom of which Jesus is the Messiah is in their eyes the Jewish monarchy now to be restored as at the time of its early splendour, a monarchy which will lower the pride of the Gentiles and restore Israel to the position of ascendancy. How far this was from being Jesus' own view of his Messiahship we have already seen and shall yet see.¹

Luke omits "Hosanna," and Matthew gives it in a much less original way, "Hosanna to the Son of David!" he says. Compare *Didache*, x. 6, "Hosanna to the God of David!"

11. The Messiah, as Jesus conceives the office, has to do not with the politics and wars of Israel, but with the religion. He goes, on arriving at Jerusalem, straight to the Temple. He does not, however, speak in the Temple on this occasion. He looks round, as if he were a stranger, and had first of all to inform himself as to what went on in the building and its courts.² This appears indeed to be Mark's view. We shall see directly what opinion Jesus formed of what he saw in the Temple; he does not now express it. The hour is late, and he reserves himself for another day. The Entry has

¹ Wellhausen, *Ist. u. jiid. Gesch.*, 3rd ed., p. 381, and Dalman, *W. J.*, p. 182, consider that Jesus' Entry cannot have been so markedly Messianic as this account would show. The Messianic proclamation is not referred to by his enemies in the encounters of the last days; and the story, as we have seen, possibly shows

traces of a simpler version afterwards worked up to a higher tone. Mark's view of the occurrence appears to me to be historical.

² The phrase, "looking round at everything," is not to be put down to Mark's colouring here, but describes an act called for by the circumstances. (See iii. 5, 34, x. 23).

The barren Fig-tree, xi. 12-14.

12 Καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον ἔξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Βηθανίας ἐπείνασεν.
 13 καὶ ᾧδὼν συκῆν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔχουσαν φύλλα, ἥλθεν εἰ ἄρα τι
 εὑρήσει ἐν αὐτῇ· καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐπ’ αὐτὴν οὐδὲν εὑρεν εἰ μὴ φύλλα· ὁ
 14 γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Μηκέτι εἰς
 τὸν αἰῶνα ἐκ σοῦ μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι. καὶ ἤκουον οἱ μαθηταὶ
 αὐτοῦ.

The cleansing of the Temple, xi. 15-17.

15 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἥρξατο
 ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ
 τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων
 16 τὰς περιστερὰς κατέστρεψεν, καὶ οὐκ ἦφιεν ἵνα τις διενέγκῃ σκεῦος
 17 διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ· καὶ ἐδίδασκεν καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Οὐ γέγραπται ὅτι
 ‘Ο οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν;
 ὑμεῖς δὲ πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπῆλαιον ληστῶν.

taken place, and the claim he has come to advance has been declared. He therefore retraces his steps to Bethany, where he has friends and is to find night quarters for himself and the Twelve.

12. If this narrative is to be interpreted literally as telling how Jesus dealt with a fig-tree near the road which disappointed his hopes of a morning meal, it becomes very difficult. Peter (ver. 21) says that his Master cursed the tree, and implies that the curse has made it wither; and this has perhaps been the general view of the occurrence. But surely if Jesus' words were anything more than an impatient ejaculation, interpreted by Peter much too seriously, he must have been thinking of some other subject when he uttered them. This individual fig-tree, later in producing fruit than the fig-trees of the happier climate of Galilee, was not worth so serious an address; it must have stood to Jesus' mind as the symbol of something else. Mark makes the excuse for the tree that it was not the season for figs. If Jesus was aware of this then it is the more plain that he was not concerned about food but only looking for an emblem. Hilgenfeld calls these words "Mark's awkward interpolation."

Luke does not give this incident, but

furnishes a Fig-tree parable (xiii. 6-9) which may help us. It stands in connection with a passage where Jesus is considering the dangers threatening the Jewish people (ver. 1-5); the tree in the parable evidently represents the Jewish State. It is planted in a favourable situation, but as it does not fulfil the just hopes of the owner it is marked for speedy removal. Now this view of the position of the Jewish State must have been formed at this time; the first impression made on Jesus by looking at Jerusalem and at the Temple must have confirmed if not indeed suggested it. The parable of the Husbandmen (Mark xii. 1 sq.) spoken a few days after has almost the same point as that of the Fig-tree. In this fig-tree, which has leaves but no fruit, Jesus sees therefore a symbol of Israel with his immense and gorgeous religious apparatus and his scanty yield of the true fruits of religion, humility and mercy. The words to the fig-tree might thus be spoken metaphorically to the nation of Israel and might indicate the doom which Jesus sees to be too surely impending over his nation. It is of no profit to God or to mankind, keeping up as it does an elaborate worship which does not serve to make men better or happier, and as with so much show it bears no fruit, it cannot justify its existence any longer in the

[Matthew xxi. 18-19.]

And the next day, after they had set out from Bethany, he ¹²
was hungry. And he saw at a distance a fig-tree in leaf, ¹³
and went to see if he could find anything on it. But when
he came to it he found nothing but leaves: for it was not
the time for figs. And at that he said to it, No man eat fruit ¹⁴
of you any more, for ever. And the disciples heard him.

[Matthew xxi. 12, 13; Luke xix. 45, 46.]

And they come to Jerusalem. And he went into the Temple, ¹⁵
and began to drive out those who were buying and those who
were selling in the Temple, and he overturned the tables of
the money-changers and the perches of the sellers of doves,
and he would not allow any one to carry a vessel through the ¹⁶
Temple; and he taught and said to them, Is it not written, ¹⁷

My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations?

But you have made it a den of robbers.

sight of God or man, and its days are numbered.

14. The disciples, we are told, heard the words Jesus spoke; they showed soon after that they had not understood them.

Matthew does not say the tree was cursed, but states that it withered up at once after Jesus' words. In Mark this is only observed the day after.

15. For an account of the **Temple-market** in the time of Christ, see Edersheim, *Life and Times*, etc., Book III., chap. v. If the profits of the market went to the family of Annas, the high-priest, it might well be unpopular, and the authorities might feel a difficulty in defending it, either by act or argument. The practical result was that the Court of the Gentiles was full of a kind of life most unbefitting the place, such life as the traveller sees and hears in an eastern bazaar.

With all this Jesus is deeply offended. To him it is the glory of the Temple that it offers the true religion which consists in direct intercourse of man's spirit with God, to all who will join in it. And part of the Temple is open to the Gentiles, meant for them, and called after them, yet how impossible is it for the pious Gentile to carry out there

the object of his journey to Jerusalem! Everything is arranged not for prayer, but for acts of outward sacrifice. The air is full of the chink of coin, the voices of bargainers, the rustling of the wings of victims. So little is the place held in awe that it is used as a thoroughfare even by those carrying burdens, whose heavy footsteps swell the din. This latter point is noticed by Mark alone. Josephus (*c. Ap.* ii. 8) tells us it was forbidden to use the Temple as a thoroughfare, but the rule does not appear to be observed at the time of our story.

Jesus had seen all this the day before; now he proceeds to action. What he did was no doubt much beyond the competence of any private individual. Not without authority could any one undertake it, and Jesus is afterwards asked for his authority. The regular course, no doubt, would have been to apply to the captain of the Temple, and failing him to the Sanhedrin, to get the abuse rectified. Any such procedure would have been entirely hopeless, and Jesus does not think of it. The enthusiasm of the crowds which acclaimed his entry is carrying him forward; he is a leader backed by popular feeling, from whom therefore bold action was to be expected. But

Effect of this act on the authorities, xi. 18, 19.

- 18 Καὶ ἥκουσαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, καὶ ἐξῆτον πῶς
αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ αὐτόν, πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ὄχλος
19 ἔξεπλήσσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. καὶ ὅταν ὀψὲ ἐγένετο,
ἔξεπορεύετο¹ ἔξω τῆς πόλεως.

Discourse on the Fig-tree, xi. 20-25.

- 20 Καὶ παραπορευόμενοι πρωῒ εἰδον τὴν συκῆν ἐξηραμμένην ἐκ
21 ῥιζῶν. καὶ ἀναμνησθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ, 'Ραββεί, ἵδε ἡ συκῆ
22 ἦν κατηράσω ἐξήρανται. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς,
23 Ἐχετε πίστιν θεοῦ. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἀν εἴπη τῷ ὅρᾳ
τούτῳ, 'Αρθητι καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ μὴ διακριθῇ ἐν

he was also conscious that he himself possessed sufficient authority to do in the meantime what is required—an authority not derived from any human source but from the spirit within him. He assumes a position of command, therefore, and proceeds to clear the Court of the Gentiles, by the strong hand and at once, of its ugly encumbrances.

17. Along with this act, which must have drawn all eyes towards him, and must have shown at once that he claimed a unique position, we are told that Jesus also taught; in xiv. 49 we hear of his having taught daily in the Temple up to the day of his arrest (cf. Luke xix. 47). The teaching spoken of here is of more limited scope; its point is expressed in the two verses quoted from the prophets Isa. lvi. 7, Jer. vii. 11.; the substance of the lesson is given above. It was about the nature of the true service of God and the place in that service of the Temple and its rites (cf. Matth. v. 23, 24; Mark vii. 10, 11).

The cleansing of the Temple is related by all four evangelists, but they place it differently. In Matthew and Luke, Jesus does this act at once on arrival at Jerusalem, on his first visit to the Temple. In Mark his first visit to the Temple is one of observation, and the cleansing takes place on the second day. The fourth Gospel, it is well known, places this act at the very beginning of Jesus' career. There, as in the Synoptists, the act is done at his first visit to Jerusalem after

beginning his ministry; but in the first three Gospels the first visit is also the last, while in John it is only the first of a series. The act of the cleansing is that of one quite certain of himself, confident of his position, and with his mind fully made up as to the existing religious system of his country. In the earlier tradition it is only by degrees, and only towards the close of his career that Jesus assumes this degree of authority.

18. The high-priests here are not mentioned because of their connection with the Temple. There was only one high-priest actively connected with the national religion, and the duty of maintaining order in the Temple did not rest on him but on the captain of the Temple. (Acts iv. 1, etc. See Schürer, section 24). The high-priests and Scribes of our passage are members of the ruling class whose influence is threatened by Jesus' proceedings, and of the Sanhedrin. (See under ver. 27). If Jesus demanded further reforms and was supported by the mass of the people, the power of the ruling classes might come to be seriously endangered. If a Messiah succeeded in establishing himself, he would supersede all existing officials, and might entirely set them aside. We cannot wonder, therefore, that the high-priests and Scribes aimed at Jesus' destruction. They were withheld, however, from proceeding at once to carry out their wishes by the fact of his popularity. His preaching had pro-

¹ ἔξεπορεύοντο.

[Matthew xxi. 14-17; Luke xix. 47, 48.]

And the high-priests and the Scribes heard of it, and they ¹⁸ looked for some way to destroy him; for they were afraid of him, for all the multitude was astonished at his teaching. And ¹⁹ when it was evening he went outside the city.

[Matthew xxi. 20-22; xvii. 20; Luke xvii. 6.]

And as they were passing in the morning, they saw the fig-tree withered from the roots. And Peter remembered about it ²⁰ and says to him, Master, look, the fig-tree which you cursed is withered. And on this Jesus says to them, Have faith in God. ²² Assuredly I tell you that whoever shall say to this mountain, ²³ Be removed and be cast into the sea, and shall not doubt in his

duced the same effect on the mass of the people at Jerusalem as it did at first in Galilee (ch. i. 22). What were the themes of this open preaching at Jerusalem we are not told; a number of debates with representatives of various classes are reported to us, but not the general teaching. The themes and the powerful delivery were, no doubt, the same as in Galilee. The rulers cannot therefore attack him in public; even if they had any regular force at command for such a purpose, which they had not,¹ it could not be used on the streets during the daytime. Nor could they so easily take him at night, since he was in the habit (the tense implies this) of leaving the city in the evening.² He had friends at Bethany; the colt was provided for him there; and we find him in Simon's house there just before the Passover; but perhaps he did not go there every night: it was not there that he was actually taken at last.

If the verb in ver. 19 is read in the plural, "they went out," then this story begins with that verse. Ver. 19, like ver. 11, tells of the evening walk of the party out of town. With the text adopted the new story begins at ver. 20, somewhat more abruptly.

20. The party came the same way the second morning as the first, which suggests that they spent the two nights at

the same place, i.e. Bethany (ver. 11). On the former occasion we were told that the disciples heard the words spoken to the fig-tree; we now see how Peter at least had interpreted them. If his interpretation was correct, Jesus had blasted the fig-tree by his curse, and now goes on to explain that one who has enough faith can do such a thing (thus encouraging the disciples to act in the same way), or may perform even a greater physical marvel. But the passage admits of a different interpretation. The words, "Have faith in God," remind us of those used to Jairus (v. 36), to the father of the epileptic (ix. 23), to the disciples in the storm (iv. 40). Jesus summons those who look to him to have faith in God when they are in great danger, or when they are seeking with all their heart some boon which outward appearances declare to be all but hopeless. Similarly the words as to the power of faith to remove mountains occur in Matth. xvii. 20 in a better connection than here, in connection with the cure of the epileptic, a case of special difficulty and calling for special efforts. (See also Luke xvii. 6). Both these sayings assert in other passages where they occur the power of man to call to his aid forces which will enable him to achieve the seemingly impossible. On meeting them both here, we ask what was the great and almost insurmount-

¹ Brandt, *Evan. Geschichte*, p. 4.

² Reading *έγενοπέντε*. This is the third imperfect describing the situation as between the authorities and Jesus. They were looking—the people were in wonder at his preaching—he

went outside the town when evening came (Winer, p. 389, "whenever"). If *έγενοπέντε*, they went out, is read, ver. 19 must be taken as the introduction to the following narrative, and refers to a particular evening.

τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ πιστεύῃ ὅτι ὁ λαλεῖ γίνεται, ἔσται αὐτῷ.
 24 διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, Πάντα ὅσα προσεύχεσθε καὶ αἰτεῖσθε,
 25 πιστεύετε ὅτι ἐλάβετε, καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν. καὶ ὅταν στήκετε προσευ-
 χόμενοι, ἀφίετε εἴ τι ἔχετε κατά τινος, ἵνα καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ
 ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφῇ ὑμῖν τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.¹

**Jesus challenged to state his authority to cleanse the Temple.
His answer, xi. 27-33.**

27 Καὶ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ ἐν τῷ ιερῷ περιπα-
 τοῦντος αὐτοῦ ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμ-
 ματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ, Ἐν ποίᾳ ἔξουσίᾳ
 ταῦτα ποιεῖς, ἢ τίς σοι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἔξουσίαν ταῦτην ἵνα ταῦτα

able difficulty on this occasion which Jesus bids his disciples summon up all their spiritual forces to overcome. The difficulty consists in the state of mind of the Jewish people, of which the fig-tree was the symbol. To bring the Jews to a right way of thinking so that they may stand on the side of the Messiah and not against him at the great day of decision, that is the work which Jesus is attempting, which he feels to surpass so far all human skill and power. If the fig-tree is an emblem of Israel, does its withering indicate that Israel is doomed and must be abandoned to impenitence : that only an elect can be saved ? Against that inference Jesus protests most strongly. The fig-tree is withered, but with God's help there is still hope for Israel. Jesus will not abandon hope for his nation, but will nerve himself for a supreme effort, in which the disciples are to take their part, to remove the mountain of unbelief which he sees opposing him, and to bid it take itself away.

There is no doubt that the passage thus interpreted gives a correct representation of what must have passed through the mind of Jesus during the visit to Jerusalem. When he saw how great the forces were which were arrayed against him, and how impossible it was to human eyes that the changes should be effected which were needed for the Kingdom, he must have passed through some of that discussion as to the fate of Israel which was afterwards expressed

in writing by the Apostle Paul, with the difference that Jesus' own fate depended on an immediately favourable practical issue. Now was the time for him to have faith that God must and would make His own cause prevail, and to believe that what he asked in prayer was being granted to him even though he could not see it. The disciples are to share the great experience along with him. Not only they but all whom his words reach are to take his bearing at this crisis as a type to be followed in their spiritual life. They are never to doubt the power of God to help them and to crown with success the efforts they make for Him ; and they are to ask with confidence for whatever they feel to be required for His cause and their work in it, and to be perfectly sure that such prayers are heard and answered, however unlikely it may seem and however little the petitioners may at first see of it themselves (Matth. vii. 7, 8).

The 25th verse contains the only instance in Mark of the phrase "Father in Heaven." If the verse belongs to this connection, which may be doubted, it must reflect, as the preceding verses do, the mental processes of Jesus at this crisis. Those whom he had difficulty in forgiving at this time would be the priests and Scribes ; his prayers were hindered till he could think of them in charity ; and he had to consider that if he were cherishing angry or revengeful thoughts he could not be worthy to accomplish a

¹ Add (ver. 26) εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀφίετε, οὐδὲ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.

heart but shall believe that that which he says is coming to pass, it shall be done for him. Therefore I say to you, Every-²⁴ thing you pray and ask for, believe that you have received it, and you shall have it. And when you stand praying, forgive²⁵ what you have against any one, that your Father in heaven may also forgive you your transgressions.¹

[Matthew xxi. 23-27; Luke xx. 1-8.]

And they come again to Jerusalem. And as he is walking²⁷ in the Temple there come to him the high-priests and the Scribes and the Elders; and they said to him, By what authority do²⁸ you act in this way, or who gave you authority to act in such

great work for God. But his words are in a better setting in Matth. vi. 14, xviii. 35; and of the whole discourse before us, while we have given what appears to be the thought connecting the verses as they stand, it must be said that that thought is far from obvious. Perhaps we have here as in former instances (iv. 21 *sqq.*, ix. 39 *sqq.*) a composition by Mark out of various materials, the result of which is not entirely happy (cf. Introd. p. 26).

27. The insertion of the word 'again' seems to disconnect the visit to Jerusalem from the journey of ver. 20. Mark makes no pretence of giving a full enumeration of the days at the capital, and so far as his narrative extends, Jesus may have been longer than a week there. On this occasion he is newly arrived, and showing himself publicly in the Temple (xiv. 49), when a question is put to him which could not fail to be asked and which he must have expected. Mark says the question was put to him by the high-priests and the Scribes and the elders, i.e. the Sanhedrin, which was made up jointly of these three elements, men of hereditary priestly rank, jurists, and men of weight outside these classes. On this occasion we have to think of a deputation of that high Court. Its members had already determined to get rid of Jesus (ver. 18); but he was too popular to allow their decision to be quite easily

accomplished, and they are watching for a chance. In the meantime, however, they can do something to assert their position and to make the innovator from Galilee feel that he has them to reckon with. His position is vague; he must be asked to define it. So Jesus is met as he is walking in the Temple by a party of men representing that composite body; these accost him and ask to be informed as to his title to act as he is doing, referring, of course, to the purification of the Temple. What is the authority which makes it competent for him to take such action in matters of the public religion; or, as he evidently claims to have authority, will he explain from what source he derives it? Among the Jews a man was proved competent to act in religious matters, not primarily by his ability to do so with effect, but by the fact that he held a commission from some source outside and above himself. Priests were authorized to officiate because they were descended from Aaron or from Zadok, prophets because they were sent by Jehovah (there are rules in the O.T. for finding out whether the prophets' assertion to this effect was true or false). The Sanhedrin was quite entitled to enquire into the credentials of any one coming forward to speak or act on the religion of the country. They had heard, no doubt, that Jesus had entered the town at the head of a procession which proclaimed him as Messiah; and

¹ Many uncials and other authorities add ver. 26: But if you do not forgive, neither will your Father in heaven forgive your transgressions (Matthew vi. 15, xviii. 35).

29 ποιῆσ; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐπερωτήσω ὑμᾶς ἔνα λόγον,
καὶ ἀποκρίθητέ μοι, καὶ ἐρῷ ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἔξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ.
30 τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάννου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἦν ἡ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; ἀποκρίθητέ
31 μοι. καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες, Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ
32 οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ, Διατί οὖν¹ οἰκτέπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; ἀλλὰ εἴπωμεν
Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; ἐφοβούντο τὸν λαόν² ἀπαντεῖ γὰρ εἶχον τὸν
33 Ἰωάννην ὅντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν. καὶ ἀποκριθέντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ
λέγουσιν, Οὐκ οἴδαμεν. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς, Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ
λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἔξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ.

The Parable of the Vineyard, xii. 1-12.

- 1 Καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν Ἀμπελῶνα ἀνθρω-
πος ἐφύτευσεν, καὶ περιέθηκεν φραγμὸν καὶ ὥρυξεν ὑπολήμιον καὶ
ῳκοδόμησεν πύργον, καὶ ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς, καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν.
2 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς τῷ καιρῷ δοῦλον, ἵνα παρὰ

the act of purifying the Temple probably showed that he thought himself to be in that position. Would he say to them that he was the Messiah? If he openly said so, they would be able to dispose of him very quickly, by letting the Roman governor know of it. If he only said he was a prophet, he would be taking lower ground, and would quickly, they would argue, find his proper level. Any-way, the question would be a difficult one for him to answer.

29. Jesus in this Gospel makes no explicit declaration of his Messiahship before that made in answer to the adjuration of the high-priest at the trial (xiv. 62). His views of Messiahship were so different from those of his countrymen that he naturally shrank from doing so, expecting, as he did, that events would speak for him in a way to convince all men. He does not answer the present enquiry directly; he has never preached himself, and he will not now do so, nor will he descend to lower ground which is not really his. The reply, therefore, appears like fencing. It consists in the pointed suggestion that those questioning him are not good judges of the qualifications of a religious teacher. They have shown that in the attitude they took up towards John the Baptist. We have seen

how deep an interest Jesus took in the Baptist (cf. ix. 13, also Matth. xi. 7-14). He regarded him as a true prophet sent according to Scripture to prepare the way for the Messiah, and he considered that the treatment John had met with foreshadowed his own fate. The general population had made up their minds as to John's claims, and had come to an opposite conclusion with regard to him from that of the leaders. At this stage the latter do not dare to avow the opinion they held formerly about John; if they are to speak of him at all they must profess different sentiments from those they notoriously held before. By pointing out this fact Jesus disqualifies their judgment of himself. If they could not estimate John aright, neither can they estimate him. And this is a sufficient answer to them in reason, especially considering the motives with which the question was put. It was not certainly an answer to propitiate them; it was not prompted by policy, but was the fruit of sad reflection and strong indignation.

xii. 1. **He began to speak in parables.** These words have been thought to convey that more parables were given at the time; Matthew calls this story "another parable," having just given

¹ Omit οὖν.

² δχλον (as in Matth.).

a way? But Jesus said to them, I will ask you one question, ²⁹ and do you answer me, and I will tell you by what authority I act as I do. Was the baptism of John from heaven ³⁰ or of men? answer me. And they discussed the matter with ³¹ each other in this way, If we say, From heaven, he will say, Why then did you not believe him? But are we to say, Of ³² men?—they were afraid of the people, for they were all firmly persuaded that John was a prophet. And they answer Jesus ³³ and say, We do not know. And Jesus says to them, Neither do I tell you by what authority I act as I do.

[Matthew xxi. 33-46; Luke xx. 9-19.]

And he began to speak to them in parables. A man planted ¹ a vineyard; and he put a hedge round it, and dug a pit for the winepress, and built a tower, and let it out to tenants, and went abroad. And at the season he sent a servant to the tenants to ²

that of the Two Sons. Mark's opening, however, is a conventional one, and simply means that Jesus now took to this method of discourse. (Cf. iii. 23, iv. 2).

What Jesus does not wish to say directly can yet be indicated in a parable. We saw before (notes on iv. 10-12) that the parabolic method enabled Jesus to suggest truths about the Kingdom which could not be plainly stated. As then with the Kingdom so now with the Messiah. He also is still veiled; he has not yet declared himself, but is waiting for the future. Yet he also is there; the discerning already recognize him; and a parable may lead many to think the matter over and to see what is before their eyes. This parable is spoken in Mark to *them*, i.e. to the questioners of the preceding section, the high-priests and Scribes. In Luke it is said to have been spoken to the people. The epilogue, ver. 12, indicates that both the great men and the people heard it.

The parable now given is not a new one. Isaiah was its original author (v. 1-7); with him the theme of the story is the relation of Jehovah to Israel; how much Jehovah has done for Israel and how poorly Israel has requited all His care (cf. also Ps. lxxx.). With Jesus the theme is still the same; the parable is to illustrate God's deal-

ings with Israel, but with special reference to the position of the stated rulers of the people and their attitude to the messengers sent from time to time by God. The rulers of the Jews were under the error, so common in the administrators of states and churches, of admiring too much their own authority and system and losing touch of the great living Source of all authority, as if having once founded the system they administer God no longer kept up any more direct relations with men. To Jesus' view, God, though not visible, never ceases to act for His people; He sends them communications from time to time, and the great virtue of the rulers of His people is to recognize these communications when they arrive and to pay due heed to them.

The **vineyard** like that of Isaiah v. is very completely equipped. It is well protected from straying animals; it has a tower for a watchman, which serves also as a storehouse, and the pit is digged in which the winepress is to stand, with space under it for filling the skins in which the wine is to ferment and to be preserved. How could any one go to all this trouble and expense and not expect that he would get at least a moderate share for himself of what the vineyard yielded?

2. It would not be interpreting the parable aright if we attempted to

3 τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος· καὶ λαβόντες
 4 αὐτὸν ἔδειραν καὶ ἀπέστειλαν κενόν· καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς
 5 αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον· κάκεινον ἐκεφαλίωσαν¹ καὶ ἡτίμασαν· καὶ
 6 ἄλλον ἀπέστειλεν κάκεινον ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ πολλοὺς ἄλλους, οὓς
 7 μὲν δέροντες, οὓς δὲ ἀποκτένοντες· ἦτι ἔνα εἶχεν, οὐν ἀγαπητόν·
 8 ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων ὅτι Ἐντραπήσονται
 9 τὸν οὐν μου· ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν ὅτι
 Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἡμῶν
 10 ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία· καὶ λαβόντες ἀπέκτειναν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔξεβαλον
 αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος· τί ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος;
 ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργούς, καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα
 ἄλλοις· οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταίτην ἀνέγνωτε,

Διθον δν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οι οικοδομοῦντες,
 οντος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας·
 παρὰ Κυρίου ἐγένετο αὐτη,
 καὶ ἐστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν δόθαλμοις ἡμῶν;

II

specify what is indicated by each of these details. They belong to the story, which has to be vivid and complete in order to produce its impression. The general meaning is that Jehovah sent the prophets to Israel, and that the leaders of the nation generally treated the prophets ill, as was the case with the Baptist, and failed to give them what they asked for, the observance of mercy and truth, with a view to which all God's provisions for Israel had been instituted. On the treatment of the prophets by the Jews see Luke xiii. 33 sq., Matth. xxiii. 33-37, Acts vii. 51-53.

6. The point of these verses is in the first place the determination of the tenants to ignore their landlord, and to acknowledge no obligations to him. Even when he sends his son, who represents him so fully and whose coming ought to have been greeted with almost as much respect as if he had come himself, they are not brought back to their duty; their only thought is that they have a chance to shake off their responsibility altogether. In this there is a telling representation of the fact of the decay in Jesus' time of the sense of the nearness and reality of God. As often happens when the religious system is highly elaborated, God was in the background of thought, and messages

were not expected from Him nor recognized when they arrived. The words put in the mouths of the tenants belong of course to the story and an equivalent is scarcely to be sought for them.

In the words about the landlord's beloved son whom he sent last of all, the question as to the authority of Jesus (xi. 28) receives its answer. After the prophetic line there comes a son, one who knows the mind of the landlord more fully than the servants who were sent before; a 'beloved' son who enjoys his confidence and is able to speak for him fully. These words being part of a parable are not to be pressed too hard. The word 'beloved' is fully accounted for in this passage by the story, and can scarcely be the Messianic title which is possibly to be recognized in the word in i. 11 and ix. 7. In a parable meant to indicate his Messiahship in a veiled way, Jesus could not use a plainly Messianic title. The words do not contain an explicit declaration of the divine sonship; they were not so understood by the Jewish opponents, for the high-priest was still to ask at the trial if Jesus claims to be the Messiah, the Son, as the Messiah was, of the living God; only then does Jesus directly make that claim and explain the sense in which he makes it. In the parable

¹ ἐκολάφισαν [conjecture of Linwood and Bakhuyzen adopted by Baljon].

get payment from them of his part of the produce of the vineyard. And they took him and beat him and sent him away empty. And again he sent to them another servant; and him they wounded on the head¹ and treated with insult. And he sent another, and him they killed; and so they did to many others, some they beat and some they killed. He had one left, his son whom he loved; him he sent to them last, saying, They will reverence my son. But those tenants said to themselves, This is the heir, come let us kill him and the inheritance will be our own. And they took him and killed him and threw him out of the vineyard. What will the owner of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy those tenants, and will give the vineyard to others. And have you not read this Scripture,

The stone which the builders rejected,
that stone is made the head of the corner.
From the Lord this came,
and it is wonderful in our eyes?

before us he speaks of himself as the last of the chain of messengers through whom God's claims on Israel have been conveyed; and he intimates that this last communication is the most complete and authentic of all, being brought by one who not only has a fixed message to deliver but is able from the intimacy in which he has lived with God to speak of Him fully and authentically. From this the hearers could with a little thought infer that he did claim to be the Messiah, although he did not put forward the claim in set terms. The act in the Temple had already practically expressed the claim, and the parable repeats it.

The question as to his authority is thus answered. The parable also conveys Jesus' expectation that his claim would be repudiated and that he would not fare otherwise at the hands of his people than God's earlier messengers had done. The expectations with which he came to Jerusalem have

not been altered but rather confirmed by nearer acquaintance with the views which are held there. Although he is the Messiah, he is not now a triumphing Messiah. The parable passes here into prophecy. Jesus feels himself being driven away from helping Israel, and put outside the inheritance he came to claim for God.

9. The prophetic strain is here continued, though the end of the story is not to be interpreted. What Jesus expected to take place as the consequences to the Jewish state of his rejection by its heads is not to be gathered from this passage but from others where his anticipations are stated more explicitly. But that the present regime of Israel would be brought to an end is here distinctly foretold. Who were the "others"? Compare the saying (Matt. xix. 27, 28) as to the twelve disciples sitting on twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel. Israel is not there set aside, but passes under a new government. Did Jesus sometimes, when not

¹ The interpretation of the κεφαλαιώ or κεφαλιώ is merely conjectural and cannot be considered satisfactory. Baljon's conjectural emendation, 'buffeted,' does not make the treatment of the second messenger worse than that of the first, as the sense requires, and can scarcely be right. See *Journal of Theological Studies*, ii. 298 (Jan. 1901), where ἐκεφαλίσαν is supposed to be a word coined by a translator who misread the Aramaic שָׁבֵך (Lxx. κακοῦ: malefacere) as שָׁבְך.

12 καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτὸὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν. καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθον.

Should the Jews pay tribute? xii. 13-17.

13 Καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν πρὸς αὐτὸν τινας τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγρεύσωσιν λόγῳ. καὶ ἐλθόντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Διδάσκαλε, οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθῆς εἶ καὶ οὐ μέλει σοι περὶ οὐδενός

thinking of the Messianic splendour of the future, anticipate the absorption of his nation in the Roman power? Cf. Matt. v. 24, Luke xiii. 4, 5, and the Apocalypses in the Gospels. It is quite on the lines of Jewish prophecy to predict that if the chosen nation does not give itself to carry out God's plan, He will reject it from being His people. That another people will be put in their place is not, perhaps, to be found in the Old Testament prophecies. Paulinism attained to the idea of another Israel, the heirs of Abraham who were one with him in faith.

10. These words applied originally (Psalm cxviii. 22, 23) to the wonderful recovery of Israel; the walls of Zion having been rebuilt, the Psalmist foretells another building in which Zion, lately ruined and destroyed, will yet be the centre and foundation of the true Kingdom of God on earth. The verse was a favourite of the Christians of the Apostolic Age, who applied it to their Master, rejected by the Jews but made the principal stone of a new building which these unbelievers had no power to injure (cf. Acts iv. 11, Ephes. ii. 20, 1 Pet. ii. 7). This new building of the Church lies outside of the eschatology of Jesus himself, where the prevailing expectation is that of his personal and immediate return to set up the Kingdom; and Jesus cannot have used these verses as he is here made to do. The parable, with its answer to the question about authority, is quite wound up in ver. 9, and the quotation adds a reflection as to the little authority Jesus enjoyed during his lifetime and his great authority after-

wards, which of course is highly appropriate in the Apostolic Age, but spoken by Jesus himself would not have been very intelligible. Luke has additional speculations drawn from passages in the prophets (Isa. viii. 14, 15, Dan. ii. 34, 35, 44) as to the fate of those who oppose themselves to the stone. Matthew speaks of a 'nation' which is to supersede the Jewish one, referring, no doubt, to the spiritual Israel.

12. We heard before this encounter (xi. 18) that the authorities were resolved to make away with Jesus, but were withheld by fear of the people from taking steps in that direction. Here we read that they are planning the arrest; the parable, being a declaration of war against them on his part and a summons to the people to throw off their rule, necessarily made them more determined than before. But the same obstacle still presents itself. Their fear of the people was the reason why they went no further than "seeking" to arrest him, and did not in the meantime carry out their design.

A very similar statement of plans formed against Jesus occurs in iii. 6, where it appears to stand too early.

We now come to a set of encounters between Jesus and the Jewish parties very similar to that given by Mark in the second and third chapters (ii. 1—iii. 6), and like that earlier set given by the three Synoptists with close verbal agreement, as if the collection had been early extant and familiar to them all.¹ The motive which led to

¹ The two sets are connected together by the occurrence in each case of the alliance of Pharisees and Herodians in hostility to Jesus (compare iii. 6 with xii. 13). Wendt (*Lehre Jesu*, 23 *sqq.* untranslated part) builds on this cir-

cumstance the theory that ii. 1—iii. 6 is placed too early, and belongs really to the present situation. The use of the phrase 'Son of Man' (ii. 10, 28) appears to him otherwise to be too early.

And they sought to lay hold of him, and they feared the people; ¹² for they knew that he meant the parable to apply to them. And they left him and went away.

[Matthew xxii. 15-22; Luke xx. 20-26.]

And they send to him some of the Pharisees and of the ¹³ Herodians to catch him with a word. And they come and ¹⁴ say to him, Master, we know that you are true and that you do not care for any one; for you do not regard men's outward

the early collection of these stories is not hard to make out. They all deal with questions of great interest to the Christian society in its earliest stage; the relations of the Church to the Roman State (cf. Rom. xiii.), the nature of the future life (1 Cor. xv.), the fundamental law of Christianity (Rom. xiii. 8-10), and the difference between the Jewish and the Christian view of the Messiah (Rom. i. 3).

The material thus provided is used by Mark with great skill. The encounter with the Pharisees as to tribute carries on the discussion, already begun in the official enquiry (xi. 28) as to the authority of Jesus and in the Parable of the Vineyard, of Jesus' Messiahship. This piece is shown by its subject to belong to this point in the narrative. In the fourth discussion (ver. 35 *sq.*) Jesus reverts to the same theme. The discussion with the Sadducees and that with the lawyer are not related to that theme, and might stand anywhere; but Jesus is shown as getting the better of each of the Jewish parties in turn.

13. Who is it that sends these Pharisees and Herodians to Jesus? In Matthew the Pharisees deliver this attack on their own motion, getting some of the Court-party to go with them. In Mark, Pharisees and Herodians seem to be set in motion by some agency behind the parties which does not itself appear. We might think of the priests and rulers, the dominant class, of xi. 18, who, unable in the meantime to proceed against Jesus openly, devise plans to undermine his influence and choose suitable instruments to execute them. But the concocting of such a policy could scarcely have come to the knowledge of Jesus' disciples. It is more natural

to think that the latter put their own construction on what they themselves saw; and on this occasion they saw that the first attack was not delivered by Jesus' worst enemies, and judged that the real authors of it were in the background.

The object of this first attack is to make out the exact scope of Jesus' Messiahship, and the emissaries belong to two parties which looked on such a question from opposite points of view. The Pharisees were pure theocrats who desired that God alone should rule over the Jewish people, and who ought naturally to have sympathized with any one seeking to bring about the rule of God. If they objected to Jesus' movement on principle it must have been because he was setting up new laws, or because a Messiah would supersede the Law, for which they were zealous (cf. Philipp. iii. 5-10). The Herodians, upholders of the native monarchy, were averse to any political disturbance which might complicate the relations between the Roman governor and that monarchy, and could not desire any Messiah to succeed.

What is the practical meaning of Jesus' Messiahship? The people hail him as the Son of David, and speak of the Kingdom of Father David which is coming again. That means that the Jews are to be supreme once more, as they were in the time of David, over the surrounding nations; there is to be an end of their long subjection, and they are to have their own king in their own land. Does Jesus share these anticipations? He has said nothing to show that he does. If his parable is any indication, his Messiahship is a religious rather than a political one—that of a teacher claiming to come from God, not a liberator. Is he a liberator at all

οὐ γάρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν
όδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις· ἔξεστιν κῆνσον Καίσαρι δοῦναι ἢ οὐ;
15 δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν; ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,
16 Τί με πειράζετε; φέρετέ μοι δημάριον ὥντα ἵδω. οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν.
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τίνος ἡ εἰκὼν αὐτῇ καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφή; οἱ
17 δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Καίσαρος. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν,¹ Τὰ Καίσαρος
ἀπόδοτε Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ. καὶ ἔξεθαύμαξον
ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

Second encounter; the Resurrection, xii. 18-27.

18 Καὶ ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν, οἵτινες λέγονταις ἀνάστασιν
19 μὴ εἶναι, καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν
ἡμῖν ὅτι ἐάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ καὶ καταλίπῃ γυναῖκα καὶ μὴ
ἀφῇ τέκνον, ὥντα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ ἔξαναστήσῃ
20 σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ. ἐπτὰ ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ πρώτος

then? If he is not, then the people's enthusiasm for him is misplaced, and they can be told that. If he is, then the Roman governor can be told, and will doubtless make short work with him. Whatever side he takes on such a question, his word will compromise him; they will 'snare' him with it.

14. The question by which the colour of his Messiahship is to be tested is not brought out too plumply. The emissaries give themselves the air of serious enquirers, address Jesus as a teacher, and have much to say about truth and honesty, things they are so fond of and are so glad to see in him. He is a true teacher, they declare, and cares for nothing but his message. They have heard something of his doctrine and cannot but approve of it, and they are glad also to see how fearless he is with it; whoever is offended, he teaches the way of God, the way in which God commands His people to walk, as it really is. They thus express approval of all his proceedings since he arrived in Jerusalem; they have no fault to find with him, and as he is so straightforward and uncompromising, no doubt he will answer at once a question they have to lay before him; he will not be like other teachers from whom it is difficult to get a plain answer

to a question, but will tell them at once if it is lawful to pay tribute to Caesar. The Law says a great deal about the dues the Israelite has to pay to God, but nothing about any tribute to the Emperor. Can it be right to pay an impost which is a sign of the degradation of Israel from his true place as ruler of the nations to a position of subjection? He will no doubt tell them at once; shall we pay or not pay? The impost spoken of was a Judean tax; it was not paid in Galilee, which was under a native ruler. The question therefore was one which Jesus had not yet required to deal with. Judas the Gaulonite (*Jos. Antiq.* xviii. 1) declared that the tax when introduced by Cyrenius the governor (Luke ii. 2), was nothing but an introduction of slavery, and urged resistance to it.

15. Jesus sees at once that these are not true enquirers and that there is craft in their smooth words. They are tempting him, he says, not only trying to get from him a declaration on a subject which he has never had to deal with, but trying to lead him astray into a false position. He is to be made to define his attitude towards the Roman government, a thing which he never thought of doing. Nor will he be drawn now into any political declaration; it

¹ Add *αὐτοῖς*.

appearance but teach the way of God according to truth. Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not; shall we pay or shall we not pay? But he knew the part they were playing ¹⁵ and said to them, Why do you thus tempt me? Bring me a shilling to look at. And they brought him one. And he says ¹⁶ to them, Whose effigy and inscription is this? And they said to him, Cæsar's. And Jesus said, Pay Cæsar what belongs to ¹⁷ Cæsar, and God what belongs to God. And they wondered at him greatly.

[Matthew xxii. 23-33; Luke xx. 27-38.]

And there come to him Sadducees—they are the people who ¹⁸ say that there is no such thing as a resurrection—and they questioned him to this effect, Master, Moses gave us a law, ¹⁹ that if a man's brother die and leave a wife behind him but no child,—that his brother should take his wife and raise up offspring to his brother. There were seven brothers; and ²⁰ the first took a wife and died without leaving any offspring.

would be wrong for him to be entangled in politics. He is not sent to adjust the relations between the Jews and the Romans, but to point out to the Jews the way in which God and their own history call them to go. The question is about the payment of certain moneys to the Emperor, and when the money is brought which is in debate it proves to be the Emperor's money; it has his effigy and inscription on it. If the money he claims is not to be paid him, then the Jews ought not to use his money at all. The fact that they use it shows them to be living in his realm and under his protection, and common honesty declares that they ought to pay the price of these benefits. No doubt, then, they must pay the Imperial taxes, even though they are not mentioned in the Law. (For a later view of the Emperor's money see Rev. xiii. 17). Thus Jesus gets the better of these questioners; they cannot lay hold of his answer in any way, nor do anything but wonder at him.

18. While the wonder is still fresh that so insidious a question as that about the tribute should be answered so readily and yet so wisely and so

satisfactorily, another group of questioners appears. The Sadducees come of their own motion, and with a less dangerous question. There is nothing political in what they bring forward; they ask Jesus about a matter on which the Pharisees and they had differed from each other for a century. The Sadducean party was largely drawn from old priestly houses, in which it was natural to be conservative, and they had not advanced with the times when the new beliefs about a future life and the existence of angels and spirits were added to the old stock of Jewish doctrines in the period after the rise of the Maccabees. Ever since that period this debate had gone on in Jewish thought,¹ and here Jesus is invited by the aristocrats, who were so little carried away by any enthusiasm, to take a part in it. It is propounded to him in a somewhat absurd form. The belief in a future life does not admit of being drawn out into detail; every attempt to do so is dangerous to the belief itself; a fact which its assailants have always understood and which its defenders often forget. These Sadducees, then, bring forward a problem about the resurrection which no doubt had often

¹ See the Book of Enoch; see also the article on "Eschatology" in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*.

- 21 ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα, καὶ ἀποθνήσκων οὐκ ἀφῆκεν σπέρμα. καὶ ὁ δεύτερος
 ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν, καὶ ἀπέθανεν μὴ καταλιπὼν σπέρμα, καὶ ὁ τρίτος
 22 ὡσαύτως· καὶ οἱ ἐπτὰ οὐκ ἀφῆκαν σπέρμα. ἕσχατον πάντων καὶ
 23 ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν. ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν,¹ τίνος αὐτῶν
 24 ἔσται γυνὴ; οἱ γὰρ ἐπτὰ εἰχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα. ἔφη αὐτοῖς ὁ
 Ἰησοῦς, Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ
 25 τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ; ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν, οὕτε
 γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι² ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.
 26 περὶ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν ὅτι ἐγείρονται, οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ
 Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου πᾶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς λέγων,
 'Ἐγώ δὲ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακάβ;
 27 οὐκ ἔστιν θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ἥώντων. πολὺ πλανᾶσθε.'

done duty before, and would often be produced again. In a law of Moses which they quote (Deut. xxv. 5) the legislator appears to take no account of the resurrection; if he had had any such consideration before his mind, must he not have made a different provision? Addressing Jesus with all respect, then, as a teacher to whom such difficulties might properly be brought for solution, these representatives of conservative views, both in doctrine and in affairs of state, bring forward their puzzle.

20. The case stated need not be thought to have actually occurred. Though Deuteronomy prescribes levirate marriage (xxv. 5, 6), the later legislation of the Priestly Code forbids it (Levit. xviii. 16, xx. 21), and we cannot suppose the practice to have been in force in Christ's day. Mark does not say as Matthew does that the case had actually occurred in the knowledge of the speakers ("with us"), but only sets it up in imagination. It is a puzzle, then, on the working out of a certain law in the Pentateuch, and the difficulty is academic rather than real.¹ Does not Moses deny the future life when he sets up such an ordinance? that is the point. The doctrine was held among the Jews in a very materialistic

way, as if the life to come were a time of pleasures and enjoyments beyond the measure of the present life. (See Enoch lxxii. 14, etc.). With such a view of the future life the institution of levirate marriage was certainly not consistent. But the difficulty is one which meets us still. Which of the many relationships we have occupied in this life are we to occupy permanently in the life to come? Especially where any one has married more than once does the puzzle forcibly present itself. And the natural man judges that if there are such difficulties connected with the future life, then that life is an absurd thing and need not be seriously thought of. But when such questions are raised there is another way of dealing with them.

24. Where such monstrous and irreligious speculations are entertained about the life to come it shows that the whole subject is entirely misconceived.² If the future life is looked at religiously, the mind dwelling on it as a thing decreed by God and a signal manifestation of the divine power, then no such absurdities come into view. It is only a carnal and mechanical way of thinking that stumbles on these, and shows itself thereby incompetent to deal with the matter at all. To one in such a position the testimony of Scripture to the

¹ See an article on "Mourning and the cultus of the dead in Israel," by Dr. J. C. Matthes, in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, May, 1900.

² διὰ τοῦτο refers in N.T. usage to what precedes, unless where the reason it alleges follows at once with ὅτι or ἵνα. The μὴ εἰδότες

which here follows is not grammatically equivalent to ὅτι οὐκ εἰδάτε, and must be taken, against the English official versions, to introduce not the main reason pointed at in διὰ τοῦτο but a concomitant circumstance. Cf. WM., p. 201.

¹ Omit *τοτεν* ἀναστῶσιν.

² οἱ ἄγγελοι.

And the second took her and died without leaving offspring, ²¹ and the third in the same way; and none of the seven left ²² any offspring. Last of all the woman also died. In the resurrection, when people rise again,¹ of which of them will she be the wife? for she was wife to all the seven. Jesus said to them, ²⁴ Does not this shew you to be in error and not to know the Scriptures nor the power of God? For when people rise from ²⁵ the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage but are like angels² in heaven. But as for the fact that the dead ²⁶ are raised, have you not read in the book of Moses, in the passage on the Bush, how God said to him,

I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob?

He is not the God of dead persons but of living. You are ²⁷ greatly in error.

resurrection (an example of which follows directly) is unheard and the power of God, so signally to be shown forth, unapprehended.

Jesus accordingly takes his stand on the side of the Pharisees against the Sadducees on this question on which the two parties were at issue. His belief in the resurrection, however, was not held as a dogma, but was a matter of personal conviction. He was persuaded that by God's power he would himself return from the grave if he should die (viii. 31, 38, etc.). Yet this conviction cannot have been unconnected in his mind with the general doctrine of resurrection, to which he here testifies his strong adhesion. Scripture declares the resurrection, he holds, and God is able to accomplish what is apparently so impossible (cf. on this point Rom. iv. 17-25, I Cor. xv. 35-50).

As for the nature of the life after the resurrection, it is not to be conceived, after the manner of the Sadducees and Pharisees, as a mere reproduction of this life, in which the same pleasures will be taken up again. Jesus himself, it is true, often speaks of the joys of the future under material figures. He speaks of sitting down to table in the Kingdom of Heaven, of drinking wine there, of thrones to be occupied and robes to be worn. (Matth. xix. 27-30,

xvi. 27; Mark xiv. 25). It would be impossible to speak of the happiness and triumph of the future life at all without employing figures drawn from this life which we know, and he who understands best Jesus' way of thinking will not interpret these expressions most literally. In the present passage the life of the future is entirely spiritual. Those who share it are like the angels (whose existence the Sadducees denied, Acts xxiii. 8), without any family ties, absorbed in the service they do for God, and not distracted from it by any private cares. If the future is filled with the thought of God there will be no place in it for the thought of mean and petty entanglements. See the fine development of the theme in Luke xx. 36.

26. A proof from Scripture follows of the doctrine the Sadducees deny. The import of this proof has been taken to be that though Moses instituted levirate marriage, yet Moses himself is shown by the passage quoted to have been a believer in the resurrection, so that the two cannot be inconsistent with each other. All that is contended for is probably that the doctrine of resurrection is to be found in sacred Scripture. In the passage of the Bush, Exodus iii. (thus references were made when the text was not divided into

¹ Omit this clause.

² the angels.

Third encounter; the chief commandment, xii. 28-34.

- 28 Καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς τῶν γραμματέων ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συνξητούντων,
εἰδὼς ὅτι καλῶς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν, Ποίᾳ ἐστὶν
29 ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων; ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πρώτη ἐστίν,
- 30 “Ἄκουε, Ἰσραὴλ, Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν Κύριος εἰς ἐστίν,¹ καὶ ἀγαπήσεις
Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς
ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἵσχυος σου.
- 31 δευτέρα αὖτη,

‘Αγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

chapters and verses; cf. Rom. xi. 2 (“in Elijah”), God himself speaking from the burning bush identified Himself with the forefathers of Israel, and called Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But He would not identify himself with persons who were dead. The “living and true God,” as the Jews felt Jehovah to be, compared with the gods of the Gentiles, was not a King of the dead, like Pluto of the Greeks or Yama of the Hindus, but a God of the living. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, then, were living when these words were spoken. Though their descendants knew them to be dead and buried, God must have been keeping them alive for the hour when they should rise again and enter on the resurrection life. The passage throws much light on the views Jesus held as to the state of the believer in God after death, and consequently on the prospect to which he himself looked forward if death should overtake him. In form the argument is an example of the Rabbinical method of “search” which found in Scripture meanings of which the writer had never dreamed. But in substance the words are a notable example of that faith in God by which Jesus removed mountains from his path. The Jewish religion was one from which the belief in a future life was conspicuously absent; only in the later books of the Old Testament does the great hope appear, nourishing itself on the conviction that those who belong to God cannot be separated from Him even by death, but that He will overcome the seeming impossibility and cause them to live again. That most spiritual conviction Jesus held un-

shaken for his own case; here he makes it embrace the patriarchs also. Most sure is he that the Sadducees are quite wrong about the life to come.

28. The encounter with the Scribe is found in Luke in a different and a better connection (x. 25 *et seqq.*), where the story of the good Samaritan is appended to it. Luke winds up this set of discussions at Jerusalem (xx. 39, 40) by saying that some Scribes, after the discomfiture of the Pharisees and Sadducees, declared that Jesus had said well, because they had nothing to reply. This is evidently the original tradition. Mark takes these words, “thou hast said well,” and puts them in the speech of the one lawyer or scribe whom he here introduces with the story of Luke x. He thus gets a third encounter here, and not an unfriendly one.

In Matthew this questioner is put forward by the Pharisees, who thus return to the attack; the question, though in itself innocent, is said to be a temptation; the inquirer is insincere. In Mark, on the contrary, the questioner comes forward of his own motion; he has listened with admiration to Jesus’ reply to the Sadducees, with which he is in full agreement, and the question he puts is one which can be answered without any danger.

From various passages in the Gospels we infer that the question was not an uncommon one. In Mt. xxiii. 23 we read of the “weightier” matters of the law, and in Mt. v. 19 of the “least” commandments; and the distinctions drawn by Jesus were drawn by other Rabbis also. Hillel said to a Gentile,

[Matthew xxii. 34-40; Luke xx. 39, 40.]

And one of the Scribes came up to him who had heard this discussion and seen that he gave a good answer to the Sadducees, and asked him, What commandment is the first of all? Jesus answered, The first is,

Hear, Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with thy whole mind and with thy whole strength.

The second is this,

Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

31

The sum of the Law is this: what thou hatest to have done to thee, that do not thou to thy neighbour. This question taken strictly (*πολιτικόν*, not *τύπος*) asks Jesus not to quote a particular precept, but to describe the nature of the commandment which is to be thought most important; as we should say, In what direction are we to look for the first commandment? Now, theoretically the precepts of a law which is regarded as directly inspired by God are all equally important and authoritative; he who breaks the least of them breaks all (Mt. v. 19; cf. James ii. 10, Gal. v. 3). To the Jews of the Talmud all the precepts of the law and the tradition were of equal force. But this theory could never be carried out; even where the strictest view of inspiration is held, the tastes and inclinations of men assert themselves. One part of Scripture is prized more highly than another; one commandment is selected as the leading one, in the light of which the others are to be interpreted. By the choice they make of the most important commandment men reveal their religious affinities and tendencies. This scribe's question, therefore, was not malevolent, unless it was meant to make Jesus repeat his attack on the tradition (vii. 1-13), which he was not called to do; it could be answered quite freely.

29. Jesus answers by repeating the beginning of the Sh'ma, or the Confession of the Jewish religion,¹ which

was recited twice every day by every pious Jew, and formed a part of every act of synagogue worship. It would not occur to Jesus to place in the foreground any commandment of a ritual nature; here as elsewhere he goes back to what is simplest, most universal, most undisputed. The commandment he specifies could not be compared with any other. It comprises all the others, and, in fact, supersedes all the others. What the unity of God implied to Jesus we learn from such texts as Matth. vi. 24, 33. Where there is full devotion to God of all the powers, the feelings, the intellect, the will (the heart is, in Jewish thought, the seat of the intellect; the soul, of the desires and affections), no commandment at all is called for; the whole Law is fulfilled in love. Thus religion, instead of being, as it was to the Jews, the punctual observance of a multitude of precepts, comes to be a matter of the heart. All depends on having the heart pure, the fountain unpolluted, the tree good, the eye single.

31. Jesus is not asked as to the second commandment, but he gives it also. The first standing alone does not content him. Devotion to God most High is the root of the matter. But there is a devotion to God which leads to ritualism and priesthood, also a devotion which leads to mysticism and withdrawal from the world. With Jesus it is never forgotten that man belongs to his fellow-men as well as to God: to his brothers,

¹ The complete Sh'ma consists of the passages Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21, Numb. xv. 37-41, in which the sole deity of Jehovah is enforced, and the duty insisted on of yielding to Him entire

devotion. The words quoted above are those of Deut. vi. 4, 5. See Schüller J.P. under Sh'ma, II. II. 83.

32 μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστιν. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματεὺς, Καλῶς, διδάσκαλε, ἐπ' ἀληθείας εἶπες ὅτι εἰς ἔστιν καὶ οὐκ 33 ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ· καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἴσχύος, καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν περισσότερόν ἔστιν πάντων τῶν ὄλοκαυτω-
34 μάτων καὶ¹ θυσιῶν. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἴδων αὐτὸν ὅτι νουνεχώς ἀπεκρίθη,
εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Οὐ μακρὰν εἴ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσαι.

The Son of David, xii. 35-37.

35 Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν διδάσκων ἐν τῷ οἴρῳ, Πῶς
36 λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς υἱὸς Δαυεὶδ ἔστιν; αὐτὸς Δαυεὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀγίῳ,

Ἐπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ μου,

Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν τοὺς ἔχθρούς σου ὑποκάτω² τῶν ποδῶν σου.

because of the God who is Father of all alike. Thus to the commandment of love to God is joined that of love to men, a distinctive note of our Lord's teaching; it is the conjunction of the two texts that is the peculiarity of his answer in this case. The commandment quoted from Levit. xix. 18 was very familiar to the Jews at this time. It is true that the words "and hate thine enemy" were sometimes added to it. The parable of the Good Samaritan, added by Luke to the story of the scribe's question (x. 29-37) shows that Christianity interprets the word 'neighbour' more generously; and Matth. v. 43-48 carries that teaching even further. But the Golden Rule was well known in Palestine before Christ; Hillel, speaking to Gentiles, declared it to be the sum of the Law (Matth. vii. 12, xxii. 40). With Jesus love to one's neighbour is elevated to an enthusiasm for doing good and bringing help at every opportunity.

These two commandments, then, are the most important. No others can compete with them; and it follows that the whole of Scripture is to be read in the light of them and interpreted in accordance with them.

32. In Matthew the story ends with Jesus' reply to the lawyer's question.

In Luke it goes on to the parable of the Good Samaritan. The speech of the lawyer, which is peculiar to Mark, is a piece of early apologetic, such as must often have been heard when Christians entered into discussion with Gentiles and sought to recommend the faith to them. Old Testament texts placing justice and charity above sacrifice (1 Sam. xv. 22, Micah vi. 6 *sqq.*, etc.) here find an echo; Christianity is vindicated against the charge that it has no sacrifices, since it has offerings so much better; and its principle is shown to be one with which all must sympathize who care for God or man. One who feels enthusiasm for this principle is declared by Jesus to have the root of the matter in him; he is not far from the Kingdom of God. Compare Introduction, p. 15 *sqq.*, and see the early Apologies. At the same time it is to be recognized that the teaching is that of Jesus himself, and that the touch of impatience with the sacrifices would be by no means strange in him.

No one ventured, etc. In the position given to these words no two of the synoptists agree. They are evidently meant to sum up the result of a set of hostile encounters. In Luke they do this (xx. 40), coming after two encounters only, those with the Pharisees and with the Sadducees. In Mark

² Add τῶν.

² Or ὑποκάτων.

There is no other commandment greater than these. And the Scribe said to him, Excellently, Master; most truly do you say that He is one and there is no other but Him. And to love Him with the whole heart and the whole understanding and the whole strength and to love one's neighbour as oneself, is far more than all the whole burnt offerings and sacrifices. And Jesus seeing that he answered intelligently said to him, You are not far from the Kingdom of God. And no one ventured any longer to question him.

[Matthew xxii. 41-46; Luke xx. 41-44.]

And Jesus took the word and said as he was teaching in the Temple, How is it that the Scribes say that the Christ is David's son? David himself said in the Holy Spirit,

The Lord said to my Lord,
Sit thou on my right hand, till I put thy enemies under thy feet.¹

the words come after three encounters, that with the lawyer being thus treated as hostile, which in itself it is not. In Matthew (xxii. 46) the words sum up the result of four encounters; that with the lawyer is expressly described as a temptation (ver. 34, 35). The tendency is to make the set of interviews longer and more hostile, and Luke is in this point nearer the earliest tradition than Mark.

35. We now come to a piece of the public teaching of Jesus at this time. (In Matthew this is different; the following address is spoken to the Pharisees). The scene is stated afresh; this piece is not originally continuous with the preceding section. But the subject is the same as that in the interview about the tribute-money; it had also been alluded to in the parable of the Vineyard. It is the question of the Messiahship which is thus brought before the people. But as always, that subject is not treated openly but in a kind of parable, the inference from which is left to be gathered by the hearers for themselves, and which is variously interpreted to this day.

The Scribes, he says plainly to his audience in the Temple, the theologians who spend their lives in the study of

Scripture and are accepted by the people as religious guides, are wrong about the Messiah. They declare the Messiah, who is the hope of Israel, to be David's son (for illustrations of this see notes on x. 47; Matth. ii. 4; the genealogies; John vii. 42 (but cf. John vii. 27); Rom. i. 3), and all their views of the Messiah's functions and character are based on this assumption. He is to be born of David's race, in David's city, and is to be what David was, a successful warrior, who will vindicate the freedom and supremacy of Israel, and will be the head of an earthly court.

But David himself took another view of this subject. In the 110th Psalm, which he wrote under inspiration, with foresight of things to come, David sketches a very different Messiah. Jesus takes it for granted that this Psalm is Messianic, as all the New Testament writers do, no doubt following his lead; and if David is speaking of the Messiah in this Psalm, then the Messiah is not a mere copy of himself, but a figure of a different order. David represents the Messiah, his Lord, as having been invited by the Almighty, the LORD, to sit on His right hand in glory and security while his wars are fought for him by other

¹ Or, make thy enemies the footstool of thy feet.

37 αὐτὸς Δανείδ λέγει αὐτὸν Κύριον, καὶ πόθεν αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν υἱός;
καὶ ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος ἥκουεν αὐτοῦ ἡδέως.

Jesus denounces the Scribes, xii. 38-40.

38 Καὶ ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν, Βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς 39 καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς 40 δείπνοις οἱ κατέσθοντες τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι, οὗτοι λήμψονται περισσότερον κρίμα.

The Widow's Mite, xii. 41-44.

41 Καὶ καθίσας κατέναντι τοῦ γαξοφυλακίου ἐθεώρει πῶς ὁ ὄχλος βάλλει χαλκὸν εἰς τὸ γαξοφυλάκιον καὶ πολλοὶ πλούσιοι ἐβαλλον

hands and his enemies reduced without any exertion on his part to entire submission. David then regards the Messiah as a Being not like himself, but greater than himself, not as one called to fight, but as one to be fought for. In the Psalm David's Lord is a priestly figure, and enjoys a higher dignity than that of the secular king.

The inference is that it is a very inadequate view of the Messiah to say that he is the Son of David, and therefore that one who has very little of the outward appearance of a Son of David may yet be the Messiah. It is not his birth, or the vigour of his arm, or his outward splendour, that mark him out as Messiah, but the divine call addressed to him to be near God. In the Epistle of Barnabas (xii. 10), this verse of the 110th Psalm is used to prove that the Messiah was not lineally descended from David, since David does not call Him his son.¹ Many critics consider that the verse is used by Jesus in our passage in the same way, his argument being that he might be Messiah though he was not descended from David at all. But this is to overload the argument, the obvious point of which is that on the authority of David himself a higher and more spiritual view of the Messiah must be substituted for the current one. To his own lineal descent Jesus does not refer.

It may be noticed that all the pas-

sages which speak of the risen Christ as seated at the right hand of God, are undoubtedly founded on this one (Acts ii. 34, v. 31, vii. 55, Rom. viii. 34, 1 Cor. xv. 24 sq., etc.). Jesus himself, however, was not speaking of the risen Christ, and the working out of the picture suggested by the quotation is not his work but that of his followers.

37b. Jesus' preaching produced the same effect at Jerusalem as in Galilee (i. 22). It was the men of position, the officials of the existing system, who were suspicious and hostile. They could not but see that if his ideas prevailed they and their works must soon appear superfluous. To the common people, who want religion itself and are less attached to any system, it was a surprise in Jerusalem as in Galilee to hear from such a commanding voice that the service of God was so simple and so well within their reach. What Mark tells us of the teaching in the Temple is all controversial, and belongs to the working out of the story he relates; the general phrases, "as he was teaching in the Temple," "in the course of his teaching," suggest that there was much more of it.

38. This short warning against the Scribes, addressed in Mark and Luke to the multitude, is expanded by Matthew into a long speech, the beginning of which is addressed to the disciples,

¹The Didache seems to share that view, using the expression, "Hosanna to the God of David" (chap. x.).

David himself calls him Lord, and how does he come to be his son? And the common people listened to him with delight.

[Matthew xxiii.; Luke xx. 45-47, xi. 37-54.]

And he said in the course of his teaching, Beware of the Scribes; what they care for is to walk in long robes, and to be saluted in the markets, and to have the first seats in the synagogues and the first places at banquets. They devour widows' houses and make long prayers for a pretence! Their condemnation will be all the greater.

[Luke xxi. 1-4.]

And he sat down facing the treasury and watched the people putting their pence in the treasury; and many who were rich

while from ver. 13 onwards Jesus turns to the Scribes and Pharisees and denounces them directly in a number of separate 'woes.' The scribes spoken of in our text, in a style never applied to the country scribes of Galilee, appear to have been a special set of people who flourished at Jerusalem. Not all the scribes at Jerusalem were like those attacked here. The scribe who asked about the first commandment attracted the sympathy of Jesus. But there was a class of scribes there against whom his indignation was kindled by what he witnessed of their arrogance, and by compassion for their victims. Their vain assumptions appear in their dress. The long robe or *talar* was the dress worn by kings, priests, and persons of rank, and indicated that the wearer did not work with his hands. (In the parable of the Prodigal Son the best robe is brought out from the press to be worn at a special festive occasion). The scribes were not properly entitled to wear it, as they were not public functionaries (those excepted who had seats in the Sanhedrin), and most of them belonged by birth to the class of tradesmen. They affect, therefore, by wearing this dress a rank and sacredness to which they are not entitled. The same ambition is apparent in all their demeanour; like all ambitious persons who occupy a doubtful social position, they grasp eagerly at little distinctions. They love to be publicly saluted with titles of honour, to be called "Rabbi,"

"Father," "Master" (in Matth. xxiii. 7-12, the titles are given and the Christian view of each of them). They push themselves forwards among the magnates in synagogue and banquet-hall, risking humiliation thereby to which the Christian is forbidden to expose himself (Luke xiv. 7-14). Nor did they escape the temptations which wait for every set of religious professionals, from the fact that the weaker and the unprotected members of society are apt to lean upon them. That influence is easily abused, and this was to be seen in Jerusalem. Widows were known there, it appears, who had been reduced from comfort to beggary by giving up their means to religious uses at the suggestion of scribes (it is not necessary to read into the charge that these scribes appropriated the substance of the widows to themselves). Those who were responsible for such calamities justly drew suspicion on the religion they practised so devotedly; their prayers were not sincere, they were thinking while they prayed, not of the need of God's help, but of some object of their own. This class of scribes will meet with special condemnation and punishment when the day of reckoning comes, that day on which the evil-minded tenants of God's vineyard will meet with their deserts (ver. 9).

41. The foregoing section spoke of widows who had suffered from the prevailing religious system. Here we have

- 42 πολλάκις καὶ ἐλθοῦσα μία χήρα πτωχὴ ἔβαλεν λεπτὰ δύο, ὅτι ἐστιν
 43 κοδράντης. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,
 Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἡ χήρα αὕτη ἡ πτωχὴ πλεῖον πάντων ἔβαλεν
 44 τῶν βαλλόντων εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον πάντες γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ περιστερώντος αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον, αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσεως αὐτῆς πάντα
 ὅσα εἶχεν ἔβαλεν, δλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς.

Jesus' Prophetic Discourse, ch. xiii.

He predicts the destruction of the Temple, xiii 1, 2.

- 1 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ λέγει αὐτῷ εἰς τῶν
 μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, Διδάσκαλε, ἴδε, ποταπὸι λίθοι καὶ ποταπαὶ
 2 οἰκοδομαὶ· καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας
 οἰκοδομαὶς; οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ¹ λίθος ἐπὶ λίθου ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ.²

a widow who practises true devotion in a way of which that system takes but little account. Jesus is sitting opposite the chest or set of chests in which visitors to the Temple deposited their offerings. We hear of thirteen trumpet-shaped receptacles in which offerings were placed, in some for the Temple service, in some for the poor, etc. The gifts were not all in the bronze coinage, as the word used, *χαλκός*, might indicate (cf. Peter's *pence*), since they differed widely from each other in value. Nor did the givers make any secret of what they were offering; the left hand knew it quite well and the priests who were on the spot, and the bystanders also. An act of oblation, holding up to the Lord, was perhaps a feature of the gift. Even the widow who offers such a tiny contribution does not conceal it. She holds up two of the smallest coins of the currency; the two together would be worth a quadrant, Mark explains to his Roman readers, i.e. a quarter of an as, or, as the A.V. has it, a farthing. That, the priests would think and the other givers also, was a very inconsiderable offering, not worth noticing at all. They looked to the total, as churches and synods do, and thought therefore much more of large gifts than of small. Jesus, on the contrary, is

attracted to the giver of the small gift, and sees the heroism and devotion in it which, if unnoticed by man, make it a great gift in the sight of God.

xiii. JESUS FORETELLS THE FUTURE.

1. We now have another reminiscence from the last days at Jerusalem. Jesus is leaving the Temple; the way lies down stately staircases, past pillared porticoes, and through passages enclosed in the massive outer wall—all the splendours which the excavations are now bringing to light. As one leaves the Temple the eye commands a wide view of the surrounding country, and at that spot one was in the focus of the sacred traditions of a millennium, and felt that the architectural splendour was not thrown away. On the magnificence of Herod's Temple see Josephus *B.J.* v. 1-6; *Ant.* xv. 11, 3; *B.J.* vi. 4, 7, 8; at the siege of Jerusalem Titus was anxious to have the Temple spared, as it was one of the wonders of the world.

2. But Jesus is out of humour with the Temple, and does not share his disciples' delight in its magnificence. The splendour does not dazzle him since he has in his mind something that is greater than the Temple, the Kingdom of God, which the Temple rather hinders than

¹ Add ὥδε.

² Add καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ὅμεν χειρῶν.

put in large gifts. And a poor widow came and put in two ⁴² mites, of the value of a farthing. And he called his disciples ⁴³ to his side and said to them, I do assure you that this widow, poor as she is, has put in more than all those givers to the treasury; for they all contributed from their superfluity, but ⁴⁴ she from her deficiency, she put in all she had, her whole living.

[Matthew xxiv.; Luke xxi.]

[Matthew xxiv. 1, 2; Luke xxi. 5, 6.]

And as he was leaving the Temple, one of his disciples says ¹ to him, Master, look, what stones and what buildings! And ² Jesus said to him, Do you see these great buildings? Not a stone shall be left¹ on another that shall not be torn down.²

promotes. Since he came to Jerusalem he has seen the Temple to be the chief stronghold of obstruction to the reform he aims at, and has even been led to speak of it as a den of robbers. Besides, his prescience had assured him that the Jewish system of which the Temple was the symbol and the fortress was coming to an end. He had seen the signs of the time and marked that the sky was red and lowering. He had uttered warnings even in Galilee that a people which did not repent must perish like those on whom the tower of Siloam fell, and had warned those whom it concerned to agree with their adversary quickly. More is to be found to this effect in the earlier teaching; and in the parable of the Vineyard, spoken in Jerusalem, these warnings were summed up. Hence the tremendous prediction, spoken here to the disciples but also uttered on other occasions and alleged against him at his trial, that the time was at hand when the **Temple would be destroyed**. (The fourth Gospel, ii. 19, connects this saying with the purging of the Temple, there placed at the beginning of the ministry). This prediction therefore rests on a firm historical basis, and is connected with more than one train of thought clearly to be traced in Jesus' teaching. It is not a prophecy *post eventum*, since it does not

correspond with the facts as they occurred, the Temple not having been battered down, but accidentally burned (Josephus, *B.J.* vi. 4). One who had seen its cold and desolate ruins would have used another expression than that of this verse.

In thus prophesying the downfall of the building round which the association and hopes of his countrymen centred, Jesus is following in the steps of the prophets of the Old Testament who saw the religion of Jehovah to be a greater thing than its national embodiment in Israel, and foretold the ruin of their race as a step to the triumph of God. Compare Isa. vi. 11 *sqq.*, Amos v., vi. 7 *sqq.*, and especially Jer. xxvi. 3-7; for the impression made by Jeremiah's prophecy against the Temple see the rest of that chapter. The charge of speaking against the Temple was afterwards brought both against Stephen (Acts vi. 14), and Paul (Acts xxi. 28); the crime was one the Jews could not forgive.

With the genuine utterance about the Temple there was early connected a prophetic discourse on the events which were to take place up to Christ's Second Coming, and the duty of the Christians with regard to them. This discourse is given by Mark in an earlier form than by either Matthew or Luke.

¹ Add, here.

² Add, and another shall be raised up in those days without hands.

The disciples ask for a revelation, xiii. 3, 4.

3 Καὶ καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὅρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν κατέναυτι τοῦ
ιεροῦ ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν κατ' ιδίαν Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης
4 καὶ Ἀνδρέας, Εἰπὸν ἡμῖν, πότε τῶντα ἔσται, καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον
ὅταν μέλλῃ τῶντα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα;

The earlier Signs of the End, xiii. 5-8.

5 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἤρξατο λέγειν αὐτοῖς, Βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ,
6 πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνόματί μου, λέγοντες ὅτι Ἔγώ εἰμι,
7 καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν. ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς

3. The scene changes ; it is another occasion ; the Master is sitting on the Mount of Olives in the daytime. It is not said that he was on the way to or from his night quarters. Perhaps the position was that where he was generally to be found at this time, when not at the Temple, and various discourses about the doomed city may have been spoken here. He is in full view of the Temple, and his disciples recall the words he had spoken about that great building. If he knows so much of the future, he doubtless knows more ; and they ask him to expand what he has said and make it more precise. They ask specially for two things : 1. the date when the destruction of the Temple is to take place ; 2. the sign, on seeing which they are to be sure that the destruction of the Temple and along with it the consummation of all that he has spoken of is to be looked for ; he has referred, it is implied, to other events of the future besides that one. The questions of the disciples are to be interpreted by the answer which is returned to them, and viewed in this light they are a request for a complete unveiling of the future. First, the times and the seasons are asked for, and then the sign of the events which will be the consummation of the Age.

Luke omits the word ‘all’ here, which gives the question the appearance of referring more strictly to the one foregoing prediction. In Matthew the question is made more definite. The disciples ask first for the date, then for the sign of Christ’s “coming and of the consummation of the Age.”

The discourse which follows is of a composite nature. It contains an *apocalypse*, or detailed prediction of the

future. This occupies ver. 5-8, 14-20, and 24-27. The situation for which this apocalypse was originally composed is easily seen. It is a written work (ver. 14), and was addressed to the Christians living in Judaea before the siege of Jerusalem, to which there is no reference (as there is in Luke xxi. 20). It was written when the mission to the Gentiles was going on, but far from complete. Its aim, like that of similar works in the N.T. (compare 2 Thessal. ii. 1-12, 2 Peter iii., and the Revelation of St. John the Divine), was to soothe the excitement into which Christians were liable to fall from their intense expectation of the Second Coming of the Lord, by the assurance that various events must first take place before the Lord could come, and at the same time to encourage them to look without alarm at the disquieting occurrences of their day, these being all embraced in the divine plan, which the writer sets forth in detail.

Alternating with the sections of this apocalypse are parts of a *discourse* in which the disciples or Christians generally are *exhort*ed as to their behaviour in various trying circumstances in which they may be placed. (Sections of this discourse have already been given by Matthew in his tenth chapter in the address to the disciples when they are sent out to preach ; he now, however, repeats these sections). These parts of the discourse are not so boldly predictive as those of the accompanying prophecy, and deal with matters which could be foreseen and guarded against, even at an early time. They have much more affinity with Christ’s early teaching. But we have to exercise great caution in dealing with any

[Matthew xxiv. 3; Luke xxi. 7.]

And as he was sitting on the Mount of Olives opposite the 3 Temple, Peter asked him privately, and James and John and Andrew, Tell us, when is this to take place, and what will be 4 the sign when it is all on the eve of accomplishment?

[Matthew xxiv. 4-8; Luke xxi. 8-11.]

And Jesus took the word and said to them, Be on your 5 guard lest any one deceive you. Many will come in my 6 name, saying, I am he, and will deceive many. But when 7 you hear of wars and rumours of wars, do not be alarmed;

anticipations placed in Christ's mouth of events or circumstances to arise after his death. While he certainly foretold his death and his return, there are strong indications that he expected his return to succeed his death almost immediately. After the short period, "three days," of his abode in death's realm he was at once to be active with and for the disciples; cf. chap. xiv. 28 and 25. It was only when his return was deferred that his followers began to fill up the gap with admonitions placed in his mouth as to the position in which they found themselves, and with detailed prophetic histories.

5. The discourse is addressed to men eagerly looking out for an event which is to come suddenly, and liable in consequence to false alarms. As they are watching for the Messiah, attempts will be made to take advantage of them; claimants to the Messiahship will come forward declaring 'I am he.' 'I am he' means I am the Messiah (see Matthew); the two Greek words are the same as those used by Jesus before the high-priest (xiv. 62). The synoptists all predict that this claim will be made 'in my name,' as if the false Messiah were to say that he was Jesus risen again. But no claim of this kind is likely to have been made; we hear of false prophets who appear in Jesus' name (Matth. vii. 22, 23; Acts xx. 30; 1 John ii. 18), but not of false Messiahs. The words 'in my name' were, no doubt, inserted to give the prediction, which otherwise is purely Jewish, a Christian air. It implies a Messianic expectation on a very humble scale, when it is thought that

a prophet or charlatan starting up suddenly could claim to fulfil it. Of such occurrences in the early Church we know very little. When Messianic claimants come forward, it is here urged, they must be scrutinized. We learn afterwards that when the Messiah actually comes it will be in a very different fashion; there will be no doubt about it then. As Matthew has it, his coming will be like lightning; those who least desire him will be compelled to see him (cf. Rev. i. 7).

7. We now come to the prediction of events in the great world. In every Scriptural prophecy of the last things outward disturbances play a great part; wars, famines, earthquakes, and so on, are a feature of every apocalypse. To judge of those mentioned in any particular piece, a close knowledge of the history up to the time of its composition is required. In our passage the Christians are first reassured as to wars taking place at a distance. To their imagination any disturbance taking place in any part of the world may be a harbinger of the great event they expect; but they are told that distant wars such as that with the Parthians in A.D. 58, or the frontier disturbances which never quite ceased, are to be regarded with equanimity. These are not, like the wars in Daniel or the Revelation, immediately connected with the winding up of the Age. They are a part of the divine decrees; no doubt they must take place; the prophets predict them, in words here quoted from Isa. xix. 2 (see also 2 Chron. xv. 6), but Christians should assign them their true place in God's plan; they are not the end but the beginning

8 πολέμων, μὴ θροεῖσθαι δεῖ γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' οὕπω τὸ τέλος. ἐγερθήσεται γάρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, ἔσονται λιμοὶ¹ ἀρχὴ ὡδίνων ταῦτα.

Warnings and exhortations to disciples for the period of persecution, xiii. 9-13.

9 βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἁυτούς παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς διηρήσεσθε καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθῆτο σεσθε ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη 10 πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. καὶ ὅταν ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ προμεριμνάτε τί λαλήσητε, ἀλλ' ὃ ἐὰν δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, τοῦτο λαλεῖτε· οὐ γάρ ἔστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες 11 ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον. καὶ παραδώσει ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς

of the throes from which the new Age will be born. The same is true of the earthquakes which the readers knew of—one took place at Laodicea in A.D. 61 (Tac. *An.* xiv. 27), and Pompeii was partly ruined by one in A.D. 62 (*An.* xv. 22); for prophecies of earthquakes see Isa. xxix. 6, Rev. viii. 5, xvi. 18—and of the famines. For famines in prophecy see Jer. xv. 2, Ezek. v. 17, xiv. 13. A historical famine of the period is that under Claudius mentioned in Acts xi. 28. Famine also played a great part in the horrors of the siege of Jerusalem (Jos. *B.J.* vi. 3, 3-5). All these things are the beginning only of the pangs. This phrase is taken from O.T. prophecy (Hos. xiii. 13, Micah iv. 9, 10, Isa. lxvi. 7-9), where the chosen people is spoken of as passing through a crisis of intense suffering before emerging into a happier time. Later Rabbinical thought developed from this the doctrine of the birth pangs of the Messiah (Cheble M'shiach), the Messiah being born into the world after a time of tremendous convulsion; here we have rather the O.T. mode of speech.

All these things, then, belong to the beginning, not the end, of the troubles which must precede Christ's Second Coming. In this way they are deprived of their unsettling tendency, yet the Christian is kept watchful, for as the first steps of the denouement have been made, the other acts of it may be expected to follow shortly.

9. From what is passing in the great world, the discourse turns to something nearer at hand. (The verses now before us do not originally belong to a prophecy; in Matth. x. 17-22, they are found in an earlier form, and there they are a part, not of a prophecy, but of a speech of instruction and warning to the disciples. By adding the words of ver. 10, Mark gives them a prophetic colouring). While the Christians are not to be alarmed at the upheavals and distresses they hear of in the world, they are to be prepared for the worst in their own lives. Their acts and sufferings also contribute to the final result which is hastening on. They are to be brought before Sanhedrins, i.e. local Jewish magistracies, not only at Jerusalem, but also elsewhere (see Acts iv. 5 sqq., v. 21, 1 Thess. ii. 14); and in synagogues, where the procedure is summary, they will meet with hard usage (cf. Acts ix. 2, 2 Cor. xi. 24). They will also have to stand their trial before Roman procurators (cf. Felix, Festus); as used here the word would no doubt embrace the proconsuls Sergius Paulus and Gallio (cf. Acts xiii. 7 sqq. and xviii. 12 sqq.). As for kings, we have Agrippa and Caesar; but the terms used do not necessarily look beyond Palestine. They are to be put on trial "for my sake," i.e. not for any crime they have committed, but because they are Christians (not yet for bearing the name of Christians, as 1 Peter iv. 14-16,

¹T.R. adds καὶ ταραχαί.

such things must take place, but the end is not yet. For ⁸ nation will rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom, there will be earthquakes in this place and in that, there will be famines.¹ These are the beginning of the Pangs.

[Matthew xxiv. 9-14; Luke xxi. 12-19.]

But do you look to yourselves: they will hand you over to ⁹ local councils, and you will be beaten in synagogues and brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony to them. And the Gospel must first be preached to all ¹⁰ the Gentile nations. And when they are taking you away to ¹¹ the court, do not be anxious beforehand as to what you are to speak, but what is given to you at that hour, that do you speak; for it is not you who speak but the Holy Spirit. And ¹² the brother will give up his brother to death, and the father give up the child, and children will revolt against their parents

where the name itself appears to be a crime; see also Luke here, xxi. 12); and this is to be for a testimony to them, i.e. it is to be placed beyond doubt by such scenes that the Gospel has been preached in the places concerned (Matthew adds, and to the Gentiles), and that not in a corner, but in such a way that even governors and kings know of it. Mark dwells more on this thought in ver. 10, which he alone gives. In Matth. x. 23 the disciples are told that they will not have gone over the cities of Israel when the Messiah comes. Mark gives a longer day, and one more appropriate to his readers. The consummation cannot take place, he holds, till the Gospel has been brought fully to the Gentiles. The Gentile mission is going on when this is written, but not nearly complete, and Paul's view that the conversion of the fulness of the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 25 sq.) is a necessary preliminary to that of the Jews and to the consummation of all things, is evidently in the writer's mind.

11. The rule that the Christians when placed on their defence were not to trust to preparation, but to follow the inspiration of the moment, must belong to the earliest Christian times. The

speeches in Acts are not unpremeditated effusions, but well-constructed theological studies with the necessary rhetorical colour. (See, however, Acts iv. 8, "Peter full of the Holy Ghost"). Nor does any of the lists which we possess of the spiritual gifts of the early Church include that of 'apology' or defence of the faith. In preaching to the Corinthians, Paul relied on the aid of the Spirit (1 Cor. ii. 4), and defence of the faith made in this way might often, no doubt, be more forcible than if carefully prepared beforehand. If the whole life of the Christians was under the power of the Spirit this part of it ought not to form an exception.

12. To be quite faithful in religion often involves, both in the Old Testament and the New, the estrangement of one's relatives and dearest friends (Matth. x. 34 sqq.). The division of families and the failure of natural affection is often spoken of as a symptom of the growing evil of the world which calls for judgment. Micah vii. 6 is, perhaps, referred to here. On the other hand, the better Age when it comes is to reknit the faintly bond and restore natural relations among men (Mal. iii. 1, iv. 5, 6, Luke i. 17, Matth. xvii. 11-13). Christians, therefore, who

¹ Add, and disturbances.

θάνατον καὶ πατὴρ τέκνου, καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς
 13 καὶ θανατώσονται αὐτούς· καὶ ἔστεθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ
 τὸ δονομά μου· ὃ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται.

The immediate Signs of the End : great tribulation, xiii. 14-20.

14 "Οταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ

βδελυγμα τῆς ἡρημόστεως

ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ—οἱ ἀναγυνώσκων νοεῖτω—τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ
 15 Ἰουδαΐᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὅρη· ὃ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω
 16 μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω τι ἄραι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὃ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν
 17 μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὄπιστα ἄραι τὸ ἴματιον αὐτοῦ. οὐαὶ δὲ
 ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς
 18 ἡμέραις. προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται χειμῶνος. ἔσονται γὰρ
 19 αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι θλίψις, οἵα οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως

regard the world as rushing to its catastrophe must expect to see this degeneration and be prepared for this kind of suffering. They must expect, indeed, to become the objects of general hatred. Matthew limits the hatred to the Gentiles, but originally the Jews were thought of. The enmity which their Master encountered will vent itself on those who bear his name. (This extreme unpopularity of the Christians scarcely belongs to the earliest time; Acts shows little of it; it must belong to the rising fanaticism of the Jews before ruin overtook them). But the hatred and persecution of the world will not destroy them. They will not be exterminated even when all bonds are relaxed and all passions set at large. If they bear with patience and courage all that is laid on them, as long as it is necessary to do so, or till the final act of the drama is revealed (the end here may be taken in either of these senses), they will survive and be ready for the gracious change when it takes place (ver. 20 recurs to this).

In Matthew the endurance to be practised is placed in another light by his ver. 12, which Mark has not, "Because of the abounding of iniquity the love of many shall be chilled." The Christian is to resist this chilling of his love—to persist in maintaining his charity.

14. The former verses were against being alarmed. They dealt with matters which had already happened at the

time of writing. Now that time is reached, and things are spoken of which have not yet transpired; now is the time for alarm, when these events emerge, and for immediate action. The event anticipated is spoken of in mysterious terms, and something is left to be made out by the reader, i.e. to the private reader into whose hands this apocalypse might come. Such a work was not suited for a meeting, and we need not think of the person who read aloud to the brethren assembled. 'The reader is to note this,' i.e. this is the point at which action is called for, and the reader is to attend and see how the signal is described on which he is to act, and if the signal is actually taking place, what he is called to do. The enigmatic words are taken, Matthew says, from Daniel. In Mark their strange grammar makes them emphatic. The signal for action is to be the appearance of the "abomination of desolation," or the horrid thing which works desecration. These words stand in Daniel xii. 11, and in 1 Macc. i. 54, and in both passages they indicate the heathen altar which Antiochus Epiphanes caused in the year 168 B.C. to be erected on the great altar of burnt-offering in the Temple at Jerusalem, and on which sacrifice was there offered to the Olympian Zeus. Such an event could not be forgotten by the Jews, and in prophesying its repetition the evangelist anticipates the occurrence of the most dreadful thing that could happen to the Jewish race. 'The abomination'

and put them to death. And you will be hated by all men ¹³ on account of my name. But he who endures to the end shall be saved.

[Matthew xxiv. 15-22; Luke xxi. 20-24.]

But when you see the

¹⁴

Abomination of Devastation,

see him standing where he ought not (let the reader pay attention!) then let those who are in Judaea flee to the mountains; he who is on the roof of his house, let him not ¹⁵ descend nor enter the house to get anything out of it, and ¹⁶ he who is in the field, let him not turn back to fetch his coat. But woe to women who are with child and to those ¹⁷ who are nursing infants, at that time! And do you pray that ¹⁸ it may not take place in winter. For the time will be one of ¹⁹ such distress that there has been nothing like it from the day

is to stand again ‘where “he” ought not,’ an euphemism by which the writer avoids uttering fully the horrible thought. Why does he use the masculine gender here in speaking of the ‘abomination’? Because the outrage on Jewish feeling which he anticipates, is the setting up of the worship of a living man. All the Emperors were called ‘Divus,’ divine being, and were worshipped officially throughout the Empire; and while Jewish feeling was generally spared in this matter, the Emperor Caligula had in the year 38 A.D. instituted a bloody persecution of the Jews for refusing to worship him. Another Emperor might act in the same way. If the Romans, enraged at the Jews and now advancing to make an end of them, should carry out their whole system at Jerusalem, then the abomination of desolation would be seen again, the Emperor’s image standing where it ought not, namely, in the Holy of Holies. This fixes the date of the present apocalypse, though not necessarily of the Gospel. It was put in circulation a few months before the capture of Jerusalem.¹ Cf. Cheyne’s article on ‘Abomination of Desolation’

in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, and Driver on the same in Hasting’s *Bible Dictionary*.

When the event thus mysteriously indicated takes place, then is the time to be alarmed. The Christians in Judaea—only they are addressed—are to take to flight at once. It is not their business to defend the Temple, but to keep together and be in readiness for their returning Master. The shocking event interests them only as a step in the process of the winding up of the world. That they are to betake themselves to the mountains may be suggested by Ezek. vii. 16: “They that escape of them shall be on the mountains, like doves of the valleys.” Ensebius, *H.E.* iii. 5, 3 tells how the Christians left Jerusalem when the troubles preceding its destruction arose, and removed to Pella in accordance with an old oracle, apparently our passage. Flight is to be resorted to with the greatest haste. He who is on the housetop when the news comes is to escape over the roofs, leaving everything behind him; the man in the field is not to go to the end of the furrow for his coat.

17. In a hurried flight on foot the case

salem being surrounded by armies. But Daniel’s phrase must be taken, unless otherwise explained, in its original significance; and a Roman army was no new thing in Palestine.

¹ Weiss proposes to understand the abomination of desolation of the Roman army, and ‘where it ought not’ of the sacred soil of Palestine. This makes Matthew and Mark agree with Luke, who does not mention the abomination of desolation, but speaks of Jeru-

20 ἦν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς ἕως τοῦ νῦν καὶ οὐ μὴ γένηται. καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολόβωσεν Κύριος τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἀν ἐσάθη πᾶσα σάρξ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο ἐκολόβωσεν τὰς ἡμέρας.

Warnings to disciples for the critical period, xiii. 21-23.

21 Καὶ τότε ἔαν τις ὑμῶν εἴπῃ, Ἰδε ὁδε ὁ Χριστός; Ἰδε ἔκει, μὴ πιστεύετε. ἐγερθήσονται δὲ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ¹ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ ποίησουσιν σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα πρὸς τὸ ἀποτλανᾶν εἰ δυνατὸν τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς. ὑμεῖς δὲ βλέπετε· προείρηκα ὑμῖν πάντα.

Signs in heaven; the Coming of Messiah, xiii. 24-27.

24 Ἀλλὰ ἐν ἔκειναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἔκείνην ὁ ηλιος
25 σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς, καὶ οἱ
ἀστέρες ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίπτοντες, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν
26 τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται. καὶ τότε ὅψονται τὸν νιὸν τοῦ

of women so encumbered would be a hard one indeed. If it took place in time of rain—January and February are generally cold and rainy in Palestine—its miseries would be much increased. This verse may be taken to show that the writer saw the crisis to be some time distant (Matthew adds ‘nor on the Sabbath’—one of his legalistic Jewish touches). These realistic features are then merged in the general statement that the distress which is impending will exceed anything ever known before (Joel ii. 2, Dan. xii. 1), and if continued would cause the extermination of the human race, that is in Palestine, for the view does not here extend further. Even the Flood is left behind ; it does not figure here, but in the eschatology of Matthew and Luke it is compared with what is coming. As on that occasion, the forces of destruction are to be restrained by God, not for the sake of the general population of the world, but because of His chosen ones. His gracious purpose for them, according to which they are to greet the Messiah at his return to earth and to enter an age of peace and happiness with him, must be carried out ; and it stands therefore as a part of His

decrees that the coming distress is not to be allowed to proceed to the uttermost, but to come to an end before men are exterminated.

21. The prediction of ver. 6 is here repeated, and substantially in the same words, though with some additions. The two predictions are no doubt drawn from different sources (see Weiss), but the reading of D, given in the note, makes them less clearly identical. Deut. xiii. gives tests to be applied to prophets with their signs and wonders. The belief that such persons may appear, and that they will authenticate themselves by considerable performances to which few will be able to refuse credence, is general in the New Testament, though few examples of the class can be cited. In Matthew the words follow (Luke has them elsewhere, xvii. 24), which describe the real coming of Messiah as very different from these impostures, and a thing which no one can fail to recognize. His coming will be like lightning.

24. This is continuous with verse 20, and carries on the series of events be-

¹ Omit ψευδόχριστοι καὶ.

when God began the work of creation till now, and never will be again. And unless the Lord had cut that time short, no ²⁰ one would be left alive; but for the sake of His elect ones whom he elected, He has cut it short.

[Matthew xxiv. 23-25.]

And then if any one say to you, Look, here is the Christ! ²¹ or, Look, he is there!, do not believe him. False Christs will ²² appear and false prophets¹ and will work signs and wonders so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect. But do you ²³ be on your guard; I have forewarned you of it all.

[Matthew xxiv. 29-31; Luke xxi. 25-28.]

But in those days, after that distress, the sun will be ²⁴ darkened, and the moon will not give her light, and the stars ²⁵ will be falling from heaven, and the powers in the heavens will rock. And then they will see the Son of Man coming ²⁶

ginning with the appearance of the 'abomination.' Readers of the Old Testament are familiar with the prediction of celestial disturbances as signs that the day of God is coming, or accompaniments of His judgments. Isa. xiii. 10, xxiv. 21, 23, xxxiv. 4; Jerem. iv. 23; Ezek. xxxii. 7, 8; Zeph. i. 15; Hag. ii. 6, are some of the passages. Joel ii. 31 is quoted by Peter in Acts ii. 19-21. Compare also the sixth seal in Rev. vi. 12-14.

Such expressions belong, of course, to a period of astronomical knowledge in which the stars were regarded as powers, or as sentient beings who had some influence on the affairs of the earth and were involved more or less in its catastrophes.

26. The great event to which all the signs have pointed and for which all the labours and sufferings of the Christians have been a preparation, is described in Mark very briefly. The coming of the Messiah is told in almost the same words as those used by Jesus at the trial (xiv. 62). Matthew and Luke have discourses and parables about the suddenness of the Parousia, the state of preparation or unpreparedness in which it will find the Christians, and

the judgment which it ushers in. These matters are necessarily Jewish in colouring, and the scene in which they are looked for is the land of Palestine. The writer for the Western Church, if he knew them, does not give them, but contents himself with the briefest statement of the return of the Messiah and his meeting with his saints. The term Son of Man is used here in its traditional sense. In Enoch xlvi. 2, xlviii. 2, lxix. 29, the Son of Man is one who has been kept in reserve by God, though he was created before all things, and who, when his time comes, is brought forward to vindicate the cause of God and His saints on the earth, in the face of powerful opposition, and to "sit on the throne of his glory, and all evil will pass away before his face." On other uses of the term, in Mark, see p. 82. Applied as it is here to Jesus, the character grows, of course, much more definite; yet it remains Jewish, both in its moral colour and in its incidents. The great power with which he comes consists of a numerous retinue—the armies of angels and their trumpets are detailed in other parts of the New Testament (1 Thess. iv. 16, 1 Cor. xv. 52, etc.). The glory with

¹ False prophets will appear.

ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης.
 27 καὶ τότε ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἄγγελους καὶ ἐπισυνάξει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς
 αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου
 οὐρανοῦ.

Parable of the Fig-tree, xiii. 28-29.

28 Ἐπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν. ὅταν αὐτῆς ἥδη ὁ
 κλάδος ἀπαλὸς γένηται καὶ ἐκφύγη τὰ φύλλα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς
 29 τὸ θέρος ἐστὶν οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδητε ταῦτα γινόμενα,
 γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύραις.

The time of the Second Coming. It is certain, but the precise date is a mystery, xiii. 30-32.

30 Ἄμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη μέχρις οὗ
 31 ταῦτα πάντα γένηται. ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται, οἱ δὲ

which he comes is his outward splendour, so different from the lowly guise in which he dwelt with men before. At the time of his coming there are Christians in every part of the world, and they have to be collected in order to enter all together into the joy of their Lord and sit down at his table in the Kingdom. They are brought from the farthest East, the extremity of the earth to which the Jew looked, turning his back on the sea; and from the farthest West, the end of heaven, where the sky dipped down on the ocean. They constitute a new Diaspora, to be brought together like the old one, from the four winds (Ps. civii. 2, 3). The working out of this representation, here condensed into one sentence, gave occupation to several N.T. writers. While Jesus himself no doubt looked forward to a judgment, the details with which it is set forth here must be regarded as beyond his view.

28. The emblem of the **fig-tree** is here used in quite a different way from that which we saw in chap. xi. 13, 14, 20-24, and in Luke's parable, xiii. 6-9. There the fig-tree which bears no fruit is held up as a warning; here we have a parable of growth, or of the signs to be apprehended in nature.

29. It is difficult to see what occurrences are meant here to be taken as the

signs of the approaching Parousia. Not surely the heavenly disturbances of ver. 24, with which the leafing of the fig-tree has little analogy. The matters spoken of in ver. 14-20 are also too definite to be thus referred to. The preceding sections have laid down as in a chart the succession of events which is to lead up to the Second Coming and the winding up of the Age. With such a chart before him the Christian can know pretty accurately where he stands. The parable of the fig-tree, however, is, like other parables, an appeal to the reason of the hearers; it tells them of something which by thought and care they can make out for themselves, which accordingly is not plainly indicated but only suggested. The meaning evidently is that those who apply to the events which are going on in the world even a moderate amount of insight, will be able to see when the catastrophe is at hand. If that is the case, if Christians are able to read the signs of the times for themselves, then there is no need for such a set of flaring beacons as we have been reading of to announce the end.

The parable, in fact, must be considered out of place here. It belongs to that strain of Christ's teaching in which he deprecates the Jewish eagerness for signs, and maintains that to the discerning, and to those who

on clouds with great power and glory. And then he will send ²⁷ the angels and will gather his elect together from the four winds, from the furthest point of the earth to the furthest point of heaven.

[Matthew xxiv. 32, 33; Luke xxi. 29-31.]

But from the fig-tree learn her parable. When once her ²⁸ branch turns soft and puts forth leaves, you know that summer is near. So do you, when you see these things taking place, ²⁹ know that it¹ is near, at the doors.

[Matthew xxiv. 34-36; Luke xxi. 32, 33.]

I tell you assuredly that this generation will not die out ³⁰ till it all takes place. Heaven and earth will pass away, but ³¹

believe in God's rule, no signs are necessary to teach them where they stand. If signs are wanted, he teaches (Luke xii. 54 *sqq.*), they may always be seen in the course of events, as the signs of the weather in the face of the sky.

On the one hand, taking the words as they stand, the catastrophe is not so near but that there will be some warning before it comes, at least to the discerning. On the other hand, however, it is not far off; even if no signs of it appear, Christians are to know that the delay is not for long.

30. We come now to a more definite statement as to the time of the consummation. On the one hand it is so near that persons who are living will see it. The prediction (ix. 1) that there were some living in Christ's presence who would live to see the Kingdom of God come with power, is repeated. The situation reflected by the words is the same as that in 1 Thess. iv., where the Church of Thessalonica had lost a number of members by death. In that chapter and in 1 Cor. xv. Paul expresses the conviction that many who were living when he wrote would witness without dying the second coming of the Lord. 'We who

are alive and remain,' he says (1 Thess. iv. 15). 'We shall not all sleep,' (1 Cor. xv. 51). So here: while some have died since Christ's removal from the earth, some of the generation living in Christ's day (so at ix. 1), or more likely, when this piece was written, will see his return and triumph.

31. On the other hand there is delay: yet that delay does not make Christ's promise vain. Ver. 31 is not to be taken as a prediction of the passing away of heaven and earth. The expression is from Isaiah li. 6 (compare also Isaiah xxxiv. 4, xl. 8; Ps. cii. 25, 26), and is a strong asseveration that the words of the Lord in the foregoing apocalypse are to be depended on. The assurance is no doubt in answer to the question, "Where is the promise of his coming?" Though the promise has not yet been fulfilled, it yet stands sure. The day is impending, no doubt of it. The words of the Lord are here an authority, as in Matth. vii. 24, and frequently in John. The process of collecting them and of investing them with authority would take some time; but this kind of collection came before the composition of complete biographies of Jesus. Here the eschatological discourse is part of the inviolable words of the Master.

¹ Or, he, = "The Lord is at hand!" Translating 'it,' we have to think of 'the accomplishment.'

³² λόγοι μου οὐ παρελεύσονται. περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ὁ νιός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.

The disciples are to Watch, xiii. 33-37.

³³ ³⁴ Βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε· οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρός ἐστιν. ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος ἀφεὶς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ δοὺς τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ τὴν ἔξουσίαν, ἐκάστῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῷ θυρωρῷ ³⁵ ἐνετείλατο ὥνα γρηγορῆ. γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται, ἢ ὅψε ἢ μεσονύκτιον ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας ³⁶ ἢ πρωΐ· μὴ ἐλθῶν ἐξαίφνης εὕρῃ ὑμᾶς καθεύδοντας. ὁ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω πάσιν λέγω, γρηγορεῖτε.

The Resolution to put Jesus to death, xiv. 1, 2.

¹ Ἡν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄξυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας. καὶ ἐξήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς πῶς αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ¹ κρατήσαντες

32. In Zech. xiv. 7 the day of judgment is known to the Lord alone. ‘The day or the hour’ is a standing phrase among the early Christians; cf. 1 Thess. v. 1. When such expectations as those now before us possess men’s minds, attempts are made to fix the date of the great event; of this we have abundance of evidence even in our own day. If such attempts were made in the early Church the text declares them to be vain. No one can say when the great day is to be, or at what part of the day the new order will flash upon the world (the hour, ver. 35). It is kept a great secret; even in heaven no one knows it but the Supreme Himself. The Son is here spoken of as a heavenly figure; in the parable of the Vineyard this was not yet the case. If the words, in chap. i. ver. 1, “the Son of God,” are received, they must be interpreted according to their meaning to the evangelist in the passage now before us, of the Christ in heaven. It appears, however, very possible that a saying like this may have been spoken by Jesus himself, and that he

may have spoken of the Son as he does in Matth. xi. 27, not meaning, as the phrase here must imply, the Son at God’s right hand, but the Son on earth. The belief in God’s final intervention to set up His Kingdom was always present to Jesus’ mind; even in the parables it forms the background of his thought, and as the end drew near this prospect became more closely impending. Yet he does not presume to fix a date for the great event. Even the evangelists, when they do so, preserve a judicious vagueness. Before the generation passes away, they say; before the Jewish mission is completed; or, not till the Gentile mission is complete. In the verse before us we may have a true reminiscence of what Jesus himself said on this point, in what circumstances we cannot now tell. He declared that it was a thing God kept to Himself; even to the Son to whom all things were delivered it was a mystery.

33. As the date of the Second Coming is so entirely unknown, and as in spite of all the signs and premonitions of the

¹ Omit ἐν δόλῳ.

my words will not pass away. But about that day or hour ³²
no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, not even the
Son, but only the Father.

[Matthew xxiv. 42—xxv. 30; Luke xii. 35-48, xiii. 25,
xix. 11-27, xxi. 34-36.]

Look to it, keep awake; for you do not know when the time ³³
is. It is like the case of a man who was going abroad and left ³⁴
his household and gave his servants their charge, to each of
them his work, and to the porter in particular he gave orders
to watch. Do you then watch, for you do not know when ³⁵
the master of the household is coming, whether in the evening
or at midnight or at cockcrow or early in the morning; lest ³⁶
he should come suddenly and find you sleeping. And what I ³⁷
say to you I say to all, Watch.

[Matthew xxvi. 1-5; Luke xxii. 1, 2.]

Now it was two days to Passover and unleavened bread. ¹
And the high-priests and the Scribes were looking for some

earlier part of the chapter no one in heaven or earth save God Himself can have any certainty about it further than that it will infallibly take place, the Christians must have it always present to their minds and keep themselves in readiness for it night and day. The rationale of this is not fully set forth in Mark's Gospel. He does not explain wherein the danger lies of being found asleep when Christ returns. That is set forth in the parables, given at this point by Matthew and Luke, of the Watching Servants, of the Talents, of the Ten Virgins. Luke's parable of the Unjust Judge also has reference to this point, and many another saying in the parallel synoptics. The short parable given by Mark presents the same situation as that of the Talents—the master away on his travels, the servants left in charge and ignorant of the date of his return. The point of Mark's parable, however, is different: it is from the porter and the charge given to him that the lesson is here drawn. The porter is to keep awake, that is his special function, and the Christians are in the same position as the porter. The master may come at any hour of the night (the four watches are enumerated, according

to the Roman division), and the porter has to keep awake all night to be ready to open the door when the summons comes. Ill were it for the porter if he were not found ready; ill for the Christian if the hour to which he looks forward comes when he is bent on something else, and he should lose its joy and triumph.

37. That lesson is not only for the Apostles but for all Christians; not only for the Christians of Palestine, where the Lord is to set up his Kingdom, but also for those of Rome and of all lands. Wherever they are they must be intent on the return of Christ; they must keep up the habits of prayer, devotion, regularity, presence of mind, sobriety in all things, by which alone it is possible to make sure that when the master comes they will not be put to shame.

xiv.—xv. THE PASSION.

xiv. 1. Here first is the Passover mentioned in this Gospel. The synoptical tradition does not describe Jesus' journey to Jerusalem as that of a pilgrim to a festival, but as undertaken for the fulfilment of his own

2 ἀποκτείνωσιν ἔλεγον γάρ, Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, μή ποτε ἔσται θόρυβος τοῦ λαοῦ.

The Anointing at Bethany, xiv. 3-9.

3 Καὶ ὅντος αὐτοῦ ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ, κατακειμένου αὐτοῦ ἥλθεν γυνὴ ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς· συντρίψασα τὸν ἀλάβαστρον κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ
4 τῆς κεφαλῆς. ἦσαν δέ τινες ἄγανακτούντες πρὸς ἕαντούς, Εἰς τὶ

mission. No indication is given in that tradition how long a time Jesus was in the capital before his death. Here all at once we are told that the Passover, and the unleavened bread, which began on the day on which the Passover was killed (the two elements of the festival being joined together in one phrase) was only two days off. The combination of the Passover with the last scenes of the life of Jesus is not worked up to in this Gospel, and we shall see how little stress is laid on it even where it might naturally have been noticed. The first and immediate consequence of the occurrence of the Passover at this juncture is that the plans of the authorities in connection with Jesus are hastened, and they proceed to act in a way they had not formerly intended. That the highpriests and scribes were seeking to bring about Jesus' arrest, is nothing new; we heard the same statement at xii. 12, after Jesus spoke the parable of the Vineyard which they felt to be aimed at themselves. What is new in the present passage is that they do not wish the arrest to be made during the festival. At that time Jerusalem was, of course, thronged with pilgrims, and the multitude was one which the rulers could not manage so easily as the ordinary population which was there at other times. Many of Jesus' friends from Galilee were, no doubt, at the festival, and multitudes of others not so tied to the Jerusalem system as to be hostile to Jesus. If, therefore, the arrest was to take place at the time of the festival, it must be managed quietly and not on the streets or near the Temple, where it

might lead to a riot; it must be done by craft.¹ Judas afterwards comes and shows them how it may be done in the way they have been thinking of.

The question here meets us of the evidence on which the tradition may be supposed to rest when it speaks of the plans and intentions of Jesus' enemies in these last days. The proceedings at the trial must have been reported by a person cognizant of the policy of the authorities.

3. Here Jesus is a guest in a house at Bethany. It is not said by Mark that the disciples are with him; Matthew says so, and in John xii. 1-8 the story is further developed. In Mark, Jesus appears to have friends at Bethany, from whom the animal is borrowed for the triumphal Entry; the disciples go there in xi. 11, 12, and in xi. 27 they make the same journey again; in xiii. 1 the company is on the Mount of Olives, it is not said they were going to Bethany, though the Mount of Olives was on the way there; in xiv. 32 after supper they proceed in the same direction, but the disciples go to sleep on reaching Gethsemane. At xiv. 12-17 Jesus is living outside the town, and arranges the Passover meal, which could only be eaten in Jerusalem, from there. Luke's statement (xxi. 37, 38) that Jesus went regularly to the Mount called Elaiion, Mount of Olives, for his night quarters, appears to preclude the belief that the regular night quarters were at Bethany; in connection with which we notice that Luke does not give the anointing at Bethany, but gives an anointing at the house of Simon (vii. 36-50), in which,

¹ D omits ἐν δόλῳ, underhand, and makes it appear that two decisions had been come to by the authorities: 1. to get Jesus arrested and killed; 2. not to have it done at the festival. The addition of ἐν δόλῳ imputes to

them a third resolution, viz., if the arrest was to take place at the festival, to have it arranged quietly. The omission makes the history simpler.

underhand¹ way to get him arrested and put to death. For 2 they said, Not during the festival, lest there be a disturbance among the people.

[Matthew xxvi. 6-13.]

And he was at Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, 3 and while he was reclining, a woman came who had an unguent-flask of genuine nard of great value; she broke the flask, and poured out the contents on his head. But there 4 were some there who showed displeasure at this, and said to

however, Simon is not a leper but a Pharisee, and the woman, on the contrary, a sinner. Luke gives the visit of Jesus to Mary and Martha at "a certain village" (x. 38). The fourth Gospel combines in one the traditions formerly separate of the two sisters and the anointing.

Jesus is under a friendly roof at Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, a person known to the early Church, no doubt, since he needs no further introduction, but not mentioned in the Gospels except on this occasion. The only leper otherwise spoken of in Mark is he of i. 40-45; if the persons are different, Jesus was acquainted with two restored lepers. In this house a scene is enacted which forms the most striking contrast with those on which the Gospel is now to enter; we are shortly to see the Lord among enemies who have him at their mercy and pour out on him the full measure of their rancour; for a moment we see him reclining in the house of friends, sheltered from the world and treated, as those in after times who love his memory would fain have treated him, with unstinted love and devotion. The woman whose act is now to be recorded has no name in Mark, nor are we told whether she was one of the inmates of the house or entered from outside. A poor woman would not have possessed what this one brought with her; and she was one who knew Jesus, had exulted, no doubt, in his triumphal Entry which started from Bethany, and fully sympathized in his labours and struggles at Jerusalem. For the Messiah no mark of kindness

could be, in the eyes of such a one, extravagant. She came, then, to anoint the Master as he reclined, perhaps at table, as in Matthew; anointing was an ordinary refreshment after a journey or in connection with a meal, and if the host did not provide it another might do so (Luke vii. 46). She made use of the most expensive material. Nard is a product of N. and Eastern India, and was highly valued in antiquity: there was a trade in it at Tarsus, the precious unguent being sent out in long-necked alabaster flasks. Like every such substance it was liable to adulteration and imitation, but this lady has a flask of genuine nard. On the word here translated genuine, also rendered in other ways, see Bruce's note (*Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. i.); on nard, see Riehm, *Handwörterbuch des bibl. Altertums*, sub voc. The flask is called an alabaster, but the word was used of an unguent flask though not made of that lucent white material. The breaking may refer to the seal, or the neck of the flask may have been broken, as none of the contents were to be kept any longer. The woman is not reported to have said anything as to the meaning of her anointing; Jesus afterwards gives an interpretation of it of which she may not have thought. It is an act of pure and uncalculating kindness and devotion.

4. Mark does not say it was disciples who objected: Matthew says so, and in John it is Judas. They are people, at any rate, of a frugal standard of living, and accustomed, as good Jews were, to think of almsgiving as part of a good life. Jesus himself, they knew, was far

¹ Omit, underhand.

5 ἡ ἀπῶλεια αὐτῇ τοῦ μύρου γέγονεν; ἡδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ
μύρον πραθῆναι ἐπάνω δημαρίων τριακοσίων καὶ δοθῆναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς.
6 καὶ ἐνεβριμῶντο αὐτῆς. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "Αφετε αὐτήν· τί αὐτῇ
7 κόπους παρέχετε; καλὸν ἔργον ἡργάσατο ἐν ἐμοί. πάντοτε γὰρ
τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, καὶ ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε αὐτοῖς
8 πάντοτε¹ εὐ ποιῆσαι, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε. ὁ ἔσχεν ἐποίησεν
9 προέλαβεν μυρίσαι τὸ σῶμά μου εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν. ἀμὴν δὲ
λέγω ὑμῖν, "Οπου ἔαν κηρυχθῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον,
καὶ ὁ ἐποίησεν αὐτῇ λαληθήσεται εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς.

The Betrayal, xiv. 10, 11.

10 Καὶ Ιούδας Ἰσκαριώθ, ὁ εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς τοὺς
11 ἀρχιερεῖς ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδοῖ αὐτοῖς. οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐχάρησαν καὶ
ἐπηγγείλαντο αὐτῷ ἀργύριον δοῦναι· καὶ ἔζητε πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαίρως
παραδοῖ.

from thoughts of luxury ; he told his followers to sell their goods, and give alms with the proceeds, trusting in God for what they needed. And here is a piece of culpable luxury applied to such a teacher—a sum poured out in a transitory individual pleasure which could have brought relief to hundreds of the poor. They are not against the anointing, but oil would have done, or a less expensive unguent ; and they hold up to the woman, no doubt in strong and pointed language, the incongruity of her act.

6. Jesus, however, though he had taught his disciples the lessons of poverty and charity which the first preachers of a new faith require to learn, knew more himself than he had taught, and when a fine act was done in his sight was able to rejoice in it even if it did not square with the rules of his order. A warm heart dispenses with all rules, he knew, and perhaps he also saw that the rich are able to do things the poor cannot think of, by which life is brightened and ennobled. ‘She has done a good work on me.’ The Greek word would suggest aesthetic merit, a beautiful work, but the word Jesus used

was Aramaic, and probably did not convey this. He has sympathy at any rate with the woman’s motives, and will not have her molested or distressed. It is well to think of the poor, but not well to let the thought of them spread over the whole of life and choke the action of other good impulses. There is something to be said for her extravagance, at least on this occasion. It is a special time with him ; he is going away, and for kindness to him there will be little further opportunity. It was not ill done on her part, then, to come forward in this brief space that is left and do her best for him. Little can be done for him—a woman cannot set him on his rightful throne or make his enemies to yield. What she can do is only to express her own conviction, and that her generous act has done. The act has another significance, indeed. It is the beginning of the burial rites which his friends will soon have to think of for him. He knows his death is near, and after it there will be the anointing,¹ for only in the case of rich and great people was embalming resorted to. He has almost done with his body, and this woman’s act is an indication to him clear that Jesus, while foreseeing his death, did not foresee the manner of it.

¹ In the case of crucifixion there were no such rites ; from this and other indications it seems

¹ Omit πάντοτε.

each other, What was the use of wasting the ointment in such a way? This ointment could have been sold for more than fifteen pounds, and the money given to the poor! And they broke out upon her. But Jesus said, Let her alone: why do you trouble her? She has done a good work on me. For the poor you have always with you, and whenever you like you can always¹ do good to them; but you are not always to have me. She has done what she could; she has anointed my body beforehand for burial. And I tell you assuredly, wherever the Gospel is preached in the whole world, this woman's action also shall be spoken of, for a memorial of her.

[Matthew xxvi. 14-16; Luke xxii. 3-6.]

And Judas of Karioth, one of the Twelve, went to the high-priests and offered to give him up to them. And they were delighted to hear it, and promised to give him money; and from that time onwards he looked for a convenient opportunity to give him up.

that others will care for it afterwards as far as they can. A tragic and solemn tone is thus given to the scene. We read in the sequel how, when the death had taken place, three women, who are named, brought spices to the tomb to do the work Jesus here speaks of, and how they were prevented from accomplishing it.

9. A verse is added which states one result of this little incident. This unknown woman obtained by her reckless generosity a place in the **Gospel narrative**, from which she was never to be removed. Wherever the Gospel is preached—Gospel here being a message with a certain amount of historical matter contained in it, but still a spoken, not a written thing—wherever the Gospel is preached (readers will know what is meant by the Gospel, and not a word of explanation needs to be added to the term) this woman's act will be recited, and she will be held in honour. This verse accordingly takes us to the time in the early history of the Church

when the oral tradition of the Gospel in becoming fixed, and it is known that a certain narrative belongs to it; but the Gospel is not yet a written work.

10. This statement about Judas continues the story interrupted by the incident of Bethany; ver. 10 takes up ver. 2. There we heard that the authorities did not wish the arrest of Jesus to take place during the festival. If it did take place then, they wished it to take place quietly, where it would not be noticed. The **action of Judas** makes them forget their resolution to keep off the festival; he satisfies them that from his knowledge of his Master's habits he will be able to get the arrest effected so that no one will know of it. The result showed him to be right, as the mass of the pilgrims with whom Jerusalem was crowded knew nothing of the arrest, nor even, it is probable, of the crucifixion, till after it was over.¹

The story of Judas gives a striking

to get him arrested before the festival, and Judas having assisted them to do so. But *ekaipein* means opportunely, at a suitable time, and the context must decide in each case whether the time it describes is early or late.

¹ Spitta, *Urchristentum*, vol. i., p. 225, renders *ekaipein* "in good time," sc. early enough. He considers that Jesus did not hold the Passover with his disciples, the authorities having planned, so ver. 2 is taken,

¹ Omit, always.

Preparation for the Passover, xiv. 12-17.

- 12 Καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἡμέραν τῶν ἀξύμων, διετέ τὸ πάσχα ἔθνον, λέγουσιν
αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, Ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες ἐτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα
13 φάγης τὸ πάσχα; καὶ ἀποστέλλει δόν τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ
λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ ἀπαντήσει ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος
14 κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάξων ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ, καὶ ὅπου ἔσται
εἰσέλθῃ εἴπατε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ ὅτι Ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει, Ποῦ
ἐστὶν τὸ κατάλυμά μου ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου
15 φάγω; καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἐτοιμον
16 καὶ ἐκεὶ ἐτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν. καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ἥλθον εἰς
τὴν πόλιν καὶ εὑρούν καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.
17 καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.

The Passover meal, xiv. 18-21.

- 18 Καὶ ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσθίοντων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ἄμην
λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με, ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ.

example of the growth of the tradition from one Gospel to another. In Mark he does not ask for money; the authorities promise it, we do not hear how much. In Matthew he asks for money, and the sum agreed on is named; it is connected, we afterwards hear (xxvii. 9), with an O.T. prophecy. In Luke Satan enters into Judas, and the money is agreed on between the authorities and him. In John xii. 1-8 Judas is the keeper of the bag; his history is fully explained.

12. Jesus is living with his disciples outside the walls, but the *Passover* could only be eaten in Jerusalem, close to the Temple where the victim was killed. The necessary *preparations* embraced the killing of the lamb and the application of its blood to the altar, the cooking of the lamb and of the bitter herbs, the providing of wine, etc. As we shall see afterwards there is nothing in the description of the meal itself which Jesus ate with his disciples on the last night of his life to show that it was a feast of *Passover*. The reader will remember that in the fourth Gospel Jesus does not eat the *Passover*, but is crucified on the day of that festival, and with this much early

testimony also agrees. The belief that he did eat the *Passover* is based on the passage now before us. The story here found in Mark is of the same graphic and circumstantial character as that of the finding of the animal for the triumphal Entry, and like it points to relations of private friendship occupied by Jesus which are not fully stated to us in the Gospels. In Matthew the person to whom the disciples are sent in Jerusalem appears to be named by Jesus—Go to such an one, he there says; the evangelist does not give the name, but indicates that the messengers know who was meant. In Luke this matter is just as in Mark, but it is Jesus himself who broaches the subject of the *Passover*.

The day having come, the 14th of Nisan, which commemorated to the Jews the departure out of Egypt, the disciples ask for instructions as to the *Passover* meal. The lamb should, according to the ritual (Exodus xii. 3), have been selected on the tenth of the month, even if it was not bought in the Temple market, though this, like other parts of the old ritual, may not have been rigidly adhered to at the period. At all events there was no doubt in the company that Jesus intended to observe

[Matthew xxvi. 17-20; Luke xxii. 7-14.]

And on the first day of unleavened bread, when people killed ¹² the Passover, Jesus' disciples say to him, Where do you wish us to go and make the preparations for your eating the Passover? And he sends two of his disciples and tells them, Go ¹³ into the city, and there will meet you a man with a water-jar; follow him, till he enters a house, and say to the master of ¹⁴ that house, Our Master says, Where is my room, in which I am to eat the Passover with my disciples? And he will ¹⁵ show you a large dining-room, furnished for a meal and ready; there make the preparations for us. And the disciples ¹⁶ set off and came into the town, and found everything as he had told them; and they prepared the Passover. And when ¹⁷ evening fell he comes with the Twelve.

[Matthew xxvi. 21-25; Luke xxii. 15, 16, 21-23.]

And as they were at table and were eating, Jesus said, ¹⁸ Assuredly I tell you that one of you is going to betray me,

the festival with his friends in the usual manner. The only question in doubt appears to be that of the place in which the meal is to be eaten. Jesus has not discussed this point with his friends, and they are in the dark even up to the morning of the day when the lamb had to be killed and eaten.

13. We appear to find here, as in the case of the colt at Bethany, a preconcerted arrangement, made by Jesus, and not communicated to his disciples till the moment arrives for carrying it out. As water is generally fetched by women in the East, a man with a water-jar would act as a good signal. He was to wait near the gate at which the messengers from Jesus would enter, and in some way he would recognize them. The lamb they would have with them. As they had often found Jesus aware of their necessities beforehand, and wisely providing for them, so in this instance all was already in train. According to the custom of the dwellers at Jerusalem who lent rooms to the pilgrims from a distance to eat their Passover, they were to find a large upstairs room bespoken for them and suitably arranged for the occasion. This little narrative is so circumstantial, and so likely, as to furnish the

strongest proof that Jesus did eat the Passover with his disciples. If the meal Jesus ate with his disciples on the last evening of his life was, as the fourth Gospel implies (xiii. 1, 2), not the Passover, then we have to ask how he came to be at supper within the walls of Jerusalem; only if it was a Passover, is the evening meal in Jerusalem accounted for. On that supposition there was good reason for his not coming to town during the day. In the confusion of the festival, when every one was busy with preparing for the Passover and the Temple was full of the blood of thousands of victims, there could be no preaching. Only in the evening does he come to town, reversing the direction of his usual evening journey (Mark xi. 19, Lk. xxi. 37). Mark alone states this clearly.

17. The word disciples, having been used of the two who went early, could not be conveniently used again of the ten who came later, and so they are called the Twelve, as in 1 Cor. xv. 5, though only ten are meant.

When we come to the narrative of the meal, we find it to be by no means full. Only two points are dwelt on in Mark and Matthew, that of the betrayal

19 ἦρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς κατὰ εἶς, Μήτι ἐγώ;¹ ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Εἴς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς 21 τὸ² τρύβλιον. ὅτι ὁ μὲν νιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι’ οὗ ὁ νιὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἀνθρωπὸς ἐκεῖνος.

The Lord's Supper, xiv. 22-25.

22 Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, Δάβετε· τοῦτο ἔστι τὸ σῶμά μου.

and that of the new institution. Luke has here, as in the whole history of the Passion and Resurrection, a number of additions. In John the last meal forms the basis of those discourses in which the relation between the dying Saviour and his Church is set forth in strains which can never cease to thrill the Christian heart. What we have now to consider is a lively narrative of very concrete incidents.

18. What they were eating we are not told, it has to be inferred from the Passover ritual; the story is very fragmentary. The incident about the *betrayal* could not be forgotten, the interruption of the meal by Jesus himself with such a shocking announcement, and the grief and dismay in which the disciples were plunged. Those eating together, especially those eating the great sacrifice, the Passover, together, naturally regarded themselves as a family; the eating from the same dish, and drinking from the same cup, was a mutual pledge of faith and brotherhood (1 Cor. x. 18). And this company was not a fortuitous concourse, bound together for the moment by an occasional rite; on the contrary its members had come through many things together and had high hopes in common. How dreadful then to be told as they are celebrating fellowship with each other in the common meal, that one of their company is turning his hand against his associates, and is on the point of betraying the Master, without whom their fellowship could have no existence, to his enemies outside. No wonder that cries of distress

arose, cries of indignation, of personal anxiety. The others, it appears, do not suspect Judas—he has dissembled very successfully; only the Master has noticed in these two days the change that has taken place in him. The others, therefore, each think that a dreadful charge is being made against himself; he does not understand how he can be guilty of such a crime, and yet the Master's statement is very positive. Can he be acting, without knowing it, in such a way as to incur such a charge? And each puts the question, expecting an answer in the negative, Not I, is it, Master? If he gets a warning in reply he can yet, perhaps, guard against the danger. But still Jesus does not name any one. The meal consists not only of bread and wine, or wine and water, the staple diet of all but the very poor in Palestine; in addition to the unleavened cake set down for each guest, there is also a dish standing in the centre, or handed round, to which each applies for his portion. At the Passover there might be two dishes, that containing the lamb and that with the bitter herbs with which it was eaten. "Dipping with me in the dish" has been interpreted as a ceremony of special friendship, like drinking wine together in our days; and it has been thought that Jesus by these words pointed out Judas, who was just paying him this compliment. But this goes beyond the words. The dish was common to all who sat at table, and the words "dippeth with me in the dish" indicate no more than the words "eateth

¹ Add καὶ ἄλλος, Μήτι ἐγώ;

² Add εν.

one who is eating with me. They began to be very sad, and 19 to say to him one by one, Surely it is not I?¹ But he said 20 to them, It is one of the Twelve, one who is dipping with me in the² dish. For the Son of Man is going away indeed 21 as Scripture says about him; but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed; well were it for that man if he had not been born.

[Matthew xxvi. 26-29; Luke xxii. 17-20.]

And as they were eating he took a loaf and after saying 22 the blessing he broke it and gave it to them and said, Take,

with me" in ver. 18, or the words of Luke xxii. 21, "the hand of my betrayer is with me on the table," which evidently do not point out any individual. The phrase brings out a little more strongly the blackness of the treachery. That one just about to carry out such a horrid plot should yet join with his intended victim in using the symbols of brotherhood and faithfulness!

21. Here we have a further idea entertained by Jesus about his own death. We found him before speaking of his death as necessary, as a part of the divine plan for him, and also declaring that his death would not be the end with him, but that he would rise again and come to judgment (viii. 31, x. 33 sq.). In Mark x. 45 a view is indicated in very general language as to the benefit which would accrue to others from his death. Here the circumstances and conditions of the death of the Messiah are again spoken of. Jesus speaks of the Son of Man, a phrase which, as we have seen, is used in its traditional and proper sense in those passages where the figure in question is that of a judge and avenger at the last day (xiii. 26, xiii. 38). The Son of Man is the Messiah, primarily in this aspect. But Jesus recognized that the Messiah's career was not to be one of unbroken triumph and majesty, and here this conviction is expressed in the phrase, "The Son of Man is going away." Scripture states that he is to do so, i.e. there is a Scripture passage which speaks of an interruption of the career of the Messiah,

and represents him as withdrawn for a time in order to appear again. If we enquire what passage is meant, the 53rd chapter of Isaiah readily occurs to us. The Messiah once identified with the Servant of Jehovah in that chapter, Scripture is seen to give this forecast of his history (ver. 10-12); he is to go away out of the world under the most painful circumstances, but only in order to come back again to enjoy a complete and final triumph. We see in Acts viii. 32 sqq. and other passages in the N.T. how this famous chapter was applied by the early Christians to the Messiah. Did Jesus himself carry the development of Messianic doctrine so far? If, while he foresaw his death, he yet expected to be present and to have a part to play in the establishment of the Kingdom, he must have done so. Yet some degree of perplexity attaches, as we saw (p. 82), to all the passages where Jesus speaks of himself as the Son of Man.

The rest of the verse is clear. Though it stands as part of the divine plan that the Messiah is to suffer and die, yet the guilt of the betrayer is not thereby removed. It is with mingled indignation and compassion that Jesus speaks of him, for a terrible fate awaits him. He will not only be left outside when the Messiah comes to his Kingdom; he will be visited with some special punishment: far better for him to have remained unborn!

22. If the meal Jesus ate with his disciples was the Passover, no details

¹Add, and another said, Surely not I?

²Or, according to the variant: the *one* dish.

*23 καὶ λαβὼν ποτίριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐπιον ἐξ
24 αὐτοῦ πάντες. καὶ ἐπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ ἀλμά μου τῆς*

are given to identify it. The writer shows no interest in the Passover ritual and only records incidents which have no connection with it. What is now to be told took place as they were eating, i.e. during the course of the meal; the meal was going on, but this is not a part of its ordinary form. Jesus, for the last time, acts as the host of his party; in doing so he bears himself exactly as he did when he fed the multitude at the lakeside (vi. 41, viii. 6), but here he connects the familiar acts with the thought of his own death in a way never to be forgotten. When he fed the multitude he made them think of other things than material food; it was a feeding of the spirit as well as of the body, and they all felt satisfied, though the quantity of food was so small which he distributed among them. So here he makes the disciples think of far different things from the bread and the cup he hands to them. He takes a loaf of bread, one of the round cakes or scones of unleavened bread which were on the table—each about a man's portion for a meal—and he breaks it into pieces, a piece for each of the disciples, he himself not sharing, then he says the blessing. The word "blessed" in this verse and the word "gave thanks" in the following (ver. 23), both represent the same Hebrew term and refer to the same act, so that no idea is suggested here any more than at vi. 41, that the blessing was meant to confer on the loaf some special character as consecrated. The Jew, desiring to take his food as from God's hand, offered thanks before eating to God the Giver. The thanksgiving might of course be followed by other petitions connected with any matter in hand. "Blessed be He who brings forth bread out of the earth" is the ordinary Jewish form, and in the earliest Christian accounts of the action the prayer before the bread and the cup is a thanksgiving to God, who causes the earth to produce such things. Cf. Didache, ix., Irenaeus, iv. 18, 4. The blessing said, Jesus gives the bread which he has broken to the disciples and bids them take it; they are to eat it, not he; he is giving it to them. And this bread which he gives them furnishes a par-

able. As he has often made use of common everyday things and incidents to suggest thoughts about God and God's Kingdom and the Messiah, so he does now. The bread he has broken and given to them is, he says, his body. It represents his body, i.e. it is a parable of his body, as when he says "the seed is the word," "the reapers are the angels." How does the bread represent his body? The point, it is commonly held, lies in the breaking. His body was about to be broken as the bread had been. The words of the Authorized Version in I Cor. xi. 24, "This is my body which is broken for you," imposed this interpretation on its readers. But the word 'broken' is absent from the Revised Version, the Greek word *κλάμενον* having been removed from the text by the editors.

Luke has, This is my body which is given for you.

Matthew, Take, eat, this is my body.

Mark, Take, this is my body. None of the passages, therefore, states that Jesus compared his body to the loaf in respect that both were broken. And there are also great difficulties in thinking that this was the original intention of the words. The body of Jesus was not broken in his death, a fact in which Christians saw a fulfilment of prophecy (John xix. 36). If Jesus then foresaw the manner of his death (cf. x. 34, also on xiv. 8), he could not say that his body was about to be broken. The point of the comparison of his body to the broken loaf lies in another direction, not in the breaking but in the giving. He has quite made up his mind to die; and in the scene at Bethany he speaks of his body as almost ready for the last anointing. Here he expresses the view he has learned to take of his death, now so certainly impending. He undertakes it willingly; called to give up his life he willingly devotes it to the service of those who may be benefited by it. In saying to his disciples "Take, this is my body," he means that they are to regard his death as a gift, the last of all his gifts, which he makes to them deliberately. His life is not taken from him against his will, but freely given. Even in his death he is to be thought of not as one who is over-

this is my body. And he took a cup and gave thanks and 23 gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said to 24 them, This is my covenant-blood which is poured out for

whelmed and hurled by the might of circumstances into a dark fate, but as one who goes cheerfully, with love in his heart, to make the last great sacrifice, and feels as he does so that he is allowed to serve his brethren in his death as he had served them in his life. In 1 Cor. and in Luke the disciples are told to "do this in remembrance of me," words which Mark and Matthew do not give. It was inevitable, however, that the action should be repeated after the departure of Jesus, and that in repeating it his followers should consider themselves to be carrying out his orders. (See on this passage a paper by the present writer in *The Expositor*, Oct. 1899, "The Lord's Supper: St. Mark or St. Paul?" where the views stated above as to the institution of the Supper are set forth more at large. For a careful statement of the points in the recent controversy on the institution of the Lord's Supper see Schmiedel in *Prot. Monatshefte* iii. 125. Plummer in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, 'Lord's Supper,' may also be consulted).

23. It is not said that this cup was a part of the Passover ritual; and as the breaking of the loaf was a symbol freely chosen to express a new truth, so probably here also. We are not told at first what was in the cup, but only infer from ver. 25 that it was wine. No stress is to be laid on the use of this particular substance.¹ The "thanksgiving" is the same form as the "blessing" of the foregoing verse. He gave the cup to the disciples, but did not drink of it himself; the reason is given in ver. 25. In Luke xxii. 17, 18 this appears more clearly: "Divide this among yourselves," he says there; "I will not drink." The wine also is a parable; they are to think as they drink it of something else which does not appear. The words in which he indicates this hidden truth do not at

once yield their meaning. Like the words about the bread they are not to be interpreted in the light of the crucifixion. As the body was not broken on the cross, so neither was the blood shed. The agony of the death arose from fever and congestion. We must ask what the disciples could find in the words before they knew of the death on the cross. They knew that their Master considered himself to be on the point of being arrested and put to death. And they knew from the symbol of the bread he had given them that he was prepared to die, and was in his own eyes voluntarily giving up his life for their benefit. What is added to these thoughts by the words "This is my covenant-blood which is shed for many"? They introduce a view as to the use of Christ's death. He recognizes his death as God's will, and voluntarily undertakes it for the sake of others, but in what way is it to benefit them? It is his view on this point that we now learn. Covenant-blood is the blood of a victim offered to celebrate and ratify the inauguration of a new relation or new terms of agreement (Exodus xxiv. 8, Psalm 1. 5). The phrase is an old one, and is to be taken as a whole; its terms are not separately dwelt on by Christ, and neither should we so dwell on them.² Christ then regards his death as a sacrifice by which the new conditions of life in the Kingdom he came to set up, are to be introduced. A strange fact that the death of the Messiah should be called for as the preliminary to the coming of Messiah's Kingdom! Yet there is Scripture for it, as we saw (in ver. 21); and Jesus has considered the matter and consented to play the part, so different from that which might have been anticipated, which now opens before him. In this case also the point of the parable lies in the giving, not

¹ Many bodies of early Christians celebrated the Eucharist with bread and water, some with bread and cheese. The acts were important, but even at Rome there was some freedom as to the elements used. See Harnack, "Brot und Wasser; die Eucharistischen Elemente bei Justin," in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. vii.

² If he thought of a covenant as being formed at his death, it would be after the fashion of that described by Jeremiah xxxi. 31-34, a covenant which is no covenant, but the oblivion of all the broken covenants of the past in a new era of grace. But this is going beyond Christ's words.

25 διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πώ ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἔως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸς πίνω καὶ νὰ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

To the Mount of Olives. Prediction of Peter's denial, xiv. 26-31.

26 Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὅρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν. καὶ λέγει
27 αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεοτε, ὅτι γέγραπται,
28 Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται. ἀλλὰ

the shedding. As Jesus gladly and delightedly plays the host to his disciples, and hands them the cup to drink which he does not himself share, so gladly and willingly he gives up his life to be the sacrifice at the opening of the Kingdom. For him the death ; for many, for far more than the disciples, for men who do not yet believe but will now do so (see on ‘ransom for many,’ x. 45) the Kingdom and its joys. He does what he can to help them to these joys ; and they will bless the Messiah who gave up his life that they might reign.

Here also the parallels have various additions which appear to be drawn from later ritual and thought. In 1 Cor. xi. 25 we read “this cup is the new testament in (or by means of) my blood”—the drinking of the cup being equivalent to appropriating the blessings of the new dispensation. Matthew adds “for the forgiveness of sins,” according to later doctrine (Rom. iii. 25, Heb. ix. 22, x. 29), but probably also with reference to the old notion of an amnesty as a feature of a new treaty or covenant. When Jehovah promises the new covenant (Jer. xxxi. 31 sqq.) it is mentioned that the sins of the people are no more to be remembered. Luke has “for you” in place of Mark’s “for many.” In Paul’s addition (1 Cor. xi. 25) “Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me,” we see the practice of the early Church.

25. In the first two Gospels these words indicate the close of the meal ; and also give the reason why Jesus did not himself drink of the cup he handed to the disciples. In the third, they have only the latter sense, since in Luke various conversations are reported after this, which are spoken still at table. He cannot drink of the draught he has compared to his own blood ; it is a thing he gives ;

it is for others, not for him. He knows his death is at hand, Judas is seeing to that, and his drinking is over for the present. But he will drink again. The separation is to be very short to which he is looking forward, and after it he will be in the Kingdom of God where all is new, the wine as well as other things. For a similar half-material view of the Kingdom cf. Matth. viii. 11, xix. 28, 29. On the other side compare Mark xii. 25, Matth. xx. 25 sq., and generally the teaching about the Kingdom and the qualifications for it. It would show very dull preceptions if we insisted, from the expression in our verse, that the Kingdom Jesus looked forward to was one of physical pleasures. It is God’s Kingdom, in which His will is done and, to use words which Jesus heard without condemning (Luke xiv. 15), those who eat bread are blessed. The verse shows certainly that he looked for the advent of that Kingdom to take place at once ; his death was to be the signal of its appearance (ver. 24) ; he was to return at once out of the realm of death to take his place in it at the head of those whom by dying he has enabled to enter it.

26. The hymn is the Hallel with which the Passover ritual concluded. Even the Jewish authorities in the early centuries did not agree as to its composition, some saying it consisted of Psalms 115-118, others of the 136th Psalm, or of Psalms 134-136. The old law prescribed (Ex. xii. 22) that none of the guests at the Passover were to leave the house where it took place until the morning ; but many parts of that law had now become obsolete. Luke gives a number of sayings of Jesus as belonging to the conversation before leaving the house and some of them agreeing with that situa-

many. Assuredly I tell you, I will never again drink of the fruit of the vine till that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God.

[Matthew xxvi. 30-35; Luke xxii. 31-34, 39.]

And after they had sung the hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives. And Jesus says to them, You will all fall away, for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered. But after I am raised up I will go

tion. The three accounts agree that after rising from table the party set off to the Mount of Olives. It is not stated that they went there because the Mount of Olives was on the way to Bethany ; and it is open to us to think that they did not mean to go further (see on ver. 3). It is during this short journey, on which Luke tells us that the disciples did not walk at Jesus' side but behind him, that the Master made the painful and for them humiliating prediction that they would all desert him. He knew them better than they knew themselves, and saw that as one of the twelve has already failed him he cannot count on any of them, he could not count on them to defend him when he was actually attacked by his enemies. They would be made to stumble, so the Greek word says, i.e. they would prove untrue to him and to their own convictions. This is confirmed by prophecy. This saying of Zechariah would very easily be added to the tradition as a striking prediction in Scripture, and so an explanation both to the world and to the believer, of a fact of the Gospel history which, however strange, was very well known, that the disciples deserted their Master in his hour of need. Of that fact the quotation is good evidence. The verse of Zechariah (xiii. 7) is altered to suit its Christian application. Originally it is a summons by Jehovah Himself, calling the sword to strike down a ruler who is making a bad use of his position as Jehovah's friend and ruling sinfully. In our passage it is Jehovah Himself who strikes ; even in the dark event of the betrayal of Jesus His hand is to be seen.

28. Thus the disciples are to be separated from their Master before his

death, and by their own want of courage. But though they are to desert him, he will not forget them nor cease to care for them. In fact he will be with them again very shortly. No sooner will he be raised up, and that, we remember, was to be 'in three days', or in a very short time, than he will be setting his face towards the place where they and he are to meet again. They will not see him again in Jerusalem or Judaea ; but he appoints them to meet him in their own country, and says he will be there before them. This meeting in Galilee to which Mark thus makes us look forward is not given in his Gospel as we now have it ; but it is spoken of in the last chapter of Matthew (xxviii. 16-end), and the newly discovered fragment of the Gospel of Peter ends as the disciples have returned to Galilee and Peter and Andrew, Levi also being with them, are setting off with their nets to the sea, the scene in the fourth Gospel of the Lord's appearance to Peter at his fishing (John xxi.). It seems probable that the original conclusion of Mark's Gospel, which is now lost, contained the fulfilment of the promise here made to the disciples, and narrated their meeting with the risen Lord in Galilee.

Luke, with whom the meetings with the risen Lord take place in and about Jerusalem, which the disciples never leave (xxiv. 49 ; Acts i. 4-8), omits this promise of Jesus to appear in Galilee as well as the prediction of the scattering of the disciples, which, in his narrative, never takes place. Here Peter alone is warned of the danger of defection ; so that the original fact is hidden.

We have thus a confirmation of the view, already noticed, that Jesus expected the separation from his disciples, occasioned by his death, to be of very

29 μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος
 30 ἔφη αὐτῷ, Εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ. καὶ
 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σὺ σήμερον ταύτη τῇ
 31 νυκτὶ πρὶν ἡ δὶς¹ ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. ὁ δὲ ἐκπε-
 ρισσῶς ἐλάλει, Ἐάν με δέρι συναποθανεῖν σοι, οὐ μή σε ἀπαρνήσωμαι.
 ὥσταύτως δὲ καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον.

Gethsemane, xiv. 32-42.

32 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς χωρίον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανεῖ, καὶ λέγει
 33 τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, Καθίσατε ὧδε ἕως προσεύξωμαι. καὶ παρα-
 λαμβάνει τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ
 34 ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Περίλυπτός
 35 ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου ἕως θανάτου μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε. καὶ

brief duration. We have also here a simple and primitive indication of the nature of his Second Coming. We see that when he speaks in the language of the current eschatology of coming with clouds with escort of angels, these grander representations did not banish from his mind the simple human joys of meeting again the friends he loved. How these two prospects, each well attested, are related to each other in his mind, is a question we are not here called to discuss.

29. The disciples do not, even yet after all that has been said, realize what is before them. They do not seriously believe their Master is to die, or they would be less full of protestations. Peter, as usual impulsive and generous, takes the lead in expressing the feeling they all share; the Master does not judge him truly; he will not desert him; if the Master is really to die, Peter will die with him.¹ But Jesus knows better how these countrymen, overawed as they are already by the splendour of the capital, will act when authority puts forth its hand. Peter he declares will repudiate him repeatedly that very night. The words of this speech are less original in Mark than in Matthew or Luke. Mark speaks of two cock-crows, the others of one,

and in this they are no doubt right. Cock-crow is a definite part of the night (Mark xiii. 35), the watch before daybreak; but to speak of the cock crowing twice is to depart from the ordinary meaning of the term, and to make the prediction very strained and artificial. In the following narrative of the denial Mark has two cock-crowings (ver. 68, 72), the other Synoptists having one only, and the speech of Jesus in this verse is made to correspond with the more elaborate story.

32. Jesus has been in the company of others ever since it became clear to him that measures were being taken, against which he was powerless, for his destruction. He has devoted himself all the time to his disciples, and made his death, while speaking of it as inevitable, appear to them not in its terrors but in its beauty—as the ordinance of God, as a service freely rendered for the members of the Kingdom, as the opening act of the new Age. Now when the day with all its claims is over, the other side of the shield appears to him; he thinks of himself, and we see him in his weakness, but also see how his weakness is turned into strength.

Gethsemane, or "Oil-press," is a piece of enclosed land with olive trees

¹ What Peter asserts and what Jesus replies to him is, in the main, the same in the three accounts; but in Mark and Matthew it arises out of what has been said to the disciples

generally, in Luke out of Jesus' address to Peter individually. This distinguishing of Peter does not belong to the Peter tradition which Mark uses, but is later.

¹ Omit δὶς.

before you to Galilee. But Peter said to him, Though all 29
desert you, I will not. And Jesus says to him, Assuredly I 30
tell you, that you, to-day, this night, before the cock crow
twice,¹ you will deny me thrice. But he redoubled his assertion 31
and said, Though I should have to die with you, I will never
deny you. And they all spoke in the same way.

[Matth. xxvi. 36-46; Luke xxii. 40-46.]

And they come to a place called Gethsemane, and he says 32
to his disciples, Sit here while I pray. And he takes with 33
him Peter and James and John and began to be overcome
with fear and to be restless and distressed; and he says to 34
them, My soul is in great suffering even to death, stay you
here and watch. And he went a little further on, and cast 35

and the apparatus for dealing with their produce, on the right side, if the modern identification may be trusted, which however is uncertain, of the road to Bethany directly after crossing the Kedron. John calls it a garden, and says that Jesus was often there with his disciples. Luke does not name Gethsemane, but says that Jesus went, as he was accustomed to do, to the Mount of Olives. He goes on, however, to speak of his "arriving at the place," by which he can scarcely mean the Mount of Olives generally, but no doubt refers to a tradition which he also knew as to the precise locality of this scene. It is a place well known to Jesus and his party—Judas also knows of it. The disciples are left perhaps at the entrance or near the entrance inside the enclosure, for the Master has need of prayer, and when that is the case with him he seeks to be alone (i. 35, vi. 46). But on this occasion he does not wish to be quite alone. He is not a Stoic to meet the dark hour relying on his own unconquered will and defying all the power of circumstances to injure him. On the contrary he meets it with a sense of weakness and helplessness, calling out for God, and taking his dear friends with him as far as they can go. The faithful Three, his special intimates, who had witnessed passages in his career from which others were excluded, are taken with him further

into the enclosure, and there they hear from him what they had never heard before, and would not have thought possible, a confession of **weakness and extreme mental suffering**. He began to be overcome with fear, and in distress, we are told. The horror of the situation laid hold on him as he felt the moment approaching when he must be subjected to physical violence which must end in his death. So much we learn from the disciples' report and from the words of his prayer which they repeat; what more entered into his thoughts the evangelist does not enable us to judge. The Master is not above letting his friends see in what state of mind he is; far from hiding his distress he tells them of it quite simply and frankly; it is a sorrow even to death, the very extremity of mental suffering, that has taken hold of him. And they cannot help him. He must pray, and they cannot be with him in his praying. Yet they must not be far away. They must stay where they are and watch, not as sentinels to warn him of approaching danger, but as friends who share his distress and support him by their sympathetic nearness. Luke omits the verse which shows the Saviour in his weakness; Matthew changes 'fear' into grief.

35. The disciples can still see his movements and hear some of his words; else we could not have known what is here recorded. (Luke, whose narrative

¹ Omit, twice.

προελθών μικρὸν ἐπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ προσηύχετο ὥνα εἰ
 36 δυνατόν ἔστιν παρέλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα, καὶ ἔλεγεν, Ἐββᾶ ὁ
 πατήρ, πάντα δυνατά σοι παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ'
 37 ἐμοῦ ἀλλ' οὐ τὴ ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τί σύ. καὶ ἔρχεται καὶ εὐρίσκει
 αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, Σίμων, καθεύδεις; οὐκ
 38 ἵσχυσας μίαν ὥραν γρηγορῆσαι; γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὥνα
 μὴ ἔλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν. τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σάρξ
 39 ἀσθενής. καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών.
 40 καὶ πάλιν ἔλθων ἐφρεν αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ
 ὄφθαλμοὶ καταβαρυνόμενοι, καὶ οὐκ ἤδεισαν τί ἀποκριθῶσιν αὐτῷ.
 41 καὶ ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ

here differs in many points from those of Mark and Matthew, says that he went about a stone's throw from them, but implies that they could both see and hear him). Mark describes in imperfets, as if what is detailed went on for some time. The Master was seen to throw himself on the ground (Luke says on his knees). The general purport of his prayer, again and again renewed, was that the hour, the critical hour, the hour of death, might be spared him. (Compare 'the hour,' 'my hour,' etc., in John's Gospel). This is what weighed upon his mind with such intolerable weight, and in this distress of mind we have to recognize not a mere ordinary shrinking from pain and violence, though this also no doubt was there, but more the strain of the dark problem presented to the mind of one who believed himself to be God's Elect and the destined ruler over God's Kingdom, by the thought that he must die, his destiny all unaccomplished. If a crucified Christ was to the Jew an agonizing thought which could scarcely be entertained without an intellectual and moral revolution, the Christ himself who died must first of all have borne that agony. That he did bear it, and thereby led his followers into a new world of thought and of worship, this is a great part of his work. In the meantime he has his period of deepest and acutest suffering. Cannot God spare him this hour which he sees inevitably coming on? Cannot God bring the Kingdom without letting the Messiah die at its threshold? God can do everything, He can make His Kingdom

come without such bloodshed, He can bring to nought the plans of the Scribes and the treachery of Judas. Will He not do so? That is the burden of the prayer again and again repeated, with such perseverance and intensity as he recommended men to use in their approaches to God, and regarded as certain to attain their end, since God could not withstand such prayers. The address is virtually the same as that at the head of the Lord's Prayer in its shorter form. Luke, who gives the shorter form of that prayer, has here also simply 'Father.' Mark, however, gives the Aramaic word Jesus used, and then the Greek word for it, as Paul does in Gal. iv. 6, and Rom. viii. 15, the double address having apparently passed into liturgical use in Gentile churches.

The prayer concludes with the recognition that the divine will must be accomplished even when the suppliant most earnestly desires something else. When the divine will is fixed, prayer cannot alter it; *it will come to pass*. He had not willed his death, but if it is God's will, then it is doubtless about to take place. A simple future is to be supplied to complete the sentence. The point of entire resignation is not yet reached (ver. 39).¹

37. The scene depends on the evidence of Peter; it is not told, however, from Peter's point of view, but from that of the Master; this transformation is the result of a very early literary operation. The disciples awake and find Jesus standing over them and reproaching them for not having kept

¹ Compare 1 Macc. iii. 60, where Judas, exhorting his followers to fight, and recognizing that he and they may lose their lives, says:

As may be the will in heaven, so shall He (God) do.

himself on the ground and prayed, that if it is possible the hour might pass away from him; and he said, Abba, Father, 36 everything is possible to Thee; take away this cup from me; yet it is not what I will but what Thou. And he comes and 37 finds them sleeping, and he says to Peter, Simon, are you sleeping? were you not able to watch one hour? Watch and 38 pray all of you that you may not come into temptation. The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak. And he went away 39 again and prayed, speaking to the same effect as before. And 40 he came again and found them sleeping, for their eyes were heavy and they did not know what to say to him. And he 41 comes the third time and says to them, Sleep on, then, and

awake to hold up his hands. Why had they not done so? Did they not believe in the danger he spoke of? Or had they arrived at their usual night-quarters, and after keeping awake for a little, as he bade them, did they conclude that there was no occasion to do more? Luke says they were sleeping for sorrow, which does not quite clear up the question. In Mark and Matthew the rebuke is addressed to Peter, who is called by his Aramaic name, but in Matthew what here follows the name Simon is spoken to all the party, in Mark to Peter only, who is thus most severely treated in the Gospel of his own interpreter. Jesus is grieved that he has been thus left alone; but he is no longer so absorbed as before in his own case; he is concerned about the disciples, specially Peter, whom he believes to be in urgent danger. He insists again that they must keep awake, not only for his sake as before, but also for their own. They are to pray, as in the Lord's Prayer, that God would not allow them to be placed in temptation. What temptation does he mean? That of deserting him no doubt which he foretold in ver. 27. Compare Luke xxii. 31, where he says that Satan has been seeking to get the disciples to put them to a severe trial, and that he, Jesus, has prayed specially for Simon that he may stand that trial. It is a clearly realized definite temptation he speaks of here. Judas has lost his faith in the Master and the cause, and the motives which worked so disastrously in his case are no doubt present to the mind of the other disciples also. They may be frightened and concussed,

and may not say the right word when the time comes for it. If he should return and find that any of them whom he had trusted so fully had proved untrue to him and could not be acknowledged before the face of the heavenly Father! (viii. 38). Thus, though he has foretold that they will all be offended and desert him, he does what he can to nerve them to meet the crisis worthily. They mean well, he admits; their spirit is willing, but they are weak as men are, and therefore they must pray, adding their prayers to his, that the hour may pass, and if it must come, may not find them unfaithful. The words spirit and flesh are here used, not as in Paul where the spirit is an element higher than man's normal constitution which enters a man when he becomes a Christian, but according to ordinary usage such as prevails even among ourselves. Spirit is the higher, less material, principle; flesh, the weak and earthward part of man, and the words are worthy of one who understood so well man's composite nature.

39. In Matthew the second prayer is an advance on the first, and expresses resignation to the will of God, which Jesus now sees to be fixed in a way contrary to his desire. In Luke there is but one prayer, but the scene receives other additions.

From the friends he loves and is so anxious for he returns to prayer. And we are told that he uses the same language as before. The point of resignation is not reached yet; he is still asking that the cup may pass away. A second time back to the friends who are so helpless and will not wake up

ἀναπαύεσθε· ἀπέχει· ἥλθεν ἡ ὥρα, ἵδον παραδίδοται ὁ νιὸς τοῦ
42 ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν. ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν· ἵδον
ὁ παραδιδόντες με ἔγγυικεν.

The arrest, xiv. 43-52.

- 43 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἔτι αὐτῷ λαλοῦντος παραγίνεται Ἰούδας¹ εἰς τῶν
δώδεκα καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ἔνδων παρὰ τῶν
44 ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. δεδώκει
δὲ ὁ παραδιδόντες αὐτὸν σύστημον αὐτοῖς λέγων, Ὁν ἦν φιλήσω
45 αὐτός ἐστιν· κρατήσατε αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπάγετε ἀσφαλῶς· καὶ ἐλθὼν
46 εὐθὺς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ λέγει, Ραββέ, καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτὸν. οἱ

properly to take in the situation and help him in his prayers (cf. ix. 6). And a third time (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 8) to the solitary pleading with God who this time is so hard to move.

41. The third going away is not mentioned, as if the reporter had been too sleepy to notice it. The speech at the third coming belongs throughout to the new situation produced by the approach of the arresting party, and is spoken under the strongest excitement. The “It is enough,” however we interpret it, marks the closing of the scene just narrated, with its awful tension, and thus, to some extent, corresponds psychologically with Matthew’s ‘Thy will be done.’ ‘Sleep on, then, and take your rest’ is scarcely ironical, but indicates that the reason which made Jesus so anxious before that his friends should keep awake, now exists no longer. The effort in which they were to help him for his sake and their own, is at an end. The prayer has not been granted, and he need not urge them longer. It is not he who this time breaks upon their slumber. And with the word ‘Enough’ (on which the enquiries as to what there has been enough of, need not detain us), the former situation is dismissed, and the new one accepted. The hour has come of which he prayed that it might pass away, the hour, that is, of the death of the Messiah, long foreseen but never till now realized in its full unnaturalness and dreadfulness. This is what the succeeding words express. They are uttered in view of the arresting party, after Jesus has caught

a glimpse of the kind of people who are sent to take him. They are not Roman soldiers, as we shall see, so that the thought in these words is not the same as that of Acts ii. 23, where the Jews are charged with having allowed wicked hands (literally, lawless hands, the hands of men outside the law, of heathen and profane) to put to death the Messiah of their race. Nor is the word ‘sinners’ used from the Christian point of view, viz. that those who used violence to the Messiah rendered themselves guilty of a great crime. They are sinners already, before their act is accomplished. The word is rather used as in the phrase ‘publicans and sinners,’ to indicate persons of the class which makes little religious pretensions. (See notes on ii. 15; also Gal. ii. 15). Not with such as these should the Messiah have been brought in contact when the leaders of his people enter into dealings with him. He should have been recognized as first of all, and none but the noblest and wisest should have been near him; but instead of that he is given up into the hands of such people as these. This utterance makes it clear that the struggle of Gethsemane did not arise out of Jesus’ apprehension of personal pain and reproach, but was largely Messianic. It was the fate of God’s representative, of the bearer of God’s message to His people, and the fulfiller of that people’s hopes, that was in question. The title ‘Son of Man’ is used here in its traditional sense; the paradoxical contrast is between the honours and splendours with which the Son of Man was expected to appear

¹ Add ὁ Ἰούδας.

take your rest. Enough; the hour is come; see, the Son of Man is delivered up into the hands of sinners. Rise, let us go; see, he who betrays me is here.

[Matthew xxvi. 47-56; Luke xxii. 47-53.]

And forthwith, while he is yet speaking, comes Judas¹ one of the Twelve and with him a crowd of people with swords and staves from the high-priests and the Scribes and the elders. Now he who betrayed him had given them a signal; He whom I kiss, he had said, he is the person; take him and lead him away safely. And on coming to the spot he at once stepped up to him, and called him Rabbi, and gave him his kiss. And they laid hands on him and seized him.

and the degradation of being the sport of rude people of no class.

But as the hour has come it must be met worthily. It must not find the disciples lying on the ground, but standing by their Master's side. 'Let us go' does not point to flight, but to an advance to meet the approaching party. In that party only one figure is recognized. The predictions of the supper-table are verified; the traitor is on the ground doing his errand. No doubt the hour has come.

43. Judas is here introduced with the same epithet, 'one of the Twelve,' which was used in telling of his application to the high-priests (ver. 10). Why does he need a new introduction here, and why is it in the same terms? Unless the words are a gloss, the writer surely cannot have had ver. 10 before him, and the two pieces of narrative must have come from different sources. The peculiarity appears in all the three Synoptists. Judas, then, has undertaken to lead a party to a spot where Jesus can be arrested quietly; he had been present at the Passover meal, had left the room before the company set out for the Mount of Olives, and had then gone to the dignitaries who had promised him his fee, and told them it was time to carry out the plan agreed on. Of what nature was the party whom he led to make the capture? According to the fourth Gospel (xviii. 3, 12) they were Roman soldiers, the cohort, in fact, with their

colonel, accompanied by servants of the high-priests and of the Pharisees. In Mark, who is followed by Matthew, and less distinctly by Luke (who brings the Sanhedrists themselves on the scene), they are not soldiers at all, but an undrilled collection of people with various equipment; some have swords, some sticks. Jesus is not lodged in the barracks, as must have been the case if the arrest had been effected by a party of soldiers, but is taken to the house of the high-priest; only after the trial before the Sanhedrin is he brought before the Roman governor, and only when sentenced to crucifixion is he handed over to the Roman soldiers. That the account of the matter given in the fourth Gospel is historically inadmissible, is conclusively proved by Brandt, *Evan. Gesch.*, Part I., Chap. i.

This party is said to come from the high-priests and Scribes and Elders, i.e. the Sanhedrin, but we have not heard of any meeting of that body to deal with the case of Jesus, and perhaps the evangelist anticipates a little in making the arrest an official act. Those who reported the scene inferred from what they saw that Judas had arranged to point out Jesus to his party by a certain signal. They were not likely to learn this from Judas himself, nor from any of those he led. The latter apparently did not know Jesus by sight. Their place, perhaps, by day and at ordinary times, was in the kitchen and courtyard, while their masters walked

¹ Add, Iscariot.

47 δὲ ἐπέβαλαν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν. εἰς δέ τις τῶν παρεστηκότων σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν ἔπαισεν τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ
 48 ἀρχιερέως καὶ ἀφέιλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὡτάριον. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, 'Ως ἐπὶ ληστὴν ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ἔνιων
 49 συλλαβεῖν με· καθ' ἡμέραν ἦμην πρὸς ἴμας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων,
 50 καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί· καὶ
 51 ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον πάντες. καὶ νεανίσκος τις¹ συνηκολούθει²
 52 αὐτῷ περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ, καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν· ὁ
 δὲ καταλιπὼν τὴν σινδόνα γυμνὸς ἔφυγεν.

The trial before the High-priest, xiv. 53-65.

53 Καὶ ἀπήγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα, καὶ συνέρχονται³
 54 πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς. καὶ ὁ

the pavements of the Temple. The signal consists of the ordinary greeting rendered to a teacher by his pupil. The kiss is not that of family affection, on the cheek; the pupil calls his master by the name of Rabbi, makes an obeisance, and kisses his hand. In this case, Jesus and his treacherous disciple are each a little in advance of his party, so that the action is distinctly seen. The moment the greeting was paid (the word implies that it was done with a show of affection), the followers of Judas started forward, laid hold of Jesus, and made him their prisoner.

47. According to Matthew and Luke's account it was one of the party of Jesus who did this. Mark does not directly say so, but speaks of the striker with a certain significance, as if the narrator could have named him but refrained from doing so. If the authority for the incident was Peter, the matter is explained. When he went to the high-priest's house afterwards, he might learn there who it was that had been wounded, and his connection with the affair might make him specially anxious not to be drawn into any communications with that household; this would in part explain his conduct there. It was not, perhaps, a matter of such importance as to find a place in the

Gospel apart from some such personal interest connected with it.

48. The difficulties connected with this passage are forcibly stated by Brandt. After a serious blow had been struck, he holds, other blows must have followed, and from the other side; and the flight of the disciples is most readily accounted for by supposing that they got the worst of the scuffle. At any rate, a scene so begun was no suitable opportunity for speeches; if there were both blows and speeches, the speeches must have come first. There is less force in Brandt's contention that the speech of Jesus is addressed to the wrong people—to the hierarchs themselves and not to their servants. Luke meets this difficulty, if he felt it to be one, by bringing the high-priests and captains of the Temple and elders themselves upon the scene.

The remonstrance against the style of the arrest must be placed at the beginning of the scene, when Jesus has just been taken and before any blows have passed.¹ While not calling in question the legality of the arrest, it expresses the same thought as the words of Jesus as to the Son of Man being betrayed into the hands of sinners, and points to the needless indignity to which he is subjected. There has been

¹ The sentence about the use of the sword, in Matthew, is of a different nature, and as a vehement appeal to his followers against

the use of violence, is not incongruous to the circumstances.

¹ εἰς τις νεανίσκος.

² ἡκολούθησεν.

³ Add αὐτῷ.

But a certain one of those who stood by drew his sword and 47 struck the servant of the high-priest and cut off his ear. And Jesus took the word and said to them, You have come 48 out as if against a brigand, with swords and staves, to take me. I was daily with you in the Temple teaching and you did 49 not lay hold of me. But the Scriptures must be fulfilled. And they left him and fled, all of them. But a certain young 50 man¹ followed along with him,² with nothing on him but a linen cloth about his naked body, and they lay hold of him; but he left the linen cloth and fled naked. 52

[Matthew xxvi. 57-68; Luke xxii. 54, 55, 63-71.]

And they took Jesus away to the high-priest; and all the 53 high-priests and the elders and the scribes come together.³ And Peter followed him at a distance as far as inside 54

nothing underhand in his proceedings; he has never resisted nor denied any lawful authority; he taught openly and regularly, and it was well known where he was to be found. He ought to have been arrested, if that was necessary, as a public teacher not as a brigand, where the people could see what was done and not behind their back, by the levitical Temple guard and not by a miscellaneous rabble irregularly accoutred. That such a Messiah as he has aimed at being—one who relied on teaching alone, and appealed openly to his nation at the national place of assembly to hear the word of the Lord—that he should be treated as a low criminal and as one against whom it was necessary to be armed with all sorts of weapons!

It is true that the way in which Jesus arranged his life during these days at Jerusalem, preaching by day to sympathetic crowds and going outside the town at night, was itself the reason why the arrest could not be made openly. Still, the wrong and indignity remained of treating one who dealt in nothing but persuasion and appeal, after the manner of a vulgar criminal—a great wrong both to Jesus himself and to the Jewish nation. The only way to account for such an outrage was that it was the will of God that the Messiah should die,

and that all the steps leading to that end were thus in a sense divinely appointed. What Scripture had foretold of the death of the Messiah had to come to pass, and so Jesus submits to the arrest, protesting against the manner of it, but recognizing in the fact itself the will of God.

50. That the disciples, with the exception of Peter, *forsook Jesus and fled* is the last we learn about them in this Gospel. That they had some reason for apprehension we see from the attempted arrest of the young man; they had been present when resistance was offered to the representatives of the hierarchs in the act of making an arrest, and for this, if not for the mere fact that they were Jesus' followers, they might well be apprehensive.

51. The young man of whom the following incident is told by Mark alone was not one of the Twelve. The word "followed him" need not refer to discipleship (Brandt takes it so, and sees in the young man one of those of whom we have just heard that they *forsook Jesus and fled*: the flight of this one of their number being told with more detail); and one of the immediate circle of Jesus, who had been with him all the evening, would not have been found so scantily clad on the Mount of Olives. He is a

¹ One particular individual, a young man.

² followed him.

³ The variant gives: "and a meeting takes place for him of all the high-priests," etc.; or "the high priests, etc., came together with him."

Πέτρος ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἡκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ἔως ἐσω εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, καὶ ἦν συνκαθήμενος μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν καὶ θερμαινόμενος πρὸς τὸ φῶς. οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον ἔζητον κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαρτυρίαν εἰς τὸ θανατῶσαι αὐτόν, καὶ οὐχ ἥψισκον πολλοὶ γάρ ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἵσται αἱ μαρτυρίαι οὐκ ἥσαν. καὶ τινες ἀναστάντες ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ’ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες ὅτι Ἡμεῖς ἡκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον, καὶ διὰ τριῶν ήμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω. καὶ οὐδὲ οὕτως ἴση ἦν

person known to the Church, or the incident would not have been worth recording, and there is much attractiveness in the view that it is the evangelist Mark, who thus records his own experience of that evening. It might be his mother's house (Acts xii. 12) in which the Passover was eaten, and he might have followed the party unseen when they left for the Mount of Olives. There are difficulties in this view, but it is at least possible that we have here, as Zahn says, "the signature of the artist in a dark corner of the picture." This incident would be the principal one with respect to which the Muratorian Canon, as here interpreted by Zahn, says that Mark was personally concerned in the events of the Evangelical history, and so was led to set them down. See Introduction, p. 44. The text of the verse is very uncertain, and any view taken of its contents must be problematical.

53. We enter here on what purports to be a circumstantial account of the trial of Jesus by the Sanhedrin. The third and fourth Gospels differ widely at this point from the first and second, Luke having no trial by night but only that at daybreak, and John having only an examination by the high-priest. With regard to the trial in Mark, Brandt (pp. 53-67) considers that while all the other accounts are derived from this one, it is difficult to make out how any report of the trial could be obtained, and that the procedure is not such as could have taken place in a Jewish Court.

The arrest being made in the middle of the night, the Sanhedrin—for so the body is styled (ver. 55) which came together to deal with the matter—could not meet in its ordinary *locale*. That, according to all accounts, was some-

where in the Temple buildings, and at night the Temple was locked. The meeting takes place, therefore, in the house of the high-priest, called by Matthew, Caiaphas. We are to think of a politician to whom it was of the utmost importance to keep on good terms with the Romans, and to whom, therefore, any Messiaenic movement was a thing hateful and to be suppressed (John xi. 47-52). In his house the members of the High Court assemble, at an hour which cannot have been earlier than midnight. According to later practice no trial for a capital offence could take place at night, and only 23 members, or a third of the body, required to be present. Here no such provisions appear to be spoken of or known. But Mark has told us long before that the members of the Sanhedrin had made up their minds to put Jesus to death. What he here represents is in accordance with that statement. It is not so much a trial of which the issue is uncertain, and where the accused gets the benefit of every regular form, as a hasty concourse to carry out, with such legal forms as the occasion admits of, a political murder. The meeting takes place, according to Mark, on the first day of unleavened bread, the day of the Passover. Could religious venom and political eagerness combined prevail on these men to commit such a breach of their law?

The high-priest, in this account, has everything in readiness. According to one translation of the variant, the councillors arrive at his house just when Jesus is being brought in; the reading preferred by the editors makes them arrive immediately after. All the high-priests, we read. There was but one, but the office appears to have conferred an indelible character, and there were always at this period a number of men

the court of the high-priest, and was sitting there with the servants, warming himself at the fire. And the high-priests and the whole Sanhedrin sought for evidence against Jesus to put him to death, and they could not find it; for while many gave false witness against him their evidence did not tally. And certain persons came forward and bore false witness against him, saying, We heard him say, I will destroy this temple which is made with hands, and after three days I will build another not made with hands. And not even so

who, after serving as high-priests for a time and being deposed by the government, still busied themselves with public affairs and exercised great influence. See Schürer, II. i. 195. It appears doubtful whether the designation was applied to men of high-priestly family who had not themselves held the office.

With the high-priests came the Elders and the Scribes; a fully constituted meeting of the Sanhedrin could be described in no other terms. That Peter cannot have witnessed or reported the proceedings, we see from the next verse. Braver than the other disciples who have fled quite out of sight, yet not courting arrest, he follows at a distance, and penetrates into the court of the house, the space in the centre, open to the sky and surrounded by buildings, in one of the rooms of which upstairs (ver. 66) his Master was. The story of Peter in this situation is the same in Mark and Matthew, where there is a nocturnal trial of Jesus, as in Luke where there is no trial till the morning. Those coming to the meeting and leaving it would pass through the court, and some inkling of what was passing inside might reach the servants there, so that Peter, as he sat and warmed himself at the open fire, might learn what was happening to his Master. In cases of blasphemy later Jewish procedure rigorously excluded from the trial all but the judges and the witnesses (*Mishna*, Sanhedrin vii. 5). The passages of the *Mishna* bearing on the trial are collected and discussed in Brandt.

55. This is not a trial for blasphemy, not at least in its beginning. That charge emerges during the proceedings, but other charges were thought of. It was necessary to observe the forms of a trial and to prove that Jesus had offended against Jewish law. Evidence

therefore was required, and a number of persons are invited to say what they can against the accused, having of course been summoned late at night for that purpose. The efforts made during the preceding days to get Jesus to say something for which he might be attacked, had been defeated by his ready resource, so that while there was much prejudice against him, there was no proof of any illegal act or speech. And the Roman governor would not pass a death-sentence for mere prejudice, if no breach of the law was proved. Speeches against the scribes could be quoted, but such speeches were not illegal, nor were words showing want of sympathy with the ritual of the Temple, nor even the fact that Jesus had allowed himself to be acclaimed as Messiah. Many charges were brought which Mark says were false, i.e. perversions of his words, misrepresentations of his acts. But there was no charge of sufficient gravity for the occasion, supported, as Jewish law required (Numb. xxxv. 30; Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15), by a plurality of witnesses.

57. At last a charge is brought which appears to have more substance in it, and which is supported by the necessary number of witnesses. It referred to an utterance of Jesus which certainly was made, though it was variously reported and interpreted. In Mark's Gospel (xiii. 2; see comments on that passage) Jesus predicts the downfall of the Temple; in John (ii. 19) he is reported to have said, on visiting the Temple at the beginning of the ministry, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." His utterance on this subject echoes through the whole New Testament; it is a commonplace of Christian teaching that God does not dwell in temples made with hands (Acts vii. 48, xvii. 24; Ephes. ii. 22;

60 ή μαρτυρία αὐτῶν. καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσον ἐπηρώτησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγων, Οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν; τί¹ οὗτοί σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν; ὁ δὲ ἐστόπι καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν. πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ ὅψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον 62 μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς διαρήξας τὸν

Heb. ix. 11, 24), and the view meets us frequently that Christians themselves are the new Temple taking the place of the old one (2 Cor. vi. 16; 1 Cor. iii. 16, vi. 19; 1 Peter ii. 5; Heb. iii. 6; Ephes. ii. 22. Cf. also John iv. 21). But while Jesus like Stephen considered that the destruction of the Temple would be no disadvantage to religion, and though he predicted its downfall, we may be very certain that his words on the subject were not what these witnesses are said to have reported, and that he had never spoken of lifting his own hands against the Temple. The readers of the Gospel would know in what sense the words had been spoken by Christ. This evidence therefore was, as the evangelist says, false; the words of Jesus were not given as he spoke them but twisted from their original tendency, and a design was imputed to him which he never cherished. These witnesses also failed to agree. No serious charge could be built on their testimony.

61a. An attempt is therefore made to lead Jesus to incriminate himself. It was for speaking against the Temple that Stephen was stoned; and while there was a more suitable charge than this to be produced to the Roman governor, this one if it were established would be enough for the Jews who heard of the proceedings. The high-priest, therefore, asks Jesus to defend himself against what has been alleged. But as he had foiled all former attempts to get him to compromise himself, so on the present occasion also. It is not necessary to suppose that his silence was suggested by what is said of the Servant of Jehovah (Isaiah liii. 7. Cf. Acts viii. 32). As this was no true trial, and those sitting in the place of judges were men he knew he could not convert (compare on this point the

parable of the Vineyard), any explanations he could offer would be thrown away or would make matters worse. Better that he should leave the words he had spoken to do their work in those who understood them, and for himself simply bow before "the hour" and all it brought. He had moreover to consider not only the assistance he might render to the judges by any statement he made, but his own position and dignity as Messiah. One who claimed no more than that he was a teacher or prophet could defend himself before these men; one who felt himself to be the Messiah could perhaps scarcely do so.

61b. The high-priest enunciates the charge on which the hierarchs must have made up their minds to proceed against Jesus before the governor when the opportunity arrived. Jesus had been hailed as Messiah at his Entry into Jerusalem, and his proceedings since then had not been those of a prophet and teacher merely, but those of one who expected himself to occupy the highest place in the Kingdom he announced. But there had been in him nothing of the revolutionary. His methods, with the exception of the act in the Temple, had been those of peace and reason. To accuse him as dangerous to the Roman power because he was the leader of a Messianic movement, was obviously somewhat absurd, since (as Pilate saw) such a Messianic movement as his had no political danger in it. It was to the leaders of religion, not to the political rulers, that it was dangerous. Still the attempt was to be made to get him put to death by the Romans. But for this end it was necessary to have clear evidence that Jesus did claim to be Messiah. In Mark the claim has never been made in so many words. It has

did their evidence agree. And the high-priest rose and came 60 forward and asked Jesus, Have you no answer to make ? what of the charge these witnesses bring against you ? But 61 he was silent and made no answer. Again the high-priest questioned him, and says to him, Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed ? And Jesus said, I am, and you will see 62 the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of the Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven. And the high-priest tore 63 his clothes and says, What further need have we of witnesses ?

been suggested in parable, in act, in question, but never nakedly stated. To remove all possible doubt on the subject, therefore, the high-priest puts his question. Jesus had protested (xii. 35-37) against the title, 'Son of David,' for the Messiah. To get to the root of the matter he is asked if he claims to be that Anointed looked for by all, who, as the chosen agent of the Blessed (the divine name is not uttered, but this equivalent for it which is used in N.T. doxologies and afterwards on every page of the Talmud), are placed near Him and sharing His counsels, may be called **His Son** ? Are you that person ? it is asked ; not perhaps without a tone of scorn. (See for the current Messianic ideas of the time of Christ, "Apocalyptic Literature" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica* ; Stanton, *Jewish Messiah* ; Holtzmann's *N. T. Theologie*, i. 68 *sqq.*, where much of the literature of the subject is cited).

62. Here we come to the first open declaration by Jesus of his **Messiahship**. It is only before the Sanhedrin, when solemnly challenged to declare himself, that Jesus made the public declaration which imposed on his followers thenceforward the duty of proclaiming him as Messiah on all occasions, and constituted him the object of faith for them and for the world. The courage of this great act is to be seen not only in the danger to which the confession necessarily exposed him, but in his original assumption of the rôle which as he understood it made him claim to fulfil the best hopes of men, and promise to all men what they most required. How he came to believe that what all the world wanted could come to it through him, is a mystery which we can partly, but never wholly, understand. The 'I am,' which pronounces the great fact of the Evangelical history, that

Jesus is the Messiah for whom all were waiting, reverberates, as Holtzmann says, in the whole New Testament. We hear it in the storm on the Sea of Galilee, and in the upper chamber at Jerusalem ; in the fourth Gospel it is applied in manifold ways ; in the Apocalypse we read of "He that is and was and is to come" ; and in the last chapter of the New Testament the comforting words are more than once repeated. Matthew does not give the words ; and Luke gives them in a less impressive position.

If Jesus is Messiah it is plain that his present appearance and bearing veil rather than manifest his real nature. He is a **Messiah in disguise** ; but that will soon be altered. Thinking as he now does of the lot which is appointed for him as Messiah, Jesus can scarcely answer the question of the high-priest with a bare "I am" ; the time for parables is past, and it is time for a plain declaration of the truth. Though now in lowly guise, he is on the point of being invested with all that belongs to the office. The Messiah, as spiritual-minded Jews conceive him, is about to appear. Even his enemies will see Jesus clothed with all the power and splendour of the Son of Man, sitting as that personage was expected to do on the right hand (xii. 36) of the Power, the powerful or Almighty One (Jesus also avoids the divine name), and coming with the clouds (xiii. 26) to execute His judgment and set up His kingdom. The representation, founded on Daniealand Enoch, is of a different order from those in ver. 25 and 28 of this chapter.

63. The high-priest's paroxysm of grief, expressed by making a tear in his dress (his undergarments), as people did who were in mourning, and his declaration that **Jesus has spoken**

64 χιτῶνας αὐτοῦ λέγει, Τί ἔτι χρέιν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων; ἡκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας· τί ὑμῖν φάνεται; οἱ δὲ πάντες κατέκριναν 65 αὐτὸν ἐνοχὸν εἶναι θανάτου. καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ, Προφήτευσον· καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον.¹

Peter's denial, xiv. 66-72.

66 Καὶ ὅντος τοῦ Πέτρου κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ ἔρχεται μία τῶν 67 παιδισκῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, καὶ ἴδουσα τὸν Πέτρον θερμαινόμενον ἐμβλέψασα αὐτῷ λέγει, Καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ ἦσθα, τοῦ 68 Ἰησοῦ. ὁ δὲ ἡριώσατο λέγων, Οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι σὺ τί

blasphemy, stand in need of explanation. In Jesus' words, as reported by Mark and Matthew, there is nothing that could be called blasphemy. That offence was capital, but it consisted in speaking ill of God, His sacred name being pronounced (Levit. xxiv. 10-23); there is no blasphemy of any such kind here.¹ Nor is it easy to make out even constructive blasphemy. It was no crime in Jewish law to claim to be the Messiah. [Jeremiah (xxvi. 11), whose case has some analogy with this one, was judged worthy of death, not for blasphemy, but for having spoken against Jerusalem and prophesied its downfall]. The Jews did not expect their Messiah when he came to be a divine being; that was impossible for strict monotheists; and Jesus in asserting his Messiahship makes no claim to deity; he is to sit on the right hand of the Power, in a subordinate position though a high one, and to be not God, but the representative and instrument of God. A claim to share the divine nature and to be equal with God in the later Christian sense, might, if made to the Sanhedrin, have been construed as blasphemy (see John x. 33, 36); and when that doctrine arose, the Jews no doubt applied the term to it. But no such claim is put forward by Jesus here. His claim to Messiahship might no doubt appear, when his figure and surroundings were considered, to be extravagant and absurd. But it involved no insult to the divine Being; and that only is what constitutes blasphemy. If then Jesus was legally

condemned by the Sanhedrin on a charge of blasphemy, the words on which that charge was based are not reported in any of the Gospels. If the condemnation was illegal, it may have come about in various ways. A charge of constructive blasphemy was likely to be made against him by those who were familiar with his utterances in Galilee, e.g. those as to the forgiveness of sins (said, ii. 7, to be blasphemous), and as to the Sabbath. A condemnation on such a charge lay within the competence of the Sanhedrin, and was likely to impress the mind of the Jews. It is not unlikely that the charge was blasphemy, but the report of the trial cannot be considered to be full or satisfactory. In Luke there is nothing about blasphemy; Jesus is there condemned simply for having claimed to be the Messiah. The councillors, appealed to for their opinion and vote, at once agree with their president, and Jesus is unanimously declared to have incurred the death penalty.

65. Jesus being now, as it were, outside of the law, the venom of his enemies bursts forth. The extremest insult is bestowed on him (Numbers xii. 14, Isa. 1. 6); is it some of the councillors who do these unworthy acts, or others who are there, perhaps some of the witnesses? We cannot tell. It is not the attendants, as their turn comes afterwards. Those who set the example of this treatment also make sport of Jesus' character as a prophet (not only of the prediction, ver. 62). His face is covered, he is

¹ See Brandt, *Evang. Gesch.*, p. 62 sqq.

You heard that blasphemy; what do you think? And they all condemned him and declared that he had incurred the penalty of death. And some began to spit on him and to cover his face and buffet him and say to him, Prophesy!, and the attendants took him in charge with blows.¹

[Matthew xxvi. 69-75; Luke xxii. 56-62.]

Now Peter is downstairs in the court, and one of the high-priest's maidservants comes where he is, and on seeing Peter warming himself she looks at him and says, You too were with the Nazarene, with Jesus. But he denied it and said, I neither know nor understand what you mean.² And

struck, and is then asked to prophesy, either as in Matthew and Luke, to identify the striker, or perhaps to predict his fortune. Like master, like servant. The attendants, those who have been acting as guards of Jesus at his trial, not Roman soldiers, now that the sentence of condemnation has been passed, have to take him in charge for safe keeping. Their blows are dealt perhaps with their staves, as they indicate to him where he is to go. It is not necessary to suppose this scene to be formed on *Isaiah* 1. 6; the various incidents explain themselves quite naturally.

66. This scene is narrated more circumstantially by Mark than by Matthew or Luke; and he alone gives the two cock-crowings, which make the story more difficult.

We have been told what went on in a large room upstairs. All this time Peter, who (ver. 54) got as far as to the court of the house, has been sitting there with the servants, warming himself at the fire. Ver. 54 described the situation in which he was left. Ver. 66 tells of something which happened to him when in that situation. Peter, therefore, is not the reporter of the scene of the trial. Something about it might be heard by the party round the fire; but one does not look for an accurate account of a case to the crowd

at the door of the Court. On such a point the Synoptists are too objective and impersonal to tell us anything. What happened to Peter passed into the tradition no doubt from his own account of it. He does not point out to us, however, the danger of his position in the high-priest's court (see on ver. 50), but only how his Master's words about the betrayal were fulfilled. A maid-servant detected him—he could scarcely have expected to escape it—not by his speech but by his face, by looking at him, we are told, and declared aloud that he was one of the companions of the man from Nazareth, of Jesus who was being tried upstairs. In many a story of adventure the hero is admired for extricating himself by bold denial from a dangerous situation. That is what Peter does, but he is judged not by the standard of personal audacity but by that of faithfulness to a leader worthy of supreme devotion, whom he had just sworn that he would never deny.

68. Feeling his position dangerous, Peter moves out from the inner court where the servants were sitting round the fire, to the outer court, the space between the house and the street, where a number of people, not perhaps members of that household only, but attendants of councillors summoned to the meeting, and others were standing. This space also is in some

¹ Or 'fetched blows at him'; with the variant the phrase is less strong. A.V.'s "smote him with the palms of their hands" is enough, but *πάτισμα* may be a blow with a rod.

² Or, what do you mean?

69 λέγεις. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον.¹ καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἤρξατο πάλιν λέγειν² τοῖς παρεστῶσιν ὅτι Οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν 70 ἐστίν. ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἤρνεῖτο. καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν οἱ παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον τῷ Πέτρῳ, Ἐληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ· καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος 71 εἶ. ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύναι ὅτι Οὐκ οἶδα τὸν 72 ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ὃν λέγετε. καὶ εἰθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου³ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ρῆμα ὃς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πρὸν ἀλέκτορα δίς φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν.

The trial before Pilate, xv. 1-5.

1 Καὶ εἰθὺς πρωὶ συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες⁴ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ὄλον τὸ συνέδριον, δήσαντες

way lighted, but here too the girl (Matthew says another one, but Mark's words even with the variant scarcely allow this) sees him, and declares him to be of the party of Jesus. Peter—thinking more perhaps of maintaining his position, so as to know what happens to his Master, than of the other interpretation his words allowed of—denied again what was said. But it could not be denied. The bystanders, their attention drawn to Peter by the girl's words, make sure that he is a Galilean. Matthew indicates that it was Peter's dialect that made them sure of this, but Mark, followed by Luke, says nothing of his speaking, and it is not likely that he drew attention to himself by speaking, either in the inner court or in the fore court.

71. He who enters on a wrong course even from the best motive is apt to be carried farther than he wished to go. So Peter, having lied to keep his place near the room where his Master was being tried, continues to do so with more and more energy.

72. The second cock-crow is in Mark alone, and all the phrases referring to it are critically uncertain. Matthew and Luke have their one cock-crow at this point. The prophecy of two cock-crows (ver. 30) is absent from Codex D., and, as we said before, its genuineness

may be questioned. Three denials are specified in the narrative, which thus gives the prediction a more literal air than perhaps it had at first. (Compare the “three days” of the prediction of the Resurrection). “When he realized it,” literally “when he hit upon it” (other proposed translations of the clause are: he covered his face and wept, he began to weep, he wept bitterly, assuming a Hebraism), describes the revulsion. His vehemence is arrested in a moment; as often happens to impulsive men he is covered with grief at what he has just done. What he protested to Jesus was quite impossible has actually happened; he has disowned his Lord. Such is the end of Peter's connection with Jesus in his lifetime; of the other disciples there is nothing to add to ver. 50.

xv. 1. The date “in the morning” must refer to the principal action in the sentence, the handing over to Pilate. Before this was done, the members of the Sanhedrin have met and consulted. It is not clear from Mark's words whether a formal meeting of the Court was held at that early hour. The word συμβούλιον may mean either consultation or the resolution arrived at in common deliberation (see note on iii. 6); and accordingly as we read ποιήσαντες with

¹ Add καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν.

² Omit εἰθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου.

³ εἶπεν.

⁴ ἐποιμάσαντες.

he went out into the fore-court.¹ And the maid-servant saw him there and began again to say² to the bystanders, This is one of them. But he denied it again. And again after a little the bystanders said to Peter, Surely you do belong to them; for you are certainly a Galilean. But he began to call down penalties on his head (if he were not speaking truth) and to swear, I do not know this man of whom you are speaking. And immediately a second time³ a cock crowed.⁷¹ And Peter remembered the word how Jesus said to him, Before the cock crow twice you will deny me thrice. And when he realized it he wept.⁷²

[Matthew xxvii. 11-14; Luke xxiii. 1-5.]

And in the morning the high-priests with the elders and scribes and the whole Sanhedrin held a consultation and bound Jesus and took him away and handed him over to

WH or *étaulement* with Tischf. we shall find it stated that the members of Sanhedrin held a consultation or that they prepared, or had already prepared, the line of action now to be followed. In neither case need the meeting, so far as the words go, be regarded as a regularly formed one. The members of the High Court act, but the provision of later Jewish law (*Tract. Sanh.* v. 5), that in a capital case the Sanhedrin must hold a meeting on the second day to confirm the verdict arrived at on the first, does not seem to be complied with. There is no hearing of the case in the morning, but only consultation as to the carrying out of the verdict. This meeting, moreover, is not on the second day; the two meetings are on the same day, which began on the evening of the Passover, and are only separated by an hour or two from each other. Sanhedrin practice was, no doubt, less precise in the time of the Gospel than in the time of the *Tract. Sanhedrin*. In Matthew it is merely said that the members of the Court held consultation against Jesus. In Luke

there is only one meeting, that in the morning.¹ The morning procedure, accordingly, was that of prosecutors, not judges. The enemies of Jesus had to consider the terms of the charge to be brought against him before the governor, and to put it in such a way that Pilate could not regard it as a mere question of doctrine and refuse to do anything about it. Their measures were taken with extreme haste. As the arrest had been made at dead of night, the handing over to Pilate was to take place before the population was abroad. Some populous streets, perhaps, had to be traversed (we cannot know this, as we cannot tell where the high-priest's house was) on the way to the Antonia or to Herod's palace, or wherever it was that Pilate held his court. Jesus is bound as a condemned person awaiting sentence, and hurried off in the early morning, for the crucifixion takes place at 9 a.m. Mark's readers know about Pilate, and he is not introduced in any way. It is not even explained how he came to be in Jerusalem at this time (cf. Luke xxiii. 7). All this takes place on the

¹ On the whole set of scenes up to the crucifixion, which took place in public, we are met by the question, Who is the reporter of these

transactions, of the early Sanhedrin, of the trial before Pilate, of the scene in the barracks?

¹ Add, and a cock crew.

² Omit, immediately a second time.

⁴ Or, having made ready their plan of action.

² For began to say, "said."

2 τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήγεγκαν καὶ παρέδωκαν Πειλάτῳ. καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν
αὐτὸν ὁ Πειλάτος, Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ιουδαίων; ὁ δὲ ἀποκρίθεις
3 αὐτῷ λέγει, Σὺ λέγεις. καὶ κατηγόρουν αὐτοῦ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς πολλά.
4 ὁ δὲ Πειλάτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν, Οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν; ἦδε
5 πόσα σου κατηγοροῦσιν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη, ὥστε
θαυμάζειν τὸν Πειλάτον.

Jesus and Barabbas, xv. 6-15.

6 Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν ἀπέλυνεν αὐτοῖς ἔνα δέσμιον ὃν παρηποῦντο.¹
7 ἦν δὲ ὁ λεγόμενος Βαραββᾶς μετὰ τῶν στασιαστῶν δεδεμένος,
8 οἵτινες ἐν τῇ στάσει φόνον πεποιήκεισαν. καὶ ἀναβὰς ὁ ὄχλος
9 ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς. 'Ο δὲ Πειλάτος ἀπεκρίθη
αὐτοῖς λέγων, Θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ιουδαίων;

great day of the feast, and the priests and lawyers do not simply send Jesus to Pilate, but go with him themselves; so strongly does their fear and hatred of Jesus act on them, or, as they might represent, so urgently does the public peace require that their prisoner be dealt with at once. But of all this there is not a word in the synoptists, where all the illegalities are left without any explanation.

2. This is the charge; it is afterwards fixed on the cross. Jesus is accused of being a Pretender to the Jewish crown. This is not a different matter from that in connection with which he was condemned in the Jewish Court; it is the Messiahship that is in question on both occasions; but in the Sanhedrin the religious side of it is regarded, the relation of the Messiah to God; before Pilate the political side is urged, the relation of the Messiah to the sovereign power of Rome. The charge was apt to prove fatal; the Messiahs we know of in this period of Jewish history had very brief careers. How different a Messiah Jesus was from the Judas and the Theudas we read of in Acts v. we can see readily, but Pilate might not draw such fine distinctions. He asks Jesus if the charge is true, putting it as stated to him, with emphasis, perhaps satirical, on the word *you*. As to the high-priest, so to Pilate Jesus affirms his Messiahship in the simplest terms. Swete, following patristic opinion, holds that the words

'Thou sayest it' neither affirm nor deny. WH suggest (margin) that the words are a question, Do you say it? The answer in both these cases is left to Pilate's conscience. But the form 'Thou sayest it' is a recognized form of affirmation. See Blass, *Gr.* § 77, 3, who says that it is implied that the person asked would not of himself have made the affirmation (cf. Matth. xxvi. 64).

3. The scene is precisely similar to that in the Sanhedrin—Jesus silent, summoned to speak, but persisting in his silence. In John it is otherwise in the trial before Pilate. Luke's hearing before Pilate also consists of the same statements; and while the silence at xiv. 61 can be explained (see notes there) the inference is suggested that very little was known of the procedure which led to the crucifixion, and that the various trials which are so like each other and at none of which either Peter or any of the other disciples was present, were formed on the prophecy, Isa. liii. 7 (cf. Acts viii. 32 sq.). What could be alleged against Jesus we have learned to some extent. He entered Jerusalem riding in the centre of a crowd who acclaimed him as Messiah. He had little sympathy with the Temple system, had even put forth his hand in an unauthorized way to reform what he thought an abuse in it, and had prophesied, if not threatened to bring about, its downfall. The accusations were serious, and ought to be met, Pilate thought; but Jesus

¹ ἐνπερ γῆτοῦντο.

Pilate. And Pilate asked him, Are you the King of the 2 Jews? And he answered him, Yes. And the high-priests 3 brought many charges against him. And Pilate asked him 4 again, Do you make no answer? See what charges they are making against you! But Jesus still made no answer, so that 5 Pilate wondered.

[Matthew xxvii. 15-26; Luke xxiii. 18-25.]

Now it was customary for him to release to them at the 6 time of the festival one prisoner, whom they asked of him.¹ And the person called Barabbas was lying in prison with the 7 insurrectionaries, those who had committed murder in the insurrec-
tion. So a crowd of people came up and began to ask him for the 8 customary favour. And Pilate answered them, Are you willing 9

refuses to meet them. Was it because he knew his cause was lost, and that nothing he could say would be of any avail? Or because such charges could only be met by explanations, into which the Messiah could not enter before such a tribunal? What Pilate thought of the accusations and Jesus' way of meeting them we are told later. Here it is merely said that he wondered. He would not be accustomed to see accused persons who refused to defend themselves. There was something more there, he saw, than was stated in the accusations.

6. A new turn is here given to the trial. Two pieces of information are given to account for it: the first with regard to a custom Pilate observed in connection with the festival, and which might have been applied in favour of Jesus; the other about the person in whose favour it was applied on this occasion. Of the custom of Pilate, not, of course, of the Roman governors generally, this passage alone informs us. The accounts given by Philo and Josephus¹ of Pilate's proceedings in Judaea and of his character are very unlike what is here reported of him. Philo says he was "unbending and inexorably hard," and his reported

acts show him to have had but little regard to the feelings of the Jews and to have had no desire to ingratiate himself with them.² Taking the statements of Mark as they stand, it appears that Pilate did to some extent seek to be popular. At the feast—the phrase does not necessarily imply that this occurrence took place on the first day of unleavened bread—he granted an amnesty to one prisoner, and he allowed the populace to come to his tribunal and name the person they wanted released, provided, no doubt, that no reason of state forbade the release of that person. Here is an opportunity which may turn out in favour of Jesus, standing bound before the governor. But we are told first about another prisoner. He was under arrest, it appears, not for any serious crime he had committed himself, but because he had been mixed up with the rioters (the definite article is taken by some to show that Mark must have told the story of this riot in a passage now dropped out of the Gospel; readers at Rome were not likely to know the circumstances). From Mark's words we should not judge that Barabbas was a robber, or (John xviii. 40) far less a murderer (Acts iii. 14); but that he was a person accidentally connected

¹ Philo *De legat. ad Caïum*, 88. Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 8, 1-3; *B.J.*, ii. 9, 24.

² Brandt, *Evang. Gesch.*, 94 sqq., goes so far

as to deny that any Roman procurator could have such a custom as that here described, and regards the whole scene as an invention.

¹ whomsoever they asked.

10 ἐγίνωσκεν γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδάκεισαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς.
 11 οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν
 12 ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς. ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς,
 13 Τί οὖν¹ ποιήσω ὃν² λέγετε τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων; οἱ δὲ
 14 πάλιν ἔκραξαν, Σταύρωσον αὐτόν. ὁ δὲ Πειλᾶτος ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς,

Τί γὰρ ἐποίησεν κακόν; οἱ δὲ περιστῶς ἔκραξαν, Σταύρωσον
 15 αὐτόν. Οὐ δὲ Πειλᾶτος βουλόμενος τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἰκανὸν ποιῆσαι
 ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Βαραββᾶν καὶ παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν φραγελ-
 λώσας ἵνα σταυρωθῇ.

The mocking, xv. 16-20.

16 Οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν ἕσω τῆς αὐλῆς, ὅ ἐστιν
 17 πραιτώριον, καὶ συνκαλοῦσιν ὅλην τὴν σπείραν. καὶ ἐνδιδύσκουσιν

with a serious riot in which murder had been committed, and who might very well be set at liberty as being in no way dangerous. The sequel shows him to have been a well known person, and not unpopular.¹

8. These explanations given, the story goes on. The trial is interrupted by the appearance on the scene of a crowd of people who have come up from the street to the tribunal, and at once begin to state the object they have come for. We are not to suppose that this crowd consisted of the same persons as that which hailed Jesus as Messiah—shouting Hosanna!—when he entered Jerusalem, or that which attended his preaching in the Temple. The latter would be composed chiefly of pilgrims; but those who appeared before Pilate would be residents in Jerusalem, who were acquainted with the habits of the procurator, and knew the proper time for claiming the favour now in question.

9. Pilate knew, so the story implies,

that Jesus was popular among the common people. Any one claiming to be Messiah was sure of their favour. He saw that the charges brought against Jesus had no substance, and that the high-priests were afraid, not of his disturbing the Roman power, but of his having more influence with the people than they had themselves. If, therefore, the people would take Jesus for the released prisoner of the day, he would please them, and at the same time escape from having to deal with one whom he saw to be so harmless. Here Pilate acts with much more feeling and consideration than we should have believed him to possess.

11. In Matthew it is Pilate who offers Barabbas or Jesus as alternatives. In the older narrative the high-priests see that they are in danger of being balked of their design against Jesus, and go among the people and work on them to ask rather for Barabbas. The narrative is extremely condensed, and

¹ The parallel passage in Matthew (xxvii. 18) has a variant attested by a number of cursive copies and the Armenian and some Syriac versions, as well as by very old patristic evidence, which opens up a curious discussion on the name and position of Barabbas. In these MSS. his name is Jesus, and Barabbas is a second name or perhaps an attribute added to the name. Pilate asks, Shall I release to you Jesus Barabbas or Jesus who is called Christ? On this passage Jerome says that in the Gospel according to the Hebrews the word Barabbas is rendered "Son of their Master." Barabbas represents the Aramaic

Bar-Abba, which means Son of the teacher. Bar-rabban, the form given in one of the Syriac versions, would mean "Son of a Rabbi." On these materials the view has been advanced that the person in question was the son of a learned man, and had got into a scrape along with other people of a different stamp, from which the populace, who knew his father, were glad to rescue him. If, however, the reading of the word in the uncials is upheld (as it is by the editors), then Barabbas is not a descriptive attribute, but is the man's name, and the speculation falls to the ground.

that I should release to you the King of the Jews? For he ¹⁰ saw that it was from envy that the high-priests had handed him over. But the high-priests stirred up the people, urging ¹¹ that he should rather release Barabbas to them. And Pilate ¹² repeated his question and said to them, What then am I to do ¹ to him whom you call the King of the Jews? ² And they cried ¹³ again, Crucify him! But Pilate said to them, Why so? What ¹⁴ harm has he done? But they cried still more, Crucify him! ¹⁵ But Pilate, desiring to satisfy the people, released Barabbas to them and handed over Jesus, after a scourging, to be crucified.

[Matthew xxvii. 27-31.]

And the soldiers took him away inside the court, i.e. the ¹⁶ Praetorium, and they call together the whole cohort. And ¹⁷

we hear only the salient points of what took place. All the blame is laid on the high-priests. The people would not, if left to themselves, have refused Pilate's proposal; and, after Barabbas has been named for release, Pilate raises the objection that if that person is released something must be done with Jesus, he does not know what. It was not a case, he felt, for punishment; and if the people regarded Jesus as their king, as their leaders told him ("Your king," he would say—*King of the Jews* is evidently not what Pilate said; the phrase is taken from the inscription on the Cross), they could not wish him to be severely dealt with. If the people would say something in favour of Jesus he would be relieved of a serious difficulty.

13. To understand this strange transaction it is necessary to suppose that the people, who cannot have felt any animosity to Jesus, acted out of blind opposition to whatever the procurator might bring forward. It is easy for the leaders of a subject population to excite suspicion against the alien governor, and the people, once wound up to the point of opposing Pilate, went on vehemently in that course till they carried their point. The exclamation "Crucify him!" must have been prompted by the high-priests. It was to get Jesus put to death by the Roman power that the Sanhedrists had brought him to Pilate, and the mode of capital

punishment practised by the Romans was crucifixion. Nothing less will serve the purpose of these enraged persecutors; and the people took up the demand of the high-priests that Jesus should be crucified, without apparently understanding the grounds on which it was made.

15. It is for the people, accordingly, that Pilate does what, but for their intervention, he might have refused to do for the high-priests, and thus the appearance of the people, instead of helping Jesus as it seemed likely to do, proved fatal to him. (1 Cor. ii. 8 ascribes the guilt of the crucifixion to the "rulers of this world." Acts iii. 13-17 distributes it between people and rulers as in our passage). Pilate, though friendly to Jesus and convinced of his innocence, abandons him in an unprincipled manner to his enemies. The scourging here spoken of in a casual way was the usual preliminary to crucifixion in Roman practice, and the word for it is the Latin one in a Greek form. In Luke's account of the trial before Pilate scourging is spoken of as a minor alternative punishment; and Luke omits the scourging preliminary to crucifixion, as also does the fourth Gospel.

16. We are still in the dark as to the source of the narrative, and this scene in which the rude **soldiers** make cruel sport with the King of the Jews, takes

¹ do you wish me to do? ²to do, do you say, with the King of the Jews?

αὐτὸν πορφύραν καὶ περιτιθέασιν αὐτῷ πλέξαντες ἀκάνθινον στέ-
 18 φανον· καὶ ηρξαντο ἀσπάξεσθαι αὐτόν, Χαῖρε, βασιλεῦ τῶν Ιουδαίων·
 19 καὶ ἔτυπτον αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν καλάμῳ καὶ ἐνέπτυνον αὐτῷ καὶ
 20 τιθέντες τὰ γόνατα προσεκύνουν αὐτῷ· καὶ ὅτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ,
 ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν πορφύραν, καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἵματια
 αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐξάγουσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα σταυρώσωσιν αὐτόν.

The last journey, xv. 21.

21 Καὶ ἀγγαρεύοντις παράγοντά τινα Σίμωνα Κυρηναῖον, ἐρχόμενον
 ἀπ' ἀγροῦ, τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ρούφου, ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν
 σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ.

The Crucifixion, xv. 22-32.

22 Καὶ φέροντιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Γολγοθᾶν τόπον, ὃ ἐστιν μεθερ-
 23 μηνευόμενον Κρανίου τόπος· καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον·

place in the interior of the palace of the governor. Luke omits it; and by what channels it became known to Christian tradition it is hard to say. The soldiers, we are told, led Jesus away (from the judgment-hall, which was accessible from the street) into the interior of the building, the court (xv. 54) or open space surrounded by the rooms. A note is added to the effect that the court means the praetorium, a word which if used of a building means either the palace of the governor or the soldiers' barracks. This explanation does nothing to make Mark's narrative clearer, but rather the opposite, and may have crept in first as a gloss on the margin from Matthew, where the statement appears to be that the soldiers took Jesus off to another building, viz. to the praetorium, and collected there the whole cohort. In the inner court of the palace then, according to Mark's first words, the whole cohort is brought together. The court must have been large, for a cohort consisted of six hundred men. Only a party of four soldiers was required to carry out a crucifixion (ver. 24); but before the party sets out, the whole garrison is represented as indulging in some rude play with the prisoner. He is the King of the Jews, they have been told; those present at the hearing before Pilate heard this, and the inscription to be put on the Cross confirms it. A worthy

king these mercenaries no doubt think, in scorn of such a people! They act out the idea therefore, and dress up Jesus in purple—it was a scarlet robe Matthew says, but the royal colour is what is aimed at, and Mark calls it accordingly. A crown is put on his head—it might be plaited hastily out of the brushwood that lay in a corner for the fire—there were thorns on the twigs, but that did not matter. And this improvised king they greet with royal honours, acclaiming him with shouts by his title, "King of the Jews." He is not made to hold a sceptre, but the reed is there which might represent that symbol, and if he does not hold it they can strike him with it. (In Matthew this is different. The cane is first put in his hand and then taken from him to be used as in Mark). He does not hold out his hand for their kiss of homage, for that part of the performance they spit on him; and they go through the farce of kneeling and paying him a mock obeisance.

20. The make-up would not do for the streets, for various reasons, and is left behind when the party sets out on its dreadful errand. The place of execution lay outside the town, a fact every one knew—for here, after the various transactions in the interior of the house, we come to what took place in public and at once became notorious. The Christians did not forget that the

they put on him a purple robe and set on him a crown they had plaited of thorns. And they began to salute him, Hail, 18 King of the Jews. And they struck his head with a reed 19 and spat upon him, and knelt down to pay homage to him. And when they had made their sport with him, they took off 20 the purple robe and dressed him in his own clothes. And they take him out to crucify him.

[Matthew xxvii. 32; Luke xxiii. 26-32.]

And they impress a man who was passing, Simon of Cyrene, 21 coming from the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to bear his cross.

[Matthew xxvii. 33-44; Luke xxiii. 33-43.]

And they take him to the place Golgotha, or in our language 22 Skull-place. And they gave him myrrhed wine; but he would 23

Master had to pass through one of the gates of the city to reach the place of suffering (Heb. xiii. 12, 13). Mark's readers knew what *crucifixion* was, and no explanations are entered into on that point. The details of the punishment have to be pieced together from references in classical literature; the fullest treatment of the subject is to be found in Fulda, *Das Kreuz und die Kreuzigung*, and the results are lucidly summed up by Brandt (*op. cit.*, p. 178 *sqq.*). See Prof. Brown's article, "Cross," in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. The practice at our period, however, might not be in all points the same as that described by these writers. The word *σταύρος*, translated Cross, properly denotes the upright stake fixed permanently in the ground at the place of execution, or if necessary carried there for the occasion. The cross-piece to which the hands were fixed was carried to the spot by the condemned person; and to this he was fixed by ropes or nails before being elevated on the upright post, which would be seven or eight feet high. A projection at middle height supported the body which was entirely naked, and the feet were fixed to the upright with cords or withes tied across the instep or with nails. Some, however, maintain that the feet hung free. There was very little bleeding; the limbs would grow numb from their unnatural position, and

there must have been intolerable fever and thirst as well as torture from flies. Yet death was often long of coming, the victim sometimes lingering for days before being released.

21. In this awkward sentence the evangelist communicates a good many facts. As the soldiers, the number of whom is not mentioned by Mark, are leading Jesus out of the town, it is necessary to get some assistance for him, since his strength is failing. He is carrying the crossbeam, according to practice, but he is not able for the burden. The soldiers therefore lay hold of a person who happens to be passing in the opposite direction, coming not from his field-work (for in this case *ἀγροῦ* would have the article (*cf. xvi. 12*); the argument that as this man had been at his work the day cannot have been the first of the festival, and that this speaks for a tradition in the Synoptists that the Crucifixion took place as in John on the day before the evening of the Passover, cannot be upheld), but from the country, where he had gone on some errand not explained. And as it afterwards proved, this was a person of some interest. He was the father of Alexander and Rufus, persons known to Mark's readers as Christians, settled no doubt, when he wrote, at Rome. Simon, however, came from Cyrene in

24 ὅς δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβεν. καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτὸν καὶ διαμερίζονται τὰ
 25 ἴμάτια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλῆρον ἐπ' αὐτὰ τίς τι ἄρρ. ἦν δὲ
 26 ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐστάυρωσαν αὐτόν. καὶ ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας
 27 αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη, Ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῶν Ιουδαίων. καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ
 σταυροῦσιν δύο λγυστάς, ἕνα ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἕνα ἐξ εὐωνύμων αὐτοῦ.¹
 29 καὶ οἱ παραπορεύμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς
 αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες, Οὐά ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν²
 30 τρισὶν ἡμέραις, σῶσον σεαυτὸν καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ. ὅμοιας
 31 καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων
 32 ἔλεγον, Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι· ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ
 βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ, καταβάτω μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἵνα ἰδωμεν
 καὶ πιστεύσωμεν. καὶ οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι σὺν αὐτῷ ὠνείδιζον
 αὐτόν.

Africa, and was not likely to have field-work to do outside the wall. He is added to the party, and in him we see a possible reporter of the further incidents.

In Luke we have here the incident of the crowd of Jews who followed the party, and of Jesus' address to the wailing women. The impressing of Simon, who was going the other way, makes against the presence of such a crowd, and Jesus' speech, in which allusion is made to circumstances connected with the siege of Jerusalem, scarcely belongs to this situation.

22. Whether Golgotha is identical with the site of the Chapel of the Crucifixion in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, this is not the place to enquire. The evangelists do not speak of a hill, but of a place in which, if the name is derived from the natural features of the place and not from some incident which had taken place there (skulls could not, among the Jews, lie about even in a place of execution), some resemblance had been seen to the curves of a skull, perhaps a moderate swelling of the ground. It was outside the town, and close to a thoroughfare. Crucifixion, like gibbeting, was meant to terrify, and a public place was chosen for it.

23. In the Talmud (*Sanhed.* 43. 1) we read of a custom which was practised at Jerusalem, of giving to persons

condemned to the cross a draught of wine with frankincense in it, in order that they might lose consciousness (cf. Prov. xxxi. 6). If this is what is referred to, the act would not be that of the soldiers, but of some merciful persons in the company. Wine mixed with myrrh would not have this effect; in fact, wine is often treated with myrrh in the East to give it, as is supposed, a more agreeable flavour. In Matthew it is wine mixed with gall, and therefore with a bitter taste, which is offered to Jesus before he is raised on the cross, perhaps with reference to Psalm lxxix. 21. He tastes and refuses it, apparently because of its bitterness. In Mark the reason of the refusal seems to be that he desires to retain full consciousness. (See Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, s.v. 'Gall,' vol. III., appendix, p. lv.).

24. The condemned was crucified naked, and his clothes became the perquisites of the executioners. The dress of a Jew consisted of five pieces; coat, tunic, headgear, girdle, sandals. Mark has not said that only four soldiers carried out the execution, and does not need to dispose of the fifth piece in a special way, as the fourth Gospel does. But this verse is a literal reproduction of Psalm xxii. 18, only the words, "what each should take," which contain no further information, being added by the evangelist. No eyewitness was needed to supply them.

¹ Add ver. 28: καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα, Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη.

² Add εὐ..

not take it. And they crucify him, and they divide his garments, casting lots upon them what each was to get. And it was the third hour when they crucified him. And the inscription stating the charge was this, THE KING OF THE JEWS. And with him they crucify two brigands one on his right hand and the other on his left.¹ And the passers-by railed at him shaking their heads and saying, Ah! you that destroy the Temple and build it in three days, save yourself and come down from the cross. Similarly also the high-priests scoffed to each other, and the Scribes, and said, He saved others, but he cannot save himself. The Christ! the King of Israel! Let him come down from the cross now; when we see that we will believe! And those who were crucified along with him reviled him.

25. Mark gives the fourfold division of this day: ver. 1, Jesus is taken to Pilate "early in the morning," i.e. at the end of the last watch of the night (cf. xiii. 35). The crucifixion is at the third hour, i.e. at 9 a.m.; darkness comes on (ver. 33) at the sixth hour and continues till the ninth, i.e. 12-3 p.m.; at ver. 42 it is evening, and a new day begins. As for the **Inscription**, nothing is said here of the use of several languages. If written by a soldier, it would be in Greek or Latin; either Greek or Aramaic would be legible to those for whom it was intended. The inscription in three languages has now dropped out of the text of Luke's gospel, and stands in John only. In Matthew and Luke the charge forms a sentence; in Mark it is more pointedly insulting to the Jews, the crucified being simply called their King, as if that were the fact. At the trial (ver. 12) Pilate used similar language, speaking of Jesus as "him whom you call King of the Jews." The words contain in themselves the whole history that has led to this tragical scene, the hatred and misunderstanding of the Jews, the weakness and contemptuous cynicism of Pilate, and on the part of the sufferer a claim which, though misapprehended, is yet put forward and was never afterwards to be forgotten or withdrawn.

27. It was on men of such a character, rioters, rebels, and outlaws, that the dreadful punishment of crucifixion was ordinarily inflicted, and none of its degrading and terrible associations were absent in this instance. The two men spoken of are not said to have been brought to the ground along with Jesus; only here are they mentioned. Jesus is placed in the centre as in the place of honour.

29. The **reproaches** of various classes of men **heaped on Jesus** in the hour of his humiliation, are gathered together in one statement. The influence of the Psalms is felt in this section, especially in Matthew; many prophecies receive their fulfilment here (Rom. xv. 3). But the things said are also such as the early Christians must often have heard in the controversy they carried on with the Jews. The offence of the Cross to the Jews is pointedly expressed in them, the contrast between the lofty Messianic claims of Jesus and his helplessness in his last hour. The passers-by shake their heads as in Ps. xxii. 7, cix. 25. What now, they say, of the lofty boast that he would take down the Temple and build it in three days (xiv. 58)? The words are notorious, and they have given deep offence. The speaker will have to do something for himself first, before he can proceed to

¹ Add: 28. And the Scripture was fulfilled which says, And he was numbered with the transgressors. This verse only appears in the later uncials. The quotation (Isaiah liii. 12) occurs in Luke xxii. 37 where it is the Lord himself who utters it as a forecast of his impending fate.

The Death of Jesus, xv. 33-41.

33 Καὶ γενομένης ὥρας ἕκτης σκότου ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἔως
34 ὥρας ἐνάτης. καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὥρᾳ ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ,

^{Ἐλωτ, ἀλωτ, λαμὰ σαβαχθανεῖ;}¹

ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνεύμενον, 'Ο θεός μου ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπες
35 με; καὶ τινες τῶν παρεστώτων ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον, "Ιδε Ἡλείαν
36 φωνεῖ. δραμὼν δέ τις καὶ γεμίσας σπόγγον ὅξους περιθεὶς καλάμῳ
ἐπότιζεν αὐτὸν λέγων, "Αφετε ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλείας καθελεῖν

that brave work of profanation and destruction! The high-priests and scribes too have come out, though it is the great day of the festival, to see their work accomplished; and stand there in the light of day, now that they have carried through their secret plans, hurling reproaches at their victim. As they afterwards argued in synagogue and school, so they are made to argue here under the cross itself. One so helpless, exposed to such a humiliating fate, he cannot be Messiah! Now is the time for him to show a sign of what he claims; if they saw such a sign they would turn Christians too! The very brigands who are being crucified along with him are not too abject and miserable to join in this work of heaping reproaches on the Messiah who cannot stir a hand to help himself. So lonely is he that even his fellow-sufferers turn against him.

33. Luke says there was an eclipse of the sun; but Passover was at full moon. Renan, Weiss, and others consider that Mark's statement refers to the state of the weather at the time of the crucifixion, the sky having been covered with heavy clouds. But more than this is intended. Celestial phenomena attend the important crises of the life of Jesus, the Baptism (i. 10), the Transfiguration (ix. 7), and it was but natural that when he was dying the earth should be in darkness. Prophecy has many predictions of such darkness in connection with the unfolding of the divine purpose. See Joel ii. 10, 31, Jer. xiii. 16, and particularly Amos viii. 9. The darkness lasts from mid-day to mid-afternoon, from the middle of the

time of Jesus' hanging on the cross to the time of his death.

34. We see from this passage that the Roman soldiers did not keep everyone at a distance from the cross, and that there were Jews beside it. With the exception of the words in which he declared his Messiahship, first to the Sanhedrin and then to the Roman governor, Jesus has been completely silent in this narrative ever since the arrest. The beautiful words put in his mouth at this period by Luke and John are absent from the narrative of Mark and that of Matthew; here the tragedy is unrelieved. Only at the very end is the silence broken. The words of the last cry are in Aramaic, and would not be understood by the soldiers. In the form in which Mark gives them they could not give rise to the reported misunderstanding; Matthew has them in a form in which they could do so. The Hebrew word Eli, my God, (Matthew) could be taken for the beginning of the name of the prophet Elijah, but not the word Eloi, which the bulk of the testimony fixes here for Mark. It seems clear that the Hebrew form of Matthew is the right one, and that the Aramaic of Mark is due to a corrector, who reflected perhaps that Aramaic and not Hebrew was spoken in Palestine at the time. The quotation which in this Gospel formed the last and only words of the Saviour on the cross, and which he uttered in the sacred language, does not enable us to infer what was in his mind at the time. That he speaks now, not having spoken before, may show that he felt the crisis of death to be at hand, which supervened directly after. But he who quotes the first words of a poem may

¹ ἡσαφθάνει.

[Matthew xxvii. 45-56; Luke xxiii. 44-49.]

And at the sixth hour there was darkness over the whole 33 earth till the ninth hour. And at the ninth hour Jesus cried 34 with a loud voice, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani¹, which is when translated,

My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?

And some of the bystanders said on hearing it, Look, he is 35 calling Elijah. And one of them ran and filled a sponge with 36 vinegar and put it on the end of a reed and gave it him to drink, saying, Wait,² let us see if Elijah will come to take

be thinking not of these words only but of some later part of the poem or of its general course of thought, and the twenty-second Psalm, while it opens with a cry like that of despair, is not by any means a Psalm of despair, but of help and salvation coming to one brought very low. Even the opening words are an appeal to God and a confession that no help is looked for but from Him alone. He who speaks thus has taken leave of all other refuge and counsel but that which lies in God; and that he speaks thus in a loud voice indicates that faith is not wavering or faint in him, but still able even in the extremity of pain and when strength is all but exhausted to maintain her great affirmation. That Jesus saw and foretold his death cannot, as we have seen, be doubted, though he may not have entered into such detail on the subject as is in some passages put in his mouth; the symbols of the bread and wine are incontrovertible evidence that he knew he was to die; that his death therefore should actually occur, could not be a shock but rather a relief to his personal feeling. Nor can we suppose that his Messianic self-certainty wavered at the approach of death, or that he ceased to feel that he was giving his life freely to realize God's purpose and to bring salvation to many.

35. Some, who afterwards reported these words, apprehended them correctly, but some misunderstood or maliciously perverted them. The Eli, 'my God,' they thought was Eli-jah; and they knew Jewish ideas well enough to understand what an appeal

to Elijah by one in such circumstances would mean. To later Jewish thought Elijah was a saint or angel who advised, warned, and comforted the faithful in this earth and welcomed them to Paradise (see Hamburger's *Real-Encyklopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, sub voce), and who was expected to be present at every festival. In N.T. thought he is the forerunner of the Messiah, coming before him to put everything in order, and his advent is constantly awaited. These bystanders half expect, or pretend to expect, that Elijah will come as he is summoned, and then he will take Jesus down from the cross; perhaps they even imagine that on the appearance of the great prophet the Day of the Lord will arrive and bring the great revolution of which the prophets spoke. To such a result one of them at least thinks he can contribute, or he allows himself (Weiss) an act of mercy under cover of that supposition. He will refresh Jesus and keep him alive so that when the great moment comes he may be prepared for it. And so he gets a draught of ordinary wine, thin and sharp-tasted—the soldiers would have it with them—and conveys it to Jesus in the only way in which that can now be done. Wait, he says, or Let me do it, as if to keep off all that might interrupt such a course of events; Let us see if Elijah is coming to take him down. It is not said this time that the draught was refused; but it availed not; the sufferer immediately after uttered a loud cry (in Mark not said to be articulate; in Matthew this is probably

¹ Or, zaftani (the Hebrew instead of the Aramaic form of the word).

² Or, Let me do it.

37 αὐτόν. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀφεὶς φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν. καὶ τὸ
38 καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο ἀπὸ ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω.
39 οὗτον δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ διὰ οὕτως¹
40 ἐξέπνευσεν, εἶπεν, Ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἀνθρωπὸς υἱὸς ἦν Θεοῦ. οἵσαν
δὲ καὶ γναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι, ἐν αἷς καὶ Μαρίᾳ ἡ
Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρίᾳ ἡ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσῆτος μήτηρ
41 καὶ Σαλώμῃ, αἱ δὲ ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ ἡκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ
διηκόνουν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἄλλαι πολλὰι αἱ συναναβᾶσαι αὐτῷ εἰς
Ἴεροσόλυμα.

Burial of Jesus, xv. 42-47.

42 Καὶ ἥδη ὀψίας γενομένης, ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή, ὃ ἐστιν προσάβ-
43 βατον, ἐλθὼν Ἰωσῆφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, εὐσχήμων βουλευτής, ὃς
καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τολμήσας
εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τὸν Πειλάτον καὶ ἤτησατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

implied; and in Luke the words are given), not a cry of dismay nor extorted from him by agony, but giving the impression of power and of satisfaction, and thereupon ceased to breathe.

38. This is the effect to Christian thought, of the death of Jesus. Luke has it before the death. In the Jewish Temple God was behind a veil which was never lifted except once a year to the high-priest; but Christians have ‘access’ or admission, Rom. v. 2, Ephes. ii. 14-18, iii. 12, and in Hebrews ix. 11 *sqq.*, it is described how Christ by the sacrifice of himself opened up the way to God. In the Gospel of the Hebrews it is the great stone over the doorway of the Temple (*superliminare*) that is broken at Christ’s death. Matthew gives other signs which took place at this point.

39. We read in Seneca of an execution which was under the charge of a centurion; he may not have had his whole company with him. In this Gentile the impression at once begins which is to be produced with regard to Jesus on the whole Gentile world. He notes the manner of the death, so different from what is usual on such occasions. Instead of utter languor and prostration Jesus exhibits at the close of life a triumphant vigour, which makes the centurion think him not an ordinary

man but a hero or a demigod surpassing the measure of human strength and courage. Mark’s readers would not interpret the words placed in the mouth of a heathen in a higher sense than this; but it was much to have such testimony from one in such a position. In Luke the crowd of spectators also is at once seized with compunction (as in Rev. i. 7); they had come out as to a spectacle, but returned making signs of grief and mourning. In the Cureton Syriac they exclaim: “Woe to us because of our sins”; in the Gospel of Peter we have the following at this point; “Then the Jews and the elders and the priests, seeing what harm they had done themselves, began to lament and to say, Alas for our sins; the judgment has drawn nigh, and the end of Jerusalem.”

40. This is the close of the scene of the crucifixion. None of the disciples was there; but friends of Jesus were not quite wanting. They were not close to the cross so as to hold any communication with the Master, but they saw what happened, and when there was a service they could render they were at hand. These verses not only close the account of the crucifixion, but also point forward to the story of the resurrection.

Why, we may ask, did not Mark

¹ Add *κράξας*.

him down. But Jesus uttered a loud cry and expired. And ³⁷
the curtain of the Temple was torn in two from top to bottom.
And when the centurion on the ground, who stood facing him, ³⁸
saw that he expired in this way,¹ he said, Surely this man was
a son of God. But there were also women looking on from ³⁹
a distance, among whom were Mary of Magdala and Mary the
mother of James the Less and the mother of Joses, and Salome,
who when he was in Galilee followed him and waited on him, ⁴⁰
and many others who had come up with him to Jerusalem.

[Matthew xxvii. 57-61; Luke xxiii. 50-56.]

By this time it was evening, and since it was the Preparation, ⁴²
that is the day before the Sabbath, Joseph of Arimathaea, a ⁴³
councillor in good position and one who was himself looking
for the Kingdom of God, came and made bold to go in to

give the information he gives here
about the women who went about and
waited on Jesus in Galilee and those
who came with him to Jerusalem, at
an earlier part of his narrative? Luke
omits it here, but gives it in his
account of the ministry at viii. 1-3,
adding some names and the fact that
these women helped Jesus with their
means. We can only account for Mark's
using the statement as he does by sup-
posing that it was firmly established as
a part of the tradition in the place where
he does use it, and that he adhered
faithfully to his source. We now learn
from him what we did not learn before,
that in the Galilean ministry Jesus had
these women in his train, at least now
and then, and that they did what
they could for his physical wants. In
Mark's account of the journey to
Jerusalem (chap. x.) there is little room
for these women; it is the sons of
Zebedee themselves who come to him
with their ambitious request, not as in
Matthew (xx. 20) their mother.

The women are: 1. Mary of Magdala,
who is unwarrantably treated in Chris-
tian art as a penitent who had lived an
immoral life, because she is identified
with the 'sinner' of Luke vii. 37. Luke
states in his passage parallel with this,
that she had formerly been a demoniac,
which is giving her a very different

history; and this is repeated in Mark
xvi. 9. 2. Mary the mother of James
the Less and of Joses. In the catalogue
of the Twelve the second James is
called the son of Alphaeus, and this
Mary must be considered the wife of
Alphaeus. If Alphaeus is identical
with Clopas then this Mary is called
by John (xix. 25) the sister of Mary the
Lord's mother. 3. Salome. Matthew
(xxvii. 56) here speaks of the mother of
the sons of Zebedee; in his narrative
she has appeared before. In the Gospel
of the Egyptians Salome is childless.

Luke does not name the women
here, having done so in his eighth
chapter, but only mentions the fact
that they witnessed what took place
from a distance. But he makes a more
general statement that Jesus' "ac-
quaintances" were also spectators in
this way. Does this term cover the
disciples, who in Luke do not take to
flight at the arrest, and do not after-
wards leave Jerusalem?

42. The crucifixion took place ac-
cording to all the Gospels on a Friday.
With sunset the same evening the
Sabbath began, so that if Jesus was to
receive the last marks of respect there
was no time to lose. In the ordinary
course of things these rites would not
have been paid him. In other countries

¹ Add, with such a cry.

44 ὁ δὲ Πειλάτος ἐθαύμαζεν εἰ τὴν τέθηνται, καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος
 45 τὸν κεντυρίωνα ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν εἰ πάλαι¹ ἀπέθανεν, καὶ γνοὺς
 46 ἀπὸ τοῦ κεντυρίωνος ἐδωρήσατο τὸ πτῶμα τῷ Ἰωσῆφ. καὶ
 ἀγοράσας σιδόνα καθελὼν αὐτὸν ἐνείλησεν τῇ σιδόνῃ καὶ ἔθηκεν
 αὐτὸν ἐν μνήματι ὃ ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας, καὶ προσεκύλισεν
 47 λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου. ἡ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ
 καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσῆτος ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται.

The empty grave, xvi. 1-8.

i Καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ
 Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἤγόρασαν ἀρώματα ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι

the bodies of those who suffered crucifixion were left to decay or otherwise to disappear, where they were. Among the Jews the law of Deuteronomy (xxi. 23) would secure a hasty covering up of the body (cf. Gospel of Peter, p. 1). That Jesus was duly buried as Paul assures us (1 Cor. xv. 4), was not a matter of course, and there was an explanation for it. The explanation is that he had an influential friend, not named in the narrative till now, who was able to obtain this favour. Joseph of Arimathea (identified with Ramathaim, 1 Sam. i. 1, but with no certainty), is introduced by Mark as a counsellor of good position, a phrase which must indicate a member of the Sanhedrin, and as one who was interested in the hope of the Kingdom. This many of the Pharisees were, and the phrase would not of itself imply that he was a disciple, as Matthew says he was. What Luke adds may be implied though it is not expressed by Mark, that Joseph had been cognizant of the action of his fellow Sanhedrists against Jesus, and had not voted for it. The condemnation of Jesus by the Sanhedrin is reported as unanimous, but Joseph may not have been present; in that case, however, he could not furnish the report of an eyewitness of the nocturnal meeting. Now, however, he is so strongly concerned about Jesus that he takes the unusual step of applying to the Roman governor with the request that the ordinary

course with respect to the bodies of persons crucified should not be followed in this case, but that he might be allowed to take possession of Jesus' body. The evangelist intimates that it required some boldness to make this request. Pilate, as known from Jewish writers, was not a man likely to grant a favour; and the carrying out of military law was not with the Romans, any more than elsewhere, of an elastic nature.

44. This verse, if the variant is adopted, adds nothing to the information of the narrative; any one acquainted with the incidents of crucifixion could supply what is said; and Matthew and Luke take it for granted that Pilate satisfied himself as to the facts. With the text above, the verse speaks more strongly of Pilate's consideration for Jesus; he would not have the body hurried off the moment death took place, but only after a decent interval. Mark also intimates, to the credit of Pilate, that he did not exact anything for the favour thus granted.

46. It is late in the evening and what Joseph has in hand has to be done at once. Yet he has no difficulty in purchasing the linen he wants, and this no doubt would indicate that the day was not a holiday, not the first day of unleavened, but the day before it, as in John. But as danger of life dispensed with the Sabbath, the neces-

¹ ηδη.

Pilate and ask for the body of Jesus. And Pilate wondered 44 if he was already dead, and he sent for the centurion and asked him if he was some time dead,¹ and on hearing the 45 facts from the centurion he made Joseph a present of the body. And he bought a piece of linen and took him down 46 and wrapped him in the linen and placed him in a burial-vault which was hewn out of the rock and rolled a stone up against the door of the tomb. But Mary of Magdala and Mary the 47 mother of Joses were looking on and saw where he was laid.

[Matthew xxviii. 1-10; Luke xxiv. 1-12.]

And when the Sabbath was past, Mary of Magdala and 1
Mary the mother of James and Salome bought sweet-smelling

sities of burial may have prevailed in this case over the law of the festival. The vault in which the body was laid would be near the cross, as the occasion was urgent, and it is not said here that it belonged to Joseph; that is Matthew's addition. The body is simply deposited in a convenient spot, without any rites of lamenting or anointing, to keep it from further exposure on the cross. It is not said that this was intended by Joseph to be its final resting place. The vault was hewn out of the rock, as places for burial are in the East. The entrance was an opening in a rocky slope two feet wide by two feet four inches high, and stooping down to enter one found oneself standing on a floor some inches deeper or even more, in a room which had no light but from this opening, and which was provided with a shelf hewn in the rock all the way round, or with horizontal openings stretching into the rock, to receive bodies. The tomb of our passage had apparently not yet been occupied; we hear of its having been hewn, and it is left for Joseph to provide the stone to cover the entrance. A tomb had to be guarded against wild beasts and against thieves; and this was commonly done in the way here described.¹ Joseph also in his piety towards Jesus must have looked for-

ward to the discharge of more complete funeral rites when the Sabbath was over.

47. The above narrative might be due at least partly to the women, of whom we heard before and whose subsequent proceedings it serves to explain. The life of Jesus down to his last cry has been fully told; what follows in the narrative is a matter in which the women were concerned. Hence the careful introduction of them at ver. 40. Without changing their position that afternoon—Matthew says they were sitting opposite the tomb; Mark does not give this touch but implies it—they were spectators of the crucifixion and then of the entombment. It is left to the reader to imagine their sorrow, but one part of it is plain from what they do afterwards. While the crucifixion was going on they could not know that any funeral rites would be possible. Had the body remained on the cross, the last offices could not have been paid to their Master, and his words in the house of Simon to the woman who anointed him would have appeared fully prophetic in one sense but not in another, for he would have received no other anointing, and no burial. But when they saw his body taken from the cross and placed in a tomb they knew that they would be able to do

¹ On tombs in Palestine see the *Reports of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, *passim*; especially Herr Schick in the volume for 1889. On the

proposed identification of Golgotha and of the Saviour's tomb, see Sir C. Wilson in the same publication, 1893, p. 87.

¹ if he was dead yet.

2 ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν. καὶ λίαν πρωΐ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἔρχονται
 3 ἐπὶ τὸ μημεῖον ἀνατείλαντος¹ τοῦ ἡλίου. καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς,
 4 Τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μημείου; καὶ
 ἀναβλέψασι θεωροῦσιν ὅτι ἀνακεκύλισται ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας
 5 σφόδρα. καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τὸ μημεῖον εἰδόν νεανίσκον καθήμενον
 ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκὴν, καὶ ἔξεθαμβήθησαν.
 6 ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς, Μή ἐκθαμβεῖσθε· Ἰησοῦν ἤπειτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν
 τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον· ἥγερθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁδε· ἵδε ὁ τόπος ὃπου ἔθηκαν
 7 αὐτόν. ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε, εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ

something. The wailing for the dead could not be performed at the right time,¹ but the anointing could be attended to, though late.

xvi. 1-8. THE EMPTY TOMB.

From this point onwards the accounts of the Gospels exhibit great divergences. As in the narrative of the period before the ministry, so here after the ministry is finished we have not one stream of tradition but several. Persons, places, acts, and speeches, all differ in the various accounts.

The narrative of the women at the grave which they find empty comes first in point of time of those connected with the resurrection. Paul's account in 1 Cor. xv. 4 *sqq.*, which must be regarded as embodying the earliest tradition accessible to us, excludes Christophanies before that to Peter, but allows of the discovery by the women of the empty grave, and of the resolve to which they were led to seek their Master in Galilee.

1. The women, the same as those mentioned in xv. 40, set about the last rites as soon as possible. In Luke they make their purchases with this view on Friday evening (cf. Mark xv. 46 and the note there), and the Cambridge Codex (D) has that statement here also. They have no thought about Jesus but that he is dead; and nothing is to be wanting that pious hands can do, for his long repose. His predictions of his rising again might, had they been as plain as they appear to us now,

have been thought of at this time; but nothing is said of them. It is when the sun has just risen on Sunday morning that the women come to the tomb. Perhaps they did not know whose the tomb was which they had seen receive their Master. They came early to avoid observation and possible interference; yet there was plenty of light.

In Matthew there are only two women, as before; in Luke the number is indefinite. In Matthew there is no buying of unguents, and no thought of burial rites. In Luke as in Mark they come to the grave on Sunday morning; Matthew's statement of time is confused: "late on the Sabbath, as the day (or hour) was dawning for Sunday."

3. The women had seen on Friday evening the efforts which were needed to set the stone against the aperture of the tomb. That stone presents a difficulty; they are determined to get into the tomb to do their pious work, but they cannot get in without assistance. Would Joseph have helped them? Who can say? At least they have made no application to him, his name might not be known to them till afterwards, and in the meantime they are left quite to their own resources.

But here is a surprise. Talking to each other, and with their eyes fixed on the ground, they approach the spot, their minds full of the stone and its bulk and weight. They lift their eyes at the end of their journey, and lo! the stone is turned back, away from the aperture which is now quite free.

In Matthew the women come to see the tomb only; the watch which has

¹ In the Gospel of Peter the body is washed before being laid by Joseph in his own tomb. The women when they come to the sepulchre

say, "although on the day on which he was crucified we could not weep and lament, yet now let us do these things at his sepulchre."

herbs, intending to come and anoint him. And very early on 2 the first day of the week they come to the tomb after¹ sunrise. And they were saying to each other, Who will roll away the 3 stone for us from the door of the tomb? And they looked 4 up and saw that the stone was rolled back; for it was a very large one. And they went into the tomb and saw a young 5 man clothed in a white robe, sitting on the right side, and they were terrified. But he says to them, Do not be afraid. 6 You are looking for Jesus the Nazarene, who was crucified; he is risen, he is not here; look, this is the place where they laid him. But go, tell his disciples and Peter that he is going 7

been set makes the inside of it inaccessible to them. Their cares about the stone are not mentioned, but it is rolled away by an angel who is visible to them as well as to the guards, and he takes his place upon the stone which he has rolled back.

5. Going into the tomb which has thus been left open, they meet with another surprise. A young man is sitting there, dressed in such a garment as young men on earth do not wear, a white robe, the dress of priests and that of dwellers in the heavenly regions (Rev. iii. 4, 5; vii. 13, etc.), and he is on the right side, in the place of honour. At this they are alarmed, as people are in the Bible and elsewhere when they see figures not of flesh and blood, and they allow their alarm to be plainly seen.

In Matthew the visitant is called an angel, and he is outside the tomb, sitting on the stone; the women do not enter the tomb at all. In Luke the women enter the tomb to look for the body, and meet with two angels in the vault.

6. The young man, whom the women see to be a being from another sphere, delivers his message. There is nothing in it that the circumstances and the empty grave might not have suggested already to the hearers of the words Jesus had spoken. The words of the message, however, are in character; Jesus is not described in terms a believer would use, or with any reference to his Messiahship, but in such words as might be used to identify him either to a follower or an unbeliever—"Jesus the

Nazarene, who was crucified." Having thus made sure that they know of whom he is speaking, the speaker points out to them what they could see for themselves, that the grave was untenanted. This is the place where they laid him—he is not here; these latter words, common to all the Synoptists, embody the fact which was made out that morning. How was it to be accounted for? In John, where the tomb is in a garden, Mary of Magdala surmises that some one employed there has carried off the body to deposit it in another place. On the Jewish side it might be said that Jesus' followers had removed the body during the night; this theory was still upheld when the conclusion of Matthew's Gospel was written (Mt. xxviii. 15); the story of the guard is meant to show that this had been impossible. The conclusion to which the women are led by the angel is different; it is that Christ has risen, i.e. that the power of God which did not come to prevent him from dying has come to his aid after his death, has brought up his spirit from the underworld and caused it again to animate his frame laid in this tomb, so that he is once more living on the surface of the earth. Thus the disappearance of the body afforded a suggestion of the resurrection, but without the subsequent appearances that belief could not have attained to any vigour or consistent form. All that is attained to here is the vague impression that Jesus is not dead but alive, as the angels say in Luke xxiv. 23.

7. In this later part of the message also, there is nothing that would not

¹ at.

ὅτι προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε, καθὼς
8 εἶπεν ὑμῖν. καὶ ἔξελθοῦσαι ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, εἶχεν γὰρ
αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἕκστασις· καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν· ἐφοβοῦντο
γάρ.

naturally suggest itself to the women. If Jesus was alive, it was in Galilee that he would be met with. Yet it is not the women who are to see him—Mark knows of Christophanies in Galilee to the disciples and to Peter, but of none to the women either at Jerusalem or in Galilee. The words in which Jesus held out the prospect of a meeting in Galilee (xiv. 28) were spoken to the Twelve, and the angel's message also is for them. In Luke

(xxiv. 6) this reference, like the former one, to visions in Galilee is obliterated. Instead, there is a reference to what Jesus had said ("to you," the women?) when still in Galilee.

8. The women do not fulfil their commission. The startling contact with the spirit-world, and the utter reversal of the ideas and intentions with which they had come, deprive them of the power of action, and we are simply told that they made no communication to

before you into Galilee; there you will see him, as he said to you. And they went out and fled from the tomb, for they were seized with trembling and bewilderment; and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid.

any one. How long this silence lasted is not said, but it seems as if the Christophanies in Galilee were to be treated as abrupt occurrences for which the women had not in any way prepared their brethren. When the appearances had taken place, the women called to mind what they had heard at the empty grave, hence this report; but at the time they had not fulfilled the order given them (ver. 7.)

In Matthew and Luke the women are not so reticent, but set out at once to tell the disciples what they have heard. In Luke it is very noticeable that the communication of the angel (xxiv. 7) contains nothing new, but is only a reminder of what Jesus himself had said of his sufferings and his resurrection. His words, rightly remembered and understood, explain the empty grave and make the future clear.

Conclusion added later, xvi. 9-20.

- 9 Ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωὶ πρώτη σαββάτου ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρίᾳ τῇ
 10 Μαγδαληνῇ, παρ' ἣς ἐκβεβλίκει ἐπτά δαιμόνια. ἐκείνη πορευθεῖσα
 ἀπήγγειλεν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις πενθοῦσιν καὶ κλαίουσιν.

Here ends the text of the Gospel according to Mark. The twelve verses which follow in the Received Text and in the English Bible are pronounced more and more decidedly by criticism to be a later addition to the text, and to have no inherent affinity with what goes before. But, though the original text ends here, all critics are agreed that the writer cannot have meant the words "for they were afraid" to be the last words of his Gospel. Everyone can see that he had more to add. The writer must have meant to record the meeting of the Master with his disciples in Galilee, which has been so plainly predicted (xiv. 28, xvi. 7). The appearance to Peter, which we know from Paul to have been the first of all the appearances, was doubtless meant to have a place in the work (cf. ver. 7), and the account of it in this Gospel would have been the most authentic (cf. Matthew's Christophany in Galilee, xxviii. 16-20). The lately discovered fragment of the so-called Gospel of Peter shows a similar intention, for us similarly frustrated, for it breaks off as Simon and Andrew with Levi are just setting off with their nets to the lakeside where Jesus had so often been with them. And if Mark had information about the appearances in Galilee and must have intended to speak of them, he must also have meant to justify in the close of his work the claim made for Jesus in his title, that he was the Son of God; the Gospel has not yet exhibited him plainly in that light but only in prophetic glimpses and in parables (i. 11, ix. 7, xii. 6, xiv. 62), and has yet to show how he was

proved to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection (Rom. i. 4).

The Gospel, then, is imperfect at its close, and we are left to conjecture, though the indications are pretty clear, what it was still to contain. A further question is whether the case is one of mutilation, a conclusion having been lost which the author wrote, or whether he, having written down to this point, was prevented from finishing his work. Most critics adopt the former view. It is that of Westcott and Hort, who consider that the last leaf of the manuscript was lost. The theory of mutilation has also another form, in which it is held by many German scholars, viz. that the conclusion Mark wrote was suppressed because, for reasons we can only surmise, it did not recommend itself to Christian feeling. If, as we have often noticed, Mark's narratives are judged by the writers coming after him to be too homely (cf. on i. 36, iii. 21, viii. 22-26, etc.) and not to exalt the Saviour enough above the ordinary human lot, it is possible that his account of the Christophany also was not on a scale to recommend it, and that this part of his Gospel was left behind.

But could it be so left behind? Zahn (*Einleitung*, ii. 234) strongly denies that it could. The Gospel, he holds, must have been multiplied at once after it was written, and the conclusion could not have been suppressed so that no vestige of it remained, once that multiplication had begun. As all the copies, therefore, of which there is any evidence were without it, it must be concluded that Mark's own conclusion

[Matthew xxviii. 9, 10, 16-20; Luke xxiv. 13-53.]

Now when he was risen early on the first day of the week 9
he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had
cast seven demons. She went and reported it to those who 10

was never there, and therefore that it was never added by him to his book. By death or by some other interfering cause he was prevented from finishing his work. The argument, perhaps, scarcely proves all that Zahn claims ; books were suppressed by the early Church which were not approved of ; and a part of a book might be suppressed if there were good reasons for it. But those who hold that Mark's Gospel was used not long after it was written, and was the basis of other Gospels, will allow that if there was a suppression it must have taken place very soon after the book was finished and before many copies of it had gone abroad.

Though the conclusion which stands in the Bibles of all lands is judged by criticism not to be a part of the original Gospel of Mark, it must, of course, be given in any treatment of that Gospel. By reading it carefully we apprehend the internal evidence for its rejection from the text. A short statement of the external evidence must go first.

In the great uncials of the fourth century, *s* and *B*, the Gospel of Mark ends with the words "for they were afraid." Several versions also want the last twelve verses, among which may be mentioned the Sinaitic Syriac, copies of the Ethiopic, and the important early Latin *k*, while in many versions which give the conclusion there are marks denoting that the scribes had doubts of its authenticity. That such doubts were entertained in the early Christian centuries we learn from the express statements of several fathers, notably Eusebius and Jerome, who both declare

that it was wanting in most of the Greek copies. It was not embraced in the scheme of divisions of the Gospels known as the Ammonian sections and the Eusebian canons ; and Fathers writing on the necessity of baptism to salvation do not quote the very express declaration of verse 16.

On the other hand, the Gospel has in several uncials a different conclusion from ver. 9-20. *L* *τ* *p* and *Ψ*, to which are to be added the uncial 274 and several MSS. of versions, present us with what is known as the Shorter Conclusion (see below). The uncials give both conclusions, and, as Dr. Swete points out, they give the shorter one first, *L* *τ* *p* giving it after signs indicating the end of the Gospel, and *Ψ* writing it continuously with ver. 8. They do not seem to prefer the longer to the shorter, but give both the attempts known to them to cure the abruptness of the ending at ver. 8. These codices belong to the 7th and 8th centuries, and show the doubts as to the end of Mark to have been still unsettled at that period. (See Swete's *Mark* pp. xcvi-xcix for a very useful conspectus of the manner in which the Gospel is finished in these four MSS.).

While we thus see that the longer conclusion was regarded in the early centuries with much suspicion, and that though it made its way into the great mass of copies, it was known in many quarters to be open to question, it was undoubtedly known to Irenaeus in the end of the second century as a part of the second Gospel, so that "at Rome and at Lyons the Gospel then ended as it does now." In Burgo's *The last*

11 κάκεῖνοι ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ξῆ καὶ ἐθεάθη ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἡπίστησαν. μετὰ
 12 δὲ ταῦτα δυσὶν ἔξ αὐτῶν περιπατοῦσιν ἐφανερώθη ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ
 13 πορευομένοις εἰς ἄγρον· κάκεῖνοι ἀπελθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν τοῖς
 14 λοιποῖς· οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις ἐπίστευσαν. ὕστερον ἀνακειμένοις αὐτοῖς
 τοῖς ἔνδεκα ἐφανερώθη, καὶ ὠνείδισεν τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν καὶ
 σκληροκαρδίαν ὅτι τοῖς θεασαμένοις αὐτὸν ἐγγερμένον οὐκ ἐπίσ-
 15 τευσαν. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἀπαντα-

twelve verses of the Gospel according to St. Mark, 1871, the argument will be found set forth with great learning that a section acknowledged so early and making its way thereafter to general acceptance must be genuine. But the controversy has now entered on a new phase. In an Armenian MS. found by Mr. F. C. Conybeare in 1891, the writer of xvi. 9-20 is named: the fragment is attributed to "the Presbyter Ariston."¹ The discovery has been regarded by the most competent scholars, Zahn, Nestle, Swete, Harnack, as a true one; in the presbyter Ariston they recognize the Aristion mentioned by Papias in Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii. 39, and stated by him to have been a disciple of the Lord and an authentic hearer of John the Elder. The fragment may thus belong to the early part of the second century. The mention of Ariston suggests a connection with Asia Minor; he is spoken of by Papias along with the Presbyter John, writer of the *Apocalypse*. An interesting study by Rohrbach, *Der Schluss des Markus-Evangeliums, der Vier-Evangelien-Kanon, und die kleinasiatischen Presbyter*, 1894 (compare Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 696 *sqq.*), seeks to prove that the original conclusion of Mark, which resembled that of the Gospel of Peter and placed the appearance of the risen Christ in Galilee, displeased the Elders of Asia who followed the tradition of Luke and John with its appearances at Jerusalem (John xxi. 14, the appearance in Galilee is said to be the third); and that it was under the influence of John, great in that region, that the original conclusion was removed and the present one, which agrees with Luke and John, substituted for it. (See Introduction, p. 48 *sqq.*).

The question is discussed in Tischendorf's note on the passage and in West-

cott and Hort, vol. ii. *Notes on Select Readings*, pp. 28-51; and with the addition of later knowledge by Swete, *St. Mark*, Introduction, p. xvi., *Alternative Endings of the Gospel*, who gives a facsimile of the page of the Edschmatzin MS. containing the beginning of the conclusion with the ascription to "Ariston." See also Zahn, *Einf.* ii. 227 *sqq.*

xvi. 9-20. THE LONGER CONCLUSION.

9. The subject of the foregoing verses was a feminine plural; we were hearing of the experiences of the women visiting the grave. Here the subject is a masculine singular, and without any transition we are hearing an enumeration of the different appearances of the Lord after the resurrection. Before, we were being prepared to hear of the resurrection by various graphic narratives in which the feelings the looks and the words of the actors were all reported; we heard of the women at the tomb, we were about to hear of the appearance to Peter: here the resurrection is announced as a fact known to all, and put in a participle in order to let us pass on to the list of the Christophanies. The resurrection, we are told, took place on the morning of the first day of the week (the Hebraistic numeral μία of ver. 2 is here changed into the Greek πρώτη), cf. 1 Cor. xv. 4.

The first appearance, we are told, was to Mary Magdalene. The earlier part of the chapter was about her; but here she is introduced *de novo* with the statement of Luke viii. 2. This agrees with the story of John xx. 1-18. In Matthew also, xxviii. 1-10, the first Christophany is to both the Marys. In Luke xxiv. 1-10, 22 *sq.*, the women see angels, and receive a message at the tomb, but do not see the Lord. This agrees with Paul's account, 1 Cor. xv.

¹ *Expositor*, 1893, October, p. 241 *sqq.*

had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, on 11 hearing that he was alive and had been seen by her, would not believe it. And after this he appeared in another form 12 to two of them on their walk when they were going to the country. And they went and reported it to the rest, and 13 they did not believe them either. Afterwards he appeared to 14 the Eleven themselves as they were at table, and reproached them for their unbelief and hardness of heart because they did not believe those who had seen him risen. And he said 15 to them, Go into the whole world and preach the Gospel to

4 sqq.; and Mark's own conclusion, whether unwritten or lost, probably was of the same tenor.

Ver. 10 might be supposed to be intended to meet the harshness of ver. 8, where the women are prevented by fright from obeying the angel's injunction. But there is no need to suppose this motive here. Where the appearance to Mary, or to the two Marys, stood first the story naturally went on to say that the appearance was reported to the disciples. John xx. 18 expressly says this, and Matth. xxviii. implies it. For the mourning and weeping, see Gospel of Peter (Dr. Swete's text) 3, 14, "We fasted and sat mourning and weeping night and day until the Sabbath."

The unbelief of the disciples was a well-known fact and could scarcely be omitted in any enumeration of the Christophanies. In John xx. the doubt is impersonated in Thomas alone, but in Luke it is general (xxiv. 11) and on the part of some lasts longer (41). See in Mark ix. 10 an echo of the disciples' difficulties at this time.

12. Here we have the story of Luke xxiv. 13-35, with the difference that in Luke the two disciples who met the Lord outside Jerusalem are met, on coming back and reporting their experience, with the answering announcement that the Lord has appeared to Simon, and that the fact of his resurrection is beyond doubt. In Luke, however, doubts still linger, ver. 38, 41. On the "other form" we compare, of course, the narrative of the Transfiguration, ix. 2.

14. Jerome, *con. Pelag.* ii. 15, tells us that in some copies, and more especially Greek ones, the following statement stood at the end of Mark's Gospel:

"Afterwards . . . seen him risen (as above). And they made the excuse, 'This is an age of iniquity and unbelief under Satan, and by means of unclean spirits does not allow the true power of God to be known. Therefore do thou now reveal thy righteousness.'" Zahn considers that this curious passage in which the disciples excuse their unbelief and suggest a remedy for it, gives the true situation for the understanding of the verses now following, and is inclined to regard it as connected with Papias, and as, in fact, one of the Diegeses or narratives which he compiled (*Hind.* ii. 229 sq.).

Zahn is also of opinion that ver. 14-18 are of a different character from the beginning and the end of the conclusion, less of a summing up and more of a real narrative. But the piece cannot be regarded as original. The materials for it are given in Luke xxiv. (see ver. 38, 41, 46) though the tradition is here treated differently, and with more of the light of later experience upon it. In John these reproofs are for Thomas only, and John xxi. has various admonitions for Peter.

15. This universal destination of the Gospel carries us a good way down in the Apostolic Age; in vii. 27 we read that the children were to be fed first; and in Paul we find the formula, "to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile" (Rom. ii. 10). In xiii. 10 the Gospel was to be preached to all the nations before the end came; and in Matth. xxviii. 19 and Luke xxiv. 47, the preaching is to be to all the nations (in Luke "beginning at Jerusalem"). Here all limitations are left behind; the Gospel is cosmical in its scope, as in John iii. 17. And if we touch Johannine thought in ver. 15 it

16 κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει. ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ
 17 βαπτισθεὶς σωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας κατακριθήσεται. σημεῖα
 δὲ τοῖς πιστεύσασιν ταῦτα παρακολουθήσει ἐν τῷ ὄνόματί μου
 18 δαιμόνια ἐκβαλοῦσιν, γλώσσας λαλήσουσιν καιναῖς,¹ ὅφεις ἀροῦσιν,
 κανὸν θανάσιμόν τι πίωσιν οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς βλάψῃ ἐπὶ ἀρρώστους
 19 χείρας ἐπιθήσουσιν καὶ καλῶς ἔξουσιν. ὁ μὲν οὖν κύριος² μετὰ
 τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς ἀνελήμφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐκ
 20 δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ. ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἔξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ, τοῦ
 κυρίου συνεργοῦντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιοῦντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολου-
 θούντων σημείων.

is still more distinctly present in ver. 16. The broad assertion that baptism is necessary for salvation reminds one of John iii. 5, and the condemnation of unbelievers is stated just as in John iii. 18.

17. This is the experience of the early Church (see Irenaeus ii. 32), which fully believed itself to possess these powers. Compare the charges to the disciples in Matth. x., Luke ix. and x. In Mark's charge (iii. 15, vi. 7) much less is claimed; and the deficiency is here made good. On Tongues, see Acts ii., x. 46, I Cor. xiv.; Exorcism, Acts xvi. 17, 18, xix. 13; Serpents, Acts

xxviii. 3-5; Healing the Sick, James v. 14. As for immunity from poison, see Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii. 39, 9 where Justus surnamed Barsabas is said to have drunk poison but through the grace of the Lord to have suffered no bad effects from it.

19. These verses sum up the history of the Lord and of his people down to the writer's time. "The Lord" is the title by which he is here spoken of; it indicates a divine and heavenly Being (1 Cor. viii. 6, John xx. 28). The title is not used of Jesus in this absolute way in the genuine Mark, though sometimes in Luke. What is said of the Lord is

¹ Omit καιναῖς.

² Add Ἰησοῦς.

the whole creation. He who believes and is baptized shall be 16 saved, but he who refuses to believe shall be condemned. And 17 these signs shall accompany those who believe: in my name they will cast out demons, they will speak with new¹ tongues, they will take up serpents, and if they drink anything deadly 18 it will do them no harm; they will lay their hands on the sick and they will recover. So then the Lord² after he had 19 spoken to them was taken up into heaven and sat on the right hand of God. But they went out and preached every- 20 where, the Lord working with them and confirming the word by the signs which followed it.

not a part of the biography of the human Jesus but an utterance of Christian faith, expressed in the language of the early creeds, with regard to the departed Saviour. There is no attempt as in Luke and Acts to narrate what the disciples saw of the Ascension nor to set forth the sweet assurances as to his departure which are found in John. As to the sitting on the right hand of God see on xii. 35-37.

The account of the disciples' proceedings is also very summary. It is

also notable for its modesty. No claim is made that they have preached to 'all the nations' or to 'all creation,' or that they have made multitudes of converts. They have preached everywhere, and their Lord has been with them in their labours. The successes they have had are traced directly to his hand. The early Church confidently believed itself to possess powers of healing and of exorcism, and the writer claims that these wonderful things had actually taken place in connection with the preaching of the Gospel.

¹ Omit, new.

² Add, Jesus.

The Shorter Conclusion.

Πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον συντόμως ἐξιγγειλαν. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐφάνη αὐτοῖς, καὶ¹ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἄχρι δύσεως ἐξαπέστειλεν δι' αὐτῶν τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτον κήρυγμα τῆς αἰώνιου σωτηρίας.

The shorter conclusion may also be given here. Dr. Swete prints it (page c.) with a critical apparatus.

It is a second attempt to mend the mutilated ending at ver. 8; the author of this one was not of course acquainted with 9-20. This writer is much briefer than the other; his language is more ecclesiastical and it looks as if he felt the attempt more venturesome than

'Ariston' did. He first puts the women right by saying that in spite of ver. 8 they did fulfil the injunction of the angel (ver. 7), in accordance with the narratives of Matthew and John. In view of ver. 8 he can scarcely say that they gave a full account; he contents himself with saying that "they reported briefly" what was enjoined. 'Those about Peter' instead of 'the

¹ Several of the authorities omit ἐφάνη αὐτοῖς καὶ. So Tisch.

But all that was enjoined them they reported briefly to those who were about Peter. And after this Jesus himself appeared to them and¹ from the East and as far as to the West sent forth through them the holy and incorruptible proclamation of eternal salvation.

'Eleven' may point to the special mention of Peter in ver. 7.

Here we have no enumeration of the appearances but only the fact that Jesus appeared to the disciples in general, and through them sent out the Gospel so that it filled the world.
'Holy and incorruptible proclamation'

is not quite a primitive expression. The first conclusion speaks simply of 'the word'; the writer adds epithets as the copyists came to do to the titles of the Gospels. Yet his attempt must belong to an early time, before the longer ending had taken possession of the MSS.

¹ Omit, appeared to them and.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

- Abbott, 3.
 Abiathar and Ahimelech, 89 n. 2.
 'Abomination of Desolation,' 236 *sq.*
 Ἀγαθός, 191.
 Ἀγαπητός, 61 *sq.*, 175, 216.
 Ἀγρος, 277.
 Alexander, 28, 277.
 Allegorical interpretation of Scripture, 114.
 Alphaeus, 83 n., 283.
 Ἀμαρτωλός, 84, 260.
 Ἀμφόδος, 205 n., 206 n.
 Ἀναβλέπειν, 204.
 Antipas, 138.
 Apocalypse, 232.
 Apostle, 96, 134 *sq.*, 141.
 Ἀφέντες, 119 n. 1.
 Aramaic words and idioms, 33, 36,
 66 n. 1, 82, 86, 89 n. 1, 97, 107 n. 2,
 119 n. 1, 2, 122, 123 n. 1, 2, 159,
 199 n. 1, 203 n., 217 n., 246, 258,
 259, 274 n., 280.
 Aretas, 138.
 Arimathaea, 284.
 Ariston and Aristion, 48, 292, 296.
 Arrangement of material, Mark's, 29,
 77 *sq.*, 113, 118, 149, 160, 171, 213,
 219, 232.
 Αρτος, 144, 252.
 Αρχεσθαι, 105 n.
 Ascetic side of Jesus' teaching, 186.
 'Babylon,' 43.
 Baedeker's Palestine, 121.
 Bakhuizen, 216 n.
 Baldensperger, 60.
 Baljon, 217 n.
 Barabbas, 273 *sq.*
 Barnabas, Epistle of, 228.
 Barsabas, 294.
 Bartimaeus, 202.
 Baur, 191.
 Beelzebul, 100.
 Bethphage, 204 *sq.*
 Bethsaida—Julias, 146 n. 2, 165.
 Bingham, 71.
 Blasphemy, 102, 268.
 Boanerges, 97.
 Blass, 53, 67 n., 206 n., 272.
 'Borrowing-Theory' of the Synoptic
 Gospels, 3 n. 3.
 Brandt, 86 n. 1, 96 n., 184 n., 211 n. 1,
 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 268 n., 273 n. 2,
 277.
 Braun, 71.
 Brothers of Jesus (see Kinsmen).
 Bruce, A. B., 245.
 Brückner, 62 n., 83.
 Burgon, 291.
 Burial rites, 130, 222 n. 1, 246, 283 *sq.*,
 285.
 Burton, 87.
 Caesarea Philippi, 167.
 Caldwell, R. C., 70.
 Caligula, 237.
 Campbell, 63, 195 n.
 Charles, 61, 83, 187.
 Christophanies, 286, 289, 290, 292.
 Christophanies and the Transfiguration,
 175.
 Clement of Alexandria, 45.
 Cloud as the symbol of the Divine
 Presence, 175, 267.
 Collections of Gospel-Materials, Early,
 21, 77 *sq.*, 104, 112, 118, 161, 218,
 232, 241, 261, 283.
 Conclusion of Mark's Gospel, 48 *sq.*,
 290.
 Conclusion, Shorter, 296.
 Conybeare, 48, 292.
 Cross, Jesus' anticipation of the, 170,
 172, 182, 198, 246, 251, 252, 257 *sqq.*,
 281.
 Crucifixion, 277.
 Crucifixion, Day of the, 248, 264, 277,
 283, 284.
 Cures (see Healing).
 Cyrenius, 220.
 Χαλκός, 135, 230.

- Dalman, 33 n., 57 n., 61, 64, 83, 89 n., 98 n. 1, 105 n., 114 n., 119 n., 123 n., 169, 184 n., 191, 203, 205 n.
 Dalmanutha, 162.
 Daniel, 83, 170.
 Date of Mark's Gospel, 39.
 David and Christ, 90, 203, 207, 219, 227 sq.
 Day, Division of the, 243, 256, 279.
 Decapolis, 126, 158.
 Death of Jesus, Use of the, 201, 252, 253.
 Deissmann, 57 n., 76 n. 1, 93 n., 205 n. 2.
 Demons and Demonology, 67, 68 sqq., 95, 99 sqq., 121. sqq., 177 sqq.
 Denarius, 143.
 Destination of Mark's Gospel, 36.
 Didache, 87, 207, 228 n., 252.
 Διδάσκαλος, 119 n. 2.
 Diegesen-Theory of the Synoptic Gospels, 3 n. 2.
 Δίκαιος, 85 sq.
 Diminutives, Mark's use of, 95, 127.
 Divi filius; divus, 57 n., 237.
 Doctrinal tendency in Mark's Gospel, 38.
 Edersheim, 66, 150, 209.
 Egyptians, Gospel of, 283.
 Et in solemn negation, 163 n. 2.
 Eisenmenger, 70 n.
 Ἐλέγειν, 112.
 Elijah, 59, 138, 174, 281.
 Ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, 67.
 Enoch, Book of, 61, 83, 170, 221 n., 222, 239.
 Ἐπιτημᾶν, 66, 68, 118, 119.
 Ἐφφαδί, 159.
 Esoteric teaching, 113.
 Εὐαγγῆλιον, 56, 247, 293.
 Εὐθύς, 61.
 Εὐκαρπώς, 247 n.
 Εὐλογεῖν and Εὐχαριστεῖν, 144, 252.
 Eusebius, 45, 237, 291, 292, 294.
 Exorcism, 30, 68, 74, 99, 135, 184 n., 294.
 Ἐξορύξαντες, 79.
 Faith, 64, 119 sq., 129, 134, 211, 224.
 Fasting, 86 sq., 181.
 'Father in Heaven,' 212.
 Flesh and Spirit, 259.
 Forgiveness of sins, 79 sq., 254.
 Fries, 131 n., 172.
 Fulda, 277.
 Future life, 172, 221 sqq.
 Gadara (Gerasa; Gergesa), 120 sq.
 Gehenna, 187.
 Gennesaret, 148.
 Gentiles, 13, 85, 104, 150, 152, 155 sqq., 226, 282.
 Georgios Hamartolos, 199 n. 2.
 Gethsemane, 256.
 Gifts of healing, etc., in the early Church, 77, 135, 137, 184, 294.
 Golden Rule, 226.
 Golgotha, 278, 285 n.
 Gospel originally spoken, 1 sq., 56, 247.
 Gospel written, 14, 21.
 Haggadah, 90.
 Halachah, 90, 151 sq.
 Hallel, 254.
 Harnack, 45, 46 n., 56, 253 n., 292.
 Hebrew idiom, 163 n. 2, 270, 280, 292.
 Hebrews, Gospel of the, 282.
 Healing, Jesus' method in, 68, 71, 76, 81, 92, 128, 130, 149, 158 sq., 165, 179.
 Herod, 137 sq.
 Herodians, 93, 164, 219.
 Herodias, 138.
 Herondas, 76 n. 2.
 High-priest, 210, 264.
 Hilgenfeld, 208.
 Hillel, 224, 226.
 Historicity of Gospel narratives, 18.
 Holtzman, 61, 64 n., 131, 162, 267.
 Hort, 43 n. 1, 141.
 Hosanna, 207.
 'Hour,' 242, 258, 260.
 Infancy and early life of Jesus, 58, 62, 132 sq.
 Irenaeus, 45, 252, 291, 294.
 Iscariot, 98.
 Jairus, 126.
 Jerome, 291, 293.
 Jerusalem, Siege of, 237.
 John the Baptist, 58 sqq., 137 sqq., 177.
 John the Evangelist, 198 sq.
 John the Presbyter, 46, 292.
 John, Gospel according to, 48 sq., 144 sq., 210, 245, 248, 250, 264, 279, 292, 293.
 Joseph of Arimathaea, 284.
 Josephus, 137, 138, 148, 209, 220, 230, 231, 234, 273 n. 1.
 Judas the Gaulonite, 220.
 Jülicher, 87, 88, 100, 102, 105, 106, 110.
 Justin, 1.
 Justus Barsabas, 294.
 Καθαριζεῖν, 75 sq., 155 n. 3.
 Καὶ ἐγένετο, 89 n. 1.
 Καραβός, 98.
 Kautzsch, 76.
 Keim, 168 n.
 Κεφαλῆς, 217 n.
 Kephas, 97.

- Khersa, 121.
 Kingdom of God, 64, 115 *sqq.*, 162,
 168 *sqq.*, 194, 218, 239, 253, 254.
 Kinsmen of Jesus, 98, 103.
 Koetsveld, 117 n.
Koύνος, 149 *sqq.*
Kύριος, 58, 119 n. 2, 227, 294.
Κυάνη, 157.
Κωμόπολις, 74 n.
 Late appearance of the Gospels, Cause
 of, 5.
 Latham, 135 n.
 Latinisms in Mark's Gospel, 37.
 Law of Moses, 89, 152, 189, 193, 222,
 224, 265, 268, 284.
 Leaven, Symbolic use of, 164.
 Lietzmann, 82 *sqq.*
 Lightfoot, J., 159, 166.
 Lightfoot, J. B., 45 n. 1, 46 n., 157.
 Link, 46 n.
 Linwood, 216 n.
 Legion, 122.
 Levi, 83.
 Liturgical use of the Gospel narrative,
 35.
 Logia Jesu, 112 n.
 Lord's Supper, 144, 160, 202, 252 *sqq.*
Διττός, 201.
 Machaerus, 139.
 Mackintosh, 163.
 Mark, Personal information regarding,
 40 *sqq.*, 264.
 Mark, his literary style, 33 *sqq.*, 58, 61,
 95, 121, 127, 139, 194, 277.
 Mark, his purpose in writing the Gospel,
 36.
 Marriage customs, 86.
 Marriage and divorce, 188 *sq.*
 Marriage, levirate, 222.
 Mary Magdalene, 283, 292.
 Mary the mother of James, 283.
 Mary the mother of Jesus, 133.
 Matheson, 7 n. 1.
 Matthes, 69 n., 222 n. 1.
 Matthew, 83.
 Messiah, 57, 137, 167 *sqq.*, 176, 219 *sqq.*,
 233, 239, 251, 266, 272.
 Messiah and David, 90, 203, 207, 219,
 227 *sq.*
 Messianic claims of Jesus, 31, 62, 82,
 90, 170, 202 *sq.*, 214, 267.
 Messianic consciousness of Jesus, 61,
 166 *sqq.*, 182, 200, 219, 228, 253, 258,
 281.
 Meyer, 98, 199 n.
 Ministry, Early Judaean, 63.
 Ministry, Crisis of the, 166.
 Mommsen, 93 n.
 Morfill, 61.
 Moses, 174 (see Law of).
- Motives of the formation of Gospel
 tradition, 4, 14 *sqq.*, 78, 218 *sqq.*, 226.
 Mourning for the dead (see Burial
 rites).
 Muratorian Canon, 44.
 Nard, 245.
 Nestle, 53, 56, 71 n., 74 n., 98 n. 2,
 102 n. 2, 123 n. 1. 2, 139 n. 2, 159,
 203 n., 292.
 Nevius, 70, 71, 95.
"Οδον ποεῖν, 89 n. 1.
Οἱ λοιποὶ, 98 n. 2.
 Old Testament, Jesus' use of, 90, 151,
 177, 189, 192, 208, 215, 223, 225, 227,
 280 *sq.*
 Old Testament, Mark's use of, 58, 151,
 255, 278.
 Oral-Tradition-Theory of the Synoptic
 Gospels, 3.
 Order of Mark's Gospel (see Arrange-
 ment).
 Origen, 45.
"Ορφα, 184 n., 233, 294.
"Οργαθεῖς, 74 n.
"Οὐδὲνες, 234.
"Οὐφθῆ, 174.
 Papias, 45 *sqq.*, 292, 293.
 Parable, 100, 104 *sqq.*, 153, 214, 240,
 242.
 Parable, interpretation of, 110, 154, 216.
 Parable, purpose of, 108 *sqq.*, 118, 215.
 Parousia (see Second Coming).
 Passover ritual, 248 *sq.*, 252.
 Paul, Mark's connection with, 40 *sqq.*
 Paulinism in Mark's Gospel, Traces of,
 38 *sqq.*, 63 *sqq.*, 109, 154, 157, 186,
 202, 218, 252 *sq.*
Περιβλεψάμενος, 92, 194, 207 n. 2.
 Peter, Mark's connection with, 28, 43
 sqq., 77, 256 n., 258, 259, 262, 269.
 Peter, Gospel of, 255, 282, 284, 286 n.,
 290, 293.
 Pfeiffer, 120.
 Pharisee, 84, 86, 149, 162, 164, 188, 219.
 Philip the Tetrarch, 138, 167.
 Philo, 273 n. 1.
Πιστεύειν, 64 n. (see also Faith).
Πλοιάριον, 95.
 Plummer, 88, 253.
 Praetorium, 276.
 Primitive-Gospel-Theory of the Syn-
 optic Gospels, 3 n. 3.
 Primitive-Source-Theory of the Syn-
 optic Gospels, 3 n. 2.
Πυγμῆ, 150.
 Purification, Rites of, 150.
 Purpose of Mark's Gospel, 36.
Ψευδοπροφῆται, *ψευδόχριστοι*, 233, 238.
Ψυχή, 172.

- Rabbi, 119 n. 2, 229, 282.
 Ramsay, 43 n. 2.
 Rescb, 98 n. 1.
 Resurrection, Jesus' anticipation of his, 170, 172, 176, 198, 233, 254, 255, 288.
 Resurrection, Jewish views of Death and, 131 n., 221 *sqq.*
 'Righteous,' The, 85.
 Robinson, A., 63 n.
 Robinson, J. A., 62.
 Rohrbach, 46 n., 48 n. 2, 292.
 Rüegg, 27 n.
 Rufus, 28, 277.
 Rutherford, 148 n.
 Sabbath law, 89, 92, 284.
 Sacrifice, 201, 253.
 Sadducees, 221.
 Salome, the daughter of Herodias, 138, 139.
 Salome, wife of Zebedee, 283, 285.
 Sanday, 10 n., 100.
 Sanday and Headlam, 57.
 Sanhedrin, 91, 170, 198, 213, 261, 264, 271, 284.
 Satan, 62, 100, 163, 259.
 Schmiedel, 3 n. 3, 43 n. 2, 83, 253.
 Schürer, 66, 127, 138 n., 139, 140, 150, 210, 225 n., 265.
 Scribes, 79, 84, 85, 99, 149, 176, 192, 210, 213, 224, 227, 229, 261, 265, 280.
 Second Coming, Prediction of the, 173, 231 *sqq.*, 239 *sqq.*, 241, 254 *sqq.*, 267.
 'Servant of Jehovah,' 61, 200 n., 251, 266.
 Sh'ma, 225.
 'Signs,' 162, 233 *sqq.*, 236 *sqq.*, 240, 280, 282, 294 *sqq.*
 Simon the Canaanæan, 98.
 Simon of Cyrene, 28, 277.
 Simon the leper, 245.
 Simon Peter, 65, 71, 169, 211, 256, 259, 269, 288, 296.
 Sinaitic Syriac MS., 159 n., 162, 291.
 'Sinners,' 84, 260.
 Somerville, 8 n. 3.
 Son of David, 203, 207, 219, 227, 267.
 Son of God, 38, 57, 61, 122, 168, 216, 242, 267, 282, 290.
 Son of Man, 31, 80, 82, 90, 102 n., 169, 170, 218 n., 239, 251, 260.
 Sources of Mark's Gospel, 27, 77 *sqq.*, 232 (see also Collections).
 'Speculator,' 140.
 Spitta, 247 n.
 Stanton, 267.
 Style of Mark's writing (see under Mark).
- Συμβούλιον, 93 n., 270.
 Synagogue rulers, 126.
 Synagogue Services, 66, 225.
 Swete, 89 n. 2, 93 n., 96, 155 n. 3, 162, 173, 177 n., 291, 292, 296.
 Tacitus, 234.
 Talmud, 225, 278.
 Tatian, 1.
 Τελώνης, 83.
 Τηλαυγῶς, 166.
 Temple destruction foretold, 231, 265, 279.
 Temple market, 209.
 Temple offerings, 230.
 Temple structure, 230.
 Temple, The Christian, 218, 266.
 Temple veil, 282.
 Theories of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels, 3, 34 n. 2.
 Thomson, 121.
 Tongues, Gift of, 294.
 Tradition, Jewish, 150.
 Tradition, Jesus' attitude to, 89, 151, 189.
 Tradition (Evangelical), prior to Mark's Gospel, 20 *sqq.*, 77, 131 (see also Collections).
 Tribute, 220.
 Tylor, 70, 71.
 Τίδες τοῦ δρθρόπτου, in Aramaic, 82 *sqq.*
 'Ur-Marcus' Theory of the Synoptic Gospels, 34 n. 2.
 Volkmar, 125.
 Von Soden, 10 n. 2, 57.
 Weber, 150, 192 n., 201.
 Weiss, 63, 105, 134, 162, 205, 237 n.
 Wellhausen, 33, 66 n. 1, 82, 89 n. 1, 107 n. 2, 207 n. 1.
 Wendt, 31 n., 218 n.
 Wernle, 15 n.
 Westcott, 5 *sqq.*
 'Western' Readings, 71 n., 74, 83 n., 85 n. 2, 98 n. 2, 102 n. 2, 108, 128 n. 1, 138 n. 1, 162, 166 n., 196, 198, 210, 230, 238, 244, 250, 260, 270, 280, 286.
 Winer, 87, 155 n. 2, 211 n. 2, 222 n. 2.
 Women, The Holy, 283, 285 *sqq.*, 292 *sqq.*, 296.
 Wright, 3 n. 1, 12, 135.
 Wünsche, 90.
 Zahn, 45 n. 1, 6, 46 n., 56, 57, 83 n., 97, 290, 292, 293.
 Zebedee, Sons of, 65, 97, 199.
 Ζηλωτής, 98.

II. INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES REFERRED TO.

GENESIS.		Page	JUDGES.		Page	PSALMS—cont.		Page
x. 16,	.		xiv. 17,	.		civ. 3,	.	
EXODUS.								
iii. 1 <i>sqq.</i> ,	.	223	i. 1,	.	86	ovii. 2, 3,	.	240
xii. 3,	.	248	xv. 22,	.	226	cix. 25,	.	279
xii. 22,	.	254	xxi. 1-6,	.	89 n. 2	cx.,	.	227
xvi. 23,	.	89	1 SAMUEL.		218	cxviii. 22, 23,	.	218
xx. 8-11,	.	89	viii. 10,	.		cxviii. 25,	.	207
xxiv. 8,	.	253	xix. 2, 10,	.	207	exxiv. 4, 5,	.	199
,, 18,	.	62	xix. 8,	.		PROVERBS.		
xxxii. 19,	.	178	xiii. 4-6,	.		xxxi. 6,	.	278
xxxiv. 28,	.	62	1 KINGS.		218	ISAIAH.		
xxxv. 2,	.	89	viii. 10,	.		v. 1-7,	.	215
LEVITICUS.			xix. 2,	.	218	vi. 4,	.	175
ii. 13,	.	187	xix. 14,	.		vi. 11,	.	231
xi. 22,	.	59	15,	.	218	viii. 14,	.	218
xii.-xv.,	.	153	16,	.		16,	.	65
xiv. 2 <i>sqq.</i> ,	.	75	xxi. 10,	.	239	xiii. 10,	.	239
xviii. 16,	.	138, 222	xix. 2,	.		xix. 2,	.	233
xix. 18,	.	226	xxiv. 21,	.	239	xxiv. 21, 23,	.	239
xx. 21,	.	138, 222	xxix. 6,	.		xxix. 6,	.	234
xxiv. 10-23,	.	268	xv. 10,	.	234	10,	.	109
NUMBERS.			13,	.		13,	.	151
xii. 14,	.	268	18,	.		18,	.	160
xv. 37-41,	.	225 n.	ESTHER.		239	xxiv. 4,	.	241
xxxv. 30,	.	265	v. 3, 5,	.		xxxv. 5,	.	160
DEUTERONOMY.			140		239	xl. 3,	.	58
vi. 4-9,	.	225 n.	PSALMS.			8,	.	241
xi. 13-21,	.	225 n.	ii. 7,	.	268, 269	xlii. 1,	.	61
xiii. 1 <i>sqq.</i> ,	.	238	xxii. 7,	.	187	xlii. 25,	.	80 n.
xvii. 6,	.	265	18,	.	241	1,	.	199
xix. 15,	.	265	xxii. 7,	.	199	11,	.	199
xxi. 23,	.	284	18,	.	266, 272	6,	.	266
xxii. 25,	.	89	xlix. 6-9,	.	272	17,	.	272
xxiv. 1,	.	189	1,	.	251	10-12,	.	251
xxiv. 14,	.	193	5,	.	279 n.	12,	.	279 n.
xxv. 5,	.	138, 222	lxix. 21,	.	278	7,	.	80 n.
xxix. 4,	.	109	2, 3, 15,	.	210	7,	.	210
			lxix. 8 <i>sqq.</i> ,	.	234	9-12,	.	234
			215	.	187	24,	.	187
			cii. 25 <i>sqq.</i> ,	.				

JEREMIAH.	Page	MALACHI.	Page	MATTHEW—cont.	Page
iv. 23,	239	iii. 1,	58, 235	xii. 28,	103
vii. 11,	210	iv. 5,	138	” 30,	184
xiii. 16,	280	” 5, 6,	235	” 32,	83
xv. 2,	234			” 38-42,	163
xxvi. 3-7,	231			” 43-45,	123
” 11,	268			” 45,	69
xxxi. 31 <i>sqq.</i> , 80 n., 253				xiii. 16, 17,	110
n. 2, 254		ii. 4,	227	” 34, 35,	118
xlix. 12,	199	iii. 2,	64	” 36-43,	110, 112
		iv. 8-11,	173	xiv. 1,	138
EZEKIEL.		” 12,	141	” 13,	141
		” 24 <i>sqq.</i> ,	94	” 14,	188
v. 17,	234	v. 1 <i>sqq.</i> ,	86	” 33,	176
vii. 16,	237	” 13,	187	xv. 13,	118
xiv. 13,	234	” 14-16,	114	” 30,	160
xvii. 23,	117	” 17 <i>sqq.</i> ,	151	xvi. 13,	83
xxxi. 6,	117	” 19,	224, 225	” 14,	138 n.
xxxii. 7, 8,	239	” 21-48,	150, 155	” 17,	97
		” 23, 24,	210	” 27,	223
DANIEL.		” 24,	218	xvii. 10-13,	138, 235
		” 43-48,	226	” 12,	141
ii. 34, 35, 44,	218	” 48,	192	” 20,	211
vii. 13, 82, 83, 170, 200		” 14,	213	” 21,	181
xii. 1,	238	” 16,	86	xviii. 1-4,	191
” 11,	236	” 17,	87	” 35,	213
		” 19, 20,	194	xix. 21,	112
HOSEA.		” 22,	114	” 28, 96, 195, 198, 217	
vi. 2,	170	” 24,	112, 225	” 28, 29,	223, 254
xiii. 13,	234	” 25,	172	xx. 2,	143
		” 33,	114, 225	” 16,	196
JOEL.		vii. 6,	157	” 25,	254
		” 7, 8,	212	xxii. 40,	226
ii. 2,	238	” 12,	226	” 46,	227
” 10,	280	” 22, 23,	184 n., 233	xxiii. 7-12,	229
” 31,	239, 280	viii. 6,	78	” 23,	224
AMOS.		” 11,	254	” 33-37,	216
		” 20,	83	xxiv. 41,	186 n.
		ix. 1,	126	xxv. 29,	114
vi. 7 <i>sqq.</i> ,	231	” 9-13,	83 n.	” 32, 33,	185
viii. 9,	280	” 27-31,	165, 204	xxvi. 64,	272
		” 32-34,	99	xxvii. 9,	248
MICAH.		x. 6,	96, 157	” 16,	274
		” 7,	64	” 56,	283
iv. 9, 10,	234	” 8,	77, 97	xxviii. 1-10,	292
vi. 6,	226	” 17-22,	234	” 15,	287
vii. 6,	235	” 23,	83, 134, 235	” 16-20,	255, 290
		” 25,	100 n.	” 19,	293
ZEPHANIAH.		” 26,	114		
		” 34-37,	104, 171, 235		
i. 15,	239	” 39,	172	LUKE.	
HAGGAI.		xi. 2-6,	160		
ii. 6,	239	” 5,	77	i. 1,	25
		” 10,	58	” 17,	235
ZECHARIAH.		” 7-14,	59, 214	ii. 2,	220
		” 14,	138	” 22,	76
ix. 9,	205	” 19,	83, 85	” 37,	87
xiii. 7,	255	” 21,	165	” 41 <i>sqq.</i> ,	190
xiv. 7,	242	” 25,	190	iii. 1,	139
		” 27,	242	iv. 4,	145
		xii. 27,	68, 102	” 18, 21,	102

LUKE—cont.	Page	LUKE—cont.	Page	JOHN—cont.	Page
i. 21-27,	104	xix. 26,	114	xix. 36,	252
“ 24-27,	132	“ 47,	210	xx. 1-18,	292
v. 33,	151 n.	xx. 36,	223	“ 11-18,	50
vi. 12-16,	94, 96, 98	“ 39, 40,	224, 226	“ 18,	293
“ 17,	94	xxi. 12,	235	“ 24, 25,	293
“ 19,	95	“ 20,	232	“ 28,	294
“ 32, 33,	84	“ 37, 38,	244, 249	xxi. 1 <i>sqq.</i> ,	255
“ 46,	13	xxii. 17, 18,	253	“ 14,	292
vii. 27,	58	“ 21,	251		
“ 36-50,	244, 245	“ 24-27,	200	ACTS.	
“ 37,	283	“ 27,	183, 201		
viii. 1-3,	283, 292	“ 29,	195	i. 4-8,	255
“ 9,	110	“ 31,	259	“ 13,	98
“ 40,	126	“ 37,	279 n.	“ 22,	58
ix. 2,	97, 135	xxiii. 7,	271	“ 24,	96
“ 7,	137, 138	xxiv. 1-10,	288, 292	ii. 4 <i>sqq.</i> ,	294
“ 10,	148	“ 7,	289	“ 19-21,	239
“ 18,	83, 168	“ 11,	176, 293	“ 23,	170, 260
“ 61, 62,	193	“ 13-35,	293	“ 23-36,	8, 169
x. 17,	135	“ 22,	292	“ 34,	228
“ 18,	101	“ 23,	287	“ 36,	58
“ 23, 24,	110	“ 30,	144	“ 38,	59, 60
“ 25 <i>sqq.</i> ,	224	“ 34,	174	iii. 1,	135
“ 29-37,	226	“ 38, 41,	293	“ 13-17,	275
“ 38,	245	“ 37-43,	176	“ 14,	273
xi. 5, 6,	144	“ 44,	176	iv. 1,	210
“ 19, 20,	102, 103	“ 46,	293	“ 5, 6,	234
“ 29-32,	110, 163	“ 47,	293	“ 8,	235
“ 33, 34,	113, 114	“ 49,	255	“ 10,	8
“ 38,	150			“ 11,	218
xii. 2,	114			“ 36,	41
“ 20,	172			v. 15,	95
“ 32,	198			“ 21,	234
“ 33,	195	i. 6, 15,	58	“ 30, 31,	8, 228
“ 54-57,	241	“ 17,	175	vi. 14,	231
xiii. 4, 5,	218	ii. 11,	49	vii. 48,	265
“ 6-9,	208, 240	“ 19,	231, 265	“ 51-53,	216
“ 10-17,	91 n.	iii. 5,	294	“ 55,	228
“ 23 <i>sqq.</i> ,	194	“ 17,	293	viii. 14,	135
“ 33, 34,	216	“ 18,	294	“ 32,	251, 266, 272
xiv. 1-6,	91 n.	“ 30,	118	ix. 2,	234
“ 5,	92	iv. 21,	266	x. 15,	76
“ 7-14,	229	“ 43, 44,	63	x. 16,	156
“ 15,	254	vi. 5-13,	144, 145	“ 28,	87
“ 25-27,	171	“ 15,	146 n.	“ 30,	87
“ 25-35,	193	“ 17,	146	“ 36-38,	21, 58
“ 34, 35,	187	vii. 27,	227	“ 37 <i>sqq.</i> ,	8, 56
xv. 1,	85	“ 39,	60	“ 43,	59
“ 2,	84	“ 42,	203, 227	“ 46,	294
“ 4,	62	ix. 1,	166	xi. 9,	76
“ 7,	86	x. 33, 36,	268	“ 28,	234
xvii. 6,	211	xi. 21-23,	131	xii. 1, 2,	199
“ 11-19,	75, 76	“ 47-52,	264	“ 12,	40, 264
“ 20,	163	“ 54,	188, 197	xiii. 2,	135
“ 24,	238	xii. 1-8,	244, 248	“ 3,	87, 96
“ 33,	171, 172	“ 40,	109	“ 5,	41
xviii. 10,	84	xiii. 1, 2,	249	“ 7,	234
“ 12,	86	xviii. 3, 12,	261	“ 23,	58
“ 14,	86	“ 40,	273	“ 23-32,	56
xix. 7,	84, 85	xix. 25,	283	“ 31,	174

ACTS— <i>cont.</i>	Page	1 CORINTHIANS— <i>cont.</i>	Page	GALATIANS— <i>cont.</i>	Page
xiii. 38,	59	ii. 8,	275	iv. 6,	38, 258
xiv. 23,	87	„ 14, 15,	114	„ 9-11,	88, 93
xv. 1-31,	93, 150	iii. 16,	266	v. 3,	225
„ 36-39,	42	vi. 19,	266	„ 19-21,	154
xvi. 17, 18,	184 n., 294	vii. 5,	87		
xvii. 24,	265	„ 10, 11,	12		
xviii. 12,	234	„ 15,	190	EPHESIANS.	
„ 24 <i>sqq.</i> ,	59	viii. 5,	158	ii. 14-18,	282
xix. 11, 12,	95, 149	„ 6,	294	„ 20-22,	218, 266
„ 13,	68, 100, 135	„ 9,	186	iii. 12,	282
	184 n., 294	ix. 18,	38		
„ 18,	59	„ 14,	12, 135	PHILIPPIANS.	
„ 28,	206 n.	x. 18,	250	ii. 7,	9
xx. 30,	233	x. 20,	158	„ 11,	57
xxi. 28,	231	xi. 23 <i>sqq.</i> ,	12, 252, 254	iii. 2,	157
xxii. 8,	223	xii. 9,	135	„ 5-10,	219
xxiv. 22-27,	39, 139	xiv. 2 <i>sqq.</i> ,	294		
xxviii. 3-5,	294	xv. 1, 2,	56		
„ 26-28,	109	„ 1-8,	8, 56	COLOSSIANS.	
		„ 4,	170, 284, 292	ii. 16,	93
ROMANS.		„ 4-8,	174, 286, 292	iv. 10,	41, 42
i. 1,	63	„ 5,	96, 249		
„ 3,	203, 219, 227	„ 12,	176	1 THESSALONIANS.	
„ 3, 4,	38, 57, 290	„ 24, 25,	228	ii. 8, 9,	63
„ 9,	38	„ 35-50,	219, 223	„ 14,	234
„ 16,	157	„ 51,	241	iv. 13-17,	12, 239, 241
„ 29-31,	154	„ 52,	239	v. 1,	242
ii. 10,	157, 293	xvi. 19,	136		
„ 16,	56				
iii. 21,	175	2 CORINTHIANS.			
„ 24,	39, 202	i. 19,	38	2 THESSALONIANS.	
„ 25,	39, 59, 254	iv. 6,	174	ii. 1-12,	232
iv. 17-25,	223	„ 16,	10		
v. 2,	282	„ 21,	202		
„ 7,	191	vi. 2,	64		
vi. 4, 5,	199	„ 16,	266		
viii. 9, 10,	60	viii. 9,	9		
„ 15,	38, 258	x. 8,	25	1 TIMOTHY.	
„ 34,	228	xi. 24,	234	vi. 6 <i>sqq.</i> ,	112
ix. 24,	157	xii. 8,	260		
x. 9,	57	xiii. 3,	25		
xi. 2,	224				
„ 7, 8, 25,	38, 109, 235	GALATIANS.		2 TIMOTHY.	
xiii. 1 <i>sqq.</i> ,	219	i. 4,	7	ii. 12, 13,	173, 199
„ 8-10,	219	„ 6, 9,	1, 56	iv. 11,	42
xiv. 5 <i>sqq.</i> ,	93	„ 16, 17,	62		
„ 13-19,	39, 186	„ 19,	96	PHILEMON.	
xv. 3,	279	ii. 2,	1	ii. 12,	42
„ 19,	38	„ 12,	85		
xvi. 25, 26,	64	„ 15,	84, 260		
		iii. 1,	7		
1 CORINTHIANS.		„ 5,	59, 61	HEBREWS.	
i. 16,	136	„ 12,	193	i. 1, 2,	175
ii. 4,	235	„ 13,	202	ii. 3,	57
„ 6, 7,	114	„ 24,	59	iii. 6,	266
		iv. 4,	38, 57, 64	v. 7, 8,	9

HEBREWS—cont.		Page	1 PETER.	Page	1 JOHN.	Page
vi.	1, 2, .	114	ii. 5,	266	i. 1 <i>sqq.</i> , .	49
ix.	11 <i>sqq.</i> ,	266, 282	,, 7,	218	ii. 18, .	233
,,	22,	80, 254	,, 21,	9		
,,	24,	266	iii. 18,	9		
x.	29,	254	iv. 14-16,	43, 234		
xiii.	12, 13,	277	v. 13,	43		
JAMES.						
ii.	5,	195			i. 7,	233, 282
,,	10,	225			ii. 7, 11, .	106
v.	4,	193			iii. 4, 5, .	287
,,	14, 15,	135, 137, 294	i. 16-18, .	175	vi. 12-14,	239
			iii. 1-18, .	232	vii. 13, .	287
2 PETER.						
					viii. 5, .	234
					xiii. 17, .	221
					,, 18, .	106
					xvi. 18, .	234
REVELATION.						

WORKS ON THE GOSPELS.

**THE COMMON TRADITION OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS,
IN THE TEXT OF THE REVISED VERSION.** By Rev.
E. A. Abbot and W. G. Rushbrooke. Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE LEADING IDEAS OF THE GOSPELS. By W. Alexander,
D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Archbishop of Armagh, and Lord Primate of
All Ireland. New edition, Revised and Enlarged. Cr. 8vo. 6s.

PHILOLOGY OF THE GOSPELS. By Friedrich Blass, Dr.Phil.
Cr. 8vo. 4s. 6d. net.

TWO LECTURES ON THE GOSPELS. By F. Crawford Burkitt,
M.A. Cr. 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

THE SYRO-LATIN TEXT OF THE GOSPELS. By the Rev.
Frederic Henry Chase, D.D. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

**SYNOPTICON : AN EXPOSITION OF THE COMMON MATTER
OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.** By W. G. Rushbrooke.
Printed in Colours. 4to. 35s. net.

**THE AKHMIN FRAGMENT OF THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPEL
OF ST. PETER.** By the Rev. H. B. Swete, D.D., Regius Pro-
fessor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 5s. net.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.
By the Right Rev. Bishop Westcott. Eighth edition. Cr. 8vo.
1os. 6d.

**FOUR LECTURES ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE GOS-
PELS.** By the Rev. J. H. Wilkinson, M.A., Rector of Stock
Gaylard, Dorset. Cr. 8vo. 3s. net.

**A SYNOPSIS OF THE GOSPELS IN GREEK AFTER THE
WESTCOTT AND HORT TEXT.** By Rev. Arthur Wright,
M.A. Demy 4to. 6s. net.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS. By Rev.
Arthur Wright, M.A. Cr. 8vo. 5s.

VERSES ON THE GOSPELS. By C. M. Yonge. Pott 8vo. 1s.
Sewed. 6d.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW. Greek Text
as revised by the Right Rev. Bishop Westcott and Dr. Hort.
With Introduction and Notes by Rev. A. Sloman, M.A. Fcap. 8vo.
2s. 6d.

LONDON : MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. MARK.

SCHOOL READINGS IN THE GREEK TESTAMENT. Being the Outlines of the Life of our Lord as given by St. Mark, with additions from the Text of the other Evangelists. Edited, with Notes and Vocabulary, by Rev. A. Calvert, M.A. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK. The Greek Text. With Introduction and Notes by Rev. H. B. Swete, D.D. 8vo. 15s.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.

THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN. A Course of Lectures on the Gospel of St. Luke. By F. D. Maurice. Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE. The Greek Text, as revised by the Right Rev. Bishop Westcott and Dr. Hort. With Introduction and Notes by Rev. J. Bond, M.A. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO S. LUKE IN GREEK AFTER THE WESTCOTT AND HORT TEXT. Edited by Rev. A. Wright, M.A. Demy 4to. 7s. 6d. net.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

THE CENTRAL TEACHING OF CHRIST. Being a Study and Exposition of St. John, Chapters XIII. to XVII. By Rev. T. D. Bernard, M.A. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. By Rev. F. D. Maurice. Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

THE OLD SYRIAC ELEMENT IN THE TEXT OF THE CODEX BEZAE. By the Rev. F. H. Chase, D.D. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By Rev. F. D. Maurice. Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Being the Greek Text as revised by Bishop Westcott and Dr. Hort. With Explanatory Notes by T. E. Page, M.A. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. The Authorized Version, with Introduction and Notes, by T. E. Page, M.A., and Rev. A. S. Walpole, M.A. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES IN GREEK AND ENGLISH. With Notes by Rev. F. Rendall, M.A. Cr. 8vo. 9s.

THE CHURCH OF THE FIRST DAYS. THE CHURCH OF JERUSALEM. THE CHURCH OF THE GENTILES.

THE CHURCH OF THE WORLD. Lectures on the Acts of the Apostles. By the Very Rev. C. J. Vaughan, D.D. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LONDON : MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.