

St. Mark's Gospel

Two Stages of its Making

By

J. M. C. CRUM

Residentiary Canon of Canterbury

CAMBRIDGE

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD

BS 3585

.C 9

First Published 1936



Dun

PRINTED AND BOUND IN GREAT BRITAIN AT THE WORKS OF
W. HEFFER AND SONS LTD.,
CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

Preface

If the author was asked what has prompted him to add another to the countless books which handle this and kindred matters, he would say that he believes himself to be offering a rather simple solution of problems which have long exercised his own and so many other minds.

He believes that the accepted views of the Synoptic Problem can be carried on one step further. As the recognition of the priority of St. Mark has made it possible to measure the change of thought which has taken place between the writing of St. Mark's Gospel and the copying of it by St. Matthew and St. Luke, so it is possible to distinguish in "St. Mark" itself two "strata," between the formation of which there has taken place a change in the Church's mind and language.

The phenomena to be accounted for are the existence side by side of incompatible elements. Side by side are found there two stories, one of incidents and sayings such as Simon Peter might tell in Rome and Mark record: homely, frank, vivid, giving such memories as would convey an idea of what Jesus of Nazareth had said and been to His first disciples. And the other stratum uses a different vocabulary and tells of a different "Christology," a story told by metaphor and allegory, setting out the mystical implications, the divine meaning, of the bare facts of what the Lord had said and done and suffered and been.

The author of these essays believes that the two strata can be distinguished, and that the places where one work interrupts the other can (within limits) be determined; so that the reader has got before him, a Mark II who tells mystically a Gospel story of the Church of the Rome of the time of Nero, and within and behind that and separable from that, a Mark I, a Gospel story which goes back to the scenes of the house in Capernaum and the boat in Galilee and the streets in Jerusalem of thirty-five years before.

9th April, 1936.

Contents

	PAGE
PREFACE - - - - -	V
ST. MARK'S GOSPEL—TWO STAGES OF ITS MAKING -	I
CHAPTER I	
THE TEXT OF MARK THE FIRST - - - -	4
CHAPTER II	
MATERIALS USED BY MARK II OTHER THAN MARK I	16
CHAPTER III	
MATERIALS OF MARK II - - - - -	43
CHAPTER IV	
INDICATIONS OF RE-WRITING IN THE GOSPEL OF ST. MARK - - - - -	54
CHAPTER V	
METHOD AND OBJECT OF MARK II - - -	65
CHAPTER VI	
LANGUAGE: EARLY CHRISTIAN USE OF WORDS - -	82
CHAPTER VII	
NAMES BY WHICH THE FIRST CHRISTIANS SPOKE OF OUR LORD - - - - -	96
CHAPTER VIII	
THE VOCABULARY OF MARK II - - - -	120
CHAPTER IX	
MOBILITY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN THOUGHT; EXAMPLE OF THIS IN LETTERS OF ST. PAUL - - - -	131

ST. MARK'S GOSPEL

Two Stages of its Making

THESE essays are printed to illustrate a proposed explanation of the structure and contents of the Second Gospel.

For three generations, now, many minds have been employed in search of an explanation. The writer has followed to the best of his ability the suggestions which have been proposed during one of these generations. Like many others he has spent many of the hours of these thirty years looking and looking at the Gospel of St. Mark. In this last year he has found himself urged to new effort by the Bampton Lectures of 1935; incited thereto by much which the lecturer himself taught him or put him in the way of learning from the great German doctors, and provoked and stimulated thereto by a sense that the lecturer had failed to hold positions which ought not to be abandoned. And lately, as he was looking again at this Gospel, the Gospel has seemed to him, rather simply, to "come in two." All those familiar awkward junctures, marks of patching, abrupt changes of tone and manner and subject, juxtapositions of inappropriate neighbours, wide separations of close relations; all these signs, like so many cracks running through some bit of masonry, seemed to gather themselves into one consistent system: one division and separation between two writers. The one Mark became two Marks. There lay these two writings into which the Gospel seemed to divide itself. The one was a simple, straightforward, consistent story of our Lord; such a story as might have been told by a man who had been very near to the original company of those who had been with Jesus of Nazareth. And the other was what is left when this story has been separated out from our Gospel. It is a second writing,

amplifying and interrupting and working over this first writing: using a later Christian language and thinking a later Christology. It belongs to a later Church. It thinks in the language of the Greek of the Septuagint. It makes use of a document closely related to "Q."

I have called these two, Mark the First, and Mark the Second.

Mark the Second will have written about the year of Nero's persecution of the Christians in Rome. His date will be about A.D. 65. And Mark the First, whenever it may have been that he wrote down the first "Gospel," writing it to be read to the first Christians at Rome; Mark the First is speaking with the mind of those who were Christians from the very beginning. He may have been himself the lad who was in the Garden, with that linen garment cast about his naked body: the linen cloth which was left in the hands of the temple-police, the men with their lanterns and swords and clubs who stood and looked, and perhaps gave a rough laugh, as the lad ran away naked across the shadows of the olive tree trunks under the Passover full moon. Peter's friend, the innkeeper's son, may be this Mark I, telling the story as talk with Peter had shaped it in his mind, as he grew up from fifteen to forty-five years old, or, say, from A.D. 30 to 60.

In A.D. 64 Tacitus speaks of an "immense multitude" of Christians in Rome. Let us suppose that two "Gospels" were made for this multitude; by Mark I and Mark II. I believe you can still distinguish the differences between the two, and that the work of Mark II has so much the character of one piece of work of which the several parts bear traces of being the work of one hand, that Mark II can be, as it were, lifted away all in one, leaving behind the older, the less theological story which is Mark I. Every step in the delicate operation of making this separation is, of course, conjecture. The writer offers his conjecture to his fellow-servants in the House of the Truth as one more conjecture, asking them to make open-minded trial of it. The hypothesis is one which will have to stand, and if it is a true one will be able to stand, a multitude of trials and

tests which he himself does not foresee. The hypothesis of the priority of St. Mark among the Synoptic Evangelists has already had to stand, and has been well able very steadily to stand, ten thousand tests. There is no hurry in this kind of argument. What is true will abide until it is recognised to be true. Here let us begin by reading "Mark I," cleared, as I think, of the interruptions and interpretations with which his simpler story was complicated by Mark II.

CHAPTER I

The Text of Mark the First

MARK the First would, I am supposing, begin with some mention of Jesus of Nazareth coming to Galilee and finding the two fishermen.

i. 9. And Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee . . . and . . . 16. he saw Simon, and Andrew the brother of Simon, . . . 21. and they go into Capernaum; and on the sabbath day he entered into the synagogue and taught. And they were astonished at his teaching: for he taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes. 29. And when they were come out of the synagogue, they came into the house of Simon and Andrew. 30. Now Simon's wife's mother lay sick of a fever; and they tell him about her: 31. and he came and took her by the hand and raised her up; and the fever left her, and she ministered unto them.

32. And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were sick. 33. And all the city was gathered together at the door. And he healed many. 35. And in the morning, a great while before day he rose up and went out, and departed into a desert place, and there prayed. 36. And Simon and they that were with him followed after him; 37. and they found him, and say unto him, All are seeking thee. 38. And he saith unto them, Let us go elsewhere into the next towns, that I may preach there also; for to this end came I forth.

[It is possible that somewhere here once stood a Mark I account of the scene which, in Mark II, stands at vi. 1.

vi. 1. And he cometh into his own country; And when the sabbath was come, he began to teach in the synagogue: and many hearing him were astonished, saying, Whence hath this man these things? Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and brother of James, and Joses, and Juda, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended in him. And Jesus said unto them,

A prophet is not without honour, save among his own kin, and in his own house. And he marvelled because of their unbelief.]

ii. 1. And when he came again into Capernaum after some days, it was noised that he was in the house. 2. And many were gathered together, so that there was no longer room, no, not even about the door: 3. And they come, bringing unto him a man sick of the palsy, borne by four. 4. And when they could not come nigh unto him for the crowd, they uncovered the roof, where he was: and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed whereon the sick of the palsy lay. 5. And Jesus seeing their faith saith unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins are forgiven. 6. But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts. 7. Why doth this man thus speak? he blasphemeth: who can forgive sins but one, even God? 8. And straightway Jesus, perceiving in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, saith unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts? 9. Whether is easier, to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed and walk? 11. And he saith unto the sick of the palsy, I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house. 12. And he arose, and straightway took up the bed, and went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all amazed.

ii. 13. iii. 7. And Jesus withdrew to the sea: and a great multitude followed . . . 9. and he spake to his disciples, that a little boat should wait on him because of the crowd.

iv. 1. And he began to teach by the seaside. And there is gathered unto him a very great multitude, so that he entered into the [boat] and all the multitude were by the sea. 2. And he taught them many things in parables, and said unto them in his teaching 3. Hearken; Behold, a sower went out to sow: 4. and it came to pass, as he sowed, a seed fell by the wayside, and the birds came and devoured it. 5. And another fell on the rocky ground, where it had not much earth; and straightway it sprang up, because it had no deepness of earth: 6. and when the sun was risen, it was scorched; and, because it had no root, it withered

away. 7. And another fell among the thorns, and the thorns grew up, and choked it, and it yielded no fruit. 8. And others fell into the good ground, and yielded fruit, growing up and increasing; and brought forth, thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold. 9. And he said, who hath ears to hear, let him hear. 10. And when he was alone, they that were about him asked of him the parable. 13. And he saith unto them, Know ye not this parable? and how shall ye know all the parables?

26. And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed upon the earth; 27. and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up and grow, he knoweth not how. 28. The earth beareth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. 29. But when the fruit is ripe, straightway he putteth forth the sickle, because the harvest is come.

30. And he said, How shall we liken the kingdom of God? or in what parable shall we set it forth? 31. It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown upon the earth, though it be less than all the seeds that are upon the earth, 32. yet, when it is sown, groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches; so that the birds of the heaven can lodge under the shadow thereof.

33. And with many such parables spake he unto them.

v. 22. And there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name; 23. and seeing him, he falleth at his feet, and beseecheth him much, saying, My little daughter is at the point of death: (I pray thee) that thou come and lay thy hands on her, that she may live. 24. And he went with him; and a great multitude followed him, and they thronged him.

25. And a woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years, 26. and had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse, 27. having heard the things concerning Jesus, came in the crowd behind, and touched his garment. 28. For she said, If I touch but his garments,

I shall be made whole. 30. And Jesus, turned him about in the crowd, and said, Who touched my garments? and his disciples said unto him, Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me? 32. And he looked round about to see her that had done this thing. 33. But the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what had been done in her, came and fell down before him, and told him all the truth. 34. And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague.

35. While he yet spake, they came from the ruler of the synagogue's house, saying, Thy daughter is dead: why troublest thou the Teacher any further? 36. But Jesus overhearing the word spoken, saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, Fear not, only believe. 38. And they come to the house of the ruler of the synagogue; and he beholdeth a tumult and (many) weeping and wailing greatly. 39. And when he was entered in, he saith unto them, Why make ye a tumult, and weep? the child is not dead, but sleepeth. 40. And they laughed him to scorn. 40. But he taketh the father and mother of the damsel, and them that were with him and entereth in where the child was. 41. And taking the child by the hand, he saith unto her, Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, Arise. 42. And straightway the damsel rose up, and walked; for she was twelve years old.

vi. 14. And king Herod heard; and he said, John the Baptist is risen from the dead, and therefore do these powers work in him. 15. But others said, it is Elijah. And others said, It is a prophet, even as one of the prophets. 16. But Herod when he heard, said, John, whom I beheaded, he is risen. 17. For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for the sake of Herodias

(here follows the story of the daughter of Herodias dancing, and the Baptist's death).

28. . . . and the soldier of the guard brought his head in a charger, and gave it to the damsel; and the damsel gave it to her mother. 29. And when (the Baptist's)

disciples heard thereof, they came and took up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb.

vi. 45. And straightway Jesus constrained his disciples to enter into the ship and to go . . . to Bethsaida.

viii. 22. And they came unto Bethsaida.

27. And Jesus went forth and his disciples, into the villages of Caesarea Philippi: and in the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them, Who do men say that I am?

28. And they told him, saying, John the Baptist: and others, Elijah; but others, One of the prophets. 29. And he asked them, But who say ye that I am? Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ.

ix. 11. And they asked him, saying, The scribes say that Elijah must first come. 12. And he said unto them, Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things. 13. But I say unto you, that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed.

MATT. XI. 12. And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and violent men prey upon it.

Mark ix. 1. But, I say unto you, that there be some here of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power.

ix. 30. And they went forth from thence and passed through Galilee; and he would not that any man should know.

ix. 33. And they came to Capernaum: and when he was in the house he asked them, What were ye reasoning in the way? But they held their peace: for they had disputed one with another in the way, who was the greatest. 35. And he sat down and called the twelve; 36. and he took a little child and set him in the midst of them: and he said unto them,

x. 15. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein.

x. 13. And they brought unto him little children, that he should touch them: and the disciples rebuked them. 14. But when Jesus saw it, he was moved with indignation, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me; and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God:

16. And he took them in his arms, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them.

17. And as he was going forth into the way, there ran one to him, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Teacher, what shall I do that I may inherit [the kingdom of heaven]? 21. And Jesus looking on him loved him, and said unto him, Come, follow me. 22. But his countenance fell at the saying, and he went away sorrowful: for he was one that had great possessions. 23. And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God: 25. It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. 28. Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee.

MATT. XIX. 28. Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me [in the regeneration] . . . shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Mark x. 32. And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem and Jesus was going before them; and they that followed were afraid. 35. And there came near unto him James and John the sons of Zebedee, saying unto him, Master we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall ask of thee. 36. And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you? 37. And they said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy glory. 38. But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask. 40. To sit on my right hand or on my left hand is not mine to give: but it is for them for whom it hath been prepared. 41. And when the ten heard it, they began to be moved with indignation concerning James and John. 42. And Jesus saith unto them, Ye know that they which . . . rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. 43. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your servant: 44. and whosoever would be first among you, shall be bondservant of all. 45. Even as I came not to be ministered unto but to minister.

x. 46. . . . and as he went out of Jericho, Bartimaeus, a blind beggar, was sitting by the wayside. 47. And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out, and say, Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy upon me. 48. And many rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he cried out the more a great deal, Thou son of David, have mercy on me. 49. And Jesus stood still, and said, Call ye him. And they called the blind man, saying unto him, Be of good cheer: rise, he calleth thee. 50. And he, casting away his garment, sprang up, and came to Jesus. 51. And Jesus answered him, and said, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? And the blind man said unto him, Rabboni, that I may receive my sight. 52. And Jesus said unto him, Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole. And straightway he received his sight, and followed him in the way.

xi. 1. And when they drew nigh unto Jerusalem and Bethany, at the mount of Olives, he sendeth two of his disciples . . . 7. and they bring (a) colt unto Jesus, and cast on it their garments; and he sat upon it. 7. And many spread their garments upon the way; and others (swathes of grass) which they had cut from the fields. 9. And they that went before, and they that followed, cried, Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: 10. Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, the kingdom of our father David. 11. And he entered into Jerusalem, into the temple; and when he had looked round about upon all things, it being now eventide, he went out unto Bethany with the twelve.

12. And on the morrow, when they were come out of Bethany, he hungered. 13. And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find anything thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; for it was not the season of figs. 14. And he answered and said unto it, No man eat fruit from thee henceforward for ever. And his disciples heard it. 15. And they came to Jerusalem: and he entered into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and them that bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers

and the seats of them that sold the doves; 16. and he would not suffer that any man should carry a vessel through the temple. 17. And he taught, and said unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations? but ye have made it a den of robbers. 18. And the chief priests and the scribes heard it, and sought how they might destroy him: for they feared him, for all the multitude was astonished at his teaching. 19. And each evening he went forth out of the city.

20. And as they passed by in the morning, they saw the fig tree withered away from the roots. 21. And Peter calling to remembrance saith unto him, Rabbi, behold the fig tree which thou cursedst is withered away. 22. And Jesus answering saith unto them, Have faith in God. 23. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou taken up and cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he saith cometh to pass; he shall have it.

27. And they came again to Jerusalem: and as he was walking in the temple, 28. they said unto him, By what authority doest thou these things? or who gave thee this authority to do these things? 29. And Jesus said unto them, I will also ask you one question, 30. The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men? 33. And they answered Jesus and say, We know not. And Jesus saith unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.

xii. 1. And he began to speak to them in parables.

A man "planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a pit for the winepress, and built a tower," and let it out to husbandmen, and went into another country. 2. And at the season he sent to the husbandmen a servant that he might receive from the husbandmen of the fruits of the vineyard. 3. And they took him, and beat him, and sent him away empty. 4. And again he sent unto them another servant, and him they wounded in the head and handled shamefully. 5. And he sent another; and him they killed: and many others; beating some, and killing some. 9. What therefore will the lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the

husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others. 12. And they sought to lay hold on him and they feared the multitude; for they perceived that he spake the parable against them: and they left him, and went away.

xii. 13. And they send unto him some to catch him in his words. 14. And they came and say unto him, Teacher, we know that thou art true, and carest not for any man: neither lookest thou on the person of men, but teachest the way of God in truth: is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar, or not? 15. Shall we give or not? But he, knowing their hypocrisy, said to them, Why tempt ye me? Bring me a penny, that I may see it. And they brought one. And he saith unto them, whose is this image and superscription? And they said to him, Caesar's. 17. And Jesus said, Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's. And they marvelled at him.

xiii. 1. And as he went forth out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, behold, what manner of stones and what manner of buildings! 2. And Jesus saith unto him, Seest thou these great buildings? There shall not be left here one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down.

xiv. 1. And after two days was (the feast of) the passover and the unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him with subtlety, and kill him: 2. for they said, Not during the feast, lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people. 3. And while he was in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, 10. Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went away unto the chief priests, that he might deliver him unto them. 11. And they, when they heard it, were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently deliver him unto them.

17. And when it was evening he cometh with the twelve. 18. And as they sat and were eating, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, one of you shall betray me. 19. And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? 20. And he said unto them, It is one of the twelve. 22, 23. And [as they were eating], he took a cup, and when

he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it. 24. And he said unto them, 25. Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God. 26. And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives. 27. And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered abroad. 29. But Peter said unto him, Although all shall be offended, yet will not I. 30. And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, that thou to-day, even this night, before the cock crow twice, shalt deny me thrice. 31. But he spake exceedingly vehemently, If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee. And in like manner also said they all. 32. And they came unto a place which was named Gethsemane: and he saith unto his disciples, Sit ye here, while I pray. 35. And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed. 37. And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto them, Could ye not watch one hour? 39. And again he went away and prayed, 40. and again he came and found them sleeping, for their eyes were very heavy. 41. And he saith unto them, 42. Arise, let us be going: behold he that betrayeth me is at hand. 44. Now he that betrayed him had given them a token, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that is he; take him, and lead him away safely. 45. And when he was come, straightway he came to him, and saith, Rabbi; and kissed him (again and again). 46. And they laid hands on him, and took him. 47. But a certain one of them that stood by drew his sword, and smote the servant of the high priest, and struck off his ear. 50. And they all left him, and fled. 51. And a certain young man followed with him, having a linen cloth cast about him, over his naked body: 52. and they lay hold on him; but he left the linen cloth, and fled naked. 53. And they led Jesus away to the high priest: 54. And Peter followed him afar off, even within, into the court of the high priest; and he was sitting with the officers, and warming himself in the light (of the fire). 57. And there stood up certain, saying, 58. We heard him say,

I will destroy this temple. 65. And some began to spit on him, and to buffet him, and to say unto him, Prophesy.

66. And as Peter was beneath in the court, there cometh one of the maids of the high priest; 67. and seeing Peter warming himself, she looked upon him, and saith, Thou also wast with the Nazarene, Jesus. 68. But he denied, saying, I neither know, nor understand what thou sayest: and he went out into the fore-court; and the cock crew. 69. And the maid saw him, and began again to say to them that stood by, This is one of them. But he again denied it. 70. And after a little while again, they that stood by said to Peter, Of a truth thou art one of them; for thou art a Galilean. 71. But he began to curse, and to swear, I know not this man of whom ye speak. 72. And straightway the second time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word, how that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept.

xv. 1. And in the morning the whole council held a consultation and bound Jesus and carried him away, and delivered him up to Pilate.

6. Now at the feast he used to release unto them one prisoner, whom they asked of him. 7. And there was one called Barabbas, lying bound with them that had made insurrection, men who in the insurrection had committed murder. 8. And the multitude went up and began to ask him to do as he was wont to do unto them. 9. And Pilate answered them, saying, Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews? 11. But the chief priests stirred up the multitude that he should rather release Barabbas unto them. 12. And Pilate again answered and said unto them, What then shall I do unto him whom ye call the King of the Jews? 13. And they cried out again, Crucify him. 14. And Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out exceedingly, Crucify him. 15. And Pilate, wishing to content the multitude, released unto them Barabbas, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged him, to be crucified. 16, 20. And the soldiers led him out to crucify him.

21. And they compel one passing by, Simon of Cyrene, coming from the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to go with them, that he might bear the cross. 22. And they bring him unto the place Golgotha. 25. And it was the third hour, and they crucified him. 26. And the superscription of his accusation was written over, "The King of the Jews."

33. And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice 37. [Jesus cried with a loud voice] and gave up the ghost.

40. And there were also women beholding from afar: among whom were both Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and [Mary the mother] of Joses, and Salome.

42. And when even was now come, because it was the Preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath, 43. there came Joseph of Arimathaea, a councillor of honourable estate, who also himself was looking for the kingdom of God; and he boldly went in unto Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus. 44. And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead: and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead. 45. And when he learned it of the centurion, he granted the corpse to Joseph. 46. And he bought a linen cloth, and taking him down, wound him in the linen cloth, and laid him in a tomb which had been hewn out of a rock; and he rolled a stone against the door of the tomb. 47. And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid.

xvi. 1. And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought spices that they might come and anoint him. 2. And very early on the first day of the week, they come to the tomb when the sun was risen. 3. And they were saying among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the tomb? 4. and looking up, they see that the stone is rolled back: for it was exceeding great. 8. And they fled from the tomb; and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid.

CHAPTER II

Materials used by Mark II other than Mark I

PARADIGMS—"Q"

Now that we have set on one side our (conjectured) Mark I, let us proceed to consider what other material Mark II has used when he was rewriting the Gospel. For there remain in the Gospel indications of the use of other traditional material besides Mark I. Some of this material, like Mark I, may have been Christian memories already thirty-five years old, when, in the years round about A.D. 65, Mark II "took in hand to draw up his narrative." For Mark II uses material of various kinds. At the very beginning, after his title, "the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," he heads his first chapter with a quotation; two quotations. I suppose he wrote, first:

"Even as it is written in Isaiah the Prophet,
'The voice of one crying in the wilderness,
Make ready the way of the Lord,
Make his paths straight'";

that is Isa. xl. 3 in the Septuagint Greek. But, between the reference to "Isaiah the Prophet" and the words of Isaiah's prophecy, he has put in two more lines,

"Behold I send my messenger before thy face,
Who shall prepare thy way before thee."

You notice he says "thy way." Those are not the Septuagint words. The Septuagint has "my way before my face." The quotation has come round to Mark II by way of another writer who has quoted it before him. The quotation is a quotation of a quotation (which you will find in Matt. xi. 10; Luke vii. 27) from Mal. iii. 1 in the Septuagint. That is to say, the quotation is from the lost document which is,

for want of a more Apostolical name, spoken of as "Q." And so at the outset you are reminded that Mark II has two other kinds of material to draw upon besides Mark I. There was the Bible of the Greek-speaking Church, the Septuagint. And there was "Q."

You will find "Q" appearing again. "Q" has some saying about "shoes," i. 7; and "I baptise you with water, but he shall baptise you with fire." And "Q" had "A voice, Thou art my beloved Son": not less than that, for the "Q" account of the Temptation twice alluded to that Voice; "If thou art the Son of God." And "Q" had the words which are used at Mark i. 15 "The kingdom of God is at hand" (Matt. x. 7; Luke x. 9, 11).

In the same introductory paragraphs there are Septuagint quotations too. One was about John Baptist, who is accepted to be the new Elijah. And so Mark II quotes the Septuagint words about Elijah to describe the Baptist (2 Kings i. 8): "The man was a man with (a garment of) hair and girt with a girdle of leather about his loins." And Mark II quotes the Septuagint about our Lord; an allusion to Moses in Sinai (Exod. xxiv. 18), "the forty days"; and an allusion to Ps. lxxviii. 25, "So man did eat angels food." These are the first of many places where Mark II makes use of "Q" and of the Septuagint.

There is a third quarry from which he has hewn, which is now for us still further removed into the region of conjecture. I mean the folk-memories and folk-stories of the early Church, which have become the subject of most suggestive and exciting conjecture in Germany. We have been taught to look for early Christian stories which have formed themselves in the common use of the Church from the beginning. Anyone writing in A.D. 65, writing as the approved writer for the Christian community, would know whatever there was of this kind to know, preserved in the tradition of the Church in which he lived. In this case it is, of course, the Church of Rome. St. Mark's Gospel supplies more than all the others of these folk-stories to German scholarship. We will look for them as one more kind of material made use of by Mark II. He has four

altogether: Mark I, "Q," the Septuagint, and the original Christian tradition.

Let us now review Mark II, leaving on one side what has been above ascribed to Mark I, and see what is to be seen of the early stories, and of "Q."

An early story is thought to lie behind Mark i. 23-28. On my suppositions, what is of ancient tradition here, and not added by Mark II for the purposes of his own composition, amounts to very little. So I pass on to a group of scenes, six paragraphs, i. 40-45; ii. 1-13; ii. 14-17; ii. 18-20; ii. 23-28; iii. 1-6, five of which Mark II has added to Mark I to complete Mark II's representation of his Second (ideal) Day. You will notice that the first eight chapters are divided into Six Days. I think Mark II already had, from Mark I, for the composition of this Second Day, Jesus going out into the open country, and, a few days later, returning to Capernaum (ii. 1) to Peter's house, where the roof was broken in and the palsied man was let down and his sins were forgiven and his sickness was healed.

Let us review the remaining five of these six scenes, conjecturing in what form Mark II received them.

(1) Of Mark i. 40-45, I take the words: "There cometh to him a leper, saying, If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And he stretched forth his hand and touched him, and saith unto him, I will; be thou clean. And straightway the leprosy departed from him, and he was made clean."

The serviceableness of this story to Mark II is obvious, for Mark II is making a representation of Jesus rejected by the religious Jews and going away to the rest of mankind with the Gospel. And he will have found the story waiting ready for him in the Christian tradition. The thing was remembered because it was so startling an act of Jesus to touch a leper. The wonder of that human kindness gave to the story its original life and it passed from hearer to hearer, secure of being unforgotten in foreign churches, because of the same quality which had made it so surprising in the Jewish Church.

(2) Mark ii. 1-12 is from Mark the First.

(3) Mark ii. 13-17. Perhaps the traditional story told how Jesus was sitting at meat, and "many publicans and sinners," sat with Him. [Matt. xi. 19 and Luke vii. 34, show that already in the time of "Q" this was almost a proverbial phrase], "and many publicans and sinners sat down with Jesus and his disciples. And the scribes [Mark II adds, 'of the Pharisees'] said unto his disciples, He eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners. And when Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick."

That would seem to be the quite final word of Jesus, which gave this story life and kept it living. But Mark II adds, "I came not" [the words are words which open a vista: "came" . . . "whence?"] Mark II adds, as though he were quoting from Rom. v. 8, "I came not to call the righteous but sinners."

(4) Mark ii. 18-20. [I think the story was originally of John's disciples only. Mark II adds "the disciples of the Pharisees."] "And John's disciples were fasting, and they come and say unto him"—[these vague "theys" are very characteristic of the earliest stories]—"they say unto him, Why do John's disciples fast, but thy disciples fast not? And Jesus said unto them, Can the sons of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?" Subsequent events caused the Saying to be continued. But the original contrast was between the disciples of John who (vi. 29) had lost their "Bridegroom" and the disciples of Jesus who had their "Bridegroom" still with them.

I will deal with "Q" passages like Mark ii. 21, 22 separately, and come to the fifth story which tells of Jesus and the disciples in the corn fields.

(5) Mark ii. 23-28: "And it came to pass, that he was going on the sabbath day through the corn fields; and his disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn. And [they] said unto him" [Mark II has inserted the Pharisees, to fit his own design, again] "they said unto him, Behold, why do they on the sabbath day that which is not lawful? And he saith unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath."

If ever a saying had finality, you would have thought this sentence was final. But there has been added to it an argument about Abiathar—though, as a matter of fact, it was not Abiathar. And there has been added after it, "So that the Son of man is lord even of the sabbath." I will come to that again: meanwhile let this abbreviation stand as the story which the Christian tradition supplied to Mark II.

(6) The sixth is Mark iii. 1-6. With this, Mark II closes his Second Day. "He entered into the synagogue; and there was a man which had his hand withered. And they watched him, whether he would heal him on the sabbath day. And he saith unto the man that had his hand withered, Stand forth. And he saith unto them, Is it lawful on the sabbath to do good or to do harm? But they held their peace. And he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it forth. And his hand was restored." I take the rest, especially the Deuteromarcian and Pauline word of the "hardening of their heart" to be Mark II editing.

Verses 5 and 6 round off this collection of incidents by use of which Mark II (making his Second Day) reaches a degree of alienation of "the Pharisees" which involves them in a mortal hostility.

Mark iii. 20-35 I suppose to be "Q"; and Mark iv. 21-25; and so I pass on to Mark iv. 35-v. 20, in which one is left wondering what lies behind Mark II's accounts of the Stilling of the Tempest, and of the Cure of the "Legion" Demoniac at Gerasa.

The purpose of Mark II in his use of them is clear, but this need not prevent our supposing them to have had an origin quite unrelated to that purpose. Of the Scene of the Storm one may be permitted to conjecture that the disciples would not have invented out of nothing a story of Jesus being tired out and falling asleep while they went on with their work. It is even tempting to imagine that the steersman who gave up the cushion to the Teacher who was tired out could still remember in Rome how He had looked, resting His head on it. But as Mark II writes

the story, it is set out with Septuagint allusions, and shaped to serve a particular purpose in his plot, and made as one in a series to correspond with other scenes of Mark II, in a way which proves that we have not before us an unedited story.

And in the Gerasene story, at any rate verses 6, 7, 8 are interpolations. The story runs along much more smoothly if you leave them out. The closing verses about the ministry of the man among the Gerasenes are there because they help forward the plot of the drama of Mark II. But, again, there must surely have been something in the early memories of Christianity for this to grow out of; a vivid story of some strange scene which refused to let itself be forgotten; a marvel which is remembered because it was so marvellous.

The healing of the paralytic was remembered because Jesus had said, Thy sins are forgiven. The healing of the withered hand in the synagogue was remembered because it happened on the sabbath day. But it is another kind of memory which is here so vividly told. Has it not haunted our minds, so long after, with that strange delusion of "the Legion"; that perishing of the swine in the waters? The origin of the story is a matter quite independent of the use to which the story is put in Mark II.

I find, again, early tradition which I daresay is not Mark I, and which does not seem to be "Q," at vi. 1-6.

Mark II has introduced it with an editorial "he went from thence: and his disciples followed him." "His disciples" have a way of being inserted, like "the Pharisees," because Mark II is manipulating all his material to mould it into an account of the Pharisees being alienated and the disciples initiated. Somewhere after the introduction you come to traces of an ancient memory; I will try to select the words of it. "And, in his own country . . . He began to teach in the synagogue: and many hearing him were astonished saying, What is the wisdom that is given unto this man? Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, and 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 unto them, A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country."

There may be a complicating of the passage with an addition of "mighty works," which may be a Deuteromarcan word. It is a Pauline word. Mark II may have added "miracles" to "teaching" here, as he did when he added i. 23-28 to i. 21, 22. But the simple story would be there first for Mark II to use his art upon, making of it a critical episode in his history. It is a farewell of Jesus to the synagogue. His next act is the mission of the XII.

At vi. 30-44, the story is given of the feeding of the five thousand. If this story (35-44) is compared with the story of the feeding of the four thousand (viii. 1-10), the reader will, I think, be conscious that the story of the feeding of the four thousand is very artificial, and that this story of the feeding of the five thousand is by comparison a very original story.

As they stand in Mark II they are both serving one purpose. Indeed the second miracle has been composed as a companion picture for the first. One is Galilean, the other Decapolitan. The second grew out of the first; but what did the first grow out of? Mark I shows no trace of having included any such story. It is even impossible to find a place for it anywhere in Mark I's story as it runs smoothly on through the miracle of the saving of Jaira's daughter and the rumour that Herod has been too much interested in that miracle, on to the hurried departure out of Herod's country to Bethsaida and the arrival at Bethsaida (v. 41; vi. 14, 54; viii. 22).

Mark II, it would seem, knew of some Christian memory which went back to earliest days, and which was now sacred because it had come to be associated with the Christian Coming together for the Breaking of Bread. The story as Mark II tells it lies before us now and leaves us to wonder what was its origin. It is like some sacred place which has been transformed just because it is sacred: like Nazareth itself, or the Church of the Resurrection, transformed into new places by the very reverence which desired to preserve them but which has almost obliterated what it wished to

save. As you read you are aware of Mark II working upon the story with the Septuagint to help: Isa. lv. 1 helps him, and Ps. xxiii., and Exod. xvi., and 2 Kings iv. 43. And still there are, behind and beneath his superstructures, which are themselves venerable now as being the monument of so ancient a Christian veneration; still there are in Mark II's story suggestions of an earlier story, more authentic and more original, about fish that the disciples actually caught, and the greenness of the Galilean grass, remembered long afterwards and far away in Rome.

At vii. 1-23, I come upon clearer indications of old tradition, old work not obliterated although much amplified in the later editing. At vii. 1 ["the Pharisees" are due, I daresay, to Mark II.] "Certain of the scribes which had come from Jerusalem, and had seen that some of his disciples ate their bread with 'common' hands, 5. ask him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders but eat their bread with 'common' hands? 14. and he said, 15. Hear me all of you, and understand: there is nothing from without a man, that going into him can defile him: but the things which proceed out of a man are those that defile the man." These three verses have been expanded into twenty-three verses.

At vii. 24-30, is what is surely an ancient memory: one which, like the centurion story in "Q," must have come to mind when Jewish Christians were questioning whether they would be doing the will of Jesus if they went out to the Gentiles with the Gospel. The woman is a Syro-Phoenician: which means that the story has already travelled from Galilee and Antioch to Rome. For, in Galilee or Antioch, all Phoenicians would be Syro-Phoenicians—only as you travel westward do you begin to distinguish Syro-Phoenicians from Libyphoenicians. I suspect that Mark II is responsible for the addition of "Hellenis," "a Greek woman." The division of all our neighbours into two; the classing of all men as either "Hellenes" or "Jews" begins to be seen in St. Paul. In the Fourth Gospel, the "Jews" are the recognised enemies of the faith. There is there a dreadful reiteration; "the Jews," "the Jews," seventy

times. The Hellenes (in that Gospel) come into sight, as messengers out of a new world waiting to be discovered, at John xii. 20. In the same way this Hellene woman is, for Mark II, the first complete foreigner. She, with her plaintive cries, is like one of the western birds that perched on the rigging of the ship of Christopher Columbus and told him and his sailors of a country waiting there. Mark vii. 26, "and she besought him that he would cast forth the devil out of her daughter. 27. And he said unto her [Let the children first be filled: for] it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs. 28. But she answered and saith unto him, Yea, Lord; even the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs. 29. And he said unto her, For this saying go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter."

One notices again that the miracle is not remembered because it is miraculous, but because it was an answer to Gentile prayer. Tellers of the story can little have imagined how it would appeal to us in later days, to whom it is the story of Jesus coming for the first time into contact with all that the "Greek" genius, its sanity, its humanness, its quick clear wits, its friendliness (back to the *Odyssey*) for dogs; all that "Greek" culture means to the civilised world now.

At vii. 32-37; viii. 23-26, are two more miracle stories. They come to us with a suggestion of Septuagint about them. In Isa. xxxv. 5, 6 there is a Septuagint word for "impediment in the speech." But if they are "late" in this telling of them, and the language suggests this, they also go back to Aramaic memories. "Mogilalos" is late. But "Ephphatha" is very early. The gradualness of these two cures has made it seem to a pious writer, by the time when St. Matthew wrote, seemlier to leave them out altogether. Such a sense of effort seems to him unbecoming and undivine. On the other hand, it is this very gradualness which suits the purpose of Mark II. For his emphasis, just here, is on the effort and the gradualness of the revelation which was the cure of Simon Peter's blindness.

At ix. 14-29 is another miracle, with vivid touches,

comparable to those of the "Legion" miracle at Gerasa. Yet it has been so much worked over by Mark II that it is impossible to go through it and distinguish the sentences of the older tradition from the alterations and additions of Mark II.

At ix. 38-40 is just such a story as we are taught to imagine would have lived from the beginning, a guide to Christians in cases of doubt.

"John said unto him, Master we saw one casting out devils in thy name: and we forbade him, because he followed not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a mighty work in my name, and be able quickly to speak evil of me."

There is added a Saying from "Q" (Matt. xii. 30; Luke xi. 23), "For he that is not against us is for us." This story of St. John must surely be a very early memory. Yet it is not so easy to accept as primitive the phrase "in my name" which comes four times in four verses here. It will be noticed that the phrase comes three times again in St. Mark, in passages which are certainly all of them unoriginal. Two are in Chapter xiii. and the third is at xvi. 17.

At xii. 18 is the question of the resurrection of the dead. The story may have run, 18. "And there came unto him Sadducees, which say there is no resurrection, and he said unto them, 26. Have ye not read in the book of Moses, in 'the Bush,' how God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but of the living."

It is natural to believe that this saying was one which Christians "would not willingly let die." It is easy to believe that it comes from the earliest days. It is alive with a vitality with which it is not equally easy to credit the argument of the Sadducees about the seven brothers who married the one wife.

At xii. 41-43 and xiv. 3-9 are companion stories, which are now separated by Chapter xiii.

They will be felt to be gentle tender digressions from the bare stern story of how Jesus cleansed the temple and how

He saw in the fig tree that was withered a parable of Jerusalem's withering religion, and how Jesus was challenged "By what authority doest thou these things?" and how He countered the question and how he spoke of the temple in terms of Jer. vii. 11, using the words which have that desolate context, "Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are these! Is this house which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes? Behold, I, even I, have seen it, saith the Lord. But go ye now unto my place which was in Shiloh . . . therefore I will do unto this house, which is called by my name, wherein ye trust, and unto the place which I gave to you and to your fathers, as I have done to Shiloh." Mark I's story is very bare and stern.

The stories of these two nameless women would, I say, have seemed such wild flowers as we must not stop to gather in a story which tells, straight on, of the enemies longing to lay their hands on Him, and sending certain men to catch Him with the question, Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar? His answer is as deadly in earnest as their question. It is a counter-attack on those who had misappropriated and exploited the Holy Place, "Render unto God the things that are God's." And then, at xiii. 1, He went out of the temple, speaking of the coming of a day when "there shall not be left here one stone upon another." This is parry and counter-thrust! The issues at stake, the mortal hostility are never lost sight of in Mark I's account. At xiv. 1 the chief priests and scribes were plotting. At xiv. 3, 10 He was in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, and Judas Iscariot went to them and planned to betray Him.

At the time it may be doubted whether the story would attend to these women, but the two stories would come in later, as naturally as the ivy-leaved toad-flax or pennywort or valerian or the wild wallflower come and grow in the masonry of some old wall that is scarred with the sieges of old wars, and the stories are there for us now, gentle and fresh and fragrant. Mark II, I daresay, wrote them for

us and not Mark I. But Mark II had them out of old tradition.

Mark xii. 41-43. "And he beheld how the multitude cast money into the treasury. And there came a poor widow, and she cast in two mites" (in Rome, a Roman equivalent is given). "And he called unto him his disciples, and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, This poor widow cast in more than all they which have casting into the treasury." That poor widow's piety comes to mind over against the cold impiety of the chief priests who desecrate the Holy Place; and then, over against the treason of Judas, the other woman brings her offering: Mark xiv. 3-9, and her story will be told wherever the Gospel goes. That may have been a "prophecy after the event" written by Mark II, now that her beautiful act is always spoken of at any rate in Passion Week. The story one notices is "a memorial" of her; some known Christian sister, dead now, perhaps. Her simple act is admitted to a place and remembered along with the memories of the immeasurably great Act of Love which, in Passion Week, the adoring Church recalls. Now, when that long-past "little good deed" is still remembered all this way off in Rome, it may have been a "prophecy after the event" for Mark II to add to his story, "Whosoever the Gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her." I note that the Gospel remembers things as out of a later generation. It calls as witnesses "the father of Alexander and Rufus" and "the mother of Joses" and "the mother of James." It is the sons that we know best.

The stories of the Colt on Palm Sunday and of the Upper-room (Mark xi. 1-7 and xiv. 12-16) suggest that there were some stories ready to hand, for Mark II to work into Mark I's story of the last week, in which the faithful had attributed to Jesus a kind of second-sight. It is interesting to notice how free so much of these early memories is from that kind of wonder. The stories themselves are capable of simple explanations, but these versions of them take pleasure in a secondary sort of wonderfulness. Jesus is

said to have known where they would find the colt, and what the owners of the colt would say. At xi. 3 He tells the two disciples to call Him "the Lord." It is not likely that He ever did that.

In xiv. He knows about the man and the waterpot, and the guest chamber already mysteriously prepared. The story is capable of an unmysterious explanation, but it is our modern mind rather than the mind of Mark II which desires one. Mark I does not use this kind of "mystery" and Mark II does. How long would it take for the Church to find this kind of sentiment becoming acceptable in its stories? They would be many-times-told stories before A.D. 65.

We have reviewed, I think, all the material which Mark II has made use of, drawing upon the general church-memory, the unwritten tradition of folk-stories which would be the common property of Christian minds. But, besides borrowing these, Mark II has made use of that Collection of Sayings and Incidents which has been conjecturally recovered from certain passages in St. Matthew and St. Luke and which is labelled "Q."

We must proceed to review what Mark II owed to his "Q" document, or to a "Q"-like source, whether it came to him written down or known by heart among the Christians. Here and there are words opposite which one may put a note "Q." I spoke of i. 2, 11, 15. At iii. 20-35, we come to a longer "Q" passage. Let me marshal the references.

I would group together Mark iii. 20-26, 27, 28-30, 31-35, and with these, Mark vii. 32-35; viii. 11-13. And with these I would compare, as "Q" parallels, Luke xi. 14-23; xii. 10; xi. 27, 28, 29 and xii. 54-56.

And there are the Matthew parallels, Matt. ix. 32, and (where Matthew begins the story a second time, introducing this time alterations which show what manner of liberty he thinks permissible to an Evangelist) Matt. xii. 22-30, 43-45, 38-42.

Jesus, St. Luke says, was casting out a devil, which was dumb. I should not suggest that this is a version of the same miracle as Mark vii. 32 (the "Ephphatha" miracle),

if it had not been that "they came seeking a sign from heaven," in Mark viii. 11, close by. But, finding Luke xi. 14-28 and 29-32 together, and Mark vii. 32-37 and viii. 11, 12 also close together, I do suggest that they are "Q."

To the request for a sign the answer may have been, not that indignant "If there be given a sign to this generation!" but, an answer which is found in Luke xii. 54-56:

"When ye see a cloud rising in the west,
Straightway ye say, There cometh a shower;
And so it cometh to pass.
And when ye see a south wind blowing,
Ye say, There will be scorching heat;
And it cometh to pass.
Ye hypocrites, ye know how to interpret
The face of the earth and the sky;
How is it that ye know not how to interpret
This time?"

This would be an answer, though not the one expected, to a request for a sign from heaven.

"Q" gives the Sign of Jonah (Matt. xii. 39; Luke xi. 29).

Much of the story is told by Mark and Luke without great difference.

Mark says, "The scribes who had come down from Jerusalem said."

Luke says, "Some of them said,"

"He hath Beelzebul, and by the chief of demons he casts out demons."

"And He, knowing their thoughts, saith to them," Luke and Matthew write.

"And He, calling them to Him, said to them in parables," says St. Mark:

"Every kingdom divided against itself
is brought to desolation,
And every house divided against itself
cannot stand,
and if Satan is divided against himself,
[or, 'and if Satan casts out Satan,']
he cannot stand [or, 'how can his kingdom stand?']"

Then—what is not in Mark—Matthew and Luke say:

“If I by Beelzebul cast out demons,
By whom do your sons cast them out?
Therefore shall they be your judges.”

I think, Isa. xlix. 24, 25, is not far out of sight:

“Shall the prey be taken from the mighty,
Or the lawful captives (or, the captives of the
terrible) be delivered?

But thus saith the Lord,
Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away,
And the prey of the terrible ones shall be delivered:
For I will contend with him that contendeth with
thee,

And I will save thy children.”

And there is Isa. xliii, 8:

“Bring forth the blind people that have eyes,
And the deaf that have ears,”

[which may account for Matthew's accumulation of distresses, xii. 22].

And there is Isa. xlii. 18:

“Hear ye deaf; and look, ye blind, that ye may see.”
and Isa. xxxv. 5, 6:

“Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened,
And the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped,
And the tongue of the ‘dumb’ shall sing”

[“dumb,” there is the unusual word “mogilalos”].

But we were reading Matthew and Luke and had got to,
“Therefore shall they be your judges,”

“But if I by the spirit of God,” Matthew goes on,

“But if I by the finger of God,” Luke writes,

[Luke is remembering the Septuagint's Exodus viii. 19, and the afflicted Magicians of Egypt . . . “the finger of God.”]

“If I by the [power] of God cast out demons,
Then is the kingdom of God come upon you.”

Matthew, Luke, Mark differ little in what follows:

“When a strong man keepeth his house,
No one can enter into his house and spoil his goods,
Except it be a stronger than he,
Who overcomes him and spoils his goods,”

and then Matthew, Luke have:

“He that is not with me is against me,
And he that does not gather [my flock] with me
scatters it.”

Then come verses where Mark differs from Luke and Matthew. Mark has:

“Verily I say unto you,
All shall be forgiven to the sons of men,
All their sins and blasphemies
Wherewithsoever they blaspheme:
But whosoever blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit,
He has no forgiveness, forever,
But is guilty of everlasting sin.”

“Q,” in Matthew and Luke’s version of it, has been misled by this “sons of men,” and so Matthew has:

“And every one who shall say a word
Against the Son of man,
It shall be forgiven him:
But if he blaspheme the Spirit
It shall not be forgiven him.”

It would seem that here Mark is the trustworthier guide, and yet in one respect Matthew has kept the faithfuller record. Here Matthew has spoken of “the Spirit.” Mark and Luke have made a change. They say what must have been commonly said in very nearly the earliest, but not in the earliest days. They speak of, “the Holy Spirit.” It is a name which the Church found waiting in the Septuagint Greek. Ps. l. (li.) 11, for example.

In connection with this incident, Mark had a Saying about, The strong man keeping his house. Matthew and Luke have given this, and also a second Saying. The second also speaks of entry into a house. The wandering demon returns from the wilderness and finds “his” house clean but untenanted. That is in Matt. xii. 43, 44, 45 and Luke xi. 24, 25, 26, and then, following St. Luke, we read (Luke xi. 27, 28) “And it came to pass as he said these things, a woman lifted up her voice in the crowd and said to him, Blessed is she that was your mother and blessed is she that nursed you,” to which the parallel in Mark is, “And

there come his mother and his brethren; and standing without, they sent unto him, calling him. And a multitude was sitting about him; and they say unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee. And he answered them, and saith, Who is my mother and my brethren? And, looking round on them which sat round about him, he saith, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."

St. Luke continues (xi. 29):

"This generation is an evil generation.

It seeks a sign.

And no sign shall be given it"

Matt. xiii. 39; Luke xi. 29. Here are attached, in "Q," the Sayings about the Queen of the South and the Men of Nineveh. But I conjecture that the "sign" corresponding to Mark's refusal of a "sign from heaven" was the one I have given above. If this is so, you are admitted here to watch the changes which the Evangelists in the beginning felt themselves at liberty to introduce. In copies of "Q" it seems already there had arisen variations. And, long after "Q," St. Matthew has permitted himself to make an alteration of his own to this "Q" version with its "Sign of Jonah." Matthew makes his own commentary about "the three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

I have spent long on this passage because it throws light in many directions. What most concerns us is that St. Mark has (it seems) made use of something which is very like the "Q" of St. Matthew and St. Luke; very like, and yet in some respects St. Mark's is a different and not a poorer version.

In Mark iv. 21-25 Mark II has introduced "Q" material into Mark I's account of the parables. The point he wishes to make is that the parables served as an esoteric teaching committed to a very few chosen disciples. In Mark I the parables are quite simply spoken and a multitude of simple hearers understand. In Mark II only the elect are meant to understand, and it is explained that this is the method of God. God is preparing the Twelve Apostles.

“Is the lamp brought to be put under the bushel or
 under the bed,
 And not to be put on the lamp-stand?
 For there is nothing hid
 Save that it should be manifested,
 Neither was anything made secret
 But that it should come to light.”

The words do not greatly differ from Matt. v. 15; x. 26 and Luke xi. 33; xii. 2. Only in Mark there is this “purpose” introduced. God is preparing in secret these lamps, the disciples. They are at present being secretly prepared in order that later on they may be produced for public use.

In Matthew and Luke the Saying says little more than that it is the business of light to shine. It only *is* light on condition of its doing this blessed thing.

Mark iv. 24:

“And he said unto them,
 Take heed what ye hear:
 With what measure ye meet,
 It shall be measured unto you:
 And more shall be given unto you.
 For he that hath,
 To him shall be given:
 And he that hath not,
 From him shall be taken away even that which he
 hath.”

the words are from “Q” (Matt. vii. 2 and Luke vi. 38) and (Matt. xxv. 29 and Luke xix. 26). They do not appear to have had, originally, reference to an esoteric training of selected Christian disciples.

At Mark vi. 7-13 we find “Q” used again. Mark has a shorter form than the version which lies behind Luke x. 1-16 and Matt. ix. 37, 38; x. 5-16, 23-25, 40. The version of Matthew is interesting as still bearing traces of a period and phase of Jerusalem Christianity which must have lain in the years between the ministry of Jesus Himself and the later age when the Church had gone out into the world of foreigners. In the interval between these two there must have lain another Christian phase, a phase of a Jewish-Christian

Church in Jerusalem and Judaea. Few traces of it remain, but it is Matthew who has preserved (x. 5, 6, 23):

“Go not into any way of the Gentiles,
 And enter not into any city of the Samaritans:
 But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel . . .
 And when they persecute you in this city,
 Flee into the next:
 For verily I say unto you,
 Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel,
 Till the Son of man be come.”

This, which is markedly omitted by St. Luke, and has, in place of it (as St. Luke's defence of his omission) the story of Jesus and the Samaritan village (ix. 52) and the parable of the Good Samaritan (x. 30-37): this singular example of a Christian-Jewish exclusiveness, preserved in St. Matthew, must belong to a period when Jerusalem Christians thought of Christianity as intended only for Israel. It cannot have long been the predominant Christianity. All traces, almost, are gone now. You can watch St. Luke effacing them. But here in Matt. x. you can see them still. In Mark vi. 7-13 there are none left. In Luke there are not quite none; for, in his Gospel, the traces have been a little too vigorously erased, so that there are still traces of the obliteration of the traces which remained in “Q.”

The Marcan version is simpler than Matthew's. Matthew forbids a staff and shoes, Mark allows them. Matthew thinks of the money with which Christians might provide themselves as gold or silver or copper, Mark does not think of any money but copper. St. Matthew is perhaps imagining a rather romantic poverty, Mark is severely practical. Besides these few words which they have in common, the other words found in both Matthew and Mark are those about the “dust of your feet” to be “shaken off against” the place that rejects you. Mark's is an abbreviated version. The additions to the “Q” material (verses 7 and 13) seem to be Deuteromarkan. The verses have Mark II's preoccupation with unclean spirits and devils. I think it is forty times that these come into the Gospel, and never once, perhaps, in a Protomarkan passage.

Mark II can be seen working out his own theme in three passages (at iii. 13-19 and again here, vi. 7-13, and again at vi. 30), he is seen composing his representation of the early Church as already an Apostolic Church. The Twelve Apostles are represented as, already and from the very beginning, advanced to a solitary dignity such as, looking back, the later Church attributes to them. If you get back to "Q" there appears no hint of this.

I find no more vestiges of "Q" until we come to a passage already alluded to (vii. 31-37), the "Ephphatha" miracle, which is located by Mark II in Decapolis, as an incident in a journey from Tyre through Sidon to Bethsaida. (vii. 31), "He went out from the borders of Tyre, and came through Sidon unto the sea of Galilee."

I have been looking for a comparable journey on the map of Kent, measuring the miles and planning it on the same scale, and I find that it is as if you said that someone went from London to Canterbury neighbourhood, and then, from the neighbourhood of Canterbury, returned to London through Hastings. That is not an impossible journey. But if the intention is to go direct, it makes a curious geography: curious enough to quicken your attention to this which is being said about "Bethsaida" and "Tyre and Sidon."

He says "Tyre and Sidon," and the geography would have led you to expect "Sidon and Tyre." I submit the conjecture that this map-making comes, not out of accurate memories of anything that actually happened, but out of Mark II's familiarity with "Q" (Matt. xi. 21, 22 and Luke x. 12-14): a moment ago we were at the next verse (Luke x. 11). Here is Luke x. 12:

"Woe unto thee, Chorazin, Woe unto thee, Bethsaida!

For if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon which were done in you,

They would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes.

Howbeit I say unto you,

It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment, than for you."

It is "done in Tyre and Sidon," "tolerable for Tyre and

Sidon," not "done in Sidon and Tyre," or "tolerable for Sidon and Tyre." If it is this "Q" order which accounts for the inverted geography of Mark II, the words "Tyre and Sidon" in Mark vii. 24 and 31 may be regarded as another evidence of Mark II's use of "Q" or of some "Q"-like document.

Mark II, I suggest, has taken "Q" to help him to compose a journey which did not happen in real life, but which is a kind of foreshadowing of the coming journey of the Church. For the Church came, and with the Church the Lord did come, to make to the Gentiles that offer of the Gospel which the Jews had rejected. And the Gentiles accepted what the Jews had refused.

The memory of this Tyre and Sidon Saying, which "Q" had preserved, must have weighed with Christians at critical moments in their time of indecision, when it had still to be decided whether Jesus had intended His Church to keep far from the "ways of the Gentiles" [we call them "Roman roads"] and to avoid "any city of the Samaritans," and to "go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."

But in the time of Mark II the decision has long been made.

"Q" appears again at viii. 33-38. It is just possible that the words in viii. 33 and ix. 2 "Get thee behind me, Satan," and "taketh them into a high mountain" have been borrowed for use here by Mark II out of a "Q" account of the Temptation (Matt. iv. 8, 10). On the other hand, Matthew may borrow them from Mark II (Mark viii. 33 and ix. 2) to put into his Matt. iv. 8, 10, for Luke does not give them.

It is clear that the Sayings viii. 34-38 are worked up out of "Q." I will write them out as they stand, but they are fragments collected together out of different Sayings.

"If any man would come after me,

Let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.

For whosoever would save his life shall lose it;

And whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the Gospel's shall save it.

For what doth it profit a man

To gain the whole world, and lose his life?
 For what should a man give in exchange for his life?
 For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words
 In this adulterous and sinful generation,
 The Son of man shall be ashamed of him,
 When he cometh in the glory of his Father with the
 holy angels."

Compare with these lines:

Matt. x. 38. "And he that takes not his cross and follows
 after me

Is not worthy of me."

39. "He that finds his life shall lose it,
 And he that loses his life for my sake shall
 find it."

33. "Whosoever denies me
 before men
 I also will deny him
 before my Father which is in heaven."

Here is a case where Matthew has words on which no trace can be detected of their passage through the apocalyptic years, whereas Mark's words are marked by the apocalyptic minds through which they come to us.

(In passing, notice that Jesus says (in Matt. x. 33) "my" Father, not "your" or "our" Father.)

Both versions speak of the Cross in a manner which suggests days of a Church which has already moved some way towards making this its Christian sign. It is not easy to imagine Jesus saying words which would be so difficult to understand before the Crucifixion. It is easy to imagine His words being quite unconsciously changed by Christians into this form. It is easier still to see how Mark II would quote them, writing when Nero was emperor in Rome. "Others," says Tacitus, "were put on crosses" ("crucibus adfixi") "to be set on fire" (dressed, I suppose in shirts soaked with pitch), "and when daylight failed, to be burned for use as lights by night." Of such Christians as these, Tacitus says, there was "a vast multitude," condemned on information given by those unhappy Christians whose nerve had failed them, when, like the "two maidservants, called

deaconesses," of Pliny's letter to Trajan, they were examined "per tormenta."

The next "Q" passages are found from Chapter ix. 37 to x. 12. I introduce here, because I do not know where else to introduce it, a hypothetical Saying which may or may not have come from "Q"; a Saying of which I find traces in Mark ix. 37, 41, 42. These verses have thrust themselves into a place in Mark I, where, on Mark I's page, stood once the words which are now Mark x. 15. This looks like suggesting that the verse Mark x. 15 has been moved to a place twenty-six verses away. But it must be remembered that these twenty-six verses are all of them Deuteromarcian. In the Protomarcian book which lay before Mark II these twenty-six verses did not exist, and Mark ix. 33, 34, 36 and x. 15, 13, 14 were lying side by side there.

I disengage the following pieces from Mark II (ix. 37-42) because the conjecture that there was once such a Saying as I have given below affords a rather simple explanation of some confusing composition there. The Saying would run something like this:

"Whosoever shall receive a little child in my name,
receiveth me:

And whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him
that sent me.

And whosoever shall give to one of these little ones a
cup of cold water to drink, because they are Christ's,
I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward.

And whosoever shall cause one of these little ones that
believe on me to stumble,

It were better for him if a great millstone were hanged
about his neck and he were cast into the sea."

These four "whosoever" have come in into Mark II's Gospel together, though they are not really very appropriate to his purpose.

I have suggested above that originally Mark I gave as our Lord's Saying, when the disciples were round Him and the little child was close beside Him, not Mark ix. 37: "Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name receiveth me," but Mark x. 15 (which Mark II has

allowed to be pushed away by his new twenty-six verses): "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein."

It will be noticed that Mark x. 13, 14, 16 run much more naturally without than with Mark x. 15. Mark x. 15 then, originally followed Mark ix. 33, 34, 36. And, while it was still there, Mark x. 15 attracted to itself this Saying of the Four Whosoever. When once ix. 37 has got lodged there the other verses (ix. 41, 42) have followed. But even so, Mark ix. 41 was not allowed to remain there undisturbed. It has had to be knocked into a new shape in order that it may serve as an introduction to the story about St. John and the Christian who did not "follow" with the other disciples. I suppose that verse ix. 41 spoke originally about "the little ones," but Mark II has altered "the little ones" into "you." "Whosoever shall give *you* a cup of cold water" The "you" is there because Mark II wants to introduce his story of John. And if anyone asks what support have I for this conjecture that Mark II has made this change, the answer is that I have the support of St. Matthew the Evangelist, who at Matt. x. 42 has kept the Saying in its original form:

"And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones

A cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple,
Verily, I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward."

Then, at Mark ix. 43, Mark II has allowed the "stumble" or "scandal" of ix. 42 to attract other "stumbles." This Mark ix. 42: "Whosoever shall cause one of these little ones to stumble," has attracted to itself a quite distinct Saying on "Causes of Offence."

This "Offences" Saying (Mark ix. 43-48) is, in form, a very typical Saying. It is clean-edged and clear-cut like a crystal. You can see, as you look at it, how securely it would abide in the memories of unlettered people. Matthew gives it in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 29-30). This "Offences" Saying was very likely in "Q," although it is not certain that Luke knew it. However, Luke has preserved

fragments which prove that he had more of the Sermon on the Mount Sayings than he has thought fit to copy. There is one bit, Luke xvi. 17 and another bit, Luke xvi. 18, about "Jot or Tittle" and about "Divorce"; two broken bits of the same Sayings as Matthew gives at Matt. v. 17-48. It is natural to infer that Luke has only preserved fragments of "Q" where, perhaps, Matthew has amplified "Q." And that the passages which they both had before them were found also by Mark II in his version of "Q." This would supply him, for example, with Mark ix. 43-48, and then you will notice that (Mark ix. 49) the Saying about "Salt" is from "Q" (Matt. v. 13) and Mark x. 4; "Divorce" and Mark x. 11 "Remarriage," are like the "Q" passage (Matt. v. 31; Luke xvi. 18). All this suggests that Mark ix., Matt. v. and Luke xvi. have all been written with some sort of "Q" document lying before the writer.

Mark ix. 43-48 has:

(1)

"And if thy hand cause thee to stumble,
cut it off:

It is good for thee to enter into life maimed,
rather than having two hands
to go into hell, into the unquenchable fire."

(2)

"And if thy foot cause thee to stumble,
cut it off:

It is good for thee to enter into life halt,
rather than having two feet
to be cast into hell."

(3)

"And if thine eye cause thee to stumble,
cast it out:

It is good for thee to enter into the kingdom of God
one-eyed,
rather than having two eyes
to be cast into hell;
Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not
quenched."

The Saying ends with a lengthened line, which is, as happens

again in the closing lines of other Sayings, a quotation from the Old Testament. This line uses the closing words of the Book of Isaiah.

What follows, Mark ix. 49, has in it the Saying about "Salt," which Matt. v. 13 and Luke xiv. 34, 35 have copied from "Q." So that you have all three, Matt. v. 13 and 31, Mark x. 4 and 11, Luke xiv. 34 and xvi. 18 bringing together these two Sayings. It cannot be any very intimate connection between "Salt" and "Divorce" which accounts for their keeping one another company like this. It is more natural to suppose that they are found together in these three places because they have never been separated since they chanced to come together in the "Q" tradition.

Mark is again quoting "Q" at x. 31:

"But many that are first shall be last;
and the last first."

The presence of a "Q" quotation here supports the opinion that at Mark x. 29-31 we are reading Mark II and not Mark I, and that here Mark II has replaced whatever it was that in Mark I had stood, after Peter's saying "We have left all," as Jesus's answer to Peter.

At Mark xi. 23 is a Saying which is also in "Q" (Matt. xvii. 20 and Luke xvii. 6): "The Mustard-seed Faith." It was one of the "Q" Sayings. And yet I do not feel convinced that Mark II had it from "Q" or that Mark II is responsible for its presence here. It comes naturally in Mark I at the moment when the disciples are staggered by the fig tree miracle. The place where St. Mark—I believe it to be Mark I—tells of it as having been said, is exactly appropriate. The Mount of Olives supplies the mountain, and the Dead Sea, blue as sapphire in its chasm four thousand feet below and twenty miles away, supplies the sea. The Saying suits both time and place. And it is exactly time and place that are lost to us in "Q" and saved for us by Mark I.

Mark xii. 28-34 may or may not be from the "Q"-like collection. Luke has it (Luke x. 25, 26, 27) rather differently given and without the words: "said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." These are surely not

words which Mark II would invent. Perhaps in them we catch one glimpse of a truer view of the Lord's mind towards some of the scribes: a memory otherwise lost: completely lost, especially in the "Q" tradition.

Mark II appears to have included the story here to "make up a set" of questions put to our Lord. He has taken this story from some other setting, I expect, and rounds it off, rather unexpectedly, "And no man 'durst' ask him any question." Why "durst"? There is no sound of menace in: "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God."

The unexpected gentleness of Christ to the scribe seems scarcely to have been noticed by Mark II. And yet it may have influenced him in his treatment of the next "Q" passage he quotes: the passage which we have in Matt. xxiii. and Luke xi. 39-42, 44, 47-51. This "Q" passage, to judge from its closing words, must have had its place near the ending of "Q." Mark II uses it as a final denunciation of the scribes (xii. 38, 39, 40). Matthew has made thirty-nine verses of it, Mark has only three. Matthew has given us what he, somehow, can believe to be Sayings of Jesus, verses like 27, 31, 33. They do not sound to us authentic. That an Evangelist should have written them down as the words of Jesus, and that they should have been accepted as such by the Christians among whom the writer lived, is a measure of what the Church in Jerusalem had suffered at the hands of the Jews. Mark II has not this Jew-hate, and the difference is natural enough between the two Evangelists, for to move from "Q" to Mark II is to move from Jerusalem A.D. 45 to Rome A.D.65. At Rome the Jews were no longer the terror. Nero had taken their place. Matt. xxiii. remains as evidence of the light in which Jerusalem Christians saw the Pharisees. Mark xii. 38, 39, 40 are evidence that Mark II had read something of the same kind, and that he did not think himself bound to accept the words as what a Christian must believe his Lord had said.

The remaining Marcan parallels to "Q" are found in Chapter xiii., a chapter which scarcely affects the subject of these essays.

CHAPTER III

Materials of Mark II

USE OF SEPTUAGINT IN THE PASSION STORY

THERE is another origin from which the Gospel of St. Mark has drawn material, to which attention must now be drawn. In speaking of it I will begin by making two assumptions about the first Christians. One is that their meetings carried on into Christian worship much of the traditional use of the Jewish synagogue. There would at their services be prayer, psalms, readings from the Scripture. It is clear from Justin Martyr, for example, that this was so. The Greek-speaking Christians would know their psalms in words of the Septuagint. They would hear Exodus, or Job, or Jonah, or Isaiah in the words of the Septuagint. They, and still more their teachers and any writer among them, would have Septuagint language for the natural expression of their religious thought. St. Luke, for example, thinks in Septuagint Greek.

And the second observation to be made is that they would have services yearly at Holy Week time in which, more even than at other times of the year, they would be dwelling on the story of the Passion. A Church originating from Jewish antecedents would incline towards a sense that days like the Passover and Pentecost were not like other days. And at such times there is no question in what way Christian thoughts would be occupied. I think the form itself of our Gospel records and the mere amount of the space given in them to the closing days is evidence that Christians did observe such sacred times from the beginning, although you have to wait for an age when the Church was free to come out into the open for evidence of such observance. In Constantine's days you have the mother, Helena, at Jerusalem devoutly visiting the sacred places,

and in the same century a lady of Aquitaine, Silvia (or perhaps she was a Spanish nun called something else) tells of services of pilgrims consisting of long hours of going over the Passion story at the Sacred Sites. Pilgrimage is older than Christianity, and the references to Christian pilgrims go back even behind Constantine: to Origen, for example. And few modern Christians will be inclined to doubt that one of the earliest pieties of the Church would be to "keep Holy Week," whether among dwellers in Jerusalem, or among pilgrims coming there, following the old pilgrim habit of the Jewish Church; or perhaps, a long way from Golgotha, among congregations of Christians meditating, as the year came round, on the sacred records which the Evangelists supplied.

If these two statements are accepted, it would seem likely that from the beginning certain Septuagint passages would come to be associated in the Christian mind with the story of the first Passion Week. And where evidence about what had happened in those days was scanty, the Septuagint would very soon be found helping to fill the gaps in the Church's knowledge of the sacred hours. As we read it now, the tradition offers as history details of which it is sometimes scarcely possible, and sometimes not possible at all, to suppose that there can have been eyewitness. Sometimes such details can be seen to have been supplied by what the Church found in the Psalter, or Isaiah, or Amos, or Zechariah. No doubt it would begin at once that chosen passages of the Sacred Book would be felt to refer especially to Holy Week. In St. Mark are found statements which appear to have made their way into the account by this means of entry. Such statements may be assigned, I suppose, to Mark II; for they are not likely to have been required by one who was so near the occurrences themselves as Mark I appears to have been. These details would have had time to find their way into the Church's tradition by the year A.D. 65.

Certain Psalms (Ps. xl., xli., xlii., xliii., and others) can be seen supplying the New Testament words, sentences, even details of the story.

I turn to Psalm xl. [*“Expectans expectavi”*—“I waited patiently”]. This supplies a very early word in the Church’s vocabulary, *“hupomonē”*—“patient waiting.” In Thessalonians, Corinthians, and Romans, St. Paul has used it a dozen times. It is a name for exactly what was needed in that apocalyptic phase of a Church awaiting the Lord’s return. It is the mood of *“Maran atha”*—“O Lord, come.” The Psalms supply the word. Also Ps. xl. lends a foundation for the thoughts of Heb. x. 5, where the Septuagint version allows what the Epistle’s argument needed, “a body”—“a body hast thou prepared for me.” The Hebrew version would not have served. “Mine ears has thou opened.”

Ps. xli. 9 makes its own distinct mark on the Gospel story. “Yea mine own familiar friend, whom I trusted: who did “also eat of my bread, [“my loaves,] hath laid great wait for me,”—or, “hath lifted up his heel,—or, magnified his heel,—against me.” It is an obscure Hebrew phrase, but its obscurity does not prevent it from taking a firm hold on the Passion Story. It is at work in Mark xiv. 18. Mark I had “one of you shall betray me.” And Mark II adds, “even he that eateth with me.” That is only a faint sign of reminiscence, but that it is one is confirmed by John xiii. 18, where the words are “That the scripture might be fulfilled, He that eats of my bread lifted up his heel against me.” It was, no doubt, understood among Christians that the verse referred to the Traitor. Long before St. John wrote, the Christians were agreed upon that. St. John has altered the word “bread” from plural to singular to suit the quotation for use here in the Last Supper. St. John has prepared the way for the use of the word as far back as Chapter vi. So that when Ps. xli. 10, is quoted in John xiii. 18, the one word “loaf” brings into that most sacred scene the thought of all the human treacheries that have been done under the sun from the days of the Psalmist to the day of the Lord’s betrayal. In Ps. xli., again, you have the same words, “my soul is exceeding sorrowful,” as in Mark xiv. 34, and the same words, “my soul is troubled within me,” as in John xii. 27.

The words of Mark xiv. 34, come into the chorus of this Psalm, "*perilupos*," three times: "exceeding sorrowful."

And Ps. xlv. is used by St. Paul, Rom. viii. 36, "For thy sake we are slain all day long, we are numbered as sheep for sacrifice." Such a use of the Psalm in a letter is significant of what it meant to Christians. St. Paul uses it so; and his Roman letter-readers, before the letter was 10 years old, had occasion to attach to the words a more personal meaning than St. Paul had intended. When Mark II, in Rome—whither, meanwhile, St. Paul had followed his letter—is describing the ship of Christ and His disciples in a storm at sea (in Mark iv. 39), he makes use of Ps. xlv. 23, the verse immediately following the verse (Ps. xlv. 22) of St. Paul's quotation. Mark is quoting or suggesting the Psalmist's words, "Awake! Why sleepest thou, O Lord. Rise up! It is likely that when Mark II spoke of the storm he thought of Nero's cruelties.

I have lingered at Ps. xl.—xliii.; but the connection between the Septuagint Psalms and Mark xiv., xv. will be even more strikingly brought out if a reader will go through Ps. xxi. (xxii.) and lxviii. (lxix.). They are two of our Good Friday Psalms still.

Ps. xxii. has: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" That is at Mark xv. 34. It may influence our manner of understanding these passages in our Gospel to watch another Evangelist, St. Luke, taking leave to substitute a quotation from another Psalm at this place. He turns to Ps. xxxi. 5, and uses instead: "Into thy hands I commend my spirit." A writer to whom it seemed natural to do this, and who anticipated no resentment of his hearers to his doing it, was not intent upon a reporter's exactitude as we understand it. The Evangelists had other objects in view. Their work stands. It is valuable still with its own values. No doubt from the very first Ps. xxii. had found a place in the Church's devotions in the Passion-tide. "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me."

The Aramaic of St. Mark, "Eloi, Eloi"; and the misunderstanding, "He calleth for Elias"; may mean that the Psalm influenced the story as soon as any story was told.

Perhaps I ought to have called it "Mark I" and not "Mark II." I did not do so because it seemed to me likelier that it is Mark II who is writing here. It seemed to me that Mark II is here thinking again of those two mystical figures, Moses and Elias.

In his introduction, Elias and Moses are figures moving in an allusion across the background. At Mark i. 6 Elijah comes (out of 2 Kings i. 8), and is a sort of shadow cast by the Baptist. And at i. 13 Moses comes (out of Exod. xxiv. 18) moving as a shadow behind the Christ. They are of the past. They do not come to stay. An allusion to them, a quotation from their story, and that is all.

Then, in the Transfiguration Mountain, like shadows on the shining mist, like two phantoms, Moses and Elias appear. They appear in order that they may disappear. They are the Old Testament which is going to be transformed, transfigured, into the New Testament. In the Transfiguration Elias and Moses appear. The scene is a revelation of the light of the glory of God in the face of the Son of God. They are there: and then:—the disciples "saw no one any more, save Jesus only with themselves." It is an allegory, a parable.

And here in the third and last scene—Mark II is fond of threes—at Mark xv. 35, 38, is a last allusion. An unanswered cry: "He calleth for Elias": and there follows the tearing across of the veil of the Holy of Holies of Moses; his transient symbol; his copy of the pattern shown him in the Mount. It is torn across. So Moses and Elias, the Law and the Prophets, pass. The Transfiguration is an allegory, a parable. It's mountain is like a sunlit cloud that appears and then disappears. It is such stuff as dreams are made on. And still, the stuff that dreams are made on can be an enduring material.

Ps. xxii. lends words for use in the Passion story. "They parted my garments, casting lots." "They railed on him, wagging their heads." "Why hast thou forsaken me?" Mark xv. 24, 29, 34, are Ps. xxi. 19, 8, 2 (or xxii. 18, 7, 1). And St. Luke (xxiii. 35) borrows his long word for "The rulers scoffed"—(*exemuktērisan*)—from Ps. xxii. 8.

Perhaps the "Save! Save"! of Ps. xxii. 8, 21, find echoes in the "save thyself," "he saved others, himself he cannot save" of Mark xv. 30, 31.

Again, I think the word for "they encircled," "they came about me," of Ps. xxii. 12, 16 (and fourteen times elsewhere in the Psalms) commends itself for use in John x. 24, by the associations it had for the Church through familiarity with it here. And look at the words of verse 18, "They divided my garments among themselves and cast lots upon my vesture." They are found again in Mark xv. 24: "They part his garments among them, casting lots upon them." But in John xix. 24 the reference has become more detailed: "The coat was without seam," (mystical, like the High Priest's) "woven in one from top to bottom. So they said to each other, Let us not tear it, but cast lots who shall have it: that the Scripture might be fulfilled, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots." The reader has to decide whether this is a Christian memory recovered after two generations, a memory which has somehow come down from an hour and a place in which lookers-on of the kind that cared were few and far away; or is it a more probable explanation that the scene which the Psalm had made in men's minds had gained a stronger hold on the Church's imagination as time went on?

I turn to Ps. lxxviii. (or lxxix.), "Save me, O God, for the waters have come in to my soul. I am stuck fast in deep mire, and there is no standing: I am come in to the depths of the sea, and the storm hath overwhelmed me"—("kat-epontisen"—"over-sea-ed" me). [Matt. xiv. 30 has the same word, where our translation says that Peter was "beginning to sink." If a reader thinks of such a word as that, "sea-ed-me-under," and how it would have come to be associated with its context of Ps. lxxix. in the minds of Christians, he will be prepared to modify the matter-of-fact acceptance of St. Matthew's story of St. Peter's "beginning to sink." A man can sink in other than watery depths.]

Ps. lxxix. 4: "They that hate me without a cause are more

than the hairs of my head: my enemies that persecute me unrighteously are strengthened."

St. John quotes (xv. 25), "They hated me without a cause," from this Psalm. It is a Psalm which he has much in mind. At John ii. 17 it is quoted: "The zeal of thy house shall eat me up." And at xix. 28, "They gave me vinegar to drink," seems to quote Ps. lxxix. 21. But it is more than a use of express quotations that is here. The feeling of all the Psalm passes into the Gospel. Its verse 8, "I became an alien to my brothers, and a stranger to my mother's sons" matches John vii. 5, and the passage in verses 30, 31, "I will praise the name of my God with a song, I will magnify him with praise: and it shall please God more than a young calf having horns and hoofs," is related to the cleansing of the Temple in John ii. 14, 15, where the quotation from this Psalm comes about "The zeal of thy house." Mark nowhere borrows words from the Psalm (as Matthew does at Matt. xxvii. 34). But Mark xv. 23 has, "And they offered him wine mingled with myrrh." And Mark xv. 36 has "And one ran and, filling a sponge full of vinegar, he gave him to drink." These are almost the words of Ps. lxxix. 21, "For my thirst they gave me for drink vinegar." The word used for "reproached" him, in "they that were crucified with him reproached him," Mark xv. 32, comes in this Psalm six times:

7. "For thy sake I suffered reproach."
9. "The reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me."
10. "I wept and chastened myself . . . and that was turned to my reproach."
19. "Thou knowest my reproach, my shame, and my dishonour."
20. "My soul has waited for reproach and misery. . . ."

It may be said that Mark II is reproducing the thought of the Psalm, and that Matthew reproduces its language. What begins in the Evangelists as allusion becomes verbal quotation. The Church's earliest conception of the Crucifixion of the Lord is strongly influenced by this Psalm.

But more even than by the Psalms it was influenced

by the great chapters of the Second Isaiah: most of all by Isa. liii.

I find Isa. l. 6 in the verse Mark xiv. 65, "And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say Prophecy, and the officers received him with blows of their hands." This Marcan passage appears to have had two authors, however we may divide the words between them. Mark I must have known something, and it would be easy for him to guess more. But again there is a sound of Septuagint words in the passage. Isa. l. 6 has "I do not disobey, nor dispute. I gave my back to scourges, and my cheeks to blows; and I turned not away my face from the shame of spitting."

About Isa. liii. we would gladly learn how soon the Church began to think of it as a poem about their Lord. Rom. iv. 25 quotes: "He was delivered up for our transgressions." Perhaps 1 Cor. xv. 3, "Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures" means that this Christian application of Isa. liii. had already begun. If not, then Rom. iv. 25 is the earliest evidence we have of the belief that Isaiah's "Suffering Servant" foreshadowed Christ on the Cross. The Epistle to the Romans, at any rate, has made this use. And the Gospel of St. John is full of allusions to Isaiah's chapter. St. John Baptist's "Behold the Lamb of God" includes an allusion to it. And I find the author in John xii. 23, 28, 32, 34, taking up, as if they were a theme of music, the opening words of the Greek of Isaiah lii. 13. "Behold my servant . . . shall be lifted up . . . glorified." St. John takes up the words and uses them again and again. "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified . . ."; "Father, glorify thy name"; "I have glorified it and will glorify it again"; "I, if I be lifted up"; "The Son of man must be lifted up." In the making of that great chapter of Sacrifice (John xii.), allusion to Isa. liii. is unmistakable.

This literary influence of Isa. liii., felt in the language of St. Paul and this Evangelist, corresponds with a simpler and less literary influence which can be traced in the thought of the first Christians. Where evidence was meagre and

where thought was baffled, men turned for help to Isaiah. Here is an English translation of the Greek that would be read in Rome: Isa. liii. 5:

“He was wounded on account of our sins
and was bruised because of our iniquities
and he, because of his affliction,
opens not his mouth.

He was led as a sheep to the slaughter,
and as a lamb (the word is in the wrong place in the
Greek, but it is the word for ‘lamb’ of St. John’s
Gospel, not of the Apocalypse),
and as a lamb before the shearer is dumb,
so he opens not his mouth.”

[I notice that in Mark I there is no spoken word of Jesus recorded in all the Passion Scene.]

“In his humiliation his judgment was taken away:
who shall declare his generation?
for his life was taken away from the earth:
because of the iniquities of my people he was led to
death.

And I will give the wicked for his death;
for he practised no iniquity,
nor craft with his mouth.

If ye can give an offering for sin,
your soul shall see a long-lived seed.

The Lord also is pleased to take away the travail of his
soul,

to show him light,
and to form him with understanding;
to justify the just one who serves many well;
and he shall bear their sins.

Therefore he shall inherit many,
and he shall divide the spoils of the mighty;
because his soul was delivered up to death:
and he was numbered among the transgressors;
and he bore the sins of many,
and was delivered up because of their iniquities.”

Mark xv. 27, has, “and with him they crucify two robbers.”

[Verse 28 is a significant addition of the copyists.]

I have copied from "S. Bagster & Sons" their rather bald translation, because there is no escape from the obscurity and crabbedness of the Septuagint version. It is a proof of the spirit and life that are in the prophecy that they could be so little injured by the Greek misreadings of the Hebrew: the Hebrew itself (it seems) difficult and dim enough. It is not until some Hebrew scholar comes to our aid that we see more than fitful gleams of its light. And still the general purport has been felt and understood. The life and spirit of it have quickened and inspired.

In Mark x. 45 (Mark II) the words come: "and to give his life a ransom for many." They are words of the Septuagint Isaiah. The word for "ransom" comes constantly; the substantive once (Isa. xlv. 13), and the verb eleven times. And the thought spoken of in Mark x. 45 is exactly told in Isa. liii. 11:

"He shall bear their sins (away)," and in the next verse:

"He bore (away) the sins of many,"

"and was delivered (up) because of their iniquities."

The words "of many" are heard again in Mark xiv. 24, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many."

The word on which the poem closes (Isa. liii. 12) is "*paredothē*"—"He was delivered up." It comes twice in that verse. It can have the force of "he was betrayed." But the same word appears also at verse 6: "The Lord gave him up for our sins"—("*paredōken*"). St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xi. 23 bequeathed the word—if indeed it was not in use before 1 Corinthians was written—so that it is associated by our communion of Christians still with their most sacred prayer. "In the night in which he was delivered up," or "betrayed"—("*paredideto*.") No doubt this closing word of Isa. liii. vibrated in St. Paul's memory like the sound of a great bell that has been tolled and goes on sounding. The same word haunts Mark II. The warnings of the coming betrayal use it at ix. 31 and x. 33. In Chapter xiv. it sounds seven times. The Son of man is "delivered," "betrayed," into the hands of sinners (xiv. 41). Judas "gave Him up" to the chief priests (xiv. 10). The chief priests "gave Him up" to Pilate (xv. 1). Pilate "gave Him up" to those who

scourged and crucified Him (xv. 15). And "the hands of sinners" is another echo from the Psalms of the Septuagint.

You will find "the hand of sinners," twice: Psalm xxxv. 11, xcvi. 10. And "the hand of the sinner" three times: Ps. lxx. 4, lxxxii. 4, cxxxix. 4. And xl. 2: "deliver him not up into the hands of his enemy." And lxii. 10: "they shall be delivered up into the hands of the sword." And cv. 41: "he delivered them up into the hands of the enemy."

I will speak of two more quotations and so make an end: Mark xiv. 21, "Good were it for the man [through whom the Son of man is betrayed] if he had not been born."

This is quoted from Enoch xxxviii. 2:

"Where then will be the dwelling of the sinners,
And where the resting-place of those who have denied
the Lord of Spirits?

It had been good for them if they had not been born."

And one more, a Septuagint passage which suggests the darkening of the Crucifixion scene:—Amos viii. 9: "And it shall be in that day, saith the Lord, that the sun shall set at noon and on the earth the light shall be dark in the daytime."

CHAPTER IV

Indications of Re-writing in the Gospel of St. Mark

If it is the case that the Gospel of St. Mark as we read it now is a twice-written Gospel, the work of distinguishing the two writings and separating them will be one which will grow clearer as it goes on.

It will not be a work of judging at each step disconnectedly, This seems to be Mark I, or This seems to be Mark II, for you have to do with two continuous stories which the two writers have composed. It will be—if I may use the comparison—not like sorting out and selecting one at a time two kinds of beads or stones, unthreaded and loose, out of a mixed heap, but like disentangling and freeing and separating two strings of them; two entangled strings of them, sorted already to match each other and strung together to be two necklaces.

We are to separate from what does not belong to it the continuous story of Mark I. And also to identify as the work of Mark II, work which has a very definite and recognisable purpose running continuously all through it.

And, further, if it is possible to form some notion of the kind of language which is characteristic of Mark II, distinguishing his language from Mark I's language, by his use for example of Pauline words or of Septuagint quotations or of "Q" material; and if it is possible also to form some notion of his manner of telling his story, and of the ends he kept in view in the telling of it; we shall have "something to go by": we shall have "rules to guide us." In arguing the case I will begin by looking at places where it seems to me that the writing and the rewriting meet, and there are marks of discontinuity; places where alterations have been made, and there has been left a certain awkwardness, because

the "join" has not been left as smooth as you would expect one writer's uninterrupted writing to be.

In a small way, the kind of awkwardness of which I speak may be noticed where Mark II is fitting older material for his new book, it may be "Mark I," or "Q," or some old Christian traditional story. Mark II edits, and leaves marks of his editing the older material. You can see where the text has been "gone over again." As you read, for example, in Mark ii. 1-12, "Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven, or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power," etc.; no reader but is conscious of an awkwardness there in the telling of the story. And it is accounted for if you realise that Mark II has desired to insert—what was originally not there—a claim for "the Son of man" that he "hath power on earth to forgive sins." If you may leave out that parenthesis (verse 10); the story, Mark I's story, runs smoothly again.

Or again at ii. 16: "And the scribes of the Pharisees" is an awkward phrase. If I may conjecture that for some reason Mark II wishes to keep before the reader's mind for special blame "the Pharisees," then their genitive plural here is explained. So again at ii. 18 I find: "And the disciples of John and of the Pharisees were fasting, and they come"—it is so often in the oldest stories "they," a very undefined "they" who speak—"they come and say unto him, Why do John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees fast," etc.? The passage is much more comfortable if we may relieve it of "the Pharisees" in these two sentences. And the answer given is a most appropriate answer if it is to John Baptist's disciples that it is given. For they were "children of a bridechamber" from whom their "bridegroom" had been taken. But Mark II wants to give prominence to the Pharisees, and so they are here as an interpolation.

One of the breaks in Mark I which I conjecture is at ii. 12, where I suppose that Mark II leaves Mark I and inserts fifty verses of his own before he comes back to his next considerable borrowing from Mark I. It seems to me that

at Mark ii. 13, and again at Mark iii. 7, 9, Mark II is, as it were, trying to get on with his copying of Mark I, which he only reaches after two interruptions at Mark iv. 1.

He writes at ii. 13: "And he went forth by the sea side, and all the multitude resorted unto him." Then in Mark II the scene is changed to the house of Levi, and the multitude has disappeared, and there is a contention of the Pharisees.

But at iii. 7 the copying by Mark II out of Mark I begins over again, "And Jesus withdrew to the sea and a great multitude came unto him" . . . "And," [we get a little way on with our copying of the old story], "And he spake to his disciples that a little boat should wait on him because of the crowd."

Nothing happens about this little boat and this crowd; indeed at verse 13 Jesus has gone up into a mountain; the Twelve are appointed; there is the controversy, "He hath Beelzebub, and by the prince of the devils casteth he out the devils." And then once again at iv. 1 we take up the old story, "And [by the sea side] there was gathered unto him a very great multitude, so that he entered into a boat . . . and all the multitude were by the sea on the land. And he taught them."

When you do arrive at Chapter iv. you have, first, nine verses of the Parable of the Sower, and then at verse 10, hearers asking Jesus about it. At verses 10-25 there have been awkwardly inserted verses whose purpose is to add to Mark I's account Mark II's conception of a very special training of the Twelve Disciples. There was a multitude of hearers; but, according to Mark II's view, the teaching was not really for them. It was for the Twelve. Accordingly the Twelve are inserted at iv. 10. "And when he was alone, they that were about him—with the twelve—asked him of the parables." The Mark I account went on: "And he saith unto them [present tense], Know ye not this parable? and how shall ye know all the parables?" And then (I expect) in Mark I Jesus spoke another parable, iv. 26-29, and another, 30-32, and at 33 you read, "And with many such parables spake he unto them."

There is no suggestion in Mark I that when He spoke to

the multitude who had come in such enthusiasm to hear Him, Jesus knew that He was speaking to people who were predestined not to understand.

But as we read the story now, at iv. 10 the Twelve came and asked Him and "he said unto them [imperfect tense], Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God"—"mystery" does not look like a very early Christian word—"but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables." Could anything be more awkward than to have to reconcile this with the scene as Mark I had handed it on? And, if you look at the structure and the tenses of verses 10, 11, 12, 13, you will see that verses 11, 12 the moment you touch them come away, and verses 10, 13 come together and close up, leaving no sign of the join.

Then in Mark II an explanation of the parable follows (14-20), in which there is a suggestion of later days; days when persecution had come and had been too much for some Christians, and other Christians had by now had time to grow rich and worldly. That passage also very easily comes away, and there come away also along with it the quotations (21-25) from "Q"; "Q" Sayings which have been twisted and shaped a little so as to make them suggest that lamps are hidden and kept secret "in order that" they may be brought out presently and give light. It is Mark II making a parable of the purpose of God; the preparation of the Twelve Apostles—it is one of his special themes. The story as it was before he so changed it is not difficult to recover. You read verses 1-10, 13, 26-33, and Mark I is running clear before you.

Between iv. 33 and the next passage of Mark I, at v. 21, there are twenty-eight verses. In them Mark II is getting on with his account of the progress of the Gospel outwards; from Capernaum to Galilee; from Galilee to "the other side," that is, Decapolis; and from Decapolis to Tyre and Sidon. I cannot now trace any connection between Mark I's account of the Teaching from the little boat (iv. 33) and Mark I's account of the two miracles at Capernaum (v. 22). If there was a link in Mark I it does not appear now in Mark II. But the story would have run

more smoothly than it does if the boat had not gone (as it goes now) away to Gerasa and back. It was a small boat at iii. 9 and has become a big one at iv. 1 and iv. 36, 37. I find no traces of any old connection between the two scenes, but there is a certain awkwardness in the present connections. For just as "the seaside" comes in, in a kind of mistimed scene-shifting at ii. 13, when the place of interest is really Levi's house, so the "boat" and "the seaside" do not seem to be the right properties and scene at v. 21, 22, where the story tells of Jaira's little daughter and the crowd which delayed Jesus in the street on His way to her. And how did the crowd know that Jesus was coming just then from Gerasa? How long did they stand waiting on the shore?

But, at the next "juncture," when we go on from the scene of the raising up of the daughter of Jaira to the passage about Herod, I find a join between Mark I at v. 42 and Mark I at vi. 14, which suggests that the story as originally told by Mark I ran on with a smoothness of which Mark II's interpolation of fourteen verses has deprived it. The little girl was thought to have been dead. And it was known that Jesus had healed her. If you leave out fourteen verses and read on at vi. 14 the following verses gain a meaning which they have lost by the digression about "His own country" and The Mission of the Twelve.

Reading straight on from v. 42 to vi. 14 you have "King Herod" hearing at Tiberias, not that the disciples have gone out two and two, with staves but without wallets, and with sandals but without loaves—which would not greatly have interested "King" Herod—but you have Herod now hearing that someone six miles away across the lake has raised (so rumour says) a little girl from the dead. Rumour coming back from Tiberias to Capernaum said that Herod has believed the story and has said, It is John Baptist. People credited King Herod with a guilty conscience about the Baptist. He said, It is John whom I beheaded. Others remembering what the prophet Elijah had done for a small dead boy said, It is Elijah. This Tiberias talk repeated among Capernaum fishermen is a very natural sequel to

the miracle of Jāirus's house. And a natural sequel again of such court talk being repeated at Capernaum is found, if you leave out fifteen verses between vi. 29 and vi. 45 and go on at "And straightway Jesus constrained his disciples to enter into the boat to go to Bethsaida." It was desirable to leave Herod's country. St. Luke is obviously dissatisfied with St. Mark's account. And it is said, I understand, that the story of Herodias and Philip and the dancer daughter is difficult to reconcile with history. But it is with the stories that passed among the fishermen of Capernaum and not with history that it has to be reconciled, and no one will think the evidence which we have here to be less trustworthy evidence as to the movements of Jesus on the seashore or in the houses of Capernaum, because it may be mistaken about the marriages and ages and relationships of the Herod family. It is possible, although it is not certain, that Josephus was rightly informed about these.

At vi. 45 I become acutely conscious of what I have called "awkward joining." "And straightway he constrained his disciples to enter into a boat, and to go before unto the other side to Bethsaida." As Mark I tells the story it was natural to go to Bethsaida, for the intention was to leave the country of Herod. But then, Bethsaida was not "the other side." And at vi. 53, when once more they had "crossed over," you find them still at Gennesaret which is in Herod's country. After Mark vi. 45 there are seventy verses—I suggest that they are the work of Mark II—after which, at viii. 22, you come to the words, "And they came to Bethsaida."

One is almost vexed for Mark I's story thrown into such confusion. The miracle of Jāirus; the news of the miracle reaching Herod; the report of what Herod had said when he heard of it; the departure of Jesus out of Herod's country: vi. 45, "they entered into the boat to go to Bethsaida," and then—such a natural sequel—viii. 22, "and they came to Bethsaida." That is the first writing.

But Mark II has utterly confused this sequence, for Mark II has an entirely different objective in his rewriting

of the story. He is interested in the progress of the Gospel from Galilee and Jerusalem to (where he finds it in A.D. 65) Rome. He gives his account of it in a kind of allegorical drama, with a geography which "never was on land or sea." At vi. 1-6 Jesus is rejected by the Jews. Rejected by the old order He founds a new one, and sends out His Christian missionaries (vi. 7-13). At vi. 40-44, through the hands of the Twelve, who are the Hierarchy of a newly organised order, the multitude is fed. It is the Christian Breaking of Bread. Perhaps Mark II is thinking of the multitude of hearers attracted to the Church in Rome who came to "hear" and then are dismissed and go away; the Poor of Rome whose is to be the kingdom of heaven. They hear. They are admitted to some kind of charitable feast of Love: and then go. And then, when the multitude of hearers went away, there would happen something more like Jesus walking upon the sea and coming to be with the disciples in the boat. There would be the service of the Real Presence of Jesus with the innermost company of the Faithful. You will notice that the hearers are sent away, the "multitude" is dismissed, both at vi. 45 and at viii. 9. Jesus walking on the water (Mark II says) was no mere "apparition." "About the fourth watch of the night" it happened. Jesus was in the boat with the disciples. "The wind had ceased." One can partly imagine what such words as those may have signified to the Church in Nero's Rome.

At vii. 1-23 the gulf between the old order and the new is widening. The Pharisees appear again; one is not to ask where from, or how. They are needed for Mark II's train of thought, and so they are there. All that the Pharisees have been able to see in that Christian Breaking of Bread is that the disciples have eaten with "defiled, that is, unwashed hands." The alienation from the Pharisees is signified by the act of Jesus, vii. 24: "And from thence he arose and went into the borders of Tyre," and vii. 31: "and again he went out from the borders of Tyre, and came through Sidon." And the miracle of the feeding is repeated for a Gentile multitude. It is a miraculous feeding, not in Galilee this time, but in Decapolis.

All this is continuous and intelligible enough if you are following the writer's train of thought. Only he has thrust it in between vi. 45 (the embarking in the boat "to go to Bethsaida") and viii. 22 ("And they come unto Bethsaida"); and there remains that tell-tale awkwardness, that "bad join" which causes the reader to suspect that "make-shift" work has been done here: the words "Unto the other side to Bethsaida": and "Bethsaida" is not "the other side." For the moment it is this kind of suspect joinings that I am noticing.

Notice again, there is an obvious injury and bruising of the original material during a recasting of the text in the passage which follows (viii. 27-ix. 13). There you have clearly some of the original material remaining; some of it work which is of the same hand as vi. 14-17. Look at vi. 14-17: "and he said, John the Baptist is risen from the dead. But others said, It is Elijah. And others said, It is a prophet, even as one of the prophets. But Herod, when he heard [thereof] said, John, whom I beheaded, is risen."

Compare with that viii. 27-29: "And in the way Jesus asked his disciples, saying unto them, Who do men say that I am? And they tell him, saying, John the Baptist: and others Elijah; but others, one of the prophets. And he asked them, But who say ye that I am?" Here we are reading Mark I.

And again at Mark ix. 1, 11, 12a, 13a you are reading sentences of Mark I.

But, as it now stands, Mark viii. 27 to ix. 13 is very awkward reading. No one can have read it through and not felt the awkwardness. Someone is writing the story over again, and while he keeps where he can the older words, he is pursuing a purpose which is his own with which the older words fit badly.

You are here, in fact, at the climax of the work of Mark II. There is no alteration which he has made in Mark I which is more vital to him than this of supplementing the scene of Peter's Confession (viii. 27-29) with the scene of the Transfiguration (ix. 2-8). Presently we will consider of what material he composes the Transfiguration scene.

Just now I am saying to the reader, Can anything be plainer than that in Mark ix. 9-13 you have exactly that kind of awkwardness which would result from a second writer rewriting a story of which he will keep anything he can, and which nevertheless he is determined to make into his own story? There is the same kind of injury to the text at Mark ix. 33 to x. 16.

All the while the analogy is present to my mind of a twice-built wall, such as you will find in some old church-building. I would point to verses ix. 1 and ix. 11, 12, 13, or again ix. 33, 34, 35 and x. 15, as any day of the week someone will point to stones which appear in a later building and bear on their faces evidence, in their tooling or the like, of their belonging to a building of an earlier date. The verses have been twice used. And they have lost their old places and lost their relative positions during their second builder's use of them.

Look at Mark ix. 33: "And they came to Capernaum: and when he was in the house he asked them, what were ye reasoning in the way? But they held their peace: for they had disputed one with another in the way, who was the greatest." That is Mark I.

And Mark I went on (ix. 36): "And he took a little child, and set him in the midst of them . . . and he said unto them, . . ." and then I find Mark I's verse which once followed here removed now to Mark x. 15: "Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein." So I determine to read Mark ix. 33, 34, 36; x. 15 as Mark I. But then, to restore the original order, I must go back from Mark x. 15 and continue the reading of Mark I at Mark x. 13: "And they brought unto him little children, that he should touch them: and the disciples rebuked them. But when Jesus saw it, he was moved with indignation, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me; forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God."

In Mark I, restored and reunited, you have a story of Jesus (it is Dr. Bacon's suggestion) passing southwards and visiting Capernaum: making there a last visit. The disciples

are preoccupied with the unknown coming events; their coming visit to Jerusalem; the immense political or religious importance of their going; their own importance. "And Jesus took a little child, and set him in the midst." And then, if Mark I is not interrupted, "They"—I suppose it was the mothers (perhaps the grandmother too of whom we read Mark i. 30, in the opening scene of Mark I)—"they" brought other children, children smaller still, perhaps, than the little child of ix. 36. Their doing so is as natural as the disciples' masculine annoyance and "rebuke." The story runs so smoothly. But in among this straightforward story Mark II has introduced another "Q" Saying, and made out twenty-four verses of interruption, as a result of which, while in Mark I we are still in the house of Peter at Capernaum, or at the door of it saying Farewell; we have, in Mark II, wandered away into "the borders of Judaea beyond Jordan" and discussed divorce.

Well! let Mark I be our guide. Jesus and the disciples had said goodbye to the little children and the mothers and the grandmother, and were out upon the road.

x. 17. "And as he was going forth into the way, there ran one to him and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may [enter into the kingdom of heaven?] And Jesus looking upon him loved him, and said unto him, Come, follow me. But his countenance fell at the saying, and he went away sorrowful: for he was one that had great possessions." And Jesus spoke of this. "And Peter began to say unto him, Lo we have left all, and have followed thee. And Jesus said, Verily I say unto you"

You are at verse 29. I think few can have read Mark x. 29, 30, 31 without a sense that something untoward has happened to the text. The answer of Jesus, if it is to be taken quite literally, is that he who leaves one house will have a hundred houses, and he who leaves one field will have a hundred fields. Nothing could be less in keeping with the occasion. Let us restore the Saying which St. Matthew has preserved (in a highly apocalyptic version of it) at Matt. xix. 28. There Matthew has, "Verily I say

unto you, that you who have followed me, in the New Age when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, that ye shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Here, I suggest, is preserved a memory of what Mark II found in Mark I at Mark x. 29. Restore some simpler form of this Saying and read on (Mark x. 32): "And they were in the way, going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus was going before them: and they that followed were afraid" ["and they were amazed" which follows is a favourite word of Mark II, and it is so awkwardly placed here that the copyists have varied it in the different copies]. "They that followed were afraid and (x. 35) there came unto him James and John, the sons of Zebedee, saying unto him, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall ask of thee." And they ask for two thrones, one on the right hand and the other on the left hand.

CHAPTER V

Method and Object of Mark II

MARK II AND HIS DESIGNS

I HAVE perhaps spoken fully enough of the "joins" which can be perceived in the structure of the Gospel. Now let me speak of the composition of Mark II; of the purpose which he had in mind as he reconstructed the Gospel of Mark I.

What I take to be Mark II can be seen as one piece of work, in the first nine chapters of which there is one theme which advances steadily to its culmination in the Transfiguration. There are all sorts of cross-references which relate one part of it to another, until the whole comes together as of one design and one texture. I come to feel that when you remove Mark II from the complete Gospel, it "comes away all in one piece." And what is left behind is equally one consistent, straightforward piece of work.

The introductory verses Mark i. 1-13 are Mark II. The title which is "The Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" declares the purpose of the author. He found a Gospel of Jesus the Messiah. He transforms it into a Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

The new Gospel opened with the Baptist. "As it is written in Isaiah the prophet, The voice of one crying in the wilderness." I imagine that the Isaiah quotation stood there, in Mark II, first alone. And then Mark II has inserted (it is one of his awkwardnesses) from "Q" a quotation which is not Isaiah but Malachi.

He is clearly using "Q," for Matt. xi. 10 = Luke vii. 27, shows that "Q" had the quotation worded that way: "who shall prepare thy way before thee"—"who shall prepare thy way." And Malachi has "my way before me."

The introduction is Mark i. 1-13. And the first of what turn out to be Six Days of Mark II begins at i. 14.

There are about a hundred paragraphs of St. Mark, nearly all of which begin with an "and." The exceptions are i. 14; i. 32; vii. 24; viii. 1; x. 32; (Chapter xiii.); xiv. 1 and the end of Chapter xvi. Whenever there is a paragraph which does not begin with an "and," the singularity is a kind of signal to the readers or hearers of the story. It is so here. At Mark i. 14 the First Day begins. And, in his First Day (somewhere in verses i. 14-31), Mark II has begun to make use of Mark I. I think that his first deliberate interpolation into the material of Mark I can be traced at i. 23.

We read at i. 21: "And they go into Capernaum;" . . . this is Mark I . . . "and straightway" . . . ["straightway" comes so many times in St. Mark, I have suggested that it is generally Mark II who is responsible for it. It has been used until it sounds like a tiresome mannerism].

Mark i. 21: "and straightway on the sabbath day he entered into the synagogue and taught. And they were astonished at his teaching: for he taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes."

So far Mark I: but here Mark II interposes,

i. 23: "And straightway there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace [Be muzzled], and come out of him. And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What is this? a new teaching? with authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey him. And the report of him went out straightway everywhere into all the region of Galilee round about."

Mark II has taken up Mark I's "new teaching" and introduced a new kind of novelty, a new and not a nobler kind of wonder. Here Jesus is recognised (though the recognition seems to convey nothing to any human hearer) by the unclean spirit. He is acknowledged to be the Son of God. There are forty-one mentions of "demons" and "unclean spirits" in St. Mark now. I dare say they are all inserted by Mark II.

It is Mark II's conception that Jesus, the Son of God, enters here upon His conflict with the world-rulers of this darkness. It is as the Holy One of God that He is seen here. He next reveals Himself as such, in Mark II, in a companion-picture at iv. 35-41. The two pictures are by the same hand. The same Holy One of God is in the storm, and says again, Be muzzled. He is disappointed that the disciples have had any misgivings about His power. "Why are ye fearful? Have ye not yet faith? And they feared exceedingly, and said one to another, Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?" That scene in the boat is a companion-picture to this scene in the synagogue: "they were all amazed and questioned, What is this? a new teaching? with authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey him."

I called these companion-pictures, but of "Christ in the Storm" a closer companion-picture would be "Christ walking on the Waters." The two are two sea-pictures drawn in the same manner with the same feeling, by the same hand. "And he went up unto them into the boat"; "and the wind ceased"—it is the same words at Mark iv. 39 and vi. 51—"and they were sore amazed in themselves; for they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened."

Always in Mark II there is Jesus the Son of God who is not known and yet should be known as such, quelling unclean spirits, multiplying the loaves, stilling the storm, walking on the water. It is Mark II's purpose to present to the hearers his own conception of the Son of God. And as in comparing any other two sea-pictures a man might say, I feel confident that they are by the same hand, for there is the same feeling in them both, and then, if there were arguing, he might go on to argue that he was sure they are indeed the work of one artist because the material itself, the colours, the paints that the painter has used are the same; so here the materials of which the two pictures are composed are the same. For the Christ in the Storm is composed with the help of the Septuagint, Ps. xliii. (xliv.) 24, 25, 27, and the Book of Jonah i. 10, 16, etc. And

the Christ on the Waters is composed with the help of the Septuagint, Job ix. 8, 11 and Ps. xlvi. 2, 5, 10.

But it was only at Mark i. 23-28 that we had arrived. The incident of the Unclean Spirit has been introduced by Mark II into the story of Mark I. We return at Mark i. 29 to Mark I's story. It gives the first memory of Jesus coming to Capernaum and visiting the synagogue, and speaking with authority as the scribes did not speak. And then, in the house of Simon and Andrew [I think James and John are added at i. 19 and i. 29 by Mark II] Jesus healed Peter's mother-in-law. And the multitude crowded round the door, as soon as the sabbath was over and pious people had leave to carry their sick. Mark II has copied Mark I for us, but even when Mark II is following the story of Mark I, I think that the story is taking on a transcendental and mystical and symbolical aspect. Everything in the scene becomes significant. Simon and Andrew had been casting their drag-net and Jesus had spoken to them. But in A.D. 65 it can be seen how momentous is this event. It is something more than a personal memory. It is the calling of Apostles that has begun. For Mark II the Apostles require more than two representatives. Sometimes it is three names. Sometimes it is "Peter and James and John," almost as someone might say, "Abraham and Isaac and Jacob." Here (as in Mark xiii. 3) it is four. I find something symbolical and significant in James and John called from "mending their nets," which is a retrospective occupation requiring much attention to detail; called from their work with "their father," which suggests tradition; and called from being with the "hired" servants, which suggests merit and the winning of reward. So the sons of Zebedee are called out of Judaism to follow Christ. And it happens on the seashore. The "passing along by the sea," the being "on the seashore" becomes symbolical. The seashore becomes, as is suitable, a place significant of new departures. There is all the difference in Mark II between the synagogue, which is the stationary place, the place of souls that will not be moved, and the boat which will put out into the waters and become itself almost a

living thing. It is not always understood that Mark II has an allegorical use for "synagogues," and "houses," and "the seashore" and "waters of the sea" and "across the sea to the other side." Here Peter and Andrew and James and John are called "beside the sea." Mark II never degrades the Sea of Galilee as St. Luke does to the rank of a mere lake. The disciples are called "beside the sea."

So is Levi at ii. 14. And the seashore at ii. 14 seems to have been brought in, or made use of, so that Levi may be called in an appropriate setting. For, except symbolically, the seashore does not seem a particularly appropriate scene for the publican's work or the publican's home.

At i. 32 you find one of the paragraphs which does not begin with an "and." I think it is Mark I who is writing here, but the words of Mark I have suggested to Mark II the beginning of another day. "And at even when the sun did set," then for Galileans and Jews another day begins. So it is in Genesis, "and the evening and the morning were" . . . such and such a day. This is the beginning of Mark II's Second Day.

At iv. 35 and vi. 47 Mark II has said again "and when even was come," putting the words (his own this time) to introduce his Fifth and Sixth Days. The Third Day begins I think at iii. 7. The Fourth Day at iv. 1. At ix. 2 you read: "And after six days Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James, and John." It is as if Mark II were writing a new Six Days of a new Creation. He begins his book much as Genesis begins, "The beginning" is his first word. The same is, I believe, true of the Fourth Gospel: "In the beginning" for opening words: and the opening scenes, St. John i. 28, 29, 35, 43; ii. 1: a day, a next day, a next day, the day following, the third day. That would be six days of a new Creation, and the Seventh Day the Day of the Wedding Feast.

In the evening then (at i. 32) the Second Day of Mark II begins. i. 35 is its morning. That first early morning, after the most stirring events of yesterday, must have been memorable to Simon Peter. Read it, thinking of it as Protomarcian. They would after all that excitement have

gone to rest. They would sleep no doubt on the floor. And Peter's last consciousness as he fell asleep would be that he lay near Jesus. And Peter would wake early and, as consciousness returned, he would first be vaguely aware that life is good, and wonder why it is that he is vaguely happy, and then he would be conscious of the cause why he should wake this morning with a sense that his world was a new exciting world. He would look towards the place where Jesus had been lying close to him last thing last night. And the place was empty. Mark II has not edited the passage. Here would have been an occasion for an "and immediately"! It only says, "Simon and they that were with him followed after him." "All are seeking thee." And Jesus explains that He must go into other towns.

But Mark II is working out his own design. "Jesus went into their synagogues throughout all Galilee, preaching and casting out devils." It is forty-one times I think that they come into Mark II.

It is a public view of what is happening that Mark II takes, and so he leaves St. Peter and gathers together six examples of incidents in Jesus' ministry which were shocking to the Pharisees. In i. 40-45 (the Leper story) he has, no doubt, made use of an old story, but the use to which he is putting it can be seen if you will compare i. 44; vii. 10; x. 4. The three are a graduated series; three scenes all concerned with Moses.

(1) In i. 44 it is: "show thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing the things which Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them."

(2) In vii. 10: "for Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; . . . but ye say, etc. Ye no longer suffer him to do aught for his father or his mother, etc."

(3) In x. 4: "What did Moses command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement and to put her away. But Jesus said unto them, For your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment. But . . ."

In the first the command of Moses is the order that is to be obeyed. In the second the Pharisees are making the

commandment of Moses of no effect. In the third Moses himself is corrected. He is left behind. The three passages are one of the examples of Mark II's manner of composition. They are the work of the same workman, and his hand will be recognised in other "Threes," elsewhere.

I have looked in another essay at the material of which Mark II makes his Second Day, i. 32-iii. 6. It has been noticed that this group is rounded off with a sentence which seems premature: "They took counsel against him, how they might slay him." The presence of this sentence, for which Mark I so little prepares us, will be explained if the reader attends to the scheme of Mark II. The Third Day begins with the coming of a multitude who arrive from Judaea and Jerusalem, Idumea and beyond Jordan, and about Tyre and Sidon. It is preparing for what is to follow. Mark II is going to conduct his story away from the Jews as far as Tyre and Sidon.

The Third Day is the day of the Apostolical Calling of the Twelve, with only one illustrative incident. But the incident chosen is the story (from "Q") of a moment of decisive importance. It is the scene in which St. Luke says, "some of the people," and Mark II says, "the scribes from Jerusalem" explained the power of Jesus over "devils" as the power of the "Prince of the devils." So far were they alienated. They had blasphemed the Holy Spirit. But the followers of Jesus, sitting listening to Him there, saw Him turn and look at them, and heard Him say of them and to them, "Behold, my mother and my brethren!"

The Fourth Day is the day of the Parables, and at iv. 35, "and when even was come," the Fifth begins. It is the first sign of a ministry in Decapolis, a Gentile ministry. (iv. 35): "He saith unto them, Let us go over unto the other side." (v. 1): "They came to the other side of the sea." In Gerasa the "Legion" demoniac is typical and representative of what most repelled the faithful Jews, and the Christians educated in Jewish communities in the Gentile world. An unclean spirit dwelling in the tombs night and day crying out and cutting himself with stones, would be symbolic of what most horrified a pious Jew or a

converted Christian in the insane orgies they may have heard and shuddered to hear, in the night, at Rome or Corinth and Ephesus. Even cool scientific accounts of the Mystery Religions suggest that (not all, but) some of them were very vile. St. Paul speaks of the first century, St. Augustine of the fourth. There were rites about which Christians would be left imagining hideous things: the more so because it would seem to them, not candid, but unspeakably wicked to enquire more closely into their nature. The pagans more than repaid any injustice upon the Christians with their grisly suspicions and their talk of Thyestes and Oedipus, and "the secret crimes connected with the name."

The hand of Mark II is apparent in the awkwardness of verses 6, 7, 8, intruding into the older story. Mark II at 19, 20 has secured the first footing of Christianity into Gentile life. "Go to thy house unto thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee. And he went his way, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him: and all men did marvel." Meanwhile, in Mark I, Jesus has not left Capernaum.

Mark II's Fifth Day continues. It is a long one (iv. 35-vi. 44) for it has to include, rather uncomfortably, thirty-five verses of Mark I's story of Jairus and of his story of Herod and the Baptist. But it carries on the Church's story. Jesus in the ship, the ship is safe. [A ship in a storm has new meanings if one remembers the date as somewhere about Nero's year A.D. 64, described by Tacitus, who in that year had been a boy of ten years old, when even pagan Rome sickened at what Nero had done to the Christians.] The ship is safe: and comes to where the heathen "Legion" receives Jesus. Then, after a final rejection by the Synagogue (vi. 1-6) the Twelve were sent out. At vi. 30-44 is a scene in which you see the Church of Rome A.D. 65, the Church of the Christians whom Mark II knew. The "immense multitude" of whom Tacitus speaks is there. They are in the wilderness, but the wilderness for them has rejoiced and blossomed as the rose. They sat

down in ranks by hundreds and by fifties, companies, "flower-beds, flower-beds upon the green grass." The catacomb of St. Sebastian still has Peter and Paul's names scratched on broken bits of earthenware, "Peter and Paul, pray for us" and also "Paul and Peter, pray for us." And there are still the catacomb pictures of the Shepherd. One is to imagine a very early company of Christians listening to the Gospel, "He saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd." The same company would use the Septuagint Psalms (Ps. xxii. the Septuagint calls it): "The Lord shepherds me, nothing will be wanting for me, in a place of meadow land there he overshadowed me, by the water of refreshing he brought me up." And they would read Septuagint Isaiah. Isa. lv.: "As many as have no silver, come buy! Come, eat!"

"Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place," Jesus had said, "and rest awhile." It is the Psalm word for the "waters of rest." It is mystical, an allegory, all the way. The disciples had had to come away from Capernaum in Mark II because "they had no leisure so much as to eat." So they, hungry themselves, go and find the desert place full of hungry folk. And the satisfying of the disciples appears to be found in that "Give ye them to eat." St. John comments: "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me."

The disciples said, "Send them away, to buy," and again, "Shall we go and buy?" And instead they are told to give. "As poor and making many rich, as having nothing and yet possessing all things," they feed the multitude.

This is the activity of the Church in the pagan world, rather than the mystical life within the communion of the Church. The mystical life of the Church requires a further scene; it is waiting for something else. "And he cometh unto them walking on the sea. And he went up unto them into the boat, and the wind ceased." Pliny says: "They assemble before daylight and sing by turns a hymn to Christ as a god. Then they depart, and come together again" (at dawn for the Sacrament one supposes). This

sea is not the mere waters of the Lake of Galilee. It is a sea that Jesus walks on in that fourth watch of the night. Mark II has his own uses of words, his own use of the word "sea," for example.

At iv. 1, "He entered into a boat, and sat 'in the sea'"; that is a curious expression of Mark II. Mark I had had the rowing-boat ready at Mark iii. 9. Mark II allows the rowing boat to disappear. He changes it into a ship at iv. 1. And now, when Jesus would have been in the rowing-boat, Mark II says, He sat in the sea. "He entered into a ship and 'sat in the sea' and all the multitude were 'toward the sea' on the land." It is a curious expression.

Whatever memory of a Galilean fisherman lies behind these scenes, they have become in Mark II symbolical. In Mark II the scenes of an allegorical drama are passing before you.

Day Six begins at vi. 45. It has been composed and inserted between the beginning and the end of one of Mark I's sentences (Mark vi. 45): "And straightway—for fear of Herod—he constrained his disciples to enter into a (larger) boat, to go to Bethsaida"; (and viii. 22): "And they come unto Bethsaida." You will remember the stage reached. The Twelve chosen and then at work, and then returning from work, the Pharisees declared hostile, the multitude following Jesus (at vi. 33) as eagerly as "Peter and they that were with him" had followed Him (at i. 36).

It is a Galilean multitude still, or at least a multitude in Galilee. Now Jesus is drawing and almost pulling the disciples into the secret of His Mystery. There are the miracles of the Five thousand and the five loaves, and of the Walking on the Waters.

Meanwhile the multitude follow again (vi. 54). They are still on the seashore, the place of new departures, the place where adventure offers itself. Then, after another arguing with the hostile Pharisees, a passage closely related to St. Paul's Roman Epistle (which Mark II's readers would know very well for it was a letter written to them ten years ago), Jesus goes, Mark II says, to Tyre and Sidon.

In this search for Bethsaida—Bethsaida lost somehow,

though it lies in view across the water—on the way to Bethsaida, Jesus finds Tyre and Sidon. It is to be noted that He does not find Sidon and Tyre, which would have been the natural order as the story goes, but “he came from the borders of Tyre and came through Sidon unto the sea of Galilee.” Where did Mark II get this history and geography from? And where was the high mountain of Mark ix. 2? I was just now conjecturing that they came to him out of his religious and not his historical and geographical thinking.

“Woe unto thee Chorazin! Woe unto thee Bethsaida!
 For if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and
 Sidon which were done in you,
 They would have repented long ago in sackcloth and
 ashes.”

I dare say the sound of that Saying was a great deal more familiar to Mark II than any view of Bethsaida, or Tyre, or Sidon.

I have argued elsewhere that it is “Q” that has supplied the nomenclature which Mark II has used when he was to tell of Gentiles having accepted the Christian faith which Jews rejected.

He has told of Galileans, five thousand miraculously fed, and now he composes, as is his manner, a companion-picture. He gives you four thousand Gentiles miraculously fed. He changes the number of the “Twelve” baskets, and will not have them “*Kophinoi*”—Jewish baskets. But for the rest he simply repeats the earlier picture, introducing scarcely an original word, unless it is that “some of them came from far,” which may be an echo of Eph. ii. 13 and St. Paul’s quotation there of Isaiah: “You, Gentiles, who were once so far away.” And, between the two miracles of feeding, Mark II inserts a story of the mother who said that when the children have been “filled” the dogs under the table eat. The word “filled” comes at vi. 42 and viii. 8. And here between the two it comes, at vii. 27, in the Syrophoenician story. It is a favourite word in the Septuagint Psalms and perhaps became a favourite with Mark II. The Syrophoenician story could do quite well

without it. I dare say it is Mark II who has put it in at vii. 27.

Then he adds (a pair of companion-pictures again) two miracles which appear to have once belonged to one another. He places the first between Sidon and Decapolis, a deaf and dumb man healed, slowly healed. His ears were opened. His tongue was loosed. He is a representative heathen, like the heathens of whom we have glimpses in St. Paul's Epistles to Corinth or to Ephesus, "having no hope, and without God in the world." And the second miracle is placed in Bethsaida, at which the story has at last arrived. It is a miracle which very naturally and easily leads on towards the consummation, the Seventh Day, the Transfiguration. For here at viii. 22-ix. 8 Mark II has come to the decisive moment. Mark I had told of St. Peter confessing, Thou art the Messiah. Mark II will supplement that with Peter and James and John hearing the "Voice out of the cloud saying, This is my beloved Son: hear ye him."

As a prelude to these two scenes he has (viii. 22-26) the blind man cured of his blindness; first, half cured; then, seeing all things clearly.

As you read Mark I's verses viii. 27, 28, 29 you feel that they can scarcely have originally led straight on, as they do now, to that rebuff "Get thee behind me, Satan." Mark II has rewritten Mark I's story. He has much to add. For between Mark I and Mark II the Church's vision of Jesus has changed. Those letters, "Galatians" and "2 Corinthians" had come, and they had influenced thought. And the Roman Christians had had their Roman Epistle. And they had had St. Paul himself.

In the years A.D. 30 to 65 the first faith has lived and opened out. Jesus is not merely a Jewish Messiah whom it is possible for Jewish Christians to follow without any final severance from the Jews of the old faith. St. Paul had fought the question out in his mental fight of "Galatians." The Law slays. The Law is merciless to those who do honestly seek life through their own obedience to the Law. It is a matter of life and death to pass on beyond

the Law and confess Jesus as the Lord. Gal. ii. 19: "For I, through the law, died to the law, that I may live to God. I was crucified with Christ. But I live. I live yet not I, but Christ lives in me. And the life I live in the flesh, I live in faith, in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me."

And the Galatian Epistle, written (A.D. 50) speaks of Peter (or rather Kephas) as having hesitated to acknowledge the death through the Law to the Law. "How dost thou insist that the Gentiles must Judaize?"

One begins to see why the sight of the Bethsaida man was only half restored at first: "men as trees walking." And to see too, why Peter is spoken of as unable to receive the Lord's words about crucifixion. One begins to see why the "Q" Saying about taking up the Cross should come in at viii. 34. The vision of Jesus as the Son of God is what makes clear both the necessity and the possibility of the Christian self-surrender: "Let him deny himself, and take up his cross." "Whosoever would save his life shall lose it."

Mark viii. 30-38 is Mark II. Mark ix. 1 is Mark I. Mark II preserves these words of Mark I. But when Mark II uses them they have become mystical words. The words are these: "There be some here of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power." [St. Luke leaves out "with power."]

One has to make an effort of the imagination to transfer that language from its use as language which tells of an apocalyptic return of Jesus the Messiah, to its new use as language telling of the Son of God mystically abiding with His Church. Mark II has reached a phase of Christianity which has succeeded the Mark I phase. It satisfies him and it seems to him natural to transfer the words to a quite new use, to use them not of apocalypse but of mystical life. And so he passes from quoting Mark I to creating his supplement, the Transfiguration. To see Jesus in that mystical light is, for Mark II, to see "the kingdom of God come with power." At his writing of the Transfiguration scene, Mark II seems to have dipped his pen in the ink of

the St. Paul of 2 Cor. iii., iv., v. It is not merely that here and there an unusual word of St. Paul's 2 Corinthians is found again in Mark II. It is that St. Paul, in the intensity of feeling which still lives and glows in 2 Cor. iii., iv., v., has found words such as were needed to express the meaning which Mark II is trying to convey to his hearers in Mark ix. 2-8. It had been in order to say these very things that Mark II had begun to write at all.

In 2 Corinthians St. Paul is describing the experience of being a Christian in the figures of speech which come naturally to one who has been a devout Jew, and who compares his thoughts of Christ with the old thoughts he used to think of Moses in Horeb, and of the shining of Moses' face and of the voices out of the Cloud when the Old Law was given. St. Paul has found the real of which that was the shadow. The stress of his experiences, of which the Galatian and 2 Corinthian Epistles tell, takes him deeper and deeper into this mystery. 2 Cor. iv. 17: "Our light affliction which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory, while we look . . . at the things which are not seen." Or iv. 4: "The light of the Gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God [dawns on the Christian]." "God, who said, 'Light shall shine out of darkness,' has shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

St. Paul had arrived at this kind of thinking and speaking in 2 Corinthians, and Mark II has taken this thought and this language and is using them at ix. 2-8. There you reach his essential Gospel and Good-news. It is the Seventh Day of his week. St. Peter had seen less than this when Jesus was to him the Messiah. Even now St. Peter is represented as slow to see what this means. St. Peter's saying about the three tabernacles is not meant for the saying of one who has attained to the clear vision. And St. Peter still calls Jesus, Rabbi. It is the only time that Mark II uses "Rabbi."

I would close my remarks about the workmanship and plan of Mark II by drawing attention to his scheme of

The Three Disciples, Peter and James and John. This artificial arrangement of his story by itself might be enough to warn a reader that Mark II is not telling a story of things in the order and manner in which they actually happened, but is using symbolical means to say what he wants to say, speaking in parables. I think he would, for example, have been surprised if you had demurred to his Days having so many more than twenty-four hours.

Mark I had the story of Jairus, Chapter v., and into it (I believe) Mark II introduces verse 37. "And he suffered no man to follow him, save Peter, and James, and John the brother of James."

And at v. 40: "having put them all forth, he taketh the father of the child and her mother and them that were with him," and at 43: "and he charged them much that no man should know this." Remove the words and there is left no trace of their having been removed. The word "he taketh with him"—"*paralambanei*"—comes all the three times that the Three are admitted to go alone with Jesus. Here the miracle has been turned into a Mystery into which they only are initiated. "And he charged them much that no man should know this."

Then at ix. 2 comes the Transfiguration: "And after six days [we have seen the importance of that] Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James, and John, and bringeth them up [*anapherei*, it is no climbing up a mountain, it is being lifted and borne up] into a high mountain." [The mountain is not in the land of Syria, but in the Book of Exodus. Perhaps it is the same mystical mountain where ("Q" told the story) Jesus was tempted]: "into a high mountain apart by themselves: and he was 'transfigured' before them" [it is St. Paul's 2 Corinthians word]. The Vision follows: and Peter spoke unwise words, "For he wist not what to answer." [The explanation of this "wist not what to answer" appears later.] "And there came a cloud overshadowing them: and there came a voice out of the cloud [as in Exodus] a voice saying, This is my beloved Son: hear ye him."

Now turn to the third passage of the Three Disciples.

Mark II is using Mark I at Mark xiv. 32. "And they come unto a place which was named Gethsemane: and he saith unto his disciples, Sit ye here, while I pray."

Then Mark II repeats his phrase: "And [*paralambanei*'] he taketh with him Peter and James and John," . . . and goes on, "and he began to be greatly amazed [it is a characteristic Deuteromarkan word] and sore troubled."

"And he said unto them [it is a Septuagint quotation], My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death: abide ye here, and watch."

[Then Mark I again] "And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed . . ."

[But it is Mark II who adds] "that if it were possible, the hour might pass away from him." "And he said [as in Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6: words which the Greek-speaking Christians used], Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt" [continuing the Lord's Prayer].

[Mark I again] "And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon, sleepest thou? Coudest thou not watch one hour?"

[Mark II] "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation [again the Lord's Prayer]. The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" [which is Pauline language].

[Mark I] "And again he went away, and prayed,"

[Mark II] "saying the same words."

[Mark I] "And again he came, and found them sleeping, for their eyes were very heavy";

[Mark II] "and they wist not what to answer him." [Naturally enough here: and accounting by its presence here for its less appropriate appearance at Mark ix. 9 in the companion-picture.]

[Mark I] "And he [Mark II] cometh the third time, and"

[Mark I] "saith unto them,"

[Mark II] "Sleep on now, and take your rest: it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners."

[Mark I] "Arise, let us be going: behold he that betrayeth me is at hand."

It is mystical language suggesting much more than it can tell. But the story-telling has become formal as a piece of ritual. This third time the Three Disciples are alone with Jesus. And they sleep three times.

It is a dramatic representation of that into which no listeners or watchers ever entered. Mark II in his presentation of the Transfiguration and the Agony is attempting to tell in the symbols of human words what it would be for man to hear the Voice of God the Father commending the Son to mankind, and again, to hear the Voice of God the Son answering the Voice of the Father. It is a mystical formula of faith speaking to faith about the light of God which is known in the face of Jesus Christ.

It is as if Mark I had told men, This is what was seen and heard. His is surely a profoundly moving account. But then the Christian heart says, Yes, yes, but what does it mean? What was really happening? And Mark II goes over the account of Mark I. Brothers, shall we interpret it thus, and thus?

CHAPTER VI

Language: Early Christian Use of Words

WORDS, like coins, supply their own evidence of the time and place in which they were current; and the language used in different passages of St. Mark would enable a reader to distinguish earlier from later writing there, if only we were "numismatists" who knew more about these ancient coinages. Two easy examples of words which suggest their origin are the words "*Ephphatha*" and "*Talitha kumi*" (Mark vii. 34, v. 41). They are Jesus speaking in the Aramaic which was spoken in Galilee, and which would have been rarely heard in Antioch or Ephesus, or Corinth or Rome. And at the other end of a long journey, in Mark xii. 42, you read words which tell you that the widow's offering was "two mites"—"*lepta*" (the name appears still on the smaller modern Greek coinage), and then for readers in Rome it is explained that these two coins with the Greek name are equal in value to one Latin "*quadrans*" or farthing. When St. Luke comes in his copying to the story he copies out the "*lepta*" but leaves out the "*quadrans*." It is interesting to notice what St. Luke is doing there.

It has been noticed that there are some thirteen examples of Latin words in St. Mark. St. Luke, where he copies St. Mark, is each time disinclined to use Mark's Latin. The "centurion," for example, of Mark xv. 39 becomes, in Matt. xxvii. 54 and Luke xxiii. 47, a "*hecatontarch*"; and the rather homely bed—"*krabbatos*" of Mark ii. 4, 9, 11, 12 (from the Latin "*grabatus*") becomes a Greek bed—"*klinē*" in Matt. ix. 6; and in Luke v. 18, 19, 24, 25 once "a bed"—"*klinē*" and twice "a little bed"—"*klinidion*," and at the fourth mention of it, "that on which he lay" (borrowed from Mark ii. 4): all this to escape the Latin slang and also

to escape the Aramaic repetitions and rustic simplicity of speech with its "*grabatus*," "*grabatus*," four times in one short tale. Altogether you have the vocabulary itself bearing witness to quite a lot of travelling of St. Mark's story. The story was Galilean and went away to live in Rome. And then it went from Rome out into the Graeco-Roman world. And perhaps in Rome it picks up that slang word of the Latin, but then to go out among more cultivated people, its homeliness has been improved away by the rather literary Hellenist, St. Luke. So too the "sea" of Galilee caught sight of the great Mediterranean world and learned from St. Luke to be a "lake."

The word Syrophoenician in Mark vii. 26 affords evidence of its own. It comes where different writers have been at work, locating a miracle which Jesus worked for some foreign mother. The woman (as we have noticed) has been called "Hellenis"—"a Greek woman." The present description of her also says she was a "Syrophoenician by race." The story stands now in Mark II at a most critical moment. The Gospel is leaving the Jews and going out into the Greek-speaking world. Now no one who reads this story is likely to doubt that it is an authentic story of Jesus and some real foreigner mother, a story which Christians recalled when questions arose among them as to what would have been the will of the Lord with regard to Gentiles. This story and the story of the centurion in "Q" must have reinforced those who sided with St. Paul and others when the opposition arose of which St. Paul complains (1 Thess. ii. 16).

"The Jews: who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and drove us out, and please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they may be saved" The Syrophoenician story (one cannot doubt it) is a true account of some foreign mother's answer which induced Jesus to go past the "middle-wall of partition" which the Jews had set up between Jews and Gentiles.

But if it had happened in the country north-west of Galilee, it would not, to Galileans, have happened in Syrophoenicia. Syrophoenicia distinguished the Phoenicians of

Syria from the Phoenicians of Libya, of whose existence Simon and Andrew are not likely to have been aware. The India of the East would be simply India if one had no concern whatever with the West Indies. The name Syro-phoenicia comes and introduces itself to the Story on its voyage, as the Story travels from the Holy Land to Rome. And then—such restless living things are stories—the Syro-phoenician becomes (as I have elsewhere noticed) a “Hellenis”—a Greek woman, in spite of her remaining “a Syro-phoenician by race.” And for this kind of use of the name “Greek” one must look, I think, to Gal. iii. 28; 1 Cor. i. 22, 23, 24; x. 32; xii. 13 and Romans, six times, where a new manner of thought has invaded Christianity. For the mankind which the Church has to do with is, after a certain date, a mankind which is divided into Jews and Greeks. This talk of “Jews” and “Greeks” would be well advanced by the year 50. And by the year A.D. 100, at Ephesus, the Fourth Gospel speaks for a Christianity whose hope lies in the Greeks; for the Jews there is no hope.

So I would conjecture three stages of these words of Mark vii. 26. (1) a Phoenician; (2) a Syro-phoenician; (3) a Hellene-woman, a Syro-phoenician by race.

I named the words “*Talitha kumi*” and “*Ephphatha*” as words which still bear on their face traces of the place from which they came. They do not date the form of the story in which we have it now. But they do prove not less than that some Aramaic speaker has had a part in the transmission of them. It will be noticed that when Matthew and Luke come in their copying to Mark v. 41, the words “*Talitha koun*” disappear. The presence of the words in Mark is evidence of something. It would be an unimaginative reader that could read them with no quickening of emotion.

This passage, Mark v. 21-43, is one of those which are assigned to Mark I. And the other, the “*Ephphatha*” passage (Mark vii. 31-37) is assigned to the early “Q”-like document of which Mark II makes use. I believe that in a group of four passages (Mark iii. 20-30; iii. 31-35; vii. 31-37 (the “*Ephphatha*” passage) and viii. 11-13) Mark II is making use of “Q.” [The references in St. Luke are

Luke xi. 15-26; xi. 27, 28; xi. 14; xi. 29-32.] And here again there are traces of an Aramaic origin. For where we read "Beelzebub" we ought to read "Beelzeboul"—"the lord of the house" (this is Sir Edwyn Hoskyns's suggestion), and at once the two parable-Sayings, which are the answer of Jesus (Luke xi. 21, 22; Mark iii. 27 and Luke xi. 24-25), are seen to have a point which we were not noticing. The "lord of the house" defends his house. The "lord of the house" returns to his house. Who then is this who has expelled the unclean spirit from the house, the house which is a Human Soul? There cannot be two lords of the same house. It is what you might call "good-natured" to take their ugly Beelzeboul-word and use it so much more pleasantly. It is not unlike the Syrophoenician's answering-back.

In this rediscovered appositeness there is an evidence of the authenticity of this group of stories given by "Q," which is the more convincing inasmuch as it is evidence which has been found when it was almost but not quite obliterated; preserved unintentionally by translators who had no notion that it was there and was worth preserving. A similar evidence of authenticity in "Q" is found by Dr. Klausner where he returns to the Aramaic and finds the Baptist saying: "God is able of these stones (*abanim*) to raise up children (*banim*) to Abraham." But this is a digression.

We were to think of the early speech of the Church. One must all the time be trying to discover how Christian language grew. There would be changes if we could discover them which would come into the common thought of Christians, and manifest themselves in the common speech of Christians, as the years went on in the first generation of the Church's life. Perhaps to think of this is a task which requires an effort of the imagination. One must imagine, so far as one can, what would be the talk of Christians when they were—this was their essential distinction—the men who had had experience of what it was like to be with Jesus. They had had experience of what He was. They knew by heart many Sayings He had said. They were

beginning to be the people who were, later on, called Christians. But Christians had not yet been heard of. The thing was there, but it had no name.

There are expressions which we scarcely stop to notice, which yet must have taken time to come into common use. There would even have had to form itself a whole vocabulary of new words. Often, a thing itself would be there and there would be no name for the thing.

I will first speak of notions for which new words would need to be coined, such as, the "love" of Christians; the "grace" of our Lord Jesus Christ; "humility"; a special kind of Christian "patience" and "waiting." A name would be needed too for this "new message" itself, of which Christians are the bearers to an ever-widening world. There is at first no regular name for the Influence in which they go to bear it. It took time to say "the Holy Ghost." It is only by degrees that they found a title for Him who sent them and called Him "the Lord."

It requires an effort of the imagination now for Christians to conceive a time when the things themselves were there, but as yet the names which are so familiar now had not been found.

Consider, for example, that word "grace." As you read the Sermon on the Mount, the thing itself is there. It is the goodness of God; of God who is good to men because it is His Nature to be good, not because men have deserved that He should be good to them. "Your Father which is in heaven: he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust." This is the "grace" of God; and the recognition of it, the sense in His children that it is there, becomes "grace" in them and makes them also "gracious." It makes them men and women who win others and draw them into the same grace. Other good men had had various "virtues," but this lies outside and beyond any "virtues" which men can have as they go about and do not think of the goodness, the grace of God. If the sense of it touches any man, that man will have a new value among men. And a sense of all this is conveyed in Matt. v. 38-48. The thing itself has

come into our ken through the Aramaic of Galilee. And it is from the Aramaic that it passed, nameless as yet, and is found, still nameless, in the Greek of the first Christians. But as you watch the Greek you will see this thing which cannot tell its own name, coming into a language, learning to express itself. You will see the thing happening if you watch Matt. v. and Luke vi. for the first signs of words being found to tell of "grace." They do not come at once. Matt. v. 46: "If ye love them that love you, what reward have ye?" He chooses out a Greek word and says, What "*misthos*"? It is almost an ungracious word that St. Matthew uses, although he is talking of "grace." But it is exactly here that St. Luke has used the new word. We have it translated "thank." "What thank have ye?" What "*charis*"?

So where St. Matthew has:

"That ye may be sons of you Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust.

For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same?

And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others?

Do not the Gentiles the same?"

where St. Matthew says that, St. Luke has altered the language. He had been brought up to think kindly of several Gentiles himself! But St. Luke makes more important changes than that. He makes the "just and unjust" into "the kind" and "the unthankful," or "the ungracious" (*a-charistous*). And he uses his word "*charis*," "what thank have ye?" twice over (verses 32, 33). And for St. Matthew's "ye therefore shall be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect," St. Luke has substituted: "Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful." St. Luke has kept the word "reward" in verse 35, and this suggests that it is he and not St. Matthew who had departed from their common original, at Matt. v. 46; Luke vi. 32. A comparison of the language of St. Luke with the language of St. Matthew gives the reader a feeling of St. Luke making an advance

in the coining of a new Christian speech in which this "grace," which was already there, only wanting a name, found one by which the Christians could henceforward name it.

When we turn to St. Paul to see what stage he has reached in the use of this new Christian vocabulary we find that this word "*charis*" is already there, if only twice, in his earliest letter (1 Thess. i. 1 and v. 28). "*Charis* be with you and peace," and "the *Charis* of our Lord Jesus be with you." But his use of it and of kindred words grows more frequent from year to year. It, and other gracious words of joyous thankfulness, cannot remain for long unspoken where Christian folk are talking. At the moment, what I am chiefly noticing is this: first, the thing itself was there; and then, language was found to speak of it. And it gives a feeling of having got very near to the earliest beginnings of such things if, as in Matt. v. 38-48, you may see them, too new to have a name, and then go on to St. Luke and St. Paul and find names for them being invented or coming into common use.

It has the same kind of interest to consider the use of such Church words as "Apostles," or "Following," "Followers of the Lord." One may find it hard to imagine a time when Christians did not speak as a matter of course of "the Lord," "the Holy Spirit," "the preaching of the Gospel," "the Apostles," "the Followers," "the Word." But here too the thing is there first, and later a name is found for a thing. And I am going to say that the appearance of this vocabulary, which it now seems hard to imagine a Christianity *without*, is an indication, when you find it, that you are reading the Second and not the First Gospel of St. Mark.

I was struck by the manner in which even Mark II, as I suppose him to be, introduces the name "Apostles." He uses it once only in the Gospel—St. Luke uses it six times. He comes to it gradually, explaining as he comes, as if he were conscious that he must not hurry his hearers, but must prepare them to accept the new word in his version of the old story.

The word itself comes at Mark vi. 30. But vi. 30-34, etc. is the third of three closely connected passages, the other two being iii. 13-19; vi. 7-13. [Mark II is fond of "threes."]

(1) iii. 13, 14: "He appointed 'Twelve,' that they might be with him, and 'that he might send them forth' ("*apostell*" them) to preach."

(2) vi. 7: "He called unto him the 'Twelve' and began to 'send them forth' (to "*apostell*" them) two and two."

(3) And here, vi. 30: "The apostles gather themselves together unto Jesus." Mark has conferred on them their title. In A.D. 65 or so, for some reason, Mark II introduces the word as though it required introduction. It is one of the characteristics of the work of Mark II that he does introduce into the work of Mark I these three passages about the apostles. The Church is conscious of itself as an organised society. The highest title in Mark II's story of the Church is "Apostles." The account of the training of them occupies much of Mark II's attention. That is in A.D. 65. In Mark I all this is absent.

Or compare the use of the word "following" in Mark I and Mark II.

In Mark I "to follow Jesus" is quite simply to walk after Him while He walks before.

"Jesus went out from Capernaum," ix. 33; x. 17, "And as he was going forth into the way, there ran one to him, and kneeled to him . . . what shall I do? . . . And Jesus looking upon him, loved him, and he said unto him, . . . Come, follow me." And he failed. And Peter said, x. 28: "Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee."

"And (x. 32) they were going in the way, up to Jerusalem; and Jesus was going before them: . . . and they that followed were afraid . . ." x. 46, "and as he went out of Jericho, with his disciples and a great multitude, the son of Timaeus, . . . and he sprang up and came to Jesus . . . and straightway he received his sight and followed him in the way."

That is the earliest and simplest use of a word which so naturally came to be otherwise used, of Christian discipleship, of being Christians, the Followers of Christ.

You see the change happening in x. 17-22, where Mark II has amplified the story, quoted just now, of the man who came kneeling and said, What shall I do? There comes in a discussion of the commandments, and since by now (A.D. 65) it is an accepted doctrine that a man cannot be justified through the Law, this man is sent away to transact the considerable business of the sale of a great property: his "following" Jesus consists of his going away from Jesus and selling whatsoever he has and giving to the poor.

The one use would imperceptibly change into the other, but in Mark viii. 34, for example, "and he called unto him the multitude with his disciples, and said unto them, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me," the language is language of the later days. It is figurative, compared to that plain use of x. 22, "and Jesus was going before them; and they that followed were afraid." There the thought is of actual walking on a particular day and road from Capernaum towards Jerusalem.

These are the sort of distinctions to which I would call attention: distinctions between the earliest use, and the very nearly, but not quite earliest, Christian use of words. And then I would point to two signs which may cause a suspicion of unprimitiveness in words, and may lead to their being attributed to Mark II rather than Mark I. Where words have come to us as Pauline words, they must be examined so that you may decide, did Mark II get them perhaps from St. Paul's own letters or even from St. Paul himself? or do they possibly come from some more original source, and did they come to St. Paul from those who had heard Jesus use the words? And very much like this suspicion which attaches to "Pauline" words, is the suspicion of unprimitiveness which cannot be escaped by words which have come from the Septuagint. For St. Peter and St. Andrew, and St. James and St. John would have had nothing to do with the Septuagint in Capernaum. Naturally St. Paul and St. Luke and all the Greek-speaking Church would find their language forming itself by the help of the Septuagint. The Septuagint was their constant reading,

for Church-going, for Psalm-saying, for all their own personal religious feelings and thought and prayer.

I will take one very tiny indication of what I mean. At Mark v. 28 the timid invalid woman "came and touched his garment—(*himatiou*), for she said, If only I could touch his garments—(*himatiōn*) . . . and Jesus said, Who touched my garments?" It is a very ordinary word, "*himatiou*," "*himatiōn*." In St. Matthew (ix. 20), where he is copying St. Mark, "She came and touched the hem of his clothes," the word is "*kraspedou*." The same word is used in Luke viii. 44, "*kraspedou*." And this is disconcerting, because if Matthew and Luke both copied Mark, they ought surely never to agree together as against Mark. But here they both differ from Mark and they both use an unusual word, "*kraspedou*."

The explanation is that in the Septuagint, at Zech. viii. 23, it says: "In those days it shall come to pass that ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations, shall even take hold of the 'skirt'—(*kraspedou*)—of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you."

When the Church, reading its Septuagint, saw this thing which Zech. viii. had foretold actually happening in the world, and a kind of parable of it all in St. Mark's story, it would be felt that Zechariah's word was the word we should like to use here. And St. Luke and St. Matthew used it. But Mark I, telling his story in the simplest words that happened to come to him, used the word "*himatia*"—"clothes." That is Mark I. But Mark II does use this word "*kraspedou*." You will find it at Mark vi. 56, where Mark II is summing up a certain stage he has arrived at in his account of the ministry of Jesus. It is a moment when the multitude is being drawn towards Jesus, and the Pharisees are being repelled, and Jesus is on the way to "Tyre and Sidon" to visit (according to Mark II) the men of whom the prophet had spoken, "men out of all the languages of the nations." Then Mark II says "*kraspedou*."

I spoke of the word "following" as passing from simpler

to more technical use. And a similar change comes over the word for being "made whole," being "saved"—(*sōzein*). It is used fourteen times in the Gospel. At the beginning of the Christian life-story of this word it is used by Mark I of the little girl at Capernaum, and the woman who had been ill twelve years (v. 23, 28, 34). And again of the blind son of Timaeus who sees (x. 52). But there comes in another use of the word. Its use runs into the use of another phrase. At x. 25 Mark I speaks of the would-be disciple's enquiries about "entering into the kingdom of God." The expression is used by Mark I and by Mark II also. It is used in a "Q" passage (in Mark ix. 43-47) by Mark II. There Mark II has used three sentences, "enter into life" (43), and "enter into life" (45), and "enter into the kingdom of God" (47), as if they are exactly equal. Here, at x. 25, Jesus speaks (it is Mark I who tells the story) of the rich man "entering into the kingdom of God," and the disciples answering (I think it is Mark II's hand here), "Then who can be saved"? I date these phrases of "entering into life" and "being saved" later than the phrase, "entering into the kingdom." But even the words "entering into the kingdom of God" are not quite primitive.

In Galilee and Jerusalem they would have said (as Matthew is accustomed to say, and as he found it no doubt in "Q"), they would all have said, "into the kingdom of heaven." Mark I, writing in Rome, would say, "into the kingdom of God," using the name of God, a thing which piety forbade men in Jerusalem to do. St. Paul uses "the kingdom of God" ten times, but in Ephesians and Colossians he begins to vary his words, the kingdom "of the Son," and "of the Christ and of God." It is another example of the restlessness of words. They are like living creatures.

Mark II uses the phrases, "entering into life" and "being saved." There are three certainly late passages, passages later than Mark II (Mark xiii. 13, 20 and xvi. 16), and in all of these the word "saved" has taken on its theological meaning (the meaning which St. Paul has given to the word from Thessalonians onwards): xiii. 13, "He that endures to the end shall be saved"; xiii. 20 (with a less definitely

mystical force), "If the Lord had not shortened the days no flesh could have been saved; xvi. 16, "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." This, from the admittedly late addition at the end of the Gospel, shows the final stage of the process. It is no part of the original Christian tradition that Jesus ever said that. It is not in Mark I nor in Mark II, but in a sort of Mark III.

At xv. 30 "Save thyself," and xv. 31 "He saved others, himself he cannot save," seem to me the writing of Mark II. The word there could have various meanings. I suggest that here it is Mark II who is using words capable of the simplest meaning, but using them as suggesting notions of which the supposed speakers could have had no notion. It is a kind of "irony" which is found again in the Fourth Gospel.

Of the words of the Pauline vocabulary which has found its way into Mark II I will give two examples. They are both of them important words. The first shall be Mark ix. 2: "And he was transfigured before them"—("metemorphōthē"). It is the word used in 2 Cor. iii. 18, "We all, with unveiled face, reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed—"(*metamorphoumetha*)"—into the same image from glory to glory"; and the other, Mark xiv. 58, "I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands"—("cheiropoiēton"), (*a-cheiropoiēton*). In 2 Cor. v. 1 St. Paul speaks of a transfigured body of the soul in another life, which is a house "not made with hands"—("a-cheiropoiēton").

Both words will be felt to be unusual words. St. Paul has turned to the Septuagint and with its help has coined new expressions for Christian use. The words would be unknown to Mark I. They are very unlike his manner. But in Mark II they appear. He borrows them from St. Paul. And their appearance dates the passages where they are found in use. Mark ix. 2 is later writing. Mark xiv. 58 is later writing.

Close to 2 Cor. iii. 18, in 2 Cor. iii. 14, is another important

word, "but their minds were dulled," "were hardened"—("epōrōthē"). This word again seems to have come to Mark II through St. Paul. It carries with it, like the two words last spoken of, many associations.

St. Paul may have found it in the Septuagint. It is used in Job xvii. 7. At any rate, the process of which it speaks is familiar in the Septuagint. St. Paul called it "*pōrōsis*," and the process is one in which Mark II is deeply interested. It is the dulling and deadening of heart which St. Paul watched in his fellow-countrymen who rejected him and his Lord. While it is happening, St. Paul becomes convinced that it is divinely predestinated. When it has happened Mark II speaks as if, for the Pharisees, there had from the beginning been no escape. Before the great sin of the Jews had been sinned, Jesus had three times said—so Mark II tells the story—that they would sin it. It is St. Paul's word, this "*pōrōsis*," in Rom. xi. 7, 25. Only the elect escaped it, the rest ("*epōrōthēsan*") were hardened. And in Rom. xi. 25 this hardening—("pōrōsis")—"has happened in part to Israel," in the providence of God.

From St. Paul in 2 Corinthians, Romans (and Ephesians) it passes to Mark II, and in Mark iii. 5; vi. 52; viii. 17 the word appears as Mark II records the process of this alienation of the Jews—"the scribes," "the Pharisees" is what Mark II calls them—until he comes to the Crucifixion scene. Mark iii. 5: "Jesus looked round about in anger, for he was grieved at the hardening of their hearts." The Pharisees go on inevitably in this growing alienation. The disciples are rescued from it. Mark II uses the same word when he is telling of the disciples' failure to see who Jesus is when He walked on the water. "They were beyond measure amazed, for they understood not concerning the loaves, for their hearts were hardened." And again, after Mark II's second miracle of loaves, Jesus asks them, "Why reason ye because ye have not a loaf? Do ye not perceive, neither understand? Have ye your heart hardened? having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember?" Have ye your heart "*pepōrōmenēn*"? (viii. 17). The Pauline word is recognisable there as coming from

2 Cor. iii. 14. Mark II uses it at Mark viii. 17. And its presence at Mark viii. 17 connects that conversation of Jesus and the disciples in the boat (viii. 14-21) with the Vision in the mountain. The word for transfiguration at Mark ix. 2—(*metemorphōthē*) is a stone hewn from the same quarry as the word "*pepōrōmenēn*" in Mark viii. 17. "*Metamorphoumetha*" comes from 2 Cor. iii. 18.

These are the kind of linguistic indications which suggest that the same writer, writing late enough to have assimilated the thought and language of 2 Corinthians, has been at work here in one passage and another, altering a story of which the climax was Peter's confession of the Messiah into a story of which the climax is, "This is my Beloved Son, hear ye him.

CHAPTER VII

Names by which the First Christians Spoke of Our Lord

RABBI—THE SON OF MAN—THE LORD— THE SON OF GOD

A READER has only to attend to the names used to name our Lord in the Gospel of St. Mark to be persuaded that at any rate two very different conceptions of the ministry of our Lord are to be found side by side in the Gospel as we read it now. One earlier and simpler, and another, or others, offering a less simple representation. The parting of the simpler and the less simple ways of thinking and speaking can be seen at the scene in the Capernaum synagogue (i. 21-28).

In Mark I Jesus taught in the synagogue. And they were astonished at the authority with which He spoke. Of what kind was His authority, His influence, His ascendancy over men, the story that follows will declare. Mark I says no more as yet. That is enough.

But Mark II at this point introduces into the account of Mark I an illustration of the quality of the authority of Jesus. He tells of Jesus, as he and the Church now think of Him, as the Son of God come to join battle with the unseen enemies of mankind. The selected manifestation of these malignant and diabolical influences is "an unclean spirit" such as no doubt it was a part of the experience of the early Church everywhere to combat. Pagan writers give us a notion of the Graeco-Roman world haunted by ghostly enemies able to do all kinds of injury to human flesh and blood.

A whole century later, Marcus Aurelius is grateful to

Diognetus who has weaned him of "belief in the exorcizing of demons and such like marvels." The emperor was a lonely philosopher enjoying a rare liberty from superstitious terror, and our Christian writings have plenty of pagan company to join them in bearing witness to the difference between the Mediterranean world in the first and second centuries and modern centuries in Europe where fears are of another kind.

During the interval between the Lord's ministry and the year A.D. 65, the Church has arrived at an accepted way of saying who Jesus of Nazareth was. Christian thought about Him has become more articulate. There have been found words to denote what, I suppose, can never be expressed. And when Mark II wishes to put before men what Jesus was, he is not content to speak of an authority quite unlike anything to which men were accustomed in the scribes. He gives a scene of Jesus with divine authority commanding an unclean spirit and of the unclean spirit recognising its adversary as divine: "I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God." At the coming of the Son of God among human lives the powers of Hell's darkness cry out in alarm. The difference between the two Marks is in great part a difference of emphasis. Mark I tells of a new Teacher, One who taught with authority. But he goes on to tell of His having a mysterious power to bring healing where He came. Mark I tells of miracles as Mark II tells of miracles. But Mark I tells his story more simply. He is content to say what happened and to leave that to speak for itself. After teaching in the synagogue Jesus goes to the fisherman's house and takes the sick woman by the hand, and she is well; and the rumour of the cure brings, the same evening, a multitude to the house door. "And many," he says [not "all": he does not say "all": it is Matthew (viii. 16) who says "all"] "many were healed." Then Jesus, in Mark I, goes away from the town out into the open country and the hills, and his new friends go in pursuit to bring Him back.

Presently He is back in Capernaum, and one is brought of those who were left unhealed "some days" ago [in Matt.

viii. 16 there would be none such left]. One paralysed man is brought, in spite of the multitude that blocks the street and the doorway and the court of the house, and the sick man is let down by his four friends through the roof; the roof, I suppose, of Peter's house. And Jesus says, Thy sins are forgiven. Jesus said that: as well as cured the palsied man.

The greatness of the multitude causes Jesus to move away to the seaside, and there from the boat He teaches the multitude gathered on the shore. In Mark I Jesus taught in parables a multitude of people such as would best understand teaching in parables. It was the kind of thinking which appealed to them. Mark I gives three examples of the parable-teaching. When they asked Jesus about the first parable He told them two more parables to help out the meaning of the first. He uses for the kingdom of God the analogy of Nature. Sowing goes on, and corn is reaped. Though one seed and another and another comes to nothing, men still sow corn. And the corn grows, whether the man who sowed the seed is conscious of its growing or not. And when the time is come for the harvest, then there will come the harvest. If Mark I recorded no more than this, what he has recorded implies much, and throws light on the attitude of mind of the hearers and the manner of message which Jesus delivered. Jesus spoke, it is clear, of the coming of the kingdom, and to an audience prepared to receive an announcement that the kingdom was coming. Mark I tells nothing but that at present.

Still at Capernaum, Jesus is next seen in Mark I working two works of wonder; the healing of the woman who delayed Him, and the raising of the little daughter of Jāirus. And Herod heard of this miracle and it became dangerous to stay in Herod's country, and Jesus and the disciples withdrew to Bethsaida and to Caesarea Philippi. There Peter says the words, Thou art the Messiah. And Jesus (as I suppose Mark I to have told his story) foretells the coming of the kingdom with power. The time of violence and oppression, the time of such acts as Herod's crime, is near its end.

From the scene of St. Peter's confession Mark I's story moves very directly to Jerusalem; through Capernaum and Jericho to Jerusalem and the cleansing of the temple, and the inevitable consequence, the Crucifixion.

That is a simple consistent clear account. In it Jesus is represented by Mark I as Rabbi, however, unlike other Rabbis. Twice the Aramaic "Rabbi" is given. He is still "teacher" (the Greek "*didaskalos*"), four times. The friends of Jairus say, "do not trouble the Teacher further" (v. 35). The would-be disciple, the rich man who thinks of becoming disciple, calls Him "Good Teacher" (x. 17), and James and John's request is to their Teacher (x. 35). The disciples who call Him to admire the temple buildings say, Teacher (xiii. 1). "Rabbi" is Peter's word when they see the fig tree withered (xi. 21). Judas as he kisses Him says, Rabbi, Rabbi. At Jericho the son of Timaeus, who also calls Him Son of David, uses the expression "Rabboni," or "great Teacher" (Mark x. 51).

It is natural to think that in this shorter and earlier account the use of the Aramaic is a sign of accurate remembering. But such memories would not necessarily long retain their vividness. If you pass from Mark to Matthew you can see the distinctions fading. When the son of Timaeus acclaims Jesus as Son of David the title is felt to be full of significance, and no doubt it was the blind man's cry that suggested to the multitude their Palm Sunday shout of triumph at Jerusalem, their acclamation of "the kingdom of our father David which cometh." In Mark I that first use of the title "Son of David" is felt to have a very great significance. But the historical significance of this use of the title is lost sight of in Matthew who uses it quite inappropriately at xii. 23. Matthew has introduced it into the scene of Jesus casting out a dumb spirit, where St. Luke's copy of the same passage suggests that "Q" knew nothing of Jesus being so addressed.

And Matthew also makes the "Chananaean" woman (the Marcan "Syrophoenician") call Jesus "Son of David." This is the same kind of indifference to historical development as we find elsewhere. An extreme example is found in the

Fourth Evangelist (John i. 41) where Andrew finds Simon and tells him, We have found the Messiah (which is, being interpreted, Christ). "And he brought him to Jesus." The wonder of the discovery, so gradually arrived at and so momentous in Mark viii. 29, has vanished from the Church's recollection, so that in John vi. 68 Simon Peter must now say something more than Thou art the Christ, when he arrives at the moment of Mark viii. 29. In the Fourth Gospel he has to say, "Lord, to whom shall we go away? Thou hast the sayings of eternal life. And we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God." So as time passes any clear outlines of history are lost.

Matt. xv. 22 has "O Lord, Thou Son of David" as what the Chananæan said. "The Son of David" is an anachronism. It is not due until those days at Jericho and Jerusalem. And the "Lord" is an anachronism too. It arises out of the Greek woman (Mark vii. 28) calling Jesus, Sir. "Sir" is "*Kurios*" in common Greek. But "*Kurios*" is also "the Lord" in Septuagint Greek, from which it came to be used as the name of our Lord later. As yet Peter was saying Rabbi. In Rome it is still remembered that Peter had said Rabbi, when he spoke to Jesus, and it was remembered, so long after, that Judas said it twice when he betrayed his master, Rabbi! Rabbi!

The use of Mark II begins to move away from the use of Mark I. Yet Mark II makes Peter use the Aramaic "Rabbi" in his own special Transfiguration scene. It may be as a reminder that Peter is still a backward Christian. "Rabbi, it is good that we are here. We can make three tabernacles." The remark is not intended to sound like a wise remark. It is in this one utterance of Peter only that Mark II has used "Rabbi." But Mark II has "*didaskalos*" six times. He uses it when he is using the old traditional stories. In the same way he has allowed it to remain when he was using Mark I. It has puzzled readers that the message is sent to the owners of the colt at Mark xi. 3 in the name of "the Lord." The explanation will be that it is Mark II who is writing there and not Mark I. This is an exceptional, you might say a unique use, even in Mark II. More often

Mark II uses the title, the Son of man. It will be necessary to consider his use of this name separately further on. Meanwhile I will look at the use of the word "*Kurios*" in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and notice that in their copying they take it for granted that people addressed Jesus as "Lord."

Matthew has three times "*Kyrie eleison.*" In St. Matthew's day the Church would, no doubt, already be using the words in prayer. For Christians found it ready for their use: found it many times repeated in the Septuagint Psalms. Matthew, for example, changes the Syrophoenician woman's "Sir" in Mark vii. 28 into this Psalm quotation, *Eleison me, kurie* (Matt. xv. 22).

At Mark ix. 5 the "Rabbi" of St. Peter's saying: "Rabbi, it is good that we are here," is changed by Matthew (xvii. 4) to "*Kyrie*," and by Luke (ix. 33) to "*Epistata*," which means a Master of workmen, not of scholars.

In one chapter, in Matt. viii., "*Kyrie*" is used five times: (1) viii. 2, Matthew adds it to Mark i. 40; (2), (3) viii. 6, Matthew has it twice where Luke vii. 6 has it once in their copying of "Q" [it would appear then that "Q" had it once at least: which it is important to notice]; (4) viii. 21, Matthew has it, and not Luke (ix. 59); (5) viii. 25, Mark iv. 38 has "*Didaskalos*," Matthew has "*Kurios*."

Also, "Q" tells of a Saying in which ineffective Christians are thought of as greeting the returning Lord with, "*Kyrie, Kyrie*." The Saying is evidence of the Church's use. It must have begun early. Altogether it is noteworthy that in all Mark II, "*Kurios*" should come but once, and in Mark I not at all.

The use of "Lord" is then a sign of a writer's "later" date; but not of a "late" date; not late as in the Gospels we count lateness. It is surely a thing that will strike the imagination of some people, to discover themselves making their way so far back into the memories of Christianity as to find Christians not yet calling Jesus "Lord." Already when St. Paul is writing his very earliest Epistles the custom is entirely familiar. A little more than twenty years had passed, and now Jesus was the "Lord" and the disciples

were "the Apostles." But Mark I does not know the names. And even Mark II uses "the Lord" of Jesus once, if at all; and "Apostles" of the Twelve once only. A Rabbi has learners, and the Lord has Apostles. It is a significant development.

But, in a consideration of what was happening in those twenty years, the name which most arrests attention is "the Son of man." I must turn to the consideration of this name.

Jesus is called "the Son of man." The name comes from a very striking passage in the Book of Daniel, Chapter vii. It is after the casting down of the thrones of the four Animal kingdoms, lion-like, bear-like, leopard-like, and the fourth like nothing ever seen before, a beast dreadful and terrible. vii. 9. "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. 10. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousands and thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. 11. I beheld then because of the voice . . . the beast was slain 13. I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. 14. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." The savage animal powers pass away and a human greatness succeeds: "One like unto a Son of man."

It is from this passage ultimately that the name "the Son of man" comes into the Church's use.

The name has been much discussed. It is found fourteen times in St. Mark and eight times in "Q." My contention is that in the Gospel according to St. Mark it is used by Mark II and not by Mark I. I believe it to have been in use in the Church in the earliest years of the Church, at Jerusalem especially. It goes back almost; almost but not quite, to the days of our Lord on earth. The Church,

expecting His immediate return, conceived that Advent as being like the vision of Dan. vii. 9-14. Such a conception would occupy for a while the whole mental outlook of many Christians. It would be a kind of formula in which they would seem to themselves to express all that they believed about their Lord. He would be habitually thought of as "the Son of man." Stories of Him would, before many years had passed, take for granted that He himself had spoken of himself as "the Son of man." This would be during the apocalyptic phase of the life of the Church. And the name has survived when the phase has passed. The name remains. For all the stories that have survived from the beginning, have of course, come down to later times through that apocalyptic phase. There is no road from the year 30 to the year 60 which does not pass through the years 40 and 50. The task now is to imagine what changes were made during this passage; and to discount, if it is possible, whatever marks the stories as having travelled to us through those years. I believe the name "the Son of man" to be one of them. In St. Mark and "Q," as I say, it is present twenty-two times; used often as if it had little or no connection with Daniel's vision.

There is no choice for us but to examine one by one the fourteen examples in St. Mark's Gospel.

(1) At ii. 10, "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he saith to the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise"

This is a passage very awkwardly put together. And the awkwardness would disappear if the sentence about "the Son of man" were ruled out as Mark II's interpolation into Mark I.

"Let it be granted" that Mark I wrote straight on from verse 9, to "[then] saith he to the sick of the palsy, I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed"

(2) At. ii. 28, about the sabbath day in the cornfields, Mark I's story ended with a final saying: "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath." Could words have greater finality? One can only be astonished that anyone should have ventured to add anything to that:

even the words, "so that the Son of man is lord even of the sabbath." And yet the earliest copyists of it known to us, that is to say, St. Matthew and St. Luke, have both of them preferred Mark II's secondary conclusion. And then, perceiving that one story cannot rightly have more than one conclusion, they have left out the genuine and primary Saying of our Lord.

(3), (4), (5) viii. 31, ix. 31 and x. 33 go together. I have already thrown doubt upon them because they conform to Mark II's characteristic love of pattern and design in his story-telling. They are a prophecy after the event. As they stand now they do most dreadfully decide the doing of the deed before ever it has been done. They are designed in the pattern of the "Three-times-over" story-telling which belongs to story-telling rather than to actual life.

(6) The passage at Mark viii. 38 is found also in Matt. x. 32, and there the name "Son of man" has not yet been inserted. "Q" uses elsewhere the name "the Son of man," but does not use it in this passage. A converse example is Mark iii. 28, which speaks of "blasphemy against the sons of men." The "Q" version, given at Matt. xii. 32 and Luke xii. 10, has fallen into an error which is the slip of someone hearing the words "sons of men" and introducing in consequence the name "Son of man" into the Saying. But Mark iii. 28 remains to explain how the mistake of "Q" has arisen, and to correct it. Thus, Matt. x. 32 warns us against being misled by Mark viii. 38, and Mark iii. 28 against being misled by Matt. xii. 32.

(7), (8) ix. 9, 12 is one of the injunctions to be silent which are characteristic of Mark II's working into Mark I's story his theory of the Concealed Divinity of Jesus.

(9) x. 45 is a very important verse. (x. 42-45):

"Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the
Gentiles

lord it over them," . . . down to . . .

"Whosoever would be first among you,
shall be servant of all."

This would sound like a final word, if our ears were not

accustomed to the further sentences with which the Saying closes now:

“For verily the Son of man came
not to be ministered unto, but to minister,
And to give his life a ransom for many.”

St. Matthew (xx. 28) has copied this word for word, seventeen Greek words. But Luke xxii. 27, 28 suggests that St. Luke had in his version of “Q” a passage similar to the passage which Mark II is copying here. It is probable then that Mark II and Luke are both using “Q” and Matthew is using Mark. And Luke says nothing about “the Son of man.” “Q” said nothing either.

Luke has (xxii. 27), “whether is greater,
he that sitteth at meat or he that serveth (that
‘ministers’)?

is not he that sitteth at meat?

but I am among you as he that serveth (‘ministers’).”

It looks as if Mark II has taken from “Q” the words “not to be ministered unto, but to minister.” There remain the words, “the Son of man came” and the words, “to give his life a ransom for many.” I suggest that Mark II is responsible both for the “Son of man,” and for “to give his life a ransom for many.”

The name “the Son of man” becomes more and more suspect of being unprimitive, for I have found reason to suspect it in eight examples already. And here the company in which it comes is a quotation from the Septuagint.

This ninth example of the use of “the Son of man” comes in company with a quotation from the Septuagint Isaiah. It was not the very earliest Christians who saw that Isa. liii. was, in effect, an account of what had happened in their days, a vision seen long before of the Passion of our Lord. If I turn to the series of St. Paul’s letters, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Romans, I can see (in those years (say) A.D. 50 to 55) that 1 and 2 Thessalonians do not use Isa. liii. Gal. i. 15 uses xlix. 1 and alludes to “the Suffering Servant,” but—and surely this is very significant—St. Paul applies the Saying about the Suffering Servant not to his Lord but to himself. He

could scarcely have done that; he would have done anything rather than that; if, at that time, Isa. xlix. 1 had been habitually applied to the Lord.

It is only when you come to Rom. iv. 25 that you find St. Paul for the first time identifying our Lord with the Suffering Servant, "He was given up" or "betrayed" "for (our) sins." So far as we know, this (in A.D. 55) is the first time it has occurred to Christian hearts to do this thing. If so, Rom. iv. 25, quoting Septuagint Isa. liii. 12, is the well-spring and source of a great river. I do not feel much doubt about dating (however unwillingly I may do it) Mark x. 45 later than A.D. 55.

(10) xiii. 26 is from the Little Apocalypse which seems to have come from the Church of "them that are in Judaea" (xiii. 14), not a great many years before the year A.D. 70 and the fall of Jerusalem, to the Church at Rome: "deep calling to deep." It has been included in our copy of the work of Mark II, and has found a place for itself (where no place for it had been planned) between Mark II's two stories; of the widow in the temple, and of the woman unnamed who had the alabaster cruse of ointment.

(11), (12), (13), (14) There are left the four uses, xiv. 21, 21, 41, 62; of these, perhaps xiv. 62 is the most crucial. The double naming of "the Son of man" in xiv. 21 comes with a quotation from the Book of Enoch.

The whole of this passage, Mark xiv. 10-65, has the air of being the result of two writings, and Mark xiv. 21, 41, 62 appear to belong to the second writing. I will write out my notion of Mark I that the reader may read it through. I am urging the reader to weigh this matter with great care. For it is here, I imagine, the reader will be critically influenced.

xiv. 17, "And when it was evening he cometh with the twelve. And as they sat and were eating, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you shall betray me. And they began to be sorrowful and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? And he said unto them, It is one of the twelve."

"And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto

them, Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kindgom of God. And when they had sung a hymn, they went out unto the mount of Olives."

27. "And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered abroad."

[The quotation is from Zech. xiii. 7. It will be remembered that the passage Zech. ix. 9 is closely associated with Mark xi. 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, a passage assigned to Mark I. Here are met again the alternatives: Did the prophecy found in their Bible make it seem natural to the Christians to believe that Christ had done or said this, or this? or, Was it that the Christ was Himself influenced by the prophecy to do, or to say it? The alternatives present themselves at Mark x. 7-10 and at Mark xiv. 27. And I am supposing that in both cases the Lord had the prophecy of Zechariah in mind.]

29. "But Peter said unto him, Although all shall be offended, yet will not I."
30. "And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, that thou to-day, even this night, before the cock crow twice, shalt deny me thrice."
31. "But he spake exceeding vehemently, If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee. And in like manner also said they all."
32. "And they came unto a place which was named Gethsemane: and he saith unto his disciples, Sit ye here, while I pray."
35. "And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed."
37. "And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon, sleepest thou? Coudest not thou watch one hour?"
- 39, 40. "And again he went away, and prayed. And again he came, and found them sleeping, for their eyes were very heavy."
41. "And he saith unto them, Arise let us be going: behold he that betrayeth me is at hand."

44. "Now he that betrayed him had given them a token, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that is he; take him, and lead him away safely."
45. "And when he was come, straightway he came to him, and kissed him (again and again)."
46. "And they laid their hands on him, and took him."
47. "But a certain one of them that stood by drew his sword, and smote the servant of the high priest, and struck off his ear."
50. "And they all left him, and fled."
51. "And a certain young man followed with him, having a linen cloth cast about him, over his naked body:"
52. "And they laid hold of him; but he left the linen cloth, and fled naked."
53. "And they led Jesus away to the high priest."
54. "And Peter had followed him afar off, even within, into the court of the high priest; and he was sitting with the officers, and warming himself in the light of the fire."
- 57, 58. "And there stood up certain, saying, We heard him say, I will destroy this temple."
65. "And some began to spit on him, and to buffet him, and to say unto him, Prophecy."
66. "And as Peter was beneath in the court, there cometh one of the maids of the high priest; and seeing Peter warming himself, she looked upon him, and saith, Thou also wast with the Nazarene, Jesus."
68. "But he denied, saying, I neither know, nor understand what thou sayest: and he went out into the forecourt; and the cock crew."
69. "And the maid saw him, and began again to say to them that stood by, This is one of them. But he denied it."
70. "And, after a little while again, they that stood by said to Peter, Of a truth thou art one of them; for thou art a Galilean."
71. "But he began to curse, and to swear, I know not this man of whom ye speak" [this wording suggests

that Jesus was not at the moment within the sight or hearing of the speakers].

72. "And straightway the second time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word, how that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept."

I have invited the reader once more to read these verses, that he may weigh them, thinking them over as Mark I's story: a story coming very directly from St. Peter himself.

And into this, as it seems to me, he will find that passage xiv. 53, 55, 56, 58 and 61, 62, 63, 64 are intruding unhistorical details.

The motives for this addition would be the writer's desire to make clear to the mind's eyes of the hearers the scene of the Christ, and over against Him, the representatives of the Jewish people. Here he has set out Christ's claim and the high priest's rejection of the Christ. He is placarding the renunciation of which the Jews were guilty, official and complete.

So the high priest asks: "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" (which is as near as he could come to naming the Holy name).

"And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power"—that again comes as near as was allowed to the naming of God—"and coming with the clouds of heaven."

"And the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, What further need have we of witnesses? Ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye?"

"And they all condemned him to be worthy of death." This is supposed to have taken place at a meeting of all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes come together, before the first cock crow, in the high priest's house.

It is not easy to imagine how what happened within at such a meeting would have come to be known to the Church. St. Peter was in the courtyard, xiv. 54; and in the fore-court, xiv. 68; and no Christian would be nearer to see what was done or to hear what was said.

The secret which it is supposed Judas betrayed was that Jesus believed Himself to be Messiah. But the high priest asks Him whether He is the Son of God. To Mark II there is all the difference imaginable between these two titles. And Jesus answers that He is about to fulfil the prophesy of Dan. vii. about "the Son of man."

Central for Mark II's purpose is that question, "Art thou the Son of the Blessed?" and the answer, "I am." [One must go on to the Fourth Gospel to see what the words "I am" can imply.] In Mark II's story the improbabilities are enormous. The alternative to accepting the story as history is to suppose that it came to be accepted to fill a blank in history during the apocalyptic phase of Christianity, when Jesus was to the Church, the Son of man who is to come with the clouds of heaven.

There must have been a time when to believe that this was how Jesus had actually spoken to the high priest meant to hearers of the Gospel that the Advent of Jesus would take place during the lifetime of some, if not of all, of those members of the Sanhedrim. It is remarkable that the story should reach us unchanged, surviving so long any possibility of fulfilment. The intrusion of this incident into the Passion story is every way of the very greatest interest. It tells us other things; but it cannot be accepted as having added trustworthy information to the incomplete story which is found in the verses of Mark I. Mark I tells, on quite simple and trustworthy evidence, what the Church may well have been accustomed to tell: what Peter, or that young man with the linen cloth, or Simon of Cyrene, or people in the crowd, or the women who came to watch the dying and the burial, or Joseph of Arimathaea had had to tell.

For my present purpose I notice Mark xiv. 61, 62 is like all the other mentions of "the Son of man," the work of Mark II and not of Mark I. And the conclusion reached is, that on all the fourteen occasions on which the phrase "the Son of man" is used in this Gospel, the title is there because it has been interpolated by Mark II into the work of Mark I. The title, already in Mark II, is a kind of

survival from a phase which in Mark II's days of authorship had already passed, leaving as a vestige of itself the use of this name as a name of Jesus in the current stories.

I must now go on to consider the passing away of the use of this name and the coming in of the use of another name, "the Son of God."

The conception of our Lord as the Son of man who is coming on the clouds would distinguish a certain phase in the evolution of the Church. It was a phase during which many of the Jewish Christians were content with a mission of the Church to the Jewish people only; a mission to Jews in Jerusalem and in the towns and villages within reach of Jerusalem. This limitation of the Church's vision is represented by a few sentences which have survived, in spite of their all having had to come to us through Gentile writings. There are, for example, the translations of "Q" into Greek. The differences between the Jewish Christians who "judaised" and those who did not must have arisen—even in Jerusalem—earlier than the days of the famous contention among the Christians at Antioch. But the crisis known to us is that which had to be faced on the occasion of the visit of "Kephaz" to Antioch. We read St. Paul's account of it in Gal. ii. It cannot be dated exactly. There was a famine we know. It may have been A.D. 45, or 48, or 50: for there were several famines in the reign of Claudius.

St. Paul says that his visit to Jerusalem (the result of the sending of alms from Christians in Antioch to the starving Christians at Jerusalem) was "after fourteen years." The fourteen years may be additional to the three years, or may include the three years which St. Paul spent "in Arabia" after his conversion (Gal. i. 16, 17, 18). St. Paul had been a Christian fourteen or seventeen years, in the year: the year 45? or the year A.D. 50? And then there comes this crisis which causes him to write his Epistle to the Galatians.

Already in 1 Thessalonians (about A.D. 50?) St. Paul writes of Jesus as the Son of God. He speaks of the Christian expectation of the Coming of the Christ as "waiting for God's Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, Jesus, who delivers us from the wrath to come." But a

reader has only to compare the number and nature of the references to "the Son" in Romans with this solitary reference in all the two Thessalonian Epistles to feel the change that is going on in the proportions of St. Paul's dogmatic conceptions.

Also, from Thessalonians onward, there is a diminution of any emphasis on the imminence of the return of Christ. In a general view of all the Epistles it is seen to have been a more gradual and a less complete change than appears on a comparison of the Thessalonian and Galatian Epistles only. Thessalonians is altogether "apocalyptic," Galatians is altogether "mystical." The contrast between these two is, no doubt, the result of the passionate fervour with which St. Paul has thrown himself into a new conception of the implications of the faith.

It is clear that the contention between Christians who were content to think of the Lord as Messiah; a Messiah who would fulfil the Daniel-vision of the Son of man: the contention between Jewish Christians of Jerusalem so formulating their faith, and unJewish Christians of Antioch and elsewhere who were discovering a further-reaching conception of the Lord, as, by native and inherent right, the Lord over every human heart among all the races of men, One who is this because He is divine, the Son of God: it is clear that this contention, "this mental fight," has kindled in the mind of St. Paul a new and most vivid realisation of the wonder of the meanings which had been implied, even when he had least realised it, in that first "apocalypse" of his, the apocalypse of Gal. i. 16, revealed "in him" fourteen (or seventeen) years ago. Galatians is written in a language quite unlike the language of the Thessalonian letters. Its words are flames. It is a new speech which says: "When it pleased him who had separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal—(*apokalupsai*)—his Son in me, that I might bring his Gospel to the Gentiles (the foreign races)" And again, at iii. 19: "I died, through the law, to the law. I was crucified with Christ. And I no longer live, but Christ, it is Christ who lives in me. And the life which I live now in the body

I live by faith, faith which is the faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me." If this fire had been burning in the thoughts of the writer of 1 and 2 Thessalonians, it would have been apparent, do you not think?

This is, from now onward, St. Paul's conception of the meaning of what St. Paul had seen those fourteen or seventeen years before. It is his expression now of something which perhaps had been latent in his thought hitherto, and has only found utterance when St. Paul was confronted and challenged and deeply moved by the failure of the Jewish Christians to see what Christianity was. But the Church has from the day of the thinking out and writing of these Galatian sentences a new faculty of speech to say what the Lord is. It is a third phase in the process of the evolution of Christianity. It is a change, not so much in the actual content of Christianity, as of the conscious expression, the language of the Church to declare its meaning and convey its numinous influence from mind to mind.

I have stopped to speak of this here because it seems to me to be of vital importance to notice that there are three early phases of Christianity. When Galatians was written there began to be a Christianity and a Church which can never again be just as they still were when there had not yet been that experience of St. Paul. In the years before that there had been a Church and a Christianity which was satisfied to live in that apocalyptic phase, the Church of "Jacob" in which "Kephas" lived, but about which "Kephas" must have found himself increasingly uncertain: the Church awaiting in Jerusalem the coming of the Son of man. That is a pre-Galatian phase. But again, earlier than that pre-Galatian phase, that apocalyptic phase, there lay a phase of Christianity which called Jesus "Rabbi," and learned from Him. There would in that phase be very little defining or wish to define what He was. They were with Him while He was there, and learned from Him what they could of that which He had to teach. We come nearest to seeing into that earliest phase, in reading Mark I.

The "Paradigms" have their help to offer. In "Q" there are Sayings that tell much. But Mark I is the fullest and clearest evidence.

And Mark I does not come to us unmingled with later material. Here, as elsewhere, it is true that all knowledge a man can have of the earliest phases must have come to us through the subsequent phases. We cannot, I say, have a story of A.D. 30 which has not come to us through A.D. 40, 50, 60. We have always got to examine the evidence as evidence which has come to us, passing through times and places, through influences and experiences which may have changed its expression as it came. A man must try to detect any traces there may be of this gradual changing of Christianity. One can look at the Christianity (say) of A.D. 60 and read its language in Ephesians. And then one can look back beyond that and read the language of Galatians, and so again beyond Galatians there is Thessalonians. Or again, we can read Matthew and Luke and see beyond them; for we can watch the changes they made in Mark and "Q." And within St. Mark, as we read him now, we can find two different phases of Christianity. St. Mark's Gospel is separable into two works, belonging to different phases of Christianity. The mind of Mark II, I fancy, colours all our reading of the Gospel now. But there can be separated out from it that evidence of the earliest phase of all, which I have called "Mark I."

Mark II is our evidence of what Christianity was like in Rome about the year A.D. 65. The objective of Mark II in writing his Gospel is to show Jesus as "the Son of God." As you read about Him there He is all the while "the Son of God." The hearers are to know in Him the Son of God. The writer's method of presenting this is to make a picture of Jesus as One who has a hidden divinity which is yet not wholly hidden: a secret which He is seen revealing to the few disciples. No one else is to discover it; and the disciples when they know it are to keep it secret. I think the secret is allowed to appear in the story in such a way that the reader feels that it has been allowed to appear "at too high a price." The story has every now and then to "disregard

the probabilities" in order that the reader may see clearly that this secret is there and is being kept. The Lord is represented as making quite ineffective efforts to escape publicity. He gives commands which cannot possibly be obeyed. Even the earliest copyists of Mark II, St. Matthew and St. Luke, have felt that the dignity of the representation has suffered, and they have modified their original accordingly.

Mark II is too much concerned with his own aims to realise the impression he is making. Notice what happens. Mark II makes his introduction and then he comes to copying Mark I. At i. 23 Mark II makes his first interpolation in the story as told by Mark I. You can see the purpose of the interpolation. It is to tell us about that secret. The unclean spirit says, I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And, for example, Simon and Andrew show no sign of being conscious of what it is that has been said. It was said to the readers of the Gospel and not to them. It was said in Mark II not in Mark I. Simon and Andrew never heard it! They have felt only "the authority" with which Jesus spoke on that first sabbath; the difference between Him and any other Rabbi in a synagogue. And so He and they go together to their house where the wife of Peter is and her mother. And there they discover the new wonder of His power to heal. Mark II keeps that part of the story as he found it in Mark I. And so it and the interpolation of Mark II are at cross-purposes.

The next interpolation of Mark II into Mark I is the story of cleansing of the leper, Mark i. 40-45. It is an old Christian story to which Mark II makes his own additions. Jesus "sternly charged"—it is the kind of emphatic expression that is characteristic of Mark II—"He strictly charged the man, See thou say nothing to any man But he went out, and began to publish it much, and to spread abroad the matter, insomuch that Jesus could no more openly enter into a city, but was without in desert places: and they came to him from every quarter." The difficulties of Mark II begin again. The unintended wonder is that Jesus is most wonderfully disobeyed. And there is

the added awkwardness that in the next verse we have openly come and are back in Capernaum. And all the city knows it.

In Chapter iii., Mark II is seen preparing to give a description of the widest extension of the Christ's ministry by introducing a multitude, some of whom come from "Tyre and Sidon." He summarises the power in which Jesus came (iii. 7-10). People with "plagues"—it is a Septuagint word "scourges"—pressed, kept pressing upon Him, and "the unclean spirits" cried and kept crying, saying "Thou art the Son of God." And He charged them much that they should not make Him known. This is a desperate attempt at the same time to keep a secret, secret, and to draw attention to its being there.

In the fourth chapter, in the storm (iv. 35-41), there is a disclosure which continues the disclosure which began in the scene in the Capernaum synagogue. The veiled divinity of the Lord is allowed to disclose itself so that the disciples may be drawn further in, may come nearer to seeing. They are stimulated like learners. They are asked "have ye not yet faith?" They do not as yet see, but they have been disturbed as men had been disturbed in the synagogue, What is this? What is this power? They did say one to another, Who then is this, that even the wind and sea obey Him? The disciples in the storm have unconsciously spoken to Jesus such words as the Ps. xlv. addresses to Jehovah, Up, Lord, why sleepest Thou? Awake! They said, "Who then is this?" Their question is one to which there is only one answer.

At v. 1-20, into an older story Mark II introduces verses of his own, 6, 7, 8, with the words "Thou son of the most High God." So he reminds the reader of the nature of the secret of Jesus. And how secret it is, is again indicated by the charge inserted in Mark I's story of Jairus's daughter. Mark II has added verses 37 (and 40?). The number of witnesses has been reduced. Only the parents and the chosen Three have been allowed to go in where the child was. He "charged them much" again that no man should know it. And yet so soon Herod did know it.

And indeed it would be difficult to conceal the difference between a little girl dead and a living little girl.

In Chapter vi. we are brought to another disclosure to the disciples of the divinity concealed from the people. It follows on the miraculous feeding of the multitude. It will be noticed that the description of the Christ walking on the waters is as much indebted to the Septuagint as the description of the storm. And the whole story of the miraculous feeding and what followed has been set out in such a way as to suggest the approach of the moment when the secret divinity of Jesus will become known to the disciples. The feeling of the narrative is one of expectancy, almost of impatience. The disciples ought to have seen! They were amazed, more than they ought to have been: amazed in the wrong way! "They were amazed in themselves; for they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened."

At viii. 11-21 the writer, as it were, reviews the situation; and shows how far his story has gone. The Pharisees are incapable of receiving any sign. The disciples come away and leave them and are alone with Jesus. And Jesus questions the disciples in a manner which (the author is suggesting) surely must bring them over the edge into discovery. There has been the miracle of the five thousand. He has stilled the storm. He has walked on the water. There has been the miracle of the four thousand (viii. 17, 18). "Do ye not yet perceive, neither understand? have ye your heart hardened? Having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember?" It was said at vi. 52, at the first miracle of feeding, that it was slow of them not to perceive the divinity of Him who had performed it. And even earlier, even at iv. 40 it was said, "Why are ye fearful? have ye not yet faith?" . . . "not yet?" They are to blame for being so slow to see.

The discovery draws very near, and at viii. 22-26 it has for prelude the miracle of the blind man of Bethsaida. There follows the miracle of Peter's seeing. Mark II has chosen this (Bethsaida) miracle as suited to his purpose, not merely because Peter saw at viii. 29, but because Peter

saw something at viii. 29: and saw more at ix. 2-8. Mark I had been content with "Thou art the Messiah." But Mark II cannot rest at that. He must go on.

At ix. 7 is the making known of the secret of Jesus, and in order that it may remain a secret those who know it were immediately warned (ix. 9): "and as they were coming down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, save when the Son of man should have risen from the dead." So now the secret of Jesus is still a secret to the world. And even now the full initiation, even of the disciples, must wait for Gethsemane and Calvary and Easter morning. The First Week of Mark II is completed at Mark x. 31. The Passion Week is a kind of Second Week, a kind of Part II of the Gospel of Mark II.

The title of the Gospel declares at the outset the design of the Evangelist. There rests a shadow of a suspicion on the reading, but it is only a shadow. The Gospel is "The Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God."

Mark II has added much less to the second part than to the first part of the Gospel, but he has introduced at the close of the Crucifixion a few sentences in which he can be seen achieving his end. Mark xv. 39: "And when the centurion, which stood by over against him, saw that he so gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God." That is a daring addition to make. To make a centurion say that! And who heard it and repeated it? It is to be noticed that St. Luke feels free to alter this into the words, Certainly this was a righteous man.

I do very heartily admit that in an attempt to separate Mark I and Mark II the advance can only be made by a series of conjectural steps. The steps will be justified or not justified by the result to which they lead. I separate Mark I and Mark II and then I look to see what after all Mark I and Mark II are like. I think that the story of Mark I runs clear now. And I think that the design attributed to Mark II in his rewriting of Mark I (as that has here been conjectured) accounts satisfactorily for the form of the Gospel as we have it now. If so, something

may be deduced concerning the processes through which the Church's presentation of our Lord has passed. He is at first the Rabbi whom many follow, and some few follow very faithfully. Among these few, Simon Peter is he who comes to understand that Jesus is conscious that He is Messiah. Then the story tells of what happened because He was conscious that He was Messiah. And there the story passes into experiences for which manifestly old words and old conceptions were not adequate.

The conviction of the faithful in the earliest Christian days about the first Easter Day is stated in Mark I. It is spoken of in his closing words with an astonishing quietness. The tomb lay open and empty. That is all.

If the account was written to be read, and if it was first read perhaps by the writer himself to Christians at their meeting on the first day of the week for the Breaking of Bread; if Mark I himself read it at such a gathering of the faithful; and St. Peter, still living, was one of the hearers—and that is not impossible—its reticence is explained and its conclusion is sufficient. When the reading of it ended, the Service of the Real Presence of the Living Lord began. The Gospel itself does not encourage anyone even to try to imagine with what kind of reverence the first Christians regarded a mystery about which those who came after them have adopted formulas and constructed theories. The language would certainly not have been the same as ours. They would, in that springtime of the faith, have been less able to talk than we are.

It is the privilege of new life to be free from the later questionings and simply to be alive. Here is a mystery about which it is wise to use only so many words as are needed to say that the mystery is here!

CHAPTER VIII

The Vocabulary of Mark II

THE writer will begin by bespeaking the reader's patience and good nature for this essay. He asks for a threefold forbearance, because:

(1) We are embarked on a sea of conjecture. And conjecture may seem like begging questions where there is no chance to show all the reasons a conjecturer may have, or seem to himself to have. He is, I submit, not a proper cause of irritation or object of suspicion so long as it is understood between reader and writer that the writer remembers that his conjecture is conjecture; conjecture which he is bound under the terrible penalty of never coming nearer the truth, to surrender, however much the "ill-favoured thing" may be "mine own," if there is just cause shown for mistrust of his conjecture. The method here is one used in another field of operations and known as the trial-and-error method. Even mistakes may help!

(2) There is an unavoidable overlapping of subjects in such a discussion as this. It is inevitable that some things will be said more than once, and in whichever field of the subject the writer wanders, he may presently find himself (or the reader may find him) straying into another meadow.

(3) Our subject-matter is words, and it is Greek words. Sometimes we must have the actual Greek syllables and letters. And to some it will seem a monstrous thing to see their dear Greek transliterated into English spelling and robbed of accents. But you are asked to bear with this monstrosity for the sake of some whom I greatly long to interest in matters which concern many besides Greek scholars, and who will, it is hoped, take the pains, if I use English lettering, to struggle with the sounds of an ancient and foreign speech in much the same way as some of us

who do not know Hebrew and are baffled by Aleph-Beth-Gimel would be grateful if a learned author would, in kindness to our unlearning, write out the Hebrew words in letters which are readable to us, instead of using still an alphabet which parted company from ours and went a different way, I dare say about the time when Abraham decided that if Lot took the left hand Abraham would take the right, and if Lot took the right hand Abraham would take the left.

So then, conjecturing and overlapping, and using an English alphabet, I proceed. If I do at last arrive at a conjectural division of St. Mark into Mark the First and Mark the Second, it is natural to look at the individual words I find in each of the separated divisions and note to what extent Mark II has a characteristic language of his own. One can only approach the words tentatively and ask each of them for their evidence, and, as it were, "try them both ways." If we suppose this word or that to be Mark II's word, how does that supposition settle down, and how will it work as a stable opinion in a general view of the two writings? I suspect a word, say, of being written by Mark II; I go through the passages in which it occurs, noting whether, on other grounds, this passage or that passage has seemed to be written by Mark II. The two or three different lines of argument either do or do not support and reinforce one another. It is a case where, as Bishop Butler said of larger dilemmas, probability is the guide. The method has to be a trial-and-error method. If we go on aiming we presently hit the truth.

For example, there is that word for "straightway," which, if you include doubtful readings, comes forty-one times.

It is sometimes, not very often, "*euthus*." It is nearly always in one reading or another "*eutheōs*." The Authorised Version has wearied of the word and translated it variably. I think it is in thirty-nine of the forty-one places, when the word has any claim to stand, that the Authorised Version has accepted the text which accepts the word. And, to translate, the Authorised Version uses "straightway" seventeen times, "immediately" sixteen times, "anon"

once, "as soon as" twice, and "as soon as . . . straightway" once. These variations of the Authorised Version illustrate the fluidity of language: and language is the material we have in our hands. Words are fluid things, and Mark II might easily put in or leave out an "immediately" when he was copying from Mark I. But on the whole the impression grows that it was a characteristic mannerism of Mark II, and that he liked to use the word. It may have seemed to him (as I have said) to accelerate the pace of his story, to give the hearer a sense of urgency—as though some composer grew impatient and added "*accelerandos*" to his score.

He may, I say, have felt that he was giving that feeling of stress and speed which is felt in the two lines of poetry he has written at the top of his first page, "make his paths straight." "Straight" is "*eutheias*." It is the same word. Certainly as you examine the word's occurrences in the Gospel, "*eutheōs*" seems generally to be Mark II's own writing. I find five cases where it seems to be Mark I's. Let them stand here:

vi. 25, 27: "the daughter of Herodias came" [back from the mother], "she came in straightway," "I will that thou forthwith give me the head." "And straightway the king sent a soldier . . ." to bring the head.

And hearing the story of Herod's talk about Him and the raising up of the daughter of Jāirus, vi. 45, "straightway [Jesus] constrained his disciples to enter into the boat and to go . . . to Bethsaida."

x. 52, Bartimaeus heard Jesus say, "Go thy way, thy faith hath made thee whole" [or, "saved thee"]. "And straightway he received his sight, and followed him in the way."

xiv. 45. "And when (Judas) was come, straightway he came to him, and saith, Rabbi; and kissed him." I do not think there are any other examples which need to be noticed. No one would have felt that there was any "mannerism" in the use of the word, if the other examples (Mark II's) sounded as natural as these of Mark I.

The "*eutheōs*" mannerism then becomes for what it is worth an indication or suggestion (where it occurs) that

Mark II has had a hand in the writing, and about "*eutheōs*" let this suffice. But next I have chosen out some thirty-six words for the reader's inspection, and will ask the reader to run through them and consider whether they cannot help to detect traces of Mark II's hand.

Mark II uses words of extreme stress and agitation.

"*a-dēmonein*," for example (xiv. 33), with "*ek-thambeisthai*." It is a word which he would find in some Septuagint versions, a word of "being dismayed" and "sorely troubled." It is used once only in the Agony. The other word "*ek-thambeisthai*," translated "amazed," occurs four times in the Gospel, and each time as I suppose, it is Mark II who uses it.

"*apostoloi*," vi. 30—"apostles." I suppose this name is a sign of an advance of ecclesiastical organisation when it appears as a title. It is used once only in the Gospel. It is Mark II who uses it.

"*arrhōstos*" is a Septuagint word, though a rare one, for "sickly," "feeble." It is used by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 30, and three times in the Gospel, each time by Mark II.

"*archomai*"—"I begin." I am considering especially the Semitic use, "he began to speak" or "preach" or "go," cases in which other races mark no intervening stage between "not-doing" and "doing" a thing. This idiom is used twenty-six times. No inference can be drawn from its use. Both Marks use it. And it seems to be about equally divided between them.

"*daimonizomenos*" is used four times, "possessed with a demon."

"*daimonion*," thirteen times; "*daimōn*," once. In most cases it is Mark II quite certainly who uses it. It might even be maintained that wherever it appears in a passage of Mark I it is Mark II who has interpolated it.

"*di-estelleto*, *di-esteilato*" comes five times; always Mark II.

"*embrimēsamenos*"—"Jesus strictly charged the leper to be silent," "He sternly charged him" (Mark i. 43), and

"*embrimōnto*," the disciples "murmured against" the woman who anointed the head of Jesus with her costly ointment (Mark xiv. 5). Both are Mark II's writing.

"*en-epaixan*," three times, x. 34; xv. 20; xv. 31. The word comes from Isa. xxxiii. 4 and other Septuagint passages. It is Mark II.

"*epi-skiázousa*," of the cloud "overshadowing" (Mark ix. 7), is a quotation from Exod. xl. 35. It is Mark II who has used it.

"*euangelion*," eight times in Mark, always I think in Mark II. It is already in common use in 1 Thessalonians. A word learned very early by the Church from Isa. xl., lii., lx., and especially from lx. 1. And the Psalms use it three times.

"*ephobēthēsan phobon Megan*"—"they feared a great fear" (iv. 41) is a Hebrew idiom borrowed from the Septuagint (of Jonah i. 10 and 16) by Mark II.

"*Kat' idian*" is used seven times by Mark II for "privately," "apart," "apart by themselves." Never by Mark I.

"*kērussōn*," always either Mark II or later than Mark II. And it is used fourteen times. It is one of the words found in Chapter xiii. (the apocalyptic chapter) and twice (at xvi. 15 and xvi. 20) in the unauthentic ending of the Gospel. It is of "heralding" or "preaching" "proclaiming," "good news" or "gospel" especially. It would be good to recall how young and fresh the word once was. In Mark I's writing it does not appear. In 1 Thess. ii. 9 it is already in use; and in Gal. ii. 2; in 1 and 2 Corinthians and in Romans, twelve times.

It comes especially from Isa. lxi. 1 "*kēruxai*," together with "*eu-angelisasthai*" in the same verse. To "preach" or "herald," or "proclaim" release to the prisoners, and to "tell the good news" to the beggars. Isa. xl. 9; lii. 7; lx. 6.

"*kraspedou*," vi. 56, is a Septuagint word from Zechariah which has found its way into Mark II. And this is the more noticeable because in the Jāirus story Mark I does not use it, and Matthew and Luke both do.

"*lailaps*," iv. 37, is a word used with singular significance by Mark II in his scene of the storm at sea. It is used in Job three times, most notably at xxxviii. 1, "Then the Lord

answered Job out of the whirlwind." Mark II is here, even in his choice of a name for the wind, signifying that his subject is a divine revelation of the Son of God in Jesus of Nazareth.

"*logos*," the word is undergoing the change which will end in its being the Logos of St. John. It can be seen in its simplest use at v. 36, "and Jesus 'overhearing,' or 'ignoring,' the word which was spoken to Jāirus," that is "the message sent to Jāirus from his house." And on the other hand, at iv. 14-20, it is used eight times almost as a technical expression, for example, iv. 16: "They hear the word and straightway receive it with joy: then, when persecution arises because of the word, straightway they are offended." I attribute the "*logos*" in Mark v. 36 to Mark I, and the "*logos*" in Mark iv. 14-20 to Mark II (and suppose the verse iv. 33, 34 to have been altered by Mark II in the rewriting).

"*marturion*," for "a testimony" unto them, three times by Mark II. The Septuagint use of the word which comes nearest to Mark i. 44 and xiii. 9, is found in Isa. lv. "I have made him—David—a '*marturion*,' a testimony among the Gentiles . . . and they shall flee to thee for refuge, for the sake of the Lord thy God . . . for he hath glorified thee."

"*metemorphōthē*" (Mark ix. 2) is from 2 Cor. iii. 18 (also at Rom. xii. 2).

"*meta-noia meta-noein*," three times, for "change of mind," "repentance": always Mark II. Common in Septuagint, see Isa. xlvi. 8, "repent, ye that have gone astray." In the Authorised Version the verse is given, "Bring again to mind, O ye transgressors."

"*mogilalos*" (vii. 32), the deaf man "with an impediment in his speech." Isa. xxxv. 6 has this same word "*mogilalos*." That chapter is a chapter which, like Isa. lxi. or lv., has had a great influence on the mind and speech of the Church when the Gospels were coming into existence. It is the chapter which opens with "the wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad; and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose."

"*mustērion*," Mark iv. 11 only: Mark II. Including Ephesians and Colossians, the word is used nineteen times in St. Paul's Epistles. It is first used by him in 2 Thess. ii. 7. St. Paul's use of it is a Greek, rather than a Jewish or Old Testament use.

"*methoria, horia*," Mark vii. 24 and v. 17; vii. 31; x. 1. These four verses seem all of them to be Mark II.

"*parakalein*" is used nine times, and always by Mark II.

"*parrhesia*," in Mark viii. 32 only. By St. John nine times. One of St. John's uses of the word seems to echo or allude to Mark viii. 32. St. Peter saith, "Thou art the Christ . . . 31. the Son of man must suffer . . . and be rejected . . . and be killed. 32. And he spake the saying 'openly'" or "with freedom of speech." In the scene of John x. 22-39, "the Jews" of St. John, in contrast to the St. Peter of St. Mark viii., are saying, "Thou art not the Christ," and at 24, "If thou art the Christ, say so to us openly" (John x. 24). Also John vii. 4, 13, 26, where the subject is the same. The word comes twice in 2 Corinthians, and five times more in other Pauline Epistles. It will be likely it is Mark II's word and not Mark I's.

"*pepōrōmenē*," Mark vi. 52, viii. 17; "*pōrōsis*," Mark iii. 5, is of the "hardening" and "dulling" of the heart. St. Paul uses the words at Rom. xi. 7. Israel, except the elect, "were hardened according as it is written"; (in Isa. xxix. 10), "Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see" Rom. xi. 25, "I would not have you ignorant, brethren, of this mystery, that 'a hardening' hath befallen Israel."

"*peran, dia-perasantos*," eight times used, always by Mark II, "to the other side," "across." Commonly it has become a symbolical movement and, ostensibly speaking of transit from place to place, is an underlying allusion to departures into new spheres of life and work.

"*pisteuō*"—"I believe." No expression could be thought of which would be more sensitive to the changes of the mind of the Church. It is capable of meaning anything from simple "trust" to "ecclesiastical orthodoxy." Accordingly it will be found at Mark I (at v. 36) in the simple saying to Jaiirus, "fear not, only believe," and at the other end of a

long process, in xvi. 14, 16, 17, it appears with different force in the late addition to the Gospel. Here are the verses. They have several of the distinctively later words. I will underline them.

“He upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness (*‘sklērokardian’*), because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach (*‘kēru~~x~~ate’*) the Gospel (*‘euangelion’*) to every creature. 16. He ‘that believeth’ (*‘pisteusas’*) and is baptised, shall be saved (*‘sōthēsetai’*); but he that believeth not (*‘a-pistēsas’*) shall be condemned. And these signs shall follow them that believe: in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues . . . lay hands on the sick (*‘arrhrōstous’*) and they shall recover. So then the Lord Jesus . . . was received up. And they went forth and preached (*‘ekēru~~x~~an’*) everywhere, the Lord (*‘Kurios’*) working with them. . . .”

So many secondary expressions meet in these few verses that I have continued the quotation. That “in the name,” for example, appears in the other uses of it to be Mark II.

“*En onomati*,” five times it comes: “in my name,” and once “in thy name,” once “in the name of Christ.” It is often “the name of the Lord” in St. Paul’s writing. It comes straight from the Septuagint, its use in the Psalms is very frequent. The Christians put it to a new use. It had meant the name of Jehovah. Already in 2 Thessalonians it is found twice; “the name” and “in the name” “of our Lord Jesus Christ.” And the use of it becomes hymn-like in Ephesians and Philippians, “Christ above every name that is named,” and “a name that is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow”

“*Splanchnistheis*” is four times found in Mark, always Mark II. It means “having compassion,” having “human pity,” “tender feeling.” “*Splanchna*” is the word in the

Septuagint which would be translated "heart" with us. The Hebrew "heart" is already taken up and employed and occupied with other things than "feelings." For, with the Hebrew the heart thinks. When they say "heart" we say "mind." Some, alas, would even say "brains."

"*Su-zētein*," six times, always Mark II, "questioning," "discussing," "disputing."

"*tēlaugōs, eneblepse tēlaugōs*"—"he saw clearly." It is the blind man "of Bethsaida." I expect the word is most of all reminiscent of Ps. xviii. (xix.) 8. "The just judgments of the Lord ('*Kuriou*') are straight ('*eutheia*'), delighting the heart. The command of the Lord is clear ("'*tēlaugēs*'), giving light to the eyes." To feel that the story at Mark viii. 22-26 has in it reminiscences of Ps. viii. (xix.), "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork. There are no speeches or languages where their voices are not heard"; to recognise the associations which would come in company with the word which Mark II has chosen, helps to an understanding of his choice of the miracle of the blind man at Bethsaida as an introduction to the vision which became clear to St. Peter's eyes in the Transfiguration.

"*Pharisaioi*"—the Pharisees—are spoken of twelve times. It is interesting to notice that nearly every time the name is used it is certainly Mark II, and that every time the name is used it is almost certainly Mark II who uses it.

"*a-cheiropoiēton*" is "not-made-with-hands." Mark xiv. 58 has it from 2 Cor. v. 1 where St. Paul is speaking of the transfigured body. The language of "made" and "not-made" "with hands" comes from the often-used Septuagint words about the idols. The idols are so spoken of seven times in Isaiah for example.

"*chortasai*" to "satisfy with food" is four times in Mark: always I think Mark II. It is a usual word in the Psalms of God's goodness satisfying "the eyes that see His glory," or "the hungry in the days of famine," or "the empty soul," or "the poor with bread." Once more its use in the two miraculous feedings suggests that Mark II was thinking of mystical hunger when he told of the loaves of bread in

those two scenes. I suggest that at vii. 27 it was Mark II who added the words "Let the children first be filled." They are not needed by Mark I. But Mark II wanted them for the sake of his Mark vi. 42 and his Mark viii. 8.

I notice as an after-thought one rather curious result of the division which has been made of the Gospel between Mark I and Mark II.

The Gospel has come to some of us as though we were listening to the innkeeper's son telling us the story he heard from the fisherman. And so it seemed natural to find eighteen mentions of "ships" in the first eight chapters, and one (at iii. 9) of "a little boat," "a shipling"; eighteen "*ploia*" and one "*ploiaron*." But to my surprise I find that all but one of the "*ploia*"—"ships" or "larger boats" have been relegated to Mark II. The one "little boat" of Mark iii. 9 (which I suspect Mark II to have changed into a "*ploion*" at Mark iv. 1) belongs to Mark I. It and one "*ploion*" or "larger vessel" (in vi. 45) are all that are left to the early Gospel out of the fleet of eighteen fishing boats. It is one of many conclusions at which one arrives in this arguing, not because of any liking for them, but because the argument leads there. But though I have lost seventeen "*ploia*," there do remain in the original story the rowing-boat and the ship. Mark II has no rowing-boat. And it is wanted for the day of parables in Chapter iv. Mark I supplies it. And for the journey from Capernaum to Bethsaida with the disciples all on board, where the rowing-boat would have been insufficient, Mark I still has a "*ploion*," a sea-going sailing-ship to make the journey from vi. 45 to viii. 22. That is the journey which Mark II has made so long and has led a-wandering like a phantom sailing-ship, over hill and dale into a mountain, into cities and into villages, into the borders of Tyre through Sidon and the parts of Dalmanutha, and so at length to Bethsaida, seven miles away across the bay.

Mark II has done strange things with the story, imagining new shapes for it thirty-five years or more later, and sitting penning his new edition of the book in Rome. Yet Mark II who has done these strange things is going to be thought

poorly of only by readers who do not understand what kind of thing it is that he is trying to tell them. This "*ploion*" which comes seventeen times in Mark II is no more a real seaworthy ship than is the boat of the disciples in Raphael's cartoons, which looks all the time as if it must capsize. This "*ploion*" is much nearer to being "the Church" than to being a Galilean fishing-boat. "*Ploion*" in Greek is "*navis*" in Latin. And to-day in countless naves which sail across the years and not the waters, fishing-boats of stone and not of timber, in the cities and in the villages, on plains and high up among the hills, shoals of human fish will be congregated, and one of the nets that dragged them in is the Gospel of Mark II.

CHAPTER IX

Mobility of Early Christian Thought; Example of this in Letters of St. Paul

ST. PAUL AND "Q"—ST. PAUL AND CHRISTIAN TRADITION RECEIVED—MYSTICAL MODIFICATION OF APOCALYPTIC—FROM "I" TO "WE"—FROM "CHURCHES" TO "CHURCH"

WE do not know any living thing if we empty our thought about it of the sense of living movement. And the faith, the outlook on life of the first Christians, was not a stationary one.

The Church's mind lived and moved and grew and changed. I am all the while holding this opinion, and I fear some reader may feel that I have begged an open question. It is necessary therefore to argue, and my opinion leans much upon my belief that there is mobility and progress and unfolding from phase to phase discernible in the Epistles of St. Paul. You can trace the changes if you will read the letters as a series in the order of their writing. It will not, I admit, be easy to arrive at a right estimate of the degree to which St. Paul so changed. One will have to try to imagine again at what moment of Christianity St. Paul started; and then to watch through what changing phases he can be seen in his letters to be passing. I admit that to discuss the character of the Christianity in which St. Paul found himself when he first was Christian is to discuss that about which one must be thankful for the help of any smallest evidences.

I ask, for example, did St. Paul know of the Lord as the Lord whom we know: we who know of Him as One who said those Sayings which have been saved for us in "Q"? Did St. Paul know Him as Jesus of the Sermon on the

Mount? If "Q" was in fact what it is now commonly supposed to have been, it would indeed be disconcerting to find it otherwise. But there is singularly little guidance to an answer. There is almost no quotation of "Q" in St. Paul. But there are allusions which suggest that it was the Jesus whom "Q" presents to us Who influenced St. Paul. The Personality of Whom we are aware behind those Sayings and the Influence felt to be influencing St. Paul are the same. And a close inspection does reveal traces of "Q" Sayings. I have underlined the passages which seem relevant.

1 Thess. ii. 4, "not as pleasing men but God who tries our hearts." So far as this is conscious quotation, it is a quotation of Jer. xi. 20. But the sentence stands there, surely, partly because Jesus had taught His hearers the Saying of Matt. vi. 1-18 about "the Father which seeth in secret." I suppose if someone were set to name the most distinguishing characteristic of the Sayings of Jesus he would name the stress which Jesus lays on the vital necessity of singleness of heart. St. Paul returns to this in Gal. i. 10, "For am I now persuading men, or God? or am I seeking to please men? if I were still pleasing men, I should not be a bondservant of Christ." Read that, bearing Matt. vi. 1-18 in mind. It would be easy to overpress this as evidence that St. Paul was thinking of the Saying. But his words reveal his sense of the incongruity between being Christ's man and seeking to please any other master.

1 Thess. ii. 15, here the Jews are spoken of as those "who persecuted both the prophets and us." This is Matt. v. 10, Luke vi. 23. "Blessed are ye when men . . . persecute you . . . for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." St. Luke has the phrase in slightly different words, and then he has it inverted (to balance the "Blessed" stanza he has a "Woe" stanza): "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! For in the same manner did their fathers of the false prophets."

1 Thess. iv. 8, here the word "*athetōn*" is used. It is "he who disregards," or "slights," or "rejects." St. Paul uses

it in a charge to the brethren to guard, each one of them, their purity and cleanness of life. He speaks of immorality as doing someone else a wrong. It is want of respect for someone else. It is not very clear whether he means disrespect to the "sister" whose self-respect is injured by the sin, or disrespect to the "brother," the husband, or lover, or family that is wronged by the sin. The word of "disregarding" and "disrespect" comes in rather unexpectedly. The offender, perhaps, would hardly "have thought of it in that light." "He that disregards, disregards not man, but God who giveth his Holy Spirit unto you." You would say, there must be some special association with the word to cause him to use it just there. And it would surprise you to find some pagan writer talking like this. The Greek word (*athetōn*) is the same as St. Luke has used at Luke x. 16, quoting a Saying of Jesus. There it refers to insulting and ill-treatment of Christians by strangers when the Christians come as missionaries. "He who disregards you . . . disregards God," Jesus had said.

I feel that the sentence of St. Paul is best understood as his appealing to a great human principle which he has received as coming from Jesus. Here is the charter of a new kind of self-respect, a quiet strong Christian self-respect. There is a new self-reverence and a new reverence for one another in the new community. No one can be ignored. To insult the son, or the daughter; to wrong our brother, or our sister, is to ignore the Father. He who does dishonour to a man, dishonours not that man only, but God who gives His Holy Spirit among you.

1 Thess. v. 2, "For ye yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night . . . so then . . . let us watch and be sober." This is a clearer example of an allusion to a known Saying, for in Luke xii. 39, Matt. xxiv. 43 you read, "know this, that if the householder had known in what hour the thief cometh he would have watched, and not have allowed his house to be broken into. Be ye ready, for in an hour that ye know not the Son of man cometh."

St. Matthew has, "he would have 'watched'"—"egvë-gorësen"—at xxiv. 43. St. Luke has the same word at xii. 37, "grëgorountes," and at xii. 39, corresponding to St. Paul's "let us watch"—("grëgorömen"), 1 Thess. v. 6, 10 [a word like the name of our watchful Roman, Gregory the Great].

1 Thess. iii. 3, the subject is "afflictions"—1 Thess. ii. 14 shows that he means the afflictions of persecution—and here St. Paul speaks of persecution as something which the Church has been told from the beginning is bound to come. "For yourselves know that hereunto we are appointed." I find in Reference Bibles no references here, and yet I am inclined to add the reference "Matt. x. 23-39" as well as "Matt. v. 4, 10, 11, 12." For St. Paul is echoing what "Q" represents Jesus as having said at the beginning. Persecution is bound to come.

1 Thess. ii. 6, "We might have been burdensome to you as apostles of Christ," and, more explicitly still, 1 Cor. ix. 14, "Even so did the Lord ordain that they which proclaim the Gospel should live by the Gospel."

Matt. x. 10 is using a more primitive Christian language, and does not speak of "the Gospel." But he does say, "the working man has earned his food." Luke x. 7, a shade less primitive, has, "the working man deserves his wages." That is an economic change, from food to wages.

1 Thess. v. 15, "See that none render evil for evil; but always follow after that which is good, one toward another, and toward all." Compare with this Matt. v. 38-43 (Luke vi. 29, 27). "But whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. 44. I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; 45. that ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust."

Hard by, in Matt. v. 32 (Luke xvi. 18), is a passage of "Q" which I find explicitly quoted in 1 Cor. vii. 10. In the Sermon on the Mount it is, "I say unto you, that every one who putteth away his wife . . . and whosoever shall marry her . . ." In 1 Cor. vii. 10, "But unto the married

I give charge; yea, not I, but the Lord, That the wife depart not from her husband . . . and that the husband leave not his wife."

Here the Saying of the Lord is to guide the community in their decision between the rival claims of duty to a husband or a wife who is not a Christian, and duty to the Church as a society which must keep itself pure from the world outside. The Saying of Jesus is the final authority. It is the Lord, and not I, who give this charge. So the Saying which we know in "Q" speaks in the letter of St. Paul.

From Romans I will cite four examples which may be far-off echoes of the Sayings of Jesus.

Rom. ii. 13, "For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be counted just." The real alternative to Judaism is found to be the Sermon on the Mount.

In Matt. vii. 24, "Everyone who heareth my words and doeth them . . . and 26. everyone who heareth these words of mine and doeth them not."

Rom. ii. 19, St. Paul taunts the Jew, "Thou art confident that thou art a guide of the blind."

In Matt. xv. 14, "And if the blind guide the blind"

Rom. ii. 29, the true man is he "whose praise is not of men, but of God."

Matt. vi. 1, 4, 6, 18, "else ye have no reward with your Father which is in heaven . . . Verily I say unto you, they have received their reward . . . and thy Father which seeth in secret shall recompense thee."

Akin to these is Rom. x. 2, 3, "knowing not the righteousness of God, they seek to establish their own."

Rom. xii. 17, 18, 19, though the language is largely the language of Proverbs, is very near the Sermon on the Mount. "Render no man evil for evil. Take thought for things honourable in the sight of men. Avenge not yourselves, beloved . . . Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good" (as in 1 Thess. v. 15).

It is only a sentence here and there in St. Paul that sounds

like an echo of the actual Sayings of Jesus which are known to us. But these are enough to correct the notion, if anyone ever held it, that to St. Paul, Jesus was One who had transacted a transcendent mystical drama in the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Ascension: an apocalyptic Christ in whose human life and relations with men and personal character St. Paul took little interest. Of course, there is character as well as plot in this drama of the Passion as St. Paul has received it. And little as we can postulate about St. Paul's knowledge of the human acts and the Sayings of Jesus, Jesus was of a certain character and mind and personality to St. Paul. Jesus is to St. Paul the same Speaker as He who speaks to us in "Q." To St. Paul, above all, Jesus was He who has loved: "He loved me and . . . gave himself up for me." One could not know that there was this love in those dramatic events unless one had learned it through words and acts of His, which had been lovingly remembered and handed on.

I turn now to St. Paul's conception of the drama of the Christ; "the thing which He had done." It was into a tradition that told how Jesus had died and risen again and would return, that Saul of Tarsus was received by the Church when he was baptised.

It is in 1 Cor. xv. that the creed of the early Church is for the first time clearly set out, "The Gospel which I preached." 1 Cor. xv. 3, "I delivered unto you first of all, that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried: and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures; and that he was seen of Kephas . . . of the Twelve . . . of five hundred brethren at once . . . of James . . . of all the Apostles; and last of all . . . of me also."

The Christian faith was formulated thus, before ever it came to St. Paul: "Which I also received," he says. In A.D. 50-something he speaks of it as what he has habitually handed on and what was not new when he himself received it.

The same clearly defined creed is found in Rom. x. 9; "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord,

and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." The same acceptance of the same tradition is implied here as is implied in the Corinthian words.

And when you turn back to 1 Thessalonians you find that in his earliest letter St. Paul is already holding the same dogmatic position. He speaks already to "the Church." He calls Jesus "the Lord." He says we "wait for the Son of God from heaven, whom God raised from the dead, Jesus, who delivereth us from the wrath to come." "The Lord make you unblameable in holiness before our God and Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus with all his saints." The statements are as clear as crystal. iv. 14, "Jesus died and rose again." 16. "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with a voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead shall rise, and we shall be caught up . . . to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." One begins to think that some of the statements are even too crystal-clear.

In Thessalonians, already the Church is intrusted with a Gospel. The good news of God is the news that Jesus will come and receive to Himself into everlasting life (v. 9, 10) those who "obtain salvation" through the Lord Jesus "who died for us."

All the "dogma" is there before St. Paul writes his first letter. It must have come to St. Paul along with Christianity itself before he went up to Jerusalem (Gal. i. 18). He must have received it from the Church in Damascus or Antioch or elsewhere. This is written about the year A.D. 50. This is not much later than the twentieth year of the life of the Church. In his earliest letter St. Paul is already speaking thus, and it is only the proportions of the faith that, by degrees, are seen to change as you go on to read the later letters.

This framework of dogma was there, it is clear, from the beginning. And then one asks, what was the result of the acceptance of this formula of faith in Salonika and Galatia and Corinth and Colossae? What was Christianity like,

in the very beginning, for example, when 1 Thessalonians was being written? You can, as you read that letter, catch sight of the faces of "the brethren"—St. Paul calls them "brothers" thirteen times in these five chapters—and I find myself becoming less interested in the question, what was the exact formulation of that early system of Christian belief, and more interested in the wonder of the new beauty which has come with it and animated that new community and brotherhood.

To have known the tenderness of the love of St. Paul "as a nursing mother," "as a father" (he says) to his own children, and to have seen those children of his "taught of God to love one another," must have been a revelation in the pagan world. If that Church had been assembled together and there had come in an unbelieving man, I think he could scarcely have failed to feel the "grace" of it. And even if, by some gift of prophecy this stranger pagan had quite certainly known that St. Paul and his Thessalonians were misinformed as to the history of the immediate future and that it was a delusion to expect that, "we that are alive, shall hear the voice of the archangel, we (still living here, in Thessalonika, A.D. 51) shall hear the trumpet of God and see Christ come and rise to meet him in the clouds": even so he would have been of the opinion that the mistake was not such as to vitiate the influence of the faith.

Through that faith there had arisen, and there existed now, a community of people lifted up out of the shame of those who have no strength of will and out of the sorrow of those who have no hope, into a love as of brothers and a new simplicity, a strangely tranquil life and a thankfulness that was somehow always singing and making melody in its heart.

The reader is asked to go over this ground again and to observe what is there already, in the earliest letter of St. Paul, because my task is to watch the changes through which this same Christian belief passes in the experience of St. Paul. So much of this of which I speak is continuous: so much of the dogma and of the spirit. It is the formulating of

St. Paul's conceptions, the proportions of the features of the face of his faith that change and make the Christianity of Galatians so different from the Christianity of Thessalonians; and again, as you turn from Galatians to Colossians, make it seem scarcely possible that it is the same writer writing.

In Thessalonians it is the imminent return of Jesus that occupies all the view of life. I will notice one small sign. The three requisites of 1 Thess. i. 3 are faith that works and love that labours, and then, as if this were the climax, hope that endures, that is patient; that "expects"—["*expectans expectavi*"]. In Thessalonians that is their order. In 1 Corinthians the three appear again, not very long after. But in 1 Cor. xiii. there is no hesitation about the order: and it is not the same order. "But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three: and the greatest of these is love."

In the language of the Thessalonian letter the stress is laid on the age which is to come, on present endurance and future joy. But, none the less and all the while, the Thessalonians were, through their apocalyptic expectation, being "taught of God to love one another." The expectation of Christ's immediate return had, you can see, set them free, with a "Sermon on the Mount" freedom, from worldliness and lovelessness. It is an experience common to many manifestations of apocalyptic religion that it does simplify character and set it free. It does make life spiritual.

That is why the change from Thessalonians to Galatians, written so shortly after, is not more startling. There is no mention or thought—and this indeed is surprising enough—of the coming of the Christ, in the Epistle to the Galatians. The nearest to that is Gal. v. 21, where St. Paul says they "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" unless they follow the leading of the spirit: and that may be a mystical rather than an apocalyptic saying. St. Paul will in other Epistles return to apocalyptic words, e.g. in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, "*Maranatha*"—"Come, O Lord." And the belief that Christ will come to judge is present to his mind still in the later letters; in Phil. i. 11; ii. 16; iv. 5 (the Lord is near) and Col. ii. 4, "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear," and possibly

in Eph. vi. 8, [to servants]—"knowing that whatsoever good thing each one doeth, the same shall he receive again from the Lord," [and to masters], "there is no respect of persons with him," St. Paul is thinking of the Advent. But looking back to Thessalonians from these last letters, the proportion of the emphasis is felt to be so different that the message comes as a different message.

If from Thessalonians you go on to Galatians, something has come in which changes the character of the Gospel.

The contention between St. Paul and the Judaising Christians, Christians who believed exactly as he had himself believed in the imminent coming of the Lord, has set St. Paul on a kind of fire. He is burning now with a new intensity of thought and feeling. He sees, as in a new vision, what is implied (and I dare say, had always been implied) in what the Church has taught him. Now Christ is to him something which makes it a comparatively small concern whether we wait a longer or a shorter time for his final disclosure of authority and power. It is what Christ is to St. Paul that matters. Nothing else. For the moment so intense is this revelation that St. Paul is individual and alone in it. Galatians is his most solitary letter. Compare Gal. i. 15, "It was the pleasure of God, who separated me from my mother's womb and called me through his grace to reveal his Son in me . . . I conferred not with flesh and blood, I went away" . . . and ii. 19, etc., "I died that I might live, I have been crucified . . . yet I live . . . no longer I, but Christ liveth in me, and that life which I live . . . I live in faith, which is in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me." These are six "me's" and nine capital "I's."

Compare those singulars with these plurals.

1 Cor. ii. 10:

"Whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him, God hath revealed unto us through the Spirit."

and still more in Rom. viii.:

11. "the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead: shall quicken also your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you."

16. "We are children of God"
 18. "the glory shall be revealed in us"
 24. "by hope we are saved"
 32. "God will freely give us all things"
 35. "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?"
 37. "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors
 through him that loved us."

In Gal. ii. 20 it was "who loved me."

In Rom. viii. 37 it is "who loved us."

There is a change from Thessalonians to Galatians, and a change from Galatians to Romans. There is a whole new language arising as the thought of St. Paul changes from the apocalypse of Thessalonians to this which he now calls an "apocalypse" in Gal. i. 16, "it pleased God to reveal (*apocalypsai*) his Son in me." St. Paul is now not so much looking for a coming as seeing a vision of Him who is come. The apocalyptic has gone, the mystical is there.

But there is no standing still. From Galatians you must go on. And the next vehement agitation of which St. Paul tells, and which you can almost share with him still as you read his letters, is in 2 Corinthians. The storm is (some think) at its height in 2 Cor. x.-xiii. That is (they say) the old letter which he wrote "with many tears." The subsequent calmer moods are what we read now as though they were part of the same letter. But they are really another and a later letter, 2 Cor. i.-ix. The sea of his mind heaves like a ground-swell after the storm. In 2 Cor. iii., iv., v., he is inventing a new language to tell what this agitation has meant, and means, to him. With all his heart he appeals to all the heart of the Corinthians. He trusts them passionately and adventures everything on his belief in them and their belief in him. The light of his exaltation is on his own face. It is on their faces too, this light of Christian believing. It is the light that is on faces that have turned and looked and seen the glory which is in the face of Jesus, and reflect it. So there is a transfiguration (a metamorphosis) of human souls, a new light in the world for those for whom God has said, as if it had been the first day of a new creation, Let there be light! It is a new day

in which these Christians have together entered into this mystery. The singular has gone. They are all together in the One Light.

And all about, in Corinthians and Romans, you are aware of a Christian life which cannot be alive as anything less than the life of a community. St. Paul is passing on to a more articulate sense of the communion of saints. It comes in, enlisting new metaphors, finding new figures of speech. The experience is there and it must express itself. It takes into its service the metaphor of the building of a Temple and the metaphor of the life of a body. 1 Cor. iii. 16, "Ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwells in you."

1 Cor. vi. 19, "Know ye not that your body . . . the body of 'you' . . . is a temple 'of the Holy Spirit that is in you'?"

I will leave those to represent a multitude of references. The two analogies—of the one masonry of the several stones, and of the one life of the many living members—run on side by side and pass insensibly the one into the other in this new language. The thing spoken of is greater than any one analogy can compass. It is the mutual and common Christianity experienced in the Church, the Communion of Saints, the Communion of the Holy Ghost. The thought of it becomes an imperative at Rom. xii. 1, 4, 5, "I beseech you, present your bodies a living sacrifice . . ." and there is the sequel and consequence, "Many members in one body," "one body in Christ." So 1 Cor. xii. 12 had had "many members," "being many, are one body: so also is Christ." One looks back to Thessalonians, and it is as if an enigma had been explained. So then this is what it had been meaning from the beginning! This is what Christians were to discover when they set out on their adventure and accepted the conditions of admission into those new communities in Philippi and Salonika and the Galatian Churches and at Corinth.

But again, in his last letters St. Paul has moved. He had had time; at Caesarea, and on the sea, and in Rome. He had had, perhaps, four years to think over and gather

into one view the experiences which he had seen and shared in those Churches which had arisen wherever he came, as a result of his coming with his astonishing message. He could see them all now, the Churches, the beloved communities he knew, as one society. They came into one view as he wrote to Colossae, or as he wrote for the same post-bag the still more impersonal letter, the "circular" letter which came to Ephesus. The mind is never stationary. While it lives, it learns. And as St. Paul had lost his singular "I" in the plural "we," on the way from Gal. ii. 20 to Rom. viii. 37, so now his talk of Churches changes. It loses its plural and becomes singular. In Thessalonians there is one Church at Thessalonika and several more in Judaea (i. 1, ii. 14). In Galatia there are "Churches" (i. 2). In 1 Corinthians he silences the Corinthians by reminding the Corinthian Church that there are other Churches (xi. 16; xiv. 33, 34). In 2 Corinthians he speaks of "the burden of the care of all the Churches" (xi. 28). In Rom. xvi. 16, all the Churches of Christ salute the Church in Rome. But in Ephesians there is one Church only. Nine times he names it, but it is always singular. It is the only one. It is the living body, the holy temple, the never-aging bride of Christ. In it man is to be what man was meant to be (iv. 13), quickened by a one life in which all live, able, in a communion of many apprehensions, "to apprehend, with all the saints, what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of God which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled unto all fulness of God."

The foregoing is a sketch of the development which can be traced in the letters one after another of St. Paul. There is change in living thought. There is a sense in which life is never motionless. Life learns by living. Life, as long as it is living, grows. And I have taken this progress, which is seen in the mind of St. Paul, to be an illustration of the progress which must have been taking place in the mind of the Church. There are sufficient indications to prove that this was so. If we knew more; if we could know enough; it would become possible to date certainly, as we cannot now, the expressions of different phases of the

Christian Church. I mean in the way one can date the work of different ages of medieval architecture. The wording of any sentence would indicate to what phase of Christian development it belonged, as the style of any building declares itself to any interested eyes, as being (say) of the twelfth or thirteenth or fourteenth century. A misuse of St. Jude has saved the saints much trouble which they ought to have taken, by the phrase, "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints."

As to this changing Christian mind one has only to watch closely, looking as it were over the shoulder of the writer, as St. Matthew or St. Luke make their copies of St. Mark, to become sensible of the continued changing of the general feeling of the Church. The copyist feels himself free or feels himself compelled to leave out from the original words which in the later age are felt to be unacceptable to modern feeling, unsuitable nowadays for Christian reading and hearing. Or, in another place, the copyist tries to enhance the wonder of the Lord by improving a phrase. We have all become conscious of this as we compared the first three Gospels. But this change from the time when Mark wrote to the time when Matthew and Luke copied, implies a change of the Church's thought about the Lord. The thought is not the same: whether we say there was a new awe and reverence of Him about whom the Gospels told, or whether we say there was a new timidity and faltering to accept the frank old evidence, and that their fears have obscured our record of the Incarnation. There has come, either way, an alteration of the thought of the Church. And the same must all the time have been happening. It did not end with St. Matthew and St. Luke. It did not begin with St. Mark.

The change is there, and you can watch and measure it by a comparison of the Synoptic Gospels; and you can watch, as I have said, a like change indicated by the passing of St. Paul's mind from phase to phase as he writes his different letters. His mind is not a measure of all Christian minds. For example, among the Christian minds in Ephesus, a generation later, one author is so deeply influenced by

St. Paul's later Epistles that, after long contemplation of these, he can write the Fourth Gospel. But another is so little under the spell of St. Paul's influence that he can write the Apocalypse. There are different traditions, different inheritances. I think the author of the Fourth Gospel knew St. Mark's Gospel by heart. In the Book of the Revelation, in a Reference Bible [I have stopped writing to look, and] I find one reference only, among all the close-printed columns of Revelation references, and that a not very apposite reference, to the Gospel of St. Mark.

We might use St. Paul's mind which we can watch emerging in his letter-writing from time to time: we might use the stages of his thought as a kind of test and measure, and ask to which stage among these progressive Pauline stages is Mark II nearest. The earlier Mark, Mark I, shows, I should say, no sign of any Pauline influence at all. But this other and later Mark, Mark II, is influenced by St. Paul, and uses words because he knows them in St. Paul's Epistles. He inculcates a doctrine about our Lord because he has been influenced by St. Paul. The question is only which St. Paul? the St. Paul of which Epistles? the St. Paul of which phase of thought?

I think the answer is the St. Paul of Galatians, 2 Corinthians, Romans: of the Epistles which, it is usual to think, had all been written by the year A.D. 55: maybe two years, maybe five, before St. Paul came to Rome. But there is nothing in the work of the Roman Christian Evangelist, Mark II, to suggest that his mind was influenced by the letters written from Rome by St. Paul. Their date would be about A.D. 60, and Mark II writes a few years later. Mark II, I say, is at the phase of Galatians and 2 Corinthians. A whole new world of Christian thought had come into existence since Mark I had satisfied the Church. Mark II rewrites the story in an atmosphere of new ideas. And the new ideas are most like those which are found in those Epistles: Galatians, 2 Corinthians and Romans.