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The first lecture in this series dealt with the materials for a Life of Jesus outside the New Testament. We saw that the reliable extra-canonical evidence, though very small in amount, corroborates some essential points in the primitive Christian kerygma. We found that both Christian and non-Christian statements agree in presenting the figure of a crucified teacher, with this difference that whereas the non-Christian sources, both Jewish and pagan, regard him as a false teacher who fully deserved the fate that overtook him, the Christian sources make the amazing claim that the crucified teacher is the promised Messiah, the hope of Israel and the world. To rebut Jewish and pagan criticisms and to establish Christian claims, it was necessary to produce the teaching of Jesus, necessary to describe the ministry. It was not sufficient to do this in general terms, merely asserting that Jesus taught as one having authority, or that he went about doing good: it was imperative to produce specimens of those oracles which had made so tremendous an impression, and of those mighty acts and gracious deeds of service which had drawn men and women to him and fastened their hopes upon him. To convince or convert the outsider detailed evidence in support of Christian claims was urgently required.

Nor was there any lack of interest in the words and deeds on the part of those who were already members of the Christian community. If the teaching and example of Jesus were to be authoritative for Christians, there was every reason why detailed knowledge of the Lord’s Ministry should be made available in

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on the 12th of January, 1944.
the Church. And indeed we have striking evidence that this was the case. In the fifties of the first century we find Paul dealing with the moral problems of the Corinthian community, and discriminating carefully between matters on which he can quote a ruling from the Lord and those on which he can offer only his own opinion.¹ Again, in dealing with the disorders of Corinthian Eucharistic worship, he appeals direct to the traditional account of what Jesus did at the institution of the Supper, evidently taking it for granted that that should be the norm for all Christians.² The inference has been drawn, rightly I think, that even at this early date there were available some more or less systematic collections of the Lord’s teachings. It is possible, even probable, that such collections of teaching, and of narrative too, were more numerous than we commonly suppose, and that much of the material contained in them has been lost beyond recovery. Some of the fragments in Resch’s great collection of Agrapha may well be the wreckage of early compilations of sayings. Again, Synoptic criticism and Form-criticism alike converge on the conclusion that between the unorganised mass of isolated pericope and isolated logia on the one side, and the completed Gospels on the other, there were blocks, groups, or aggregations of sayings or narratives, some of which in whole or part went to the construction of our existing Gospels. In Mark, for example, besides the Passion narrative, there are other groups which resist the attempt to break them up into their constituent elements. Thus the section, Mk. iv. 35—v. 43, to which we shall return later, is recognised by Dibelius and K. L. Schmidt as probably a unity before Mark wrote. This is a group of miracle stories, including the stilling of the storm, the cure of the Gerasene demoniac, the cure of the woman with the issue of blood, and the raising of Jairus’ daughter. Similar aggregations are Mk. i. 23-38 (incidents placed on one day in Capernaum), ii. 15—iii. 6 and xii. 13-27 (disputes with opponents: possibly the two groups are really parts of a single collection broken up by the Evangelist); and, if Professor Dodd’s hypothesis is right, Mk. i. 14-15, 21-22, 39; ii. 13; iii. 7b-19; vi. 7, 12-13, 30

¹ Cf. I Cor. vii. 10 f.; ix. 14; Moffatt’s Commentary on I Cor. p. 80; A. M. Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors, pp. 52-61.
² I Cor. xi. 23 ff.
(an outline of the Galilean ministry, broken up to accommodate other detailed materials). The Evangelist’s task may well have been to select, simplify, and reduce, in order to bring what seemed to him an unwieldy mass of material within the compass of his papyrus roll. It is clear from the treatment of Mark by Matthew and Luke that they were not afraid of editing, or even sub-editing; and what has happened in the case that we can check has doubtless happened in many another case that we cannot check. We know what Matthew and Luke did to Mark: we can only guess what Mark did to the pre-Markan sources, and what Matthew and Luke did to sources other than Mark.

With these preliminary remarks we may turn to the earliest of our canonical Gospels, that of Mark. This is the document upon which, more than any other, any critical attempt to write the life of Jesus must depend. What does it offer? It presents an outline of the Ministry, starting from the activity of John the Baptist and ending with the discovery of the empty tomb. It is generally acknowledged that the true text of Mark ends at xvi. 8 with the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ—‘for they were afraid’. There has been much debate on the question whether a sentence may end with γάρ, and enough evidence has been accumulated to show that the thing is possible; but it has been forcibly argued that, while ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ may conceivably be the end of a sentence, it cannot well be the end of a Gospel, or even of a paragraph. We must suppose that the end of the Gospel is lost, and that the additional verses which appear in our manuscripts are attempts to repair the damage.

How much of the original has been lost? To this question a firm answer is not possible; but, as we shall see, there is some reason for thinking that the amount is not great. For the moment we leave the end of the Gospel and turn to the beginning.

The opening of Mark has long been as difficult a problem to commentators as its close, in some ways even more difficult. Verse 1 offers a subject with no predicate; verses 2 and 3 a subordinate clause with no main clause; and verse 4 gives a

---

statement of fact about John the Baptist, which seems to have some links in thought with what has gone before, but no obvious grammatical connexion. Various solutions of the problem have been proposed. One of them—that defended by C. H. Turner¹—would, if it could be accepted, allow us to believe that the opening of the Gospel has come down to us intact. It consists in taking verse 1 as subject and verse 4 as predicate of a single sentence, with verses 2 and 3 as a long parenthesis. The sense then is (in Turner’s words): ‘the beginning of the Good News of Jesus ... was John the Baptist’s preaching of a baptism of repentance’. It is true that this interpretation has support from the Greek Fathers, but even so it is more ingenious than convincing. If we reject it, as I think we must, the most obvious alternative is to put (with Hort and von Soden) a full stop at the end of verse 1, which is then to be regarded as a kind of title or superscription to the whole book. Here again, if we may regard the verse as genuine, it will be evidence that the beginning of the Gospel has not been lost.

But now we are confronted by a difficulty raised forty years ago by Spitta,² who argued that if verse 1 is a title, and the story proper begins with verse 2, then we have to account for the strange fact that an Old Testament text is cited as a proof-text before any event has been mentioned which could be regarded as the fulfilment of the prophecy in question. The normal order is that first the fact is stated, and then the relevant text is cited with the formula kathôs gýraptai or the like.

That this difficulty is a real one is shown by the fact that both Matthew and Luke have rearranged the order, presumably independently of one another. Both begin with a note of time (Mt.: εν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις. Lk.: εν ἐτει δὲ πεντεκαίδεκατῳ ... Ἀννα καὶ Καίᾳφα), followed by a description of the appearance of John and his preaching of repentance. Then comes the proof-text from Isaiah.

So far as Mark is concerned Spitta’s solution is that the Gospel lacks both beginning and end. The text offered by the best MSS. is already patched up by the addition of verse 1. But

¹ A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, Part III, p. 50.
² Z.N.W., V (1904), pp. 305-308.
once the patch is removed, it becomes clear that the genuine beginning has been lost.

There are other, and even more drastic methods of dealing with the opening verses. Some commentators have taken verse 1 as the title of the book and rejected verses 2 and 3. Others would reject verses 1-3 altogether, and regard the story as beginning with verse 4. These methods get rid of some of the difficulties; but they leave us with a very abrupt opening in verse 4, so abrupt that if we suppose the authentic text of Mark to begin there, the corollary would almost inevitably be that the true beginning of the Gospel has been lost, and that verses 1-3 are patchwork of the same order as the various 'endings'.

The conclusion to be drawn is, I think, that Mark as we know it is defective both at the beginning and the end. It is at this point that a new factor comes into the discussion, the fact that the use of the codex rather than the roll is being pushed farther and farther back in the history of early Christian book-production. If the common ancestor of all our defective MSS. was written in codex form we should have at once a simple and satisfying explanation of the loss at the beginning and the end of the Gospel. For that is what would happen if the outside leaves of the book were lost, and it is just the outside leaves that are most liable to loss or damage. If the Gospel was written in codex form it would make a relatively small volume. Sir Frederic Kenyon has estimated that it probably occupied some thirty pages of the very ancient papyrus codex P⁴⁶. If we suppose a much smaller size of page we might double the number of pages, and even so we should have only about fifteen sheets of papyrus in the codex. (The Chester Beatty Isaiah, when complete, consisted of a single quire of 112 leaves, and the codex of the Pauline Epistles (P⁴⁶) was a quire of 104 leaves.¹ Supposing that this is the right explanation of the phenomena, it is reasonable to suppose that the loss at the beginning and end of Mark is relatively small in extent, since it is probable that only the outside pair of leaves would be likely to be lost through fair wear and tear. But though small in extent it must also be very early in date, for neither at the beginning of the Gospel nor at the end is there

any convincing indication that Matthew and Luke were any better off than we are.

I turn now to the much-discussed testimony of the Elder John quoted by Papias and from Papias by Eusebius:—

'This also the elder used to say. Mark, indeed, having been the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately, howbeit not in order, all that he recalled of what was either said or done by the Lord. For he neither heard the Lord, nor was he a follower of His, but, at a later date (as I said), of Peter; who used to adapt his instructions to the needs [of the moment], but not with a view to putting together the Dominical oracles in orderly fashion: so that Mark did no wrong in thus writing some things as he recalled them. For he kept a single aim in view: not to omit anything of what he heard, nor to state anything therein falsely.'

This passage may be taken to represent the tradition about Markan origins as Papias held it early in the second century. The Elder John, from whom he derived it, takes us a little farther back, perhaps into the closing years of the first century, that is, within some thirty years of the writing of Mark, on the commonly accepted date. Let us see what the testimony of the Elder comes to.

First of all it claims that at least one of the sources from which Mark derived his material was the teaching of Peter. As no other source is mentioned, we may assume that the Elder believed that the teaching of Peter was the only, or at least the principal, one. We, too, may well believe that it was the principal, though not necessarily the only, source. Secondly, it is made clear that Mark himself had no first-hand knowledge of the sayings and doings of the Lord: like Luke he was dependent for his materials on those who had been eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. Thirdly, the information which he

1 H.E. iii. 39. 15, Lawlor and Oulton's translation.
2 The late Dr. Vernon Bartlet argued strongly for a date about 110 for Papias' Expositions. See Amicitiae Corolla, pp. 15-44.
3 The absoluteness of this statement may be modified if one possible interpretation of the fragmentary first line of the Muratorian Canon be accepted. In that case Mark will have been an eye-witness of some incidents of the Ministry. See Zahn, Geschichte des ntlichen Kanons, iii, pp. 18 ff.
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derived from Peter had been picked up in the course of his employment as hermeneutes, interpreter, to the Apostle. (I have suggested elsewhere\(^1\) that this office may have included the duties of a private secretary and an aide-de-camp.) Further, it was not an organised body of teaching—a course of lectures by Peter which were later published by Mark.\(^2\) It was a loose collection of the sayings and stories which the Apostle had brought out from time to time to meet the needs of the moment. The way in which this kind of thing happened can be illustrated from Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, to which reference has already been made. Here we see the teaching or practice of the Lord adduced as authoritative for the settlement of the day-to-day problems of the Corinthian community. These quotations are very precious; but they are not very numerous; and we may imagine that Mark might have been a long time with Peter and still not have got anything like a complete and comprehensive account of the Ministry.

When Mark decided to write a connected account of the Ministry, he had these unorganised sayings and anecdotes which he had heard during his attendance on Peter. The Elder clearly implies that there was no longer any possibility of going to Peter and asking to have these pieces arranged in order. It must be assumed that the connexion between the Apostle and the Evangelist had come to an end, either by the death of Peter or for some other reason.\(^3\) Mark thus had to do the best he could with his reminiscences of Peter's teaching and such other material as he possessed. That other material was at his disposal there is no good reason to doubt. We need not suppose that he came to Peter with his mind a tabula rasa. On the contrary, if he is the John Mark of the early chapters of Acts, he must have known

---

\(^1\) Teaching of Jesus, p. 23, n. 1.

\(^2\) As, for example, Adamson's lectures on the history of modern philosophy were posthumously published from his students' notebooks, and at once became a standard work on the subject.

\(^3\) This consideration settles the translation of γενόμενος in the opening sentence of the Papias statement. We must render 'having been' with Lawlor and Oulton rather than 'having become' with Lightfoot (Apostolic Fathers, p. 529). In all probability we have here an example of the use of γενόμενος as we use 'ex-' to indicate the holder of an office now given up. See Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary, p. 126.
a great deal of the tradition about Jesus before he became Peter's assistant. Let us look at what we know about John Mark and his opportunities for becoming acquainted with facts about Jesus before he attached himself to Peter.

The earliest piece of evidence about Mark—if it can be accepted as such—is a bit of autobiography embodied in his Gospel. In Mk. xiv. 51 f. we read that

'A certain young man followed with him, having a linen cloth wrapped round him over his naked body: and they lay hold of him; but he left the linen cloth and fled naked'.

It has been pointed out that:
(a) This bit of narrative is peculiar to Mark.
(b) It cannot well be derived from any of the disciples, since they had already run away; and the description does not suggest that the young man himself was one of the Twelve.
(c) It can hardly come from Jesus, who apparently had no further communication with his friends after the arrest.

The natural inference is that the story came from the young man himself: and it is in itself so insignificant a detail that there seems no good reason why Mark should have troubled to relate it unless he himself was the young man. From this it is an easy step to the conjecture that the reason why the young man came to be there was that he had followed the party from the house where the last supper was held—and that the house was his home. This again fits in quite well with what we subsequently learn from Acts about the place taken by Mark's home and family in the life of the early Jerusalem community.

There is, however, one difficulty in the way of accepting the theory. It is this. There is a discrepancy between the Synoptics and John with regard to the date of the last supper. The details are too complex to be discussed here, but the upshot of the matter is that the Johannine tradition, supported indirectly by Paul and the Didache, makes the last supper fall on the evening twenty-four hours before the Jewish Passover meal, while Mark, followed by Matthew, identifies the last supper with the Passover meal. The opinion of scholars is still divided on this problem.

1 I do not think it is possible to bring in 'Proto-Luke' or Luke's special source as a witness on this side.
There are some who hold that on this point John is right as against the Synoptics. Others, including Dalman\(^1\) and J. Jeremias,\(^2\) hold to the view that the last supper was a Passover meal. There is a third solution proposed by Billerbeck,\(^3\) who holds that in the year of the Crucifixion, owing to a dispute between Pharisees and Sadducees about the calendar, the Passover was celebrated twice, the Pharisees observing it on Thursday evening, the Sadducees on Friday evening. Jesus and his disciples fell in with the Pharisaic arrangement. John records the Sadducean date. This is very ingenious; but the evidence on which Billerbeck relies is too scanty to warrant any real confidence in his theory.

Now if we leave Billerbeck on one side we must choose between Mark and John; and it seems to me that the balance of probability is decidedly in favour of John. But if we accept John's date for the last supper, it seems fatal to the identification of the young man who fled naked with Mark. For if that young man was from the house where the last supper was held, he must have known whether or not it was a Passover meal; if that young man wrote the Gospel he could not possibly—one would think—have forgotten what night it was when these things happened. It does not seem possible to maintain both the Johannine date for the last supper and the identification of the young man with Mark: and of the two I should be more ready to sacrifice the identification.

We are on firmer ground when we come to Acts. From the early chapters it appears that Mark's home and family played a prominent part in the life of the Early Church. His mother (at this time a widow) was a member of the Jerusalem community, and her house was a regular meeting place of the brethren. When Peter escaped from prison, it was the first place he made for (Ac. xii. 12), and there he found a prayer meeting on his behalf in progress. Mark was also in the movement: he was, in fact, what we call a Jewish Christian. He accompanied Paul and Barnabas on the first missionary journey in the capacity of υπηρέτης (Ac. xii. 25; xiii. 5)—assistant or general factotum.

---

\(^1\) Jesus-Jeschua, pp. 80-166, E.T., Jesus Jeshua, pp. 86-184.

\(^2\) Die Abendmahlswopte Jesu.

\(^3\) Kommentar, ii., pp. 812-853.
He continued with them until they came to Perga, where, for some reason, he decided to return to Jerusalem (Ac. xiii. 13). The result of this was that when Paul and Barnabas planned the second journey, Paul would not have Mark again. Barnabas, who was related to Mark (first cousin or uncle), was equally determined to take him, with the result that Paul and Barnabas fell out, and Barnabas undertook a missionary trip of his own to Cyprus, taking Mark with him (Ac. xv. 36-41). These events may be placed in the late 'forties of the first century. There is an interval of about a dozen years before we hear of Mark again in Col. iv. 10 f. and Phm. 24, written from Rome during Paul's detention there. By this time Paul and Mark are completely reconciled. Mark is praised and commended to the Church at Colossæ. It is suggested that he may pay them a visit in the near future. Still later we have a note preserved in II Tim. iv. 11 where Timothy is commanded to bring Mark with him to Rome, 'for he is useful to me for ministering' 1. Finally, he is referred to by the author of I Peter v. 13, as 'Mark, my son'.

The New Testament evidence goes to show that Mark had considerable opportunities of gathering knowledge of the kind that would later be useful in the composition of the Gospel. It is very far from being the case that Peter was the only one from whom he could learn facts about the Ministry.

The Patristic evidence from Papias onwards lays stress on the Petrine connexion. According to the anti-Marcionite prologue to the Gospel Mark was Peter's dragoman, 2 and the Gospel was composed in Italy after Peter's 'departure'. This information is also given by Irenæus. Ecclesiastical traditions preserved by Eusebius (H.E. ii. 16. 1 and ii. 24) declare that Mark was the first to evangelize Egypt, and the first to found churches in

1 On this passage see P. N. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, p. 123.
2 Marcus adseruit, qui colobodactylyus est nominatus, ideo quod ad ceteram corporis proceratatem digitos minores habuisset. iste interpres fuit Petri. post excussionem ipsius Petri descriptit idem hoc in partibus Italiae evangelium. (See De Bruyne, Rev. Biblique, 1928, pp. 193-214; Harnack, SBA, 1928, pp. 322-341; Howard, Exp. Ti., xlvi. (1956), pp. 534-538). Harnack assigns the prologue to the period A.D. 160-180, and regards the testimony of Irenæus (iii. i, 1, Harvey, ii. 4 ff.) as derived from it.
Alexandria; and that in the eighth year of Nero's reign he was succeeded in the Ministry (λειτουργία) of the community at Alexandria by Annianus. ¹ If this implies the death of Mark, then Mark died in 63. But the death of Mark is not explicitly stated by Eusebius in ii. 24, and the tradition transmitted by Irenæus puts the composition of the Gospel in the period after the ἐξοδὸς of Peter and Paul, which, if it means their death, implies probably a date after 64. It is not necessary to suppose that Mark's activities in Alexandria were terminated by death: a founder-missionary might well move on to other fields when he had got a Church established.

The evidence of Clement of Alexandria ² places the composition of the Gospel in Rome at the request of those who heard the preaching of Peter and wished for a permanent record. The views of Peter on this proceeding are not stated in the Adumbrationes passage; in Eus. H.E. vi. 14. 6, he is represented as non-committal; while in H.E. ii. 15 he is said to have authorised the book for reading in the churches.

We have thus evidence from three centres of Early Christianity: Asia, represented by Papias quoting the Elder; Alexandria represented by Clement; and Rome (with Gaul) represented by the anti-Marcionite prologue (followed by Irenæus). The tradition from these three centres is second century. It is of one voice as to the connexion of the Gospel with the preaching of Peter. Clement locates the composition in Rome; the anti-Marcionite prologue says in partibus Italicae; Papias gives no indication. Clement places the writing in the lifetime of Peter; the prologue places it after his 'departure' (excessio); Papias implies that the Gospel was written when Mark was no longer associated with Peter, but leaves open the question whether the contact had been terminated by Peter's death or in some other way.

Looking at this tradition as a whole, one begins to wonder

¹ For the Alexandrian Episcopal succession, see Harnack, Chron., i. 96 ff., 138 ff., 202 ff.
² Clement is cited by Eusebius, H.E. ii. 15 and vi. 14. 6: the two passages do not entirely agree. There is a further passage in the Adumbrationes, on 1 Pet. v. 13 (ed. Stählin, iii. p. 206).
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whether we have not gone a little too fast in taking Papias and interpreting him in the light of Irenæus (having settled that ἔγορος in Irenæus must mean Peter's death). There are considerations which suggest that the Alexandrian tradition of Clement should not be dismissed without being carefully weighed. First of all there is the fact that ecclesiastical tradition connects Mark himself with the Alexandrian church. Even if this means no more than that the Alexandrian community was a daughter-community of Rome,¹ it does imply a close connexion between Rome, the place of origin of the Gospel, and Alexandria. Secondly while the office of ἅρμενευτὴς, discharged by Mark for Peter, may doubtless be understood in the wide sense already suggested, it would be a mistake to leave out of account the primary significance of the word—'interpreter'. But if Mark was Peter's interpreter during such time as the Apostle was touring the Gentile world, including Rome, that very fact suggests that the tour cannot have been prolonged. If Peter had spent many years in Rome or elsewhere in the Hellenistic world, he would surely have picked up enough Greek to dispense with the services of an interpreter. In that case we should expect that any of his hearers who wished for a permanent record of his teaching could have made one with little or no difficulty. The traditions regarding the origin of Mark's Gospel are not favourable to the theory of a prolonged activity of Peter in the Gentile Christian field. Nor does the New Testament evidence suggest anything of the sort. For the period down to about A.D. 50 all the indications are that Peter's base is Jerusalem, and that his sphere of work is Palestine and Syria. Later, in the middle 'fifties there are traces in Paul's Corinthian correspondence which may mean that Peter's following in Corinth was the result of a personal visit to the city.² If he visited Corinth, he may also have gone on to Rome; but there is no trace of his presence there in the closing chapters of Acts or in those letters of Paul which probably

¹ Lietzmann, Geschichte der Alten Kirche, ii. pp. 57 f.
² See Lietzmann, Geschichte der Alten Kirche, i. pp. 109 f. That Peter had visited Corinth was certainly the opinion of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, in the second half of the second century. Whether this opinion (stated in a letter to Rome quoted by Eusebius, H.E. ii. 25. 8) was an inference from the Corinthian letters or rested on local tradition we cannot say.
belong to the Roman captivity. Yet those very letters, which show no trace of Peter’s presence, contain greetings from Mark. If Peter had paid a visit to Rome some time between 55 and 60; if Mark had been his interpreter then; if after Peter’s departure from the city Mark had taken in hand—at the request of the Roman hearers—a written record of what Peter had said; then the essential points in the evidence would all be satisfied.

A record of what Peter had said on a visit of his kind would not necessarily be a Gospel such as that of Mark now is; but it might well have formed the nucleus of such a work. Further, if Mark had acted as Peter’s interpreter in other places besides Rome, he would have a fairly extensive body of Petrine reminiscences at his disposal, when in Rome he undertook the task of writing. But Petrine material would not be all that he had.

The upshot of all this is that Mark, from the early days of the Jerusalem community, was in touch with the Christian tradition, and had ample opportunity of learning facts about the Ministry quite apart from his association with Peter. There does not seem to be any reason why he should not have used this information in the composition of his Gospel, along with that derived from Peter, especially since, as we have already seen, the Petrine information was not a dictated continuous story, but only separate pieces or small groups gathered probably over a considerable period and recalled at a later date. We should, prima facie, expect to find in the Gospel matter that can be called without hesitation ‘Petrine’; other material which may be Petrine; and, again, other which there is no good reason to assign to Peter at all. That expectation is borne out when we examine the text.

In his valuable and stimulating commentary on Mark, C. H. Turner drew attention to a frequently recurring phenomenon in the Gospel. He describes it thus (p. 48):

1 Col. iv. 10; Phm. 24.
2 If there is anything in this, it suggests that the date of Mark may be a few years earlier than is usually thought likely. A date before 60 would be quite possible.
In strong contrast to Matthew and Luke, Mark's Gospel may be called autobiographical. They write Lives of Christ, he records the experience of an eye-witness and companion. It is crucial in this respect to note the predominant use of the plural in the narrative of Mark. Time after time a sentence commences with the plural, for it is an experience which is being related, and passes into the singular, for the experience is that of discipleship to a Master. So in i. 21 'they enter Capernaum; and at once he taught on the sabbath in the synagogue'; v. 38, 'they come to Jairus's house; and he sees the tumult...'; ix. 33, 'and they came to Capernaum: and when he was in the house he asked them...'; x. 32, 'and they were on the road going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going on ahead of them...'; xi. 12, 'and on the morrow, when they had left Bethany, he hungered...'; xi. 27, 'and they came again to Jerusalem: and as he was walking in the temple...'; xiv. 32, 'and they came to...Gethsemane: and he saith to his disciples...'. In none of these cases do either Matthew or Luke retain the plural...

If the reader will now take one step further and put back Mark's third person plural into the first person plural of the narrative, he will receive a vivid impression of the testimony that lies behind the Gospel: thus in i. 29, 'we came into our house with James and John: and my wife's mother was ill in bed with a fever, and at once we tell him about her'.

In his note on Mk. i. 21 (p. 54) Turner gives a list of passages in which 'Mark's third person plural may be reasonably understood as representing a first person plural of Peter's discourses'. The list is as follows: i. 21, 29; v. 1, 38; vi. 53, 54; viii. 22; ix. 14, 30, 33; x. 32, 46; xi. 1, 12, 15, 20, 27; xiv. 18, 22, 26, 32. In what follows I shall refer to the phenomenon appearing in these passages as 'Turner's mark'.

Now if we take the passages that have Turner's mark and examine them in their context, it becomes clear that in some cases the adjoining passages belong naturally to the passages with the mark. For example, in the first chapter, verses 21-28,
the account of the visit of Jesus and his disciples to the Capernaum Synagogue has the Turner mark; and it presupposes verses 16-20 which do not have the mark, but which describe the call of the first four Apostles. Further, in verses 29-31, the cure of Peter’s mother-in-law, Turner’s mark is present; and again verses 32-39 are the sequel. Now it is admitted by K. L. Schmidt that verses 23-38 form a pre-Markan unity. Similarly, iv. 35-41, which has not the Turner mark, is bound up with v. 1-20 and 21-43, two passages which have the mark; and again the whole section, iv. 35—v. 43, is recognised as a pre-Markan unity by Dibelius and Schmidt. Pursuing this line of inquiry, it becomes possible to draw up a tentative list of Petrine paragraphs in Mark, consisting of those paragraphs which have the Turner mark along with other paragraphs which seem to attach themselves. The extent of the Petrine matter is as follows: i. 16-39; ii. 1-14; iii. 13-19; iv. 35—v. 43; vi. 7-13, 30-56; viii. 14—ix. 48; x. 32-52; xi. 1-33; xiii. 3-4, 32-37; xiv. 17-50, 53-54, 66-72.

The matter dealt with in these sections are the call of the first disciples, the Synagogue service, the cure of Peter’s mother-in-law, travel-preaching in Galilee, the cure of the paralytic at Capernaum, the appointment of the Twelve, the storm on the lake, the cure of the Gerasene demoniac, the Hæmorrhousa and the raising of Jairus’ daughter, the Mission of the Twelve, their return and the feeding of the 5000, the walking on the sea and the return to Gennesaret, the warning against the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod, the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida, Peter’s confession and the first prediction of the Passion, the Transfiguration, and healing of the epileptic boy, the second prediction of the Passion, the rebuke to jealousy and self-seeking among the disciples. All these events are set on the Galilean background, with Capernaum as the principal centre.

A second group begins with the third prediction of the Passion, on the road going up to Jerusalem, the request of the sons of Zebedee, the cure of Bartimaeus, the triumphal entry, the story of the barren fig-tree and the cleansing of the Temple, the question about Jesus’ authority, the question about the time of the end, the last supper, the events in Gethsemane, the
arrest of Jesus and removal to the High Priest’s house, Peter’s denials.

Of the material that falls outside this collection it is not possible here to make a detailed examination. For the present it must suffice to notice a few well-defined blocks. Mark i. 1-15 covers the period prior to the call of Peter; and, at the other end of the story, xiv. 55-65 and xv. 1—xvi. 8 describe incidents at which Peter was not present. (Mk. xiv-xvi is regarded as a pre-Markan unity by K. L. Schmidt.)

The account of the death of the Baptist (vi. 17-29) has its peculiar problems. At the same time, it has all the appearance of being a piece of Palestinian (originally Aramaic) tradition. The most attractive solution is perhaps that proposed by J. Thomas,¹ that the Evangelist has here made use of a written document embodying the tradition of the followers of John, what might be called the Passio Iohannis as it circulated in the Johannite sect.

The so-called ‘Little Apocalypse’, which appears in the non-Petrine collection, is thought by many to have circulated in the Early Church as a separate document; and it is at least possible that the specimen parables, given with comment in iv. 1-34, were extracted from a collection of parables. The passage x. 1-12 is regarded by Dibelius² as a pre-Markan unity.

Specially interesting are the two groups of polemical passages in chapters ii—iii and xii. These have been the subject of an illuminating discussion by B. S. Easton.³ He observes that the former block ends at Mk. iii. 6 with the statement that the Pharisees and Herodians plotted to kill Jesus: the latter begins at xii. 13 with the statement that the Pharisees and Herodians sent representatives to entrap him in his talk. Apart from a parallel in Mt. xxii. 16 to Mk. xii. 13, these are the only instances of ‘Herodian’ in the New Testament. The difficulty about the word, according to Easton, is that while in Galilee ‘Herodian’

¹ _Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie_, pp. 110 f.
² Following a suggestion made by Thomas, I use Johannite as a convenient means of distinguishing persons and things connected with the Baptist from those connected with the John (or Johns) of the Early Church.
³ _Formgeschichte des Evangeliums_, p. 223.
could mean any official of Herod, it could hardly mean that in Jerusalem where Herod’s writ did not run. Hence it must be explained in Jerusalem as being the name for those in Jerusalem who supported Herodian rule, and, since that was not in force in the capital, supported the Roman rule as the next best thing.\footnote{For a full discussion of the name ‘Herodian’, see H. H. Rowley’s article, ‘The Herodians in the Gospels’, \textit{J.T.S.} xli. (1940), pp. 14-27.}

But it is awkward to have to give two interpretations of the same term. Easton further noted that the plot mentioned in iii. 6 leads to nothing, and indeed comes too early in the story. In xii. 13 however, he argues, the appearance of the Herodians is natural. They were the one class of Jews who favoured the payment of tribute to Rome.

Easton also notes that the matters discussed in these polemical passages would not have any very lively interest for Gentile converts. From that it would presumably follow—though Easton does not argue the case in this way—that they would not be likely to form part of Peter’s preaching to the Gentiles.

Easton’s solution is that ii. 13—iii. 6 and xii. 13-27 originally formed a single continuous whole; that ‘this account was formed in pre-Markan times and belonged to the tradition of the Palestinian Christian community’.\footnote{Op. cit. p. 92.} Why did Mark split it up? Having begun to incorporate it where he does he had to ‘break off at iii. 5, for tribute to Rome, the theme of the next paragraph was paid only in Judæa, while the Sadducees of xii. 18-27 were scarcely to be found in Galilee. But as iii. 5 was too abrupt a conclusion for the first part, Mark wrote iii. 6, forming it out of the next sentence in the tradition (xii. 13), without noticing (or caring) that he had made Galilean characters of the Herodians. The remainder of the tradition he was obliged to postpone until his narrative could treat of Jerusalem events.\footnote{Ibid.}

All this seems to be quite possible. The only reservation that needs to be made is in favour of ii. 13-14, the call of Levi.\footnote{I very much doubt whether ii. 15-17 has anything at all to do with ii. 13-14. They could—so far as Mark goes—be treated perfectly well as separate paragraphs.} This paragraph seems to me to hang together with the preceding matter.

With this somewhat hasty survey of a large subject the
present discussion must close. It is obvious that there are—and probably always will be—many loose ends. But a few things seem to emerge fairly clearly. First and foremost is the conclusion, suggested by converging lines of argument, that the basis of the Markan story is a good deal broader than we sometimes think. Petrine reminiscence is part of the foundation, perhaps the main part; but other sources have made their contribution. And we need not suppose that 'non-Petrine' necessarily means inferior in historical worth. The further we go back the larger the number of available first-hand witnesses becomes. If the identification of the Evangelist with John Mark of Jerusalem is sound, he was from the beginning in touch with many such witnesses. And, secondly, if our interpretation of the traditions about Peter, Mark and the Gospel is anywhere near the truth, the composition of the Gospel may be put several years earlier than the date commonly accepted.