

GALILEE AND GALILEANS IN ST. MARK'S GOSPEL

BY G. H. BOOBYER, B.A., B.D., D.THEOL.,

LECTURER IN DIVINITY, UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM (NEWCASTLE DIVISION).

ST. MARK devotes more than half his gospel to a public ministry of Jesus centred upon Galilee, during which the teaching and mighty works of Jesus are said to find much response from the common people. At its conclusion the Master moves southward into Judaea and Jerusalem, only to be finally rejected there by the leaders of Judaism and crucified. But then the narrative points back to Galilee again. Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 indicate that the Lord and the disciples are to reassemble in Galilee immediately after the resurrection by the Lord's own appointment. These are clearly important features of St. Mark's record; and we are indebted particularly to Professors E. Lohmeyer and R. H. Lightfoot for calling special attention to them.¹

Professors Lohmeyer and Lightfoot have argued that doctrinal considerations lie behind the parts assigned to Galilee and Judaea in the Second Gospel. The evangelist, they suggest, regarded Galilee as the land divinely chosen for the revelation of salvation, whereas Judaea and Jerusalem were localities predestined to cast out the Christ, and then to be visited with judgement and doom. N. B. Stonehouse has instanced Marcan data which seem difficult to reconcile with this theory, such as the empty tomb in Jerusalem, or the events in the regions of Caesarea Philippi; ² but even so, Stonehouse concedes that the

¹ E. Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (1936); *Das Evangelium des Markus* (1937). R. H. Lightfoot, *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels* (1938); *The Gospel Message of St. Mark* (1950). Much is also said about the Galilean character of the Second Gospel by Dr. P. Carrington in *The Primitive Christian Calendar*, vol. i (1952).

² N. B. Stonehouse, *The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ* (1944), especially pp. 40-9. Lohmeyer suggests that Mark's reference to revelation and mighty works in Tyre and Sidon, Caesarea Philippi and the Decapolis means that he thought in terms of a "christliche Galiläa" which included these regions (*Galiläa u. Jerusalem*, p. 27).

extent of Mark's interest in Galilee as an area where the gospel is proclaimed and the powers of the kingdom of God are disclosed is a real problem, inviting further examination.

The question is not without relation to the treatment of Galilee in St. Matthew's Gospel, for there again Galilee has its importance. A picture of the risen Christ meeting the eleven disciples on a Galilean mountain, where he commissions them to go forth to a world-wide mission amongst the Gentiles closes the gospel. Its beginning also suggests the importance of Galilee; and, somewhat surprisingly, perhaps, it appears to associate the commencement of Christ's ministry in Galilee with the proclamation of the gospel to Gentiles, since Matt. iv. 15 f. treats the movement of Jesus from Nazareth to Capernaum as a fulfilment of Isa. ix. 1 f. The Lord's action brings light in place of darkness to "Galilee of the Gentiles". How literally did the First Evangelist intend this reference to Gentiles in applying Isa. ix. 1 f. to the Galilean ministry of Jesus? And how far was his connection of Galilee with Gentiles carried in the thought of the apostolic church? Did St. Mark share it? If so, was he too writing under the influence of the Old Testament?

1. There are Old Testament passages, more especially in the LXX, which seem to shed light upon the conception of Galilee and Galileans in St. Mark.

(a) In several places the LXX speaks of Galilee as inhabited by Gentiles, or uses the designation "Galilee of the Gentiles". Like the Massoretic text, the LXX at Judges i. 30 and 33 mentions that the tribes of Zebulon and Naphtali did not drive the Canaanites from amongst them. Joel iv. 4 indicts Galilee as a Gentile land which conspired with other Gentile lands against Judah. 1 Macc. v. 21 reports that Simon Maccabaeus did battle in Galilee with Gentiles who lived there. Finally, the land is explicitly named "Galilee of the Gentiles" three times: in Isa. viii. 23 *Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν*; and in Joel iv. 4 and 1 Macc. v. 15 *Γαλιλαία τῶν ἄλλοφύλων*. Perhaps the rendering of LXX Joshua xii. 23 should also be noted. It seems that *גַּלְיָלָה* in the Hebrew text has been taken by the Greek translator as a proper name, whereas the M.T. text apparently intended a

reference to “Galilee of the Gentiles”. In the Old Testament, then, and especially in the LXX version, there is a repeated association of Galilee with the Gentiles. Gentiles are said to have lived there; and some prominence is given to the name “Galilee of the Gentiles”.

(b) But there are two LXX passages which may have peculiar importance for our problem. They are Isa. viii. 23-ix. 6 and Ezek. xlvii. 1-12; and they depict Galilee of the Gentiles as specially appointed to receive salvation in the messianic age, and, further, as a land which will be one of the first to experience God’s deliverance.¹

The writer of Isa. viii. 23-ix. 6 proclaims that the light of the messianic day will disperse the shadow of death lying over “Galilee of the Gentiles”; and the LXX text of ch. viii. 23 begins with a notable addition to the M.T. version—an addition which apparently means that God will pour forth this light of His salvation first upon Galilee: *τοῦτο πρῶτον πίε (οἱ ποίει)². ταχὺ ποίει . . . Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν.*

Again, according to Ezek. xlvii. 1-12, the prophet beholds a river issuing from under the threshold of the house of the Lord in Jerusalem. It is a river of life with trees of healing upon its bank, and it gives life whithersoever it courses. Fishers standing upon its banks are to catch a great multitude of fish (verse 10)—and it was flowing towards Galilee (verse 8)!

The Christian seer of Patmos had pondered over this picture; though he spoke of a river whose source was in the New Jerusalem. He also added another feature to the river’s significance: with its tree of life it was *εἰς θεραπείαν τῶν ἐθνῶν* (Rev. xxii. 2). Had the writer of the Second Gospel also reflected upon Ezekiel’s Galilean coursing river, and made his connections between it and the Gentiles? Had he, further, linked it up with Isa. viii. 23-ix. 6, and in this way come to the conclusion that Galilee

¹ H. W. Montefiore in “The Position of the Cana Miracle and the Cleansing of the Temple in St. John’s Gospel”, *J.T.S.*, l. (1949), 183-6, uses both these passages in an explanation of the Fourth Evangelist’s early placing of the miracle of the wine and the cleansing of the temple.

² Swete’s edition of the LXX text prefers the lection *πίε* instead of the first *ποίει*, whilst A. Rahlfs’ choice is *ποίει* in both places. Rahlfs also includes the reading *τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας* after *Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν.*

was chosen to be the scene of the beginning of these saving activities of God amongst the Gentiles? Mark i. 17 with its call to Simon and Andrew in Galilee to become fishers of men certainly reminds us of Ezek. xlvi. 10; and when Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 bid the disciples return to Galilee after the resurrection might it not be for a fuller discharge of missionary obligations on lines suggested by Ezek. xlvi. 1-12 taken together with Isa. viii. 23-ix. 6? In other words, is the prominence given to Galilee in St. Mark's Gospel in some measure due—as apparently in St. Matthew—to an association of Galilee with the Gentile mission? And do Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 really mean that in Mark's mind the commencement of the post-Easter work of the church was to be in Galilee and was to consist principally in the ingathering of the Gentiles?

2. The ethnic situation in Galilee in the first century would have permitted Mark to think in such terms.

Galilee had a mixed population in Mark's day. Towns like Tiberias and Sepphoris were mostly Gentile communities with a pagan way of life. Greeks and hellenized Syrians were scattered over the land. Romans were also to be seen. G. Schrenk remarks that the audiences of Jesus in Jewish localities will have contained Gentiles, and even in the synagogues;¹ whilst E. W. G. Masterman ventures to say that only in more secluded places like Nazareth were Jewish ideals preserved with any considerable degree of perfection.²

But were the writer and the first readers of the Second Gospel aware of these Galilean, racial conditions? Knowledge of them was certainly not limited to Palestine, for we find a writer like Strabo speaking of "mixed stocks of people from Aegyptian and Arabian and Phoenician tribes" occupying Galilee.³ And would not Diaspora Jewry have had knowledge of the Galilean situation? Diaspora Jews were in touch with the homeland. Moreover, in their efforts to keep the Law in their pagan environment, similar problems arose to those which confronted Jews in Galilee by the racial mixture in that area.

¹ *Galiläa zur Zeit Jesu* (1941), p. 17.

² *Studies in Galilee* (1909), pp. 129-41.

³ "The Geography of Strabo", XVI, 2,³⁴ (*Loeb Classical Library*, vii. 281).

This would increase their interest in Galilean affairs and in the attitude of Judæan Jewry to Galilean, Jewish life. But many of these Jews of the Dispersion became members of the Christian church, and would then become sources of information about Galilee in the new Christian communities. There is also the tradition that Mark was the author of the Second Gospel. If this is reliable, and if it refers to John Mark of Jerusalem, as is commonly believed, then the writer of the Second Gospel, as a Jerusalem Jew, was, presumably, fully conversant with the extent to which Galilee in his time was inhabited by non-Jewish peoples. But as a matter of fact the gospels themselves do show some awareness of the presence of Gentiles in Galilee, not forgetting Matthew's reference, already mentioned, to "Galilee of the Gentiles".

Both the LXX, then, and the ethnic facts of the Galilean situation could have induced the Second Evangelist to connect Galilee with Gentiles; and he could therefore have looked upon it as a natural starting place for the Gentile mission. If so, the Master's express wish, mentioned in xiv. 28 and xvi. 7, that the disciples should go to Galilee after the resurrection may well have implied for Mark an exhortation to go there chiefly for the purpose of commencing the Gentile mission.

3. Are these suggestions supported by a study of Mark's text? The first question to ask is:

(a) What was likely to happen in Galilee after the crucifixion, according to Mark's view of the subsequent course of Christian history?

E. Lohmeyer held that when the evangelist inserted Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 into his gospel, he understood them to mean, primarily, that in Galilee the disciples were soon to witness the parousia—the final consummation of the redemptive work of Christ, not resurrection scenes before that final triumph.¹

Much more frequently, Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 have been thought to point forward to resurrection appearances of Jesus in Galilee. There the disciples would meet the risen Lord

¹ *Galiläa und Jerusalem*, pp. 10-14; *Evangelium des Markus*, pp. 312 and 356. Cf. also R. H. Lightfoot, *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*, pp. 61 ff. and 73-7.

again, before his ascension; and from this conclusion the further inference has been drawn that the author of the gospel originally continued beyond xvi. 8 with a record of Galilean, resurrection episodes.

But Professor Lightfoot's more recent treatment of Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 suggest that there is another possibility with which to reckon. The disciples, he writes, were to go to Galilee, because there they "have a work awaiting them . . . the reader's thought is turned back to the story of the ministry in the early chapters of the book, and he perceives that this is also the ministry to be fulfilled henceforth by the Lord . . . and through his disciples who now represent him in the world".¹

These words allow more fully for an important expectation which has a firm place in what St. Mark relates about the fulfilment of the eschatological process after the crucifixion. This expectation has been much neglected in attempts to interpret Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7. The Second Gospel does, of course, point forward to the resurrection and the parousia of the Son of Man. Passages like viii. 31, 38; ix. 9, 31; x. 34, 37; xiii. and xiv. 62 explicitly attest it. But the gospel is also concerned to say that another event must take place before the final consummation. The resurrection is to be followed by a world-wide proclamation of the gospel to the Gentiles. Volkmar, indeed, held this to be the main interest of the evangelist, who, he argued, was writing in defence of St. Paul's thought and work.² But although much of Volkmar's exposition may be mistaken, partly because of the extreme lengths to which he carried the symbolical interpretation of St. Mark, it is none the less true that the post-Easter mission to the Gentiles does find prominent mention in Mark's work. Scholars naturally vary in their assessment of the extent to which the author of the Second Gospel was occupied with this theme, and we shall return to this point. Suffice it here to say that the importance of the conversion of the Gentiles for Mark is recognized. Apart

¹ *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, p. 116. Cf. also P. Carrington, *op. cit.* p. 88.

² G. Volkmar, *Marcus und die Synopse der Evangelien nach dem urkundlichen Text* (Zürich, 1876).

from possible allusions to it in passages like i. 17 ; iv. 32 ; x. 45 ; xi. 17 ; xiv. 24 and others, its presence is definite in xii. 9 ; xiii. 10, 27 and xiv. 9.

Is it not then evident that this feature of Mark's narrative must have a considerable bearing upon the exegesis of Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 ? A place must be found for the commencement of the evangelization of the Gentiles in Mark's conception of the course of affairs after the cross. Since, therefore, he depicts the disciples as under a dominical injunction to return to Galilee after the resurrection, is it not likely that he thought that there they were not only to see the risen Lord, but were also under his guidance to begin the evangelization of the Gentiles ?

(b) St. Mark's attitude to the Jews is another relevant point. He is at pains to show the rejection of Jesus by the leadership of Judaism, and that means by the Jewish nation.

From ch. ii. onwards the evangelist begins to reveal the main source of the opposition to Jesus Christ. Already, in the Galilean period, it springs principally from the scribes and Pharisees, though the Herodians, too, take a hand in it, and Herod himself is shown to be apprehensive about Jesus and to be in opposition to the Lord's cause in that he has slain John the Baptist whose life and witness were, for Mark, part of " the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ " (i. 1-8). The information in iii. 22 and vii. 1, that some of the scribes concerned in this hostility to Jesus had come down from Jerusalem, serves to underline the point that even in the Galilean period the attack upon Jesus had support from the Jerusalem authorities. As the narrative moves towards its conclusion, the Jerusalem leaders come more prominently to the fore as the main opponents. Precise mention is made of the Sadducees ; the chief priests ; the Sanhedrin ; Judas, after he had made common cause with the high priests and the Sanhedrin (xiv. 10, 11, 43) ; a Jerusalem multitude acting under instructions from the Sandehrin (xiv. 43) ; and a multitude stirred up by the chief priests (xv. 11). This woeful story of criticism, obstruction and enmity from those whom the evangelist regards as the religious and political heads of Israel reaches its terrible climax at Calvary ; and in this action the leaders of Judaism are regarded as the

real judges and executioners who condemn and crucify their king.¹

Upon such outright Jewish rejection of Jesus there must fall the divine judgement ; and Mark makes that clear, too. The judgement is also as final as the rejection. We see it in passages like that of the withering of the fig tree (especially xi. 14), the prediction of the disinheritance and destruction of the wicked husbandmen (xii. 9) ; the forecast of the overthrow of the temple (xiii. 2) and the rent veil (xv. 38). As M. Werner has pointed out, there is not even a Pauline theory of the temporary hardening of Israel to soften the severer lines of the tragedy.² But if the Jewish nation has so completely as a nation cast out the Son, and has itself in turn been cast out, what remains for the Lord's disciples but to concentrate upon the winning of the Gentiles ? Not, of course, in the sense that no Jews would now hear the gospel and be saved ; but in the sense that the old Israel as such, officially represented in its leadership, had been disowned, and was to cease to be the main objective of the saving work of Jesus Christ. Therefore the field now to be harvested was principally the Gentile world. Is this not another reason for supposing that when the disciples are told to leave the Judæan scene of the Jewish rejection of Jesus to meet the resurrected Lord again in Galilee, it is, as St. Mark sees it, largely because in Galilee they are to enter the new Gentile field in which it now remains to put forth the sickle ?

(c) In St. Mark's Gospel the passion seems to be viewed as an occasion on which Jesus is handed over by Judaism to the Gentile world. That is to say, the cross is not only the climax of Israel's repudiation of the Christ, its king, but also the moment at which in delivering him up to the Gentiles for

¹ Cf. Mark iii. 6 ; xi. 18 ; xii. 7, 8, 12 ; as well as xiv. 1 and the part played by the Jewish authorities in the rest of the passion narrative. Mark, of course, represents a view current in the early church, e.g. Acts iii. 13-17 ; v. 30 ; x. 39 and 1 Thess. ii. 15.

² *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium* (1923), pp. 184-96. Werner thinks, however, that although Mark emphasizes the rejection of Jesus by the heads of Judaism he regarded many Jews as predestined for salvation along with Gentiles.

crucifixion the Jews are in fact transferring him from the unbelieving enmity of their own group to the responsive faith of the other. The passion is a transition point at which Jesus ceases to be king of the Jews, and begins to be Lord of the Gentiles.¹

This conception of the cross is suggested in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen and its appended O.T. quotation (xii. 1-12). The story implies that the Jewish people, represented in their leaders, slay the messianic Son, and cast him out of the vineyard. But as a result not only is the vineyard to go to "others", but also the Son; and amongst those "others" this stone, rejected by the builders, is received to become head of the corner. Verse eleven makes it apparent who the evangelist considered these "others" to be. "It is marvellous in our eyes" will surely have meant for him that it was marvellous in the eyes of the members of the Gentile Christian church for whom Mark compiled his gospel.

This attitude to the passion is even more explicit perhaps in the report concerning the Roman centurion at the foot of the cross. He was one of those Gentiles to whom "the chief priests and the scribes" had delivered Jesus to be mocked, scourged and crucified (x. 33 f.). But in the centurion's case this step had further consequences immediately. As Mark looked upon it, apparently, the centurion, by receiving Jesus to crucify him came also to behold and confess him as Son of God, and thus exemplifies the beginning of that believing acceptance of Jesus which was forthwith to follow in the wider, Gentile world.

Is it not also along similar lines that important passages like viii. 31; ix. 31; x. 33 f. and xiv. 41 receive their full meaning? They speak plainly of the cross as the rejection of the Son of Man by the Jews—especially viii. 31 and x. 33 f.—and also add that *παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων* (ix. 31), that *παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* (x. 33), and that *παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν* (xiv. 41). No doubt the betrayal by Judas to the Jewish authorities and

¹ Cf. M. Kiddle, "The Death of Jesus and the Admission of the Gentiles in St. Mark", *J.T.S.*, vol. xxxv (1934), 45 ff.

the Sanhedrin's handing over of the Son of Man to Pilate and the Roman soldiery were included in the evangelist's understanding of these passages. The actions of the Roman soldiers are clearly in mind in x. 33. But is it not also certain that these verses mean more? What, for instance, asks J. Schniewind, does "deliver up" really mean?¹ Many scholars suggest that the words of ix. 31, at least, contain wider soteriological teaching like that in Rom. viii. 32.

It is surely significant that St. Mark reports Jesus as using such broad terms as "men", "Gentiles" and "sinners" for those to whom he will be handed over, when elsewhere the narrative is so much more specific, and refers directly to the Pharisees, Herodians, chief priests, elders, scribes, the Sanhedrin, or to Pilate, the soldiers and the centurion as those immediately implicated in the Son of Man's destruction. Indeed, throughout the Second Gospel there is no hesitation in naming Christ's enemies precisely. Again, it is of importance to ask what possible meanings *ἄνθρωποι* and *ἁμαρτωλοί* could have had for Mark. They appear in Mark i. 17 and ii. 17, to describe the total scope of the mission of Jesus, to indicate those whom the Lord came to save. In these two passages *ἄνθρωποι* and *ἁμαρτωλοί* would naturally include believing Jews; but is it not just as certain that the writer of the gospel, who stresses Jewish unbelief, will have understood them in the light of the missionary situation of the church in his day, and have seen in them a reference chiefly to Gentiles? Philologically, too, this would have been quite possible. *ἄνθρωποι* was a common enough expression for "men in general"; and *ἁμαρτωλοί* had come to be used in the sense of *ἔθνη* in the vocabulary of the LXX, in Greek speaking Judaism and in the early church.²

Does not real justification then exist for saying that the full sense in which the Second Evangelist interprets "men" in ix. 31 and "sinners" in xiv. 41 includes the meaning "Gentiles"? Especially as the use of "Gentiles" at x. 33 could be only a more

¹ In commenting upon Mark. ix. 31 f. in "Das Evangelium nach Markus", (*Das Neue Testament Deutsch* series) (1949), p. 126.

² See, for example, Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, I, especially pp. 328-32.

precise expression of what is contained in the other two, parallel verses. In sum, in all these three passages, the evangelist's account of the words of Jesus appears to carry a reference to the Gentiles in the world at large whom the Son of Man has come to save, and with viii. 31 they represent the passion as a moment at which Jesus is surrendered not only to the Jewish authorities, or to Pilate and his soldiers to be crucified, but also to the wider Gentile world to become its Lord. If so, then *παραδιδόναι* in ix. 31 ; x. 33 and xiv. 41 has a double meaning : it implies the betrayal of Jesus to his Jewish foes and his Roman executioners, but also, thereby, his deliverance to the Gentiles in the more general sense to become their Saviour.¹ It is not surprising, then, that in Mark's view of the cross the Gentiles who actually put Jesus to death were not his real enemies at all. The evangelist does not, of course, represent them as having had any premeditated will to destroy him. They are simply depicted as tools of the Jewish authorities, and the agents through whom the predestined suffering and death of the Son of Man are realized. But in playing this rôle they do but perform the tragic necessities of their own salvation. They liberate the Lord from the limitations of his life in the flesh amongst his Jewish compatriots, and free him to enter forthwith upon his resurrection life of universal sovereignty amongst the Gentiles. The cross, therefore, with the subsequent resurrection is the passing of Jesus from the one sphere to the other.

But what does this imply, again, for the Second Evangelist's conception of the events which are to follow upon the crucifixion ? What does it bring to the interpretation of the Lord's expressed desire to be reunited with the disciples in Galilee, as stated in Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 ? Is it not, once more, that the reunion in Galilee is for the purpose of setting forward the new dominion of Christ amongst the Gentiles ?

¹ What happens to St. Paul in the Acts of the Apostles provides an interesting parallel to all this. In Acts xxi. 11, Agabus prophesies that in Jerusalem the Jews will bind Paul and *παραδώσουσιν εἰς χεῖρας ἔθνων*. At Acts xxviii. 17 this becomes *δέσμιος ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων παρεδόθην εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν Ῥωμαίων*. But the ultimate outcome of it all was that with the final, Jewish repudiation of Paul made plain (Acts xxviii. 23-7), the Jews have brought it about that Paul and " this salvation of God " go to the Gentile community.

(d) Galilee is already associated with the evangelization of the Gentiles in St. Mark's account of the Galilean period of Christ's public ministry. Mark i. to ix., in fact, presents Jesus at that stage of his work as already breaking with Judaism and turning to the Gentiles.

The interest in the Gentiles in the first half of the gospel has been noticed by many scholars, especially its presence in vi.-viii. Johannes Weiss, for example, thought that in the Galilean period the writer of the gospel endeavoured to present Jesus as the founder or forerunner of the Gentile mission.¹ Recently, Austin Farrer has interpreted Mark vii. 1-ix. 1 as occupied chiefly with the theme of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church.²

Naturally opinions vary about the extent to which the Gentiles occupy the evangelist's thought in his account of the Galilean ministry. Much depends upon how one understands the structure of the gospel as a whole and the interpretation to be given to numerous details. But it seems possible to maintain that two leading themes are consciously in Mark's mind in these early chapters. From ii. onwards we are deliberately shown that Judaism is rising up against Jesus Christ; and this Jewish hostility, as K. L. Schmidt held,³ reaches something of a climax in the Galilean period with the rejection of Jesus in the *πατρίς* as described in vi. 1-6. The suspicion and previous actions of Herod in ch. vi. 14-29 also illustrate the same topic. Alongside this growing Jewish unbelief there emerges an interest of Jesus in the Gentiles; and it becomes more pronounced after Christ's rejection by his fellow-townsmen in the *πατρίς* and the references to Herod. There are probably allusions to this subject as early as i. 17 and ii. 17, as already suggested; and possibly again in iv. 32. It has more explicit reference in v. 1-20 (especially verses 19 and 20); but it becomes an outstanding theme in vi. 30 to viii. 26. vii. 1-23 deals with defilement by food, and endorses to a surprising extent an attitude acceptable to Gentile Christians, especially in the

¹ *Das älteste Evangelium* (1903), pp. 82 ff.

² *A Study in St. Mark* (1951), especially chs. vi. and xiii.

³ *Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (1919), pp. 152-71.

apparent repudiation of all the Levitical food taboos (vii. 18 f.). vii. 24-30 shows the Master sharing the children's bread with a Gentile woman ; vii. 31-7, viii. 22-6 and ix. 14-29 depict him opening the eyes, ears and lips of (apparently) Gentiles ; and the remainder of vi. 30 to viii. 26 is chiefly concerned with the miracles of the loaves and the comment upon them in viii. 14-21. The feeding of the four thousand has frequently been held to symbolize the spiritual feeding of the Gentiles ; and a case can be made out for the view that the feeding of the five thousand had the same prefigurative sense. It points to the later Gentile mission. I have tried to show this in an article published elsewhere.¹ It is also of consequence that from v. of ix. Jesus repeatedly uses Galilee as a centre from which to make incursions into Gentile territory. He visits the Decapolis, Tyre and Sidon, Bethsaida and the villages of Caesarea Philippi ; and earlier, in Mark iii. 8, the multitude around him even in Galilee is said to have been made up partly of people who came to him from some of these Gentile territories.

For Christians in Mark's Gentile Christian circle, laid probably under the necessity of defending their claim to be the true Israel against Jewish attack, these features of the Galilean ministry of Jesus must have had the greatest significance. In them, as they saw it, the Master's intention was plain. He had concerned himself with Gentiles. In Galilee, he had met them, and had spoken words which justified Gentile-Christian practices. From Galilee, he had gone to them, even into neighbouring territories, and there had healed them and fed them ; and possibly the feeding of the two multitudes was looked upon as a particularly important revelation of what was ordained to come to pass—though not even the Twelve then understood these miracles (viii. 14-21).

If therefore it was above all in Galilee that Jesus had made his first approaches to the Gentiles ; if there he had had response from Gentiles ; and if there he had spoken and acted in ways which foreshadowed the fuller proclamation of the gospel to the Gentiles, would it not be natural that, when rejected by the

¹ "The Miracles of the Loaves and the Gentiles", *Scottish Journal of Theology*, vol. vi, no. 1, March 1953.

Jews, he should return to Galilee to resume and fulfil this work? Is it even possible that the author of the Second Gospel sees that suggested in Mark iii. 31-5? It may not be unimportant that this pericope immediately precedes the parables of the Kingdom in iv., in which the extent and nature of the harvest of the Kingdom of God is set forth. But who will be gathered, and have their place in the Kingdom? In Mark iii. 31-5, the Lord is addressing a multitude in Galilee. He asks, "Who is my mother and my brethren?" "Mother" and "brethren" were terms current in the later fellowship of the Christian church to describe the unity in Christ of Christian believers.¹ For that reason, the passage will have been readily associated in the minds of the evangelist and his readers with the church as they knew it—the Gentile Christian church. But where and from amongst whom was this eschatological community of the elect to be gathered? Mark iii. 31-5 certainly links some of that ingathering with Galilee. "*And looking round on them which sat round about him, he saith, Behold my mother and my brethren!*" (verse 34).

It is of consequence to mention here a conclusion of Dr. P. Carrington's about the use of the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand in the apostolic church. Dr. Carrington, holding the Second Gospel to have been compiled as a lectionary for church worship, believes it possible, largely on the basis of manuscript evidence, to assign Mark's sections to the places they had in the calendar of the liturgical year of the primitive church. He maintains that the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand was an Easter Sunday reading.² I have already referred to an article of mine (written before Dr. Carrington's book was published) in which it has been maintained that this miraculous feeding prefigured the evangelization of the Gentiles. If these two conclusions are put together, the result is obviously most relevant to the theory set out in the present essay. Here it is being suggested that Mark's considerable interest in Galilee

¹ "Brother" and "sister" were commonly used. For "mother", see Rom. xvi. 13. Other passages indicate the family character of early Christian fellowship, e.g. Rom. xvi. 16; Gal. vi. 10; Eph. ii. 19; Acts. ii. 44 and iv. 32.

² *The Primitive Christian Calendar* (1952), especially pp. 75-89.

arises in no small degree from his association of Galilee with the commencement of the Gentile mission ; and that Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 mean that the disciples are to return to Galilee, because there they are to carry forward this activity. Then what more fitting lection could be chosen for Easter Sunday than a passage in which the Lord had signified that as the disciples had distributed natural bread to a hungry multitude so they were to take the bread of life which he provided and carry it to the Gentile world ?

With this point we end the review of the internal evidence of St. Mark's text. Does it not of itself suggest that the evangelist is so interested in Galilee because he looks upon it as the land from which the disciples were to initiate that mission which would result chiefly in the conversion of the Gentiles ? But this evidence, we have intimated, should perhaps be read against the background of the LXX and the facts of the racial situation in Galilee in the evangelist's lifetime. From both these sources, the writer of the gospel had every encouragement to think of Galilee as " Galilee of the Gentiles " and, therefore, as the area of Christian outreach mainly to the Gentiles. He believed that messianic salvation had gone forth from Jerusalem—from the cross and the empty tomb. But Ezekiel's Galilean flowing river and Isaiah's light of the messianic deliverance in " Galilee of the Gentiles " could have helped to persuade him that the Lord had intended that the first missionary objective was to be neither Jerusalem nor Judaea but Galilee of the Gentiles, where the disciples had been first called to be fishers of men. There they were now to take a *πλήθος πολὺ σφόδρα*, like the fishers of Ezekiel's vision (Ezek. xlvii. 10). The dominical mandate, therefore, to return to Galilee after the resurrection, as mentioned in Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7, was in the nature of a charge to them to enter fully upon their divinely appointed, missionary responsibilities ; it was tantamount, as Mark saw it, to an announcement that now, even though believing Jews could still be saved, the hour had struck for the world-wide offering of salvation to the Gentiles—an eschatological, redemptive mission by means of which " the stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner ".