

## THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

LITERATURE.—The principal commentaries and dissertations on the Gospel of Mark are those of Petter on the *Gospel of Mark* (London, 1661); Fritzsche, *Evangelium Marci* (Leipzig, 1830); De Wette (Leipzig, 1846); Hilgenfeld, *Das Marcus-Evangelium nach seiner Composition, nach seiner Stellung in der Evangelien Litteratur* (Leipzig, 1880); Ewald (Göttingen, 1850); Baur, *Das Marcus-Evangelium nach seinem Ursprung und Charakter* (Tübingen, 1851); Olshausen (1853, English translation, 1863); Dr. Joseph Alexander of Princeton (New York, 1858); Alford in his *Greek Testament* (4th ed. London, 1859); Meyer (last ed. in 1894; 1st ed. 1860; 6th ed. 1878; English translation by the Rev. Robert Wallis, Edinburgh, 1880); Lange (Bielefeld, 1861; English translation by Professor Shedd, 1866); Klostermann, *Das Marcus-Evangelium nach seinem Quellenwerthe für die Evangelische Geschichte* (Göttingen, 1867); Weiss, *Das Marcus-Evangelium* (Berlin, 1872); Morison (1st ed. London, 1873; 3rd ed. 1881); Volkmar, *Marcus und die Synopse der Evangelien* (Zürich, 1876); Canon Cook in the *Speaker's Commentary* (London, 1878); Maclear in *Cambridge Bible for Schools* (London, 1886). Also Dean Burgon, *The last twelve verses of the Gospel according to Mark* (Oxford, 1871).

### I. THE GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPEL.

The genuineness of the Gospel of Mark is sufficiently attested. It is true that no undoubted citations from it can be produced from the writings of the apostolic Fathers,

because the resemblance between it and the Gospels of Matthew and Luke is so close as to render it impossible to determine from which of these Gospels the citations have been taken. The first undoubted reference to it is found in that famous passage, quoted by Eusebius from Papias' *Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις* (A.D. 120), to which we have formerly adverted.<sup>1</sup> "This also the Presbyter said: Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, though not indeed in order, whatever he remembered of the things said or done by Christ."<sup>2</sup> It is to be observed that Papias gives this statement on the authority of the Presbyter. Without doubt John the Presbyter is here meant, whether he be, as some suppose, the Apostle John himself, or a person, otherwise unknown, who was an immediate disciple of the Lord, and whose testimony consequently carries us back to the days of the apostles. It has indeed been maintained by many biblical critics that Papias cannot here refer to our canonical Mark, but to some original document which lay at the foundation of Mark's Gospel, because his description does not correspond with our Gospel of Mark. We have already referred to this objection,<sup>3</sup> and shall afterwards more fully discuss it.

Justin Martyr (A.D. 150) has the following direct citation from Mark: "It is said that He changed the name of one of the apostles to Peter; and it is written in his Memoirs that this occurred, as well as that He changed the names of other two brothers, the sons of Zebedee, to Boanerges, which means the sons of thunder."<sup>4</sup> This title given to the sons of Zebedee is only found in the Gospel of Mark (iii. 17).

The Muratorian canon (A.D. 170) is mutilated at its commencement, but it evidently contained a reference to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, for the fragment commences with the words: "The third Gospel is that according to Luke."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See p. 19, where the original Greek is given.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39.

<sup>3</sup> See *supra*, pp. 66, 67.

<sup>4</sup> *Dial. c. Tryph.* ch. cvi.

<sup>5</sup> *Tertium Evangelii librum secundum Lucam.*

Irenæus (A.D. 180) has many references to Mark, and directly affirms that he is the author of the second Gospel: "Wherefore also Mark, the interpreter and follower of Peter, does thus commence his Gospel narrative: The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God."<sup>1</sup> "Also toward the conclusion of his Gospel, Mark says: 'So, then, after the Lord Jesus had spoken unto them, He was received up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God.'"<sup>2</sup> "Those who separate Jesus from Christ, alleging that Christ remained impassible, but that it was Jesus who suffered, preferring the Gospel by Mark, if they read it with the love of the truth, may have their errors rectified."<sup>3</sup>

Besides these quotations, there are the patristic statements of the intimate connection which exists between the Gospel of Mark and the preaching of Peter, made by Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, and others, to which we shall afterwards refer. There is also the testimony of the two chief versions, the Syriac (A.D. 150) and the Old Latin (A.D. 170).

Nor are internal evidences wanting. The attribution of this Gospel to such a comparatively obscure author as Mark, is in itself a presumption in its favour. If the design was to impose it upon the Church, it would have been assigned to one of the chief apostles, especially to Peter, whose preaching, according to the Fathers, it contains, and not to one who was not an apostle, and perhaps not even a disciple, and who, provided he be the same as the Mark who is mentioned in the Acts, so far from being an eminent teacher in the Church, deserted Paul and Barnabas on their missionary journey. But especially does the Gospel contain in itself the evidences of its genuineness. The narrative is of the most graphic description; little incidents are mentioned which could only be the observation of an eye-witness.<sup>4</sup> There is a vividness, a freshness, and a naturalness in this Gospel which give it the stamp of truth.

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Hær.* iii. 10. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* iii. 11. 7.

<sup>4</sup> It is not necessary to assert that Mark himself was an eye-witness, but that the narrative contained in his Gospel was the report of an eye-witness.

Yet notwithstanding these external and internal evidences in favour of the Gospel of Mark, its genuineness has been frequently disputed. The objections to it arise chiefly from the difficulties in which the question as to the origin of the Synoptic Gospels is involved, and not from any defect in the evidence. The first who called in question its genuineness appears to have been Schleiermacher, and he has been followed by Baur, Weisse, Gfrörer, Credner,<sup>1</sup> Schwegler, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Köstlin, Reuss, Schenkel, and Dr. Samuel Davidson.

The chief objection brought forward is, that the statement of Papias is not applicable to our canonical Gospel of Mark.<sup>2</sup> The genuineness of Mark's Gospel, it is asserted, rests entirely on the testimony of Papias; the other authorities come too late. But the description which Papias gives of the writing of Mark cannot apply to our canonical Gospel. Papias asserts that Mark, the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, but not in order (*οὐ τάξει*), whatever he remembered of the things said or done by Christ; and that he followed Peter who adapted his discourses to the needs of his hearers, but "with no intention of giving a connected account of our Lord's discourses" (*οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων*). These words, it is maintained, cannot refer to the Gospel of Mark, as we now possess it, because that Gospel, so far from not being written in order and destitute of connection, is the most orderly and connected of the three Synoptic Gospels; indeed it is on its chronological order that harmonies of the Gospels are in general formed.

It is to be observed that this is the mere opinion of Papias, or of the Presbyter to whom he refers, and that on a subject which admits of a variety of opinions; nor are his words to be pushed too far. There is a considerable variety of opinion as to what Papias intends by *οὐ τάξει*. Tholuck supposes that he refers to the incompleteness of the Gospel,—that Mark merely gives a collection of anecdotes without observing any definite order with regard to the time of the occurrence of the incidents stated. Schenkel supposes that the words

<sup>1</sup> *Einleitung*, pp. 123, 124.

<sup>2</sup> So Schleiermacher, Credner, and Weisse.

indicate the occasional manner of Mark's writing; that he did not compose his Gospel continuously at one time, but in parts at various times. Others think that *οὐ τάξει* refers, not to the actions, but to the discourses of Christ, and indicates that Mark gave no continued account of our Lord's discourses (*σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λόγων*). But, apparently, what he affirms is not that there was no order in the composition of Mark's Gospel, but that the events are not related in a chronological order. Papias asserts the accuracy of the events which Mark relates, that "Mark wrote down accurately every thing that he remembered," that "Mark committed no error," but for some reason he was dissatisfied with his arrangement. The want of chronological order is to some extent applicable to all the three Synoptics. The evangelists did not relate the events of the life of Christ chronologically; they do not profess to give a biography of Christ; their Gospels rather consist of memorabilia or collections of the remarkable incidents in His life. The words of Papias are to be understood comparatively. It is disputed with what Gospel he compares the order in Mark. Some suppose that Matthew's Gospel, to which he afterwards alludes, was in his view; others, as Ewald and Bishop Lightfoot, think that it is the order followed in the Gospel of John; Dr. Salmon thinks that what Papias regarded as the right order was that of the Gospel of Luke.<sup>1</sup>

It has been maintained that there must have been an original Gospel of Mark, of which our canonical Gospel is a recension. Those who adopt this opinion suppose that a collection of incidents in the life of Jesus, based perhaps, as the Fathers testify, on the preaching of Peter, was drawn up by Mark, one of his disciples, without any order, and that it is to this collection that Papias alludes. Afterwards, it is supposed, a succeeding writer composed the second Gospel, taking this original gospel as his basis, arranging the incidents in order, and adding to them additional material drawn from oral tradition.

We have already referred to this hypothesis of an original Mark,<sup>2</sup> and shall not again recur to it. Those who

<sup>1</sup> Salmon's *Introduction*, p. 121.

<sup>2</sup> See *supra*, pp. 66, 67.

adopt it differ widely as to its nature and extent. Ewald and Holtzmann suppose that the original Mark was longer than our present Gospel, containing a greater number of the incidents and discourses of Christ than our present Mark. Paul Ewald supposes that i. 1–3, vii. 24, viii. 26, and xvi. 9–20 are interpolations.<sup>1</sup> Weizsäcker, on the contrary, considers that it was shorter, and that our present Mark is an enlargement. In the writings of the Fathers there is no reference to a Gospel of Mark different from that which we now possess. “The assumption,” observes Meyer, “of an original treatise which has been lost would only have a historical point of support in the event of the contents of the fragment of Papias, so far as it speaks of the treatise of Mark, not really suiting our canonical Mark. But since, on a correct interpretation, it contains nothing with which our Mark is at variance, and therefore affords no ground for the assertion that it is speaking of another book ascribed to Mark, it remains the most ancient and the most weighty historical testimony for the originality of our second Gospel, and, at the same time, for the high historical value of its contents.”<sup>2</sup>

## II. THE AUTHOR OF THE GOSPEL.

This Gospel has been uniformly assigned by the Fathers to Mark; it is known in the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament as *Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον*. If we assume that this Mark is the same as he who is mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, the following incidents in his life are recorded. He was a Jew by birth, being mentioned by Paul as among those of the circumcision (Col. iv. 10, 11), and bore the Hebrew name of John. But, like many of his time, he had also the Roman name of Mark. Hence he is called “John, whose surname was Mark” (*Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Μάρκος*, Acts xii. 12, 25, xv. 37). In the Acts he is generally called by his Hebrew name John (Acts xiii. 5, 13); whilst in the Epistles and in the Fathers the Hebrew name is dropped and the Latin name Mark retained. We

<sup>1</sup> Ewald, Paul, *Evangelienfrage*, pp. 165, 170, 178–191.

<sup>2</sup> Meyer's *Commentary on Mark*, vol. i. Eng. trans. p. 12.

learn that his mother's name was Mary, and that she had a house in Jerusalem, where the disciples were accustomed to assemble (Acts xii. 12). In the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 10), Mark is called *ὁ ἀνεψιὸς Βαρνάβα*, which may either denote nephew or cousin; in the Revised Version it is translated cousin. From this relationship to Barnabas it has been arbitrarily inferred that he was a Levite. It was probably by reason of this relationship that he was brought in contact with Paul; for we read that Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, and took with them John, whose surname was Mark (Acts xii. 25). He accompanied these apostles on their first missionary journey as their assistant or minister (*ὑπηρέτης*, Acts xiii. 5); but either because his zeal waxed cold, or because the dangers and difficulties of the mission alarmed him, he deserted them at Perga, and returned to Jerusalem (Acts xiii. 13). Four years afterwards, when Paul and Barnabas proposed to proceed on a second missionary journey, Mark was the occasion of a dispute between them; Barnabas wished to take him with them, but Paul refused on account of his previous desertion; and accordingly Paul took Silas, whilst Barnabas took Mark, and departed with him to Cyprus (Acts xv. 39). This is the last notice which we have of Mark in the Acts of the Apostles. But from Paul's Epistles we learn that he was afterwards fully reconciled to Paul. He was with that apostle during his first Roman imprisonment, when he wrote the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24). He afterwards appears to have journeyed into Asia, for during his second Roman imprisonment Paul writes to Timothy: "Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is useful to me for the ministering" (2 Tim. iv. 11).

Such is the scriptural account of the connection between Mark, the relation of Barnabas, and Paul. But there is also mention of a Mark in the First Epistle of Peter written from Babylon, or, as some think, from Rome. There we read: "She that is in Babylon, elect together with you, saluteth you; and so doth Mark my son" (1 Pet. v. 13). Some (Bengel, Neander, Credner, Tholuck, Dean Stanley) suppose that, when Peter calls Mark his son (*ὁ υἱός μου*), he does not

allude to a spiritual, but to a natural relationship. Thus Dean Stanley observes: "It is difficult to resist the conclusion that ἡ συνεκλεκτή is the wife of Peter; and if so, ὁ υἱός μου is not metaphorically (in which case τέκνον would be the natural word, as in 1 Tim. i. 2), but literally, his son."<sup>1</sup> But such an opinion is unfounded. There is no reason why Peter and Paul should not employ different words to express a spiritual relationship. Peter calls Mark his son, because he was converted by him; he was his spiritual father.

We have said that these incidents refer to Mark, the evangelist, on the assumption that he is the same person as is mentioned in the Acts and in the Pauline Epistles. Some, however, suppose that there are two Marks; one mentioned in the Acts, who was the companion of Paul, and another mentioned in the First Epistle of Peter, who was the companion of Peter. This opinion has been adopted by Grotius,<sup>2</sup> Schleiermacher, Cornelius a Lapide, Cave,<sup>3</sup> Greswell,<sup>4</sup> Baring-Gould,<sup>5</sup> and Dr. David Brown of Aberdeen. There is nothing unreasonable in this supposition, nor is it contradicted by any of the statements of the Fathers of the first three centuries. The reasons for it are that Mark is in Scripture, with the exception of 1 Pet. v. 13, uniformly represented as the associate of Paul and Barnabas; and there is no allusion to any connection between him and the Apostle Peter. He was with Paul at Rome (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11), and could hardly approximately about the same time have been with Peter at Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13). Besides, Mark or Marcus was a very common name, borne by many illustrious Romans, as Marcus Tullius Cicero, Mark Antony, and the emperor Marcus Aurelius. Hence it has been inferred that there must have been two Marks, and that it was not Mark the relation of Barnabas, but another Mark, the companion and interpreter of Peter, who was the author of the Gospel.

<sup>1</sup> Stanley's *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age*, p. 91, note.

<sup>2</sup> Grotius, *Prooemium in Marcum*.

<sup>3</sup> Cave's *Lives of the Apostles*, p. 439.

<sup>4</sup> Greswell's *Dissertations*, vol. i. p. 71.

<sup>5</sup> Baring-Gould's *Lives of the Saints*, April 25.



On the other hand, it has been maintained that this supposition is unnecessary, and that Mark might be the companion both of Paul and Peter. After Mark had separated from Paul at the commencement of his first missionary journey and returned to Jerusalem, he might have attached himself to Peter in that city; and after he had left Barnabas in Cyprus, he might have been with Peter in the interval between that and Paul's imprisonment at Rome. Besides, a connection between Peter and Mark is hinted at in the Acts: it was to Mark's house that Peter betook himself after his miraculous deliverance from prison (Acts xii. 12). "To suppose two Marks," says Dr. John Lightfoot, "one with Peter and another with Paul, is to breed confusion where there needeth not, and to conceive that for which Scripture hath not only no ground, but is plain enough to the contrary. It is easily seen how John Mark came into familiarity both with Paul and Peter; and other Mark we can find none in the New Testament, unless of our own invention."<sup>1</sup> There is much, however, in favour of the theory that there were two Marks, a supposition which would remove several difficulties which arise from the long continued connection of Mark with Paul, rendering a connection with Peter improbable.

It has been supposed that Mark was the young man mentioned in his Gospel who followed Christ after all the disciples had fled, when He was led from Gethsemane to the palace of Caiaphas (Mark xiv. 52). It is narrated by the evangelist as a personal incident in a most graphic manner. Disturbed in his sleep by the tumult, and not taking time to put on his clothes, he threw a linen sheet over him, and rushed into the street to see what was the cause of the tumult: the soldiers seized him, and he left the linen cloth in their hands, and fled naked.<sup>2</sup> The objection to this is, that according to the statement of Papias, Mark was not one of Christ's disciples: "he neither heard the Lord nor followed Him"; so that if Mark himself is the person

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot's *Works*, vol. iii. p. 323, edition by Pitman.

<sup>2</sup> See Greswell's *Dissertations upon a Harmony of the Gospels*, vol. i. p. 82, edition 1830.

alluded to in his Gospel, we must suppose that Papias was mistaken. The Mark mentioned in the Acts was at least at a very early period a disciple of Christ. Others go the length of supposing that it was in Mark's house that our Lord and His disciples met to celebrate the last Passover: that, being a disciple, and having a house in Jerusalem, he gave it up for the use of our Lord.<sup>1</sup> This, however, is a mere conjecture which rests on a very slender foundation.

There are several notices of Mark in ecclesiastical history. According to Epiphanius, he was one of Christ's seventy disciples, and one of those who left Christ on account of His words: "Except ye eat My flesh and drink My blood, ye have no life in you" (John vi. 66), but was afterwards reclaimed, and, as it were, reconverted by Peter, whose spiritual son he became.<sup>2</sup> He is uniformly known by the Fathers as the interpreter of Peter. He is represented as the founder of the Egyptian Church. Eusebius informs us that "Mark was the first who was sent to Egypt, and that he preached the Gospel which he had written, and established churches in Alexandria."<sup>3</sup> The multitude of believers that were collected there, and lived lives of the most philosophical and excessive asceticism, was so great, that Philo thought it worth while to describe their pursuits, their meetings, their entertainments, and their whole manner of life."<sup>4</sup> The allusion is to the Therapeutæ whom Philo describes; but they were not Christians, and hence this statement of Eusebius must be considered as legendary;<sup>5</sup> though it may be assumed that Mark converted numbers in Alexandria, and that his preaching was of an ascetic character. Jerome tells us that Mark died a natural death in the eighth year of Nero, and that he was buried at Alexandria.<sup>6</sup> Nicephorus, on the other hand,

<sup>1</sup> Farrar's *Messages of the Books*, p. 55, note 4.

<sup>2</sup> Epiphanius, *Hær.* li. 6.

<sup>3</sup> That Mark founded the Church of Alexandria is also asserted by Epiphanius, *Hær.* li. 6; Jerome, *De vir. illustr.* 8; and Nicephorus, *H. E.* ii. 42.

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 16.

<sup>5</sup> The Therapeutæ were a Jewish sect. Eusebius probably confounds them with the Christian monks.

<sup>6</sup> *De vir. illustr.* ch. viii.

informs us that he suffered martyrdom, being cruelly put to death by an Alexandrian mob.<sup>1</sup> His remains were believed to have been removed to Venice, of which city he was regarded as the patron saint, and where one of the most magnificent churches in the world has been erected to his memory.

### III. THE SOURCES OF MARK'S GOSPEL.

The inquiry into the sources from which Mark derived the materials for his Gospel is one of much difficulty. These sources were not, as is maintained by Griesbach and Bleek, the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. This point we have in the previous part of this Introduction fully discussed.<sup>2</sup> Mark was not a compiler from previous Gospels. His own Gospel is original and independent, and in all probability was written and published before the other two.

On the other hand, it is the uniform testimony of the Fathers that Mark was intimately associated with Peter as his interpreter. This is a tradition which is both general and undisputed. It is first mentioned by Papias in the passage so often referred to; there Mark is called *ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου*. Irenæus says: "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter (*Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου*), transmitted to us in writing these things which Peter had preached."<sup>3</sup> Clemens Alexandrinus, according to Eusebius, says: "The Gospel according to Mark, had this occasion: As Peter had preached the word publicly at Rome, and declared the gospel by the Spirit, many that were present requested that Mark, who had followed him for a long time, and remembered his sayings, should write them out. And having composed the Gospel, he gave it to those who had requested it. When Peter learned this, he neither directly forbade nor encouraged it."<sup>4</sup> Tertullian writes: "The Gospel which Mark published may be affirmed to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was."<sup>5</sup> Origen, quoted by Eusebius, says:

<sup>1</sup> Nicephorus, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 43.

<sup>2</sup> See *supra*, pp. 46-48.

<sup>3</sup> Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 1. 1; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion.* iv. 5.

"The second Gospel is that according to Mark, who wrote it according to the instructions of Peter."<sup>1</sup> Eusebius writes at length concerning the Gospel of Mark. "So greatly did the splendour of piety illumine the minds of Peter's hearers, that they were not satisfied with hearing once only, or with the unwritten teaching of the divine Gospel, but they besought Mark—a follower of Peter, and the one whose Gospel is extant—that he would leave them a written monument of the doctrine which had been orally communicated to them. Nor did they cease until they prevailed upon him; and such was the occasion of the written Gospel which bears the name of Mark."<sup>2</sup> And to the same effect Jerome observes: "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, at the desire of the brethren at Rome, wrote a short Gospel, according to what he had heard related by Peter."<sup>3</sup>

From these testimonies it must be admitted that the preaching of Peter had some influence in the formation of the Gospel of Mark. It has been affirmed that traces of this influence and of this connection between Mark and Peter are to be discerned in the Gospel itself.<sup>4</sup> There is frequent mention of Peter in places where he is not alluded to in the other Gospels, as if it were the writer's desire to record facts concerning him of which he had been personally informed. Thus we are told that Simon and those that were with him followed Jesus after the miracles at Capernaum (i. 16); that it was Peter who drew the attention of our Lord to the withering of the fig tree (xi. 13); that Peter, along with John, James, and Andrew, asked our Lord concerning the sign that should precede the destruction of Jerusalem (xiii. 3); and that the angel who announced the resurrection of Christ to the women, specified Peter as the person to whom the announcement should be made: "Tell His disciples and Peter" (xvi. 7). But, on the other hand, there are also numerous instances where Peter is omitted in the Gospel of Mark, while men-

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 25.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Jerome, *De vir. illustr.* ch. viii.

<sup>4</sup> See Dods' *Introduction to the N.T.* pp. 26-28; Klostermann's *Marcus-evangelium*; Guericke, *Isagogik*, p. 161; Maclear's *St. Mark*, p. 14 ff.; Davidson's *Introduction to the N.T.* vol. i. pp. 145-147.

tioned in the other Gospels. Thus in Matt. xv. 15, Peter is represented as asking the explanation of a certain parable, whereas Mark has simply "the disciples." The blessing pronounced on Peter (Matt. xvi. 16-18), Peter walking on the sea (Matt. xiv. 28, 29), and his capture of the fish in which was found the Roman coin (Matt. xvii. 24-27), are omitted by Mark. His mission along with John (Luke xxii. 8) to prepare the Passover, and the fact that he accompanied John to the sepulchre (John xx. 2), are not mentioned. It has indeed been suggested that these omissions may be accounted for by the humility of Peter, and from his reluctance to allude to anything that might redound to his praise; but, not to mention that it is difficult to see how this could affect the narrative of Mark, there are several instances of omission to which this remark cannot apply. Upon the whole, we do not think that the connection between Mark and Peter can be discovered by any traces in the Gospel itself.

Different meanings have been attached to the expression "interpreter of Peter" (*ἐρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου*; Latin, *interpret*) given by Papias and Irenæus to Mark. Some think that the word is to be taken in the sense of *translator*; that Mark translated into Greek (Eichhorn, Kuinoel, Schleiermacher) or into Latin (Bleek) what Peter preached in Aramaic; or that Mark translated into Greek Peter's Aramaic Gospel (Smith of Jordanhill). But there is no reason to suppose that Peter was ignorant of Greek, as it was one of the languages of Galilee, and his Epistles prove his acquaintance with it; and Latin was not required even in Rome, as Greek was the usual language of the Roman converts; nor is there the slightest trace of an Aramaic original of Peter's Gospel. Others—Meyer, Tholuck, Klostermann after Jerome—take the word in the sense of *amanuensis* or secretary, and suppose that Mark wrote down the oral teaching of Peter. Thus Jerome observes that as Paul employed Titus for his interpreter, so Peter employed Mark, whose Gospel was composed by the apostle dictating and the evangelist writing.<sup>1</sup> But the probability is that Mark is called "the

<sup>1</sup> *Epist. ad Hedibeam*, ii.

interpreter of Peter," because his Gospel contains the substance of Peter's preaching, and thus interpreted that preaching to the Church. The tradition is so early and universal, that we must allow some connection between the Gospel of Mark and the preaching of Peter, yet not to the extent of supposing either that Mark wrote his Gospel to the dictation of Peter (Origen, Jerome), or that it contains a mere literal repetition of Peter's preaching.

In accordance with these testimonies of the Fathers, we infer that one of the sources of Mark's Gospel was the preaching of Peter, though how far the Petrine element entered into it we cannot determine. Mark, as the companion and interpreter of that apostle, collected notes of his preaching, and by their aid constructed his Gospel. Two of the Fathers of the early Church, Justin and Tertullian, appear actually to have regarded it as the Gospel of Peter. Justin Martyr, in a passage already quoted, says that Christ changed the name of one of His apostles to Peter; and it is written in his *Memoirs* (ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ) that He changed the names of other two apostles to Boanerges.<sup>1</sup> The question is, What are the *Memoirs* to which Justin alludes? It has been affirmed that the most natural interpretation is to refer the pronoun (αὐτοῦ) to Peter, the immediate antecedent. Lardner and De Wette refer it to Christ; His *Memoirs*, that is, the *Memoirs* concerning Christ. But to this it is answered that Justin always uses the genitive of authorship—the *Memoirs* of the apostles, so that the phrase would denote Peter's *Memoirs*. But although the meaning of these words may be doubtful, yet Tertullian expressly calls Mark's Gospel the Gospel of Peter: "The Gospel which Mark published may be affirmed to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was."<sup>2</sup>

But besides the oral teaching of Peter, the general oral tradition of the Church formed another source of the Gospel of Mark. An oral Gospel for the instruction of catechumens would be formed at an early period, and, as we have had already occasion to observe, would enter largely into the

<sup>1</sup> Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* ch. cvi. Otto, an editor of Justin, thinks that for αὐτοῦ we ought to read αὐτῶν.

<sup>2</sup> *Adv. Marcion.* iv. 5.

formation of the Synoptic Gospels. Besides, we must also remember that Mark was a native of Jerusalem and an early convert to Christianity; and, consequently, would have ample opportunities for collecting particulars concerning the life of Christ by his intercourse with those who were the personal followers of Christ and the hearers of His discourses.

#### IV. THE DESIGN OF THE GOSPEL.

Clemens Alexandrinus gives an account of the occasion on which Mark's Gospel was composed. He tells us that the disciples requested Mark to write down the sayings of Peter, and not to leave them to the uncertainty of tradition; and that this was done with Peter's knowledge and concurrence.<sup>1</sup> We cannot tell what truth there is in this statement: in all probability there is much that is legendary about it, and it contradicts other statements of the Fathers. This Gospel was doubtless written for the purpose of giving a connected view of the life of Christ and of gathering together those evangelical fragments, whether oral or written, which were dispersed throughout the churches. Christ is represented in this Gospel as the active agent, the worker of miracles: as at once the Son of God and the Son of Man; revealing Himself as God by His mighty words, and as Man by His human personality and human feelings: it is "The Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (Mark i. 1). Peter's statement of the testimony of the apostles: how "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with Him" (Acts x. 38), has well been described as the programme of this Gospel. Whilst Matthew records the discourses of Jesus, Mark dwells chiefly on His actions.

It is probable, from various indications, that this Gospel was written, not like that of Matthew, for Jewish, but, like that of Luke, for Gentile Christians. There are in it several Latin words and expressions. Of these Credner specifies *δηνάριον*, denarius, vi. 37, xiv. 5; *κεντυρίων*, centurio, xv. 39,

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 14. A similar statement is made by Eusebius himself, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 15.

44, 45; κῆνσος, census, xii. 14; κοδράντης, quadrans, xii. 42; κράββατος, grabatus, ii. 4, 9, 11, 12, vi. 55; λεγιών, legio, v. 9, 15; ξέστης, sextarius, vii. 4, 8; πραιτώριον, prætorium, xv. 16; σπεκουλάτωρ, speculator, vi. 27; φραγελλόω, flagello, xv. 15; τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι, populo satisfacere, xv. 15; ἐσχάτως ἔχειν, in extremis esse, v. 23.<sup>1</sup> The use of these Latin words and phrases will be best accounted for, if the ordinary supposition is correct, that Mark wrote chiefly for the Romans.

So also translations are attached to Aramaic words and expressions for the information of Gentile readers who were ignorant of that language. Thus our Lord called James and John, "Boanerges, that is, the sons of thunder" (iii. 17). In raising the daughter of Jairus, our Lord said to her, "Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, Arise" (v. 41). The pharisaical Jews excused their want of filial affection by offering gifts to God, saying, "It is Corban, that is, given to God" (vii. 11). When Jesus took the blind man aside privately, "He said unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened" (vii. 34). The name of the blind man who was cured at Jericho was Bartimæus, the son of Timæus (x. 46). In Gethsemane our Lord used the word Abba, that is, Father (xiv. 36). The place where He was crucified was called "Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, the place of a skull" (xv. 22). And on the cross our Lord exclaimed, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? which, being interpreted, is, My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" (xv. 34).

Jewish customs and usages are often explained, as if for the information of Gentile readers. Thus we are informed that the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders (vii. 3); that the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast (ii. 18); that the Sadducees say, there is no resurrection (xii. 18); that on the first day of unleavened bread, the Passover was killed (xiv. 12); that at the Passover the Romans were accustomed to release to the Jews a prisoner, whomsoever they desired (xv. 6); that the preparation was the day before the Sabbath (xv. 42). So also localities which would be well known to

<sup>1</sup> Credner's *Einleitung*, p. 104.



Jewish, but not to Gentile readers, are explained. The Jordan is called the river of Jordan (i. 5); the Mount of Olives is over against the temple (xiii. 3). The Jewish law is nowhere alluded to; indeed the word νόμος, of such frequent occurrence in the New Testament, does not occur.

#### V. LANGUAGE OF THE GOSPEL.

Baronius, Bellarmine, and other Catholic writers suppose that the Gospel of Mark was written in Latin. The reason assigned for this opinion is that the readers of this Gospel were Romans or Latin Christians. It is also supported by the two Syriac versions, the Peshito and the Philoxenian. Thus a note appended to the Peshito says: "This is the end of the holy Gospel preached by Mark, who preached in Roman at Rome." And Scholtz mentions four Greek manuscripts in which it is asserted that the Gospel was written in Latin.<sup>1</sup> But such an opinion is undoubtedly incorrect; the Greek and Latin Fathers unanimously testify that the Gospel was originally written in Greek.

The style and diction of Mark is graphic and vivid. There is a preference for the present to the historical tense; events are represented as happening before our eyes, imparting a vividness to the description. Thus: "There comes to Him a leper, beseeching Him" (i. 40). "They come to Him, bringing one sick of the palsy, borne of four" (ii. 3). "And straightway, while he was yet speaking, comes Judas, one of the Twelve" (xiv. 43). In the narrative εὐθέως or εὐθύς frequently occurs as the particle of transition, imparting a lively character to the narrative; it occurs thirty-nine times, and is in the Authorised Version variously translated by the words straightway, immediately, forthwith. There are numerous references to persons, which impart a graphic character to the narrative; thus: "The Pharisees took counsel with the Herodians" (iii. 6); "Judas, which betrayed him" (iv. 11); Simon, "the father of Alexander and Rufus" (xv. 21). There are minute descriptions of localities: "He began to teach by the seaside" (iv. 1); "He was in the stern asleep on the

<sup>1</sup> ἐγγράφη Ῥωμαϊστὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ.

cushion" (iv. 38); "they find a colt tied at the door without, in the open street" (xi. 4); "He commanded them to sit down by companies upon the green grass" (vi. 39). There are precise statements of periods of time: "at even, when the sun did set" (i. 32); "in the morning, a great while before day" (i. 35); "on that day, when even was come, He said unto them, Let us go over to the other side" (iv. 35). There is a large use of diminutives, as *παῖδιον*, *θυγάτριον*, *κοράσιον*, *κυνάρια*, *ὠτάριον*. Numerous repetitions are made to add force to the narrative; as the accumulation of negatives, *μηδενὶ μηδέν* (i. 44), *οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς* (vii. 12); the addition of similar expressions, as when it is said: "And with many parables spake He unto them: and without a parable spake He not unto them" (iv. 33, 34). There is also a large number of words which are peculiar to this Gospel.<sup>1</sup>

There are nineteen quotations from the Old Testament in Mark's Gospel, but these are all common to Matthew and Luke, often agreeing verbally. All these quotations are given in reporting our Lord's discourses; there is only one (i. 2, 3) which Mark gives as from himself.

The following is the list of them:—

N.T.	O.T.
Mark i. 2 . . . .	Mal. iii. 1.
„ i. 3 . . . .	Isa. xl. 3.
„ iv. 12 . . . .	Isa. vi. 9.
„ vii. 6, 7 . . . .	Isa. xxix. 13.
„ vii. 10 . . . .	Ex. xx. 12, xxi. 17.
„ x. 6 . . . .	Gen. i. 27.
„ x. 7, 8 . . . .	Gen. ii. 24.
„ x. 19 . . . .	Ex. xx. 12–15.
„ xi. 9 . . . .	Ps. cxviii. 25, 21.
„ xi. 17 . . . .	Isa. lvi. 7; Jer. vii. 11.
„ xii. 10, 11 . . . .	Ps. cxviii. 22, 23.
„ xii. 19 . . . .	Deut. xxv. 5.
„ xii. 26 . . . .	Ex. iii. 6.

<sup>1</sup> See Credner's *Einleitung in das N.T.* 102–105; Davidson's *Introduction to the N.T.* vol. i. pp. 150–152; and his *Introduction to the Study of the N.T.* vol. ii. 3rd ed. pp. 521–523; Guericke's *N.T. Isagogik*, pp. 162, 163; and Schaff's *History of the Church*, vol. ii. pp. 637–639.

N.T.	O.T.
Mark xii. 29, 30 . . .	Deut. vi. 4.
„ xii. 31 . . .	Lev. xix. 18.
„ xii. 36 . . .	Ps. cx. 1.
„ xiii. 14 . . .	Dan. ix. 27.
„ xiv. 27 . . .	Zech. xiii. 7.
„ xv. 34 . . .	Ps. xxii. 1.

One peculiar feature of the Gospel of Mark is its brevity. It is of much smaller compass than the other Gospels; there is little that is peculiar to it—only one parable and two miracles. Most of the discourses which are in the other Gospels are omitted. And yet this brevity consists rather in the omission of particulars than in condensation. What is common to the other two is often expanded by Mark by the addition of minute particulars.

The chief characteristic of this Gospel is its vividness. The narrative is picturesque, so as to secure for the evangelist the name of a “word-painter.” The transactions are described as if we saw them with our own eyes; minute touches lighten up the whole subject. One scene may be selected for illustration. If we compare the account of the cure of the demoniac lad, when our Lord descended from the mount of transfiguration (ix. 14–29), with the narratives in the other two Gospels (Matt. xvii. 14–21; Luke ix. 37–48), the graphic nature of Mark’s description will at once be seen.<sup>1</sup> Mark alone tells us that when our Lord came down from the mount, He saw a great crowd about the disciples, and the scribes disputing with them. And when all the people beheld Him they were greatly amazed, probably because some vestiges of His glory were still seen on His countenance, and running to Him they saluted Him. Mark alone tells us that when they brought the lad to Jesus the spirit tare him grievously, and he fell to the ground, and wallowed, foaming. He alone gives us, in a most graphic manner, the conversation between the father of the lad and our Lord. “And He asked his father, How long time is it since this hath come unto him? And he said, From a child. And oft-times it hath cast him both into the fire

<sup>1</sup> This is well exhibited in Rushbrooke’s *Synopticon*, p. 60; also Abbott and Rushbrooke’s *Common Tradition of the Gospels*, pp. 70–72.

and into the waters to destroy him; but if Thou canst do anything, have compassion on us, and help us. And Jesus said unto him, If thou canst, all things are possible to him that believeth. Straightway the father of the child cried out, and said, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief." Then we are told the crowd came rushing together; and when Jesus commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the lad, the spirit cried and rent him sore, and the lad fell into such a death-like faint that the greater part of the crowd said he was dead. But Jesus came and took him by the hand and raised him up. The whole scene is graphically described, as by the hand of a painter<sup>1</sup>—the epileptic fit that seized the boy, the crowd rushing together, the agony and earnestness of the father, and the dignity and majesty of Christ, are all vividly portrayed before us.

Mark, more than the other evangelists, represents Jesus as He actually lived and walked on this earth. There is a peculiarly realistic character about this Gospel; Jesus Christ, the Son of Man and the Son of God, is evidently set forth before us. His feelings are disclosed: how He grieved for the hardness of men's hearts (iii. 5); how, looking up to heaven, He sighed (vii. 34); how He loved the rich young man who came asking what he should do to inherit eternal life (x. 21); how He was moved with indignation with His disciples when they sought to prohibit little children to be brought to Him (x. 14); how He was moved with compassion for the people who followed Him (vi. 34); and how He marvelled at the unbelief of His hearers (vi. 6). So also His actions and gestures are described: He turned about and looked on His disciples when He administered the severe rebuke to Peter (viii. 33); He took up the little child in His arms (ix. 36); He put His fingers into the ears of the deaf-mute, and did spit and touched his tongue (vii. 33); when the woman with the issue of blood touched His garment, He looked round to see who had done it (v. 32); He fell asleep from fatigue in the stern of the boat (iv. 38). The very words which He spoke in Aramaic are given. We almost hear the accents of His

<sup>1</sup> Raphael's great picture of the Transfiguration is chiefly taken from the description in Mark.

voice. All is brought vividly before us; the scenes are photographed, so that we see them. Jesus is followed by the multitudes of Galilee; He can find no place for retirement; there is no room even about the door of the house where He was; the multitude come together, so that they cannot so much as eat bread (iii. 20, 21).<sup>1</sup>

The Gospel of Mark is, as we have seen, no abbreviation of Matthew and Luke. In neither of these Gospels is Jesus so vividly displayed before us. He is in this Gospel seen to be in all points tempted like as we are, with the notable exception of being without sin; He is actuated by human feelings; He is subject to human wants; He is a great Personality whom we see and know. "I regard," observes Dean Alford, "the existence of the Gospel of Mark as a gracious and valuable proof of the accommodation by the Divine Spirit of the records of the life of our Lord to the future necessities of the Church. While it contains little matter of fact which is not related in Matthew and Luke, and thus, generally speaking, forms only a confirmation of their more complete histories, it is so far from being a barren duplicate of that part of them which is contained in it, that it comes home to every reader with all the freshness of an individual mind, full of the Holy Ghost, intently fixed on the great object of the Christian's love and worship, reverently and affectionately following and recording His positions, and looks, and gestures, and giving us the very echo of the tones with which He spoke."<sup>2</sup>

## VI. INTEGRITY OF THE GOSPEL.

In considering the integrity of Mark's Gospel, we come to the important discussion on the genuineness of its last twelve verses.<sup>3</sup> Some of the most distinguished critics suppose that Mark ended his Gospel at the close of the eighth verse of the

<sup>1</sup> See Maclear on the *Gospel of Mark*, pp. 16-20: *Cambridge Bible for Schools*.

<sup>2</sup> Alford's *Greek Testament*, vol. i. p. 39, Prolegomena, last ed.

<sup>3</sup> This subject is discussed at considerable length by Dean Burgon in his able monograph, *The last twelve verses of St. Mark*; by Dr. Hort in *The New Testament in the Original Greek* by Westcott and Hort, Notes on Select Readings, vol. ii. pp. 28-51; by Scrivener in his *Introduction to the*

sixteenth chapter with the words, ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ, "for they were afraid," and that what follows (Mark xvi. 9–20) was an addition by some other writer. This is the view taken in the Revised Version: a space is put between the eighth verse and the rest of the chapter, along with the footnote: "The two oldest Greek manuscripts and some other authorities omit from ver. 9 to the end. Some other authorities have a different ending to the Gospel." The first critic who called in question the genuineness of these verses was Griesbach, and he has been followed in recent times by several distinguished critics. Tischendorf, who has been justly called "the first biblical critic in Europe," says "that these verses were not written by Mark is proved by sufficient argument."<sup>1</sup> Dr. Tregelles says: "The Book of Mark himself extends no farther than ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ, xvi. 8." "I look on this section (xvi. 9–20) as an authentic anonymous addition to what Mark himself wrote down from the narrative of St. Peter, and that it ought as much to be received as part of our second Gospel as the last chapter of Deuteronomy, unknown as the writer is, is received as the right and proper conclusion of the books of Moses."<sup>2</sup> Dean Alford gives the following as the result of his examination of the passage: "The inference seems to me to be that it (Mark xvi. 9–20) is an authentic fragment, placed as a completion of the Gospel in very early times, by whom written must, of course, remain wholly uncertain; but coming to us with very weighty sanction, and having strong claims on our reception and reverence."<sup>3</sup> Meyer expresses his view of the subject in the following terms: "The entire section, from vers. 9–20, is a non-genuine conclusion of the Gospel, not composed by Mark."<sup>4</sup> Its genuineness is also denied by Bishop Westcott: "The original text, from whatever cause it may have happened, terminated abruptly after the account of the angelic vision. The history of the revelations of the *Criticism of the New Testament*, pp. 429–432, 1st ed.; vol. ii. pp. 337–444, 4th ed.; and by Tregelles on the *Printed Text of the New Testament*, pp. 246–261.

<sup>1</sup> Hæc non a Marco scripta esse argumentis probatur idoneis, *in loco*.

<sup>2</sup> Tregelles, *Printed Text of the Greek Testament*, pp. 258, 259.

<sup>3</sup> Alford's *Greek Testament* on Mark xvi. 9–20, last ed. vol. i. p. 438.

<sup>4</sup> Meyer's *Commentary on Mark*, critical notes on vv. 9–20.

Lord Himself was added at another time, and probably by another hand.”<sup>1</sup>

Opposed to the views of these distinguished critics are the opinions of other critics of great eminence. Lachmann inserts the passage in his critical *New Testament*, with the remark that from ἀναστὰς to the end is found in A, C, D, Irenæus, but omitted in B, Eusebius.<sup>2</sup> Scrivener, perhaps our greatest biblical critic in recent times, with the possible exceptions of Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Hort, says: “We engage to defend the authenticity of this long and important paragraph without the slightest misgiving.”<sup>3</sup> And Dean Burgon has written an elaborate work in defence of the passage, in which he gives at great length the external and internal evidences for and against these verses, and claims to have demonstrated their genuineness: “It shall be my endeavour to show, not only that there really is no reason whatever for calling in question the genuineness of this portion of Holy Writ, but also that there exist sufficient reasons for feeling confident that it must be genuine.”<sup>4</sup>

1. The *external evidence* against and for the genuineness of Mark xvi. 9–20.

*External evidence against its genuineness.* The paragraph is omitted in the two oldest manuscripts, the Vatican (B) and the Sinaitic (Ⲱ). In both, after the words ἐφοβούντο γὰρ, comes

<sup>1</sup> Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p. 309, 1st ed. The passage is also rejected by Westcott and Hort in their critical edition of the *Greek New Testament*. “Its authorship and its precise date must remain unknown,” vol. ii. *Notes on Select Readings*, p. 81. The passage is also rejected by Archbishop Thomson, *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 239, and by Bishop Lightfoot.

<sup>2</sup> Lachmann's *Novum Testamentum*, vol. i. p. 314.

<sup>3</sup> Scrivener's *Introduction to the Study of the N.T.* p. 429, 1st ed. The same remark is repeated in his 3rd edition, p. 583; and in the 4th edition, published after his decease (1894), vol. i. p. 337.

<sup>4</sup> Burgon, *The last verses of the Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 1. This is an admirably reasoned work, a masterpiece in biblical criticism. Dr. Scrivener remarks: “Dr. Burgon's brilliant monograph has thrown a stream of light upon the controversy, nor does the joyous tone of his book misbecome one who is conscious of having triumphantly maintained a cause which is very precious to him.” *Introduction to Biblical Criticism of the N.T.* vol. ii. p. 337, 4th edition.

the subscription. There is, however, some reason to doubt whether these manuscripts should be considered as independent testimonies, or whether they should not rather be regarded as one witness, being, not indeed copies of the same manuscript, but of two manuscripts closely related to each other, as there is a general agreement in their readings. This is especially the case if there is any truth in the statement of Tischendorf, that the same scribe who wrote the Codex Vaticanus also transcribed certain pages of the Codex Sinaiticus. The six pages of Codex  $\aleph$ , which Tischendorf selects as proofs of this statement, are from Mark xvi. 2 to Luke i. 56, and consequently contain the very portion of Mark's Gospel which includes these verses. So that, if this statement is correct, it follows that in these pages at least we have the testimony only of one witness, namely, the Vatican manuscript.<sup>1</sup> This is certainly a witness of great importance, being the oldest extant Greek manuscript of the New Testament. But even this testimony of B is somewhat weakened by the fact that not only is the remainder of the column, where the words ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ occur, left blank, but the next column is also vacant, and as has been remarked, "it is the only vacant column in the whole manuscript; a blank space abundantly sufficient to contain the twelve verses" which are omitted.<sup>2</sup> The only reason that can be assigned for this vacancy is that the scribe of the Vatican had before him a manuscript which contained the verses in dispute, but which he, for some reason, left out.

The uncial manuscript L, or Codex Regius Parisiensis No. 62, belonging, according to Tischendorf, to the eighth century, has the following conclusion after the words ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ: "Something to this effect is met with: All that was commanded them they immediately rehearsed to Peter and the rest. And after these things from the East even to the West did Jesus Himself send forth by their means the holy and incorruptible message of eternal salvation. But this also

<sup>1</sup> Scrivener's *Introduction*, 4th ed. vol. ii. p. 337, note. "At least," he observes, "in these leaves, Cod.  $\aleph$ , B make but one witness, not two." See also *Speaker's Commentary, New Testament*, vol. i. p. 301.

<sup>2</sup> Burgon's *Last twelve verses of St. Mark*, p. 87.



is met with after the words, 'For they were afraid,' Now when he was risen early,' etc.; then follow the words, vv. 9–20 as found in the *textus receptus*.<sup>1</sup> Thus there are attached to this manuscript two conclusions, one undoubtedly spurious, the other that which is usually attached to the Greek text.<sup>2</sup>

Among the cursive manuscripts, Codex 22 concludes with the words ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ, and then adds in red ink: "In some copies the Gospel is completed at this part, but in many these are also current"; then follow vv. 9–20.<sup>3</sup> In Codices 20 and 300 we read after ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ: "From here to the end forms no part of the text in some copies. But in the ancient copies it all forms part of the text."<sup>4</sup> It has been affirmed by Birch that two cursive manuscripts, 137 and 138, have the passage marked by an asterisk, as denoting a suspicion of its genuineness; but this point has been carefully examined by Dean Burgon, and the result of his examination is that Codex 137 has a simple cross referring to an annotation, and that Codex 138 has neither cross nor asterisk.<sup>5</sup>

There is hardly any evidence from the versions against the genuineness of this passage. The Codex k, or Codex Bobbiensis of the Old Latin version, now in the National Library of Turin, wants the usual conclusion of Mark's Gospel, and in its place inserts a Latin translation of the spurious ending found in Codex L already given. The verses are omitted in some Old Armenian codices, and one of them in a space between vv. 8 and 9 has the remarkable reading, "Of Ariston, presbyter," as if Ariston were the writer of the verses which follow. To this remarkable reading we shall afterwards advert. The verses are also omitted in the Sinaitic

<sup>1</sup> Burgon, pp. 123, 124; Tregelles, *Printed Text of the Greek Text*, p. 254.

<sup>2</sup> This manuscript is supposed to have been one of those used by Stephens (η) in the formation of his *Greek Testament*. It bears a close resemblance to the Vatican and to the citations of Origen. Scrivener observes: "It is but carelessly written, and abounds with errors of the ignorant scribe, who was more probably an Egyptian than a native Greek." Vol. i. p. 138.

<sup>3</sup> Alford's *Greek Testament* on Mark xvi. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Burgon, p. 118.

<sup>5</sup> Burgon, pp. 116, 117.

palimpsest of the Syrian version of the Gospels recently discovered (1892, 1893) by Mrs. Lewis.

Eusebius, in the fourth century, on whose words great stress has been put by those opposed to the insertion of this passage, was the first to cast doubts on its genuineness. His words are contained in the fragment of a lost work found in the Vatican Library, and published by Cardinal Mai in 1825.<sup>1</sup> They are a reply to a certain Marinus who asked how the statement contained in Mark xvi. 9, that Jesus rose early the first day of the week, could be reconciled with the statement in Matthew's Gospel, that He rose on the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week.<sup>2</sup> To this question Eusebius replies: "Two answers might be given. He who denied the whole passage might say that it is not found in all the copies (εἴποι ἂν μὴ ἐν ἅπασιν αὐτὴν φέρεσθαι τοῖς ἀντιγραφοῖς) of Mark's Gospel, the accurate copies ending with the words of the young man who appeared to the women, 'Fear not ye! Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth' . . . to which the evangelist adds: 'And when they heard it they fled, and said nothing to any man; for they were afraid.' These words in almost all the copies of Mark's Gospel form the end. What follows which is met with in some but not in all the copies may be regarded as superfluous; especially if they should prove to contradict the statements of the other evangelists. This one might say for evading and getting rid of a superfluous discussion. But another, not daring to reject anything which is met with in the text of the Gospels, might say, Here are two readings, and both are to be received; inasmuch as by the faithful *this* reading is not held to be genuine rather than *that*." Although the language is somewhat ambiguous, yet it may be admitted that Eusebius here asserts that these concluding verses were omitted in almost all the copies of Mark's Gospel with which he was conversant. This, however, must be regarded as a rhetorical

<sup>1</sup> *Questiones ad Marinum*, published in Cardinal Mai's *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, vol. iv. pp. 255-257.

<sup>2</sup> The whole passage is given in Burgon's *Last twelve verses of St. Mark*, pp. 265, 266, App. B.

exaggeration, for only a very few manuscripts have come down to us which want these words. Eusebius then here either uses rhetorical language, or perhaps does not express his own opinion, but puts the words into the mouth of the person who answers the question: "One may say" (*ταῦτα μὲν οὖν εἴποι*): "This is what a person may say for getting rid of the whole question." The testimony of Jerome is given in his *Epistle to Hedibia*,<sup>1</sup> but it is only a repetition of the statement of Eusebius; the same difficulty is proposed, and the same solution is given. Similarly Hesychius, bishop of Jerusalem (A.D. 400), refers to the same difficulty, and gives the same answer: he says: "The more accurate copies of Mark's Gospel end with 'For they were afraid'; but in some it is added, 'But when He was risen again,' etc. But this appears to contradict what has been before asserted in Matthew."<sup>2</sup> It is also maintained that there is no reference to this passage in the writings of the early Fathers, whether Latin, as Tertullian and Cyprian, or Greek, as Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, in their discussion on subjects where they would naturally refer to it. But this *argumentum e silentio* is very precarious.

*External evidence in favour of its genuineness.* With the exception of  $\aleph$  and B, the words are contained in all the other uncial manuscripts of this Gospel.<sup>3</sup> They are found in the Alexandrian manuscript (A), in the Codex Ephræm (C), in the Codex Bezae (D), and in the other thirteen uncial manuscripts.<sup>4</sup> Almost all the cursive manuscripts of this Gospel, of which there are six hundred, contain the words in question, except, of course, those which are defective.

The versions are virtually unanimous in their testimony in favour of the retention of the passage. It is found in all the manuscripts of the Old Latin with the exception of the

<sup>1</sup> *Ep. 120 ad Hedibiam.*

<sup>2</sup> See Burgon, pp. 57-59; M'Clellan's *New Testament*, vol. i. p. 682.

<sup>3</sup> "With the exception of the two uncial manuscripts which have just been named," says Dean Burgon, "there is *not one* codex in existence, uncial or cursive, (and we are acquainted with at least eighteen other uncial and about six hundred cursive copies of this Gospel,) which leaves out the last twelve verses of St. Mark," p. 71.

<sup>4</sup> Namely, E F<sup>g</sup> G H K M S U V X  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$  II.

Codex Bobbiensis (k) already mentioned. It is inserted by Jerome in the Vulgate, thus proving that that Father did not, as some suppose, seriously call in question its genuineness. It is contained in all the Syriac versions—the Peshito, the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Cureton Syriac, one of the fragments of which contains the last four verses, with the exception of the Syriac manuscript of the Gospels recently found at Mount Sinai. It is contained in the Armenian version, except in some codices, and in the two Egyptian versions. In short, it is not affirming too much to say that the evidence of the versions is practically unanimous in favour of this section of the Gospel of Mark.

The positive testimonies of the Fathers until Eusebius are all in favour of the genuineness of the section. It is a short passage, and consequently is not often referred to. Justin Martyr (A.D. 150) in his first *Apology* apparently cites Mark xvi. 20: "That which he (David) says, 'He shall send to thee the rod of power out of Jerusalem,' is predictive of the mighty Word which His apostles, going forth from Jerusalem, preached everywhere."<sup>1</sup> On this, however, we do not lay much stress; for although there is a striking resemblance between these words and the conclusion of Mark's Gospel, there may be some doubt whether Justin actually quotes from it. Much more important is the testimony of Tatian (A.D. 160). The passage is undoubtedly contained in the Diatessaron, as is proved from the Arabic manuscript from Egypt recently brought to light and now translated.<sup>2</sup> This demonstrates that the words formed part of Mark's Gospel toward the middle of the second century. So far as we can ascertain, this important testimony of Tatian was unknown to Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Meyer, and Westcott and Hort, when they arrived at their opinion unfavourable to the genuineness of this passage; and if so, this fact must to some extent invalidate their conclusion.<sup>3</sup> Irenæus (A.D. 180)

<sup>1</sup> *Apol.* i. c. 45: ἐξελθόντες πανταχοῦ ἐκήρυξαν; compare with this the concluding words of Mark's Gospel: ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ.

<sup>2</sup> Tatian's Diatessaron, translated from the Arabic version by the Rev. J. Hamlyn Hill. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1894.

<sup>3</sup> Tatian's Diatessaron is not referred to by these distinguished biblical critics.

has a distinct quotation from Mark xvi. 19: "Toward the conclusion of his Gospel, Mark says: So then, after the Lord Jesus had spoken to them, He was received up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God."<sup>1</sup> So also Hippolytus, a contemporary of Irenæus (A.D. 200), quotes vv. 17 and 18 in a fragment of a work concerning spiritual gifts: "Jesus said to them all collectively concerning the gifts given from Him by the Spirit: These signs shall follow them that believe: In My name shall they cast out demons; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall in nowise hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."<sup>2</sup> And in his treatise against Noetus there is also an apparent reference to this section in Mark's Gospel. "Christ is taken up to heaven, and is set down at the right hand of the Father" (Mark xvi. 19).<sup>3</sup> The passage is also twice cited in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, written in the fourth century: "For the Lord says, He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark xvi. 16).<sup>4</sup> "With good reason did He say to all of us together, when we were perfected concerning those gifts which were given from Him by the Spirit: Now these signs shall follow them that have believed in My name; they shall cast out devils, they shall speak with *new* tongues," etc. (Mark xvi. 17).<sup>5</sup> The passage is quoted or referred to by Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, and subsequent Fathers.

2. The *internal evidence* against and for the genuineness of Mark xvi. 9-20.

The objectors to the genuineness of this passage generally place the great force of their argument on the internal evidence. Many of them admit that the external evidence is rather favourable than otherwise, but assert that the internal

<sup>1</sup> Irenæus, *Adv. Hæc.* iii. 10. 6: In fine autem Evangelii ait Marcus: Et quidem Dominus Jesus, postquam locutus est eis, receptus est in cœlos, et sedet ad dexteram Dei. Mark xvi. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Hippolytus (*περί χαρισμάτων*), *Opp.* 545.

<sup>3</sup> *Contra Hæc. Noeti*, c. 18.

<sup>4</sup> *Apost. Const.* vi. 15.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* viii. 1.

evidence is preponderantly unfavourable. "The internal evidence," observes Dean Alford," is, I think, very weighty against Mark's being the author. No less than twenty-one words and expressions occur in it, and some of them several times, which are never used elsewhere by Mark, whose adherence to his own peculiar phrases is remarkable."<sup>1</sup> The style, it is affirmed, is very different from that of Mark. Instead of those graphic touches which impart a vividness to Mark's narrative, and represent the scenes described before the mind's eye, we have a dry summary of events. The particle of transition, *εὐθέως*, *forthwith*, so constantly used by Mark, and which imparts life to the narrative, is wanting. The phraseology also is not that of Mark. Thus, for example, the first day of the week is called *πρώτη σαββάτου* instead of *μία τῶν σαββάτων* (Mark xvi. 2). Mary Magdalene is introduced as "she out of whom He had cast seven devils," although mentioned a few verses before (ver. 1). Jesus is twice called *ὁ κύριος* (vv. 19, 20), a title which is not elsewhere found in Mark's Gospel. And the following words and phrases, given by Tregelles, are not found elsewhere in this Gospel: *πορεύομαι* (thrice), *θεάομαι* (twice), *ἀπίστω* (twice), *ἕτερος*, *παρακολουθέω*, *βλάπτω*, *ἐπακολουθέω*, *συνεργέω*, *βεβαιόω*, *πανταχοῦ*, *μετὰ ταῦτα*, *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*.<sup>2</sup>

These points are apparently unfavourable; but when closely examined they are not so adverse as they at first appear. The style is not wholly different from that of Mark. The passage is certainly a category of particulars, but still it is not wanting in traces of Mark's graphic style. For example, when Mary came to the apostles to announce the appearance of the Lord to her, there is the graphic touch that she found them utterly cast down: "She went and told them that had been with Him, as they mourned and wept" (xvi. 10). So also the unbelief of the disciples at the repeated news of the resurrection of their Lord is recorded only here (xvi. 13). It is true that the favourite transitional particle *εὐθέως*

<sup>1</sup> Alford's *Greek Testament*, *in loco*.

<sup>2</sup> Tregelles, *Printed Text of the Greek Testament*, 257. See also Farrar's *Messages of the Books*, p. 67 ff.; Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. i. p. 219.

does not occur, but it is also wanting in the twelfth and thirteenth chapters. The expression *πρώτη σαββάτου* instead of *μία τῶν σαββατῶν* is only another expression used by the author for the sake of variety. The mention of Mary Magdalene as she out of whom Jesus had cast seven devils, is designed to show the wonderful love and condescension of Christ in appearing first to her. The objection that the title *ὁ κύριος* is foreign to the diction of Mark,<sup>1</sup> is of no force; as in like manner *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* only appears once in his Gospel (Mark i. 1). And although it is true that the phraseology of the section is somewhat different from that of Mark, yet there occur in it expressions which are often found in his Gospel, but rarely in the other Gospels, and which may be considered as words and phrases peculiar to Mark, as *κτίσις*, *πρωτ'*, *κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, etc. The rare word *σκληροκαρδία* (ver. 14) occurs again in Mark's Gospel (x. 5), but is only found once again in the New Testament (Matt. xix. 8).

The extreme improbability of the Gospel having such an abrupt conclusion, if the closing words are omitted, is a strong internal evidence in favour of the genuineness of the section. If the passage is not genuine, the Gospel terminates at the eighth verse with the words *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*. There is no mention of the appearance of Christ to His disciples or to the women, no intimation of the astonishing events which followed, no record of the resurrection. Even those who call in question the genuineness of the passage do not suppose that this was the close of the Gospel, but admit that there must have been a conclusion, either actual, which has been lost, or intended, which Mark was prevented writing. "That Mark," says Griesbach, "should have intentionally ended his Gospel with the words *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*, ought to seem incredible to all."<sup>2</sup> "It would be," says Michaelis, "a wonderful conclusion of a book."<sup>3</sup> "Few Greek scholars," observes Dr. Abbott, "will be induced to believe that the author of the Second Gospel deliberately chose to end a book on the good

<sup>1</sup> In ver. 19 the true reading is *ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς*.

<sup>2</sup> *Com. Crit.* p. 199.

<sup>3</sup> Michaelis, *Einleitung*, p. 1060; Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. iv. p. 210.

news of Christ with the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. From a literary point of view the γάρ, and from a moral point of view the ἐφοβοῦντο, make it almost incredible that these words represent a deliberate termination assigned by an author to a composition of his own."<sup>1</sup> And even Dr. Hort says: "It is incredible that the evangelist deliberately concluded either a paragraph with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, or the Gospel with a petty detail of a secondary event, leaving his narrative hanging in the air."<sup>2</sup>

If, then, the Gospel once had a conclusion, actual or intended, we are entitled to ask the objectors to this passage, What has become of it? Two answers have been given to this question. The one, favoured by Norton,<sup>3</sup> is that Mark was prevented finishing his Gospel; either because Peter, to whom he was indebted for his information, perished at this time in the persecution by Nero (Michaelis), or because Mark himself died (Davidson). Both of these are merely gratuitous suppositions. Mark was not so entirely dependent on Peter that he could not finish his Gospel without his aid; and it would be most extraordinary that he himself should die at the very time when he was about to finish his Gospel. The other supposition, favoured by Griesbach and adopted by Alford,<sup>4</sup> is that the last leaf was torn away.<sup>5</sup> This is certainly a strange hypothesis, the resorting to which can only be accounted for by the impossibility of otherwise explaining the fact of such an abrupt conclusion. The Gospel, when written, would be committed to the custody of some particular Church, and by them it would be most carefully preserved. Surely the supposition is far more reasonable, that the present conclusion of Mark's Gospel is genuine, and was written by the evangelist himself.

<sup>1</sup> *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article "The Gospels," vol. x. p. 801.

<sup>2</sup> Westcott and Hort's *Greek Testament*, vol. ii. notes, p. 46.

<sup>3</sup> Norton's *Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. i. p. 221.

<sup>4</sup> "The most probable supposition is that the last leaf of the original Gospel was torn away."—Alford.

<sup>5</sup> "Two contingencies," observes Dr. Hort, "have to be taken into account—either the Gospel may never have been finished, or it may have lost its last leaf before it was multiplied by transcription." Westcott and Hort's *N.T. Notes*, p. 47.



This may be the most appropriate place for adverting to a most ingenious hypothesis recently advanced by Mr. Conybeare in the *The Expositor*, and which has received the support of such distinguished critics as Zahn and Resch.<sup>1</sup> In an Armenian manuscript found in the patriarchal library of Ećmiadzin, at the foot of Mount Ararat, written about 986, which Mr. Conybeare collated, he found the Gospel of Mark copied out as far as "For they were afraid" (ver. 8), and between vv. 8 and 9 the words Ariston Eritzon, equivalent to Ἀρίστωνος πρεσβυτέρου. The last twelve verses then follow, written in the same hand. From this he inferred that it is here affirmed that these last verses were written, not by Mark, but by the Presbyter Ariston. Resch and Sanday suppose that by Ariston is here meant Ariston of Pella, otherwise known to us, who lived about A.D. 140–150; but Conybeare and Zahn think that this is too late to permit of the passage being so generally inserted in the manuscripts and quoted by Tatian and Irenæus. Mr. Conybeare therefore supposes that the person meant is Aristion, the name being wrongly spelt, one of the disciples of the Lord, from whom Papias, according to Eusebius,<sup>2</sup> derived his traditions. According to Conybeare, the same mistake in spelling occurs in the Armenian version of Eusebius, where the name Ariston occurs for Aristion. Hence it has been inferred that the last verses of Mark's Gospel were taken from the lost work of Papias, and ultimately from the oral tradition of Aristion. It has been supposed that some one, wishing to attach a befitting conclusion to the Gospel, incorporated an extract from the work of Papias containing a tradition of the presbyter Aristion. This hypothesis is most ingenious, and fully accounts for all the anomalies of the passage; and is also in accordance with the opinion of those critics who assert that it is some ancient fragment inserted for the completion of the Gospel (Alford, Hort, Tregelles, Bishop Lightfoot, Archbishop Thomson, etc.). It can, however, hardly be adopted. It occurs only in an obscure Armenian

<sup>1</sup> *Expositor* for October 1893, pp. 241–254; and for September 1894, pp. 219–232.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39.

manuscript of no authority, and is destitute of all other confirmation.

Such, then, is the evidence for and against the genuineness of Mark xvi. 9–20. The external evidence is strongly in its favour. The whole external evidence against the passage amounts to its omission in the Vatican manuscript, to statements annexed to the conclusion of the Gospel in Codex L and in three unimportant cursive MSS., and to an exaggerated assertion of Eusebius, which has been followed by Jerome and Hesychius. The Sinaitic manuscript  $\aleph$  is considered as the same testimony as the Vatican: or if this be called in question, then there are only three uncial manuscripts ( $\aleph$  B L<sup>1</sup>) against the passage. On the other hand, with these exceptions, all the Greek manuscripts, both uncial and cursive, all the Fathers who refer to the passage, and all the versions except the recently discovered Sinaitic Syriac, are in its favour. It may be that the internal evidence is against its retention, though this is a matter of opinion which may be and has been questioned. But in all critical questions, unless there are decided reasons to the contrary, which in this case do not exist, the internal evidence must yield to the external. With regard to the external evidence, we have facts to go upon, whereas the internal evidence is almost purely subjective. As Dr. Hort himself observes in his elaborate examination of this passage: "We do not think it necessary to examine in detail the intrinsic evidence supposed to be furnished by comparison of the vocabulary and style of vv. 9–20 with the unquestioned parts of the Gospel. Much of what has been urged on both sides is, in our judgment, trivial and intangible."<sup>2</sup> The internal evidence against it is certainly not so strong or so clear as to counterbalance the external evidence for it. We therefore feel constrained to come to the conclusion that Mark xvi. 9–20 is a genuine portion of the Gospel. We are perfectly aware that in arriving at this conclusion we may be accused of undue confidence in opposing the views of critics of such pre-eminence as Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, who, in their critical

<sup>1</sup> Even in L the passage is inserted as an alternative reading.

<sup>2</sup> *The Greek New Testament Notes*, p. 48.

editions of the New Testament, all reject this passage. But they had not the data which we now possess in the important testimony of Tatian, and the authority of these great names does not destroy our private judgment, or cause us to relinquish our convictions; nor are we unsupported in this conclusion by other eminent critics, such as Scrivener<sup>1</sup> and Burgon.

The opinions of biblical critics are much divided, although we at once admit that the preponderance of authority, though not so great as is generally supposed, is unfavourable to the genuineness of this passage. Wetstein, Storr, Mill, Grotius, Bengel, Scholz, Kuinoel,<sup>2</sup> De Wette, Hug, Bleek,<sup>3</sup> Guericke, Schleiermacher, Principal Campbell of Aberdeen,<sup>4</sup> Ebrard, Hilgenfeld, Keil, Stier, Lange, Scrivener, Burgon, Bishop Wordsworth, Dean Bickersteth, Canon Cook,<sup>5</sup> McClellan, Edersheim, Salmon,<sup>6</sup> Morison, Wace, and Bishop Ellicott declare in favour of its genuineness. Whereas Michaelis, Griesbach, Credner, Wieseler, Ewald, Norton,<sup>7</sup> Tischendorf, Tregelles, Meyer, Alford, Westcott and Hort, Klostermann, Bishop Lightfoot,<sup>8</sup> Archbishop Thomson,<sup>9</sup> Davidson, Warfield, Farrar, Abbott, Zahn, Resch, and Holtzmann decide against its genuineness.

<sup>1</sup> Scrivener thus states the result at which he arrives: "All opposition to the authenticity of the paragraph resolves itself into the allegation of Eusebius and the testimony of  $\kappa$  B. Let us accord to these the weight which is their due; but against their verdict we can appeal to a vast body of ecclesiastical evidence reaching back to the earlier part of the second century; to nearly all the versions; and to all extant manuscripts excepting two, of which one is doubtful." *Introduction to the Criticism of the N.T.* vol. ii. p. 344, 4th edition.

<sup>2</sup> Kuinoel, *Novi Testamenti Libri Historici, in loco*.

<sup>3</sup> Bleek, *Introduction to N.T.* vol. i. p. 312, Eng. trans.

<sup>4</sup> Campbell, *On the Gospels*, vol. iii. p. 178.

<sup>5</sup> Cook's *Revised Version of the first three Gospels*, pp. 120-125.

<sup>6</sup> Salmon's *Introduction to the N.T.* pp. 190-193, 1st ed. 1885.

<sup>7</sup> Norton's *Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. i. pp. 217 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Lightfoot ascribes it to "that knot of early disciples who gathered about St. John." *Revision of the N.T.* p. 28.

<sup>9</sup> He says: "It is probable that this section is from a different hand, but was annexed to the Gospels soon after the time of the apostles." *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, vol. ii. p. 239.

## VII. TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The date of this Gospel is a point of great dubiety, on which the most contradictory opinions prevail; indeed, it is a point on which we have not data sufficient to warrant any definite or even proximate decision. There are conflicting testimonies with regard to it, and it is interwoven with other questions, as, for example, with the synoptic problem on the sources of the Synoptics. Whilst external evidence is defective, there are in the Gospel itself few indications of time.

The opinions of the Fathers are here not in agreement. Some assert that Mark wrote his Gospel after, and others before, the death of Peter. Irenæus, in a passage already quoted, asserts that it was written after the death of Peter and Paul. "Matthew published his Gospel among the Hebrews in their own language, while Peter and Paul were preaching and laying the foundations of the Church at Rome. After their departure (*μετὰ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον*) Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, also transmitted to us in writing those things which Peter had preached."<sup>1</sup> Some, as Mill, Kuinoel, and others, suppose that by *ἔξοδον* is meant *departure*, as is the evident meaning of the word in Heb. xi. 22—after the departure of Peter and Paul from Rome; but such a statement would be useless and insignificant. Others, as Hug, Credner, Guericke, and Ebrard, interpret the expression as denoting *death*—after the decease of Peter and Paul, that is, after A.D. 64, the year of the persecution by Nero, when it is supposed that these two apostles were put to death; and this seems to be the usual scriptural meaning of the word,<sup>2</sup> and is an important statement. Some connect with this statement the words of Peter in his Second Epistle: "I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease (the same word *ἔξοδον*) to have these things always in remembrance" (2 Pet. i. 15). "Here," observes Professor Warfield, "is a promise by Peter that he will see to it that his readers shall be in a position after his death to have his teaching always in remembrance;

<sup>1</sup> Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iii. 1. 1; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Luke x. 21; 2 Pet. i. 15.

and in this he has special reference to the facts of the life of Christ, witnessed by him, as is proved by the purpose which he expresses for so arranging, namely, that they may know that they have not followed cunningly devised fables, but facts autoptically witnessed. Surely this seems to promise a Gospel."<sup>1</sup> The truth of this statement of Irenæus is, however, extremely doubtful. It is uncertain that Peter and Paul were together in Rome: they certainly did not lay the foundation of the Church of Rome; that Church was founded years before their arrival, as is evident from the fact that Paul at an earlier period wrote an Epistle to the Romans, and that on his arrival at Rome he found a Christian Church already existing. The implied coincidence of the time of their martyrdom is legendary.

This statement of Irenæus is counterbalanced by that of Clemens Alexandrinus, who informs us that Mark published his Gospel, not after the death of Peter, but in his lifetime, and with his knowledge and approval. Thus in a passage quoted by Eusebius, Clement says: "As Peter had preached the word publicly at Rome, and declared the Gospel by the Spirit, many that were present requested that Mark, who had followed him for a long time and remembered his sayings, should write them out. And having composed the Gospel, he gave it to those who had requested it. When Peter learned this, he neither directly forbade nor encouraged it."<sup>2</sup> The same opinion was adopted by Eusebius and Jerome. Jerome speaks as if Peter had actually dictated the Gospel to Mark.

These testimonies contradict each other; Irenæus asserting that Mark wrote his Gospel after the death of Peter, and Clemens Alexandrinus that it was written before that event. All critics, except those belonging to the Tübingen school, agree that this Gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, that is, before A.D. 70. There is no reference in it to that event: on the contrary, there are in the prediction of our Lord indications that it had not yet occurred (Mark xiii. 13, 24, 30, 33). The catastrophe was impending, but had not taken place. There were the symptoms of the coming storm, but it

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Kerr's *Introduction to N. T. Study*, p. 37.

<sup>2</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 14.

had not burst upon the land. So, also, there is an intimation that this Gospel was written after the dispersion of the apostles and after the diffusion of Christianity beyond Jerusalem, that is, after A.D. 44. "And they (the disciples) went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by the signs that followed" (xvi. 20). Thus, then, between these two limits, A.D. 44 and A.D. 70, the composition of this Gospel is to be placed.

If Mark's Gospel is the earliest, constituting one of the chief sources of the other two, for which opinion there are plausible reasons, then it must have been written before A.D. 55, the date which we found most probable to ascribe to the Gospel of Matthew. But, if Mark's Gospel is not the earliest, if, as many critics suppose, the Gospel of Matthew preceded it, then a later date must be adopted. Several objections have been made to the earlier date. If, it has been said, the Gospel of Mark was written before Paul's first Roman imprisonment (A.D. 63), Paul in his Epistle to the Colossians, written at that time, would have mentioned Mark by a much higher designation than merely as the cousin of Barnabas (Col. iv. 10); he would have alluded to him as the author of the Gospel. But this is a mere conjectural statement; it proceeds on the doubtful supposition that Mark, the disciple of Peter, the author of the Gospel, was the same as Mark the companion of Paul and the cousin of Barnabas: and, besides, the *argumentum e silentio* is always precarious. It is also affirmed that this early date contradicts the testimonies of Irenæus and Clemens Alexandrinus; but we have seen that their testimonies are conflicting, and cannot be relied upon for fixing a precise date for the writing of Mark.

Accordingly, no arguments can be drawn from the statements of the Fathers with regard to the date of the Gospel of Mark; and the indications of time in the Gospel itself are slight and ambiguous. The opinions of critics are very diverse, varying from A.D. 40 to A.D. 170. The Paschal Chronicle and Hesychius fix on A.D. 40; Eusebius in his *Chronicon* gives the third year of the reign of Claudius, A.D. 43; Birks fixes on A.D. 48; Schenkel, on A.D. 45-58;

Hitzig, on A.D. 55–57; Lardner, on A.D. 64; Guericke, on A.D. 67 or 68; Alford, “after the dispersion or even the death of the apostles, and before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman armies under Titus, in the year A.D. 70.” The critics belonging to the Tübingen school generally place the composition of the Gospel after the destruction of Jerusalem; Hilgenfeld, about A.D. 81; Köstlin, about A.D. 110; Keim, about A.D. 115–120; Davidson, in the last edition of his *Introduction*, about A.D. 120; and Baur himself, about A.D. 130–170.

The place of composition has been as much disputed as the time. The most common opinion is that this was Rome. This is the uniform assertion of the Fathers—Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Jerome, and Epiphanius. It is stated in the subscription to several cursive manuscripts. In the Peshito there is the following subscription: “Here ends the holy Gospel, the announcement of Mark, which he spoke and preached at Rome in the Roman language.” The same opinion is adopted by most recent critics. The fact that the Gospel was written for Gentile readers, and the Latinisms which are found in it, are favourable to this supposition. An argument has been drawn from Rom. xvi. 13, where it is written: “Salute Rufus, the chosen in the Lord.” In the Gospel, Simon the Cyrenian, who carried the cross of Jesus, is called the father of Alexander and Rufus (Mark xv. 21). Now, if this Rufus who, being thus saluted in the Epistle to the Romans, was evidently an important member of the Church of Rome, was the son of Simon the Cyrenian, it was natural that Mark, when writing his Gospel at Rome, should allude to him. To this supposition there is, however, a formidable objection. If Mark wrote his Gospel at Rome and for the Romans, there was not sufficient time for its transmission to Palestine, in order to its being used by Matthew at such an early period as A.D. 55.<sup>1</sup>

Other places have been fixed on. Chrysostom mentions a tradition which fixes on Alexandria as the place of composition. “Mark is said (λέγεται) to have composed his Gospel in Egypt at the solicitation of his friends there.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *supra*, p. 140.

<sup>2</sup> Chrysostom, *Hom. in Matt. i.*

This statement is also found in some cursive manuscripts to which the subscription *ἐγγράφη ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ* is attached. Some (Simon, Lardner, Eichhorn, Michaelis) suppose a double place of composition: that the Gospel was written partly in Rome and partly in Alexandria. Jerome says that Mark, taking the Gospel with him which he had composed, went into Egypt.<sup>1</sup> Michaelis supposes that Mark wrote his Gospel at Rome, but finished it at Alexandria, which accounts for the difference which exists between Mark xvi. 9–20 and the rest of the Gospel.<sup>2</sup> There is no ground for this supposition: it is mentioned by none of the Alexandrian Fathers.

Storr<sup>3</sup> conjectures Antioch to be the place of composition, because Mark was residing there, near the seat of apostolic tradition, and in contact with the Gentile converts. The Church of Antioch was also visited by Peter (Gal. ii. 11), whose companion and interpreter Mark was. Storr also enforces his argument by the combination of Acts xi. 19, 20 and Mark xv. 21. In the Acts we learn that men of Cyrene came to Antioch: in the Gospel we are told that Simon, the father of Alexander and Rufus, who bore the cross, was a Cyrenian. He thinks it probable that Alexander and Rufus were among the men of Cyrene who came to Antioch.

More plausible is the supposition of Birks, that Cæsarea was the place of writing. "The second Gospel," he observes, "was written by John Mark about the year 48, and probably at Cæsarea, with a reference not only to Jewish believers, but to Gentile Roman converts, who would have multiplied there in seven or eight years from the conversion of Cornelius."<sup>4</sup> This would afford Matthew easy access to the Gospel of Mark, and that at an early period. Mark's connection with Peter may have been, not in Rome, but in Palestine.

<sup>1</sup> *Assumpto itaque Evangelio quod ipse confecerat perrexit Ægyptum.*

<sup>2</sup> Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. iv. p. 210.

<sup>3</sup> *Ueber den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte*, p. 278 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Horæ evangelicæ*, p. 238.



## VIII. CONTENTS OF THE GOSPEL.

This Gospel may be conveniently divided into three parts.

1. *The preparation for the ministry*, i. 1–13, containing the ministry of John the Baptist, the baptism of Jesus, and the temptation in the wilderness.

2. *The ministry in Galilee*, i. 14–x. 42, forming the main part of the ministry, containing the call of the apostles, an account of the miracles of Christ, a series of parables, the mission of the apostles, the death of the Baptist, the twofold miraculous feeding of the multitude, the confession by the disciples of the Messiahship of Jesus, the Transfiguration, a minute account of the cure of the demoniac boy, the blessing pronounced on little children, the rich young ruler, the cure of blind Bartimæus.

3. *The close of the ministry at Jerusalem*, xi. 1–xvi. 20, containing the triumphal entrance into Jerusalem, the retirement to Bethany, the parable of the wicked husbandmen, the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, the partaking of the Passover and the institution of the Lord's Supper, the agony at Gethsemane, the double trial before Caiaphas and Pilate, the crucifixion, the burial, the women at the sepulchre, the resurrection.

There is little that is peculiar to Mark, but there are many additions to the narrative. Many of these we have already noted when considering its vividness and its graphic touches.<sup>1</sup> It is from Mark that we learn that Jesus Himself was a carpenter; that those who were cured, although told to tell the miracles to none, yet blazed them abroad; that the reason why His friends wished to lay hold of Him was because they thought that He was beside Himself; that Jesus was repeatedly moved with indignation at the perversity of His hearers; and that it was Peter, James, John, and Andrew who asked him about the destruction of Jerusalem.

No fewer than eighteen miracles are narrated in Mark's Gospel. It is the record, not so much of the discourses of Jesus, as of His mighty works. The miracles recorded are,

<sup>1</sup> See *supra*, p. 185.

the cure of the man with an unclean spirit in the synagogue of Capernaum, i. 23-28; the cure of Simon's wife's mother, i. 30, 31; the cleansing of the leper, i. 40-45; the healing of the paralytic man, ii. 1-12; the cure of the man with the withered hand, iii. 1-5; the stilling of the storm, iv. 35-41; the cure of the Gadarene demoniac, v. 1-20; the healing of the woman with the issue of blood, v. 25-34; the raising of the daughter of Jairus, v. 35-43; the feeding of the five thousand, vi. 30-44; the walking on the lake, vi. 45-52; the cure of the daughter of the Syrophenician woman, vii. 24-30; the healing of the deaf mute, recorded only by Mark, vii. 31-37; the feeding of the four thousand, viii. 1-9; the gradual cure of the blind man at Bethsaida, recorded only by Mark, viii. 22-26; the cure of the epileptic boy, ix. 17-29; the cure of blind Bartimæus, x. 46-52; and the withering of the fig tree, xi. 12-14.

On the other hand, only four parables are recorded by Mark: the Sower, iv. 3-8; the Seed growing gradually, peculiar to Mark, iv. 26-29; the Mustard Seed, iv. 30-32; and the Vineyard and the Husbandmen, xii. 1-11.