

66-71), and he attributes the brutal abuse of the prisoner to "the men that held him" in detention until daylight in the courtyard of the high priest's palace.

The noticeable point about the inferiority of Mark to Luke in this instance is not merely the earlier evangelist's lower degree of appreciation of things Jewish, but also the attitude of general antipathy which makes the misrepresentation possible. Such a conception would hardly be developed and find currency in circles where men had actually seen sessions of the Jewish Sanhedrin. In short the indiscriminate anti-Judaism of Mark makes it extremely improbable that it owes its present form to an Oriental environment. Compared with the tendencies of which Paul seems chiefly apprehensive at Rome, it confirms to no small extent the tradition of Roman provenance.

E. ATTITUDE TOWARD JEWISH-CHRISTIAN LEADERS

Connected with this anti-Jewish radicalism of Mark is a phenomenon of the Gospel in which it contrasts even more conspicuously with Matthew and Luke, and whose character would be almost unaccountable in the East — or indeed in the West at any period much later than First Peter (87 A.D.). I refer to the depreciatory attitude of this Gospel toward the Galilean Apostles, especially Peter, and toward the kindred of the Lord, the so-called *δεσπόσωνοι*, who formed a sort of caliphate at the centre of the Palestinian mother church until its dispersal in 135 A.D.

When we reflect that the wide and dominating influence secured by Mark toward the close of the first century was due to the claim put forth on its behalf (a claim which is in some degree and in a limited sense justified by the internal evidence) that it represents *ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρον*, there can be few things more startling than to take unbiased account of its actual report wherever the individual figure of Peter appears.

At bottom it is apparent that many elements of the Markan story, especially at beginning and end, must be derived from Peter. The scenes of the Beginnings at Capernaum (1, 16-39; 2, 1-4, 11-12) and of the Night of Betrayal (14, 17-54, 65-72) are not explicable unless based, more or less directly, on Peter's

story. Nevertheless the Gospel did not win its first standing under the name of Peter, but under that of one of the lieutenants of Paul. Moreover, so far from giving special prominence or commendation to Peter, as is done in Luke-Acts, and still more strikingly in Matthew,¹ Mark never introduces the Apostle to the circumcision for any individual part without making him the target for severe reproof and condemnation.

1. This manifestly applies to the story of the Night of Betrayal, where Peter's boastful claim to a loyalty beyond that of any of the rest marks the beginning (14, 29-31) of a narrative which makes Peter the example of unfaithful watching (14, 37; cf. Luke 22, 45-46), and whose climax (verses 54, 65-72) is Peter's humiliating and cowardly denial of his Master at the challenge of a maid-servant. True, as the surviving references in 14, 27-28 and 16, 7 imply, this story of Peter's denial was originally but the prelude to the Apostle's "turning again," the story of how the church first came to conscious life through the resurrection faith when Peter "stablished his brethren" in his own new-born faith.² For this pioneer triumph of the faith over the gates of Sheol that had closed upon Jesus, Peter deserves the name of its foundation "Rock." None is more prompt than Paul himself to acknowledge a supreme and common obligation from "circumcision" and "uncircumcision" alike to him who had been first to receive the revelation of the risen Lord (1 Cor. 15, 5; cf. Gal. 2, 7-8). But this is just the portion of the Petrine story which Mark (as we know it) has suppressed.

Mark, in the oldest form known to us, breaks off abruptly at 16, 8, leaving unfulfilled the promise to "the disciples and Peter" of an appearance "in Galilee." Nor can this abrupt ending be due to accident. Mere mutilation of one particular

¹ See Bacon, "Petrine Supplements of Matt." in *Expositor*, 8, XIII, (1917), 73.

² Luke 22, 28-32 has a parallel fragment also attaching the story of Simon's turning again to the "covenant" (*διαθήκη*) of the Supper. The Petrine Supplement of Matt. 14, 28-33 shows (if the conclusions of the *Expositor* article above cited are correct) that the story of the Walking on the Sea (victory over Sheol) symbolizes the ultimate triumph of Peter's faith (through interposition of the risen Christ) over his earlier collapse. These fragments, together with a few others less important, are all that survive of what Paul refers to in 1 Cor. 15, 1-11 as the original and apostolic resurrection story.

MS would not account for it unless this MS were the only one obtainable for multiplication; and even on this highly fanciful supposition it cannot be imagined that no oral tradition remained from which an early editor could reconstruct the story. The tradition known to "more than five hundred brethren" in Paul's time as kindred to their own experience did not suddenly cease to exist. It has disappeared from Mark because something different was preferred. The change which begins in Mark and from it passes on to Matthew and Luke is nothing less than a revolt from the apostolic resurrection-gospel reported in 1 Cor. 15, 1-11, whose primary manifestation is "to Peter." In place of this common narrative proclaimed by all (verse 11) in Paul's time, Mark has "another gospel," of which not one hint or trace appears in Paul. The nucleus of this secondary resurrection-gospel, which knows no more of the incidents of the apostolic than the apostolic knows of it, is the story of the Empty Tomb reported by the women. This story begins the new theme which is taken up in 15, 40. After Mark 15, 40-16, 8, room was still found (in a form of Mark no longer extant) for an appearance "to Peter and the Eleven." But the bringing in of this as a kind of supplement, after the women have received the Easter message, is manifestly secondary, and the mutilated Mark of the earliest mss has suppressed even this.¹ A Gospel in which the original resurrection appearance to Peter is first made secondary to the story of the women at the sepulchre, and next cancelled altogether, can hardly have developed where Peter was the supremely revered authority.

2. Peter plays an individual part in but three other passages of Mark.² The first of these is the so-called Confession of Peter, from the fact that in Matthew's reconstructed form of the story it tells of the original confession of Jesus as "the Christ, the Son of the Living God." Matthew (not Mark) follows this

¹ A trace still remains in *Ev. Petri*; but here too the story breaks off at the point where the disciples, ignorant of the women's experience, have spent the remainder of the Passover week in Jerusalem "mourning and weeping" in hiding from the Jews. Thereafter, as in John 21, 1 ff., they return under Peter's lead, to their fishing in Galilee.

² The remainder Mark 11, 21 is entirely colorless, and can scarcely be reckoned an "individual part."

up with the well-known Beatification of Peter for the revelation and his endowment with the power of the keys (Matt. 16, 16-20). Doubtless in its basic feature (Peter as leader of the Twelve in the acceptance of the messianistic program now proposed by Jesus) Matthew's reconstruction restores a genuine element of the history which Mark obscures. For in Mark there is no revelation. Peter merely answers as he is expected to answer. To all except "those without" Jesus in Mark has been "the Christ" from the baptism. Even "those without" would know it from the unwilling witness of shrieking demons, did not Jesus purposely silence them.¹ Per contra, Peter becomes at this point the representative and spokesman of the false (Jewish) idea of Christhood which in the Second Source is enunciated by Satan (!) and incurs the frightful *Apoge Satanas* of the Temptation story, accompanied by the declaration that his opposition to the gospel of the cross represents the things "of men," not those "of God" (Mark 8, 27-33).

3. The second of the remaining individual appearances of Peter in Mark repeats, in the symbolic form of apocalyptic vision, the lesson of the incident of the Confession of which we have just spoken. On the Mount of Transfiguration, "Peter, James and John" receive the revelation of the true nature of the "Son of God," and of his calling to be a redeemer from death (Mark 9, 2-10). Peter plays an individual part only to receive rebuke for his "ignorant" desire to substitute a permanent abiding with the Christ in the "tabernacles" of the present fleshly body² for "metamorphosis" into the body of glory. The imaginative vision-story suffuses the matter-of-

¹ On this Markan "hiding of the mystery of the kingdom from those without," see Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimniss*, 1901. The common impression that the disciples first learn of Jesus' Christhood at Caesarea Philippi (Mark 8, 27-30) is due to the modern line of approach, through Matt. 16, 17. Viewed simply in their own light, unaffected by later parallels, the series of statements Mark 1, 1, 11, 24, 34; 2, 10, 19, 28; 3, 11; 4, 41 makes a very different impression. It is the false ideal of Christhood, the Jewish ideal, intolerant of a suffering and dying Christ, which is rebuked (in Peter as its spokesman) in Mark 8, 27-33. The Temptation story has the same function in Q, the Tempter being here the spokesman of the unworthy ideal.

² In this sense *σκηνή*, *σκηνοῦν*, are almost technical terms in the New Testament. Cf. 2 Cor. 5, 1; John 1, 14; 2 Peter 1, 14.

fact narrative, into the midst of which it has been rather abruptly interjected, with the doctrinal content of 2 Cor. 3, 12—5, 10. Peter's apostleship is thus enriched with the mystical meaning given by Paul to the "ministry of the new covenant."

4. The third remaining individual appearance of Peter in Mark is as spokesman for the Twelve in the appeal: "Lo, we have left all and followed thee; what then shall we have?" (Mark 10, 28—31). The rebuke called forth by this self-seeking petition forms part of a group the lesson of which is renunciation (Mark 10, 13—45; cf. Luke 14, 25—35).

From special references to Peter, we may pass next to Markan references to the two sons of Zebedee, James and John, who in ancient tradition stand next after Peter in consideration. The pair take a more prominent part even than Peter in the renunciation group just mentioned, because of their martyr fate. In voluntarily undertaking to share Jesus' cup they go to the extreme limit of renunciation. Even James and John, however, are here denied a claim to special rank or privilege. Their ambitious request, like Peter's, is treated by Mark as presumptuous (10, 32—45). The only other separate appearance of "the sons of Zebedee" in Mark is the mention of their designation as "sons of thunder" in 3, 17. The significance of it is problematical. On the other hand, in Mark 9, 38—39, "John" is rebuked for narrow intolerance. No other separate mention is made of this "pillar" apostle. The group "Peter, James, and John" appears on several occasions, the special significance of which is not entirely clear,¹ and in two instances (1, 16—20; 13, 3) Andrew, Peter's brother, is added to the group. Andrew has no individual rôle whatever. No other Apostle plays any part in Mark. Only Matt. 10, 3, in a gloss attached to the name "Matthew," attempts to say which of the Twelve is to be identified with "Levi son of Alpheus" (Mark 2, 14), and "Matthew" is on this ground substituted for "Levi" in the

¹ See, however, Bacon, "The Martyr Apostles," in *Expositor*, 7, IV, 21 (Sept., 1907). The two Jameses, both martyrs, both prominent in the Jerusalem church, were naturally confused at an early date. It is possible that one reason for the Markan group "Peter, James, and John" is the fact that Paul mentions these three names as those of the "pillars" at Jerusalem (Gal. 2; 9), though the "James" there meant is not the Son of Zebedee.

dependent version of the story (Matt. 9, 9). Levi also remains functionless in the rest of Mark.¹ The amount and character of this mention of individual Apostles and groups of Apostles in Mark suggests slight interest in the body so revered in the Palestinian church, and that interest not untinged with opposition. It is not easy to imagine such references had the Gospel grown up in the circle where, at the very time the Elders Aristion and John were relating their "traditions," others of the same group could relate "what Andrew or Peter had said, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples."

The Twelve as a whole, and Jesus' "mother and brethren," the group who are associated with them in the Jerusalem caliphate, fare no better in Mark than Peter and other individual Apostles. Jesus' kindred appear on two occasions only, in both cases in alliance with his opponents, and as typical examples of Jewish unbelief (3, 21; 6, 4, "his own kin"). Jesus disowns them in favor of those who "do the will of God," taking the disciples to be his spiritual kin (3, 34-35). But the Twelve themselves suffer from the same Jewish *πῶρωσις*. They too are repeatedly rebuked for being "without understanding." They share in the "hardening" of their less privileged fellow-countrymen (4, 13, 40; 6, 52; 7, 18; 8, 16-21; 9, 18-19, 28, 32; 10, 13-14, 24, 26, 32; 14, 50), so that Peter's rebuke for "minding not the things of God, but the things of men" is only the culminating instance of a condemnation that rests on the Jews in general. But to Mark's doctrine of the "hardening" (*πῶρωσις*) of Israel we must devote fuller discussion; for at this point we again find ourselves face to face with a highly significant connection of the Gospel with the Epistle to the Romans.

F. MARKAN VERSUS PAULINE DOCTRINE OF THE HARDENING OF ISRAEL

The most distinctive feature of Romans is the Apostle's great survey of human history from the Jewish point of view of the

¹ In Ev. Petri he reappears in the group who return with Peter to their fishing in Galilee after the crucifixion. The fragment breaks off after the mention of his name.