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PART I
THE INVESTIGATION

THE THEORY AND DEFINITION OF UMARCUS

1. Scope of Investigation
2. Inductive study of the umaran concept
3. Definition of Umarcus
4. Nature of the umaran's theories
5. Significance of the un-dogmatic, apologetical historical orientation
THE INVESTIGATION

The purpose of the present study

The method of investigation
   An inductive study of the Urmarcan theory
   A definition of Urmarcus
   The picture of Our Lord in the resultant document.

The significance of this un-dogmatical, non-apologetical historical presentation.
THE PROBLEM OF MARK

Accepted conclusions of scholars regarding Mark.

- Its literary priority
- The date
- The author, John Mark of Jerusalem
- The significance of Mark's equipment for his task
- The Question of genuineness of our Gospel

Certain Patriarchal and Critical considerations

from consonant differences
from the Letter to the Hebrews
from the crucifixion
from internal articles
from the crucifixion
II

EVIDENCE FOR UMARCUS

Certain Patristic and Critical considerations seem to indicate a prior document underlying our Gospel, which may be called Umarcus.

The evidence from Papias

The evidence from Justin Martyr

The argument from the "Great Omissions"

The argument from Marcan matter omitted from Mt and Lk

The argument from consentient differences of Mt and Lk

The argument from the Little Apocalypse

The argument from linguistic co-incidences

The argument from Luke's Preface

The argument from the present literary structure

The argument from the Aramaisms in Mark

The argument from internal criticism

The argument from Form Criticism

The argument from "doubles"

The argument from theological peculiarities
THE INVESTIGATION

This study does not contemplate the work of a commentary on the Gospel according to Mark. The exegesis, explanation, and exposition of the text of the Second Evangelist is therefore excluded from this consideration.

Nor does the study purport to be "a Life of Jesus, as typical even with the restriction, "According to Mark," nor yet, "according to Urmarcus." Hence psychological, environmental, and other factors necessarily entering into a study of the Life are included but incidentally.

The purpose of the investigation is to discover presented in the picture of Jesus which was presented by the first Gospel to the first converts. That Gospel does not contain a complete portrait, but is rather a study of our Lord's career with a definite objective before it. That objective is the presentation of Jesus as the divine Son of God. That this was the object does not in the least militate against the historicity of the narrative, but in so far as it does destroy the possibility of drawing a portrait or the recounting the "life" from this single source. Our task is to uncover the picture thus presented in "Urmarcus," or the document which lies back of our present Second Gospel.

Since so little agreement as to the scope of Urmarcus...
THE PROBLEM OF MARK

The literary priority of the Gospel according to Mark is at present generally accepted by critics of the Synoptics. Bacon points out that the use of the Marcan outline of the chronology of the life of Jesus by the first and third Gospels necessitates the conclusion that Mark was held as "quasi-canonical authority" when Matthew and Luke were written. The Jewish apologist Montefiore is constrained to admit that "Mark is not only the oldest Gospel, but the first Gospel." By this statement, however, he does not mean to infer that no literary sources were used in the composition of Mark.

Further unanimity of opinion today tends to push back the date of Mark to early days of the Christian movement. Bacon alone of the more recent critics assigns to it a date so late as AD. 80. Streeter cannot think of Mark as later than AD. 60. On the whole, the tendency is to assign its composition to a date more nearly approximating that assigned by the Paschal Chronicle, AD 40. The commonly accepted date is, however, shortly before AD 70. This makes the date not more than 40, and perhaps less than 15, years after the death of Jesus.

4. The Four Gospels, p. 150.
5. HBD, III, p.261, col.2.
6. Moffatt- Introduction to the NT, xxi.
na.ked from the arrest.

All of these incidents end references show that Mark had an unusual opportunity of knowing the whole Jerusalem situation from the last week thru to the dissolution of the church there following the persecution of Stephen.

The events of the last week would be known to the adolescent youth in Mary's home, who would be profoundly influenced by the strange events centering in a way around his home. He would be privileged to listen to the discussions of the women who had followed Jesus from Galilee, and who made Mary's home their headquarters during the Passover. He would be privileged to listen to the declarations of the women at Mary's home, who would be proclaiming the resurrection of Jesus to the1. youth in Mary's home, who would be proclaiming the resurrection.

The events of the last week would be known to the adolescent youth in Mark's home, who would be profoundly influenced by the strange events centering in a way around his home. He would be privileged to listen to the discussions of the women who had followed Jesus from Galilee, and who made Mary's home their headquarters during the Passover. He would be privileged to listen to the declarations of the women at Mary's home, who would be proclaiming the resurrection of Jesus to the youth in Mary's home, who would be proclaiming the resurrection.

The events of the last week would be known to the adolescent youth in Mark's home, who would be profoundly influenced by the strange events centering in a way around his home. He would be privileged to listen to the discussions of the women who had followed Jesus from Galilee, and who made Mary's home their headquarters during the Passover. He would be privileged to listen to the declarations of the women at Mary's home, who would be proclaiming the resurrection of Jesus to the youth in Mary's home, who would be proclaiming the resurrection.

Eat Bark's information was not exclusively Petrine. Indeed, his first work outside Jerusalem was a companion of Peter and Barnabas when they returned to Antioch after a

Indeed, his first work outside Jerusalem was a companion of Peter and Barnabas when they returned to Antioch after a

Indeed, his first work outside Jerusalem was a companion of Peter and Barnabas when they returned to Antioch after a
visit to Jerusalem. He is not listed among those who preached, but as Paul says later was "useful for ministering." This journey gave Mark ample opportunity to become acquainted with Paul and his Gospel, for which the Apostle claimed revelation from the Lord. While Paul refused to carry Mark further after this one trip, Barnabas, his cousin, worked with him in Crete.

Beyond this, little is known of Mark. His relationship to Peter was close, as we learn from 1 Peter 5:13, where Peter calls him "his son." From this same epistle we know that Mark was familiar with the churches in Asia. He was also known to the church in Rome, for Paul calls for his services during the imprisonment in the Capital. The epistle of Peter indicates an acquaintance with Babylon, the far east, where Peter ministered.

Thus Mark's opportunity to gather facts about the ministry and person of our Lord was extremely varied. He knew probably all the Apostles during boyhood in Jerusalem. He knew Peter intimately. He knew Paul almost as well. He knew the churches in Palestine, Italy, Asia, and the far East; tradition adds Egypt to this list. It is probable that he knew John, for that Apostle lived in Ephesus.

1. Ac.12:25
2. 2 Tim.4:11
3. 1 Cor.15:3; Gal.1:12
4. Col.4:10
This wide acquaintance qualified him for writing a Gospel quite as well, if not better, than would have been possible had he been a personal disciple of the Lord.

That it was this John Mark who wrote our Gospel is confirmed by the fact that the earliest MSS bear the title "kata Markon," which expression signifies the author, rather than the source of information. The latter would require the expression "kata Petron." This patristic judgment summarizes the external and non-Marcan Biblical evidence.

While the Gospel is anonymous, certain internal evidence confirming this external evidence has been produced which overcomes all doubt. Zahn holds that the description of John as the brother of James is an unconscious revelation that the author's own name was John. Mk 14:17 describes the approach of the Twelve to the house for the Passover, from the point of view of one seeing them come. Whereas, both Matthew and Luke describe the same event from the viewpoint of members of the approaching party.

The view of the ancients that Mark's Gospel is the record of Peter's preaching is confirmed by modern criticism. The Gospel contains vivid details and frequent use of the historical present tense, characteristic of the relation of an eye-witness. The Gospel is impressionable rather than reflective, emotional rather than logical, thus suiting Peter's character.

---

1. Introduction to the NT, II §61
2. Allen, Comm. on Mark, Intr., pp. 12-26
3. Burton, Short Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels
corresponds to Peter's sermon as recorded in Acts 10.

A certain "uneclesiastical unconventionality", shown in Mark's bald realism, relating candidly the obtuseness and failures of the Apostles, likewise argues for both the early date and the Apostolic source of the Gospel. In short, in spite of Bacon's attempt to relegate the Gospel to a late, non-Apostolic origin, the literary priority and Apostolic tradition of Mark is generally conceded.

But, do we have the Gospel which Mark, the widely known companion of Peter and Paul, the child of the central home among the earliest Christians in the earliest Church, wrote? Is the Mark of Papias our Mark? On what evidence may we deduce the existence of an "_Marcus?"

---


_Epigraphs_. This Eusebian quotes:

"And this the Elder [John the Presbyter] said:

'Mark, who had been [become] the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately whatever things he [Peter] related, yet not in order, of the things said or done by the Christ. [Nor he neither heard the Lord nor followed Him, but afterwards, as I said, with Peter, who gave teachings according as they were necessary to his converts, but not as setting out a connected system of the Lord's words. So that Mark made no mistake, writing down some things as he remembered them. For he gave attention to but one thing, not to leave out anything that he heard or to say anything false among what he gave]." (E. L., iii.59.)

---

1. Advocate by Westcott, in his _Intr. to the Study of Gospels_.
4. St Mark's Indebtedness to St Matthew.
5. Introduction to the NT, II, 506f.
6. Montefiore, _The Synoptic Gospels_, I, xxxvi; Streeter gives the dates 150-160 (The Four Gospels, 340); while Zahn, _Intr. to NT_, II, 456, gives c.125.
EVIDENCE FOR MARCcus

In opposition to the theory of an oral transmission of the Gospel, modern criticism is agreed that Matthew and Luke used Mark in some form. Of the 660 vv in Mk, 610 are used by Mt and Lk together. Only Radham and Zahn maintain the priority of Mt in the face of the present tendency.

Certain facts as to such use, however, give rise to the question of the nature of the Marcan document before the first and third Evangelists when they wrote. That the document was not our Gospel is thought to be indicated in the following arguments.

1. The argument from Papias:
   
   
   Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, Phrygia, writing c. 140-150, produced a work in five volumes, the "Exegesis of the Lord's Teachings." (Logion Kuriakon Exegesis). This Eusebius quotes:
   
   "And this the Elder (John the Presbyter) said: 'Mark, who had been (become) the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately whatever things he (Peter) related, yet not in order, of the things said or done by the Christ.' For he neither heard the Lord nor followed Him, but afterwards, as I said, with Peter, who gave teachings according as they were necessary (to his converts), but not as setting out a connected system of the Lord's words. So that Mark made no mistake, writing down some things thus as he remembered them. For he gave attention to but one thing, not to leave out anything that he heard or to say anything false among what (he gave)." (H. E., iii.39.)

1. Advocated by Westcott, in his Intr. to the Study of Gospels.
4. St Mark's Indebtedness to St Matthew.
5. Introduction to the NT, II, 509f.
Here we note that Papias is quoting the Elder John to the effect that Mark did not write "in order". Papias would seem to be, then, attempting to show why Mark's Gospel, in the form in which it was then known, was not "in order", presumably while the others known were in order. Papias' defense of Mark's Gospel is that Mark wrote it in disorder.

However, our present Mark is decidedly written in an orderly fashion. Its construction is definite, logical, progressive in movement, and reaches a climax. It bears no resemblance to a collection of sermons, like the Clementine Homilies.

Therefore, it is concluded, Papias had before him a different Mark than ours. This is the conclusion reached by Moffatt, Scholton, S. Davidson, Wendt, von Soden, Wendling, Wellhausen, Reuss, and others.

This conclusion is strengthened by Papias' remarks on Mt: "Matthew wrote the "oracles" (logia) in the Hebrew, and everyone interpreted them (aorist tense, i.e., the interpretation had ceased by Papias' own day) as he could."

1. Introduction to the NT, p.191f.
2. Het Oudste Evangelie
3. An Introduction to the NT, 2nd ed., p.541
4. Das Lehre Jesu
6. Urmarcus
7. Einleitung, 53-57; and Komp, Marcus.
8. History of the NT, p.184-187
Thus, while our Mt and Mk resemble each other, it is evident that the Mt of Papias was a collection of sayings. Thus it is held that the Mk of Papias was essentially a collection of the deeds of Jesus.

2. Argument from Justin Martyr.

Justin Martyr likewise is called to witness for Marcus, on the ground that he quotes the Gospels quite extensively, but constantly in words differing widely from those of the canonical texts. Further, he mentions incidents not in our canonical Gospels, such as the birth of Christ in a cave, and the origin of the Magi as Arabia. Therefore, it is argued, the texts which he had before him were different from those of our Gospels.

3. The Argument from the "Great Omission."

While Lk does not always follow Mk, yet he usually substitutes for the omission another form of the same incident or saying. But a striking fact is the total omission of the whole section of Mk.6:45-8:26, containing some 77 consecutive verses. The section contains the account of the Syrophoenician woman.

How can this omission be explained except on the ground that the section was not in the Gospel which Lk used in preparing his own work? It cannot be that Lk would not be interested in the contents—rather the contrary. For the section contains the account of the Syrophoenician woman.

1. Renan, Life of Jesus, Gospels, p.173
3. Holdsworth, Gospel Origins, p.155
considerable teaching on ceremonial defilement, and
criticism of Pharisaical teaching, all of which is par-
ticularly Lukian in tone. Nor can the omission be due
to Luke's aversion to doublets, for he is not. Nor
does it seem probable that Lk accidentally overlooked
a passage of such significance.
Moreover, it is noted that the section contains cer-
tain internal evidence of being an interpolation, or a
duplication of matter given but once in the 'Vemarcous,
and repeated by the insertion of some parallel document.
Bacon, indeed, finds the whole section to be due largely
to R, a late Redactor who is writing for the Church, and
takes occasion to call the attention of the community to
the Breaking of Bread on two separate occasions, to em-
phasize the importance of the ecclesiastical Eucharist.
4. The argument from the Marcian matter omitted by Mt and Lk
It is strange that both Mt and Lk should fix upon the
same omissions, if the following were in Mark in the form
in which they possessed it: (1) The word "Gospel" would
scarcely be omitted from Lk, who uses the verbal so frequent-
ly. (2) If the phrase "for all nations" found in Mk.11:17
had stood anywhere in Mk originally, surely Mt with his
regard for the OT, or Mk with his universality, would have
used it. (3) Mk.2:27, "The Sabbath was made for man", is

a striking saying, not likely to be ignored by both Mt and Lk, if it appeared originally in Mk. (4) Mk notes many names; e.g., that of Simon, who carried the Cross. Why should Mt and Lk have failed to copy these names? But if these details should have been added later, by local interpolation because of some special interest, then we may conclude that Marcus was less vivid and detailed than has usually been supposed.

5. Argument from consentient differences of Mt and Lk from Mk. A form of this theory is advocated by Sanday. But there are some minor agreements of Mt and Lk against Mk in Marcan contests. Sometimes the same or similar words are assigned to different speakers; sometimes the same words are used with different application; and sometimes one Gospel will represent in the form of speech what another gives as narrative. These, it is held, indicate that our Mark was not before the first and third Evangelists.

6. Argument from evidences of redaction in Mark. This argument is presented in various forms by several scholars. Williams defines three recensions: (1) "Evangelium," our present Gospel, minus the Great Interpolation (Mk.6:45-8:26); and the little Aposiopase. (2) Our Mark, minus the Great Interpolation, but containing Lk's form of the Little Synoptics; the client as giving most nearly the very words in which the Apostolic traditions were delivered. We can give here only a few of the more important points:

1. B. Weiss, Das Marcus-evangelium, pp.49, 50, 133, 400 & c.
2. Sanday, in Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, p.6f.
3. Stanton, The Gospels as Historical Documents, II, 139-152
4. in Oxford Studies, pp 421ff.
5. Oxford Studies, pp.11-22
6. The Gospels in the Second Century
Apocalypse. (3) Our Gospel, in its present form, which was used by Mt. A detailed exposition of this theory is given by Holdsworth: (1) A Palestinian Gospel, written at Caesarea by John Mark; (2) which was revised by Mark during his visit to Egypt, for the Church there; (3) and our Mark, written at Rome for the Gentile-Jewish Church there, on the basis of the earlier work. Lk used the first edition, and Mt the second. Lk is secondary to Mt and Lk in those places where the Gospels have a common origin. A third form of this theory is advocated by Sanday. He suggests that the variations may be due to the apologetic aims of the different writers. In another place, he seems to think them due to external circumstances, such as the overlapping of documents and the use of MSS rolls. Schmiedel argues that several sentences and phrases could not have belonged to the original Mark. He finds, e.g., that Mk.3:28 has substituted "sons of men" for the Ἰουδαίος "Son of Man" which is now preserved in Mt.12:31f. Again, he thinks the phrase in Mk.9:1, "the Kingdom of God come in with power" is a revision of the earlier phrase now in Mt.16:28, "the Son of Man coming into his Kingdom." Other examples are given at length. Sanday has perhaps phrased this theory best when he says: "Mark is at once the oldest and youngest of the Synoptics: the oldest as giving most nearly the very words in which the Apostolic traditions were delivered; the youngest as to the present framework."

2. Oxford Studies, pp.11-22
3. The Gospels in the Second Century
5. Introduction, Lect.IX, p5f.
7. The argument from the Little Apocalypse.

It is thought that Mk.13 was an independent document which was incorporated into Mk either by himself or some later editor. The expression "let him that readeth understand", is commonly thought to prove this fact. Fleiderer presents the argument extensively: He divides the whole into two parts: (a), consisting of 13:5-6; 9-13; 21-23; and 28-37, may well be genuine logia of Jesus. (b), 13:7-8; 14-20; and 24-27, comprises three sections, the Beginnings, of Sufferings, the Distress, and the End. This was an original Jewish Apocalypse inspired by the growing fear for the Temple, and was composed between 60 and 70.

The cosmic catastrophe of vv 24-28 is sufficiently explained in Dnl 7:13; for, had the writer been a Christian, he would have said that the coming Son of Man was the crucified Jesus coming again. This Jewish Apocalypse necessitated a Christian apologetic to meet it. So, the Christians interpolated into it a number of hortatory sayings, endeavoring to show that the real doom of impending disaster would rest upon the Jews. Then, in course of time, this document was placed in Mark’s Gospel.

Streeter likewise argues that the document was a mixture of an early Christian Apocalypse and genuine logia. He places the origin of it well before 52, and known to Paul.

1. Mk.13:14
2. Primitive Christianity, II, 63-69
3. The Four Gospels, p.491-494
8. The argument from the close coincidencies of language in the Synoptics.

This argument, somewhat older than the foregoing, is ably reviewed by Gloag, who, however, does not accept it. The leading English advocate of the theory is Abbott who holds that the matter common to all three is the original Gospel, which he calls the Tripple Tradition. This original Gospel was in the form of shorthand notes, which the Synoptists used independently, thus giving rise to our Synoptic Gospels. The theory is further elaborated by Resch, who holds that this original was in Aramaic, and contained chiefly "sayings" or logia. He thinks it was known by Paul also. This is perhaps the simplest statement of the whole problem. It is employed in various forms by a large number of critics.


That Luke gives a hint as to the manner in which all the Gospels were constructed, is the argument of a number of scholars, following the lead of Reuss. He holds that this statement of Lk indicates the existence of many Gospels, in both Greek and Aramaic, older than our Four. In this he is followed by the lastest exhaustive study of textual criticism. The argument for an \textmu

1. Introduction to the Synoptic Problem.
2. Ibid., p.66
5. The Agrapha
6. Lk.1:1-4
7. History of the NT, p.181
8. Streeter, The Four Gospels, Ch.II.
that Mk as we have it is too elaborate and logically constructed to be one of the original loose groups of logia of collections of deeds.

10. The argument from the present literary structure.

Carre analyses our Mark into five parts. These are an introduction, Five incidents of popularity, Five incidents of opposition, Thirteen incidents showing how Jesus tried to avoid the Consequences of the Two contrary Forces, and a Conclusion containing the ministry to the Twelve to prepare them for the Cross. The whole thus reflects a church which was suffering at the moment but hoped to be ultimately successful by means of adhering to convictions set in motion by its hero, Jesus. Such a situation is, of course, much too late to think of Mk as the original story of the Life.

Easton, in an article in the same volume, supports the work of Bacon in trying to relegate our Mark to the Gentile Church after the fall of Jerusalem. He finds in developing this theme that the present structure of Mk is due to the dual controversy with the Jewish religious leaders, on the nature of Jesus' authority, and on the current beliefs and practices of the time. He admits, however, that the Petrine series "contains none the less a true recollection not only of the general teaching but of certain definite events in the life of Jesus."

2. Ibid., "A Primitive Tradition in Mark."
3. The Gospel of Mark. op. cit., p. 101
4. Ibid. has perhaps the most cogent argument here.
5. The Beginnings of Gospels of Gospel Story, p.xii.
Presumably, then, Urmarcus would consist of a document bearing "true recollections" in a more elementary form than our Mark.

11. The argument from Aramaicisms in Mark.

Our Gospel of Mark contains a number of "Aramaicisms", of Greek phrases which have an Aramaic syntax, besides a number of sayings of Jesus which are given in Aramaic, and then translated. Examples are seen in the Agony in Gethsemane, and in the voices on the Cross. This fact, combined with the supposition that the first Gospel would naturally be expected to appear in the mother tongue of the disciples and the Master, has induced the hypothesis that the original of Mark was Aramaic. This is the thesis of Abbott, Resh, Wellhausen, and Allen. It is not generally accepted, however.

12. The argument from the internal structure.

It is sometimes held that our Mark is a colorless composite work produced from a number of conflicting early sources, none of which may be properly an Urmarcus. Thus, Wendling finds three prior documents represented, the Poet, the Historian and the Theologian. Bacon finds four primary sources, none of which seem dominant in our Gospel. Any matter carrying a Petrine cast of thought is thus held to come from a different document than the narrative or the events of them verbatim into his text.

1. Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels
2. The Agraphta
3. Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien
4. Comm. on Mt.
5. Blass has perhaps the most cogent argument here.
13. The argument from Formgeschichte.

Closely allied to the foregoing is the recent development in Germany of "Form" criticism, which follows the lead of Wellhausen and others in dealing with the OT narratives. The method is also quite similar to that of Bacon's criticism. Debelius, for example, divides the narratives of the NT into paradigms, novels, exhortations, and myths. He thinks that the trustworthiness of the traditions can be determined by formgeschichte. Thus, an Urmarcus would be the sum of the paradigms found in Mark, while other types of literary structure indicate later additions to the text, less authentic. Its advocates, moreover, claim that by means of formgeschichte we are able to go behind even an Urmarcus, to the isolated documents out of which even this primitive document was formed.

Rawlinson thinks that these forms were adopted because of the catechetical needs of the early converts.

14. The argument from "doubles".

A special form of this criticism is that adopted by Eduard Meyer, in making the "Great Interpolation" the point of departure in his account of the early church. The doublet indicates, to him, that Lk was a compiler of older documents, who did not attempt to weave conflicting stories into a whole, but merely copied them verbatim into his text.
15. The argument from theological classification.

It has long been recognized that the Gospel of Mark contains much matter that is Petrine, but also other matter equally Pauline, with perhaps other due to neither. This subjective classification of theological distinctions in Mark was developed by Parsons. In some respects it has close affinity to formgeschichte; but it is not necessary to tie the two inseparably together. Stanton recognizes these theological strains, without, however, admitting that any of them cannot be reasonably traced to Mk. If the principle be recognized as admissible, then an "Urmarcus may easily be distinguished.

E. Meyer, largely on this hypothesis, divides the strata in Mk into six groups -- Petrine Reminiscences and the Disciples; the Twelve-source; the Lukan-source; the Logia, or Q; the Matthew-source; and Mk.13. But he places the Petrine source as earliest, altho avoiding the term "Urmarcus." And his conclusion is that Mark is a most valuable historical record, since his sources go back to the earliest days.

While some critics have combined two or more of the above types of argument, none of them have employed all of them. Usually each individual critic urges reasons for ignoring some of them. But somewhere among these arguments all find room for, indeed, necessity for, an "Urmarcus."

1. Bacon, Beginnings of Gospel Story
2. A historical Examination of Some non-Marcan Elements in Lk
4. op. cit. vol.1.
Early speculations on Gospel construction
Abbott and the "triple tradition."
The Aramaic school
Resch and the "original Gospel"
Reuss
Salmon
Davidson
Rawlinson
Baur and Renan
Holtzmann
Wellhausen and Loisy
Weiss, Johannes
Von Soden
Schmiedel
Wendling
Bacon
Weiss, E.
Stanton
Holdsworth
Wright
Easton
Meyer, E.

Estimates of the success of the work reviewed.
A REVIEW OF MARCAN SPECULATION

The hint of Luke 1:1-3 that there existed in his day a number of Gospels from which he drew his information regarding the ministry of our Lord, gives an adequate reason for an attempt to discover if possible the earliest of these Gospels. And while Mark's Gospel is recognized as the earliest extant Gospel, yet it is legitimate to attempt to go back of Mark, and see if there were not documents before he wrote, which, indeed, he might have used.

It is frequently noted that Le Clerc first suggested this possibility in 1716. However, the first attempt to work out the hypothesis was that of Eichhorn in 1794. Not long afterward, Michaelis elaborated the attempt, with the help of Marsh following in an extensive re-working of the same thesis. The general tenor of this treatment may be indicated as follows. An original Aramaic document was translated by three different Greek authors, each of whom employed a different collection of logia. Hence our Synoptics.

While this elaborate hypothesis is no longer accepted, yet it has certain affinities with even the most recent attempts at reconstruction of Mark's sources.

Schleiermacher, writing in 1817, holds no brief for an Urmarcus, although he is universally quoted as one of the pre-

cursors of the theory. Rather, he holds that there were
several sources, more in the nature of shorthand notes,
which were current throughout the Christian community.

To this number of early critics of the subject we should
add the name of Lessing, who postulated an original "Gospel
of the Nazarenes", in Aramaic, from which all three Synoptics
redrew material. His prediction of the Fall of
Temple. A variation of this Urmarcan speculation may be said

1 Unto begin with H. Ewald, who discovers, employing the
heterostructure of OT criticism, nine different sources or elements
in the composition of the Synoptics. The earliest, a brief
Gospel of the events from the Baptism to the death, he at-
tributes to Philip the deacon, and holds it known to Paul.

2 A renewed interest in Urmarcan was created by Abbott,
who revived the essential features of Eichhorn. The "Triple
Tradition", or the matter common to all three Synoptics, he
finds as the original Gospel. This Urmarcan had no account
doing the genealogy, incarnation, or infancy. It stressed the
relation of John the Baptist and Jesus. It contained but
a few parables. It had no extended discourses, except an ab-
ridged account of the Second Coming. It sets forth fully the
disputes between Jesus and the Pharisees, concerning the Sabbath
fasting, exorcism, the baptism of John, tribute to Caesar,
Christ as the son of David, and the dialogue with the Sad-
the evidence submitted lacks toward the conclusion that
1. Die drei ersten Evangelien
1. Rushbrooke, Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels,
and a later volume, Corrections of St Mark.
duces on the resurrection, together with the dialogue with the rich young ruler. The document also sets out the teachings peculiar to Jesus, such as His attitude toward the Law, His instruction on entering the Kingdom as a little child, His demand for utter devotion to Himself, His confidence in His resurrection, His instruction regarding forgiveness, His prediction of the Fall of the Temple, and the institution of the Supper. Further, the Urmarcus contained several miracles, including those of healing, exorcism, stilling the storm, the Feeding of the multitude, and the Transfiguration. The document was confused at the close, due to the presence of so many living witnesses when it was written.

This hypothesis may be criticised on two grounds. In the first place, as Salmon points out, the value of the original document is less than that of our present Gospels, for certainly everything in it not erroneous would be eliminated in these later documents. Further, this Tripple Tradition does not mean a tripple attestation, but a single attestation. Therefore, the matter in this "Urmarcus" is not that most abundantly, but least abundantly, attested. However, it is too highly subjective and literary to be It rests upon but one authority. And this one authority when sifted down, eventually becomes the Petrine tradition, which everyone admits to be in Mark. In the second place, the evidence submitted looks toward the conclusion that

1. Introduction to the NT, p.150-3.
Mt and Lk were indebted to Mk, rather than that all three used a similar source. Indeed, it becomes increasingly clear that the only requirement for an Urmarcus is to be found in the passages in which Mt and Lk agree against Mk. This is clear from such reasoning as that of Burkitt as well as of Stanton and Streeter.

Several attempts have been made to discover an Aramaic Urmarcus. Among these we may mention that of Smith, who thinks that Matthew, Peter, and John all wrote accounts of the life of Jesus in Aramaic. Matthew then drew up a Gospel from these notes, in both Greek and Hebrew. Luke then wrote his Gospel, using, besides the witness of eye-witnesses, Peter's Hebrew Memoir and Matthew's Greek Gospel. Then finally Mark translated this Hebrew Memoir of Peter's into Greek, which gives us our Mk. This theory is supported by a parallel type of historical writing in modern times, using the histories of the Peninsular War by Suchet, Napier, and Alison. The co-incidents of the Gospels are strikingly paralleled by the parallels of the three moderns. Were it not for the absence of both traditional or textual supporting arguments, this thesis would prove of great value. However, it is too purely subjective and literary to be widely accepted.

The huge work of Resch attempts to work out in detail those theories are much the same as those of Rahlfs and these theories are much the same as those of Rahlfs and these theories are much the same as those of Rahlfs and these theories are much the same as those of Rahlfs.

2. The Gospels as Historical Documents, II, ch.2.
3. The Four Gospels for 1890.
5. The Agrapha.
the thesis that an original Aramaic Gospel, written so early as to be of use to Paul in writing his earliest epistles, lies at the basis of our Synoptics. He calls this an "Ur-Evangelium". Variations in the words and clauses of the Synoptics are accounted for on the basis of different translations given to the same Aramaic words. Much detail is shown, particularly in illustrating how the omission of vowel points might easily give rise to misunderstandings by different translators. Marshall gives an elaborate review of this work, together with numerous contributions of his own.

Another form of this theory is supported by Blass in an ingenious reconstruction of early Apostolic history. On this basis and that of philology, he finds that Mk is a translation of an original Aramaic. Traces of this are still to be discerned in our Gospel. And since it might well be that several Greek versions of Mark's original Aramaic were made, the variations between the Synoptics are easily accounted for. Luke's omissions are to be explained on the ground that Lk selected only the groundwork from Mk for his story, presupposing an acquaintance of his readers with Mark.

Objections to these theories are much the same as those proposed against the work of Smith. Of the three, Blass has the advantage of writing without theological bias.

1. In the "Expositor" for 1890.
3. Ibid, p.197-203.
and with a probably superior philological basis. However, it may be noted specifically that the majority of Blass' "Aramaics" are found in the logia, just where we should expect to find preserved the mother-tongue of our Lord. This does not point so much to an Urmarcan, as to a careful notation by the author of the exact logia as preserved in the memories and notes of the apostles and disciples.

A less convincing statement of this theory, although possessing numerous suggestive lines of thought, is that of Petrie, who finds a "Gospel nucleus" which each of the Synoptists worked over in his own way, preserving nevertheless many individual characteristics.

Another Urmarcan school may be discerned by grouping the writings of Reuss, Salmon, and Davidson. Reuss begins with an analysis of Eusebius, who, he says, is concerned to establish the credibility of Mk by connecting him with Peter; but who, while accurate in reporting the logia, was not concerned about its chronological order; so that Mk cannot be called a systematic history, as Mt qualifies. He then notes that Eusebius is vague with regard to the formation of the Gospels. And finally he arrives at the conclusion that Proto Mark, as he calls it, is our Mark less the Introduction (1:1-20); and without the Great Interpolation (6:46-8:26). Deducting these, Reuss finds

1. The Growth of the Gospels
2. History of the NT, E.T., 1884
3. Ibid., p.187ff.
that Urmarcus was a work without aversion to Jewish Christianity, and yet without aversion to the Gentiles. Particularly his exegesis in Mk.7:27 shows him to have been without any part prejudice at all.

Salmon begins with accepting Reuss' analysis of the Synoptics into 47 sections common to all. These, he says, are the contents of the original primary document used by all the evangelists. However, having gone this far, he suddenly announces that this is not an Urmarcus, and attempts to show that this document was almost identical with our present Mark.

Hawking, follows somewhat the same method to arrive at a deduction of four sections from our Mark in order to find an Urmarcus: Mk.4:26-29; 8:22-26; and 14:51,52; besides the usual omission of 16:9ff. He finds other short interpolations, none of any great significance.

Samuel Davidson holds that John Urmark did not write our Synoptics into 47 sections common to all. These, he says, are the contents of the original primary document used by all the evangelists. However, having gone this far, he suddenly announces that this is not an Urmarcus, and attempts to show that this document was almost identical with our present Mark.

It is to be noted that all these critics arrive at a very conservative position about the content of the Ur-
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9. The Life of Jesus
10. Perhaps first advocated by Simon: Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthaeus benannt?
This being the case, it is difficult to see why we need to postulate any editor of the original.

With the foregoing may be coupled the names of Baur and Renan, who also held that the original ur.marcus was very different from our Mark. Like Davidson, he believes that the original Mark was combined with the Gospel of Peter, which apocryphal Gospel bequeathed to our canonical Mark its connection with the Apostle.

The name of Holtzmann is perhaps the greatest in NT criticism during the last half of the 19th century, and early 20th. He treats the subject with great care, and comes eventually to the conclusion that the original Mark was Aramaic, but that it was written by two authors—one by John Mark, and another anonymously, which was used by Mt and Lk. This latter tended to fall out of use, being superceded by the first and third evangelists; while our Mark is a late revision of the recension by John Mark.

To this general view Wendt also accedes. The whole argument is based upon the assumption that Lk is acquainted with Mt, thus accounting for the agreements of these two as against Mk.

It is difficult to see how Holtzmann's usually acute discernment has become so confused on this question of an Ur.marcus. The theory is neither consistent or of value theologically for his general position.

1. Life of Jesus
2. Die Synoptiker; for his later views, Einleitung in das NT, p.350ff.
3. The Life of Jesus
4. Perhaps first advocated by Simons: Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthaeus benutzt?
Certain of the critics have discerned in Mark a series of tradition not of first historical importance.

Among these are Wellhausen and Loisy who have not attempted to distinguish an Urmarcus, but who have tabulated some of the sections of the Gospel as of little historical value. The former has indeed advocated an original Aramaic source, but he does so on general terms, and the instances to which he points may be explained on simpler grounds than his. Loisy gives a list of incidents which he thinks were interpolated into the text of Mark. The basis of determination of these interpolations seems to be his subjective perception of what ought to be in the original. It is difficult to take either of these two authors seriously on this subject.

J. Weiss holds that in the instances in Mt where that Gospel parallels Mk but is more concise, the former is following an original Urmarcus which Mk has amplified from Peter's reminiscences. These Petrine narratives form the major portion of Urmarcus. To them, however, are added a collection of "school-discussions" (2:23-28; 7:1-23; 10:1-12; 12:18-27) and a large number of logia, besides some narrative from Q and a few other traditions of inferior historical reliability. Of his Petrine narratives he shall have occasion to speak a little later. The criticism which may be presented in general is that the method em-

1. Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien
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3. Das alteste Evangelium, p.156f, 198
ployed to distinguish the various parts is too comp-
plicated. The factors noticed may be explained on
much more simple grounds.

1 Von Soden thinks that Mk.1:14-4:34 is Petrine.

This section is the criterion for measuring all other
Petrine elements, which together form Urmarcus. In
general, these sections are more concise, are less con-
cerned with logia, as such, and contain few accessory
features. The section from 4:35-5:43 are non-petrine,
apparently due to Mark. The rest of the Gospel is a
mixture of these two. But this argument is wholly from
stylistic differences, which is notoriously inadequate.

The style of any writer changes with his subject. And
the introduction of details is not at all indicative of
a later narrative. Indeed, the opposite opinion might
find similar stylistic characteristics in other passages.

The following is von Soden's analysis of Urmarcus:

John the Baptist and the Baptism of Jesus; a Sabbath at
Capernaum; the offense of the Jews at Jesus' forgiving
of sins, breaking the Sabbath, and the fact that his
disciples do not fast; how the Jews attempted to take
Jesus; How Jesus met the general situation; parables
about the kingdom; the question of who shall enter the
kingdom; the development of the apostolic circle; and
glimpses of the future.

2 Schmiedel argues for an Urmarcus on the ground that

the Matthaean parallels of Marcan matter show that when Mt wrote certain details now in Mk were not there, but on the contrary have been added by a later editor. Thus, he points out that the expression "let the children first be fed" in Mk.7:27 is an insertion by the editor who thus displays his aversion to Jewish particularism. Mt in his parallel account does not use the words in question. The same objection may be urged here. Schmeidel is not proceeding on the basis of any tradition, or upon any textual basis, but upon subjective criticism. This alone cannot be held adequate.

Perhaps the most famous of all attempts has been that of Wendling. He first picks out certain references which seem to come from an editor, and then proceeds to find similar stylistic characteristics in other passages. Then he separates the remainder into two sources, , an Aramaic source, comprising Peter's Memoirs, which was translated into Greek by , who added certain poetical touches of his own to show Jesus as a supernatural Messiah, the Son of Man. These two were united by a Redactor, , (Evangelist), who had a theological interest in the writing. The original Urmarcus, then, comprises the following 212 verses: 1:16-34a, 35-39a, 40-44; 2:1-15a, 16b-17, 18b, 19a, 21-3:5, 20, 31-4:9, 26-29,33; 4:32-34; 8:27-30a, 33b, 36, 37; 10:1, 13-23, 25, 31-32a, 35-37, 41-44; 11:15-17, 27b-12:1, 14a, 14c-31, 1. Urmarcus

1. Urmarcus
The tests by which this most elaborate and minute division of sources is made seems untrustworthy. For it would be hard to find an author of any history who does not have at various points all the characteristics of historian, poet, and theologian. Moreover, an examination of Hawkins’ results in his careful investigation of the style of Mark, shows that all of the sections thus divided by Wendling have about the same number of special peculiarities. Thus on his own initial basis, the theory falls to the ground.

Another extremely elaborate analysis is found in Bacon’s work. Here three primitive documents are supposedly combined. They are P, the primitive Petrine tradition, the character of which may be defined by Acts 10:37, 38; and Q, the Logia; and X, an unknown source. The Redactor, R, is a radical anti-Jewish Paulinist. Bacon assigns every possible passage to R, whose work thus dominates the whole Gospel. But it is difficult to see just where he draws the distinction between Q and X. Were the content of Q more generally agreed upon, the distinction would be more obvious. Furthermore, the influence of Pauline thought is entirely consistent with Marcan authorship.

This emphasis on Pauline thought as a criterion for

1. Horae Synopticae
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3. Gospels as Historical Documents
detecting a later strata in Mark is also used by Hemzies and by J. Weiss. The arguments need not be traced in detail to give a general view of the question. The Gospel, it is said, has traces of the earliest age. In particular, the time-worn Petrine emphases are restated. Peter occupies a central position. He first confesses the Messiahship. He is the leader of the inner circle. Events in which he figures are more clearly drawn than others. And so on. But, Paul does not use the favorite Marcan expression "Son of Man." The prominence given the miracles is hardly Pauline. The Pauline Christology is not present. Nor are the references to the Cross particularly the property of Paul. If the Redactor was really a Paulinist, he failed signally to recast the Urmarcus in the interests of the Apostle to the Gentiles.

Nor is the attempt of B. Weiss to find an "Oldest" or "Apostolic" source more successful. Here the argument reverts to the "Aramaism" of the Gospel, which we have treated above. In addition to this, however, Weiss attempts to show the existence of Urmarcus from the consentient differences between Mt and Lk together against Mk, in Marcan contests. This position is, however, ably refuted by Burkitt who shows that all the divergences, mostly of a secondary nature, can be explained on the
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3. Das Marcus Evangelium, p. 72 ff
bases of special and obvious cases, when each special one, some 20 in all, are considered separately. Burkitt also shows that the larger proof of the non-existent nature of this Urmarcus is that it presupposes an interest in the life of Christ which did not arise until too late for such a document to be written.

It remains to notice in this connection another assumption on the part of Menzies and Holtzmann, to mention the two leaders of many critics of the same opinion, that it was the Church and its interests who secured this supposed revision of Mark. The same position is assumed in another field by Case in recent discussion. Here the argument is that as the community enlarged, various institutional motives caused a revision of the earlier reverence in which Jesus was held, and a heightening of the natural events into miraculous happenings. Another and most complete instance of the same teaching is in the work of O. Holtzmann.

However, on these grounds, it is difficult to see why Mark ever became a part of the canon at all. It would have been far easier to suppress it altogether, as in the case of the apocryphal "Gospel of Peter". The only conclusion which we may reach is, that by the time these supposed "institutional interests" came into being, this Gospel was already received as canonical by the church.

1. Gospel History, p60
2. Case, Jesus: a New Biography
3. Life of Jesus
Stanton, in an illuminating and exhaustive work on the whole synoptic problem, comes eventually to the conclusion that we have the Gospel of Mark as it was originally composed, when certain interpolations have been removed. But these interpolations are words and phrases, which do not materially affect the whole. He finds Mark on the whole reliant upon Peter, altho not by any means exclusively so. And he finds that Lk used Mk practically, if not wholly, in the form which we now possess. The majority of interpolations are in the nature of Logia, which do not always stand in historical connection with the context to which Mk assigns them. Here we have some editing, but no Urmarcus.

1 About the same time Holdsworth put forth his clear and scholarly work advocating a triple edition of an original Urmarcus. In this work he adopts and expands Wright's thesis of three editions of the Gospel, all by John Mark himself. The first edition of Mk was an account of Peter's work up to the conversion of Cornelius. The sermon of Peter at Caesarea is an epitome of the marcan narrative. This earliest edition was used by Lk. Then while Lk was in Alexandria he made a revision for the church there, c.62 AD, during his episcopate. In this edition he omitted incidents not of interest to Egypt, and added

1. Gospels as Historical Documents, p.202
2. The Christ of the Gospels
3. Some NT Problems; and, Introduction to the Synoptics.

other material likely to interest foreigners, and explaining
Palestinian references. Thus, in the Marcan narrative
incorporated in Mt, we have the Flight of the Holy Family
to Egypt, the explanation of such words as "Golgotha", and
the incident of the Syrophoenician woman. This material is
not found in Lk, the assumption being that it was not in
the first edition. Then the third edition of the Gospel
was made at Rome, to which Mark came in 62. Here he met
Peter again, and revised his work from that Apostle's
vivid reminiscences.

These three editions, Holdsworth maintains, represent
Mark's attempt by three efforts to record "faithfully, but
not in order," what he had heard from Peter. Thus Papias
is justified in his estimate of Mark. The Urmarcus, then,
would be the matter common to Mt and Lk, minus the vivid
Petrine touches.

Here again we have a brilliant speculation, with some
greater historical insight than that displayed by the
general critic of the texts. The whole is not incompatible
with the work of Stanton or Sanday, perhaps the two most
discerning critics until the present decade. Nevertheless,
he bases too much of his argument on the Great Omission of
Luke, which Stanton, as noted above, has shown cannot be due
to the fact that it was not in the original Lk.

Easton has presented lately another attempt to dis-
cover the primitive narrative of Mark. He does not venture
in Chapter: "A Primitive Tradition in Mark", in Case
Studies in Early Christianity, 1928.
to name it an urmarcus, but indicates that he thinks it
the original nucleus. He finds in disputes revolving
around certain beliefs and practices of the age the traces
of this primitive tradition. He discovers this tradition
in the following sections: 2:13-17, on sinners; 2:18-22,
the neglect of fasting; 2:23-28, disregard for Sabbath
traditions; 3:1-6, healings on the Sabbath; 12:13-17, the
legality of tribute; and 12:18-27, on the resurrection.
That they are of common origin he maintains is proved by
the fact that they are of the same length; they each state
the situation briefly; the dissenters are named only by
their party, not individually; their objection is put
interrogatively; Jesus' reply is a single logion or group
of logia; and with Jesus' words the controversy ends. He
then finds certain internal agreements indicating an original
organic connection between the sections. To which he
adds the statement that the content of these sections would
naturally be of significance to the earliest Palestinian
community, distinguishing as they do the "Way" from the
Jewish "Ways". Then he excises certain expressions which
he thinks Mk may have added, and the result is a very
primitive tradition.

We may well question, however, that this series,
though it may be important, may be less significant to the Palestinian community than the
controversial sections not included in this selection.
should be omitted, except for the fact that it does not fit into his scheme as a literary cog. And the discussion on true purity in 7:1-23 is surely of primary Jewish interest. Indeed, he frankly admits that it is not included because it is "much too long." So on the ground that subjective reasons cannot be admitted as the sole criteria of historical matter, we must reject this interesting theory.

Eduard Meyer, a secular scholar, has lately published a work which unfortunately I have not been able to secure. Of numerous reviews of it, perhaps that of Lowther Clarke is the best. Meyer assigns to Mark six sources: the original Petrine Reminiscences and the Disciples source; the Twelve source; and Mark 13; the Lukan source; the Logia; and the Matthew source. He finds Mk of a high degree of historical credibility. It may be doubted, however, if we may accurately distinguish between the Disciples and the Twelve sources. But the significant feature of his work is his theory that the Apostles kept notes on what our Lord said throughout His ministry. This much, I think, is of permanent value.

Finally, we may note the work of the Formgeschichte school. This is most ably presented in English by Easton but has thus far not attempted to reconstruct the original Mark by its method. However, we may say in criticism of

1. Ursprung und Anfange des Christentums, 3 vol.
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the method that it is not historical in procedure, but entirely literary. As we have remarked before, the historian cannot accept this method when it is not carefully supported by textual or traditional corollaries. However, form-criticism may perform a service in calling attention to certain irreducible paragraphs, or units of tradition, back of the Gospel of Mark. For, communities do not produce sayings. The controversies recorded in the Gospels were not current when they were written. The subjects of them had been settled in the first generation of Christians. Their recording can therefore mean but one thing, that they are historical. This is not the conclusion of form-criticism, but of historians on the basis of form-criticism investigations. So with cures, and even miracles. These supernatural events would not have been first set forth in the second generation. Their very presence indicates a substantial basis in fact. As to "myths" and "legends", they prove too much. For instance, a standard illustration of how "legends" grow in the Synoptics is the relation of Mκ.1:29-39 and parallels. In Mark the story is simple, in Lk more complex, but in Mt Jesus assumes the initiative, without waiting to be asked to heal the woman, which He does without much contact. Now, form-criticism, as e.g. in Klosterman, insists that there is no development in the three versions, but that Mt must be understood as Lk or Mt records the incident. Which may well be true. But in so proving, form-criticism proves

1. Matthaus, quoted by Easton, p.146.
that Mark had inherited his phraseology from the first stage of the tradition. And when we see that Mark is not afraid to speak as the Jesus' power to heal were limited, then it would seem evident that the passage has not been retouched in the effort to "heighten" the supernatural in Jesus, but that the whole account is that of an eye-witness, and hence historical.

But all this elaborate criticism is too refined. It has too much the appearance of hypercriticism. It harks back to the OT documentary criticism, whose methods cannot be applied to the NT. The time elapsing between the composition of the earliest accounts and that of the canonical Gospels is too short for any such process. The failure of Keim and Strauss forecasts the fate of this method of criticism.

To conclude, a survey of 80 years of urmarcan speculation, with an observance of the decreasing efforts to maintain any urmarcus in the last decade, leads to the judgment that any urmarcus radically different from our Mark is out of the question. Patton remarks:

"In other words, if urmarcus differed from our Mark only in those words and phrases in which Matthew and Luke agree against our Mark, then urmarcus was at the most not a different Mark from ours, but only a different copy or text of our Mark."

Similar judgment is expressed by Sir John Hawkins:

"On the whole it seems to me that such an examina-

1. Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, p. 92
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tion of the Marcan peculiarities as has now been attempted supplies results which are largely in favor of the view that the Petrine source used by the two later Synoptists was not an "Marcus, but St Mark's Gospel almost as we have it now."

And Swete, at the conclusion of an exhaustive study of the Gospel, says:

"The present writer has risen from his study of the Gospel with a strong sense of the unity of the work, and can echo the "requiescat Urmarcus" which ends a recent discussion. But he is not prepared to express an opinion as to the nature and extent of the editorial revision which St Mark's original has undergone."

And Streeter, in his monumental work on the Gospels, rests with these words:

"Renounce once and for all the chase of the phantom Urmarcus, and the study of the minor agreements (of Mt and Lk vs Mk) becomes the high road to the recovery of the purest text of the Gospels."

With these hints and conclusions we may now turn to a definition of Urmarcus, in final preparation for our earliest picture of Jesus of Nazareth.

The Omission of the Little Apocalypse
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A SUGGESTED DEFINITION OF URMARCUS

In order to reach a reasonable view of Urmarcus, it is essential that we think our way back into the beginnings of the Church in Palestine. Shortly after the Assumption, the Church is founded on the day of Pentecost, A.D. 30, according to the commonly accepted reckoning. The problem is to determine about how long after this a demand for a Gospel would arise in the newly established community.

In the difficult field of NT chronology, no part is quite so confused as that of the first few years after Pentecost. We have virtually no records of the sequence of events, the record in Acts being obviously a highly condensed narrative. However, without entering into a discussion of the chronological problem in detail, several facts are fairly clear.

In the first place, the fact that Peter continues in and near the city for several years seems evident. We hear of him in Jerusalem as a leader in evangelizing until the persecution under Herod Agrippa, after which he seems to have left the Holy City. He remains near enough, however, to be present at the Council. After this he appears at Antioch, the great center of Christianity in Asia Minor. In the meantime, an agreement has been

2. Acts 12
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reached by himself and Paul unto a division of territory, not of race, whereby Paul goes to the West, and Peter to the East. However, since Asia was the hotbed of the fight against the Church, both labor there for a while. Evidence of this is seen in the subsequent letters of both, in which each writes to these churches.

By the year 50, therefore, there is an armstrong group of churches not only in Judæa, but in Samaria, and in Asia Minor. And this is the result of the work of only two of the Apostles, Peter and Paul. The others were not idle. Where they worked is not told us. But that they remained in Jerusalem until the Herodian persecution is evident from the account of the Council in Ac.15. It is reasonable to suppose, however, that they would have done work at least partly as fruitful as that of the two whose work we have partially recorded. In addition to the work of the Apostles, it should be noted also that the vast number of converts at Pentecost, many of whom were visitors in Jerusalem, very likely remained for a period of instruction, and returned to their homes to found churches.

A glance at the map showing the wide diffusion of these churches founded in the first two decades after Pentecost will suffice to show that it was from practically the beginning impossible for the Apostles adequately to testify to the Gospel by personal visitation. Of course,
there were many who could testify to the resurrection who had not been with the Lord during His earthly minis-
try. But from the first there would be an overwhelming desire to know the teachings and the deeds of our Lord during the "days of His flesh."

From Luke we learn that such desire had early fruit. We know also that there were many "household churches", which naturally would serve as centers for collecting the logia and deeds of the Master. The synagogues regularly had archives for their Scriptures. It would be unreasonable to suppose that the churches would not cherish the sketches of Christ available to them. Further, we know that the practice of letter-writing was quite common during the first century of our era. Even papyrus books instead of rolls were not uncommon. It is natural therefore to suppose that an extensive correspondence between Christians in Jerusalem and those in distant cities would pass, the subject of which was the logia and deeds of the Lord.

Moffatt shows that the speeches of the time of the Gracchi were carefully preserved. It is hardly to be supposed that some notes were not kept by some of the Apostles of the speeches of Christ, especially after their conviction of His Person at Caesarea Philippi.

The above will be sufficient to denote the demand for Gospels, and the sources of the supply. Perhaps no small
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part of the labors of the Jerusalem Church was that of corresponding with Christians scattered in distant parts. The fact that we do not know who founded the churches of Rome, Alexandria, Carthage, and many other cities, argues for a host of unknown missionaries who would constantly require documentary evidence of what they taught, from the scene of the events of which they testified. 

Now, of all the Apostles, who would most fittingly supply the needs thus indicated? A little reflection will indicate that none of the Twelve could be spared from actual preaching to gather the scattered notes into shape for publication. Their lives were filled with danger. They knew from the experience of Stephen and James that their lives might be required of them at any moment. They must therefore hasten to reach as many people as possible before this imminent fate. At the same time, moreover, they were becoming scattered. Never do we hear of them all in Jerusalem after the Council, about A.D.44. The advantage of several memories working together was not now possible.

Moffatt points out that according to Justin Martyr, the Gospels were regularly used in all the churches in the worship, even before the Epistles. Intr., p.53.

From that time onward he would remain the faithful disciple of Peter, the outspoken, the impulsive, the warm-hearted, and Peter would become his hero. In all

1. Ac.12:12 3. Ac.12:11-14
However, there was one man who was admirably fitted to do this work. This was John Mark, the son of Mary of Jerusalem, a widow, probably, of wealth. Her house was large, her Greek slave is casually mentioned, and her brother-in-law Barnabas evidently a man of some means. Here was the center of the first church. Peter naturally comes there after his escape from jail. Here he found a large number praying.

It was shortly after this that Mark was chosen to accompany Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, and thence with them on their first missionary journey.

This was somewhere around A.D. 44. As we pointed out above, Mark's home was probably Jesus' city headquarters while in Jerusalem during the last week, and Mark was the young man who fled naked. He must have been somewhere around 14 or 15 years old at the time.

In all probability he was one of those who witnessed the trial. The account he gives of it is vivid, as tho of an eye-witness. Yet it is not so extensive as to be that of an adult. He could mingle unsuspected in the crowd, gain their general sentiment, store in his memory certain words spoken, and thus be qualified to recount an angle of that trial otherwise lost to us.

From that time onward he would remain the faithful protege of Peter, the outspoken, the impulsive, the warm-hearted, and Peter would become his hero. In all

1. Ac. 12:12 3. Ac. 12:11-14
probability Peter baptized him. It is not un-
reasonable to suppose that he was Peter’s traveling com-
panion on the latter’s journey to Samaria after the
work of Philip the Evangelist had begun, or on some
similar journey. For some 14 years, then, Mark was in
the closest touch with Peter. These were most im-
pressionable years, those of adolescence and early man-
hood. The Gospel as preached by Peter would during
that time become almost perfectly Mark’s own.

But there were other sources of information for
Mark during these years in Jerusalem. The words of the
beloved disciple, the memories of Thomas, the recollection
of the women from Galilee, the presence of Mary the Mother
of Jesus in the home of John, the visitors from every
quarter who would constantly be coming to this center of
the Church, made an admirable atmosphere for collecting
data about the Life of Jesus. It is incredible that
Mark would not keep a notebook in which he treasured
the bits of information which would come to light under
the roof of his mother.

However, even this was not all of which Mark had ad-
vantage. For a year it was his privilege to be under the
memorable preaching of Paul, whose single gesture silenced
mobs, whose speeches are classics, whose letters have
illuminated Christian life, whose career altered the course
of the Roman Empire. But what did Paul know of the life

1. 1 Pe. 5:13
2. Ac. 8:14
of our Lord? Much in every way. Paul knew that this man Jesus of Nazareth was a man, that He had been arrested, tried, and condemned, crucified, and that He was preached as risen from the dead. Paul was not less than 25, and probably more nearly 30, when Jesus was tried. If he was the latter age, he was a member of the Sanhedrin when Jesus was before it. He could never have forgotten that night. But even if he were not a member of the body which condemned the Lord, it is without doubt probable that he was present. He was about to enter his Rabbinic career, and would of course have been in Jerusalem, especially as he belonged to the Pharisees, at the Passover. He seems to have been a leader in this more or less secret religious order. He could not have been ignorant of the events which culminated in the betrayal by Judas and execution by the Romans, dictated by his own party.

And yet this man Paul worshipped Jesus of Nazareth as deity, surrendered to His will as Lord, gave up every human advantage and reward, for the Gospel. One of his intellectual attainments does not come to so radical a change without cause. Such a one does not worship a "mere man." Were Mark in his presence for a year only, that time would suffice to teach him many things about the divine personality of their common Lord. Paul may not have known so much of the deeds and Logia of the Lord in the flesh, but none knew Him better as the Son of Man, the Messiah of Israel.

1. 2 Cor.11:16-33
Out of this rich experience, then, Mark began to construct his Gospel. As catechizer of Peter's and of Paul's and of Barnabas' converts, Mark instructed them under the eyes of the Apostles. He taught in Jerusalem, he was Peter's "interpreter" when letters came from distant points to that Apostle, he instructed men and women who had made the confession under Paul's preaching. He carried with him notes from his Jerusalem days in the mother church, he added to these notes as occasion was presented. He revised, condensed, classified, the materials until he had developed a perfect system of instruction "that they might believe."

We are now ready to define "Urmarcus." That document is the earliest draft of our Mark, a Gospel written to instruct converts in the Life of Christ. It was written to fortify them for the struggles they must engage in with unbelievers in the deity of the Lord. It was written to inspire men who had never seen the Lord to live the Christ life. It was written to give them the words of Jesus with reference to burning questions of how to act. This theory explains the minor agreements of Urmarcus was put into shape from a desire to extend the field of instruction beyond the limitations of his own and the Apostles' physical limitations. He had the materials at hand, and the need had arisen, before Paul

1 summoned him to Rome in the early 60s. Urmarcus, then,

explaining von Boden's theory.

2, 2 Tim. 4:11


1. 2 Tim. 4:11

Barae Synopticae, p.172
may be judged to have been composed in the late 50s.

What may we say, then, as to its contents?

1. Urmarcus did not have our present Mark's literary finish. Just which particular particles, words, and phrases must be omitted to restore Urmarcus cannot now be determined. But in any case, they are of no moment in the story of our Evangelist. Mt and Lk have both toned down present Mark's style. And when the influence of the Diatessaron is eliminated, we arrive at probably an even more Aramaic tone to Mark's Greek.

Or, Mk may have revised his own work at a later date, bringing to the revision certain niceties of style which make it seem that two documents instead of one bore the name of Mark. Indeed, this might well be the case. For there was no way to recall the first edition.

This explains fully why certain variations between Mt and Lk in the sections where they follow Mk are to be seen in their Gospels. The simple, obvious, reasonable explanation is that each had a different edition of Mark, varying in style but not in matter.

But will this theory explain the minor agreements of Mt and Lk against Mark? There are relatively few, and they occur usually in places where the later Evangelists are correcting Mk's colloquial style. The only conclusion reasonable is that Mt and Lk have used a

1. Kenyon, Textual Criticism of the NT, 2ed, pp363-9, explaining von Soden's theory.
3. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, p.172
second edition, which we do not now possess—and it therefore follows that we really have in our possession an earlier edition than that used by them. In other words, that our Mark is nearer to Lk’s original than that possessed by either Mt or Lk.

Some other minor agreements have been shown conclusively to be the result of the influence of Q, or of textual corruption. These details are not, of course, relevant to our discussion here.

1. Urmarcus contained, contrary to most of the investigators, the omissions of Mt and Lk of Marcan matter, especially the “Great Omission” of Lk. As to Mt’s omissions, they total only 55 verses, 25 of which are in Lk. And of these remaining 30, the essential events are given in another setting, showing that Mt was not omitting, but conflating, incidents in the Marcan narrative. And as to the “Great Omission”, which is the chief difficulty which has given rise to the Urmarcus theory in the first place, a little study will reveal that it must have been in the original. Lk could not well condense this section without.

4. For, the vocabulary is essentially Marcan, hence it must be credited to Mark by the rules of literary criticism under which this argument is presented. Again, it is obvious that Lk the historian is not obliged to follow his source in every detail. Lk was limited in space, not material.

He may therefore have deliberately omitted this section

2. Lk. 6:45-8:26
3. Streeter, op. cit., p. 151
4. Hawkins, Oxford Studies, p. 64f
densed, of little catechetical value, dealing with a period of little interest to Mark, who was too young to have heard of the Baptist, and more or less formal, contrary to the usual Marcan style. The real Gospel begins with the Baptism of Jesus, which some of the Twelve may have witnessed. This is wholly in accord with Mark's plan, which does not recount the Virgin birth, Annunciation, Flight, or Infancy. While Mk assumes throughout the fact of the Incarnation, he treats it as too well known to use.

This situation is best understood, perhaps, when we recall that from the beginning the Christmas cycle of stories has been especially suitable for use with children. Mark was writing for adults lately confessed. Their primary interest was pragmatic, ethical, and polemical. They wanted to know how Jesus proved Himself to be the Son of God. The Incarnation, however, is to be understood by those born into the Christian society, and by theologians.

A somewhat similar situation is involved in the Herald. The Baptist was of interest to Jews, and to children. But Mk is writing, according to universal tradition, for Gentiles, and, as we have shown above, for adults. They cared little for the Forerunner, great as he was, and significant as he was to later ages.

So, in after years, when Mk put out his authentic,

1. Moffatt, Introduction to NT, p. 220
revised edition, he added an introduction, serving some­what as a preface, with a style correspondingly different from the main narrative.

We do not agree, however, with Moffatt and others who extend this introduction to the call of the first disciples. For from v.8 on the style and matter is typically vivid, striking, exact, just as in the remainder of his Gospel. Indeed, we strongly suspect that had it not been for the words attributed to God in v.11, there would never have been a suggestion that this section did not belong essentially to the main body. Doctrinal sub­jectivism has no place in a historical study.

4. Similarly, Urmarcus omitted Mk.6:19-29, the expanded account of the fate of the Baptist. Had the story stood in the original, there is no good reason why Urmarcus should have abbreviated it as he does, nor why Lk should have almost altogether omitted it. That it was added at a later date by Mark seems sufficiently explained as due to the influence of Paul, with his intense interest in the historic connection of Christianity and Judaism. To this reason may be added the interest in the Baptist shown in the fact that he had many disciples expending well into the Christian era.

In any case, however, this passage adds nothing to our understanding of Jesus as presented in Urmarcus, and could be permitted to stand, were we dominated by apologetic

1. Ro.3.
2. Ac.19:1-6
interests. That the section is rarely numbered among the excised passages in Urmarcus is due, it may be, to just this fact— that it serves no particular dogmatic purpose to eliminate it.

5. Urmarcus omitted the eschatological discourse in Mx.13:3-36. We are moved to make this concession to our inductive study of Urmarcan speculation. Even Streeter is not sure that this passage belongs to Mx at all, rejecting as he does any "phantom Urmarcus."

Objections to it commonly noted are that it is a mixture of early Christian and Jewish Apocalypse, inspired by a hatred of Rome. However, we omit it on other grounds. In the first place, it is the Christians, not the Jews, who are the persecuted people. Hence it must have been even earlier than just before '70, rather, the whole flavor of it seems to point to the time of Herod Agrippa. The horror is, that the ancient Israel of God is to lose the Temple, and all that it stood for, if they continue to persecute the new Israel of God, the Church of His First-born. The historic continuity will be broken. A last ruin and dispersion of the race of the Messiah will fall upon them for their disobedience. Hence, let the true Israel watch and be ready to flee when the storm breaks.

The Little Apocalypse is therefore a leaf from Peter's note-book, perhaps by his own pen, containing a record of that memorable night conversation with the Lord about the

future of the Temple and the Church.

But why should it have been omitted from Mk's first draft? Two reasons may be assigned. First, it was not in Mk's possession until after his late work with Peter at Babylon after his return from Rome after seeing Paul, the prisoner executed. That calamity, with the rumblings of the Jewish War which he picked up on the return journey East, caused Peter to remember the conversation, and entrust his notes to Mk for an addition to his Gospel.

Second, and near to this, is the fact that at first the Church was little concerned about the Second Coming. Indeed, so little did that enter the minds of the Apostles that Paul had to write a special letter on the subject to Thessalonika recalling to them his cursory but clear teaching that the Second Advent was yet far in the future. The business of the Apostles was that of planting Churches, and nurturing Christian life. While the Second Coming was naturally part of their teaching, yet they constantly remembered the words of the Lord that even He did not know its date. They had more practical things with which to occupy their time. Hence, not until the passage of too many years for the inclusion of the Little Apocalypse in Urmarcus, did interest in the subject seem to make it necessary to revise the edition.

6. The Urmarcus contained an account of a Galilean resurrection appearance. In spite of the contention of Dean Burgon, the longer conclusion, as the last twelve verses of Mark, p.351-350.
verses of Mark are commonly called, does not seem to have been a part of Urmarcus. Three considerations seem to make this conclusion inevitable. First, it is not found in the oldest and best MSS. Second, it is not at all in the Marcan style. Third, the promised Galilean appearances are not forthcoming.

The shorter ending is not supported by the MSS. Indeed, in the MSS in which it appears, the hiatus between the "ephobounto gar" and the succeeding words is so evident as to make them really an argument against this ending.

Nor does the ending given by W clear the difficulty, so we are forced to conclude as above.

Great ingenuity has been shown in attempting to explain the primitive loss of the ending. Burkitt argues that Mk was a neglected Gospel, and when interest in him arose and end had already been lost. But, when Mt and Lk wrote, the loss had already been sustained. For, although Mt recounts a Galilean appearance, his style is so different from that he commonly employs in following Lk, that we cannot think he had Mk before him. It is also conjectured that Mk did not live to complete his Gospel, which is hardly reasonable. Or, it is said that the original copy was mutilated before reaching its original destination, which is also not in accord with the general facts in the case.

Streeter suggests that the original ending of Mk is preserved in John 20:11-18 and 21:1-23, not, indeed, verbatim.

1. Two Lectures on the Gospels, p.33
2. Four Gospels, p.351-360
but with characteristic Johannine freedom in detail.

This corresponds with what we have argued for an Asian
provenance for Mk, and with Tapias' and Tatian's use
and approval of Mk. That Antioch is equally good with
1
Rome as the source for Mk is argued by Bacon. If the
longer ending was written in Rome, and the original Marcan
ending retained at Ephesus, but superceded by John's
Gospel, a reason for Tatian's use of it in the Diatessaron
is found. That is, Mk would fall into disuse in Ephesus,
John's home.

Streeter presents five arguments for Jn.21 as the
Umarcan ending: 1. Mk.16:7 clearly demands an appearance
in Galilee to Peter or to the Apostles in which Peter is
prominently figured. 2. If Jn.21 be read without the note
in 21:14, this appearance would have seemed the first. 3.
Lk.5:4-7 and Mt.14:29-30, the call of Peter and the Walking
on the Water, seem to be fragments of the oral tradition
contained in Jn.21. 4. The intimation that Peter must
lead in Gentile missions suits a Roman provenance, such as
Streeter assigns to Mk. 5. Since Streeter holds John to
have used Mk and Lk in writing his Gospel, he thinks that
he has here combined Lk's account of the appearance to Mary
Magdalene with the Marcan account of the appearance to Peter
and the charge to "Feed my sheep", so the latter account
may well have stood in Mark's Gospel as read in Ephesus
about 90. To this summary, Streeter adds an original
suggestion that Lk also contained an appearance to Mary
1. Is Mark a Roman Gospel?
Magdalene. He argues this as follows: 1. Jn. shows no trace of following Mt in the Resurrection, except in this appearance. If, then, it stood originally in Mk, the source of both Mt and Jn is discovered. 2. The appearance to Mary in the Garden is trypically Marcan in vivid detail. 3. Since Jn is combining Mk and Lk, and since Lk did not have the Marcan ending, Jn must have secured this appearance from Mk, (our Urmarcus.) 4. If Mk were originally mutilated in a Roman police raid, the Mt ending is what we should expect from one who took the mutilated copy to Ephesus and endeavored to reconstruct it from memory, which Mt then copied in his Gospel. 5. This would also account for the opening words of the long ending, assuming it to be written at Rome: "He appeared first to Mary Magdalene." 6. Paul's account in 1 Cor. and Lk's account confirm the impression that the first appearance was to Peter. The statement of the long ending that it was to Mary Magdalene is to be accounted for only by the tradition at Rome, which in turn is to be accounted for on the ground that it was so in Lk's original ending.

Another recent effort to reconstruct the lost end of Mk is made by Goodspeed. He assumes that if Mk was ever complete, it was when Mt wrote. When Mt breaks off, Mt is copying him faithfully. The sequence of Mk.16:8 and

1. New Solution of MT Problems, p.116-122
Mt. 28:9 is much better than that of Mt. 28:8 and Mt. 28:9.

This is proof that he had before him a fuller Mk than ours, and continues to follow him, when our Mk disappears from sight. The original of Mk's end is, then, Mt. 28:9, 10, 16-20.

Since the Galilean appearance is the distinguishing feature of Mt among the synoptists, we cannot doubt that he got it from Mk. The reconstruction of the ending of Mk, is, then, as follows:

"And Jesus met them, saying "Hail!" And they came and took hold of his feet and worshipped him. And Jesus saith unto them, Be not afraid, go, tell my brethren to depart into Galilee and there they shall see me. And they departed with great joy and ran to tell his disciples. And the eleven disciples went into Galilee to the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped him. And Jesus came to them and spoke to them, saying, God and preach the Gospel to all the nations. Behold, I am with you all the days until the end."

Blass argues that the original ending of Mk is now preserved in the first part of Acts, which abounds in Aramaisms, while the latter section is free from them, showing that Lk is depending on an Aramaic source for the first part of his book. He supports this by the fact that in Tischendorf and the Westcott & Hort text, the Ascension in Lk is omitted.

He thinks that Mk wrote a continuation of Mk.16:9, which included the resurrection appearances and the founding of the church. Lk then followed Mk's "continuation" in Acts.

This accounts for the omission of the resurrection appearances in Mk's Gospel. He thinks also that Mk and Lk were acquainted, and that Mk permitted his second part to be suppressed only when the appearance was first to Peter at all.
planted by Lk's history.

On the whole, we adopt Streeter's suggestion. The suggestion of Goodspeed is too mechanical, and the reconstruction far too tame for Lk's pungent style. Moreover, it assumes that it was earlier than Lk, which is by no means certain. And as to Elss's argument, it does not account for the lack of Galilean appearances, which is just the difficulty in consideration.

On the other hand, we do not see that Streeter's arguments based on a Roman provenance for Mk help his theory. Rather, excluding those arguments, the whole hangs together better. The charge to Peter in Jn 21 is wholly Asian, not Roman. The first Gentile converts, and the whole Judaizing propaganda, were largely Asian. That Mk knew Peter and Paul to be at one on this question would be evident from his close association with both.

As to the probability of Mk's original Roman mutilation, we rather think that the end was lost thru the careless treatment of the Gospel in Ephesus, where John's work superceded it. Or, the mutilation might just as easily been due to Gnostic or police mutilation in Asia, after Mk left for Babylon, or on his journey to Rome, or when he was in Alexandria, if one prefers to assign him to that ancient church. The fact that John knew and used his ending would satisfy Mk. The Apostles had little pride of authorship. And as to Paul's account in 1 Cor., he does not say that the appearance was first to Peter at all.
His words are: "He appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve, then......" Paul is not giving a chronological narrative of the appearances at all. It is not strange that he would omit the purely personal and preliminary appearance to Mary Magdalene.

PART II

Omitting, then, the Roman bias of Streeter, we accept his outline of the end of Mark, as including Jn. 20:11-18, 21:1-23, minus the Johannine additions from the beloved disciple's own rich memory. Or, if one choose, the whole as it stands, for Mk could as easily have known of the appearances thru John as thru Peter.

We conclude, then, that Urmarcus was our Mark, with the following limitations: 1. Whatever of literary finish one may think too polished for a first edition. 2. The retention of Mk. 6:45-8:26. 3. The omission of Mk.1:1-8. 4. The omission of Mk6:19-29. 5. The omission of Mk.13:3-36. 6. The addition of Jn. 20:11-18, 21:1-23.

There remains before us the problem to which we set ourselves, that of defining the picture of our Lord thus presented in the earliest Gospel narrative.
PART II

JESUS IN THE RESULTANT DOCUMENT
I

THE TEACHER

Jesus as Teacher

His equipment

General recognition of His work

Methods employed

Expository work

Original contributions

Not a reformer

Integration of OT with His own teaching

His ethical teaching

Anticipatory teaching

Present and Future as merged in His ideal

Pedagogical devises

His success

The Twelve

The disciples

Provision for continuation

Jesus as an example
Jesus is presented in Urmarcus as the Teacher first of all. The Gospel introduces Him as entering Galilee "preaching the Gospel of God." As the words are used, there is little difference between preaching and teaching. The content of this teaching was three-fold. It was prophetic—"the Kingdom of God is at hand." It was ethical—"repent ye". It was religious—"believe in the gospel." Here we are introduced to what we are to expect in the following pages. Jesus is a Teacher. But His teachings are not confined to prophetic, ethical, or religious phases of life; rather, He embraces all these in one comprehensive whole.

We are likewise given to understand that Jesus had this whole scheme in His mind as He starts to teach. Urmarcus gives no hint of a progressive development of His program during His ministry. He knows what this "Gospel" is, and persistently renounces every temptation to change it, or be false to it. He knew Himself to be the Christ after His baptism, and He knows what to do with this office.

Nor is His knowledge the result of a gradual experimental recognition of truth. Rather, He is in actual possession of truth and knowledge. He taught as one having authority, not as one who has ultimately arrived at authority. He is master of every situation, whether in the presence of friends or of enemies. He is never in doubt. He never quotes any authority but His own. He presents His Gospel, from the beginning, as God's.

This produces an unquestioned recognition on the part of the people that He was a Teacher. This aspect appears especially in Gal. 6:15, "...not as the world, but as it were a Teacher..." But in every chapter of the Gospel except the 10th, Jesus is specifically the Teacher. In the 10th, His teaching is contrasted with the teaching of the false Messiahs. In the 11th, Jesus is clearly the foreshadower of the Saviour King. In the 12th, Jesus is the risen Redeemer. In the 13th, Jesus is with the Father, and the power of the Holy Spirit is given to His followers. In the 14th, Jesus is the Judge of the Universe. In the 15th, Jesus is the Head of the Church. In the 16th, Jesus is the Christ who is coming again with power and great glory. In the 17th, Jesus is the Lord of heaven and earth. In the 18th, Jesus is the God-man who has conquered death and sin, and who will return to judge the living and the dead.
friends or of enemies. He is never in doubt. He never quotes any authority for His words. He presents His Gospel, from the beginning, as God's.

This produced an unquestioned recognition on the part of the people that He was a Teacher. This title is applied with surprising universality to Him in Mark, especially in view of the usual view that Mark does not deal with Jesus as "Teacher". But in every chapter of the Gospel except the 7th, 13th, 15th, and 16th, Jesus is specifically called "Teacher" or Rabbi. The 7th chapter gives the longest teaching section in the Gospel, portraying Him as Teacher without using the word. The 13th we have eliminated from Urmarcus, but is nevertheless as "teaching" chapter.

The account from 14:55 to the close deals with the trial and death, followed by the resurrection, in which section of course occasion to refer to Him as Teacher would not occur. Thus, the whole presentation of His work is with the understanding that He is Teacher. Moreover, if our conjecture that Urmarcus is continued in the close of John is correct, the startled recognition of Mary forces to her lips the affectionate term, "Rabboni!"

An analysis of these passages in which He is called by this term Rabbi indicates that it was generally employed, not by His disciples alone, but by the public at large.

1. The following references to Jesus specifically as Teacher may be given: 1:14, 21,38; 2:8, 13, 17; 3:7-9; 4:38; 5:21; 6:2, 6, 34; 7:1-23; 8:14-21; 9:7, 17; 10:1, 17, 35, 51; 11:18, 21; 12:14, 19, 32, 38; 14:49;(13:3-37.)
2. 3n:20:16
His disciples naturally called Him Teacher, as when the
storm threatened them, or when they had special requests to
make, or when they doubted the destructibility of the
Temple. But He appeared as a public Teacher in the
Synagogues of the land, and in the temple. Further, He
taught in the open to great crowds of people.

This latter fact makes it evident that although He was
tattically a public Teacher in the Synagogues of the land, and in the
Temple. But He appeared as a public Teacher in the
Synagogues of the land, and in the temple. Further, He
taught in the open to great crowds of people.

The astonishment of the people was not so much at
the people exclaimed: "A new teaching!" It was due in
part at least to His immediacy of knowledge. He spoke
It serves to show the universal respect which He commanded as
a Teacher. Even had the Jerusalem authorities not been
willing to recognize His right to be called Rabbi, yet they
were required to so address Him in deference to the people.

Jesus in His teaching was to some degree expository.
He knew the OT, and quoted it freely. He defends Himself
by its precedent. He attacks the Pharisees by applying to
them a prophecy from Isaiah. He sets forth His claims to
Messiahship by citing this same OT. He is the stone which
the builders rejected. He is the Christ, the Son of God,
not the political son of David, as the Jewish thought
The teaching in the Synagogues, to which we have referred, was naturally expository, although He gives no examples of this work. The custom of the Jews was to permit the exposition of the Law or the Prophets on any Sabbath, by anyone present who had anything to say germane to the subject. The fact that He so held their attention would suggest that Jesus was a master of this rabbinic teaching.

But Jesus was more than an expositor of the OT. He was an original teacher as well. This originality is seen in the first result of His public work: What is this, by the law as a proposition, which cannot be removed, the people exclaimed; "A new teaching?" It was due in part at least to His immediacy of knowledge. He spoke a new message, without citing "authorities." He placed His own word against the OT traditions, as regards the eating of meats, for example. He utterly disregarded the traditions of the scribes, as those with reference to fasting. He appealed partly to reason in making these original pronouncements, but not altogether. He did not ask the large body of Jews to accept these teachings during His own lifetime, for He was not yet proved to have the authority of God. This was reserved for Him after His resurrection- when His word was enough.

Perhaps His originality is no more strikingly shown than in His distinction which He seems to make between the authority of God. This was reserved for Him after His resurrection- when His word was enough.

It is for this reason that Jesus does not appear as a reformer, nor as one who would establish a new religion.
to supplant Judaism while He yet lived. With all His
originality, He was yet a good Jew. He emphasized the
Law, giving absolute heed to its teachings, fitting him­
self for participation in the Passover, worship in the
Temple, and the like, throughout His life.

He linked up His originality with the true under­
standing of the Law. Thus, to be truly pious was to do
the will of God. This was orthodox enough for any Jeru­
salem Pharisee. But, to obey the Law was to act according
to its spirit, regardless of its concessionary teachings.
Thus, divorce is absolutely wrong; and it is only permitted
by the Law as a concession, which ought now to be removed.
This part of His teaching was rather original, to say the
least. It could not be answered, but was not welcome.

Furthermore, His originality did not involve a re­
jection of the OT. The answer to the Sadducees with
reference to the future life is an appeal to the peculiar
wording of the Pentateuch. No where does He imply that
the OT was wrong, or that it is not applicable to the age
in which His auditors live.

Perhaps His originality is no more strikingly shown
than in His distinction which He seems to make between the
spirit and the letter of the law. This is a distinction
which delights certain of His critics who hope thereby to
loose certain duties required by the Law. And this is in­

1. 3:35
2. 10:5
3. 12:26, 27
deed is the first result of His teaching. But if this position issues in a more liberal ceremonialism, as in the question of fasting, at the same time it issues also in a more rigid morality, as in the matter of divorce.

Here is one of His most striking positions as a teacher. **quick to forgive, upon reading the heart of men, clear in laying down conditions of forgiveness of men by God,**

and liberal in providing that nearly every sin might be forgiven, yet at the same time He upholds the most rigorous moral system, without admitting any compromise. Jesus has no place for sin in His economy.

He is represented in Mk as an ethical teacher. Men come to Him with problems to solve. The question of the Sadducees was intended to confuse Him on ethical grounds, since they knew Him to be an ethical teacher. Of course, it can be argued that He has absolutely nothing new in His ethical scheme. This is true, except that Jesus does not pretend to draw up an ethical scheme apart from His religion which is soon to be inaugurated. To Him, the ethics of the kingdom were inseparably bound up with the King. He had no ethical salvation to offer. **Ethics are a part of the Kingdom, but His religion has efficacy apart from ethics.**

1. 10:2-12
2. 2:5
3. 11:25
4. 3:28
5. Alausner - Jesus of Nazareth, p.284: "...through the Gospels there is not one item of ethical teaching which cannot be paralleled either in the OT, the Apocryphal, or in the Talmudic and midrashic literature of the period near to the time of Jesus."
Jesus is a teacher of the imminent kingdom of God. He does not profess to offer a nationalistic salvation, nor an ethical salvation, which the Jews required of their "messiah". He teaches the introduction to the kingdom. He prepares men to enter the kingdom when it comes. He teaches men to know the king, and to be ready to surrender to that Ruler. But He does not teach in the Gospels, nor indeed, in the Gospels, what man must do in that Kingdom.

The only exception to this statement must be that He does give some anticipatory teachings of the Kingdom. He found it necessary to anticipate somewhat, in order to show men the desirability of the coming Kingdom. Thus, He looses His disciples from certain fastings to give an illustration of the difference between the religion which He will build and that of the Jews. And, He anticipates a time when fasting will be appropriate, in His memory. In this same connection He indicates that Christianity is too new to be contained in the old wine-skins of Judaism. But it is to be noted that He does not here denounce or invalidate Judaism. That is to be done on the Cross.

The clearest anticipatory teaching of the Lord is that of the Sermon on the Mount. But Mk did not include it, for it is clearly Christian teaching, presupposing for success a Christian Community. Mk is writing only as much of this anticipatory matter as may seem necessary. This Mk finds

in the section on ceremonial versus real defilement. Here is the heart of Christian teaching. Jesus addresses it to the multitudes as well as to the Pharisees, attempting to show both that the spirit of the Law requires the completion of the teaching on defilement and purity which He sets forth. But this system of purity is not intended by Jesus to be put into operation by the Jews. This section is a sample of Christian teaching—He is anticipating the "Gospel of the Resurrection." The Jewish objection to the Sermon on the Mount, as well as to this section on defilement, that the principles laid down will not work, is correct—until Jesus' prerequisites are observed, and one becomes a member of the Kingdom of God which He announced.

So on the question on Divorce, to which we have referred above, and on the question of greatness in the Kingdom, while Jesus calls attention to the fact that the Law never intended to condone divorce, and in spirit condemns it, yet He at the same time admits that because of "the hardness of your hearts" the ideal home could not be built under the Law, but must await the founding of the Kingdom, in which there is to be no divorce. And as to greatness in the Kingdom, conscious search for it, ambition as such, defeats its own end. The only great ones in the Kingdom will be those who have no prerequisites for greatness.
Humility, and anxiety for other, without consciousness of
the reward to accrue to oneself, are the qualities which
God will recognize when He makes up His list of nobles in
the Kingdom of God.

So also the institution of the Lord's Supper may be
1
called an anticipatory teaching. Jesus dramatized the
event before it took place, gave its meaning to His
disciples before they could be expected to understand it.
This was necessary because He intended the Supper to be
a permanent institution, but He could not tell His dis­
ciples of its meaning plainly, since they would not un­
derstand that He actually intended to die. So He an­
ticipated their needs, and the teaching necessary for the
kingdom which was soon to be founded.

Closely connected with the idea of anticipatory teach­
ing is the fact that Jesus taught without making a dis­
tinction between "present" and "future" Kingdom. To His
mind, the kingdom is at once social and eschatological.
2
It is to be inaugurated "in power". This event was seen
by many standing by, when the first Pentecost after the
resurrection came. To those in the kingdom, from that
moment on, the Laws, prerogatives, salvation, pardon, and
personal relationship to God, are given. But these things
are not extended to the whole race until some time remotely
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in the future, which even the Son does not know, when the Son of Man is to come in the glory of the Father with the holy angels. Jesus is providing a means of bridging the gap between the temporal and the eternal concepts. One who accepts the reign of God is elevated even in this life above generally accepted limitations.

The whole account we have given of this anticipatory teaching thus shows that Jesus maintained his role of prophet throughout His career. He begins by predicting the coming of the Kingdom of God. His career as teacher forces Him to use the terminology and imagery of His day. He also is forced to deal with the Law. But thru it all He remains faithful to His task, that of preparing men to see and enter the Kingdom when it is founded. To foresee what essentials He must teach in an anticipatory way required the most acute prophetic vision. And to blend His ethical, prophetic, and religious spirit together was a task finished only by virtue of His Personality, by virtue of His divine Sonship.

There remains to be mentioned the methods by which He accomplished this task of a Rabbi. He was a master of pedagogical methods. The task before Him was that of
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Disciples may not like to be placed "on a stand" but they have been placed there. There is no escape.
proving Himself to be the Son of God, and procuring the means of salvation for men, and then of securing the perpetuity of this Gospel of God. To accomplish this, He had to train a group of men who would be able to see the Messiah as He was rather than as the Jews expected Him to be. He had to convince the multitude that there was something in His claims, without arousing them to rebellion against Rome. He had to interest men in the coming Kingdom. He had to build on the Law and yet supersede the Law. Surely to accomplish this task even imperfectly would require almost perfect pedagogical technique.

The most striking feature of His teaching method was mastery of the Socratic method. Often a single pungent question silenced critics, convinced the open minded, and comforted the disciples. "Can the sons of the bridechamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?" 1 "Is it lawful to do good on a Sabbath day?" 2 These questions cannot be answered in any other than that in which He intended.

"Who are my brethren?" This question He had to answer for them. But no one ever forgot the reply. This manner of teaching the universality of His relationship to men is clear, whether accepted or not. "Why is a lamp lighted?" 3 Disciples may not like to be placed "on a stand" but our Lord has placed them there. There is no escape

1. 2:19-21
2. 3:14-22
3. 3:33-35
4. 4:21-25
from His teaching. Christians can not be hidden any more than Jesus could be treated indifferently by His own generation.

When the time for recognition of His Person by the disciples, He used this method of teaching them. "Whom say ye that I am?" follows the leading question, "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" The answer is not one that could be answered on the spur of the moment, but was elicited because He had carefully prepared them for it, and because He was skilled in the Socratic method of drawing out all His disciples knew.

Nor was He one to fall into traps set for Him by this same method. He saw their attempts to entangle Him, and answered the question "By what authority doest thou these things?", by another, "The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men?" Here His mastery of the method is clearly shown.

His method of teaching by example is no less striking. When He associated with sinners and publicans, Jesus gave a lesson on saving men, and on individual worth, which the disciples learned to the total obliteration of their Jewish exclusiveness. When He rejected the Torah fasts, by a concrete example, He gave impetus to the Christian conduct that made Christianity completely independent of the Judaizers who were to torture the work of
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His great Apostle to the Gentiles. No merely verbal teaching of His independence of death could have taken the place of His teaching by example, when He raised the daughter of Jairus. When He fed the five thousand, He gave by example lessons in His Person, in the Communion, and in divine Providence, which were far more forceable than any amount of exposition could have been.

So also when He walks on the water, and stills the storm, and when He frees a boy from an evil spirit after the disciples have failed to do so, He drives home this lesson of His deity, as never could be done with any theological method. He demonstrates the truth of His Gospel.

Likewise, in the sinless life He lived, because of which all attempts to fasten sin upon Him at His trial failed, He demonstrated His right to kingship, and His right to command. No mere assertion of this right could have been accepted, He does not argue these points, but teaches by example in such a way that the conclusion to which the Church must come is obvious.

Not the least forceful of His teachings by example is the tender scene when He takes little children into His arms as He blesses them. Here is an example that has led to Christian orphanages, the rights, of childhood.
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and family love ennobled by Christian understanding.

Perhaps the most striking scene of His life was the dramatic moment when He overturned the tables of the money changers in the Temple and declared this building to be a house of prayer. Had He stood by and deplored the desecration, He would have secured an audience. But by acting, and teaching thus by example, He so enforced the lesson as to make it a heritage wherever His Gospel has gone.

In Jesus' method of teaching by parable, He showed Himself complete master of this Oriental system. Other parabolic teachers are only beside Him. But no religious mind can forget the striking stories thus told. Men may not see all there is in any of them, but they cannot miss the essential truths He desired to have then remember. When He speaks of binding a strong man to spoil him of his goods, no one can ever again be in doubt about Jesus' purpose in coming to earth to bind Satan. When He speaks of the Kingdom of God, He seeks to leave some impression of its nature by a large number of parables, of which Mk gives two, the seed growing secretly, and the mustard seed. Whole volumes might have been written, have been written, indeed, on each thought. What a masterly treatment to confine these teachings to a few brilliant
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sentences!

Of all the devices He used to bring the Pharisees into line with the Kingdom, none was of such effect as that of His parable of the Vineyard's heir. That this was most effective is shown by the sequence, after His death, when the new Church found that many Pharisees enlisted in the Kingdom. This parable pierced the conscience.

Hence, if we are to judge the teaching office of Jesus by its Oriental standard, we must accord chief place to Him.

But He was not less successful in His public preaching. Above five thousand men, besides women and children, listened to Him for such length of time that they forgot to eat, thus giving rise to the Feeding miracle. Again and again the multitude is mentioned, seeking Him, listening to His teachings. A significant phrase is given by our Evangelist when He says that Jesus taught them "as was His wont." His position as a popular preacher has never been successfully asseverated by the most critical investigators of His career. The most difficult phase of His teaching was the training of the Twelve. They were the ones who were to carry on His work to completion. In founding the Kingdom in power, they were to witness the invasion of the multitude. As in the vineyard, the final test comes; and the one most trusted, He gave theSeleccione, the vineyard, the parable.
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carry on His work to completion in founding the kingdom in power. They were to witness to His Person and work. So He selected them with care. He chose from the number of all the disciples first the Four, Peter, Andrew, James, and John. These seem to have been the ones most trusted, and to them He gave the choicest bits of revelation. To them He added Levi, the publican, discerning his heart beneath the exterior of a tax-gatherers' profession. To these He then added seven others, who should be with Him continually. His training of the Twelve was intensive and extensive. To them He revealed His Person, trusting them with the secret which they did not yet understand. To them He revealed the inner meaning of the Parables, which the crowds did not understand. Perhaps the Twelve did not grasp their meaning at the time. But following His more method of anticipatory teaching, He knew He could trust them to eventually see the truth in them. To these Twelve He first declared the Gospel of the Cross, which proved almost too much for their faith. To them He made the flat denial of any purpose to be crowned an earthly King, teaching them that the "Son of Man must be delivered up."
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Here we may see the essential method which He employed in founding the Kingdom—that of instructing a few in detail, and then of trusting them with the further proclamation of His Gospel.

Moreover, in training the Twelve, the Four were somewhat closer to Him than the others. Sometimes it is represented that the three, Peter, James and John, were the most intimate. Thus, they were the ones who were present at the Transfiguration. They were instructed to tell no man of this event. It is doubtful if they understood what it meant, themselves. Further, it was these three who were taken farthest into the Garden at Gethsemane. To these limited friends, Jesus could entrust the deeper implications of His teaching, which the others could not apprehend until later. Among them the anticipatory teaching of the Lord evidently was more fully revealed.

To the Twelve Jesus added others, although He does not tell us the number. Often it is difficult to understand from Mk's narrative whether certain teachings are addressed to the Twelve or to the larger number. The women who followed Him from Galilee were evidently of this larger number of disciples. Others must remain nameless. But many of them were alive when Paul wrote to Corinth, and
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In all probability when Mk wrote the first draft of his Gospel. From this group may well have come the nucleus of the "apostolic men" of the early church.

In all of this teaching work, Jesus was confronted with the difficult task of knowing how much to reveal and at the same time how much to conceal for a while. He must teach them by degrees. His method is most clearly revealed in His explanation of the parables. In the difficult passage in 4:10ff, the meaning seems to be that the parable is a means of gaining interest, and of revealing truth to those who want it. Jesus knows that it is dangerous for a man to learn the truth in an unsympathetic mood. And He sees the other half of this truth, that the reception of religious truth is morally conditioned. Thus the parable is admirably adapted to reveal and at the same time conceal truth as and to the degree that the hearer is able to bear its revelation.

Part of the training of the Twelve consisted in sending them out on a preaching tour, in pairs. Apparently, they worked largely in Galilee during this trip. This was not the Gospel, but it did prepare them to preach the Gospel later. On this journey they were to go without extensive preparations, and were to live on the hospitality of the land. This was excellent training in conduct for the time when they would be forced to live in poverty and in exile, depending on the hospitality of others.
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Jesus left His Gospel to men, after He had once trained them. There is good reason to suppose that some form of the Great Commission was in Mark's close. In whatever form this may be, it displays Jesus' absolute trust in men. This same committal of His Gospel is seen in the interview with Peter on the Lake as recorded in John, which we have conjectured to have been included in the Urmarcus. "Peter, lovest thou me more than these?" "Yea, Lord..." "Feed my sheep." Peter did not understand this commission. But, in accordance with the principle of teaching which Jesus, as we have seen, universally employed, the teaching was addressed to Peter because he apprehended it most clearly of all of them. The work of the Teacher must be carried on after His death, by His body, the Church.

1. Such is the picture of Jesus the Teacher as presented in Urmarcus. He is a teacher of authority. As such He is given universal recognition by people and religious leaders alike. His teaching was expository of the OT, and at the same time original. This originality involved a acceptance of the OT but a development of its spirit into a new religion, and the announcement of the immanent Kingdom of God.

Preparatory to the Kingdom, Jesus gives certain anticipatory teachings, or teachings to become operative after the inauguration of the kingdom. This prophetic teaching Jesus blends with His ethical and religious Gospel into one harmonious whole. To do all this Jesus displayed the utmost skill in pedagogy, employing the Socratic method, teaching by example, by parable, and by public ministry or preaching. Further, He tactfully drew out the best in all men whom He touched, and revealed the truth to the disciples as rapidly as they were able to understand. Then He sent the Twelve out to gain practical experience, and finally entrusted His Gospel to them when He had reached the Cross.

1. As, e.g., the Jerusalem scribe who asked about the commandments. See Mk.12:28-34.
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II

TEACHING

We do not usually think of Mark as a Gospel of Teaching. However, not less than one third of this book is in the form of didactic sayings or discourses of our Lord. It is our purpose in this chapter to examine these sayings, with a view to determination of how much of the Gospel we may find here.

1. The doctrine of repentance.

The prologue of the Gospel was the preaching of John the Baptist, whose doctrine was that of baptism of repentance unto remission of sins. After John's arrest, the evangelist represents Jesus as preaching in Galilee that the kingdom was now at hand, and that men should therefore repent. Here Jesus continues part of the work of John, and that part is the preaching of repentance.

Jesus represents Himself during His first preaching as a preacher rather than as a wonder-worker. "To this end came I forth," He insists to His disciples. Not to startle men, but to bring them to repentance. This purpose was nearly wrecked by His healings. The first healing in Capernaum was not premeditated, but was forced upon Him by the fearful demon. His struggle thereafter is to make men understand that His primary message is not that of curing the body, but healing the soul.

1. 1:4
2. 1:15
3. 1:38
This teaching and preaching of repentance continued. He sends His disciples on a preaching tour, giving them power to cast out demons and heal the sick. But their chief business is to be that of preaching repentance. He does not cease to call even the Pharisees to repentance, indicting their hypocrisy. He makes a last effort to save Judas, even just before the betrayal. "Woe unto that man thru whom the Son of man is betrayed!" The Kingdom is at hand; but he who would enter must be repentent.

Jesus does not tell us just what this repentance may be in Mark's Gospel. The Jews understood very well what repentance was. Mark's readers would be familiar with the idea. Even if Mark is a Roman Gospel, it would be addressed to Romanized Jews first of all. There is no need for Jesus to explain the significance of the term.

2. The doctrine of forgiveness.

The first time Jesus comes in contact with the Scribes, while he is teaching in the house in Capernaum after that notable Sabbath when He cast out the demon, He brings up the doctrine of forgiveness. Looking at the helpless wreck who was brought to Him to be cured, He says: "Son, they sins are forgiven."

Typically of Mark, Jesus does not here propound a doctrine, but acts a doctrine under compulsion of the circumstance. Here was a challenge to the Law. Here is a claim to deity. Here is the statement of a fact. Jesus is not propounding a doctrine of forgiveness, but is
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exercising a royal prerogative. Nor when the Scribes accuse Him of blasphemy on the ground that only God can forgive sins, He calmly accepts their challenge, and still assumes that the sins are forgiven. The doctrine here announced, is this: when Jesus chooses to forgive sins, that is an end of those sins. Nothing further is needed.

On another occasion, He gives another pronouncement upon this question of forgiveness. When some ascribed His power over demons to Beelzebub, Jesus rebukes them, on the ground that to ascribe good to an evil source constitutes an unpardonable sin. Here is the doctrine that sin is eternal. Not as a mere abstract theory, but as a distinct irradicable stain in human souls. Evidently there is only one way to get rid of sin, and that is by forgiveness. But this one sin cannot be forgiven.

But what must be done in the cases of sin which can be forgiven? This is answered incidentally upon the occasion of the first recorded parable. Here Jesus says that repentence brings forgiveness. If men will repent, then their sin shall be forgiven them. Repentance is man's part, forgiveness is God's part, in getting rid of sin.

This law of repentance preceding forgiveness is general. It applies to both sinners and Christians. The procedure may be different in the two cases, but the principle is clear and basic.

But God's forgiveness is conditioned, in the case of believers, by one more consideration. The sinning believer must pray for forgiveness, with a forgivable heart. And
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this means, that he must himself forgive. To forgive our human enemies and those who sin against us, then, is an essential condition of God's forgiveness of our sins.

This doctrine makes forgiveness moral rather than in any way sacramental. Nothing is said of sacrifices, or of priestly rites. A man may determine his own state by an analysis of his own heart. However, after forgiving his enemies, one must pray to God the Father, who then may forgive.

3. The doctrine of sin.

Jesus does not give a definition of sin in Mark. He assumes here also that the readers are familiar with the concept. Sin is transgression of divine law. No people knew better than the Jews what sin was.

Our Lord states, however, that the source of sin is definitely known. Satan, he says, is that source. Even in His own case, it is the devil who brings the temptation. Sin is conduct belonging to the Kingdom of Satan as opposed to the Kingdom of God.

However, it is not necessary for man to remain in sin, for every sin except one may be forgiven. Only the sin against the Holy Spirit, which blights the vision and prevents desire for Godliness, cannot be forgiven.

Sin is heinous in its nature. It springs out of a defiled, lustful heart. It is not so much ceremonialism, as it is moral deflection. It is not that which goeth into a man, but that which cometh out that defiles. It is the
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product of evil thoughts, a product which takes as many forms as human nature can be corrupted into. Lust, lies, murder, pride, foolishness, are all the result of the evil mind within man.

The chief sin of the Pharisees was their voiding of the word of God by stultifying human traditions. In this connection Jesus upbraided their practice of Corban, a devise by which they robbed God legally. Against this casuistry and sophistry He warns his disciples in strong terms. Peter rebelled against His proposed suffering in Jerusalem, suggesting that the purpose of His Advent might be attained otherwise, only to receive a scathing rebuke: "Get thee behind me, Satan!" It is a dangerous sin to tamper with God's word.

Nor can legal procedure liberate one from the guilt of sin. While Moses suffered divorce, yet Jesus points out that from the beginning God had intended the two contracting parties in marriage to be joined in one flesh. From this union, no freedom is possible. To divorce a partner, and re-marry, is to commit adultery. The marriage relation is not a matter of legal enactment, but of divine decree. While Moses permitted divorce, it was because of the hard hearts of the people, not that God had ever intended such practice to be permanent.

It is bad to sin; it is by implication even worse to cause others to sin, especially "one of these little ones." Such an one were better off, had a "great millstone been
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hanged about his neck, and he were drowned in the sea."
He carries eternal guilt of another's soul around his neck. For, evidently, such a man is doing voluntarily the work of the devil, who may be expected to cause men to stumble.

Extreme care should be taken to avoid sin. If a hand, or a foot, or an eye, causes offence, Jesus advises the expulsion of that member from its place in the body. This is not asceticism, but a sacrifice of the flesh to spiritual advantage. Asceticism finds the good in the privation; Jesus finds the good in using if necessary the most extreme measures to avoid sin. So far from seeking sin to conquer it, Jesus teaches a spirited effort to avoid sin as an Oriental does the leprosy.

4. The doctrine of Faith.

As repentence is an attitude of change from evil to good, so faith is an attitude of acceptance on our part of the person and religious authority of our Lord. It is nothing supernatural, but is the result of the judgment we exercise on the basis of the evidence He presents to us as to His right to our obedience. Such is faith as Jesus teaches in Mark.

The healings which Jesus performed were usually the result of faith. It was faith, Jesus said, which cured the blindness of Bartimaeus. The leper had faith that Jesus could cure him. Jairus had faith in the power of
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Jesus to heal his little daughter. The friends of the paralytic had faith in His ability. When word was brought to Jairus that His daughter was dead, Jesus exhorted him to "Fear not; only believe" and the subsequent raising indicates that the ruler of the synagogue did. The Greek woman whose daughter was possessed had faith even after discouragement. To all these cases of faith, Jesus responds with the desired favor.

But faith that enables the reception of favor is not the only faith Jesus inculcates. He teaches also of a faith that accomplishes things. He rebukes the disciples who have failed to cure a demoniac: "O faithless generation!" Sufficient faith may remove mountains. Indeed, "all things are possible to him that believeth." Whether these words are to be understood literally or figuratively, it is evident that a lack of this effective faith is characteristic both then and now.

But faith is still something more--and perhaps more easily grasped. Jesus says quite categorically: "Have faith in God." Here is the gripping principle of the religious life. Such a faith enables the believer to approach God confidently. The promise of our Lord is that God will grant to the believer whatever he may ask for in faith.

Finally, faith is to be likewise in Jesus Himself. "It is I; be not afraid." This faith is induced by what
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the disciples have observed of His deeds and understood of His teachings. The judgment at Caesarea Philippi was deliberate exercise of the power to weigh evidence. This is evidence available not only to His immediate disciples, but to all who live subsequently. Mark is one of the original documents preserving this evidence.

It is to be noted, however, that Jesus never asked the disciples to believe that He would rise from the dead. This was to be His supreme proof, and He prepared them for its introduction. But He did not ask them to believe without demonstration. And of course, after the demonstration, the resurrection was no longer a matter of faith, but of knowledge.

5. The Doctrine of God.

The doctrine of Jesus about God is not different from that understood by the Jewish faith, in particular emphasis. God is the "Most High God," a familiar concept. He is likewise the Author of the Law. He stands ready to forgive sins, for He is "your Father in heaven." He is especially the Father of the Jews, although Jesus expects this limitation to be immediately extended.

Jesus is Himself the Son of God, in a special sense, as He admits underoath to the High Priest. This may be part of the meaning of the cry on the Cross in which He addresses God as His God, not as His Father. For He habitually identifies Himself with humanity, under the
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title "Son of Man," thus participating in the common Fatherhood of God. That His teaching on this subject is not more complete is perhaps due to the familiarity of Mark's readers with the Jewish doctrine. Yet it is strange that Mark reports nothing more of Jesus' doctrine of God's Fatherhood than the one isolated and incidental reference. The explanation is only that this doctrine must have been a commonplace to Mark's circle.

6. The doctrine of the Son.

We reserve a more elaborate treatment of this doctrine for another chapter. Here it is sufficient to point out that this doctrine is the heart of the book, and as well the core of Jesus' teaching. The Gospel of Mark is the evidence that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God.

Here we deem it sufficient to say, that He is so recognized by demons, that He is so acclaimed by God Himself, and that He is so named by men. He claims God as His Father in cleansing the Temple. He lays claim to Messiahship in the Triumphal Entry. He admits this office both before the religious and the civil courts.

But altho He claims an equality with the Father in certain matters, yet He is distinct from the Father. He came forth into the world for a distinct purpose. He does not use the title Christ, preferring that of Son of Man,

as a title Messianic but not openly subjecting Him to
arrest on the charge of blasphemy.

7. The doctrine of the Kingdom of God.

The Kingdom is represented as being at hand in the
beginning of His preaching. There is no account in the
text of the founding of the Kingdom. When the book
closes, it is still to be realized.

The Kingdom is similar in its growth to a field of
grain. First, the Sower scatters the seed, which is
the Word of the Gospel of God. This Word falls upon
different types of soil, meaning different classes of
people who respond in various ways. Some men hear the
Word, but pay it so little attention that Satan destroys
it. Others accept it with enthusiasm but without will­ingness to endure persecution for it. Others are op­pressed with diverse worldly cares, and so give the word
and wealth, even for the sake of the Church. They must carry no
culture, so that the young plant soon dies. Others
hear the Word and accept it, and care for the growing
grain until it reaches a rich fruition.

But in any case, the growth of the Kingdom is to be
from small beginnings, even as small as a mustard seed.

But the promise is large. Growth, however, is slow, often
so slow as to be imperceptible. Nevertheless, it will
continue to grow, and eventually harvest will come.

The manner of receiving the Kingdom must be that of
a little child, humbly and obediently. To begin in this
unpretentious manner, will eventually bring eminence to
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to the faithful. But this eminence is not like that of the Gentiles, an eminence of authority and ruler-
ship. It is the eminence of service in absolute self-
forgetfulness, that brings eminence to the Christian.
"Whosoever would be great among you, shall be your
minister."

Citizenship in the kingdom is to be exacting. It may require the surrender of one's wealth. Wealth at
any rate may weight down the struggling disciple. He
should accordingly give up the thing that hinders his
discipleship, whether it be house, or brethren, or
sisters, or mother or father, or children, or lands, or
hand, foot or eye-- it must be surrendered if it checks
growth in the Kingdom.

Indeed, those in the Kingdom must expect persecution,
and hatred, even family treachery. They must expect to
be arrested, cast out of the synagogue, delivered into
jails, put to death. False prophets and false Christs
shall arise in the Kingdom. The lot of the disciple is
one of suffering and endurance.

But the rewards of the Kingdom are correspondingly
great. The faithful shall find new houses and lands and
kinsfolk. If he endures to the end, he shall be saved.
He is to come into the Kingdom of God, naturally to be as
enduring as the Most High.

1. 10:42-45 4. 13:9-12
2. 10:23 5. 10:29-31
The Kingdom of God is to fill a great function in civilization. Believers are to be the salt of the earth— the savoring, preserving, seasoning element, 1 which is responsible for the progress of things. The Kingdom itself is spiritual, but its practical application is to lie in society wherever and however constituted. Disciples are not therefore to lose their saltiness. They are to guard jealously that within them which makes them the vital element in civilization.

And, in order to be effective, they are to be at peace among themselves. They are not urged to be at peace with the world, nor the Kingdom of Satan, with evil things and purposes and men. With these there must be perpetual enmity. But peace must reign in the Kingdom of God. And that peace is the result of the common obedience they have to their King.

The spirit of the Kingdom is revealed on the occasion of Jesus’ discussion with the Scribe who approved His controversies with the Pharisees and Sadducees on Tuesday of His last week. When Jesus told him that the essence of the Law lay in the dual command to love God and one’s neighbor, this man saw the point at once. The Law, he saw, is a moral, not a legal nor yet a sacramental, system. Jesus’ answer to this observation reveals what the spirit of the Kingdom is. Such an understanding, He informs the Scribe, places him not far from the Kingdom.

That this teaching on the Kingdom represents the most extensive single doctrine in Mark is natural. Jesus is

1. 9:29,50
2. 9:50c, 11:23a
3. 12:34.
laying the foundations for the kingdom. He is training men to do this work. Hence the devotion of so large a portion of the work to it.

8. The doctrine of the Old Testament.

Jesus quotes the OT in Mark on several occasions, using the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. In each case He quotes in the usual fashion of His people, accepting the OT as the revelation of God. Here He does not differ in His attitude nor His doctrine from the Scribes of His day. He thus gives the tacit approval of His use to the OT.

Moreover, Jesus specifically quotes Moses' commandments as the commands of God. Indeed, He calls these commandments, the Word of God. In 10:16 He accepts them as fact of God's creation of man. He quotes Moses as sustaining the doctrine of the future life. He quotes Zechariah 13:7 as prophesying the dispersal of the disciples upon the crucifixion. The OT, to Jesus, contained the revelation and the prophecies of God. Yet He does not hesitate to alter the regulations of OT Law. The Sabbath question, and that of Divorce, are cases in point. However, as we shall show in our section on His relation to the Law, these were external rather than internal changes.

9. The doctrine of eschatology.

The doctrine of Jesus with reference to the last things is warmly disputed. Some consider eschatology as


His
the chief thing in His teachings. Others have disputed this view. The question is whether or not Jesus adopted the cataclysmic view current among the Scribes, and whether He expected to return within that generation. Such is the view of many from 9:1 - "There are some here of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Kingdom of God come with power."

Did He mean the Transfiguration, Pentecost, the Destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD, or when did He think of the Kingdom of God as coming in?

To accuse Jesus of making an unfulfilled prophecy on this point, is to ascribe to Him the very thing which He said He did not possess -- knowledge of the times and seasons. So far as the fulfillment of 9:1 is concerned, Pentecost fits the needs fully. The Kingdom was indeed founded and with power on that day.

As Jesus was teaching in Jerusalem, His disciples from Galilee were impressed with the huge temple stones. This leads Him to predict the destruction of this Temple, which actually did happen in AD 70. They press Him at once for details, time, and signs of the destruction.

He begins His answer by warning them not to be led astray. Many shall claim to be the returned Jesus. But beware! About the only certain thing about the whole business is, that if anyone says "Lo, here is the Christ!"

His disciples are not to believe. For these claimants

1. Schweitzer: Quest of the Historical Jesus.
2. Sanday: The Life of Christ in Recent Research.
3. 13:32
4. Ac. 2:1-42
5. 13:6
will be false prophets. It is clear when the second
come. Moreover, disciples are not to be disturbed by
cataclysmic disturbances. Wars and rumors of wars
shall come, but "the end is not yet." These are the
usual disasters of history. Not even when nation attacks
nation; nor yet when earthquakes scatter over the land;
nor when famines lay waste continents; not then is the end.
Son, Again, the faithful shall be subjected to all mal-
treatment. They shall be arrested, imprisoned, beaten,
persecuted, for the name's sake. They shall be cast out
of their families, and shall be hunted to the death. But
the second coming is not yet.

They shall become as the filth of all things, as
Paul says of the Apostles in Corinthians. They shall
not be anxious, however, for the Holy Spirit will teach
them what to say. Until the Gospel shall have been
preached unto all nations, the end is not yet.

Not even in the terrible days of the destruction of
the Holy City, will the end be. In these times of hard-
ship, it is well to beware, for men's nerves are strained,
and even the elect may be tempted. But since He has
warned them, they are to stand fast.

The Second Coming shall not be until the sun and the
moon shall hide their light. Stars shall fall, and the
powers of the heavens tremble. Then shall the Messiah
return the second time. This may be highly figurative

language. But one thing is clear: when the second coming takes place, there will be no doubt about what is happening. Everyone knows what it would be to see One coming in the clouds. This perfect objectiveness of the Second Coming is what is meant.

The other definite thing about it, let it be repeated, is, that no one, neither the angels nor the Son, nor one but the Father, knows when this will be. Jesus' teaching about eschatology ends in a very practical note. Since the day of the return is not known, "Watch." The doctrine of ethics.

In addition to what has been said about the ethical note in the kingdom of God, and the criterion of eminence among Christians, it may be well to note the brief but profound principle of Christian ethics taught in Mark. In rejecting Peter's insistence that he need not go to Jerusalem to be killed, our Lord lays down the one principle in His scheme of ethics for His own. Whoever would be a disciple, must take up and bear his own cross, in self denial. This self-denial is the only real self-realization. To seek to save one's self is to lose reason for it. From the days of the Greeks and Romans who found the doctrine false, and the Jews who found it a world at the cost of losing self, where the soul is lost, everything is lost.

Jesus did not expect this doctrine to work in the world at large, but only among those who followed Him.

1. 13:37
2. 8:34
3. 8:35-38.
It is a workable rule, but only when men are first in him. On this doctrine hinges the whole moral teaching of Jesus. Self-denial is not merely denying oneself the pleasures and luxuries of the world. It is not even asceticism. It is whole self-surrender to a mighty cause and an absolute Lord of Life.

This same thought is expanded in the dispute soon arising as to places of power in the Kingdom (9:30-50). The true great ones are the servants—slaves, of the rest. There are no rights in the Kingdom, only duties. So with the question of the man who cast out demons in His name, although not one of the disciples. Here He makes a clear-cut distinction. There is no middle ground. One is either for or against Jesus. If he does good, he is to be counted a friend. It is conduct, not formal alliance, that makes one a friend of Jesus.

11. The doctrine of the atonement.

Properly speaking, Jesus does not give any doctrine of the atonement. He merely announces the fact. He says that He must give His life as a ransom for many. He does not attempt to explain this statement. He gives no reason for it. From the days of the Greeks and Romans who found the doctrine foolish, and the Jews who found it a stumbling block, until today, men have sought a reason for it, and found none. Bacon denounces it as immoral. But Jesus announces it as a fact.

On the occasion of the institution of the Communion,

1. 9:38f 2. 10:45
Jesus again teaches the doctrine, again without explanation. "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many." Theology may suggest many weighty reasons for this doctrine. Faith merely accepts the fact, without attempting to explain what the Lord did not choose to illumine.

12. The doctrine of the future life.

The question of the existence of a future life is settled by Jesus teaching to the Sadducees, who propound their famous physical objection to the doctrine. In this passage, Jesus explains that the future life is to be a spiritual plane of existence, where marriage and other temporal considerations do not obtain. And as to the fact itself, He says it is proved in Exodus 3:6, where the use of the present tense shows that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are still living. This is the clearest reference to the future life in the Pentateuch, which alone the Sadducees accepted as the Word of God.

As to the nature of this future life, Jesus divides it into Heaven and Hell. Heaven is a place where God and the angels are. These angels are servants who may be sent on material missions even to men. Men are to be resident there, but the places of distinction are not disposed by our Lord. It is a spiritual place, inhabited by spiritual beings, as He mentions in discussing its nature with the Sadducees.

2. 12:18-27  4. 16:5

1. 10:37; 5:39; 12:36  5. 10:18
2. 9:23-27  4. 9:46  6. 3:29
3. 3:29  7. 10:26, 27
This heavenly state is that of "glory". Jesus is asked to permit certain ones to be in places of honor "in thy glory". He promises to return to earth in "the glory of the Father with the holy angels". He is the "Lord" of David's Psalm whom Jehovah places at His own right hand.

The teaching with reference to Hell is even less extensive. It is the domain of the devil and the demons. The consequence of sin is that it casts the sinner into hell. The sin destroys the soul. A sinning soul falls into "eternal sin". This is one of the most terrible phrases in the Scripture. Sin is bad enough at any time, but to make it eternal is punishment indeed. This permanence is shown also in the expressions, "where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." The worm feeds itself on its own pollution, and the fire burns inwardly.

The two realms are contrasted as the Kingdom of eternal life over against that of eternal sin. The one is a place for the living God, with all that life implies, the other is eternal error, mistakes, confusion, rebellion.

But this is the extent of the doctrine. Mark is content to relate these destinies as facts, instead of describing or explaining them.

13. The doctrine of salvation.

The casual question of the disciples, "Who then shall be saved?" shows that Jesus taught much on this doctrine. Yet Mark relates little of what He taught. Jesus in this

1. 10:37; 8:38; 12:36
2. 9:43-49
3. 3:29
4. 9:48
5. 10:18
6. 3:29
7. 10:26, 27.
passage tells them that it is difficult for a wealthy man to enter the Kingdom. They are surprised, and want to know who can be saved. This tells us that to be saved and to enter the Kingdom of God is one and the same thing. This same passage reveals another thing about salvation, that it is a thing impossible with men, but possible with God. Salvation is not earned, but a gift of God.

The Kingdom is the reign of God in the human heart. But it is a state in which a man must endure. This endurance must be "to the end", and such a man "shall be saved." Here it is evident that salvation is a process of living in this life, which shall eventually, at the end of an enduring life, be converted into a state of assurance or security in "eternal life".

The only other passage in which the idea is presented is the obscure passage in 13:20, which refers to Jehovah's anxiety that some be saved. This passage refers to the "elect", but no teaching of who there may be is given.

This lack of teaching may seem strange. But it is not so on a deeper examination. Mark is not writing a treatise on salvation, but is writing a cumulative proof of the Messiahship of Jesus. The Acts are the documents of salvation.

Conclusion.

Thus in Mark the most important doctrines of the Christian system are taught in element, at least. One
phase of Jesus' teaching we have not mentioned here, that of His controversies, since we treat them in the chapter devoted to their exposition.
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THE AUTHORITY OF THE MASTER

Mark is essentially a Gospel of Authority of the Lord Jesus, the Son of God. This descriptive phrase may not belong to the Urmarcus, but the title was not inaptly chosen by that unknown scholar who gave the book its lasting head. If Mark is a Roman Gospel, as is commonly accepted, then this appeal to Authority. Here, in the person of Jesus, is a religious Lord whom even haughty Rome may not safely reject.

This Authority carries with it a recognition of Power. It is no empty claim to Lordship that Jesus presents in Mark. Rather, the vitalizing Power compels admission of the Authority. It is the Authority of a Man who is conscious of a complete resident Power within Himself. Hence our treatment does not separate His Power into a distinct section.

1. Moral Authority.

It is significant that the first exercise of this Authority is related prior to the account of any miracle. While apparently the successor to the Prophet John the Baptist, Jesus calmly summons to Himself the four leading disciples. He appeals to Simon and his brother Andrew, and sons of Zebedee, James and John, to come with Him and learn to fish for men. They obey "straightway".

1. Bacon: Is Mark a Roman Gospel?
Here is a frank reliance upon a dominating personality and altruistic program. The picture is that of a strong man, who successfully draws men away from their business and families for a special task. Regardless of the size of the business of these men, it cost them effort to leave. Only a strong inherent authority living in the leader could so have drawn them.

The same is true with reference to the calling of Levi and of the remainder of the Twelve. Nor was this selection restricted to the Twelve. These favored ones were chosen out of the large number who responded to that moral authority He exerted. "...and calleth unto him whom he himself would. And they went unto him." (3:13). He had that radiant personality which subordinates all but the moral purpose of being.

Moral authority springs from moral integrity. It is highly significant that this integrity is challenged but once. In 3:22f it is related that a deputation of Jerusalem scribes attempted to discredit Him by attributing His power to Beelzebub. Jesus silences this accusation by pointing out its absurdity. And at the same time places Himself in absolute opposition to all evil by showing the true significance of His casting out of demons. Implicitly, He here also demonstrates His superior power and authority in the realm of righteousness to which the scribes themselves belonged.

This moral authority is shown also in His teachings.

1. 2:14
2. 3:13-19
3. 1:22; 12:34c
Over one third of Mark is devoted to these teachings. We give a more detailed consideration of them later. Here we merely point out that the impression made on His hearers was that He possessed infinite moral authority. This impression was not local, but extended wherever He taught.

Perhaps no other testimony is so conclusive in this realm of moral authority, than the fact that the chief priests and scribes dared not seize Him openly. These men were not devious by nature. They were the most eminently respectable group among the Jews. But even they did not dare risk an open contest of authority in the moral realm.

Time and again they had sought to catch Him in some moral fault. He had replied by pointing out what real defilement was. He refused a sign to the Pharisees, who pretended to desire an obvious Christophany. He lifted the question of divorce from the legal to the moral and religious realm. He refused to lay Himself open to the charge of blasphemy by propounding a moral dilemma to the chief priests at Jerusalem. He refused to make a legal controversy a moral issue. He identified the purpose of the Law with the righteousness of God. There was but one course left to His enemies, unless they should become His disciples; to take Him secretly and kill Him. Beside their moral infamy, His integrity stands brilliant in authority.

Finally, this moral authority is demonstrated by the intense consternation shown in the ranks of Satan by His Advent.

1. 14:1,2. 5. 11:27-33
2. 7:20f. 4. 10:2-12.
3. 8:11,12. 6. 12:13-17
4. 10:2-12.

See also: "Christian Origins."

Mark but mentions the Temptation. But the absolute route of Satan is shown in his contemptuous dismissal of that attempt to destroy the Son at the outset of His ministry. That this route was complete, is illustrated by the wild fear of the first demoniac to see Jesus after the temptation: "What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Nazarene? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee, who thou art, the Holy One of God." Thus graphically Mark represents the utter disorganization of the powers of hell. Again and again this moral authority is recognized by the demons. They must obey Him, and come out. They obey His orders to be silent. They fall down before Him. They pray Him to torment them not. His very name so strikes terror in their minds, that they respond to exorcism by it, even when used by non-disciples. No other explanation of this total disruption of Satanic power can be offered, than that in Jesus' person resided a supreme moral authority.

2. Physical Authority.

Jesus' authority in the physical realm is not less noteworthy. This is the side which has caught the attention of most works upon Mark, since this Gospel is known as excessively given to miracles. The historicity of Mark is attacked on this account, as, e.g., "The evangelic tradition consists of so and so many anecdotes, told and retold for the purpose of explaining or defending beliefs and practices of the contemporary church". We are not concerned here,
however, with a defense of Mark's historicity. This matter is therefore assumed in this discussion.

Jesus' authority in this physical realm is demonstrated by Mark by His authority over disease. He restores Simon's mother in law from fever to active health by a touch. He cleanses a leper. He heals a paralytic, and a withered hand, and a woman with an issue of blood long standing. He gives speech and hearing to one man, and sight to another. He heals a blind beggar who becomes a disciple. Here are eight of the eighteen miracles recorded.

The point is not the number. These have been selected by Mark as representative of no one knows how many others. The significance lies in the variety and malignity of the diseases. Leprosy, blindness, deafness, paralysis, shriveled members, bloody issues--these are not functional, but organic diseases. They are not cured by the introduction of a favorable mental state into the victim. Such cures can mean only that Jesus possessed authority in this realm.

This authority is further exemplified in Jesus' relation to "nature". In this, He stills the storm on the Lake. He provides food for five thousand. He walks calmly out over the troubled waters of the Sea, and again feeds four thousand. He cures a fig tree, causing it to wither in mid-season.

Such authority is not to be denied. It cannot be explained away, except by impeachment of the testimony. This

2. 1:30 7. 7:31-37 on Matt., xxxiiii.
3. 1:40-45 8. 8:22-26
4. 2:1-12 9. 10:46-52
6. 5:25-34 11. 4:35-41
It should be noted that these "nature" miracles, as they are commonly called, seem to have taxed our Lord's strength the least of any. Healing tired Him, and He withdrew to rest and pray. A touch by one seeking health took power from Him. But His mastery over nature seems entirely effortless.

Jesus' authority over unclean spirits has been treated under the section on His Moral Authority. But it might have been discussed here. To Him, the distinction we draw was of no moment. Humanity is a part of nature.

But the most noteworthy exhibition of this authority in the physical realm, in Mark, is His raising of the daughter of Jairus. Mark's comment on this occasion is that which strikes all whose apprehension is not dulled: "They were amazed straightway with a great amazement." Here Jesus invaded a realm admittedly closed, and broke the closing bond. That the girl was entirely recovered is shown by His command that they give her something to eat.

Here, then, is the mightiest proof of His authority, exclusive of the Resurrection, which is discussed later, that Mark gives. It is of the nature to compel belief. Even Spinoza could refrain from faith only by rejecting the historical accuracy of Jesus' authority over death.

Yet there is a limit to this authority. Only once did that limit appear, and that once at Nazareth. Here it is recorded of Him that "he could do no mighty work."

1. 6:31 3. 5:21-24, 35-43.
2. 5:30 4. 6:1-6.
The limitation was, however, not other than that which God has placed upon Himself. Unbelief made the inability. The integrity of human personality was not impaired by our Lord's Incarnation. It is the same type of limitation necessitated by the creation of independent personalities with the power of choice.

Mark does not record that anyone tried to find an explanation for this physical authority of Jesus. Its exercise was so patent, so completely demonstrated, that no one who lived in His own day, when the evidence might most exhaustively be studied, dared deny it, or discount it by ingenious suggestions. They could do but one thing: admit it.

The picture Mark gives is the only normal, logical one to be expected. These "wonders" which Jesus wrought were not "mere" wonders. He refused to give such to the Pharisees who demanded a thaumaturgical marvel. Rather, these "signs" are inextricably wrought into the personality and message of Jesus. If He is indeed what He claimed to be, then they are to be expected, not decried.

3. Religious Authority.

Mark's picture of Jesus' moral and physical authority is, however, only secondary to His religious authority. It is true that this religious authority is derived from many sources--His Person, His Teachings, His Deeds, His Lordship, especially the latter. His miracles are not merely wonders and powers, but are signs. The total picture Mark leaves with us is that of a Lord of Supreme Authority in Religion.

It is significant that the first impression made upon
men in His teaching of religion is that He had the manner of authority. And it is further significant that in this same connection, the people understood that a vital connection between His "new teaching" and His authority over demons, existed. His authority was such as to induce obedience, invite confidence, warrant faith, and assure belief.

It is the manner, the poise, of the man, rather than the content of His message, that we have now to do. He is utterly at home with the religious authorities of the nation. He does not hesitate to call them hypocrites. He calmly refuses their demand for a sign. He elevates Himself above the chief priests of the nation, in teaching that they will reject Him. He assumes the role of Judge-ment when He found the Temple sanctity abused. With outward calm, He accuses the Pharisees of rejecting their Messiah, long before the people are conscious of His danger. He gives a 1st solemn warning to Judas just before the betrayal. He acknowledges with dignity His Messiahship before the High Priest. He makes the same admission before Pilate a little later. The manner of His teaching and His bearing through Mark's story is that of conscious religious authority.

We defer consideration of the teaching until later. But it should be noted here also that the content of this teaching carries with it religious authority. "Verily I say unto you" is not the word of one who was quoting, or

1. 1:22  2. 7:6  3. 8:12
4. 8:32  5. 11:15-18  6. 12:1-12
10. 10:15.
who had learned what was being imparted from others, or
who had arrived at a conclusion by careful ratiocination.
This is the word of One Who knew, by virtue of His Person.
His words carry authority.

Similarly, the words "why callest thou me good?
none is good, save one, even God," carry under the surface
a direct claim to divine authority in religion. Jesus
says, in effect: "My advice to you is of value only if
you acknowledge me to be good, even God.

His Jesus speaks intimately of the kingdom of God. This
familiarity is too definite and naive to come from any but
either a fool or one who was in position to speak with
authority. He spoke of who might enter. He told His
disciples the mysteries of the kingdom. He revealed the
manner of its growth. He warned of evil growing up in
the kingdom. These are words which can only mean that
He spoke with authority, not as a fool.

Again, his authority in religion is shown by his
mastery of the situation in which He found Himself—rejection
by His people. After Caesarea Philippi He reveals Himself as doomed to suffering, rejection and death, with
resurrection to follow. This predictive prophecy cannot be
gainsaid. The escatological 13th chapter likewise bears a
similar import. Only supreme authority in mystical affairs
can explain these teachings.

Perhaps the supreme claim to such authority is in His
pronouncement of the forgiveness of sins. This was a

plain exercise of the prerogatives of deity. Jesus assumes this authority, naturally, with proof, as an integral part of His rightful Lordship.

This authority is recognized on two occasions by widely different men. Peter voices the conviction of the Twelve at Caesarea Phillippi. This was after mature opportunity for observation and reflection. The disciples had no occasion to foster self-deception. It was rather to their interest to discover His error or His fraud, if such existed. This confession is therefore of deepest significance.

The other confession was wrung from the startled lips of a Roman soldier. The bearing of the victim, the cries on the Cross, as well as the phenomena following His death, bring conviction to this utterly impartial observer: "Truly this man was the Son of God." This confession is as spontaneous as the other is deliberate. Both incontestibly attest His authority in religion.

Altho treated to a greater length subsequently, it must here be noted that the confession of demons, and the attestations of God, and the message of the angel at His resurrection, all add to this general picture of His religious authority.

One further example of this fresh authority of Jesus in religion is seen in His attitude toward fasting.

Challenged to show cause why His disciples did not fast, He explains that they are in the immediate presence of divine grace, and needed no mediation of the fast.

1. 15:39
2. 2:18-22.
To this statement Mark adds the remarks about the new wine in new wine skins, and about the patching of old garments. He is Himself the avenue thru Whom God is to be effectively reached. Here is an anticipation of the doctrine of the Great High Priest of Hebrews. He is the Messiah, He is Authority in religion.

Finally, He likens His authority in religion to that of a physician in sickness. He possesses a cure for their illness of soul. On another occasion He reads the same lesson to the disciples, in the famous saying: "For the Son of man came also not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." This is true authority. He dared risk contamination by association with evil. He dared battle Satan in the world of spirits, that He might save the souls of men.

4. Paucity of Social Authority.

The realization that Mark says little or nothing about the social authority of Jesus comes as a shock to our socially minded age. But with Jesus, sociology is swallowed up in religion. He seems to hold that right religious relations will bring corresponding right social insight and conduct. He was not a social reformer.

Marriage, He teaches, is a mystical union, not a legal convenience. Wealth makes it hard to enter the Kingdom, for men incline to trust in it. Discipleship may mean social ostracism, altho eventually it will bring new social contacts infinitely richer than the

1. 2:17  3. 10:2-12  5. 10:29f.
2. 10:45  4. 10:23f
ones abandoned for the Kingdom. Social preferment is not to be desired. Forgiveness is enjoined, not by reason of social health, but as a prerequisite of prayer. Disputed points of economics He evades, throwing the whole responsibility upon the questioners. Present social adjustments are temporary, not eternal. The second great commandment is social, but its value lies in its complementary relation to the commandment to love God. Disciples must expect to be hated of all men, but the religious reward overshadows the social failure. These six passages contain all that might be termed social in Mark's picture of Jesus. This is a disappointment to us. We miss the Sermon on the Mount. We miss the word "brotherhood". But the loss is more apparent than real. Jesus did not contemplate remaking the world with men as they were or are. He has place in the Kingdom only for those made over, re-born, in Himself. He desires a perfect world. But He knows that perfection of society can come only thru a regenerate humanity.

5. Source of His Authority.

It is not difficult to find the source of all this authority. It lies first of all in His Person. (See below.) But beyond this, the source lies in His own intimate relationship with God. After the first day's healing, He retires to pray, alone. He seeks to escape the multitudes, for peace. He "looks up into heaven"
and blesses the loaves and fishes. He speaks of certain demons who will not be cast out save by prayer. No man could have lived thru the tremendous strain of Gethsemane without this thorough training in God's intimacy.

6. Conclusion.

In these three realms, moral, physical and religious Mark pictures Jesus as supreme. It is no delegated authority He possesses, but innate. In two instances alone does He disclaim authority. One, when His disciples dispute about honors in the kingdom. And the other, when they ask for the time of the second coming. The first was not in His power to bestow; the second He did not know.

Such authority forces the conclusion that His condemnation on the ground of blasphemy was unjust. He really was the Son of God.

1. 9:23
2. 10:40
3. 13:32.
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THE MESSIAH

Introduction: The Jewish Expectations.

The current Jewish expectations of the Messiah in Jesus' time were not those of the OT, but of the later Rabbinic teachings and of the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings. The Sibylline Oracles, (160-150 BC), the Book of Enoch (c.107 BC), the Fourth Ezra, the Book of Jubilees, the Targums, and the Psalms of Solomon (40 BC), are the sources of these Jewish ideas of the Christ.

The ideal of all these writings may be characterized as that of a national renaissance. They are based upon a literal interpretation of the later prophesies. The Kingdom of God is to be established on earth under the Son of David, who will rebuild Jerusalem, including the Temple. The Heathen will be subjugated, and the Dispersion will return to the Holy Land.

The Advent of the Kingdom is to be under the leadership of the Messiah, or Son of Man, and accompanied by many catastrophic "signs"—lighted torches falling from heaven, darkened sun, and falling meteors. The redemption of Israel is to be thru the miraculous intervention of God thru this Son of David. After he has conquered the heathen, he will slay the wicked and establish justice. His kingdom will not depend upon armies, but upon righteousness and mercy. It will be a theocracy.

1. Charles: Apocrypha and Pseudepigraphy of the OT.
2. Sibylline Oracles, vv.573-608.
3. Psalms of Solomon.
This is the current, orthodox Pharisaic ideal of the Messiah and the Kingdom. The Kingdom is holy, ruled by the Law, composed of righteous Jews. It is supernatural, even as the delivery of Israel from the ancient Egyptians. The Messiah is a leader similar to Moses, but greater. The Gentiles are to be blessed in having the honor to be ruled over by the holy Jews.

In addition to this general conception of the Messiah, there is to be discerned another which may be called the Apocalyptic ideal. This ideal is based chiefly upon Daniel. The future age is to be ushered in by a divine judgment upon mankind, preceded by a general resurrection of the dead. The Messiah, who has existed from the beginning of the world, shall appear at the consummation, and then shall be manifested the Heavenly Jerusalem, which is the future abode of the righteous and blessed.

This ideal became strong after the fall of the Macabees in 27 BC. The Messiah is no longer David's Son, but is the ruler of the heavenly regions. The present evil kingdom of the princes of this world will be overthrown, and the elect will sit on thrones helping the Messiah govern the new earth.

There seems to be no distinct hiatus between these two doctrines. But that of the Pharisees is more widely accepted in Jesus' time.

1. Cf The Assumption of Moses; Daniel; The 4th Esdras.
This Pharisaic conception of the Messiahship was that accepted by the common people. The Pharisees were the Holy Ones. They were the accepted religious leaders of a nation blindly partial to their "leaders". Hence, the populace hail Jesus: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord! Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, the kingdom of our father David: Hosanna in the highest!" Even the disciples did not understand fully until Pentecost. Peter, altho selected to preach the recorded sermon on this day, did not understand until the conversion of Cornelius.

1. The Herald.

Our Gospel opens with an account of a Herald of the Messiah and the Kingdom. "There cometh after me he that is mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. I baptized you in water; but he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit."

This reference to the kingdom of the Messiah is clearly directed toward the consciousness of the Hope of Israel as portrayed above. John could only have been understood by the people as referring to the promised Messiah. True, this hope had been considered as about to be answered before this. It remained for the promised One to demonstrate that he is indeed the Messiah.

Mark takes the first step toward this demonstration by recording the estimate of John in the minds of various people. That the people at large held John to be a great
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prophet worthy of acceptance is shown by the impression he made. From all over Judea men came confessing their sins and being baptized. Even the Holy City contributed crowds of magnitude who accepted this herald. His preaching was heard even in the corrupt court of Herod, where fear of him caused Herodias to demand and secure John's death. Only a "righteous and holy man" could have so moved a vicious queen. Even after his death the people at large held John in no less regard. The Pharisees dared not derogate John for fear of the people.

This attitude of the Pharisees is not to be explained wholly by fear of the people. The unspoken conviction of the Pharisees in Mark is given voice in John. Here it is recorded that the Pharisees were concerned enough to question the Baptist closely upon his mission, indicating that they thought he might be the Messiah. No ordinary prophet could have so stirred the smug Pharisaic circle.

Jesus Himself highly regarded John. This is seen not only in Mark, but even more clearly in Matthew. He speaks in no uncertain voice: "Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of woman there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist...." But Mark is not silent regarding this high estimate of Jesus. When the Pharisees ask Him with what authority he does His work, He attributes the message of John to revelation.

Thus we have the testimony of the people, of the
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Pharisees, of Herod, and of Jesus Himself, to the divine mission of John the Baptist. Such evidence is not to be lightly regarded. John is the Herald of the Messiah foretold in the OT and in the popular hope of Israel. And Jesus is that Messiah.

2. Significance of the terms "Son of Man."

It is to be remarked that John Mark does not use the term Son of God, but "Son of Man", when reporting Jesus' claims to the Messiahship. What significance had this term?

We may note first of all, that this title was used in Enoch to designate the Messiah: "Before the sun and the signs of heaven were created, before the stars were made, the name (Son of Man) was named before the Lord of Spirits." "This Son of Man whom thou hast seen shall raise the kings and the mighty men from their beds, and the powerful even from their thrones; and shall unloose the bands of the powerful, and break in pieces the teeth of sinners. And He shall hurl Kings from their thrones and their kingdoms, because they praise Him not,..." The heavenly bodies "rejoiced greatly, praising and magnifying God because that to them was revealed the name of that Son of Man."

1. Enoch, c.xlvi.
2. Ibid.
3. Enoch cl lxix. 26. Cf. xlvi; lxii. 6, 7; lxii. 10; lxix. 1; xlvi. 7; xlvi. 5, 9 &c.
Nor is the term exclusively to be found in the Apocrypha. It is also employed in Ezekiel, where it refers to that prophet. But more especially it appears in Daniel. In Dan. 7:3ff is a passage in which the eternity and universality of the Kingdom of the "Son of Man" is set forth. When it is recalled that at the trial Jesus employs this term to indicate His coming in the clouds to judge, and this is coupled with the teaching of Jesus when He begins to instruct the disciples as to the nature of His kingdom at Caesarea Philippi, the connection seems self-evident.

Jesus could assume that the scribes were familiar with the term "Son of Man" as it was used in the apocrypha. But as this term was not clearly taught as Messianic, and as the Apocrypha were not clearly inspired books in their eyes, the significance of His use of the term seems to be that it would serve to call the attention of these learned men to His claims, without Himself clearly asserting His Messiahship. Thus He was able to challenge their investigation. If they would not believe on this basis, He did not care to have their support.

His close acquaintance with Dan would serve to challenge the attention of the disciples in particular and the people in general. They had been accustomed to regard the expression in Dan as referring to Israel. By His personal assumption of the title, He would challenge
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the consideration of them as the former use would attract the learned of the nation.

Stalker traces three reasons for the use of this term by our Lord. First, Dnl uses the term clearly as Messianic; and Jesus knew Himself to be Messiah. Second, this term half-revealed, and half-concealed, His Person. Third, it emphasized His close kinship with mankind.

This reasoning seems sound, and in full accord with Mark. Jesus is represented as determined to bring men to the conclusion that He was Messiah by the exercise of their own observation and reason. Their conviction was not to be supernaturally imposed upon them, but was to be the result of their own unhampered consciousness. A use of the term "Son of God" would have at once revealed Him. This would have been preferred by those who rely on authority rather than self-conviction for their religion. But it would not suit the nature of the Christian system, with its utter dependence upon individual responsibility.

3. Jesus' exposition of the term.

We now turn to Jesus' own exposition of the term "Son of Man" as recorded by Mark.

The first use of the term is on the occasion of His preaching in Capernaum, when a man with paralysis was lowered thru the roof in the belief that Jesus could heal him. When He said to the man, "Son, thy sins are forgiven," the scribes at once recognized the significance of the teaching of Jesus concerning Himself.
of this statement. "Who can forgive sins but one, even God?" Jesus seemed to be claiming deity. At once Jesus responds to the challenge: "That ye may know that the Son of Man hath power to forgive sins,..." he performs an objective demonstration of Messianic power. This miracle was a direct Rabbinic sign. It placed Him before them as clearly claiming Messiahship. But more--it claimed direct deity, equality with God, which was a new thought to the Scribes. Further, it identified the terms "Son of Man", Messiah, and "Son of God", with which Mark opens his Gospel. If no other passage existed in the whole of Mark, this would be enough to show what Jesus meant by the use of the term. Only God can forgive sins; this Jesus knows; and He forgives them.

Further demonstration of this Messiahsip is given upon the occasion of the controversy on Sabbath work. Here Jesus distinctly claims superiority over the Sabbath: "...so that the Son of Man is Lord even of the sabbath." No institution was more zealously and scrupulously regarded than the Sabbath. It was a divine institution, its observance a divine command. To break it defiled a man. Its origin was Mosaic, is not Patriarchal. To deny it seemed to deny the very heritage and genius of Israel. Nevertheless, Jesus does precisely this thing. He not only justifies the particular Rabbinic violation of which the disciples have been guilty, but advances His own lordship over the institution as ordained in the Law.
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This was tantamount to a declaration of deity. For the Pharisees held the Ten Commandments to be of divine legislation. Hence, to modify or repeal the Sabbath was to claim deity. Only the authority which enacts can repeal a law. The significant thing just here is that Jesus speaks this as "Son of Man."

From these two samples of His teaching, it is evident that both the "learned" and the disciples understood who the Son of Man was. For Peter confesses what was in the minds of the disciples. Son of man is Messiah. And He is God, for only God could forgive sins and modify the Sabbath.

Thus the first part of His work is done. Now comes the extremely difficult part, and the part which failed to be understood. He begins to teach them of His humiliation. That He must suffer, and be rejected by the most religious people of the age. He must be set at naught, He must be mocked and scourged, He must die, at the command of scribe, Pharisee, and elder. He must be delivered into the hands of His enemies. And these enemies are the very ones who would be expected to espouse His cause. Moreover, they would deliver Him to the hated and despised Gentile, for further humiliation and death.

Such a fate for the Messiah, long promised, and particularly for a Messiah such as Jesus claimed to be—equal with God, nay, even God Himself,—these disciples nor the populace could not imagine. It was utterly incongruous that
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the Almighty God whom they had known from earliest days as the Lord of Israel, would be so humiliated by His enemies, especially false Jews and haughty Romans. On the one hand, they were constrained to believe by the power of His works and the depth of His teaching and the magnificence of His personality. But ancient Jewish understanding of deity could not reconcile His conduct with His power.

Jesus repeatedly presses this point, but He does not wait for them to catch up to this view. He advances another equally difficult consideration in His revelation of the Son of Man. That is, that He is to voluntarily give Himself as a "ransom for many." While this doctrine is tied up with the general teaching of the Gospel of the Cross, it is none the less special and applicable to Himself in a peculiar sense. It is His own self-surrender of life that is to bring redemption to the faithful. The long-hoped-for salvation of Israel is dependent upon the death of the equally anticipated Messiah.

This idea is not only incorporated into His teaching as to the nature of the Messiahship, but is built into that ordinance which He established just before Gethsemane, as He says: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many."

Mark does not record how this teaching was received. However, it is quite evident that it was not understood.
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Mark does not lay any particular theological significance upon the teaching, but merely states this statement as a fact. To say that Mark here is theological, is to mis-apprehend the function of theology, which is to explain the reason for a doctrine or a fact in religion. Mark does not explain, he states, the fact.

Again, it is in connection with the assumption of the designation "Son of Man" that Jesus predicts His resurrection from the dead. This prediction is made after Caesarea Philippi. The next occasion of this teaching is following the transfiguration, which was not to be told until after He had been raised. At the last supper, He declared that the Son of Man was about to go (to His death, preparatory to His resurrection). That is, it is in His capacity as Son of Man, or Messiah, that He is to be raised from the dead.

Moreover, the Son of Man is to be exalted. He shall be seated at the right hand of Power. This is a clear reference to the Messianic expectation that the Anointed shall sit upon a divine throne. And in this capacity, the Son of Man shall judge the world. In this judgment, He will gather "His elect" to Himself for their salvation. But those who have been ashamed of Him, He will regard with shame when He cometh in the glory of His father and the holy angels.

In this last reference is stated indirectly, but all the more strongly thereby, that He is to return to
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the earth a second time. If we are to accept the "little Apocalypse" as a part of \textit{mr}-marcus, then He promises to return in connection with this teaching.

The statement in the trial of His return with the clouds of heaven has little significance except as a promise or warning that He will return even though they kill Him.

The picture presented by Mark of Jesus is a picture of the long expected, predicted Messiah of Israel. But it is a picture of the Son of Man who is all the ancient prophets desired for their beloved nation, with the additional grandeur and power of deity Himself. He forgives sins and alters divine legislation by a word. But He is a suffering, rejected, killed deity, who shall be raised, exalted, and glorified in the kingdom both here and hereafter. And the occasion of this humiliation is that He might ransom many.

4. The title "Son of God" as applied to Jesus.

The title "Son of God" is more obviously a claim to deity than the foregoing title. There is no hint in Mark that this is a generic term, capable of being applied to anyone. Indeed, the title of the Gospel suggests that such a Personage is very special indeed. So with every occasion in which it occurs. That anyone else might be a Son of God does not occur to Mark.

When Jesus comes to be baptized in the Jordan, the Spirit descended upon Him in the form of a dove,
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and God spoke: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Here the divine filiation is acknowledged, with distinct approval of Jesus stated.

The peculiar nature of Jesus is here emphasized, for He was but one of thousands who had been thus baptized. Again at the Transfiguration, and in the presence of Moses, the Lawgiver, and Elijah the Prophet, God announces that Jesus is the Son of God: "This is my beloved Son: hear ye him." To the former approval, there is now commanded a distinct attention to the teachings of Jesus. To say that Mark does not emphasize the teachings of Jesus is to ignore the significance of this direct divine command.

God has thus broken the silence of centuries, according to Mark, to call especial attention to the nature and doctrine of Jesus of Nazareth. But these are not the only times when the Gospel attributes to Jesus this title. The demons knew that He is God's Son. It is to be noted that Jesus does not disclaim the title here. He commands silence, as acknowledgement of Him from these sources is not likely to be of much value. Nevertheless, it is a testimony from the world of Spirits, and is treasured by Peter or whoever Mark consulted on this point.
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The use of the title is again prominent in the trial. It is the High Priest this time who asks Jesus the direct question, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" Here Jesus approves, not by silence as in the case of demons, but with a direct answer: "I am." The question of the High Priest suggests that he might have been willing to accept Jesus as the Messiah, except for the divine content of the office which Jesus had taught of Himself. The priest does not ask, Art thou the Christ? Rather, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? To claim to be Christ is to be subjected to rigid examination. But to claim to be God is blasphemy in the sacerdotal mind.

The words of the soldier at the foot of the cross, who is moved by the cataclysm of nature at His death, to exclaim: " Truly this man was the Son of God!" have been discounted as the words of a pagan, applying them in a heathen sense. But this Gentile was not the first to recognize Jesus as more than man. The Syrophoenician woman obtained a cure for her daughter no less than the faithful among the Jews. Spiritual discernment is not confined to any one race. It was another Gentile centurian who was instrumental in teaching Peter that others than Jews might be Christians. Perhaps Cornelius recalled to Peter's mind the decision of this other unnamed soldier of Rome, and caused him to preserve it.
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Thus directly does Jesus receive and approve the title "Son of God." But this is not all. The title is implicit in three other passages in Mark. In 8:38 Jesus calls God the Father of the Son of Man. In the prayer of agony in Gethsemane, Jesus prays directly to "My Father!" And in the Little Apocalypse, He employs the distinguishing terms Father and Son to apply to Himself and God. This incidental use of the title is stronger, if possible, than the direct assertion. It shows how thoroughly the title was applied to Jesus both by Mark and by those to whom he wrote.

Of the four parables in Mark, one implicitly gives Jesus the title Son of God. This is the parable of the Vineyard. Here Jesus' reference to Himself and the priests and scribes and elders, who were rejecting Him and plotting to kill Him, was so evident that even His enemies say the inference. The significant statement just here is the words Jesus puts into the mouth of the lord of the vineyard: "They will reverence my son." This was an only, and a beloved son. Clearly, this is claim to the exclusive title of Son of God.

The Messiah is, therefore, as represented by Mark, the Son of God, so approved by God's voice, acknowledged by demons, feared by the Sanhedrin, confessed by the centurion, and implied by Mark's whole treatment.

What, if anything, remains in Mark's picture of Jesus as the promised Messiah, than that contained in the teaching surrounding the two titles, Son of Man and Son of God? These two ideas and their implications really carry the whole essential teaching of the Messiahship. The remaining words are rather in the nature of embellishments.

We may note in the first place that Mark's evident purpose is to produce belief in Jesus as the Messiah. But it is to be noted that this in no way detracts from the historicity of the Gospel. And, on the whole, Mark is strangely objective. He has no long hortatory passages. He does not moralize. He states the facts, the events, and shows the teachings inhering in each.

Thus, the present title of the Gospel is a true index to its content. "Whether the present headline is due to Mark or to an early editor, it admirably expresses the idea of the Book. It is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Mark is presenting, not the life of Christ, nor a collection of His teachings, but a picture of the Messiah as a Worker and Teacher. If this picture will not convince men, then Mark does no special pleading. It is a straightforward, historical appeal, with a reasonable willingness to stake everything on the evidence presented.

2. Swete: Commentary, p.lxxxiv. Cg. Wernle, Sources of our Knowledge of the Life of Jesus, p.112.
A word as to the divine approbation of Jesus in Mark's picture of His Messiahship might be in order. As noted above, God directly approves Him at His baptism, and commands attention to His teachings at the transfiguration. But in addition to this, God is represented in Mark as approving Jesus Messiahship at the Cross, when all nature is convulsed at His death.

Not the least significant among these catastrophies is that of the rending of the veil in the Temple. That Mark attributes something of the significance to this event as does the author of Hebrews is shown in the very mention of the fact. Nor is the divine evidence of approval closed, until the third day, when an angel is sent to inform the women who come to the tomb that "He is risen."

Nor would a review of Mark's picture of the Messiah be complete without mentioning that he knows Jesus as Prophet, who inaugurates a new teaching; and as Priest, who provides a ransom for sin; and as King, with supreme legislative, judicial and executive powers. His Kingship is acknowledged before Pilate. The spiritual nature of this kingdom is taught when the disciples scheme for advancement in His service. Legislative functions are assumed, as e.g., in changing the Mosaic Code as it dealt
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with divorce. Judicial functions are clearly assumed in
His apocalyptic, as well as in the similar passage when
he teaches the disciples concerning His fate at Jerusalem.
The executive function of government is taught clearly when
the High Priest asks Him who He is. There he looks forward
to the time when He will sit on the Throne.

Mark has too notable omissions in his picture of the
Messiah. The first of these is any reference to the
Nativity and infancy. But to say that this proves that
"the narratives in Matthew and Luke are religious legends
of no historical value", is a dangerous argument from
silence. As an historian, no such judgment can be rendered.
Evidently, Mark did not give a complete picture of Jesus,
but selected such incidents as would serve his purpose. We
may question the value of his judgment in this regard without
challenging the judgment of those who saw fit to include this
omission.

The second omission is that of the first year of public
ministry, if we rely upon John's Gospel as history. But here
again, it cannot be shown that Mark has omitted anything vital
from his picture of the Messiah. He has picked and chosen
only certain of the many events which might have been preserved.
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Finally, Mark does not show any "developmental Messianic consciousness" on the part of Jesus. The Baptist recognized Jesus at once as the One who he heralded. The dove and the voice assigned to Him at the outset full Messianic consciousness. There is no denial or astonishment on Jesus' part at the fear and confession of demons. The Temptation, while not detailed by Mark, is not worth consideration as important unless made to one fully conscious of what He was doing. There is no trace in Mark of any hesitation on Jesus' part between the spiritual, material, or eschatological conceptions of His Kingdom. From the beginning He shows determination to force confession of Himself as Messiah by His deeds and Teachings. In this, He is the patient teacher, not the religious experimenter who gradually discovers Himself. Rather, from the very first, His interest in calling the disciples is to make them "fishers of men." His enemies perceive who He is, and early plot to destroy Him, as He is conscious. From the time Mark opens His Gospel, Jesus is fully conscious of His Messiahship.

7. Training the Twelve.

How, then, does Mark represent Jesus' work of revealing Himself to His chosen Twelve? It is well to
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note in the first place, that Mark gives large prominence to the teaching of Jesus in the first eight chapters. He does not record so much of the words, as he speaks of our Lord's desire and purpose to instruct. The first miracle recorded is done after not the teaching in the synagague. Indeed, Jesus attempts throughout the Galilean ministry to escape these works of power, in preference to teaching. He retires to rest and pray; He crosses the Sea; He leaves Capernaum where He is known as a wonder-worker to go thru the villages preaching, "for to this end came I forth". Hence we may say that the miracles were more incidental at all times than of great prominence in His teaching, and work. They were the signs of His power, but more than that, were "wonders" to call attention to His message and validate what He taught. Thus we cannot agree with Gould that Jesus shows no purpose in His ministry. Rather, His purpose is one of masterly choosing. He knows exactly what to do with each situation as it arises, without forcing artificial circumstances, that He may lead His disciples into full apprehension of the Truth. The test question in 8:27ff, is, therefore, a sort of summary of the situation, to focus attention of the disciples on a conclusion which they ought by that time to have made for themselves, on the basis of their own opportunities for observation.

1. 1:21
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The reason for the caution displayed by Jesus in announcement of His Messiahship, is not as Gould represents, due to a lack of definite conviction or purpose, but is due to a fear of premature arrest. The crisis must come naturally, and when He is ready for it. It must not come before the training of the Twelve is carried as far as might be by His earthly ministry.

Thus it is with distinct purpose in mind, that He begins early to foretell of His death. The bridegroom is not merely going to leave, He will be "snatched away". With this, and similar hints, judging by the fragmentary nature of Mark's record, Jesus prepares His disciples for Caesarea Philippi, the Journey to Jerusalem, and the Cross, each in turn preparing for the immediately following step, until they are ready to stand the crucifixion.

Such clear foresight and patience was the only method He might use. When we consider the obtuseness of the disciples, which lasted until Pentecost and the conversion of Cornelius, we cannot wonder at the method of Christ, nor discount the teleological character of His teaching from the first. He had of necessity to plant in their hearts certain teachings whose application and inner meaning would become clear later. That this course was indeed successful is evident from this Gospel, which records those puzzling events of His ministry with an unspoken air of wonder that anyone could have been so dull of understanding.

1. Gould, Commentary, p.xxv.
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We may now turn to the consideration of a specific incident in which Jesus claims not only messiahship, but deity. The young man who has observed his statement regarding children and the kingdom, accosts him on the way with a question: "Good Teacher, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?"

Jesus' answer draws attention to himself, not upon some legal thing to be done. "Why callest thou me good? None is good, save one, even God." Here there is no escape. Jesus is here either disclaiming goodness, and hence deity; or He is claiming goodness, and hence deity.

Now, Mark does not answer the question in words. But he shows the sinlessness of Jesus quite as effectively as if he wrote a thesis on the subject. There is no trace in his Gospel that Jesus was ever accused of sin. His enemies are at last forced to arrest Him secretly. The trial makes little headway, until Jesus admits that He is the Son of the Blessed. And if He is good, then, He says in effect to this young man, He is God.

A more striking fact lies in the further words of Jesus to this young man. In answer to his question, He commands the youth to observe the second table of the Law, the ethical relations. And when the youth answers that this he has observed from his youth up, Jesus does not add a command to observe the first table, which requires worship of God to
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the exclusion of all others. But for this series of four commands in the Decalogue, Jesus substitutes following Himself. That is, He places Himself in the place of God to this soul.

Who is Jesus, then, who dares thus supersede the Law in its most exalted phase, if He be not God indeed? If Jesus means to deny that He is good, then there is no explanation for the singular omission of His answer to the youth. But if He means to claim absolute goodness, then His answer is perfectly plain.

The answer of our Lord is then not only persuasive, but at the same time imperial, kingly, autocratic. He is laying down conditions of entry into the Kingdom, not on the basis of Law, nor of a religious system, but on the basis of perfect submission to Himself, as One who has a right to grant or refuse entry into that Kingdom. Surely the plain sense of the passage emphasizes the deity of our Lord, for only God could so dispose of the Kingdom of God, the term habitually used in Mark.

Moreover, in the subsequent conversation with the disciples, Jesus points out to them what it was that this young man had refused— a place in the Kingdom. And when Peter replies that they have left all and followed Him, He answers that in so acknowledging Him they had won wealth here and hereafter. That is, He reaffirms to them that He has a perfect right to dispose of the Kingdom on the basis of personal loyalty to and obedience to Himself.

One final thing ought to be noted in Mark's picture of the Messiah—the reception accorded Him by the various people concerned. We have mentioned these attitudes in passing, so need devote little space to them here.

The friends of Jesus thought Him insane. In this opinion His mother and His brethren evidently shared. They came to rescue Him from His excitement. They feared that He had gone crazy over religion. This heart-searching incident gave rise to the teaching of Jesus regarding true brethren.

Quite opposite was the teaching of the Pharisees, who regarded Him as possessed by Satan. This was a more serious charge than mere possession by some demon. Such possession not infrequently gave the victim a sort of doubtful honor among men. But to be in league with the devil was another thing altogether. It was to deserve severest reprimand, even incarceration. However, as we pointed out above, even the Pharisees were convinced against their will that He was really Messiah. Their denial was due to self-interest.

Nazareth rejected Him likewise. They had seen Him as a carpenter, and refused to see anything else in Him. Whatever the cause, their rejection cost them all further consideration on Jesus' part. He left, never to return.

Herod did not reject Him exactly, but felt sure that He was John the Baptist returned to haunt his slumbers.

1. 3:21
2. 3:22
3. 6:1-6
4. 6:16.
His own guilt prevented investigation. He was afraid to face what he felt sure he would discover.

Others of the court circle offered other explanations--that He must be some prophet of the old time returned to earth. Surely God would do nothing new in their day! God's immediate interest in earth had long since passed away.

Yet others did not accept Him. The man of wealth found that he could not follow Jesus to the point of giving up his money. This is hardly to be supposed an isolated instance.

Every one of those who rejected Him did so for a philosophical, rather than for a historical or evidential reason. The Pharisees never once denied the Messianic nature of either His works or His teachings. On the contrary, He was dangerous to them just because He did so clearly approximate their own tenets with regard to the nature of the Messiah.

Of the favorable reception of the Messiah, we may but note that their number was so great that it caused the Pharisees to plot secretly and arrest Him secretly, for fear of the people. The common people would have known and followed the Messiah, their God, had the religious leaders of the time and the "religious folk" of "pious mysticism" left them alone.
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The Jews lived in the future. The time was to come when they would have a King who would rule the Kingdom of God. All the other nations would be blessed in having the privilege of being ruled by this King—and incidentally His Jewish officials. There was One who was to come.

From the Rabbinic teachings we may gather two dominant ideas as to the nature of this Messiah. First, the idea of a Divine-human Personality was foreign to their concept of the Messiah. Second, they regarded the Anointed One was far above human nature, having a royal, prophetic, and angelic nature narrowly divided from divinity. He was to inaugurate a kingdom of power and splendor which would be eternal, holy, and administered by the faithful of Israel.

This kingdom was to be launched catastrophically. It was a supernatural Kingdom, whose King would overthrow the hated Roman legions with supernatural means. The Messiah was a wonder-worker superior to Moses, who liberated the children of Israel from the oppression by supernatural heavenly interpositions. Thus the Pharisees demand a "sign" from this reputed Messiah, similar to the wonders of Moses, such as the striking of water from a rock or the slaughter of the first born of the oppressor.

1. Edersheim: Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, I, 171.
2. 8:11-13.
1. Jesus' ideal of the Messiah.

But the ideal of Jesus toward His messiahship is radically different from this. He is king of the Jews, but he is a Jew who is one inwardly. He is to rule the nations, but His kingdom is not of this world. He is the highly exalted One, but becomes so because He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, yea, the death of the cross. He is the Lord, who is to be obeyed, but His right to obedience is based on His moral ascendancy. He has proved His right to reign by His ability to serve. He has purchased the souls of men and erected a kingdom of the Redeemed of many nations.

It seems that Jesus drew His doctrine of the Messiahship directly from the Old Testament, rather than from the current Rabbinic thought. The Rabbis had expanded and annotated the Old Testament teaching. While their doctrine was based upon the Law and the Prophets, yet the ultimate deductions drawn therefrom in the days of our Lord were far from the doctrines contained in the ancient books. Jesus in a measure would restore in Israel a more Biblical conception of the Messiah.

Thus we may say that He founded His conception of His office on Isaiah rather than upon the Rabbis. He was the Suffering Servant, despised and rejected of men. He was to be scorned by the people to whom He came, and would suffer death at their hand. The Founder of a religious
kingdom, He nevertheless was to be killed on a charge of blasphemy by the most religious men of his day. He was the stone which the builders rejected.

2. His problem.

Now let us glance at the problem He faced. How was He to reveal this radical divergence from the best religious and patriotic thought of His day, to His disciples and to the nation, without destroying their confidence, and without prematurely forcing the destruction of His body which He saw to be inevitable?

No people were ever more intensely religious than the Jews. No people more stubborn. Long centuries of persecution, disaster, stultification, providential guidance, had produced a race deeply devoted to their God and to their religious teachers. The Pharisees enjoyed the universal admiration of the people. They were the holy group in a religious nation. To promulgate any doctrine radically different from their teaching was to invite disaster. He must first break down the confidence of His disciples in these leaders.

But in breaking down this reverence, He must move with such caution as to prevent total rejection of religion. He must build constructively as well as destructively. He must have something to which He might point the people in place of their traditional religious dependence. He must, that is, show Himself superior to them in every respect.
And again, this He must accomplish slowly enough to prevent arrest and death before His time. To be destroyed before He had built up a confidence that would carry His disciples thru the test of the crucifixion, would be fatal to the inauguration of His Kingdom. He must first teach them every essential truth, and this would take time and patience. It would require the most delicate task, a balancing of reticence and frankness, which would give His enemies no premature cause for His arrest, and yet would make perfectly clear to His disciples just who He was.

Finally, He must accomplish all this with sufficient dispatch to be ready when the crisis came. The time was short-- the Kingdom was at hand. He must not move so slowly that His enemies might gather their forces and destroy His Kingdom while it was in embryo. He knew the value of time.

All this He knew from the beginning of His ministry. The voice of God at His baptism, if nothing else, told Him of His mission. The demons recognized Him from the start. This demonic confession He does not deny, merely silences for the moment. This bursting knowledge stamps Him with the most heroic mould. Never to flesh was entrusted such momentous issues. He must not fail.

1. The first intimation. (8:31-9:2.)

Not, therefore, until He has lead the disciples to an independent judgment as to His Messiahship, does

1. 7:11
2. 1:24.
He ventured to be instructing them in the Gospel of the Cross. If He has succeeded in getting them to form their own conclusion, on the basis of His deeds and teachings and personality, then and not until then are they ready to begin the slow, painful process of learning the nature of this Messiah.

But upon the basis of this confession, He now speaks frankly. The time for reticence with the disciples is past. They can now hear the fate and program of the Messiah openly taught. They do not need parables, but plain talk. They will be slow enough to learn, even tho a spade is called a spade.

Mark but intimates the violent discussion which this frank announcement provoked. Jesus deals this doctrine to them as a body blow. It upsets their whole conception of the Messiah, the Kingdom, and their relation to it. Perhaps James and John see their vision of the Premiershiup and Chancellorship falling into utter ruination. Judas may see his vision of a revolution financed by his acute economic resourcefulness being ruthlessly discarded by a visionary dreamer. Peter is convinced that this man of strange power lacks practical common sense, and thinks that he must now take the teacher in hands and teach Him some elementary statecraft.

At any rate, Peter now in his earnestness grasps the Master and begins to upbraid Him in no uncertain terms.

1. 8:29
2. 8:32a
3. 8:32b.
One would like to know what Peter said. Certainly the scene is as human as it is foolish. To assume the role of instructors of divinity is, however, not confined to the Jewish race. The crux of the matter is that Peter rebukes our Lord for even entertaining so utterly foolish an idea as the Gospel of the Cross. To him it is indeed a stumbling block. And Peter knew his Jews. It was this doctrine that they would not have. They were willing to grant Jesus a Triumph, even in anticipation of a catastrophic deliverance from Rome. But they would not have a crucified Savior.

To all this objection Jesus replies in as severe and uncompromising a tone. "Get thee behind me, Satan!" You are speaking the wisdom of men. The Messiah knows the wisdom of God. It is God's wisdom that must prevail, for this world is after all God's. You are the instrument of the devil, Peter, in thus tempting Me.

Peter is silenced, but sullenly unconvinced. Jesus now acts upon one of those brilliant flashes of genius which leave us as much amazed as it did the disciples. He summons the crowd, for this dispute has taken place among the disciples alone, and puts this doctrine before then as an unconditional requirement of discipleship.

The Gospel of the Cross is not for Jesus alone. As applied to Himself, it involved rejection by the religious leaders, death, and ultimate triumph in the resurrection. With modifications, this same doctrine is

1. 1 Cor. 1:23
2. 8:33
3. 8:34.
now applied directly to all disciples. "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me."

This bold preaching was directed to the apostles quite as much as to the crowd. The latter might well be mystified at this sudden change in teaching. But the inner circle knew at what He was driving. Jesus not only proposes a strange doctrine that will destroy Himself; He is actually summoning all disciples to the same inexplicable insanity of conduct.

However, the doctrine is silencing and appealing and challenging. There is more than insanity to it. Jesus is no fanatic, cultivating self-annihilation. He proceeds into the reverse of the doctrine at once: To save one's life is to lose it; to keep self is to lose self; to gain the world at the expense of soul is to lose in the gaining. Nothing is worth the cost of the soul. That is the most valued possession one has. But paradoxically, he who would save it cannot do so. Only to lose one's self in the Gospel for Christ's sake is the road to saving that soul.

Is it objected that such conduct is unworthy of men of red blood, who should in their strength take what is theirs? That is not Jesus' Way. Should any be ashamed to lose himself in such service, he shall meet equal shame on Jesus' part when He comes to judge men with the glory of the Father and the holy angels.

1. 8:35, 36.
2. 8:38.
Thus, the Gospel of the Cross is not that of Nirvana, not that of Oriental carelessness of the individual soul. It is a new emphasis on the value of the human soul, that value to be preserved in a way utterly foreign to worldly wisdom, but entirely compatible with divine omniscience. It is immediate subjection looking toward ultimate exaltation. It is learning to rule by being ruled.

The second step. This ultimate note of victory is most frequently neglected by the students of Jesus as presented in Ur-marcus. Yet it is evident that this is that which caught the attention of the disciples. The Jew had been well trained to look forward with patience to a better day, when present shame would be turned into victory. This was a true note, and Jesus' problem is now to spiritualize this note of ultimate triumph. The disciples seem now to have grasped something of the first part of the lesson—that they must humble themselves to the Cross. Jesus' exhortation.

But Jesus does not teach fatalism, Stoicism, self-destruction, depreciation of self into nothingness. The temporary eclipse must culminate in a burst of glory. So, He teaches them more specifically the triumphant note: He is to be killed, but after three days will rise again. He is not to be forever debased. He is not being really destroyed. His defeat is temporary. There is to be a

1. 9:31.
victory the like of which the world has never seen. He is to rise from the dead.

But this does not impress these hard-headed men. Not even the memory of the little daughter of Jairus can make them believe that Jesus is speaking literally here. No, He must mean some esoteric principle of triumph, not a literal coming forth from the tomb, they think. When deity speaks hard sayings, men never think to find their solution in the simple and obvious sense of the words. So it is recorded that "they understood not the saying."

Nor will Jesus force them. They know Him well enough now to be sure that He means something vital by this plain teaching. But they will not ask Him to explain, perhaps for fear that He will tell them that He means just what He says! And our Lord, with infinite patience and wisdom, is content to let them ponder this thing well, and let events rather than argumentation ultimately bring light to their minds.

5. Jerusalem: Jesus' application.

Finally, Jesus turns toward Jerusalem. The time has come to demonstrate that He means precisely what He said He meant. He is now to make the personal application to himself of this strange Gospel of the Cross. He deliberately, with full knowledge of the consequences, sets out to His death.

The disciples can scarcely believe it. There is a difference between intellectual apperception of a

1. 8:32
2. 9:32c.
principle and its application to practical life. It is all very well to talk of sacrifice, but to put it into action is another thing altogether. Not only did they marvel at this course, but they feared. For the now beloved Teacher, and perhaps for themselves also. Yet, be it said to their credit, they followed.

Jesus now enters into a still more detailed account of His impending fate. Now He tells them the details of His death. The Sanhedrin of course have no power to impose the death penalty. But that legal mind which invented Corban could also invent a way around a Roman law. He would be delivered to the Roman, and legally killed. His rejection at the hands of the "best people" is to be complete.

Moreover, the last possible humiliation will be inflicted upon this Messiah of Israel. The Gentile dogs will mock Him, and in Him as Representative will mock Israel. They will spit upon Him--an ignominy of the last extremity. They will lay the scourge upon His back, and whip Him as they beat all their subject nations. And it is Israel itself who wills all this shame upon their own king.

But in this teaching, given to the Twelve as they travel southward to the Holy City, Jesus does not neglect the other side of the Gospel of the Cross--in three days He will triumph over death. Will He never explain what He means by this strange statement?

1. 10:32d
2. 10:33d
3. 10:34.
6. Obsession.

Whatever He may mean by this teaching, James and John decide that it cannot mean what it purports to mean, and that for the sake of preferment in the coming Messianic Kingdom they will be willing to undergo the implied hardships. So they ask to be appointed as chief officers in the Kingdom. They reason that if He is to come in glory, as He promised, they could stand temporary humiliation for the honor of eminence in the ultimate victory. They are willing to drink the cup and be baptized.

A point often overlooked is that Jesus gave them a favorable answer. Not, it is true, that He promised them the coveted seats of power. This was not His to grant. But He did promise them the cup and the baptism, and thereby pointed them the road to eminence in the Kingdom. But He carefully explained to them that this eminence is not like Gentile glory. But its attainment lies thru the Way of the Cross. Moreover, only those who do not want it secure it. What can He mean?


At the conclusion of this discussion, Jesus points again to Himself as the supreme example of the leader who Himself undergoes all that He asks of His disciples. He is come to minister, not to lord it. He is the chief Servant. He is to suffer.

More than this, however, is in the Gospel of the Cross as it applies to Jesus especially: He is to 

1. 10:37  2. 9:1  3. 10:39a  4. 10:40  5. 10:42-44.
this with an objective purpose of ransoming men—not a few, but many. Here is the doctrine of the atonement, stated as a fact, not explained. Not, perhaps, that He could not have explained it. But that its purposes in the eternal scheme of God did not concern men. This was His own particular work as a subject of the universal Gospel of the Cross.

8. The instrument of the Cross: treachery.

The crowded days of the entry into Jerusalem leave little time for further teaching of this doctrine. But the thought of it was uppermost in the minds of all. Not until the eve of the Passover did the subject come up again into conversation. Judas in the meantime has not yet come to his decision. He has made the preliminary negotiations. He is checking the details.

As the Twelve sat that evening at meat, Jesus calmly announces, "One of you shall betray me." This word finds eleven of them stupid. Yet so great is their confidence in Him now that they rashly ask, "Is it I?" They were almost willing to acknowledge that they would do the very thing they most of all—deliver their King.

Here is one of the saddest phases of the Gospel of the Cross. The Cross is so often made necessary by the treachery of a trusted lieutenant. Here the ugly head of the basest treachery raises itself. One of the inner circle, one of the Twelve, one with whom they had lived.
intimately and fully, is a traitor! And not to Jesus alone, nor to the Twelve only; but a traitor to all Israel; and, they increasingly suspect, a traitor to God. Of all treachery, religious treason is the worst. It is selling out God to the devil.

8. The Ordinance of the Cross.

But his note of depression is not permitted to last. Jesus now gives them bread to eat and wine to drink, calling them His body and His blood.

Then He gives again the meaning of the Gospel of the Cross: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many." Here again is that now beautiful doctrine that to lose one's life is to save it, especially applied, however, in this case, to a far-reaching act of atonement. This particular Cross was one for Jesus alone. Its importance to the disciples could not yet be seen.

Thus came about the Ordinance of the Cross. The Supper looks back to the Servant who was faithful unto death. It reviews the steadfast purpose to go to Jerusalem. It recalls the farcical trial, the rage of the "chosen", the irreolution of the Roman, the mockery of the world, the agony of the Garden, the bitter desolation of the tortured flesh. It embodies the mystery of the ransom for many.

But it has a forward look also. It carries a promise that this is not the last Supper. It sees the glory of the Father and the holy angels. It looks for the Lord coming in the clouds. It anticipates a heavenly banquet,
where the triumphant Lord drinks anew in the Kingdom of His Father. It is a promise of a beginning as well as a farewell end of things.

10. The defection foretold.

Not the least difficult part of the Gospel of the Cross is the assured defection of the most trusted and faithful. With saddened countenance, Jesus now tells them that they all will be ashamed of Him, and will deny Him this very day. The conversation has been prolonged thru the night.

Peter speaks for himself and the rest. Each is sure of himself. The Lord will have at least one defender, each one is sure. "And in like manner so said they all."

Jesus does not answer. He accepts their protestations as sincere--as indeed they were. In the rarified air of devotion in the Upper Room, they felt equal to any test that might be imposed. But He did not retract His judgment.

11. Arrangements for the proof.

Jesus does not press the Twelve to believe in His promised resurrection. This He will demonstrate. He knows they do not yet believe that Jesus will actually die. He has taught His lesson well. They believe that He is indeed the Messiah. Doubtless God will intervene at the last moment and will confound the Romans and the Priests. So He sets the stage for His supreme proof.

1. 14:25
2. 14:27
3. 14:31c.
Altho' they will be scattered abroad, He says, He will go to Galilee to meet them, after He is raised up. There, when their despair and chagrin is deepest, He will meet them on the shores of the Lake, as He did when He called them. This time the call will be to a service of witnessing to the most astounding fact the world has known. He will show there and then that He means exactly what He says about being killed and coming forth victorious from the tomb.

This will not be a matter of faith for the Eleven who will be left. It will be proof. They will know by actual observation that He speaks the truth.

12. The actual surrender.

Jesus must now prepare for the traitor. He will pray. They go to Gethsemane. Here He feels the exceeding sorrow, even unto death. They have never seen the Master so disturbed. The agitation of His soul is troubling Him and amazing Him, as the He can scarcely realize that this is indeed the hour.

So He prays that if possible the hour might pass from Him. But the prayer is not without condition. It is after all the will of God that is to dominate the Gospel of the Cross. If God so wills it, even this last full measure of devotion will be His choice.

Twice He prays in the agony of loneliness, with the disciples sleeping thru His most difficult hour. But without their help, eventuall He conquers. His resolution
is now fixed. He is calm again, altho drained of strength, yet with a new strength upon Him. He sits for a while, lost in no one knows what meditations.

The hour arrives. He rouses the Eleven, and they go to meet Judas with the soldiers. His calm in the midst of the agitated Judas, the suspicious police, and the bewildered disciples, is a divine calm. The kiss of the traitor is endured. "And they laid hands on him and took him."

Now the old spirit of amused mockery takes Him.

"Are ye come out as against a robber, with swords and staves to seize me? I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and ye took me not..." How the words must have cut the hearts of the proud Priests!

13. The trial.

The witnesses are suborned. They offer their testimony before the High Priest, but their testimony does not agree. Things are going wrong. Jesus is calm in its midst. He needs not answer this evidently perjured and contradictory evidence.

At last the High Priest takes a hand. Failing to get Jesus to commit Himself under the testimony of the hirelings, he resolves to cut all legal procedure, and gets to the point: "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" This is the question all along. They unconsciously have feared to bring it into the open, but no other way is now open.

1. 14:46 3. 14:59
The answer of our Lord is clear and unequivocal. "I am." Here was the evidence they had sought by such indirect means, now obtained against all legal precedent and right, which the accused might have refused to answer had He so chosen.

At once the assembly was in an uproar. The High Priest turns advocate, and with Oriental venom demands the death penalty on the ground of blasphemy. Here the Anointed One, the Son of God, is adjudged guilty of blasphemy because of His admission, without opportunity to present His credentials: Indeed, it was those very credentials these priests so much feared.

The Gospel of the Cross carries Jesus on. He has seen the predicted defection of the Eleven, even the violent Peter. He is calm in the midst of the abuse of those who should have been the first to hail the Messiah. He is rejected by His own.

There remains the formality of a Roman trial before the death penalty of the Sanhedrin can be carried out. Here again He might have claimed legal protection. Rome was not usually stampeded by colonials. Indeed, Pilate showed some conscience in the matter, but that of a degenerate officer of Rome, not that of the old justice proud governor of a Province. He proposes a settlement out of court. The rabble cries for Jesus' blood.

The Roman now pronounces the death penalty, and turns the Messiah over to the executioners. In all of

1. 14:62
2. 15:11.
this Jesus has maintained His calm. He is enduring that which He knew He must if He came to Jerusalem. He is on the road to paying the ransom. The Gospel of the Cross is taking its toll.


Mark does not tell us anything of the thoughts of the Lord of Creation as His creatures mock Him and spit upon Him and scourge Him. Here is the fulfillment of the last details of what He had predicted. He is going the last hard Way to the Cross. The Gospel of losing His life is exacting the fullest measure of its demands.

With merciful brevity, our record then brings Him to Golgotha. The executioners offer Him a sedative, but Jesus refuses. The Gospel of the Cross demands full possession of the faculties during the ordeal now immediately at hand. The physical courage of the Lord is nowhere more evident. And the moral courage is none the less exalted. Here is opportunity to ease the torture. Everything is done but the pain. But even this last enactment of the strange Gospel is not to be denied. He will hang before His people as a ruler ought, with perception clear.

Now He is on the Cross. What is the physical pain to the jeers of the rabble, now turned to a howling mob under the blood now flowing? In scorn they give Him the title He ought to wear in honor: King of the Jews. The

1. 15:16-20
2. 16:26.
honored chief priests join in the mockery. His merciful works of salvation are recalled, and turned to blasphemous jests. Again they demand the sign they asked of Him long ago: a catastrophic supernatural "wonder": "Let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the cross, that we may see and believe." Still they demanded that God act as they deemed it fitting for God to do.

Then darkness came. Three hours it hung over the awed earth. Where now were the jeers? Whence did these priests and scribes betake themselves? No one knows.

Then came the cry of despair: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" It is the call of flesh driven to the last extremity. Is it not now enough? Is the suffering not now complete? What will it profit to hang and suffer more?

This cry moves some merciful soul to offer Him again a sedative. But Jesus merely uttered a loud voice, of what indescribable agony and sorrow human imagination cannot understand, and departed.

15. Triumph.

The burial does not here concern us, save to note that every legal precaution was taken to insure that the body was actually dead. The burial permit was given. The place and circumstances of burial are carefully noted.

Friends who knew Him saw Him said away.

1. 16:31  3. 16:36a
2. 16:34  4. 16:37
3. 16:36a  5. 16:42-47.
But the Gospel of the Cross is not yet finished. Only half has been shown. Jesus had promised from the initiation of the doctrine that its promises were greater than its exactments. No one would be asked to give up possession or family or friends without finding others, and eternal life besides. To lose a life is to save it. To minister well is to gain eminence. For Himself, to die would be in the nature of a ransom for many. He would not only die, but in three days would rise again. He would then offer demonstration to His disciples of the truth of the Gospel of the Cross.

On the third day, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, come to anoint the body. The Sabbath is now past. But in the place of the closed tomb, they find an open grave. In the tomb is a young man. "Be not amazed: ye seek Jesus the Nazarene, who hath been crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold, the place where they laid him! But go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him, as he said to you."

Here is the proof. The tomb is empty. The place is identified. There can be no mistake that He is gone. He has kept His word. The other half of the Gospel of the Cross is complete. Triumph has come thru ministry.

At this point the record of Markus closes. If

1. 16:5, 7.
there was once more, it is now gone. However, the Gospel is complete. That the word of the young man in the tomb is true is proved by the existence of the Gospel of Mark. Had he lied, there would have been no point to the whole narrative. Our Lord evidently did meet the disciples as He said He would. He did demonstrate to them the power of the Gospel of the Cross. And so effectively was this done, that they all traveled the same road, each bearing his own particular cross.
VI
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Conclusion
Jesus began His work without opposition from the people, who were quite willing to listen to some positive voice in the discord of conflicting parties. When He healed the man in the synagogue at Capernaum, and also Peter's mother-in-law, there was nothing but astonished approval, altho the day was the Sabbath. Perhaps this was not the first contact that Jesus had had with the public. The Synoptics would indicate that there was some teaching before this time. However, this is the first incident related by Mark. Jesus is pictured as meeting popular approval at the beginning.

The beginning of controversy is attributed by Mark to the action of the Scribes, who were observing closely the work of this Galilean prophet. While He is teaching in Capernaum, a man is brought to Him for healing, whom He addresses with the words, "Son, they sins are forgiven."

At once the Scribes are convinced that He blasphemes, for, as they say, "Who can forgive sins but one, even God?"

The Scribes are thus quick to see the implications of Jesus' teaching. If He can forgive sins, then He must be not merely a prophet, but something more. He is invading the prerogatives of deity. And they were right in so

1. 1:21-31
2. 2:5.
concluding. In spite of modern critics, forgiveness does not belong to God rather than to man. If they let this incident pass without challenge, they tacitly admit Jesus to bear more than prophetic authority. This they had no right to do. They were right to put him to the test.

Jesus met the challenge, even before it was articulated, by an act in which he exercised the same authority by which he had pronounced the forgiveness of sin, but exercised now in a different realm—that of the material world, which could be tested by the senses of those present. If he could so far defy the natural course of events as to cause a paralytic to walk, who was so far taken by the disease as the man before then, then the conclusion inevitably demanded was, that he really had the power to forgive sins.

This conclusion was precisely that to which the common people came. But the scribes, by keeping silence, had placed themselves in an uncomfortable situation. They could not deny, and they dared not affirm, the obvious. Whatever their reason man have been, the unmarcus records the fact that this incident, coupled as it was with Jesus' claim to a ranking more than prophetic, was the beginning of that series of controversies that was to culminate in

1. Admitted by Holltmann, Life of Jesus, p.203.
His death. That Jesus was not in entire sympathy with the hierarchy was evident. They therefore resolved to withhold their approval, and as He unfolded more and more of His teaching regarding the Kingdom, they became more and more opposed to Him.

Marcus represents the major portion of this opposition as coming from the Pharisees. No less than nine controversies are related as taking place between Jesus and the Pharisees prior to His last week in the capital. The Sadducees are represented as coming to Him only once in controversy. The Scribes are present with the Pharisees, indeed, the evangelist does not distinguish carefully between them. Several controversies during the last week are noted, together with some few with His own disciples.

We may devote the major portion of our study of Jesus as the controversialist, therefore, to His controversies with the Pharisees. The Pharisees were those among the Jews who opposed the Hellenization of the people, and in general insisted upon the Law and Traditions, refusing to compromise with Rome. They looked for a redemption of Israel from all foreign oppression, and the restoration of the Davidic Kingdom. They believed in a personal Messiah, who should lead Israel to this glory.

2. 11:27-33
4. 8:32-34; 14:3-9, 27-31, 33-42.
They were the patriotic party among the people, who trusted in God for a new Kingdom. Anything that looked toward usurping the place of God in this nation was, therefore, immediately opposed by these "Separated" or devoted people. "Israel was a nation, not because of race, but because it had the torah...accordingly, the Rabbis looked askance upon a government which derived authority from the deification of might (or a man)."

The Pharisees, therefore, after this first encounter, which indicated that Jesus was implicitly claiming divine attributes, looked carefully upon His teachings and doings. They soon found occasion to criticise His actions. For, after calling Levi, He ate a meal with the new disciple and his friends, the "publicans and sinners." This act of eating with sinners had more significance in the orient than it has for our day. To eat a common meal was to declare friendship with that person. This controversy ends with a sharp saying on the part of Jesus: "They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick..." This irony was not lost on the Pharisees. Nor, what was worse for their peace of mind, upon the people!

Shortly after this Jesus is asked why His disciples do not fast during an extra-legal fast, which the Pharisees were observing. Here again Jesus turns the tables on His traducers. He declares Himself the "bridegroom", and

2. 2:15-17
3. Robinson, St Mark's Life of Jesus, p.38,39.
that fasting will be observed when such occasion presents itself. Further, He takes occasion to remark, His teaching is not such as will be contained in old wineskins. The sacramentarianism of Judaism will not be sufficient to contain His religion.

But this was not so disturbing to the Pharisees as His neglect of the Sabbath. At this point the question of the interpretation of the Law touched practical life. The traditions of the elders had laid down strict regulations as to what man might or might not do on the Sabbath. And, when these proved impossible to keep, a curious system of casuistry was developed by means of which many of these regulations were evaded. But Jesus would have nothing to do with all this formality. The Sabbath was made for man. The people readily admitted this principle. They raised no objections to His Sabbath work. But not so the strict sect of the Pharisees. Accordingly, when there happened to be a man in the synagogue the following Sabbath with a withered hand, they watched Jesus to see what would be done. The question with which Jesus confutes them here cannot be answered. "Is it lawful to do good on the sabbath day?" As they could not reply, Jesus healed the man.

This event drove the Pharisees into an alliance with the Herodians, the lax party religiously, which shows how keenly the Pharisees must have felt the power of this

1. 2:19-22
2. Headlam, The Life and Teachings of Jesus the Christ, p.196
3. 2:27
4. 3:1-6.
prophet who was appealing to the people for leadership in religion.

From this time on, Jesus appeared no more in the synagogues. Evidently He was excluded. The powers of Jerusalem had given the word. He was free of course to preach in the open air, and does. But He was not in good standing with the Scribes and their synagogue.

The controversy now changed from a Galilean to a Jerusalem source. The next and all following controversies seem to have been prosecuted by Scribes sent down from Headquarters. "And the scribes that came down from Jerusalem said, He hath Beelzebub." This was an accusation intended to destroy His influence by admitting the actuality of His miracles, and the seeming wisdom of His teachings. The devil, they said in effect, is simulating good in order to more effectively controvert righteousness when he has led you astray.

The attitude of Jesus is now altered completely toward the Pharisees. In the beginning, He had recognized the right to challenge so revolutionary a teaching as that of His in claiming to forgive sins. It was right that investigation be made. He did not blame them, but demonstrated to them His power. But now, He is angered at them, for they have hardened their hearts. And the Scribes from Jerusalem are patently not seeking information, but opportunity

1. 3:16
3. 3:22
4. 3:15.
to discredit his work at any cost. That they were in
desperate straits in shown by the weakness of the solution
they ultimately offered to explain the works and teach-
ings of the prophet. Jesus' reply is correspondingly
severe. To spoil the goods of a strong man, one must
first bind him; one does not serve the devil by dividing
the Satanic kingdom. Then He subjoins to this refutation
of their accusation a statement, without comment, as to
the nature of the sin of attributing the work of God to
the devil. This cannot be forgiven. This was carrying
the war into the enemies' territory with a vengeance.
The Pharisees now found themselves not in the position of
accusers, but of accused, and with the uncomfortable feel-
ing that they had very little of a case.

After this encounter Jesus seems to have withdrawn
from the public eye, and to have sent out the Twelve on
their mission. But before long another occasion of con-
troversy is found. Again it is the Jerusalem Pharisees,
together with some Scribes, who find fault with Him. This
time the question is with regard to defilement. This
defilement was not that of a mere formality. Such a con-
ception did not exist among the Jews. The righteous man
was he who observed all the Law, and the traditions of the
elders in addition. He showed his good character by what
he did. Thus, to neglect the washing of the hands before

1. 3:25-27
2. 3:29
3. 7:1-23
4. Kütersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, V.II, p.10f.
eating was to be a sinner— to neglect the Law and the honored elders, who must have had good reasons for en-
joining the practice! Ebersheim points out that one 
Rabbi who scorned this regulation was actually buried excommunicated. Thus the Pharisees here charge Jesus 
with being a sinner, an unrighteous man, and consequent-
ly not the Christ.

This of course was a variation of the former accusa-
tion, that of securing power by Beelzebub, or being indeed 
almost an incarnation of the devil, which would of course 
have destroyed His claim to Messiahship. Jesus, upon 
this companion charge, turns with violence upon the 
Pharisees, condemning them for hypocrisy. He denounced 
them in terms of Isaiah, and makes application of His 
charge in their practice of "Corban". Thus, He urges, 
they not only are morally unrighteous, and thus destroy 
the very law they profess to love, but they are really not 
even ceremonially corrupt, since corban is merely an illegal 
subterfuge.

This was a severe indictment. That it drew blood is 
evidenced by the fact that from this time on we may detect a more respectful treatment of Him by the Pharisees. They 
seek Him out and ask for a sign, in desperate effort to 
save their face. They come to Him in Jerusalem only after

1. 7:6-13.
they are virtually forced to do so by His popularity, which they see will destroy them anyhow, unless they can stop it by some means.

But Jesus had not finished with them. This charge, that He was really a sinner, aroused Him to the limit. He had been content to let those who were present remember or forget the former controversies. But now He summoned the people, and explained to them fully what it was all about, and what real uncleanness, unholliness, and defilement, actually is. The Pharisees had been the "holy", separated, clean and most religious people of the age. Now Jesus carried the war into their own camp, and accused them of being sinners, rather than Himself, and insisted that they did not know what real uncleanness was.

Nor did this suffice. After the multitudes had gone, Jesus taught the disciples still more of the implications involved. In this connection, He taught them that it does matter a great deal what a man believes, for "out of the heart are the issues of life." No sin is ever become objective that was not first the subject of thought in the mind of the man. Man actually does what he wants to do. Sin is not necessitates, but is the result of the free choice of a man's evil will. If that will be not evil, then no sin can come to the fore in a man's life. This is strong teaching, which the Church has not thru the ages seen fit to accept with any grace. But its truth is none the less

1. 7:14-16
2. 7:18-23.
evident to a reflective mind.

After this experience the Pharisees troubled Him but little until He went to Jerusalem. Once, however, they approached Him with an almost pathetic plea. They were losing face, and in the orient. They had suffered defeat. One way remained whereby they might be able to recognize Him as Messiah. If He would only concede to them a "sign from heaven", such as the traditions of the elders had said the Messiah would exercise, then they might plead that they convinced, and join His company. But our Lord would no longer deal with them at all. This craving for a sign was still an effort to make Jesus into the kind of Messiah which they thought He ought to be. The record says abruptly that He flatly refused them, and "departed" to the other side (of the lake), leaving the holy ones standing speechless on the bank.

It is after this that Jesus warns His disciples about the leaven of the Pharisees and Herodians. The two parties were hostile to each other, but more hostile to Himself and to the spiritual faith which He now proclaimed as essential to righteousness in God's sight.

During the last week other controversies are related. One was with the Pharisees, who now approach in the guise of students seeking to know intricate problems in the Law.

1. 8:11-12
2. 10:2-12.
The first of the questions brought before Him is that of divorce. None of the Rabbis actually prohibited divorce, but differed widely as to the grounds on which it might be granted. The Law unquestionably sanctioned it. But Jesus swept away all this characteristic legalism, and placed His prohibition of divorce on the grounds of the nature of marriage, as an institution of God, which cannot therefore be dissolved by man. Here as perhaps in no other case is the difference between Jesus and the Scribes pictured. Marriage, the institution of God, is a spiritual relationship. Even the Law recognized this primary fact, and allowed divorce as a protection to woman, because of the hardness of heart of the Jew.

Unable to answer, the Pharisees come to Him when He has entered the city, and ask Him about His authority for teaching and doing as He does. This controversy shows Jesus master again. For He at once turns tables upon them by requiring them to give an estimate of John. "The baptism of John, was it from heaven or from men?" This was too much for the learned scribes from the Sanhedrin, who dared not offend the disciples of John, for they were too numerous in the province. The implication is, of course, that Jesus' authority is from the same source as that of John, with the accentuation that Jesus is superior to the Baptist.

1. 10:2-12
2. 11:27-33.
Then the Zealot party of the Pharisees came to Him with another question, that of the Tribute to Rome. This was of course one of the most vexed problems of that fiercely independent people. Either to accept the legality of the Tribute, or to deny it, would destroy Jesus' position, with the Jews on the one hand, and with the Romans on the other. With consummate skill, Jesus not only disposes of the dilemma, but lays down a principle of the relation of Church and state which is impregnable.

Next in order, according, it would seem, to a pre-arranged plan, the Sadducees propose to Him their stock objection to the doctrine of the future life. Whose wife would she be who had married seven times? Jesus silences them by quoting from the OT to the effect that there is indeed such a life; and then lays down the principle that life is wholly on the spiritual plane, so that their question does not apply.

In the meantime the Scribes had been saying that Jesus could not be the Messiah, for the promised one is to be the "Son of David". That is, Messiah is to be of the Royal type, a King over the renewed Israel, like his ancestor. They pointed out that Jesus was a Galilean, and thus could not qualify at all. To all this accusation Jesus replied by hitting as usual at the center of the problem. To an oriental nothing could be so incongruous

1. 12:13-27
2. 12:18-27
as a Father who was subject to his Son. Yet, Jesus pointed out, this is the very situation which David himself had predicted in his psalm. Without stopping to argue the question of Judean birth, ancestry, or eschatological aims, Jesus silenced these critics of His claims. Here again Jesus is not attempting to teach them. They had gone too far for teaching. They must first be silenced. Then perhaps they will be in a mood to listen. And if not, then at any rate, to silence them will give Jesus command of the people.

So far we have noted only the controversies which Jesus had with the groups more or less at enmity with Him. But it would not be unjust to note that He engaged in a few passages at arms with His disciples. The only difference between these controversies and the others was that the disciples were willing to hear what He said. Otherwise they too would have been cast aside.

When Jesus first announced the Gospel of the Cross, He met with determined opposition on the part of Peter, who went so far as to "rebuke Him." Peter was acting precisely as the Scribes, who were hoping for a restoration of the ancient glories of Israel. What He said is not recorded. But the answer of the Lord is just as sharp a reproof as ever addressed to the Pharisees. "Get

1. Ps.110:1; Mk.12:36
2. 8:32.
thee behind me, Satan; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men." To call Peter Satan was not a mild epithet, but an imputation of league with the archenemy of Messiah and the kingdom. It was as severe a condemnation as that meted to the Pharisees, whom He called hypocrites. His reaction to this defection on the part of His disciple was the same as that which He displayed against the captious accusation that He was a sinner Himself. That is, He at once called in the people, and began to teach them that He must be rejected, the very point for which Peter had rebuked Him.

So it was when He was eating at the house of Simon, in Bethany, and the woman anointed Him. To the protestation that this was a waste of good money, Jesus replied that the value of deeds is not to be determined by any materialistic or commercial standard. The act is definite-approved. "She hath done what she could." Her act is to be related with credit to her, wherever the Gospel shall be preached.

Almost within the realm of controversy, yet with a note of pathos is Jesus' prediction of the scattering of the disciples and Peter's especial denial. In this instance Jesus enters into no argument to show that His position is correct--that is to be demonstrated all too soon. But the same confidence is to be noted in this instance as in all

1. 8:33
2. 14:8
former situations. Jesus is absolutely sure of his ground. Peter is of course just as certain. The issue proved Jesus' contention.

The final contention with the disciples was in the Garden just before the arrest. Here He strives to give them something of His own anxiety over the situation, but in vain. Finally He gives over the attempt. "Sleep on now, and take your rest..." Here alone in all His contests with men, does He seem to be unable to be victor--and then His defeat is more apparant than real.

Once more Mk presents Jesus as a controversialist, in the scenes of the trial. Before the Sanhedrim, Jesus maintains a provoking silence, while the suborned witnesses prove too much or contradict each other. And when the High Priest takes matters into his own hands, and forces a direct answer to the question, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" Jesus has the last word of the controversy: "Iam: and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." This ended the trial, for the judges turned into a mob demanding His death at this statement. Again His calm word proved too much for the opponents. They are convicted by their own vehemence against Him. They procure His death, but the controversy eventually ended in His victory.

nor did the inquisition before Pilate prove more
successful. Jesus' answer to Pilate, "Thou sayest," afforded that official no grounds for conviction. So the condemnation was no real victory for the Roman law, nor for the Jewish accusers. The issue now lay in another realm, that of the resurrection soon to be.

Jesus had to assume the work of a controversialist during most of His career. First with the local scribes and Pharisees, then with the help from headquarters in Jerusalem, then with the Sadducees and Zealots in the city itself—in all these contests Jesus falls into no trap that is laid for Him, but on the contrary involves His inquisitors in hopeless confusion. They, not He, are continually placed in an uncomfortable position. With His own disciples, too, He had occasionally to enter the lists, and prove His right to command. Here He was as successful as before. And the arrest and trial proved nothing against Him or His claims to Messiahship. He thus earned His title to King in every test of wisdom, knowledge, and wit to which He was subjected.
VII
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Summary
THE PERSONALITY

The effect of the Gospel of Mark upon the reader who asks the nature of the Person of our Lord is remarkably unanimous among all classes. While critics may by various processes deny the truth of the Marcionian definition of the Person, all agree that Mark presents a combination of the divine and human inextricably woven into one in the personality of Jesus.

That the Urmarcus has this same peculiarity is also admitted. Bacon, for example, in his latest work, finds three "traditions" independently preserved in Mark, which he calls the Hellenistic, or supernatural; the "strong Son of God" or Adoptionist; and the universalistic "Son of Man" Christology of the Transfiguration; the two latter being two forms of the Jewish tradition.

That these "traditions" are in Urmarcus may be readily admitted. But that they are "independent" does not fit the circumstances of the composition and date of Urmarcus which we have found to be required in our inductive study in Part I. Urmarcus is too early, for the Christology to be "composite" as Bacon thinks. And its literary form is too rough for it to be a conscious effort at harmonizing divergent ideas of the Person.

Actually, it is unfair to take any one of these ideas

1. Bacon, e.g., in Is Mark a Roman Gospel? p.85-90
and make it an indication of divergent views in the
time when Mk wrote. A modern treatise which takes
consideration of various elements or aspects of its sub-
ject is not thereby penalized by the stigma of "composite"
authorship. Nor should the Urmarcan, clearly a very
early, compact, stylistically united document professedly
setting forth a selective argument on the nature of
Jesus, be so regarded.

We are to examine, then, the Urmarcan presentation of
the Person of our Lord, to see the historic Jesus as
this earliest document presents His personality.

Perhaps the most striking feature of this presentation
is its vivid note of the human side of our Lord's Person.
This emphasis made Mark the Gospel of Cerinthus and all
Adoptionist theologians. Jesus in this Gospel is the
carpenter of Nazareth, whose family is well known in that
1 village, and who had himself labored there. His friends
at Nazareth, perhaps His kinfolk, think Him demented when
2 He begins to preach. There must have been little of
remark in His life up to that point. He requires food
and shelter, lodges with His friends, lives the ordinary
3 life of the current rabbi of His day. While He was
strong in body, yet He grew tired, strength flowed from
4 Him, He slept, He withdrew to rest. His touch is of
such quality to be remembered. Here is a strong picture

1. 6:3,4
2. 3:26-35
3. 2:1,15; 11:12
4. 2:38; 1:35; 4:38; 5:30
5. 1:41.
of a living human personality.

Other touches fill the pages of this Gospel. He
needs the solace of prayer. Occasionally, we are told
the nature of these prayers, as when He prayed before
casting out demons, or in the Garden when He asked that
He might be released from the Cross, or on the Cross
when He cried to God in distress of soul. Another in-
dication in Mk as to His human limitations is found in
His admission of ignorance as to the time of the Second
Advent. Similarly, He has no power to dispose of seats
of honor in heaven. Again, He asks question, apparently
that He may discover what He seeks to know. He speaks
distinctly of His own human will as contrasted with that
of God.

Besides these negative proofs of His humanity, as
seen in His limitations, Mk offers positive proofs as
seen in His attractive human traits. He is pictured
as one who had compassion upon the people at large and
indeed upon all with whom He came in contact. This
sympathy extends not only to the earnest seeker for the
kingdom among the Pharisees, but to the scorned Gentile
woman whose child was ill. He has a deep appreciation
for others. He has courage, such as can hardly be dup-

2. 13:32
3. 10:42
4. 5:30; 8:5; 9:16.
5. 14:36.
licated, as He sets out on the course which He knows will lead to crucifixion. He has the courage to remain silent under unjust condemnation. He had patience of the most remarkable kind in the midst of perverse misunderstanding of His Gospel. His willingness to reason with anyone who would listen is most unusual. Most religious leaders have appealed to their mystic revelations, have relied upon commands and prohibitions. While these qualities are not lacking in Jesus, yet the impression He leaves is that of reasonableness. Nothing gave Him quite so much pain as sin. He grieved at this state in men. He was moved by love toward men; but could be provoked, and sometimes angered. Painful emotions stirred His heart. His human soul is the seat of His perception and of His religion. Especially attractive is Mk’s picture of Him as the friend of children, whom He picked up in His arms. His breadth of soul is seen in His loyalty to His Jewish inheritance, without being bigoted. A keen wit played upon the carping opposition of His enemies. While anxiety gathered over Him in overwhelming measure just before His arrest.

Here is certainly a strong picture of a strong, real human personality. There appears to be no apologetic in-
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6. 10:21 13. 2:17
7. 8:21 14. 14:3ff.
terest in this representation, but the objectivity of
the man with a true story to relate.

We have noted His ready human sympathy, but perhaps
specific reference should be cited, as when He tolerantly
grants the request of the Syrophoenician woman; or when
He tenderly raises the "little Daughter"; or when He
meets Mary Magdalene with the familiar address which
called recognition to her mind after the resurrection:

"Mary!" (Jn. 20:16)

Perhaps the connecting link between this human
personality and the divine side of His Person is seen in
His strange ability to read the hearts of men. Whether
of His enemies, or of His disciples, He knows the secret
thoughts they harbor. This mystery of mind-reading seems
to be a fairly well authenticated psychical fact. But
no experiment in modern times under the best of conditions
has duplicated the accuracy with which Jesus knew the
minds of those around Him. If telepathy be the solution
of the mystery, Jesus knew more about it than the best
modern investigators have been able to discover.

The case for His divine nature, however, rests in
Urmarcus on more substantial foundations than this. He
has supernatural authority, both with respect to divine
law and to future power. He calmly pronounces sins for-
given. He knows the future. Some of this knowledge

1. 2:8
2. 9:17; 9:34
3. Hanchison, The Case for and against Psychic Research,
  ch.XII.
4. 2:28
5. 2:8,10
could be tested in His own day, as when He foretold when and to what degree Peter would deny Him. Other prophesies remain to be fulfilled.

It is true that there are no birth or infancy stories in Urmarcus. But to argue from this silence that Mk did not know of them would be a false argument from silence. Indeed, that Mk knew of such stories is evident from his references to His human descent. The reason for their omission would seem to be two-fold. As we have indicated in the Introduction, the Christmas cycle had made them familiar to those for whom Mk is writing. And, since Mk's Gospel is that of action rather than that of reflection, they would not be strictly in place here.

Indeed, Mk has no definite Christology to offer. He certainly is not docetic, for the traits of human personality are too marked. Nor is he adoptionist, in spite of giving prominence, to the Baptism, Transfiguration, and Exaltation. Mk should fall into one or other of these classifications, according to modern theories of the development of Christology. That he does not do so is a complete mystery unless we admit that he probably represented this side of Jesus' nature as it really was.

The arguments that Mk presents as to the personality

of our Lord may be summarized as these. Jesus is baptized by John in the Jordan, and is acclaimed as the
Son of God. This approval and acknowledgment of the
Father is confirmed at the Transfiguration. Besides these
heavenly attestations, various recognitions of this
divine nature are made by demons, who are usually for-
bidden to speak. The Centurion who has observed the
phenomena of the crucifixion is moved to make the same
acknowledgment. Peter's confession is the calm judg-
ment of the disciples, and meets with our Lord's own
approval. Furthermore, Jesus admits his identity on
oath before both the high Priest and Pilate. The
sublimity of this office is manifested and perpetuated
in the institution of the Supper. To all of which proof
Mk adds the resurrection, with its various experiences.

It might seem at first sight that the picture thus
presented of the Son of God conflicts or contradicts the
picture presented as Jesus the carpenter and human teach-
er. But to so read the Gospel is to ignore the intricate
admixture of the two pictures as presented in the document
itself. Only with considerable labor and with much
detract from the total effect of the Gospel is it
possible to separate the two thoughts. They are woven to-
gether as one seamless cloth, in the Urmarcus.

Perhaps this will appear more evident when we note,
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how other so-called "Christologies" are presented in this document. Besides Son of God, Jesus is presented as Son of Man. This title has been examined exhaustively in a former chapter. It is sufficient to point out here that the title serves to emphasize the Incarnation. To the objection that the term means merely "man", it may be replied that as Jesus uses it, it certainly means anything else— for man as such cannot forgive sins, nor return in the clouds, nor ask identification as Son of God.

There is some element of truth in the contention, then, that the expression Son of Man is that chosen by our Lord to indicate His personality as the meeting point of humanity and divinity. This is admitted by almost any student of the Life of Christ. Delman, e.g., says:

The name Messiah denoted the Lord of the Messianic Age in His capacity as Ruler; in reality it was applicable only when His enthronement had taken place, not before it. Suffering and death for the actual possessor of the Messianic dignity are, in fact, unimaginable according to the testimony of the prophets. When Jesus attached to the Messianic confession of Peter the first intimation of His violent death, He did so in order to make it clear that the entrance upon His sovereignty was still far distant... But the 'one who was like unto a son of man' of Dm 7:13 has still to assume sovereignty. It is possible that he should also be the one who had undergone suffering death."

That is, the Son of Man links humanity and deity in one Person, uniting two apparently antithetical conceptions of Messiah.

1. 212
2. 3:38
3. 8:29
The Incarnation is further represented in Mk by the title "Son of David." This is a Messianic title current in Palestine during Jesus' lifetime, expressive of the national hopes of Israel. The Son of David was to restore the glories of the ancient Kingdom. Jesus uses the title, according to Ursinus. He is addressed as such by the blind man at Jerico. And when He uses it Himself, it is addressed to the Pharisees via the people, in a repudiation of the Jewish idea that the title "Son of David" expresses all that is in the Messiahship. Jesus does not here deny His lineage, but He does not use it in defense of His Messiahship. The Messiah is more than, although not less than the Son of David.

Thus the particular phase of the Messiahship which is expressed by this title is that of the Royal estate and function. As such, Jesus could claim the title which the Romans wrote above His head on the Cross: "The King of the Jews." Here again the idea of Incarnation is present.

For, His Kingdom was a spiritual Kingdom, and He a King, of course, such a conception identified Him with God, as the Jews understood, for the spiritual King of Israel was none other than Jahweh. The theocracy might have God as its Ruler, with a human son of David under Him; but if that Son of David claimed spiritual realm, then

1. 10:47f.
2. 12:35-37
no one knew better than a Jew that the implication was that this Son of David was not only man, but more.

A final conception of Christology current in the NT Church was that of the Suffering Servant. And this idea is in Mk also, altho not in words. The whole Gospel of the Cross, which we have considered before, is based on this idea of the Messiah. Jesus distinctly claims at one point that He is to give His life instead of many. At another time, He says that He is to suffer and pour out His blood on behalf of many. Again, He says of the Son of Man that He must "Suffer many things and be set at naught."

Thus the idea of the suffering Servant is in the background of Mk, altho the reference is not specifically cited. Surely the humanity of the Servant is evident. But just as surely the divine nature of the Servant must be admitted, for in Urmareus, Son of Man, and Son of David, are one and the same. The incarnation, then, is accepted as a fact by Urmareus, but no explanation of its mystery is given.

To sum up, then, the Personality is presented in Mk as an organism with two sides, one human and the other divine, joined in chemical synthesis, indissoluble without involving the destruction of the picture. The Person is transcendentally human and immanently divine.

1. 10:45
2. 11:24.
Finally, be it noted that in this Christology there is no development, no "attainment of divinity", no progressive deification, to be seen in the personality of Jesus as shown in Urmarcus. He is divine when He is introduced at the Baptism, He acts as divine throughout His life, He is so named in the Transfiguration, He admits this station at the Trial, He rises in consequence of this divine nature. Indeed, Deissmann would extend to the whole of the Gospels this same lack of development. So His divinity is no more developed than His humanity. He is not more or less human, nor more or less divine; but altogether both in one.

1. The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, p. 28.
Jesus as the connection between Judaism and Christianity

Jesus the Jew

Conformity to Judaism in general

His defense of His Judaism in controversy

His attitude toward the OT

His attitude toward the oral Law

His independence of the Law

His dependence on the Law

Master of Law

Servant of the Law
VIII

HIS RELIGION

No picture of Jesus is complete without an examination of His personal religion as a man. We therefore now turn to such inquiry. What, according to the Urmarous, is Jesus' own religion, the religion which He lived? This chapter is not concerned with the religion which He taught for His disciples. That religion is the Christian faith. But Jesus was a Jew, He was not a Christian, He was the Christ.

Such a distinction is not incongruous. Jesus stood between two great streams of revealed religion. On the one side was Judaism, into which He was born, and thru which He was trained. On the other is Christianity, which He founded, growing out of Judaism, yet containing new revelations of the Father, a child greater than its parent. To Jesus was given the difficult task of living according to the Law, while preparing for a new religion which was to supersede that Law.

Jesus was not come to destroy the Law. Accordingly, He lived a loyal Jew. The Urmarous pictures Him as being welcomed into the Synagogues, where He taught, throughout Galilee. The Synagogue was the invention of the Pharisees. And He been other than a loyal Jew, He would have been excluded at the first. He was not one of the 'amme-ha-

areas, that group of Jews who ignored or violated the provisions of the Law. Throughout the Marcus, the Scribes are shown as watching closely both his actions and his teachings, for a possible violation of the Law. But they found none. They were obliged to confess themselves worsted in controversy; and they were forced to admit the judgment of the people that this Man was a prophet of blameless life.

The general fact that Jesus so lived is further proved by the events of the last week of His life. Here He is to be seen daily in the Temple, using its porches for teaching, cleansing it from profanation, calling it the seat of God's dwelling among men. While the charge was that He threatened to destroy the Temple, yet the form of the language makes it clear that He referred to the divine judgment to be executed against the people rather than any act against the Temple as such.

Further, while it relates only one festival in which Jesus took part at Jerusalem, it is evident that the disciples had visited the Holy City with Him before. For, they are seen to be familiar with the city, and with

1. 9:27; 9:15-18; 12:35; 14:49.
the countryside, including Bethany, and with the general features of the celebration of the Passover. They make seemingly accustomed preparations for it. They are no strangers to the city. The remark on the huge stones of the Temple is not one of wonder at seeing it for the first time, but one of wonder that it may ever fall.

The fact that Jesus was habitually addressed as Rabbi is a correlative fact which shows His Jewish life. The questions which He treated, the coming Kingdom of God, the nature of the resurrection, the matter of divorce, the most important commandment, the fasts and keeping of Sabbaths, all of these were of interest to Jews. In dealing with them, He shows Himself a Jew. True, He has a larger vision; He is a Prophet, the like of which had never been heard; but still, a Jewish Prophet. It is distinctly significant that Jesus did not preach among the Gentiles, nor send His disciples to them. He was a Jew.

One minor fact, mentioned incidentally by Urmarcus, would alone be decisive on this question, were there no other evidence. The Evangelist speaks of the people who tried to touch His garments, and mentions especially the tassel, or fringe, of His garment. This same word, kraspedon, is the word used in the LXX in detailing the dress of Jews. In the time of Christ, "The "sizith in
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fact served as a Jew's uniform whereby he was recognized and distinguished from a Gentile. Hence a Jew must not sell a fringed garment to a non-Jew unless the fringes are removed."

Again, when Jesus healed the man of leprosy, He commanded the man to observe the instructions of Moses in such matters. In this case He shows Himself familiar with the Law of Leviticus, and employs it with approval. Had He been opposed to the Law, or outside the pale, He would hardly have done this.

Jesus thus is represented in Mark as a Jew. What, then, was His attitude toward the OT Scriptures? Fortunately, this question is settled by a specific statement of our Lord in the Mark. In quoting Ps.110:1, Jesus uses the words "in the Holy Spirit" as the state in which David wrote the passage. This is the common Rabbinic designation of inspiration. Now, the Psalms were the least regarded of the entire OT. It is therefore evident that if Jesus regarded them as inspired, the rest of the OT may be regarded as similarly inspired.

Another incident is recorded in which the Sadducees ask Him about the future life. Here Jesus responds by citing as a proof text from the OT, in which He follows the
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traditional Rabbinic exegesis of Scripture. The proof of future life is the inspired statement of the OT.

Similarly, when He is accused of violating the Sabbath by permitting His disciples to pluck grain, He cites the example of David. In cleansing the Temple, He quotes Isaiah and Jeremiah. When He taught the essential truth of the marriage relation, He quoted Gen.1:27. When He taught the Gospel of the Cross, He derived His assurance from the OT. The suffering servant of Isaiah lived in His own Person, as He clearly saw. When He would pray on the Cross, the opening words of the 22nd Psalm came to His mind.

In teaching the nature of the Kingdom of God, which shall guarantee eternal life, Jesus employs the Ten Commandments. When asked the greatest commandment, Jesus quotes Dt.6:4f, and approves the questioner's exegesis with the words: "Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God." The righteous brethren of the Lord are those who "do the will of God", a typically Jewish concept.

Thus, Jesus speaks of the commandment of God, and the word of God, as a Scribe or a Pharisee might speak of the OT. In a word, He accepts the Jewish reverence for the OT and its message as indeed the very word of God.

All this is significant in picturing His religion. He
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might have been a Pharisee so far as His general recognition of
the Law as authority in religion was concerned. There
is ample evidence that He was a Jew. If any further argu-
ment were desired, it might be added that at His trial, no
charge of disrespect to the Law could be made. He was a
blasphemer, they charged, but could find no disrespect for
Moses or the prophets.

But what was His attitude toward the Oral Law, that
vast system that had grown up around the written provisions
of the OT? The Pharisees accepted it unquestioningly. The
people at large thought them especially holy because of this
ceremonialism. Adherence to the oral Law was the soul
of Pharisaism. But it was also largely accepted by most
of the Jews. Did Jesus accept this general attitude?

In some measure, He seems to have accepted the oral
Law. He participated in the Temple sacrifices, which were
dependent upon the oral Law. He forbid carrying vessels
thru the Temple, which was a violation of the oral code.
It was His custom to give thanks at meals. This was not
required in the written Law, but was sanctioned by oral Law.
The singing of a hymn at the close of the Passover was a
custom of the oral Law. From these illustrations, it would
seem that Jesus conformed to the customs of the times, and
to the usual ceremonies, under ordinary circumstances.

1. Moore, Judaism, I., p.251ff.
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Sometimes Jesus appealed directly to the oral Law, as in the question "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath day, or to do harm?" The written Law forbade all work. But He appealed to the oral Law, which permitted good to be done on this day. Thus Jesus is not a prophet who is asking for a restoration of the written as opposed to the oral Law. However, it is not against the Law to act.

But, Jesus ordinarily cited neither Law; He taught not as the scribes, not according the Halacha. His references to the Law are incidental, usually in controversy. His appeal is to reason, to the conscience, to the religious sense of men, rather than to the Law. The Scribes tried to find OT ground for their whole traditional scheme. But Jesus teaches in a fresh, unhampered, authoritative, unconsciously Kingly, manner. Jesus did not aspire to be a Jewish Rabbi, expounding the Law. He was Master of the Law, indeed, the only complete Master the Law ever had, in that He not only perfectly understood, but perfectly lived, its precepts. But His chief concern was to prepare for the Church, and so He gives little attention to the Law as such. It was His mission to live it, not teach it.

However, since He was accused at various times of some violation of the Law, such incidents are deserving of investigation on their several merits.

The first accusation recorded in Mark was that of
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eating with publicans and sinners. Pharisaism was erected on the principle of separation of the righteous and the sinners. The sinners were excluded from social contacts, marriage, public office, and the right to witness in court. Even commerce with them was restricted. To eat with them violated the whole ideal of Pharisaism, or separatism.

However, it was not against the Law to eat with them. But the example thus set was contrary to the ideal of the Law. One might eat with sinners without violating the letter of the Law, but not without violating its spirit. It was this of which Jesus was accused in the question of the Pharisees: "How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners?" This man who claimed to be a pure prophet, with a superior message, how could he thus let down the bars?

The answer of Jesus is clear and to the point: "They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners." The ironical note seems clear, in spite of denials. But whether ironical or not, the point germane to our discussion here is, that Jesus does not cite the Law, nor its silence, in justification of His course. He occupies a place above both the oral and the written Law. He understands what He is doing. He is not to be taken to task by Pharisees. He
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has "come" with a purpose. That purpose is the calling of
sinners to Godliness and Salvation. This is a new note in
religion. Even Montefiore admits that "to deny the great-
ness and originality of Jesus in this connection, to deny
that He opened a new chapter in men's attitude towards sin
and sinners, is, I think, to beat the head against a wall."
And Abrahams says that while the Rabbis were anxious always
for the return of the sinner, they were "inclined to leave
the initiative to the sinner... The Rabbis attacked vice
from the preventive side; they aimed at keeping men and
women chaste and honest. Jesus approached it from the cur-
ative side; he aimed at saving the dishonest and the unchaste."

In the prosecution of this purpose, then, which these
Jewish commentators have deemed to be merely the calling of
sinners, or, as we deem it, preparing the way for His Church,
Jesus is willing to be technically righteous according to the
Law, at the risk of violating the Pharisaic ideal of the Law.
If the Pharisees would be meticulous, He would meet them on
that ground. But He does not deign to give them His real
reason for thus courting the "sinners." He is still a Jew.

The incident which recounts the controversy over fasting
is of similar import. The fasts involved were not legal
either according to the oral or the written Law. He may be
a good Jew and ignore them.

However, the question of Sabbath observance brings us to
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the heart of the problem. "The two fundamental observances of Judaism are circumcision and the Sabbath."¹ The definition of work forbidden on the Sabbath was most minute. Whether designed to alleviate the original harshness of the Law, or to increase it, matters not here. Jesus justifies Himself with the Law by an appeal to David's example, and by citing the expression of the command: "The Sabbath was made for man." The command reads: "Observe the Sabbath, for it is holy for you." This interpretation is absorbed by later Judaism as the orthodox interpretation.² Thus Jesus maintains Himself as blameless before the Law. He does not dispute the scribal definition of work, but cites the Law against the Law, and chooses the humanitarian purpose as being the real design of this commandment.

However, it is to be noted that here He also declares Himself superior to the Law, its Master, by frankly telling the Pharisees that "The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath." In His own good time, He will abolish even this recognition of the Sabbath. He is a Jew in flesh. When occasion demands, He will exercise Lordship over Sabbath.

In the other Sabbath controversy little is added to this treatment. In response to the silent question as to what Jesus will do with the withered hand in the Synagogue, He propounds a question to the Pharisees: "Is it lawful on the Sabbath day to do good or to do harm? to save a life or to

¹. Moore, Judaism, II, p.16  
kill?" The Pharisees had a pat answer. It was well to
save a life on the Sabbath. But the Law did not permit
acts of labor merely because they might be classed as good
deeds. Evidently, the man with the withered hand might
wait until Sunday to be cured. But Jesus' question clearly
puts His own answer: to do good, and to save a life, are in
principle one and the same. If one is right, the other must
of necessity also be right.

Thus the conclusion to which we are forced is, that
Jesus was not in opposition to the Law. He accepted it, but
without the S orphan halachic interpretation. The Law was
not designed to hinder, but to help, man. Jesus was a
good Jew in thus obeying the Commandments.

The question of divorce was debated from early times,
and in the time of Jesus was the subject of dispute between
the school of Hillel, which permitted divorce by the husband
on any ground, and the school of Chamaai, which permitted
divorce only on the ground of adultery. When the Scribes
come to Jesus with their question, "Is it lawful for a man
to put away his wife?", this dispute must be held in mind.

Our question here, is, what attitude did Jesus display
toward the Law in answering this question? The first part
of His reply is a counter-question, "What did Moses command
you?" The answer was obvious. Moses permitted divorce.

Jesus now explained the temporary nature of this command.
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It was given by permission, on account of "their hardness of heart," on account of a rude, primitive state of society.

But the real purpose of God was that the two might be one flesh. Hence, man has no right to abrogate what God has joined together. Divorce is not justifiable. To prove this, Jesus cites Genesis, thus counterbalancing the temporary Law with the original, permanent provisions of God. Thus Jesus, while a Jew, is superior in His understanding of the Law, and on His own authority abrogates the temporary permission in favor of the permanent Law. The real design of the Law was to preserve the immutability of the home. Jesus here shows Himself a Jew of even more strict type than either of the Pharasaic schools. He emphasized the original decree of God, as opposed to the temporary permission of Moses.

The teaching of Jesus with reference to divorce is clear. Divorce is sin. To marry a divorced person is to commit adultery, as He explained to His disciples when they asked Him about it. But this applies to the guilty party. In His view, adultery per se dissolved the marriage bond. The innocent party is free. For that party to remarry is then permissible. He therefore associates Himself with the school of Shammai, which admits divorce on grounds of adultery.

But this was not the question specifically before the Pharisees in asking the question. They hoped to trap Jesus into some disagreement with the Law. He avoids this trap by citing the older, more fundamental Law, but gives no comfort to the Pharisees, by immediately abrogating, in His own right, 1. 10:10-12.
altho with Biblical approval, the very provision about which the two schools had been arguing. Thus, He again proves Himself to be a good Jew, living by the Law, but at the same time Master of that Law.

We now come to the most difficult part of Jesus' relationship with the Law, the controversy that arose over the washing of hands before eating. The dispute was not over a matter of cleanliness, but over ceremonial purification. This rite was enjoined upon the Levites by the Law, but not upon the Jews as a whole. However, large numbers of the Pharisees had voluntarily assumed this practice, in accordance with the general principle of separation. The practice was therefore an extension of the written and the oral Law both, to include ordinary meals, and to include laymen as well as priests. However, it was on the basis of this extension of the oral Law that the Pharisees attack the practice of Jesus' disciples of neglecting the lustrations. They refer here specifically to the traditions of the elders."

Jesus' reply clearly indicates His position regarding the oral Law. He does not deny that it might be beneficial, he does not abrogate it. The traditions might in themselves be good. But He proceeds to attack the Pharisees on the ground that they have followed slavishly the traditions of men, with too little regard to the commandment of God. This is another way of saying that the important things after all
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is the written rather than the oral Law. To extend the provisions of the Law to classes for which it was not intended does little honor to the Law. Further, when such extensions are observed, while the weightier matters of the Law are ignored, as the Pharisees condone in the practice of Corban, following the traditions becomes positively harmful.

Thus, as a matter of the Law, Jesus here maintains His position as a good Jew, loyal to the Law, as given, in its original signification, without the extensions provided by Rabbinic theology. As Montefiore admits, "observance of the human traditions has led to the violation of the commands of God." Men become too interested in trivial things, and leave undone the great matters.

But in assailing the Pharisees on this point, Jesus has set Himself against another and cherished dogma of the Pharisees. That is, that the oral Law is basically the unbroken tradition of the elders or scribes. To thus deny this authority, was to deny the principle of the oral Law, and thus vitiate the whole Pharisaic position. The literal and tiresome series of quotations by which the scribes sought to give authority to their teachings is entirely repudiated. In this, Jesus is still a Jew, but of a different spirit from that of the Scribes. His succession is rather prophetic than Rabbinical.

With reference to the remainder of the passage under consideration, we have noted in a prior chapter than this

section deals with what we have called His "anticipatory teaching." Modern Liberal Judaism attempts to annex this part of Jesus' teaching, without admitting His right to Lordship. The principle contained in vs 15 is said by Montefiore to be "worthy to stand side by side with Hosea 6:6, and is to my mind one of the most truly original sayings, if not the most original saying, in the Synoptic Gospels." However, he finds this a "difficult saying" in its context, and is obliged to do many things to the text to rid it of its logical implications. This difficulty is avoided, and the congruity of our Lord's teachings preserved, if we note that the teaching was given to the disciples after the departure of the Pharisees, and that it clearly looks forward to the Kingdom. The editorial comment of Urmucus, "This he said, making all meats clean," is clearly for the edification of the Church, for which, as we have seen, Mk is writing.

The religion of Jesus was that of Judaism, therefore, but not that of Pharisaic Judaism, nor that of the Sadducees, nor of any other sect among them. He conformed to the Law, was admitting as a Rabbi in the Synagogues, won respect among the people as such, paid His Temple tax, and participated in the rites of the Passover at Jerusalem, all as an orthodox Jew. He accepted the Law as inspired, the word of God, in which He included the Psalms, as well as Pentateuch and
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Prophets. He found in the Law the essential training for entry into the Kingdom of God. He approved the Ten Commandments, and commended them to those who would seek the Kingdom. He lived so well under this Law, that none dared prefer charges against Him, even in the heated days of the Trial. With reference to the Oral Law, this too He accepted to the degree that it did not obscure the inner and true meaning of the written Law. He observed it, but as a Master, reserving the right to abrogate it when it proved harmful to men. The only times when He came into conflict with the oral Law was when that instrument was tortured into a means of avoiding the true implications of the original Law. But, further, even the written Law He regarded as being in places temporary; in which cases He did not hesitate to change it.

Jesus was a Jew. But the living of His religion was only part of His work. The Urmarcus does not attempt to show us how a good Jew ought to live, altho it does incidentally show us how a perfect Jew did live. Beyond Judaism lay Christianity. Jesus was a Jew that He might earn the right to found the greater religion, of which He is Lord.
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THE ARGUMENTATION IN URMARCUS

The earliest Gospel, first edition of our Mark, is not merely a life of Jesus. It is a picture of Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God. It is not intended to be an historical treatise, except in-so-far as history is called in to assist in presenting that picture. It might well be called a study in personality. It exists for a purpose, that of demonstrating why Jesus was acknowledged by the primitive Christian community as the Son of God.

Herein lies the significance of the study we have now completed. Jesus is definitely a historical character, as has been demonstrated completely by modern criticism. But to have arrived at this conclusion is not enough. If He is an historical character, then what picture had that earliest age of Him? What did they think of Him, in the days before dogma had time to form, before traditions obscured His figure, before the community began to assign the origin of rites to Him? What, in short, was the nature of this man? "Whom say ye that the Son of Man is?"

Suppose that all we knew of Jesus was what is in the Urmarcus, the earliest document dealing with Him? What is the total impression of the varied richness of that brief treatment? What was Jesus to His own time?

1. e.g., Case, The Historicity of Jesus.
Jesus in the Urnarios is unmistakably a man approved of God. He hungered, thirsted, tired, rested, slept. He is moved by emotions of life—love, anger, pity, compassion, wonder, severity, indignation, tenderness toward children. He fears the Cross, He prays. Some things He does not know. He learns, perceives, hears, questions. His relentless energy drives Him long distances, fills His days with teaching and ministry.

He creates a stir among people which cannot be ignored. He disturbs comfort. He confutes the local Rabbis. He attracts the attention of the Sanhedrin. He draws fire from Herod. He drives the desecrators out of the Temple. He fills Pilate with wonder. He drives the heathen centurion to a confession of His deity.

He does deeds which no man then or now can explain. As the Pharisees of old, some today may deny them; but none can explain why the unprejudiced believed Him and His works. He is master of minds, souls, and nature. He treats devils as real. He heals all kinds of diseases. He drives devils out of Jews and Gentiles alike, at home and abroad. He is master of swelling seas and foods for the multitude. He restores withered limbs, drives out fever, and casts out the hired mourners that He may calmly restore life to the corpse cold in death.

None the less are the people astonished at the teaching of this One. Accustomed to the cold, formalistic, legalism and casuistry of the Scribes, Jesus' teachings seem to them
fresh, original, divine. Familiarity has served in these
days to make us forget the tremendous novelty of that clear
voice in religion. Others had used parables, but none
such as He. By these parables He concealed the truth from
those unable to know it, but revealed it to those who were
spiritually receptive.

He is the Bridegroom, the Son of Man, the Son of God,
the Messiah. Of nothing else were the disciples of the
earliest age so sure. This surity changed them from timid,
uncertain, instable disciples to bold, positive, firm Apostles
of His Lordship. In His person He forgave sins, broke the
traditions of the Sabbath, designating Himself the Lord of
even Sabbath, abrogated the distinction between clean and
unclean, established the principle of taboo, denies a place
in the Kingdom to the divorce sanctioned by Moses and the
modern social prophets, cultivated sinners and brought in the
time of the Kingdom of God.

The two great ordinances of the Church are provided in
Urmarius. The Communion definitely, in detail, with in-
finitely vivid command. The Baptism, by His own example,
and in the original ending now lost. The Kingdom is a
voluntary association of redeemed men, entering thru one
ordinance, maintained in spiritual fellowship with the now
risen Christ in the other. The mission of the Kingdom is
to preach the Gospel to the whole of mankind, individually.
Thus the Kingdom comes in power. But eventually the Kingdom
is to come in fullness, when the world shall have accepted
the Lordship of the Messiah. That is the day of the Second Advent, whose date no one knows but the Father. Meantime, the kingdom, beginning as a grain of mustard seed in size, will grow silently and unobserved into power and wealth of spirit. This growth is at once intensive and extensive, individual and social. The kingdom is at once subjective, in the willingness of men to do the provisions of divine law, and objective, in the visible organization of His disciples for fellowship, worship, witnessing and work.

But He is such a Messiah as no Jew could ever dream—such an one indeed which the modern Church is unwilling to accept or follow. He was a Messiah of the nature of the suffering servant. He was the Messiah of the Gospel of the Cross. Victory must be won not according to the wisdom of the world, nor yet according to the wisdom of the Scribe and Pharisee and Sadducee. Human virtue is in surrender to the will of God. The Resurrection depends upon identification of the human with the divine will. Eminence in the Kingdom is not to be won, but to be graciously bestowed upon those who have forgotten then meaning of the world "dominion", save in so far as that term is applied to God. The great bone of contention among those who from then until now reject His Messiahship, is this doctrine of selflessness and suffering, surrender and the Cross. The cup of which He drank is still full to the brim, waiting for those to drink who love Him sufficiently to taste of His drink.

There is no "Corban" in His Kingdom. One may not be
released from duty on the ground of religious oaths. There is no conflict of ethics and religion in Christianity. If this and that be not ethical, neither is it religious. It must be integrated into perfect harmony of life with the will of God, which is to be voluntarily assumed as one's own.

The reason for the suffering of the Messiah, as given in Urnarcus, is not argued, but stated. God has decreed, in His Providence, that the service of man required this supreme act of suffering. There is no doctrine of the atonement here, but a clear statement of the fact of the atonement. He is writing too early for theology. He has no rational explanation of Christianity to offer. His is not a picture of any of the eight Christs of Hegbert, but a simple picture of a figure sublimely simple yet inexplicably divine. But what little theology may be implied here, seems to point the truth, that the Gospel of the Cross is the Way of Life in the Kingdom of the Son of Man.

Jesus saw in His own death more than the mere consequences of a reformer's activities among a people unwilling to be reformed. He told the disciples again and again that He would rise from the dead. He even gives them the very date on which they are to expect this d palm oil event. They may wait three days to see Him after they bury Him. Then they may tell of the Transfiguration. He appointed a place of tryst with them: "He goeth before you into Galilee; there ye shall see him, as he said unto you." This they thought another deep parable. To their astonishment, it proved a

fact. Thus the Resurrection is the climax of the Urmarsus and his picture. This is the crowning miracle, the highest teaching, the complete demonstration of His Personality. Here in the risen Christ is the answer to the question, "Who then is this, that even the winds and the waves obey Him?"

Jesus in the Urmarsus is no less Sovereign than He is in John's Gospel, altho the method in Urmarsus is not that of assertion, but that of historical demonstration. Jesus calls to Himself whom He would. He summoned the Scribes and Pharisees and they came. He disposes of the property of others as a Sovereign; destroying swine, appropriating asses. "The Lord hath need of him" is the only explanation given to the owner of the ass. He summons men to leave all they have and follow Him; they obey. He considered it no exorbitant demand to require of men their lives, a life of service and hardship, and of all hope for human preferment. He summons men not to a "cause", or to an "ideal", or to "eternal principles of spiritual religion." Rather, He summons them to Himself, as absolute Lord, without reserve. For such devotion, His own approval is sufficient reward.

He is the physician, the bridegroom, the lamp, the Lord of the House who is going away for a time and sets His servants to watch, the shepherd, the Father: "Daughter, thy faith hath saved thee"; "My child", He addresses the man with palsy; "Children, how hard it is to enter into the Kingdom of God", He says to His disciples; "Little daughter, arise" He speaks to the spirit-empty temple of the little daughter of Jairus.
His own favorite name for Himself, in Urmarcus, is Son of Man. It has the definite article. He so speaks of Himself when He forgives sins, designates Himself as home- less, assumes Lordship over Sabbath, and offers Himself for the sins of the world. That He did not mean "man" or "man- kind" is obvious; no man in his proper senses goes around calling himself the human race. Instead, Urmarcus represents Jesus as Son of Man in the perfect, divine sense. To be a perfect man is to be perfectly divine, it would seem. Thus, He can speak for humanity. He knows from experience what is good for man. He understands man, by virtue of this quality or essence of kinship with him. So understanding him, the Son of Man may judge, as well as atone for, men.

This admixture of human and divine in one Personality has given trouble to theologians from the beginning. But that is no concern of Urmarcus. He is presenting a picture of the Man, regardless of difficulties of catalogueing Him. His human tenderness and understanding is as vividly portrayed in Urmarcus as in Luke, the Gospel which won the Greek world. But His divine majesty is as strikingly pictured in Urmarcus as in the Fourth Gospel, which wins moderns to His allegiance. This divine nature of Jesus in nowhere more strikingly seen than in the question He proposed to the people about the Son of David. The blind man had just appealed to Him as Son of David. He now points out to the crowds that Messiah is One who, even tho of Davidic lineage,
will require from even that most famous of Kings, an obedience and humble reverence just as He requires such of all men, even to the least.

The Jews rejected Jesus, under the leadership of the Sadducees in control of the High Priesthood, not so much because He claimed to be the Christ of David and the Prophets, nor yet because He was a suffering Christ, but because He claimed so much as included within His Messiahship. He modified the Law, or abrogated it, at will. He set it aside as a permanent thing. He spake with authority on the most delicate proposition of men's lives, their religion.

He calmly demands the surrender of their freedom. All mankind, according to the parable of the Vineyard, are bond-servants of Messiah, who is the Beloved Son of the Lord God.

As such Jesus lived according to this earliest picture. He summons men, but does not force them, to His service of God thru sacrifice. This membership in the Kingdom is voluntary. Those who receive Him, receive Him that sent Him. He is the Son, whom angels themselves shall hasten to obey when the time comes to gather His elect. Meanwhile, Peter and those who follow thru the ages are to feed the lambs and the sheep, tending the flock, building the Kingdom, watching for it, expecting the Lord's return, until in His own good pleasure this consummation shall be seen.

No other case in all the history of religion may be seen in which the disciples of any prophet deified that leader in his own age, among his own people, including in the list...
his own personal friends and kinsmen, within so short a
time after his death, with such certainty, without literary
devices, without dogmatics, with such absolute fidelity to
detail both favorable and unfavorable to their own positions,
amissions, hopes and fears, and in which the object of their
common life among men becomes within a few days the subject
of their deepest worship and most devotion.

The argumentation in Urmarcus is, then, the presentation
without prejudice of the picture of the historical figure
of Jesus of Nazareth, as remembered by those who knew Him
best, both in Jerusalem and in Galilee. The Gospel is thus
objective, vivid, concrete. While this treatment does not
enable us to know the inner life of our Lord so well as does
the Gospel of John, it does enable us to know how His own
generation became convinced that He was the Christ.

And for ourselves, the value of the Urmarcus lies in
the very objective nature which makes it so little of value
for a study of Jesus' inner biography. For, on only one
ground may we explain their conviction that He was the divine
Christ, who rose from the dead and was exalted to God's right
hand; and that ground is, that this was actually what happened.
Those who lived then were in the best position to know. They
had nothing to gain by imposture. They had everything to
lose by being deceived. We must take their historical and
critical investigations of the claims to Jesus at their fact
value.
Finally, attention should be directed toward the unstudied skill of the author of Mark, a skill not of the literary art, but born of the very greatness of his theme. In simple dignity he opens the scene on Jesus’ life by recounting His Baptism and the approval of God’s voice, in which He is called “Son.” Beginning to preach, He settled in Capernaum, where He confounded men by both deeds and teachings which no man could explain save as being from God. These miracles, for the most part humanitarian, yet with a deeper apologetic lesson behind them, demonstrates Jesus’ control over all things within the world, demons, souls, minds and nature. He then selects a few for special training, and who shall be His witnesses to His Person. He then gives some sample teachings, anticipatory of the coming Kingdom of God. These arouse animosity among the religious leaders, who conspire against Him, and finally bring about His arrest and death on the charge of blasphemy. Meanwhile, His anticipatory teachings have modified the ancient and supposedly immutable Law of the Jews, even among their own orthodox number who have rejected their Messiah. The now risen Christ then appears, demonstrates His resurrection as a fact, and assumes a Living Lordship of religion. The Church is then set to win the world to His Lordship.

Such is the simple, dignified, yet powerful, compelling thesis of the earliest document dealing with our Lord’s life. It presents, in the language of Mark’s aged friend John the Apostle, the Word of God become Flesh, dwelling among men.
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