

JESUS AND THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

The Study of a Pre-Markan Sayings Tradition.

Elaine Jennifer Blakey, B.A.(Newcastle-upon-Tne)

(Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of Ph.D.)

## PREFACE.

The thesis is concerned with a sayings tradition that is discernible in the text of the Markan Gospel. I have given the thesis the title, 'Jesus and the Gospel of Mark' because the evangelist appears to be aware of handling a very early Jesus tradition, quite possibly originating with Jesus himself. It is hoped that this study will throw some new light on the subject of the origins and methods used in the creation of the earliest Gospel Tradition.

In an attempt to unravel the layers of traditions in the Markan Gospel in order to establish this sayings tradition, it has been necessary to question the whole nature of the documentary hypotheses. It is far beyond the scope of the thesis to propose an alternative theory, although a different approach to the Synoptic problem has been suggested in the light of this inquiry.

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to all who have assisted me in my research. In particular, I would like to mention my supervisor, Prof. Max Wilcox, who initiated me into the delights of New Testament studies during my undergraduate days and has been a source of unfailing encouragement and help to me. I hope that Professor Wilcox finds in this thesis some measure of reward for his inexhaustable patience and time he has lavished on me.

Next, I would like to mention my parents, whose utter confidence in me made me continue when I felt my task was impossible, and John, who took over the task of support and encouragement as part and parcel of our marriage contract.

Finally, I extend my thanks to friends at the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne who have been of great help in many practical ways.

July 1976

Elaine Blakey.  
Leicester.

CONTENTS.PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS.

p.viii

I) INTRODUCTION.

p.1

- 1) Critical Methods, Mark and the Synoptic tradition. p.3
- 2) Criteria to Distinguish Pre-Markan Tradition. p.7
  - i) Stereotyped Forms.
  - ii) Discrepancies between Pericope and saying.
  - iii) Inconsistent Stages of Traditional Development.
- 3) General Assessment of Narrative and Sayings Tradition. p.10
- 4) Criteria to Distinguish Authenticity. p.18
- 5) Previous Treatment of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* Formula. p.26
- 6) The Distribution of *καὶ ἔλεγεν*. p.30
  - i) The Grammatical implications of *ἔλεγεν*.
  - ii) The Distribution of *ἔλεγεν* in the Synoptic Gospels.
  - iii) Note on the Presence of *ἔλεγεν* in the Old and New Testaments (excluding the Synoptic Gospels).
- 7) The Aims and Considerations of this Inquiry. p.38

II) THE STUDY.

- 1) The Passion Predictions (a test case). p.39
  - i) The First Passion Prediction. p.41  
Mk.8:31 (Mt.16:21, Lk.9:22)
  - ii) The Second Passion Prediction. p.53  
Mk.9:31 (Mt.17:22, Lk.9:44)
  - iii) The Third Passion Prediction. p.63  
Mk.10:33-34 (Mt.20:18-19, Lk.18:31-33)
  - iv) The Resurrection Sayings p.75
  - v) Concluding Remarks. p.85
- 2) The Parables. p.89
  - i) The Meaning of *παράβολα*. p.89
  - ii) The Use of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* / *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* in Mark 4. p.92
  - iii) Mk.4:1-20, 7:14-23. p.95



iv)	Mk.4:21-32.	p.110
	a) 4:21-25                      b) 4:26-32	
v)	Two Further 'Parables'.	p.120
	a) Mk.2:27-28                      b) Mk.3:23-27	
vi)	Concluding Remarks.	p.132
3)	The Narratives.	p.134
i)	Pronouncement Narrative Sayings.	p.135
	a) Mk.6:4                      b) Mk.7:27                      c) Mk.8:21	
	d) Mk.11:17	
ii)	Integral Narrative Sayings.	p.150
	a) Mk.6:10-11                      b) Mk.14:36	
iii)	Concluding Remarks.	p.160
4)	Further Sayings.	p.163
i)	Sayings Closely Connected with the Terms διδάσκω/διδάχη.	p.163
	a) Mk.12:35-37                      b) Mk.12:38-40	
	c) Concluding Remarks.	
ii)	Isolated καὶ ἑτέραν Sayings.	p.171
	a) Mk.7:9-13                      b) Mk.9:1	
	c) Concluding Remarks.	

### III) A SURVEY OF THE MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE καὶ ἑτέραν p.182 TRADITION.

1)	Sayings Forming the Basis for Church Formulations.	p.183
i)	Mk.6:10-11	p.184
ii)	Mk.7:15	p.186
iii)	Mk.9:31	p.188
iv)	Mk.12:35	p.189
v)	Mk.14:36	p.190
2)	The Use of καὶ λέγει Sayings in Relation to the καὶ ἑτέραν Tradition.	p.192
3)	Methods of Interpretation used within the καὶ ἑτέραν Tradition.	p.199
4)	The Extent of the καὶ ἑτέραν Tradition Recorded in Mark.	p.202
i)	Sayings Linked Together.	p.203
ii)	Extended Blocks of καὶ ἑτέραν Sayings.	p.204
iii)	Evidence for Limited Recording of the Tradition.	p.205
5)	Concluding Remarks.	p.208

IV) THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE *καὶ ἑλεγε* TRADITION AND THE MARKAN CONTEXT. p.209

- 1) Sayings at Variance with the Markan Context. p.210
  - i) Mk.4. p.211
  - ii) Mk.3:20f. p.213
  - iii) Mk.12:35f. p.215
  - iv) Mk.7:24f. p.215
- 2) The Original Meaning of the Sayings Altered by their Contexts. p.218
  - i) Mk.2:23-28. p.218
  - ii) Mk.9:1. p.219
  - iii) Mk.9:31. p.220
  - iv) Mk.12:35f. p.222
- 3) Methods Used to Draw Attention to the Sayings. p.224
  - i) The Use of the Introductory Formula. p.224
  - ii) The Presence of Indirect and Direct Discourse. p.225
  - iii) The *καὶ λέγει* Interpretations. p.228
- 4) Concluding Remarks. p.230

V) THE *καὶ ἑλεγε* TRADITION AND THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION. p.231

- 1) The Mark/Q Overlaps. p.233
  - i) Mk.3:20-30, 6:6-13. p.233
  - ii) Mk.4:21-25, 4:30-32. p.239
- 2) Isolated Sayings Containing Minor Agreements. p.248
- 3) Concluding Remarks. p.254

VI) THE *καὶ ἑλεγε* TRADITION OF MARK AND ITS RELATION TO MATTHEW AND LUKE - SOME PROBLEMS. p.255

- 1) The Use of *ἑλεγε* in Luke. p.255
- 2) Aramaisms in Matthew and Luke not found in the Markan Tradition. p.266

VII) GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

p.273

VIII) A LIST OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE *Ēlgyev* MATERIAL IN  
THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

p.276

IX) BIBLIOGRAPHY.

p.282

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS.

BT.	<u>Biblical Theology.</u>
BJRL.	<u>Bulletin of John Rylands Library.</u>
BZ.	<u>Biblische Zeitschrift.</u>
CBQ.	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly.</u>
Ex.T.	<u>Expository Times.</u>
HUCA.	<u>Hebrew Union College Annual.</u>
JBL.	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature.</u>
JR.	<u>Journal of Religion.</u>
JTS.	<u>Journal of Theological Studies.</u>
NT.	<u>Novum Testamentum.</u>
NTS.	<u>New Testament Studies.</u>
SJT.	<u>Scottish Journal of Theology.</u>
NTS.(BULL),	<u>Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas. (Bulletin).</u>
TDNT.	<u>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.</u>
TZ.	<u>Theologische Zeitschrift.</u>
ZNW.	<u>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.</u>
ZTK.	<u>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.</u>

I.

## INTRODUCTION.



The twilight period of creative Gospel development lying behind our canonical Gospels is sufficiently revealed to stimulate much speculation but, to a large extent, eludes constructive conclusions. Form critical analysis of Gospel material has indicated existing collections of elements of tradition behind the present Gospels, originally independent of one another. These elements comprise, on the one hand, sayings, parables and discourses (1), and on the other, rudimentary frame-work and narratives dealing with the events in Jesus' life (2). Therefore, to find a way into one such collection and establish its pre-Gospel independence would be the first step towards building up our scanty knowledge of Gospel development. Such a collection would constitute a pivot between the original tradition and its present form in our Gospels.

Many traditional units and collections have been cited. All have one fact in common; the tradition has been absorbed in block form by the Evangelists. This is not due to any lack of imagination or intuition on the part of the Evangelists, but such a formidable subject must be carefully approached. Such selective methods have produced certain useful results, albeit limited ones. These conclusions must now be used to form the starting point for further investigations.

---

1) The existence of these elements of tradition is clarified by R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford, Blackwell, 1972 as Apophthegms and dominical sayings and by M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, London, Nicholson and Watson, 1934, as Paradigms.

2) Again, in Form Critical terms: Miracle stories, Tales and Legends.



It is proposed that this inquiry should consider a possible traditional collection, whose presence is indicated by the recurrent appearance of a stereotyped form, rather than a block of material. For this purpose, the introductory formula *καὶ ἔλεγεν (αὐτοῖς)*, which is largely confined to the Gospel of Mark, has been selected as an obvious example of such a recurring formula.

It is necessary to present the general problems for this inquiry in the next few pages and possible resolutions to them, before concentrating upon the specific introductory formula.

# 1) CRITICAL METHODS, MARK AND THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION.

Consideration of traditional material used in the composition of the Gospel of Mark has been limited. In the first place, the statement of Eusebius (1): *Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτῆς Πέτροῦ γινόμενος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ ἀχθέντα ἢ παρθέντα* seems to leave no grounds for further traditions to supplement the Gospel (2). A second long-established opinion, that Matthew was the first written Gospel, took Mark to be just an abbreviated account of Matthew. The differences between the two gospels were explained as a process of redaction, thereby leaving little room for the presence of other Markan sources (3).

In this century, the general acceptance of the two document hypothesis and Markan priority has done little to encourage any Source Critical studies on Mark itself. Whereas Matthew and Luke have a starting point in Mark, the Markan Gospel has no such text for comparison. Nevertheless, an interest in the early Gospel traditions and their subsequent formulation in the finished canonical Gospels has led to some research into the question of the possible presence of traditional material in the Markan Gospel. Two literary studies illustrate the basic line of the

---

1) Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine, III 39:15, Papias is quoted.

2) The exact meaning of *ἐρμηνευτῆς* is dubious and could suggest something more than simple memorization.

3) In the last few years there has been a revival in a sympathetic study of Matthaean priority. It is possible that renewed interest in Matthaean priority and its relationship to the other Gospels may throw new light on Markan sources.

research into Mark. A.T.Cadoux (1) proposed that three sources covered the vast proportion of material in Mark. These three sources reflect distinct periods in the Church's development; ie. the Palestinian Gospel, the Gospel of the Dispersion and the Gentile Gospel. Large portions of these sources have been interwoven to create the present form of the Gospel. Cadoux (2) commented upon the Form Critical school's failure to recognise the existence of extensive source material lying behind the Gospel. Knox (3) in his study of Markan sources also stressed the limitations of Form Criticism in neglecting the Evangelist's ability to use source material and work it into the Gospel framework. Knox cites many sources which have been acknowledged prior to his study. The sources fall predominantly into unified blocks which follow on from one another in the Markan framework. The concept of sources being absorbed, almost untouched, into a Gospel account, with little evidence of editorial reworking has, to some extent, been rectified by the advent of Redaction Criticism.

Form Criticism brought into prominence the activity of the Church in formulating isolated units of tradition, and Literary Criticism, the prominence of pre-Gospel sources. In both cases the role of the Evangelist was reduced to a mere compiler of existing material. Redaction Criticism pioneered the Evangelists'

---

1) A.T.Cadoux, The Sources of the Second Gospel, London, J.Clarke and Co, N.D.

2) A.T.Cadoux, ibid., p.15

3) W.L.Knox, The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels: Mark, vol.I, Cambridge, CUP, 1953, p.1



claim to originality. An interest arose in how Mark the Evangelist handled his material rather than in the material itself.

Nevertheless, the same problem confronted the students of Redaction Criticism as it did those of Literary Criticism: how to compensate for the lack of written sources for Mark. The two document hypothesis again hindered any unbiased research. However, Redaction Critical methods can be turned to good use in a literary study of Markan material. The general isolation of elements which can be termed 'redactional' has left a large proportion of 'unclaimed' material. From this material Perrin (1) and Fuller (2) amongst many, have found a spring-board to the pre-Markan tradition. The absence of Markan traits alone does not automatically suggest the presence of authentic tradition, so supplementary criteria have to be established to support the possibility that certain passages in Mark are traditional.

To begin any study it is necessary to establish working propositions. The application of critical methods to the Markan Gospel in order to reveal pre-Markan tradition has highlighted two major weaknesses. In the first place, pre-conceived notions concerning Synoptic dependence have led to a premature abandonment of the quest for pre-Markan traditions. It is possible that the tables might be turned, and a study of Markan material on equal terms with Matthew and Luke could throw light upon the relationship

---

1) N.Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, London, SCM., 1967, p.35f.

2) H.H.Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London, Collins, 1969, p.16f.

between the Synoptic Gospels rather than fit the Gospels initially into a prior mould. It is, therefore, intended that the study of Markan texts will not be submitted to any pre-conceived plan. To see Mark's Gospel as an equal companion with Matthew and Luke will not only help to elucidate pre-Markan material but may result in a reappraisal of Synoptic dependence.

The second problem is concerned with supplementing Redaction Critical methods. These criteria fall into two categories:

- a) criteria to distinguish pre-Markan tradition from the hand of the Evangelist, (this material could be termed Primitive Tradition),
- and b) criteria to determine if the pre-Markan tradition is part of the original Jesus Tradition, (this material could be called Authentic tradition).

## 2) CRITERIA TO DISTINGUISH PRE-MARKAN TRADITION.

Naturally, Redaction Criticism highlights all material that is devoid of Markan redaction. When dealing with sayings which represent a small part of a larger context, the absence of redactional elements on its own is very insubstantial evidence. It is necessary, in such cases, to supplement Redaction Critical analysis. The following criteria are suggested.

### i) Stereotyped Forms.

This is particularly appropriate for introductory formulas (1). The recurrence of a particular form is of interest, especially if it appears where no introduction is necessary; eg. in the middle of a discourse, thus making a definite break between preceding sayings material and the subsequently re-introduced saying.

An introductory phrase, seen as a stereotyped form by some, is explained by others as an editorial feature. The recurrence of a form would seem to justify this opinion. However, two observations negate this argument. In the first place, the stereotyped forms are not always the sole prerogative of one Gospel (2). Secondly,

---

1) cf. λέγει Ἰησοῦς which appears to be the recurring introductory formula in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri. J.B. Wright, Alterations of the Words of Jesus, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1952, p.14 suggests the use of λέγει represents a reasonable attempt at quotation. Also H.A. Guy, 'A Sayings-Collection in Mark's Gospel', JTS., 42, 1941, pp.173-6 states that the use of regular formulas for quotations suggests a reference to a collection of sayings.

2) cf. the distinctiveness of the ἀμὲν formula in the gospels.  
Mkn sayings (par.) with ἀμὲν form: 9:21, 10:15, 29, 13:30.  
Mkn sayings (Mt. only) with ἀμὲν form: 9:11, 23, 41, 14:9, 18.  
Mkn sayings (Lk. only) with ἀμὲν form: 12:43?



it must be remembered that although this inquiry is concentrated upon one particular introductory form, that form is by no means the only one. Terms such as τὸ ὄρος, ἡ ἐρημος, ὁ βίβλος, (1) could reflect the presence of stereotyped forms, where traditional material has been inserted into the Gospel framework.

ii) Discrepancies between Pericope and Saying.

Although some sayings are preserved in apparent isolation from any context or setting, it is the occasions where both narrative and sayings tradition merge that detailed contradictions occur. It is natural to assume that a saying within a pericope should form a harmonious unit with the narrative. Therefore, discrepancies arising between the narrative and saying within the same pericope are not easily explained. The full implications of this criterion will be revealed within the course of this inquiry.

iii) Inconsistent Stages of Traditional Development.

This criterion is akin to the previous one discussed. However, this criterion does not deal with minor details that

---

2) Mkn. sayings with ἀμὴν form (Mt. and/or Lk. without ἀμὴν form): 3:28(Mt.), 8:12(Mt/Lk.), 14:24(Lk.), 14:30(Lk.)  
 Lkn. sayings with ἀμὴν form: 12:37, 23:43  
 Mtn. sayings with ἀμὴν form: 5:18, 6:2,5,16, 10:23,42, 18:18,19, 21:31, 24:34, 25:12,40,45.  
 Mtn sayings with ἀμὴν form found in Lk.without ἀμὴν form: 5:26, 8:10, 10:15, 11:11, 13:17, 17:20, 18:13, 23:36, 24:47?  
 Mtn. sayings with ἀμὴν form found in Mk. without ἀμὴν form: 19:23,24:2  
 Jn. uses ἀμὴν form liberally.  
 1) R.Bultmann, K.Kundsin, Form Criticism, New York, Harper and Bros, 1962, p.26

could easily have been eliminated by editorial reworking.

Gospel Tradition developed in line with a growing Church. There was a need to clarify, expand and modify the Jesus Traditions in order to accommodate this growth. Evidence of different stages of development between saying and narrative tradition will indicate that certain pericopes are composite constructions.

It is really only as a supplement to a Redaction Critical approach to the texts that these criteria are valid. The role of Redaction Criticism is to distinguish the Evangelists' use of existing material. The use of these supplementary criteria is to establish this material as pre-Markan.

In the above criteria, mention is made of a narrative and sayings tradition. Although there is no doubt of a considerable overlap of traditions, these broad categories shed important light on the transmission and development of Gospel Tradition. Particularly interesting to this inquiry is the role of sayings material.

### 3) GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF NARRATIVE AND SAYINGS TRADITION.

The possibility that sayings material was transmitted more conservatively than narrative traditions has not gone unnoticed. Comparisons between Synoptic pericopes comprising both narrative and sayings material have revealed that on a number of occasions the narratives differ widely from one another, whereas the content of the sayings remains constant (1).

An initial impulse is to reject out of hand the extreme view put forward by Reisenfeld (2) and Gerhardsson (3), who claimed Jesus drilled selected disciples to be the memory banks for the first generation of Christians. Nevertheless, there may be a considerable amount of truth underlying this theory. Not only is it possible to imagine that the leaders of the Early Church had a part in crystallising words of Jesus into a form acceptable for recitation and transmission, but that such an aim was close to the heart of Jesus himself (4). It would be very rash to conclude that strict control of the transmission of sayings traditions has led to the preservation of every saying in its original form. It cannot be doubted that sayings were subject to development and refinement, interpretation and modification by the Church.

---

1) E.Schweizer, Jesus, London, SCM., 1971, pp.7-8. R.H.Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1952, p.28

2) H.Riesenfeld, The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings, London, A.R.Mowbray and Co., 1957.

3) B.Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, Upsala, C.W.K.Gleerup, 1961, also, Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity, Lund, C.W.K.Gleerup, 1964.

4) cf. reference to remembering Jesus' words, Mk.14:72 par., Mt.27:63, Lk.24:68, Jn.2:17,22, 12:16, Ac.11:16



Nevertheless, if certain sayings were crystallised at an early stage in Gospel development, it is possible that the additional outer layers of a saying can be peeled off to reveal the saying in its original form. Comparisons within the Synoptic framework will inevitably help to distinguish these layers. In a comparison of the words of Jesus at the Last Supper in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt.26:26-8, Mk.14:22-24, Lk.22:19-20) and I Corinthians 11:23f., Bruce (1) raises the interesting point that 'the main deeds and words are fixed, but interpretive glosses are added and conflation is practised'. These developments are not just arbitrary but are to stress or clarify liturgical points. The continuation of such a practice is witnessed in the later Church presentation of these words (2).

This method of detecting layers of traditions in sayings cannot so easily be applied to narrative material. Although some additional development may be obvious, in a comparison of the Synoptic accounts, the remaining material is by nature a second hand account explaining what Jesus did. Such tradition could quite easily be, and no doubt is, a Church interpretation of Jesus' actions. Therefore, the origins of narrative tradition are shrouded by subjectivity. It would be a fair assessment to make that the development of the sayings tradition is relatively more reliable than that of narrative material both in authenticity and transmission.

The sayings to be found in the Canonical Gospels are an end product of the period of transmission (3). It would be of great

---

1) F.F.Bruce, Tradition Old and New, Exeter, Paternoster Press, 1970, p.33

2) F.F.Bruce, ibid., pp.34-6

3) The written word is a culmination of free and developing oral tradition. It must not be assumed, however, that the written form stopped oral development in its tracks overnight.

value to this inquiry if the form these sayings took prior to their present existence could be discovered. Material is very limited indeed for such a task, but for generalised conclusions the evidence is very promising.

The Pauline Epistles are the most obvious starting point. It is very tempting to deviate from the main line of this discussion and consider the use of the Jesus Tradition in the Pauline corpus. Keeping strictly to the main point at issue, however, a few considerations may be noted. The list of Synoptic sayings paralleled in the Pauline Epistles and set out by Davies, (based on a critical selection of sayings parallels cited by Resch) (1), illustrates Paul's use of cited and uncited sayings. Allusions to words of Jesus are in preponderance to a small handful of those cited. Maybe the Pauline Epistles harbour even more quotations but the Synoptic material can be the only accepted comparison (2). Although a completely untried theory, it is possible that the numerous allusions to the words of Jesus by Paul reflects a use of these sayings akin to a use of the Old Testament texts. On many occasions use is made of the Old Testament quotations without citing reference or introductory form. However, it would be difficult to establish a case that Paul was either ignorant of any sayings of Jesus or chose to ignore them (3). Dibelius (4) and Davies (5)

---

1) W.D.Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, SPCK., 1970, p.138f

2) cf. Ac.20:35

3) R.Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol.I, London, SCM., 1971, p.35.

4) M.Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, London, Nicholson and Watson, 1934, pp.238f.

5) W.D.Davies, op.cit., p.136



associate the presence of words of Jesus in Paul's letters with ethical teaching and claim that the sources for this teaching are to be found in collections of sayings (1). There is evidence of the use of sayings collections in other early Christian documents, cf. 1 Clem. 13:2, Polycarp to the Philippians 2:3, Didache 1:3f. The title 'Didache' itself reflects the nature of the material. Although controversy still continues about the importance of the Gospel of Thomas and its actual date, certain early elements cannot be ignored. In particular, it is of great interest that this document, composed entirely of unconnected sayings, designed to instruct, is called a 'Gospel'(2).

The fact is that sayings collections have been unearthed behind the Synoptic framework. Extreme scepticism concerning the 'Q' source will become obvious within the course of this inquiry, but it is interesting that this material comprises, with one or two exceptions, sayings. Dodd (3) argues with the aid of Synoptic material that sayings material falls under the headings designed for instruction.

Considerable evidence has been produced on the presence of catechetical material in the New Testament. (A Catechism is a precise form of didactic material). Although no New Testament book is a

---

1) also cf. A.M.Hunter, Paul and his Predecessors, London, S.C.M. Press, and Watson, 1940, pp.52-61

2) An interesting exercise would be to qualify the term 'Gospel'. Is it necessary to include narrative material to pass as a Gospel form? Is some form of birth narrative essential? If so, what has happened to Mark and John? Is the witness of Resurrection appearances necessary? Again Mark is sadly lacking.

3) C.H.Dodd, 'The "Primitive Catechism" and the sayings of Jesus', More New Testament Studies, Manchester, MUP., 1968, pp11-29.



catechetical treatise, the labours of Sāwyn (1) and Carrington (2) have revealed that catechetical material lies behind certain passages in the Epistles. Again, it is generally accepted that the words of Jesus form the basis for these Catechisms (3). The problem arising, however, concerns the relationship between the words of Jesus and the Catechism. G.Schille (4) proposes that the catechisms found their origin in the teaching of Jesus, whereas C.F.D.Moule (5) gives evidence to favour the view that catechetical influence was later brought to bear upon sayings of Jesus. Davies (6) is probably correct when he states that words of Jesus both antedate and transcend the use for catechisms.

The common theme, linking all these sayings is that they are a medium for instruction. The existence of this form for transmitting instruction is very credible.

Returning to the words of Jesus in the Pauline corpus, one more point must be raised. Davies (7) sees <sup>these</sup> sayings used purely in terms of didactic rather than kerygmatic material. However, the actual record of the Institution of the Last Supper (I Cor.11:23f.) is surely in opposition to this claim. If the Kerygma is concerned with the role of Jesus as Saviour, surely this section fits the

---

1) E.G.Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, London, Macmillan & Co., 1947, pp.365-466.

2) P.Carrington, The Primitive Christian Catechism, Cambridge, CUP., 1940.

3) cf. D.L.Dungan, The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul, Oxford, Blackwell, 1971, p.xxiii, and A.M.Hunter, op.cit., p.68.

4) G.Schille, 'Bezmerkungen zur Formgeschichte des Evangelium Rahmen und Aufbau des Markus-Evangeliums', NTS., 4, 1957, pp.1-24.

5) C.F.D.Moule, 'The Use of Parables and Sayings as Illustrative Material in Early Christian Catechesis', JTS., 3, 1952, pp.75-9.

6) W.D.Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, Cambridge, CUP., 1964, p.386

7) W.D.Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, SPCK., 1970, p.142

definition perfectly (1). It is necessary to clarify the terms 'Didache' and 'Kerygma'.

Didache and Kerygma. It is generally accepted that the term 'Didache' stands for the transmission of ethical and moral teaching by the Church. Such teaching was really for audiences who were Christian converts or interested listeners (2). Furthermore, it has been suggested that the Church received the basis for its teaching from the sayings of Jesus. Therefore, the transmission of the words of Jesus and the Church's Didache go hand in hand (3).

Although the use of the term 'Didache' is not really disputed, it is closely linked with the more controversial term 'Kerygma'. The content of the Kerygma is the proclamation of Jesus as Messiah and is, therefore, essentially to convince and convert; having basically a missionary setting (4). Although it is probable that the 'Didache' would be of no interest to non-committed audiences, as it tends to deal with the daily running of the Christian community and its moral code, the 'Kerygma' would certainly be of immense interest to recent converts who wished for more knowledge about Jesus, as well as Christians of long-standing. Therefore, the distinction between 'Didache' as a term for Church teaching and 'Kerygma' relating to missionary teaching is not so readily accepted (5).

---

1) D.L.Dungan, op.cit., p.xxxii realises the difficulty I Cor.11:23f. presents.

2) C.H.Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Development, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1935, p.7.

3) This will become evident in the course of this inquiry.

4) C.H.Dodd, op.cit., p.7

5) R.A.Bartels, Kerygma or Gospel Tradition. Which came First? Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing House, 1961, p.101

Another difference between 'Didache' and 'Kerygma', which is more important than its setting and the audience, is the origin of the respective material. Rengstorf (1) clearly defines the areas of origin for both Didache and Kerygma as stemming from the Gospel Tradition. 'Didache', as already stated, originates from the transmission of words of Jesus, and 'Kerygma' from the collections of narrative material. Bartels (2) agrees that the Kerygma is from narrative material and he suggests that the Gospel tradition is basically biographical material rather than sayings. If the Kerygma is wholly the product of narrative material then the origin is once removed from the historical Jesus (3). In this case, Bultmann's (4) statement that the Kerygma masks rather than reveals the original Jesus is quite valid.

However, the opinion that the Kerygma is material about Jesus, rather than from Jesus, does not go undisputed. Jeremias (5) says that the Kerygma must have originated with Jesus. The Early Church acknowledged this by supplementing the Kerygma with the Didache. At no time was there a Kerygma without Didache. Therefore, it can be assumed that Jeremias sees a link between 'Didache' and 'Kerygma' in that the Kerygma owes some of its origins to the Didache. Bartels (6) similarly suggests that the origins of the Kerygma may

---

1) Rengstorf, TDNT, vol.II, p.145.

2) R.A.Bartels, op.cit., pp.38-52

3) cf. R.Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol.I, London, SCM., 1971, p.3, 'Christian Kerygma; ie. a kerygma proclaiming Jesus Christ. He was so proclaimed in the Kerygma of the Early Church, not in the message of the historical Jesus'.

4) cf. the argument for this statement in the previous list of criteria: 'General Assessment of Narrative and Sayings Tradition'.

5) J.Jeremias, The Problem of the Historical Jesus, Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1971, p.14.

6) J.Jeremias, ibid., p.14. R.A.Bartels, op.cit., p.101.



be attributed in part to Jesus.

It will be seen during this inquiry that kerygmatic material is to be found in the sayings of Jesus. Therefore, it is difficult to accept the neat dividing line between Kerygma and Didache. The definition of 'Didache' as moral teaching and 'Kerygma' as proclamation about Jesus is plausible. Although the Didache is of more interest to the Church, the Kerygma gains an audience for believers and unbelievers alike. Neither the Didache nor Kerygma can claim prior existence, nor one form the basis for the other. Both areas of instruction originate with Jesus and both contain a wealth of development.

#### 4) CRITERIA TO DISTINGUISH AUTHENTICITY.

It must now be decided to what stage in the development of the Gospel Tradition these sayings are to be attributed. So far, our criteria have helped to isolate pre-Markan material. Now it is necessary to distinguish between the various stages of Church development and interpretation.

Words of Jesus can reflect elements of development from either a Hellenistic or Palestinian background, or both. It is possible that a saying is completely formulated under Hellenistic influence, in which case, any hope of finding a factual basis for the saying is impossible. On the other hand, a saying of Jesus may reflect only a partial development, in the form of an inserted or appended phrase which can be separated from an earlier stratum of material. Such 'stripped' sayings could be examples of authentic sayings.

A step-back from the Hellenistic influence (1) into the Palestinian world brings both its advantages and disadvantages. Clearly, many of the authentic sayings would reflect the contemporary Jewish environment, but the reverse is true; the sayings which have originated or been drastically developed by the Jewish community will, in essence, be no different from these sayings of Jesus. Although evidence of a Jewish background brings the formation of sayings closer to the actual words of Jesus, it does not guarantee authenticity.

---

1) The term 'step-back' is used metaphorically not chronologically in this instance for the Jewish and Hellenistic worlds co-existed.

The criteria to be employed in this present investigation have been used in recent studies, in which it is stressed that no one criterion can indicate either authenticity or primitiveness (1). Rather, criteria must be used jointly to gain any measure of objectivity. The first two criteria firmly establish sayings within a Palestinian setting.

a) The presence of semitisms does indicate that the sayings concerned originated in a Jewish rather than a Hellenistic environment. Whether or not semitisms can be a criterion for primitiveness, however, is more difficult to assess.

Recently, Sanders (2) has questioned the widespread use of this criterion of semitisms. From his catalogues of semitisms, Sanders has drawn certain conclusions. To begin with, the list of semitisms in later manuscripts reveals a slight tendency to preserve semitisms in late Gospel texts (3). On a number of occasions, however, this tendency could be the result of texts being copied in a semitic-speaking environment, or conflation of Gospel harmonies (4).

Concerned with the distribution of semitisms in the Canonical Gospels, Sanders queries the opinion many scholars have held, linking the presence of semitisms with the priority of Mark to Matthew and Luke; the general conclusion being that Matthew and Luke correct Markan semitisms. Sanders' list indicates that this

---

1) cf. N. Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, London, SCM., 1967, pp. 32.

2) E. F. Sanders, The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition, Cambridge, CUP., 1969, pp. 190-255.

3) E. F. Sanders, ibid., pp. 228-32.

4) D. L. Dungan, 'The Impact of E. F. Sanders.' Book and a Proposal for Future Research', (paper read at SNTS Conference, August, 1973, as yet unpublished).



theory of de-semitising by Matthew and Luke does not always hold true. Infact, at times, the reverse appears true. Sanders' tendencies of synoptic Tradition are based upon a rigid two document theory. Under this hypothesis, the opinion that semitisms are to be equated with original material does appear difficult to accept. This does not destroy the efficacy of this criterion. It is possible that the distribution of semitisms suggests primitive material in all three Gospels, thus questioning the validity of the two document hypothesis rather than the criterion of semitisms.

Sanders' study of the role of semitisms in the Gospels and textual variants has warned against some pit-falls, but rather than destroying the validity of this criterion, it has provided safeguards against its misuse.

Therefore, a careful use of this criterion can produce a very valid contribution to this study. The presence of semitic names and phrases at once puts sayings into a Palestinian setting. Also, if sayings, put into Aramaic, reveal a pun or some other literary feature not apparent in the Greek, this would further tend to support a view that it was originally Aramaic. Any further indication of minor semitisms within a saying could help to establish such sayings firmly within a Palestinian background. The probability that a saying was originally formed in Aramaic does not immediately imply authenticity, it only opens the possibility to such a claim.

b.) The presence of Old Testament quotations in Words of Jesus can also be a factor for establishing primitive tradition. Initially, many Old Testament quotations must be excluded. Fuller (1) points

---

1) R.H.Fuller, op.cit., p.19.

to the use of Septuagintal quotations which can only reflect a Hellenistic Jewish stratum of the Gospel tradition. Similarly, many Old Testament quotations reflect later thought in justifying certain words and actions of Jesus and developing christological motifs.

On a more positive note some Old Testament references may find an origin in Primitive Tradition. To begin with, targumic quotations reflect a Jewish setting, but as with the presence of semitisms in sayings, they do not necessarily indicate authenticity.

However, it is impossible to know exactly how Jesus used the Old Testament, as quotations have been attached to sayings at later stages of development. There are few pointers to possible original references. Quotations may be original if they form the basis of or are fundamental to an otherwise authentic saying. Also, quotations which are of no benefit to the Early Church or are used within sayings in a way contrary to later Christian interpretation may reflect an authentic text.

If sayings reflect Jewish traits, then further criteria must be produced to build on the possibility that certain sayings indicating this strongly Palestinian Jewish bias may preserve actual words of Jesus.

c) The criterion of dissimilarity, so-called by Perrin (1), finds its roots as far back as the work of Bultmann (2). This criterion operates on the principle that a saying of Jesus must be unique, having links neither with Jewish nor Church thought.

---

1) H. Perrin, op.cit., p.39-43.

2) Acknowledged by Perrin, ibid., p.40.

In this way, Perrin (1) hoped to find an objective method of establishing, with 'reasonable certainty', the beginnings of the Jesus Tradition. He aimed to establish a small nucleus of sayings with this criterion, and then proceed to enlarge the scope of the sayings in the Jesus Tradition by applying further criteria (2).

It is not intended, however, to use this criterion in the exact way proposed by Perrin. For Perrin, this criterion was to establish the extent of the Jesus Tradition as well as determining primitive characteristics. For this inquiry a corpus of sayings is already selected. Therefore, it is not essential to isolate material. Jeremias (3) criticised the criterion of dissimilarity for excluding so many sayings. Although this criticism appears a little harsh on the line of research Perrin was taking, it is a valid observation for the present study of sayings. Therefore, in one respect, the criterion has been modified. It is obvious that words of Jesus would not influence Jewish Literature (4), so any saying finding a parallel with Rabbinic thought must, on the basis of this criterion reflect a Jewish development within the saying. It is not suggested that Jesus made no literary allusions to Rabbinic tradition, but in such cases, other factors have to point independently to the authenticity of the Jesus sayings.

On the other hand, similarity between the words of Jesus and the Church's teaching is not so clear-cut, for it would be ludicrous

---

1) N.Perrin, ibid., p.39.

2) The second criterion is of coherency, pp.43-5, and the third, the criterion of multiple attestation, pp.45-6.

3) J. Jeremias, New Testament Theology, vol.I, London, SCM., 1971, p.2.

4) Material written after Jesus' ministry would be anti-Christian.



could  
to suggest that under no circumstances a saying of Jesus would influence Church teaching. In Perrin's study, the exclusion of any kind of influence in the formulation of a saying is an acceptable premise, but for this investigation, an understanding of the relationship between a saying and Church teaching may help in determining the reason for the existence of such a sayings tradition.

Nevertheless, there is the possibility that sayings were formulated or developed on the basis of Church teaching. It is, therefore, proposed that the presence of any inconsistencies between a saying and Church teaching, relating to the same subject, should act as a qualified criterion of dissimilarity. This would suggest that the saying is prior to the Church's teaching and has not been developed to fit the precepts of subsequent dogma and doctrine. This would indicate the authenticity of the saying.

d) The prominence of teaching in the ministry of Jesus is generally acknowledged. It has been assumed that the parable constitutes the basis teaching form of Jesus (1). It is, therefore, possible that other pedagogic and mnemonic methods of teaching and transmission should be used by Jesus.

Gerhardsson (2) suggests a number of techniques belonging to the oral traditions of the Rabbinic schools which Jesus could have used. These include:

keywords, or linking phrases joining a string of ideas together (3);

---

1) cf. C.H.Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, London, Fontana, 1965, also, J.Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, London, SCM., 1954, etc.

2) B.Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, Upsala, C.K.W.Gleerup, 1961.

3) B.Gerhardsson, ibid., pp.148-53, M.Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1967, pp.160-85.

4) B.Gerhardsson, op.cit., pp.154-5.



a text of scripture used to recall a number of ideas (1);  
a number of key-words, letters or phrases which bring to mind  
longer passages (2); and  
'rhythm' and 'cantillation' in a passage to make an easily memorised  
form (3).

It is unlikely that many examples of the second and third  
methods remain intact in the present written form in the Gospels,  
although hints of these forms may be evident. Evaluation of sayings  
in the light of these transmission techniques could indicate the  
crystallisation of sayings at a very early stage of the Gospel  
Tradition.

e) The final criterion to be suggested is concerned with the  
relationship of the sayings to the narrative tradition. There  
are certain indications that sayings form the basis for the development  
of narratives. Form Criticism has singled out a number of cases  
where a saying is preserved in a narrative setting, whose whole  
purpose is to be a frame on which to hang the saying (4). In  
other cases there exist fulfilment narratives which give 'historical'  
significance to prophetic words of Jesus (5). It is possible  
that sayings of Jesus in some instances do form the basis for  
haggadic development in the Gospel material.

---

1) B.Gerhardsson, op.cit., pp.154-5

2) B.Gerhardsson, ibid., pp.155-6

3) B.Gerhardsson, ibid., pp.156-7. M.Black, op.cit., pp.142-60.

4) ie. Paradigms or Pronouncement sayings.

5) M.Wilcox, 'The Denial Sequence in Mark 14:20-31, 66-71', NTS.,  
17, 1971, pp.426-36; also, 'The Composition of John 13:21-30',  
Neotestamentica et Semitica, ed. E.Ellis, M.Wilcox, Edinburgh,  
T.& T.Clarke, 1971, pp.143-56.

Now that method and criteria have been selected and discussed, it is time to turn to a discussion of the actual sayings which form the basis of this inquiry.

## 5) PREVIOUS TREATMENT OF THE *καὶ ἔλεγεν* FORMULA.

The use of the imperfect *ἔλεγεν* in Mark has not escaped comment in various studies, but no systematic treatment on the use of the phrase *καὶ ἔλεγεν (αὐτοῖς)* has been tackled. What comments have been made are very interesting and it is necessary to enumerate previous discussions on the subject.

Generally, remarks on the *ἔλεγεν* introductory formula have centred around the parables chapter (Mark ch.4), where the abundance of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν (αὐτοῖς)* formula is bound to cause comment. It would appear to be the general opinion of Jeremias (1), Marxsen (2) and Butler (3) that Mar<sup>1</sup> used this introductory form to represent old tradition. Jeremias and Marxsen differentiate between *καὶ ἔλεγεν* material, forming an original traditional source, and *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* introducing additional sayings redacted into the source by Mark. Whether the introductory forms themselves were created by the Evangelist or received by tradition, Jeremias and Marxsen agree that the material Mark uses is traditionally based. The same applies for Butler's case. He sees the introductory form as 'an editorial mannerism when normal connexion has been broken through Mark deserting his source'. It is interesting to note that the source Butler refers to is Matthew. Therefore, Matthew and Mark diverge at this point.

Butler also notes the presence of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν (αὐτοῖς)* formula in passages other than the Markan parables chapter, cf. Mark 2:27, 6:10, 7:9, where the formula appears to initiate words of Jesus rather than expand existing sayings material. Butler

---

1) J. Jeremias, *op.cit.*, p.14 n.11

2) W. Marxsen, 'Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie des Markus', *ZTK.*, 52, 1955, pp.255-71.

3) B.C. Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew*, Cambridge, CUP., 1951, pp.89-90



ascribes to 'normal usage' the presence of *ἐλεγεν* in Mk. 7:27, 6:4, 8:21 but does not justify such clearly defined divisions. There would appear to be no obvious reason why the introductory *καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς* could not represent a divergence from Mark's primary source, whether Matthew or not, in both uses of the formula.

The proposition that the *καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς* formula represents an introduction for traditional sayings material can be traced back to Bultmann. Bultmann (1) notes the use of the formula in Mk. 2:27, 7:9, 9:1.

A different opinion from those stated above is expressed by Gils'. (2) study of Mark 2:23-8//, 'the Plucking of the Corn on the Sabbath'. He notes the obvious interruption into the context made by the introductory formula and saying (Mk.2:27), both of which are absent from Matthew and Luke. The same formula is pinpointed at Mk.4:2,11,21,24,26, 6:10, 7:9, 8:21, 9:1. Gils suggests that the *καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς* formula is a Markan technique for re-working traditional material, which is found faithfully presented in Matthew and Luke. Like Butler, Gils draws attention in these instances to a Synoptic relationship different from the standard two document hypothesis, but unlike Butler, ascribes the differences between Mark and Matthew entirely to redaction rather than any traditional intrusion. However, Gils notes that some Markan sayings are not reflected in Matthew or Luke, cf. Mk.2:27, 4:21,24,26, so it would be very hard to assume re-working of traditional material

---

1) R.Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford, Blackwell, 1972, pp.16-17, p.121.

2) F.Gils, 'Le Sabbat a été fait pour l'homme et non l'homme pour le Sabbat -Mc II:27', RB., 69, 1962, pp.506-23.



present in the Matthaean and Lukan parallels in these cases. Gils' (1) conclusions are drawn from limited data and are probably biased.

A most interesting note by Essame (2), also commenting on the use of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* in the parables chapter, throws a completely new light on the formula. He has noted a similarity between the Hebrew construction *וְאָמַר ה' אֵלֵינוּ* and *καὶ ἔλεγεν*, which recurrently appears in Pirke Aboth and is translated by the imperfect in the Danby Mishnah, (cf., Pirke Aboth 1:2,3,13,14, 2:4,6,7,8,16, 3:11, 15,17,18, 4:3,8,21,22). Essame says that these sayings represent carefully prepared statements which were memorised and handed down. There is little doubt that this form of transmission was a popular method of preserving rabbinic sayings and there is a possibility that this introductory formula *וְאָמַר ה' אֵלֵינוּ* preceded material that was carefully transmitted. It is not a far step from there to reach the possibility that the Early Church preserved and transmitted sayings of Jesus under groups of sayings formulae. The similarity in meaning between *וְאָמַר ה' אֵלֵינוּ* and *καὶ ἔλεγεν* is very appealing.

Evidently, the *καὶ ἔλεγεν (αὐτοῖς)* formula has been seen as a Markan technique for introducing traditional material into his primary source. However, only a limited selection of cases of this introductory formula has ever been discussed at one time. This has not only led to the neglect of many other uses of the formula

---

1) It must be pointed out that no Markan redactional elements are evident in the cited passages (cf. Study) and Gils has no constructive reasoning for disagreeing with the consensus of opinion.

2) W.G.Essame, 'καὶ ἔλεγεν in Mark 4:21,24,26,30', Ex.T., 77, 1965-6, p.121.

but also the presentation of little or no explanation for such a selective process. Essame's suggestion that the καὶ ἔλεγεν formula specifically relates to carefully memorised sayings, opens the way, however precariously, to contemplate the possibility of a defined tradition lying behind this specific sayings formula.

6) THE DISTRIBUTION OF *καὶ ἔλεγεν*.

i) The Grammatical Implications of *ἔλεγεν*.

From a purely grammatical standpoint the imperfect *ἔλεγεν* may be used either to introduce longer discourses or string together additional sayings (1). It cannot be denied that *ἔλεγεν* fits into this pattern on many occasions (cf. Mk. 6:10, 9:31, 11:17, 7:27, 12:35, 14:36). However, if a sayings tradition lies behind the use of the introductory form *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*, it is inevitable that the material would consist of discourses and multiple sayings.

It appears that this grammatical explanation of the use of an *ἔλεγεν* introductory form does not adequately cover its use in Mark. Previous comments on the use of *ἔλεγεν* have not tended to be grammatically orientated (2). Nevertheless, the precise interpretation of *ἔλεγεν* is of some importance to this inquiry.

Two lines of investigation must now be followed. In the first place, it would be rash to equate the presence of *ἔλεγεν* immediately with a pre-Synoptic tradition. Therefore, it is necessary to isolate traditional material from occasions where *ἔλεγεν* is used genuinely to indicate an imperfect in its context. Secondly, the use of *ἔλεγεν* outside the Markan framework must not be ignored, as such peripheral studies usually produce interesting side-lights on the main thesis. As the presence of an *ἔλεγεν* introductory form is so basic to this present inquiry, it is essential

---

1) F. Blass, A. Debrunner, R. W. Funk, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature, Cambridge, CUP., 1961, p. 170(2).

2) cf. previous section: Previous Treatment of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* formula.



that a comprehensive study of the use of the verb is carried out.

ii) The Distribution of ἔλεγεν in the Synoptic Gospels.

ἔλεγεν is part of the verb λέγειν reflecting the past continuous. It can be translated in at least two ways: a) to suggest the process of repetition, ie. 'he used to say', 'he repeatedly said', or 'he kept on saying'; and b) that what someone was saying, motivated a certain action as a consequence (1). The first appropriate test of ἔλεγεν must be its use in Mark's Gospel.

First, there are a few occasions where ἔλεγεν is used to emphasise repetition. The section between Mark 6:14-16 narrates the view of certain people concerning the identity of Jesus. Three groups are first cited and then Herod's view is recorded. It is an interesting fact that the three groups all have their opinions introduced by the verb ἔλεγεν as well as Herod's introduced by ἔλεγεν. Therefore, the correct translation of these phrases would probably be as follows: '...and some were saying that... and others were saying that... but when Herod heard, he kept saying...' This verb is used in a similar way in Mark 15:12,14 where Pilate repeatedly asks the crowd about Jesus' fate. Mark 8:24 relates the words of the blind man, and in this case it could be used as a detailed expression of the excited state of the man who was anticipating the idea of normal sight. Thus the phrase would run: 'and looking up, he kept saying...' The confessional cry of

---

1) N. Turner, (J.H. Moulton), A Greek Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol. III, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1963, p. 64-67, illustrates the meaning of imperfect tenses along these lines.



the father of the epileptic boy in Mark 9:24 could be a repetitive plea for Jesus to help his son and belongs to the development of the story.

The second use of this verb is to be found in the account of the Geresene madman at Mark 5:8. In this case, it is Jesus speaking. It is apparent from the context that the man's outburst is in response to Jesus' attempt at exorcism. Therefore, this introduction to the saying should run something like: 'For he (Jesus) was saying to him...' Mark, again, records words Jesus spoke which appear to be firmly anchored in the narrative of the woman with a haemorrhage. As in Mark 6:14-16, not only Jesus' words are introduced by ἔλεγεν but the corresponding comment of his disciples also begin with ἔλεγον. It is as if the use of ἔλεγεν in 5:30 forms the beginning of a parenthesis. Jesus turns around, not in consequence of the immediate sensation of withdrawal of strength, but at the request of his disciples. His immediate reaction is to ask his disciples, not the crowd, who touched him. The words could possibly be translated: 'and immediately Jesus knowing in himself power had drained out of him, turned in the midst of the crowd; (he was saying, "Who touched my garment?" and his disciples were saying to him, 'Look at the crowd thronging you"), and said, 'Who touched me?' ' At this point, only when Jesus asks the crowd, does the woman hear Jesus and come forward. Mark 6:18 should read, that because of John's accusation that Herod's marriage to Herodias was unlawful, Herod had John thrown into prison.

The words of the woman in Mark 5:28 can be translated either as an indication of repetition, ie. '...for she kept on saying, "If only I touch his garment I will be healed,"! or similarly,

it could indicate that the woman goes with the crowd to see Jesus in consequence of this suggestion.

A number of conclusions can be drawn from the use of ἔλεγεν in Mark. It is interesting to note that only twice is ἔλεγεν used in its ordinary force for Jesus' words. The other occasions, where ἔλεγεν is used grammatically, are when other people speak. Therefore, all ἔλεγεν introduced sayings in Mark, which are attributed to people other than Jesus, may be left to one side for our purposes.

Furthermore, the exclusion of the above sayings for this inquiry tends to highlight a stereotyped formula even more. Besides the use of the phrase ἔλεγεν δὲ οὕτως in Mark 7:20 and καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῇ in Mark 7:27, where the context necessitates a change in the formula, all noticeable irregular positioning of ἔλεγεν in introducing phrases apart from the stereotyped form καὶ ἔλεγεν (αὐτοῖς) has been omitted. There are a few occasions where the formula is broken by inserted phrases (1), but these are more likely to be due to modification of the formula within a defined setting. Therefore, καὶ ἔλεγεν (αὐτοῖς) would appear to represent the obvious introductory formula for the Markan sayings tradition.

Another interesting fact about those sayings using ἔλεγεν grammatically is that they belong exclusively to narratives and form an integral part of them. It is true that some of the sayings containing the καὶ ἔλεγεν formula are also found in pericopes as

---

1) ie. Mk.7:14 καὶ (προσκαλεσόμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον) ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς...  
 Mk.12:35 καὶ (ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς) ἔλεγεν (διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ)  
 Mk.12:38 καὶ (ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ) ἔλεγεν...



opposed to instructional or teaching blocks, but on a number of occasions these sayings constitute call-lines or pronouncement sayings (1), and, therefore, have precedence over the narrative (2).

The presence of the verb ἔλεγεν in Matthew and Luke must not be neglected.

The use of ἔλεγεν in Matthew is very sparse. In fact, it only occurs three times. Twice he parallels the use of the verb found in Mark 5:28 (Mt.9:21) and 6:18 (Mt.14:4). On both occasions where Matthew reproduces the same tense as Mark, its use is grammatical and does not suggest a knowledge of the Markan καὶ ἔλεγεν (αὐτοῖς) material. The other occasion where Matthew alone records a καὶ ἔλεγεν introduction is in the account of the healing of Jairus' daughter in Matthew 9:23. Jesus is telling the crowd of mourners and players to leave and it is quite possible that ἔλεγεν is used in a continuous sense. Therefore, it is not proven from the use of ἔλεγεν in Matthew that the verb represents a sayings tradition akin to Mark's Gospel.

The use of ἔλεγεν in the Lukan Gospel yields more interesting results. The word to introduce sayings occurs sixteen times. In two cases, the introduction and the sayings are parallel to Mark: Luke 6:5 (Mk.2:27) and 13:18 (Mk.4:30), and in both cases Luke reveals a certain knowledge of the Markan material without explicitly recording it (3). Out of the other fourteen times the verb appears,

---

1) ie., Mk.2:27-8,6:4, 7:27 (esp.T.A.Burkill, 'The Historical Development of the Story of the Syrophoenician Woman', NT., 9, 1967, pp.161-77), 8:21, 11:17.

2) These are Mark 3:23-7, 6:10, 14:36, which appears to be isolated units within a pericope.

3) cf. the section on these Markan καὶ ἔλεγεν texts in the Study.

eight are without any Synoptic parallels (1). Four occasions are not words spoken by Jesus. The use of the verb appears to reflect an ordinary use of ἔλεγεν, similar to that in Mark. Twice in Luke 3:7, 11 the term applies to words spoken by John the Baptist. It would appear from the context that the verb could be translated: 'he used to say'; ie. 3:7 - 'he used to say to the crowds that came to be baptised by him...' and then an example of his message is given. Similarly, in 3:11, '...the crowds saying, "what then shall we do?" and he used to say to them...' and an example answer is given. It would appear that Luke is trying to indicate an outline of John the Baptist's teaching. Another occasion ἔλεγεν is used is within the Parable of the Unjust Steward, and here again, the verb translated as 'he used to say...' fits well the flow of the sentence. The plea of the penitent thief in Luke 23:42 reveals a grammatical use of ἔλεγεν. The criminal repeatedly urges Jesus to remember him.

The use of ἔλεγεν in Luke to introduce sayings is by no means as well preserved as the καὶ ἔλεγεν (αὐτοῖς) formula in Mark. Nevertheless, it appears evident that Luke preserves a small corpus of sayings which derive their form from the καὶ ἔλεγεν sayings material. Not only is an overlapping of tradition to be found in two sayings, but also, the introduction in Luke, as with Mark, is largely confined to the words of Jesus (2).

There is no doubt that Mark, and to a certain extent Luke,

---

1) cf. Lk. 3:11, 12:54, 13:6, 14:7, 12, 16:1, 18:1, 23:42.

2) Only Luke contains an instance of teaching by John the Baptist.



contain an introductory sayings formula which demands explanation. The extent of the formula has been limited. As a further check on the conclusions of this section, an additional note on the use of ἔλεγεν in other New Testament and Old Testament texts must briefly be considered.

iii) Note on the presence of ἔλεγεν in the Old and New Testaments (excluding the Synoptic Gospels).

The limited distribution of ἔλεγεν throughout the New Testament is not sufficient to merit any detailed analysis. Furthermore, besides the Gospel of John and Acts, there is little scope for introductory phrases. In fact, ἔλεγεν only occurs once outside of John and Acts, in Romans 7:7, and this introduces an Old Testament quotation.

It is possible that the presence of ἔλεγεν in John is due in the majority to a stylistic feature of the Evangelist. The imperfect third person plural, ἔλεγον, is used twenty-nine times in John (1), and ἔλεγεν twelve times (2). On a number of occasions, ἔλεγεν/ἔλεγον are found grouped together within a pericope. Also, all but two introductions can be easily explained as grammatically correct (3). Therefore, it seems unlikely that ἔλεγεν in John reflects anything remotely similar to the Markan use of ἔλεγεν.

---

1) Jn. 4:33, 42, 5:10, 6:14, 42, 7:11, 12, 25, 31, 40, 41, 8:19, 22, 25, 9:8, 9, 10, 16, 10:20, 21, 24, 34, 11:36, 56, 12:29, 16:18, 19:3, 21, 20:25.

2) Jn. 2:21, 22, 5:18, 19, 6:6, 65, 71, 8:23, 31, 12:29, 33.

3) Jn. 5:14, 6:65 are difficult to translate and maintain any relevant sense of repetition.

In Acts, only four instances of ἔλεγεν are recorded. Twice, the presence of ἔλεγεν reflects a grammatical use (1). In Acts 28:17, the words συνελερόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἔλεγεν πρὸς αὐτούς ... begins the last Pauline speech. The most interesting use of ἔλεγεν outside the Markan Gospel, however, is to be found in Acts 11:16, where words of Jesus are quoted: ἐμνήσθην δὲ τοῦ ρήματος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς ἔλεγεν Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ. This saying ties up with a saying of the Risen Lord in Acts 1:5. Although it would be impractical on such limited evidence to surmise that the saying in Acts 11:16 reflects the same sayings tradition found in Mark, it may be feasible that the use of ἔλεγεν in both Acts 11:16 and Mark represents a formula for recording words of Jesus.

It would be fruitless and tedious to make a detailed study of the use of ἔλεγεν in the Old Testament. A note on ἔλεγεν / ἔλεγον by Hawkins (2) reveals that the imperfect occurs relatively infrequently in the Septuagint next to other verbs of saying. The forty instances the verb is used, however, indicate that the later Old Testament books tend to lose the imperfect sense of continuity or repetition. A survey of the use of ἔλεγεν in the Synoptic Gospels has shown that the use of the form of the verb to express repetition is by no means extinct in the New Testament times, but the freer use of ἔλεγεν / ἔλεγον in some Old Testament books allows some scope for the use of ἔλεγεν as an introductory formula where a less precise translation of the verb is essential.

---

1) Acts 4:32, 13:25

2) J.C.Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968, p.52.

7) THE AIMS AND CONSIDERATIONS OF THIS INQUIRY.

Now that both criteria and subject matter have been stated, all that is left to be considered in this introductory chapter is the form that this inquiry will take. Basically, the thesis will fall into three sections.

a) A study of the selected texts will concentrate on how far the formula reflects an authentic sayings tradition and what are the characteristics of such a tradition. From this study, two further lines of investigation will be followed.

b) The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition is an example of how Mark viewed and used traditional material. Therefore, an examination of Markan redactional style may be useful for future Markan studies.

c) The presence of a pre-Synoptic Markan tradition has repercussions on the principal Synoptic theories. It is important to place the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition within the context of Synoptic and Gospel development.

II.

THE STUDY.



## THE STUDY:

### 1) THE PASSION PREDICTIONS

The Markan unit 8:27-10:52 contains five of the seven suffering Son of Man sayings recorded in the Gospel (8:31, 9:12, 9:31, 10:33f, 10:45). The other two sayings are placed in near proximity to the Passion story itself (14:21, 14:44). The three Predictions of the Passion (8:31, 9:31, 10:33f), are found in the first unit (8:27-10:52). Of these three sayings, the second Prediction is introduced in Mark by a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* formula. It is intended that this saying should form the test case for this study. The reason for choosing this particular saying as a primary example to develop the case for a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings tradition is the readily available two-fold comparison:

- a) the comparison between the Synoptic Gospels to help evaluate the characteristics of this saying, and
- b) the comparison of the three Prediction sayings found within the Markan Gospel itself.

The three Prediction sayings in Mark are not only concerned with the Passion of the Son of Man, but also with his Resurrection. It is proposed that this two-part logion should be seen as incorporating a Passion saying and a Resurrection saying, which will be dealt with separately. This is not to assume that these two sayings are totally alien to one another and have only been connected under the Evangelist's pen. There is a noticeable tendency in the Synoptic Gospels to record the sayings in isolation from each other. Thus, a number of Passion sayings without reference to the Resurrection are recorded (Mt.26:2, Mk.9:12/Mt.17:12, Mk.10:45 par., Mk.14:21 par., Lk.17:25).

Even within the three Son of Man Passion Predictions, Luke 9:44 records only the passion saying in the second Prediction. In Matthew 27:63, the Resurrection saying, in isolation from the passion saying, is recorded as a saying of Jesus. There is also the difficulty of the two Resurrection formulas: *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας* being found in Mark (also of Mt.27:63) and *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* being found in Matthew and Luke, which suggests two sharply-defined traditions of Resurrection sayings used in conjunction with the passion sayings. Therefore, it will be more profitable to deal with each saying separately and then discuss their relationship to one another.

With the aid of the criteria suggested in the Introduction, each prediction will be examined, within the Synoptic framework, with a view to discerning:

- a) the most probable original form and meaning of the predictions and
- b) the interpretation given to the three sayings by each Evangelist.

Likewise, the same form of approach will be used in dealing with the Resurrection sayings, but this will be dealt with as one individual saying, and not three..



i) THE FIRST PASSION PREDICTION.

Mk.8:31 (Mt.16:21, Lk.9:22)

Only the first Passion Prediction is introduced in the Synoptic Gospels with the term  $\delta\epsilon\iota$ . Tödt investigates the precise meaning of this word and draws the basic concept of the term from the Septuagint rendering of Daniel 2:28 -  $\delta\epsilon\iota$  γενέσθαι ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν (1) The  $\delta\epsilon\iota$ , here, is an interpretation of the future tense in the original Aramaic text. This brings the text into line with an apocalyptic eschatological concept. Tödt finds that the term  $\delta\epsilon\iota$ , employed in the Markan Apocalypse (13:7,10), appertains to the events preceeding the End, and not the End itself. Seeing the Son of Man as an Eschatological figure, he says that the  $\delta\epsilon\iota$  cannot refer to this figure but rather to 'the history of salvation founded in Jesus Christ' (2). Tödt sees  $\delta\epsilon\iota$  isolated from the Son of Man in Daniel 2:28. Instead of  $\delta\epsilon\iota$  being combined with the sayings on the Son of Man, it is combined with the picture of the stone shattering the image.

Tödt equates  $\delta\epsilon\iota$  with  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  πᾶς γένεσθαι of Mark 9:12.

Having earlier discussed the two texts (Mk.8:31, 9:12) and identified them as parallel formations by referring to scriptural evidence adduced in Psalm 118:22, Tödt continues to say, 'the "must" in Mark 8:31 thus has the same meaning as the phrase in

---

1) H.E.Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, London, SCM., 1965, p.188f.

2) H.E.Tödt, ibid., p.190

Mark 9:12b, "It is written"(1).

Tödt's assumption that the apocalyptic  $\text{ܕܥܝ}$  recorded in Daniel 2:28 is completely isolated from the Son of Man concept must be questioned. Black (2) quotes a number of occasions where the Son is linked to a stone-typology by virtue of an Aramaic word-play on  $\text{ܕܥܝ}$ , which in turn could be an allusion to the Son of Man Messiah inspired by Daniel. He points out, in what is probably the earliest midrash on Daniel 2:34-5, (the picture of the stone shattering the image) in IV Ezra 13:6f., that the 'stone cut without hands' which shatters the image and then becomes a mountain, is portrayed here as the Son. Furthermore, IV Ezra 13:3 comments 'this Man flew with the clouds of Heaven', which appears to be an allusion to the Son of Man in Daniel 7:13f. It is interesting, if this is the case, to notice the interpretation of 'Son of Man' as 'this Man', which could quite feasibly reflect the meaning of the Aramaic  $\text{ܕܥܝ ܕܡܢ}$  (3).

Therefore, there is a case to put forward for supposing the possibility of a link between  $\text{ܕܥܝ}$ , the stone cut without hands of Daniel 2:28,34, and the Son of Man.

This, however, does not necessarily indicate that Tödt's final association of  $\text{ܕܥܝ}$  with the fulfilment of scripture is

---

1) H.E.Tödt, ibid., p.191

2) M.Black, 'The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', ETL, 18, 1971, pp.12-13. Black argues from the premise that the Son of Man is a Christological figure, but G.Vermes, in M.Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1967, p.327, says, 'I would put it on record that not one among the hundreds of examples scrutinized by me suggests that bar nash(a) was ever employed as a messianic designation'.

3) G.Vermes, ibid., p.320f.

invalid. The  $\text{סֵפֶר}$  represents the apocalyptic fulfilment of the Son of Man role. In Daniel, the Son of Man may be represented by the Stone, but this is through a later form of interpretive midrash (ie. IV Ezra 13:6f). It is necessary to relate the Son of Man to a better known stone-typology. In this instance, Tödt (1) is correct in his assumption that the underlying link between the  $\text{סֵפֶר}$  and Son of Man is Psalm 118:22.

The association of this Passion saying with Psalm 118:22 revolves around the phrase  $\kappa\alpha\iota \text{ἀποδοκνῶσθῃτε}$  which is the same verb as is used in the Septuagint translation. Here, there is a direct link between the rejection of the stone in Psalm 118:22 and the rejection of the Son of Man in Mark 8:31. The phrase  $\piολὺ \text{παθεῖν}$  is in juxtaposition to  $\kappa\alpha\iota \text{ἀποδοκνῶσθῃτε}$ ; the latter phrase having been 'lifted' from the Psalm. Now Marxsen, in a study of Mark 1:4, relates the paradoxical phrase  $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\eta \text{ἐρήμῳ}$  to the midrashic quotation in Mark 1:2-3 (2),

Here, he finds that 'the wilderness' does not represent a geographical location, but is a theological comment on the role of John the Baptist. In the same way, it is suggested that in Mark 8:31 there is a similar theological approach, where  $\kappa\alpha\iota \text{ἀποδοκνῶσθῃτε}$

---

1) H.E.Tödt, op.cit., pp.161-70. Also, C.H.Dodd, According to the Scriptures, London, Fontana, 1965, p.69, and M.Black, op.cit., p.11, see reflected in Lk.20:18, the end of the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, (cf. Black, p.12, the Parable of the Rejected Son), a link between the stone of rejection - Ps.118:22, the stone of stumbling - Lk.8:14 and the stone of Dn.2:34. Dodd says this could possibly reflect the presence of a testimonium, but thinks the link indicates a later, rather than a primitive, stage. Neither Dodd or Black recognises the  $\text{סֵפֶר}$  as referring to Dn.2:34; another link between these passages. The eschatological implications of Dn.2:34, related to Ps.118:22, suggest a primitive rather than secondary stage as Dodd suggests.

2) W.Marxsen, Mark the Evangelist, N.Y., Abingdon Press, 1969 pp.31-38



is an interpretive text relating to the role of the Suffering Son of Man (1). Marxsen (2) equates the phrase ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ with the theological interpretation of the redactor imposed upon traditional material, but in this case such a position must not be assumed until Mark 9:12b has been taken into consideration.

Mark 9:12b represents a similar passion saying to that in Mark 8:31, except that καὶ ἔξουθενήσῃ is substituted for καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθήσεται. The use of this verb corresponds with the quotation of Psalm 118:22 found in Acts 4:11f. Jeremias' (3) attempt to make this phrase correspond to Isaiah 53:3 and thus, to see the saying in the light of the Isaianic Suffering Servant, has been overwhelmingly refuted by Michaelis' (4) proof that the words ἔξουθενήσῃ and ἀποδοκιμασθήσεται are synonymous. For this reason, the use of different verbs, whether reflecting

---

1) M. Wilcox, 'The Denial Sequence in Mark 14:26-31, 66-72', NTS, 17, 1971, pp.429-31, refers to a similar break-down of a Jesus saying in Mk.14:27, where οὐ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε is explicitly related to Zechariah 13:7 within the 'saying'. The direct relationship between the two texts puts Jesus' saying on a par with the quotation and represents the saying of Jesus as quasi-canonical. Wilcox suggests the possibility that this scriptural allusion could have been original to Jesus, but unless one accepts the idea put forward by B.Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, C.W.K.Gleerup, Uppsala, 1961, that Jesus used carefully planned rabbinic methods of transmission and preservation of teaching, a direct association of the words of Jesus with a scriptural interpretive quote is a secondary construction. However, the use of the sayings of Jesus as quasi-canonical, to stand alongside scripture and interpret it (Wilcox, op.cit., p.436) could be applied to Mk.8:31. There is a difference, however, that here it is Ps.118:22 which interprets the Son of Man's role as suffering and not vice versa.

2) W.Marxsen, op.cit., p.37

3) J.Jeremias, New Testament Theology, vol.I, London, S.C.P., 1972, p.295 n2

4) Michaelis, TNT, vol. V, pp.914-5

two different versions of the Septuagint or two different translations of one Aramaic or Hebrew text is resolved, and Tödt (1) is justified in seeing them as parallel formulations. Therefore, there are two traditions in 8:31 and 9:12b relating to the same saying and interpretation. Wilcox (2) suggests that the textual variant in Acts 4:11f could be due to influence of Mark 9:12b, as could the use of the verb in the Lukan narrative of Herod's humiliation of Jesus (Lk.23:8-12). It is strange, if this is the case, that Luke's parallel saying of the first passion prediction (Lk.9-22) and also Luke 17:25 have been unaffected in his use of ἀποδοκιμασθήναι. Moreover, Acts 4:11f. could be earlier than Mark 9:12 as it occurs in one of the early speeches in Acts. It is possible that both Acts 4:11f. and Mark 9:12b originate from a similar tradition which was taken up by each Evangelist and assimilated into the mainstream tradition they were preserving. In spite of the permeation of this phrase into the existing tradition, it had no effects other than this single mention.

Also, there is some reasonable claim for supposing Mark 9:12b is pre-Markan apart from the use of ἐξουθενήσῃ instead of the Septuagint rendering. The use of ἵνα instead of ὅτι suggests a mistranslation of the Aramaic 'ܝܢ, and this is peculiar to this Markan saying. This possibly suggests that the saying has its origin in a Palestinian language area. The verb ἐξουθενέω

---

1) H.E.Tödt, op.cit., p.168

2) M.Wilcox, The Semitisms in Acts, Oxford, Clarendon Press 1965, p.173

does not relate to any particular agent of rejection, but in 8:31 ἀποδοκιμασθήναι is represented as being at the hands of πῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων (1). Mark 8:31 could be a further midrashic expansion of Isalm 118:22 to answer the question of who were the οἰκοδομῶντες of the verse (2).

If Mark 9:12b is pre-Markan, this would imply that Mark 8:31 was either an embellishment of 9:12b or that Mark was drawing from a different version of the same saying. It is generally understood that the three Passion Predictions are firmly embedded in the Synoptic context Mark 8:27-10:52 which reflects pre-Markan traditions. Jeremias (3) says that the number of Passion Predictions recorded is purely arbitrary, and just testifies to a certain number of traditions preserving the Passion Predictions of which Mark knew. Jeremias (4) however, is in a minority, and the general opinion is that the three Passion Predictions are recorded in a systematic arrangement leading to a climax. Even if the pre-Markan unit did explicitly link the Passion Predictions with the context, there is reason to suppose that the Passion Prediction was originally isolated from its original context. Perrin (5) sees in Mark that his Christological titles are tempered by the setting of the Son of Man title in juxtaposition to χριστός and Son of God. This would imply that the Son of Man title, whilst

---

1) A small point of interest here is that Mt./Lk. use the more idiomatic ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ... against Mk's ὅπῳ ... This is just one of the numerous Semitisms recorded by Mt./Lk. against Mk. which cannot be explained by 'Q' or some common source, and replaces a better Greek word recorded in Lk. This theme will be taken up in more detail later on in this inquiry.

2) H.E.Todt, op.cit., p.171

3) J.Jeremias, 'Die Drei-Tag-worte der Evangelien', Tradition und Glaube Festgabe für K.G.Kuhn, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971, p.228

4) cf. N.Perrin, 'The Christology of Mark: A Study in Methodology', JR, 51, 1971, p.179

5) N.Perrin, ibid., pp.179-80



seen by Mark as a Christological title, would nevertheless have some interpretative and modifying influence on the other Christological titles. This saying, however, does not reflect a Christological Son of Man but an eschatological figure. The stone typology, like the  $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$  imagery (1) was used by the Church prior to any Christological interpretation. Nothing in Mark 8:31 suggests a Christological origin but rather one related to Daniel 2 and the eschatological stone typology. Ferrin (2) says that the original Son of Man was not a Christological concept but was given such a connotation when set within the Synoptic context. This appears the case in Mark 8:31. It is only the surrounding context which assumes the saying is a Christological statement: the saying itself does not. Therefore, the saying was not originally associated with the events of Caesarea Philippi (3). The use of direct scriptural quotation in such a precise form shows the saying has definitely been

---

1) The question of the original non-Messianic interpretation of  $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$  in the Early Church revolves round the question of its association with the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53. Despite the numerous attempts to assert a Messianic significance in these passages, which was current in Jewish thought around the first centuries B.C.-A.D., M. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant, London, SPCK, 1959, pp.53-8, demonstrates this is a minority view and suggests the Servant was interpreted collectively as either Israel or the Righteous within Israel. Also, a much overlooked interpretation is that of the Servant as Isaac; cf. R.A. Rosenberg, 'Jesus, Isaac and the Suffering Servant', JBL, 84, 1965, pp.381-8. This study of the concept of the Suffering Servant as a non-Messianic figure may throw new light on the use of this term by Jesus and its early, but brief, use in the Church; ie, that its non-Messianic connotations led to a phasing out of the title  $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$  and a reinterpretation of Isa.53 along strictly kerygmatic lines.

2) W. Ferrin, op.cit., p.181

3) cf. R.H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London, Collins, 1969, pp.109-111

expanded, if not formulated, by the Church, but a non-Christological use of the Son of Man title and its interpretive text suggests an early formation.

Turning to the parallel passage in Matthew 16:13-23, the narrative is more Christologically orientated than in Mark, with the Passion Prediction relating to Ἰησοῦς χριστός instead of the Son of Man. A Matthaean insertion into the text between 16:17-19 stresses Jesus' praise of Peter's confession that Jesus is the Christ. Tödt (1) justifies the omission of the title Son of Man within the saying itself by indicating that the Son of Man in Matthew 16:13 applies to the whole passage. Therefore, to save repetition, the Evangelist substitutes the title Son of Man for αὐτόν. The 'Son of Man' in Matthew 16:13 acts as a heading to a new period of the Church initiated by Peter's confession. Whereas for Mark 8:31, the Son of Man is used as an alternative to χριστός, to Matthew it forms a complementary title. A noticeable difference between Mark 8:31 and Matthew 16:21 is the lack of the Psalm 118:22 quotation καὶ ἀποδοκίμασθῆναι and in the Matthaean parallel of Mark 9:12b at 17:12, again καὶ ἐξουθενηθῆναι is lacking. The absence of this interpretive phrase does suggest that Matthew knew of a tradition which did not record Psalm 118:22 in combination with this particular saying (2). As the δέ of Matthew 16:21

---

1) H.E.Tödt, op.cit., p.150

2) cf. a recent article by M.Wilcox, 'Peter and the Rock: A Fresh Look at Mt.16:17-19', NIS, 22, 1976, pp.73-88, where it is suggested that this incident is a stone midrash, replacing the reference to Ps.118.

and μέλλει of 17:12b does not indicate this scriptural basis, the necessity of the Passion has to be found elsewhere. The beginning of the saying runs οὐ δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα ἀπελθεῖν καὶ ... in which the δὲ is in immediate relationship to Jerusalem. It appears in this context that the necessity is that Jesus must go to Jerusalem to suffer. In Matthew 17:12b, as with Mark 9:12b, the Passion saying is found in a block of teaching on Elijah having already come, which is appended to the Transfiguration. Also, the Lukan account of this incident mentions the words that Moses and Elijah speak to Jesus concerning his departure - ὃν ᾔμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ. Again, found in Luke 13:33 is a reference to a prophecy by Jesus - οὐ οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἱερουσαλὴμ. Even within the third Passion Prediction, reference is made to the Passion of the Son of Man being specifically related to Jerusalem. This does suggest that some form of prophecy was known relating to Jerusalem as the city in which the Passion story was to be enacted. The lack of any scriptural evidence tends to suggest the basis of this prophecy is to be found, not in a scriptural passage, but possibly in a prophetic saying of Jesus which was fulfilled in the course of historical events (1). The δὲ of Matthew 16:21 could even refer to the saying of Jesus found in Luke 13:33 but there is no foundation for suggesting such a claim as anything more than hypothetical. However, it does appear that this conception of the necessity to suffer in Jerusalem as a condition of fulfilment of the Son of Man role,

---

1) The lack of scriptural quotation also suggests the interpretative phrase was secondary in as far as the saying was originally devoid of such a connotation.



(cf. Mk.10:33f.par.), was the same condition by which Matthew interpreted the first Passion Prediction.

Next to the Markan first Passion Prediction, it can be seen that Matthew uses a form of the saying which is drained of its eschatological and primitive associations with Psalm 118:22, making it easier for Matthew to reinterpret <sup>the saying</sup> (1) and make it more compatible with the heightened christological context.

Luke preserves the *καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθήναι* of the Markan tradition recorded in 8:31, both in the parallel saying, Luke 9:22, and Luke 17:25, but in spite of this, Luke reinterprets the saying within his own gospel framework. Conzelmann (2) sums up the situation by stating 'it is characteristic of Luke that although he develops a Christology of his own, he is no longer aware of the original peculiarities of titles such as 'Son of Man' etc. He has taken them over from the tradition and interpreted them according to his own conceptions'. This is what is found contained in this saying.

The *ἐν* of the saying no longer rests upon a particular passage of scripture as Mark 9:12b explicitly states. The term *ἐν* is a commonly used word in Luke/Acts, appearing no less than forty-one times in different situations(3). It is used a number of times in the Lukan Passion sayings (9:22, 17:25 24.7, 26:44) whereas Matthew and Mark only preserve the term

---

1) Although the Matthaean tradition is drained of any primitive association with Ps.118:22, it does not mean that the Jesus saying is not primitive.

2) H. Conzelmann, The Theology of Saint Luke, London, Faber and Faber, 1969, pp.170-1

3) Grundmann, TNT, vol.II, p.22

once in the Passion sayings - that of the first Prediction.

Conzelmann (1) notes that Luke does not use  $\delta\epsilon\iota$  eschatologically in these cases, but as a reference to the Passion. The eschatological character of  $\delta\epsilon\iota$  in Mark 8:31 has been modified to fit in with Luke's view of Redemptive History.

On the other hand, the Luke/Acts meaning of  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\omega$  in some circumstances being synonymous with 'to die' (2), is not superimposed upon the saying. Some of the Lukan Passion sayings (22:15, 24:26, 46) use  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\omega$  as referring to his death, but the pre-Lukan saying in 9:22 does not contain this same comparison. The presence of  $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$  in conjunction with  $\pi\theta\epsilon\iota\acute{\nu}$  and the association with  $\alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\tau\alpha\nu\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$  illuminates the Luke/Acts association of  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\omega$  with death (3).

It appears from Luke's adaptation of this text that the preservation of the tradition in such an exact form only allows the Evangelist to work within the confines of that transmitted text. His theology can be imposed upon the saying but it must not alter the construction.

The form of the first Passion Prediction demonstrates its pre-Synoptic origin; the use of Psalm 118:22 as an interpretative quotation of the role of the Son of Man suggests it is a kerygmatic statement, but formed at an early period when the stone typology was associated with the eschatological Son

---

1) H. Conzelmann, op.cit., p.153 n3

2) Michaelis, TNT, vol.V, p.913

cf. Lk.22:15, 24:26, 46, Ac.1:3, 3:18, 17:3. Also cf. a similar use of the verb in Hebrews and I Peter, pp.917-9

3) Michaelis, ibid., p.914

of Man and not the Christ. Mark's use of the Irediction does not betray whether he understood the original significance of the interpretive quotation, but its use as an alternative to the proclamation of Jesus' Messiahship does not suggest this. It is obvious, from the other gospels, that they either did not know the connection of Psalm 118:22 with this saying as in Matthew, or did not understand it, as seems to be the case with Luke.



ii) THE SECOND PASSION PREDICTION.

Mk.9:31 (Mt.17:22, Lk.9:44).

The second Prediction of the Passion is situated between the account of the Healing of the Epileptic Boy and the Dispute on Greatness. The Passion saying is not found within a narrative context, as is the first Passion Prediction, but appears to be an inserted, isolated saying. It is possible that Mark 9:30 is an editorial verse constructed for the purpose of giving the saying a context. The phrase *καὶ οὐκ ᾔθελεν ἵνα τις γνῶι* could refer to the secrecy motif which is a frequently used theological feature of the Evangelist. Not only does the introductory verse bear the marks of an editorial hand, but also the conclusion to the saying, where the disciples' reaction, as one of fear, is recorded in 9:32. It would appear that the Evangelist has enshrined this saying in an editorially constructed context, which suggests that he saw it as significant or important enough to give it a separate context, rather than insert the saying into a narrative framework or a speech.

The Passion saying in Mark 9:31 is introduced by *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*. It is at once noticeable that this saying is not just a variant of Mark 8:31, but is recorded as a different saying; so from the start, it does not have to be discussed which of the sayings is the secondary form of the other. The use of the verb *παράδιδόναι* is fairly common in the Son of Man Passion sayings (Mk.10:33, par., 14:21, par., 14:41, Mt.26:45, Mt.26:2, Lk.22:48, 24:27). The further use of this verb in certain kerygmatic statements in the Epistles, (I Cor.11:23, Rom.4:25, 8:32, Gal.2:20, Eph.5:2) has led Jeremias (1) to presuppose a *παράδιδόναι* formula. Tödt's

---

1) J. Jeremias, (W. Zimmerli), The Servant of God, London, SCM, 1957, p.96

definition of a formula as 'an order of words of a somewhat stereotyped uniform structure and context as well as a concept which is comparatively self-contained...' does not describe the use of παραδίδωμι, where it is only in connection with its context that the precise meaning of the verb is ascertained. (1). Jeremias (2) says that underlying the phrase παραδίδωμι is an allusion to Isaiah 53 and the Suffering Servant. Tödt (2) points out that the use of παραδίδωμι in Isaiah 53 is used in conjunction with other important phrases. This is reflected in the letter to the Romans, where 4:25 and 8:32 represent a pre-Pauline credal statement (4) and the allusion to Isaiah 53 is a Church formulation. On the other hand, the uses of παραδίδωμι with the Son of Man in the Gospels are combined with no interpretive phrases similar to those in Isaiah 53. Tödt (5) concludes from this survey of the use of παραδίδωμι that the variety of meanings of παραδίδωμι and the lack of a unifying dependence on Isaiah 53 in the Synoptic Gospels show παραδίδωμι is not used as a formula.

Emptying the phrase of any kerygmatic connotation, Tödt (6) proceeds to reveal further the early use of παραδίδωμι. He notes the consistent use of 'Christ' with the term 'died' and of 'Son of Man' with 'to be delivered'. Even the use of παραδίδωμι in the Epistles reflects early titles such as God's Son or Lord

---

1) H.E.Tödt, op.cit., p.159.

2) J.Jeremias, op.cit., p.90.

3) H.E.Tödt, op.cit., p.160.

4) ie. statements of belief which could have formed part of early confessional statements or kerygmatic material.

5) H.E.Tödt, ibid., pp.159-61.

6) H.E.Tödt, ibid., p.161.

Jesus, (I Cor.11:23, Rom.4:25f., 8:32, Gal.2:20). The categorical use of these terms together suggest they were not both formulated within the same church. Having ascribed the phrase 'Christ died' to the pre-Pauline Hellenistic Church, Tödt (1) therefore presupposes the Predictions of the Passion fall within the sphere of the Palestinian Church.

Tödt's conclusion suggests the possibility that the use of *παράδοσις* in the Passion Predictions and sayings on the one hand, and credal statements on the other, reflects a non-Hellenistic tradition, especially as it is always used in combination with Son of Man or other early designations. Can the primitive use of *παράδοσις* in Mark 9:31 be further justified, for the verb itself reflects neither a Semitic or Greek background?

Within the saying in Mark 9:31 itself, there is much justification to suppose an early origin. Büchsel (2) points out the phrase 'into the hands of ...' is more likely to be the result of Semitic influence, and Jeremias (3) refers to an Aramaic word play on Son of Man and men. Therefore, the original saying probably would have run something like:

(4) מֵאֵת מִסֵּר בֶּר נְשָׂא בִידֵי גֵנִי נְשָׂא

The lack of detail and sufficient vagueness of this saying not only suggests an early origin but also that its composition

1) H.E. T8dt, ibid., p.161.

2) f.Büchsel, TDNT., vol.II, p.169.

3) J. Jeremias, op.cit., p.102.

4) The text of Codex Bezae records a variant reading: οτι υλος του ανθρωπου παραδιδεται εις χειρας ανθρωπου . The latin parallel text, however, still retains the more usual form of the plural. The Greek text of the Codex Bezae could be preserving a different form of the saying. An Aramaic pun in this case would be even more pronounced.



dates from before the actual event it sets out to describe (1).

At least its non-kerygmatic quality shows the saying was consolidated in its present form at an early stage.

If both the credal statements of the Epistles and Mark 9:31 originate from the same tradition, (the former of which has been formulated by the Church, and the latter unaffected), can any link be found to suggest some connection between a saying of Jesus and a kerygmatic statement? It is possible that these credal statements find their origin in a saying of Jesus rather than that they are completely isolated from any historical link with Jesus, as presumed by Bultmann (2).

The most frequent use of *παράδοσις* after its use in connection with the Son of Man is with the figure of Judas. Not only that, but there are certain sayings which link the betrayal of the Son of Man exclusively with Judas, (Mk. 14:21, par., 14:41/Mt. 26:45, Lk. 22:48). The reason for the preservation of a Judas tradition is completely centred around his betrayal of Jesus. Frequently the epithet *ὁ παραδιδούς* is given to Judas, Mk. 3:19

---

1) It is overwhelmingly accepted that Mark 9:31 represents the earliest form of all the three Passion sayings. J. Jeremias New Testament Theology, vol. i, London, SCM., 1972, pp. 281-2 states the saying could have been formulated prior to the events described;

but many scholars including, A. J. B. Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, London, Lutterworth Press, 1964, pp. 34-6, M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, London, Nicholson and Watson Ltd., 1934, pp. 225-6, H. E. Tödt, op. cit., p. 201, find it difficult to accept that the saying is original, although all date it early. This is usually due to the fact that the rejection of an interpretation that is put on the text leads to the rejection of the saying also.

2) R. Bultmann, The Theology of the New Testament, vol. I, London, SCM., 1971, p. 3

par., also cf. Jn. 12:4, 13:2. 18:2). There are also occasions where the title is used in place of Judas, (cf. Mk. 14:41/Mt. 26:46 14:44/Mt. 26:48). Wilcox (1) has argued that the use of the betrayal of Judas at the Last Supper in John 13:21-30 reflects two elements of tradition. One is the non-Synoptic tradition similar to the credal statement of I Corinthians 11:23f., and the other which preserves sayings of Jesus, reflects a sayings source common with Mark. The preservation of the Judas tradition, not only in the credal statement of I Corinthians 11:23f, but also in the sayings of Jesus does suggest that at sometime, a certain amount of importance was attached to the role of Judas.

A saying concerning both the Son of Man and the Betrayer is found in Mark 14:21, the account of the Last Supper, where Jesus speaks of the Betrayer. It could be assumed that *καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ* refers to the allusion to Psalm 41:10 in Mark 14:18b (2)

It appears, however, that the Old Testament quotation is linked to the saying in Mark 14:18a rather than 14:21 and stands as a comment on that saying, a procedure which could indicate a redactional feature of the Evangelist (3). The suggestion put forward by Wilcox (4) that the sayings of Jesus in the parallel section in John's Gospel are used as canonical should be applied to this passage. *καθὼς γέγραπται* does not necessarily have to

---

1) F. Wilcox, 'The Composition of John 13:21-30,' pp. 143-56 Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black. ed. E. Ellis, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clarke, 1969

2) V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, London, Macmillan and Co., 1969, p. 542 says the only Old Testament quotation which could possibly refer to this saying is Daniel 7:21

3) cf. F. Wilcox, op. cit., p. 145, also Mk. 8:31 with the interpolated text of Ps. 118-22

4) F. Wilcox, op. cit., p. 153-4



depend on an Old Testament quotation, but rather it may be profitable to look for an appropriate saying of Jesus to which it may refer.

Taylor (1) says that the use of *οὗ* to introduce 14:21 suggests the original saying was independent of the context as the term is substituted for an original introductory sayings formula. There also appears to be an Aramaic word-play similar to that found in Mark 9:31 between Son of Man and that man:

וְיֵשׁוּעַ בְּרַחֲמֵי אֲבִי אֱלֹהִים בְּרַחֲמֵי אֲבִי אֱלֹהִים

The quotation nowhere refers explicitly to Judas although in the light of subsequent events it is obvious that Judas is referred to. It is possible that *καθὼς γέγραπται* could refer to the immediate words in 14:21b, but noting the similarity between 9:31 and 14:21b, it is possible that the quotation introduction refers to the saying now known as the second Passion Prediction (2). If this is so, what then is the relation between these two verses? It was noted earlier that the Judas tradition is completely centred around the verb *παραδίδωμι*. It could be that 14:21b is an 'haggadic' interpretation of 'men' in 9:31. Judas is representative of those who betray Jesus. The subtlety of meaning instilled into *παραδίδωμι* as used in the Passion account further reflects the interpretation of 'men'. Although *παραδίδωμι* does not reflect a formula as Jeremias proposes, it nevertheless seems to represent a series of 'Midrashic' interpretations on the saying of Mark 9:31. The

---

1) V. Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 542

2) Following the reading of Codex Bezae, cited at p.55, n.1, the similarity between these two texts appears more acute. It is difficult to state whether 9:31 preserved in Codex Bezae or 14:21 is the earlier. It is possible that 14:21 could have influenced



closest 'haggadic' interpretation of this theme is seen in the Judas tradition and specifically 14:21, where direct reference is made to the saying of Jesus. The παραδίδωμι tradition has even found its way into the credal formula of the Church. I Corinthians 11:23 begins: *ὅτι ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παραδίδεται . . .* Freed (1) draws attention to the view that the *καὶ τὰς γραφάς* in I Corinthians 15:3f. need not necessarily refer to Old Testament proof texts, but may be rather found in sayings of Jesus which very early received canonical status. This illustrates further the supposition that underlying kerygmatic statements are references to the words of Jesus. It could even be inferred that the words of Jesus at one point were the credal statements used by the Church instead of just the basis for them.

Jeremias (2) says that the formation of the saying as a pun and the reaction of the disciples of mystification concerning the meaning of the saying in 9:32, reflect a basic teaching form of Jesus. As well as the use of the parable as an original paedagogic technique, a primitive teaching form can be detected in the use of riddles. *ἐδίδασκεν* in 9:31 could also reflect the view that the Evangelist still saw this saying as a teaching saying although the same verb is used to introduce the first Passion Prediction. It could be quite possible, however, that the Evangelist applied the verb to the first passion prediction

---

the reading of 9:31 in Codex Bezae.

1) E. D. Freed, The Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John, Leiden, J. Brill, 1965, p.119f.

2) J. Jeremias, op. cit., p.182

either to link the two passion sayings thereby accentuating the three-fold motif as a unity, or similarly, that *ἐδίδασκεν* in 8:31 refers to the saying as a Church teaching implicit in the Psalm 118:22 interpretation, and *ἐδίδασκεν* in 9:31 refers to an original teachings saying of Jesus.

In the Matthaean parallel of the saying, 17:22, the Evangelist does not record the Markan secrecy motif. Neither is the disciples' reaction one of mystification at the meaning of the saying. The reaction of the disciples is that of those who view the saying in the light of subsequent events. Matthew brings the saying more in line with a straight prediction than with a riddle and teaching saying. The disciples understand the implications of the saying and are sorrowful. Luke appends the second Passion Prediction in 9:44 to the Story of the Epileptic Boy, thus creating a context for the saying. The introductory phrase to the Lukan saying is very interesting. Not only does the phrase *θεῶδε ὑμεῖς εἰς τὰ ὥτα ὑμῶν τοὺς λόγους τούτους* contain a semitism, (1) but the meaning suggests a determined effort on behalf of Jesus to make his disciples learn this saying (2)

This reflects more forcefully the teaching concept found in the Markan account, and suggests that Luke unconsciously or purposely recorded this saying as a teaching saying of Jesus.

The interesting point of these parallel passages is not

---

1) The redundant preposition and noun in the accusative *εἰς τὰ ὥτα* instead of *τοῖς ὣτι*

2) cf. B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, C.W.K. Gleerup Uppsala, 1961, passim. for Jewish and Christian methods of transmission.

so much the differences of context setting and subsequent interpretation, but the interpretation of the saying itself. Both Matthew and Luke use a different form of *παράδοσις* from that of Mark.

*παράδοσις* in Mark 9:31 is a simple present passive, whereas Matthew and Luke have identically changed it to a future passive construction with *μέλλει*, plus the infinitive *παράδοσθαι* ..

Jeremias (1) says this change is not surprising, for they are only altering a difficult reading in Mark. The use of the present passive reflects an Aramaic participle which Matthew and Luke subsequently rectify. This view rests on the assumption that the Resurrection saying is an integral part of the Passion saying recorded in Matthew and Luke, which, quite evidently from Luke 9:44, is not the case. The absence of the Resurrection saying in the Lukan parallel suggests that the change is not due to any grammatical correction. Hooker (2) argues that the change of tense is more significant than just a grammatical rectification. She says that the *μέλλει* corresponds to the *šē* of the first Passion Prediction saying. Matthew and Luke reflect the necessity of scriptural evidence to support the Prediction. Mark, on the other hand, represents a purer form of the saying where the words of Jesus stand as evidence in themselves and do not require Old Testament references. The reliance on scriptural proof reflected in the Synoptic parallels

---

1) J. Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 281-2

2) M. D. Hooker, op. cit., p. 95



suggests that Matthew and Luke are recording a different tradition from that of Mark. It seems surprising, otherwise, that they both reproduce the necessity of scriptural backing, which is introduced by the same phrase, although no specific quotation is given.

The study of the second Passion Prediction has produced some interesting conclusions. The form of tradition recorded in Mark 9:31 reflects an Aramaic origin and lack of detail suggests that this could even be an original saying of Jesus (1). The absence of any kerygmatic inferences in this saying may be due to the 'canonical' quality of the saying which from an early stage preserved it from corruption. Furthermore, the saying appears to have been used as a basis from which various Church haggodot and credal statements grew. It is even possible that at sometime the saying was used as a credal statement itself. Furthermore, it appears probable that this saying constitutes a recognised teaching form of Jesus and is recognised as such by the Evangelist. The parallel sayings in Matthew and Luke seem to reflect a different form of this saying. In their tradition, the saying has not been so faithfully preserved in its primitive form but is developed by the Church, which pre-supposes a later tradition than that recorded in Mark.

---

1) It is obvious from the context of Mk. 14:21 that the Son of Man is not a title but is the Aramaic expression for 'I'. cf. G. Vermaes. 'The Uses of  $\text{ܐܢܝܝܐ}$  /  $\text{ܐܢܝܝܐ}$  in Jewish Aramaic', M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to The Gospels and Acts, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1967, pp. 310-30. This probably also true of its use in Mk. 9:31. Therefore, as in Mk. 8:31, this title is not used christologically.

iii) THE THIRD PASSION PREDICTION.

Mk.10:33-34, (Mt.20:18-19, Lk.18:31-33).

The similarity, at first glance, between the second and third Passion Predictions has led to the conclusion that these sayings either come from the same tradition (1) or one is a development of the other (2). Having shown grounds for believing that Mark 9:31 originated from a pre-Markan source in the previous section, any view that Mark 10:33f. forms the basis for Mark 9:31 can be excluded. On the other hand, the explicit mention of the Jewish authorities in 10:33f. could be a direct development from Mark 8:31 rather than 9:31 thus weakening the link between the second and third Passion Predictions. Therefore, two alternatives are to be considered. The third Passion Prediction is either a Markan formation or is preserving a different tradition from that of the first two Passion Predictions.

As Taylor (3) pointed out, the context ~~setting~~ of the third Passion Prediction is the same as that of the second Passion prediction : namely the journey up to Jerusalem. The reference to fear and amazement in 10:32 and the setting of a journey to Jerusalem all suggest familiar redactional features similar to those introducing the second Passion Prediction. This redactional verse suggests that the saying originally existed

---

1) M.D.Hooker, The Son of Man in Mark, London, SPCK., 1967, p.134.

2) This view is more widely held, cf., A.J.B.Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, Lutterworth Press, 1964, p.35.

3) V.Taylor, The Gospel according to Saint Mark, London, Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1959, p.436

without any context setting and was given one by Mark, or possibly not only the saying, but the context of Mark 9:31 has been preserved when 10:33 was formulated by the Evangelist. This seems less likely as we have questioned the assumption that 10:33f. is based on 9:31. It is, therefore, more probable that 10:32 reflects standard Markan redactional techniques for introducing a saying with no previous context. This would suggest a pre-Markan constructed saying such as parallel in Mark 9:31; this we must consider more closely.

The phrase: *ἐν ᾧ ὁδοῦ ἀνασπίνεμεν εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα* appears to be an introduction to the Passion Prediction within the saying itself. It could be that this phrase is a further redactional element comprising a link between the saying itself and the constructed context. This would seem pointless, however, whether the saying is pre-Markan or a redactional composition. If the Passion Prediction is a pre-Markan tradition, the idea of a linking phrase between constructed context and saying is not necessary, as no similar reference is required in the parallel construction of Mark 9:31, while if the saying is a Markan composition, the Evangelist would have no reason to introduce a linking phrase between context and saying because both were constructed by the same author. What appears more likely is that this phrase is an intricate part of the Passion Prediction and that the context has been shaped around it. This is reflected in the Lukan parallel (Lk.18:31) where Luke ignores the Markan context, but still preserves this phrase. This further suggests a pre-Markan source.

The saying itself must be considered next. It is at once



noticed that the saying comprises two adjacent phrases both introduced by the verb *παράδοσεν*. The first part refers to the actions of the Jewish authorities, and the second to the actions of the Gentiles. Such a detailed saying seems to point to a knowledge of some passion account and not to the undetailed passion prediction of Mark 9:31 as a basis. Therefore, it appears necessary to disregard the assumption of any form of link with the previous Passion Predictions, and to turn to the actual tradition of the Passion event itself. The problem at hand is whether 10:33f is based upon the Synoptic Passion account and therefore probably constructed by Mark from this material, or whether the saying reflects a passion account which is unknown to Mark except for its preservation in this saying (1) This would necessitate a pre-Markan construction.

The use of *παράδοσεν* could suggest a reliance in Mark 9:31, but as has been already discussed, the verb frequently occurs in association with the Passion. *παράδοσεν* here refers to the Arrest which is the beginning of the passion account recorded in the Synoptic Tradition. (2) Tödt (3) points

---

1) H. E. Tödt, London, S.C.M., 1965, p.175 suggests a further possibility that the non-Synoptic form of the Passion account was known to Mark and it was from this that Mark constructed the details of this saying. There are two objections to this view, however. In the first place if Mark knew of another passion account, why does it not influence the Synoptic version? Secondly it seems strange that Mark should base a saying on such a Passion account instead of using the one he draws on for the end of his Gospel and thus bring the saying and account into line with each other. It is therefore suggested that any evidence of a non-Synoptic Passion account must reflect a pre-Markan origin to this saying.

2) Of V. Taylor, The Passion Narrative of St. Luke, Cambridge U.P., 1972, a study of the Lukan Passion account which sets out a comprehensive claim for believing Luke used a non-Markan account.

3) H. E. Tödt, ibid., p.175

out that from the number of occasions where the Jewish authorities are linked with the death of Jesus, the sayings appear to correspond to kerygmatic pronouncements. The explicit reference to the Jewish authorities could imply a reliance on Mark 8:31, but the Jewish authorities in Mark 10:33f are emphasised as being more guilty of the death of Jesus. The phrase: *παραδοθήσεται . . . καὶ κατακρινούσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ* (Mk. 10:33) is more forceful than *ἀποδοκιμασθήναι* (Mk. 8:31) and also stresses a rather different event; that of the arrest or betrayal rather than the rejection. At first glance, however, the act of putting Jesus to death described as totally under the guidance of the Jewish authorities (Mk. 9:31) appears more damning than the judgement of death and turning over to the Gentiles described in 10:33, but Tödt (1) points out that in several kerygmatic pronouncements in Acts, the Jews are reproached for having executed Jesus through 'the hands of lawless men.' In some circles this would appear more abhorrent than killing Jesus themselves.

The second part of the Passion saying deals with the actions of the Romans after the Jews have condemned the Son of Man. Tödt (2) deals with the incidents in the Passion Account which record the mocking of Jesus. These sections are: Mark 14:65, where abuse and ill-treatment are administered by the Jews after the nocturnal trial; Mark 15:29-32, the mocking at the cross by the Jewish high-priests; and Mark 15:16-20, the only instance of Roman mockery mentioned, which takes place in the

---

1) H. E. Tödt, *ibid.*, p.175

2) H. E. Tödt, *ibid.*, pp.173-4

Praetorium as a prelude to the crucifixion. He concludes that the Markan accounts of the mockings are centred around the Jewish part of the passion story rather than the Roman part, to emphasise the guilt of the Jewish authorities in their active condemnation of Jesus, whereas in Mark 10:34, the guilt of the Jews lay with the fact that they handed the Son of Man over to the Gentiles to perform such atrocities. (1) This idea, as has been remarked earlier, is reflected in the kerygmatic statements in Acts but is not so in the Markan recension of the Synoptic Account of the passion.

A study of the individual words used in the prediction may throw more light upon the relationship between the saying and the Synoptic passion Account or an unknown passion Narrative. The first term ἐμψύχουσι, as Todt (2) points out, is a comprehensive phrase incorporating all the humiliating acts meted out to Jesus (Mk. 15:20, Lk. 22:63, 23:11). The action of mocking in the passion Story is ascribed to both the Romans and the Jews. The general use of this term in the passion story of the Synoptic Gospels does not assume any link with the use of this term in any version of this passion prediction.

ἐμψύχουσι is found lacking from the Matthaean prediction. The use of this verb in the passion Account appears in Mark 14:65 at the Jewish nocturnal trial, and Mark 15:19 at the Praetorium and in the respective Matthaean parallels, but nowhere in the Lukan passion accounts. Bultmann (3) says that the Lukan form of

---

1) H. E. Todt, ibid., p.175

2) H.E. Todt, ibid., p.173

3) R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford Blackwell, 1963, p.271



the mocking immediately after the death sentence given by the Jews (Mk. 22:62-5) is a more original form than that of Mark 14:65. The verb, not appearing in the Lukan form, suggests that its presence is secondary in the Markan account. Furthermore, the incident of the mocking at the Praetorium is considered by Bultmann (1) to be a dogmatic development of Mark 15:15a, which again could indicate that the verb ἐπιτιμᾶσθαι is secondary to the original Passion Account used by the Synoptics. Whereas the mocking at the Praetorium could have been a Markan development of 15:15a, it appears more probable that the account of the Jewish mocking in 14:65 is a pre-Markan source which is just misplaced (2). It could tentatively be suggested that the verb more probably applies to the Jewish rather than Roman incident in the Synoptic Passion Account whereas the verb in the third Passion Prediction applies to Roman mocking. The preservation of ἐπιτιμᾶσθαι in the Lukan Passion Prediction further suggests the saying is not based upon the form of the Passion Account with which Luke was acquainted.

The third act of scorn mentioned in Mark 10:34 is the most interesting in relation to the Synoptic Passion Account.

μαρτυρᾶσθαι is used by the three Evangelists in this

---

1) R. Bultmann, ibid., p.272

2) Mark's first Sanhedrin meeting (Mk. 14:55f) invites complications. Luke does not record a nocturnal meeting.

saying, but nowhere does this verb appear in the Synoptic Passion account. The mention of scourging in Mark 15:15 (Mt. 27:26) by the Romans is represented by a different verb: *δραγμαῖσας*. The only occasion of *μαστιγώσουσιν* used is in the account of the Roman trial narrated in John 19:1.

Conclusions drawn from this survey of the terms of scorn used in the passion prediction saying are these. *ἐπιταΐσουσιν* is a general term in the Synoptic Passion Account and does not reflect any special feature. Therefore its use in the Passion Prediction sayings is very neutral. *ἐπιτιύσουσιν* appears to reflect a secondary element in the Synoptic Passion account, but it is more alien to the Roman mocking than the Jewish mocking. This could reflect a knowledge of a different Passion Narrative used as a basis of Mark 10:34. The most prominent difference between the passion prediction saying and the Synoptic Passion Account is found in the term *μαστιγώσουσιν* which is a different verb from that found in the Synoptic Account. The most probable conclusion to be drawn from Tödt's study of the shifting role the Jews played in Jesus' death, in this linguistic survey, is that the third Passion Prediction reflects a different Passion Account from that found in the Synoptic Gospels. This further substantiates earlier evidence given for supposing that Mark 10:33f is a pre-Markan saying.

It is obvious from the detailed description of the Passion saying, and conclusive if it is agreed that the basis of the passion saying is recalling a passion narrative, that the saying represents a Church formation. We can even further define the characteristics of this Church-formulated saying. The language

of the saying betrays a primitiveness. Black (1) points out that Mark 10:33f is a typical parataxis in the Markan Gospel. Although this saying is formed with hindsight to the event, the technical term 'to crucify' is absent just as the more general term 'Gentile' is used instead of 'Roman'. The passion saying is centred around the figure of the Son of Man, not Jesus or the Christ. As the title Son of Man was quite early eliminated from any Church or kerygmatic statements, this further bears witness to the early character of this saying. The grammatical structure of the saying with the combination of the primitive title Son of Man and an unkerigmatic use of terms leads to the conclusion that the third passion prediction saying, although a Church formulation, reflects an early employment of an ancient passion narrative as its basis, pre-Markan both in content and construction.

In the parallel passage in Matthew and Luke, a number of differences are at once noticeable. The problem presenting itself here is whether the variations reflect a knowledge of a different form of this saying from that recorded in Mark, or if the variations reflect editorial changes in order to make this saying conform with any preconceived ideas of the individual Evangelists.

The first part of the passion saying in Matthew 20:18-19 is verbally almost identical to the Markan tradition. The second part, concerning the handing over of the Son of Man to the Gentiles, preserves a number of variations. The finite verbs are changed to infinitives and the act of spitting in the

---

1) M. Black, op. cit., p.63



description of the mocking is absent. The phrase 'to be killed' is replaced with the kerygmatic *σταυρώσει*. The first part of the saying, being identical with Mark, creates no problem of origin, but the second section could suggest the origin of a different tradition. The first phrase of the second section however, is still identical to the Markan version: *καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*. The central area of difference is contained in the description of the derisive actions and the death sentence. It is possible that the differences here can be ascribed to the influence of Matthew 23:34. This verse is contained in the section of the Woes against the Pharisees in which the representatives of the Jewish authorities are accused of persecuting *προφῆτας καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς*. The verse speaks of *σταυρώσετε* and *μαστιγώσετε*. The parallel section in Luke 11:49 does not contain these terms. Accepting the use of *ἐμπαῖξαι* as a comprehensive term reflecting all the actions listed in the saying, <sup>and</sup> therefore less likely to have been affected by this saying, the absence of *ἐμπαύσουσιν* and the use of *σταυρώσει* could be to bring the passion of the Son of Man in line with the persecution and death of former prophets and men of God recorded in Matthew 23:34. This is the only occasion in Matthew where the two terms *μαστιγώσετε* and *σταυρώσει* come together. The use of the infinitive is much more impersonal than *καὶ ἐμπαύσουσιν αὐτῷ . . .* in the Markan account which further suggests this idea of the Son of Man as the last in a line of persecuted servants of God. It is therefore possible, that the Matthaean passion saying is

essentially the same as Mark; the differences due to a tendency to equate Jesus' death in Jerusalem with that of the former prophets of God.

The saying found in Luke 18:31-3 presents much more of a problem than that of Matthew. The first part of the saying records completely different material concerning the events in Jerusalem appertaining to the Son of Man as fulfilment of prophecy, and the second part of the Passion saying has the addition of *ὑποβιβησεται* to the acts of mockery. It appears to be a frequently used theme in Luke that the death of Jesus is foretold by scripture (1). The presence of this saying here suggests its Lukan formulation. The use of the title Son of Man provides a link between this Lukan saying and the second section of the Passion saying. It is most probable that Luke knew the complete passion saying in a form similar to that in Mark and chose to substitute the first part for another saying, rather than that Luke knew only of the saying in the form in which it is recorded, for the use of Son of Man as a link between the Lukan saying and the second half of this Passion saying reveals a knowledge of the Passion saying as Son of Man 'orientated'. (2).

It is possible to see Lukan influence in the second part even more clearly. The additional term *ὑποβιβησεται* (3)

---

1) M. D. Hooker, op. cit., p.137

2) Similarly, the introductory phrase within the saying concerning the journey up to Jerusalem, which is an original part of the Markan saying, is used as a link to introduce the special Lukan saying on fulfilment of scripture.

3) *ὑποβιβησεται* occurs only five times in the New Testament; in Mt. 22:6, 1 Thess. 2:2 and three times in Luke/Acts - Lk. 11:45

could possibly reflect the lukan pericope of Jesus before Herod (Lk. 23:6-12) where a similar maltreatment of Jesus is recorded by the use of the verb *ἐξουθενήσας*. The phrase *παραδοθήσεται* is only related to the *ἔθνεσιν* (1) and not to the Jewish authorities. By altering the Prediction, Luke brings the saying more in line with his form of the Passion Account, where it is only the Romans that condemn Jesus to death, not the Sanhedrin(2).

It would appear, therefore, that this Lukan Passion Prediction, which at first sight seemed to represent a different saying tradition from that found in Mark 10:33f, can be explained by appealing to known lukan redactional features and that the basis of this saying is the one recorded in Matthew and Mark.

The third Passion Prediction represents a saying which is a pre-Markan Church construction. Its early origin is attested by the use of Son of Man in combination with a brief outline of a Passion Account which differs from the Synoptic Account. We can see here another possible development of the *ἀνθρώπων* in Mark 9:31 by the early Church other than the Judas tradition already discussed (3) In Mark 10:33f, the

---

18:32, Acts 14:5. It is possible that *ἔθνη* is a lukanism.

1) F. Parker, 'Mark, Acts and Galilaean Christianity,' *NTS*, 16, 1969-70, p.299, says in certain passages in Luke's Gospel, *ἔθνος* does refer to Israel and not Gentiles, eg. Lk. 7:5, 23:2

2) If P. Parker, *ibid.*, p.299 is correct assuming the fluid meaning of *ἔθνος* in the lukan Gospel, the term here could be seen as referring to the Jews and therefore Luke would not be bringing the saying into line with his passion account.

3) The term *ἀνθρώπων* could be the link between the second and third Passion Predictions. Not so much that 10:33f is based upon 9:31, but that this pre-Markan saying is seen in the light of 9:31 as an exposition of *ἀνθρώπων*.



*ἄνθρωποι* are the Jews and the Gentiles, whereas in Luke the term only refers to the latter. The developments of the saying found in Matthew and Luke are along the lines of the fulfilment of scripture by the enactment of the Passion. This tendency is more noticeable feature in the Lukan saying.

#### iv) THE RESURRECTION SAYINGS

The Resurrection saying appended to each of the passion predictions reflects two different traditions, one which is constantly used by Matthew and reflected in the Lukan sayings; *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται* and the other which is found exclusively in Mark: *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται* (1). The suggestion that these two terms are interchangeable and represent the same length of time (2) side-steps the issue that, whether these terms have identical meanings or not, two separate Resurrection traditions are preserved. The first consideration is to analyse the use of these two Resurrection sayings found in the Gospel tradition and also in the kerygmatic statements of the Church, before drawing any conclusions as to the nature and reasons for a preservation of the two Resurrection sayings traditions.

The credal statements found in the speeches in Acts and the Epistles reflect the fact that Jesus rose, or was raised from the dead, rather than that he rose at a specific point in time. Besides the Resurrection sayings of the Gospels, two further passages recording both the act of visiting and the time involved are the credal statements Acts 10:40: *τούτων ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρε τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* and I Corinthians 15:4: *ἐγέρθη τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*. The phrase, 'on the third day' rather than 'after three days',

---

1) also cf. the unusual use of *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας* in Mt. 27:63  
 2) cf. McArthur, 'On the Third Day', *NTS*, 18, 1971, p.85 also J. Jeremias, 'Die Drei-Tag-Worte der Evangelien', *Tradition und Glaube. Festgabe für K. G. Kuhn*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971, p. 227

was accepted as part of the kerygmatic formula. This is further attested in its consistent use in all subsequent Church creeds (1). Even in the Gospels, emphasis is laid on the third day as the Resurrection day.

The use of the verb *ἐγείρεν* does not appear to be as consistent as the phrase 'on the third day' in the New Testament. At first sight it would seem to be interchangeable with *ἀνίστημι* and this suggests that the use of *ἐγείρεν* in Acts 10:40 and I Corinthians 15:4 is not kerygmatic and could have been substituted for *ἀνίστημι*. This would weaken the idea that these two passages represent a stereotyped Resurrection formula. A study of the use of *ἐγείρεν* and *ἀνίστημι* in connection with the Resurrection of Jesus in the New Testament reveals that, although *ἐγείρεν* is used extensively throughout, there is only one case of the use of *ἀνίστημι* outside the Gospel and Acts, namely in I Thessalonians 4:14,16 and here the Resurrection of Jesus is related to the Resurrection of the Christians at the Last Day.

A survey of the use of *ἀνίστημι* in the Gospels and Acts produces further interesting results. The verb is extensively used in Acts and would at first sight appear to be interchangeable

---

1) There is virtually no reference to any specific Resurrection formula in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. In a long credal statement in the 'Epistle of Ignatius to the Trallaeans' 9:2, he says Jesus rose (*ἡγέρθη*), but mentions no time concerning this event. In the Visions of Hermas III:VIII/7, *μετὰ τοῦς ἡμέρας* is used in a context quite possibly relating to the general Resurrection of the saints at the Last Day. The possible use of this phrase in an eschatological context could be interesting in the light of subsequent discussion in this section.

However, despite the lack of any early documented evidence beginning with the Nicene creed of 334 AD. the use of the third day became the normal statement to use in the Christian Church.



with the term *ἐγείρειν* (1). Wilcox (2) suggests that the prominent use of *ἀνίστημι* as well as *ἐγείρειν* in Acts could be due to the author's connection of the raising of Jesus with that of the raising of a prophet like Moses recorded in Deuteronomy 18:15, 18. This Old Testament reference is twice quoted in Acts (3) which follows the Septuagint translation in incorporating the verb *ἀναστήσει*. It is suggested that *ἐγείρειν* was the traditional formula used to describe the Resurrection of Jesus which Luke adapted to fit in with his theology of the Risen Lord. On three occasions in Luke's Gospel where reference is made to Jesus being raised on the third day, the verb *ἀνίστημι* is used. It is interesting to note, however, that of the three references, two are in special Lukan material (4) and are usually thought of as Lukan formulations (5), and the other reference is the third Passion Prediction, which we have noted has been extensively rewritten by the Evangelist (6). The presence of *ἀνίστημι* in Luke/Acts is conceivably due to the redaction of the Evangelist rather than the influence of tradition, and the preservation of *ἐγείρειν* in Acts 10:40. could further indicate that Luke was recording a stereotyped Resurrection formula.

---

1) The use of the two verbs in Acts are relatively evenly distributed: *ἀνίστημι* : 2:24, 32, 3:26, 13:33, 34, 17:31  
*ἐγείρειν* : 3:15, 4:10, 5:30, 10:40, 13:30, 37, 26:8.

2) M. Wilcox, The Semitisms in Acts, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1965, pp.79-80

3) Acts 3:22, 7:37.

4) Luke 24:7, 46.

5) H.E. Tisdal, op.cit., p.181. M. Black, 'The "Son of Man" Passion Sayings in the Gospel Tradition', ZNW, 60, 1969, p.7 argues against this general view, proposing Lk. 24:6 preserves an ancient tradition.

6) See above study of Lk. 18:31-3.

Matthew reflects a consistent use of *ἐγείρειν* throughout. (1). In the three Passion Predictions, his Resurrection sayings are completely in line with the credal statements mentioned above using *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* and *ἐγερθήται*. The special Matthaean pericope of the Guard at the Tomb in Matthew 27:62-66, however reveals a very interesting situation. The Jews ask Pilate to set up a guard over the Tomb of Jesus *ἕως τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας* which falls into line with the Kerygmatic statements concerning the day of the expected Resurrection of Jesus. The Jews justify the need for this request by quoting a saying which they attribute to Jesus: *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγείσθαι*. The use of *ἐγείσθαι* is consistent with Matthew's use of the verb but *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας* is contrary to the period of time stated in the next verse. This pericope reveals a very complex tradition and a detailed analysis of this narrative is outside the scope of the present study, but the pericope primarily appears to enshrine a saying of Jesus that goes contrary to the chronological order established in the Matthaean Gospel. It is possible that the saying represents a tradition older than the narrative which surrounds it.

Although the Johannine Gospel uses the terms *ἀνίσταμαι* and *ἐγείρειν* sparingly, it appears to have a general tendency to use *ἀνίσταμαι* for the Resurrection at the Last Day (2) and *ἐγείρειν* to denote the Resurrection of Jesus (3). This use is

---

1) Cf Oepke, *TDNT*, vol.II, p. 335

2) Jn. 6:39, 40, 44, 54, 11:23, 24

3) i.e. Jn. 2:19, 20, 22, 12:1, 9, 17, (this is especially relevant if the raising of Lazarus is seen as a prototype of the raising of Jesus), 21:14



not totally consistent, however (1). The one reference which could possibly claim any parallel to a credal Resurrection saying is in John 2:19-22. Here, the Temple logion: *Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν*, which appears to have entered the Gospel tradition in at least four versions (2), and must therefore have constituted an important and controversial saying of Jesus in the Early Church, is explicitly interpreted in John as referring to the Resurrection of Jesus. If an interpretation relating this saying to the resurrection is apparently secondary (3) it is possible that John's interpretation has influenced the structure of the saying to place it within the verbal sphere of the kerygmatic Resurrection statements (4).

Jeremias' (5) study of the three-days sayings found in the Gospels has produced some interesting results. He (6) concludes from his survey that all these sayings are free from any Church theology and are part of the pre-Easter tradition. The interchangeability of *ἐν* and *ἐν* in the Temple logia indicates translation variants of the semitic *ל*. This can be translated as either 'within' or 'after the course of'. Jeremias (7) accepts

---

1) Jn. 20:9 - *ἀνίστημι* is used to refer to Jesus' Resurrection  
Jn. 5:21 - *ἐγείρειν* describes the action of the Father raising the dead. i.e. the General Resurrection.

2) Mark 14:52/Mt. 26:61, Mk. 15:29/Mt. 27:39, Mk. 13:2 (D W it Cyp)  
Jn. 2:19 Also Acts 4:13, Gospel of Thomas log. 71:2

3) F. I. Cheetham, 'St. Jn. 2:19 - 'Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up', *JTS*, 24, 1922-3, pp. 315-7

4) C.H. Dodd, The Historical Tradition of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, University Press, 1963, p. 90 suggests the possibility that *ἐγείρειν* instead of *οἰκοδομεῖν* could be due to Johannine interpretation, but does not think this view totally acceptable.

5) J. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 231-8

6) i.e. Mk. 14:58 par., Mk. 13:32f, Jn. 16:16-19

7) J. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 222



the second translation, within the context of the Temple logion as a correct one. The saying refers to the consummation of the New Age equated with the raising of the new Temple. Thus, the saying represents a pre-Master, eschatological logion.

The Temple logion appears in Mark's Gospel three times (1). It is only in Mark 13:2 (2) that the saying is actually put into the mouth of Jesus. It is set within an Apocalyptic framework which reflects the true meaning of the saying. Here we find a striking parallel between the Markan Resurrection sayings attached to the Passion Predictions: *διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν* corresponds to *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας*, and *ἀναστήσεται* is common to both. A suggestion put forward by Dodd (3), which has some support (4), is that the Resurrection sayings find a verbal link in Hosea 6:2 (5). Black (6) further points out that the Targum on Hosea 6:2 is interpreted as referring to the Resurrection of the Dead on the Last Day.

It seems possible that both the Temple logion and the Resurrection sayings in Mark find a common tradition in the eschatological setting. Linguistic similarities between these

---

1) Mk.13:2, 14:58, 15:29.

2) The Temple saying in the Church had an importance which suggests it was an original controversial saying of Jesus. It is surprising that only in the Western texts such a reference is found relating the saying explicitly to Jesus. The view that Codex Bezae may be preserving early non-synoptic material mentioned earlier in connection with Mark 9:31 is further attested here.

3) C.H.Dodd, According to the Scriptures, London, Fontana, 1965, p.77.

4) M.Black, op.cit., pp.4-5, and H.W.Tödt, op.cit., p.85.

5) H.Conzelmann, 'On the Analysis of the Confessional Formula in I Corinthians 15:3-5', Interpretation, 20, 1966, p.21.

Conzelmann says that the connection between the saying and Hosea 6:2 does not necessarily mean that the saying was constructed to refer explicitly to Hosea, but rather that the Hosea interpretation was imposed upon an already existing tradition.

6) M.Black, op.cit., p.5.

two sayings suggest an even stronger link. We have noticed how the Temple logion (as preserved, for example, in Mark 13:2) has been the basis for a developed kerygmatic Resurrection statement in John 2:19-22. It is possible that we can see a similar development taking place in the Synoptic parallels of the Markan Resurrection sayings. Jeremias (1) suggests that the sayings are pre-Easter and eschatological, and therefore, in a similar vein to the Temple logion. Matthew and Luke, however, betray evidence of a kerygmatising influence by specifically relating the saying to the Resurrection of Jesus rather than to the general Markan eschatological situation (2).

Therefore, there are preserved two pre-Easter eschatological sayings which have been taken up by, and become important to, the Church, both being interpreted in the light of historical events. The Resurrection sayings transmitted by Mark appear to have been the basis from which the kerygmatic Resurrection sayings were developed. This process is similar to that already noted in connection with the second Passion Prediction in Mark 9:31, where an original saying of Jesus forms the basis for the kerygmatic tradition.

It has been suggested that originally the sayings of the Suffering Son of Man circulated in isolation from the Resurrection sayings. If this was so, under what circumstances, and for what reasons were the two sayings joined together? Black (3) has

---

1) J. Jeremias, op.cit., p.285.

2) H.E. Tödt, op.cit., p.184 quotes Schekle, who says that the Resurrection sayings in Matthew and Luke are 'bound by the credal formula which was in process of formulation'.

3) E. Black, op.cit., p.7. Also cf. C.K. Barrett, Jesus and the Gospel Tradition, London, SPCK., 1967, p.86-7.



suggested that one of the earliest forms of the Suffering Son of Man tradition may have referred to the Son of Man's rejection and exaltation without reference to his Resurrection. In the Johannine Son of Man sayings (Jn. 3:14, 12:32), the verb *ὑψωθήσεται* is used. Although in Greek it can have only one meaning: 'to be lifted up' or 'exalted', in Aramaic: ܦܬܝܠܐ it has a further meaning: 'to be crucified'. Therefore John incorporated an exaltation/crucifixion motif in one word.

In Mark's present text of the second Passion Prediction (Mark 9:31), the meaning of the words Jesus spoke are not so obscure, but Black (1) suggests it is possible that this tradition of exaltation/crucifixion underlies the motif of the failure of the disciples to understand. If this is so, there was no difficulty in attaching an eschatological saying to the Passion Predictions used in Mark, as the Passion Prediction included an implicit reference to Jesus' Resurrection, and his imminent return and Parousia was a natural progression (2).

This, however, does not appear to be the case with the Matthaean and Lukan sayings which apparently lack the knowledge of such a tradition. Therefore, it appears necessary to change the original meaning of the eschatological saying to relate to the

---

1) M. Black, op. cit., p. 7

2) It is a widely accepted attitude to see the early Church living in full expectation that Jesus was to return as Messiah in the immediate future and bring the Eschaton. This belief would be hard to understand if its seeds had not been sown within the lifetime of Jesus. With the lapse in time between the Resurrection and the unfulfilled Eschaton, the modification of the Church's view is quite marked. Such phrases as 'Christ was raised to life - the first fruits of the harvest of the dead' (I Cor. 15:20) help to reconstruct a Pauline and probably an early Christian theology of the Resurrection of Jesus immediately initiating the Eschaton.



Resurrection of Jesus. It is only in the Markan Son of Man Passion Prediction in 9:31 that the verb ἀποκείνω is used twice: καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀποκτανθεὶς μετὰ. . . This phrase seems to establish a link between the suffering and death of the Son of Man on the one hand, and his death and Resurrection on the other. If, however, ὑψωθῆναι underlies the Son of Man tradition, it could form the link between the suffering and crucifixion, and the exaltation and the Parousia. The link between the Passion saying and Resurrection saying would be a verbal tally pivoting on the word ὑψωθῆναι which is now obscure in the Markan tradition recorded in 9:31.

From this study of the Resurrection sayings attached to the Passion Predictions, a case has been made for establishing the Markan form of the Resurrection saying as pre-Easter and therefore as quite probably original words of Jesus, relating to the eschatological coming of the Son of Man at the Last Day (1). The saying is attached to the Suffering Son of Man Predictions through a link with the exaltation theme akin to that found in John; itself probably being an early form of the Suffering Son of Man sayings. This would suggest that such a link was formed at an early stage. Mark 9:31 suggests this link more obviously than any other saying but even so, it is very obscure and would appear to have been accepted rather than understood. Furthermore, it appears that the

---

1) G. Strecker, 'The Passion - and Resurrection-Predictions in Mark's Gospel', Interpretation, 22, 1968, p. 429 further establishes the Resurrection saying as pre-Markan, as the time 'after three days...' is not consistent with the Markan narrative and this indicates the use of a special tradition.

Larkan Resurrection saying forms the basis for the kerygmatic developments found in the Synoptic parallels and possibly the later kerygmatic Resurrection statements. It is possible that this saying played a similar role to that of the second Passion prediction in that an original saying of Jesus is found to underline the credal statements of the Church.

v) CONCLUDING REMARKS

It is now time to enumerate the conclusions which can be drawn from this detailed analysis of the three Synoptic Passion Predictions,

A) The Original Sitz-im-Leben.

From our study of the three Passion Predictions, it has become apparent that they represent an old pre-Markan tradition. Even the third Passion Prediction, which is usually mentioned as a highly-developed, ex-eventu piece of tradition at best (1) or a saying that was extensively redacted by the Evangelist himself modelled upon existing tradition (2), has been set within an early period of the Church. The first Passion Prediction appears to bear marks of an even earlier origin. This is primarily a pre-Easter saying which has been overlaid with a primitive Church interpretation.

It is, however, the second Passion Prediction, (the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying), that betrays no obvious sign of Church development or interpretation, and reveals the most noticeable marks of authenticity. At the same time, it appears to have formed the basis for a midrash (3) on the word *παραδίδωμι* (4) which is detectable throughout the New Testament, and even possibly is behind the credal statements concerning the death of Jesus in Acts

---

1) cf. A. J. Higgins, pp. 34-6

2) cf. G. Strecker, *op. cit.*, pp. 421-2

3) A. Perrin, 'Mark 14:26, The End Product of a Christian Peshar Tradition?' *NTS*, 12, 1965-6, pp. 150-5 sets out a case for the development of an original saying of Jesus along similar lines to the view advanced in this chapter concerning the certain sayings of Jesus.

4) It would be an interesting study, but outside the realm of the present thesis, to follow through the midrashic development of *παραδίδωμι* in the Septuagint.



and the Epistles. The link between the Passion Prediction and the Resurrection saying in 9:31 seems to be more intrinsic than in the other Passion Predictions. The role of the Resurrection saying is similar to that of the Passion Prediction, representing a primitive credal statement that is developed in the Synoptic parallels and Kerygma. This would account for an early stereotyping of the saying during a period which might loosely be described as 'pre-kerygmatic'. The words of Jesus in this instance would be preserved as quasi-canonical. The techniques employed in using this saying betray a similar use to that employed in the use of the Old Testament in Jewish Literature and the New Testament by the Church Fathers, which further accentuates this theory.

It is at this stage that a review of the form in which the second Passion Prediction is cast may throw light upon its role and function.

#### B) The Form of Mark 9:31.

On the basis of Jeremias' study concerning this Aramaean saying, it appears that the saying represents the form of a riddle. The basis of this argument rests upon an Aramaic word-play on  $\chi\psi\iota$   $\gamma\iota\gamma$  /  $\chi\psi\iota$   $\gamma\iota$ . It has been noted that there are further double meanings within the saying, namely the apparently lost meaning of the crucifixion/exaltation motif and the original eschatological saying. These ambiguities accentuate the claim that the saying is a riddle. The riddle should be set along side the parable as an original didactic technique used by Jesus.

The teaching of Jesus not only covered attitudes and reactions

to various situations in life which later formed the grounding for Church discipline and Jewish-Christian controversy, but also covered teaching concerning his own person, nature and purpose. Whereas the first form of original teaching became the basis for the Church manual of discipline, i.e. *ἡ διδασχὴ*, the teaching Jesus gave concerning himself became the basis for confessional statements and creeds, i.e. *ἡ κηρυγμὰ*.

C) The First Step towards unfolding the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* Saying Tradition.

The characteristics which have been put forward concerning the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying of the Passion Prediction must now be applied to a wider context. Not only have the criteria proved to be valid but their use has highlighted certain features which could indicate the characteristics of the sayings tradition itself.

From the study of just one *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying, it appears that the following characteristics have emerged:

- a) The tradition in question reflects great authenticity.
- b) The sayings of Jesus have received a quasi-canonical status.
- c) The saying is presented in a teaching form and could suggest some catechetical purpose underlying the tradition.
- d) Mark's presentation of the saying suggests that he did not quite understand the exact meaning of the tradition he was preserving, but at the same time knew it to be important and essential to preserve (1). The Synoptic parallels show a

---

1) E. Best, The Temptation and the Passion, Cambridge, CUP., 1965, p.163 says of the Passion Predictions, although it could apply to other sayings, that Mark 'may have preserved it' (ie. the Passion Predictions) 'either because it had meaning to him or because its meaning had been lost and it had become almost magical in its use'.

different attitude and approach, although there is a possibility that Luke understood the quality of the saying a little more than Matthew, for he emphasises the teaching nature of the saying.

These conclusions are based upon one *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying and in the course of investigations, some points may have to be modified, and others added.

This detailed study of the Passion Predictions may seem too extensive for only one saying, but it was essential to provide a test case as a control, for as little as possible should be taken for granted. From the results of this individual study the rest of this inquiry can proceed.



THE STUDY:

2) THE PARABLES.

Manson's (1) list of parables is a comprehensive guide to all the sayings and similes found in Mark's Gospel that could possibly be put under the heading of parables. Using this list as a starting point, it is interesting to note the position of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* parables in it. Manson records eighteen parables found in Mark's Gospel, and of these eighteen, nine are introduced by *καὶ ἔλεγεν*. These nine parables appear between Mark 3:23-7:27 and within this block no other parables are recorded. The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* parables fall largely within two blocks of teaching material found in 4:1-34 (2) and 7:1-23 (3), which are separated by a block of narrative and miracle traditions -some containing *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings other than parables (4).

i) The Meaning of *παραβολή*.

The meaning of *παραβολή* in Mark's Gospel presents itself in two apparently paradoxical situations: either as a method of clarification for even the simplest of audiences, or as an attempt

---

1) T.W.Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, Cambridge, University Press, 1959, pp.66-7

2) The parables designated in 3:23-7 do not appear to be part of the original setting. The pericope itself seems to be misplaced and did not originally belong to its present position. G.H.Boobyer, 'The Redaction of Mark IV:1-34', NTS, 8, 1961, p.64 sees a link between the sayings on parables, 4:11f. and the sayings in 3:23-7 which will be discussed at a later stage in this section. Therefore, although not linked to chapter 4 by position and context, it is closely linked by application and content.

3) Although the teaching section ranges from 7:1f. 7:9 contains a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying, it is generally accepted that 7:14 is the beginning of a new section. (The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying, which appears in the Pericope of the Healing of the Syrophenician Woman's Daughter is contained within the similar contextual setting of the *οἶκος* motif as that of the sayings in 3:23-7).

4) P.J.Achtemeier, 'Towards the Isolation of Pre-Markan Miracle Catanae', JBL, 89, 1970, pp. 265-91, isolates all the narratives and teaching stories between 4:35-8:26 which include *καὶ ἔλεγεν* material, and in doing so, unveils two narrative catanae.

to mystify and confuse the listener as stated in Mark 4:11 (1).

This saying has been set within such a context that 4:10f. immediately suggests a deliberate desire on behalf of Jesus to withhold the means of understanding the Kingdom of God, and therefore salvation, from all but a chosen few. If the saying is not isolated from its immediate context, however, it need not relate to the use of parables as a means of mystification. Rather, it could indicate that the unsympathetic approach of many listeners to the words of Jesus leads to a total misunderstanding of the meaning behind the parables (2). What is more interesting than the original application of the saying for this present study, is the meaning of the term *παροιμία* in this instance and if this concept found here reflects the general use of the terms in the Gospels.

With respect to this saying, Boobyer (3) picks up and develops Fiebig's concept of the parable (4). The use of the term *παροιμία* in the New Testament is similar to the Hebrew *ḥōk* which had a very fluid meaning incorporating not only figurative phrases and stories, but also riddles and puns. Therefore, Boobyer (5) suggests that the parables referred to in 4:11f. did not directly relate to the parable recited just previously (6) or for that matter any other parable, but Jesus' teaching generally. This is further suggested by the use of

---

1) W. Marxsen, 'Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der Sogenannten Parabel-Theorie des Markus', *ZTK.*, 52, 1955, p.255.

2) cf. C.H. Peisker, 'Konsekutives *wa* in Markus 4:12', *ZNW.*, 59, 1968, pp.126-7

3) G.H. Boobyer, *op.cit.*, pp.59-70.

4) also cf. Hauck, *TDNT.*, vol.v, pp.750-1, where Fiebig's analogies are cited and theories are set out.

5) G.H. Boobyer, *op.cit.*, p.61.

6) ie. The Parable of the Sower, Mk. 4:3-8.



*τὰς παραβολὰς* instead of the singular in 4:10 (1). Boobyer even widens the field of application for the term in the light of the reference to the Targum on Isaiah 6:9-10 within the saying. Not only does it refer to the lack of hearing but also to the lack of seeing. He suggests that this is an implicit reference to the actions of Jesus as well as his teaching. Boobyer helped much in his development of the term *παραβολή* to remove the usual confining definitions.

A general survey of the use of the term *παραβολή* in Mark's Gospel indicates that Mark uses it to relate to teaching material as well as parables (2). Both 3:23-7 and 7:14-23 are designated parables by Mark and yet are technically sayings. The interesting point of this comparison is that both sections contain *καὶ ἔλεγεν* material. Boobyer (3) points out that there are only three occasions in Mark (4) where he uses the term parable although it is obvious that the teaching concerned does not fall within the usual meaning of the word.

Therefore, the parables in the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition contain certain sayings which are introduced under the title of *παραβολή* although not strictly parables in the usually limited sense of the word. One further definition of the term by Ambolic (5) introduces another concept of the use of the phrase which includes a further saying Manson does not list in his parable chart.

---

1) cf. Lk.8:9 - *ἡ παραβολή*

2) G.H.Boobyer, *op.cit.*, pp.61-62.

3) G.H.Boobyer, *ibid.*, p.62.

4) ie. 3:23-7, 7:14, 13:28.

5) A.M.Ambožic, 'Mark's Concept of the Parable', *CBQ.*, 29, 1967, pp.220-227.

Amboic (1) says that the actions and words referred to in the use of the *παροβολή* in Mark 4:11 relate, not just to instruction but also to decisions and decrees. Mark 7:15 is seen in the interpretation of 17-19 as both a parable and an ecclesiastical rule. To a certain extent, the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying in 2:27-8 although not classified as a parable (2), fits this definition very well. It is proposed therefore, to include this saying among the parable sayings to be reviewed in this chapter.

ii) The Use of *καὶ ἔλεγεν / καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* in Mark 4

The difficulties in attempting to discern traditional and redactional influences in Mark 4 are well enough known (3). In an attempt to create some sense of order into Mark 4, Jeremias (4) sets out three stages of development. To begin with, the three parables of the Sower, the Seed Growing Secretly, and the Mustard Seed were brought together by a common link of subject matter, and circulated as an independent unit, verbally linked by *καὶ ἔλεγεν*. Secondly the tradition was developed by the addition of a contextual setting in 4:10 and 33, and the interpretation of the Parable of the Sower (4:13-20), probably prior to Mark. The third development was introduced by the Evangelist himself who inserted 4:11, 21-3, 24f, by the introductory formula *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* and the developed framework found in 4:10f. Marxsen (5) also comes to similar conclusions, agreeing with

---

1) A.M. Amboic, *ibid.*, p.226

2) A.M. Amboic, *ibid.*, p.226

3) Lowrie cited by C.E.B. Cranfield, 'St. Mark 4:1-34, pt. 1', *STT*, 1951, p.400: 'I do not find it possible to comment in an orderly manner upon so disorderly a chapter.'

4) J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, London, SCM Press, 1969 p.14 n11

5) W.Marxsen, *op.cit.*, pp.250-9.

Jeremias that the καὶ ἔλεγεν introduction represents a traditional source whereas καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς is a Markan formula used to introduce old material.

Two difficulties arise from this solution to the Mark 4 complex, however. In the first place, the Parable of the Sower is introduced by καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς and not καὶ ἔλεγεν. Jeremias (1)

says that the use of καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς in 4:2 is redactional but if so, why has Mark made this change in order to imply that it may not come from the same tradition as the other 'seed' parables.

Marxsen (2) suggests the old traditional source was introduced by something similar to the wording found in 4:2: καὶ ἐδίδασκεν (ὁ Ἰησοῦς) ἐν παραβολαῖς (πολλά) therefore implying καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς could be redactional, but it seems strange that a saying or parable source should lack any introductory formula.

However, it is just as possible that ἐδίδασκεν is redactional (3).

Secondly, Marxsen says the formula καὶ ἔλεγεν applies to the Parable of the Sower by linking it to 4:9, as well as the other two καὶ ἔλεγεν parables (Mk. 4:26f, 30f). Mark 4:9, however, introduces a separate saying and certainly is not an integral part of the Sower parable (4). If καὶ ἔλεγεν introduces a specific tradition

1) J. Jeremias, op. cit., p.14 n11

2) W. Marxsen, op. cit., p.262

3) cf. the redactional influences in the context of Mk. 9:31 a καὶ ἔλεγεν saying. See study p.59

4) The Parable of the Sower in the Gospel of Thomas, log. 9 does not conclude with this little saying, although it forms the conclusion of the Parable of the Wise Fisherman in the immediately preceding logion. Therefore both the Gospels of Mark and Thomas, although associating this saying with the Sower Parable, acknowledge it as a separate logion.



4:9 would be used as an introduction to the Parables of the Seed Growing Secretly and the Mustard Seed, and not as a call-line to the Parable of the Sower. The conclusions drawn from the idea of two separate sources would mean that the Parable of the Sower was part of a different source from the Parables of the Seed Growing Secretly and the Mustard Seed. This is difficult to accept (1).

Confining the survey to the use of these introductory formulas in Mark 4 can easily lead to biased conclusions, so it is necessary to see whether or not Jeremias' and Marxsen's claims about *καὶ ἔλεγεν/καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* are substantiated by the use of these formulas in Mark's Gospel generally. The number of occasions on which *ἔλεγεν* is used in an introductory formula in Mark is thirty-one in all. In fifteen of these, *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* is used. (2). A further nine times, where different forms are used the sayings introduced are spoken by people other than Jesus (3). (The apparent 'unstereotyped' use of *ἔλεγεν δὲ αὐτῷ* to introduce 7:20 is quite possibly due to redaction. The saying is essentially meant to be a continuation of 7:17-19 and would run more smoothly without any introductory formula at all. The phrase *ἔλεγεν δὲ αὐτῷ* does not prominently emphasize the division between the two sections as would *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*). A further six introductory formulas are introduced by *καὶ ἔλεγεν*. (4). Three are found in chapter 4:10, 21, 24, and two in 12:35, 38. The introduction to the saying

---

1) M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1967, pp.162-6. All three parables have similar Aramaic word-plays.

2) 2:27, 3:23, 4:2, 10, 21, 24, 6:4, 10, 7:9, 14, 27, (modification of *αὐτοῖς* to *αὐτῷ*), 8:21, 9:1, 31, 11:17

3) 5:3, 28, 30 (although spoken by Jesus, intricate part of narrative), 6:16, 18, 8:24, 9:24, 15:12, 14

4) 4:9, 26, 30, 12:35, 38, 14:36

in 14:36 is spoken by Jesus when alone, and therefore would have been modified to make sense.

It is suggested that a possible reason for the use of *καὶ ἰδιῶν* in these five cases (1), rather than *καὶ ἰδιῶν αὐτῶν* lies with the lack of a defined context. The saying in Mark 4:9 is appended to the Parable of the Sower, and 4:26f and 4:30f to the collection of sayings on the right use of parables, (Mark. 4:21-5). Similarly, 12:35f and 38f are appended to the preceding discussions in the Temple. In both cases, the sayings themselves do not possess a self-contained context or a setting within a narrative pericope, and the introductory formula is modified accordingly.

One further question to be raised concerning this subject is which of the two formulas is original? One ought not to be too pedantic here, but the tendency in the Gospel to use *καὶ ἰδιῶν αὐτῶν* more than any other form and the almost redundant inclusion of *αὐτῶν* in certain contexts on occasions suggests that the longer form was the more original and that Mark found it necessary to modify it in a few instances.

iii) Mark 4:1-20, 7:14-23

A parallel between these two teaching sections has been noted in a number of studies (2). Discussion concerning the original meaning of the parables and the problems of interpretation

---

1) 4:9, 26, 30, 12:35, 38

2) cf. G.H. Boobyer, op. cit., pp.62-63. H. Wrede, The Messianic Secret, London, J. Clarke and Co. Ltd., 1971, p.61, J. Wellhausen Das Evangelium Marci, Berlin, G. Reimer, 1903, p.57-8



is apparently hampered by the context setting for the sayings.

Two articles, discussing the similarities between the two sections have done much to help solve this difficulty. It is worth briefly looking at them as a starting point for further comparison.

Daube (1) looks at the form of teaching followed in four Gospel passages. The plan follows the form of a public pronouncement about which the Talmidim ask, in private afterwards, for its true meaning and receive an explanation. Two of these four narratives are Mark 4:1-20 and 7:14-23. Daube's contention is that the layout of these four sections reveals an original context similar to that usually portrayed in literature on rabbinic discussions. He therefore agrees with the usual assumption that although the public saying is original, the request for an explanation and the subsequent answer are redactional. The position of the *מ' ע'ג'ר'ר* tradition in these sections is that both the sayings, 4:3-8 and 7:15, and part of the explanation, 4:11-12, 7:20-3, are introduced by this formula. The Sitz-im-leben of the context for these sayings, however, does not essentially relate to the sayings themselves, which could have been earlier in origin (2). It has become increasingly evident that the saying on parables in Mark 4:11f did not originally refer to the tower but that it is reinterpreted as such within the confines of the present context. This conclusion does not necessarily mean that the development of such contexts for various sayings lessens the likelihood of the originality of the sayings themselves. The creation of such

---

1) D. Daube, 'Public Pronouncement and Private Explanation in the Gospels,' *ET*, 57, 1945-6, pp. 175-7

2) Whereas Daube *ibid.* p.177 considers the context a reworked tradition, J. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p.98 considers it redactional.



contexts may have been an attempt by the Church to preserve sayings of Jesus and give them an authority equal to those in Jewish tradition. As seen in the study of the Passion Predictions, Jesus' words carry a certain quasi-canonical scriptural authority, and have been framed as such by subsequent tradition. so it is equally possible that words of Jesus are here preserved in Early Church traditions, to reflect his teaching authority. Although Daube rightly questions the assumption that certain sayings in these teachings sections are not original, his conclusions throw more light on these as made of original sayings within the Christian tradition than on the nature of the sayings themselves.

Marxsen (1), in his discussion of the parable theory in Mark's Gospel also sees similarities between Mark 4 and 7. He says Mark 7 records a purer form than Mark 4, for the inserted section, 4:10-12, interrupts the flow of the plan (2). However when the two teaching sections are compared, it can be seen that he fails to recognise the idea of a double interpretation given to the parable. The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* interpretation in 7:20f is not once mentioned by Marxsen and 4:11 is considered to be imposed upon the existing context. He therefore sees the layout of these two sections as a saying or parable pronouncement, followed by an explanation given to a small group of disciples. It is precisely the double interpretation which makes these two teaching sections special and this fact has been ignored by both Marxsen and Daube.

---

1) W. Marxsen, op. cit., pp.257-61

2) W. Marxsen, ibid., p.262

At this stage, it would be most profitable to place the two teaching sections parallel to each other and see what further similarities appear. This might help to illuminate the method of composition and suggest reasons for the placing of these sayings within their present form and context.

Chapter 4

2 καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς  
 πολλὰ, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ  
 αὐτοῦ  
 3 ἀκούετε  
 4 ἰδοὺ ἐξηλθεν ὁ σπείρων σπείραι. καὶ  
 ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν  
 πρὸς τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ ἦλθεν τὰ πτενύα καὶ  
 5 κατέφαγεν αὐτό. καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν  
 ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν  
 πολλήν, καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀνέτειλεν διὰ τὸ μὴ  
 6 ἔχει γάθους γῆς. καὶ ὅτε ἀνέτειλεν  
 ὁ ἥλιος ἐκαυρώθη, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν  
 7 ῥίζαν ἐξηράθη. καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς  
 τὰς ἀκανθὰς, καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἀκανθὰ καὶ  
 συνέπνιξαν αὐτό καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν.  
 8 καὶ ἄλλα ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν,  
 καὶ ἐβόου καρπὸν ἀνθρακνόντα καὶ ῥιζανό-  
 μενα, καὶ ἔφερον εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν

Chapter 7

14 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τοὺς  
 ὄχλους ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς  
 ἀκούσατέ μου πάντες καὶ σῦνετε.  
 15 οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου  
 εἰσπνεύσαντος εἰς αὐτόν, ὃ δύναται  
 κοινῶσαι αὐτόν· ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ  
 ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορεύονται, καὶ ἐστὶν τὰ  
 κοινῶσα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατὸν

9 καὶ ἔλεγεν· ὅς ἔχει ὥτα  
ἀκούειν ἀκούετω.

10 καὶ ὅτε ἐγενετο κατὰ μόνας,  
ἤρστων αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν  
τοῖς δώδεκα τὰς παραβολαῖς.

11 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἱμῖν τὸ  
μυστήριον δεδοται τῆς βασιλείας  
τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἐκεῖνος δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν  
παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γένηται,

12 ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ  
μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν  
καὶ μὴ συνῶσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν  
καὶ ἄφεσιν αὐτοῖς.

13 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· οὐκ ἄρατε τὴν  
παραβολὴν ταύτην, καὶ πῶς πᾶσας τὰς  
παραβολὰς γινώσεσθε;

14 ὁ σπείρων τὸν λόγον στείρει.

15 οὗτοι δὲ εἰσὶν οἱ πᾶρά τὴν ὁδὸν  
ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὅταν  
ἀκούσωσιν, εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ σατανᾶς  
καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον  
εἰς αὐτούς. κτλ.

16 εἰ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκούετω.

17 καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον ἀπὸ  
τοῦ ὄχλου, ἐπῆρσταν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ  
αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολήν.

20 ἔλεγεν δὲ ὅτι τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου  
ἐκπορεύμενος, ἐκεῖνο κοινὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

21 ἔσθωθεν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας τῶν  
ἀνθρώπων οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοὶ

ἐκπορεύονται, πόρνεια, κλοπαί, φόνοι,

22 μοιχεῖαι, πλεονεξίαι, πονηρίαι,  
δόλος, ἀσέλγεια, ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρὸς, βλασφημίαι,  
ὑπερηφανία, ἀφροσύνη.

23 Πάντα ταῦτα τὰ πονηρὰ ἔσθωθεν  
ἐκπορεύεται καὶ κοινὸν τὸν ἀνθρώπου.

18 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· οὐτως καὶ ὑμεῖς  
ὁσύνετοί ἐστε; οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι πᾶν τὸ  
ἔσθωθεν εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸν ἀνθρώπον  
οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινεῶσαι,

19 ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν  
καρδίαν ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸν  
ἀφροῦνον ἐκπορεύεται, καθιρίζων πάντα  
τὰ βρώματα;



A parallel pattern clearly emerges. The statement made to the crowd, in each case, is introduced by the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* formula. Both begin with a call to listen and finish with a formula of exhortation (1), which in Mark 4:9 is introduced by a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* formula. Then comes a change of scene where Jesus, alone with his disciples (2), is questioned about the preceding parable (3).

In each case two explanations are given. One is introduced by *καὶ ἔλεγεν* and the other by *καὶ λέγει*. Mark 7:17-23 has the two explanations in reverse order to Mark 4:10-20.

The incongruity of the framework to the sayings is obvious in the saying on parables, where its meaning in the present context is confined just to one parable whereas the saying itself suggests application to the full range of Jesus' teaching. This suggests that the original sayings here are preserved within a traditional, unchanged framework. Also, Mark 7:17 introduces the *ὅτι* motif. This motif could possibly be a pre-Markan framework upon which various sayings and stories have been hung. Therefore it appears most probable that in both these teaching sections two sayings plus the two explanations are framed within a quasi-stereotyped framework.

A number of problems must be dealt with.

a) The suggestion that the framework and sayings do not form an

---

1) 7:16 is occasionally left out of Greek mss. One of the mss. that contains this exhortory verse is Codex Bezae.

2) There has been some concern over the meaning of *οἱ περὶ Ἰησοῦ* *οἱ δώδεκα*, which suggests a much larger and less intimate group than the immediate disciples of Jesus. R.J. Meyer, Mark 4:10 'Those about him with the Twelve,' Studia Evangelica, 11, 1963 pp.211-8, says that the phrase could be translated as certain 'belonging to' the Twelve.

3) cf. Mark 4:10 par. 7:17 par.

original cohesive unit, poses the question; what was the reason for setting out the sayings in this way?

b) What is the relationship between the sayings and two explanations?

and

c) Can any 'Kerygmaticizing' influence be seen in the explanations?

i.e. Are the explanations Church interpretations of the sayings of Jesus?

First, the arrangement of 4:1-20 must be investigated. The context of the Parable of the Sower and the two interpretations is greatly modified in Matthew and Luke. Only Mark introduces a complete change of scene between the parable and the first interpretation. Matthew and Luke mention the request for an explanation by Jesus' disciples, but not that the request is made on another occasion when alone. Also they modify the question put to Jesus. In Mark 4:10 the question about parables is incongruous to both the immediate context and the wider meaning of the saying. However, in Matthew 13:10, the disciples ask why Jesus speaks in parables and Luke 8:9 confines the question to the Parable of the Sower itself, thereby resolving any difficulties. The clear-cut division between the first and second interpretation is not muted in Mark. Mark 4:13 positively introduces the second explanation with the *καὶ ἄγετις αὐτοῦ* formula and a counter-question both of which are missing in Matthew and Luke. It would appear that Matthew and Luke have lost the clear-cut division, apparent in Mark, of a parable plus two explanations. Also, the Markan context shows a fuller awareness of the wide meaning that could be attributed to the saying in 4:11f despite the fact that he had inserted it into a context causing it to refer to only one parable (1).

---

1) This reflects a similar feature to that found in Mark 9:31 where the context does not do justice to the full implications of the saying.



A comparison of the Saying on Parables itself, recorded in the three Gospels (Mt.13:11-14, Mk.4:11-12, Lk.8:10) reveals an interesting situation. Matthew and Luke agree in construction against Mark. Both introduce the word *ῥαῖναι* and use the plural *τὰ μυστήρια*, which tends to alter the meaning. Also another quotation from Isaiah 6:9-10 appears, for Mark sides with the Targum by concluding the quotation with *καὶ ἀφ' οὗ αὐτοῖς* which is absent in Matthew and Luke. The same quotation appears in John 12:39 and Acts 28:27. On both occasions, the concluding phrase, *καὶ ἰσχυρὰ αὐτοῖς* reflects the Septuagint and Massoretic texts. An absence of either conclusion in Matthew and Luke is rather strange. It is evident that the quotation in John and Acts represents a proof of the Jews' blindness, produced from scripture. On the other hand, such a use of the text is not so evident in Mark (1). Although the complexities of Matthaean and Lukan agreement will be dealt with at a later stage in this inquiry, it would appear that on some occasions when Mark is preserving his *καὶ ἄλλων* tradition, Matthew and Luke retain the same 'Synoptic' tradition which is usually ascribed to Mark.

Contrary to the general opinion that the allegorical interpretation of the Parable of the Sower (4:13-20) is secondary (2), Gerhardsson (3) suggests that Parable and its interpretation go together. The Parable of the Sower itself is generally accepted as original (4) and there is no reason to suggest otherwise.

---

1) see Study, p.55.

2) V.Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, London, Macmillan, and Co. Ltd., 1969, p.258 cites a number of scholars who accepted this view.

3) B.Gerhardsson, 'The Parables of the Sower and its Interpretation', NTS., 14, 1967-8, pp.190-191.

4) V.Taylor, op.cit., p.250.



Therefore, if the parable is original, the interpretation must be also. Gerhardsen (1) says that the parable is recounted as a fixed text which was learnt by heart as a method of transmitting Jesus' teaching. The interpretation, however, could have been vastly developed and changed from its probable original meaning. Therefore, it was essential to transmit strictly certain sayings of Jesus, whereas other sayings were developed to act as a commentary or interpretation on carefully presented sayings of Jesus which presumably formed the core of his teaching. Although the saying on parables (4:11f) acts as an interpretation of the parable of the sower, no attempt to change the actual wording of the saying is discernable. This first interpretation of the parable is therefore essentially in a different category from the second interpretation.

Another conclusion Gerhardsen (2) draws from his examination of the Synoptic texts is that the Matthaean account is more original. Underlying the parable interpretation in Matthew is the text of Deuteronomy 6:4f which relates the four ways by which God can be honoured according to the Shema to four types of people. The Lukan parallel interpretation has obvious Christian developments and is not concerned with recording the reaction of carefully defined types of people (3). Mark's interpretation, on the other hand, takes the form of an initial heading that the seed is interpreted as the word and then sets out a table of four categories of people

---

1) B. Gerhardsen, 'The Parable of the Sower and its Interpretation' *NTS*, 14, 1967-8, p.190-1

2) B. Gerhardsen, *ibid.*, p.175-9

3) B. Gerhardsen, *ibid.*, pp.183-4

represented by the different soils (1). It is at once noticeable that the form the interpretations in Matthew and Mark take have similarities with a haggadic midrash, (rather than the usual explanation) that it is an allegorical interpretation (2). Instead of Mark using an underlying Old Testament quotation to substantiate the parable and interpretation as in Matthew, the parable itself forms the sole basis of the interpretation (3). This is not necessarily due to a later tradition than that recorded in Matthew as Gerhardsson assumes. The words of Jesus could be the 'scriptural' basis for both parable and interpretation. Just as Mark probably knew the basic Synoptic tradition of the Saying on Parables (4:11f) and has superimposed on it the older *מִלֵּיפָא* tradition, so here also Mark may have known the basic tradition recorded in Matthew but chose his alternative tradition. The Markan interpretation (4:13-20) emphasises not only four categories of people but also the importance of 'the Word', i.e. Jesus teaching. Whether this alteration to the commentary is Markan or pre-Markan is difficult to tell, although Jeremias (4) suggests that the conclusion is pre-Markan.

The conclusions drawn from this section Mark 4:1-20 are substantially different from the usual view of the construction and development of the Synoptic tradition (5). The framework is

---

1) J. Jeremias, op. cit., p.79

2) R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford Blackwell, 1972, p.187

3) A similar situation found in the second Passion Prediction supports the view that these sayings represent a more primitive form, later sayings having higher incidences of proof texts underlying them.

4) J. Jeremias, op. cit., p.79

5) cf. J. Jeremias, ibid., p.14 nll., D.W. Riddle, 'Mark 4:1-34 the Evolution of a Gospel Tradition', JBL, 56, 1937, pp.77-90

used primarily to accentuate the role of the words of Jesus: a parable of Jesus has been interpreted by another 'parable' which although originally concerned with a different situation, is here applied directly to the parable of the Sower. The second interpretation is in the form of a midrashic exposition of the first parable which, although again pre-Markan, and its method betraying Jewish rather than Greek influence, cannot be thought of in its present form as original. This layout reflects a Jewish midrashic technique where one Old Testament quotation may be interpreted by another, the quotations are taken completely out of their original context but linked by subject or linguistic similarities (1), which in turn are interpreted by a commentary tending to be more fluid. It would seem that the words of Jesus are used, as with the second Passion Prediction, scripturally and the *καὶ ἄλλος* saying corresponds to an early commentary form.

The next step is to put into practice the conclusions drawn from the teaching section in 4:1-20 and see whether a similar pattern can be discerned in 7:14-23. Although only part of a longer teaching section starting from 7:1 concerning ritual washing, it is generally agreed that 7:14 begins as a new detached section linked only by the common theme of uncleanness (2). Here we find a similar layout: the parable is spoken, then two explanations in private are given. The substantial difference is that the *καὶ ἄλλος* explanation precedes the *καὶ ἄλλος* interpretation. Looking at the Matthean parallel, (15:10-19), certain differences are to be found (3).

The most important one which concerns us here is the coalescing

---

1) W. Marxsen, *op. cit.*, p.264

2) J. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p.57

3) i.e. absence of *ἐπερωτήσας* motif, and Peter, not the disciples, questioning Jesus about the parable.



of the two explanations into one continuous exposition. It has already been noticed that Mark's use of his *καὶ εὐαγγέλιον* material has led to certain inconsistencies in the text of 4:1-20, and 7:14-23 appears to be no exception. Mark has kept the order of sayings established in the tradition known to him as recorded in Matthew and Luke, and therefore, the explanations in 7:14f appear in reverse order to those in 4:1-20.

The corresponding Matthean teaching section 15:10f attempts to form a unity with the preceding teaching on ritual washing 15:1f. Matthew 15:20 sums up the whole teaching section by bringing it back to its original starting point. The modified list of vices in 15:19 fits those listed in the Decalogue more precisely than the Markan list (1), and the emphasis on the vices which are spoken or thought tends to bring the list more in line with the immediate controversy.

The Markan section makes a clear-cut division between the two explanations i.e. 7:18-19, 20-3, and at the end of the first one, inserts the statement *καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ βρώσις τὸ βρώμενον*. This immediately puts the saying on a level with ecclesiastical pronouncements made by the Church and not Jesus. The statement is also grammatically awkward in its context which similarly suggests that it may not be part of the original discussion. The first interpretation, 7:18-19 is similar to 4:13-20. The explanation has been introduced by the Church for didactic reasons. This interpretation, elevating the saying to the role of a decree, should naturally exclude any further interpretation, but the tradition Mark was working from included a further separate explanation. If Mark 7:18-19 was taken out of its present context, 7:15, 20-3 would

---

1) C. Carlston, 'The Things that Defile' (Mk. 7:14) and the law in Matthew and Mark, *NTS*, 15, 1968, p.90

run together smoothly and recall the layout in 4:3-12. The need to insert the other explanation in accordance with the *order of* the basic Synoptic Tradition known to Mark, has led to the unnecessary inclusion of two explanations.

The second explanation beginning *ἀγινόμενον* makes no attempt as in Matthew, to relate back to the original discussion, 7:1f, but only relates it to the 'parable' in verse 15. The explanation here is concerned with moral instruction rather than ritual interpretation. The first explanation fits well within the period of the Church where such practicalities as Jewish dietary and cleansing laws were reviewed in the light of the growing number of Gentile Christians. Dibelius (1) says that the double explanation of verse 15 can only be understood from the Church's interest in the food question, but the second explanation is not concerned with food and does not betray any obvious Sitz-im-Leben by its contents. Bultmann (2) and others (3) immediately assume a list such as this must be the product of the Jewish Hellenistic Church.

The division of the list under the heading *οἱ ἐντολὰς ἀγαθὰς καὶ κακὰς* into two parts, each containing six vices (4), suggests that it is set out in this way to aid easy memorization. Taylor (5) proposes a closeness to Pauline vocabulary, but it contains certain words not used at all in the Pauline epistles. It is usually assumed that a vice list which bears no direct relationship to the Decalogue or similar lists in the Jewish literature, must necessarily

---

1) M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, London, Nicholson and Watson, 1934, p.221

2) R. Bultmann, op. cit., p.166

3) cf V. Taylor, op. cit., p.247

4) C. Carlston, op. cit., p.90

5) cf comparison list of words in the New Testament in V. Taylor op. cit., p.346

be Hellenistic in origin (1), but there is evidence in Qumran (2) and the Didache (3) that such lists were constructed which were not obviously connected with the Hellenistic lists and similarly not directly dependent on the Old Testament. Taylor (4) says that 7:20-23 shows signs of an early Christian catechetical interpretation. He (5) is surprised, however, that the Church still needed the teaching of Paul on food laws and the discussion that ensued, considering there were already two Christian arguments on the saying. If, however the original interpretation of verse 15 was verses 20-3, reflecting a moral explanation of the saying, and the ritual explanation was superimposed upon the text at a later stage, the full implications of the saying could easily give rise to discussion and debate. As 7:18-19 is a secondary commentary, similar to that of 4:13-20 in form, the implications of the interpretation are more fluid and can be seen reflected in the discussions subsequently put forward in the New Testament (6).

A final problem must be discussed.

What was the role these groups of sayings played in the early Church? It has been noted that the sayings are faithfully preserved and that any development is only introduced in the context or in the additional commentary. In both cases, the two groups appear to represent some form of catechetical instruction. Admittedly, at

---

1) C.H. Dodd, More New Testament Studies, Manchester, University Press, 1968, p.25

2) S. Wibbling, Die Tugend und Lasterkataloge in Neuen Testament, Berlin, Alfred Topelmann, 1959, p.60: 'Das A.T. bietet keine direkten parallelen'

3) D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London, Athlone Press, 1956, p.104-105

4) v. Taylor, op. cit., p.347

5) v. Taylor, ibid., p.343

6) Romans 14:14 even cites this saying of Jesus in relation to the food laws.



first sight, chapter 4:1-20 does not appear to show signs of a Catechetical influence. There is nothing to suggest the original context of the parable when first spoken. However, Jeremias (1) sees reflected in the interpretation, an attempt to turn the parable into an admonition addressed to converts. In this case, the converted are represented not by the crowd but by the disciples. It would appear logical to assume that the disciples would be regarded as the original converts. Therefore, the interpretation and possibly the parable, also was not meant for everyone, but for those converts who were willing to receive instruction. The parable of the Sower begins with a call to listen and ends with a little saying exhorting the listeners, again, to take note. The stress on hearing is so that it can be committed to memory (2). Codex Bezae adds *καὶ ὁ ἀκούων ἀποκρίσας* bringing in the concept of understanding as well. ~~The presence of the disciples as sole~~ recipients of the instruction, along with the emphasis on teaching, bring to mind a setting similar to the second Passion Prediction.

Again, 7:14-23 reflects the idea of a small group of disciples receiving special instruction, also containing and emphasizing the need to listen and understand (3). Furthermore, the *καὶ ὁ ἀκούων* explanation in 7:20-3 seems phrased in such a way as to render it easier to commit to memory.

The use of these original sayings of Jesus appears to confirm an opinion already stated in the conclusions on the Passion

---

1) J. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 79

2) cf Lk. 9:44 which is the introduction to the second Passion Prediction, where Luke stresses the need to listen.

3) 7:14, 15, 18

Predictions that the words of Jesus, having received in some cases a quasi-canonical status in the Church, became the basis for catechetical instructions. The result was that, when the sayings were drawn upon by the Evangelist, misunderstanding of the original meaning of the sayings led to different interpretations being imposed on them by the Church (1), despite the Evangelist having succeeded in preserving the exact wording, and its authority, as faithfully as possible, within the existing framework.

iv) Mark 4:21-32

The continuation and conclusion of the Parable section in Mark falls into two parts: a) Mark 4:21-5, which contains a number of short sayings; b) Mark 4:25-32 a pair of parables: the Seed Growing Secretly (4:26-29) and the Mustard Seed (4:30-2). Neither unit is attached to any form of context but hangs upon the original setting in Mark 4:1-2

a) Mark 4:21-5

Libelius (2) suggests that these verses are a continuation and conclusion to the interpretation of the Parable of the Tower. An assumption like this, however, is difficult to substantiate, for as Jeremias points out, any meanings attached to these sayings are work of the Evangelist, for the original context is irretrievable.

Theoretically, this section is a collection of four sayings but the layout presents them in a special way. The question arises whether the arrangement is due to the Evangelist, or to the tradition which he may have used. Jeremias (3) says the grouping of these

---

1) cf W. Marxsen, op. cit., p.256 suggests the Synoptic collectors preserve traditions which they did not properly understand.

2) B. Libelius, op. cit., p.227

3) J. Jeremias, op. cit., p.91

four sayings in this section is secondary, but it is more important to ascertain whether this grouping is due to redaction (ie. the Evangelist) or tradition (ie. pre-Markan). There is no reason to assume that the sayings presented in this form were once attached to a particular context, and the unusual manner of presentation for Mark (ie. of no direct context on which to hang these sayings) suggests that the Evangelist is drawing from a collection of isolated sayings. Kennedy (1) notes a similarity between these sayings and the rest of chapter 4. The introductory formula in 4:21, 24 occurs a number of other times in this chapter, which he says indicates Mark's conscious use of a stereo-typed tradition. The artificial arrangement and orderly presentation of the sayings has similarly suggested to Taylor (2) that Mark is preserving a source.

Turning to the section itself, the indications of a stereo-typed tradition and the suggestion of a link with the previously mentioned *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings in the chapter are easily seen. The four sayings are set out in a pair of double similes or parables. The double parables are very similar in construction. Both begin with the formula *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* which introduces the simile; this is interpreted by an explanatory saying, which is attached to it by the conjunction *γὰρ*. It is noted by Jeremias (3) that the division of these four sayings into a pair of double parables is even marked by *Μένετε τὶ ἀκούετε* (Mk. 4:24a, cf 4:3a) *εἰ τὴν ἑστῶσαν ἀκούετε, ἀκούετε* (Mk. 4:23) (4) It is with exactly the same phrase in Mark 4:9 that the Parable of the Sower is linked with the

---

1) H.A.A. Kennedy, 'The composition of Mark 4 21-5. A study in the Synoptic Problem', *ET*, 25 1913-4, p.305

2) V. Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp.262-3

3) J. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p.91



the subsequent interpretations. Similarly, the phrase *ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ βασιλείου* (Mk. 4:24) recalls the use of *ἀρχή* to introduce the beginning of the Parable of the Sower (cf Mk. 4:3) (1).

The use of these sayings in Matthew and Luke indicates a completely different application and presentation. The four sayings are represented individually in separate contexts in both Matthew and Luke, a fact which is usually assumed to indicate a reliance on 'Q'. The 'interpretive' saying of the second parable (Mk. 4:25) is reproduced a second time in Matthew 13:12, the Matthaean parallel of the reason for parables (cf Mk. 4:10-12). As Kennedy (2) points out, this is the only indication in the Matthaean parables section that the Evangelist may have been acquainted with the Markan material. The addition of *καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀκούοντες* in Matthew 13:12 appears in the same saying in Matthew 25:29, but neither in Mark nor in the apparent 'Q' passage in Luke 19:26. Its inclusion within the same section as that in Mark, at most indicates a very dim recollection of the Markan material but on the whole it could be assumed that Matthew was directly influenced by a non-Markan source.

Luke, on the other hand, besides recording the individual

---

4) W. J. Loader, 'Mark 4:23', *ET*, 25, 1913-14, pp. 427-30 suggests that this verse is a later addition to the texts, and that the use of this phrase in Mk. 4:23 and 7:16 is based upon the original use in Mk. 4:9. It has been noted that on three occasions where this saying occurs in Mk. it is part of the *καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ* tradition and part of the parables section at that. Also, the occurrence of the phrase in Mt. 13:9, 11:15, 13:43 and Mk. 8:8 and 14:35 begin with *ὁ ἔχων* (4:9) which differs from the Mkn. *ὁ ἔχων* (4:23, 7:16). The stereotyped introductions suggest this saying as an integral part of the tradition.

1) Also cf Mk. 7:14

2) H.A.A. Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 305

sayings parallel to Matthew, does have a section similar to Mark 4:21-5 at Luke 8:16-18. Although three out of four of the sayings are recorded in the same order, it must not be automatically assumed that Luke is following the Markan parallel. On the contrary, there is reason to suppose that Luke had knowledge of a source which relied neither on Mark nor 'Q'.

The identical saying to Luke 8:16 in 11:33 comes within a section which contains a great deal of special Lukan material and Kennedy suggests that these two sayings are not independent of one another. This is evident in the similarities between the first and last phrase in both Lukan sayings (1) which is not found in the Markan or Matthean parallels (Mark. 4:21, Mt. 5:15). Although Kennedy (2) suggests that both sayings are drawn from, or influenced by, a special Lukan source, he thinks that the parallel use of 8:16f with Mark 4:21f indicates a knowledge of this Markan material. However, he does not assume a detailed knowledge of Mark 4:21-5 by Luke, for it is inconceivable why the third saying (cf. Mark. 4:24) is left out. In the presentation of the four sayings by Mark, the third saying or simile is interpreted by the fourth saying (Mark. 4:24, 5). Luke has completely violated this by retaining the interpretative saying (Lk. 8:18) but not the simile which it should be interpreting. It is possible that the passage in Luke represents a completely different tradition from that preserved in Mark. The first simile in 8:16, as has been suggested, is probably not Markan but is from

---

1) Lk. 8:16 οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἄρας... ἵνα οὐ εἰσέλθῃσιν καὶ σβήσωσι τὸ φῶς  
 // Lk. 11:33 οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἄρας... ἵνα οὐ εἰσέλθῃσιν καὶ τὸ φῶς σβήσωσι  
 2) H.A.A. Kennedy, ibid., p.303



another source. The use of *καὶ* as a linking conjunction between the simile and interpretive saying is not only kept in 8:17 but also in 8:18 and it is feasible to argue that 8:17-18 represents two interpretations of 8:16. All evidence suggests that Mark and Luke retain two separate collections of sayings.

It is at once noticeable, from the use of the individual sayings in Matthew and Luke that the Markan use of these sayings as similes or interpretive sayings is disregarded by them. The simile of the lamp is given a completely different interpretation (Mt. 5:15, Lk. 11:33) and its interpretive saying (Lk. 4:22) stands as a separate saying (Mt. 5:15, Lk. 12:2). The simile of 'measure for measure' is used as an explanatory saying to the saying on Judging in the Great Sermon (Mt. 7:2, Lk. 6:38) and its interpretive saying (Lk. 4:25) is added as a concluding comment to the Parable of the Pounds (Mt. 25:29, Lk. 19:26).

There appears to be little evidence from the use of these sayings in Matthew and Luke, either individually or in the parallel context, to suggest that either Matthew or Luke knew of the sayings as set out in the Markan section. It is more probable from the artificially constructed tradition in Mark, that the separate use of the corresponding sayings in Matthew and Luke represents a more general tradition, whereas the idea of a collection is more specific.

In the Markan passage, the layout of these sayings indicates the use of a saying of Jesus to interpret a parable given by him. A similar tendency to use a saying of Jesus to interpret his own parables has been noticed in Mark 4:3-9, 11 and 7:15, 20-3. Here, too, can a quasi-canonical use of the words of Jesus be seen



which is not evident in the Synoptic parallels?

b) Mark 4:26-32

The Parables of Seed Growing Secretly and the Mustard Seed are generally thought of as similar to the Parable of the Sower in both content and presentation (1), and that these three parables form the basis for the parables section. Although it is undoubtedly true that these three parables do represent similar themes of seed and growth, they neither form a basic triad nor reflect the same interpretation.

The Parables of the Seed Growing Secretly and the Mustard Seed form a pair of parables which are closely linked by a similar application of each parable to the Kingdom of God. These interpretive clauses constitute part of the beginning of each parable. The Parable of the Sower, on the other hand, stands by itself, and has no application within the framework of the parable but a detailed interpretation appended to it. It is possible that the Evangelist rearranged his source, containing three separate parable units, into a single parable and a parable doublet; however, a study of the parables will indicate that the pair of parables were linked prior to the Markan use of the material. Even although the Markan form of the parable of the Sower was not originally attached to the interpretation given in Mark's Gospel, the idea of a coherence between parable and interpretation at such an early stage (2) does suggest that this parable stood on its own and did not need to be supported by other parables.

---

1) J. Jeremias, op. cit., p.14 nll, cf. Black, op. cit., pp.162-66  
2) B. Gerhardsson, op. cit., pp. 165-93. See study p.104

The pair of parables is applied to the kingdom of God. This is unusual in Mark's Gospel for nowhere else are parables applied to this theme. Black (1) notices that the parables, when translated into Aramaic, form various word-plays, and the double question in the introduction to the parable of the mustard seed betrays signs of an original Semitic poetic formula (2). These forms suggest techniques used for easy memorization, but this theory is even further enhanced by an almost identical construction used for both parables.

Mark 4:26-9

Mark 30-2

1) Sayings Formula

καὶ ἔλεγεν

καὶ ἔλεγεν

2) Application of Parable

οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ,

πῶς ἐκσπύσσεται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ  
Θεοῦ, ἢ ἐν τίᾳ σπορῇ παρέρχεται θεῖται.

3) The Subject of Parable is Introduced. The seed is sown on the earth.

ὡς ἰσχυρὸς σπέρμα τὸν σπέρμα  
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

ὡς ἰσχυρὸς σπέρμα, ὅς ἐστιν σπέρμα  
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

4) Leads to first Climax

καὶ ὡς δὴ καὶ ἐκσπύσσει αὐτὰ  
καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ ὁ σπέρμα βλάσκει  
καὶ μακρύνεται ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός

μακρύνεται ὡς πόντος τοῦ σπέρματος  
τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

5) Reference again to Sowing and Earth

ἀποσπότη ἡ γῆ καρποφέρει

καὶ ὅταν σπέρῃ

6) Second Climax of Growth

πρῶτον χρόνον, εἶπεν σπέρμα  
εἶπεν πλήρη αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ σπέρματι

ὡς βλάσκει καὶ γίνεται μέγαν παντὶν  
τῶν λαχόντων καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους

1) G. Black, op. cit., pp. 164-6

2) J. Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 37. H. W. Bartsch, 'Eine bisher  
Überschene Titierung der LXX in Mark 4:30', TLZ, 15, 1959, pp. 126-8

# 7) Scriptural appendices

ὅταν δὲ παραδοί ὁ καρπός, εὐθὺς ὥστε συνιστάει ὑπὸ τὴν σκιάν αὐτοῦ  
ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, ὅτι παρέ- τὰ πτενὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν  
σῆκεν ὁ θεριστής

Clearly, these two parables form a pair of parables. They were developed in this way for didactic purposes and indicate a traditional rather than a redactional construction.

The interesting point is that in the Matthaean and Lukan parallels, the Parable of the Mustard Seed forms one of a pair of parables with the Parable of the Leaven, and nowhere, in either Gospel, is the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly recorded (1). The twin parables in Matthew and Luke are usually ascribed to 'Q'.

The position of the twin parables in Mark and Luke is very similar. Luke's parables appear to be inserted into the text between the story of the woman with the eighteen year infirmity, (13:10-17), and teaching on the condemnation of Israel, (13:22-30), the latter opening with a completely new setting from the previous incidents. The Markan parables similarly are attached to no special context and can be taken out without any damage done to the flow of the text. This would suggest that both Luke and Mark are retaining twin parables which at one time represented two over-lapping, floating parables traditions.

The Matthaean use of the twin parables reveals a completely different use and application, however. Gerhardsson (2) sees the seven Matthaean parables, which form the basis for the Parables Section in Matthew 13:1-52 corresponding to Mark 4:1-34 constituting

1) Reasons for the absence of this parable in Matthew and Luke are usually thought to be due to deliberate omission because the parable does not suggest a need for watchfulness on the part of the Evangelist which the missionary Church wished to foster cf. J.C. Hawkins, Morae Synopticae, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1899, p.123, or that the parable recorded in Mark is a later addition, cf., J. Wellhausen, op.cit., p.36-7.

2) B. Gerhardsson. 'The Seven Parables in Matthew 13', MTS., 19, 1972, pp.16-37.



traditional material on which Matthew drew. The Parable of the Sower is interpreted by three sets of twin parables. The first pair, the Parable of the Tares and of the Drag-net are separated to form the first and third interpretation of types of soil described in the Parable of the Sower, and the other two sets of twin parables are inserted inbetween them. Of these, the Parables of the Mustard Seed and of the Leaven form the second interpretation. Gerhardtsson (1) says that this material which Matthew uses as the basis of his chapter is not Markan. Whether Matthew knew the Markan parables section or not does not detract from the conclusion that the Matthaean source was non-Markan. Similarly, the twin parables, as found in Matthew, are definitely part of a tradition of which Luke betrays no knowledge, and it cannot be assumed that Luke knew the twin parables *except as* an isolated tradition. These conclusions make it difficult to accept that the 'Q' and Mark theory underlies the use of the sources illustrated in the use of the twin parables.

The Lukan use of *ἐλέγερ οὖν* in the introduction to the Parable of the Mustard Seed suggests ~~a certain similarity that~~ *Mark and Luke* ~~between this tradition and that recorded in these two Gospels~~ do have a certain affinity with one another (2). Also, Luke's introduction comprises a double question whereas Matthew does not record such a form. The Matthaean introduction :  
*ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων*

---

1) B.Gerhardtsson, *ibid.*, p.19.

2) cf. Study, p.80.

introduces the parables either side of the Parable of the Mustard Seed and could possibly be a feature of his tradition (1), but there is no reason for ~~Luke to include~~ the double-questioned introduction if not known to Matthew. It would appear that Luke's use of his tradition shows evidence of the tradition reproduced in Mark's Gospel, but not necessarily the Markan setting of the parables.

Lastly, it is noted that both parables in Mark's Gospel have an Old Testament allusion appended to them. In the Lukan Mustard Seed tradition, the climax of the parable comes with the birds nesting in the branches of the mustard tree and therefore the Old Testament allusion is essential to the parable. In Mark however, the significance of the parable is the surprisingly large size of plant which was produced from such a small seed and the quotation here is an addition which is essentially superfluous to the parable. Similarly, in the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly it is wonder at the growth of the seed rather than the harvesting which is essential to the Markan account. In both these cases the Old Testament allusions are incidental in Mark.

These parables, (Mk. 4:21-32), differ from the preceding section of parables (Mk. 4:1-20) in that they are not connected with a specific context, but are attached by the introductory formulae to the preceding section. The use of the sayings in Mark 4:21-5 gives a further example of a quasi-canonical use of the words of Jesus, the general layout of the section in doublets (Mk. 4:21-2, 24-5, 26-32) reveals techniques to encourage memorization of the sayings. Furthermore, a brief study of the use of these parables in Matthew and Luke tends to undermine the widely-held

---

1) B. Gerhardsson, ibid., p.27

view that 'e' was used in this instance, and suggests that a more complex tradition lies behind the Synoptic make-up. Luke appears to have closer affinity to the tradition recorded in Mark than does Matthew, even though he does tend to reproduce his own source.

v) Two Further Parables.

These two sayings are similar in that they are found within a narrative setting, but in their present form in Mark's Gospel are easily isolated since they destroy the original progression of the narrative which is probably more faithfully recorded in Matthew and Luke.

a) Mark 2:27-8

This two-part mashal (1) forms the climax to the Pericope of the Plucking of the Corn on the Sabbath. It is usually agreed however, that 2:27-8 are additional to the pericope, which originally ended at 2:26 with the analogy from the Old Testament of David and the shew-bread (2). The original end of this pericope does not go undisputed. Beare (3) suggests that 2:27-8 forms the original basis of the pericope and the answer in 2:25-6 is secondary. The reproduction of the pericope in the Synoptic parallels, however, does indicate that the first answer is more embedded in the narrative tradition than are verses 27-8. Matthew and Luke are not so intent on preserving the saying in Mark 2:27-8, although the first answer about David and the shew-bread is much more faithfully recorded. Whether Matthew and Luke are using the Markan tradition as a basis for their narratives or not, it would seem that both writers find

---

1) R. Bultmann, op. cit., p.81

2) J. Wellhausen, op. cit., p.22 V. Taylor, op. cit., p.218

3) E.W. Beare, 'The Sabbath was made for man?', JBL, 79, 1960 p.130-6



it essential to preserve the answer in Mark 2:25-6 intact rather than Mark 2:27-8.

It is apparent, that two distinct answers to the question put by the Pharisees in 2:24 are recorded by Mark as shown below.

Matthew 12:1-8

1 ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ  
ἐπορεύθη ὁ ἰησοῦς τοῖς  
σάββατον διὰ τὸν σιναῖον·  
οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ  
ἐπείνεον καὶ ἤρξαντο  
τίλλειν στάχυν ἐπὶ ἐσθίειν  
2 οἱ δὲ φαρασαῖοι ἰδόντες  
ἔτιμον αὐτοῦ ἰδοὺ οἱ μαθη-  
ταὶ σου ποιεῖσιν ὃ οὐκ ἐξ-  
ἔστιν ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ  
3 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οὐκ  
ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ,  
ὅτι ἐπείνεον καὶ οἱ μετ'  
4 αὐτοῦ; πῶς εἰσῆλθεν  
εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ  
τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως  
ἔφαγεν· οὐκ ἐξόν ἦν αὐτῷ  
φαγεῖν αὐτὰς τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ  
εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν μόνοις;  
5 ἢ οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῷ  
καιρῷ ὅτι τοῖς σάββατον ὁ  
κύριος ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ σάβ-  
βατον βεβηλόσιν καὶ ἄν-

Mark 2:25-8

23 καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς  
σάββατον παρεπορεύθη διὰ  
τῶν σιναίων καὶ οἱ μαθη-  
ταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὁ δὲ  
ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχυν  
καὶ οἱ φαρασαῖοι  
ἔτιμον αὐτοῦ· ἰδοὺ τί  
ποιοῦσιν τοῖς σάββατον  
ὃ οὐκ ἐξἔστιν  
25 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς  
οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε τί  
ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ, ὅτε  
χρεὼν ἔσχεν καὶ ἐτεί-  
νασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ  
26 μετ' αὐτοῦ; πῶς  
εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον  
τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ ἡβιαθάρ  
ἀρχιερεῶς καὶ τοῖς  
ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως  
ἔφαγεν, οὐς οὐκ ἐξἔστιν  
φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῖς,  
καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τοῖς σὺν  
αὐτῷ οὔσιν;

Luke 6:1-5

1 ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ  
διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ  
σιναίων καὶ ἔτιμον οἱ  
μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤρξαντο  
τοὺς στάχυν τίλλοντες  
τὰς χεροῖν·  
2 πλὴν διὰ τῶν φαρασαίων  
εἶπαν· τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ  
ἐξἔστιν τοῖς σάββατον;  
3 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς  
εἶπεν ὁ ἰησοῦς· οὐδέ ποτε  
ἀνέγνωτε ὃ ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ, ὅποτε  
ἐπείνεον αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ'  
4 αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὗς εἰσῆλθεν  
εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς  
ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγον·  
ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς μετ'  
αὐτοῦ οὓς οὐκ ἐξἔστιν φαγεῖν  
εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῖς;

6 αἰτίαι εἰσιν, λέγω δὲ  
 ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μέγαν  
 7 ἔστιν ὧδε. εἰ δὲ ἔγν-  
 ῶκατε τί ἐστὶν ἔλεος θεοῦ  
 καὶ οὐ θυμὸν, οὐκ ἂν κατ-  
 ἐδικράντε τοὺς ἀγατίους.

27 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· τὸ 5 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς  
 σάββατον διὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου  
 ἐγένετο, καὶ οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ  
 τὸ σάββατον.  
 28 ὥστε

κύριος γάρ  
 ἐστὶν τοῦ σαββάτου  
 ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ κύριός ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου  
 ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου. ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

Neither Matthew nor Luke record the first part of the second answer (Mk. 2:27-8 par.) found in Mark (ie. Mk. 2:27), but only the concluding statement (Mk. 2:28 par.). The rest of the concluding statement contained in Matthew and Luke is different from the statement in Mark's account. The form of the answer given in Matthew and Luke presents an interesting study.

Matthew presents two arguments. Matthew 12:3-4 parallels the first answer given in Mark but his second argument 12:5-7, is different. It begins with the same phrase as the first answer: οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε . . . which introduces a second Old Testament illustration from Numbers 28:9-10 and a specific quotation from Hosea 6:6. Matthew 12:8, which is parallel to the saying in Mark 2:28, is appended to the second argument as a kind of concluding comment with no renewed introductory formula as found in the other two Gospels.

Luke 6:3-4, similarly, records the first answer of Mark 2:25-6. As in Mark, also, the second answer, (Mk. 2:27-8, Lk. 6:5), is introduced with the identical introductory formula: καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς which immediately suggests the possibility that Luke was in possession of the same tradition as that recorded in Mark. Luke however, proceeds to follow Matthew's exclusion of the first part of Mark's answer (ie. Mark 2:27).

Another point of comparison is that Matthew and Luke both record the same word order: καὶ εἶπεν τοῦ ἀφέντου ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ, as opposed to the Markan order; εἶπε καὶ εἶπεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀφέντου καὶ τοῦ ἀφέντου. Therefore, the only part of the second answer which Mark has in common with the parallel accounts happens to record an identical word order opposed to Mark's.

The use of Mark 2:28 in the Synoptic parallels reflects an interesting situation. Although it appears that Matthew and Luke preserve two arguments as does Mark, they are not broken up into two separate answers. Luke preserves the same introductory formula by Mark, in a similar situation (Mk. 4:30 par. Lk. 13:18) (1). This does not necessarily indicate that Luke followed the Markan tradition and layout but rather, implies a knowledge of the tradition recorded in Mark without explicitly stating it. It is possible that the inclusion of καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς in Luke 6:5 is not to introduce a second answer but reflects knowledge of the special traditions found in Mark.

Matthew similarly bears witness to the concept of a single answer: Matthew 12:5-7, which constitutes the bulk of the second

---

1) Study p.118



argument,<sup>15</sup> especially Matthaean material (1). If this material is omitted from the Matthaean narrative, a similar answer to that given in Luke appears with a direct analogy between David and *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. Who or what the Son of Man represents in this instance is open to a number of suggestions. Wellhausen (2) sees the close link between David and the Son of Man in Matthew and Luke representing the actions of David as the Messianic prototype in contrast to the Son of Man as a Messianic title. It is true that the Son of Man here could represent the community's actions played out by the disciples in this account (3), or simply mean 'Man' (4). However, in Matthew and Luke, there appears to be a strong connection between the Davidic reference and the Son of Man saying (5). Although it is Jesus' disciples who are breaking the Sabbath rule, the answer given by Jesus gradually moves away from the defence of the disciples by the Davidic analogy. This refers directly to David as the central figure in the example (although his followers also participate in breaking the rule concerning the shewbread). It is therefore suggested that not only are the arguments found in Matthew and Luke contained in a single answer, but also lead away from the initial question, and the reasons which prompted such a discussion, to a Messianic pronouncement: if David as the prototype of the Messiah can break rules, how much more can the true Messiah when he comes.

Turning, to the layout of the Markan pericope, at once a

---

1) E. Dibelius, op. cit., p.145

2) J. Wellhausen, op. cit., p.22

3) F.W. Beare, op. cit., p.132 concerning Manson's theory

4) cf. G. Vermes, in J. Black, op. cit., 310-30

5) cf. R. Iervstad, 'Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man', NTS, 18 1972, p.251. He cites a previous article by himself which suggests the Son of Man could be used to suggest and contrast <sup>with</sup> Son of David.

similarity to the plan in Mark 4:3-20, 7:14-23 is noticed. The first answer is introduced by the introductory formula: καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς and the second by καὶ ἐκρίθη αὐτοῖς. Whereas in Mark 4:3-20, 7:14-23 the two sayings of Jesus are used in both cases to comment on a parable or pronouncement made initially by Jesus, here the sayings represent answers to a question of law posed by the Pharisees. Taylor (1) suggests that these two answers have different characteristics: 2:25f represents a polemic saying whereas 2:27f is apologetic. Dibelius (2) points out that the Davidic analogy represents a haggadic answer. It does appear from the substance of each answer that the first is haggadic and the second halakic. The saying of Jesus represents a legal ruling which was adhered to by the Early Church and which over-rode any previously formulated ruling found in the Old Testament. Mark, therefore, has presented this saying as having scriptural authority equal to the law of the Old Testament.

A clear-cut division between the first and second answers in Mark throws Mark 2:27f into relief. The saying is given a special authority by Mark which is apparently glossed over by the other two Gospel writers. The absence of the special Markan saying in 2:27: τὸ αἰσῶτον δὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο καὶ εἰς ὁ ἄνθρωπος δὲ τὸ αἰσῶτον in Matthew and Luke raises the question whether this saying was known to the other Evangelists. If 2:27 does represent part of the special Markan tradition, can any light be thrown upon the nature of this saying and its relationship to 2:28?

It is obvious from the use of Mark 2:28 by Matthew and Luke and the similar interpretation imposed on it by them opposed to that in Mark, that two separate traditions are preserved here.

---

1) V. Taylor, op. cit., p.218  
 2) U. Dibelius, op. cit., p.143



Therefore, it is quite reasonable to suppose that 2:27 is a

legitimate part of the *mišna* tradition. Whereas in Matthew

and Luke, the parallel saying of Mark 2:28 stands as an independent

saying, in Mark it forms a comment or interpretation to 2:27.

Matthew's and Luke's use of only the saying in Mark 2:27 suggests

the saying was originally independent. This at once draws attention

to a similar situation already noted in Mark 9:31 - the second

Passion Prediction. Both the Passion and the Resurrection sayings

found separately on a number of occasions, are joined together to

form a two-part saying. The necessary linking word or phrase is

easily provided for in Mark 2:27-8. Mark 2:27 uses the term

*ἄνθρωπος* and 2:28 *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. In Aramaic, these terms

may be synonymous and therefore interchangeable. It is suggested

that these two sayings are used in such a way to interpret one

saying of Jesus by another (1). The method of exegesis, it will

be remembered, is used in Mark 4:21-5. Mark 2:27 contains no

implicit christological or eschatological title: *ἄνθρωπος* is

mankind and cannot be anything else. The interpretation of this

saying by 2:28, could however indicate a development of the meaning

of 2:27. This is not conclusive if the original saying was Aramaic.

Fuller (2) thinks that 2:27 has an eschatological significance.

It is possible that the Markan sayings retain an eschatological

implication whereas the use of the Markan saying (2:28) is

christological in Matthew and Luke.

Indications from this investigation suggest that Mark 2:27-8

---

1) It must be noted that 2:27 is very reminiscent of a rabbinic maxim, Strack-Billerbeck Vol. 11 p. 5, but the saying receives a specific meaning 2:28 which is not in the interest of the Church.

2) R. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London Collins, 1969, p.149



has similarities with the Second Passion Prediction, Mark 9:31.

Mark 2:27-28 is a *sayings pair*, being joined by linking words.

The sayings have lost what was apparently much of their original meaning by their inclusion in the Markan account. Nevertheless, the sayings themselves are left intact and are only appended to the contexts.

b) Mark 3:23-7

Mark 3:20-1 forms the framework for an extended discussion (3:22-30) and a pronouncement story (3:31-5). The *ἀκούω* motif, as Taylor (1) points out, is used to introduce an isolated fragmentary tradition (3:19b-21). In Matthew and Luke, the Beelzebul controversy is preceded by a short healing story of a blind and dumb man in Matthew 12:22 or a dumb man in Luke 11:14. It is this incident which sparks off the discussion. It would appear that Matthew and Luke could be preserving a common context for this discussion *different* from that preserved in Mark.

This assumption is further substantiated by the incident recorded which follows the controversy. In Matthew and Luke, the discussion is followed by a discourse on signs and the return of the Evil Spirit (Mt. 12:38-45, Lk. 11:24-32, order reversed). In Mark, however, the discussion is followed by the pericope of Jesus' Real Family (3:31-5). This pericope in Matthew and Luke is independent of the Beelzebul discussion. In Matthew 12:46-50 the pericope is appended to the discourse on signs and the Evil Spirit, and in Luke 8:19-21, it is an entirely independent unit. It will be seen that not only is the setting for the Beelzebul Controversy different from that in the Markan account, but also

---

1) V. Taylor, op. cit., p.235

the actual discussion in Matthew and Luke is more developed and expanded.

At first sight this would suggest that the Beelzebul controversy was known in at least two different fixed contexts; ie. Matthew and Luke recording a different one to Mark. The Markan context, however, appears to be a traditional unit, which does suggest that the sayings in Mark 3:23-30, (the Beelzebul controversy), were transmitted in a tradition isolated from the context.

The immediate introduction to the Beelzebul controversy in Mark 3:22 is presented as a double accusation. The first accusation is that Jesus is possessed by Beelzebul: *ἔχει δὲ βελζεβούλ* *ἔχει*. This reiterates in another form the view expressed in Mark 3:21 by Jesus' associates: *ἔλεγον γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔχοντα* and could suggest a possible reason for linking these two units of tradition together. The second accusation is that Jesus casts out demons by the authority of the Prince of Demons: *καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ ἔχειν τὸν δαμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαμόνια*. Bultmann (1) sees these two statements as parallel expressions of the same accusation that Jesus' power to heal comes from an evil source. Not only does Mark 3:22 suggest two accusations, however, but also the answer given by Jesus suggests that it has taken into account these two accusations. Mark 3:25-7 is concerned with the accusation of Jesus' authority whereas 3:28-30 indicates the consequences of suggesting that Jesus is possessed. This is reiterated in 3:30 which directly relates the preceding saying to this accusation. Mark 3:28 begins with the phrase: *ἰσχυρὸν λέγω ὑμῖν* ... which suggests the beginning of a new statement detached from the previous sentence (2).

---

1) R. Bultmann, op. cit., p.13

2) Also the saying in Mark 3:28-9 is found in the Gospel of Thomas, Log. 44 as a separate saying.

The discussion, therefore, breaks up into two sections, 3:23-7, and 28-30. It is also found that each section answers one of the accusations put forward by the Scribes. Mark 3:23-7 counteracts the view that Jesus' power of healing comes from an evil source, (cf. Mk. 3:22b) and 3:28-30 answers the first accusation that Jesus is possessed by a devil (Mk. 3:22a). Taylor (1) suggests that 3:28-30 is linked to the question of demon-possession raised in 3:20-1 but the accusation is possibly found more closely connected with the words of the Scribes, 3:22.

The Synoptic parallels of the accusation initiating the controversy (Mt. 12:25, Mk. 11:15) reveal an interesting situation. In both Gospels, Beelzebul is explicitly paralleled to the Prince of Demons, making both terms synonymous, and thus reducing the accusations to one; namely that Jesus heals by the authority of Beelzebul.

The question arises whether the accusations in Mark 3:22 are part of the controversy or not. Taylor (2) sees Mark 3:22 as editorial and presumably this is used as a basis for the forms of the accusation in Matthew and Luke. This opinion presents two problems. In the first place, it appears very strange that both Matthew and Luke independently record only one of the two Markan accusations, and that it is the same in each case; namely that Jesus is possessed by Beelzebul. Secondly, if Mark did compile an introduction to suit the saying's source, he did so very badly, for the name of Beelzebul never occurs in these sayings.

---

1) V. Taylor, op. cit., p.237

2) V. Taylor, ibid., p.237



(ie. Mk. 3:23-30), whereas in Matthew and Luke reference is made to him in the controversy itself (Mt. 12:27, Lk. 11:18-9). The name *ΕΛΕΑΖΑΡ* which appears in Mark 3:23, is not found anywhere in the synoptic parallels or in the Markan introduction. This substantiates the earlier claim that the sayings and introduction in Mark are not totally compatible with one another.

The actual sayings in Mark must be briefly considered. Although the furthest extent of the *καὶ ἑτέροις* sayings group has been put at the 3:27, the inclusion of 3:27 itself in the *καὶ ἑτέροις* tradition must be discussed. It has been suggested that 3:27 was attached at a later stage than 3:28-30 to the original corpus of sayings (1). Similarity of subject matter (2) contents and a continuation of the same parabolic methods used in 3:23-6, suggests a consistency between 3:23-6 and 3:27 which would assure the sayings cohesion by the time Mark drew them from his tradition, if not before. The form of the sayings in Mark 3:24-7 of four parallel clauses and parataxis, not only suggests an early Aramaic form (3) but also an aid for easy memorization.

Generally, it must be concluded that Mark 3:23 presents similar characteristics to those sayings in the parable section already discussed. The contextual setting (3:20-1) is linked to the introduction of the controversy (3:22) by the similarity of comments on Jesus' sanity by associates or friends (ie. *οἱ ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ*)

---

1) R. Bultmann, op. cit., pp.13-14. Development: 3:22-6, 28-30, 27.  
2) J. Wellhausen, op. cit., p.28  
3) H. Black, op. cit., p.189

and the Scribes. Both these elements appear to be traditional not redactional. The discussion itself is made up of two groups of sayings which attempt to answer the two accusations levied against Jesus. It appears probable from the uneasy correlation between the introduction in 3:22 and the sayings that the latter do not properly belong to this context and were originally floating sayings. Therefore, it would seem that Mark has attempted to reconcile traditional framework and sayings with limited success.

From what can be ascertained, it is probable that Mark had some sort of knowledge of the Beelzebul Controversy preserved in Matthew and Luke. The introduction to the controversy in Mark 3:22 is not wholly the invention of Mark, but has been developed by him from a form of introduction akin to that recorded in Matthew and Luke. The first accusation reiterates the charges in the context setting (3:20-1), forming a link between them, while the introduction of a second accusation is used to initiate the answer given in 3:23-7 which embodies the *καὶ ἄλλων* sayings, thereby keeping 3:23-7 separate from the rest of the discussion.

Both these *καὶ ἄλλων* sayings (Mk. 2:27-8, 3:23-7) have been used as answers in polemical discussions. In each case the sayings have been emphasised in Mark's Gospel by dividing Jesus' answer to the question into two parts, one of which contains the *καὶ ἄλλων* sayings. In Mark 2:27-8, the second answer appears to be appended to the pericope, and does not necessarily constitute an essential part of it. In Mark 3:23-7 the *καὶ ἄλλων* sayings and the accusations which precipitate the discussion do not completely correspond to each other. The 'L' theory does not explain the Markan contradiction. In both instances, then, it

would appear that Mark has some knowledge of the account preserved in Matthew and Luke, and has altered the material to facilitate inclusion of the *מִן הַמִּצְוֹת* tradition.

vi) CONCLUDING REMARKS

Several conclusions may be drawn from this chapter. A study of the *מִן הַמִּצְוֹת* parable material has led to a number of interesting possibilities, not only concerning the nature of the source itself, but also its application in Mark's Gospel. In the first place, it has been noted that these parables present many of the characteristics of the tradition set out in the conclusions of the study of Mark 9:31. In a number of instances, Jesus' words are used as scripture (ie. Mk. 4:3-9, 11, 7:15, 20-3, 4:21-5) or form the basis to a legal proclamation (ie. Mk. 2:27-8). Aramaic word plays consistently recur in the *מִן הַמִּצְוֹת* sayings. Although this is only a minor factor in selecting authentic material these Aramaisms must be seen in relation with the original meaning sometimes noted, (cf 2:27-8), and have not been quite understood by Mark when preserving his material. In the Synoptic parallels to Mark 4:30-2, 2:27-8, it is quite possible that the Lukan form suggests some knowledge of the tradition preserved in Mark, albeit continuing ~~as~~ to record another tradition. The sayings generally reflect catechetical or didactic influences with an emphasis on methods to aid memorization. On a number of occasions, Aramaic word-plays appear to form the basis of these sayings.

Secondly, in Mark 4:13, 7:17, and 2:25, the use of another introductory formula, *מִן הַמִּצְוֹת אֵתָּה* has been briefly noted and commented upon. On these three occasions, the formula has been used



to introduce a commentary or interpretation. It could be possible that *καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς* might indicate the beginnings of another stereotyped formula, not this time for introducing traditional material but a developed midrashic interpretation. This would be quite different from the *καὶ ἔφη* tradition which appears to have been formulated as a tradition to record the words of Jesus as scripture.

Thirdly, an increased understanding of the use of the *καὶ ἔφη* tradition by Mark has led to an interesting and important insight into the Synoptic problem. It is becoming increasingly obvious that Mark is reproducing a sayings tradition either unknown to, or ignored by, the other two Evangelists. Agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark are not easily explained away by the 'Q' hypothesis. Without 'Q' one of two conclusions must be drawn. On the one hand, Mark is to be dated later than Matthew and Luke and depends on them for his basic Gospel outline, upon which he superimposes his own sources; or on the other hand, no Synoptic independence as we have come to accept it existed. Rather interdependence amongst the Synoptic Gospels is in the form of a common Gospel tradition which no Synoptic Gospel entirely represents. This problem must be dealt with in detail at a later stage.

THE STUDY:

3) THE NARRATIVES

Before making a detailed study of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings which are found within narrative contexts, it will probably be useful to note anything of interest resulting from any previously discussed sayings found in narrative contexts. Mark 2:27-8 and 3:23-7 might be of some help in assessing the results of the study of similar sayings.

The most important conclusion drawn from the preceding investigation is that, although these sayings are given in a narrative context, this does not constitute part of the original framework of the saying itself. In Mark 2:23-8, the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying is far from being subject to the pericope. The narrative quite probably finishes at 2:26 and the more original meaning of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying does not suit the development of the argument presented by Jesus (Mk 2:25-6). A similar situation is found in Mark 3:20-30. Jesus' argument is built up from a number of sayings. Unlike the saying in 2:23-8, the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings found in this discussion, 3:23-7, cannot be omitted from the argument without affecting its development. These sayings, however, are obviously substituted for a certain corpus of sayings, similar to, but not identical with, the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition (1). Consequently, there appear a number of discrepancies between the sayings and their contexts.

The conclusion that these sayings are not an essential part of their narrative settings supports the concept that this tradition concentrates only on sayings material. The two previously discussed sayings illustrate two possible methods used to incorporate them into a narrative. On the one hand Mark 2:27-8 is used as a pronouncement saying in the pericope and is supplementary to the development of the story. On the other hand, Mark 3:23-7 appears to be a more integral part in

---

1) cf. Mt. 2:25f, Lk. 11:17f. Also see Study p. 127



the development of both discussion and narrative. Nevertheless, in this instance two points reveal that the sayings and narratives are not homogeneous. In the first place, it is obvious that the pericopes are composite works, quite possibly developed from traditional units (1). Secondly, the small contradictory elements between the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings and the context further suggests that the sayings were not originally connected with this incident.

These two examples will form the broad dividing categories into which the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings to be studied in this chapter will be divided i.e., Pronouncement narrative sayings and Integral narrative sayings.

One further point must be mentioned. The use of *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* in narrative settings in a number of cases has been excluded from this study. It would appear in these cases that the phrase is grammatically correct in the context and is used as a development to the story, and seems unlikely to imply a sayings tradition lies behind the use of the phrase. The reasons for the exclusion of these texts from the sayings corpus is dealt with fully at an earlier stage (2).

i) PRONOUNCEMENT NARRATIVE SAYINGS

a) Mt. 13:54-8, Mk.6:1-6, Lk4:16-30

This present investigation must include the isolated saying found in John 4:44 which is very similar to that recorded in Mark 6:4 par. Furthermore, the Gospel of Thomas log.31 pl.87:5-7 also records a

---

1) cf. Study p.120 concerning the possibility that at least two sayings unit make up the argument.

2) See Introduction. pp.31-34

similarly isolated saying. It would appear, therefore, that the saying found in Mark 6:4 is not entirely dependent upon the context in which it is now found. Comparision of these five sayings reveals at least two different traditions of the same logion.

a) Mt.13:57

Mk.6:4

Jn.4:44

οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης  
ἄγιος ἐν τῇ  
πατρίδι καὶ ἐν τῇ  
οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης  
ἄγιος ἐν τῇ  
πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν  
τοῖς συγγενέσιν αὐτοῦ  
καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ

προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ  
πατρίδι τὴν ἑνὸς οὐκ  
ἔχει.

b) Lk.4:24(23)

Gospel of Thomas L.31, pl.87:5-7

ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι  
οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός  
ἐστίν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ  
(ὡς περὶ Θεράπευσαν δευτάν)

No prophet is acceptable in his  
village, no physician heals those who  
know him.

It would appear that whereas Matthew, Mark and to some extent John retain one form, the Gospel of Thomas and Luke record another form of the saying. Despite the fact that John and the Gospel of Thomas present different forms of the saying, they both isolate the saying from a narrative context. John's Gospel suggests a narrative similar to the synoptic accounts surrounding the saying, but it is secondary to the saying. On the other hand, the saying in the Synoptic Gospels does not hold such a primary position in the narrative. Therefore, it appears evident that neither form of the saying relies upon a narrative context (1).

1) cf. C.H.Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, U.P., 1963, p.239, who suggests this saying is not confined to the corresponding narrative in the Synoptic accounts.



At first sight Luke seems to be recording a variant tradition. The setting of the event is chronologically different from Matthew and Mark; the saying is presented in a different form, and the narrative is much more developed. This, however, does not necessarily indicate a completely divergent tradition (1).

The different chronological settings of narratives in the Gospels suggest that they were not an essential part of some traditional pericopes; e.g. the Cleansing of the Temple (2). Furthermore, the imposition of a variant saying on a context is far from difficult to accept; not only in this case where a certain interplay between saying and context is observed (3); but as a noticeable feature of pericopes already investigated (4). As to the Lukan narrative itself, the development of the story follows closely the outline recorded in Mark. The expansion of this basic narrative helps clarify the change of mood that comes over the crowd during the course of synagogue debate, mainly giving an account of Jesus' teaching. This is not to suggest that the narrative is due to the Evangelists' attempt to clarify the situation, but rather that the account in Luke, at what ever time it was expanded, finds its basis in a similar tradition to that recorded in Mark.

---

1) cf. R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford, Blackwell, 1972, pp. 31-2. M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, London, Nicholson and Watson, 1934, pp. 110-1

2) cf. Jn. 2:13-22, at the beginning of Jesus' Ministry and Mk 11:15-19 par, during Holy Week.

3) C. H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 239 says 'all three Gospels drew the saying from variant strains of tradition'.

4) From the *sayings* found in narratives already looked at, it is evident that Mark preserves a sayings tradition different from the other two Synoptic Gospels, although he uses the same narrative tradition.



Mark 6:1-6 contains a basically inadequate tradition.

The reason for this could be that Mark wanted to draw attention to the saying of Jesus whilst still preserving the narrative. By giving such a scant outline, Mark succeeds in his purpose. In Luke, however, the force of the saying is muted. This is due not only to the added narrative detail but also to the insertion of extended teaching material (Lk.4:25-27), delivered by Jesus. Whereas Luke appears to be more concerned with the rejection, Mark's priority lies with the saying, his narrative forming an extended introductory context to the saying.

Grässer's (1) fairly recent study of the redactional and theological elements in this Markan pericope contains a different view. He concludes that much of this account is due to redactional influences propounding a certain theological attitude. A number of phrases, Grässer (2) suggests, are redactional elements indicating a new and important point which the author wishes to stress. Amongst these, at least two could relate to the introduction of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* material. The introduction of the disciples into the account, *καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* (v.1), although not part of the actual narrative, appears to be quite an essential element in the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* material. The sayings are usually witnessed by the disciples, even if not spoken specifically to them (3).

- 
- 1) E.Grässer, 'Jesus in Nazareth (Mk.6:1-6a)', NTS, 16, 1969, pp.1-23
  - 2) E.Grässer, ibid., pp.18
  - 3) Sayings to disciples: 4:21-32? 7:20-3, 4:21-32 Sayings witnessed by disciples: 3:23-7? 4:3-8,9, 2:27-8

Similarly, the reference to teaching .... ἵνα διδάσκῃ... (v.2), as will be argued further on in this study, might also suggest a feature of this sayings tradition.

Grässer (1) puts forward another reason for believing that the account is a Markan construction, namely, the absence of any specific teaching. The scarcity of teaching material recorded by Mark is well known (2), but such an omission in this instance clearly makes the development of the story difficult to understand. Rather than construct an inadequate narrative, it seems more probable that Mark's account is based upon a pre-Markan pericope, which either contained teaching material which he excluded or was already corrupted.

Turning to the saying of Jesus in Mark 6:4, par., Grässer (3) suggests that the addition of καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκῇ to the phrase ἐν τῇ πατρίδι is redactional, but finds little evidence in the narrative itself to warrant such a development. In both the Markan and Matthaean accounts the mention of Jesus' family in the synagogue, (Mk.6:3, Mt.13:55), would explain the use of either συγγενέσιν or οἰκῇ but a double reference is pointless. It is only Mark who records both additional phrases (4).

---

1) E.Grässer, op.cit., p.12

2) cf. M.Dibelius, op. cit., pp.233-8

3) E.Grässer, op. cit., p.16

4) ἐν τῇ πατρίδι (αὐτοῦ) - Mt. Mk. Lk. Jn. Gospel of Thomas  
 ἐν τῇ οἰκῇ αὐτοῦ - Mt. Mk.  
 ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσιν - Mk.

It would appear that the influence of the sayings tradition recorded by Luke and the Gospel of Thomas is not totally absent from the Markan account. Dibelius (1), has seen a similarity between Mark 6:5a: (the inability of Jesus to heal anyone, *ἐν μὴ ὀλίγοις* ), and the phrases in Luke 4:2; *ὡς περ*, *ὁφθαλμοῦν δ' αὐτοῦ* and the Gospel of Thomas: 'No physician heals those who know him.' It would seem that Mark's Gospel contains some reminiscence of these proverbs in the form of an actual incident. Matthew, on the other hand, not apparently aware of the significance of this episode, glosses over the embarrassing situation (Mt.13:58)

So, Mark, preserving a scant narrative outline in order to accentuate the saying of Jesus in Mark 6:4, also indicates influence or knowledge of the form of saying recorded by Luke and the Gospel of Thomas. Furthermore, the use of both *συγγενῶν* and *οἰκία* in Mark is unnecessary to the narrative, which suggests that Mark did not construct the narrative for the saying nor vice versa, but integrated two traditions. Matthew is probably nearer the original complete narrative and sayings unit, whereas Mark reveals a complex knowledge of at least two traditions, if not three (2).

---

1) M.Dibelius, op. cit., p.110

2) Mark knew at least the basic narrative recorded in Matthew plus the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition. He also was possibly influenced by the sayings tradition recorded in both Luke and the Gospel of Thomas.



b) Mt.15:21-8, Mk.7:24-30

The Pericope of the Healing of the Syrophoenician Woman's Daughter is recorded only by Matthew and Mark. It is noticeable from the start that the place of contact between these two accounts comes in the words of Jesus (Mark 7:27, Matthew 15:26). Both the events preceding this saying and the subsequent dialogue are presented in different forms by each writer.

The setting to this pericope is interesting. Burkill (1) thinks that the choice of the region of Tyre as a setting for this narrative corresponds with the plan set out in Mark 3:7-12, although there is no reason to assume a foreign location because of the woman's nationality (2). Another opinion put forward by Marxsen (3) is that this setting is part of the narrative, and although Mark is reluctant to include it, nevertheless he did not wish to violate the text. Although any conclusion concerning the originality of the location is speculative, the *οικία* motif in Mark (not found in Matthew, although he retains the Tyre setting) suggests that the setting to the pericope is traditional.

A study of the form of the pericope yields most promising results. It has been claimed that this story corresponds more to a pronouncement than a miracle story (4). Burkill (5) accentuates this idea by suggesting that the original story finished with the

---

1) T.A.Burkill, 'The Syrophoenician Woman: The Congruence of Mark 7:24-31'. ZNW, 57, 1966, pp.33,37.

2) cf. The Pericope of the Centurion's Servant, Mt.8:5-10, Lk.7:1-10 - the centurion is a Gentile.

3) W.Marxsen, cited by T.A.Burkill, op. cit., pp.35-7

4) V.Taylor, op. cit., pp.347 also cf. R.Bultmann, op. cit., p.38

5) T.A.Burkill 'The Historical Development of the Story of the Syrophoenician Woman, (Mk.7:24-31)', NT, 9, 1967, pp.175-6

pronouncement of Jesus in Mark 7:27 - the answer and recommendation being added later. Dibelius (1) took this line of thought one stage further by suggesting that the original transmission of this tradition is to be found amongst the sayings rather than the paradigms.

This is an interesting view in relation to the Pericope of the Centurion's Servant, (Mt.8:5-13, Lk.7:1-10). The assumption is that this narrative is part of the 'Q' source which is primarily a sayings tradition. It is difficult to understand the inclusion of this narrative into the 'Q' source unless it is seen as an example of a saying of Jesus and recorded as such. It would appear from the Pericopes of the Healing of the Centurion's Servant and the Syrophoenician Woman's Daughter, that in incidents of narratives transmitted as sayings material, the narrative is augmented and supplemented at will. The saying, however, is found rigidly intact and constitutes the link between the various differing Synoptic accounts. So it would appear that the saying in Mark 7:27 was attached to a narrative at one stage as a climax to a paradigm which was subsequently modified to become a miracle story.

Despite the fact that the accounts of Matthew and Mark are linked by a saying of Jesus, there is an addition in Mark of the phrase:

*ἀφ' ὧν πρῶτον χρησάμενος τὰ τέκνα* at the beginning of the saying.

It has been suggested that at least the term *πρῶτον*, if not the whole phrase, is a Markan addition. The inclusion of the phrase, especially *πρῶτον*, implies that although the Jews

---

1) M.Dibelius, op. cit., p.261



must have priority, the Gentiles will get their turn; whereas the exclusion of it in Matthew stresses the unwillingness to help the Gentiles altogether (1). This theme is continued by Matthew into the reply of the woman (Mt.15:27) by the use of the derogative term: *τῶν κυρίων αἰσῶν* (cf. Mk 7:28: *τῶν παίδων*).

The reluctance of Jesus initially to assist the woman in Mark, although not quite so adamant as in Matthew's account, is nevertheless evident. There is no reason why Mark should have portrayed a hostile Jesus whilst preserving a modified saying. It is therefore possible that the phrase is original rather than editorial.

As the saying of Jesus originally held a prominent position in the tradition, developments to the narrative should be seen as an attempt to adapt the events to the saying. The embellishment to the basic tradition would not be for any arbitrary reason but for a purpose.

In Matthew's account, the woman's faith, like that of the Centurion in the other pericope (Mt.8:10), moves Jesus to healing and compassion. The faith of the woman which Jesus commends (Mt.15:28), not only refers to the immediate conversation (15:26-7) but also her persistence against Jesus' silence (15:22-3a) and the request of the disciples to send her away (15:23b). In such a context it would appear that Jesus' saying in 15:26 is seen as a test of her steadfastness in her faith.

---

1) cf. Rom.1:16, 2:9-10, where Paul states the Jews are first to be informed of the Gospel message, and then the Gentiles.



The reason for Jesus showing compassion eventually in Mark's account is due to the reply the woman gives to Jesus: *δὲ*

*τοῦτον τὸν λόγον* ... (Mk.7:29). The words of the woman are seen as an interpretation of the saying of Jesus, so suggesting the reasonableness of giving aid to the Gentile community. In connection with this idea, it may be worth noting the use of

*καὶ λέγει αὐτῇ* to introduce the woman's interpretive<sup>at</sup> words.

Could this possibly be reminiscent of the use of this formula already noted in Mk.4:13 and 7:16 where a saying of Jesus is interpreted immediately by another to meet the requirements of the Christian community? This clear distinction between saying and interpretation in Mark is not recorded in Matthew.

The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying in Mark and its parallel saying in Matthew are used by both authors for different purposes; *they* consequently arrange their narrative material to comply with the interpretation. It would seem that Mark has substituted the saying in this basic narrative with a slightly variant form. The interpretation of the saying given in the words of the woman is not to identify the children and dogs, for this would seem immediately obvious to the reader (1), but forms a modification to the original saying. This form of modification of a ruling or law by addition to the wording rather than altering the original phrasing is a noticeable feature of the development of the Torah in Judaism (2) and in the early Church (3).

---

1) W.Storch, 'Zur Pericope von der Syrophönikizierin,' *BZ*, 14, 1970, p.257

2) An example of the modification of the Torah is even mentioned in Mark 10:2-9 where Jesus says the Law of Divorce was given by Moses to modify the existing Law established at the Creation, that man and wife cannot divorce.

3) cf. Didache VI: 2-3



preceding discussion, all bring to mind a similar call-line in Mark 4:9, where *καὶ ἔλεγεν ὅς ἔχει ὅτι ἀκούειν ἀκούεται* is isolated from the Parable of the Sower (1). It has been suggested that the form of the Parables section has been influenced by catechetical motifs. Here, also, Taylor (2), sees catechetical influences at work in the substance and form of the discourse. It is possible to assume that call-lines, the same or similar to these two preserved in the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition, were used freely in such catechetical traditions and blocks. The *ἔλεγεν* of 8:17 could possibly introduce an interpretation of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying.

d) Mt.21:12-13, Mk.11:15-19, Lk.19:45-8

An account of the Cleansing of the Temple and a related saying found in John 2:13-17 must also be taken into account. The Johannine narrative records some details not found in the Synoptic accounts. Nevertheless, in other respects, the Johannine and Markan accounts have similarities which are not recorded in Matthew and Luke (3). The different chronological setting in John causes no basic problem, for there is no reason to assume that this pericope was specifically fixed to the passion week or, for that matter, any period in Jesus' life. Rather it belongs to a specific setting: i.e., the Temple, rather than to a chronological setting. In the Synoptic Gospels, any tradition with a Temple setting has to be placed within Holy Week as it is the only time Jesus is in

---

1) Could have the addition to Mark:4:9: *καὶ ὁ συνῶν συνιέτω*, in Codex Bezae be due to an influence of this call-line?

2) V.Taylor, *op.cit.*, p.363

3) I.Buse, 'The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John,' *ET*, 70, 1958-9, pp.22-4 goes further on to say that Mark was used by John, and Matthew and Luke could even have used a different source.



Jerusalem, but in John, Jesus frequents the city on many occasions; *John*, therefore, has a choice as to where he places this pericope.

The original extent of the pericope was probably verses 15b-17 (1). Markan editorial expansions, giving a Holy Week setting are found in 15a and 19. It would seem that verse 18 recalls similar references to the authorities' reaction to Jesus found in Mark 3:6, 12:12, and could be an editorial comment, to illustrate a development in the authorities' plot to arrest and kill Jesus.

Bultmann (2) suggested that the saying was a secondary insertion to a primarily narrative tradition. The idea is accepted by Buchanan (3) who sees the saying formulated after the destruction of Jerusalem. The reference to *οἶκος προσευχῆς*, Hamilton (4) suggests, really refers to a synagogue not the Temple; but this phrase forms part of a quotation from Isaiah 56:7 which could only have originally referred to the Temple. Dibelius (5), on the other hand, suggests this pericope is a paradigm of a less pure type; but if the original story is to be found in the verses 15b-17, it would appear to confirm much more the outline of a true paradigm than Dibelius (6) suggests.

---

1) V.Taylor, op.cit., p.461

2) R.Bultmann, op. cit., p.36

3) G.W.Buchanan, Mark 11:15-19: 'Brigands in the Temple' Hebrew Union College Annual, 30, 1959, pp.169-77

4) N.Q.Hamilton, 'Temple Cleansing and Temple Bank', JBL, 83, 1964, pp.365-72

5) M.Dibelius, op. cit., p.43

6) cf. M.Dibelius, ibid., pp.37-69 where he explains the salient features of a paradigm.

The saying, nevertheless, however much an integral part of the narrative, is not subject to it. Variant sayings traditions can be recorded within the same narrative framework (1).

Before looking at and comparing the saying found in each Gospel, it must be noted that the pericope is interpreted in the light of the surrounding events. In Matthew, the account of the Temple Cleansing is followed by the authorities' rebuke of the crowd's acclaim of Jesus as Son of David (Mt.21:15-16). The Temple Cleansing apparently inspires such a claim and must therefore be seen as a Messianic act. In Luke, the Temple Cleansing is immediately preceded by the Prediction of the Destruction of Jerusalem. The Cleansing in this case would seem to illustrate the corruptness of the age which would initiate its own destruction. The account in John is understood in terms of the Resurrection of Jesus (Jn.2:18-19). Mark sandwiches the event between the cursing of the fig-tree and its significance. Thus, the pericope is seen in relative isolation, with no obvious interpretive incidents attached.

Turning to the saying, it will be at once noticeable that it is largely composed of two Old Testament quotations: Isaiah 56:7 and Jeremiah 7:11. It is usually assumed that the quotations correspond to the Septuagint. This, however, may not be the case if Black's (2) suggestion is taken into account. It would appear that a certain Aramaic word-play can be seen between *ܡܪܝܬܐ ܕܠܬܝܢ* (*s<sup>e</sup>lutha*) and *ܕܠܬܝܢ* (*d<sup>e</sup>lestin*).

---

1) The use Mark makes of existing narrative to frame his *ܡܬܝܬܐ ܕܝܫܘܥ* sayings, has been noted.

2) M.Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1967, p.176



If this is so, not only does it suggest that at one time the texts quoted were originally in Aramaic, but also that the two quotations are linked primarily because of this verbal tie. It is quite possible that this saying preserves a sample of Midrashic teaching by Jesus (1).

Mark contains the additional phrase: *πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*, which is part of Isaiah 56:7, but is omitted by Matthew and Luke. By the inclusion of the phrase in the saying, Mark presents a different interpretation to the one implied without the phrase. In Matthew and Luke the *οἶκος προσευχῆς* is compared with *σπήλαιον ἁγίων*. John's saying, although phrased differently, also suggests a similar comparison: *τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου* compared with *οἶκον ἐμπορίου*. This would imply that the saying was aimed against the unnecessary trading in the Temple precincts. In Mark, the comparison lies between *πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* and *σπήλαιον ἁγίων* (2). In certain instances *ἁγίων* can be understood as 'Zealots' or 'nationalists' (3). In such a circumstance, the Temple, which was originally designed for a place for all nationalities to gather together, is seen as a breeding ground for nationalists. This meaning does not seem to reflect the situation shown in the pericope, and could possibly be another example of the use of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings imposed upon a narrative framework.

- 
- 1) Note the phrase which introduces this saying: *καὶ ἐδωκεν*
  - 2) C.Roth, 'The Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah XIV:21', NT, 4, 1960, pp.174-81.
  - 3) Josephus, The Wars of The Jews, IV, ch.III f.



ii) INTREGAL NARRATIVE SAYINGS

a) Mt.10:11-14, Mk.6:10-11, Lk.9:4-5

Mark 6:10-11 is the second part of a missionary address given by Jesus to the Twelve. The narrative setting in 6:7 and 12-13, so Taylor (1) points out, is a redactional construction. Dibelius (2) substantiates this view by pointing out a similarity in the use of a brief narrative framework found in Mark 3:7f and 3:13-19. There are noticeably strong links between the framework in 3:14-5: *καὶ ἵνα*

*ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύττειν καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐξβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια* and 6:7, 12: *καὶ ἔρχομαι αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν ... καὶ ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἁκαθάρτων ... καὶ ἐξελθούτες ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοήσιν ...*

It would appear that a direct reference is made in the framework material to the Appointing of the Twelve. Mark probably realises a connection between these two incidents. Matthew, in fact, fully recognises this link by placing the two pericopes next to each other in 9:35-10:16. The Matthaean account would seem far from just an attempt to resolve the Markan separation, however, for the Account of the Sending differs drastically. It is found that the verses relating to the Sending of the Twelve in Matthew are similarly recorded in Luke 10:1-16 as a different missionary charge, this time to a larger group of disciples. Luke 9:1-5 also records the Sending of the Twelve parallel to the Markan incident, but connects neither accounts with the Appointing of the Twelve.

---

1) V.Taylor, op.cit., p.302

2) M.Dibelius, op. cit., p.224

It would seem from the use of these missionary charges in the Synoptic records that these sayings had no fixed chronological or narrative setting, except a natural association with a mission of some kind. The missionary charges in Matthew 10:9f and Luke 10:4f reflect a variant form of the sayings in Mark and are much more developed.

In Mark, the framework introduces just two sayings and is the simplest in form of all the Synoptics with the possible exception of the Lukan parallel, (Lk.9:1-6). Taylor (1) says that the narrative was constructed by Mark purely to form a framework for the sayings preserved in 6:8f and 10f. Taylor differs from Dibelius (2), who acknowledges that the sayings were isolated pre-Markan units; the scant narrative framework does not form a frame for these sayings. Rather, he holds that the sayings are used to augment the narrative. This, Dibelius says, is shown by the fact that the first saying is reproduced in reported speech.

Looking at the problem of the relationship between the narrative and sayings, two points must be taken into account. In the first place, the Markan missionary charges apparently fall into two sayings: 6:8f, concerned with the apparel and possessions of the missionaries and 6:10f with their conduct during their mission. In the sayings recorded in Matthew 10:4-11 which are produced in a different form from the Markan sayings, the charges are found together, in the same order, but are not separated by an introductory formula and the second theme is much more developed. The Lukan account in 9:4-5, similarly,

---

1) V.Taylor, op. cit., p.302  
2) M.Dibelius, op. cit., p.224

makes no division between the two charges. Secondly, although the first saying in Mark 6:8 is given in reported speech, as Dibelius (1). argues, this is not totally consistent in 6:9

where the sentence lapses into direct speech, - καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσασθε  
 δύο χιτῶνας (2). The corresponding sayings in Matthew

and Luke are consistently direct speech throughout.

It would appear that the general unity of the missionary charges as found in the Synoptic Gospels has been broken by Mark with the addition of an introductory formula in 6:10 and the use of different forms of speech. The adaptation of the first saying to indirect speech in Mark's Gospel is probably due to the Evangelist. The inconsistency of style in 6:9b. is no doubt a fault of the author in transmitting this saying in indirect speech (3). It would then seem Dibelius is correct in as far as Mark wanted the first saying to augment his edited narrative. The direct form of the second saying, especially with an introductory formula, stands out in contrast to the rest of the pericope. It would appear that Mark's purpose for presenting the first saying indirectly was to throw into strong relief the second saying, and not to diminish the importance of the sayings and accentuate the narrative aspect.

The first missionary charge in Mark, including the words, 'Except a staff and sandals' would appear a more developed theme than the totally negative commands given in Matthew and Luke (4).

---

1) M.Dibelius, op. cit., p.225n.1

2) ἵνα + the subjunctive ἵνα μὴ could also be a purpose clause therefore making 6:8 entirely direct speech.

3) cf. Acts 1:4f, where similar shift from reported to direct speech is found.

4) V.Taylor, op. cit., p.304, cf. J. Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Marci, Berlin, C.Reimer, 1903, p.46, εἰ μὴ could be a mistranslation. of ἵνα for ἵνα



The second saying, however, presents a different picture. It must be noted that the missionary charge concerned with the conduct of the missionaries appears to have had more impact upon the actions of the Christian missionaries than did the first charge. In Act 13:51, reference is made to Paul and Barnabas leaving a hostile community and performing the ritual prescribed in Mark 6:11 (1). The conduct of a missionary whilst resident in a town is developed in the Didache 11:4f. It is quite reasonable to assume that the charge found in Matthew 10:9-14 and Luke 10:4-11 is also a development of the teaching given on this important issue.

The Lukan parallel account in 9:1-6 is in many respects similar to Mark. The simplicity of form and similarity in recording two themes closely correspond to Mark. There is a noticeable lack of understanding of the sayings which Luke is presenting, however. Both sayings are in direct speech and no division between the first and second charge is visible. It would seem that the Lukan account shows a knowledge of a simpler form of the Sending pericope akin to the Markan account, but his sayings tradition records only a single unit. Mark may have used a similar tradition to that in Luke's Gospel as a basis for the *καὶ ἐμύη* saying.

b) Mt.26:39, Mk.14:36, Lk.22:42

The scene in the Garden of Gethsemane is recorded by all three Synoptic Gospels. The Lukan account, however, indicates a special development of the pericope by the Evangelist. The link between the Lukan account and that in Matthew and Mark comes in the

---

1) Also cf. M. Wilcox, The Semitisms of Acts, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1965 p.176. Acts 13:51 has striking verbal similarities to the Matthaean charge in 10:14b against Luke and Mark. Wilcox says that this could reflect the preservation of an alternative tradition.

Prayer of Jesus. The basic theme in the Markan passage, Kelber (1) points out, is not concerned with the doubts of Jesus, but rather, with the ultimate failure of the disciples, epitomised by the three favourite disciples. In Luke, however, the role of the disciples is considerably weakened (2) and the agony of Jesus is heightened (3).

The main thesis of Kelber's (4) article is the suggestion that the Markan pericope is a developed redactional composition. The Gethsemane tradition, however primitive or brief, appears to be an essential part of the Passion Account, probably because it was the traditional place of Jesus' arrest (5). Each Evangelist has developed or received a developed form of this pericope which suits the individual theological motifs of each Gospel (6). In a sense this is similar to Kelber's position. He (7) suggests that Markan redactional motifs are brought clearly into play in this pericope.

- 
- 1) W.H.Kelber, 'Mark 14:32-42: Gethsemane', ZNW, 63, 1972, p.81-4
  - 2) Very little reference is made to the disciples in the Account, and the three disciples singled out in Matthew and Mark for special attention are omitted.
  - 3) The three-fold disciple motif is absent, and additional material concerning Jesus' suffering is inserted in 22:43-4
  - 4) W.H.Kelber, op. cit., p.176
  - 5) cf. John 18:1-11, where the Gethsemane tradition is purely a narrative account of Jesus' arrest.
  - 6) M.Wilcox, 'The Composition of John 13:21-30', Neotestamentica et Semitica, Edinburgh, T. & T.Clark, 1969, p.155-6) cf. Mk.14:42 - the betrayer theme with Jn.13:21-30, where the sayings are part of the Eucharistic theme.
  - 7) W.H.Kelber, op. cit., pp.169-176 presents an analysis of Markan redaction.

He does not definitely state that Mark has invented such a pericope and therefore implies some traditional basis for this story.

An even more interesting observation of Kelber's (1) for this present study is the fact that he singles out Mark 14:35-6, from the whole of the pericope, as presenting fewer editorial insertions or comments. The role of the disciples is completely absent from these two verses and Jesus stands as the central and only figure.

The Matthaean account does not maintain so constantly the role of the disciples as does Mark, but he echoes in 26:42 a similar prayer to the one in 26:39. The three-fold motif of prayer and return to the disciples, implied in Mark, is more methodically narrated in Matthew. It would seem that Matthew's concern is a contrast between the faithful obedience of Jesus and the failure of the disciples to understand and resist temptation.

The fourth Gospel presents an interesting comparison. The account of this tradition in 18:1f is directly related to the arrest. A saying similar to the prayers uttered in the Garden is found earlier in the Holy Week chronology at the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem (Jn.12:27). In John's Gospel the time for indecision comes before the night of the Last Supper, but John still includes this prayer in the chronicles of Holy Week.

Despite similarities in presentation of the pericope between Matthew and Mark, they differ considerably in the prayer sequences. It will be helpful at this point to compare the prayer forms in each Gospel.

---

1) W.H.Kelber, ibid., p.175



Matthew	Mark	Luke	John
26:39 πᾶτερ μου εἰ δυνατόν ἐστίν παρελθέτω ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον· τούτου πλὴν οὐχ ὥς ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλ' ὥς σὺ	14:35 [καὶ προσ- ήχητο ἵνα] εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν παρ- έλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα	22:42 πᾶτερ, εἰ βούλει προένεγκε τούτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω	18:11 πατέρ, σῶσόν με, ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης
26:42 πᾶτερ μου, εἰ σὺ θύνασαι τούτο παρελθεῖν ἐὰν μὴ αὐτὸ πῶς γενηθήτω τὸ θελήμα σου	14:36 ἄβρα ὁ πατήρ πάντα δυνατά σοι παρ- ένηκε τὸ ποτήριον τούτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· ἀλλ' οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλὰ τί σὺ 14:39 τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπὼν		
26:44 τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπὼν πάλιν			

Mark records two forms of the prayer, an indirect form in 14:35 and a spoken form in 14:36. Matthew also records the prayer twice, but in this case, the forms of the prayers on two separate occasions are identical (Mt. 26:39, 42). Luke and John record the prayer only once. A comparison of the relationship and actual contents reproduced within the various accounts appears necessary at this point.

The Markan prayer unit is nearer in presentation to Luke and John than to Matthew, for although Mark records two forms of the prayer, they are concentrated within the first episode of Jesus leaving the disciples to pray. In Matthew, however, the two prayer units are separated into the first and second times Jesus prays.

Mark puts more emphasis on the first time Jesus prays whereas Matthew concentrates more upon fitting the prayer sequence into the three fold motif. Despite the fact Mark has suggested this motif in this narrative, it appears less defined than in Matthew. The second time Jesus goes to pray, the phrase: *τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπὼν* (1) describes the incident, and the third time it is only suggested by the fact that Jesus comes back to the disciples, although no reference is made to his going to pray. It cannot be denied that Mark was aware of this motif but it appears that its presence is to stress the disciples' continuing failure and not to emphasise the prayer Jesus uttered. Therefore, the motif is an essential part of the narrative upon which the prayer unit has been imposed.

In Matthew, the relationship between Jesus' prayer and his repeated conversations with the disciples appears more consistent. The prayer is recorded twice and the third time reference is made to it. The possibility arises that Mark imposed this prayer unit upon the narrative, as Kelber (2) implies, but in such a way to form an isolated nucleus within the pericope, whereas Matthew's account diversifies the material to develop further the three-fold motif in the narrative.

---

1) It is interesting to note that this identical phrase is used by Matthew to describe Jesus' prayer on the third occasion, 26:44

2) W.H.Kelber, op. cit., p.178-9. The prayer of Jesus appears secondary to the theme of the narrative except as a contrast, and it is not so Markan.

The spoken form of the prayer in each Gospel begins with the title *πάτερ* ; Matthew recording *πάτερ μου* . The Markan prayer, however, has an apparently developed form: *ἄββᾶ ὁ πατήρ*. M<sup>c</sup>Casland (1) says that the difficulties of the phrase in Mark lead to the omission of *ἄββᾶ* by Matthew and Luke, and it must be supposed, John. This may possibly be true if Mark forms the basis of the other Gospels, and especially, if the saying recorded in Mark 14:36 is primarily identical to the other prayer sayings. The fact is, however, that the prayer recorded in Mark 14:35: *εἰ δυνατόν ἔστιν παρέλθω ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα* relates only to the first part of the prayer actually spoken in 14:36: *πάντα δυνάτᾳ σου παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ* . It is immediately obvious that these two phrases are far from synonymous. A more significant similarity to Mark 14:35 is not found elsewhere in Mark but rather in the two recorded prayers in Matthew: *εἰ δυνατόν ἔστιν, παρέλθω ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο* . In essence Mark 14:35 is closer in meaning to Luke 22:42: *εἰ βούλει παρένεγκε τούτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ* than is Mark 14:36. A further link with another non-Markan version of this prayer is found in the common reference to *ἡ ὥρα* in Mark 14:35 and John 12:27 instead of *τὸ ποτήριον* . It is possible that the prayer represented by reported speech in Mark 14:35 is part of the prayer form found in the other Gospels. The preservation of this particular part of the prayer could be due to the fact that it diverges here from the prayer Mark chose to be the one Jesus actually spoke.

---

1) S.V.M<sup>c</sup>Casland, 'Abba, Father', JBL, 72, 1953, p.30



It would seem therefore, that Mark knew of two versions of this prayer. Instead of using them to develop the three-fold motif present in Matthew, they have been put together to intensify a prayer unit almost divorced from the events in the pericope. The composition of this prayer unit is interesting as it reflects a similar use of direct and indirect speech to that found in Mark 6:8-12 (1). In this case, the two sayings are linked, not through similar subject matter, but as traditional variants of the same saying. The indirect presentation of the prayer forms a précis of the prayer which follows. The prayer Mark singles out for attention by recording it in full and in direct speech, begins with the introductory formula. *καὶ ἔλεγεν*.

The use of the Markan prayer in 14:36 serves to isolate and give importance to the saying within this primarily narrative pericope. Despite this, there is a striking feature in the prayer itself, which further isolates it from the saying traditions found in the other Gospels. The introductory title: *Ἰεσοῦ ὁ πατήρ*, mentioned earlier, is unique to the Markan prayer. A general impression is that *ὁ πατήρ* is a direct translation of *Ἰεσοῦ* (2). M<sup>c</sup>Casland (3) notes that *Ἰεσοῦ* should literally be translated as 'my Father', not 'the Father' and suggests the use of *ὁ πατήρ* on a number of occasions in the Epistles should be translated as

1) The use of *ἵνα* and subjunctive in 14:35 is a similar construction to 6:8. In 14:35, the phrase is definitely intended as reported speech. This possibly indicates that use of construction in 6:8 is also reported speech.

2) S.V.M<sup>c</sup>Casland, *ibid.*, p.81 cites various attempts, not only by scholars but also textual critics, to see *ὁ πατήρ* as an interpretation of *Ἰεσοῦ* rather than a correct translation.

3) S.V.M<sup>c</sup>Casland, *op. cit.*, pp.86-8 gives the full extent of the use of the definite article to express a pronoun in the New Testament.

'my Father'. This seems implicit in the Markan use of *ὁ πατήρ*, thereby giving the correct translation. It is interesting to note Matthew 26:39,42 has *πάτερ μου* which does not necessarily illustrate a knowledge of *אבא* but represents a logical conclusion of the use of *ὁ πατήρ* in the Epistles.

The simple explanation that *ὁ πατήρ* is a translation of *אבא*, however, even M<sup>C</sup>Casland is not totally satisfied with. The term is only found three times in the New Testament and each time it is within the identical phrase: *אבא ὁ πατήρ*. Besides Mark 14:36, the other occasions are Romans 8:15 and Galatians 4:6 where the phrase stands alone as a confessional statement (1). It would seem feasible to suggest, as M<sup>C</sup>Casland (2) does, that in such a case, *אבא* is no longer seen as an Aramaic word needing translation, but as a title for God. It appears that embodied in the Markan prayer is the basis for a liturgical utterance which was at sometime used by the Early Church (3).

### iii) CONCLUDING REMARKS

The study of the presence of *καὶ ἐλάλει* sayings in narrative material not only improves our knowledge of this Sayings Tradition but also helps to throw light on the role of the narratives in the Gospel Tradition.

---

1) Romans 8:15 ... *ἐν ᾧ κολομεν Ἀβδὸν ὁ πατήρ*...  
Galatians 4:6 ... *κἀλάει Ἀβδὸν ὁ πατήρ*...

2) S.V.M<sup>C</sup>Casland, op. cit., p.90

3) J.Jeremias, The Problem of the Historical Jesus, Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1971, p.18 points out *אבא* as one of the distinguishing features of the original Jesus.

It must be noted that a similar use of an Aramaic phrase is found in I.Cor. 16:22: *ΜΑΡΑΝΑΘΑ*. Its Aramaic origin suggests a very early formulation, but no doubt it became used by a Church that did not know this language. Therefore, it gained liturgical connotations at a very early stage. The use of *אבא ὁ πατήρ* in Romans and Galatians does suggest this also.



A comparison of the narratives and sayings in the various gospels indicates that, whereas the narrative material is basically similar, not only has it been varied to reflect the theology of each Evangelist, but, especially in Mark, the alteration to the narrative is also due to the super-imposing of a variant sayings tradition. The reason for textual alteration, however, is not an attempt to reconcile any contradictions between the saying and narrative that may occur, but rather it is an attempt by the redactor to draw attention to the authoritative character of the saying being preserved. It is evident that a certain amount of contradiction within the narrative still remains.

Both groups of sayings are given prominence within narrative sections. The sayings in the first group are seen as pronouncement sayings, and therefore, the purpose of the narratives in these instances is to form a framework for the sayings. It is apparent that the Markan

*καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings are not always suited to the framework.

This would suggest that the framework was developed for a saying which was not identical in form to the present one. In the second category of sayings, traditional framework units are developed in order to accentuate the sayings and not just an arbitrary development of narrative tradition. Similarly, it is found that the framework and *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings are uneasy partners.

The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings found within narrative frameworks reflect the presence of two traditions which Mark has linked, sometimes deliberately, in uneasy harmony. Although the narratives are vastly different in each Gospel, the basic account is identical. It is possible



to see the build up of material thus: a basic narrative tradition is used by the Evangelists upon which are placed theological and specific themes. The link between all accounts is usually the words of Jesus. However, the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings in Mark indicate a deviation from this by superimposing a saying, which is essentially an isolated unit, over a saying whose meaning is developed by the surrounding context.

The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings in this chapter continue to reveal the characteristics already noted in the previous sayings. The sayings continue to reflect primitive qualities. The teaching aspect of the saying is still very noticeable, and it is becoming evident that the disciples figure largely as the recipients of the teaching (6:10-11, 8:21) or are singled out as being witnesses (6:4, 7:27, 14:36). The *καὶ λέγει* formula in 7:28 and 8:17 would be recorded on purpose as a commentary form on the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings. Luke 9:1-6 appears to have some knowledge of the Markan missionary charges. The sayings in 6:10-11, 14:36 especially, appear to have repercussions on later Church thinking.

THE STUDY:

4) FURTHER SAYINGS

i) SAYINGS CLOSELY CONNECTED WITH THE TERMS διδάσκω/διδάχη.

Three examples of the use of διδάσκω/διδάχη in relationship to καὶ ἔλεγεν sayings have already been investigated. The introduction to the Parable of the Sower, if not to the whole of the parables in Mark 4, is introduced by: καὶ ἔλεγεν ἐν τῇ διδασκίᾳ αὐτοῦ ... Similarly, the second Passion Prediction is 'taught' (ἐδίδασκεν) to the disciples. The saying concerned with the cleansing of the Temple is also introduced with the phrase: καὶ ἐδίδασκεν καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς.

Before moving on to look at the remaining two sayings using these terms, it would be of value to qualify the meaning of the words διδάσκω/διδάχη to the Evangelist in Mark's Gospel.

The use of διδάσκω/διδάχη in Mark brings to light an interesting situation. It would appear that the primary use of διδάσκω (1) and διδάχη (2) is as a general term, and not to introduce specific teaching material. In a number of cases, the terms are used in a general framework to a narrative (3). The few occasions, however, where these terms are applied to specific words of Jesus are in the introductions of certain καὶ ἔλεγεν sayings (4).

1) Mk.1:21, 22, 2:13, 4:1,2, 6:2,6,30,34, 7:7, 8:31, 9:31, 10:1, 11:17, 12:35,38, 14:49.

2) Mk.1:22,27 4:2, 11:18, 12:38

3) cf. Mk.1:21-2,27-8,2:13, 6:2,6,34, 10:1 Other uses: 6:30 - disciples tell Jesus all they have done and taught on their return from their mission. 7:7 - part of a quotation from Isaiah 29:13. 14:49 - at Jesus' arrest, he says why did they not arrest him as he taught daily in the Temple.

4) cf. Mk.4:2, 9:31, 11:18, 12:35,38. The use of διδάσκω in Mark 8:31 is probably due to the influence of 9:31 which forms the basis for the first passion prediction.



Kuhn (1) suggests that the use of these terms indicates a Markan formulation and it would appear that, especially in these cases, this argument is justified. Mark uses these terms as a general indication of Jesus' teaching with the exception of certain *καὶ ἑτέροις* sayings where *διδάσκω/διδάχῃ* may reflect the nature of the tradition preserved.

Matthew and Luke similarly use *διδάσκω/διδάχῃ* as a general term except in one instance (Mt.5:2, Lk.11:1). In this case, both Gospels are introducing the teaching material of the Great Sermon and could be justified in using *διδάσκω* anyway.

a) Mt.22:41-6, Mk.12:35-7, Lk.20:41-44

It is necessary in dealing with the two sayings, to look at their setting jointly. These two sayings are placed at the very end of the questioning in the Temple in Holy Week. Taylor (2) says that it would appear Mark 12:35-7 constitutes little more than a saying introduced by a brief statement. The context, given in 12:35a, is editorial. This view is supported by Gagg (3) who also cites 12:37c as Markan. In this case, any narrative falls away to reveal two *καὶ ἑτέροις* sayings unconnected by any traditional setting.

Gagg (4) points out that the phrase *πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς* used by Jesus to initiate his argument suggests that a comment or question from the Scribes originally engendered this discussion. The introduction in

- 
- 1) H.W.Kuhn, Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1971, p.138  
2) V.Taylor, The Gospel According to Saint Mark, London, Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1969, p.490  
3) R.P.Gagg, 'Jesus und die Davidssohnfrage', TZ, 7, 1951, p.20  
4) R.P.Gagg, ibid., pp.19

Mark 12:35a, however, does not even hint at this, but suggests that the discourse is solely initiated by Jesus himself. This is further supported in Daube's (1) theory that the questioning in the Temple represents the four hagadic questions. He proposes that this Messianic saying corresponds to the fourth question which is initiated by the father on behalf of the son who does not know how to ask. This is further attested in Mark 12:34 which states: *καὶ οἰδῆς οὐκ ἔτι ἑορτὴν αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι*, disconnecting 12:35-7 from the preceding questioning (2). A contradiction between the limited context and saying in Mark becomes at once apparent.

In Matthew's account, the discourse has strong links with the preceding question concerning the Greatest Commandment (Mt. 22:34-40). In Matthew, the question is seen as a trick question put by the Pharisees. Now in Matthew 22:41-6, it is time for Jesus to put a question to the Pharisees. The first phrase in the Markan saying, which causes difficulty in the text, is incorporated by Matthew into narrative. Jesus asks the Pharisees, 'whose Son is the Christ,' to which they reply, 'David's'. Apparently, Matthew 22:41-6 is seen as part of the preceding

---

1) D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London, Athlone Press, 1956, p. 166f, on the four questions on the Passover Seder.

2) D. Daube, *ibid.*, p. 167, sees this phrase belonging to the Davidic discussion rather than the previous question. Whether it is to be related to one question or another is not so essential to our problem. The fact that it comes just before the Davidic discussion means that the Scribes did not ask any question at all and, therefore, the phrase in the saying is still at variance with the context.

pericope, for it is not until 22:46 that Matthew concludes the questioning with the sentence that no-one dared ask any more questions. In Mark and Luke, it has been noted, this statement precedes the discourse.

The saying recorded in Luke is much more general: *πᾶς λέγουσιν* (1) and therefore escapes any contextual difficulties. As in the Markan context, this saying of Jesus is apparently not motivated by any questioning. Therefore, the Matthaean and Lukan settings appear to obscure the Markan Passover haggadic setting as well as the awkward presence of 'the Scribes' in the saying itself.

Taylor (2) says that the language and content of the Markan saying suggests that its origins are in the Palestinian tradition. The quotation of Psalm 110, Gagg (3) says, could have no meaning in non-Jewish discussions (4). Strack-Billerbeck (5) also suggest that the phrase *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ* is not Christian but Rabbinic terminology. Psalm 110:1 occurs a number of times in the New Testament (6), but only in Mark 12:35 does the quotation relate to a

---

1) and possibly Aramaic.

2) V. Taylor, *op. cit.*, p.490

3) R.P. Gagg, *op. cit.*, pp.21

4) cf. J.A. Fitzmeyer 'The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament', *SNTS*, 1973, who suggests underlying Ps. 110:1 is an Aramaic pun.

5) Strack-Billerbeck, Vol II, p.30-1

6) cf. Mk. 14:62f, Ac. 2:34, I Cor. 15:25, Eph. 1:20, Col. 3:1, Heb. 1:3, 12, 10:13, 12:2



'Son of David' Messiah. This title never seemed to be very popular with the Early Church, so the argument in the Synoptic Gospels could be of little interest to the Church unless it was an authentic reflection by Jesus.

So it appears that the Markan saying retains knowledge of some original confrontation with the Scribes which is neither developed in the editorial context nor, probably, was attached to one in the form Mark received it. Due to a desire to keep the saying intact and isolated, no attempt has been made either to omit the offending phrase in the saying or develop the context (1). Gagg (2) suggests that the reason for presenting this saying in isolation was to highlight the saying, especially alluding to Jesus himself as the Messiah. This saying, originally spoken in a polemic against a standard Messianic concept, is possibly used by Mark, and even preserved in the tradition, as a comment upon the nature and person of Jesus. Dodd (3) says that this quotation became an essential article of the Christian Church. Bearing this in mind, it is possible to suggest that this saying, which was originally didactic, has become in the course of time, a part of the Church's Kerygma. The presentation of the saying in Mark would suggest a knowledge of both didactic and kerygmatic connotations.

---

1) cf. the ambiguous and sketchy narrative surrounding the saying in Mark 6:4.

2) R.P.Gagg, op. cit., p.29-30

3) C.H.Dodd, According to the Scriptures, London, Fontana, 1965, pp.120-1

b) Mt.23:1-36, Mk.12:38-40, Lk.20:45-7

No Markan context is given. The saying is attached to the preceding discourse. It is introduced by the simple phrase:

*καὶ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐκλογῇ*

. Dibelius (1)

points out that this form of stringing *καὶ ἐκλογῇ* sayings

together with little or no contextual setting is similar to the form found in the parables of Chapter 4. The link between the

Son of David saying (Mk.12:35-7) and this attack on the scribes

(Mk.12:38-40) would appear to be the common subject: *ὑποκριταὶ*

Whether this link is editorial or traditional, can only be a matter of conjecture.

Matthew does not record the section found in Mark. Instead, he records a much more developed attack (Mt.23:1f) which is not found anywhere in Mark. This longer attack against the Scribes and Pharisees is reproduced earlier in Luke 11:30ff which Luke attaches to the Pericope of Eating with Pharisees. Luke 20:45-7 also records the shorter woes, of Mk.12:38-40. Matthew 23:1 and Luke 20:45 introduce the attack with Jesus calling together both the crowd and his disciples. This is entirely missing in the Markan introduction.

Taylor (2) questions the integrity of Mark 12:38-40. He says this attack appears to comprise of a double extract, and that 12:40 is a separate extract attached to 12:38-9 for topical reasons. There is nothing in the text to suggest a Markan addition, however, and it must be assumed that the section 12:38-40 was received by Mark intact.

---

1) M.Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, London, Nicholson and Watson, 1934, p.236

2) V.Taylor, op. cit., p.493

Taylor (1) agrees with Dibelius (2) that Mark only intended to quote an extract from his tradition. It is Taylor's (3) suggestion that the *καὶ ἔτι* tradition of the Markan section could have been a similar compilation to that found in Matthew and Luke. Butler (4) extends this argument by stating positively that Mark relied upon the Matthaean attack. Although an overlap of contents between Matthew 23:6-7a and Mark 12:38-39b is apparent, thus suggesting the possibility of a basically similar tradition, the Matthaean passage has been developed into a Christian homily on humility. It is easier to assume that Matthew 'christianized' a passage rather than Mark 'de-Christianized' it. Luke 20:45-7 would appear to maintain a closer link with Mark in this case.

This saying in Mark is no doubt only part of a much longer attack upon the Scribes, but cannot be associated with the longer attacks found in Matthew and Luke.

c) Concluding Remarks.

One further point must be dealt with. Dibelius and Taylor (5) agree that the use of *καὶ ἔτι* was to indicate an extract taken from a larger section. It cannot be doubted that the *καὶ ἔτι* tradition is not completely represented by Mark and in this respect Mark is no doubt selective.

---

1) V.Taylor, op. cit., p. 493-4

2) M.Dibelius, op. cit., p.236

3) V.Taylor, op. cit., p.493

4) B.C.Butler, The Originality of St.Matthew, Cambridge, U.P., 1951, pp.73-6

5) M.Dibelius, op. cit., p.236 and V.Taylor, op. cit., p.493 in the case of Mk.12:38f. Also B.C.Butler's theory, op. cit., pp.72-106, esp. pp.73-6, 85-93.



Dibelius (1) also points out that the use of *διδάσκω/διδάχη*, if used to indicate specific teaching material for all, only appears to give examples. The use of *καὶ ἔλεγεν*, however, cannot specifically claim to introduce only extracts, for it is used to introduce pronouncement sayings which are in essence limited short sayings. Therefore, although there are cases where *καὶ ἔλεγεν* introduces extracts, it is not the only reason for using such a formula. It is possible, however, that the combination of *διδάσκω/διδάχη* with *καὶ ἔλεγεν* indicates that the quotation is a selection from a larger section found in the tradition. The use of *διδάχη* in Mark 4:2 and 12:38 definitely indicates a selection of material. Also, it is possible that Mark 9:31 and 12:38, both being sayings relating to Jesus himself, come from a block of material devoted to the purpose and person of the Messiah. The use of *ἐδίδασκεν* in Mark 11:17 may indicate that a section of proof-texts lies behind this saying and quotation. This is purely hypothetical, but the use of *διδάσκω/διδάχη* exclusively with *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings cannot be disputed, although the reasoning behind it can only be conjecture. What is evident, however, is that the use of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* to introduce sayings no doubt indicates that much more is concealed than is revealed by Mark.

---

1) M.Dibelius, op. cit., pp.236-238

ii) ISOLATED *מאן עמר* SAYINGS.

The two remaining sayings to be looked at now are found appended to composite discourses or discussions. Mark 7:9-13 is an isolated unit attached to a Discussion on Ritual Hand-washing (1). A further isolated unit is appended to Mark 7:14. This unit is similarly part of the *מאן עמר* tradition and has been investigated thoroughly in the chapter on the Parables (2). It would seem that neither of these sections appended to the original discussion develops the initial theme of ritual cleansing but picks up a secondary concept found in the original text and enlarges upon that. Mark 7:9-13 is concerned with the impropriety of the oral tradition and 7:14-23 picks up the theme of spiritual cleanliness as opposed to ritual cleanliness.

The saying in Mark 9:1 completes a Discourse on the Conditions of Discipleship starting at 8:34. It would seem that the basis of this teaching is a number of sayings strung together forming a composite speech.

Wellhausen (3) singles out these two sayings amongst such sayings as Mark 2:27, 4:11, 7:20 and 8:21 as examples of isolated sayings used in constructed teaching material. It is interesting to note that all the examples cited are part of the *מאן עמר* tradition.

---

1) V. Taylor, op. cit., p.339

2) Study pp.15f.

3) J. Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Marci, Berlin, G. Reimer, 1909, p.57

a) Mt.15:3-6, Mk.7:9-13

The discussion on ritual hand washing and subsequent material is recorded only by Matthew and Mark. Examination of the *καὶ ἔτι* material in Mark 7:14f has already revealed the use Mark makes of general gospel material upon which the special *καὶ ἔτι* material is imposed. The re-arrangement of blocks of material(1) and the isolation of the sayings tradition (2) have already been noted in respect to Mark 7:14f. It would appear a possibility, considering the extent of the *καὶ ἔτι* material in this discussion, to assume that this tradition contained a similar section to that underlying the Synoptic account in Mk7:4f par.

A re-arrangement of the material is also noticeable in this present unit. Both Gospel accounts begin with a question from the Scribes and Pharisees concerning the lack of observance on the part of Jesus' disciples of the hand-washing laws laid down by Oral tradition. Mark 7:3-4 includes an elaborate explanation of this observation. Mark 7:5 uses the term *παραβάσειν* to relate to the Tradition of the Elders which reflects a technical Jewish term for the observation of the Law. Matthew uses *παραβαίνειν* 'to transgress'.

Matthew 15:3f immediately picks up the Korban theme. This development of the discussion appears to follow naturally on from the question in 15:2; for in retaliation to the accusation of the Scribes

---

1) eg. Matthaean insertion into the text from 15:11-14 and the absence of the *οἶκος* motif.

2) eg. the use of *ἔτι δὲ οὐ* in Mark 7:20 to distinguish a new saying is absent in Matthew. The Matthaean saying tends to be a continuation of the previous discussion.



and Pharisees: *διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ σου παραβαλίνουσιν τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων* ; Jesus answers ( *ἀποκριθεὶς* ) : *διὰ τὸ καὶ ὑμεῖς παραβαίνετε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν*. This rhetorical question would seem to take its form from the initial question of the Jewish authorities by the identical form of question and use of the same verb *παραβαίνω* . It is, therefore, very noticeable that a link is established between the question concerning ritual cleansing observances in 15:1-2 and Jesus' following discussion (15:3f).

The quotation from Isaiah 29:13 continues on from the Korban question as a conclusion to the present discussion (Mt.15:7-9). Matthew's account of the discussion up to 15:10, where a new section begins, indicates a natural development from the original question.

Mark's account reveals a different use of his material. The discussion set out in Mark to answer the extended introduction and question in 7:1-5 is given in a reverse order to Matthew's Gospel.

The quotation from Isaiah is followed by 7:8 which is not represented in Matthew's account (1): *ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. Mark 7:9f, the Korban question, begins with the *καὶ ἔρχεν* introductory formula which severs its unity with the Isaiah quotation. Bultmann (2) amongst others (3), has suggested that the original discussion finishes at 7:8 and that 7:9f and 14f were later additions to the discussion. In Matthew, however, the Korban discussion cannot be isolated from the original unit.

---

1) Mark 7:8 is also omitted from the Syriac manuscripts.

2) R.Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford, Blackwell, 1972, p.17

3) cf. V.Taylor, op. cit., p.334

Although the introductory formula in 7:9 tends to suggest a break from the previous discussion, it would appear that 7:8, which strongly echoes the beginning of the Korban question, forms a link between 7:6f and 9f. The similarity between these (7:8 and 7:9) suggests a doublet is recorded. The question arises, for what reason is this doublet formed here and what is the relationship between these two sayings? Whereas Mark 7:9 forms the introduction to the Korban question, 7:8 concludes the quotation from Isaiah. Therefore, neither saying stands quite in isolation. The use of *τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ* in both sayings possibly suggests that one saying is an editorially constructed verse based upon the other (1). Nevertheless, the use of different verbs, *ἀφέντες* (7:8) and *ἀρετέετε* (7:9) and the phrase *τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀρχιερέων* (7:8) differing from *τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν γραμματέων* (7:3,5) (2) and *τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν* (7:9,13) rather suggests that Mark records two variants of the same saying rather than one saying has influenced the formation of the other.

Whether the saying in 7:8 is redactional or traditional is not so important to the present study as is the reason for its preservation with the Isaiah quotation. An alternative to the view that 7:8 is an attempt to link the Isaiah quotation to the Korban Question, is that the presence of the doublet helps rather to separate the two sections. The Isaiah quotation in Matthew is appended to the Korban discussion and forms a unity representing a single train of thought. The rhetorical question 15:3 gives rise to both the

---

1) C. F. Burney, *The Poetry of Our Lord*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1925, p.74 suggests these two verses correspond to antithetic parallels not found in Matthew.

2) J. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p.57 sees this phrase in Mark 7:8 more likely related to a formal phrase in 7:3,5.



Korban Question and the Isaiah quotation. In Mark's account, however, this statement comes at 7:9 after the Isaiah quotation, thus separating the quotation from the Korban Question. Rather than the original discussion ending at Mark 7:8, with the Isaiah quotation as Dibelius suggests, it seems feasible that the Matthaean account preserves the original discussion incorporating both the Isaiah quotation and the Korban Question. In Mark's attempt to isolate his *καὶ ἔτι* tradition, only the Isaiah quotation as the initial answer to the authorities' question remains. Mark 7:8 makes the Isaiah quotation even more independent from the following Korban Question (1).

Turning to the interpretation of the saying found in both Matthew and Mark, very little difference between the texts of Mark 7:9-13 and Matthew 15:3-6 is noticeable. Even the quotation of Exodus 21:17 in Matthew and Mark both side with the Massoretic text, and the Targumim against the Septuagint (2). It would seem that the presentation, rather than the actual contents, reveals a difference between the two sayings units. One difference, however, must be mentioned. Where Mark 7:11 records the Aramaic term *קרבן* and then translates it: *ὅ ἐστιν δωρεάν*, Matthew 15:5 only records the Greek. Fitzmyer (3) has pointed out a similarity between an inscription found on an ossuary and the reference to Korban in Matthew and Mark. The Mishnaic references to Korban in M. Nedarim 1:2-4,

---

1) J. Wellhausen, *ibid.*, p. 57 suggests that Mark 7:9-13 is not a continuation but a parallel phrase to 7:6-8; thereby strengthening the view that 7:6-8 is not reliant in Mark's account upon the Korban question.

2) T. W. Manson 'The Old Testament and the Teaching of Jesus', *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, 1951, 34, p. 315.

3) J. Fitzmyer, 'The Aramaic Korban inscription from Jebel Hallet et-Turi and Mark 7:11/Matthew 15:5', *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, London, G. Chapman, 1971, pp. 93-100.



2:1-2,5 etc., refer<sup>ring</sup> to the use of Korban as a gift of God, date back to the pre-christian period (1). He therefore suggests that Matthew and Mark preserve a dedicatory formula which was in common use around the first few decades of the Christian era and before. This formula is by no means stereotyped but a variety of formulae existed side by side at an early period (2). It is possible that the slight variations in the presentation of the Korban formula by Matthew and Mark indicate a variation of tradition.

Another point of difference between the Matthaean and Markan texts must be noted in the saying that initiates the Korban Question (Mt.15:3, Mk.7:9). In Matthew's account it is a rhetorical question being directly linked with the preceding accusation of the authorities. Therefore, the Korban Question is firmly attached to the Matthaean context. Mark, on the other hand, begins his Korban question with the saying in the form of a statement, or rather, an exclamation, which need not necessarily relate to the authorities' question.

Therefore, it would appear, definitely on the use Mark makes of his material, and, to some extent, on the contents of the saying, that Mark is preserving a saying-tradition known to him which he imposes upon a framework similar to that used by Matthew.

b) Mt.16:28, Mk.9:1, Lk.9:27

This saying, recorded by all three Synoptic Gospels comes at the end of teaching material about the Conditions of Discipleship. The teaching material itself is constructed from sayings which probably.

---

1) J.A.Fitzmyer, ibid., pp.99,97  
2) J.A.Fitzmyer, ibid., pp.97-8

were at one time isolated from one another but had been brought together at one stage to form this teaching block.

The view that these sayings were independent of each other is suggested to a certain extent within the Synoptic Gospels themselves. The Markan material apparently preserves four sayings. Mark 8:34-5 seems to be a highly developed Christian saying, using such vocabulary as *σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ* and *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*. Mark 8:36 represents a poetic rhetorical question (1), 8:37-8, a Son of Man saying, and 9:1, the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying. Mark 8:34-5 par. is found also in a variant form recorded in Matthew 10:38-9. Luke, however, reproduces the two verses separately at 14:27 and 17:33. Similarities to Mark 8:38 and Luke 9:26 can be found in Matthew 10:33 and Luke 12:9 but the later sayings deal both with those who accept Jesus as well as those who reject him. By the use of the introductory formula, Mark 9:1 is the only saying recorded in the Markan teaching block, as well as in Matthew and Luke, which retains its identity as an isolated saying.

Perrin (2), however, raises strong objections to the pre-Markan origins of 9:1. Rather, he suggests, it is a completely redactional verse, the first half drawing its form from Mark 13:30 and the second half from 8:38, thereby linking it to the preceeding material. Against such scholars as Jeremias (3), Perrin (4) suggests that the formula *ἡμῆς λεγώ ὑμῖν* does not necessarily indicate an early origin

---

1) cf. the use of this form in Mark 4:26

2) N.Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, London, SCM Press, 1967, p.200

3) J.Jeremias, The Problem of the Historical Jesus, Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1971, p.18

4) N.Perrin, op. cit., p.200

of the saying, but rather 'in such cases as this, where an early Christian prophet is certainly offering to his Church an apocalyptic discourse in the name of the Risen Lord, the imitation of the dominical style would be natural'. In the first place, it must be questioned whether the imitation of Jesus' style to give such sayings equal status with original pronouncements was really the case in the early Church. There is no evidence that the role of the prophets was to imitate 'dominical sayings'. It would appear from Acts 11:28, 21:10-11 that their role was to prophesy (1). Secondly, Perrin (2) states that the 'Amen' formula is the only evidence to suggest it was an isolated saying and in doing so overlooks the Markan inclusion of the introductory formula. Whereas Perrin's argument could logically relate to the saying found in either Matthew or Luke, it is not sufficient evidence to suggest Mark 9:1 is an independent saying.

A comparison of the text of Mark 9:1 and 13:30 reveals to Perrin (3) that 13:30 is a Christian Apocalyptic saying which forms the basis for 9:1a. The main argument for this statement centres around the Markan use of *ἐως* in 9:1 and the equivalent use of *μέχρις* in 13:30. The rare use of *μέχρις* in Mark shows that 13:30 must be a pre-Markan saying whereas the use of *ἐως* in 9:1 is a distinctively Markan feature which betrays the redactional nature of the verse. Developing Perrin's line of thought, it would seem logical to assume that the use of *ἐως* instead of *μέχρις* in Matthew 24:34 and Luke 21:32 (par. Mk.13:30) is due to a simultaneous adaptation

---

1) D.Hill 'On the Evidence for the Creative Role of the Christian Prophets', *NTS* 20, 1974, pp.262-74.

2) N.Perrin, *ibid.*, p.200

3) N.Perrin, *ibid.*, p.200



of the Markan tradition and therefore must be redactional, or that Matthew and Luke are using a slightly variant form of the Markan saying. It is worth noting that not only does Mark appear to use *ὡς* much more frequently than *μεν* (1) but the same applies to Matthew and Luke (2). Therefore, the frequent use of *ὡς* in Mark 9:1 does not necessarily involve rejecting this saying as a pre-Markan tradition.

Lastly, Perrin's argument that Mark 9:1b is based on 8:38 is no doubt centred around the phrase *ἐλθὲν ἐν δυνάμει*. This phrase does not appear in either the Matthaean or Lukan sayings. The closest parallel to this phrase found in 8:38 is *ἐλθὲν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ*. Besides this phrase, no other similarities can be found, and the evidence of a link between 8:38 and 9:1 on this one issue seems very shaky.

The saying in 9:1, being detached from 8:38 loses any Son of Man eschatological colouring that might have otherwise overlapped from this Son of Man saying. Whereas it can not be doubted that 13:30 is an eschatological saying, 9:1 does not fall into this category. The saying is more concerned with the Kingdom of God and, although it cannot be denied that its juxtaposition to 8:38 may suggest the possibility of some influence, its isolation here preserves it from such obvious attachment to the Son of Man eschatology.

The Kingdom of God saying in Matthew's Gospel, however, has been completely absorbed into the preceding saying. This Son of Man saying (Mt.16:27) to begin with is different from the parallel saying in

---

1) cf. Mark uses *ὡς* 10 times and *μεν* only once.  
 2) Matthew uses *ὡς* 27 times and *μεν* 3 times.  
 Luke uses *ὡς* 15 times and *μεν* only once.

Mark and Luke. The use of *μέλλει* (1) and the quotation from Psalm 61:13 indicates a scriptural basis lacking in the other two Gospels. The essence of the saying, however, is the same, and it would seem feasible that this saying in Matthew originated from the same tradition as found in Mark and Luke, but either prior to Matthew or due to redaction (2), has been given a scriptural orientation. Matthew 16:28 speaks of the Son of Man being seen coming into his Kingdom. The addition of *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον* echoes *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεσθαι* in 16:27 and forms a verbal link between these two verses.

The link between the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying and the rest of the teaching block is not so strong as in Matthew, but nevertheless is hinted at in Luke. The 'Amen' formula of Matthew 16:28, Mark 9:1, has been replaced in Luke 9:27 by the words *λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς*, which appear only twice more in the Lukan Gospel; 12:44 and 21:3. In both cases, the construction of the phrase resembles the 'Amen' formula more closely: *ἀληθῶς λέγω ὑμῖν* ... Also, the use of this phrase in both places does indicate a break but fits into the context as a method of expression (3). It would seem, therefore, that the opening phrase in Luke 9:27 is a considerably weakened form of the 'Amen' formula and does not form such a break between the preceding teaching material and this saying.

---

1) cf. the use of *μέλλει* in Matthew 17:22, the second Passion Prediction, where the term refers to scriptural necessity.

2) cf. A.J.B.Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, London, Lutterworth Press, 1964, p.58

3) Lk. 12:44 is part of an explained parable and 21:3 concludes the Pericope of the Widow's Mite. In both cases the saying seems to be part of the context and not imposed upon it.

Whereas Mark 9:1 would seem to be an isolated addition to the teaching material on Discipleship, the Matthaean and Lukan accounts illustrate the sayings inclusion into the material and make it an integral part of the teaching block.

iii) Concluding Remarks.

Whereas, in the Markan accounts, the two *καὶ ἔτι* sayings 7:9-13, 9:1 are isolated in some way from the rest of the section as a separate entity, Matthew and Luke contain the sayings within the body of the teaching material and in no way draw specific attention to them.

The *καὶ ἔτι* saying in Mark 7:9-13 is part of a block of *καὶ ἔτι* sayings (also 7:14, 20) which makes up the extended discourse beginning at 7:1. Another group of *καὶ ἔτι* sayings is found in chapter 4, the parable section, and similarities between these two sections have been noted already in the parable chapter of this study.

The use of the *καὶ ἔτι* formula to isolate a specific saying within a composite group of teaching material in 9:1 finds parallels in other *καὶ ἔτι* sayings already mentioned: 2:27-8, 3:23-7, 6:10, 8:21. It would appear from this study of the *καὶ ἔτι* tradition that the sayings are not an integral part of even these composite discussions and teaching blocks. In some cases, discrepancies between teaching material and the *καὶ ἔτι* sayings are to be found in Mark which are not found in the Synoptic parallels.



### III.

A SURVEY OF THE MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE *mis'elayer* TRADITION.

The criteria used in the preceding Study not only isolated a sayings tradition but also distinguished certain of its characteristics. Furthermore, the Study revealed the use to which Mark put these sayings in his Gospel. The next two chapters will be concerned with assessing the results of the Study. The first chapter will concentrate upon the main characteristics of the sayings. The primitive form of the *K/A* *Chayv* sayings generally suggests that they were preserved from arbitrary development at an early stage in Gospel development. It is hoped that this chapter may suggest a reason for preserving these sayings, and preserving them in such a form.

1) SAYINGS FORMING THE BASIS FOR CHURCH TEACHING MATERIAL.

This feature of the sayings Tradition has already presented itself in the study. It is possible that a definition of the relationship of the sayings to Church teaching may emerge from a further look at the sayings concerned. From the start, the possibility that the sayings were formulated to support the Church's teaching seems an unlikely link between saying and Church formulation for two reasons.

In the first place, the primitiveness of the sayings has been established. Although Perrin (1) has suggested that primitiveness may occasionally be due to Christian prophets imitating the style of Jesus to give an authority to their pronouncements, there appears to be little foundation for such a claim (2). Therefore, it can be stated that the primitive form of the sayings precludes any reliance on Church formulations.

Secondly, if a saying were a development from a Church statement, then it would be formulated precisely to fit the requirements of that statement. However, a primitive saying which is subsequently connected with an ecclesiastical pronouncement will retain differences if not smoothed over. A number of inconsistencies between the *Logia* sayings and Church formulations were noted in the study.

The priority of the sayings does not define the precise relationship between these sayings and the Church teaching. There are two possibilities. On the one hand, the Church delivers a ruling and then applies a suitable saying to the teaching to give it an added authority. On the other

---

1) N. Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, London, SC, 1967, p.200  
2) see Study, p.178



hand, the saying itself forms the starting point for the Church's teaching. In both instances, inconsistencies may arise. It is hoped to clarify the position at the end of this chapter.

It is possible that Matthew and Luke may be worthy as points of comparison. The sayings in Matthew and Luke which parallel the Markan *καὶ ἕτερον* sayings may prove to be the mid-point between the authentic saying and the Church's teaching. Thus, it may be demonstrated that a 'conforming' influence was at work even within the transmission of Gospel material. While attempts were made to bring some sayings into line with Church teaching, other sayings, such as those in the *καὶ ἕτερον* tradition, remained free from development.

It is apparent from the study that five sayings reveal certain similarities with Church teaching. These five sayings will now be looked at a little more closely.

i) Mark 6:10-11.

This saying is the second of the missionary charges given to the disciples. Matthew and Luke record a more developed account which is usually assumed to be a 'Q' passage. Besides this, Luke also reproduces a simpler account of the incident, more akin to that found in Mark than the 'Q' passage.

A number of developments in the 'Q' passage of Matthew and Luke are evident. In the first part of the charge, Mark 6:10, the disciples are told to enter *οἶκος* and remain there. In Matthew 10:11, the house is to be found within *πόλις* or *κώμη*. Whereas Matthew develops the extent of the mission field, Mark contemplates only a small household unit. Later, in Matthew 10:14, both *οἶκος* and *πόλις* are used, but

Mark uses the vague term *τόπος* which, in this instance, could only refer to *οἶκος* of the previous verse. It is apparent that the Matthean account sees a much more developed evangelising policy than that found in Mark's account.

The Lukan account tends to specify more precisely than any of the accounts the role of the missionary disciples. The finding of a suitable house where to stay (Lk.10:6) is also recorded in Matthew 10:13. Luke continues this theme. The missionaries are workers of God and, therefore, should be kept by the household as deserving labourers (10:9). These instructions seem highly developed and would appear to reflect a period in which the missionary activity of the Church was well-defined and accepted (1).

The rejection of missionaries from a town in Matthew and Luke concludes with a condemnation of the place. The Sodom and Gomorrah theme (Mt.10:15, Lk.10:12) is found also in later manuscripts of Mark (2) but there can be no doubt that its presence is due to harmonising tendencies.

An interesting phrase to note is found in the description of the disciples shaking the dust of an unreceptive town from their feet. The phrase in Matthew 10:14 *ἐκνέματε τὸν κόπον τὸν τοῦ πόλεως ἐν ὑμῖν* is literally closer to Acts 13:51a, where Paul and Barnabas perform this act after their rejection in Antioch, than the phrase describing

---

1) It is evident that even during the period when Paul was evangelising, missionaries still worked for their keep in some places, cf. Acts 18:3. Didache 11:4f. gives the precise ruling on the conduct of missionaries. Living off his host for three days or more indicated a false missionary.  
2) cf. A, f1, f13, etc.

the same act in Mark 6:11, Luke 9:15, 10:11. It is possible that the action described by Jesus in Mark's Gospel became a symbolic action performed by Christian missionaries, and Matthew is reflecting a conforming tendency to bring the wording in line with more official phraseology. Luke 10:11 could possibly reflect this also, by transforming the action from narrative status to a spoken proclamation. It is possible that the Gospel Tradition in Matthew and Luke represents the development of a primitive tradition into a symbolic act of rejection which was used by the early Christian missionaries.

The other Lukan account (9:1-6), having similarities to the Markan narrative, records no signs of development. It is possible that Luke's knowledge of the *καὶ ἑλεγε* tradition has led him to record two accounts of the missionary charges to enable him to retain a less primitive form of the narrative.

ii) Mark 7:15.

This saying is found in the discussion of the Tradition of the Elders. Because of the surrounding context, it is usually assumed that this saying is concerned with the food laws. Nevertheless, a careful reading of the saying reveals no connection with this topic. A similar saying in Matthew 15:11, however, does refer specifically to the food regulations by the addition of the words *τὸ σιτοῦν*. Matthew's saying is interpreted as a declaration that food laws are irrelevant for food cannot harm a man, but that a good moral conduct is rather to be desired. Similarly, both interpretations are present in Mark. It has already been argued that the interpretation that all foods are clean in the Markan account is a Church interpretation



(7:18-19), whereas the moral interpretation (7:20-23) is from the same *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition as the saying (7:15) (1). Nowhere in the Markan saying is there any suggestion that *οὐδὲν* refers to food, but the original meaning and interpretation is obscured by its present context. The only indication of its meaning is that it may have originally been connected with moral issues similar to those involved in the second part of the saying.

It would seem that although the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* interpretation of the saying has been kept, the saying itself in the tradition recorded in Matthew has been altered to represent another meaning.

A more oblique reference to the interpretation of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition might be seen in Galatians 5. The Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:6-29) concluded that Gentiles did not have to be circumcised or obey the Jewish Laws but had to submit to a few moral regulations. This opinion is upheld in Galatians 5. In this instance, the moral regulations are found in the form of vice and virtue lists (Gal.5:19-23). It is possible that the general moral regulations binding both Gentile and Jew stem from the original interpretation found in the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition. Later, the saying became linked specifically with the relaxing of food regulations. In Romans 14:14, Paul echoes the first part of Mark 7:15 which is frequently linked to the food laws (2).

---

1) see Study, pp.95f.

2) C.H.Dodd, 'The Primitive Catechism and the Sayings of Jesus', More New Testament Studies, Manchester, MUP., 1968, p.25 n.3

iii) Mark 9:31.

The second Passion Prediction is part of a complex Gospel Tradition (1). Tödt (2) has pointed out that the terms 'Christ/died' and 'Son of Man/to suffer' constitutes a word formula present in the early Church. There is evidence of the selective use of these terms in the Epistles. Although the title 'Son of Man' is found nowhere (3) outside the Gospels, the use of 'to suffer' is found in conjunction with early christological titles: His Servant (child) Jesus (Ac.3:31), Jesus our Lord (Rom.4:25), Lord Jesus (I Cor.11:23), His Own Son (Rom.8:32). It is possible that the basis of these statements stem from the original use of the terms 'Son of Man' with 'to suffer' (4).

The phrase *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται* in the Markan saying is consistently used in all Markan Passion Predictions which include a Resurrection clause (ie. 8:31, 10:34). In the Matthaean parallel and other Resurrection clauses in Matthew and Luke, this phrase is constantly changed to *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται*. Twice outside the Gospels (Ac.10:40, I Cor.15:4) statements are found referring to the time between Jesus' death and Resurrection. In both these instances, the same phrase as that found in Matthew and Luke is used. It is possible that the strange combination of *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, ἐγερθήσεται* in Matthew 27:63 indicates a midway development between the primitive tradition and a more

---

1) see Study, pp53f.

2) H.E.Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, London, SCM., 1965, pp.156ff.

3) Except Ac.7:56, Rev.1:13, 14:14 which reflect Daniel 7:13 and do not reflect a popular use of the title, but rather a popular use of Dan.7:13.

4) Mt.16:21 presents a slight inconsistency in this formula. However, *ἡμεῖς, χριστός* is not part of the saying itself but appears in juxtaposition to the saying.



precise kerygmatic formula.

iv) Mark 12:35.

It has been previously suggested that the original quotation from Psalm 110:1 and Jesus' comment was not seen as a christological reference concerning Jesus himself, but part of a theological dispute with the Scribes over a point of interpretation (1).

However, even in the Markan setting one becomes aware that the saying is seen in the light of Jesus' claim to Messiahship (2).

No definite development of this theme is evident in Matthew or Luke. Nevertheless, the fact that Jesus is a direct descendant of David is made clear in the birth narratives. Furthermore, the title 'Son of David' is applied to Jesus in the accounts of Blind Bartimaeus (3) and the Entry into Jerusalem (4) in all three Gospels. It would appear that the title is used, in these instances, christologically (5). However, the title does not appear in the New Testament outside the Gospel material, and, although many references are made to a link between Jesus and David (6) it is never in a strictly christological sense. The use of Psalm 110:1 also occurs in Acts 2:34, I Corinthians

---

1) see Study, p.167

2) With the omission of a context, the saying appears to refer to Jesus.

3) Mark 10:47,48, par.

4) R.H.Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London, Fontana, 1969, p.113 says Mt.21:9,15 make the indirect allusion to Davidic sonship in Mark 10:10 par., directly.

5) R.H.Fuller, ibid., pp.111f.

6) Of the twenty references to David outside the Gospels, only four connect Jesus to David. On all occasions, 'Son of David' is never used. Rom.1:3, II Tim.2:8 refer to Jesus as the descendant of David and Rev.5:5, 22:16 as the root of David. It is evident that no defined Davidic title was attached to Jesus by the Church. No doubt the historic connection with David recorded in the Gospel Tradition forms the basis for these references but this has not been developed by the Church.



15:25, Ephesians 1:20, Colosians 3:1, Hebrews 1:3,13, 10:13,22

and it is in these instances that a christological application is found.

It would seem that the quotation from Psalm 110:1 was developed as a christological text in the Early Church (1) but the belief that Jesus was the Son of David was not. The Markan saying poses the problem of the Messiah's Davidic sonship. The Church accepts this pronouncement and at the same time takes over the quotation as a messianic proof text.

v) Mark 14:36.

The unusual Aramaic phrase *אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי* found in the prayer of Jesus in Mark 14:36 is reproduced in Romans 8:15b and Galatians 4:6b as liturgical statements. It is unusual to find a direct and verbal link with the primitive tradition in Mark and its preservation in Church formulations. This is even more true when it is noted that both the Matthaean and Lukan sayings contain an apparently *literal translation* of *πάτερ*. The use of *πάτερ* in the New Testament as an epithet for God is quite common. Matthew and Luke may be recording the title which was in frequent use. On the other hand, *אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי* is a primitive title which happens to be recorded as a secondary tradition on two occasions in the Epistles.

It would seem evident from the preceding study that Mark records sayings which do not directly agree with the didactic material of

---

1) cf. C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, London, Faber and Co. Ltd., 1953, pp.34-35.

the Church, as recorded in the Epistles. Matthew and Luke appear to introduce a conforming tendency into their versions of the sayings and a progression from the primitive saying preserved in Mark to Church teaching can be seen in them.

It is, therefore, suggested that sayings such as these selected from Mark's Gospel, are very close in origin to , if not authentic, sayings of Jesus which have initiated interpretation and development to become useful elements of Ecclesiastical teaching.

## 2) THE USE OF *καὶ λέγει* SAYINGS IN RELATION TO THE *καὶ ἔλεγεν* TRADITION.

It is not proposed that *καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς* represents a formula introducing a sayings tradition as does *καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς*. It is self-evident from the abundant use of *καὶ λέγει* throughout the Markan Gospel (1) that the form *λέγει* is used to introduce sayings that are a necessary part of narrative sections (2). The sayings introduced by *καὶ λέγει*, as opposed to those introduced by *καὶ ἔλεγεν*, at first glance indicate a less precise preservation of authentic words of Jesus. On a number of occasions, the *καὶ λέγει* sayings are in the form of an answer to questions raised by Jesus' opponents on legal matters (3). It would seem that the *καὶ λέγει* sayings represent arguments and opinions which would be put forward by the Early Church to consolidate the position against opponents' attacks. Many of these sayings are concerned with Jewish customs and beliefs which suggest that the sayings were developed or formulated in the Palestinian stratum of the Gospel Tradition. It is possible that some sayings are original but have been extensively developed.

On a number of occasions in the study of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings, it was noted that a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying was found in juxta-

- 
- 1) Introductions to sayings using *λέγει* are found 61 times in Mark.
  - 2) A number of *καὶ λέγει* introduced sayings are spoken by people excluding Jesus; 4:35, 5:7,9, 7:28, 8:29, 9:5, 11:21, 13:1, 14:45, 61,67, 16:6. There are also a number of occasions where words of Jesus are just part of the narrative and cannot be intelligibly extracted from the context; 1:41,44, 2:5,10, 3:3,5, 5:19,36,39, 6:31,38,50, 7:34, 8:1,33, 11:3, 14:10,32, 34,37,41.
  - 3) cf. 2:8,17,25, 3:4,33-34, 7:18, 8:12, 10:11, 11:33, 12:16.



position to a *καὶ λέγει* saying (1). In these cases, it does appear that the *καὶ λέγει* saying acts as an interpretative passage on the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying. This could possibly represent an attempt on the part of the Evangelist, in these instances, to use the *καὶ λέγει* sayings as interpretations of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings tradition, thus meeting the Church's requirements without altering the actual saying itself.

a) On two occasions it was found that a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* parable was interpreted by both a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* and a *καὶ λέγει* passage. The first example is to be found in the Parables Section, where the Parable of the Sower (4:3-8) is interpreted by a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying at 4:10-12 and a *καὶ λέγει* passage at 4:13-20. It has already been noted in the Study that this *καὶ λέγει* interpretation shows a tendency towards the Jewish form of interpretation rather than Greek influence. It is, nevertheless, evident that the interpretation is for the edification of a community under pressure and persecution. The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying in 4:10-12 would imply that the Parable of the Sower was about people's reactions to the parables and teaching of Jesus. The preconceived attitude of some listeners led them to reject Jesus' teaching (2). This does not at once suggest an interpretation given by the Church to help its present needs as does the *καὶ λέγει* interpretation.

The second occurrence of the two interpretations of a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* parable is found in the Discussion on Defilement, 7:1-23. The 'parable' in 7:15 is interpreted by a *καὶ λέγει* statement at

---

1) see Study on Mark 4:3-20, 7:15-23, p.95f., 2:27-8, p.120.  
2) see Study, p.102.

7:18-19 and the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* statement at 7:20-23. In Matthew 15:11, the equivalent saying to Mark 7:15, the word *τὸ σῶμα* is introduced twice, which directly relates the saying to the subject of dietary observances. The Markan saying, however, does not suggest such a specific meaning. The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying in 7:20-23 interprets the saying as a 'parable' on morality. The *καὶ λέγει* explanation, on the other hand, is more closely related to the interpretation found in the Matthaean version of the saying, 15:11. Whereas 7:18-19 emphasises food laws but in passing mentions *τῆς καρδίας*, 7:20f. is centred around *τῆς καρδίας*. It has already been noted in the preceding Study that the phrase in Mark 7:19b: *καταργεῖ πάντα τὰ βρώματα*, which is peculiar to the Markan account, is either a Church interpretation used by Mark, or else the words are of the Evangelist himself. The difficulties of expecting non-Jewish Christians to accept the strict dietary laws of Judaism was a very important issue in the Early Church (1) but would have not, in all probability, arisen in the life-time of Jesus. Here, again, the *καὶ λέγει* interpretation would make the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* 'parable' more relevant to the Christian reader.

In both the above cases, the *καὶ λέγει* sayings are used to interpret a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying which has its own interpretation included within the tradition itself in the form of another saying (2). The *καὶ λέγει* explanations would appear to be a way of interpreting

---

1) cf. Acts 15:19-20

2) The Parable of the Sower (4:3-8) is interpreted by the saying on the Right use of Parables (4:10-12) and the 'Parable' on Defilement (7:15) is interpreted by 7:20-23. This use of interpretation within the tradition is discussed in a separate section.



the *καὶ εἰπὼν* saying to comply with the needs of a growing Church, without altering the *καὶ εἰπὼν* saying itself. The saying in Matthew 15:11 could reveal that the Evangelist was less pedantic about preserving the originality of the saying.

The two *καὶ λέγει* interpretative passages mentioned need to have the *καὶ εἰπὼν* parables to make sense. Whereas the *καὶ εἰπὼν* interpretations of the parables take the form of sayings which stand quite apart from the present context and make sense as self-contained sayings, the *καὶ λέγει* passages are only intelligible in relation to the parable they are interpreting.

b) There are instances, however, where *καὶ λέγει* sayings, as self-contained units, are used in juxtaposition to *καὶ εἰπὼν* sayings, thus modifying or qualifying their meaning.

The question of Sabbath breaking in Mark 2:23-28 is posed by the Pharisees (2:24). This question receives two answers in Mark, a *καὶ λέγει* explanation in 2:25-6 and a *καὶ εἰπὼν* statement in 2:27-8. In the Matthaean and Lukan accounts, the two answers become one (1). In the *καὶ λέγει* saying in Mark, David breaks the Sabbath regulations. This haggadic interpretation is continued throughout the whole explanation in Matthew and Luke. The *καὶ εἰπὼν* formula in Mark, however, produces a new factor in the argument. The presence of *τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο καὶ οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸν σάββατον* in 2:27, in neither Matthew nor Luke, interprets the *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* of the next verse as 'mankind', and gives Man arbitrary power to break the Sabbath

---

1) see Study, p.132.



observances. The Early Church would tend to accept the view that the Sabbath had been broken by them because of the dawn of the Messianic Age rather than it being a natural right of Man to invalidate the Jewish laws. The *καὶ λέγει* explanation in Mark qualifies the explanation in 2:27-8 by relating the Son of Man, by implication, to the Messianic role. Without this *καὶ λέγει* explanation, the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* statement would be seen to allow wholesale abandonment of Sabbath regulations as a natural prerogative of Man. It has been pointed out already (1) that the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying would appear to be a halakic rule but this has been qualified by the haggadic explanation of 2:25-26.

In the Pericope of the Syrophoenician Woman's Daughter, Mark 7:24-30, the reply of the Syrophenician Woman, introduced by *καὶ λέγει* (7:28) is used to modify the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying in 7:27. The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* formula introduces a saying of Jesus. The Markan saying begins with the phrase: *ἄρτι πορεύσομαι πορεύσθαι τὰ τέκνα* which is missing in Matthew 15:26, although the rest of the saying is preserved. The Markan phrase suggests that the mission to the Jews should be completed before the Gentiles were allowed any attention. This may have been true in Jesus' ministry, but it is evident that the Early Church carried out a mission amongst both groups simultaneously (2). The reply of the Syrophoenician Woman in Mark 7:28 tends to act as a modifying influence on the saying of Jesus allowing a certain amount of missionary activity amongst the

---

1) cf. M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, London, Nicholson and Watson, 1934, p.143.

2) cf. Acts 10, the Conversion of Cornelius.

Gentiles at the same time as the Jewish mission was continuing.

In these two cases, the *καὶ λέγει* sayings would appear to be an integral part of the narrative tradition, and the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying has been imposed upon the framework in order to modify it by implication in the narrative and interpretation in the *καὶ λέγει* sayings.

c) The last example of the possible use of *καὶ λέγει* sayings to re-interpret *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings is to be found in the discourse on Leaven, Mark 8:14-21. The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying in 8:21 stands as a call-line to the previous *καὶ λέγει* discussion in 8:17-20. At least twice (1) the call-line: *ὅς ἔχει ὄψα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω* has been used to introduce interpretative passages to parables (2). It has been noted that there is a similarity between 8:21 and the other call-lines. Furthermore, the Isaiah 6:9 quotation in 8:18 is a recurrence of a similar quotation in Mark 4:11, which is part of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying on parables. In 8:18, the stubbornness of heart is explicitly linked to the disciples. The saying in 4:11f., containing the quotation, also has connections with a call-line in 4:9. It is possible that the *καὶ λέγει* interpretation of the Feeding Stories has made use of a traditional call-line on which to hang its interpretation; (cf. *ὅπως συνίετε* (8:21) and *ὅπως νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε* (8:17)); and also to give the explanation an authoritative basis.

It is evident that the use of *καὶ λέγει* sayings in these

---

1) Mark 4:9,23 and possibly 7:16.

2) It is also possible that the call-lines were used as a reminder of the interpretation.

in these incidents are attempts to re-interpret *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings. As they stand, the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings are not totally consistent with the teaching or work of the Early Church. Therefore, the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* interpretations stand as modifying phrases to bring the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings into line with later developments. The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* interpretations tend to illustrate problems that arose in the Jewish Christian community rather than the Gentile community. Furthermore, this form of interpreting the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings is due to a redactional technique of the Evangelist. It must be noted that this method of interpretation does not affect the form of the saying itself. The presence of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* interpretations indicates the need of the Church to re-interpret sayings originating with Jesus in order to apply them to their present needs. It is a method by which these particular sayings were interpreted without touching the actual sayings themselves. Instead of re-interpreting sayings of Jesus by affecting the meaning of the saying itself, as can be found in the parallel sayings in Matthew and Luke in some instances, the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings appear to have a more special status.



### 3) METHODS OF INTERPRETATION USED WITHIN THE *καὶ ἔλεγεν* TRADITION.

The interpretation of certain *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings by *καὶ λέγει* passages introduces a method of interpreting the sayings outside of the tradition itself. A process of interpretation is evident within the sayings tradition also, and it is proposed to make a short survey of this subject.

a) The most obvious starting point, as was found with the preceding section, is the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* interpretations of the Parable of the Sower (4:3-8) and the Parable on Defilement (7:15). It is at once noticeable that the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* interpretations of the Parables consist of self-contained sayings, whereas the *καὶ λέγει* interpretations, in these instances, are purely interpretative passages which rely on the presence of the Parables to make sense. In the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* interpretation of the Parable of the Sower, it is obvious that this explanation is seen as a self-contained saying, as Mark gives it a separate context. It has also been commented in the Study that the Saying on the Reason for Parables (4:10f.) was not originally uttered in association with the Parable of the Sower (1). Nevertheless, it would appear that in the sayings tradition, Mark 4:10f. was used to interpret the Parable of the Sower. The Evangelist introduced a context for the saying to isolate it from the Parable of the Sower once more. This immediately gives prominence to the *καὶ λέγει* interpretation, (Mark 4:13-20). Similarly, the *καὶ λέγει* interpretation of the Parable of Defilement in 7:18-19 ends with a specific decree.

---

1) see Study, p.101

This reduces the καὶ ἐλέγιν interpretive saying (Mark 7:20-23) to an after-thought in its Markan context.

This artificial method of interpreting one saying by another in the καὶ ἐλέγιν tradition is noticeable in at least two other instances.

b) The καὶ ἐλέγιν saying on Sabbath observance (2:27-28) at the climax of the Pericope of Plucking Corn on the Sabbath (Mark 2:23-28 par.) contains two separate sayings. In the Matthaean and Lukan accounts of this Pericope, only the second of these two sayings is recorded. Although it might be assumed that the saying in Mark 2:28 was an interpretive clause formulated to comment upon the saying in 2:27, the presence of this second saying without the first in both parallel Gospel accounts does suggest that it is seen as a self-contained unit. It is obvious, however, that in Mark, the second saying is seen in the capacity of an interpretation of the first saying. The two sayings are linked together by the terms ἀνθρώπος (2:27) and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (2:28). In Aramaic, these two terms are synonymous. It has already been observed that the technique of linking two sayings together is evident in the sayings tradition (cf. 9:31). Furthermore, the use of a similar technique in Mark 11:17, where two Old Testament quotations are linked together by a word-play in an interpretive capacity, suggests that the linking of the two sayings in 2:27-28 could be an imitation of a method of interpretation whereby one piece of scripture is interpreted by a second. The two sayings in Mark 2:27-28 are connected by the use of common terms and therein

lies the interpretation. In both Matthew and Luke, nothing stops the Evangelists from seeing ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as a Messianic title. In Mark, however, the title cannot escape the link formed with ὁ ἄνθρωπος of 2:27, thereby indicating that the term is used in a non-Messianic sense. The use of one saying to interpret another is similar to that of scripture interpreting scripture.

c) A similar layout is to be found in the preservation of a group of four sayings in Mark 4:21-25. The form of the sayings in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke reveals a very complex tradition (1). The Markan sayings are divided into two pairs by the call-line in 4:23. In turn, each pair of sayings consists of a saying (a similitude in 4:21) and an adjoining saying forming an interpretation introduced by the conjunction γάρ. It is noted that the use of these interpretive sayings in Matthew and Luke as self-explanatory (2) reveals that the interpretive clauses used in the καὶ ἐλκεν tradition are infact sayings in their own right.

The suggestion that interpretation within the καὶ ἐλκεν sayings tradition took the form of saying interpreting saying, not only indicates that both the Evangelist and the καὶ ἐλκεν tradition itself reveal a great respect for the antiquity of the sayings. The respect for these sayings is demonstrated by the methods of interpretation used in the formation of the sayings tradition and then in its use by Mark.

---

1) see Study, p.110

2) cf. the individual use of the sayings: Lk.8:18, 12:2, 19:26, Mt.13:2, 10:26, 25:29



4) THE EXTENT OF THE *καὶ ἔλεγεν* TRADITION RECORDED IN MARK.

The sayings under investigation belong to a tradition rather than a fixed sayings source. Therefore, it is impossible to reconstruct the original order of the sayings and to determine if the introduction and conclusion of this tradition are incorporated into the Markan text. However, this does not mean that the sayings tradition was not subject to certain principles in its formulation and transmission. In the first place, there is evidence that sayings have been joined together by connecting words, which indicates an elementary attempt to link sayings together in a fixed order. Secondly, there are larger units comprising a number of sayings, each introduced by the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* formula. These groupings could indicate attempts to preserve the order found in the sayings tradition. Lastly, it is probable that Mark has not recorded all the sayings belonging to the tradition in his Gospel (1). It is possible that certain *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings indicate only excerpts from a larger passage in the tradition.

It is these three topics which will be investigated in the following section to illustrate the possibility of some form of guiding principles in the transmission of the tradition, which is still evident in Mark's use of the sayings, and the probability that Mark tended to select from his tradition rather than incorporate it in its entirety.

---

1) Luke appears to record some sayings introduced by the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* formula which do not appear in Mark. See, VI The Tradition of Mark and its Relation to Matthew and Luke-Some Problems.

i) Sayings Linked Together.

There are a number of instances where a *καὶ ἔτι* introductory formula introduces two or more sayings strung together. Mark 3:23-7 is an instance of a string of short sayings which all hang on a *καὶ ... ἔτι* formula in 3:23a. Although it is generally assumed that the three parallel sayings in 3:24-6 appear to represent a unit, the saying in 3:27 does seem at once to have been an isolated saying joined on to the preceding unit. It has already been suggested in the Study (1) that this link was initiated by the Markan source and is not editorial.

There are further occasions where a *καὶ ἔτι* formula appears at first sight to introduce just one saying, but an investigation of the material reveals a closely linked double saying. The second Passion Prediction in Mark 9:31 is an obvious example of this technique, as the Synoptic Tradition records both Passion and Resurrection sayings in isolation. Despite the apparent ease with which the two sayings read as one, it is possible to see that the sayings were linked by a word common to both: *ἀποκτενέει*, which Mark still maintains.

A similar word link between two sayings is found in Mark 2:27-28. The link is apparent in the Aramaic *ܟܕܢ ܕܢܐ* which underlies the terms *ὁ ἀνθρώπος* (2:27) and *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* (2:28). Only the second of the sayings is reproduced in Matthew and Luke which indicated that the *καὶ ἔτι* unit in Mark 2:27-28 does contain two separate sayings.

---

1) see Study, p.130 n.1

The last noticeable instance of this technique is found in the attachment of two Old Testament quotations to one another to form a teaching of Jesus after the Temple cleansing in 11:17. Here again, a possible underlying Aramaic word play forms the link between the two quotations (1).

It would seem that the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* formula introduces, on some occasions in Mark, more than one saying. There are occasions where a string of sayings, each introduced by a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* introductory formula is recorded in Mark's Gospel. These must be pointed out.

ii) Extended Blocks of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* Sayings.

Three blocks of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* material are apparent in the Markan text. The most obvious block of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings is found in the Parables section in Mark 4. Apart from the *καὶ λέγει* explanation of the Parable of the Sower in Mark 4:13-20, the rest of the chapter, which consists entirely of parables and similitudes, is introduced by *καὶ ἔλεγεν* (ie., 4:3, 9, 11, 21, 24, 26, 29).

A similar block of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* material is found in 7:9-23. Again, the only saying not introduced by *καὶ ἔλεγεν* in this section is a *καὶ λέγει* interpretive passage in 7:18-19. The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings are concerned with the necessity to follow a moral rather than legal code.

The final indication of an extended block of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* material is the presence of two *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings found in 12:35-40. It is possible that these two sayings form a section in the tradition devoted to a polemic against the Scribes (cf. 12:35, 38).

Each block of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings appears to follow through a particular theme. This could indicate that these blocks of

---

1) See Study, p.148 n.2



*καὶ ἑτέρον* material recorded by Mark preserve the order of the tradition. It would appear that although similar themes and sayings are recorded in both the *καὶ ἑτέρον* blocks and their Synoptic parallels, the order is not identical (1). Therefore, the *καὶ ἑτέρον* tradition used by Mark may retain sayings grouped under topics similar to those recorded in the Matthaean and Lukan sections. However, the presentation of this *καὶ ἑτέρον* material differs from the sayings found in the Synoptic parallels.

iii) Evidence for Limited Recording of the Tradition.

It does not seem likely that Mark would have recorded in total all the *καὶ ἑτέρον* tradition. It appears from the use of this tradition in Mark's Gospel that it was superimposed upon an existing tradition. Therefore, it seems probable that the Evangelist would use material only appropriate to his existing framework. Also, it is evident from the supposed use of Mark by Matthew and Luke, or even the use of a common tradition by all three, that each Evangelist was selective in the use of his material. There is no reason why Mark should not have been selective in the use of his *καὶ ἑτέρον* tradition.

---

1) Parables section: Mt. adds many parables throughout the section. He does not include a section on the Right use of Parables but the third simile is found in the saying on the Reason for Parables. Lk. has abbreviated his section and the Parable of the Mustard seed is attached to another section. In the section on the Right Use of Parables, the third simile is missing. In Mk., the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly is missing in Mt. and Lk.  
Mk. 7:9-27. 7:6-8, 9-13, is in the reverse order in Mt. Mt. also adds extra teaching, 15:12-14.  
Woes against the Scribes: Mt. and Lk. have longer sections than Mk. Luke preserves much of his material in a separate section.

There may be external evidence for Mark's selective use of his material in the presence of *καὶ ἕτεραι* sayings in the Gospel of Luke.

Moreover, there are two pointers in Mark's Gospel which possibly illustrate a selective tendency.

The use of *καὶ ἕτεραι* sayings within a narrative context may represent just one saying which has been lifted out of a section of sayings. Such *καὶ ἕτεραι* sayings as the missionary charge in 6:11 may have been part of a larger section of missionary commands in the tradition. Also, the *καὶ ἕτεραι* saying in 11:17, concerning the Cleansing of the Temple, consists entirely of two Old Testament quotations and it is likely that in the Markan tradition these would have stood as a teaching of Jesus ~~associated~~ dissociated from any other teaching material. On its own, the saying does not make sense, but given a context or complementary saying, it is intelligible.

A specific incident suggested by both Dibelius (1) and Taylor (2) is that ~~of the~~ Woes against the Scribes in Mark 12:38-40, which they say is a limited extract from a larger section, similar in proportion to that recorded in Matthew and Luke.

It would appear from the preceding investigation that the *καὶ ἕτεραι* material recorded in Mark is subject to the presentation and order of a Markan framework. This does not seem very surprising considering that the order and framework in Mark is narrative

---

1) see Study, p.169 n.2

2) see Study, p.169 n.1

tradition basically, rather than a sayings tradition. However, where larger groups of *καὶ ἔπειτα* sayings are found, there is a suggestion that the *καὶ ἔπειτα* tradition arranged sayings in blocks of material which are similar to teaching material found in Matthew and Luke.

The integration of the tradition into the Markan framework is so complete. that the original order of the saying tradition is totally obscured. What has been established , however, is that the sayings tradition was subject to a framework in Mark which in many cases is consistent with that found in Matthew and/or Luke. This adds weight to the proposed view that Mark deviates from the framework used by him and found in the other Gospels. to include his own sayings.



5) CONCLUDING REMARKS.

This survey has led to the conclusion that the *καὶ ἐν* sayings have a quasi-canonical standing or, at least, are held in very high esteem. This is evident from all sides. Within the sayings tradition itself, the sayings are presented as scripture. The use of *καὶ ἐν*-introduced sayings to act as interpretative comments on the *καὶ ἐν* sayings rather than violate the actual sayings themselves, indicates Mark's apparent respect of the tradition. Mark was employing his sayings within the confines of a Gospel framework which limited his use to a certain extent. Nevertheless, those sayings he did include were carefully recorded.

IV.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE *καὶ ἑλεγε* TRADITION AND THE MARKAN  
CONTEXT.

The problem to be considered now is the relationship of the *καὶ ἄλλων* sayings to their surrounding contexts. Already, various aspects of this problem have arisen in the Study. It is the purpose of this chapter to reveal the methods used by the Evangelist to incorporate the *καὶ ἄλλων* sayings into his Gospel framework.

It is, therefore, intended to divide the chapter into three sections, each dealing with a specific aspect of the relationship between the sayings tradition and the Markan tradition.



1) SAYINGS AT VARIANCE WITH THE MARKAN CONTEXT.

It has been found that on a number of occasions a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying contradicts in some way the information recorded in the surrounding narrative. This is quite an obvious result of incorporating an originally isolated saying into any form of context. Nevertheless, it raises the question, why did the Evangelist not see fit to alter either the context or the saying to resolve the contradictions? It has been suggested in the previous chapter that the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings have a quasi-canonical status which preserves such sayings from the process of alteration. However, it would still be possible, then, to alter the narrative. It does not seem very likely that narrative tradition was transmitted under such strict rules regarding form and content as were the sayings (1). The Evangelist would be able to alter the narrative tradition if he wished. It would, therefore, seem that he chose to leave the contradiction between saying and narrative in order to stress that two traditions are present within the pericope, thereby allowing the saying to retain some degree of former independence within a narrative setting.

Before looking at the individual texts, the difference between the terms 'narrative' and 'framework' must be considered. Narrative tradition, as suggested previously, was transmitted very freely. The narratives are stories which frequently include sayings.

---

1) cf. T.R. Rosche, 'The Words of Jesus and the Future of the 'Q' Hypothesis', JBL, 79, 1960, pp.212, 213. R.H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1950, p.28.

These sayings act as a pivot within narratives, whereas the surrounding events greatly fluctuate (1). Framework material, however, gives a context to sayings and teaching blocks. Infact, framework material is meaningless on its own, whereas the sayings in the narratives, however important, are not always essential. The narrative itself is a complete form. Dodd (2) suggested that certain framework material in Mark shows evidence of a short historical outline of Jesus' life which was used in the Kerygma of the Early Church and formed the basis for the Gospel tradition. Besides the purpose of some of the framework material to represent a purely historical outline, other framework units are topical and form a framework on which to hang sayings. Such locations as the house (3), the seaside (4) and the mountain (5) repeatedly occur in Mark. Framework material, such as these, would be fairly stereotyped. This difference between narrative and framework tradition should be noted when reviewing the *καὶ ἑτέροις* sayings and their surrounding contexts.

i) Mark 4.

The first text is concerned with the layout of the Parables Section. The scene is set by a framework unit. The mention of

---

1) M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, London, Nicholson and Watson, 1934, p.31, also, B. Gerhardsson, Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity, Lund, C.W.K. Gleerup, 1964, p.44.

2) C.H. Dodd, 'The Framework of the Gospel Narrative', ET., 43, 1931-2, p.399.

3) cf. 2:1, 3:20, 7:17, 9:28.

4) cf. 1:16, 2:13, 3:7, 4:1.

5) cf. 3:13, 6:46, 9:2.

Ἀλλοιῶν and πλοῖον (4:1) certainly suggests the use of traditional motifs mentioned above. The summary given in Mark 4:1-2 forms the introduction to the parables and this is where the differences begin to appear. Mark 4:2 says Jesus taught ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλάς but then only one parable, that of the Sower, is cited.

The next section of the summary framework can be found in 4:10. Wenham (1) thinks that the context to the saying in 4:11-12 was ~~either~~ originally a continuation of the Parable of the Sower which was altered to include 4:11-12, whereas Marxsen (2) suggests the context was a redactionally constructed introduction to the saying. Both theories are based upon the use of τὰς παραβολὰς which is incompatible with the surrounding setting. It is possible that Mark may have altered the framework to make it applicable to the saying, although conclusions drawn in the recent discussion make this unlikely. What does seem more probable in this case is that 4:1-2,10 form a unit which has been separated by the Parable of the Sower, with a suitable comment added to qualify the general statement in 4:10. Mark 4:10 is a general statement as is 4:1-2. Wenham (3) points out the use of the verb ἔλεγεν in Mark indicates an interruption in the text. This certainly appears to be the case. Wenham, however, is selective in his analysis of the use of ἔλεγεν, for the Parable of the Sower is also introduced by the same verb but he does not suggest this Parable has been superimposed upon the Markan framework.

---

1) D. Wenham, 'The Synoptic Problem Revisited: Some New Suggestions about the Composition of Mark 4:1-34', Tyndale Bull., 23, 1972, p.18  
2) W. Marxsen, 'Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie des Markus', ZTK., 52, 1955, p.260  
3) D. Wenham, op.cit., p.19



Again, Mark 4:33-34 reveals certain inconsistencies with the preceding events. From Mark 4:10f., the explanation of the Parable of the Sower and further parables are spoken to the disciples. Suddenly, in 4:33, the scene reverts back to a public setting. Wenham (1) assumes 4:34b to be an interruption in the text as it refers back to 4:10, which he claims is redactional. However, reading through the framework material in 4:1-2,10,33-34 only reiterates what has already been stated, that the framework itself appears consistent. The parables have been fitted around the framework and there is evidence that neither the framework nor the parable sayings were modified in this process. It would seem strange, otherwise, that Mark should have made such an unintentionally bad job of amalgamating two traditions.

Therefore, the Parables Section of Mark 4 reveals evidence of two traditions, one framework and the other sayings, which kept their original form and identity. Mark placed them side by side and made no noticeable attempt to merge the traditions.

ii) Mark 3:20f.

Certain similarities between the Beelzebul Controversy and the Parables Section can be seen. The Beelzebul Controversy is not basically a narrative, but it is a teaching discourse, to which a scene has been appended, giving it some semblance of historicity. Taylor (2) suggests that 3:20-1 is 'an independent fragment of early tradition'. Appended to this is another introductory verse, 3:22,

---

1) D.Wenham, ibid., p.23.

2) V.Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, London, Macmillan, 1966, p.235.

the actual discourse beginning in 3:23. Taylor (1) distinguishes between 3:20-21, which is an independent tradition freely reworked by Mark and 3:22, a completely redactional verse. However, it would seem pointless Mark reworking the framework if he does not directly apply it to the immediate controversy. If anything, 3:20-21 relates closely to 3:31-35, the Pericope concerning Jesus' Family rather than the Controversy in 3:23-30. Also, the use of the motif further suggests that the unit is an independent traditional framework (2).

The development of the setting in 3:22, Taylor attributes completely to Mark. As with Mark 4, if the Evangelist constructed this verse to complement the Discourse, he made a very inadequate attempt. The name *Βεεζεβοὺλ* is only mentioned in 3:22 and although the discourse is referred to as the Beelzebul Controversy, Mark never records the name in Jesus' sayings. Infact, the name *δαταῖς* is found in 3:23. To construct an introductory verse which does not bear much resemblance to the succeeding discussion appears pointless.

If 3:22 is neither part of the introductory framework tradition nor redactional then it is possible that it records the beginnings of a Beelzebul controversy which may have been similar to Matthew or Luke (3), but for which Mark has substituted the *καὶ ἄλλων* sayings. There is no reason to think Mark was hindered by the transmission of this narrative tradition as he may have been with

---

1) V. Taylor, *ibid.*, p.237.

2) cf. recent discussion on framework material in this chapter, p.212

3) cf. Study, p.128

framework tradition. Therefore, Mark 3:22f. is the first evidence that the Evangelist deliberately left unaltered a narrative setting when he inserted the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings.

iii) Mark 12:35f.

The Saying about David's Son is introduced very briefly by the phrase: *καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἔθνεϊ*. However, the saying commences with *πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς* which suggests a more detailed context than that given in Mark. Both Matthew and Luke appear to have overcome the inconsistencies between the context and sayings (1), which Mark retains. There does not appear anything to suggest the introduction was a stereotyped framework unit. It fits well into the surrounding context of a Temple setting and links well with 12:34, where it states that no-one dared to ask Jesus any more questions. However, according to Daube (2), Mark 12:35-37 constitutes the fourth question of the Passover Haggadah. Mark may have been recording a predetermined plan which he did not wish to alter.

Here, again, it seems that Mark is placing side by side two fixed traditions and makes no attempt to resolve any differences.

iv) Mark 7:24f.

Of all the sayings discussed in this section, 7:24f. is the only proper narrative which includes a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying. In the

---

1) see Study, pp.163.

2) D.Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London, Althone Press, 1956, pp.158-69.



saying, a clear-cut division is made between evangelising and ministering to the Jews first and then possibly to the Gentiles. This immediately suggests that the time for helping the Syrophoenician woman had not yet come. The woman's answer, 7:28, in reality tends to answer the second part of the saying common to both Matthew and Mark. She suggests that the Gentiles can still be given some assistance over and above that given to the Jews, whereas the *καὶ ἐπὶ* saying explicitly states this can not be. The woman's answer to Jesus' saying, ignoring the first part of the saying, is a good argument, but her answer to the saying as present in Mark just appears to be a blatant contradiction rather than a clever statement.

It is obvious from the drastic changes in the Matthaean narrative that Mark would have been justified to alter his account, but here again, it is evident that he deliberately chose not to do so.

The use of two traditions within one account is not a new concept. It is evident from the stilted style and awkward Greek (1), and also from a doubling up of the event so that it is narrated twice within the account (2). The use of the *καὶ ἐπὶ* tradition in Mark, however, reveals a different method to incorporate an alien tradition into a narrative. The saying originally attached to the narrative is substituted for the *καὶ ἐπὶ* saying. It was very unlikely that Mark constructed narratives and framework units to contradict the sayings he was preserving. An example of a redacted

---

1) cf. Mk.3:1-6, 2:1-12 where the recurrence of *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ* interrupts the flow of the narrative.

2) cf. Mk.9:14-29 where two Accounts of the Healing of the Epileptic Boy seem apparent. Also, the presentation of possible doublets: The Feeding of the 5,000 (Mk.6:30-44) and the 4,000 (Mk.8:1-10), the Healing of the Deaf Mute (Mk.7:31-37) and the Blind Man (Mk.8:22-6).

framework for a *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying in 9:31 illustrates that the Evangelist could construct an adequate context if he wished so to do. Therefore, it can only be concluded that Mark used narratives and framework units already known to him to act as the background to some of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings. He preserved their identity to a certain extent by leaving both setting and saying in their original form. It would seem that any contradictions arising from these settings were deliberately left to draw attention to the different traditions present.

## 2) THE ORIGINAL MEANINGS OF THE SAYINGS ALTERED BY THEIR CONTEXTS.

Again, the contexts used in Mark's Gospel to surround the *καὶ ἐλεγεν* sayings give a clue to his knowledge and attitude to the tradition. Whereas in the previous section it was indicated that great respect for the independent nature of the sayings was shown by Mark in the deliberate preservation of the inconsistencies between sayings and adopted contexts, this section is concerned with Mark's awareness of the meaning of the sayings he preserves.

### i) Mark 2:23-28.

The sayings in 2:27-28 draw to an end the Discussion of the Sabbath Breaking. The cross reference between *ἄνθρωπος* in 2:27 and *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* in 2:28 seems to indicate that the 'Son of Man' in this context is used in a generic sense and has not christological eschatological or ecclesiastical connotations (1).

However, the context ~~setting~~ for the sayings in Mark's account does start to hint at the interpretation Fuller sees present in the sayings themselves (2). Mark 2:27-28 is seen in juxtaposition to the first

---

1) R.H.Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London, Collins, 1969, suggests that 2:28 is a developed eschatological saying, p.149

2) R.H.Fuller, ibid., p.149



argument in 2:25-26. This argument does have slight christological overtones which could be thought to continue into the second interpretation. If 2:27-28 was the only answer given to the question concerning the disciples' action, these sayings could be seen as a direct answer that Man has authority over sabbath laws. Instead, the argument in 2:25-26 draws an analogy explicitly with Jesus and not the disciples. The pericope shows Jesus answering for the actions of the Church (1). Therefore, the second argument in 2:27-28 is immediately related to Jesus in the present setting.

Mark uses the introduction *καὶ ἔφη* as a conscious pin-pointing of the tradition within his text. The introduction seems to have a further purpose here. Mark isolates the second argument from the first in an attempt to draw attention to the initial question it seeks to answer rather than just a continuation of 2:25-26. It is not possible to decide whether Mark realised the original meaning of the saying and tried to protect it by using the introductory formula, or whether he only knew the interpretation applied to it by the Church and used the introduction merely to present the sayings tradition.

ii) Mark 9:1.

This saying ends a teaching section about the Conditions of Discipleship. It has already been noted that the sayings were at one time isolated units which have been joined together to make this teaching discourse (2).

---

1) R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford, Blackwell, 1972, p.16.

2) see Study, pp 176.

Nowhere in this section is the independence of any saying more pronounced than in the introductory *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* for the last saying. In the Markan saying and a similar saying in the parallel Gospel accounts, the phrase *ἀπὸν λέγει ὑμῖν* occurs (1). This is in itself enough to indicate the independence of the saying (2). Therefore, it does appear that the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* introductory formula is used in this case, primarily to introduce the sayings tradition and not to isolate it from the previous teaching block, as the first phrase of the saying does this adequately.

The linking of the sayings into a teaching block does suggest that a certain amount of interpretation and reinterpretation of sayings within this new framework was necessary to harmonise the unit. In both Matthew and Luke, the last saying is more closely linked to the preceding saying on the coming of the Son of Man (3). However, Mark neither adapts the sayings nor softens the break between them. The eschatological implications of the preceding verse are not carried over into 9:1.

Again, it is difficult to state categorically the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* here serves to isolate the saying from the previous interpretation as well as to indicate the presence of a new tradition.

### iii) Mark 9:31

This saying is framed by a short introductory framework which

---

1) cf. Lk. 8:27 where the formula is weakened. See the Study, p. 180

2) eg. the use of this formula in Mark 3:28 indicates the presentation of a new tradition.

3) See the Study, pp 179-180.

shows signs of Markan redaction (1). It is quite feasible to suppose that the Evangelist compiled the framework for the sole purpose of introducing the *καὶ εἰπὼν* saying. It has already been suggested (2) that this saying does not reflect the messianic interpretations found in the other Passion Predictions. The limited introductory comments leave the saying free from any interpretations that may have been implied from a different setting.

The presentation of the other Passion Predictions, however, does indicate that Mark saw such sayings as christological statements (3). The Resurrection sayings attached to the Passion Predictions on all three occasions are the same. Mark 9:31b has christological connotations, but it is possible that in 8:31b and 10:34 the saying is reinterpreted by the context and also the Passion saying itself.

The two other Passion sayings are found within the Passion narrative itself, 14:21,41, and are interpreted in the light of the Church's view of Jesus' Passion as expressed in the Gospel account.

Therefore, although the Passion Predictions in Mark reflect a christological interpretation, Mark 9:31 escapes by a summary introduction which dissociates it from any such possible interpretation.

It is possible that Mark just wanted to highlight the tradition by giving it a short introduction of its own. This, however, does

---

1) see the Study, p.53

2) The Passion saying has eschatological implications in connection with the Resurrection saying in Mark. The Passion saying itself is non-committal.

3) Mark 8:31 is linked to early christological proof-texts and 10:33 is part of a more developed, but still early, kerygmatic view of Jesus' Passion.



seem a bit extreme, as usually the καὶ ἔτι formula suffices. It seems more likely that Mark attempted to preserve the original meaning of the saying over against the christological interpretations of the other Passion Predictions.

iv) Mark 11:17.

This saying is attached to the Pericope of the Cleansing of the Temple. The saying itself deals with the tendency of the Jews to see the Temple as the symbol for nationalist aspirations rather than an international house of prayer. The incident, however, is concerned with the removal of the traders from the Temple precincts which does not suggest any immediate connection with the saying in its present form.

In the Markan pericope, the saying is not so closely linked with the saying as might be expected. The phrase, καὶ ἐδίδρακεν, could almost be seen as introducing the saying in a new context of just teaching in the Temple, and not directly connected with the previous incident. Mark may have introduced this clause to dissociate the saying to some extent from the interpretation implied in the Cleansing of the Temple Pericope.

v) Mark 12:35f.

Gagg (1) has suggested that this saying about David's Son was originally part of a polemic discussion. The reference to the Scribes in the saying certainly does suggest this. The new setting of this saying appears to turn the meaning of the saying into a comment upon Jesus' opinion of his own messianic role.

However, matters are complicated by the wider context of this

---

1) R.P.Gagg, 'Jesus und die Davidsohnfrage', TZ, 7, 1951, pp.19-20

saying suggested by Daube (1). Mark 12:35f. is the last of the four Passover questions. Therefore, to alter the context of the saying would be to destroy the setting of the Passover questions.

This complication makes it even more difficult to discern whether Mark was aware of the original application of the saying or not.

No positive conclusion has emerged as a result of this investigation. It has been noted that the *καὶ ἐλεγεν* introduction could serve a double purpose. On the positive side, it is used to draw attention to the sayings tradition within its setting in the Gospel. The negative use of the introductory formula is to divorce the saying from its present setting. The saying is isolated not only from the narrative or framework, but also from any interpretation which might be suggested from the context. The presence of *καὶ ἐλεγεν* alone does not confirm this second use. Mark 9:1, 9:31 and 11:17 seem to supply additional information suggesting Mark wished to keep the sayings free from the interpretation present in the context. Mark 2:27-28 gave no positive evidence and 12:35-37 is complicated by the use of a complex framework. Although no unanimous conclusions can be drawn there appears a tendency to dissociate sayings from reinterpreted contexts. Mark may have been aware of the original meaning of the sayings which would have been altered by the settings he imposed on them.

---

1) D.Daube, ibid., p.166.

### 3) METHODS USED TO DRAW ATTENTION TO SAYINGS.

The first two sections of this chapter indicate that Mark had a great respect for his sayings tradition and endeavoured to preserve its identity and original meaning where it differed from the newly assumed contexts. This last section now attempts to indicate further methods that were used by Mark to draw attention to the preservation of this tradition within the present Markan Gospel.

#### i) The Use of the Introductory Formula.

From the presence of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* introductory formula two uses of this phrase have been discerned in the Markan text. First, the formula highlights the saying and secondly, the saying becomes detached from its surrounding context thus isolating it from any interpretation present in the narrative. It is necessary at this point to indicate yet another use of the introductory formula.

Some form of introduction is necessary when a saying is to be indicated. On a number of occasions, the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* introductory formula fulfils this role, and although it does indicate a sayings tradition which is not native to the present text, it forms a necessary link between narrative and saying. However, three instances are noted where the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* introductory formula interrupts the flow of a discussion or teaching block. In 2:27-28, an entirely separate argument is made out of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying; 8:21 acts as a call-line to a preceding discussion and 9:1 is the concluding verse of a teaching block.



On all three occasions, the sayings have been imposed upon a harmonious block of material (1). The introduction of the new tradition breaks the continuity of the original utterances. This, however, is not an obvious feature of the other sayings. In the Beelzebul Controversy, 3:23-27 is the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition. The introductory formula not only introduced the tradition but also the whole discussion. Therefore it forms a natural link between the narrative and sayings. However, the re-introduction of the original discussion in 3:28f. (2) continues on from the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings without an introduction. It is the first phrase of the saying, *ἰσχυρὸν λέγει ἔμην*; that indicates new teaching material. The use of a similar phrase to begin Mark 9:1 is not a sufficient introduction for the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition, however. A new formula precedes the saying.

Therefore, it is evident that a redundant use of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* is present on a few occasions.

## ii) The Presence of Indirect and Direct Discourse.

It is interesting to note that on two occasions in Mark, where *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings are present, the use of sayings in indirect speech is found. Within the pericope of the Sending out of the Twelve (6:6-13), two commands are given to the missionaries. In both the accounts of Matthew and Luke (3), these charges are introduced by introductory phrases (4) and the sayings are found in direct

---

1) cf. Mk.2:25(27) and Mt.12:3, Lk.6:3

Mk.8:15(21) and Mt.16:6

Mk.8:34(9:1) and Mt.16:24, Lk.9:23

2) see the Study, p.128

3) Mt.9:35-10:16, Lk.9:1-6, 10:1-16

4) cf. Mt. 10:5 - *ὁ ἡγεὺς παραγγέλλας αὐτοῖς λεγὼν...*  
Lk.9:3 - *καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ..*

speech. In Mark, a different presentation of the charges is to be found. The first charge is indirectly given, whereas the second charge is specifically introduced by *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*.

Two alternative views could possibly explain this situation. On the one hand, Mark may have been using a tradition which presented both charges in an indirect form and superimposed the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying upon this. On the other hand, the use of indirect speech in the first charge was a technique used by Mark to throw into relief the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying.

The second alternative seems the more probable for two reasons. First, none of the charges recorded in Matthew or Luke are given in an indirect form and secondly, the first charge in Mark is totally consistent with the rules of reported speech, but lapses at the end into a direct form (1). This would suggest that Mark attempted to transpose the original direct form of the saying into reported speech form.

Therefore, the use of the indirect form for this first charge is in order to give prominence to the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying and has been adapted for this purpose.

A different use of the indirect form of a saying is to be found in Mark 14:25-26. In the Markan account of Gethsemane, these verses represent the prayer of Jesus which forms a unit within the narrative. Matthew, however, spaces the prayers out into three separate events (2). In the Markan unit, two forms of the prayer

---

1) F. Blass, G. A. Debruener, (R. W. Funk), A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, Cambridge, CUP., 1961, p. 247(1), says that it was difficult to sustain reported speech in Koine Greek. However, one verse is not as such a sustained effort.

2) see the Study, p. 157



are presented side by side. The first prayer, of which only part is used, is presented as a *précis* of the prayer, in direct speech and is followed by the exact words of the prayer. In essence, the part of the prayer recorded in reported speech is closer to those in Matthew and Luke, than in Mark 14:36 (1). Thus, it would appear that Mark kept part of the prayer which was original to the narrative rather than substitute it entirely for the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying.

Is there any possible reason why Mark wanted to retain the saying that was originally part of the narrative as this is not a usual technique of the Evangelist? It is possible that a clue may be found in Mark 14:36, where the phrase *ὁ ὦρα* is present in the reported prayer. Only in the prayer in John 17:1 does the prayer also refer to *ὁ ὦρα*. Both Matthew and Luke, and also the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying, refer to *τὸ ποτήριον*. It would appear that Mark did not originally preserve the prayer in a form similar to the Matthaean and Lukan prayers, but is closer, in this instance, to the Johannine tradition. Furthermore, although in presentation the saying appears closer to Matthew and Luke than to the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying, the length of the saying corresponds closer to John than any other prayer recorded.

Usually, *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings are found in passages where the original saying was probably quite close to those recorded by Matthew and Luke. However, it would seem that Mark has imposed the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* prayer upon a narrative that he already realised contained a deviant prayer tradition (2). In the way the prayers

---

1) see the Study, p.158

2) 'A deviant tradition' in this case only means that the saying differed from that recorded in Matthew and Luke. This may suggest yet another instance where Mark deviates from the accounts in Matthew and Luke. The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings are not the only instances.



are presented in Mark, both traditions are preserved but the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying is highlighted by the other prayer which is recorded as an introductory précis.

It must be noted that this device is used by Mark very sparingly, but is nevertheless a method by which he attempts to highlight the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition against the Gospel background.

iii) The *καὶ λέγει* Interpretations.

Although the subject of the *καὶ λέγει* interpretations has been dealt with (1), it is necessary to refer back briefly to the discussion. It was found that the *καὶ λέγει* passages represented interpretations of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying. A method such as this appeared necessary as it seems Mark was loath to alter the content of the saying itself. It is possible, from the view put forward in the second section of this chapter, to believe Mark was also conscious that some of the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings originally meant something different from the interpretations present in the contexts. He sought to save the original meaning of the sayings from being completely lost by the later interpretation. The use of the *καὶ λέγει* interpretations is a similar method of preserving both the original identity of the saying by placing the later interpretation standing alongside.

Furthermore, the *καὶ λέγει* interpretations are another indication that Mark wanted to highlight the sayings tradition. The interpretation gives an importance to the sayings in the present contexts. Therefore,

---

1) see Chapter III, pp.192f.

the *ra' léye* interpretations serve the dual purpose of interpreting and highlighting the *ra' élyer* tradition.

4) CONCLUDING REMARKS.

It is noticeable that Mark seeks to distinguish the *ku* sayings from their surrounding contexts. He does not always attempt to smooth over the resulting contradictions between saying and narrative that arise from the superimposing of one tradition upon another. Isolation of the saying from its immediate surroundings also ensures isolation from the interpretation readily available in the setting.

Retaining inconsistencies is a negative attempt to indicate the presence of the sayings tradition. Mark makes a more positive stand with his use of the introductory formula on the most awkward occasions, the use of indirect speech and the *ku* interpretive sayings.



V.

THE *Kritik* *Euler* TRADITION AND THE PROBLEM OF THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION.

Repercussions from the presence of a pre-Markan sayings collection are to be found in the complex problem of the Synoptic tradition. The sayings tradition highlights a number of minor agreements noted between Matthew and Luke against Mark.

Streeter (1) proposed to explain texts containing certain Matthaean and Lukan agreements with the theory of the Mark/Q overlaps. Four *καὶ ἔτι* passages are included within this category (Mk.3:20-30 par., 4:21-25 par., 4:30-32 par., 6:6-11 par.) but a further five are single *καὶ ἔτι* sayings where minor agreements are present (2:27-28, 4:11, 9:31a, 11:17, 14:36).

These sayings containing minor agreements must be studied in the light of various solutions that have been put forward to explain the Synoptic relationship by literary interdependence. Such theories which advocate the process of selecting phrases or even individual words from alternating sources to produce a conflated tradition are viewed with scepticism. It is not to be assumed, however, that no passage can reflect more than one tradition, but that a continuous and ruthless arbitrary dissection of material appears an artificial solution.

Three possible solutions must be considered in this inquiry:

a) Mark knew Q.

This would suggest that the sayings tradition may be a revised or corrupted form of Q as it appears in Matthew and Luke (2). The

---

1) B.H.Streeter, Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, (ed. W.Sanday), Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911, pp.166-78

2) J.P.Brown, 'Mark as a Witness to an Edited Form of Q', JBL., 80, 1961, pp.29-44.

possibility of Mark knowing a form of Q does rather weaken the two document hypothesis, for to follow this theory to its natural conclusion, Q becomes an Ur-Gospel from which all draw, thus destroying the probability of literary dependence.

b) Mark used Matthew.

This makes the Q document an obsolete factor (1) and suggests that the Markan sayings tradition is a development from the Matthaean sayings.

c) Matthew conflates his sources of Mark and Q.

Q represents a purer form of the two sources (2). Although it has been suggested that conflation of texts is an artificial solution, it cannot be ignored in this case as the theory that Matthew conflated Mark and Q has been a widely accepted one for quite a while.

---

1) E.C. Butler, The Originality of St. Matthew, Cambridge, CUP., 1951, passim.

2) This opinion is found in B.H. Streeter, The Four Gospels, London, Macmillan and Co., 1924, pp. 293-331, when he realised that the Mark/Q overlap theory was a weak link in the two document hypothesis.



1) MARK/Q OVERLAPS.

It is convenient to subdivide the four *καὶ ἄλλοι* passages into two categories:

- i) Mark 3:20-30 and 6:6-13. Both contain narrative material as well as sayings within the Mark/Q overlap units. This at once suggests a weakening of the view that Q represents a sayings source (1).
- ii) Mark 4:21-25 and 4:30-32 are purely sayings material and depend on no immediate narrative tradition.

i) Mark 3:20-30.

Referring back to the study of this *καὶ ἄλλοι* saying (2) it is noted that the framework to the controversy (3:20-21) and the introductory context (3:22) are both traditional elements which Mark used, and not redactional. The contexts found in Matthew 12:22-24 and Luke 11:14-16 agree against Mark. It is interesting to note that a healing similar to the Matthaean and Lukan controversy context appears in a Matthaean doublet (9:32-34). This suggests that the material Matthew and Luke used to introduce the Beelzebul Controversy was also traditional material and not originally a necessary part of the controversy. If this is so, it means that Q can still be acknowledged as a sayings document, but if the narrative is not to be attributed to Q, what other explanation is there to resolve the agreements between Matthew and Luke?

---

1) S. Petrie, 'Q is only what you make it!', *N.T.*, 3, 1969, pp.28-33, illustrates Q as a document is still an ~~amorphous term~~ *undetermined quantity*.  
2) see the Study, p.127f.

It is evident, also, that Mark did not use Matthew in this instance. Therefore, it can only be assumed, on the basis of literary dependence, that Luke must have known Matthew or that they were using a common source which cannot be assumed to be Q.

To move on to the sayings themselves, it is interesting to note that 3 : 23-27 appears to be a pre-Markan unit (1)

and, although the sayings may have originally been separate, they were brought together before Mark used them. If these sayings do form a pre-Markan unit, it presents the possibility that Mark used a revised or mutilated form of Q.

However, the Markan sayings unit is broken up in both Matthew and Luke. The discussion at Mark 3:26 is interrupted to introduce the Beelzebul sayings (Mt.12:27f., Lk.11:19f.). It is evident that Mark had no knowledge of such a passage as he would have included it to balance the accusation: *ὅτι βεελζεβὴλ ἔχει* (3:22). Luke continues to present a different form of the saying found in Mark 3:27 (par. Mt.12:29, cf. Lk.11:21). A further saying is added after the saying of the strong man (cf. Mt.12:30, Lk.11:22). In Luke it forms a conclusion to the discussion, but in Matthew it forms a link with the sayings on blasphemy (12:31f.) (2).

The completion of the Lukan Beelzebul Controversy more or less coincides with the Markan *καὶ ἐπεὶ* material. This may indicate that Luke had some knowledge of the Markan sayings material although did not quote it.

---

1) For further discussion see the Study, p. 130

2) J.P. Brown, op.cit., p. 35-36

Both Matthew 12:31f. and Mark 3:28f. continue the argument by introducing the Saying on Blasphemy. Mark gives the appearance that the discussion now falls into a preconceived pattern possibly akin to the Matthaean account. There is a possibility that Matthew relies on Mark for the form the discussion takes, but this would clash with the evident lack of knowledge concerning the previous *καὶ ἕτερον* material. Furthermore, the opinion that Luke was using Matthew, thus explaining the similarity of form between the two accounts is difficult to accept as it appears that Luke had some knowledge of the Markan discussion. In the first place, it would seem strange to find Luke, who is more faithful in his preservation of Q, conflating Matthew and Mark, and secondly, the concept of conflating material unnecessarily has already been suggested to be artificial.

The use of τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in Matthew 12:32 and τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων in Mark 3:28 indicates that Mark is preserving a more primitive form of the saying than the more Christologically orientated form preserved in Matthew (also cf. Lk.12:10). Again, this indicates that the Markan account seems unlikely to have been based upon the Matthaean record of the controversy.

Matthew 12:33-35 contains sayings developing the Saying on Blasphemy. These sayings are found dispersed throughout the Lukan Gospel (1). The process of making up a collection of sayings by selecting sayings from an existing collection appears strange.

---

1) cf. B.C.Butler, op.cit., p15



Therefore, on the basis of the Q hypothesis, Matthew once more preserves the Q tradition whereas Luke diversifies the material in his Gospel. If Matthew is preserving Q, he cannot be seen to have based the sayings on the Markan sayings.

It is evident from the above investigation that one consistent theory cannot be upheld throughout the Beelzebul Controversy. Mark 3:20-22, par. seems to indicate a common non-Q source linking Matthew and Luke, or possibly Luke's reliance on the Matthaean Gospel. Mark 3:23-27 par. shows a link between Matthew and Luke, and Mark and Luke, but the obvious conclusion that Luke selected at random from Matthew and Mark seems improbable. Mark 3:28-30 (Mt.12:31f.) suggests that neither Matthew used Mark nor vice versa if Q is to be assumed, but if Q is not accepted, Matthew may have used Mark.

It can be seen that no satisfactory solution to the Synoptic problem in this investigation is evident.

Mark 6:7-11.

With the Missionary charges, a more complex situation appears. It is evident that the so-called Q passages in Matthew 10:1-14 and Luke 10:1-12 are similar but more developed accounts of the missionary charges in Mark 6:7-11. In addition, a further account of the incident appears in Luke 9:1-6, which at first sight seems to be a parallel account of the Markan narrative. This led Butler (1) to initially <sup>to</sup> dismiss the Lukan account from any part of the subsequent

---

1) B.C.Butler, op.cit., p.15

discussion on the missionary charges. It is believed, however, that the presence of Luke 9:1-6 cannot be dismissed simply as a Markan parallel. In fact, Streeter (1) pointed out that Luke 9:1-6 contains a number of allusions to the Q material found in Matthew 10:1-14, thus suggesting that Luke has conflated Mark and Q. This is yet another occasion where Luke does not present the purer Q form.

The introductory verses to the missionary charges reveal a number of minor agreements between Matthew and Luke. Luke 10:1f., the Q passage, has no similarities with the Matthaean Q setting (10:1f.) (2), whereas Luke 9:1f., the Markan parallel, is closer to the Matthaean than the Markan setting. The 'sending out' motif, present in Mark 6:7 is not recorded in either Matthew or Luke (3), who both continue to give further instructions to heal the sick (Mt.10:1, Lk.9:2) and preach the Kingdom (Mt.10:7, Lk.9:2). The Matthaean context included the Naming of the Twelve as well as the missionary commandments. Although neither Mark nor Luke connect these two incidents, Mark's introduction contains verbal agreements with his account of the Naming of the Twelve found in Mark 3:13f. It has been suggested in the Study of this *καὶ ἐλθόντες* saying (4) that the context in Mark is redactional. Therefore, there are no indications in the text to suggest any *literary* relationship between Matthew and Mark.

---

1) B.H.Streeter, Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, ed W.Sanday, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911, p.73

2) However, it is possible that a reference in Lk.10:1 to send the disciples in groups of two has slight connections with Mark 6:7:

3) The word *ἀποστέλλειν* does appear in Luke 9:2 but the stress is on the preaching of the Kingdom rather than the Sending.

4) see the Study, p.150

Also, if the similarities between Matthew and Luke indicate the presence of the Q source, then the extent of Q must again be questioned. Similarities between the Matthaean and Lukan context of the Beelzebul Controversy seemed to form a part of the Q source and the concept of Q as a sayings source is being rapidly destroyed. It would seem that Q is rapidly becoming an Ur-Gospel.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that Luke 9:1 represents the Q material or at least the material also found in Matthew 10:1. What does the introduction in Luke 10:1 represent if not the purer form of Q? Does Luke 9:1f. represent a conflation of Q (or Matthew) and Mark? It is possible that Matthew's and Luke's introduction does not represent Q at all but then no satisfactory Synoptic relationship can explain the minor agreements.

The actual contents of the missionary charges have been discussed in the Study of these sayings (1). The presentation of the sayings in the four accounts illustrates a very complex situation. The Markan saying (6:8-9) appears to be a developed form of the negative lists found in Matthew 10:9-10 and Luke 10:4 and could possibly be seen as a revised form of Q. This could only be feasible if compared with the possible original form of Q but the Q sayings in Matthew 10:9-10 and Luke 10:4 bear no close relationship to each other. The saying in Luke 9:3 is closer in the order of the list to Mark than Matthew, although Luke 9:3 agrees with Matthew 10:10 against Mark that no staff should be taken. As no basic Q form can be constructed it would seem probable that each saying represents

---

1) see the Study, p. 150f.



an independently constructed saying based on a common tradition.

The second missionary charge, however, falls into two broad categories. Matthew 10:11f. and Luke 10:5f. appear to be preserving a similar saying, whereas Mark 6:10f. and Luke 9:4f. record a simpler form. The Markan saying is more primitive in structure to Matthew's (1) which makes it improbable that Mark used the Matthaean saying. Furthermore, the primitiveness of the Markan commandment rules out the possibility that it records a corrupted or revised form of Q.

As with the Beelzebul Controversy, no satisfactory solution can be found to explain the construction of the Gospel material within the confines of Synoptic dependence.

The context to the missionary charges suggests that Matthew 10:1 and Luke 9:1 may not be recording Q but another common source or possibly that Luke used Matthew. In the first missionary charge no relationship between any saying is visible. The second missionary charge, the *καὶ ἐλθὲν* saying in Mark, reveals no relationship between Matthew and Mark but a link between Matthew 10:11f. and Luke 10:5f., and Mark and Luke 9:4f.

It is evident that no consistent middle term can be proposed and any attempt to introduce a unifying factor from within the present Synoptic Gospels has proved fruitless.

ii) Mark 4:21-25.

This Markan unit differs from the preceding two sayings.

These sayings, to begin with, stand in isolation from any context

---

1) cf. the more stereotyped phrasing in Matthew, see the Study, p.152

setting. Also, there is no parallel collection of sayings found in Matthew but they appear as individual sayings in separate contexts. Luke similarly records each saying separately but also has a parallel passage recording three out of four of the Markan sayings.

The stylised formation of the sayings and careful construction does not suggest that the sayings were haphazardly put together but that they form a definite collection of sayings (1). Butler (2) says that the use of *καὶ ἐκείνη* in the Markan text indicates a diversion from his source, (in Butler's case this would be Matthew), thus suggesting that even Butler sees these sayings as a special collection inserted by Mark into the text.

Because Mark 4:21-25 is a pre-Markan sayings collection (3), it might be possible to assume the material comes from some form of Q. However, the precise presentation and form of the sayings hardly suggests a corrupted or poorly memorised form of Q.

A brief look at each Markan saying and its parallels will clarify the position of the sayings within the Synoptic context.

The first saying, in Mark 4:21, is found in Matthew 5:15, linked closely with the Salt Similitude. This similitude is separately preserved in Mark 9:50 and Luke 14:34. The context ~~setting~~ in Matthew is the Sermon on the Mount. In Luke, the saying is found at the end of the Discourse on the Sign of Jonah (11:24-32). Although both sayings are found in non-Markan contexts, it does not appear

---

1) see the Study, p.111.

2) B.C.Butler, op.cit., pp.89-90.

3) see the Study, p.111.

that either saying has a fixed context but that the sayings were isolated units given a context by each Evangelist. Furthermore, the Lukan saying is different in form from the Matthaean ( or Markan) (1) saying, but <sup>cor</sup>responds with the saying in Luke 8:16, par. Mark 4:21. This further adds weight to the opinion that the sayings were once floating units and that the Q hypothesis raises more problems than it solves. It has been suggested that Luke had knowledge of a collection of sayings similar to Mark, but arranged them into a different form (2). It was from these sayings that he drew the version found in Luke 11:33 and not from Matthew or Q.

The saying in Mark 4:22 is found again in two entirely different contexts in Matthew 10:26 and Luke 12:2 although in both cases the saying is part of a common teaching block. It would seem, at least, that the saying in one form was closely associated with the subject of revelation which Matthew and Luke both knew and used independently. Although it is possible that Luke used Matthew it would seem more probable that a common source was known to both.

Mark 4:24 is the only saying Luke omits from his parallel unit. The saying, as found in Matthew 7:2 and Luke 6:38, comes from the Great Sermon, the Section on Judgement. Again, it appears that this saying was known by each Evangelist, and incorporated into a larger unit. The Markan saying concludes with the phrase *καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν*, which is absent in the other parallel sayings. Streeter (3) says that the phrase is due to the conflation of the sayings of Matthew 6:33b and Luke 12:31b. As Honey (4) points out,

---

1) cf. a possible Markan influence in the phrase *ἡ ὁμοιωσις καὶ τῆς ἰσχυρίας* (Lk.8:16 and *ἡ ὁμοιωσις καὶ τῆς καλῆς* (Mk.4:21).

2) see the Study, p.112f.

3) B.H.Streeter, *op.cit.*, p.172.

4) T.E.Floyd Honey, 'Did Mark use Q?' *JBL.*, 60, 1943, p.325.



this does seem a very unnatural conflation of texts. The Markan phrase probably indicates that Mark represents a completely different tradition from Matthew or Luke.

It is interesting to note that the last saying, in Mark 4:25, occurs twice in Matthew, 25:29, which is appended to the Parable of the Talents and 13:12, which is part of the Matthaean Parables Section. Both Matthaean sayings include the additional phrase *ἡ ἀποδομις αὐτῶν*. The Lukan saying in 19:26 concludes the Parable of the Pounds and might possibly be seen as a Q saying in a parallel Matthaean context. Considering the vast differences between the presentation of the parables (1) in Matthew and Luke, it is evident that Luke did not draw his material directly from Matthew, but that a common tradition underlies them. In fact, Luke 19:26 is closer in meaning to Mark 4:25 (2). Also, the additional Matthaean phrase in his sayings could indicate a special Matthaean version of the saying and confirm the view that the sayings had no fixed context, other than that which they received from the various traditions.

It is evident from the above investigation of the sayings that Matthew and Mark recorded two completely different developments of the sayings and have no relationship to one another.

The Lukan parallel passage cannot be assumed to be a straightforward Markan copy. In the Study of the Markan sayings (3), it was noted that the Lukan saying in 8:16 was very similar in form to Luke 11:33 and differed from both Matthew 5:33 and Mark 4:21. Furthermore, the context setting of Luke 11:33, the supposed Q

---

1) cf. M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Oxford, 1967, Clarendon Press, p.2 which seeks to explain some of the differences.

2) In Lk. 8:18, the subject and *ὁ κτλ* smooths out the difficulties in 19:26.

3) see the Study, p.113 n.1

saying differed from the Matthaean context. It would seem reasonable to conclude that the Lukan context and saying of 11:33 does not suggest the Q hypothesis as a solution. Also, the entire form of the sayings collection in Luke 8:16-18 reflects a different presentation of the saying found in Mark (1). It is possible that Luke 8:16-18 represents another form of the sayings collection found in Mark and not a copy.

Besides the fact that Luke 8:16/11:33 indicates a special form of the saying peculiar to Luke, a similar situation presents itself in the case of Matthew 13:12 and 25:29, where the additional phrase *καὶ ὑποβιβάζονται* appears. Here again, there may be evidence that Matthew is recording a saying-form not known to either Mark or Luke.

Therefore, the conclusions would run as follows: little relationship between the sayings in Matthew and the parallel *καὶ ἕτερον* sayings in Mark is evident.

The collection in Mark is too well-defined and regulated to be the result of a poorly memorised Q passage, especially if it is assumed that Q is represented by the sayings found in Matthew and Luke.

The sayings found in Matthew 13:12 and 25:29 and in Luk 8:16 and 11:33 do not suggest that Luke used Matthew or that both used a common source. The other two remaining sayings could be a result of literary dependence of some kind.

The Lukan collection of sayings paralleled in Mark is essentially

---

1) cf. the Study, p. 113f.



not a copy of Mark but a special Lukan collection, although complete rejection of any Markan influence cannot be ruled out.

It is apparent that no one theory can easily explain the relationship of these sayings within the Synoptic framework. Again, a consistent middle term is missing.

Mark 4:30-32.

The Parable of the Mustard seed in Mark 4:30-32 is paralleled both in Matthew 13:31-32 and Luke 13:18-19. Besides the number of verbal agreements between Matthew and Luke found in this parable, it is also part of a twin parable unit, being followed by the Parable of the Leaven. This has inevitably led Streeter (1) to assume that Matthew and Luke are recording Q material and that Mark's single parable is a mutilation of the Q parable unit.

Streeter(2) argues that the Gospel Tradition transmits a number of parables in pairs. It must be noted that the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly could form the first part of a double parable unit in Mark. Butler (3) says that the double parables were not constructed simply by appending one parable to another, but by complementing and recalling each other in both form and content. He says that this definition applies to the Parables of the Mustard Seed and leaven in Matthew and Luke, but not the Parables of the Seed Growing Secretly and the Mustard Seed in Mark. It is not proposed to reiterate the arguments for assuming that the Markan parables form a double parable unit (4) but there is a strong indication that the definition of

---

1) B.H.Streeter, op.cit., p.173.

2) B.H.Streeter, ibid., p.173.

3) B.C.Butler, op.cit., p.115.

4) see the Study, p.115f



a double parable unit, as given by Butler, suits the Markan parable unit equally as well as the Matthaean and Lukan parable units.

It may be concluded that Mark is recording a fixed double parable tradition differing from Matthew and Luke and cannot be ascribed to a mutilated Q form. Honey (1) suggests that in comparing the Markan Parable of the Mustard Seed with Luke, (Luke being the purer form of Q), Mark contains a couple of superfluous statements concerning the contrast between the smallness of the seed and the vastness of the end product. These statements in Mark, Honey concludes (2), represent an expanded form of Q. However, the earlier study of the parable has indicated that the meaning of the parable differs from that represented in Luke, and these phrases, not present in Luke, are just the statements that give emphasis to the Markan interpretation (3). Therefore, there does not appear to be any reason to assume any relationship between Q and Mark in this case.

Streeter (4) states that the numerous points of detailed agreements in the Parable of the Mustard Seed in Matthew and Mark can only indicate that Matthew conflated his two sources, Mark and Q. He admits that the parallel phrases in Matthew and Mark represent irrelevant details. By this admission, Streeter almost invalidates his argument, for it would seem pointless to extract unimportant details from the Markan account just for an exercise in conflation. It would seem a more appropriate argument that Mark was based upon the Matthaean parable and extracted the irrelevances (5), rather than the conclusion Streeter draws.

---

1) T.F.Floyd Honey, op.cit., pp.325-6.

2) T.F.Floyd Honey, ibid., p.326

3) see the Study, p.119

4) B.H.Streeter, The Four Gospels, Macmillan and Co., London, 1924, pp.247-8.

5) cf. B.C.Butler, op.cit., p.4.

However, this alternative to Streeter's theory does not seem very probable as it is evident that Mark's parable is constructed to form one of a double parable section and its form is primarily due to this factor. It is probable that the Parable of the Mustard Seed in both Matthew and Mark are not reliant upon each other.

Now, the possibility that Matthew and Luke are using a common source Q is hindered by the fact that the double parable unit in Matthew appears to be an integral part of a non-Markan parable section (1). Although Luke records these parables, he appears to have no knowledge of this wider parable unit, placing the two parables between the Pericope of the Woman with an Eighteen Year Infirmary (Lk.13:10-17), and teaching material (Lk.13:22-30). This would indicate that Luke knew the parables in the form of an isolated unit independently of Matthew or, knowing the Matthean parable, for some reason took these two parables and placed them in a different context.

However, further evidence suggests that Luke's parables are independent of Matthew. Luke cannot be seen as preserving the purer form of Q or Matthew for the parable begins with a double introduction paralleled to Mark 4:30 (2), and the word *ἡμετέρας*, Butler (3) suggests, may be an influence of Mark 4:26. Again, this comparison only reveals unnatural dissection of sources by Luke which is totally unacceptable. Facts suggest that Luke preserves an isolated form of the parable unit independent of the Matthean parables.

---

1) see the Study, p.118 where Gerhardsson's theory of Matthew's parable section as a non-Markan composition is reviewed.

2) cf. the Lukan introductory phrase: *ἡμετέρας*

3) B.C.butler, op.cit., p.3

The investigation of the Parable of the Mustard Seed seriously impairs any of the usual proposed Synoptic theories. No satisfactory hypothesis, based upon Synoptic relationships, can be developed.

The study of the above sayings has sought to raise a problem. In the instances concerned, no consistent middle term has been established. Within just one section, a number of possible Synoptic solutions suggest themselves, rapidly following one after the other. Furthermore, on a number of occasions, it is completely impossible even to suggest a possible relationship between the Gospels. It would, therefore, seem necessary to look outside the Gospels for a common denominator.



## 2) ISOLATED SAYINGS CONTAINING MINOR AGREEMENTS.

In this section, the sayings under review are individual units usually assumed to be part of the Markan context. Therefore, the theory of the Mark/Q overlaps does not suggest itself (1). These minor agreements alone are too limited to be suitable texts for Synoptic analysis. However, they must not be ignored. These texts may reveal further evidence to suggest ~~that~~ a common tradition links the Gospels, rather than any Synoptic dependence in the more usually accepted form.

a) In Mark 4:10f. the short context includes some minor agreements. The wider context of this saying, Mark 4:1-20, is paralleled in both Matthew and Luke. However, it has been noted before that this section forms just one part of a parable unit in Matthew which is non-Markan in origin (2). On the other hand, the layout in Mark 4:1-20 par. is a feature of neither Markan redaction nor the Matthaean unit. The presentation of this parables unit is not an unusual form, corresponding to Mark 7:14f. Maybe there are other sections, outside the scope of this inquiry, which indicate a similar plan. The probability that Mark 4:1-20 preserves a pre-conceived form further weakens any link with the Matthaean unit.

Streeter (3) suggests that the minor agreement in Matthew and Luke during the introductory context *οἱ μαθηταί* opposed to the longer Markan phrase *οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ σὺν τοῖς ἐσώκεν* is due to

---

1) B.H. Streeter never attempts to explain these sayings as Mark/Q overlaps in The Studies in the Synoptic Problem, but in The Four Gospels, pp. 293-331 he tackles a number of minor agreements by explaining them away by other criteria.

2) see the Study, p. 118

3) see the Study, p. 100 n. 2

coincidental attempts to alter the difficult Markan rendering. It is evident that Mark did not use Matthew in this instance as he would not have entered into a more difficult reading. Furthermore, the identical section in 7:17 uses the term *μαρτυρί*. It is more likely that Mark would have been influenced to use this term as he does in 7:17 unless his context setting is seen to be based upon pre-Markan traditional material.

Streeter (1) explains the additional term *γνώρι* in Matthew and Luke as an easier reading to the Markan saying. Even if this is feasible, it is still necessary to explain the change of the Markan *τὸ μυστήριον* to the plural form and the re-arrangement of the structure of the sentence (2). The saying is given a different meaning which both, apparently independently, preferred to the Markan rendering. If Mark was using Matthew, he would not have introduced a harder reading.

No direct link between the Gospels can be ascertained. Mark's sayings appears the more original of the accounts. It is possible that Mark preserves a deviation from the tradition found in Matthew and Luke.

b) The Pericope of the Plucking Corn on the Sabbath, Mark 2:23-28, is primarily similar in all the three Gospels although there are certain developments peculiar to each account. Whilst Matthew and Luke(3) retain just one argument culminating in the second part of the Markan saying in 2:27-8, Mark breaks off at 2:26 to introduce a

---

1) B.H. Streeter, *op.cit.*, p.302.

2) cf. Mk. 4:11 *ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ*  
 Mt. 13:11, Lk. 8:10 *ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶσκειν τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ*  
*(ὁὐρανῶν).*

3) see the Study, p.123 indicates *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς* in Luke 6:5 does not necessarily suggest the introduction of a second argument.



second argument (1). The harmonious treatment of the discussion in Matthew and Luke could indicate that Mark's form of the discussion is secondary.

It is in the concluding saying in Matthew and Luke (Mk.2:27-8), that the minor agreements occur (2). Both Matthew and Luke omit the first part of the saying preserved in Mark 2:27. Hawkins (3) argues the reason for its omission is that the saying was too difficult for the Jewish Christians to accept. However, the harmonious arrangement of material in Matthew and Luke would suggest a process of addition to the Markan text rather than an omission by Matthew and Luke. Furthermore, the part of the saying recorded in all three accounts preserves identical grammatical variations in Matthew and Luke. In fact, the Markan reading is the more difficult.

It is evident that Mark cannot be based on the Matthaean parallel saying as the additional saying and different word formation both indicate original, rather than secondary, tradition.

Whereas the Markan account is usually assumed to be the basis for parallel accounts in Matthew and Luke, it is much easier in this instance to assume no literary dependence but look to the presence of a tradition common to all three.

c) A minor agreement of omission appears in the parallel sayings to Mark 11:17, from the Pericope of the Temple Cleansing. Whereas the saying in Mark could be independent of the Temple Cleansing (4)

---

1) see the Study, p.120

2) The minor agreements in the narrative noted by Streeter, *op.cit.*, pp.311-312, possibly reflect a common Mtn./Lkn. tradition within the pericope.

3) J.C.Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968, p.122.

4) see p.146



in Matthew and Luke it definitely forms the climax to the pericope. It would appear that the introductory clause in Mark 11:17, καὶ ἐδίδρακεν καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς ... is redactional. Again, it is possible that in this pericope, as in 2:23-28 par., Mark interrupts the narrative which is harmoniously presented in Matthew and Luke. Therefore, it would appear that Mark was not the basic material used by the other two Evangelists. The omission of the phrase πάντες τοῖς ἔθνεσιν in Matthew and Luke seems strange. The omission of the phrase not only opposes the Markan saying but also the Old Testament quotation (Isaiah 56:7) where the words occur. Luke also alters the first few words of the quotation. It certainly appears likely that Matthew and Luke preserve a saying not based upon the Markan form.

The most probable solution to the lack of connection between the accounts can only be the presence of a common tradition used by all three.

d) J.P.Brown (1) points out that the Resurrection saying in the second Passion Prediction in Luke 9:44 is absent. He supposes that Luke is recording Q and concludes that Q did not have any Resurrection formulae. It must be noted, however, that Matthew preserves the Resurrection saying in all three Passion Predictions (16:21, 17:23, 20:19) and Luke in the first and third Passion Predictions (9:22, 18:34). The Matthaean and Lukan Resurrection sayings agree every time against Mark. It has already been noted that the Passion and Resurrection sayings were at one time individual isolated sayings (2).

---

1) J.P.Brown, op.cit., p.34.

2) see the Study, p.39

Therefore, the omission of the Resurrection saying from Luke could be due to a tradition he used which did not have a Resurrection formula attached (cf. Mk. 9:12).

The use of the word *μῆμν* in the Matthaean and Lukan Passion Predictions (1) also reflects a non-Markan basis. It is a possibility that Matthew developed the saying in Mark into a more liturgical form. The absence of any Resurrection formula in Luke seems to suggest that Matthew and Luke were using a common source which in Luke's case was minus the Resurrection formula. However, the similar, but not identical, Lukan Passion Prediction reveals that the Matthaean sayings is not a developed Markan saying.

No satisfactory conclusion can be drawn from the limited information gleaned from the text. The basis for the second Passion Prediction seems unlikely to be Mark for there appears to be a strong non-Markan link between Matthew and Luke. However, the Matthaean and Lukan productions are by no means identical.

c) The saying in Mark 14:36 is the prayer of Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane. The narrative material has been vastly altered by each Evangelist, and a great deal of redaction is evident in Mark's account (2). The prayer in Mark 14:36 begins with the name which is not present in the prayers recorded in Matthew or Luke. There is no obvious reason why the term should be excluded. Paul's use of *ὑπα* in Galatians 4:6 and Romans 8:15 suggests the term is used in a literal way and its original meaning is not understood. Therefore, the inability to interpret the phrase would not be sufficient reason to leave out the expression. Therefore it seems

---

1) see the Study, p. 61

2) cf. W. H. Kelber, 'Mark 14:32-42: Gethsemane', *ZNW.*, 63, 1972, pp. 166-87.

unlikely that the Markan saying formed the basic saying for Matthew. It would appear that underlying the whole narrative, and not just the prayer, a common but much developed tradition is present.

These isolated sayings certainly suggest the possibility of a common tradition behind the Synoptic Gospels upon which the Evangelists individually drew and *which they revised*.



3) CONCLUDING REMARKS.

In the first section an attempt was made to test the more prevalent solutions of the Synoptic problem based on literary dependence. The second section is an attempt to be a little more constructive and develop a solution which was already presenting itself; namely, a non-literary solution. It must be stressed that these texts discussed do not justify a statement concerning the whole Gospel framework, but that in these instances a middle term could not be adequately distinguished. Instead, a common tradition independently used would appear to be the necessary linking factor. The importance of such a conclusion is two-fold. In the first place, the position of the *reli' Elizer* sayings tradition representing pre-Markan material which has been imposed upon an existing framework is strengthened. Secondly, a non-literary solution to the Synoptic problem will lead to a more lively, unhindered look at Mark and his tradition which hitherto has generally been the prerogative of Matthew and Luke.

VI.

THE *raison d'être* TRADITION OF MARK AND ITS RELATION TO MATTHEW AND  
LUKE. - SOME PROBLEMS.

# 1) THE USE OF ἔλεγεν IN LUKE.

A number of scholars have expressed the opinion that the use of ἔλεγεν in Mark indicates the introduction of a new tradition (1). In the case of Mark, not only is this evident, but the use of the stereotyped formula καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς to introduce the new material, and similarities between the sayings introduced, have led to the conclusion that καὶ ἔλεγεν in Mark indicates the introduction of a pre-Markan sayings tradition.

Conclusions drawn from the use of ἔλεγεν in Mark, however, cannot be automatically applied to its use in Luke. It is essential to begin again with the opinion that the use of ἔλεγεν might be an occasion for introducing new material into the Lukan text.

The corpus of ἔλεγεν sayings in Luke has already been briefly reviewed in the Introduction (2). It was concluded that a number of times ἔλεγεν was used in a purely grammatical sense. A similar fact was also established with some of the Markan ἔλεγεν sayings. However, a corpus of Lukan sayings remain, twelve in all, which are introduced by the verb ἔλεγεν. From the introductory phrases, it is evident that no single introductory formula emerges as was found in Mark.

Only once does the stereotyped phrase καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς occur in Luke 6:5 and this is a direct parallel of the καὶ ἔλεγεν saying in Mark 2:27-8, where an identical formula is used. The Beatitudes

---

1) cf. R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford, Blackwell, 1963, p.16, and also W. Marxsen, 'Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie des Markus', ZTK, 82, 1955, pp.255-271. Their conclusions are different from those reached in this inquiry, however.

2) see Introduction, p.34f.



in Luke 6:20f. are introduced by καὶ ... ἔλεγεν. However, the other examples are introduced by ἔλεγεν οὖν (Lk.13:18), τότε ἔλεγεν (Lk.21:10) or ἔλεγεν δέ (πρὸς / καὶ) (Lk.9:23, 10:2, 12:54, 13:6, 14:7,12, 16:1, 18:1). The frequent occurrence of ἔλεγεν δέ (πρὸς / καὶ), (eight out of twelve sayings to be discussed), possibly points to the beginning of a trend which may develop with further investigation, for both the use of δέ καί and πρὸς with a verb of speech are Lukanisms (1). These Lukanisms are found in conjunction with other forms of speech so they can only be assumed to reflect general redactional techniques. The presence of Lukanisms makes it impossible to argue for a stereotyped ἔλεγεν introductory formula.

Nevertheless, the reason for the presence of the verb ἔλεγεν to introduce the sayings still remains. Therefore, although Luke does not use ἔλεγεν as a formula for introducing a specific sayings tradition, it is still a possibility that the sayings material introduced by ἔλεγεν does indicate the introduction of a separate tradition into the Lukan text. The first set of sayings to be considered will be those which are found within 'special' Lukan passages.

a) The Parable of the Wedding Guest (Lk.14:7-11) and the following saying (Lk.14:12-14) are appended to the Pericope of the Healing of the Man with Dropsy (Lk.14:1-6). The setting of this narrative and subsequent teaching is a meal at a Pharisee's house. Another

---

1) J.C.Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968, pp.21,17

teaching block, the Parable of the Great Supper, also hangs on this setting (14:15-24). Each teaching block is related to the setting in 14:1f. by a small introductory clause (14:7,12 and 15) and it is probable that these introductory remarks are redacted into the teaching material to give them an anchor in the Gospel account. It is evident that Luke has exploited the original story, using it as a foundation to build up a teaching block of separate, unconnected units which has a common theme linking them. Therefore, the two *ἐλεγεν* blocks represent new material.

Similarly, the Parable of the Unjust Steward (Lk.16:1-12,13) is also found within a string of teaching units. It is evident from 16:1 that the Parable is loosely attached to the context established in 15:1-2. The comment about Jesus' relationship with publicans and sinners gives a basic framework for the Parables of the Lost Sheep (Lk.15:4-7), the Lost Coin (Lk.15:8-10) and the Prodigal Son (Lk.15:11-32). A common theme would appear to be the reason for the presence of these three Parables. However, a further teaching block is appended at 16:1f. by the simple phrase: *ἐλεγεν δὲ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς*, which introduces the Parable of the Unjust Steward. Again, it would appear probable that Luke is using a small introductory framework on which to hang a number of teaching units. In this case, the *ἐλεγεν* material introduces the theme of wordly riches and is not consistent with the preceding parables in Chapter 15, which are more concerned with the repentance of sinners. This could be a further indication that the *ἐλεγεν* verb introduces a separate tradition.

Again, it is noticeable in Chapter 18 that both the Parable of the Unjust Steward (18:1-8), introduced by the *ἐλέγξω* verb, and the Parable of the Publican and the Pharisee (18:9-14) are appended to the Pharisees' question concerning the Kingdom of God (17:20-1). The subsequent discussion on the Day of the Son of Man (17:22f.) appears to be a comment upon the setting in 17:20-1. (There are verbal similarities between 17:21, and 23, 17:25 containing a Passion Prediction logion and 17:31 which has parallels with Mark 13:15,16). The two Parables contain additional sayings which also seem to be commentary statements linking the Parables to the general theme of the Coming of the Kingdom (Lk.18:8,14).

The sayings on the Signs for This Age (Lk.12:54-9) and the Parable of the Barren Fig-Tree (Lk.13:6-9) conclude a string of teaching units possibly hinging on the events in Luke 11:53-12:1. Some of the teaching blocks are quite extensive (cf. Lk.12:22-40). It would seem that Luke does not find it necessary to introduce each saying or parable individually. The introductory formulae must indicate something else. The *ἐλέγξω* introduction to the Parable of the Fig-Tree (Lk.13:6-9) contains no context reference. Therefore, it is evident that the introduction has no role in the account except to introduce a new tradition. The context in 12:54 introduced the *ὄχλος*. However, this is appended to the discussion of Jesus' disciples on the same subject of the Signs of This Age. It is possible that this section is reintroduced, not necessarily to indicate a shift of audience, but to introduce new material.

It would appear from the Lukan passages looked at, that the Evangelist shows a tendency to build up teaching blocks by appending



sayings to a short context in string formation. These sayings units are primarily isolated teaching blocks which are sometimes linked together because of similarities in theme, or more generally, by relating each unit back to the original short framework. The repetitive introductions to sayings and parables emphasise an attempt to introduce material which has no fixed context.

There is no obvious reason why Luke should use *εἰπεν* for one unit and *ἐλεγεν* for another. The apparent interchange of both forms of *λέγειν* could indicate that the Evangelist is motivated by traditional changes, however. It may be noted that there is an interchange of introductory form: *εἰπεν / ἐλεγεν δὲ καὶ πρὸς ...* (1). The Lukan construction remains consistent but the verb changes. The question arises, why Luke should use these forms apparently arbitrarily, especially when the *ἐλεγεν* form appears ill suited to the contexts (2)? One possible solution to this problem is that although the introductory form is Lukan, the choice of the verb is governed by the introduction of specific traditions.

It can be concluded from the passages already studied, that Luke uses *ἐλεγεν* to introduce new material. Luke's use of *ἐλεγεν* appears to differ from the Markan use in that no stereotyped introductory formula based on *ἐλεγεν* has emerged and that the *ἐλεγεν* sayings are not confined to the disciples as happens in Mark (cf. 12:54). The *ἐλεγεν* material in Mark is presented in such a way as to highlight the tradition whereas to Luke, his material is part of a teaching.

---

1) cf. Lk. 15:3, 17:22, 18:9, 12:21, where the phrase *εἰπεν δὲ καὶ πρὸς ...* consistently appears along with the *ἐλεγεν* material.

2) see Introduction, p.34f.

complex. Also, Mark attempts to isolate his tradition, and redactional tendencies are at a minimum. Luke, on the other hand, appears to work his material into the general framework so the tradition shows great signs of redaction. Up until now, only *ἐλεγε* passages with no parallel in Matthew and Mark have been looked at. It is probable that the relationship between the Lukan and Markan sayings tradition will be revealed by further passages to be considered.

b) The *ἐλεγε* sayings preserved in the special Lukan material have indicated that the Evangelist used this verb to introduce new material. It must be seen whether *ἐλεγε* sayings in Luke, which correspond with similar sayings in Matthew and/or Mark, similarly indicate the presence of a new tradition, or whether it appears that Luke is just continuing in the tradition present in the parallel Gospels. The sayings, which will probably reveal the most information concerning the Lukan *ἐλεγε* sayings, are those which coincide with Markan *καὶ ἐλεγε* sayings.

Infact, on two occasions, sayings introduced by *ἐλεγε* in Luke correspond with Markan *καὶ ἐλεγε* sayings (Lk.6:5, Mk.2:27-28, Lk.13:18f., Mk.4:30f.). An overlap of *ἐλεγε* sayings in Mark and Luke raises a number of queries. Are these Lukan sayings purely due to copying Mark? If they are similar, could it indicate that the *ἐλεγε* material in Special Luke already discussed is an extension of the sayings tradition reproduced in Mark? However, if the sayings do appear different and Luke's sayings are independent of Mark (and Matthew), then the *ἐλεγε* sayings would represent a special tradition, although not the actual Markan sayings tradition. Why, then, do overlaps occur which are not connected with one another in any way, although using the same introductory formula? Could a link be behind the Synoptic texts that are before us, during the



period of the formation of the Synoptic Tradition?

The first occurrence of a possible overlap of *ἐλέγαν* sayings is in the conclusion to the Pericope of Plucking Corn on the Sabbath (Mk.2:23-28). It is not necessary, here, to repeat the arguments for the view that the introductory phrase, *καὶ ἐλέγαν αὐτοῖς* in Luke 6:5, although corresponding exactly to the Markan phrase (Mk.2:27), is quite unnecessary to the order of discussion in Luke (1). Therefore, it can only be supposed that Luke also wished to introduce a new tradition. The saying in Luke, however, corresponds to the Matthaean saying (2). It would seem unnecessary and pointless for Luke to have conflated both Matthew (Q?) and Mark in order to have arrived at the present reading. Thus, a strange situation presents itself in Luke where he uses an introductory formula, indicating the presence of a new saying, although appearing to continue with the original narrative.

Luke uses the phrase: *ἐλέγαν οὖν* to introduce the Parable of The Mustard seed (Lk.13:18-19). It can be seen that this introduction is not in such a fixed form as the Markan introductory formula or that used in Luke 6:5. It has been suggested that the Lukan Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven (13:20-21) are neither reliant on the Matthaean nor Markan sayings (3). Therefore, it is probable that the introductory *ἐλέγαν οὖν* in Luke is also not directly taken from the Markan introduction, but it is used independently to indicate the presence of a new tradition.

---

1) see Study, p.123

2) Chapter V indicates that Luke's account could not be reliant on Matthew, however. see, p.249

3) see Chapter V, p.244f



The Parables in Luke are appended to the Pericope of the Woman with an Eighteen Year Infirmary, and illustrate another example of attaching isolated traditional material to a self-contained narrative context.

Before drawing any possible conclusions from the overlapping *ἐλέγερ* sayings, it is worth recalling two cases where Luke seems to be recording doublets, and where in each case, one of the accounts appears to bear some parallel with Mark's *καὶ ἐλέγερ* sayings, without actually using the *ἐλέγερ* form.

c) The sayings comprising the Section on the Right Use of Parables (Mk.4:21-25) is paralleled in a Lukan block (8:16-18) and also individually (Lk.11:33, 12:2, 6:38, 19:26). A study of the relationship between the Markan and Lukan units reveals that Luke did not use Mark (1). The independent collection of sayings in Luke 8:16-18, although evidently not the same, seems to be reminiscent of a collection similar to the Markan sayings.

A Lukan passage, parallel to the Markan Pericope of the Sending of the Twelve (Mk.6:7-11, Lk.9:1-6) indicates a similar relationship. Again, it has become evident that any direct literary link between the two accounts is unlikely.(2). Nevertheless, Luke does produce sayings which are very similar to the Markan *καὶ ἐλέγερ* sayings in Mark 6:10-11.

The *ἐλέγερ* overlapping sayings have revealed that the sayings preserved by Luke are not directly the result of using Mark, nor can they, with the exception of Luke 6:5 in any way be attributed

---

1) see Study, p.113  
2) Chapter V, p. 236

to a dependence on the Matthaean parallel sayings (1). Therefore, it would appear that the use of ἔμμεν by Mark and Luke, although in some respects is linked, is very tenuous.

The remaining Lukan ἔμμεν sayings which find similar non ἔμμεν sayings paralleled in Matthew and Mark, or Matthew, give weight to the argument that Luke's ἔμμεν material is independent of Matthew and Mark.

d) Luke begins the Beatitudes with καὶ ... ἔμμεν (Lk. 6:20f., Mt. 5:2f.).

The Lukan arrangement of the section into four blessings and four woes is different from the Matthaean form of nine blessings. The ἔμμεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς in Luke 10:2, which introduces the missionary charges appears to be relying on a tradition which is not akin to the parallel Matthaean passage (9:37f.) (2). It is interesting to note that two ἔμμεν passages relating to the missionary charges occur in Mark 6:10-11 and Luke 10:2f.

On two other occasions, Lukan ἔμμεν passages have parallel material in both Matthew and Mark. In Luke 9:23f., the discussion on the Conditions of Discipleship, the introduction covers the whole of the discussion, whereas Mark 9:1 introduces only the last saying by καὶ ἔμμεν. In Luke 21:10f., part of the Apocalyptic Discourse is introduced by ὅτι ἔμμεν αὐτοὺς. This new introduction into a continuous discourse would be completely pointless if it were not to indicate the presence of a new tradition.

It must be noted that even in the Lukan ἔμμεν material which is paralleled in both Matthew and Mark, there appear to be certain

---

1) Chapter V, p. 250.  
2) Chapter V, p. 237

links between Luke and Mark.

Conclusions that can be drawn from this brief study of the use of ἔλεγεν in Luke can only be tentative as the material available is not extensive enough to justify any working hypothesis. Nevertheless, it can be stated that Luke used ἔλεγεν to introduce new material into the Gospel framework on occasions. It also appears that there are links between the ἔλεγεν material in Luke and the καὶ ἔλεγεν sayings tradition in Mark, although it does not seem that Mark forms the literary basis for Luke.

Luke's use of ἔλεγεν, however, differs vastly from Mark's use of the introductory formula. The method of distinguishing the introduction of new material in Luke is by the presence of redaction rather than the absence of it. Luke sought to integrate his material into his Gospel rather than preserve it. Nevertheless, the strangely situated ἔλεγεν form still remains, and draws attention to the possibility of a link between the καὶ ἔλεγεν tradition in Mark and the ἔλεγεν material in Luke.

An extensive amount of Special Lukan ἔλεγεν material and a very limited overlap of sayings with Mark illustrates the point that Luke does not rely on the Markan sayings. In fact, the occasions where the ἔλεγεν sayings in Mark and Luke coincide, Luke's sayings appear to be closer in form to the Matthaean parallel sayings. This strange situation reveals just the tip of a very complicated iceberg.

It is evident that the ἔλεγεν material in Luke does not reveal a sayings tradition of the type present in Mark. Nevertheless,



it would appear that the *'Nyer* form is some kind of link to introduce traditional material. It is evident that the form this material takes is at least one step removed from the tradition preserved in Mark. It is possibly a modified edition, or preserved in a compound form (ie. including amongst other traditions the *'Nyer* sayings). This possibility, along with other theories, can only ~~be an~~ assumption.

2) ARABISMS IN MATTHEW AND LUKE NOT FOUND IN THE MARKAN TRADITION.

The problems of the presence of Semitisms in the Matthaean and Lukan parallels to Mark's Gospel is vast. It is beyond the scope of this inquiry to present a competent and detailed analysis of the problem. It is intended in this section, however, to pin-point occasions where Semitisms occur in Matthew and Luke which are paralleled in the Markan *καὶ ἑβραῖς* sayings, and to assess the implications of these Semitisms.

Before turning to the texts themselves, it must be decided; where does the question of Semitisms in Matthew and Luke fit into the present thesis? In fact, the reasons are two-fold, Semitisms in Matthew and Luke, which are not present in the Markan *καὶ ἑβραῖς* sayings suggest that, in these instances, Mark was not the basis for the other Synoptic Gospels. Similarly, if Mark was based upon Matthew, it would seem equally irrational generally to maintain gross semitisms, and even introduce new ones, but within the *καὶ ἑβραῖς* sections to change the Matthaean Semitisms into idiomatic Greek.

Therefore, in the first place, the presence of Semitisms in Matthew and Luke might substantiate the claim already discussed (1) that the Markan *καὶ ἑβραῖς* sayings have no direct link with the parallel sayings and secondly, to point to the dilemma these Semitisms imply when applied to the Synoptic Problem. This point

---

1) This is reiterated throughout the course of the Study.

was raised by Sparks (1) who noted the number of times where Semitisms were observed in sections which run contrary to accepted Synoptic theories. The implications of such finds, however, have generally been passed over. Although this problem would require a thesis in its own right, it is of great interest to recall Sparks' statement in the light of the conclusions drawn on the Synoptic Problem from the development of the Markan *καὶ ἔλεγεν* corpus (2).

a) Turning to the relevant texts, it would be of some interest to note the introductory forms used by Matthew and Luke instead of *καὶ ἔλεγεν* (*αὐτοῖς*). The similarities between a few Lukan sayings and the Markan *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings suggest that the formula may not be such a vital part of the sayings tradition as it would appear in Mark (3). Now, if Matthew and Luke wished to substitute for the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* introductory formula a different and less stereotyped form, it would seem probable that the new introduction would be improved stylistically and more appropriate to the context.

The use of the introductory form (*καὶ*) *λέγει* (*αὐτοῖς*) in Matthew 21:13 and 22:43 raises some interesting points. In an earlier chapter, the close relationship between sayings introduced by *καὶ ἔλεγεν* and *καὶ λέγει* in Mark was noted (4). On these occasions, it would appear that *καὶ λέγει* indicates a stereotyped

---

1) H.F.D.Sparks, 'Some Observations on the Semitic Background of the New Testament, SNTS.Bull., II, pp.39.

2) see, Chapter V, The *καὶ ἔλεγεν* Tradition and the Synoptic Problem. Also, cf.C.C.Torrey, Our Translated Gospels, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1937, p.lvii, who does not ascribe the differences to the restyling of the Markan Greek.

3) cf. Study on Mark 4:21f., (Lk.8:16f.), Mk.6:8f., (Lk.9:1f.), Mk.9:31, (Lk.9:44)

4) see, Chapter III, A Survey of the Main Characteristics, p.192f.



commentary form introducing developed Jesus-sayings. Only twice outside the Markan contexts is a *καὶ λέγει* saying found in juxtaposition to a Markan *καὶ ἔλεγεν* saying. Both are found in Matthew.

It is impossible to decide whether the *καὶ λέγει* introductions in these instances stand as commentary forms on the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* sayings in Mark. Although in previous comparisons of the Matthaean and Markan texts no direct relationship emerges, the use of *λέγει* as a traditional rather than a redactional feature cannot be completely excluded.

If the *λέγει* form represents a substitute formula for the Markan *καὶ ἔλεγεν*, then we might expect it to be an improvement. The use of the historic present in Mark and John is sometimes seen as a redactional feature of those Gospels rather than evidence of a Semitism. However, Matthew uses the historic present on a number of occasions where none appears in the Markan parallels, Matthew 21:13 and 22:43 being two such instances (1). Furthermore, the introduction in Matthew 22:43 is asyndetic. It is evident that the Matthaean introductory forms do not improve the Markan *καὶ ἔλεγεν* formula in these instances.

The introductory form *ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν* occurs three times in Matthew 13:11, 15:3 and 15:26. Wellhausen (2) points out that the verb *ἀποκρίναι* corresponds to the Hebrew and Aramaic verb *אָנַח*. The construction *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν (λέγει)* is very common amongst all the Evangelists (3), so it is obvious that the presence

1) Use of *λέγει* in non-Mkn. parallels: 4:6,16,19, 8:7,20,22, 9:28,37, 12:44, 14:41, 17:20,25, 18:22,32, 21:16,31, 22:8,12,26;25,52, 28:10. Mkn. parallels with other forms of speech: 8:20, 15:34, 16:15, 19:8, 18,20, 20:6,7,8,21,23, 21:13,19,42,45, 22:21,43, 26:35,64,71, 27:13,22.

2) J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, Berlin, Georg Reimer, 1911, p.14

3) V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, London, Macmillan, 1966, p.246.

of ἀποκριθεὶς does not reflect the redactional style of any one Evangelist. Wellhausen (1) indicates that the construction ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν is a later refinement of ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν. In the semitic construction, ἀποκριθεὶς is a redundant verb, but on all three occasions in Matthew the form ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν is used to introduce replies to questioning. Therefore, from the Matthaean evidence no firm conclusion can be drawn.

Other variant introductory forms include λέγων (Mt.13:3,31, 22:41, Lk.19:46) which is evidently a Septuagintism and εἶπεν πρὸς (Lk.9:43, 20:41) which may be a characteristic redactional form of Luke. On a number of occasions sayings found in Matthew and/or Luke which parallel the Markan καὶ ἔλεγεν sayings have no introductory form whatsoever.

Except for the use of καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, the introductory forms in Matthew and Luke reflect no obvious Semitisms. On the other hand, the forms are not obvious improvements on the καὶ ἔλεγεν Markan formula. One possible exception could be the introduction ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν which fits perfectly into the Matthaean context but even this can be explained away as a Semitic construction. The only evidence of redaction is the εἶπεν πρὸς of Luke which may indicate a reworking of the καὶ ἔλεγεν formula (2).

b) A brief survey of the sayings parallel to the Markan καὶ ἔλεγεν sayings reveals more substantial examples.

Mt.12:25/Lk.11:17 (The Beelzebul Controversy)

Both Evangelists begin the discourse by Jesus with the phrase,

---

1) J. Wellhausen, op.cit., p.14

2) cf. the number of times Luke uses ἔλεγεν (δὲ) πρὸς : 9:23, 10:2, 14:7, 16:1.



παῖς βασιλεία. πᾶς reflects the Aramaic ܦܝܬܐ (1), and is not found in the Markan parallel (3:24 cf. καὶ ἐν βασιλείᾳ). Matthew, again, repeats this form: καὶ πᾶσα ... οἰκία in contrast to the Markan καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ. This phrase is totally absent in the Lukan parallel. It is evident that Mark represents a more polished form than Matthew and Luke.

Mt.13:31/Lk.13:19 (The Parable of the Mustard Seed).

Both Matthew and Luke record the Semitic construction ܐܢܫܐ ܕܢܚܝܐ ἄνθρωπος (2).

Mt.15:11 (The Discussion on Ritual Cleanliness).

The Matthaean account contains an example of casus pendens (3) which is absent in the Markan account.

Lk.20:41 (The Question about David's Son).

πᾶς λέγουσιν could reflect the impersonal third person plural frequently noted in Aramaic. It is possible that the Semitism is due to an omission of the subject of the verb which is found in Mark (cf. οἱ γραμματεῖς), although it is hard to see why Luke did not record the subject. It is impossible to argue from the context whether λέγουσιν is due to redaction of Mark's text or Semitic influence, but in both cases, Luke's wording cannot be seen as an improvement on the Markan text.

Mt.13:13 (The Reason for Parables).

The use of ἴδω in Mark (Luke) and ὅτι in Matthew has often been

---

1) cf., E.P.Sanders, The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition, Cambridge, CUP., 1969, pp.247, also see, K.Beyer, Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962, p.227.  
 2) see discussion on this parable in Chapter V, p.244. Similarity of form in Matthew and Luke cannot be explained by 'Q'.  
 3) M.Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1967, p.53.



described as the end result of different Greek translations of an Aramaic tradition (1). It was such 'mistranslations' of Aramaic originals that Sparks found so inexplicable within a two document framework. The use of ὅτι in Matthew does not remove the difficult reading of the Markan ὅτι. In Matthew's account, the parabolic teaching is used 'because' (ὅτι) it is unintelligible to his audience (2). Therefore, Matthew's use of ὅτι cannot be seen as an improvement.

Mark's ὅτι can only be translated as a consequence clause (3). The opinion that Mark's saying reflects a Hellenistic attitude towards the Jews (4), raises the problem that the saying is a Markan or late development. Could the Matthaean saying be the basis for Mark's developed saying? The quotation of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Mark is obviously targumic (5). This is not so in Matthew. Therefore, it is unlikely that Matthew is the source for the Markan ὅτι.

Of the five Semitisms that have been claimed for the Matthaean and Lukan parallels to the Markan καὶ ἔλεγεν sayings, only one, the use of λέγουσιν in Luke 20:41 (par. Mk.12:35), is not conclusive.

Although the evidence is limited, certain inferences can be

---

1) cf. M.Black, ibid., p.212. Also C.C.Torrey, op.cit., p.10-11.

2) M.Black, op.cit., p.213

3) W.Bauer, W.Arndt, F.Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature, Cambridge, CUP., 1952, p.378 (2). F.Blass, A.Debrunner, (R.W.Funk), A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature, Cambridge, CUP., 1961, p.187 (2). J.Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, London, SCM., 1963, p.17 complicates the meaning of ὅτι by making it an introduction to the Isaiah quotation, ie. 'in order that (as it is written)'.

4) M.Black, op.cit., p.214

5) M.Black, ibid., p.214. T.W.Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, Cambridge, CUP., 1956, p.77.

drawn. These Semitisms substantiate the claims already made in this inquiry. It would be hard to argue that these changes mentioned are wholly redactional reworking of the Markan text. Therefore, it must be concluded that, on these occasions, Mark was not the basis for the parallel Synoptic accounts.

## VII.

### GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.



It is now time to draw together the strands of this inquiry.

The reasons why the *raî élyer* sayings were such an obvious choice for this inquiry of a pre-Markan sayings tradition have been touched on in the Introduction.

These sayings have been subject to a certain amount of study prior to this investigation, although the full extent of these sayings, both in number and content, has never been realised. The problems posed by an investigation into pre-Markan traditions have been enumerated and, to a large extent, negated by the listed criteria.

However, it was left to the study, in the first place, to establish the *raî élyer* sayings as a viable tradition by implementing the criteria stated in the Introduction and, secondly, to draw out any overall features of this tradition which might appear during the the course of a close investigation. Therefore, the Study has developed into an extensive commentary on these sayings and is the central pivot of this thesis from which certain points have been raised.

The Study highlighted an interesting dichotomy. The sayings themselves all appear to be very primitive and, in some cases, it would not be ambitious to say, represented an authentic Jesus tradition. However, the subject matter of many of these sayings could be considered didactic, sometimes even kerygmatic as though Church development is evident. The example that immediately springs to mind is Mark 9:31, the Second Passion Prediction, which was used as the test case. Mark 9:31 combines possibly authentic material with a kerygmatic statement that would not shame a church statement.

Besides the subject matter of these sayings, we find the form in which they are presented indicates a systematically developed teaching form as if set out as a catechetical statement.

The use of these sayings within the tradition itself, (ie. saying interpreting saying as if canonical) and the sensitivity with which Mark uses the tradition to preserve the full impact of the sayings, certainly appeal to the view that this tradition records sacred teaching material.

How far behind the Markan Gospel do we have to look for the inspiration of this tradition?

The logical explanation of the origin of a sayings tradition which combines pure Jesus material in a developed form can only be that it was initiated at the first moment the sayings were uttered.

So how much did Jesus have to do with the formation of a sayings tradition akin to the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition preserved in Mark? It is possible that the *καὶ ἔλεγεν* tradition meets Gerhardsson's theory from the other direction. Instead of fitting a theory for transmitting certain sayings in a strictly stereotyped form onto various Gospel sayings, a sayings tradition has been found that fits the theory of transmitting certain sayings in a stereotyped form.

A large part of Jesus' ministry was concerned with teaching. No doubt, repetition of his teaching to different audiences led to a certain amount of standardisation which could have been taken up by the Early Church and passed on orally in much the same way that Jesus spoke the words.

The distribution of sayings introduced by *ἔλεγεν* throughout the Gospels is not the sole prerogative of Mark. Luke apparently uses it to

indicate the beginning of traditional material. Overlaps between the Markan and Lukan *ἐλεγεν* sayings indicate that the Lukan sayings tradition has similarities to the Markan tradition but is by no means presented in the same form.

Is the difference due to Luke radically changing his material? If so, why is he less careful with a tradition which Mark evidently respects as canonical? Could the Lukan *ἐλεγεν* tradition reflect a different dating or recension of the tradition? These are questions which have to be left unanswered as evidence is lacking, but the absence of any obvious direct link between the Markan and Lukan traditions suggests that the Lukan *ἐλεγεν* sayings reflect traditional rather than redactional elements.

Finally, the existence of the *καὶ ἐλεγεν* tradition has become an embarrassment to the two document hypothesis. The problem of fitting the *καὶ ἐλεγεν* sayings into any preconceived literary scheme has only highlighted a similar problem existing with many more Synoptic parallels. Therefore, the *καὶ ἐλεγεν* sayings of Mark have helped to call into question the methodology and pre-conception of such theories.



VIII.

A LIST OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE *Logos* MATERIAL  
IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

LIST OF MARKAN ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν (αὐτοῖς) SAYINGS.

SUBJECT OF SAYING	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
Plucking of Corn on Sabbath	2:27-28 ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	12:8	6:5 ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς
Beelzebul Controversy	3:23-27 ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	12:25f.	11:17f.
Parable of the Sower	4:2-8 ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	13:3f.	8:4f.
Saying on Hearing	4:9 ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν	13:9	8:8
Saying on Reason for Parables	4:11 ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	13:11	8:10
Similitude of Lamp	4:21-23 ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	(5:15/10:26?)	8:16f.
Saying on Judgement	4:24-25 ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	(7:2/13:12/25:29)	8:18
Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly	4:26-29 ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν		
Parable of the Mustard Seed	4:30-32 ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν	13:31	13:18 ἔλεγεν οἱ
Saying at the Rejection from Nazareth	6:4 ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	13:57	4:24
Instruction to Sending of Twelve	6:10-11 ΚΑΙ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	10:11	9:4

SUBJECT OF SAYING	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
Saying on Law and Tradition	7:9-13 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	15:3f.	
Saying on Defilement	7:14-15 καὶ ἔλεγεν	15:10f.	
Further Saying on Defilement	7:20-23 ἔλεγεν δὲ	15:18f.	
Saying to the Syrophenician Woman	7:27 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῇ	15:26	
Saying on Understanding	8:21 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς		
Saying on the Coming of the Kingdom of God	9:1 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	16:28	9:27
Passion Prediction	9:31 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	17:22	9:44
Saying on Cleansing the Temple	11:17 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς	21:13	19:46
Saying about David's Son	12:35f. καὶ ἔλεγεν	22:42f.	20:41f.
Saying about the Scribes	12:38-40 καὶ ἔλεγεν	23:6f.	20:46f.
Saying at Gethsemane	14:36 καὶ ἔλεγεν	26:39	22:42



MARKAN *ēdeyer* SAYINGS EXCLUDED ON GRAMMATICAL GROUNDS

SUBJECT OF SAYING	MARK	MATTHEW	LUKE
Words of Jesus to Geresene Demoniac	5:8 <i>ēdeyer yōp aōtōs</i>		8:29
Words of Woman with Haemorrhage	5:28 <i>ēdeyer yōp</i>	9:21 <i>ēdeyer yōp</i>	
Words of Jesus to Woman with Haemorrhage	5:30 <i>ēdeyer</i>		8:45
Words of Herod about John Baptist	6:16 <i>ēdeyer</i>		9:9
Words of John Baptist about Herod	6:18 <i>ēdeyer yōp</i>	14:4 <i>ēdeyer yōp</i>	
Words of the Blind Man at Bethsaida	8:24 <i>ēdeyer</i>		
Words of Epileptic Son's Father	9:24 <i>ēdeyer</i>		

LIST OF LUKAN *ἐλεγε* SAYINGS.

SUBJECT OF SAYING	LUKE	MATTHEW	MARK
Plucking of Corn on Sabbath	6:5 <i>καὶ ἐλεγε αὐτοῖς</i>	12:8	2:27-28 <i>καὶ ἐλεγε αὐτοῖς</i>
First Beatitude	6:20 <i>ἐλεγε</i>	5:3	
Sayings on Conditions of Discipleship	9:23f. <i>ἐλεγε δὲ πρὸς μαθητὰς</i>	10:24f.	8:34f.
Instructions to Sending of Seventy	10:2f. <i>ἐλεγε δὲ πρὸς αὐτοῖς</i>	9:37f.	
Saying on Signs of This Age	12:54 <i>ἐλεγε δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις</i>		
Parable of the Barren Fig-Tree	13:6f. <i>ἐλεγε δὲ</i>		
Parable of the Mustard Seed	13:18f. <i>ἐλεγε δὲ</i>	13:31f.	4:30f. <i>καὶ ἐλεγε</i>
Parable of the Wedding-Guest	14:7f. <i>ἐλεγε δὲ πρὸς τοῖς κεκαλημένοις</i>		
Saying on Invitation to Meal	14:12f. <i>ἐλεγε δὲ καὶ τοῖς κεκαλημένοις αὐτοῖς</i>		
Parable of the Unjust Steward	16:1f. <i>ἐλεγε δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς</i>		
Parable of the Unjust Judge	18:1f. <i>ἐλεγε δὲ</i>		

SUBJECT OF SAYING	LUKE	MATTHEW	MARK
Saying on the Signs of Parousia	21:10 <i>note ελθεν αυτοis</i>	24:7	13:8



LUKAN *ἐλέγχει* SAYINGS EXCLUDED ON GRAMMATICAL GROUNDS.

SUBJECT OF SAYING	LUKE	MATTHEW	MARK
Preaching of John Baptist  Further Preaching of John the Baptist  Words of the Unjust Steward  Words of the Thief on the Cross	3:7f. <i>ἐλέγχει οὖν</i>  3:11f. ( <i>ἰνα κηρύξῃς</i> ) <i>δὲ ἐλέγχει αὐτοὺς</i>  16:5 <i>ἐλέγχει δὲ καὶ πρὸς</i> <i>τοὺς μαθητάς</i> 23:42 <i>καὶ ἐλέγχει</i>	3:7f.	

IX.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1) BOOKS.

ALTHAUS, P, The So-called Kerygma and the Historical Jesus,

(ET. D.Cairns), Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd Ltd, 1959.

BARBOUR, R.S, Traditio-Historical Criticism of the Gospels, London,

SPCK., 1972.

BARR, A, A Diagram of the Synoptic Relationships, Edinburgh,

T.&T.Clark, N.D.

BARRETT, C.K, Jesus and the Gospel Tradition, London, SPCK., 1967.

BARTELS, R.A, Kerygma or Gospel Tradition...Which Came First?

Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing House, 1961.

BEST, E, The Temptation and the Passion, Cambridge, CUP., 1965.

BETZ, H.D, (ed.) Christology and a Modern Pilgrimage. A Discussion

with Norman Perrin, California, Claremont, 1971.

BEYER, K, Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament, Göttingen, Vanden-

hoeck und Ruprecht, 1962.

BLACK, M, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Oxford,

Clarendon Press, 1967.

G.BORNKAMPE, Jesus of Nazareth, (ET. I.&F.McLuskey), London, Hodder

and Stoughton, 1960.

BRUCE, F.F, Tradition Old and New, Exeter, Paternoster Press, 1970.

BULTMANN, R, Theology of the New Testament, (ET.K.Grobel), London,

SCM., 1971.

----Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting, (ET.R.H.Fuller),

Edinburgh, Collins, 1956.

----Jesus and the Word, (ET.L.P.Smith, E.H.Lantero), London,

Collins, 1958.



---- The History of the Synoptic Tradition, (ET.J.Marsh), Oxford, Blackwell, 1963.

----KUNDSEIN,K, Form Criticism, (ET.F.C.Grant), New York, Harper and Bros., 1962.

BURNEY,C.F, The Poetry of Our Lord, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1925.

BURKITT,F.C, The Gospel History and its Transmission, Edinburgh, T.& T.Clark, 1906.

BUTLER,B.C, The Originality of St.Matthew, Cambridge, CUP., 1951.

CADOUX,A.T, The Sources of the Second Gospel, London, J.Clark, N.D.

CARRINGTON, P, The Primitive Christian Catechism, Cambridge, CUP., 1940.

---- According to Mark, Cambridge, CUP., 1940.

CULLMAN,O, The Early Church, (ET.A.J.B.Higgins), London, SCM, 1956.

---- The Earliest Christian Confessions, (ET.J.K.S.Reid), London, Lutterworth Press, 1940.

DALMAN,G, The Words of Jesus, Edinburgh, T.& T.Clark, 1902.

---- Jesus-Jeshua, (ET.P.Levertoff), London, SPCK., 1929.

DAUBE,D, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London, Althone Press, 1956.

DAVIES,D.W, 'Reflections on a Scandinavian Approach to the Gospel Tradition', Neotestamentica et Patristica, Leiden, E.J.Brill, 1962, pp.14-34.

DIBELIUS,M, From Tradition to Gospel, (ET.L.Woolf), London, Nicholson and Watson, 1934.

DODD,C.H, The Apostolic Preaching and its Development, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.

---- The Parables of the Kingdom, London, Fontana, 1965.

---- According to the Scriptures, London, Fontana, 1965.

- 'The "Primitive Catechism" and the Sayings of Jesus', More New Testament Studies, Manchester, MUP., 1968, pp.17-29.
- DUNGAN, D.L, The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul, Oxford, Blackwell, 1971.
- FARMER, W.R, The Synoptic Problem, New York, Macmillan, 1964.
- FITZMYER, J.A, 'The Aramaic Qorban inscription from Jebel Hallet et-Turi and Mark 7:11/Mt.15:5', Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1971, pp.93-100.
- FULLER, R.H, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London, Collins, 1969.
- The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, London, SCM., 1954.
- Interpreting the Miracles, London, SCM., 1963.
- GERILDSSON, B, Memory and Manuscript, (ET.E.J.Sharpe) Lund, C.W.K.Gleerup, Uppsala, 1961.
- Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity, Lund, C.W.K.Gleerup, 1974.
- GRANT, F.C, The Gospels, Their Origin and Growth, London, Faber & Faber, 1907.
- HAUPT, W, Worte Jesu und Gemeindeüberlieferung, Leipzig, J.Hinrichs, 1913.
- HAWKINS, J.C, Horae Synopticae, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1909 (3rd.ed).
- HIGGINS, A.J.B, Jesus and the Son of Man, London, Lutterworth Press, 1964.
- HOOKE, M.D, The Son of Man in Mark, London, SPCK., 1967.
- Jesus and the Servant, London, SPCK., 1954.
- JAMESON, H.G, The Origin of the Synoptic Gospels, Oxford, Blackwell, 1922.
- JEREMIAS, J, The Problem of the Historical Jesus, (ET.N.Perrin), Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1969.
- The Parables of Jesus, (ET.S.H.Hooke), London, SCM., 1954.

- New Testament Theology, vol.I, London, SCM., 1971.
- The Central Message of the New Testament, London, SCM., 1971.
- 'Die Drei-Tage-Worte der Evangelien', Tradition und Glaube  
Festgabe für K.G.Kuhn, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1971.
- KUSEMANN, E, Essays on New Testament Themes, (ET.W.J.Montague),  
London, SCM., 1965.
- New Testament Questions of Today, (ET.W.J.Montague), London,  
SCM., 1969.
- KITTEL, G, The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament,  
(ET.G.W.Bromiley), Michigan, Eekdman Publishing Company, 1968.
- KNOX, W.L, The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, vol.I, Cambridge,  
CUP., 1953.
- The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, vol.II, Cambridge, CUP., 1957.
- KUHN, A.W, Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium, Göttingen,  
Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1971.
- LIGHTFOOT, R.H, The Gospel Message of St.Mark, Oxford, Clarendon  
Press, 1950.
- History and Interpretation in the Gospels, London, Hodder and  
Stoughton, 1935.
- MANSON, T.W, The Teaching of Jesus, Cambridge, CUP., 1943.
- 'Mark 2:27f.', In Honorem Antonii Fridrichsen, Lund, C.W.K.  
Gleerup, 1947, pp.138-46.
- MARKSEN, W, Mark the Evangelist, (ET.R.A.Harrisville), New York,  
Abingdon Press, 1969.
- Introduction to the New Testament, (ET.G.Buswell), Oxford,  
Blackwell, 1968.
- NIELSON, E, Oral Tradition, London, SCM., 1961.



- LINCOLN, D.E., 'The Order of Events in St. Mark's Gospel - An Examination of Dr. Dodd's Hypothesis', Studies in the Gospels, Oxford, Blackwell, 1955.
- PERAIN, N., What is Redaction Criticism? London, SPCK., 1970.
- The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus, London, SCM., 1963.
- Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, London, SCM., 1967.
- 'The Use of (πρῶτα) διδόναι in Connection with the Passion of Jesus in the New Testament', Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1970, pp.204-72.
- RIESENFELD, H., The Gospel Tradition, Oxford, Blackwell, 1970.
- ROHDE, J., Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists, (ET.D.M.Barton), London, SCM., 1968.
- ROPES, J.H., The Synoptic Gospels, London, Oxford University Press, 1964.
- SANDERS, E.P., The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition, Cambridge, CUP., 1969.
- SCHMIDT, K.L., Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.
- SCHWEITZER, A., The Quest of the Historical Jesus, (ET.W.Montgomery), London, Black, 1910.
- SCHWEIZER, E., Jesus, (ET.D.E.Green), London, SCM., 1971.
- SMITH, B.T.D., Parables of the Synoptic Gospels, Cambridge, CUP., 1937.
- STRACK, A.L., BILLERBECK, P., Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Munchen, G.H.Becksche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924.
- STREETER, B.H., The Four Gospels, London, Macmillan, 1961.
- TAYLOR, V., The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, London, Macmillan, 1935.
- The Gospel According to St. Mark, London, Macmillan, 1969.
- New Testament Essays, Epworth Press, 1970.
- TAYLOR, R.O.P., The Groundwork of the Gospels, Oxford, Blackwell, 1946.

- TÖDT, H.E., The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, (ET.D.M.Barton),  
London, SCM., 1965.
- TORREY, C.C., The Four Gospels, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
- Our Translated Gospels. Some of the Evidence, London, Hodder  
and Stoughton, N.D.
- VERMES, G., Jesus the Jew, London, Collins, 1973.
- VÖGTLE, A., Tugend- und Lasterkataloge, Muster, Neutestamentliche,  
Abhandlungen, 1936.
- WELLMHAUSEN, J., Das Evangelium Marci, Berlin, G.Reimer, 1909.
- WILCOX, M., The Semitisms of Acts, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1965.
- WILSON, R.McL., Studies in the Gospel of Thomas, London, A.R.Mowbray, 1960.
- WRIGHT, L.E., Alterations of the words of Jesus, Massachusetts,  
Harvard University Press, 1952.

2) ARTICLES.

ABEL, E.L., 'The Psychology of Memory and Rumor Transmission and Their bearing on Theories of Oral Transmission in Early Christianity', JR., 51, 1971, pp.270-81.

ACHTEMEIER, P.J., 'Person and Deed. Jesus and the Storm-tossed Sea', Interpretation, 16, 1962, pp.169-76.

AMBOZIC, A.M., 'Mark's Concept of the Parable (Mk.4:11f.)', CBQ., 29, 1967, pp.220-7.

ARGYLE, A.W., 'Agreements between Matthew and Luke', Ex.T., 73, 1961, pp.19-22.

BAIRD, J.A., 'A Pragmatic Approach to Parable Exegesis: Some New evidence on Mark 4:11, 33-34', JBL., 76, 1957, pp.201-7.

BALDUCELE, R., 'Prof. Riesenfeld on the Synoptic Tradition', CBQ., 22, 1960, pp.416-21.

BARTSCH, H.W., 'Eine bisher übersehene Ziterung der LXX in Mark 4:30', TZ., 15, 1959, pp.126-8.

BEARE, F.W., 'The Sabbath was made for Man', JBL., 79, 1960, pp.130-6.

BEST, E., 'An Early Sayings Collection', NT., 18, 1976, pp.1-16.

---- 'Mark III:20, 21, 31-5', NTS., 22, 1975-6, pp.309-319.

BLACK, M., 'The Son of Man Passion Sayings in the Gospel Tradition', ZNW., 60, 1969, pp.1-8.

---- 'The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', NTS., 18, 1971, pp.1-14.

---- 'The Servant of the Lord and the Son of Man', SJT., 6, 1953, pp.1-11.

---- 'The Cup Metaphor in Mark 14:36', Ex.T., 59, 1947-8, pp.195.

---- 'From Schweitzer to Bultmann: The Modern Quest of the Historical Jesus?' McCormick Quarterly, 20, 1967, pp.271-283.



BOOBYER, G.H., 'The Redaction of Mark IV:1-34', NTS., 8, 1961, pp.59-70.

---- 'Mark 12:35-7 and the Pre-existence of Jesus in Mark', Ex.T.,  
51, 1939-40, pp.393-4.

BROWN, J.P., 'Mark as a Witness to an Edited Form of Q', JBL.,  
80, 1961, pp.29-44.

BOWKER, J.W., 'Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yellamedenu Form',  
NTS., 14, 1967-8, pp.96-111.

BUCHANAN, G.W., 'Mark 11:15-19. Brigands in the Temple', HUCA.,  
30, 1959, pp.169-77.

BURKILL, T.A., 'The Syrophoenician Women. The Congruence of Mark 7:24-31',  
LNW., 57, 1966, pp.23-37.

---- 'The Historical Development of the Story of the Syrophoenician  
Woman', NT., 1967, pp.161-173.

---- 'Mark 3:7-12 and the Alleged Dualism in the Evangelist's Miracle  
Material', JBL., 87, 1968, pp.409-17.

BUSE, I., 'The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John',  
Ex.T., 70, 1958-9, pp.22-4.

CALVERT, D.G.A., 'An Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing  
the Authentic Words of Jesus', NTS., 18, 1971, pp.209-18.

CARLSTON, C., 'Things that Defile (Mk.7:14) and the Law in Matthew  
and Mark', TS., 15, 1968-9, pp.75-96.

COUTTS, J.H., 'Those Outside (Mk.4:10-12)', Studia Evangelica II,  
1963, pp.155-7.

CRAFIELD, C.E.B., 'St. Mark 4:1-34, part I', SJT., 4, 1951, pp.398-414.

---- 'St. Mark 4:1-34, part II', SJT., 5, 1951, pp.49-66.

---- 'Message of Hope. Mark 4:21-32', Interpretation, 9, 1955, pp.150-64.

---- 'St. Mark 9:14-29', SJT., 3, 1950, pp.57-67.

---- 'The Cup Metaphor in Mark 14:36 and Parallels', Ex.T., 59,  
1947-8, pp.137-8.

CROSSAN, J.D., 'The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen', JBl., 1971, pp.451-65.

CRUM, J.M.C., 'Mark and "Q"', Theology, 12, 1926, pp.275-82, 350-56.

DAUBE, D., 'Public Pronouncement and Private Explanation in the Gospels',  
Ex.T., 57, 1945-6, pp.175-7.

---- 'The Earliest Structure of the Gospels', ETS., 1959, pp.174-87.

---- 'Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric',  
HUCA., 22, 1949, pp.239-264.

---- 'A Prayer Pattern in Judaism', Studia Evangelica, I, 1957, pp.539-45.

DODD, C.H., 'The Framework of the Gospel Narrative', Ex.T., 43, 1931-2,  
pp.396-400.

---- 'Miracles in the Gospels', Ex.T., 44, 1933, pp.564-8.

DONN, T.Mckenzie, 'Discerning the Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven',  
BT., 41, 1954, pp.57-62.

DUNGAN, D.L., 'The Impact of E.P.Sanders' Book and a Proposal for  
Future Research', Unpublished Paper read at SNTS Conference, Aug. 1973.

---- 'Mark - The Abridgement of Matthew and Luke', Perspective, 11,  
1970, pp.51-96.

EMDEN, C.S., 'St. Mark's Use of the Imperfect Tense', Ex.T., 65,  
1953-4, pp.146-9.

ESSAME, W.G., 'καὶ ἔλεγεν in Mark 4:21, 24, 26, 30', Ex.T., 77,  
1965-6, p.121.

FARMER, W.R., 'A "Skeleton in the Closet" of Gospel Research', Biblical  
Research, 6, 1961, pp.18-42.

FAW, C.E., 'The Heart of the Gospel of Mark', Journal of Bible and Religion,  
24, 1956, pp.77-82.

---- 'The Outline of Mark', Journal of Bible and Religion, 25, 1957,  
pp.19-23.

- GAGG, K., 'Jesus und die Davidssohnfrage', TLZ., 7, 1951, pp.18-30.
- GEALY, F.D., 'The Composition of Mark 4', Ex.T., 48, 1936-7, pp.40-3.
- GERHARDSSON, B., 'The Seven Parables in Matthew XIII', NTS., 19, 1972, pp.16-37.
- 'The Parable of the Sower and Its Interpretation', NTS., 1967-8, pp.164-93.
- GERTNER, M., 'Midrashim in the New Testament', Journal of Semitic Studies, 7, 1962, pp.267-92.
- GILS, F., 'Le Sabbat a été fait pour l'Homme et non l'Homme pour le Sabbat - Mc.II:27', RB., 69, 1964, pp.506-23.
- GRASSER, E., 'Jesus in Nazareth (Mk.6:1-6a)', NTS., 16, 1969, p.1-23.
- GUY, H.A., 'A Sayings-Collection in Mark's Gospel', JTS., 42, 1941, pp.173-6.
- HAMILTON, N.Q., 'The Cleansing and the Temple Bank', JBL., 83, 1964, pp.365-72.
- HARRISON, E.F., 'The Gospel and the Gospels', Bibliotheca Sacra, 116/462, 1959, pp.109-116.
- HILL, D., 'On the Evidence of the Creative Role of the Christian Prophets', NTS., 20, 1974, pp.262-74.
- HONEY, T.E.Floyd, 'Did Mark Use Q?', JBL., 60, 1943, pp.319-331.
- KECK, L.E., 'Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology', JBL., 84, 1965, pp.341-58.
- KELBER, W.H., 'Mark 14:32-42. Gethsemane', ZNW., 63, 1972, pp.166-87.
- KENNEDY, H.A.A., 'The Composition of Mark 4:21-5. A Study in the Synoptic Problem', Ex.T., 25, 1913-4, pp.301-5.
- KILPATRICK, G.D., 'Mark 4:29', JTS., 46, 1945, p.191.
- LEE, E.K., 'St. Mark and the Fourth Gospel', NTS., 1956-7, pp.51-8.
- LÉON-DUFOUR, X., 'Redaktionsgeschichte of Matthew and Literary Criticism', Perspective, 11, 1970, pp.9-36.



- LOADER, W. J., 'Mk. 4:23', Ex.T., 25, 1913-13, pp. 429-30.
- MANSON, T. W., 'The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus', BJRL., 34, 1951, pp. 313-34.
- 'A Note on Mark 4:28f.', Interpretation, 38, 1937, pp. 399-400.
- MARSEN, W., 'Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie des Markus', ATK., 53, 1955, pp. 255-77.
- MEYE, R. P., 'Mark 4:10 "Those about Him with the Twelve"', Studia Evangelica, II, 1963, pp. 211-8.
- MOULE, C. F. D., 'The Use of the Parables and Sayings as Illustrative Material in Early Christian Catechesis', JTS., 3, 1952, pp. 75-9.
- McARTHUR, H. K., 'On the Third Day', NTS., 18, 1971, pp. 81-6.
- McCASLAND, S. V., 'Abba Father', JBL., 72, 1953, pp. 79-91.
- 'The Scripture Basis of "on the Third Day"', JBL., 48, 1929, pp. 124-37.
- NEUGEBAUER, F., 'Die Davidssohnfrage (Mk. XII:35-7 par.) und der Menschensohn', NTS., 21, 1974, pp. 81-108.
- NESTLE, E., 'Mk. 4:12', Ex.T., 13, 1901-2, p. 524.
- O'NEILL, J. C., 'The Synoptic Problem', NTS., 21, 1975, pp. 273-85.
- PARKER, P., 'Mark, Acts and Galilaean Christianity', NTS., 16, 1969-70, pp. 295-304.
- PATTON, C. S., 'Did Mark Use Q? or Did Q Use Mark?' American Journal of Theology, 16, 1912, pp. 634-42.
- PEISKER, C. H., 'Konsekutives ~~W~~ in Markus 4:12', ZNW., 59, 1968, pp. 126-7.
- PERRIN, N., 'The Christology of Mark - A Study in Methodology', JR., 51, 1971, pp. 173-87.
- 'The Creative Use of the Son of Man Traditions by Mark', Union Seminary Quarterly Review, 4, 1968, pp. 357-65.
- 'Mark 14:26: The End-Product of a Christian Pisher Tradition?' NTS., 12, 1965-6, pp. 150-5.

- 'The Composition of Mark 9:1', NT., 11, 1969, pp.67-70.
- 'The Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity:  
A Suggestion', Biblical Research, 11, 1966, pp.17-28.
- PETRIE, S, 'Q is Only What You Make It', NT., 3, 1958, pp.28-33.
- PIPER, O.A, 'The Origin of the Gospel Pattern', JBL., 78, 1959,  
pp.115-24.
- RIDDLE, D, 'Mark 4:1-34. The Evolution of a Gospel Source', JBL., 56,  
1937, pp.77-90.
- ROBINSON, D.F, 'The Sources of Mark', JBL, 66, 1947, pp.153-64.
- ROBINSON, J.M, 'On the Gattung of Mark (and John)', Perspective,  
11, 1970, pp.99-130.
- ROSCHKE, T.R, 'The Words of Jesus and the Future of the Q Hypothesis'  
JBL., 79, 1960, pp.210-220.
- ROTH, C, 'The Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah', NT., 4,  
1960, pp.174-81.
- SANDERS, E.P, 'The Argument from Order and the Relationship between  
Matthew and Luke', NTS., 15, 1968-9, pp.249-61.
- 'The Overlaps of Mark and Q and the Synoptic Problem', NTS.,  
19, 1973, pp.453-64.
- SANDMEL, S, 'Parallelomania', JBL., 81, 1962, pp.3-13.
- SAWYER, H, 'The Markan Framework', SJT., 14, 1961, pp.279-94.
- SCHILLE, G, 'Bemerkungen zur Formsgeschichte des Evangeliums.  
Rahmen und Aufbau des Markus', NTS., 4, 1957, pp.1-24.
- SIEGMAN, E.F, 'Teaching in Parables (Mk.4:10-12 par.)', CBQ., 23,  
1961, pp.161-181.
- SIMPSON, R.T, 'The Major Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark',  
NTS., 12, 1966, pp.273-84.
- SINCLAIR, T.A, 'Note on an Apparent Mistranslation (Mk.4:12)',  
BT., 5, 1954, p.18.

SMITH,D.H, 'The Exposition of Mark 8:14-21', Ex.T., 59, 1947-8, pp.125-6.

SMITH,M, 'A Comparison of Early Christian and Rabbinic Tradition,  
JBL., 82, 1963, pp.169-76.

----- 'Aramaic Studies in the Study of the New Testament', Journal  
of Bible and Religion, 24, 1958, pp.304-13.

SPARKS,H.F.D, 'Some Observations on the Semitic Background of  
the New Testament', SNTS.BULL., II, 1951, pp.33-42.

STANLEY,D.M, 'Liturgical Influences on the Formation of the Four  
Gospels', CBQ., 21, 1959, pp.24-38.

STEIN,R.H, 'The Proper Methodology for Ascertaining a Markan  
Redactional History', NT., 13, 1971, pp.281-96.

STORCH,W, 'Zur Perikope von der Syrophönikizierin', BZ., 14, 1970,  
pp,256-7.

STRECKER,G, 'The Passion- and Resurrection-Predictions in Mark's  
Gospel', Interpretation, 22,1968, pp.421-42.

TAYLOR,V, 'Mark's Use of Gospel Tradition', SNTS.BULL., III,  
1952, pp.29-39.

TEEPLE,H.M, 'The Origin of the Son of Man Christology', JBL., 84,  
1965, pp.213-50.

THROCKMORTON,H.B, 'Did Mark Know Q', JBL., 67, 1948, pp.319-34.

TURNER,N, 'Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark', Studia  
Evangelica, I, 1957, pp.223-4.

VASSILADES,P, 'Behind Mark:Towards a Written Source', NTS., 20,  
1974, pp.155-60.

VINCENT,J, 'Did Jesus Teach His Disciples to Learn by Heart?'  
Studia Evangelica, III, 1964, pp.105-118.

----- 'The Parables of Jesus as Self-Revelation', Studia Evangelica, I,  
1957, pp.79-99.



WALKER,N, 'After Three Days', NTS., 4, 1966, pp. 261-2.

WENHAM,D, 'The Synoptic Problem Revisited:Some New Suggestions  
About the Composition of Mark 4:1-34', Tyndale Bulletin,  
23, 1968, pp.3-38.

---- 'The Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower', NTS., 20,  
1974, pp.299-319.

---- 'The Meaning of Mark 3:21', NTS., 21, 1975, pp.296-300.

WIDENGREN,G, 'Tradition and Literature in Early Judaism and in  
the Early Church', Numen, 10, 1963, pp.42-83.

WILCOX,M, 'The Denial Sequence in Mk.14:26-31, 66-72', NTS.,  
17, 1971, pp.426-63.

---- 'Peter and the Rock : A Fresh Look at Mt.16:17-19', NTS., 22,  
1975, pp.73-88.

YATES,J.E, 'Evidence for a Primitive Outline of the Ministry of  
Jesus', Studia Evangelica, IV, 1968, pp.131-3.