

word is not mentioned, as it is in Is 49⁷ and Dn 2⁴⁶.

In the last passage (an exceedingly interesting one) we should say in Chinese that Nebuchadnezzar 'worshipped Daniel as Prime Minister.' And in that fact, and a Chinese incident about to be related, we gain much light upon the third temptation of our Lord (the third according to St. Matthew), which to modern Western minds seems to contain the utterly impossible meaning that Jesus should yield divine honours to the devil!

'During the "Divided Realms" period of the Chou dynasty, when the dukes and marquises of the various States were mostly independent of the central authority (of the literally "central realm"), and were becoming kings in all but name, the young Duke Huan of the northern State of Ch'i, in the year 684 B.C., sought for a wise man as counsellor. One Kuan I-wu had been opposed to him, and was regarded as his enemy. But was possessed of such diplomatic skill and experience that, yielding to persuasion, the young Duke Huan, finding no other so suitable, "accord-

ingly worshipped him as prime minister," and adopting his methods, became great in the land.'

Thus illustrated, the third temptation was a truly insidious one. It was not that Jesus should yield up one iota of His divine status, or of His divine commission. It may have been simply that He should adopt, in His sacred enterprise, methods which had proved fitting and successful in the non-sacred establishment of earthly realms: methods which, though ordinarily connected with satanic evil, might, under the sacred mastery of the Christ of God, be overruled for the best ultimate good.

It was such a temptation as this against which our Lord was proof, if His representatives on earth have not always been so. He was to win the human multitude without the isolation of unworldliness, waiving some of the strict demands of the spiritual, avoiding the lowliness of toilsome ministry, the risk of rejection, the tragic horrors of a seeming defeat. It was this temptation He hurled behind Him, choosing rather to suffer the 'sharpness of death,' and thus to 'open the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers.'

John Mark.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. S. J. CASE, PH.D., CHICAGO.

MARK is not a conspicuous figure in the extant records of the Apostolic Age. Apart from the title of the Gospel which bears his name, he is mentioned only ten times in the New Testament. In five instances he is called 'Mark' (Μάρκος [WH], but more correctly Μάρκος [Ac 15³⁹, Col 4¹⁰, Philem 24, 2 Ti 4¹¹, 1 P 5¹³]); three times he is referred to as 'John whose surname was (or, who was called) Mark' (Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Μάρκον [Ac 12¹²]; Ἰωάννην τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μάρκον [Ac 12²⁵]; Ἰωάννην τὸν καλούμενον Μάρκον [Ac 15³⁷]); and on two occasions he is called simply 'John' (Ἰωάννην [Ac 13⁵]; Ἰωάννης [Ac 13¹³]). 'John' is a Jewish name, and 'Mark' (Marcus) is a Latin *praenomen* assumed in accordance with a custom familiar at that time. Similarly, Saul of Tarsus assumed the *cognomen* 'Paulus' (Ac 13⁹; see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, Marburg, 1895, pp. 181-

186; Eng. tr., *Bible Studies*, Edinburgh, 1901, pp. 313-317).

The New Testament statements about Mark are very brief. He is said to be the son of a certain Mary at whose house in Jerusalem Christians were assembled when Peter escaped from the prison into which he had been thrown by Herod Agrippa 1. (Ac 12^{12ff.}). Evidently this house was a familiar place of meeting, for Peter went directly there and the maid who tended the door immediately recognized his voice. Presumably Mark was at home during these days, and so found himself in association with early representatives of the new religious movement. He is next mentioned in connexion with the return of Barnabas and Saul after they had carried relief to Judea (Ac 12²⁵). Probably Mark remained with them in Antioch, whence he accompanied them on the so-called first missionary-

journey. He is said to have been with them at Salamis serving as their 'attendant' (*ὑπηρέτην* [Ac 13⁵]), but at Perga he abandoned the expedition and returned to Jerusalem (Ac 13¹³). Nothing more is heard of him until Paul proposes a second missionary tour. In the meantime Mark has apparently come back to Antioch, and Barnabas wishes to take him along a second time. Paul's vigorous protest results in a split with Barnabas, who sets out with Mark, while Paul and Silas journey together (Ac 15³⁷⁻⁴¹). Mark's name does not appear again in Acts, but in the letter to Philemon (v. 24) he is included among those 'fellow-workers' (*συνεργοί*) who are helping Paul in the task of evangelization during his imprisonment. Also in Col 4¹⁰, of the two fellow-workers left to comfort Paul in his affliction, Mark is one. He is here said to be the cousin (*ἀνεψιός*) of Barnabas, and is commended to the Colossians as worthy of a cordial reception should he make a journey thither. In 2 Ti 4¹¹ Mark is no longer with Paul at Rome, but is somewhere in the East. Timothy is urged to come to Rome as quickly as possible, bringing along Mark, who is useful to Paul for ministering (*εἰς διακονίαν*). Finally, Mark is in 'Babylon' (*ἐν Βαβυλῶνι*), where he unites with Peter, who calls him his son (*υἱός*), in salutations to the readers of the Epistle (1 P 5¹³). In addition to these explicit statements, it has been conjectured that he was the water-carrier mentioned in Mk 14¹³ (Lk 22¹⁰), or that he was the young man who fled so hastily on the night of Jesus' arrest (Mk 14^{51f.}; see Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Leipzig, 1900², ii. p. 212, n. 6; Eng. tr., *Introduction to the New Testament*, New York, 1909, ii. p. 446, n. 6). But these conjectures do not rise above the level of interesting possibilities. Much less can Hitzig's contention that John Mark is the John of Patmos who composed Rev. be taken seriously (Hitzig, *Ueber Johannes Marcus und seine Schriften*, Zürich, 1843; cf. Spitta, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, Halle, 1889, who posits Markan authorship for one of the sources of Rev.).

Only a very meagre outline of Mark's career can be reconstructed from these New Testament data. He first appears upon the scene about the year 44 A.D. At that time he was living with his mother in Jerusalem, where he came into contact with representatives of the new religious movement. At some unknown date he espoused this cause later associating himself with Barnabas and Saul at

Antioch and in their travels through Cyprus to Perga in Pamphylia. There he left them and returned home to Jerusalem, but later came again to Antioch. He would have gone with them upon a second trip had not Paul refused his company. Thereupon he became the travelling companion of his cousin Barnabas. Their further missionary labours are ignored by the author of Acts, but it seems highly probable that Barnabas continued to carry on aggressive evangelistic work (1 Co 9⁶). Probably Mark was similarly engaged, although no record has been made of his activities during these years. We have to content ourselves with a few hints suggesting that he was at one time with Paul in Rome, at another time in the East, and on still another occasion with Peter in 'Babylon' (*i.e.* Rome).

Several difficulties arise in any effort to interpret these scanty data. (1) When Barnabas and Saul were preaching in the Jewish synagogues of Salamis in Cyprus, Mark is said to have been their attendant (Ac 13⁵). But 'attendant' (*ὑπηρέτης*) is a term having various possible meanings. In the present connexion it is commonly taken to imply that Mark, while not serving as a menial (*δοῦλος*), was nevertheless mainly busied with minor duties in connexion with the journey—'arrangements for travel, the provision of food and lodging, conveying messages, negotiating interviews, and the like (Swete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London, 1902², p. xvi). He was not engaged in the actual work of preaching, but in rendering personal service to Barnabas and Saul. Others suggest that it fell to Mark to baptize the converts (*e.g.* Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, Göttingen, 1895, p. 146). Still others take 'attendant' as an official title (as in Lk 4²⁰) used to designate an individual whose duty it was to perform stated services in the synagogue. Once upon a time, so it is assumed, Mark had occupied this office, and henceforth he was known as 'John the synagogue attendant' (so F. H. Chase, article 'Mark (John),' *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, iii., Edinburgh, 1909, p. 245 f., reading *εἶχον* as equivalent to *εἶχον μεθ' αὐτῶν*). If a choice is to be made from among these conjectures, it is perhaps safer to follow the hint given in 2 Ti 4¹¹, to the effect that Mark is useful for ministering (*εὐχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν*), and so to find in Acts a reference to Mark's general usefulness in connexion with the mission. Thus his rôle, in the eyes of the writer of Acts, is similar to that of Timothy, Titus, and

other helpers mentioned only incidentally in the New Testament.

(2) Whether Mark was so fully responsible for the breach between Paul and Barnabas, as the brief statement of Ac 15^{38f.} might imply, is also a question. One class of interpreters endeavours to justify Mark's abandonment of the first expedition on the grounds of expediency. He had not, it is said, been designated by the Holy Spirit for this work, he may not at the outset have known that the mission would extend to Asia, and home duties may have called him back to Jerusalem (see W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, New York, 1893, p. 61; Chase, *op. cit.*, p. 246). But may not the events recorded by Paul in Gal 2^{11f.} shed some light on Mark's situation? According to this representation it was not the conduct of Mark, but that of Peter, which led to the break with Barnabas (Gal 2¹³). The two incidents need not be mutually exclusive, but in any case the events at Antioch described in Gal. were in all probability earlier than those mentioned in Ac 15^{38f.}, and the former incidents must have been an important preliminary to the latter. In Acts, Mark has been made—whether by design or by accident can only be conjectured—to bear the brunt of a burden which Paul is disposed to place chiefly upon Peter. It is not impossible, to be sure, that Mark was among 'the rest of the Jews' whose dissimulation helped to lead astray 'even Barnabas'; but Peter more immediately, and James ultimately, were, in Paul's judgment, chiefly responsible for this unfortunate turn of affairs (Gal 2^{11f.}). At most, Barnabas' desire to take Mark upon the second journey was the climax, and not the primary cause, of his break with Paul.

(3) Later mention of Mark as one of Paul's most trusty helpers constitutes still another difficulty. It is a very sudden and harsh transition from the point where Mark is last mentioned in Acts (15³⁹), as being so objectionable to Paul, to the passage in Philemon (v. 24), where Mark's name is given first place among Paul's fellow-workers. The difficulty is only enhanced by the further statements in Col 4^{10f.} and 2 Ti 4¹¹, where it appears that Paul values Mark perhaps above any other of his companions, unless an exception be made in the case of Luke 'the beloved physician.' How did it come about that one who had been so distinctly *persona non grata* to Paul in earlier times could subsequently become his loyal supporter? There had been, of

course, ample time for differences to be healed; but in view of what has been said above the breach between Mark and Paul may not even at the outset have been so wide as the brief statement in Ac 15^{37ff.} standing alone might seem to imply. One thing at least is certain, Mark ultimately became one of Paul's most valued helpers. This fact is sufficiently attested by Philem 24, quite apart from any possible question about the authorship of Col. or 2 Timothy.

(4) This certainty regarding the friendship between Mark and Paul raises the problem of Mark's relations with Peter. Their acquaintance had doubtless begun in Jerusalem, but they are not found together again until we come to 1 P 5¹³. Here Mark appears in filial association with Peter; and one wonders how his attachment could have been so close to both Paul and Peter, since these two individuals are commonly thought to represent rival tendencies within early Christianity. Among the different solutions proposed for this problem, the hypothesis of two Marks in the Apostolic Age is now quite generally rejected (see Schanz, *Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Marcus*, Freiburg, 1881, p. 2. n. 1). The Tübingen School, which stresses the differences between Paul and Peter, doubts the genuineness of 1 P., making it the work of a tendency writer who for synthetic purposes transferred prominent companions of Paul, like Silvanus and Mark, into the company of Peter. Other interpreters make the gap between Paul and Peter less wide, so that the problem of adjustment becomes mainly a chronological and a geographical one. 'Babylon' is now generally taken to be a metaphorical expression for Rome, and as Mark was certainly there with Paul, so he may have rendered Peter similar service when that apostle visited the city. This whole question is bound up with other problems, such as the genuineness of the writings ascribed to Peter, his residence in Rome, and the dates at which he and Paul died. Since the discussion of these questions does not fall within the scope of the present article, we may simply note that Mark's association with Paul is much more strongly attested, so far as New Testament data go, than is his association with Peter.

In view of the scantiness and obscurity of the New Testament records, it is not surprising that early Christian tradition should have endeavoured to supply additional information about Mark. This interest was greatly stimulated by the fact that

the early Church was using a Gospel which, by common consent from an early date, was said to have been written by him. Even in the time of Papias this seems to have been a generally accepted opinion (Euseb. *H.E.*, iii. 39. 15). Accordingly lacunæ in the New Testament records were soon filled out with data regarding this evangelist's family connexions and personal characteristics, his association with Jesus and the apostles, his own activity, and the manner of his death. These traditions are rarely trustworthy, but they are of interest in showing the efforts of early Christians to enlarge upon the history of apostolic times. (1) The Vulgate preface to Mk., frequently referred to as the Monarchian Prologue, states that Mark had cut off his thumb to avoid the necessity of serving as a priest (see Wordsworth and White, *Nouum Testamentum Latine secundum editionem S. Hieronymi*, ii. [Euangelium secundum Marcum], Oxford, 1891, p. 171; and Corssen, *Monarchianische Prologe zu den vier Evangelien* [Texte und Untersuchungen, xv.], Leipzig, 1896, p. 9 f.); and in Hippolytus (*Philos.*, vii. 30 [Eng. tr., *Refut.* vii. 18]) he is called the 'stub-fingered' (κολοβοδάκτυλος). The exact meaning of Hippolytus' epithet is still in doubt, but possibly it also has reference to a supposed self-mutilation of Mark in order to avoid service as a priest. His kinship to Barnabas the Levite (Col 4¹⁰, Ac 4³⁶) doubtless furnished the incentive for such tradition.

(2) Legend also gives Mark a definite place in the history of Jesus' career. According to one interpretation of the opening words of the Muratorian canon, it affirms Mark's association with Jesus. The fragment begins in the middle of a sentence thus: 'at some, however, he was present, and so recorded them' (*quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit*). The writer apparently is speaking of Mark, hence 'at some' has been taken to mean on certain occasions in the ministry of Jesus. But more probably this language should be understood to mean that Mark was present on certain occasions when Peter preached and later recorded in the Gospel what he there heard. This is in agreement with the statement of Papias, that Mark 'neither heard the Lord nor did he follow him, but afterwards, as I said, (attended) Peter,' later writing down what he remembered of Peter's discourses (Euseb. *H.E.*, iii. 39. 15; cf. Tertullian, *adv. Marc.*, iv. 5). Several later, but wholly unreliable, authorities place Mark among the 'Seventy'

(see Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, ii. 2, Braunschweig, 1884, p. 328 f.).

(3) Tradition also enlarged upon Mark's association with the apostles, particularly with Peter. This was a natural development, considering the growing importance of the Roman Church with which Peter's name came to be so closely linked. The Monarchian Prologue says that Mark was baptized by Peter (*Petri in baptisate filius*), but this statement may be only an inference drawn from the expression 'my son' in 1 P 5¹³. More importance is commonly attached to the numerous statements (cited fully by Lipsius, *op. cit.*, p. 321 f.) which make Mark the missionary companion of Peter from whom the chief content of the Gospel of Mark is said to be derived. The earliest of these witnesses is Papias, who, on the authority of 'the Elder' (John), says: 'Mark, becoming the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, but not, however, in order, so much as he remembered of the things said and the things done by Christ' (Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii. 39. 15). This is not the place to discuss the authorship of the Second Gospel; we are chiefly concerned with the expression 'interpreter of Peter' (*ἐρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου*). This language ordinarily would mean that Peter knew only the Semitic speech and that Mark served as translator when they were among Greek-speaking peoples. Papias is usually so understood, but another meaning is possible. In a previous paragraph he has spoken of his own treatise expounding the discourses of the Lord as 'interpretations' (*ἐρμηνείαις* [Euseb., *H.E.*, iii. 39. 3]), and possibly he styled Mark 'interpreter' because the latter had embodied the substance of Peter's sermons in a written Gospel. Similarly, when Papias says that the Matthean collection of the Lord's sayings originally written in 'Hebrew' were 'interpreted' according to individual ability (Euseb. *H.E.*, iii. 39. 15), he may have in mind expositions such as his own 'interpretation.' Indeed, it is not at all certain—some would say quite improbable—that he had so much as seen the 'Hebrew' collection of which he speaks, and certainly his treatise was not in the nature of a translation. His meaning is at best obscure, and similar remarks in other early writings are mostly if not wholly inspired by his statements; and his information, or that of his informant, may ultimately have sprung from the New Testament representation that Peter's affiliations at the outset

were emphatically Jewish and that in later times Mark served him as a 'son.'

(4) Mark is also credited with important independent activities, especially in Egypt, where he was the first to preach Christianity and found a Church in Alexandria. Eusebius (*H.E.*, ii. 16. 1) is authority for this information, which he may have derived from a late second century list of

Alexandrian bishops. This he supplemented by his unjustified inference that the Therapeutæ, described in Philo's tractate *quod omnis probus liber*, must have been a company of Christians. Finally, in the late and wholly unhistorical Acts of Mark, the Evangelist is glorified as the first martyr of Alexandria (Lipsius, *op. cit.*, pp. 322-327 and 329 ff.).

Contributions and Comments.

Revelation xvi. 16.

I SHOULD much like to draw the attention of your readers to Rev 16¹⁶, the prophecy of 'a great hail' that shall fall 'out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent'; and this in connexion with the Battle of Armageddon.

For many years I have in my own mind referred this prophecy to cannon-balls; for though these do not actually fall out of heaven, yet to persons exposed to them they may easily appear to do so. To bombs dropped from aeroplanes the description seems more appropriate. 'Εκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is more accurately 'from the sky' than 'from heaven.'

Whether we are actually witnessing the Battle of Armageddon, we cannot say; but if that awful judgment is still reserved for some future generation, is it not highly probable that the art of aeronautics has a great development in store; and that its present exploits are but a preparation for an enormously greater fulfilment of this awful prophecy?

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

Corrigenda and Addenda in

'B. D. B.'

IN addition to the *Addenda et Corrigenda* printed at the end (pp. 1119-1127) of the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon (conveniently known as *B. D. B.* from the names of its editors, Dr. Brown, Dr. Driver, Dr. Briggs), I have noticed the following. (As *Addenda* are often debatable points it seems well to make two separate lists, beginning with obvious *Corri-*

genda.) Some are quite trivial; others are more important; but all seem worth noting.

I.

Page. Col.

266. 2. Under II. וּזְרִיב 19¹⁷ read לְאִשְׁתֵּי.
344. 1. ,, נְחַפְשׁוּ חַפְצֵי Niph. Ob⁶ read נְחַפְשׁוּ.
371. 2. ,, טָבוֹר, for 'Ex' read 'Ez.'
401. 1. Line 24, for 'e (4)' read '6 c.'
419. 1. Under יַעַן adj., transpose עַם in first exple.
431. 2. Piel, for 'Impf.' read 'Pf.'
435. 1. Line 1, Ges. ref. read § 76 (2) f.
498. 1. For 'Niph.,' read 'Nithpl. (or as Hithp., cf. Driver in loc.)'
534. 1. Line 15, Ges. ref., for 'Anm^s' read 'ee.'
554. 2. Line 6, for ה read ח.
620. 1. Under וּנְגַר, ו, for 'טַנְרִים' (Hoph.) read 'הַנְּגָרִים' (Niph.).
772. 4. Under עֲנַב, line 3, עֲנַבִּי, note that the Bomberg edition has עֲנַבִּי.
849. 1. Line 14, for '566' read '596.'
857. 2. Under צַעַר Qal-Inf. בְּצַעֲרָךְ, note that Mass. Text points בְּצַעֲרָךְ.
857. 2. Third line from end, Isa ref. read '3²¹.'
899. 2. Under קָרָה Qal., third line, for וַיִּקַּר read וַיִּקַּר.
903. 2. Under קִשְׁקֶשֶׁת, third line, note that Mas. Text reads קִשְׁקֶשֶׁת in passage cited.
908. 1. Line 23 from end, for '1 S' read '2 S.'
961. 1. Under שָׂדֵי, ו, between 'field' and 12¹² insert 'ψ'; and between 'also' and 10⁴ insert 'Ho.'
966. 2. Under שָׂטָן, third line, for לְשָׂטָנוּ read לְשָׂטָנוּ.
1054. 1. Line 10 from end, for the ה in first word read ה.
1075. 2. Line 4, for בִּיחָד read בִּיחָד.