
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

A Lost Verse in the Gospel of Mark.

By J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D., Birmingham.

It was in the last year that I had the happiness of recovering a missing verse or half-verse from the fourth chapter of the Gospel of John, a sentence which had disappeared from every existing copy of the sacred text, but which we were able to show to have once existed in the *Diatessaron of Tatian*, and which internal evidence showed to be the work of the Evangelist, and not the observation of an acute commentator. The missing sentence was the reply of Jesus to the inquiry of the Samaritan woman as to the source from which He derived the living water that He proposed to bestow upon a thirsty world. The discovery was published in The Expository Times for May 1927, and, if one may judge from communications which students of the Gospel made to the discoverer, there were not a few who shared in the happiness of the find and were glad of the enrichment which it gave to a chapter which was already heavily laden with deep thoughts, and a very argosy of spiritual truth.

I am now going to try to recover a missing verse from the Gospel of Mark; only my readers must be warned in advance that this time we have not the support of a single textual authority; and it is quite possible that some people will put the matter from them, and say that they do not want a Gospel which is conjured up out of non-existence by the magical spells of the imagination. Well, we are not writing for such; our appeal will only be made to those who think that the imagination as well as the reason and the power of observation may have a service in Biblical science.

In order to make clear the direction in which the aid of the imagination is to be invoked, we shall need some preliminary study.

The story of the trial, defence, and martyrdom of St. Stephen in the Acts of the Apostles, amongst whom Stephen may very properly be included as the very first missioner to the Hellenic world, and, in an indirect way, the founder of the Church at Antioch, is characterized by a singular parallelism between Stephen and his Master. Even a superficial reader recognizes that Stephen praying for his murderers is a companion portrait to the 'Father, forgive them' of Jesus Himself; and a superficial criticism, finding that the Lord's prayer for His enemies is wanting in certain copies of the Gospel of Luke, has hastily inferred that the text of the Gospel has been reinforced from the account of Stephen's prayer in the Acts. We do not stop to discuss the meaning of that particular parallel; we only refer to it as an isolated case of what occurs on a much wider scale. Indeed it becomes quite a common practice in the historians of the Early Church to observe, or even to accentuate, or possibly to invent, such cases and events as might serve to show that the experience of the Master was reproduced, even to detail, in the sufferings of the servants. Polycarp's martyrdom may serve as an illustration.

If we read the Martyrdom of Jesus as told by Mark over against the Martyrdom of Stephen, as told by Luke, we shall see that there is a literary dependence of the Acts upon Mark, over and above the general theory of an *Imitatio Christi* to which we have alluded.

For instance, Mark relates (14^{53}) that 'they brought Jesus to the high priest (ἀπήγαγον . . . πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα), and there came together all the high priests (*sic*: plural) and the elders and the scribes.' After a reference to the conduct of Peter, the account continues: 'Now the high priests (*sic*: plural) and all the Sanhedrin sought testimony against Jesus to kill him, and found none.' That is the way in which the judicial proceedings against Jesus commence: in the case of Stephen, we are told that

'They stirred up the people and all the elders and the scribes, and came upon him and brought him to the Sanhedrin (ἦγαγον . . . εἰς τὸ συνέδριον).' So far the accounts are parallel in structure, and show some coincidence in expression, over and above what may be described as inevitable.

We come next to the employment of false witnesses, and the nature of their testimony: the substance of it, in the case of Stephen, is that, 'We have heard him say that this Jesus the Nazarene shall destroy this place and change the customs which Moses delivered to us.' Ac 6^{14}: ἀκηκόαμεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος οὗτος καταλύσει τὸν τόπον τοῦτον κτλ., with which we compare Mk 14^{58}: 'We have heard him saying, I will destroy this temple made with hands' (ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον). The two accounts have now drawn very close together, not only in the matter narrated, but in the manner of the narration.

Then we have the direct appeal of the high priest to each of the prisoners. In Mark it runs thus: 'The high priest rose in the midst (εἰς τὸ μέσον), and asked Jesus, saying, Have you nothing to answer?' In the Acts the narration is briefer, 'The high priest said, Are these things so?'

It will, I think, be conceded that Luke's account of the trial of Stephen has been affected, both structurally and linguistically, by the Markan account of the trial of Jesus.

We ought not to omit from these suggestions of parallelism the fundamental element of a charge of blasphemy, in which Jesus and Stephen use matters of personal testimony (prophecy and its fulfilment) which can hardly be independent. It may very well be the case that, when Jesus says that His judges shall see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven, and when Stephen affirms that he fulfils the prediction in his own person by a vision of open heavens and of the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God, we have before us the historical motive for a highly-developed literary parallelism. The two narrations can hardly be independent. They are connected either in fact or intention. They could be printed on opposite pages with appropriate indications of type.

And now we come to the very interesting discovery upon which we have discoursed elsewhere, that the Western text of the Acts has inserted the words 'standing in the midst' at the junction of the sixth and seventh chapters of the Acts. As commonly understood, these words have been taken to refer to Stephen, whose radiant face was like that of an angel standing in their midst; but it was claimed by me, many years since, that they really belonged to the high priest, who rises to address the criminal, and that we should replace the gloss so as to read, 'And the high priest rose in the midst, and said.' I do not propose at this point to resume the discussion which was naturally provoked by this way of explaining the gloss. The point that I want to emphasize is this, that by attaching the words to the high priest we complete an already existing parallel between Luke's account in the Acts and the Markan Gospel. That is, certainly, very significant, and ought to be almost the last word in the discussion. I do not propose, at this point, to invade the whole area of the problem of the Western glosses. If our explanation is correct, we have amplified and completed the evidence for the dependence of the Acts upon Mark.

Now we come, after a lengthy prologue, to the question with which we are really occupied, over and above the ordinary questions as to the text of the Acts and its interpretation. If it be conceded that Stephen is either in actual history or in literary presentation the subject of an *Imitatio Christi*, what are we to say about the shining face by which he is most commonly remembered, at least in art and in letters? Tennyson, for instance, delineates him as follows:

> Looking upward, full of grace,
> He prayed, and from a happy place,
> God's glory smote him on the face.

Tennyson has carried forward the descent of the Divine glory upon the martyr from the trial to the martyrdom: for, in the Biblical account, the prayer comes later than the trial. Is it possible that there stood in the Markan original a statement with regard to the angelic face of Jesus Christ at His trial, similar to that which is recorded of Stephen? Nothing more likely, in view of the fact that the early Christian tradition lays stress on the glorious appearance of Christ's face. St. Paul, it will be remembered, has, in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, an actual allegory on the greater glory of the New Covenant when contrasted with the Old Covenant, the subject-matter of the allegory being the face of Jesus and the face of Moses. Christian experience, in this connexion, is defined as an 'illumination of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' (2 Co 4^6); when considered as progressive, rather than as immediate, Christian experience is defined as a change from glory to glory by beholding or reflecting the glory of the Lord (2 Co 3^{18}); the whole passage with its parallelism between Moses' face and Christ's, shows that the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ was a natural, and perhaps a familiar theme. There may be other origins for the theme, as, for instance, the Transfiguration, to which reference seems to be made in the words, 'We are transfigured into the same image'; but even the reminiscence of Tabor recalls the Face that shone like the Sun, so that we can without much difficulty enter into the Apostolic mind and look at history with St. Paul's eyes.

This, then, is our suggestion, that in the original text of Mark (or Markan origins, if we cannot be satisfied with a single 'honest ghost' for an Evangelist), there stood a statement to the effect that 'all in the council, looking upon Jesus, saw his face like the face of an angel.' The text of Mark might then have something as follows, if we wish to justify the Western text of the Acts:

οὐδὲ καὶ οὕτως
ἴση ἦν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτῶν·

[καὶ εἶδον τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ
ὡς πρόσωπον ἀγγέλου
ἑστῶτος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν·]
καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεύς
εἰς τὸ μέσον [αὐτῶν]
ἐπηρώτησε τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λέγων·

The advantage of this arrangement is that by the repetition of the line-endings, the error of omission can be explained. I should, however, prefer to omit the fifth line, and to explain the 'standing in the midst' as I have done formerly. All that I am arguing for is that a significant passage has been lost in the Gospel of Mark, of which there is a reminiscence in the Acts of the Apostles.

Was St. Paul a Stammerer?

By the Reverend W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D., London.

A new discussion of St. Paul's 'thorn in the flesh' can only be justified if new material is presented for consideration. Thus Dr. Richardson's suggestion,[1] that the Apostle was literally crucified, at least as far as the beginning of the ordeal, though hardly likely to win acceptance, must have been read by many with interest. There is room for speculation because no theory holds the field.

1. Sir William Ramsay's idea that Paul was attacked by malaria at Perga and went for his health's sake to the highlands has little in its favour. He was a native of Tarsus, and must have known other methods of treating fever than that of plunging into the heart of the bandit-infested mountains; and how would a convalescent from malaria be 'a temptation in the flesh' to the Galatians (Gal 4^{14})?

2. Epilepsy has been surmised from the 'spat out' of Gal 4^{14} (R.V. marg.), which is said to refer to the custom of spitting to avert a demonic attack. The Galatians did not do what might have been anticipated. But there is no need to insist on the literal sense, and, even if it is allowed to stand, other inflictions besides epilepsy were ascribed to demons.

3. Ophthalmia is unlikely, in view of the keen glances of the Apostle frequently referred to.

4. Skin trouble, such as erysipelas, would certainly have been unsightly, but otherwise does not fit the evidence particularly well.

5. The earliest tradition, given by Tertullian, is headache. This, again, does not explain Gal 4^{14}, but I believe it puts us on the right track.

I suggest that St. Paul was a victim to nerves, and that modern men are peculiarly fitted to enter into his experience. Splitting headaches may well have accompanied the attacks, and they could hardly be described more appropriately than by the word σκόλοψ, a stake driven into his head. Read 2 Corinthians and you see at once that the writer was a mass of nerves, acutely sensitive and a prey to melancholy and depression which came as the ebb-tide of the mighty incoming tide of exaltation which was the other side of his being. Such was his essential sanity that a cure would probably have been possible if he could have enjoyed a quiet life and sympathetic companionship. But that was always out of his reach. His body was shattered by the experiences described in 2 Co 11, 'the care of all the churches' was a terrible mental strain, and the psychic and spiritual side of his life made great demands on his weakened frame. Once his nerves began to go, the conditions of recovery were absent.

But some outward manifestation must be sought, such as at times limited his appeal severely. I suggest that, at least at times of exceptional strain, he suffered from inability to express himself clearly, partial aphasia, or, to use one word, a stammer. To test this, let us look at Lightfoot's list of conditions which any theory must satisfy (*Commentary on Galatians*, 186 ff.).

1. Physical pain of a very acute kind.

2. The malady was very humiliating, a set-off against his spiritual privileges and a check to his spiritual pride.

3. It was a grievous hindrance to the gospel and a powerful testimony to it when overcome.

4. The affliction seems to have attacked him when he preached, exposing him to possible contempt.

5. The meanness of his personal appearance may be connected with it.

6. The trouble was recurring.

Of these factors, all except five are admirably satisfied by the combination of headache and

[1] In the January number of *Theology*.