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ABSTRACT

The Marcan Portrayal of the “Jewish” Unbeliever as a Function of The Marcan References to the Jewish Bible: The Hermeneutical Basis of a Theological Construct

by Neil R. Parker

A cursory examination of any scholarly edition of Mark’s gospel suffices to demonstrate the extent of the evangelist’s indebtedness to the Jewish scriptures. We encounter the majority of easily recognisable references to OT text within the Passion Narrative. Nonetheless, some twelve pericopae within the so-called “Prolegomenon” also report demonstrable borrowings from the OT. Three quarters of these pericopae contain Jesus’ dialogues with official representatives of contemporary Judaism. Eight of these, in turn, betray a studied attempt at the exposure of errors or malpractices on the part of the religious authorities. In this connection, the OT references serve to undergird a refutation of the alleged positions of the Jews.

Institutional Judaism and its representatives receive “bad press” within the narrative world of the evangelist. The degree of vitriolization in this portrayal bears a direct relation to the degree of redactional interference within a given vignette. Yet the evidence of the text demands two further conclusions. Firstly, a majority of Jesus’ verbal exchanges with religious figures can on no account indicate Palestinian soil as their provenance. Secondly, a significant proportion of Mark’s intended addressees at the very minimum must have comprised Greek-speaking Christians of non-Jewish background. With that, the Marcan “Jew” finds a ready explanation as a literary construct. The purpose of the device is to rationalize the perennial problem of unbelief/misunderstanding for the Marcan community. Here the evangelist enlists the OT as a theological underpinning of his explanation.

The diachronic nature of our investigation has determined our employment of the historical-critical method. However, a discussion of four methodological considerations precedes our exegeses of individual texts. Thus in ch. 1 we examine: (a) classification of types of scripture reference, (b) manuscript tradition of passages used by the evangelist, (c) literary applications of the OT in the NT, and (d) separation of Marcan redaction and pre-Marcan tradition. In ch. 2 we investigate Mk 1:2-3 and 4:11-12/8:14-21 as a pair of test cases. The former serves to characterize the use of scripture within strand(s) of pre-Marcan tradition. The latter serves to delineate the evangelist’s “script” for the “Jew” as the typical unbeliever (4:11-12) and proffer this theological construct as a rationale for the “disciples’” misunderstanding/unbelief. With that, remain Jesus’ nine dialogues with religious authorities. Five of these occupy our attention in ch. 3. Here we observe a playing-out of the assigned script of the exclusion formula among Jesus’ opponents.
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Introduction

The appointed task in the following dissertation is to revisit the oft-overlooked subject of Marcan scriptural hermeneutics. Undoubtedly the topic is a complex and far-reaching one. The scope of our inquiry will thus include but two areas. Firstly, the morphological and interpretative treatment of Marcan references to the OT will be examined, and secondly, the implications of that treatment for the function of Mark's image of the Jew within his gospel. At the outset, we will articulate our thesis as follows. Within the narrative world of the evangelist, the principle opponents of Jesus, that is to say, the "Jews," represent a rhetorical device—a literary construct whose primary function is to exemplify Mark's conception of the non-believer within his community and without. In short, Mark's picture of the "Jew" is nothing other than that of a "man of straw." "Man of straw" notwithstanding, the Marcan "Jew" assumes a significant role within the Marcan proclamation. For this reason, his portrait enlists the support of Sacred Writ. Over the course of our inquiry, we will, so far as it is possible, reconstruct the tradition-history of every text considered. The perceptibility of Mark's conception of the typical unbeliever will thus manifest a direct correlation with the degree of editorial manipulation.

Heretofore the subject of Marcan use of OT text has not received an overabundance of scholarly attention, to say the least. Over the past 40 years, we find the publication of one
comprehensive study. Thus we will consider Suhl first. A brief overview of his treatment of the Marcan exclusion formula serves to shed considerable light on the general thrust of his investigation. In this connection, no authentic dominical utterance underlies the logion of 4:11-12, in Suhl's opinion. What we have here, instead, are the words of Mark himself. Still, the reference to Is 6:9-10 in v. 12 of this passage does not find its origin in Mark himself, says Suhl, but in a "source," viz. a Targum. To what purpose does Mark cull this OT reference? In answer to this question, Suhl states that the OT 'explains the present.' Put differently, the "OT paraphrases" the present or provides a "qualifying description" of it.

Undoubtedly Suhl's investigation affords a number of useful insights. First of all, the evangelist has had a hand in his citations. Indeed the application of OT text in Mark's gospel

---

1 Alfred Suhl, Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1965).
2 Form-critically, the term "formula" denotes a short literary form. Typically a concise phrase or clause, a formula designates or characterizes persons, actions, literary types, and so forth. The Marcan exclusion formula, viz. 4:11-12, serves to distinguish two groups of people within Mark's gospel. On the one hand, the so-called "insiders," i.e. the disciples, receive special explanations of the "mystery of the kingdom." On the other hand, "those outside" receive no such explanations of Jesus' public teaching. In point of fact, Jesus' parabolic--enigmatic/riddling--speech effectively renders his teaching totally incomprehensible to all, even his disciples. The latter individuals are, however, provided the necessary interpretation.
3 Funktion, 151, 157, 158.
4 Ibid., 159.
5 Ibid., 151.
evidences significant freedom. In Suhl's words, "the present is understood from the OT." Secondly, the presence of OT references does not establish the "existence of scripture-proof" in general, let alone "prophecy-proof" in particular--indeed we can envision other purposes. Finally, "[t]he use of scripture [in Mark's gospel] has an independence which needs to be distinguished from the later succession in the scheme of prophecy and fulfilment." The foregoing insights notwithstanding, Suhl's study betrays no fewer than three methodological flaws. In the first place, Suhl traces the saying in question (4:11-12) to Mark himself. At the same time, Suhl does not--mistakenly, we believe--consider Mark an author in his own right, but merely a redactor of a Targum. To our chagrin, we are never told who prepared this

6 Ibid., 159.
7 Ibid., 157-58.
8 Ibid., 158.
9 E.g. typology.
10 Funktion, 160.

The "specific thing or event" (à la Suhl, ibid., 157) wherein an OT text finds its alleged fulfilment would, in our opinion, constitute the difference between Mark's use of the scriptures and that of Matthew, for example. Thus we would endorse W. S. Vorster's observation:

"[Thel particular use of the Old Testament [in Mark's gospel] ... is not the same as in Matthew's account, where the Old Testament is regarded as fulfilled in Christ. In Mark's Gospel, these quotations are part of the narrative statement and are fulfilled within the boundaries of that text"

Targum. Indeed the explanation of Suhl is something of a "pis aller." Thus some "unknown Jew" is supposed to have delivered Mark this particular Targum. Speculation, to be sure!

In order to establish his hypothesis, Suhl cites a deviation of v. 12 (Is 6:9-10) from the LXX. On the one hand, the LXX translators (Is 6:10) employ the verb ἴαμαί (''heal''), notes Suhl, the gospel the verb ἄφιξαι (''forgive''), on the other. However, the verb ἄφιξαι suggests Mark's own redactional activity, not that of an imaginary Targumist. In point of fact, Mark employs this same verb in 3:28. Suhl's recourse to a hypothetical Targumist at this point is anything but a persuasive argument, to say the least.

Secondly, any alterations of an OT text would, for Suhl, signal non-compliance with the scheme of prediction-fulfilment. Significantly, an exceedingly rigorous criterion underlies his definition of prediction-fulfilment. Not only must "the reflection on a necessarily past event ... [establish] the fulfilment of a previously issued prophecy," but "[t]he fulfilling event must [also] correspond to it as closely as possible in order

---

11 Funktion, 149, 150.
12 According to the author, the Targumist substituted the root נוד for מַדַך.
13 Furthermore, Suhl's dubious hypothesis of the evangelist's dependence on a Targum in v. 12 fails to address the use of LXX language in the remainder of the quotation. In this connection, the evangelist employs the conjunction μὴ μοτε as does the the LXX.
14 Suhl, Funktion, 149.
to make the appeal to this one scripture passage conclusive."

This criterion serves to measure Marcan scripture-hermeneutics.

Yet Howard Clark Kee has rightly challenged this definition. That
is to say, Suhl's understanding of prediction-fulfilment, says
Kee, "embodies a simple arithmetic equation of what was predicted
and what in fact occurred." In point of fact, the NT literature
does not evidence "an exact correspondence between these two
factors."

15Ibid., 157, cf. 47, 65, 178.

16"The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in
Mark 11-16", in E. Earle Ellis and Erich Gräber, eds.,
Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70.
Geburtstag (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 177 n. 13.

17Ibid.

Significantly,
"the fulfillment that begins in Jesus is 'contrary to every
Jewish conception,' and the fulfillment is itself 'provisional
and concealed.' It loses its quality as σκάνδαλον only through
knowledge of the promise yet to come'" (W. G. Kümmel, Promise
and Fulfillment [Naperville, 1957], 154, 155, cited in ibid.).

More recently, Vorster who endorses Suhl's aforesaid position
("Function", 65), has written:
"Rather than making use of a hermeneutical framework of promise
and fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New, Mark uses the Old
Testament quotations and allusions in the same way as he does with
narrative commentary to substantiate a particular train of
thought" ("Function", 69).

In our reading, this can be nothing other than promise-fulfilment.
The very next paragraph Vorster says as much himself, in fact:
"The absence of so-called 'formula quotations' in Mark's Gospel
is particularly significant since his text is structured ... by what may be called prediction-fulfilment techniques
(cf. 1:2-3 prediction ——> 1:4ff. fulfilment ... )" (ibid.).

Even Suhl's sympathetic reviewer Herman Mueller nonetheless has to
conclude his article with the following observation:
"To be sure, this distinction between history as prophecy and
fulfilment [sic] and history merely portrayed in OT colors [sic]
is at times very subtle, but valid, although one wonders at times
if one can clearly penetrate the distinction"
(Review of Funktion, by Suhl, CBQ XXVIII (1, January, 1966), 97).
A final criticism of Suhl's method concerns the purview of his investigation in toto. That is to say, Suhl excludes two categories from his study—contacts between Mark and scripture which do not a. reflect a known textual reading, and b. reproduce a known textual sequence. Quite clearly, this particular dictum would impede one's access to important data.¹⁸

In addition to these methodological difficulties, Suhl leaves a number of questions unanswered:
(a) Suhl can define Mark's treatment of OT references in negative terms only, i.e. in terms of what it is not. In our dissertation, we intend to provide an explanation of Mark's use of OT text and demonstrate his reasons for such use;
(b) Suhl identifies the "kerygmatic" function of Mark's OT references but does not consider the Sitz im Leben des Kerygma. Somewhat later in this introduction, we shall address this issue directly; and
(c) Suhl overlooks didactic, apologetic concerns completely.

This shortcoming notwithstanding, Suhl's dictum has had significant influence among European scholars. Thus Joachim Gnilka flatly denies prophecy-fulfilment in Mk 1:2-3 (Suhl, Funktion, 134-37, cited in Das Evangelium nach Markus, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, II, (1st ed.; Köln: Benziger Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978-79), I, 44).

Once again, Pesch, though he does not explicitly deny prophecy-fulfilment, here elects to characterize John's preaching as being 'in accordance with the scriptures'—his bibliography includes Suhl's aforesaid study (see "Anfang des Evangeliums Jesu Christi: Eine Studie zum Prolog des Markusevangeliums [Mk 1:1-15]", in Rudolf Pesch, ed., Das Markus-Evangelium, Wege der Forschung, Vol. CDXI [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1979]).

¹⁸So Kee, "Function", 165 n. 2.
Immediately subsequent to our discussion of difficulty no. "b" we can shed some light on these concerns on the basis of our consideration of the *Sitz im Leben des Kerygma*. The deficiencies of Suhl's investigation of Mark's use of OT material signal the need for additional research in this area. To this extent, the object of our dissertation is to provide a treatment of Marcan scripture-hermeneutics more adequate than Suhl's.

At this point, we consider a more recent study. Craig A. Evans' Ph.D. dissertation of 1983 is aptly entitled "Isaiah 6:9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation."19 His contribution may be summarized as follows. First of all, the Masoretic Text has most likely preserved the original thrust of the oracle. Thus the intention of the Lord was to render the people of ancient Israel obdurate. However, Israel's God could not leave this obduracy unanswered. It demanded divine judgement. Accordingly, the oracle conveys a decidedly damning tone. Yet contributions of deutero- and trito-Isaiah envision the hope of restoration in the judgement. Thus the aim of God's judgement, within the scheme of canonical Isaiah, was to fashion a purged righteous remnant from a sinful people. Thereby, the prophet affirms God's absolute sovereignty.

A number of writers in the NT appear to employ their references to Is 6:9-10 to similar ends. That is to say, Paul, Mark, and John in particular view the Jews' obduracy as an

19 Claremont Graduate School.
outworking of the divine economy. In this connection, Pauline references serve to explain Jewish rejection of the gospel, and that of the Marcan exclusion formula of 4:11-12 the rationale behind Jesus' use of parabolic teaching. The linking of Is 6 and 53 in John's gospel serves to portray Jesus as the exalted, glorified Servant of the Lord. Thus the prophet, at his inaugural vision, had in fact witnessed that same glory of the Johannine Jesus. For Evans, therefore, the oracle of Is 6:9-10 constitutes an important paradigm for the NT writers.

The central focus of Joachim Gnilka in his 1961 monograph is the use and the meaning of Mk 4:11-12; par. and Acts 28:25-28. Of particular import to our inquiry, the Marcan exclusion formula finds its basic significance within the broader framework of the Messianic Secret. The mystery of the kingdom of God is for Mark the person of Jesus Christ. Neither the Jews nor disciples can penetrate this mystery, but each group owes its benightedness to different causes. In connection with the Jews, their misunderstanding finds its origin in their rejection of divine revelation. For the disciples, the problem is an impairment of cognitive faculties. One of the overarching concerns of Mark is to rationalize the rejection of the Messiah Jesus by his

---

21 As we shall see, Gnilka recalls Wrede at this point.
22 Here the evangelist has wittingly or unwittingly inherited an OT concept.
compatriots. To be sure, none of the synoptic gospels reports the logion of Mk 4:11-12; par. in its original context. Originally, a general summary of the Galilaean ministry, this saying indeed represents Jesus' comment on the rejection of his message by the Jews.

Three further contributions warrant our attention. Firstly, there is W. S. Vorster's essay. The substance of the article is a restatement of Suhl's position. In short, Mark's OT references are a linguistic resource for the fashioning of a narrative. However, Siegfried Schulz in 1961 basically developed a proposition of the form critics. Thus the kerygma of primitive Christianity (in substance Phil 2:6ff.) engendered the writing of Mark's gospel. The achievement of the evangelist entailed two aspects: (a) the integration of the Hellenistic kerygma into the Jesus tradition; and (b) a criticism of the Pharisaic application of the Law specifically and the OT generally. Unfortunately a factual interpretation of the Marcan "Jew" and the "anti-Jewish" posture of the evangelist's story not only raises an historical problem to which we plan to direct our attention below, but it also engenders a serious misunderstanding of the purpose of Mark's use of his OT references. Finally, we cite M. D. Hooker's study:

---

23 Here again, Gnilka recalls Wrede's earlier research.
24 Indeed this assessment of the saying resembles that of Vincent Taylor. In our Excursus of ch. 1, we shall argue the untenability of this claim.
25 See above p. 3 n. 10.
"The Old Testament in the New Testament: Mark." In her survey of Marcan references to the Torah, she sees the conflicts between Mark's Jesus and the Jews as evidence of later debates between the church and the synagogue. Indeed our response to Schulz' view finds equal validity here.

The misconceptions and omissions of earlier studies notwithstanding, can we determine the intended readership of the Marcan proclamation, within certain definable limits? Let us briefly examine the controversy about what renders a man unclean in 7:1-23. A nucleus of this pericope might, speculates Hooker, find its origin within the context of the ministry of Jesus. Little if any evidence exists to support claims of this kind. No doubt we can identify and excise elements of redactional overlay. Ernest Best, for example, cites vv. 1, 9, 14 and 17 as "Marcan seams" and vv. 3-4 as "Marcan explanations." With that, Best, in line with Hooker, speculates that '7:1ff. is a genuine argument' wherein 'Jesus endeavours to win over his opponents.'


29 We would add the parenthesis of v. 11.


31 Ibid., 39.
Yet the inflammatory tone of Jesus' comments renders such a verdict untenable. To see this, we need only consider the denigration of the "teaching of the elders" (v. 3) as the "tradition of men" (v. 8) and indeed the radical break with Jewish Law (v. 15). The well-known adage makes the point admirably: "one attracts more flies with honey than vinegar." The 'vinegar-like' inflammatory nature of the comments made within this pericope, if Jesus had ever in fact made them, would of course, preclude any constructive dialogue between Christians and Jews as a more likely context for such an exchange, despite Best's reconstruction. Furthermore, the report of the Corban practice (vv. 11-12) does not truly reflect what transpired within contemporary Judaism. In and of itself, this consideration in turn would preclude discussion amongst Jewish Christians about the admission of Gentiles into the church.

---

32 Cf. Hooker, Mark, 174: strangely enough, she considers "much of this material" "likely to have been used in arguments between Jews and Christians in the period between Jesus and Mark." The question which the scribes put to Jesus in v. 1 concerns not the behaviour of him, but that of his disciples (ibid.). With that Hooker appears to find her corroborating evidence.

33 Admittedly the traditions of the rabbis did not assume their extant written form until the fourth century A.D. At the same time, little reason exists to assume any radical discontinuity with earlier custom.

In light of these observations, must we then limit Mark's intended readership to Christians of non-Jewish background? Not necessarily. The evangelist himself either knows little about institutional Judaism or he is deliberately misrepresenting it. In that case, the community whom Mark is addressing comprises one or both of two groups of individuals: (a) persons who themselves possess little or no knowledge of institutional Judaism—most likely, but not necessarily, they would represent individuals of non-Jewish background; or (b) persons who are conversant with institutional Judaism, but who harbour little or no reservation in regard to the Marcan caricature—once again, most likely, but not necessarily, they would represent individuals of non-Jewish background. If persons of Jewish background did in fact form part of the evangelist's intended readership, they must have represented a constituency which, for whatever reasons, was voluntarily or involuntarily alienated from the teachings and ordinances of its socio-religious rootage.

The foregoing delimitation of the demographic parameters of the Second Gospel permits but one evaluation of the evangelist's depiction of Jesus' principle adversaries. That is to say, the Jewish people, their religious leaders in particular, are a theological construct, a Christian stereotype with a definite hermeneutical function. The Marcan Jew represents the typical infidel. For the evangelist, "Jew" has become a byword for

"others" in 12:9 confirms Best's conclusions beyond any shadow of a doubt.
unbelief. The choice of the Jews as a stereotype does not of necessity imply any real antipathy toward Jewish people per se, but rather a recognition of the dictates of political expediency. A group of people who were virtually out of the picture would have been the only politically acceptable choice for such a role. The Jewish people would have met this requirement admirably. In point of fact, the Jews of the pre-Marcan tradition already bore the indelible stamp of opposition to the mission of Jesus. No doubt, such a consideration would have influenced Mark's choice of a stereotype, as well. To borrow the words of John C. Hurd, then, the narrative world of the evangelist is so fashioned that for Mark "Judaism neither hears what God is saying nor does it speak correctly about him."35

The aforesaid portrayal of the Jews of Jesus' particular day represents a distinctly Marcan contribution in two respects—the heightened causticity of its criticism on the one hand and, on the other, the greater precision of its application. Those passages which contain references to OT texts serve to throw this Marcan tendenz into sharp relief. This should hardly surprise us. An appeal to the Bible of early Christianity, viz. the Jewish scriptures, would certainly lend some additional credibility to the Marcan profile of the typical non-believer.

A brief comparative overview of two pericopae--12:18-27 and

---

12:35–37—will demonstrate the heightened causticity with which various criticisms are levelled at the Marcan Jew. The discussion about the resurrection (12:18–27) manifests a proportionally high number of redactional features. On this occasion, the Sadducees attempt to embarrass Jesus with a trick question. The reply of Jesus comprises three components: (a) the ascription of an error in judgement to the Sadducees, the root of which is their alleged ignorance of the scriptures (v. 24); (b) the quotation from Ex 3:6 (v. 26) attended with an exposition (v. 27a); and (c) a more emphatic reiteration of the former refutation of the Sadducees as "quite wrong" (v. 27b). On no account can we miss the condemnatory tone.

By contrast, the discussion about the scribes' teaching as to the Davidic sonship of the Messiah (12:35–37) conveys the impression of a manifestly different disposition on Jesus' part. Accordingly, this second pericope evidences proportionately less redactional handling. This time the occasion of the discussion is Jesus' own query after the rationale behind the teaching of the scribes (v. 35). Immediately thereafter he cites Ps 100:1 (v. 36) and he reiterates his initial question (v. 37). The academic

---


37 Further to this, see e.g. Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 87, 93, 105, 124, 126 and 132; and Pryke Redactional Style, 24, 37 incl. n. 1 and 126–28.
Tenor of Jesus' speech in this passage sharply contrasts the condemnatory thrust of his speech in the former (12:18-27). 38

A brief summary of our treatment of the parable of the Wicked Tenants in 12:1-12 serves to demonstrate the second aspect of Mark's contribution, viz. the greater precision of application of pre-existing anti-Jewish criticism. The pre-Marcan tradition as we are able to reconstruct it, attests a decisive and all encompassing condemnation of the nation of Israel. An allegorical presentation of salvation-history, the parable in question depicts God's erstwhile chosen people as a recalcitrant lot. That is, they consistently fail to heed the admonition of God and proceed to mistreat all of his emissaries. As a consequence, they incur the wrath of God. Presumably, this divine judgement encompasses leader and commonfolk alike. Subsequent emendation of the text by the evangelist has, however, effected a narrowing of the purview of this judgement. Thus the leaders of the nation now bear sole responsibility for the rejection of ancient Israel. The selection of the pericope and the reshaping of the text can only supplement the Marcan portrayal of the basic incorrigibility of the nation's leaders.

The application of the Jewish scriptures in Mark's gospel affords us a field for critical investigation. However, this particular field entails difficulties of two kinds. In the first

---

38 A respective comparison between 7:1-23 and 2:23-28, and between 10:2-10 and 10:17-22 provides further documentation of this development. In ch. 3, however, we will give these pericopae intensive examination.
instance, could we investigate all the OT references? The scope of such a task would clearly exceed the normal limits of a dissertation. On the one hand, the Gospel of Mark is a document of considerable magnitude, comprising sixteen chapters. On the other hand, the collection of works comprising the canonical scriptures, which Mark is alleged to have employed, is a corpus of much greater magnitude, the more so should we include the "extra" books of the Greek OT. Moreover, a number of authorities have already applied their exegetical skills to the use of scripture in chapters 14 to 16—the Passion Narrative.\(^{39}\) In view of these considerations, the purview of our investigation will not include any OT references in these final chapters. However, this caveat would still leave us with a formidable undertaking. A cursory review of any scholarly edition of the Marcan text\(^{40}\) will convince the reader of the enormity of the task of treating every reference to the OT in this 'introduction to the story of the Passion.'\(^{41}\)

Yet Vorster has made this observation:

> It is not necessary to treat every allusion in [Mark's] gospel ... to show how Mark used the Old Testament in


\(^{41}\)À la Martin Kähler: see Summary and Conclusion p. 474 n. 1357.
order to get his story told.\textsuperscript{42}

Clearly the goal of our examination is not the same as that of
Vorster's. Nonetheless, his comment finds ready application here.
With a view to maintaining the manageability of our task, our list
of passages for in-depth examination will thus include the
following: 2:23-28; 7:1-23; 10:2-10; 10:17-22; and 12:1-12 in
ch. 3.\textsuperscript{43} in addition, of course, to our Test Cases of ch. 2,
viz. 4:11-12/8:17b, 18a and 1:2-3.\textsuperscript{44}

Secondly, our investigation of the use of sacred text by
the evangelist will require an understanding of the difficulties
associated with any line of inquiry of this nature. The areas of
concern include: 1. classification of types of scripture
reference; 2. manuscript tradition of OT passages used by the
evangelist; 3. literary applications of the OT in the NT; and
4. separation of Marcan redaction and pre-Marcan tradition. Such
considerations require extensive treatment. In line with this
brief introduction, we will now direct our attention to the
details and develop our thesis step by step.

\textsuperscript{42}"Function", 71.
\textsuperscript{44}4:11-12 pp. 120-84; 8:17b, 18a pp. 185-223; and 1:2-3 pp. 224-45.
Chapter One

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Classification of Types of Scripture Reference

Those scholars who have detected evidence of the influence of OT texts in various contexts of the NT generally assign it to three different categories, viz. quotation (or citation), allusion and reminiscence. The identification of a passage as a quotation presupposes a significant degree of verbal contact between that passage and the source from which it is said to be a quotation. Quotations may be formal or informal. A formal quotation of scripture includes some kind of citation formula; an informal quotation does not include a citation formula. For example,


46 See Hühn, Alttestamentliche Citate, xi; cf. Swete, OT in Greek, 381-82.
Mk 12:36 is a formal citation of Ps. 110:1 (LXX). The NT reads:

αὐτὸς Δαυίδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ.

eἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου.

κάθοι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,

ἐὼς ἄν θῶ τοὺς ἐκθρούς ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου.

The LXX Version reads:

Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου

κάθοι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,

ἐὼς ἄν θῶ τοὺς ἐκθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. 47

What we find in 1 Pet 4:18, however, is an informal citation of Prov 11:31 (LXX). The NT reads:

καὶ εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σφέτεται,

ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται;

The LXX Version reads:

eἰ ὁ μὲν δίκαιος μόλις σφέτεται,

ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται;

An allusion is somewhat different. The degree of verbal correspondence between a given passage and the source to which it is said to allude is somewhat less than that of a quotation and may, in fact, be virtually absent. 48 Here again allusions may be formal or informal. A formal allusion to scripture includes some kind of introductory formula; an informal allusion includes no


introductory formula. For example, Mk 2:25-26 is a formal allusion to 1 Sam 21:1-6. The NT reads:

25. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς·
oûdēpote ἀνέγνωτει ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ
ὅτε χρείαν ἔσχεν καὶ ἐπείνασεν αὐτός καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ,

26. πῶς εἰσήλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθάρ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τοὺς ἀρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν,
oûς οὔκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἱερεῖς,
καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ οὔσιν;

The parable of the Wicked Tenants in Mk 12:1-9 contains a number of informal allusions to Is 5:1-7. The one which is most obvious is ἀμπελών ("vineyard") as a metaphor for Israel.

Since the degree of verbal correspondence between a text and its alleged source or sources is less than that of a quotation it is sometimes difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain which of several possible sources were used. The text of either Jer 5:21 or Ezek 12:2 could, for example, be that from which Mk 8:18a has been derived.

Mk 8:18a:

ὁπάλμως ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε
καὶ ἔτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε;

The LXX Version reads thus for Jer 5:21:

ὁπάλμοι αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν,
ὅτα αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐκ ἀκούουσιν.

The LXX Version reads thus for Ezek 12:2:

οὐ ἔχοντες οὕτως ἰδεῖτε
καὶ ὅτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε;

The terms quotation and allusion both denote conscious deliberate use of external documents. This, of course, would have to be established from the context. Yet one has to exercise caution here. Firstly, verbal correspondence between earlier and later compositions in and of itself is not a sufficient condition to establish a direct literary relationship between them. The story of the death of John the Baptist (Mk 6:14-29; par.) is a case in point. The episode involving the daughter of Herodias could, as J. Frank Kermode contends, betray a drawing upon the Book of Esther by Mark.\footnote{In fact, Kermode claims that "Mark knew [the Book of Esther] well" (The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative [Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1979], 133); The following authorities list this reference also: The Greek New Testament, ed. Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger and Allen Wikgren in co-operation with the Institute for New Testament Textual Research (2nd ed.; New York: American Bible Society; London: British and Foreign Bible Society; Edinburgh: National Bible Society of Scotland; Amsterdam: Netherlands Bible Society; Stuttgart: Württemberg Bible Society, 1966, 1968 printing); Die Heilige Schrift des Alten und des Neuen Testaments (Zürich: Verlag der Züricher Bibel, 1971); Hühn, Alttestamentliche Citate; Johann Perk, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament: Alttestamentliche Parallelen (Angermund: Verlag "Der Pflug" Julius Nüttgens, 1947); Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Parallel passages of the non-canonical gospels and applications of the Fathers ed. Kurt Aland (11th ed. adapted to the text of the 26th ed. of Nestle-Aland and the 3rd ed. of Greek New Testament; Stuttgart:} A dance performed by the girl so pleases
Herod Antipas that he makes her a rash promise (6:22b-23). Queen Esther, having made a favourable impression, prompts a similar promise from King Ahasuerus (Est 5:3,6; 7:2). Verbal contacts are readily apparent. The NT reads:

εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ
αἰτήσον με δὰ εἶναι θέλης, καὶ δώσω σοι.
καὶ ὅμοσεν αὐτῇ [πολλά]
ὁ τι ἔναν με αἰτήσῃς δῶσω σοι
ἐὼς ἡμέρας τῆς βασιλείας μου.

The LXX in Est 5:3 reads:

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς
Τί θέλεις, Εσθήρ, καὶ τί σοῦ ἐστιν τὸ ἄξίωμα;
ἐὼς τοῦ ἡμέρας τῆς βασιλείας μου
καὶ ἔσται σοι.

The verbal similarity between the two passages notwithstanding, in terms of its theological content the similarity is hardly striking. The content having derived from ordinary life, it is difficult to establish that we have here an intentional use of an OT text.

Secondly, a demonstration of literary dependence per se does not establish conscious use of source material. Anthological use of scripture is a case in point. Daniel Patte writes:

An inspired and faithful Jew, the Apocalyptist was nourished by Scripture. He was impregnated by Scripture, he meditated [on] it day and night (Deut. 6:7). His inspired message appears therefore as a 'mosaic' of biblical phrases and allusions. As said,

Deutsche Bibelstiftung, n.d.)

51 So Hooker, "OT in NT: Mark", 224.
we call the amalgamation of biblical phrases to express
a new inspired message, an *anthological* use of
scripture.

Patte, of course, is discussing Jewish apocalyptic writings. Yet
any writer who owned the Jewish scriptures as his sacred text,
regardless of his cultural or ethnic background, could conceivably
have so steeped himself in them that their idiom became a part of
his mental equipment. At times the works of a writer such as this
might well be literally shot through with reminiscences to, and
apparent allusions to the OT.

Reminiscences of OT texts constitute a different phenomenon
altogether. A reading of a passage in the NT simply reminds a
given reader of another passage in the OT. The identification of
reminiscences would therefore involve an element of subjectivity.
A look at Mk 12:41 will illustrate precisely what we mean. Jesus
watches as the multitudes deposit their offering money into the
temple treasury. The verse itself stands within the pericope
wherein the widow's two-copper-coin offering elicits the
commendation of Jesus. Several compilers of OT references in the
NT record for this verse a reference to 2 Kg 12:9. This passage
contains an account of the preparation of an offering chest by the
priest Jehoiada. While the Marcan text contains a reference to a

---

52 *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*, Dissertation Series,
No. 22 (n. p.: Society of Biblical Literature; Missoula, Mont.:

53 *Greek NT, Heilige Schrift, Hühn, Alttestamentliche Citate; Perk, Handbuch zum NT, Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. The LXX Version
(4 Kg 12:9) reads:

Καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἰωδαὲ ὁ ἵερεὺς κιβωτὸν μίαν, καὶ ἔτρησε πρώγην ἐπὶ
τῆς σανίδος αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔδακεν αὐτὴν παρὰ ἀμμαξατὶ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ
ἀνδρὸς οἰκοῦ κυρίου. καὶ ἔδωκαν οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ φυλάσσοντες τὸν
σταθμὸν πᾶν τὸ ἀργύριον τὸ εὐρεθὲν ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου.
temple furnishing whose origin is explained in Second Kings, the points of contact between the text both in terms of vocabulary and substance are minimal. That we have in Mk 12:41 a conscious use of 2 Kg 12:9 is, in the mind of the present writer, not altogether certain.

Reminiscences of texts in the OT may or may not, therefore be literary phenomena of genuine theological import. Indeed Alfred Suhl offers this caution:

Thus one should speak of references to specific OT passages only if a characteristic sequence of similar words clearly establishes the relationship, or if--in a merely remote "harmony"--the striking formulation and its syntactical position emphasises the distinctive function of these words (translation ours). 54

Those reminiscences which scholars have detected in Mark's gospel will be recorded in an appendix along with bona fide scriptural references. However, they do not lie within the scope of this dissertation.

Brian McHale has proposed a progressive scale wherein he describes the various ways in which oral communication is represented in text. The phenomenon with which we are concerned is different from that investigated by McHale in one important respect--it relates not to oral communication, but rather to text as it is represented in text. Still, the two phenomena possess many features in common. Thus the results of McHale's study

54 *Funktion*, 158. The German text reads: "Von Bezugnahmen auf bestimmte atl. Stellen sollte man also nur dann reden, wenn eine charakteristische Folge gleicher Worte die Beziehung eindeutig herstellt oder--bei einem nur entfernten 'Gleichklang'--die auffällige Formulierung und syntaktische Stellung im neuen Zusammenhang auf die besondere Funktion dieser Worte hinweist."
constitute a useful point of departure. These results we reproduce below substantially intact. However, examples from the NT--Mark's gospel in particular--have been selected wherever possible and substituted for those selected by McHale from Dos Passo's trilogy, *U.S.A.* (1938).

i. **Diegetic Summary**

This type of text representation is "submerged" text, the bare report that a written communication has occurred, without any specification of what was said or how it was said. Reported text of this type is on the same level as the report of any non-verbal event. Properly speaking, no reference to scripture is admissible according to this particular definition. To make any mention of the scriptures whatsoever is to specify the content of a written communication. Yet within the context of the bare reference to the scriptures, we cite Lk 24:32:

> καὶ εἴπαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους·
> οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη ἢν ἐν ἡμῖν
> ὡς ἔλαλεν ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ,
> ὡς διηνοιγεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφὰς;

ii. **Summary, Less "Purely" Diegetic**

This type of text representation is summary which to some degree represents, and not merely mentions a written communication insofar as the topics of the communication are specified. We cite Mk 1:44:

> καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ·

---


iii. **Indirect Content-paraphrase**
This type of text presentation corresponds to the common characterization of indirect reporting as paraphrase of the content of a written communication without regard to the style or form of the supposed "original" text. We cite Mk 2:25-26. 56

iv. **Indirect Reporting, Mimetic to Some Degree**
This type of text presentation is a form of indirect reporting which creates the illusion of "preserving" or "reproducing" aspects of the style of a text, above and beyond the mere report of its content. We cite Mk 12:32-33:

32. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματεὺς·
καλῶς, διδάσκαλε, ἐπὶ ἀληθείας εἶπες
ὅτι εἰς ἑστὶν καὶ οὐκ ἑστὶν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ.

33. καὶ τὸ ἄγαπᾶν αὐτὸν
ἐξ ὄλης τῆς καρδίας
καὶ ἐξ ὄλης τῆς συνέσεως
καὶ ἐξ ὄλης τῆς ἴσχύος
καὶ τὸ ἄγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν
περισσότερον ἑστὶν πάντων τῶν ὀλοκληρωμάτων
καὶ θυσιῶν.

---

56The text, along with its OT cross reference, is already cited on p. 20 above as an instance of "formal allusion."
The LXX in Dt 6:4-5 reads:

4. Ἄκουε Ἰσραήλ· κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἰς ἐστίν.
5. καὶ ἀγαπησεις κύριον τὸν θεὸν σου
   ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδιᾶς σου
   καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου
   καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεως σου. \textsuperscript{57}

v. Free Indirect Reporting

This type of text presentation is not only grammatically, but mimetically intermediate between indirect and direct reporting. Free indirect reporting may, in fact, be mimetic to almost any degree short of "pure" mimesis. We cite Mk 4:11-12:

11. καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς:
    ὤμων τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῇς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ·
    ἐκεῖνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται,

12. Ἕνα βλέποντες βλέψασιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν,
    καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούσασιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν,
    μήποτε ἔπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.

The LXX in Is 6:9-10 reads:

9. Καὶ εἶπεν
   Πορεύθητι καὶ εἰπὼν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ
    Ἁκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνήτε
    καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε.

10. ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου,

\textsuperscript{57} The verbal contacts which are indicated here are those which exist between Mk 12:32-33 and Dt 6:4-5. However, verbal contacts of the same kind can be detected in Mk 12:33—noteworthy are the injunction to love one’s neighbour (cf. Lev 19:18) and the statement about the place of sacrifice (cf. 1 Sam 15:22).
vi. Direct Reporting

This type of text presentation is the most purely mimetic type of report. The "purity" of this kind of report is an "illusion" insofar as it applies to oral communication. However, literature of all kinds may contain verbatim citations of text. We cite Mk 7:6-7:

6. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἡσαΐας περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν,
ὡς γέγραπται (ὅτι)
οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσιν με τιμᾷ,
ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

7. μάτιν δὲ σέβονταί με
διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.

The LXX in Is 29:13 reads:

Καὶ εἶπε κύριος

'Ἐγγίζει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσιν με,'

---

58 According to McHale, "all novelistic dialogue is conventionalized or stylized to some degree. Straightforward transcription would be intolerable in a novel, since 'normal non-fluency' of ordinary speech has the appearance of illiteracy in print" ("Free Indirect Discourse", 259). A cursory reading of Hansard would confirm the veracity of this statement.
vii. Free Direct Reporting

This type of text presentation is normal direct reporting stripped of its conventional orthographic cues. The presentation of Prov 11:31 (LXX) in 1 Pet 4:18 is a case of free direct reporting.\(^{59}\)

The foregoing typology is certainly not exhaustive. McHale himself acknowledges the fact. What we have here is "a convenient partitioning of the continuum. Other categories could be introduced to capture transitional and mixed forms."\(^{60}\) However, an application of the system of classification advanced by McHale to the use of the OT in NT writings would indeed represent a refinement over the more traditional practice of labelling conscious use of OT material as either citation (or quotation) and allusion. The third category, viz. "reminiscence," has, however, no counterpart in McHale's typology.

The application of McHale's system of classification to the various usages of the OT in Mark's gospel yields an array of texts which B. H. Swete would designate either as "passages formally cited" or, by inference, as passages not formally cited. These include: (a) "those which are cited with an introductory formula;" and (b) "those, which not announced by a formula, appear

---

\(^{59}\) The text, along with its OT cross-reference, is already cited on p. 19 above as an instance of "informal citation."

\(^{60}\) "Free Indirect Discourse", 260.
from the context to be intended as quotations, or agree verbatim with some context in the OT.\textsuperscript{61} We mention this fact so as to recognise both explicit and implicit uses of the Jewish scriptures.

One final observation is worthy of mention. Some references to the scriptures in Mark represent a conflation of two or more OT texts. We note, for example, Mk 1:2-3:

Mk 1:2b

\begin{verbatim}
idou apostello ton angelon mou
pro prophou sou ...
\end{verbatim}

The LXX in Ex 23:20aa reads:

\begin{verbatim}
kai idou ev apostello ton angelon mou
pro prophou sou ...
\end{verbatim}

The LXX in Mal 3:1aa reads:

\begin{verbatim}
idou ev exapostello ton angelon mou ...
\end{verbatim}

Mk 1:2c

\begin{verbatim}

\end{verbatim}

The LXX in Mal 3:1ab reads:

\begin{verbatim}

\end{verbatim}

The LXX in Ex 23:20ab reads:

\begin{verbatim}

\end{verbatim}

The second half of the citation is a near-verbatim quotation of Is 40:3.

\textsuperscript{61}Swete, \textit{OT in Greek}, 381-82.
Mk 1:3

φωνή βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ,
ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου,
εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ,

The LXX in Is 40:3 reads:

φωνή βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου,
εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

The person or persons responsible for assembling this composite citation has attributed the material derived from three different books of the OT all to Isaiah.
1.2 Manuscript Tradition of OT Passages Used by the Evangelist

A complete investigation of the manner in which a writer has made use of earlier literary sources would ideally require a knowledge of the texts and versions of those literary sources which were available to him. This piece of information would afford some standard for comparison. However, this information may be virtually beyond recovery. On the one hand, extant texts and versions may or may not have preserved certain readings which were contained in earlier manuscripts. The relationship between the Septuagint Version and the Masoretic Text is an illustration of what we mean by this. No official text of the Hebrew Bible enjoyed undisputed authority during the first century A.D. Nor did the NT writers in fact recognise one. Yet a thorough revision of the Hebrew Bible, presumably under the official direction of the Jewish authorities, must have taken place at some time between the completion of the LXX (third century B.C.) and the work of Aquila (early second century A.D.). The text of the Hebrew Bible has undergone virtually no change since that time. However, the LXX, in reality representing a series of versions rather than a single version, comprises an assortment of variant readings which in turn presuppose a plurality of Hebrew archetypes.

---

62 Ibid., 439.
63 Ibid., 320, 439-40.
64 Ibid., 319.
65 Ibid., 315, 441. A discussion of the major recensions of the LXX is provided on pp. 59-86, and on pp. 442-44 a list of passages in which the LXX reflects a Hebrew text different from the MT.
On the other hand, some references to the Jewish scriptures
do not appear to derive from the MT or any of the extant versions.
The Marcan parable theory is a case in point. Here in Mk 4:12 the
evangelist gives a Greek paraphrase of Is. 6:9-10:

\[\text{ἐναβλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἱδώσιν,}
καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούσωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιδίσων,}
μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.\]

The MT reads:
\[
\begin{align*}
a & \quad \text{ךָנְיָרֵךְ אֶלֶף לֵאמְךָ לָעֵם הָוהָה} \\
ab & \quad \text{שֶׁמֶעָ תַּמָּךְ אֶלֶף-שֶׁבִּינוֹ} \\
bβ & \quad \text{זָהָי לְאֶלֶף-מִטְעָה} \\
aα & \quad \text{כָּפֵי לָעֵם הָוהָה} \\
aβ & \quad \text{כָּפְיָה בָּשָׁם} \\
b & \quad \text{לַשָּׁם בָּשָׁם} \\
\end{align*}
\]

66 The Hebrew text of passages cited in this dissertation is that of
Biblia Hebraica, ed. Rudolf Kittel (Stuttgart: Württembergische
Bibelanstalt, 1937 [1962 printing]).

The RSV reads:
9. And he said, "Go and say to this people:
'Mhear and hear, but do not understand;
see and see, but do not perceive,'

10. Make the heart of this people fat,
and their ears heavy,
and shut their eyes;
lest they see with their eyes,
and hear with their ears,
and understand with their hearts,
and turn and be healed."

English translations, unless otherwise specified, are taken from
the Revised Standard Version of the Bible copyright 1946, 1952 and
1971 by the Division of Christian Education of the National
Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.
The LXX reads:

9. καὶ εἶπεν,

Πορεύθητι καὶ εἶπον τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ a
"Ακοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνητε bα
καὶ βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ έδητε bβ

10. ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδιὰ τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, aa
καὶ τοὺς ὄσιν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἠκουσαν ab
καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν,
aβ
μήποτε ἵδωσιν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς kα
καὶ τοὺς ὄσιν ἀκούσωσιν
καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνώσιν
καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτοῖς.67 b

Finally, Matthew Black’s translation of the Aramaic Targum reads:

9. And he said, “Go and speak to this people, a
who hear indeed but do not understand, ba
and see indeed but do not know. bβ

10. Gross is the mind of this people, aa
and its ears has it made heavy, aβ
and its eyes has it blinded,
lest they should see with their eyes
and with their ears should hear
and with their mind should understand,
and repent and obtain forgiveness.”68 b

The Hebrew text and the versions of Is 6:9-10 manifest some

67 The LXX translated reads:
9. And he said, "Go and say to this people:
'You shall hear indeed but not understand,
and you shall see indeed, but not perceive.'
10. for the heart of this people has become dull
and they have been hard of hearing
and they have closed their eyes,
lest they should see with the eyes
and hear with the ears
and understand with the heart
and be converted and I should heal them" (translation ours).

interesting relationships with the text of Mk 4:12.

The reading of Is 6:9-10 provided in the Targum affords the greatest number of verbal contacts with Mk 4:12. We note regarding Mk 4:12a (Is 9:6b): (a) the verbs in the Hebrew and LXX texts occur in the second person, but those in Mark and the Targum occur in the third; and (b) a participial equivalent to the participle ἀκοῦοντες in Mark appears only in the Targum. We note regarding Mk 4:12b (Is 6:10): (a) the verb "heal" is employed in the Hebrew (נָחַל) and LXX (ἰάσομαι) texts, but the verb "forgive" is employed in Mark (ἀφίημι) and the Targum; and (b) the direct use of the divine name is implied by the active voice in the Hebrew (לִשְׁכָּח) and LXX (καὶ ἱάσομαι αὐτοῖς) texts, but the direct use of the divine name is avoided by the use of the

---

71 T. W. Manson, Teaching of Jesus, 77. In connection with the Marcan reading καὶ ἀφεθῆ αὐτοῖς, M. Black writes: "No such Greek reading ever existed, for it is not a variant but a characteristic Targumic paraphrase of Hebrew rapha' peculiar to the Targum of Isaiah; it occurs again as a paraphrase of the same verb in liii. 5, lvii. 18" (Black, Aramaic Approach, 156). Still, this use of the idiom ἀφεθή αὐτοῖς in Mk 4:12 is less significant than one may be led to believe. It also occurs in 3:28: πάντα ἀφεθῆσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Moreover, the verb ἀφίημι is used elsewhere in the sense of "forgive" (see 2:5, 9). Clearly, we are not dealing with language which is atypical of Mark (the occurrence of the verb in 1:18 and 20 is also noteworthy; however, it carries the sense of "leave" in these verses).
passive voice in Mark (καὶ ἄφεσθαι αὐτοῖς) and the Targum.\textsuperscript{72}

The Targumist has introduced structural changes. Firstly, the secondary quotation of v. 9b, which occurs as an imperative statement in the MT (כַּשְׁמַע שֵׁם נֵבֶר וּמְאֹד לַאֶל-חָיבה), has now assumed in the Targum the form of a relative clause ("who hear indeed but do not understand, and see indeed but do not know"). Secondly, the imperative statement reported at v. 10a in the MT (כַּשְׁמַע לָבֵן שֵׁם נַה הָאָמְרוּ נְבֶרְוֹ יִשְׁמַע לָפֵינוֹ) has been recast in the Targum in the form of an indicative one ("Gross is the mind of this people, and its ears has it made heavy, and its eyes has it blinded"). The one alteration is complemented by the other. Clearly the theological motive here was to mitigate the predestinarian thrust of the Hebrew text. The author of the people's rejection is no longer God but the people itself.

So also does the LXX Version manifest structural changes. Firstly, the secondary quotation in v. 9b has now assumed the form of a predictive statement.

'Ἀκοῦ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνήτε
καὶ βλέπετες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἰδητε.

Secondly, the imperative statement reported in v. 10a has been recast in the form of a causal clause.

\textsuperscript{72}Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 15. Jeremias also rightly makes this observation: the recipient of the healing occurs in the singular in the Hebrew text, but the recipient of the forgiveness occurs in the plural in Mark and the Targum. However, this is offset by the fact that the recipient of the healing occurs in the plural in the LXX. Jeremias omits to mention this.

\textsuperscript{73}The imperative statement quoted secondarily in the underlying Hebrew text appears to be a characterization of the people's unresponsiveness in the form of a taunt.
The first alteration is, as in the Targum, complimented by the second. These alterations, like those effected by the Targumist, serve to attenuate the theological difficulty presented by the original text.

The form of the hardening command as it stands in the extant Marcan text represents that of a conflation of Is 6:9b and the terminal "lest"-clause of Is 6:10. A further alteration of Isaiah which is noteworthy is the transposition of vv. 9ba and 9bβ in Mk 4:12a.

The conception of parable as a means of confounding the listener, in the opinion of T. W. Manson, begs the inclusion of Is 6:10a, assuming that Mark had understood these clauses as did the original Hebrew writer: 74

Make the heart of this people fat, and their ears heavy, and shut their eyes: (lest) they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart,

The omission of the foregoing material in the Marcan paraphrase might at first suggest that the evangelist was not acquainted with a complete reading of Is 6:9-10. Be that as it may, Black has, in our opinion, explained the omission of v. 10a quite adequately. That is to say, it "enable[s] the writer, by his adapted μὴ ποτὲ [sic] clause, to complete the main thought of the ἵνα clause, that

74 Teaching of Jesus, 78.
the purpose of the parabolic teaching was to prevent repentance."\(^75\)

However, direction of literary dependence is not a readily ascertainable datum. The import of the Marcan text more closely approximates that of the MT than it does that of the LXX or the Targum. Yet the closer verbal contacts between the Marcan and Targumic versions would suggest that there exists here a literary relationship between the two compositions.\(^76\) Neither of these

---

\(^75\) Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 155-56.


"The paraphrase of Isa 6:9-10 in Mark 4:12 probably betrays acquaintance with the Aramaic version, but it is going too far to say that Mark's version is dependent on it" ("The Function of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Mark and John", *NovTest* XXIV [2, 1982], 132). The fact that Mk 4:12 manifests literary links with the Targum does not dissuade Lambrecht from labelling this verse a "free quotation of Is., VI, 9." To the evangelist he would attribute the following: the abbreviation of the citation (i.e. the conflation of Is 6:9 with the terminal clause of v. 10), the transposition of the seeing- and hearing-clauses, the conjunction μὴ προέτεινε, and perhaps some connection with the "unforgivable sin" in Mk 3:28-29 on the basis of the verb ἀφίησε (*Redaction and Theology*, 284). Dismissing Lambrecht's proposal as "less than convincing," Bernard Brandon Scott entertains the possibility that Mk 4:12 was perhaps an "early Christian proof-text." In support of this, Scott notes the use of Is 6:9-10 in Acts 28:26-27 and Jn 12:40 in addition to the verbal contacts with the Targum (*Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* [Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1989], 24). Regarding the former, Lambrecht rightly asks: "[D]oes this apply to the time before Mark?" (*Redaction and Theology*, 284). Regarding the latter, one does well to heed the caution of John Terence Forestell who makes this observation:
alternatives have gained unanimous support among scholars. Heinz O. Guenther writes:

There is an appreciable degree of ecumenical consensus today to the effect that the synoptic gospels, including the Sayings Gospel Q, are not translations from either Hebrew or Aramaic but are rather from the first Greek compositions.

That the MT, the LXX and the Targums manifest a number of significant variations demonstrates that within Jewish literature a certain freedom was exercised in the reproduction of texts. Despite his obvious reference to the OT, Mark also employed the Isaiah passage in service of his own vision. The search for Mark's source has, if that be our primary objective, proven in this case quite futile. What we have been able to demonstrate rather clearly, however, is the significance Is 6:9-10 held for both the Targumists and Mark. Clearly, neither Christianity nor Judaism evidences mechanical transmission of its

"There certainly was an oral targumic [sic] tradition in first century Palestine. Such a tradition would be commonly known to all Jews who frequented the synagogue. It is still a matter of conjecture to what extent this oral tradition was already committed to writing in the pre-Christian era" (Targumic Traditions and the New Testament: An Annotated Bibliography with a New Testament Index, Society of Biblical Literature, Aramaic Studies, No. 4 [Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1979], 3).

Heinz Otto Guenther, "Greek: Home of Primitive Christianity", TJT V (2, Fall, 1989), 248-49. For a list of scholars who hold this view see ibid., 269 n. 11. Still, E. J. Pryke believes that Mark translated his material from Aramaic sources (Redactional Style, 29, cf. 8) and Suhl argues that the evangelist 'at least knew the Hebrew language' (Funktion, 151 n. 306).
A charge laid by Christians that the Jews had falsified their Hebrew manuscripts presupposes a certain degree of freedom in the reproduction of texts within mainline Judaism. The general sense of the Marcan parable theory does, in fact, parallel that of the extant Hebrew text of Is 6:9-10. In the next chapter we shall establish the validity of this interpretation. This and other NT evidence Jerome uses to demonstrate the preposterousness of the above charge. See Jerome, *Commentariorum in Esaiam Libri I-XI*, Vol. 73A of *Corpus christianorum: series latina*, ed. M. Adriaen (? vols.; n.p.: Turnhout, 1963), 91-94 (3. 6. 9-10).
1.3 Literary Applications of the OT in the NT

The task with which we will concern ourselves in this section is the identification of various applications of OT material by NT authors. At the outset we introduce an important caveat. However illuminating a comparison of such applications of OT scripture to current systems of exegesis may be, there remains, nevertheless, an ever-present danger of conforming the former to the latter by a tour de force. In order to avoid this danger, the use of OT texts in Mark's gospel will be considered phenomena which exist in their own right and employ literary mechanisms which transcend cultural barriers. Any comparison to specific systems of exegesis will be reserved for in-depth examinations of individual cases.

Having thus defined the parameters of this present survey, we now note the uses of the OT in the NT identified by Marshall. These are:

1. Influence of the Language of the OT
2. Influence of the Style of the OT
3. Literal Use of the OT: Reference to Events
4. Literal Use of the OT: Reference to Divine Commands, Etc.
5. Literal Use of the OT: Reference to Passages Believed to Relate to Contemporary Events
6. Typological Use of the OT
7. Allegorical Use of the OT

---

79 In contemporary Judaism, for example, we encounter such scripture hermeneutics as midrash, pesher, etc.
Here, the need for greater precision necessitated a redefinition of the third, fourth and fifth categories as *Factual Reading of the OT: Events, Injunctions and Fulfilments*, respectively.  
Likewise, the sixth and seventh categories have been redesignated *Typological Reading*, and *Allegorical Representation and Reading of the OT* respectively.

**i. Influence of the Language of the OT**

The authors of the NT had access to, and made use of the Greek OT. The degree of verbal contact with the LXX, in conjunction with the degree of verbal divergence from the MT such as one finds in Acts 28:26-27 = Is 6:9-10 serves to establish a judgement in favour of a direct literary dependence of the writer of Acts on the version preserved in the LXX beyond any reasonable doubt. The LXX Version reads:

\[
\text{Πορεύθητι καὶ εἰπὼν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ}
\]
\[
\text{Ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνήτε}
\]
\[
\text{καὶ βλέποντες βλέπετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε.}
\]

---


81 This distinction between a *literal* and a *factual* reading of scripture we owe David E. Demson who himself learned of it in a public lecture by Hans Frei. On the one hand, a *factual* reading of a scripture passage denotes a reading wherein the words are understood at face value. On the other hand, a *literal* reading of that same passage would denote a reading of it wherein the words are understood as the author intended. The two ways in which the creation narratives are commonly read will clarify exactly what we mean by this distinction. A *literal* reading of Gen 1 and 2 would consist in claiming that the author(s) intended to address the question "Who?" (i.e. God the supreme being), not "How?" (i.e. the means God employed). A *factual* reading of these texts would consist in claiming that the author(s) intended to address both the questions "Who?" and "How?" The *literal* and the *factual* readings of any given passage may, or may not be the same, depending on the intention of the author himself.
The demonstration which we provided on pp. 36-37 above establishes the divergences between the LXX—and hence Acts—and the MT. The Gospel of Mark likewise manifests verbal contact with the LXX.

For example, the citation of Is 29:13 in Mk 7:6-7:

{oùteis ò laòs toîs xéileseîn me tîmâ,}

is significantly closer to the Greek version than it is to the Hebrew text. Is 29:13 (LXX) reads:

'Eγγίζει μοi ò laòs oútois toîs xéileseîn aútôn tîmôsî me,

δìdaskeîteis ëntalmas ònthròpov kai δìdaskeîas.
By contrast Is 29:13 (MT) reads:

The foregoing examples from Acts and Mark provide solid evidence of the linguistic influence of the LXX on the NT corpus. A less obvious influence of the LXX on the language of the NT has also captured the attention of a number of commentators. That is to say, the NT writers from time to time intersperse their works with vocabulary or grammar characteristic of the Greek Bible.\(^8\)\(^2\) One would expect this. Their intimate knowledge of the Greek-written scriptures would, either through conscious imitation or through unconscious influence,\(^8\)\(^3\) constrain these writers to adopt these so-called Septuagintisms. The majority of such phenomena find their source in the Hebrew Bible.\(^8\)\(^4\) If they ultimately derive from the Hebrew text, we can classify these Septuagintisms quite rightly as Semitisms.

Yet one has to exercise caution here. Not all Septuagintisms are Semitisms. The occurrence of the noun \(\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\) ("virgin") in


\(^8\)\(^3\)So Hooker, "Mark", 224.

\(^8\)\(^4\)Koester, Introduction, I, 111.
the citation of Is 7:14 in Mt 1:23 may be designated a
Septuagintism since Matthew follows the LXX instead of the Hebrew
which reads נָתוֹנָה ("young woman"). As Soulen justly observes
"[t]he use of parthenos is peculiar to the LXX" yet it has
"nothing to do with Hebrew (Semitic) terminology or expression."85

Conversely, not all Semitisms in the NT are Septuagintisms.
Some of them are, in fact, Aramaisms.86 Such utterances as Talitha
cumi (Mk 5:41), Abba (Mk 14:36) or Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthananai
(Mk 15:34), for example, may represent materials originating with
Jesus or the early Palestinian church.87 Alternatively, the
presence of Aramaic vocabulary and grammatical construction could
be the result of a later Judaization of the tradition.88

85 Richard N. Soulen, Handbook of Biblical Criticism (2nd ed.
revised and augmented; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), 77.
Apparently Marshall overlooks this possibility. His description
of "the influence of the language of the OT on the diction of the
NT authors 'includes' a 'Biblical Greek' distinguished by its
secondary Semitisms, ... i.e. Semitisms which have been
transmitted through the LXX" ("Assessment", 9). According to our
understanding the term Septuagintism would include all idiom
unique to the Septuagint Version of the Jewish scriptures.
87 Soulen, Handbook, 176.
88 So Guenther, "Greek: Home of Primitive Christianity", 249 and
Jesu; Neues Testament, Forts. [Kanonische Schriften und
Apokryphen]), Vol. II, Pt. 25, Sec. 2 of Aufstieg und Niedergang
der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Rome im Spiegel der
Neueren Forschung, eds. Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase
(Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), 984. The Gospel
of John may have undergone a 're-apocalypticization'
(so Ulrich B. Müller, "Die Parakletenvorstellung in JohEv",
ZThK LXXI [1, March, 1974], 67-68). Some occurrences of the term
"gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον/εὐευγέλιον) in the NT where influence of
Isaianic usage is in evidence may also represent "the product of
secondary redaction of older materials" (so Helmut Koester,
Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development [London:
Other Semitisms resist definite classification. The use of the verb γίνομαι, such as occurs in Mk 4:11b—"as an impersonal verb with the person in the dative"—is not, according to Jeremias, a Greek idiomatic construction, but a Semitism: 89 ἐκεῖνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται. The occurrence of a similar construction in the LXX rendering of Gen 15:1 might suggest either a conscious imitation or a subconscious influence of the Greek version: ἐγένηθη βῆμα κυρίου πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ ἐν ὄραματι ... No final decision can be reached in this case. However, this example reveals yet another fact. The LXX translators employ the preposition πρὸς with the accusative. We note, for example, Gen 19:5: καὶ ἔξεκαλοῦντο τὸν Λωτ καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς αὐτὸν ... 90 The evangelist Mark uses the person in the dative case without any introductory preposition. The above examples show (a) the unquestionable influence of OT language in the NT, (b) the considerable freedom with which OT text is used, and (c) the divergence of the LXX from the MT.

ii. Influence of the Style of the OT

The influence of the Jewish Scriptures also manifests itself in the style of the NT. Luke, most notably in the Book of Acts, adopts a style similar to that of the LXX. The speeches attributed to Peter in Acts 2:14-39 and 3:12-26 look to be each a

89 Jeremias, Parables, 16.
90 See also Gen 18:5; Ez 4:11, 12, 18; 5:7, 17; Dan 2:24.
conscious reproduction of the Greek of the LXX. This apparent adoption of a LXX style by the writer of Luke-Acts may well signal his intention of continuing the "'salvation historical' story" which he discovered therein. The superscription to the Gospel of Mark could represent something of the same phenomenon at work. The text of Mk 1:1 reads:

'Αρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου 'Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [υἱοῦ θεοῦ].

The LXX in Hos 1:2 reads:

'Αρχὴ λόγου κυρίου πρὸς Ωση.

Here again the question arises: did Mark believe that he was writing a work which was similar in some respect to the Book of Hosea? Although we would not wish to go this far, what we can say is that the style of the LXX is in evidence here.

iii. Factual Reading of the OT: Events

A factual reading of an event recounted in the OT by a NT writer may serve the purpose of illuminating or contextualizing either a contemporary situation or a NT teaching. Thus the

---

91 Soulen, Handbook, 177. The commentary on Acts by Ernst Haenchen contains numerous instances of LXX Greek idiom (The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971)). The speeches of Peter evidence the following, for example: διὰ χειρὸς for the instrumental "by" in 2:23 (180 n. 12); διαφθορά ("deterioration" or "putrefaction"), a mistranslation based on the erroneous derivation of the Hebrew פָּג ("pit") from פָּג ("to spoil") in 2:27 (182 n. 1); δεῦς ἐν προσκαλέσθαι κύριος, an echo of Ιε 3:5b (LXX) (δεὺς κύριος προσκέκληται) in 2:38 (184 n. 5); ἀπεκρίνατο ("to launch into speech"), the LXX derivation of the Hebrew פָּג in 3:12 (204); ἔδωξασεν τὸν πατὰ αὐτοῦ, a reflection of Isa 52:13 (LXX) (Ὀ παῖς μου δοξαθήσεται) in 3:13 (205); ὁ ... θεὸς ... προκατήγγειλε διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ, a LXX location in 3:18 (208 n. 1).


93 See ibid., 9-10.
speech of Stephen before the council, as it is represented by Luke (Acts 7:2-56) includes numerous references to significant events in the scriptural record of the history of Israel. We note, for example, in Acts 7:47, mention of the fact that King Solomon built the temple of the Lord (1 Kg 6:1-38).

Another factual reading of OT events, viz. the drawing of analogies, serves to justify an action or teaching of Jesus or his followers. This type of argumentation is called an argument from analogy. It may be defined thus:

A form of (usually inductive) inference in which from the assertion of similarities between two things it is then reasoned that the things will probably also be similar in yet other respects.

Thus the unlawful eating of the bread of the Presence by David and his entourage on a sabbath when they had run out of food (1 Sam 21:1-6) provides Jesus a justification on the basis of scripture for permitting his disciples to pluck heads of grain on the sabbath when they were hungry.

iv. Factual Reading of the OT: Injunctions

A second factual use of the OT cited by Marshall is the reference to commands, etc., which are found in it. The treatment accorded materials such as these by a given writer involves one of three possibilities: affirmation of continuing validity, updating or abrogation. Thus Jesus' reply to the query as to which of the


commandments is the greatest (Mk 12:28 par.) includes an endorsement of the two OT injunctions of love toward God (Mk 12:29-30; par. = Dt 6:4-5) and the neighbour (Mk 12:31; par. = Lev 19:18). Moreover, the equation of acts which meet human need and those which are lawful on the sabbath by Jesus (Mk 2:27; 3:4; par.) constitutes a significant qualification to sabbath day observance. The injunction to "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy ..." (Ex 20:8-11) was traditionally interpreted so as to prohibit work of any kind. Here the NT writers use the OT apologetically to justify Jesus' deeds on the sabbath.

v. Factual Reading of the OT: Fulfilments

The final reading of OT scriptures in a factual manner listed by Marshall is the reference to passages thought to be prophecies pointing forward to contemporary events. Marshall cites Acts 8:34-35:

And the eunuch said to Philip, "About whom, pray, does the prophet say this, about himself or about someone else?" Then Philip opened his mouth, and beginning with this scripture [Is 53:7-8] he told him the good news of Jesus.

No such formula as καθώς γέγραψαν or ἐνα πληρωθῇ precedes the direct reporting of Is 53:7-8 in vv. 32-33. The absence of such an introductory formula notwithstanding, this example is a clear instance of prophecy-fulfilment as the question, "About whom, pray, does the prophet say this ...?," shows. A similar reading of OT material is that which we encounter in Mk 7:6-7. Here the Jesus represented by the evangelist identifies the Pharisees as

96 Ibid.
97 Ibid.
the referent of Is 29:13 (LXX). The prefatory clause, καλῶς ἐπροφητεύσειν Ἡσαΐας περὶ ύμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὃς γέγραπται [ὁτι] ... makes this identification quite unmistakable. Once again we have the prophecy-fulfilment motif. ⁹⁸

vi. Typological Reading of the OT

One of the ways in which people universally seek to understand the phenomena about them is that of drawing analogies between those phenomena and others with which they are already familiar. ⁹⁹ The writers of the NT quite understandably, then, on numerous occasions attempt to demonstrate a material correspondence between their message and that of the OT. ¹⁰⁰ That is to say, a NT writer reflecting on the saving action of Christ's coming will interpret events, persons or things in the OT as foreshadowings or prefigurements of events, persons or things in the NT. ¹⁰¹ Such treatment of texts is called typology or typological interpretation. ¹⁰² Paul in his reflection on the origin of sin and death/justification and life in Rom 5:12-21 designates

⁹⁸ As noted earlier, Suhl categorically denies the use of the prediction-fulfilment scheme in Mark's gospel. Further to this, see above Introduction pp. 4-5.


¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 363-64.

¹⁰¹ Thus the events and institutions in the OT become prototypes of the saving events in the NT. The latter are the antitypes (ibid., 365).

¹⁰² Soulen, Handbook, 206. The origin of the word typology is a combination of two Greek words—the noun τύπος ("the original type or model of a thing") and the verb λέγω ("to speak").
Adam a "type of the one who was to come," viz. Jesus (v. 14).\(^{103}\)

Similarly, the three days and three nights Jonah had spent in the belly of the fish (Jon 1:17) prefigure the three days and three nights the Son of man was to remain in the grave (Mt 12:38-41).

The alleged uniqueness of the Christ-event is accorded considerable significance by the NT writers. At the same time, they made free use of OT text. This fact might at first occasion our surprise. However, von Rad offers this explanation:

[The writers of the Gospels and the Apostles were firmly convinced that the God of Israel was none other than the one who, when the time was fully come, sent forth his son (Gal. IV.4). The typological understanding of the Old Testament was an important way of putting its correspondence with the New in a theological frame of reference and of using it in preaching ...\(^{104}\)

This attempt to draw a relationship between a contemporary phenomenon and another phenomenon from the past serves to locate the latter within a larger context which bears some analogy to it and thus facilitates one's understanding of its essential nature. In the words of von Rad:

The larger context into which [the NT writer would have to set] the Old Testament phenomena if they are to be meaningfully appreciated is ... the compass of a specific history, which was set in motion by God's words and deeds and which, as the New Testament sees it, finds its goal in the coming of Christ.

Here a "typical central feature" binds the Old and New Testaments.\(^{105}\) Just as sin and death entered the world through the one man Adam, so also righteousness and life entered the world through the one man Jesus. Similarly, just as God employed

\(^{103}\)Ibid.

\(^{104}\)See von Rad, OT Theology, II, 364.

\(^{105}\)See ibid., 368-69.
Jonah's act of disobedience as an integral part of the process whereby the city of Nineveh was spared (even though Jonah was to spend three days and three nights in the belly of the fish he would finally go to preach to the Ninevites), so also God mediated salvation to humanity through the wrongful execution of Jesus (even though Jesus was to spend three days and three nights in the grave, he would be raised to life again and convey eternal life to believers).

The reader who is unaware of the import of the Christ-event and its ramifications may, or may not apprehend the OT event, person or thing as it was presented in a previous literary context. Nevertheless we can say this much. The phenomenon as reported in the OT retains its own independent significance for the reader. Yet once having heard the proclamation of primitive Christianity and accepted its claims, readers come to recognise the events, persons or things significant to the history of Israel as part of an ongoing process whose completion lies in the future.106 Thus Adam and Jonah together with the events associated with those figures come to assume an incomplete character within a salvation-history which culminates in the Christ-event.107

The OT phenomena interpreted typologically in the NT do not

107 The correspondence between NT phenomena and those of the OT illumines not only the latter but also the former (see Marshall, "Assessment", 10). The illumination of OT phenomena is but a possibility for Marshall. However, we would exercise less caution. Both the NT and the OT phenomena assume a significance within the context of *Heilsgeschichte*. Thus the stories of Adam and Jonah serve to *typify* the saving action of God in history.
signify some abstract principle relating to religion or morality. Our comparison of analogy, typology and allegory (see below) will make this important point of distinction sufficiently clear.

A typological reading of the Jewish scriptures may manifest itself in what Patte calls broad biblical patterns. A so-called "Exodus pattern" allegedly couches many biblical laws and stories. Several depictions of the future judgement of God may, for example in Dan 7:23-27; Ezek 38-39; Is 59:1-21; Ps 68:2-4, evidence much the same underlying framework. A number of different biblical commentators have also detected broad biblical patterns in the NT. Thus the life and ministry of Jesus as portrayed in the first half of Matthew's gospel suggests parallels between his experiences and those of the nation of Israel in her earlier history. The Marcan saga of John the Baptizer (1:2-6; 6:17-29) recalls that of Elijah the prophet in 1-2 Kg.

The broad biblical patterns which we find in sacred text --i.e. OT, NT, apocryphal writings and pseudepigrapha--represent

---

111 Patte's treatment of the use of the OT in Sectarian Judaism includes two discussions of broad biblical patterns among apocalyptic writers (Early Jewish Hermeneutic, 169-75, 84-85).
two literary manifestations of typological reading of the OT.\(^{112}\)

The first is the anthological style. A writer who incorporates scripture anthologically is simply expressing his new message in biblical language. The amalgam of biblical phrases and allusions which results constitutes what is aptly described as an anthology. Patte observes that "the anthological style can easily be seen by consulting the ... footnotes to biblical passages where similar ideas or images can be found."\(^{113}\) Thus the Passion Narrative of Mk 14–15 par. contains numerous quotations of, or allusions to OT passages.\(^{114}\) However, von Rad reminds us:

> This [i.e. references to OT prototypes] is in no sense always done by means of formal citation of Old Testament texts. Very often it is merely a matter of fairly trivial references to attendant circumstances, by means of which the connexion between the New Testament saving events and prototypes in the Old Testament become clear for those who understand ...

In this instance an element of uncertainty would inevitably attend the identification of references to OT material. Anthological style of reference embodies the following formative principle. Reference to events, persons or things in the OT are set within the framework of events contemporaneous with the writer. Thus the events themselves, and not scripture are, notes Patte, the "primary locus of revelation."\(^{116}\)

\(^{112}\) Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutic, 171.

\(^{113}\) Ibid., 184. In this connection, Patte provides a number of instances among Qumran writers: the Hodayot (1 QH) (ibid., 257–63), and the Manual of Discipline (1QS) (ibid., 273–74).

\(^{114}\) So von Rad, OT Theology, II, 366.

\(^{115}\) Ibid., 365.

\(^{116}\) Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutic, 184.
The second literary manifestation of typological reading encountered in broad biblical patterns is what Patte has described as the structural style. Here an author in fashioning his own text adopts the structure of one or several biblical passages. The story of John the Baptist and his misadventure with Herod Antipas and his wife Herodias (Mk 6:17-29), as we will demonstrate later, is an account structured according to the story of Elijah and his dealings with Ahab and his wife Jezebel (1 Kg 21). Here scripture itself, as opposed to the contemporary events, is, notes Patte, the "primary locus of revelation." This shift in the "primary loci of revelation" of the anthological and structural styles, then, constitutes the fundamental difference between these two literary manifestations of the typological reading of the OT.

Be that as it may, we must not consider anthological and structural styles mutually exclusive. A text basically structured according to one or more biblical passages may well contain units best explained as an anthology of biblical images or allusions.

vii. Allegorical Treatment of the OT

A final treatment of OT scripture in the NT involves an

---

117 In this connection, Patte cites a number of instances within Sectarian Judaism. Among apocalyptic writers, he identifies the structural style in four different documents 185-99). The Hodayot (1 QH) (ibid., 263-67) and the Manual of Discipline (1 QS) alone contain many examples in relation to Qumran writers (ibid., 274-77).

118 See Patte's discussion of the anthological and structural method of incorporating scripture text (ibid., 169-72, 184-85). The focus of his study is the texts of sectarian Judaism. What he says in connection with the literature of sectarian Judaism does, however, find application in the writings of the NT.
allegorical treatment\textsuperscript{119} of one or more OT passages. Basically the literary form which we call allegory is a 'saying of something other than what is intended'.\textsuperscript{120} As it is applied to the OT in the NT corpus allegorical treatment may assume one of two forms --allegorical presentation and allegorical reading.\textsuperscript{121} An allegorical presentation of the OT is a narrative presentation of the OT. That is to say, a phenomenon related in the OT scriptures assumes a narrative form, the details of which signify some aspect of the phenomenon thus depicted. As C. H. Dodd would put it, the details presented in an allegorical presentation are metaphors for the various aspects of the situation being depicted.\textsuperscript{122} Yet the entity which assumes the place of what is in fact meant is not something which is arbitrarily chosen, but which bears some relation to it. In her brief but excellent discussion Eta Linnemann gives the following description of how allegory functions:

\begin{quote}
Strictly speaking what happens is as if two tracings were laid one over the other, of which the lower one contains the outlines, the upper one the colours: the allegory in its entirety allows the reality with which the author is concerned in the allegorical narrative to show through it.\textsuperscript{123}
\end{quote}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{120}The origin of the word allegory is the combination of two Greek words--the adjective ἄλλος ("other") and the verb ἀγορεύω ("to speak in assembly").
\textsuperscript{121}However, Soulen prefers the term allegorical interpretation (Handbook, 15).
\end{flushleft}
The structure of an allegorical presentation will, therefore, presuppose a logic basically extrinsic to itself. A composition of this kind will often strike the addressee as somewhat bizarre. In order to grasp the significance of the allegorical presentation, the addressee must, in that case, possess some knowledge of the situation about which the narrator is speaking. If the addressee is not 'in the know', the allegorical presentation will remain a riddle unless another person can disclose its deeper meaning. Thus the decisive function of an allegorical presentation is to transmit an evaluation of a reality to the initiated. The parable of the Great Feast as it has been reported in Mt 22:1-14 affords an illustrative example of OT tradition presented in the guise of allegorical presentation.

Says Linnemann,

The allegory in Matt 22:1-14...speaks of servants and means prophets and apostles; it speaks of a king and means God; it speaks of recalcitrant guests, who maltreat and kill the messengers who summon them to the feast, and means the people of Israel, which "kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it" (Matt 23:37); it speaks of the punitive expedition of the king against the unwilling guests, which destroys their city, and means the destruction of Jerusalem, and so on.

The Matthaean conception of a God who repeatedly summons his people but is rebuffed each time assumes the form of an allegorical presentation of the history of Israel beginning with

125 E.g. the intended guests in the parable of the Wedding Feast (Mt 22:1-14) killed (?) the servants who conveyed the invitations.
126 Linnemann, Parables, 6-7.
127 Ibid., 6.
the prophets and ending with the destruction of Jerusalem.

An allegorical presentation of OT tradition has found its way into Mark's gospel also. The Song of the Vineyard as it is originally narrated in Is 5:1-7 is an allegorical presentation of Israel's failure to maintain her covenant with Yahweh. However, the allegorical presentation borrowed from Isaiah has undergone an interesting re-application by the evangelist. The metaphor of the vineyard, though its referent remains the nation Israel, now assumes its role as a powerful image within an allegorical presentation of salvation history.

An allegorical reading of a text would, in the words of Soulen, denote,

that kind of interpretation which assumes that the text to be interpreted says or intends to say something other than its literal wording suggests, that it contains within it a deeper, mystical sense, not derivable from the words themselves ...

An allegorical reading of the OT is a reading of an OT passage. Here the individual who is interpreting the text treats it as if it were an allegorical presentation. That is to say, each of the details in the text signifies some encoded datum which must be deciphered. Yet such an assessment of the text may, or may not represent the actual intention of the author. The allegorical reading of the story of Hagar and Sarah in Gal 4:21-31 is an

---

128 Mk 12:1-9 (the parable of the Vineyard).
130 Soulen, Handbook, 15.
illustrative example wherein Paul contrasts the principles of law and grace. The slave woman (Hagar) represents the Sinaitic Covenant; the free woman (Sarah) represents the new covenant. Yet, so far as we have been able to determine, there are no purely allegorical readings of OT text in the synoptic gospels.

The foregoing survey of the ways in which the NT authors employ their sacred texts does not yield a system of classification which can be applied with precision in each and every case. That is to say--Marshall himself would enter this caveat--, it serves to facilitate a convenient partitioning of what is at times a continuous spectrum.¹³¹ Moreover, the uses of OT material mentioned above are not all of them mutually exclusive. Thus, for example, the treatment accorded the prohibition against the muzzling of an ox while he is treading out the grain (Dt 25:4) in 1 Cor 9:3-10, constitutes a factual reading of the OT which involves the character of an event, on the one hand, and an injunction on the other. To the extent that Paul speaks of God as having been "concerned" (v. 9) or having "spoken" (v. 10a), we have a reference to an event. At the same time, Paul makes reference to an injunction contained in the Law of Moses, whose content is explicitly stated in (v. 9a).¹³²

¹³² Paul's reading of Dt 25:4 would, for Soulen, represent an instance of typological reading (Handbook, 206). An element of prefigurement may be present here; still we cannot accept the judgement of Soulen. In the first place, the Mosaic injunction does not retain a significance in and of itself, but merely functions so as to illumine a contemporary situation. The question posed by the apostle himself makes this abundantly clear: "Does he [God] not speak entirely for our own sakes?"


Allegorical treatment, and typological and analogical readings of text warrant some additional clarification as regards their internal mechanism. All three of these approaches to a given text are such that the text carries a significance extrinsic to itself. This important point of similarity between these approaches notwithstanding, we must note other points of similarity as well as difference between them. The referents associated with allegory and typology are events, persons or things in the scriptures. However, the two genres manifest two rather important differences. Firstly, a typological reading of text presupposes one point of comparison. However, an allegorical treatment presupposes more than one point of comparison.

Secondly, Soulen observes that,

T[ypology] differs from allegory in that the latter sees the hidden, spiritual meaning of a narrative whereas the former sees the revelatory connection between two

(Moreover, Soulen's definition of 'drawing analogies' itself would, in our judgement, place the emphasis on the contemporary situation. "To 'draw an analogy' is to make a comparison between similar features or attributes of two otherwise dissimilar things, so that the unknown, or less well known, is clarified by the known" [Underlining added. See ibid., 17 s.v. "anology"]). In addition the tertium comparationis in this case is not the "compass of a specific history" as stipulated by von Rad (OT Theology, II, 369), but rather a general moral principle, viz. a worker's entitlement to remuneration for services rendered. Thus Paul's treatment of Dt 25:4 would also not be an allegorical reading of the text. If it were, the apostle would have had the following equations in mind: ox = apostle, treading out grain = preaching the gospel, and feeding on grain = receiving material support. As is evident in Gal 4:21-31, Paul can, on occasion, read his OT scriptures in this manner. However, he does not do this here. What is at issue in 1 Cor 9:3-10 is a juxtaposition of two analogous situations. Thus the Pauline treatment of Dt 25:4 would, in our estimation, represent an analogical reading of an OT injunction. (A passing observation: yet another factual reading of the OT suggests itself, viz. that of analogies. Cf. category No. 3 above.)
historically distinct but religiously significant persons or events.

That is to say, a text read typologically carries a literal as well as a non-literal significance. Events, persons or things related in the OT are not only assigned correspondence with events, persons or things in the NT, but the former retain the meaning which they bore in their original historical context. Thus the phenomena related in the OT serve to prefigure those related in the NT. However, a text treated allegorically carries a non-literal significance only.

The literary mechanism associated with analogy is similar to that associated with allegory. Texts which are treated allegorically or which are read analogically do not carry a significance which lies within a literal reading of them. Thus the definitive element of prefigurement which is indeed a hallmark of typology is something which is much less evident, if not totally lacking in allegory and analogy. Nevertheless, allegory and analogy represent two distinct literary genres. Firstly, referents associated with allegory are events, persons or things. However, the referent associated with analogy is some general truth or moral principle. Secondly, an allegorical treatment presupposes more than one point of comparison. However, an analogical reading of text presupposes one point of comparison.\(^{133}\)


\(^{134}\)An *analogical reading* of text, as we define it, thus closely resembles a *parable* when the latter is understood as a one-point analogy. However, this classical definition of *parable* no longer enjoys universal acceptance in the academic world. Thus the designation of this reading of text as *parabolic* did not commend itself to us as the most advantageous choice of terminology.
Texts read analogically and typologically presuppose one point of comparison only. Still analogy and typology represent two distinct literary genres. Firstly, analogy, by its very nature, serves to shed light on something extrinsic to itself. Thus Jesus in justifying his breach of sabbath-day observance, as it was traditionally applied, cites the action of David and his entourage as legal precedent to his own practice (Mk 2:23-28; par.). However, the reality which the typologist perceives and thus attempts to underline, viz. God's saving action in and through history, finds itself instanced or 'typified' in both the event(s), person(s), or things(s) of the OT and those of his own day. Indeed the prefigurement of the contemporary phenomena in the earlier one is the definitive element in typology, which is virtually non-existent in analogy. Secondly, analogy and typology serve to establish different points of comparison. The subjects of analogy are general truths or moral principles--events, persons, and things are the subjects of typology.

The literary applications of OT scripture in the NT as we have defined and illustrated them in the foregoing survey will constitute the third point of reference in our endeavour to ascertain the governing principles of the scripture-hermeneutics employed by Mark.
1.4 Separation of Marcan Redaction and Pre-Marcan Tradition

A delineation of the distinctive manner in which the evangelist Mark uses his scripture source(s), as opposed to that of his precursors, presupposes the feasibility of identifying Marcan redaction and pre-Marcan tradition. However, the task of distinguishing redactional material from pre-gospel tradition is, as Robert H. Stein has noted, a much more difficult one for Mark than it is for Matthew or Luke. Firstly, the evangelist never makes an explicit statement of purpose. Secondly, none of the sources to which Mark had access have withstood the ravages of time and therefore we do not possess a standard against which we might compare the Marcan text. Nonetheless, a judicious application of form- and redaction-critical tools should facilitate the recovery of pre-Marcan material. Mark's editorial activity is in this way rendered more readily available for investigation.


136 Any global tendencies which a composition might exhibit would, nonetheless, shed some light on the intention of its author.

137 "[M]uch of the material [in Mark's gospel] ... had pre-Markan origin, meaning and application. Mark, however, took the material and read into it a new meaning, a meaning consistent with his own purposes in constructing his gospel" (Hurd, "Isaiah's Curse", 4). In other words all of the pre-Marcan material in Mark's gospel has mediated itself to us through the hands of the evangelist.

Ascertainment of Marcan redactional material is a straightforward task, generally speaking. The activity of the evangelist will evidence itself in the following ways:

A. Marcan Seams;
B. Marcan Insertions;
C. Marcan Summaries;
D. Marcan Creation of Pericopae;
E. Marcan Modification of Material;
F. Marcan Selection of Material;
G. Marcan Omission of Material;
H. Marcan Arrangement of Material;
I. The Marcan Introduction;
J. The Marcan Conclusion;
K. Marcan Vocabulary;
L. Marcan Christological Titles.139

Such passages in which Mark has thus edited existing material or created his own will shed important light on his theological standpoint and editorial propensities.

Writers, be they inspired or not, do not fashion their works out of a vacuum. Ex nihilo nihil fit. Thus we can, in principle, isolate pre-Marcan tradition. Once having extracted such material and stripped it of any redactional overlay we may investigate it so as to disclose the residual theological tendencies of the community which transmitted it. However, the mediation of the

139So Stein, "Proper Methodology", 181-98. However, No. I, the Marcan Introduction, we would consider a pre-Marcan composition for the most part. See (ii) below.
pre-Marcan tradition through the evangelist has not only affected its present form and arrangement, but its content as well. Ulrich Luz asks rightly,

Is the material contained in the Gospel of Mark exhaustive, i.e., does it provide information about the entire stock of tradition known in his community? Is it likely that Mark ... has not compiled traditions systematically and from several communities, but presented essentially the material of a single circle of tradition, [viz.] his community? (translation ours)\textsuperscript{140}

Thus all of our observations regarding the use of scripture within the traditional material available to Mark assume validity only to the extent that such material is represented by him and accessible to us. Whatever theological and hermeneutical tendencies we happen to observe in individual passages carry more weight the broader the textual basis on which they are founded.\textsuperscript{141} Yet the pre-Marcan passages in which there is an unmistakable use of scriptural material represents a relatively small number, thus precluding any possibility of fulfilling this methodologically ideal condition. This should not surprise us. The evangelist was writing his gospel. Thus, if Mark is wont to employ scriptural material to any appreciable degree, we should indeed expect the Marcan applications of such material to exceed in number those of his precursor(s). Nevertheless, the fact that the pre-Marcan

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{140}"Jesusbild", 350. The German text reads:
"Ist der im Markusevangelium enthaltene Stoff erschöpfend, d. h. gibt er Auskunft über den ganzen in seiner Gemeinde bekannten Überlieferungsbestand? LäBt es sich wahrscheinlich machen, daß Markus ... nicht systematisch und aus mehreren Gemeinden Überlieferungen gesammelt hat, sondern im wesentlichen den Stoff eines einzigen Traditionskreises, seiner Gemeinde, darstellt?"

\textsuperscript{141}Luz, "Jesusbild", 350, 351 no. 2.
\end{footnotesize}
tradition manifests a theological consistency along other lines,\textsuperscript{142} tends to enhance the overall probability of whatever assessments we make regarding the scripture hermeneutic of the pre-Marcan tradition.

Finally, "much of the material [in Mark's gospel] ... is not

\textsuperscript{142}Observes Luz, "Firstly, the [pre-]Marcan tradition shows a strong tendency toward \textit{de-eschatologizing} which can be credited to the tradition and not just to the redaction by the evangelist. Secondly, corresponding to the de-eschatologizing, very many texts are stamped with the belief that the earthly Jesus himself in his earthly activity had a kerygmatic function which gave rise to this belief" (translation ours).


A comparison of the tradition about the preaching of John the Baptist as it is reported in Mark (1:2-8) and Q (Mt 3: 3, 7-10, 11-12/Lk 3:3, 7-9, 16-17) reveals a relative paucity of content in the Marcan report of the Baptist's preaching. Clearly, the absence of the speech about the winnowing shovel (Mt 3:12/Lk 3:17) in Mark diminishes the eschatological point of the story. The "Mightier One" in Q is the coming world Judge and administers a baptism of fire (Mt 3:11/Lk 3:16). By contrast, the "Mightier One" of the pre-Marcan tradition is the bearer of the Holy Spirit who gives it in baptism (ibid., 353, 359). A comparison of the reports of the tradition about the sign of Jonah in Mark (8:11-13; par. Mt 16:1, 4) and Q (Mt 12:38-42/Lk 29-32) shows much the same de-eschatologizing tendency of the former. Not only through the Son-of-man saying has the Q version an eschatological meaning, but also through the logion about the signs of judgement of Israel (Mt 12:41-42/Lk 11:31-32). However, the eschatological features which so mark the Q report, are, by contrast, totally absent in the version attested in Mark. Here we have a legend about the person, not the word of Jesus. By refusing his opponents a self-authenticating "sign" from heaven Jesus endures the test to which he is put, thereby showing himself superior to "this generation." An assembly of eschatological logia whose purpose is to discredit the religious authorities is not the main point in Mark so much as a focusing of the reader's interest in Jesus himself (ibid., 353, 359-360).
'either-or' but 'both-and'--both traditional and Markan." Some of the material comprising Mark's gospel will be such that it is not easily separable into its Marcan and pre-Marcan elements. This fact, not to mention the inevitable overlapping of conceptions and terminology, for example, means that we will have to treat certain passages as either "more" or "less" Marcan in character. In theory this should not, however, present an insurmountable difficulty. The characteristic features of the scripture-hermeneutic exhibited in Mark's gospel should assert themselves in proportion to the respective degree of Marcan or pre-Marcan colouring in a given passage.

Bearing the foregoing methodological considerations in mind we now turn to our practical demonstration of the feasibility of ascertaining (A) Marcan redaction, and (B) pre-Marcan tradition.

A. MK 4:11-12: ITS LOCATION WITHIN THE MARCAN REDACTIONAL STRATUM OF TRADITION

i. Marcan Seam

The phrase καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς is a characteristically Marcan connecting formula. Within the parable-chapter alone, the construction occurs no fewer than three times: 4:11, 21 and 24. One might expect this. Both pericopae represented here serve to express a Marcan theological motif.

ii. Marcan Insertion

A considerable number of NT scholars regard Mk 4:11-12 as a

---

143 Hurd, "Isaiah's Curse", 4.
144 Taylor, Mark, 218; Jeremias, Parables, 14. E. J. Pryke also considers καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς redactional (Redactional Style, 76).
later interpolation. This saying situated as it now is within the Marcan discourse on parables, interrupts and thus conceals the original transition between the parable of the Sower and its interpretation. A question concerning the parables in general is addressed to Jesus by the disciples in v. 10. The answer is provided in vv. 11-12. However, the reproach of Jesus in v. 13a presupposes a question concerning the parable just told (Οὐκ οὗδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην ...;). The question which initially stood in v. 10 should have had a form similar to that of Lk 8:9. Presumably the original singular number of the noun παραβολὴ in v. 10 has undergone an assimilation to the plural number of the noun in v. 11. Reconstruction of the passage along these lines

---


However, the analysis of Rudolf Pesch has yielded a somewhat different tradition-historical development. In his opinion, the evangelist inherited a parable-collection of Hellenistic-Jewish provenance. Those living within a Hellenistic-Jewish environment would have understood parable as difficult, occasionally enigmatic speech. Parabolic speech, which at all events required interpretation, could have conveyed its message only to those who possessed special insight. Thus the collection of parables as it came into the hands of Mark would have included the question of v. 10 in its extant form—i.e. with παραβολὴ in the dative plural. The parable of the Sower (vv. 3-8) as it is interpreted in vv. 13-20 would have constituted the definitive answer to the question of v. 10. That is to say, the allegorical interpretation of the parable of the Sower represented the paradigm for interpreting all of the parables in the parable-collection. The parabolic form of utterance customarily employed by Jesus in his public preaching (v. 34), would have denoted encoded speech requiring the 'good soil' of faithful hearing for a proper understanding of them (Markus, I, 240; see also 237 on the
shows the hardening formula of vv. 11-12 to be an intrusion into an otherwise continuous text. That the question of v. 10 does not specifically relate to the reasons for Jesus having spoken in parables, indicates further that the logion has come to assume its current location by the hand of a later revisionist.

The referent of τὰς παραβολαῖς in v. 10).

Interesting and thought-provoking though Pesch's hypothesis may be, it must remain an hypothesis, as at least one consideration points in the opposite direction. The question posed by the disciples in Mk 7:17 and the answer provided by Jesus in vv. 18-23 suggests the existence of a pre-Marcan form of discussion wherein Mk 4:10 (as reconstructed by Bultmann et al.) directly preceded vv. 13-20 (see next paragraph). As explicitly stated in Mk 4:13a, the discussion concerns one, and only one parable. The juxtaposition of the plural and singular forms of παραβολή in 12:1 and 12 resp. does not afford a legitimate comparison to what we find in Mk 4:10 and 13a as Pesch argues (ibid.), but rather to 4:1 and 10 (as reconstructed); cf. 13a. In fact, we would make yet another suggestion. Not only the plural form of παραβολή reported in the extant form of 4:10 is a Marcan assimilation to 4:11, but the existence of 4:13b where the plural of παραβολή is once again reported.

So each of the authorities mentioned in the preceding note, i.e. with the exception of Pesch. Pesch, who argues that Mark has reported v. 10 in the form in which he obtained it (see preceding note), nonetheless regards Mk 4:11-12 as a Marcan interpolation (ibid., 237). Cf. Best, who for reasons unspecified, also regards the exclusion formula as an interpolation by the evangelist (Gospel as Story, 63).

A prima facie comparison of the general format of Mk 4:1-20 with that of 7:14-23 might suggest that 4:11-12 is an interpolation into a structure which existed prior to Mark. Indeed the only element of 4:1-20 without a structural counterpart in 7:14-23 is the exclusion formula.

Mk 4                   Mk 7

vv. 1-2               v. 14
scene:               scene:
δρόλος καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς δρόλος (καὶ) ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς
v. 3                  v.
ἀκούστε                  ἀκούσατέ μου

69
The body of tradition comprising the Gospel of Mark has, in

vv. 3-8
parable of the Sower

v. 9
καὶ ἔλεγεν· δὲς ἔχει ὑπά ...

v. 10
change of scene:
kατὰ μόνος

oἱ περὶ αὐτὸν—δῶδεκα

question in the plural
(τὰς παραβολὰς)

v. 13
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς

amazement over misunderstanding
evident in question (v. 10)

vv. 14-20
explanation of the parable

v. 15
parable of What Defiles a Man

v. 16
............. εἰ τίς ἔχει ὑπά ...
... (only ἔθο π/ etc.)

v. 17
change of scene:
eἰς οίκον

oἱ μαθηταῖ

question in the singular
(τὴν παραβολὴν)

v. 18
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς

misunderstanding evident in question (v. 17)

vv. 18b-23
explanation of the parable

(Table from Marxsen, "Parabeltheorie", 259; cf. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 105-6 and Gnilka, Markus, I, 164.)

Little of the content of Mk 7:14-23 signals redactional interference (Marxsen, "Parabeltheorie", 258-60). One notable exception would be the question of v. 18a: "Then are you also without understanding?" (so also Gnilka, Markus, I, 278, 287). The "parable discourse" includes a similar rebuke in 4:13a: "How then will you understand all the parables?" (here we also note the accommodation to the "parables" of v. 11). This recalls the caricature of the disciples encountered elsewhere in Mark's gospel (e.g. in 8:17-18). Other common redactional cues would include the double occurrence of the Marcan succession formula—καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς—(4:2/7:14 and 4:10/7:18) (see above p. 67) as well as the recurrent pattern of public teaching of the crowd (4:1/7:14) followed by private explanation of that teaching for the disciples (4:10/7:17). (This typically Marcan scenario manifests itself several times in the remaining chapters of Mark's gospel [9:14-29; 10:1-12; cf. 8:11-21] [cf. ibid., 164-65]). The common Vorlage with which we are left, then, is the disciples' request for an explanation and Jesus' compliance with it which issues in further instruction. (The alleged source of this common Vorlage could be either "tradition process" [ibid., 164] or a pre-Marcan source, e.g. the "disciple source" [so Marxsen, "Parabeltheorie", 260]).
Jeremias' judgement, undergone a process of growth consisting of three recognisable stages--Jesus, the primitive church and Mark. An evaluation of a global characterization of the work is neither necessary nor feasible within the limited scope of this inquiry. Still, this global characterization Jeremias alleges to hold true for the Marcan parable-chapter itself. The logion reported in vv. 11-12 along with its immediate context is not only illustrative, but obviously relevant to the present discussion.

Assigned to the earliest stratum is the parable of the Sower (vv. 3-8), to the next, the question about, and allegorical interpretation of that parable (vv. 10, 13-20), and to the last, the hardening formula concerning parables (vv. 11-12).

A certain number of authorities trace the parable of the Sower to Jesus. In our view the claim to authenticity has been exaggerated. The parable does manifest Palestinian

---

148 Ibid., n. 11.
149 Ibid. Linnemann is in agreement with Jeremias' reconstruction of the tradition-history of Mk 4 (see Linnemann, Parables, 180).
150 E.g. the Fellows of the Jesus Seminar assigned the Marcan version of the parable (4:3b-8) a "pink" [i.e. authentic] rating (Butts et. al., Parables of Jesus: Red Letter Edition, 26, 74).

Similarly James Breech lists the Sower among the "core" [i.e. primary Jesus] material (The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man [Toronto: Doubleday Canada Limited, n.d.], 231 no. 6). Before doing so, he has, however, pared the parable down considerably (ibid., 82-84). Breech's reconstructed version, i.e. stripped of its 'secondary explanations,' reads: "There was a man who went out to sow, and as he sowed, some seed fell on the road, other seed fell on rocky ground, other seed fell on thorns, and other seed fell on good soil" (ibid., 84-85, 231 no. 6). Yet, we must ask Breech: does this "restoration" of the parable to its original form still not reflect the missionary endeavour of the early church?
characteristics. The farming practices and the kinds of soil depicted are cases in point.\textsuperscript{151} Yet the presence of Palestinian features could reflect a church community based in Palestine. Again, a Judaization of material may have taken place at some later time.\textsuperscript{152} Jeremias has also detected Semitisms.\textsuperscript{153} However, the "Semitisms" which occur in the gospels are, as Reginald Fuller points out, all "explicable as Septuagintalisms."\textsuperscript{154} Attempts have also been made to locate the parable within a particular situation in Jesus' ministry. According to Jeremias, for example, it represents an attempt by Jesus to quell "doubts ... occasioned ... by the ineffectual preaching (Mark 6.5f.), the bitter hostility (Mark 3.6), and the increasing desertions (John 6.10)."\textsuperscript{155} The point being made, says Jeremias, is this: "In spite of every failure and opposition, from hopeless beginnings God brings forth the triumphant end which he had promised."\textsuperscript{156} Yet a similar situation could have arisen in the early church.\textsuperscript{157} The very fact that the parable found its way into Mark's gospel is proof in itself that it did serve a function within the life of the church. Thus we cannot reach a certain conclusion. The literary evidence, in conjunction with the tradition-historical development of the

\textsuperscript{152}Guenther, "Greek: Home of Primitive Christianity", 249.
\textsuperscript{153}See Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 11 n. 2, 149 n. 80.
\textsuperscript{155}See Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 150-51.
\textsuperscript{156}See ibid., 150.
\textsuperscript{157}See Linnemann, \textit{Parables}, 117-18, 185 n.16.
parable, is, however, such that inauthenticity rather than authenticity is suggested.\footnote{158}

The allegorical interpretation appended to the parable of the Sower (vv. 13–20) indeed represents a later stratum of tradition than that of the parable itself. Its post-Easter origin is a virtual certainty: (a) the exposition of the individual points of the parable presupposes a knowledge of the \textit{Sitz im Leben der Kirche};\footnote{159} and (b) some of the terminology used is characteristic of the primitive church.\footnote{160} That the point of the allegorical


\footnote{160} E.g., the use of λόγος as a technical term for the gospel. See Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 77 nos. 1-3; Scott, \textit{Hear then the Parable}, 344.

However, the precise community origin is by no means certain. Mystifications in the form of allegory comprised a literary genre used extensively in the Hellenistic world (Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 17; cf. Dodd, \textit{Parables}, 15). The genre of parable itself was no stranger to the Hellenistic culture (see Guenther, "Greek: Home of Primitive Christianity", 256-58). Missionaries from the Christian community no doubt would have employed both of these forms in their preaching. On the other hand, the social matrix out of which the Jesus-movement emerged was one which by that time had long been infiltrated by Hellenistic thought-forms (ibid., 251). The general character of the Antiquities by Josephus is a sure testimony to this fact. Says Philip S. Alexander: "The Antiquities lives easily in two worlds—as a work of hellenistic historiography, and as an example of jew\textit{s} Bible exegesis—because it occupies a position where jew\textit{s} and hellenistic worlds coincide" ("Retelling the Old Testament",}
interpretation differs from that of the parable, however. indicates also that the former must be assigned to the more recent stratum of tradition.\textsuperscript{161} Now Linnemann notes:

> Once this understanding [many are lost for one reason or another] had been kindled by the parable, it was noticed that it not only illuminates the question as a whole, but throws light on many individual points.\textsuperscript{162}

That is to say, the parable is 'pregnant' with the allegorical presentation of 4:14-20. The metaphor for the preacher, viz. "a sower," would, for example, suggest itself readily to those engaged in evangelistic activity. Thus the parable and its allegorizing exposition seem to be, to all intents and purposes, simultaneous events. However, the interpretation betrays rather extensive reflection.\textsuperscript{163} The fate of the seed sown on rocky soil does not, for instance, readily suggest members of the church who have succumbed to persecution. Moreover, the fact of persecution

\textsuperscript{161}See below. Moreover, the allegorical interpretation, as Jeremias observed, does not include the eschatological point of the parable itself (Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 78-79, 149-51).

\textsuperscript{162}Linnemann, \textit{Parables}, 118.

\textsuperscript{163}The temptations mentioned (e.g. cares of the world [v. 19]), if they are to be regarded as genuine, would require the existence of the church for a considerable period (Best, \textit{Gospel as Story}, 42).
itself bespeaks an established community with a history. The allegorical interpretation in Mk 4:14-20, therefore, must represent, at the earliest, a tertiary formulation.\textsuperscript{164}

\textsuperscript{164}The allegorical interpretation of the parable of the Sower is not reported with the parable itself in the Gospel of Thomas (Logion 9). Jeremias along with others has rightly called attention to this fact (\textit{Parables}, 79). However, the tradition-historical relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the synoptic tradition determines whatever significance this observation may have for the matter at hand. On the one hand, one painstaking comparison of the Coptic Gospel of Thomas with the synoptic gospels has disclosed considerable evidence of literary dependence of the former on the latter. At any rate, such is the conclusion of Wolfgang Schrage (\textit{Das Verhältnis des Thomas-Evangeliums zur synoptischen Tradition und zu den koptischen Evangelienübersetzungen: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur gnostischen Synoptikerdeutung}, ZNW, Bh. 29 [Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann], 1964). The reconstruction of the tradition-histories of the parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven in Thomas (logia 20 and 96 resp.), proffered by Harry Fleddermann, lends credence to the position of Schrage (see "The Mustard Seed and the Leaven in Q, the Synoptics, and Thomas", in David J. Lull, ed., \textit{Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers}, 28 [Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1989], 225-30, 235-36). Tendentious editing of nascent ecclesiastical traditions by a gnostic editor would thus explain the absence of allegorical explanations in the Gospel of Thomas (so William Schoedel, "Parables in the Gospel of Thomas: Oral Tradition or Gnostic Exegesis", \textit{Concordia Theological Monthly} XLIII [8, September, 1972], 548-60). In any case, an increasing number of scholars have maintained the literary dependence of the Gospel of Thomas on the synoptic gospels (Scott, \textit{Hear then the Parable}, 32); However, this view does not represent a new development: see e.g. Gilles Quispel, "The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament", \textit{VC} XI [1957], 189-207; Willem Cornelis van Unnik, \textit{Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings: A Preliminary Survey of the Nag Hammadi Find}, trans. the Rev. H. H. Hoskins, Studies in Biblical Theology, no. 30 [London: SCM Press, 1960], 55; R. McL. Wilson, \textit{Studies in the Gospel of Thomas} [London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1960], 52-53). The point on which the whole debate turns is the religious matrix out of which the composition originated. That is to say, the Gospel of Thomas may or may not represent the work of a gnostic writer (see Scott, \textit{Hear then the Parable}, 31-33). In view of this uncertainty we will invoke such evidence only with caution. As yet no conclusion has been reached in the scholarly debate concerning the provenance of the Gospel of Thomas.
The foregoing analysis of the traditional strata comprising Mk 4:3-20 suggests a process of growth consisting of three distinct stages: (a) Jesus; or (b) earlier primitive church (vv. 3-8 [9]); (c) later primitive church (vv. 10, 13-20); and (d) Mark the evangelist (vv. 11-12). Thus our conclusion is not that of Jeremias. The hardening formula as it stands in Mk 4:11-12 represents not a tertiary, but a quaternary interpolation, i.e. if we include a possible Jesus stage.

iii. Marcan Modification of Material

The evangelist Mark was not an historiographer. By modern standards, his portrayal of the life of Jesus manifests a veritable plethora of historical difficulties. Not surprisingly, then, the turn of the century saw the publication of Wrede's "proto-redactional" study of the gospels. Of particular interest, an overarching theological conception appeared to govern the compilation of Mark's gospel throughout, viz. the Messianic Secret, and a reading of the work from this standpoint served to

See e.g., Mk 4:13; 7:18; 8:18. On the one hand, parable for Mark signifies enigmatic speech (Mk 4:11-12), yet on the other, the disciples are expected to know something they are prevented from understanding (Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 103-5; William Wrede, The Messianic Secret, trans. J.C.G. Greig, Library of Theological Publications (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic Press, 1971), 102). The parables, according to Mark, as Wrede rightly observed, are the means whereby Jesus conceals himself or his teaching and as such need to be explained to the disciples (p. 237). See also William Wrede on the raising of Jairus' daughter (Mk 5:22-24, 35-43), in his Messianic Secret, 50-51.


explain no small number of its historical anomalies. For Mark, Jesus was the Messiah—yet he could not reveal his messianic identity. This portrayal of Jesus as the Messiah of Jewish expectation, who nevertheless strove to conceal his messianic dignity, did not constitute a datum from the life of the historical Jesus, but rather a theological construct whereby the primitive church attempted to rationalize a vexing inconsistency between kerygma and history. The early church proclaimed Jesus as Messiah, on the one hand; on the other, the historical Jesus did not fulfil contemporary messianic expectations. The so-called hardening formula at Mk 4:11-12 which the evangelist has inserted into the parable chapter is, of course, one particularly notable

168 Ibid., 68; cf. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 96.

Allegedly the following features in Mark's gospel are manifestations of the Messianic-Secret Motif: the injunctions to silence in connection with Jesus' identity and his wonder-working activity, the enigmatic character of his teaching especially as it relates to his parables, and the private instruction of his disciples coupled with their inability to comprehend it (cf. Wrede, Messianic Secret, 80). Significantly, the instruction of the disciples in ch. 4 takes place only when Jesus is alone with them (v. 10).

The characterization of the Messianic Secret as an "overarching theological conception" does not preclude the possibility of other definitive theological conceptions operating in Mark's gospel. However we must make this point. A proper understanding of the significance of any given passage within a composition demands a sound grasp of the Sitz im Leben of the composition in its entirety (Marxsen, "Parabeltheorie", 257-58).

Religion-historically, and indeed within the framework of Mark's gospel, Schulz deems it more appropriate for us to speak of 'the secret of divine sonship' rather than the 'so-called Messianic Secret' ("Markus und AT", 186; cf. Gnilka who is non-committal [Markus, I, 165]). The distinction, however, is a spurious one. "Divine sonship" and "messiahship" are, biblically speaking, co-extensive. King David, for example, within the same psalm (2) can designate himself "his [the Lord's] anointed one"—literally "his messiah"—(v. 2) and "[the Lord's] son" (v. 7b).

passage wherein an attempt to resolve this inconsistency evidences itself.\textsuperscript{170}

Attractive as Wrede's reconstruction is, it deserves correction in one significant respect, nonethless. That is to say, a critical evaluation of the tradition supports the conclusion that the ministry of Jesus did in fact engender messianic expectations. In this connection, Günther Bornkamm notes the Lucan narrative wherein two disciples encounter the resurrected Jesus on the road to Emmaus. Within the ensuing dialogue, a statement attributed to those disciples bespeaks a faith in Jesus as the promised saviour by his followers prior to his death: "But we had hoped he was the one to redeem Israel" (Lk 24:21a).\textsuperscript{171} Yet another consideration to which Bornkamm calls our attention is the fact that numerous messianic movements had taken place around the time of Jesus and in these movements

\textsuperscript{170} So Wrede, \textit{Messianic Secret}, 56-57, 64-65; cf. the comments of Burkill (\textit{Mysterious Revelation}, 96, 100, 110) and Morton Smith ("Comments on Taylor's Commentary on Mark", \textit{HTR} XLVIII [1, January, 1955], 29-31).

\textsuperscript{171} Günther Bornkamm, \textit{Jesus of Nazareth}, trans. Irene and Fraser McCluskey with James M. Robinson (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1960), 172. Again, a question which gives expression to much the same hope as the statement of Lk 24:21a is ascribed to the eleven disciples in their meeting with the resurrected Jesus prior to his ascension: "Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1:6). Non-Lucan sources corroborate this picture. At Jericho blind Bartimaeus twice hails Jesus as Son of David (Mk 10:47, 48; par.). In the triumphal entry into Jerusalem Jesus elicits a similar response from the crowd (Mk 11:10; par.). Finally, an editorial comment to the effect that people wanted to make Jesus king serves to conclude the Johannine account of the feeding of the five thousand (6:15).
messianic claim and prophecy found themselves closely associated, if not in the words of the leaders themselves, then at least in the faith of their followers.\textsuperscript{172} Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we have to give full weight to a piece of evidence cited by Bornkamm, viz. the \textit{titulus} above the cross which bears the verdict of Pilate: "The King of the Jews" (Mk 15:26).\textsuperscript{173} At all events, it would appear that Jesus was executed by the Roman officials as a revolutionary.

In all likelihood, the action undertaken by Jesus in the Jerusalem temple was the catalyst for the initiation of legal proceedings against him.\textsuperscript{174} What we find in Mk 11:12-21 is a typical Marcan "sandwich." In other words, the story of the so-called cleansing of the temple (vv. 15-19) finds itself interpolated into that of the cursing of the fig-tree (vv. 12-14, 20-21). Clearly the purpose of this arrangement is to interpret the one event by the other. On any reading of the cursing of the fig-tree we cannot miss the theme of destruction of something deemed useless. In Mark's view, therefore, the action of Jesus in the temple signals not a symbolic cleansing\textsuperscript{175} but a symbolic

\textsuperscript{172}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{173}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{174}Burkhill, \textit{Mysterious Revelation}, 298-99.

\textsuperscript{175}Indeed the commerce in the temple manifests nothing which could be deemed improper (John Dominic Crossan, \textit{The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant} (San Francisco:
destruction of it.\textsuperscript{176} A symbolic action against the temple could, as Crossan has well documented, get one killed, insofar as it represented a challenge to Roman and Herodian authority.\textsuperscript{177} According to the gospel accounts, the incident in the temple had taken place just days prior to the Passover. The pilgrim feasts were potentially explosive situations.\textsuperscript{178} For this reason, the Roman and Herodian authorities always made necessary preparations for a possible outbreak of violence. Given such circumstances, the behaviour of Jesus in the temple would have been considered a disturbance of the peace, which called for his arrest.\textsuperscript{179}

\textsuperscript{176} That is to say, Jesus attacks its fiscal, sacrificial and cultic necessities (Crossan, \textit{Who Killed Jesus?} Exploring the Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Gospel Story of the Death of Jesus (San Francisco: Harper, 1995), 357. 

\textsuperscript{177} In this connection, Josephus recounts just such an incident: The Jewish law against the placing of either images, busts or any representation of a living creature in the temple notwithstanding, shortly before his death in 4 B.C. Herod the Great had installed a golden eagle above the great gate. On the occasion in question, two highly esteemed doctors of the law had instructed their disciples to destroy the golden eagle, whereupon the latter proceeded to do so. With considerable force the king's captain apprehended about forty of the culprits who were subsequently escorted to the king. Execution followed forthwith (\textit{Jewish War} 1:648-55 = \textit{Jewish Antiquities} 17.149-67, cited in Crossan, \textit{Who Killed Jesus?}, 57-58). Says Crossan: "[T]he golden eagle represented Roman [authority] over the Temple [--and presumably all that transpired therein--], and to destroy it was a symbolic action [against that authority]" (ibid., 58). 

\textsuperscript{178} Ibid., 54-56. The Passover in particular presented a potentially explosive situation. On the one hand, the people were celebrating ancient deliverance from slavery in Egypt; on the other, they now found themselves inhabitants in an occupied country (sim. ibid., 58). 

\textsuperscript{179} Here the Jewish religious establishment may have instigated the legal proceedings against Jesus. Thus Burkill writes:
Three allegedly independent sources, viz. Gospel of Thomas Logion 71 (speech only), Mk 11:12-21 (action only) and Jn 2:13-31 (action and speech), all bear witness to an action and/or a speech against the Jerusalem temple on the part of Jesus. Until such time as we can ascertain the literary relationship between these texts with any degree of probability, however, we cannot endorse any appeal to multiple attestation as a criterion for the historicity of the traditions in question, such as we find in Crossan. Yet the manifest unease with which Mark and especially

"We have no definite knowledge of the evidence on which the accusations were based. One possibility is that the so-called cleansing of the temple [Mk 11:15-19; par.] aroused the Sadducean priesthood to active opposition against Jesus (n.b. esp. 18). Even if it was originally intended to have only a religious or eschatological significance, a violent action of that kind might easily have had serious political consequences. Apparently it required but little provocation to excite the patriotic passions of the multitudes that assembled in Jerusalem at the time of the Passover, and the Sadducean leaders possibly thought that, as a precautionary measure, Jesus must be put out of the way before the feast began. Thus they might have acted, partly at all events, from quite disinterested motives, for they would be well aware of the violence with which the procurator was wont to suppress popular risings. Without making very close inquiries they may have concluded that Jesus was a Zealotic or Cananean nationalist who made pretensions to messianic or royal dignity. Accordingly, it is not unreasonable to suppose that, soon after the incident in the temple, some of the Sadducean magistrates (who generally sought to uphold friendly relations with the Roman authorities) resolved to have Jesus secretly arrested and proceeded to make arrangements for a procuratorial trial at which the prosecution was to be conducted on the basis of a charge of sedition" (Mysterious Revelation, 298-99).

The evidence furnished in Mk 11:18 and 14:57-59 supports the picture painted by Burkill. Plausible though this explanation may be, we must nonetheless exercise caution: throughout Mark's gospel Jesus repeatedly elicits the hostility of the religious authorities. In other words, their entrapment of Jesus could very well be nothing other than an outworking of the evangelist's own theological agenda.

180 See Who Killed Jesus?, 59.
John treat Jesus' action and/or speech in the temple does add weight to the probability of its/their historicity, as Crossan rightly maintains.\(^{181}\) To this effect, James Breech has formulated a criterion of embarrassment.\(^{182}\) What we observe in both Mark and John is the fact that the evangelists seek to legitimate Jesus' action in the temple with a reference to scripture: in Mk 11:17 Jesus himself cites a mixed quotation from Is 56:7 and Jer 7:11, Jesus' disciples recall the words of Ps 69:9 in Jn 2:17. This mention of the disciples' recollection in John seems to suggest a degree of concern with respect to Jesus' behaviour, and it makes yet a second appearance in the Johannine text, this time immediately following an allegorical reading of what looks to be a muted version of Jesus' saying against the temple. Regarding the muting of the saying, Jesus does not say, "I shall destroy this house ..." (Thomas Logion 71; cf. Mk 14:58, but rather "[You destroy this house ..." (Jn 2:19). Regarding the allegorical reading, John re-interprets the saying as a reference to Jesus' death and resurrection (2:20). Evidently the saying against the temple causes some difficulty for Mark as well as John. Firstly, the prediction of the destruction of the temple is credited Jesus, but--significantly--not the agency whereby it comes to pass (13:1-2). Secondly, the saying against the temple is credited

\(^{181}\) See ibid., 59-63 and idem., The Historical Jesus, 356-59.

\(^{182}\) Breech has observed that "when someone reveals to us something that is not in his best interest, or is embarrassing to him, we usually feel rather confident that he is telling us the truth" (Silence of Jesus, 22). In other words, the degree of embarrassment occasioned by a report lends corresponding weight to the probability of its historical reliability.
Jesus during his examination before the high priest, but by false witnesses (14:58) and again, on the cross by mocking unbelievers (15:29b-30). Indeed these manifest efforts to distance the reports about the action and/or saying with respect to the Jerusalem temple from Jesus, or to re-interpret them, bespeak considerable discomfort with this material, on the one hand, and the realization on the other, that it was too deeply entrenched in the remembrances of the believing community for it to be edited, let alone omitted, without some explanation.

The picture which emerges from the foregoing investigation is not that of a non-messianic ministry conducted by Jesus, or even the failure of his compatriots to recognise the messiahship of Jesus. On the contrary, argues Bornkamm, "We should ... not speak about the non-Messianic history, but rather of a movement of broken Messianic hopes, and of one who was hoped to be the Messiah, but who not only in his moment of failure, but in his entire message and ministry, disappointed the hopes which were placed in him."

A demonstration of a *Leitmotiv* in a literary work does not in itself establish the author of that work as its ultimate source. The idea that Jesus sought to conceal his messianic dignity during his ministry had, according to Wrede, imprinted itself on the tradition by the time Mark incorporated it into his gospel. The

---

185 *Jesus of Nazareth*, 172.
186 Ibid., 145-46. The Q-saying reported in Mt 11:25-26 = Lk 10:21
presence of this motif does, however, impart a disjointedness to
the narrative.¹⁸⁷ Such a peculiarity, together with the frequency
with which we observe it, would not establish the hand of the
evangelist beyond all doubt. Nonetheless it increases the
likelihood that Mark did not simply adopt the theme of the secret
messiahship from the pre-Marcan tradition, but at least brought it

is very interesting in this connection--revelation to the disciples
as opposed to concealment from the crowd. See Taylor, Mark, 257;
cf. Cranfield, Mark, 253. While Taylor's suggestion that Mark was
directly influenced by Paul (see Acts 15:37-38) is open to debate,
it is noteworthy that the apostle in Rom 9-11 does speak of the
hardening and rejection of Israel (see Taylor, Mark, 257).

¹⁸⁷ A typical example of this disjointedness in the Marcan narrative
manifests itself in the account of the healing of Jairus' daughter
(5:21-24, 35-43). The girl who is presumed dead by everyone
present at the home of her father (vv. 35, 38-40a) regains
consciousness when Jesus takes her by the hand and tells her to
arise (v. 41-42a). Thereupon Jesus, this public display of
amazing healing powers notwithstanding (v. 42b), "strictly
charge[s all in attendance] that no one should know this" (v. 43).
An injunction to silence is a self-evident absurdity here (Wrede,
Messianic Secret, 50-51). This in itself indicates a certain
artificiality.

Interestingly, a resolution of the apparently contradictory
statements of Mk 4:11-12 and 4:21-25 takes place if one considers
them within the context of Wrede's Messianic-Secret hypothesis.
All things must remain hidden from the outsider (4:11-12), and yet
all things must become manifest (4:22). This tension which comes
to expression here in the Marcan parable-chapter is precisely the
same as that which obtains between Mk 8:30 and 9:9. Jesus'
messiahship must remain hidden and yet Jesus' messiahship must
become manifest after the resurrection (See Wrede, Messianic
Secret, 70-71, 112. This important analogy also suggests itself
in Burkill's analysis. See Mysterious Revelation, 98-99, 103,
The hardening formula of Mk 4:11-12 together with the logia of
Mk 4:21-25 finds its most economical explanation within just such
a literary/theological framework. (Indeed the group of sayings
reported in Mk 4:21-25 represents a redactional insertion of
traditional materials. However, we can no longer ascertain their
original setting
[Best, Markan Soteriology, 74; see below "Marcan Seam"]).
to its current stage of development.\textsuperscript{188}

A number of scholars have proposed refinements to Wrede's thesis.\textsuperscript{189} One such refinement is that of Schuyler Brown. Thus the secret of the kingdom of God to which reference is made in Mk 4:11 would not represent one of a number of manifestations of the Messianic-Secret motif but a different motif altogether. Unfortunately Wrede, in his exegesis of the Marcan parable-chapter, failed to make this distinction and thus subsumed all Marcan redactional features under the rubric of "Messianic Secret." To the extent that the evangelist attempted to bridge an alleged hiatus between the paraenesis of the early church and the preaching of the earthly Jesus, however, similar circumstances attended the formulation of the secret of the kingdom of God as did that of the Messianic Secret. Just as the Messianic Secret in the "strict sense" served to explain why it was that the one whom the church proclaimed as Messiah was crucified, so also the secret

\textsuperscript{188}The disjointedness in the Marcan narrative of which we speak is not an "inconsistency between what Mark records and what actually happened" à la Stein ("Proper Methodology", 189), but rather an inconsistency within the context of the narrative world itself. A "'consistent' inconsistency" of this kind (see preceding note) "portrays a Markan vocabulary, style, theme, etc." The Marcan vocabulary, style, theme, etc. would, in turn, signal an "inconsistency between what Mark records and what actually happened." Unfortunately, Stein, in his description of this important method of uncovering Marcan redaction, does not clearly distinguish the two kinds of inconsistency of which we speak--viz. the "'consistent' inconsistency" within the narrative, on the one hand, and on the other, "the inconsistency between what Mark records [--Jesus of Nazareth is the long-awaited Messiah (1:1)--) and what actually happened [--the Jewish people reject Jesus as their Messiah]" (ibid.). The former we prefer to call a "narrative disjointedness."

\textsuperscript{189}S. Brown, "The Secret of the Kingdom", 60.
of the kingdom of God served to explain why it was that Jesus had apparently not provided the operative instructions regarding life in the Church. In other words, Jesus had in fact imparted such instruction to the disciples in private, but they were not to disclose it until after the resurrection.\footnote{So S. Brown, "Secret of the Kingdom", 61-72; cf. Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 240.} This subtle distinction between the secret of Jesus' messiahship in the so-called "strict sense" and that of the kingdom of God is open to question at several points.\footnote{See ch. 2 pp. 136-38.} However, the point which is particularly germane to the present discussion involves the claim that a similar theological problem has engendered both secrets, and above all, that the source of the ideas in Mk 4:11-12 is none other than the theological reflection of the evangelist.\footnote{So, e.g. Pesch (\textit{Markus}, I, 237) and Scott (\textit{Hear then the Parable}, 347). Cf. 7:17; 9:28; 10:10; 13:3.}

Several different scholars over the past three or four decades have identified discipleship as the dominant theme in the Gospel of Mark.\footnote{Some scholars such as S. Brown (cf. Pesch) do not accept Wrede's treatment of Mk 4:11-12. Yet others express some ambivalence. Taylor writes: "The passage as it now stands in vv. 11f. represents the beliefs of Mark" (Mark, 257). Similarly Linnemann: "What we find in vv. 10ff. is a theological conception of the evangelist" (\textit{Parables}, 118, n. "h"). Yet despite their reserve toward the idea of the Messianic Secret, both scholars see Mk 4:11-12 as a vehicle which serves to bring Marcan dogma to expression. Here we have additional proof that this logion is redactional.} Certain features of Mark's gospel subsumed under the rubric of the Messianic Secret by Wrede may be explained quite

\footnote{See S. Brown, "Secret of the Kingdom", 60. Significantly, the verb διδάσκω and its cognates make their appearance most often within Marcan "seams" (Best, \textit{Markan Soteriology}, 71-72).}
convincingly, perhaps more convincingly, from the standpoint of
the theme of discipleship.\(^{194}\) Moreover, the exclusion formula of
Mk 4:11-12 does have relevance to the Marcan conception of
discipleship, but as we shall see in Test Case 1b, it does so in a
manner different from that conceived by S. Brown.\(^{195}\)

iv. Marcan Arrangement of Material

The arrangement of a significant portion of the material in
Mark's gospel manifests various forms of what may be described as
structural dualism. Neirynck has identified three instances
in Mk 4:11-12: (a) multiplication of cognate verbs in vv. 2, 9,
11, 13, 21, 24, 26, and 30 (λέγω);\(^{196}\) (b) antithetic parallelism in
v. 11;\(^{197}\) and (c) the doublets of v. 12 and 8:18.\(^{198}\)

v. Marcan Vocabulary

In addition to the formula καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς we can detect
other examples of Marcan vocabulary in 4:11. These include:
ἐκείνοις ... τοῖς ἔξω as opposed to ὑμῖν (v. 12), τῆς βασιλείας
τοῦ θεοῦ as a characteristic Marcan theme, and ἐν παραβολαῖς as
the manner of addressing 'outsiders.'\(^{199}\)

The foregoing application of Stein's proposed method of

---

\(^{194}\)See S. Brown, "Secret of the Kingdom", 61 n. 7.

\(^{195}\)See ch. 2 pp. 138-39.

Interestingly, Ernest Best who recognises the importance of
the theme of discipleship in Mark (see Gospel as Story, 83-92)
does not treat the passage at length, but simply characterizes it
as "a redactional insertion by Mark" (see ibid., 63).

\(^{196}\)Duality in Mark, 77.

\(^{197}\)Ibid., 133: ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον ... δέδοται ... ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς

\(^{198}\)Ibid., 135.

\(^{199}\)See Lambrecht, "Redaction and Theology", 282-83.
distinguishing Marcan redaction from pre-Marcan tradition suggests that one can with reasonable assurance ascribe Mk 4:11-12 to none other than Mark himself.

This result of our attempt to map out a redaction-history for the exclusion formula of Mk 4:11-12 supports the result of our effort to ascertain the text-form of the reference to Is 6:9-10 contained therein. Mark's representation of Is 6:9-10 in 4:12 is best designated an instance of "free indirect reporting." That is to say, the speech presentation in Mark preserves certain aspects of the style of the Isaianic passage, but it lacks the grammatical construction normally associated with a reported speech. At the same time, the form of the Marcan presentation manifests common divergences from the extant text and versions of Isaiah. These Marcan divergences entail: (a) a conflation of Is 6:9b and the terminal "lest"-clause of Is 6:10 and the concomitant omission of Is 6:9a and 10a; and (b) a transposition of Is 6:9bα and 9bβ in Mk 4:12a. The general sense of Mark with the (intentional) ἐγὼ-clause in v. 12a more closely approximates that of the MT with the imperative mood in Is 6:10a than it does that of the LXX with the (causal) γάρ-clause in Is 6:10a or that of the Targum with the indicative mood in Is 6:10a. A working knowledge of the Hebrew language on the part of Mark cannot be presupposed here on any

---

200E.g. the conjunction σὺν or ὁς preceded by a verb of saying, and followed by the reported speech with the appropriate alterations in tense, mood and person (H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament [Toronto: The Macmillan Company, 1957], 296-99). For a comparison of Mk 4:12 with the MT, LXX and the Targum in Is 6:9-10 see above pp. 33-40.
account. For that reason, we must ascribe this approximation in general tenor to the MT to the evangelist himself. All of the divergences of Mk 4:12 from Is 6:9-10, which the extant text and versions of the Isaianic passage have in common, find the same source as the other salient features of Mk 4:11-12, which we have discussed in this section—the theology of Mark.

B. MK 1:2-3: ITS TRADITION-HISTORICAL LOCATION WITHIN THE PRE-MARCAN STRANDS OF (ORAL/WRITTEN) TRADITION

The group of OT texts cited in Mk 1:2-3 (Mk 1:2b, c = Ex 23:20/Mal 3:1; Mk 1:3 = Is 40:3) finds itself near the beginning of the Marcan Prologue. This prologue most likely extends as far as v. 15\(^{201}\) and comprises two identifiable

\(^{201}\)So. e.g., Best, Gospel as Story, 129.

This position has not gained universal acceptance. Some scholars maintain that the prologue extends no further than v. 13 (e.g. Burkhill, Mysterious Revelation, 9; Cranfield, Mark, 33; Luz, "Jesusbild", 352 n. 10; Pryke, Redactional Style, 30 n. 6; and Taylor, Mark, 90. As a somewhat less probable hypothesis Cranfield suggests that the prologue might end at v. 8). Noting the Marcan practice of using ἐτέρω to signal "some large new departure in his narrative" Burkhill favours the variant reading μετὰ ἐτέρω (N) in v. 14 insofar as it underlines the beginning of Jesus' public ministry (Burkhill, Mysterious Revelation). Manuscripts B and D attest the usual reading in κατ ἐτέρω (ibid.). Further, theological, structural and terminological considerations support our contention that vv. 1-15 belong together. Firstly, the activity of the Baptist and that of Jesus are thus connected that John is interpreted as the forerunner of Jesus. Moreover, references to the word of God serve to introduce the missions of both these figures. Again, one theological statement overarches all of the prologue. The statement that Jesus Christ is the Son of God in v. 1 re-asserts itself in the divine annunciation of the beloved Son in v. 11 (Gnilka, Markus, I, 39). Secondly, and in large measure related to the foregoing theological interconnections, there is a structural parallelism which exists between the sub-sections vv. 2-8 and vv. 9-15 (see below). Finally, the word εὐαγγέλιον forms an inclusio in vv. 1 and 14-15 (Gnilka, Markus, I, 39; Rudolf Pesch, "Anfang", 314).
sub-sections: (a) vv. 2-8: a passage which relates the ministry of John the Baptist; and (b) vv. 9-15: a passage which relates the beginning of Jesus' ministry in Galilee.\textsuperscript{202} A title or superscript precedes the section in v. 1.\textsuperscript{203} Sub-sections (a) and (b) in turn comprise three components and therein manifest some

\textsuperscript{202}Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 39; Pesch, "Anfang", 317. Cf. the following proposed division of the prologue: the ministry of the Baptist (vv. 1-8); the baptism of Jesus (vv. 9-11); and the temptation (vv. 12-13) (Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 33-60; Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 151-64).

\textsuperscript{203}The title represents \textit{Marcan redaction} (Bultmann, \textit{HST}, 127). Pryke lists the following as \textit{Marcan vocabulary}: \textit{ἀρχή} (3 out of 5 occurrences redactional), \textit{εὐαγγέλιον} (7\textsuperscript{a} out of 7 occurrences redactional), \textit{νῦν θεοῦ} (3 out of 5 occurrences redactional) and \textit{Ἰησοῦς Χριστός} (once) (\textit{Redactional Style}, 37 n. 2). (\textsuperscript{a}In distinction to Pryke, however, we consider the noun \textit{εὐαγγέλιον} in v. 15 pre-\textit{Marcan}). In addition, Neirynck has noted two features which constitute \textit{Marcan "dualism."} These include the substantive followed by apposition (\textit{Ἰησοῦς Χριστοῦ [νῦν θεοῦ]) (\textit{Duality in Mark}, 107) and the inclusion formed by vv. 1 (\textit{Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ}) and 15 (πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ) (ibid., 131).

Burkill has noted:
"The word 'beginning' may here refer to the mission of John the Baptist (God begins his redemptive action in the Messiah by sending the forerunner) [cf. Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 34-35] or to the ministry of Jesus (the Messiah's incarnate life is the prelude to his final manifestation in glory) [so Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 152]" (\textit{Mysterious Revelation}, 9).

Best has also noted:
"In 1:1 it is difficult to decide whether in the phrase 'the gospel of Jesus Christ' Jesus Christ is to be taken as the person whom the gospel proclaims (objective genitive) or as the person who proclaims the gospel (subjective genitive). In fact there is a sense in which both are true; Christ is both a figure of the past in the book of Mark and he speaks in and through it as a living Lord" (\textit{Gospel as Story}, 39).
degree of structural parallelism:

vv. 2-3  
the annunciation of the forerunner of the Lord  
vv. 9-11  
the annunciation of the beloved Son of God

vv. 4-6  
the activity of the Baptist in the wilderness  
vv. 12-13  
the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness

vv. 7-8  
the preaching of the Baptist  
vv. 14-15  
the preaching of Jesus

One can readily identify counterparts at the beginning in the divine annunciation and at the conclusion in the preaching activity (the verb κηρύσσειν [vv. 7, 14]). The corresponding element in the middle part is the scene of the preaching activity of the Baptist and the temptation of Jesus (the noun ἔρημος [vv. 4-6 (inferred from v. 3), 13]).

Generally speaking, those commentators who have applied their exegetical skills to the Marcan Prologue (Mk 1:1-13 [14-15]) have concerned themselves with an analysis of its function in relation to the gospel in toto. An approach to the prologue along these lines serves to illumine the theology of Mark and the salient features of his editorial work. While the value of such information cannot be overestimated, it nonetheless affords no immediate information as to the erstwhile function of the tradition at his disposal. Not only would an identification and

---


205 The events related in the vv. 4-6 and 12-13 being different in nature, Gnilka sees the middle parts corresponding minimally, thus rendering the structural parallelism between vv. 2-8 and 9-15 somewhat less than absolute (*Markus*, I, 39).

examination of pre-Marcan tradition—where this is feasible—yield information which is interesting in its own right, but it would also provide a background against which the Marcan redaction itself could be cast into sharper relief. As we shall see, the value of this additional information will manifest itself when we finally come to compare our findings in Test Cases 1, and 2a and b.

The references to the Jewish scriptures in Mk 1:2-3 find themselves within a sub-section consisting of vv. 2-8. Within this sub-section the hand of the evangelist confines itself primarily to what may be regarded as stylistic features. These include: (a) multiplication of cognate verbs in vv. 4 and 9 (γίνομαι) and in v. 8 (βαπτίζω [2x]); use of the double participle in vv. 4 (βαπτίζων/κηρύσσων) and 6 (ἐνδεδυμένος/ ἔσθων); (b) double statement: firstly, general and special in vv. 5, and 5 and 9; secondly, repetition of a motif in vv. 2 and 3; (c) correspondence in narrative in vv. 4 and 5; (d) quotation and comment in vv. 2 and 14, and 3 and 4; (e) antithetical

---

207 Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 77.
208 Ibid., 82.
209 Ibid., 96: πάσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολύμαται πάντες (v.5); ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολύμαται πάντες, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ (v. 5)/θλθεν Ἰησοῦς ... καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνῃ ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου (v. 9)
210 Ibid., 97: δς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὅδὸν σου (v. 2)/ἐτοιμάσετε τὴν ὅδὸν κυρίου (v. 3).
211 Ibid., 112: ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ... κηρύσσων βάπτισμα ... εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτίων (v. 4)/καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ... ἐξομολογομένοι ... τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν (v. 5).
212 Ibid., 124: ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου τρό προσώπου σου
parallelism in v. 8 (ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ... βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς) and direct discourse preceded by a qualifying verb in v. 7 (ἐκήρυσσεν λέγων). However, the content of vv. 2-8 comprises strands of tradition which antedate Mark's gospel.

The existence of a linguistic bridge between Mal 3:1b and Is 40:3b in the Hebrew suggests an association of the texts of Mal 3:1 (v. 2) and Is 40:3 (v. 3) before the compilation of Mark's gospel. In v. 3 the identification of the κύριος with Jesus may well represent further evidence of a pre-Marcan association of these passages.
The complex of references to scripture passages reported in Mk 1:2–3, in turn, orients itself to the report in v. 4 which is itself substantially tradition. Various claims as to the presence of Marcan vocabulary in v. 4 has elicited a number of very telling observations from Pesch: 218 (a) the noun ὁ βαπτίζων, along with ὁ βαπτιστής, is the traditional designation of the Baptist—cf. 6: 24, 26; (b) the occurrence of the verb κηρύσσω is not limited to Marcan redactional contexts 219—along with 1:4, 7 we note, for example, 14:9; moreover, the construction κηρύσσων βαπτίσμα is not unlike the formulation κηρύσσω νηστείαν of the LXX in 2 Chr 20:3 and Jon 3:5; and (c) the adverbial phrase ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ is not a redactional insertion 220 but arguably a pre-Marcan, 221 or possibly an authentic statement of place; in this connection we note the Q tradition in Mt 11:7/Lk 7:24 regarding the Baptist where there is mention of the reed which is native to the wilderness of the Jordan. 222

218 "Anfang", 315.
219 The verb κηρύσσειν appears 12x in Mark; of these Pryke records 11 as redactional (Redactional Style, 137).
220 The noun ἔρημος appears 8x in Mark; of these Pryke considers all 8 redactional (ibid., 136).
221 Best has observed that, "In the editorial passages Mark used ἔρημος τόπος (or the plural), whereas the phrase in the tradition is ἡ ἐρήμος (γῆ) (i.e. 3, 4, 12, 13)" (Markan Soteriology, 26; see discussion pp. 25–27).
222 Still, the connection of the work of the Baptist with the wilderness and, in particular, with Is 40:3 may represent not an historical fact but rather a mentality akin to that of Qumran as reflected in 1QS 8:12–16 (Gnilka. Markus, I, 41–42).

Noting the frequent use of the parenthetical remark in Mark (so C. H. Turner, "iv. 'Parenthetical Clauses in Mark'", JTS XXVI [January, 1925], 145–46 [the 4th of a series of articles in JTS XXV–XXIX (1924–28) entitled "Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and
In all probability the traditions reported in vv. 5 and 6 found themselves within the same unit as comprised vv. 2-3 and 4. The antecedent of the personal pronoun which occurs in the prepositional phrases πρὸς/ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ in v. 5 is the person of John the Baptist who is first identified by name in v. 4. Likewise the Baptist of v. 4 is the referent of construction ὁ Ἰωάννης in v. 6.

Exegetical, on the Second Gospel,"1 cited in Pryke, Redactional Style, 32), the location of the verb ἐγένετο at the beginning of v. 4, but primarily the probable orientation of the phrase ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (v. 1) toward the ministry of the Baptist (vv. 5-8), Pryke has reached the conclusion that the so-called title or superscript to the Gospel of Mark in v. 1, together with v. 4, constitutes a single sentence in which vv. 2-3 appear as an explanatory note (Redactional Style, 38). The verses would read thus:

"The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ [the Son of God] ... [scripture quotation] ... was John baptizing in the wilderness and preaching a baptism for the forgiveness of sins."

Maintaining firstly, that Marcan vocabulary is present in vv. 1 and 4, and secondly, that four of thirteen quotations of OT material in Mark's gospel of one or two verses in length are suspended in the middle of a sentence (1:1-4; 7:6-8; 10:5-8; 14:27-28), Pryke further concludes that Mk 1:1-4 represents the work of the evangelist (ibid., 37). In view of the established reference to Is 40:3 in v. 3 the word εὐαγγελίου may also reflect the influence of 2 Isaiah (cf. εὐαγγελίζεσθαι [40:9 (2x)]; 52:7 (2x))] (cf. Best, Markan Soteriology, 150), thus suggesting some affinity between vv. 1 and 3. Even so, we contest Pryke's second premise. Only one of the four examples of OT quotation suspended in mid-sentence cited by Pryke--1:2-3--is an instance of scriptural material suspended in the middle of a sentence, in our assessment, and as such a parenthetical note. Moreover, Pryke himself, later in his discussion, contradicts his initial observation regarding Mk 10:5-8:

"10-8 is not a quotation suspended in the middle of a statement, but a quotation skilfully interwoven into the deduction which the speaker makes from it" (ibid., 39).

Pesch, "Anfang", 315-16.

Ibid. The prologue, as Burkill rightly notes, contains no mention of Elijah by name. Nevertheless Burkill's setting aside of the description of John provided in v. 6 (cf. 2 Kg 1:8) as material imported from Mt 3:4 strikes us as being an hypothesis
The preaching of the Baptist in vv. 7-8 Gnilka thinks to be material which was inserted by the evangelist himself. This material, in addition to that reported in v. 2b, Gnilka rightly considers an attempt to secure John as forerunner of the earthly Jesus. The older Q tradition,\(^ {225} \) it is noted, represents John as forerunner of the coming Messiah. Thus, when Gnilka strips vv. 2-8 of what he alleges to be Marcan redactional overlay, we have left vv. 2a, 3-6, a 'closed report', 'stamped by the citation from Isaiah' and 'bearing no recognisably Christian features.'\(^ {226} \)

Two things must be added. Firstly, Gnilka's conclusion that Mark is responsible for the present form and location of vv. 2b, 3-6 presupposes the dubious hypothesis that the evangelist had access to and made use of the Q-tradition.\(^ {227} \) Secondly, if, as

which, while interesting, has no hard evidence to support it. Only one of the extant manuscript traditions, viz. D, attests a reading of Mk 1 in which v. 6 is absent. Burkill himself acknowledges this fact (see Mysterious Revelation, 12). Furthermore, the reference to Mal 3:1a in Mk 1:2b, c indicates that the redactor has Elijah in mind.

\(^ {225} \)The Temptation Story reported in Mt 4:1-11/Lk 4:1-13 is a late addition to Q (so John S. Kloppenborg, The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections, Studies in Antiquity & Christianity [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987], 247-48). Yet the addition of the Temptation Story to the Logion Source seems to represent a movement away from being a collection of sayings "toward a biographical cast such as Mark 1 offers" (James M. Robinson, "Jesus--From Easter to Valentinus [or to the Apostles' Creed]", JBL CI [1982], 22, cited in ibid., 257 and endorsed 262). Thus even the more recent recensions of Q would, by implication, constitute an earlier stage of development than the pre-Marcan tradition.

\(^ {226} \)See Gnilka, Markus, I, 41.

\(^ {227} \)The question of a possible literary relationship between Mark and Q received extensive treatment prior and subsequent to B. H. Streeter's definitive formulation of the 'Two-source Theory' (The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates [New York: The Macmillan
Gnilka states, one is hard pressed to explain what function the Marcan Prologue itself would have had as an isolated unit, what then shall we say in regard to vv. 2a, 3-6 as a 'closed report'? Gnilka's position is hardly convincing.

Still, the preaching of the Baptist as presented in vv. 7-8 may have undergone some minor stylistic modification at the hands of the evangelist. A concern to make the ensuing proclamation stand out in fuller relief may have prompted substitution of a simpler transition formula (καὶ ἔκηρυσεν) for a subordinate clause (κηρύσσων ...) in v. 7. Yet a pre-Marcan tradent(s) could just as easily have for similar reasons effected this kind of change. Noting again in v. 7 the occurrence of the finite verb ἔρχεται in the same verse over against the articular participle ὁ ἔρχομενος attested in Q (supposedly represented in Mt 3:11), Gnilka discerns what he alleges to be the historicizing tendency of Mark coming into play, insofar as the latter is said to have

Company 1925). Indeed the divergences between reports of the same tradition in both Mark and Q are such as to make it exceedingly improbable that Mark knew or used Q. See e.g. George Dewitt Castor, "The Relation of Mark to the Source Q", JBL XXXI (2, 1912), 82-91; T. E. Floyd Honey, "Did Mark Use Q?", JBL LXII (1943), 319-31; Carl S. Patton, "Did Mark Use Q? Or Did Q Use Mark?", AJT XVI (1912), 634-42 and Burton H. Throckmorton Jr., "Did Mark Know Q?", JBL LXVII (1948), 319-29.

228 A la Gnilka, Markus, I, 40. Such a complex of tradition, that is, vv. 2a, 3 (Is 40:3) without the substitution of αὑτοῦ for τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν), 4, and possibly 5 and 6, would, in the estimation of Pesch, constitute a short summary concerning the activity of the Baptist, interpreting his mission eschatologically, but exhibiting no reference to Jesus' person and mission. The extant text of Mk 1:2-8 would, in that case, represent a second layer of tradition (Pesch, "Anfang", 319).

229 Ibid., 316.
altered his source.\textsuperscript{230}

Alterations in material content are considerations of greater moment. What is at issue for the evangelist in v. 8 is the contrast between the water baptism of the Baptist with the Spirit of "the one coming after."\textsuperscript{231} The Q tradition wherein John subordinates his own baptism to that of the fire (Mt 3:11/ Lk 3:16) is a more primitive form of the same tradition in all likelihood.\textsuperscript{232} No preaching of judgement (Mt 3:7-10, 12/}

\textsuperscript{230}Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 42.

\textsuperscript{231}This distinction between Jesus and his appointed precursor emphasises and defines the superiority of the former over the latter (Burkhill, \textit{Mysterious Revelation}, 12). The speech attributed to John the Baptist in vv. 7-8 represents a "clearly polemic[all]" statement as M. Smith has correctly noted ("Comments on Taylor", 21). These verses, if indeed they do manifest a polemic against the Baptist himself, nonetheless reveal an attempt to secure him a place--albeit a subordinate place--within the Christian tradition.

\textsuperscript{232}The Q-version of the saying did not likely contain the reference to the Spirit (πνεῦμα). Certainly, Jewish speculation concerning the Messianic age had long included the possibility of an outpouring of the Spirit (cf. Is 44:3; Jl 3:1-2) (Bultmann, \textit{HST}, 247). In addition to this, the πνεῦμα of baptism could signify the fiery breath of the eschatological Judge (Is 11:4; 2 Th 2:8; etc.) (see ibid., 398 suppl. to 111 n. 1). Yet the presence of the adjectival modifier Holy (ἁγιός) coupled with the contrast between the water baptism of John and the Spirit baptism of Jesus bespeaks secondary Christian development similar to what we find in Acts 1:5; 11:16 (see ibid., 246). Thus the Q-source would not have originally included the phrase ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίω (Mt 3:11; Lk 3:16). On the contrary, Matthew and Luke have likely imported it from the Marcan version (1:8) (see Castor, "Relation of Mark to Q", 89; Patton, "Did Mark Use Q?", 635). Two considerations support this hypothesis. Firstly, theologically speaking, the de-eschatologizing tendency of the pre-Marcan tradition, accommodates the Holy Spirit more easily than does the Q-tradition. Secondly, stylistically speaking, the inclusion of the phrase πνεῦματι ἁγίῳ blunts the vivid and natural contrast between πῦρ and ὁ δόρος.

The Q report of the Baptist's preaching--excluding the phrase ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ and thus qualifying Bultmann (\textit{HST}, 246)--would, in view of the foregoing observations, represent a more primitive
Lk 3:7-9, 17) do we find in Mark's gospel either. Yet to attribute these divergences to a Marcan reworking of Q material is to invoke an hypothesis which has little hard evidence to support it. Moreover, the time period by which Q antedated Mark afforded ample opportunity for theological developments to have taken place.

No compelling evidence, so far as we can determine, exists to connect the basic content of Mk 1:2-8 to the evangelist himself. All the same, the function which vv. 2-15--and by inference vv. 2-8 as well--would have served in isolation from its present context, eludes Gnilka, thus leading him to view the section as a Marcan assemblage of different traditions, whose function was to introduce the larger composition. Nevertheless the Marcan account of the Baptist's mission would have served the interests of primitive Christianity in two ways. Firstly, the designation of John as the forerunner to the Messiah would correct a tendency to place too high an estimation of the former. Secondly, the form than that of Mark.

---

234 So ibid.
235 Viz., that Mark knew Q.
236 In the same light, of course, we would view the alleged insertion of the adjective "Holy" before the word "Spirit" in v. 8. The ascription of such discrepancies between the versions reported in Mark and Q to Marcan redaction is an hypothesis which Pesch quite rightly rejects, although he does not offer any explicit reasons for his judgement (see Pesch, "Anfang", 316).
237 So ibid.
239 Pesch, "Anfang", 318.
identification of the Baptist with Elijah redivivus, would have countered an objection within Judaism (or even the church) that the Messiah must be preceded by that prophet.

The tradition-historical analyses which we have conducted in the foregoing section serve to demonstrate some of the ways which we might identify Marcan redaction and pre-Marcan tradition. Once again certain passages may contain material of both kinds. In ideal cases we can separate the stages quite easily. However, the conglomeration of the two kinds of material may be such that a clean separation of them is out of the question. In passages where this is in fact the case we will have no other option than to speak in terms of degree.

The presuppositions underlying the tradition-historical method we have adopted having thus been set forth, we now reconsider the passages investigated on the preceding pages, this time attempting to shed some light on the scripture-hermeneutics operative at the Marcan and pre-Marcan stages of the synoptic tradition.\textsuperscript{240}

\textsuperscript{240}See ch. 2, Test Cases 1 and 2.
Excursus 1

Mark 4:11-12: An Authentic Dominical Saying?

The logion with which we have been dealing, so far as its present form and location is concerned, has several apparent historical difficulties associated with it. Particularly noteworthy are the following:

a. Even though more than one criterion has to be applied to the saying, the religion-historical observation of similarity with mystery cults speaks against authenticity; 241

b. 'Parable' in its original sense is used not to hinder, but to facilitate understanding. 242 Authenticity cannot be assumed in light of this observation;

c. A preaching ministry, whose express purpose is to conceal the preacher's message, is not only pointless, but bizarre in the extreme; 243

241 See Cranfield, Mark, 152.
242 This is the view held by Taylor (Mark, 250, 255). Yet as Burkill notes, it is a widely accepted view (Mysterious Revelation, 100, 112). It is presupposed when scholars claim that 'parable' was used as a means of stimulating the conscience, or awakening religious insight (T. W. Manson, Teaching of Jesus, 65), as argument (Dodd, Parables, 11-12), or as weapons of controversy (Jeremias, Parables, 21).
243 Wrede, Messianic Secret, 62; cf. T. W. Manson, Teaching of Jesus, 76. Similarly Drury poses the question: "Could Jesus have behaved like this"? He then cites John Chrysostom: "If he [Jesus] had not wished them to hear and be saved, he would have kept quiet, not spoken in parables" (Matt. Hom. 45 n. 2). Neither were Matthew and Luke at peace with Mark's presentation: they went to some trouble to attenuate the "offence" in the passage (John Drury, "Origins of Mark's Parables", in Michael Wadsworth, ed., Ways of Reading the Bible [Sussex: Harvester Press; New Jersey: Barnes and Noble Books, 1981], 184).
d. No one was executed for uttering riddles; 244

e. People would not continue to listen to a speaker whose message was totally incomprehensible.

These allegations on the surface appear to undermine a serious claim to authenticity. Still they warrant closer scrutiny.

a. Taylor writes:

In the N.T., and especially in the Pauline Epp., it [μυστήριον] means an 'open secret' made known by God, and is used of the Gospel, or the inclusion of the Gentiles. 245

This statement may well be true as it applies to this or that instance, and as far it concerns the Pauline writings Cranfield would certainly endorse it. 246 Yet Taylor continues:

There is no case in which it [μυστήριον] connotes secret rites or esoteric knowledge communicated to 'initiates'. In the present passage [Mk. 4:11] and its parallels, it is used of a knowledge concerning the Kingdom of God which has been imparted to the disciples, but not to the people in general. 247

The first sentence is contradicted and refuted by the second. 248

Particularly germane to our present concern is the following observation made by Morton Smith:

[T]he secrets to which [μυστήριον] refers in the rest of the N.T. are not always 'open', e.g. I Cor. 2:6f. (cf. 3:1-3); Col. 2:2; Eph. 5:32. In I Cor. Paul says


245 Taylor, Mark, 255.

246 Cranfield, Mark, 152.

247 Taylor, Mark, 255.

248 The benefit of the doubt is extended to Taylor by M. Smith: "[P]erhaps T[aylor] intended to distinguish between 'the disciples' and 'initiates', or some word such as 'Elsewhere' should be understood before the first [quotation cited]" ("Comments on Taylor", 29).
plainly that there is a wisdom which he preaches among
the 'initiate' (τελειωτας), but which he cannot yet
preach to the Corinthians because they are still
'carnal'. Paul, therefore, claimed to have a secret
document. As for Jesus, Mark, of course, represents him
as teaching in secret and commanding secrecy on many
occasions.

Mark and the writers of the apostolic period knew the idea of
secret teaching imparted to initiates. Direct influence of the
latter upon the former is not established, but still a conceptual
background common to them.

Two other factors must be considered. For the most part,
the translators of the LXX do not use the word μυστήριον in the
canonical books. Chapter 2 of Daniel is the one exception.
There it occurs eight times and represents the Aramaic "ןככ. The
word is also found a number of times in the Apocrypha, and other
Greek versions of the OT employ it as a rendering of the Hebrew
תפם. A relative absence of the term μυστήριον in the earlier
translators would, says Cranfield, reflect a conscious avoidance
of it in view of its pagan connotations. Later on, it came to
enjoy more common usage. With that, the word assumed a more
neutral sense. At that point, translators could employ it with
greater freedom. The discrepancy between the LXX version of
Am 3:7 and the quotation of that verse in Rev 10:7 evidences the
occurrence of some such process, in Cranfield's view. In this
connection, the latter passage reports the word μυστήριον, but not
the former.

---

249 Ibid.
250 Mark, 152-53.
251 Ibid., 153. Indeed this substitution of the noun μυστήριον for
However, an idea similar to that expressed in Mk 4:11 is not unknown to an early stratum of the Jesus-tradition. The Q-saying reported in Mt 11:25-26 = Lk 10:21 is a clear instance of this.²⁵² Although not necessarily an authentic Jesus-logion, it does not include the word μυστήριον.

b. "Parable is a figurative utterance in which the speaker draws a single point of comparison." A legacy of Adolf Jülicher's opus magnum²⁵³ that dictum became the linchpin of an exegetical tradition which still prevails in parable scholarship. Subsequent studies conducted by C. H. Dodd²⁵⁴ and Joachim Jeremias²⁵⁵ resulted in a number of methodological refinements, but the basic outlook remains the same. They all agree, as Drury points out, that the parables uttered by Jesus were realistic, simple and, above all, free of allegory.²⁵⁶ But are the dominical parables really like

²⁵² Ibid.
²⁵⁵ Die Gleichnisse Jesu (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1947).
²⁵⁶ Drury, "Origins of Mark's Parables", 171. Each of the details in an allegory constitutes a separate metaphor. Herein lies the basic difference between it and parable (see Taylor, Mark, 249-50; Bernard Harrison, "Parable and Transcendence", in Michael Wadsworth, ed., Ways of reading the Bible, 191). For a more detailed discussion of the differences between the two forms, see Dodd, Parables, 5-12. Only parable can, in Dodd's opinion, serve as argument (ibid., 11-12). Yet it is conceivable that allegory could also assume this function. For a short, but excellent treatment of the nature of, and difference between parable and allegory, see Linnemann, Parables, 3-8.
this? That is the question we now ask ourselves.  

On the one hand, there is absolutely nothing abstruse about the parables in Mark's parable-chapter. The parable of the Sower (vv. 3-8) is a case in point. Similar in its general import is the similitude reported in 2 Esd 8:41:

For just as the farmer sows many seeds upon the ground and plants a multitude of seedlings, and yet not all that have been sown will come up in due season, and not all that were planted will take root; so also those who have been sown in the world will not all be saved.

There is nothing at all enigmatic about the parable. However, the evangelist or his sources read an enigmatic meaning into it and appended the allegorical interpretation in vv. 13-20.

---

257 The foregoing sketch of parable scholarship during this century is a condensation of that provided by Drury ("Origins of Mark's Parables", 171-72).

258 Linnemann, Parables, 117-18 incl. n. "g." However, n.b. Dodd, Parables, 146: "The 'eschatological' school, rightly as I think, lays the stress where it falls in the parable as told, upon the abundant crop ... " Sim. Linnemann, Parables, 117 n. "f."

259 So Wrede (Messianic Secret, 60-61). However, cf. Bultmann: "And as for the Parable of the Sower in Mk. 4:3-9!--is it a consolation for every man when his labour does not all bear fruit? Is it in this sense a monologue by Jesus, half of resignation, half of thankfulness? Is it an exhortation to the hearers of the divine Word? Is it Jesus' preaching? or the message of the Church? or was there originally no meditation at all on the Word, and we have to understand it as akin to [2] Esdras 8:41 ...[?]" (HST, 200).

The parables reported in Mark do not consistently represent a form of riddling discourse. See, e.g., Mk 3:19b-30. Mark's Jesus evidently intended his trilogy of parables--the Divided Kingdom/House (vv. 24-25) and the Strong Man (v. 27)--to clarify his rebuttal to the charge of collusion with Beelzebub. At first glance the parable of the Wicked Tenants (Mk 12:1-11) appears to involve the same sort of inconsistency. Apparently Jesus' opponents "perceived that [Jesus] had told the parable against them" (v.12); however, their hostile response to the telling of the parable does not--within the narrative world of Mark's gospel--necessarily imply that Jesus' veiled (ἐν παραβολαῖς [v. 1a]) claim to messianic dignity (v. 6) had in fact been penetrated. See also ch. 3 pp. 427-31.
Factors contributing to the various responses evoked by the preaching of the word are enumerated here, but this particular interest seems quite beside the point of the parable. The parables reported in Mark 4 do not appear to have been originally intended as allegories, much less riddling speech.

On the other hand, Jesus himself could have either misunderstood the manner in which parable operates or intentionally employed it in an unorthodox fashion. That actual instances of riddling discourse are seldom to be found in Mark may be explained by the fact that it would have found no practical application in the early church. The problem with this explanation is that it is merely a "cover story." No hard evidence exists to support it.

Nevertheless, Mark may not have been entirely mistaken in his depiction of parable as riddling speech. The term is used of a variety of literary forms, of which the simple one-point analogy is but one. Says C. F. Evans:

The word, "Mashal" and its synonyms, which underlie the "parabole" of the gospels, cover a wide range of utterance, varying from, at the one end, the brief and self-explanatory proverb, through manifold forms of extended metaphor to, at the other end—and this is the most surprising—the riddle or enigma. Jeremias himself made the same observation some years earlier and supported it with a host of examples. Moreover, the Hebrew

260 E.g. 7:14-23.
262 Parables, 20.
word ἁμαρτήματον is usually rendered μυστήριον in the Greek Bible and
normally denotes "riddle" or "dark saying." The non-translation
παράβολή may also bear this same meaning. The Marcan
representation of παράβολή as "riddle" may, therefore, not be
such an anomaly as commonly assumed. The so-called parable-theory
which is articulated in Mk 4:11-12, Jeremias concludes, was not
originally concerned with Jesus' "parables" per se, but rather
his preaching in general. This logion, which had become severed
from its original context, was subsequently, albeit quite
erroneously, inserted into Mark's parable-chapter on the basis of
the catch-word παράβολή. The underlying presupposition, that
"parables" were used to facilitate understanding, is, however, the
very idea which is being called into question. So also is its
corollary:

[T]he passage [4:11-12] affords no criterion for the
interpretation of the parables, nor any warrant for
seeking to find in them by means of an allegorical
interpretation some secret meaning hidden from the
outsiders.

---

263 See ibid., 16 incl. n. 22; so also Cranfield, Mark, 154;
Kermode, Genesis of Secrecy, 23.
264 Jeremias, Parables, 20.
265 Ibid., 17-18. The scripture saying of v. 12 involves seeing
as well as hearing. Thus παραβολαί in v. 11 did not originally
denote the parables of Jesus (Pesch, Markus, I, 239, cf. 240).
266 Ibid., 18. The linguistic affinity between the hardening logion
and the rest of Mk 4 extends not only to the the noun παραβολή
(cf. vv. 2, 11, 13, 30, 33, 34) but also to the verbs ἀκούειν
(cf. vv. 3, 9, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 24, 33) ἀφύημι (cf. 3:28-29)
and the phrase τοῦ ἔξω (cf. οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν [v. 10]) (Markus, I,
237, cf. 226). However, Pesch, who agrees that παραβολή denotes
"riddle" within the context of the isolated logion, does not argue
that the interpolation of it in 4:11-12 was done erroneously
(ibid., 239).
267 Ibid. Scott would adamantly contest this:
Not a great many present-day scholars subsume allegory under the rubric of parable. However, a certain number of authorities have noted an affinity between parable and riddle. Literary critic J. Frank Kermode sees this affinity as residing in the fact that each requires interpretation to complete it. Moreover, narrative by its very nature manifests a certain degree of opacity, and to the extent that narrativity inheres in parable the latter will always be "dark saying." Parable, it seems, may proclaim a truth as a herald does, and at the same time conceals truth like an oracle. That is to say, parable possesses a double function—simultaneous proclamation and concealment. Yet all this could just as well be said of allegory. Still another literary critic locates the riddling quality of parable elsewhere:

For if it is true that parables are given in answer to "[T]he parable as genre is neither by necessity allegorical nor by necessity metaphorical. The importance of this conclusion needs to be insisted upon: Jülicher's categorical rejection of the possibility of allegory in Jesus' parables is unwarranted. The genre parable can be allegorical, metaphorical, or mixed" (Hear then the Parable, 44).

Moreover, the hypothesis that Mark made an error is not something to which we can give credence. His "error" is quite intentional. The sayings reported in vv. 21-25, which are Marcan insertions (Marxsen, "Parabeltheorie", 262), furnish proof that the evangelist concerned himself with riddling speech (ibid., 264). Moreover, the word "parable" did, at the time of the composition of Mark's gospel, assume a somewhat riddling connotation. See below p. 116.

Drury is one such scholar. He has argued that the Marcan parable represents the terminus ad quem of a tradition of historical allegory beginning in the OT and spanning the Intertestamental Literature. See "Origins of Mark's Parables".

Kermode, Genesis of Secrecy, 24.

See ibid., 24-25.

Ibid., 47.
questions, it is also true that they answer those questions only by asking a further question, and a question, moreover, which can only honestly be answered "Yes and No." 

Yet he adds:

The doubleness is not the indeterminacy of bafflement or wilful mystification: it is the necessary duality of self transcendence; it is the slow climb to successively more adequate levels of vision.

Again, it is not inconceivable that allegory could so function.

When all is said we have to bear an important consideration in mind. That is to say, pure genres seldom exist outside of the mind of the scholar. They are indispensable investigative tools, but at the same time they are abstractions. Real cases almost invariably will exhibit a certain degree of overlapping of one form with another. There is no presumptive reason for doubting that this would have happened in connection with Jesus' teaching ministry. 

c. Morton Smith has warned us about the danger of assessing this text in light of "modern notions of what Jesus should have done." However, we will not press the point. Even so, the objection does not stand up under close scrutiny. Mark says that Jesus deliberately spoke so as to confuse his listeners. Why would anyone do this? All language exists for communication. Two

---

273 Ibid., 208.
274 Scott has observed rightly: "The problem with allegory in the parables is not allegory per se, but the ideological reading of the parables with an ideology that is manifestly later. For example, the allegory of A Man Planted a Vineyard (the parable of the Wicked Tenants (Mk 12:1-11; par.) demands salvation history as its ideological structure" (Hear then the Parable, 44).
kinds of people behave like the Jesus depicted in Mk 4:11-12: buffoons and lunatics. The evangelist Mark nowhere depicts Jesus as a buffoon. Yet we are told in 3:21 that some people believed Jesus to be a lunatic.\textsuperscript{276}

A report such as the one found in Mk 3:21 can hardly be said to have been in the best interest of the primitive church. It would have been acutely embarrassing.\textsuperscript{277} The veracity of the report is thereby supported. Now behaviour of the kind depicted in 4:11-12 might lead one to draw a conclusion similar to that of the people in 3:21. This in turn would speak for the veracity of 4:11-12.\textsuperscript{278}

Argumentation of this kind will not satisfy the viewpoint of everyone. Nonetheless M. Smith issues this caution:

\begin{quote}
Whether or not Jesus intended the parables to conceal the true purport of his teaching, there has certainly been enough disagreement about their meaning to make defensible the opinion that they are deliberately obscure.
\end{quote}

A deliberate attempt 'to conceal the true purport of one's teaching' within the context of a public preaching ministry is quite consistent with the report that some people came to believe that Jesus was "beside himself."

\textsuperscript{276}Mk 3:21 reads:
καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἔξηλθον κρατήσαντες αὐτὸν, ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἔξεστη.
\textsuperscript{277}On the criterion of embarrassment see above p. 82 n. 182.
\textsuperscript{278}Some of the exilic and post-exilic prophets as well as the pseudepigraphers spoke or wrote in a riddling fashion. Such individuals apparently experienced hallucinations as well. As Drury rightly observes, their careers coincided with a period when they were under great stress ("Origins of Mark's Parables", 179-82).
\textsuperscript{279}"Comments on Taylor", 31.
However, David Daube in his article entitled "Public Pronouncement and Private Explanation" provides a number of rabbinic analogies to the scenario depicted in Mk 4:1-20. These possess the following characteristics:

1. a public pronouncement by the master;
2. a question posed by the disciples after the departure of outsiders;
3. an explanation of the public pronouncement given by the master to the disciples in response to their inquiry.\(^{280}\) Thus the Marcan depiction of Jesus' teaching activity may not be quite the oddity it might at first seem. Yet the Marcan scene wherein private instruction to the disciples follows public pronouncement evidences two significant points of departure from its alleged counterpart in the rabbinic sources. Firstly the evangelist, generally speaking--10:2 is an exception--shows Jesus offering his teaching entirely of his own accord. The public utterances of the rabbis are responses to questions put to them. Secondly, the purposes of catechesis underlie Jesus' instruction of the disciples. The rabbis seek to defend their teaching. Thus Marcan dependence on a rabbinic Vorlag is not something we can safely assume here.\(^{281}\)


\(^{281}\) Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 164.

This distinction between the public teaching of the people and the private instruction of the disciples reveals not only the foregoing divergences from the rabbinic scenario cited by Daube, but furthermore decidedly Marcan redactional features. For details see below ch. 3 pp. 304-5 n. 857.
d. The criterion of the cross is invoked here. Once again caution is advised. Application of this criterion involves a shortcoming similar to the one identified by Schuyler Brown in connection with the criterion of dissimilarity (or distinctiveness). The crucifixion affords a standard by which one is able to ascertain the kind of activity which might have prompted Jesus' opponents to do away with him. However, it is of no help to us whatsoever in attempting to determine the common ground which must have stood between Jesus and his opponents.282

e. Riddles fascinate people. Newspapers abound in puzzles of all kinds. Witness also the wide following of such writers as Edward Albee, Samuel Becket or Franz Kafka--their words are immensely difficult to fathom. There is no reason to suppose that human nature has changed significantly over the past two millennia.

None of these alleged historical difficulties in themselves are sufficient for ruling out the authenticity of Mk 4:11-12. Yet when they are considered as a group, they exert a cumulative force with which we have to reckon. To rebut them in seriatim fashion and then ignore them is to employ a form of argumentation which is seriously flawed. The cumulative force of the historical difficulties associated with Mk 4:11-12 indicates that this logion has a rather dubious claim to authenticity.

Additional evidence including the implicit understanding of God's rule, the terminology and formulations employed, and the

application of Is 6:9-10 in Mk 4:11-12 render the authenticity of the exclusion formula of Mk 4:11-12 quite out of the question. Firstly, the presentation of the "mystery" (μυστήριον) as "given" (δέδοται) presupposes the fact that the revelation has already taken place. However, the content of the mystery has undergone a significant change in the early church. On the one hand, the eschatological secret revealed through Jesus is the rule of God realized in and through his mission (cf. 1:14-15). On the other hand, the early church in its proclamation presents the divine Sonship of Jesus as the content of the secret (1 Cor 2:7-8; cf. Eph 6:19). 'The preacher becomes the preached.' Secondly, the designation of the knowledge to which the "initiated" (οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα) alone have access as "mystery" reflects the sort of apocalyptic linguistic usage not normally encountered in the preaching of Jesus but that of the early church (cf. the Pauline Corpus passim). Thirdly, the labelling of the unbelieving as "those outside" (οἱ ἔξω) is a rabbinic characterization of the Gentiles which Paul applies to non-Christians (1 Th 4:12; 1 Cor 5:12-13; Col 4:5). A self-contained community which perceives itself to be sharply separated from those who do not belong to it is the context out of which a logion such as 4:11-12

---

283 Pesch, Markus, I, 238-39.
284 Cum Gnilka (Markus, I, 166) for whom the evangelist represents this important hermeneutical shift (ibid., 165; cf. Butts et. al., Parables, 3-4); contra S. Brown ("The Secret of the Kingdom of God"), endorsed by Pesch (Markus, I, 239-40), for whom such a development does not take place.
285 Ibid., 238.
must have emerged. Finally, the use of Is 6:9-10 in Mk 4:12—as it is elsewhere in the NT—is a theological reflection of the early church on the failure of its missionary endeavour among the Jewish people.

Nonetheless, a certain number of authorities claim to detect historical reminiscences in the saying. T. W. Manson, with whom Taylor and Jeremias concur, declares that its linguistic affinities with the Targum version "stamps the saying as Palestinian in origin and thus creates a strong presumption in favour of its authenticity." Plainly this argument is a non sequitur. That a unit of tradition originated in Palestine does not, however, indicate that it necessarily originated with the historical Jesus. Alternatively its provenance could be the Palestinian church. Once again, a later Judaization of the tradition could have given rise to the extant form of the verse.

Taylor and Jeremias, along with a somewhat reluctant Wrede, attempt to locate Mk 4:11-12 within the context of the ministry of Jesus. The logion, a free-floating unit of Jesus-tradition, did

286 Ibid., 239.
287 See below ch. 2 pp. 173-81 (Excursus 3 Sec. E.).
288 Pesch, Markus, I, 239.
289 T. W. Manson, Teaching of Jesus, 77; cf. Taylor, Mark, 256-57; Jeremias, Parables, 15 (followed by Gnilka, Markus, 163). Jeremias identifies several uses of typically Palestinian idiom in the saying (Parables, 15 incl. n. 15, 17 n. 27). We assess this argument above p. 72.
290 Linguistic affinities with the Targumic paraphrase of Is 6:9-10 in Mk 4:12 would, states Suhl, indicate the synagogical divine service of Christian tradition as its provenance. Someone acquainted with just such a milieu would have been responsible for the transmission of the verse (Suhl, Funktion, 147).
not, say Taylor and Jeremias, originally have any connection with the parables uttered by Jesus, but was later inserted at Mk 4:11-12 by means of the catchword παραβολή. Be that as it may, each scholar accounts for the origin of the saying differently. The saying, concerned as it is with the hardening of the people's hearts and the coincidental enlightenment of the disciples, must have, concludes Jeremias, been uttered by Jesus sometime during the period following the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi (Mk 8:27-30), at which time the disciples came to recognise Jesus' messiahship. However, Taylor makes the following proposal:

It is possible that Jesus was impressed by the similarity between the results of His ministry and the experience of Isaiah and that He made use of the ironic words of Isa. vi. 9f. . . . after the failure of the Mission the Twelve and His own fruitless activity in Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum (Mt. xi. 20-4 = Lk x. 13-15). To the disciples it had been given to know the secret of the Kingdom, but to those without everything happened in parables.

Wrede very cautiously suggests a third possibility. An evaluation of the message of Jesus according to which he spoke in such a manner that he could be understood only with difficulty, if at all, would have reflected the impression of those whom the parables had reached, either directly through Jesus' preaching or indirectly through others' reports, but who were unable to apprehend their meaning. This would have posed difficulties. Subsequent reflection on the problem would have engendered the

---

291 Taylor, Mark, 257-58; Jeremias, Parables, 18.
292 Jeremias, Parables, 29.
293 Taylor, Mark, 258.
view represented in Mk 4:11-12. Still, Wrede himself deems this development quite improbable.\(^{294}\)

However, a number of scholars locate Mk 4:11-12 in a post-Easter context. Wrede, whom we noted above, prefers to explain the hardening logion as follows. The datum that Jesus uttered parables was very firmly entrenched in the tradition. Now the association of parable with enigmatic speech enjoyed currency during the time Mark wrote his gospel.\(^{295}\) Moreover, the primitive church in time came to formulate the concept of the veiled messiahship. These two ideas were independent, though compatible. The church at an early stage took over the former and employed it in service of the latter.\(^{296}\)

Yet another explanation takes a different tack. The context in which Jesus addressed his parables, some say, may have dropped out of sight with the passage of time. Such a situation would have created problems for interpretation. Thus the early church at some point came to portray Jesus as a speaker who uttered riddles.\(^{297}\) A form whose purpose as conceived at the time of Jesus' ministry was to elucidate, then, comes to assume a somewhat

```
\(^{294}\) Wrede, Messianic Secret, 64.

\(^{295}\) See Wrede, Messianic Secret, 63-64, cf. 65, 212, 244. The enigmatic ἰδιος of Jewish apocalyptic is a noteworthy instance in this connection (Gnilka, Markus, I, 164-64; Marxsen, "Parabeltheorie", 266).


\(^{297}\) See Bultmann, HST, 199-201; Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 10. Given this scenario the interpretation of the parable of the Sower preserved in vv. 14-20, for example, would show how the parable came to be understood once the original sense given it by Jesus had been lost (so Best, Gospel as Story, 4).
```
broader meaning over the period leading up to the composition of Mark's gospel. However, the irrecoverability of the original *Sitz im Leben* of the parables is one of three possible origins of Mk 4:11-12 suggested by Marxsen and Gnilka. The tendency to regard parables as allegories, which arose at an early stage in their tradition-history, necessitated the formulation of allegorical interpretations, so as to facilitate the extraction of their supposedly encoded messages. Furthermore, the endeavour to gain as much paraenetic mileage from the parables as possible would have spawned a number of re-applications and re-interpretations thus making what was originally clear somewhat ambiguous.298

The foregoing efforts to reconstruct either a *Sitz im Leben Jesu* or a *Sitz im Leben Kirche* for Mk 4:11-12 appear to be little more than educated guesses insofar as none of their exponents, apparently, are able to produce evidence to support them.299 Those

299 Jeremias does observe, however: "The concordance readily shows μυστήριον, δέσωται as a circumlocution for the divine action, οἱ ἐξω, τὰ πάντα, ἐπιστρέφειν used for conversion, all that appears in Mark only at 4.11f. Furthermore, our passage limits the application of Isa. 6.9f. to οἱ ἐξω, Mark himself extends it to the disciples, as 8.14-21 shows" (Parables, 15 n. 12).

Such findings, in the opinion of Jeremias, constitute evidence of the pre-Marcan origin of 4:11-12 (ibid., 15). Yet the last statement of Jeremias is one which is open to debate. The context of the reference to Is 6:9-10 in 8:18 does not imply that Mark applies the saying to the disciples. On the contrary, the Marcan Jesus merely asks them if they number among the unbelievers (Suhl, *Funktion*, 146).

The agreements of Mt 13:11, 13 and Lk 8:10 with each other are stronger than those of either of them with Mk 4:11-12. Yet this fact, in and of itself, does not locate the origin of Mk 4:11-12 within pre-Marcan tradition. The hardening logion could still be a Marcan creation (contra Marxsen "Parabeltheorie", 264 n.1). The discrepancies of the Matthaean and Lucan versions
scholars who are disposed to ascribing this logion to the historical Jesus encounter the further difficulty that they cannot reconstruct an original form of the saying. Taylor writes: "Mark has given an unauthentic version of a genuine saying," but then adds: "The original form of the saying can only be conjectured." Yet conjectures do not constitute solid evidence. Thus we can only affirm Wrede's judgement:

The saying ... gives ... [such] precise expression to the evangelist's view ... [that] it should therefore have [no] source other than just this view.

The evidence, when weighed as a whole, in fact, does not support the contention that Mk 4:11-12 is an authentic Jesus logion. Mark the evangelist exercised considerable editorial freedom. His citation of OT passages is incontrovertible proof of this fact. Thus a pre-Marcan form, if such, in fact, be the basis of Mk 4:11-12, is probably beyond recovery, obscured as it would be by redactional modification. Yet we can say this much: the exclusion formula in its current form and location assumes a demonstrable function within the context of Marcan theology.

with the Marcan may be the result of stylistic improvement and material correction of the latter (Suhl, Funktion, 150).

Only the words from Is 6:9-10 (v. 12) would, in Suhl's view, represent the hand of the evangelist (Funktion, 150-51). The evidence does not support Suhl's judgement. The assertion of the hardening which befalls Israel forms an integral part of the statement made in vv. 11-12 (Gnilka, Markus, I, 163).

300 Mark, 257.

301 Ibid.

302 See Wrede, Messianic Secret, 63-64; sim. Bultmann, HST, 325 n. 1: i.e. an editorial formulation of the evangelist.

303 So e.g. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 98 and Marxsen, "Parabeltheorie", 264 n. 1.
Embedded within this redactional formulation is a reference to Is 6:9-10. The location of this passage in v. 12 enables us to gain considerable insight into Mark's application of Jewish Scripture.\textsuperscript{304}

\textsuperscript{304}Suhl's conjecture that Mark conflated the reference to Is 6:9-10 (v. 12) with a previously isolated saying (v. 11) (\textit{Funktion}, 150-51) has no hard evidence to support it. Gnilka rightly asks whether the saying, in that case, would not lose something of its essential meaning (\textit{Markus}, I, 163). In agreement with Pesch we would insist that the \textit{vva}-clause affords the theological 'basis and impact of the distinction' between believers and non-believers (Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 237).
Chapter Two

TWO TEST CASES

MARCAN REDACTION (4:12; 8:17-18) AND PRE-MARCAN TRADITION (1:2-3)

2.1 Test Case 1a: The Marcan Parable Theory - Mk 4:11-12

A. TRADITION-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

B. MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF SCRIPTURE REPORTED

The analyses of preceding chapter served to underline three important facts concerning Mk 4:12:

1. The reference to Is 6:9-10 which is represented here finds itself embedded in a redactional formulation of Mark; 305

2. Neither the extant Hebrew text (MT) nor the extant versions (LXX and Targum) afford readings which stand in near-exact agreement with the Marcan version. 307

However, references to the OT elsewhere in Mark's gospel indicate the evangelist's knowledge of, and use of the LXX. 308 A juxtaposition of two versions serves to show verbal contacts between them.

Mk 4:12

ίνα

βλέποντες βλέπωσιν και μὴ ἴδωσιν,
καὶ ἁκούοντες ἁκούσωσιν και μὴ συνιούσιν,
μὴ ποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς.

305 See above ch. 1 pp. 67-89.
306 See above ch. 1 pp. 67-89.
307 See above ch. 1 pp. 33-40.
308 NT writers as a whole employed the LXX Version (S. Brown, Origins of Christianity, 30).
The verbal contacts between these versions are considerable but Mark provides a version more abridged than that of Isaiah. Like all other extant versions the LXX shows a transposition of the clauses 9ba and 9bβ.\textsuperscript{309}

The representation of Is 6:9-10 in Mk 4:12 is an instance of \textit{free indirect reporting}. That is to say, the evangelist not only preserves the general content of his source but also reproduces certain distinctive elements of its style.\textsuperscript{310} That being the case we cannot mistake this obvious reference to Is 6:9-10.\textsuperscript{311}

\textsuperscript{309}Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 163.

\textsuperscript{310}See above ch. 1 pp. 27-28; cf. pp. 26-27 (Indirect Reporting, Mimetic to Some Degree) and 28-29 (Direct Reporting).

\textsuperscript{311}The Marcan parable theory also manifests verbal affinities with Dt 29:4. In addition we note Jer 5:21 and Ezek 12:2. However, the degree of verbal similarity with Mk 4:12 is something less in these passages than in Is 6:9-10.
C. THE MEANING OF MK 4:11-12

Approximately nineteen centuries have elapsed since the Gospel of Mark assumed its position as a normative writing for the church, and perhaps no other passage in that work has caused so much scholarly unease during the ensuing period than the saying attributed to Jesus in 4:11-12. The reason is readily apparent, for the most natural translation of the Greek text bears the same meaning as that of the RSV.\(^{312}\) It reads:

To you has been given the secret of the kingdom of God, but for those outside everything is in parables; so that (\(\tau\nu\alpha\)) they may indeed see but not perceive, and may indeed hear but not understand; lest (\(\mu\varepsilon\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\varepsilon\)) they should turn again, and be forgiven.

The difficulty lies in v. 12. Jews and Christians alike have traditionally esteemed God as intrinsically just and fair. Yet Jesus, whom the church acclaims as God's envoy par excellence, is adopting a policy which is not only exclusivist, but quite frankly capricious.\(^{313}\)

i. Proposed Emendations

A certain number of scholars have offered proposals for emending the passage. These proposals, all of which involved the conjunctions \(\tau\nu\alpha\) and \(\mu\varepsilon\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\varepsilon\), may be assigned to three categories. The first concerns the sense which the evangelist intended his Greek text to convey, the second, the Aramaic original from which

---


\(^{313}\)That is to say, God himself withholds revelation from "those who are outside" (so Best, *Markan Soteriology*, 41, 65). Taylor finds the Marcan interpretation of parable as the means whereby Jesus deliberately conceals his life-giving message from the people "intolerable" (*Mark*, 257). Somewhat less emphatically, Gnilka characterizes the logion as 'predestinarian' (*Markus*, I, 165).
the Marcan text is presumed to have been translated and the third, embracing both of these.\textsuperscript{314}

Let us look firstly at the proposals involving the Greek text. The authorities which were consulted by us had most frequently adopted a telic translation of the conjunction ἵνα. The conjunction ἵνα would, in other words, mean "in order that."\textsuperscript{315} Similarly, the authorities consulted in this study had, for the most part, adopted a telic translation of the conjunction μὴ ποτε. In that case μὴ ποτε would bear the sense of "lest" or the somewhat weaker "lest perhaps"/"lest haply."\textsuperscript{316}

The other translations of ἵνα and μὴ ποτε which have been proposed are not convincing. Not only are they weakly, if at all, attested elsewhere in the NT or in the LXX, but they are also suspect insofar as they appear to be theologically motivated—they represent a blatant attempt to attenuate the "offence" of the passage. Moreover, they are not historically probable. A proposal wherein ἵνα should be translated "because," and μὴ ποτε "perhaps," would be a case in point. The people are taught in parables because of their obtuseness, the purpose being to facilitate their understanding of Jesus' message. Yet aside from

\textsuperscript{314}Burkill, \textit{Mysterious Revelation}, 112.
\textsuperscript{315}Black, \textit{Aramaic Approach}, 153-56; Burkill, \textit{Mysterious Revelation}, 112-15; Evans, "Function of Isaiah 6:9-10", 130-33; Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 257. In addition, Cranfield prefers the telic rendering (\textit{Mark}, 155-56).
\textsuperscript{316}Black, \textit{Aramaic Approach}, 153-56; Burkill, \textit{Mysterious Revelation}, 112-15; Evans, "Function of Is 6:9-10", 130-33 and Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 66 n. 24 both render the conjunction ἵνα "lest." This rendering Cranfield deems a possible option (\textit{Mark}, 156). Taylor renders ἵνα "lest perhaps"/"least haply" (\textit{Mark}, 156).
the fact that we have two unusual translations in one short passage, coupled with the fact that we have so obvious a theological motive at work here, we have to ask the following question with Burkill:

Why does the evangelist persist in stating that Jesus explains the parables privately to his disciples? If the parables are deliberately designed to facilitate understanding on the part of the dull-minded, surely those to whom the mystery is granted would hardly stand in need of special elucidations.

A teacher who had adopted a teaching method, the express purpose of which was to insure that his audience was able to grasp the significance of his message would hardly continue the use of that method, once he was fully aware of the fact that it was generating the very results which he had taken positive steps to avoid. The historical difficulty alone renders the causal ὑπάρχει highly improbable.

A further effort to render the passage theologically innocuous betrays itself in the translation of ὑπάρχει in a consequential sense. The failure of the multitude to comprehend the meaning of Jesus' message is to be explained not as the purpose, but as the result of his teaching in parables. An appeal

---

317 See e.g. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 112-13. The use of ὑπάρχει in the causal sense (ὅτι) occurs at most three times elsewhere in the NT: Jn 8:56; Rev 22:14 and possibly Mt 13:13. The use of μὴ πᾶρεν to introduce a desired contingency occurs but once elsewhere in the NT (Mt 25:19).

318 Ibid., 113. Evans writes:
"T. A. Burkill has concluded that ὑπάρχει should be understood as 'because' and μὴ πᾶρεν as 'perhaps'" ("Function of Is 6:9-10", 129). A careful reading of both Burkill (Mysterious Revelation, 112-15) and Evans reveals a serious misunderstanding on the part of the latter. Moreover, Evans in defence of his statement quotes Burkill entirely out of context ("Function of Is 6:9-10", 129 n. 20).
is generally made to a tendency of the Hebrew mind to represent the inevitable consequence of an action as though it were the purpose of that action. The preaching of Isaiah was not intended to hinder the repentance of his audience. On the contrary, something rather different finds expression in Is 6:9-10—either the prophet's pessimistic assessment of the prospects of his work, or his reaction to years of fruitless warning.319

This argument breaks down for grammatical, theological and historical reasons. Firstly, more typically Semitic than the use of a command to express a result is the use of a command to express a command. So argues M. Smith. He adds:

Further, in Biblical Hebrew the imperative is not normally used to express result unless subordinated by waw copulative to a prior verb. "Make the heart of this people fat" is not so subordinated and clearly expresses not result, but purpose (as proved by the following "lest" and correctly understood by RSV).320

Secondly, Isaiah's manner of speaking cannot be said to conflict with his own belief. Evidently he believed in the divine nature of his calling and thus would have regarded all that had taken place as being in accordance with God's predetermined will.321

Thirdly, critical scholarship up to and including the present has not produced convincing evidence that Mark was familiar with Semitic idiom.322 Theological as well as historical considerations, then, render a consequential reading of Is 6:9b quite improbable.

319 Ibid.
320 M. Smith, "Comments on Taylor", 30.
321 Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 113-14.
322 See above ch. 1 pp. 38-40 incl. nn. 76 and 77.
Two points need to be made in connection with Mk 4:12. Firstly, more typical of the Greek employed in the LXX or NT than the use ἵνα to express result is the use of ἵνα to express purpose. Secondly, Mark the evangelist presents Jesus as the Messiah whose life and work, including the negative response to his preaching, are a fulfilment of God's predestined purpose. Thus a telic reading of the conjunction ἵνα "reflects the teleological thinking characteristic of the whole of the Bible, including the synoptic gospels," and any attempt to read it otherwise is misguided.

Proposals of the second category are also deserving of our consideration. Here the Greek text of Mk 4:12 is alleged to have been translated from an Aramaic version of Is 6:9-10. This allegation certainly cannot be dismissed as mere speculation, since the versions of the Isaianic passage reported in Mark and the Targum agree against those reported in the Hebrew and the LXX at a number of points. Marcan dependence on an Aramaic paraphrase of Is 6:9-10 such as is known to us through the Targum might be suggested, but for the fact that Mark employs a telic (ἵνα) as opposed to a relative form (ὅτι). However, Manson attributes this inconsistency to a mistranslation of the Targum arising from the

---

ambiguity of the Aramaic particle ٧. Thus the free quotation of Is 6:9-10 in Mk 4:12 would not constitute an explanation of the purpose of teaching in parables, but rather a definition of the people who are outside. On the other hand, an intention on the part of the evangelist to define parable as a deliberate attempt to conceal the message contained therein would, says Manson, invite some representation of the content of the clauses reported in Is 6:10a in Mark, and not an omission of it as is the case.

These proposals, like those of the first category, encounter difficulties at at least two points. Firstly, the theological motive behind them makes them less than convincing. The conjunction ٧ is indeed used in different ways, but there is no compelling reason, other than that of theological expediency, for preferring a relative pronominal (٧) to a telic (٧) sense. Secondly, the reading proposed by Manson is not particularly well-suited to the context. Says Burkill:

[T]he proposed rendering is not altogether satisfactory.

---

326 Manson, Teaching of Jesus, 77-78. Jeremias also allows this possibility (Parables, 17 n. 24). Given a telic rendition of ٧ the logion would, in Manson's opinion, represent a contradiction of the parable of the Sower: "In other words the efficacy of the parables depends, not on the parables, but on the character of the hearers" (Teaching of Jesus, 13).
327 Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 114-15.
328 Manson, Teaching of Jesus, 78. For Black's critique of Manson at this point see above ch. 1 pp. 37-38.
329 Cranfield—who refuses to commit himself—prefers to render the particle ٧ as a telic conjunction (Mark, 155-56). Thus the more probably correct reading would, in his opinion, be the more difficult of the two.
[as a definition], since it would serve equally well as a definition of the disciples who, no less than the multitude, are unable to grasp the meaning of the parables.

This hypothesis, based as it is upon an appeal to the ambiguity of an Aramaic particle alleged to have underlain the ὑνα of Mk 4:12, has no solid evidence to commend it, not to mention the historical and syntactical considerations which point in the opposite direction.\textsuperscript{332}

\textsuperscript{331}Burkill, \textit{Mysterious Revelation}, 115.

\textsuperscript{332}Allegedly, the Manson reading, of itself, would not alter the overall sense of the passage (Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 17 n. 24). That is to say, "the μὴ ποτὲ ('lest') still seems to imply that the hearers are not meant to understand and to repent." (so Burkill, \textit{Mysterious Revelation}, 115; cf. Black, \textit{Aramaic Approach}, 155). This same statement, if applied to v. 12a alone, would mean that a relative clause is understood in terms of prophecy-fulfilment. However, Suhl rejects this option (\textit{Funktion}, 147). In any case, Black further argues:

"To remove the first 'stumbling-block' [i.e. the ὑνα] by regarding it as a misunderstood ἔδειπνο一句 clause, which should have been relative, makes its dependent μὴ ποτὲ [sic] clause meaningless" (\textit{Aramaic Approach}, 154). He concludes thus:

"In Mark there is only one way in which the recalcitrant μὴ ποτὲ [sic] can be taken into the sentence as it stands and the ὑνα regarded as mistranslating a relative; it may be connected with the main clause and a comma placed at the end of the ἔδειπνο一句 clause: 'All things come to those without in parables, who seeing see ... but do not understand, lest they should repent and obtain forgiveness.' The last clause alone then gives the reason for the parabolic teaching, the prevention of repentance and forgiveness'" (ibid., 155).

On the contrary, the Manson reading might well alter the sense of the passage as a whole. The μὴ ποτὲ-clause would undergo a realignment. No doubt it would retain its telic thrust. However, the clause would signify the intent of "those outside." To this extent, the impercipeience of the crowds is an outworking of their obduracy. Refusal to repent begets failure to perceive.

Burkill offers yet another argument for rejecting Manson's hypothesis that a mistranslated Aramaic particle underlay the Marcan ὑνα:

"This means, however, that Jesus is asked one question and offers the answer to another, for in verse 10 the disciples do not ask for information concerning the multitude outside but make inquiries about the significance of the parables"
However, Manson makes a further suggestion: the last clause in v. 12 should be rendered either as a factual condition ("For if they did, they would repent ...") or as a desired contingency ("Perhaps they may yet repent ..." ). The aforesaid omission from Is 6:9-10 demands this, otherwise the Aramaic conjunction הָלַב הָלַב, presumed to have underlain the Greek conjunction μήποτε, "is left in the air." Still, this rendering of the conjunction הָלַב הָלַב says Burkill, "gives the impression of being somewhat forced."

(Mysterious Revelation, 115). This argument on the ground of incompatability is not entirely clear. The characterization of the crowd as being unable to apprehend the significance of Jesus' message could very well be understood in terms of the effect of his manner of speaking. Moreover, the exclusion formula of vv. 11-12 could be considered an explanation of the Sower parable. That is to say, the issue is the preaching and what comes of it. Where it falls on good ground the harvest is enormous. Where it falls on bad ground --"outside"--it yields no fruit (cum Marxsen, "Parabeltheorie", 267).

333 Manson, Teaching of Jesus, 78-79. Cranfield allows the possibility (Mark, 156).

334 Manson, Teaching of Jesus, 78.

335 Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 115.

The readings of וַּא and μήποτε which are advanced by Rudolf Pesch represent yet another example of proposals of the second category. Pesch, having noted the verbal affinities between Mk 4:12 and the Targum on Is 6:9-10 (Markus, I, 238, 239), proceeds to render the conjunctions וַּא and μήποτε in the sense of "because" (ibid., 240, 236 [n.b. the explicative "daB" in the German translation]) and "unless" (ibid., 238, 239) respectively. As indicated above, the statement of Mk 4:11-12 continues to articulate a parable-theory, but of a different kind. The parables employed by Jesus no longer serve the express purpose of confounding "those outside." Rather, the "parables" as encoded speech define the response of a recalcitrant people (ibid. 240). At the same time, the statement of Mk 4:11-12 now serves to interpret the preceding parable of the Sower (vv. 3-8) and vice versa. The parable thus interpreted allegorically--not only in vv. 14-20, but in vv. 11-12 as well!--the fruitful soil (v. 8) represents "those about Jesus with the twelve," the unfruitful soil (vv. 4-7) "those outside" (ibid., 237-38). Moreover, this allegorical interpretation of the parable of the Sower would, in
Finally, it is necessary to examine proposals of a third kind. In these proposals an appeal is made to both Greek and Aramaic usage. A number of the authorities consulted have proposed a modification of the telic rendering of ἵνα. That is to say, the conjunction introduces a "free quotation" of scripture and is thus tantamount to an abbreviation of the phrase ἵνα πληρωθῇ.\textsuperscript{336} The express purpose of Jesus' enigmatic teaching would not be the hardening the hearts of those outside. On the contrary, the community whom Mark represents has interpreted this experience in terms of the fulfilment of OT prophecy (Is 6:9-10).\textsuperscript{337} Indeed, this proposal is an appealing one. Yet we must note two view of the plural παραβολαί (v. 12, cf. vv. 10, 13b), constitute the paradigm for understanding all the parables (ibid., 240, cf. 237). Thus the parables as allegories, as encoded speech, would require 'good soil' for the full understanding of faith (ibid., 240). "[T]he formulaic 'Whoever has ears let him hear' [v. 9] [becomes] an invitation to do the allegory yourself, \textit{if you can}" (Kermode, \textit{Genesis of Secrecy}, 43 [italics added]).

Thus the interpretation of the exclusion formula which Pesch has proposed would involve an adaptation of its meaning (παραβολή = "riddle," etc.) to that of the pre-Marcan parable discourse (παραβολή = "allegory"). By contrast, the interpretation which we propose involves an exchange of respective meanings in quite the opposite direction.

Historical considerations (e.g. the fact that "those about Jesus" also require an explanation of the parables), not to mention the theological motivation behind it, render a causal reading of ἵνα (based on the alleged existence of an underlying Aramaic particle ܢ) improbable (cf. above pp. 127-28). Lack of attestation for the introduction of a negative condition by the Aramaic conjunction ܢ serde, casts doubt on a rendering of μὴ ποτέ in the same sense, as does once again the theological motivation which gives rise to it (see below pp. 131-32).

\textsuperscript{336} Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 17; Marxsen, "Parabeltheorie", 269. According to Gnilka the ἵνα-clause carries a significance approaching prophecy-fulfilment (\textit{Markus}, I, 166).

\textsuperscript{337} Marxsen, "Parabeltheorie", 269.
things. Firstly, the idea of prophecy-fulfilment does not mitigate the telic force of ἕνα.\footnote{Evans, "Function of Is 6:9-10", 130-31. In this connection, Jeremias attributes the hardening not to Jesus, but to God (Parables, 17). Such a distinction resolves nothing, theologically speaking. For the evangelist, Jesus' ministry is an outworking of God's will.} Secondly, neither Matthew nor Luke assume or develop this alleged motif of prophecy-fulfilment.\footnote{Ibid., 130.} A decision not to further underline an incipient prophecy-fulfilment motif should occasion some surprise in view of his marked propensity for employing this motif.\footnote{One of Manson's objections to rendering ἕνα in a straightforward telic sense ("in order that") was the lack of any apparent reason for the omission of the clauses in Is 6:10a (see above p. 127). In the opinion of Suhl, Manson's statement is pre-eminently true for the proposed scripture-fulfilment sense (Funktion, 147-48). Still, Black's assessment of Manson at this point would, in our view, find just as valid application to the position of Suhl. That is to say, it "enable[s] the writer, by his adapted μη δοκε [sic] clause, to complete the main thought of the ἕνα clause, that the purpose of the parabolic teaching was to prevent repentance" (Aramaic Approach, 155-56). Moreover, the explanation offered by Black lends additional credence to the hypothesis of Marcan dependence on the LXX. That is to say, the γάρ-clause of Is 6:9-10 (LXX) was omitted because it tends to dull the overall telic force of the passage.} To this extent, then, theological and redaction-historical considerations do not lend credence to proposals of the third category.

Jeremias, also supposing the Targum on Is 6:9-10 to have underlain Mk 4:12, takes the conjunction μη έλη, on the basis of contemporary rabbinic exegesis, to mean "unless."\footnote{Jeremias, Parables, 17. So also Marxsen, "Parabeltheorie", 269-70 and Suhl, Funktion, 150.} Yet this is not a widely accepted translation of that conjunction.\footnote{Rosenthal makes no mention of this rendering. The only one he records is "lest." See Grammar of Biblical Aramaic, 38.} Moreover
the theological motive behind Jeremias' proposed rendering of ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ—i.e. the Messianic Secret—renders Jeremias' proposal suspect.

Now Marxsen likewise supports the translation "unless." The collection of five sayings reported in Mk 4:21-25 would, in Marxsen's opinion, imply that the μυστήριον does not remain hidden indefinitely. It presses to disclose itself. Marxsen writes:

Thus the secret is neither deliberate nor even definitive. That the preaching does not really affect "those outside," is a necessity, which one must establish, with which one must also reckon, since it is in fact prophesied. Nevertheless the preaching goes farther. It could indeed be, that it then finds its mark, that someone "hears," turns back and is forgiven (translation ours).

That the evangelist expands the audience information provided in 4:10 would, for Marxsen, indicate that he is addressing a current situation within his community. Presumably the failure with which the preaching mission of the church met to one degree or another, would have posed a problem for certain of its members.

---

344 Ibid., 269-70. The German reads: "So ist das Geheimnis weder gewollt noch gar definitiv. Daß die Verkündigung ,die draußen' nicht wirklich trifft, ist eine Not, die man konstatieren muß, mit der man auch rechnen muß, da sie ja vorausgesagt ist. Dennoch geht die Verkündigung weiter. Es könnte ja sein, daß sie dann trifft, daß dann jemand 'hör', umkehrt und ihm vergeben wird."
345 Ibid., 266-67.
346 Alternatively, the "insider-outsider" dichotomy might have characterized the Marcan community itself. Attractive though this suggestion may be, it cannot represent Marxsen's intention, for it contradicts statements which he makes elsewhere. That is to say, those within the community are given the τὸν μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ—i.e. the Messianic Secret—, those outside
The Marcan application of Is 6:9-10 thus serves to assure the church that not only is failure of its evangelistic mission foreordained by God, but even in such cases of initial failure there remains the possibility of ultimate success. Marxsen's exegesis of Mk 4:12 renders the interpretation of the conjunction μήποτε proposed by Jeremias somewhat more plausible. However, the proposal, modified as it is by Marxsen, encounters the same difficulties which it did in the form proposed by Jeremias.347

Very little solid evidence can be adduced in support of any of the proposed emendations to the extant text of Mk 4:11-12. A number of considerations indeed subtract weight from their probability: firstly, the proposed emendations of ἀνα and μήποτε in the Marcan text and יָבַע “י in the Aramaic version presumed to underlie it are unusual; secondly, the proposed emendations, as is that of the evangelist Matthew in 13:13, are theologically motivated; and thirdly, the proposed emendations give rise to

receive τὰ πάντα ἐν παραβολαῖς (ibid., 268-69-70).

347 Suhl, like Jeremias and Marxsen, prefers to translate the conjunction μήποτε as "unless" (Funktion, 150). His rendering of the conjunction ἀνα, however, is such that it carries a consecutive significance (ᾠτε). The sole basis on which Suhl is able to render ἀνα in this sense is his finding that on several previous occasions Mark characterized his present 'in OT colours' (ibid., 150-51). Yet his statement that Mark characterizes his present in OT colours is a position which he attempts to establish in his book. Clearly, Suhl is using circular reasoning. Moreover, the rendering of the conjunction ἀνα in the sense of ᾠτε, as Manson's rendering of it in the sense of ὄτ, lends the succeeding clause a definitive character (cf. above pp. 126-27), and as such "it is not altogether satisfactory since it would serve equally well as a definition of the disciples who, no less than the multitude, are unable to grasp the meaning of the parables" (Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 115).
historical difficulties.\(^{348}\) Furthermore, a number of considerations add weight to the probability of the more natural reading of the passage:

(a) it coheres with Mark's literary motifs;\(^{349}\) (b) the verb \(\delta\varepsilon\delta\omicron\omicron\tau\acute{a}\) in v. 11 would imply a corresponding \(\omicron\upsilon\delta\omicron\omicron\tau\acute{a}\)--made explicit in Mt 13—even if v. 12 were absent;\(^{350}\) and (c) a telic reading of the conjunction \(\upsilon\alpha\) reflects the teleological thinking characteristic of the whole of the Bible. Cranfield endorses the last point but fails to carry it through to its conclusion, for he opts to render \(\mu\acute{e}p\omicron\omicron\tau\omicron\varepsilon\) as either "unless" or "perhaps."\(^{351}\) The conjunction \(\mu\acute{e}p\omicron\omicron\tau\omicron\varepsilon\) is conditioned by the conjunction \(\upsilon\alpha\) and must be translated accordingly.\(^{352}\) In view of the foregoing considerations, we can only reaffirm the words of Matthew Black from nearly a half century ago:

Nothing is more certain than that Mark wrote and intended \(\upsilon\alpha\ldots\mu\acute{e}p\omicron\omicron\tau\omicron\varepsilon.\)\(^{353}\)

In all likelihood the evangelist attempts to explain the problem of Israel's unbelief.\(^{354}\)

\(^{348}\) Yet we should not press this objection too far as Mark did not work with the same presuppositions as the modern historian does.\(^{349}\) This will be shown below.\(^{350}\) Cranfield, Mark, 156.\(^{351}\) Ibid. Here is an instance of the kind to which Kermode referred when he observed that the "best authorities" feel compelled to render \(\upsilon\alpha\) in a telic sense, even though they would prefer to render it in some other sense. Another such instance is Jeremias' treatment of \(\upsilon\alpha\ldots\mu\acute{e}p\omicron\omicron\tau\omicron\varepsilon.\) Kermode finds the refusal of scholars to explain away the \(\upsilon\alpha,\) despite their personal inclinations, impressive. See Kermode, Genesis of Secrecy, 29-30.\(^{352}\) Taylor, Mark, 256-57.\(^{353}\) Black, Aramaic Approach, 155.\(^{354}\) Undoubtedly the evangelist betrays this concern elsewhere. See e.g. 7:1-23 and 12:1-12) So Gnilka, Markus, I, 165.
Another matter in need of clarification relates to the use of the words μυστήριον and παράβολή in v. 11. The second of these figured prominently in the examination of the historical difficulties presented in Mk 4:11-12. The reader will recall that we already discussed παράβολή at some length in the Excursus of the preceding chapter. Yet it would be wrong to suppose that we could speak about μυστήριον without at the same time saying something about παράβολή. The two clauses of v. 11a. and v. 11b provide a contrasting parallelism—this requires a correspondence between the words μυστήριον and παράβολή. A "parable," in v. 11, denotes, it appears, a "riddle." The transition from 'parable' to 'riddle' requires an investigation into the meaning of 'mystery.'

However, the solution to the problem posed by mystery is not readily accessible. Firstly, Mark does not specify the content of the mystery. Secondly, we no longer have a concrete picture of the kingdom of God. The expression has assumed the nature of a formula. Consequently the qualifying genitive, "of the kingdom of God" (τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ), affords no reliable information

---

355 Cum Jeremias who formulates the argument most elegantly (Parables, 16); contra Pesch who understands παράβολή—in the Marcan sense—not as riddles but allegories (Markus, I, 240; cf. 237). Jeremias notes also that παράβολή carries the sense of "riddle" in Mk 7:17 (Parables, 16 n. 22). However, he is neither the first nor the most recent scholar to maintain this position. Cf. Wrede, Messianic Secret, 57; Taylor, Mark, 256; Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 100; Cranfield, Mark, 154.

356 Streeter was unable to solve the mystery. He simply characterizes the statement, "the mystery is given to you," as being "obscure" (Four Gospels, 313).
that would assist us in defining the mystery.\textsuperscript{357}

The singular form of the noun \textit{μυστήριον} is given full weight in the following statement of Jeremias:

Mk. 4:11f. asserts that the parables too, like all the words of Jesus, announce no special 'secrets', but only the one 'secret of the kingdom of God', to wit, the secret of its present dawning in the words and work of Jesus.\textsuperscript{358}

The utterances of Jesus may well signal the inbreaking of the kingdom. Still the element of secrecy may include more than this one datum. A broader sense of the word \textit{μυστήριον} is supported not only by its contrasting parallelism with \textit{τὰ πάντα},\textsuperscript{359} but also by the content of the teaching reported both in chapter 4 and elsewhere in Mark.

Some years later Schuyler Brown interpreted the mystery of the kingdom of God with instructions and exhortations addressed to the Christian community.\textsuperscript{360} The thesis does find some support in the text; in spite of this, we may challenge it at a number of points. Firstly, all the material cited as comprising the content of the mystery is rather mundane in character. The allegorical interpretation appended to the parable of the Sower (4:3-8) is a case in point. Says Brown himself: "there is actually nothing

\textsuperscript{357} Wrede, \textit{Messianic Secret}, 59.

\textsuperscript{358} Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 18; see also ibid., 16.

\textsuperscript{359} Wrede, \textit{Messianic Secret}, 57. N.B. also Mk 4:34: \textit{παραβολή} stands in contrasting parallel with \textit{πάντα}.

\textsuperscript{360} See "The Secret of the Kingdom of God", 60-74. In other words, the "mystery of the kingdom of God" would, in view of the parables of the Seed Growing Secretly (4:26-29) and the Mustard Seed (4:30-32), signify the 'hidden rule of God' in the community (so Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 239, 240; see also Best, \textit{Markan Soteriology}, 65-66, cf. 181).
mysterious about the straightforward parenthesis that we find in 4:14-20." 361 Secondly, and indeed strangely, Brown does not give the phrase τὰ πάντα full weight. 'Prescinding from' the expression, he thereby demonstrates an inconsistency in his method. That is to say, Brown criticizes Gnilka for "prescinding from" 4:14-20 both in his interpretation of v. 11a and in his presentation of the Marcan understanding of parables." 362 Says Brown:

Mark's redactional skill is of too high an order to permit us to assume that he absent-mindedly took over traditional material which contradicted his own theological conceptions. 363

There is no presumptive reason for not applying this statement to Mark's handling of 4:11. The use of τὰ πάντα is not a trifling matter. Other aspects of the mystery of the kingdom of God than those of a didactic nature, such as are contained in the individual parables, must be considered. 364 Finally, there is nothing in Mk 4:11 to limit the application of that saying to the preaching of Jesus in general, 365 let alone his parables in particular. Without question, "parable" means "riddle" in 4:11. Thus we agree with the judgement of Cranfield. That is to say, the secret of the kingdom of God is the secret of Jesus' person.

361 "The Secret of the Kingdom of God", 66 n. 32.
362 Verstockung Israels, 79, cited in ibid., 64.
363 Brown, "The Secret of the Kingdom of God", 64.
364 Wrede, Messianic Secret, 57; sim. G. H. Boobyer, "The Redaction of Mark iv. 1-34", NTS VIII (1961), 59-70: the phrase τὰ πάντα in Mk 4:12 includes not only parables in the strict sense, but also the δινάμεις and the διδαχή.
365 Jeremias, Parables, 17-18.
works and words, not just his words. A wider reference to the ministry of Jesus as a whole may or may not better fit the parallelism of vv. 11a and 11b as Cranfield claims, but it does find support insofar as vision as well as audition is mentioned in the ensuing paraphrase of Is 6:9-10 in v. 12. Other means of communicating the various aspects of the mystery of the kingdom of God than explicating the parables must be considered.

iii. **Mystery is a Marcan Device**

All aspects of Jesus' teaching are, therefore, subsumed under

---


367 Ibid.

368 Accordingly Gnilka writes: "Mark represents the disclosure of the 'secret' ... as [the disciples'] 'being with Jesus (cf. Mark 3:14: μετ' αὐτοῦ)'" (Verstockung, 83, quoted in Brown, "The Secret of the Kingdom of God", 63).

The mystery of the kingdom of God is that of the coming of that kingdom in the person of Jesus (sim. Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell [London: Faber and Faber, 1960], 103). S. Brown's nonetheless insightful exposition of the element of secrecy associated with the kingdom would, in our view, find quite ready accommodation to the versions of the so-called exclusion formula provided by Matthew and Luke. In this connection, the later synoptists report the plural form of the noun μυστήριον (μυστήρια) as opposed to the singular of Mark (cf. Mt 13:11/Lk 8:10 with Mk 4:11). What is at issue for Luke is not the coming of the kingdom, but rather its nature. The allegorical interpretation (vv. 11-15) of the parable of the Sower (vv. 4-8), which has been given an ethical nuance by the evangelist, is thus afforded some degree of correspondence with the exclusion formula (v. 10), as Conzelmann has indicated (ibid., 103-4). Not surprisingly, Matthew's similar manipulation of the exclusion formula (v. 11) has effected much the same correspondence with the allegorical interpretation (vv. 18-23) of the aforesaid parable (vv. 3-9). Here, the allegorical interpretation, like the Marcan version (4:14-20), retains not only the emphasis on the fruits without qualification, but also the sense of immediacy which is so palpably dampened in Luke.
the rubric of mystery. The same conclusion was reached by Wrede. Yet Wrede needed to qualify his judgement. That is to say, some pre-eminently important facet of the mystery, may have been what the evangelist had in mind when he used the term. This more fundamental sense of the mystery could only be determined in light of the evangelist's global view. In the opinion of Wrede the Marcan presentation is such that Jesus conceals his identity as Son of God/Messiah. Thus the mystery may be interpreted by this fact.

The singular form of μυστήριον speaks in favour of Wrede's proposal. Indeed a majority of scholars find it the most convincing interpretation. This latter fact does not establish it, but it does add weight to its probability.

The meaning of Mk 4:11-12 may be stated in the following way. Those who stand within the circle of Jesus' disciples are privy to the significance of his ministry, particularly at a more fundamental level as it relates to his identity. Those who stand outside the inner circle are unable to make any sense of his ministry. That this state of affairs is in accordance with the

---

369 Wrede, Messianic Secret, 60; see also 80-81.
370 Ibid., 60.
371 Jeremias, Parables, 16.
372 Burkhill's position is similar to that of Wrede. See Mysterious Revelation, 102. Other authorities use alternative formulations of the mystery of the kingdom of God. See, e.g., Jeremias, Parables, 18: The "secret of the kingdom of God" is "the secret of its present dawning in the words and work of Jesus." Yet this formulation is virtually equivalent to that of Wrede since it is God's chosen one who ushers in the kingdom.
divine will is made clear by the fact that Mark supports his assessment with a somewhat abridged paraphrase of Is 6:9-10.

D. THE MEANING OF IS 6:9-10

i. The Masoretic Text

The English version of Is 6:9-10 reads:

And he [Yahweh] said, "Go, and say to this people: 'Hear and hear, but do not understand; see and see but do not perceive.' Make the heart of this people fat, and their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and turn and be healed."

Its meaning is quite unmistakable. The preaching of the prophet must not facilitate the understanding of the people.\(^{373}\)

Some biblical authorities detect irony in Is 6:9-10.\(^{374}\) The word "irony" in its primary sense denotes a particular kind of verbal communication:

A figure of speech in which the intended meaning is the opposite of that expressed by the words used; usually taking the form of sarcasm or ridicule in which laudatory expressions are used to imply condemnation or contempt.\(^{375}\)

This definition of the word "irony" may well have relevance to the hardening command of Isaiah. The simulated impugnment of God as

---


well as the prophet's action would be the means whereby the 
people's obtuseness is held up to ridicule. Watts' comment is 
quite apropos:
The closing line [of v. 10] in a backhanded way provides 
a lucid description of revelation's normal purpose: 
seeing and hearing (the vision and word of God) should 
lead to understanding (of their perverted and evil ways) 
which should cause rational beings to change and be healed. 
Yet the word "irony" can also carry a more figurative 
significance:
A condition of affairs or events of a character 
opposite to what was, or might naturally be expected; a 
contradictory outcome of events, as if in mockery of the 
promise and fitness of things. 
Now this definition could also have relevance to Is 6:9-10. The 
simulated malevolent purpose of the Lord is the very thing which 
comes to fruition. This passage would, in that case allow two 
possibilities. Either the prophet is (a) predicting the outcome 
of his work; or (b) assessing the results of his work. The 
predestinarian view is no longer explicit. Still it remains 
essentially unaltered. That the calling of a prophet was of a 
divine nature would for him be a given: so also would it be that 
the practical outworkings of it were consistent with divine will. 

376 John D. Watts, Isaiah 1-33. Word Biblical Commentary, XXIV 
(Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publisher, 1985), 75. The reference 
to hearing, seeing and understanding instances a motif which runs 
from 1:3 through 42:16-20. A frequent indictment against Israel 
is that she is "blind" and "deaf." See Watts' discussion of the 
377 The Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. "irony".
378 See Clements, Isaiah 1-39, 77 and cf. above p. 125. This 
judgement would still apply if the imperative were used to express 
a result. Grammatical considerations, however, preclude that 
possibility (see above p. 125).
Yet "[t]he hardening is a multi-faceted event."

The characterization of the people provided in v. 9b suggests a condition which already existed in the present. Other Isaianic texts corroborate this important observation. The threat of judgement confronted the people but they only resisted Yahweh all the more (9:7ff.). Time and again the narrator reproaches them for indifference towards Yahweh (e.g., 5:12; 28:12). The people should hear Yahweh's word (e.g., 1:10). Evidently, the prophet desires a turning back (e.g., 30:15). This collection of data can mean but one thing only. Yahweh's people as depicted by the prophet bear some degree of responsibility for their fate.

Self-will reigns supreme. Blind to Yahweh's acts and deaf to his words, they remain quite unperceptive and unknowing of his plan of action in their time.

In that case the hardening command of Is 6:9-10 finds itself in dialectic tension with its broader context. Affirmation of human free-will balances affirmation of divine predestination.

Kaiser's observation provides a useful insight, modifying or deepening the dialectic tension:

If anyone hardens his heart, God will complete the hardening. Anyone whose heart is hardened has his condition made worse by the call to repent. By this truth the poet is clearly interpreting the fate of

---

379 Wildberger, Isaiah 1-12, 256. The German text reads: "Die Verstockung ist kein einliniges Geschehen."
380 Wildberger himself seems to recognise this fact (see ibid., 255).
381 Ibid., 256.
382 Watts, Isaiah 1-33, lii.
383 See Wildberger, Isaiah 1-12, 256; Watts, Isaiah 1-33, 75.
his people; he makes God lead the people to disaster through the prophet in order to redeem God's power and freedom for his people in the present.\textsuperscript{384}

ii. The Septuagint Version

A comparison of the LXX with the MT serves to reveal two significant alterations in the Greek version. First of all, we note modifications in the secondary quotation of v. 9b. The LXX reads:

\begin{quote}
'Ακοὴ ἀκοῦσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε
καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἔσθετε·
\end{quote}

Here the secondary quotation,

\begin{quote}
שַׁמְתָּה שַׁמְתָּה לַעֲלָהוֹת וְרָאוֹי לַעֲלָהוֹת
\end{quote}

has retained its original form as a secondary quotation. Yet an emphatic predictive statement has replaced the imperative sentence of the original text. This grammatical change appears to weaken the telic force. Secondly, v. 10a evidences significant changes. The Greek version reads:

\begin{quote}
ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου,
καὶ τοὺς ὡςίν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν
καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν ...
\end{quote}

The verbs \(חָשׁ, רַבָּר\) and \(נָשׁ\) assume the hiphil-indicative form in the Hebrew text. However, the corresponding verbs \(חָשַׁד\) (aorist passive), \(אָכַז\) (aorist active with βαρέως) and \(קָמַךְ\) (aorist active) have undergone a shift in mood within the LXX from the imperative to the indicative. At the same time, the LXX translators have introduced this reformulated clause with the causal conjunction γὰρ. Clearly, the resultant indicative causal

\textsuperscript{384} Kaiser, Isaiah 1-12, 132.
clause serves to attenuate the predestinarian thrust of the underlying Hebrew text. That is to say, the impercipience of the people now finds its source in an impairment of cognitive faculties. With that, the μήποτε\textsuperscript{385} -clause (v. 10a) also undergoes a significant redefinition. In this connection, the people's cognitive dullness becomes a voluntary outworking of their obdurate disposition. Evidently, a statement of intent has thereby become a statement of cause. This should not surprise us. Any soteriology articulated in predestinarian language makes God into a capricious despot. Those who prepared the Greek Bible evidently strove to alleviate the theological difficulty of the Hebrew text.

iii. The Targum and Other Manuscript Traditions

The same theological tendency as we observed in the LXX manifests itself once again in the Aramaic Targum. That is to say, the Targumist attempts to mitigate the predestinarian thrust of the underlying Hebrew text. The imperative sentence in v. 9b of the Hebrew text--a secondary quotation--assumes the form of a relative clause in the Targum--a qualifying description:

who hear indeed but do not understand,
and see indeed but do not know.

Moreover, the original imperative sentence of v. 10a has also assumed an indicative form--a statement of fact:

Gross is the mind of this people,
and its ears has it made heavy,
and its eyes has it blinded ...

A heightening of the tendency to mitigate the predestinarian note

\textsuperscript{385}LXX (μήποτε) = MT (נָּפָּשׁ).
has taken place in the Targum as over against the LXX.

The tendentious editing which we observe in the LXX and the Targum asserts itself throughout the manuscript tradition, be it Qumran, rabbinic or Patristic literature. Still, this concern, interesting though it is, is one which lies outside the scope of this present inquiry.

E. SCRIPTURE-HERMENEUTICS IN MK 4:11-12

That Mark has taken considerable liberty with regard to the structure of the passage does not mean that he has not preserved in large part the ideas expressed in it. The Isaianic hardening command and the Marcan paraphrase of it serve analogous functions within the compositions in which they find themselves.

A record of events significant in the life of Yahweh's recalcitrant/disobedient people up to and including the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in 587 B.C., the deuteronomistic history constituted a serious attempt on the part of the Deuteronomist to gain some insight into the current situation and to determine Yahweh's will for them in the exile and beyond. Judgement had, on numerous occasions, confronted the nation and the prophets had, as many times, announced it. Yet the people

---

386 The theological Tendenz manifest in both the LXX and Targumic Versions is the attenuation of the predestinarian thrust of the underlying Hebrew text.

consistently ignored their call to repentance and disaster was inevitable. The people themselves had, in the view of the Deuteronomist, engineered their own demise. Indeed the extant recension of Isaiah's prophetic message seems to reflect a similar appraisal of God's covenant people. Thus says Watts:

The faults that led first to the destruction of the northern Kingdom and then of Jerusalem are developed at length. They turn primarily on self-will, which makes them blind to Yahweh's acts, deaf to his words, unperceptive and unknowing of his plan of action in their time. This flaw lies at the heart of the tragedy. It leaves no room for a redemptive outcome for the people as a whole.

However, later reflection on the catastrophe of 587 B.C. and the resultant deportation of the Jews served to engender a certain degree of doubt regarding the previously unquestioned assumption of the omnipotence of Yahweh. Could it be that Yahweh had been unable to avert the disaster which had befallen his people? Indeed the narrator rejects any such thinking. In other words, Yahweh himself had hardened the hearts of his people and had thereby precipitated the catastrophic events of 587 B.C. Not only the omnipotence of God as the Lord of history is thus vindicated, but so also the witness of his spokesmen through the ages. Kaiser writes:

The notion of the call to harden men's hearts presupposes [the deuteronomistic] understanding of prophecy while at the same time going beyond it by assessing the catastrophe on this interpretation, primarily as a failure of the prophet and then making God himself responsible for it. Only in this way is there an end to the suspicion that Yahweh could in the last resort simply have proved impotent in the catastrophe which happened to his people, and a demonstration that without any doubt 380

380 Watts, Isaiah 1-33, lii cf. xxxiii, and li-lii.
Yahweh has power over the history of his people in the present as in the past. A central theme dominates Isaiah: Yahweh is Lord of history.

Mark the evangelist undertakes a similar task. The kerygma of the primitive church was common knowledge, but so also was the recollection of Jesus' earthly ministry. The rejection of Jesus by his own people and his ignominious execution would have posed a formidable difficulty for those who endeavoured to present their master as Messiah. Still Mark found a solution. Everything that had transpired during Jesus' ministry had taken place in accordance with God's predetermined plan. The intention of God included self-concealment of his Messiah. Not only Jesus and his entire ministry is vindicated, but so also the earliest Christian confession.

The form of argument employed by Mark affords a striking parallel to that employed in Isaiah. Yet their structures manifest three significant differences. Firstly, the evangelist Mark enlists the support of scripture. The final redactor of Isaiah makes no use of such resources. Secondly, the passage reported in Isaiah retains a remnant of the deuteronomistic view. In other words, the people themselves brought about their own catastrophic demise. The characterization of the people in Is 6:9b suggests this, but so do other Isaianic passages, frequently more explicitly. However, the hardening logion of Mk 4:11-12 does not reveal the slightest hint of such thinking.

389 Kaiser, Isaiah 1-12, 121-22. See also ibid., 120-21.
390 Watts, Isaiah 1-33, xxxiii, lv.
The hardening of the people is solely an act of God. Thirdly, the intended referent of the statement of Mk 4:12 is a referent different from that of the statement of Is 6:9-10. In the former instance, the prophet Isaiah, speaking through the "mouth" of Yahweh, makes a theological statement which concerns the nation of Israel. The people of Israel realize the words of the prophet and do so in accordance with God's predetermined will. In the latter, the evangelist Mark, speaking through the mouth of Jesus, makes the same theological statement but here it concerns a group of people who, from the standpoint of national identity, are less precisely defined. Once again, those who reject the gospel message do so in accordance with God's predetermined will. Yet the intended readership is primarily, if not entirely a non-Jewish one. Indeed the Galilaean Jews of Mk 4, of which the disciples would constitute an exception, represent a group of people who on no account could be reckoned among the Jews of Palestine.

The scripture-hermeneutics associated with the citation of Is 6:9-10 in Mk 4:12 entails three noteworthy elements, viz. the atavistic character of the citation, the presentation of a typological correspondence between OT and NT event, and the assumption of a stereotypical role by the Jewish people. Excepting the MT and Jerome's Isaiah commentary, the manuscript traditions reveal a progressive tendency toward attenuating the predestinarian tenor of Is 6:9-10. The evangelist has reversed that tendency. Once again the God of Israel is ultimately the author of his people's obduracy. Thus the Marcan application of
Is 6:9-10 constitutes an atavism in terms of its intentionality.\(^{391}\)

This agreement between Is 6:9-10 and Mk 4:12 in intentionality does not, however, establish a direct literary relationship between the passages.

That Mark's use of the conjunction γιναι does not constitute an abbreviation for the formula γιναι πληρωθη indicates that he does not consider the response of "those outside" to Jesus' preaching a fulfilment of prophecy.\(^{392}\) Hence the application of Is 6:9-10 in Mk 4:12 does not constitute proof from prophecy in the strict sense. On the one hand, the text, extensively edited as it is, does not meet the stringent criterion for scripture-proof advanced by Suhl.\(^{393}\) On the other hand, the divine commission to Isaiah in Is 6:9-10 finds some realization in, but more importantly constitutes an anticipation or prefigurement of a similar commission to Jesus. Therein the circumstances surrounding Jesus' public preaching activity with Is 6:9-10 manifest a typological correspondence with the prophet's experience centuries earlier.

Our sacred texts, as indeed many other literary works, frequently evidence two distinct levels of significance—the factual and the literal. The insightful comments of Roger A. Bullard on the nature of poetry find immediate

\(^{391}\) Evans, "Function of Isaiah 6:9-10", 138 n. 56. In making this observation, we do not, however, imply a Marcan dependency on the MT.

\(^{392}\) Contra C. A. Evans, "The Hermeneutics of Mark and John: On the Theology of the Canonical 'Gospel'", Bib LXIV (2, 1983), 162 et al.

\(^{393}\) Further to this, see above Introduction pp. 4-5.
application in our differentiation between these levels of meaning in the scriptures. He writes:

A characteristic of poetry is that its meaning does not reside in the simple semantic content of the words. The reader must see the image that the words project, fuller and richer than a mere grammatical analysis of the poem would suggest.

Put differently, the text may say one thing---its factual significance---, but the writer intends to say something else--the literal significance of the text. Without a doubt, the Marcan exclusion formula carries both a factual and a literal significance.

The Jesus-movement failed to make significant inroads into contemporary Judaism. The early Christian missionary enterprise achieved very little success as well. Indeed the futility of such endeavours would have made itself abundantly clear and henceforth the church would have abandoned any further dialogue with the synagogue. Thus a factual reading of Is 6:9-10 as it is applied in Mk 4:11-12 serves to furnish a theological basis of the general unbelief of the Palestinian Jewish population. Nonetheless, the provenance of Mark's gospel was a non-Palestinian church community. Moreover, the church itself had by this time existed three, possibly four decades. Thus a literal reading of the Marcan exclusion formula serves to disclose a theological explanation of belief within the Gentile world. At the same time, the Gentile Messiah: The Gospel according to Handel's Oratorio, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993), 101.

Cf. Pesch, Markus, I, 239.
church had to address unbelief or doubt within its own ranks. For such purposes the proverbial "Jew" would constitute the Marcan stereotype of the unbeliever. That is to say, the Marcan conception of the unbeliever is that of an individual whom God has benighted—religiously speaking—in accordance with his predetermined plan. This motif of definitive rejection of "Israel" by God lends the scripture-hermeneutics employed in Mk 4:11-12 a decidedly denigrating tone. In point of fact, R. Alan Culpepper's evaluation of the significance of Jn 5:16, 18 would find equally valid application in the case of Mk 4:11-12:

In these verses [the "Jews"] receive their "script" for the rest of the story ... the narrator is telling the reader what to expect from the "Jews." 

Suhl's dictum, 'that Mark [merely] characterizes his present time with OT colours', hardly does justice to the sophisticated redactional work of the kind which we find in Mk 4:11-12.

---

396 The enclosure of the signifier "Jew" within quotation marks serves to denote Mark's stereotype of the Jew. Below we have applied the same practice in the case of the word "Israel."


398 Funktion, 149.
Excursus 2

The Role of the "Jew" within the Gospel of Mark

At this point, however, we have to consider a matter of far-reaching implications. A factual reading of any given text may or may not represent a literal reading, i.e. the writer's intention. What, above all else, is Mark telling the reader in 4:11-12? The question of the intended referent and/or function of the Jews has not attracted the same degree of scholarly attention in the case of Mark's gospel as it has in the case of John's. If it is true that "majority opinion overwhelmingly identifies [the Johannine Jews] with the (Jewish) authorities in the context of Jesus' life and/or with the synagogue authorities or the synagogue tout court at the time of the evangelist," we could say much the same of scholarly assessment of the adversaries of Jesus in Mark where, in contrast to John, they are explicitly named. Yet such parenthetical remarks as we encounter in Mk 7:3-4 and 11 render it an incontrovertible fact that the Second Evangelist is addressing his message to a non-Jewish readership. Clearly, the Jews who figure so prominently in Mark's gospel, whether they be official


400 In Mark, Jesus finds himself in controversy with Pharisees, scribes, elders, chief priests and the like; John, on the other hand, can interchange the names of such groups as the Pharisees and the chief priests with the less specific designation "the Jews" (see ibid., 163).

401 Some, at least, of what we are told of Jewish ritual practice in Mk 7:1-23, for example, cannot be assigned anything but the barest minimum of historical probability (see below ch. 3 pp. 291-94). Only two explanations suggest themselves--gross ignorance or deliberate misrepresentation. Either way, a Jewish readership is quite out of the question.
representatives of the religious establishment or, to a lesser extent, the people in general, can scarcely embody a factual referent, for the most part, in a composition written by a Gentile for a Gentile community; otherwise it would have assumed little relevance in such a milieu. In that case, we have but one remaining option. That is to say, the Marcan references to Jewish people have to find their significance in terms of their function in the text. The so-called "Johannine Jews,"\(^{402}\) as Bultmann demonstrated, assume the role of "representatives of unbelief."\(^{403}\)

\(^{402}\)I.e. in the negative sense as adversaries of Jesus (Caron, "Exploring", 160).


Generally speaking, the so-called "problem of the Jews in John's Gospel" has elicited two kinds of approach from scholars, on the one hand, the "historical" reading of the expression in question where it is asked, "Who were the Jews?" and on the other the "more theological and symbolic" reading of it in which we would ask, "What is the function of the Jews in the text?" Those who would adopt the first line of approach would identify "the Jews" with some specific group such as the religious authorities, those who adopt the second, as we have seen, might view the Jews, for example, as representatives of unbelief (Caron, "Exploring", 161). Not entirely satisfied with either of these options, Gerald Caron would reformulate the foregoing questions as follows: "Who are the Jews?" and "What is their role or function in the narrative?"—that is, as opposed to outside it or behind it (ibid., 162-63). In his view, the significance of the expression finds itself primarily at one of two levels at which John's gospel should be read, viz. the religious. (The other level is the political or historical.) Thus "one needs to understand the Johannine Jews not as a term referring to a well-defined group such as the Pharisees or the authorities, but rather as the description of an attitude, a frame of mind, more concretely, a type of 'Judaism' which comes into view in a most special way, although not exclusively, in the Pharisees and high priests" (ibid., 164-65). Certainly we would endorse this statement, but with two qualifications. Firstly, we would delete the words "a religion," and secondly, substitute the word "religion" for the word "Judaism" in the phrase "a type of 'Judaism.'" Contrary to what Caron maintains, the Johannine Jews do in fact find their significance outside the text. On no account can it be said that the unbelieving "world" defines "the Jews"—this was not John's purpose—the unbelieving "Jews," rather, define "the world," at
The Marcan Jews assume the same role. Moreover, the Jews of John's gospel, as Culpepper contends, receive their "script" for the rest of the gospel in 5:16, 18: "Jesus comes to his own and the people do not receive him ([Jn] 1:11)." The Jews of Mark's gospel receive the same script in 4:11-12. Indeed the Marcan Jew, thus conceived, represents little more than a rhetorical device. 

least insofar as the latter manifests itself in his community (contra ibid., 171). Otherwise the Johannine narrative loses its practical relevance. More pertinent to our own inquiry, however, we would apply Caron's characterization of the Johannine Jews -- that is, with our proposed qualifications -- to the Jews of Mark's gospel.

404 Anatomy, 127.
Excursus 3
A Chronological Survey of the Applications of Is 6:9-10 within the New Testament and the Emergence of an Unfavourable Depiction of the Jews in Primitive Christianity

A. TRADITION-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

The applications of Is 6:9-10 by four NT writers besides Mark, viz. Paul, Luke, Matthew and John, serve to indicate the broad appeal of that passage within early Christianity. However, none of these applications afford direct insight into Mark's conceptual background or his own understanding of this passage. Those of Mt 13:13 and Lk 8:10b are clearly redactions of the Marcan hardening logion (4:11-12) and do not represent a part of Mark's conceptual background. That of Mt 13:14-15, however, is arguably a post-Matthaean interpolation. Clearly John's gospel is a post-Marcan composition. However, we need to exercise caution here. The Johannine writings contain strands of tradition which antedate their composition, yet Jn 9:39 and 12:40 serve


406 This Johannine "echo" of Is 6:9-10 is indeed 9:39 and not 9:38 as in Kaiser (Isaiah 1-12, 132 n. 81).
their present function within a post-Marcan redactional context. Nevertheless, the separation of such pre-Johannine elements as might exist in Jn 9:39 or 12:40 from extensive redactional overlay is an uncertain process at best, thus rendering these passages as material of limited value in shedding light on earlier stages of tradition. A tradition-historical investigation of Acts 28:26-27 would, of course, encounter difficulties of a similar nature. No doubt the Pauline Corpus antedates the Gospel of Mark and its historical value requires no demonstration whatsoever. At the same time, little, if any solid evidence exists to support an hypothesis of direct indebtedness to Rom 11:8 in Mk 4:12.

In point of fact, Luke would appear to have culled Is 6:9-10, in this particular instance. One of the global motifs in Acts is consistent failure in Paul's missionary activity among the Jews. No fewer than three times, this futile enterprise reaches its climax in an abrupt revelation of the Apostle's call to Gentile mission. The first of these instances is his visit to Pisidian Antioch (13:46), the second his activity in Corinth (18:6), and the third his detention at Rome (28:23-28). A reference to the OT in the third (vv. 26-27) serves to designate this experience as an outworking of God's intention. Unlikely a chance occurrence, the repetition of this pattern must, concludes Haenchen, find its source in the creativity of the author (Acts, 729).

However, the OT reference of Acts 28:26-27 is part of yet another common literary pattern. To this extent, the Apostle's involvement with the Jews often entails a double encounter, the first meeting marked by cordiality, the second by rejection. In 28:17-22, for example, some of the Jews initially accept the preaching of Paul, while in vv. 23-27, the Jews as a whole do not (see Joseph B. Tyson, Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts [Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1992], 175-76). Five other vignettes from Paul's missionary activity show this acceptance-rejection pattern, as J. B. Tyson says. These include: Pisidian Antioch: vv. 13-43/44-44-52; Iconium: vv. 1/2-7; Thessalonica: vv. 1-4/5-9; Beroea: vv. 10-12/13-14; and Corinth: vv. 1-4/5-7. Once again Lucan composition is the most likely explanation (see ibid., 132-45).

According to Bultmann (HST, 347-48; sim. Schulz, "Markus und AT", 185), the rationale behind the Gospel of Mark is a marriage of Hellenistic kerygma as represented in Phil 2:6-11 and Rom 3:24 with the tradition about Jesus. For a concise discussion of the
B. MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF SCRIPTURES REPORTED

Morphologically the references to Is 6:9-10 encountered in the aforesaid passages represent either direct reporting or free indirect reporting. In descending order of mimesis those of the first category include Acts 28:26-27, Mt 13:14-15, Jn 12:40 and Rom 11:8, those of the second Lk 8:10b and Mt 13:13 followed by Jn 9:39. All four instances of direct reporting of the OT are such that the references themselves have prefixed the following formulae: καλῶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγιον ἐλάλησεν διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρους ὑμῶν λέγων (Acts); καὶ ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῦς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαίου ἡ λέγουσα (Mt); ὅτι ... εἶπεν Ἡσαίας (Jn); καθὼς γέγραπται (Rom). The form of text reported in Acts manifests four minor deviations from the LXX: (a) the primary quotation is prefaced by the aforesaid introductory formula in Acts 28:26, but in Is 6:9a it is prefaced by the words καὶ εἶπε· (b) the phrase ὁ λαὸς οὗτος occurs in the accusative case and is introduced by a preposition (πρός), but in Is 6:9a it occurs in the dative case and is not introduced by a preposition; (c) the same phrase follows the verb πορεύομαι in Acts 28:26, but in Is 6:9a it follows the verb λέγω; and (d) the possessive adjective αὐτῶν follows the noun ὁφθαλμὸς in the γάρ-clause of Acts 28:27, but in the corresponding clause of Is 6:10aβ it follows the noun οὖς. The form of text reported in Mt 13:14-15 manifests one major and one minor deviation from the LXX: in connection with the former, Matthew omits all of Is 6:9a in 13:14; in connection with

problems associated with this kind of hypothesis see Best, Gospel as Story, 136-37 nos. 3 and 4.
the latter, the possessive adjective αὐτῶν follows the noun ὅσοιαλμός in the γάρ-clause of Mt 13:15 (sim. Acts 28:27), but in the corresponding clause of Is 6:9αβ it follows the noun οὐς.

The text encountered in Jn 12:40 is a significantly less mimetic report of Is 6:10 than those encountered in Acts or Matthew. Indeed the text of Is 6:9 (LXX) finds no counterpart at all in Jn 12:40. Furthermore, the Johannine representation of Is 6:10 manifests several important deviations from the LXX. First of all, the verbs τυφλῶ ("blind"), πωρό ("harden") and νοεῖ ("perceive") have assumed the respective positions of the verbs παχύνω ("render dull"), καμμύω ("close") and συνίημι ("understand"). Secondly, the Johannine text lacks all reference to hearing. Thirdly, the evangelist has placed eyes before heart. However, a certain number of the foregoing deviations find ready explanation in John's theology. Less significantly,

409 With that, Lindars calls attention to Mk 4:12 (John, 438).
410 These deviations of John from the LXX would, in C. F. Burney's view, signal the independence of the former from the latter. John has omitted the reference to the ears, and transposed the clauses about perception and sight. But for these deviations from the Hebrew text, the Johannine text would, he argues, represent a reasonably accurate rendering of the allegedly underlying Hebrew text. Firstly, the presumed hiphil imperatives of וַיֶּסֶג ("make/become fat") (יָסָב) and וַיַּכְבָּ ("be blinded") (יָכָב) possess the same form as the corresponding infinitives absolute; in that case, the evangelist quite correctly could have interpreted these forms as perfect tenses. Alternatively, the unpointedly Hebrew text would permit the rendering of these forms as perfect tenses (יָסָב, יָכָב). Secondly, the third person singular form of the verb τυφλῶ (τεύφλωκεν) with God as subject more closely approximates the Hebrew text than it does the LXX in the third person plural form of the verb καμμύω (ἐκάμμυσαν) with the people as the subject (The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel [Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1922], 120 ff., cited by Edwin D. Freed, Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. XI [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965], 85).
the conjunction μὴποτε with which the "lest"-clause of the LXX is introduced has become ἵνα μὴ ("lest") in John and within that clause the verb ἐπιστρέφω ("be converted") has been shorn of its prefix without substantial shift in meaning. However, the clauses ήδωσιν τοῖς ὄφθαλμοῖς καὶ ήάσομαι αὐτοῖς indicate verbatim contact between John and the LXX.\textsuperscript{411} In short, little or no evidence exists to establish Lindar's hypothesis of a "Palestinian ... form with strong Semitic colouring."\textsuperscript{412}

The text-form encountered in Rom 11:8 is by far the most

\textsuperscript{411}Ten of the final twelve words in John have the same form as in the LXX version (OT Quotations, 88).

\textsuperscript{412}John, 438.
weakly mimetic direct report of Is 6:9-10. In rather summary fashion Paul merely restates the general thrust of the passage:

God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that should not see and ears that should not hear, down to this very day.

When the texts of the NT and the LXX are compared, we can readily see that the former does not represent a deliberate effort to reproduce the style or form of the latter. Indeed the one direct verbal contact with the LXX is that of the noun ἀθάνατος (1x) in the accusative plural. Indirect verbal contacts with the LXX include those of the noun ὄσις (1x) in the accusative plural and the negated articular infinitives τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν/ἀκούειν (1x each).

The free indirect report of Is 6:9-10 in Mk 4:12 showed considerable deviation from the LXX Version. Those of Lk 8:10b, Mt 13:13 and Jn 9:39 show even greater deviation from the LXX.

413 The morphology of the scripture reference itself is that of an indirect report which is mimetic to some degree. However, the presence of the introductory formula καθάπερ γέγραπται signals an alleged appeal to scripture, even though the book that is cited is not identified.

414 C. K. Barrett (A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, [2nd ed.; London: A & C Black, 1991], 195), Ernst Käsemann (Commentary on Romans, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromily [Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980], 301 [translation of An Die Römer, 4th German ed., 1980]) et. al. have identified Rom 11:8 as a reference to Dt 29:4. However, this alleged OT reference would also exhibit rather weak verbal mimesis. Moreover, the original context of the Deuteronomy verse is Moses' third address (Dt 29:1-30:20). Clearly, the compiler of Moses' address presupposes Israel in exile and her eventual restoration (see 30:1-10). Here indeed Dt 29:4 and Is 6:9-10 seem to reflect much the same conceptual background; to wit, the Lord himself effected the impercipient of his people (cum Lindars, John, 352). Interestingly, Käsemann himself sees influence of Isaianic prophecy in Rom 11:8 (ibid.). That is, both Paul and Isaiah (29:10) employ the phrase πνεύμα κατανύξεως ("spirit of stupor") (ibid.).

415 See above ch. 1 pp. 36-38 and ch. 2 pp. 120-21
Using Mk 4:12 as a basis of comparison we note that the μήποτε-clause is absent in Matthew, Luke and John. In the ένα-clause all three writers omit the words καί μή ἔδωσιν. Luke and Matthew insert the negative particle μή/οù before the main verb βλέπω, John before the participial form of the same verb. In Luke and Matthew the participle βλέποντες fulfils an adverbial function as it does in Mark. By contrast, the presence of the definite article before that same participle in John's version serves to transform the adverbial function of the participle to a substantive one. Both Luke and Matthew retain the clause concerning the faculty of hearing (ἀκούω); however, Luke omits the finite verb and the conjunction καί which immediately follows it and Matthew inserts the negative particle οὐκ between the participle and finite verb. By contrast, the Fourth Evangelist omits the clause concerned with hearing and understanding altogether, in favour of the clause καί οἱ βλέποντες τύφλοι γένωνται. Finally and most significantly, Matthew, unlike Luke or John, substitutes the conjunction ὅτι ("because") for ένα ("in order that") and accordingly makes all the orthographic changes necessitated by the alteration of mood from the subjunctive to the indicative.

C. THE MEANINGS OF THE NT TEXTS

i. Paul

Paul's discussion of the rejection of Jesus as Messiah by the Jews in Rom 9-11 includes the only application of Is 6:9-10 in the NT which antedates the Marcan treatment of that passage in Mk 4:11-12. For Paul, as for Mark, the stance of the Jews represents nothing other than the outworking of God's sovereign purpose. M. Smith writes:

God, 'wishing to show his wrath and to make known his power' has created some men--i.e. the Jews who rejected Jesus--as 'vessels of wrath made for destruction' (Rom. 9.22).

Much the same line of thought manifests itself in the direct report of Is 6:9-10 in Rom 11:8:

As it is written, God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes that should not see and ears that should not hear, down to this very day.

Again the unbelief of Israel (v. 7) finds its origin in God himself. The subsequent quotation from Ps 69:22-23 serves to reinforce this particular line of thought:

Let their feast become a snare and a trap, a pitfall and a retribution for them; let their eyes be darkened so that they cannot see, and bend their backs for ever.

Yet, the rationale behind the hardening of the Jews is given a different explanation in Rom 11 from that of the prophet Isaiah. In Paul's view, the hardening of the heart of the Jew does not effect his ultimate destruction but his eventual salvation. On the one hand, God has not rejected his people in toto. An

\[\text{417} \text{ The NT writers with which we are concerned are arranged in descending order of their relative ages.} \]

\[\text{418} \text{ Cum e.g. M. Smith, "Comments on Taylor". 30;} \]

\[\text{Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 116;} \text{ Pryke, Redactional Style, 56.} \]

\[\text{419} \text{ "Comments on Taylor", 30.} \]
Israelite himself, the Apostle is corroborative evidence of that fact (v. 1c). Besides Paul, there exists a chosen remnant (v. 5).\(^{420}\) Here the experience of Elijah in his situation serves to prefigure the experience of Paul in his situation (vv. 2b-4).\(^{421}\) On the other hand, "the rest [of the Jews]" have suffered a divinely-wrought impairment of their cognitive faculties (v. 7c).\(^{422}\) The resultant rejection of these benighted Jews did, however, allow the attainment of salvation by the Gentiles. Discovery of this extension of grace to the Gentile by God would, in turn, engender jealousy in Israel. This enlightenment and concomitant jealousy would ultimately effect a return of these Jews to God with a view to their salvation (vv. 11, 13b-14).\(^{423}\) By contrast, 

\(^{420}\) Paul Achtemeier, Romans, Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Preaching and Teaching (Atlanta, Ga.: John Knox Press, 1985), 179; Käsemann, Romans, 300. Thus Barrett--correctly--does not consider vv. 1a and 11a all-encompassing statements (Romans, 195, 197-98).

\(^{421}\) Käsemann, Romans, 300. Says Käsemann: "The point of comparison to the apostle is ... that [Elijah] seemed to be alone among his people and had to bewail the unbelief of Israel as Paul does in 9:30-10:3" (ibid., 301).

\(^{422}\) Cf. 2 Cor 3:12-18: the metaphor of the veil.

\(^{423}\) On v. 12 Achtemeier has offered the following comment: "Israel's enrichment means further enrichment for all, Israel as well as gentiles [sic]" (Romans, 181). The statement per se may well represent the Pauline position. At this point, however, the Apostle "is not ... addressing himself to Jews and their fortunes" (v. 13a) (so Barrett, Romans, 199). In this same verse, Barrett calls our attention to the noun ἑπτώμα. Indeed the word normally conveys the idea of "defeat" (cf. RSV: "failure"). Yet "dimunition in numbers" would, for Barrett, represent an appropriate English rendition. The idea of the remnant in v. 5 would, of course, support this particular rendition of the noun ἑπτώμα. Unfortunately, a total lack of hard supporting evidence for this proposed translation necessitates Barrett's recourse to pure speculation. Indeed the Apostle could have anticipated his subsequent use of the noun πληρώμα in the same sentence. However, the alleged requirement of a term opposite in meaning to the noun πληρώμα does not afford a convincing explanation for an incorrect derivation of the noun.
Isaiah did not entertain any such optimism.

ii. Luke

Our morphological inspection of the free indirect report of Is 6:9-10 in Lk 8:10b served to disclose one particularly important deviation from that in Mk 4:12, viz. the absence of the μὴ τοτε-clause. Certainly the Jesus of Lucan theology does not readily accommodate the Marcan notion of the use of enigmatic speech for the prevention of the hearer's repentance. Thus Fred Craddock can say: "In giving Jesus' response to the disciples (v. 10), Luke noticeably softens Mark (Mark 4:10-12)." Moreover, the diction and syntax of the ἵνα-clause also evidences some alteration by the evangelist. Nonetheless, the conjunction ἵνα carries a telic significance. With that, the Lucan Jesus still attempts to confound the hearers of his message. Why is this?

The immediate context of the Lucan version of the hardening logion shows a close correspondence with the Marcan text. In this connection, the disciples request an explanation (v. 9) of the parable of the Sower (vv. 5-8). Immediately thereafter Jesus utters the hardening logion (v. 10). The aforesaid parable is ἴδιατον from the comparative ἴδιον ("inferior," "less," "smaller") (contra ibid., 198). In all likelihood, Käsemann has correctly deciphered the meaning of the ἴδιατον. Thus the underlying sense of this rare word involves a "failure to meet demands posed" (cf. 1 Cor 6:7) (Romans, 305). Such a rendition would have reference to v. 7b.

The question "... how much more ... ?" is probably given answer in v. 15. An apparent departure from his usual terminology, the Apostle nonetheless, employs the construction ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν ("life from the dead")--normally Paul uses ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν ("resurrection of the dead")--as an allusion to the awaited parousia (see ibid., 307).

then given an allegorical interpretation (vv. 11-15). Indeed the scene depicted looks to be a Lucan didactic paradigm. Obtainment of answers to questions would thus be the responsibility of the seeker. The message of Jesus would certainly raise questions for his compatriots. Presumably they do not pose their questions, and their questions receive no answer, therefore. Yet the telic conjunction τὰ αὐτά suggests a conformity with predetermined purpose. The secrets of the kingdom of God must necessarily remain parables in the sense of riddles for the "others." This should not completely surprise us. Similar predestinarian reasoning betrays itself in Acts 13:48: "And when the Gentiles heard [the message of Paul and Barnabas (vv. 46-47)], they were glad and glorified the word of God; and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." Faith, and by implication unbelief, "lies hidden in the purposes of God."\(^{425}\) Clearly "Luke has no [consistent] parable theory parallel to Mark's;"\(^{426}\) nevertheless, thinking of the kind inherent in Mk 4:11-12 is not something totally foreign to Luke.

The reference to Is 6:9-10 found in Acts 28:26-27 is a near-verbatim citation of the LXX. With that, the causal conjunction γάρ serves to introduce the statement of Is 6:10 in v. 27. Accordingly, a dullness of the faculties on the part of certain Jews remains the stated cause of their negative response to the gospel message. Thus the translators of the Greek OT do not explicitly attribute this cognitive dullness to divine fiat here. Moreover, the γάρ-clause of the LXX effects a redefinition of the

:\(^{425}\) Ibid.

:\(^{426}\) So Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, 28. In other words, Luke does not consistently apply 8:10 to Jesus' parables.
subsequent μήπωτε-clause. That is to say, the emendation of the text serves to reassign the listeners' unresponsiveness to their own obduracy. To this extent, the present reference to Is 6:9-10 serves to blunt the decided predestinarian flavour of Luke's truncated version of the hardening formula. Yet the prediction-fulfilment formula--Kalâ το Πνεύμα το Ἄγιον ἐλάλησεν διὰ Χριστοῦ τοῦ προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ύμῶν λέγων (v. 25b)--does preserve the element of divine intent, with the explicit reference to the prompting of the Holy Spirit.

A notable point of singularity manifests itself in the reference of Acts. Elsewhere in the NT the Isaianic passage finds its application in the preaching ministry of Jesus. In Acts, Luke applies Isaiah to the preaching ministry of Paul. The Roman mission of the Lucan Paul fails to make significant gains within the Jewish constituency. The citation of Is 6:9-10 by the evangelist affords a theological explanation of this evangelistic fiasco. Thus Kee writes: "Even the disbelief of the Jews is in fulfilment of [the Jews'] scriptures ..."\(^{427}\) The Lucan corollary to this OT citation is the legitimation of the Christian mission to the Gentiles (v. 28).

iii. Matthew

Our morphological analysis of the free indirect report of Is 6:9-10 in Mt 13:13 served to disclose two important modifications of its parallel in Mk 4:12. First of all, the causal conjunction διὰ has usurped the position of the original

telic conjunction ἵνα. Thus the impercipientness of the people outside the group of Jesus' disciples now represents Jesus' stated reason for his use of parabolic speech in his public preaching. The purpose of parable is to facilitate comprehension among "those outside." Apparently the theology of the evangelist will not accommodate any notion of intentionally riddling discourse on Jesus' part. Secondly, Matthew does not report the μὴ ποτὲ-clause. Thus Matthaean theology will neither tolerate the ascription of obduracy to the crowds. With the foregoing alterations, then,


Hare writes:
"There is no 'softening' of Mark's theory of the parables in Matthew" (Matthew, 149-50).

He continues:
"The substitution of 'because' ... does not alter the statement [of Mk 4:11-12] significantly, which in Matthew's version can be paraphrased: 'I speak to them in veiled speech, because they behave in accordance with God's decree as decreed by Isaiah: they see and do not see, they hear and do not hear, nor do they understand.' In Isa. 6:10 the prophet is instructed, 'Make the heart of this people fat, and their ears heavy, and shut their eyes,' because God has already determined to punish his people (Isa. 6:11-13)" (ibid., 150).

Overman cites Mt 13:11:
"To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it has not been given."

Patte concludes:
"Jesus speaks to [the crowds] in parables [because] [t]hey have put themselves in a position where they are not yet ready to hear the mysteries of the kingdom" (Matthew, 189).

Against Overman, Mt 13:11 serves to indicate the need for transparent speech. In addition, Scott would rebut all three scholars:
"Matthew has no interest in Mark's hardening aspect of parable; throughout the discourse in chapter 13, his accent is on hearing, understanding, and kingdom" (Hear then the Parable, 26: italics added).
Matthew will no more impugn the intentions of "those outside" than he will those of Jesus.\textsuperscript{429}

The \textit{direct report} of Is 6:9-10 (vv. 14-15) with its introductory formula—καὶ ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαίου ἡ λέγουσα (v. 14a)—represents a classic example of the prediction-fulfilment scheme. To this extent, there is implied a realization of divine intent. The very nature of Jesus' public proclamation thus serves to preclude the possibility of repentance in his listenership.\textsuperscript{430} However, the implication is a subtle one. At the same time, the conjunction γάρ (sim. LXX) mitigates the telic thrust of the Hebrew text significantly. In other words, the impercipience of Jesus' listenership finds its origin in an impairment of cognitive faculties. With that, the μὴ ποτὲ-clause, in turn, undergoes a realignment. In this connection, the crowd itself becomes the author of its cognitive dullness.\textsuperscript{431} Inability to perceive presupposes refusal to repent. Moreover, the words of commission to the prophet—Πορεύθητι καὶ εἰπών τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ (Is 6:9)—are conspicuously absent in the Matthaean report. The deletion of this clause effects a distancing of the prophecy from God himself. From this standpoint, the Matthaean form of the \textit{direct report} (vv. 14-15) exhibits a consistency with the \textit{free indirect report} (v. 13). The retention of the μὴ ποτὲ-clause does, 

\textsuperscript{429}This should not surprise us. After all, Matthew is addressing a "Jewish" church.

\textsuperscript{430}According to vv. 16-17, the disciples have been granted sight and hearing, i.e. insight. By implication, the crowds do not enjoy this blessing (so Margaret Davies, \textit{Matthew, Readings: A New Biblical Commentary} [Sheffield, Eng.: JSOT Press, 1993], 100), hence the need for parabolic instruction.

\textsuperscript{431}Cum Patte, \textit{Matthew}, 188.
however, impugn the motives of "those outside." Interestingly, the resultant tension between v. 13 and vv. 14-15 adds weight to Stendahl's hypothesis of post-Matthaean interpolation of vv. 14-15.  

iv. John

In Jn 9:39 the free indirect report of Is 6:9 affords an interpretation of an event in Jesus' ministry. A man who had been blind from birth and who has received his sight at the hands of Jesus (vv. 1-11) undergoes intensive interrogation by the Pharisees (vv. 13-17, 24-34a) who eventually expel him from the synagogue (v. 34b) for confessing Jesus as a 'man from God' (v. 33). The "epilogue" to the story (vv. 39-41) contains Jesus' assessment of the incident:

For judgement I came into this world, that those who do not see may see, and that those who see might become blind (v. 39 = Is 6:9).

Not only has the blind man received his sight in a physical sense, but now he also gains sight in a figurative sense insofar as he comes to believe in the Son of man (v. 38). By contrast, the Pharisees who claim to be "disciples of Moses" (v. 28) and thereby claim to "see" (v. 41) are nonetheless "blind" insofar as they reject the testimony of the man whom Jesus has healed. A prerequisite for the bestowal of this "sight" is a person's recognition of his spiritual "blindness." For John, the Pharisee exemplifies just such a need.

The foregoing reference to Is 6:9 in Jesus' summary statement implies a correspondence of the Pharisees' "blindness."  

---

432 See above p. 155 n. 405.
433 Ironically, such individuals are designated "those who see"
with divine economy. On first inspection, therefore, there could
be no question of moral culpability. Indeed the coming of Jesus
--the "Light"--into the world serves to divide his hearers into
two camps, viz. the "blind" and the "seeing." Yet each individual
has to choose his/her own camp. That is to say, "everyone must
face the question to which of the two groups he wants to belong."\textsuperscript{434}
Indeed "some Pharisees" within earshot of Jesus' pronouncement
pose the question, "Are we also blind?" Undoubtedly, the
Pharisees anticipate a negative response.\textsuperscript{435} By contrast, the
reader knows the Pharisees' "blindness" all too well.\textsuperscript{436} The
response of the Johannine Jesus serves to underline the irony of
the Pharisees' question, as Culpepper says:\textsuperscript{437}

\begin{quote}
If you were blind, you would have no guilt; but now
that you say, "We see," your guilt remains (41).
\end{quote}

In Haenchen's words,

because you claim that you see, that is, that you know
God, and do not recognize him, for you there is no
forgiveness of sin.

Evidently the Pharisees do not "recognize the higher plane of

\textsuperscript{434}Bultmann, \textit{The Gospel of John: A Commentary,
trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, (general eds. R. W. N. Hoare and
of the 1964 printing of Das Evangeliums des Johannes [with the
Supplement of 1966]).

\textsuperscript{435}Ibid., 341.

\textsuperscript{436}Lindars, \textit{John}, 352.

\textsuperscript{437}Dramatic irony in the form of an unanswered question is one of
the preferred literary devices of John. Here the character, often
on the basis of a false assumption, "suggests or prophesies the
truth without knowing it" (\textit{Anatomy}, 176). In this connection,
Culpepper lists a number of examples (ibid.). We would add 9:27c:
"Do you too want to becomes his disciples?" (the healed blind man
to his interrogators the Pharisees).

\textsuperscript{438}Ibid., 178.

\textsuperscript{439}\textit{John}, II, 41.
their own words." Thus the Pharisee does see, but rejects what he sees, viz. his "blindness." The ultimate cost to such an individual is a deeper entrenchment of his/her spiritual "blindness." In this way, the Johannine Pharisee incurs the judgement of "those have seen the light but rejected it." To this extent, then, the Pharisees "have made their own bed and now they must lie in it."

The direct report of Is 6:10 in 12:40 finds itself within the editorial summary of vv. 36b-43. This scripture reference in conjunction with the preceding reference to Is 53:1 of v. 38 serves to explain the unbelief of the crowd in terms of a fulfilment of OT prediction. In point of fact, the people "could not believe," even though Jesus "had done so many signs before them" (v. 38).

The editorial comment of v. 39 after the first scripture-reference leaves absolutely no doubt in view of God's predetermined will (v. 40). Once again, the culpability of Jesus' listeners appears to be out of the question. The meaning of the main clause of the citation from Is 6:10 in v. 40, with the verbs τυφλώω ("blind") and πωρώ ("harden") reported in the indicative mood, is such that

---

439 Culpepper, Anatomy, 179.
440 Sim. Bultmann: "He who does not believe is judged, and the judgement is carried out on him precisely in his holding on to the delusion that he can see" (John, 341). Obversely, the acknowledgement of one's "blindness" is the precondition for the receiving of one's "sight"--the dialogue of vv. 35-38 renders this abundantly clear.
441 Culpepper, Anatomy, 192.
442 The causal conjunction γάρ serves to introduce Is 6:10 (v. 40) in v. 39b.
God himself has dulled the faculties of the crowd. The meaning of the subordinate clause of this citation, introduced as it is by the negated telic conjunction, viz. ἐκ μή, is such that God has effected the impercipience of the crowd with the express purpose of preventing repentance and reconciliation. What we encounter in Jn 12:40 in terms of its basic meaning appears to be a reversion to Mk 4:12 and indeed to Is 6:9-10 (MT), i.e. a case of atavism.

Yet the citation of the two Isaianic oracles could well represent a simple function of the exigencies of the Johannine plot. Says Haenchen:

Jesus had labored [sic] over the Jews in the first twelve chapters, in vain, as 12:37-42 lamentably and accusingly confirms. What is prophesied in Isaiah 53:1 and 6:10, in those important forecasts of doom for a deluded Jewish people, is realized in this passage. As a consequence, Jesus has nothing more to say to the Jews.

Yet the connection of the citation from Is 53:1 with that of Is 6:10 gains a "new significance" for the former, as well. Says Bultmann,

For in the Evangelist's mind the idea of determination ought to illuminate the character of revelation: the revelation brings to light the authentic being of man. Accordingly, a "nevertheless" statement immediately follows the citation of Isaiah's prophecies (vv. 42-43). Many even of the "leaders" (ἀρχοντές) among the Jewish listenership believed but did not confess their belief for fear of the Pharisees who would expel them from the synagogue (cf. 9:34). Not content to level the charge of moral cowardice alone, the evangelist adds that

443 John, II, 186.
444 John, 453.
445 To this extent, says Lindars, "the complaint of v. 37 has been too sweeping" (John, 439).
"they[--i.e. Jesus' audience--]loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Elsewhere in 9:39-41, Culpepper had already observed that the Pharisees did in fact see, but they rejected what they had seen. Of vv. 42-43, we can in consequence say precisely the same.

D. THE MEANING OF THE OT

E. SCRIPTURE-HERMENEUTICS

i. Paul

The introduction of Is 6:9-10 by means of the formula καθὼς γέγραπται in Rom 11:8 serves to relate a factual reading of an OT prophecy to a contemporary situation in which Paul claims that the prophecy finds its fulfilment. Here the dulling of the cognitive faculties of the Jews by God has allegedly caused the failure of the Christian message to gain overall acceptance among the Jewish people. The addition of a further reference to scripture by means of the formula καὶ Δαυιδ λέγει in v. 9 signals the factual reading of a second OT passage whose fulfilment consists in the hardening of Israel. Here the alleged fulfilment of a Davidic curse from Ps 69:22-23 in Rom 11:9-10 lends added weight to the Pauline notion of an innate impercipient on the part of the Jew. Undoubtedly the prophecy-fulfilment motif employed by Paul, as opposed to that of typological correspondence as in Mk 4:11-12, bespeaks the more studied attempt to locate the source of the

446 See above pp. 140-45.
447 The NT writers with which we are concerned are arranged in descending order of their relative ages.

The enclosure of the word "Jew(s)" in quotation marks serves to denote the literary function of this word as a rhetorical device.
hardening of Israel in the divine economy. Accordingly, none other than God himself renders the Jews impercipient according to Rom 11;\(^448\) by contrast, Jesus—and only by implication God—effects a similar result in Mark by preaching "in parables."

Both Paul and Mark are addressing a largely, if not entirely non-Jewish readership.\(^449\) Moreover, the Pauline "Jew," like the


\(^449\) Mark's intended readership was considered above in the Introduction on pp.10-12.

F.-W. Marquardt's detection of Jews and Gentiles as "ideal" discussion partners behind the direct addressees of Rom 1:5-6 and 13-14 (in *Die Juden in Römerbrief*, Theologische Studien 107 [Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1971], critiqued by Günter Klein, "Erbarmen mit den Juden! Zu einer historisch-materialistischen Paulusdeutung", *EvTh* XXX [March-April, 1974], 204-5) finds its sole support in his inadequately documented hypothesis of the use of the fictitious discussion partner, a literary device known to diatribists. The texts which he cites afford tenuous evidence of a Jewish readership at best. The thou-address employed in 2:17ff. would, argues Marquardt, signal Paul's intimacy with the Jewish brotherhood. This seemingly reckless assessment would, surprisingly enough, deserve similar application in the second-person plural addressee of 8:2. However, this second-person plural addressee represents a textually uncertain reading. Ultimately, Marquardt abandons this reading. In other words, Paul himself is supposed to have written \(\mu\epsilon\) in lieu of \(\sigma\epsilon\). Obviously no evidence exists to corroborate such a claim. To make matters worse, the statement of 8:2 concerns the existence of those who participate "in the Spirit of life in Jesus Christ." Those of whom the Apostle writes in 8:12 comprise the same group of individuals. Still, the term \(\sigma\alpha\rho\xi\) ("flesh") would, states Marquardt, betray a "specifically Jewish question." Thus the designation \(\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\varsigma\) ("brother") with which this so-called catchword is associated would allegedly locate its referent in that portion of the intended readership which comprised Jews. Once again in 7:1, 4, the designation \(\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\varsigma\) closely connects itself with a so-called catchword, this time \(\nu\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\varsigma\) ("law"). Once again, the catchword in question would reflect interest in a "specifically Jewish question." Once again, however, Marquardt overlooks a very important consideration. That is to say, the individuals of whom Paul writes in 7:4 include "those[---and only those---]who devolve from the deadly grip of the law on the resurrected Christ."

On first inspection, the statements of 3:21-31, lifted from their present context, might suggest an apology intended for a Jewish constituency. Still, such material could represent a pre-Pauline source (see John H. P. Reumann, "Gospel of the
Marcan "Jew" constitutes a stereotype of the non-believer. To this extent, then, the "Jew" is a literary construct in each writer. These similarities notwithstanding, Paul and Mark apply Is 6:9-10 in significantly different ways. On the one hand, the view of salvation-history expounded by Paul in Rom 11 is such that Israel remains God's chosen people and that as such she will ultimately find salvation. On the other hand, the evangelist never entertains the possibility of salvation for the Jews. Not surprisingly, then, the church supersedes ancient Israel as the "New Israel" (12:9b).

Righteousness of God", Int XX [October, 1966], 433-43). A knowledge of Jewish persons among his readers would, in fact, belie Paul's self-declaration as an apostle to the Gentiles (Rom 1:1-6, 14; 15:15-21; Gal 2:6-9). His previous evangelistic endeavours "from Jerusalem as far round as Illyricum" (15:19) have reached their conclusion (15:20, 23). Now he is envisioning yet another Gentile mission in Spain via the church at Rome (15:24, 28). A careful reading of the metaphor of the olive tree (11:17-24) serves to confirm the non-Jewish identity of Paul's intended addressees beyond all doubt: "[Some branches[--Jews--]were broken off, and you, a wild olive shoot[--Gentiles--]were grafted in their place to share the richness of the olive tree" (11:17). Indeed the unqualified referent of the metaphor of the olive tree--ὁμοίως passim--makes little sense, if it were so construed as to include Jews. Moreover, the general thrust of Paul's application of the olive-tree metaphor anticipates a subsequent statement regarding a Gentile indebtedness to the Jerusalemite Christians (15:26-27). The underlying intention of this particular comment would presumably be enlistment of future financial assistance from Rome (cf. Gal 2:10). Clearly, Roman Jewish Christians hardly could have incurred an indebtedness of this kind. The Letter to the Romans affords no solid evidence of Jewish addressees whatsoever (contra William Neil, The Acts of the Apostles, The New Century Bible, Based on the Revised Standard Version (London: Oliphants, 1973), 258.

450 By the end of this chapter, it will become abundantly clear that for Mark the "Jew" represents the typical unbeliever, the one who is quite unable to fathom religious truths.
ii. Luke

What we find in Lk 8:10b is a typological reading of Is 6:9-10 as we do in Mk 4:12. The purpose attributed to Jesus, as in Mark, is that of confounding his "Jewish" audience. The similarity between the two evangelists ends here, however. Indeed the purpose of parabolic utterance in Mark was to prevent comprehension on the part of the listener and thus effect his hardening. By contrast, if our exegesis of Lk 8:9-15 is sound, incomprehension should in fact represent a step on the way to faith. That is to say, incomprehension in the Lucan scheme should not drive the honest seeker from Jesus; on the contrary, it should prompt that individual to bring his questions to Jesus. The ascription of just such a benevolent intention to the Lucan Jesus does, in turn, manifest a coherence with the absence of the μήμονε-clause. Thus the responsibility for clarification of doubts or misunderstandings concerning the Christian proclamation rests with the listener. Those who do not avail themselves of this opportunity are the authors of their own damnation. Here the "Jew," like the "disciple," fulfils a representative function as the typical unbeliever.\(^{451}\)

The introductory formula of Acts 28:25b, with which the words of Is 6:9-10 in vv. 26-27 are prefaced, serves to relate a factual reading of an OT prophecy to a contemporary situation in which the

writer claims that the former has found its *fulfilment*. Indeed
the application of Is 6:9-10 in Acts 28:26-27 manifests the unique
feature that Luke refers the words of Isaiah to Paul's mission
among the Jews. All other applications of this OT passage within
the NT canon reveal application to the ministry of Jesus. Still
the evangelist, as do other NT writers and as does he himself in
Lk 8:10b, invokes the prophet as a theological explanation for the
failure of the evangelistic mission among the Jews. That is to
say, the Holy Spirit predicted this failure through the prophet
Isaiah (v. 25b), and by implication God willed it, so that "this
salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles" (v. 28a).
Thus observes Kee:

> Even the resistance of [Paul's] hearer's [among the
Roman Jews] is seen to be in accord with scripture
(28:26-27 = Isa. 6:9-10). Their opposition does not
thwart God's saving purpose, but contributes instead to
its going out now to the wider Gentile audience, and
'they will listen' (28:28).

At the same time, the unbelief of the "Jews" is not an
all-encompassing fact for some "Jews" do in fact believe (v. 24). With this qualification of Isaiah's statement, Luke might well
accord the "Jews" bear a certain degree of responsibility for
their unbelief. On the whole, though, the "Jew," here as in

---

452 *Theology of Acts*, 99, sim. 97, 105; sim. Hans Conzelmann,
(London: Faber and Faber, 1960), 163: with that, the Gentiles
now share in the "hope of Israel" (v. 20);
Tyson, *Images of Judaism*, 175-76.

453 However Luke does not emphasise the point (Hans Conzelmann,
trans. James Limberg, A. Thomas Kraabel and Donald H. Juel,
Lk 8:10b, represents the typical unbeliever, the individual who has ample opportunity to attain faith but refuses to seize it. Indeed the realignment of the μὴ ποιεῖ-clause in the LXX serves to attribute the cause of the apparent dullness in the Lucan "Jew" in their obdurate disposition. With that, we can endorse the assessment of Conzelmann:

> The scene has been constructed with the express purpose of conveying the impression that the situation with the Jews was hopeless.

iii. Matthew

First among the Matthaean OT references is the indirect content paraphrase of 13:13. Unlike the synoptic parallels of Mk 4:12 and Lk 8:10b, what we find here might appropriately be labelled a "negated" typological reading of Is 6:9-10. Indeed the situation depicted in the antitype (the Matthaean Jesus) constitutes a reversal of that which is depicted in the type (Isaiah). In other words, Jesus in the view of Matthew adopts a parabolic mode of speaking for the express purpose of facilitation of comprehension in his "Jewish" audience. The substitution of the causal (ὅτι) for the telic conjunction (ὡς) thus serves to render explicit what is implied in Lk 8:9, 11-15. God, through Jesus, works to overcome the people's impercipience. At the same time, the absence of the μὴ ποιεῖ-clause serves to forestall a redefinition of that clause by way of a conversion of the ὡς- to a ὅτι-clause. In this way, the evangelist refuses to characterize the "Jews" as obdurate persons.\(^{455}\) With that, neither Jesus, nor,

\[^{454}\textit{Acts}, 227.\]

\[^{455}\text{In our view, this interesting fact would suggest the possible existence of a Jewish-Christian constituency among Matthew's intended readers.}\]
by implication, God bears primary responsibility for rejection of the gospel message or the consequences thereof.

The direct report of Is 6:9-10 in vv. 14-15 with its introductory formula serves to relate a factual reading of an OT prophecy to a contemporary situation. Here the reference to the OT allegedly finds its fulfilment in the incomprehension of Jesus' audience. Clearly the prediction-fulfilment scheme implies a realization of divine purpose. However, the fulfilment of OT prophecy itself is an outward expression of the cognitive impairment of the hearers. Moreover, the LXX realignment of the μήποτε-clause with its substitution of the conjunction γάρ serves to locate the source of this incomprehension in the obduracy of the people.

iv. John

The reference to Is 6:9-19 in Jn 9:39, like those of Mk 4:12 and Lk 8:10b, is a typological reading of an OT prophecy. Evidently John detects a correspondence between the circumstances attaching to the preaching ministry of Isaiah and the mission of Jesus described in Jn 9:35-41. In this connection, Jesus comes into the world that "those who see might become blind." To this extent, the published motive behind the work of the Johannine Jesus accords with that ascribed to him in Mk 4:12. In contrast to the Marcan Jesus, but in line with the Jesus of both Lk 8:9-15 and Mt 13:13, the Jesus of 9:39 also comes into the world that "those who do not see might see." Ironically, those in the world who claim to see--the Johannine "Pharisees"--also find themselves in the ranks of those who do not "see." An acknowledgement of
one's "blindness" is the pre-condition of one's healing. Unlike the blind, the sighted do not acknowledge their spiritual "blindness." For these, there can thus be no healing of their "blindness." Everyone in the world is preveniently granted the possibility of enlightenment. The "Pharisees" with other worldlings thereby bear ultimate responsibility for their unbelief.

As we have already indicated, the Johannine "Jews," the "Pharisees" in particular, assume a representative function as they do in Mark, Paul, Luke and Matthew. That is to say, the "Jewish" leadership in general represents those of the world who refuse to remain open to Jesus, the individual 'who shuts himself up against the light and in this way rebels against God.' To quote Bultmann,

The ruler of the (or this) world is the Devil (12:31; 14:40; 16:11). Because he is their father, the "Jews" are his offspring.

Not only do the Johannine "Jews" find themselves in such an unfortunate condition, but we can infer from Jn 9:39 that they have chosen to remain in that condition.

The introductory clause of Jn 12:38a (ὁνα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαῖου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθή δὲ εἰπον) with which the reference to Is 6:9-10 is prefaced serves to indicate a factual reading of OT prophecy, the statement of v. 37 constituting its fulfilment. Indeed the general thrust of Is 6:9-10 MT is recaptured even more explicitly than it is in Mk 4:12--the Lord himself ordained the impercipeince of the "Jews" and thus also their alienation from

\[456\] Bultmann, TNT, II, 18.
\[457\] Ibid., 16.
him—and on initial inspection one might see some tension with Jn 9:39. However, we must take cognizance of 12:42-43:

Nevertheless many even of the authorities believed in him [Jesus], but for fear of the Pharisees they did not confess it, lest they be put out of the synagogue: for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.

What we find in these verses, therefore, is both a fulfilment of Jn 9:39 and at the same time a significant qualification of the prophecy cited in Jn 12:39. Some did, in fact, believe. Meanwhile the "Pharisees" incur an even harsher censure than they do in 9:39.\footnote{The crowd, however, seems to escape this severe castigation. In 12:39a John explicitly tells us, "They could not believe" (italics added), because God willed it so (v. 40 = Is 6:10). Evidently the crowd comprises Jewish people: in v. 34 they acknowledge the authority of the Law.} Not only do they reject the enlightenment offered by Jesus for themselves, but they excommunicate those who do believe and thereby throttle all expression of their faith. On their part, those of the authorities who nonetheless believe in Jesus are impugned with the charge of moral cowardice and seeking the approval of men—generically speaking—instead of God.

F. THE HERMENEUTICS OF PAUL AND THE EVANGELISTS: A COMPARISON OF FINDINGS

Our analysis of the references to Is 6:9-10 in the NT indicates a broad variation in the degree of mimesis with which this passage is reported. At the one extreme we found near-verbatim citations in Acts 28:26-27 and Mt 13:14-15, at the other the much more weakly mimetic reports in Rom 11:8 and Jn 9:39. What is generally true of these references to Isaiah, however, is the fact that they and their respective contexts function so as to interpret one another, though differently in...
each writer. The differences in the divers treatments of Is 6:9-10 manifests itself notably with regard to the light in which the "Jew" is portrayed. Moreover, a chronological comparison of these treatments serves to disclose a progressive development in the portrayal of the Jews within primitive Christianity. For Paul the nation of Israel continues to occupy a decisive position within the scheme of salvation-history, partly for existential reasons. Paul himself was a Jew. For him God ordained the rejection of the gospel by the Jews but did so with a view to their eventual salvation. A byword for the unbeliever, the Pauline "Jew" continues to find some degree of reference among the Jewish people nonetheless. Mark, however, signals a critical development. Firstly, the Marcan "Jew" continues to represent a literary construct. However, the Marcan stereotype of the unbeliever no longer finds any reference in the nation of Israel per se. Secondly, God through the person of Jesus remains the prime mover in effecting the unbelief of the "Jews," but assumes that role for the purpose of preventing their repentance and resultant salvation.459

In Luke, Matthew and John the "Jews" assume the same role as they do in Mark. However, the "Jews," i.e. the unbelievers whom they represent, bear the burden of responsibility for their unbelief, even though their response is interpreted as consistent with OT prophecy in Acts 28:26-27 and Mt 13:14-15. While this is

459 On Acts 28:26-27 Conzelmann makes the following observation: "Luke does not look beyond the present hardening to a future conversion of Israel" (Acts, 227). This statement finds equally valid application in Mark.
implicit in Lk 8:9-15, it is explicit in Mt 13:13. Luke and Matthew, each in his own way, state that Jesus so preached that his audience might come to understand his teaching. Yet the direct report of Mt 13:14-15 is something of a qualifier to his indirect content paraphrase. On the one hand, the prediction-fulfilment formula of v. 14 serves to locate the ultimate source of the people's cognitive impairment in the the divine economy. On the other, the γῦρ-clause of this quotation of the LXX effects a redefinition of the subsequent μὴ ποτε-clause: the impercipient of the people is a function of their obduracy. Again in 9:39-41 John makes the same point. At the same time, the mission of Jesus is to impart "sight" to the blind, that is to say, the spiritually "blind" who declare themselves as such. Yet in 12:36-43 he paints an exceedingly unfavourable depiction of the "Jews'" response to the mission of Jesus. On the one hand, he levels two charges against those of the "authorities" who believed. Firstly, there is the charge of moral cowardice: they did not confess their belief "for fear of the Pharisees." Secondly, there is the charge of assigning more value to the praise of men (the "world") than to the praise of God. On the other hand, the "Pharisees" are not merely unbelievers but destroyers of faith. The foregoing survey of the applications of Is 6:9-10 by different NT writers thus serves to disclose an increasing tendency to denigrate the "Jewish" people. A people who are initially considered the object of God's redemptive action are in the end accorded the unenviable

460 Nonetheless, ascription of the prophecy to Isaiah effects a dampening of this element.
status of a people who are not merely indifferent, but in fact actively opposed to God's saving intention.
2.2 Test Case 1b: The Disciples Compared to "Those Outside" - Mk 8:17b, 18a

A. TRADITION-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

The immediate context of the scripture references which we encounter in Mk 8:17b, 18a is the conversation between Jesus and his disciples which is reported in Mk 8:14-21. No doubt the crossing of the lake by boat signals (ἐμβας⁴⁶¹/ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ) (vv. 13, 14) yet another such exchange which takes place in private. An instruction of the disciples, the pericope is best designated a didactic dialogue, in terms of its form.⁴⁶² The variant readings en masse serve to establish the reliability of the extant text.⁴⁶³

⁴⁶¹ An ellipsis for ἐμβας εἰς τὸ πλοίον (v. 10).
⁴⁶² Gnilka, Markus, I, 310.
⁴⁶³ A certain number of manuscripts (WΘ B⁴⁶⁵vid fam. 1 fam. 13 565 700) attest the reading ([ΕΝ μόνον ἄρτον ἔχοντες]) in v. 14. The evangelist elsewhere locates the construction εἰ μὴ after the verb (2:26; 5:37; 6:4, 5, 8; 9:8, 29; 10:18; 11:13; 13:32). In this case, however, the variant text looks to be a simplification of a more difficult original (Taylor, Mark, 364-65). Each of the remaining variants finds a ready explanation in assimilation. In v. 15, assimilation to 3:6 and 12:13 affords a ready explanation for the reading τῶν ἤρωδανων (so GWAΘ B⁴⁵ fam. 1 fam. 13 [excl. 124] 22 28 60 251 561 6799 i k vg [1 MS.] sa geo arm) (so ibid., 366). The insertion of the participle λέγοντες after the pronoun ἄλληλους in v. 16 (so ACŁΔΘ et al., fam. 13 22 33 118 157 579 892 1071 al. pler. f g l r vg sy w vulcan arm) betrays assimilation to Mt 16:7, as does the first person of the verb ἔχω (attested in most of the same manuscripts with the addition of Ν) (cf. ἐλάβομεν in Mt) which is necessitated by resultant ὁτι recitativum. Thus the text in ἔχουσιν (so BW B⁴⁵ fam. 1 [excl. 118] 28 565 700 1342 c g k) is given preference by Taylor, esp. if εἶχαν (so D a b d ff et al.) be a grammatical variant (so ibid.). Likewise, the interpolation of such phrases as ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὀλιγόπιστοι (so W B⁴⁵ fam. 13) ἐγὼ ταῖς καρδίαις ὀλιγόπιστοι (ΘΘ 28 124 565 700 sy h m geo arm) indicates the influence of the synoptic parallel of Mt 16:8. In this connection, Taylor has expressed somewhat more caution, noting 'harmony with the Marcan narrative' (ibid., 367). Over against this, however, we should note the absence of the adjective ὀλιγόπιστος elsewhere in Mark. Four of the five occurrences of this term in the NT find themselves in Matthew (6:30; 8:20; 14:31;
From the standpoint of thematic development, we may divide the passage into two sub-sections, viz. vv. 14-17a and 17b-21. With regard to the first, the disciples express concern over an apparent shortage of food. Evidently they forgot to make adequate provision. With regard to the second, Jesus, who has ascertained the deliberations of the disciples, proceeds to interrogate them as to their appreciation of the significance of the feeding miracles (vv. 19-21; cf. 6:43-44; 8:1-10). Not surprisingly, reconstructions of the tradition-history of the pericope manifest some variations in detail from one commentator to another. In spite of this, the vast majority of scholarly authorities have reached agreement in their ascription of its compilation to the evangelist.  

On first inspection, the saying of v. 15 appears to disrupt the flow of the discourse of vv. 14-17a. In this connection, the warning against the respective leavens of the Pharisees and Herod bears no obvious relation to the disciples' failure to provision themselves with an inadequate supply of food. Here the association of "leaven" and "bread" has, according to some authorities, facilitated the interpolation of an essentially foreign element."  

Taylor has stated that,  

---

16:8), one in Luke (12:28). Finally, the accepted text of v. 19 reads καὶ οὐ μημονεύετε ... accompanied by several variants. These include: οὐπώ νοεῖτε οὐδὲ μημονεύετε (so Θ Φ 565); οὐπώ νοεῖτε (so ΝΣ); and οὐδὲ μημονεύετε (so D) (ibid.). Once again, assimilation is virtually a certainty—cf. Mt 16:9: οὐπώ νοεῖτε, οὐδὲ μημονεύετε.

464 E.g. ibid., 363, 364.
465 E.g. Pryke, Redactional Style, 61.
466 Cranfield, Mark, 259. According to Burkill, an association of
it is not Mark's habit to insert sayings into the body of a narrative, as Matthew does ... but to append them at the end. \textsuperscript{467}

However, a re-arrangement of the material, such that v. 15 is excised and re-inserted following v. 17a would, argues Pesch, yield a coherent and meaningful apophthegm which comprises vv. 14, 16, 17a and 15 in that order. \textsuperscript{468} On this basis, some such composition in turn is alleged to have been the archetype which underlay the Marcan text. The dominical saying preserved in v. 15 thus would have represented the pronouncement with which the pre-Marcan apophthegm culminated. At this stage, the logion about the leaven of the Pharisees and that of Herod served to warn the disciples against the influence of their respective political visions for the nation of Israel. \textsuperscript{469} The foregoing reconstruction, then, presupposes an hypotheses of dislocation.

To what purpose would anyone effect such a dislocation? Notably, the rehearsal of the situation delineated in v. 14 ideas has facilitated the present location of a traditional saying (Mysterious Revelation, 106).

\textsuperscript{467}Mark, 366; also cited with approval in Cranfield, Mark, 259.

\textsuperscript{468}Pesch, Markus, I, 411; sim. Gnilka, Markus, I, 310.

The apophthegm as reconstructed by Pesch does not include the phrase \(\text{ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ} \) in v. 14. Clearly the phrase is a redactional link (see below). At the same time, the interpretation of the "one loaf," which Pesch himself proposes, serves to undermine his claim for the words καὶ ἐς μὴ ἐνερχαί as the embodiment of a 'concrete recollection' (Markus, 412). Clearly these words do serve a redactional purpose. That is, the "one loaf" characterizes Jesus who gives his life for all (so ibid., 414; contra ibid., 412: the "one loaf" carries no symbolic significance). In and of itself this would render Pesch's 'concrete recollection' highly suspect. Indeed this so-called 'concrete recollection' might have been 'symbolically laden' from the outset.

\textsuperscript{469}On the one hand, the Pharisees envisioned a loosening of Roman rule; on the other, Herod sought to preserve the status quo (ibid., 413).
now follows the warning against the leavens of the Pharisees and Herod. In other words, the direct speech of the disciples in v. 16 becomes response to the warning of Jesus in v. 15. Here the disciples miss the point entirely. Presumably Jesus would have overheard their ruminations. A simple manipulation of a pre-Marcan text would thus facilitate the addition of a speech of Jesus. The purpose of this 'sharpened discussion about the misunderstanding of the disciples (vv. 17b-21)' would be to have referred Jesus' warning to the demand for a sign, whose context itself is the miracle narratives.

Indeed a certain amount of evidence exists to support the overall reconstruction proposed by Pesch. In the first place, we have noted consistency with Marcan editorial policy. In the second, the presence of such telltale formal characteristics as the description and examination of the situation and the termination of the vignette with a saying of Jesus would presumably enhance the probability of the existence of such an apophthegm in the pre-Marcan tradition, as would also its structural similarity with other extant apophthegmata in such features as the situation en route, the deliberations among the disciples, and the preparation for the closing word with a question posed by Jesus (cf. 3:31-35; 8:10-12; 9:33-35).

470 Ibid., 414: i.e. a 'misunderstanding,' a 'lack of appreciation for Jesus and his word.'
472 Pesch, Markus, I, 413-14.
473 Ibid., 412.
Nevertheless the foregoing hypothesis would require some degree of refinement. On first inspection, a warning against the influence of the respective political visions of the Pharisees and Herod, as v. 15 is interpreted by Pesch,\textsuperscript{474} seems to have little or no bearing on the disciples' concern over the fact that they had not provided themselves with an adequate supply of food. In the final analysis, would we have here a "coherent apophthegm?" Not insignificantly, the apparent lack of accommodation of the framework of vv. 14, 16 and 17a to the logion of v. 15, which Pesch himself is ultimately forced to acknowledge,\textsuperscript{475} furnishes the basis on which he argues his case for the non-secondary character of his proposed reconstruction.\textsuperscript{476} To wit, the reconstruction proffered by Pesch lacks an "ideal scene," his hallmark of a true apophthegm.\textsuperscript{477} Quite clearly, he cannot have it both ways.

The interpretation of v. 15 proposed by Gnilka would, interestingly, afford us a solution to this dilemma, however. He asks: "Wherein do the Pharisees and Herod so agree that they can be used as cautionary examples?" He answers: "unbelief."\textsuperscript{478} The leavens of the Pharisees and Herod, though different as Pesch rightly indicates,\textsuperscript{479} each engender the same unbelieving response to

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{474}Ibid., 413.
\textsuperscript{475}Ibid., 412. The catchwords ἄρτος ("bread") and ζύνη ("leaven") allegedly afford the sole point of contact (ibid., 413).
\textsuperscript{476}Ibid., 412.
\textsuperscript{477}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{478}Markus, I, 310.
\textsuperscript{479}Indeed the text supports such a differentiation. Had this not been the case it should have read τῆς ζύνης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Ἰρώδου instead of τῆς ζύνης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῆς ζύνης Ἰρώδου.
\end{footnotes}
the work and words of Jesus. Not only does the logion of v. 15, which at its deepest level represents a warning against such influences as give rise to this attitude, constitute a fitting conclusion to a discussion which, as we shall argue, concerns a lack of faith, but it finds contextual support in the depiction of the Pharisees' attitude toward Jesus provided in vv. 11-13.\(^{480}\) The resultant emergence of vv. 14, 16 and 17a as the "ideal scene" thus substantially increases the probability of Pesch's reconstruction, but at the same time it significantly undermines the probability of its authenticity.

To the extent that the extant text of vv. 14-17a represents a fitting introduction to a discussion wherein the lack of comprehension on the part of the disciples is thrown into relief, therefore, Mark would represent the hand most likely responsible for the present ordering of the verses which comprise the sub-section under consideration, as Pesch has in fact contended. Attractive though Pesch's hypothesis of dislocation may be, however, there does exist a more economical explanation for the configuration of the material which comprises vv. 14-17a.

Dislocation hypotheses have not won the support of all commentators. Indeed the two references to the Pharisees in

\(^{480}\) Indeed the logion may well represent a "see-above" reference. On "footnotes" within the body of the text, see Pryke, *Redactional Style*, 32-61.

Interestingly, Pesch's explication of the significance of this logion within its extant context evidences no substantial disagreement with the position which we have articulated here (see Markus, I, 414). However, the reference the "leaven of Herod" allegedly owes its presence to Marcan 'faithfulness to the tradition.'
vv. 11-13 and v. 15 afford the sole verbal contact between v. 15 and its proximate context. Nevertheless, the existence of this one point of contact in v. 11 would, in Cranfield's view, secure the present location of this logion as its "true historical context." The reference to the Pharisees purportedly signifies "a false and inconsistent piety," to wit their hypocrisy, and the reference to Herod "the godlessness of the man of the world." In that case, the admonition to the disciples in v. 15 would constitute a warning against the influence--hence the leaven--of such attitudes.

Likewise "preservation" of an "undoubtedly genuine saying" "in its original setting" is the position which Taylor assumes in his tradition-historical assessment of the passage in question. On his reckoning, though, the "leaven of the Pharisees" signifies the "evil disposition" manifest elsewhere in Mark's gospel. Also, the supporting evidence which he adduces follows somewhat different lines from that which Cranfield cites. Thus the "connexion ... with the crossing of the lake" and "the artless allusion to a want of food" in vv. 14-15 might well locate the origin of these verses in the tradition, as might "the introduction in [v.] 15 which is not irrelevant to the

---

481 Cranfield, Mark, 260-61.
482 Ibid., 259. Its context would thus seem "natural enough" (ibid., 261).
483 Ibid., 260-61.
484 Notably in 7:1-23 and in 8:11-13 (Mark, 365).
   The "leaven of Herod" "may possibly be an addition," though "timely" (ibid.).
situation." Moreover, the reference to a shortage of food in v. 14 could, says Taylor, represent a detail "which the disciples might well remember." 

Still, the apparent lack of incorporation of v. 15 into the ensuing discourse demands an explanation, that is, unless we simply dismiss vv. 14-17a as a "cat-and-dog" paragraph. Both Cranfield and Taylor have frankly acknowledged the difficulty, in fact. 

"If the disciples were so preoccupied with their own problem and the resulting recriminations among themselves," conjectures Cranfield, "that they failed to heed at the time what Jesus was saying to them." No doubt, the argument is an historically plausible one. Yet no hard evidence exists to support Cranfield's position; indeed we can refute it on redactional grounds.

Certainly the explanation offered by Taylor affords more help than that of Cranfield. In this connection, the overriding concern of the evangelist, in his assessment, "is to emphasize [the disciples'] failure to understand the sign of the loaves in the stories of miraculous feeding." To what purpose would Mark emphasise the disciples' impercipience? Says Taylor:

---

485 Ibid., 363.
486 Ibid.
487 In other words, the saying of v. 15 would bear no relation to vv. 14, 16-17a whatsoever.
488 Cranfield, Mark, 259.
   According to Taylor, Mark ignores the saying after v. 16 (Mark, 363; but cf. ibid., 364): in our view Mark does so immediately after v. 15.
489 Cranfield, Mark, 259-60.
490 Mark, 366.
Mark is writing didactic history with the special needs of the Church in mind. Accordingly, under the pressure of practical interests, the historical prelude [--i.e. vv. 14-16--] fades away.\footnote{Ibid., 364: "Touch with history is not lost, but catechetical interests supervene."}

Put differently, the disregard for v. 15 would find its origin in an editorial Tendenz.\footnote{Clearly the editorial perspective which Taylor has identified is an element of a theological construct, viz. Mark's Messianic Secret (see above ch. 1 pp. 76-87). Ironically, Taylor earlier rejects the Messianic-Secret hypothesis (Mark, 122-24).} Consequently, the compilation of material which follows v. 15 could scarcely represent anything more than the theology of Mark.\footnote{In addition, Taylor has envisioned an historical scenario. Thus "the saying on the leaven is ignored because the disciples do not understand it" (so ibid., 366). Yet no hard evidence whatsoever exists to support the probability of this hypothesis. With that, Taylor's alternative explanation goes the way of Cranfield's. In fairness, however, this "historical" solution is assigned less probability than his "redactional" one (ibid.).}

Each of the authorities whose tradition-historical analyses we have reviewed presupposes a pre-Marcan stratum of tradition, if not an historical reminiscence. On the whole, Gnilka dismisses this presupposition as unnecessary. In so doing, he presents a very convincing argument. The leavens of the Pharisees, different though they be, indeed as the structure of the sentence would require, each of them nevertheless exemplifies the sort of disposition which is fundamentally at odds with the character of Jesus' ministry as it is conceived by Mark. The heated exchange in vv. 11-13 serves to illustrate the unbelief of the Pharisees. At this point, they attempt to discredit Jesus by means of their demand for a self-authenticating sign from heaven. Without any observable malice aforethought, Herod nonetheless fails to discern
the true identity of Jesus, as well. As we learn in 6:16, he mistakes Jesus for John the Baptist redivivus. Evidently, some factor operative within the Pharisees and Herod themselves fosters an intractibly unbelieving response vis-à-vis the public ministry of Jesus. For that reason, the disciples must beware their influence at all costs. The warning of v. 15 notwithstanding, the disciples continue to discuss their failure to provision themselves with an adequate supply of food (v. 16, cf. v. 14). Indeed the miraculous feedings which are recalled in some detail in the interrogation of vv. 18b-20 have thus far availed nothing in the way of an edification of their faith in the Master as one who can more than adequately meet their need.\footnote{See Markus, I, 311.}

The configuration of the verses which comprise the first sub-section of the pericope, therefore, serves to introduce the second wherein the obtuseness of the disciples is thrown in relief. Pesch himself acknowledges this fact. Moreover, the Marcan motif of the slow-witted disciple dominates the pericope virtually in its entirety. Indeed this observation in itself would, as Gnilka indicates, render the question of traditional elements almost irrelevant.\footnote{Ibid., 309.}

In terms of its function, Pryke has appropriately described v. 15 as a footnote within the body of the text.\footnote{On our reckoning, yet another indication of the unlikelihood of his hypothesis of the dislocation of v. 15 is the apparent facility with which Pesch expounds the train of thought which governs the extant text of vv. 14-17a (see above pp. 187-88).} The very

\footnote{See Redactional Style, 32-61.}
mention of the Pharisees and Herod brings their unbelief to mind, in the manner indicated above. Conversely, the rhetorical question addressed the disciples in v. 17c directs one's attention back to the parties named in v. 15, as Gnilka rightly noted: "Are your hearts hardened (πεπωρωμένη)?" In 3:5-6 the Pharisees together with the Herodians likewise elicit the reproof of Jesus for their "hardness (πόρωσις) of heart." An interruption in the dialogue of vv. 14-17a, it nonetheless serves to provide a cross-reference between its extant context and other parts of the gospel narrative. To that extent, we can scarcely question its secondary character.

In and of itself the saying about the leavens could still represent the one strand of tradition in the entire pericope. At any rate, such is the view of Gnilka. Form-critically speaking, scholars tend to classify it as a warning. Even so, the Marcan version of the saying betrays some measure of redactional manipulation, as we shall see.

---

497 *Markus*, I, 311.


499 *Markus*, I, 310. In this connection, the Sayings Source Q or the special Lucan Source L may be reporting the saying of v. 15 as an "isolated logion" in Lk 12:1, as Taylor indicates (*Mark*, 365). At the same time, Pesch does not doubt the authenticity of v. 15. "Cause arising out of the situation" (v. 14) bears 'loose relationship to utterance' (v. 15). Such 'loose connection' does not afford evidence of 'fabrication' (so *Markus*, I, 413). However, this "paraphrase of the Lord's words," or alternatively "the church's interpretation of its mission," à la Pryke (*Redactional Style*, 61), has undergone adaptation by the Mark "in an esoteric sense," to which extent we must regard it as secondary material (ibid., 54).

500 So e.g. Bultmann, *HST*, 131; Gnilka, *Markus*, I, 130; Pesch, *Markus*, I, 412. In addition, Bultmann calls the saying a "legal saying" or "church rule" (*HST*, 130-31).
Evidence of a stylistic nature does suggest vestiges of tradition in vv. 14-17a. We note the *hapax legomenon* in the verb ἐπιλανθάνομαι, the use of the eucharistically nuanced construction λαβεῖν ἄρτον (cf. e.g. Mk 14:22; par.; I Cor 11:23) in the sense of "taking along bread," and the apparent semitism in the phrase εἰ μὴ ἔνα ἄρτον, all in v. 14.501 Again in v. 15 the verb διαστέλλομαι which Mark normally uses to introduce Jesus' commands to silence (5:43; 7:36; 9:9), finds itself in the preface to the admonition to beware the leaven of the Pharisees and Herod,502 whilst the figure of the leaven itself is a typically Jewish metaphor for the influence of a person, thing or message.503

Over against such considerations, however, we have to note telltale signs of Marcan editorial work. A traditional saying could well underlie the logion about the leaven in v. 15. Yet even this verse betrays evidence of redactional interference. Although it does appear to interrupt the flow of the discussion in vv. 14-17a, what we have in v. 15 may not simply be a 'dislocated' saying, as Pesch argues, but rather a parenthetical clause of the

502 Ibid., 413.
kind the evangelist employs on occasion. Furthermore, the interest in Herod and the Herodians exhibited by Mark signals redactional overlay in the reference to Herod, as does indeed the absence of this reference in Lk 12:1. At the same time this double group of persons in the Pharisees and Herod represents the sort of duality of expression which so characterizes Mark’s gospel. Yet another example of this duality in v. 15 manifests itself in the verb pair ὁρᾶτε - βλέπετε. What we have in this construction is at one and the same time double imperative and synonymous expression.

504 See Pryke, Redactional Style, 32-61. As Pryke states, the logion constitutes a footnote, i.e. within the body of the text. That Luke reports a similar saying at 12:1, but in a different context, indicates that some form of Mk 8:15 may have circulated in isolation at some stage prior to Mark (contra Pesch, Markus, I, 411; Taylor, Mark, 365-66). Within the saying as reported by Luke, the "leaven of the Pharisees" signifies the hypocrisy which the gospel tradition frequently associates with this party.

505 Gnilka, Markus, 310. In the story of the healing of the man with the withered hand on the sabbath (3:1-6), the Pharisees enter a conspiracy with the Herodians to destroy Jesus (v. 6: at v. 5 the evangelist notes their "hardness of heart") (ibid., 311). Again after the utterance of the parable of the Wicked Tenants (12:1-12), the religious authorities appoint "some of the Pharisees and some of the Herodians ... to entrap [Jesus] in his talk" (12:13), no doubt with a view to destroying him. Herod Antipas himself mistakes Jesus for John the Baptist redivivus (6:16) (ibid.).

506 Ibid., 310. On the other hand, Taylor conjectures assimilation to 3:6 and 12:13 (Mark, 365). In his survey and analysis, Bultmann calls the saying a warning against the leaven of the Pharisees (HST, 131).

507 Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 109. Alternatively, the phrase καὶ τῆς ζύνης Ἡρῴδου could, as Taylor suggests, represent later assimilation to the similar references in 3:6 and 12:13 (Mark, 365).

508 Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 84.

509 Ibid., 103. In Gnilka’s view, the verb ὁρᾶτε is Marcan intensification of the warning (Markus, 310).

In this connection, the degree of redactional interference
The remaining verses of the first sub-section reflect the activity of the evangelist as well, though mostly in the form of duality. Here the motifs of the boat-crossing (4:35-41; 6:32) and the reference to an intended snack break for the disciples (3:20; 6:31) represent two exceptions in v. 14, just as does the use of the verb λέγω in the historic present tense another in v. 17a. In this connection, we note a number of instances: two examples of negative-positive double statement in (a) a negation followed by an εἰ μὴ or ἐὰν μὴ construction, and (b) an οὐκ ... ἀλλά or an allied construction, both in v. 14, the correspondence between in v. 15 as also the existence of a variant form in Lk 12:1 lends substance to Bultmann's pessimism as regards the possibility of a reconstruction of its original form, not to mention its original meaning.

In spite of this, Pesch forthrightly maintains both the originality and authenticity of the Marcan version. On his reckoning, this alleged genuine utterance of the historical Jesus serves to convey a warning against the influence of two political visions of the day. In so doing, it would also afford evidence of Jesus' Messianic self-consciousness. Of particular interest to Pesch, Jesus hereby debunks the Davidic political version of the Messiah. Protestations to the contrary (Markus, I, 413) notwithstanding, herein would consist an argument for the secondary character of the saying of v. 15. Such a statement of absolute orientation to a divine rule does not of necessity find its origin in an attempt to immunize the disciples against the political visions of the Pharisees and the Herodians, but perhaps a need to divest the ministry of Jesus of any political overtones. In that case, we would detect the hand of the church.

510Gnilka, Markus, I, 310-11. More precisely, the accounts of 4:36-5:2 and 6:32-34a contain references to the foregoing boat-trips throughout. In addition to these, the evangelist recounts other boat-trips in 5:18-21a, 6:45-54, 8:10 and 8:13-22a.

511The evangelist frequently uses the historic present tense (so Taylor, Mark, 46-47).

512καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐνα/ἀρτον οὐκ εἶχον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν (Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 89). However, the respective order of the components in this instance is the reverse of that stipulated by Neirynck.

513Επιλάθοντο λαβεῖν ἁρτοὺς/καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐνα ἁρτον οὐκ εἶχον (ibid., 92).
narrative elements in vv. 14 and 16,\textsuperscript{514} and the correspondence between narrative and discourse furnished by vv. 16 and 17 resp.\textsuperscript{515} Beginning in the first section of the pericope and continuing into the second, we finally call attention to the multiplication of a cognate verb in the recurrence of the verb ἔχω in vv. 14, 16, 17 (2x) and 18.\textsuperscript{516}

In connection with the second sub-section of the pericope (vv. 17b-21), wherein Jesus examines the disciples with respect to the two feeding miracles (6:34-44; 8:1-10), we note first of all one of the contradictions, and a resultant disjointedness in the Marcan narrative. On the one hand, parable, for example, constitutes enigmatic speech which consistently requires explanation. On the other, Jesus, on two occasions (4:14; 7:18), rebukes the disciples because they fail to comprehend one of his parables.\textsuperscript{517} This "consistent inconsistency" in itself bespeaks secondary manipulation of the tradition.\textsuperscript{518} In other words, the rebuke of the disciples in 8:17-18 in conjunction with the enigmatic saying of Jesus in 8:15 represents but one instance of a "consistent inconsistency" which signals the non-historicity of the scenario wherein such an inconsistency occurs--that is, unless

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{514}ἐπιλάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἔνα ἄρτον οὐκ εἶχον (v. 14)/ καὶ διαλογίζοντο ... ὑπὶ ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν (v. 16) (ibid., 113).\textsuperscript{515}διαλογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὑπὶ ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν (v. 14: εἰ μὴ ἔνα ἄρτον εἶχον) (v. 16)/ τί διαλογίζεσθε ὑπὶ ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; (v. 17) (ibid., 117).\textsuperscript{516}Ibid., 79.\textsuperscript{517}Wrede, \textit{Messianic Secret}, 102.\textsuperscript{518}On "consistent inconsistency" see above ch. 1 pp. 83-84 incl. nn. 187 and 188 (onto p. 85)
\end{flushleft}
we choose to argue that Jesus was an eccentric.

One indisputable sign of Marcan redaction in vv. 17b-21 is the less than flattering portrayal of the disciples. That is, the disciples fail to grasp the import of their master's deeds (vv. 17-18). What we encounter here is a global characterization, or rather a caricature. The Marcan disciples consistently manifest incomprehension and hardening. While the theme of the impercipient mind and the hardened heart receives considerable stress in Mark's gospel, but it does so markedly in redactional passages. To this extent, therefore, it has to represent the

---


At first glance, the use of the pronoun οὐπω ("not yet") (4:40; 8:17b, 21) would seem to suggest no progress in the cognitive faculties of the disciples. However, the characterization of the disciples to this effect (so Wrede, Messianic Secret, 108-9; sim. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 103) represents something of an overstatement of the case, as the story of Peter's confession in Mk 8:27-30 plainly demonstrates.

520 On two occasions, the adjective πεπωρωμένη ("hardened") serves to characterize the hearts of the disciples (6:52; 8:17c). This hardening of the hearts of the disciples can also find expression in references to lack of faith (4:40b; 9:19a). Again hardness of heart can assume the form of fear (4:40c; 6:52a, 52b).

521 Best, Gospel as Story, 53-54; cf. Wrede, Messianic Secret, 103. The verbs συνίημι (8:17b, 21; cf. 6:52; 7:18a) and νοεί (8:17b; cf. 7:18b) along with the substantive phrase καρδία πεπωρωμένη (8:17c; cf. 6:52) "clamp the redactional theme together" (Pesch, Markus, I, 411), so to speak, in a succinct formulation.

At face value, the quotation of Jer 5:21/Ezek 12:2 in 8:17b seems to constitute a reference to the cognitive faculties of the disciples. Yet the text of Is 6:9-10 LXX which the evangelist knew (cf. 4:12) evidences an association of the senses of vision and audition with the heart. This exercise of similar function somewhat blurs the distinction between heart and mind.
work of the evangelist.\textsuperscript{522}

From the standpoint of style, as well, Marcan influence betrays itself at a number of points in vv. 17b-21. The use of the historic present tense of the verb λέγω in vv. 19-20 signals the hand of Mark,\textsuperscript{523} as does that of the connecting formula καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς in v 21.\textsuperscript{524} Also manifest in these verses are several instances of Marcan duality. First of all, we call attention to the following: three examples of double question reported in

\textsuperscript{522}The misunderstanding and hardening of the disciples represents a redactional trend for Pesch (ibid.), as does their incomprehension and the resultant rebuke elicited from Jesus for Gnilka (Markus, I, 309).

Granted, this characterization of Jesus' disciples may not entirely represent a fabrication of the evangelist (Best, Gospel as Story, 47). The queries of the disciples as to the meanings of the parables of the Sower (4:10--i.e. Bultmann's reconstruction) and What Defiles a Man (7:17) together with the reproaches of Jesus for their inability to comprehend (4:13a; 7:18a) (so construes Wrede, Messianic Secret, 102; cf. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 104; Kermode, Genesis of Secrecy, 29-31) may well be vestiges of a pre-Marcan parable collection (see above ch. 1 pp. 69-70 n. 147). Indeed the three questions of 8:17b-18a express the same mood as 4:13a and 7:18a (cf. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 106). In that case, the evangelist certainly could have amplified an element inherited from the tradition. To the extent that he did this, however, we have here neither an historical datum nor traditional element but rather a redactional tendency.

The contradiction inherent in the Marcan portrayal casts even further doubt on its historicity. On two occasions (4:13 and 7:18), Jesus reproaches the disciples because they fail to understand one of the parables--the Sower (4:3-9), and What Defiles a Man (7:15). That is to say, the very datum of the tradition which Mark develops is itself inconsistent with his other notion that the parables are riddles and that the disciples regularly receive an explanation of them (ibid., 104, 105-6). The questions posed in 8:17-18 possess precisely the same character (ibid., 106). Such an historical difficulty betrays the operation of an overriding non-historical dynamic (see ibid., 104-5).

\textsuperscript{523}See above p. 198 n. 511.

\textsuperscript{524}See above ch. 1 p. 67 n. 144.
(a) vv. 17b and c, (b) v. 18a, and (c) vv. 19 and 20, Other instances of duality include parallelism in sayings in each of vv. 17b and 18, as well as doublet sayings in each of the former with 6:52 and 4:12 resp.

Yet other indications of the redactional character of vv. 17b-21 are the references to the two feeding miracles in vv. 19 (cf. 6:30-44) and 20 (cf. 8:1-10). In the first instance, we mark the precision with which the events are reported. The coinciding details include: (a) the number of loaves broken and distributed among the people: five (6:38; 8:10) and seven

---

525 οὐπώ νοείτε οὕδε συνίετε; (v. 17b)/πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; (v. 17c) (Neirynck, Markan Duality, 125).
526 ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε, καὶ ὡτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε; (ibid., 126).
527 ὅτε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους ἔκλασα ..., πόσους κοφίνους ... ἡρατε; (v. 19)/ὅτε τοὺς ἔπτα ..., πόσων σπυρίδων πληρώματα ... ἡρατε; (v. 20) (ibid.).
528 οὐπώ νοείτε οὕδε συνίετε; (v. 17b)/ οὐπώ συνίετε; (ibid., 131).
529 V. 17b: οὐπώ νοείτε οὕδε συνίετε; v. 18: ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε, καὶ ὡτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε; (ibid., 134).
530 ἔνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἔδοσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούσαν καὶ μὴ συνίσθιν (4:12)/ὀφθαλμούς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε, καὶ ὡτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε; (8:18); οὐ γὰρ συνήκαν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρτους (6:52)/οὐπώ νοείτε οὕδε συνίετε; (8:17b) (ibid., 135).

Neirynck lists two further examples of duality in vv. 17b and c, and in vv. 17a and 18b-19. The former allegedly represents a negative-positive double statement in which an οὐκ ... ἀλλὰ or an allied construction is employed. However, the text reads: οὐπώ νοείτε οὕδε συνίετε; (v. 17b)/πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; (v. 17c). Just wherein lies the οὐκ ... ἀλλὰ or allied construction escapes us. The latter example allegedly involves a double question. Yet the text reads: τί διαλογίζεσθε ὧτι ἄρτοις οὐκ ἔχετε; (v. 17a)/καὶ οὐ μνημονεύετε, ὅτε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους ..., πόσους κόφινους ... ἡρατε; (vv. 18b-19). In the three instances cited as legitimate instances of double question, one can readily identify some affinity between the component elements which serves to justify their grouping together, but the affinity between vv. 17a and 18b-19 is rather less pronounced.

531 Gnilka, Markus, I, 309; Pesch, Markus, I, 411.
(8:5, 20); (b) the number of people who ate: 5,000 (6:34; 8:19)
and 4,000 (6:44; 8:19); (c) the number of baskets full of
fragments left over from the distribution of the loaves and fish:
twelve (6:43; 8:19) and seven (8:8, 20); and (d) the nouns
employed to designate the baskets filled with the fragments:
κόσινος (6:43; 8:19) and σπυρίς (8:8, 20).\textsuperscript{532} Clearly the
occurrence of these cross-references in itself robs the questions
of vv. 19 and 20 of any independence and even more importantly the
pericope as a whole (8:14-21) loses its significance apart from
this broader context.\textsuperscript{533} Such evidence already signals a
redactional formation.\textsuperscript{534} The fact that the two narratives on which
vv. 19 and 20 are dependent, together represent an instance of
Marcan duality\textsuperscript{535} only lends further support to this conclusion,\textsuperscript{536} as
does the later perspective which is implied by the use of the
relative adverb ὅτε in each of the aforesaid verses.\textsuperscript{537}

Significantly, the entire discussion between Jesus and his
disciples and the setting in which it is presented forms the
latter segment of a two-part schema which recurs several times in

\textsuperscript{532} Even so, each reference to the two feedings in vv. 19 (6:30-44)
and 20 (8:1-10) contains vocabulary which is found in the report
of the other feeding under consideration. In v. 19a the verb
καλάω of 8:6 is employed, not its cognate verb κατακαλάω in 6:41.
Likewise in v. 20a the noun πλήρωμα of 6:43 is employed, rather
than the noun περίσσεμα in 8:8—in this case, however, the
adjective πλήρης in v. 19a shares the same root with the noun
πλήρωμα (ibid., 415).

\textsuperscript{533} Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 309.


\textsuperscript{535} Neirynck, \textit{Duality in Mark}, 135.

\textsuperscript{536} See Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 367-68.

\textsuperscript{537} See Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 411.
Mark's gospel. In this connection, the evangelist, when he reports an event in the teaching ministry of Jesus, often juxtaposes two distinct scenes, the first wherein Jesus delivers a teaching on some subject in public, the second wherein he expands or elucidates that teaching for his disciples in private. The scene of 8:11-13, which immediately precedes the discussion in the boat, finds Jesus engaged in a public controversy with a group of Pharisees. On this occasion, the opponents of Jesus attempt to entrap him with their request for a self-authenticating "sign from heaven." Jesus, however, refuses their request: "Truly, I say to you, no sign shall be given this generation" (v. 12b). At this point already, a Marcan motif betrays itself, viz. the withholding of the "secret" from "those outside" (cf. 4:11). Immediately thereafter he and the disciples take the boat (ἐμβάς) "to the other side" (v. 13). The private scene, i.e. "in the boat" (ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ) (v. 14), now established, there ensues a dialogue ostensibly related to the enigmatic saying about the "leaven of the Pharisees/Herod" (v. 15). That Mark has inserted the interlocking phrase "in the boat" in v. 14 indicates that he views the public and private scenes in relation to one another.

---

538 An ellipsis for ἐμβάς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον (cf. v. 10).
539 Pesch, Markus, I, 411. In support of his contention, Pesch further observes the synthetically parallel construction which emerges when the phrase is excised (ibid., 412).
Not only the connection between the phrase ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ of v. 14 and the clause ἐμβάς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν of v. 13 does Cranfield note, but also the verbal contact between vv. 11-12 and v. 13 in the pronoun αὐτοῦς, if in fact v. 13 marks the beginning of a new vignette (Mark, 260).
540 The uncertainty as to whether the pericope in question begins at v. 13 or v. 14 only attests further the very close relationship
The scenario in vv. 11-21 is patently a Marcan artifact.\footnote{541}

Wider intertextual evidence still, suggests the hand of the evangelist. Thus the public controversy of Jesus with the religious authorities (vv. 11-13) in conjunction with the private discourse of Jesus with his own disciples together (vv. 14-21) are a component element of one of two parallel cycles. A miraculous feeding brackets each cycle at the beginning (6:30-44/8:1-10a) and between the public debate of vv. 11-13 and private discussion of vv. 14-21 (Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 364).

The way in which the Pharisees rather "conveniently" make their appearance in Gentile territory bespeaks the artificiality, and hence the secondary character of the scene which we encounter in vv. 11-13 itself, as well. In all probability, unnamed individuals make the demand for a sign (cf. Lk 11:16) (Bultmann, \textit{HST}, 52).

\footnote{541} A comparison of 8:11-21 with 7:14-23 (see below ch. 3 pp. 304-5 n. 857) serves to underline the redactional character of this scenario. The aforesaid thematic and stylistic considerations themselves signal the authorship of the evangelist throughout 8:14-21. In this connection, however, we also note the esoteric instruction of the disciples (vv. 13, 14; cf. 4:10; 7:17; 9:28; 10:10) (cf. Best, \textit{Gospel as Story}, 63; Bultmann, \textit{HST}, 330). On the other hand, the authorship of 8:11-13 in and of itself bears no implication for the present discussion. On the contrary, what is required is to show that Mark has enlisted these verses in service of his redactional intentions. Of interest, however, the vignette of 8:11-13 does contain evidence of redactional interference. The use of the verb \textit{λέγω} in the historic present in v. 12 affords such evidence (so Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 46-47), as does the motif of the boat-trip in v. 13 (see above p. 198 n. 510), which also forms the connecting link with the following vignette of vv. 14-21 (cf. v. 14).
a miraculous healing each cycle at the end (7:31-37/8:22-26). ⁵⁴²

The two cycles exhibit a unifying theme. ⁵⁴³ With that, no compelling reason exists to withhold assembling of them both from Mark. ⁵⁴⁴

The foregoing evidence, taken as a whole serves to identify

⁵⁴² Over the years many scholars have noted the correspondence between the two sections (so Hurd, "Isaiah's Curse", 6-7; cf. Best, Markan Soteriology, 120).

The following table in which the two cycles are portrayed is a reproduction of that offered by Hurd ("Isaiah's Curse", 6 [scripture references added]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30-44</td>
<td>8:1-10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding of 5,000</td>
<td>Feeding of 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45-53</td>
<td>8:10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip by boat</td>
<td>Trip by boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1-13</td>
<td>8:11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy with Pharisees</td>
<td>Controversy with Pharisees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:24-30</td>
<td>8:14-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's bread</td>
<td>Leaven of Pharisees/Herod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:31-37</td>
<td>8:22-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healing of deaf-mute</td>
<td>Healing of blind man</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entirely correct though the parallel between the exchange between Jesus and the Syrophoenician woman concerning the "children's bread" (cycle 1) and the discussion between Jesus and the disciples on the "leaven of the Pharisees/Herod" (cycle 2) is, we would identify what we consider to be yet another significant parallel, viz. that which obtains between the private instructions given the disciples by Jesus in connection with "What Defiles a Man" (7:14-23 [cycle 1]) and the "leaven of the Pharisees/Herod" (8:14-21 [cycle 2]).

⁵⁴³ In the words of Hurd himself we might express Mark's intention in constructing the cycles thus: "the pattern with eyes [---'seeing' is emphasised in cycle 2---] and ears [---'hearing' is emphasised in cycle 1---] in poetic parallelism ... [serves to represent] Jesus as the one who gives hearing to the believer's ears and sight to his blind eyes" (ibid., 12; see also 7-11).

⁵⁴⁴ Contra, e.g., Best, Markan Soteriology, 120.
none other than Mark as its author. Both the content and structure of the second sub-section of the vignette (vv. 17c-21) so patently betray the hand of the evangelist as to render such a judgement a virtual certainty. The warning against the leaven in the first (vv. 14-17a), may very well represent a strand of pre-Marcan tradition, as we have stated. Yet the overall arrangement and content of the material reflects nothing other than the theological interests of the evangelist. In view of the evidence, we have to classify this sub-section as Marcan redaction also. Our tradition-historical analysis thus concluded, we now proceed to investigate Mark's use of the OT in 8:17b, 18a.

B. MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF SCRIPTURES REPORTED

The brief dialogue between Jesus and the disciples reported by Mark in 8:17-20 manifests varying degrees of verbal contact with Is 6:9-10 in v. 17b and Jer 5:21/Ezek 12:2 in v. 18a. Common to Mark and Isaiah is the verb σωνίημι ("understand") in Mk 8:17b/Is 6:9ba, 10aβ. In addition, the meaning of the verb νοεω in Mk 8:17b is the same as that of the verb ὁράω in Is 9:ββ, 10αβ—"perceive." However, the root of the perfect passive

---

545 The verbal contacts which we have established do not indicate a "direct citation from Is 6:9ff. (LXX)" in Mk 8:18 (so Pryke, Redactional Style, 57; but cf. 55 incl. n. 11: a quotation from Is 6:9). Nor, for the same reason, can 8:18 constitute "a direct allusion to Mk 4:12" (so Suhl, Funktion, 152). On the contrary, the evangelist manifests somewhat closer correspondence to Jer 5:21/ Ezek 12:2 (Gnilka, Markus, I, 311; Pesch, Markus, I, 414). Certainly we do not contest verbal affinities with Isaiah -- i.e. alongside Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Cranfield, Mark, 262; Taylor, Mark, 367). Still, the Isaianic text cannot represent the primary OT reference.

546 In this case, the evangelist or his sources may have substituted the one verb for the other quite intentionally. In the clause immediately following, Jesus makes direct reference to a 'hardening of the heart' in connection with the disciples.
participial form of the verb πωρόω ("harden") in Mk 8:17c carries a somewhat different meaning from that of the aorist passive form of the verb παχύνω ("render dull") in Is 6:10aα.

The text representation encountered in Mk 8:17b, c is best designated a mimetically weak free indirect reporting. In other words, the evangelist reflects the content of his OT source, but preserves rather few of its stylistic features.

The LXX versions of Jer 5:21 and Ezek 12:2 provide a useful comparison with v. 18a of Mark.

Mk 8:18a:

οφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε
καὶ ὅτα ἕχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε;

Jer 5:21:

ὁφθαλμοί αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν,
ὅτα αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐκ ἀκούουσιν.

Presumably, the faculties of 'understanding' and 'perception' which are mentioned in v. 17b are those which the writer associates with the heart as the "organ of natural and spiritual enlightenment" (William Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, a translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, 4th rev. and aug. ed., 1952 (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1974 [1957]), s. v. "καρδία" 1.b.β (henceforth cited Arndt/Gingrich). In this connection, contemporary Greek usage appears to know the idiom τῇ καρδίᾳ νοεῖν (Is 44:18 LXX; Jn 12:40 [paraphrase of Is 6:10 LXX]) as it does τῇ καρδίᾳ συνιέναι (in 6:10 LXX), but apparently not the idiom τῇ καρδίᾳ ὅραν.

547 See above ch. 1 pp. 27-28.
Mark and the OT manifest a pair of differences:

a. The OT verses are simple assertive statements but the Marcan verse is an interrogative statement;

b. The OT verbs assume a third-person form but the Marcan verbs assume a second-person form.

The degree of verbal contact between Mark and the OT is greater when Jer 5:21 is the basis of the comparison. However, the construction of the verb ἔχω ("have") with the accusative in Mark, as in the LXX version of Ezek 12:2, assumes the place of the possessive dative employed in the Hebrew text and preserved in the LXX version of Jer 5:21.

The text we encounter in Mk 8:18a is best designated free indirect reporting as in Mk 4:12.\(^{548}\) However, the degree of divergence between Mark on the one hand, and both Jeremiah and Ezekiel on the other, makes a judgement as to which of the latter documents constitutes the archetype of the former uncertain.

C. THE MEANING OF MK 8:17B, 18A

On the factual level, we may thus summarize the dialogue reported in Mk 8:14-21. An important cue, the setting of the

\(^{548}\) See above ch. 1 pp. 27-28.
vignette is "the boat" (vv. 13, 14) in transit of the Sea of Galilee. What the evangelist depicts in 8:14-21, therefore, is a private dialogue between Jesus and his disciples. In their preparations, the disciples forget to include an adequate supply of bread (v. 14). Meanwhile, the immediately preceding exchange with the Pharisees, wherein Jesus refuses a request for a self-authenticating "sign from heaven" (vv. 11-12), has afforded him an opportunity for his delivery of a warning against the leaven of the Pharisees and that of Herod (v. 15). Evidently, the purpose of the warning is to immunize the disciples against an unbelieving attitude. The disciples misconstrue this admonition. What they have heard, they consider a reproof for inadequate preparation (v. 16). This supposition of their dependence upon, or his concern with worldly provisions causes Jesus some exasperation in view of his earlier demonstrations of his supernatural ability to supply more than enough food (v. 17a).\(^{549}\) Twice over the miraculous feedings of the multitudes (6:30-44; 8:1-10a) had furnished the disciples ample proof of the divine identity of their Master. Thus far, however, the disciples enjoy no advantage over "those outside" (vv. 17b-18a). In this connection, Jesus queries the disciples about the feeding miracles and their answers to his questions attest the abundance of

\(^{549}\)In this connection, the interrogative particle τι serves to introduce the questions of both v. 17a and v. 12a. Undoubtedly, the latter question manifests a decidedly reprimanding posture. As well, the verb διαλογίζομαι in v. 17a receives a negative accent in 2:6 and 8 (Pesch, Marcus, I, 412-13). In any case, the intention of the evangelist is to convey some displeasure on the part of the interrogator. In no way, does the badgering posture of Jesus in the ensuing questions dispel this impression either.
leftovers (vv. 19-20). In spite of this, there is no indication of "heightened awareness" (v. 21).550

550 In general, scholars tend to support the foregoing interpretation. See e.g. Wrede, Messianic Secret, 104; Taylor, Mark, 367-68; M. Smith, "Comments on Taylor", 40; Cranfield, Mark, 262; Kermode, Genesis of Secrecy, 46; cf. Pryke, Redactional Style, 55.

The figure of the leavens has elicited a variety of scholarly interpretations. Yet this should not occasion our surprise. In the first place, a significant number of scholars do not see any logical connection between v. 15 and its immediate context (e.g. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 106). In the second, the evangelist himself provides no explicit interpretation of the leavens (Cranfield, Mark, 260; Taylor, Mark, 365). Our tradition-historical analysis did, however, disclose several interesting possibilities. Thus the interpretation of the two leavens maintained by Pesch involved the respective political visions entertained by the Pharisees and Herod (Markus, I, 411). The "leaven of the Pharisees" represented a "false and inconsistent piety," proffered Cranfield, and the "leaven of Herod" the "godlessness of the man of the world" (Mark, 261). Taylor, who considered the reference to Herod perhaps a later addition, equated the "leaven of the Pharisees" with their "evil disposition" manifest elsewhere in Mark's gospel (Mark, 365).

However, the two leavens must have possessed some factor which inhered in both of them; otherwise the parties with whom they were associated would not constitute comparable object lessons. Thus the inquiry of Gnilka served to identify that inherent factor as unbelief (Markus, I, 311).

Not a small number of authorities have applied their interpretive skills to the figure of the leavens. Further to this observation, we note Taylor's reviewer M. Smith: like Taylor he would construe the "leaven of the Pharisees" as their "ill will and its expressions" ("Comments on Taylor", 40). In much the same vein, Pryke defines the leaven of the Pharisees as "demanding a sign of Messiahship" and "'hardness of heart' (lack of faith)" (Redactional Style, 55). Indeed the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod involve concepts attended with uncertainty; this uncertainty notwithstanding, Best would define the leavens in terms of the thinking and acting of the aforesaid parties (Markan Soteriology, 36). By contrast, Burkill leaves the figure unexplained (Mysterious Revelation, 106). Likewise Bultmann, for whom the original form and meaning of the saying is "almost beyond recovery" (HST, 131) attempts no explanation of the figure within its extant Marcan context.

Elsewhere in the synoptic tradition, Matthew defines the "leaven of the Pharisees" as their "teaching" (16:12), and Luke as "hypocrisy" (12:1). However, these are secondary explanations (Cranfield, Mark, 260). In fact, the writers of the NT and rabbinic documents writers tend to employ the term as a metaphor for an evil influence or contagion (see above p. 196 n. 503).
The disciples' misinterpretation of the warning issued in v. 15 provides the rationale on the basis of which Mark ascribes the questions of vv. 17b (cf. v. 21), c, d and 18a to Jesus. In vv. 17b and 18a the disciples are asked whether or not their cognitive faculties are impaired. With that, the attentive reader of Mark's gospel remembers what was said of "those outside" in 4:12. Yet the citation of Jer 5:21/Ezek 12:2 in v. 18a—as opposed to Is 6:9-10—seems to suggest a certain degree of responsibility on the part of the referent for the impercipient described therein. Moreover, the morphology of the quotation itself lends it nothing other than an accusatory nuance. In other words, the evangelist reports it as a pointed question. Again, in v. 17c, the disciples are asked whether or not their hearts are hardened. In this case, Mark's readership could not help but recall what he already said of the Pharisees in 3:5 and the disciples in 6:52 as presumed fact. To this extent, then, the inquiry of vv. 16-21, bears the trappings of a hostile inquisition.

That Jesus expresses the foregoing criticisms in the form of questions would nonetheless mean that he applies them to his disciples in an oblique manner. To this extent, he thus qualifies the application of his criticisms. However, the introduction of this qualifying element facilitates the introduction of yet another qualifying element. The criticisms of the Pharisees and the people in 3:5 (hardened hearts) and 4:12 (dulled faculties) have found respective applications to the disciples in v. 17c and

---

551 See below under Sec. D.
b, as noted above. At the same time, the situation of the disciples is not an inalterable fate, as is that of "those outside."\textsuperscript{552} Otherwise the question οὐκ ἐστὶ συνέτατος; which is addressed the disciples in v. 17c, and again in v. 21, would have no point at all, nor in fact would the entire discussion of vv. 16-21. On the contrary, the primary intention of Jesus is to stimulate reflection on the part of his disciples. Here remembrance assumes considerable importance.\textsuperscript{553} In particular, Jesus recalls the feeding miracles (vv. 19-20). The disciples themselves can attest the abundant leftovers. A demonstration of this kind, not once, but twice over, should thus dispel the disciples' fears about the satisfaction of their material needs. Jesus can more than adequately meet them. In this way, the disciples find their worldly concerns "relativized."\textsuperscript{554}

On the literal level, E. Best's careful investigation of Mark's gospel has yielded a convincing explanation for its unfavourable portrayal of the disciples. In other words, the teaching with which Jesus furnishes his disciples in Mark is a kind which would find application among the members of the Christian community.\textsuperscript{555} Thus the stance assumed by the evangelist in relation to his readership would be that of a pastor seeking to edify his congregation in the faith.\textsuperscript{556} The depiction of the disciples as weak and failing affords Mark the opportunity of

\textsuperscript{552}Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 415.
\textsuperscript{553}Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 311; Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 414.
\textsuperscript{554}So ibid., 413: cf. The Q-text Mt 6:25-34/Lk 12:22-32; sim. 14.
\textsuperscript{555}Best, \textit{Gospel as Story}, 49.
\textsuperscript{556}See ibid., 51, 93-95, 99.
discussing the nature of discipleship. Best adds:

The strength of God can only be seen when it can enter into and work out through human weakness. The grace of God only appears when men and women fail ... Mark wants his community to realise that they can be strengthened by God in time of difficulty and forgiven when they fail ... [Thus] he must show the disciples as those who are weak but are at the same time made strong, as those who fail but are forgiven; this in fact is what he has done.

Here the disciples of Jesus would represent members of the Marcan community. Says Best:

[T]he Christian can identify with [the disciples] in their failure and in their faithfulness; he fails as they failed and he hopes to be faithful as they in the end turned out to be faithful.

This emphasis on the pastoral role of the evangelist affords us a valuable insight as to the import of Mk 8:14-21. In this connection, restoration of sight to the blind (8:22-26) and hearing to the deaf (7:31-37) constitutes the background against which the addressee is intended to be reading the dialogue.

Thus Best writes:

Jesus can both open the ears and the eyes of those who at present in the pagan world do not see [8:22-26; 10:46-52] or hear [7:31-37], and he can also do the same for those within the community who are deficient in sight or hearing in relation to what their faith means for them.

Thus a restoration of impaired faculties requires an encounter with the Jesus of Mark's gospel. A major emphasis here is total

557 Ibid., 47.
558 Ibid.
559 Ibid., 83, 94. Cf. Pesch, Markus, I 413: the evangelist is thinking "typologically" here.
561 See ibid., 62; Gnilka, Markus, I, 311; Hurd, "Isaiah's Curse", 7-11, 12.
562 Best, Gospel as Story, 62.
dependence on Jesus. Yet the believer, like the original
disciple, has had such encounters with Jesus, perhaps many.
Otherwise, how could the disciple incur such criticism? Once
again remembrance plays a vital role. Here we can fully endorse
Burkhill's assessment:

the disciples ought to see the secret significance of
the miracles of the loaves; that is to say, they ought
to understand, namely, that Jesus is none other than the
Messiah and Lord, whose presence is discerned at the
church's sacramental meals of fellowship and who imparts
spiritual food for the nourishment of the souls of the elect.

Jesus can satisfy the need for spiritual food; in this respect, it
suffices to know him. Less metaphorically speaking, Jesus is our
spiritual mentor; to wit, he provides the disciple correct
teaching.

The rebuke concerning the impaired faculties of the disciples
serves to define the relation of seeing and hearing to proper

563 Gnilka, Markus, I, 311.
564 Ibid.; Pesch, Markus, I, 414. In this sense, the call of
v. 18b ("remember") is as much a call to the Marcan community,
as it "was" to Jesus' disciples.
565 Burkhill, Mysterious Revelation, 107, cf. 149;
566 Hunger for "spiritual" as opposed to material food
appears several times in scripture as Best has observed
(Am 8:11; Is 40:1; Ps 42:2-4; Mt 5:6)
(ibid., 104 n. 2; sim. idem., Gospel as Story, 63).
567 Cf. Gnilka, Markus, I, 311.
568 Best, Gospel as Story, 49; idem., Markan Soteriology, 104-5.
In this connection, Best notes the comment prior to the feeding
of the five thousand:
"[Jesus] had compassion on [the great throng], because they
were like sheep without a shepherd; and he began to teach them
many things (6:34)" (Gospel as Story, 49).
This relation between feeding and teaching is given a more
detailed treatment in idem, Markan Soteriology, 76-78. Of
particular relevance, the writer cites several precedents in
OT scripture.
understanding. That is, the assimilation of correct teaching demands clarity of vision (8:22-26) and keenness of audition (7:31-37). Otherwise, the disciple must experience a miraculous restoration. Jesus alone can effect this restoration. The reference of Is 6:9-10 and Jer 5:21/Ezek 12:2 to the disciples would thus also underline their total dependence on Jesus in their benighted condition. Fortunately, the community to which Mark addresses his gospel continues to meet its Lord in the present-day celebration of the sacrament. To this extent, then, the feedings could be considered a prefiguration of the eucharist.

---

569 Gnilka, Markus, I, 311.
570 So Taylor (Mark, 97) and Burkill (Mysterious Revelation, 107 incl. n. 7).

The Marcan accounts of the feeding miracles contain a significant amount of eucharistic terminology (sim. Best, Markan Soteriology, 104). To see this, one need only consider such evidence as follows. The verbs εὐχαριστεῖ ("give thanks") (8:6) and εὐλογεῖ (6:41; 8:7) ("bless") recall liturgical speech, the constructions λαβεῖν ἄρτον ("take bread") (6:41; 8:6) and ([κατα]κλαῖν [ἄρτον]) ("break [bread]" (6:41; 8:6), and the verb δίδωμι ("give") (6:41; 8:6) denote liturgical actions associated with the eucharist, in which case some connection with the sacrament would seem to be intended. Our two earliest accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 11:23-26; Mk 14:22-25) each contain no fewer than three instances of such terminology—εὐλογεῖ (Mk 14:22) and εὐχαριστεῖ (Mk 14:23; 1 Cor 11:24), λαβεῖν ἄρτον (Mk 14:22; 1 Cor 11:23), κλαῖν (ἄρτον) (Mk 14:22; 1 Cor 11:24), δίδωμι (Mk 14:22, 23). The recollections of the two feeding miracles provided in vv. 19 and 20 each contain a reference to the breaking of bread—directly in v. 19, by ellipsis in v. 20. The idiom "breaking bread" (κλαῖν ἄρτον) became a kind of "shorthand" for the Lord's Supper. In order to see this, we need only note texts marked by Pesch: Acts 2:46 (κλαῖν ... ἄρτον); 20:7 (κλάσας ἄρτον) and 1 Cor 10:16 (ὁ ἄρτος δὲ κλαίμεν) (Markus, I, 414-15). Interestingly, the last of these contains a definition of "breaking bread" (v. 16b). Yet another illustrative example which we could cite is Lk 24:35 (ἤ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου), similarly a "shorthand" for the somewhat fuller formulation in Lk 24:30 (λαβεῖν ἄρτον, εὐλογεῖ, κλαῖν [ἄρτον], δίδωμι).

According to Gnilka, the one loaf (v. 14) carries no symbolic significance, be it a sign of Christ's presence in the boat, a sign of a further feeding miracle or indeed a reference to the
the primary focus is not the sacrament per se. On the contrary, what the evangelist endeavours to emphasise is the centrality of the person attendant at it and the spiritual nourishment with which he furnishes the disciple.\textsuperscript{571} Indeed the central concern of the pericope is thus a christological one, as Gnilka states.\textsuperscript{572}

D. THE MEANING OF THE OT

The precise dating of the oracles of Jer 5:21 and Ezek 12:2 is a point of debate among OT commentators. Brian Peckham, for instance, dates them to the period before 587 B.C.\textsuperscript{573} The first of eucharist (Markus, I, 310). Apparently, the foregoing evidence represents no difficulty for him. The mention of the one loaf is simply a reference to fact—i.e. in the story. At the same time, Gnilka attributes the pericope to Marcan redaction. Thus the evangelist must have included this detail himself. The question thus arises: to what purpose? At the same time, the christological concern of the pericope would, as Gnilka later concedes, permit a symbolic, albeit a non-eucharistic understanding of the one loaf (ibid., 311-12). With that, no real ground exists to deny the evangelist a symbolic interpretation.

\textsuperscript{571}Cum Best, Gospel as Story, 49.

Thus writes M. Smith: "The notion that Mk. writes his second account [of a miraculous feeding (8:1-10)] to instruct a community 'which failed to understand the significance of the eucharist' [so Taylor, Mark, 97] and then himself fails to explain that significance is incredible. Further, the point of 11-13 is not that 'the disciples—as opposed to the Pharisees—had received the sign of the loaves,' but that no sign at all will be given to this generation (in which, presumably, the disciples are included). ... [Taylor] sees correctly that Mk. attributes [Jesus'] rebuke [of the disciples] (vv. 17-21) 'to their want of faith in the power of Jesus to supply their need' (p. 367), but he does not see that this [presupposes a miraculous rather than a sacramental interpretation of the feeding, and so contradicts his exegesis of the whole section" ("Comments on Taylor", 39-40).

As Smith says, absolutely nothing in the text exists to suggest a readership "which failed to understand the significance of the eucharist;" on the other hand, we would maintain the presence of decidedly "sacramental" nuances, in 8:14-21, if not 6:30-44 and 8:1-10a also (contra Gnilka, Markus, I, 312) (see above p. 216 n. 570).

\textsuperscript{572}Ibid., 311.

\textsuperscript{573}Professor Peckham expressed his informed opinion about the
these oracles finds itself within the larger complex of Jer 5:20-31. This complex comprises three sub-sections:
(a) vv. 21-25 concerning the folly of the people in rebelling against God and not recalling his mercies;
(b) vv. 26-29 concerning the crimes whereby the people make a mockery of Yahweh's covenant law; and
(c) vv. 30-31 concerning the highhanded behaviour of the clergy and the people's acceptance of it.

The initial verse is an introductory formula. Two details suggest early composition. Firstly, the judgement is a moral certainty but the prophet Jeremiah does not define it any further. The only evidence of divine displeasure in vv. 21-25 is a drought which, as in 3:3, antedates 622 B.C. Secondly, the abuses described in vv. 26-31 resemble those denounced in the "Temple Sermon" (7:2-15). This was uttered soon after Jehoiakim's accession to the throne. The composition of these verses would have taken place at about this time.\footnote{574} Those characterized in v. 21 have, in the prophet's view, become morally and spiritually lax.

However, Walter Zimmerli does not support Peckham's view. Ezekiel, along with many of his countrymen had been deported after the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. However, some managed to avoid this deportation. The prophet, from his position in exile, considers the fate of those remaining in Jerusalem. Some of these people had evidently "forgotten" the events of 587 B.C. Ezekiel pre-Exilic origin of Jer 5:21 and Ezek 12:2 during a brief conversation with the present writer.

in 12:1-16 is, says Zimmerli, addressing this particular situation.\(^{575}\) Concerning v. 2 he writes:

When they [Ezekiel's countrymen] are addressed by Ezekiel as a 'rebellious house, who have eyes to see but do not see, and ears to hear but do not hear,' this all points to the fact that Ezekiel opposes the conduct of Israel (also among the exiles of his environment) in which the so recently experienced catastrophe of 598/7 B.C. had strangely faded into the background and had been removed from consciousness.\(^{575}\)

Neither Jeremiah in 5:21 nor Ezekiel in 12:2 would, in any case, attributes the people's lack of perceptiveness to the divine purpose. To this extent, these passages differ significantly from Is 6:9-10 (and Mk 8:17).

E. SCRIPTURE-HERMENEUTICS IN MK 8:17B, 18A

One of the principle aims of the foregoing inquiry was to discern the intention behind the Marcan portrayal of the disciples. Though different in focus, the investigations conducted by Best et. al. have not yielded results which in any way undermine the earlier findings of Wrede. On the contrary, the one set of findings derives some measure of support from the other. The need for additional instruction which the evangelist attributes to the disciples throughout the gospel narrative attests the degree to which he sought to underline the inscrutability of the public ministry of Jesus. Conversely, the inscrutability of the public ministry serves to explain the need


\(^{576}\) Ibid., 270.
for esoteric instruction. Certainly the Marcan presentation would, from either standpoint, bear the telltale stamp of an editorial formulation. This in itself would demand assignment of the vignette of Mk 8:14-21 to the hand of Mark. Accordingly, NT commentators tend to assume such a position.\(^{577}\)

The discernment of language similar to that of Is 6:9-10 in Mk 8:18 leads Suhl to view the latter as a conscious allusion to Mk 4:12.\(^{578}\) There, in 4:12, Mark applies Isaiah to "those outside." Suhl's observation provides useful insight. It nonetheless deserves some correction. The degree of verbal contact between Mk 8:17b (c) and Is 6:9-10 (LXX) suggests Mk 8:17b (c), not Mk 8:18, as the primary reference to Is 6:9-10 (LXX). Furthermore, the following verse, Mk 8:18, as Suhl himself has observed, shows greater verbal contact with Jer 5:21b or Ezek 12:2 than with Is 6:9-10.\(^{579}\)

Moreover, the application of the foregoing OT texts to the disciples (8:17b, 18a)\(^ {580}\) evidences a qualitative difference from that of Is 6:9-10 to "those outside" (4:12).\(^ {581}\) Firstly, the interrogative form of these citations itself serves to introduce an element of uncertainty as to the appropriateness of that

---


\(^{578}\) *Funktion*, 152.

\(^{579}\) Ibid.

\(^{580}\) So Jeremias, *Parables*, 15 n. 12: Mark extends the application of Is 6:9-10 to the disciples; sim. C. A. Evans, "Hermeneutics of Mark and John", 162; but cf. Suhl, *Funktion*, 146: Jesus asks the disciples if that application is appropriate.

application. The paraphrase offered by Suhl encapsulates this element quite well: "Should you not truly understand, should you not in fact be numbered among the unbelieving?" (translation ours: italics added). Secondly, the original disciples, unlike "those outside," do ultimately find faith through their walk with Jesus. The reproach of Mk 8:17b, 18a--including 17c--represents a call for remembrance among those in the church. A genuine encounter with the Master did, in the end, engender proper understanding in the original disciples. An encounter with that same Jesus would likewise engender proper understanding in the Marcan community. By contrast, reference to Is 6:9-10 in 4:11-12 does not represent a call to proper understanding, but a condemnation to no understanding.

The reproach of 8:17 is, notes Suhl, presented once again in v. 18. Here Suhl sees a redundance. Yet the evangelist, when recasting v. 17, employs language borrowed from Jer 5:21b or Ezek 12:2. Suhl himself makes this observation. However, he fails to develop it further. The tradition attested in Jeremiah and Ezekiel does not attribute the impercipient of Israel to divine fiat. To this extent, the use of this OT tradition in

---

583 Ibid., 151. The German text of Suhl's statement reads: "Solltet ihr wirklich nicht verstehen, solltet ihr wirklich zu den Ungläubigen zählen?"
584 So Pesch, Markus, I, 414: thus the disciples resemble "those outside;" "those outside" do not include the disciples, however.
585 Cf. Suhl, Funktion, 152.
586 Nonetheless, 4:11-12 and 8:17b, 18a say essentially the same thing, in Suhl's judgement (ibid., 152). Further to this, see above pp. 212-13, 220-21.
587 Ibid., 151.
v. 18a serves to create a certain degree of tension with the exclusion formula of 4:11-12. Yet the disciples—and hence the church also—are there made the recipients of the secret of the kingdom of God. To that extent, the responsibility for comprehending Jesus' message is something which falls to the disciples themselves as well.588 Those among the disciples who fail to comprehend Jesus' proclamation will—as may be inferred from Mk 8:17b (c), 18589—find themselves in precisely the same position as those whom Jeremiah and Ezekiel addressed. Here, as in Mk 4:12, we encounter a typological correspondence between a situation in early Christianity and another in Israel's distant past. What we have seen of Mark's scripture-hermeneutics in 8:17b (c), 18a does not satisfy Suhl's criteria for prophecy-fulfilment, but it surely involves something far more sophisticated than simply 'painting the new with various OT colours.'590 The reference to Jer 5:21/Ezek 12:2 in Mk 8:18a serves

588 Best has also noted this. That is to say, Jesus imparts spiritual understanding to his followers: "if they will but look at what he, the wonder-worker, has done [6:30-44; 8:1-10a], they will understand (viii. 17, 18, 21)" (Markan Soteriology, 105; sim. Pesch, Markus, I, 414).

At the same time, "those who are outside" are absolved of any guilt concerning their lack of perception. Schuyler Brown asks: "But is such a [moral] distinction sufficient to explain how Jesus can apply such similar texts as Is 6:9 and Jer 5:21 to both the crowds and the disciples, whom he so clearly distinguishes in 4:11-12?" (Schuyler Brown, "Secret of the Kingdom", 62, n.13). This question misses the point. The verbal similarity between Isaiah and Jeremiah is indisputable as we have shown. However, the passages differ insofar as the responsibility for lack of perception is assessed differently. Furthermore, Mark looks to preserve this distinction.

589 The allusion to Mk 4:12 suggested in Mk 8:17—Suhl incorrectly identifies it in 8:18 (Funktion, 152)—allows us to draw this important inference.

590 Ibid.
to characterize those members of the Marcan church community who have apparently erred in some sort of manner. In this connection, the evangelist likens them to their Israelite forebears. Consequently, the stereotypical Jew of Mark's gospel constitutes the basis of a decidedly negative metaphor. In fact, the Marcan Jews have, in v. 18a, become virtually a byword for obduracy.

The supplementary reference to Is 6:9-10 in vv. 17b (c)—and thus the reminiscence of Mk 4:11-12—serves to underline the foregoing characterization of doubting or unbelieving individuals within the Marcan community. In other words, if they are in fact like those addressed in Jer 5:21/Ezek 12:2, they are in the last analysis at no advantage to those whom God had categorically forsaken in Is 6:9-10.
2.3 Test Case 2: OT Texts Applied to John the Baptist - Mk 1:2-3

A. TRADITION-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

B. MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF SCRIPTURES REPORTED

The references to the Jewish Scriptures to which we now direct our attention find themselves within the first major sub-section of the Marcan Prologue (vv. 2-8), which relates to John the Baptist. In terms of its morphology this presentation of OT material represents one which is more complicated than we examined in Test Case 1. The first reference, occurring in Mk 1:2b, c, is a harmony of Ex 23:20a and Mal 3:1a. The second reference, occurring in Mk 1:3, is a nearly verbatim citation of Is 40:3 LXX. A citation formula which appears a number of times in the LXX precedes these two passages in Mk 1:2a, attributing them both to the prophet Isaiah (γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἰσαὰκ τῷ προφήτῃ). The following juxtaposition of Mark's scripture-references with the LXX version serves to underline a high degree of verbal contact between the two documents.

Mk 1:2a

Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἰσαὰκ τῷ προφήτῃ,

Cf. LXX 2 Kg 14:6; 23:21; 2 Chr 23:18; 25:4; Tob 1:6.

καθὼς γέγραπται ...

591 See above ch. 1 pp. 89-100.
592 See Gnilka, Markus, I, 44 incl. n. 26.
The second half of the reference is a nearly verbatim reproduction of Is 40:3:

593 Here the dotted line which indicates a commonality between the verbs κατασκεύασε (Mk 1:2c) and ἐπιβλέψεται (Mal 3:1aβ) serves to highlight an approximation in meaning rather than morphology.

594 The substitution of αὐτοῦ (Mk) for τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν (Is), though seemingly minor is a theologically significant modification as we shall see.
The text of Mk 1:2b, like that of its verbatim parallel reported in Q,\(^{595}\) is a significantly closer approximation to the LXX text of Ex 23:20aα than to that of Mal 3:1aα.\(^{596}\) Similarly, the text of Mk 1:2c, along with that of its variant reported in Q,\(^{597}\) represents a closer approximation to Mal 3:1aβ in its more accurate rendering κατασκευάσεται as against the LXX in ἐπιβλέψεται,\(^{598}\) and also an assimilation to Ex 23:20aβ in the words

\[\text{Is 40:3 (LXX)}\]

\[\text{φωνὴ βοῶντας ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, }\]
\[\text{Ετοιμάσατε τὴν ὄδον κυρίου, }\]
\[\text{εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.} \]

\(^{595}\) Strictly speaking, only Lk 7:27b is verbally identical to Mk 1:2b. The Matthaean variant reported in 11:10b includes the pronoun ἐγὼ as in Ex 23:20aα/Mal 3:1aα LXX. The occurrence of Ex 23:20aα both in Mark and Q does not establish itself in the verbal contact between Mark and Q alone, but in conjunction with the fact that Matthew/Luke report it in the same non-Marcan context, viz. the Q testimony of Jesus concerning the Baptist (Mt 11:7-11, 16-19/Lk 7:24-35).

\(^{596}\) Cranfield, Mark, 39; Pesch, "Anfang", 319; Taylor Mark, 153.

\(^{597}\) However, the Q version (Mt 11:10c = Lk 7:27c) with its inclusion of the phrase ἐμπροσθέν σου attests a more accurate rendering of the Hebrew text of Mal 3:1aβ than the LXX in πρὸ προσώπου μου (Pesch, "Anfang", 319). Absence of the phrase ἐμπροσθέν σου in Mk 1:2c could represent a Marcan omission motivated by stylistic considerations. Some of the factors which might have come into play include a desire to effect a correspondence with v. 3 or avoid overlengthening (ibid., 346 n. 35).

\(^{598}\) Cranfield, Mark, 39; Pesch, "Anfang", 319. So also Suhl and Taylor who note: (a) the LXX Version in ἐπιβλέψεται reads the verb ἐπιβλέψεται as a qal (جير); (b) the Marcan text in κατασκευάσει, along with Symmachus in ἐποιεῖσθαι and Theodotion in ἐτοιμάσει reads מֵב as a piel (יִבְּהֶלָה).

Thus the rendering of the Hebrew reported in Mark is more accurate than that reported in the LXX (Suhl, Funktion, 135 n. 217; Taylor, Mark, 153 incl. n. 1). The observation by Suhl that the Marcan
The reference to Is 40:3 in Mk 1:3 is a very close citation of the LXX. Mark's version of the passage does, however, manifest one small but significant emendation. The phrase τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν which stands at the end of v. 3b in Isaiah now reads αὐτοῦ so that an implied antecedent Jesus stands in lieu of God. That is to say, the Marcan version allows the identification of Jesus with the Kurios. Furthermore, only the LXX Version, which is followed by Mark, permits the evangelist to assign the words of Isaiah to the Baptist. Here the underlying Greek version situates the "voice calling" in the wilderness. On the other hand, the syntactical structures of both the MT and the Targum are such that "the way for our God" (MT)/"the way for the people" (Tg) is to be prepared in the wilderness.

Two text-critical questions are worthy of note. Firstly, a number of manuscript traditions read ἐν τοῖς προφήταις for ἐν τῷ Ἁσωματίκῳ προφήτῃ in Mk 1:2a. The variant reading, as has been rightly observed, is an obvious attempt to correct a reading is supported in second-century recensions of the LXX may not be totally beside the point; indeed these later recensions may well preserve ancient variants to the Greek version as old as, if not older than the LXX itself.

In his analysis of the morphology of the citation of Mal 3:1 in Mk 1:2 Burkill allows the possibility that the version of the passage might betray the influence of Ex 23:20 LXX (Mysterious Revelation, 10-11).
600 Cranfield, Mark 39; Pesch, "Anfang", 318; Taylor, Mark, 153.
601 Cranfield, Mark, 39-40.
602 Cranfield, Mark, 39-40.
603 Ibid., 40; Gnilka, Markus, I, 41, 44; cf. Taylor, Mark, 153-54.
citational inaccuracy.  

Secondly, the scriptural material cited in Mk 1:2b, c strikes Taylor as a gloss by a copyist. Three arguments are presented: (a) the citation is lacking in the parallel accounts of Mt 3:1-12 and Lk 3:1-9, 15-17; (b) the citation interrupts the obvious connection between v. 2a ("Isaiah the prophet") and v. 3 (Is 40:3); and (c) the citation occurs in Q (Mt 11:10 = Lk 7:27) in practically identical form. Yet no textual evidence exists

---

604 Cranfield, Mark, 38; Taylor, Mark, 153.
605 Taylor, Mark, 153; also Cranfield, Mark, 38-39. Best is ambivalent. On the one hand, he can doubt as to the originality of Mk 1:2b, c (Mal 3:1) (Markan Soteriology, 114 n. 1, cf. 150); on the other hand, he can write: "Mark [i.e. the evangelist] has set out Jesus in i. 2 as the messenger of God who comes to the Temple (Mal. iii. 1) and in the Gospel he spends all the time of his visit to Jerusalem in the Temple" (ibid., 126).

A reluctant Taylor writes: "Matthew and Luke may have deliberately omitted the quotation in i. 2, and Mark may have inadvertently introduced it from a collection of proof-texts" (Mark, 153). The citational inaccuracy of v. 2a or the inclusion of v. 2b, c in Q would have prompted a revision of the first kind (so Pryke, Redactional Style, 35). Two further considerations suggest the second possibility. Firstly, Longenecker writes: "The ascription of both passages to Isaiah alone (καθώς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἱσααὶ τῷ προφήτῃ) probably stems from a testimonia collection, existing within Judaism generally or in the early church in particular, wherein composite citations or multiple passages were credited to the more prominent prophet in the listing" (Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 138).

Secondly, the juxtaposition of Mk 1:2b, c and 3 may have taken on similar grounds Gnilka, Markus, I, 44). Now as an interesting observation of Pesch seems to suggest, a 'lexical bridging' affords itself much more readily in the Hebrew than it does in the Greek ("Anfang", 319):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mal 3:1aβ</td>
<td>Ἰσααὶ τῷ προφήτῃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is 40:3aβ</td>
<td>ἐπιβλέπεται ὁδὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to support the absence of v. 2b, c. The inclusion of this material constitutes a rather more difficult reading. Thus v. 2b, c is probably original.

The presence of the introductory formula καθώς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ marks this reproduction of OT material as direct reporting. Yet what we really have here, as already noted, is a conflation of two different passages—Ex 23:20/ Mal 3:1a and Is 40:3.

C. THE MEANING OF MK 1:2-3

Preparation of the way by John the Baptist, as it is understood in the prologue of Mark's gospel, signifies a call to the people to make a fresh start in view of the imminent end. Nothing of the preaching of judgement, which so characterized the role of John according to the Q tradition, informs the Marcan account, so that preparation, according to the latter, is construed in the sense of a forerunnership which is keyed to the Messiah Jesus. Thus the composite reference to Mal 3:1a and Ex 23:20a in v. 2b, c would, in Gnilka's estimation, receive primary emphasis, rather than the near-verbatim citation of

Furthermore, the affinity of Mk 1:2c with Mal 3:1aβ Heb which we have already noted would suggest that the person(s) who had first juxtaposed Mk 1:2b, c and 3 had been working with Hebrew texts. The association of these scripture passages, therefore, may well represent an early-Christian (pre-Marcan) or even pre-Christian development. Taylor notwithstanding, the synoptic evangelists could have used a similar form of text (Mark, 153).

Cranfield, Mark, 39; Pesch, "Anfang", 318; also Taylor, Mark, 153. In fact, the only major alteration to Mk 1:2b, c for which we have any evidence is the deletion—not the insertion—of this verse from the Marcan context in Mt 3:1-12 = Lk 3:1-9, 15-17.

Cum Cranfield, Mark, 39; Pesch, "Anfang", 318; contra Taylor, Mark, 153.

See above ch. 1 pp. 28-29.
Is 40:3 LXX in v. 3.\textsuperscript{609}

Undoubtedly Gnilka's assessment of the Baptist's mission as construed in Mk 1:2-8 finds considerable supporting evidence in the two OT passages in v. 2b, c. First of all, the reference to Mal 3:1a in this verse recalls the depiction of the day of the Lord in Mal 3:2-3:21 LXX/4:3 Heb. Immediately following this depiction of the day of the Lord is the summons to observance of the Law of Moses. Although the motif of the coming judgement is not restated in Mk 1:2-8, we do find the summons to obedience of Mal 3:22 LXX/4:4 Heb reflected in the call for repentance of Mk 1:4. The second reference to the OT embodied in Mk 1:2b, c also assumes a role in illuminating the nature of John's mission. A repetition of the events of the exodus will, interprets Gnilka, take place in the events of the last days.\textsuperscript{610} Unfortunately Gnilka does not develop this insight. However, the correspondence he envisions might entail a scenario such as follows. The giving of the Law of Moses (Ex 20:22-23:19), upon which the covenant established between Yahweh and his people was contingent, preceded the appointment of the angel of the Lord to guard Israel through the wilderness en route to the promised land (Ex 23:20). In similar fashion, but in arranged reverse order, John, the appointed messenger of God (Mk 1:2b, c), calls his countrymen to repentance, back to the wilderness to a restored relationship to God (Mk 1:5).

While there is much to say in favour of the foregoing

\textsuperscript{609}Markus, I, 44-45.
\textsuperscript{610}Ibid.
interpretation of Mal 3:1a/Ex 23:20a as it is applied in
Mk 1:2b, c, we cannot, in the final analysis, accept Gnilka's
contention that it is this combined reference which receives the
primary emphasis among the OT passages assembled in vv. 2-3.
Firstly, according to v. 2a, what follows is a citation of the
prophet Isaiah. Secondly, the statements of vv. 4-6 constitute a
perceived outworking of Is 40:3 LXX. The scene of John's activity
is the wilderness of the Jordan and, furthermore, the immediate
context of Is 40:3 concerns the forgiveness of sins--Is 40:1-2.\footnote{611}
That being the case, we can ascribe equal importance to Isaiah
here.\footnote{612}

The conglomeration of OT tradition which we find reported in
Mk 1:2-3 clearly represents an attempt by primitive Christianity
to legitimate itself as a religious phenomenon. Burkill says
this:

[It] was largely by trying to show that the career
of Jesus was in accordance with the prophecies of
the Old Testament that the apostolic church sought
to demonstrate the validity of its belief in the
Messiahship of the Master.\footnote{613}

Later he adds:

Accordingly, the [church] does not appreciate the
mission of John for its own sake, but only in so far as
it is the divinely ordained prelude to the saving action
of God in the earthly life of Jesus the Messiah.\footnote{614}

Only one of the passages employed in Mk 1:2-3 appears to carry an
eschatological significance. In Mal 3:1 the prophet Elijah

\footnote{611}{See Pesch, "Anfang", 318.}
\footnote{612}{Ibid.}
\footnote{613}{Mysterious Revelation, 10;
cf. Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 138.}
\footnote{614}{Ibid., 12. In the foregoing quotation we have substituted the
word "church" for the word "evangelist."}
redivivus is to make preparation for the day of the Lord. The preparation of the way of the Lord in the wilderness which is summoned in Is 40:3 may, figuratively, denote safe passage through such a region for the people of God returning from captivity in Babylon. Then, the scene which is related in Ex 23:20 after the ratification of the Sinai Covenant concerns the appointment of an angel/messenger who will guard Israel on her journey to Canaan. Like Mal 3:1, Mk 1:2-3 carries an eschatological significance. John the Baptist is designated Elijah the prophet. However, the task with which the Baptist is charged entails preparation for the Messiah Jesus, not for God himself. The scripture traditions employed in Mk 1:2-3 is, as Taylor rightly states, given a messianic interpretation in this particular instance.

D. THE MEANING OF THE OT

i. Mal 3:1

The prediction of the return of the prophet Elijah before the day of the Lord in Mal 4:5 (Heb)/3:23 (LXX) serves to identify the messenger whose purpose it is to prepare the way for the coming

---

615 The application of Is 40:3 to activity of the kind demonstrated by the Baptist makes yet another appearance in the eschatological interpretation of this same passage in 1QS 8:12-14 (cf. 9:9-10) (Pesch, "Anfang", 318). The rabbis also interpreted this text messianically (St/Bi, I, 96-97, cited in Taylor, Mark, 153).

616 Taylor, Mark, 153.
One Intertestamental document attests this same doctrine. Significantly, this passage carries no messianic significance.

ii. Ex 23:20

This passage, like Mal 3:1, is devoid of messianic import. Situated within the context of the conclusion (Ex 23:20-23) to the Covenant Code (Ex 20:22-23:19), wherein God addresses Israel, Ex 23:20 records the promise of God to provide the covenant people an angel en route to Canaan.

iii. The Composite Citation Mal 3:1a-Ex 23:20a

Gnilka, in his treatment of the composite citation of Mal 3:1a-Ex 23:20a reported in Mk 1:2b, c, takes cognizance of the fact that rabbinic Judaism is acquainted with the same formulation. Yet Forestell writes:

The use of rabbinic literature for this purpose [i.e. for gaining "a better knowledge of Jewish exegesis at the time of Christ"] has always been precarious; for although much of rabbinic teaching was early in origin, it was not committed to writing prior to the third century of the Christian era.

Still, a pre-Christian association of these two passages should

---

617 So Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 11; Cranfield, Mark, 39; Gnilka, Markus, I, 44 and Pesch, "Anfang", 346-47 n. 36. Yet the identity of "my messenger" might be the "angel of Yahweh" as in Ex 23:20; cf. 32:34; 33:2 etc. Reference to the "messenger of the covenant" in Mal 3:1b suggests this as another possible meaning (Cranfield, Mark, 39).

618 See Sir 48:1-14, esp. v. 10. Along with Ben Sira, however, Burkill cites two witnesses of questionable relevance. The first, 2 Esd 6:25-28, is late first-century-A.D. material. The second, Sib Or 5:187ff., looks to be a typographical error (see Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 12).

619 Ibid., 11.

620 Ibid.

621 Gnilka, Markus, I, 44.

622 St/Bi, I, 597, cited in Gnilka, Markus, I, 44.

623 Targumic Traditions and the NT, 2.
occasion no surprise, if we note their respective contexts. The giving of the Covenant Code in Ex 20:22-23:19 precedes the promise of a guardian angel in Ex 23:20. Similarly, the enjoining of the people to observe the Law of Moses in Mal 4:4 (Heb)/3:22 (LXX) immediately precedes the foretelling of the return of Elijah who is to make preparation for the day of the Lord in Mal 4:5-6 (Heb)/3:23-24 (LXX). The association of Mal 3:1a and Ex 23:20a is one which would suggest itself readily. As Gnilka has opined, this admixture of scripture passages intends to say that the events of exodus will repeat themselves in the end-time.\footnote{Gnilka, Markus, I, 44.}

iv. \textit{Is} 40:3

This passage, standing as it does within the initial section of Deutero-Isaiah, in which the prophet is called to herald God's coming (Is 40:1-11), is a post-exilic formulation, a promise to Israel that her captivity in Babylon is about to end and she may return home.\footnote{Ibid.} The preparation of an highway for God, to which the people are called, betokens Babylonian influence, taking its pattern from the procession of the gods in Babel. Though Yahweh is not present via the image borne through the streets, he is nevertheless present and active in the return of his people to their homeland.\footnote{Ibid.} Evidently those who prepared the Hebrew text had been entertaining this line of thought:

\textit{In the wilderness prepare the way for the people of Yahweh! Make in the wasteland an highway for the}
assembly of our God! (translation ours)\textsuperscript{627}
The version of Is 40:3 which is reported in the LXX, however, manifests a variant reading which re-appears in Mk 1:3. The wilderness is the intended location of the 'preparation of the way' in the Hebrew text and the targumic version, but in the LXX the location of the "voice of one calling," as we find in certain rabbinic authorities, is the wilderness.\textsuperscript{628} Yet all extant non-Christian manuscript traditions possess two features common to them all. On the one hand, the work of the fore-runner figure does not yet entail preparation for the coming of the Messiah, as opposed to God.\textsuperscript{629} The Manual of Discipline for the Qumran sect affords additional corroboration of this fact.\textsuperscript{630} On the other hand, the theme of forgiveness of sins plays a role in the immediate context of Is 40:3.\textsuperscript{631}

E. SCRIPTURE-HERMENEUTIC IN MK 1:2-3

The placing of the introductory formula καὶ γέγραπται κτλ. at the head of Mk 1:2-3 serves to designate the ensuing representation of OT material as a direct report from the prophet Isaiah. Our morphological analysis of these verses showed this representation to be somewhat inaccurate. The scriptural material reported in v. 3 is a nearly verbatim citation from

\textsuperscript{627}Gnilka's German rendition of the Targum reads: "In der Wüste bereitet den Weg für das Volk Jahwes! Richtet in der Öde eine Straße für die Versammlung unseres Gottes!" (Markus, I, 44).

\textsuperscript{628}Gnilka, Markus, I, 44; St/Bi, I, 96-97; II, 154 is cited.

\textsuperscript{629}Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 11; Gnilka, Markus, I, 42.

\textsuperscript{630}1QS 8:12-16, cited in Gnilka, Markus, I, 42.

Is 40:3 LXX. However, the material reported in v. 2b, c proved to be a conflation of Mal 3:1a and Ex 23:20a. The latter reference, while largely Septuagintal in form, evidenced some affinity with the underlying Hebrew text.

A formula of the kind employed in v. 2a leaves no other option but to speak of scripture-fulfilment. Suhl would vigorously contest this. The interpretation of the scriptures which we find in Mk 1:2-3, has its source in a post-Easter faith looking back. Not proof from prophecy, but conformity with scripture is what we encounter here just as in Mk 9:11-13. Hence for Suhl the narrator is merely expressing himself in OT colours in Mk 1:2-3. However, the need to establish the veracity of his statements would, in our view, explain the appeal of a writer to sacred texts more convincingly. Gnilka's attempt to associate the introductory formula of v. 2a with legal language employed in the LXX does not alleviate the difficulty, since the OT materials being reported in vv. 2b, c have nothing to do with legal proceedings. The distinction between fulfilment of scripture and conformity with scripture is, in any case, a very subtle one, if it exists at all.

Several methods of interpretation of OT material manifest themselves in the composite reference of Mk 1:2-3. That which is represented in v. 3 is the most straightforward of these methods and involves divine command ostensibly applied in a factual sense.

---

633 Suhl, Funktion, 133-37.
634 Markus, I, 44.
Thus Taylor writes:

[The] intention appears to be to assert that, just as Scripture told of a Voice crying in the wilderness, so John came preaching in the wilderness. 635

The voice in the wilderness who summons preparation of the way for the coming of the Lord (i.e. God, for the prophet) serves to identify the Baptist whose preaching of a baptism in the wilderness constitutes preparation for the coming of the Messiah (i.e. Jesus, for the evangelist). This association of the prophecy with the coming of Jesus has necessitated the substitution of the pronoun αὐτοῦ for the phrase τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. 636

The designation of Jesus as "Lord," resulting from the fact that the pronoun αὐτοῦ now functions as the antecedent of the noun τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, might have posed a theological difficulty for the church and those with whom she was in dialogue, but for the fact that the κύριος is identified with the "mightier one" (v. 7). Thus the divine command of Is 40:3 as it is applied in Mk 1:3 does not concern the coming of God himself but rather that of his messianic emissary. Still, this presentation of Jesus as the Messiah represents a significant development in the christology of the early church. The church, through her bold interpretation of

635 Mark, 154.

636 The occurrence of the pronoun αὐτοῦ in Mk 1:3 may, in Black's opinion, reflect a "well-known Aramaic idiom," viz. the "proleptic pronoun" (Aramaic Approach, 73). Black defines the proleptic pronoun as follows:

"The employment of a personal pronoun in the nominative or the oblique cases to anticipate, for the sake of emphasis, a following noun, is a well-known Aramaic idiom" (ibid., 70).

The extant reading, then, would not involve a substitution of the pronoun αὐτοῦ for the phrase τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν but a deletion of the latter. However, no OT authority attests a variant in αὐτοῦ. Moreover, the hypothesis of an Aramaic document having underlain Mark is one which has no solid evidence to lend it credibility.
the OT, has moved Jesus into the immediate vicinity of God. Later Christian writers, the Johannine community in particular, not only appropriated this christological distinction but carried it to its conclusion.

The application of the conflated references in Mk 1:2b, c poses a problem more complex than that of Mk 1:3. The two passages as they have been applied in v. 2b, c involve hermeneutical principles different one from each other and that of v. 3. The manner in which Mal 3:1a is employed here is best designated as a passage supposedly relating to contemporary event applied in factual sense, that is, fulfilment of prediction. The prophet Elijah, whom the Lord had promised to send before the day of his visitation, serves to identify the Baptist who, this time in his preaching of repentance, makes preparation for the coming of the Messiah. This identification of John with Elijah further grounds the Christian kerygma in Jewish scripture. That is to say, the figure of John in Mk 1:2-3 not only makes preparation for the coming of the Lord (Yahweh) as it was required in Is 40:3 but, in accordance with contemporary Jewish expectation, he is the prophet Elijah redivivus who must come before the day of the Lord (Christ).

The purpose to which the OT is used in connection with the

---

638 See Mk 9:11-13 (Jesus identifies John with Elijah redivivus) and Mk 1:6 (the narrator likens the attire of John with that of Elijah [cf. 2 Kg 1:8]) (Best, Markan Soteriology, 114). The rabbis also interpret Elijah's role messianically. However, this expectation regarding the return of Elijah is but one of several attested in rabbinic literature (Burkitt, Mysterious Revelation, 14; Cranfield, Mark, 39).
reference to Ex 23:20a is that of establishing a *typological correspondence* between the Exodus and the Christ-event. On the one level, the divinely appointed angel who guarded the children of Israel through the wilderness *en route* to the promised land, prefigures the divinely appointed messenger John who prepares the way for the coming of the Messiah through his ministry in the wilderness. On yet another level, the establishment of the Old Israel as the consummation of the Exodus prefigures the establishment of the New Israel as the consummation of the movement begun in John's ministry. Put differently, ancient Israel as an independent political entity typifies the church as an independent religious phenomenon.

The different hermeneutical principles to which the references to Mal 3:1a/Ex 23:20a and Is 40:3 in Mk 1:2-3 are applied notwithstanding, they both serve to secure the figure of Jesus as the Messiah and to that end the Baptist as his divinely appointed forerunner. Otherwise stated, the correspondence between the activity of John (vv. 7-8) and Holy Writ (vv. 2-3) represents conscious linking of the Old and New Testaments, a bridge between the ministry of John and that of Jesus Christ (vv. 9-15).\(^{639}\)

\(^{639}\)Best, *Markan Soteriology*, 113-14.
Test Cases 1 and 2: Comparison and Conclusion

The rejection of Jesus as Messiah by his own people would have posed a difficult, if not embarrassing problem for the early church. What the Christian community, rightly or wrongly, perceived to be the attitude of the Jews came to be a frequent explanation for this rejection, as witness the frequent appeals to Is 6:9-10. The compatriots of Jesus, in rejecting him as their Messiah, thus exhibit a recalcitrance in character with that of their forbears who rejected other divinely appointed emissaries. All applications of Is 6:9-10 in the NT, save that of Paul,\textsuperscript{640} betray an unfavourable assessment of the Jewish people and their place within Heilsgeschichte. Yet the Marcan exclusion formula (4:11-12) carries a particularly damning assessment of Israel. Using an adaptation of the text of Is 6:9-10 which coincides with the general tone of the MT and is thus atavistic, the evangelist is in effect saying that the Jewish people have rejected the Messiah (Jesus) and thus incurred the wrath of God which has issued forth in an intensification of their recalcitrance as divine retribution.\textsuperscript{641} A factual reading of the text renders such an assessment quite inescapable. Put differently, God has definitively rejected the old Israel.

The script which Mark assigns the Jews in 4:11-12 finds application in the discussion in the boat in 8:14-21. A somewhat oblique reference to Is 6:9-10 in v. 17—and thus also 4:11-12--

\textsuperscript{640} See Rom 11:7-32. Here the hardening of the heart of the Jew, far from effecting his ultimate destruction, serves to ensure the salvation of the Gentiles in which the Jew him/herself will share.

\textsuperscript{641} Again, Paul would not go this far. In 2 Cor 3:12-15 the Apostle attributes the "veil" not to God but to Moses.
together with a more obvious reference to Jer 5:21/Ezek 12:2 in v. 18 serves to characterize individuals within the church who fail—perhaps even refuse—to achieve a "proper" grasp of the significance of Jesus and his teaching. Thus portrayed, they recall Jesus' obdurate compatriots. At this point, the Jews have become a Marcan byword for obduracy. This depiction of the Jews of the early Christian era in terms of their attitudinal posture toward those sent them by God has sufficiently entrenched itself in the pre-Marcan tradition that Mark need not justify his reading of the scriptures, viz. Is 6:9-10 and Jer 5:21/Ezek 12:2, in order to typify it.

Clearly, the inability of the disciples to comprehend the teaching of Jesus is given considerably greater emphasis in 8:14-21 than it is in the parable-chapter. Certainly, the question posed by Jesus in 4:13 underlines a lack of comprehension by the disciples. Moreover, the disciples throughout Mark's gospel manifest an inability to absorb Jesus' teaching. Still, the disciples are appointed the special custodians of the secret of the kingdom of God (4:11-12). An instruction to reveal in

---

642 Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 103.

Yet Wrede's assertion that the disciples evidence no progress in their understanding (Messianic Secret, 108-9), is an overstatement of the case, as the story of Peter's confession in Mk 8:27-30 plainly demonstrates.

future what is at present secret (4:21-25)\(^{645}\) is given them as well. Quite noticeably, however, the same Jesus has no words of edification for his disciples in 8:14-21. On the contrary, the barrage of questions addressed the disciples in vv. 17-18 and 21 betrays an accusatory, almost badgering quality which we do not encounter in Mk 4. This should not surprise us. On the one hand, the "Jesus" of 4:10-13—that is to say, the evangelist—is not addressing the first disciples, nor is he depicting historical Jewish people. Neither one of these groups represents a current issue for Mark. On the other hand, the people to whom "Jesus" speaks in 8:17-18 and 21 do represent an issue for him, viz. the problem of unbelief among "disciples" of his time. In other words, the disciples—to borrow Culpepper's "lingo"—are fulfilling the "script" which Mark assigns the "Jews" in 4:11-12. Accordingly, Mark seems to invest considerable passion. This observation further underlines the intended role of Marcan Jews. At the risk of repetition, the Marcan Jew constitutes nothing other than a rhetorical device.

The conflation of references to Mal 3:1a/Ex 23:20a and Is 40:3 in Mk 1:2-3 finds itself within the pre-Marcan (oral/written) layers concerning the Baptist in vv. 2-8. Our inquiry into the nature of the scripture-hermeneutics employed in Mk 1:2-3 revealed nothing of the menacing posture which so marked that of Mk 4:11-12 and 8:17-18. What we encounter here is a

\(^{645}\) Wrede, *Messianic Secret*, 112;

\(^{646}\) Mark's gospel gives expression to the evangelist's own vision of Jesus. For clarity, we have enclosed the name "Jesus" within quotation marks as a designation for the Marcan Jesus.
dispassionate theological statement. Exponents of contemporary Judaism--with scriptural justification (Mal 3:23 [LXX]/4:5 [MT]; cf. 3:1)--would have rebutted the Christian kerygma by indicating that the coming of the one to whom the church ascribed messianic dignity had not been preceded by the return of the prophet Elijah. An attempt to establish John the Baptist as the divinely appointed forerunner of the Messiah Jesus constitutes the reply of the early church to the Jewish objection, i.e. insofar as she asserts that the Baptist is Elijah redivivus.

This difference between the scripture-hermeneutics of the Marcan composition and its pre-Marcan components manifests itself within the body of materials about Elijah which are included in Mark's gospel. The report concerning the death of John the Baptist enjoyed currency prior to the composition of the Gospel of Mark. An instance of structural use of the Jewish scriptures, the narrative account of Mk 6:17-29 takes its pattern from that of 1 Kg 21 wherein Jezebel seeks to do away with Elijah. In this passage we do not encounter any apparently "anti-Jewish" rhetoric. What we find here is simply early Christian theology. From its beginning to its end the story as presented in Mk 6:17-29 bespeaks an effort to establish a typological correspondence between the experiences of John and Elijah. John the baptizer is Elijah the

---

647 So Gnilka, Markus, II, 245-46. The reluctance of Gnilka to assign the account to the tradition of either the church or disciples of John surprises us, especially insofar as his preferred alternative is to regard it as a popular tale about court intrigue (ibid., 246).

648 Various commentators also have noticed the parallel (e.g., Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 21 n. 19 and Taylor, Mark, 310).
This brings us to Mk 9:11-13. The dialogue between Jesus and his disciples following the transfiguration concerns Jewish expectation of the coming of Elijah redivivus in preparation for the mission of God's Annointed One. Jesus affirms this. Yet, as Gnilka has observed, the rhetorical question of v. 12b serves to challenge the assertions of Mal 3 (LXX)/3-4 (MT) that Elijah has restored all things. To wit, those who wielded authority conspired to put the Messiah and Elijah to death. Clearly a Marcan insertion, this particular verse is an "intrusive and unconnected saying about the Son of man." Not surprisingly, the content of this half-verse constitutes a dissociation from Jewish thought. This dissociation from contemporary Jewish theology reaches its climax in Jn 1:21 where the identification of John with Elijah is explicitly denied. Here the evangelist John modifies the synoptic tradition.

A comparison of findings in our investigation of the scripture-hermeneutics employed in Test Cases 1 and 2 serves to reveal a marked shift in the stance adopted by the church in its portrayal of contemporary Judaism. The pre-Marcan traditions

---

649 See Gnilka, Markus, II, 41-42. Other commentators, however, seem to overlook this significant point (e.g. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 183-84 and Suhl, Funktion, 133-34).

650 Cum Bultmann, HST, 125. In Bultmann's judgement, the evangelist has interpolated 9:2-10 on the transfiguration of Jesus. Thus vv. 12-13 originally followed v. 1. The latter apparently serves to contradict the Jewish theory of the forerunner to God's future reign. Yet the church's re-interpretation of the forerunner in the person of the late Baptist represents the content of the former. With that, Bultmann can reconcile vv. 1 and 12-13 (see ibid., 124-25). The accuracy of his reconstruction or lack thereof notwithstanding, v. 12b is a redactional insertion.
inherited by the evangelist still attest the perception of common
ground between church and synagogue. As an independent religious
entity, the church nevertheless continues to articulate her
identity in terms of a continuity with Judaism. On the other
hand, the redactional passages--and to a corresponding degree the
traditional materials which betray the interference of the
evangelist--reflect a time when the church long ceased to concern
itself with the possibility of the existence of common ground
between herself and the synagogue. In the first instance, the
primitive church failed to legitimate itself in the eyes of
contemporary Judaism. In the second, the evangelist Mark
addresses his gospel to a largely, if not exclusively Gentile
community. With that, the Jews no longer represent a current
reality for the church. Presumably in response to questions or
doubts raised from within, the church elects to redefine herself,
this time in negative terms, that is, over against a caricatured
Judaism. To this extent, the "proverbial" Jew is assigned the
role of the quintessential infidel. Such an individual, it is
alleged, finds him/herself rejected by God because of his/her
allegedly intractible obduracy.\textsuperscript{651} Indeed the
scripture-hermeneutics associated with Test Cases 1 and 2 manifest
a decidedly different tone; in both cases, however, the church
exhibits a willingness to exercise considerable freedom in her
adaptation of scripture text to her own purposes.

\textsuperscript{651}Put differently, the hardening logion as employed in Mk 4:11-12
serves to define the distinction between "insiders" (church) and
"outsiders" (unbelievers) in theological terms (cf. Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 238).
Chapter Three

FIVE SELECTED CASES

3.1 The First Sabbath-day Controversy - Mk 2:23-28

TRADITION-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

The first confrontation of Jesus with the Pharisees over observance of the sabbath law possesses no narrative links with its immediate context. Nonetheless each of the vignettes of 2:1-3:6 evidences the common theme of religious conflict between the same principles. Absence of reference to Jesus by name in 2:23-28 is yet another indication of an association of this pericope with a wider context. Thus the personal pronoun αὐτός (vv. 23 [2x], 24, 27) makes reference to the Son of man as its antecedent in v. 28. Only from v. 10 can one identify Jesus as Son of man. Thirdly, Joanna Dewey's rhetorical-critical investigation of the proposed source (2:1-3:6) has indeed revealed a chiastic symmetry among the component vignettes:

A 2:1-12 the healing of a paralytic
B 2:13-17 the call of Levi/eating with sinners
C 2:18-22 the sayings on fasting and the old and new
B' 2:23-27 plucking grain on the sabbath
A' 3:1-6 healing on the sabbath.

The extant portrait of Jesus' Galilaean controversies would thus exhibit a definite unity from the standpoint of its overall

652 Cranfield, Mark, 114.
653 Pesch, Markus, I, 180.
A number of scholarly authorities have argued the existence of a collection of conflict stories at the time of the writing of Mark's gospel. However, the discussion of the precise extent of this source has yielded no consensus. Lack of consensus notwithstanding, two considerations increase the probability of the transmission of a collection of vignettes with conflicts at the time of the composition of Mark's gospel. First of all, 2:1-3:6 interrupts the sequence of the narrative. Secondly, two pericopae within this section include a Son-of-man saying as integral components of their respective arguments, but the ascription does not make another appearance until Mk 8:31, and with a different nuance.

The tradition-history of Mk 2:23-28 in extant form entails

---


656 Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 152-53.

657 Ibid., 153.

658 See below pp. 256, 257-59.

Dewey's meticulous examinations of the literary techniques of 2:1-3:6 in addition to its theological emphases, and interconnections of Mk 2:1-3:6 with 1:16-45 would, in her view, indicate the evangelist's editorial activity as the creative process behind the extant Galillean controversy section (Markan Public Debate, 181-91). Nonetheless Mark probably employed a source. To her admission, however, she cannot reconstruct that source with any certainty (see ibid., 192-93). Interestingly, her own rhetorical-critical evaluation of the structure of the extant controversy section will, as we shall see, undermine her proposed deletion of vv. 25-26 from a pre-Marcan source.
at least two, and possibly three stages. Material of the first stage of development comprises that of vv. 23-26. On the one hand, no compelling arguments exist to connect the controversy dialogue of Mk 2:23-26 with the historical Jesus. However, Pesch invokes several criteria of authenticity to this end:

(1) This particular argument entails three separate components. Firstly, Jesus' stance toward sabbath observance finds further documentation in the synoptic tradition: Mark's gospel (3:1-6), the special Lucan material (13:10-17; 14:1-6; cf. 6:5 [D]) and John's gospel (5:1-18; 9:1-41)—multiple attestation. However, multiple attestation merely establishes the relative antiquity of a given datum. Secondly, the debate over application of sabbath-day legislation may well signal a "law-abiding" Palestinian matrix—dissimilarity. An application of the criterion of dissimilarity in the direction of the church would, however, undermine claims for the authenticity of 2:23-26. In this connection, the exercise of freedom by Jesus with respect to the Law is not a principle unique to Jesus. On the contrary, this particular principle enjoys wide attestation in the Pauline Corpus and on no account can it support claims to authenticity.

Thirdly, vv. 23-26 exhibit Palestinian colouring and concrete details. Two features would, for Gnilka, reflect Palestinian colouring: (a) the scribal character of rebuttal by way of

---

659 Pesch, Markus, I, 183.
660 Ibid. Thus the Matthaean report (12:1-6) omits the so-called "radical logion" (2:27) (Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 112).
661 Contra Gnilka, Markus, I, 122.
662 Pesch, Markus, I, 183.
reference to a situation recounted in the OT (vv. 25-26); as well as (b) the presupposition of familiarity with the commandment relating to sabbath rest. The plucking of ears of corn by the disciples and their wending of their way through the fields would constitute a concrete detail in this particular narrative (v. 23). Yet Palestinian colouring and apparent concreteness could well represent a lending of verisimilitude to the account.

Indeed the same consideration serves to rebut one of Hultgren's arguments for Galilaean provenance for 2:23-28: to wit, some plains of Galilee grow grain abundantly.

Two of Pesch's remaining arguments for authenticity are appeals to the criterion of consistency--nos. 2 and 5. Arguments nos. 3 and 4 resp. are basically criteria of verisimilitude and/or consistency, dissimilarity. They may be stated thus:

(2) Jesus and his disciples were itinerent preachers;
(3) The assumption of a responsibility by Jesus for the actions of his disciples not only conveys the impression of historical plausibility and but also finds the support of documentary evidence;
(4) Jesus' reference to the OT is a feature unique among the controversy dialogues;

663 Markus, I, 119. The counter-question with an appeal to scripture is a form of argument attested in rabbinic sources (Taylor, Mark, 216; cf. Bultmann, HST, 41).
664 Gnilka, Markus, I, 121.
665 Ibid., 122; Pesch, Markus, I, 180.
666 See above ch. 1 p. 45 incl. n. 88 (onto p. 46).
667 Jesus and Adversaries, 158. This Galilaean feature is one of a number cited in support of a Galilaean provenance the collection of 2:1-3:6 (ibid., 158-59). One of these, the Pharisees as Jesus' opponents is treated below p. 255 n. 693.
(5) Jesus' consciousness of "being sent"--allegedly reflected in the comparison with King David--is an historical feature. Indeed Pesch supports the foregoing observations with evidence in the text. Nonetheless, the criterion of consistency (arguments nos. 2, 3 and 5) does not have the methodologically required support of the other three criteria of authenticity. Pesch's application of the criterion of dissimilarity (argument no. 4) has been given consideration in its application in argument no. 1. Our earlier statement about appeals to consistency find equally valid application here (arguments no. 3).

On the other hand, little evidence exists to signal Marcan redactional interference in 2:23-26. From the standpoint of theology, we note the absence of the classic Marcan portrait of the disciples. In this connection, Dewey characterizes the disciples of 2:13-28 in this way:

The disciples, with Jesus, engage in behavior [sic] characteristic of the coming of the kingdom--they eat with outcasts, they do not fast, they ignore the sabbath requirements. The new freedom is not Jesus' alone but extends to his disciples.

Here the disciples understand the implications of Jesus' teaching.

Interestingly, rhetorical critic Dewey regards the reference...
to David in vv. 25-26 as redactional material. Here we note two difficulties. Firstly, Dewey's preferred reconstruction of the pre-Markan source behind the Galilaean controversies (2:1-3:6) does in fact manifest greater chiastic symmetry than other similar structures in the Marcan narrative.\textsuperscript{672} Evidently, the addition of vv. 25-26 would have introduced asymmetry into the complex. Secondly, Jesus' reference to eating per se allegedly carries no real significance in its present context.\textsuperscript{673} At the same time, the citation of David's eating of the bread of the Presence would constitute a satisfactory rebuttal to the implicit criticism of Jesus for eating with sinners in the chiastic counterpart (vv. 13-17) to the present vignette.\textsuperscript{674}

Mark's relative disregard for the chiastic structure of the Galilaean conflict source would, admittedly, present something of a challenge with regard to our tradition-historical assessment of vv. 25-26. Yet the alleged irrelevance of these verses to its present context does not bear the weight of further examination, in our view.\textsuperscript{675} Our exposition of these verses, we will in fact

\textsuperscript{672}See ibid., 193.  
\textsuperscript{673}Ibid., 97-98.  
\textsuperscript{674}See ibid., 112-14. In this connection, Dewey notes the catch-phrase χρέων ἡγεῖω in vv. 17 and 25 (ibid., 114). Moreover, the topic of the central component of each pericope --vv. 15-17 and vv. 25-26-- is eating: vv. 16 and 26 each report the verb ἐσοθω̃ς twice (ibid., 113).  
\textsuperscript{675}Hultgren's investigation of these verses fails to identify a conclusion based on an exegetical argument. The absence of this feature would, in his view, distinguish the scripture-hermeneutics employed in vv. 25-26 from that of Hellenistic Christianity (Jesus and Adversaries, 180). Such a finding would support a pre-Markan origin for the use of the Davidic references. Yet David's eating of the bread of the Presence affords a "precedent" for the disciples' food-gathering activity on the sabbath (ibid., 113). The use of the OT in Hultgren's "addition" would therefore
demonstrate vv. 25-26 as a logical response to the Pharisees' objection of v. 24. Furthermore, the alleged irrelevance of Jesus' first answer granted, how does one then explain why Mark did not add vv. 25-26 after v. 16?

Yet another difficulty in Dewey's hypothesis of Marcan addition is the relative paucity of decisive evidence of redactional interference in the Davidic citation. Existing evidence comprises stylistic features. In the first place, we note several instances of Marcan duality. These include: synonymous expression, a compound verb followed by the same preposition, a multiplication of cognate verbs, two instances of repetition of the antecedent and double statement. Other evidence of the hand of the evangelist includes the use of the historic present tense (λέγει) (v. 52) and the idiom οἱ μετ'

constitute exegesis in the form of an analogical reading of scripture.

Best, Markan Soteriology, 71.

V. 25: χρείαν ἔσχεν/καὶ ἔπείνασεν (Neirynck, Marcan Duality, 103).

V. 26: εἰσέρχομαι εἰς (ibid., 75).

V. 26: ἐσθίω (2x) (ibid., 77).

Firstly, the redundant pronoun αὐτός in v. 25 (cf. v. 25a: Δαιάδ) (ibid., 85); and secondly, the repetition of the antecedent implicit in the reiteration of the verb ἐσθίω in v. 26 (φαγεῖν/ἐφαγεῖν) (ibid., 86).

V. 26: τοὺς ἀρτοὺς ... δὺς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν/εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἱερεῖς (ibid., 89: negative-positive double statement: εἰ μὴ or ἐὰν μὴ following a negative element).

Certainly vv. 23-26 contain other examples of structural duality: two of exposition and discourse (ibid., 114), and one of question-and-answer correspondence in discourse (ibid., 127). However, the development of the plot seems to be the governing factor in all three instances.

See Taylor, Mark, 46-47.
Similarly, Hultgren sees vv. 25-26 as a secondary, though pre-Marcan insertion. The conflict stories of Palestinian provenance do not normally make use of references to scripture. So argues Hultgren. Nonetheless, Hultgren identifies Palestine as the provenance of 2:23-28. The Davidic reference of vv. 25-26 and v. 28 with its dominical logion were later additions. Yet the Palestinian—not the Hellenistic—church effected the addition of this material. The purpose of these emendations of the text was to qualify the logion of v. 27 in view of its radicality. Apparently, the Palestinian Jewish church could not countenance such freedom with respect to the sabbath. Thus the story about David’s action afforded a precedent for sabbath-law breaking. The appending of the logion of v. 28 would similarly relativize freedom in one’s stance on sabbath-day observance. Accordingly, man’s freedom with respect to the sabbath retains its validity within the context of the lordship of the Son of man.

To some extent, we would endorse Hultgren’s exposition of the extant form of the conflict story. In this connection, v. 27 would constitute a logical response to vv. 23-24 in isolation from the Davidic analogy. Yet Hultgren’s general disqualification of exegetical arguments as a Hellenistic practice does not reflect

---

683 Gnilka, Markus, I, 120 n. 9. The presence of this phrase serves to emphasise the role of the disciples (cf. Dewey, Markan Public Debate, 126). Such an emphasis is characteristic of Mark.

684 Jesus and Adversaries, 178-79.

685 Ibid., 180.

686 Ibid., 113-14.

687 Sim. Gnilka, Markus, I, 120: in other words, v. 27 represents an argument in itself.
the actual content of the rabbinic sources. Secondly, Hultgren's account of the Davidic reference evidences a certain incongruity. In other words, the conflict stories of the Galilaean collection (2:1-3:6) "are all church compositions in which the church responds to Palestinian Jewish criticism". The earliest form of this conflict story (vv. 23-24, 27) would then defy explanation --it would scandalize the very circle of its original currency. In our view, one could more cogently argue a Palestinian provenance for vv. 25-26, than for v. 27, or even v. 28. The Davidic references thus find their best explanation as part of the original composition.

All told, the foregoing considerations serve to stamp the vignette of Mk 2:23-26 as pre-Marcan composition. Besides certain pieces of evidence support this conclusion in a positive way. Firstly, "Jesus is questioned about the disciples' behaviour; why not his own? [Obviously] the Church ascribes the justification of her Sabbath customs to Jesus." Secondly, the use of scripture proofs in controversy dialogues is not a practice which we can reliably attribute to the historical Jesus. Thirdly, the

---


689 Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 132.

690 Bultmann, HST, 16 (italics added).

691 Debates within the church would occasion the collection of proof-texts. Those who formulated the controversy dialogues would use such polemic/apologetic material to good effect (ibid., 49). In any case, an appeal to scripture would indicate that a certain amount of reflection had taken place.
frequency with which the synoptic tradition reports confrontation between Jesus and the religious authorities bespeaks the great importance of the question of sabbath-day observance in the early church.⁶⁹² Fourthly, designation of the opponents of Jesus as "the Pharisees" (v. 24) reflects a progressive tendency within the synoptic tradition to present this group along with the scribes and as the agreed enemies of Jesus.⁶⁹³

⁶⁹² So Taylor (Mark, 214), who nonetheless argues the historicity of 2:23-26 (ibid., 215).
⁶⁹³ See Bultmann, HST, 51; cf. also Pesch, Markus, I, 180. Writes Bultmann:
"In the controversy dialogues we can see that originally the questioners were for the most part unspecified persons, but that as the tradition developed they were characterized as opponents, Pharisees or scribes" (HST, 67).
A comparison of the respective versions of various traditions reported in the synoptic gospels serves to demonstrate the likelihood that this tendency has been lacking, or at least not nearly as pronounced in the earliest layers:
(1) The dialogue concerning the great commandment is reported both in Mark (12:28-34) and in Q (Mt 22:34-40/Lk 10:25-2). In the Marcan account we observe a rather amiable discussion taking place between the scribe and Jesus: the scribe endorses what Jesus has to say (vv. 32-33) and in turn receives a commendation from Jesus (v. 34). In the account from Q we find a complete absence of this material: the Pharisee-lawyer/lawyer tries to "test" Jesus (Mt 22:35/Lk 10:25) and the only faint trace of any commendation of the lawyer is contained in Lk 10:28;
(2) The Q discourse concerning the nature of discipleship (Mt 8:18-22/Lk 9:57-60) includes a saying wherein the speaker expresses a desire to follow Jesus. Matthew places the saying in the mouth of "a scribe" (v. 19), but Luke in that of "a man" (v. 57);
(3) The dialogue concerning resurrection of the dead is reported in the triple tradition (Mt 22:23-33/Mk 12:18-27/Lk 20:27-40). Luke alone includes a saying wherein "the scribes" commend Jesus for his refutation of the Sadducees (v. 39);
(4) The special Lucan tradition reports a saying--attributed to "some Pharisees"--wherein Jesus is advised to flee in view of the plan of Herod Antipas to kill him.
The existence of these few isolated instances wherein the scribes and Pharisees are favourably depicted suggests the possibility that the predominantly unfavourable picture given these groups in the synoptic tradition represents a later stage. Indeed the prominence of the Pharisees as Jesus' opponents would decrease the likelihood of the mention of this party as an indicator of
The occurrence of the connecting formula καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς in v. 27 signals a Marcan seam, thus indicating a conflation of separate traditions in vv. 23-26 and 27-28. Furthermore, both the vocabulary and the argumentation in the two sections are somewhat at variance. The reference to David's eating of the bread of the Presence reports the plural form of the noun σάββατον in vv. 23 and 24 (cf. 3:2, 4). By contrast, the logians of vv. 27 and 28 report the same noun in the singular form. The reference to David's caper concerns what is lawful (ἔξεστιν [vv. 24, 26]) in situations of human need. However, the logion of v. 27 concerns the relative places of mankind and the sabbath in the broader scheme of things, and that of v. 28 the prerogative of the Son of man to adjudicate on such matters.

Form-critically speaking, v. 27 is a wisdom or legal saying. The chiastic structure of the saying, as well as the antithetical parallelism could reflect Palestinian provenance.

Galilaean provenance (contra Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 159-60, 165-66).

694 Contra Gnilka, Markus, I, 120; see above ch. 1 p. 67.

The presence of the connecting formula could, as we will show, signify a new stage (so Cranfield, Mark, 117), not a "break" in the argument (so Dewey, Markan Public Debate, 98).

695 Pesch, Markus, I, 179.

Even so, the first and second answers of vv. 25-26 and 27-28 resp. employ the word σάββατον, a significant verbal contact. Hence we cannot endorse Dewey's statement that, "The second answer is not connected to the first answer ... by means of word repetition" (Markan Public Debate, 96).

696 Cf. ibid.

697 So Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 120. Pesch characterizes the logion as a "two-membered wisdom saying" (Markus, I, 184; sim. Bultmann, HST, 81).

698 For Hultgren, the logion could represent an authentic dominical saying. However, Gnilka's argument for the authenticity of the saying is unconvincing; he derives his conclusion from the fact
Moreover, the saying is well-balanced without the \( \omega \sigma \varepsilon \) -clause of v. 28\(^{699}\) and constitutes an argument in itself.\(^{700}\) At first, therefore, v. 27 was probably an independent logion.\(^{701}\)

By contrast, the saying of v. 28 as a deduction seems to presuppose some such statement as v. 27 as its premise.\(^{702}\) Indeed the statement of v. 28 on Jesus' lordship knows no equivalent parallel\(^{703}\) in the rhetorical counterpart of vv. 23-28 in 2:13-17. In that case, the conflation of these sayings may well represent the work of the evangelist.

---

that Jesus ascertains the will of God from the divine action, viz. the order of creation (Markus, I, 123).

The existence of a saying attributed to Rabbi Simeon b. Menasya in Mekilta 109b on Ex 31:14 (Cranfield, Mark, 117) suggests the possibility that v. 27 at one time circulated as an independent saying (so Bultmann, HST, 84). It reads: "The Sabbath was given to you, not you to the Sabbath" (St/Bi, II, 5, cited in ibid.). Indeed the teaching embodied in this saying is attested several times in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (Taylor, Mark, 218-19; cf. Bultmann, HST, 108). Yet the fact that the rabbi cited lived c. A.D. 180 qualifies the saying as evidence for the period antedating Mark.

\(^{699}\)So Pryke, Redactional Style, 117.

\(^{700}\)So Gnilka, Markus, I, 120.

\(^{701}\)So Bultmann, HST, 84 and Cranfield, Mark, 117; Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 114: the logion was the occasion of the creation of the narrative and the question of the Pharisees (vv. 23, 24).

\(^{702}\)In the extant text of 2:27-28 we have an argument after the manner of a minori ad majus:

"The thought is that since the Sabbath was made for man, He who is man's Lord and representative has authority to determine its laws and use" (Taylor, Mark, 219). Presumably Matthew and Luke did not find the argument satisfactory. Their omission of v. 27 notwithstanding, we do not share the judgement of Pesch, that the verse does not follow from v. 27 on the basis of "Son of man" as a title (Markus, I, 185).

\(^{703}\)Dewey, Marcan Public Debate, 123.
Undoubtedly, v. 28 on the authority of the Son of man would have held significant import for the church. That is to say, the aphorism of v. 27 eventually had come to be considered an inadequate justification of her manner of sabbath-day observance: at that point, the addition of the Son-of-man saying of v. 28 would have provided further christological support for her various practices (cf. v. 10).\textsuperscript{704} The high christology of the Son-of-man saying does not permit ascription of it to Jesus.\textsuperscript{705} Indeed the implicit debunking of the overriding authority of the Mosaic Law would be an inflammatory statement within a Jewish milieu. Nor, for that reason, could we ascribe such a saying to a Jewish-Christian milieu. Thus the Son-of-man logion of v. 28 does not in fact qualify that of the preceding aphorism here.\textsuperscript{706}

At first glance, two considerations appear to cast doubt on an adoption of this saying by Mark. For one thing, such an addition of this kind appears to compromise Mark's doctrine of the

\textsuperscript{704}Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 124; sim. Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 118.

In all probability Mark accorded the saying christological significance. To the extent that Mark added v. 28--note the connecting formula κατ' έλεγέν αυτούς in v. 27--we have to consider it redactional (cf. Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 140, endorsed by Pryke, \textit{Redactional Style}, 140 [see also 12, 24]), in which case the noun κύριος as it is applied to Jesus denotes the title "Lord" (so Best, \textit{Markan Soteriology}, 167; Pryke, \textit{Redactional Style}, 118). The context in which we find the designation Son of man, therefore, suggests that the evangelist understood it as a title.

\textsuperscript{705}So as to avoid the difficulty and thus preserve the authenticity of vv. 27-28, Pesch elects to interpret the Son-of-man title in a generic sense, i.e. to signify "mankind" (see \textit{Markus}, I, 185-86). Likewise Gnilka cannot ascribe v. 28 to Jesus without weakening the designation "Son of man" to a veiled form of "I" (\textit{Markus}, I, 124). Yet is such a levelling of "mankind"/"Son of man" not something of a tour de force?

\textsuperscript{706}Contra Hultgren, \textit{Jesus and Adversaries}, 114.
Messianic Secret. Moreover, other Son-of-man sayings in the Marcan narrative do not lay emphasis on the authority of Jesus, but rather his role as suffering, dying, servant of God (cf. 8:31; 9:31; 10:33). Here, we may note two facts. Firstly, Gnilka observes:

In truth the correction to Mark consists in the conflict which runs toward death and the cross (3:6). Revelation does not occur without protection whenever the cross is kept in mind.

Secondly, the Son-of-man sayings of 2:10 and 28 could well serve a Marcan purpose in his intended identification of that authority figure with the earthly Jesus.

From the standpoint of style, we note five instances of duality in vv. 27-28: repetition of the antecedent (1x),

---

708 Markus, I, 124: the German text reads: "In Wirklichkeit besteht für Markus die Korrektur im Konflikt, der auf Tod und Kreuz zuläßt [3,6]. Offenbarung geschieht immer dann nicht ungeschützt, wenn das Kreuz im Auge behalten wird." Put differently, just as Jesus silences those who confess him Son of God, so also do the religious authorities ultimately silence him--Jesus--who confesses himself Son of man. In view of these considerations, we can ascribe the addition of v. 28 to Mark--but in conjunction with v. 27.
710 τὸ σάββατον (2x) (v. 27)/τὸ σάββατον (v. 28) (Neirynck, *Marcan Duality*, 86).
double statement (2x), and parallelism in sayings (1x).

Form-critically speaking, Mk 2:23-28 meets the usual criteria for a controversy dialogue: (a) an objectionable situation (v. 23); (b) a protest by Jesus' opponents (v. 24); and (c) Jesus' reply (vv. 25-26, 27-28). No doubt, such a genre serves a useful function in the classification of pericopae in the synoptic tradition. However, Gary G. Porton's careful examination of the twenty-five cases of closest correspondence with Bultmann's criteria in the Tannaitic collection has disclosed several unparallelled features of the apophthegmata in the gospels. Firstly, this rabbinic collection does report dialogues, as a rule. Moreover, the concerns of rabbinic discussions are usually halachic or exegetical matters, and in point of fact, such discussions seldom include a concluding "punch-line" as its focal point. The dialogues reported usually involve rabbis of equal

711 Firstly, a negative-positive double statement (οὐκ ... ἀλλά and allied constructions) in v. 27: τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐγένετο, καὶ οὕχ ὁ ἀνθρώπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον (ibid., 90); and secondly, double statement with a repetition of a motif in vv. 27-28: τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐγένετο (v. 27)/ ὃστε κυρίος ἔστιν ὁ νῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου (v. 28) (ibid., 97).
The above examples respectively, represent instances of antithetic and synonymous parallelism (ibid., 133).

712 See previous footnote.

Hultgren's proposed formulation of the criteria for a conflict story requires the following components: (a) an introductory narrative, (b) a question or attack by the opponent/s, and (c) a dominical saying (Jesus and Adversaries, 52-53).
stature. Hence, the final statements of such dialogues typically lack the significance accorded those of Jesus.\textsuperscript{714} On no account, therefore, do the apophthegmata of the synoptic tradition suggest a Christian-Jewish milieu as a likely provenance. Porton's summarizing observation supports this conclusion further:

When we compare the passages from the Tannaitic corpus which are collected here with the examples my colleagues have assembled from the Greek authors, it becomes clear that the Greek sources provide better parallels for the Gospels' pronouncement stories than do the rabbinic sources. Following the line of research taken by my colleague Professor Vernon K. Robbins, I would suggest that the authors of the Gospels were influenced by Greek works on the philosophers and politicians in their use of pronouncement stories.\textsuperscript{715}

\textsuperscript{714}See "The Pronouncement Story", 96.

One methodological difficulty in Bultmann's research of the rabbinic collections was his inclusion of materials of late origin. In his connection, Amoriaic documents represent the period from the mid-third century to the end of the seventh A.D. (ibid., 97 n. 4). By contrast, the Tannaitic literature comprises documents edited prior to the mid-third century (ibid., 83). Thus a restriction of research to the latter would have afforded a parallel of greater contemporaneity with the gospels (see ibid., 83-84).

\textsuperscript{715}Ibid., 97.
Excursus 4
The Relation between Rhetorical and Redaction Criticism

The task of rhetorical criticism is to ascertain (a) the use of structural patterns in the formation of literary units; and (b) the function of literary devices in the composition of various parts of literary units and in the arrangement of those units into unified wholes. In this connection, the object of the rhetorical-literary investigations of literary units is the extant textual representation of such units with no regard for their particular tradition-historical developments. Thus Dewey writes:

Rhetorical or literary criticism does not concern itself directly with historical questions about Mark, his community, or the traditions he used, but rather views the text as a given and attempts to illumine its meaning through study of its means of expression.

By contrast,

redaction criticism attempts to understand Mark's theological intentions and the Sitz im Leben of his gospel; it attempts to answer historical questions raised by the text and by our interest in early Christianity.

Certainly the ascertainment of literary structure and rhetorical emphasis in literary units may, on occasion, corroborate the results of form or redaction-critical investigations. In that case, one can make an appeal to the "criterion of multiple methods". Even more importantly, apparent anomalies in a text may well find ready explanation with the knowledge of literary

718 Ibid., 7.
719 Ibid.
720 So ibid., 9. Dewey employs the term "multiple methodologies." However, "methodology" would, precisely speaking, denote study of method.
structure. That is to say,

If they [the "anomalies"] are not stressed rhetorically in the narrative, and if they do not bear on themes being emphasized by the structure, then, they probably represent traditions which Mark could assimilate but which were not important to his own theology or polemic. If, on the other hand, the strange material is highlighted by the structure or by literary devices that focus attention on it, then probably the material may be considered a markan [sic] emphasis.²²¹

With that, a rhetorical approach not only affords a useful adjunct to the redaction critical method,²²² but indeed a "fundamental to good exegesis."²²³

---

²²¹Ibid.
²²²Ibid., 9-10.
²²³Ibid., 10.
B. MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF SCRIPTURES REPORTED

i. Verbal Contacts between Mk 2:23-28 and 1 Sam 21:1-6

The story of David and his entourage having eaten the loaves of the Presence when they had experienced a shortage of food is a reference to the incident related in 1 Sam 21:1-6. A comparison of Mk 2:23-28 with the LXX is helpful, especially in regard to vv. 25-26 in Mark.

Mk 2:23-28

23. Kai ἐγένετο αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν παραπορεύεσθαι
diὰ τῶν σπορίμων,
kai οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες
toὺς στάχνας.

24. kai οἱ φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον αὐτῷ:

25. kai λέγει αὐτοῖς:

26. πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀβιαὰρ

27. kai ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς:

28. Ὅστε κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

The solid line (—) designates verbatim verbal contacts, the broken line (-----) inflexional variations. Contacts listed here do not include the verb λέγω.
The majority of verbal contacts of the NT with the OT find themselves in vv. 25-26. Here the manuscript evidence reveals a number of text variants. In v. 25 we find the following variants: (a) an insertion of the pronoun αὐτός after the initial καὶ (RA074:al), (b) the substitutions of the aorist of the verb λέγω (ἐλήμεν) (BRA074:033:pm), and the construction ἀποκρίθης εἶπεν (Θα) for the historic present of the verb λέγω (λέγει), (c) a substitution of the words οὗθει τούτῳ for the adverb οὐδέποτε (W it), and (d) an omission of the words χρεῖαν ἔσχεν καί (sa). The last two variants betray the influence of Lk 6:3, and Mt 12:3 and Lk 6:3 resp. In v. 26 we find even more variants: (a) the omission of the adverb πῶς (BDr't), (b) a substitution of the aorist participle εἰσελθόν (W) of the verb εἰσέρχομαι for the aorist finite verb εἰσῆλθεν, (c) an omission of the definite article τοῦ (C*) before the noun θεοῦ, (d) an omission of the phrase ἐπὶ ... ἀρχιερέως (DW it sy*), (e) an insertion of the article τοῦ (CAθ074αφαλ) before the noun ἀρχιερέως, (f) an omission of the conjunction καί in the second clause in conjunction with relocation of the verb ἔφαγεν (W) before the noun ἀρχιερέως, (g) a substitution of the noun προσθέσεως (D) for the noun προθέσεως, (h) a transposition of the clauses οὗς ... ἱερείς and καί ... οὔσιν (W[DΘ]pc it), (i) a substitution of the dative form of the phrase τοῦς ἱερεύσιν (CRADWΘ074:0133.0135:pm lat) for the accusative τοῦς ἱερεύς, (j) an omission of the conjunction καί in the final clause, (k) and a substitution of the phrases μετ' αὐτοῦ οὔσιν (D) and μετ' αὑτοῦ (Θ). Variant reading 26 (j) betrays influence of Mt 12:5. On the whole, the foregoing variant readings represent stylistic improvements. In this connection, we cite variant 26 (b) in conjunction with variant 26 (f). The variants 26 (k) look to be assimilations to the phrase μετ' αὑτοῦ in v. 25.
On the other hand, the Markan summary conflicts with ἀγαθὸς and δρᾶμα.

Including the phrase οὕτως τὸ ἰδιωτικόν and the verbs ἀποκριθοῦν, we note the following vocabulary: the nouns άλλης, ληφθήκη, and ἄπορος were concerned with the same event. In this connection, we note such as would be virtually unattainable as long as both writers later. Most of the verbal contrasts between the two accounts are account without apparent regard for the style or form of the account. What we encounter in Mk 2:25-26 is a brief summary of the OT.

If contemporary μὴ ἴδητε ἡ ζηλωτὴ γῆς ἡμῶν αὐτοῖς.

6. καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἀργὺς ἀργοῦσιν ἐκ πρὸς τὸ ἀργόν τοῦ ἀργοῦ τοῦ ἄργου.

Hebrew poetry did not differ from the Hebrew poem.

Markings הַשָּׁמֶשׁ הַיָּמִים, הַשָּׁמֶשׁ הַיָּמִים, הַשָּׁמֶשׁ הַיָּמִים, הַשָּׁמֶשׁ הַיָּמִים, הַשָּׁמֶשׁ הַיָּמִים.

In Hebrew ὡς ἔφεσα, ὡς ἔφεσα, ὡς ἔφεσα, ὡς ἔφεσα, ὡς ἔφεσα.

All and the Lord's decree is a mystery of the OT.

5. καὶ δεινότερον πρῶτον πάντα ὡς ἄλλη γῆς ἠλευθερώθη καὶ ἀποκριθήκαν καὶ ἀποκριθήκαν.

Earthly and heavenly, καὶ ἀποκριθήκαν.

In Aριστότελος Γρίφον οἱ μημαχάνεται ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρμάδας ὡς ἄρομα, καὶ τὸν οὐκ οὕτως οὕτως οὐκ ἐφεξήγη οὐκ ἔκρινεν, οὐκ ἔκρινεν οὐκ ἔκρινεν.

4. καὶ Δεινόντα οἱ θεσμοὶ τὸ ἀργὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀργοῦ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀργοῦ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀργοῦ.

Earthly and heavenly, καὶ ἔκρινεν τὸ ἀργὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀργοῦ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀργοῦ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀργοῦ.

3. καὶ λῶς καὶ ἐλευθέρων ὡς ἄρομα, καὶ ἔπεσεν σκότος, σκότος, σκότος, σκότος, σκότος, σκότος, σκότος, σκότος, σκότος, σκότος, σκότος.
Ahimelech, but according to Mk 2:26 that of his son Abiathar. 

Secondly, according to 1 Sam, David approaches the priest with a request for food (v. 1), a request which is granted when the priest gives him the loaves of the Presence (v. 6); according to Mark, David enters the house of God and eats the loaves of the Presence without having consulted the priest beforehand (v. 26).

Thirdly, according to 1 Sam, David comes to the priest unaccompanied (v. 1); according to Mark he acts in company with his supporters (v. 25). Fourthly, the writer of the Marcan account includes a clause to the effect that it was unlawful for anyone other than the priest to eat the bread of the Presence (v. 26); the account of 1 Sam contains no corresponding note.

Fifthly, while David figures prominently both in Mark and in 1 Sam, it is significant that the priest assumes a role equally

---

726 The apparent historical difficulty has troubled readers from the outset. Thus manuscripts D W it sy ^ omit the phrase ἐπὶ Ἁβιαθάρ ἄρχιερεως as do Matthew and Luke. Alternatively manuscripts A C Θ et. al. report the definite article preceding the noun ἄρχιερεως, in which case the phrase would mean "in the days of Abiathar the high priest." Thus the text of Mark, emended in this way, need not imply that Abiathar was high priest at that time (Cranfield, Mark, 116; Taylor, Mark, 217). However, J. W. Wenham has put forward an interesting suggestion based on Marcan usage. That is to say, the phrase ἐπὶ Ἁβιαθάρ ἄρχιερεως could mean "at the passage concerning (or entitled) Abiathar the high priest" (cf. 1 Sam 22:20, 21, 22; 23:6, 9) ("Note: 'MARK 26,'", JTS, n. s., I [1950], 156). Here Wenham draws an analogy with Mk 12:26 wherein the phrase ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλείου means "in the passage about the bush" (RSV). Along consistent lines, Cranfield opines that, "it is perhaps more likely that Jesus himself or possibly Mark mentioned Abiathar as the High Priest particularly associated with David, forgetting that at the time of the incident he was not yet high priest" (Mark, 116; cf. Taylor, Mark, 217). In keeping with the canons of text criticism the proposals of Wenham and Cranfield are such that the reading which occasioned the historical difficulty is left intact. Moreover, the fact that the OT itself manifests some confusion on the respective tenures of Ahimelech and Abiathar adds materially to the probability that "ἐπὶ Ἁβιαθάρ ἄρχιερεως" is the original reading.
important in 1 Sam, but in Mark he merely serves to provide a temporal context, and that the companions of David who receive no mention in 1 Sam are co-actors with him in Mark.

A much abbreviated report of the narrative in 1 Sam 21:1-6, Mk 2:25-26 is best designated an indirect content-paraphrase. At the same time, the Marcan report diverges from the narrative represented at several points.

ii. **Verbal Contact between Mk 2:24 and the Prohibition of Work on the Sabbath**

The reference to the prohibition of work on the sabbath is a bare summary of the fourth commandment of the Decalogue (Ex 20:9-10; Dt 5:13-14). Several restatements of this prohibition appear elsewhere in the Pentateuch (Ex 31:14-15; 35:2-3; Lev 23:3). No obvious attempt to reproduce the style or form of any of these can be established in the Marcan representation. The reference to the OT in Mk 2:24 is thus best designated as indirect content-paraphrase.

iii. **Verbal Contact between Mk 2:26 and Lev 24:9**

The reference to the unlawfulness of the eating of the bread of the Presence by anyone other than the priest is a bare summary of but one stipulation governing the preparation and disposal of a particular burnt offering to the Lord. No obvious attempt to reproduce the style or form of Lev 24:9 can be detected in the Marcan representation. In that case the reference to the OT in Mk 2:26 is best designated as indirect content-paraphrase.
iv. Other Affinity of Mk 2:23-28 with OT Text

V. 27: the sabbath was created for mankind, not vice versa

Dt 5:14b: an excerpt from the fourth commandment, according to which the sabbath is intended as day of rest

cf. Ex 23:12: another version of the statement in Dt 5:14b

C. THE MEANING OF THE NT

i. The First Part of Jesus' Rebuttal: Mk 2:25-26, 28

This controversy dialogue between the scribes and the Pharisees on the one hand, and Jesus on the other, concerns the behaviour not of Jesus, but that of his disciples. As they wend their way through the cornfields, the disciples begin to remove ears for the purpose of eating (v. 23). In and of itself the

---

727 A number of alleged references to the OT have no apparent bearing on our discussion of Mk 2:23-28: v. 23: mention of the fact that the disciples pluck ears and eat them as they wend their way through the cornfields (cf. Dt 23:25: the right to harvest a neighbour's standing corn by hand); and v. 28: the conclusion that the Son of man is Lord of the sabbath (cf. Gen 2:2-3; Ex 20:11: the institution of the sabbath by God).

The occurrence of the verb γυνωματι in v. 27 and Gen 1:1-2:4a LXX (passim) (cf. Jn 1:3 [3x]) could reflect some form of literary relationship with the Priestly Creation Narrative (Gnilka, Markus, I, 123; Pesch, Markus, I, 184). However, the conceptual affinities which have been alleged do not lend a great deal of credence to this conjecture. We note, for example, the divine decree concerning the dominion of mankind over creation (Gen 1:26b, 28; cf. Ps 8:5-8); the creation of mankind before the institution of the sabbath (Gen 1:26-2:4a).

728 Cum Gnilka, Markus, I, 121; Pesch, Markus, I, 180. Evidently this is the way Matthew understands the text: "his disciples were hungry ... " (12:1b). Yet Dewey does reject this reading: "The reason for the plucking of the grain, insofar as it is indicated in the text would appear to make a path for Jesus" (Markan Public Debate, 96).

Thus, "[t]he plucking of grain is not presented as a step in the gathering and preparation of food; nor is the reader told that Jesus or the disciples were in any need or hungry. The relevance of Jesus' answer does not have to do with eating" (ibid., 97).

Dewey's argumentation is anything but compelling. The plucking of ears of grain would hardly form a path through a grainfield, and the plucking of ears thus has to constitute a gathering of food.
action would have presented no problem for the religious authorities. Gathering of food from a neighbour's field for one's immediate consumption was an action expressly permitted according to a stipulation of the Torah itself.\(^{729}\) What constituted the difficulty for the scribes and the Pharisees was an apparent violation of the OT prohibition of work on the sabbath.\(^{730}\) The prohibition of all forms of work on the sabbath notwithstanding, here were the disciples unabashedly performing a work on the sabbath, viz. that of harvesting.\(^{731}\) To make matters worse, their Master appeared to give them approval by his silence. Thus Jesus' opponents address their reproving question:

\[ \text{Ἰδε τί ποιοῦσιν τοῖς σάββασιν ὥς οὐκ ἔξεστιν; (v. 24)} \]

Jesus in his capacity as the Master accepts responsibility

Moreover, the purpose of the gathering of food is to satisfy hunger in the event of a need for sustenance. Barring that, the formation of a path would itself represent the meeting of a need.\(^{729}\) Dt 23:25.


\(^{731}\) Cranfield, Mark, 115; Gnilka, Markus, I, 121-22; Pesch, Markus, I, 181.

Oddly, Taylor writes:

"[I]t appears that the disciples' offence is not that of working or of exceeding a Sabbath's day's journey, but of gathering and eating on the Sabbath" (Mark, 215). We must ask Taylor (a) would "gathering" not constitute a form of harvest; and (b) would an agrarian society such as ancient Israel not have considered harvesting a form of work. Hooker also confuses the issue:

"It is important to realise that the behaviour of the disciples does not necessarily contravene the law: plucking ears of corn is clearly distinguished from reaping in Deut. 23:25, so that it is questionable whether their action could properly be described as 'work'" ("OT in Mark", 225).

This statement is a non sequitur. Compliance with this particular stipulation of the Torah has no direct bearing on the question as to whether or not plucking of ears constitutes work.

The shelling of the kernels which is explicitly mentioned only in Lk 6:1 would have constituted preparation of a meal, thus making the activity of the disciples a double violation of the sabbath (Pesch, Markus, I, 181).
for the action of his disciples.\textsuperscript{732} A sound knowledge of the scriptures on the part of his opponents assumed, Jesus counters them with a rhetorical question:

\begin{quote}
οὐδὲποτε ἀνέγνωτε τι ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ ὅτε χρείαν ἔσχεν καὶ ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ,
πῶς εἰσήλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθὰρ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθεσμίας ἔφαγεν,
οὐς οὐκ ἔφαγεν οἰκεῖον εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἱερεῖς,\textsuperscript{733}
καὶ ἤδωκεν καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ οὐσίν; (νν. 25-26)
\end{quote}

Here the point of correspondence between OT and NT event is a freedom which renders an infringement of the Law possible.\textsuperscript{734} Specifically, the allusion to the unlawful action of David—the eating of the bread of the Presence—when he was in need, serves to justify the complicity of Jesus in the unlawful action of the disciples—the breaking of the sabbath—when they were in need. Yet the freedom which is now exercised by the disciples in regard to one part of the Law presupposes a generalization of the freedom which was earlier exercised by David in regard to another part. This relativizing stance towards the Law which is ascribed to Jesus in vv. 25-26, in other words, does not concern the Law as it is embodied in particular stipulations, but the Jewish Law as a whole.

As noted earlier, Dewey's rhetorical-critical analysis of the Galilaean conflict section (2:1-3:6) has disclosed a chiastic symmetry among its component pericopae. This in itself would suggest a mutual relationship between 2:13-17 and 2:23-28. In this connection, we have already noted two verbal contacts between

\textsuperscript{732}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{733}Lev 24:9.

\textsuperscript{734}Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 122.
the two scenes. Further examination serves to confirm this relationship. Jesus' table-fellowship with reputed sinners (2:15-17) has occasioned v. 27 as his definitive response to the Pharisees' question of v. 16. The matter of Jesus' table-fellowship involves a contravention of rabbinic laws of ritual cleanliness. The matter of David's act of the eating of the bread of the Presence constitutes a violation of Mosaic Law. Both actions constitute illegal eating. Indeed one of the functions of the Davidic reference in vv. 25-26 may well be that of justification of the behaviour of Jesus in v. 15.

The question arises as to wherefrom derives the freedom exercised by David and Jesus—from their persons or from their respective circumstances? Is it a question of overstepping the letter of the Law if urgent need so dictates? Or must we say rather, that just as David as a man of God was authorized to exercise such freedom of action, so also can Jesus in a similar

---

735 See above p. 251 n. 674.
737 Cum Bultmann, HST, 383 suppl. to 16; Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 123; Dewey, Marcan Public Debate, 97; but contra Gnilka, Markus, I, 122; Pesch, Markus, I, 181.

For Gnilka, such an interpretation would be anachronistic and hence eisegetical; that is to say, the pre-eminence of high necessity over the letter of the Law represents a concept "too modern" (see Markus, I 121).

Cranfield writes: "It would be a wrong interpretation to take this to imply that Jesus excused David on the ground that he was compelled by necessity ... Rather, the drift of the argument is that the fact that scripture does not condemn David for his action shows that the rigidity with which the Pharisees interpreted the ritual law was not in accordance with scripture, and so was not a proper understanding of the law itself" (Mark, 115).

The question arises: if the action of David is not condemned in scripture, as appears to be the case, then on what ground does his infringement of the Law escape criticism?
capacity confer a similar freedom on his disciples?\textsuperscript{738} Certainly this interpretation of vv. 25-26 constitutes a statement about Jesus' person. Thus interpreted these verses would carry a definite christological significance.\textsuperscript{739} Yet the foregoing interpretations do not represent two mutually exclusive alternatives.\textsuperscript{740} Moreover, the emphasis of the one interpretation to the exclusion of the other would truncate considerably the hermeneutical potential of vv. 25-26.\textsuperscript{741}

The statement attributed to Jesus in vv. 25-26 bears a christological relevance in and of itself. Just as David as man of God could assume responsibility for adjudicating on matters relating to the observance of one part of the Law, so too could Jesus as man of God assume that same responsibility in regard to another part of the Law. However, the addition of vv. 27-28 serves to amplify the christology implicit in vv. 25-26.\textsuperscript{742} The answer originally ascribed to Jesus, when it is juxtaposed with v. 28, assumes the character of an argument in the form of an a

\textsuperscript{738} Dewey, Markan Public Debate, 97; Gnilka, Markus, I, 122; cf. Pesch, Markus, I, 181: an a minori ad majus conclusion.

\textsuperscript{739} Gnilka, Markus, I, 122.

\textsuperscript{740} So Dewey, Markan Public Debate, 97.

\textsuperscript{741} In either case, "the analogy will hardly work unless Jesus is in some way comparable to David" (so Hooker, "OT in Mark", 225).

\textsuperscript{742} In all likelihood, the intention of the evangelist was to refer the ὡτε-clause of v. 28 to the entire pericope (so Gnilka, Markus, I, 124).

Gnilka has made a statement to the effect that the addition of vv. 27-28 serves to 'underline' (unterstreichen) the christological substance of vv. 25-26 (ibid., 186). In our view, the statement deserves correction insofar as some such verb as "amplify" would have been more appropriate. On the one hand, the christology which is associated with vv. 25-26 appears to be that of being a man of God of the kind that David was. On the other hand, the christology which is associated with v. 28 is that of being the Son of man.
minori ad majus clause. That is to say, David in his capacity as God's chosen one could legitimately overstep the requirements of cultic Law: how much more legitimately could Jesus in his capacity as Son of man\textsuperscript{743} exercise that same authority in connection with the requirements of sabbath-day observance.\textsuperscript{744} This intensification of Jesus' authority over the sabbath law would further legitimate his endorsement of the disciples' action as their Master.

ii. The Second Part of Jesus' Rebuttal: Mk 2:27-28

By means of the connecting formula καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῦς Mark has appended the sayings couplet of vv. 27-28. As was the case in vv. 25-26, so also in v. 27 there is an appeal to the authority of scripture. Whoever may have crafted this verse evidently assumed some knowledge of the Torah on the part of the reader. The claim that the sabbath was created for man and not vice versa may derive its argumentative force from a pair of traditions, viz. the Priestly Creation Story,\textsuperscript{745} and an addendum to the fourth commandment of the Decalogue.\textsuperscript{746} In connection with the creation narrative we note that creation of mankind represents the completion of creation itself, and that the creation of mankind precedes the institution of the sabbath. In connection with addendum to the fourth commandment, we note that the requirements of sabbath-day observance serve to provide a period of rest from

\textsuperscript{743}In view of the pronouncement in v. 10, the reader, will similarly identify Jesus with the Son of man in v. 28. With that, Jesus enjoys authority (ἐξουσία) on earth as Lord (κύριος) (Dewey, Markan Public Debate, 99).

\textsuperscript{744}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{745}Gen 1:1-2:4a.

\textsuperscript{746}Dt 5:14b; cf. Ex 23:12.
labour, and that insofar as they serve to promote the well-being of mankind, thereby they remain subservient to him.\textsuperscript{747} Abolition of sabbath-day observance is not intended, but rather a relativization of it to whatever extent it might compromise the welfare of humanity.\textsuperscript{748}

The concluding statement of v. 28 does not represent a conscious use of scripture tradition. Indeed the presence of the conjunction ὅστε establishes this beyond reasonable doubt.\textsuperscript{749} What we find in vv. 27-28, rather, is an argument in the form of an a minori ad majus clause. That is to say, the requirements of sabbath-day observance are subordinate to humanity insofar as they were instituted so as to promote his well-being: how much more, then, would these requirements be subordinate to Jesus in his capacity as Son of man.\textsuperscript{750} This orientation of the requirements of


\textsuperscript{748}Cf. Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 124; Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 184.

\textsuperscript{749}That is to say, the resultative conjunction ὅστε serves to introduce a logical inference from the preceding statement (\textit{contra} Dewey, \textit{Markan Public Debate}, 99; see Pryke, \textit{Redactional Style}, 115, 116).

At the same time, Pesch detects an allusion to the Priestly Creation Story. According to that account (Gen 1:26, 28; cf. Ps 8:5-8), God granted mankind dominion over all creation. Thus the expression "Son of man" would then have originally represented a circumlocution for "man" (\textit{Markus}, I, 185). The saying would mean, "The sabbath was made for mankind ..." For Gnilka the saying could not represent the \textit{ipsissima verba Jesu} unless we were prepared to 'weaken' the designation "Son of man" to a veiled form of "I" (\textit{Markus}, I, 124). In that case, the saying bears much the same significance insofar as Jesus was a member of the human race. However, within Marcan redactional contexts—and this must include pre-Marcan materials re-interpreted by the evangelist—the noun κύριος means "Lord." Thus the designation "Son of man" would carry a christological significance in v. 28. With that, the logion of v. 28 in Mark's presentation would not constitute an application of OT text. Rather, as Gnilka rightly observes, Jesus is being ascribed an authority normally referred to God (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{750}Cf. Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 219.
sabbath-day observance towards the needs of humanity thus serves to establish the authority of Jesus as Son of man--and of his church--to exercise judgement as to their application or suspension.\textsuperscript{751}

The argument of vv. 27-28 exhibits a significant difference from that of vv. 25-26, 28. Whereas in vv. 27-28 the discussion is confined to the question of sabbath-day observance, the argument in vv. 25-26, 28 proceeds from one aspect of the Law to another. What is articulated in vv. 25-26, (28), therefore, is a position on the Law in general. Jesus' authority and that of the church supersedes the authority of the Jewish Law.\textsuperscript{752}

D. THE MEANING OF THE OT

i. 1 Sam 21:1-6

The story of David's visit in Nob (vv. 1-9) follows the account of the break between him and King Saul (ch. 20). Significantly, no one accompanies David. When he approaches the priest Abimelech and is asked why he is alone (v. 1), David employs the pretext that the king has charged him with a confidential matter, and that he intends to rejoin the "young men" later (v. 2). Thereupon David requests five loaves of bread or whatever else might be available (v. 3). After a brief exchange between the two men (vv. 4-5), the priest gives David the bread of the Presence as there was no "common" bread on hand (v. 6).

ii. The Prohibition of Work on the Sabbath

The prohibition of work on the sabbath is recorded a number

\textsuperscript{751}Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 124.
\textsuperscript{752}Cf. Best, \textit{Gospel as Story}, 64, 80, 139; idem., \textit{Markan Soteriology}, 164, 167.
of times in the OT. Both versions of the Decalogue include it as the fourth commandment. In the version of the Decalogue reported in Ex 20 the prohibition (vv. 9-10) is brought into relation with the Priestly Creation Story (v. 11; cf. Gen 2:2-3). The same holds true for the restatement of it in Ex 31:14-15 (v. 17). In the version of the Decalogue reported in Dt 5 the prohibition (vv. 13-14) is brought into relationship with the crossing of the Red Sea (v. 15; cf. Ex 14). The two remaining statements of the prohibition of work on the sabbath (Ex 35:2-3; Lev 23:3) stand near the beginnings of the instructions regarding the establishment of the cult (Ex 35-40) and the sacred calendar (Lev 23:1-44).

iii. Lev 24:9

The prohibition of the eating of the bread of the Presence is one of a group of various priestly laws reported in Lev 24:1-23. Yet the story in 1 Sam 21:1-6 betrays no knowledge of it. Could the material of 1 Sam 21:1-6 antedate that of Lev 23:3?753

iv. The Sabbath was Created for Mankind, not Vice Versa

The statement about the purpose of the sabbath (Mk 2:27) is a possible inference from a principle stated twice in the OT. Both the addendum to the fourth commandment of the Decalogue (Dt 5:7-21) in Dt 5:14b and the restatement of it within the context of the cultic calendar (Ex 23:10-19) in Ex 23:12 serve to define the rationale behind sabbath-day observance in terms of providing a time of rest for mankind as well as domestic animals.

753 So Taylor, Mark, 217.
E. SCRIPTURE-HERMENEUTIC IN MK 2:23-28

i. **Mk 2:23-26, 28**

The precipitating factor in the controversy dialogue of Mk 2:23-28 is an alleged contravention of the OT prohibition of work on the sabbath. Evidently plucking ears in a field of standing corn represents a work of harvest for the scribes and Pharisees. Insofar as the disciples performed such an activity on the sabbath, they are violating a statute which appears a number of times in the Law of Moses. The opponents of Jesus as they are depicted in v. 24 call attention to the illegality of the disciples' behaviour. To this extent, therefore, the objection is a *factual representation of an OT injunction*.

The rebuttal offered by Jesus, like the accusation directed at his disciples, contains a *factual representation of an OT injunction*. No one but the priests were permitted to eat the bread of the Presence. Yet David in a time of food shortage does so, and encourages his *entourage* to do likewise.⁷⁵⁴ Significantly, the behaviour of David did not invite the criticism of subsequent generations. An ostensibly *factual representation of an OT event* thus affords a convenient *analogy* whereby Jesus proceeds to justify the behaviour of his disciples (as representatives of the church). The point of correspondence between OT and NT event is the freedom of action exercised with respect to the Jewish Law. However, the tradition-historical context within which we examine Mk 2:23-26 will determine the principles which undergird that freedom. On the one hand, the text represents a pre-Marcan

composition. In that case, the legitimacy of overstepping the requirements of the Law finds its source in two underlying principles, viz. the self-evident necessity associated with the respective situations with which Jesus and David are confronted, as well as the prerogatives enjoyed by these two figures as men of God. On the other hand, the evangelist has so situated Mk 2:23-26 that he intends these verses to be interpreted in light of the ως-clause of v. 28. In this case, the correspondence between Jesus and David assumes an additional element of prefigurement. The prerogative of overstepping the Law which David assumed as man of God, typifies and foreshadows that same prerogative which Jesus all the more legitimately assumes as the one who is greater than David (cf. 12:35-37). This amplified christology effected by the appending of v. 28 to the original controversy dialogue of vv. 23-26 serves to fortify the theological underpinning of the church's relativizing position with regard to sabbath-day observance. An analogical reading of 1 Sam 21:1-6 has thus come to be a typological reading of it.\textsuperscript{755}

\textsuperscript{755}Cf. Pesch who detects a typological correspondence between David and Jesus in the extant text; however, he offers no opinions as regards vv. 25-26 prior to the addition of vv. 27-28 (Markus, I, 183).

The interpretation of Mk 2:23-26, 28 which Burkill offers is a typological reading of the OT overlaid with Christian allegory. The conduct of the disciples in plucking (and eating) the ears of corn prefigures the great sabbath day of the messianic epoch when the old sabbath has been replaced. The ears of corn represent the eschatological and eucharistic bread, and David as prototype of the Messiah, performs an action which anticipates the Christian communion. The Pharisees miss the point (Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 134 n. 37). The treatment of the miraculous feedings provided by Mark would certainly render thinking along such lines on his part possible (see above ch. 2 p. 216 n. 570). Nevertheless, it would be something of an overstatement to say that the passage in question "is not really a legalistic dispute" (see Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 134 n. 37). On the contrary,
A comparison of Mk 2:25-26 and I Sam 21:1-6 serves to reveal a pair of significant divergences. In I Sam 21 we read that (a) David approaches the priest unaccompanied and requests five loaves of bread or whatever other food might be available (vv. 1, 3); and (b) the priest gives David the loaves of the Presence (v. 6). By contrast, in Mk 2:25-26 we read that (a) David enters the temple with his companions and eats the bread of the Presence; and (b) David also gives this bread to his companions. What we find thrown into relief in the Marcan account are two features which are noticeably lacking in I Sam 21:1-6. These are the responsibility of David for the infringement of the law concerning who may eat the bread of the Presence, as well as the culpability of his companions to the extent that they are active participants with him. The degree of freedom with which the narrative of I Sam 21:1-6 is represented in Mk 2:25-26, betrays a conscious effort to enhance the degree of correspondence between a contemporary event from the life of Jesus and an earlier one from the life of David which is intended to furnish an analogy to the former.

The prominent role assigned the disciples in the text of Mk 2:23-26 reflects a debate within the early church relating to the question of sabbath-day observance. Just as words representing those who adopt the more liberal stance (vv. 25-26) are placed on the lips of Jesus, so also are the words representing the more conservative stance (v. 24) placed on the

the question addressed Jesus in v. 24 as well as his rebuttal in vv. 25-26 make it abundantly clear that the dispute does in fact centre on the Law.

756 Gnilka, Markus, I, 181-82.
lips of the Jewish religious authorities. The Jews, no less than Jesus constitute a rhetorical device whose purpose is none other than that of articulating a particular theological viewpoint. Clearly the church has cited scripture against the "Jewish" position, but we cannot say that she has done so in an aggressive or hostile way. No counter-attack on the "Jewish" authorities or the position they represent takes place as we see, for example in the inflammatory rejoinder of 7:6-7. On the contrary, the rhetorical question posed by "Jesus" serves to invite further discussion with his "Jewish" opponents by way of an appeal to their knowledge of the scriptures. Indeed the argument is a relatively dispassionate one at the pre-Marcan level and has retained this character in its present Marcan context.

ii. Mk 2:27-28

The appending of vv. 27-28 to the original controversy dialogue of vv. 23-26 signals the second stage in the rebuttal mounted by Jesus. As we observed in our investigation of the first stage, an amplification of the christology implicit in vv. 25-26 results when these verses are understood in light of v. 28. Within the context of vv. 27-28, however, the ἡσυχ-clause serves yet another function. The proposition that sabbath-day observance is subservient to the needs of mankind (v. 27) is an inference which may be drawn from statements which appear in the Torah, and forms the basis of the further inference that Jesus as Son of man is not only Lord of humanity, but Lord of the sabbath as well (v. 28). This implicit application of scriptural

757 Cranfield, Mark, 117.
principle is best designated a *typological reading of the OT*. Attendance to human need takes precedence over, is in fact the very *raison d'être* of, sabbath-day observance. How much more, then, should the authority of Jesus as Son of man take precedence over that of the law which relates to observance of the sabbath. Here the priority of mankind over the sabbath prefigures the priority of Jesus over the sabbath, a priority which consists in his authority to adjudicate as to if and when sabbath-day observance is applicable (vv. 25-26).

Here again, the appending of additional material --vv. 27-28-- to the original controversy dialogue of vv. 23-26 serves to fortify the theological underpinning of the church's relativizing position with regard to sabbath-day observance. Here again, the church has cited scripture against the "Jewish" position, but we cannot say that she has done so in an aggressive or hostile way. Rather the entire argument of 2:23-28 possesses something of an academic character. Nonetheless, this first sabbath-day controversy has become a vehicle for the rejection of the Law. On the one hand, Mk 2:23-26 with its use of indirect content-paraphrase in the reference to 1 Sam 21:1-6 (vv. 25-26) could still find its original milieu within the parameters of acceptable Jewish debate. The small likelihood of any broad agreement between Christians and Jews notwithstanding, the two parties conceivably could have reached some measure of agreement at this stage even. On the other hand, Mk 2:27-28 is a genuinely christological statement. Here Jesus is accorded an authority above the Law. Christianity and Judaism now find their differences quite irreconcilable. The Father of Jesus Christ is
no longer the Giver of the Law. With that, the Palestinian church under fire from her Jewish critics could scarcely represent the context of the extant controversy over sabbath-day observance.\textsuperscript{758}

\textsuperscript{758}Contra Hultgren, \textit{Jesus and Adversaries}, 114.
3.2 The Tradition of the Elders - Mk 7:1-23

A. TRADITION-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Evidently, all of Mk 7:1-23 is intended to be considered a single section.759 First of all, the section exhibits unity in terms of theme. On the one hand, the initial sub-section and the middle sub-section both involve the subject of the tradition of the elders.760 On the other, the initial sub-section and the final sub-section each involve perspectives on the subject of uncleanness.761 Moreover, vv. 1-23 follow a logical progression. A delegation of the Pharisees with some scribes from Jerusalem question Jesus on the behaviour of his disciples. On this occasion, they do not wash hands before eating: "Why do your disciples not live [lit. 'walk'] according to the tradition of the elders (ἡ παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων), but eat with hands defiled (κοινός)?" (v. 5). With that, Jesus proceeds to refute his accusers forthwith. In this connection, he denounces them with his application of an indictment from Isaiah (vv. 6-7). His illustration of the Corban practice represents the corroborating evidence of his counter-charge (vv. 9-13). Secondly, Jesus' public utterance of a parabolic saying serves to define 'just what defiles a man' in his view (vv. 14-15). In private, Jesus, as always, has to elucidate the saying for the disciples (vv. 17-23).762

759 Cranfield, Mark, 230.
760 In this case, vv. 6-8 and 9-13 would constitute mutually dependent segments of Jesus' answer to his opponents' question (v. 5). However, Pesch does not extend unity beyond v. 13 (Markus, I, 368-69).
762 Ibid., 278-79.
Inquiries into the tradition-history of Mk 7:1-13 have yielded a variety of results from scholarly authorities. Jesus' attitude toward the oral tradition (halacha) of contemporary Judaism would, in Pesch's view, represent an historically reliable datum. The parentheses of vv. 2 (τοῦτ' ἡστιν ἁνίπτους) and 3-4 (in toto) would, of course, represent secondary, perhaps pre-Marcan accretions to the original account. Indeed Pesch adduces textual evidences in support of his position. The lines of evidence cited include the specification of the concrete circumstances of the dispute, as well as the occurrence of divers technical terminology throughout the passage. Concrete circumstances of the dispute comprise the information about the antagonists (Pharisees with some scribes from Jerusalem [v. 1]), the relatively unimportant occasion (some of Jesus' disciples do not wash their hands before eating [v. 2]), and the presupposition of halachic prescriptions in the question of Jesus' opponents (v. 5) and in the corroborating example in Jesus' counter-charge to the former.

The verb κολύω and the cognate adjective κολύς are theme words (vv. 2, 5, 15 [2x], 18, 20, 23) (ibid., 278; Cranfield, Mark, 232). Less prominent, but nonetheless a significant point of contact is the noun χαρδία in the citation from Is 29:13 (LXX) (v. 6) and in the explanation of the parabolic saying of v. 15 (vv. 18b-19a) (see Pesch, Markus, I, 373).

Yet the appending of vv. 14-23 exerts something of a strain on the unity of the passage. On the one hand, the point of departure for discussion reported in vv. 1-8 (and expanded by way of example in vv. 9-13) is the question of what renders a person ceremonially unclean, in this case the failure or refusal to wash one's hands before eating. On the other hand, the section comprising vv. 14-23 concerns supposedly unclean food --vv. 15, 18-19a (cf. Bultmann, HST, 17)--and its relation to inward "cleanliness" or lack thereof. As Bultmann has noted, Mark tends to expand apophthegms with such additions (ibid., 17).

763 Pesch, Markus, I, 375.
764 Ibid., 368.
Technical terminology in a discussion of this kind would include such words as περιπατέω, παράδοσις, παραδίδωμι and παραλαμβάνω.

Pesch's argument evidences two weaknesses. On the one hand, the use of the connecting formula καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς is a stylistic feature of Mark's gospel. In all probability, its presence in the account does not signal an original development in the argument, but a redactional seam. On the other hand, the specification of the concrete circumstances of the debate, and the use of appropriate terminology would certainly lend an impression of historicity to the account, but the impression itself could signal a secondary manipulation with a view to verisimilar account. Further to this, we have already made two significant observations: (a) the identification of the Pharisees and scribes as Jesus' opponents is a later development in the synoptic tradition; and (b) the criticism of the behaviour of the disciples as the point at issue implies a Sitz im Leben der

---

765 See ibid., 375, cf. 368-69.
766 Ibid., 375; cf. Taylor, Mark, 336.
767 See above ch. 1 p. 67.
768 So Pesch, Markus, I, 368.
769 See above p. 255 n. 693.
Kirche. 770

Taylor's proposed reconstruction of 7:1-8 in its original form involves a significant degree of paring-down of the extant text. Its earliest version comprised vv. 1-2 and 5-8. In vv. 6-7 the citation of Is 29:13 would have assumed a non-Septuagintal morphology. The reconstructed text would, for Taylor, possess considerable historical value. 771 Taylor in his considered judgement would likewise invest vv. 9-13 with considerable historical value. In this case, however, he has to take much less liberty with the extant text. His sole proposed reconstruction is to substitute a non-Septuagintal form of Ex 21:16 in v. 10 for the

---

770 Cum Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 143 n. 86.
See above p. 254.

Certainly tractate Nedarim of the Mishnah knows the scenario described by Jesus. We note Ned V, 6. A son in this case has withheld benefit of his property from his father by means of a vow. Somewhat later, however, the son wishes to invite his father to the wedding of the grandson of the latter. Unfortunately, the father would have nothing to eat. Consequently, the son attempts to rectify this awkward situation through an abortive ruse. On this occasion, the sages hold the son to his vow (our citations from the Mishnah in this dissertation represent The Mishnah, translated from the Hebrew, with introduction and brief explanatory notes by Herbert Danby [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933]).

The criticism of the Corban practice levelled in vv. 9-13 may thus be an authentic reminiscence from the life of Jesus (so Pesch, Markus, I, 375). Yet the fact that evidence from the Mishnah is not dated (and not readily datable) demands that we exercise more caution in the use of such evidence than is apparent in Pesch's references. Says Forestell:

"The use of rabbinic literature for this purpose [viz. that of obtaining 'a better understanding of Jewish exegesis at the time of Christ'] has always been precarious; for although much of rabbinic teaching was early in origin, it was not committed to writing prior to the third century of the Christian era" (Targumic Traditions, 2; sim. Taylor, Mark, 342).

At the same time, the traditions preserved in rabbinic literature would have to have shared a certain measure of common ground with those current in the first century A.D. For that reason, we err to reckon such evidence totally irrelevant.

771 Ibid., 334.
Unlike Pesch, Taylor, does not associate vv. 1-2, 5-8 and vv. 9-13 with the same event. Instead the connecting formula καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς (v. 9) would indicate one of two possibilities as to the origin of vv. 9-13: part of a scene parallel to vv. 1-8 or an excerpt from a sayings tradition. Nonetheless, the verses in question for both scholars reflect Jesus' attitude toward the oral tradition of contemporary Judaism. Thus Taylor's proposed tradition-history encounters difficulties of the same kind as Pesch's.

Bultmann's ascription of the component materials of Mk 7:1-23 to the creative genius of early Christianity would, in Gnilka's estimation, afford a more convincing reconstruction of the tradition-history of the present passage. The basic component is that of vv. 1-8. A polemic against the Pharisees and the scribes, this sub-section first of all contains a reference to OT prophecy (vv. 6-7 = Is 29:13) in support of Jesus' counter-charge of hypocrisy against the critics of his disciples. Presumably, appeals to Holy Writ would require some degree of reflection. Secondly, the question of the Pharisees and the scribes (v. 5) does not concern the behaviour of Jesus, but that of his disciples (v. 2). Finally, the relation of the oral tradition to the Law

---

772 Ibid., 339.
773 Ibid., 339-40.
775 Bultmann, *HST*, 17.
776 Ibid.
777 See above p. 254. According to the report of Lk 11:37-38 it is not the disciples, but Jesus who does not wash hands before eating.

Unlike Bultmann, however, Gnilka maintains the authenticity of vv. 1-8. He argues: (a) the relaxation of Jewish cleanliness
had allegedly been a living issue among the Palestinian Christians. Accordingly, Bultmann ascribes this first sub-section to the Palestinian church.\footnote{HST, 18; but cf. Gnilka, Markus, I, 277: the LXX quotation (vv. 6-7) suggests a Hellenistic Jewish-Christian community; presumably Gnilka would apply the same consideration in connection with the second sub-section.}

Similarly, vv. 9-13 are considered community polemic. Once again, this second sub-section concerns the relation of oral tradition to the Law. Once again, references to the OT in v. 10 (Ex 20:12/Dt 5:16 and Ex 21:16) assume a key role in Jesus' counter-charge against his religious critics. Furthermore, the argument itself does not presuppose any specific challenge.\footnote{Bultmann, HST, 17.} On this basis, Bultmann would also ascribe vv. 9-13 to the church in Palestine.\footnote{See ibid., 17-18, cf. 49.}

At first glance, lexical and idiomatic considerations appear to confirm the Palestinian origin for the first sub-section (vv. 1-8). Firstly, use of hyperbaton\footnote{That is to say, a "displacement of the subject or object of a subordinate clause so that it becomes the subject or object of another clause, usually the main clause" (Cranfield, Mark, 231).} in v. 2--ιδόντες τινάκτις ... δει ... ἐσθίουσιν--is a grammatical feature more typical of Aramaic writers than Greek writers.\footnote{Ibid., 231-32.} The Semitic cast of this

rules attributed to Jesus is consistent with his table-fellowship with the common people; and (b) the critical stance in regard to the Torah adopted by Jesus could have provided the occasion for the legal proceedings against him by the Jewish authorities (Markus, I, 286).
construction gains further support in the expression ἔσθω τοῦς ἄρτους.\textsuperscript{783} Again, the use of the adjective κοινός in v. 2 "shows knowledge of ... fine points of rabbinical law."\textsuperscript{784} Finally, use of the verb περιπατέω ("walk") in connection with a person's life-style in v. 5 or its cognates represents Jewish metaphorical idiom.\textsuperscript{785}

Indeed, a Palestinian provenence for the first sub-section seems to find a certain degree of support in the Q, M and L tradition. Firstly, castigation of Jesus' designated opponents on account of the alleged superficiality of their piety in vv. 1-8 receives no less emphasis in the Q tradition. The religious authorities in Mt 23:25-26/Lk 11:39-41 attend details of external cleansing ritual, but ignore matters of more profound significance. Again labelling of the Pharisees and the scribes as "hypocrites" in 23:13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29 (cf. the special Lucan tradition 13:10-17: the ruler of the synagogue and the others in the synagogue are labelled "hypocrites") in the special Matthaean material reflects that in v. 6.\textsuperscript{786} This multiple attestation of this unfavourable assessment of the Jewish authorities would not establish a Palestinian provenance of such an assessment feature, but perhaps its early appearance.

The Semitic features in the first sub-section bespeak a Palestinian influence on its component materials. Even so, the

\textsuperscript{783}Ibid., 232.
\textsuperscript{784}See M. Smith, "Comments on Taylor", 37.
\textsuperscript{785}So Cranfield, Mark, 235; Gnilka, Markus, I, 282; Taylor, Mark, 336. Here cognate forms may serve the same function.
\textsuperscript{786}Cf. Pesch, Markus, I, 376.
presence of such features does not establish Palestinian provenance beyond reasonable doubt. Among other possibilities, we have to entertain that of later Judaizing of the tradition in the interests of verisimilitude.\textsuperscript{787}

One positive indication of the Hellenistic pedigree of the first sub-section (vv. 1-8) is the argumentation on the basis of OT scripture (vv. 6-7 = Is 29:13). Such a feature does, generally speaking, characterize Hellenistic controversy dialogues. By contrast, controversy dialogues of Palestinian vintage make their appeals to the conduct and attitude of Jesus himself.\textsuperscript{788} The same observation finds equally valid application in the second sub-section (vv. 9-13).

Yet another indication of the non-Palestinian origin of the first sub-section is the demonstrable use of an OT citation from the LXX version. The occurrence of direct references to the Greek version of the Isaiah citation in other literature of Greek-speaking communities is a certain indication of its currency within non-Palestinian Hellenistic Christendom.\textsuperscript{789} As above, the same consideration finds equally valid application as to the LXX form of the OT citations of the second sub-section (v. 10).

Finally, solid evidence exists to connect the observance of

\textsuperscript{787}See above ch. 1 p. 45 incl. n. 88 (onto p. 46).
\textsuperscript{788}Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 178-79.
\textsuperscript{789}See ibid., 117-18.

Interestingly, v. 8 as the exegetical inference from the Isaiah citation of vv. 6-7 would, for Hultgren, find its scriptural basis in the Greek version at the point of its lexical divergence from the Hebrew text. As corroborative evidence, he notes the verbal contacts of v. 8 with the LXX version. Yet the OT reference could just as well derive its argumentative force from the Hebrew text (\textit{cum} Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 373; see also Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 337-38).
ritual hand-washing with the Jews of first-century Palestine. However, the Jews of the Diaspora would have encountered so-called 'Gentile impurity' on a daily basis. Consequently, the latter would have to have developed their hand-washing regulations before their Palestinian counterparts.  

Indeed the Marcan representation of the Corban practice raises two serious difficulties for Bultmann's assignment of Palestinian provenance to the second sub-section. First of all, Mark's report contradicts the evidence of tractate Nedarim. In IX, 4 we observe the following ruling:

Moreover R. Meir said: They may open the way by reason of what is written in the Law, and say to him, 'Hadst thou known that thou wouldst transgress the command Thou shalt not take vengeance, or Thou shalt not bear any grudge, or Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart, or Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, or That thy brother may live with thee, [wouldst thou then have made thy vow?] --perchance he may grow poor and then thou wilt be unable to succour him'. If he said, 'Had I known that this was so, I had not made my vow', then he may be released from his vow.

On no account, therefore, does a vow as an impediment to the fulfilment of the Law represent a binding obligation. In point of fact, R. Eliezer explicitly applies this same judgement to the fulfilment of a vow at the expense of one's compliance with the Fifth Commandment. Thus Ned IX, 1 reads:

R. Eliezer says: They may open for men the way [to repentance] by reason of the honour due to father and mother. But the Sages forbid it. R. Zadok said: Rather than open the way for a man by reason of the honour due to father and mother, they should open the way for him by reason of the honour due to God; but if so, there could be no vows. But the Sages agree with R. Eliezer that in a matter between a man and his father and mother, the way may be opened to him by reason of the honour due to his father and mother.

---

790 Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 118. Further to this see also pp. 142-43 n. 85.
Moreover, the Marcan report of the Corban practice may not afford an accurate picture of the Jewish practice.\textsuperscript{791} A Palestinian milieu could scarcely engender such portrayal. Certainly the writing of Mark's gospel does antedate the compilation of the Mishnah. Moreover, R. Eliezer did liberalize application of Pharisaic discipline in the aftermath of the destruction of A.D. 70.\textsuperscript{792} Nonetheless, R. Eliezer, as Jacob Neusner says, was "an important representative of the old Pharisaism,"\textsuperscript{793} and for that reason we might reasonably expect substantial continuity with earlier policy.

Secondly, the charge of rejection of the commandment in favour of "your tradition" (vv. 9, 13) would still signal a misrepresentation of the Corban practice in the absence of the foregoing testimony of tractate Nedarim. This Jewish institution

\textsuperscript{791}Contra Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 375; Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 284.

Evidently, the authorities of tractate Nedarim could render different verdicts in similar cases. One such case is that of Ned V, 6 (see above p. 287 n. 770). Pesch rightly describes a "muddled state of affairs" on the matter. Yet this in itself tends to weaken the credibility of Mark's portrayal. Pesch's resolution to this uncertainly is to assign the liberal view of Ned IX, 1 and 4 to a later date (cf. Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 342: this view possibly later). However, no conclusive evidence exists to justify Pesch's judgement (cf. Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 237).

The Marcan report of the Corban practice does not reflect this variance of opinion among first-century Pharisees. To this extent, we cannot endorse Jacob Neusner's optimistic assessment of the accuracy of the synoptic accounts: "Since the materials now found in the synoptics were available in Palestine between [A.D.] 70 and 90, ... they may be presumed accurately to portray the situation of the time, because their picture had to be credible to Christians of the period" ("'Pharisaic-Rabbinic' Judaism", in idem., \textit{Early Rabbinic Judaism: Historical Studies in Religion, Literature, and Art}, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, Vol. XIII [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975], 64-65).

\textsuperscript{792}See ibid., 59-62.

\textsuperscript{793}Ibid., 65, sim. 61, 64.
finds support in the legislation of Num 30:2.\textsuperscript{794} A Palestinian community would surely take cognizance of this.

Clearly Marcan interference manifests itself throughout 7:1-13. The most obvious redactional cue in either of these two sub-sections is the telltale occurrence in v. 9 of a favourite Marcan construction: the connecting formula καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς.\textsuperscript{795} Indeed Mark employs it liberally.\textsuperscript{796} Here it serves to link vv. 1-8 with 9-13. Jesus' counter-charge against his accusers is that of accordance of a precedence over the "commandment of God" to the "tradition [of the elders]" (v. 8). Thereupon Jesus proceeds to cite the Corban practice as a corroborating example (vv. 9-13a).\textsuperscript{797}

The remaining redactional materials would first of all comprise the three parenthetical remarks. No doubt, their purpose is to clarify various relevant points of Jewish ritual for an uninformed readership. These would include: (a) a definition of

\textsuperscript{794}Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 238; Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 284; Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 375; Hooker, "OT in Mk", 221: Dt 23:21-23 also cited.
\textsuperscript{795}Cum Best, \textit{Markan Soteriology}, 79 (presumably); Bultmann, \textit{HST}, 17; Pryke, \textit{Redactional Style}, 129-30; contra Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 374: various layers of the tradition report this formula.
\textsuperscript{796}See ch. 1 p. 67.
\textsuperscript{797}So Bultmann, \textit{HST}, 17, cf. 329-30; Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 277; Pryke, \textit{Redactional Style}, 129-30; Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 339; contra Pesch who argues that the connecting formula represents the \textit{ipsissima verba} Jesu (\textit{Markus}, I, 368). As Gnilka has correctly observed, the \textit{Stichwort} παράδοσις has facilitated the fusion of vv. 1-8 and 9-13 (\textit{Markus}, I, 277). His further suggestion that v. 8 is a redactional link (ibid.), less certain though it may be, does nevertheless find support in Pesch's observation that vv. 9-13 amplify it (\textit{Markus}, I, 374). Moreover, the noun παράδοσις in v. 8 anticipates the leading \textit{Stichwort} of vv. 9-13--παράδοσις (vv. 9, 13) (cf. ibid., 371). In other words, the evangelist may have fashioned a redactional "peg" on which to fasten vv. 9-13.
the adjective Κωνώς (v. 2);⁷⁹⁸ (b) a description of Jewish ceremonial cleansing rites (vv. 3-4);⁷⁹⁹ and (c) a definition of the term "Corban" (v. 11).⁸⁰⁰

Secondly, the first and second sub-sections report the generalizing statements of vv. 8 and 13b resp. The second looks to be yet another Marcan editorial comment.⁸⁰¹

Whether or not Mark is responsible for the morphology of the various citations from the OT is not certain.⁸⁰² The version of

⁷⁹⁸ Gnilka, Markus, I, 277; Cranfield, Mark, 232; Pryke, Redactional Style, 49-50; Taylor, Mark, 335.

⁷⁹⁹ Best, Gospel as Story, 53; idem., Markan Soteriology, 79; Cranfield, Mark, 232, 234; Gnilka, Markus, I, 277, 280; Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 116; Pesch, Markus, I, 371; Pryke, Redactional Style, 49-50; Taylor, Mark, 335; cf. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 117 n. 1. Taylor argues a Marcan predilection for the verb κρατέω and the noun παράδοσις (Mark, 335). Pryke corroborates this, identifying 9 of 15 occurrences of the former and 3 of 5 of the latter in Mark's gospel as redactional (Redactional Style, 137). Pryke (ibid., 127-35), Best (Gospel as Story, 11) and Taylor (Mark, 335) agree that explanatory clauses introduced by the conjunction γάρ accord with Mark's style.

⁸⁰⁰ Cranfield, Mark, 237; Gnilka, Markus, I, 277; Taylor, Mark, 340. The occurrence of the clause gives rise to an anacoluthon (no apodosis follows the protasis), a Marcan stylistic feature (ibid.).

Pryke also considers the scripture quotation in vv. 6-7 (Is 29:13) with its introductory formula a parenthetical remark (Redactional Style, 38 incl. n. 38, 49-50, 61). However, the reference to the OT assumes an important role in the main argument. With that, we do not consider these verses "parenthetic."⁸⁰¹

⁸⁰¹ Gnilka, Markus, I, 277.

The original transmission of v. 8 as a "free-floating logion" (Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 142 n. 80, 144 n. 98) is a problematic hypothesis in view of Hultgren's acknowledgement of the dependence of it on the preceding scripture-reference (ibid., 117). Moreover, the logion (παράδοσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων [v. 8, cf. v. 7: ἐνταλμα ἀνθρώπων]) facilitates the transition from the first sub-section (παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων [v. 5]) to the second (παράδοσις ὕμων [vv. 9, 13a]). This in itself suggests Marcan redactional work (Gnilka, Markus, I, 277). Furthermore, the logion is a generalizing conclusion.

⁸⁰² Undoubtedly, Col 2:22 does manifest significant verbal contact
Is 29:13 cited in vv. 6-7 (largely Septuagintal), for example, contains some nine words which are infrequent in Mark. As always, we must apply statistics cautiously. One of the nine words listed by Taylor is the noun διδασκαλία. However, the verb διδάσκω and its cognates tend to occur in Marcan seams.

A number of instances of structural duality indicate redactional interference in both sub-sections. In the first, we note the following: compound verb before corresponding preposition, verbal form with cognate accusative or dative, double participle, negative-positive double statement (5x), general and special double statement, double statement with repetition of a motif, complementary statement with an

with the last clause of the Marcan citation in the words ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Nonetheless, a comparison of the Colossian reading with the LXX would, in our assessment, manifest a similar degree of verbal contact (see below pp. 310-11). Thus we see no need whatsoever for Taylor's "florilegium of Old Testament prophesies" as an explanation for these NT readings (Mark, 337).

803 Ibid.

804 Best, Markan Soteriology, 71-72. The occurrences of the verb διδάσκω alone in Mark's gospel number 17, 15 of which are found in redactional material (Pryke, Marcan Redaction, 136).

805 V. 6: ἀπέχω ἀπ' (Neirynck, Duality in Mark. 75).

806 V. 7: διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας (ibid., 76).

807 διδάσκοντες (v. 7)/ἀφέντες (v. 8) (ibid., 83).

808 A. Negative clause before εἰ μὴ or ἐὰν μὴ:

v. 3: ἐὰν μὴ πυγμή νυσσοῦται τὰς χείρας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν;

v. 4: ἐὰν μὴ παντίσονται οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν (ibid., 89).

B. οὐκ ... ἄλλα and allied constructions:

v. 2: κοιναίς χερσίν, τούτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτος;

v. 5: οὐ περιπατοῦσιν ... κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν

πρεσβυτέρων, ἄλλα κοιναίς χερσίν ἐσθίουσιν τῶν ἄρτον;

v. 8: ἀφέντες τὴν ἑντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ, κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν

τῶν ἀνθρώπων (ibid., 91).

809 V. 3: οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι (ibid., 96).

810 ἐὰν μὴ πυγμὴ νύσσονται τὰς χείρας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν (v. 3)/

ἐὰν μὴ παντίσονται οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν (v. 4) (ibid., 98).
accusative,\textsuperscript{811} translation,\textsuperscript{812} apposition after substantive,\textsuperscript{813} doubling of groups of persons (3x),\textsuperscript{814} qualifying verb as preface to direct discourse,\textsuperscript{815} quotation with comment,\textsuperscript{816} parallelism in sayings,\textsuperscript{817} multiple cognate verbs.\textsuperscript{818}

In the second sub-section, identifiable instances of Markan duality include: verbal form with cognate accusative or dative (2x),\textsuperscript{819} repetition of antecedent (2x),\textsuperscript{820} double negative,\textsuperscript{821}

\textsuperscript{811} V. 2: ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ κοιναῖς χερσίν ... ἔσθιον τοὺς ἄρτους (ibid., 101).

\textsuperscript{812} V. 2: κοιναῖς χερσίν, τούτων ἔστιν ἀνύπτος (ibid., 106).

\textsuperscript{813} V. 1: οἱ φαρισαῖοι καὶ τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων ἔλθοντες ἀπὸ Ἰεροσολύμων (ibid., 107).

\textsuperscript{814} V. 1: see preceding note, cf. 2:16; v. 3: see above p. 296 n. 809; v. 5: οἱ φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς (ibid., 109).

\textsuperscript{815} V. 6: καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἰησοῦς περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται ὅτι οὗτος ὁ λαός τοῖς χείλεσιν με τιμᾷ (ibid., 123).

\textsuperscript{816} διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων (v. 7)/ ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων (v. 8) (ibid., 124).

\textsuperscript{817} Antithetic parallelism:

v. 8: see above p. 296 n. 808 (ibid., 134).

\textsuperscript{818} Vv. 3, 4, 8: κρατέω (ibid., 237).

In addition, Neirynck reports one example of exposition and discourse (vv. 2, 5) (ibid., 115), but here we would regard the duality as a requirement of the narrative. The antithetic parallelisms in vv. 6 and 7 (ibid., 134) are both part of a reference to the OT, and therefore we do not attribute them to Mark.

\textsuperscript{819} V. 10: θανάτῳ τελευτάω;

v. 13: τῇ παραδόσει ... ἡ παραδώκατε (ibid., 76).

\textsuperscript{820} V. 10: σου (cf. v. 10: σου);


\textsuperscript{821} V. 12: οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτοῦ οὐδὲν ποιήσαι ... (ibid., 88).
negative-positive double statement (2x),\textsuperscript{822} translation,\textsuperscript{823} doubling of groups of persons,\textsuperscript{824} quotation and comment,\textsuperscript{825} parallelism in sayings (4x).\textsuperscript{826}

Form-critically, scholarly authorities have classified vv. 1-13, in whole or part thereof, as a controversy dialogue\textsuperscript{827} or a pronouncement-story.\textsuperscript{828} A useful classification of genre within

\textsuperscript{822}οὐκ ... ἀλλά and allied constructions:
v. 9: καλὸς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ,
ἐνα τὴν παράδοσιν ύμῶν τηρήσατε;
v. 13: ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ
τῇ παράδοσει ύμῶν ἢ παραδόκατε (ibid., 91).
\textsuperscript{823}v. 11: κορβάν, ὦ ἐστίν ἄνίπτος (ibid., 106).
\textsuperscript{824}v. 11, 12: τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ;
cf. v. 10: τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου/πατέρα ἢ μητέρα (ibid., 109).
\textsuperscript{825}τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου (v. 10)/
ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ. ... (vv. 11-12) (ibid., 124).
\textsuperscript{826}Antithetic parallelism:
v. 9: see above p. 298 n. 822;
v. 10: a juxtaposition of two references to the OT:
tίμη τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου (Ex 20:12; Dt 5:16)/
Ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτᾷ
(Ex 21:17 [Lev 20:9]);
vv. 10, 11-12: see preceding note;
v. 13: see above p. 298 n. 822 (ibid., 134).
\textsuperscript{827}So Bultmann, HST, 12, 39, 41: vv. 1-8; Gnilka, Markus, I, 277:
vv. 1-7 cf. 2:23-26; Pesch, Markus, I, 369: all of vv. 1-13
---vv. 1-8 and vv. 9-13 constitute mutually dependent segments;
cf. Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 26: vv. 1-8 a "conflict story." On formal criteria see above resp. pp. 260 (controversy dialogue) and 260 n. 713 (conflict story).
\textsuperscript{828}Taylor, Mark, 334: vv. 1-8.
The first sub-section would, for many scholars, comprise the basic unit of the apophthegm: e.g. Gnilka, Markus, I, 283:
vv. 8-13 the remnant of an independent controversy dialogue with the prefacing of a commensurate request for an explanation;
Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 182: vv. 9-13 a supplementary illustration of the scribes' and Pharisees' transgression of the divine commandment; Taylor, Mark, 339: vv. 9-13 an appended remnant of an independent pronouncement-story or a Marcan excerpt from a sayings tradition.
The introductory verse of the extant apophthegm would, in Hultgren's view, represent a creation of the evangelist (Jesus and Adversaries, 116): N.B. the Marcan construction
the gospel tradition, it nonetheless does not constitute evidence of a Palestinian Jewish provenance for vv. 1-13. As noted elsewhere, the vignette finds closer parallels among Greek writers. 829

The church in dialogue with Diaspora Jews could scarcely represent a more likely setting for vv. 1-8 and 9-13. 830 Even a riddance of all identifiable Marcan redactional features from the vignette would leave us with a highly inflammatory residue of material. To see this, we need only consider the introductory formula at the beginning of the Isaiah quotation. Jesus' opponents are called "you hypocrites." The hurling of such epithets would hardly encourage fruitful dialogue between church and synagogue. On this account, we must locate the Sitz im Leben of vv. 1-8 and 9-13 elsewhere.

The final sub-section of vv. 14-23 in this extended pericope evidences even less likelihood of a Palestinian provenance. A maschali about the source of the defilement of a man, v. 15 itself has been called the earliest stratum in the synoptic tradition. 831

---

829 See above pp. 260-61 incl. n. 714.
830 So e.g. Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 118, 132: a defence against Jewish criticism.
831 So Bultmann, HST, 147: the oldest material; the verse might even characterize Jesus' teaching (ibid., 105, 147); Gnilka, Markus, I, 277: i.e. originally an independent dominical saying. Not only
Nonetheless the extant logion evidences redactional handling. The phrases εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτὸν and ἐκπορευόμενα both are easily detachable explanatory additions and represent the evangelist's characteristic vocabulary.832 Furthermore, the implicit abrogation of Jewish food proscriptions in this "parabolic" saying is not a simple debunking of mere human tradition. The designation of certain food-stuffs as "unclean" here and thus unfit for the purposes of human nutrition, is an integral part of the Mosaic Law.833 Consequently, v. 16 contravenes the written Torah.834 A saying of this kind would likely cause a certain amount of consternation among a Jewish readership.835 This in itself serves to render Palestinian origin doubtful. In addition, its present context does not accommodate the saying easily. That is to say, Jesus' ruling is not a logical outworking of his earlier counter-charge (v. 8).836 Clearly, its extant location betrays an unfamiliarity with institutional Judaism on the part of the

does the use of the κοινός ("make cultically unclean") indicate a Jewish or Jewish Christian provenance, but the absence of any distinction between cleanliness of body and soul further reflects a Palestinian as opposed to a Hellenistic Jewish Christian milieu (ibid., 278). A number of other authorities would similarly consider the saying authentic tradition (so Cranfield, Mark, 240; Taylor, Mark, 343; and possibly Pesch, Markus, I, 383).

832 Taylor, Mark, 343. Moreover, the verbs εἰσπορευόμεναι and ἐκπορευόμεναι play an integral part in several manifestations of Marcan structural duality (see below p. 306 n. 870).

833 So Hooker, "OT in Mk", 221-22; sim. Taylor, Taylor, 343 (see Lev 11 = Dt 14).

834 Cranfield, Mark, 244: yet strangely he will not acknowledge a contradiction of vv. 8 and 10-11.

835 Cum Bultmann, HST, 147: v. 15 a "brief conflict saying;" Taylor, Mark, 343: v. 15 "revolutionary" "in its implications."

836 Contra Cranfield, Mark, 244: v. 15 not a contradiction of vv. 8 and 10-11; Taylor, Mark, 343: v. 15 not a direct repudiation of the food laws of Lev 11 = Dt 14.
A certain number of scholars have noted the antithetic parallelism of v. 15, and Bultmann has thus characterized it as a double-stranded maschal. Form-critically speaking, the verse is a wisdom logion. Clearly the saying does not betray scribal or rabbinic pedigree. Nor again does it reflect Jewish apocalyptic. Yet its content is something new and exceeds popular wisdom and piety. The function of v. 15 was that of legal saying or church rule.

Presumably vv. 18b-19 as commentary on v. 15 would have been formulated somewhat later than the latter. Moreover, Taylor writes:

The explicitness of 18b-19 and its crudity of expression suggest that this explanatory saying received its form in a Gentile community, for we cannot account for the early disputes at Jerusalem and Antioch if Jesus spoke so directly.

The majority of commentators on Mark's gospel attribute the "Pauline" category of vices of vv. 20-23 to a Hellenistic

---

840 Ibid., 74, 81, 92, 105.
842 Bultmann, *HST*, 130, 147.
843 *Mark*, 342.
source, if not the evangelist himself. In any case, the evangelist would appear to have appended these verses. The phrase ἐξωθέν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας recalls ἐξωθέν in v. 15, and the phrase within that phrase ἐκ τῆς καρδίας the phrase εἰς τὴν καρδίαν in v. 19. Such catch-word connections are a preferred Marcan device. Yet the catalogue itself would, for Cranfield, manifest "thoroughly Jewish" character. For that reason, he refuses to discard the possibility of its origin with Jesus himself.

Significant to him is the fact that, of the twelve items ten occur in the LXX in the canonical books, while another, ἀσέλγεια, occurs in the LXX in the Apocrypha and is used by two other translations (Aquila and Symmachus) in Hos.

---


845 So Bultmann, HST, 17.

By contrast, the vice-catalogue would, for Pesch, reflect the problems of the corporate life of a blended--Jewish and Gentile Christian--community as its Sitz im Leben. Here, he cites the vice-catalogue of Rom 1:29 as his analogy. Unfortunately, the Roman church was a Gentile constituency. Pesch's argument thus lacks documentary support (Markus, I, 384).

846 Pryke, Redactional, Style, 130.

847 See Mark, 242-43.

848 Ibid., 242.

The relatively later formation of this section--vv. 14-23--as compared with that of either vv. 1-8 or vv. 9-13 betrays itself in the fact that Jesus' opponents, according to v. 5, take the initiative whilst in v. 14 it is Jesus who does so
Yet Cranfield's observation only serves to undermine his position. Indeed Pauline vice-catalogues should manifest a decidedly Jewish character.\(^{849}\) That is to say, the Apostle preached his gospel to the Gentiles within the proselyte traditions of the Jews.\(^{850}\) The function of such catalogues was to contrast the Jewish way of life with that of pagan society.\(^{851}\) Similarly, the function of catalogues of vices in Paul's letters was "to remind the church of the fact that vices, which it thinks to have left behind for ever, easily creep back."\(^{852}\)

Structurally speaking, this third sub-section is a paranetic discourse with two distinct scenes—the teaching of the crowds in vv. 14-15, and in vv. 17-23 the teaching of the disciples. Evidently, the first takes place in public. Here Jesus proceeds to address his audience in parabolic speech (v. 15). Notably, "parable" has to denote enigmatic speech.\(^{853}\) Accordingly, the disciples request an explanation of the "parable" (v. 17).\(^{854}\) However, they do not do so until the change of scene. The crowds

---

\(^{849}\) In this connection, the Marcan vice-catalogue recalls a number of proscriptions of the OT. Moreover, the human heart as the 'store-room' of every conceivable evil bears the characteristic stamp of 'Jewish anthropological pessimism' (see e.g. Is 59:7; Jer 4:14) (Pesch, Markus, I 381-82).


\(^{851}\) Ibid.

\(^{852}\) Schweizer, "Traditional Ethical Patterns", 196.

\(^{853}\) Hurd, "Isaiah's Curse", 10; Jeremias, Parables, 16 n. 22; cf. Bultmann, HST, 17.

\(^{854}\) Cranfield, Mark, 240; Taylor, Mark, 344.
leave Jesus and he enters "the house." Then the disciples present their request. The impercipientness of the disciples earns them Jesus' rebuke (v. 18a), but thereupon they receive an explanation of the parable (vv. 18b-23). Significantly, the connecting links and the characteristic vocabulary serve to identify transition verses (14 and 17) as formulations of the evangelist. Clearly this scenario is a Marcan construct.

The obtuseness of the disciples is no doubt a Marcan caricature (cum ibid.). Thus Gnilka is probably correct in assigning the rebuke of v. 18a and also the shaping of the interpretation of vv. 18b-19a into a question to Mark (Markus, I, 278, cf. 287). The question posed by the disciples in v. 17 serves to introduce this unfavourable portrayal of the disciples. Thus Bultmann, who regards the question as the means whereby the evangelist appends the instruction to the disciples (vv. 18-23), is also likely correct, treating v. 17 (HST, 330; sim. Best, Markan Soteriology, 79), indeed all of vv. 17-18a, as redactional (HST, 17). Two additional redactional cues in vv. 17-18 are noteworthy, viz. the phrase εἰς οἶκον (v. 17) and the historic present tense (λέγει) (v. 18a) (Jeremias, Parables, 97-98 incl. n. 33).

See following paragraph.

Cum Bultmann, HST, 17; Pesch, Markus, I, 379, 380; sim. the themes of "hearing" and "understanding" (ibid., 379); but contra Gnilka, Markus, I, 278: the distinction of the two groups of Jesus' addressees antedates the evangelist--yet the transition of v. 14 at least in extant form represents Marcan redaction, and also Jesus' stern rebuke of his disciples in v. 18 on account of the dullness of their cognitive faculties (ibid., 278, 285), maintains the existence of this distinction before the writing of Mark's gospel (ibid., 278).

The dominical logion (v. 15) and its two-fold explanation (vv. 18-23) would, for Pesch, reflect two developmental stages with the pre-Marcan tradition (Markus, I, 381). However, the disciples' request for an explanation in v. 17 as an expression of their consistent incomprehension, Jesus' rebuke of his impercipient disciples in his question of v. 18a in conjunction with v. 18b in its reformulation of the dominical logion as a question (cf. 4:13, 40; 6:52) (ibid., 378, 381) and the motif of special instruction for the disciples (ibid., 381) are modifications of the tradition by the evangelist.

The Pharisees' request for a sign in Mk 8:11-13 along with the discourse on leaven of Mk 8:14-21, and the parabolic discourse of Mk 4:1-34 at those points where the hand of the evangelist is clearly discernible, both share a number of features with the discussion of Mk 7:14-23: e.g., Jesus' practice of employing parabolic/evasive speech in his public teaching (7:14, 17;
Additional redactional features in the third sub-section would comprise the connecting formula καὶ ... ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς (v. 14), the verb προκαλέσομαι, the noun ὄχλος, the adverb πάλιν within that same formula, the verb εἰσέρχουσαί, the phrase εἰς οἶκον, the verb ἐπερωτάω in the transitional link between the two parts of Jesus' teaching (v. 17), the connecting formula (cf. 8:12/4:1-2, 11, 33-34); Jesus' practice of providing his disciples special teaching in private (7:17; cf. 8:13/4:10); the disciples' inability to comprehend Jesus' teaching (7:17; cf. 8:16/4:10); and Jesus' rebuke of his disciples for their lack of comprehension (7:18; cf. 8:17-18/4:13b).

On a possible rabbinic parallel see above ch. 1 p. 111.

So presumably Best (see Markan Soteriology, 79). Oddly the occurrence of the connecting formula in v. 14 has escaped notice of the commentators consulted by us. (The one possible exception is Taylor [see Mark, 218].) Nonetheless he writes: "These sayings [vv. 14-23] are attached to vii. 1-8, 9-13 by the method already illustrated in ii. 21 f., 27 f., iii. 27-9, and iv. 21-5, according to which Mark appends sayings on similar topics to Pronouncement-stories or Parables. The arrangement is topical and the narrative element small" [ibid., 342]). Indeed the evangelist has "buried" the construction somewhat. Yet an excision of the circumstantial/temporal clause—προκαλεσόμενος ... ὄχλον—from the verse would set the connecting formula καὶ έλεγεν αὐτοῖς in full relief.

858 Cranfield, Mark, 239; Taylor, Mark, 343.
859 Ibid.
861 Taylor, Mark, 344; Jeremias, Parables, 98 n. 33: εἰς οἶκον uniquely Marcan in the synoptic tradition—and so also the location of Jesus' activity in the house itself: in this connection, Pryke identifies parallel references in 1:29; 2:1, 15; 3:30; 7:24; 9:28, 33; 10:10 (Redactional Style, 69 n. 3).
862 Jeremias, Parables, 98 n. 33; Pesch, Markus, I, 372; Pryke, Redactional Style, 136: 14 of 25 occurrences redactional.
863 So Taylor, Mark, 342.
864 The verb εἰσέρχουσαί occurs some 30x in Mark's gospel; frequent contexts of this verb are the editorial links (Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 95 n. 67). Yet another redactional construction might well be the phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου (Pesch, Markus, I, 380).
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς (v. 18a), the parenthesis on the general implications of Jesus' public teaching (vv. 18b-19a) in his private explanation to his disciples (v. 19b), and perhaps the generalizing comment of the final verse (v. 23).

This final section, like the first two, also reveals a number of instances of Marcan duality. These signs include the following: compound verb before corresponding preposition (7x), adverb in -θεν with compound verb in ἀπό- or ἐκ- (2x), multiple cognate verbs and analogous non-verb repetition (4x), double imperative, repetition of antecedent (5x), negative-positive

---

865 The historic present tense (λέγω) is a typical Marcan feature (cf. 4:13/8:17) (Jeremias (Parables, 98 n. 33; see Taylor, Mark, 46-47). Moreover, the construction καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, along with similar introductory formulae, is a feature found throughout Mark's gospel (cf. 2:5a, 10c, 17a; 4:13a; 10:23, 27; 14:27) (Pryke, Redactional Style, 76 n. 4).

866 Cranfield, Mark, 241; Gnilka, Markus, I, 277, 285.

867 Ibid., 278.

868 V. 15: εἰςπορεύομαι εἰς;
   ἐκ ... ἐκπορεύομαι;

v. 17: εἰςέρχομαι εἰς;
v. 18: εἰςπορεύομαι εἰς;
v. 19: εἰςπορεύομαι εἰς ... εἰς;
v. 20: ἐκ ... ἐκπορεύομαι;
v. 21: ἐκ ... ἐκπορεύομαι (Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 75).

869 V. 21: ἔσωθεν ... ἐκ ... ἐκπορεύομαι;
v. 23: ἔσωθεν ἐκπορεύεται;
   cf. v. 15: οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰςπορευόμενον εἰς;
   cf. v. 18: πάν τὸ ἔξωθεν εἰςπορευόμενον (ibid., 76).

870 Vv. 15, 18, 19: εἰςπορεύομαι;
vv. 15, 19, 20, 21, 23: ἐκπορεύομαι;
vv. 15 (2x), 18, 20, 23: κοινώς; cf. vv. 2, 5: κοιναῖς; (ibid., 78);
   πονηρία (v. 22)/πονηρός (v. 22)/πονηρά (v. 23) (ibid., 82).

871 V. 14: ἀκούστε μου πάντες καὶ σύνετε (ibid., 84).

872 V. 15: εἰςπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτόν
   (cf. v. 15a: ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου);
   v. 15b: τὸν ἀνθρώπον (cf. v. 15b: ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου);
   v. 18: εἰςπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτόν (cf. v. 18b: τὸ ἔξωθεν);
   v. 20: redundant pronoun ἐκεῖνο (cf. v. 20a: τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον);
double statement (4x),\(^{873}\) temporal or local double statement (2x),\(^{874}\) double question,\(^{875}\) parallelism in sayings,\(^{876}\) and doublet sayings.\(^{877}\)

A number of commentators on Mark's gospel have noted an apparent absence of any connection of the pericope as a whole with the preceding narrative.\(^{878}\) This contention will not bear close scrutiny. On the contrary, Mk 7:1-23, in the same way as 8:11-21, is a constituent element of one of two parallel cycles. A miraculous feeding serves to bracket each cycle at the beginning.

---

v. 20 (cf. v. 20a): see above v. 18 (cf. v. 18b). (ibid., 86).

\(^{873}\) οὐκ ... ἀλλὰ allied constructions:
σύνετε (v. 14)/καὶ ὡμεῖς ἀσύνετοι ἡστε; (v. 18);
οὐδὲν ... ἐξώθην τοῦ ἄνθρωπον εἰςπορεύμενον ... κοινοῦντα/
ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐκπορεύμενα ἐστὶν τὰ κοινοῦντα (v. 15);
πάν τὸ ἐξώθην εἰςπορευμένον ... οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινόσαι (v. 18)/
τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐκπορευμένον, ἐκείνο κοινοῖ ... (v. 20);
οὐκ εἰςπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν/
ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν καὶ εἰς τὸν ἄνδρόνα ἐκπορεύεται (v. 19) (ibid., 91).

\(^{874}\) v. 17: εἰς οἴκον/ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀχλου
v. 21: ἔσωθεν ... ἐκ τῆς καρδίας (ibid., 95).

\(^{875}\) οὐτος καὶ ὡμεῖς ἀσύνετοι ἡστε; (v. 18)/
oὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι ... ; (vv. 18b-19) (ibid., 125).

\(^{876}\) Antithetic parallelism:
v. 15: οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἐξώθην τοῦ ἄνθρωπον εἰςπορεύμενον εἰς
αὐτὸν ὅ δύναται κοινόσαι αὐτὸν... ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ
ἄνθρωπον ἐκπορευμένα ἐστὶν τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον;
(ibid., 134);
cf. vv. 18c, 20;
πάν τὸ ἐξώθην εἰςπορευμένον εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐ δύναται
αὐτὸν κοινόσαι/
Τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐκπορευμένον ἐκείνο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον
(ibid.).

\(^{877}\) Vv. 15 and 18-23: parable and interpretation;
v. 17 and 4:10 (ibid., 135).

Some textual authorities include ετι τις ἐχει ὅτα ἄκουετε ἃκουέτο (RADθω λ φ pc latt sy* pt sa bo*). Taylor considers this reading probably original (Mark, 344), somewhat more cautiously Bultmann expresses uncertainty (HST, 326). However, the weight of textual evidence does not support its inclusion (BNLΛ* 0274 pc).

\(^{878}\) E.g. Cranfield, Mark, 231; Gnilka, Markus, I, 279;
Taylor, Mark, 334.
The cycles each exhibit a unifying theme. Certainly no compelling reason exists to preclude the assembling of them both by the evangelist. Furthermore, the development within 7:1-23 parallels that within its respective cycle. Jesus and his intellectual break with the official representatives of Judaism foreshadows the spatial break with Jesus' subsequent departure from the Jewish region--Gennesaret in Galilee (6:53; cf. Dalmanutha in 8:10b)--for the Gentile region--Tyre and Sidon (7:24; cf. Bethsaida in 8:22a). With that, 7:1-23 itself provides the "connecting link" between 6:53-56 and 7:24-30.

Our tradition-historical analysis of this extended passage does not preclude the possibility of the existence of certain strands of pre-Marcan tradition. In this connection, we would note considerably pared-down versions of the two sub-sections of the first vignette. The first sub-section (vv. 1-8) would nonetheless find its origin on non-Palestinian soil. The possible remnant of a controversy dialogue in the second sub-section (vv. 9-13) would likewise betray its formative matrix within non-Palestinian Greek-speaking Christendom. First of all, the explanation of Jewish customs would serve no purpose whatsoever, in a Jewish milieu. Secondly, both sub-sections

879 See above ch. 2 pp. 205-6 incl. n. 542.
880 See above ch. 2 p. 206 n. 543.
881 Hurd, "Isaiah's Curse", 7-11.
882 Gnilka, Markus, I, 278, 287.
883 Best, Gospel as Story, 30.
evidence an unfamiliarity with Jewish piety. Granted, the Jesus logion of v. 15 in the final sub-section might also represent an earliest stratum of the synoptic tradition. Yet the constituent material in the rest of this paraenetic discourse bespeak a Gentile-Christian readership for the most part, at least.\footnote{In this connection, we note "some of his disciples" (v. 1).} Additionally, the entire third sub-section indicates a typically Marcan structure. In point of fact, the pericope of 7:1-23 throughout indicates extensive editorial manipulation by the evangelist.

B. MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF SCRIPTURES REPORTED

i. Verbal Contacts between Mk 7:6-7 and Is 29:13 (LXX)

The inclusion of the introductory clause ΚΑΛΩΣ ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἰησοῦς περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται at the head of v. 6 serves to advance what immediately follows in vv. 6-7 as the actual words of the prophet Isaiah.\footnote{Cf. Mk 1:2-3--however, the scriptural material reported in 7:6-7 is not a conflation of passages as in 1:2-3 but one passage only.} Indeed the degree of verbal agreement between Mark and the LXX as attested by Sinaiticus (\textit{N}) and Alexandrinus (\textit{A}) indicates a literary relationship between the text types represented by the OT and the NT.

\textbf{Mk 7:6-7}

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{ὅ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·}
  \begin{quote}
    καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἰησοῦς περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν,
    ὡς γέγραπται \[δὲ\]
    \textit{οὕτως ὁ λαὸς τοῖς κείλεσθιν με τιμᾷ,}
    \textit{ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ.}
  \end{quote}
\end{enumerate}
The reporting of the OT by Mark falls somewhat short of verbatim text representation. In terms of vocabulary, the three disagreements between the NT and the LXX include the absence of the predicate ἐγγίζει μοι and the possessive adjective αὐτῶν after the noun τοῖς χείλεσιν in v. 6, and the particle καὶ in v. 7. In terms of syntax, the Marcan representation of Is 29:13 shows a transposition of words ὁ λαὸς and οὗτος comprising the subject phrase, a transposition of the verb τιμᾷ and the pronoun με, and an alteration of the number of the verb τιμᾷ from the singular to the plural in v. 6, and a transposition of the object phrase ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων with the adverbial genitive noun διδασκαλίας in

---

886 The textual apparatus reports six variant readings for the Isaiah reference: (a) a transposition: the demonstrative adjective οὗτος and the noun subject ὁ λαὸς (p) 2 3 1 BD pc lat), and (b) a substitution: the verb ἄγαται for the verb τιμᾷ (DW a b c; Cl Tert), in the initial clause of the quotation (v. 6). Both variants show weak attestation. Moreover, the former is an obvious assimilation to the LXX version. The second clause (v. 6) knows three variant readings for the verb ἀπέχει: (c) ἀφέστηκεν (D), (d) ἀπέστη (Δ), and (e) ἀπεστίν (LΘ 565.893 lat). Again, these variants find weak attestation. Finally, we note the insertion of the conjunction καὶ before the noun ἐντάλματα in the fourth clause of the quotation (v. 7) (345). Weakly attested, this variant reading looks to be an assimilation in the direction of the LXX.

887 Sinaiticus (K) supports the text, Vaticanus (B) and Lucian (L) include the words ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν.
v. 7. Yet the high degree of correspondence between Mark and the LXX (N and A) indicates classification of the former as a strongly mimetic direct reporting.

ii. Verbal Contacts between Mk 7:10a and Ex 20:12a = Dt 5:16a

The use of the introductory formula Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν at the beginning of v. 10 serves to present the injunction which follows as a stipulation of the Law—Ex 20:12a = Dt 5:16a.

Mk 7:10a

Τύμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου\footnote{Cf. Col 2:22: τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων.} ...  
Ex 20:12a (LXX) = Dt 5:16a (LXX)

τύμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου ...

Verbally and syntactically the statement reported in v. 10a is an exact quotation of the LXX in the basic component of the fifth commandment of the Decalogue. The text representation here is verbatim direct reporting of the OT.

iii. Verbal Contacts between Mk 7:10b and Ex 21:17 (LXX)

The occurrence of the co-ordinating conjunction καὶ at the beginning of v. 10b serves to present the malediction which follows as an additional prescription from the Law of Moses.

Mk 7:10b

ὁ κακολογῶν\footnote{Rather few text traditions (DΘ pc) do not support the second occurrence of the possessive pronoun σου after the noun μητήρ.}  

πατέρα ἡ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάτῳ.

\footnote{The variant reading ἀθέτω enjoys weak attestation (W).}
Ex 21:17 (LXX)

ο κακολογούν

πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἢ μητέρα αὐτοῦ τελευτήσει θανάτῳ.⁹⁹¹

In terms of verbal contact the statement of Ex 21:17 (LXX) affords the greatest degree of coincidence with the Marcan report. The one deviation exhibited by Mark is the absence of the possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ after the nouns πατήρ and μητήρ. Syntactically, the Marcan report shows two disagreements, viz. a transposition of the noun θάνατος and the verb τελευτάω, and the alteration of the tense and mood of the verb τελευτάω from the future indicative resp. to the present imperative. Thus the text representation is best designated strongly mimetic direct reporting.

iv. Verbal Contacts between Mk 7:21-22 and the Decalogue⁹⁹²

Mk 7:21  

κλοπαί  

14/19 (15/--) OÜ κλέψεις (8th)

φόνοι  

15/18 (13/17) OÜ φονεύσεις (6th)

μοιχευά  

13/17 (14/18) OÜ μοιχεύσεις (7th)

Mk 7:22  

πλεονεξίαι  

cf. 17/21. OÜ ἐπιθυμήσεις (10th)

βλασφημία  

cf. 16/20. OÜ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις (9th)

The ordering of those defilements of the heart in v. 21 which

⁹⁹¹ Cf. a secondary reference in Lev 20:9a (LXX)—δς ον κακως εἰπη τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἢ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, θανάτω θανατούσθω—, and a tertiary reference in Dt 27:16 (LXX)—'Επικαταβατος ο ἀτιμάζων πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἢ μητέρα αὐτοῦ.

⁹⁹² For the sake of easy representation the versification of the LXX has been adopted, the versification of the MT where different given in parentheses. The ordering of the commandments which is also given in parentheses follows that of the MT which is the same in Exodus and Deuteronomy.
are prohibited in the Decalogue shows a greater agreement with the ordering of the corresponding prohibitions reported in Ex 20 (LXX) than it does with that reported in Dt 5 (LXX). On the one hand, the listing of theft and murder in that order in Mark reflects the order of their prohibitions in Exodus. The one deviation of the Marcan ordering of defilements from their prohibition in Exodus is the listing of adultery immediately after theft instead of immediately before murder. On the other hand, the Marcan listing of theft (κλοπαί), murder (φόνοι) and adultery (μοιχεύα) in that order is the exact opposite of that of their prohibitions in Deuteronomy.

The ordering of those defilements in v. 22 which are prohibited in the Decalogue—coveting and slander—is the exact inversion of that of their respective prohibitions reported in the LXX, which is the same in Ex 20 and Dt 5.

In terms of content, we make two observations regarding vv. 21-22. Firstly, the defilements examined thus far recall the sixth through tenth—the ninth without the addenda—commandments of the Decalogue (see table above). Secondly, a number of the defilements listed by the evangelist bear no relation to the prohibitions included in Ex 20:3-20/Dt 5:7-21 or any other OT code of ethics. These include: evil thoughts (οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοί), fornication (πορνεύα) (v. 21), wickedness (πονηρία), deceit (δόλος), licentiousness (ἀσέλγεια), envy (ὁφθαλμὸς πονηρός), pride (ὑπερηφανία) and foolishness (ἀφροσύνη).

Syntactically, the use of substantives for the designation of the various defilements represents a notable deviation from the LXX wherein prohibitions assume the future active indicative form of a
verb preceded by the negative particle οὔ. Nonetheless, the table presented above indicates significant verbal contacts between Mark and the LXX. That is to say, the nouns which serve to denote theft, murder and adultery in Mark 7:21 find their corresponding cognate verbs in the prohibitions of the eighth, sixth, and seventh commandments respectively in the LXX. At the same time, however, the coveting (πλεονεξία) and slander (βλασφημία) bear no verbal similarity with the respectively corresponding prohibitions of the tenth (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις) and ninth commandments (οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις).

The foregoing considerations, coupled with the fact that the designation of the behaviours enumerated in vv. 21-22 as defilements of the heart (v. 23) implies their prohibition, entitle us to classify those components of vv. 21-22 which manifest some contact with OT text as indirect reporting which is mimetic to some degree.

v. Other Affinities of Mk 7:1-23 with OT Text

V. 2, cf. v. 3: the disciples omit to wash hands before eating
(χερσίν ... ἄνεπτοις)

cf. Lev 15:11: a reference to hand-washing within a legal precept on ritual cleansing
(τὰς χεῖρας οὖ νέπτοι)

Vv. 11-12: the designation by a man (adult male person) of what he might otherwise give his parents as "Corban" is absolutely binding

Num 30:2: a vow to the Lord made by a man (adult male person) is absolutely binding

cf. Dt 23:21-23: a vow to the Lord is absolutely binding
(gender of subject notwithstanding)

V. 19b, cf. 15a, 18b-19a: "Thus he [Jesus] declared all foods clean."

cf. Lev 11; Dt 14:3-20: various animals are designated fit or unfit for human consumption

C. THE MEANING OF THE NT

i. Mk 7:1-8

The "objectionable" behaviour as precipitating factor in this controversy dialogue is the eating of food with unwashed hands (v. 2). Here the "problem" of this omission was not that of poor hygiene, but a violation of cultic Levitical custom. With that, Jesus' accusers are, in fact, questioning the piety of his disciples (cf. Lk 11:38). As in 2:23-24, so also in 7:2, 5, the reproach of the inquisitors--once again the Pharisees (cf. 2:24), but this time in company with the scribes (vv. 1, 5)--concerns not Jesus' own behaviour, but that of his disciples. As in 2:25-26, so also in 7:6-7, Jesus accepts responsibility for the actions of the disciples and proceeds to rebut his opponents with an appeal to scripture. Not a direct defence of the behaviour of the disciples and apparent approval of that behaviour with a rhetorical question--that is, an invitation to his opponents to their approval of David's conduct under comparable circumstances--this time, however, Jesus denounces them as "hypocrites." His counter-charge is preface to a citation from Is 29:13. Allegedly, Isaiah's prophecy concerns the scribes and the Pharisees. Here the adverb καλῶς (cf. v. 6) serves to emphasise the applicability

---

893 Gnilka, Markus, I, 279; Pesch, Markus, I, 370.
894 Sim. ibid., 372.
of the quotation. Clearly, Jesus' accusers profess to worship God. Unfortunately, "their heart is far from [God]" (v. 6). Their profession is mere lip-service. The second half of the Isaiahic citation (v. 7) does, however, receive stress in the summary statement of v. 8. That is to say, Jesus' opponents pre-empt the divine commandment in favour of mere human tradition (cf. 8:33; 10:9; 11:30; 12:14). Therein the Pharisees and the scribes primarily betray their hypocrisy. The issue in this first segment of the discussion—vv. 1-8—is the authority of the tradition of the elders.

ii. Mk 7:9-13

This second segment of the controversy dialogue serves to develop Jesus' counter-charge of abandonment of God's commandment in favour of human tradition (v. 8). First of all, we observe

---

895 At this point Pesch would see a reminiscence of Dt 6:4-5. The love of God which is required of the Jew includes that of loving him with his whole being, including his heart (ibid., 373).

896 I.e. worship of God and human commands, as opposed to lip-service and reverence of the heart (Gnilka, Markus, I, 282). The first half of the quotation (v. 6) is developed in vv. 14-23.

897 Ibid.; Pesch, Markus, I, 373.

898 Gnilka, Markus, I, 282.

899 Pesch, Markus, I, 372.

The tradition of the elders, i.e. Jewish teachers of the Law, may have assumed binding authority for the Pharisees and the scribes (so Taylor, Mark, 336). Neither in Jesus' time nor that of the evangelist, however, was the so-called oral tradition accorded an authority equal to that of the written Law (contra Cranfield, Mark, 236; Gnilka, Markus, I, 281; Pesch, Markus, I, 371). As Neusner indicates, the Mishnaic purity laws would likely presuppose the distinctive beliefs of the Pharisaic authorities of the pre-A.D. 70 period ("The Meaning of Oral Torah", in Jacob Neusner, Early Rabbinic Judaism: Historical Studies in Religion, Literature, and Art, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, Vol XIII [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975], 5).

Still, the centrality of the oral Torah was a motif characteristic of later rabbinism (Neusner, "'Pharisaic-Rabbinic' Judaism", 63).

900 Pesch, Markus, I, 369, 373.
the double repetition of the counter-charge itself (v. 9, 13a).\textsuperscript{901} This time, however, Jesus sharpens the focus of his charge. No longer is there talk of "the tradition of men" (vv. 7, 8). Nor is the "tradition of the elders" mentioned again. Instead we find the more pointed reference "your tradition." Indeed the ironic use of the adverb καλῶς (cf. v. 6)\textsuperscript{902} conveys unmistakable hostility in the first repetition of Jesus' counter-charge (v. 9).

Secondly, the alleged manipulation of the Fifth Commandment by Jesus' religious opponents represents but one instance of the placing of human tradition before the divine word (vv. 10-13a)\textsuperscript{903} Finally, the foregoing example provides support for the generalizing statement in v. 13b.\textsuperscript{904}

The corroborating illustration of observance of human tradition at the expense of observance of the divine commandment involves a blatant misuse of the Corban practice as a legalistic subterfuge. Evidently, some individuals for whatever reasons attempt to avoid the fulfilment of their responsibilities towards their parents.\textsuperscript{905} On the one hand, the Mosaic Law contains a definite stipulation: "Honour your father and your mother" (v. 10a = Ex 20:12a/Dt 5:16a [LXX]). Moreover, its codicil serves to emphasise the gravity of non-compliance with this law: "He who speaks evil of father or mother let him surely die"

\textsuperscript{901}Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 283; cf. Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 370, 374.
\textsuperscript{902}The prophet Isaiah described Jesus' opponents excellently; likewise Jesus' opponents fulfil Isaiah's prophecy "excellently" (Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 283; Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 374).
\textsuperscript{904}Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, I, 284; Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 376.
\textsuperscript{905}So Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 238.
(v. 10b = Ex 21:17 [LXX]). Nonetheless, the Pharisees and the scribes render a verdict no less definite: pledges of offerings to God have an absolutely binding character. Entitlement to that offering by parents does not constitute a mitigating factor, nor attendant circumstances of that pledge (vv. 11-12).\footnote{E.g. the Corban formula which had been invoked rashly in the heat of anger was nonetheless binding, even if the person who had done so subsequently desired to retract it (ibid., 237-38; Gnilka, Markus, I, 283). The discussion in Ned IX, 1 of the Mishnah (see above p. 292) attests an awareness of such problems within contemporary Judaism.} In this way, the keeping of human "tradition" serves to render God's word null and void (v. 13a).\footnote{Cf. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 120.}

Clearly three important assumptions underlie the foregoing argument of vv. 9-13a. They may be stated thus: (a) honouring of parents includes a provision of material well-being;\footnote{Put differently, such a suspension of God's commandment (vv. 10-13a) evidences a heart 'far from God' (v. 6 = Is 29:13a; cf. 12:34a). Cf. 8:33: the purely human thoughts entertained by Peter prevent his comprehension of the true nature of Jesus' messiahship (ibid., n. 8). The central point of Jesus' castigation of the religious authorities seems to be theological justification of inhuman conduct (Gnilka, Markus, I, 284). Here the scribes and the Pharisees apparently did not restrain Corban vows against one's parents, nor did they declare such vows null and void. On the contrary, they would, on the basis of divine service, hold an individual to blatant violations of divine commandment (Pesch, Markus, I, 375). To do so would constitute a reverencing of God with the lips (ibid., 375-76). By contrast, Jesus refuses to divorce service to God from service to others. (Gnilka, Markus, I, 284, sim. Pesch, Markus, I, 373, 376). Summum jus--summa injuria! (so ibid., 376).} (b) calumny of parents includes a deprival of material support;\footnote{Gnilka, Markus, I, 283; Pesch, Markus, I, 375.} and (c) observance of the practice of Corban can represent
non-compliance with the commandment of God. At this point, we do not offer any assessment of these assumptions. However, such an assessment will form a necessary part of our examination of the scripture-hermeneutic in this second sub-section.

iii. **Mk 7:14-23**

On initial inspection, this third and final sub-section of our pericope does not evidence the tension of observance of God’s law with that of human tradition. The overall thrust of the first sub-section was to state the pre-eminence of divine commandment over ‘human tradition.’ The stated intention of the second sub-section was to debunk human tradition as an impediment to one’s observance of divine law. At this point, however, Jesus proceeds to abrogate a part of the Law. The assimilation of those things from the outside into an individual cannot defile that individual. Such things do not affect one’s essential being, i.e. the "heart" (vv. 15, 18b-19a) as the seat of his decision-making. On that basis, Jesus can declare all foods "kosher" (v. 19b). With that, Jesus has, in essence, abolished the levitical cleanliness code.

---

910 Ibid., 374, cf. 368. Cf. "human tradition" (v. 8) and "your tradition" (vv. 9, 13a) with "commandment of God" (vv. 8, 9) and "word of God" (v. 13a).


Of v. 15 Taylor has written the following: "Ultimately, it implies the abrogation of the Law regarding clean and unclean meats (cf. vii. 19b); but this consequence is not expressly stated. ... Nor is it likely that Jesus directly repudiated the food laws of Lev. xi = Deut. xiv, since otherwise the hesitations of the primitive Church on this issue (cf. Ac. x. 14, xv. 28f., Gal. ii. 11-17, Rom. xiv. 14, Col. 11. 20-2) would be inexplicable" (*Mark*, 343). However, we have to ask Taylor this question: Why, if this
By contrast, true defilements find their origin within the heart. Theft, murder, adultery, coveting and slander (vv. 21-22) --all of these things constitute free decisions for evil. All such things thus represent alienation of the heart from God (v. 6 = Is 29:13a). Accordingly they involve specific violations of the commandments of the Decalogue (v. 7 = Is 29:13b).

To this point, we no longer witness a tension of the Law versus human tradition. Nevertheless, our reading of this sub-section manifests an internal inconsistency as well as an external one. The internal inconsistency involves vv. 19b and 21-22. First of all, Jesus debunks the Jewish food laws. Immediately thereafter he rehearses a so-called vice-catalogue. A good number of these vices constitute readily identifiable infractions of the Mosaic Law. Indeed Jesus labels sources of defilement. In so doing, he is in fact endorsing legal stipulations of the OT. Secondly, our readings of the first two sub-sections of our pericope do not easily accommodate our exegesis of this sub-section. The Mosaic Law represents the divine commandment in the earlier sub-sections. Yet the Jesus of this final sub-section simply abrogates the food laws with no further ado.

"revolutionary" verse be authentic dominical tradition, did the original tradents not recognise its implications at the outset? They were, after all, Palestinian Jews!

914 Pesch, Markus, I, 380, 381.
915 Cum ibid., 380.
916 In this connection, the resultant violation of the Fifth Commandment in the Corban practice (vv. 10-13a) would also signal alienation of one's heart from God (cf. 12:34a).
917 Lev 11 = Dt 14.
Hooker has written:
Clearly we encounter three possibilities. The compiler may perhaps have not recognised this inconsistency. Thus he may not have had any acquaintance with the food regulations of the Torah. On the other hand, an informed compiler may have assumed virtually no familiarity with Jewish law on the part of his intended readership. From either standpoint, the food laws would, within the narrative world, constitute nothing other than human tradition. With that, we would resolve the aforesaid inconsistencies. In addition, we would find re-instated the original tension of human tradition and the written Torah.

Here the argumentation in this sub-section would lack a significant component of that of the second sub-section. A strict adherence to presumed human tradition in the food regulations would not in itself presuppose the express aim of nullification of the divine commandment in favour of mere human tradition. Nor, for that matter, do we find that particular accusation in the first sub-section. On the contrary, Jesus' opponents subvert the

"[T]he radical nature of the saying [v. 15] fits uneasily into a context where the issue has so clearly been a conflict between human tradition and divine command ... " ("OT in Mk", 221). Of the fact that "Jesus" is abrogating the Law, there can be no reasonable doubt (so ibid., 222; Taylor, Mark, 343), but the statement that "the issue has so clearly been a conflict between human tradition and divine command" is erroneous. As we saw in our examination of vv. 9-13a, "Jesus" debunks a tradition, viz. the Corban practice, which also finds implicit support in "divine commandment."

Evidently the tension between Jesus and the Law is not an ideal state of affairs for Cranfield (see Mark, 244-45). With that, he attempts to rationalize this tension somewhat: "[S]ome elements of [the Law] ... , though still valid as witness to Christ, are no longer binding in the sense in which they were before his coming" (ibid., 245: italics added).

Conceivably, the evangelist may be employing a double entendre. The observance of food regulations would, factually speaking, represent an 'honouring of God with the lips' (v. 6).
divine will and—not in order to keep their tradition intact. In this alone would consist their alleged hypocrisy.

Yet there remains a third possibility. Thus the evangelist and his addressees did in fact take cognizance of the implications of the pronouncement of v. 19b. Quite simply, then, Jesus is accorded a higher authority than that of the written Torah.

D. THE MEANING OF THE OT

i. Is 29:13 (LXX)

This statement wherein Judah is criticized for the superficiality of her piety (v. 13) forms the first half of a "because ... therefore ..." pronouncement, the second half of which concerns the establishment of a new relationship with God. A positive response to God's act will replace what is ironically called "wisdom" and "discernment" (v. 14). The group of miscellaneous oracles to which vv. 13-14 belong (29:9-24) itself is part of a collection of pre-exilic oracles generally relating to Judah's intrigue with Egypt, its implications and consequences (chs. 28-32).

ii. Ex 20:12a = Dt 5:16a (LXX)

The injunction to "honour [one's] father and [one's] mother" is the fifth commandment of the Decalogue, without the blessing attendant upon the observance of it (Ex 20:12b; Dt 5:16b).

iii. Ex 21:17 (LXX)

This stipulation according to which anyone who maligns or reviles his/her father or mother incurs the death penalty finds itself within that segment of the Covenant Code (20:22-23:33), the

919 Cf. v. 9: the telic conjunction וַאֲבָל.
precepts of which relate to the protection of persons (21:12-32).
The peculiarly severe penalty attaching this particular violation owes its origin to the fact that κακολογέω ("malign," "revile") is the Septuagint rendition of the Hebrew verb הָרַע ("curse") which signifies a far more malevolent act.

iv. The Binding Character of Vows to the Lord

The statement according to which a vow to the Lord made by a man (adult male person) is absolutely binding (Num 30:2) finds itself in a section which actually relates to such vows as are made by women (vv. 1-16). In contrast to a vow taken by a man, a vow taken by a young woman still living in her father's house or a married woman, could be declared null and void by her father or husband provided he did so on the day which he learned of it. Apparently the establishment of the latter provision served to protect society from the consequences of rash or foolish vows.

The law according to which a vow to the Lord is absolutely binding (Dt 23:21-23) is part of a collection of various laws relating to humanitarian and religious obligations. Here the gender of the person who has made the vow does not qualify the binding character of the vow in any way. According to v. 21b failure to pay one's vow is considered sin.

v. The Food Laws of Lev 11 and Dt 14:3-20

The collection of laws according to which certain animals are designated fit or unfit for human consumption, as presented in Lev 11, is an excerpt from a larger collection of laws which comprises a number of chapters (11-15) and whose general topic is what is "clean" or "unclean." These chapters, wherein the distinctions between "clean" and "unclean" are based on ritual,
and not simply sanitary or hygienic considerations, follow the
tradition of the ordination of priests (chs. 8-10) which task it
was to make such distinctions.

A similar collection of laws to that of Lev 11, that of
Dt 14:3-20, forms part of a collection of laws (chs. 14-15) which
relate to the conduct of a holy people.

vi. The Commandments of the Decalogue

E. SCRIPTURE-HERMENEUTIC IN MK

i. MK 7:1-8

The explicit reference to the prophetic activity of the
prophet Isaiah in the introductory clause of v. 6 and the concrete
example of that activity which immediately follows it in vv. 6-7
(Is 29:13 [LXX]), indicates that the evangelist purports to
provide his readership a factual reading of the OT. Within the
introductory clause we also encounter the formula ὥς γέγραπται.
With that, the evangelist intends to characterize the situation in
question as a prediction-fulfilment. The Pharisees and the
scribes pose the question: “Why do your disciples not [walk]
according to the tradition of the elders, but eat with hands
defiled?” (v. 5). Jesus responds by citing Is 29:13, the meaning
of which he explains: you leave the commandment of God, and hold
fast the tradition of men (v. 8). As an answer to the question
addressed in v. 5, the statement ascribed to Jesus could be
interpreted thus: the disciples do not live according to the
tradition of the elders because it does not represent the
commandment of God.

The unfavourable portrait of the "Jews" in this first sub-section manifests itself in the parenthesis of vv. 3-4. Here the evangelist purports to describe the cleansing rituals of the Jewish people. No doubt an uninformed Gentile readership would have found such practices a curiosity, if not an eccentricity. Here we cannot miss the biting satire. Worse still, the ascription of these rituals to all of the Jews is a gross generalization with no factual basis. An equally unfavourable characterization of the Pharisees and the scribes manifests itself in the introductory clause of v. 6 before the Isaiah reference. At this point, the "Jewish" religious authorities are labelled "hypocrites." Thus a mere refutation of the "Jewish" position does not satisfy the evangelist. Ironically Jewish sacred writ serves to undergird an attack on the integrity of the custodians of institutional Judaism. Finally, the generalization of v. 8

---

921 Taylor, Mark, 335.
922 Sim. ibid., 336.
923 Admittedly, the Pharisees did practise elaborate cleansing rituals. Thus far we can accept the Markan report (so Martin Hengel, "Mc 73 πιστευτική: Die Geschichte einer exegetischen Aporie", ZNTW LX [1969], 196, cited in Pesch, Markus, I, 371; Gnilka, Markus, I, 281). Yet no historical evidence exists to connect these rituals with other Jews. The people tended to distance themselves from them, and the Sadducees resisted assignment of such observances to religious life in general (ibid.) In fact, the placing of the phrase "and all the Jews" after "the Pharisees" looks to be an afterthought wherein Mark holds the Jewish tradition up to ridicule. Certainly an exaggeration (Cranfield, Mark, 232; Pesch, Markus, I, 371), the inclusion of the phrase could be simply a rhetorical device which has "run wild." The inclusion of the words καὶ κληρον ("and beds") at the end of v. 4 would, of course, befit the irony with which the whole matter of Jewish cleansing ritual is treated (Gnilka, Markus, I, 282). However, this variant probably does not represent the original Marcan reading (absence: Βο ΒΝ ΡC βο; presence: ΡΑΔΘΗΛΦ ΠL latt sy' sa). In any case, the evangelist is not speaking sine ira et studio (ibid., 281).
924 Interestingly, the noun μάτην ("hypocrite") itself is one of the
looks to be something of an anti-Pharisaic caricature.\textsuperscript{925}

Certainly such statements would not promote fruitful discussion between Christians and Jews. Moreover, the composition itself reflects a largely non-Jewish milieu. Hence the Marcan "Jew" looks to be a rhetorical device. A literary construct, the Marcan "Jew" serves to represent a non-Marcan theological stance. Mark seeks to refute that viewpoint through a discrediting of its exponents.

ii. \textit{Mk 7:9-13}

A case of an observance of human tradition at the expense of divine commandment serves to illustrate the summary statement of Jesus' charge in v. 8 at the end of the first sub-section. Indeed the Fifth Commandment of the Decalogue plainly stipulates: "honour your father and your mother" (v. 10a), and its codicil: "he who speaks evil of father or mother, let him surely die" (v. 10b). These citations each constitute a \textit{factual reading of the OT text}. Moreover, they both possess the form of an \textit{injunction}. Such injunctions represent divine commandment (vv. 8, 9). Over against these, stands the Corban practice. Strict observance of the latter could, as we saw, pose a hindrance to compliance with the former. The charge in vv. 8, 9 of abandonment of divine law in favour of man-made tradition is thereby provided a concrete illustration and has thus fulfilled Isaiah's prophecy "excellently" (καλῶς).

However, three basic assumptions underlie the argument of recurring words of the Greek translator of Isaiah (27:3; 28:17; 30:5; 41:20) (Pesch, \textit{Markus}, I, 373).

\textsuperscript{925}Hultgren, \textit{Jesus and Adversaries}, 144 n. 98, 142 n. 80, 179.
vv. 10-13a. The first poses no difficulty whatsoever. Attention to the material well-being of one's parents could constitute a form of honouring them. Unfortunately the other two assumptions fare somewhat less favourably. On the one hand, it is not immediately obvious how the deprival of one's parents could represent "speaking evil of father or mother" (v. 10b). Taylor has opined that the Septuagint version of the quotation from Ex 21:17 is secondary and that the original text type bore a significance somewhat more akin to that of the MT. This proposal would certainly alleviate the difficulty. A deprivation of material support could in intention and consequence represent a "cursing" of one's parents. However, no manuscript evidence exists to support Taylor's otherwise attractive suggestion. On the other hand, the dismissal of the Corban practice as mere human tradition, is a blatant inaccuracy. Indeed several scholars have indicated the scriptural basis of Corban in Num 30:2 as part of the written Torah. Jewish religious authorities would scarcely jettison a Mosaic legal prescription in such a summary fashion. Moreover, the evidence of tractate Nedarim in the Mishnah suggests a debate among Pharisees themselves over the possibility of a retraction of Corban vows in such cases as the above.

The foregoing difficulties themselves serve to reveal the

---

926 Cf. above pp. 318-19.
927 So Taylor Mark, 340.
928 Presumably, the purpose of the inclusion of this codical (v. 10b = Ex 21:17) was to stress the gravity attendant upon deprivation of one's parents. To wit, Jesus thereby places this particular abuse of the Corban formula under a divine curse (Gnilka, Markus, I, 283).
929 So Cranfield, Mark, 238; Gnilka, Markus, I, 284; Pesch, Markus, I, 375. Hooker cites Dt 23:21-23 as well ("OT in Mk", 221).
patent artificiality of the discussion in this third sub-section. Nonetheless, we also need to consider the broader context of the Corban discussion. The actual relevance of this discussion to the question of Jesus' religious opponents (v. 5) is not altogether clear. In what way does the insistence upon ritual hand-washing undermine the divine commandment? What is explained is why the disciples do not "walk" in accordance with the tradition of the elders as a general principle: under certain circumstances doing so could hinder compliance with the commandment of God.\footnote{The emphasis here is the indissoluble connection between love of God and love of neighbour (Pesch, Markus, I, 376).} What remains unexplained, though, is the manner in which ritual cleansing in particular, human tradition as it is, could pose such a problem. To this extent, the whole discussion of the Corban practice is something of a digression from the issue of v. 5.

As in vv. 1-8, so also in vv. 9-13, we find a studied effort to cast the theological stance to the "Jews" in an unfavourable light. We note the ironic use of the adverb καλὸς in (v. 9), the juxtaposition of "your tradition" with the "commandment/word of God" (vv. 9, 13a),\footnote{Cranfield writes thus: "In the last resort the oral law or tradition was an attempt by men to get control of and to manipulate the Divine Law ... In so doing they substituted for the Law of God a human legalism ... [F]or all human handling of the Word of God is continually beset by the temptation to try to turn the Word of God into a business of conventional piety and morals, something manageable and complimentary to human self-complacency" (Mark, 243-44). Yet this pitting of tradition against the divine commandment may not be an altogether appropriate representation: "[T]he generative concept ... from which the Mishnaic tractates emerge is not scripture, precisely as the rabbis of the second and later centuries claim, but an entirely separate 'Torah' --'revelation' in theological language" (Neusner, "The Meaning of Oral Torah", 28). Its autonomy and independence notwithstanding, the oral Torah did}
of the severe penalty on violation of the former (v. 10b),\textsuperscript{932} and the concluding statement with its "glittering" generalization (v. 13b). This unflattering depiction of the "Judaism" as an institutional religion already found its apparent confirmation in the Isaianic proof-text in vv. 6-7 of the previous sub-section. At the same time, the stance of Mark's "Jesus" also finds its justification in the sacred texts of the Jews. The placing of the injunctions of Ex 20:12a = Dt 5:16a on the lips of her "Jesus" --her Lord and her spokesman--serves to establish the Christian community as loyal to the Sinaitic Covenant.\textsuperscript{933} As such, she constitutes the new Israel. The appeal to the scriptures by the church in this sub-section serves a two-fold purpose. Firstly, the church endeavours to legitimate her theological stance through the mouth of the Marcan "Jesus." Secondly, she attempts to discredit her opponents' theological position by ascription of it to the allegedly misguided "Jew."

serve a purpose complementary to that of the written Torah. Says Neusner:
"Perhaps a certain logic, inherent in the subject-matter, dictated that there should have been two Torahs, the written one for the cult, the oral, other, for the world outside the cult, one for the place of the holy, the other for the realm of the ordinary and profane" (ibid., 32).
The purpose of oral tradition thus was not the usurpation of the place of Holy Writ. Granted, the foregoing assessment by Neusner finds reference in a post-Marcan period. All the same, we would not expect a total discontinuity with the practice of the Marcan period.

\textsuperscript{932}The citation of the codicil does indeed emphasise the gravity of violation of the commandment. However, the citation also conveys a severe condemnation of the practices of contemporary Jewish religion.

\textsuperscript{933}Cf. Hooker: "Jesus is presented as a loyal son of Moses" (ibid., 221); also Burkill: "Jesus fulfils a divine commission, and hence he does not wish to subvert the God-given Law of Moses, but carefully complies with its requirements (see 1:44; 7:9-13 and 12:28-34)" (Mysterious Revelation, 119).
Once again, the Marcan "Jew" is a rhetorical device. The hostile tone of the discussion would not facilitate fruitful debate between church and synagogue. Once again, the manifest inaccuracies of its representation of Jewish religious custom signal a largely non-Jewish context for the development of this second sub-section. This sub-section, like the first, embodies a refutation of the "Jews" as theological opponents of the evangelist. However, this section proceeds somewhat further than the first. That is to say, it serves to portray "Jesus" as the Marcan party as faithful within the covenant relationship with God.

iii. *Mk 7:14-23*

The final sub-section of the present pericope contains two references to the Torah. First of all, we find a sweeping allusion in the dictum of v. 19b to food laws of the written Torah. Here the general outline in vv. 18b-19a of the digestive process indicates a factual reading of such OT injunctions. Conceivably, the compiler and/or his readership might have viewed such injunctions as non-biblical precepts. At the same time, the evangelist and his readership could have had full cognizance of a categorical dismissal of an entire corpus of OT law. Secondly, the list of so-called vices in vv. 21-22 constitute violations of specific commandments of the Decalogue. Each one of these violations would entail a factual reading of an OT injunction. Here we cannot establish a direct appeal to the OT texts. The designation of such vices as defiling agents shows a consistency with the previous sub-sections in their explicit endorsement of divine commandment. Yet the catalogue of vices as a whole
possesses the overall form of similar compositions within Jewish proselyte traditions.

The impossibility of the defilement of an individual in his essential being (i.e. the heart) through the ingestion of anything material (e.g. food) (vv. 18b-19a; cf. v. 15a) is the presupposition of the lifting of all proscriptions against certain food-stuffs (v. 19b). From our standpoint, no reason exists to question the principle itself. However, people of Jewish background would no doubt see this dictum as revolutionary. By contrast, a largely non-Jewish readership would draw two important conclusions from such a statement. Firstly, the Lord of the church represents a higher authority than the Mosaic Law. As Hooker says, the authority to overrule the Law attributed to Jesus reflects a similar position adopted with respect to sabbath-day observance in 2:28 ("OT in Mk", 222).

Accordingly, he pronounces the food laws null and void. To this extent, the third sub-section represents a significant development in comparison with that of the first two. Secondly, institutional Judaism does not know its God. Once again, the whole posture of the discussion in this final sub-section seems to preclude the church's response to Jewish criticism as its formative matrix.

The assigned role of the "Jew" as the mouthpiece for the expression of a non-Marcan viewpoint clearly manifests itself in v. 18a. In this connection, "Jesus" addresses his disciples with the reproachful question, "Are you also [i.e. like the 'Jews']

---

934 Best, Gospel as Story, 139.
935 Cf. Best, Markan Soteriology, 99 n. 1.
936 With that, the universally-binding authority of the Mosaic Law is unconditionally debunked (cf. Pesch, Markus, I, 384, cf. 381).
without understanding?" Indeed the "Jew" has become a byword for misunderstanding. Not surprisingly, "foolishness" (ἀφοροσύνη) is one of the fruits of a heart far from God (v. 22). Thus Hurd observes: "'Judaism' neither hears what God is saying nor does it speak correctly about him."

The shaping of the discussion of 7:1-23 did not take place in close proximity to Jewish milieu. To be sure, the patent misrepresentation of Jewish religious institutions at the pre-Marcan stage (vv. 2, 5-7[8?], 9-13a) would itself render such a provenance highly unlikely. Labelling of the Pharisees and the scribes as "hypocrites" (v. 6) would similarly not reflect a serious attempt at the facilitation of fruitful dialogue with the Jewish authorities. At the same time, these same considerations would not enhance the probability of the presence among the intended readership of a sizable proportion of Christian believers of Jewish background. Moreover, the Marcan editorial comments (vv. 2 [final clause], 3-4, 11 [final clause], 13b) would, Jewishly speaking, lend the first two sub-sections a decidedly inflammatory tone.

The "Jesus" of the first two sub-sections of our pericope is a champion of the Mosaic Law. Yet the third sub-section is a purely Marcan artifact. Not surprisingly, this part of the pericope constitutes a further development. In this connection,

937 The fool (cf. 18b: ἄσυνετος ["senseless," "foolish" (Arndt/Gingrich, s.v. ἄσυνετος)]) does not know God (Pesch, Markus, I, 283). Cf. Ps 14:1a = 53:1a: "The fool (ἀφορον) says in his heart, 'There is no God.'"
938 "Isaiah's Curse", 10 (quotation marks added); cf. Schulz, "Markus und AT", 191.
"Jesus" is no longer merely the champion of the Law as against the oral tradition of the Jews. Here Mark's own "Jesus" can abrogate the written Torah. Otherwise stated, the Jesus of Marcan theology represents a higher authority than the Law itself. Such a bold statement would hardly warrant serious consideration within the context of institutional Judaism. On the contrary, it seriously questions the founding principle of Judaism as a religious phenomenon.

Consequently, the "Jews" of the narrative world of Mark's gospel can on no account represent an historical reality.\textsuperscript{939} What we have instead is a rhetorical device.\textsuperscript{940} The hermeneutical function of this literary construct is to explain theological misconception for/within the Marcan community in terms of a heart alienated from its God.\textsuperscript{941}

\textsuperscript{939} Nor, for that matter, can the "Jesus" of our pericope represent an historical reality. With that, we cannot endorse Best's assessment of this pericope. In other words, Mk 7:1-23 is considered a "genuine argument" and therein Jesus strives to gain the support of his opponents (so Best, Markan Soteriology, 39).

\textsuperscript{940} Best has written thus: "The church continued to be involved in controversy with the Jews and so accounts of Jesus' discussions with them would be of use ... " (Gospel as Story, 4).

To be sure, such "accounts of Jesus' discussions with [the Jews]" continue to provide useful material for the church. However, the evangelist is addressing a largely Gentile community, and for that reason we have to question Best's evaluation of the usability of such accounts.

\textsuperscript{941} To this extent, we would not ascribe the evangelist an hostility to Jews per se. Thus Pesch's assessment with respect to the reference in vv. 3-4 to "all Jews" (Markus, I, 376) would rightly characterize the pericope in question as a whole.
A Discussion about Divorce and Remarriage - Mk 10:2-10

A. TRADITION-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

The introductory verse which stands at the head of the pericope (v. 1) serves to locate the three topics of instruction in vv. 2-31\(^{942}\) within the general framework of the anabasis to Jerusalem.\(^{943}\) In view of this consideration alone, we can safely regard it as a redactional formation.\(^{944}\) The occurrence of the construction εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου tends to support this conclusion insofar as it contains a geographic inaccuracy.\(^{945}\) This apparent unfamiliarity with Palestinian geography indicates a non-Palestinian provenance for v. 1, but beyond that the occurrence of a similar turn of

---

\(^{942}\)I.e. divorce (vv. 2-12), children (vv. 13-16), and riches (vv. 17-31).


The so-called 'ecclesiological' section of Mark's gospel (8:27-10:52) (so Pesch, *Markus*, II, 119) includes instruction on the nature of his ministry and the meaning of discipleship (Best, *Markan Soteriology*, 121). Here the "disciples" represent the believing community (so Pesch, *Markus*, II, 119). The frequency of appropriate cues with which the section is punctuated (8:27; 9:2, 9, 14, 30, 33; 10:1, 17, 32, 46) (Best, *Markan Soteriology*, 121 n. 3) serves to convey a sense of continual movement towards Jerusalem (ibid., 121). Yet strangely, the incident described in vv. 2-12 Best considers to be a variation from this pattern (ibid., 124) in that here no actual teaching of Jesus is provided (ibid., 72)!

\(^{945}\)The two principle text variants are obvious corrections of this inaccuracy. They are: εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (C2 GDWΘαλφα latt); and εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας διὰ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (RAmmpm). Not surprisingly, the manuscript evidence tends to support the most difficult reading (BNC*LPpc co). A number of scholars give the problem detailed treatment. See e.g. Cranfield, *Mark*, 317-18; Gnilka, *Markus*, II, 70-71; Pesch, *Markus*, II, 121; Taylor, *Mark*, 416-17.
expression elsewhere in Mark's gospel (3:7b-8) suggests a stylistic peculiarity of the evangelist. Further evidence of redactional activity includes the use of the adverb πάλιν (2x) (cf. v. 10) and the verb διδάσκω as well as the use of the verb ἄρχομαι with the infinitive (διδάσκειν) and the use of the redundant participle ἀναστάς (if that in fact be what it is).

The pericope reported in vv. 2-12 comprises two parts, the public teaching of the crowds (vv. 2-9) and the private teaching of the disciples (vv. 10-12). Form-critically, vv. 2-9 constitute a controversy dialogue. Above all, three considerations serve to

---

946 The double statement of locale is also a Marcan stylistic feature (Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 95).
947 Pryke, Redactional Style, 96-99, 135, 137 (25 of 28 occurrences redactional); Taylor, Mark, 192.
948 Pryke, Redactional Style, 136 (15 of 17 occurrences redactional); cf. Best, Markan Soteriology, 71-72.
949 Pryke, Redactional Style, 79-87, 135 (26 of 26 occurrences redactional).
950 Taylor, Mark, 63.
951 So ibid., 416; diff. Pryke, Markan Redaction, 24.
952 So Bultmann, HST, 12, 39, 41; Gn, Markus, II, 70, 71; sim. Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 26: 10:2-9 a conflict story.
953 On the other hand, Pesch classifies 10:2-9 as a scholastic dialogue. The following observations are made. Firstly, a question is addressed the master (v. 2); secondly, the master responds with a counter-question (v. 3); thirdly, those who pose the question respond to the counter question (v. 4); and fourthly, the master gives his answer to the original question (vv. 5-9).
establish the patent artificiality of this first part. First of all, Bultmann has called attention to the inappropriateness of vv. 3-4 in the mouth of Jesus. A counter-argument to Jesus' position (v. 9), such material would have assumed greater appropriateness in the mouth of his opposition. Thus one might have expected a somewhat different counter-question from that of v. 3.\textsuperscript{953} Secondly, the Pharisees' question (v. 2) is a general one (cf. Mt 19:3: "for any cause").\textsuperscript{954} Accordingly, the response of the Pharisees (v. 4) to Jesus' counter-question (v. 3) contains nothing in regard to grounds for divorce (cf. Mt 19:9). This omission would, however, represent an improbability.\textsuperscript{955} Thirdly, v. 9 as Jesus' pronouncement on the indissolubility of marriage conveys the decided impression of an insertion into an essentially

\textsuperscript{(Markus, II, 120). Yet, the distinction between the public and private answer to a question addressed to Jesus (v. 2) appears to be a decisive reason cited for his form-critical evaluation of the text (see ibid., 126, cf. 120). Unfortunately, Pesch appears to overlook two considerations. Firstly, the difference in perspective evidenced in vv. 2-9 and vv. 10-12 (see below pp. 344-45) raises doubts as to whether vv. 2-9 are a scribal defence of the position assumed in vv. 10-12. Secondly, a significant feature of the question addressed to Jesus in v. 2 is the fact that his opponents pose it in order to entrap him (πειράζω) (Best, \textit{Markan Soteriology}, 32). The tone of the discussion portrayed in vv. 2-9 is not that of an academic debate, but a controversy (see Bultmann, \textit{HST}, 39). In short, the dialogue of vv. 2-9 would more adequately fit the genre of controversy dialogue. At the same time, the pronouncement of v. 9 would also permit a classification of the discussion as a pronouncement-story (Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 415; Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 317).

\textsuperscript{953} See \textit{HST}, 27.

\textsuperscript{954} Hultgren, \textit{Jesus and Adversaries}, 187.

\textsuperscript{955} See \textit{HST}, 27.
alien narrative. In consequence of the citation of OT text in vv. 7-8 marriage partners are said to have "one flesh." The dominical saying would not thereby represent a superfluous addition. Nonetheless, v. 9 reflects a different understanding of the marital bond. Here the conception is that of a "yoking" of partners. Moreover, the structural pattern of v. 9 is that of an antithetic parallelism. Sayings constructed thus are generally wisdom or legal sayings. As such, they do not constitute arguments from the exegesis of scripture. In point of fact, they embody, arguments in and of themselves.

956 So Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 22.
957 Contra ibid., 120. The narrator has, as Hultgren himself acknowledges, construed v. 9 as the conclusion of the scriptures in vv. 7-8 (ibid., 144 n. 98).
958 Ibid.
959 Ibid. On the contrary, [t]heir authority rests not on exegetical arguments but, at least in the conflict stories, on the attitudes of Jesus as remembered by the church (ibid.).
960 So ibid., 120; but contra Gnilka, Markus, II, 70: v. 9 as an intelligible logion requires the foregoing material of vv. 2-8.

In spite of the manifest artificiality of the construction of this vignette, Bultmann does see a possible reminiscence of Jesus. He writes:
"It is ... probable that the way in which Mk 10:2-9 sets one quotation of scripture against another actually goes back to Jesus ... [T]his was unheard of among the Rabbis. They often constructed aporia out of two apparently contradictory texts of scripture, but only in order to pass on its solution" (HST, 49-50).

Taylor has observed that, "[the clause] πειράζοντες αὐτόν indicates the [Pharisees'] intention is to put Jesus to the test (cf. viii. 11, xi. 15) either by bringing Him into conflict with the Law or by compromising Him in the eyes of Herod (cf. vi. 17f.)" (Mark, 417; sim. Cranfield, Mark, 318). The position ascribed to Jesus in vv. 5-9 could have prompted opposition from the religious authorities, that of vv. 11-12 opposition from Herod. To this extent, the scene depicted in
Three additional characteristics would, in Pesch's view, identify this first section as a fabrication of the early church:
(a) the question which is addressed to Jesus by the Pharisees in v. 2 presupposes a prohibition of divorce which as such follows from Christian as opposed to Pharisaic-Jewish premises;
(b) the scripture-proof formulated in vv. 6-8 is based on the LXX;
(c) the prohibition of divorce (vv. 6-9) in its reasoning does not presuppose Jewish legal relationships, but Hellenistic ones.
That is to say, vv. 10-12 indicate the same applicability of the prohibition for husband and wife. Arguments (a) and (b) present no major difficulties. Indeed argument (c) seems to involve an interesting observation. The query of the Pharisees concerns the case of a man who divorces his wife. Yet Jesus' reply to that query could also involve the case of a woman who divorces her spouse. To this extent, one might indeed regard vv. 2-9 as a defence of the position articulated in the logia of vv. 11-12. Nonetheless, condemnation of remarriage after divorce as adultery in vv. 10-12 looks to be an expansion of the first part of the pericope.

v. 2 may contain a reminiscence from the life of Jesus. Nonetheless, "[the clause πειράζοντες αὐτόν] may have been added by Mark or an early scribe" (so Taylor, Mark, 417).

961 Pesch, Markus, II, 120.

962 Admittedly Jesus could have uttered a prohibition of divorce (so Gnilka, Markus, II, 70; Pesch, Markus, II, 125). Yet the probability that a Palestinian Jew would have done so is, in our estimation, quite small.

963 See below p. 341 incl. n. 978.

964 Cf. Pesch, Markus, II, 126.
A number of additional considerations signal the formulation of vv. 2-9 in the church. Firstly, the Pharisees are Jesus' designated opponents.965 Secondly, the Pharisees' question of v. 2 with its testing posture implies prior knowledge of Jesus' position. This prior knowledge would, in itself, suggest later debate within the church.966 Thirdly, a discussion of ethical problems reflects an community in existence for some time.967 In this connection we note the ethical admonitions in the Pauline epistles. Finally, the argument in vv. 2-9 employs appeals to OT scripture.968 Again, this would necessitate some period of time for theological reflection.

Interestingly, Bultmann elects to ascribe the compilation of

965 Certainly the synoptic tradition evidences a progressive tendency to represent Pharisees and/or scribes as opponents of Jesus (see above p. 255 n. 693). With that, one would argue this particular reference as a later development within the synoptic tradition (cf. Gnilka, Markus, II, 71 n. 12). Nevertheless, some commentators regard the identification of Jesus' opponents at this point (v. 2) as a post-Marcan gloss (so e.g. Taylor, Mark, 417: a probability; cf. Cranfield, Mark, 318 and Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 119-20, 182: a possibility. Yet the so-called "Western readings alone lack the identification of Jesus' opponents as the Pharisees (D a b k r sy\textsuperscript{2}) (ibid., 143 n. 94; Taylor, Mark, 417). Moreover, several important manuscripts do, in fact, attest the phrase (καὶ) προσελθόντες (οἱ) Θαρισάιοι (BANCW0) (Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 143 n. 93). Indeed a number of Western texts would appear to have escaped revision at points (ibid., 143 n. 95) and assimilation to Mt 19:3 would certainly explain the reference to the Pharisees here (ibid.). Still, no solid evidence exists to corroborate an hypothesis of post-Marcan gloss.

966 So Gnilka, Markus, II, 70.
967 Cf. ibid., 75.
968 See above p. 254 n. 691.
vv. 2-9 to Palestinian Christianity.\textsuperscript{969} However, textual evidence serves to render this view indefensible. The morphology of the OT references evidences a direct dependence on the LXX.\textsuperscript{970} This in itself serves to locate the origin of the composition within Greek-speaking circles.\textsuperscript{971} Furthermore, the formulation of the question in v. 2 among a group of Palestinian converts is an exceedingly unlikely possibility. A community of Palestinian converts would undoubtedly take cognizance of the legality of divorce under the Law of Moses. The ascription of the citation of Dt 24:1 in v. 4 in response to Jesus' counter-question to the Pharisees (v. 3) would itself be a tacit acknowledgment to such an awareness.

The formulation of the initial question of this section would, for Hultgren, preclude its purpose as a rebuttal to Jewish criticism.\textsuperscript{972} So also would the attendant circumstances of this controversy dialogue. Neither Jesus' activity, nor his disciples' is the precipitating factor. Hence the setting of this first part does not represent the "typical scene" in Jesus' ministry. With that, vv. 2-9 do not convey the impression of a response to Jewish criticism.\textsuperscript{973} On the contrary, the reply of

\textsuperscript{969}HST, 48.

\textsuperscript{970}Pesch, Markus, II, 120, 124.

\textsuperscript{971}Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 121.

\textsuperscript{972}Ibid., 122.

\textsuperscript{973}Contra Gnilka, Markus, II, 70: yet the narrator's chief interest is a catechetical one. Moreover, the intended readership might also include doubting members of his community.
Jesus to his interrogators serves to impart instruction on a point of doctrine. Yet the composition does, in Hultgren's opinion, find its provenance among the churches of the Diaspora.

Hultgren has characterized the initial question (v. 2) as a suitable introduction to a catechetical response. To this extent, we find no difficulty with that judgement. Yet we would seriously question his identification of its intended addressees as Jewish converts. First of all, an unqualified prohibition of divorce (v. 9) at the earliest stage of the church tradition finds no additional documentation in our extant sources. This in itself undermines Hultgren's hypothesis of catechesis for Jewish converts. Secondly, presence of the noun ἀνθρώπος in the LXX citation (cf. MT: ἡ ἱματική) of v. 7 (cf. v. 9) casts doubt on Hultgren's exclusion of women from the ruling of Jesus in v. 9. Such an exclusion would eliminate Gentile converts as intended.

---

974 Cum Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 146 n. 113: Mark locates vv. 2-9 in the catechetical section of vv. 1-27; however, ibid., 145-46: vv. 2-9 betrays catechetical interest from the outset of its tradition-history; contra Bultmann, HST, 146: vv. 3-9 a "debating saying" for polemic/apologetic purposes, ibid., 136: a "legal saying" for the justification of the new against the old outlook.

975 Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 132-33; sim. Gnilka, Markus, II, 70.

976 Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 122.

977 On the contrary, 1 Cor 7:12-15 (cited in ibid.!) as an early stage of development attests exceptions.

978 To wit, the noun ἀνθρώπος would convey the generic sense of a "human being" (Arndt/Gingrich, s.v. ἀνθρώπος 3.a.a-γ). The text does, of course, report the noun γυνή ("wife") unchanged. Yet this observation should not surprise us at all. Neither the LXX translators nor contemporary Christian authors know a designation for spouses of unspecified gender.
Finally, an unqualified application of v. 5 to a Jewish convert would scarcely elicit a favourable response. Moreover, the statement serves to compromise the integrity of Moses as mediator of the Law. Again, such a suggestion would not readily gain a sympathetic hearing among a Jewish-Christian readership.

On no account can vv. 2-9 represent a unitary composition. The dominical saying of v. 9 betrays insertion into an alien context. Presumably, the compiler of these verses has composed the question of v. 2 in view of that logion and added the scriptures of vv. 7-8 as preparation for the latter. The final statement of v. 9 would thus have initially enjoyed currency as a free-floating logion. Form-critically, Bultmann classifies this single-stranded maschel as a "personal formulation" under sub-category "principle." In substance, this pronouncement might well reflect Jesus in his attitude about divorce. Yet its

---

979 Roman law would have permitted initiation of divorce proceedings by women (Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 122).
980 Contra ibid., 122-23. See e.g. 2 Cor 3:13.
981 Contra Taylor, Mark, 419 and Gnilka, Markus, II, 70 also.
982 See above pp. 336-37.
983 Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 145 n. 108.
984 Bultmann, HST, 81; Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 120, 144 n. 97.
985 HST, 81.
986 Ibid., 73, 74: Cf. Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 120: a "wisdom" or "legal saying."
987 Ibid., 121: cf. Q (Mt 5:32 = Lk 16:18) and Paul (1 Cor 7:10).
provenance is the Hellenistic church.\textsuperscript{988} Firstly, the accusative form of relative pronoun \(\tau\) serves to introduce the first member --itself a relative clause--of the antithetic parallelism. This is not a Semitic, but a Greek construction.\textsuperscript{989} Secondly, use of the verb \(\sigma\nu\zeta\varepsilon\upsilon\gamma\nu\mu\iota\) ("yoke together") for marriage represents Hellenistic idiom. However, the literature of the Diaspora affords the sole Jewish counter-parts.\textsuperscript{990} Finally, use of the verb \(\chi\omega\rho\iota\zeta\omega\) for divorce represents Hellenistic idiom. Paul and Josephus employ it as well. Yet the LXX never uses this term as divorce terminology. Nor, in fact, does the gospel tradition use it elsewhere (parallel Mt 19:6 excluded), but rather the verb \(\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\omega\).\textsuperscript{991}

Not only does the controversy dialogue of vv. 2-9 prove to be an artifact of the early church, but positive evidence exists to establish some measure of redactional interference. First of all, we note the clause \(\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\zeta\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\) in the preface to the Pharisees' question.\textsuperscript{992} Next Jesus' religious opponents are given an unfavourable portrayal with their "hard-heartedness" (\(\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\sigma\kappa\alpha\vartheta\delta\iota\sigma\)) underlined (v. 5). This characterization of Jesus' adversaries is also an out-playing of Marcan theology.\textsuperscript{993} Stylistic

\textsuperscript{988} Cum ibid., 178.
\textsuperscript{989} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{990} Ibid., 121; cf. Pesch, \textit{Markus}, II, 124.
\textsuperscript{991} Hultgren, \textit{Jesus and Adversaries}, 121; cf. Pesch, \textit{Markus}, II, 124.
\textsuperscript{992} So Hultgren, \textit{Jesus and Adversaries}, 120: N.B. the same construction in the redactional Mk 8:11; sim. Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 417: the phrase possibly a Marcan addition.
\textsuperscript{993} Cum Lambrecht, "Redaction and Theology", 284;
considerations also betray the hand of the evangelist. Thus we find the verb ἐπερωτάω (v. 2, cf. v. 10). Moreover, Neirynck has observed several instances of Marcan duality. These include: the quotation of scripture (vv. 6-8a) with a commentary (vv. 8b-9), positive-negative double statement (vv. 8b and 9), a juxtaposition of negative clauses (vv. 8b and 9), a repetition of a motif (vv. 8a and 8b), and antithetic parallelism (v. 9). On first inspection, the redactional features appear to represent a small number, yet the large proportion of material from the Jewish scriptures (vv. 3-4, 6-8a), serves to offset this initial impression. Indeed we would not deny the distinct possibility of Marcan indebtedness to a pre-gospel tradition. Nonetheless, stylistic features, as well as theological considerations signal considerable editorial manipulation in vv. 2-9 of our present pericope.

The second part of the pericope (vv. 10-12) is an expansion

contra Pesch, Markus, II, 125.
994 See above p. 305 n. 863.
995 Duality in Mark, 124.
996 V. 8b: ... οὐκέτι ... ἀλλά ...;
v. 9: ... συνέζευξεν ... μὴ χωρίζετω (ibid. 92).
997 V. 8b: οὐκέτι-clause; v. 9: μὴ-clause (ibid., 88).
998 Ibid., 99.
999 Ibid., 133.
1000 So Gnilka, Markus, II, 70; see Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 120: his reconstruction.
1001 Contra ibid., 119: "The Marcan pericope contains little which can be attributed to the editorial work of Mark;" Pesch, Markus, II, 120: the evangelist has left the vignette largely, if not completely unaltered.
to the first part (vv. 2-9).

First of all, we detect a shift in the focus of the discussion. The preceding verses concerned the legitimacy of divorce per se. Now the focus here is remarriage after divorce. Not surprisingly, v. 10 as a sentence of transition also manifests a significant number of typically Marcan features. Firstly, the teaching of the disciples takes place in private, i.e., "in a house" (εἰς τὴν οἶκίαν). Secondly, the

---

1003 Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 143 n. 88.
1004 Cf. Pryke who lists vv. 10-11a as redactional (Redactional Style, 18, 24).

The redactional features evidenced in v. 10, to say nothing of those in vv. 11-12, renders Gnilka's hypothesis that the addition of vv. 10-12 to vv. 2-9 antedates Mark's gospel highly improbable (Markus, II, 69). Not explicitly identified as such, vv. 2-9 as a scribal defence of the position articulated in vv. 11-12 (ibid., 70) nonetheless appears to be an underlying assumption in the argument, since the genre in question typically includes a scene wherein the master provides his disciples esoteric instruction (see ch. 1 p. 111). However, the degree of conformity with rabbinic narrative in vv. 2-9 is open to debate. Bultmann, for example, has observed that, "the way in which Mk 10 sets one quotation of scripture against another ... was unheard of among the Rabbis. They often enough constructed aporia out of two apparently contradictory texts of scripture, but only in order to pass along its solution" (HST, 49-50).

1005 Cf. e.g. 4:10; 7:17; 8:13-14; 9:28.

Two typically Marcan motifs may be asserting themselves at this point. Firstly, the disciples' need for further explanation serves to set their incomprehension in relief (Gnilka, Markus, II, 75). Secondly, the instruction of the disciples in private underlines their dependence on Jesus (cf. above ch. 2 pp. 213-17) and their obligation to transmit his teaching to the community (cum Gnilka, Markus, II, 75; our earlier observations would indicate thinking of this kind [ch. 1 p. 84 n. 187 (2nd para.)]).

1006 Best, Markan Soteriology, 63.

Certainly, the catechesis of the community is the origin of the instruction of the disciples in the house (so Gnilka, Markus, II, 69-70). Nevertheless this observation by Gnilka falls somewhat short of the mark. The adjective "Marcan" needs to
verse together with the formula which serves to introduce the
initial question of the Pharisees (v. 2), is an instance of
"duality in Mark"—as do the Pharisees, the disciples address a
question to Jesus.\(^{1007}\) At the same time, v. 10 reveals several
purely stylistic features of Mark. These include, the use of the
verb ἐπερωτάω (cf. v. 2),\(^{1008}\) the adverb πάλιν (cf. v. 1).\(^{1009}\)
Finally, the introductory clause which stands at the head of the
logia of vv. 11-12 contains the verb λέγω used in the historic
present tense.\(^{1010}\)

Neither of the logia reported in vv. 11 and 12 present a
serious claim to authenticity.\(^{1011}\) In connection with v. 11 we make
precede the noun "catechesis."

In connection with the phrase εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, Pesch has noted
the "mechanical" way in which the house becomes available on the
way to Jericho (Markus, II, 125).

\(^{1007}\) Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 99. N.B. the use of the same verb
ἐπερωτάω.

\(^{1008}\) See above p. 305 n. 863.

\(^{1009}\) Jeremias, Parables, 98 n. 33; see also above p. 335 n. 947.

On the other hand, the reference to the disciples without the
possessive adjective αὐτοῦ is not a typically Marcan feature
(cf. Pesch, Markus, II, 125).

\(^{1010}\) Taylor, Mark, 46-47; sim. Bultmann considers the introductory
formula καὶ λέγει αὐτοῦς Marcan (HST, 26).

\(^{1011}\) The logia reported in Mk 10:11-12 find parallel formulations in
the Q-source (Mt 5:32; 19:9/ Lk 16:18). A man who divorces his
wife and remarries commits adultery according to both Mark and Q
(Mt 19:9 [the qualifying rider μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεύῃ added (cf. 5:32)];
Lk 16:18). However, Matthew and Luke exhibit two agreements
against Mark. The condemnation of marriage to a divorced woman
as adultery is reported in Mt 5:32; Lk 16:18, but not in Mark. A
woman who divorces her husband and remarries commits adultery
according to Mark, but in Matthew and Luke she receives no
mention.

Endeavouring to connect Mk 10:11 with the historical Jesus,
Gnilka identifies the oldest extant form of the saying with
Lk 16:18, Mt 5:32 representing a rejudalized version (see Markus,
two observations. Firstly, the designation of the proceeding wherein a husband remarries after having divorced his wife as an act of adultery, presupposes a monogamous as opposed to a polygamous pattern of marriage. While the former represented the accepted norm in Hellenistic societies, the Jews adopted the latter in which case a married man could contract a second marriage without violating the first. Secondly, the notion of a man committing adultery against his wife (ἐν' αὐτῇ) does not reflect Jewish legal thought as it is transmitted by OT writers, although they are acquainted with the idea of violating the marriage of another man.

In connection with v. 12, one feature which is immediately

II, 75). Adopting a similar stance, Pesch, however, identifies Mt 5:32—excluding the reference to sexual impropriety—as the earliest form (see Markus, II, 125). Our own observations will not support the existence of an authentic logion underlying Mk 10:11-12. What our observations recorded in the foregoing paragraph do indicate is the existence of pre-gospel tradition relating to divorce and remarriage (cf. Cranfield, Mark, 317; Taylor, Mark, 415), and with that a tradition-history of vv. 11-12 independent of that of the controversy dialogue in vv. 2-9 (cf. Gnilka, Markus, II, 69).

1012 See Pesch, Markus, II, 125. As Pesch rightly says, the writer of v. 11 does not presuppose the drafting of a bill of divorce. Yet the assertion that divorce and legal separation are therefore not clearly distinguished and that only the contracting of a new marriage renders the latter irrevocable, is not given any sort of documentation (see ibid.).

1013 Ibid.; Taylor, Mark, 419; Cranfield, Mark, 321.

On the strength of the resultant inconsistency between Mk 10:11 and OT thought on the matter, Gnilka prefers to render the phrase ἐν' αὐτῇ ("with her") instead of the more widely recommended "against her" (Markus, II, 74-75). It is noted that a similar construction (ἐν τῇ γυναικί) may carry the same significance in Jer 5:8b (LXX): "every man lived in sin with his neighbour's wife" (see ibid., 75 n. 29).
obvious is its derivative character. This in itself establishes its secondary formation. Beyond that, the proceeding wherein a wife divorces her husband and remarries, does not accord with Jewish legal tradition but it is consistent with Graeco-Roman divorce law. In that case the verse cannot find its provenance on Palestinian soil. Indeed, the possibility that Mark himself may have formulated v. 12 suggests itself in the fact that it is a saying parallel in structure to v. 11.

---

1014 Ibid., 70, 75. The antecedent of the personal pronoun αὐτή (v. 12) is the noun γυνή ("wife") mentioned in v. 11, but αὐτή in v. 12, cannot denote the divorced wife (see below p. 349 n. 1017).

1015 Cranfield, Mark, 322; Taylor, Mark, 417, 419–20; cf. Pesch, Markus, II, 123. Salome's divorce of her husband elicits the following assessment by Josephus: "[T]his was not according to the Jewish laws; for us it is lawful for a husband to do so; but a wife if she departs from her husband, cannot of herself be married to another, unless her former husband put her away" (Ant. xv.7.10, cited in Taylor, Mark, 420).

   Given certain circumstances, a Jewish woman could obtain a divorce from her husband (Cranfield, Mark, 322 incl. n. 1; Taylor, Mark, 420; see St/Bi, II, 23–24). Still, the husband had to initiate the divorce proceeding (Taylor, Mark, 420).

1016 Best, Gospel as Story, 36; Gnilka, Markus, II, 75. Cf. 1 Cor 7:13.

   Nonetheless, the women of the community at Elephantine may have enjoyed greater freedom: see ibid., 75 n. 34; Taylor, Mark, 420.

1017 Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 134.

In our discussion of the tradition-history of Mk 10:12, we have assumed the reading which has the strongest support in the manuscript evidence; the Alexandrian text reads: καὶ ἐὰν αὐτή ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γάμησῃ ἄλλον (NBC σα βο).

Two other variants are attested:

(a) ... ἀπολύσῃ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλω (RAmp);
and (b) ... ἐξέλεξεν ἀπὸ ἄνδρος καὶ ἄλλον γαμήσῃ (D[Θ]pc it).

The Alexandrian reading according to which a woman could exercise the same right to divorce a spouse as could a man, would have afforded difficulties, so that the variant readings would constitute "an attempt to reduce the position of the woman who seems too daring" (Gnilka, Markus, II, 75; cf. Cranfield, who for reasons not stated, also accepts the Alexandrian reading..."
By way of summary, we may be permitted the following conclusions. Firstly, Mark has given the pericope of vv. 2-12 its current location by way of the introduction in v. 1. Secondly, the controversy dialogue of vv. 2-9 shows a considerable degree of redactional overlay. Thirdly, while vv. 11-12 in some form might represent pre-Marcan tradition, the vignette of vv. 10-12 is otherwise a Marcan construction.

[Mark, 320].

On first inspection, the personal pronoun αὐτῇ looks to be ambiguous in that its referent "may be the one in x. 11 who is divorced" (so Taylor, Mark, 420). Thus Bultmann can write: "the original text of Mark forbids a man to divorce his wife and his wife to marry again" (HST, 132). Such an exegesis, which presents an obvious ethical dilemma for the divorced wife, would afford ample reason for altering the original reading. Yet this exegesis contains a serious flaw. The protasis of v. 11 does not govern the statement of v. 12, but the apodosis of v. 11! That is to say, each of the two verses represents an independent grammatical construction, as the intervening punctuation (')shows. Thus we cannot assume that the pronoun αὐτῇ of v. 12 signifies a divorced woman, and what is more, if she were divorced, how could she then divorce her husband? The argument is self-evidently absurd. The other side of Taylor's alleged ambiguity, wherein the second wife is the referent of αὐτῇ, makes it difficult to understand why the writer had to employ the pronoun "another" as opposed to the pronoun "him."

A reminiscence of the case of Herodius (cf. 6:17-18) does not establish the originality of variant (b) as Taylor supposes (Mark, 420). On the contrary, no presumptive reason exists to deny a later assimilation to that story. Moreover, the attempt to explain the Alexandrian reading, and with it variant (a), as an assimilation of variant (b) to Gentile practice (ibid.) is an equally unconvincing hypothesis when we consider the fact that the evangelist was writing for a Gentile community in the first place.
B. MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF SCRIPTURES REPRESENTED

i. Verbal Contacts between Mk 10:4 and Dt 24:1-4 (LXX)

Mk 10:4

ἐπέτρεψεν τῷ Μωσῆς

βιβλίον ἀποστασίου γράψατε

καὶ ἀπολύσατε.

Dt 24:1, 3 (LXX)

γράψεται αὐτῇ βιβλίον ἀποστασίου ...

καὶ ἐξαποστελεῖ τὸν αὐτήν ...

The referent of the Pharisees' rehearsal of Mosaic divorce proceedings in Mk 10:4 is Dt 24:1-4 with its written codification of the accepted practice at that time. Indeed the opening verse of the LXX translation reports the law as a directive:

And if any one should take a wife, and should dwell with her, then it shall come to pass if she should not have found favour before him, because he has found some unbecoming thing [ἀδερφόν πράγμα] in her, that he shall

\[1018\] Here the dotted line which indicates a commonality between the infinitive ἀπολύσατε (Mk) on the one hand, and the finite verb ἐξαποστελεῖ (Dt) on the other, serves to highlight an approximation in meaning rather than wording.

\[1019\] A correct rendering would signify an "indecent act" (Arndt/Gingrich, s.v. ἀδερφόν). The sexual connotation to the adjective ἀδερφόν manifests itself in the story of the seduction of Jacob's daughter in Gen 34:1-7. Schechem is said to have "wrought folly" (v. 4). However, a literal translation of the phrase ἀδερφόν ποιεῖω would yield the reading "act indecently." Thus he defiles (v. 4: μαίνω) Dinah in 'lying with her' (vv. 2, 7).

The underlying Hebrew text reads דִּרְשׁוּת נְעֵרִים. Here the RSV renders the Hebrew "some indecency." A literal translation yields the reading "disgraceful thing" (Benjamin Davidson, The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, every word and inflection of the Hebrew Old Testament arranged alphabetically with grammatical analyses: a complete series of Hebrew and Chaldee paradigms, with grammatical remarks and explanations [Grand Rapids, Mich.:
write for her a bill of divorcement, and give it into her hands and he shall send her away out of his house. Similarly, the question attributed to Jesus in Mk 10:3 concerns what Moses commanded (cf. "he shall ... " [Dt]) in connection with divorce procedure. By contrast, the Pharisees' use of the verb "permit" serves to represent these stipulations as a privilege as opposed to a requirement of the Law.

Contentwise, the OT and the NT manifest commonality in their references to the writing of a bill of divorce (ßibblion òposstasiou) by the husband for the wife before his dismissal of her (Mk 10:4; Dt 24:1, 3). Neither the grounds for divorce, viz. evidence of some indecency in the wife (Dt 24:1), nor the delivery of the bill of divorce (Dt 24:1, 3) does the evangelist report, nor again the stipulations regarding any future relationship of the husband with the divorced wife (Dt 24:2-4). Lexically, there is but one significant contact between the LXX and NT, viz. the phrase γράψε·αι ... ßibblion òposstasiou (Mk 10:4; Dt 24:1, 3; Zondervan Publishing House of the Zondervan Corporation, 1970, 15th printing 1982 (Originally published by Samuel Bagster & Sons, Ltd., London, 1848, 2nd ed. 1850)], s.v. ̀̀hò III [henceforth cited Davidson]). By contrast, the Hebrew text behind Scchehem's "folly" in the RSV translation attests the construction òsì Patriots. Here the predicate signifies "performance of an act of disgrace" (ibid., s.v. ̀hò III). The immediate context of this phrase would necessarily denote a misdemeanour of a sexual nature. The Greek translators of Dt 24:1 have also construed òsì Patriots as a sexual impropriety. Interestingly, the construction is attested but once more at Dt 23:14 in the Hebrew scriptures. Yet its immediate context here is the Lord's instruction in connection with disposal of excrement en route to the Promised Land (vv. 12-14). Thus no "indecent thing" (RSV) must enter the camp. Such a finding serves to introduce uncertainty in connection with the significance of òsì Patriots in Dt 24:1.
Different verbs are used in regard to the dismissal of the wife—ἀπολύω (Mk 10:4) and ἐξαποστέλλω (Dt 24:1, 3). In view of the foregoing considerations, the representation of scripture encountered in Mk 10:4 is best designated a mimetic though somewhat abridged indirect content paraphrase of Dt 24:1, cf. 3.

ii. **Verbal Contacts between Mk 10:6 and Gen 1:27/5:2a (LXX)**

Mk 10:6

ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἤρθεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.

Gen 1:27 (LXX)

καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός τὸν ἄνθρωπον,

κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν,

ἤρθεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.

Gen 5:2 (LXX)

ἤρθεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς.

καὶ ἐπωνύμασεν τῷ ὄνομα αὐτῶν Αδάμ, ἥ ἡμέρα ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.

The words of scripture reported in Mk 10:6 are a verbatim quotation of the final clause of Gen 1:27 (LXX) and the initial clause of Gen 5:2a (LXX). Moreover, the prefacing of the quotation with the formula\(^{1020}\) ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως signifies the claim of providing a direct report from the beginning of the creation narrative.\(^{1021}\)

---

\(^{1020}\) So RSV.

\(^{1021}\) *Cum Gnilka, Markus, II, 72; contra Cranfield, Mark, 320.*
iii. **Verbal Contacts between Mk 10:7-8a and Gen 2:24 (LXX)**

**Mk 10:7-8a**

7. ἐνεκεν τοῦτού καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ματέρα,

[kαὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ]

8. καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

**Gen 2:24 (LXX)**

ἐνεκεν τοῦτον καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ματέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

Also governed by the introductory formula of Mk 10:6, the quotation of Gen 2:24 (LXX) in vv. 7-8a represents what the writer purports to be additional material from the narrative of creation. One minor deviation of the NT representation from that of the LXX is the absence of the possessive adjective αὐτοῦ after the noun μητήρ. In addition, some manuscript traditions do not report the clause καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ. On the one hand, the presence of these words is something of an oddity in light of the generic noun ἄνθρωπος. 

This consideration would explain their omission. On the other hand, a desire to bring the citation into line with the LXX or with Mt would explain the addition of the clause. However, the manuscript evidence tends

---

1022 That is to say, a person of unspecified gender: cf. the German Mensch.
to support the Alexandrian omission. Thus the representation of scripture encountered in Mk 10:7-8a is a highly mimetic, though somewhat abridged direct report.

iv. **Verbal Contact between Mk 10:11-12 and Ex 20:14/Dt 5:18 (LXX)**

Ex 20:14/Dt 5:18 (LXX)

οὐ μοιχεύσεις

Mk 10:11-12

11. δὲ ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχάται ἐπ' αὐτὴν,

12. καὶ ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχάται.

The two sayings reported in Mk 10:11-12 contain a reference to the commission of adultery. Indeed the use of the phrase ἐπ' αὐτὴν in conjunction with the verb μοιχάωμαι (Mk 10:11) underlines the negative manner in which the act of adultery is portrayed and thus suggests the prohibition of it in the Seventh Commandment of the Decalogue. The verb μοιχάωμαι is employed in both the LXX and the NT; yet there is no obvious attempt to reproduce the stylistic features of either formulation of this Decalogue prohibition. Only the existence of the prohibition is indicated--implicitly at that--and for this reason we would consider the representation of scripture a less "purely" diegetic summary.

---

1023 Omission - BNΨpc sy⁸; inclusion - (CL)R(A)DWΘ(λ)φpl lat sy⁹ sa bo.
v. Other Affinities of Mk 10:1-12 with OT Text

V. 5: Jesus ascribes "hard-heartedness" to the Pharisees:
πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν

Dt 10:16 (LXX): Moses exhorts the people of Israel to 'circumcise their hardness of heart:'
περιτεμεύσετε τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν

Jer 4:4 (LXX): Jeremiah exhorts the men of Judah to 'circumcise their hardness of heart:'
περιτέμεσθε τήν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν

cf. Ezek 3:7c (LXX): the Lord describes the people of Israel as "hard-hearted:"

πᾶς ὁ οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ... εἰς ...
σκληροκάρδιοι

V. 9: "What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder:"

Mal 2:16 (LXX): an admonition against the forsaking of the wife of one's youth (v. 14)\(^\text{1024}\)

cf. Mal 2:16 (MT): "'... I hate divorce,' says the Lord,
the God of Israel ..."

C. THE MEANING OF THE NT

i. Mk 10:2-5

The initial question posed by the Pharisees in v. 2, "Is it

\(^{1024}\text{Mal 2:16 (LXX) in full reads:}
 ἀλλὰ ἐὰν μισήσας ἐξαποστείλῃς, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ καλύψει ἀσέβεια ἐπὶ τὰ ἐνθυμήματά σου, λέγει κύριος πάντοκράτωρ. καὶ φυλάξασθε ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ὑμῶν καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπητε."
lawful for a man to divorce his wife?" implies a prior knowledge of Jesus' position on the issue of divorce insofar as it is characterized as testing. Not only the reference to the provisions outlined in Dt 24:1-4 (v. 4), but indeed various indictments against Israel wherein the prophets envision the possibility that the Lord himself should initiate divorce proceedings against his chosen people (albeit in a metaphorical sense) attest an acceptance, not to mention scriptural sanction of the practice of divorce within official Judaism, as does Tractate Gittin ("bills of divorce") of the Mishnah. Thus even a rudimentary knowledge of the socio-religious context in which the question of v. 2 is framed, would signal the theological stance of Jesus from the outset of the controversy dialogue, viz. his rejection of divorce. Jesus' perceived opposition to the Law would certainly elicit a challenge from his Jewish opponents.

A significant feature of the ensuing exchange between Jesus and his opponents is the difference in the perspectives from which they view the Mosaic directive concerning the writing of a bill of divorce. On the one side, the Pharisees interpret it as a God-given sanction of the divorce of a wife by her husband. The initial query reads, "Is it lawful [ἐξεστήν] ...?" (v. 2). Then,

---

1025 Gnilka, Markus, II, 71; cf. Pesch, Markus, II, 122. Undoubtedly the purpose of the Pharisees' question is to elicit a statement from Jesus on the matter. The point on which the Marcan community and contemporary Judaism differed, however, did not concern the possibility of divorce, as Best seems to suggest (Markan Soteriology, 32), but rather the circumstances under which divorce was permissible.

1026 Gnilka, Markus, II, 71.
instead of answering the question, as reformulated by Jesus, they elect to answer their own question: "Moses allowed [ἐπέτρεψεν] ... " (v. 4). On the other side, Jesus refuses to answer the Pharisees' question, parrying with his counter-question, "What did Moses command [ἐνετείλατο] you?" (v. 3). Again, when the Pharisees adamantly maintain their application of the Law, Jesus no less adamantly maintains his own: " ... he wrote you this commandment [ἐντολήν]" (v. 5). That is to say, the Pharisees view Dt 24:1-4 in terms of what God permits, but Jesus in terms of what God requires. 1027 Hence the very formulation of the question posed by the Pharisees, as well as that of their answer to it, manifests a significant inconsistency with the intention underlying the Mosaic provisions.

However, the phrase which stands at the beginning of v. 5, "For your hardness of heart [σκληροκαρδίαν]" implies more than simply a misreading of Dt 24:1-4—it is a relativization of a particular provision of the Law itself in that this provision is relegated to the status of being a concession to human failing, viz. "hard-heartedness." 1028 A man who wished to divorce his wife the Law of Moses required to write her a bill of divorce which was to be placed in her hand (Dt 24:1, cf. v. 3). Moreover, a valid bill of divorce was to bear the signatures of two witnesses. 1029 No statement of the grounds for the dissolution of the marriage was

1028 On "hard-heartedness" see below p. 363.
1029 Pesch, Markus, II, 123.
included, but rather a declaration that the wife was free to remarry:

The essential formula in a bill of divorce is, "Lo, thou art free to marry any man." R. Judah says: "Let this be from me thy writ of divorce and letter of dismissal and deed of liberation, that thou mayest marry whatsoever man thou wilt." The essential formula in a writ of emancipation is, "Lo, thou art a freedwoman: lo, thou belongest to thyself" (Git 9:3).

The granting of a bill of divorce to the wife by her husband thus served to allow her the opportunity to remarry without incurring the reproach of adultery. A divorce proceeding regulated in this way would thereby reduce any hardship experienced by the divorced wife. Yet the dissolution of the marital union does not reflect the original intention of God, according to the NT (v. 6-9). To this extent, Jesus can label it hardness of heart. Thus any provision enacted so as to limit adverse consequences of human rebellion, may be designated a concession to--certainly not an endorsement of--hard-heartedness, though violation of specific legal statements is not intended in the case of divorce.

1030 Ibid., 122-23.
1031 Cranfield, Mark, 319; Taylor, Mark, 418.
1032 See Cranfield, Mark, 319-20; sim. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 120.
1033 Undoubtedly the subversion of the original intention of the provisions of Dt 24:1-4 does betray a form of lawlessness or apostasy from God's will, as Pesch claims (Markus, II, 123). Nevertheless, these provisions, though in fact attributed to Moses in vv. 3-5, cannot be accorded the same assessment as the commandment reported in Mk 7:10a (cf. Ex 20:12a = Dt 6:16a) is, in 7:13a (so ibid., 122). The original intention behind the bill of divorce was that of providing legal protection for the divorced wife, yet the hard-heartedness of the men (adult male persons) of Israel, which Jesus now attributes to the Pharisees, had necessitated the institution of the procedure in the first place (ibid., 123; Gnilka, Markus, II, 72). On the one hand, the
A conflation of two scripture passages from Gen 1:27/5:2 (v. 6) and 2:24 (vv. 7-8a) serves to establish the union of spouses in the fact and intention of creation itself. From the beginning of creation, God made humanity a pair, male (ἄρσεν) and female (ἡλυ) (Gen 1:27/5:2a). Thus (ἐνεκαν τούτοι) each (ἐνθροπος) leaves his parents and the two (δύο) become one flesh.

Fifth Commandment of the Decalogue presupposes the possibility of thorough-going commitment to the will of God; on the other hand, the law concerning the bill of divorce, like the penalty attaching to the vilification of one's parents in Mk 7:10b (cf. Ex 21:17), presupposes a state of affairs wherein the divine will is already compromised (see Cranfield, Mark, 319).

Interestingly, Pesch unwittingly undermines his own exegesis by alluding to a tradition of interpretation which had developed within Judaism. That is to say, the idea that the provisions of Dt 24:1-4 represent a concession to hard-heartedness may recall a certain relativization of the cultic and ritual law over against the commandments of the Decalogue. The people of Israel, after they had received the original covenant code, committed an act of apostasy which entailed the worship of a golden calf. The re-establishment of the covenant relationship required the formulation of a second code. However, the code which was given this time involved a compromise with the idolatry of the people. Thus the rank of the second covenant code was a rank inferior to that of the first. A review of the rise and fall of Israel provided by Ezekiel manifests what is perhaps just such a critical stance toward the Mosaic Law:

"Moreover I [the Lord] gave them [the people of Israel] statutes that were not good and ordinances by which they could not have life" (20:25).

The assessment of Dt 24:1-4 expressed in v. 5 may indeed reflect an attitude already present within the OT (Markus, II, 123; so also Gnilka, Markus, II, 72). If this is true, as Pesch in fact supposes, Jesus is hardly according the provisions Dt 24:1-4 a status equal to that of the Decalogue.

Pesch, Markus, II, 123; cf. Schulz, "Markus und AT", 192-93.
In v. 8b Jesus again underlines the unity of spouses. Then in v. 9 follows the ethical conclusion: "What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder." In other words, the contracting of marriage as an outworking of the divine intention implies the prohibition of its dissolution. Any such qualification of the divine intention as is evidenced in the Mosaic provision of Dt 24:1-4, Jesus thus considers a concession to "hard-heartedness"—rebellion against the will of God—on the part of the Jews (v. 5).

iii. Mk 10:10-12

The final verses of the pericope include the private instruction given the disciples. Enunciating a normative principle (vv. 11, 12), Jesus refers it firstly to the husband,

---

1035 The clause which is reproduced in v. 8a does not reflect the idea of a consanguineous relationship (Pesch, Markus, II, 124). Now a metaphor, the expression μία σάρξ serves to underline the depth of the marital union. On the other hand, the inclusion of this clause from Gen 2:24 could symbolically represent a return to an originally androgy nous constitution which may well be reflected in Gen 1:27/5:2 (cum Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 203-4 n. 32; contra Pesch, Markus, II, 124).

1036 Gnilka, Markus, II, 72, 74; Pesch, Markus, II, 123-24.

1037 Gnilka, Markus, II, 74; Pesch, Markus, II, 124.

Here the logic resembles that of 2:27. In other words, "Jesus appeals to God's intention at creation to override a Mosaic law" (Dewey, Markan Public Debate, 98).

1038 Pesch, Markus, II, 124. The notion of a divine repudiation of divorce recalls the tone of the indictment in Mal 2:13-16 (cf. ibid.). We note v. 16a: "I hate divorce, says the Lord God of Israel."

Indeed the God-man antithesis in v. 9 does not effectively label the Mosaic provision per se as "human statute" (so Gnilka, Markus, II, 74). On the contrary, what Jesus would in fact label human statute is a prostitution of the Mosaic provision for one's own ends. In this way, Jesus' opponents effectively abandon the Law in favour of their tradition (cf. 7:8, 9, 13a).
and secondly to the wife. As Gnilka has rightly noted, the point of vv. 11-12 is not the same as that of v. 9. The pronouncement of v. 9 is a prohibition of divorce. However, the principles expressed in vv. 11-12 represent a denunciation of remarriage after divorce. What is particularly striking in these verses is not so much a consideration of the case of a woman who divorces her husband and remarries, but rather the opposition of remarriage after divorce with the Seventh Commandment of the Decalogue (Ex 20:14; Dt 5:18). Clearly the assumption underlying these statements is necessarily a belief in the indissolubility of the marriage union. By contrast, the presupposition underlying the prohibition of v. 9 is a tacit acknowledgement of the reality of divorce, however contrary to God's intention it may be.

D. THE MEANING OF THE OT

i. Dt 24:1-4

This old case law which relates to the duties encumbent upon a husband who intends to divorce his wife is one of a collection of laws which relate to humanitarian and religious obligations encumbent upon the people of Israel (23:15-25:19). Apparently the husband had to initiate divorce proceedings. The process required the writing of a bill of divorce with delivery to the wife before her dismissal (vv. 1 and 3). A discovery of "some unbecoming thing" in a wife would constitute sufficient grounds for the initiation of divorce proceedings (v. 1). Here the LXX

1039 Ibid.
translators envision a sexual misdemeanour. Yet the idea of initiation of divorce proceedings by the husband on the ground of "hatred" for his wife (v. 3) suggests the possibility of the dissolution of a marriage on other grounds besides sexual impropriety.

ii. Gen 1:27; 5:2a

The first clause of Gen 1:27 and the initial clause of Gen 5:2a are excerpts from the sayings doublet which occurs in Gen 1:27 and 5:1b-2. Both members of the doublet recorded in the Priestly (P) source, the first finds itself within the section of the creation story which relates to the origin of the human race (1:26-31), the second at the beginning of the tradition which relates to the generations from Adam to Noah (5:1-32).

iii. Gen 2:24

This verse which is reported in the South or Seir (S) source, finds itself within a second creation narrative (2:4b-24) which concludes with an account of the Fall (3:1-24). As it stands in its OT context, the phrase ἐνεκεν τούτου with which Gen 2:24 begins, serves to relate the normal affinity of man and woman which culminates in marriage to the myth about her creation out

---

1040 See above pp. 350-51 n. 1019.

The accusatory oracle of Jer 3:6-10 serves to identify adultery as one "unbecoming thing." Here the adulterous wife is a metaphor for Israel's apostasy. Accordingly, Yahweh dismisses her with a decree of divorce. In other words, he dissolves his covenant relationship with the nation Israel.

1041 So the LXX (Arndt/Gingrich, s.v. μισέω) and the MT (Davidson, s.v. μισή).
of his rib (vv. 21-23). Indeed the reference to the two becoming "one flesh" recalls the consanguinity of man and woman implied in the preceding verses.

iv. Ex 20:14/Dt 5:18

v. The Jewish Leaders Manifest Hardness of Heart

The word σκληροκαρδία which translates literally "hardheartedness" denotes an attitude of "stubborn rebelliousness against God." Not an expression used by classical Greek writers, the LXX translators employ it as do the Pseudepigraphers. Indeed, a consistent display of what might aptly be described as "hard-heartedness" in the face of repeated exhortations to repent is also one of the central motifs in the deuteronomistic formulations of the history of Yahweh's covenant people.

vi. Mal 2:16b

The basis of the indictment reported in Mal 2:16b (MT) is the alleged 'faithlessness to the wives of their youth' demonstrated by the men of Israel (vv. 14b, 15b, 16b). What we encounter in

---

1043 Cranfield, Mark, 320; see also Gn6ka, Markus, II, 72; Pesch, Markus, II, 123.
1044 Taylor, Mark, 418. See Dt 10:16 (Moses' final exhortation to the people of Israel prior to their settlement of the Promised Land [10:12-11:32]); Jer 4:4 (Jeremiah's call for Judah's repentence [3:1-4:4]); cf. Ezek 3:7c (σκληροκαρδίας) (a global characterization of the Israelite people in Ezekiel's second commission [vv. 4-9]).
1045 Not surprisingly, OT writers employ synonymous expressions as well. The more common ones include: "stubbornness" (2 Kg 17:14); "rebelliousness" (Dan 9:5); "stiff-neckedness" (Jer 7:21); and "disobedience" (Neh 9:26).
1046 See below p. 445 n. 1298, p. 446 n. 1302.
the pronouncement of v. 16b, in addition to a divine condemnation of divorce, is an equation of divorce with faithlessness, indeed the violation of a covenant ratified before God (v. 14b). "Faithlessness" alone, not to mention Israel's violation of her covenant relationship with Yahweh, serves to indicate that divorce represents adultery in the mind of the prophet.

The LXX translators attenuate the metaphor considerably. In the first place the word ἀποστάσιον ("divorce") is not used; yet the occurrence of the verb ἐξαποστέλλω ("put away") indicates that the topic of discussion is divorce. In the second place, there is no talk of men "being faithless" (ἀπιστέω) to their wives, but rather "forsaking" (ἐγκαταλείπω) them (vv. 14b, 15b, 16b).

E. SCRIPTURE-HERMENEUTIC IN MK 10:1-12

i. Mk 10:2-5

In typical fashion, the evangelist has given the "Jews" a "bad review." The question with which the "Pharisees" initially approach "Jesus" (v. 2) is a question designed to "test" him, as we noted earlier. Presumably, "Jesus'" opponents know his position already. Yet the manner in which Mark employs Dt 24:1-4 serves to impugn the motives of the "Pharisees" all the more. First of all, what Moses wrote is presented by Mark as having been distorted. Not as a means of minimizing the suffering incurred by a wife whose husband happened to divorce her, as originally intended, was the Mosaic provision employed, but rather as a

1047 Cf. the cognate noun ἀποστασία ("apostatise").
1048 Dt 24:1,3 (LXX).
licence for initiating the divorce proceeding in the first place. Put differently, "Jesus" interprets the Law as "duty" (vv. 3, 5), his opponents as "privilege" (vv. 2, 4). Given the fact of divorce, in other words, the hard-heartedness of men (adult male persons), the Mosaic provision as originally conceived represents a pis aller, an effort to make the best of a less than ideal situation. Viewed from this perspective, the reference to Dt 24:1-4 in Mk 10:2-5 constitutes a factual reading of an OT injunction, the continuing validity of which "Jesus" does not contest. The hermeneutical purpose to which the evangelist uses

---

1049 The impression created by Mark may well be a distortion of the facts. Indeed just what would have constituted valid grounds for divorce might have been a point of contention among the Pharisees of Jesus' day (Pesch, Markus, II, 122). Tractate Gittin reads: "The School of Shamai say: A man may not divorce his wife unless he has found unchastity in her, for it is written, Because he hath found in her indecency in anything. And the School of Hillel say: [He may divorce her] even if she spoiled a dish for him, for it is written, Because he hath found in her indecency in anything. R. Akiba says: Even if he found another fairer than she, for it is written, And it shall be if she find no favour in his eyes ... " (IX, 10).

1050 Cf. ibid., 123.

1051 Cum Taylor, Mark, 413, 418.

Hooker comments: "[O]n this occasion 'what Moses said' proves to be inadequate ... because it was adapted to human weakness. So in contrast to Moses' concession in Deuteronomy 24, Jesus appeals to Gen. 1:27 and 2:24, where the ideal for marriage is set out ... The logical outcome of this argument is set out in v. 9, which in effect annuls the provision of Deuteronomy 24" ("OT in Mark", 222). No doubt we can accept the second statement. However, the first and third reveal something of a misunderstanding. The 'inadequacy' of the provisions of Dt 24:1-4 is not the so-called "adaptation to human weakness." The inadequacy of "what Moses said," if it can be called that, is precisely this: it does not prevent men (adult male persons) from misusing it as a legitimation of the very hard-heartedness whose consequences it was intended to limit. Yet neither "Jesus" nor the "Pharisees"
the text is that of exposing the perceived obduracy of those who enlist it as a divine sanction for divorce.

The second way in which Mark impugns the motives of "Jesus'" opponents reveals itself in "Jesus'" explanation of why Moses implemented the law concerning the bill of divorce. But for the fact that men divorced their wives and the "Pharisees" legitimated the practice, there would have been no necessity for the institution of a legal procedure whose purpose was none other than that of limiting the dire consequences of their actions. Viewed from this perspective the reference to Dt 24:1-4 in Mk 10:2-5 represents a factual reading of an OT event, the significance of which relates to a contemporary reality. In v. 5 we read:

"For your hardness of heart he [Moses] wrote you this commandment" (italics added). This saying which has been attributed to Jesus is at the same time a biting reproach levelled against the "Jews," as well as a distancing of itself from their alleged hard-heartedness by the Marcan community.\textsuperscript{1052}

\textsuperscript{1052}So Pesch, \textit{Markus}, II, 122, 123.

Indeed the verses in question do betray a blatant antipathy toward Judaism. Yet the reclamation of the Mosaic prescription for "Jesus'" opponents does not constitute this "anti-Judaistic thrust," as Gnilka supposes (\textit{Markus}, II, 71), but rather their alleged misapplication of this prescription. At the same time, a statement of this kind certainly represents an attack on the moral integrity of the "Pharisees." The stated reason for the institution of the Mosaic provision leaves no doubt--here we encounter a devastating attack on their character. Herein the aforesaid verses convey the unmistakably "anti-Judaistic"
Once the misapplication of the Mosaic provision is exposed and the reason for its institution is explicated, "Jesus" seeks to establish the unity of spouses by means of an appeal to the original intention of God as this manifests itself in the created order. In the preceding section we observed the manner in which the reference to Dt 24:1-4 (v. 4) is identified not solely as an OT injunction (v. 2), but beyond that as an event in the history of God's people, which bears witness to the hard-heartedness of the "Jews" (v. 5). In somewhat similar fashion, the introduction of the quotations from Gen 1:27/5:2 and 2:24 with the phrase "from the beginning of creation," which appears in Wisdom Literature, serves to identify these texts not merely as scriptural authorities, but as declarations of the divine will. For that reason, we cannot simply state that 'Moses is dashed against Moses' or that 'scripture stands opposed to scripture.' Nor would it be entirely accurate to say that 'the original thought of God stands opposed to the secondarily added commandment.' On the contrary, the tension evident in vv. 2-9 is the result of the juxtaposition of the obduracy of the "Jews"—as evidenced

sentiment.

Ibid., 72; cf. Pryke, Redactional Style, 39: not only do we find "a reference to the Genesis creation stories," but "perhaps [also] a principle of creation, something which belongs to the natural order."

Cum Gnilka, Markus, II, 70, 72-73; contra Hooker, "OT in Mark", 222; Schulz, "Markus und AT", 192.

Contra Gnilka, Markus, II, 73.
primarily in the purpose, and secondarily in the prostitution of the provisions of Dt 24:1-4 (vv. 2-5)—and the will of God—as ascertained from the order of creation (vv. 6-8a). Thus the exposition of the divine intention on the basis of Gen 1:27/5:2 and 2:24 serves to throw the alleged hard-heartedness of the "Jews" into sharp relief. \(^{1056}\)

The first of two components in the scriptural argument against divorce is the verbatim excerpt from Gen 1:27/5:2 (LXX) in Mk 10:6. This passage as it is applied by the evangelist conveys the same meaning as it does in the Priestly tradition. Humanity as originally created comprised both male and female. What we encounter in v. 6, therefore, may be designated a *factual reading of an OT event*. The temporal aspect of the event which is recalled is such that it occurred once in the past.

The second component in the scriptural argument against divorce is the reference to Gen 2:24 (LXX) in Mk 10:7-8a. Here the evangelist has introduced a significant alteration. The clause "and he shall cleave to his wife" has been deleted so that its applicability is no longer restricted to the man. A man/woman (\(\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\piο\zeta\)) \(^{1057}\) leaves his/her parents and the two become one flesh.

\(^{1056}\) Conversely Pesch, *Markus*, II, 126.

Nevertheless the scripture-proof in vv. 6-8a does not in fact constitute an overcoming of the Mosaic commandment (so Gnilka, *Markus*, II, 69). On the contrary, what is overcome is the hard-heartedness which is evidenced firstly in the necessity for implementing the commandment, and secondly in the subversion of its original intent.

\(^{1057}\) The referent of the noun \(\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\piο\zeta\) in Gen 2:24 (LXX) is the husband. However, the noun as used by Mark must carry a generic significance (contra Taylor, *Mark*, 419). Otherwise, his
Clearly, the mutually applicable prohibition against divorce in v. 9 has necessitated a reworking of the text which as been employed to support it. "What therefore God has joined together, let not man [ανθρωπος] put asunder." What we encounter in this mutually applicable prohibition against divorce is an accommodation to Hellenistic society wherein woman as well as man enjoyed the right to terminate a legal relationship. In other respects the essential meaning of Gen 2:24 as represented in Mk 10:7-8a, in and of itself, has remained the same as that of the passage represented, in and of itself. Consequently, the Marcan application of Gen 2:24 constitutes a factual reading of an OT event. However, the OT event read in vv. 7-8a manifests a fundamentally different relation to time from that read in v. 6. To wit, the joining of man and woman in matrimony constitutes an open-ended series of events which had its beginning in the past.

The phrase ἐνεκέν τούτου which stands at the beginning of the quotation from Gen 2:24 serves to establish a causal connection between it and the quotation from Gen 1:27/5:2. In other words, the mutual affinity between man and woman which culminates in their being joined together in a state of marriage finds its origin in the fact that God created the two sexes "from the beginning of creation," presumably with a view to their complementation of one another. The character of the resultant bond between spouses Mark asserts to be such as that of their abridgement to the passage defies explanation.
virtually becoming one flesh. However, the creation story reported in the S-tradition contains a different account of the origin of woman. The substance from which God fashioned woman was a rib which was taken from the man (Gen 2:21-22). The consanguineous relationship between man and woman which is thereby depicted (Gen 2:23) thus provides the basis—ἔνεκεν τούτου (cf. Mk 10:7)—not only for the mutual affinity which culminates in marriage, but also for the characterization of the unity between husband and wife as being that of being one flesh (Gen 2:24). The severance of Gen 2:24 from a literary context which reflects a social order wherein women were accorded a status inferior to that of men, by means of a juxtaposition with Gen 1:27/5:2, represents once again an accommodation to v. 9 which reflects Hellenistic society wherein women enjoyed considerably

---

1058 The conflation of citations from Gen 1:27/5:2 and 2:24 indicates the inadequacy of the second as an argument against divorce. Indeed the bringing together of man and woman in marriage (1:27/5:2) represents the fulfilment of the divine intention in creating them as male and female (2:24) (Gnilka, Markus, II, 73). Interestingly the account of the creation of humanity as provided in Gen 2:4b-23 serves the same foundation for Gen 2:24 in the OT as does Gen 1:27/5:2 in Mark. Yet the consanguineous relationship between man and woman which is depicted in the account of Gen 2:2b-23 affords an underpinning for the assertion that husband and wife become "one flesh," which is noticeably lacking in Gen 1:27. In this respect, the compiler of the S-tradition, rather than Mark, provides the more cogent argument for the indissolubility of marriage. No doubt the mutual applicability of the prohibition of divorce in v. 9 necessitated the substitution of Gen 1:27/5:2 for 2:4b-23.

1059 In this connection we call attention to the following: man is the first living being created (2:18-19), woman the last (2:20-22); the existence of woman is something derived from man (2:21-23); the subservience of woman to man manifests itself in the idea that she is a "helper fit for him" (2:18, cf. 20).
more freedom, including that of initiating divorce proceedings.\(^{1060}\)

iii. **Mk 10:10-12**

The final vignette, wherein the disciples pursue the matter of divorce, further contains a normative principle in vv. 11-12 which applies to husband and wife alike. Extending the teaching of vv. 2-9 according to which divorce is contrary to the original intention of God, "Jesus" attempts to establish the indissolubility of marriage by condemning remarriage after divorce as adultery. To this extent, the teaching presented here is not

\(^{1060}\)With that, we cannot endorse Ched Myers' statement: "Jesus' conclusion (10:9) ... is not meant as an absolute prohibition upon 'divorce,' which would overturn both the Mosaic statute and return to a legalistic solution. ... Rather it protests [against] the way in which patriarchal practice drives a wedge into the unity and equality originally articulated in the marriage covenant" *(Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* [Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1988], 265).

In consequence, the foregoing statement would represent an accurate assessment of the argument, but not in intention. However, Myers' statement contains yet another difficulty. The author renders the verb *χωρίζω* "separate," as opposed to "divorce" (*άπολύω*). Thus Mk 10:9 would not signify a prohibition of divorce, but rather separation. Unfortunately we cannot follow this logic. In our view, one could hardly prohibit separation without an implicit prohibition of divorce.

On the basis of a prohibition of the taking of more than one wife during a lifetime reported in Damascus Document (4:21), a practice denounced as a sexual offence, Gnilka conjectures that the application of Gen 1:27 in Mark represents a refurbishing of the Jesus tradition with a Qumranian or near-Qumranian tradition. The similarity between Mark and the Damascus Document is twofold: the passage from Genesis is (a) cited as the "fundamental principle of creation;" and (b) employed in conjunction with other OT material. Nonetheless, the two applications of the text from Genesis manifest significant differences. In the first place, the passage as used in CD 4:21 forms part of an argument against multiple marriages over a lifetime as opposed to a prohibition of divorce as in Mk 10:6. Furthermore, what we encounter in CD 4:21 is not a position against the Law (Mk 10:5-9 vs.Dt 24:1-4), but a radicalization of the Law (see Gnilka, *Markus*, II, 73).
a relaxation of the prohibition of divorce, but in fact an intensification of the latter which renders it redundant. What is prohibited in v. 9 and thus entertained as a possibility --dissolution of marriage--is something which in the end turns out to be an impossibility. In any case, one of the underlying presuppositions in this teaching is the continuing validity of the Seventh Commandment of the Decalogue (Ex 20:14; Dt 5:18). This reference to the Seventh Commandment constitutes a \textit{factual reading of an OT injunction}. The application of this condemnation of remarriage after divorce to both husband and wife indicates a Hellenistic and probably non-Jewish readership as was evident in vv. 7-9. At the same time, the pitting of remarriage after divorce against the Decalogue serves to reinforce the attack on the moral integrity of the "Jews," particularly that of their religious leaders (cf. v. 5).\footnote{Cf. ibid., 74.}\footnote{In connection with vv. 11-12, Hooker writes: "Jesus' pronouncement in vv. 11-12 declares that those who take advantage of the Mosaic provision are guilty of adultery" ("OT in Mark", 222). We could endorse this statement if by "take advantage" Hooker meant "misuse." Unfortunately this is not her intention, for she continues: "As in 7:19, the authoritative teaching of Jesus is now challenging the law itself" (ibid.). Hooker is wrong. Only when the stipulation concerning the bill of divorce is severed from its original context (Dt 24:1-4) might one understand divorce proceedings as endorsed in the Law: what is at issue here is rather the procedure to be followed, given the husband resolves to divorce his wife, and thus making the best of a bad situation. Clearly the thrust of this pericope is the honouring of the God-given male-female relationship by both partners. Yet the understanding and the sustenance of healthy relationships do not presuppose any special revelation but what is self-evident, viz.}
The foregoing vignette does not constitute an historical representation of Jesus' encounters with his religious opponents. On the one hand, more than ample evidence exists to connect the entire pericope of 10:2-12 with a non-Palestinian milieu. Moreover, "Jesus'" critical stance over against the Mosaic Law\(^{1063}\) would suggest a principally, if not wholly non-Jewish\(^{1064}\) community as the intended readership. A literary device, this "Jesus" articulates a theological treatment of divorce by the primitive church.\(^{1065}\) As her spokesman, the Marcan "Jesus" exemplifies a resolute loyalty to the divine will. On the other hand, the generalizing statement of v. 5--"For your hardness of heart ... " --betrays either a gross ignorance, if not a deliberate falsification of Jewish thinking on divorce. The evangelist has further underlined this alleged "hard-heartedness" in his portrayal of Jesus' opponents with his reference to their creation as a concrete expression of the original intention of God. Indeed the Mediterranean mind was no stranger to such speculations. Guenther observes: "All near Eastern sapiential writings, the Bible included, seek to penetrate into the secrets of life" ("Gnosticism in Corinth", in Bradley H. McLean, ed., Origins in Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 86 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], 79). Creation wisdom as opposed to Holy Writ might have provided the original impetus for the evangelist's thinking. Thus his reflections on the OT would have afforded secondary theological support for insights of essentially non-scriptural origin.

\(^{1063}\) The relationship of "Jesus" to the Law discloses itself in the statement of v. 9 (Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 57). One could also say this of vv. 11-12.

\(^{1064}\) Contra Gnilka, Markus, II, 70; Pesch, Markus, II, 126.

\(^{1065}\) Ibid., 122.
'testing' posture (v. 2). The caricature of Jewish practice, not to mention the explicit condemnation of remarriage after divorce as an adulterous practice (vv. 11, 12), can scarcely reflect any serious attempt at the securing of the agreement of Jewish religious opponents.\textsuperscript{1066} Here the "Jews," no less than "Jesus," represent nothing more than a literary device.\textsuperscript{1067} The sole function of this literary device is the articulation of the theological stance of religious opponents. Thereafter the compiler endeavours to refute the position so stated.\textsuperscript{1068} This role of "devil's advocate" would readily explain this unfavourable portrait of the Marcan "Jew."

\textsuperscript{1066}Cf. Best, \textit{Markan Soteriology}, 39.
\textsuperscript{1067}\textit{Contra Pesch}, \textit{Markus}, II, 122.
\textsuperscript{1068}Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, II, 70. Here the "Jewish" opponents could, Gnilka suggests, represent the 'doubting members of the Christian community.' Yet Gnilka advances an unfortunate qualification. Thus the designation of Jesus' opponents as Jewish persons might find its factual referent among believers within the community of Mark of similar religious background (ibid.).
3.4 The Rich Man Inquires about Eternal Life - Mk 10:17-22

A. TRADITION-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

The brief dialogue between Jesus and the rich man reported in Mk 10:17-22 shares one formal characteristic with the call-narrative. Thus in v. 21 we read:

"... come, follow me."

At the same time, this brief dialogue is but the first of three components which comprise the extended discussion of 10:17-31. These are: (a) the fruitless call of a rich man which includes the charge to sell all possessions and distribute the proceeds to the poor (vv. 17-22); (b) the private instruction of the disciples—the man who poses the initial question departs in v. 22—which concerns the possession of wealth and its hindrance for entry into the kingdom (vv. 23-27); and (c) the concluding segment of the discussion which concerns renunciation in the present life and subsequent reward in the next (vv. 28-31). Form-critically this extended discussion manifests a number of features characteristic of the scholastic dialogue. Firstly, a situation depicted, someone arrives thereon, posing a question (v. 17); secondly, the question is addressed to the teacher (v. 17); thirdly, the teacher responds with a counter-question (vv. 18-19); fourthly, the one who poses the original question provides an intermediate answer in response to the counter-question (v. 20); fifthly, the teacher provides the definitive answer to original

1069 Gnilka, Markus, II, 84.
1070 Cf. Pesch, Markus, II, 137, 140-41.
question (v. 21); and finally, the teacher provides his students special teaching (vv. 23-31).\footnote{Ibid., 136.} The extant text of Mk 10:22-31 thus represents something of a hybridization of forms. What we encounter in this passage looks to be a call-narrative embedded within the context of a scholastic dialogue.

This apparent embedding of the one form within the other in Mk 10:17-31 would suggest a tradition-history which encompasses more than one stage of development. However, scholarly efforts to discern the various stages have engendered more than one tradition-historical reconstruction, each of which differs to one degree or another. The tradition-history as reconstructed by Bultmann entails three stages: (a) the original apophthegm in vv. 17-22; (b) the addition of tradition-historically old sayings by a pre-Marcan editor in vv. 23 and 25; and (c) the addition of vv. 24 and 26 by the evangelist.\footnote{Ibid., 22.} In his analysis of 10:17-31 Taylor claims to endorse the tradition-historical reconstruction...
proposed by Bultmann. What he calls the pronouncement-story of vv. 17-22 is the basic element to which supplements have been added in vv. 23-27, 28-30 and 31.\(^{1073}\) Whether and to what extent the scenario represented in vv. 17-31 constitutes a genuine historical reminiscence is not a question considered by Bultmann; however, for Taylor the incidents recounted in vv. 23-27 and 28-31 were "recorded because it was remembered that they were connected with the story of the Rich Man's Question."\(^{1074}\) The tradition-historical development proposed by Gnilka also follows the same lines as that of Bultmann: vv. 17-22 represents the original apophthegm, v. 21 the apophthegmatic saying.\(^{1075}\) In distinction to Bultmann, however, Gnilka terminates the section within which the apophthegm is situated at v. 27 and thus regards the section as comprising two parts, viz. vv. 17-22 and vv. 23-27. Cranfield, who identifies three parts in 10:17-31, viz. vv. 17-22, vv. 23-27 and vv. 28-31, envisions a two-stage process of development: (a) vv. 17-22 and 23-28 which should be associated with each other historically; and (b) the appending of vv. 28-31 which can be detached from each other "easily."\(^{1076}\) Attributing the

\(^{1073}\)Mark, 424-25; cf. Bultmann, HST, 61, 324.

\(^{1074}\)Mark, 425. This connection between the dialogue of vv. 17-22 and the incidents reported in vv. 23-27 and 28-31 could find its origin either in the life of Jesus or in the period of oral transmission. Whether Taylor has one or the other option in mind is a question which is left unanswered for the reader.

\(^{1075}\)Markus, II, 84-85.

\(^{1076}\)Mark, 325. The possibility that sub-sections 1, 2 and 3 represent units independent of one another, Cranfield would nonetheless allow and thereby qualify the stance of Taylor that sub-sections 2 and 3 constitute units dependent on sub-section 1.
underlying structure of vv. 17-27 to a pre-Marcan collection
Pesch, like Cranfield, proffers a tradition-historical
reconstruction which involves two stages: (a) the original
scholastic dialogue of vv. 17-22 (om. καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι in
v. 21), 23 (om. πῶς ... εἰσελεύσονται), 24 (om. οἱ δὲ ... αὕτοῖς)
and 25; and (b) the addition of vv. 21 (om. ὁ δὲ ... οὐρανῷ),
23 (om. Καὶ ... αὐτῶν), 24 (om. τέκνα ... εἰσελθεῖν), 26-27. The
most adequate of the foregoing reconstructions is that of Pesch,
although it too is somewhat flawed.

The instruction given the disciples in vv. 23-27 appears to
be a secondary expansion of the original apophthegm of vv. 17-22.
In the first place Gnilka has noted a significant shift in focus
from the latter to the former. The relative importance of worldly
possessions to a particular individual and the implications of the
attitude expressed thereby is given consideration in vv. 17-22,
yet in vv. 23-27 this particular case becomes a paradigm of the
sort of hindrance possession of material wealth might pose for
those who hope to enter the kingdom of God. However, none of the
material which comprise the extant text of vv. 23-27 permit his
recovery of the conclusion to a scholastic dialogue which
purportedly extended beyond v. 22 and included vv. 23 and 25. A
typical feature of Marcan syntax, the explanatory γάρ-clause of
vv. 22b is the sole indication that the man with whom Jesus

1077 Markus, II, 135-37.
1078 Gnilka, Markus, II, 85.
1079 See Pryke, Redactional Style, 72, 126-35; 57 of 63 occurrences
converses in vv. 17-22 possessed great riches. Indeed v. 22b appears to be a redactional "peg" which facilitated the addition of vv. 23-27.\footnote{1080}

Moreover, the vignette of vv. 23-27 as a whole evidences a number of stylistic features which betray the hand of Mark. In this connection Pesch has made note of two repetitions in content, viz. that of the saying concerning the difficulties associated with entering the kingdom (vv. 23, 24b). as well as that of the reference to the astonishment of the disciples on hearing this assessment.\footnote{1081} He also identifies two terminological repetitions, viz. that of the verb ἐμβλέπω in vv. 21a and 27 and that of the phrase ἐπὶ τὸ λόγῳ τοῦς λόγους in vv. 22a and 24a.\footnote{1082} Yet these repetitions of content and terminology do not constitute evidence of layering in the pre-Marcan tradition as Pesch supposes, but as Neirynck has demonstrated, the structural duality which is so characteristic of Mark.\footnote{1083} The generalization of the problem posed find themselves in redactional contexts (ibid., 135).

\footnote{1080}In this clause we note three Marcan stylistic features. The use of πολλά-accusative is the first (ibid., 70-72) --9 of 10 occurrences find themselves in redactional contexts (ibid., 135) --the second is the catchword association (ἐχων κτήματα πολλά) with v. 23 (χρήματα ἐχοντες) (ibid., 72). A very significant feature is the use of periphrastic tenses (see ibid., 103-6; Taylor, Mark, 45); 29 of 30 occurrences find themselves in redactional contexts (Pryke, Redactional Style, 135): the periphrastic imperfect tense of the verb ἔχω—ἡν ... ἔχων—is noted in this connection (so ibid., 72; Taylor, Mark, 430).

\footnote{1081}Markus, II, 135.

\footnote{1082}Ibid.

\footnote{1083}With regard to content, the restatement of v. 23 in v. 24b is an instance of Marcan double statement; that is to say, the second is a generalization of the first (see below) (see Neirynck, Duality
by the possession of riches in vv. 23-27—as compared with vv. 17-22—Pesch once again considers evidence of a layering of tradition prior to the composition of Mark's gospel. Yet in light of the fact that we already have ample evidence that vv. 23-27 were assembled by Mark, does there exist any presumptive reason for not ascribing this generalization to him also?\footnote{Likewise the variation in terminology between vv. 22b (κτήματα) and 23b (χρήματα) does not increase the probability of this facet of his tradition-historical reconstruction (contra Pesch, \textit{Markus}, II, 135). The nouns in question are both \textit{Marcan hapax legomena}. (The inclusion of the phrase τούς πεποίθοτας ἐπὶ (+ τοῖς – ΔΘΦ 1 αι] χρήματα] after the verb ἦστιν in v. 24 does find support in such manuscript authorities as CRADΘλωπι lat sy* [sy* boρ*]; Cl. Yet the manuscript evidence as a whole tends to favour the absence of these words, embracing such authorities as ENWAΨκ sa boρ*β [sim. Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 431], and perhaps representing an effort to mitigate the saying somewhat [so Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 332]). The very brief reference to the "delight in riches" (ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου) of 4:19 is the only other allusion to the problem of riches in Mark's gospel. Clearly data such as this bear little statistical significance and do not constitute the kind of evidence on which we should base hypotheses.}

The sub-section bound by vv. 23 and 27, then, owes its extant form to the evangelist. Indeed the theology implied by the context within which the vignette appears is a further indicator of Marcan redactional activity, for the departure of the rich man (v. 22a) suggests that the discussion between Jesus and his disciples takes place in private. At the same time such a conclusion does not preclude the possibility that various strands of pre-Marcan
tradition have been incorporated in it. Thus the logion reported in v. 25 may form part of an old apophthegm which would have included the individual saying of v. 23 along with it, or perhaps even a saying uttered by the historical Jesus. Gnilka calls attention to the provocative nature of the speech, the attitude toward the kingdom expressed therein, as well as the implicit denunciation of mammonism. The question concerning the relative age of the doublet verses of vv. 23 and 24 can be answered only tentatively, and consequently the question of the authenticity of these verses must be left open. On the one hand, Gnilka with Bultmann regards v. 23 as the earlier version. In that case v. 24, a generalization of v. 23, serves to extend the difficulties associated with the rich to all would-be disciples.

On the other hand, Pesch ranks the saying proper of v. 24b with

1085 Bultmann, HST, 22.
1086 Markus, II, 89. Unfortunately Gnilka does not offer corroborative examples. Nonetheless his contention finds some degree of support in the Q-saying about the narrow gate (Mt 7:13-14/Lk 13:23-24). In addition to this the rabbinic sources report a saying which concerns the passage of an elephant through the eye of a needle (see St/Bi, I, 828).

Still, several Marcan dualities have imposed themselves upon v. 25. In this connection, Neirynck calls attention to the following: two instances of a compound verb preceded by the same preposition—δία ... εἰςλθεῖν and είς ... εἰςελθεῖν (Duality in Mark, 75), which in conjunction with one another constitute a multiplication of cognate verbs (ibid., 79); and a double statement which entails both repetition of a motif—πῶς δυσκόλως ... εἰςελθεῖται (v. 23)/πῶς δύσκολόν ... εἰςελθεῖται (v. 24b)/εὐκοπώτερον ... εἰςελθεῖν (v. 25) (ibid., 99) and contrasting assertions—πῶς δύσκολόν ... εἰςελθεῖν (v. 24b)/εὐκοπώτερον ... εἰςελθεῖν (v. 25) (ibid., 92).

1087 Markus, II, 84; cf. Bultmann, HST, 22. The triple-tradition saying of Mk 8:36/Mt 16:26/Lk 9:25 implies more or less the same negative attitude toward possession of wealth.
the introductory clause of v. 23 as the older version. In that case the saying proper in v. 23 is considered both a generalization (extension of its application to all rich people) and a mitigation (limitation of its application to rich people alone) of the saying proper of v. 24b. On the whole, we tend to favour the position of Pesch: firstly, the attitude expressed in the saying proper of v. 24b approximates that expressed in the Q-saying about the narrow gate (Mt 7:13-14/Lk 13:23-24) than does that expressed in the saying proper of v. 23; secondly, the use of the future tense of the verb εἰσέρχομαι in the saying proper of v. 23 seems to have reference to the kingdom as it comes to expression in the early church. At the same time, his judgement as to the relative age of the introductory clauses of vv. 23 and

---

1088 At the same time, several Marcan features assert themselves in the introductory clause of v. 23. Firstly, we note the noun μοθητής (35 of 46 occurrences redactional) and secondly, the adverb πάλιν (25 of 28 occurrences redactional) (Pryke, Redactional Style, 137, see esp. 96-99). Thirdly, the construction καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, along with similar introductory formulae, is a feature found throughout Mark's gospel (cf. 2:5a, 10c, 17a; 4:13a; 7:18; 10:27; 14:27) (ibid., 76 n. 4).

1089 Pesch, Markus, II, 137.

1090 Yet the logia proper of vv. 23 and 24b taken together manifest the kind of double statement characteristic of Mark (see above p. 379 incl. n. 1083 [onto p. 380]). An additional Marcan feature which is common to both versions of the saying is the following of a compound verb by the same preposition: εἰς ... εἰσελθονταί in v. 23 and εἰς ... εἰσελθείν in v. 24b.

The occurrence of the extremely rare adverb δυσκόλως in v. 23 and the cognate adjective δύσκολος in v. 24 affords a rather ambiguous piece of evidence, the former a word which appears only here and in the synoptic parallels, the latter a hapax legomenon in the NT (Cranfield, Mark, 331). On the one hand, we have a word (δύσκολος) which is peculiar to Mark, on the other hand, one (δυσκόλως) which is hardly characteristic of him.
24b carries less weight insofar as both of them evidence stylistic features characteristic of Mark.¹⁰⁹¹ What should be noted in the latter, however, is the interest in the disciples¹⁰⁹² as well as the motif regarding the astonishment¹⁰⁹³ of the disciples at the pronouncement of Jesus in v. 23.

The last two verses of the sub-section are clearly the work of the evangelist. In the first place, the double reference to the reaction of the disciples to Jesus' speech (vv. 24a and 26) may well be an instance of the duality of structure characteristic of Mark's gospel. Furthermore, the intensification of that reaction in v. 26--astonishment as opposed to amazement--could represent compliance with a dramatic requirement in the development of the

¹⁰⁹¹ The introductory clause of v. 23 shows influence of Marcan structural duality. Single occurrence of the verb περιβλέπων in this clause in conjunction with the repetition of the verb ἔμπληκω in proximate verses (vv. 21 and 23) represents an instance of multiplication of cognate verbs (Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 79). Use of the verb περιβλέπων itself in v. 23 may be a Marcan feature. The introductory clause ("having looked around at them") makes frequent appearance in editorial links in Mark's gospel (cf. 3:5, 34; 5:2; 9:8; 11:11) (Hultgren, Jesus and Adversaries, 82, 96 n. 70). A total of four of six of these occurrences are redactional contexts (Pryke, Redactional Style, 122, 136). The introductory clause of v. 24b would also show influence of Marcan structural duality. In this connection, Pryke notes the redundant participle of the verb ἀποκρίθη (see ibid., 99-103; sim. Taylor, Mark, 63: a redactional feature).

¹⁰⁹² Gnilka, Markus, II, 85. See above p. 382 n. 1088: the noun μαθητής occurs a majority of times in redactional contexts.

¹⁰⁹³ See Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 97-10--surprisingly Neirynck does not include this example.

The use of the verb θυμήσων is a Marcan linguistic feature (3 of 3 occurrences redactional) (ibid., 137). Moreover, the adverb πάλιν occurs a majority of times in redactional contexts (see above p. 382 n. 1088).
plot. In this verse the use of the verb ἐκπλήσσωμαι is a feature which may be ascribed to the evangelist. Finally, the reference to the all-powerful grace of God in v. 27 is again a motif which is peculiar to the Second Gospel (cf. 9:23). Two features which are characteristic of Marcan composition include the explanatory γάρ-clause which is a hallmark of Marcan syntax, as well as a duplication of statement and the introductory formula ... αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει.

The third sub-section of the pericope, which is bound by vv. 28 and 31, is a secondary expansion which as been appended to the original apophthegm of vv. 17-22 in much the same manner as the second. That is to say, the insertion of the clause καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι ("and come follow me") by the evangelist in v. 21 provides the redactional "peg" by means of which he introduces the

---

1094 Gnilka, Markus, II, 84.
1095 All 5 occurrences of the word find themselves in redactional contexts (so Pryke, Redactional Style, 136). According to Neirynck, what we find here is "Direct Discourse Preceded by a Qualifying Verb," another Marcan indicator (Duality in Mark, 123).
1096 Gnilka, Markus, II, 85, cf. 89. Coupled with 9:23, v. 27 might be considered yet another instance of Marcan duality.
1097 See Pryke, Redactional Style, 127-35.
1098 The logion proper of v. 27 evidences a duplication of two kinds: firstly, a negative followed by a positive statement conjoined with the particle ἀλλά (παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατον, ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ θεῷ· πάντα γάρ δυνατό παρὰ τῷ θεῷ) (Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 92), and secondly, double statement involving repetition of a motif ( ... ἀδύνατον, ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ θεῷ· πάντα γάρ δυνατά παρὰ τῷ θεῷ) (ibid., 241).
1099 On the introductory formula καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς and the like see above p. 382 n. 1088.
theme of renunciation in vv. 28-31.\textsuperscript{1100} Here the verb ἀκολουθεῖο --perhaps a redactional word\textsuperscript{1101}--constitutes the point of contact between v. 28 and the redactional "peg" of v. 21. A syntactical feature which serves to identify the introductory formula of v. 28 as a Marcan transition is the use of the verb ἀρχομαι in conjunction with the infinitive.\textsuperscript{1102} The introduction to the response of Jesus to the declaration made by Peter in v. 28 manifests a further characteristic of Marcan syntax, viz. the asyndetic use of the verb φημι.\textsuperscript{1103} The response itself evidences two Marcan tendencies. Here the construction οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀργοὺς in v. 29, and in v. 30 its counterpart οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἀδελφὰς καὶ μητέρας καὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀργοὺς instances the duality of structure encountered throughout Mark's gospel.\textsuperscript{1104} Yet another example of this Marcan

\textsuperscript{1100}Pesch, Markus, II, 135, 140-41; cf. Taylor, Mark, 434. The connection between vv. 28-31 and vv. 17-27 is thus a strong one despite the absence of a grammatical link, viz. a conjunction (so ibid., 433; contra Cranfield, Mark, 325).

The command καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι of v. 21 recalls similar injunctions in 1:17-18, 20; 2:14 (Taylor, Mark, 429). Clearly the response of the disciples (v. 28; cf. 1:17; 2:14) affords a contrast to that of the rich man (v. 22a) (so Cranfield, Mark, 325).

\textsuperscript{1101}So Pryke who ranks 11 of 18 occurrences of this word as redactional (Redactional Style, 136).

\textsuperscript{1102}See Taylor, Mark, 48; Pryke, Redactional Style, 79-87--Pryke ranks 79 of 87 occurrences of this construction as redactional (ibid., 136).

\textsuperscript{1103}See Taylor, Mark, 49-50.

\textsuperscript{1104}According to Neirynck's classification, this is an instance of double statement which involves juxtaposition of both general and special statements (Duality in Mark, 96), and negative and positive statements wherein the negative statement is followed by a clause introduced by ἐὰν μὴ (ibid., 89) as well as repetition of
duality is the duplication of a temporal datum in v. 30.\textsuperscript{1105}

Finally, the material in v. 31 could well be a freely circulating logion added by Mark.\textsuperscript{1106}

The group of verses which we consider lastly are those which comprise the first sub-section, vv. 17-22. As we have already indicated there have been added in vv. 21 and 22 redactional "pegs," the second of which lends the apophthegm the character of a call-narrative. Otherwise the hand of Mark betrays itself in but three places. Firstly, the introductory clause of v. 17 serves to depict the dialogue between Jesus and the rich man—as well as the instruction of the disciples (vv. 23-31)—as an event \textit{en route} to Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{1107} Secondly, the rich man addresses Jesus as

\begin{itemize}
\item a motif (ibid., 99).
\item Further traces of Marcan composition include perhaps the presence of the noun \textit{οίκτα} (2x) (so Pryke who ranks 11 of 18 occurrences as redactional [\textit{Redactional Style}, 137]) and almost certainly the noun \textit{εὐαγγέλιον} (ibid., 136 [7 of 7 occurrences of redactional]). In fact the entire construction \textit{ἐνεκέν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου} looks to be a phrase which was added later (cf. 8:35) (sim. Taylor with most commentators [\textit{Mark}, 434]; cf. Cranfield entertaining the possibility [\textit{Mark}, 333]).
\item On no account can we endorse the view that vv. 29-30 in substance constitute authentic material (ibid., cf. 326; cf. Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 433). Three features in v. 30 serve to establish these verses as a product of primitive Christianity: these would include the references to the enriched sense of relationships characteristic of the early church, the existence of persecution, and the association of eternal life with the age to come (see Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 333; Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 434-35).
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{1105}I.e. νῦν/ἐν καιρῷ τούτῳ (Neirynck, \textit{Duality in Mark}, 95).

\textsuperscript{1106}Bultmann, \textit{HST}, 22; Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 325, 326; cf. Best, \textit{Markan Soteriology}, 82. Cf. Mt 20:16; Lk 13:30. Alternatively, the logion added in v. 31 (Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 433, 435) may have found its way into a primitive collection (ibid., 433). In any case, Cranfield considers the verse "probably authentic" (\textit{Mark}, 326).

\textsuperscript{1107}Best, \textit{Markan Soteriology}, 121 incl. n. 3; Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, II, 84, 89.
διδάσκαλος ("teacher") twice (vv. 17, 20). The third redactional feature involves a Marcan duality of structure, that is to say, the double statement in v. 18 entails a negative clause followed

The introductory clause (ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδόν) is a redactional formulation (Taylor, Mark, 425; somewhat less certainly Cranfield, Mark, 326). Use of genitive absolute constructions is a stylistic feature of Mark (see Pryke, Redactional Style, 62-67)--29 of 29 occurrences find themselves in redactional contexts (ibid., 135).

With regard to the phrase εἰς ὁδόν Pesch notes the fact that Mark customarily includes the article before the noun ὁδός (cf. 8:27; 9:33-34 [2x]; 10:32, 52; 11:8). The depiction of the rich man's hasty approach to Jesus as an event "on the road" may, he concludes, represent the work of a pre-Marcan redactor (Markus, II, 137). Yet all but one of the references cited by Pesch are such that the phrase ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ--a different construction from εἰς ὁδόν--is employed. Only the remaining reference of 11:8 wherein the phrase εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν occurs affords the construction under consideration in 10:17. With that, this syntactical feature hardly suffices to signal a stylistic preference of the evangelist. Nonetheless the depiction of Jesus and his disciples as "on the way" nonetheless is a motif which recurs throughout 8:27-11:8 (Best, Gospel as Story, 84).

One further feature which Mark associates with the journey to Jerusalem is the participial clause wherein the man in question makes a hasty approach to Jesus (προσδραμόν) and pays him obeisance (γοναπίτησας). Here we have double participle (Neirynck, Duality in Mark, 83). Moreover, this placing of two or more participles before or after the main verb is itself a syntactical feature which characterizes Marcan composition.

The use of the pronoun εἰς in the same sense as the pronoun τίς ("someone") may well constitute a Greek rendering of a Semitic idiom (so Taylor, Mark, 60), but such evidence in and of itself need not indicate a Palestinian influence (see ch. 1 p. 45 incl. n. 88 [onto p. 46]).

1108 The noun διδάσκαλος which is frequently addressed to Jesus as a title appears no fewer than twelve times in Mark's Gospel (see Best, Markan Soteriology, 173 incl. n. 1). Oddly, the list of redactional words, which Pryke has compiled, does not include the word itself, let alone the frequency with which it occurs in redactional contexts. However, such cognates as the verb διδάσκω and the noun διδαχή are listed, the former occurring 15 of 17 times in redactional contexts, the latter 5 of 5 times.

Other vocabulary which might betray Marcan influence includes the verbs ἐκπορεύομαι (6 of 11 occurrences redactional [Pryke, Redactional Style, 136]) and ἔρωτάω (14 of 26 occurrences redactional [ibid.]) in v. 17.
by another clause introduced by the conjunction εἰ μὴ.\textsuperscript{1109} However, a piece of evidence which suggests non-Marcan formulation is the occurrence in vv. 17-22--excluding the redactional "pegs" of vv. 21 and 22b--of five words not normally used by the evangelist.\textsuperscript{1110} This consideration and the relative dearth of Marcan stylistic features, coupled with the fact that the sub-section--stripped of the redactional "pegs" of vv. 21 and 22b and the introductory participial clauses in v. 17--constitutes a unity in and of itself,\textsuperscript{1111} renders it most probable that the

\textsuperscript{1109}I.e. οὐδεὶς ἄγαθος εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός (Neirynck, \textit{Duality in Mark}, 89).

Neirynck identifies two further instances of Marcan duality; these include: multiplication of cognate verbs in v. 21 (ἐμβλέπω recurs in v. 27, περιβλέπομαι occurs in v. 23) (ibid., 79) and the double use of the participle in v. 22 (ἀποτυχομένος, ἦν γὰρ ἔχων) (ibid., 83). In this connection, we have to ask: (1) did Mark introduce all three βλέπειν-verbs in vv. 21, 23 and 27, or did he merely duplicate that of v. 21 when he appended vv. 23 and 27, and (2) did he intentionally introduce a duplication of participles in vv. 22a and 22b, or did he inadvertently create it when he appended the γὰρ-clause of v. 22b?

\textsuperscript{1110}These words include the verbs κληρονομέω (v. 17), ἀποστερέω (v. 19) and στυγνάξω (vv. 22a), and the noun θησαυρός (v. 21) (see Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, II, 85 incl. n. 6).

\textsuperscript{1111}Cf. Bultmann, \textit{HST}, 22. No doubt, Cranfield's contention that the sub-section in question seems incomplete, in the absence of some comment by Jesus looks to possess some validity insofar as the γὰρ-clause of v. 22b is the point of departure for the discussion of vv. 23-27. In light of the fact that the final clause of v. 21--"and come, follow me"--serves to provide the point of departure for the discussion of vv. 28-31, however, it is difficult to understand why this third sub-section was not considered a part of the extant pericope as well. Indeed this last criticism would also find application in the case of Gnilka. What is most surprising of all is the fact that Pesch who himself calls attention to the redactional "peg" in v. 21 elects to exclude vv. 28-31 as a part of the pericope. Bultmann's observation would thus require further precision. That is to say, the apophthegm of vv. 17-22 does constitute a unity--but in its \textit{pre-Marcan} form.
apophthegm of vv. 17-22 did in fact circulate without the addenda of vv. 23-27 and 28-31 prior to Mark.

Although the apophthegm of 10:17-22 is a pre-Marcan entity, it is a virtual certainty that it cannot have originated within the context of Jesus' ministry. On the alleged ground that the radicality of thought concerning the nature of emulation reflects Jesus' understanding of discipleship, Gnilka allows the possibility that the composition reflects the words of Jesus in stylized form. Yet Gnilka himself has observed that the turning away of the rich man finds illumination in Mk 4:19. It is extremely doubtful that the case of the rich man is an imaginable instance of the defection of disciples during the time of Jesus.

In the words of Best,

the community has probably lasted long enough for the first flush of enthusiasm to have been lost. It was in danger of slipping back into the "easy and self-indulgent life" which seemed to be the goal of the Graeco-Roman world Mark knew. There is an unwillingness to go the way of the cross.

That is to say, the response of the rich man to the charge of Jesus is an illustrative example of the kind of discussion

---

[1112] Markus, II, 89. No textual evidence is offered. Argumentation on the basis of the chief commandment is a criterion for Jesus' teaching, i.e. in Pesch's estimation. In other words, argumentation of this kind exhibits consistency with his proclamation of God's sovereignty and the doing of his will (Markus, II, 139).


[1114] One of the proposed Sitze im Leben for the parables of the Mustard-seed and the Leaven (so Jeremias, Parables, 150-51), possesses no credibility at all; that is to say, it is based solely on the evidence of Jn 6:60, a text whose historical worth is dubious, to say the least.

[1115] Gospel as Story, 144.
concerning property, which took place in the early church.\footnote{1116}

The provenance of 10:17-22 is a somewhat vexing question. Still we can say this much. On no account can we establish a Palestinian Jewish-Christian provenance. The idea of "inheriting" (κληρονομεῖω) (v. 17) eternal life reflects Jewish idiom\footnote{1117} as does the phrase "treasure in heaven" (θησαυρὸς ἐν οὐρανῷ) (v. 21).\footnote{1118} Yet the presence of Jewish idiom in and of itself cannot establish the origin of a text within a Palestinian milieu.\footnote{1119} Nor can Jewish concepts guarantee this. The view that God alone is good (ἀγαθός) (v. 18) reflects the Jewish mindset\footnote{1120} but not necessarily a Palestinian one. Precisely the same view informs Pauline thinking in Rom 7:18.\footnote{1121} A Hellenistic Jewish-Christian home for vv. 17-22 has somewhat more to be said for it. Apparently conversion coupled with renunciation was an idea known to Hellenistic Judaism.\footnote{1122} However, the fact that the Decalogue commandments

\footnote{1116}{A corpus of tradition on the subject of property may have enjoyed currency within the early church (so Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, II, 89). Here we would note e.g. Mk 4:19 and Acts 4:32-37.}
\footnote{1117}{Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 327.}
\footnote{1118}{See St/Bi, I, 429-31. Indeed late-Israelite apocalyptic also knows this hope in a store of good works in a heaven (Pesch, \textit{Markus}, II, 140).}
\footnote{1119}{See ch. 1 p. 45 incl. n. 88 (onto p. 46).}
\footnote{1120}{Apparently, the Greek world did not share this sentiment with Judaism (cf. e.g. Lk 23:50).
Yet the writers of the OT do apply the adjective "good" to men (e.g. Prov 12:2; 19:14; Eccl 4:2) (Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 327), and also to things (e.g. Gen 1:31) (see Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 426), on occasion.}
\footnote{1121}{See ibid., 425.}
\footnote{1122}{So Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, II, 87.}
provided a means whereby social order was maintained in
Hellenistic Jewish society\textsuperscript{1123} lends no support in this connection
because we must seriously question whether the commandments of
10:19 are cited with this objective in view. We maintain that
they are not, in which case the premise of Gnilka's argument is
refuted.\textsuperscript{1124} Indeed one piece of evidence serves to indicate a
non-Jewish provenance for the apophthegm. That is to say, very
seldom do we encounter the address διδάσκαλε ἄγαθε in Jewish
literature,\textsuperscript{1125} yet it and similar addresses were a frequent
occurrence in Greek.\textsuperscript{1126}

In conclusion, the vignette of Mk 10:17-22 looks to be
essentially a pre-Marcan construction, a church formulation
reflecting the milieu of Graeco-Roman Christianity, and the two
scenes of Mk 10:23-27 and 10:28-31 wherein the disciples receive
private instruction, though they incorporate strands of primitive
Christian tradition, represent secondary formulations which betray
the hand of the evangelist at a number of points.

\textsuperscript{1123} Ibid., 84.
\textsuperscript{1124} However, his assumption of a 'flexibility of the tradition'
(which would include cross-cultural adaption of the tradition)
astoundingly prevents Gnilka from dismissing the possibility
of a Palestinian Jewish-Christian provenance (ibid.).
\textsuperscript{1125} Cranfield, Mark, 326; Pesch, Markus, II, 137; Taylor, Mark, 425.
Rabbinic authorities report but one instance (fourth century A.D.)
of the title (St/Bi, II, 24-25).
\textsuperscript{1126} Cranfield, Mark, 326.
B. MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF SCRIPTURES REPORTED

i. Verbal Contacts between Mk 10:17-22 and Ex 20:12-16/Dt 5:16-20 (LXX)

Mk 10:19

τὰς ἑντολὰς οἶδας.

μὴ φονεύσῃς,

μὴ μοιχεύσῃς.\(^{1127}\)

The order of the first two Marcan commandments (μὴ φονεύσῃς, μὴ μοιχεύσῃς) as presented here finds the strongest support in the manuscript evidence (p|BN\(^{corr}\)ΔΨ 0274 pc sy′ sa bo) and is the same as that of Matthew (19:18). Two variant readings warrant our attention, however. The first which represents a transposition finds considerably weaker manuscript attestation (RAWΘΙΔ 157pm lat; Cl) and is the same as that of Luke (18:19). The second which finds the weakest attestation (D[pc][cl]k; Ir) follows the order of the first variant reading but the commandment against fornication (μὴ πορνεύσῃς) has taken the place of that against murder (μὴ φονεύσῃς). Certainly the text, as well as the first variant reading, allows the possibility of assimilation to the texts of Matthew and Luke resp. (see ibid., 328; Taylor, Mark, 428), and the prohibition of murder which is included in these readings would presumably occasion the least amount of controversy. Yet the fact that the second variant does not enjoy strong attestation renders it more likely that the prohibition of fornication finds its origin in scribal error due to a similarity in pronunciation (cf. πορνεύς and φονεύς) (cum Cranfield, Mark, 328; contra Taylor, Mark, 428). Indeed the imagery used by writers of the OT renders an inadvertent substitution of the prohibition against fornication for that of murder even more probable. To wit, the image of the unfaithful wife is a frequent metaphor for the apostasy of Israel to idolatry in the OT. Not only sexual immorality did fornication (ἐκπορνεύω) denote, but also infidelity to God expressed in idolatry (see e.g. the LXX in Ex 34:15, 16; Lev 17:7; 20:5; Dt 31:16; Jg 21:7; 8:27, 33 etc.; cf. 1Cor 10:8 [πορνεύω]) (see John Coolidge Hurd, Jr., The Origin of I Corinthians [London: S·P·C·K, 1965], 226, 247). Involvement in adultery (μοιχεύω/μοιχάμαι) finds a similar application (see e.g. the LXX in Jer 3:8-9; Ezek 16:32 [in light of v. 17]; 23:37). The verb μοιχεύω and the imagery associated with it might well suggest the verb πορνεύω especially within the immediate context of the nearly homophonic verb φονεύω.

Finally, neither the text nor the first variant reading commends itself on the basis of internal evidence alone. However,
the weight of manuscript attestation shifts the balance of probability in favour of the text.

1128 A certain number of manuscripts do not include the prohibition of fraudulence (pJ B*ΨAL 700al syg Cl), but other manuscript traditions do report this prohibition (see Taylor, Mark, 428). In all probability copyists have omitted it because it is not included in the Decalogue (ibid.; Cranfield, Mark, 328-28). Assimilation to Matthew and Luke who also omit the prohibition could also be a factor in the origin of the variant reading.

1129 For the sake of easy representation, the versification of the LXX has been adopted, the versification of the MT where different given in parentheses. The numbering of the commandments follows the ordering of the MT which is the same in Exodus and Deuteronomy.

1130 Cf. Lev 19:11 (prohibition of theft), 13a (prohibition of robbing one's neighbour).

1131 Cf. Lev 19:11 (LXX) (prohibition of false testimony against the neighbour).
In terms of its relative ordering, the list of commandments reported in Mk 10:19 shows greater divergence from the two formulations of the LXX on the one hand, than it does from that of the MT on the other. The one deviation from the Masoretic ordering exhibited by Mark is the placing of the Fifth Commandment of the Decalogue after the Ninth. Mark exhibits the same deviation from each of the LXX orderings. However, the Sixth Commandment, reported ahead of the Seventh, Eighth and Ninth, in that order by the evangelist, appears between the Eighth and Ninth in Exodus and between the Seventh and Eighth in Deuteronomy.

The list of commandments which appears in Mark also manifests two deviations from the Decalogue in terms of content. Firstly, Mark cites the Fifth Commandment without the addendum (ἓνα εὖ ὑπάρχουσιν ... [Ex]) and the Ninth in an abridged form. Secondly, he reports a prohibition which is not included in the Decalogue—μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς.\(^{1134}\)

\(^{1132}\) See above p. 393 n. 1130.

\(^{1133}\) See above p. 393 n. 1131.

\(^{1134}\) In view of the disparity in content, not to mention diction, a combined summary of the Ninth and Tenth Commandments, viz. the prohibitions of giving false testimony and coveting resp., would not convincingly explain the Marcan prohibition of fraudulent dealings as Gnilka (Markus, II, 87) and Pesch (Markus, II, 139).
In terms of vocabulary, the Fifth Commandment as cited by Mark is a verbatim report of the leading clause in the LXX, except for the absence of the possessive adjective τοῦ after the noun μητήρ in Dt 5:16. The Sixth through the Eighth Commandments and the Ninth with the verb and the negative particle are verbatim citations of the corresponding commandments in the LXX, except for the fact that the evangelist employs the aorist imperative form with the negative particle μὴ instead of the future indicative with the negative particle οὔ. Thus the representation of scripture text in Mark exhibits a high degree of mimesis.

The foregoing considerations, coupled with the fact that the Decalogue commandments are introduced by the statement τάς ἑντολὰς οἶδας allows us to classify this aspect of the Marcan representation of scripture text as highly mimetic direct reporting.\(^{1135}\)

ii. **Affinities with Other Legal Statements in the Pentateuch**

Prohibitions of unjust denial of material welfare occur a have maintained.

An hypothesis of citation from memory would, of course, explain deviations in ordering as well as an "extra" commandment. However, Gnilka, who rejects the hypothesis of faulty memory, prefers to explain the Marcan text on the basis of analogous codes of ethics known to Hellenistic Judaism (Markus, II, 86-87). Unfortunately, Gnilka does not indicate the apologetic advantage of citing such a code, rather than the LXX which itself was a product of Hellenistic Judaism.

\(^{1135}\) *Contra* Pesch, *Markus*, II, 139.
number of times in the Pentateuch. These include:

Ex 21:10 (LXX): denial (ἀποστερέω) of a second wife food, clothing or fulfilment of sexual needs\(^{1136}\)

Dt 24:14 (LXX [Cod. A]): oppression (ἀποστερέω) of a hired servant who is poor and needy\(^{1137}\)

cf. Lev 19:13b: withholding the wages of a hired servant until the following morning

cf. Lev 19:11: false dealings in general

The prohibition of fraudulence in Mk 10:19 appears to be a general summary of several OT statements.\(^{1138}\) Yet the employment of the verb (ἀποστερέω) serves to identify the Marcan text representation as a less "purely" diegetic summary.

iii. Other Affinities with OT Text

Mk 10:18b: οὐδεὶς ἄγαθος εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ πατέρας\(^{1139}\)

Dt 6:4 (LXX): ... Κύριος ὁ θεός ἡμῶν, Κύριος εἰς ἐστι

Mk 10:21: "Ἐν οἷς ἑπτήτες

Ps. 23:1 (LXX): ... οὐδέν με ὑπερήψει

The use of the accusative (οἷς) with the verb ὑπερήψει is something of a grammatical peculiarity and may represent an allusion to the


\(^{1138}\) In view of the content of the Marcan prohibition Taylor prefers to understand it as a 'negative form of the [Eighth] Commandment μὴ κλέψης' (ibid.).

\(^{1139}\) The manuscript evidence as a whole does not support the textual variant μόνος εἰς (text: εἰς ὁ) (D it).
the Twenty-third Psalm.\textsuperscript{1140}

C. THE MEANING OF MK 10:17-22

i. The Pre-Marcan Stage

The opening question of v. 17 in this dialogue of Jesus with the rich man reads: "Good Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?" Evidently, the inquirer assumes knowledge of the will of God on the part of Jesus.\textsuperscript{1141} However, Jesus proceeds to challenge the accolade "good" (ἀγαθός) (v. 18a).

The man's ascription of the accolade "good" serves to establish his regard for Jesus as divine man. Evidently Jesus takes cognizance of the import of his interlocutor's manner of address. His counter-question renders this judgement incontrovertible:

Why do you call me\textsuperscript{1142} [ i.e. Jesus] good? (v. 18a).

Jesus forthwith re-assigns the ascription of goodness to "God alone:"

No one is good but God alone (v. 18b).

His apparent rejection of the accolade "good" would thus find its rationale in his association of it with an attribute of God alone (v. 18b).\textsuperscript{1143} His tacit gesture beyond himself to God's

\textsuperscript{1140}Cf. Taylor, Mark., 429; Cranfield, Mark, 330. The variant reading in the dative σου reported in many manuscripts (RADΦΨΛΦ 157pl lat) is undoubtedly a grammatical correction to the original text of Mark. Matthew (19:20-21) and Luke (18:22) avoid the construction altogether.

\textsuperscript{1141}Pesch, Markus, II, 138.

\textsuperscript{1142}Italics added.

\textsuperscript{1143}Some authorities do not detect a categorical rejection by Jesus of a divine predicate. One alleged motive behind the "apparent"
commandments and the observance of them as the life-giving way serves to underline deflection of the accolade from himself. Here there can be no questioning whatsoever of the rich man's ascription in a derivative sense.

On occasion, both OT and NT writers apply the adjective "good" in a less absolute sense to persons or things. Yet Jesus does not challenge the ascription of the epithet in this sense. Indeed the conceptual background of his reply to the rich man (v. 18) is the OT understanding of the good God as giver of life. The commandments were given Israel for life, and as such they attested God's goodness. Jesus' rehearsal of various commandments from the Second Table of the Decalogue in v. 19 as an answer to the initial question about the attainment of eternal life (v. 17) would presuppose such thinking.

Nonetheless, some commentators endeavour to avoid the full rejection of the epithet "good" is correction of the inquirer's implicit expectation of the giving of some new special commandment(s) from Jesus (Pesch, Markus, II, 138; Taylor, Mark, 426). The kind of deeds required would thus involve observance of the commandments of God (v. 19) (so Pesch, Markus, II, 138). Yet this argument only goes to support our own conclusion. Jesus' non-compliance with the rich man's request for new teaching constitutes a tacit refusal of the role of the divine Legislator.

---

1144 See following paragraph, also below pp. 401-2.
1145 See above p. 390 n. 1120.
1146 Pesch, Markus, II, 139. Cf. e.g. the addendum to the Fifth Commandment: "Honour your father and your mother, that your days may be long in the land which the Lord your God gives you" (Ex 20:12; cf. Dt 5:16). The prophets also reflect such thinking: cf. e.g. Am 5: "Seek me [the Lord] and live" (v. 4); "Seek the Lord and live" (v. 6); "Seek good, and not evil, that you may live" (v. 14).
implications of the rich man's address.\textsuperscript{1147} The refusal of the epithet "good" and the ascription of it to God alone would thus designate God as "the only source and norm of goodness."\textsuperscript{1148} A consciousness of sin or distinctness from the Godhead would, of course, be possible implications of this interpretation (v. 18a).\textsuperscript{1149} A salutation of Jesus as "Good Teacher" would again simply acknowledge Jesus as 'a teacher of outstanding merit,' 'true teacher of the way of God' (cf. 12:14, but here ironically).\textsuperscript{1150} Still, the upshot of Jesus' response would entail "a tacit contrast between the absolute goodness of God and His own goodness."\textsuperscript{1151}

Indeed we err to read v. 18 in isolation. On the contrary, the verse serves a discernible function within its broader context. Here we note two things. Firstly, Jesus in his rehearsal of the commandments in v. 19 does not reproduce the order of the MT or the LXX. Secondly, we call attention to Jesus' caveat of v. 21:

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{1147}So e.g. Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 326.

\textsuperscript{1148}So ibid., 328; contra Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 427. As we shall see, it bespeaks a theological motive on the part of Mark, and again that of the pre-Marcan tradition (contra Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 326).

\textsuperscript{1149}Contra ibid., 327; Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 426, 427.

\textsuperscript{1150}See Pesch, \textit{Markus}, II, 137-38.

\textsuperscript{1151}Cum Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 427. Unfortunately Taylor, not content to leave well enough alone, eisegetes the text when he explains this "disclaimer of God's perfect goodness" on the basis of Heb 4:15; 5:8; that is to say, Jesus' goodness as opposed to that of God was "subject to growth and trial in the circumstances of the incarnation," "as One who learned obedience by the things he suffered, being tempted in all points as we are" (ibid.).
You lack one thing.

Significantly, this appraisal follows the self-assured profession by the rich man of his life-long observance of all the commandments. Not once, but twice Jesus assumes the role of God's interpreter of the Law. Indeed his authority supersedes that of Moses. The christological implications of the broader context not only set the statement of v. 18 in sharp relief, but sheds a considerable amount of light on its literary function. To wit, Jesus is here employing literary irony. The purpose of the device is to place emphasis on the authority of Jesus. Put differently, the text invites an endorsement of the rich man's affirmation of Jesus' divinity.\(^{1152}\)

Significantly, the manner in which Jesus refers his interlocutor to God emphasises the uniqueness of God in the phrase "God alone" (εἷς ὁ Θεός). A reference to the preface to the injunction of Dt 6:5 (LXX), it cannot but call attention to the commandment itself: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and all thy strength."\(^{1153}\) This reformulation of the First Commandment of the Decalogue (Ex 20:3; Dt 5:7) in positive terms is the presupposition of the

\(^{1152}\) Much the same literary technique manifests itself in the story of the healing of the paralytic in 2:1-12. Jesus forgives the sins of the paralytic (v. 5). Thereupon the scribes express their objections: "Why does this man speak thus? It is blasphemy! Who can forgive sins but God alone?" (v. 7). However, the intended reader infers Jesus' status as divine man.

\(^{1153}\) See Gnilka, Markus, II, 86; but cf. Pesch, Markus, II, 139. Unlike Pesch, we would not regard the phrase εἷς ὁ Θεός as a reference to God as law-giver.
remaining commandments of the Decalogue and in fact the Mosaic Law in toto.\textsuperscript{1154} The reference to the introductory clause of Dt 6:4 thereby serves to lend support to the list of commandments from the Second Table which follows in v. 19.

The hope of "eternal life" denotes life in the coming aeon (cf. v. 30)\textsuperscript{1155} and presupposes a belief in the resurrection of the dead.\textsuperscript{1156} This hope which finds its provenance within Jewish apocalypticism engendered the notion that commitment to the people of Israel no longer secured one's salvation as a fait accompli. Rather the individual upon whom ethical decision was now incumbent, had to demonstrate proof of his moral worth, the touchstone of which was the performance of the Law. Yet different interpretations of the Torah, up to and including the rigorism of Qumran where strict observance of it was considered the only way of salvation, could well explain the fact that there existed some degree of confusion among the pious in matters of salvific significance.\textsuperscript{1157} A scenario of just such a kind serves to illumine the language in which the question of v. 17 is framed. The underlying principle here, the use of the verb "inherit" (κληρονομεῖω\textsuperscript{1158}) notwithstanding, is basically a doctrine of

\textsuperscript{1154} Cf. ibid., 138. In this connection, William O. Fennell once said, "There is no such thing as 'loving disobedience.'"
\textsuperscript{1155} So Pesch, Markus, II, 138; sim. Taylor, Mark, 426.
\textsuperscript{1156} Gnilka, Markus, II, 85.
\textsuperscript{1157} See ibid., 85-86.
\textsuperscript{1158} The use of the verb κληρονομεῖω reflects Jewish idiom wherein one spoke of "inheriting" eternal life (Cranfield, Mark, 327; Pesch, Markus, II, 138; Taylor, Mark, 426).
salvation by works. Not only the question itself—"what must I do (ποιέω) to inherit eternal life"—but also the absence of any effort on Jesus' part to condemn the question, indeed his explicit reference to the commandments of the Second Table, and even his invitation and promise of v. 21 establishes this conclusion beyond any doubt.

The second part of Jesus' response to the rich man entails a reference to the Second Table of the Decalogue (v. 19). Evidently, the principle operative here is the same as that found elsewhere in the NT. That is, the fulfilment of the First Commandment of the Decalogue implies a fulfilment of one's responsibilities towards the neighbour (cf. Mt 7:12; Rom 13:8-10; Gal 5:14). The rich man makes the following response to Jesus' directive:

[A]ll these I have observed from my youth (v. 20).

Here Jesus discerns the man's dissatisfaction with this particular admonition. Jesus in his counter-response adopts the idiom of Ps 23:1 (LXX):

You lack one thing.

---

\(^{1159}\) *Contra* ibid.

\(^{1160}\) So Gnilka, *Markus*, II, 86.


\(^{1162}\) Cranfield, *Mark*, 328.

\(^{1163}\) In that case he may reckon himself a righteous man (cf. 2 Esd 3:36; 7:45) (so Pesch, *Markus*, II, 140) (cf. also Phil 3:6: Paul claims to be "blameless under the law"). This observance of the commandments the man in question claims might also reflect rabbinic teaching according to which observance of the whole Law is deemed possible (see St/Bi, I, 814).
The one thing lacking is "treasure in heaven" (v. 21). 1164 "Treasure in heaven" would, of course, represent a circumlocution for "eternal life." 1165 Acquisition of this "treasure in heaven" would, however, require a radical form of almsgiving—liquidation of all material assets. The rich must then distribute the proceeds among the poor. There is no mistaking the meaning of Jesus' charge. Neither is there any mistaking of the difficulty in connection with the realization of that charge. 1166 Unfortunately, the man cannot accept Jesus' charge. He cannot renounce his possessions. Consequently, he departs a dejected man (v. 22a).

Jesus' charge in v. 21 with the response in v. 22 of his interlocutor has received two interpretations, neither without merit. On the one hand, a negative observance of the commandments, that is to say, the omission of injury to others, does not represent the sum total of what is required if one is to attain "treasure in heaven," but must include over and above this a positive deed, to wit, a doing of what is beneficial to others. The extent to which one is prepared to do this indicates the extent to which one loves God with one's heart, soul and strength (Dt 6:5; cf Mk 12:28-34a). 1167 On the other hand, what may be reflected in these verses is the First Commandment in its

1164 Pesch, Markus, II, 140.
1165 Ibid. More precisely, a store of good works would represent a "treasure in heaven," on which the hope of eternal life was based.
1166 Best, Markan Soteriology, 80.
1167 See Pesch, Markus, II, 140-41.
Decalogue formulation:

You shall have no other Gods before me (Ex 20:3; Dt 5:7). Evidently, the man in question loved his worldly possessions too dearly, because they stand in the way of his thorough-going devotion to God. However, the one interpretation does not exclude the other. Jesus' charge, as Best says, does not simply entail a divestiture of worldly possessions; it involves use of one's wherewithal in the service of God. Here, alleviation of poverty constitutes just such a use.

ii. The Marcan Stage

Our tradition-historical analysis served to identify the introductor clause of v. 17 as Marcan redactional material. Here the evangelist frames the ensuing vignette within the context of Jesus' progression toward his Jerusalem ministry. Moreover, the outward act of obeisance before Jesus by the rich man gives frank expression to the implicit christology of Mark's source. Mark's conception of Jesus is that of divine man.

Other redactional contributions included the supplementary "pegs" of vv. 21 and 22. The final clause of v. 21 as the first "peg" facilitated addition of the material of vv. 28-31. Here

---

1168 Cranfield, Mark, 330. Here divestiture of all worldly possessions represents the charge to one particular individual. The form of the charge issued by Jesus finds its origin in the fact that the man's possessions have become an idol for him (ibid.; cf. Taylor, Mark, 429).

1169 Gospel as Story, 84.

1170 The hasty approach to Jesus by the rich man serves to lend a sense of urgency to his question (cf. Pesch, Markus, II, 138).
Peter declares the full compliance of the disciples with the charge to the rich man:

Lo, we have left everything and followed you (v. 28).

Jesus in turn promises "treasure on earth" as well as "treasure in heaven:"

Truly, I say to you, there is no one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or lands, for my sake and for the gospel, who will not receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses and brothers and sisters and mothers and children and lands, with persecutions, and in the age to come eternal life (vv. 30-31).

Notably, the rewards of the present also exact a cost. There will also be persecutions.

Yet another result of the insertion of this first peg is the transformation of the pre-Marcan apophthegm into a call-narrative. Indeed one feature of Jesus' call here is the ultimate refusal of it by the rich man. Therein it enjoys a dubious distinction within the gospel narratives. Indeed the original act of renunciation enjoined on the rich man remains a prerequisite for the attainment of eternal life. Immediately thereafter, however, Jesus calls him to discipleship. The words, "come, follow me," look to be expository. Nonetheless we cannot mistake their christological significance. Emulation of Jesus represents Mark's answer to the question,

What must I do to inherit eternal life?

\[1171\text{Taylor, Mark, 430.}\]
\[1172\text{Ibid., 429.}\]
Stated otherwise, thorough-going discipleship must accompany the inquirer's observance of the Decalogue prescriptions. Gnilka rightly observes,

Emulation of Jesus signifies personal joining to the one himself who was poor and did not expect consolation from the world and for that reason goes to the cross (translation ours)\(^{1173}\) (cf. 8:34).

Here the evangelist might well endorse the words of John:

I am the way, the truth, and the life (14:6a).

Those who accept the call have "treasure in heaven" (v. 21) now and in the age to come (v. 30).\(^{1174}\)

The second "peg" of v. 22b wherein it is stated that the questioner "had great possessions" not only serves to sharpen the demand made on him in v. 21, but it also constitutes the link whereby Mark can provide an answer to the question implicit in the verb ὑστερέω in the same verse. While the sub-section bound by vv. 23-27 concerns the problem of riches for the Christian community, it is significant that Jesus makes the statement, "With men it is impossible, but not with God; for all things are possible with God" (v. 27). Surely, this statement which may reflect OT thought\(^{1175}\) constitutes an answer to the question which

---

\(^{1173}\) Markus, II, 87. The German reads:

"Nachfolge Jesu bedeutet personalen Anschluß an den, der selbst arm war und seinen Trost nicht von dieser Welt erwartet und darum zum Kreuz geht."

\(^{1174}\) Thus for Mark "treasure in heaven" can also denote "treasure with God in the life of the Kingdom" (Taylor, Mark, 429).

\(^{1175}\) Gen 18:14 (μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ῥῆμα;); Job 10:13; 42:2; Zech 8:6 (so ibid., 432). However, Pryke sees "no exact parallels in the LXX" (Redactional Style, 133), and in addition to that, the statement resembles a proverb.
immediately precedes it.

Then who can be saved? (v. 26).

What is indeed answered, rather, is the question, then how can anyone be saved. In other words, how is one to come by what is lacking in the life-style of the rich man and so exemplify the quality of discipleship demanded of those who aspire to eternal life? For the evangelist, the answer is none other than the grace of God (Ps 23:1). The truth which is implicit in the answer to the question of v. 17 in v. 18 Mark gives full expression in his answer to a related question, which he offers his own readership.

D. THE MEANING OF THE OT

i. Dt 6:4 (LXX)

This introduction to the great commandment of Dt 6:5 serves to express the Jewish belief in but one Lord who is sovereign and unique. Indeed this conviction concerning the uniqueness of Yahweh is the presupposition of loving him with totality of one's being.

ii. Ex 20:12-16/Dt 5:16-20

This citation of the Fifth through Ninth Commandments of the Decalogue comprises all but one (the Tenth) of those which relate to one's duty towards the neighbour. The immediate context of the Decalogue in the Book of Exodus is the theophany at Mt. Sinai (19:1-20:21) wherein the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel is established (19:3-6). The context of the citation of the Decalogue in the Book of Deuteronomy is the portion of Moses' second address (chs. 5-26, 28) wherein he recounts the giving of
the Law at Sinai (ch. 5).\textsuperscript{1176}

iii. The OT Prohibition of Fraudulence

As noted in the foregoing section on morphology this prohibition appears in various forms and contexts in the OT.\textsuperscript{1177}

The prohibition of denying a wife food, clothing and satisfaction of sexual needs (Ex 21:10) is found in the section of the Covenant Code concerning the protection of human persons (21:12-32), that of withholding the wages of a hired servant until the following morning (Lev 19:13b) in the Holiness Code (ch. 19), and that of oppression of a hired servant who is poor and needy (Dt 24:14 [Cod. A]) in a collection of laws relating to humanitarian and religious obligations (23:15-25:19).\textsuperscript{1178}

iv. Ps 23:1 (LXX)

Writes Taylor:

\textit{[No]thing is lacking to the Psalmist because God is his Shepherd.}\textsuperscript{1179}

E. SCRIPTURE-HERMENEUTIC IN MK 10:17-22

The scripture-hermeneutic in this pericope involves three parts: vv. 18, 19 and 21(27) resp. Each application of OT text may be considered a \textit{factual reading of the OT}. The first of these

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1176} Interestingly, adultery increasingly came to be a metaphor for Israel's apostasy to other gods (Pesch, \textit{Markus}, II, 139; cf. above p. 392 n. 1127). The basis of the metaphor is violation of a covenant relationship.
\item \textsuperscript{1177} See above pp. 395-96.
\item \textsuperscript{1177} Thus the prohibition of fraudulence, though in certain contexts it concerns the withholding of wages from a hireling, can assume more general application (\textit{contra} Pesch, \textit{Markus}, II, 139) to cases where a person is wrongfully denied money, goods, etc. (cf. Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 428).
\item \textsuperscript{1179} Ibid., 429.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
may be considered a *factual reading of the OT*. The first of these applications concerns an event from the history of the people of Israel, viz. the giving of the Law. A rehearsal in the following verse of a number of the *injunctions* of the Second Table of the Decalogue represents the second use of the Jewish scriptures. Together the two statements of vv. 18 and 19 look to be a correction of any misconception—i.e. from a Christian standpoint—that the ethical teaching of the church is in any way at variance with that of scripture or the God to whom she bears witness. Evidently, the church speaking through the mouth of "Jesus" thereby seeks to represent itself as an institution which upholds the Law.\(^{1180}\)

The third reference in v. 21 to the Twenty-third Psalm serves to invoke the principle of the opening verse of the latter. No doubt the verb ὑπερέω signals a deficiency in the rich man's observance of the Law.\(^{1181}\) Negative observance of the Law proves itself insufficient. On the contrary, the intention behind the Law finds its realization in positive action (v. 21). The positive reformulation in Dt 6:5 of the First Commandment—the presupposition for all Law-observance—evidences a definite development in that direction within the Law itself.

At the same time, Mark proceeds to develop the reference to Ps 23:1 in his sources. Full compliance with the ethical demands of Christian discipleship is a "tall order," to say the least.

\(^{1180}\)Hooker, "OT in Mark", 223.

\(^{1181}\)Cf. ibid.
Not surprisingly, the disciples ask:

Then who can be saved? (v. 26).

Stated otherwise, how, then, does the disciple fulfil this ethic and attain eternal life?

Says Jesus,

With men it is impossible, but not with God; for all things are possible with God (v. 27).

The evangelist has thereby drawn the full implications of the psalmist's statement. His "Jesus" directs the disciple to divine grace.

On no account, do we detect any ad hominem attacks on representatives of the "wrong"—i.e. "Jewish"—viewpoint. Nothing in the narrative indicates the inquirer expected to 'get off easily.' The salutation of Jesus as "good teacher" cannot be considered mere flattery. Nor can we regard it as a currying of favour. The favourable impression made upon Jesus in v. 21 renders such a judgement out of the question. Moreover, the posing of his question itself marks him as a man unsure of himself—despite his claim in v. 20 as to observance of the commandments. Finally, in v. 22 with his departure in a mood of dejection after hearing the pronouncement of the Master in v. 21 we experience a definite sense of tragic ending to a narrative with a promising beginning.

---

1182 So Gnilka, Markus, II, 85.
1183 Taylor, Mark, 425; cf. Cranfield, Mark, 326: "his use of the epithet [δώδεκα] is surely sincere—not an insignificant tribute to the impression made by Jesus."
1184 Ibid.
For all that, we nonetheless cannot mistake a criticism of institutional Judaism and its reading of the OT. Ancient Israel has been given the Law. Indeed she reads it assiduously. Unfortunately, the "Jews" lack insight into scripture. "Jesus" alone discerns and interprets the true intent of the Mosaic Law. Proper understanding of Holy Writ requires an opening of one's eyes. Jesus alone can effect that opening. Indeed he does accomplish such an eye-opening for the rich man. The latter hears Jesus' words. His failure in the observance of God's commandments is thus brought home to him. A representative of the "Jewish" reading of the scriptures he departs a dejected man. The "Jewish" reading brings him to grief.

The evangelist has appended vv. 28-31. A representative of the "church," the Marcan "Peter" possesses access to the insights of Jesus. He draws the right conclusions from the Decalogue:

Lo we have left everything and followed you (v. 28).

Unlike the rich man he acts accordingly.

---

1185 Thus we would not detect an ascription to Jesus of an authority greater than that of the Law (contra Hooker, "OT in Mark", 223).
1186 However, the teachings of the rabbis do emphasise the duty of almsgiving and one's obligation to God (Taylor, Mark, 429). Cf. St/Bi, I, 817.
3.5 The Parable of the Wicked Tenants - Mk 12:1-12

A. TRADITION-HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

i. Logic does not Bespeak a Setting in the Life of Jesus

The parable of the Wicked Tenants in Mk 12:1-12 is the only narrative parable which Mark reports outside the parabolic discourse of ch. 4.\(^\text{1187}\) Since the publication of Jülicher's seminal work on the parables of Jesus there has been no consensus as to whether this composition was originally a parable in the strict sense—a one-point analogy—and later allegorized or an allegory from the outset. Those who adopt the former position, viz. that the segment of text comprising vv. 1b-9 does constitute a true parable, claim to detect evidence of socio-economic conditions as they existed in Palestine around the time of Jesus. Thus writes Dodd:

The story has the more verisimilitude if we remember the conditions of the country at the time. Palestine, and Galilee in particular, was a disaffected region. Since the revolt of Judas the Gaulonite in A.D. 6 the country had never been altogether pacified. The unrest had in part economic causes. If now we recall that large estates were often held by foreigners, we may well suppose that agrarian discontent went hand in hand with nationalistic feeling, as it did in pre-war Ireland. We can then see that all the conditions were present under which refusal of rent might be the prelude to murder and the forcible seizure of land by the peasantry. The parable, in fact, so far from being an artificially constructed allegory, may be taken as evidence of the kind of thing that went on in Galilee during the half century preceding the general revolt of A.D. 66.\(^\text{1188}\)

What, then, would be the application? Dodd concludes:

The opening words of the story are all but a quotation from Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard (Is. v. 1-2), which would be familiar to every Jewish hearer. Every such

\(^{1187}\)Scott, Hear Then the Parable, 22.
\(^{1188}\)Parables, 97, cited with approval and further developed in Jeremias, Parables, 74-76.
hearer would also know that by long tradition, beginning from that poem of Isaiah's, Israel was the Lord's vineyard. It follows that the crime of the wicked husbandmen, who refused their landlord his due, and met his appeals with defiance that stopped at nothing, is the crime of Israel.

Otherwise stated, "the slaying of the owner's son may point to the actual situation, the rejection of God's definite and final message." The allegorical nature of the extant narrative would thus owe its origin to a transformation of a non-allegorical parable into a salvation-historical presentation during its circulation within early Christianity.

A challenge of Israel's rejection of God's message could well find its origin within a *Sitz im Leben Jesu*. The foregoing reconstruction of a non-allegorical parable would, however, represent a highly inflammatory statement for a Jewish readership. Jesus, in fact, would be characterizing his listeners as murderers of God's emissaries. An "unvarnished" accusation of such a kind would hardly gain a sympathetic hearing. This consideration alone demonstrates the historical improbability of Dodd's non-allegorical reconstruction.

Clearly, certain other features of this allegedly "real-life" parable would also defy logical explanation. Firstly, would the

---

1189 *Parables*, 97-98.
1190 *Jeremias*, *Parables*, 76.

Not surprisingly, other authorities have envisioned the *Sitz im Leben Jesu* somewhat differently. Thus Jeremias, for whom the parables of Jesus constitute argumentative tools, considers the original form of the parable in question a "vindication of the offer of the gospel to the poor" (ibid., 16). Unfortunately, no solid evidence exists to identify "others" with "the poor."

1191 Indeed the hostile reaction which is recorded in v. 12 could, argues Dodd, represent the response which it elicited from his hearers (*Parables*, 98; sim. Pesch, *Markus*, II, 214).
owner of the vineyard continue to send his servants in the hope of collecting rent from the tenants, given the treatment accorded the first servant? The sending of a second servant (v. 4), let alone that of the third (v. 5a) and indeed "many others" "leaves his behavior [sic] not only foolish but incomprehensible." 1192 Secondly, is it plausible that the owner could expect rebellious tenants to accord his son due respect (v. 6)? 1193 Thirdly, even if it were, would the owner not insure the safety of his beloved son before sending him to tenants who had repeatedly mistreated his servants (vv. 3, 4 and 5)? 1194 Fourthly, could the tenants reasonably hope to inherit the vineyard by murdering the owner's son? 1195 Finally, how

1192Scott, Hear then the Parable, 247; sim. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 201 n. 25.
The position of Pesch is something of an enigma. After stating that the owner's investment in laying out the vineyard (v. 1) serves to justify repeated attempts at securing his share of the harvest (Markus, II, 215), he qualifies this stance somewhat by admitting that the sending of the second servant (v. 4) exerts a "strain" on the "real-life picture" (ibid., 216). In the end, Pesch reverses his position altogether. That is to say, the owner's sending of "many others" to be beaten and killed (v. 5b) is "extraordinary," and thus "plainly allegorical" (ibid., 217).

1193So Linnemann, Parables, 29.
The son, unlike the slaves, could, according to Jewish Law, assert his father's claim of ownership (Pesch, Markus, II, 217). Certainly the soliloquy of the owner (v. 6b) serves to underline the special authority of the son (ibid., 218). Yet the increasing heinousness of the tenants' crimes (cf. vv. 3, 4 and 5a) affords little hope of better treatment of the son than that of the servants. Thus the threefold sending of servants would render the decision of the owner blatantly unrealistic (contra ibid.) and the sending of the son most implausible (contra ibid., 214).

1194Cranfield, Mark, 367.

1195Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 201 n. 25; Scott, Hear then the Parable, 247.
Undoubtedly a plan such as this strikes the modern mind as foolish beyond credibility (Taylor, Mark, 472, 475). Yet the rabbinic sources provide evidence of long-term leases. Evidently the tenants presumed the owner dead. Their liquidation of the
could a hitherto impotent landlord suddenly assert his claim on the vineyard by expelling the tenants and leasing it to "others" (v. 9b)?

Heir might thus afford them possession of the property (so St/Bi, I, 871-72; sim. Pesch, Markus, II, 219). However, the unsettled conditions in first-century Palestine (so Dodd: see above p. 412) impresses Taylor as a more probable explanation for the tenants' behaviour (Mark, 475). At the same time, Jeremias cites a law to the effect that "an inheritance," "under specified circumstances," may be considered "ownerless property" [and] "claimed by any one, with the proviso that the prior right belongs to the claimant who comes first" (Parables, 75: for documentation in rabbinic sources see ibid., nn. 99 and 1). Even so, "[t]he tenants' legal claim to the vineyard is shaky, to say the least" (so Scott, Hear then the Parable, 251).


Says Dodd:

"When a mutinous tenantry had broken out into open revolt, it was no doubt possible for the landlord to obtain assistance from the government to put it down by force" (Parables, 98), "][much as Marcus Brutus collected a debt from the corporation of Salamis by arranging for the dispatch of a force of cavalry obtained from Cilicia" (ibid., 98 n. 1, Cicero, Ad Atticum, v. 21, vi. 1 cited). If the owner did in fact have access to assistance from the authorities, why did he not avail himself of it much sooner? Perhaps the delayed reaction of the owner represents an attempt to enhance the dramatic effect. That is to say, the delay serves to increase suspense and alertness for allegorical meaning (so Pesch, Markus, II, 216).

Commentators have identified a break-down of the historical verisimilitude of the narrative at four additional points. Firstly, the parable evidences nothing of the idea that the tenants thought themselves exploited (Gnilka, Markus, II, 145). Secondly, the killing of the son (v. 8) seems to exceed the degree of that which seems plausible, given the circumstances delineated (ibid.; also mentioned in Jeremias, Parables, 76). Finally, the alleged misrepresentation of the prophets by servants who collect tribute (Taylor, Mark, 472, 474), and the Jewish leaders by tenants rather than guardians (ibid., 472). In connection with the first point, it could be replied that the original intended audience would be sufficiently familiar with the situation as to render any mention of the tenants' dissatisfaction unnecessary. In connection with the second, it might be argued that the political situation in Palestine at the time would be just the sort of milieu wherein such outrageous acts of violence could well occur. In connection with the two alleged misrepresentations, Cranfield replies "that the prophet's function was indeed to
A *Sitz im Leben Jesu* would, in short, raise more problems than it solves. With that, the parable must find its origin within the life of the church.

ii. The Parable's Setting within the post-Easter Church

The parable proper has, in all likelihood, contained some reference to the Isaianic allegory of the vineyard from the very outset of its tradition-history. That is to say, the parable has always presented the deuteronomistic theme of the violent fate of the prophets (sending, killing, judgement) in an allegorical narrative. The intended referent of the figure of the "man" (Ἀνθρωπός) who planted the vineyard in Mark would thus be the explicitly identified referent of the figure who planted the vineyard in Isaiah—God. However, the emissaries of God fail to accomplish the mission with which they are charged. This obvious frustration of the divine purpose would have demanded a gather God's dues, to claim on God's behalf the loyalty and obedience owed to him by his people" (*Mark*, 367), and we would argue that the position of the so-called leaders of an occupied country resembles more that of a tenant than that of a guardian.

In any case, the parables attributed to Jesus do frequently manifest inconsistencies with the experience of everyday life: one need only consider, for example, the "infuriating grace" portrayed in the Matthaean parable of the Workers in the Vineyard (20:1-15). Nonetheless, these unusual features are not left "hanging in thin air:" as Linnemann says, they find support in the inner logic of the narrative (see Linnemann, *Parables*, 28-29). Certainly, we always have to bear Scott's observation in mind: "In the world of the parable the standards are askew from the standards of the everyday world" (*Scott, Hear then the Parable*, 424; cf. also Taylor, *Mark*, 472).

---

1197 E.g. Gnilka, *Markus*, II, 143; but less certain are Cranfield, who deems the authenticity of v. 1 "conceivable" (*Mark*, 367) and Pesch, who admits it as a possibility (*Markus, II, 215*).

1198 Gnilka, *Markus*, II, 143-44; cf. Cranfield who admits the probability (*Mark*, 367), and Pesch the possibility (*Markus, II, 215*).
self-vindicating response from God. Just such a self-vindicating response is what we read in Mk 12:9:

What will the owner of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the tenants, and give the vineyard to others.

Other commentators, however, view the reference to Is 5:1-2 as secondary material. Absence of any allusion to Is 5:1-7 in the version of the parable in Logion 65 of the Gospel of Thomas would, of course, lend support to this position—prima facie it would suggest the existence of an originally non-allegorical composition independent of, and perhaps older than Mark. Yet Thomas does make such an allusion. Indeed there is mentioned the "vineyard." Other indications of grape-growing activity include references to "tenants," 'cultivation,' and "fruit." At most, Thomas lacks details: "hedge," "pit" and "wine-press." Moreover, the Gospel of Thomas in extant form is arguably a compilation by a gnostic.

---

1199 Scott, Hear then the Parable, 248.
1200 See, e.g. ibid., 245-51. The salvation-historical reading of the parable would constitute the first stage of development. Eventually the idea of planting might have suggested the reference to the Isaiahic allegory of the vineyard (so ibid., 246-47).

Salvation-history as a principle of interpretation of the events of scripture reads these events within the framework of God's unflagging attempts at the re-establishment of his relationship with an estranged humanity in the face of its rebellion (cf. Soulen, Handbook, 83). Here, of course, the church envisioned a definitive shift from a focus of the process of salvation on ancient Israel to an inclusion of the Gentile world. Undoubtedly, such a theology constitutes the conceptual basis of the parable of the Wicked Tenants. To this extent, our text embodies a salvation-historical ideology (see Scott, Hear then the Parable, 428).

1201 Admittedly, the gnostic character of the Gospel of Thomas is somewhat less pronounced than it is in most gnostic works (see ibid., 31). Yet the gnostic theme of recognition and knowledge manifests itself in the owner's response to the ill-treatment of the first servant—"Perhaps [they] did not recognize him" (Gnilka, Markus, II, 143; Jacques-E. Ménard, L'évangile sen Thomas, Nag Hammadi Studies 5 [Leiden:
With that, tendentious editing would have left an indelible stamp on any pre-Thomas traditions. Such a compiler might have effected two changes: (a) a reduction in the number of extended allegories,1202 and (b) a deletion of any obvious references to salvation-history.1203 Accordingly, the writer would appear to have attenuated the allusion to Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard. The Thomas version with its gnostic interpretation does not establish a pre-Marcan version of the parable without the vineyard allegory.1204

Attempted reconstructions of the original form of this parable have required considerable manipulation of the text. One feature commonly thought to be a later addition to the parable is the question posed by the narrator in v. 9a along with the answer to it provided in v. 9b. Quite apart from the fact that Jesus does not usually answer his own questions,1205 the content of the answer, and indeed the question itself, represents a logical inconsistency with the preceding developments. Asks Scott: "How

---

1203 Gnilka, Markus, II, 142.
"Salvation-history" is defined above p. 417 n. 1200.
1204 Significantly, the writer of Thomas has not deleted the concluding reference to Ps 118, either. Nonetheless the presence of the saying about hearing ("He who has ears, let him hear") serves to distance the quotation from the parable, "thereby severely muting the salvation-history reading" (Scott, Hear then the Parable, 244).
1205 So Dodd, Parables, 97; Taylor, Mark, 467.
can a[ ] [hitherto] impotent master suddenly become powerful?" For that reason, Scott maintains that the original parable did not conclude with the question and answer in v. 9.

On further examination, however, the verse in its entirety appears to represent yet another reference to the vineyard allegory. A failure of the divine emissaries of God would, as mentioned above, constitute a conclusion which is theologically unacceptable. The self-vindicating response of v. 9 does, however, provide Mark with a workable solution. Interestingly, the question of Mk 12:9a resembles that of Is 5:3-4, the answer of Mk 12:9b that of Is 5:5-6—in terms of their respective judgemental and punitive tones. This intimate association of the scripture reference of v. 9 with that of v. 1b would suggest that

---

1206 Cum John Dominic Crossan, In Parables, 90, cited in Hear then the Parable, 248.

1207 Contra Bultmann, HST, 177; Cranfield, Mark, 366; Dodd, Parables, 97; Gnilka, Markus, II, 143; Pesch, Markus, II, 220. Similarly, the writer of Thomas does not include the question and answer of v. 9. Years before Scott, Jeremias thus reckoned the verse a secondary addition (Parables, 74). Indeed Scott accepts Jeremias' conclusion but challenges his line of argument: "Even if the Thomas tradition is independent, it is not obvious that it is superior" (Hear then the Parable, 245).

Interestingly, Dodd, prior to the Nag Hammadi finds shortly after World War II, reconstructed a 'more original' form of the parable proper which—up to, but not including v. 9—is remarkably close to the version found in Thomas (Parables, 100 n. 2; [the first scholar to note this agreement was R. McL. Wilson in "Thomas and the Growth of the Gospels", HTR, LIII (1960), 238-39]).

1208 The existence of verbal contacts constitutes evidence of a literary relationship. A comparison of v. 1 and Is 5:1-2 (LXX) serves to reveal such evidence, but not that of v. 9a and Is 5:3 (LXX). Not only v. 1 follows the LXX, says Jeremias (Parables, 71), but so also the question of v. 9a (ibid, 74). Unfortunately, the premise on the basis of which Jeremias makes the latter judgement is the erroneous observation that the MT in Is 5:3 does not report a question, whilst the LXX does. In fact, the MT and the LXX both report this verse in the form of a question.
the same hand may be at work in both instances. At the same time, the destruction of the original group of tenant farmers and the subsequent assignment of the vineyard to "other" tenants betrays events of the Jewish War of ca. A.D. 66. The statement of v. 9b certainly, and perhaps v. 9a as framing question, look to be the evangelist's additions to the original parable.\textsuperscript{1209}

Another section of the parable proper which seems to betray secondary manipulation is that which includes the sendings of the servants. From the standpoint of dramatic structure, the threefold sending of the servants (vv. 2, 4, 5a), along with the sending of the son (v. 6) represents a deviation from the so-called "rule of three" operative in folk-tales,\textsuperscript{1210} and thereby neutralizes the climax of the story--the murder of the son.\textsuperscript{1211} Moreover, the statement regarding the sending and fate of "many others" in v. 5b raises suspicions as to its possible secondary

\textsuperscript{1209} The theme of destruction does mark 11:1-12:40 at several points. This further consideration would also suggest v. 9b as a Marcan feature (\textit{Hear then the Parable}, 241). The verse, however, does not betray Marcan stylistic features.

\textsuperscript{1210} Dodd, \textit{Parables}, 11 incl. n. 1; cf. Scott, \textit{Hear then the Parable}, 247: "The simple sending of a single servant, twice, ... [w]ith the sending of the son ... [serves to provide] three sendings ... [thus] follow[ing] the 'rule of three' operative in folk tales." On the other hand, Jeremias (\textit{Parables}, 71), Pesch (\textit{Markus}, II, 214) and Taylor (\textit{Mark}, 475) see conformity with the "rule of three" in the threefold sending of the servants.

\textsuperscript{1211} Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, II, 143. That is to say, the fate of the third servant (v. 5a) anticipates that of the son (vv. 7-8): so Jeremias (\textit{Parables}, 71). Yet adherence to the "rule of three" should produce an enhancement of dramatic effect. The actual dampening of the climax observed by Jeremias himself (ibid.) would thus call his application of the "rule of three" (see previous note) into question.
character for precisely the same reason. Theologically speaking, the sending of 'many other' servants, along with a third sending of a single servant, but particularly the former, serve to facilitate identification of the servants as a whole with the prophets. However, "the alignment of the sendings with the fate of the prophets has produced a riot of violence that leaves [the owner's] behavior [sic] not only foolish but incomprehensible." A cursory examination of grammatical peculiarities establishes further the secondary character of v. 5b. The use of a variant form of the verb ἀποκτέννω—the participle ἀποκτέννοντες—in v. 5b, as opposed to the later LXX form ἀποκτείνω in vv. 5a, 7 and 8, suggests a hand different from that of the person who first committed the parable to writing and the extreme infrequency of the construction μέν ... δέ in Mark's gospel indicates that the hand which added v. 5b did so prior to the composition of Mark's gospel.

---

1212 Contra Taylor, Mark, 475: "5b heightens the tension."
1213 Dodd, Parables, 100.
1214 Scott, Hear then the Parable, 247.
1215 So Cranfield, Mark, 365.
1216 Jeremias, Parables, 71 n. 83. The only other occurrences of this construction in Mark's gospel are the two which we encounter in the Passion Narrative (14:21 and 38)—a pre-Marcan composition.

The grammatical evidence cited thus far would not suggest a post-Marcan addition to the composition (so Taylor, Mark, 475). Indeed, the ascription of this conjecture to Dodd by Taylor (ibid.) looks to be a misreading of the former by the latter (cf. Parables, 100). Moreover, no manuscript evidence exists to lend support to this notion.

Further evidence cited by Jeremias entails a perceived violation of the structure of v. 5 as a whole. Two features noted in this connection include:
(a) the absence of a verb after πολλούς ἄλλους (v. 5b), and
(b) the disagreement of the participle δέροντες (v. 5b) with the main verb ἀπέκειναν (v. 5a) (Parables, 71 n. 83).
With that, we can say three things with a reasonable degree of certainty about the original structure of the parable proper. Firstly, the owner of a vineyard lets it to tenant farmers in order that he might collect the produce, and thereupon departs. Secondly, the owner twice sends a servant at harvest-time in order that he might procure the produce, but the tenants on both occasions beat the servants and send them away empty-handed. Thirdly, the owner, after these two abortive attempts, sends his son on a similar mission in the hope that the tenants will accord the son due respect, but the tenants recognise the son as the heir to the vineyard and kill him with the expectation that the vineyard will devolve upon them.\textsuperscript{1217}

All extant witnesses to the parable of the Wicked Tenants report a reference to Ps 118:22\,-\,23 immediately following it.\textsuperscript{1218} However, the independent application of the so-called "stone testimony" elsewhere in Christian literature\textsuperscript{1219} suggests its original circulation as an isolated text, and only later its function as a conclusion to the parable. Nonetheless, the "stone testimony" would have assumed its function as the conclusion to the parable proper an early stage of the tradition-history of the

\textsuperscript{1217} The reconstruction of the parable described here is the same as that proposed by Scott (\textit{Hear then the Parable}, 245-48: a reading is provided on pp. 248-51).
\textsuperscript{1218} Vv. 22-23 of the psalm are reported in Mk 12:10-11 = Mt 21:42, v. 22 in Lk 20:17 and Thomas Logion 66.
\textsuperscript{1219} Acts 4:11; 1 Pet 2:7; Barn 6:2b; 16:5; cf. Eph 2:20. Taylor's list of early Christian references to Ps 118 in Mk 12:10-11 also includes additional extra-canonical references to this and other "stone testimonies" (see \textit{Mark}, 477).
latter. Contra Bultmann, HST, 177.

The proximity of the statement of rejection in Ps 118 to the tradition about the fate of prophets was perhaps the decisive factor operative in the choice of text whereby the church would complete its allegorical representation of salvation-history. Other such factors may have included:
(a) the paranomasia on the words מֵאֹ מְאֹ ('stone') and מֵאֹ מְאֹ ('the son'), which is employed in a contemporary exegetical tradition, (Matthew Black, "The Christological Use of the OT in the NT", NTS XVIII [1971/72], 11-14, cited in Pesch, Markus, II, 222);
(b) the completion of the temple of Zerubbabel with the placing of the top stone, which is prophesied in Zech 4:7 (Gnilka, Markus, II, 148: other texts cited include Dan 2:34 and 7:14);
(c) the destruction of the kingdoms of the earth by the "stone," which is depicted in Dan 2:34-35 and 44-45 (E. Earle Ellis, "New Directions in Form Criticism", in Georg Strecker, ed., Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie: Neutestamentliche Festschrift für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1975), 313, cited in Pesch, Markus, II, 222).

The first of these considerations presupposes the additional -- and somewhat dubious -- hypothesis that the synoptic tradition was written in Aramaic and later translated into Greek. Still, the stoning of the OT prophets was a tradition known to primitive Christianity (see e.g. Lk 13:34), as was that of the violent fate of the prophets (as we shall demonstrate). Indeed the text of v. 4 as attested in some manuscripts includes the addition of the aorist active participle λήθοςολήσαντες directly ahead of the verb κεφαλίω (ΣΦΑΓΕ Φ 157:892pm) Gnilka, Markus, II, 146; Taylor, Mark, 474). Evidently, these copyists associated the two traditions. Thus the verb λήθοςολάσω ("stone" [cf. Lk 13:34]) may have recalled the cognate noun λήθος ("stone") and hence Ps 118:22-23 (LXX) as the proof-text for the resurrection in Mk 12:10-11; par. Alternatively, other OT texts such as Zech 4:7 contain the same kind of imagery as Ps 118:22(-23) and may have influenced the selection of the latter in vv. 10-11. However, the references from Dan 2:34(-35) and 44-45 would appear to have had rather less influence on the selection of Ps 118, and have approximated more nearly that of Is 8:14-15 in Lk 20:18. The alleged influence of Dan 7:14 (see above) eludes us, to say the least.
employ the verb γέγραπται or the formula καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς. On the other hand, the existence of a version of the parable, independent of Mark but wherein a similar reference to Ps 118 still represents the conclusion, would demand a similar judgement. In any case, once the parable had been given a salvation-historical reading, that is to say, once the son (Mk 12:6-8; par.) came to represent Jesus, a reference to the resurrection would be demanded. The proof-text of the

1221 So ibid., 476. Even so, Taylor—indeed unexpectedly—refuses to discard the possibility of Marcan addition (ibid., 473, cf. 477). The allegedly supporting evidence cited by him includes the sayings reported in 2:21-22, 27-28 and 11:23-5. Yet the only typically Marcan literary device is the introductory formula of 2:27, viz. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς. Furthermore, not one of these texts manifests a construction similar to that of 12:10-11. On the other hand, a question serves to introduce scriptural material both in 2:25 and 12:26. In each case, the evangelist finds the question in his sources (Gnilka, Markus, II, 142). Near the end of his treatment of Mk 12:1-12, Taylor does, however, state that "there are no decisive arguments in favour of [the] view" "that Mark has appended 10 f.," but "[o]n the whole it is more probable that the interest of primitive Christianity in the thought of Christ as the λίθος rejected by men, but made by God the cornerstone of a new Temple, is based on the memory that He used Psa. cxviii. 22f. in a devastating attack on the Jewish hierarchy" (Mark, 477).

1222 See below Excursus 5 pp. 435-40.

1223 The inclusion of the "son" (v. 6) in the parable as originally composed does not betray any theological agenda but rather the logic of the story (Dodd, Parables, 100-1; Jeremias, Parables, 76). Certainly, "a representation which puts the death of the son on a level with that of the slaves, differing only in its malignity and the dishonour done to the body, and which does not mention the Resurrection, is the reverse of what might be expected in a community product" (Taylor, Mark, 472). Moreover, "[n]o Jew, hearing in our parable the story of the mission and slaying of the 'son,' could have dreamed of applying it to the Messiah" (Werner Georg Kümmler, "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärttern (Mark 12, 1-12)", in J.-J von Allmen et. al., eds., Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire, Bibliothèque Théologique (Neuchatel and Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé S. A., 1950), 130, cited in Jeremias, Parables, 73).
corner-stone provides such a reference outside the narrative time of the parable proper.\textsuperscript{1224}

Our tradition-historical analysis would thus far permit two conclusions. Firstly, the original composition was a pre-Marcan artifact. The stylistic features of subsequent additions render such a judgement incontrovertible. Secondly, the composition existed as an allegorical presentation of the salvation-historical ideology by the time it reached Mark. The content of the aforesaid additions establishes this conclusion beyond doubt as well.

At the same time, the evangelist did not simply adopt the text without subsequent modification, as Pesch claims.\textsuperscript{1225} On the


The fact that the manner in which the reference to Ps 118 is introduced does not reflect normal Marcan practice, Cranfield cites to question the view that the early church added vv. 10-11 to the parable proper (*Mark*, 369). This argument does not warrant serious consideration. Pre-Marcan character of a tradition does not secure authenticity of that tradition in relation to the life of Jesus. A second point which Cranfield notes, viz. that "[t]he psalm is one of the Hallel psalms which Jesus used (xiv. 26) and upon which he must often have reflected" (ibid., 368) demands a similar response. That is to say, the Passion Narrative represents pre-Marcan, but not necessarily authentic tradition. A further point made, that "[i]n viii. 31, Lk. ix. 22, xvii. 25, Jesus applies this passage to the Son of Man (ιπποδοκιμάζω)" (ibid.) may well be a true statement, but did Jesus in fact identify himself with the Son of man? Finally, Cranfield makes this observation: "Rabbinic parables do sometimes end with a scriptural quotation to clinch the matter" (ibid., 368-69). However, evidence of Jewish hermeneutic can at best establish provenance within a Palestinian context. In short, none of the points raised by Cranfield cast reasonable doubt on the view that Mk 12:10-11 bespeaks a *Sitz im Leben der Kirche.*

\textsuperscript{1225}Pesch, *Markus*, II, 223. Similarly, Cranfield does not mention any Marcan alterations (Mark, 364-69 passim). By contrast, Taylor identifies the citation of Ps 118 (vv. 10-11), and the allusion to
contrary, theological, structural and stylistic evidence serves to indicate the greater likelihood of Marcan interference at a number of points. From the standpoint of style, the editorial framework (vv. 1a, 12) within which the parable—including the citation of Ps 118—is situated, manifests a number of examples of typical Marcan usage. In v. 1a we note the pleonastic use of the verb ἄρχομαι as well as the occurrence of the verb λαλέω,¹²²⁶ in v. 12a the occurrences of the verbs ζητέω, κρατέω, φοβέρμαι and γινώσκω.¹²²⁷ Within the parable proper, the succession of clauses strung together with the conjunction καὶ is yet another instance of Marcan style.¹²²⁸ From the standpoint of structure, Neirynck has

the priests (v. 12) as possible Marcan contributions (Mark, 473), and Gnilka, though he detects 'no clear-cut Marcanisms,' regards the framework within which the parable is located as such (Markus, II, 142) and likewise the epexegetical reference to the "beloved son" as the only Marcan interference within the parable (v. 6) (ibid., 143).

¹²²⁶ Neither the pleonastic use of the verb ἄρχομαι ("begin") nor the verb λαλέω ("say," "speak," "talk," "tell") in v. 1a can be considered a stylistic feature of the pre-Marcan Passion Narrative in particular (contra Pesch, Markus, II, 214), but rather a stylistic feature of the gospel as a whole (ἀρχομαι + infinitive: Pryke, Redactional Style, 79-80; Taylor, Mark, 48; λαλέω: Pryke, Redactional Style, 137 [see caption, 136]. Each of the following passages contain the verb ἄρχομαι used pleonastically:

1:45; 2:23; 4:1; 5:17, 20; 6:2, 7, 34, 55; 8:11, 31, 32; 10:28, 32, 41, 42, 47; 11:15; 12:1; 13:5; 14:19, 33, 65, 69, 71; 15:8, 18. Each occurrence, save one, finds its source in Mark (ibid., 136). The following passages contain the verb λαλέω:

1:34; 2:7; 4:33, 34; 5:35, 36; 6:50; 7:35, 37; 8:32; 13:11 (3x); 14:9, 43. Of the 19 occurrences, 12 betray the hand of the evangelist (ibid., 137). Hence, no convincing evidence exists to establish a pre-Marcan origin for v. 1a.

¹²²⁷ The frequencies with which these verbs find themselves in redactional contexts are: for ζητέω 6 of 8 occurrences, κρατέω 9 of 15, φοβέρμαι 8 of 12, γινώσκω 7 of 12, παραβιβάζω 12 of 13 (so ibid., 47 n. 5).

¹²²⁸ While it "is especially characteristic of Semitic style," "in the NT," "[parataxis] ... is the most distinguishing characteristic of Mark" (Soulen, Handbook, 143). In their treatment, Dana and
disclosed several instances of alleged Marcan duality. Of these, the most convincing include: (a) the inclusion of vv. 1 and 12; (b) the existence of doublet sayings in vv. 1-2 and 13:33-34; (c) a repetition of the antecedent; (d) two instances of a multiplication of cognate verbs; (e) a correspondence in narrative; and (f) a compound verb followed by the same preposition.

The theology of the evangelist, like the stylistic and syntactical features which may be assigned to him, asserts itself not only within the editorial framework, but also within the parable proper. In the framing verses we note firstly, the manner
of address to the religious leaders, viz. ἐν παραβολαῖς (v. 1a), and secondly, their apparent understanding of the parable (v. 12a). Here we have a contradiction. On the one hand, Mark not only designates parable as the form of speech which Jesus customarily employs in public, but he also construes it as riddling speech (4:12) which must be explained even to the disciples (4:13; 7:17-18a). On the other hand, what we read in v. 12a is the statement that "they [the religious authorities] perceived that he had told the parable against them." Further examination only confirms this apparent contradiction. The distribution of Marcan vocabulary throughout the remainder of the verse serves to justify the ascription of its two main clauses to Mark also: "And they tried to arrest him, but feared the multitude." The hostility of the religious authorities towards Jesus is also a motif which recurs throughout Mark's gospel.

Clearly, such a consideration precludes summary dismissal of this datum as pre-Marcan tradition. On the contrary, this competing motif of "obdurate understanding" on the part of Jesus' opponents (cf. 3:22) appears to establish the Marcan character of v. 12 and along with that an inconsistency in the evangelist's application of his parable theory.

---

1235 Cf. 3:23; 4:2, 12 (Lambrecht, "Redaction and Theology", 283).
1236 See Pryke, Redactional Style, 47.
1237 Cf. e.g. 3:6 and 21-30 (Lambrecht, "Redaction and Theology", 284).
1238 Pesch, Markus, II, 223.
1239 So ibid.
1240 Contra ibid.
1241 Cum Jan Lambrecht, Once More Astonished: The Parables of Jesus
If the thrust of v. 12 subjects the evangelist's theory of parables to a strain, then the title ὑιὸν ἀγαπητόν ("beloved son") in v. 6 does likewise in relation to his conception of the Messianic Secret. An obvious reference to Jesus, the expression finds itself within the divine annunciation formulae of 1:11 (the baptism) and 9:7 (the transfiguration).\(^{1242}\) Certainly the title Son of God, which is clearly implied here, is "the most important of the titles of Jesus in Mark"—even though "it is used sparingly."\(^{1243}\) The allegorical presentation of 12:1b-9 wherein the landlord represents God\(^{1244}\) and the son Jesus, imparts a similar significance to the title "beloved son," i.e. one of a divine annunciation.\(^{1245}\) Although the annunciation occurs within the context of a soliloquy, the soliloquy is nonetheless one to which the listener is privy. What we have in v. 6, therefore, is "pre-eminentely the [Marcan] title of confession,"\(^{1246}\) and the publication of it exerts a "strain" on the Marcan conception of the Messianic Secret.

Burkill writes:

St. Mark's fundamental belief [that Jesus is the

---


\(^{1243}\)See Best, *Markan Soteriology*, 167-69; sim. Schulz, *Markus und AT*, 186: here the predicate "Son" is deemed the most important title of sovereignty in Mark's gospel. Or, as Pesch would put it, the predicate "beloved/my son" carries a christological 'charge' in Mark's gospel (*Markus*, II, 223).

\(^{1244}\)Contra, ibid., 214.


\(^{1246}\)Best, *Markan Soteriology*, 168.
Christ], which is evidently pressing for explicit recognition in his narrative concerning the triumphal entry in Jerusalem and the cleansing of the temple, here subjects his doctrine of the [Messianic] [S]ecret to a strain that it cannot withstand, the result being that there is a temporary disclosure of the Messiahship outside the circle of the initiated.

At the same time, "parable"--as construed by the evangelist--produces the effect, indeed serves the purpose, of hardening the heart\textsuperscript{1248} and thereby preventing the recognition of Jesus' true identity. A brief look at Mk 11 establishes this fact beyond all doubt. The so-called cleansing of the temple (vv. 15-17) is arguably an action with messianic overtones.\textsuperscript{1249}

Evidently the chief priests and the scribes fail to recognise the implicit claim for they immediately conspire to destroy Jesus (v. 18). The dialogue over Jesus' authority (11:27-33) serves to make this point abundantly clear. Burkill writes:

\begin{quote}
In 11:27ff. the chief priests and the scribes and the elders ... betray their ignorance of the truth by coming to Jesus and questioning him about the authority to which he lays claim.
\end{quote}

Indeed the whole tenor of these verses implies ignorance of divine authority, let alone messianic dignity. Similarly, a veiled declaration of divine Sonship (12:6), that is to say ἐν παραβολαῖς (12:1a),\textsuperscript{1251} serves to alleviate somewhat the apparent contradiction\textsuperscript{1252} to the Marcan Messianic-Secret motif. The

---

\textsuperscript{1247}Mysterious Revelation, 202-3; cf. 128-129.
\textsuperscript{1248}Lambrecht, "Redaction and Theology", 285.
\textsuperscript{1249}See above ch. 1 pp. 79-80.
\textsuperscript{1250}Mysterious Revelation, 200.
\textsuperscript{1251}Cum Cranfield, Mark, 367-68; Pesch, Markus, II, 223; contra Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 128-29. 202.
\textsuperscript{1252}So Scott, Hear then the Parable, 240; but cf. Pesch, Markus, II, 223: the parable, though allegedly unaltered by the evangelist, could still find itself at home within the "Marcan conception."
religious authorities against whom Jesus directs the parable\textsuperscript{1253} reject the veracity of his veiled messianic claim. Nonetheless, they do not completely miss the point. That is to say, Jesus has likened them to their lawless forebears.

Thus we can draw two conclusions. In terms of form and content we can reliably assign vv. 1a and 12 to the evangelist. However, the body of the composition under consideration (vv. 1b-9, 10-11) demands a different assessment. In other words, the hand of Mark does not betray itself here, except for the designation of the son as "beloved" (v. 6) and the purely formal characteristics identified above.

The majority of NT commentators have rightly affirmed the allegorical nature of the parable from the outset of its tradition-historical development. Yet their inquiries after the *Sitz im Leben* of the composition have yielded no consensus. On the one hand, such conservative authorities as Cranfield and Pesch ascribe the extant composition or some part thereof, to the historical Jesus.\textsuperscript{1254} Its *Sitz im Leben Jesu* is envisioned much the same--Cranfield a "warning parable,"\textsuperscript{1255} Pesch a "threat of judgement"/"warning."\textsuperscript{1256} Here original addressees would have been the religious leaders of the previous vignette. There they had just previously questioned Jesus in his claim to authority

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{1253}So Best, *Markan Soteriology*, 86.

\textsuperscript{1254}Presumably Cranfield thus assesses the entire pericope (vv. 1-12) (see *Mark*, 364-69), and Pesch quite explicitly the parable proper (vv. 1b-9) (*Markus*, II, 213, 221)--vv. 1a and 10-12 represent pre-Marcan (ibid., 223) supplements (ibid., 213).

\textsuperscript{1255} *Mark*, 367-68.

\textsuperscript{1256} *Markus*, II, 221; cf. 223 and 222: a "conflict parable."
Taylor indeed acknowledges vv. 5 and 9b as possibly later additions. Otherwise "the fundamental idea of the parable contains nothing which contradicts the teaching of Jesus." On the other hand, less conservative scholars in this same camp tend to assign the composition to primitive Christianity. Thus Gnilka regards the material of vv. 5 and 6 as later additions. Nonetheless he views divine judgement upon Israel as its message. Clearly, any Christian presentation of a salvation-historical drama demands a perceptible reference to the resurrection as its fitting conclusion. Thus the early church came to read the rejected stone of Ps 118 as the resurrected Jesus. Generally speaking, therefore, liberal and conservative authorities alike consider the citation of Ps 118:22(-23) as part of the allegory.

Our tradition-historical investigation will permit but one conclusion. The original form of the parable of the Wicked Tenants has embodied a salvation-historical ideology in the form of an allegorical presentation from the very outset of its complex

---

1257 Cranfield, Mark, 364; Pesch, Markus, II, 213, 223. The antecedent of the pronominal reference to the addressees of the parable αὐτοῖς (v. 1a) would be the "chief priests and the scribes and the elders" (11:27) of the previous vignette (Cranfield, Mark, 364; Pesch, Markus, II, 214).
1258 Mark, 473.
1259 Ibid., 472.
1260 Bultmann, HST, 177, 205, 419; Gnilka, Markus, II, 144, 148.
1261 V. 5: a pre-Marcan addition; v. 6: the epexegetical reference to the "beloved son" a Marcan addition (ibid., 143).
1262 Ibid., 143, 148.
1263 For this reason, we find it incomprehensible that Bultmann (HST, 177) would credit Mark with the reference to Ps 118, or that Cranfield (Mark, 368-69) and Taylor (Mark, 473, 477) would even consider Marcan redaction a possibility.
tradition-history. Even a reconstruction of its earlier form bears the unmistakable stamp of the theology of the early church. The composition cannot, on any account, represent the historical Jesus in his preaching ministry.\textsuperscript{1264}

On first inspection, a number of considerations appear to locate the extant composition within Jewish Christianity. Theologically, some have called attention to the telltale notion of God's coming in judgement in v. 9\textsuperscript{1265} in addition to the use of a messianic proof-text in vv. 10-11.\textsuperscript{1266} Stylistically, one might also note the two semiticisms of vv. 1b and 3. The first of these is the anarthrous use of the noun ἀνθρωπός ("man") so as to bear the same meaning as the indefinite pronoun τις ("someone"),\textsuperscript{1267} the second the pleonastic construction λαβόντες αὐτοῦ.\textsuperscript{1268}

Certainly the deuteronomistic scheme of history reflected in the parable proper\textsuperscript{1269} as well as the absence of any notion of the pre-existence of the son\textsuperscript{1270} prior to Mark or of his expiatory

---

\textsuperscript{1264} The debate with the religious authorities in Jerusalem outlined in 11:27-33 is the Sitz im Leben proposed by Cranfield and Pesch. However, the theology of the early church reflected in the composition is not the only problem associated with the proposal. The group of discourses reported in 11:27-12:40 could well owe its arrangement to the evangelist as well: the theme of animosity between Jesus and his opponents recurs several times in this section (see 11:27-33; 12:12a, 13, 18-27, 35-37a, 38-40).

\textsuperscript{1265} Cf. Ps 95:13; Am 5:17 (Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 476).

\textsuperscript{1266} From time to time, rabbinic sources assign the "stone testimony" a messianic significance (see St/Bi, I, 875-76). In that case, Scott correctly labels it "prooftexting from Jewish Christianity" (\textit{Hear then the Parable}, 142).

\textsuperscript{1267} Pesch, \textit{Markus}, II, 215.

\textsuperscript{1268} Ibid., 216.

\textsuperscript{1269} Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, II, 144.

\textsuperscript{1270} Ibid.

For Best, the idea of sending implies the pre-existence of
death would indicate a Palestinian provenance as would perhaps the method employed in the laying out of the vineyard. However, the depiction of Palestinian agricultural practices is certainly no surprise in a reference to the Jewish scriptures, and it might well reflect an attempt to Judaize the tradition. Likewise, the presence of Semitic stylistic features could reflect an attempt to invest the tradition with a measure of historical verisimilitude.

At the same time, no fewer than three considerations serve to indicate a non-Palestinian origin. Firstly, not the formulation of the name "son" alone, but its association with the idea that the son is heir to the election of, and promises to Israel and that Christians from among the Gentiles as well as Jews become heirs through him. Secondly, our analysis of the morphology of the scripture references will establish the use of the LXX both in the parable proper (vv. 1b-9) and its sequel (vv. 10-11). This in itself suggests a Greek-speaking milieu. Finally, a writing-off of the Jewish people by Jewish Christians is not an historically probable hypothesis.

the son (Markan Soteriology, 126). This is peculiar reasoning, for he observes shortly thereafter that the prophets are also sent by the father (ibid., 129). Would Best thus argue the pre-existence of the prophets? Clearly we have to reject Best's particular argument for a Hellenistic influence.

1271 Gnilka, Markus, II, 144.
1272 See Taylor, Mark, 473.
1273 See above ch. 1 p. 45 incl. n. 88 (onto p. 46).
1274 Gnilka, Markus, II, 144.
Excursus 5

Mk 12:1-12/Lk 20:9-18/Gospel of Thomas Logia 65-66: The Question of Literary Dependence or Literary Independence

The version of the parable proper reported in the Gospel of Thomas manifests three principle divergences from the version reported in the Gospel of Mark:

a. the absence of any allegorical amplification of the metaphor of the vineyard;

b. the emphasis on the designation of the son of the owner as respected son; and

c. the twofold rather than a threefold sending of servants to the vineyard.

On the basis of four considerations a certain number of scholars have claimed Thomas as an earlier form of the parable proper. Firstly, the double sendings of servants and the sending of the son in Thomas would represent compliance with the "law of three" rather than the triple sending of servants and the sending of the son.\footnote{Bultmann, \textit{HST}, 188 (endorsed by Linnemann, \textit{Parables}, 12); Scott, \textit{Hear then the Parable}, 247; cf. Dodd, \textit{Parables}, 100 n. 1.} Secondly, the parable proper in Thomas (Logion 65), together with the parables of the Rich Fool (Logion 63) and the Great Feast (Logion 64), is one of a group of three parables, all of which are evidently intended to interpret one another and relate to the theme of loss.\footnote{Butts, Funk, and Scott, \textit{Parables}, 51; Scott, \textit{Hear then the Parable}, 34.} Additive connections of this kind are a typical feature of oral presentation.\footnote{Ibid., 34-35.} Thirdly, the version of the
parable reported in Thomas lacks the allegory which so characterizes the Marcan version.¹²⁷⁸ Fourthly, the person or persons responsible for the form of the parable in Thomas did not designate the son of the owner as a beloved son, as does Mark in conformity with the theology of the church.

Telling though these arguments may be, we must nevertheless note other considerations which point in the opposite direction. Firstly, the reference to the three (as opposed to two) sendings of the servants (vv. 2, 4, 5a), as indeed the summary of other sendings (v. 5b), looks to be not a secondary expansion, but a natural development of the allegory with which the parable was already pregnant, if not stamped, from the outset. In any case, this embellishment does not add anything materially to the overall sense of the passage. Secondly, neither the presence nor absence per se of allegory constitutes reliable evidence as to the relative age of a literary unit. Parable and allegory do not always represent easily separable genres.¹²⁷⁹ As noted above, the version of the parable reported in Thomas would appear to have undergone a tendentious editing which effected a removal of its allegorical features. Moreover, the presence of the reference to Ps 118:22 (Logion 66) to the "pre-allegorized" version of the parable is an inexplicable feature, that is to say, unless it had already been understood allegorically, as Butts, Funk, and Scott¹²⁸⁰

¹²⁷⁸Bultmann, HST, 199. On our reckoning, however, the version reported by Thomas does not lack "the allegory," but rather "the degree of allegory" evident in Mark.
¹²⁷⁹See above Excursus 1 pp. 106-9.
¹²⁸⁰Parables, 51.
and Pesch\textsuperscript{1281} and Schoedel\textsuperscript{1282} suppose. Thirdly, the appositional reference to the beloved son (v. 6) does not betray a uniquely Marcan emphasis, but that of the church generally.\textsuperscript{1283} On the other hand, the Gospel of Thomas does contain a redactional motif in Logion 65. "The clause 'but when it falls on the earth which has been cultivated...'" betrays "a new emphasis on the need for preparation if the kingdom is to have its effect." Precisely the same motif manifests itself in Logia 9 and 20.\textsuperscript{1284}

A comparison of the versions of the parable reported in Lk 20:9-16a and Thomas Logion 65 further serves to illustrate the difficulties involved in an attempt to define the literary relationship between the synoptic tradition and the Gospel of Thomas. The similarities between the two versions include:

a. the abridgement of the reference to the Isaianic allegory of the vineyard so as to include less detail than that of Mk 12:1, 9 = Mt 21:33, 40-41; and

b. the curtailment of the concluding reference to Ps 118 so as to include v. 22 only (Lk 20:17 = Thomas Logion 65), as opposed to vv. 22-23 as in Mk 12:10-11 = Mt 21:42.

The divergences include:

a. the threefold sending of a single servant in Lk 20:10, 11a and 12a, as opposed to the twofold sending of a single servant in Thomas Logion 65;

\textsuperscript{1281} Inferred from Markus, II, 213 together with 222.
\textsuperscript{1282} "Parables in the Gospel of Thomas", 560.
\textsuperscript{1283} Cf. above p. 425 n. 1225 (onto p. 426), p. 429 n. 1243.
\textsuperscript{1284} Fleddermann, "The Mustard Seed and the Leaven", 235.
b. the soliloquy following the sending of the first servant wherein the owner suggests that the tenants may not have recognised him (the first servant), in Thomas, as opposed to its absence in Luke;

c. the explicit use of the verb "know" in the statement that the tenants recognised the son, in Thomas, as opposed to its absence in Luke;

d. the description of the reaction of the audience to the telling of the parable proper in Lk 20:16b, as opposed to the absence of any such statement in Thomas;

e. the presence of the saying, "Let him who has ears hear," between the parable proper and the reference to Ps 118 in Thomas, as opposed to its absence in Luke; and

f. the reference to Is 8:14-15 following that to Ps 118 in Lk 20:18, as opposed to its absence in Thomas.

In this connection, Pesch considers Thomas a "de-allegorized abridgement" of Luke.\textsuperscript{1285} The differences listed under nos. "b," "c," and "e" likewise manifest themselves in a comparison of Mark and Thomas and what was said above\textsuperscript{1286} finds equally valid application in a comparison of Luke and Thomas. Pesch declines to speculate, however, whether Luke is dependent on Mark or some other source. With respect to the former possibility, it could be maintained with Scott that, "the Isaianic allusion identifying the vineyard with Israel is omitted because the owner's final punishment refers not to the destruction of Jerusalem but rather

\textsuperscript{1285} Markus, II, 213.
\textsuperscript{1286} See above p. 417 n. 1201 (onto p. 418), p. 418 n. 1204.
to the Parousia." Here Scott takes up the observation of Hans Conzelmann, that the Lucan reluctance about Jerusalem relates to the problem posed by the apparent delay of the Parousia.  

According to Gnilka, both Luke and Thomas betray tell-tale signs of "stylistic polishing" and "systematizing" (of Mark, presumably). The double sending of a single servant together with the sending of the son in Thomas manifests stylistic polishing in its compliance with the "rule of three." So also does the triple sending of a single servant reported by Luke (20:10-12) in the presence of typical Lucan vocabulary. Theologically speaking, the double sending of a single servant in Thomas also tends to dampen identification of the servants with the prophets, and thus serves to mute a salvation-historical interpretation, as does to a lesser extent the triple sending of a single servant in Luke. The suppression of the allegory of the vineyard likewise serves to mute a salvation-historical reading in Thomas, as it does in Luke. So also does the interpolation of

---

1287 Hear then the Parable, 243. Presumably, the line of thought which is entertained here would represent an 'accentuation of the christological content' (à la Gnilka, Markus, II, 142).


1289 N.B. the verbs ἐξαποστέλλω (vv. 10 and 11), and προστίθημι (vv. 11 and 12) -- in v. 11 προστίθημι in lieu of the Marcan adverb πάλιν (12:4); the adjective ἀτερος (v. 11); the construction δὲ κι' (vv. 11 and 12); and the use of the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος as personal pronoun (Jeremias, Parables, 72 n. 84).

1289 So Scott, Hear then the Parable, 243.

1290 Cf. above p. 436 n. 1278: likewise, the version reported by Luke does not lack "the allegory," but rather "the degree of allegory" evident in Mark.
the saying about hearing between the parable proper and the quotation of Ps 118:22 in Thomas. With the insertion of the people's response to the parable proper in Lk 20:16b--divergence no. "d"--, the evangelist effects a separation of the people from their leaders and thereby employs the parable in service of a "selective condemnation" of the latter.¹²⁹³

To conclude our investigation, we know but two things for certain: firstly, Luke had access to the Marcan version, and secondly Mark had access to a pre-Marcan version. The nature of the agreements and divergences between the extant versions of the parable of the Wicked Tenants thus permit two general solutions to the problem of the literary relationship between them: (a) Thomas and Luke are ultimately dependent on Mark; (b) Thomas is a gnostic elaboration of an early pre-Thomas version to which Luke also had access. In either case, the parable antedates the synoptic tradition as we have it.

¹²⁹³Scott, Hear then the Parable, 244.

A separation between the people and their leaders also manifests itself in Mk 12:12. This observation further signals a literary relationship between Mark and Luke.
B. MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF SCRIPTURES REPORTED

i. Verbal Contacts between Mk 12:1-9 and Is 5:1-7

Mk 12:1-9

1. Καὶ ἡρέσατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν· ἀμπελώνα ἀνθρώπος ἐφύτευσεν καὶ περιέβηκεν φραγμὸν καὶ ὄρυξεν ὑπολήνιον καὶ ἁκοδόμησεν πῦργον καὶ ἔξεδετο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν.

2. καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς τῷ καίρῳ δοῦλον ἵνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τοῦ ἀμπελώνος.

3. καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἔδειραν καὶ ἀπέστειλαν κενὸν.

4. καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον· κάκεινον ἐκεφαλίσαν καὶ ἡτίμασαν.

5. καὶ ἄλλον ἀπέστειλεν· κάκεινον ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ πολλοὺς ἄλλους, οὓς μὲν δέροντες, οὓς δὲ ἀπεκτέννοντες.

6. ἦτι ἕνα εἶχεν, υἱὸν ἀγαπητὸν· ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων ὅτι ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱὸν μου.

7. ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν ὅτι οὗτος ἔστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἡμῶν ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία.

8. καὶ λαβόντες ἀπέκτειναν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔξεβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελώνος.

A vineyard which has been carefully prepared by its owner serves to characterize the nation of Israel both in Mk 12:1b-9
and in Is 5:1-7. The evangelist has not specified his source. Moreover, the re-application of the metaphor in Mark has occasioned some alterations in the text of the LXX. Most notably, the laying-out of the vineyard in Mark (v. 1) is the work of the owner, identified in the third person as a "man" (ἀνθρωπος). On the other hand, the laying-out of the vineyard as depicted by Isaiah is again the work of the narrator (ἐγώ implied), viz. the Lord (v. 2), but the prophet does not clearly specify who the owner is. Is he the narrator—ὁ ἀμπελών μου (v. 1a), or "the beloved"—ἀμπελών ἐγενήθη τῷ ἡγαμημόνῳ (v. 1b)? Still, the degree of verbal contact between the two versions suffices to render Marcan literary dependence incontrovertible.

Most of the direct verbal contact of Mark with the LXX shows itself in the laying-out (φυτεύω) of the vineyard (ἀμπελών). In Mk 12:1 and Is 5:2 we note: the enclosure (περιτίθημι) of the vineyard with a hedge (φραγμός) (cf. Is 5:5), the building (οἶκος) of a tower (πύργος), and the digging (ὀρώσω) of a pit for the winepress (ὑπολήνιον) (Mk; cf. Is [προλήνιον]). Yet the question addressed to the hearers in Mk 12:9a—"What will the owner of the vineyard do?"—also recalls the question addressed to the inhabitants of Jerusalem/Judah Is 5:4a—"What more shall I do for my vineyard that I have not done for it?" Likewise punishment of the tenants in Mk 12:9b recalls that of the vineyard in Is 5:5-6. Moreover, the general tone of Mk 12:9a approximates that of Is 5:3-4—a solicitation of a judgement—and the tone of Mk 12:9b approximates that of Is 5:5-6—a pronouncement of a

judgement. However, the punishments themselves assume different forms in each account. The prophet envisions the punishment of the vineyard as a demolition of its enclosure and a laying-waste of the plantation. By contrast, Mark announces the destruction of the tenants and the transfer of the vineyard to other tenants. Finally, the reference to "beloved son" (νικός ἀγαπητός) in Mk 12:8a recalls the reference to "the beloved" (ὁ ἀγαπητός; cf. ἡγαπημένῳ [2x]) in Is 5:1. Thus Mark's representation of the Isaianic metaphor of the vineyard can be considered a free indirect reporting of the LXX, which is mimetic to some degree.

ii. The Deuteronomistic Interpretation of History as the Conceptual Background of Mk 12:1b-9

The parable of the Wicked Tenants, which is demonstrably a transparent allegorical presentation, represents a

---

1295 Both Mark in v. 9a and Isaiah in v. 5a report the principle verb in the future tense. Moreover, the statements evidence rather similar content; to wit, both serve to introduce pronouncements of judgement. Admittedly the former statement is a question, and the latter a simple assertion, but the aforesaid similarities between them do clearly indicate assimilation of the NT to the OT (so ibid., 147; cf. Pesch, Markus, II, 220). In turn, the prefatory statement of Is 5:5a recalls solicitation of judgement in Is 5:3 (ibid.).

1296 The reference to Is 5:2, 5 in Mk 12:1 is not "all but a quotation from Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard (Is. v. 1-2)" (Dodd, Parables, 97), but rather a 'free use of Is 5:2, 5' (Pesch, Markus, II, 215).

1297 So Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 201 n. 25. On the one hand, Cranfield (Mark, 366-67) and Pesch (Markus, II, 214), who see the parable as allegorical in part (so also Taylor, Mark, 472), believe that it was intended to carry an allegorical significance from the outset. On the other hand, the allegedly earlier version of the parable reported in the Gospel of Thomas does not exhibit quite the number of allegorical features as the synoptic versions, thus leading some authorities to attribute its present allegorical character to secondary manipulation (Butts, Funk and Scott, Parables, 51). See below.
salvation-historical drama patterned after the deuteronomistic interpretation of the history of pre-exilic Israel. Three important details establish this beyond doubt. Firstly, the owner of the vineyard sends servants to secure a portion of the harvest (vv. 2, 4a, 5aα, 5bα, 6); secondly, the tenants of the vineyard mistreat the servants (vv. 3, 4b-c, 5aβ, 5bβ, 8); and thirdly, the owner destroys the tenants and lets the vineyard to others (v. 9). A number of the deuteronomistic histories in the OT present themselves as more or less summary formulations. The deuteronomistic formulation which we find encapsulated in Neh 9:26-27a warrants particular note as it involves killing of

1298 So ibid.
The deuteronomistic picture comprises four basic propositions:
a. the people of Israel disobey Yahweh throughout their pre-exilic stay in the promised land;
b. Yahweh, through the prophets, patiently exhorts the people to turn back;
c. Israel remains stubborn;
d. the people of Israel thus incur the judgement of God in the catastrophes of 722 and 587 B.C. (Steck, Gewaltsame Geschick, 63-64).
1299 Ibid., 100-1. The corresponding statement of the deuteronomistic presentation (viz. "b:" see previous note) concerns the sending of the prophets by Yahweh to exhort Israel to "turn back."
1300 Ibid., 101-2. The corresponding statement of the deuteronomistic presentation (viz. "c:" see 2nd note above) concerns Israel's indifference to--and later her violent rejection of--the message of the prophets. At the same time, the rejection of the servants in the parable serves to underline element no. "a" of the deuteronomistic picture, viz. the disobedience of Israel (ibid., 103 n. 8).
1301 Ibid., 102 incl. n. 7. The corresponding statement of the deuteronomistic presentation (viz. "d:" see above n. 1298), concerns Yahweh's judgement upon an unrepentant Israel. However, the events of 587 B.C. no longer assume a pivotal role as the definitive act of judgement (ibid., 104-5).
However, the attestation in the OT of the conceptual background against which Mk 12:1b-9 is composed does not establish direct mediation to the evangelist: on the contrary, late Judaism evidences application of deuteronomistic thought to post-exilic Siṭze im Leben not unlike that of primitive  

\[\text{1302}\]

Moreover, the occurrence of the verb ἀποκτείνω/ἀποκτέννω affords a significant verbal affinity between Neh 9:26αβ LXX (ἀπέκτειναν) and Mk 12:5 (ἀπέκτειναν/ἀπεκτέννοντες).

Here an indebtedness to the 'deuteronomistic scheme of the violent fate of the prophets' and 'possibly also Jer 7:25ff.' (so Gnilka, Markus, II, 143) provides a less economical hypothesis than that of an indebtedness to the kind of statement reported in Neh 9:26-27α. In either instance, this "indebtedness" would not be a direct, but an indirect indebtedness.

The killing of the prophets as expression of the chronic stubbornness of Israel finds its earliest extant occurrence within the context of a deuteronomistic formulation in Neh 9:26-27α (Steck, Gewaltsame Geschick, 61-62). However, the most primitive form of the deuteronomistic presentation of the history of pre-exilic Israel available to us (2 Kg 17:7-20) contains no explicit statement in connection with the prophets, except insofar as they assume the role of preachers of repentance and obedience to the Mosaic Law (ibid., 66-71). The explanation of the origin of the conception of the violent destiny of the prophets within the deuteronomistic tradition, proposed by Steck, entails a series of tradition-historical stages of development beginning with that of 2 Kg 17:13-14 and concluding with that Neh 9:26-27α (ibid., 60-80).

Other deuteronomistic historical summaries in which the exhortations of the prophets are simply ignored include those of Jer Source C (7:25-27, 32-8:3; 25:3-14; 26:2-3, 5-6; 29:17-20; 35:13-15, 17; 44:2, 4-6, 9-14) (see ibid., 72-74), Zech 1:4-6; 7:7,12 (see ibid., 74 incl. n. 2); 2 Chr 36:14-16 (17-21) (see ibid., 74-75); cf. also 2 Chr 24:17-19; Ez 9:10-15, Neh 9:29β-30 and Dan 9:5-14.

Neither the killing of prophets nor the rejection of their admonitions are features unique to deuteronomistic historical summaries. Reference to the same crimes of Israel finds itself chronicled in other contexts: the OT writers recount the former e.g. in 1 Kg 19:10, 14; Jer 2:30 (by the people); 1 Kg 18:4, 13 (by Jezebel); 26:20-23 (by Jehoiakim), and the latter e.g. in 1 Kg 22:26-27 (Ahab arrests Micaiah); Jer 26:7-19 (the "priests and prophets and all the people" arrest Jeremiah); Am 7:10-17 (Amaziah the priest of Bethel expels Amos from the northern kingdom).
Christianity. Indeed Steck writes:

Since this idea of the violent destiny of the prophets is supported by documentary evidence in two late-Jewish logia [Lk 11:49-50 and 13:34-35], since it appears in primitive Christianity mostly in polemical contexts and therefore must be conceded by the opponent, [and] finally, since it is demonstrably living tradition in Josephus and even in the rabbinic tradition, there can be no doubt that primitive Christianity has received this general conception as a living tradition from the late-Jewish transmission process (translation ours).  

That the deuteronomistic tradition continued to develop and find new applications well into the period of late Judaism means that a conscious and direct application of scripture to Christian concerns should not be hastily ascribed to Mark, at least not insofar as it concerns such material.

iii. Other Affinities of Mk 12:1b-9 with OT Text

V. 6: the reference to the vineyard owner's one child,  

a "beloved son:" ἐνα ... υἱὸν ἄγαπητόν

Gen 22:2, 12, 16: references to Isaac, Abraham's "beloved son:"  

ὁ υἱός σου ὁ ἄγαπητός

Jg 11:34: a reference to Jephthah's only child, a daughter:  

αὕτη [i.e. ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτοῦ] μονογενῆς αὐτῷ ἄγαπητή

V. 6: The vineyard owner hopes the tenants accord his son

---

1303 See ibid., 81-109.
1304 Ibid., 103. The German text reads: "Da diese generelle Geschickvorstellung Lk 11:49f. und 13:34f. in zwei spätjüdischen Logien belegt ist, da sie im Urchristentum allermeist in polemischen Zusammenhängen auftritt und also vom Gegner konzediert sein muß, da sie schließlich bei Josephus und noch in der rabinischen Überlieferung als lebendiges Traditions-gut nachweisbar ist, kann kein Zweifel sein, daß das Urchristentum die generelle Vorstellung vom gewaltsamen Geschick der Propheten als lebendige Überlieferung bereits aus spätjüdischen Tradition übernommen hat."
1305 Elsewhere in the OT the term ἄγαπητός serves to designate a/an "beloved/only son" in the abstract. See Jer 6:26; Am 8:10 and Zech 12:10.
respect:

... ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου.

2 Chr 36:12: King Zedekiah does not humble himself before the prophet Jeremiah:

... οὐκ ἐντράπη ἀπὸ προσώπου Ιερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου ... 1306

V. 7b: The tenants plot to kill the son of the vineyard owner:

... δεῦτε ἀποκτεῖνωμεν αὐτὸν ... 1307

Gen 37:20a (LXX): Joseph's brothers plot to kill him:

... δεῦτε ἀποκτεῖνωμεν αὐτὸν ...

V. 9b: The vineyard owner destroys the tenants and gives the vineyard to others.

Ps. 96:13: The Lord comes to judge the earth.

Am 5:17: The Lord will pass through the midst of the people and there will be wailing in the vineyard.

1306 Undoubtedly the deuteronomistic tradition of the fate of the prophets would encompass the concept of the authority of God and his messengers (Pesch, Markus, II, 218). Moreover, the passive form of the verb ἐντράπω denotes the fitting stance vis-à-vis the proclamation of the Lord. In this connection, Pesch cites other passages besides 2 Chr 36:12: Ex 10:3; Lev 26:41; 2 Kg 22:19; 2 Chr 7:14; 12:7, 12; 34:27. However, none of these texts underline disrespect for the message-bearer per se.

1307 Other possible contacts with, and affinities between the parable proper and the story of Joseph include:

a. On the one hand, the clauses which serve to introduce the consultations among the tenants in Mark and the brothers of Joseph in Genesis, and the demonstrative references to the tenants in Mark and Joseph in Genesis, on the other:

   Mk 12:7a: ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν ὅτι οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος

   Gen 37:19: εἶπαν δὲ ἐκαστὸς πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἐνυπνιαστὴς ἐκεῖνος ἔρχεται.

b. the thought of sending the son in Mk 12:6 and that of sending Joseph in Gen 37:13; and

c. the casting of the son out of the vineyard in Mk 12:8 and the casting of Joseph into the pit in Gen 37:24 (ibid., 219).
Except for that of v. 7b, each one of the above contacts with the OT entails either short phrases or general concepts. Presumably, the prophet Isaiah has knowingly employed familiar OT concepts. However, the allusive nature of the foregoing contacts precludes ascertainment of the degree of such an awareness on the part of the various tradents of the source(es) in question. Even Mk 12:7b in its verbal contact with Gen 37:20 (LXX) comprises but three words with no identification of its biblical source. Yet this verbatim report did, as we shall demonstrate, possess no negligible degree of importance within its immediate context. The representation of Gen 37:20 (LXX) in Mark’s gospel would thus constitute free direct discourse.

vi. Verbal Contacts between Mk 12:10-11 and Ps 118:22-23 (LXX)

Mk 12:10-11

10. ὁδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε·

λίθον δὲ ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες,

οὐτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γονίας.

11. παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη

καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν;

Ps 118:22-23 (LXX)

22. λίθον, δὲ ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες.

1308 The frequent attestation of the expression ἀμπελῶν φυτεύω in the OT (e.g. Gen 9:20; Dt 20:6; 28:30, 39; Ps 107:37; Ec 2:4; Is 5:2; 37:30; Jer 2:21; 31:5; Ezek 19:10; 28:26; Am 5:11; 9:14) does not establish it (cf. Mk 12:1a) as a biblicism—at any rate not a significant one (contra ibid., 215), but as part of “the normal depiction for the laying-out of a vineyard” (ibid. [italics added]). Similarly, the adverbial use of κενόν in the OT (Gen 31:42; Dt 15:13; Ruth 1:21; Jer 14:3 [indicated in ibid., 216]) does not establish its occurrence in Mark (12:3) as a conscious reference to scripture. Rather it looks to be a commonplace.
The scriptural material in Mk 12:10-11 is a verbatim quotation of Ps 118:22-23. Moreover, an introductory formula serves to introduce this material as scripture. What we have here, then, is a case of direct discourse.

C. THE MEANING OF MK 12:1-12
i. The Parable Proper - Mk 12:1b-9

The parable, as it now stands in Mark's gospel, possesses allegorical traits, if it is not allegorical in its entirety. The owner (κύριος) of the vineyard represents God, the vineyard (αμπελών) itself Israel's election as God's people, the tenants

---

1309 Cum Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 202 n. 26; Cranfield, Mark, 368; Gnilka, Markus, II, 148; Pesch, Markus, II, 222; Taylor, Mark, 476.

1310 Is 28:16 (LXX) reads: "Therefore thus says the Lord, even the Lord, 'Behold, I lay for the foundations of Sion a costly stone, a choice, a corner-stone, a precious stone, for its foundations; and he that believes on [it] [Brenton eisegetes "him"] shall by no means be ashamed.'" However, the verbatim correspondence between Mk 12:10 and Ps 118:22-23 makes it clear that the primary reference here is that of the Psalms.

1311 Gnilka, Markus, II, 144, 145; Jeremias, Parables, 70; contra Dodd, Parables, 67 n. 2; Pesch, Markus, II, 214, 218.

1312 The setting of the narrative in the vineyard signals an interest in the nation of Israel. Indeed the writers of the OT frequently compare Israel to a "vineyard," e.g. in Ps 80:8; S of S 8:11; Is 5:7; 27:2; Jer 2:21; 12:10; Ezek 15:1-8; 17:5-10; 19:10-14; Hos 10:1 (cf. Jeremias, Parables, 70, 167; Pesch, Markus, II, 220). Here the house of Israel is the referent of the metaphor. However, the equation 'vineyard = Israel' does not, says M. Smith, hold true in Mark's parable. He writes: "Israel is the people (not a geographic term). Nor would 'the land of Israel' fit, for the Jews had already lost that and Jesus was not cast out of it. The casting out, then, reflects the same theory as Heb 13:11ff. and the transfer of the vineyard, as

---

οὗτος ἐγένεθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γυνίας.

23. παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὐτή
καὶ ἦσθιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν.

The parable proper - Mk 12:1b-9

The owner (κύριος) of the vineyard represents God, the vineyard (αμπελών) itself Israel's election as God's people, the tenants
Thus the referent of the vineyard is likely the election of Israel (so Pesch Markus, II, 215, 220, 221 and M. Smith, "Comments on Taylor", 49; contra Jeremias, Parables, 70, Scott, Hear then the Parable, 240, Steck, Gewaltsame Geschick, 270 and Taylor, Mark, 472, for whom the vineyard represents the nation of Israel; but cf. Gnilka, Markus, II, 144: the vineyard represents both the nation of Israel, and the election of Israel [ibid., 146]). However, Burkill offers another proposal. That is to say, the opening verses of the parable presuppose the nation of Israel as the referent of the vineyard, but v. 9 the "God-given privileges of the chosen people" (Mysterious Revelation, 201 n. 25). In any case, the Jewish writers tend to associate the ideas embodied in these interpretations. A metaphor for the nation of Israel, the vineyard typically denotes a people elected, presented with promises and representing God's heir (Steck, Gewaltsame Geschick, 270-71: see esp. n. 7).

Here the tenants would not represent the nation collectively (so Gnilka, Markus, II, 146; Steck, Gewaltsame Geschick, 270 and tentatively Taylor, Mark, 472), but its leadership alone (so Best, Markan Soteriology, 86; Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 201 n. 25; Cranfield, Mark, 367-68; Jeremias, Parables, 70 and Scott, Hear then the Parable, 240). Cranfield observes: "[T]he fact that, whereas in Isa. v the vineyard was at fault, here it is only the husbandmen," indicates "[t]hat [the parable] is directed specifically to the leaders of the people and not to the people at large" (Mark, 367-68).
The tenants as keepers of the vineyard would, of course, represent overseers of Israel's privileged relationship to God. Curiously, Pesch's observation that the parable is directed at the leaders --indeed the antecedent of the pronoun αὐτοῖς in 12:1 is the religious leadership to which Mark refers in 11:27! (Markus, II, 214; see also Dodd, Parables, 98, 127; Jeremias, Parables, 166-67) is itself a refutation of his unqualified rejection of the equation "tenants = leaders" (Markus, II, 220; cf. 215: tenants represent Israel). A further consideration pointing in this direction is the obvious disagreement between the people and their leaders in v. 12.
the prophets, the owner's son (υἱὸς) Jesus, the fruits (καρποί) of the vineyard behaviour befitting election and promise, the mistreatment of the envoys a similar treatment of the prophets, the murder of the son the execution of Jesus, the destruction/expulsion of the tenants God's judgement upon

---

1314 Cum Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 201 n. 25; Butts, Funk, and Scott, Parables, 51; Cranfield, Mark, 367; Gilka, Markus, II, 146; Jeremias, Parables, 70; Pesch, Markus, II, 216; contra Taylor, Mark, 472, 474. The noun δοῦλος in vv. 2 and 4 undoubtedly signals an interest in the prophets. The appositive definition of the "prophets" as "servants" -- ([οἱ] δοῦλοι μου/σου/ σου τοῦ θεοῦ) -- appears a good number of times in the OT, e.g. in 2 Kg 9:7; 11:13, 23; 21:10; 24:2; Ez 9:11; Jer 7:25; 25:4; (26:5; 29:19; 35:15 [MT]); Ezek 38:17; Dan 9:6, 10; Am 3:7; Zech 1:6; cf. Jos 14:6 (Μωσῆς ἄνθρωπον τοῦ θεοῦ), 7 (Μωσῆς ὁ παῖς τοῦ θεοῦ). In this connection, Cranfield suggests that, "Jesus ... [took] up the O. T. figure of God's vineyard and then [spoke] of the owner sending his slaves one after another ... thinking of the prophets (cf. Jer. vii. 25f. ... and also xxv. 4, Josh. xiv. 7, Am iii. 7, Zech. i. 4)"

(Mark, 367; cf. Pesch, Markus, II, 216).

Though accepting the foregoing interpretation as the most probable Scott, deems the wounding of the second servant in the head (v. 4) a possible reference to the fate of John the Baptist (Hear then the Parable, 240). Presumably the Marcan account of the Baptist's beheading (Mk 6:17-29; cf. Mt 14:3-12) would lend some degree of support to Scott's conjecture.

1315 Cum Jeremias, Parables, 70; Cranfield, Mark, 367-68; Scott, Hear then the Parable, 240. The owner's soliloquy (v. 6) includes an expository apposition. Therein the reference to the "beloved son" (υἱὸς συναγαπητός) recalls the theophanies at the baptism (Mk 1:11) and the transfiguration (Mk 9:7); cf. 3:11; 15:39 (υἱὸς θεοῦ); also 5:7; 13:32; 14:61. Indeed the predicate "beloved/my son" carries a 'christological charge' in Mark's gospel (so Pesch, Markus, II, 223). However, the words of the apposition do not impart a christological significance to the "one" (ἐνα) (so ibid., 218), but lend emphasis to what is already there.

1316 So Cranfield, Mark, 367; Steck, Gewaltsame Geschick, 271, also cited with approval in Pesch, Markus, II, 216; contra Taylor Mark, 472, 474. Cf. the Q-text Mt 3:8-9/Lk 3:8.
Israel, and the letting of the vineyard to 'others' (ἄλλοι)
the transfer of Israel's chosen status to the church. The
multiplicity of demonstrable metaphorical contacts between the
picture and the reality parts establishes the allegorical nature
of this "parable," notwithstanding the fact that various scholars
have argued the "reality" of the situation depicted in it.

1317 The judgement visited upon Israel does not entail her ruin as a
nation (contra Jeremias, Parables, 70), but rather a forfeiture of
her elected status (Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 201 n. 25,
Gnilka, Markus, II, 147; Pesch, Markus, II, 220-21). The
composition of Mark's gospel antedated the Jewish War of c. A.D.
68/69; in that case, the evangelist would have had no knowledge of
the destruction of Jerusalem.

1318 Gnilka, Markus, II, 147. The 'others' allegedly signify Gentiles
(Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, 201 n. 25; Jeremias, Parables,
70; Pesch, Markus, II, 220-1), signify Gentiles and include Jews
(Steck, Gewaltsame Geschick, 271; cf. Gnilka, Markus, II, 149),
or signify Jews and include Gentiles (Best, Markan Soteriology,
180). Taylor proffers no interpretation: the evangelist does not
give "any precise connotation to ἄλλοις" (Mark, 476). The
church's self-understanding as the new Israel would, in our view,
identify the "others" as the Gentiles.

1319 E.g. Dodd, Parables, 97-102; Jeremias, Parables, 74-76
and Linnemann, Parables, 8.

Thus Dodd observes that,
"the description of the murder of the son betrays no reminiscence
of the manner of the death of Jesus [but that] Matthew has in
fact attempted to remedy this. He makes the tenants first expel
the son from the vineyard and then kill him--as Jesus suffered
'without the gate' (Heb. xiii. 120). But in the Marcan version
there is not even this hint" (Parables, 101).

Nevertheless, Dodd acknowledges this fact:
"The parable as we have it in Mark invites an allegorical
interpretation in which the 'servants' stand for the prophets,
and the 'beloved son' for Jesus" (ibid., 99-100).

Jeremias as well compromises his non-allegorical assessment. Not
only does he identify a significant number of features in the
parable as allegorical (see Parables, 70), but he quite frankly
concludes that,
"[t]his parable, linked up as it is with the Song of the Vineyard
in Isa 5.1-7, exhibits an allegorical character which is unique
among the parables of Jesus" (ibid).

The parable as originally conceived did not perhaps demand an
allegorical reading; even so it was "pregnant" with such a
reading. Says Dodd himself:
"The number [of 'servants' sent by the landlord to claim his
The initial verse of the parable proper (v. 1b) serves to portray the establishment of the covenant between God and Israel. However, the relationship as depicted in the ensuing verses (vv. 2-5) is anything but a happy one. The leaders of the chosen people flout their obligations under the covenant relationship, and ignore the admonitions of the prophets. On top of this, the religious authorities not only treat God's messengers with contempt, but in some cases even murder them. Indeed the summary statement of v. 5b embodies a motif regularly associated with the deuteronomistic history. Surprisingly, then, God does not visit judgement upon Israel. Instead of this, he resolves to send the last (ςχατον)--his son (v. 6).

rent] may well have been multiplied in order to suggest the long roll of prophets sent by God to His people and rejected or martyred by them" (ibid., 100). To borrow Dodd's own idiom, "the Church is dotting the i's and crossing the t's of the original application" (ibid., 99). That is to say, the early church is merely underlining what was already incipient in the parable. Dodd's treatment of the servant-metaphor lends credence to our assessment; he writes: "They [i.e. those to whom the parable was addressed] were familiar with the idea of Israel as the servant of the Lord; and in particular of outstanding figures in the history of Israel, such as leaders, rulers and prophets, as in an especial sense His servants" (ibid., 126-27 [italics added]) --and so would be Jesus, incidentally (Cranfield, Mark, 367). In principle, no reason exists to preclude the possibility that the parable elicited an allegorical interpretation from the outset.

Cum Pesch, Markus, II, 218: cf. 2 Chr 36:15-16.

Here the narrator employs the "fate-of-the-prophets" tradition (cf. Jer 7:21-28) (ibid., 221). To this point in the narrative, we do not find the slightest hint of the Jesus event. Strictly speaking, therefore, there can not yet be any talk of salvation-history (contra ibid., 217).

The last messenger before the judgement' (so Gnilka, Markus, II, 146); 'the eschatological prophet vis-à-vis Israel's end-time apostasy' (so Pesch, Markus, II, 217).
owner reaches his appointed destination and the tenants forthwith recognise him as heir to the promises of Israel. They plot to kill him. Allegorically speaking, their express purpose is possession of the vineyard. In non-allegorical language, the aim of the Jewish leaders is to withhold any share of the promises from the Gentiles.\textsuperscript{1323} No doubt whatsoever, the tenants appreciate the gravity of their action.\textsuperscript{1324} However, the killing of the beloved son and the frustration of his mission (v. 8) exhausts God's patience, whereupon he rejects Israel as his chosen people and confers her erstwhile privileged status upon a new people of God (v. 9).\textsuperscript{1325} The intention of the parable thus construed is to articulate a salvation-history from the election of Israel to her rejection.\textsuperscript{1326}

ii. The "Stone" Testimonium\textsuperscript{1327} - Mk 12:(7b), 10-11

The "stone" testimonium of vv. 10-11 represents an allegorical interpretation of Ps 118:22-23 (LXX). An early Christian proof-text for the resurrection\textsuperscript{1328} these verses serve to

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1323] Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, II, 147.
\item[1324] Pesch, \textit{Markus}, II, 219.
\item[1326] Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, II, 147.
\item[1327] So Dodd, \textit{Parables}, 99.
\item[1328] Cum Burkhill, \textit{Mysterious Revelation}, 202 n. 26; Butts, Funk and Scott, \textit{Parables}, 51; Gnilka, \textit{Markus}, II, 148; Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 108; Pesch, \textit{Markus}, II, 222; Scott, \textit{Hear then the Parable}, 248; Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 477; contra Best, \textit{Markan Soteriology}, 86: a justification of the new Israel, the rejected Messiah as its foundation; Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 369: an authentic saying of the historical Jesus, no less!--i.e. a "clear warning to the leaders of Israel." In this connection see Acts 4:11; Eph 2:20;
\end{footnotes}
complete the salvation-historical drama begun in the parable proper. The cornerstone represents Jesus, the builders represent the Jewish leaders, and the building the church, i.e. the new Israel. Certainly the initial clause of v. 10 (οὐδὲ ... ἀνέγνωτε;) serves to introduce the quotation in a formal way. However, the words of the tenants reported in v. 7b of the parable proper constitute the theological peg whereby the story of Joseph is juxtaposed with the Passion. The brothers of Joseph along with him are to become the twelve founding fathers of ancient Israel. Joseph, the favourite son of his father Jacob, incurs the jealous wrath of his ten elder brothers. The latter sell their brother into slavery, and thereupon his grief-stricken father presumes him dead. Thereafter a series of misadventures lands Joseph in prison in Egypt, but a subsequent reversal of fortunes finds him the minister of agriculture. Eventually famine visits the Near East. Ironically, this same Joseph previously rejected saves his father and brothers from starvation. Just so, the religious authorities engineer the ignominious death of Jesus. Yet this same Jesus

1 Pet 2:7.

1329 Scott, *Hear then the Parable*, 54-55; the concept is also mentioned in Cranfield, *Mark*, 368.


1332 The jealousy of the Jews could well underlie the behaviour of the tenants. In other words, the nation of Israel (in the parable 'the tenants') purportedly recognises Jesus as heir to the
whom the leaders rejected finds his vindication in his resurrection from the dead and in the founding of the church his exaltation secures him the position of pre-eminence in the New Israel. ¹³³³

D. THE MEANING OF THE OT

i. The Song of the Vineyard - Is 5:1-7

The Song of the Vineyard is an allegory. In v. 7 the writer interprets the allegory in part: the vineyard (vv. 2 [2x], 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7) represents the house of Israel (v. 7a), the choice vine (v. 2a) the men of Judah (v. 7a), and the grapes and the thorns (vv. 2b and 4) justice/unrighteous and lawlessness/a cry (suggesting oppression) resp. (vv. 7b and c). Other metaphors include the following: the improvements to the vineyard—the digging of a trench, the planting of a choice vine, the building of a tower in the middle of it, the digging of a place for the wine-vat in it (vv. 2a, cf. 4a)—representing the various past mercies of Yahweh, and the punishment (vv. 5 and 6) military promises of Israel. Not only would the death of Jesus (in the parable 'the heir') secure her elected status for herself (v. 7b), but it would also pose an obstacle for his—i.e. Jesus'—intended inclusion of the Gentiles as co-heirs (v. 9b) (so Gnilka, Markus, II, 147). Certainly this assessment of the tenants' motives seems to fit the general thrust of the composition as a whole.

However, Gnilka's reference of the builders to the general populace does not find support, even when the citation is abstracted from its Marcan context (contra ibid., 148). He himself, in his exegesis of vv. 10-11, notes the contemporary rabbinic designation of teachers as builders (ibid.; see St/Bi I, 876). Not just contextual (11:27) therefore, but internal evidence serves to establish the religious leadership as the referent in question.

defeat.\textsuperscript{1334} Possibly imitating a song composed for a vintage festival, the prophet levels charges against Judah for having violated her covenant obligations before Yahweh. In allegorical language,

> [the Lord] expected [it] to bring forth grapes, but it has brought forth thorns (v. 4b).

In other words,

> [the Lord] expected [it] to bring forth justice, and it brought forth iniquity; and not righteousness, but a cry (v. 7b).

The rhetorical solicitation of a judgement from Judah in v. 3 finds its reply in the statement of Yahweh himself in vv. 5 and 6. In allegorical language,

> [the Lord] shall forsake [his] vineyard; and it shall not be pruned nor dug, and thorns shall come up upon it as on barren land; and [he] shall command the clouds to rain no rain upon it (v. 6).

Less figuratively,

> [the Lord] shall take away its hedge, and it shall be for a spoil; and [he] shall pull down its walls, and it shall be [left] to be trodden down (v. 5b).

Put differently, the enemy will overrun and plunder the city of Jerusalem. Divine judgement will entail military defeat.

Significantly, Isaiah's allegory of the vineyard serves to explain the Babylonian exile. Here the prophet employs minatory language with a view to Israel's repentance.

\textbf{ii. Gen 37:20a (LXX)}

The original context of this short quotation found only in

\textsuperscript{1334} Cf. M. Smith, "Comments on Taylor", 48.

\textsuperscript{1335} On the whole, the OT concepts of justice and righteousness would respectively entail a faithful application of the divine will to daily living, and a state of being spiritually and morally acceptable before Yahweh. The coupling of justice and righteousness is a recurring motif in the OT: e.g. Ps 33:5; 99:4; 103:6; Is 1:21; Jer 9:24; 22:3; 33:15; Am 5:7, 24.
the LXX is the conspiracy among the sons of Jacob to kill their brother Joseph.

iii. Ps 118:22-23

These verses excerpted from a psalm of thanksgiving for victory in battle may express the king's gratitude for the Lord having exalted him over his enemies. On first inspection, the cornerstone appears to represent the king, the builders his enemies. Yet the quotation, in and of itself, possesses rather the character of a proverbial saying, and as such could find application in a number of situations. Here the subject is reversal of fortunes. Thus Burkill can make this suggestion: "Perhaps the psalmist's words were originally meant to refer to Israel, disdained in the present yet divinely destined to a future of glorious supremacy." Thus construed the statement possesses the character of parable.

E. SCRIPTURE-HERMENEUTIC IN MK 12:1-12

i. Mk 12:1b-9

The linguistic contacts between Is 5:1-7 and Mk 12:1b-9 (see above Sec. B) establish the existence of a literary relationship between the two passages. In each passage the writer employs the metaphor of the vineyard. Yet even a cursory review of foregoing Secs. C and D serves to reveal two appreciably

---

1336 Gnilka, Markus, II. 148.
1338 In that case, the subject, "builders," does not carry any metaphorical significance of its own. The genre of the text does not support Gnilka's interpretation "men in general," therefore (Markus, II, 148), or any other, for that matter.
1339 See above pp. 441-44, esp. pp. 443-44.
different applications of this multi-faceted metaphor. On the one hand, the vineyard which is ultimately gone to ruin in Isaiah because it brought forth an unsatisfactory harvest represents the nation of Israel who, because of her disobedience before Yahweh, brings upon herself divine judgement in the form of military defeat. On the other hand, the vineyard from which the original tenants are expelled for their repeated refusal to pay rent in the form of a portion of the harvest and which is subsequently let to others, in Mark, represents the special status of Israel as God's chosen people, which is ultimately forfeited to others, the church. The nation of Israel, exemplified in her leaders, not only manifests consistent disobedience before God but violently rejects all of his messengers, the prophets and ultimately Jesus himself, along with their call to repentance. Isaiah and Mark thus represent significantly differing *allegorical presentations*. Moreover, the referent of the *allegorical presentation* in Mark is a *typological reading* of a *broad biblical pattern* of the OT, i.e. the deuteronomistic history. This body of OT traditions, re-interpreted within the OT itself, probably mediated itself to the primitive church by way of late-Jewish tradition. Thus the strand of tradition which is reported here, is not likely a first-hand application of OT materials. Yet we are entitled to

---

1340 The metaphor of the vineyard in Mk 12:1b, which M. Smith dubs "an early but mistaken gloss" ("Comments on Taylor", 49), does not strike us as a 'mistaken gloss' but rather a *re-application* of the metaphor.

1341 Our analysis of the parable supports Steck's succinct characterization of it: the vineyard metaphor stamps the 'picture part,' the deuteronomistic tradition the 'reality part' (Gewaltsame Geschick, 271 n. 2).
say this much. The sending of the prophets (servants) for the purpose of securing repentance (fruits) typifies and prefigures --for the church--the sending of Jesus (son) for the purpose of securing repentance (fruits). Likewise the violent rejection of the prophets and their admonitions (mistreatment including murder) typifies and prefigures the violent rejection of Jesus and his admonitions (crucifixion). A Christian reader who would be conscious of his participation in the 'new Israel,' and familiar with the deuteronomistic conception of history, would undoubtedly see the alleged forfeiture of status as the 'chosen people' by the Jews (the letting of the vineyard to others) as having been prefigured and typified by the event of 587 B.C. These correspondences between the deuteronomistic presentation of the circumstances attendant upon the mission of the prophets, on the one hand, and the Marcan presentation of the circumstances attendant upon the mission of Jesus, on the other, bespeak a definite structuring of the latter on the basis of the former, whose express purpose, among others, is that of characterizing Israel as having been lawless and stubborn throughout her entire history. The fall of Israel and the exile of her people to Babylon no longer carries the same significance for the Christian as it does for the Jew: it now merely gestures beyond itself to what the Christian perceives as definitive annulment of the covenant relationship between God and his erstwhile 'chosen

\[1342\] As Jeremias has noted, no Jew who heard the parable would connect the experience of the son with the Messiah of Jewish expectation (Parables, 73). On the other hand, a Gentile reader might well detect a certain irony here.
people. Here one cannot mistake the unflattering depiction of Israel.

Indeed the Marcan application of the vineyard metaphor manifests a further difference from that of Isaiah. The prophet still entertains the hope of repentance by his readership. By contrast, Mark no longer envisions such a prospect. God's judgement on ancient Israel is final. A new Israel has assumed her erstwhile status as God's chosen people.

Undoubtedly, a certain number of scholars believe the parable bespeaks strained relations between church and synogogue. Thus the decisive rejection of Israel as heir of the promises and the characteristic emphasis on the Son as such might constitute a response to hostility directed towards the Hellenistic church by Christians of Jewish background because of her mission to the Gentiles. The parable as thus construed serves to legitimate the church's inclusion of Gentiles. However, its

1343 Moreover, "the violent rejection of the prophets is understood not as a guilt annulled by 587 B.C. but as one lasting into the present and weighing heavily on the people" (translation ours) (Steck, Gewaltsame Geschick, 104).

The German text reads:
"[D]ie gewaltsame Abweisung der Propheten [wird] nicht als durch 587 getilgte, sondern als darüber hinaus bis in die Gegenwart andauernde, auf dem Volk lastende Schuld verstanden ..."

1344 Cf. ibid., 104.

1345 However, cf. ibid., 272-273: the Jews harbour this hostility. We find this statement strange. It is not at all obvious why a Jew would object to a Christian mission to the Gentiles. Perhaps Steck in fact meant to indicate Christians of Jewish background.

1346 Yet the demography of the Marcan community renders the likelihood of this scenario very slim. Best writes thus: "The controversy about the admission of Gentiles appears to be over for there is little about it and it is assumed that Gentiles are in the church" (Gospel as Story, 145).
tradition-history has, for Gnilka, proceeded a step further. The
general view of salvation-history and the sharp criticism of
Israel would both justify a separation from, and represent a
charge against Judaism. This insight helps us but it falls
somewhat short. The caricature of the people of Israel which we
find here would establish the separation between the church and
synagogue as a *fait accompli*, and thus signal a cessation of all
dialogue between the two institutions—that is, if any such
dialogue had ever taken place. This caricature comprises two
elements. Firstly, Israel, throughout her history as a people,
has manifested rebellion against God by rejecting his emissaries
(the prophets). Secondly, Israel, through her ultimate act of
rebellion, viz. the rejection of the Son (Jesus), has finally
exhausted the patience of a long-suffering God who responds by
definitively rejecting her as his people. A depiction of a people
such as this would hardly facilitate further constructive dialogue
with them. Clearly the so-called "problem of the Jews" can no
longer be an issue of immediate concern. Yet the problem of
unbelief continues to pose a challenge to the church. Here the
stereotypical "Jew" furnishes the church an explanation. The
source of the problem of unbelief is the attitude of the
unbelieving people themselves. To wit, such people possess a
deep-seated impenetrable mindset.

---

1347 Gnilka, *Markus*, II, 149.
1348 The earlier stages of the Christian tradition (e.g. the Q logion
of Mt 23:34-36/ Lk 11:49-51) do not uniformly attest a total
break with the old Israel. Yet other Q texts provide a decidedly
different picture: here we note, e.g., Mt 19:28/Lk 22:28-30;
Mt 10:15/Lk 10:12, to name two.
On his part, the evangelist has sharpened the focus and increased the intensity of this critique. On the one hand, the object of this negative assessment was never the people of "Israel" as a whole, but rather the custodians of her religious institutions. Yet the pronoun αὐτὸς in the first half of the Marcan inclusio in v. 1a, whose antecedent is the "chief priests, the scribes, and the elders" mentioned in 11:27, serves to concentrate the focus on the religious establishment as the party ultimately responsible for the death of Jesus, as does the second half in v. 12 wherein the evangelist reports an attempt to arrest Jesus. The religious leaders as such betray their culpability in two ways. In the first place, their office would imply some expertise in religious matters, and in the second, some demonstration of exemplary behaviour. On the other hand, the epexegetical reference to the "beloved son" in v. 6 serves to emphasise the divine sonship of Jesus—cf. the divine annunciations in 1:11 and 9:7. In this way, the evangelist seeks to underline the heinousness of his execution. The "Jewish religious establishment," i.e. insofar as it is depicted within the narrative world of the evangelist, is emphatically assigned full responsibility for its rejection of Jesus and all that

\[\text{Footnote:} 1349\] The leaders assume the foreground. Moreover, the Sanhedrinists within the narrative world of Mark bear ultimate responsibility for the death sentence imposed on Jesus. Indeed the nation as a whole suffers the revocation of her elected status (so rightly Gnilka, Markus, II, 149). Yet the preceding accounts of the cursing of the fig-tree (11:12-14, 20-21) and the temple-cleansing (11:15-18) 'sustain' and 'intensify' a judgement against contemporary Judaism as a religious institution (cum Scott, Hear then the Parable, 238-40; contra Gnilka, Markus, II, 149: Israel collectively incurs the judgement).
followed therefrom. At the same time, Mark is addressing a Gentile Christian readership. Once again, the church attempts to rationalize the problem of unbelief. Once again its source is a deep-seated closed-minded attitude. Once again, the people concerned bear the responsibility for this attitude. Yet a significantly greater emphasis on this burden of responsibility manifests itself in Mark's gospel than it does in his sources. In so doing, it seriously compromises the Marcan theory of parables. However, the increased emphasis on personal responsibility for unbelief serves to render that compromise more blatant than would have been the case, had the evangelist incorporated his sources unaltered.

ii. Mk 12:7b, 10-11

The salvation-historical presentation which was begun in the parable proper has necessitated the appending of Ps 118:22-23 for its completion. A parable in the OT, the passage there provided an analogy to a reversal of fortunes experienced by Israel. A proof-text for the resurrection in Mark, the passage here concerns the reversal of fortunes experienced by Jesus, but is now given an allegorical interpretation which presupposes the following metaphors: the cornerstone represents Jesus, the builders the Jewish leaders, and the building the church, i.e. the new Israel.

1350 The location of the accounts of the cursing of the fig-tree (11:12-14, 20-21) and the temple-cleansing (11:15-18) immediately prior to the debates between Jesus and the religious leaders serves to direct the criticism expressed in these vignettes at the practice and administration of contemporary Judaism (contra ibid.).

1351 Scott, Hear then the Parable, 54-55; cf. Butts, Funk and Scott, Parables, 51.
Yet these verses together with the excerpt from Gen 37:20a in v. 7b constitute a *typological reading* of the OT scriptures as well. That is to say, the "stone testimonium" allegorically depicts Joseph's position of pre-eminence in Egypt after his earlier rejection by his brothers (cf. v. 7b). Thus, the experience of Joseph and its saving significance for ancient Israel prefigures and typifies the experience of Jesus and its salvific significance for the new Israel. Through their evil manoeuvrings the contemporary Jewish leaders, like the brothers of Joseph, attempt to thwart the divine will as it works itself out in the mission of Jesus. Ironically, the very attempt to thwart the will of God becomes the means whereby God brings his saving activity to fruition.

However, the particle οὐδὲ ("not even") which appears in the introductory formula of v. 10 does not necessarily signal a text which was well-known among the compatriots of Jesus, but may in fact reflect his surprise at the apparent scriptural ignorance of his opponents (cf. 11:26). A reading of this kind serves to mitigate the moral culpability of the Jewish leaders. The alleged act of rebellion against God has in any case proved contemporary Judaism totally misguided and ultimately futile. Yet the "Jewish

---

1352 A comparison of the story of Joseph with the parable proper reveals two additional parallels, viz. the sending of Joseph to his brothers by his father (Gen 37:12; cf. Mk 12:6b) and the casting of Joseph into a pit by his brothers (Gen 37:24; cf. Mk 12:8). See Pesch, *Markus*, II, 219.
1353 Ibid.
1355 So Taylor, *Mark*, 476.
leaders," in this pre-Marcan citation of Ps 118:22-23 in vv. 10-11, are, as also in the parable proper of vv. 1b-9, nothing other than a rhetorical device whose purpose is to rationalize the problem of unbelief for the Christian community. This time, however, her approach possesses a positive as well as a negative aspect. Not only does unbelief prove itself totally misguided and ultimately futile, but commitment to the new Israel will ultimately find its vindication in God.  

Our foregoing investigation of the parable of the Wicked Tenants has yielded the following conclusions:

a. the parable represents pre-Marcan/Marcan theology: the post-Easter church is its home;
b. the primary source of the pre-Marcan/Marcan parable is Is 5:1-7: Mark/pre-Mark adopts all OT traditions in Isaiah's vineyard allegory;
c. the transfer of chosen status from ancient Israel to the church;
d. the early church has ironically employed Jewish sacred text in service of such a theology;

1356 A definite dialectic manifests itself within the narrative world of Mk 12:1-12. On the one hand, the evangelist underlines the guilt of those who engineered the crucifixion (v. 12; cf. 11:18) (so Best, Markan Soteriology, 125). On the other hand, conformity with the OT and the concomitant sense of divine necessity (ibid., 113), within the framework of the Messianic Secret--as we have insisted--, raises the question as to what extent Mark maintains the culpability of Jewish leaders in respect to the events portrayed in the pericope consideration. In any case, the parable of the Wicked Tenants is not simply a justification of the new Israel, built on the rejected Messiah (ibid., 86). A concerted effort to portray the old Israel as decisively rejected by God manifests itself, so that an anti-Jewish bias is quite unmistakable (cf. Best, Gospel as Story, 145) at the narrative level.
e. the annulment of Israel's privileges represents a Christian radicalization of the deuteronomistic perspective. A factual reading of these OT traditions in the pre-Marcan/Marcan parable affords a "damnation-historical" conception of the Jewish people:

f. the use of the deuteronomistic tradition for the purposes of the portrayal of God's definitive rejection of the Jews. A literal reading of these OT traditions in the pre-Marcan/Marcan parable affords primitive Christian insight into the unbelieving mentality:

g. the use of the deuteronomistic tradition for the purposes of the caricature of the typical infidel as a "Jew."
The contribution of the evangelist represents a refinement of the focus of his predecessor in both reading:

h. the referent of pre-Mark's portrayal is the Jews as a people; the referent of Mark's portrayal is institutional Judaism with its leadership.
Summary and Conclusion

Our investigation of the use of the OT in Mark's gospel took a pair of Test Cases--4:11-12/8:17b-18a and 1:2-3--as its point of departure. In the case of the exclusion formula\footnote{The Marcan exclusion formula, viz. 4:11-12, serves to distinguish two groups of people within Mark's gospel. On the one hand, the so-called "insiders," i.e. the disciples, receive special private explanations of Jesus' public teaching. On the other hand, "those outside" do not receive any such explanations of these "riddling"discourses. On form see above Introduction, p. 2 n. 2.}, Mark himself is the most probable originator as to morphology, content and consequent significance. His reference in 4:12 to the OT --Is 6:9-10--serves to establish the unenviable role of the Marcan Jew. That is to say, the divine in his economy has rendered the cognitive faculties of his erstwhile chosen people dull. Consequently, they cannot penetrate religious truths.

Essentially, the Marcan portrait of the Jew is a literary-theological construct, nothing more or less than a rhetorical device with a definable function within the narrative world of the evangelist Mark. To see this, we need only consider a similar reference in 8:17b, along with the immediately following reference to Jer 5:21/Ezek 12:2 of 18a. Again we encounter redactional material. As we saw earlier, the Marcan Jesus compares the disciples with the Jews of 4:11-12 insofar as the former cannot fathom the import of his teaching. Clearly, the parenthetic clauses of 7:3-4 and 11 suggest a readership unfamiliar with the institutional Judaism. Apparently, the Jews
cease to be a present reality. For the evangelist, therefore, the "Jew" not only embodies his characterization of the typical non-believer, but it also affords a theological explanation for unbelief within his community and without.

The second Test Case—1:2-3 affords a significantly different picture. Here, what appear to be strands of pre-Marcan tradition have preserved the Baptist's call for repentance in the form of a conglomeration of references to Ex 23:20a/Mal 3:1a and Is 40:3. A call to repentance implies a criticism of the people to whom it is addressed. Yet the admonition of the call itself does not suggest a people hopelessly damned to gross misunderstanding by divine fiat, so that the possibility of repentance is precluded. In this regard, then, the use of OT references in 1:2-3 presents a stark contrast to that of 4:11-12.

In our final chapter, we endeavoured to demonstrate the aforesaid findings in other Marcan pericopae. The material contained in 2:23-26 manifests relatively little in the way of redactional interference. A dispassionate, rational response to the Pharisees' criticism of the disciples' sabbath violation, Jesus' response serves to rebut this criticism by means of analogy with David's action. However, the Marcan additions of vv. 27-28 not only betray a relativization of Jewish Law, but a supersedure of its authority by that of Jesus himself.

By contrast, the pericope of 7:1-23 evidences considerable redactional manipulation, so much so that it renders an attempt to identify a pre-Marcan composition impossible. Here the evangelist
saturizes, misrepresents and ultimately debunks Jewish cleanliness prescription. Furthermore, the Marcan Jesus identifies an inconsistency in Pharisaic practice. What is perhaps a misrepresentation of the Corban practice is the linch-pin of this argument.

A comparison of 10:2-10 and 10:17-31 reveals much the same pattern. As with 7:1-23, the first of these pericopae reflects the hand of the evangelist at a considerable number of points. Here the Mosaic certificate of divorce, whose original purpose was to protect the divorced wife, allegedly came to represent a legal technicality whereby a husband could divorce his wife on whatever grounds he saw fit. Identifying the practice for what it was, Jesus proceeds to demonstrate the essential discontinuity of divorce with the divine plan, on the basis of two quotations from Gen 1:27/5:2 and 2:24. Immediately thereafter, the private conversation with the disciples finds Jesus radicalizing the Law in his pronouncement that anyone--husband or wife--who divorces his/her spouse and marries another commits adultery against her/him. No one can mistake the exceedingly negative appraisal of contemporary Judaism. Firstly, the bill of divorce is merely a concession to "hardness of heart", and secondly, the concession itself facilitates commission of adultery.

The immediate encounter of Jesus with the rich man (10:17-22) contains relatively few redactional features by contrast. In this passage, there is no vehemently anti-Jewish attack. On the contrary, Jesus explicitly endorses the commandments of the
Decalogue and in point of fact, Jesus "loves" the man who professes to observe them from his youth. Certainly the rich man refuses to sell his possessions and distribute the proceeds to the poor, and for that reason does not incorporate the full implications of the Law into his life. Yet this man bears a sorrowful countenance and is a tragic figure. Indeed here we observe no bitter castigation.

The final pericope which we examined was the parable of the Wicked Tenants in 12:1-12. This allegorical presentation of the salvation-historical drama is a pre-Marcan composition, though the hand of Mark betrays itself at several points. The Jews, even at the pre-Marcan stage, receive "bad press" insofar as they consistently reject divine admonition and mistreat God's emissaries. As a result, ancient Israel as a whole finds itself rejected as God's chosen people. However, redaction emendation has narrowed the purview of God's judgement to the leaders. Thus the custodians of institutional Judaism bear sole responsibility for the demise of old Israel.

In short, therefore, Mark employs his OT references as a legitimation of his negative portrait of institutional Judaism. In this connection, the evangelist not only introduced his own unfavourable image of contemporary Judaism, but as our examination of 12:1-12 has revealed, he also enlisted and modified certain strands of the pre-Marcan tradition in service of that image. However, the intention of the evangelist was not a denigration of Judaism per se. The demographic parameters of the Marcan
proclamation render such a possibility extremely unlikely. On the contrary, the Marcan Jew represents the evangelist's conception of the proverbial infidel. In other words, the phenomenon of non-belief finds its source in divine fiat. By implication, so also would the phenomenon of faith.

Unfortunately, a profound misunderstanding of Marcan scripture hermeneutics has in part facilitated the persecution of Jewish people over 20 centuries. The atrocities against this people have ostensibly found some measure of legitimation in sacred text. However, a factual interpretation of a biblical text on the one hand, and on the other, a literal interpretation of that same text do not always bear the same import. As witness the present case of the Marcan Jew—with devastating results.

Inflammatory comments against any group would no doubt preclude fruitful discussion with that group. In and of itself this consideration serves to eliminate Jesus as the originator of such comments against Jews. Indeed the same consideration would eliminate the Palestinian church as a likely candidate. With that, the stereotypical Jew has to represent a secondary addition to the gospel tradition. The broader NT tradition evidences much the same development. Here we cite two instances. In the first, neither the Jesus of the gospels nor the authentic Paul betrays an anti-female bias such as occurs in the deutero-Pauline epistles. As the church strove to make greater inroads into Gentile society, she began to assimilate herself by the adoption of essentially non-Christian values of Graeco-Roman society. In the second
instance, the oldest Christian confession was simply, "Jesus is Lord" as is widely known. Only at a later stage did the church allegorize the death of Jesus in terms of the Jewish sacrificial rites. The chief exponent of this doctrine was of course Paul of Tarsus. In both examples there have been unfortunate repercussions as in the case of the Christian stereotype of the Jew.

As a closing observation we propose two opportunities for additional research. First of all, the practical limitations of the present inquiry have precluded the investigation of every Marcan pericope wherein references to OT passages can be established. An examination of such pericopae would, in our opinion, establish our general conclusions beyond all reasonable doubt. Secondly, the question concerning the unity of Mark's gospel could bear additional study in light of our investigation.

In the late nineteenth century Kähler characterized the synoptic gospels "passion narratives with extended introductions." More recently, of course, D. Moody Smith and Robert A. Spivey observed that "[the] force [of Kähler's characterization] is most appropriate to Mark." A comparison of the use of OT references

---

1358 Sim. Meeks, Writings of Paul, 85 n. 7.
in the passion narrative with the uses of OT references in the alleged "introduction" to it, would afford an additional criterion as to whether the passion narrative represents pre-Marcan tradition or an artifact of Mark himself.
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