RIKKI E. WATTS

Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe
88

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgegeben von
Martin Hengel und Otfried Hofius

88

Rikki E. Watts

Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark

Mohr Siebeck

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Watts, Rikki E.:
Isaiah's new exodus and Mark / Rikki E. Watts. – Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 1997
(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament : Reihe 2 ; 88)
ISBN 3-16-146222-X
978-3-16-157204-3 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019

The book was printed by Druck Partner Rübelmann GmbH in Hemsbach on non-aging paper from Papierfabrik Niefern and bound by Buchbinderei Schaumann in Darmstadt. Printed in Germany.

ISSN 0340-9570

Preface

This book is a revised version of a doctoral thesis, outlined in papers read to the SNTS special study group on 'The Use of the OT in the NT' (UK) and to the Cambridge New Testament Seminar in Easter Term 1989, and submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy while at Jesus College Cambridge in 1990. The revision consists primarily of some updating and, in taking advantage of the removal of the word limit, some structural rearrangement, extra detailing and reformulating of selected argumentation, and the addition of two new chapters.

The updating enabled me to interact with articles, monographs, and commentaries—notably R. H. Gundry's massive work on Mark—published since the original submission. One monograph in particular—*The Way of the Lord* by Joel Marcus of Glasgow University (1992)—has two chapters that gratifyingly offer independent support to elements of the thesis as originally proposed. The structural rearrangements amounted to laying out the material more in keeping with the literary structure of Mark as I understand it. This entailed breaking up and moving some of the original thesis chapters into different sequences. Some arguments, primarily those related to Jesus and the Isaianic 'servant' materials, have been rearranged and supported with further detail. Finally, the two new chapters cover materials not able to be treated in the original submission: Chapter 2, 'History as Hermeneutic: the Role of Ideology in Community Self-Understanding' which originally occupied three brief paragraphs in the thesis' Conclusion, and Chapter 9, 'Isaiah's Promise and Malachi's Threat: Part 2: Arrival in Jerusalem', which deals with the third and final section of Mark (i.e. chs. 11-16) .

I would also like gratefully to acknowledge all those who have contributed to attaining what at the outset seemed an impossible goal. It is easy to forget, in hindsight, what a quantum leap it is from merely longish essays, to a (hopefully) substantial book. My debt to many is great.

Without the substantial financial assistance of a Fellowship from the Church of the Pioneers (and Dr. Robert Cooley, President of Gordon Conwell Theological Seminary, who encouraged me to apply), an exceedingly munificent Tyndale House Research Grant over several years, an American Friends of Cambridge Scholarship, several allocations from Jesus College Bane Fund, generous help from the PCC of St. Barnabas, Cambridge, and our many friends in the United States, in particular Harold and Wendy Jacobi, and in Australia, including our community at Truth and Liberation Concern (Melbourne, Australia), Andy and Daphne Callow, and the Rev. Ross and Jenni Green, this thesis could not have been completed. The Bible College of Victoria and Regent College, Vancouver, kindly allowed me to extend a visit to the latter so as to include several weeks at Tyndale House, Cambridge, in order to finish the last half of the final chapter during Michaelmas term, 1995.

I am especially grateful to my supervisor, Rev. Dr. Christopher Rowland, now the Dean Ireland's Professor of Holy Scripture in the University of Oxford, for his ready availability, thoughtful criticisms, and gracious good humour. An excellent supervisor, he allowed just the right balance between room to pursue whatever interests might arise and the need to keep the project within a reasonable timeframe. The Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, Dr. Morna Hooker, also kindly supervised me for one term, and her many pertinent observations and clarity of writing have helped me greatly. Professor Hooker, correctly in my view, alerted scholarship to the many easy assumptions made about Jesus' relationship to the so-called Servant of Isaiah. Her work here was seminal and although I will on several occasions beg to differ it is only with the greatest respect.

Drs. Bill Lane, H. G. M. Williamson, Don Carson, Rev. R. T. France (who introduced me to Mark and in whose class this thesis began), and the members of the Cambridge New Testament Seminar and of the SNTS special study group on 'The Use of the OT in the NT' (UK) have all contributed through their kind encouragement, thoughtful comments, and gracious criticisms. Thanks are also due to my Professors at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Drs. Douglas Stuart, Gary Pratico, Christy Wilson, T. David Gordon, and particularly Drs. Meredith Kline, Gordon Hugenberger, and epecially Greg Beale for their inspiration and instruction

on the use of the OT in the NT. Very special thanks are due to Dr. Gordon D. Fee and his wife Maudine. Gordon has proven a dear friend and honoured mentor, who introduced me to NT studies, in particular the practice of exegesis, and whose integration of a passion for Christ and a sharp mind have profoundly shaped by life.

I wish also to thank my former fellow students at Cambridge and the courteous secretarial and library staff at Tyndale House—a truly wonderful establishment—for their innumerable kindnesses and assistance during my time there, especially Dr. Steven Meyer, Dr. Peter Head, Rev. Dr. John Kleinig, Dr. Paul Wagner, Rev. Dr. Michael Thompson, Dr. Brent Kinman, Rev. Dr. Mark Dever, Dr. Steven Smith, Rev. Dr. Mark Labberton, Rev. David Deboys—who was an exceptionally helpful librarian—and last but not least the Warden, Rev. Dr. Bruce Winter. On my return to Australia Mrs. Ros Devenish and Mrs. Kathy Caddie, the librarians at the Bible College of Victoria, were ever helpful in facilitating inter-library loans during the antipodean summers of 1993-5, when much of this revision took place. Rev. Dr. Colin Kruse helped with some of the proof-reading. Ken Wade, a student assistant at B.C.V., kindly undertook the exceedingly onerous and thankless task of compiling the indices which he continued even after graduation. My BCV teaching assistants, Westan Johnson, and Ian Wragg have both been of considerable help. Scot Becker, my teaching assistant at Regent has also laboured hard and long in the final correlation and checking of the indices.

None of the above, of course, are in any way responsible for errors or deficiencies which may have remained. As this book was submitted in camera-ready copy, I have done my best to detect and eradicate errors—volunteer proof readers have helped in places—but I find proofing my own work most difficult. Consequently, I sincerely apologise to readers in advance for any mistakes that have slipped through.

I am delighted to express my appreciation to Prof. Dr. Martin Hengel and Prof. Dr. Otfried Hofius for accepting this book for publication in the WUNT 2 series. My genuine thanks, too, to the publisher and the editors for their considerable patience over the six years that have elapsed since the offer of publication was first made. My induction into the 'busyness' of a teaching post, the introduction of a new degree program by the Australian College of Theology, and then the recent move of our family to

Regent College, Vancouver, meant that the preparation of the text for publication has been considerably delayed.

Finally, I wish to dedicate this book to my parents, Pastor and Mrs. E. S. Watts, both now with the Lord, who trained me in the way that I should go, to my parents-in-law, Ian and Pauline Noble, who provided encouragement and much support, and especially to my lovely wife and true companion, Catherine, and our special children, Steven and Rebecca, for their unfailing confidence and loving support over the years.

Summer 1997 Rikk E. Watts
Regent College, Vancouver

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of primary Greek and Jewish sources follow Loeb and *JBL* convention—in respect of the Qumran writings, I have elected to stay with the older abbreviations since they may help the reader more than a merely numerical designation—and those of series and journal titles as laid out in *JBL*, *NTA*, and *OTA*. These will not be repeated here. Standard reference works are cited either by author, for example, Schürer, 2.231, or by abbreviated author(s), for example, BDB, 123. References to multi-volume editions are indicated by volume and page number, separated by a period, for example, 1.115. In the case of works such as *TDNT*, articles are cited by author, volume, and page number, for example, Jeremias, *TDNT*, 5.701ff. These standard works are not itemised in the select bibliography. Footnotes in articles and books are signified by page number followed by n. or nn., for example, 101n35. Footnotes within this book are referred to as fn. or fnn., for example, fn. 104 when within the same Chapter, and p. 34, fn. 8, when not.

In the interests of space, bibliographic entries in the footnotes are cited by author, one significant word from the title, and page number, for example, Hahn, *Titles*, 345n42. Exceptions are the major commentaries on Isaiah and Mark, and the works listed below, which are referred to by author only, for example, Westermann, 203 (meaning his commentary on Isaiah), and Marcus, 57 (see the work referred to below). Occasionally in order to avoid confusion a key-word title is given, for example, Gundry, *Mark*, 341, which refers to the commentary. In the case of commentaries page numbers are commonly given only if considered necessary, otherwise the reference is to the discussion under the passage being considered.

Ambrozic, A. M., *The Hidden Kingdom: A Redaction-Critical Study of the References to the Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel* CBQMS 2 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1972).

Boucher, M., *The Mysterious Parable* CBQMS 6 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Commission, 1977).

Burkill, T. A., *Mysterious Revelation. An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel* (Ithaca: Cornell University, 1963).

Dewey, J., *Markan Public Debate* SBLDS 48 (California: Scholars Press, 1977).

Grimm, W., *Die Verkündigung Jesu und Deuterojesaja* ANTI 1 (Frankfurt am Main, Bern: Peter Lang, 1981²).

Juel, D., *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* SBLDS 31 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).

Kelber, W. H., *The Kingdom in Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974).

Kertelge, K., *Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* SANT 23 (Munich: Kösel, 1970).

Kingsbury, J. D., *The Christology of Mark's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).

van der Loos, H., *The Miracles of Jesus* NovTSupp 9 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968).

Marcus, J., *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis in the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox, 1992).

Martin, R. P., *Mark: Evangelist and Theologian* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972).

Marxsen, W., *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel* trans J. Boyce *et al* (New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1969).

Mauser, U., *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and Its Basis in the Biblical Tradition* SBT 39 (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1963).

Pryke, E. J., *Redactional Style in the Markan Gospel* SNTSMS 33 (Cambridge: University, 1978).

Quesnell, Q., *The Mind of St. Mark: Interpretation and Method through the Exegesis of Mark 6.52* AnBib 38 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969).

Richardson, A., *The Miracle Stories of the Gospels* (London: SCM, 1959).

Räisänen. H., *The 'Messianic Secret' in Mark's Gospel* trans. C. Tuckett, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clarke, 1990).

Robinson, J. M., *The Problem of History in Mark* SBT 21 (London: SCM, 1957).

Schneck, R., *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I-VIII* BDS 1 (Vallejo, CA: BIBAL, 1994).

Stonehouse, N. B., *The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Guardian, 1944).

Suhl, A., *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Güttersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965).

Trocmé, É., *The Formation of the Gospel According to Mark* trans. P. Gaughan (London: SPCK, 1975).

Weeden, T. J., *Mark—Traditions in Conflict* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971).

Introduction

In his 1978 survey of Markan scholarship, H. C. Kee observed:

> The history of recent research on the Gospel of Mark can be seen as the record of an attempt to discern the aim of the evangelist and so to discover the perspective which gives coherence to all the features of the Second Gospel.[1]

A decade later W. R. Telford noted that 'further investigation needs to be conducted into its (i.e. the Gospel's) place in the theological history of early Christianity'.[2] M. A. Tolbert's subsequent remark that 'no consistent interpretation of the Gospel in all its parts has yet been elicited'[3] suggests that Kee's observation still applies.[4] This book continues the line of inquiry.

Markan studies, recently reaching flood-like proportions and showing little sign of abating, have variously located Mark's main concerns in his portrayal of eschatological conflict,[5] use of the miracle traditions,[6] understanding of the Kingdom of God,[7] treatment of the disciples,[8] interest in instructing his community,[9] concept of discipleship,[10] Christology,[11] and more recently, in a straightforward apology for the Cross.[12] Given Mark's considerable interest in the OT, attempts have been made to postulate a Markan program either reflecting events in Israel's history,[13] in particular the Exodus,[14] or based on lectionaries[15] and calendars.[16]

---

1 'Recent', 353.
2 'Introduction', 22.
3 *Sowing*, xi.
4 See the surveys in Hurtado, 'Gospel'; Pokorny, 'Markusevangelium'; Lane, 'Present', and the comments of Gundry, 1022ff.
5 Robinson.
6 Kertelge; Koch, *Bedeutung*; Schenke, *Wundererzählungen*.
7 Ambrozic; Kelber; cf. Marcus, *Mystery*.
8 Weeden; Schmahl, *Zwölf*.
9 Reploh, *Lehrer*; Schweizer, 'Leistung'; Beavis, *Audience*.
10 Best, *Following*.
11 Perrin, 'Christology'; Kingsbury.
12 Gundry.
13 Derrett, *Making*; Roth, *Hebrew*; also here Miller and Miller, *Midrash*.
14 E.g. Farrer, *Study*; Hobbs, 'Exodus'; Swartley, 'Study'.
15 Goulder, *Calendar*.
16 Carrington, *Primitive*.

Various studies have examined the Gospel from the standpoints of narrative criticism,[17] rhetorical criticism,[18] and reader response,[19] while others sought the key to Mark's literary structure in ancient dramatic,[20] biographical,[21] rhetorical,[22] and reading[23] conventions. Still others offer sociological,[24] socio-political,[25] Marxist,[26] and structuralist analyses.[27] In spite of this plethora of approaches—or perhaps because of it—agreement as to that 'perspective which gives coherence' to Mark's theological emphases and literary structure has continued to elude scholars.

While this hiatus may indicate that no overarching unity exists, many of these studies have highlighted Mark's theological and literary sophistication—although this should not be overstated as has sometimes been the case.[28] It seems generally agreed that the Gospel is neither merely 'a passion narrative with an extended introduction' (Kähler) nor simply strung together 'like pearls on a string' (Schmidt). Consequently, to deny the existence of an overarching schema may well be premature.

This attempt to investigate Mark's organisational principles builds upon several lines of earlier endeavour. First, it assumes that the final form of Mark's Gospel is the best guide to what it was that the author wished to communicate.[29] It would seem that it is not merely Mark's own material or his adaptations of his sources, but also what he has taken up

---

17 Williams, *Gospel*; Rhoads-Mitchie, *Story*; Kermode, *Genesis*; Best, *Gospel*.
18 Dewey.
19 Fowler, *Loaves*, and *Reader*; Tannehill, 'Disciples'.
20 Bilezikian, *Liberated*; Standaert.
21 Talbert, *Gospel*; Cancik, 'Gattung'; Hadas and Smith, *Heroes*.
22 Robbins, *Teacher*; Tolbert, *Sowing*.
23 Beavis, *Audience*.
24 Kee, *Community*; Neyrey, 'Purity'; Watson, 'Social'; Mack, *Myth*.
25 Myers, *Binding*; Waetjen, *Reordering*.
26 Belo, *Reading*.
27 Via, *Ethics*; Malbon, *Narrative*.
28 As noted by e.g. Meagher, *Clumsy*, and Räisänen, 16ff. Nevertheless, one of the weaknesses of Räisänen's otherwise sage criticisms is his failure to appreciate the 'occasional' dimension of Mark's Gospel and therefore the possibility that Mark may have assumed some knowledge on the part of his readers. So e.g. Räisänen's observation that the episode of Jesus' temptation is 'strangely inconclusive' (16n64), tells us more about how the text strikes Räisänen than it does about how it might have appeared to Mark's intended audience. This is all the more likely if Mark's gospel is not a theological super-nova but instead represents traditions with which his 'community' was already well acquainted.
29 See Lane's comments, 'Present', on the recent commentaries of Pesch and Schmithals; Gundry, 18ff; cf. Güttgemanns, *Candid*.

unaltered, both in terms of individual pericopae and their order, that together provide a reliable indication of his concerns.

I am also persuaded by those who have urged that the OT is foundational to Mark's thought world.[30] One also notes here C. H. Dodd's conviction that the NT and OT authors share the same *Weltanschauung*,[31] and that of Francis Foulkes, who saw the basis of this continuity to be in the belief that 'as God had acted in the past he would act in the future'.[32]

Two other factors contributed to the genesis of this book. As an Australian student studying in the United States I was fascinated by my lecturers' occasional references to 'four-score and seven years ago' and the uniformly 'knowing' response of my American fellow-students. Only on learning that the phrase was the first line of Abraham Lincoln's famous Gettysburg address did its significance became apparent. By evoking the Founding Fathers' ideology these few words functioned as a hermeneutical indicator, pointing not so much to the text of Lincoln's address *per se* (as in Dodd's 'text plot'), but to the larger interpretation of American history which Lincoln's speech assumed and with which it interacted. This raised the possibility, given Dodd's shared-*Weltanschauung* hypothesis, that Mark's use of OT citations might also function in a similar manner. Kee's recognition that OT citations appear at crucial junctures in Mark only served to strengthen this conjecture.[33]

The second contributing item, complementing and supporting the first, was the work of Jacques Ellul and Paul Ricoeur, both of whom stress the formative influence of a group's founding moment on its self-understanding.[34] This is especially so in times of uncertainty or internal conflict. These theories are significant on two counts.

First, Israel's founding moment was the Exodus. Not only did it shape the national identity and character but the prophets of the Babylonian exile

---

[30] In addition to those examined in Chapter 1: Fitzmyer, 'Judaic'; Best, *Story*, 140ff; and now Marcus, *Way*; cf. Kline, 'Origins'. On the citational conventions of the period, including the unique implications for the OT as authoritative literature, the degree of freedom to vary wording, and the constraints upon same, see the excellent work of Stanley, *Language*.

[31] *According*, 133. See Marshall's survey of recent discussion, 'Assessment'.

[32] *Acts*, 9.

[33] Kee, 'Function'. Following the completion of this thesis in its original form Joel Marcus, *Way*, has also argued strongly along these lines.

[34] Respectively, 'médiateur', and 'Function' and 'Science'; see Chapter 2.

used it as the paradigm for the deliverance they announced.[35] It is not surprising that several emergent groups within Judaism, including the movement known according to Acts as 'the Way', should also describe themselves in these terms.[36]

Second, the tensions between the 'Way' and the larger Jewish community, with the one claiming over against the other to be the legitimate heir of the norms and prophetic traditions of the past, only make it more likely that the former's *bona fides* should be couched in such historic terms.

There is, however, the danger of anachronism. Ellul and Ricoeur were discussing modern societies. Nevertheless, the basic model—the role of the founding moment in times of conflict—appears appropriate; at least on a surface reading of the NT materials. Given the difficulty of reconstructing the mental world of ancient societies, authors, and readers, the applicability of the model may finally have to be judged in terms of its ability to make more and better sense of the Markan data.[37]

These factors form the basis upon which the original contribution of this book is argued. Namely, as his opening editorial citation indicates, Mark's fundamental hermeneutic for interpreting and presenting Jesus derives from two sources: A) a positive schema whereby Jesus' identity and ministry is presented in terms of Isaiah's New Exodus (hereafter NE);[38] and B) a negative schema by which Jesus' rejection by the nation's leaders and his action in the Temple is cast in terms of the prophet Malachi's warning; a warning which itself concerned the delay of the Isaianic NE (hereafter INE). This dual perspective of salvation and judgement—both within the context of the INE—seems to provide the fundamental literary and theological structure of Mark's Gospel. This is not to deny the presence of other concerns (e.g. discipleship, Mark 13) or OT themes (e.g. Son of Man Christology), but instead suggests only that they presented within the larger literary and theological scheme proposed herein.

---

[35] See e.g. the survey in Fishbane, *Biblical*, 356-68, and earlier, 'Motif'.

[36] For further comment e.g. Horsley, 'Figures', 277-285.

[37] So also Tolbert, *Sowing*, 10-13. On a prodigious attempt to articulate a generalised first century Jewish world view, see now Wright, *People*.

[38] Other scholars have suggested to varying degrees and in varying guises such a motif, e.g. Swartley, Best, Lane, but have not sought to demonstrate this in a thorough-going manner concentrating primarily on Mark's prologue and his 'way' section. Subsequent to the completion of this thesis a more comprehensive approach along these lines has been argued strongly by Marcus, *Way*.

I. Outline

Chapter 1 surveys modern scholarship concentrating primarily on the OT and Mark's literary structure or his overall attitude to the OT. Other relevant works are discussed at appropriate junctures later in the book.

Chapter 2 concerns the social function of ideology—namely its schematisation of historical memory as the foundation of community identity—as a theoretical basis for what the rest of the book argues exegetically. The postulated constructs of social theory on the one hand, and the practical results of exegesis on the other, can stand alone and so confirm each other.

Chapter 3 argues that in line with ancient literary convention, Mark 1:1-3, Mark's only editorial OT citation and opening sentence, conveys the conceptual framework for his story. Isaiah 40:3 presages the inauguration of the long-awaited INE while the Malachi 3:1/Exodus 23:20 conflation ominously highlights the threat inherent in Yahweh's NE coming.

Chapter 4 submits that the INE also explains the prologue's integration of OT motifs. John is Malachi's Elijah who prepares the way for Yahweh's long-delayed INE coming. εὐαγγέλιον connotes the Isaianic conception of God's in-breaking reign, signalled by the rent heavens and the descent of the Spirit (Isa 63). The voice declares Jesus to be true 'servant'-Israel (son of God, Isa 42) who will deliver 'blind' Israel, the Davidic Messiah (also son of God, Ps 2), and perhaps the 'unique' Son of God (Gn 22).

Chapter 5 contends that Mark's three-fold structure comprising Jesus' powerful ministry in Galilee and beyond, his leading his 'blind' disciples along the 'Way', and arrival in Jerusalem echoes the INE schema where Yahweh as Warrior and Healer delivers his people from bondage, leads the 'blind' along the NE way of deliverance, and arrives at Jerusalem.

Chapter 6 proposes that Mark's asymmetric distribution of miracles is consistent with an INE hermeneutic. Jesus' exorcisms (Mark's first miracle) are linked to the Isaianic Yahweh-Warrior (3:22-30; Isa 49) and his healings (blind, deaf/ dumb, and lame,) and feedings are inaugural signs of the NE (Isa 35; 29). The section's final healing miracle (7:31ff; 8:22ff is transitional) summarises the people's amazed response, 'He has done all things well!'. At the same time several of Jesus' actions imply that his sonship goes beyond earlier categories: he is also the Son of God.

Chapter 7 argues that Jesus' outright rejection by Jerusalem's leaders at the crucial Beelzebul controversy (Mk 3) echoes Israel's first Exodus rebellion against Yahweh's Spirit (Isa 63) and results in the division and judgement of Israel, now effected through the parables (Isa 6 in Mk 4). The only other confrontation between leaders 'from Jerusalem' and Jesus prior to his arrival in Jerusalem (Mk 7) is presented in similar terms (Isa 29).

Chapter 8 discusses the 'Way' section which is framed by the Gospel's only 'sight' miracles. Picking up on Mark's interest in the disciples' incomprehension ('blindness' and 'deafness'), it is argued that Jesus' leading his 'blind' disciples in the 'Way' echoes wise Yahweh's leading the 'blind' along the 'unknown' NE way (Isa 42:16). The passion predictions indicate that, in Yahweh's wisdom, the INE is to be effected by the suffering and death of true messianic 'servant' Israel (Mk 10:45; Isa 53).

The two themes—Jesus as the one who fulfils the INE but who is rejected by Israel's leaders—intersect in Mark's account of the events of Jesus' arrival and death in Jerusalem.

Chapter 9 argues that, although Jesus' 'triumphal entry' is consonant with Yahweh's arrival, his cursing of the fig tree and Temple cleansing reflect the threat implied in the opening Malachi citation and Mark's presentation of John as Elijah. At the same time, Jesus' rejection and death echoes the career of the enigmatic Isaianic 'suffering servant'.

Chapter 10 draws on the Philosophy of Science, applying the theory selection criteria of consilience, simplicity, and analogy to argue that an INE hypothesis is the best explanation of the phenomena observed. The concept of 'ideology' is reviewed to offer an explanation as to how the idea of presenting Jesus in these terms could have arisen.

II. Limitations and Assumptions

1. 'Mark' is used to refer to the book's author, but implies nothing as to his identity.

2. Without denying the importance of other influences, in keeping with Mark's opening citation and the importance of the INE for Jewish expectation, this book concentrates on Mark's use of Isaiah. Other influences are discussed only as they relate to this central concern.

3. The NT makes little use of non-OT texts. While perhaps due to the unique authority granted the OT, it may be that many apocalyptic and pseudepigraphical texts were not widely known or accepted. There is also the problem of dating: to what extent do later texts (e.g. rabbinical materials, Targums) reflect earlier traditions? (And again how widely known and accepted were they?) By way of contrast, Synagogue worship and Temple instruction would have made the OT far more familiar. Consequently, while reference is frequently made to a range of ancient literature, it seems wise initially to grant priority to OT materials.

4. Anachronistic language such as 'Deutero-Isaiah' is avoided since Mark is hardly likely to have thought in these terms. Similarly, titles like Servant Songs and Suffering Servant are prefaced by 'so-called' or written in lower case and placed in inverted commas. This is not to exclude the possibility that some sort of integrated reading of these Isaianic texts, with a coalescing of the figure(s) described therein, might have been under way in the first century; only that it is not assumed.

5. 'Messiah', 'messianic', and related expressions do not imply the existence of a monolithic expectation within Judaism (even if, as I think, in an understandable reaction to past simplifications 'messianic' diversity is sometimes overplayed).[39] It is equally important to recognise that this does not mean that Mark (or his audience) shared a similarly diffused conception. Indeed, the opposite seems more likely in that the focussing of these ideas in the person of Jesus would have exercised a consolidating effect on what might have been, in other contexts, less consciously related concepts. In this respect, while recourse is often made to the ways in which various OT texts and expressions appear to have been understood within contemporaneous Jewish traditions, it must be borne in mind that

[39] See the discussions in e.g. Horbury, 'Messianic'; Charlesworth, 'Messianology' and *Messiah*; Neusner, *Judaisms*; Horsley and Hanson, *Bandits*; and Wright, *People*, 170-81, 307-20. Here as always caution should be exercised. Thus e.g. one implication of VanderKam, 'Enoch', and Kee, 'Christology', is that different titles do not necessarily imply different figures. Likewise, the scarcity of references to a Davidic messiah or his links with the 'kingdom of God' may no more suggest that these were not central ideas than a similar dearth of references to covenant indicate that this was not an important concept (on the latter, Wright, *People*, 260ff, citing Sanders, *Paul*, 420f). Given such texts as Jer 23:5ff; 30:9f; 33:14-26; Ezek 34:20-31; 37:15-28; etc. (and 2 Sam 7 is after all a covenant), it seems more likely that these associations were largely assumed—note the unaffected way in which Jesus' Davidic messiahship is mentioned—with exceptions being just that; cf. Horbury, 'Messianic'.

this book deals with their setting in Mark's Gospel, a Gospel which not only apparently post-dates the Pauline literature but also presupposes an emergent Christian perspective which may well have integrated not only these concepts but also 'other motifs and passages of the OT not previously regarded as "messianic"'.[40]

6. Methodologically, an allusion is considered more likely when:[41]

A) linguistic parallels and conceptual congruence are marked;

B) either the linguistic or conceptual parallels or both tend towards being unique to the proposed OT source passage;

C) themes evoked by the allusion not only cohere with but also clarify the meaning of the Markan passage under consideration;

D) the explanatory function of the allusion displays a high degree of congruence with broader Markan themes (this assumes a certain degree of thematic coherence in Mark's presentation of Jesus);

E) there is a similar application of the OT source passage elsewhere. This last criterion is not as weighty as the others listed. Although it may lend support to a similar use in Mark, neither the absence of such nor even the presence of a different application elsewhere can be taken to establish the negative. Mark must be allowed the creative possibility of seeing things in a new light. To this extent, the Markan context must always be given hermeneutical priority.

7. To maximise agreement on the data , if not its interpretation, I have by and large restricted myself to those texts which a substantial proportion of Markan commentators hold to reflect a specifically Isaianic influence.[42]

8. In keeping with my beliefs and without prejudice or polemical intent, BC and AD are used for dates, and the designations Old Testament and New Testament for the major divisions of the Christian Bible.

9. Finally, in keeping with first century Jewish and Christian practice, the deity is referred to in the generic masculine.

---

[40] Dunn, 'Messianic', 366, although his 'not previously regarded' ought to be qualified by 'in terms of the evidence we now have available'. See also Charlesworth's statement, 'Messianology', 10, that by at least ten years after the crucifixion 'Christ' became for Christians Jesus' proper name which may be taken to imply some degree of consolidation as to the meaning of the term; cf. Hengel, 'Between' and 'Paul'.

[41] The literature on this controversial matter is notoriously volumious, but see the nuanced discussion in Thompson, *Clothed*, 28-36, to whose work I am indebted, and also e.g. Hays, *Echoes*, and Stanley, *Language*.

[42] Including those where Isaianic citations/allusions are combined with other sources, e.g. Mal 3:1 and Ex 23:20 in 1:2f; Jer 7:11 in 11:17.

Chapter 1: Scholarship on the OT in Mark

I. Introduction

This chapter surveys seriatim rather than in narrative form only those works which either propose a thorough-going OT influence on Mark's literary/theological structure or discuss, as their main focus, Mark's overall attitude to the OT. Specialised studies such as those by U. Mauser, on the wilderness, L. Hartmann, on Mark 13, H.-J. Steichele, on the suffering Son of God motif, and more recently Joel Marcus, on Markan Christology, are not included here, being discussed along with other secondary literature if and when appropriate in the body of the book.

II. Survey

a) A. M. Farrer, A Study in Mark (1951), and, St. Matthew and St. Mark (1954)

A. M. Farrer's monographs are among the earliest in recent gospel studies to deal extensively with the OT's influence on Mark. Given Mark's frequent puns, Farrer feels that a sophisticated literary approach is justified and thus argues for a two-fold unifying literary-theological pattern.

First, Mark 'like all Christians sees our salvation through Jesus as a spiritual exodus and a conquest of the promised land' (pp. 55f).[1] Second, Mark developed this motif using a triple cycle of 'twelve-plus-one' callings (the twelve disciples plus Levi), healings, and loaves (the five and seven loaves plus the eucharist)[2] to indicate Jesus' institution of New Israel (pp. 69f). 'Thirteen' disciples is not problematic because, on the one hand, Israel was really composed of thirteen tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh replacing Joseph, and since, on the other, Levi had no tribal allotment and so is not included. Mark's awareness of this complexity is evident in Levi's individual treatment and absence from the list of twelve.

---

[1] This and other references refer to *Study* unless otherwise indicated.

[2] Added in his second study, *Matthew*.

Jesus' miracles provide further support. The legion exorcism is set by the sea and Jesus is accused of being an agent of Beelzebub, a play זבל, corresponding to Zebulun (cf. Gen 49:13), and Jairus is reminiscent of Jair the famous Manassehite judge (pp. 324ff). Of the thirteen healings, one involves a gentile which points to something greater for them (pp. 305f). The healings of the paralytic and of the shrivelled limb before a critical leadership correspond to Moses' miracles of the 'crawling' staff and leprosied hand when confronted with the Jewish leaders' unbelief (Ex 4:4ff). Jesus' retreat to the sea (3:7ff) and the drowning of the demonic swine (5:1-20) conform to Israel's escape and the destruction of Pharaoh (pp. 76ff). The Transfiguration is a new Sinai and the ensuing teaching 'across Jordan' prior to entering Jericho (Mk 9, 10) marks the beginning of a new conquest (pp. 110-3).

Although noting some helpful parallels, particularly with the Exodus, Farrer's intriguing theory is unconvincing. It is unclear why the callings and healings should be determinative—little in Mark suggests such—and he overlooks the 'fourteenth' loaf in the boat (8:14). Aside from the identification of healings with individual tribes, Farrer's structural patterning often seems contrived and inconsistent—frequent lapses are attributed to Mark's creative freedom—while in retrospect his divisions cut across Markan structural units, for example, one cycle breaks the series of conflict stories (2:12) and another the now widely-recognised 'Way' section (10:32).

b) P. Carrington, The Primitive Christian Calendar (1952), and, According to Mark (1961)

Appearing about the same time as Farrer's work, P. Carrington's proposal, elaborated in his later commentary, belongs to that stream of Anglo-Saxon scholarship which was particularly concerned with the influence of early Christian liturgy. Carrington argues that Mark's gospel was originally a distillation of lectionary readings in keeping with the Jewish calendar and later adapted to the Roman Julian year. The hermeneutical key is found in the Passover and Pentecost allusions in the feedings of the five and four thousands which, when recognised, enable the rest of Mark to be assigned to calendrical and hence liturgical schedules (although Mark 13 has to do double-duty and the passion narrative does not quite conform).

The chapter divisions of Vaticanus provide external verification,[3] while internal support is found in Mark's 'major triads', especially the three Markan mountains. These divide the Galilean Gospel (Mark 1-10) into four sections[4] which the agricultural pattern of the seed parables

[3] *Primitive*, xiii.
[4] *Ibid.*, 94ff.

relates to the rhythm and imagery of seed-time (the seed parables) and harvest (the Transfiguration), symbolising the growth of spiritual understanding. This goes back to Jesus' own utilisation of these festivals as occasions for his preaching, for example, the nuptial symbolism of Mark 2:18-22 which would be interpreted, via the Tammuz myth, as being connected with the restoration of the Temple. Indeed 'it might well be that Jesus would ... possibly play the part of the bridegroom' in local celebrations.[5]

The crowd's ordering in the feeding (read at Passover) recalls the Sinai host (Ex 19:21) and the 'sheep without a shepherd' recalls Moses' death (Nu 27:16f, pp. 12f). The feeding of the four thousand occurs at Pentecost because the presence of the crowds with Jesus reminded Mark of the first giving of the Law on the first Pentecost (Ex 19:11; p. 163). Mark 8:13-21, a key passage in view of Mark's concern with spiritual insight, is a midrash on Psalm 78, which describes Yahweh's guidance of, and provision for, his rebellious people during the Exodus. Moses' offer to die for Israel is reflected in 8:31ff while his ascent of Sinai is seen in the Transfiguration (Ex 19:9; pp. 192-6). These and other echoes demonstrate that 'the story of the gospel in Galilee, from the parables to the Transfiguration, is a new Exodus saga with a new Shepherd gathering a new people for God' (p. 170).

Although stimulating, Carrington's lectionary hypothesis has gained little acceptance. Apart from the lack of external evidence for the derivation of Christian lectionaries from the Jewish calendar (cf. Col 2:16), there is none that the Gospels functioned as proposed, or that, apart from the passion narrative, the chapter divisions of Vaticanus were related to liturgical use.[6] On internal grounds, the important mountain 'triad' has in fact no second mountain—it is 'imported' from John 6:3—while the frequent 'ironing out' of offending verses when they do not fit the theory tells against the proposal's plausibility.

c) O. Piper, 'Unchanging Promises: Exodus in the New Testament' (1957)

Otto Piper's more general article again suggests the importance of the Exodus event—from deliverance to conquest—noting its significance for the OT (especially Hosea and Isaiah) and the NT (p. 3). The conspicuous place of the wilderness in Mark (1:4, 12, 13, 35, 45) and its association with the kerygma is to be explained by the use of the 'Exodus as the model for the original Gospel story' (p. 17).

Malachi 3:1 and Exodus 23:20 together present the Baptist as the 'angel' who goes before the chosen people in the desert while Jesus' baptism is at

---

[5] *According*, 67ff, hereafter 'pp.'.

[6] See the critiques in Davies, 'Reflections'; Morris, 'Lectionaries', *Jewish*, 23-6, 29f; Talbert, *What?*, 14f.

once the escape through the Red Sea and the pre-conquest crossing of the Jordan (p. 18). The perplexing crisscrossing of Galilee and Jesus' journeys into Phoenicia and Caesarea Philippi (Mk 7-8) echo Israel's wanderings and 'the fact that of all Jesus' visits to Jerusalem only the last one is mentioned in Mark, and that it is described as the entry of a conqueror', shows that it is regarded as the goal of this New Exodus migration.

Jesus is the second Moses, 'not primarily as Lawgiver however, but as the leader of his people to the promised goal' (p. 18). Mark 10:45 reflects Moses' offer in Exodus 32:32, and the words of the Institution, 'chosen for their close resemblance with Exod. 24:8', present the new covenant in an Exodus setting (p. 19). Piper wisely recognises that not everything in Mark's gospel can be explained on the basis of Exodus. Instead, it provides the typological framework within which the material was arranged (p. 19).

Piper has surely noted a number of interesting parallels, although not all would accept his identifications. However, since so much of the Gospel's material and present order is unaccounted for, one wonders if he would be more justified in speaking of several Exodus cameos instead of an overarching framework.

d) E. C. Hobbs, 'The Gospel of Mark and the Exodus' (1958)

In a relatively unknown Ph.D. thesis from the University of Chicago, E. C. Hobbs takes up Farrer's spiritual Exodus model and posits an even more systematic Exodus influence on the progression of Mark's narrative (pp. 67f).

The escape through the Red Sea is echoed in Mark 3:6-19 where the leaders' hostility toward Jesus, Jesus' movement toward the sea and the mountain, and his miraculous signs correspond respectively to the hardness of Pharaoh's heart, Moses' withdrawal across the sea and the covenant at Sinai, and the signs which Moses performs. In the larger section of 4:35 - 5:20, the storm and the disciples' fear during the night, the opposition encountered on the other side, the drowning of the pigs, and the 'dread' that falls on the neighbouring countryside echo the fearful night attending the exodus crossing, Pharaoh's resistance to Israel's deliverance, the drowning of Pharaoh and his armies, and the fear that descends on the lands of Edom and Moab.

Israel's wilderness journey also provides the model for the extended midrash in Mark chapters 5-8 where, for example, the two healings of the daughters of Israel (5:21-43), the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth, and the sending out of the twelve disciples (6:1-29) correspond to the healing of Marah's bitter waters (Ex 15:22-26) and the twelve springs and seventy palms at Elim (15:27; pp. 40-2). The two feedings replicate the provision

of manna, and the objections of the Pharisees (8:11-13) parallel Miriam and Aaron's opposition (Nu 12:1-15).
Numerous parallels exist between Sinai and the transfiguration—the six days, the three associates, the building of the tabernacles, God speaking from the cloud, the shining, and the failure of the disciples as the golden calf incident—while Mark 10:1 - 11:11 is a second giving of the law, again 'across Jordan', before arrival in Jericho (pp. 45-8). Finally, Jesus' passing through 'the waters of death' fulfils his creation of the new Israel (p. 68).

Hobbs takes up but modifies Farrer's 'twelve-plus-one' scheme where the call of Levi is proleptic of the Gentiles and thus parallels the Gentile healing (pp. 5ff). Mark's point in structuring his threefold 'twelve-plus-one' symbolism around these parallels is to indicate that just as Israel was called from bondage, saved through the sea from the threat of death and destruction, and sustained in her hunger, so too the church is called from bondage, is healed through baptism which cleanses and raises from death, and is fed on the eucharist (p. 55).

A number of Hobbs' suggestions are persuasive, for example, those linking the Transfiguration with Sinai. But, as he prudently recognises, a number of other Exodus connections are marginal, for example, Mark 5-6, and some perhaps incidental, so Mark 8:11-13. In terms of his general thesis, however, to the extent Hobbs follows Farrer the same criticisms apply. In terms of his own contribution, the three-fold interpretation of the church's Exodus is tenuous—not least considering Mark's apparent lack of interest in associating healings with baptism. A particular weakness of Hobbs (and Farrer before him) is his failure in varying degrees to integrate Mark's clearer OT citations and allusions with the overall Exodus schema of their proposals.

e) S. Schulz, 'Markus und das Alte Testament' (1961)

Influenced perhaps by more continental interests, S. Schulz locates his discussion of Mark's use of the OT within the milieu of emerging Gentile Christianity. Presupposing a distinction between the pre-Pauline Hellenistic *kurios*-kerygma and the diverse Palestinian Jesus-traditions, Schulz saw Mark as the first attempt to combine the two (p. 185).[7] The

[7] Schulz' initial distinction, apparently following Heitmüller, 'Problem', is questionable, not only because the terminology is vague, but also because a convincing historical reconstruction of the origins of a pre-Pauline Hellenistic Christianity has yet to be proposed. Hengel, 'Between', 27ff, argues that the translation into Greek of large parts of the synoptic tradition 'did not begin in Antioch, Ephesus or Rome but at a very early stage in Palestine itself' and was the work of the Greek-speaking Jews in Jerusalem in order that they might proclaim Jesus' sayings and activity to visiting members of the Diaspora, cf. Wenham, *Redating*. This tends to undermine Schulz' assertion, 184, that 'Paulus hat in der

influence of the former can be discerned in Mark's use of the Son of God title, in the 'sogenannte Messiasgeheimnis', in the discussions of Pharisaic piety and Mosaic Torah, and in Mark's emphasis on the passion—Schulz approvingly cites Kähler's aphoristic summary—which reflects the pre-Pauline Hellenistic kerygma's concern with Jesus' death (pp. 187f). Any interest Mark shows in the historical Jesus and the unity of his preaching and deeds is primarily an attempt to actualise Philippians 2:8, 'being found in fashion as a man' which resulted in the creation of the Gospel as a new genre (pp. 186f). Consequently,

> Markus kommt also nicht *evolutiv* von einzelnen alttestamentlichen Schriftstellen zu seiner Theologie, sondern umgekehrt: allein vom Kyrios-Kerygma und überhaupt der kerygmatischen Tradition des Heidenchristentums bekommt er die palästinischen Jesustraditionen und damit das Alte Testament in den Blickpunkt (p. 188).

Mark's view of the OT is, therefore, somewhat ambivalent. From the stand-point of Gentile Christianity, the Markan Jesus rejects Israel's *Heilsgeschichte* (Mk 12:1-12), the Law having no positive function as it did for Paul where Christ is its *telos*. The OT Torah and Pharisaic Mishnah stand in opposition to the Will of God as revealed in the obedience of Christ (pp. 193ff). On the contrary, this obedience is a matter of doing good and saving life (Mk 3:4), even on the Sabbath, even to the extent of saving Gentiles, and indeed even to the point of death. At this juncture, however, Mark is willing freely to draw on the whole of the OT for justification (cf. 3:4ff; 10:1ff; 11:15ff and 12:28ff). Mark's use of the OT, therefore, derives primarily from its capacity to justify his presentation of Jesus, viewed through the lens of his kerygmatic tradition:

> Die besondere theologische Leistung des Markus beruht nun aber darin, daß er dieses ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου als Gehorsam gegenüber dem im Alten Testament manifest gewordenen, ursprünglichen Gotteswillen interpretiert hat (p. 196).

While it seems incontrovertible that some of Mark's concerns would have found special relevance in Gentile Christianity, as they would in any community facing the question of the relationship of Jews and Gentiles, it hardly follows that Philippians 2:8 provides the hermeneutical rubric for Mark. In addition, although the Markan Jesus is clearly concerned with the Law, Schulz' stress on the Gospel as an attempt to reinterpret it

---

von ihm übernommenen kerygmatischen Tradition des Heidenchristentums keinerlei Jesusüberlieferung - mit Ausnahme wenigen Spruchgutes im paränetischen Zusammenhang - urgemeindlichen Charakters übernommen' in that the Palestinian Jesus traditions may in fact be the presupposition of, and not a 'beziehungslos parallel' to, the so-called pre-Pauline Hellenistic *kyrios*-kerygma. Further, the assumption of Hellenistic syncretism as the grounds for the adoption of the title *Kyrios* is questionable (cf. Hengel's detailed argument 'Christology ', 33ff).

appears reductionistic, and his emphasis on the 'kyrios-kerygma' also seems at odds with Mark's interest in Jesus' pre-exaltation career.

Ultimately, the comprehensiveness of Schulz' theory is undermined by his terms of reference and his presuppositions concerning the origin of Mark's Gospel. While he correctly notes the role of the OT in Jesus' conflict with the Jewish leadership, he fails to consider seriously the significance of, for example, Mark's citation in 1:2f, the OT images in the prologue, or even the vineyard parable. In the case of the latter, it is the Jewish leaders' oversight of God's people that is revoked, not Israel's *Heilsgeschichte*.

f) J. Bowman, The Gospel of Mark and the New Christian Haggadah (1965)
Seeking to uncover 'how and why the Gospel as a literary form came about' (p. 311), John Bowman's monograph returns to a liturgical focus. Noting that the Exodus was the Jewish paradigm for deliverance and that the Passover meal became the focal memorial meal for Christians (p. 91), Bowman suggests that just as the Jewish meal was accompanied by an explanatory *haggadah*, so too the annual Christian equivalent was accompanied by Mark as its *haggadah*—the Passover being the one festival which clearly stands out in the Gospel (p. 158).

Such a usage explains why not only individual incidents in Jesus' life but the whole Gospel itself is a midrash on selected OT passages (p. xii). Thus Jesus' divine election, his being driven into the wilderness, and his forty day temptation is a midrash on Moses' call. The call of the first four disciples, the amazement of the crowds, and the opposition to Jesus, reflect the Exodus tradition of the response of the elders, the initial belief of the people, Pharaoh's response, and the slaves' anger with Moses (Ex 4:29ff; cf. 5:21ff; pp. 108-15). Mark's characteristic references to hardening (3:5; 6:52; 8:17; 10:5) are a deliberate point of contact with the Exodus—but ironically here of the redeemer's own people (pp. 121, 136, 180)—and the Transfiguration and the feedings reflect Sinai and the wilderness provision (pp. 157). Whereas the signs and wonders of the first Moses brought plagues, the miracles of the second removes them (pp. 159, 176).

The relative lack of 'testimonies' in Mark as compared to Matthew is not because Mark was written for Gentiles, after all they would not have had the necessary OT background. Instead, Mark presupposes the *testimonia* either because his Gospel represents a stage when the blatant scaffolding of 'that it might be fulfilled' is largely dismantled, or because its early Jewish hearers were so well versed in the fulfilment schema that they did not need them pointed out (pp. 19f).

Although several of Bowman's observations are helpful, others are less so. For example, seeing in the healing of the leper a *haggadah* on the healing of Moses' leprous hand, and in the cure of the issue of blood a 'direct counter' to Moses' plague of blood on Egypt (pp. 113, 147) seems rather too clever. Granted that there are occasions when Jesus could be understood in Mosaic terms (e.g. the feedings and transfiguration), it is not clear that all, or even most, of Jesus' actions are so cast. The fundamental weakness of Bowman's independent proposal, however, is that he does not establish any constitutive literary criteria for a Passover *haggadah*, nor does he explain why, for example, there are no Markan equivalents of the questions and answers. Last but not least, we have no evidence that Mark was ever used in a yearly celebration of a Christian Passover.

g) A. Suhl, Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium (1965)

Published in the same year as Bowman's work, A. Suhl's volume marks a major shift in emphasis. Reflecting a redaction-critical approach, it is concerned primarily with Mark's more explicit use of the OT and still remains the only modern monograph to do so at length. Suhl proposes that Mark's OT citations are not a matter of '*»Weissagung und Erfüllung«, sondern um Auslegung des Jesusgeschehens mit Hilfe des AT:* Indem man das Neue in den »Farben« des Alten erzählte' (p. 47).[8] Mark merely wants to show that Jesus' history unfolds κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, as 'schriftgemäß' not 'Beweis' (pp. 157ff)—the emergence of the promise and fulfilment schema arising only with the delay of the parousia.

Suhl's thesis, stolidly following the view of his doctoral supervisor W. Marxsen, labours under two presuppositions. First, in view of the imminence of the parousia, Mark has abandoned all sense of history and has no room for *Heilsgeschichte* because all has been overtaken by the apocalyptic present. Second, Mark's gospel is 'Anrede' not 'Bericht' (pp. 9-25). Vital for Suhl's argument here is Paul's use of κατὰ τὰς γραφάς in 1 Corinthians 15:3f. He contends that Paul does not have salvation history in mind—κατὰ τὰς γραφάς is *Schriftgemäßheit* not *Schriftbeweis* (pp. 34ff)—and therefore, since it is a Gentile gospel, neither does Mark.

Apart from the weaknesses of Marxsen's existentialist thesis, questions are rightly raised when Suhl's easy acceptance of it leads him to dismiss what might otherwise be seen as the plain meaning of a text. *Contra* Suhl, Mark 14:49 does appear to address fulfilment (see also 7:6 and 14:21) and

---

[8] As 'qualifizierte Sprache', 169, cf. 69; as material for the present preaching, 14; as illustration, 137.

his argument that the plural, γραφαί, reflects the Pauline plural, γραφάς, and thereby disallows any fulfilment motif, is hardly convincing. Suhl's treatment then does little to allay the suspicion that his presuppositions are skewing his exegesis.[9] Furthermore, it is not clear that 'Anrede' and 'Bericht' are mutually exclusive (cf. 1 Cor 15:1ff) and the typological character of Paul's comments elsewhere (1 Cor 10:1-11; 2 Cor 3:7-12; Rom 4; 5:12-21; and 9-11), despite Suhl's denials, suggests that Paul does have *Heilsgeschichte* in mind.

Matthew and Luke may well have a more pronounced use of the OT, but it is mistaken to judge Mark's 'introductory formula' by theirs. Granted, too, that not every OT citation or allusion in Mark necessarily invokes the *Schriftbeweis* schema, it is nevertheless difficult to imagine that a prophetic utterance like Isaiah 40:3, which held considerable significance for Israel's future (see Chapter 3), would not have implied a fulfilment motif. Indeed, why should Mark bother at all to present his account of Jesus as conforming to the OT in only the 'broadest sense'? When viewed against an implicit prophetic background, it is difficult to accept that Suhl has produced sufficient evidence to establish his case.

h) H. Anderson 'The Old Testament in Mark's Gospel' (1972)

Partly in response to Suhl, H. Anderson sets out to 'examine the main features of Mark's use of the Old Testament and to inquire to what extent, if any, this bears upon his aim and intention in his overall portrayal of Jesus Christ' (p. 218).

Recognising that Matthew and Luke subscribe to a promise-fulfilment formula, Anderson notes that there are few fulfilment phrases in Mark (1:15 and 14:49). However, given that beginnings and endings provide important clues to design and intent, it is significant that, although Mark's conclusion contains 'no express allusion to Scripture prophecy', his introduction contains the only occasion when Mark himself appeals to the OT (p. 281). Granted the questions surrounding Mark 1:1ff are complex, the unity of verses 1-13 suggests that Mark's linking of John and Jesus with the OT cannot easily be dismissed (*pace* Suhl; pp. 283-5). Instead, these verses are constitutive of Mark's overall interest in the OT, but, and herein lies Anderson's thesis, Mark's point is that the work of John and Jesus are in conformity, not with 'the letter of the Old Testament and its fulfilment', but with a more general expression of the divine will (p. 286).

Although the combination of Isaiah 56:7 and Jeremiah 7:11 in Mark 11:17, the use of δεῖ in Mark 8:31, and Psalm 118:22f in Mark 12:1-11 are

---

[9] See Grässer's review in *TLZ* 91 (1966) 667-9.

'eschatological',[10] that is, have an element of futurity (pp. 287, 293), they are not seeking to prove anything by matching a specific Scripture to an event. Mark wishes only to demonstrate Jesus' conformity to that 'set of Old Testament ideas concerning the persecution of God's true servants ... by his impenitent people...' (p. 299) '... under which the Christ goes forward through suffering and death to eventual vindication and victory' (p. 297).

All this is in keeping with Mark's prominent 'detainment' motif—as in the messianic secret, parable theory, and commands to silence. Just as Jesus' final vindication is 'held in suspension' so that the framework of suffering and passion must first be encountered, so too Mark's avoidance of the past fulfilment of the OT in Jesus' life enables him to focus his community's attention on its future in the light of the delay of the parousia. Likewise, the teaching of Mark's Jesus actually supersedes and transcends Scripture rather than making 'the Scripture point to himself as its fulfilment'—a fact which tells against Dodd's suggestion that it was Jesus himself who was behind the NT's creative use of the OT (p. 304).

It is also 'detainment', not a Gentile audience unfamiliar with the OT, nor a Jewish one so well-versed that it needed no help in recognising fulfilment, nor yet because the Gospel represents a stage when fulfilment formulae scaffolding had been dismantled, which explains Mark's 'comparative neglect of testimonies' (p. 305; *pace* Bowman). Compared then to Matthew and Luke, Mark stands 'at a rudimentary stage of the Christian community's apologetic endeavours to demonstrate from the Old Testament the relations between Jesus and that which is the messianic vocation' (p. 306).

Although rightly critical of Suhl, Anderson's proposal is also open to question. His 'detainment' motif hypothesis, namely that Mark is 'acutely conscious of having something new to say' which involves the *'as yet undisclosed* secret of who Jesus really is' (p. 305), seems unlikely. Aside from whether Mark is confronting the delay in the parousia, how realistic is the assumption that no-one in Mark's original audience would have been aware of who Jesus 'really is', particularly given the prologue? Further, if Anderson is correct, one would expect to see considerable use of testimonies after the passion narrative, but this is not the case. Nor need 'detainment' be the only explanation of what Anderson perceives as Jesus' reticence in applying Scripture to himself—assuming of course that

[10] Following Fitzmyer's 'eschatological' and 'modernising' categorisation of OT usages in Qumran and the NT, 'Use', 316, where the former category expresses something that is yet to be accomplished, while the latter involves not only the taking over of an analogous situation in the OT and re-applying it to a new situation, but also the sense of completeness or fulfilment.

Anderson's perception is correct and not simply a failure to appreciate the highly allusive fashion in which Mark's Jesus uses the OT (e.g. Chapter 6 below). More problematic, however, is his distinction between fulfilment and a 'general expression of the divine will'. This sounds rather like Suhl's *Farbe*, and the same criticisms apply. Anderson's categorisation of Mark as representing a rudimentary stage reveals the fundamental issue: the common failing of using Matthew as a yardstick for Mark. Much to be preferred is an attempt to appreciate the OT texts as they were most likely understood among Mark's contemporaries, and when this is done, given the thorough-going Jewish character of the Jesus story, it is difficult to escape the impression that, for example, 1:2f would have had some kind of fulfilment connotation.

i) W. M. Swartley, 'A Study of Markan Structure' (1973); cf. 'The Structural Function of the Term 'Way' (Hodos) in Mark's Gospel' (1980)

Reflecting a shift back from redactional to more literary concerns, W. M. Swartley's little-known Princeton Ph.D. dissertation is a full-scale attempt to understand Mark entirely in terms of an Exodus paradigm. Observing that, although Farrer, Hobbs, Piper, and others had recognised a distinctive Markan use of the OT, little had been done to relate these insights to the Gospel's literary structure, Swartley sets out to rectify the situation.

Mark's introductory citation is programmatic for the themes of covenant, Temple, and cultic purity (Mal/Ex), and 'way' and 'desert' (Isaiah). These are variously picked up in Mark's 'Way' section, in the Temple cleansing, and Mark's transitional locations such as 'by the sea' (1:16-20), 'on the mountain' (3:13-35), and 'in the wilderness' (6:7-31). Deriving from events and places which structured Israel's Exodus memories, these motifs likewise provide the Gospel's six-fold literary framework.[11] That some of them are not immediately obvious complements the secretive nature of Mark's material (cf. 4:34 and 13:14).

The 'sea' motif (1:16; 3:7) delineates 1:21 - 3:6 as the place of deliverance for the new Israel (pp. 103-8). Opening with 'the mountain', 3:13 - 6:6 reflects the Sinai event with its election of a new community (3:13-19, 31-35) and God's self-disclosure (via parables and miracles, 4:1 - 5:43), while the Nazareth rejection echoes the golden calf incident (6:1-6; pp. 109-12). The 'wilderness' theme characterises 6:7 - 8:21(26) with God's provision (6:30-44 and 8:1-10), guidance and testing (cf. the disciples' incomprehension, 6:52), and the people's rebellion (cf. the Pharisees rejection of Jesus, 8:11f). The positive Gentile response (7:24-37) echoes those wilderness traditions

[11] 'Study', 36ff, hereafter 'pp.'; 1:14 - 3:6//3:13 - 6:6a//6:7 - 8:21//8:27 - 10:52; 11:1 - 13:37; 14:1 - 15:47; with 16:1-8 as epilogue.

which had connotations of hope (pp. 86ff), and the 'Way' section's presentation of Jesus' teaching on messiahship and discipleship reflects OT ethical and eschatological features (particularly Deutero-Isaianic, pp. 68-80). Finally, the 'Temple' theme (covering two panels, 11:1 - 16:8) represents Mark's use of the Temple's fate to symbolise the failure of the Jewish mission (e.g. 11:12-25) and the success of the Gentile one (e.g. 12:1-12, pp. 92-101). The emphasis on ἔρημος and ὁδός in Mark 1:2f speak of the isolated wilderness and so highlight the secrecy component (e.g. 6:31-35) which characterises the nature of Jesus' self-disclosure on the 'Way'.

Swartley develops this last idea in a later essay, arguing that the interleaving of typological exodus- and entrance- motifs (Mk 9 is a new Sinai) with discipleship themes reveals that Mark's 'Way' is 'The Way of Discipleship (Suffering and Cross) that Leads to the (Promised Land) Kingdom of God'.[12] Mark, finally, is a missionary document with an apologetic for the eclipse of Judaism expressed in the waning of Jerusalem and the increased prominence of Galilee (p. 226).

Swartley's attempt, first, to take seriously the formative nature of Israel's founding event, and second, to integrate possible echoes within one overarching literary structure, is to be applauded. It cannot, however, be deemed a success. Although the analyses of the 'Way' and 'Temple' panels have much to commend them, other characterisations fail to convince: the most significant sea story occurs not in the 'sea' section but in the 'mountain' section, and Mark 9 reflects more Sinai influence than the brief reference in 3:13ff. The treatment of Markan motifs is sometimes inconsistent: the Pharisees' hostility in 8:11f reflects the wilderness rebellion while their opposition in 2:1 - 3:6 is cast in other terms. Swartley's hypothesis rests on the integration of earlier transitionals with later panels, but can these brief and relatively obscure transitional comments bear the load placed on them, Mark's 'secrecy motif' notwithstanding? It is difficult to avoid the feeling that Swartley's structure is being read into rather than out of the text. Finally, apart from one or two exceptions (for example, 1:2f; 11:17), Swartley makes little attempt to correlate Mark's use of OT citations or more explicit allusions with his overall structure.

j) H. C. Kee, 'The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16' (1975)

In this article just prior to his monograph on Mark, H. C. Kee seeks 'to determine which of the Scriptures are Mark's favorites (*sic*) and then to discover how he has interpreted and adapted Scripture in the service of

---

[12] 'Structural', 82. Swartley has recently restated his position in *Scripture*.

his own theological and literary aims' (p. 166). Although not covering the whole of the gospel—Kee deals primarily with the last third of the book but other sections are briefly mentioned—his focus on Mark's use of the OT, and the fact that it is here that Mark most frequently appeals to the OT, merits its inclusion in this survey.

Noting at least 57 quotations and 160 allusions to Scripture, Kee criticises Suhl's arbitrary decision to limit his investigation to explicit and extended quotations as inadequate 'for tracing the fuller hermeneutical picture'. He then observes that Mark not only 'clearly prefers prophetic and eschatologically interpreted passages of Scripture' but employs these quotations at the most crucial points in his developing argument (p. 173). Similarly striking is his 'synthesis' technique where, in close analogy with for instance the *Florilegium*, two apparently unconnected OT texts are brought together in order to make a new claim (so Mal 3:1 with possibly Ex 23:20 and Isa 40:3 in 1:2f; the voice in 1:11; Zech 9:9 and 10:10 with Ps 118:25-26 in Mk 11:1-11; pp. 175ff). Thus, fulfilment is not merely an apologetic device, nor is the appeal to Scripture merely to embellish or 'to give specific content to a simple kerygmatic formula' (p. 179). The Scriptures are instead Mark's 'indispensable presupposition', a 'necessary link with the biblical tradition that Mark sees redefined and comprehended through Jesus' (*ibid*).

Mark's 'Hegel-like' synthesis centres on three re-definitions. His re-definition of the covenant people invokes Isaiah and Zechariah, of the law almost exclusively appeals to Torah, and of the hope of redemption uses Daniel when dealing with the nature of the path to victory (that is, the necessity of suffering as a path to vindication), and both Isaiah and Daniel when re-defining the enemy. Christologically, Daniel influences the picture of Jesus as the prophet who unfolds the hidden meaning of Scripture whereas Isaiah modifies the traditional nationalistic treatment of the Son of David who becomes an eschatological agent through whom light comes to the blind. As with Qumran, there is no conflict between the concern for law (rules of admission and maintenance of fellowship) and for eschatology (pp. 177f).

In keeping with his interest in apocalyptic, Kee places considerable, but not exclusive, store on Daniel. But in view of the use of the blinding texts from the classical prophets (cf. Isa 6 in Mk 4 ; Isa 29 in Mk 7 and Jer 5:21/ Isa 6:9 in Mk 8:18), Kee's distinction between them and Daniel on the basis of hidden meaning seems unwarranted. Likewise, Kee's concentration on Daniel in dealing with the suffering motif is not in keeping with the evidence. On his own analysis of Mark 14-15, citations, allusions, and

influences from the so-called Servant Songs considerably outweigh those from Daniel (pp. 170ff).[13] If, in addition, Mark 1-10 is regarded as the context for chapters 11-16, then the allusions to Isaiah 42:1 in Mark 1:11 (which Kee recognises) and 53:3 in 9:12 along with at least the influence of 53:10-12 in 10:45 further strengthen the case for some Isaianic component (cf. Isa 40:3 in Mk 1:2f). These criticisms aside, however, Kee's observations on Mark's 'synthetic' method, his preference for eschatological texts, and his placement of appeals to the OT at crucial junctures in his narrative, serve to highlight the importance of the OT for Mark.

k) M. D. Goulder, The Evangelist's Calendar (1978)

In yet another British revival of the liturgical approach, M. D. Goulder revamps the lectionary theory arguing that Mark is to be understood on the basis of reconstructions of the OT lections which would have accompanied the reading of the Gospel.

Aside from the considerable assumptions inherent in such a task, which it should be noted Goulder undertakes in painstaking fashion, the connections observed between the reconstructed readings and Mark vary greatly. It seems strange that Isaiah 34f is proposed as the OT lection for Mark 1:1-20, a selection which in any case runs right over a major Markan division, when Mark himself speaks of Isaiah 40 (p. 246). It becomes increasingly difficult to feel any certainty when, in dealing with other readings, Goulder has to refer to OT lections past or future in order to explicate the significance of the passage (pp. 249f). Other connections seem tenuous. For example, Goulder outlines a series of 'fulfilments' of Elijah-Elisha themes in Mark 5:35 - 8:1-10 based on the lections from 3 Kingdoms 1:7 - 4:42ff. Naboth is a type of John the Baptist and apostasy is the thematic link between Jesus at Nazareth and Elijah on Carmel. Nazareth, where Jesus could do no mighty work and is rejected, reflects Elijah's great miracle which causes the crowd's confessional response. Given the not-unlimited range of OT themes and the fact that the NT has its roots in the Old, one wonders if many of Goulder's points of contact are more co-incidental than intentional.

In terms of literary structure, a number of Goulder's divisions run right across recognised Markan intercalations: 3:21/22-30/31-35; 5:21-4/25-

[13] For Daniel, citations: Dn 7:13 in Mk 14:62; allusions: Dn 12:10 (LXX) in Mk 14:38. For Isaiah, citations: 50:6 in Mk 14:65 (ignoring 53:12 in 15:28); and allusions: possibly 53:12 in 14:21; *Tg. Isa* 53:5 in 14:58; possibly Isa 53:7 in 14:60; Isa 53:6 (LXX) in 15:15; Isa 50:2f in 15:33; Isa 53:9 in 15:43 and 46. Kee's 'lowest' category, 'influences', has Dn 7:21, 25 in 14:21; 10:16-19 in 14:34ff; and 7:25 in 14:35; while Isa 53:3-5 is seen in 14:65. Weighting this, for the sake of argument 3-2-1, gives Daniel '10' compared to the so-called Songs's '18'.

34/35-43; 6:7-13/14-29/30; and 11:12-14/15-19/20-35. It is hard to believe that this is Mark's intention.

Goulder provides interesting insights on the OT background of different events. However, in terms of his overall hypothesis, perhaps the most telling aspect is the considerable uncertainty and fluidity of the weekly readings which, when combined with the concerns above, tends to call the whole rather inflexible construction into question.[14]

l) W. S. Vorster, 'The Function of the Old Testament in Mark' (1981)

W. S. Vorster's article reflects the trend away from *Redaktions-geschichte* to narrative analysis. His contention is that Mark uses the OT as a 'literary' means to put across his narrative point of view. Reminiscent of Suhl, Vorster's Mark is likewise not interested in promise-fulfilment nor with the OT context (for example, 1:2f), but instead wants to establish 'perspectives through which the reader is presented with this story' (p. 62).

Although Mark eschews using the OT within the promise-fulfilment schema, his Gospel is structured according to prediction-fulfilment techniques.[15] Mark 14:27f contains combined predictive statements, verse 27 from Zechariah 13:7 and verse 28 from Jesus himself, which respectively find fulfilment in 14:49 and 16:7f. The significant point is that 'these quotations form part of the Markan narrative of Jesus and are fulfilled in that narrative' (p. 70). For Vorster, this 'embeddedness' in the narrative is further borne out by Pryke's observation that Mark sometimes suspends his quotation in the middle of a sentence,[16] so that 'they sound as if they are the words of the narrator or narrated figure although they stand in parenthesis' (*ibid.*). Similarly, Mark 1:2f does not present John's history as fulfilment but simply as part of the story of Jesus. The fact that the great majority of OT quotations are on the lips of Jesus is taken by Vorster as further support for his narrative theory.

While it is true that Mark's avoids Matthean fulfilment interjections, this hardly demonstrates that Mark is uninterested in fulfilment: the criticisms applied to Suhl's conception of OT prophetic literature also pertain here. Granted too Mark's general confinement of OT quotations and their 'fulfilments' to the narrative, this only tells us about his narrative style; it does not necessarily follow that he is thereby disinterested in OT *Heilsgeschichte*. Vorster's attempt to reconcile Mark's

---

[14] Cf. his admission in *Midrash*, 227n2.

[15] E.g. 1:2f as prediction, cf. 1:4ff as fulfilment; so 1:7 and 1:9ff; citing Petersen, *Literary*, 49ff.

[16] 1:1-4; 7:6-8; 10:5-8; 14:27f; Pryke, *Redactional*, 37.

lack of fulfilment formula vis-à-vis Matthew, with his apparent prediction/fulfilment structure is, therefore, ultimately unconvincing.

m) J. D. M. Derrett, The Making of Mark (1985)

J. D. M. Derrett's commentary constitutes another reading of Mark through the grid of the first 'trek' of Israel from Egypt to Canaan. Involving an exodus, an invasion, and a triumph, Jesus is presented as a second and greater Moses/Joshua. This Gospel 'of sermon outlines' is to be interpreted on the basis of precise passage by passage parallels to sections of the Hexateuch—namely the first half of Exodus, parts of Numbers, and nearly all of Joshua—although 1 Samuel, Lamentations, Canticles, Daniel, Isaiah 53, and Psalm 22 influence later chapters.

The complex citation at the outset (Mk 1:2f)—Mark's only explicit editorial use of the OT—merely serves to inform us that he intends to draw from all three sections of the Jewish Scripture. On the other hand, the single word ἀπέχει in the Gethsemane account recalls Yahweh's announcement in Deuteronomy 1:6 and 2:3 that the first trek is about to end. Likewise, passing over the question of the possible significance of the clear-cut OT quotation in the parables section, Derrett proceeds instead into a highly speculative *haggadah* on the manna traditions.

As this Chapter has suggested, the idea that Mark's gospel owes a great deal to Israel's history appears to have a solid basis. But Derrett's quixotic journey proceeds along such subtle paths that it becomes increasingly difficult to follow him, not least because his eclectic method and ingenious use of material appear to lack any consistent controls. Too much is built on the scantiest allusion and insufficient attention given to clear OT parallels for Derrett's undoubtedly innovative reading to carry conviction.

n) M. D. Hooker, 'Mark' (1988)

Although at first sight Mark appears to make little use of the OT, M. D. Hooker recognises that this is largely because of his distinctive approach. Not only is the opening quotation significant, 'his story is good news precisely because it is the fulfilment of Scripture', but 'Jesus' words and activities constantly echo OT scenes and language, until what is "written" of the Son of Man (9:12; 10:21) is finally fulfilled' (p. 220). Due to space limitations, Hooker's article focuses on Mark's use of the Pentateuch, and thereby his view of the law.

In the conflict over the Pharisees' and scribes' traditions, Mark 7:1-23 shows that while Jesus upholds the Law (vv. 1-13; cf. Nu 30:2; Dt 23:21-23) his authority is even greater than that of the Law (vv. 14-23). The same is borne out in examinations of 12:18ff and 28-34 (p. 224), and several Pentateuchal allusions (2:1-10; 2:23 - 3:6; cf. 1:44). Three other allusions

recalling incidents in Moses' life serve likewise to demonstrate that Jesus is either Moses' successor (6:34, cf. Nu 27:17) or his superior (9:2-13; cf. Ex 24:15f; Dt 18:15), while 9:38-40 (cf. Nu 11:26-29) shows Jesus acting as did Moses.

Mark's presentation of Jesus' relationship to the Law is therefore somewhat ambiguous, and results at least once in Jesus abrogating one aspect of the Law (10:10ff; cf. also 7:19). Since such challenges occur in private, they reflect the fact that 'neither Jesus nor the earliest generation of Christians regarded the teaching of Moses abrogated ... but interpretation ... led inevitably to the point of rupture—a point which had not yet been reached when Mark wrote' (p. 228).

Hooker's observation that Mark's Jesus is faithful to the Law and yet above it, judges by the Law and yet decisively re-evaluates it when his own acts are called into question, is well put, and accurately reflects the tensions in a community coming to terms with past and present. On a smaller point, however, it is not entirely obvious that Jesus' abrogations are so private as to be left for a later generation to resolve, since the public statements and their clear implications can hardly be reconciled with Moses (7:14f and 10:5ff). Be this as it may, the 'tension' inherent in the response of Mark's Jesus to the Law is not dissimilar to Kee's account of Mark's larger scheme of 'redefinition'. Both phenomena suggest that an important Markan concern is the question of how past traditions and expectations are to be reconciled with what Mark is convinced is their present fulfilment.

o) W. Roth Hebrew Gospel: Cracking the Code of Mark (1988).

Inspired by several Markan features, namely, the expectation that 'Elijah must come first' (Mk 9:11-13), Mark's introduction (Ex 23:20 and Mal 3:1), and his portrayal of the Baptist, W. Roth's suggestion is that the Gospel's 'conceptual-narrative paradigm' follows 1 Kings 17 to 2 Kings 13 such that Jesus' Elisha plays successor to John's Elijah as they re-establish the Lord's reign. Accordingly, the Gospel is composed of four acts—Commissioning of the Kingdom's Bringer (1:1-13), his Authentication (1:14 - 7:37), Confrontation with Apostasy (8:1 - 15:39), and Vindication (15:40 - 16:8).

Evidence is found in Jesus' sixteen miracles up to 7:37 (equalling Elisha's miracles, cf. 'all' in 2 Kgs 8:4/Mk 7:37), and parallel feedings, Mk 6:32ff/2 Kgs 4:42f, and resuscitations, Mk 5:21ff/2 Kgs 4:18ff). Just as Elisha extends Elijah's miracles by eight, so too Jesus extends Elisha's (but not John's?) by eight (after 7:37 and including the rending of the Temple curtain). As Elisha traversed the land after the departure of his 'master', so also Jesus after John's egress. Further, Jesus' preaching of the 'good news'

echoes the four lepers' announcement in 2 Kings 7:9, and 'repent and believe' represents 'the invitation to accept the scriptural paradigm of divine intervention that the gospel presents' (p. 11, presumably 1-2 Kgs). The seed parable's 'one hundred fold' recalls 2 Kings 1:9-12 (two fifties) and 18:13, and thus the three 'poor' soils echo the responses of Jezebel, Ahab, and Jehoram. Peter's threefold denial before the cock crows twice reflects Elijah's threefold refusal to leave Elisha and his two-fold endowment with his master's spirit. If this seems esoteric it is only because it is inherent in Mark's parabolic enterprise which is 'pointedly a journey of discovery by speaking the secret of the kingdom—without ever unveiling it' (p. 19).

Roth is correct in interpreting Jesus' miracles within the OT prophetic tradition rather than Hellenism, but even so, most of his parallels seem either forced, co-incidental (does Judas' kiss really echo the kissing of Baal in 1 Kgs 19:18?), or due to the broad intertextuality of biblical themes (cf. pp. 92ff). His paradigm fails to take seriously Mark's one clear editorial citation—Malachi's Elijah does not precede a new Elisha—and his outline cuts across otherwise clear indications of literary structure (e.g. the 'Way' section) or thematic markers (Jesus' only two confrontations with leaders from Jerusalem—both important and both outside Jerusalem—occur before Roth's 'Confrontation' section).

p) R. Schneck, Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I-VIII (1994).[17]

R. Schneck's thesis grows out of the contrasting claims of M. A. Beavis (Isaiah is Mark's favourite book) and A. C. Sundberg (Daniel is primary),[18] finding in favour of Beavis. Noting allusions to Isaiah in every chapter of Mark,[19] Schneck also finds extensive parallels between the themes of the original Isaianic context and the Markan setting. This indicates that Mark uses OT texts such that their original contexts inform his narrative (pp. 245f).[20] The same applies to combined citations. Mark does this not only because Jesus fulfils OT hopes (*pace* Suhl; p. 249) but also because he is following Jesus' own use of Scripture (with Dodd; p. 251).

Overarching OT models for Mark are rejected, however, since 'we can hardly expect to discover that any NT author would ever use the Isaian

---

[17] A revision of his 1992 thesis, Schneck's work came to my attention during the final stages of the preparation of this book. Consequently, I have been unable to interact extensively with Schneck in the body of my early Chapters, although comment may be found in the footnotes.

[18] Respectively, *Literary*, 110, and 'Testimonies', 274, cited on p. 1.

[19] Isaiah in parentheses: Mark 1:1a (40:9), 2-3 (40:3), 10 (63:19a), 11 (42:1); 2:7 (43:25-26), 16-20 (58:2-7), 20 (58:8); 3:27 (49:24-25); 4:12 (6:9-10), 24 (Tg. 27:8); 5:1-20 (65:1-7); 6:34-44 (55:1-3), 39-40 (25:6), 52 (6:9-10); 7:6-7 (29:13), 32 (35:5); 8:17b (6:9-10), and 25 (42:6-7).

[20] With Marcus but *pace* Juel, *Messianic*.

corpus as a model or paradigm ... in composing a new writing' (p. 3) because 'the prophetic material is quite diverse and the different pericopae do not appear to be organically constructed' (*ibid*). It is not clear, however, that a model or paradigm must necessarily be 'literary'—Isaiah 40-55 makes considerable use of the Exodus 'event'. Given, too, the prologue's function in antiquity,[21] that Mark's is replete with imagery from Isaiah 40-66 (pp. 40ff, 60ff) surely implies something about his overall agenda.

While not every identification is equally convincing (for example, Isa 53:2-7 in 2:16-17 and 53:8 in 2:20), Schneck marshals considerable support for his case—at least for Mark 1-8. This limitation is problematic since Schneck cites Kee's study on Mark 11-16 but fails to mention Kee's support for a primarily Daniellic influence; indeed, this alternative is not discussed. Nevertheless, Schneck's work is welcome since at the least he shows not only that Isaiah is of considerable importance for Mark, but also provides good evidence to suggest that Mark was aware of the OT context.

III. Analysis

Numerous studies on Mark's use of the OT have examined his technique (Suhl, Kee, Vorster, Schneck), his view of the Law (Schulz, Hooker), the impact of OT *Heilsgeschichte* (Farrer, Piper, Hobbs, Swartley, Derrett, Roth), the influence of Jewish/Christian religious observance (Carrington, Bowman, Goulder), and his attitude to fulfilment (Suhl, Anderson, Kee, Vorster, Schneck). Several features emerge.

In terms of technique, Mark tends to conflate OT references and to place them at critical points in his argument (Kee). He not only avoids editorial interjections, but has the great majority of OT quotations in the mouth of Jesus. Longer quotations are not infrequently suspended in mid-sentence (Vorster). Mark also prefers certain categories of texts for particular concerns: the Torah when he re-defines the Law (Kee, Hooker), Isaiah and Zechariah with regard to the re-definition of God's new people, and Daniel and Isaiah when re-defining redemption (Kee).

Mark's view of Jesus' relationship to the OT Law is not of major concern in this book, except to note that Mark's Jesus judges his critics by its standards, and yet decisively re-evaluates it in the light of his own person and mission (Hooker). It may not surprise us then if Mark's understanding of the OT reflects a similar approach.

---

[21] See Chapter 2, 54f.

A number of scholars observed the influence of Israel's *Heilsgeschichte* on Mark, notably the Exodus, suggesting that he intends to present the message and person of Jesus in such terms. In a number of cases there is good evidence that this is so. However, the scholars reviewed have been more successful in demonstrating this influence on individual sections than on the theology and literary structure of the Gospel as a whole. Further, there has often been little effort to integrate Mark's explicit uses of OT texts with the various structures proposed (Swartley is a part-exception). On balance, no suggestion along these lines has been satisfactory, lectionary and new *haggadah* hypotheses even less so.

In view of both the teleological aspect of the prophets and Mark's considerable interest in them (especially Isaiah) it is likely that he has fulfilment in mind (Kee, Hooker, Schneck; *pace* Suhl, Anderson, Vorster). Arguments to the contrary tend either to judge Mark in terms of Matthew or appear to suffer from a predisposed point of view. It seems Mark, at least in the case of Isaiah, uses OT texts to allude to their original contexts with the aim of illuminating his own narrative (Schneck).

Given the sometimes overly complex, contrived, and/or selective nature of the analyses surveyed, D. E. Nineham's early scepticism as to the existence of any 'single and entirely coherent masterplan' for Mark might appear justified.[22] Similar reservations are expressed by Martin who approvingly cites J. M. Robinson's critique of such approaches in that their 'argument is not built upon what Mark clearly and repeatedly has to say, but upon inferences as to the basis of the Marcan order, a subject upon which Mark is silent'.[23]

Robinson has put his finger on an important matter: does Mark really remain silent as to his order? It is generally agreed that certain sections of the Gospel betray conscious structuring, for example, the 'Way' section. But if here, why not elsewhere? And why, for instance, do nearly all the miracles occur only in the first eight chapters? The difficulty with the scepticism expressed by Nineham and others is that it is based on negative evidence. A critique of the models offered to date does not provide grounds for denying the possibility that Mark may have had an outline in mind. All that can be said is that these models do not adequately describe the data. Is there a way forward? This book suggests that there is. And it is to be found in terms of the relationship between a community's founding moment and ideology's role in maintaining social cohesion.

---

[22] *Mark*, 29; citing Cadbury, *Making*, 80, who asserts that there 'is scarcely any thorough-going theological theory that permeates the whole narrative'.

[23] *Evangelist*, 91; and *History*, 12.

Chapter 2: History as Hermeneutic: Ideology and Community Self-Understanding

Inherent in ideology's social function is the mediation of the ideals and energies of a group's founding moment. This provides an interpretative schema by which the group defines and understands itself. To the extent that various texts and motifs become associated with elements of this interpretative schema, their use in a given literary context serves to invoke elements of that schema and thereby provides an implicit hermeneutical framework. Mark's use of OT texts may function this way.

I. Introduction

In his ground-breaking book on Jesus' parables, Kenneth Bailey stresses the importance of common tacit knowledge in the interaction between Jesus and his audience. By way of illustration, he explains that when an Englishman relates the tale of King Arthur and Camelot to his countrymen, everyone knows exactly how the characters are expected to act. For example, knights obey the king, carry out daring quests, and rescue damsels in distress. Likewise, castles, dark forests, and so on, are never explained but are simply assumed as familiar images. This pool of shared expectations and stock figures constitutes the 'grand piano' upon which the English story teller deftly plays.

> Imagine then an Englishman telling the same story about Sir Lancelot to Alaskan Eskimos. Obviously the music of the "grand piano" will not be heard because the piano is in the minds of the English listeners who share a common culture and history with the story teller. In the case of the parables of Jesus, *we are the Eskimos.*[1]

Bailey's thesis is that in order to appreciate fully the point of Jesus' parables we too must enter into their world of shared expectations where everyone knows how a rich man ought to behave, how the Samaritans are beneath contempt, and how seasonal pressures weigh heavily upon a day labourer seeking work in an agrarian society. Only then will we be in a position to identify those 'points of reference'—usually stereotypical characters and situations—which aroused in the original hearers the particular

---

[1] *Through*, xiv.

expectations, generated and conditioned by the daily interplay of social roles and mores, upon which the point of the story turns. It is these unstated but universally known expectations, Bailey argues, that the parables presuppose and against which they are told such that their 'main points, climaxes, bits of humor (*sic*), and irony are all heightened by "variations on a theme," that is, by changing, reinforcing, rejecting, intensifying, etc., the known pattern of attitude and behaviour.'[2]

The aim of this Chapter is to suggest that a similar approach may explain aspects of Mark's use of OT texts and images. Perhaps they too function as keys on a larger 'grand piano' so that Mark's 'main points, climaxes ... and irony' are also 'heightened ... by changing, reinforcing, rejecting, intensifying, etc., the known pattern' not, however, of social 'attitude and behaviour', but of a similarly assumed pattern of OT interpretation and expectation.[3]

As briefly stated in the 'Introduction', it was while studying at a North American Seminary that I experienced how this might work. During a lecture one of my American professors underlined his point with a brief statement which included the phrase 'four score and seven years ago'. The class responded to this as one, whereas I failed to see the relevance of this additional and archaically phrased comment. Over morning coffee, I asked what had happened eighty-seven years ago, and was met with blank puzzlement. This surprised me. Further discussion was just as unhelpful until the phrase was retranslated back into the original. Immediately a

---

[2] *Ibid.* See also Baxandall, *Painting*, where he argues that the 15th C. Italian painters presupposed their contemporaries' sensitivity to the influence of significant social trends such as the moralism of religious preaching, the pageantry of social dancing, the shrewdness of commercial gauging, and the renewal of interest in the grandeur of Latin oratory that were characteristic of their time. Thus Baxandall sees in Giovanni Bellinni's work an example of the 'interaction between the painting and the visualising activity of the public mind—a public mind with different furniture and dispositions from ours', 48. It is this 'public mind' that provided the true medium for the painter, i.e. the capacity of the audience to see meaning in his work. On the congruence between literature and art in this respect see Ricoeur, 'Function'.

[3] In its concern with the way in which texts and images functioned in invoking elements of a generalised first century Jewish world-view, this study complements both Burridge's account of the Gospels, *What?*, as belonging to the Græco-Roman genre, βίοι, and the work of others who are concerned with the readers' (hearers') education and literary knowledge, cf. e.g. Bilezikian, *Liberated*; Beavis, *Audience*; and Tolbert, *Sowing*. For a more comprehensive delineation of the basic world-view in question also from within a narrative framework, see now Wright, *People*.

chorus of recognition informed me that this was the first line of Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg address.

Speaking at the dedication of the national cemetery honouring the site of arguably the greatest battle in the American Civil War, Lincoln, in this time of great crisis, reminded his hearers of the ideals upon which the nation was founded. It was fidelity to these ideals, Lincoln suggested, that not only justified the North's commitment to its present course of action, and thereby sanctified the deaths of these thousands of her men, but also summoned her to even greater efforts. Only in so doing could the North lay true claim to the heritage of Washington, Jefferson, and others. Here then, in spite of employing a mere ten sentences scribbled out during the train ride to the site, Lincoln managed in a most extraordinary way to encompass the sweep of American self-understanding and to capture the nation's sense of destiny. This, I discovered, was what 'four score and seven ...' really meant in that lecture room setting.

Several points should be noted. Obviously the part-citation refers to the first line of a famous address. But it clearly does much more. The phrase is a pointer not merely to the text of Lincoln's speech but instead to the 'history' which that speech both assumes and interprets. And this 'history' is not merely the immediate event of Gettysburg or even the Civil War, but instead the setting of these events within the broader compass of U.S. 'history' as a whole. Furthermore, this broader setting is predicated on those founding events to which Lincoln himself alludes.

Even more importantly, this 'history' is not the 'objective', detailed, even quiescent version of the academic élite, but rather a popularist, highly processed and digested, yet pungent and persuasive 'history', cast in terms of the parameters set by the Founding Fathers mythology.[4] That is, although the text is a part-citation, its primary function is to allude to and therefore to invoke, a powerful hermeneutical framework originating with the Founding Fathers, namely, the ideologically shaped popular recounting of the 'essence' of U.S. history. In this sense the part-citation functions very much like the 'point of reference' in a parable.

---

[4] Throughout this Chapter 'myth' is used not to imply falsity or deception, but rather that which in attempting to draw out as fully as possible the significance of an event tends toward the heroic and poetic.

The procedure is almost unconscious. Again, as in the case of Bailey's account of the parables, it seemingly requires no great mental effort on the part of informed listeners to make the necessary connection—it simply strikes the right chord on the hearer's mental 'grand piano'. The point being, however, that the whole process presupposes a tutored audience whom it is simply assumed will make the right connections; the untutored (such as this Australian) occupying the place τοῦ ἰδιώτου.

Only the barest minimum of 'text' was supplied. The extent of the allusion/citation is determined primarily by the need to ensure that the correct connection is made—with perhaps some consideration for good style. Since in this case it is a part-citation, style is already fixed, but the archaic character of the expression naturally aids identification. In spite of its apparently fragmentary form, these few words are perfectly adequate to the task.

This particular instance serves to illustrate the way in which the true significance of a brief and even fragmentary citation may go far beyond what might otherwise appear to be the case. Although to the untutored the citation might seem of little importance, the fact remains that to trained hearers it has considerable allusive power and thereby serves to invoke a comprehensive hermeneutical framework.

The following analogy may help to explain the mechanics of the process. Suppose a given history is represented by a journey taken through an expanse of land. There are certain features: hills, valleys, grassy plains, unusual bluffs, small trees, large forests, rivers, mountains, deserts, and so on, which represent concrete events. Attempting to comprehend this history corresponds to mapping the journey, and just as all maps have to be selective as to which features are to be included, so too a given history must also make judgements as to which events are significant (crossing a lake) and which are not (stepping over a puddle). Completing the analogy, imagine a grid system overlayed on the map which enables easy reference to its various parts, and allow that this grid system represents various texts describing or interacting with those events.

Now neither the map nor the grid system are real in the sense that the events they 'map' are real. The grid reference ('four score and seven') is simply a shorthand way of using the grid system (here including Lincoln's address) to refer to the map (the schematised version of significant events)

that is designed to make sense of the journey through the landscape (the course of the myriad events themselves). The point here is that neither the citations/allusions nor the texts they point to exist alone. They find their meaning within the larger interpretation of that on-going history which the texts themselves presuppose and with which they interact.

Returning to Mark, I suggest that his 'grand piano' is a schematised interpretive 'map' of Israel's 'history' and that his OT part-citations or allusions may function as 'grid references' to that map which gives expression and order to Israel's interpretation of her history, namely the OT. In other words, it may well be that Mark uses some of his OT texts in much the same way as Lincoln or my Professor used their 'points of reference'; that is, to indicate to his hearers/readers what particular aspect of their common tacit understanding he has in mind. This, of course, raises the same problem Bailey refers to: how are we, as 'Eskimos' listening to Mark's 'Camelot', to uncover the nature and content of this tacit knowledge? How might it be structured, and what is its basis?

The first question will be addressed throughout the following several Chapters as we seek to ascertain the significance of particular OT texts within Israel's larger historical self-understanding. The second question occupies the remainder of this Chapter, which is an attempt to lay out in a summary manner how social theory[5] may go some way toward providing a theoretical explanation of this process.[6] The first section (*The Social Function of Ideology*) outlines the way in which, according to Jacques Ellul and Paul Ricoeur, ideology facilitates social cohesion. This is effected particularly through ideology's *revivification* of the group's founding moment such that it becomes A) the shared and almost unconscious basis of the group's self-definition and B) its interpretative framework for understanding the world.[7] In order to do this, however, the group's ideology must be inculcated from birth. This requires that it be accessible

[5] For sage warnings on the dangers of positivism, reductionism, relativism, and determinism inherent in the uncritical use of social science models, see Herion's remarks in 'Reconstruction'.

[6] Dodd's discussion, *According*, refers to the shared *Weltanschauung* of OT and NT authors but does not go beyond a surface probing of the matter; see below.

[7] To speak blandly of a community's 'ideology', as if it were one homogenous and indivisible whole, clearly does not do justice to the more complex, variegated, and amorphous nature of the reality. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this exercise it seems justifiable to treat as a unit those major constructs about which the group would be in broad agreement.

to all members of the group. Consequently, ideology's re-telling must be *schematised* into digestible 'slogans'. The media of this schema are the *icon* and the *symbol* which, by means of *iconic augmentation*, serve as shorthand references to ideology's larger interpretive framework.

The second section (*Ideology and Crisis*) examines what transpires when a community's present experience contradicts the future projected by its ideology. Given the importance of maintaining the link with the founding moment, and therefore the community's heritage, one approach is to *re-present* the prevailing ideology whereby previously unconnected 'icons' are juxtaposed so as to explain the unexpected present. However, the new ways of seeing reality engendered by these juxtapositions may be rejected by members of the community if they exceed its *doxic threshold.* This may lead to a debate over who are the heirs of the community's traditions which is then carried out in terms of fidelity to the mores of the community's founding moment. The Chapter concludes with an outline of how this model might explain aspects of Mark's use of the OT.

II. The Social Function of Ideology

a) Ideology: A Provisional Definition

The issues involved in the continuing debate surrounding the definition of 'ideology'[8] and its relationship to 'myth' and 'utopian thought' are

[8] The term, generally believed to have been coined by Destutt de Tracy in 1796 to refer to a science of ideas that would allow the reconstruction of society on a rational basis, was soon used pejoratively to describe 'a naive logical construct, notable for its abstract neatness but lacking a genuine understanding of the complex givens of human nature and of historical reality', Bluhm, *Ideologies*, 2, before being denounced by Marx as a destructive falsehood. Some relevant areas of debate include: A) is ideology inherently negative as most assume or is there a positive or at least neutral role as per e.g. Geertz, 'Cultural'; Ellul, 'médiateur'; Ricoeur, 'Science'? B) does it properly beset only those classes wishing to legitimate their domination of others, e.g, Engels, *Anti-Dühring*; Arendt, *Origins*; or does it have wider application to any system of action oriented beliefs, e.g. Seliger, *Ideology*, or is it inseparable from all human consciousness e.g. Mannheim, *Ideology*; Geertz, 'Cultural'; Manning in O'Sullivan, *Structure*, ix? C) is the concept applicable only to post-Enlightenment societies, e.g. Habermas, *Towards*, 99; Mullins, 'Ideology'; or to pre-modern societies (including ancient Israel) as well, e.g. Meszaros, *Philosophy*, xi; to some extent Geertz, 'Cultural'; and note the ambiguity in Boudon, *Analysis*, 11, 33, 201; J. Thompson, *Surveys*; K. Thompson (ed.), *Beliefs*, 24; MacIntyre, *Against*, 5ff; Coole, 'Phenomenology', 136f? Interestingly, few biblical scholars who use the term seem aware of these aspects of the debate. It has also been suggested that due to these and other difficulties the substantive 'ideology' be abandoned and its critical component—namely the distorting or